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ABSTRACT

Every community cares deeply about its past. In many literate communities, this historical consciousness manifests itself not only as disparate oral traditions but also as local historiography. The ubiquity of the form is astonishing: whether the focalizer is polis or urbs, state or nation, county or parish, local history abounds. This is a study of the phenomenon of local historiography in Classical and Hellenistic Greece. I have three primary aims: first, to emphasize the preponderance of the local as a historiographical mode in ancient Greece and indeed also in countless communities outside of Greece, in the ancient and in the modern period; second, to illuminate the great variety of Greek local historiography, a point that must be reiterated inasmuch as modern scholarship tends to approach all Greek local histories synecdochally by way of the Athenian model, Attidography; last, to explore the relationship in the ancient Greek world between community identity and local historiography. The idiosyncratic character of an individual community, I argue, influenced the way it articulated its past and, consequently, the way its historians shaped their narratives.

This study consists of three parts. Part I explains the key concepts of community, community memory, and local historiography, surveys major examples of local historiography from the mid-fifth century BCE to the modern age, and argues that local historiography can be productively read as community autobiography. Part II addresses local historiography in Classical and Hellenistic Greece. It demonstrates first that the local was an indigenous Greek mode of historiography and then focuses on the local histories of four communities, Samos, Thessaly, Argos, and Pontic Herakleia, distinguishing variations in the sources used to construct a narrative of the past, in the organization and conceptualization of territory, and in the treatment of non-local communities. In the Conclusion, I extend this analysis to examine different articulations
of time in Greek local historiography as well as issues of audience. Native Greek local historians wrote about their communities from the perspective of an outsider communicating to other outsiders, and this peculiar authorial stance tells us something both about the nature and the origins of the form.
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INTRODUCTION

There is something so natural in enquiring into the history of those who have lived before us, and particularly of those with whom we have any connexion, either by ties of relation or place, that it is surprising anyone should be found by whom this subject is regarded with indifference. To trace the settlement and progress of our native town—to read the history of the play place of our early hours, and which has been the scene of our materer joys—to follow the steps of our fathers through the course of centuries, and mark the gradation of improvement—to learn who and what they were, from whom we are descended—and still further, to be informed of the people who were here before them, and who are now vanished like a dream of childhood; and all these in their connexions with the history of the world and of men—must certainly be objects of peculiar interest to every inquisitive mind.

Alonzo Lewis, *The History of Lynn* (1829)

He [Hellanikos] went straight to the local record, inscriptional or oral: he collected a mass of definite, authorized statements of fact; forced them into order by a through-going system of chronology; made each local history throw light on the others, and recorded his deductions in a business-like way. Unfortunately the material he was treating was unworthy of his method. The facts he collected were not facts; and the order he produced was worse than the honest chaos which preceded it.


In his 1846 address to the Vermont Historical and Antiquarian Society, James Davie Butler, Vermont native and newly appointed professor of ancient languages and English literature at Norwich University, bemoaned the apathy of Vermont historians in their failure properly to commemorate the exploits of their young state, in particular during the War of Independence. “We shall always remember two men that swam the Hellespont,” he laments, but there is “danger of forgetting a citizen of our own who swam as broad a strait at Ticonderoga, at midnight, threading his way through a hostile fleet, not for himself but for his country.” As a national event, the taking of Fort Ticonderoga is well known, Butler admits, but the New York historians who narrate the battle do so without reference to the Green Mountain Boys, “as if there had no Vermonter
raised a finger.” Accounts about the origin of the state of Vermont similarly reflect a New York perspective, with the struggle for statehood explained as if it were “merely about the price of land” rather than “a conflict between New England and New York principles—those of the Puritan and of the Patroon—between our township system, with local elections and taxes, and New York centralization.” It is high time, Butler perorates, for Vermont to gain a historiographical consciousness. “Scholars! Can you remember that Massachusetts has published scores of volumes to illustrate her history—that Connecticut, New Hampshire, New York, and even Georgia have followed in her footsteps, and blush not that we are behind them all?” The responsibility for correcting this delinquency lies at Vermont feet: “Let us leave our history to be written by foreigners, and it will be the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet omitted.”

Butler’s diatribe serves as an appropriate entrée into ancient Greek local historiography insofar as it explicitly preserves for us what our Greek sources seldom do, namely some of the reasons why a locality, in this case a nineteenth-century American state, might be prompted to write its history. First, there is the mechanism of local pride. Vermonters, Butler insists, must amend the errors perpetrated by non-native historians about Vermont history and at the same time integrate the state’s heretofore unsung achievements into a non-local history. But Vermont’s exploits in fact belong also to an even grander historical narrative: so Butler compares the natatorial feat of one Vermonter to the prowess of Byron and Hero, while the rebel Ethan Allen outshines even Martin Luther. Such analogical augmentation of the local, we might note, is also behind the once common comparison between Vermonters at the Battle of Bennington and the

---

1 1846, passim.
2 “Luther when the Pope burned his books, burned the Pope’s bull. In what did he surpass Allen’s retorting the setting a price on his head by New York, with setting the price on the head of a New York dignitary?” (1846, 18).
Spartans at Thermopylae, and the device is widely embraced in the local historiography of many communities from nearly every age—think of Cato the Elder’s similar use of Thermopylae as a comparandum in his description of a Roman tribune’s heroic last stand during the First Punic War.

Second, Butler points to community competition as a potential prompt for local historiography. What really raises his hackles is less the absence of Vermont historiography in and of itself than its deficiencies relative to other states. We may observe a similar anxiety in the spate of English county histories written in the wake of William Lambarde’s *A Perambulation of Kent* (1576). Lambarde’s path-breaking work led many men, as John Stow said in the 1603 edition of *A Survey of London*, “to do somewhat for the particular Shires or Counties where they were borne or dwelt”: Sir William Dugdale published his *Antiquities of Warwickshire* in 1656, Dr. Robert Thoroton his *Antiquities of Nottinghamshire* in 1677, and Thomas Denton his *Perambulation of Cumberland* in 1687-88. Such relational chauvinism also evidently incited the Florentine writer, Giovanni Villani, to begin his comprehensive history of Florence; it was on a visit to Rome during the Jubilee of 1300 that Villani first felt compelled to do for his city what “Vergil, Sallust, Lucan, Livy, Valerius, and Paulus Orosius” had done for Rome, namely to record the history of Florence from its origins and early history up to the present day (8.36).

Butler’s oration, of course, does not encompass all possible stimuli to the writing of local history. He understandably makes no reference to romantic yearnings for a bygone age, which sometimes play a part in communities with a more inveterate history; such an interest in cultural heritage can be seen today in the locally produced guidebooks

---

3 Note the remarks of New Hampshire Governor B.F. Prescott at a ceremony marking the laying of the cornerstone of the Bennington Battle Monument on August 16, 1887 (1887, 8); E.J. Phelps at the dedication of the Bennington Battle Monument on August 19, 1891 (1892, 84); and F.B. Jennings’s speech to the Bennington Battle Monuments and Historical Association (1897, 225).

4 Cato, *Orig.* 4.7a (Chassignet = F83 Peter, *ap.* Gell.3.7.19).
available in tourist bureaus of many American and European towns, and it can explain the ease with which the periegetic Pausanias gathered information about Greek poleis under Roman rule. Butler also has little interest in discussing more personal factors: William Burton was perhaps motivated to write his Description of Leicestershire (1622) less by Lambarde’s Kentish prototype than by the popularity of Anatomy of Melancholy, the monumental work of antiquarian erudition recently published by his younger brother, Robert, and Matteo Villani became a local historian of Florence first and foremost because he took it upon himself to finish the work begun by his brother, just as his son, Filippo, must have felt obliged to enter the family trade. So too can one member of a community write a local history in reaction to that composed by a predecessor or by a contemporary rival. The Rev. Thomas Prince wrote his Chronology of New-England in part as a reaction to Daniel Neal’s History of New England published some eight years before, which was, he thought, rife with errors of fact and, more importantly, had been written by an Englishman who had never set foot in the New World. And Leonardo Bruni published his Historiae Florentini Populi (1442) almost as a corrective to the Nuova Cronica of the family Villani, advancing a completely novel account of the origins of Florence.

But one additional motivator of local historiography to which Butler does call especial attention is a community’s awareness of and curiosity about its own past. “What is of more interest,” he asks, “than a town history—to each man that of his own town? No where in Europe did I seek without finding one. How long shall we desire such histories in vain?” So it is understandable that Butler was disturbed by Vermonters’ apparent indifference to their own past; how can it be, he asked, that the trophies from the Battle of Bennington are displayed at the Senate Chamber not of Vermont but of

---

Massachusetts, that “the papers of our first and most memorable Governor were sold to a pedlar with paper rags”? When he calls on Vermonters to embrace their past, we should note, Butler does not merely mean the noble achievements of their fathers, the exploits through which Vermont history could become relevant to the larger world. Vermont local history must encompass the “characteristic minutiae” and “trifling particulars” of everyday life, lest it be but a “vapid steam” of abstractions.

Butler would find his efforts rewarded. In the second half of the nineteenth century the inherent interest of a community in itself, coupled with the general growth of literacy in the middle class, made local historiography increasingly appealing and accessible to the non-professional historian. The form would further proliferate in the face of the American Centennial, which coincided with the Reconstruction and a crises of identity brought on by a new wave of immigration. Yet the popularity of local historiography is certainly not unique to nineteenth-century America. Just over a century after Butler exhorted his fellow countrymen, the first Chair of the Department of English Local History at Leicester University, W.G. Hoskins, was able to conjure, without apparent irony, the following scene: “Each year as the evenings grow longer and darker, some few thousands of men and women, even a few schoolboys here and there, feel the renewed impulse to turn inwards after the outward activity of the spring and summer. They take out once more their notes on the history of their own parish or village, less often their town (for this is a large undertaking), to browse over again, to add a detail here and there, and to wonder how to go on, where to look next for more material, and how to find the answers to questions that have been bothering them winter after winter.”

The winter notes that Hoskins’ English schoolboy jots down in the late 1950’s about the history of his parish are, of course, a far cry from the history of Athens written

---

8 C. Kammen 1986, 18-19.
9 W.G. Hoskins 1959, 4.
by a prominent Athenian politician in the mid-fourth century BCE, just as a history of octogenarian Vermont reads somewhat differently from Villani’s chronicle of Florence. It is certainly not the case that all local historiography is by nature the same or that we can rely only on extant modern local histories to help us fill in the fragmentary histories of ancient Greece. Indeed, local history in England has undergone major changes in the twentieth century alone, when partly under the influence of the Annales school local historians such as Hoskins began to look beneath the pedigreed landowning class as a means of uncovering the true local community. Nevertheless, every community cares deeply about its past; and in literate communities, English villages, American states, and Greek poleis, this historical consciousness manifests itself not only as disparate local traditions but also as local historiography. The persistence of the form is astonishing: whether the focalizer is polis or urbs, monastery or parish, local history thrives. And the discourse in which post-Classical local historians (like Giovanni Villani or James Davie Butler) participate can shed some light on ancient practices and concerns, for which our evidence is so tenuous. It will be instructive to keep Butler’s oration in mind, for example, when we encounter Felix Jacoby’s influential formulation about the origin of local historiography in the Greek world: “It is much less the absence of a political life of their own,” he writes, “or a romantic absorption in a greater past . . . that leads writers to the Local Chronicle in the fifth century, than just this upspringing historical interest and the wish to secure for their native town a place in the Great History of the Greek people . . . . These writers did not find enough details about their native town in the great historians, or they found wrong statements or even unfavourable opinions; the local chronicle was compiled to redress this grievance.”

---

11 1949, 289 n.211.
And when we read the critiques of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Thuc. 5, 35*) and his older contemporary, Cicero, of the style of local historiography—local historians, says Cicero, had no interest in generating engaging prose, believing brevity to be the only virtue of writing (*De orat. 2 53*)—it may be comforting to realize that local historians still today are commonly denounced for their insipid prose. H.P.R. Finberg, Hoskins’ successor as head of the Department of English Local History at Leicester, thus humorously describes the typical local historian’s approach to writing: “No need to shape his narrative, to give it a beginning, a middle, and an end; no need to enliven it with graphic touches, to season it from time to time with the salt of irony, to work on the imagination and sympathies of the audience. He can go straight ahead, spilling the contents of his notebooks pell-mell over the page, never pausing to ask himself whether he is becoming a bore.”

This consistency of criticism reassures us because, while the popularity of the form ensures a modicum of mediocrity, there are today many local histories that are well written, enlightening, and even engaging. And when we are in the fortunate position of glimpsing what seem to be verbatim quotations from ancient Greek local histories, we very rarely concur with the judgment of Cicero and Dionysius: Nymphis’s history of Pontic Herakleia, for example, included a scintillating and finely wrought description of the acupuncture required by the fat tyrant of Herakleia, Dionysius (*FGrHist 432 F10*), and Philokhoros’s description of Philip’s maneuverings in Greece before the Battle of Chaironeia contains at least as much hypotaxis as a Demosthenic oration (*FGrHist 328 FF55-56*). Timaios, who wrote a history of Sicily for which he was roundly rebuked (*FGrHist 566 TT11, 17-19*), was never charged with monotony (T20), and there is no reason to assume that Douris approached his history of Samos (*FGrHist 76 FF22-26*) with any less fervor and flourish than he wrote his *Hellenika* (F1). Polybius, in fact, criticizes Zenon, who wrote up the history of his native Rhodes, first and foremost

---

12 H.P.R. Finberg and V.H.T. Skipp 1967, 73.
because his extravagant writing style apparently took precedence over *ta pragmata* themselves (FGrHist 523 F6).

This study consists of three parts. Part I, “Community and Community Autobiography,” will explore several of the concepts on which our argument depends (namely community, memory, and local history) and will outline the pervasiveness and persistence of the local as a historiographical mode from the ancient world to the modern. After surveying some post-Classical examples of local historiography, we shall consider the prerequisites for the production of community autobiography and conclude by offering an interpretation of local historiography as community autobiography. In Part II, we turn to the fragments of ancient Greek histories themselves. After establishing that the local was an indigenous form of historiography in ancient Greece, we survey the post-Classical reception of ancient Greek local historiography, focusing on the testimony of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the influential interpretation of Felix Jacoby. Next, we examine the evidence from four localities: Samos, Thessaly, Argos, and Pontic Herakleia (*i.e.* an island, a mainland region, and two *poleis*, one of which is a colony). Each test case begins with a historical précis, outlines the major local historians and their works, and then highlights a distinctive feature of that community’s unique brand of local historiography, thereby demonstrating that individual Greek communities engendered idiosyncratic representations of the past. In the Conclusion, I summarize my arguments and suggest ways that my approach can be extended. I look first at the various chronological shapes employed by local histories and then at the ideation of audience. The particular stance of a native Greek local historian in relation to both his own community and to his implied audience, we shall see, sheds some light on the genesis of local historiography in Greece.
PART I: COMMUNITY AND COMMUNITY AUTOBIOGRAPHY

1.1 COMMUNITY

Communities . . . have a history—in an important sense they are constituted by their past—and for this reason we can speak of a real community as a “community of memory,” one that does not forget its past. In order not to forget that past, a community is involved in retelling its story, its constitutive narrative, and in so doing, it offers examples of the men and women who have embodied and exemplified the meaning of the community. These stories of collective history and exemplary individuals are an important part of the tradition that is so central to a community of memory.

Robert N. Bellah et al., Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life (1985)

1.1.1 COMMUNITY AND LOCALITY

Francis Drake perhaps meant to point out the obvious when he claimed in his history of York (1736) that a local history is at base “the history of any particular place.” Yet Drake’s Eboracum, despite his prefatory remark, is no topography. To survey a tract of land over time, this is the business of a geographer or environmental historian. The concern of a local historian, rather, as Drake’s history itself attests, is a locality of a particular kind: an occupied locality, a territory. A local historian, as H.P.R. Finberg famously concluded in his inaugural lecture as head of the Local History Department at Leicester University, seeks “to re-enact in his own mind, and to portray for his readers the Origin, Growth, Decline, and Fall of a local community” (1952). We may well take

---

1 1985, 153.
2 From the Preface of his Eboracum: or the History and Antiquities of the City of York From its Original to the Present Times, Together with the History of the Cathedral Church, and the Lives of the Archbishops of the See, From the first Introduction of Christianity into the Northern Parts of this Island, to the present State and Condition of that Magnificent Fabrick (1736).
3 1952, 1. See also the comments of the contemporary historian of American local historiography, C. Kammen, viz., that local history is “the study of past events, or of people or groups, in a given geographic area” (2003, 4).
issue with Finberg’s teleology and implicit pessimism, but we would be hard pressed to contest his emphasis on community as the determinant of local history. Before we address the phenomenon of local historiography, then, it will be necessary to explore this concept of community.

Definitions of community are notoriously manifold. Etymology reveals a core concept, viz. collectivity and association (a notion also at the heart of the Greek equivalent, ἡ συνοικία), but debate about the meaning of the term has nevertheless been one of the lynchpins of modern sociological discourse. While we can of course speak of communities of belief or interest or language, and while, as Aristotle long ago realized, the bonds of community are often intangible and amorphous, the communities to which Finberg refers as actuating local historiography and those at the heart of this study are corporeal and cohabitational, with association a product of collective living. Because such groups very often organize themselves with a view toward self-governance, they may in many cases be considered political.

Early sociologists, seeking to substantiate a developmental model for the mechanisms through which such cohabitational communities derived solidarity and unity, frequently recognized a transition from a biological to territorial basis. In Ancient Law (1861), Henry Sumner Maine described a progression from what he called “status” communities of kinship to “contract” communities of law, and he emphasized in these

---

5 *Cum + munus* (duty, obligation, task). As M. Weber put it, “‘Vergemeinschaftung’ soll eine soziale Beziehung heißen, wenn und soweit die Einstellung des sozialen Handelns – im Einzelfall oder im Durchschnitt oder im reinen Typus—auf subjektiv gefühlter (affektueller oder traditionaler) Zusammengehörigkeit der Beteiligten beruht” (1972, Vol. 1, Sect. 1.9).
7 So N. Rose defines community as “a moral field binding people into durable relations” and as “a space of emotional relationships through which individual identities are constructed” (1999, 172).
8 As the American historian C.M. Green wrote in her essay, “The Value of Local History,” “Demarcation by political jurisdiction can be regarded as an accident growing out of a fundamental geographic and economic unity, although it is true that political administrative unity, once established, tends to exert an enduring cohesive influence which affects cultural evolutions” (1940, 275-276).
post-kinship groups “the principle of local contiguity.” The importance of land tenure was reiterated by Fustel de Coulanges (1864), for whom right to property was a hallmark of early society; and in his Ancient Society (1877), the American Lewis H. Morgan forwarded a similar evolution from societas, “founded upon persons” and based on kinship, to civitas, founded upon territory and property. Civilization, Morgan claimed, meant a political society “organized upon territorial areas” and in stages of integration: “the township or ward, which is the unit of organization; the county or province, which is an aggregation of townships or wards; and the national domain or territory, which is an aggregation of counties or provinces.” Soon afterwards, Ferdinand Tönnies (1887) identified three types of community (Gemeinschaft): of kinship, of locality, and of mind, with “the truly human and supreme form” being a conjunction of the three orders; and a similar typology is evident also behind the analyses of Emile Durkheim and Max Weber. “The neighborhood,” Weber wrote, “is the natural basis of the local community (Gemeinde),” with the goal of the political community (politischer Gemeinschaft), being the subordination “to orderly domination by the participants a ‘territory’ (ein Gebiet) and the conduct of the persons within it, through readiness to resort to physical force, including normally force of arms. The territory,” Weber concludes, “must at any time be in some way determinable, but it need not be constant or definitely limited.”

Territory has continued to play an important role in community studies, underpinning much of the discourse of the so-called Chicago School in the first half of the twentieth century. According to Robert Redfield (1941), for example, societies are communities when “they are made up of individuals occupying a common territory,

---

9 1984, 63.
11 Durkheim’s continuum of social groups moves from hordes through clans to territory-based populations and cities (1984, 126-136).
12 1978, 363.
13 1978, 901.
possessing a habitat”; and George A. Hillery Jr.’s ideal of “the Vill” stipulated that the “system integrated by means of families and cooperation” be “located in only one place outside of which the system has no identity.” But sociologists began concurrently to propose other ideas about the roots of group cohesion. By 1915, C.J. Galpin had discarded territory as a means of analysis for cohabitational communities; in his study of rural Wisconsin communal nodes, he concluded that “the trade zone about one of these rather complete agricultural civic centers forms the boundary of an actual, if not legal, community, within which the apparent entanglement of human life is resolved into a fairly unitary system of interrelatedness.” The “cultural turn” of the late 1960s further de-emphasized the territorial dimension of cohesion in cohabitational communities. Frederik Barth (1969), for example, posited that the boundaries by which ethnic groups are defined are social and need not correspond to land; Benedict Anderson (1983), although nominally addressing nations, popularized the notion of “imagined communities”; and Anthony P. Cohen (1985) drew attention to the “symbolic construction of community,” whereby “the quintessential referent of community is that its members make, or believe they make, a similar sense of things either generally or with respect to specific and significant interest, and, further, that they think that that sense may differ from one made elsewhere.”

Groups of people who live collectively and are not (or not wholly and primarily) related by blood do, as we shall see, derive solidarity from a variety of symbolic and imagined means, such as appeals to collective praxis and dogma. But cohabitational communities are very frequently rooted in space. As such, they predicate unity not only on shared behavior and belief but also on a notion of shared territory. It is perhaps a

14 1941, 15.  
15 1968, 65.  
16 1915, 18.  
17 1969, 15.  
18 1985, 16.
tautology, but one that nevertheless bears repeating, that our best evidence for the primary role of territory in the formation of a group identity is the fact that when a cohabitational community writes its history, this rarely manifests itself as pure ethnography (i.e. the history of a people) but almost always as local historiography: local communities focalize their history through their territory.

1.1.2 Community and Society.

The term “community” is generally applied to positive social relationships, where membership is voluntary and beneficial. Although “society” was once used synonymously, developments stemming from the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution led many early sociologists to reserve the term for those broader abstract associations thought to have been introduced by the modern world. All the while, “community” maintained its almost utopian connotations. The dichotomy between community and society was most famously formulated by Tönnies, who distinguished a “real” and organic Gemeinschaft from the “mechanical” and constructed Gesellschaft (1887). For Tönnies, Gemeinschaft arose from human action reacting to Wessenwille (natural will), Gesellschaft from action reacting to Kürwille (rational will). “All kinds of co-existence that are familiar, comfortable and exclusive,” he argued, “are to be understood as belonging to Gemeinschaft. Gesellschaft means life in the public sphere, in the outside world. In Gemeinschaft we are united from the moment of our birth with

---

1 As R. Williams has said of “community,” “unlike all other terms of social organization (state, nation, society, etc.) it seems never to be used unfavourably, and never to be given any positive opposing or distinguishing term” (1976, 23).
2 See R. Williams 1976, 75.
4 1887, 1. We should note that versions of this dichotomy had pre-existed Tönnies: F.W. Hegel, for example, contrasted the family with bürgerliche gesellschaft; and O. von Gierke distinguished medieval society from the modern nation state, Genossenschaft from Herrschaft.
or own folk for better or for worse. We go out into *Gesellschaft* as if into a foreign land.\(^5\)

A similar divide, although with the foil provided not by “society” but rather by the “state,” was already very much at the heart of Alexis de Tocqueville’s analysis of New-England politics (1835). “The *commune*,” he wrote, “is the sole association that is so much in nature that everywhere men are gathered, a *commune* forms by itself. *La société communale* therefore exists among all peoples, whatever their usages and their laws may be; it is man who makes kingdoms and creates republics; the *commune* appears to issue directly from the hands of God.”\(^6\) De Tocqueville goes on to contrast the *commune* with *le comté*, the county, which, like the French *arrondissement*, is a *circonscription arbitraire* and “forms a body of which the different parts have no necessary ties between them and to which are attached neither affection nor memory nor *communauté* of existence.”\(^7\) The special status of community as a natural and organic association (juxtaposed to the artificial and mechanical state) has persevered. In 1917, Robert MacIver reiterated de Tocqueville’s formulation quite forcefully in his attack on the so-called “neo-Hegelians”: “it is quite obvious,” he said, “that the State is neither conterminous nor synonymous with community.”\(^8\) And the thought animates more recent ideals of communitarianism. The sociologist Amitai Etzioni, for example, has argued that in order to strengthen communities, “the state” must avoid usurping “activities that provide opportunities for communities to act.”\(^9\)

The notion of community as intimate, personal, and face-to-face has remained a prominent strain in community studies, notably among the members of the Chicago School, who worried about the threats on social groups posed by modern urban life.

\(^5\) Translation J. Harris and M. Hollis (2001, 18).
\(^6\) Translation (adapted) from H.C. Mansfield and D. Winthrop (2000, 57).
\(^7\) 2000, 66.
\(^8\) 1917, 29.
\(^9\) 1996, 148-149.
Robert Redfield touted the “folk society” and the “folk village,” which he argued were marked, in contradistinction to urban societies, by “cultural homogeneity; organization of the conventional understanding into a ‘single web of interrelated meanings’; adjustment to the local environment; relative importance of familial institutions; relative importance of sacred sanctions as compared with secular; development of ritual expression of belief and attitude; tendency for much of the behavior of the individual to involve his familial or local group.”

Related is Redfield’s concept of the “little community”: a social group characterized by “distinctiveness, smallness, homogeneity, and all-providing self-sufficiency.”

This putative dichotomy between community and society bears on our study of local history in two fundamental and interconnected ways. First, the idea that a community is limited in size has meant that the ancient Greek community *par excellence* is the *polis*.

Larger social groups—in the case of Greece, regions like Arkadia, Thessaly, and Boiotia, or islands like Crete and Sicily—tend on the other hand to be categorized less readily as communities. They are associations, to be sure, but too expansive to engender an authentic communal consciousness. The “local” in local history, meanwhile, is often seen not as an indication of locality *per se, i.e.* as “relating to or concerned with place,” but rather as “some comparatively small district.”

Its opposite is thus frequently understood to be not the global but the state or nation, whose corresponding histories are as a consequence seldom classified as local. The fact that many post-Enlightenment works of local historiography in Europe and the United States

---

10 1941, 343.
12 Tönnies (along with other early sociologists) held up the *polis* as a prime example of *Gemeinschaft* (2001, 48-50).
14 *OED, s.v.* “local,” def. 1a.
15 *OED, s.v.* “local,” def. 2c. For the notion of localism, its implications in the ancient world, and a review of the bibliography, see T. Whitmarsh 2010, 2; with reference to modern English local historiography, see C. Phythian-Adams 1987 and 1991.
did, as we shall see, focus on “little communities” has led some scholars of the ancient world to reject the term “local history” altogether with reference to histories of Greek communities. But if we take “community” to signify, again in the words of Finberg, “a set of people occupying an area with defined territorial limits and so far united in thought and action as to feel a sense of belonging together, in contradistinction from the many outsiders who do not belong,” a state, country, or indeed a nation should satisfy this demand, and the histories that such communities engender ought themselves to be classified as local. For the purposes of this study, then, I shall use the term community to refer to a cohabitational group of any size and the term local history to refer to the history of any local community.

The second consequence of modern community theory on our study of local history is the belief that communities are not only restricted in size but also constituents of a larger whole, be this aggregate “society,” “the state,” or the “nation.” Many definitions of the nation, in fact, such as those formulated by Ernest Renan in 1882 or by Ernest Gellner a century later, emphasized the putative “anonymity of membership”; nations, Gellner asserted, comprise “a large collection of men such that its members identify with the collectivity without being acquainted with its other members, and without identifying in any important way with sub-groups of that collectivity.” Local histories are accordingly seen not simply as the “history of a place,” as Francis Drake

---

16 See P. Harding 2007.
17 1932, 32-33.
18 As C. M. Green writes in her early assessment of American local history, “Obviously ‘locality’ may be interpreted with considerable elasticity. Any community having clear geographic or cultural unity, however extensive in area, may come within the terms of any reasonable definition” (1940, 275-276). For a distinction between local and regional history in modern America, however, see J.A. Amato 2002, esp. 12-16; cf. G. Thuillier and J. Tulard 1992. The definition of nation advanced by one of the leading experts on nationalism, Anthony D. Smith, reveals how difficult it is to separate our idea of community from that a larger social groups: a nation, he says, is “a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public cultures, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members” (2000, 11). For the reading of Athens as a nation, see E.E. Cohen 2000, passim, esp. 79-103.
19 E. Gellner 1987, 6 (from an essay originally published in 1983).
would have it, but as a filter through which generalities of the nation may be localized and reduced in scale.\textsuperscript{20}

The first histories of “Greece,” composed as they were in the eighteenth century,\textsuperscript{21} and indeed most subsequent examples of the form naturally posited a correlation between on the one hand individual Greek \textit{poleis} and on the other Greece \textit{in toto}, “Greek Society,” or the “Greek nation.”\textsuperscript{22} There is no doubt that there was, at least since the archaic period, a sense of Greekness, what Herodotus called τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν (8.144.2), facilitated in part by language, in part by major sanctuaries and cult cites, nor that the Greeks occasionally had recourse to an ideology of Hellenism.\textsuperscript{23} Many Greek \textit{poleis} believed that they had once enjoyed relationships with figures (like Herakles) of importance to a plurality of communities and had participated in large-scale, pan-local events (like the Trojan War) alongside other Greek communities; some Greek communities had indeed united together against the Persians at the beginning of the fifth century. Neither these occasions of cooperation nor the mechanism of peer-polity interaction, undoubtedly an

\textsuperscript{20} See e.g. P. Goubert 1971, C. Violante 1982, and D. Ambaglio 1998, 93. Some recent studies have questioned the existence of local historiography \textit{tout court}; so, according to V. Skipp, “In the last resort, the boundaries of local history—or any other kind of history for that matter—are artificial. All history is one—like existence itself, a seamless garment” (1981, 328).

\textsuperscript{21} As A. Momigliano wrote, “There is a very elementary difference between Roman and Greek history to which perhaps not enough attention has been paid. Roman history, to the ordinary educated man, has definite limits in space and time: it has a beginning, it has an end; and it is obvious, if you speak of Roman history, that you mean the history of a well-defined territory . . . With the Greeks it was the opposite. There were no obvious limits of time and space, no proper beginning, no agreed end and no geographical boundaries” (1984, 133–34). See also K. Vlassopoulos 2007, 38-40. The \textit{Hellenika} that begin to appear around the middle of the fourth century BCE are by no means local histories; nor are they an indication of a distinct geographical area called Hellas. Polybius writes that his goal is to write about events occurring in all known parts of the world (τὰς ἐν τοῖς γνωριζομένοις μέρεις τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀναγράφειν ἐπεξεργασμένοις), and not to concentrate on τινὰς πράξεις, καθάπερ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν, οίον τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς ἢ Περσικὰς; but he is not, despite some modern translations, delineating Greece as a fixed geographical entity vis-à-vis Persia nor does he imply that \textit{Hellenika} are “national” histories. He is rather juxtaposing \textit{Hellenika} to \textit{Persika} and considering both as examples of non-“universal” historiography.

\textsuperscript{22} On the notion of Greece as a conglomeration of \textit{poleis} see W. Gawantka 1985, M.H. Hansen 1994, E.E. Cohen 2000, 9; and K. Vlassopoulos 2007, \textit{passim}.

\textsuperscript{23} See e.g. J. Hall 2002; L. Mitchell 2007; S. Goldhill 2010, esp. 48-49, and M. Scott, 2010, Ch. 9. Non-Greeks were apparently at times excluded from participation in the Olympic Games, although the evidence this is, frankly, slim: Hdt. 2.160; 5.22; 6.18-44; cf. Lysias 33.1-3.
important lens through which Greek communities viewed identity, perforce entails the existence of an all-embracing nation as opposed to a plurality of distinct communities.

There is little indication, even (and indeed especially) in the Hellenistic period, when Greek communities interacted more and more frequently with non-Greeks, that Greek communities considered themselves constituents of a larger cohabitational community, viz. a territory called “Greece.”

The correlation between e.g. seventeenth-century Warwickshire and Britain (and thus between a history of Warwickshire and one of Britain) cannot then be cleanly superimposed on ancient Greece. Nevertheless, many modern discussions of ancient Greek local historiography suggest that the histories of individual communities by necessity interacted with a larger historical tradition: “Local history” in Greece is presumed to be in constant dialogue with panhellenic Greek history, what Jacoby would call “Great historiography.”

This is a model, I shall argue, in need of adjustment.

---

24 See e.g. C. Renfrew and J. Cherry 1986 and J. Ma 2003.
25 We shall have the opportunity in our discussion of Argive local historiography to note an oracle, mentioned by the third-century Argoligrapher Deinias (FGrHist 306 F6), that compares Argos to Thrace, Sparta, Chalcis, and Megara: γαίης μὲν πάσης τὸ Πελασγια τὸ Ἀργος ἀμείνον· ὑπὸ Θρημίων, Λακεδαμώνια δὲ γυναῖκες· χαῖς ἀνδρῶν δ᾽ οὐ πίνουσιν ὕδωρ καλῆς Ἀρεθούσης· ἀλλὰ ἔτι καὶ τῶν εἰσιν ἄμεινονες, οὗ τὰ μεσημῆς· Τίρυνθος ναίοι καὶ Αρχαδῆς πολυμήλου· Ἀργεία ἐνοθόρφρικες, κέντρα πολέμων· ὑμεῖς δ᾽ ὡς Μεγαρεῖς, οὔτε τρίτοι οὔτε τέταρτοι / οὔτε δυωδέκατοι, οὔτ᾽ ἐν λόγοι οὔτ᾽ ἐν ἀρχήσι. The emphasis on distinct communities with which Argos was in competition helps us understand the Umwelt of an archaic Greek community. The oracle probably predated Deinias in some form, since Photius (Lex. 2.238) and the Souda (Υ 108) say that Ion of Chios claimed it for Aigina; see J. Fontenrose 1978, 276-277 and E. Suárez de la Torre 1995 and 2004.
27 For Jacoby on “Great Historiography”, see 1949, 118 and 184 and below, 2.1.2. As G. Shrimpton writes, “As far back as our evidence goes, the Greeks recognized two perspectives on the past, one local or regional, the other Panhellenic or universal” (1997, 27-28); see also K. Clarke 2008, 97-98, 174-179, and 183-193.
1.1.3 Community and Memory

Unlike the relationship between a mother and a child, where “mutual affection is in itself enough to maintain the bond,” as Tönnies put it in his study of Gemeinschaft (1887), associations independent of consanguinity must derive trust through other means. “All relationships based on affinity,” Tönnies maintained, are “underpinned by living together and shared habits.” This sentiment was supported by many of Tönnies’ successors. Emile Durkheim (1912) emphasized a need for societies to uphold and reaffirm “at regular intervals the collective sentiments and the collective ideas which make its unity and its personality,”¹ and his student Maurice Halbwachs identified communautés affectives as a crucial component of social solidarity.² Shared beliefs can take many forms: some pertain to the future and some to the present; but very many are bound to the past. The contribution of a putative shared past, of collective remembering (and indeed forgetting), to the formation of community, has been a mainstay of early sociological thought. It was highlighted by Fustel de Coulanges, for example, who wrote in La Cité Antique (1864) that “Il n’y avait pas de ville, si petite et obscure qu’elle fût, qui ne mît la plus grande attention à conserver le souvenir de ce qui s’était passé en elle. . . . Chaque cité avait son histoire spéciale, comme elle avait sa religion et son calendrier.”³ And Johann Gustav Droysen said in his Grundriss der Historik (1868) that, inasmuch as memories belong to man’s very essence and needs, they form, personal though they seem to be, a bond between “the souls that meet in them.” There is no human community, he argued, that lacks communal memories; each has “in ihrem Gewordensein, ihrer Geschichte das Bild ihres Seins”: a common possession (Gemeinbesitz) of its members,

¹ 1915, 427; for Durkheim’s notion of the so-called conscience commune/collective, see 1984, 65, 69-70.
² 1968, 11-15.
³ 1984, 198-199.
which makes their *Gemeinschaft* all the firmer and more intimate.\(^4\) Ernest Renan applied a similar criterion to the nation (1882), the “soul” of which, he asserted, consists on the one hand of “the possession in common of a rich legacy of memories” and on the other hand of “present-day consent, the desire to live together, the will to perpetuate the vale of the heritage that one has received in an undivided form.” For Tönnies, too, it was “shared memories,” that engendered “gratitude and loyalty,”\(^5\) while Max Weber suggested that the *Erinnerungsgemeinschaft* (“community of memory”) was even more powerful than the cultural, linguistic, or ethnic ties.\(^6\)

Shared memories and their contribution to community formation have continued to play an important role in twentieth-century sociological discourse, from Halbwachs’ seminal study of “the social frameworks” of memory (1925)\(^7\) and Bronislaw Malinowski’s psychological analysis of myth (1926), through the Structuralist anthropology of Roger Bastide (1960) and Claude Lévi-Strauss (1966), to the nationalist critiques of Eric Hobsbawm (1983)\(^8\) and Anthony D. Smith (2000) and contemporary theories of social mnemology.\(^9\) Various terms have been devised to describe a community’s shared memories. Halbwachs used “collective memory.” Others, like James Fentress and Chris Wickham, worrying about implicating “the image of a Jungian collective unconscious”\(^10\) suggested “social memory” (1992), building on a concept developed by the art historian Aby Warburg.\(^11\) Jan and Aleida Assmann, meanwhile, have called for a distinction between what they call “communicative memory,” which

---

\(^4\) 1968, 81.
\(^5\) 2001, 30.
\(^6\) 1978, 903; cf. 389 and 394 on beliefs of common ethnicity.
\(^7\) *Les Cadres Sociaux de la Mémoire* (1925); see, too, *La Mémoire Collective* (1950), and *On Collective Memory* (1980).
\(^8\) See, for example, 1983, 12: “All invented traditions,” Halbwachs wrote, “so far as possible, use history as a legitimator of action and cement of group cohesion.”
\(^10\) 1992, ix.
refers to the everyday social transmission of malleable shared memories (and in this sense overlaps to some degree with oral history), and “cultural memory,” which is “characterized by its distance from the everyday,” and consists of “fateful events of the past, whose memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication (recitation, practice, observance).”

Sometimes shared memories are the result of actual shared experience. But the authenticity of the events from which such memories are derived is immaterial, and very often it is the present that manufactures and retrojects joint action. This is essentially the position of Malinowski, for whom most myth is a “charter” by which present behavior is explained (1926), and of E.E. Evans-Pritchard (1940), for whom the “points of reference” of the Nuer “time-reckoning” system were “a projection into the past of actual relations between groups of persons.” And the notion lies also behind the “invented traditions” of E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (1983). Cultural memory requires only that memories be shared by a plurality of people, not that they be true or stem from any real event. In any case, when a community draws upon the same memory, it is not remembering precisely as an individual remembers. Even that earliest theorist of group

---

13 This is what L. Vygotsky called “natural memory,” which “is characterized by the nonmediated impression of materials, by the retention of actual experiences as the basis of mnemonic (memory) traces” (1978, 38). Natural memory is also behind Weber’s contention that “The politically unorganized tribe, as a presumed ‘blood community,’ lived from the memory that it once engaged in joint political action, typically a single conquest or defense, and then such political memories constituted the tribe” (1978, 394). “Traditions in memory,” wrote the anthropologist and historian Jan Vansina, “are only distinguished from other more recent information by the conviction that they stemmed from previous generations, just as memory itself is only distinguished from other information by the conviction that the item is remembered, not dreamt or fantasized. The convictions can on occasion be erroneous, but by and large they hold up well” (1985, 147).
14 From “Myth in Primitive Psychology” (1948), 120.
15 “It is less a means of co-ordinating events,” E.E. Evans-Pritchard wrote, “than of co-ordinating relationships, and is therefore mainly a looking backwards, since relationships must be explained in terms of the past” (1940, 108).
16 “Just as a nation cannot eat or dance,” wrote the historian Amos Funkenstein, “neither can it speak or remember. Remembering is a mental act, and therefore absolutely and completely personal” (1996, 6). This is another reason why J. Fentress and C. Wickham, among others, have avoided the term “collective memory,” lest the individual be rendered “a sort of automaton, passively obeying the interiorized collective will.”
memory, Maurice Halbwachs, recognized that while collective memory “draws strength from its base in a coherent body of people, it is individuals as group members who remember” and that while a community’s “remembrances are mutually supportive of each other and common to all, individual members still vary in the intensity with which they experience them.”

It is nevertheless important to keep in mind two qualities of community memory. First, since personal memory is itself a constructive process, a “post-hoc representation of the past” as Jeffrey Prager has said, “and not a return to the past,” the mechanisms through which a community reconstructs its past are not categorically different from those involved in an individual’s process of remembering. Second, as Halbwachs contended, an individual’s memory is conditioned by the group in which he lives: it is the group that provides the “social framework” through which an individual’s memories are mediated.

Not all individuals within a community remember the same things, of course, or, when they do, remember them in the same way. There are discrete and diverse divisions within each group that access different sets of data about the past—such “memory/mnemonic communities” may be individual neighborhoods or villages subsumed into larger political communities; opposing factions during or following stasis; distinct social classes; occupational guilds; various age groups; and either gender. Indeed, even within the same restricted memory community, memories will be recalled in

---

19 “One cannot in fact think about the events of one’s past,” Halbwachs wrote, “without discoursing upon them. But to discourse upon something means to connect within a single system of ideas our opinions as well as those of our circle. It means to perceive in what happens to us a particular application of facts concerning which social thought reminds us at every moment of the meaning and impact these facts have for it. In this way, the framework of collective memory confines and binds our most intimate remembrances to each other” (192, 53).
21 Pausanias attests to memories preserved by individual Athenian demes distinct from those of the polis as a whole (1.14.7).
vastly different ways. Yet when actuating or accessing a shared memory, community members by necessity distinguish it from personal memory. By claiming that a memory is shared, that is to say, we acknowledge the existence of a group and our membership therein; and at the same time we assert our heuristic authority over the past. A community is composed in part through competing claims of remembering these shared memories. “What is common in community,” writes David Sabean in the context of early-modern Germany, is that its members “are engaged in the same argument . . . in which alternative strategies, misunderstandings, conflicting goals and values are thrashed out.”

As Malinowski and Evans-Pritchard recognized, shared memories are not only a tactic for group cohesion; they are also a primary means through which a community negotiates and articulates an image of itself. To this extent memory functions for the group as it does for the individual. In the same way that personal memory (primarily what is called autonoetic, or episodic, memory) is, as Hume recognized, “the source of personal identity” so too do communities rely on shared memory to construct a sense of the collective self. The idea that a community reiterates those memories of its past that emphasize its idiosyncratic identity is the basis for Jan Assmann’s idea of “cultural memory,” the “cultivation” of which “serves to stabilize and convey that society’s self-image.” And it lies also behind Hans-Joachim Gehrke’s notion of “Intentional History,” viz. what “a society knows and holds for true about is past,” which directly influences its

22 1984, 29.
24 Without which “we never shou’d have any notion . . . of that chain of causes and effects, which constitute our self or person” 1739-1740, I.4, sect. 6 1:542). As T. Luckmann more recently put it, an individual is “built of the stuff of time” (1983, 69).
25 As Durkheim wrote with reference to Australian Aboriginal society, the community’s thoughts on feast days were “centered upon their common beliefs, their common traditions, the memory of their great ancestors, the collective ideal of which they are the incarnation” (1915, 349). For the parallels between individual and group memory as a means of self-identification, see D. Lowenthal 1985, 197-200.
26 It is upon this “collective knowledge, for the most part (but not exclusively) of the past,” that “each group bases its awareness of unity and particularity” (1995, 132).
“imaginaire . . . its inner coherence and ultimately its collective identity.”

By assessing a community’s shared memories, then, we can learn much about the way it thought about itself in the present.

Community memories manifest themselves in a variety of ways. Most often, they are discrete, disconnected, and episodic. Most often, moreover, they congregate in particular periods in a community’s past. According to Vansina, in fact, a community’s “historical consciousness works primarily on two registers: time of origin and recent times.” Shared memories about recent times, Vansina points out, are generally transmitted through everyday communication—they thus approximate what the Assmanns have termed “communicative memory” —and reach back only about three generations. Since the limit of oral history moves forward with the progression of the generations, Vansina has famously called the space between the two registers a “floating gap.” This vacuum between the recent past and the foundational period is observable in a good deal of the traditions retained by individual Greek communities, especially, as Rosalind Thomas has shown, in genealogical lists. But many shared memories have to do with the archaic period, which in the late-fifth, fourth, and third centuries BCE was considerably more than 100 years in the past. The time of origins, furthermore, is often

27 2001, 286. N. Luraghi and L Foxhall have recently defined “Intentional history” as the “projection in time of the elements of subjective, self-conscious self categorization which construct the identity of a group as a group” (2010, 9). The importance of shared memory for group identity features in numerous definitions of social or collective memory. J. Fentress and C. Wickham, for example, see social memory as identifying “a group, giving it a sense of its past and defining its aspirations for the present” (1992, 25); B. Misztal understands “a group’s representation of its past” as giving “substance to that group’s identity, its present conditions and its vision of the future” (2003, 158); and G. Beiner defines social memory as the “process by which members of a community negotiate the identity of the society with which they are affiliated in relation to its past” (2007, 28).

28 See A.P. Cohen 1985, 101: “For most people, at most moments of history, the past is inchoate, transmitted only selectively without historiographical rigour.”


30 2008, 112.

31 See also A. Assmann, who identifies “an embodied and participatory historical memory of approximately 100 years . . . built up by oral transmission” (2001, 6823).


33 1989 157, 177-180, 207, 236.
far more expansive than the simple moment of *ktisis* and comprises numerous non-coincident episodes that often require some sort of chronological scaffolding.

One of the primary carriers of shared memory for communities rooted in space is, not surprisingly, the landscape itself.\textsuperscript{34} In the case of ancient Greece, notable land formations were often attributed to celebrated personages or to gods: Mount Lykabettos in Athens was said to have been dropped by the sky by an angry Athena (*FGrHist* 330 F1), and we shall see that the Thessalians attributed their central plain to Poseidon (see Hdt. 7.129; Baton *FGrHist* 268 F5) or to Herakles (Diod. 4.18.6 and Lucan 6.348-349; *cf. FGrHist* 129F1 = 130F1) and the Samians attributed fissures and cliffs to the piercing cries of prehistoric animals (*Euagon* *FGrHist* 535 F1; Aristot. *Ep.Herakl.* 30 Dilts; Euphorion F193 Lightfoot; Plut. *Mor.* 303DE). Some natural formations, moreover, were thought to have marked the spots were notable events occurred: in Athens, two daughters of Erekhtheus, the historian Phanodemos tells us, were sacrificed on Hyakinthos hill in order to protect the city from the Boiotians (*FGrHist* 325 F4); Plato’s Socrates explains that a third daughter was snatched away by Boreas at a spot on the Ilissos River near the temple of Artemis at Agraia (Plat. *Phaid.* 229c; Apollod. 3.15.2); and the Athenian Kleidemnos gives a very detailed description of the battle in the Agora between the Amazons and the Athenians—the left flank of the invading army, he says, was facing “what is now called the Amazoneion,” and the right approached the Pnyx beside the Khyrsa; the Athenian army attacked the invaders from the *Mouseion* and the Palladion, Ardettos, and the Lykeion and forced them to yield at the shrine of the Eumenides (*FGrHist* 323 F18).

\textsuperscript{34} “If a truth is to be settled in the memory of a group,” Halbwachs wrote in *La Topographie Légendaire des Évangiles en Terre Sainte*, “it needs to be presented in the concrete form of an event, of a personality, or of a locality” (1992, 200); see in general R. Bradley 2000. For the importance of *loci* for the retention of memory see *e.g.* F. Yates 1966 and M. Carruthers 2002.
The mnemonic role of the land extends also to toponyms.\textsuperscript{35} In Attica, Mounykhia near the Peiraios was said to have been named after a certain King Mounykhos (Hellanikos \textit{FGrHist} 323a F5a-b) and the Areiopagos after the god Ares (\textit{e.g.} Hellanikos \textit{FGrHist} 323a FF1, 22a-b. The tendency is evident all over Greece, and in some cases eponyms gave their names both to a territory and its inhabitants: for Thessaly and the Thessalians there is a Thessalos; for Boiotia and the Boiotians a Boiotos. The mechanism is so powerful, in fact, that non-existent toponyms were sometimes invented for important local figures. Athens, we read, was once named Kekropia after King Kekrops (\textit{Mar.Par.} 1; Georg. Synk. \textit{Ekl. Khron.} 289; \textit{cf.} Philokhoros \textit{FGrHist} 328 F94), and Thessaly was called Pyrrhaia after the wife of Deukalion and then Haimonia from Haimon, the son of Pelasgos (Rhianos \textit{FGrHist} 265 F30a-b). Sometimes toponyms were thought to commemorate particular events rather than people: the use of the word \textit{asty} to describe the civic center of Athens, for example, could be linked to the idea that the nomadic Athenians finally “stood still (\textit{stenai})” in that place (Philokhoros \textit{FGrHist} 328 F2a-b); and the Horkomosion in the Athenian agora was said to have marked the spot where the Athenians had signed the treaty that ended their war with the Amazonians (Kleidemos \textit{FGrHist} 323 F18).

There are numerous other physical media for communicating shared memories. Some are monuments specifically designed as carriers of memory: in the case of Athens, sculptures, such as the portraits of Harmodios and Aristogeiton;\textsuperscript{36} vases depicting Athenian kings like Kekrops and Theseus;\textsuperscript{37} murals, like the representation of the Battle of Marathon on the Stoa Poikile ([Dem.] 59.94; Aiskhin. 3.186); shrines and altars, like that marking the spot where Demetrios Poliorketes first alighted from his chariot upon entering Athens (Plut. \textit{Dem.} 10); tombs of the fallen, like that at Marathon (Hdt. 9.85; 9.86).

\textsuperscript{35} For a fascinating and lively account of naming practices in the United States, see G.R. Stewart 1967.\textsuperscript{36} For the history of this sculpture, see M.W. Taylor 1991, H.A. Shapiro 1994 and 2012, and S. Kansteiner 2007.\textsuperscript{37} See recently H.A. Shapiro 2012.
Paus. 1.32.3); and trophies set up to commemorate victories in war, like the monument, to look for a moment outside of Attica, erected at Delphi in honor of the Greeks who fought Xerxes (ML 27). Some monuments, while not necessarily designed to memorialize specific events, nevertheless become carriers of community memory. Vansina has called these “etiological commentaries” iconatrophy. In Greece, such iconatrophy is widespread: the Athenians said that a dilapidated ship was once used by Theseus (Plat. Phaid. 58a-b; Plut. Thes. 22.1); bones of prehistoric animals could be refigured as the remains of monsters (see Euagon FGrHist 535 F1 and Aristot. Ep. Herak. 30 Dilts for Samos) or heroes (see Paus. 1.17.6 for Kimon’s repatriation of Theseus’s bones); and Bronze-Age remains were re-imagined as the vestiges of an extinct population. So an ashlar wall around the Acropolis of Athens was called the “Pelasgikon” and attributed to primordial interlopers in the city (Hdt. 6.137.1; Kleidemos FGrHist 323 F16 cf. Thuc. 2.17.1); and Mycenaean tombs, such as those at Pontic Herakleia (FGrHist 430 F3) and Argos (FGrHist 306 F3), were thought to have housed the remains of local heroes. In many cases, furthermore, monuments were more recently charged (or recharged) with memory. In Attica, the sanctuary of Pallenian Athena was associated with the battle between the tyrant Peisistratos and his opponents (Hdt. 162.2); a shrine to Pan at the foot of the Acropolis was connected to the god’s alleged conversation with the runner Philippides before the Battle of Marathon (Hdt. 6.105); and a sanctuary of Herakles was said to have been the spot where Xerxes sat to watch his

38 See S. Alcock 2002, 75-86 for Persian War memorials in Greece.
39 1985, 7, 10, 46, 54, 154, 187, and 197. In Herodotean studies, these stories are sometimes called as Monument-Novellen (see C.M. Keesling 2005). I am avoiding here the term lieux de mémoire espoused by Pierre Nora in the context of twentieth-century France to refer to “vestiges, the ultimate embodiments of commemorative consciousness that survives in a history which, having renounced memory, cries out for it,” a concept that emerges, Nora says, when a “society has banished ritual” (1996, 6). Despite the literal meaning of the term, Nora did not have in mind (or only in mind) physical places; cf. D. Lowenthal 1997. For the interaction of Lieux de mémoire with Loci memoriae, see P. Den Boer 2008. On Greek temples as lieux de mémoire, see M. Haake and M. Jung 2011.
40 For the Homeric recognition of monuments as carriers of shared memories, see J. Grethlein 2008 and 2012, 22-24.
fleet prepare for the Battle of Salamis (Phanodemos *FGrHist* 325 F24). Monuments often derive meaning in part from their interaction with the landscape; we can recall Kleidemos’s narrative of the rout of the Amazons in the Athenian Agora (*FGrHist* 323 F18). But all monuments rely on the viewer’s experience to activate a thought about the communal past. For this reason, the interpretations of monuments—indeed the monuments themselves—are seldom fixed; as Halbwachs noted in his study of his study of the “Legendary Topography of the Holy Land,” the *cadre materiel* of memory is often reinterpreted to reflect current exigencies. In Greek communities, statues could be moved; temples could be rebuilt, repainted, pediments reworked; and the very same object could be endowed with divergent memories. The pose of a statue of Solon in Salamis suggested to Aiskhines that Athenian orators of the late archaic age were marked by self-restraint (Aeskhin. 1.25; Dem. 19. 151); the statue reminded Demosthenes, on the other hand, of Solon’s courage in advocating war with Salamis and of several of his elegies (19.252).

A related carrier of shared memories is epigraphy. While inscriptions cannot easily be separated from their settings, and while texts could be overwhelmed by the monuments of which they formed a part, many inscriptions were undoubtedly meant to be read. We ought then to mention, however briefly, some of the affects of literacy on the workings of cultural memory. For despite the contention of Plato (and indeed a

---

42 See Young 1993, 1-7, and 1994, 38; see also J.L. Shear 2011, 8-9.
43 1992, 202-203.
45 See e.g. J.K. Davies 1994, D. Harris 1994, and P.J. Rhodes 2001. Epitaphs often addressed themselves to passers-by; names painted onto vases were meant to help a viewer identify the scene; and laws were sometimes explicitly inscribed “so that all other men may also know (see e.g. *IG* II² 233) or included stipulations that their *stelai* be well positioned (see e.g. the Athenian law against tyranny: *SEG* 12.87). Many laws, moreover, would have been effective only if they were read (see e.g. the Athenian law on Silver Coinage (*SEG* 26.72) and various grants of citizenship.
good many others) that knowledge of writing hampered one’s ability to remember, the relationship between orality and literacy is rather more complex. For one thing, many of the traits associated with oral literature are found more frequently in literate societies; at the same time, most literate societies, even in the modern world, actually rely a good deal on oral communication. Still, literacy did influence a community’s construction of its past primarily by providing a means for measuring and assessing the passage of time. Writing gave communities, in the words of Geoffrey Cubitt, “an objective existence [to mental data] outside the minds that formulate them.” Once a memory was set in stone or on papyrus, that is to say, it became fixed, and it thus allowed a community to observe change in ways that oral tradition did not. It is important to emphasize, however, that literacy did not in itself engender the production of historiography. Some Greek communities evidently recorded bare lists of eponymous magistrates in the late-sixth century and perhaps somewhat earlier; but as Felix Jacoby famously argued, such a practice did not itself lead Greek communities to produce cohesive local chronicles.

47 On Plato and memory (especially Phaidr. 274C-275B) see J. Notopoulos 1938. The point is for our purposes moot, since we are not worried, as Plato may have been, about the extent to which memories about the past actually derive from authentic events; we are concerned, rather, only with what communities and community members believed happened.


50 In particular, G. Cubitt notes four ramifications of literacy: the ability to communicate more complicated and dynamic memories; the creation of records and archives, which are independent of interview, public performance, and other oral carriers of memory; an increased ability of memory storage; and a facilitation of the propagation of information (2007, 188).


53 1949 passim; see also L. Porciani 2001. We shall have the opportunity in section 1.3 to mention D.E. Brown’s study of the prerequisites for historical consciousness (1988). After surveying numerous literate but non-historiographic communities, Brown concludes that however “effective literacy may be in facilitating historical writing . . . , it does not motivate it” (1988, 309).
Greek communities produced many types of inscriptions. Some were commemorative: the Greek cities who fought against the Persians in 480 erected an inscribed monument recording their accomplishment (ML 57); the Samians acknowledged at the Heraion several important naval battles in which they contributed, such as that fought in Egypt in he early 450s (ML 34); and Kimon inscribed three epigrams on a group of Herms in which he compared the recent Battle of Eion to the Trojan War.\(^{54}\) So too did dedicatory inscriptions at cult centers, although in many cases initially commemorating individuals, frequently propagate group memory, as is clear from Herodotus’s accounts of his visits to the sanctuaries of Apollo at Delphi and at the Heraion on Samos.\(^{55}\) Some inscriptions, moreover, referred both to a contemporary event and to anterior events.\(^{56}\) This is often the case in treaties between two communities, where present praxis was justified through precedents,\(^{57}\) as well as in honorary decrees: Demokhares, for example, passed a decree in honor of his uncle, Demosthenes, cataloguing the statesman’s illustrious career (Ps.-Plut. Lives. 850F-851C). Sometimes, finally, a Greek community inscribed a text purporting to derive wholly from the past: in the third century BCE, for example, Troizen decided to record what it alleged was the text of the motion through which Themistokles had convinced his countrymen to leave Athens for Troizen over two centuries earlier; and an oath allegedly sworn by the Greeks before the Battle of Plataea was published in late-fourth century Athens (SEG 16.140).

While shared memories could be communicated through physical means, through the landscape, monuments, and inscriptions, many relied on oral communication. In some cases, such oral traditions were transmitted in fixed form, namely poetry (lyric, epinician, elegiac, dramatic, as well as the hexameters later associated with oracular

\(^{54}\) Plut. Kim. 7; Aiskhin. 3.184-185. See F. Jacoby 1945 and H.A. Shapiro 2012.
\(^{55}\) e.g. 1.14.1-3, 1.31.5, 1.51.3-4, 1.92.1, 8.82.1, 8.121.2, 8.122) and of Hera on Samos (1.70.3, 2.182.2, 3.60.4, 3.123.1, 4.88, 4.152.4.
\(^{56}\) What J. Grethlein has recently identified as the “plupast” (2010, esp. 94; see also, with C. Krebs, 2012 passim).
\(^{57}\) see ML 5 regarding Cyrène and Thera.
pronouncements) and songs. In Greece, some communities may even have generated local epics: we know of the Argocentric Phoronis; archaic Athens may have had access an epic about Theseus; and Eumelos was said to have composed a Korinhtiaka (FGrHist 451), which rooted the genealogies of many Greek heroes to Corinth. In Greece, verse generally preserved memories of the distant, “mythological,” past (on the far side of the floating gap, that is). But more recent events were on occasion addressed. At the beginning of the fifth century, the Athenian Phrynakhos wrote a tragedy on the too-recent fall of Miletos (see Hdt. 6.21.2) and some years later treated the defeat of the Persians at Salamis, a subject that would soon be taken up by Aiskhylos as well. The lyrics of Alkaios and Solon, meanwhile, served as a medium for trafficking political ideology and for this reason made frequent reference to contemporary events. And popular songs, like the skolia bandied about at symposia, were sometimes motivated by recent occurrences—one famous skolion praised the tyrannicides Harmodios and Aristogeitont (Athen. 15.50 695ab). It is possible that archaic Greek elegy, too, made reference to the recent past; more likely, however, contemporary events (like the Battle of Plataea) provided occasions for analogical explorations of the distant past. Other formalized (and often versified) utterances also preserved more recent community memories, in particular proverbs: at Athens, “Hippokleides doesn’t care” was attached to an Athenian aristocrat’s halfhearted attempt to woo the hand of the daughter of a tyrant of Sicyon (Hdt. 6.129-130), and “Cavalry away!” to an incident at the Battle of Marathon (Souda, X 144).

---

60 See M.L. West 2002 and D.L. Toye BNJ 431.
61 To this extent, archaic elegy seems to have reflected Pindar’s epinician Odes, where the individual’s victory provoked a mythic narrative. For the subjects of archaic elegy, see e.g. F. Lasserre 1976; H. Funke 1986; E. Bowie 1986, 2001, and 2010; and J. Grethlein 2011.
62 On proverbs, in particular in relation to Samian cultural memory, see 2.2.2.3.
There were other, non-poetic, oral avenues for the transmission of episodic shared memory, such as anecdotes, apophthegmata, and longer and looser narratives. These were transmitted in a variety of settings, casual and formal, private and public. The versions of the overthrow of the Peisistratids retained by Herodotus and Thucydides are a good case in point (Hdt. 6.123; Thuc. 1.121 and 6.53-59), as are the historical allusions made by Athenian orators in dikastic and probouleutic speeches, exempla through which contemporary behavior was very often commended or criticized. Such allusions, at least in Athens, tended to congregate in the period of the monarchy and in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, but we also find references made to the archaic age, particularly to statesmen whose legislation contributed to the shaping of the Athenian politeia. Lykourgos contrasts Leokrates’ cowardly desertion to the heroic self-sacrifice of King Kodros in the face of the Peloponnesian invasion (84-90); Aiskhines compares Timarkhos unfavorably to the honorable Solon (1.26); and Deinarkhos juxtaposes Demosthenes’ treatment at the hands of the Athenians to that of the general Timotheus a generation before (1.14; cf. 3.17).

One last carrier of community memory to consider is praxis, primarily cult. While Greek communities did on occasion found festivals directly after important victories as a means of deliberate commemoration—in the case of ancient Athens, we can think of the cults founded after the victories of Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea—

---

64 For historical allusions in the orators, see e.g. K. Jost 1936, L. Pearson 1941, S. Perlman 1961, M. Nouhaud 1982, R. Thomas 1989, 196-237, K. Clarke 2008, J. Hesk 2010, and B. Steinbock 2013, 96-99 and passim. Thomas’s argument for the oral sources of these allusions has decidedly overpowered older attempts to derive them from the orators’ use of histories.
65 B. Steinbock has recently explored one particularly complex set of allusions in Greek oratory about the relationship between Athens and Thebes (2012, esp. Chapters Two and Three).
66 For the mnemonic importance of cult outside of ancient Greece, see R. Bastide 1978, 240-259; C. Lévi-Strauss 1966, 233-244; Y.H. Yerushalmi 1982, 11; and P. Connerton 1989, 41-71. “Even while fully preserving their organic links to the natural cycles of the agricultural year,” Yerushalmi wrote of First- and Second-Temple Jews, their festivals “were transformed into commemorations of the Exodus from Egypt and the sojourn in the wilderness.”
particular ceremonies were more frequently imagined as commemorating episodes from the distant past. At Athens, the Oskhophoria, an autumnal rite that marked the grape harvest, invoked an elaborate etiology centered on Theseus and his rescue of Athenian captives on Crete (Demon FGrHist 327 F6; Philokhoros FGrHist 328 FF16 and 183; and Istros FGrHist 334 F8); according to Herodotus, Athenians explained that women’s khitons were broochless because it was with their brooches that years before a group of Athenian women had murdered a hapless soldier (Hdt. 5.87); and the Athenians claimed to have founded their law court on the Areiopagos because that had been the spot where the first trial in Athens took place, Poseidon’s persecution of Ares (Hellanikos FGrHist 323 FF1 and 22a-b; Androtion FGrHist 324 F3-4a-b; Phanodemos FGrHist 325 F10 Philokhoros FGrHist 328 FF3-4, 20a-c, and 196; and Istros FGrHist 334 F14).

While shared memories in Greece (whether carried by natural features of the land, monuments, texts, anecdotes, or cult) most often manifested themselves discretely and severally, communities also had access to more elaborate, diachronic narratives. There were memory specialists, for one thing, who were charged, or charged themselves, with the task of communicating a longer sequence of communal memory.68 According to Plato, in the late-fifth century the sophist Hippias was just such a sort of memory technician; the Spartans, Hippias tells Socrates in his eponymous dialogue, were very fond of hearing about the genealogies of heroes and men and of settlements, how poleis were founded in ancient times, and in short about every sort of arkhaiologia, and he was thus “obliged to learn by heart for them and to rehearse all that sort of material” (Hipp. Mai. 285d). And many centuries later, Pausanias attests to various τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἔξηγηται whom he encountered in his journeys around Greece (e.g. 1.13.8, 1.41.2) and who seem to have retained not only site-specific memories but more cohesive local

68 L. Porciani (2001, 117-124) makes an attempt to identify such memory specialists behind a remark of Thucydidès about οἱ τὰ σαφέστατα Πελοποννησίων μνήμη παρὰ τῶν πρότερον δεδεχόμενοι (1.9.2). For the importance of logioi andres in Herodotus, see F. Jacoby 1913, 392 and 1949, 215-225; J.A.S. Evans 1980, 8-16; G. Nagy 1990, 221-225; and N. Luraghi 2009.
narratives as well. A group of individuals, too, may act as the conduit of longer local stories. In the context of honorary dedications, a committee was sometimes involved in stringing together an individual’s benefactions so as to provide an extended narrative. When Olbia bestowed honors on its citizen Protogenes in the late-third century, for example, the so-called Seven composed a protracted account, ratified by the boule and demos, that focused on Protogenes’ philanthropy over an extensive period of time and in reaction to a lengthy series of external and internal threats (IOSPE I^2 32 = Syll.3 495). Or when Athens honored Kallias of Sphettos in 270/69, Eukhares of Konthyle wrote a lengthy account, approved by the boule and demos, that began with the battles against Demetrios Poliorcetes in the mid 280s, moved into Kallias’s advocation on behalf of Athens to Ptolemy a decade later, and concluded with Kallias’s procurement of ropes for the robe of Athena in a recent Panathenaic procession (SEG 46.135).

Communities also sometimes promulgated such local narratives in the context of civic festivals. At Athens, the Dionysia generated dramatic competitions where episodes from Athens’ past were versified and performed before large segments of the population. Some community festivals, moreover, provoked even longer historical narratives. In the case of Athens, we think primarily of the annual state-sponsored funeral for the war dead, where a citizen was elected by his community to praise the fallen primarily by telling in chronological order a series of loosely linked episodes of communal military action. Other civic festivals, like the Panathenaia, may have

---

69 See C.P. Jones 2001 for “Pausanias and his Guides” and D. Ambaglio 2001 for the meaning of the term ἐπιχώριος.
70 For this aspect of Athenian drama, see in particular R. Scodel 2008; A. Romano 2012; J. Henderson 2012; and B. Steinbock 2013, 49-69. As Jacoby noted, however, Athenian tragedy more frequently focused on non-local myth (1949, 220). Aiskhylos was reported to have called his tragedies “slices from the great feasts of Homer” (Athen. 8.39 347E).
71 We have fragments of a funeral speech by Gorgias (DK 82 B 5a-b, 6), which may have been a rhetorical exercise, an oration of Lysias (2) delivered during the Corinthian War (ca. 392); one preserved in the Demosthenic corpus (and perhaps delivered by Demosthenes himself) delivered after Chaireoneia (60); and finally that of Hypereides (6) delivered after the Lamian War. We also have Thucydides’ famous recreation of Pericles’ oration from 431 (2.35-46) and Plato’s parody of the genre (Menex.236d4-249c8).
engendered similar local narratives. Several of Isocrates’ epideictic orations purport to have been geared for public delivery and may give us an idea about the categories of discourse. The Panegyrikos (380 BCE), for example, ostensibly addressed to festival attendees at Athens (4.1-3), allows Isocrates an opportunity to sew together several episodes from Athenian history and to survey, as he says, τὸν τῇ χρόνῳ ὅτι ἀντὶ ἀρχῆς καὶ τὰς πράξεις τὰς τῆς πόλεως ἐπεξήγης (4.26): autochthony (4.23-25); Demeter and Persephone (4.28-32);72 early relations with neighboring communities and colonization (4.33-37); legislative successes (4.38-40); the foundation of local festivals (43-45); the supplication of the Herakleidai and the burial of the Seven (54-63); and Athens’ achievements against barbarians (66-98), including the Persian Wars (85-98). In the Panathenaikos, published over forty years later (ca. 338 BCE) and allegedly delivered at the Panathenaia (see 4.17)—Isocrates provides an account περὶ τῶν τῇ πόλει περιφραγμένων καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν προγόνων ἀρετῆς (12.5), emphasizing Athenian autochthony (125), early monarchy (119, 126-130), and the development of democracy (131-145). Athens was certainly not the only community to generate locally focused epideictic logoi. The historian Ephoros, we know, wrote a σύνταγμα about his homeland of Kyme (FGrHist 70 F1), in which he claimed that Homer was a native Kymaian (F1) and that “ἡμεῖς δὲ περὶ τὴν τῶν νόμων εὐταξίαν [ἡσχόληται]” (F97);

Among the events usually comprised by these logoi were the invasion and defeat of the Amazons (Lys. 2.4-6, Dem. 60.8, Pl. Menex. 239b); the Athenian attack on Thebes after the Siege of the Seven (Lys. 2.7-10; Pl. Menex. 239b, Dem. 60.8); the repulsion of the Thracians under Eumolpos (Pl. Menex. 239b; Dem. 60.8); and Athens’ protection in the face of Eurystheus of the Herakleidai (Lys. 2.11-16, Pl. Menex. 239b; Dem. 60.8); the Persian Wars, featuring the Battle of Marathon (Lys. 2.21-26; Pl. Menex. 240c), Thermopylae (Lys. 2.27-32), Salamis (Lys. 2.32-43; Pl. Menex. 241a), and Plataea (Lys. 2.44-47; Pl. Menex. 241c); and battles from the fifth century, like that against Corinth and Aigina (Lys. 2.48-53; cf. Pl. Menex. 241c) and against the Lakedaimonians at Aegospotami, where even in defeat, the Athenians showed their bravery (Lys. 2.57-60). For the epitaphios logos, see e.g. N. Loraux 1981, R. Thomas 1989, 196-237; R. Parker 1997, 131-141; H.-J. Gehrke 2003; J. Herrman 2004; B. Steinbock 2013, 49-69. 72 For resonances between Isocrates’ Panegyrikos and Atthidography, see P. Harding 2007, 6.
and Dionysios of Halicarnassus refers to a Δηλιακός, written by a certain Deinarkhos, that gave an overview of Delian history.\(^{73}\)

Some longer local narratives were a response to other, non-cultic stimuli, like public trials. One of the best examples of an extended local narrative in a dikastic oration is Lykourgos’s accusation of Leokrates, where he compares his opponent’s condemnable behavior to a series of episodes from the collective Athenian past: the war with Xerxes (68-71); the oath at Plateia (80); and the ninety-year Athenian hegemony over Greece, including the Battle of Eurymedon and reconquest of Asia Minor (72-73). He then provides a précis of Athenian history from the \textit{ktisis} in loose chronological order (μικρὰ τῶν παλαιῶν ὑμῖν διελθεῖν: 1.83), touching upon the self-sacrifice of King Kodros in the face of the Peloponnesian invasion (84-87); the invasion of Attica by Eumolpos during the reign of Erekhtheus and the sacrifice of the king’s daughters (98-100); the role of the Athenian Tyrtaios as leader of the Spartans against the Messenians (105-107); the battle of Marathon (108-109); the oligarchy at the end of the fifth century (111-112); the ostracism of Hipparkhos (117); and the Spartan siege of Dekeleia (120-121).

One final venue for the delivery of such epichoric \textit{logoi} was interstate diplomacy. In the mid-second century BCE, the Knossians praised Dioskourides of Tarsos for composing an encomium about “our \textit{ethnos},” which he had his pupil Myrinos perform \textit{(IC 1.8.12)}.\(^{74}\) On some occasions, visiting dignitaries recited not \textit{logoi} but poems: in the mid-third century two Teians were honored by the Priansians on Crete for speaking appropriately and for performing a historical cycle about Crete and the Cretan gods and heroes \textit{(IC 1.24.1 = FGrHist 466T1)};\(^{75}\) and Aristodama of Smyrna recited before the Aitolians some of her own verses in which she remembered worthily the \textit{ethnos} of the

\(^{73}\) περιτρέχων τὴν τοπικὴν Δήλου καὶ †Λέρου ιστορίαν \textit{(de Dein. 11 = FGrHist 401d T1)}. Greeks tended to refer to such encomiastic \textit{logoi} distinctively, by using the masculine singular form of the ktetic adjective.

\(^{74}\) See K. Clarke 2008, 350-351.

Aitolians and the ancestors of the *demos* (*IG 9² 62 = FGrHist 483 F1*). But these *logoi* and poems, whether they were delivered by a community member or by an outsider in a bid to earn his host community’s gratitude, were on the whole laudatory and often subsumed within larger projects. To this extent, as I will argue in the following section, local though these *logoi* may have been, they are not examples of historiography.

---

56 See I. Rutherford 2009.
1.1.4 Community and History

Appeals to shared memories, we have seen, helped communities to cohere as well as to negotiate their communal identity. While for the Greeks discrete and episodic group memories were often attached to the landscape, to monuments, and to cult, communities also had occasions to articulate longer narratives, usually in the context of festivals or interstate diplomacy. But epideictic oratory, like the epichoric encomia of Isocrates and of Ephoros, and local poetry, like that of Dioskourides or Aristodama, are not manifestations of local historiography. For here community history tended to be embedded in longer, non-local narratives whose goals were primarily encomiastic. The same may be said about the Epitaphioi logoi, which Leone Porciani has argued represent an earlier stage of the impulse that would develop into Atthidography. Both local historiography and epideictic oratory, it is true, were assembled from a common stock of shared memory and both were manifestations of the autobiographical impulse, but the roots of local historiography are distinct. Local historiography emerged when the autobiographical impulse began to be filtered not through public oratory (which produced primarily panegyric) but through the medium of prose.

The ancient Greeks generally situated memory and history along the same continuum, inasmuch as both comprised stories about the past. Herodotus famously began with the assertion that his ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις was a memory aid, aimed to prevent the record of human events from disappearing with time (1.1). Four centuries later, Cicero praised his friend Atticus for putting together in one book annorum septingentorum memoriam (Orat. 120), and his younger contemporary Dionysios of Halicarnassus claimed that the goal of the earliest Greek historians was in part “to bring to public attention memories preserved in various local communities” ethne and poleis

---

1 L. Porciani (2001) argues not only that local history existed first in an oral form (transmitted by the so-called logioi Andres and then emerging after the Persian Wars in the Funeral Orations) but also that it was through the union of these two forms that “Great Historiography” was born.
alike (de Thuc. 5). The symbiosis between memory and history is a trope that was frequently repeated by historians—Francesco Giucciardini begins his history of Italy (1540) by stating that his aim was “scivere le cose accadute alla memoria nostra in Italia” (1.1), and Francesco Patrizi (1560) wrote that, since history preserved memory, it ought in fact to be called “written memory” (Dial. 4)—even on into the modern day. So the American historian Carl Becker (1931) said that history was “the memory of things said and done” and “the artificial extension of the social memory.” John Lukacs called history “the remembered past” (1968). And Eric Hobsbawm claimed that the task of historians is to “compile and constitute the collective memory of the past.”

But history is not the mere haphazard assemblage of discrete logoi. A historian’s task is to apply the tools of criticism, to weigh and assess the value of individual memories, and to attempt to join them together into a coherent narrative about the past. So Hekataios, in one of the earliest preserved proemia of Greek historiography, distinguished his enterprise from mere logoi (FGrHist 1 F1a-b): Ἐκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὤδε μνημεῖται· τάδε γράφω· ὡς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοὶ τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὡς ἐμοί φαίνονται, εἰσίν. Such a distinction does not imply that history (unlike memory) is objective, although this claim has of course been made, primarily in the nineteenth century but also more recently by the likes of Halbwachs, R.G. Collingwood, Pierre Nora, and Jacques Le Goff. But, while a historian’s role in

\(^2\) As G. Shrimpton writes, “ancient history was predominately memory—the recording of what might be called ‘the collective memory’” (1997, 28-29).
\(^3\) 1932, 221-4.
\(^4\) 1968.
\(^5\) 1997, 24-25.
\(^7\) Halbwachs considered collective memory to be an organic social construct, while history was a product of scholarly and detached study, dependent in fact on a sense of rupture with the past.
\(^8\) R. Collingwood argued (1946) that “history is a certain kind of organized and inferential knowledge, and memory is not organized (1999, 8). He went on to say, ‘If I say, ‘I remember writing a letter to So-and-so last week,’ that is a statement of memory, but it is not an historical statement. But if I can add ‘and my
assembling and evaluating various *logoi* does not in itself ensure that his narrative be objective or true, historians do very often purport to take both impartiality and veracity as their guiding principles. A true and bias-free account of the past, on the other hand, is rarely the objective of epideixis or encomium. In Greece, critical analysis of the past was a consequence in part of the introduction of writing, which, as we have seen, allowed communities better to understand change by freezing in time manifestations of group memory. Yet historiography arose not as an immediate consequence of literacy but rather as a result of the advent of a particular form of writing.

Emerging at the end of the sixth century, prose was from the onset tied to a new intellectualism that involved a critical stance endowing the writer with epistemical expertise. Early examples of prose include laws, philosophical texts (like the treatises of Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Herakleitos), and geography and ethnography, such as the works of Hekataios at the end of the sixth century and the anonymous *Airs, Waters, Places*. Through prose, writers sought first and foremost to understand and rationalize the phenomena of the natural world, and they offered logical arguments, often with source attributions, to back up their claims. To this extent, prose was not the mere transcription of spoken language but a mode specifically designed to endow the writer with the authority to judge and evaluate competing claims about the world. It is only through the application of the criticism of prose to the autobiographical impulse that local memory is not deceiving me; because here is his reply,’ then I am basing a statement about the past on evidence; I am talking history.”

9 For P. Nora, memory and history are entirely antithetical. “Memory,” he claimed, “is always suspect in the eyes of history, whose true mission is to demolish it, to repress it” (1996, 1-3). It is against memory that Nora sets the so-called *Lieux de Mémoire*, “fundamentally vestiges, the ultimate embodiments of a commemorative consciousness that survives in a history which, having renounced memory, cries out for it” (1996, 6). Yerushalmi has made similar link between modern Jewish historiography and the fading of Jewish collective traditions (1996, esp. 86; see A. Funkenstein 1989 for a response).

10 J. Le Goff claims that history “must seek to be objective and to remain based on the belief in historical ‘truth’” (1992, xi-xii, trans. S. Rendall and E. Claman).

11 For the importance and innovations of Greek prose, see S. Goldhill 2002, J. Greethlein 2010 and 2011, and L. Kurke 2011.

12 R. Thomas 2001, 219. Thomas goes on to suggest that Herodotus uses the word *historie* primarily as a synonym for this sort of Ionian science (270).
historiography emerged in the third quarter of the fifth century. This is not to say that local histories could not be written in verse. But in the case of Greece, poetic local histories as autonomous texts are a learned and largely Hellenistic response to local historiography in prose. We shall return to the role of prose in the emergence of local historiography in Greece. At this point, however, I want to look broadly (both chronologically and geographically) at the phenomenon of local historiography.
1.2 LOCAL HISTORIES

Roaming through these little Ligurian towns makes me utter just the old groans you used to join in when we roamed about France,—groans, I mean, over the state of our local histories in England. There isn’t one of these wee places that glimmer in the night like fireflies in the depth of their bays that hasn’t a full and generally admirable account of itself and its doings. They are sometimes wooden enough in point of style and the like, but they use their archives, and don’t omit, as all our local historians seem to make a point of doing, the history of the town itself.

John Richard Green in a letter to Edward Augustus Freeman (March 20, 1871)\(^1\)

1.2.1 SOME DEFINITIONS

A history is local when its narrative is focalized by a single locality and when this locality corresponds to the real or imagined territory of a discrete community. While Xenophon’s *Hellenika* is localized inasmuch as it narrates events attached to a specified area of the world, it is not a local history; for it traces the actions and interactions of a variety of discrete communities.\(^2\) A local history may address occupiers of the focal territory before the immigration of the focalizing community, but once the focalizing community appears on the scene, locality and territory are one and the same. A community history is not local if its focal community is not itself rooted in space, as with *e.g.* the Pentateuch, Jordanes’ *Getica*, and the *Historia Langobardorum* of Paulus Diaconus. When we have only fragmentary evidence, as is the case for much of Greek local historiography, it can be difficult to distinguish histories of localities from histories of *ethne*, all the more so given Greek titular ambiguity and inconsistency: Ariaithos and Aristippos wrote τὰ Ἀρκαδικά, ostensibly focalized by the region of Arkadia, while Staphylos of Naucratis wrote Περὶ Ἀρκάδων. But a history of a locality occupied by a

\(^{1}\) In J.R. Green 1901, 296.

\(^{2}\) The relationship of the title *Hellenika* to “Greece” is not, as we have seen, analogous to the relationship of *Sikelika* to Sicily or *Argolika* to Argos.
particular community and of a community occupying a particular region very often amount to the same thing.

A local text is historical, conversely, if it attempts to describe the past. Treatises that elucidate local custom or law synchronically are indeed local but they are not histories, nor are works that assess multiple aspects of a given community/locality with emphasis only on the timeless present, as in the case, for example, of Xenophon’s *Lakedaimonion Politeia*. But it is exceedingly rare to find an ethnography or chorography that totally ignores the past. Tacitus’s *Germania*, Biondo Flavio’s *Italia Illustrata*, and William Camden’s *Britannia* each contain enough historical material to be categorized as local historiography even though they do not offer a complete and chronologically organized account of a locality’s past. So too, as we shall see, do the local gazetteers that arose in China and Japan in the early-Medieval period retain a focus on the past even in light of the great quantities of topographical data they preserve.

The focalizing community of a local history varies greatly. Most are civic: in Greece, *poleis*; in the United States, colonies, states, towns, and cities, and, after the War of Independence, the country *en masse*. In some cases, the focalizing locality is a kingdom, a phenomenon particularly common in the East (e.g. Persia, China, Japan, Korea, and Thailand), Mesoamerica (e.g. the Aztecs or the Incas), and Medieval Europe. Histories such as the *Shi Ji* of Sima Qian, the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* of William of Malmesbury, or, in the New World, the *Annals of Cuauhtitla*, often manifest themselves as dynastic annals,3 local inasmuch as the kingdom is geographically fixed (albeit sometimes expanding and contracting), but in rare cases actually corresponding to

---

3 In the context of pre-Spanish, Mexican historiography, particularly with reference to the Oaxacan Mixtecs, E. Florescano comments that “the history of the realm was confused with the person of the ruler,” since “the basic function of the scribe was to record the principal events in the life of the ruler, to exalt his deeds, and to inculcate in the population the idea of the divine and inextinguishable character of the royal office” (1994, 42). Or, on the subject of Persian local historiography A.K. Lambton remarks that the term “local or regional history” is “slightly misleading; many such works, both in Arabic and later in Persian, while devoting much space to description of their respective regions, are chiefly concerned with the history of the rulers of those regions” (1999, 9).
community history. But it is important to emphasize that not all local histories are focalized by civic communities; in modern England and America, institutions such as colleges and universities generate histories of their own, as do religious communities in many cultures. In ancient Greece, we find temple history (e.g. the Lindian Chronicle, which narrates the history of the temple to Athena Lindia on Rhodes); in Medieval England, abbatial chronicles and parish histories; in Thailand, monastery chronicles. On occasion, a particular history may treat both a political and a religious community: Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, for example, which begins with a geographical and topographical description of Britain and Ireland, is permeated by a hagiography of the sort that motivated his earlier *Historia Abbatum*; and some early New England histories, like Edwin Stone’s *History of Beverly, Civil and Ecclesiastical* (1843), have no reservations about blending town and church history. Nearly all of the communities that engender local historiography, however, even non-civic communities, nevertheless have developed systems for self-governance. It is only very recently, in the past century or so, that we find local histories of non-civic communities that do not correspond to some administrative unit, such as the American Midwest or South or the English Midlands.

While local histories deal by definition with the past, they need not deal with the total past. Many, it is true, do track the focal locality from the advent of its first inhabitants to the age of the historian himself. But other texts focus predominately on the time of origins or on a segment of the more recent past. Some, moreover, pick up where a previous account had ended. In Trecento Florence, Matteo Villani continued his brother Giovanni’s *Nuova Cronica*, dealing only with the period 1346-1363, while Filippo took over his father’s project and recorded only the years 1363-1364. Other local historians chose to focus on contemporary history but without recourse to already

---

4 See D. Russo 1988, 51.
published histories; one thinks, to stay for a moment at Florence, of Dino Compagni’s *Chronicle*, which dwells only on early Trecento Florence. Some local histories, finally, may privilege topography as an organizational principle. Many of the county histories of Stuart England are periegetic, and some histories of American cities similarly eschewed the chronological framework. Self-styled “City Historiographer” Silas Farmer’s massive *History of Detroit and Michigan* (1884), for example, was organized in multiple sections such as “Locality,” “Hygenic,” “Governmental,” “Judicial,” “Military,” “Social,” and “Architectural.”

In regard to authorship, local histories can be divided broadly into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic. The former originate from the focal community itself and are written either by a member of that community or by a sponsored outsider. American towns in the wake of the American Centenary often hired a reputable historian from an outside community to sift through local records and compose a proper literary text; in the 1880s, for example, the town committee of Weare, NH hired William Little, who had already published a history of his native town Warren, NH some 80 miles to the north, and we shall have the opportunity soon to address the wide-ranging career of J.W. Temple. Another example is the use of the newly-formed country of Chile of a French botanist based at Santiago, Claude Gay, to write the first history of Chile, the thirty volumes of which were published in Paris over the course of the following decades.

Extrinsic local histories, on the other hand, are not a direct result of an indigenous impulse. Such texts, *e.g.* Ktesias’s *Persika*, Dutch histories of the West Indies, and Portuguese histories of India, are often referred to as ethnographies, but the term confounds in part because it appears to privilege a group of people, an *ethnos*, rather than the locality on which the *ethnos* is based. Local histories composed by outsiders without the formal participation of the focal community are not necessarily disinterested in local

---

5 See D. Russo 1989, 120-121.
ways of thinking about the past. Often, as we shall see, such peregrine historians do make an attempt, however misguided, to pay heed to native sources, both oral and written. These historians do sometimes impose their own notions and mythological systems on the locality whose history they were writing—Spanish historians often equated the Aztecs or Incas with the lost tribe of Israel, for example—but this does not mean that they willfully ignored indigenous accounts. Aristotle, as we shall see, wrote numerous local histories and produced very different works depending on the local sources he had at his disposal. Extrinsic local histories, then, often help to shed some light on indigenous expressions of the form. The distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic histories, however, is not always clear; quite apart from the fact that in the case of Classical and Hellenistic Greece we are often unaware of a particular historian’s provenance, in the modern period ostensible intrinsic local histories can on occasion be deemed extrinsic by disgruntled community members. Such was the fate, as we shall see, of J.W. Temple’s history of Whately, Massachusetts, despite his pretensions of authenticity.

It is important to emphasize that local historiography is a natural response of all literate communities, from the West and the East, communities in many cases without access to ancient models. Before we turn to Greek examples of the form, then, it will be essential to cast our net more widely and survey some extant examples of local historiography from diverse periods and cultures. This will help us both to highlight the prevalence and the variety of the form and better to understand the prerequisites for the production of local historiography.

6 The classic exposition of this tendency in the Greek world is E.J. Bickermann 1952.
7 See e.g. J. Cañizares-Esguerra 2001; D.R. Woolf 2011, 251-255.
8 Many communities in New England—and surely the tendency can be found elsewhere, too—set rather a high bar for membership. It is not uncommon in Vermont, for example, to hear the following remark, aimed to cast doubt on the authentic Vermonthood of an individual born to out-of-state parents: “Just because your cat has kittens in the oven, doesn’t mean you can call them biscuits.”
1.2.2 Snapshots of Local History

1.2.2.1 Herodotus’s Ἀἰγύπτιος Λόγος (ca. 460-450 BCE)

Herodotus’s account of Egypt is one of a series of logoi about foreign people and lands that he has embedded in the form of digressions in his Histories. Because the Egyptian logos is so disproportionately long (it is only slightly shorter than the narrative of the rise of Persia that encompasses Book One and far longer than any other excursus on peoples and places)¹ and because it has nothing strictly to do with Cambyses’ invasion of Egypt, the event that formally links it to the overarching narrative of Persia’s rise (2.1.2), the logos appears to have been composed separately and perhaps quite early.² Its apparent autonomy and cohesion, at any rate, allowed it to take on a life of its own even after the Histories had been disseminated as a whole.³

Herodotus commences with a detailed description of the territory—Αἰγύπτου γᾶρ φύσις ἐστὶ τῆς χώρης τοιήδε (2.5.2)—and a survey, replete with detailed measurements of distance, of the major settlements (2.4-18). “Egypt,” he reckons, “is the land that the Nile irrigates; the Egyptians are those who live below the polis Elephantine and drink from the river” (2.18.3). Herodotus follows the geographical survey by a treatise on the Nile, its behavior and its sources (2.19-34), and only after dispatching with these data does he turn to the community of the Egyptians (2.35-98). This he tackles in two parts: first ethnography (2.35-98), comprising the religious practices (2.37-76) and customs of the peoples who live in agricultural Egypt, so-called σπειρομένη Αἴγυπτος (2.77-91), and “in the marshes” (2.92-98); second οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι λόγοι (2.99.1), an

---

¹ It is true that the book divisions of Herodotus’s text are a later addition, but the Αἰγύπτιος Λόγος corresponds almost precisely with Book II, “Euterpe.” Some events from Egyptian history spill also into Book Three (3.1-64), but these fall without the bounds of the self-contained excursus.
account of the Egyptian past up to the rule of Amasis, the Pharaoh who held power at the
time of the Persian invasion (2.99-182). The historical narrative is itself broken into two
parts. The first section (2.99-142), the archaeology, begins with the reign of Min, the
first human king, and ends with that of Sethos, and it is based upon information allegedly
relayed to Herodotus directly by the Egyptians themselves (2.147.1). For the second
section, which covers the period from the rule of the Dodaecarchy to Amasis (2.147-282),
Herodotus is able to supplement native accounts with his own autopsy and with what
others have written before him.⁴

As is typical of the history of a monarchy, Herodotus tells much Egyptian history
as a series of anecdotes about the individual dynasts.⁵ But the Egyptian community also
plays a prominent role. Apart from the detailed ethnography with which he begins his
logos, Herodotus repeatedly cites “the Egyptians” as a source for his information about
the Pharaohs.⁶ What is more, the Egyptians are themselves characters in the narrative:
after the reigns of Cheops and Chephren, for example, we read that the Egyptians
suffered keenly (τοῖσι Αἰγυπτίοισί τε πάσαν εἶναι κακότητα: 2.128), and in periods of
civil war, such as that following the usurpation of Amasis, it is the decisions of the
Egyptians en masse that dictate the course of affairs. Last, Herodotus intersperses his
historical account with descriptions of Egyptian belief and society—note, for example,
2.123 on Egyptian ideas of immortality, and 2.164-168 on the Egyptian class structure.

Inasmuch as Herodotus’s history of Egypt is extrinsic, his audience is not native;
he is writing in Greek, after all. For this reason, Book II is almost always classified as
ethnography. But while it may be true that, as Alan Lloyd has said, Herodotus evinces

⁴ See P. Vanicelli 2001 for a detailed analysis of Herodotus’s Egyptian chronology.
⁶ This may, it is true, be only be shorthand for the Priests from Thebes, Memphis, and Heliopolis whom
Herodotus often says he consulted (2.2.5, 3.1, 10.1, 13.1, 19.1, 28, 54-55, 73.1, and passim). But even his
claim to have relied on epichoric memory specialists like the priests nevertheless reinforces his history’s
alleged dependence on the local community.
“no genuine understanding of Egyptian history” and forces his narrative into a “Greek mold,”\(^7\) and while Herodotus sometimes introduces non-native elements, such as the King Proteus (2.112-121),\(^8\) his claim is to be relying on indigenous conceptions of the past (2.99). He takes pains, moreover, to show that he visited Egypt, with his description of the Persian skulls at Papremis (3.12.4) even providing a putative *terminus post quem* for his visit (459 BCE). My concern is not to argue for the veracity of Herodotus’s account or its points of contact with authentic Egyptian conceptions of the past. I want only to suggest that Herodotus frames his Αἰγύπτιος Λόγος as a local history derived ultimately from the local community itself.\(^9\) While we can explain the precise time of the publication of the Egyptian *logos* (*i.e.* the mid-fifth century) only by the fact that its author was active at this time, we may connect the ease with which Herodotus (as well as Hekataios before him)\(^10\) was able to gather information about the Egyptian past, as well as his particular version of Egyptian history, to an indigenous contemporary movement among the Egyptians.\(^11\) As Ian Moyer has recently argued, Herodotus’s Egyptian sojourn directly followed a period of considerable social unrest in Egypt, precipitated by periods of foreign rule and by the revolt of Inaros: during this period of upheaval, Moyer suggests, the Egyptian priestly elite felt particularly obligated to articulate the past (both to themselves and to any inquisitive visitor) in order to extrapolate links with the present.

**1.2.2.2 LIVY’S *AB URBE CONDITA* (27 BCE- 17 CE)**

By the time of his death in 17 CE, the Paduan Titus Livius had tracked Roman history in 142 books from the coming of Aeneas to the death of Drusus in 9 BCE. While the first six books of his *Ab Urbe Condita* focus entirely on the city of Rome itself, the

---

\(^7\) 1988, 52.
\(^8\) See A.B. Lloyd 1988, 45-46.
\(^9\) See N. Luraghi 2001 on Herodotus and local knowledge.
\(^10\) Herodotus only explicitly mentions Hekataios once (2.143), but *cf.* Jacoby *FGrHist* 1 F300, and L. Pearson 1939, 82-88.
rest of the work wanders far afield: Books Seven to Ten treat Rome’s wars with its neighbors; Books Eleven to Fifteen the Pyrrhic Wars and the conquest of Italy; Books Sixteen to Thirty the First and Second Punic Wars, much of which took place in Sicily and Africa; Books Thirty-One to Forty-Five, the Second and Third Macedonian Wars; and so forth. Yet Livy’s history nevertheless remains unswervingly local. This is not simply because the territory of Rome itself expanded with the augmentation of Roman Imperium but rather because Livy’s narrative is everywhere focalized by the city of Rome. This is clear in the preface appended to the publication of the first five books ca. 28 BCE—Livy apparently published his history piecemeal, in groups of five or ten books—where Livy outlines his goal to record the affairs of the Roman people from the foundation of the city: “a primordio urbis res populi Romani” (Praef. 1.1). Livy reiterates this equivalence between the history of the Roman community and the city of Rome at the beginning of Book Six: while the first pentad covered “quae ab condita urbe Roma ad captam eandem Romani . . . gessere,” he will now proceed, he says, to relate the “renatae urbis gesta domi militiaeque” (6.1.3): events that took place both at Rome and abroad, that is to say, belong to the history of the city.

When the narrative begins to move beyond the confines of the urbs, moreover, Livy continues to emphasize the central role of Rome by inserting local material at the beginning and end of each new year (magistrates’ assumptions of office, local prodigies, forensic activity, obituaries, new construction projects); and it is the local consular elections at Rome that mark the passing of each year. Res externae, that is to say, are always counterpoised to res internae; even when he details a war that the Romans fought overseas, Livy frequently focuses attention back to Rome. So he introduces a narrative about the Third Macedonian War (Books 42-43) with an account of the construction of a

---

12 See K. Clarke 1999, 251-252; D. Feeney, on the other hand, has recently emphasized the universal nature of the Ab Urbe Condita (2007, 60).
temple to Juno Lacinia at Rome (42.3). And in the last book (142), which survives only in the epitome preserved in the fourth-century <i>Periokhai</i>, Drusus’s death on the Rhine precipitates a narrative about the translation of his body to Rome, his burial, Augustus’s eulogy, and the posthumous distinctions conferred upon him at Rome.

Livy had no compulsion to localize his history. He had access to many historiographical paradigms: monographs like those of Sallust; contemporary history like that of Asinius Pollio; or universal history like that of Diodorus. He could have tracked, moreover, the growth either of the Roman empire without the focus on the <i>urbs</i> (in the way that Velleius Paterculus would in the next generation); or he could have written a biography of the Roman people (as Florus would). But Livy chose to follow in the footsteps of Fabius Pictor, to write up Roman history via Rome. Although he was not born in the city of Rome, nor was he ever a senator with a hand in the day-to-day running of the <i>urbs</i> or its <i>imperium</i>, Livy’s history is intrinsic since it was written from within the focal community and was aimed at his Roman peers, whose opinions and policies he certainly intended to influence. His goal, as he says in the preface, was to explore the past as a refuge for the present (<i>Praef.</i> 5), since <i>disciplina</i> had begun to decay and the Roman state to suffer from its vices and proposed remedies (<i>praef.</i> 10). His work, he hopes, will provide his readers with numerous <i>exempli documenta</i> to imitate for their own benefit and that of the Republic—not for no reason did Tacitus’s Augustus call Livy a Pompeian (<i>Annals</i> 4.34). It is anxiety about the precariousness of the Republic that motivates his project: to remind his contemporaries about the fundamental character of their community and thereby to sway their behavior at this moment of upheaval.

14 And Livy has frequent occasion to reinforce this local focus; when he describes a war between the Lycians and Rhodians in the years leading up to the outbreak of the Third Macedonian War, for example, he interrupts himself, writing, “sed externorum inter se bella, quo quaque modo gesta sint, persequi non operae est satis superque oneris sustinenti res a populo Romano gestas perscribere” (41.25.8); see also 33.20.13, 35.40.1, 39.48.6 (although <i>cf.</i> D. Feeney 2009, 147).
1.2.2.3. Ἡ Ῥωμαικὴ Ἀρχαιολογία, BY DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS (ca. 7 BCE)

Dionysius, the son of Alexandros, moved to Rome in 30 BCE in order to teach rhetoric (de comp. verb. 20, 23). His works of literary criticism earned him celebrity (ad Pomp. 1.1.3.1); but it was his history of early Rome, the first part of which he published in 7 BCE (1.7.2; cf. 7.70.2), for which he would be best known (Strab. 14.2.16).15 His subject, he says, was the polis itself (περὶ τε πόλεως γράφω τῆς περιφανεστάτης: 1.3.6), whose rise he tracked (in twenty books)16 from its ktisis to the beginnings of the First Punic War in 264 BCE (1.8.1-2).17 His plan, as he says several times in his preface, was specifically to write about the foundation of the Rome (1.5.1-2), to cover ancient legends (παλαιώται μῦθοι) up to the First Punic War, to treat all foreign wars and internal disturbances, to describe the politeiai both during and after the monarchy, and to survey Roman customs and laws, in short to reveal the whole ancient life of the polis: συλλάβδην ὅλον ἀποδείκνυμι τὸν ἀρχαίον βιόν τῆς πόλεως (1.8.3-4). He begins his narrative proper by reiterating this local focus—the first words after the preface are τὴν ἠγεμόνα γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἁπάσης πόλιν (1.9.1)—and by providing a topographical survey of Latium. Later in the work, Dionysius explicitly names himself as a local historian, one of those who recorded τὰς ἀρχαίας καὶ τοπικὰς ἱστορίας (7.70.2).

Yet Dionysius takes pains to distinguish his Ἀρχαιολογία from other sorts of local histories, in particular τὰ χρονικά, like the Ἀτθίδες, which he claims are monotonous and tedious to read. The form (σχῆμα) that he has adopted, he asserts, combines such annals both with the sort of ἱστορίαι employed by writers who focused on wars and also with the πολιτείαι that appeal to philosophical theorists (1.8.3). And while Dionysius’s chronological system is complex and deliberate—he wrote, after all, a

---

15 Josephos’s similarly titled early history of the Jews, also in twenty books, is sometimes taken as evidence for the popularity of Dionysius’s project.
16 Half survive intact: Book Eleven is incomplete, and Books Twelve through Twenty are preserved only through excerpts and epitomes.
17 Upon completing the history, we learn from Photius’s Bibliotheca (83-84), Dionysius apparently wrote a five-book Epitome of the work.
separate work on Roman and Greek chronography ($1.74.2 = FGrHist$ 251)\textsuperscript{18}—he eschews horography. He dates the early migrations of the Greeks to Italy generationally (\textit{cf.} 1.11.2), by length of rule (\textit{cf.} 1.70-71), or by years elapsed since the fall of Troy (\textit{cf.} 1.71.5), and subsequent events, like the foundation of Rome, by a combination of Olympiad, Athenian archons, and, for events after the fall of the Roman monarchy, the Roman consuls. But Dionysius makes no attempt to mark the passing of each year.

Dionysius is clear about what motivated his project: the Roman Empire surpassed all other \textit{poleis} and \textit{ethne} in extent, splendor, and longevity, and no account has yet paid this proper heed (1.2). More precisely, no adequate account of Rome has been written by a Greek (1.5.4), for which reason the Greeks are generally unaware of Roman history (1.4.2). Dionysius’s implied audience, then, is unambiguous; like Herodotus, he is ostensibly aiming his narrative away from members of the community whose history he is writing. Dionysius is best equipped to illuminate Roman history for his countrymen, he says, because he lived at Rome for 22 years, knows the dialect well, has had the opportunity to speak to Romans well versed in their city’s past, the so-called \textit{λογιώτατοι ἄνδρες}, and is well acquainted with Roman epichoric writings, \textit{γραμμάτων ἐπιχωρίων} (1.7.2-3), such as the histories of Cato, Fabius Maximus, Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, Aelius, Gellius, and Calpurnius (1.7.3). Like Herodotus’s \textit{Αἰγύπτιος Λόγος}, his \textit{Arkhaiologia} is an extrinsic history ostensibly based on indigenous sources (\textit{cf.} 7.70.2). To what extent Dionysius’s version of Roman history jibed with the vision of his Roman students and friends we cannot know; his oft-repeated goal to prove the Greek origins of the Romans, their customs, and their language (1.4.3; 1.90.1-2; 7.70) may well have ruffled some Roman feathers.

One last thing to note is that Dionysius very deliberately ends his history at the outbreak the First Punic War, about two hundred years before his birth. In part, this may

\textsuperscript{18} See C. Schultze 1996.
be because he conceived of his history as a prelude to that of Polybius, whom he names several times in the first book (1.6.1, 1.7.1, 1.32.1). But Dionysius’s emphatic focus on the early history of the polis, which he variously calls τὰ ἀρχαῖα, τὰ παλαιά, or ἡ ἀρχαιολογία (1.4.1), is a defining feature of his project. He can accomplish the twin aims of his study, he argues, by looking solely at Rome’s origins. For therein lies the quintessence of Rome’s identity, its Hellenic stock and its piety (1.5-3).

1.2.2.4 THE HUÁYÁNG GUÓ ZHI, “RECORDS OF THE LANDS SOUTH OF MOUNT HU,” BY CHANG QU (CA. 336-361 CE)

The earliest Chinese histories were dynastic: works like The Spring and Autumn Annals (dated to the early-fifth century BCE) and the several commentaries devoted to its explication focused on the state of Lu, while Sima Qian’s Shi Ji (ca. 90 BCE) treated the successive ruling dynasties of the empire of China up to the Western Han. They were also state sponsored: both Sima Qian and his father, whose work formed the basis of the Shi Ji, were court-appointed astrologers. The Shi Ji and its continuation by Ban Gu (32-92 CE) are remarkably heterogeneous, collating dynastic annals alongside treatises on chronography, astronomy, ethnography, genealogy, and biography.19 While portions of these histories elucidate discrete regions within the empire—in one section, Sima Qian records the history of the Yellow River; Ban Gu included a thorough “Geographic Treatise” outlining the territory of the Han empire; and an earlier work, the “Tribute of Yu,” surveys the lands of the empire as the Emperor travels around his realm in an attempt to limit flooding20—and while we are frequently confronted with the important role of territory in shaping a population’s temperament,21 autonomous works devoted to

---

19 For a thorough overview of Chinese historiography, see O. Cho Ng and Q.E. Wang 2005.
21 As Ban Gu says, a community’s demeanor is “bound to the wind and qi of the water and earth”; see A.B. Chittick 1997, 14.
particular localities do not begin to be produced until the Jin period (317-400 CE).\textsuperscript{22} One of the earliest extant examples of the form is the \textit{Huayang Guozhi}, “\textit{Records of the Land South of the Mount Hu}” (modern-day Sichuan), composed by a native of the region, Chang Qu, a former archivist of the breakaway Cheng-Han dynasty (304-347) and afterwards an advisor to the Jin court.\textsuperscript{23}

Chang Qu divides the \textit{Huayang Guozhi} into three parts. Part One treats the geography and topography of the “lands south of Mt. Hu” region-by-region, surveying local produce, climate, and the characteristics of the diverse populations; Part Two is a chronicle in five chapters focusing on the economic and political history of the several dynasties that ruled the region from the third century BCE to the author’s own day; and Part Three offers a series of biographies of prominent local scholars and administrators (mostly men) arranged chronologically. The \textit{Huayang Guozhi}, then, employed on a smaller scale the organizational principle of the larger histories: sections of dynastic chronicle nestled between geography and biography.\textsuperscript{24} A roughly contemporaneous local history, Xi Zuochi’s \textit{Record of Old Xiangyang}, reveals a similar format. In his “Postscript,” in fact, when Chang Qu describes the activity of earlier local historians (of whom one, notably, was his own father), he notes that they “collected biographies and records and compiled annals, summarizing and praising their corner of the world.”\textsuperscript{25}

The first four books of the history, it is important to note, are not mere chorography. Frequently, Chang Qu attaches historical anecdotes to the particular places he is describing.\textsuperscript{26} In Dian village, for example, there is a lake whose outer perimeter is deeper than the middle; here a divine horse mated with a local mare and gave birth to the

\textsuperscript{22} For the development of local historiography in China, see A.B. Chittick 1997 and J.M. Farmer 2007a, 121-143.
\textsuperscript{25} The translation is from J. Farmer 2007b, 123-124.
\textsuperscript{26} A.B. Chittick calls them “locality stories” (1997, 123).
so-called “Inverted-Pond Colt,” the region’s native breed of horse, which can travel huge distances in a single day (4.267-268). In another anecdote, we read of the Zong people, who lived along the Yu River and who served as an advance unit in the Han army. The emperor admired their love for dance and said, “These are the songs that King Wu attacked Zhou by.” He then sent musicians to practice and study the dance, which became known as the ‘Ba Yu Dance’ (1.4). Historical information is preserved in other formats, too. In the first book, which treats the commandery of Ba, Chang Qu cites a number of songs involving certain individuals connected to the region: these tend to praise locals but to blame those officials sent by the emperor for administrative purposes. A certain Chen Shan, for example, refused to watch a troupe of magicians perform and was for this reason praised by the Han court; a Ba native thus composed a poem honoring him as a loyal and true state official.

The production of local history in China continued well beyond the Jin period, fully flowering not until the Song Dynasty (960-1279 CE) with the proliferation of the so-called local gazetteers (difang zhi or fangzhi). Inasmuch as they seem to have grown out of Tang dynasty maps and geographies compiled by the regional administration and submitted to the emperor, these later texts should be linked to the attempt of the central government to tighten its control on the empire. The local biographies may even have functioned as a form of propaganda through which the Emperor could recruit for governmental administration. The earlier local histories like the Huayang Guozhi, on the other hand, were a response not to centralization but its opposite, the regionalism accompanying the political fragmentation of the empire after the fall of the Han dynasty.

28 On these songs, see J. Farmer 2007b.
29 See Farmer 2007b, 30.
31 As A.B. Chittick says, “local history” was a “forum for ideological exchange between imperial agents who commissioned most later local histories and were their target audience, and local elites, who did the actual work of compilation” (164).
Local tradition was not of course generated as a response to this balkanization; but the loosening of the center nevertheless promoted the articulation and transcription of these traditions into history. Yet even in this earlier slate of local histories, the center, the imperial court, is always in view. Many of the Huayang Guozhi’s locality stories, in fact, serve to emphasize the contribution of a local site to the empire as a whole, while the poems in praise of the local elite help, along with the biographies of the final section, to align the local dignitaries of the region with the paradigms of the court officials. The intended audience for texts like the Huayang Guozhi was thus both local and non-local.

1.2.2.5 THE IZUMO FUDOKI, “THE RECORDS OF WIND AND EARTH OF IZUMO,” BY MIYAKENO OMI KANATARI (733)
Historiography developed later in Japan than in China, but it too was tied firmly to the state, in this case to the Yamato court. The earliest Japanese histories were written in fact as a result of official decree: in 620 Prince Shōtoku ordered the composition of three works (Fundamental Records, National Records, and Record of the Emperors), and in 681 the Emperor Temmu requested another imperial chronicle. The earliest surviving work, the Kojiki, or the “Record of Ancient Matters,” was the fruit of an edict issued in 711 by Temmu’s daughter-in-law, the Empress Gemmei. The Nihon Shoki, the first of the so-called Six National Histories, was published eight years later, perhaps the culmination of the initial project instigated by Temmu. Despite some differences in arrangement, style, and focus, both of these early texts are concerned first and foremost with establishing the legitimacy of the ruling dynasty; although they pay some heed to topography, noting e.g. the formation of the various Japanese islands, they are genealogical in emphasis. Yet the imperial program from which these first histories emerged also instigated the production of local historiography. In 713, Gemmei ordered

---

33 It is important, in this regard, that Chang Qu’s national history was particularly biased against the regions to the south (see J. Farmer 2007b, 47-49).
each provincial governor to submit a report about his province in order to record the “origins of names of mountains, rivers, plains, and fields;” to note strange tales passed down through the generations; to gather information about things like precious metals, the fertility of the soil, flora, and fauna; and to give “good Chinese characters to the names of the villages, districts, and provinces.”\textsuperscript{34} We have significant remains of several of these reports, known as \textit{fudoki} (“Records of Wind and Earth)—the model seems to have been local works in post-Han-Dynasty China, like the \textit{Huayang Guozhi}\textsuperscript{35}—and quotations from many others preserved in later works; but the only \textit{fudoki} that has survived intact is that on the Izumo province, compiled under the auspices of a local official named Izumo no Omi Hiroshima and composed (largely in Chinese, the official language of the Yamato court) by a man named Miyake no Omi Kanatari.\textsuperscript{36} It was submitted to the court twenty years later in 733.

The \textit{Izumo Fudoki} begins with a general description of the province, its size and topography and the names of its nine districts. In the nine chapters that follow, each district is surveyed by way of its “communities” and “villages,” as well as its shrines, mountains, rivers, islands, and produce (plants, birds, animals, seafood) and culminates by naming the district officials responsible for submitting the required information to Izumo no Omi. Evenness of style suggests that the individual submissions of the local officials served only as the raw material from which Miyake no Omi assembled the final text. At the end of the ninth chapter, an appendix compiles information about the highways, posting stations, army divisions, beacons, and fortresses of the entire province.

Despite its chorographic emphasis on data—typical passages list the distances of local mountains from the district office and the circumferences of various lakes and

\textsuperscript{34} This is how the edict is described in the \textit{Shoku Nihonngi} for the year 713 (see E.A. Cranston 1993, 470).

\textsuperscript{35} The term \textit{fudoki} represents the Chinese \textit{feng t’u chi}, a term applied to local gazetteers of the early sixth century.

\textsuperscript{36} For the \textit{Izumo Fudoki}, see M.Y. Aoki 1971, from which all translations come. Since the text is not divided by book or chapter number, citations are to page numbers of Aoki’s translation.
ponds—the *Fudoki Izumo* is undeniably interested in the past. The first section of the chapter on the District of Ou, for example, begins with a detailed narrative about the *ktisis*, the God Yatsukamizu Omizunu’s “pulling” of the land from across the Sea of Japan in order to create the province of Izumo; and to almost every community and village is attached a historical etymology. In the preface to the entire work, in fact, we read that one of the principal tasks of the *Fudoki* was basing “etymology on the authenticity of tradition” (79). The name of the district Ou comes, we learn, from the sound that the god Omizunu uttered when he finished pulling the province together (83); the Community of Saka is named from a sake brewery built there by the gods (110); and the Community of Shitafuru (“Yearning”) Hill in the district of Nita takes its name from the unrequited love of a shark for a local goddess (135). Not all such historical information is etymological, however; nor are all historical anecdotes connected to the time of the gods. Foundations of particular shrines and temples elicit more recent anecdotes—the Kyokoji Temple, for example, was built by the Priest Kyoko, “the grandfather of Oshii of the Uehara no Obito clan” (88). And one lengthy anecdote involves the daughter of the Katari no Omi, who was killed by a shark on Cape Himesaki “on the thirteenth day of the seventh month of the second year of the Emperor Temmu” (85).

Although the *fudoki* were certainly tied to the attempt of the Yamato court to consolidate its rule, they were composed by locals who themselves drew on local sources. “The people who live in the five districts between the river mouth and the village of Yokota” we read, “make a living from the water as well as from the land. From the first month to the third, lumber is transported along the river” (119). And, “today a woman with child will not eat rice grown in the village of Misaha,” since the

37 The *Nihongi* records that in the year 403 CE, “Local recorders were appointed for the first time in the various provinces, who noted down statements, and communicated the writings of the four quarters” (translation, W.G. Aston, 1956, 307). Centralization was effected, we should note, quite late, only in the late-seventh century, with the Taika Reform of 645 and the Taihō Code of 701.
Lord of the Great Land, Ajisuki Takahiko, who was born dumb, lived there (134). And not infrequently explicit reference is made to the carriers of community memory: regarding Tako (“Octopus”) Island, we read that “the old folks told us the story” about an eagle who carried an octopus to the island (98). Or of a cliff in the Community of Uka, “It is said that anyone who dreamt that he was approaching the cave was destined for immediate death; therefore, the people call the cliff ‘The Cave of Hell’” (116).

The role of local tradition made each fudoki distinct in form, content, and emphasis. The Hitachi Fudoki, for example, is written in a florid literary language that cites numerous poems and songs (the Izumo Fudoki retains no verse whatsoever). The Izumo Fudoki, moreover, preserves traditions that are not represented by, that in fact contest, official Yamato historiography. The god Susanowo, for example, is linked in the court histories to the underworld but in the Fudoki Izumo is peaceful and benevolent. While the fudoki were composed as a response to an official edict and while they ostensibly served as a means for the Yamato Court better to understand the extent of its empire, the form and content of each local history reflected the idiosyncratic character of its focal community.

1.2.2.6 THE ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE (891)

In 891, a scribe at Winchester Cathedral wrote out a brief genealogy of King Alfred and followed it by copying out a narrative that tracked the history of Britain from the creation of the world to the present day; the text, quite extraordinarily written not in

---

38 Regarding the Cape of Maheara, we read that “It is such a beautiful place that people of both sexes occasionally come to enjoy it. Some go home after enjoying the gathering to the full; others become so engrossed in the outing that they forget to go home” (98).
39 For this text, see M. C. Funke 1994.
41 Izumo appeared to have retained a particularly vibrant local history. It may be worth noting in this context, that by the early eighth century, Izumo was one of two provinces that were still controlled by a kuni no miyatsuko, who was both a magistrate and Shinto priest; all other provincial governors were deprived of religious authority by the Yamato court.
Latin but English,\textsuperscript{42} is known as the \textit{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle}. Numerous manuscripts from diverse monasteries in central and southern England preserve a similar core yet extend the narrative beyond 891; at Winchester, several scribes added material that continued the coverage for another generation or so, and the longest extant version (from Peterborough) covers even the reign of Henry II. But the earliest edition of the \textit{Chronicle} is that produced at Winchester,\textsuperscript{43} and the so-called Common Stock that it preserves must belong to King Alfred’s cultural revival following his unification of England after the Danish invasion.\textsuperscript{44} A notice in the twelfth-century history of the Anglo-Norman Gaimar, \textit{L’estoire des Engleis}, tells us that Alfred had “caused a book to be written in English about events and about laws and about battles in the land and about kings who made war”\textsuperscript{45} and that this book was sent to Winchester “and fastened to a pillar.”\textsuperscript{46} But even if the king did not himself command the history,\textsuperscript{47} its impetus seems to have come from his court: not only do several passages evince a West Saxon bias (notably in the story of Cerdic and Cynric, the founders of the line, and in numerous West Saxon genealogies),\textsuperscript{48} but Alfred himself also features very prominently and always in a flattering light.\textsuperscript{49} Still, the \textit{Chronicle} was not composed \textit{ab ovo}; it represents, rather, a collation of already existing traditions and texts,\textsuperscript{50} selected in such a way as to emphasize Wessex’s claim on the territory of Britain.

\textsuperscript{42} There is, however, precedent for the use of vernacular in a contemporary translation of Bede’s \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica} into English.

\textsuperscript{43} See A. Jorgensen 2010, 11-13.

\textsuperscript{44} He himself apparently translated several Latin histories (\textit{e.g.} Orosius and Boethius) into English. See F. M. Stenton, 257-270, A. Grandsen 1974, 33, and M. J. Swanton 1990, xviii.

\textsuperscript{45} Lines 3445-8, translation from M. J. Swanton 1990, xviii.

\textsuperscript{46} 2312-36.

\textsuperscript{47} See A. Gransden 1990, 137.

\textsuperscript{48} See F.M. Stenton 1925 and B. Yorke 2010.

\textsuperscript{49} He is even anointed at Rome by the Pope. That the \textit{Chronicle} was initially employed as royal propaganda is further suggested by the fact that several of its continuators highlight the career of Alfred’s successor Edward, in some cases to the detriment of Alfred himself. But see A. Jorgensen 2010, 13-14.

\textsuperscript{50} As B. Yorke says, “Had Alfred set out to commission his ‘ideal’ portrayal of West Saxon history he would surely have come up with something that looked rather different and in which his own ancestors in the direct male line would have played a prominent part” (159).
Like the earlier histories of Gildas (6th century), Bede (672-735), and Nennius (ca. 830), the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* begins with a description of the island of Britain (800 miles long, 200 miles wide, etc.) and of its inhabitants, with the first immigrants being the Britons, followed not long afterwards by the Picts from Scythia. The localization of the history is thus underscored by the *Chronicle*’s exploration of Britain’s history before the advent of the focal community. After this ethnographic prelude, the narrative commences with Britain’s entrée onto the world stage: the failed attempt of Julius Caesar to conquer the island 60 years before the birth of Christ. From here it proceeds to record events of Christian and universal history (*e.g.* Christ was born in the 42nd year of Octavian’s rule; Herod committed suicide 5200 years after the creation of the world; and in the year 70 Titus killed 111,000 Jews in Jerusalem) alongside those of local relevance (Claudius’s invasion of England in the year 47; the embassy of Lucius to the Bishop Eleutherius at Rome in the year 167; Severus’s fortifications of the island and his rule at York; and the birth of Maximus and his accession to the throne). Increasingly, however, it is the local events that percolate to the forefront. And, by the time of the sack of Rome, after which point “the Romans never again reigned in Britain,” and the invasion of the Germans Hengest and Horsa in 449, local events predominate. At the same time, the chronicle gradually begins to privilege a particular subset of the island’s inhabitants, the community of the English. And in the mid-eighth century, the focalizing community becomes even more restricted, with the narrative focusing constricting on the kingdom of Wessex: the longest and most detailed entries (such as that for 755, which describes the tension between the Wessex kings Sigeberht and Cynewulf; or those that cover the reigns of Aethelwulf and his son Aethelred) all concern West Saxon events. Alfred first appears in the year 853, when he is sent to Rome by his father, and he is thenceforth at the

---

51 The text actually claims that the Britons came from Armenia: an interesting case of misreading, since this must be a reference to Bede’s Armoricano (*i.e.* Brittany).
vanguard of the action. The longest entries now deal strictly with Alfred and his efforts to check the Scandinavian invasion (e.g. in the years 871, 878, and 885).

By establishing the island of Britain as the focalizing locality of the history and Wessex as the ultimate protagonist, the historian creates a link between locality and community. He thereby substantiates King Alfred’s possession of and right to the entire island of Britain. In 891, having recently reoccupied London and required the entire Saxon population to submit to his sole rule, Alfred would have especial reason to promote this correspondence.

1.2.2.7 THE CHRONICA BOEMORUM, BY COSMAS OF PRAGUE (1120-1125)

Cosmas (ca. 1045-1125), a Dean of Prague Cathedral with an enviable command of Latin literature, was seventy-five years old when he published (in 1120) the first book of his Chronica Boemorum, which recorded in Latin the history of the Czechs from the flood of Noah to the enthronement of Duke Bretislav I in 1037. He went on to cover in a second installment the rule of Bretislav, the great conqueror of Poland, and the subsequent reign of Vratislav, the period in which Cosmas spent his youth. The third book, which he was still writing when he died on Oct. 12, 1125, covers the years of Cosmas’s adulthood (1092 to 1125) and ended with the enthronement of Soveslav I. As Cosmas’s title makes clear, the Chronica is a history of a people—the Bohemians—and for this reason it is often classified, alongside e.g. Jordanes’s Getica and the Gesta Danorum of Saxo Grammaticus, as a national history. But Cosmas continually makes explicit the equation between nation and locality.

He emphasizes the localism of his history, in fact, in his prefatory letter to the Archdeacon Gervasius: “Igitur huius narrationis sumpsi exordium a primis incolis terre

---

52 Cosmas often quotes from Sallust, Lucan, Ovid, and Livy, texts that that evidently encountered in his student days at Liège (3.59).
Boemorum.” And, after a discussion of the flood and the original dispersion of mankind, he moves on to define the “situm terre huius Boemice et unde nomen sit sortiata” (1.1). As in the case of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the land focalizes the narrative even before the advent of the focal community: the first inhabitants of Bohemia, Cosmas claims, are wild animals and locusts (1.2). At some point (the chronology is vague) the eponym Bohemus arrives with his retinue at the future site of kingdom, which he, like Aeneas, immediately calls his patria and terra fatalis, and there he founds the first settlement around Mt. Rit (1.2). Cosmas describes the original population, who are without agriculture or politeia, by quoting liberally from the ethnography of the Scythians in the Chronicon of Regino of Prüm (132). But at the same time, he refers to them as cives (1.4), thereby suggesting the early politicization of the community. Very swiftly, the group submits to a monarchy (1.3)—it is the ploughman Premysl who becomes the first duke and progenitor of the Premyslid dynasty, still in power at the time of Cosmas’s death. And it is Premsyl’s wife, Libuse, who founds the urbs of Prague, “in a forest, thirty stades from the village where the Vltava ends in streams” (1.8). Prague now becomes a second lens through which Cosmas filters his narrative, and soon thereafter, he introduces a third local focalizer: the church founded in 929 by Vaclav in honor of the martyr Vitus (1.18). The church, which is first placed under the guidance of the sister of Duke Boleslav I, soon becomes (in 1060) the Episcopal see of the principatus (1.22) and is given a bishop of its own (1.23). Its bishops henceforth serve as a chronological

54 Dates begin to appear part way through Book One (1.14), starting with 894; they are expressed with reference to the death of Christ and are largely taken from the Chronicle of Regino of Prüm. Not every year is named, and some entries are left blank: 1.16, for example, merely says “in the 895th year after the birth of Christ.” Nor does Cosmas feel compelled to invent material where he has found none: regarding Duke Boleslav I, for example, he says that he was able to find nothing else worthy of report except for the fact that the church was consecrated under his reign (1.18). Some years, moreover, report events that have little to do with the Czechs: in the year 935, we read that King Henry became paralyzed; in 939, we read that King Louis married Gerberga (1.20). But the closer he gets to his own time, the more detailed Cosmas becomes and the less opportunity he has to mention non-local data.
55 Regino himself cited Justin (2.103).
56 Cosmas claims to cite Pope John’s letter verbatim.
scaffolding on which Cosmas hangs his narrative. It is through the Cathedral, in fact, that Cosmas himself enters the narrative; he is ordained as a priest along with the future bishop Hermann (3.9). All three focalizers (Bohemia, Prague, and the Cathedral) sometimes work in tandem. In speaking about the transference of the remains of Adalbert to the church in 1039, for example, Cosmas writes, “O that day, a day to be honored by the Bohemians, to be commended to memory for all time, . . . O exceedingly lucky metropolis Prague, once raised up by a holy duke, now elevated by a blessed bishop, receive the double joy conferred on you by God and through these tow olive trees of mercy” (2.4).

Cosmas tells Archdeacon Gervasius in his prefatory letter that his goal in writing the Chronicle was to preserve the past (“non humane laudis ambitione, sed ne omnino tradantur relata oblivioni”) and to proffer his book as materia with which others might clarify their own knowledge and glorify their own names (as Vergil had earned fame by way of the fall of Troy and Statius the Aeacidae). But the prefatory letter to Book Three suggests another motive. Here, Cosmas highlights the political turmoil of the time, namely the dynastic disturbances set off by the assassination of Bretislav II in 1100. With a nod to Sallust and Livy, he bemoans the problems inherent in writing contemporary history: it is easier, he says, to remain silent than on the one hand to speak the truth, through which he might incur enmity, or on the other hand to be accused of deceit. The powerful men of today, he continues, seek only to be praised; their only response to the duke is “Yes, lord.”57 Cosmas’s narratees, it is true, are his peers in the church—Book One is addressed to Provost Severus of Melnik; Book Two to Clement Abbot of the Church of Brevnov; and Book Three to Archdeacon Gervasius, to whom he also addresses the entire work—but Cosmas surely expected that a history written by a

57 Cosmas is here quoting the words that he attributed to Libuse in the beginning of the first book.
high ranking official of the Cathedral like himself, would reach the ears of the court.\textsuperscript{58} His overriding plea, aside from the eradication of yes-men and the re-establishment of a strong dukedom\textsuperscript{59} is for an end to civil strife. As Vratislav is told by his sister-in-law, a conjurer of Lucan, “You commit a war worse than civil. . . . He who attacks his own people goes against god” (2.45).\textsuperscript{60} Cosmas’s history would be continued in the following decades by several anonymous churchmen: one canon of Vysehrad extended the coverage to the reign of Sobeslav I (to 1142); and a collection of works emanating from St. Vitus Cathedral in the late-thirteenth century continued the narration to 1283.\textsuperscript{61} But the first soundings of local historiography in Bohemia belong to Cosmas, to his literary talent, to his high rank, and to his anxiety.

1.2.2.8 THE RAJATARANGINI, BY KALHANA (1149)

In 1149, Kalhana published the \textit{Rajatarangini}, “River of Kings,” which tracked in some 8,000 verses divided into eight cantos (\textit{tarangas}) the history of Kashmir from its mythical beginnings to the present day. Kalhana’s work is often cited as the sole example of indigenous historiography in India before colonial rule\textsuperscript{62}—the idea of India’s ahistoricity was forwarded by the great Persian polymath Al-Buruni\textsuperscript{63} and touted thenceforth rather frequently, by the likes of Mill, Hegel, and Wilamowitz.\textsuperscript{64} Although

\textsuperscript{58} See L. Wolverton 2009, 14.
\textsuperscript{59} As his hero, Duke Bretislaw, tells Emperor Henry III, “Our land is your treasury; we are yours and wish to be yours. He who rages against his own subjects is known to be more cruel than a cruel enemy” (2.12); cf. 1.12 where Duke Neklan flees before battle, and Cosmas asks, “What would limbs do without a head, or warriors in battle without a duke?” For the important role of the duke, see L. Wolverton 2001, 5.
\textsuperscript{60} See L. Wolverton 2009, 8-9 for the references.
\textsuperscript{61} We may also note the so-called \textit{Chronicon aulae regiae}, begun by Abbot Otto of Zbraslav in 1305 and continued by Abbot Peter of Zittau, which covered the last of Premyslides up to 1338, and the \textit{Chronicle of Dalimil}, a rhymed chronicle in the vernacular, which appeared at the beginning of the fourteenth century.
\textsuperscript{62} See, for example, R.C. Majumdar 1961, 14 and A.A. Macdonell 1900, 10: “History is one weak spot in Indian literature. It is, in fact, non-existent.”
\textsuperscript{63} He prefaced his 11\textsuperscript{th}-century history of India with the remark that “the Hindus did not pay much attention to the historical order of things.”
\textsuperscript{64} In his \textit{The History of British India}, J.S. Mill wrote that “this people, indeed, are perfectly destitute of historical records. Their ancient literature affords not a single production to which the historical character
the formulation has recently met with some criticism, the *Rajatarangini* stands out as our earliest extant example of a Sanskrit local history.

Kalhana was almost certainly Brahman and had perhaps been a poet of some renown before he set to work on his history. He took his role as poet-historian quite seriously: “That noble-minded [poet] is alone worthy of praise whose word, like that of a judge, keeps free from love or hatred in relating the facts of the past” (1.7). He relied in his endeavor on the one hand on written sources, claiming to have access to “Eleven works of former scholars containing the chronicles of the Kings” as well as “inscriptions recording the consecration of temples and grants by former kings” (1.14-15); on the other hand on oral tradition, not only epics, like the *Mahabharata*, but anecdotes as well. When King Hansa executed four conspirators in the previous generation, Kalhana says that “the beauty which remained with them even in death is described to this day by those of great age” (7.1066). Another source is Kalhana’s father, belongs (2.1). See Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Weltgeschichte* (1836), 3.3.69; and Wilamowitz 1908, 5.

65 See, for example, R. Thapar 1978 and *Textures of Time* (2001), by V.N. Rao, D. Shulman, and S. Subrahmanyam 2001, which claims that histories did indeed exist in pre-Colonial India but took a form that was very different from that belonging to communities the western world. Paradoxically, however, Rao et al. see Kalhana as a case of “mistaken identity,” since his insensitivity to ideas like causality and his hyperrealism was seen to mitigate against the poem’s historicity (2001, 254-261).

66 Its singularity stands out even considering genealogical chronicles (*vamsāvalis*, *prādhīvañca*, and *khyāta*) from nearby regions (like Nepal and Orissa). R.C. Majumdar (1961, 20): “For the fact remains that except Kalhana’s *Rajatarangini*, which is merely a local history of Kashmir, there is no other historical text in the whole range of Sanskrit literature which makes even a near approach to it, or may be regarded as history in the proper sense of the term.” For Majumdar, too, the local focalization of the *Rajatarangini* seems to argue against its status as historiography.

67 As were most pandits. He was also probably Shaivist, since he introduces each of the eight cantos with a prayer to Shiva, although with significant Buddhist sympathies (see M. A. Stein 1892, 8-9).

68 If he can be equated with the contemporary poet Kavi Kalyana, as M. A. Stein suggests (1892, 12-14).

69 As a translation, I am using the edition and translation of M.A. Stein (1892 and 1900); other English translations were made, notably by R.S. Pandit (1935). For a good discussion of the influences of these translations on our understanding of the text, see C. Zutshi (2011).

70 In his preface, he defines his task as somewhat more difficult than simply connecting “the narrative of events in the works of those who died after composing each the history of those kings whose contemporaries they were” (1.9-11).

71 Kalhana is very critical of some previous histories (1.13), and he explicitly avoids inventing traditions where he has found no precedent—the 35 kings who followed Gonanda II, he says, “have been immersed in the ocean of oblivion” (1.83).
a minister for King Hansa, “the Illustrious Lord Canpaka” (e.g. 7.1586); Kalhana once even reports what he has himself witnessed (8.895).

Kalhana’s goal, reflected in the title of his work, was to record the actions of the kings of Kashmir; in this sense, the *Rajatarangini* is a dynastic history. Yet he focalizes his narrative very explicitly through the land of Kashmir. His first task, in fact, is to describe his focal locality (1.25-45): “the land in the womb of the Himalaya,” he says, was first a lake; Jalobdhava, who lived in that lake, was killed by the gods, and the land known by the name of *Kashmir* was created in the space (1.25). After surveying the gods with particular attachment to Kashmir and their influence on the landscape—e.g. “There the goddess Samhya produces on an arid hill water which serves as an indication of the presence of merit and the absence of sin” (1.33)—Kalhana praises his region. “That country,” he says, “may be conquered by the force of spiritual merits, but not by forces of soldiers. Hence its inhabitants are afraid only of the world beyond” (1.39). And, “learning, lofty houses, saffron, icy water and grapes: things that even in heaven are difficult to find, are common there” (1.42). Even when his history moves decidedly into dynastic chronicle, the territory retains an important role. Kalhana takes pains, for example, to note the ways in which the kings shaped the landscape: King Lava built 84 lakhs of houses and founded the town of Lolora (1.86); Asoka built a massive Caitya and the capital city of Shrinagari, replete with 96 lakhs of houses (1.103-104); in the reign of Avantivarman, the illustrious Surra rerouted the rivers, “which have to this day in the vicinity of the city their confluence” (5.97-98; cf. 99-112).

Kalhana is interested, moreover, not only in rulers but also in the ruled: up to the time King Jaauka, we read, “there existed in this land . . . wealth . . . . and a government like in most countries. There were seven main state-officials: the judge, the revenues superintendent, the treasurer, the commander of the army, the envoy, the Purohita, and the astrologer” (1.118-119). And in the reign of Yasaskara (939-948), Kalhana writes
that “the villages, being wholly absorbed by agriculture, never saw the royal residence. The Brahmans, devoted to their studies, did not carry arms” (6.9). One notable passage describes a great famine that took place in the reign of Tunjina I, “in the month of Bhadrapada,” when a snow fell on the just ripening rice-crop and the masses of starving people moved about “like ghosts.” “Tormented by hunger,” Kalhana tells us, “every one thought only of his belly and forgot in his misery love for his wife, affection for his children, and tender regard for his parents” (2.20-21). On the occasion of a later famine, Kalhana records that one measure of rice could be purchased for “1050 Dinnaras” (5.71; cf. 5.271).

Like many of the other local historians we have been surveying, Kalhana lived through a period of considerable political unrest in Kashmir. Upon the death of King Hansa (1089-1101), under whom Kalhana’s father had served, the region was subjected to fifty years of civil war and social unrest. Like Cosmas and Livy, moreover, Kalhana was given to complaining about the decadence of the present. While he admires the military valor of the ancient Kashmiris (1.39), he frequently bemoans contemporary Kashmiri soldiers (e.g. 7.57, 85, 117, 1158, 1191; 8.324, 463, 800, 1322, 1340), especially in comparison to foreign mercenaries (e.g. 8.1082, 1148). Some of his harshest judgments, however, are aimed at the Dāmaras, the landowning class who he thinks single-handedly caused the downfall of King Hansa. But unlike his father, Kalhana himself held no official position. This may help to explain his freedom explicitly to criticize several of the kings under whose rule he spent his adult life. But it may also explain his motivation for writing local history. Denied, like Livy, the opportunity to contribute actively in the political life of his community, he sought

72 Hansa’s murderers (and relatives), the brothers Sussala and Uccala, split the territory and independently dealt with various problems, including discontent among the landed classes and the revolt of a pretender, Bhiksacara. In 1128, Sussala’s son Jayasimha came to power, and he managed to remain alive at least through the composition of the Rajatarangini.
73 See M.A. Stein 1892, 18.
74 8.1553, 1566, 2105, and 3405.
influence through other means. Kalhana was not the first local historian of Kashmir—he claims, as we have said, to have relied on a series of earlier dynastic chronicles—and the Rajatarangini was itself continued by at least three other Kashmiri chroniclers in the ensuing centuries. Yet his text illuminates the relationship between local historiography and political life, as well as the priority of the form: it is no coincidence that the one manifestation of Kashmiri historiography is local.

1.2.2.9 The Tārīkh-i Bayhaq (History of Bayhaq) of Ibn Funduq (1168)

In 1168, the prolific author Zahīr al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Zayd al-Bayhaqī, known as Ibn Funduq, completed his history of his native Bayhaq (modern-day Sabzevar), one of the major towns of the Khurasan region (in northeastern Iran). Ibn Funduq was from a well-connected family, a descendent, he said, of one of Mohammed’s Companions, and both his great-grandfather and grandfather were judges in several cities of the region. Born in Bayhaq in 1097, Ibn Funduq pursued his studies (the Quran and law, as well as literature, astronomy, and math) in nearby Nishapur, and it was here that he settled after a brief career as a judge of Bayhaq, which he owed in part to the influence of his father-in-law, the governor of Rayy. Despite his withdrawal from politics, Ibn Funduq remained well connected and even enjoyed a close relationship with Sanjar, Sultan from 1118 to 1153. After Sanjar’s capture by the Oghuz Turks in 1153, the Saljuqs lost their hold of Khurasan; and upon Sanjar’s death four years later, the empire fractured. It was during these years of uncertainty and upheaval that Ibn Funduq set at work on his local history.

---

75 See M.A, Stein 1892, 21.
76 It was, interestingly, translated into Persian in the 15th century (by Mulla Ahmed, the Court Historian of Sultan Zain-al-Abidin) and into French in the 17th century by Francoise Bernier.
77 For a good introductory discussion of the work, see J.S. Meisami 1999, 209-229. Among the 74 works attributed to Ibn Funduq are a lost general history of Iran, a continuation of another historian’s Tārīkh-i Yamini, covering the years 961-1036, and a biographical dictionary of Muslim philosophers (see P. Pourshariati 2000, 141).
Although the *Tārīkh-i Bayhaq* is one of the earliest extant Persian local histories, Ibn Funduq refers to numerous earlier examples, including fifteen from communities in Khurasan alone.\(^{79}\) In format, he followed the rubric employed by these earlier works, which, like local histories of China, tended toward heterogeneity, including sections on geography, foundation stories,\(^{80}\) traditions of the Islamic conquest, and, most significantly, biographies of local dignitaries.\(^{81}\) But Ibn Funduq made the unusual decision to write his history both in Arabic, the learned language of Islam, and in Persian, sometimes even moving between the two in the midst of a paragraph or sentence. He drew also on oral tradition. Several times, in fact, he explicitly cites his own family tradition, quoting anecdotes transmitted by his grandfather, Shayk al-Islam Amīrak (*e.g.* 82-83). “One day,” his grandfather reported, “I went to see Sūbāshi (the hājib of Masʿūd), ‘who was in the palace of Shādyākh in Nishapur . . . A scout entered and said, ‘Ten thousand Turkmens have been seen in the region of Tukāb.’ Sūbāshī ordered the drum beaten and the golden trumpets sounded. . . He said to me, ‘Khvāja Imām, don’t withhold your prayers and supplications that I return safely without encountering them.’ I answered, ‘Amīr, so much caution and pessimism is not right. May you see nothing but good.’ I went out, and told the people, ‘The sun of the dawlat is setting’” (274).\(^{82}\)

After an introductory invocation in rhyming prose, Ibn Funduq begins by outlining his own genealogy, which he traces all the way back to Noah. Next, he offers a

---


\(^{80}\) So the *Fārsnāmah* of Ibn Balkhi, a twelfth-century history of the province of Fars, goes into great detail about the four dynasties that controlled the region before the advent of Islam. This interest is reflected in several Arabic histories, as well, like the fourteenth-century *History of Alexandria* by Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Nuwayri, which, although focusing on events of 1365-6, also provides a lengthy account of Alexander.

\(^{81}\) See P. Pourshariati 2000, 135-137. This biographical emphasis, we should note, is present in much of Islamic historiography: the *Tārīkh Baghad* of Al-Khatib (ca. 1059), for example, is essentially a topography prefacing some 7800 biographical entries; and Abu Zakariya’s *History of Mosul* is described by those who cite it as a work on the local scholars of hadith, even though the extant section of this text is an annalistic account of years 719-839.

\(^{82}\) Translation from J.S. Meisami 1999, 226.
complaint about his ager, comparing it to former days when scholarship was fully patronized and supported by the sultans: “(But) in these unfortunate days and this treacherous age,” he writes, “a time of trying tests and civil unrest, when hopes and desires are about to expire. . . learning has become (as rare as) red sulphur.”83 Among the disappearing sciences, Ibn Funduq bemoans the decay of genealogy, an especial preserve of the Arabs (the noblest of people), and the discipline of history (4). This leads naturally into praise of the historical arts. First and foremost, history is utilitarian, offering a set of exempla to which current events can be compared (8-9). Those who benefit most from the study of the past, however, are kings and amirs, whose success depends upon knowledge of events and battles, strategies for warfare, and policies (13-15).

Ibn Funduq’s introduction leads into a general survey of the fifty provinces and regions of the world (e.g. India, Africa, Byzantium, Rus, and China) and then to an overview of his sources. And only now does he turn to Bayhaq. He begins by listing the Companions of the Prophet who passed through the region, comprising the major events of the Islamic conquest. Next he describes Bayhaq’s climate, geography, and temperament: just as wise men are associated with Greece, weavers with Yemen, and archers with the Turks, he claims, Bayhaq is known for its udabâ, scholars. Then comes the etymology of the name of Bayhaq, its constituent villages, and its bordering settlements, along with their (predominately pre-Islamic) ktiseis.84 He moves now to biography, first of the prominent sayyids (descendants of Husayn) and rulers of the region, then of noble Bayhaqis (73-137), some of whom were Ibn Funduq’s own ancestors (101, 107). The longest section of the text is a prosopography of some 150 Bayhaqi scholars, including a good smattering of poets, some of whose verses he quotes

84 Prominent here is a lengthy narrative about Sasan, the eponymous ancestor of the Sasanians, who founded Sabzavâr.
The Tārīkh-i Bayhaq concludes with a summary of Bayhaq’s history, which reprises certain themes and events alluded to in the biographies: e.g. a devastating regional famine a century before, battles recently fought between the Saljūqs and Khwārazmians, and the account of two famous cypress trees allegedly planted by Zoroaster, whose destruction had untoward consequences for the caliphs (282-3). The book closes with a prayer and the date on which it was completed (July 12, 1168).

In his introductory chapter on historiography, Ibn Funduq divides previously published historical works into two categories: on the one hand, biographical dictionaries and those “famous histories” that deal with dynasties; on the other, the histories of cities and regions and their authors (12). He draws attention to a distinct genre of local historiography a second time when he catalogs some of the typical contents of such works, like genealogy and dynastic lists (65). But the phenomenon of local historiography was relatively recent; earlier Islamic histories tended to focus on the Prophet and his Companions, opting for a more universal approach to the past. It has been argued that this universalism was a characteristic of ninth- and tenth-century “Abbasid absolutism”; the emergence of local historiography, on the other hand, is generally linked, as it is in China, to a belated regionalism engendered by the weakening of central rule. Part of Ibn-Funduq’s motivation is certainly local pride, as is made explicit in other contemporary local histories. Yet local histories were far more prevalent

---

85 His biographies, not surprisingly, privilege the elite, and a distrust of the masses is evident throughout, especially in the numerous sections describing civil unrest (272, 274-275, 285); see P. Pourshariati 2000, 157-160.

86 The recognition of local historiography as its own distinct genre is not unique to Ibn Funduq. A similar sentiment can be seen in the Tārīkh-i Qum and the Tārīkh-i ṣadīd-I Yazd of Husayn ‘Allī Katib (P. Pourshariati 146). For the importance of the local in Islamic historiography, see F. Rosenthal 1952, 130.

87 See A.K. Lambton 1991, 228-229, who argues “that the contribution of the regions is worthy of record and that their histories, rather than [those] of larger political units, represent or reflect the vigour and strength of the community as a whole.” See also C. Robinson (2003, 138-139): “local chronography and non-Prophetic biography are emblematic of the late- and post-Abasid world of the tenth to the thirteenth centuries, in which the unified state was replaced by a commonwealth of regional polities.”
in Iran than in other areas formerly under firm central control.\textsuperscript{88} Other factors may thus be at work. One explanation points to a contemporary controversy in the Islamic empire between Iranians and Arabs.\textsuperscript{89} The indigenous Iranian response to the Arabic promotion of genealogical descent as a standard for membership in Muslim society was an accentuation of the territory: a people, it was argued, could be defined not only by blood but also by a common claim on a particular place.\textsuperscript{90} On this reading, local historiography developed in Persia as a result less of the loosening of central rule than of a fresh emphasis on locality as the bedrock of community.

1.2.2.10 \textit{Liber Eliensis}, History of the Isle of Ely (ca. 1173)

Towards the end of the twelfth century, a monk at Ely abbey in Cambridgeshire published in Latin a three-book history of the “insula” of Ely—\textit{insula} because the monastery was based on a tract of dry land in the midst of marshes.\textsuperscript{91} It was St. Aethelthryth, the daughter of King Anna, who founded Ely in 673 by, and the monastery initially housed both monks and nuns under the direction of an abbess. Destroyed in the ninth-century Scandinavian invasions, Ely was reformed a century later as a Benedictine monastery, which became a bishopric, thanks to the initiative of King Henry I, in 1109. The final section of the \textit{Liber Eliensis} recounts the actions of the first bishop of Ely, Hervey, and his successor Nigel, who revolted from King Stephen in the civil war of 1139 but managed to retain control of the monastery until his death in 1169. The last

\begin{footnotes}

\textsuperscript{88} P. Pourshariati 2000, 138.

\textsuperscript{89} As suggested by R. Mottahedeh 1976 (see also P. Pourshariati 2000, 139-140).

\textsuperscript{90} The so-called \textit{sub‘ūbtyah} controversy takes its name from a verse in the Quran (13.49) that sets up a dichotomy between “groups” (\textit{shu‘ūb}) and “tribes” (\textit{qadā‘il}). The interpretation of this passage favored by a certain section of the non-Arab population the empire, Mottahedeh points out, favored “a distinction . . . between sha‘b understood as a people related by a common place of residence or birth, and qabīlah understood as a people related through a common ancestor. The residential or territorial concept is specifically associated with the ‘Ajam, the non-Arabs, while the genealogical concept is associated with the Arabs” (1979, 169-170).

\textsuperscript{91} The text was published in 1962 by E.O. Blake and translated into English in 2005 by J. Fairweather.
\end{footnotes}
recorded events, in fact, are Nigel’s death and the murder of Thomas à Becket the following year.

The anonymous author sets out a plan for his work in the Prologue: the First Book, he says, will address the characteristics and situation of the island and provide a biography of the foundress of the monastery, Queen Aethelthryth; the Second Book will treat the monks of Ely and the rebuilding of the church after the Norman siege; the Third Book will treat the time of the Bishops, i.e. the tenures of Hervey and Nigel. Each book, moreover, is prefaced by a prologue of its own as well as a list of chapter headings. Not surprisingly, we begin with etymology—Ely is apparently named for the eels caught among the fens—with geography, and with an explanation of work: “Omnes preclari et nobiles suum penitus oppidum decorari et magnificentare contendunt et statum provincie atque suorum facta mariorum memoriae digna litteris commendare nonnulli intendunt.”

Much the first book is devoted to the life of and miracles associated with the abbey’s founder, Aethelthryth; after an interlude surveying Aethelthryth’s immediate successors and the Scandinavian invasion, it concludes with seven chapters borrowed explicitly from another text, a book of miracles written by an earlier monk at Ely called Aelfhelm, ostensibly for the benefit of a disbelieving new head priest. Book Two, considerably longer, focuses on King Edgar, under whose rule Ely becomes a monastery. Here archival documents outline the monastery’s jurisdiction and territory: a letter from King Edgar and excerpts from the Libellus beati Aethelwoldi, an early twelfth-century translation of English documents concerning land acquisition. In the chapter, “About Sutton,” for example, we read that a certain family “gave to God and the holy Aethelthryth three hides in Sutton and they put Abbot Byrthnoth into possession of it in the presence of the hundred so that remembrance of them would be kept with the brothers of a church.” Book Three concentrates on the bishopric. Here, too, documents are liberally cited: letters from the Pope to King Henry; additional royal charters, some
establishing the autonomy of monastery, some its lands; lists of miracles; and inventories (50). But most of the book is devoted to contemporary history, namely the conflict between Bishop Nigel and King Stephen, a narrative that ultimately derives from a short history composed by a monk named Richard (3.44).

We do not know who was responsible for composing the Liber. While it is true that much of the text is compilatory, preserving charters, writs, wills, title deeds, and inventories alongside fragments from other (often local) histories, the author is not a negligible presence. For one thing, he translated many local documents from English into Latin. For another, he writes frequently in the first person, most notably in the essays that preface each book. It was only after “considering the excellence of the Isle of Ely,” he says, that “my attention lighted upon past events which, because of the passage of years, of epochs, of kings and of rulers of the Isle, are not at all well known. . . . For up to now we have not had in our house writings of this kind, assembled in an orderly fashion and at the same time in historical sequence.”

Like Cosmas of Prague, however, the author of the Liber Eliensis presents his researches as material from which a proper historiographer might more artfully fashion a text. He is motivated, he repeats at the end of the invocation to Aethelthryth, not by fame but only by local pride, first and foremost by his love of St. Aethelthryth. He is goaded, too, by his community’s interest in asserting its authority over the insula, a tenure weakened by the tumultuous reign of Bishop Nigel. The original impetus for undertaking the work allegedly came from the community as a whole, whose sollicitudo et gratia first convinced the author to take up his pen (Prol. 1); in the Prologue to the Second Book, furthermore, the historian claims that certain men ex nostris urged him not to abandon his undertaking but to continue to

---

92 He is sometimes equated with the future prior, Richard, whose history of a particular episode of contemporary history regarding the vill of Stetchworth is explicitly cited by the Liber Eliensis (3.96). Another possible candidate is the monk Thomas, who wrote an autobiographical account of his miraculous cure (3.61); but cf. E.O. Blake 1962, xlvi.

93 e.g. the Liber de terries Sancti Aethelwoldi composed by the Bishop Hervey (Prol. 2).

94 Translation J. Fairweather (2005, 1).
narrate the “gesta nostra insule,” as he had promised. We may be able to say something more about the genesis of the book. As Janet Fairweather argues in the introduction to her recent translation of the Liber, the history was almost certainly published in the early 1170s, probably in 1173. For one thing, no local events later than 1169 are recorded, and the author was clearly aware of the canonization of Thomas à Becket in 1173. ¹¹ seventeenth is also the year when the new Bishop, Ridel, was enthroned and, more remarkable, the five-hundredth anniversary of the monastery. This may explain why, as Fairweather points out, the last chapters of the third book seem to have been hastily written: it was the impending anniversary, arriving sooner than anticipated, that motivated the assemblage of diverse community memories and the composition of this Liber as an authoritative statement about Ely and its past.

1.2.2.11. Nuova Cronica of Giovanni Villani (ca. 1320-1348)

The Florentine Giovanni Villani was born ca. 1276 and became a shareholder of the Peiruzzi Company in 1300. In the same year, he joined the bankers’ guild and journeyed to Rome on business, where he witnessed what was apparently a life-changing event: the great Jubilee of Boniface VIII. ² Six Banking was to keep Villani busy for the next decades—although he switched allegiance by the early 1320s to the Buonasccorsi firm—yet Villani concurrently began to develop an interest in matters of state. In 1316, he was elected Prior of Florence, an office that he would hold again in 1321, 1322 and 1328; and in 1324 he oversaw the rebuilding of the city walls (9.256-257). This, along with his post as Commissioner of the Mint in 1316, would have given him especial access to Florentine antiquities. His service to Florence went beyond mere city administration. In 1325, he fought (unsuccessfully) along with the Florentine Guelfs against Castruccio

¹¹ A terminus ante quem of 1177, the date on which a certain monk Richard become prior, is suggested by the fact that this Richard is referred to in the third book not as prior but as a brother (J. Fairweather 2005, xxii-xxiii).

² Six For the biography of Giovanni Villani, see L. Green 1972, 11-13 and G. Porta 1990, xix-xx.
Castracani at Altopascio, and he served as ambassador in several diplomatic ventures: to Bologna in 1329 and to Ferrara in 1331. But in the last decade of his life, Villani’s fortunes turned. The bankruptcy of the Buonaccorsi firm in 1338 landed him, a major shareholder, in jail; and upon his release, he found his city in the hands of novi cives, “vulgar upstarts” from the country, who jeopardized the position of the merchant class (13.43). He died from the plague not long after his release.

By the time of his death in 1348, his history of Florence, which he had been writing at least since the late 1320s and perhaps a good deal earlier,97 covered (in thirteen books)98 events from the foundation of the city up to 1346; the twin trajectories of his narrative and his life had by this point drawn asymptotically close. His brother Matteo made the decision to continue the Cronica, which he worked on for the next fifteen years, until he himself died of the plague in 1363 (having written eleven books, which covered the years from 1346 to 1363). Matteo’s son Filippo next tried his hand at the family business, but unlike his father and uncle, he did not find himself obligated to extend the chronicle indefinitely. He stopped writing in 1364, having reached his own day, although he lived for another forty years, publishing his most famous work, the two-book De Origine Civitatis Florentiae et Eiusdem Famosis Civibus, in 1381-1382.

While both Matteo and Filippo put their own stamp on the chronicle, it was Giovanni who established the form and style of the entire chronicle. He wrote, importantly, in the vernacular, probably to reach a larger audience,99 although he was perhaps also influenced by the precedent set by his older contemporary Dante.100 His decision to forego Latin in any case justified the adjective of the title; for earlier histories of Florence, like the Chronica de origine civitatis and a text (not extant) referred to as the

97 See L. Green 1972, Appendix II, 164-169, on the dating of Villani’s text.
99 “E però io fedelmente narrerò per questo libro in piano volgare, a ciò che li laici siccome gli aletterati ne possano ritrarre frutto e diletto” (Praef.).
100 Although it is possible that he simply did not feel secure enough in his own command of Latin (P. Clarke 2007, 114-115).
Gesta Florentinorum, on which he certainly relied, were written in Latin.\footnote{The Chronica de origine civitatis did however exist in both Latin and the vernacular.} It was also Giovanni who, as Jacob Burckhardt noticed,\footnote{1944, 50-51.} injected the Cronica with an interest in econometrics and statistics, surely a consequence of his involvement in Florentine fiscal management. In one passage (12.92-94), Villani reports the number of Florentine children in primary school, the average annual income, the number of lawyers and doctors in the city, the number of bakers’ ovens, and the amount of wine that was needed to satisfy Florence’s considerable thirst. And when he later records a famine that hit the city in 1346, he reports the cost of barley and wheat (13.73).

The Cronica can be divided roughly into two sections: the first half (books one through seven) follows Florentine history from the Tower of Babel to 1264; the second treats contemporary history to 1346. Like Livy, of whose history he was certainly aware,\footnote{See P. Clarke 2007, 116-117.} Giovanni covered the longest span of time in his earlier books: Books One and Two go from Babel to the death of St. Zenobius in 417 CE; and Book Three begins with Totila’s destruction of the city in the mid-sixth century and ends with Charlemagne. Yet as he approaches his own age, Villani grows considerably more expansive: Book Thirteen treats a mere four years (1342-1346). Like Livy, moreover, Villani does not attempt to cover every year (5.18). Between Totila’s invasion and the crowning of Charlemagne, in fact, Florence, in ruins, is altogether absent from the narrative (3.21). In these sections, the progress of time is marked by non-local events; and, like the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Liber Eliensis, Villani relied in these sections on a general chronicle, in his case that of Martin of Troppau.\footnote{On the sources used by Giovanni Villani, see L. Green 1972, Appendix I, 155-163. Much debate has been generated over the relationship between Villani’s Cronica and the Chronicle of Ricordano and Giacotto Malispini, since they in some places retain precisely the same account.}

In his preface, Villani outlines his motivation for undertaking the project. Because negligence or the destruction of the city by Totila has left few records of the fatti
passati of “our city of Florence . . . I, Giovanni, a citizen of Florence, considering the nobility and greatness of our city at our present times, think it fitting to recount the origin and beginnings of so famous a city, as well as its past deeds and its changes of fortune, both for the good and for the bad.” His hope, Villani continues, echoing Cosmas of Prague, among others, is to provide posterity with materia and, here with a nod to Livy, to provide an example of past changes and events and their causes, so that his successors follow virtue and avoid vice and thereby preserve the republic. In a second preface in the middle of Book Nine (9.36), Villani offers further motivation. It was at Rome in 1300, he says, in the midst of the Jubilee, in the presence of Rome’s impressive ancient remains, and in in the footsteps of its historians (“Vergil, Sallust, Lucan, Paulus Orosius, Valerius Maximus, and Titus Livy”) that he was struck with envy: the idea of his chronicle, he says, came after “Considering that our city of Florence, the figliuola e fattura of Rome, was prospering while Rome was declining.” In this year he began to compile the materials for his history.

One of Villani’s underlying themes, as he makes clear in this programmatic passage, is the symbiosis between Florence and Rome. In Villani’s account—and he evidently drew on local tradition popular enough at the time to find its way also into the Chronica de origine civitatis, the Gesta Florentinorum, and Dante (Par. 15.88-16.87)\(^\text{105}\)—Florence was founded by Julius Caesar. The Roman general had come to the region in order to check a group of Catilinarins based at Fiesole, an ancient town of Trojan foundation,\(^\text{106}\) and after destroying Fiesole he founded a settlement nearby explicitly modeled on Rome: Flavia, named after a Roman general in Caesar’s army killed in the attack on Fiesole. Florence had itself destroyed and absorbed Fiesole in 1125. So aside from cement a connection between Florence and Rome, the Caesarian

\(^{105}\) See P. Clarke 2007, 119.

\(^{106}\) See N. Rubinstein 1942; C.T. Davis 1988; and P. Clarke 2007, 119-120.
tradition managed also to retroject Fiesolan inferiority. At the same time, it helped Villani explain civic tensions in contemporary Florence. For just as Florence had been formed from Trojans (from Fiesole) and Romans, so too was Florence now divided between two factions, Ghibilene and Guelf.\textsuperscript{107} The support of the Guelfs by the Duke of Anjou may explain Villani’s emphasis on the second foundation of Florence by Charlemagne (3.1-3, 21; 4.1).

Louis Green suggested in \textit{Chronicle into History} (1972) that Giovanni Villani’s \textit{Cronaca} marked the culmination of the chronicle tradition at Florence: while he had been able to link natural events (in particular celestial occurrences) to history and history to the divine will, his brother, who survived for a good two decades more, found himself unable to maintain such a scheme to the crises that were assaulting the city late in the century. With the death of Matteo, Green argued, the history of Florence had to be approached along different avenues, like biography. Yet local history continued to thrive after 1348. Fillipo Villani published his \textit{De Origine} forty years after his uncle’s death (1381-1382), and while it was indeed partly devoted to local biography, the first half treated the legendary foundation of the city. In the early fifteenth century, moreover, Leonardo Bruni published his \textit{History of the Florentine People} (the first installment came out in 1428), which, although offering a very different account of the origins of the city and despite its titular emphasis on people rather than place, was nevertheless focalized by locality;\textsuperscript{108} and in the next century Machiavelli wrote an eight-book \textit{Istorie Fiorentine} (1520-1525). While Green may be correct to suggest that Giovanni Villani’s particular religious view could scarcely be accommodated by successive historians, crisis by no means dampened the impulse toward local history.

\textsuperscript{107} Villani himself was a self-proclaimed Black Guelf (9.39), favoring the papacy. For a good discussion of Villani’s reading of the foundation of Florence, see F. Salvestrini 2002. For Villani’s consistent support of the Black Guelfs and his use of the “Guelf catchword libertas to mean freedom from interference from the Empire,” see G. Ianziti 2012, 135-136.

\textsuperscript{108} For Bruni, see G. Ianziti 2007 and 2012.
1.2.2.12 *HISTORIA DE TLALETELOCO DESDE LOS TIEMPOS MAS REMOTOS* (1528).

The Spanish explorers who arrived in the New World in the early-sixteenth century were quick to compose accounts of their conquests and the native peoples whom they encountered. They often sought at the same time to extirpate native historiographical texts. In the wake of the Spanish Conquest, the Mexica communities soon adopted European modes of historiography, sometimes even reiterating the Eurocentric traditions imposed by Spanish historians. St. Thomas makes an appearance as an Incan wise man, for example, in the early-seventeenth-century *Relación de antiguiedades deste reyno del Piru* written by the native Peruvian Juan de Santa Cruz Pachacuti-Yamqui Salcamayhua. Some native histories, however, managed to retain indigenous traditions and modes of thought while employing Spanish historiographical forms.

One of the earliest indigenous New-World histories, preserved in only two manuscripts, is *Unos Anales Históricos de la Nación Mexicana*, dated just seven years after the Spanish Conquest. The text consists of five documents: two dynastic lists of kings of the cities Tenochtitlan and Tlatelolco respectively (both cities were located in what is today Mexico City); a genealogy of the kings of Azcapotzalco (a nearby city); a supplement to this genealogy; and finally a history of Tlatelolco from the times of origins

---

109 See E. Florescano 1994 and E.H. Boone 2000 on indigenous American historical and historiographical (albeit pictographical) traditions. The Spanish did not have a monopoly on censorship, we may note. When Tenochtitlan consolidated its power over the region a century before, the new rulers burned much previous historiography allegedly to suppress the proliferation of the lies it contained (see J. Bierhorst 1992, 1-3).

110 e.g. *The Annals of Cuauhtitlan* and *The Legends of the Sun*, both contained by the so-called *Codex Chimalpopoca* (see J. Bierhorst 1992).

111 In the mid-sixteenth-century, for example, the Spaniard Diego Durán’s *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España y Islas de Tierra Firme* described the Aztecs as a tribe of Israel that had been transferred to Assyria by Shalmaneser.

112 For doubt about this date’s authenticity, see J. Lockhart 1993, 18 and 39-40—he suggests ca. 1540, still very early.
to the Conquest, the text on which we will concentrate here. It is the preface to this history that provides a date for the publication: “This book, as it is written, was made in ancient times here in Tlatelolco, in the year 1528. The Castilians were just arriving in the country; they had barely taken root there.” The five documents are anonymous and written in Nahuatl, but, quite extraordinarily given their date, they use the Roman alphabet; the author was likely one of the Aztec elite associated with and educated by the first wave of missionaries. There may also have been earlier, pictographic versions of this dossier, for which these alphabetic texts perhaps served as a memory aid, “a primer for oral performance.”

The narrative itself can be divided roughly into four sections: (1) the initial period of migration; (2) the Tepanec period, describing the foundations of Tenochtitlan and Tlatelolco and culminating in the union of Tlatelolco and Tenochtitlan; (3) the period of the alliance between Tlatelolco/Tenochtitlan, Texcoco, and Tlacopan (the so-called Triple Alliance); and (4) the period of the Spanish conquest. Although it was subsumed by Tenochtitlan before the arrival of the Spanish, it is the community of the Tlatelolca that focalizes the narrative, and the Tlatelolca are clearly implied as the primary audience. They are often designated using the first-person plural (see e.g. sections 269, 286); and they are consistently singled out for praise. During the arrival of the Spanish, for example, they are favorably compared to their neighbors. “Only we, the Tlatelolca,” we read, “were guarding the roads when the ships arrived (315).” Or later, “when they reached Yacacolco here, Spaniards were captured on the Tlilhuacan road, as well as all

---

113 The entire dossier has been edited and translated into Spanish by H. Berlin and R.H. Barlow 1948, whose edition will be cited unless otherwise indicated. See also J. Lockhart 1993, 37-43 and G. Baudot 1995, 57-60.
116 As J. Rabasa writes, even without a focus on locality, “the Historia de Tlatelolco exemplifies a form of grassroots literacy in which indigenous writers operated outside the circuits controlled by missionaries, encomenderos, Indian judges and governors, or lay officers of the Crown. By all appearances, the Historia de Tlatelolco was written to perpetuate the history and identity of the Tlatelolcans. . . . In the best of the pre-Columbian traditions, it is local history (2000, 12).
the people from the various altepetl. Two thousand died there, and the Tlatelolca were exclusively responsible for it. (344-345). And the conquest is told consistently through Tlatelolcan eyes.117

“The old men who beat the cylindrical drums had their tobacco pots and their rattles. It was them they first attacked; they struck off their hands and lips. Then all who were dancing, and all who were looking on, died there. When they attacked us, they were killing us for three hours... At this time we Tlatelolca set up skull racks... After this they drove us from there and reached the marketplace. That was when the great Tlatelolco warriors were entirely vanquished. With that the fighting stopped once and for all” (295-297, 344-345).118

Some parts of the narrative even preserve local verse: war chants (194), lamentations (233-241), and victory songs (270-272). “Here is their victory song that they sang after this happened (the conquest of Cotastla); the song that the Tlatelocatl sing to mock someone” (270). Even though in some areas that the narrative is reduced to bare annals—section 247 is typical: “In Year 11 House nothing happened; In Year 12 Rabbit nothing happened; in Year 13 Reed nothing happened—attention is paid to data like local crop yield. “In Year 2 Reed,” we read, “it rained and then they verified the cyclic binding of the years, and since it rained, no-one sowed. Corn, chia, amaranth, pumpkins, which no one planted, sprouted everywhere, in the mountains and in the roads.”119

Yet the Historia de Tlatelolco Desde los Tiempos Mas Remotos is not localized like the other histories we have been examining. For one thing, it begins not by narrating occupants of a particular region before the arrival of the focal community but rather the migration of a conglomeration of tribes, the Mexica, who emerged from Colhuacan, Chicomóztoc, Quineuhyan, and a cave called Chicomóztoc “in the year 1 Reed and the day 1 Crocodile” (sections 103-105), and it considers their various settlements prior to

117 The so-called Codex of Tlatelolco, a pictorial history dated to some point after 1565 gives an apologetic account of the Conquest.
118 Translation from J. Lockhart 1993, 257-259.
119 200, 12.
Tlatelolco, like Chapultépec (“Grasshopper Hill”), Culhucana, and Tenochtitlan. More to
the point, there is nowhere an emphasis on locality, neither on the landscape of Tlatelolco
nor on the monuments of the city. This prominence given to the *ethnos* rather than the
topos is likely a response to the destruction of Tlatelolco, first by the Tenochtitlan and
then by the Spanish: here, we might say, loss of territory eradicated locality from
the historical narrative and foregrounded the movements of the uprooted people. Yet this de-
emphasis on locality, as we shall see, is only one reaction to the destruction of a
community.

1.2.2.13 *The Antiquities of Warwickshire*, by *Sir William Dugdale* (1656)

Pre-Renaissance English local historiography was frequently focalized by
religious community. A few histories, as we have seen, took the island of Britain as their
historiographical unit; and the city of London generated a series of chronicles stretching
back to the late-eleventh century, with notable examples being the *Description Londiniae*
of Williams Fitzstephen (1174/1183) and later John Stow’s *Survey of London* (1598).
But in the late-sixteenth century, England saw develop another order of local
historiography, chorographic and periegetic in focus, which took as its basis the
county. Hints of such an impulse can be seen in William Worcester’s *Itineraries of
Bristol* (1477-1480) and John Leland’s *Itineraries* (1529-1543), but the first self-standing
county history was William Lambardé’s *Perambulation of Kent* (1576). Lambardé had
planned in fact to investigate other counties of England—his wish was “that someone in
each shire would make the enterprise for his own country to the end that by joining our
pens and conferring our labors . . . we might at the last by the union of many parts and
papers compact on whole and perfect body and book of our English topography”—but he

---

120 Although topographical surveys of England can be found as early as the *Polichronicon* of Ranulf Higend
shelved the project upon receiving a copy of William Camden’s *Britannia* (1586), which took Lambarde’s lead and surveyed, albeit cursorily, the entire island county by county. Despite the popularity of Camden’s *Britannia*, it was the autonomous history of a single county that would set the tone for English local historiography for the next few generations. As John Stow said in the 1603 edition of his *A Survey of London*, Lambarde’s *Kent* inspired many men “to do somewhat for the particular Shires or Counties where they were borne or dwelt.” So John Carew published a *Survey of Cornwall* in the 1580s; John Norden an account of *Middlesex* in 1593 and later *Hertfordshire* (1598); William Burton, the brother of the anatomist of Melancholy, a *Description of Leicestershire* from 1597 to 1604; and Sir William Dugdale the magisterial *Antiquities of Warwickshire* in 1656.

Dugdale (1605-1686) drew inspiration first and foremost from Burton’s *Leicestershire*, and it was through Burton that he was introduced to notable antiquarians of the day. With one of them, Sir Symon Archer of Tamworh, he set to work on a history of his native county. But the *Antiquities* that he published some twenty years later, after the Civil War had come and gone, was his project alone. It was massive. What William Camden had covered in a mere eleven pages, Dugdale expanded to 826. He introduced his work by way of two epistles, one addressed to The Right Honorable Christopher Lord Hatton, Comptroller of the Household to the late King Charles, a man similarly taken with “antiquities,” whom Dugdale considered his “Maecenas of learning”; the other “To my Honoured Friends The Gentrie of Warwickshire.” In this letter, while acknowledging the influence of Lambarde, Burton, and Archer, Dugdale adumbrates an audience of his fellow nobility: it is “unto you my Noble Countriemen,” he declaims, “as the most proper Persons” that the book is dedicated, since “all things perish by Age and time, or some unhappy accident.” He moves now from Herodotus to Livy: “you will see very much of your worthy Ancestors, to whose memory I have erected it, as a Monumentall Pillar, and
to shew in what Honour they lived those flourishing Ages past.” By setting “before you the noble and eminent Actions of your worthy Ancestors,” Dugdale hopes to incite the present and future ages to virtuous imitation of the past.

Dugdale elaborates on his goals and motivations in the Preface. He has been working on this “Illustration of the Antiquities with which my native Countrie (Warwickshire) hath been honoured,” for more than twenty years, “diligently searching into the vast treasuries of publique Records, besides a multitude of Manuscripts, originall Charters and Evidences in private hands, as the margents where they are cited do manifest; therein imitating Polybius, Livie, Suetonius and Tacitus, who made special use of the publique Records of Rome, which were preserved at their Temple of the Nymphs, and at that of Libertie in the Aventine.” He acknowledges that his county history is not the first of its kind. Quite apart from his English predecessors, “Antiquities of particular Counties, Places, and Families, by men of eminent learning” have been published elsewhere: a history of Provence by Caesar Nostradamus; of Languedoc by Guillaume Catel; of Bresse and du Bugey by Samuel Guichenon—indeed France attests a robust tradition of county historiography, among which works we may list also the Historie de Bretagne of Bertrand d’Argenté (1580) and the Historie de Béarn of Pierre de Marca (1640).121

In the Preface, Dugdale also sets out the structure of his work; and (as in the case of the Izumo Fudoki), periegesis will trump chronology. He will follow the Rivers “as the most sure and lasting markers,” as well as “those great and well-known Roman ways.” The history of the county will unfold hundred by hundred, parish by parish, and village by village. For each settlement, Dugdale provides an overview of landowners, churches, customs, and other local data, exploring the past chiefly through toponymic

---

121 For the importance of the region in French historiography, see B. Bedos-Rezak 1993. For a corresponding lack of city historiography, see D. Hay 1962.
etymology and genealogy. On occasion, he casts an eye back to Anglo-Saxon times, but as he says in introduction, most of his inquiry, relying as it does on physical remains, concerns the more recent past. Like the Liber Elienis, Dugdale’s Antiquities—and the same may be said of the county histories that followed in its wake, notably Roger Thoroton’s The Antiquities of Nottinghamshire (1677)—is marked by is embrace of diverse archaeological, epigraphical, and archival evidence (e.g. Domesday, epitaphs, patent rolls, heralds’ notes, and monastic chronicles).

Jan Broadway has recently argued that the English county historians relied on kinship networks and a gentry-ideology that was pan-local, exploiting a network of antiquarianism based not in each individual county but rather at the central hub of London. Richard Helgerson, meanwhile, has seen nationalism more than local pride behind this unique historiographical enterprise. Yet Burton very clearly identifies a collective sentiment behind his focal locality: “rather than my native country should any longer lie obscured with darkens, I have adventured (in some sort) to restore her to her health and dignity.” And just as Lambarde addressed his Kent to “his Countrieman, the Gentlemen of the Countie of Kent,” men who were “either bred and well brought up here, or by the goodness of God and your own good provision, are well settled here,” so too did Dugdale explicitly address his history to the Warwickshire gentry, his countrymen. It is worth noting in this regard that what we may consider as the first Dictionary of National Biography, Thomas Fuller’s “Worthies of England” (1662), was organized county-wise. It may be true, as Peter Laslett has said, that “county communities” were not only important “communities of locality” but also “mediated between the individual,

---

122 2006, 108-109 and 153-154: “In a period of social upheaval the English gentry increasingly demonstrated an interest in genealogy, a study predicated on continuity and hierarchy.”
123  See R. Helgerson 1992, in particular Chapter 3: “The particularities, after all, constantly remind us of the whole of which they are part and form which they take meaning, even if only by difference.” Dugdale’s project, Helgerson suggests, is predicated on a sense of nationalism. “And the nation, unlike the dynasty, is in turn strengthened by its very receptiveness to such individual and communal autonomy” (138).
or such closely knit groups of individuals as the family, and English society as a whole.” But the proliferation of county historiography in England was a response to an authentic community identity. The county, not the city or nation, was the order of community actuated by gentry historians, and for this reason it is the county that serves in this period as the primary focalizer of historiography.


In the preface to his Chronological History, Thomas Prince (1687-1758) claims to have long been interested in American history, endeavoring in his youth “to lay hold on every Book, Pamphlet, or Paper, both in Print and Manuscript, which was written by Persons who lived here, or that had any Tendency to enlighten our History.” Among his primary interests were histories of the foundation of the Plymouth and Massachusetts colonies, e.g. New England’s Memorial by Nathaniel Morton (1669) and Cotton Mather’s Magnalia Christi Americana: The Ecclesiastical History of New England (1702), as well as histories of particular episodes of early American history, like Increase Mather’s A Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in New England (1676). What Prince found missing, however, was a general work of American history, with events “disposed in the order of time wherein they happened, together with the rise and progress of the several towns, churches, counties, colonies, and provinces throughout this country;” and this lack became all the more obvious during his residency, after graduation from Harvard, in England: here he was struck by “the want of a regular history of this country everywhere complained of.” What really goaded him to action was the publication in 1720 of Daniel Neal’s History of New England (1720), a work that he considered rife with errors of fact and lacking authority: Neal was an Englishman, after all, who had never set foot in the New World. And so in 1728 Prince began to compose a “short Account of the most remarkable Transactions and Events, in the form of a meer Chronology,” thinking,
because he intended “to write no more than a *Line* or two upon every Article,” that the final text “would not take above Six or Eight *Sheets.*” But the project soon consumed him. Thanks in part to the financial help of 550 original subscribers, Prince spent the next eight years working on the introductory volume of his *Chronology,* which spanned, in some 254 pages, the years between the creation of Adam and the establishment of Boston as the capital of the Massachusetts Bay Company on Sept. 7, 1630. Although the publication failed to generate significant interest, Prince went to work on a second volume, published some twenty years later (1755), which continued the annals for another 96 pages and only another three years, to August 5, 1633.

What Prince had intended to be “A summary and exact account of the most material occurrences relating to these parts of the world from their first discovery in the order of time in which they happened,” became in fact an *Arkhaiologia.* He was not unusual among Christian historians in beginning a local history well before the formation of the focal community with an event of “universal” import; Villani, we may recall, started with Babel. But while Villani had dispensed with Biblical accounts quite quickly, and while other self-styled ecclesiastical histories of New England, like those of Prince’s mentor Cotton Mather and of Daniel Neal, began essentially at the arrival of the Puritans,\(^1\) it took Prince 100 pages even to reach to the “discovery of New England by Captain Gosnold.”

Prince divided his prefatory annals into eight “Periods”: (1) from Adam to Moses; (2) from Moses to Saul; (3) from David to Zedekiah; (4) from Nebuchadnezzar to Actium; (5) from Augustus to Constantine; (6) from Constantine to Charlemagne and Egbert; (7) from Egbert to the discovery of the New World by Columbus; and (8) from 1492 to the discovery of New England and the death of Queen Elizabeth I. His model, as

\(^1\) Although Daniel Neal did discourse for several pages on the Scythian and far eastern origins of the native Americans.
he admits himself, was the *Annals Veteris Testamenti* of James Ussher (1650). But Prince’s emphasis on world history was not parenthetical; for he was interested first and foremost in showing that the world had been created with the culmination of New England in mind. This is highlighted by the full title of his first installment, after all, was *A Chronological History of New-England in the Form of Annals, Being a summary and exact Account of the most material Transactions and Occurrences relating to This Country, in the Order of Time where in they happened, from the Discovery by Capt Gosmold in 1602, to the Arrival of Governor Belcher, in 1730, with an Introduction Containing A brief Epitome of the most considerable Transactions and Events abroad, from the Creation: Including the connected Line of Time, the Succession of Patriarchs and Sovereigns of the most famous Kingdoms & Empires; the gradual Discoveries of America, and the Progress of the Reformation, to the Discovery of New England*. His emphasis on origins, while decidedly exaggerated, nevertheless reflected a tendency of many subsequent New England historians who wished to establish links to Europe. The phenomenon was well parodied by Washington Irving in his pseudonymous *History of New York from the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty, by Diedrich Knickerbocker* (1809), the first chapter of which he devoted to “Divers Ingenious Theories and Philosophic Speculations, concerning the Creation and Population of the world, as Connected with the History of New York.”

Granted Prince’s shandean reluctance to move beyond what he classifies as introductory matter, his lengthy title indicates a desire not simply to provide an

---

125 The full title of Ussher’s work was, *Annales Veteris Testamenti, a prima mundi origine deducti, una cum rerum Asiaticarum et Aegyptiacarum chronico, a temporis historici principio usque ad Maccabaicorum initia producto*. In his dedicatory epistles to the governor and lieutenant governor of the Massachusetts Bay, Prince confesses that his work will not take “the specious form of a proper History, which admits of artificial ornaments and descriptions to raise the imagination and affectations of the reader; but of a closer and more naked Register, comprising only Facts, in a Chronological Epitome, to enlighten the understanding, somewhat like the Form of Ussher’s Annals, which a competent historian may easily fill up a beautify.”

126 The primary target seems to have been the recent publication of the *Picture of New York*, by Dr. Samuel L. Mitchell (1807), one of Irving’s professors at Columbia.
ecclesiastical reading of the foundation of New England but a Puritan one as well: the progress outlined by his history, he asserts, is specifically “of the Reformation.” Hence the attention he gives to unsuccessful, pre-Puritan attempts at colonization.\footnote{127}{J. Van de Wetering, 1961, 550-551.}

[The Puritans] are the \textit{Christian People} who were the Founders of \textit{Plimoth} Church and Colony: who seem to be some of the 1st in \textit{England}, that were brave enough to improve the \textit{Liberty} wherewith the \textit{DIVINE AUTHOR} of our Religion has made us Free, and observe his \textit{Institutions} as their ONLY RULE in Church-Order, Discipline & Worship; for which they dearly suffered & left their Native Country.

During the years of Prince’s activity the fate of Puritanism was uncertain and precarious; in the face of external threats, the community was rent by faction,\footnote{128}{J. van Wetering 1961, 551.} exacerbated by the death of Cotton Mather. It was in the year of Mather’s death, in fact, that Prince published a series of sermons advocating for traditional Puritanism and began work on his history. This he dedicated to the “Descendants from the worthy Fathers of these Plantations; whom Yourselves and Posterity cannot but have in everlasting Honor.” As he wrote in his preface, “You will doubtless take a noble and useful pleasure in reviewing the names and actions of your predecessors, that You may imitate their virtues.” Returning to the standards of the Planters meant renewing a commitment to their creed.

1.2.2.15. \textit{Osnabrückische Geschichte}, by Justus Möser (1765, 1780)

Whereas in the case of medieval and early-modern England the focal unit of local historiography tended to be the religious community or region, Germany (like Italy) boasts an early tradition of town and city history. As in Italy, such town chronicles at least from the thirteenth century, were often written in the vernacular.\footnote{130}{See F.R.H. Du Boulay 1981.} Some, like Gottfried Hagen’s \textit{Buch von der Stade Colne} (1277-87), were composed in verse. Many early German city historians identified themselves by name and position, and many, we
know, were town scribes and administrators (*Stadtschreiber*). Each historian, of course, was motivated by different factors. But by the beginning of the sixteenth century, almost every town in Germany could claim a town chronicler and chronicle. Osnabrück, a *Fürstbistum* in Westphalia, was no different. An anonymous *Reimchronik* in 230 lines treated the bishops of Osnabrück from Wiho to Rudolph; and the so-called *Der Werlde Lop* (“The Course of the World”) by Albert Suho (1394-1449), ostensibly a universal chronicle from the beginning of the world to 1447, in fact focused predominately on Osnabrück. The most influential history of Osnabrück and a work that would become a cornerstone of German historicism was Justus Möser’s *Osnabrückische Geschichte*.133

Like his father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, Möser (1720-1794) pursued work as a government official in his own bishopric, attaining the highest positions that were available to him as a burgher. In 1744, in the midst of legal studies at Gottingen, he took up the post of secretary to the nobility (*Ritterschaft*); a few months later, he was elected *advocatus patriae*; in 1762, he was named *justicarius*, chief justice; and in 1768 *Geheimer Referendar*, chief administrator of the town. His active political life left him some room for a literary career: he wrote a *Wochenblätter* (1746) and editorials for his own weekly paper, *Wöchentliche Osnabrückische Anzeigen*.134 While his father had apparently long ago suggested a local history for a dissertation project,135 Möser claimed to have begun work on the project during the Seven Years War,136 while stationed in England; like Thomas Prince, it was the experience of leaving home that spurred Möser’s

---

131 Some aimed to memorialize particular families; others related wars between the focal and neighboring communities; still others emphasized internal discord and stasis (see F.R.H. du Boulay 1981, 449).
133 On Möser and historicism, see F.C. Beiser, 63-97.
134 Möser’s daughter would later publish these editorials in four volumes (1774-1786), called *Patriotische Phantasien*.
135 E. Beins and W. Pleister 1939, 11.
136 “Vorrede,” *Sämtliche Werke* XII-2, 46.
interest in his home. Möser was early on assisted in this endeavor by his receipt in 1755 of the papers of a good friend, Karl Gerhard Wilhelm Lodtmann, who had until his untimely death been working on a history of Osnabrück of his own. Ten years later, Möser began to publish his history in installments, with the first four appearing as “Allgemeine Einleitung” in 1768. It was not until 1780 that he published the work in full.

Möser had initially intended to divide his history into four sections, the first ending with Charlemagne, the second tracking the subsequent control of the bishops and courts, the third focusing on the growth of the city, i.e. the shift away from agricultural means of production and the subjugation of the citizens to the kings; and the fourth dealing with the rise of the territorial state and the Reformation. But while the first volume did indeed treat pre-Carolingian times; the second, dealing with the bishopric from 918 to 1250, would be the last. Like Thomas Prince, Möser found himself overwhelmed by Arkhaiologia; but like Prince (and indeed Dionysius of Halicarnassus), he understood that a community’s identity was embedded in its origins. By exploring the early history of his community he could prove his point, viz. that the bedrock of the community of Osnabrück was its landowning farmers. As he wrote in his preface, “In my opinion, German historiography can hope for an entirely new direction if we take the property-owner (gemeine Landeigentümer) as the true substance of the nation and pursue him through all of his change.” Möser devoted the first volume entirely to this golden age, when each man took as much land and resources as he needed according to the erste Anlage der Natur (12.2, 64), when each farmer was the rule of his own house, and the only form of statehood was the appointment of a common judge to settle disputes and the contribution of Wehrfeld for a common defense fund.

137 Briefe, 146.  
138 Sämtlich Werke XII-1, 34-35. See also Briefe, 197 (Aug. 10. 1765), a letter to Abbt, in which Möser is more specific about his aims to privilege the role of the commoners, who were the only population truly to comprise the nation.
Nineteenth- and early-twentieth century German historians, like Wilhelm Dilthey and Friedrich Meinecke, saw in Möser’s history the beginnings of national historiography. Möser used the local lens, it was said, to frame issues of the nation. Yet Möser’s focus on the local community should not be overlooked: “The institutions of a land,” he wrote, “depend to a very great extent upon the nature of its soil and setting.” And this localism only grew more pointed as he became more deeply entrenched in Osnabrück politics. As he noted in a letter to a friend (Oct. 1763): “I have fallen in love with the history of the bishopric and have discovered a completely new and exciting theory. I discard all previous methods of writing the history of the empire and of the territorial state.”

1.2.2.16 The History of the Whole Mani, Its Customs, Villages, and Produce, by Nikitias Niphakos (ca. 1782)

Nikitias Niphakos, a poet born in the village of Mília in the Outer Mani, composed his account of his native region in the fifteen-syllable meter employed by many klephtic ballads. Nothing certain is known about his life. It probably spanned the second half of the eighteenth century, with his praise of Zanetbey Grigorakis (1782 to 1788) helping to pinpoint a date of composition. So too the fact that Col. W.M. Leake

139 See Dilthey 1914, III 250 (from Das Achtzehnte Jahrhundert und die Geschichtliche Welt); F. Meinecke 1965, 315.
140 According to W.F. Sheldon, Möser’s “understanding of the national and the local stood in a dialectical relationship. In order to understand the local, the historian had to begin with a hypothesis about the national. And through the study of the local, one could arrive at a better, profounder comprehension of the national” (1970, 83). See, too, F. Beiser, who writes that the “great paradox” behind Möser’s writings is “the universal significance of locality” (2011, 64).
141 Sämtlich Werke, XII-1, 49.
142 W.F. Sheldon divides Möser’s life into three phases: in the first phase, he was “committed to the bishopric of Osnabrück; in the second, he became “intricately involved in his homeland”; and in the third phase, “he became the most influential person in Osnabrück.” It was “his responsibilities in the state” that “were the decisive stimuli for his mature thought” (1970, 89).
144 Unlike these ballads, however, Niphakos has frequent recourse in his poem to the Maniate lexicon.
145 See P. L. Fermor 1958, 289, whose book on his travels through the Mani preserves much information and some translation of the poem. See also W.M. Leake, who discusses the poem in some detail (Vol. I 1830, 333ff), although the manuscript that he saw at Mistra appears to have been some seventy lines shorter than that accessed later by Fermor.
was able to read a certain portion of the poem at Mistra in 1810. Like the chorographers of England, Niphakos organized his work less by chronology than \textit{periegesis}. He begins with a description of his focal region: “A great mountain stands on the Morea,” he writes, “in the \textit{topos} of Lakonia. The ancient Spartans called it Taygetos, and the Maniates call it Far Away \textit{Élia}. There are other smaller mountains between it and Cape Matepan. To these did the \textit{μαύροι Σπαρτιάτες} flee, in order to live freely, the same men who are today called the Maniates.”¹⁴⁶ There are, he says, 117 villages in the Mani (he includes even Marathonisi/Gytheion), and these are divided into three regions: to the east is Lower Mani, to the West are Outer and Inner Mani.

Most of the rest of the poem consists of a catalogue of Maniate villages, sometimes a mere litany of names, sometimes with adjectives (often in rhyme), and on occasion more elaborate descriptions: “Skoutari shines among other towns like the moon;” the Outer Mani produces “silk, oil, and acorns; it has frightful gorges, wild ravines, amazing towns, and powerful villages.” But Niphakos is more frequently critical. “On the cape is Kelepha with its castle, but it is a desert and has nothing else.” From Arachova, nestled in a bewitched valley, he proceeds along the “paths of the wolves, the land of sheep- and goat-rustlers and of night walkers” to the village “of the eaters of stolen goat meat, the hole-dwellers and mule-thieves and the murders of flocks.” This, he says, is the thrice apostate \textit{Mília}” (his home town no less), “from which Garbelea is a quarter of an hour away.” The Lower Mani receives most of his wrath. “Of woods, trees, and bushes there is not a single one . . . Nothing but chickpeas and dried oats. . . . Half naked they [the women] load the grain on their backs . . . And from the boiling heat and the burning of the sun their tongues hang out like the tongues of heatstruck dogs.” There follows an unpleasant description of women gathering dung and drying it in the sun to use as fuel. The men of the Lower Mani are thieving hoodlums, he continues,

¹⁴⁶ Unless indicated, I am using P.L. Fermor’s translation.
pirates who seize passing ships, who invite a stranger in to eat and then strip him of his clothes and belongings, ostensibly to protect him from the potential thieving of others. “These are the men,” he concludes, “who have given the rest of the Mani a bad name.”

Between his surveys of Outer and Lower Mani, Niphakos addresses Zanet Grigorakis, whom the Ottoman Turks established as bey (hence Zanetbey) in 1782—he was deposed some fourteen years later after he was found plotting with the Klephts and with Napoleon. For Niphakos, Zanetbey is “hero and wonder, father to orphans and firm pillar of his fatherland. He should be the first leader and bear the princely rank through all the Mani, even in all Laconia. He is great and hospitable and a mighty warrior. . . . I tell of things I have seen, not lies.” Niphakos describes the conflict between Zanetbey and Bey Koumoundouros (from Messenia), who had invaded the Mani with Turkish aid. A battle was fought at Skardamoula, where “one man repelled a hundred, and a hundred drove back a thousand”: Koumoundouros fled, leaving his Turkish commander on the shore. This, along with the first stanza of the poem about the origin of the Maniates, is the sole historical episode, and it leads quickly to lamentation. It is to ignorance and lack of education that Niphakos ascribes “the disunion of the Maniate, and the want of obedience to their chiefs, whence arise civil wars, the destruction of houses and churches, and piracy and robbery.” From this, he says, issues “disorder and civil wars, and robbery and murder, and ruin and convulsion.” At the close of the poem he renews his diatribe: “Ah! Ah! Would I could shed a river of tears to submerge my fatherland! Once it was alive and famous, now it is dead and befouled. My country, covered once with glory and renowned through all the kingdoms of the world, what has become of you? Where are all your lances and your bows?” But Niphakos’s History is not mere jeremiad. “For their country and their liberty,” he says, “these men quickly unite and act in concert
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147 According to P.L. Fermor, Niphakos was said to have been mugged in Kitta (in the Lower Mani), although this tradition could easily have been extrapolated from the biases of the poem.
with fury.” He offers a remedy, in fact: to establish several schools “that your chiefs may learn to govern, and the inferiors to obey their leaders; that your nation may be esteemed, that the towns and villages may be in peace, and that evil may cease.”

Niphakos’s interest in the past is overwhelmed by vigorous invective focused on the present day, and his text is thus perhaps more akin to epideictic \textit{logoi} than to local historiography. Nevertheless, his poem is a useful comparandum inasmuch as it demonstrates how a geographical region—the Mani, after all, is a peninsula which contains a multitude of independent and disconnected (and often inimical) villages—can generate a shared identity and thus a shared past. More important, it reveals the extent to which “history”—for that is what Niphakos named his work—was considered a suitable means of social criticism. Niphakos’s anxiety about the survival of his community and his desire to propose a remedy led him naturally to the form of local historiography.

1.2.2.17 \textit{History of the Town of Whately, Mass., by the Rev. Josiah H. Temple} (1871)

In 1871, Josiah H. Temple (1815-1893), a native of Framingham, Massachusetts, was asked by “the citizens of Whately, to deliver an Address at the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the Incorporation of the Town” (\textit{Pref.}). In the published notes to the centenary celebration, we read that his address, “which occupied a little more than an hour and a half in delivery, was condensed from a work which Mr. Temple has in preparation, giving a complete history of the town.” In the following year, this history was itself published “in accordance with a unanimous vote of the town at is annual meeting” and “printed for the town” as the \textit{History of the Town of Whately, Mass., Including a Narrative of Leading Events From the First Planting of Hatfield: 1660-1871 (with Family Genealogies)}. Whately was not alone in celebrating its Centenary by
authorizing the publication of its local history. The mid-nineteenth century, in particular the decades after the Civil War, saw an unprecedented proliferation of local historiography in the United States. Whereas the first wave of American historiography had focused on the original colonies, the second (in which Thomas Prince participated) on conglomerations of colonies, like New England, and the third on individual states—Jeremy Belknap’s *History of New Hampshire* (1784-1792) was an early and important work of this kind—an attention was now paid to the town and city.

Some of these civic histories were tied to the simultaneous emergence of local historical societies. Many were composed by ministers and pastors. Either because there was felt to be a dearth of eligible historians in a particular community or because town officials thought that obtaining the help of an established historian (rather than a mere local amateur) would bode better for the longevity of the text, some communities looked for help beyond the confines of their community. It was natural that the town of Whately would appeal to Temple: he had been the fourth pastor of the town’s Congregational Church for a few years in the middle of the century; he was married to a local woman; and he had even recently published a discourse (delivered on January 7, 1849) entitled, *Early Ecclesiastical History of Whately*, which was prefaced by a brief historical sketch of the town. Since the time of his stint at Whately, moreover, Temple had applied his historiographical acumen to an exploration of his hometown, publishing in 1868 a *History of the First Sabbath School in Framingham, Mass., from 1816 to 1868*. The history that he wrote of Whately led also to other offers, and in the following years Temple wrote on four other Massachusetts towns: Northfield (1875), North Brookfield (1887); a full-scale history of his own native Framingham (1887), and Palmer (1889).

150 ibid, 9-11.
151 J.D. Butler, we may recall, delivered his “Deficiencies in Our History” (1846) before the recently formed Vermont Historical and Antiquarian Society.
Temple began his history by noting that although Whately has “nothing of natural advantages to attract notice” and “has laid claim to no special distinction among her neighbors,... the public spirit of her people, and the generous liberality displayed in arranging and carrying out to a successful issue the commemoration of her centenary, and in providing for the preservation of her annals in the printed volume, are worthy of imitation by the other towns in the Commonwealth” (3). Despite Whately’s apparent lack of distinction, however, Temple managed to eke 326 pages and thirteen chapters out of the community. For the most part, he moves chronologically. Chapter One deals with the “Indian ownership” and the purchase of the land by Pynchon and the Hadley Company; Chapter Two with the original settlements, division of the land, and the incorporation of the town of Hatfield; Chapter Three with the First Indian War (1675-1678); and so forth. Some chapters take a different approach: Chapter Eight tackles the town’s “Ecclesiastical History” (a condensation of Temple’s earlier history), Chapter Nine “Whately Roads,” Chapter Ten “Local Education, “Chapter Twelve “Local Industries,” and Chapter Thirteen “Miscellany and Statistics.” Appended are a thorough genealogical survey, a petition addressed to Governor Hutchinson of the Massachusetts Bay from several citizens of Whately, and the aforementioned transcript for the Centenary Celebration.

Nearly thirty years after the publication of Temple’s history, and six years after his death, James M. Crafts, an elderly Whately native, revised and enlarged Temple’s history (to 750 pages!) and published it with Temple’s original title (1899). Part of his motivation, Crafts claims, was that following “the issue of Mr. Temple’s work, a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction was manifested by our townspeople,” and that for this “and other reasons, the Town desires me to commence the work at once” (2). Although, as Crafts himself admits, he adopts much of Temple’s history verbatim, he often changes “radically some of his statements, as well as his inferences, drawn from
what he has stated as facts” (2-3). For one thing, Temple was far too ecclesiastical: “All proper and right for a history of the church,” Crafts concludes, “but seemingly out of place in a town history.” For another, Temple was not a native: “The three years that he spent in the early days of his ministry,” Crafts claims, “were insufficient to gather all of the truth pertaining to the multifarious transactions of the people of our town, the location of many of the roads, the names of various localities, the hills, brooks and streams, the places where the settlements were first made, etc.” Crafts, on the other hand, can boast “eighty-two years experience” (3).

Many of Crafts’ corrections and augmentations are genealogical in nature; and many have to do, not surprisingly, with the Crafts family. To give only one example, Temple had concluded his section on “Miscellany” with “Extracts from the Town Records,” writing under the year 1801, “A wolf was killed in Whately. The bounty paid by the town was $10” (194). Crafts is far more expansive: “In 1801,” he writes, “Reuben Crafts and two other hunters killed a wolf towards the south-west part of Whately. It had been heralded for some days that a wolf was thought to be about in this region. The snow was very deep, but they brought the old rascal to the center and exhibited it at the store of Lemuel and Justus Clark which stood where now is the garden of Porter Wells, south of this house. The hunters received a bounty of ten dollars” (340).

1.2.2.18 History of the Gold Coast and Asante, based on Traditions and Historical Facts Comprising a Period of More Than Three Centuries from About 1500 to 1860, by Carl C. Reindorf (1895)

It was apparently the declining health of his grandmother, who “used to relate the traditions of the country to her people when they sat around her in the evenings,” that first prompted Carl Christian Reindorf around 1860 to begin collecting notes for his history of his native region, the Gold Coast. Reindorf’s father was of Danish extraction—his mother was from a well-connected family from Akra, although both of
his parents, he says, “belonged to the families of national officiating high priests”—and it was at the Basel Mission School at Christiansborg that he was educated. He was at Christiansburg, in fact, in 1854, when the English bombarded the fort—they had obtained control of most of the area in the middle of the nineteenth century and had imposed a poll tax that provoked several revolts. And it was at the Basel Mission at Christiansborg where, after a productive career as a missionary in various villages of the region, Reindorf settled to write his history.

Most of the work appears to have been completed by 1889, the year in which Reindorf penned the preface, addressed “To the Educated Community in the Gold Coast Colony,” but the history was not published until 1895. According to remarks written in this year and appended to the History by Reindorf’s friend Johann Gottlieb Christaller, a German missionary and philologist at the Basel Mission, Reindorf had first tried to get the work published in England but was able to procure the assistance of a German printer in Basel who had some experience with the Ga language. Reindorf clearly had good working knowledge of English—in his Preface, he cites numerous English works that he consulted—but Christaller admits that both he and Reindorf were required to enlist the editorial services of an English teacher in Basel to polish the text. Christaller himself helped prepare the manuscript for the press, comparing it with a version of the first half of the book that Reindorf wrote in Ga, which was to be printed in the newspaper, Christian Reporter for the Natives of the Gold Coast speaking the Ga or Akra language.

Although Reindorf made the decision to write his local history in English, he implies an audience composed both of resident Europeans and of his countrymen. It was chiefly in the interests of his countrymen, in fact, that “I collected so many names of our forefathers, who defended our country from the yoke of Asante, trusting that every one of
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you will be pleased to find his grandfather’s name in the lists” (xix). A proper history of the Gold Coast, he continues, must be undertaken by a native, who can write “with true native patriotism” and has had “the privilege of initiation into the history of its former inhabitants,” (xvi). Reindorf’s history was indeed read by his countrymen. In the second edition (1966), the author’s son, C.J. Reindorf attests to repeated demands for the history’s republication “from all parts of the Gold Coast Colony and from all classes of the community” and points to the fact “that the book is regarded as an authority in our law Courts where Judges are often-times called upon to decide on matters having particular reference to our customs and usages.” A similar ambivalence of audience is evident in a contemporary work, Dr. Samuel Johnson’s *The History of the Yorubas from The Earliest Times to the Beginning of the British Protectorate* (1897). Johnson asserts that the main goal of the history was to introduce Yorubas to their own history—“Educated natives of Yoruba,” he says, “are well acquainted with the history of England and with that of Rome and Greece, but of the history of their own country they know nothing whatever! This reproach it is one of the author’s objects to remove”—but he nevertheless writes in English, beginning even with a lengthy overview of Yoruba language and grammar.

Like many of the historians we have been examining, Reindorf excuses any potential inadequacies by claiming in his Preface merely to be providing material for a better-equipped historian to rework. “The sole object of this publication” he says, is “to call the attention of all you my friends and countrymen, to the study and collection of our history” (xv). Through his notes “for a future more complete history of the Gold Coast” (xv), his “native friends . . . may, laying aside all prejudice, be induced to unite to bring the history of the Gold Coast to perfection” (xvii). Reindorf also takes the opportunity
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155 Later in the Preface, Reindorf writes, and “An (sic) in conclusion I must beg you, my native friends, not to despise this work coming from one of your own brethren, but let it rather encourage you to assist me by your kind informations and co-operation, so as to get our own history complete.”
in his preface to describe his own approach to history, and the default mode of
historiography, in his opinion, was local: “A history,” he writes, “is the methodical
narration of events in the order in which they successively occurred, exhibiting the origin
and progress, the causes and effects, and the auxiliaries and tendencies of that which has
occurred in connection with a nation” (xv). Later, he defines history as a nation’s
“speculum and measure-tape . . . showing its true shape and stature” (xv) and bringing
“the past of that nation to its own view, so that the past may be compared with the present
to see whether progress or retrogression is in operation; and also as a means of judging
our nation by others, so that we may gather instruction for our future guidance” (xvii).

But what nation is Reindorf addressing? Indeed, in Reindorf’s time the Gold
Coast—a region “situated on the Western part of this great continent” and equivalent to
“that portion of Upper Guinea which is bounded on the East by the River Volta” (17)—
hosted a conglomeration of tribes, communities, and kingdoms (e.g. Asante, Ga, Fante,
Akwapim, and Akim), which he outlines one-by-one in the first ten chapters of his
history. Reindorf has clear allegiances to one of these communities, the Ga and their
kingdom of Akra—he aims his history, as we have seen, specifically at those who fought
against the yoke of Asante (xix). But a coherent narrative of the entire locality does not
emerge until the tenth chapter with the rise of Asante. It is only after Asante’s conquest
of Fante that the chapters begin to follow on one another chronologically and thereby
form a unified narrative. “There must be a starting point,” he says, “in writing the
history of a nation.

If the kingdom of Akra, which appears to have been the first established on the
Gold Coast, could have continued and absorbed that of Fante, or been absorbed
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156 After an introductory chapter on the mythic arrival of the first people and traditions about the coming of
the Phoenicians, Egyptians, and Carthaginians, Chapters Two and Three focus on his native Ga (1500-
1660), “the name particularly applied to the people and county bounded on the east by the lagoon Tshemu
near Tema, west by the river Sakumo fio, south by the sea, and north by the Akwapem mountains” (24).
Chapter Four treats the Twi (1500-1700); Chapter Five the Kingdoms of Akwamu and Akyem (1530-
1730); and so on.
by the latter, I might easily have obtained the starting-point. But both kingdoms having failed and the kingdom of Asante having become the leading and ruling power, a Gold Coast history would not be complete without the history of Asante, as the histories of both countries are so interwoven” (xvii).

Another unifying principle behind his history was the Basel Mission. Before the introduction of Christianity, Reindorf says, “the whole county was lying in an Egyptian darkness of barbarism and superstition” (217). At first, “a gleam of the light of Christianity shone only among the officials of the different Governments on the Coast by the soldiers and the Mulatto ladies” (217-218), but soon, “It pleased our merciful Lord to direct his devoted servant, Count Zinzendorf,” the leader of the Moravian church, “to meet one Protten at Copenhagen in the year 1735” (218). Reindorf’s adolescence, however, coincided with the ascent of British influence in the region; and even though Akra became an important center of British colonial government, it was the English Wesleyan Mission based in Fante that had the monopoly on Gold Coast historiography: according to S.R.B. Attoh-Ahuma, in *The Gold Coast and National Consciousness* (1911), a work based largely on newspaper clippings from the 1890s, it was Cape Coast, not Akra, that was “the center of Enlightenment” for the entire region.157 Reindorf, on the other hand, downplayed the role of Fante in preference for his eastern half of the Gold Coast.158 Part of the reason that he wrote in English, then, was to enable the English missionaries access to his novel vision of the past.

Reindorf began to revise his history in 1907, but it was not until 1951, well after his death (in 1917) that the second edition of the work was published in Basel and some time later in Ghana (1966).159 The editors of the new edition are not named, but the new text included several important alterations and two new prefaces: a dedication written by

158 His goal, as R. Jenkins suggests (2000, 190), was to resist the “onward march of Anglophone Cape Coast and Twi-centered historical, ethno-historical and anthropological perspectives, in contemporary Gold Coast politico-cultural studies.”
159 R. Jenkins 1977, 123.
one of Reindorf’s sons, C.J. Reindorf, and his biography by another son, Dr. C.E. Reindorf, as well as a “Biographical note on Dr. C.E. Reindorf (summarized from his unpublished memoirs).” By 1916 the British had fully ensconced themselves in the region, in the process ridding the area schools of most Basel-Mission materials. So it is perhaps not surprising that the new edition drastically de-emphasized the role of the Basel Mission in the Gold Coast history.\footnote{See R. Jenkins 1987, 98 n. 104.}

1.2.2.19. \textit{Sejarah Kerajaan Melayu Patani (History of the Malay Kingdom of Patani), by “Ibrahim Syukri” (ca. 1962)}

Patani (the northernmost of the Islamic Malay kingdoms), was at the height of its prosperity in the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but began to fall into the orbit of Siam thereafter. Its final conquest in 1784 unleashed a series of revolts, first in 1791 and then again in 1808 and 1831, and the separatist movement has remained active ever since. Advocation for an independent Islamic state continued with renewed force after Britain’s formal recognition of Siamese dominion in 1909, with acts of resistance peaking just after the Second World War, when the newly formed country of Thailand redoubled its efforts to integrate the Muslims in the South. It is in this period that the \textit{Sejarah Kerajaan Melayu Patani} was published.\footnote{This work has been translated by C. Bailey and J.N. Miksic (1985), whose edition has been consulted here. The last dates explicitly mentioned in the \textit{Sejarah Kerajaan} are Oct. 10, 1949 and a vague 1950 (75-76). See A. Teeuw and D. Wyatt 1970.} It was not the earliest history of Patani. The so-called \textit{Hikayat Patani}, recorded by multiple authors over the course of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, had appeared in 1839;\footnote{See A. Teeuw and D. Wyatt 1970.} but that text, like the seventeenth-century \textit{Sejarah Melayu (Malay History)}, has a genealogical, not a local, focus.\footnote{It was apparently the Sultan of Malacca who ordered the composition of “a chronicle setting forth the genealogy of the Malay Rajas and the ceremonial of their courts, for the information of my descendants who come after me, that they may be conversant with the history and derive profit therefrom.” The chronicle argues for the descent of the Sultanate from Alexander the Great (see C.C. Brown 1970).} It is true that the word “sejarah” used in the title of our text literally means
family tree; but it has by this time become synonymous with history in general and its use here does not detract from the ultimately local nature of the *Sejarah Kerajaan Melayu Patani*.

We know little about the author of the history, identified pseudonymously as Ibrahim Syukri, aside from the probability that he was a native of Patani—he writes in the local script Jawi—and that he could read English, since he cites a newspaper article written by an American journalist. Given the inflammatory nature of the text, it is no surprise that the author chose to publish the book in Kelantan, Malaysia, although it was forthwith banned in both Thailand and Malaysia. As David K. Wyatt notes in his introduction to the modern edition of the history, the intended audience was clearly local; for by the late 1950s, Jawi was used in southern Thailand but no longer in Malaysia. The historian’s goal was evidently to rouse sympathy for his nationalistic cause among his countrymen (and not among a wider Malaysian audience).

The history begins with a brief “Author’s introduction,” where Syukri outlines some of the difficulties he had in collecting sources. “There were some old people in Patani,” he says, incidentally conjuring Hekataios, “who had written a few stories, but many of them were legends which were illogical or useless tales and not important to a precise history.” What is more, the older generation kept their manuscripts “closely guarded.” He alludes to one very informative handwritten text, probably a copy of the *Hikayat Patani*, from which he borrowed heavily. But his *Sejarah Kerajaan* goes well beyond the eighteenth century, and for recent history the historian “expended great effort and much time seeking additional information in history books written in foreign languages.” He acknowledges, furthermore, that he has likely made errors in his narration but that he has nevertheless “proceeded because to this day there are no chronicles or histories written in the Malay language concerning the historical
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164 On the influence on our text of the *Hikayat Patani*, see D. Puaksom 2008, 84-87.
development of the Malay Kingdom of Patani. . . . To this day,” moreover, “many Patani Malays are not aware of the circumstances concerning their kingdom in ancient times, that is, during the time that the Malay Kingdom or Patani was sovereign and in complete authority.” His history, he hopes, will not only inform his countrymen about “the life and circumstances of their ancestors” but will also “inspire them to study and compile more detailed books such as this” (1).

The history is divided into four chapters, the first three essentially following the Malaysian Hikayat tradition. Chapter One surveys the physical situation of Malay. Here, the author lists the various populations of the region: the indigenous people (the Semang and Sakai); the Hindus; the Siamese who lived in Siam before the coming of the Thai from China and who intermingled with the Hindus; the Thai; and finally the Malays, who came from Indonesia, and intermarried with the Hindus. It ends in 1403, with the conversion of the Hindu Malay Rajas to Islam. Chapter Two treats the origins of the Patani Kingdom. After describing the ktiseis of the two centers of power, Kota Mahligai and Kampung Pak Tani, Syukri moves into dynastic chronicles, which address the community’s conversion to Islam and its relationship with the Portuguese. Sources include the diary of a Portuguese trader named Pinto (1538) and remarks of a French traveler in the seventeenth century. Chapter Two treats Patani at its zenith, when it was able to repel four Siamese invasions and participate in Burma’s sack of Ayuthia. Chapter Three, “The Government of Patani in the Period of Decline,” tracks Patani’s fall in the eighteenth century, its subjugation to Siam in 1784, and the unsuccessful revolts that followed. Here, we read of Patani’s division into six regions and the respective rulers from the nineteenth to early-twentieth century. Chapter Four, “The Country of Patani in the Period of Reawakening,” begins with an account of the suffering caused by Siamese rule in the early twentieth century and narrates the revolt of 1933, the subsequent
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imposition (in 1940) of Siamese culture, when Buddhism was made the official religion, and the revolts caused by the Japanese attack (on Dec. 8 1944). For these recent events, Syukri relies not on personal experience but rather primarily on an English article from the “Straits Times” by Barbara Wittingham-Jones (Dec. 1, 1948).

“Even though closed off and covered up by the government of Siam,” the history concludes, “the condition of the Malays in southern Siam has become clear to the world. Their life is one of constant sorrow and they receive no assistance from the Siam-Thai government. . . . if studied in depth, since the fall of Patani in the 18th century until his day,” it is clear that Siam has woefully misgoverned Patani (75). “In matters of health, education, association, and economy,” moreover, “Patani has lagged far behind the progress of its neighbors in Malay” (75-76). But the goal of the local history, like that of Niphakos’s Maniate diatribe, is not bootless lamentation: for it is not the “ultimate condition of the Patani Malays to be forever satisfied to live imprisoned under the conservative government of Siam” (76). Autonomy will bring salvation: “In truth the fate of the Patani Malay people should not be placed in the hands of the Siam-Thai government.” The Sejarah Kerajaan Melayu Patani remains an important text of Patani nationalism, forming the basis for a more recent local history, Patani: adit lae patchuban (Past and Present), written by student activist, O. Bangnara in 1976. Bangnara was also motivated to write local history by a period of Thai aggression toward Patani, although he, envisaging a wider audience, chose to write his account in Thai.

1.2.2.20. Salama al-basila: Basalat Balda Filastiniyya (Brave Salama: The Heroism of a Palestinian Village), by Saqr, 'Abd al-'Aziz Muhammad (1990)

In 1985 the Center for Research and Documentation of Palestinian (CRDP) Society at Birzeit University in the West Bank began, under the direction of Sharif Kanaana, to publish “a collection of ethnographic snapshots of the Palestinian villages as they were in the 1940s or this century before they were destroyed between 1948 and
1950,” a project that came to be known as “Al-qura al-Filastiniyya al-mudammara” (“The Destroyed Palestinian Villages”). Among the thirteen histories whose publication Kanaana oversaw—the series has continued, now under another editorship—was a history of Salama, a village (once in the vicinity of Jaffa) whose territory has been absorbed by Tel Aviv. Like the other books in the series, the history of Salama begins with a “popular history of the village,” which included a section of topography, and goes on to describe the major “clans and families,” “the Village in the 1940s,” and “Politics, War, and Exile.” The project relied almost entirely on interviews conducted with former residents of the villages, and it preserves the dialect of the villagers themselves. The publication of this work had a galvanizing effect: the ensuing decade saw the composition of two additional histories of Salama: one by Sahira Dirbas (1993), the author of two other local histories, of her family’s village, Tirat Haifa and the second of al-Birwa in Galilee; the second a few years earlier (in 1990) by the lawyer ‘Abd al-‘Aziz Saqr, a native of the village, who had spent the last forty years of his life as a lawyer in Jordan.166

Unlike the CRDP histories, Saqr wrote his history not in his native dialect but in Modern Standard Arabic, and he relied not on interviews with natives but rather on his own memory. Despite his youth at the time, he had had a role in his village government before its destruction, not least as a member of the committee for village defense. His history begins with a map and an overview of his reasons for writing and moves swiftly on to etymology—the village took its name, he concludes, after Salama bin Hashim, a companion of the Prophet. Next comes an outline of the village in the Middle Ages up to the foundation of the Sayyidna Salama Mosque in the early nineteenth century. And finally, Saqr turns to more recent events: the influx of immigrants between 1810 and

---

166 These works and many other local histories of destroyed Palestinian villages are detailed in R. Davis 2011.
1850 from Egypt and other nearby villages and the means by which the land was divided among the newcomers. Most of the narrative, however, deals with genealogy of village families (38 pages of 174) and the period between the Mandate and the 1948 War (70 pages). Some chapters take an ethnographical approach, treating the village schools and organizations (there are even sections on the Salama Bus and Cars Companies, the Salama Company for Spinning and Weaving, of which Saqr was himself a member, and the village’s agricultural pursuits), as well as customs and religious traditions—although, as Rochelle Davis concludes in her fascinating study of Palestinian Village histories, Saqr was less interested in such matters than in proving that his village had contributed to the “economic development of the country” as a whole and that “the events that took place in Salama make sense in the larger context.”

The history ends with the foundation of the village association (in 1978) in Amman, an effort in which Saqr himself took part. It was through the auspices of this organization, in fact, that the history was published, a copy provided to every member.

Saqr says that he wrote the book “because today’s young people wanted to know how their parents and grandparents were noble and well-mannered, and how they forgot their hatred between each other and turned to the real enemy.” His primary motivation, then, was not the destruction of the village in and of itself but the thought that now, some forty years after its destruction, Salama’s traditions were in danger of disappearing. But Davis suggests other factors that may also have played a part. The first Palestinian village histories were published in 1985, just after the PLO was driven out of Lebanon to Tunisia and hence for the first time was “not connected geographically to a border with Israel-Palestine.” This was also the year of the first Intifada and the seizure of the PLO’s

167 R. Davis 2011, 46-47.
168 R. Davis 2011, 42.
169 R. Davis 2011, 77.
Palestine Research Center in Beirut by Israel,\textsuperscript{170} a period when many Palestinians began to worry about the efficacy of the PLO.\textsuperscript{171} We may perhaps see the rise of local historiography in the late 1980s as a response to these changes. On the other hand, as Davis suggests, these texts also allowed Palestinians to “shift the meaning of ‘struggle’ from carrying arms and fighting to writing.”\textsuperscript{172} Saqr might have been prompted to pick up his pen by yet other reasons. A history of Salama had indeed already been written, it was true, but it was extrinsic; while it relied on oral testimony and employed the vernacular, an authentic history of Salama could only be written by a native son. It is important to note that, unlike the \textit{Historia de Tlatelolco Desde los Tiempos Mas Remotos}, in the case of Palestinian villages the loss of territory did not lessen its importance; for Saqr and his contemporaries, community history was framed first and foremost by locality, absent though it was.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{170} R. Davis 2011, 50.
\item \textsuperscript{171} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{172} 2011, 51.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
1.3 Local History as Community Autobiography

The history of his city becomes for him [sc. “for the man who preserves and reveres”] the history of himself; he reads its walls, its towered gate, its rules and regulations, its Volksfest, like an illuminated diary of his youth and in all this he finds again himself, his force, his industry, his joy, his judgment, his folly and vices. Here we lived, he says to himself, for here we are living; . . . Thus with the aid of this ‘we’ he looks beyond his own individual transitory existence and feels himself to be the Haus-, Geschlechts- und Stadtgeist. Sometimes he even greets the soul of his nation across the long dark centuries of confusion as his own soul.

Friedrich Nietzsche, *Vom Nutzen und Nachtheil der Historie für das Leben* (1874).¹

Our database of local historiography is by no means complete. We could certainly adduce other examples from Egypt, Italy, China, Japan, England, Bohemia, Germany, Kashmir, Iran, America, Africa, Malaysia, and the Middle East, as well as from numerous other regions of the world. Our survey nevertheless reveals that many communities from many cultures and over the course of many centuries have produced texts that treat their past through the lens of territory. Whether focalized by monastery or village, city, county, bishopric, commandery, province, kingdom, or nation; written by visitor, resident, citizen, scribe, monk, minister, banker, judge, or government official; whether in prose or verse, organized by chronology or periegesis, horographic or biographic; treating the recent past or only the time of origins; drawing on a long tradition of local historiography or based solely on oral tradition; whether concerning a community ascendant or decadent, or one that has been destroyed, local history abounds.

Aside from demonstrate the great variety of forms local historiography, our survey also allows us to note some commonalities of form. First, local histories tend to begin with a description of the focal locality and a discussion of toponymical etymology. Second, local histories give pride of place to the foundational period and the time of

¹ Adapted from a translation by R.J. Hollingdale in D. Breazeale (ed.) 1997.
origins. Many, it is true, proceed to track a community’s history chronologically up to the historian’s own day; others don’t seem to get much beyond the moment of *ktisis*; but few, unless explicitly a continuation of an earlier local history, ignore the *ktisis* altogether. Third, local histories tend to marry descriptive, synchronous passages (explications of the local community’s present-day praxis and dogma) with *res gestae*. And while it is most often the actions of particular elite individuals (gods, heroes, kings, tyrants, princes, bishops, dukes, government officials, and prominent politicians) that propel the narrative, most local histories also feature actions of the local community *en masse* (“the Egyptians,” “the Romans,” “the Zong people,” “the people who live in the five districts between the river mouth and the village of Yokota,” and so forth). Still, local histories prioritize the elite. Not until the late-nineteenth century do they begin to look beneath the landowning class as a means of understanding the composition of the local community, a focus that would be sharpened in the next century by the influence of the *Annales* School in France and the Leicester School in England.

Our database also allows us to draw some conclusions about the types of community that produce local historiography. First and foremost, as we have said, the phenomenon of local history is predicated on the existence of a communal consciousness, and a communal consciousness, more to the point, that is derived in part from the occupation of a distinct territory. The locality through which these histories are focalized, we should emphasize, need not correspond precisely to a community’s actual territory at the time the history is composed. In some cases, the focal locality far exceeds the bounds of the community; so the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle views all of Britain through the lens of Wessex, while Carl C. Reindorf filtered his history of the Gold Coast through Ga lands. In other cases, like the *Historia de Tlatelolco* and the Palestinian village histories, the community lacks territory altogether. But it is the putative possession of territory that underpins all local historiography.
The historiographical community need not be autonomous, furthermore. Many local histories were indeed written about independent city-states, nations, and kingdoms; but other historiographical communities were embedded in larger empires. Ban-Gu (now Sichuan) was a part of the Jin Empire in China; the province of Izumo belonged to Yamato Japan; and the Gold Coast, at the time that Carl Reindorf was writing, was largely controlled by the British. Nevertheless, almost all historiographical communities possess some form of local government, even if it is under the direction of a monarch or tyrant or representatives of a central regime. As we have said, the sorts of communities that produce local histories, even a religious community like that of the monks of Ely, not only can claim a communal identity but have also developed structures of self governance.

It is not surprising that all of the pre-twentieth century local historians at whom we have so far looked were men who came themselves from the upper classes—for one thing, a local historian must be literate, and this entails access to education. But what is striking is that all of the local historians in our database who wrote about their own communities actually participated in some way in local politics (or else had close friends or family who did). By the same token, the audiences implied by these intrinsic local histories always consist of the local historian’s immediate peers and narratees addressed in epistolary prefaces are frequently prominent local officials. It is not simply that local histories were inaccessible to the non-literate. There is, rather, a fundamental interrelation, at least until the early-twentieth century, between local historiography and local government. It was the men who helped to run their communities wrote community history.

Another conclusion is that local historiography belongs only to literate communities. This is not to say, of course, that every member of a historiographical community knew how to read and write; but a subset of the community had to be literate.
Yet a community that produces historiography must also have access to mechanisms through which diverse group memories may be assessed, compared, sorted, and arranged; it must match literacy, that is to say, with historicity. How communities acquired such a historical consciousness is a difficult question to answer. Some years ago, in his book *Hierarchy, History, and Human Nature: The Social Origins of Historical Consciousness* (1988), the anthropologist Donald E. Brown examined a series of communities (the Jews, Assyrians, China, Kashmir, India, Sri Lanka, Byzantium, Sassanid Persia, Greece, Rome, Florence, Venice, etc.) and concluded that the phenomenon of historiography was dependent on “open patterns of social stratification,”2 where rank “is more achieved than ascribed at birth.”3 Ahistoricity, on the other hand, he found to be “typical of literate caste-organized societies.”4 While Brown’s thesis does indeed explain why we should find the production of historiographical texts in, say, Kashmir and Sri Lanka5 but not in Hindu India, there are some problems with his assumptions, not least with his Rankean distinction between “sound” and “unsound” historical traditions.6 Some closed communities (like Tlatelolco or, in the case of Greece, Sparta), furthermore, did produce a form of local historiography. Nevertheless, Brown may be correct to link the manifestation of a historiographical tradition to a community’s recognition of an individual’s agency, to the potential role, that is to say, of community members in their community’s past. The central task of a historian, namely to organize and evaluate

---

2 1988, 304.
3 1988, 14.
4 1988, 304.
5 *e.g.* the *Dipavamsa,* “History of the Island,” or the *Mahavamsa.*
6 “I use the term *historiography,*” Brown says, “primarily to denote the general principles—sound or unsound, conscious or unconscious—that underlie any account of the past (1988, 10), distinguishing between “things *alleged* to have taken place in the past” and “real history” (1). “What distinguishes a sound history, then, is that in addition to its subjective elements it maximizes its objective content. It is not wholly subjective” (11). Later, he writes, “Let me also emphasize that sound history is not simply modern Western history. . . . When I speak of soundness, it must be borne in mind that I speak of relative soundness” (13). Also: “What they [modern historians] find to be acceptable historical writing I will label as sound, or historical; what they find as unacceptable I will label as unsound, as historical, or mythical” (13).
various memories, in itself acknowledges his ability to function as an autonomous and mobile individual within his group.\textsuperscript{7} The upshot of Brown’s analysis in any case is that not every literate community wrote history. Yet more important is the fact that every community that does write history writes local history.

Local historiography often exists alongside other forms of historical writing. In Greece, a historian could write a monograph about a pan-local war, follow the affairs of a plurality of communities over the course of a generation or two, write a universal history ostensibly tracking a multitude of communities from the beginnings of the world, or pursue a variety of other explorations of the past. Such multiplicity of historiographical forms is also manifest in \textit{e.g.} Rome and England, Iran, China, Japan, and Germany. In some cases, notably China, Japan, and Iran, we have evidence that local history followed the development of other types of historiography, dynastic, national, or imperial. But elsewhere (\textit{e.g.} Rome in the mid-Republic or Medieval Kashmir), local historiography came first and thenceforth predominated. And while we are able in the case of some regions (\textit{e.g.} China and Japan) to construe local historiography as a reaction to a pan-local precedent, positing a rubric whereby a constituent community wrote its history in order to establish a place for itself in relationship to the center, the local is not perforce actuated by the national.

One last conclusion to draw from our survey is that local histories tend to emerge at certain moments in time. In some cases, this is not until long after the formation of the focal community. Sometimes, however, as was frequently the case in North American colonies and newly formed nations, local history appeared directly after the \textit{ktisis}. No matter the time frame, however, the programmatic statements of our local historians reveal that one of the primary factors motivating the production of local historiography was an anxiety about the present. This tension did not always entail a sense of doom: so

\textsuperscript{7} See C. Darbo-Peschanski 2007 on the important role of the \textit{histor} in historiography.
the *Liber Eliensis* was probably composed to mark the five-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the monastery at Ely, and J.H. Temple wrote his *History of Whately, Mass.* in connection to the town’s centenary celebration. But very often this anxiety did derive from a perception of crisis. Considering the *status quo* as somehow deviating from an ideal, a local historian would retroject this ideal into the times of origin in order both to substantiate his community’s present decadence and to recommend a course of future action. Of course, a historian’s stated anxiety about the stability of his community may in some cases have been an empty gesture, a literary trope (derived perhaps on occasion from Livy) through which a historian aimed to justify his project. In some cases, furthermore, it may have been an authentic gesture but entirely personal and not at all representative of the community as a whole. As we shall see when we turn to Classical and Hellenistic Greece, local historiography could serve to facilitate a citizen’s entrée into (or exit from) political life, functioning as autobiography and memoir would in late-Republican Rome (and indeed in many countries of the modern world).8 We may recall that, as in the case of Livy at Rome, Kalhana in Kashmir, and Ibn Funduq in Bayhaq, the act of writing local history could allow even those without an active role in local government access to political participation.

Yet, while the motivation and inspiration of a particular local historian are ultimately responsible for the composition and publication of a particular local history, there are distinct periods in a community’s life where the phenomenon of local historiography is especially prevalent. And these periods do tend to correspond to moments of social upheaval. We are thus permitted to take a step back and observe the phenomenon without recourse solely to personal agency, to read local historiography as a community act. We have noted that for communities in Classical and Hellenistic Greece

---

8 Political autobiographies in Greece and Rome are also the subject of a recent collection of essays edited by G. Marasco (2011).
there were distinct occasions (e.g. funerals and civic festivals) that elicited longer narratives of the past. By the same token, we may infer that there were distinct occasions in which a literate community was prompted to generate local historiography. A community’s production of local historiography can to this extent be seen as analogous to an individual’s production of autobiography. Just as an individual may at times feel compelled both to enunciate and inscribe his life narrative, so too is a community apt, during critical moments in its life, to become autobiographical.

As we have seen, a community does not remember in categorically different ways from an individual. Just as an individual builds a sense of personal identity from his memories, specifically from autonoetic, or episodic, memory, so too does a community derive communal consciousness from its shared past. By the same token, just as an individual’s autobiography is predicated, as Georg Misch emphasized, on his Selbstbewußtsein—“In a certain sense,” Misch wrote, “the history of autobiography is a history of human self-awareness”—so too does local historiography require a distinct community identity. But there is a deeper connection between personal autobiography and local historiography. For while the community provides the framework for an individual’s construction of his personal memories, so too does community memory depend on the mediating activity of the individual. “The person who seeks the connecting threads in the history of his life,” wrote Wilhelm Dilthey, “has already, from different points of view, created a coherence in that life,” which is “the root of all historical comprehension.”

For Dilthey, it is the “power and breadth of our own lives and the energy with which we reflect on them” that forms the basis for “historical vision,” and “alone enables us to give life back to the bloodless shadows of the past.”

---

9 1950, Vol 1, 6 (translated by E.W. Dickes).
10 Cited in H.P. Rickman 1961, 85-86. These quotations come from Dilthey’s “Drafts towards a critique of historical reason,” which formed part of his “Plan for the continuation of the Construction of the Historical World in the Human Studies.”
11 2002, 222.
the autobiographical impulse is indeed the foundation of historical thought, it is natural that the autobiographical form should be so intimately tied to the historiographical enterprise. Communities are apt to write local histories, we might say, because community members are apt to think autobiographically.

Although current definitions of autobiography have been devised with modern (often post-Enlightenment) models in mind, the autobiographical impulse is certainly identifiable in the ancient Greek world. For Misch, the first “conscious and deliberate literary autobiography” was in fact Isocrates’ *Antidosis*, a text ostensibly written to defend the orator from the charge of corrupting the youth. And Lysias also emphasizes the role of public *apologia* as a prompt for autobiography: ἐν δὲ ταῖς δοξιμασίαις δίκαιον εἶναι παντὸς τοῦ βίου λόγον διδόναι (*Or.* 16.9). But autobiographical forms are evident even earlier in Homer, where life narratives serve as a common means of introduction or self-justification: wandering Odysseus told autobiographies, marked by *peripeteia*, in order to elicit the compassion and aid of his hosts, as did Demeter (also falsely, we might note) in the Homeric Hymn in her name (2.123-144). So too in the monologic prologues of many of Euripides tragedies do we encounter rudimentary autobiographies, often culminating in a reversal of fortune or fall from grace (usually

---

12 P. Lejeune, for example, succinctly defined autobiography as “a retrospective prose narrative produced by a real person concerning his own existence, focusing on his individual life, in particular on the development of his personality” (1982, 193).
13 See G. Misch 1950, Vol. 1, 16-17. Some modern theorists see autobiography as essentially a modern phenomenon. For G. Gusdorf (1956, reprinted and translated by J. Olney 1980, 30): autobiography “becomes possible only under certain metaphysical preconditions. To begin with, at the cost of cultural revolution humanity must have emerged from the mythic framework of traditional teaching and must have entered into the perilous domain of history,” a cultural revolution that comes for Gusdorf well after Augustine and only with Copernicus.
14 1950, 155-156.
15 See e.g. Glaukos to Diomedes (*Il.* 6.150-211), Diomedes to Agamemnon (*Il.* 14.111.113); and Aeneas to Akhilles (*Il.*20. 208-248). The standard elements in this introductory autobiography are at the very least an evocation of homeland, a naming of parents, and an episode or two from ancestral history. For those fighting at Troy identity and legitimacy more often come from a connection to the famous exploits of an ancestor than from personal recollections.
16 In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus’s so-called “Cretan Tales” are a good example, conscious fiction though they are, of autobiography as social introduction (e.g. 14.192-359 and 19.165-202).
involving exile and bereavement), whose remedy, or attempted remedy, forms the crux of the action of the play.\textsuperscript{17} My concern is not to explore the development of personal or political autobiography in Greece or elsewhere. I want only to suggest that the autobiographical form was a paradigm familiar to Greeks of the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

Autobiographical consciousness, as Misch understood, was rooted in “man’s need for self-revelation” and self-assertion; it was thus “an instrument of knowledge”\textsuperscript{18} and at base motivated by “the instinct for self-preservation.”\textsuperscript{19} It is not surprising in this light that life narratives should be considered so essential a component of modern psychoanalysis, forming the rudiments of many approaches to therapy. According to Dan McAdams, building on the work of e.g. Jerome Bruner,\textsuperscript{20} our life stories are not merely narratives about our experiences but comprise our very identities.\textsuperscript{21} Practitioners of “Narrative Therapy,” developed in the 1970s by Michael White and David Epston, in fact, work in collaboration with their patients to construct “thicker” narratives. In moments of crisis, such as trauma or terminal disease, these life narratives become more urgent, more frequent, and indeed thicker.\textsuperscript{22}

It is one thing to tell stories about oneself, as a patient undergoing analysis, a traveler seeking shelter, or an Athenian politician undergoing dokimasia. It is quite another to write (and publish) autobiography. Georges May has divided the stimuli behind the production of autobiography into “emotional” and “rational motives.”\textsuperscript{23} The former category, which overlaps to some degree with life narratives, relate either to an awareness of the passage of time (both to the pleasure in reminiscence and to an anxiety

\textsuperscript{17} Euripides autobiographical monologues are spoken by men, women, gods, and once even by a ghost (Hecuba).
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 10.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 9-10.
\textsuperscript{20} See J. Bruner 1987.
\textsuperscript{21} See D. McAdams e.g. 1987 and 1988.
\textsuperscript{22} See L.J. Price 1995 on the role of “Life Stories of the Terminally Ill.”
\textsuperscript{23} 1979, 40-41.
about the future) or to the need of understanding the meaning of a life elapsed.\textsuperscript{24} As Jean Starobinski has said, “one would hardly have sufficient motive to write an autobiography had not some radical change occurred in his life—conversion, entry into a new life, the operation of grace.”\textsuperscript{25} But there is something more at stake in autobiography than perceived crisis or change; for autobiography entails, indeed requires, an audience. The “deepest intentions” of autobiography, for Georges Gusdorf, “are directed toward a kind of apologetics or theodicy of the individual being.”\textsuperscript{26} Such stimuli lie behind May’s second category, “rational motives,” which he separates into “Apology” (\textit{i.e.} an individual’s need “to justify in public actions that have been committed or ideas that have been professed”)\textsuperscript{27} and “Testimony” (\textit{i.e.} an individual’s perceived obligation to testify about events that he has been in the privileged position to witness, lest his experience die with him).\textsuperscript{28}

If we are permitted to read local historiography as community autobiography, we can see May’s categories, sometimes several in operation at once, behind many of the examples of local historiography that we surveyed earlier: local history as an outgrowth of the pleasure of reminiscence; local history as therapy for a community in distress or plagued by disease; local history as a justification of a community’s actions or its very existence vis-à-vis its neighbors or the nation or empire to which it belongs; and local history as a means of communicating potentially moribund collective memories. Let us keep in mind this equation between local historiography and community autobiography and these potential motives behind the production of community autobiography as we turn to the fragments of Greek local histories in Part Two.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[24] \textit{ibid.}, 41. As A. Hornung noted, many literary autobiographies are instigated by an “awareness of the approaching end of life” or by some form of a “mid-life crisis” (1997, 222).
\item[25] 1980, 79.
\item[26] p. 39.
\item[27] 1979, 41.
\item[28] 1979, 43.
\end{footnotes}
PART II: GREEK LOCAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

2.1 τοπικὴ ἱστορία

Est autem humana historia communis aut propria: haec unius hominis aut ad summum
unius populi dicta factaque memoratu digna complectitur. . . . communis plurium
hominum vel citivtatum gesta narrat, idque bifarium: aut enim plurium populusorum, puta
Persarum, Graecorum, Aegyptiorum; aut omnium quorum modo res gestae proditae
sunt, vel maxime illistrium. Quod item multis modis fieri solet, cum unius temporis,
scilicet diei cuiusque, vel mensis, vel anni, unde ephemerides sive diurna & annales
dictae; aut ab ortu cuiusque civitatis, vel ab extrema memoria, vel ab orbe condito
Rerum Publicarum initia, incrementa, status, conversiones, exitus memorantur.

Jean Bodin, Methodus ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem 1 (1566)

2.1.1 LOCAL HISTORIOGRAPHY IN GREECE: AN INDIGENOUS FORM

Literate, landed communities engender autobiographies focalized by territory:
local historiography. Although these works vary in organization and emphasis, in style
and in length, we have seen that there are certain characteristics common to almost all: a
delineation of the geographical boundaries of the focal locality; a survey, however
cursory, of the collective past, often through etymology and toponyms but relying also
on other carriers of cultural memory, both oral and written; a signal emphasis on the
community’s κτίσις and foundational period; and an attention to epichoric customs.
Classical and Hellenistic Greece is no exception; here too we find texts that focus on
particular landed communities, their territory, history, and behavior. In the case of
Greece, however, we are at disadvantage; for aside from a significant portion of
Aristotle’s Athenaion Politeia, no local history survives in Greek from the four

1 While I recognize the flexibility of literary categories or genres in the ancient world (see e.g. G. Conte
1994 for Classical literature in general, and J. Marincola 1999 and now C.A. Baron 2013, 202-231 for
Greek historiography in particular), a Greek setting out to write history in the Classical and Hellenistic
world had available to him a variety of potential narrative focalizers, the most important of which was
community/locality. Choosing to write a history of a particular landed community, I argue, entailed a
particular approach and required the inclusion of particular sorts of data.
centuries between the publication of Herodotus’s history of Egypt and Dionysius’s history of Rome. Any appreciation of the form must, then, depend almost entirely on references, paraphrases, and quotations made by later writers.²

In assessing the extent to which the local was an indigenous historiographical category in Classical and Hellenistic Greece, we may begin by noting that locality was an important criterion by which the Greeks categorized literature, both poetry—as early as Herodotus, Homer’s major output was divided into a poem about a man (Ὀδύσσεια)³ and one about a locality (Ἰλιάς)⁴—and prose.⁵ Localized titles for prose works sometimes employed specialized terms,⁶ but most often they are expressed either by a combination of the preposition περί with the genitival form of the focalizing polis, island, or region (e.g., περί Ὀμβρίων,⁷ περί Λέοβου,⁸ περί Αρκαδίας⁹) or by the neuter plural form of the ktetic adjective, built from the conjunction of toponym with the suffix –κό– or –ικό–¹⁰ (Ἀγγολικά,¹¹ Σικελικά,¹² θεσσαλικά¹³). Most of our evidence for such titles is late, largely from the generation of Didymos and beyond. But the

³ Hdt. 4.29.
⁴ Hdt. 2.116. To Mimnermos (FGrHist 578) was also attributed a poem about a locality (Σμύρνης) and a person (Ναννώ), although there is some discussion about whether these two titles actually referred to the same work (see M.L. West 1974, 72-76 and C.W. Müller 1988). One of Solon’s poems was also referred to by way of its focal locality, viz. Salamis (Plut. Sol. 8; Diog. Laert. 1.47).
⁵ When Didymos and his contemporaries catalogued the speeches of the Attic orators, for example, they tended to distinguish them either by way of the person accused/defended or by way of geographical focus: Demosthenes wrote Philippiics and Olynthiacs, as well as On the Halonnesos and On the Chersonesos; and Deliakoi Logoi were attributed to the likes of Aiskhines (FGrHist 401a), Hypereides (FGrHist 401b), and Lykourgos (FGrHist 401c).
⁶ In the case of Athens, “Ἀτθίς” is used (e.g. FGrHist 324-328); numerous Ionian communities of Asia Minor, we shall see, employed the term Ὁσιόι often with the genitive form of a particular people (see, in the case of Samos, e.g. FGrHist 76, 147, 536, 539, and 544). And some works produced after the second century CE are known as Πάτριαι (see D.P. Orsi 1994, 159-160).
⁷ e.g. FGrHist 380.
⁸ e.g. FGrHist 476.
⁹ e.g. FGrHist 4 F37.
¹⁰ The suffix is common in many Indo-European languages and is added to nouns to indicate “origin or material composition” (B.W. Fortson 2010, 135).
¹¹ See e.g. FGrHist 305.
¹² See e.g. FGrHist 555.
¹³ See e.g. FGrHist 602.
classification of prose works by way of locality is not only a Hellenistic phenomenon. On the rare occasion that Thucydides deigns to discuss a written source, one of Hellanikos’s histories, he calls it as ἡ Ἀττικὴ Ἑὐγραφή (1.97.2).

The localizing principle is evident not only in titular conventions but also more generally in the geographical compartmentalization of texts. The “Catalogue of Ships” is a good early example of this principle. So too, to turn to prose, Hekataios’s Periodos Ges is divided into discrete sections centered on separate topoi. And in the next generation, Herodotus used a similar technique in his Histories. Along with associate individual localities with site-specific traditions, Herodotus divides his text into separate local logoi—he clarifies this organizational principle, in fact, at the very beginning of the work: ὁμοίως σμιχότα καὶ μεγάλα ἀστεα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιών (1.5)—and he arranges these logoi by way of the respective community’s point of contact with a foreign power (usually Persia). So, when Darius marches against the Scythians, Herodotus addresses Scythia (4.1-82)—τῆς γὰρ Ἀσίης ἦρξαν, ὡς καὶ πρότερον μοι εἴρηται, Σκύθαι ἔτεα δυῶν δέοντα τριήκοντα—resuming his overarching narrative at the conclusion of the excursus: θωμάσια δὲ ἡ χώρη αὕτη οὐκ ἔχει, . . . τοῦτο μὲν νυν τοιοῦτο ἔστι, ἀναβήσομαι δὲ ἐς τὸν πατὴρ ἀρχὰς ἡμα λέξων λόγον (4.82). So too does he insert a Thracian logos at the point in his overarching narrative when the Persians arrive in northern Greece (5.2), proceeding to treat its customs and history for the next ten chapters before rejoining his account of the Persian

14 See R. Nicolai 2013, 140-142.
15 Even if the names of his two books, Europa and Asia respectively, to which Stephanos of Byzantium so often refers, do not originate with Hekataios himself, there are indications that he divided his periegesis into self-contained and localized units. One seems to have focused on the Hellespont (FGrHist 1 F139), another on Aeolia (FGrHist 1 F226).
16 See N. Luraghi 2001. Herodotus sometimes uses the adjective ἐπιχώριος to refer to customs and traditions associated with specific places; sometimes he refers to his local sources as ἐπιχώριοι (e.g. 2.60, 63, and 150); And once he even refers to an ἐπιχώριος λόγος (7.197.1); see also Dionysios of Halicarnassus (A.R. 2.61.3, 3.69.3, 4.2.1, 5.47.2, 8.56.4, and 12.4.2) and Pausanias (D. Ambaglio 1998 and 2001).
17 For these logoi, see S. Cagnazzi 1975.
conquest: ταύτα μέν νυν τῆς χώρης ταύτης πέρι λέγεται· τα παραθαλάσσια δ’ ὄν αὐτῆς Μεγάβαζος Περσῶν κατήκοα ἔποιε (5.10). Most impressive, as we have already seen, Herodotus devotes a lengthy excursus, later designated as the entire second book of his Histories, to Egypt. The local rubric employed by Hekataios and Herodotus was adopted in the following generation by Hellanikos, as is evident from the frequency with which his works, as we saw in the case of Thucydides, are named by way of focalizing locality. Whether he wrote a series of separate works or such titles refer only to discrete sections within a larger work, Hellanikos clearly approached his subject matter κατὰ τόπους.

In the case of fragmentary works, of course, a local title alone is no proof that the cited work was a local history. Ἐλληνικά, as we have said, are not local histories of Greece; Heliodoros’ Αἰθιοπικά is a novel that merely begins and ends in Ethiopia; and, while Περσικά do indeed tend to refer to histories of the Persian Empire, the term Μηδικά usually indicates the early-fifth-century wars between Greece and Persia. So, when Hesykhios reports that “Eukrates in his Ῥοδιακά says ‘garment’ (ἐνδύμα), ‘strap’ (κατάζωσμα)” (FGrHist 514 F1), we are left very much in the dark about the scope, organization, and aim of this text. Nevertheless, in many cases it is quite clear

---

18 See also Hdt. 1.178-200 on Babylon, 3.17-25 on Ethiopia, 3.98-106 on India, and 4.181-196 on Libya.
19 poleis (Αργολικά FGrHist 4 F36; Ατθίς FF38-49), islands (Κυπριακά F57; Λεσβιακά FF33-35), mainland regions (Αἰολικά F32, FF158-160; Πελοποννησιακά F37, FF 9, 161-162; Βοιωτιακά FF50—51; Θεσπολικά F52, F201) and monarchies (Αἰγυπτιακά FF55-55, 173-176; Περσικά F58; Πελοποννησιακά FF59-63, F132, 177-184; Σκύθιακά FF64-65, FF185-187, 189).
20 L. Pearson, for example, posits that the Βοιωτιακά and Αργολικά were alternate ways of referring to the first and second books of Hellanikos’s mythographic work, Φορωνίς (1939, p. 170). But as R. Nicolai has recently concluded, it is a moot point whether the titles correspond to discrete texts or to sections of a longer work. “For the real publication was not the written, but the oral one; in this latter case it is possible that units that had been written separately could be put together for specific events, or that, on the contrary, a written unit could be broken into parts (2013, 141-142).
21 See e.g. J. Marincola 1997, 295.
22 See A. Momigliano 1978, 375.
23 A second reference to Eukrates in Athenaeus about bread, and without reference to a book title, is hardly more illuminating (FGrHist 514 F2).
that particular texts with a localized title did indeed focus on a territory, its occupant community, and its past.

For one thing, our cover texts\textsuperscript{24} often both provide a localized title and retain local information: Dionysios of Halicarnassus cites Ariaithos “the writer of Ἀρκαδικά,” for example, regarding the fact that Aeneas helped to found Kapyai in Arkadia (A.R. 1.49.1 = FGrHist 316 F1).\textsuperscript{25} And when Thucydides cites the “Attic work,” he tells us that Hellanikos touched on Athenian history, albeit somewhat too concisely and without proper chronological acumen (1.97.2). Sometimes, moreover, we have access both to a local title and also to a summary of the work made by later readers. The Souda (Φ 441) reports that Philokhoros’\textit{ Attthis} was seventeen books long and comprised the deeds of the Athenians and their kings and archons (περιέχει δὲ τὰς Ἀθηναίων πράξεις καὶ βασιλείς καὶ ἀρχοντας) up to the death of Ptolemy Theos (FGrHist 328 T1). Or, to take another example, the Souda tells us that Nymphis wrote thirteen books about Pontic Herakleia that included events after the Epigonoi up to the overthrow of the tyranny even up to Ptolemy III (N 598 = FGrHist 432 T1). Some summaries are even more instructive. The ninth-century patriarch of Byzantium, Photius, provides very thorough epitomes of numerous Greek works, some of which were local histories. In the case of Memnon’s history of Herakleia, he describes eight of its books in great detail (over 11,000 words!) prefacing his summary with an overview: the “historical book” of Memnon, he begins, “has as its goal to record what happened in Pontic Herakleia and treated those who were tyrants there and their deeds and customs, as well as and the lives of other men” (\textit{Bibl.} 224 = FGrHist 434 T1). Some of these summaries are actually quite early. In his \textit{Attia} (3 = P.Oxy. 7.1011, F75 Pf.), Callimachus cites Xenomedes of Keos—Dionysius of Halicarnassus ranked him as

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24}To employ the terminology of G. Schepens 1996.
\item \textsuperscript{25}λέγεται δὲ ταῦτα ἄλλοις τε καὶ Ἀριαίθων <τῷ> γράφαντι τὰ Ἀρκαδικά.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
a contemporary of Thucydides (De Thuc. 5)—regarding the early history of Keos (FGrHist 442 F1): “the ancient Xenomedes,” he writes, “once put the whole island into mythological memory (ὅς ποτε πᾶσαν νῆσον ἐνὶ μνήμῃ κάτθετο μυθολόγω), beginning when it was settled by Korykinian nymphs, who were driven from Parnassus by a great lion, for which reason they called it Hydroussa. . .”

Sometimes, finally, our cover texts actually provide programmatic statements verbatim from the authors themselves about the scope of their work. Dionysios of Halicarnassus purportedly preserves the opening sentence of a late-fifth-century history of Italy by the Syracusan Antiokhos: “Αντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίης ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα· τὴν γὴν ταύτην, ἣτις νῦν Ἰταλίη καλεῖται, τὸ παλαιὸν εἶχον Οἴνωτροι” (A.R. 1.12.3 = FGrHist 555 F2). In this case we can see that the title, viz. περὶ Ἰταλίης, was formulated by the historian himself.

In order to assess the indigenity of local historiography in Greece, however, we are happily not compelled merely to rely on titles and summaries. For there are other indications that local historiography was recognized, at least from the late Hellenistic period, as a distinct enterprise. For one thing, Alexandrian critics frequently collated historians who focused on a particular locality, referring to them collectively. The local historians of Athens were treated as a group with particular frequency:26 Strabo refers to τὴν Ἀττιδα συγγράφας εν (5.2.4 and 9.1.6 = FGrHist 329 FF1-2), Dionysius of Halicarnassus to οἱ τὰς Άττιδας πραγματευομένου (A.R. 1.8.3 = FGrHist 329 T1), Josephus to οἱ τὰς Άττιδας συγγραφότες (Contr. Ap. 1.17 = FGrHist 311 T1 and 329 T2), and Pausanias to ὅποιοι τὰ Αθηναίων ἐπιχώρια ἔγραψαν (10.15.5 = FGrHist 323 T1). Historians of other localities were also addressed en masse: Hyginus cites a story told by qui autem Argolica consciptserunt (Astron. 2.5 = FGrHist 311 F2),

26 See in general Jacoby 1949, 1-2.
Harpokration a group oĩ τὰ Εὐβοικά γράψαντες (FGrHist 427 F1), and Josephus the Sikeliographers and oĩ τὰ περὶ Ἀργοὺς ἱστοροῦντες (Contr. Ap. 1.17).

By the Augustan age, moreover, specific terminology had been developed to designate locally focused works. In the seventh book of his Arkhaiologia, a work, as we saw, explicitly framed as a history of the polis of Rome, Dionysius reiterates his intention to demonstrate the Greek roots of Rome by citing an array of different types of evidence (7.70.2). “It is not enough,” he says, for historians such as himself “writing ancient and topical histories (τοῖς ἀναγράφουσι τὰς ἀρχαίας καὶ τοπικὰς ἱστορίας) simply to report what they have received from the locals (παρὰ τῶν ἐπισημωρῶν).” Dionysius uses this term, “topical histories,” elsewhere. In his essay on Demosthenes (de Dem. 2), for example, he notes that the plain and simple style of prose was used by philosophers, orators, and historians (συγγραφεῖς), in particular by those historians who wrote genealogy and topical history (οἱ τὰς γενεαλογίας ἐξενέγκαντες καὶ οἱ τὰς τοπικὰς ἱστορίας πραγματευοῦμενοι). And in his essay on Thucydides (de Thuc. 7), he actually juxtaposes such “topical” histories to what he calls “ethical histories”; he understands why writers of ethical and topical histories (ἐθνικὰς καὶ τοπικὰς ἐκφέροντες ἱστορίας) latched onto fictional stories, since these were the sorts of traditions (μνήμαι) retained by all people, both in common in topoi and privately in poleis (ἐν ἄπαισι γὰρ ἀνθρώπως καὶ κοινῆ κατὰ τόπους καὶ κατὰ πόλεις ἰδίᾳ).

Dionysius is not here distinguishing local history from ethnography, either histories of place from histories of people, or histories of Greek places/people from those of non-Greek places/people. He is rather differentiating two types of locality in Greece: the ethnos, spread out κατὰ τόπους, and the polis. He makes this clear earlier

27 In addition, we may note that a scholion to Homer refers to writers of τὰ Αἰολικά (FGrHist 301 F10), Aelian to oĩ τὰς ὑπὲρ τῆς Χίου συγγράψαντες ἱστορίας (FGrHist 395 F1), Harpokration and Zenobios to writers of τὰ Εὐβοικά (FGrHist 427 FF1-2), and Parthenios to oĩ τὰ Μιλησιακά (sc. ἱστοροῦντες) (FGrHist 496 F1).
in his essay on Thucydides (de Thuc. 5), a passage to which we shall return in the following section, when he says that Herodotus broke ground by choosing to record not the history of a single polis or ethnos but rather to gather together into one narrative many different events that took place in Europe and in Asia (οὔτε πόλεως μᾶς οὔτ’ ἑθνους ἕνος ἱστορίαν προελόμενος ἀναγράψαι, πολλάς δὲ καὶ διαφόρους πράξεις ἐκ τε τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐκ τε τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς μᾶς περιγραφὴν πραγματείας συναγαγεῖν); so too was Thucydides innovative, he says, in not wanting to focus his history on one place alone (οὔτ’ ἐφ’ ἑνος ἐβουλήθη τόπον καθιστῶαι τὴν ἱστορίαν) (de Thuc. 6). For the earliest Greek historians, whether they wrote αἱ Ἑλληνικαὶ ἱστορίαι or αἱ βαρβαρικαὶ ἱστορίαι, all divided their work by ethne and poleis (κατ’ ἑθνη καὶ κατὰ πόλεις διαιροῦντες), and all had the same goal: to publish the oral and written traditions that had been preserved by the local community, ethne and poleis alike (παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις κατὰ ἑθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις). Aside from designate the local as a distinct (and early) form of history writing, then, Dionysius continues to differentiate two separate orders of local focalizer in Greece: the ethnos and the polis.

Dionysius offers the clearest ancient exposition of local historiography as a distinct category of historical writing but by no means the earliest. In the early-fourth century, Plato posited in his Hippias Maior a fundamental distinction between genealogy and local historiography. To Socrates’ question about the listening preferences of the Spartans, we saw, Hippias claims that what appealed most to the Spartans were stories about “the families of heroes and men, and about settlements, how cities originally were established, in short, about ἀρχαιολογία in general” (Pl. Hp.Mai.

28 Dated perhaps to the first quarter of the fourth century—the dramatic date, however, is around 420 BCE.
Hippias thereby divides the study of ancient history (ἀρχαιολογία) by way of two organizational principles: gene and locality (Pl. Hp. Mai. 285d). In fact, Socrates goes on to designate a third approach to the past, chronography: “it is lucky,” he says, “that the Lakedaimonians do not enjoy hearing someone recite all our archons from Solon,” otherwise Hippias would have to memorize that too. Plato’s Hippias does not suggest that all Greek local historiography dwelt only on the foundational period, only that the Spartans were fondest of ancient (i.e. not contemporary) history. His emphasis on ktiseis here is not surprising given our earlier observation about the importance of origins in local histories of myriad languages and periods. Some Greek works are actually referred to as Κτίσεις—in the mid-fifth-century, Ion of Chios wrote a Χίου Κτίσεις by (FGrHist 392 FF1-2), Hellanikos of Lesbos Περὶ Χίου Κτίσεως (FGrHist 4 F71a-c) and on the Κτίσεις Ἑθνῶν καὶ Πόλεων (FGrHist 4 F70), and Kharon of Lampsakos two books on the Κτίσεις Πόλεων (FGrHist 262 T1)—and we saw that Dionysius’s history of Rome stopped at the First Punic War, many generations before his birth.

Plato was not alone in juxtaposing genealogy/myth to locality-based ktiseis. The dichotomy was repeated, Polybius tells us, by Ephorus (FGrHist 70 18b), and also, although with a twist, by Polybius himself. In the προεκθέσεις to Book Nine (Ol. 142 = 9.1.1.), a second prologue to his history, Polybius recognizes that unlike other historians who attract many readers by employing a variety of historiographical categories (τῆς ἱστορίας μέρεα), the austerity of his own work and its consequent μονοειδές will

29 περὶ τῶν γενῶν, ὧν Σόκρατες, τῶν τε ἡρώων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν κατοικίσεων, ὡς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐκτίθησαι αἱ πόλεις, καὶ συλλήβδην πάσης τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας.
30 For A. Momigliano, the accounts of the past with which Hippias allegedly entertained the Spartans were not “historical” at all; he even considered the term “ἀρχαιολογία” to be a sophistic coinage generated to connote just the sort of material as does our term “antiquaries,” namely research about the past that is learned but altogether devoid of political engagement.
31 On earlier poetic treatments of ktiseis, see C. Dougherty 1994, who argues that such accounts by and large were embedded in longer poetic narratives; cf. E.L. Bowie 2001.
32 τὸν μὲν γὰρ φιλήσας ὁ γενεαλογικὸς τρόπος ἐμπαίπαται, τὸν δὲ πολυπράγμονα καὶ περίττων ὁ περὶ τὰς ἀποικίας καὶ κτίσεις καὶ συγγενεῖας, καθά που καὶ παρέ Ἐφόρωι λέγεται,
appeal to only one class (γένος) of readers. He proceeds to distinguish three distinct historiographical μέρεα: οἱ γενεαλογικοί τρόποι (which, he says, was connected to οἱ μῦθοι and appeals to the man who is φιλήρωος); οἱ τρόποι περὶ τὰς ἀποξίας καὶ κτίσεις καὶ συγγενείας (which appeals to the man who is πολυπράγμων and περιττός), and last, the τρόπος that he himself privileged, viz. περὶ τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἑθνῶν καὶ πόλεων καὶ δυναστῶν (which attracts οἱ πολιτικοὶ). Polybius has added a third category, we note, to the two already outlined by Plato and Ephorus: in addition to what Hippias called Arkhaiologia, which Polybius likewise divides into genealogy and foundation-stories, there is now also meta-Arkhaiologia, πράξεις, which in turn can be divided by locality type. Here, in addition to poleis and ethne, Polybius adds a third local focalizer: monarchies.

“Deeds” (αἱ πράξεις) was a term often frequently employed as a synonym for post-ktisis events. The term could describe an individual’s accomplishments or the general past, but it also frequently designated locally restricted collective action: Polybius himself refers to πράξεις κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ Σικελίαν καὶ Λιβύην

33 F.W. Walbank suggests “the man with antiquarian interests” as a translation for this curious phrase (1967, 117).

34 Xenophon, for example, speaks of the πράξεις of Jason of Pherai (Hell. 6.1.19) and of Cyrus the Great (Cyr. 1.2.16). Later examples of this usage abound: Strabo says that one of his earlier works dealt with the Πράξεις of Alexander (2.1.9; cf. 17.1.43); and Diodorus speaks of the πράξεις of Alexander (e.g. 18.1.6) and of Agathokles (21.17.3).

35 So Isocrates mentions παλαιαὶ πράξεις (12.1). Isocrates had several opportunities to discuss “deeds.” Here in the introductory priamel of his Panathenaikos (338 BCE), he lists possible subjects of logoi available to him as an aspiring writer in the late-fifth century: οἱ μυθώδεις; logoi full of τερατεία and γενεαλογία; and logoi that recounted παλαιαὶ πράξεις and οἱ πολέμοι Ἑλληνικοί—he decided, of course, to focus on something entirely different, which was the true interests of Athens and the rest of the Greeks (12.1). A few years earlier, in his Antidosis (15.45) he had offered a slightly different typology. Just as in poetry, there are several τρόποι τῶν λόγων: some men have devoted their lives to investigations of heroic genealogy (τὰ γένη τῶν ἡμιθέων), others to the poets (περὶ τούς ποιητὰς), some (the so-called antilogicians) to questions and answers, and others to the deeds that took place in wars (τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις). We should recall that the subject of wars had recently been put on the map by Thucydides, who famously began his work by asserting that he ἔξυπνηκτικῶς τῶν πολέμων τῶν Πελοποννήσων καὶ Ἀθηναίων (1.1). The Iliad, of course, was focused on a war, as was the last third of Herodotus’s Histories, but the innovation of Thucydides was clearly recognized; as Dionysios of Halicarnassus writes in his essay on Thucydides: rather than follow the precedent of Hellenikos and Herodotus, Thucydides “chose a single war, that waged between the Athenians and Peloponnesians” (De Thuc. 5). On the importance of this type of historical writing, see J. Marincola 1997, 293.
(39.8.5). At the beginning of the sixteenth book of his *Bibliothèke*, Diodorus says that in all historical texts historians should include the deeds of either *poleis* or kings complete in themselves, from beginning to end (ἡ πόλεων ἢ βασιλέων πράξεις αὐτοτελεῖς ἀπ’ ἁρχῆς μέχρι τοῦ τέλους). He does not, it is true, repeat Polybius’s third category (deeds of *ethne*), but he nevertheless illuminates the tendency to divide πράξεις by locality type. At the same time, he frequently alludes to such locally bounded πράξεις: e.g. of the Greeks and Barbarians (1.3.2. 16.76.5); of the Trojans (1.4.6); and of the early kings in Egypt (3.1.1; cf. 1.69.1). The term πράξεις as a synonym for *res gestae* appears also in a variety of Hellenistic inscriptions. In the second century BCE, for example, the *demos* of the Samians had recourse to honor the Samian Leon, son of Ariston, with an inscribed statue set up at the Heraion. His accomplishment, we read, had been to “bring into reliable histories the deeds concerning his fatherland (i.e. Samos)”: ὃς περὶ πάτρας πράξισις εἰς πινυτὰς ἄγαγεν ἱστορίας (FGrHist 540 T1). Another example comes in the dossier of inscriptions generated by Magnesia’s late-third-century bid to win Panhellenic status for its local games to Artemis Leukophryene and public recognition of the inviolability of the city and temple; at Epidamnos, Magnesian ambassadors presented the benefactions that their community had performed on behalf of the Cretans and the other Greeks by way of “the oracles of the god, the poets, and the historians who had written up the deeds of the Magnesians”: καὶ διὰ τῶν πόρων καὶ διὰ τῶν ἰ[ο]τορ[η]ν ἱστορ[ίας] τῶν συγγεγραφέων τῶν Μαγνήτων πράξεων.

In order to establish the indigenity of the form of local historiography in Greece, finally, we may look also to the texts themselves. For in addition to the *Souda’s* summary of Philokhoros’s *Atthis*, we are lucky to have well over two hundred

36 Incomplete actions, on the other hand, he says (explicitly recalling Polybius), break the enthusiasm of those who are fond of reading (τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τῶν φιλαναγνωστοίντων).
fragments from this work, some of them verbatim, which illuminate its orientation and organization. And in the case of Nymphis, we may supplement the Souda’s brief précis with some seventeen revealing fragments, two of which (from the indispensible Athenaeus) verbatim. In conjunction with the summaries and paraphrases, fragments such as these reveal that also in these texts we can discern the elements that we earlier identified as emblematic of local historiography in general: a demarcation of territory; an emphasis on toponyms and etymology and community customs; and a systematic (although not necessarily cohesive or continuous) account of a community’s past. So Xenomedes’ history of Keos, as Callimachus indicates, opened with a description of the 

\textit{ktisis} and tracked the island’s history through successive waves of immigrants (\textit{FGrHist} 442 F1). And Antiokhos suggests in his prologue to the work Περὶ Ἰταλίας suggests that he too began with his locality’s first inhabitants (\textit{FGrHist} 555 F2). According to Dionysius, in fact, Antiokhos devoted the first part of his history of Italy to enumerating “the most ancient inhabitants of Italy” in the order that “each took control of any part of it” (\textit{A.R.} 1.12.3 = \textit{FGrHist} 550 F2). Antiokhos explained how the land came to be called Italy after a certain king named Italos (\textit{A.R.} 1.35 = \textit{FGrHist} 555 F5)—“When Italos got old,” Dionysios says, quoting Antiokhos verbatim, “Morges became king; in his reign a man arrived having been exiled from Rome; his name was Sikelo” (\textit{A.R.} 1.73.3 = \textit{FGrHist} 555 F6). The beginning of Antiokhos’s history of Italy also featured a topographical analysis of the focal territory. According to Strabo, Antiokhos claimed in his Περὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας όσον γράφει that Italy, “the land about which he is writing,” was formerly called Oinotria, “and he designates its boundaries, on the one hand (in the direction of the Tyrrhenian Sea) the river Laos, on the other hand (in the direction of Sicily) Metapontum” (6.1.4 = \textit{FGrHist} 555 F3).

Many fragments of Greek local historiography discuss the customs, both cultic and otherwise, of the focal community. For the time being, it will suffice to mention
only a few examples. In Kleidemos’s history of Athens, we observe alongside a
delineation of territory (FGrHist 323 F1) and a narrative of “deeds” (e.g. FGrHist 323
FF10, 17-18) considerable attention paid to Athenian political and cultic behavior: e.g.
FGrHist F5a-c on the so-called “Guild of Cooks” at Athens; F7 on the assemblies; F8
on divisions of the civic body; and F12 on sacred cakes. Semos of Delos wrote in his
Δηλίας not only about Herakles’ murder of the Boreades (FGrHist 396 F19) but also
about how precisely the Delian women propitiate Brizos (FGrHist 396 F4) and what
sort of dedications the Delians make to Iris (FGrHist 395 F5). And in his Ἀργολικά,
Derkylos discussed not only Harmonia’s parentage (FGrHist 305 F6) and the
contribution of the Phrygian Midea (305 F9) but also the Argive proclivity for canicide
(305 F8b) and the various local springs from which the Argive women fetch water for
ritual purposes (305 F4).

As we saw in our brief glance at Herodotus, non-local historians often integrated
miniature epichoric logoi into their narratives. Such potted local histories abound in
e.g. Strabo, Diodorus, Pompeius Trogus/Justin, and Pausanias. And it is instructive to
note that the elements that we have identified as typical of local history tend to travel en
masse. A digression about a particular community, that is to say, very often entails a
discussion of territory, history, and custom. So, to look for a moment at Justin’s
Epitome of Trogus, the first half of Book Four is devoted to a local history of Sicily,
which comes just after the departure of the Athenian fleet for Sicily in 416; and here
Justin treats the island’s geography, topography and toponyms, as well as its
inhabitants, early kings, and tyrants. The phenomenon is evident earlier, in Polybius
(e.g. Book Six on Rome) and in Ephoros (e.g. FGrHist 70 FF 137-138, 141), who was
known for having written περὶ κτίσεων, συγγενειῶν, μεταναστάσεων, ἄρχηγετῶν
(FGrHist 70 F18a). It is evident also in Thucydides. Thucydides himself introduced
the Athenian invasion of Sicily with a history of the island, a Ktisis in the vein of the
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stories with which Hippias regaled the Spartans (6.1-6): he begins with a geographical and topographical analysis of the island and moves into a survey of Sicily’s first ethne, the foundations of various Greek poleis, and the early tyrants. He even comments on the customs of various Sicilian communities, in particular their laws and dialects (e.g. 6.5). So too does Thucydides insert a potted history of Athens in connection to a mid-fifth century event, the Athenian migration to the asty in the face of the Peloponnesian invasion (2.15). Here he has recourse to write about the foundation period of Athens, about the territorial limits of the early polis, and about the customs of the Athenians, in the process switching registers so markedly that the passage has sometimes been suspected as an interpolation and accordingly excised.39

Pericles’ population transfer was particularly traumatic, Thucydides says, because the Athenians had been so accustomed to living in the country. From Kekrops to Theseus, Attica had been divided into distinct poleis, each having its own prytany and magistrates and coming together only at times of emergencies. But when Theseus took the throne, he disbanded the separate governments and united Attica together under one administration, with one bouleuterion and prytaneion.

And the Athenians from that time even up until now have celebrated the Synoikia as a publicly financed festival for the goddess. [3] Before this, what is now the Acropolis was a polis, as was that part beneath it generally facing the south. The proof of this is that the temples of the other gods, too (i.e. in addition to that of Athena) are on the Acropolis itself, and those that are outside it are situated more towards this part of the polis: the temple of Olympian Zeus and that of Pythios (Apollo) and that of Ge and that of Dionysius in the Marshes, the same god in whose honor the older Dionysia are to this day celebrated in the month of Anthesterion, both by the Athenians and by their Ionian descendants. In the same place are also other ancient temples and a spring now called Enneakrounos, after the tyrants prepared it in this way (i.e. with nine spouts), but which formerly, when its waters were open, was called Kallirrooe, and this they used for the most important purposes because of its proximity. And from ancient times even still today it is customary to use the water before marriages

---

38 See R. Nicolai 2013, 148 for the division between ethne and poleis.
39 See S. Hornblower 1991 ad loc. for the references.
and for other ceremonies. And still to this day because of the ancient settlement there the Athenians call even the Acropolis polis.

When Thucydides has an opportunity to discuss non-contemporary Athenian history, he does so ostentatiously by donning the hat of a local historian.

Greek local histories, despite their commonalities, nevertheless differed in form and organization. Some, we have seen, tracked the history of the focal locality all the way to the time of the historian; some focused solely on the period of ktisis. So at Sparta, it was through the lens of Lykourgos’s politeia that Spartans viewed the history of their polis, the first local histories of Sparta being the early-fourth-century Politeiai of King Pausanias (FGrHist 582) and the generals Thibron (FGrHist 581) and Lysander (FGrHist 583). Dionysios of Halicarnassus offers an appreciation of the variety of potential formal approaches to local history. After identifying his subject, the most illustrious polis of Rome (1.3.6), and his goal (καὶ συνελήβην ὅλον ἀποδείκνυμι τὸν ἀρχαῖον βίον τῆς πόλεως)—he addresses the format of his history in terms very similar to those employed by Polybios (9.1). He will give a σχῆμα to his subject, he says, not like that given to their ἱστορίαι by those writers who have focused on wars nor in the manner of those who have focused on politeiai in and of themselves, nor even like the chronicles (χρονικαί), such as those of the Atthidographers, for these are monotonous and quickly bore the reader. His history, rather, will be a mixture of all three ἰδέαι.40 Dionysius thus reveals that while local histories might well employ the chronicle form, there was no direct equation between local historiography and annals.

Diodorus may recognize (1.26.5)41 a Greek term, horography, that referred to a year-by-

---

40 Some illumination on this interesting passage is provided by A.R. 11.1.1 and 11.1.4.
41 . . . ἀφ ἧς αἰτίας καὶ παρ' ἑνίοις τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς ἐνιαυτοὺς ὥρους καλεῖσθαι καὶ τὰς ἐτοὺς ἀναγραφὰς ἡμερολογίας προσαρκοεύθεσθαι. See also Censorinus (De die nat. 19.6); Hesychius (s.v. Horographoi); and the Etymologicum Magnum (s.v. Horos). On the use of the work Ὁρος for year, see Plut. Quest. Conv. 5.4.1 677e. See S. Mazzarino 1965, I, 13 and F. Landucci-Gattinoni 1997, 204-207. On οἰκον and their relationship to Greek historiography, see R. Stiehle 1853; C. Wachsmuth 1895, 553-559; Mazzarino 1966, 2, 447; and E. Flores 1991, 12-22.
year organization of a historical narrative. But, as Dionysius indicates, such an approach appealed not to local historians in general but to the Atthidographers in particular.\footnote{Jacoby 1949, 86-89, 99, 126; cf. K. von Fritz 1967, 94-97 and J. Marincola 1999, 294.}

Whatever its form, local historiography was one of the most popular categories of history writing in Classical and Hellenistic Greece. We know of over 125 different Greek localities (poleis, mainland regions, and islands), ranging from the shores of the Black Sea to northern Africa, from Cyprus to Marseilles, that could claim some form of local history. That Aristotle was said to have written about the politeiai of 158 (mostly Greek) localities,\footnote{On the number of Aristotle’s Politeiai, cf. O. Gigon 1987, 561-722. Diogenes Laertius puts the number at 158 (5.27), and this is confirmed by a list of Aristotle’s works attributed to Hesychios. A list ascribed to Ptolemy, however, which survives only in the Arabic, gives 171. We have fragments of 40 different Aristotelian Politeiai, while Herakleides provides 44 epitomes.} suggests in fact that the number of historiographical communities was probably a good deal higher. A more impressive indication of the popularity of the form is that of the 856 Greek historians embraced by Felix Jacoby’s monumental collection of fragmentary historians, some 614 (about 72%) are reported to have written at least one work focalized by locality, or at any rate assigned a title that betrays a focus on a particular city, island, or region. Only twelve historians are classified as autobiographers or memoirists, 23 as chronographers, 42 as general Greek historians (who wrote what Jacoby called Zeitgeschichte, Universalgeschichte, or Hellenika), 63 as genealogists or mythographers, and 121 as monographers. Even discounting Greek histories of non-Greek localities,\footnote{We shall look in detail at Jacoby’s FGrHist in the following section, but it is important to note here that Jacoby’s criterion for distinguishing a Greek historian is, quite understandably, not the subject on which he chose to focus but the language in which he wrote; hence we find among Jacoby’s local historians Q. Fabius Pictor (FGrHist 809) and L. Cincius Alimentus (FGrHist 810) but not Cato the Elder.} which Jacoby had included in his collection, and local works that are not obviously historical (that are devoted e.g. to particular cults or to collections of local inscriptions) there are still some 415 historians who wrote local

---
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history out of about 671. A Greek setting out to write history in the Classical and Hellenistic ages, that is to say, was a little less than twice as likely to concentrate on a particular city, island, or region than to write any other sort of history.

Local history, particularly of the intrinsic sort, was so natural an impulse in Greece that by a sort of hypallage the historians who wrote about a particular community tended to be considered historians from that community. Plutarch, for example, cites the writers of Naxian local histories as “οἱ Ναξίων συγγραφεῖς” (Mul. Virt. 17 254B-F = FGrHist 501 F2), and he calls writers of Μεγαρικά “οἱ Μεγαρόθεν συγγραφεῖς” (Plut. Thes. 10 = FGrHist 487 F1). When, furthermore, a new form of historiography was developed in the Augustan age that attempted to narrate the history of the entire world from its very beginnings to the present day, the so-called κοιναὶ ἱστοριαί, it was naturally framed as a local history writ large. As Diodorus claims at the beginning of his Bibliotheka (1.1.3), the sole example of this type of historical writing that has survived more or less intact, universal historians were those οἱ τε τὰς κοινὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης πράξεις καθάπερ μᾶς πόλεως ἀναγράψαντες.

45 We should also note that Jacoby assigns FGrHist numbers not only to individual authors but also to collective citations, which he calls Sammelzitate or sometimes Anonymoi, as well as to appendices (Anhängen), into which are slotted lengthy passages from Pausanias, Strabo, and other collectors of local tradition. So FGrHist 322 refers to what Jacoby calls Anhang (aus dem Arkadika des Pausanias), a series of excerpts from Pausanias Book 8.
46 See also Plut. Thes. 20.8 = FGrHist 501 F1 (καὶ Ναξίων δὲ πινεῖς ἱδίως ἱστοροῦσιν) and de Her. Mal. 36 869a-c = FGrHist 501 F3 (οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ναξίων ὑφογράφοι).
2.1.2 The Reception and Study of Greek Local Historiography

Although Greek local historiography was certainly recognized in antiquity as an autonomous and indigenous form of historiography, we have access to only one ancient passage, that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus from his essay on Thucydides (5), that treats the subject head-on. Dionysius surely did not pull his theory about the development of Greek historiography entirely from thin air, and he may well have relied on earlier, perhaps peripatetic, treatments (e.g. of Theophrastus, Praxiphanes of Mytilene, Callimachus, or Aristophanes of Byzantium). But it is Dionysius’s formulation that alone remains, and it was thus his argument that set the terms of the discussion for the next two thousand years.

Dionysius begins his essay on Thucydides by establishing his subject’s originality. To this end, he argues that there were many earlier historians active both before the Peloponnesian War (ἀρχαῖοι μὲν οὖν συγγραφεῖς πολλοί καὶ κατὰ πόλεις τόπους ἐγένοντο πρὸ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου) and during Thucydides’ own lifetime who wrote a different sort of history. These men employed the same criterion in their selection of subject matter and were of more or less equal ability, some writing up Ἑλληνικαὶ ἱστορίαι, some βαρβαρικαὶ ἱστορίαι; not attaching these to one another but rather dividing them κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις and publishing them separately; having one and the same goal, namely to bring before the common knowledge of all whatever μνήμαι were preserved by the locals κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις [as well as] γραφαί stored in places both sacred and profane; and they took them just as they were, neither adding to them or taking anything away. And in these (μνήμαι and γραφαί) there were even some μῦθοι that had been believed for a long time and some dramatic reversals of fortune, which seem very silly to men of today. For the most part they used the same λέξεις and chose the same dialect: clear and ordinary and pure and concise and suited to the events that they narrated and without showing σκευωρία τεχνικῆ. And yet their works are

---

2 Euagon of Samos, Deiokhos <of Kyzikos, Bion> of Prokonnesos, Eudemos of Paros, Demokles of Phyele, Hekataios of Miletos, Akousilaos of Argos, Kharon of Lampsakos, and Amelesagoras of Calchedon.
3 Hellanikos of Lesbos, Damastes of Sigeion, Xenomedes of Keos, Xanthos of Lydia, and indeed many others
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imbued with a certain charm, to a greater degree in some than in others, and because of this ἀἱ γραφαί still survive.

Herodotus was the first to deviate from this model, Dionysius says. For he focused neither on a single polis or a single ethnōs but compiled a variety of events that had taken place in Asia and in Europe into one composite and comprehensive work. Unlike the earliest historians, moreover, Herodotus paid especial attention to λέξις. While Thucydides followed Herodotus in his embrace of multiple τόποι, he wrote ἱστορία not ἐξ ἅπασης χώρας but rather concentrated on a single war (6).

He differed from previous historians, then, not only in his choice of subject matter, which was neither μονόκωλος nor divided into many disconnected headings, but also in the fact that he completely avoided μυθῶδες and did not gear his writing to deceive and bewitch the many, as everyone before him had done, putting in their histories Lamiai rising from the earth in the woods and glens, and amphibious Naiades streaming out of Tartaros and swimming, half-animal, through the seas and interacting with and mating with men, and the half-divine offspring of these intercoursing mortals and gods, and many other ἱστοριαί that seem in our time incredible and extremely stupid.

Dionysius’s particular claims are (1) that individual Greek communities, whether poleis or regions, engendered not only idiosyncratic local traditions but also written records, and that these were connected in part to temples; (2) that the first soundings of Greek historiography emerged from the assemblage of these unadulterated epichoric traditions and writings with the aim of exposing them to the greater world and thus (3) that the first Greek historians were local historians; and (4) that Herodotus and Thucydides actively rejected a local framework, thereby actuating a novel mode of historiography and a consequent bifurcation in Greek historiography between the local and non-local. Dionysios may well err in attributing to Greek communities of the early-fifth century a documentary habit far better attested for this period in the East.4 But the

4 See L. Porciani 2001, 13-27. For the notion of the Egyptian priests as sources for local history, see Hdt. 2.99 and 2.10, 13, 36-37, 54, 65, etc.; see also Plato. Tim. 22b-23a and Diodoros 1.69.7 (cf. Diod. 1.42-68). Greeks thought that priests were the first historians in Phoenicia, too (see, for example, FGrHist 790 F1).
dichotomy between sacred and profane memories is not his own invention; so a late-sixth century Cretan inscription records an agreement between Arkades and the scribe Spensithios and specifies that he be in charge of recording for the polis public matters (δαμόσια), both divine and human (τά τε θιμία καὶ τά τάνθηρωπα) (SEG 27 631A). \(^5\)

No matter how much credence we give to Dionysius,\(^6\) we must keep several things in mind when assessing his argument. First, he was writing as an Ionian Greek in the orbit of Rome; he had in fact been living among the Romans, whose upper crust he had tutored, since the Battle of Actium. And at the time that he wrote his Arkhaiologia and his essay on Thucydides, Rome was firmly in control of the Mediterranean with individual Greek communities decidedly integrated into the Roman Empire. Dionysius easily applied to early Classical Greece the tension that he perceived in the age of Augustus between the “little communities” of Greece and the conglomeration to which they now belonged: he analogized, that is to say, the relationship between e.g. late-first-century Athens and the Empire to that of early-fifth-century Athens and Greece in toto. Second, Dionysius was himself involved in writing a local history of Rome; and while some of his contemporaries were of course attempting something similar, there were other competing historiographical modes, notably the new universal approach favored by Diodorus, Pompeius Trogus, and Nikolaos of Damascus. Dionysius’s nomination of

---

\(^5\) It is a dichotomy, incidentally, also maintained by Josephus (Ap. 1.11): τὸν δὲ περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τόπον μυρίαι μὲν φθοραὶ κατέσχον ἐξαλείφουσαι τὴν μνήμην τῶν γεγονότων, ἀεὶ δὲ καὶ μόλις ἐγνώσανθαι φύσιν γραμμάτων ὁ Φοινίκης, ὁ Κάδμος μὲν ἐν Φοινίκης, ὁ Θαλείας δὲ ἐν Κάδμω συμπάθησε καὶ ἔγνωσεν· οἱ γοῦν ἀρχαιοτάτην αὐτῶν τὴν χρῆσιν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ παντὸς ἐνόμιζον ἀρχαῖοι· οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οὐδὲ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας μνήμης ἄρχειν ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτῶν εἰς τὸν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ παντὸς ἐνόμιζον· διὸς τοῦ τὸν ἄρχειν ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἄρχειν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ παντὸς ἐνόμιζον· φοινίκης, ὁ Κάδμος μὲν ἐν Φοινίκης, ὁ Θαλείας δὲ ἐν Κάδμω συμπάθησε καὶ ἔγνωσεν· οἱ γοῦν ἀρχαιοτάτην αὐτῶν τὴν χρῆσιν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ παντὸς ἐνόμιζον ἄρχειν ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτῶν εἰς τὸν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ παντὸς ἐνόμιζον· διὸς τοῦ τὸν ἄρχειν ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἄρχειν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ παντὸς ἐνόμιζον· φοινίκης, ὁ Κάδμος μὲν ἐν Φοινίκης, ὁ Θαλείας δὲ ἐν Κάδμω συμπάθησε καὶ ἔγνωσεν·

\(^6\) The passage has been defended by S. Gozzoli 1970-1971, W.K. Pritchett 1975, 50-57, D.L. Toye 1995, and R. Fowler 1996 and criticized by Jacoby 1949, 79, 86, 136, 147, 178, and 201 and by L. Porciani 2001a and 2001b. Not all of Dionysius’ early historians, it is true, actually wrote local works (e.g. Akousilaos)—in fact, as he says elsewhere in his letter to Pompeius on Thucydides’ style, Hellanikos and Kharon actually wrote works similar to that of Herodotus (in ad Pomp. 3)—and Hekataios for one did not merely copy out silly tales but actually engaged critically with them (FGrHist 1 F1). But the main grounds for dissent involve Dionysius’s alleged reliance, in arranging his chronology of historians, on stylistic grounds (it is not that Dionysius is wrong, that is to say, but that is not indisputably right): as Jacoby succinctly wrote, Dionysios “converts the stylistic development into a development in historiography” (1949, 354 n. 13). For Dionysius’s views of history, see H. Verdin 1974.
the local as the primal historiographical mode, then, boosted the prestige of his own project. Third, in his history of Rome Dionysius explicitly sought to expose epichoric Roman traditions and writings to the greater Greek world; it was a natural assumption, then, that his forbearers had been animated by similar motives. And fourth, he was familiar with contemporary Roman ideas about the development of Roman historiography, best summed up by a passage that Cicero wrote (through the mouthpiece of Antonius) in 55 BCE (de Orat. 2.52):

> erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confection; cuius rei memoiaeque publicae retinendae causa ab initio rerum Romanorum usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum res omnis singulorum annorum mandebat litteris pontifex maximus referebatque in album et proponebat tabulam domi; qui nunc Annales Maximi nominator.\(^7\)

We know that Dionysius agreed broadly with Antonius’s views about the role of the development of Roman historiography, in fact. For in his Arkhaiologia, he says that although Rome had no ancient (παλαιῶς) historian (συγγραφεύς) or logographer (λογογράφος), all Roman historians did indeed take something ἐκ παλαιῶν λόγων preserved in ancient tablets (ἐν ἱερῶι δέλτοις οὐξομένων), and so all were fundamentally reliable (A.R. 1.73.1). Dionysius even at one point mentions the possibility of verifying a particular claim by looking ἐπὶ τοῦ παρὰ τοῖς ἄρχεσιμοι κειμένου πίνακος ἕνος καὶ μόνου (1.74.3). It is not thus surprising that he would have related this model to the development of Greek historiography: so too at Greece, he claimed, did epichoric traditions and priestly records engender local historiography. The influence may, it is true, have worked the other way, with Cicero deriving his theory of Roman historiography from a Hellenistic Greek source, perhaps even the same rhetorical treatise on which Dionysius’s de Thucydidēs is sometimes said to have

---

\(^7\) See also de Leg. 1.6-7. The other primary ancient evidence for this theory comes from Servius A. 1.373. See B. Frier 1999, who suggests that it was younger contemporary of Dionysios, Verrius Flaccus, who wrote most fully about the reliance of Roman historiography on the so-called Annales Maximi kept by the Pontifex Maximus
been based;\textsuperscript{8} after all, Cicero’s Antonius does mention the stylistic innovations of Herodotus and Thucydides directly after his reference to the \textit{Annales Maximi} (\textit{de Orat.} 2.55). But we can distinguish in Cicero two strains of tradition, the first about the \textit{Annales Maximi}, which certainly had earlier Roman precedent (see \textit{e.g.} Cato \textit{F 77} Peter); the second about the development of prose style. And even if Dionysius and Cicero both drew on a Greek source for some of the more literary aspects of their argument, it does not follow that the entire Roman idea about the priestly origins of Roman historiography (right or wrong)\textsuperscript{9} developed from Greek notions of Greek historiography.

More to the point, what stands out about Roman historiography, aside from the fact that it began quite late—Fabius Pictor wrote the first history of Rome only about 150 years before Cicero wrote his \textit{de Oratore}—is that it began decidedly as local historiography. It was the local form that held sway over all manifestations of Roman historical writing until just about Cicero’s own day. A Greek local historian like Dionysius who lived in and wrote about Rome would quite naturally infer that something similar had been the case in Classical Greece. These early Greek historians, he would imagine, must themselves have been aware of a divide between their native community and the greater Greek world; they too must have had the goal of bringing epichoric writings (some of which, like at Rome, kept by religious officials) to the attention of the entire world.

Whatever his influences and whatever his accuracy, Dionysius’s template for the development of Greek historiography and his emphasis on the priority of Greek local historiography set the tone for most subsequent discussions of Greek historiography. So Josephus, albeit arguing that historiography arrived later in Greece than elsewhere,

\textsuperscript{8} See, for example, B. Frier 1999, 77-81.
\textsuperscript{9} It is, incidentally, surely wrong. An important model for Roman local historiography was (via Timaios and the Sikelikographers) Greek local historiography.
nevertheless employed the same model. In the case of ancient Greece, Josephus said, it was impossible to produce any examples of writing preserved either in temples or on public monuments (σωζομένην ἀναγραφὴν οὐτ’ ἐν ἱεροῖς οὐτ’ ἐν δημοσίοις ἀναθήμασιν) (Contr Ap. 1.11), for there simply were no public records of contemporary events (δημοσίας . . . περὶ τῶν ἐκάστοτε πραττομένων ἀναγραφὰς) (1.20). The Egyptians, Babylonians, and Phoenicians, on the other hand, to say nothing of the Jews, “applied great forethought to leaving nothing of what happens among them unrecorded;” they have sought rather “to have them consecrated continuously in public records (ἐν δημοσίαις ἀναγραφαῖς) composed by the wisest individuals,”10 among the Egyptians their priests, among the Babylonians the Chaldeans (1.28). Yet at the same time, Josephus, like Dionysius, suggests that the local was a natural historiographical mode. His proof for the unreliability of the historical record in Greece is the fact that Greek historians disagreed with one another (1.17); and among the discrepancies that he cites are those on the one hand among geneagraphers (Hesiod, Akousilaos, and Hellanikos), and, on the other, among Sikelikographers (Timaios, Antiokhos, Philistos, and Kallias περὶ τῶν Σικελικῶν), Athidographers (οἱ τὰς Αττιδὰς συγγεγραφότες δο not agree περὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν); and Argolikographers (οἱ τὰ περὶ Ἀργος ἱστορούντες contradict one another περὶ τῶν Ἀργολικῶν).

When local historians of Medieval and Renaissance Europe looked to the Classical world for precedents, they naturally looked not to Greece but to Livy and to Rome.11 Contemporary typologies of historiography, initially under the influence of Latin historians, tended to privilege the form, not the focalization, of narratives. So in his Etymologies, Isidore of Seville (with a nod to Tacitus) juxtaposed historia, treating events witnessed by the historian himself, to annales, which concern with those years

---

10 From J.M.G. Barclay 2007, 14.
11 So Giovanni Villani was prompted to write a local history of his native Florence, he says, because of an interest to do for his city what “Vergil, Sallust, Lucan, Livy, Valerius, and Paulus Orosius (sic)” had done for Rome (8.36).
“that our age has not known” (1.54). He accordingly considered Livy (and by extension all local historians, whose interests partly lay with the foundation period) as an annalist alongside Eusebius and Jerome. The equation between local historians and annalists was frequently reiterated in the early modern period. In an essay on Herodotus (1601-1602), for example, Isaac Casaubon wrote that unlike Herodotus, “alia circa civitatem unam sicut Philochori Atthis. Et hi sunt veterum ὡρῳγόραφοι qui annales urbium Graeciae descripserunt. ὡρος annus est; unde ὡρῳγόραφοι scriptores Annalium.”

Nevertheless, as we can see in Casaubon’s distinction between Herodotus and Philokhoros, by the sixteenth century Dionysius was once again very much in the background. Even a generation before Casaubon, Francesco Patrizi had conjured Dionysius in his Fifth Dialogue on History (1560), writing that it was a people’s priests, the most holy men, who “faceano le memorie di tutto ciò, che avveniva ciascun’anno, et le riponeano ne i lor sacrarii.” Such documents, he continued, formed the basis of each people’s histories, as was the case with Berossus in Asyrria, the Persian Metasthenes, and the Egyptian Manetho. And when the German historian David Chytraeus took up Herodotus (in 1579) he noted that it was his embrace of multiple regions, as well as his style, that set him apart from earlier historiae ethnicae:

Res gestas usque ad bellum Xerxis, optima fide et lenissimo ac suavissimo orationis genere contexuit, verum etiam regni Lydorum et Medorum, ac in primis Aegyptiaci historiam amplissimam, et multis in locis cum Prophetica congruentem, et antiquissimae Gentis Ionicae ac urbis Atticae, et Regum laconicorum et Corinthiorum historias descripsit. Ac omnibus ceteris historiae scriptoribus Ethnicis, tum antiquitate rerum ac regnorum, tum exemplorum

12 Isidore, incidentally, agrees with Josephus that the Greeks began belatedly to write history: Herodotus was the first Greek historian, he says, followed by Pherekydes, but he was preceded by Moses and Dares the Phrygian.
13 Bod. MS Casaubon 52, 110 vo; quotation from A.D. Grafton 2007, 224.
14 It in 1547 that Robert and Henri Estienne assembled and edited the edition princeps of Dionysius’s history of Rome.
15 Wherein he cites Dionysius by name alongside Livy: “Et tra Livio & Dionysio, dalla edificazione in poi non sono infinite le differenze?”
16 1560, 29 ro; see A.D. Grafton 2007, 139.
multitudine, tum vero inimitabili purissimae et dulcissimae orationis elegantia et suavitate antecellit.\textsuperscript{17}

Some contemporary typologies offered subtler appreciations of local historiography. As we saw in the quotation with which this chapter began, Jean Bodin claimed in his \textit{Methodus} (1566) that “particular human history” comprised the memorable deeds and sayings of a single man or people, while “universal human history,” dealt with multiple people or states. Historians, he said, “may trace from the origin of each state or as far as memory permits, or even from the creation of the world, the beginning, growth, established type, decline, and fall of states.”\textsuperscript{18} The Dutch Gerardus Vossius followed suit in his own \textit{Ars Historica} (1623).\textsuperscript{19} His category of human history, \textit{historia civilis}, had to do with

\begin{quote}
\textit{narrationes institutas de situ alicuius regionis, vel urbis, aut eius moribus, institutis, legibus; . . . Verum imprimis sibi hoc nomen vindicant illae, quae sunt de rebus gestis unius pluriumv populus, aut civitatum. Ut quae refernt res Atheniensium, aut Romanorum, sive universe, sive ex parte, ut de bello Peloponnesiaco, aut bellis Punicis, et similibus.}
\end{quote}

In the introduction to his \textit{De historicis Graecis libri IV}, moreover, the innovative chronological survey of Greek historiography (including many fragmentary works)\textsuperscript{20} that he published in the same year as the \textit{Ars Historica} (1623), Vossius continues this

\begin{footnotes}
\item[17] As quoted in the anthology of J. Wolf 1579; see A.D. Grafton 2007, 243.
\item[18] 1966, 18 (translation B. Reynolds). This division, Bodin asserts, is also applicable to divine history, which focuses on the origin and development of either one religion or of several.
\item[19] See N. Wickenden 1993, Chapter Three.
\item[20] Vossius claimed in his project that “\textit{minutos quosdam, et iamdiu mortuos, quasi ab orco revocave\textsuperscript{rim}” (from a letter written to Erycius Puteanus: 1629); see N. Wickenden 1993, 24. Vossius’s \textit{De historicis Graecis libri IV} was not the earliest attempt systematically to confront fragmentary historians, we should note. In the previous century, Conrad Gesner’s \textit{Bibliotheca universalis sive catalogus omnium scriptorum locupletissimus in tribus linguis Latina, Graeca et Hebraica: extantium & non extantium, veterum & recentiorum} (1545-1549) had included articles on many fragmentary historians, and Henri Estienne had collected the fragments of Ktesias’s \textit{Persika} from Photios’s \textit{Bibliotheke} already in 1557. Nicolaus Krag, meanwhile, had collected the fragments of Nicolaus of Damascus in 1593. On the Roman side, Antonio Riccobono had already in the 1570s assembled a comprehensive edition of the fragmentary Roman historians. On some of these early collections of fragments, see A.D. Grafton 1996 and G. Most 2009.
\end{footnotes}
train of thought, now echoing Josephus more clearly. The *Historicum nomen*, he says, is much more recent among the Greeks than among the so-called barbarians.

Nam quid habuere unquam Graeci quod posset conferri cum annalibus Aegyptiis, quos Manethos exscripsit, aut Babyloniiis, quos Berosus sequebatur, aut Phoeniciis, quos habuit Sanehuniathon? Mitto annales, unde sua hauserunt historici illi; neminem habet Graecia, qui non multo iunior sit Sanehuniathone ipso.²¹

In the second half of the eighteenth century, a new philology animated Classical scholarship and prioritized the collection of fragmentary historians,²² and this shed further light on the practice of Greek local historiography. In 1787, Friedrich Sturz published the fragments of Pherekydes, Akousilaos, and Hellanikos; in 1806 Friedrich Creuzer published the fragments of Hekataios, Kharon, and Xanthos, in a volume that was intended to be the first in a series of *Historicorum Graecorum Antiquissimorum Fragmenta*; in 1810 Karl Gottfried Siebelis published his *Observationes in locos quosdam Philochori difficiliores* and in the following year assisted Karl Gotthold Lenz with his *Philochori Atheniensis librorum fragmenta*; in 1812 Lenz and Siebelis published the fragments of the remaining Atthidographers; in 1818 Franz Göller collected the fragments of Philistos and Timaios as part of his work *De Situ et Origine Syracusarum (ad explicandam Thucydidis potissimum Historiam scripsit)*; in 1824 Johann Christian Felix Bähr focused on Ktesias; and in 1841 J.G. Hulleman completed his *Duridis Samii quae supersunt*.

In this same year, Karl Wilhelm Ludwig Müller published the first volume of his massive collection of Greek historical fragments, which, unlike the previous spate of work, attempted to provide a cohesive and comprehensive account of all fragmentary Greek historiography from the earliest times to the sixth century CE. He took his starting point from Creuzer’s unfinished project, and over the course of the next thirty

²¹ 1623, 2.
²² See G. Most 2009, 15.
years, eventually with the help of his son Theodor, he published five volumes of fragments. Müller’s guiding principle of organization was chronology. Volume One dispatches with those authors for whom the most fragments survive: Hekataios, Kharon, and Xanthus, as well as Hellanikos, Pherekydes, Akousilaos, Antiokhos, Philistos, Timaios, Ephoros, Theopompos, Phylarkhos, and the Atthidographers (Kleidemos, Phanodemos, Androtion, Demon, Philokhoros, and Istros). Volumes Two through Four, on the other hand, collect the fragments of the less-well represented historians, divided into ten books chronologically arranged. And the fifth volume takes on later Christian chronicles, like Aristodemos, Eusebius, Priscus, Malalas.23

Müller’s collection was an admirable achievement, and its latter books have not been surpassed, but like many of the earlier collections of fragments, he gave himself little room for extended commentary on the development of Greek local historiography, the fragments of which are scattered throughout his collection. On occasion, some of the early philologists did have recourse to assess Greek historiography more broadly, but only en passant. So Christian Gottlob Heyne summons Dionysius in his excellent first Excursus to the second book of the Aeneid (1775).24

Nam, cum pedestris orationis usus et cultus increbrescere inter Graecos coepisset, multique essent, qui antiquissimos mythos historiasque Graeciae, partim singularum urbium fabulis, religionibus ac sacris, festis ac ritibus, locorum etiam monumentis, templorumque donariis consecrates, partim ex priscis carminibus, quae superant, collectas litteris manderent; inter quos Pherecydes Atheniensis et Acusilaus Argivus, Hecataeus Milesius, et post hos alii Θεωγονίων auctores, genealogiis deorum ac cosmogoniis condendis inprimis inclaruerant.

And Lenz and Siebelis advanced a similar sentiment (citing Heyne, in fact) in the introduction to their 1811 edition of Philokhoros, whose Atthis, they said, treated

23 Three years after the final volume came out (1873), Reinhold Dorschel published his Adnotationes ad Fragmenta Historiorum Graecorum, which raided a source ignored by the Müllers, the Mythologiae sive Explicationis Fabularum Libri Decularum Libri Decem by Natale Conti, an impressive mythography that drew on a large array of Greek sources (1567).
Athenian history *ab ovo*, “ab antiquissimis temporibus rerum gestarum memoriam repetebat, fabulasque attics verae historiae praemittebat. Conspirunt in hoc ratione Atthides scriptores fere omnes, ac praeivisse viam omnino putandi sunt Dionysius Miletus et Hellanicus Lesbius.”

The clearest and most direct discussion of the development of Greek historiography came in Creuzer’s *Die historische Kunst der Griechen in ihrer Entstehung und Fortbildung* (1803), which he published three years before his collection of fragments. Drawing on comparative data from Scandinavia, Creuzer argued that Greek historiography developed initially from Homer, whose work led first to the proliferation of the epic cycle, but that it was from an intermediary group of prose writers, whom Creuzer called the *logographoi*, that Herodotus and the first *bona fide* Greek historians emerged. Creuzer gave less of a role than had Dionysios to epichoric records as the spur for historiography in Greece, but his logographers are essentially equivalent to Dionysius’s ὀρχαίοι συγγραφείσι πολλοί. The earliest writings of the logographers, Creuzer said, contained “einzelne Ortsgeschichten und Stammhistorien,” and even when several of these *Ortsgeschichten* were united in one work, the geographical principle still dominated. Herodotus’s *Historiae* was innovative inasmuch as “ein grosses System von Ortsgeschichten.”

A renewed attention to Greek local historiography came at the end of the nineteenth century as a result of the publications, in 1880 and 1891 respectively, of two significant portions of the *Athenaion Politeia* attributed to Aristotle, the sole example of Greek local historiography to survive from the ancient world. It was Ulrich von

---

25 1803, 265ff. See A. Momigliano 1946 on Creuzer and his project. For further discussion of Creuzer’s logographers, see especially L. Pearson 1939 and K. von Fritz 1967, 337-338.

26 1806, 96.

27 “Von dieser Seite betrachtet, ist die Richtung des ganzen Werkes durchaus local, und in der That nur ein grosses System von Ortsgeschichten, dergleichen die bisherige Logographie bereits eine grosse Menge, theils in ihrer örtlichen Getrenntheit, theils nach einer gleichfalls localen Verknüpfung aufgestellt hatte” (1803, 110-111).
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, responsible for the 1891 edition, who first exploited the implications on local historiography, specifically Atthidography, of the *Athenaion Politeia*. What was remarkable, Wilamowitz pointed out in *Aristoteles und Athen* (1893), was not only the extent to which the contents of the *Atthides* agreed with one another but also the extent to which they jibed with Aristotle’s history, in particular regarding the general chronology of the narrative. This could only be explained, Wilamowitz concluded with a nod to Dionysius and Josephus, by positing an original source from which both the *Atthides* and Aristotle had descended: a “pre-literary” chronicle kept at least since the time of Solon by a board of religious officials at Athens, the Eupatrid ἔξητηται.28 This text was published, Wilamowitz proposed, around 380 BCE, at which point this “genuine tradition” was made available to the general public.29 Just as Zeus of Olympia, Hera of Argos, and Apollo Karneios of Sikyon and Sparta were “the chroniclers of the Peloponnesos,” so too were the priests at Athens responsible for the preservation of Athenian history.30 Like Dionysius, Wilamowitz saw local historiography (at Athens, at any rate) as the earliest form of historiography. Like Dionysios, he understood historiography as arising in Greece from the publication of written records. And like Dionysios, he read Athenian local historiography through the lens of Rome.31

*Aristoteles und Athen* should not simply be reduced to Wilamowitz’s theory of the “Chronicle of the Exegetes.” The book contains much thorough analysis of Aristotle’s work as well as a broad and incisive survey of local historiography outside of Athens, which forms a part of the essay “Die Quellen der griechischen Geschichte”

---

28 1893, 278-284.
29 The primary reason that Wilamowitz dated the publication of the “Chronicle of the Exegetai” to 380 was, as Jacoby recognized, to remove Hellanikos from the equation—he was a logographer but not local historian—and at the same time to explain the appearance of common historical information in the work of Isocrates and Plato.
30 1893 Vol. 1, 50-52.
31 For the influence on Wilamowitz of Mommsen’s conception of the development of Roman historiography, see Jacoby 1949, 53-54 and 277-278 n. 9.
with which the second volume begins. \footnote{1893, Vol. 2, 17-33.} Here Wilamowitz comments on local traditions and histories of Megara, Euboia, Northern Greece, Argos, Arkadia, Olympia, Sikyon, Corinth, Sparta, Crete, the Doric islands, Cyrene, Magna Graecia, Massalia, and finally Ionia. There was no doubt, he says, that every Greek community (not only Athens) was “ein reiches beet von sagen und novellen,” and every Greek community took pleasure in recounting “seiner eigenen geschichte.” For centuries, these local traditions had expressed themselves through poetry; but with the advent of prose literature, “musste die bequeme form der localgeschichte sich des bunten stoffes bemachtigen.” Many early local histories had only limited literary merit, Wilamowitz admits; but if we could read e.g. the Milesian history of Maiandrios or the Naxian history of Aglaosthenes, we would certainly derive some degree of aesthetic pleasure from the task. Despite these trenchant observations, Wilamowitz’s primary interest here was to establish the reliability of the traditions on which the nineteenth-century narrative of Greek history had been built. If the local histories of individual Greek states were indeed based on documentary records, as he thought was the case at Athens, they must themselves contain authentic information.

Wilamowitz’s ideas about Atthidography quickly became authoritative. Already in 1893, Eduard Meyer proposed that the Stadtchroniken, on which he supposed local historiography was predicated, had developed from the piecemeal insertion of inzelnernotizen into bare lists of eponymous magistrates—\footnote{Vol. 2, section 3.} a process, we may note, remarkably similar to what was known to have been the development of the town chronicles in medieval Germany. In 1895, the role of die Lokalchronik in the evolution of lokalerliteratur was reiterated by Kurt Wachsmuth in his Einleitung in das Studium der alters Geschichte.\footnote{554 And in 1920 Georg Busolt argued that die beamtenlisten, aside from...}
prove the reliability of our chronology, themselves formed das gerippe für stadtchroniken. Wilamowitz himself would repeat his arguments periodically: in 1908 at the beginning of the lecture he delivered at Oxford on “Greek Historical Writing;” and again in 1931 in Der Glaube der Hellenen. His approach to non-Athenian local historiography proved similarly persuasive. In 1902, Martin Vogt published his “Die griechischen Lokalhistoriker,” which expanded Wilamowitz’s survey of various traditions of local historiography to nearly ninety pages. He too argued that city chronicles were built from material taken from temples and civic records, whose form (viz. prose) dictated the conventions of early historiography. In looking for evidence for the existence of chronicles, Stadtbücher, and Tempelliste in communities outside of Athens, moreover, Vogt (like Wilamowitz) attempted to prove that there was “eine schriftlich fixierte, glaubwürdige Lokaltradition” and thus that our knowledge of ancient history rested on solid ground. But unlike at Rome, where Livy preserves verbatim the tradition of the Annales Maximi, there was no such continuity in Greece; the earliest Greek Chronicles left no trace.

For the most part, the discussions of Wilamowitz and his followers did not dwell on the transition from local chronicle to local historiography. Several years after the publication of Aristoteles und Athen, however, Eduard Schwartz inquired into the mechanism and motivation behind local historiography in his article on “Timaios’ Geschichtswerk,” (1899). “Die hellenische Localchronik und Localgeschichte,” he proposed, were in fact products of a particular nostalgia, a rejection of the present and an endeavor to recall the past, “zu erhalten, zu erneuern sich mehr oder weniger consequent bestreben, obgleich das, was entsteht, mit Nichten das Alte, sondern

35 Vol. 1, 38.
36 “In his [Herodotus’s] rejection of all chronology he consciously sets himself in opposition to the impersonal chronicles, which he must have known” (trans Gilbert Murray).
37 Vol 1, 40 n.1.
38 1902, 735.
wiederum ein Neues ist.” Such a romantic sentiment, Schwartz proposed, arose in fifth-century Ionia as a reaction to the growth of the Athenian empire and to the decadence it entailed for the subject communities.

Epos und Elegie standen wieder auf; Märchen, Novelle, vaterständische Alterthümer kristallisierten sich in der Chronik zusammen. Die autonomistische Zersetzung des griechischen Lebens nach der Auflösung des attischen Reiches brachte die Forderung mit sich, dass all’ diese Kleinen und Kleinsten, die glabuten am Rad der Geschichte mitdrehen zu müssen, sich eine historische Vergangenheit anschaften oder was längst verschüttet war, wieder ausgruben.39

Schwartz identified this same Romantic longing in Athens during the Social War: a new-Attic patriotism, fundamentally different from that of the fifth century, which coursed through Plato’s Laws and Isocrates’ Areopagitikos and flowered in the age of Lykourgos.

It was with Schwartz’s romantic model in mind that Felix Jacoby first confronted Greek local historiography. This was, of course, in the context of an address that he delivered at the “International Congress for Historical Studies” in August 1908 in Berlin, where he outlined a plan for a new collection of historiographical fragments. The paper, published the following year (1909) in Klio as “Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente,” began with light criticism of Müller’s edition, which seemed to Jacoby cumbersome and haphazardly arranged, and proposed other potential organizational rubrics.40 Instead of an alphabetical, chronological, or geographical framework, Jacoby suggested arranging the fragments by way of literary categories (“nach literarischen Gattungen”), with an emphasis on “die

39 1899, 491.
40 Jacoby was born seven years after the publication of the final volume of Müller’s Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, a text with which he was obliged to work closely, since he wrote both his dissertation (De Apollodori Atheniensis Chronicis 1900) and his Habilitationsschrift (on the Marmor Parium 1903) on fragmentary histories. For the influence of his two supervisors, Hermann Diels, at the time editing his Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker (1903), and Wilamowitz, see M. Chambers 2006.
This he saw essentially as a progression from the genealogical and ethnographic treatises of e.g. Hekataios to the *Historiai* of Herodotus, with Herodotus’s own maturation from ethnographer to investigator of the recent past embodying the evolution of Greek historiography itself.

The category of historiography that stood “ganz abseits nun von dieser Entwicklung . . . nach Ursprung Form und Inhalt,” Jacoby said, was what he called in the tradition of Diodorus, Censorinus, and Isaac Casaubon, *Horographie,* viz. “die Jahrbücher einzelner griechischer Städte,” the technical term, he said, of *die Stadtgeschichten.* Like Schwartz, Jacoby attributed the impulse of these city histories to “psychological motives” decidedly different from those that had motivated Hekataios. Horography owed its existence, he said, to “Abkehr von der Gegenwart, träumerisches Versenken in eine schöner Vergangenheit und den allerbeschränktesten Lokalpatriotismus.” To this extent, panhellenic genealogy and contemporary history were important to the horographer only insofar as they boosted the prestige of the local community itself. Jacoby took pains to distinguish official ἀναγραφαί, i.e. epichoric lists and bare chronicles that may have existed as far back as the eighth century BCE, from literary horography; and he separated both forms from chronography, which was universal, not local in outlook. His most revolutionary contribution was the idea that horography was a relatively recent phenomenon in Greece, younger than both genealogy and ethnography; it was younger even than Herodotus. Wilamowitz had previously suggested that Herodotus’s evident ignorance of local chronicles was due to his self-conscious posture as a historian, but Jacoby, pointing to the fact that

---

42 1909, 109; see 98: horography was distinct from historiography ‘im eigentlichen Sinne.’
43 1909, 109 n. 2.
44 109-110.
45 See A. Möller 2006.
46 1908, 6.
Herodotus did not avoid citing works of genealogy and geography, concluded instead that there were simply no local chronicles for Herodotus to cite.\textsuperscript{47} For it was Herodotus’s own historiographical activity, Jacoby deduced, that itself engendered *Horographie*.\textsuperscript{48}

Die scheinbar panhellenische, in Wahrheit deutlich athenische Tendenze seiner [Herodots] Μηδικά, ihre vielfach von der politischen Konstellation der Gegenwart beeinflusste Darstellung des Vergaltens der griechischen Staaten im Perserkriege, musste zu Angriffen, Entschuldigungen, Nachtägen führen, die am besten in der Form der Lokalgeschichte erfolgen konnten. Der Lokalpatriotismus trat hier wie so oft der grossen Historiographie entgegen.\textsuperscript{49}

In “Über die Entwicklung,” Jacoby outlined a putative ten volume collection of fragments, with *Horographie* (divided into “Die echte Horographie,” and “*Die antiquarische Literatur der hellenistischen Zeit*”), coming in the sixth volume, after (1) Hekataios, (2) Genealogy, (3) Ethnography, (4), Greek *Zeitgeschichte* (Contemporary History), and (5) Chronology. By 1923, when he published the first volume of his monumental *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, he had evidently changed his mind about the organization of the collection. Still adhering to the generic principle, *Die Fragmente* would now comprise six volumes: I. *Geschichte der sagenzeit* (Genealogie und Mythographie); II. Universal- und Zeitgeschichte. Chronographie; III. Geschichte von Völkern und Städten (Ethnographie und Horographie); IV. Antiquarische Geschichte und Biographie; V. Geographie; VI. Unbestimmmbare Autoren. *Theorie der Geschichtsschreibung*. By 1958, the year of his death, Jacoby had published an impressive 17 books of fragments, comprising only three of the projected six volumes. Volume III, which treated the fragmentary histories of peoples and poleis (which Jacoby translated as Ethnographie and Horographie respectively) is itself trifurcate. The first section (IIIA), whose commentary he published in 1943, assembles in

\textsuperscript{47} 1909, 111-119.  
\textsuperscript{48} 1909, 118.  
\textsuperscript{49} 1909, 118.
chronological order 35 authors (FGrHist 262-296) of multiple local histories, like Rhianos of Bene (FGrHist 265) and Staphylos of Naukratis (FGrHist 269). The second and third sections collate the 560 historians (FGrHist 297-856) who dedicated themselves primarily to single localities: IIIB, whose commentary was published in 1955, treated Greek historians interested in Greek lands (FGrHist 297-607); IIIC treated those primarily interested in non-Greek lands (FGrHist 608-856).

Both Volumes IIIB and IIIC, it is important to note, are arranged geographically, following the cue of the surveys of Wilamowitz and Vogt: IIIB is divided into 78 geographical areas (alphabetically arranged from Achaia to Troizen), IIIC into 33 (from Aegypten to Thrakien).50 The peculiarities of the arrangement of the collection, moreover, mean that Volumes IIIB and IIIC contain many more historians than the 560 to whom Jacoby grants new FGrHist numbers. So in IIIB under heading I (Achaia), five historians are named as authors of Akhaika, but only two (Autokrates and Autesion) are given numbers (FGrHist 297 and 298, respectively). The first historian listed in this section, the earliest, according to Jacoby, who wrote about Achaia, is Rhianos of Bene. He is not assigned a number because, as a historian of multiple localities, he was formally introduced already in Volume IIIa (as FGrHist 265). The two other historians of Achaia, Aristotle and Dikaiarchos, meanwhile, are numberless because as authors of politeiai they were slated to appear in FGrHist Volume IV, which Jacoby never completed.51 Some authors, moreover, are given numbers in Volume IIIB or IIIC but actually wrote local histories of multiple localities or also wrote other sorts of history:

50 Note that even though Jacoby divides IIIB-C into 111 geographical categories, considerably more than 111 localities can claim a unique tradition of local historiography; this is because under a broad category (like Egypt) we sometimes find histories both of the region and of individual cities within that region (like Naukratis and Alexandria).
51 Volumes IV and V are being currently in the process of being completed. So far, Volume IVA (Biography) has been published, edited by S. Schorn; Volumes IVB1 (literary and musical history), edited by E. Krummen, and IVC1 (Politeiai and Nomoi, Nomima), edited by G. Schepens and S. Schorn, remain forthcoming, as do IVC2 (On Cities, Islands, Ktiseis, Aitia, etc.), edited by D. Engles, and IV C3 on Callimachus, edited by M. Asper.
Philokhoros, for example, appears in IIIB (FGrHist 328) because he was primarily a local historian of Athens, but he also wrote a history of Delos, not to mention a chronography and several works of literary criticism (T1); another Atthidographer, Phanodemos, also wrote a history of the diminutive Cycladic island, Ikos, and probably one of Delos, too (FGrHist 325 T1, F1); while Nymphis is listed in IIIB (FGrHist 432) because we only have fragments of his local history of Herakleia, but he was also known as the author of a lengthy history of Alexander and the Diadochoi (T1).\(^{52}\) One last thing to keep in mind is that Jacoby actually treats many Greek communities in IIIC; we must look under Egypt for histories of Alexandria and Naukratis and under Bithynia for histories of Nikaia and Calchedon, and histories of Cyrene are treated in IIIB, while works on Libya are relegated to IIIC, even though there seems to be no clear distinction between the two titles.\(^{53}\)

For Volume IIIB Jacoby not only published a commentary but also a two-volume Supplement (in English—for he was based at Oxford during the years of its composition) specifically on the Atthidographers (1954), as well a prolegomena to the commentary, also in English, his Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens (1949). Between Jacoby’s address in 1909 and the publication of Atthis in 1949, Jacoby’s thoughts about Greek local historiography had changed. For one thing, since 1909 he had had the opportunity to examine numerous individual Greek historians in detail, contributing several important articles to Pauly-Wissowa; his massive assessment of Herodotus (1913) only reinforced the centrality of this figure in his conception of the development of Greek literature. What is more, a number of important contributions to the study of local historiography were published after 1909, many of which reiterated

---

\(^{52}\) If he thought that an author made particularly significant contributions to different historiographical traditions, Jacoby assigned him multiple FGrHist numbers. The most egregious example of this is Hellanikos of Lesbos, who is first introduced in FGrHist I as number 4, and then again in Volume III as 323a, 601a, 608a, 645a, and 687a; Jacoby gives Hellanikos only one proper number, however, so as not to disturb the final tally of total fragmentary historians (856).

\(^{53}\) This is the thesis of G. Ottone 2002.
and emphasized elements of Wilamowitz’s theory of Atthidography, which Jacoby found increasingly problematic. In 1927, for example, Richard Laqueur published his comprehensive article for Pauly-Wissowa on Lokalchronik, where he distinguished a “narrower sense” of local chronicle (like the Ionian annals) that consisted of a series of eponymous officials into which some historical information has been slotted; and Lokalchronik in the “wider sense,” where “dieses Jahrbuch meist nur einen bescheidenen raum einnimmt gegenüber einer reichen überlieferung über mythologies, gründungslegenden, ursprungsgeschichten u. dgl. m.” The Atthis, Laqueur posited, emerged from a combination of the two types. Like Wilamowitz and Vogt, we should note, Laqueur also offered some very penetrating assessments of individual traditions of local historiography outside of Athens, notably of Pontic Herakleia. In 1940, Kurt von Fritz emphasized the role of the Exegetai in preserving information about religious institutions in Athens and denied that the Atthidographers were historians at all since none “wrote an historical work proper apart from his Atthis.” Not long before the publication of Jacoby’s Atthis, finally, Lionel Pearson published his Local Historians of Attica (1942), which, while strangely disengaged from contemporary German contributions, considered it misguided to speak of an “Atthis tradition” altogether, since Atthidography represented “not a historical but a literary tradition.” On occasion, there were attempts to approach the problem from other angles. As Benedetto Croce put the matter in a brief passage in his Teoria e Storia della Storiografia (1916),

“History, like philosophy, had no historical beginning, but only an ideal or metaphysical beginning, in so far as it is an activity of thought, which is outside time. Historically speaking, it is quite clear that prior to Herodotus, prior to the logographers, prior indeed to Hesiod and to Homer, history was already, because

54 In his article, “Atthidographers and Exegetae,” 93-94.
55 1942, 125. The book is best summed up by the review of A. Momigliano: “This volume displays almost all the qualities which make a good book—command of the bibliography, lucidity, common sense, brevity—except the decisive one: the courage to be wrong (which, sometimes, turns out to be the courage to be right). The author avoids committing himself to thorough-going research: he is superficial” (1943, 74).
it is impossible to conceive of men who do not think and not narrate their deeds in some way or other. . . . the distinction that we laid down between history and philology suggests refraining from the search hitherto made for the beginnings of Graeco-Roman historiography by means of composing lists of magistrates and of adding to these brief mention of wars, treatises, embassies from colonies, religious festivities, earthquakes, inundations, and the like, in the ὥροι and in the annales pontificum, in archives and museums made in temples, . . . Such things are extrinsic to historiography and form the precedent, not of it, but of chronicle and philology, which were not born for the first time in the nineteenth or seventeenth century, or at any rate during the Alexandrine period, but belong to all times, for in all times men take note of what they remember and attempt to preserve such memorials intact, to restore and to increase them. The precedent of history cannot be something different from history, but is history itself, as philosophy is the precedent of philosophy and the living of the living.”

But notwithstanding Croce’s eccentricity, the debate about Greek local historiography continued to center on the relationship between Atthidographers and Exegetai and between chronicles and local historiography.

In Attis, Jacoby set himself the task of demolishing once and for all Wilamowitz’s thesis: “the history of Athens, as written by Athenians between c. 350 and 263 B.C.,” he wrote, “does not derive from an old and semi-official chronicle kept by the priestly board of Exegetai, but was created in the lifetime of Thukydides by a learned man, the foreigner Hellanikos of Lesbos.” Since 1909, Jacoby had become increasingly doubtful about the role of ἀναγραφαί as an instigator of historiography even in Ionia—lists of magistrates may have existed, he recognized, although now he doubted their early date, but these produced only chronology, with horography developing neither from magistrate lists nor from so-called “pre-literary chronicles”—and he now clearly denied that Dionysius of Halicarnassus de Thucydide 5 could be read as evidence for such chronicles. The form of the Atthis, Jacoby argued, was due

56 1920, 182-193 (translator Douglas Ainslie).
57 1949, 1.
58 1949, 172, 176. “The nature of these later inscriptions and the notes in the lists of eponymous officials are widely different from the idea formed of the archaic list, which is supposed to have contained brief but numerous notes of all sorts of events of public interest” (1949, 179).
not to any pre-literary chronicle but rather to the decisions made by Hellanikos to structure his history of Athens by way of archons and kings. Now, furthermore, Jacoby saw horography as belonging squarely “to the domain of historical writing.”\textsuperscript{59} *Politeiai*, he said, may rightly be considered as “a form of literature by itself, not historical at all by origin;”\textsuperscript{60} but \textit{contra} Wilamowitz, the \textit{Atthis} and the \textit{politeiai} were fundamentally distinct. Nor, for that matter, was the \textit{Atthis} tradition unified; a quick survey the various narratives about Theseus’s journey to Crete in \textit{e.g.} Hellanikos, Kleidemos, and Philokhoros reveal that disagreement among the Atthidographers (as Josephus long ago noted) was par for the course.

At the same time, Jacoby had become increasingly convinced both that local historiography was a late phenomenon, “an offshoot from the main line of historiography, which, in its turn, is a successor to epic poetry and Ionian philosophy,” and that Herodotus was its prime mover.\textsuperscript{61} No longer did he attribute the rise of local historiography merely to Schwartz’s notion of \textit{Romantik}; now he pointed to “the development of Great history and to the progress which this class of literature had made during the fifth century from Hekataios to Herodotus and Hellanikos.” In particular, he said, “The species of the local chronicles came up because each individual city endeavoured to secure in Greek history a place for herself, which Great Historiography did not assign her.”\textsuperscript{62} In this sense, the impulse toward local historiography came not from within but from without, its birth a product not of nostalgia but of envy and competition.

It is much less the absence of a political life of their own, or a romantic absorption in a greater past . . . that leads writers to the Local Chronicle in the fifth century, than just this upspringing historical interest and the wish to secure for their native town a place in the Great History of the Greek people, both for

\textsuperscript{59} See \textit{e.g.} 1949, 99.
\textsuperscript{60} 1949, 99.
\textsuperscript{61} 1949, 1-2.
\textsuperscript{62} 1949, 201.
the mythical time and for the recent national contest against Persia . . . . These writers did not find enough details about their native town in the great historians, or they found wrong statements or even unfavourable opinions; the local chronicle was compiled to redress this grievance (it sometimes distinctly show criticism of Herodotus).”

This idea was not wholly new, as Jacoby well knew. Plutarch had long ago noted in his Περί της Ἡροδότου κακοστιβίας that in his treatment of the Persian wars Herodotus had downplayed the contribution of some Greek communities and slandered others altogether. Plutarch noted that Herodotus mentioned the Eretrians only incidentally, ignoring one of their major accomplishments, the invasion of Sardis and attack on Artaphernes, which Lysanias of Mallos discussed in his Περί Ἐρετρίας (Mor. 861A-D = FGrHist 426 F1). Plutarch also referred to his own countryman, Aristophanes the Boiotian, who wrote an account of the Theban role at Thermopylae that contradicted that of Herodotus (FGrHist 379 F6 = Mor. 866F-868A). Yet Plutarch does not suggest, as would Jacoby, that this local irritation with Herodotus engendered a new form of historiography. Nor does Plutarch suggest that Lysanias wrote in response to Herodotus (only that he preserved an account unattested by Herodotus) or preserved this narrative because of Eretrian local patriotism.

Jacoby’s theory, as he recognized, explained the development of local historiography primarily in Ionia, not the communities of the mainland. Hellanikos had written his histories of Athens, Boiotia, and Arkadia in the generation after Herodotus, it is true, but his activity certainly cannot be explained by local patriotism nor could it be the case that the chauvinism of mainland communities found its first available outlet in this foreigner. Jacoby’s model fails in particular with regard to Athens: on the one hand, Herodotus’s account was famously pro-Athenian, so Athens would have had no

63 1949, 289 n.111. See also 1949, 185: When faced with “Great history” local historians “sought to acquire each for his native city a place in the history and the exploits of the Greek people; to supplement, and even more to correct the accounts of Herodotus (perhaps the brief statements of Hekataios in the Περίοδος γῆς as well.
obvious reason to rectify its exclusion from his “Great history;” on the other hand, the first Athenian local historian of Athens was Kleidemos who published his history not until the middle of the fourth century, long after Herodotus and perhaps some fifty years after Hellanikos. What would explain this delay? Wilamowitz had suggested that the production of local historiography required leisure time: “so lange die Athener geschichte machten, hatten ihre politiker keine zeit, sie zu schreiben, und ihre schriftstellerischen talente hatten keine zeit dazu, so lange die tragoedie lebte.”

But, Jacoby countered, we cannot say that “the 140 years from the Corinthian War to the Chremonidean were a period without history from the Athenian point of view . . ., a period in which the Athenians had the ‘time’ to be absorbed in the past whether in contemplation or in romantic regret.”

Jacoby took a different approach. Atthidography emerged late, he proposed, in part because historiography was “a science and an Ionic product,” and most of it was written by “by men from the colonies.” It emerged not because Athenians were for a period disengaged from world affairs but in fact for the very opposite reason. It was no accident that Atthidography “set in with the beginning of the last act of Athenian history and continued to the end of that act, viz. the contest against Philip and Macedonia.”

For “as a subspecies of local history” Atthidography, “political by it very nature,” arose “as a weapon in party strife.” The first Atthis, that of Kleidemos, “gave expression to the opinions of the dominant radical democracy,” Androtion’s political stance, on the
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64 1893, Vol. 1, 282.
65 1949, 73.
66 1949, 73. “History for the Athenians,” he continued, “is the history of their city, which they wrote just because, and as long as . . . they had, and made, history themselves” (1949, 73). The Atthides began to be written only when Athens, as it were, “came to have a local history of her own” (1949, 74), and from their first appearance in the middle of the fourth century, they continued to be published until Athens lost its independence (at which point Jacoby considered Athens had no history any longer).
68 1949, 74-75.
other hand, “was directly opposite to that of Kleidemos;”\textsuperscript{69} while Phanodemos tried in his \textit{Atthis} to support “Lykourgos’ policy of revival.”\textsuperscript{70} Jacoby was not the first to see politics behind Atthidography: not long after Wilamowitz published \textit{Aristoteles und Athen}, in fact, Adolf Bauer suggested (1899) that the chronicle at Athens was “weltlich und nicht geistlich, demokratisch und nich konservativ.”\textsuperscript{71} But for Jacoby, it was not simply that Atthidography was politically biased; rather it owed its very existence to politics. So, while in some places local historiography may have depended on Herodotus’s concept and promotion of “Great History,” Atthidography emerged (as an Athenian product) as a result of political tensions stemming from the threat of Macedon.

While Jacoby’s intricate and forceful argument has set the tone for all subsequent discussion of Greek local historiography, both in general handbooks\textsuperscript{72} and in more specialized studies,\textsuperscript{73} his theory has not surprisingly also met with occasional criticism. Some have taken issue with Jacoby’s generic and teleological conception of the development of Greek historiography and his emphasis on the career of Herodotus.\textsuperscript{74} Others have seen him too skeptical of Dionysius’s testimony that local histories were being written in the early-fifth century.\textsuperscript{75} And still others have reacted to his politicization of Atthidography.\textsuperscript{76} There are, in my opinion, several additional problems with Jacoby’s framework: (1) the mechanism of “Great History”; (2) the equation of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{69}1949, 78.
\item \textsuperscript{70}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{71}180-181. A. Bauer nevertheless followed Wilamowitz with regard to the \textit{Exegetai} and thus saw the \textit{Stadtchronik} as passing from the hands of the democrats to the conservative \textit{Exegetai (op.cit.)}.
\item \textsuperscript{74}\textit{e.g.} R. Fowler 1996, S. Humphreys 1997, and J. Marincola 1999; see also N. Luraghi 2001.
\item \textsuperscript{76}P. Harding 1975, 1976, 1977, 1994; P. Rhodes 1990; but \textit{cf.} J. McInerny 1994. For a recent appreciation of Atthidography, see G. Camassa 2010, who sees the genesis of the form not the tensions resulting from the rise of Macedon in the mid-fourth century but the rise of the Athenian oligarchy, and the trauma it entailed, at the end of the fifth.
\end{itemize}
local historiography with horography; (3) the equation of local historiography with Athidography; and (4) the relationship between local historiography and ethnography.

Jacoby is at times ambivalent about the valence of the term “Great history.” He frequently uses it to refer specifically to the literary activity of Herodotus (or Herodotus and Hekataios), *viz.* panhellenic κοιναὶ ἱστορίαι77 or simply as a synonym for non-local approaches to history. I have suggested earlier that the notion of a panhellenic history in which Greek communities in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE considered themselves as participants should be taken with a grain of salt. But even granting the authenticity of the concept, it is difficult to see just how this actually functions in Jacoby’s model. If, as Jacoby himself thought,78 Herodotus “published” most of his history by 425, we would have to date the activity of the Greek local historians to the late-fifth century, even later if Herodotus published his text closer to 420.79 And however we think that Herodotus’s text was disseminated, it is unlikely to have reached every “historiographical” Greek community immediately.80 Those communities that Herodotus visited and regaled with excerpts from his *Histories* may have been exposed to his text early on, but it is difficult to imagine that in any of these communities he would have presented a *logos* that would have ruffled local feathers. Diyllos tells us that Herodotus was honored at Athens for presenting some purple passages from his researches,81 and there is no reason either to doubt this testimony or to restrict the scenario to Athens alone. Herodotus might well have delivered, say, a pro-Athenian narrative at a pan-local setting, like the Panathenaia, thereby provoking non-Athenians in the audience by his exclusion of the activities of their native communities. But Jacoby’s theory depends not on the reception of individual local *logoi* but on a putative

77 1949, 118.
78 Based largely on allusions in Aristophanes’ *Akharnians* (1913, col. 232).
81 *FGrHist* 73 F3; *cf.* Eusebius, *Chron. Ol.* 83.4.
reaction to the finished and composite work; for it was the *Histories* as a whole, Jacoby argued, that actuated “Great History.”

One way to get around this would be to separate “Great history” from Herodotus, to suppose, as Gordon Shrimpton has suggested, that there were panhellenic versions of events circulating around the Greek world already in the early fifth-century. But we must, again, coordinate this with the generally late date for local histories of mainland regions. If this were the case, why would local history not have developed ca. 460 BCE? Aristophanes of Boiotia may (possibly) have written at the beginning of the fourth century, not long after Herodotus that is, and his account is a good piece of evidence, as we have said, for the fact that certain local histories appear to have corrected Herodotus; but Aristophanes is the only example of (potentially) so early a history directly engaging with Herodotus. And, more to the point—and this is a subject to which we shall return in the conclusion—almost all of our fragments of local historiography have nothing to do with “Great History.” What comes across in local historiography is not a community’s interest in showing the Greek world how it contributed to the Persian Wars, but how it was unique, not is cosmopolitanism, that is to say, but its parochialism. Of course, panhellenic characters appear frequently in local histories, but these belong primarily to the foundational period, when Greek communities were thought to have kept more or less to themselves. More to the point, there is little sense that a native Greek local historian wrote with the expectation that his history would be read by anyone outside of the local community itself. It is difficult to see, then, why local historiography would be the medium chosen for individual Greek communities to rectify Herodotus’s record and insert themselves into the actions of the
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82 See L. Porciani 2006, 173.
83 1997, 144-145.
greater Greek world. There was another avenue, we have seen, for the expression of such sentiments, and this was not local history but epideictic oratory.

In Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis (2008), one of the few book-length studies outside Atthis devoted to the subject of Greek local historiography, Katherine Clarke develops Jacoby’s notion of panhellenism in potentially fruitful ways. Polis historians, she says, “chose to compose their histories in such a way as to maintain the uniqueness and superiority of each polis, but with an awareness that the past of that polis ran alongside and often in conjunction with that of other poleis.” Not only did a polis fasten itself through its local history to Panhellenic heroes, like Herakles, and to Panhellenic events, like the Trojan or the Persian wars, but it also bound itself to other and more venerable localities; both Athens (via Theseus) and Sparta (via Lykourgos) forged links with Crete, for example. In the fourth century BCE, we know, the city of Thera sent delegates to their putative colony of Cyrene in order to petition for the right of land and citizenship there; to this end, they told the story of the initial Theran colonization and reproduced what they claimed to be the original oath of the settlers (GHI 5). We may think, too, of the bid of Magnesian envoys in the late-third century BCE to publicize the inviolability of their polis and sanctuary by narrating, wherever they visited, a local event that demonstrated a link with Magnesia. But Clarke also contends that polis histories were often written with non-local audiences in mind. To support this claim, she turns to itinerant intellectuals of the later Hellenistic age who were honored for performances that in some way celebrated their host cities. Yet it is not at all clear that the lecturers whom Clarke treats
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84 As C.W. Fornara has pointed out (1983, 20-21).
85 K. Clarke’s central hypotheses is in fact that “constructing the past was an activity in which the polis had a direct interest” (2008, 354), and to this end her book is only partly about local historiography. The first half, in fact, treats the articulation and construction of time in Greek poleis, expounding not only city calendars and mechanisms for measuring time but also the vast field Greek chronography.
87 2008, 195-203
here are in fact local historians rather than orators in the vein of Isocrates or poets like
Aristodama of Smyrna, and I question her supposition that the contents of their encomia
can in any way tell us about the appeal of local histories to non-locals. Clarke also
posits that local histories reached “their antennae out into the world beyond” by
employing non-local dating systems. But this alleged chronographic plagiarism is very
difficult to substantiate. Neither local traditions nor the histories built upon them
existed in a vacuum, of course, but Clarke has done more, it seems to me, to clarify the
working of interstate diplomacy in the Hellenistic world than the activity of local
historians and their relationship to “Great history.”

A second issue with Jacoby’s theory is his conflation of local historiography
with horography. Jacoby did not argue that every local history was perforce annalistic,
but he nevertheless considered horography to have been the natural impulse of a
substantial subset of local historiography, namely polis histories. Yet as Plato and
Polybius make clear (9.1), some polis historiography dealt only with the ktisis,
rendering horography unsuitable. Some, as Dionysius suggests, even employed the
politeia-form (A.R. 1.8.3). And we can recall that when Dionysius in this passage
mentions horography as a potential avenue for local history, he names only the
Atthidographers as proponents of this organizational rubric. So while individual

89 2008, 314.
90 Largely because of the fragmentary nature of the evidence, which Clarke consistently overestimates: cf. the
dubious synchronism posited between the first Attic flood and the first Argive king, Phoroneus
(FGrHist 323a F10), which Clarke discusses on page 218; or her claim that Philokhoros used “Persian
regal time to define the Athenian past,” thereby creating “a synchronism between Persian and Athenian
time” (219).
91 See 1909, 109, n.2. In the Atthis he is more expansive: “The year of the Atthides, and of all local
chronicles and chronicle-like products known to us, is the year of office of the officials of the city, and
there is no difference in principle whether these officials are archons, kings, priests, or priestesses” (1949,
87). We should emphasize that Jacoby does not claim horography to have been the natural impulse of all
local history, but only of those communities “where the government . . . was so far centralized . . . that the
authorities held their office in the city.” Local historians, according to Jacoby, “chose the form of annals
in all those cases in which a list of eponymous officials existed,” which was “as a rule only in those
places where the political form was that of the so-called city-state” (1949, 88).
Atthidographers, like Androtion and Philokhoros, wrote horography, there is no explicit evidence, let alone intrinsic likelihood, that local histories of all other cities followed suit. The case of Pontic Herakleia is a good corrective, as we shall see; Photios’s Epitome of Memnon’s history shows no signs of horography (FGrHist 434 F1), nor do any fragments from Nymphis’s Περὶ Ἡρακλείας (FGrHist 432 F10).

Related to Jacoby’s homogenization of local historiography is his tendency to read all local historiography through the lens of Athens. As is clear from the erudite essays in the commentary to FGrHist IIIB with which he introduced each locality’s tradition of local historiography, Jacoby was certainly sensitive to distinctions among the local histories engendered by diverse Greek communities. Nevertheless, in his Atthis he prioritizes the similarities—“all local histories in Greece seem to have had the same character as the ‘Atthis,’ or a similar one.”

One of Jacoby’s major criticisms of Wilamowitz’s conception of Atthidography, in fact, was its isolation of Athens and Atthidography. And while some modern studies, in particular that of D.P. Orsi (1997), have assessed various manifestations of local historiography in Greece along the lines of Wilamowitz and Vogt, most either seek to expound generalities of Greek local historiography or else focus in particular on Athens. A case in point is Philip Harding’s article on local historiography (2007), which explicitly uses “evidence from and about Athenian authors as the basis of its study of ancient Greek local historiography in general,” or Katherine Clarke’s book on polis historiography. It is not simply that
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92 See Jacoby 1949, 86-99 for some key passages. There is not a great deal of evidence about the organizational principles of the other Atthidographers, we should note. D.L. Toye argues that Hellanikos “did not compose annals but rather recounted heroic myths and genealogies” (1996, 294), and he draws our attention also to Istros, who, according to Jacoby, did not write a chronicle and for this reason is not considered an Atthidographer.
94 1949, v.
95 1949, 67.
96 2007, 180.
97 See 2008, 178, 194, 213, 243-4, 246, and 307. In observing that some non-Greek lands were “less prone to have a strongly articulated temporal dimension (153), Clarke implies that this was never the case
privileging Atthidography is methodologically unsound; as in so many arenas, so too in its approach to local historiography was Athens an anomaly.

A final weakness in Jacoby’s argument is his uneasy distinction between local historiography and ethnography. In his 1909 article, Jacoby had argued that Ethnography, *viz.* “die Beschreibung des Landes und der νόμοι der Bewohner,” developed from periegetic literature and gave a starting point to Herodotus. For this reason Jacoby had in 1909 planned to treat ethnography in the third volume of his work, dealing there alphabetically with individual localities: Egypt, Babylon, Epeiros, India, Lydia, Persia, Thessaly, and so forth. As his list confirms, Jacoby considered ethnography as consisting not only in non-Greek localities: ethnography was in fact “die auf eigener oder fremder ιστορίη beruhende geographisch-ethnographische Darstellung von Land und Volk besonders barbarischer, aber auch hellenischer Völker und Stämme.” But as such, he recognized that ethnography was hardly distinguishable from local historiography; like Dionysius’s categories of ἐθνικαὶ καὶ τοπικαὶ ιστορίαι, the primary distinction was that ethnography concentrated on localities defined by their inhabitants (*ethne*), local histories on localities defined by their geography: in 1923, when he published Volume I of *FGrHist*, he translated ethnography as “Geschichte von Völkern” and horography as “Geschichte von Städten.” Yet this overlap between the two categories led to considerable ambiguity to the extent that Jacoby ended up dealing with ethnography not in its own volume but in tandem with horography. As Joseph Skinner has recently noted, moreover, whereas this volume
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for any Greek community (*cf.* 154), that all Greek *poleis*, that is to say, interacted with their past, indeed wrote their past, in similar way. Clarke’s holistic approach to the fragments also tends to disregard diachronic change. While the book’s “primary chronological focus is the fourth century BC and the Hellenistic period” (121), substantial sections on Diodorus (121-139), Strabo (140-150), Pausanias (356-9), and George Synkellos (83-6), suggest a broader vision.

98 19, 92.
99 For Jacoby’s changing perceptions of Ethnography, see A. Zambini 2007, G. Schepens 2010, and J. Skinner 2012, 32-34.
100 1909, 123.
101 1909, 88-89 n. 4.
was (in 1923) projected to be named “Ethnographie und Horographie,” by the time of the publication of Volume IIIB it was horography that now took pride of place: “Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie).” Jacoby’s ambiguity comes across also in several asides in the *Atthis*. For while he sometimes suggested that ethnography refers to “outside regions of the Greek world”—indeed this criterion is evident in his proposed list from 1909 as well as in his organization of IIIB and IIIC—Jacoby generally emphasizes the interrelation of the two categories: “there is no difference in principle between these two branches of historiography,” which are both together distinguished from *Hellenika* and Great History. This is a position that has on occasion been repeated: Charles W. Fornara has said that “Horography was the Hellenic side of ethnography;” while Gordon Shrimpton has taken the opposite approach, seeing “no reason for regarding ethnography as anything but a local history of a non-Greek people.”

But it *Persika* and *Aigyiakata* are local history, if, as I believe, there is no fundamental difference between the form and function of histories of *ethne* and *poleis* or between histories of localities on the fringes of the Greek world and those in its very center, how can local historiography have required Herodotus as a midwife? For even if we deny the early date of Dionysius of Miletos, local history cannot have emerged in Herodotus’s wake if Herodotus himself wrote the quintessential local history of Egypt. The great innovation of the last decades of the fifth century was not that Greeks
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103 So in his initial proposal, Jacoby lists Thessaly but not Arkadia; and in his *Atthis*, he says that because Sicily and Macedonia, are outside the central Greek world, *Sikelika* and *Makedonika* are closer to ethnography than horography (1949, 118).
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105 C.W. Fornara generally follows Jacoby in equating local historiography with horography.
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108 For Dionysius, see L. Pearson 1939, 139-151; von Fritz 1967, Vol. 1, 103ff; and R. Drews 1973, 20-22. The *Souda*, albeit confusing this Dionysius with some of his namesakes, considers him a contemporary of Hekataios. Even Jacoby assigned him an early date, although his approach to Dionysius was ambivalent (see *FGrHist* IIIb Suppl. *Noten*, 1 n.7 and A. Zambini 2007).
began to write local histories but that they began to write local histories of Greek communities. Our primary question, then, should be why, if the autobiographical impulse is indeed natural in all cohabitational communities, local historiography appeared in Greece well after the advent of literacy and at first only as an extrinsic exercise. The answer, as I have suggested earlier, has to do with the nature of the medium, prose, the mode of communication through which Greek intellectuals imparted knowledge to which they purported to have an especial claim. Prose and its inherent critical engagement, that is to say, implied an audience that was perforce epistemically distinguished from the writer.

While autobiographical thinking is a natural human activity, and while the application of this autobiographical impulse to the community is a consequence of collective identity, prose was used to explain what was unknown and hence external. Among the earliest prose writings, then, were accounts of foreign lands. The revolution of the mid-fifth century was not the invention of local historiography but the appreciation of the form’s suitability not only for foreign lands but also for one’s own community. This recognition did not need Herodotus or Great History; it required only the acceptance of prose (and its “ethnographic” associations) as the standard mode of expounding the past; when it was acknowledged as authoritative, that is to say, prose (and not poetry and oratory) became the preferred filter for a community’s autobiographical impulse. As we shall see in the conclusion, extrinsic local historiography became, as a precursor to intrinsic manifestations of the form, also a prototype. Greek community autobiography, that is to say, took the form of self-ethnography.
2.2 Case Studies

2.2.1 Greek Localities

Many Greek cohabitational communities, particularly those associated with specific civic centers, took their name from localities, often through the conjunction of toponym with genitival suffix—so ἡ Ῥόδος, οἱ Ἀθήναι, and Γαργήττος gave their names respectively to οἱ Ῥόδιοι, οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, and οἱ Γαργήττιοι. As such, these communities were defined by way of their territory: Rhodians as those who inhabited the island of Rhodes, Athenians as those who lived at Athens. But for other communities, in particular those associated with multiple civic centers, like ethne and koina,¹ the opposite held true. Here, it was the community that gave its name to its territory: ἡ Ἀρκάδια is the territory of οἱ Ἀρκάδες.² In regions, that is to say, locality was a consequence of community.

A Greek would naturally have considered himself a member of several cohabitational communities at once; citizens of Khalkis were both Χαλκιδεῖς and Εὔβοιεῖς, not to mention, in certain contexts, Ἑλληνεῖς;³ just as the historian Ariaithos was both Τεγεάτης and Ἀρχάς, Androton Γαργήττιος, Αττικός, and Ἀθηναῖος. But this multidimensionality is rarely historiographically evident. Local historiography in Greece was focalized in accordance with the particular community in question. Where the polis was the dominant mode of cohesion, we generally find polis histories, but where the bonds of community extended beyond the boundaries of an individual civic node, we find regional or insular histories. It is true that in the case of some islands the land bounded by the sea approximated the khora of a single polis. It is not thus surprising that

¹ For non-polis communities in ancient Greece, see C. Morgan 2003 and E. Mackil 2013.
³ See C. Morgan 2003, 1 on different “tiers” of identity within Greek communities.
the historiographical unit of *e.g.* Chios mirrored that of Athens/Attica. But islands like Sicily, Crete, and Lesbos contained a plurality of *poleis,* and these also engendered insular histories; in the same way that a Tegean history was subsumed by Arkadia, so too did island identity trump that of individual *polis* communities. Further evidence for the significance of insularity as a binding principle of local historiography is the existence of texts that treated a plurality of islands collectively, the so-called *Νησιοτικά.*

We are on occasion aware of local histories of constituent communities within historiographical regions: alongside *Tὰ Εὐβοϊκά* of Arkhemakhos (*FGrHist* 424 FF1-4), we find *Tὰ Χαλδικά* of Proxenos (*FGrHist* 425 F1); alongside Gorgon’s *Περὶ Ῥόδου* (*FGrHist* 515) and Polyzелos’s *Πολιτικά* (*FGrHist* 514), we find the *Περὶ Λίνδου* of Phaennos (*FGrHist* 525); and we shall see that Boiotia attests to both regional and *polis* historiography. But for the most part, it is a community’s greatest common denominator that dictates the bounds of local historiography in Greece: the *polis,* not the constituent village; the mainland region/koina and the island in toto, not the *polis.* Crete could boast one hundred cities, but not a single one of them wrote its history. Androtion wrote not a history of Gargettos but an Ἀτθίς (*FGrHist* 324);8 Ariaithos wrote not Τεγεατικά but Ἀρκαδικά (*FGrHist* 316).9 In fact, even when the beguiling author of the *Parallela Minora* invented a source to support a claim about an alleged episode from the Tegean
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4 For the overlap between the *peraia* and *khora* in the case of islands close to the mainland, see C. Constantakopoulou 2007, 228-253; for the idea of Athens as an island, see 137-175.
5 See G. Reger 1997 for the distinction between islands with one and many *poleis*.
6 See C. Constantakopoulou 2005. In some cases, in fact, an island’s *khora* actually exceeded the confines of the territory bounded by the sea, and this is reflected in local historiography: Samian local histories, as we shall see, incorporated events both on the island itself and on the *peraia* across the strait. Something similar can be seen in *Σικελικά,* where the historiographical community sometimes extended into peninsular Italy (see, for example, Timaios, *FGrHist* 566 F43-53).
7 See Diodorus Book Five for insular historiography. On the *Nesiotika,* see P. Ceccarelli 1989.
8 We do know of a work *Περὶ τῶν δήμων* by Diodoros the Periegetes (*FGrHist* 372), but rather than focus on a particular deem, this work evidently treated all the demes (or perhaps only of the original Kleisthenic demes) and so was equivalent to a history of Attica.
9 As we shall see, some smaller communities are the subject of specialized works, but these seem not to be local histories; see, for example, the *Μαντινέων Ἐθη* of Aristoxenos and the *Περὶ Κυλλήνης* of Philostephanos.
past, he called this work Αρκαδικά (see FGrHist 42 F2);¹⁰ and he cites a Βοιωτικά about a Theban episode (FGrHist 294 F1). Forger though he may have been, he knew enough about the tendencies of Greek historiography to avoid a serious titular blunder.

The remainder of Part Two will consider the local histories of four Greek communities, Samos, Thessaly, Argos, and Pontic Herakleia. Not only do these localities preserve enough fragments to enable us to draw conclusions about individual texts and historians and to distinguish general trends and common characteristics,¹¹ but they also represent the three orders of community manifest in ancient Greece (islands, mainland regions/ethne, and poleis), as well as two types of polis (mainland polis and colony). Each case study will begin with a historical sketch. Since this is an exploration of local history in Classical and Hellenistic Greece, I shall primarily be tracking a given locality up to the coming of Rome; in some cases, however, in particular when a major local historian dates from a later period (as in the case of Memnon for Pontic Herakleia), I shall extend the history accordingly. After the historical précis, I shall give an overview, so far as it is possible in chronological order, of the major local historians and local histories of the locality at hand. Again, I shall be concentrating on the Classical and Hellenistic periods, although in some cases it will be difficult to date an author with

¹⁰ Here Pseudo-Plutarch cites the second book of Demaratos’s Αρκαδικά about an alleged Greek counterpart to the duel between the Horatii and Curiatii: a war between the Tegeans and the Pheneans and the nomination of two sets of triplets to decide the war’s outcome.

¹¹ We are thus avoiding those localities for which too few fragments survive or those, like Sicily and Athens, to which considerable attention has already been paid. Sicily and Magna Graecia take up some 143 pages in Jacoby’s collection, with 42 FGrHist numbers assigned (FGrHist 554-577); Athens 101 pages, with 72 FGrHist numbers (FGrHist 323a-375). We have had an opportunity already to survey the bibliography for Atthidography. Among the numerous works devoted to the Sikelika, see G. de Sanctis 1958, F.W. Walbank 1968-1969, K. Meister 1975, 3-55, L. Pearson 1987, and R. Vattuone 2001 and 2007, as well as the series of papers Vattuone assembled in 2002. Timaios has himself attracted a good deal of attention: see T.S. Brown 1958; A. Momigliano 1959; K. Meister 1989-1990, F.W. Walbank 1989-1990, R. Vattuone 1991; and now C.A. Baron 2013. Other localities and historians, we should note, have benefited from studies of their own, such as L. Piccirilli’s commentary on the Μεγαρικά (1975) and F. Landucci-Gattinoni on Douris (1997). A new Italian series, moreover, “I Frammenti degli Storici Greci” edited by Eugenio Lanzillotta (see Lanzillotta 2007 for background to the collection), has recently issued several important studies: D. Erdas on Krateros (2002), G. Ottone on Libyka (2002), V. Costa on Philokhoros (2007), M. Polito on the Milesiaka (2009) and M. Berti on Istrs (2009). Other volumes are forthcoming.
precision. I shall conclude each case study by highlighting a significant feature of the particular locality’s historiography. In some cases, this will be an especially clear example a widespread phenomenon; in other cases, it will be an idiosyncratic response of the locality itself, not elsewhere discernible.

We shall look first at Samian local historiography as a means of exploring the sources of local historiography; Samian local historiography, we shall see, privileged two carriers of cultural memory as sources: the central cult site (the Heraion) and the proverb. Second, we shall turn to Thessaly, using the remains of τὰ Θεσσαλικά to access regional historiography in Greece; we shall observe here how Thessalian local historians advanced a coherent historiographical unity through an appeal to geography and territory. Third, by way of the Ἀργολικά we shall argue that polis historiography was itself a flexible category and could well delineate a focal locality not coterminous with a civic community; for fifth-century irredentism and fantasies about the extent of Argive territory led to the creation of a historiographical community that far exceeded the borders of the polis of Argos. And last, Pontic Herakleia will allow us to discuss the cosmopolitanism of Greek colonial local historiography; here we shall look at the frequency with which Herakleian histories dealt with the contributions of non-local actors and sought to explicate the behavior and the pasts of non-local groups.
Samos is a good place to begin our exploration of Greek local historiography. For one thing, Samian local historiography appeared quite early, in the mid-fifth century BCE, and the tradition was continuous and long lasting, stretching at least into the first century CE. Samos allows us, moreover, to observe the important role that historiography could play in a community’s articulation of its identity: Samians honored their local historians at their central cult site, the Heraion; they used local histories to convince outsiders about the extent of their territory; and at least one major Samian politician, the tyrant Douris, thought local history an apposite activity. We shall be using the test case of Samos primarily to illuminate some of the mechanisms behind the composition of local historiography in Greece, in particular the sources on which local historians drew when constructing their narratives. At Samos, we can identify two primary categories of source: on the one hand, traditions associated with the Heraion, attached to the cult statue of Hera or to individual dedications; on the other hand, proverbs, pithy allegorical statements concretizing individual episodes from the Samians’ collective memory. After a brief survey of Samian history, we shall outline the remains of Samian historiography chronologically, looking first at those histories composed before the end of the fourth century and then in particular at the work of Douris. Last, we shall turn to the sources of Samian local historiography. The significant role of the Heraion in these texts stems, we shall see, from the cult’s function as the epicenter of Samian cultural memory, while the use of proverbs reveals the important contribution of philosophy to the self-conception of the Samian community.
2.2.2.1 A Brief History of Samos

The name Samos, as Herodotus attests, could refer both to the island as a whole (3.120.3) and to the polis (3.54.1), which eventually included an asty in the southeast and a khora (9.96.1) that incorporated the rest of the island. The earliest settlements on Samos, however, dating to the middle of the third millennium BCE, were a little to the south, in the environs of what would become the Heraion. The khora, furthermore, eventually came to include some of the mainland, like Phygela (IPriene 37 230) and Anaia (Ps. Skylax 98), in addition, it seems, to Batinetis and the fort Karion just across the strait, a region also claimed by Priene. At what point Samos first spread beyond the confines of the island into Caria is unclear; but this probably preceded the foundation of Samian colonies farther afield, like Kelenderis and Nagidos in Cilicia (Pomp. Mela 1.13.77), Amorgos, Perinthus, Propontic Prokonnesos, and perhaps even Samothrace, which are dated to the eighth- and seventh-century BCE. Trade seems even to have

---

1 For broad accounts of Samian history, see C. Curtius 1873 and 1877; J.P. Barron 1961 and 1966; Shipley 1987; and L. Rubinstein 2004. See Dmitriev 2005 for Hellenistic Samos.
2 Anakreon FF353 and 448 Page refer to the asty of the Samians. Herodotus clearly thought of Samos as a one-polis island (1.142.4).
3 See G. Shipley 1987, 25 and H. Kyrieleis 1993. The construction of the first temple at the Heraion (the so-called Hekatompedon) dates back at least to the end of the ninth century BCE (Shipley 1987, 28).
4 Samos’s mainland possessions are eventually (after 180 BCE: IPriene 37, 115) called περαία, in accordance with the tendencies of other Aegean islands similarly close to the mainland (see G. Shipley 1987, 10 and 31-37 and C. Constantakopoulou 2007, 242-243).
5 According to IPriene 37, Samos was allotted part of the land of Melia after the Meliac War, but this does not perforce mark the beginnings of Samian interest in the mainland. Pausanias retains a tradition that the settlement at Ainaia dates to the reign of Prokles’ son Leogoras (7.4.3).
6 The poet Semonides was said to have taken part in this venture (FGHist 534 T1), although his date is disputed (see below).
8 For Prokonnesos, see Theoph. Cont. 272 B, 437.
9 Antiphon F1.1 = FGHist 548 F5a; Aristot. Herakl. 49 Dilts; and Diod. 5.45.1. Other nearby colonies were Bisanthe (Pomp. Mela 2.24; Steph. Byz. s.v. Bisanthe; cf. Hdt. 7.137 and Thuc. 2.67) and Heraion Teikhos (Steph. Byz. and the Souda, s.v. Heraion Teikhos; cf. Hdt. 4.90).
10 See G. Shipley 1987, 41-42.
precipitated a permanent presence at Naukratis and Oasis in Egypt;\textsuperscript{11} and we hear of a Samian, Kolaios, who allegedly first explored the commercial opportunities of the Iberian peninsula (Hdt. 4.152).

Samos enters the historical record through its alleged participation in several early international conflicts: during the Lelantine War (late-8th century BCE), Herodotus says that Samos came to the aid of Chalcis against Eretria and Miletos (5.99; cf. Thuc. 1.15);\textsuperscript{12} that, perhaps in the same context, it attacked Aigina, securing what seems to have been a Pyrrhic victory (3.59);\textsuperscript{13} and that it contributed ships to Sparta in one of its early wars with the Messenians (3.47). In the so-called Meliac War (mid-7\textsuperscript{th} century?),\textsuperscript{14} moreover, Samos was said to have helped Priene and several other Ionian poleis attack and destroy Carian Melia, in consequence of which it was awarded some territory on the mainland.\textsuperscript{15}

In the fifth century, Samians tended to boast about their early thalassocracy,\textsuperscript{16} so it is difficult to know how much stock we should put in the historicity of these anecdotes. Thucydides’ claim that (thanks to an enterprising Corinthian) Samos began to build a

\textsuperscript{11} Hdt. 2.26, 2.178, and 4.152.
\textsuperscript{12} The ancient friendship between Chalcis and Samos is referred to in a Samian decree (dated to ca. 321-318 BCE), where Antileon of Chalcis is said to be upholding φιλίαν την Χαλκίδεως και Σαμίως υπόχρουσαν (IG 12. 6.1.42 = C. Habicht 1957 no.2).
\textsuperscript{13} Herodotus mentions this invasion as a means of explaining late-sixth century tensions between Samos and Aigina. The attack is dated to the time “when Amphikrates was king at Samos” (see below for a discussion of the meaning of this phrase). The date of this episode can be determined only by way of the \textit{terminus ante quem} provided by Herodotus’s narrative (ca. 525 BCE).
\textsuperscript{14} A rough date is provided by Lysimachos’s letter to Priene (\textit{IPriene} 500 = IG 12.6.1.155 = Ager No. 26 = Welles 7), where the Samian and Prienian seizure of the area called Batinetis (in the vicinity of Melia) preceded the invasion of the Ionian coast by Lygdamis (Dugdammê) and the Cimmerians, an event that was thought to have occurred in the mid- to late-seventh century BCE (see Hdt. 1.6; Callim. \textit{Hym}. 3.253; Strab. 1.3.21, 3.2.12, 11.2.5; Arr. \textit{FGrHist} 156 FF60, 76).
\textsuperscript{15} The Meliac war is mentioned in \textit{IPriene} 37, 107-123 (see below). The clearest account of what happened in this war comes actually in Vitruvius (4.1.4). The last of the thirteen original colonies of the Ionians, he says, is Mellite: on account of the arrogance of its citizens, he says, it was destroyed \textit{communi consilio}. The war may also be behind an anecdote from Valerius Maximus, where Samos sends a sibyl to the Prienians when they request help against the Carians (1.5).
\textsuperscript{16} Note the decrees dedicated at the Heraion in the mid-fifth century in honor of the victories at Eurymedon and in Egypt (\textit{e.g.} IG 12.6.1.277-279 and 12.6.1.468). See N. Luraghi 2001 for a discussion of Samian emphasis on piracy in the years following the revolt from Athens.
navy already at the end of the eighth century (1.13.3)\textsuperscript{17} should probably also be taken
with a grain of salt.

Archaic Samos was likely controlled by a landed aristocracy, the Geomoroi.\textsuperscript{18} This group was at any rate ascendant at the beginning of the sixth century,\textsuperscript{19} and it still apparently exercised power in the late-fifth century (Thuc. 8.21). But the workings of the early Samian politeia remain obscure.\textsuperscript{20} We know that, as in other contemporary aristocracies, the political equilibrium was periodically threatened by the rise of particular individuals:\textsuperscript{21} Amphikrates, whom Herodotus names as “king” at the time that the Samians attacked Aigina (3.59);\textsuperscript{22} Demoteles, who Plutarch says enjoyed monarkhia and whose “slaughter” ushered in a (renewed) period of Geomoric rule (Gr.Ait. 57; Mor. 303E);\textsuperscript{23} and an aisymnetes named Phoibias.\textsuperscript{24} In the late seventh century, Samos was embroiled in several conflicts on the mainland that would have provided good opportunities for an aristocrat to augment his prestige: there was continual fighting with Priene—in one battle, Samos lost a thousand men;\textsuperscript{25} in another, the so-called Battle of the

\textsuperscript{17} Thucydides famously dates this event to “about three hundred years before the end of the Peloponnesian
war” (ἔτη δ’ ἐστὶ μᾶλλον τριακόσια ἐς τὴν τελευτήν τούτην τοῦ πολέμου ὅτε Ἀμεινοκλῆς Σαμίων ἦλθεν).

\textsuperscript{18} For a parallel group at Syracuse, see Hdt. 7.155 and Aristot. F603 Gigon.

\textsuperscript{19} Plutarch (Aet. Gr. 57 = Mor. 303E-304C) says that after the murder of a “King Demoteles,” whose rule
probably spanned the late-seventh and early-sixth centuries (see F.X. Ryan 2006), the Geomoroi held
power, but he does not suggest that they held power here for the first time.

\textsuperscript{20} The citizens of Samos’s colony Perinthus were apparently divided by way of
the Ionian Phylai (see SGDI 5723), and this may reflect a similar categorization at Samos. Plutarch, for his part, thinks that the
Geomoroi had access to a bouleuterion and that they were in charge of appointing generals and manning
ships (Gr. Ait. 57; Mor. 304B-C).

\textsuperscript{21} On these men, see J.P. Barron 1962 and F.X. Ryan 2006.

\textsuperscript{22} ταῦτα δὲ ἐποίησαν ἔχοντον ἔχοντες Σαμίων Αἰγινηταί: πρόστεχος γὰρ Σάμῳ ἐπ’ Ἀμφικράτες
βασιλέωστος ἐν Σάμῳ στρατευόμενος ἐπ’ Αἰγίνων μεγάλα κακὰ ἐποίησαν Αἰγινηταῖς καὶ ἐπαθόν ὑπ’ ἐκείνον.

\textsuperscript{23} For discussions about the meaning of the verb and the actual position of this Amphikrates
(king, tyrant, or aisymnetes), see J. P. Barron 1964, 211 n. 3; G. Schmidt 1972, 184; R. Drews 1983, 27-29;
G. Shipley 1987, 37 n.64; and D. Asheri et.al. 2007, ad.loc.

\textsuperscript{24} We hear of this figure only in the fourteenth-century Miscellanea of Theodoros Metokhites (101).

\textsuperscript{25} See Aristot. F593 Gigon (= Plut. Gr.Ait. 20 = Mor. 296A) and IG 12.6.1.155 (= IPriene 500 = Ager No.
26 = Welles 7).
Oak, Samos was victorious—there were struggles with the Aeolians (Polyain. 6.45); and there was a war with Megara over the Samian colony of Perinthus. It was in fact the success of the nine generals appointed by the Geomoroi to aid Perinthus on this occasion that enabled them to stage a coup upon their return (Plut. Gr.Ait. 57 = Mor. 303E-304C). And the general in charge of the war with the Aeolians, Syloson son of Kalliteles, went on to use his popularity with the demos to seize control of the island (Polyain. 6.45).

The tyranny that this Syloson initiated stretched well into the fifth century; it passed from him to his son or nephew Aiakes, thence to Aiakes’ son Polycrates, and finally to Polycrates’ brother Syloson and his nephew Aiakes, who was in power at the time that the Persians invaded Greece. Thanks to Herodotus, we know most about the rule of Polycrates. According to Herodotus—and a similar picture emerges also from our other sources—Polycrates took control of Samos with the help of two brothers, one of whom he immediately killed, the other he exiled (3.39; 3.120); he amassed a great army, navy, fortune, and fame (3.39.3 cf. 3.125.2); he extended Samos’s dominion by raiding and conquering nearby islands (3.39.4); he was in fact the first Greek after Minos to contrive to control the sea (3.122.2); and he enjoyed a friendship with Amasis (2.182;

---

26 For the Battle of the Oak, see below.
27 Which would of course have occurred after the foundation of Perinthus (traditionally dated to 602 BCE).
28 They were aided, Plutarch tells us, by their Megarian captives. On this incident and its relationship to tensions between the Geomoroi and the demos in the late-fifth century, see M. Lupi 2005.
29 Herodotus says that Polycrates’ father was named Aiakes (Hdt. 2.182). Himerius (29.22) says that that Aiakes hired Anakreon of Teos to teach music to his son, who as a result became πολυκράτης; and the Souda (s.v. Ibykos I 80) says that Polycrates’ father (although here, he is named Polycrates) ruled Samos at the time when Ibykos arrived.
30 Because Herodotus says that Polycrates took power in a coup (3.39), dynastic rule may have been interrupted by periods of Geomoric resurgence.
31 e.g. Thucydides (1.13.6, 3.104.2), Diodorus (1.95.3, 10.16.1), Strabo (14.16 638A), Alexis (FGrHist 539 F2); Klytos of Miletos (FGrHist 490 F2), Plutarch (Per. 26); Polyainos (1.23.1), Maximus of Tyre (29.8), and Athenaeus (12.57 540C-F).
32 On Polycrates’ thalassocracy, see M. Miller 1971, 22-37.
cf. 3.39-40, 43) yet contributed a contingent to Cambyses’ invasion of Egypt (3.44). To Polycrates, moreover, we can attribute an interest in coinage and an impressive building program (Aristot. Pol. 5 1313b24). Probably assigned to his rule are Herodotus’s τοία μέγιστα ἀπάντων Ἑλλήνων ἐξεργασμένα (3.60): the tunnel of seven stades excavated by the Megarian Eupalinos; the mole surrounding the harbor; and the new Heraion constructed by the native Rhoikos. Under Polycrates, Samos became an important cultural center. Artists were drawn from all over the Greek world to his court: from Megara came the architect Eupalinos; from Kroton the doctor Demokedes (Hdt. 3.125.1); from Teos and Rhegion respectively the poets Anakreon (Hdt. 3.121; Him. 29.22) and Ibykos (Souda, s.v. Ibykos); and from Syros the philosopher Pherekydes (Aristot. Herak. 30-35 Dilts). It was apparently because of the tyranny, however, that Samos’s native son Pythagoras left for the West (Aristox. F16 Wehrli; see Iambl. Pyth. 5.20, 6.28). And there are other indications that Polycrates’ support was not unanimous. Herodotus alludes to Polycrates’ fear of sedition (3.44), and an obscure fragment of Anakreon (PMG 353) was interpreted by at least one ancient commentator as a reference to a fifth column (schol. Hom. Od. 21.71).

In the last quarter of the sixth century, Samos began to fall under the sway of Persia. Polycrates met his death in 522 in fact at the hands not of the disgruntled Samian

---

33 Polycrates enjoyed good relations not only with Amasis, but also with Lygdamis, tyrant of Naxos (Poly. 1.23); and he went out of his way to support Delos (Thuc. 1.13, 3.104.2). There were evident tensions with Corinth and Sparta, however (Hdt. 1.70; 3.47).
35 See G. Shipley 1987, 75 on the attribution of these works to Polycrates. Other religious centers were likely founded in this period: temples to Artemis, for example (Hdt. 3.48.3; IG 12.6. 266) and to Apollo (Paus. 2.31.6; Diod. 1.98.5-6). An altar and temenos to Zeus Eleutherios is dated by Herodotus (3.142.2) to the reign of Maiandarios.
37 Aesop also flourished around this time (Hdt. 2.134; Aristot. Herakl. 33 Dilts), but his presence as a slave at Samos should not speak to Polycrates’ cultural aspirations.
38 See L. Zhmud 2012, 80-85.
aristocracy but of Oroites, the satrap of Sardis (Hdt. 3.120-125),\(^{39}\) and, although another local tyrant, Polycrates’ erstwhile γραμματιστής, Maiandrios, managed to hold power for a few years (3.123),\(^{40}\) the Persians were soon themselves on the island: they swept Samos clear of men and handed it over to Polycrates’ malleable brother Syloson (Hdt. 3.147-149). When Syloson’s son, Aiakes, came to power (see Hdt. 4.138.2) he maintained his father’s pro-Persian policy; it was a Samian, in fact, who was responsible for Darius’s bridge across the Hellespont (Hdt. 4.87-89). In the Ionian revolt of 499, loyalty to Persia lapsed (Hdt. 5.37, 5.112.1, and 6.13), but Aiakes was soon again in control (6.8.2, 14),\(^{41}\) and his successor, Theomestor, owed his position primarily to his support of the Persian army at Salamis (Hdt. 8.85; 9.90).

The Greek victory in 479 brought a resurgence of anti-Persian sentiment, however. According to Herodotus, the Samians actually defected in the midst of the Battle of Mycale (9.99, 103-104); it was to Samos that the victorious Greek fleet first sailed after the battle; and here Samos, along with Chios and Lesbos, was formally welcomed into the League (Hdt. 9.106; Diod. 11.36-37).\(^{42}\) What started as allegiance to the Greek cause soon became adherence to Athens (Thuc. 1.94-96; Plut. Arist. 23).\(^{43}\) Like Chios and Lesbos, Samos contributed to the League primarily through its navy (Aristot. Ath.Pol. 24.2; cf. Pol. 3. 1284a39-40a); it fought bravely at Eurymedon in 465 BCE (IG 12.6.1.278; see 12.6.1.277) and fifteen years later in Egypt (IG 12.6.1.279; cf. 12.6.1 468). What became of the tyrant Theomestor after Mycale Herodotus does not

\(^{39}\) Oroites himself was assassinated soon thereafter, his hopes for dominion coming to naught (3.126-128).

\(^{40}\) Maiandrios (for whom see J. Roisman 1985 and J.F. McGlew 1993, 124-130) immediately distanced himself from the tyranny, founded an altar to Zeus Eleutherios, summoned the ekklesia—although Herodotus’s use of the word (3.142.3) should not be seen as an indication of democratic institutions—and made a public show of proclaiming isopoliteia and eleutheria. But his tyranny, supported as it was by his two brothers, probably differed little from that of his predecessor.

\(^{41}\) Those Samians who supported the revolt fled to Zankle in Sicily (Hdt. 6.22-24; Aristot. Pol. 1303a35-36).

\(^{42}\) This new stance is reflected in the honors that the Samians in 479 voted for the eleven generals who refused to rejoin the Persian cause at Lade (Hdt. 6.14.3).

\(^{43}\) On the relationship of Samos and Athens during the fifth century, see T. J. Quinn 1981.
say; but Samian support of Athens does not in itself imply an immediate turn to democracy. Some Samians may have advocated political change (see Thuc. 1.115), but Samos probably remained an oligarchy throughout the first half of the century. In 441, however, Athens became more involved with Samos as a consequence of growing tensions between Samos and Miletus over Priene—Samos apparently refused an Athenian offer to arbitrate (Plut. Per. 24.1, 25.1), and Pericles sailed in, took hostages, and installed both a garrison and democracy. A group of Samian oligarchs who had been based at Anaia (it is not clear exactly since when) responded by procuring Persian support, rising against the *demos*, and throwing off the garrison (Thuc. 1.115; Plut. Per. 25). This precipitated a siege. After nine months, Samos was forced to relinquish its fleet, tear down its walls, pay a war indemnity, and become a tribute-paying member of the empire (Thuc. 1.115-117; Isoc. 15.111; Douris FGrHist 76 FF66-67; Diod. Sic. 12.27; Plut. Per. 25-28; IG I 1 48). Samos remained loyal to Athens until the end of the war. It contributed ships to the Sicilian Expedition (Thuc.7.57.4) and supported the Athenian navy at Arginousai in 406 (Xen. Hell. 1.6.29). But it does not appear actually

---

44 See J.P. Barron 1966, 89-91; cf. T.J. Quinn 1981, 10-23; H.-J. Gehrke 1985, 140 n.3; and G. Shipley 1989 108-9. We have evidence that at some point in the fifth-century two Samians, Telesandros and Demagores, were elected supervisors for bridge construction (IG 12.6.1.278).

45 Diodorus says that Pericles reinstated democracy after the revolt in 441 (12.28.4), but Thucydides is silent on the matter. See H.-J. Gehrke 1985, 141-143; G. Shipley 1987, 120-122; and E. Robinson 2011, 179-180. Thucydides refers to a group of Samian exiles based at Anaia who (ca. 424) gave naval assistance to the Peloponnesians (3.32.2; 4.75.1).

46 Sophokles was apparently also a general in this war; see Andration FGrHist 324 F38; Ion FGrHist 392 F6; Plut. Per. 8.8; and Vit. Soph. 35).

47 Samos was still without a wall in 411 (Thuc. 8.51.2), but at some point in the next century its fortifications were rebuilt (Aristot. Oik. 2.1350b; Diod. 16.21.2).

48 See C.W. Fornara 1979 for the chronology of this war. The evidence from certain *horoi* on Samos have sometimes been taken as evidence for an Athenian cleruchy on Samos whose presence would have precipitated the revolt, but the dating is tricky, and they may just as well attest to an Athenian presence after the revolt (see J.P. Barron 1964, R. Meiggs 1972, 295-299, G. Shipley 1987, 115-116, and R. Parker 1996 142-151). We know the name of one Samian who defected during the siege, Karystion (schol. Ar. Vesp. 283).

49 It is unclear whether the Athenian loss at Sicily provoked a revolt at Samos as it did throughout Asia Minor (Diod. 13.34).
to have officially embraced democracy until 412, when the Samian demos, in collaboration with Athenian sailors stationed on the island, revolted against the δυνατοί, among whom were the Geomoroi (Thuc. 8.21; 73.2-6; Xen. Hell. 2.2.6). The Athenians rewarded newly democratic Samos by confirming its autonomy (Thuc. 8.21; IG I3 96.3-6) and later (405) by extending Athenian citizenship to all Samians, wherever their location, who had remained loyal to Athens (Syll. 3.116 = ML 94).

Samos did not remain in the Athenian sphere for long. After a brief Spartan siege in 404, Samos made terms with Lysander: the Samian democrats were allowed to leave, control of affairs was handed back to the former citizens (οἱ ἄρχοντες πολῖται), perhaps the exiles who had been based at Anaia, and a decarchy was imposed (Xen. Hell. 2.3.6-7; Diod. 14.3.5; Plut. Lys. 14.2). Those Samians who remained on the island apparently embraced the Spartans wholeheartedly. Lysander was granted divine honors, the annual festival to Hera was renamed in his honor, and the Samians even dedicated a statue to the Spartan general at Olympia (Douris FGrHist 76 F26, 71; Paus. 6.3.13-14). But Samos’s relationship with Sparta was short-lived. After the Corinthian War, the island

---

50 Even though in 427 some Samian oligarchs were still at Anaia (Thuc. 3.32.2).
51 Alcibiades was based at Samos before his triumphal return to Athens, and he appears to have kept quite busy there, as Douris, the historian, future tyrant of Samos, and product of Alcibiades’ Samian philandering, attests (FGrHist 76 T3 = F70).
52 As Thucydides says, however, there followed in Samos a period of stasis that mirrored affairs at Athens. At first, the demos disenfranchised the Geomoroi, forbidding intermarriage between the two factions (8.21). But soon afterwards, some of the demos fell under the sway of Peisander and established a council of Three Hundred; while οἱ πλέονες managed with Athenian support to kill about thirty Samian oligarchs and exile the leaders of the anti-democratic faction. Henceforth, the Samians lived together democratically (8.73.6). Some Samians apparently rejected the Athenian alliance, however; Pausanias (10.9.1) preserves the name of the Samian Kleomedes who fought with the Peloponnesians at Aegospotami. See H.-J. Gehrke 1984, 142-144; G. Shipley 1987, 124-128; M. Ostwald 1993; and S. Hornblower 1991, 193 and 2008, 808-809.
53 Thuc. 8.21: Ἀθηναίοι τε ἀφίναιν αὐτονομίαν μετὰ ταύτα ὡς βεβαιος ἠδημηποσαμένων. For the interpretation of the decree, that honors the Samian demos, see J.L. Cargill 1983 and G. Shipley 1987, 124-125.
54 Cf. IG II² 1 (= Tod 97 = RO 2); see G. Shipley 1987, 130-131, D. Whitehead 1993, and M. Ostwald 1993.
55 See G. Shipley 1987, 132-133.
56 See C. Habicht 1956, 243-244; E. Homann-Wedeking 1965; and M. Flower 1988, 128.
57 There may have been a brief democratic, or at any rate pro-Athenian, interlude following Konon’s successes in 394 (Diod. 14.97.3); for the Samians dedicated a statue to Konon at their Heraion at about this time (Paus. 6.3.16).
was probably nominally allied to Athens, although Persian influence was on the rise: in 381, Isocrates worried that Samos, along with Chios and Rhodes, might incline towards Persia (4.163), and by 366, we even hear of a Persian garrison (Dem. 15.9), a state of affairs that understandably irritated the Athenians. Timotheus, who had been sent east to deal with the rebel satrap Ariobarzanes, besieged the island and expelled the Persians (Isoc. 15.11; Dem. 15.9). Rather than grant Samos its autonomy, however, Athens took the egregious step in 365 of imposing a cleruchy (Diod. Sic. 18.18.9; Strab. 14.1.18 638; Aristot. Rhet. 2. 1384b32-35). Many Samians, oligarch and democrat alike, went into exile: to Anaia, Iasos, Rhodes, and Ephesos, and perhaps even as far away as Sicily. Those that remained do not appear to have looked kindly on the interlopers. The Athenians periodically replenished their cleruchy; we have evidence that more settlers were dispatched in 361/360 (Schol. Aesch. 1.53) and again in 352/1 (Phil. FGrHist 328 F154). The Athenians on Samos, for their part, thought of themselves as a distinct and autonomous demos (IG II2 1442.11.89-91). They had their own bouleuterion (IG 12.6.257.3)—there were enough Athenians on the island, in fact, to comprise a boule of 250 (IG 12.6.1.262)—and they employed their own eponymous arkhontes (IG 12.6.261). One of the Athenian archons at Samos, Neokles (SIG3 276A = SEG 18.200, 29.458), was very likely the father of the philosopher Epicurus (Diog. Laert. 10.1).

Samos was recognized as an Athenian possession by Philip II and, initially, by Alexander (Diod. 18.56.7; Plut. Alex. 28.1). But in 324 Alexander issued his Exiles

---

58 It was nominally under the command of (the Samian?) Kyprethemis (see G. Shipley 1987, 137).
60 See IG 12. 6.38 and the discussions of R. Kebric (1975 and 1977, 4) and J.P. Barron (2003) on the provenance of Douris’s father, Kaios.
61 Ἀττικὸς πάροικος, a proverb referring to personae non gratae and retained by Aristotle (Rhet. 2.21 1395a) and Douris (FGrHist 76 F96), was explained by Zenobios (2.28; see Comm. to Aristotle. Rhet. 21.2, 128.20) and Krateros (FGrHist 342 F21) with reference to Athenian settlers on Samos (most likely the cleruchy). See F. Landucci-Gattinoni 1997, 233 n. 46; but cf. G. Shipley 1987, 115-116, who thinks the context is the Samian revolt in 441.
Decree, and after his death the following year, Perdikkas restored the Samians to their polis and khora and helped expel the Athenians (IG 12.6.43.8-14; Diod. 18.18; Paus. 6.13.5; Diog. Laert. 10.1). In the ensuing century, Samos’s alliances reflected the shifting power dynamics in the region. First it courted the Antigonids (Diod. 19.62). At the end of the fourth century, we find evidence in Samos of a new tribe, Demetrias (IG 12.6.24), in addition to a festival instituted for Antigonos and Demetrios (IG 12. 6.55). Several extant Samian decrees, moreover, honor Antigonid generals (IG 12.6.21); and a Samian (Themison) played a role in Demetrios’s victory on Cyprus in 306 (Diod. 20.50). Even after Ipsos, Demetrios remained active in the region (Diod. 19.80-85, 93-94). There are no indications, however, that Samos lost its independence during these years. Quite to the contrary, the numerous decrees issued after the fall of the Athenian cleruchy attest to the autonomy of the island and to the continued exercise of democratic institutions, some of which, ironically, may have been influenced by the Athenian occupation: the Samians had their own eponymous magistrate called the demiourgos; a boule, over which prytaneis presided; and an ekklesia, which met regularly throughout

64 It is unclear whether, as at Athens (Diod. 20.46), there was also a tribe Antigoneis; see G. Shipley 1987 173, 288-289 and S. Dmitriev 2005, 95.
65 C. Habicht 1957 no. 13. See also IG 12.6.23, 6.25-26, 6.28-6.30.
66 See R. Kebric 1977, 4-5; W. Transier 1985, and S. Dmitriev 2005, 92-95. See Dmitriev 2005, 94nn. 164-165 for a list of decrees dated to this period that refer to “sacred matters” and perhaps shed some light on Samian relations with the Antigonids.
67 See SIG3 363 = IEphesos VI 2001 for Ephesian honors for a general of Demetrius granted after Hieron’s tyranny at Priene (ca. 297). IPriere 37.75-76, we should note, mentions that Demetrius had previously been involved in the arbitration between Samos and Priene over Batinetis.
69 These were probably the arkhontes during the Athenian occupation (see IG 12.6.261; Habicht 1957, 253), but prior to the cleruchy, there is evidence for demiourgoi (see R. Sherk 1990b, 288). The demiourgoi sometimes functioned in pairs (IG 12.6.22.1-4; IPriere 67.2-3; IG 12.6.2; see Sherk 1990b, 288-289), perhaps in correspondence to the two Samian tribes (S. Dmitriev 2005 98).
70 The prytaneis appear to have served for one month each (IG 12.6.172a).
Among the first decrees issued by the new democracy were honors granted to many of the communities that sheltered the exiles after the Athenian invasion.\footnote{See IG 12.6.1.}

Antigonid influence in the region declined as a consequence of Lysimakhos’s activities ca. 294 (Plut. Dem. 35). Our evidence for interactions between Lysimakhos and Samos, however, is slim. Samos may have been one the poleis of the Ionian League who honored Lysimakhos’s general Hippostratos in 289/288;\footnote{Copies of this decree have been found in Miletus and Smyrna (SIG 3 368; ISmyrna 577).} and we know that Lysimakhos played a role (ca. 283-281) in arbitrating the land dispute between Samos and Priene, deciding in favor of Samos.\footnote{Lysimachus’s role is mentioned in both IPriene 37.75-76, 90-96, which records the Rhodian attempt at arbitration a century or so later, and in a letter written by Lysimakhos himself (IG 12.6.1.155 = IPriene 500 = Ager No. 26 = Welles 7). Lysimakhos, we know, also periodically enjoyed good relations with Priene, which honored him with a crown, set up a statue of him in the agora, and instituted a cult in his honor (IPriene 14).} But even if we grant him a larger role in Samos than the evidence suggests,\footnote{It has been noted, for example, that during the years of Lysimakhos’s ascendancy (294-281), Samian coinage is absent from the archaeological record (J.P. Barron 1966, 122-123, 136-137, and 140-145; M. Thompson 1968; G. Shipley 1987, 183-185; and S. Dmitriev 2005, 94-95). Yet, if this is indeed evidence that Samos stopped producing coins in the early-third century—and this is not the only hypothesis, of course—it is does not follow that Lysimakhos was to blame. A cessation of coinage may have been part of the policy of the tyranny of Kaios and his sons.} there is no indication that he had anything to do with the resurgence of tyranny at the end of the fourth century.\footnote{Hieron, a tyrant at Priene at the beginning of the third century, is often adduced as a parallel for Samian affairs (see C. Habicht 1957, 156; J.P. Barron 1962; R. Kebric 1977, 6-9; G. Shipley 1987, 178-181), but there is no evidence that Lysimakhos supported even this tyranny; for Hieron see Paus. 7.2.10, IPriene 11, 12, and 37 and I Ephesos 2001. The fact that Demetrius supported Hieron’s enemies says nothing about Lysimakhos (see H. Lund 1992, 123).} We know only that the tyrant Kaios, who grew up in exile during the years of the cleruchy, came to power at some point after 322 and that he was succeeded by his son, the celebrated historian Douris (FGrHist 76 T2).\footnote{We shall look in greater detail at the evidence below: Paus. 6.13.5 and Athen. 8.18 337D (FGrHist 76 T2).}
Ptolemaic activity on Samos began after Lysimakhos’s death. It was on Samos that the League of Islanders met in 280 BCE to discuss a festival in Alexandria (SIG\(^3\) 390);\(^78\) and Ptolemy II even arranged to use part of the island as a naval base (Polyb. 5.35.11). Yet, while Samos also had numerous dealings with Ptolemaic officers,\(^79\) there is no evidence that it became Ptolemaic property. The polis continued, after all, to issue and inscribe decrees during the years of the Ptolemaic ascendency,\(^80\) and the Samian mint continued to produce coins.\(^81\) Antiochus II, on the other hand, did seize some Samian land in the peraia in the mid-third century (259-246),\(^82\) and Philip V stormed the island in 201, captured some Ptolemaic ships (App. Mak. 41; Polyb. 16.2; Livy 31.31.4), and imposed a garrison (IG 12.6.12).\(^83\) But in each case, the occupation was short-lived. By the time of Flamininus’s proclamation at Nicaea, Samos had been restored to Ptolemaic control (Liv. 33.20.11-12). Ptolemaic interference had repercussions of a different sort, too, and Samian intellectuals, like the astronomers Aristarkhos and Konon and the poets Asklepiades and Hedylos, seem to have left the island for Alexandria.

At the beginning of the third century, as Ptolemaic power waned, Samos found itself inclining towards Rhodes. It was Rhodes in 197 that secured Samian liberty in the

\(^78\) This does not mean, however, that Samos was considered part of the League.
\(^80\) From ca. 280 we have a decree in which Samos honors two judges from Myndos, sent to the island to arbitrate at the behest of Philokles SEG I 363 = IG 12.6.95. R. Bagnall (1976, 80) takes this as evidence that “the island was without any doubt not only an ally but a possession of the Ptolemites.” He also points (1976, 81-82; cf. Habicht 1957, 237-238) to the evidence from the Samian decree in honor of the doctor Diodoros (IG 12.6.12), who tended to those wounded during the restoration of the city to the pragmata of King Ptolemy (ἐν τῇ ἀποκαταστάσει τῆς πόλεως εἰς τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου πράγματα). But see S. Dmitriev 2005, 96 n. 181.
\(^81\) J.P. Barron 1966, Ch. 10. Douris is even named on one issue.
\(^82\) See G. Shipley 1987, 188. In the Samian decree in honor of Boulagoras (ca. 243-242 BCE?), Antiochus is said to have distributed some of the Samian land near Ainaia to his associates and imposed a garrison at Anaia. For the role of Antiochus, see C. Habicht 1957, 239-240, nn. 109-112; and R. Bagnall 1976, 81-82. The Ptolemies were again in the center of Samos’s attention in the mid 240’s, when Boulagoras was sent to Alexandria to assist in a festival there. For the idea that ca. 260 Samos fell under the control of the Milesian tyrant Timarkhos (based on a comment in Frontinus Strat. 3.2.11), see Habicht 1957, 220 n.74 and Bagnall 1976, 80-81.
\(^83\) The decree in honor of the doctor Diodoros, as we said, mentions his role in liberating the island from the garrison. See C. Habicht 1957 no. 64, 239-240 with nn. 109-112.
face of Antiochus III (Liv. 33.20), and we know that Rhodians came to Samos at some point in the 190s in order to adjudicate (this time to Samos’s detriment) the territorial dispute with Priene (IPriene 37). Such a change in the power dynamics of the region did not, once again, automatically impinge upon the running of the politeia. Many Samian decrees of the early second century attest to independent decision-making; the Grain Law (IG 12. 6.1.172), for example, passed ca. 260 or perhaps 200, reveals the Samians arranging for the distribution of grain grown on city-owned land and the allotment of funds for public use. The same thing may be said about the beginning years of Roman ascendancy in the East. Yet, while Samos had looked to Demetrius and Lysimakhos and then to Rhodes to settle its ongoing dispute with Priene, after Apamea Rome found itself playing the role of arbitrator. Cn. Manlius Vulso and the decem legati decided in the favor of Samos, which received back Dryoussa and Karion (IPriene 40-41). Some fifty years later, however, after Samos had been incorporated into the Roman province of Asia following its role in the revolt of Aristonikos, we find Priene resubmitting the matter to the Roman Senate. Vulso’s decision was overturned; the territory was returned to Priene (IPriene 40-41).

2.2.2.2 Local Historians of Samos

Samians were long writing about their past. In the late-seventh century Semonides wrote an Ἀρχαιολογία τῶν Σαμίων (FGrHist 534 T1a), in elegiacs, it

---

84 Again, this does not mean that Rhodes controlled Samos directly; see W. Transier 1985, 31-33.
87 He took the island by force (Flor. 1.35.4).
88 Some ancient accounts make Semonides Amorgine, but this is likely a result of the tradition that he helped to orchestrate Samian colonization and founded “Amorgos in three poleis: Minoa, Aigialos, and Arkesine” (see the Souda Σ 446 = FGrHist 536 T 1b; Strabo 10.5.12 C487; and Steph. of Byzantion s.v. Amorgos; Phot. Bibli. 239 319b; cf. C. Constantakopoulou, Comm. to BNJ 534, who thinks that it was in fact his poem on Samos that led to his identification with Samos). Semonides is not to be confused with the lyric poet Simonides, although his name is often misspelt in accordance with that of the Keian (see
seems, perhaps even two books in length. Its relationship with other historical elegies, like Mimnermos’s *Smyrneis* (*FGrHist* 578 F1) or Xenophanes’ *Ktisis of Kolophon* (*FGrHist* 450 T1), is unclear, but its subject was evidently early Samian history, with a likely focus on Samian colonization. Other Samian poets were interested in their community: Asios dealt with Samian genealogy and the idiosyncrasies of Samian cult (Paus. 7.4.1-2; Athen. 3.125C-E, 12.30 525EF = Douris *FGrHist* 76 F60), as did Khoirilos and Nikainetos, a contemporary of Douris, whom Athenaeus actually describes as ποιητὴς ἐπιχώριος and a lover of ή ἐπιχώριος ιστορία (15.11-15 671E-674A). But unlike Semonides, these poets do not seem to have written self-standing poems about the Samian past.

---

*Etym. Magn.* 713.17 and Pap. Herc. 1074, 20 N (for the distinction). Information about Semonides is unfortunately spread between two entries in the *Souda*, Σ 446 and Σ 431 Adler, the second of which has actually been conflated with information about Simmias of Rhodes. See Jacoby *FGrHist* IIIB Noten, 269 n. 8a; cf. T.J. Hubbard 2001, 227 n.6 and C. Constantakopoulou *BNJ* 534. For his date, see E. Rhode 1881, 559 n. 1 and H. Lloyd-Jones 1975, 16 E. Rhode 1881, 559 n. 1.

90 For the *Arkhaiologia* is mentioned only in Σ 431, while the other entry on Semonides (Σ 446) refers to “two books of elegies” (see E. Bowie 1986, 30 and J. Grethlein 2010, 52 and 296). Jacoby, however, writing before the discovery of the Plataea elegy, thought of the work more along the lines of Solon’s *Salamis* (*FGrHist* IIIB Noten, 289 n.8).

91 The *Souda*’s contention that Semonides contributed to the foundation of Amorgos may well have come from his treatment of the event in the *Arkhaiologia*. Jacoby thinks that the poem dealt only with the foundation of Amorgos (*FGrHist* IIIB Noten, 289 n.8); in this case, however, the title would fit very poorly indeed.

92 Khoirilos, who is linked by the *Souda* (X 595) to Panyassis and (romantically) to Herodotus and by Plutarch (*Lys*. 18) to Lysander, wrote among other things a Περσικά about the Athenian victory over Xerxes (see G.L. Huxley 1969 for the references to this work and a reconstruction of its contents). It is possible that he also wrote a Σαμιακά, but the testimony is problematic. The *Souda* (s.v. Khoirilos), who has evidently confused Khoirilos of Samos with Khoirilos of Iasos, a court poet of Alexander the Great, names a Λαμιακά, and this was emended by A. Daub 1880 (followed by F. Michelazzo 1982) to Σαμιακά (but see now Walsh 2011, who sees this as testimony that Khoirilos of Iasos wrote an epic on the Lamian War).

93 Nikainetos wrote among other things an eloquent epigram about a picnic under a willow tree near the Samian Heraion (F4 Gow and Page = Athen. 15.11-15 671E-674A). Note, too, the anonymous poet quoted by Porphyry in his *Life of Pythagoras* (2).

94 And Asios, for one, certainly did not restrict himself to Samos: (Paus. 2.6.4; 29.4; 3.13.8; 4.2.1; 5.17.8; and 9.23.6; and *cf. FGrHist* 555 F12 = Strabo 6.1.15).
Local historiography first appeared at Samos in the mid-fifth century. The Samian Euagon, in fact, heads Dionysios’s list of ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφεῖς (FGrHist 535 T1); and Aethlios probably followed not long after (FGrHist 536 F2). At the same time, we may note, non-native prose historians like Herodotus,95 Stesimbrotos,96 and Thucydides97 found opportunities to take up Samian history, as did local historians of other communities, like Malakos in his Σιφνίων Ὄροι (FGrHist 552 F1) and Klytos of Miletos in his Περὶ Μιλήτου (FGrHist 490 F1),98 all of which attests to the significant role that Samos played in fifth-century Ionia. Samian local histories continued to be produced both in the fourth century, with Aristotle composing his detailed Πολιτεία Σαμίων in the period of the Athenian cleruchy, and in the early third, when Douris wrote his Σαμίων Ὄροι (FGrHist 76). We even have evidence for a Samian local history in the first century CE, when Potamon of Mytilene, a rhetorician at Rome in the reign of

95 Much has been written about Herodotus’s relationship to Samos (e.g. E.E. Cole 1912; H.R. Immerwahr 1957; B.M. Mitchell 1975; and R. Tölle-Kastenbein 1976; cf. E. Irwin 2008 and C. Pelling 2011). Samos and the Samians certainly figure prominently in the Histories (1.70.2-3; 1.142.4; 2.182.1; 3.39-48, 3.54-60, 3.120-125, 3.139-140, 3.142-146, 4.88, 4.152, 6.13-14, 6.22-25, 8.85.2-3, 9.90-91, 9.106.4). Herodotus certainly visited the island and seems also to have availed himself of Samian local tradition. There is no indication, however, that he had access to previously written Samian local histories (see Jacoby 1949, 182-183 contra Wilamowitz 1912, 56; cf. M. Vogt 1902, 708-712 and R. Laqueur 1927, col. 1090); the one “local date” that Herodotus retains, viz. that the Samian expedition against Aigina occurred when Amphikrates was king (3.59.4), betrays no pre-existing chronicle. Nor is there any indication that Herodotus wrote or planned to write an autonomous book on Samos, as V. La Bua suggests (1978). Much of Herodotus’s Samian historiography, as Jacoby recognized, came from access to local tradition. Euagon may have written his history before Herodotus published his own work (this is what Dionysius says, at any rate), but we have no directly evidence that Herodotus read it.

96 FGrHist 107 FF1, 8, 29.

97 In addition to his frequent references to Samos in the fifth-century (1.115-117, 4.76.1, 7.57.4, 8.21.1, 8.41.2, 8.44.3, 8.63.3, 8.73-76), Thucydides retains some earlier material about Samos: that in the reign of Cambyses Polycrates possessed a powerful navy that reduced many islands (1.13.6) and that three hundred years before the beginning of the Peloponnesian War a Corinthian Ameinokles went to Samos to build some ships (1.13.3). This latter fact may indicate that Thucydides was relying on a Samian local history (of Euagon or Aethlios?), but the datum could just as well have come another source (M. Miller 1970, 216, suggests Antiokhos). In any case “three hundred years before the Peloponnesian War” implies a calculation of only the vaguest sort made by an Athenian with reference to an Athenian event.

98 Malakos included in his local history of Siphnos what seems to be a Samian tradition about the foundation of Ephesos (F1). The peripatetic Klytos of Miletus wrote of Samos and in particular Polycrates (see Jacoby 1949, 262 n.57). C. Habicht, furthermore, draws attention to an honorary decree from the fourth or third century (IG 12. 6.1.100) that honors a historian Dionysios and inscribes him among the citizens of Samos—Habicht suggests Dionysios of Chalcis, the author of Kitiseis (FHG IV 393-6).
Tiberius, published his Ὄροι Σαμίων (FGrHist 147 T1 = JCIIV 1085 T1). Some Samian historians, as is to be expected, cannot be dated accurately. For Olympikhos (FGrHist 537) and Ouliades (FGrHist 538), for example, we have only the terminus ante quem provided by their inclusion in the well-known inscription IPriene 37, dated to the early-second century BCE. For Alexis (FGrHist 539) and Menodotos (FGrHist 541), we know merely that they wrote before Athenaeus. And for Leon (FGrHist 540) and Xenophon (FGrHist 540a), termini are provided by dedications (which provide only the vaguest of dates) at the Heraion. These historians nevertheless reveal that Samian local historiography was a pervasive phenomenon and an activity pursued particularly by natives. For aside from Potamon and Aristotle, all identifiable local

100 We have for Olympikhos only two fragments. The first is a reference (alongside Euagon, Douris, and Ouliades) in IPriene 37 that the Samians received Phyrgela after the Meliac War (2a); Olympikhos may also have said that the Samians took Karion after the settlement (F2b). The second fragment is a reference in Clemens (Protr. 4.47.2) to the sculptor of the xoanon of Hera, Smilis son of Eukleides.
101 There is only one reference to Ouliades, the citation in IPriene 37.
102 For the date see H. von Gaertringen 1906, 43; S. Ager 1996, no. 74; and C. Habicht 2003 and 2005.
103 Athenaeus cites Alexis once regarding the foundation of a temple to Aphrodite in Samos by Athenian prostitutes who had accompanied Perikles (13.31 572F = F1) and once (12.57 540DE = F2) regarding Polycrates, who embellished his court with exotic animals (dogs from Mollosia and Sparta, goats from Skiros and Naxos, sheep from Miletos and Attica) and many well-paid artists. Athenaeus goes on to mention expensive curtains and cups that Polycrates gave as gifts, the tyrant’s apparent disinterest in courtesans, his relations with Anakreon, and his construction of the Samainai. All of this may also belong to Alexis, but any similarity of material with Douris cannot tell us anything about his date. As for Menodotos, Athenaeus cites him once (and at some length) regarding the cult statue of Hera at the Heraion from the ἤ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Σάμου ἐνδόξου Ἀναγραφή (15.11-15 671E-674A) and once regarding peacocks at the Heraion τὸ Περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Σαμίας Ἁρα (14.70 655A). It is possible that the Samian Menodotos is the same historian whom Diodoros once cites as Menodotos of Perinthos (26.4 = FGrHist 82 F1), and to whom he attributes a history of Greek events after 218 (see L. Perilli 2005). This identification, possible inasmuch as Perinthus was a Samian colony, would give us a terminus post quem. Two other fragments may belong to the Samian Menodotos; Diogenes Laertios says (2.104) that a Menodotos wrote about the Athenian painter Theodoros (FGrHist 541 F3) and elsewhere (9.115) that a Menodotos wrote about the philosopher Timon (FGrHist 541 F4), which would give us another terminus post quem, since Timon’s life spanned the third century (ca. 320-230 BCE). But neither attribution is secure.
104 IG 12.6.1 285. Leon’s history evidently centered on Hera and the naval exploits of the Samians.
105 IG 12.6.1 308. Xenophon’s history also seems to have focused on Hera.
106 Leon’s inscription dates roughly to the middle of the second century BCE (see now A. D’Hautcourt, BNJ 540); that for Xenophon probably to the second century CE.
historians of Samos were themselves Samian: Semonides, Euagon, Aethlios, Douris, Olympikhos, Ouliades, Alexis, Leon, Xenophon, and Menodotos.\textsuperscript{107}

In four cases (Aethlios, Douris, Alexis, and Potamon) Samian local histories are explicitly called Ὄροι; and this may also have been the name given to the histories of Euagon, Ouliades (\textit{FGrHist} 539), Leon (\textit{FGrHist} 540), and Xenophon (\textit{FGrHist} 540a), for whom titles have not been preserved. Ὄροι, as we have seen, was often applied to local histories of the Greek East, in particular Ionia: Artemon wrote Ὄροι of his native Klazomenai (\textit{FGrHist} 443 F1), Kharon of his native Lampsakos (\textit{FGrHist} 262 T1, FF1-2), Neanthes of his native Kyzikos (\textit{FGrHist} 84 F5), Kreophylos on Ephesos (\textit{FGrHist} 417 F1); Malakos on Siphnos (\textit{FGrHist} 552 F1), and Plutarch once cites an anonymous Ὄροι of Naxos (Plut. \textit{de Mal.Her}. 869B1).\textsuperscript{108} But the title crops up elsewhere as well: Aristophanes of Boiotia is also said to have written Ὄροι of Thebes (\textit{FGrHist} 379 T2a, F1a); Ps.-Lucian once refers to οἱ Περσῶν καὶ Ἀσσυρίων Ὄροι (\textit{Macr.} 14) and Dionysios of Halikarnassos once to the Ὄροι of the Romans (A.R. 7.1.6). The popularity of the term for Samian histories in particular, however, suggests that the title was closely associated with the subject matter, in the same way, we might say, that the title Ἀτθίς was eventually attached to local historiography of Athens. On four occasions, in fact, Ὄροι Σαμιακοῖ/Σαμίων are cited anonymously,\textsuperscript{109} and Tatian once even refers to a

\textsuperscript{107} In the case of Xenophon, we should say, this is a natural inference, not a certainty; for the inscription gives the name of his father not another \textit{polis}. One writer, Theodoros, whose focus was not apparently historical but rather architectural—Vitruvius cites his work on the temple of Hera (\textit{FGrHist} 542 F1)—is given no provenance, but he may in fact have been the son of the Heraion’s architect Rhoikos (see H.J. Kienast 1998 and S. Ebbinghaus 2004).

\textsuperscript{108} See also Theolytos \textit{FGrHist} 478 F1, who is said to have written \textit{Horoi} of some sort.

\textsuperscript{109} Jacoby groups four fragments under the heading “Anonyme Horoi” (\textit{FGrHist} 544). Such anonymous citations are made by Antigonus (\textit{Hist. Mitr.} 120 =\textit{FGrHist} 544 F1), by Herodian (Περὶ μου. Αἰζ. 7.9, 39.32 = \textit{FGrHist} 544 FF2-3), and by Lactantius (\textit{Inst. Div.} 1.6.9 =\textit{FGrHist} 544 F4). There is no indication that these citations belong to the same work or that any Samian annals were actually produced collectively and anonymously. The author’s name may have been left out because it was assumed—one fragment (\textit{FGrHist} 544 F2) seems to have been written in Ionic and so is early (and perhaps even derives from the work of Aethlios)—but this would be an unusual mode of reference.
Samian historian called Horos (ad Gr. 41 = FGrHist 545 F10). It is hard to know to what extent the title, in some cases probably bestowed upon these works well after their composition, refers in any way to the form and chronographical structure of these texts. At base, of course, the term signifies a chronological narrative with an emphasis on the unit of the year, as was recognized by Diodorus (1.26.5), Censorinus (De die nat. 19.6), Hesychios (s.v. Horographoi), and the Etymologicum Magnum (s.v. Horos). Lactantius even translates Horoi as Annales (Iust. Div. 1.6.9 = FGrHist 544 F4). But to call a history “years” does not in itself suggest that the narrative was articulated by the passing of each year, or that, even in cases where it clearly was, that each year was marked by an eponymous magistrate. The Atthides, which provide the clearest example of annalistic historiography, are never called Ὁροι. Only one fragment of Samian local historiography (from Aethlios), we shall see, reveals something of an annalistic flavor (FGrHist 536 F1a), but not even here do we have any indication of a chronographical formula.

A) TO THE END OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

Euagon, whom Dionysios of Halicarnassus names alongside Deiokhos of Kyzikos, Bion of Prokonnesos, Eudemos of Paros, Demokles of Phygelala, Hekataios of Miletus, Akousilaos of Argos, Kharon of Lampaksos, and Amelesagoras of Khalkedon

---

112 On the use of the work Ὁρος for year, see Plut. Quest. Conv. 5.4.1 677e. See S. Mazzarino 1965, I, 133 and F. Landucci-Gattinoni 1997, 204-207.
113 On Ὁροί and their relationship to Greek historiography, see R. Stiehle 1853; C. Wachsmuth 1895, 553-559; S. Mazzarino 1966, 2, 447; and E. Flores 1991, 12-22.
114 Dionysios of Halicarnassus, as we have seen, does call the Atthides αἱ χρονικαί (A.R. 18.3) but nowhere Ὁροί.
115 Dionysios does not apparently arrange this group chronologically or geographically; nevertheless Euagon’s prominence in the list is clear. In fact, Dionysios actually writes Εὐγένεων, and the name is often misspelt: the Souda gives Εὐγέαων as a proper name, although without connection to the historian (E 3388
as one of the ἄρχατοι συγγραφέως, is cited only four other times (de Thuc. 5 = T1), in no case with a title. Dionysios says that Euagon and his colleagues divided their texts by locality and recorded local traditions, and he was probably correct in his categorization of Euagon as a local historian, since IPriene 37 cites him alongside Olympikhos, who certainly wrote Σαμαικά (FGrHist 537 F1), and Douris (FGrHist 76), who wrote Σαμίων Ἄρων. But, once again, we have no explicit evidence that his history, local though it was, was horographical. Nor, for that matter, is there any testimony outside of Dionysius for Euagon’s early date, although there is little reason to disregard Dionysios’s chronology whole scale. That Euagon wrote before the mid-fourth century is at any rate suggested by the fact that Aristotle used him in his Politeia of the Samians, regarding both the Thracian origins of Aesop (FGrHist 535 F4) and certain prehistoric creatures that once roamed the island (FGrHist 535 F1).

It was likely near the beginning of his history that Euagon spoke about these Νῆμα, who split the earth with their loud cries (F1). In the mid-third century,
Euphorion wrote in his *Hypomnemata* that the Samians still to his day would show the bones of these great beasts; he seems to mean not simply that they pointed to fossils exposed in natural fault lines, but that they exhibited them, perhaps even at the Heraion (F193 Lightfoot). In fact, we know that the huge femur of a prehistoric animal—likely a mastodon—was dedicated at the Heraion. Plutarch refers to these bones in his *Greek Questions* (56 303DE), although he claims that they were the remains of elephants that Dionysus brought over when he came to the island to challenge the Amazons. But Plutarch alludes to the tradition that a part of the island (he calls it Phloion) was cleft by thes animals’ piercing cries. What else Euagon said about the Neia we cannot know. Jacoby plausibly suggested that Dionysios of Halicarnassus had this passage in mind when he describes, a few paragraphs after naming Euagon in his essay on Thucydides, that pre-Thucydidean historians inserted μυθῶδες into their narratives, such as “Lamiai issuing forth from the woods and glens and amphibian Naides coming out from Tartarus, swimming through the seas, half-beast and mixing with mortals...” (6.2; cf. 5.2).

It is important to note that Euagon’s history was not restricted to the island of Samos. At the beginning of the second century BCE, the Samians tried to gain (or regain) possession of a district on the mainland, namely the fort Karion and the region (Dryoussa) around it, which was at that time occupied by Priene. They appealed to the Rhodians, whose influence in the region had increased after the fall of Antiokhos, claiming that it had been allotted to Samos just after the Meliac War, when Samos and

---

120 Cited in Aelian, *N.A.* 17.28: Εὐφορίων δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἡπομνήμασι λέγει τὴν Σάμον ἐν τοῖς παλαιότατοι χρόνοις ἐρήμην γενέσθαι: φανήγα γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ θηρία μεγέθει μὲν μέγιστα, ἀγρία δὲ, καὶ προσπελάτασι τῷ δεινᾷ, καλείθαι γε μὴν νηάδας. ἄπερ οὖν καὶ μόνη τῇ βοᾷ ἤργυναι τὴν γῆν. παροιμίαν οὖν ἐν τῇ Σάμῳ διαρρέουσα τὴν λέγουσαν μείζον βοᾷ τῶν νηάδων. ὡστά δὲ ἐτι καὶ νῦν αὐτῶν δεύνυσθαι μεγάλα ὁ αὐτὸς φησί. “Euphorion in the *Hypomnemata* says that Samos in olden times was desolate; for on it appeared beasts great in size and wild and dangerous to anyone who met them; they were called *Neades*. And these beasts with only their shout broke the earth. There is a proverb popular in Samos that says, ‘He shouts louder than the *Neades*.’ And still to this day their bones are shown, and they are huge.”

121 See H. Kyrieleis 1988, who mentions that hippopotamus teeth were also dedicated and displayed at the Heraion. *Cf.* A. Mayor 2000, 182-183.
Priene, among others, took control of Melia, and again after the Battle of the Oak, when Samos and Priene each essayed to augment its lot. The Rhodians ended up deciding in favor of Priene; it is no wonder that the arbitration was recorded and inscribed there (IPriene 37).\textsuperscript{122} From the inscription, we are able to get a good sense of the Samian position. It seems that they had submitted to the Rhodian arbiters as their primary evidence a passage in the Histories attributed to the Milesian Maiandrios that allegedly supported their two contentions: first that Samos had obtained Karion and Dryoussa after Melia

The arbitration was recorded and inscribed there (IPriene 37).\textsuperscript{122} From the inscription, we are able to get a good sense of the Samian position. It seems that they had submitted to the Rhodian arbiters as their primary evidence a passage in the Histories attributed to the Milesian Maiandrios that allegedly supported their two contentions: first that Samos had obtained Karion and Dryoussa after Melia
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  \item The arbitration was recorded and inscribed there (IPriene 37).\textsuperscript{122}
  \item From the inscription, we are able to get a good sense of the Samian position. It seems that they had submitted to the Rhodian arbiters as their primary evidence a passage in the Histories attributed to the Milesian Maiandrios that allegedly supported their two contentions: first that Samos had obtained Karion and Dryoussa after Melia
  \item The arbitration was recorded and inscribed there (IPriene 37).\textsuperscript{122}
  \item From the inscription, we are able to get a good sense of the Samian position. It seems that they had submitted to the Rhodian arbiters as their primary evidence a passage in the Histories attributed to the Milesian Maiandrios that allegedly supported their two contentions: first that Samos had obtained Karion and Dryoussa after Melia
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{122} I am following here the text of A. Magnetto 2008, 75-77. For a good discussion of the inscription and its implications, see O. Curty 1989.

\textsuperscript{123} καὶ παρα[ειποντο] ἑστοιογοράφους τοὺς μαρτυρομένοις αὐτοῖς, ὅτι μὲν τὸ Κάριον ἔλαξεν μετὰ τῶν Μελίακων πόλεμον Μαιανδρίου, ὅτι δὲ <ἐδώ> ῥωίζαντο ποτὶ τοὺς / Πριανεῖς ὡς ῥαδάτων ὑορία, Ἐμάγωνα τε καὶ Ὄλυμπχον κ[αὶ] Δόυρων.

\textsuperscript{124} For Phygela, see G. Ragone 1996, 378-379. The Rhodian decision runs as follows: ἀρέστι θεωροῦντες τοὺς γράφαντας τὸν [πόλεμον τὸν] Μελίακων καὶ τὰν διαίρεσιν τὰς χώρας, τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους φεμένους ἐκ τὰς διαφέρουσας ἐλλογογοράφας Σαμίους Ἐμάγων, καὶ τετεσσάρας μὲν Σάμιους, Ὅμιλόντες καὶ Ὄλυμπχον καὶ Δόουρον καὶ Ἐμάγωνα, δυὸ δὲ Θεοφύλλου, Κρεώφυλλον καὶ Ἐμάλλης, Ἰόν δὲ Θέσσαλον, οὗ δὲ πάντας ἐν τὰς ἱστορίας εὐφράσομεν κατακεχομένους διὸ ἔλαξεν Ἐμάγων Ἐμάγων, μόνον δὲ ἐν τὰς ἱστορίας εὐφράσομεν Μαιανδρίου τοῦ Σάμιου ἱστορίας κατακεχομένους διὸ ἔλαξεν Σάμιοι Κάριον καὶ Δρυούσσαν.

For Phygela, see G. Ragone 1996, 378-379. The Rhodian decision runs as follows: ἀρέστι θεωροῦντες τοὺς γράφαντας τὸν [πόλεμον τὸν] Μελίακων καὶ τὰν διαίρεσιν τὰς χώρας, τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους φεμένους ἐκ τὰς διαφέρουσας ἐλλογογοράφας Σαμίους Ἐμάγων, καὶ τετεσσάρας μὲν Σάμιους, Ὅμιλόντες καὶ Ὄλυμπχον καὶ Δόουρον καὶ Ἐμάγωνα, δυὸ δὲ Θεοφύλλου, Κρεώφυλλον καὶ Ἐμάλλης, Ἰόν δὲ Θέσσαλον, οὗ δὲ πάντας ἐν τὰς ἱστορίας εὐφράσομεν κατακεχομένους διὸ ἔλαξεν Ἐμάγων Ἐμάγων, μόνον δὲ ἐν τὰς ἱστορίας εὐφράσομεν Μαιανδρίου τοῦ Σάμιου ἱστορίας κατακεχομένους διὸ ἔλαξεν Σάμιοι Κάριον καὶ Δρυούσσαν.
It is hard to imagine that the Samians would have submitted testimony to the Rhodian arbitrators that contradicted their contentions; we must then conclude that Euagon, Olympikhos, and Douris wrote about the earlier division of lands in such a way as to specify the allotment of Phygela to Samos without saying anything definitive about Karion and Dryoussa.\textsuperscript{125} The upshot in any case is that Euagon, and indeed several of his successors too, not only wrote about Samian activity on the mainland but also asserted that part of the mainland was Samian territory. In this regard, it is worth noting that Euagon also had recourse to discuss Homer’s father, whom he called Meles (F2); the connection with Melia is hard to ignore.\textsuperscript{126} The poet Asios, we know, also wrote about Meles’s wedding,\textsuperscript{127} so it is likely that Homer’s early life, firmly tied to the mainland though it was, was embraced by Samian cultural memory and thus by Samian local historiography. John Barron has suggested that Euagon incorporated the mainland in yet another way. For he has identified a fifth fragment of Euagon behind a reference in the anonymous \textit{Life of Sophokles} (35) to the Samian War in 441 as ὁ πρὸς Ἀναίους πόλεμος, a phrase that preserves a perspective at once contemporary (belonging to a period before the return of the Samian oligarchs from Anaia ca. 427 BCE) and pro-Athenian (since a distinction is made between the Samians and the rebels at Anaia).\textsuperscript{128} The argument is admittedly tentative, but it is an intriguing thought that the civil war

\textsuperscript{125} The other historians, like Ouliades and the Ephesians, may have been less ambiguous, which is why the Samians did not submit them initially to the Rhodians.

\textsuperscript{126} Jacoby \textit{ΠΠΒ Text}, 457-8.

\textsuperscript{127} At Athen. 3.99 125D.

\textsuperscript{128} 1961, Appendix F, 495-497. Additional fragments of Euagon have been variously identified: (1) Jacoby, as we have said, suggested (1949, 361 n. 56 and 262 n.58) that Thucydides relied on Euagon for his information about the Corinthian shipwright Ameinokles (1.13.3). Even if Thucydides’ reference to Ameinokles did come from a Samian source, it is circular reasoning to assume it must have been Euagon. There is moreover nothing that suggests Thucydides was relying on a Samian source, let alone a source that preserved a date of any kind. (2) In his Ἱστορικά Παράδοξα (120) Antigonos mentions ὁ τοῦ Σαμιακοῦ Σσιών Σσεγεγερεφώς (\textit{FGHist} 544 F1). Since Antigonos’s subject here is the appearance of a white dove, which jibes with a remark in Aristotle’s \textit{Politeia}, it may also be a reference to Euagon. (3) Finally, V. La Bua (1975) has posited that Euagon lurks behind the so-called Samian \textit{logoi} in Herodotus; Herodotus, he argues, actually wrote a self-contained Samian local history in reaction to Euagon’s account of Polycrates that he would later work into the \textit{Historiai}. 199
might have prompted Euagon’s project. Community autobiography, as we have seen, is often motivated by such schizophrenia, with local histories often appearing in periods of crisis, such as stasis, that bifurcate a community’s cohesion. Through his project, then, Euagon perhaps sought to authenticate his version of Samos and its past, legitimizing the position of the democrats and disenfranchising that of the exiles.

Aethlios is another local historian whose activity belongs to the fifth or early-fourth century. An early date is suggested by his evident use of the Ionic dialect—the *Etymologicum Magnum* (= F2) cites him verbatim for the form νένωνται (from ἄλλα λέξασθαι νένωντα)129—although such a criterion is not free from problems. For, while Ionic was indeed used by fifth-century historians, including local historians, like Antiokhos in his Περὶ Ἰταλίας (*FGrHist* 555 F2), and seldom thereafter—note the verbatim quotations from the history of Antiokhos’s successor, Philistos (*FGrHist* 556 F6)—it was sometimes employed much later by archaizing historians. Arrian wrote in Ionic, as did his contemporary, Kephalion (*FGrHist* 93 TT1-2),130 and some local historians may have followed suit.131 More to the point, Ionic was probably used longer in Ionia than on the mainland. Dialect should not then be the sole criterion by which to date a historian.132 Nor, as we have said, does the title given to Aethlios’s work, Ὄροι, in itself indicate an early date. Nevertheless, we know that Aethlios wrote before Callimachus, since the poet discusses the cult statue of Hera, specifically its

---

129 One reference to anonymous Ὄροι (*FGrHist* 544 F2) also retains Ionic forms and so may stem from Aethlios: F1 (from Herodian) = ἄλλα λα καὶ ἠ νέα νή έιριμένων ἐν Σαμίων Ὄροις· τῇ δὲ νή τῶν Πυθογειτονίων τις τὸν φυρτὸν ἔλαμβανε. Jacoby contended that *FGrHist* 544 F3 (also from Herodian) also showed evidence of the Ionic dialect, but this is less secure; see A. D’Hautcourt *Comm. BNU* 545 F3.

130 In both cases, Herodotus may have been the model, all the more likely in the case of Kephalion since his history was nine books in length (for such archaism under Hadrian, see A. Dihle 1994, 243).

131 e.g. the Ἀττωνικά of Nikandros of Kolonoph (*FGrHist* 271-272 FF2, 5), the Ναχιακά of Philteas (*FGrHist* 498 F2), and the Περὶ Κυζίκου of Agathokles (*FGrHist* FF1a and 4).

132 As it is in the case of e.g. Armenidas in his Θηβαῖακά (*FGrHist* 378 F6). Jacoby is admittedly not very consistent in his application of the criterion; regarding Agathokles, for example, he concludes, “Dass er ionisch geschrieben hat mag eine marotte des gelehrten mannes gewesen sein, wie bei Neanthes der Titel Ὄροι. Doch mag man auch sowohl an den gelegentlichen gebrauch des dialektes bei anderen lokalhistorikern wie an Kallimachos ionische Dialetstudien denken” (*FGrHist* IIIB, Text 372).
transformation from a wooden plank to a carved image (Ait. F100 Pf.), in terms that suggest a familiarity with Aethlios’s text (FGrHist 536 F3). It is true that Aethlios is mentioned neither by IPriene 37 nor by Dionysios of Halicarnassus in his list of ἄρχοιοι συγγραφεῖς. But neither omission in itself argues against an early date. In the first case, Aethlios may not have dealt, or dealt sufficiently, with Karion or Phygela; after all, we know that Aristotle treated the issue in his Politeia, but this work was not apparently read by the Rhodians judges. Dionysios’s lack of awareness of Aethlios, on the other hand, may be an indication of the historian’s relative obscurity by the Augustan period; indeed Athenaeus follows his first citation of Aethlios with a note of hesitation (F1b)—Ἀέθλιος δ᾽ ἐν Ἑων Σαμίων, εἰ γνήσια τὰ συγγράμματα—and he cites him later with the equivocal expression, ἵστορεῖν δοκεῖ Ἀέθλιος ὁ Ὁμιος, both of which suggests that he did not have direct access to the work.

Aethlios’s book is three times referred to as Ὁροι, and here the annalistic implications of the title may be justified. For Athenaeus quotes him once (14.68 653f = FGrHist 536 F1) as support for Aristophanes’ claim that certain autumn fruits were continuously available at Athens: “And so how is it strange,” asks Athenaeus, “that the Samian Aethlios seems to record in the fifth book of the Horoi of the Samians that ‘twice in the year appeared fig and grape and homomelides and apples and roses?’” Although

133 Here, Clemens cites Aethlios regarding the cult statue of Hera at the Samian Heraion: πρότερον μὲν ἦν σανις, ὀστεον δὲ ἐπὶ Προικλέους ἄρχοντος ἀνδριαντοειδες ἐγένετο. Callimachus, as Jacoby noticed, touched on this transformation in his Aitia (F100 Pf.). The Diegesis, meanwhile, reads: [.....τὸ ξόσον τῆς Ἡρας [ἀνδριαντοειδες] ἐγένετο ἐπὶ βασιλέως Προικλέους τὸ] δὲ ξὺλοιν ἐξ οὐ εἰργάσθη, (....) ἐξ Ἀρχοὺς δὲ φασι [.....] ἐτι πάλαι σανιδώδες [χομμισθῆναι κάταργον, ἀτε μηδέπο προκεκοφυίας τῆς ἁγαλματικῆς.
134 V. La Bua, however, sees Aethlios’s absence from Dionysios of Halicarnassus’s list as evidence for his late (indeed post-Duridean) date (1975, 21-24).
135 Jacoby wondered (ad loc.) whether Aethlios’s original work had been anonymously augmented at a later period (like the Lydiaka of Xanthos) and whether it was this pseudography on which Athenaeus is picking up. On Athenaeus’s occasional questioning of authenticity, see C. Jacob 2000, 99.
136 By Athenaeus (14.68 653 = F1a, 14.63 650D = F1b) and by the Etymologicum Magnum 601.20 (= F2).
137 Athenaeus actually had earlier referred to this same citation when, in his discussion of pears, he says that Aethlios calls ἁμαμηλίδες ὀμομηλίδες (14.64 650D = FGrHist 536 F1b.)
the main verb has sometimes been emended to an imperfect, the aorist should be retained (ἐγένετο). The quotation comes from the fifth book, after all, an unlikely place to insert a general description of the island’s agriculture. The context was thus more likely a specific event (a year in which certain plants bore fruit twice) that occurred outside the foundation period, perhaps even in Aethlios’s own lifetime. That Aethlios translated a harvest notice into his history says nothing about the antiquity of the chronicle tradition at Samos; again, the event belongs to his fifth book, which probably dealt with the late-fifth or early-fourth century. Nor, for that matter, does it in itself suggest that the polis of Samos or the sanctuary of Hera kept such yearly agricultural records. For the notation of the omen may be attributed to Aethlios himself, in the same way that Philokhoros recorded in his Atthis a portent about which he was himself consulted at the end of the fourth century BCE (FGrHist 328 F67). We have no evidence, furthermore, that Aethlios marked the passing of each year by way of a local eponymous magistrate. In Clemens’ discussion of the cult statue of Hera (F3), it is true, we read that Aethlios dated the transformation of the plank to a carved image to “the archonship of Prokles” (ἐπὶ Προκλέους ἀρχοντος). But Clemens does not quote this anecdote verbatim, and Prokles is almost certainly not an eponymous magistrate—the archontes were magistrates at Samos only during the Athenian cleruchy—rather but the Epidaurian descendent of the

---

138 Kaibel’s emendation of the verb from the aorist to the imperfect (ἐγένετο to ἐγίνετο) has been generally supported: by e.g. G. Shipley 1987, 18; V.D. Hansen, who uses Aethlios as evidence that “the Samians had developed a wide variety of cultivars that allowed them twice-yearly crops . . . spreading the harvest season throughout the year” (1999 453, n. 42); and by R. Fowler (2000). Jacoby was right to emphasize the aorist, however. For one thing, the imperfect far better fits the context in Athenaeus, and it would thus be difficult to explain how an original imperfect could have become an aorist. The fragment is cited (in a slightly different form) also by Eustathius (Od. η 120): Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἐν Εἰδήνῃ (sic) σεμνύνων καὶ αὐτός τὰς Λαχνάς, μαρτυρεῖ, ὡς δινειχεῖ ἐκεῖ αἰς ὅπωραι. Αέθλιος δὲ ὁ Σᾶμιος ἔφη ὡς ἐν Σάμῳ σύναυν σταφυλιᾷ ὀμομυλῆς ἢ ἀμαμμῆς καὶ μῆλα καὶ ὄφα, δίς τοῦ ἑναιμονοῦ ἐγένετο ποτε.

139 Cato’s famous reaction to his annalistic predecessors is apposite: “Non lubet scribere, quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est, quotiens annona cara, quotiens lunae aut solis lumine caligo aut quid obstiterit” (Orig. F77 HRR = A. Gell. N.A. 2.28.6). See also Cicero, de Orat. 2.52-54. Aethlios’s remark, we may note, recalls a reference made by Ps.-Antigonos of Karystos to the appearance of a white swallow (here too the aorist is employed: φανεῖ) before a group of Samians, an event recorded by ὁ τοῦ Σαμιακοῦ Ὀρους συγγεγραφός (FGrHist 544 F1).
leader of the Ionian migration, Ion (Paus. 7.4.2). In fact, when Callimachus refers to the statue in his *Aitia* (4.23), almost certainly drawing on Aethlios, he calls Prokles a *basileus*.

Another local history that belongs to the Classical era is the Σαμίων Πολιτεία, part of a corpus of 158 such *politeiai* that Aristotle either composed or whose composition he oversaw in the third quarter of the fourth century. None of these histories, save of course a good portion of the *Politeia of the Athenians*, are today extant, and already by the second century BCE they were being epitomized, in particular by the Alexandrian scholar and statesman Herakleides Lembos. But the *Politeiai* seem to have survived at least long enough for Plutarch to read them, and in the fourth century CE, Sopatros of Apamea was able to write epitomes of at least five, those of the Thessalians, Achaeans, Parians, Lycians, and Chians (Phot. *Bibl.* 161). We are lucky to have Herakleides’ epitomes, although he chose to focus only on a selection of 44 localities, sometimes quite briefly indeed. Nevertheless in conjunction with the fragments, his epitomes allow us to conclude that Aristotle’s approach to *politeiai*

141 Aristotle mentions these *Politeiai* himself at the end of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (10 1180B20-1181B24). The corpus is described in several later sources (*e.g.* Diog. Laert. 5.27).
142 Regarding the authorship of the 158 *Politeia*, see *e.g.* A.I. Dovatur 1965, 214; P.J. Rhodes 1981, 50-51; and J.J. Keaney, 1992, 5-17. See also D.L. Toye 1999 and M. Hose 2002. I see no reason to exclude the Samian Politeia, or indeed any of the other *Politeiai* that I will be discussing here, from the corpus of 158 attributed to Aristotle. Whether these texts were actually written by Aristotle’s pen is, as far as I’m concerned, immaterial. In the first place, I am not interested in establishing the veracity of any information contained by these *Politeiai* (*i.e.* on the grounds that Aristotle’s composition would by nature be more trustworthy than that of one of his students). More to the point, these texts undoubtedly belong to the late-fourth century and seem to a great extent to be compilatory, based not on original research but on previously published local texts.
143 For the date of Aristotle’s death, see Apoll. *FGrHist* 244 F38 = Dion. Hal. *ad Amm.* 3-5 and Diogenes Laertius 5.9-10. For the date of composition of the *Athenaion Politeia* in particular, see J.J. Keaney 1970 and P. Rhodes 1981, 51-58.
144 See H. Bloch 1940; M.R. Dilts 1970; and P. Rhodes 1981, 65. Herakleides is not always the most conscientious of excerptors, it must be said, and he sometimes omits to report (as we can see in the case of Athens) what we would consider to be important details. But the anecdotes that he does retain are not fabricated, and they thus help to illuminate the contents of Aristotle’s *Politeiai*.
145 *Mor.* 1093c.
markedly differed from that of Kritias or Xenophon. While in the case of Athens he provided a thorough synchronic description of the Athenian organs of government in his day, and while in the case of Sparta he provided detailed information about the Spartan educative and military system, he devoted a good deal of each Politeia to the respective community’s past. And while, like Hellanikos and Kritias, he wrote extrinsically, not deliberately aiming his Politeiai at the focal community itself, he nevertheless relied wherever possible on local sources and traditions. This is clear when we are in a position to compare his various Politeiai to one another and to set each against what we know about a particular locality’s cultural memory and local historiography. Just as Aristotle’s Athenian history resembles Atthidography and his history of Thessaly echoes many of the themes of Thessalian historiography, so too does his ideation of Samian history jibe with that of native Samians. Aristotle composed his Politeia of the Samians during the years of the Athenian cleruchy (he died the year that the Samian returned to the island). It survives in several fragments, and we are lucky to have in the case of Samos one of Herakleides’ fullest epitomes (No. 10, Dlts 30-35):

It is said that in the beginning Samos, being desolate (ἐρήμη), contained a multitude of beasts with very loud voices. The beasts were called Neides, the island Parthenia—later it was called Dryousa. Ankaioi ruled them; and it was about him that the servant planting the vines said, “There’s many a slip ‘twixt the cup and the lip.” (Aristotle says) that among the Samians there appeared a white swallow no smaller than a partridge. Pherekydes of Syros died in Samos after having been devoured by lice; when Pythagoras came in, he showed him through a hole his finger stripped of flesh. At that time Aesop the storyteller was popular. He was Thracian by birth, and he was freed by Idmon the wise, but he was at first the slave of Xanthos. The politeia of the Samians was made desolate (ἡρήμωσεν) by Syloson, from which derives the proverb, “On account of Syloson, (there is) open space.” And Theogenes, a certain Samian well born but otherwise dissolute and wicked, fled his fatherland and spent time at Athens at Euripides’. After corrupting his wife, he took him as an accomplice and persuaded the Athenians to send two thousand (Athenians) to Samos. When these men arrived, they exiled everyone.147

146 FF588-P595 Gigon, representing 19 separate fragments.
147 (30) <Σάμων> τὸ μὲν εὖ ἄρχης ἐρήμην οὕσιν λέγεται κατέχειν πλήθος θηρίων μεγάλην φωνήν ἀφιέντων. ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ τὰ θηρία νῆδες, ἢ δὲ νῆς Παρθενία, Όστερον Δρύουσα. ἐβασίλευσε δ'
The *Epitome* shows that Aristotle tracked Samian history from the pre-Greek (indeed pre-human) beginnings to the Athenian cleruchy, if this is the context of the strange anecdote about Theogenes. Other references to the *Politeia* outside of the *Epitome* support its wide breadth: we know, for example, that Aristotle wrote both about the archaic conflict between Samos, Miletos, and Priene (FF593.1-2 Gigon) and about Pericles’ invasion in 441 BCE (FF594-595 Gigon). His reliance on Samian sources, moreover, becomes clear when we compare the *Epitome* with Euagon’s account of the *Neides* and the Thracian origin of Aesop, and it is supported by Aristotle’s evident disregard of the testimony of Herodotus, both about Aesop and about the reasons behind the Samian depopulation at the beginning of the fifth century. Nor, for that matter, was Aristotle satisfied solely with Thucydides’ account of Pericles’ siege (1.115-117). As we shall see from Plutarch, he used a narrative about the Samian War that emphasized the role of the Eleatic philosopher Melissos (*Per*. 26.3 = F594 Gigon).

If Aristotle did indeed have access to historians like Euagon and gave them pride of place, we can expect that the themes thrown into relief by Herakleides’ *Epitome* reflect the interests of indigenous sources. One such theme is the contribution of animals to the island’s history—the noisy, prehistoric beasts, whom we have already encountered in

---

148 It is not certain that Aristotle treated this event in his *Politeia*, but the inference is likely (M. Hose 2002, 230).
149 In Herodotus, Aesop is a slave (along with Rhodopis) of Iadmon, and Xanthes is the name of the Samian who later brings Rhodopis to Egypt (2.134-135).
150 Herodotus attributes the depopulation to the Persians, not to Syloson (3.149).
Euagon; the white swallow; the killer lice; and an outside citation\textsuperscript{151} refers to Samian love of sheep—a significance that is indirectly reinforced by the narratives associated with the Samian Aesop. Another theme emphasized by Aristotle in his Politeia is the role of philosophers in the history of Samos; he mentions Pherekydes, Pythagoras, Aesop, Idmon, and Melissos. This is not merely an indication of Aristotle’s personal interests; for Pherekydes, Pythagoras, and Pythagoras’s son will play a role also in Douris’s local history (FGrHist 76 FF22-23). A third theme, to which we shall return in the conclusion, is the dialectic on the island between desertion and repopulation.

Many of the anecdotes in Herakleides’ epitome can be supported by outside references to Aristotle’s Politeia of the Samians. Regarding the name of the island, for example, we have evidence in Pliny (NH 5.135 = 588.1 Gigon) that Aristotle recorded at least four separate appellations: Parthenia came first, followed by Dryousa, Anthemousa, and finally Samos. Other sources allude to this metonomasia but without direct reference to Aristotle; on occasion, we even hear of a fifth name: Melamphyllos.\textsuperscript{152} Aristotle is nowhere associated with any etymologies of these names, but in the case of three (Dryousa, Anthemousa, and Melamphyllos) we need little explanation: alongside Samian fauna there was evidently an emphasis on Samian flora as well. The name Parthenia, on the other hand, emphasizes the connection between the island and the goddess Hera.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{151} According to Aelian, Aristotle also somewhere discussed (perhaps in the work on Samos) Samian interest in sheep (F590 Gigon). For other examples of the importance of animals in Samian local historiography, see Menodotos FGrHist 541 F2 on peacocks and Alexis FGrHist 539 F2 on the exotic animals imported to Samos by Polycrates.

\textsuperscript{152} Both Callimachus (Hymn. 4. 48-49) and Apollonios (1.185-197) call Samos Parthenia. Stephanos of Byzantium preserves these five names (s.v. Samos = 588.1 Gigon). Strabo lists Parthenia, Anthemous, and Melamphyllos, without Dryousa (14.1.15)—elsewhere, however, he gives a different order (10.2.17), and a scholion to Apollonios Rhodos (2.865-872 = 588.4 Gigon) lists Melanthemos, Parthenia, and Anthemousa. Hesychios, meanwhile, preserves alongside Dryousa (s.v. Dryousa), another version of the name in a separate entry: Dorussa (s.v. Doroussa).

\textsuperscript{153} The goddess was known as Parthenia on Samos (see A.B. Cook 3.2, 1027 n.1). The river itself was thought to have been named after her, since it was here that she was raised (schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.187). Pausanias (7.4.4) affirms that the Samians assigned Hera’s birth to the future precinct of the Heraion, along
Outside citations also help us to flesh out Herakleides’ reference to King Ankaios, a figure long granted a role in Samian history—the poet Asios discussed his genealogy—and generally associated with the pre-Ionian phase of the island (cf. Pherekydes FGrHist 3 F155 = Strab. 14.1.2 632). These additional fragments allow us to understand in particular how the king’s death became the source of a hackneyed proverb about the vicissitudes of life. Ankaios was apparently fond of farming and a planter of many vines. One day, while he was tending his vines, the king was approached by one of his servants, a Cretan, who prophesied that he would die before he could partake of his vintage. Much later, when he had a glass of the wine before him, he summoned his servant and mocked the prophecy. Yet as he started to take a drink, the servant with a chuckle uttered the phrase, “There’s many a slip ‘twixt the cup and the lip,” at which moment it was announced that a wild boar was ravaging the land. Ankaios put down his the Imbrasos river. Nikander in his Alexipharmaka (149) mentions “Parthenian earth . . ., the earth of the Imbrasos” (see scholia ad loc.: Παρθενια σύν κατά Σάμως, άλλα οίς έν κατά ευφεσία γή). The other fragments are a scholion to Lykophron (1.488, for some reason ignored by Rose and Gigon); a scholion to Apollonios (1.185-188 = F589.1 Gigon); a scholion to Homer (Od 22.9-12 = F589.3 Gigon); and two proverbs retained by Zenobios (5.71 = 589.4 Gigon) and in Miller, Mélanges de littérature Grecque 368 = 589.2 Gigon). See also Aulus Gellius 13.18, who makes no mention to Aristotle nor even to Ankaios. In the Greek Anthology, meanwhile, the proverb is attributed to Palladas 10.32. The son of Poseidon and Asypalaia and ruler of the Leleges, the husband of Samia, and the father of Samos (apud Paus. 7.4.1).

154. The other fragments are a scholion to Lykophron (1.488, for some reason ignored by Rose and Gigon); a scholion to Apollonios (1.185-188 = F589.1 Gigon); a scholion to Homer (Od 22.9-12 = F589.3 Gigon); and two proverbs retained by Zenobios (5.71 = 589.4 Gigon) and in Miller, Mélanges de littérature Grecque 368 = 589.2 Gigon). See also Aulus Gellius 13.18, who makes no mention to Aristotle nor even to Ankaios. In the Greek Anthology, meanwhile, the proverb is attributed to Palladas 10.32.

155. The son of Poseidon and Asypalaia and ruler of the Leleges, the husband of Samia, and the father of Samos (apud Paus. 7.4.1).

156. cf. Call. Hym. 4.50 and Strab. 14.1.15 637. According to Apollonios (1.164), Ankaios was born, like Hera, on the banks of the Imbrasos river (2.866) and was enlisted alongside his Arcadian namesake as an Argonaut (1.188; 2.865; cf. Hygin. Fab. 14). Iamblichus’s account in the beginning of his Life of Pythagoras (2) is befuddled: for him, Ankaios, an ancestor of Pythagoras himself, was born at Same on Kephalenia and was ordered by Delphi to lead a hodgepodge group of Greeks to colonize an island. The island he named Melamphyllos; the polis Samos. For a very thorough exploration of the king, see C. Thirlwall 1833.

157. We may note that Lykophron assigns the proverb to the Tegean Ankaios, who was also said to have been killed by a boar (in this case, the Calydonian), an attribution for which his scholiast roundly takes Lykophron to task (1.488); for this story, see Pherekydes FGrHist 3 F36 and Paus. 8.45.7.

158. This detail is preserved only by the Homeric scholion (589.3 Gigon).

159. A Latin version of the proverb is found in the Adagia of Erasmus 1.4.1 (“Multa cadunt inter calicem supraque labra”); and a Greek version is attributed by the Greek Anthology to Palladas (10.32). English versions are plentiful. In the form quoted here, it is used as the subtitle of a work by Theodore Hook (1840), but versions of it appear as early as Taverner’s Proverbs (1539) and in Lambarde’s Perambulation of Kent (1576).
cup without taking a sip, went after the beast, and was killed in the course of the hunt.\textsuperscript{160} Again, we note how the wilderness in Aristotelian Samos encroaches upon the civilized world; indeed, in one version of the story, Aristotle claims that Ankaios’ draught was interrupted by the “cry of a wild beast” (589.2 Gigon).\textsuperscript{161}

Other fragments help to illuminate Herakleides’ reference to the white swallow. For, as Aelian tells us, Aristotle discussed the ability of certain Samian white swallows to regain their sight after their eyes were poked out (\textit{NA} 17.20).\textsuperscript{162} Given the verb chosen by Herakleides (ἐφάνη), the swallow in Aristotle’s \textit{Politeia} was clearly attached to a particular event, almost certainly related to an inescrutable story about the appearance of a white swallow that Ps.-Antigonos claims to have taken from an anonymous \textit{Samian Horoi} (\textit{Hist. Mir.} 120).\textsuperscript{163} Whatever the context of his prodigy—it was potentially connected with an early philosophical school—it is likely that Aristotle was again relying here on a Samian source, perhaps Euagon. Euagon is probably also the source, as we have said, for Aristotle’s anecdote about Aesop. Herakleides’ elliptical phrase, “at this time (\textit{viz.} the death of Pherekydes), Aesop was famous (εὐδοξίμετ),” is in fact explained

\textsuperscript{160} Aristotelian versions of the anecdote are retained by the scholia to Lykophron (\textit{Alex.} 489-90), Apollonios (1.185-188 = 589.1 Gigon), and Aristotle (\textit{Od.} 22.9-12 = 589.3 Gigon), as well as by a lexicon of proverbs (Miller, \textit{Mélanges de littérature Grecque}, 368 = 589.2; cf. Zenobios 5.71 = 589.4). None of these fragments, we should note, explicitly derive the proverb from the \textit{Politeia of the Samians}, but for Herakleides’ \textit{Epitome}, we would be tempted to find another locus. The scholiast to Lykophron in fact mentions a discussion of this anecdote in the Aristotelian \textit{Peplos} (\textit{Alex.} 488).

\textsuperscript{161} Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ φησιν Ἀγκαῖον τινα Σαμίων βασιλέα μελλοντα μὲνειν ἀκούσαι χρωγήν περὶ θήμας γενομένην κι ἐξελθντα συμπλακῆναι τῷ συν καὶ ἀποθηκανεὶν.

\textsuperscript{162} Aelian cannot have in mind only Aristotle’s reference in the \textit{Historia Animalium} (6.5 563a13ff), which explains the ability of young swallows to regain their sight, since no mention is made of color or of provenance.

\textsuperscript{163} Jacoby’s text is as follows (\textit{FGrHist} 544 F1): ὁ δὲ τοὺς Σαμιακοὺς Ὠροὺς συγγεγραφῶς ἐπὶ τῶν πρῶτων κληθέντων μαθητῶν τῶν περὶ ἠρώτησας εἰς φησίν χελδόνα λευκήν φανήν. Like G. Shipley (1983, 86-87, 92), A. D’Hautcourt infers that the group to whom the swallow appeared was the μαθητηία mentioned by Anakreon (\textit{PMG} 353), possibly connected to rebellious sailors in the time of Polycrates; in this case, the leader of the revolt would be Herastratos—Shipley implausibly suggests that he is the merchant described by Polykharinos of Naukratis and dated to the 23\textsuperscript{rd} Olympiad (688-685 BCE); cf. \textit{FGrHist} 640 F1 = Athen. 15.18 5675F-676C). The problem with this suggestion, aside from the uncertainty of the textual restoration, is that Aristotle appears to have slotted the swallow’s appearance between Ankaios and Pherekydes, too early for Polycrates. Jacoby’s retention of μαθητῶν, while the specific allusion is out of our reach, would nevertheless support Aristotle’s interest in Samian philosophical schools and tie nicely into the discussion of Pherekydes.
by a scholion to an allusion to Aesop in Aristophanes’ *Birds* (471): according to Aristotle’s *Politeia of the Samians*, the scholiast writes, Aesop become famous by telling a fable (εἰπόντα φησίν αὐτὸν μόθον εὐδοκιμηκέναι). Aristotle dealt elsewhere with Aesop, but aside from a reference to Aesop’s murder at Delphi in the *Politeia of the Delphians* (F494.1-3 Gigon), he preserves only one other biographical anecdote, and it turns out to fit rather nicely with the allusion here to Aesop’s rise. It comes in the *Rhetoric* (2.20 1393a30-94a1 = Aes. 427 Perry), where Aristotle gives as an example of a *logos* the fable that Aesop told before the Samian demos in defense of a certain demagogue. A fox catches fleas from a fall into a river, Aesop allegedly said, and a helpful hedgehog offers to remove them. The fox declines, explaining that the fleas have taken their fill of its blood and their departure would only secure a worse fate: the arrival of fresh, and hungry, fleas. Like the fleas, Aesop concluded, his client has already fed off the Samians; were he killed, another hungrier demagogue would only come to take his place. The *Epitome* links the incident to Pherekydes’s death (32 Dilts): Aristotel epidically situated Aesop at some point not long before Polycrates’ rise. He does not name the rich client in his *Rhetoric*, but both there and in his *Politeia* Aristotle is

---

164 Aristotle worked references to Aesop into several of his works: *Met*. 2.3 356b; *de par. An*. 3.2 663a; *Rhet*. 2.20 1393a-b; *Pol. Delph.*, F494.1-3 Gigon.

165 Both Herodotus (2.134-135) and Plutarch (*De Ser. Num*. 556F-557B) mention the story that one of Idmon’s descendants went to Delphi to collect recompense for Aesop’s murder.


167 Φερεκύδης ο Σύριος ύπο φθειρὸν καταβρωθεὶς ἐν Σάμῳ έτελεύτησεν, ὅτε καὶ ἐλθόντι Πυθαγόρῳ τὸν δάκτυλον διὰ τῆς ὁπίς ἐδέξε περεφυλωμένον. (33) Άϊσαφος δέ ὁ λογοποιός εὐδοκιμεῖ τότε. ἢν δὲ Θραξίζ τὸ γένος, ἤλευθερόθη δὲ ὑπὸ Ἰδμονὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, ἐγένετο δὲ πρῶτον Σάμθου δοῦλος. Diogenes Laertius dates Pherekydes to the time of Peisistratos to the 59th Olympiad (1.120) and the *Souda* to the 45th Olympiad (600-597 BCE).

168 Diogenes Laertius places Pythagoras’s *floruit* at the time of Polycrates (see J. Sarkady, 10-11). Note that Herodotus links Aesop, via Rhodopis, to Sappho (2.135).

169 O. Gigon suggests by his numbering of the fragments (the Aristophanic scholion on Aesop is 591.1, Zenobios on Syloson is 591.2, and Strabo on Syloson is 591.3) that the demagogue whom Aesop defended was Syloson, the brother of Polycrates the tyrant, but neither does the context fit—it is hard to imagine in what circumstances Syloson would be considered a demagogue tried by the Samian demos for extortion or the like—nor is this supported by the arrangement of the *Epitome*. 
clearly casting Aesop as an orator, presumably a successful one, and retrojecting the political atmosphere of fifth- and fourth-century Samos into the archaic period.

Like Euagon, Douris, Olympikhos, and Ouliades, Aristotle referred in his *Politeia* to the territorial disputes between Samos, Miletos, and Priene, although he is not mentioned by *IPriene* 37. According to the paroimiographer Zenobios, Aristotle wrote that many Prienians were killed in a battle against Miletos at a place called “the Oak” (Drys) and that in remembrance of this battle the women of Priene swore an oath to “The darkness (σκότος) around Drys.” Plutarch discusses this oath in his *Greek Questions* (20); he does not explicitly mention Aristotle, but he, or his source at any rate (Euagon again?), lies in the background.\(^{170}\) Plutarch dates the massacre seven years after a certain battle between the Samians and Prienians in which a thousand Samians were killed, and he says that after the Battle of the Oak, “Bias the wise became famous after going on an embassy to Samos from Priene.” In the early-third century, the Samians inscribed a letter that King Lysimakhos had written (ca. 283/2 BCE), in which he outlined his reasons for deciding in Samos’s favor regarding the ongoing territorial dispute with Priene (*IG* 12.6.1.155).\(^{171}\) This text attests both to a “six-year truce” (lines 11-13), presumably the years between the two battles mentioned by Plutarch, and also to the involvement of Bias: “after the Samians retook the land,” Lysimakhos writes (lines 21-24), “the Prienians sent Bias with full authority to settle with the Samians; his reconciliation led to the emigration of the (Samian) settlers (from Batinetis).” Herodotus dates Bias to the mid-sixth century BCE (1.27.2-5; 1.170 cf. Diog. Laert. 1.82-88), and Plutarch thinks of him as a contemporary of Amasis (*Conv. Sept.* 146E), so it is likely that Aristotle located the Battle of the Oak at some point in Polycrates’ reign.

---

\(^{170}\) On the connection between Plutarch’s *Greek Questions* and Aristotle’s *Politeiai*, see K. Giesen 1901.

\(^{171}\) = *IPriene* 500 = Ager No. 26 = Welles 7. The date comes from a reference to Lysimakhos’s activity in *IPriene* 37.
The Epitome jumps from Aesop to Polycrates’ brother Sylos.172 whose rule precipitated the adage, “Thanks to Sylos, there is open space” (ἐξητὶ Συλοοώντος εύφυσαοφύτη). The proverb was apparently well known: it is retained by Strabo, who explains that Sylos ruled so harshly that the polis was depopulated (14.1.17), and Zenobios includes it in his collection with a similar explanation (3.90 = 591.2 Gigon).173 In fact, as we shall see, it was known also to Herodotus (3.149).174 Aristotle treated the aftermath of the tyranny, too, since he explained a line in Aristophanes’ Babylonians about “the many lettered (πολυγράμματος) dems of the Samians” (CAF F64) as a reference to the fact that after the fall of the tyranny, in an effort to repopulate the island, the Samians offered their slaves isopoliteia at the cost of five staters (Phot. Lex., ad loc. = 592 Gigon).175 From Plutarch, we know of one further event included in Aristotle’s Politeia of the Samians, Pericles’ siege of the island, specifically his loss to the Samian philosopher Melissos in a naval battle (Per. 26 = 594 Gigon).176

We shall have the opportunity to return to this interesting text in the conclusion. It is enough here to reiterate that Aristotle’s history, although extrinsic, nevertheless drew on local sources. His decision to write on Samos cannot be connected to any internal movement within the Samian community, in the way, say, that Euagon’s history may have been provoked by tensions resulting from the stasis following the Athenian

172 Aristotle probably dealt with Polycrates in the Politeia, since he crops up in the Politics (5.11 1313b24), but we have no evidence one way or the other.
173 ὡστε καὶ ἐλευτάνθησαν ἡ πόλις καὶ κατείθην ἐκπεσέων συνέβη τὴν παρομίαν κτλ. Gigon treats Strabo’s remark as a fragment of Aristotle’s Politeia (F591.3 Gigon).
174 Although he does not explicitly cite Aristotle.
175 Herodotus offers a different explanation: τὴν δὲ Σάμων [σαγηνεύσαντες] οἱ Πέρσαι παρέδοσαν Συλοσώντι ἐρμοῖ οὖσαν ἄνδρον.
176 As Photios makes clear here, there were other ways to explain the expression.
177 Plutarch cites Aristotle four times in his Pericles, in fact, at no time naming a work. In two places (9.2 and 10.7), the source is certainly the Athenaioun Politeia (27.4 and 25.4)—Plutarch’s numerous citations of the Ath.Pol. in his Solon show that he was well acquainted with the work (see P. Stadler 1989, lxxiv)—but in the two other citations, both regarding Pericles’ activity outside of the polis of Athens, the source is certainly not the Ath.Pol. Plutarch seems to have taken Aristotle’s reference to Pericles’s siege from a historiographical work, since he cites Aristotle alongside Douris, Thucyrides, and Ephoros (Plut. Per. 28 = 595 Gigon), and the Politeia of the Samians is the likeliest source. See J.H. Schreiner 1968, 99.
invasion. But it nevertheless sheds some light on the concerns of Samian local historiography.

B) DOURIS OF SAMOS (FGrHist 76)

Douris of Samos was an author of prolific scope: to him are assigned Περὶ Νόμων,178 Περὶ Τραγῳδίας,179 Περὶ Εὐφρίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους,180 Προβλήματα Ὁμηρικά,181 Περὶ Ζωγραφίας,182 Περὶ Τοιχοποιίας,183 and Περὶ Ἀγώνων.184 He is best known, however, for three histories: Ἱστορίαι or Μακεδονικά, which recorded in at least 23 books Greek events from the year 370/69 BCE (Diod. 15.60.3-6 = T5) at least until the death of Demetrios Poliorcetes in 283 BCE and probably until the Battle of Koroupedion in 281 (F55);185 Τὰ Περὶ Ἀγαθοκλέα in at least four books;186 and the text that concerns us here, Σαμίων Ὄροι.187 It is through these works that Douris was known to Diodoros,188 Dionysios of Halicarnassus,189 Didymos,190 Cicero,191 Strabo,192 Plutarch,193

178 F27 from the Etym. Mag. (460.49).
179 F28 from Athenaeus (14.40 636F).
180 F29 from Athenaeus (4.84 184D).
182 F31 from Diog. Laer. (1.38).
183 T12d with F32 from Pliny (1.34, 34.61).
184 FF33-34, from the Souda and a scholion to Lykopron.
185 The fragment from Pliny (NH 8.143), which describes the self-immolation of Lysimakhos’s dog Hyrkanos after the death of his master, does not preserve a title (is vero (sc. canis) cui nomen Hyrcani reddit Duris accenso regis Lysimachi rogo iniecit se flammæ) The fragments certainly derived from this work (T1, FF1-15) largely are preserved by Athenaeus (FF2-5, 7, 10, 12-15). FF 36-55, which do not give a book title, probably also derive from this work, as perhaps do FF88 and 92. Note that Nymphis’s history of Alexander and the Diadokhoi also seems to have ended at the Battle of Koroupedion.
186 FF16-21 and perhaps also FF56-59. Again, Athenaeus is the source for the majority of the fragment from the book on Agathokles (FF16, 18-19, 57).
187 FF22-26, along with 60-71, 74-77, and possibly 45 and 96.
188 15.60.3-6 = T5; 21.6 = F56a.
189 De comp. verb 4 = T10.
190 Demosth. 12.50 = T7.
191 Ep. Ad Att. 6.1.18 = T6 = F73.
192 1.3.19 = F54.
193 Alk. 32 = T3 = F70; Per. 28.1-3 = T8 = F67; Dem. 19 = F28; Dem. 23.4 = F39; Alex. 15.2 = F40; Alex. 46 = F46; Phok. 4 = F50; Phok. 17 = F51; Eum. 1.1-3 = F53; Ages. 3.1-2 = F69; Lys. 18.5 = F71; Prov. Alex. 1.48 = F84.
Diogenes Laertios, and Athenaeus. But despite his popularity as a historian, we know little about his life. When he is given nationality, he is Samian. According to Plutarch, Douris actually maintained that he was a descendent of the Athenian Alcibiades (Plut. Alk. 32 = T3), who was known to have spent some time (in exile) on the island (411–408 BCE), an intriguing claim given the anti-Athenianism that Douris on occasion espouses (FF65-67, 96). Regarding Douris’s more immediate family, both Athenaeus (8.18 337D = T2) and the Souda (Λ 776) name as his brother the peripatetic polymath Lynkeus, among whose works were comedies (one of which apparently beat Menander at a competition) and various obscure treatises. Lynkeus was apparently at Athens at the end of the fourth century BCE, since Athenaeus several times links him directly to Theophrastus, as his student and once even as ὁ Θεοφράστου γνώριμος (3.58 100e). It is sometimes said that Douris was also a student of Theophrastus, but the evidence for this assertion is problematic. Douris may well have spent some time

194 1.119-120 = F22; 1.38 = F31; 1.22 = F74; 1.74 = F75; 1.82 = F76; 1.89 = F77; 2.19 = F78.
195 4.1. 128A = T1; 8.18 337D = T2; 13.10 560B = F2; 6.55 249C-D = F3; 4.63 167C-D = F4; 10.45 434E-F = F5; 13.85 606C-D = F6; 12.60 542B-E = F10; 4.42 155C-D = F12; 12.50 525E-536A = F14; 12.66 546C-D = F15; 14.9 618B-C = F16; 13.84 605D-E = F18; 15.52 696E = F26; 14.40 636F = F28; 4.84 184 = F29; 6.19 231B-C = F37a; 4.42 155D = 37b.
196 See J. Barron 1962; R.B. Kebric 1977; P. Pédech 1989; A. Dalby 1991; F. Landucci-Gattinoni 1997; and F. Pownall BNJ 76. Under his name, the Souda says only that “Douris is the name of a poet” (Δ 1432), but Douris the historian is quoted in six other entries (Ε 3718, Π 248, Σ 77, 212, and Ω 263).
197 As he is by Athenaeus (TT1-2), Plutarch (TT3 and T8), Diodorus (T5), and Cicero (T6).
198 As G. Shipley points out, such claims were not rare among the Samians (1987, 134 n. 56); see also M. Schede 1919, 43 n.34.
199 The terminology also employed in the Souda (Λ 776).
200 Among those mentioned by Athenaeus are wrote a comedy, Κένταυρος (Athen. 4. 131F), a work on Menander (Athen. 6 424B), many letters, some of which were Ἑπιστολαὶ δευτερηματικαί (Athen. 4.1 128A-B, 75B, 330A, 469B, 496F) others to Diagoras, Poseidippus, Apollodoros; Τέχνη ὑμνημονεύματα (Athen. 228C; 313F); Ἀπομνημονεύματα (Athen. 6.53 248D, 13.46 583F); and Ἀποφθέγματα (Athen. 8.18 337D; cf. 6 245A, 248D). On Lynkeus, see A. Dalby 2000; M.P. Funaioli 2004; and M. Ornaghi 2004.
201 The once popular assumption is based on the following sentence in Athenaeus, Ἰππόλυτος ὁ Μακεδών . . . τοὺς χρόνους μὲν (γέγονε) κατὰ Λυγκέα καὶ Δοῦρον τοὺς Σαμίους Θεοφράστου δὲ τοὺ Ἐφεσίου μαθητὰς . . . This last word, as Jacoby noted and A. Dalby more recently emphasized (1991), is actually A. Korais’s emendation for the manuscript’s μαθητής. If the nominative singular is retained, however, convoluted though the phrase would be, Athenaeus would be naming Hippolokhos, not either or both of the Samians, as Theophrastos’s pupil. Korais’s emendation in fact seems unlikely, since Athenaeus elsewhere mentions Theophrastos’s tutelage of Lynkeus (sometimes in very similar phraseology; see T2)
in Athens, and the titles of some of his non-historical works do suggest that his interests overlapped with those of the Lyceum, but membership in any school, let alone direct descent from Aristotle, should not be considered a linchpin of his biography. Lynkeus’s associations with Theophrastus and Menander and Douris’s knowledge of Lysimakhos’s death do in any case help us to pinpoint a date for his floruit (ca. 320-280 BCE).

The sole additional biographical datum about Douris, and by far the most startling, is preserved by Athenaeus (T2)\(^{203}\) and the *Souda* (A 776):\(^{204}\) he was tyrant of Samos. That Douris played a political role on Samos is supported by an issue of silver hemidrachms (perhaps dated to the last decade of the fourth century) on which he is named, but we know virtually nothing about the character of his tyranny.\(^{205}\) Further information about Douris’s career comes from a passage in Pausanias (6.13.5 = T4) about a statue at Olympia in honor of a certain victor in the boys’ boxing contest. From the epigram inscribed on the statue base, Pausanias concludes that the honorand was a Samian named Kaios son of Douris, that his victory occurred at a time when the Samian *demos* was in exile from the island (surely a reference to the years of the Athenian cleruchy), and that he helped to orchestrate the subsequent repatriation of his countrymen. Because Pausanias proceeds to describe a nearby monument, furthermore, as “next to the tyrant,” we can infer that the statue’s epigram also said something about Kaios’s role at Samos after his return. Kaios must have seized power after 322,

---

\(^{203}\) Λυγκεύς δ’ ὁ Σάμιος, ὁ Θεοφράστου μὲν μαθητής, Δοῦριδος δὲ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ τὰς ἱστορίας γράφαντος καὶ τυραννήσαντος τῆς πατρίδος (8.18 337D).

\(^{204}\) Λυγκεύς, Σάμιος, γραμματικός, Θεοφράστου γνώμονα, ἀδελφὸς Δοῦριδος τοῦ ἱστορογράφου, τοῦ καὶ τυραννήσαντος Σάμου. σύγχρονος δὲ γέγονεν ὁ Λυγκεύς Μενάνδρου τοῦ χωμιστοῦ καὶ ἀντεπεδείξατο καμιῶν καὶ ένδώσα.

dedicating the statue at some point afterwards\textsuperscript{206} in order to boost his prestige before a panlocal audience. If Kaios was competing in the boys boxing event between the years 365 and 322 BCE, we can place his birth at some point between 386 and 339 BCE.\textsuperscript{207} His role in the Samian repatriation in 322 probably favors an earlier date, as does a Samian decree from the last decade of the fourth-century BCE proposed by Lysagoras son of Kaios.\textsuperscript{208} Given the rarity of the name of Kaios’s father, Douris,\textsuperscript{209} it is certainly correct to consider the homonymous historian to be the brother of Lynkeus and Lysagoras and the eldest son and political heir of Kaios.

We know little else about Douris and his family. Robert Kebric has suggested that the name Kaios is a Greek equivalent of Gaius and that the Olympic victor was born of Samian parents who had settled somewhere in Greek west.\textsuperscript{210} This is an especially intriguing suggestion in light of Douris’s particular interest in Agathokles (\textit{FGrHist} 76 FF16-21, 55-59?), but it cannot be proven. Nor do we know how Kaios came to power after the ousting of the Athenians. Such tyrannies, as we have said, need not be explained with recourse to outside intervention, and we have no obligation to adduce Perdikkas (322), the Antigonids,\textsuperscript{211} or Lysimakhos\textsuperscript{212} to explain Kaios’s ascent at Samos. Tyrants were certainly not unknown at the time in the region—a Hieron was tyrant of Priene around the turn of the third century (Paus. 7.2.10; \textit{IPriene} 37, 65ff and 109ff), and Pontic Herakleia offers a roughly contemporary comparandum. And Kaios may well

\textsuperscript{206} Pausanias may be drawing here on a separate source, which F. Landucci-Gattinoni suggests was Heironymos (1997, 24-28). I would find it surprising, however, if Pausanias knew independently from Hieronymus or another historian about Kaios’s tyranny but failed to connect the victor with the historian.

\textsuperscript{207} He would likely have been between the ages of 17 and 20 at the time of competition (see E. N. Gardiner 1930, 41).

\textsuperscript{208} Published by C. Habicht, 1957, no. 23 (see J.P. Barron 1962). For the dating of the decree, see G. Shipley 1987, 179 n.77 and S.V. Tracy 1990, 62.

\textsuperscript{209} The name Douris was given to another Samian, who ca. 200 BCE was a visiting judge in Caria (see J.P. Barron 2003, 260).

\textsuperscript{210} 1977, 4.

\textsuperscript{211} As R. Kebric asserts (1977, 5-6); see R.A. Billows 1990, 335 for a refutation.

\textsuperscript{212} As G. Shipley suggests (1987, 177, 179-181). J.P. Barron (1962) and R. Kebric (1977, 8 with n. 53) date Kaios’s tyranny to 322; Shipley, on the other hand, thinks a later date is more reasonable (1987, 179).
have used his Olympic victory, like Cylon at Athens, as an initial means of generating support. Towards the end of his life, Lysimakhos did decide in favor of Samos against Priene regarding the possession of the Batinetis (IPriene 500), and this may have made him a popular presence on the island;\footnote{See Shipley 1987, 180.} but his death at Koroupedion did not perforce mark the end of Douris’s rule. The nature of the dynasty of Kaios and Douris is simply out of our reach.

We do not know in what order Douris wrote his works. His general history, we have said, seems to have included an allusion to the death of Demetrios Poliorketes (F15), and to the same work probably also belongs his description of the funeral pyre of Lysimakhos (F55), which means he was writing this work late in his career. The local history, on the other hand, could equally have been a product of his old age and of his youth, belonging to the years of his father’s ascendancy,\footnote{See R. Kebric 1977, 79; P. Pédech 1989, 274-288; and F. Landucci-Gattinoni 1997, 206-207 for different opinions as to the order of Douris’s works.} when he sought to establish his legitimacy as his father’s heir. As we shall see in the case of Nymphis at Pontic Herakleia, local historiography allowed a politician both to establish his legitimacy among his countrymen and to authorize his particular version of the past and consequent ideation of the present. A local history thus served just as well as a foundation for a politician’s future career as it would to justify his actions after his retirement.

Douris’s local history was at least two books long.\footnote{While FF22 and 23 are explicitly taken from the second book, F24, a scholion to Euripides’ Hekabe (934) claims to quote from the twelfth book. This was corrected by J.G. Hullemann (ιβ to β) and accepted by Jacoby but questioned by others, like M. Vogt.} In the second book, he mentioned not only Pherekydes (Diog. Laert. 1.119-120 = F22) and Pythagoras’s son Arimnestos (Porph. Vit. Pyth. 3 = F23) but also a skirmish between the Athenians and Aigenetans most likely occurring in the late-sixth or early-fifth century (F24). The history went at least to the end of the Peloponnesian War, since Douris had recourse to
quote the *paian* sung by the Samians in honor of Lysander (F71).\(^{216}\) It is difficult to imagine, however, especially given his own family’s role in Samian affairs in the late-fourth century, that Douris did not continue his history into contemporary times. As we shall see, there are hints that Douris treated the Athenian cleruchy and perhaps even his father’s tenure.

Whenever the local history is named, it is always as Ὄροι (FF22-24, 26),\(^{217}\) which seems to have become by Douris’s day a titular convention without any implication of form. We have no indication in any case of an annalistic framework for Douris, whether by magistrate or otherwise. A lengthy passage cited verbatim in the scholia to Euripides (Hek. 934 = F24) about an altercation between Athens and Aigina is dated loosely (κατὰ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον) and employs a variation of phrase and vocabulary that belies the unadorned style of a chronicle. The turgid approach that earned Douris criticism in his general history (T7-8, F1) he evidently also applied to his local work.

At this time, since the Athenians were being troubled at sea by the Aiginetans, they sent [the number has dropped out] foot soldiers to the island, telling them to do harm to Aigina if they should disembark without being seen. But the Aiginetans attacked them—for some Spartans happened to have sailed to the island in their support—and they killed all of the Athenians whom they encountered except for one man, and this man they sent back to Athens as a messenger. And when he arrived, the he was surrounded by women related to dead men, some asking what had happened to their husbands, some asking about their sons, some about their brothers. And first they blinded the man with the brooches pinned at their shoulders, for they happened to be wearing Doric clothing at that time, and then they killed him. The Athenians considered the incident a great misfortune, and they decided to deprive the women of their brooches, lest they be used as weapons instead of as pins for their clothing.\(^{218}\)

Further evidence of his variegated prose comes from Douris’s ample quotation of Samian verse, epigram, and song. He made use of Asios, for example, in order to shed

---

\(^{216}\) F71 does not explicitly come from the *Horoi*, however, but it is a likely suggestion.

\(^{217}\) J.G. Hulleman 1841, 29-32; Müller FHG II, 480; and V. La Bua 1975, 1-40.

\(^{218}\) A scholiast to Euripides’ *Hekabe* (934) adduces this passage from the second book of Douris’s Ὄροι in order to elucidate the phrase “wearing only a tunic, like a Dorian girl.”
light on ancient Samian attire (F60); and he employed the paian composed in honor of Lysimakhos to explain the Samian reaction to the Spartan occupation at the end of the fifth century. In addition to verse, we have evidence that Douris relied on three other types of source. First, historiography: his account of the battle between Athens and Aigina and its aftermath (F24), for example, is clearly derived from Herodotus, whom Douris explicitly mentioned on at least on one occasion (F64). Second, epigraphy: as evidence for the identity of Pythagoras’s son, Douris adduces an epigram inscribed on a large bronze dedication (Vit. Pyth. 3 = F23). Lastly, Douris relies on a category of local tradition which we have already seen in action in Aristotle’s Politeia and to which we

---

219 It was evidently from one of Asios’s epics that Douris quoted seven lines describing how the Samians were dressed when they went to the Heraion to worship: οὐ δ’ αὐτῶς φοίτησκον ὅπως πλοκάμοις κτενίσαντοι εἰς Ἑρας τέμνονς, πεπυκαμένοι εἴμαι καλοίς/ χρυσέαις χιτώς πέδον χθονός εὑρέως εἴρουν/ χρυσέαια δὲ κορύμβαι ἐπ’ αὐτῶν τέττιτες ὡς/ χαίται δ’ ἄμφοτερον ἄνεμον χρυσέως ἐνὶ δεσμοῖς/ διαδέλλων δὲ χιλιῶν ἄρ’ ἀμφὶ βραχίοσιν ἦσαν/...........τες ὑπαιστίδοιν πολεμιστήν. “And they would go to the temenos of Hera thus with their hair combed, decked with beautiful garments, their snow-white chitons sweeping the broad earth; golden top-knots like cicadas ere on them; and their hair flowed in the wind bound by golden bands, and they wore well-wrought bracelets around both arms. . . . A warrior covered by his shield.”

220 In the 22nd books of Histories, moreover, he quoted at length the Ithyphallic hymn composed by the Athenians in honor of Demetrius (FGrHist 76 F13).

221 At 5.82-88, Herodotus describes the botched Athenian invasion of Aigina following the Aiginetan seizure of Athenian statues. Herodotus reports that the entire Athenian party was slaughtered except for one man, who was sent home to announce the news to his countrymen. The envy that he inspired among the bereft mothers, sisters, and wives of his dead comrades precipitated his murder: the women stabbed him repeatedly with the brooches that held up their chitons. The consequence of the event, according to Herodotus, was that the Athenians abandoned Doric dress and adopted the Ionian, brooch-less tunic (5.82-88; see also Thuc. 1.6.3). Douris’s account is a little different from Herodotus, since the upshot of his tale is apparently that the Athenian men began to grow their hair long and to wear long tunics, while the women cut their hair and wore Doric dress. Hence, Douris concludes, people “still to our day” say that women without tunics are dressing Dorically. Douris appears to recognize the absurdity of his story (πάντων δὲ ἰδιαίτερον συνέβαινεν ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων): why, for example, would the murder of this hapless survivor have led to these particular hairstyle changes; why would the men have adopted long chitons? and why do the women as a consequence of the murder “revel in” their Doric dress, even though that is explicitly how they happened to have been so dressed before. For suggestions, see Jacoby ad loc.; F. Landucci-Gattinoni, 251-253; and T. Figueira 1985.

222 F64 is the Souda’s entry on Panayass. The text is difficult: Παναίας, Πολυάρχου, Ἀλκιμαννοσείς, τερατοσκόπας καὶ ποιητής ἐπὸν: ὡς σβεσθείην τὴν ποιητικὴν ἐπανήγαγε. Δέος δὲ Διοκλέους τε παιδὰ ἀνέγραψε καὶ Σάμιον ὀμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἡρόδοτος Θουρίων. Since Herodotus nowhere says this, the text was emended by Krause: ὀμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἡρόδοτον <τόν> Θουρίων. This would mean Douris said that Panayass was Samian in the same way that he said that Herodotus was Thurian, i.e. that Panayass was Samian not by birth but by adoption. In any case, the juxtaposition of Herodotus with Panayass seems ultimately to derive from Douris. Herodotus lurks also behind several passages in the general history (for which see F. Landucci-Gattinoni 1997, 79). See also FGrHist 76 F45, which preserves the same information as Herodotus (3.26) regarding Egyptian Oasis.
will return at the end of this section: the proverb (FF60, 62-63, 66; see FF84-85, 91, 93, 95-96).

Only five fragments come explicitly from the *Horoi* (FF22-26), but many others preserved without book title must derive also from this work. These give us a good idea about the contents of the book. Like Euagon and Aristotle, Douris very probably began his history before human inhabitation. He may even have recounted the formation of the island itself (F87), for a scholiast to Apollonios (1.501) asserts that Douris spoke about rocks that fell into the sea as a result of the giants’ tumult. Like Semonides, he seems to have devoted some attention to Samian colonization, mentioning the Egyptian polis Oasis (*FGrHist* 76 F45), which he follows Herodotus in calling “the Island of the Blessed” (3.26). Like Euagon, Ouliades, and Olympikhos, moreover, Douris spoke about Samian territory in the mainland (F25); he was one of the three Samian historians submitted to the Rhodians in support of the Samian claim that after the Battle of the Oak the region had been divided between Samos and Priene in accordance with the rivers. Like Euagon and Aristotle, finally, Douris gave especial attention to philosophers: he quoted epigrams for Pherekydes (F22), describing his wisdom in connection to that of Pythagoras, and for Arimnestos, to whom he attributed the invention of the κανών (F23); and he treated the lineage of Thales (F74), Pittakos (F75), Bias (F77), Kleoboulos (F78), and Sokrates (F79).

Douris certainly touched upon the tyranny of Polycrates, although our only direct evidence is a remark about Polycrates’ policy toward Samian orphans after a particularly devastating war (F63). And, like Aristotle, Douris dealt also with the Athenian siege in

---

223 Stephanos gives no book title, but because he cites Herodotus in the same context as Douris and because both writers retain the same information, a Samian context is most likely.

224 Diogenes has not preserved the name of Douris’s work from which he drew with reference Thales (1.22), Pittakos (1.74), Bias (1.82), Kleoboulos (1.89), and Sokrates (2.19).

225 It is likely (see below) that Douris also discussed Polycrates’ role in the invention of the Samaina, a warship with a boar on its prow (F66). V. La Bua (1975) believes that Douris can be identified behind an
the mid-fifth century. First, he claimed that responsibility for the war was to be laid at the feet of Perikles’ mistress Aspasia, whom he also accused of starting the Peloponnesian War (F65). Second, he charged Perikles and the Athenians with a particular ruthlessness. He claimed that the Athenians branded the Samian captives on the forehead, perhaps with an image of the *samaina*, the Samian warship (F66). And after the Athenians destroyed the city walls, seizing the Samian ships and imposing a large fine, they led the Samian trierarchs and marines into the agora at Miletos, bound them and tortured them for ten days, and ordered their heads to be crushed with planks and their bodies left unburied (F67). Douris was apparently alone in attributing to the

anonymous papyrus (*Pap. Heidelb.* 1740 Fa) that deals in some way with Polycrates’ death (see also F. Landucci-Gattinoni 1997, 211-213).

226 In his Ἡμικον Σαμίων, Alexis of Samos said that the temple to Aphrodite on Samos, which is called “in the reeds” or “in the swamp” was founded by Athenian prostitutes who accompanied Perikles when he attacked Samos (FGrHist 539 F1). See Ephoros FGrHist 70 F196 (= Diod. 12.38.1-41.1) and Plut. Per. 30-32 for Aspasia’s alleged role in Athenian action at this time.

227 The evidence for this claim is a little convoluted and worth unpacking. The fullest narrative is preserved in Plutarch (26.4). After he describes Melissos’s defeat of Perikles, Plutarch claims that in retaliation for the Athenian decision to tattoo Samian prisoners on the forehead with the Samaina, the Samians in turn branded Athenian prisoners with the image of an owl. The Samaina, Plutarch continues, got its name because it was a ship built in Samos, and Aristophanes is referring to the Samian tattoos in his *Babyloniannis* when he wrote, “The *demos* of the Babylonians, how many-lettered it is” (1.408, 64K). Plutarch does not, it is true, refer directly to Douris as his source here. But he does name Douris immediately afterwards (28) regarding Perikles’ behavior after the capitulation of the Samians, and he is clearly not here following Aristotle, who explained Aristophanes’ phrase not by way of tattoos but through the enrollment of slaves as citizens after the tyranny of Polycrates (F592 Gigon). Plutarch’s narrative about the tattoos, and for that matter about the origin of the Samaina, thus probably stems then from Douris. This is supported by an entry in Photios’s Lexicon and the Souda (Σ 77) on the line from Aristophanes (Σαμίων ὁ Δήμος), which actually juxtaposes Aristotle’s etymology with that of Douris: “For after the Samians had been worn out by the tyrants, because of a lack of citizens they decreed to the slaves *isopoliteia* in exchange for five staters, as Aristotle says in the *Politieia of the Samians*. Or because the twenty-four letters were discovered among the Samians by Kallistratos, as Andron (says) in Tripod…. But some (say that the phrase comes from the fact) that the Athenians tattooed the Samians captured in war with an owl, and the Samians (branded the Athenians) with the Samaina; this is a two-banked ship first build by Polycrates, the tyrant of the Samians, as Lysimakhos says in Book Two of the Nostoi (FGrHist 382 F7). The fiction is Douris’.…. (The phrase) is used of people who are afraid of fatal misfortunes of evils, since the Athenians tattooed the Samians.” Douris is made responsible explicitly for the reciprocal tattooing (the images of which the excpector, relying evidently on Lysimakhos, has accidentally reversed); but in light of Plutarch, Douris is responsible also for the information about the construction of the *Samaina* in the reign of Polykrates. There was another proverb related to the atrocities perpetrated by the Athenians against the Samians, we should note, Τὰ Σαμίων ὑποπτευόμενα, which referred to people who feared certain irreparable calamitous retributions: see Paus. Att. (T 15), Macar. Khrys. (8.3); Photios (T 570), Append. Prov. 4.84; the Souda (T 142, cf. Σ 77); and Mich. Apost. 16.14. A variant proverb is found at Souda Σ 77: Σάμιος: εἰδὸς πίθους Σαμιακοῦν; περιέστειξαν γὰρ οἱ Αθηναῖοι τοὺς ἀλώντας Σαμίων, μετὰ δὲ ταύτα οἱ Σάμιοι τοὺς Αθηναίους.
Athenians such savagery—Plutarch, again, says that Thucydides, Ephoros, and Aristotle had written nothing of the sort. In Plutarch’s opinion, in fact, Douris was exaggerating in the tragic style (the verb he uses is ἐπιτραγωδεῖ) in order to slander the Athenians (μᾶλλον ἔοικεν ἐνταύθα δεινώσαι τὰς τῆς πατρίδος συμφοράς ἐπὶ διαβολή τῶν Ἀθηναίων). Plutarch is surely not wrong to identify an anti-Athenianism in Douris.228 Kaios’s tyranny directly followed the cleruchy, after all, and if Douris hoped to endear himself to the Samian community through his local history, he could have done worse than to exploit Samian anger towards the island’s erstwhile colonists. Quite how his attitude squared with his claim to have been himself an Alkmaionid, however, is unclear.

Douris wrote extensively on Alcibiades, we know, and this was probably in the local history. The connection must have been Alcibiades’ sojourn on Samos. According to Plutarch, Douris, “who claims to be a descendant of Alcibiades,” provided a detailed account of Alcibiades’ return to Athens. He described the triremes replete with spoils of war and the clothing of the sailors, and he names the accomplished flautist and caller to whose beat the oarsmen rowed, data whose authenticity the skeptic Plutarch questions in light of the silence of Theopompos, Ephoros, and Xenophon (Alk. 32 = F70).229 Alcibiades’ alleged philandering on Samos may have led Douris to speak of other affairs, since we have testimony (again from Plutarch, this time in the Agesilaos) that Douris spoke somewhere about Alcibiades’ seduction in Sparta of Agis’s wife Timai (Ages. 3 = F69).230 Douris devoted some attention also to Lysander in his Horoi,231 claiming that the

---

228 For another potential example of anti-Athenianism, see F96 (= Zen. 2.28) about the exile of the Samians during the Athenian cleruchy.

229 We should note that Douris elsewhere refers to a piper named Khrysogonos in the retinue not of Alcibiades but of Philip II (F36); see P. Harding 2006, 237.

230 Douris seems also to have detailed other aspects of his putative ancestor’s life. His reference to the so-called “Herm of Andokides” may stem from an account of the Mutilation of the Herms (F68 = Harpokr/Phot. s.v. Ανδοκίδου Ἑρμής). And a reference to Alcibiades’ murder of the poet Eupolis (F73 = Cic. Ep. Ad Att. 6.1.18) may have fleshed out the portrait of Alcibiades.
Spartan was the first man whom Greek cities treated as a god, erecting altars to him, sacrificing in his name, and singing paans in his honor. Plutarch even cites several lines of a paan to Lysander—his source must still be Douris—claiming that “the Samians voted to call their festival to Hera the Lysandreia” (F71 = Plut. Lys. 18.5).

No fragments of Douris’s local history refer explicitly to his own time. But it is likely that he spoke about the Athenian cleruchy: Zenobios adduces him to explain the proverb, Ἀττικὸς πάροικος (2.28 = F96), meaning a persona non grata, a proverb that Klearkos links to the Athenian cleruchy. Douris may also have mentioned his father, at any rate his victory at Olympia. For we have testimony (F62) that he sought to prove by way of much evidence (<διὰ πολλῶν παρίστησιν>, that a certain Pythagoras, having been barred from competing in the boys’ boxing competition in the 48th Olympiad (588 BCE) won in the men’s competition; and Douris elsewhere spoke of Herakles’ foundation of the boxing competition (F93).

One of Douris’s goals in writing a local history at the end of the fourth century was surely to demonstrate that the Samian community had persisted through the desolation and depopulation caused by the Athenian cleruchy, to forge links, that is to say, with the Samians of the past. His father’s victory in the boxing competition at Olympia mirrored that of Pythagoras some 250 years before, just as the desolation caused

---

231 From Athenaeus (15.52 696E = F26), we know that Douris’s discussion of Lysander came in the Horoi: οὔτε ἔχει δ' οὐδὲ τὸ παιανικὸν ἐπίρημα, καθάπερ ἄρ εἰς Λύσανδρον τὸν Σπαρτιάτην γραφεῖς ὅτε παιάν, ὃν φησι Λούφις ἐν τοῖς Σαμίων ἐπιγραφομένοις Ὄρους ἀδεσθαι ἐν Σάμῳ.
232 Cf. F29 (= Et. Magn. 469.45), on the connection between Apollo and the paan. Douris may actually be responsible for a good deal more of Plutarch’s narrative (on this question, see F. Landucci-Gattinoni, 235-239): that the poets Khoirilos of Samos and Antilokhos were a part of his retinue, for example, and the anecdote about a poetic competition between Antimakhos of Kolophon and Nikeratos of Herakleia. We have outside testimony (from Proklos on Plato’s Timaios 1.90.20 = F83) that Douris mentioned Plato’s preference for Khoirilos over Antimakhos.
233 Ἀττικὸς πάροικος. Δουρίς δὲ περί αὐτῆς λέγει, ὅτι ἐπειδή Ἀθηναίοι τοὺς περιοικοῦντας αὐτοίς καὶ γειτνιώντας ἐξεβιάλον, ἢ παροιμία ἐκράτησε. Κράτερος δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς Σάμον πεμφθέντων Ἀθηναίων ἐποίησαν τὴν παροιμίαν εἰρήνην. Ἡ παροιμία σημασίαν ἔχει. On the possibility that this refers to the cleruchy, see F. Landucci-Gattinoni, 233, n.46; contra Jacoby, GfrH1, 485-486, and G. Shipley 1987, 115-116.
234 Although the context may have been Douris’s Περί Αγώνων (FF33-34).
by the Athenian cleruchy found precedence in other periods of depopulation (neither Syloson nor the cleruchy could forever sunder Samian solidarity) and in other instances of Athenian antagonism (from which the Samians had recovered). Douris’s alleged Alkmaionid descent may even have helped him incorporate and bridge the awkward phase of Athenian occupation. But given the fact that Douris was not born on Samos and perhaps spent his early life as far away as southern Italy, his primary task must have been to authenticate his membership in the Samian community, the legitimacy of his father’s rule, and his own political clout. By making himself the first mouthpiece of Samian community autobiography after the liberation and return of the Samians, he could claim ownership on Samos’s past and, by extension, help direct its future.
2.2.2.3 THE SOURCES OF SAMIAN LOCAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

Our exploration of local historiography outside of Greece revealed several categories of source that a historian may use when composing a history of a given locality. First, there is the historian’s own experience, applicable, of course, only in cases where the narrative was extended to include contemporary times. Douris may well have written about his own contribution to Samian history, and we know of several other Greek local historians who had worked themselves into their history: Philokhoros, as we have said, wrote about his interpretation of an omen at the turn of the third century BCE (FGrHist 328 FF66-67); the Argive Deinias seems to have included his assassination of the tyrant of Sicyon in his Argolika (FGrHist 306 T1, with F5); and Nymphis wrote in his local history of Herakleia about his efforts at repatriation after the death of Lysimachus and his diplomatic exchange with the Gauls in the middle of the third century (FGrHist 432 TT3-4).

A second category of source was previously disseminated texts, both poetic and historiographical. Aside from Homer’s epics, always fruitful fodder for the construction of the past,246 local poets were natural sources. Douris used the poems of the Samian Asios (FGrHist 76 F60), just as Derkylos in his Ἀργολικά, as we shall see, liberally cribbed from the epic of the Troizenian Agias (FGrHist 305 FF2-4, 7-9); and King Pausanias very probably quoted from Tyrtaios in his account of Spartan local history (FGrHist 596).247 Local historians used anonymous poetry, too: Douris quoted the Samian Paians for Lysander (FGrHist 76 F71), just as Nymphis cited threnoi of the

---

246 In the case of Arkadia, Ariaithos wrote about the exploits of Nestor (FGrHist316 F7) and the travels of Aineias to the region (F1); and we shall soon observe the role that Peleus played in Thessalian local historiography (FGrHist 601F1, 602 F6, or 269 F4), to name just two examples.
247 Among other clear cases of a local historian’s use of poetry, we can note the case of Kallippos of Corinth, who wrote what seems to have been a local history on Orkhomenos and cited two poets, the epic of Hegesinos and epigrams of Khersios (FGrHist 385 FF1-2).
Mariandynoi, and Deinias an oracle attributed to Delphi about Argos and Megara (306 F6). Local historians also relied, wherever possible, on previously published histories: in Athens, Philokhoros used Androtion (FGrHist 324 F30 and 328 F155); in Sicily, Timaios used Philistos (FGrHist 566 FF113 and 115); and in Pontic Herakleia, Memnon used Nymphis (FGrHist 434F1.7.3, 1.16.3). The use of non-local histories by local historians is less apparent, but we have seen that Douris was certainly influenced by Herodotus (FGrHist 76 F24). A related source often used by local historians is epigraphy. To name just a few examples, some of which we shall have the opportunity to examine in more detail: Hippys of Rhegion relied on an inscription that he saw at Epidaurus about a miraculous tapeworm cure (FGrHist 554 F2); Timaios was known to have used stelai (FGrHist 566 T10); Aristophanes of Boiotia recorded information ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἀντωνίας ὑπομνημάτων (FGrHist 379 T2b = F6); Memnon quotes verbatim a letter from Scipio to the Herakleiotai (F1.18.8) and also apparently a treaty between Herakleia and Rome that had been inscribed in bronze (FGrHist 434 F1.18.10); and Ariaithos cites in his Ἀρκαδικά what he alleges was an epitaph for an early king of Arkadia (316 F7).

A third category of source available to the local historian was the oral tradition. We have had the opportunity already to examine broadly how such traditions behave within in a community’s collective memory, and we have seen how often non-Greek local historians made use of such material. It is no surprise, then, to observe this phenomenon also among Greek local historians. In rare cases, we are aware of the influence of family tradition (of the sort that animated much early Roman local

248 For other oracles, see e.g. Hesychios of Miletos in his history of Byzantium (FGrHist 390 F1.3);
249 Nymphis, as we shall see, probably cited Kharon of Lampsakos (432 F11), to name another example.
250 For other inscriptions, see e.g. Hesychios of Miletos in his history of Byzantium (FGrHist 390 F1.29-30, and 34). The question of the Atthidographers’ use of documents is a vexed one; see Jacoby 1949, 197-215 and Harding 1994, 35-47, contra Thomas 1989, 89-93.
251 On the influence of oral tradition on Atthidographic tradition, see Jacoby 1949, 215-225; see also 163, 165-170, 195-196, and 199.
historiography): Douris’s claim, for example, of descent from Alcibiades (*FGrHist* 76 T3 = F70), and Timaios’s discussion of his father’s treatment at the hands of Agathokles (*FGrHist* 566 T13). But more frequently the traditions employed by local historians purport to be shared by the larger community. Such civic memories, we saw, can be attached to toponyms: so in his local history of Chios, Ion extrapolates a narrative about snow, χιών (*FGrHist* 392 F1); in his history of Boiotia, Aristophanes derives Khaironeia from an oikistes Khairon (*FGrHist* 379 F3); and in his Ἀρκαδικά Ariaithos uses the name of the town Kaphyai to narrate the Arkadian sojourn of Aineias and Kapys (*FGrHist* 316 F1). The beginning of Aristotle’s *Politeia of the Samians* underscores the role that metonomasiai could play in local history. Local historians also had recourse to traditions attached to particular features of the landscape, either naturally occurring or man-made (Vansina’s iconatrophy): in the case of Samos, geology and paleontology led to the creation of a narrative about the early occupants of the island; and we shall see how bronze-age tombs played a role in several local histories of Herakleia (*FGrHist* 430 FF3-4l 432 FF4-5) and in Deinias’ Ἀργολικά (*FGrHist* 306 F9). Local traditions were also frequently connected to current praxis, both political and cultic. The Atthidographers were fond of extrapolating mythic narratives from cultic practice, we saw; and the phenomenon is widespread.

On Samos, cultural memory relied in particular on two carriers: the central cult site of the Samian community, the Heraion, as well as the dedications housed by the

---

252 See Jacoby 1949, 152-168, esp. 167-168, on the influence of Alkmaionid tradition on Atthidography.
253 Evidence for this sort of oral tradition abounds: see e.g. *FGrHist* 386 F1; *FGrHist* 390 F1 4-5.
254 We can note Kleidemos’s use of Athenian topography to narrate the Amazonian invasion, through which the so-called Amazonion got its name (*FGrHist* 323F18); etc.
255 See, for example, Philokhoros *FGrHist* 328 FF109, 111, 17a; Demon *FGrHist* 327 F6.
256 Arkhitimos inserts a complex narrative to explain the punishment of trespassers into the Lykaion (*FGrHist* 315); Derkylos explains by way of King Minos of Crete why on Paros the Graces are worshipped without music and wreaths (*FGrHist* 305 F8); Baton of Sinope describes in great detail the origins of the Thessalian festival *Peloria* (*FGrHist* 268 F5); and, as we shall see, Menodotos writes about the origins of the *Tonaia* festival at Samos (*FGrHist* 541 F1).
shrine; and the proverb, short, pithy statements, that communicated general statements of wisdom in connection to specific episodes from the Samian collective past. Samian local historians not surprisingly exploited these two categories of source when constructing their narratives. In the following section, we shall look in detail at the ways in which the Heraion and the proverb animated Samian local historiography.

A) THE HERAION.

Local history need not, as we have said, be focalized solely by civic community; religious communities like churches, monasteries, or even parishes, often wrote community autobiography. The same thing held true in Classical and Hellenistic Greece. In Boiotia, Amphion of Thespiai wrote on the Mouseion on Helikon (FGrHist 387 F1) and Dikaiarkhos on the oracle of Trophonios (Athen. 13 594E-F; 14 641E).257 At Samos, Theodoros—he was perhaps the son of the temple’s architect Rhoikos (Hekat. FGrHist 264 F25; Diog. Laert. 2.103)—wrote an entire work on the Heraion (FGrHist 542), while Menodotos wrote “About Things at the Temple of Samian Hera” (FGrHist 341 F2), τὸ Περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Σαμίας Ἡρᾶς.258 The best preserved example of a Greek local history focalized by religious community is the Lindian Chronicle (FGrHist 532), which lists in chronological order dedications made by visitors to Athena Lindia and epiphanies of the goddess herself.259 My interest here, however, is not so much in the distinction between these two orders of local history but rather in the role that a cult

257 This is to say nothing of local works on cultic behavior: in Sparta, for example, Sosibios wrote Περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ θυσίων (FGrHist 595 FF4-5), and the phenomenon is well attested in Athens, where Dionysios (FGrHist 357), Demon (FGrHist 327 F3), Habron (FGrHist 359 T1), Andron (FGrHist and in B360 F1), Ammonios (FGrHist 361 FF1-5), Krates (FGrHist 362 FF1-2), Glaukippos (FGrHist 363 F1), and Apollonios (FGrHist 365 FF1-2) wrote on various Athenian sacrifices and festivals; Philokhoros (FGrHist 328 T1), Melanthios (FGrHist 326 FF2-4), and Sotades (FGrHist 358 T1) on the Athenian Mysteries; and Kleidemos (FGrHist 323 F14) and Autokleides (FGrHist 353), among others (FGrHist 352, 354), general protocol on Athenian religion (the so-called Ἐξεγητικὰ).

258 On the concept of “Greek Sacred History,” see J. Dillery 2005.

center played as a storehouse of cultural memory to be mined by a historian writing a history of a political community.

In the case of many Greek communities, cult and sanctuary played an important cohering role. The function of the Heraion in Samian cultural memory, however, is particularly marked. In part, this may have to do with the fact that unlike other islands, Samos spilled onto the mainland; territory alone, that is to say, could not be used to delineate the bounds of community. In part, this must be a recognition of the early significance of the site: here, where Hera was said to have been born, was the area where the earliest settlers on the island first congregated. But the prominence of the Heraion in Samian cultural memory must also be linked to the celebrity of the temple in the late-sixth century, due largely to the initiative of Polycrates, and to the frequency with which outsiders in the following generations visited the shrine and made dedications there.

At the Heraion, many memories were anchored on the cult statue of Hera. Aethlios said that the statue was formerly a beam (σανίς) but later took on human shape (ἀνθρωποειδές) in the archonship of Prokles (ἐπὶ Προκλέους ἄρχοντος); when such xoana became carved images, they were called βρέτη from the name for mortals (βροτοί)” (FGrHist 536 F3).

Clemens, who quotes Aethlios in the fourth chapter of his Protreptikos as evidence for the absurdity of idolatry, cites other sources, too (Varro, Polemon’s Against Timaios, Philokhoros’s Atthis, and Demetrios’s Ἀργολικά)—he was

---

260 This is to say nothing of the relationship between sanctuaries and the development of the polis (e.g. F. de Polignac 1995). I want only to underscore how communities employ common cult practices and common worship as a means to emphasize their integrity and distinctiveness. For recent discussions of the role of cult in the construction of community (although focusing on regions, not poleis), see C. Morgan 2003, 07-163; D. Graninger 2011a; and E. Mackil 2013.

261 See Paus. 7.4.4. Pausanias later claims (8.23.5) that the willow growing in the Heraion is the oldest known plant, the next oldest being the oak of Dodona. Aristotle, as we have seen, claims that the island was first named Parthenia (Herakl. Epit. 30), which points to a strong connection with the goddess (see also Apoll. Rhod. 1.185); and an inscription honoring the Samian historian Leon refers to his local history as “hymning autochthonous Hera” (FGrHist 540 T1): ὑμνάσας Ἡραν αὐτόχθονα. For the meaning of the term autochthonous here, see J. Dillery 2005, n.34.

262 For which see A.A. Donahue 1988, no. 44.
clearly relying on an already collated discussion—including the Samian local historian Olympikhos: “The xoanon of Hera on Samos was made by Smilis the son of Eukleides, as Olympikhos records in Σαμιακά (FGrHist 537 F1).” In both cases, the historians were drawing not merely on autopsy—after all, the plank to which they refer was apparently no longer extant, and the sculptor responsible for carving lived at the time of Prokles, Ion’s sons, was associated with Daidalos (Paus. 7.4.4-7), and took his name from a sculptor’s knife (σμίλη)—but on the traditions associated with the statue.

The most involved narrative about the statue of Hera comes in the work of Menodotos of Samos. Athenaeus quotes Menodotos twice, in each case explicitly from a different work. An anecdote about the Samian origins of peacocks and their importance at the Heraion allegedly came from the work devoted solely to the Heraion, τὸ Περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Σαμίας Ἡρας (FGrHist 541 F2). But the discussion about the statue of Hera, which Athenaeus adduces with reference to the practice of binding oneself with willow branches (Athen. 15.11-15 671E-674A), comes from the local history (σύγγραμα), viz. “An Account of Notable Things on Samos,” Τῶν κατὰ τὴν Σάμου ἐνδοξῶν ἀναγραφή (FGrHist 541 F1). The narrative is exceedingly interesting. Menodotos described in some detail how Admete, the daughter of Eurystheus, fled from Argos to Samos, where a vision of Hera convinced her to dedicate herself to the attendance of the Heraion, the temple previously founded by the Leleges and the Nymphs. Her decision angered the Argives, who persuaded the Tyrrenians to seize the

---

263 Aethlios’ς description of the statue, as we have said, probably lies behind a passage in Callimachus’ś Aitia (F100 Pfeiffer), a fragment preserved by Eusebius in his brief discussion of wooden statues (P.E. 3.7.5-8.1), in which the poet directly addresses the image of Samian Hera. It is possible, then, that Aethlios, like Olympikhos, mentioned not only the cult image but also the person responsible for anthropomorphizing the beam. Callimachus names the sculptor Skelmios. As Pausanias (7.4.4; 5.17.1) and Olympikhos testify, however, he was more regularly called Smilis (see Jacoby, FGrHist IIIb Noten, 271 n. 6; A. Harder 2012, 2, 762-763). Pliny says that Smilis was in part responsible for the construction of the temple to Hera (NH. 36.90), and Pausanias makes him responsible for the Horai in the temple of Hera at Olympia (5.17.1), which would also place him in the late-sixth century (see T. Figueira, 21-22).

Bretas of Hera (this, they reasoned, would lead to Admete’s punishment). The pirates sailed into the Heraite harbor, seized the image (the temple was at that point still without a door), and managed to carry it onto their ship. But they were unable to depart. Eventually, they removed the statue from their ship, placing it on the shore surrounded by barley cakes, and sailed away in haste. When they discovered the Bretas on the beach the next morning the Carian Leleges, barbarians as they were, thought the statue had run away on its own, and so they bound it to willow branches and dragged it back to its pedestal, where Admete purified it. From this, according to Menodotos, derived the annual festival of Tonaia (bondage), wherein the statue was taken to the beach and purified. Like the Neides, the cult statue of Hera actually preceded the arrival of the Samians on the island; for in the story of Admete, there are Argives, Leleges, and Tyrrhenians, but no Samians are anywhere to be found. Menodotos attributes the origins of the Tonaia, moreover, to the ignorance of the Leleges. The narrative thus underscores the fact that local history in Samos was focalized first and foremost by locality, viz. the island of Samos. This is especially important at Samos since segments of the Samian community, and on occasion the community in toto, spent significant periods in exile.

The importance of the Heraion did not merely lie in the role that the statue of Hera played in the history of the island. Dionysios of Halicarnassus, we saw, claimed that one of the tasks of the first Greek historians, in his view local historians, was to introduce to common knowledge local memories and written records stored in temples or in profane places (de Thuc. 5.1). Dionysius does not claim that temple priests produced such written records, in the forms of lists or chronicles; he suggests rather that Greek

---

265 For which see M. Nilsson 1906, 46-49.
266 Athenaeus proceeds to describe the particular importance of willow-binding to the native Carians and then quotes some lines of Nikainetos and Anakreon. It is unclear whether the quotations come also from Menodotos; the entire discussion at any rate seems to have reached Athenaeus through a book by Hephaisiston called Περὶ τοῦ παῦ’ Ἀναρχέοντι λυγίνου στεφάνου, which relied on the Histories of Phylarkhos (FGrHist 81 F14).
temples preserved written materials that helped a community construct a detailed narrative. Such materials included dedications, both those made by visitors—the Spartiate Eumnastos, we know, dedicated an elaborate leonine bronze cauldron at the Heraion ca. 600 BCE (IG 12.6.540)—and by locals. It was at the Heraion that Mandrocles commemorated his construction of the bridge of boats across the Hellespont on which Darius crossed to Europe (Hdt. 4.88.1) and where a group of Samian merchants, rich from Spanish trade, dedicated an enormous and elaborate bronze cauldron (Hdt. 1.152). At the Heraion Aiakes, son of Brykhon—perhaps a relative of Polycrates—dedicated his σύλη (IG 12.6.1.561 = ML 16) and Maiandrios displayed the apparatus of Polycrates’ banquet hall (Hdt. 1.123.1). Here the Samians commemorated their successful contribution at the Battle of Eurymedon (IG 12.6.1.277; 12.6.1.278) and their accomplishments alongside the Athenian fleet in Egypt (IG 12.6.279; 12.6.1.468). Here too they honored Alcibiades (Paus. 6.3.15) and Konon (Paus. 6.3.16) with statues. It is no wonder that Strabo even in the late-first century could call the Heraion a πινακοθήκη (14.1.14).

The Samians clearly understood the importance of the site for the preservation of cultural memory. It was at the Heraion, as we saw, that some Samian dedicated a prehistoric fossil, an alleged remnant of the Neia. And it was at the Heraion that the Samian community honored their own historians. At some point in the second century the demos dedicated to Hera a statue of the Samian historian Leon (ὁ δήμος ὁ Σαμίων Λέοντα Ἀριστωνος Ἄρη), who had turned the περὶ πάτρας πράξεως into prudent histories (εἰς πανταξέως ἰσοτρείας) and earned fame throughout the polis (τὰς δὲ Λέον ἐκύρησε κατὰ πτόλιν) (FGrHist 540 T1). Here the Samian demos

267 τὸν κόσμον τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἄνδρος τοῦ Πολυκράτεως ἔστη ἀξιοθέητον.
268 The dedication of numerous miniature wooden ships attests to the association between the navy and the Heraion (see H. Kyrieleis 1980, 89-94).
and *boule* honored a certain historian Dionysios for his good will toward the *demos* (*IG* 12. 6.1.100).\(^{269}\) And here in the second century CE the *demos* of the Samians honored the historian Xenophon, son of Aristos (*FGrHist* 540a).

Given the commemorative role of the Heraion, it is no wonder that when Herodotus came to the island in the course of his research he spent a good deal of his time perusing the shrine.\(^{270}\) He noted the great bowl of Spartan origin (1.70.3; 3.47.1), a breastplate of the Egyptian king, Amasis (3.47.2), the furniture of Polycrates (3.123.1), the engraving that Mandrokles (4.88.1), and the bronze bowl dedicated by the rich merchants (4.152).\(^{271}\) In most cases, moreover, he preserved iconatrophic traditions. In the case of the krater, for example, he claims that the Spartans had made the bowl for Croesus but decided to sell it on Samos upon hearing the news of the fall of Sardis (the Samians who bought it dedicated it at the Heraion).\(^{272}\) Again, Herodotus notes a large cauldron at the Heraion decorated with griffin heads and resting upon three large bronze statues, and he reports that it was dedicated by a certain Samian merchant named Kolaios.

---

\(^{269}\) C. Habicht 1957, 198-199. The historian is evidently not native (*i.e.*, he cannot be the cyclographer Dionysios of Samos, *FGrHist* 15), since the decree, albeit much restored, appears to award him with Samian citizenship. Habicht wonders if Dionysios of Chalcis was meant.

\(^{270}\) Just as Herodotus used the dedications made at the temple of Delphi to draw similar inferences about the past (1.14, 1.50-52, 8.37-38).

\(^{271}\) See J. Dillery 2005, 518-519 on the differences between Herodotus’s use of dedications and the motivations of a text like the Lindian Chronicle.

\(^{272}\) Later, Herodotus mentioned the bowl as one of the causes of a war (ca. 525) between Samos and Sparta (3.47): when some Samian exiles went to Sparta to request help against Polycrates, the Spartans acquiesced, ostensibly in return for Samian support of Sparta during one of the Messenian Wars; the Spartans, on the other hand, alleged that their main motivation in helping the exiles was to exact vengeance on Samos for stealing the krater some twenty years before (along with a breast plate of Amasis). It is difficult to imagine, frankly, how the Samian seizure of a bowl from a Spartan ship would actually have been part of Spartan discourse twenty years after the fact (although *cf.* P. Cartledge 1982, 256). It is possible that the presence of the bowl at the Heraion was touted by the Samians themselves at the time of their war with Sparta and that the tradition was still alive when Herodotus engaged in his researches at Sparta. More plausibly, however, Herodotus is melding Samian with Spartan tradition. He had seen the Spartan krater dedicated at Samos, mentioned this curious fact later at Sparta, and then recorded the response of the Spartans, who had not independently preserved a distinct memory of the bowl; the “Spartan version” of the story was at any rate apparently not known to the Samians: τὰχα δὲ ἀν καὶ οἱ ἀποδόμενοι λέγουν ἀποκόμενοι ἐς Ἐπάρτην ὡς ἀπαθετήσαν ὕπ’ Ἐπάρτην. Plutarch, incidentally cites 3.47-48 as an example of Herodotus’s’ malice in assigning to the Spartans so base a motive for war (*de Malig. Her.* 21 = *Mor.* 859b-d).
and his comrades, who used one-tenth of their profits from trading in the West (six talents) to construct the bowl in the Argive style. Onto the act of the dedication, Samian tradition attached a narrative about Kolaios’s adventures: that he had tried to sail to Egypt but was driven to an island off the coast of Libya, where he gave one-year’s worth of provisions to the stranded Cretan fisherman Korobios; that when he tried sailing to Egypt a second time, he was driven by winds through the Pillars of Herakles to Tartessos. Herodotus must have recorded some of this information from an inscription, like the proportion of their profits that the traders dedicated to Hera. But much of his narrative, especially the anecdote about Korobios, must have had a different origin. Herodotus relied both on physical evidence and on the traditions associated with those objects.

Temple dedications were used also by local historians to build a narrative of Samian history. Just as local historians were generally keen to make use of epigraphical data, so too did they look to inscriptions associated with cult sites: Kleidemos (FGrHist 323 F15) and Philokhoros (FGrHist 328 FF22a and b) quoted dedications in order to illuminate the love life of the Peisistratidai; Semos of Delos used a dedicatory inscription at the Delian sanctuary to extrapolate a narrative about the travels Parmeniskos from Metaponton (FGrHist 396 F10); and the phenomenon is prevalent also in local histories of Olympia (see e.g. FGrHist 411 F1). At Samos, we saw, Douris used an epigram that he had gleaned from a dedication at the Heraion as evidence for the life and career of Pythagoras’s son Arimnestos (FGrHist 76 F23). When Arimnestos returned from exile, Douris said, he dedicated a bronze anathema at the temple of Hera nearly two pykheis in diameter. Douris even quoted the epigram on the dedication: “Arimnestos, the

---

273 This is a vexed passage, as Jacoby’s commentary (ad loc.) makes clear. I want to draw attention here only to the citation of the epigram, which Athenaeus (13.89 609C-D) implies came from Kleidemos.
275 Again, Hippys of Rhegion drew on an inscription he had seen at Epidauros in his Ἀργολικά (FGrHist 554 F1).
dear son of Pythagoras, dedicated me, having devised many sophiai in words.”

Porphyry, to whom we owe the preservation of this fragment, implies that Douris went on to discuss the fate of the object: Simos the harmonicist “removed this (epigram?) and claimed as his own invention the κανών (presumably the monochord); there were, in fact, seven σοφίαι that were originally inscribed on the dedication, but all disappeared on account of the one that Simos took.” It is not clear if Douris means that Simos had erased the epigram or only that he added his name to the monument. But what is certain is that Douris relied both on his own exposure to the object—he tells us how big the dedication was, for example—and on his knowledge of traditions associated with the monument: the story of Simos’s theft, for example, and the fact that Arimnestos was Demokritos’s teacher.

Aristotle had himself made significant use of a dedication at the Heraion in his Politeia of the Samians. Aelian preserves the relevant fragment, using it as evidence for the Samian love of sheep (De Nat. Anim. 12.40 = 590 Gigon). Aristotle apparently said was that a Samian named Mandrobolos made a dedication at the Heraion after his sheep stumbled upon some hidden gold. In his Elenkhoi, Aristotle actually makes an elliptical reference to something that “Kleophon does in the Mandrobolos” (174b27). This is generally assumed to be a reference to a character in a dialogue by Speusippos, but at least one ancient commentator to this passage had recourse to believe that there

---

276 For Simos’s plagiarism, see M. West 1992, 240 and D. Creese 2010, 99-102. P. Pédech claims that Douris had an especial interest in music, which he treated particularly in his work Περὶ νόμων (1989, 268-270).

277 This is not explicitly derived from Aristotle’s Politeia of the Samians, we should note, but this is a likely supposition. Euphorion also mentioned the Samians’ interest in sheep (at Clem. Protr. 2.39.9).

278 Τιμῶσι de ὁδα Τελεφοὶ μὲν λύκουν, Σάμιοι δὲ πρόβατον, Ἀμπασακάτα ὑπὲρ μὴν τὸ χύον τὴν λέαναν· τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκάστης ἐκείνης ἔναντ' ἐστὶν ἐξ ἐκείνης. Ἀλλ' ἔναντ' εἰρήνα θερισμένον καὶ ἐν τῷ Παρθενῷ κατοικοῦμεν τὸν ἄνδρον λύκος. Σάμιοι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ τοιοῦτο χρυσόν κλαπὲν πρόβατον ἄνευς, καὶ ἐνεπεύθην Μανδρόβουλος ὁ Σάμιος τῇ Ἡρᾳ πρὸς τὸν Μάνδροβολόν ἀνάθημα ἀνήψε· καὶ τὸ μὲν Πολέμων λέγει τὸ πρότερον, τὸ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης τὸ δεύτερον.

279 See I. Bywater 1883; L. Tarán 1981, 244.
was a tragedy written by the Athenian Kleophon, the plot of which was based on the experience of the Samian shepherd.\textsuperscript{280} There is a further reason why Aristotle would have included what appears to be so insignificant a dedication as this. For it was the basis of a popular local proverb, ‘Επὶ τὰ Μανδροβόλου, which, we learn from Zenobios, the Samians applied to affairs that grew progressively worse. Zenobios explains that when Mandrobolos first found the treasure in Samos, he dedicated a golden sheep to Hera; the following year, however, with less to spare, he dedicated a silver sheep, and in the third year he had only enough for bronze (3.82).\textsuperscript{281} Ephoros actually provided a very similar explanation for the proverb in the ninth book of his \textit{Histories}, albeit without reference to the sheep (\textit{FGrHist} 70 F59b)—indeed the attraction of the sheep into the story may have been a result of the actual form of Mandrobolos’s dedication, of which Aristotle, drawing as was on Samian local sources, was aware. In Ephoros’s version, moreover, Mandrobolos did not discover gold but rather the so-called \textit{geophanion},\textsuperscript{282} the therapeutic mineral ore for which Samos was renowned (see Theophr. \textit{de Lap}. 62-3).\textsuperscript{283} But Ephoros also mentions the fact that Mandrobusulos made annual dedications of decreasing value until in the fourth year he dedicated nothing at all. It

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{280} A certain Mandrobolos vows to dedicate a golden sheep to Apollo (\textit{sic}) if he became rich; and, once he is rich, he dedicates a golden sheep, then a bronze one, and finally he sacrifices a live animal, from which comes the proverb about those whose fortunes grow worse, \textit{i.e.} ‘Επὶ τὰ Μανδροβόλου χωρεῖς. See S. Ebbesen 1981 Vol. 2: Οἶον Κλεοφόνος ποιεῖ ἐν τῷ Μανδροβόλου ἡ Κλεοφών ὁ Νάντων οὕτως τραγῳδῶν ὡς Αριστοτέλης ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ποιητικῆς ἱστορεῖ δράμα δὲ τοῦ Κλεοφώντος ὁ Μανδροβόλος, ὃς τοῦ Ἐὐφιδίου ἡ Ἐκαβῆ, ἦξεταί δὲ οὕτως ὁ Μανδροβόλος ὡς ἐπὶ πλουτῆσεις ἐπὶ ἐπάσης χρόνου χρυσοῦ ἀνατιθέναι χριόν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, καὶ πλουτήσας πρῶτον μὲν χρυσοῦν ἀνεύθιε τριμώ, εἰτὰ χάλκουν, καὶ τέλος ἐθυσε ἡτοι, ἀφ’ ὧν καὶ παρομία γέγονε χαλκών τὸν ἐπὶ τὰ χείφια ἀπὸ τῶν χαλκών καταβιβάσας, ἢ ἐπὶ τὰ Μανδροβόλου χωρεῖς’ λέγουσα. οὕτως ὁ Μανδροβόλος πάλιν πτωχεύσας καταβιβάζεται τῷ Κλεοφώντι λέγουν πρὸς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ὡς ‘τὸ ζυόν ὧν χρυσοῦν προσίηνεικα’ ὁ δὲ Ἀπόλλων ἅλλ’ ἐγὼ, φησὶν, ἓρσον, ἓραν, ἓραν εἰλήφειν; ὃ δὲ λέγει ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης πάντως οὐκ ὀδηλόν.
\textsuperscript{281} Cf. Diogenianos 4.62. For a different explanation, cf. the \textit{Souda}, \textit{ad loc.} (= Ephoros F59b).
\textsuperscript{282} ἐπὶ τὰ Μανδροβόλου· ἐπὶ τῶν εἰς τὰ χείφια τραγῳδῶν. ἀπὸ Μανδροβόλου τινός τὸ ἐν Σάμω γεωφάνου εὐφόριος καὶ πρῶτον μὲν χριόν χρυσοῦν ἀναθέτοις, ἐπείτα ἰαρυφόροις, ἐπείτα χαλκών ἐλέπτονα, εἰτὰ σύκετο· ὃς Ἐφορος.
\textsuperscript{283} See also Dioskourides (5.153), who calls the earth χολλούριον. Pliny 35.53 says that there are two varieties of Samian earth, one called collyrium and the other aster, the first smooth (and gluttonous to the tongue!), the other harder and white, but both used for bloody discharges from the mouth or for wounded eyes.
\end{flushleft}
seems, then, that by the mid-fourth century the Samians, well aware of these three dedications, had encapsulated them in a proverb that allowed them at the same time to articulate some of their apparently deep-seated pessimism and to recall Mandrobolos’s innovative exploitation of the geophanion. A passage from Nikander’s *Alexipharmaka* (148-152) sheds further light on the geophanion. He says that Phyllis (i.e. Samos) bears beneath its mountains “Parthenian earth,” the “snow-white earth of the Imbrasos that a horned lamb first showed to the Khesiadic Nymphs.”

Still in the lifetime of Nikander (ca. 150 BCE), the memory of the sheep remained firmly attached to the important mineral vein.

This nexus between local proverb and dedication at Samos is present also in the strange tag, Βάτα Κάρας, which crops up in Hesykhios (*s.v.* Βάτα Κάρας = *FGrHist* 545 F8). He explains it as “two words that were written on a dedication at the Heraion on Samos: ‘Bata Karas the Samian dedicated this prey to Hera.’” It turns out that the expression was itself proverbial, used, says the *Souda* (B 175), of rich and powerful people.

The *Appendix Proverbiorum* (*BVC*. 1.50) is more helpful: “Some think that it is one name and use the proverb for rich people. But it is Karas, son of Bata, as it is inscribed in the Samian Heraion.”

The dedication of this particular Samian was so impressive, that is, that it generated its own proverb, in the same way, but with the opposite results, as the progressively diminishing dedications of Mandrobolos. We have no evidence that the dedication and the proverb were ever recorded in a local history of

---

284 Khesias is a consort of Imbrasos in a fragment of the *Ktisis of Naucratis* of Apollonios Rhodos (in Athen. 7.19 283E); Pliny (*N.H* 5.135) mentions a river called Chesius.

285 δύο ταῦτα ὄνοματα. ἐπιγέγραται δὲ ἐπὶ ἁναθήματος ἐν Σάμῳ ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἡρας ἱερῷ οὔτω· Βάτα Κάρας Σάμιος Ἡρη τήνδε θήμην ἀνέθησε. The use of the word θήμην is strange; perhaps it is a synonym for τὰ σῦλα? (See G.L. Huxley 1981, 342).

286 Βάτα Κάρας· ἐπὶ τῶν παρέξων καὶ δυνατῶν· κατὰ διαστολὴν Δὲ ἀναγνωστέων.

Samos. But this would not be an unlikely supposition. For local historians of Samos often used such παροιμίαι, as we shall now see, to construct a narrative of the past.

B) Proverbs

The word παροιμία was recognized by most ancient commentators to be the conjunction of παρά with οἶμος/οἶμη (way or path), perhaps because they are applicable along one’s journey through life, because such proverbs were displayed alongside roadways, or because proverbs convey their meanings in a roundabout way. I am using the term here to refer to short and pithy statements that communicate wisdom allegorically. Proverbs are thus to be distinguished from γνῶμαι, maxims, which express general truths without the use of allegory, and from apophthegmata, which may be proverbial but which claim to retain the actual utterances of celebrated personages and the conditions under which the remarks were made. Samian local historiography preserves proverbs of two types: those that express universal truths but are thought to have local origins (i.e. “There’s many a slip ‘twixt the cup and the lip,” which is explained by way of King Ankaios) and those that refer to specific local figures/places but whose meaning is thought to be universally applicable (i.e. “an Attic neighbor,”

---

288 Müller wondered if Menodotos is in fact the source (FHG III, 105); G.L. Huxley suggested Euagon (1981, 341).

289 See e.g. Diogenianos’ Introduction to his collection of proverbs (Par. 1.1); Ps.-Demetr. de Eloc. 232; the Souda (Π733 Adler); and Isidore of Seville (Et. 1.37.28). Part of Aristotle’s discussion of proverbs survives in Synesius’s Encomium on Baldness (22 = F13 Rose, who thought that the source was Περὶ φιλόσοφων): Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἡ παροιμία σοφόν· πῶς δὲ οὐίχι σοφόν, περὶ ῥawning λαμπτέλας φημίν, ὅτι παλαιὰς εἰς φιλοσοφίας ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις ἀνθρώπων φθοραῖς ἀπολομένης ἐγκαταλείμματα, περιοικαδέντα διὰ πυρκαχμᾶν καὶ δεξιότητα;

290 Aristotle discusses maxims in his Rhetoric (2.21.2 1394a-1395b).

which is explained by way of the Athenian cleruchy). Both types, it is important to emphasize, purport to have been generated by the Samian community itself.292

Samos may not have produced more local proverbs than other localities, we should say at the start, but Samian local historians did employ local proverbs with particular frequency to construct and flesh out a narrative about the Samian past. In the case of dedicatory proverbs, this is reflection, once again, of the significant role of the Heraion as a conduit of local tradition. But we can also connect the historiographical proliferation of the proverb at Samos to the local emphasis, at least from the mid-fifth century, on philosophers and other conveyers of gnomic wisdom, like Pheremyses, Aesop, Pythagoras, and Melissos. Samian philosophers not only made an appearance in the contents of Samian historiography, that is to say, but they also influenced its form.

Aristotle quoted at least four (and possibly as many as eight) local proverbs in his *Politeia of the Samians*. First, the warning about life’s uncertainties fastened onto King Ankaios (πολλὰ μεταξὺ πέλει κύλικος καὶ χείλεος ἄχρου), which prompted a specific and detailed narrative about the king, his wise servant, and a boar. Second, his explication of the oath of the Prienians, ὁ περὶ Δρῦν σωτός, by way of a battle between the Prienians and Milesians, an event that precipitated Bias’s embassy to Samos. It is surely a consequence of the importance of proverbs for Samian local historiography that Aristotle felt it appropriate to insert this Prienian episode in the context of Samian

---

292 As Francis Bacon somewhere said, “The genius, wit and spirit of a nation are discovered in its proverbs.” Suetonius notes (*Peri Blasph.* 13) that many proverbs have to do with a particular community but do not originate from within that community, and as L. D’Israel wrote in his short essay, “The Philosophy of Proverbs” (1823, 467), “Among these historical proverbs none are more interesting than those which perpetuate national events, connected with those of another people. When a Frenchman would let us understand that he has settled with his creditors, the proverb is, J’ai payé tous mes Anglais: ‘I have paid all my English. . . .’ There are numerous ancient proverbs of this sort: e.g. Αδείς ὑσπερ εἰς Δήλου πλέων: ἐπὶ τοῦ ᾑφοντίστου καὶ φιληδούντος” (Zenoib. 2.37 = Souda A 455); Ἀρκαδίην με αἰτεῖς (Diog. 2.50 = Souda A 3947); Αἰεί φέρει τὰ Διοίτη καινόν καινόν (Zen. 2.51); Αἰθίωπα σμήχως (1.46); Φοινίκων συνθῆκα (8.67); and Ἄριδιφυὸν ἐφικόρμα (Zen. 1.11). Alongside Ἀττικὸς πάροικος, Athens generates a good amount of negative proverbs: e.g. Ἀττικὸς εἰς λιμένα (Zen. 2.10), Ἀττικὸ τὸ Ἑλευσίνια (Zen. 2.26), Ἀττικὴ πώτες (Diog. 2.80), and Ἀττικὸς μάρτυς (3.11).
history. Third, ἕκητι Συλοσῶνες εὐφυχωρίη, which arose out of Syloson’s alleged depopulation of the island after his Persian-backed coup and preserves the Ionic dialect. And fourth, his use of the tag Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος (ἐστὶν) ώς πολυγράμματος to explain the enfranchisement of Samian slaves after the fall of the tyranny.

Other proverbs, while not explicitly attributed to the Samian Politeia, nevertheless refer to episodes that Aristotle treated there and so were very probably also cited in that work. For example, we know that Aristotle wrote about the loud-voiced Neides who originally inhabited the island; and Euphorion, who retains the same information in the Hypomnemata with some of the same turns of phrase as Aristotle, quotes a proverb that he claims was popular in Samos: “He shouts louder than the Neades.” We also know from Herakleides’ epitome that Aristotle spoke about a meeting between Pherekydes and Pythagoras, where the elder philosopher showed his pupil evidence of his phthiriasis through a hole in the wall. Diogenes Laertius tells us that when Pythagoras came to inquire into his mentor’s health, Pherekydes responded by sticking his finger through the door and saying, “χροῆδῆλα” (1.118). This expression, according to the paroimio graphers, came to be used convey the worsening of affairs.293 Another Samian proverb with similar connotation, as we have seen, was Ἐπὶ τὰ Μανδραβόλου, which Aristotle very probably quoted—Ephoros knew it, at any rate—when he wrote about Mandrobolos’s discovery of gold/Samian earth.294 Lastly, it is very possible that Aristotle mentioned the proverb, Ἀττικῶς πάροικος in his Politeia of the Samians (as would Douris in his ᾽Ωροι), since he quotes it explicitly in his discussion of maxims in the Rhetoric (2.21 1395a).

293 οἱ δὲ φθειριῶσαντα τὸν βίον τελευτήσαν ὠτε καὶ Πυθαγόρου παραγενομένου καὶ πυθαγορεύμου πῶς διακέοιτο, διαβαλόντα τῆς θύρας τὸν δάκτυλον εἰπέτεν, “χροῆδῆλα” καὶ τούντεθεν παρὰ τοῖς φιλολόγοις ἢ λέξεις ἐπὶ τῶν χειρόνων τάττεται, οἱ δ’ ἐπὶ τῶν βελτίστων χρώμενοι διαμαρτάνουσιν (cf. the Souda X529 and Φ215 Adler). See also Synesios, Epist. 116.14, Gregorios, Paroim. 3.100, and Michael Apostolios, 18.35.

294 cf. Zen. 3.82; Diogenian. 4.62; Alkiph. Epist. 1.9.1; Paus. Att. Att. E 57.1; Hesych. E 5294; Schol. Luc Е 57.1; and the Souda E 2659. The proverb is incidentally employed by Zonaras. Hist. 550.2.
There are references to eleven proverbs in our fragments of Douris. Four are evidently unrelated to Samos and probably derive from other works. For example, Douris’s explanation of ἐπεγέλα τὸ οὐράνιον (F91) probably comes from his Προβλήματα Ὥμηρος (for which see F30). Other non-Samian proverbs include δέχεται καὶ βολὸν Ἀλήτης, which Douris explained by way of an anecdote about Aletes’ attempt to secure control of Corinth (F84), and Ἐπὶ σαυτῷ τὴν σελήνην καθέλκεις, which he related to astronomers in the habit of predicting eclipses (F85).

He also cited in some unknown context the proverb Ἀττικὸν τὰ Ἑλεοῦντα, which he says was shouted whenever people come together to do something among themselves (F95). But there was another proverb related to the Athenians that Douris cited, and this does have a Samian context: Ἀττικὸς Πάροικος (F96). According to Zenobios, Douris said that the proverb took hold when Athenians drove away their neighbors and those who lived nearby, while Krateros in the same passage explicitly links the proverb to the Athenians sent from Athens to Samos (presumably in 365 BCE).
Other proverbs have a much clearer Samian provenance. So Douris quoted the proverb Πολυκράτης μητέρας νέμει, explaining that Polycrates once assigned war orphans to rich families, saying to each, “I give this woman to you as a mother” (F63). Neither Zenobius (5.64), who preserves the citation to Douris, nor (Ps.-) Plutarch (Prov. Alex. 1.58), who adduces the same anecdote but without naming a source, explains how the proverb was applied in everyday discourse. Another clearly Samian proverb quoted and interpreted by Douris was Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος ἔστιν ὃς πολυγράμματος (F66), which Aristotle also discussed. It is unclear whether the tag predated Aristophanes, who used it in his Babylonians in 426 BCE (PCG 71 = 64K)—some character in that play apparently shouted this at a group of Babylonian slaves whom he saw emerging from a mill-house and mistook for Samians (see Hesykh. Σ 150)—but by the mid-fourth century the expression had become proverbial. Douris, we saw, thought that it had to do with the tattoos that the Athenians imposed on their Samian prisoners after the revolt in 441/0, and Plutarch agreed (Per 26). But the various explanations provided by Douris, Aristotle, and even Andron (who thought that he detected an allusion to the discovery of the alphabet by the Samian Kallistratos) indicate that the phrase evidently had no fixed meaning by Douris’s day.

Several of Douris’s proverbs explain Samian dress. As evidence that the Samians used to wear armbands and walk to the Heraion with their hair combed out over their

---

300 If Aristotle is correct in his etymology, viz. that it dates back to the period just after the fall of the tyranny, its origins would be older.

301 Hesychios, for his part, thought that it referred to the Samian reputation for learning (Σ 150).

302 Note again that there is another proverb related to the treatment of the Samian prisoners by the Athenians, Τὰ Σαμῖων ὑποπτεύετες, which referred to people who feared certain irreparable and calamitous retributions. See Paus. Att. (T15), Macar. Khrysokeph. (8.3); Photios (T 570), Append. Prov. 4.84; the Souda (Γ 142, cf. Σ 77), Mich. Apost. 16.14. A variant proverb is found at Souda Σ 77: Σάμη: εἶδος πάθους Σαμικοῦ, περιεστέειαν γάρ οἱ Αθηναῖοι τοὺς ἀλόντας Σαμῖων, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα οἱ Σάμιοι τοὺς Αθηναίους.
back and shoulders, Douris cited the proverb, “To walk to the Heraion with braided hair,” 

βαδίζειν <εἰς> Ὁμιον ἐμπεπληγμένον (F60). The ancient paroimiographers tell us nothing of this proverb, and it is unclear just how Douris interpreted it. Douris quotes another capillary proverb, in fact, “The long-haired man at Samos” (τὸν ἐν Σάμῳ κομῆτην), in relation to the Samian boxer Pythagoras (F62). The context, we are told, was Pythagoras’s victory in the 48th Olympiad (588 BCE). Pythagoras had planned, Douris says, to compete in the boys’ boxing match but was banned because of his long and effeminate hair; so he entered the men’s competition, which he went on to win. Douris evidently explained the proverb in the same way as would (Ps.-)Plutarch in his Collection of Alexandrian Proverbs (2.8), viz. as applying to those who have taken on rivals stronger than they seem. But there were clearly other ways of interpreting the phrase. Our source for this fragment of Douris, in fact, an anonymous collection of proverbs (Prov. Cod. Paris. Gr. 676), also cites an Aristeides who retains a narrative about a Samian merchant looking for a “long-haired Samian thief,” while Iamblichus for his part thinks that the phrase had to do with to the homonymous philosopher (Vit. Pyth. 2.11). Douris’s younger contemporary, the epigrammist Theaitetos, actually

303 περὶ δὲ τῆς Σαμίων τροφῆς Δούρης ιστοριῶν παρατίθεται Ασίου ποιῆμα, ὅτι ἐφόρουν χλάδες περὶ τοῦ βραχίου καὶ τὴν ἐρυθήν άγοντες τῶν Ἡραίων ἐβαδίζον κατεκτενισμένοι τάς κόμας ἐπὶ τὸ μεταφέρον καὶ τοὺς ὄμους. τὸ δὲ νόμον τούτο μαρτυρεῖθαι καὶ ἧπο παροιμίας τῆρῃ ’βαδίζειν <εἰς> Ἡραίων ἐμπεπληγμένον’. ἔστι δὲ τὰ τοῦ Ἡραίου ἐπὶ ὅτους ἔχοντα.

304 Τὸν ἐν Σάμῳ κομῆτην Σάμιων ὅσιον πῦκτην κομήτην εἰς Ὁλύμπη αφικόμενον καὶ νικήσαντα ἐπὶ τῶν θηλυκοῦντα πρὸς τῶν ἀνταγωνιστῶν χλευαζόμενον εἰς παροιμίας ἐδίνει. Ἑρατοθένης δὲ κατὰ τὴν ὅλυμπα Πυθαγόραν Σάμιον τὸν κομῆτην νικήσας. Δούρης δὲ ἐκαρθεῖται τοὺς ἄνδρας προκαλεσάμενον νικῆσαι, καὶ διὰ πολλῶν τούτο παρίστησαν.

305 Prov. Alex. 2.8.1: <Τῶν ἐν Ἁμίων κομῆτης> Σάμιων τις ἐγένετο πῆκτης, ὡς ἐπὶ μαλακία σκοποῦμεν, ἐπειδὴ κόμας εἶχεν, ὧδ᾽ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνταγωνιστῶν, συμβαλλόν αὐτοὺς ἐνίκησεν. λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτούμενοιν ἀνταγωνιστάς ξείτοις κραίτοις, ἢ προεξεδόθησαν.

306 Αριστείδης δὲ ἡμιστυγοῦν τὰ τὸν ἑπιδημήσαντας τινὸς Σαμίων ἐμπόρουν ὄνησασθαί καὶ διδόντα ὀλέγον ἀραβίων παρακαλεῖν τὸ φοβήσαντα καὶ κομῆσαντα εἰς οἰκὸν κείσασθαι τὴν κόμαν ἐπὶ τῷ πρὸς ἑπιγαινείαν τοῦ δὲ ἐμπόρου εὑρίσδο τῶν κομῆτην ἀναζητοῦντος διά τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἄλλο γνώσιμα, εἰς παροιμίαν ἄρχηνα, τῆς παροιμίας ταύτης μεμηθείς καὶ Διόμων ἐν Πῆραι καὶ Φιλίμναι ἐν Δακτυλίωι.

307 The paroimiographers have a different explanation altogether: ἐπὶ τῶν οἰδὲν χάριν λεγόντων. Οἱ γὰρ οἰκούντες ἔκαψε πρὸς χοροὺς ἐπιτίθεθι, οὐ πρὸς ἄλλο τι χρήσιμον (see Diog. 4.58 and Michael Apostolios 7.31). See, too, Lexicon Sabbaitikon E 60. Diogenes Laertius, finding the passage about the
wrote an epitaph for this Samian boxer, which also emphasized his long hair (6.3368 Gow-Page = Diog. Laert. 8.47). Theaitetos was perhaps inspired to pen his verse by a monument, either at Olympia or at the Heraion. So, as in the case of the proverbs about Mandrobolos and Bata Karas, it may have been a dedication that catalyzed this crystallization of local memory through proverb.

We know that Douris mentioned a second proverb in the context of the boxing competition at Olympia: πρὸς δύο οὐδ’ ὄ Ἡρακλῆς (F93). This proverb was actually used as early as Hellanikos, Pherekydes, and Herodotus, all of whom offered idiosyncratic explanations: Hellanikos and Herodotos said that it referred to Herakles’ combat with the Hydra; Pherekydes, Kommarkhos (FGrHist 410 F2), Istros (FGrHist 334 F42), and Ekhephyllidas (FGrHist 409 F1) that it had to do with his battle against the Molionidai Kteatos and Eurytos. Douris, on the other hand, said that Herakles founded the boxing competition at Olympia and was victorious there; but in a later Olympiad, he competed against Elatos and Pherandros and lost. Jacoby wondered if the reference best belonged to Douris’s work Περὶ Αγῶνων (for which see FF33-34), but it would also have served well as background for the anecdote about Pythagoras (and perhaps

308 Πυθαγόρης δύο οὐδ’ ὄ Ἡρακλῆς (F93). This proverb was actually used as early as Hellanikos, Pherekydes, and Herodotus, all of whom offered idiosyncratic explanations: Hellanikos and Herodotos said that it referred to Herakles’ combat with the Hydra; Pherekydes, Kommarkhos (FGrHist 410 F2), Istros (FGrHist 334 F42), and Ekhephyllidas (FGrHist 409 F1) that it had to do with his battle against the Molionidai Kteatos and Eurytos. Douris, on the other hand, said that Herakles founded the boxing competition at Olympia and was victorious there; but in a later Olympiad, he competed against Elatos and Pherandros and lost. Jacoby wondered if the reference best belonged to Douris’s work Περὶ Αγῶνων (for which see FF33-34), but it would also have served well as background for the anecdote about Pythagoras (and perhaps

309 Pherekydes (FGrHist 79a and b), Hellanikos (FGrHist 5 F103), Herodoros (FGrHist 31 F23) and Plato (Phaed. 89c).

310 He may however mean the Idaion Daktyl Herakles (see the Souda O 780).
about Kaios as well). Finally we may again consider Douris’s account of Arimnestos’s monument at the Heraion (F23). After quoting the epigram, Douris reports that there were at one time seven “wisdoms” written on the dedication (ἐπι τὰς ἀναγεγραμμένας σοφίας), but because of the one that Simos took, the others also disappeared (συναφανισθήναι καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τὰς ἐν τῷ ἀναθήματι γεγραμμένας).

We do not know from Porphyry whether or not Douris quoted these σοφίαι. But the fragment nevertheless underscores the interaction between cult dedication, proverb, and the preservation of the past.

The simplest explanation for the proliferation of proverbs in the Samian local histories of Aristotle and Douris is the Lyceum. Aristotle’s employment of proverbs in the context of Samian history, that is to say, may have been a consequence of his general interest in the form—we know that he wrote a one-volume work devoted to Παροιμίαι (Diog. Laert. 5.26). Other Peripatetics followed suit: Theophrastus, who wrote Περὶ Παροιμιῶν (Diog. Laert. 5.45); Klearkhos, whose collection spanned several volumes (Wehri FF63-83); and Douris’s own brother, Lynkeus, who published a collection of Apophthegmata (Athen. 6.45 245A; 6.47 245F). Indeed this interest in the proverb seems to have been widespread in fourth-century Athens. The Atthidographer Demon wrote a multi-volume work Περὶ Παροιμιῶν (FGrHist 327 FF 4, 7-21), and a Παροιμίαι is even attributed to the tragedian Antiphanes (2.56 60D-E).

So even if Douris had no formal connection to Theophrastus, he may well have been motivated to explore proverbs and apply them to the study of the past by the same current that

---

312 See P. Moraux, 1951, 128-129, 334-336. As Jacoby points out (FGrHist IIIb Suppl., 203), the existence of the work is supported by a remark made by Isocrates’ student Kephisodoros (Ath. 2.56 60D-E).

313 On these works, see G.L. Huxley 1981, 332. Athenaeus cites from the first book of Klearkhos’s Περὶ Παροιμιῶν (10 457c, 15 701b = Wehrli FF63-64); Zenobios (5.47 = Wehrli 66a) and Michael Apostolios (3.34 = Wehrli F66b; 5.48 = Wehrli F66c) cite from the second. On the authorship of the list of maxims inscribed on a stele in the precinct of Kineas at Ai Khanoum, see L. Robert 1968.

314 The trend would continue. Khrysippus wrote at least two books on Proverbs (Diog. Laert. 7.200); Aristophanes of Byzantium wrote two books on metrical proverbs and four on prose proverbs; and Didymos’s collection of proverbs apparently stretched to thirteen volumes.
motivated his brother. Two factors suggest that early-Hellenistic, Peripatetic paroimiography is not in itself a sufficient explanation for the proliferation of proverbs in Samian local historiography, however. First, Aristotle employed proverbs far more often in his history of Samos than in other local works. Second, there is evidence for proverbs in Samian local history long before Aristotle.

That Aristotle used proverbs more often in his Politeia of Samos than in his other works of local history is clear first of all from Herakleides’ epitomes. For, while there are two proverbs in the epitome of the Politeia of the Samians, only in the case of Tenedos and Ithaka do we find any other evidence of proverbs, and in these cases, only one proverb apiece.\(^{315}\) In the Athenaion Politeia, moreover, the one Politeia that does survive (nearly) intact, Aristotle quotes several poems (5.2-3, 12) and laws (9.3) of Solon, along with other apophthegmata (\textit{e.g.} 16.6),\(^{316}\) but he makes use of no local proverbs.\(^{317}\) A perusal of the non-Herakleidan fragments from Aristotle’s Politeiai reveals that while proverbs featured in fourteen other Politeiai, in almost all of these cases there is evidence for only one proverb each, as opposed to four (or more likely eight) in the case of the Samian Politeia.\(^{318}\) Local histories, such as Aristotle’s politeiai, it is true, are not often...

\(^{315}\) Tenedos (Dilts 24): νόμον δὲ τινὰ φασὶ τὸν βασιλέα Τέννην διαθέσθαι, ἐι τις λάβοι μοιχών, ἀποκτείνειν τοῦτον πέλεκει, ἀλόντος δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ λαβόντος ἐρωμένον τὸν βασιλέα τί χρὴ ποιεῖν, ἀποχώρισθαι τῷ νόμῳ χρήσαται. καὶ διὰ τούτου τὸ νομήματος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ θάτερα πέλεκυς κεχάρακται. ἐπὶ θάτερα δὲ ἐξ ἑνὸς αἰγένος πρῶσσων ἄνδρος καὶ γυναῖκος. καὶ ἐκ τούτου λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποτόμων τὸ ἀποσεκόφθαι Τενεδίῳ πέλεκει. Ithaka (Dilts 71): πορθμεὺς Πυρρίας ὄνομα ληστᾶς διεπόρθμεσε, πρεσβύτην αἰχμάλωτον καὶ πίπταν. καὶ ὦνεται ταῦτα παρὰ τῶν ληστῶν, δεπιθέντος τοῦ πρεσβύτου. ἢν δὲ ἐν τῇ πίπτῃ κεχρυμμένον χυσίδων. πλουτήσας οὖν θύει λέγεται τῷ πρεσβύτῃ βοῦν. διὸ καὶ εἰς παροιμίαν ἤλθεν, οὐδεὶς πάσποτε εὐεργέτη βοῦν ἐθοσὶν ἀλλ’ ἡ Πυρρίας.

\(^{316}\) See also Zen. 4.76.

\(^{317}\) Zenobios (6.29) and Photios/Souda (s.v. ὑπ’ ὑπὸ τὰ Καλλικράτους) say that Aristotle coined a proverb from the fact that a certain Kallikrates increased the jury pay, but the actual passage in the \textit{Ath.Pol.} (28.3) makes no mention of any proverb. Either the paroimiographers completely misunderstood the passage or else there is something missing from the manuscripts.

\(^{318}\) In the case of Lakedaimonia (F550.1-4: Α φιλοχρηματία Σπάρταν ἑλοι, ἀλλ’ ἄλλο δὲ οὐδὲν; F551.1-6 Gigon: Μετὰ Λεόβιον φιάν), Malis (F557.1-2 Gigon: Τῶν φιλτάτων τὰ φιλτάτα; F558.1-3 Gigon: Τὸ Μηλλασανον πολίον), and Tenedos (Herakl. Dilts 24 and F610.1-3 Gigon: Τενεδίου ἄνθρωπος) do we have evidence for two separate proverbs, but for all other localities there is only evidence for one. This is the case for Delphi (F494.1-3 Gigon: Τὸ Αἰσιόπειον αἷμα)—but note the connection to Aesop!; Thebes
cited by the paroimiographers; aside from Douris, who is named three times by Zenobios, once by (Ps.-) Plutarch, and twice by anonymous paroimiographic collections, only a smattering of local historians appear as sources for proverbs. Yet our evidence nevertheless reveals that Aristotle used proverbs as a means of building a historical narrative most significantly in his local history of Samos.

A second indication that the application of proverbs to Samian local historiography was not merely a reflex of Peripatetic interests is that we can detect the role of proverbs in Samian local history before Aristotle. Euagon, we have seen, recounted the role of the Neides, the mythical beasts whose cries long ago cracked the Samian earth. His account, we suggested, influenced Aristotle and even Dionysios of Halicarnassus, who bemoans the use mythic elements by the early historians. We can be sure only that Euagon said that there were ἐν Σάμωι θηρία, ὧν φθεγγομένων ὤς τὴν γῆν (F1). Yet just as in the case of Aristotle, it is very likely that he made reference in his narrative to the proverb “to shout louder than the Neades.” In any case, the clearest proof of the pre-Aristotelian use of proverbs to reconstruct the history of Samos comes in Herodotus. After he narrates the exile of the tyrant

---

319 F63 = Zen. 5.64, F95 = Zen. 2.26, and F96 = Zen. 2.28.
320 F84 = (Ps.-)Plutarch Prov. Alex. 1.48.
322 Timaios used proverbs frequently. He is cited twice by Zenobios (FGrHist 566 FF13a and 148) and once by a scholiast to Plato (F64), while Polybios (F22) mentions another proverb, albeit with reference to Libya. Sosikrates seems to have cited a proverb in his Κηρητιά (FGrHist 461 F3b). And Anaxandridas cited at least two proverbs in his book Περὶ τῶν συμπέρασμάτων ἐν Δελφών σαπροίς (FGrHist 404 FF1 and 7). It is possible that Philokhoros noted the proverb for which he is adduced as evidence by Zenobios (FGrHist 328 F195). Staphylos of Naucratis cited one in some unnamed work, perhaps a local history (FGrHist 269 F13), while a certain Menandros also quoted one in an unknown work (FGrHist 491 F8 = 783F9). Demos, as we have said, published a collection of proverbs, and it is not unlikely that some of these worked their way into his Ατθίς. See N.G.L Hammond 1968, 39, 53-54, for Demon’s Ατθίς as the source for χωρὶς ἀπηγεῖς Souda X 444.
323 Cited in Aelian, N.A. 17.28
Maiandrios, Herodotus says that the Persians, having swept the island clear of men, handed over a desolate Samos to Polycrates’ brother, Syloson (3.149): τὴν δὲ Σάμον σαγηνεύοντες οἱ Πέσσαι παρέδοσαν Συλοσῶντι ἔρημον ἐοῦσαν ἄνδρων. This expression is very similar, we saw, to the formulation in Herakleides’ epitome: τὴν δὲ πολιτείαν τῶν Σαμίων Συλοσῶν ἦρημωσεν, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ ἡ παροιμία ἔγινε Συλοσῶντος ἄραςφρόη. So it seems likely that during his travels on Samos Herodotus encountered the proverb and used it, along with its associated tradition, to extrapolate a narrative about the Persian capture of the island. The kernel of the proverb, the adjective ἄραςφρόη, is Ionic in form and not actually used here by Herodotus, so it would be hard to argue that the proverb arose as a response to the publication of Herodotus’s history. It may also have been cited by Euagon, in fact. For Aristotle used forms of the adjective ἔρημος with reference to Samos both before the advent of the Leleges, when only Neides occupied the island, and at the Persian conquest; and we know that Aristotle drew on Euagon for the earlier episode.

Herodotus preserves another important anecdote about Syloson, here explaining why the Persians gave him control of the island in the first place. Years before, it turns out, when he was in exile in Egypt Syloson encountered Darius, at that time in the retinue of Cambyses, in a marketplace at Memphis, and he gave the Persian his red cloak. When Syloson heard some time later that Darius was on the throne, he journeyed to Susa and reminded the king of his past benefaction. Darius remembered the gift and offered Syloson bountiful treasure in return, but Syloson requested the island of Samos instead. (3.139-140). From this episode there arose a much celebrated proverb, “The cloak of Syloson,” which the paroimiographers explain was applied to people who bragged about their clothes but which also seems to have referred to unequal trades, gold, as it were,
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324 Diogenian. 5.14; Mant. 2.90, Apost. 18.27, Souda X 333.
The proverb may, it is true, have arisen as a response to Herodotus. But a likelier scenario is that the *logos* was current at the time that Herodotus was compiling his history and that the vehicle for its transmission was the proverb. The two proverbs about Syloson are juxtaposed by Strabo (14.1.17), in fact, which suggests that they circulated in tandem. Herodotus was fond of quoting maxims and proverbs. The best example of his retention of a local proverb comes in his anecdote about the marriage of Agariste, daughter of Kleisthenes of Sikyon (6.127-130). The entire narrative, from the initial proclamation of Kleisthenes at Olympia to the competition of the suitors, seems to have been spun out of a proverb, the quip of the drunk and vanquished Hippokleides with which the episode concludes: Οὐ φροντὶς Ἡπποκλείδη. We have reason to believe, in this case too, that the proverb did not actually originate with Herodotus. For the *Souda* (O 978) attributes the expression to the comedian Hermippos. Just as in his travels on Samos, we might imagine, Herodotus encountered the proverb about Hippokleides as a carrier for Athenian cultural memory; but here in the case of Athens, he chose to cite the proverb, perhaps because it was transmitted to him in the form of an apophthegma. Another example of a local proverb in Herodotus comes in the speech of Gelon, tyrant of Syracuse, to the Greek envoys from the east; if he is not given command of the Greek forces, he exclaims, he will have nothing to do with Greek resistance, in which case for the Greek army “spring has been taken away from its year” (ἐκ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ τὸ ἐαρ αὐτῆ ἐξαφαίηται). Herodotus explains this as follows: οὐτος δὲ ὁ νόος τοῦ ὁματος τὸ ἐθέλει λέγειν· δήλα γὰρ ὡς ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἔστι τὸ ἐαρ δοκιμώτατον. Τῆς δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὀστρατίης τὴν ἐωυτοῦ ὀστρατιήν (7.162). We have outside evidence from

325 For this interpretation, see Aelian 4.5.34, Themistius Or. 5.81; Julian, Ep. 9.1.
326 See, for example, 1.8.4. For Herodotus’s use of proverbs, see M. Lang 1984, J. Gould 1989, and S.O. Shapiro 2000.
327 See also Ps.-Luk. Philop. 29.18; Luk. Apol. 15.22; Diogenian. 7.21; and Zen. 5.31.
Aristotle that Perikles used this expression in his funeral speech for the Athenians killed in the Samian War (Rhet. 1.7 1365a31-3; 3.10 1411a2-4), which suggests that Herodotus was quoting the Athenian orator, intending his audience to recognize the echo.

Thucydides supplies further evidence that already in the fifth century Samian proverbs were employed to narrate the Samian past. In two places, Thucydides mentions Polycrates’ activity on Delos. In the Arkhaiologia, he says that Polycrates subdued various islands including Rheneia, which he dedicated to Delian Apollo (1.13.6); and later, with reference to the Athenian purification of Delos, he says that Rheneia was so close to Delos that when Polycrates took control of it, he dedicated it to Delian Apollo and bound it with a chain to Delos (3.104.6). We know that there was a proverb associated with this event, Ταῦτα σοι καὶ Πύθια καὶ Δήμια, which referred to those who were acting for the last and final time. It is cited by Zenobios (6.15), Arsenios (16.17a), Diogenianos (8.35), Pausanias the lexicographer (Π 40), Michael Apostolios (15.9), and twice by Photios and the Souda (Π 3128 and Τ 17). The paroimiographers explain that after subduing Rheneia and dedicating it to Delian Apollo (the language recalls that of Thucydides: ὅτι Πολυκράτης ὁ Σαμίων τύραννος ἐλὼν Ἱρνειαν καὶ ἀναθεὶς αὐτήν Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δήλῳ), the tyrant instituted a beautiful festival and asked Delphi what he should call it. “Delphi answered him, ‘This is both your Delia and your Pythia,’ which meant that he would die soon. For Oroites soon thereafter impaled him.” Several of the paroimiographers reveal that Menander used the proverb in his Self-Punisher (F147 Kock = 134 Koerte-Thierfelder)—the line is iambic, after all. Clearly it was in circulation by the end of the fourth century, and it is worth noting that Epicurus,
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328 See A. Kirchhoff 1878, 19 n.1; see P. Treves 1941; and J. Grethlein 2010, 168-170.
329 καὶ Πολυκράτης τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ ἐπὶ Καμβρικισσαίου λαὸς ἐκείνου ἐπετευράτα καὶ Πύθια καὶ Δήμια καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δήλῳ.
330 ἀπέρχεται ἤτοι Ἱρνειαν τῆς Δήλου υπότοις όλγας ὅπιτε Πολυκράτης ὁ Σαμίων τύραννος Ἰσχύσας τινὰ χρόνον ναυτικῷ καὶ τῶν τε ἄλλων νῆσιῶν ἀνέδρασε καὶ τὴν Ἱρνειαν ἐλὼν ἀνέδρασε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δήλῳ ἀλώσει δήσεις πρὸς τὴν Δήλον. καὶ τὴν πεντετερίδα τότε πρῶτον μετά τὴν κάθαρσιν ἐποίησαν οἱ Αθηναῖοι τὰ Δήλια.
who had of course spent his boyhood on Samos, included it in a letter to Idomeneus (Phot. Lex. 2.121 = Souda Π3128). Thucydides’ knowledge of the event may, it is true, be completely independent from the tradition preserved in the proverb. But it is worth emphasizing, as F. Sieveking saw, that in both passages Thucydides uses the same, metrical phrase: τὴν Ἐρήνειαν ἐλῶν ἀνέθηκε. Sieveking wondered if Thucydides had drawn on a dedicatory epigram (presumably at Delos, but perhaps also at the Heraion). If so, we can better understand the process of proverbialization of dedications: Polycrates celebrated his achievement in verse (the chaining of Rheneia to Delos and the institution of games), and after the tyrant’s demise the epigram suggested an ironical reading, a mechanism similar to that behind Mandrobolos’s dedication: what began as a boast was later seen as evidence for failure.

It would not be surprising if other Samian proverbs also found their way into Samian local historiography. We have already had recourse to note the proverb about Bata Karas and that related to the tattooing of the Samian prisoners in 441/0, τὰ Σαμίων ὑποπεύετα, both of which were probably mentioned by Aristotle and Douris. Among other such historical proverbs, we can list Σαμιακὴ λαύρα and its cousin Σαμίων ἀνθη, which were applied to people who pursued pleasure or luxury to excess. They both refer to a narrow, flower-bedecked ally in Samos where pastries were sold and prostitutes plied their ware. But there was a historical context, too: Klearkhos, who is quoted at length by Athenaeus (12.540F 44 Wehrli), says that in an attempt to imitate the softness of Lydia (τὰ Λυδῶν μαλακά), Polycrates decided to replicate in Samos a certain district in
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331 1965, 371.
332 See W. Burkert 1979, 59-60, for an interesting argument relating Polycrates’ activity to the Delian hymn.
333 Paus. Att. (Τ15), Mac. Khrys. (8.3); Photios (Τ 570), Append. Prov. 4.84; the Souda (Τ 142, cf. Σ 77), Mich. Apost. 16.14. and cf. the Souda Σ 77. Libanius uses both expressions in tandem in a letter (Epist. 287.3): τούτω τὸ μὲν γένος ἐκ τε ἐν ἀρχεὶς καὶ Γαλατῶν, πλείων δὲ αὐτῷ λόγῳ ἢς ἀρχεὶς καὶ ποις ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀρμενίαν ἐχέσει πόλεις, τούτῳ δὲ εἰ καὶ μὴ πρότερον ἐποίει, πάντως ἂν νῦν ἐφάνη ποιών σοῦ τὰς πόλεις Σαμίων ἀνθῆ φασὶ καὶ λαύραν αὐτοφήγαντος Σαμιακῆν.
334 See (Ps.-)Plut. Prov. Alex. 1.61; Mar. Khrys. 7.55.
Sardis, the so-called Sweet Elbow (Ἀγχών Γλυκύς); (Ps.-)Plutarch adds the detail that, διὰ ταύτην τὴν τρυφὴν οἱ Σάμιοι τοῖς Πέρσαις ἐδουλώθησαν. Like Ταῦτα σοι καὶ Πόθια καὶ Δήλια, then, this preserved both a sentiment and a historical memory about the excesses of Polycrates. Another Samian proverb is Γλαύκη Τέχνη, which was used as early as Plato (Phaidr. 108d) to refer to something either not easily accomplished or requiring great skill. The first to comment on the proverb, Aristoxenos (F90), connected it to the musicologist Glaukos of Rhegion. But the paroimiologists, drawing, it would seem, on Samian sources, adduced a homonymous Samian, the first man to discover the soldering of iron.

Another proverb to consider is that recorded by Plutarch among his Apophthegmata of the Lakedaimonians (233 D), Ὅς αὐτὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔχει, Σάμον θέλει, which the paroimiographers later say was applied to people who were unable to keep their own possessions but nevertheless desired those of another. Like the proverb about Polycrates and Delos, this one too is iambic. According to Plutarch, it arose from an incident at the end of the Peloponnesian War, when the Athenians had surrendered to Sparta nevertheless declared their wish to retain control over Samos. From the response of the Spartans emerged the proverb. Given both the fact that Samos is here made the quintessential desirandum and the proverb’s palpable anti-Athenianism it may well have been employed by Samian historians, like Douris. One last proverb to consider is Γάλα ὀρνίθων (14.1.15). Although the paroimiographers explain it without reference to Samos, and although the phrase was used independently by Aristophanes (Vesp. 508
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335 The phrase is used by Plato, too (Phaidr. 257D). See Apost. 5.50 and Souda Γ 316.
336 See Aristoxenos F90 (ad Plat. Phaidr. 108d); (Ps.-)Plut. Prov.Alex. 2.25; Hesych. Γ 616, Phot. Γ 125, Zen.2.91, Diogenian. 4.8; Apost. 5.45; Souda Γ 282, O982, A276; and Mar. Khrys. 2.100.
337 Although cf. Hesych. Γ 616, who attributes the invention to a Glaukos of Chios.
338 Diogenian. 7.34; Apostol. 13.5. For a twist, see Dio Chryst. 75.5.
339 Although Αἴγιναίοι ἀξιόπιστοι, ὅτε παρείσθησαν τὸ ἄστυ, Σάμον αὐτὸς μόνην ἔσσας, έξω ποτὲ καὶ ἄλλους ἔχειν ζητεῖτε· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ή παροιμία ὃς αὐτὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔχει, Σάμον θέλει.
340 See Diogenian. 2.15; Apostol. 5.19. Souda. Γ 19.
and Av. 734, 1673), Eupolis (411 K.-A.), and Menander (880 K.-A.), Strabo insists that it was applied in particular to Samos. He connects it, in fact, to the Samian tyranny and to the enmity between Samos and Athens, which, once again, suggests that he found it in a Samian source.

The Samians were certainly not the only Greek community to generate proverbs. Yet Samian local historians employed proverbs with particular frequency as sources to extrapolate narratives about their community’s past. I have suggested that this was due in part to the important role of the Heraion on the island and its role as a preserver of local memory among the Samians. But only a selection of the proverbs that find their way into Samian local historiography directly involve the Heraion or its dedications; many have to do with Polycrates and with Athens. Another explanation for the historiographical proliferation of proverbs, then, is the contribution that philosophers and other purveyors of wisdom were thought to have made to the history of the island. We have already noted the frequency with which Samian local historians referred to native philosophers: in Aristotle, we find Pherekydes, Pythagoras, Aesop, Imon, and Melisse; in Douris, Pherekydes, Pythagoras, and Pythagoras’s son, Arimnest (FGrHist 76 FF22-23). Samian identity evidently relied in part on Samian philosophers, whose celebrity would have endowed the community with an intellectualism through which they could compete with other communities, like Athens. This preoccupation with Samian intellectuals apparently animated local historiography not merely on the level of content. Samian local historians embraced their philosophers’ actions as well as their characteristic mode of communication: the gnomic utterances exemplified by Aesop’s morals and

\footnotesize{341 Περὶ μὲν [οὐν] οἰνοὺς οὐ πάνω εὐτυχεῖ Σάμος, τὰ δ’ ἄλλα εὐδείμων, ὡς δὴ ἔξι τοῦ περιμάχητον γενέθηκα καὶ ἐξ τοῦ τούτος ἐπανοήσθαν μὴ ὅσκειν ἐφαρμόσπτειν αὐτή τὴν λέγουσαν παροιμίαν ὅτι φέρει καὶ ὁρνίθων γάλα. τούτῳ δὲ καὶ τῶν τυραννίδων αἵτιν αὐτή κατέστη καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἔχθεσις.

342 See D. Dueck 2004, 47-48.}
Arimnestos’s *sophiai*. As often in local historiography, we can identify a symbiosis between content and form; the Samian community’s obsessions and anxieties have influenced both the information it chose to retain in its community autobiography and the manner in which it chose to retain it. We shall have an opportunity to revisit this relationship between content and form when we return in the conclusion to the articulation of time in Greek local historiography. In the meantime, let us turn to Thessaly in order to explore the manifestation of local historiography in mainland Greek regions and to draw some conclusions about the important role of the landscape as both a unifier of community and a focalizer of local narratives.
2.2.3 τὰ Θεσσαλικά

Τὰ Θεσσαλικά and the like were written by Hellanikos (FGrHist 601a), Kritias of Athens (BNJ 338A), Aristotle, Medeios of Larissa (FGrHist 129) and Kyrsilos of Pharsalos (FGrHist 130), Kineas of Thessaly (FGrHist 603), Euphorion of Khalkis, Baton of Sinope (FGrHist 268), Rhianos of Bene (FGrHist 265), Staphylos of Naukratis (FGrHist 269), Arkhinos (FGrHist 604), Philokrates (FGrHist 601), and Souidas (FGrHist 602).¹ We note immediately a distinction between Thessalian and Samian local historians; most of those Thessalian historians whose provenance we can identify with certainty were foreigners. We know that Thessalians wrote history—during the third quarter of the fourth century BCE, the Magnesian Antipatros wrote αἱ Ἑλληνικαὶ Πράξεις (FGrHist 69); Polykleitos of Larissa, perhaps the grandfather of Antigonos Doson, wrote an eight-volume Ἰστορίαι (likely focusing on Alexander) at the end of the fourth century (FGrHist 128); and another Magnesian, Hegesias, wrote a history of Alexander at some point in the mid-third century (FGrHist 142)²—so it not unlikely that those local historians whose provenance has not been preserved (e.g. Souidas, Arkhinos, and Philokrates) were also native. Nevertheless, Thessaly and its past were undoubtedly subjects that appealed to outsiders. One of the reasons, we shall see, for this may be the role of patronage associated with the ruling Thessalian houses. After surveying Thessalian history from the archaic age to the Roman conquest, we will look at Thessalian local historians chronologically and then use the Thessalika as a means of accessing Greek regional historiography in general. Finally, we shall look in particular at the way that Thessalian local historiography dealt with the political fragmentation of the

¹ Contra H.D. Westlake, who, albeit writing before the publication of FGrHist IIIB, identifies only Souidas and Kineas as local historians of Thessaly (1935, 44).
² See J.-C. Decourt et. al. 2004, 677 for the relationship between Magnesia and Thessaly in the late-fourth century.
region, both by foregrounding the binding device of the landscape and by retrojecting a political unity into the times of origin.

2.2.3.1 A BRIEF HISTORY OF THESSALY

Classical and Hellenistic sources generally applied the toponym “Thessaly” to a relatively narrow geographical area, essentially the two plains that straddle the Peneios River between Pindus and Mount Pelion. This was the territory that would correspond to the tetrades, the four départements Pelasgiotis, Hestiaiotis, Thessalioties, and Phthiotis. Modern discussions sometimes treat as part of Thessaly some of the surrounding, so-called perioikic, regions, like Akhaia Phthiotis, Magnesia, Perrhaibia, and Dolopia. But our ancient sources are generally agreed that these regions were occupied by non-Thessalians. Recent archaeological work, in particular at Dimini (the Homeric Iolkos?), has revealed that Mycenaean Thessaly probably differed little from centralized regions to the south. The same may be said for Thessaly in the Geometric Period, for many of the poleis of tetradic Thessaly have roots going back this far: e.g. Pharsalos in Phthiotis and Larisa, Pherai, Kranon, and Skotoussa in Pelasgiotis. Indeed the Iliad, although it nowhere recognizes a “Thessaly” or indeed any Thessaloi, is nevertheless aware of

---


4 For the tetrades, see F. Gschnitzer 1954. Hekataios may mention the tetras Pelasgiotis (FF133), although the fragment comes from Stephanos, and it is always difficult in Stephanos to know just what to attribute to the cited source. For other ancient views of the tetrades, see Apollodoros of Athens (FGrHist 244 F164), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (A.R. 1.17-18), and Strabo (9.5.4). Our first epigraphical evidence for the tetrades, we should note, does not come until the mid-fourth century (353/2), documenting the privileges that Athens granted to Thessalian ambassadors, who are divided into tetrads, each headed by a polemarch (IG 2 175). See also SEG 34, 558 for a Larisan decree from the mid-second century BCE.

5 See e.g. Ps.-Skylax (64). For the perioikic ethne see G. Kip 1910; for the ambiguity of the term “Thessaly,” see J.-C. Decourt et.al. 2004, 676. According to Herodotus (7.176.4) and Thucydides (1.12.3), the Thessaloi came to Thessaly via Epeiros; some traditions posit an earlier Boiotian presence in the region (see Diod. 4.67.2 and Paus. 10.8.4).

6 For Bronze-Age Thessaly, see B. Feuer 1983 and N. Papadimitriou 2008.

7 Aside from a king with that name at Il. 2.679.
numerous individual Thessalian poleis (29 are listed in the Catalogue of Ships, in addition to perioikic regions, like Magnesia and Perrhaibia)\(^8\) and devotes considerable attention to Thessalian traditions, both those relating to the Trojan War and to earlier episodes, like the expedition of the Argonauts;\(^9\) it even identifies the regions of lower Thessaly around the Sperkhios river as “Hellas,” a term that would of course grow to encompass all Greeks.\(^{10}\)

By the Archaic period, Thessaly was dominated by several aristocratic families rooted in particular poleis: the Ekhekratidai at Pharsalos, the Skopadai at Krannon, and the Aleuadai at Larissa.\(^{11}\) And although these families on occasion intermarried,\(^{12}\) they maintained their associations with their respective poleis well into the period of Macedonian rule. Nevertheless, we have ample early evidence for a cohesive regional Thessalian identity that transcended individual poleis. Alongside traditions that Thessaly participated en masse in the Lelantine War and the First Sacred War,\(^{13}\) we may note that Hesiod (F6 MW) and Hekataios allude to Thessaly (FGHist 1 FF14, 133-136), as does Pindar, who juxtaposes it to Sparta (Pyth. 10.2). In the later fifth century, references to Thessaly and the Thessalian abound, in e.g. Herodotus (e.g. 1.57.6; 3.96.4; 5.63.13, 7.129; 7.132.1) and in Thucydides (1.2; 1.12; 1.111.1; 2.22; 2.101; 3.93; 4.78), who calls the Thessaloi an ethnos (5.51.2). At some point in the first half of the fifth century BCE, moreover, a Thessalain polis (Pherai?) began to mint coins in the name of the Thessaloi.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{8}\) See C. Morgan 2003, 102-105.
\(^{9}\) Of which both the Odyssey (12.70) and Hesiod (Th. 992ff) show an awareness.
\(^{10}\) For the contribution of the Thessalians to the Hellenic identity, see J. Hall 2002, 125-171.
\(^{11}\) See B. Helly 1995, 154-155, 163-167.
\(^{12}\) As S. Hornblower notes (2011, 102), we know of a Skopas in the sixth century whose mother was named Ekhekrateia, and Pausanias mentions an Ekhekratides from Larissa.
\(^{13}\) Plutarch (Amator. 17) retains the episode that Kleomakhos of Pharsalos fought on behalf of the Chalcidians and was killed. See G.A. Lehmann 1983.
Such a regional awareness does not in itself attest to an early *koinon*, for which our first evidence comes only in the fourth-century and in the context of interstate diplomacy; and while a pan-regional political structure probably existed also in the fifth-century\(^{15}\) and perhaps even earlier,\(^{16}\) regional cohesion may initially have been due to other factors. Cult may have played a role.\(^{17}\) But, as Zosia Archibald has proposed, regionalism in Thessaly was more likely a consequence of the idiosyncratic power dynamics among the local aristocracies,\(^{18}\) who pooled their resources for the sake of common defense. There was a tradition attested by Aristotle that an early king, Aleuas Pyrrhos (evidently associated with Larisa),\(^{19}\) divided Thessaly into its four *tetrades* and established a network of *kleroi*, which contributed troops to a joint military force (FF502 and 504 Gigon). At particular at times of crisis, this united force may have been led by a single individual, sometimes referred to as a king, as in the case of Aleuas Pyrrhos or a certain Kineas of Konion, who Herodotus says led a contingent of one thousand Thessalian cavalry to assist Athens in the late-sixth century (5.63.3; cf. Aristot. *Ath.Pol.* 19.5). In the context of the Persian Wars, in fact, Herodotus even refers to the Aleuadai *en masse* as “kings” of Thessaly (7.6), which may imply that at this time Larisa enjoyed a dominant position in the region. Herodotus interestingly mentions that the decision to send the force under Kineas was made κοινῇ γνώμῃ, suggesting a political association of some sort, although he may only be retrojecting contemporary procedure. Such early *basileis* may have fulfilled a function similar to that of the *tagoi* who begin to crop up

---

\(^{15}\) See D. Graninger 2011, 11.  
\(^{16}\) For the early existence of a Thessalian *koinon*, see A. Momigliano 1932, M. Sordi 1958, J.A.O. Larsen 1968, 15.  
\(^{17}\) cf. D. Graninger 2011, Chapter 2, who argues that there is little evidence for common cult sites in Thessaly before the mid-second century BCE.  
\(^{18}\) 2000, 213.  
\(^{19}\) For this Aleuas, whom we shall discuss in more detail the context of Aristotle, see M. Sordi 1958 and B. Helly 1995.
later in the fifth century. For the tageia was itself connected to the Thessalian military. In a fifth-century decree from Thessaly, for example, we read that the Thetontians granted honors to a Corinthian, bestowing on him the title of benefactor 
κἐν ταγά ν’ ἐν ἄταγία, a phrase that must in the context mean something along the lines of “in both war and peace” (IG 9.2 257).

The periokic communities were initially autonomous, for Akhaia Phthiotis, Perrhaibia, and Magnesia were represented along with Thessaly in the Amphiktyonic League. But these regions were eventually overwhelmed by tetradic Thessaly. In the late sixth century, in fact, the Thessalians felt entitled to offer the exiled Athenian tyrant Hippias rule over Iolkos in Magnesia (Hdt. 5.94). And in the context of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides frequently attests to the subsidiary status of the periokic ethne (2.102.2; 4.78.6; 8.3.1). The precise relationship between these communities and tetradic Thessaly in the late-archaic and Classical periods is obscure; but it is likely that Larisa, Pherai, and Pharsalos administered particular ethne (Larisa controlling Perrhaibia, Pherai Magnesia, and Pharsalos Akhaia Phthiotis) and that the Perioikoi themselves were required to contribute financially. According to Xenophon (Xen. Hell. 6.1.19), when Jason of Pherai compelled the perioikoi to pay tribute in the early fourth century, he said that he was basing his assessment on that made in the time of a certain Skopas (who evidently ruled at Krannon). Also subject to tetradic Thessaly, at least until the late-third century, were the Penestai. Our sources often compare this group to the Helots at Lakedaimonia; but while the Penestai were similarly exploited for agricultural production and on occasion conscripted into military service, and while they too were not opposed to

---

21 See also Ps. Skylax Peripl. 65; Strab. 9.5.19.
22 D. Graninger 2011, 14-16.
the occasional revolution, the Penestai do not seem to have belonged to the state, either to individual *poleis* or to the region as a whole, but rather to particular landholders.

In the archaic period, Thessalians were well connected with the other Greek communities. Numerous Thessalians competed (and won) at the Olympic Games; Pausanias reports that the first dedication at Delphi was made by a Thessalian (10.16.8); and a Thessalian was allegedly among the suitors of Agariste of Sikyon in the mid-seventh century (Hdt. 6.127). At this time, Thessaly also enjoyed a vibrant intellectual and cultural life. Pindar wrote one of his first *Odes* for an Aleuad victor at the Pythian games (*Pyth.* 10); and Simonides performed at Krannon or Pharsalos (Euphr. F179 van Groningen). And Thessaly early picked up the epigraphic habit, with Thessalian inscriptions dating back at least to the mid-sixth century. Thessaly continued to have a reputation for intellectualism in the late-fifth and early-fourth centuries, we may note (Plato, *Men.* 70AB; Paus. 6.17.9; and Philostr., *Vit.Soph.* 1.17). This is the period to which the so-called *Περὶ Πολιτείας* would date, an incomplete oration once attributed to Herodes Atticus but now generally considered to be a native Thessalian product; the speech attests to a style of rhetoric that certainly matches its contemporary Athenian counterpart.

Our sources sometimes give the impression that in the late sixth and fifth century Thessaly behaved as a unified community. It was because of a *συμμαχίη* that Kineas led the Thessalians to Athens against the invading Spartans (Hdt. 5.63.3). The Thessalians

---

24 J. Ducat 1994, 103-104. According to Xenophon (*Hell.* 2.3.36), Theramenes accused Kritias of fomenting a revolt of the Penestai at the end of the fifth century.
25 The Penestai probably represented indigenous groups, although some traditions saw them as remnants of the earlier Boiotian occupation (Diod. 4.67.3).
26 There were also local games in which the Thessalians competed (see K.J. Gallis 1988).
28 ἀλλὰ ὅμως οὐδὲ Θετταλὸι σοφίας ἦμελον, ἀλλὰ ἐγοργίαζον ἐν Θετταλίαι μικραὶ καὶ μείζους πόλεις ἐς Γοργίαν ὄρῳσαι τὸν Λεοντίνον,
29 See the discussion S. Sprawski 1999, 34-38. Jacoby assigns the speech to the last years of the fifth century (*FGrHist* IIIB Noten, 388 n. 3).
*en masse* offered the exiled Hippias asylum in Magnesia; fought against Phokis in the early-fifth century (Hdt. 8.27); made an alliance with both Athens and Argos in the mid-fifth century (Thuc. 1.102.4; cf. 4.78); and it was the Thessalians *en masse* who medized. But upon closer scrutiny, our notion of a united Thessaly collapses. According to Herodotus, it was the Aleuadai alone who made the decision to support the Persian cause (7.6; 7.172-74 cf. 9.31.5), acting on the advice of Alexander I of Macedon (7.173); and it was to the apparent chagrin of other Thessalians that the Aleuadai continued to nurture ties to the Argeadai over the course of following century (Thuc. 4.132; 4.78.2; see also Diod. 14.92.3). The defection of a group of Thessalians from Athens at the battle of Tanagra in 457 indicates further disunity (Thuc. 1.107; Diod. 11.79); and Thucydides names a king Ekhekratides ruling at just about this time (Thuc. 1.111), suggesting that the balance of power had shifted from Larisa to Pharsalus. This was perhaps a result of the Spartan invasion of Thessaly at the end of the Persian Wars (Hdt. 6.72), which seems to have been aimed precisely to unsettle Aleuad rule (Paus. 3.7.9-10 and Plut. *Mor.* 859D). Pharsalos appears to have maintained its position until the end of the century, with a certain Pharsalian named Daokhos allegedly ruling all of Thessaly for 27 years “by law not force.” But during the Peloponnesian War, Thessaly remained disunited. For one thing, individual Thessalian *poleis*, not Thessaly *in toto*, were involved in proxeny relationships. When the Thessalians sent support to Athens (*κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν ἔξυμμαρχικὸν*) in 431, furthermore, the force was not governed by

---

30 Further evidence for the Thessalian-Athenian alliance comes from the fact that both Peisistratos (*Ath. Pol.* 17) and Kimon (Plut. *Kim.* 14.4) named a son Thettalos.
31 See D. Graninger 2011b, 310.
32 See S. Hornblower 2011, 103.
33 See A.S. Schieber 1982 for Leotykhidas’s invasion.
34 His rule is gleaned only from a monument at Delphi set up in the mid-fourth century by his grandson (*SIG* 274; *FD* 3.4. 460.5). W. Dittenberger (*SIG* I, 66-67) had put the 27 years of his rule in 431-404, but M. Sordi suggested that his rule began a decade earlier see T.R. Martin 1985, 100, 109-115.
36 *cf.* Thuc. 1.102.4 (462 BCE).
one *tagos* or king, but each *polis* sent out individual contingents led by its own general (Thuc. 2.22.3). And when Brasidas marched north to Thrace, the Pharsalians offered him help while another group (the Larisans?) stopped him at the Enipeus River and claimed that he was traveling ἕνευ πάντων κοινοῦ (4.78.3). The *Peri Politeias*, if it does indeed represent a genuine political situation, reflects Pharsalian policy, since it complains about Arkhelaos’s infringement on Thessalian affairs and advocates for an alliance with Sparta.

We also have evidence of stasis within individual Thessalian *poleis*. The son of King Ekhekratides was apparently exiled from Pharsalus in the middle of the century (Thuc. 1.111). And when several Thessalian *poleis* fought for Athens at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides mentions the presence of two Larisan generals, Polymedes and Aristonos, from each of the two factions, ἀπὸ τῆς στάσεως ἕκάτερος (2.22). At the end of the fifth century, moreover, a certain Prometheus aimed to establish a democracy by fomenting revolt among the Penestai, perhaps even calling upon the Athenian oligarch Kritias for help (*Hell*. 2.3.36). And the fourth century will provide many examples of such factionism. The Aleuad Simos was toppled after a revolution at Larisa (*Aristot. Pol*. 5.6 1306a), for example; Xenophon mentions a period of civil war at Pharsalus in the early 370s (*Hell*. 6.1.2); and the Pheraian Deinias came to power at Krannon evidently through a coup (*Polyain*. 2.34).

---

38 See H.D. Westlake 1935, 37; A.W. Gomme 1956 *ad loc*.; and M. Sordi 1958, 119. Perhaps, however, this is only a testament to Larisa’s military might at the time (B. Helly 1995, 233-240).
39 ... ἀλλ’ ἐν Ῥετταλίαι μετὰ Προμηθέως δημοκρατίαν κατεσκεύασε καὶ τοὺς πενέστας ὀπλίζειν ἐπὶ τοὺς δεσπότας. What Xenophon means by a democracy is unclear, for most of our information about Thessalian politics points towards oligarchy; Aristotle uses Larisa and Pharsalus in fact as typical examples of oligarchic rule (*Pol*. 5.5.5 1305b28-30, 5.5.9 1306a9-12). We do no know what Kritias was doing in Thessaly. H.T. Wade-Gery (1958, 280-281) suggested that he was somehow involved with the activity at Larisa to which Aristotle alludes (*Pol*. 3.1.9 1275b25-30), while C. Mossé (1969, 122 n.3) sees a connection between Kritias and disturbances to the rule of Lykophron of Pherai. See also H.-J. Gehrke 1985, 375-376; S. Sprawski 1999, 34-38; and E. Robinson 2011, 63.
In the fourth century, Thessalian disunity is even clearer. In 404 Lykophron of Pherai\(^{40}\) engaged with forces from Larisa in a battle \(\alpha \xi \o beta \oveta \varepsilon \upsilon \zeta \Theta \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \iota \alpha \varsigma\) (\textit{Hell.} 2.3.4). And when he found his rule threatened during the Corinthian War by the Aleuad Medeios (who had the support of Argos), he appealed to Sparta for help (Xen. \textit{Hell.} 6.2.4). In the following generation, we find a Polydamas ruling at Pharsalos (\textit{Hell.} 6.1.2) and Jason, perhaps Lykophron’s son, at Pherai. Jason apparently called himself “Tagos of all the Thessalians,” but later sources tend to refer to him as a tyrant (Diod. 15.60.1; Polyain. 3.9.40; Nep. 4.2; Paus. 6.17.8). In 380, in coalition with a certain Neogenes in Euboia, Jason tried to seize the acropolis of Hestiaia (Diod. 15.30), and soon thereafter he succeeded in subjecting the Marakoi, Dolopes, the Molossians, and even Polydamas of Pharsalos himself (Xen. \textit{Hell.} 3.1.2-19). After Leuktra, Jason managed to conquer Herakleia (Xen. \textit{Hell.} 6.4.27) and Perrhaibia (Diod. 15.57), and he could soon claim as allies the Boiotians, the Athenians,\(^{41}\) and Amyntas in Macedon (Diod. 15.57).\(^{42}\) He even announced plans to take charge of the \textit{panegyris} at Delphi. What he could have accomplished were he not assassinated in 370 we can only guess (Xen. \textit{Hell.} 6.4.31-33).\(^{43}\)

In Jason’s wake, a series of Pheraians sought control of Thessaly: first Jason’s brothers Polydoros and Polyphron (Diod. 15.60.5-61.2), and then Jason’s nephew, Alexander, whom Xenophon describes as categorically unpopular (Xen. \textit{Hell.} 6.4.27). The oppressed Thessalians promptly called for help: the Aleuadai appealed to Alexander II of Macedon, who seized the acropolis of Larisa and Krannon (Diod. 15.61.4; 67); other Thessalians looked to Boiotia (Diod. 16.67.3), and the Thebans dispatched Pelopidas. He dealt with both Alexanders at once, in the process taking the Macedonian prince, Philip

\(^{40}\) For the possibility that Prometheus was actually Lykophron, see S. Sprawski 1999, 31-34.

\(^{41}\) The Athenians possibly included him in their confederacy (\textit{IG II} \(^2\) 43), although the name has been erased from the charter: Jason certainly went to Athens in 373/2 to speak on behalf of Timotheus ([Dem.] 49.10).

\(^{42}\) S. Sprawski 1999, 98-99.

\(^{43}\) For further traditions about Jason, see Polyain. 6.1.
II, to Thebes as a hostage (Diod. 15.67.3). Although Alexander of Pherai regained control for a time and even managed to imprison Pelopidas for several months (Plut. *Pelop.* 27, 29.6; Diod. 15.71; IG 2² 116), Thebes was ultimately successful, restricting Alexander’s influence considerably.⁴⁴ The death of Alexander in 358—he was apparently murdered by his brothers-in-law (Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.35-36)—seems to have put an end to the period of Thessalian expansion.⁴⁵ When two of the tyrannicides, Lykophron and Tisiphronos, claimed the rule for themselves (16.14), the Aleuadai once again sought an alliance with Macedon, this time with significant consequences.

It was Philip II who answered the call, probably in 354 (Diod. 16.14.1-2). At some point during this year or the next, when he seems to have returned to Thessaly,⁴⁶ Philip managed to wrest control of Pherai from the tyrants and, with the support of 20,000 Thessalian hoplites and 500 cavalry, to defeat the Phokians in the Third Sacred War (Diod. 16.35; 37.3; 38.1). It was during this period, too, that Philip was elected *tagos* of all of Thessaly (Just. 11.3.2), although Diodoros says merely that he settled affairs there (16.38.1; cf. Just. 7.6): he ousted several Thessalian tyrants in addition to those from Pherai (Diod. 16.69.8; cf. Dem. 19.260); he reorganized the tetradic system, imposing an archon at the head of each (Theopomp. *FGHist* 115 F208);⁴⁷ and he took at least two Thessalian wives, Nikesipolis from Pherai and Philinna from Larisa, the latter of whom would soon bear him a son, Arrhidaios. In the process, Diodorus says, Philip behaved so honorably towards the Thessalians that he and Alexander henceforth were able to count on the Thessalians as willing allies.⁴⁸

---

⁴⁴ According to Diodoros, Akhaia Phthiotis and Magnesia were actually enrolled in the Boiotian League ca. 364 as separate allies (15.80).
⁴⁵ On Thessaly’s turn towards Thebes at this point, see S. Hornblower (2011, 270), who cites a scholion to Aristid. *Panath.* 179.6.
⁴⁶ For the activity of Philip in this period, see T.R. Martin 1981 and 1982.
⁴⁷ See Dem. 18.211 and 295 and for the career of the tetrarch Daokhos, the descendant of the fifth-century ruler (see D. Graninger 2011b, 316).
⁴⁸ For a more balanced picture of the Thessalian reaction to Philip’s presences, see Polyain. 4.18-19.
In fact, Thessalian support for Macedon was probably not unanimous. After Philip’s death, the Thessalians may have proclaimed Alexander as tagos (Just. 11.3.2), but Polyainos suggests that the regime change actually provoked a minor revolt (4.3.23). By the same token, while we know that the Thessalian cavalry played an important role in Alexander’s conquest of Persia (see e.g. Curt. 6.6.35), with several Thessalians ranking quite high in Alexander’s retinue (e.g. Medeios of Larisa and Kyrsilos of Pharsalos, for whom see below), a contingent of Thessalians also fought alongside Darius (Arr. 2.11.2-3). Upon Alexander’s death, moreover, Thessaly again revolted (Diod. 18.12, 18.17.7; see also Polyain. 4.4.2-3); because the leader of the revolt was Menon of Pharsalos, Pharsalos was accordingly sacked (Diod. 18.17.7). But Macedonian rule was hard to avoid. After marrying Thessalonike, the daughter of Philip’s Pheraian wife, Kassandros garrisoned Larisa, Antron, and Pteleion (Diod. 20.110.2, 111.1; cf. Diod. 20.28.3 for Kassandros’s reliance on the Thessalian cavalry). Kassandros’s death initiated a struggle over Thessaly involving both Pyrrhos and Lysimakhos, but the Antigonids managed to maintain the tageia. In 294, Demetrius Poliorketes founded Demetrias in the Pagasitic Gulf, drawing the new population from villages in Thessaly and Magnesia (Strabo 9.5.15); Demetrias soon became his capital and one of the “fetters” by which the Antigonids held mainland Greece (Polyb. 18.11.5).

Until the coming of the Romans, Thessaly remained by and large under Macedonian control (see Polyb. 4.76; see also 7.11.4-5). There were occasional disruptions, however. Some Thessalians appear to have supported the Gauls when they invaded Greece in 279 (Just. 24.7.2 and Paus. 10.19.12; but cf. 10.23.13-14); at the

---

49 Eusebios’s list of Thessalian Kings after Alexander (see A. Schoene 1967, 242-247) includes Arrhidaios, Kassandros, Phillipos, Antipater/Alexander, Demetrius Poliorketes, Pyrrhos, Lysimakhos, Agathokles, Ptolemaios Keraunos, Meleager, Antipater, Sosthenes, and then, after a period of two years without a tagos, Antigonos Gonatas. Finally Philip V, who reigned for 23 years and nine months and was defeated by Flamininus. Only at this point, Eusebios says, did the Thessalians begin to elect tagoi from amongst themselves.

meeting of the Amphikyonia in 277, Thessaly appears on the roster in its own capacity; and soon after Antigonos Gonatas came to power, Pyrrhos managed once again to insinuate himself in the region. Antigonid control over Thessaly was threatened also by the Aitolian League. In 229, in fact, following the death of Demetrius II, who had married Olympias from Larisa, Thessaly revolted from Macedon (Just. 28.3.14), and Aitolia managed as a result to seize control of Thessaliotis, Phthiotis, and Hestiaiotis, as well as Phthiotic Akhaia. And during the early years of the reign of Philip V, Aitolia made further incursions into Thessaly, reaching as far as Larisa and Pharsalus (Polyb. 5.99-100). But by 217 Aitolia had been reduced. By this point, of course, Antigonid power was on its last legs. After the Second Macedonian War in 196, Thessaly was liberated—according to Livy, Flamininus demanded that Philip free Thessaly first (32.10.7), and in this year the Eleutheria festival was founded at Larisa—and its Koinon nominally restored by Rome (see Polyb. 18.46-47; Livy 33.34.6-7). Following Flamininus’s proclamation, Eusebios tells us, the Thessalians elected Thessalian tagoi for the first time since the mid-fourth century. Over the course of the next 150 years, Thessaly grew in power and size, once again subsuming some of the perioikic that had been severed in 197. It became part of Achaia in 27 BCE but joined Macedonia in the reign of Nero.

---

52 It was probably about 274 that he dedicated his spoils at the temple of Itonian Athena near Larisa (Paus. 1.13.2.). As we shall see, Pyrrhos appears to have tried to assert to legitimize his Thessalian agenda by way of some genealogical propaganda (see Proxenos FGrHist 703 F2; Plut. Pyrrh. 1; Justin, Epitome 17.2.11 – 17.3.22).
53 See J.B. Scholten 2000, 166 n.5.
54 It was in this year that Philip sent a letter to Larisa suggesting that he deal with the population shortage there—a result of “the war”—by enrolling other Thessalians and Greeks. The Larisans followed his advice, but they soon reneged, prompting a second letter in 215; this time Larisa enrolled 200 new citizens, drawing in part on Kannon and Gryton (IG 9.2 517). The exchange is particularly interesting in light of Larisa’s fourth-century reputation for enrolling citizens (see Aristot. Pol 1275b26-30).
55 See D. Graninger 2011a, 73.
2.2.3.2 THE LOCAL HISTORIANS OF TESSALY

A) THE FIFTH CENTURY

The first attested history of Thessaly belongs to Hellanikos. His Θετταλικά has sometimes been interpreted as a segment of a larger work, the Φορωνίς or the Δευκαλιωνεία; but whatever its original form, Hellanikos certainly intended to write a discrete and self-standing account of the region. Four fragments probably derive from this work. In two cases, however, the citers have not provided a book title. We know only that Hellanikos somewhere discussed the naming of the Thessalian polis Larisa after the daughter of Pelasgos (FGrHist 4 F91) and that he elsewhere forwarded an idiosyncratic pronunciation of another Thessalian polis, Spalathra for Spalethra (F201), and the Thessalian history is a likely spot for him to have done so. In a third case (FGrHist 601a F2), our confidence is shaken by the identity of the citer, Natale Conti.

56 Because he saw Hellanikos’s contribution as so essential for understanding Thessalian local literature, Jacoby actually reprinted the two fragments explicitly derived from this work at the beginning of his section on Thessaly (as FGrHist 601a); see FGrHist IIIB Text, 675. Jacoby treated Hellanikos similarly in his sections on Athens, where he is slotted in just before Kleidemos as FGrHist 323a, on Egypt (FGrHist 608a), and on Persia (FGrHist 687a). Hellanikos is also listed as FGrHist 645a for his ἡ Εἰς Ἀµµώνος ἀνάβασις.

57 L. Pearson, for example, suggested that it was simply another name for the third part of that work, which dealt, he thought, with the “Pelasgian branch of the Phoronid family (1939, 170). This, despite Pearson’s earlier assertion that Τὰ Θετταλικά “seems to be another work” (163).

58 e.g. Müller FHG I, xxvi: Quod Argolidi Phoroneus, idem Thessaliae post diluvium fuit Deucalion. See H. Kullmer 1902, 475.

59 The work on Thessaly was probably one book long. For the scholiasts who cite Hellanikos tend to provide a book number if they are referring to multi-volume text (cf. FF38-46 from his Ατθίς and FF33-35 from the Λεσβιακά).

60 Jacoby actually assigned this fragment to the Φορωνίς. The Larisa that Hellanikos names in F36a, we should note, is the Argive polis, founded by the Ur-Pelasgos, not the Pelasgos who went north to Thessaly.

61 In 1922, when Jacoby first confronted Hellanikos (in FGrHist IIA), he listed only one fragment (FGrHist 4 F52) under Hellanikos’s Τὰ Θετταλικά, although he considered another (F201) possible. In 1950 (FGrHist IIIB), however, he also listed the fragment preserved by Natale Conti (601a F2). V. Costa has recently devoted some attention to Conti’s citation of the Greek historians. Cf. 2004a, 2004b, and 2009, which ends with a measure of ambivalence: “autore di attribuzioni certamente arbitrarie (in quanto non dichiarate), ma nondimeno spesso plausibili e talora sagaci” (924-5). On this tricky figure, see also A.G. Roos 1917, A. Cameron 2004, 249-251, and the Introduction to R. Fowler’s Early Greek Mythography, in...
who attributes a story about the abduction of Peleus to Hellanikos, in *Rebus Thessalicis* (*FGrHist* 601a F2). For Conti is fond of assigning likely and authoritative authors to anonymous variants, and he may simply have deemed Hellanikos’s work an appropriate source for the episode.

But for one fragment, from Harpokration’s lemma on τετραχιά, we are on firmer ground (*FGrHist* 601a F1). The lexicographer cites Hellanikos’s τὰ Θεσσαλικά for the fact that Thessaly was divided into τετράδες: Thetalliots, Phthiotis, Pelasgiotis, and Hestiaiotis. The lemma goes on to cite Aristotle, who wrote ἐν τῇ κοινῇ Θεττάλων Πολιτείᾳ about the date and circumstances of Aleuas’s exploit. We cannot tell when Hellanikos himself dated the division of Thessaly, or whether he addressed it in an introductory geographical sketch or by way of a genealogical discussion of the four eponyms. But his identification of a unified Thessalian territory signals an awareness of

---

62 Peleus, beloved by the wife of Akastos, was falsely accused of rape and as punishment was tied naked to a tree in the forests of Mount Pelion; taking pity on him, the gods sent down Vulcan, who released Peleus and granted him a sword with which to protect himself from the encroaching sylvan beasts; after escaping, Peleus made his way to Thessaly and avenged himself on Akastos and on all of Iolkos. For other versions of this narrative, cf. Hes. *F* 208-209, 211 MW; Pindar *Nem*. 4.57-61, 5.25-39; Pherekydes *FGrHist* F62; and *Bibl*. 3.13.1-3.

63 As Jacoby saw (*FGrHist* IIIB *Text*, 676 and IIIB *Noten*, 390 n.3), Conti seems to have been relying here on the scholia to Pindar (*Nem*. 4.88, 92, 95), but he may also have had access to a more accurate set of scholia, in which Hellanikos was actually identified by name.

64 The term was used by Demosthenes in his Third *Philippic* (9.26).

65 As well as Theopompous (*FGrHist* 115 F208), who discussed Philip II’s assignation of an archon to each τετράς. Harpokration clearly forms the basis of the *Souda*’s very similar entry (T403).

66 Pearson suggested that Hellanikos’s four-part division had to do with “Thessaly in historical times” (1939, 163 188-193). Jacoby suggested that if Hellanikos had already written the two-book Δευκάλωνεια that treated Thessalian legends (see *e.g.* *FGrHist* 4 F6a), he could have begun his specialized history of Thessaly at a subsequent point in time, after the migration of Pelasgos (for Jacoby’s chronology of Hellanikos’s writings, see *FGrHist* IIIB *Suppl.*, I 6-7). This is possible; but given Hellanikos’s general practice, I find it difficult to believe that he would have begun the history of a region as inveterate as Thessaly without addressing it *ab ovo*. As Ambaglio says in his study of Hellanikos, “In generale è da considerare che il concetto di ripetitività, applicato a uno scrittore dalla vasta e frazionata produzione come Ellanico, vissuto in un'età in cui la circolazione e la divulgazione delle opere era assai più difficollosa e meno sistematica di quanto comunemente non si creda, perde molto della sua connotazione negativa; in
a cohesive Thessalian historiographical identity, despite the realities of late-fifth-century Thessalian affairs. For during the years of Hellanikos’s activity, individual Thessalian poleis generally acted independently and very often antithetically, whatever the effects of the allegedly peaceful 27-year rule of Daokhos in Pharsalos. Hellanikos is not imposing a false unity on Thessaly by designating the region en masse as the focalizer of his narrative. The cohesion of Thessaly, as we shall see, animates all Thessalian local historiography, extrinsic and intrinsic alike.

At around the same time that Hellanikos was working on his history of Thessaly, the Athenian oligarch and sophist Kritias wrote a Πολιτεία of the Thessalians (Athen. 14 662f = DK 88 B31 = BNJ 338A F8), a work that seems to have been analogous to the Politeia he wrote of the Lakedaimonians (BNJ 338A FF9-15).67 The Thessalian Politeia was probably composed in connection to Kritias’s exile from Athens in Thessaly, a sojourn on which Xenophon blames the decay of Kritias’s character—for it was in Thessaly that he first parted with the civilizing influence of Socrates and lived among lawless men (Mem. 1.2.24 = DK 88A4 = BNJ 338A T4d).68 Philostratos provides a fuller picture of Kritias’s Thessalian stay (1.16 = DK 88 A1 = BNJ 338A T1), claiming that the sophist ignored whatever culture he could have found among the Thessalians and exacerbated the local oligarchies through his inflammatory speech, with the result that he was more detrimental to the Thessalians then they were to him. We do not know what Kritias was doing in Thessaly. According to Theramenes in Xenophon’s Hellenika, he was helping some “Prometheus establish a democracy and arm the penestai against their masters” (2.3.36 = DK 88A10 = BNJ 338A T10c). But such democratic sentiment is

altre parole, una notizia ripetuta in opere diverse raggiungeva più lettori che non una notizia data una sola volta” (1980, 37).

67 He also may have written a Politeia of the Athenians (BNJ 338A FF18-36).

difficult to square with Kritias’s behavior at Athens at the end of the century, to say nothing of the likelihood of a democracy in late-fifth-century Thessaly.

   The only explicit reference to Kritias’s work on Thessaly comes in Athenaios in a discussion of ματτύη, the rich delicacy said to have originated in the region (14 662F-663B = BNJ 338A F8). Athenaios uses the dish to dissertate on the extravagance of the Thessalians; according to Kritias’s Πολιτεία, he says, the Thessalians invited the Persians to invade Greece because they admired Persian luxury and extravagance and coveted Persian wealth (14.83 663A = BNJ 338A F8; see also 12.33 527a-b).” Aside from Thessaly’s medism and love of luxury—and we should note that in his Elegies Kritias also mentioned Θεσσαλικὸς δὲ θρόνος, γυίων τρυφερώτατη ἔδρα (BNJ 338A F1a) and prays for “the wealth of the Skopadai” (BNJ 338A F6)—we can only guess at the contents and scope of his work on the politeia. Like Hellanikos, he certainly wrote extrinsically and for a non-local audience. A perusal of the fragments from his other Πολιτείαι, moreover, suggests that his interests were largely sociological. His Politeiai, that is to say, were more akin to that later written by (Ps.-)Xenophon on the Lakedaimonians than those of Aristotle. Yet Kritias nevertheless approaches his focal community with its past in mind, using present behavior to explicate Thessalian history. Like Hellanikos, moreover, Kritias treats the Thessalians en masse: it is not the Aleuadai alone who medize but all of Thessaly; and all Thessalians revel equally in luxury.

---

69 It is possible that another fragment belongs to his work on Thessaly, a reference in Pollux (7.59 = DK 88 B38 = BNJ 338A F17), which says that in his Πολιτείαι Kritias used the word σκέλεαι (which meant trousers).
B) THE FOURTH CENTURY

We know less about the contents of Aristotle’s Θετταλῶν Πολιτεία,70 which he wrote after Thessaly had been subjected to Macedon, than about his work on Samos, since we do not have the luxury of relying on Herakleides’ epitome; there is a reference in Photius that Sopatros of Apamea wrote an epitome of Aristotle’s Thessalian Politeia at some point in the fourth century CE (Phot. Bibl. 161 104b40ff), but this text has not survived. We do have several fragments of considerable interest, however.71 One recalls Kritias’s Politeia in its focus on Thessalian drink. It is preserved, not surprisingly, by Athenaios, in this case in his prolix catalogue of cups. One of the diners notices that while the word ὁ λάγυνος (“flask”) is usually masculine, Aristotle claims in his Θετταλῶν Πολιτεία that the Thessalians treated it as feminine (11.100 499d = F503 Gigon). The point is not that Aristotle himself feminized the word but that he attributed this form to the Thessalians. He seems to have made an effort, that is to say, to draw on contemporary Thessalian data when composing his Politeia, and he clearly treated dialect as an integral aspect of community. That the Thessalians not only used the λάγυνος but used the word in its apparently poetic form72 may have enabled Aristotle to frame what he saw as an essential ambivalence of the Thessalians, caught as they were between extravagance and luxury on the one hand and high culture on the other.73

70 Harpokration is the only one to call the work Κοινὴ Θετταλῶν Πολιτεία, just as he alone refers to Aristotle’s work on Arkadia as Κοινὴ Θετταλῶν Πολιτεία (F487.1 Gigon); the other testimonia opt, on the other hand, for the title Θετταλῶν Πολιτεία.
71 For a recent survey of the work, see S. Sprawski 2012.
72 Rhianos of Bene also used the form in an epigram (Athen. 13.100 499d = FGrHist 265 T2), as did Poseidippos (Anth.Pal. 5.134.1) and Eratosthenes (Athen. 7.2.5 276B).
73 Philostratos later pointed to the tension between the drunken, violent, and tyrannical behavior of the Thessalians and their inclination toward wisdom and rhetoric (Vit. Sophist. 1.16). One other fragment may belong to this work (F505.1 Gigon; cf. 505.2 and 505.3, from Hesykhios and Macrobius respectively, but without a direct citation of Aristotle); it comes from Servius’s commentary to the Georgics (2.97) and uses Aristotle to explain the adjective aminneus, which is defined as a synonym for sine minio; the commentator
The other fragments from Aristotle’s *Politeia* concern the political activity of Aleuas Pyrrhos. In his reference to τέταρταρχία, we saw, Harpokration cites Aristotle directly after Hellanikos (F502 Gigon) and attributes to him the fact that Thessaly was divided into *tetrades* in the reign of Aleuas Pyrrhos (ἐπὶ Ἀλεύα τοῦ Πύρρου).  

We do not know when Aristotle thought that this Aleuas ruled. Plutarch mentions a king Aleuas, who, with initial support from his uncle and Delphi, “brought his *ethnos* to great fame and power,” and he narrates the story of his rise to power (*de Frat. Am.* 492 A-B), along the way citing a Delphic oracle in which the future king is called Πύρρος.  

But whenever Aristotle placed Aleuas, he attributes to Aleuad initiative what seems to have been a defining moment of Thessalian unity. The privileging of the Larisan contribution to the formation of the Thessalian community may date back to the period of Larisan dominance in the late-sixth and early-fifth centuries. It may on the other hand have had a more recent origin, connected perhaps to Jason of Pherai or to the association between the Aleudai and Philip II.  

We can say more about Aristotle’s account of Aleuas. For a scholion to Euripides’ *Rhesos*, explicating a phrase used to describe the Thracian army, defines a πέλτη by way of a verbatim quotation from Aristotle’s *Θεσσαλῶν Πολιτεία* (F504.1 Gigon = 498

---

74 I do not understand with what basis H.D. Westlake concludes, “An important passage in Aristotle (F497 Rose) does not mean, as it is commonly interpreted, that Aleuas divided an existing unity into four µοῖραι but rather that he found Thessaly consisting of four µοῖραι and—the extant fragment does not record this further step—united them into a single state (1935, 25).

75 It is not certain whether this Aleuas Pyrrhos can be connected with his namesake at the center of the Δαρδανικά written by Hegemon of Alexandria Troas (*FGrHist* 110 F1), a cattleherd with golden hair who was courted by a snake near the Haimonian spring on Mt. Ossa. See M. Sordi, who thinks that Aristotle’s Aleuas lived in the late sixth century and was the son of Simos and father of Thorax (1958, 65-84), and B. Helly 1995, 118-119.

76 F. Hiller von Gaertringen proposed that the tradition of Aleuas’s reforms goes back to Jason’s attempts to mobilize Thessaly ca. 370 (1890, 14-16). We have seen that according to Xenophon, Jason did make reference to the tribute assessment of Skopas to justify his own program, so it is possible that he appealed also to Aleuas. But it is unclear why Jason would have made an Aleuad responsible for the military organization of all of Thessaly. See also S. Sprawski 2012, 147.
The text of the scholion is a little disturbed, but the main thought is clear enough: Aleuas divided Thessaly κατὰ τὸν κλῆρον and arranged that each was to supply forty cavalry and eighty peltastai, who were to carry three javelins and a small spear called a σχέδιον. The scholiast does not indicate how these κλῆροι, which apparently served as the basis of a military conscription, relate to the four τετράδες; they are surely not synonymous, since 160 cavalry would be too small a contingent even for a putative early phase of Thessalian history. Aristotle’s Aleuas, then, appears to have divided each tetrasi into several kleroi, similar perhaps in Aristotle’s mind to Kleisthenes’ division of Attica by τριττύς and δῆμος. We cannot tell how far Aristotle traced the history of Thessaly or, aside from the tetrades and kleroi, to what extent he described the common constitution of Thessaly. He probably treated the Penestai, however, since he mentioned this group in his Politeiai of both the Cretans (Herakl. Lemb. 15) and the Syracusans (F586 Rose), as well as in the Politics (2.6.2 1269a34-39, b5), where he equated them to the Helots in Lakedaimonia, the Klarotai in Crete, and the Kallikyrioi in Syracuse.77

We can assign with certainty two other Thessalian historians to the fourth century: Medeios of Larissa (FGrHist 129) and Kyrsilos of Pharsalos (FGrHist 130). Both accompanied Alexander to Asia (Strab. 9.14.12 = FGrHist 129 T1), and both wrote about Thessaly, specifically about the Thessalian origin of Armenia and Media. About Kyrsilos, we know very little, but Medeios is a more distinct character. He was the son of Oxythemis of Larissa (Arrian. Ind. 18.7 = T2), an Aleuad, and perhaps a grandson of his namesake who led Pharsalos in the early-fourth century (Diod. 14.82.5). He was a trierarch in 326 when Alexander sailed down the Hydaspes (Arrian. Ind. 18.7 = T2),

---

77 Although we should note conclude that all of the Thessalian exempla in the Politics were perforce included in his Thessalian Politeia: Aristotle’s reference to the ὀλίγοι at Pharsalos, who are master of many men since they on good terms with them (5.5.7 1306a10-13); his reference to οἱ πολιτοφύλακες at Larisa who tried to win favor with the demos (5.5.5 1305 29-30); and his reference to the Aleuad Simos at Larisa (5.5.9 1306 30-31).
supposedly one of the most influential of Alexander’s companions, and the host at whose banquet Alexander drank the draught that caused his death (Arrian. *Anab.* 7.24.4-25.1 = T3). This, and his alleged affair with the royal cupbearer Iollas, naturally led to his implication in Alexander’s passing (Arrian. *Anab.* 7.27.2 = T4). But Medeios emerged unscathed, turning up later in the service first of Perdikkas (Arrian. *FGrHist* 156 F 10.6 = T6) and then of Antigonos (Diod. 19.69.3, 75.3; 20.50.3 and Plut. *Demetr.* 19 = T7a-d). He was honored by Gonnoi, near his hometown of Larissa, and also by Athens.

The histories of Medeios and Kyrsilos are cited only once, by Strabo in his discussion of Armenia (11.14.11-14 = *FGrHist* 129F1 = 130F1). There is, Strabo begins, an Armenian ἀρχαιολογία according to which the Thessalian Armenos (originating from Armenion in Thessaly) accompanied (συνεστράτευσεν) Jason eastward and was responsible for naming Armenia. Strabo assigns this ἀρχαιολογία to Kyrsilos and Medeios, both of whom, he says, accompanied Alexander on his campaign (ἀνδρεῖς συνεστρατευκότες Ἀλεξάνδρῳ). They apparently went on to expound the Thessalian origin of Armenian clothing, the long khitons and the cloaks fastened with clasps, as well as the Thessalian influence on Armenian and Median horsemanship. Strabo turns now to Thessalian geography, still evidently drawing on Medeios and Kyrsilos. He tells us that Armenos named Armenia’s major river after a similar waterway in Thessaly, the Araxes (which in due course would become the Peneios). The Thessalian river was so called, Strabo reports, because it had severed (διὰ τὸ ἀπαράξιος) Mount Ossa from Olympus, thereby creating Tempe. And in order further to assimilate the Armenian river to its Thessalian counterpart, Jason made a pass in the mountains through which the water could rush down (καταράτει) into the Caspian sea and thus relieve the plain of its wet

---

78 Plutarch accordingly calls Medeios τοῦ περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον χοροῦ τῶν κολάκων ὁδὸν ἔξαρχος καὶ σοφιστής κορυφαίος ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀρίστους συντεταγμένος (*Quem. Adulat.* 24 65CD = T5).

79 IG II² 498; See the discussion of Medeios in J. Hornblower 1981, 126-7.
load. This is much more plausible than Herodotus’s account, Strabo continues, where the river Araxes has forty mouths, only one of which ran into the Caspian Sea (1.202). One should conclude from all of this, finally, that the Armenians and Medes (for his account of the Medes, see 11.13.10)—are related to the Thessalians and are the descendants of Jason and Medea.

Strabo provides no titles when he cites Medeios and Kyrsilos. It is unlikely that both wrote the same book, and we should infer that one relied on or merely cited the other. We shall see a similar formulation of citation in reference to the Argive historians Agias and Derkylos (FGrHist 305). Jacoby may be right to classify Medeios and Kyrsilos as historians of Alexander’s campaigns. We do know that at around this time another Larisan, Polykleitos, perhaps the grandfather of Antigonus Doson, wrote Ἰστορίαι apparently focused on Alexander (FGrHist 128). The present passage, in this case, could have introduced the satrapy of Armenia at the point in the narrative where Alexander first assigned it a satrap (Mithrenes in 331/0: Arr. Anab. 3.16.5; Diod. 17.64.6; Curt. 5.1.44 and 8.12). Our writers would then be engaging in Alexander’s project of finding Greek precedent (and Greek roots) all over conquered Asia. But the involvement of Medeios and Kyrsilos in Alexander’s campaigns does not perforce make them historians of Alexander. In the case of Polykleitos, we have fragments that refer to

---

80 Jacoby raises the possibility that Kyrsilos was the secretary or editor of Medeios’s history (FGrHist IIC, 442), while R. Lane Fox even speaks of the two as co-authors (2004, 27).
81 P. Bernard suggests that their work might also have included an account of the wars of the Diadochii (1997, 136-7).
82 FGrHist IIC Text, 442. A.B. Bosworth (1998, 119) suggests that Medeios, who was in the service of Perdikkas in 321 (Arr. FGrHist 156 F24.6), may have been involved in the occupation of Armenia by the Epeirote Neoptolemos (Plut. Eum. 4.1; 5.1-2). P. Bernard suggests that Medeios was also in Armenia just before the Battle of Ipsos (1997, 185-187).
83 See the discussions of L. Robert (1968, 427-439) and A.B. Bosworth (1998, 98-132). As C.P. Jones has suggested (1999, 43), Kyrsilos and Medeios might even have claimed Armenios as “personal paradigm” and considered themselves to be emulating Armenios by following Alexander eastward.
Alexander or contemporary military events; but this is not so for Medeios and Kyrsilos. Their etiology of Armenia would belong just as easily to Θεσσαλικά as to a history of Alexander. A similar ambiguity affects the work of Kineas, we shall see, who is sometimes classified as a historian of Pyrrhos’s campaigns, sometimes as a writer of Θεσσαλικά (FGrHist 603). If the ἄρχαιολογία that Strabo cited belonged originally to Θεσσαλικά, Medeios and Kyrsilos would likely have treated the formation of Tempe earlier in their narrative(s) and then alluded to it again with reference to Jason and the Argonauts. For what it is worth, Justin’s epitome of Pompeius Trogus makes a parallel link between Thessaly and Armenia, and this in connection not to Alexander but to Mithridates (42.2.10), which suggests that the narrative was not inherently associated with Alexander but belonged first and foremost to the context of the Argonautika.

It is not clear how much of Strabo’s account is drawn from our Thessalian writers: certainly that Armenos came from Armenion (perhaps he was its founder) and christened Armenia and the Araxes river, that Jason split the mountain to replicate in Armenia the Vale of Tempe, and finally that the Armenians and Medes ape the Thessalians in clothing and pursuits. Possibly they were also responsible for linking Medea to the Medes and voiced disagreement with Herodotus about the sources of the Araxes River. But what is clear is that when these two Thessalians set off for the East under Alexander, now nominal archon of Thessaly, they saw as defining characteristics

---

84 The Medeios who is cited in the Makrobioi for the longevity of Antigonos Gonatas (11) cannot be the same historian (Gonatas died in 239 BCE, after all): a relative, perhaps?
85 “Sed quoniam in Armeniam transitum facimus, origo eius paulo altius repetenda est . . . Condita est autem ab Armenio, Jasonis Thessali comite, quem cum perditum propter insignem periculosamque regno suo uiirtutem Pelias rex cuperet, denuntiata militia in Colchos abire iubet pellemque arietis memorabilem gentibus reportare . . . (Jason’s quest is described). Armenius quoque, et ipse Thessalus, unus de numero ducum Jasonis, recollecta multitudine, quae amissos Jasone rege passim uagabatur, Armeniam condidit, a cuius montibus Tigris fluiius modicis primo incrementis nascitur ; interiecto deinde aliquanto spatio sub terras mergitur, atque ita post quinque et XX milia passuum grande iam flumen in regione Sophene emergit ac sic in paludes Euphratis recipitur” (42.2.10-3.9).
86 Alexander was not the first to lead Thessalians east; a contingent of Thessalians, under the leadership of Menon, had been in the retinue of Cyrus, after all (Xen. Anab. 1.2.6).
of their native community not only particular customs (horse-riding and clothing) but also Thessalian topography. Thessalians evidently had many opportunities in the late-fourth century to go abroad. Aside from Medeios and Kyrsilos, Thessalians appear in positions of power all over the Hellenistic world, in Egypt and perhaps as far away as Baktria, if the name of the founder of Ai-Khanoum correctly betrays his heritage. The impulse to tell the history of Thessaly was connected to the Thessalian experience outside of Thessaly. Related to this is the tendency of Thessalian local historians to highlight the penetration of Thessalians into the outside world. Unlike many communities whose local histories drew legendary figures of pan-local importance into the local community—to say nothing of the ubiquitous Herakles, we may note that in the Arkadika Aineias founds a city in Arcadia on his way from Troy (FGrHist 316 F1)—the Thessalika tend to cast Thessalians and Thessalian culture abroad.

C) THE THIRD CENTURY AND BEYOND

Of the remaining local historians of Thessaly, Kineas, Euphorion, Rhianos of Bene, and Baton of Sinope belong with certainty to the third century, Staphylos of Naukratis and Souidas (probably) to the late third or early second century. Arkhinos and Philokrates cannot be dated with precision.

87 CRAI 1968, 422 = Ai Khanoum 1, 207ff.
89 Since Arkhinos is cited by commentators on Pindar and Homer, a date before the end of the first-century BCE is probable. He may have been Thessalian, given the frequency with which the name appears on Thessalian inscriptions (IG 9.1.167, 230; 9.2.517, 568; AD 17B (1961/62) 179, 4a; SEG 15, 370), but the general popularity of the name throughout Greece prohibits total confidence. The two scholiasts who cite him show that he wrote Θεσσαλικά (FGrHist 604 FF1-2). Stephanos does not name a work but cites him with reference to a Thessalian polis. Only three fragments are assigned to him: the first, from a scholion to Homer (Od. 10.7), says that Aiolos (presumably the king of Thessaly: cf. Hes. F10 MW; Apoll. Bibl. 1.7.3; Diod. 4.67.2; and Paus. 9.40.1 and 10.8.4) was the first to marry his daughters to his sons (F1); the second, from a scholion to Pindar (Pyth. 3.59), is about a lake in Thessaly (F2); and the third gives an etymology for the Thessalian polis Dotion, from Dotos the son of Neonos, son of Hellen (F3).
90 Philokrates is named as the author of Θεσσαλικά only by Athenaios and by Apollodoros, who is dated anywhere between the first century BCE and the third century CE (see J.-C. Carrière and B. Masosnie
Thessalian Kineai abound. Aside from the *basileus* who offered his support to the Athenian tyrant, Hippias (*Ath.Pol.* 19.5, cf. Hdt 5.63), we know of a Kineas who allegedly betrayed his homeland to Philip of Macedon in the mid-fourth century BCE (Dem. 18.295; Theopomp. *FGrHist* 115 F35; Polyb. 18.14.4), and epigraphic data provide other homonyms.91 In one of Stephanos’s two references to Kineas, he identifies him as ὁ ὅῤῥητω (*FGrHist* 603 T1 = F1a), so our author is often, and certainly correctly, equated with that most celebrated Thessalian Kineas, the trusted and eloquent ambassador of the Epeirote king, Pyrrhos.92 This Kineas learned his craft, we are told, from Demosthenes and was so persuasive an orator that Pyrrhos claimed to have conquered more cities by way of Kineas’s *logoi* than by his own weapons (*Pyrrh.* 14 = *FGrHist* 603 T2a). Cicero (*de Senect.* 43 = *BNJ* 603 T2c), Valerius Maximus (4.3.2 = *BNJ* 603 T2d), and Appian (*Samn.* 10.1 = *FGrHist* 603 T2b) attest to the great impression his rhetorical prowess made on the Romans during his visit to Italy. If Kineas had actually trained with Demosthenes—the tradition may of course only be an inference drawn by the Romans of the late Republic—he was born no later than ca. 340 BCE,

---

91 Jacoby lists Philokrates directly after Hellanikos in his section on Thessalian local historians because he sees traces (*FGrHist* IIIB Text, 676) of Callimachus’s *Pinakes* in Athenaios’s citation (6.85 264a = *FGrHist* 601 F2). This is because Athenaios questions the authenticity of Philokrates’ work—Φιλοκράτης δ’ ἐν β’ Θησαλικῶν, ἐς γένεσι τὰ συγγράμματα, κτλ. Such doubt in Athenaios is not rare (see F. Schmidt 1922, 21-22; 79, 91 and C. Jacob, 2000, 99-101), and in one case it comes explicitly from the *Pinakes* (2 70A = *FGrHist* 1 T15a); see D. Ambaglio 2007, 113-4. If Callimachus had known of Philokrates, the Θησαλικά must have belonged to the fourth century BCE. I am not convinced that we can date Philokrates with such precision, however, since Callimachus is not the only source for such bibliographic doubt (Didymos is another possibility). Of Philokrates’ provenance we know nothing; but it is worth noting that the name is not rare in Thessaly, and several Philokrateis actually held positions of importance in the region: *strategos* (*IG* IX2 463), for example, *tamias* (*SEG* 31, 577), and *tageus* (*Gonnoi* II 90). Two fragments are assigned to Philokrates, the first from Apollodoros about the parentage of Patrokllos (3.176 = *FGrHist* 601 F1), the second from Athenaios about the Thessalian Penestai (F2). His Θησαλικά was at least two books long, for Athenaios found the discussion of the Penestai in the second book.

92 Jacoby suggests this Kineas was in fact the son of Philip’s ally (*FGrHist* IIIB Noten, 393 n. 9).
which would make him an old man during Pyrrhos’s campaigns. If we ignore the link with Demosthenes, however, we can place his birth somewhat later in the century.

Plutarch quotes several choice Kinean *apophthegmata*, which he may well have culled from Kineas’s own writings. We have other evidence that Pyrrhos’s Kineas was a writer, since Cicero mentions a tactical treatise (9.25.1 = *FGrHist* 603T3b), later identified by Aelian the Tactician as an epitome of Aineias (*Takt*. 1.2 = *FGrHist* 603 T3a). None of the four fragments collected by Jacoby under *FGrHist* 603 provide a title, however, but it is unlikely that they came from the *στρατηγικὰ βιβλία*. Jacoby suggests that Kineas wrote about Pyrrhos’s campaigns, in the tradition, say, of the Epeireote Proxenos. But as we saw in our discussions of Medeios and Kyrsilos, Jacoby has a tendency to assign to participants in a military campaign a history of that campaign. This is not self-explanatory. Excursions out of one’s homeland and into the greater world could provoke a plurality of historiographical responses. After all, even Proxenos wrote in addition to Τὰ περὶ Πύρρον Σικελικά (*FGrHist* 703 FF4, 9) Τὰ Ἡπειρωτικά (*FGrHist* 703 FF2-3).

There are three pieces of evidence that suggest Kineas wrote an autonomous work on Thessaly. The first is Stephanos’s abridged lemma on Ephyra (*FGrHist* 603 F1). The entry begins by defining Ephyra as a *polis* in Epeiros, whose name was derived from Ephyrrros, a descendant of Pelasgos. And then, after a note that Homer called Corinth Ephyra (cf. *Il*. 2.570, 6.1), we read: ἔστι καὶ ἄλλη Ἐφύρη Κράννους λεγομένη ὡς φησι Κινέας ὁ ἰτωρ καὶ Ἐπαφρόδιτος· β’ περὶ Θεσσαλίαν. γ’ Ὀινόη. Meineke astutely observed that after having just spoken about Ephyrai in Epeiros and Corinth, Stephanos could hardly speak of a second Thessalian Ephyra. He wondered, then, if the

93 Cf. the apophthegma regarding the wages of ambition (Plut. *Pyrrh*. 14.2-7) or his remark that Rome was a country of kings (Plut. *Pyrrh*. 19 and Eutropius 2.13).
94 Cicero also attributes such a book to Pyrrhos.
The text should rather read: ὡς φησι Κινέας ὁ ῥήτωρ β’ Περὶ Θεσσαλίας καὶ Ἐπαφρόδιτος, that is, “as Kineas says in the second book Περὶ Θεσσαλίας and Epaphroditos (too).” The second piece of evidence is the fact that in connection to the oracle at Dodona both Strabo and Stephanos (FGrHist 603 F2), obviously drawing on the same source, pair Kineas with Souidas, and Souidas we know for certain wrote Θετταλικά (FGrHist 602 FF1-3). Lastly, Kineas is never cited (as is Proxenos) for information about Pyrrhos; each of the four fragments, rather, is about Thessaly: his work was recognized as a definitive resource for early Thessalian history.

Stephanos’s entry on Ephyra reveals a long-standing scholarly dispute about the location of the polis; already in Homer there is some inconsistency, and it was a crux that attracted the attention of Eumelos (FGrHist 451 F1), Hippias (FGrHist 6 F12), Demetrios of Skepsis (FGrHist 2013 F55), and Apollodoros in his Catalogue of Ships (FGrHist 244 FF179-181), among others. Staking a claim to a local Ephyra was apparently a popular enterprise. As Hippias of Elis pointed to an Ephyra in Elis (FGrHist 6 F12), so too did Kineas point to a Ephyra in Thessaly (FGrHist 603 F1a); this was, he tells us, the former name of Κράννους (evidently a local version of Κράννων). A scholiast to Pindar is a little more helpful in reproducing Kineas’s thought here (FGrHist 603 F1b). Pindar refers in Pythian 10 (85a) to certain Ephyrians who dwelt around the Peneios River, the Thessalian Peneios, that is, since the Ode is addressed to the Thessalian Hippokleas. The scholiast wonders to which Ephyrians Pindar could possibly be referring. Surely, he reasons, the poet is not talking about the Ephyrians in Thesprotia (Epeiros) or Corinth, so he must mean those around Krannon. And he now adduces

96 1849, 291.
97 Which Jacoby identifies as Apollodoros the Athenian (FGrHist 244 F179, cf. FGrHist IIIB Text, 680 and 681).
98 Il. 2.659; 6.152, 210; 13.301; 15.531; Od. 1.259; 2.328.
99 Cf. Jacoby’s commentary to Apollodoros FGrHist 244 FF179-181, FGrHist IIIA Text, 787-789.
100 Κράννους may be a scribal error, with Κράννων intended, but as Meineke pointed out, there is no reason to assume that it could not be a Thessalian form (1849, 290).
Kineas, according to whom Ephyra was once ruled by Kranon and took his name after the king died at the wedding of Hippodameia in Pisa. Among the suitors for the hand of Agariste of Sikyon, we recall, Herodotus had included Diaktorides, one of the Skopadai of Kranon (6.127). Through King Kranon, then, Kineas sought an even earlier precedent for Thessalian inclusion in a broader Hellenic aristocracy. As we noted in the case of Medeios and Kyrsilos, Thessalian local historiography, rather than pull nonlocals into the local community, casts its local elements abroad. This tendency is clear also in our second Kinean fragment about Dodona, the Epeirote sanctuary and shrine of great importance to Pyrrhos.\(^{101}\)

Strabo reports (7.7.12 = FGrHist 603 F2a) that the historian Souidas, in an effort to gratify the Thessalians, advocated certain μυθώδεις λόγοι and claimed that the temple of Dodona had been moved to Epeiros from Pelasgian (Thessalian) Skotoussa; along with the sanctuary went many women, whose descendants became the prophetesses of the shrine; and it is for this reason, Souidas concluded, that at Dodona Zeus is called Pelasgian (FGrHist 602F11a). Strabo’s text is slightly damaged here, but just before it breaks off, he says that Kineas wrote something even more fabulous (μυθωδόστερον).\(^{102}\)

The lacuna prohibits any conclusions about Kineas’s contribution and in what ways his account differed from that of Souidas. But we are able to get a better sense of what both historians said about Dodona from the 9th-century abridgement of Strabo (the so-called Chrestomathy) and from Stephanos. The Chrestomathy (7 F1 Radt = FGrHist F11b), citing no source for its tale, claims that the temple was transferred to Dodona in

---

\(^{101}\) Dio says that Pyrrhos consulted the oracle of Zeus at Dodona (9.40.6) before his Italian journey, and the god gave him very much the same ambivalent response that Apollo would at Delphi (Enn. 1.167). See Paus. 1.13.2 regarding Pyrrhos’s connections to the sanctuary. A bronze dedicatory inscription survives at Dodona in honor of one of Pyrrhos’s victories over the Romans (Syll. I 392).

\(^{102}\) Regarding the alleged connection between Thessaly and Dodona, see Hyg. Fab. 225, where the founder of Dodona is named Thessalos. See the cogent discussion of B. Kowalzig 2007, Ch. 7.
accordance with an oracle of Apollo after the sacred oak tree was burned.\textsuperscript{103} The oracle apparently spoke through symbols, the flights of pigeons, which the priestesses of Dodona were trained to interpret. Yet perhaps, the \textit{Chrestomathy} suggests, these were not pigeons but three priestesses, since the words for old women and old men in Molossian and Thesprotian are \textit{πελίαι} and \textit{πελίοι} (and the common word for pigeon is \textit{πελειάς}). None of this, once again, is explicitly derived from Kineas or from Souidas, but it is possible that either or both used linguistic data to reinforce their conclusions about the Thessalian origin of Dodona. If so, we may read this along with Kineas’s use of \textit{Κράννους} in F1a as a conscious effort to employ Thessalian local dialectical forms, like Aristotle, as a means of defining the Thessalian community.

Stephanos is a third source for Kineas on Dodona. He says that Homer must have accommodated two different Dodonai, one in Thesprotia (\textit{Od.} 14.327; 19.296) and the other in Thessaly (\textit{Il.} 16.233; cf. 22.75)—Thessaly is interestingly where the \textit{Catalogue of Ships} locates Dodona (\textit{Il.} 2.750)—and then that Souidas claimed the temple of Zeus Phegonaios (of the oak-grove) was actually in Thessaly. But some writers, Stephanos continues, said that the name of this Zeus was actually Bodonaios, for there was a \textit{polis} in Thessaly called Bodona, where Zeus was honored. And then he adduces Kineas as evidence for the removal to Epeiros of both the oracle and the oak tree (\textit{FGrHist} 603 F2b). This seems more or less the account attributed by Strabo to Souidas, so it is possible that Strabo has misread his immediate source and assigned to Souidas a narrative that had been written by Kineas; it is also possible that what was in fact “more fabulous” part of Kineas’s account was the relocation not only of the temple but of the tree, too. In

\textsuperscript{103} The text actually reads τὸ χρηστήριον . . . μετηνέχθη κατὰ χρησμὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐν Δωδώνῃ, but Radt notes that the phrase ἐν Δωδώνῃ is not attached to Apollo but a \textit{Hyperurbanismus} for εἰς Δωδώνην (2007, 340).
any case, Kineas’s primary goal was to prove the Thessalian roots of Pyrrhos’s oak and oracle.

The fragments do not permit any further conclusions about Kineas’s history, but he certainly attempted to boost the prestige of his homeland, in particular its relation to Epeiros. Such a project may have served Pyrrhos, who was hard at work both before and after his Italian venture trying to wrest control of Thessaly from Antigonos Gonatas and Lysimakhos.\textsuperscript{104} We should recall in this context the inscription appended to the trophies that Pyrrhos dedicated at the temple of Itonian Athena near Larisa, where he calls himself and the Molossians Aiakidai, evidently after the father of Peleus (Paus. 1.12.2-3; cf. Plut. \textit{Pyrrh.} 26.9.10; Diod. 22.11.1).\textsuperscript{105} But Kineas’s primary intended audience was likely his own countrymen. In the early third century, the Macedonian rule on which Thessalian identity had come to depend was shaken and, for a time, displaced. The community as a result was compelled to reconfigure its autobiography, now with an appeal not to Macedon but to Epeiros.

Rhianos of Bene was born around the time of Pyrrhos’s death, working his way from lowly gymnasium doorkeeper, the \textit{Souda} tells us (P 158), to \textit{grammatikos} and thence to poet of international renown—he would be numbered among the favorites of the emperor Tiberius (Suet. \textit{Tib.} 70.2). In addition to an edition of Homer, Rhianos wrote numerous epigrams and several epics; the \textit{Souda} mentions only the \textit{Herakleia}, but we have testimony of many others, including \textit{Ἀχαικά} in at least four books (\textit{FGrHist} 265 FF1-5), \textit{Ἡλιακά} in at least three books (FF6-11), \textit{Μεσσηνιακά} in at least six books

\textsuperscript{104} Alongside his military campaign, Pyrrhos tried like Alexander to legitimize his Thessalian campaign by other means: he emphasized Neoptolemos, one of whose sons was named Pyrrhos (see Prox. \textit{FGrHist} 703 F2; Plut. \textit{Pyrrh.} 1; Justin, \textit{Epitome} 17.2.11 – 17.3.22 cf. \textit{BNJ} 328 F 10).

\textsuperscript{105} Pyrrhos may well have drawn attention to his namesake, Aleuas Pyrrhos. But he also had Thessalian origins to which he could appeal; his grandfather, after all, was Menon of Pharsalos, who led the Thessalian cavalry in the Lamian War (Diod. 18.15, 38); see J.A.O. Larsen 1968, 22.
Nearly all of the fragments of his Θεσσαλικά come from Stephanos, which makes them of limited value in shedding light on the chronological scope of the work; they do, however, give us some indication of its geographical breadth. We know, for example, that Rhianos had recourse to mention numerous ἔθνη; in addition to the Thessalian Ethnestai (FF12 and 21), he also apparently discussed the Epeirote Arkanes (F13) and Amymnoi (F33); the Thesprotian Kestrinoi, Khaunoi (FF17a and 17b), Kelaithoi (F18), Parauoi (F19), Tripolissioi (F27), and Amyntai (F34); the Molossian Genoaioi (F13), Deonettinoi (F15), and Hypailokhioi (F16); and the Thracian Krestinoi (F35). He treated not only Thessalian poleis, moreover, like Ornythion (F24), Phyllos (F25), Thamia (F26), Azoreia (F32), Ekhton (F34), Phaleron (F36) and Phalore (F37), but also Aigoneia in Malia (F28) and the Etruscan Agylla (Caere), which he said had been founded by Pelasgoi from Thessaly (F31). His Θεσσαλικά evidently comprised much of northern Greece.

In some cases, Stephanos provides more than a mere name: so Rhianos claimed that the Thessalian Ethnestai were named after one of Neoptolemos’s sons (FF12 and 21), the Molossian Genoaioi after their commander Genoos (F14). In some cases, moreover, we even have a hexameter preserved: regarding the Thessalian polis Phyllos we read, οὐ δὴ ἀφαρ ὀπλισθέντες ἱσαν κραναὶν ποτὶ Φύλλον (F25). Only two fragments are retained by sources other than Stephanos. A scholion to the Iliad 2.175 provides another hexameter (τοι δ’ ἥδη ἐπὶ νηόν ἐυνήμιδος Ἰτώνης) as proof that the adjective “well-greaved” was applied to Athena Itone (F29), while a scholion to Apollonius

---

106 It is hard to imagine how Rhianos’s poem could have been so long, but the book numbers, all in Stephanos’s Εθνικά do not seem to be erroneous. FGrHist 265 F25 cites the ninth book, F26 the 14th book, F27 the 15th books, and F28 the 16th book.

107 In 1971 E. Lobel suggested that a papyrus fragment of a commentary on a poem in hexameters belonged to Rhianos’s Θεσσαλικά (see BNJ 269 F22b) because it overlapped considerably Stephanos’s entry on the Thesprotian Amyntai (F33a). This fragment, however, does not actually name Rhianos.

108 Perhaps Rhianos treated the Thessalian polis Iton as well as the cult to Itonia, but it is impossible to know who, in Rhianos’s poem, was doing what ἐνι νηόν. cf. Hek. FGrHist 1 F2; Apollonios 1.551, 721,
preserves our longest fragment. When Apollonios has Jason reveal his homeland to Medea—he says that he comes from Iolkos in the mountain-encircled land of Haimonia, where Prometheus begat Deukalion (3.1090)—the scholiast informs us that Thessaly used to be called Pyrrha and then quotes five lines from Rhianos’s poem (F30a):

Πυρραίην ποτὲ τὴν γε παλαιότεροι καλέσασιν
Πύρρης δ’ εξαύτίς ἀφ’ Αἴμουνος, ὃν οἳ Πελαγῶς
γείνατο φέρτατον υἱόν· ὁ δ’ αὐ τέκε Θεσσαλὸν Αἴμων,
tοῦ δ’ ἀπὸ Θεσσαλίην λαοὶ μετηφημίξαντο.109

It is obvious why such a passage would have suggested itself to the scholiast, who required an explanation both for Apollonios’s nomenclature (Haimonia) and for the connection to Deukalion.110 Meineke surmised that these five lines came from the *incipit* of the poem,111 which is possible, although we should note that a similar genealogical overview comes in the second book of his work an Elis (F1).112 Given the sheer length of the poem, moreover, if these lines came at the beginning, they either formed a sort of table of contents to be filled out in the course of the ensuing epic or else Rhianos was not primarily interested in mythological precedents. Some of Stephanos’s citations do perhaps reveal an interest in contemporary events: the reference to Azoros (F32), for example, may be connected with Kassandros’s siege of Polyperkhon in 317/6 (Diod. 19.52.6).113 Such a temporal restriction would not be surprising; Rhianos’s

---

768; *Etym. Magn.* 479.47; Strabo 9.5.14, 17). On the connection with an eponymous Itonos, see *Etym. Magn.* 479.47, Simonides (*FGrHist* 8 F1); Armenidas (*FGrHist* 378 F1); and Alexandros Polyhistor (*FGrHist* 273 F97).

109 Stephanos (s.v. *Haimonia*) inexplicably says that according to Rhianos, the land was called Haimonia after Haimon, the son of Kloros, the son of Pelasgos (F30b).

110 Rhianos’s *metanomasia* (Pyrrha, Haimonia, Thetalia) was later used by Strabo (9.5.23). But this is the inverse of the tradition preserved by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, where six generations after their arrival in Thessaly, the Pelasgians are driven off by Deukalion (1.17).

111 1843, 186.

112 As L. Bertelli points out (*BNJ* 265 F30a *Commentary*). For a very similar précis of Thessalian history, cf. the last chapter of Strabo’s *Thessalika* (9.5.23), which Jacoby traces to Apollodoros’s *Catalogue of Ships* (*FGrHist* IIIA, 106).

113 As Jacoby suggests (*FGrHist* IIIA, *Text*, 107).
Messenian history but only the so-called second Messenian War (*FGrHist* 265 F42).

We do not know at whose suggestion the Cretan Rhianos wrote his epic history of Thessaly and for which audience he intended it. Like Kineas, Rhianos was writing about a region that was in his lifetime hotly contested, with the Aitolian League having wrested control of Ainis, Dolopia, and Malis in the years before the death of Demetrios II in 229. Just as at the beginning of the century, when Macedonian rule was disturbed by Pyrrhos and Lysimakhos, so too in the late third century did Thessaly need to negotiate a new position, now with an eye to the Aitolian League; it was thus obliged to reimagine itself in the context of northern Greece in general. Whether Rhianos was commissioned by Thessalians to write his epic or whether the initiative came from elsewhere, his *Thessalika* seems then to reflect the concerns of third-century Thessaly.

Baton of Sinope was a younger contemporary of Rhianos. We know that he wrote before Strabo, who cites him (12.3.11 C546 = *FGrHist* 268 T1), and according to Diogenes Laertios the polymath Eratosthenes wrote a work titled Πρὸς Βάτωνα (8.89 = *FGrHist* 268 T3). In one work, moreover, Baton apparently dealt with the Syracusan tyrant, Hieronymos (*FGrHist* 268 F4), and it is possible that Polybios is thinking of Baton when he censures certain *logographoi* for writing “tragically” about the death of that tyrant. This would allow us to date Baton’s activity between Hieronymos’s death in 215 BCE and the publication of Polybios’s history. Baton wrote Περσικά (T1), Ἀττικαὶ Ἱστορίαι in at least two books (F1), works on the tyrants of Ephesos (F2) and on the poet Ion (F6), as well as something that Athenaios calls Περὶ Θεσσαλίας καὶ

---

115 K. Geus (2002, 78) has recently suggested that the work was about the Hellenistic playwright, Baton, however, while P. Christesen suggests it was actually about Baiton, one of the official measurers of Alexander the Great (*BNJ* 268 T3, *Commentary*).
116 Jacoby *FGrHist* 3α Text, 206-208; F.W. Walbank 1978, 39.
Aἰμονίας (F5), the text that interests us here. Just after Athenaios’s diners are served their second course, they light upon the topic of the Saturnalia, the festival at which Romans took a turn in the stead of their slaves, and they attempt in the vein of Dionysius of Halicarnassus to prove the festival’s Greek origins. After assembling examples of similar social inversions from Crete, Troizen, and Kos, they turn to Thessaly. The Thessalian prototype for the festival was apparently locally called Peloria, and Athenaios proceeds to quote a substantial passage from “the book of ὁ ῥήτωρ Baton of Sinope,” Περὶ Θεσσαλίας καὶ Αἰμονίας (14.45 639-640A = F5). Athenaios’s καὶ is epexigetical, we should note, aimed to clarify for his audience the equivalence between Thessaly, the focal region of Baton’s work, and Haimonia, the name used in this excerpt.

Baton said that when the Pelasgians were celebrating a θυσία κοινή, a certain man named Peloros arrived and announced to Pelasgos (the king?) that, as a result of earthquakes, the mountains of Tempe in Haimonia had broken apart and allowed the water of the lake to pour through into the Peneios river; the entire area was as a consequence now laid bare exposing an expansive plain. When Pelasgos heard the news, he stocked a table lavishly for Peloros, with the other Pelasgians contributing their finest provisions.

And it is for this reason, they say, that once they took possession of the land, in imitation of the feast that they held at that time, they sacrifice to Zeus Peloros and set up richly decorated tables. And they hold so generous a festival that they invite even all foreigners and free their prisoners, and household slaves recline and feast with total freedom of speech, while their masters do service onto them. And even today do the Thessalians on the whole celebrate this as their greatest festival and call it Peloria.

The citation purports to be verbatim, but it is a lengthy indirect statement, and while it may closely approximate Baton’s original text, there are certainly some gaps. Baton’s original text must have said something more about Peloros; for we must infer that he was
a slave (one of the Penestai?) and that he had not been invited to the original festival, otherwise the etiology would be groundless. We must assume, too, that the Pelasgians welcomed the draining of the lake, or else they would not have bothered to reward the messenger. Jacoby noted that Baton assigns the desiccation of the plain to Zeus Pelorios while most other accounts of Tempe make Poseidon responsible, and he concluded that Baton had simply invented the episode out of whole cloth. Yet, there were multiple Thessalian explanations for the mountain pass: Medeios/Kyrsilos apparently privileged the initiative of the river itself; while Diodoros (4.18.6) and Lucan (6.348-349) suggested Herakles as the prime mover. And even Herodotus, we shall see, does not claim that all Thessalians pointed to Poseidon as a source for Thessalian topography—he says in essence that “Poseidon” is metonymy for earthquake (7.128-130). Nor is it credible that Baton would have taken pains to create an eponymous Peloros for a god that he invented; we would expect, if anything, that he knew of a Zeus Pelorios and retrojected an eponym or else that he knew of the tradition and cognominated Zeus accordingly. In any case, Baton sought an explanation for a Roman practice in Thessaly, and even if he had invented the inversion of social classes allegedly at the heart of this Thessalian festival, even if he had invented the entire festival, he proves for us again the important role that the physical landscape takes on in Thessalian local history. Baton forwards a Pelasgian phase of Thessalian history, incidentally, and he therefore imagines a cohesive

---

117 As J. Ducat suggests (1994, 101-2).
118 So Pindar has Jason invoking Poseidon Petraiios (Pyth. 4.138) and Bakkhylides (14.20) speaks of a temenos to Poseidon Petraiios in Thessaly; cf. the Schol. to Pind, Pyth 4.138, which says that the Thessalians honored Poseidon Petraiios for rending the mountains and redirecting the river, but that the epithet is sometimes explained differently.
119 Jacoby, FGrHist IIA, Text, 208-211. For more positive assessments of Baton, see J. Harrison 1927, 445-450) and N. Robertson 1984, 7-8.
120 We do not know to what source Medeios and Kyrsilos attributed Tempe. For the antiquity of Herakles’ involvement in this episode, see P. Bernard 1995, 364 n.23.
community already at this early date (Pelasgos and his kinsmen are celebrating a θυοῖα κοινῆ after all).\textsuperscript{121}

A contemporary of Baton was Staphylos of Naukratis, who is also cited by Strabo (10.4.6 475-6). If, as seems to be the case, Strabo has based his account of Cretan cities on the work of Apollodoros of Athens (\textit{FGrHist} 244), Staphylos wrote before the middle of the second century BCE. Like Baton, then, Staphylos wrote his history at the end of the third century or in the early second century BCE, perhaps even after the intrusion of Flamininus into northern Greece, which may explain the reference to the Saturnalia, if in fact the analogy belongs to Staphylos rather than to Athenaeus. Like Hellanikos, Staphylos wrote histories of several Greek poleis and regions: \textit{Περὶ Ἀθηνῶν} (\textit{FGrHist} 269 F1); \textit{Περὶ Αἰολέων} (\textit{FGrHist} 269 F2); \textit{Περὶ Ἀρκάδων} (\textit{FGrHist} 296 F3), and a work on Thessaly, variously referred to as \textit{Περὶ Θεσσαλίας} (F4), \textit{Θεσσαλικά} (F5), and \textit{Περὶ Θετταλῶν} (F6). Given the received titles of the works on Arkadia and Aiolia, we may be inclined to take Harpokration’s formulation here, \textit{Περὶ Θετταλῶν}, as the most accurate title, although there is no reason to conclude that Staphylos was thus writing ethnic rather than local history.

Staphylos’s work on Thessaly was at least four books in length (\textit{FGrHist} 269 F6). Two citations are to the third book (regarding Kheiron and Peleus) and one to the fourth (on the Penestai). Several other fragments preserved without a title very likely also derive from the \textit{Περὶ Θεσσαλίας}. So a scholiast to Apollonios explains the phrase “misty, fertile land of the Pelasgians” (1.580), in part with recourse to Staphylos, who said “that Pelasgos was Argive by birth, that he migrated to Thessaly, and that after him the land of Thessaly was called Pelasgia” (F10). Like Rhianos and Baton, then,

\textsuperscript{121} Rhianos, we may recall, derived the name Haimonia from Pelasgos’ son (F30a).
Staphylos inserted a Pelasgian phase in Thessalian history. He probably included a narrative about Jason and the Argonauts, since we know he wrote in some work about Jason’s death (F11). And he certainly dealt with Peleus (F4), claiming that the centaur Kheiron, here described as a wise man versed in astronomy, had arranged the marriage of Peleus (to Philomela, the daughter of Aktor the Myrmidon). In an attempt to magnify Peleus, Staphylos said, Kheiron spread the rumor that Philomela was actually the divine Thetis; he even timed the marriage to coincide with a thunderstorm in order to underscore the gods’ assent. Staphylos’s account evidently downplayed divine aspects of the Peleus logos: Kheiron, no longer a mythical beast, becomes royal vizier, Achilles’s mother a mere mortal. The publicity stunt of masquerading a mortal woman as a goddess recalls Herodotus’s account of Peisistratos and Phye in Athens (1.60.4), but Staphylos might also have had in mind precedents closer to home, since the Ptolemies routinely cast their consorts as goddesses.

Our last fragment of Staphylos comes in Harpokration’s lemma on Penestai, which broadly defines the group as the Thessalian counterpart to the Spartan Helots: the lexicographer cites Xenophon on Kritias’s alleged arming of the Penestai (2.3.36) and then turns to Staphylos, who evidently spoke on the subject ἐπὶ πλέον in his fourth book (F6). Such prolixity would explain why Staphylos is given pride of place in Harpokration’s lemma; but the only additional information attributed here to him is that

---

122 Jacoby (FGrHist III2 Text, 218) sees a connection between Staphylos F10 on Pelasgos and F12, which comes from Strabo’s discussion of Crete (10.4.6).
123 After describing the action of Euripides’ play and listing traditions in which Medea boils up and rejuvenates various characters, we read that according to Staphylos “Jason was in a sense killed by Medea, since she ordered him to sleep under the stern of the Argos when the ship was on the brink of falling apart from age, and Jason died when a piece of it fell on him.”
124 As L. Pitcher points out (BNJ 269 F4 Commentary).
125 A scholion to the Iliad alludes to Staphylos again regarding Peleus’s matrimony (F5). At the mention of the Myrmidonian general, Menesthios (II. 16.175)—in Homer he is described as the son of Polydore, the daughter of Peleus—the scholiast adduces Staphylos, who said that Polydore’s mother was Eurydike, another daughter of Aktor. According to Staphylos, then, Peleus married two sisters: with one (Philomela) he bore Achilles; with the other (Eurydike) Polydore.
126 The book number may be a mistake (Jacoby, ad loc.).
the Penestai were also called Thettaliketai. The appellation might imply a historical etiology, and such a narrative is indeed suggested by Arkhemakhos in his Εὐβοια: the Penestai, Arkhemakhos said, were the portion of the Boiotians who decided to remain in Thessaly (for this reason they were originally called Μενέσται) and who gave themselves over willingly (ικέται) to the incoming Thessalians as slaves on the condition that they could stay where they were (FGrHist 424 F1). As Jean Ducat points out, something similar may be reflected in a story retained by Polyainos in which Thettalos and the Thessalians overcome the Boiotians by ruse; because of the Thessalian’s clever use of fire, the Boiotians πρὸς ἰκεσίαν τῶν Θεσσαλῶν ἐτφάσαντο (Strat. 1.12). In any case, Staphylos dealt with the Penestai not until his fourth book. He must either have written a very long work (like Rhianos) or else focused only on the foundational period.

Our last historian of Thessaly is the most frequently cited, Souidas. He wrote certainly before Strabo and before Lysimakhos, whose Νόστοι belongs perhaps to the turn of the second century BCE (F7 = FGrHist 382 F8). Eustathios apparently thought of Souidas as ἀρχαῖος because of his use of the word πίλος instead of the more common σφαῖρα (F2), but it is not possible to date him more precisely or in relation to Kineas, Baton, Staphylos, Philokrates, or Arkhinos. As Jacoby suggests, Souidas was probably

---

127 See Jacoby IIIA Text, 214.
128 This is the explanation retained by the Souda and by the lexicographer Pausanias.
129 1994, 42.
130 In Philokrates’s history of Thessaly, the Penestai are called Thettaloketai (FGrHist 601 F2). In light of Staphylos’s terminology, Kaibel (followed by Jacoby) emended Athenaios’s text here to Thettaliketai. But there is no reason why Staphylos and Philokrates would be obliged to use the same word (see J. Ducat 1994, 41-42).
131 Lysimakhos wrote a work on Ephoros (FGrHist 382 F22) and mentions Mnasias of Patara (FGrHist 382 F11), who was a student of Eratosthenes.
132 Jacoby sees Souidas as a contemporary, or even a forerunner, of Philokrates first because Lysimakhos (FGrHist 382 F8 = 602 F7) mentions him alongside Aristotle of Khalkis (FGrHist 424), Daimakhos (FGrHist 65 F2), and Dionysius of Khalkis, who for Jacoby were lauter autoren of the fourth-century, and second because he is often named (FF1, 6, 8, 9) in tandem with Pherakydes (FGrHist III A Text, 677). Neither argument convinces. Lysimakhos is, frankly, harder to date than Jacoby suggests, as are Aristotle of Khalkis and Dionysios. And Souidas could as easily have produced a Thessalian history (the go-to source for Thessalian genealogy) in the third or second century as the fourth.
Thessalian, since the name is frequently attested in local inscriptions\textsuperscript{133} but seldom elsewhere. Strabo’s sole reference to the writer—he says, as we have seen, that Souidas’s account of the transference of Dodona from Thessaly to Epeiros was aimed at “gratifying (προσχαριζόμενος) the Thessalians with mythological logoi” (F11a)—does indeed imply the sort of chauvinism often found in local writers, but the impulse to flatter a community belongs to most writers of intrinsic local history, native and foreign alike.\textsuperscript{134} Souidas’s \textit{Θετταλικά} was at least two books long (F3). He may also have written a separate work, which Stephanos calls \textit{Γενεαλογίαι} (F4), but since this work is cited with reference to the Thessalian \textit{polis} Amyros, it is most likely an alternative title for the Thessalian history.

We have already had the opportunity in connection to Kineas to look at Souidas’s account of the origins of Dodona: he said that the temple was transferred from Skotoussa in Thessaly to Epeiros, that the ancestors of the current prophetesses went west at the same time, that for this reason Zeus at Dodona was called Pelasgian (\textit{FGrHist} 602 F11a); and that further proof about the relocation of the temple comes from a shrine to Zeus Phegonaios, since the epithet derives, he said, from the original oak tree (\textit{FGrHist} 602 F11c). We know also that Souidas treated the Argonautika (F3),\textsuperscript{135} as well as the family of Peleus and Achilles (FF1, 6-9). His evident focus on marriages and descent may in fact have precipitated Stephanos’s categorization of the work as genealogic (F4).\textsuperscript{136} Three times in the scholia to Apollonius, moreover, Souidas is named as a source for information about Kheiron (FF1a, 1b, and 7 = 1.554, 1.558, and 2.1231-4). He claimed

\textsuperscript{133} IG 9.2 45; IG 9.2 475; SEG 51: 711; IG 9.2 517; IG 9.2 720; SEG 26:675; SEG 43:310; SEG 43: 311.
\textsuperscript{134} As is clear from A. Chaniotis 1988, 290-326, 365-82.
\textsuperscript{135} He does not in fact mention Jason, but he is cited prominently by a scholiast to Apollonios in explicating the Argonauts stopover in the land of the Mossynoikoi (2.1015b = \textit{FGrHist} 602 F3).
\textsuperscript{136} Souidas asserted that Peleus and Thetis lived in a \textit{polis} called Thetideion, which was to fall under Achilles’ jurisdiction (F6). Like Staphylos, he made Peleus polygamous, claiming that he bore a daughter (Polydora) with the shadowy Laodameia, daughter of Alkmaion (F8). He also discussed the capture of Neoptolemos (F9), not, as in other accounts, by Makaireos or Orestes but rather by Philoxenides, a figure elsewhere unattested.
that Kheiron was father of Thetis (F7) as well as the son of Ixion and brother of Peirithoos, king of the Lapiths (F1a). As the grandfather of Achilles, Kheiron is fully integrated into Thessalian heroic genealogy. At the same time, he is humanized, along with all of Ixion’s sons, the Kentauroi (F1b), who have been reconfigured as early occupants of the region. The citizens of Amyrike (the name by which he called Amyros) were once called Eordoi, Souidas wrote, and later Leleges, and “these same (were called) Kentauroi and Hippokentauroi” (F4). Souidas perhaps explained their name, like Diodorus (4.70.1), by way of their occupation: they were the first to pursue equitation, retrojecting one of the quintessential characteristics of the Thessalian community into the foundational period. Nevertheless, Souidas did not consider the Kentauroi long-term residents in Thessaly. “Those of the Kentauroi who fled apparently came to Pyrrhaia,” he says, a μοίρα of Thessaly named after Deukalion’s wife (F5).

Were we able to date Souidas with more accuracy, to say nothing of Philokrates and Arkhinos, we would of course have a much better sense of the development of local historiography in Thessaly. Jacoby for his part pushed Philokrates and Souidas back into

---

137 This comes from a scholion to Apollonios, which cites a passage of Lysimakhos’s *Nostoi* (=FGrHist 352 F8).
138 Detaching him in the process from the divinity forwarded by e.g. Pherekydes, who suggested that Kheiron’s parents were Kronos and hippocorphic Philyra (FGrHist 3 F50).
140 Amyrike was on the border of Pelasgiotis and Magnesia, opposite the plain of Dotion (Steph. s.v. Amyros = FGrHist 602 F4) and just north of Lake Boibe (see F. Stählin 1924, 59).
141 Cf. Strabo 9.5.19-22. A scholiast to Pindar (*Pyth.* 2.78d) suggests another etiology, that the Leleges were called Hippokentauroi because they pierced through bulls (διὰ τὸ ἀποκεντῆσαι τοὺς ταῦρους).
142 We may also compare the account in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.17): six generations after migrating from the Peloponnesos to Haimonia, he says, the Pelasgians were driven out of the land by the Kouretes and the Leleges, among others, with Deukalion as their leader (1.17). It is possible that Souidas, if Dionysios’s Leleges can be connected with those of Souidas, had a similar progression in mind (cf. F11a and b on the Souidas’s notion of a Pelasgian phase of Thessalian history). But in equating the Kentauroi with the Leleges, Souidas did not necessarily view them as invaders. After all, Dionysius’s narrative clashes with Souidas in several details. For example, we have just seen that Souidas equated the Kentauroi with the Leleges, while Dionysius proceeds in this passage to call them Lokrians. Further, Dionysius names Pelasgos as the son of Larissa and Poseidon, while Souidas’s sole reference to Larissa situates her in not in Argos but in Thessaly, apparently still as a young girl, depicted as she is here with a ball (F2).
the mid-fourth century BCE, connecting the advent of local historiography in Thessaly to the Fürstenhof, which he thought were more open to the influx of new trends than the poleis of Boiotia or even democratic Athens. But the first attested works on Thessaly were those of Hellanikos, Kritias, and Aristotle. As in the case of Athens, then, the earliest Thessalika seem to have been composed by foreigners. Our evidence suggests that unlike the Samians, who began to write local histories in the mid-fifth century, Thessalians did not themselves write Thessalika until the late-fourth century, only after Thessaly had been subsumed into Macedon and Thessalians had scattered in the wake of the Alexander to the far corners of the Greek world. Yet both the foreign and native local historians of Thessaly drew on the same stock of traditions, and these importantly adumbrate a unified Thessalian community despite its actual political fragmentation. This idealized coherence, we shall see in the following section, was predicated first and foremost on the Thessalian landscape.

2.2.3.3 REGIONAL HISTORIOGRAPHY AND THE POLIS OF THESSALY

Our earliest examples of Greek local histories are of non-Greek regions: both Dionysios of Miletos (FGrHist 687 FF1-4) and Kharon of Lampsakos (FGrHist 262 T1, F3) wrote Περσικά, and our first extant local history is Herodotus’s Αἰγυπτιακά. By the end of the fifth century, many Greek regions had local histories of their own: alongside his histories of Athens and Argos, that most prolific periegete Hellanikos wrote Αἰολικά (FGrHist 4 FF32, 158-160), Περὶ Αρχαδίας (FF37, 9, 161-162), Βοιωτιακά

143 FGrHist IIIB Text, 673. Both Wilamowitz (1893, 22)—“dagegen ist in Boeotien, Phokis, Lokris, in Thessalien und selbstverständlich bei den wilden stämmen der berge und des westens, so reich die mythen sind, nirgends auch nur eine spur einer älteren geschichtlichen überlieferung.”—and M. Vogt (1902, 729) were disappointed by what they took to be a young historical tradition in Thessaly, not to mention by the apparent lack of local Thessalian chronicles.
144 FGrHist IIIB Noten, 389, n. 13.
(FF50-51), and of course Ṣετταλικά (F52, F201). Hellanikos did not, as we have said, misinterpret community boundaries or impose his own historiographical categories on the past; he responded rather to genuine manifestations of indigenous community autobiographical impulses. He wrote Ἀργολικά and Ἀρκαδικά, not Πελοποννησιακά.

It is important to keep in mind, however, that the existence of regional histories does not in itself testify to political unity or federalism.

Inasmuch as regions in mainland Greece contained a plurality of discrete (and sometimes antagonistic) civic centers, they constructed a collective historiography by assembling cultural memories from a variety of constituent communities. But the result was a unified narrative of a unified region. We can get a sense of this process by looking at Arkadia. For despite robust evidence for distinctive collective memories in individual Arkadian poleis,\(^{146}\) the wealth of archaic polis documents that had so excited Wilamowitz\(^ {147}\) and Vogt,\(^ {148}\) and the palpable tensions between various Arkadian poleis,\(^ {149}\) and despite the transience of genuine political unity in Arkadia (the actual confederacy lasted less than nine years), the only manifestation of local history in Arkadia was the Ἀρκαδικά. Even the Tegeate Ariaiithos (FGrHist 316), as we have said, wrote Ἀρκαδικά not Τεγεατικά. And these Ἀρκαδικά were not composites of individual local chronicles but rather narratives of an idealized supra-polis community. Early kings are described not as ruling e.g. Tegea or Mantinea but Arkadia as a whole (cf. e.g. FGrHist 316 F7). And the main actors of Arkadian local historiography, so far as we can tell from the fragments, are predominantly Arkadians en masse not citizens of individual

\(^{146}\) This is clear from a perusal of Pausanias Book 8; see M. Pretzler 1999 and 2005 for Pausanias’s relationship with local traditions at Tegea and Mantinea respectively.

\(^{147}\) 1893 Vol. II, p. 22.

\(^{148}\) 1902, 759-763.

\(^{149}\) Between e.g. Mantinea and Tegea, of whose conflicts in the Peloponnesian War even the earliest Arkadian local historian, Hellanikos, was surely well aware; or between Kleitor and Orkhomenos (Xen. Hell. 5.4.36-37); and we can note the havoc wrought in the third century by the Akhaian League (Polyb. 2.46.2; for which see E. Will 1979, 371-374.)
cities: it is Arkadians in Aristotle who oust the barbarian occupants of Tegea (F608 Gigon), Arkadians in Ariaithos who face Nestor and the Pylians (FGrHist 316 F7), and Arkadians in Arkhitimos who have jurisdiction over the precinct of Zeus Lykaios (FGrHist 315 F1). This does not mean that discrete Arkadian poleis are ignored. Ariaithos’s Ἀρκαδικά, we know, had recourse to mention Tegea, Nonarkis, Kyllene, Thelpousa, Orkhomenos, Nesos, Kaphyai, and (it seems) even Triphylia, communities scattered all over region. But in the Ἀρκαδικά individual poleis do not offer alternative nodes of community but rather exist as sites of particular events in which Arkadians acted as a group.

Our brief overview of Thessalian history has revealed that Thessaly was rarely a unified political community. Larisa, Pharsalos, and Pherai and the powerful families connected to these poleis jockeyed constantly for control. At times, these groups a mark on Thessalian historiography; this is particularly the case of the Aleuadai. In Aristotle, it is Aleuas Pyrrhos who is responsible for implementing the tetrads, and in the mid-third century, the poet and onetime head of the library at Antioch, Euphorion of Chalcis wrote a work entirely centered on this family, the Περὶ Ἀλευαδῶν (see FF 177-179 van Groningen). The disproportionate contribution of non-native historians to Thessalian local historiography may in fact be a reflection of the patronage these prominent families provided to aspiring historians from the greater Greek world. As the Aleuadai had once invited Pindar and Simonides to sing their praises, so too we can imagine their descendants summoning Euphorion or even Rhianos. Yet what stands out in Thessalian historiography, whether written by natives or non-natives or for a local or non-local

150 Like Rhianos, Euphorion was a favorite poet of Tiberius, but he is known also to have been an influence on Gallus and Vergil (cf. Servius ad Virg. Ecl. 6.72, 10.1; Quint. Inst. 10.1.56). For the details of his life, see the Souda E 3801 (cf. A 3419). For a good treatment of Euphorion, see B.A. van Groningen 1977.
151 Euphorion may however also have dealt tangentially with other prominent Thessalian families. For Quintilian cites him about an episode involving Simonides performing at Pharsalos (11.2.14 = F179 van Groningen).
audience, is its focus on the common territory of Thessaly. From Herodotus and Hellanikos to Medeios and Kyrsilos, Rhianos, Baton, and beyond, the community of Thessaly, politically disparate though it was, remained historigographically cohesive first and foremost through its landscape, in particular through an appeal to the geographical formation of the valley of Tempe.152

Our first indication of the role of geography in Thessalian history comes in Herodotus, at the point in his narrative where the Persians arrive at Tempe (7.128-130). When Xerxes first lays eyes on the outlet of the river Peneios and asks in wonder whether the path of the river could be brought to the sea by a different route, Herodotus writes, τὴν δὲ Θεσσαλίην λόγος ἐστὶ τὸ παλαίον εἶναι λίμνην, ὥστε γε συγκεκλημένην πάντοθεν ὑπερμήκεσον ὅρεοι, viz. Pelion, Ossa, Olympos, Pindos, and Othrys (7.129). In the middle of these mountains, Herodotus says, ἡ Θεσσαλίη ἐστὶ ἐνυσα κούλη. According to the Thessalians, Herodotus continues, it was Poseidon who made the channel that drained this sea, the river now known as the Peneios, and they are surely correct inasmuch as the outlet was clearly the result of an earthquake. Here, Herodotus rejoins his principal narrative. Xerxes’ question about a possible rerouting of the river is answered in the negative. There is only one outlet for the water, he is told: ὅρεοι γὰρ περιεστεφάνωταί πᾶσα Θεσσαλίη. Herodotus’s reason for focusing here on Thessaly’s unique landscape, viz. the susceptibility of the region to invasion, went some way toward justifying its medism (7.130)153 and may also explain why geography was such an integral part of Thessalian cultural memory, especially if, as I have suggested was the case, regional cohesion initially derived from the attempt of the disparate Thessalian aristocracies to pool their resources for common defense.

152 For Tempe and its powerful literary role, see E. Malaspina 1990.
153 See Y. Shahar 2004, 63-64, for parallels between this passage and Hdt. 3.117, which offers a Persian counterpart to Thessalian geography.
Although we have no evidence for Hellanikos’s treatment of the geological formation of Tempe or Thessaly, through his discussion of the *tetrades* he certainly paid some attention to the bounds of Thessaly’s territory. He may even have provided more precise geographical delineations. For whatever doubts we may have about the credibility of the testimony of Natale Conti, it is worth noting that in Conti’s story about the abduction of Peleus, Mount Pelion appears as one of Thessaly’s borders: “Sic igitur solutus ivit (sc. Peleus ex desertis Pelei montis) in Thessaliam.” So too in the case of Aristotle’s *Politeia* Thessaly’s territory played an important role, although we have little indication of how he handled the landscape itself. But when Thessalians began themselves to write local history, the formation of Tempe became the foundational episode. We see this in the work of Medeios/Kyrsilos, who treated both Tempe—they wrote that the Peneios River was originally called the Araxes precisely because it “cut off” Ossa from Olympus—and its relationship to Armenian geography: when the Argonauts arrived in Armenia, Armenos named the major Armenian river Araxes, and Jason even forced it to flow through the mountains to the sea so that it replicate his homeland: Ἰάσονα δὲ μυμοάμενον τὰ Τέμπη ποιήσαι τὴν διασφάγα (Strabo. 11.14.13). The formation of Tempe, we saw, was also a central episode in the history of Baton of Sinope, where it was associated with the earliest phase of Thessalian history, the Pelasgian occupation, which preceded the advent of the Thessalians (*FGrHist* 268 F5). Even if the drainage of the valley has little to do with the putative role reversals at the heart of the Peloria, even if Baton invented the festival entirely, he recognized that the incident was worthy enough of veneration to generate such a community response. The formation of the Thessalian landscape appears also in non-local works: Strabo not only

154 The Pindaric scholion on which Conti seems to have relied uses similar language (*Nem* 4.92): ἠγαγεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀπέρημα τοῦ Πηλίου δρῶς . . . φασὶ δὲ τοὺς θεοὺς τῆς σωφροσύνης ὁικτεύοντας τὸν Πηλέα Ἡραίστον ἐξαποτελεῖ: τὸν δὲ μάχαιραν ἔχοντα τῷ Πηλεί δωρήσασθαι, ἢ τὰ προσπιττοῦτα τῶν θηρίων διαχρόμενος εἰς Θεσσαλίαν κατῆλθε, καὶ κατελθὼν κατεπολέμησεν Ἀκαστόν καὶ τὴν Ἰωλκόν.
cites the *logos* about Armenios and Jason but also discusses the earthquake that originally freed the Thessalian sea (9.5.2)—from which only two smaller lakes, Nessonis and Boibeis, remain. Diodorus refers to the event (4.18.6), as do Pliny (*NQ* 6.25.2) and Lucan (*BC* 6.343-349), who attribute the act to Herakles.¹⁵⁵ Philostratos, who makes Poseidon responsible for cleaving the mountains, even juxta- 
poses the Thessalians’ relationship to the Peneios to that between the Egyptians and the Nile (*Imag*. 2.14).¹⁵⁶

In addition to emphasizing the formation of the Thessalian landscape, we have evidence that Thessalian local historiography also retrojected into the foundational period political unity. This is clearest in a fragment from Aristotle’s *Politeia*, the scholion to the *Rhesos* (F504.1 Gigon = 498 Rose) that preserves Aristotle’s treatment of the assignation of *kleroi*:

> διελὼν δὲ τὴν πόλιν Ἀλόας ἔταξε καὶ τὸν κλῆρον παρέχειν ἑκάστους ἵππεας μὲν τεσσαράκοντα, ὀπλίτας δὲ ὀγδοίκοντα. ἤν δὲ ἡ πέλτη ἀπός ἤταν οὐχ ἔχουσα ἐπίχαλκον αἴγὸς δέματι περιτεταμένη, καὶ τριάχθοντα ἢ μαχρὸν ὄφοι πάντες ἐφόρουν ὁ σχέδιον ἑκαλεῖτο.

It is the first part of this fragment that interests us here: Aleuas implemented his system of *kleroi* “after dividing up the *polis*.” Aristotle may be referring a specific *polis* (Larisa has been suggested),¹⁵⁷ which would not be impossible even given his explicit goal of treating the (Κοινή) Θετταλῶν Πολιτεία. Yet the passage naturally follows his reference to Aleuas’s division of Thessaly into *tetrades*; more to the point, the *kleroi* to which he refers here belong to tetradic Thessaly as a whole, not to any single *polis*. The

¹⁵⁵ “Hos inter montis media qui ualle premuntur,/ perpetuis quondam latuere paludibus agri,/ flumina dum campi retinent nec peruia Tempe/ dant aditus pelagi, stagnumque inplentibus unum/ crescere cursus erat. postquam discessit Olympo/ Herculea grauis/ Ossa manu subitaeque ruinam sensit aquae Nereus.” See also Seneca, *HF* 283-8 for the role of Herakles.

¹⁵⁶ Αὐγοπτίοις μὲν γὰρ παρὰ τοῦ Ῥηνίου ἢ γῆ, Θετταλῶις δὲ Πηνεῖος οὐ συνεχώρει πάλαι γην ἔχειν, περιβεβλημένοι τοῖς πεδίοις όροιν καὶ τοῦ νεόματος ἐπικλύζοντος αὐτά ὑπὸ τοῦ μῆπον ἐκβαλέαν. Ῥηξεὶ οὖν ὁ Ποσειδόν τῇ τριαίῃ τὰ δρῆ καὶ πῶλαι τῷ ποταμῷ ἐργάσεται.

conclusion must be that Aristotle is referring to all of Thessaly as a *polis*.\(^{158}\) There is, it is true, a good deal of textual confusion in the later part of the scholion,\(^{159}\) and this has led some critics to assume a similar corruption in the first clause. Rose suggested that τὴν πόλιν be replaced with τὰς πόλεις; Schwartz preferred τὴν πολιτείαν with a lacuna;\(^{160}\) and Wade-Gery τὴν πολιτικήν. But τὴν πόλιν should be retained (the emendation of one problematic word does not in itself require that all other words follow suit), especially since the reading is actually supported by several other passages, albeit not explicitly derived from any Ἐθεσσαλικὰ. In a scholion to Pindar (*Pyth.* 4.246), for example, we read that in creating Tempe Poseidon redirected the River Peneios which πρότερον διὰ μέσης τῆς πόλεως θέαντα.\(^{161}\) And in one of Polyainos’s stratagems, Thessalos gives his name to ἴ πόλις Ἐθεσσαλία (8.44).\(^{162}\) It appears, then, that in describing Aleuas’s division of Thessaly into *tetrades* and *kleroi*, Aristotle has preserved a tradition, very likely stemming from the Thessalian community itself, that viewed tetradic Thessaly as a single and integrated political community, and that this community was not simply a consequence of Aleuas’s military organization but actually pre-existed the formation of the Thessalian landscape.

---

158 As J.A.O. Larsen notes (1968, 35 n. 60).
159 Some of this can be corrected by way of a scholion to Plato’s *Laws* (813D = Gigon F504.2), a gloss of πελταστικῆς, which cites Aristotle (without naming a work) for the same specifics of the shield; two other scholia preserve the same information about the shield, without naming a source (F 504.3 and 504.4 Gigon). For a discussion of the textual problems, see H.T. Wade-Gery 1924, 55-58: Ἀλόας <Ἀλέως Rose> ἔταξε καὶ <κατὰ Pflugk> τὸν κλῆρον παρέχειν ἐκάστους ἐπίπεδας μὲν τεσσαράκοντα, ὀπλίτας <πελταστάς Cobet, Pflugk, Schwartz> δὲ ὄγδοηκόντα. ἤν δὲ ἡ πέλτη ἀσπίς ἵνα οὐκ ἔχουσα <οὐδὲ> ἐπίχαλκος <οὐδὲ βοῶς, ἀλλὰ οὔς ἴ> αἰγὸς δέρματι περιτεταμένη, καὶ τριάκοντα <τρὶ άκόντια Preller> ἴ <καὶ Schwartz> μακρὸν <μικρὸν Pflugk> δόρυ πάντες ἐφόρουν δ ἱεράδιον ἐκαλατό.
160 This is the emendation adopted without comment by Gigon.
161 Πετράνου τιμήμα Ποσειδών παρὰ Θεσσαλοῦ, ὅτι διατείμα τὰ δρῆ τὰ Θεσσαλικὰ, φημὶ δὴ τὰ Τέμπη, πεποίηκε δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπιτείχεν τὸν ποταμόν, πρότερον διὰ μέσης τῆς πόλεως ἐρεοῦτα καὶ πολλὰ τῶν χωρίων ἀναφεροῦντα.
162 Polyainos’s anecdote, in fact, centers on the war fought between Thessalos’s parents and the Boiotians, and here it is the river Akhelous that formed Thessaly’s border. On the passage and its implications, see B.G. Intzésiloglou 2002.
This conception of Thessalian unity, we have seen, certainly did not jibe with the reality of Thessalian politics at the time that local Thessalian historiography began to be produced. It is for this reason difficult to imagine just how Thessalian local histories would have accommodated more recent history. In fact, we have no evidence that any *Thessalika* did actually deal with events beyond the earliest period, and the same thing may be said of Greek regional historiography in general. Our impression of the chronological bounds of these regional histories may only be a consequence of the nature of our evidence: the “mythological” period was most relevant to commentators on Greek poetry, while lexicographers sifting through local histories for noteworthy vocabulary and unique forms would naturally look to the earliest sections of a work first. But in order to narrate the history of a plurality of civic centers, a local history would either need to take a periegetic approach to the region, which would undermine the cohesiveness of the overarching community, or else prioritize one constituent civic center as a lens through which to filter regional affairs. It is telling, then, that the one regional historiography that certainly did treat contemporary events was Boiotia (this is clearest in the work of Aristophanes of Boiotia, *FGrHist* 379 FF5-6), and Boiotia is unique as far as Greek regions go in its promotion of both regional and *polis*-based histories: alongside the Βοιωτιακά of Hellanikos (*FGrHist* 4 FF50-51) and Nikokrates (*FGrHist* 376), we find the Θηβαικά of Armenidas (*FGrHist* 378), Lykos (*FGrHist* 380), and Timagoras (*FGrHist* 380).

This dialectic in Boiotia between local histories focalized by the region *en masse* and by Thebes reflects the growing power of Thebes within the Boiotian League. For whereas the natural mode of historiography took the region as its focus—in the late-fifth century, Hellanikos wrote about foundation of Thebes in the context of his Βοιωτιακά (*FGrHist* 4 51)—when Thebes began to take on the role of hegemon within the League
ca. 379\(^{163}\) and especially after its victory at Leuktra in 371, the *polis* became a competing focalizer of local history.\(^{164}\) This ambivalence of focalization is illuminated by the work of Aristophanes, who wrote most likely in the mid-fourth century.\(^{165}\) Aristophanes is cited twice as the author of *Βοιωτιακά* (F1A Fowler and *FGrHist* 379 F3), once as the author of *Θηβαία* (FGrHist 379 F2), and once as ὁ τοὺς Θηβαίους ὄρους γεγραφώς (FGrHist 379 F1); and all three titles seem to refer to the same work, a history of Boiotia that used, for the more recent past, Theban eponymous magistrates as a chronological scaffolding. In the course of Aristophanes’ treatment of fifth-century history, that is to say, Thebes became the focalizer of regional history, and regional historiography became horography. Aristophanes even once draws explicitly ἐν τῶν κατ’ ἄρχοντας ὑπομνημάτων for the name of the Theban *strategos* at Thermopylai (FGrHist 379 F6). It was not until the destruction of the *hieros lochos* at Khaironeia (Plut. *Pel.* 18-19; Polyain. *Strat.* 2.5) and the sack of Thebes by Alexander three years later that Boiotia regained equilibrium.\(^{166}\) But with *Thebaiaka* already introduced as an alternate avenue for local historiography, we henceforth find the production of both regional and *polis* histories. The possibility of using Thebes as a potential focalizer for local historiography

---

\(^{163}\) See S.C. Bakhuizen 1994 for a good treatment of the Theban hegemony within the Boiotian League.

\(^{164}\) Armenidas, it is true, is sometimes dated to the late-fifth century, but this is because of his evident use of Ionic: F6, from a scholion to Pindar (*O.* 6.26a) retains the expression, “ποιεῖνς ἑπί τοῖς Ἦρωις ἔντασθεν” (see Jacoby, 1922, 49 n. 3). But, as we have seen, histories are not easily dated by dialect alone.

\(^{165}\) Aristophanes’ date is similarly hard to pinpoint. F. Susemihl (1891 Vol. II, 399 n. 314) and Wilamowitz (1893 Vol. II, 21) considered him Hellenistic, while E. Schwartz (1899, col. 994, no. 13), placed him after the rise of Thebes, giving Alexander’s destruction of the city in 335 BCE as the *terminus ante quem*. Contra Jacoby, Aristophanes seems to have been aware of Mantinea, since Plutarch, just after citing him about the Persian Wars, refers to Leonidas’ dream of the rise and fall of Thebes (*de Herod. Mal.* 31 865F cf. *FGrHist* 379 F6). Jacoby made Aristophanes a younger contemporary of Hellanikos and placed his literary production before the historiography of the Boiotians Anaxis and Dionysodoros (*FGrHist* IIIB Text, 152, 160 and *Noten*, 108-109 n. 3). As support for this early date, Jacoby pointed first and foremost to the phrase used by Stephanos to describe Aristophanes’ activity: he was apparently a writer of Θηβαίοι Ἐρωιδοί (*FGrHist* 379 T1). This he thought evinced a clear link with the early Ionian tradition (*FGrHist* IIIB Text, 159-160; cf. 1949, 197 n.5). As we have seen, an argument about chronology from title is precarious.

\(^{166}\) The refoundation of Thebes by Kassandros in 315 (Diod. 19.54.2; Paus. 9.7.1-2; Plut. *Proc. ger. rei.* 814B) did not change this; Thebes may have regained a civic identity, but the Boiotian League behaved thenceforth very much like its neighbors and adversaries, Akhaia and Aitolia.
seems also to have enabled the production of autonomous histories of other constituent communities. Aristotle did not write a *Politeia* of Boiotia *en masse* but rather *Politeiai* of Thespiai and Orkhomenos (he probably also wrote one on Thebes, although we have no evidence for it); Kallipos of Corinth wrote a history of Orkhomenos (*FGrHist* 385); and Aphrodisios or Euphemos wrote specifically on Thespiai (*FGrHist* 386).

In regions such as Thessaly, on the other hand, where no constituent civic community managed for too long to hold sway and where the focalizer of community autobiography remained the regions, local historiography was generally restricted to “mythological” events, privileging an ideal community whose coherence did not depend on political confederation. In such communities, we may note, the production of regional historiography did not generally rely upon political autonomy. It is for this reason that *Thessalika* continue to be written—indeed they abound—during the Macedonian occupation: quite unlike Atthidography, which essentially ceases with the loss of Athenian independence in 264 BCE, local histories of Thessaly were inspired less by Jason of Pherai than by Alexander the Great. It is important to emphasize here, while we are on the subject of Athens, that it is only Atthidography, not Athenian local historiography, that disappears with the Macedonian conquest. Local historiography emerged at Athens thereafter in an altered form. And when it did, like the *Thessalika* it concentrated on non-contemporary times, and like the *Thessalika* it was focalized by region: Istrus wrote Ἀττικά (*FGrHist* 334 FF1-16), as did Palaiphatos of Abydos (*FGrHist* 44T3), Kadmos of Miletus (*FGrHist* 335 T1), Baton of Sinope (*FGrHist* 268 F1), Poseidonios of Olbia (*FGrHist* 279 T1), and Marsyas of Tabai (*FGrHist* 135/136 TT1-2).

The mechanisms through which Greek regions produced local historiography are not categorically different from those employed by *poleis*. For in *poleis*, various factions
continually vied for control of affairs and imagined their own versions of the past, in the process eliding fragmentation and retrojecting a coherent communal consciousness. As we shall see in the following section on Argos and the Argolika, moreover, just as Greek regions like Thessaly sometimes focalized their histories by way of a locality that did not consistently correspond to community (or a community that was consistently cohesive), so too could a Greek polis delineate a focal locality that did not correspond to its territory.

167 For the amalgamation at Athens of micro-local (demic) variants, see Jacoby 1949, 123-128.
2.2.4 τὰ Ἀργολικά

The earliest attested historian from Argos was Akousilaos, but he, while certainly employing Argive local traditions, never purported to trace the history of his homeland. Norfolk did Herodotus, although well aware of episodes from the Argive past, aim anywhere to provide a cohesive account of Argos. Yet local historiography in Argos was an early phenomenon—both Hellanikos of Lesbos and Hippys of Rhegion composed their Ἀργολικά in the fifth century BCE—and a popular form. In fact, local historians of Argos were plentiful enough to engender collective citation (FGrHist 311 TT1-2, FF1-2; FGrHist 306 F2). Such aggregative categorization, as we have seen, is not in itself unique; but it is notable that Josephus in the late-first century CE could forward historians of Argos as a representative subset of Greek historians and their historiographical production as a complement to what he took to be the major branches of Greek local historiography: Atthidography and local histories of Sicily (Contra Ap. 1.17 = FGrHist 311 T1). Even Athenaeus, who rarely makes such references, once cites “the writers of τὰ Ἀργολικά” (FGrHist 311 F1). Further proof that the Argive local historians were susceptible to collective classification comes from the frequency with which individual historians are cited in tandem. We shall see that in the case of Agias and Derkylos, cited

---

1 See, for example, FGrHist 2 FF23-28. Akousilaos’s work was given several titles: Γενεαλογία (T1, F3) or Περὶ Γενεαλογιῶν (F36) and Ἰστορίη (T3, F1), while Akousilaos was himself called a συγγραφεύς (e.g. TT1-2, 5, 8-9). On Akousilaos as historian, see C. Calame 2004, esp. 232-233. His interest was in the assemblage of heroic genealogies of a multitude of mainland regions: the Argolid, of course, but also Arkadia, Boiotia, and Thessaly.

2 See e.g. Hdt. 1.1.2; 1.31; 6.127.3. Herodotus does not in fact relate more recent Argive events from a wholly Argive standpoint (see e.g. 1.82, 5.6.1; 6.77-80; 6.92); see Jacoby, FGrHist IIIB Text, 76, on Herodotus’s likely reliance on both Argive and Spartan sources.

3 These collective citations are not mere periphrasis; says Jacoby, “Es ist mindestens überflüssig, wahrscheinlich sogar falsch, hinter einem sochen zitat einen einzelnen autor zu suchen.”

4 οἱ τὰ περὶ Ἀργός ἵστορον τῶν.

5 ἄλλος ἤδη ὁ τῶν ὅσιν συμφώνειν Χαλκίης θεοποιημένοι (FGrHist 427 F5), where the emphasis is on oral tradition, not written history. So too Athenaeus’s “Sammelzitat” of Milesian local historians (FGrHist 496 F4): οἱ Μελήσιοι... φασί.
together six times, this is surely an indication of the singularity of the text assigned to them. But on two occasions commentators refer to οἱ περὶ Ἀγίαν καὶ Δεσφύλον (FGrHist 305 FF8-9), and we elsewhere read of an Argive etiology suggested by οἱ περὶ Κλεινίαν (FGrHist 306 F7). It is true that this type of expression (οἱ περὶ X, or οἱ περὶ X καὶ Y) is sometimes understood as a mere circumlocution, but it is never explicitly precisely equivalent to the nominative. There is something inherently pluralistic in the phrase, that is to say; and given the rarity with which it is employed with reference to other Greek local historians, it may have suggested itself with reference to Argive local historiography because of the popularity of the form. This tendency says nothing about the homogeneity of the form; in fact, Josephus appeals to the writers of Ἀργολικά precisely to illustrate a general lack of conformity among local historians. Nevertheless, our fragments of Argive local historiography do suggest common themes and concerns.

One of the major tendencies of Argive local historiography, I hope to show, is the designation as the focal historiographical unit a community that far exceeded the bounds of the polis, embracing the Argolid en masse and much of the northern Peloponnesos. This historiographical annexation is a consequence, I shall argue, of the Argive obsession with establishing control of the northern Peloponnesos and wresting hegemony from Sparta. For, as the following précis of Argive history shows, whether it was through alliances with Elis and Mantinea in the fifth century, experiments in isopoliteia with Corinth in the fourth, or allegiance to the Achaean League at the end of the third, Argive policy was above all concerned with positioning itself against Sparta.

7 The very imprecision of such references to historians, in fact, suggests that the citer is relying on his memory, and this in itself supports the supposition that he is imagining a plurality. When Josephus refers to the Sicilian historians alongside writers of Ἀργολικά, for example, he does so clearly in connection to Timaios, his primary point of access; and his vague recollection of the Sicilian historians—he refers to οἱ περὶ Ἀντίοχον καὶ Φιλιστον ἢ Καλλίαν—implies that he was thinking of them collectively. See also FGrHist 489 T3a and T4 regarding Kadmos of Miletos. For phrases of this sort, see S. Radt 1988 and 2002 and Gorman 2001 and 2003 (which seeks to show that Polybius never explicitly uses the phrase “οἱ περὶ X καὶ Y” periphrastically).
2.2.4.1 A Brief History of Argos

In the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, Diomedes is named as king of Argos and is given jurisdiction not only over the polis Argos but also of Tiryns, Hermione, Asine, Troizen, Eionai, Epidauros, Mases, and Aegina (Il. 2.559-568). Elsewhere, Homer says that it was Agamemnon who ruled over “many islands and the whole of Argos” (Il. 2.108). Whoever its ruler, early Argos was considered quite large. Similar contentions about its wide expanse abound in later literature—Strabo even tells us that the term Argos refers equally to the polis and to the entire Peloponnesos (8.6.5)—and the idea is implied by the traditions surrounding the Heraklid Temenos, traditions that survive mainly in later texts but that in some cases must date back considerably earlier: after receiving Argos as his lot, Temenos proceeded to amass an empire covering much of the northeastern Peloponnesos: Troizen, Epidauros, Phleious, and even Sikyon. The veracity of these claims about Argos’s ancient empire and the degree to which the narrative of the Herakleidai reflected an ancient reality need not detain us here; it is a moot point by the time that Argos enters the historical record. At the end of the sixth century BCE, Argos

---

8 See M. Piérart 2004 on the various localities of the Argolid, esp. 602-606 on the polis itself. See R.A. Tomlinson 1972 for a complete history of Argos, from the Bronze Age to the Roman conquest; a more recent and much more concise account of Classical Argive history can be found in S. Hornblower 2011; for archaic Argos, see T. Kelly 1976. See C. Bearzot and F. Landucci 2006 for several strong contributions on various aspects of Argive history, such as M. Piérart on the eighth-century synoicism of the Argolid plain (3-26), Bearzot on the fifth-century (105-146), M. Bertoli on the fourth century (273-298), and Landucci on the Argive tyrants of the third century (311-338). For a recent account of Argive democracy in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, see E. Robinson 2011, 6-21.

9 On the elasticity of the term Argos, see P. Wathelet 1992.

10 Euripides’s two tragedies, Temenos and Temenidai must deal with these traditions, but the fragments that remain are generally opaque. Ephoros devoted attention to the Herakleidai, and he certainly included Troizen in Temenos’s lot (FGrHist 70 FF18 and 115), as did Nikolaos of Damaskos (FGrHist 90 F30). The story is most complete in Apollodoros 2.8.4-5, but see also Strabo 8.3.33. Pausanias included in Temenos’s kingdom Troizen (2.30.10), Epidauros (2.26.1-2), Aigina (2.29.5), Phleious (2.13.1), and Sikyon (2.6.7; 2.7.1). The ties between the Akte and the Lot of Temenos were further strengthened by the easy etymology suggested by the name Temeneion (where Pausanias locates the grave of the Heraklid: 2.38.1).

11 For the implausibility of the notion of an Argive empire, see T. Kelly 1975, 40, 73, 116-7 and J. Hall 1995. A good discussion of Argive mythic claims on the Peloponnesos can be found in M. Piérart 1997, 325-331; see also J. Hall 1997, 56-62 and Chapter 4 passim.
may have turned the surrounding plain into its *khora*;\(^\text{12}\) but the *poleis* of the Akte, such as Epidaurus and Troizen, to say nothing the communities of the northern Peloponnesos, remained decidedly autonomous. Herodotus errs when he maintains that in the mid-sixth century BCE Argos controlled Thyrea and the whole area to the west, as far down as Cape Malea and the island of Kythera (1.82.2).\(^\text{13}\)

We know little about archaic Argive history. Herodotus, Ephoros, and Aristotle have something to say about the tyrant Pheidon, but they do not agree as to his date or the details of his political and imperial program.\(^\text{14}\) The first datable event in Argive history—and even this cannot be fixed with absolute precision\(^\text{15}\)—is the Battle of Sepeia, which the Argives fought, to their great detriment, against the Spartans in a grove near Tiryns (Hdt. 6.77-80). Later accounts of this battle (from Plutarch, Pausanias, and Polyainos) give a prominent role in this battle to the Argive poetess Telesilla, who allegedly armed women, slaves, and the elderly and thereby repelled Kleomenes and Demaratos when they turned on the city of Argos itself.\(^\text{16}\) But the primary consequence of the clash at Sepeia seems to have been the introduction of democracy,\(^\text{17}\) which led, unsurprisingly, to an alliance with

---

\(^\text{12}\) The initial synoicism of Argos had been effected by the end of the eighth century BCE. See T. Kelly 1976, 51-72, and M. Piérart 2006, 10-12. For the early incorporation of Asine, see Paus. 4.8.3 and 4.14.3. But cf. I. Ratinaud-Lachkar, who denies any historicity to the tradition regarding the early conquest of Asine. Nauplia fell under Argive sway during the seventh century (see Theopomp. *FGrHist* 115 F383; Aristot. *HA* 8 602a8; Paus. 4.35.2; and Diod. 4.33.9). On the complicated question of the Argive Heraion, which may not have fallen under Argive control until the 460s, see F. de Polignac 1995, 52-54 and J. Hall 1995, 596.

\(^\text{13}\) Herodotus is perhaps only misapplying the information he took from Homer (K.J. Beloch 1912, Vol I.1 204 n.1).

\(^\text{14}\) Herodotus mentions Pheidon (6.127.3), as do Aristotle (*Pol.* 1310b 26-28 and FF484-485 Gigon) and Ephoros (*FGrHist* 70 F115. See G. Ragone 2004 for a recent account of the problems.

\(^\text{15}\) ca. 494 BCE; see E. Robinson 2011, 8.

\(^\text{16}\) Plut. *Mor.* 245D-E, Pausanias 2.20.8, and Polyain. 8.3. The local historian Sokrates, as we shall see, wrote about Demaratos’s contribution to the invasion and probably also, although this is unclear from Plutarch’s narrative, the bravery of Telesilla (*FGrHist* 310 F6).

\(^\text{17}\) The date that Argos became democratic is debated. It is Herodotus who discusses the effects of Sepeia, which led to the enfranchisement of new citizens (6.83, *cf.* Aristot. *Pol.* 5.2.8 1303a6-8). Argos was certainly considered a democracy in the later fifth century (see Thucydides’ discussions of the correlation between political system and alliance at 5.29, 31, 44, 81-2). *Cf.* Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.44; Aristot. *Pol.* 5.2.5 1302b18 and 5.3.5 1304a27; and Diod. 12.80.23, 15.58.
Athens (Thuc. 1.102.4). At the same time, Argos began to expand into the Argolid; by the 460s, Tiryns, Mykenai, and Mideia had lost their independence. Argive policy in the early fifth century was largely defined by antagonism toward Sparta—we can note, for example, Argive support of Tegea (Hdt. 9.35) and, about ten years later in 458, of Athens at Tanagra (Thuc. 1.107.5)—although both poleis entered into a thirty-year peace, from 451 to 421 BCE (Thuc. 5.82.2), during which time Argos seems to have enjoyed considerable prosperity.

At the dissolution of the treaty with Sparta in 421 and the coinciding Peace of Nikias, we note a change in Argive policy and a resurgence of the imperialism that characterized the first half of the century. It may have been Corinth that first proposed Argos as the leader of the anti-Spartan coalition (5.27.2), but the Argives were certainly not reluctant to answer the call. As Thucydides (5.28.2) and Diodoros affirm (12.75.5-6), Argos saw itself as poised to fulfill its role as Peloponnesian hegemon. After an inconclusive war with Epidauros in 419-418 (Thuc. 5.26.2, 53-58, 75.4-5), Argos managed to take control of Orneiai in 416; and in 392 it imposed on Corinth some sort of isopoliteia, going so far as to remove the boundary stones, dominate Corinthian politics (Hell. 4.4.6), and even preside over the Isthmian Games on the grounds that

---

18 Athens does not appear to be overly concerned with the charge of medism leveled against Argos (Hdt. 8.73; 7.150.3), a charge that may actually have implicated the Argives in more than mere neutrality during the Persian invasion, since they sent an embassy to Persia in the 460s (Hdt. 7.151).
19 Hdt. 7.137; Ephoros FGrHist 70 F56; Strab. 8.6.11; Paus. 2.17.5, 2.25.8, 8.46.3.
20 Diod. 11.6.51-5; Strab. 8.6.19; Paus. 7.25.5-6.
21 Strab. 8.6.11; Steph. Byz. s.v. Mideia.
22 To some degree, as S. Hornblower has argued, this expansion may also have been aimed against Corinth, which had an interest in the Argolid (2011, 86).
23 See in general C. Morgan 2007, 249-263. To this period we can assign the reconstruction of the Heraion near Mykenai as well as an intriguing stint of Argive diplomacy in Crete (see ML 42 regarding Knossos and Tyliissos, and S. Hornblower, 85-87).
24 For the complicated relationship between Argos and Corinth at this time, see C. Bearzot 2006, 134-139.
25 Two treaties resulted: the first with Mantinea, Elis, Corinth, and Khalkis (Thuc. 5.28); the second (in 420), a thirty-year peace concluded with Mantinea, Elis, and Athens (Thuc. 5.47.8; cf. IG3 83). Argos remained outwardly anti-Spartan after the War, allying with Boiotia, Athens, and Corinth in 395, in an arrangement that led rather remarkably to a synedrion based at Corinth (Diod. 14.82.1).
26 Thuc. 5.67.2, 5.74.3, 6.7.1-2; Diod. 12.81.4-5; Paus. 2.25.6. Orneai is henceforth described as a kome (Strab. 8.6.17).
Corinth and Argos were one *polis* (4.5.1). At this time, as Xenophon reveals, Corinth could legitimately be called “Argos” (4.4.6).\(^27\) The Argives were not unanimous in their animosity toward Sparta, we should note. We know, in fact, of two oligarchic regimes: the first, in 418, even led to a new treaty with Sparta (Thuc. 5.66-73);\(^28\) the second, occurring in 370/69, is remembered primarily by the brutality with which the democrats regained control. Isocrates is probably referring to this coup, which became known as the *skytalismos*, “clubbing,”\(^29\) when he maintains in 346 that the Argives took as much pleasure as their enemies in murdering Argives were content thus merely to sit and watch their territory dwindle (Phil. 5.51-2).\(^30\)

Things were probably not quite so bleak in the mid-fourth century as Isocrates suggests; according to Diodorus (16.44), three thousand Argives (under the leadership of the flamboyant Nikostratos) joined a Theban contingent in Egypt on behalf of the Persian cause;\(^31\) and probably not longer afterwards, Kleonai, formerly its close ally, fell under Argive sway.\(^32\) And Argos made out well in the settlement after Khaironeia in 338 BCE,\(^33\) a result, perhaps, of its deference toward Macedonia:\(^34\) it gained part of the Thyreatis,\(^35\) and even, for a time, control of Epidaurus.\(^36\) This was certainly an

---

\(^27\) Diodoros agrees that whatever the initial intentions of the union, Argos soon turned this alliance into an annexation (14.91-2). For this union, see G.T. Griffith 1950; R.A. Tomlinson 1972, 134-137; C. Tuplin 1982; M. Whitby 1984; M. Sordi 2006; and E. Robinson 2011, 22-24. The arrangement did not last long, and by the King’s Peace in 387/6 Argos had abandoned whatever plans it had on the isthmus.

\(^28\) The response of the democrats was swift (Thuc. 5.77-79), as was the requisite alliance with Athens (Thuc. 5.82.5; see IG I\(^1\) 86). Argos even contributed troops to help the Athenians in Sicily in 413 (Thuc. 6.43).

\(^29\) Diod. 15.57.3-58 and Plut. Mor. 814b: Plutarch even numbers the dead at 1,500 See also Diony. Hal. A.R. 7.66.5.

\(^30\) See the discussion of S. Hornblower 2011, 92.

\(^31\) Theopompos actually calls him προστάτης τῆς Ἀργείων πόλεως (FGrHist 115 F124).

\(^32\) See Strab. 8.6.19; Diod. 11.65; SEG 30 35; IG IV 616; and M. Piérart 1982.

\(^33\) Although it was strictly neutral during Athens’ war with Philip (Dem. 18.64).

\(^34\) Cf. Dem. 19.261. This is not surprising given the alleged ties of kinship between the two states: see Hdt. 5.22.2 and Thuc. 2.99.3 regarding the genealogy of Alexander I of Macedon. See L. Patterson 2010, 170-173.

\(^35\) Polyb. 9.28.6; 33.8-11; cf. Paus. 2.20.1, 2.38.5-6. See R.A. Tomlinson 1972, 146.

\(^36\) See A. Burford 1969, 17. There might even have been an Argive klerouchy at Epidaurus (see M. Piérart 2004, 607 on IG IV\(^2\) 1.69 and SEG 11 400).
accomplishment, inasmuch as Epidauros had long been at odds with Argos: it had been a staunch member of the Peloponnesian League in the fifth century (Thuc. 5.57.1), had fought with Argos at the beginning of the Dekeleian War, and had helped revamp the Peloponnesian navy fifteen years later (Thuc. 8.3.2); it supported Sparta in the Battle of Nemea in 395 (Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.16) and continued to evince the Spartan cause even after Leuktra in 371 (Xen. *Hell.* 6.2.3; 7.2.2). In light of Argos’s acquisition, then, its fantasies about reclaiming the lot of Temenos may not have been entirely delusional.

Argos remained essentially loyal to Macedon until the advent of the Romans. 37 The expression of such loyalty became problematic during the wars of the Diadokhoi, however, and Argos found itself adhering in turn to Polyperkhon, Kassandros, and Demetrios Poliorcetes. Nor did Argos escape unscathed from these struggles. In 316, Kassandros’s commander, Apollinides, killed five hundred Argives who had been trapped in the *prytaneion* (Diod.19.63.1-2); and then, in 270, as a result of the rivalry between Antigonos Gonatas and Pyrrhos, the city was even invaded (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 30-34)—Plutarch’s narrative of Pyrrhos’s botched assault and consequent murder (the outcome of the sure aim of a worried Argive mother) is one of the more colorful episodes of Argive history. Antigonos rewarded his Argive advocate, Aristippos, and henceforth the formerly democratic *polis* was under the sway of pro-Macedonian tyrants. We can reconstruct the series of rulers from Plutarch (*Arat.* 25-29, 35, 44-45) and Polybius (2.44.6; 2.59-60): Aristippos 39 was succeeded by Aristomakhos, 40 Aristomakhos by

---

37 Although it flirted initially with insubordination, taking part along with the other Peloponnesians *poleis* in revolts both after Philip’s death in 336 (Diod. 17.3.5; 17.8.5-6) and then again after the death of Alexander (Diod. 18.11.2); we should note that Argos does appear loyal to Alexander during his reign (*cf.* Arr. *Anab.* 1.17.8).

38 Strictly speaking, however, Pyrrhos and his elephants had been invited into Argos by his supporter Aristeas.

39 It is true that Plutarch never explicitly says that this Aristippos was tyrant, but in the *Aratos* he mentions a tyrant Aristippos, who succeeded Aristomakhos (25.4), and it is a likely supposition that this was the grandson of Antigonos’s henchman, Aristippos.

40 Aristomakhos remained loyal to Antigonos Gonatas even during the revolt of Alexander, and he is even honored by the Athenians for his efforts to keep peace (*IG II²* 774); see C. Habicht 1997, 162.
another Aristippos (his son?), and Aristippos by yet another Aristomakhos (his brother?). We have little sense of how these regimes affected the fortunes of Argos or how the Argives reacted to the tyranny; the rule of the first Aristomakhos might very well have been mild, since it was to Argos that the seven-year old Aratos fled after his father was killed by the tyrant of Sikyon (Plut. Arat. 2). But that Aratos, once of age, tried to assassinate this Aristomakhos—the tyrant was eventually dispatched by his own slaves in 240 BCE—and managed to secure the death of the second Aristippos cautious against drawing any conclusions of this sort from Aratos’s actions. It is this second Aristomakhos who in 229, for the price of fifty talents and the chance at being Strategos, joined his city to the Achaean League.

By this point, Aratos had managed to add not only his native Sikyon to the League (already in 251), but also Corinth, Epidaurus, Troizen, and Megara. The fact that Argos joined only in 229 (Plut. Arat. 35; Paus. 2.8.5-6; Polyb. 2.44.6) may suggest that there was not unanimous support for Aratos, and this is supported by the success with which the Spartan king Kleomenes would two years later detach Argos from the League (Plut. Kleom. 12-17). This ambivalence is perhaps understandable in light of the inclusion in the League of several of Argos’s inveterate enemies: Epidaurus, for example, and Troizen, as well as Hermione⁴¹ and Phleious,⁴² who joined a year later in 228. Indeed, the primary allegiance that Argos displayed during this period was still toward Antigonus and Macedon. It is remarkable that after the death of the last Aristomakhos in 233,⁴³ when Antigonus was granted possession of Argos, one of the king’s first acts upon entering the city was to resurrect the statues of the tyrants (Plut. Arat. 45.3). Throughout

---

⁴¹ These poleis had also been members of the Peloponnesian League (Diod. 12.78.2 and Thuc. 8.3.2) and consistent supporters of Sparta: at the Battle of Nemea, for example (Xen. Hell. 4.2.16), and even after Leuktra (Hell. 6.2.3; 7.2.2).

⁴² Phleious, like Epidaurus, had been a faithful member of the Peloponnesian League (7.57.2; Xen. Hell. 5.2.8) and had consistently supported Sparta throughout the fifth century. After the brief oligarchic coup at Argos in 417, we should note, Phleious took in some of the exiled Argives (Thuc. 5.83.3).

⁴³ Aratos had him tortured and thrown into the sea for turning Argos over to Kleomenes.
the following decades, when the Achaean League toyed with allegiance to Rome, the Argives remained loyal to Macedon; they even allowed Philokles, the general of Philip V, to occupy the Larissa in 198 BCE. Roman intervention in Greece, however, led to a break between Argos and Macedonía⁴⁴ (to say nothing of the diminution of Macedonia’s influence). But Flamininus’s interference in Peloponnesian affairs also allowed for the augmentation of the Achaean League: now Argos could count as allies not only Epidauros, Troizen, Hermione, and Phleious, but Sparta as well.

2.2.4.2. Local Historians of Argos

Many historians of Argos cannot be dated with any accuracy. For some, we have only termini ante quos: we know, for example, that Anaxikrates wrote at some point before the first century BCE (FGrHist 307),⁴⁵ Damen at some point before the second century CE (FGrHist 304).⁴⁶ The same uncertainty applies to Demetrios (FGrHist 304);⁴⁷

---

⁴⁴ Although we should keep in mind that Philip did the unthinkable and handed Argos over to the Spartan king, Nabis, who was in control for a few years but for the grace of Flamininus.

⁴⁵ Anaxikrates is cited in the Euripidean scholia, and this suggests that he was active before Didymos and perhaps even before Aristophanes of Byzantium. F. Susemihl (1891, 656) without justification connected Anaxikrates both with an eponymous epistates appointed by Seleukos Nikator at the foundation of Antioch (Tzet. Khil. 7.118.177) and with an author of a treatise on the Red Sea (cited by Strabo at 16.4.4). E. Schwartz (1894, col. 2083) and Jacoby (FGrHist IIIB Text, 32) deny the association. Cf. W. Schmitthenner 1974, cols. 45-47. Anaxikrates’s Ἀργολικά was at least two books long (F1).

⁴⁶ The terminus is provided by Herodianos’s citation of Damen. Jacoby equates Damen with Demetrios (see following note), arguing that the former is an epichoric hypocorism of the latter (FGrHist IIIB Text, 15-16 and Noten, 9-10, n.2)—he cites as a precedent in Megarian local historiography the convergence of Hereas (FGrHist 486 FF1-2, and 4) and Heragoras (FGrHist 486 F3); but cf. L. Piccirilli 1975 for a refutation of the Megarian case.

⁴⁷ We can say only that Demetrios wrote before Clemens, whose Protreptikos can be dated to the turn of the third century CE. Jacoby actually thought that Demetrios was the earliest local historian of Argos after Hellanikos (1922, 368ff). This is because (according to Clemens) Demetrios had claimed that Argos’s famous pear-wood statue of Hera was located at Tiryns (F1), while Pausanias reports that the statute was in fact removed to the Heraion after Tiryns was sacked by Argos (2.17.5)—an event dated to the 460s BCE: Demetrios must then have written his Ἀργολικά before the statue was moved. According to A. Frickenhaus (1912, 22), the relocation of the statue was probably not effected until closer to 400 BCE, which is why Jacoby assigns the Ἀργολικά to the early fourth century. But Clemens does not insist that Demetrios actually saw the statue at Tiryns (Δημήτριος γὰρ ἐν δευτέρω τῶν Ἀργολικῶν τοῦ ἐν Τιρύνθῳ τῆς Ὑμηρίας ζούσι καὶ τὴν θΡΙΗΝΗΝ καὶ τῷ ποιητῇ Ἀργον ἀναγράφει). For the original situation of the statue was well enough known (see Akousilaos FGrHist 2 F28 and a fragment from the epic Phoronis F4 Davies) to retain its connection with Tiryns even after its relocation. Demetrios’s Ἀργολικά, we know, was at least two books long (F1).
Dionysios the Argive (FGrHist 308);\(^{48}\) the poet Lykeas (FGrHist 312);\(^{49}\) Sokrates the Argive (FGrHist 310);\(^{50}\) and Telesarkhos (FGrHist 309).\(^{51}\) But those historians whom we can date allow us to see Argolikography as a long-lived phenomenon, stretching from the fifth century BCE to the coming of Rome. As Argos moved from a democracy through a period of tyranny and Macedonian dependency, to membership, alongside its former enemies, in the Achaean League, we shall see that its local historians advanced different conceptions of the Argive past.

A) The Fifth Century

The only historians of Argos explicitly dated to the fifth century BCE are Hellanikos of Lesbos and Hippys of Rhegion, both non-natives and both interested in reconstructing the past of multiple localities. We have only one fragment that comes with certainty from Hellanikos’s Ἀργολικὰ, and it refers to one of the earliest events of Argive history, the initial division of the kingdom (FGrHist 4 F36): when Phoronis died, Hellanikos said, he divided his kingdom between his three sons: Agenor received the

---

\(^{48}\) Dionysios certainly wrote before Clemens and probably, given his appearance in the Pindaric scholia, before Aristarkhos and Didymos, as well. His work is not actually named, but Ἀργολικὰ is a likely inference.

\(^{49}\) Lykeas is cited only by Pausanias, who calls him ὁ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἔξηγητὴς (1.13.8 = F1). Since he treated the death of Pyrrhos (F4), his activity must fall between 272 BCE and the mid-second century CE, when Pausanias wrote. Jacoby places him in the early empire—“Es ist wohl möglich dass er (älterer?) zeitgenosse des Pausaniyas war” (FGrHist IIIB Text, 57)—but I see no reason for denying him an earlier date.

\(^{50}\) Sokrates is frequently cited by Plutarch (FF2-6), and his inclusion in the Euripidean (FF1, 7-8) and Pindaric scholia (FF9, 12-14) suggest a date before Didymos. Judging from Diogenes Laertios’s reference to him at the conclusion of his biography of the Athenian Sokrates (T1), Sokrates the Argive was active also before Demetrios Magnes wrote his work on homonyms (in the early first century BCE). A terminus post quem is provided by his reference to the Spartan attack on Argos in the early fifth century BCE (F6). Sokrates is credited with a Περιήγησις Ἀργοὺς and Περὶ Ὀρῶν καὶ Τόπων καὶ Πυρὸς καὶ Λίθων (9.39 388 AB = F1).

\(^{51}\) Jacoby tentatively assigned Telesarkhos to the third or second century BCE, but all we have to go on is his inclusion in the T scholia of Homer (F1) and a reference in Sextus Empiricus’s treatise Against the Mathematicians (F2). I am ignoring here Timotheos (FGrHist 313), to whom only Pseudo-Plutarch assigns Ἀργολικὰ (F1), and Aineias the Argive, named by a scholion to Pindar (FGrHist 306 F8) for information about Herakles’ children with Megara (for we have no indication that he was the author of a local history, and he may, as Jacoby suggests, be a corruption of Deinias.
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cavalry; Pelasgos the land up to the Erasinos river (where he founded Larisa); Iasos the land in the direction of Elis.

We know that Hellanikos visited Argos when he was researching the Ἱέρειαι, his great chronography structured around data, namely the tenures of the Priestesses of Hera, that he had culled from temple records at the Heraion (FGrHist 4 FF74-84); we can date this work to the last quarter of the fifth century BCE. It is reasonable to assume that the Ἀργολικά emerged from the same trip. Inasmuch as Hellanikos was an itinerant historian, his decision to write Ἀργολικά should be connected less to any developments within the Argive community than to his own intellectual curiosity; that is to say, Hellanikos wrote his Ἀργολικά in the closing decades of the fifth century because that was when he turned his mind toward recording in prose the histories of the communities of mainland Greece. Nevertheless, of the numerous titles attributed to Hellanikos, a full three focus on Argos: aside from the Ἀργολικά and Ἱέρειαι, he wrote an authoritative version of the Argive local epic, the Φορωνίς (FGrHist 4 F 1-5). This disproportionate attention to Argos may only be a reflection of the important role that

---

52 The Ἱέρειαι, while clearly demonstrating a direct engagement with Argive documents, is nevertheless not a local history. Hellanikos used the lists of the Priestesses at the Argive Heraion as a chronographic scaffolding on which to hang events of world history: the migration of the Sikels from Italy to Sicily, for example (FGrHist 4 F79), the foundation of Khaironeia (F81), and Aineias’s foundation of Rome (F84).

53 One terminus ante quem is provided by a fragment of the Ἱέρειαι (FGrHist 4 F83) that refers to the foundation of Khiona in 429 BCE (for which, see Thuc. 2.80). But we can be a little more specific. Thucydides certainly knew of Hellanikos (1.97.2) and of his chronography in particular, which he used to date the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (2.2). And so, when Thucydides says the Argive Heraion was destroyed by fire in the middle of the ninth year of the War (i.e. 423 BCE) during the tenure of the priestess Khrysis (4.133), we must assume he was using the Ἱέρειαι again here and that Hellanikos published the work at some point after 423. Jacoby tentatively suggests that the Peace of Nikias in 421 was the culmination of the chronography (FGrHist IIb Suppl., Text, 5).

54 Given the importance that Hellanikos generally attributes to topography in his local historiography, he must have considered autopsy a crucial component of his historical research. He surely predicated the writing of his Argive local history, then, on a tour of the region. For examples of the role of topography in Hellanikos’s local historiography, we may note that he situated Atalanta, and perhaps also the tomb of Arkas, on Mount Mainalos in his Περὶ Ἀρκαδίας (FGrHist 162); that he discussed in his Θετταλικά the fourfold division of Thessalian territory (F52); and that he mentioned Lake Kopais in his Βοιωτικά (F50). For a more striking example, see Hellanikos’s intricate description preserved verbatim of a marble temple in Tindion in his Αἰγυπτιακά (F54).

55 His Φορωνίς was known to Athenaeus (FGrHist 4 F2), and certainly to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who quotes a passage verbatim (FGrHist 4 F4).
Argive myth played in greater Hellenic tradition. But Hellanikos’s marked interest in the Argive past may also indicate a heightened historical consciousness in Argos itself, a reaction perhaps to the dissolution of the thirty-year peace with Sparta in 421 and the consequent efforts to secure hegemony in the Peloponnessos. As we have seen, Argos concluded two treaties with poleis of the northern Peloponnesos (Thuc. 5.28; 5.47.8; IG³ 83), though which it hoped, in the words of Thucydides, to attain hegemony (5.28.2). Diodoros may even be retaining some late-fifth century rhetoric when he uses the lot of Temenos to legitimize Argive leadership of the anti-Spartan contingent in 421 and 420 (12.75.5-7). The threat of Spartan aggression, moreover, would surely have provoked in Argos a renewed anxiety about the legitimacy of its territorial claims. On this reading, it may in fact have been the Priestesses of the Heraion themselves, anxious to demonstrate the antiquity of their community, who recommended that Hellanikos use their records as a chronological framework for Greek history.

We can assign one other local historian of Argos to the fifth century, Hippys of Rhegion (FGrHist 554), to whom the Souda attributes a three-book Αργολικά. This work likely covered both early history (FF4 and 8) and also the more recent past. This is implied by the story that Hippys relates about a miraculous tapeworm-cure at the Asklepion of Epidaurus (F2). Hippys wrote that a woman infected with parasites arrived at the temple of Asklepios for a cure at a time when the god was absent; the priests decided to work on her themselves: they laid her down on the floor, removed her head from her neck, and extracted the worm. At a loss to fit the head back on again, however, they were duly scolded when Asklepios returned to the temple and set to healing the

---

56 Such a conclusion can be drawn from the very existence of a particularly Argive epic. Herodotus implies that in the early sixth century, Argos could be thought of as dominating the Homeric poems—the tyrant Kleisthenes sought to ban Homer from Sikyon because of his biases toward Argos (Hdt. 5.67.1)—and Philokhoros even concluded that Homer was Argive (FGrHist 328 F209). It is not unlikely that Herodotus and Philokhoros were attributing to Homer other epics in addition to the Iliad and Odyssey, such as the Thebais and Epigoni (see Jacoby, FGrHist IIIB Text, 11), or even the Phoronis.

57 We can recall the concern of the Theban priests to prove the antiquity of Egypt to Herodotus (and to Hekataios) against the backdrop of national resistance to Persian rule (2.143).
woman himself.\textsuperscript{58} We cannot tell how Hippys incorporated the tale into his Άργολιτχά;\textsuperscript{59} it may have been part of a general discussion of Asklepios, but the episode involves the god’s activity not in legendary times but in the contemporary world.

Hippys seems to have visited Epidauros. This is suggested by the striking similarities between the anecdote about the diseased woman and the contents of a late-fourth century inscription dedicated at the sanctuary (\textit{IG IV\textsuperscript{2} 1.122, 10-19})—like the Heraion, the temple at Epidauros with its numerous dedications was a storehouse of community memory and thus a rich mine for historians (see Paus. 2.27.3 and Strab. 8.6.15). The inscription records the tapeworm cure of a certain Aristagora at the Asklepion of Troizen. While incubating in the temple at Troizen, we are told, Aristagora dreamt that the god was away from the temple (he was at Epidauros) so that the cure fell to his sons, and they took the initiative to cut off her head. Being ill-prepared for suture, however, they sent a messenger to Epidauros asking Asklepios to come (the priest at Troizen apparently observed at this point that Aristagora’s head became detached while she slept); in a subsequent dream, Asklepios returned, reconnected her head, and successfully extricated the worm stomach-wise.\textsuperscript{60} Even if we do not directly connect the two texts,\textsuperscript{61} the theme of miraculous worm cures was a hackneyed one at Asklepia,\textsuperscript{62} and

\textsuperscript{58} This fragment comes from Aelian’s digression (\textit{N.A.} 9.33) on the medicinal properties of wormwood, commonly used to treat tapeworm infestations. The focus of the story attributed to Hippys, whom Aeolian calls ὁ συγγραφεὺς ὁ Ῥηγῖνος, is the efficacy of the god not the plant.

\textsuperscript{59} Only one of the fragments attributed to Hippys (F1) is explicitly derived from a particular work (\textit{Περὶ Χρόνων}). So we cannot be certain that his discussion of the cure at Epidauros does indeed derive from the Άργολιτχά. It is however the likeliest source, contra Jacoby (but cf. G. Vanotti 2002, 41).

\textsuperscript{60} It has been pointed out that Hippys, unlike the inscription, rationalizes his narrative by making the surgeons priests and not sons of the god (L. Edelstein 1945, 102, 159-160, n. 12). This may be true, but he also insists that the woman’s head was severed and reattached, while the inscription maintains the device of somniative surgery.

\textsuperscript{61} R. Herzog (1931, 77-78), Jacoby (\textit{FGrHist IIB Text}, 484), and G. De Sanctis, 1958, 3-4, thought that Hippys’ version was the older one; L. Edelstein the opposite (1945, 159-160 n. 12). L. Pearson views Hippys’ version as a “parody on miracle cures,” invented “in the third century by some humorist” (1987, 10), while L. Pareti thought it is clear “che la redazione grossolamente deformata della novella, riferita da Hippys, presuppone la più fine e umoristica tradizione epidauria, fissata nella stele iscritta” (1959, 109). There is nothing more or less funny, it seems to me, in Hippys’ anecdote than in the narrative preserved on the stele.
there would likely have been other such inscribed stories with which Hippys would have come into contact during his visit.

The level of detail attested by this Epidaurian anecdote may help us to understand, if we trust the Souda, the striking length of Hippys’ work. But the Souda is not always easy to trust. It asserts, for example, that Hippys flourished during the Persian Wars (FGrHist 554 T1), a synchronism that has proven particularly tough to swallow. Jacoby, for his part, latched on to the Souda’s awareness of Hippys’ history of Sicily, the Σικελικαὶ Πράξεις, only through an epitome by someone called Myes and concluded that Hippys was a mere fiction, a literary forgery aimed to authenticate or legitimize a later work. Since Jacoby, Hippys has continued to meet with skepticism. But not every instance of an ancient epitomization perforce connotes fabrication—Theopompos epitomized Herodotus (115 T2, FF1-4), unquestionably an authentic early historian, just as an Asinius Pollio would later summarize Philokhoros (FGrHist 193 T1). More to the point, it would be surprising for Hippys’s non-existence to have slipped by Phainias in the late-fourth century BCE (F5), Antigonos in the third century BCE (F3), Aeolian (F1), and Athenaeus (F4). Last, even if Myes did indeed retroject a predecessor in the field of Sicilian historiography, the array of arcana that comes to be assigned to Hippys—we can think again of the Epidaurian tapeworms (F2)—implies either that Myes invented other

---

62 See IG IV2 1.122, lines 122-128, on the same stele, about Erasippe of Kaphyiai and her incubatory worm-cure.
63 The phrase is γεγονός ἐπὶ τῶν Περσικῶν. E. Rohde argued that the participle usually denotes the time of floruit not birth (1878); but in some cases, as with Hellanikos, the opposite is understood. I argue (see Appendix I) that Hippys is best seen as a contemporary not of Hekataios but of Hellanikos.
64 See Appendix I for a defense of Hippys’ early date.
65 1913 and FGrHist III B Text, 482-483.
66 The phenomenon was similar, Jacoby surmised, to the putative invention of the Urhistoriker Kadmos of Miletos by Bion of Prokennesos (FGrHist 332 T3 = 486 T6); see FGrHist III B Text, 403. An invention of an early source is not of course rare. Some Akousilaos apparently claimed (effectively precursing Joseph Smith) to have translated ancient bronze tablets that his father had dug up in his backyard near Aulis (FGrHist 2 T1); and in the reign of Nero, Eupraxides “uncovered” ancient writing on linden bark allegedly composed by Diktys during the Trojan War (FGrHist 49 T4, cf. T3); note the similar invention of the Phrygian Dares (FGrHist 51).
68 Indeed, the Souda (FGrHist 328 T1) even says that Philokhoros wrote an epitome of his own Ἀτθίς!
texts as well, which the *Souda* certainly does not say, or else that the charge of counterfeisance need not be extended to the Ἀργολικά.

What is most important for our purposes in any case is not Hippys’ Ἐπελεικά but his three-book Ἀργολικά.⁶⁹ And his authorship of this work is as hard for some to accept as his early date. Some have pointed out that structure of the *Souda*’s entry on Hippys casts doubt on its authenticity.⁷⁰ More problematic, it is said, is the contention that such an early history of Argos could be written by a non-local.⁷¹ Yet it is simply not true that in the fifth century local histories were written only by natives—this assumption is challenged as early as Hellanikos—nor is it any less likely that a Rhegian should visit the Peloponnesos than a Lesbian or a Halicarnassan. In fact, we know of another mid-fifth-century Rhegian who made a similar trip: Micythos, son of Khoiros, erstwhile regent of Rhegion and subsequent resident of Tegea (Hdt. 7.170; Paus. 5.26.2ff). And a western Greek interested in examining a Greek locality on the mainland could do worse than Argos, especially given Hippys’ supposition (right or wrong) that an Argive once lived in southern Italy and became king of Syracuse (F4).⁷² If Hippys was working against the same backdrop as Hellanikos, we can connect his decision to write a history of Argos during the years of the Peloponnesian War to a contemporary, indigenous interest in recording Argive history and advancing Argive claims on the past.

---

⁶⁹ Jacoby, for his part, thought that the notice of Ἀργολικά in the *Souda*’s entry could best be explained as a reference to the Ἐπιτome’s preface, which he surmised must have treated the history of King Pollis (F4), the Argive king of Syracuse (*FGrHist* III B Text, 483).

⁷⁰ The final placement of the Ἀργολικά breaks the alphabetic order of the *Schriftenliste*, it is said; but strict alphabetization is not a consistent principle in the *Souda* (see Φ 441 on Philokhoros, for example), and many entries compile texts without any apparent concern for order at all (see e.g. Κ 227 on Callimachus, or Ο 251 on Homer).

⁷¹ See e.g. Jacoby *FGrHist* III B Text, 12: “ist es schwer glaublich, dass ein sizilischer autor in der zeit der Perserkriege über Argos so gehandelt haben soll, dass man das werk Argolika nennen konnte.”

⁷² See R. van Compernolle 1966 for the possibility that Syracuse was in fact an Argive colony.
B) THE FOURTH CENTURY

At some point in the last third of the fourth century BCE, Aristotle wrote *Πολιτείαι* of Argos (FF484-486, 488) and perhaps also of Troizen (F613 Gigon). Of his *Ἀργείων Πολιτεία*, we know only that Aristotle spoke in some detail about Pheidon’s system of measures, although the one secure reference to the work, which comes from Pollux (10.179 = 484 Gigon), concerns a certain measuring cup for oil called the “Pheidon.” Another reference in Pollux (9.77 = F485.1 Gigon) about Pheidon’s *Obeloi*, however, probably belongs to the same context. The reference to the work on Troizen, which we shall discuss in greater detail in the next section, comes in the epitome of Athenaeus’s first book (1.31c = F613 Gigon). It concerns a vine called Anthedonias and Hypereias, named after an island off the coast of Troizen (see Plut. *Gr.Ait*. 19 = F614 Gigon). I argue below that there was no tradition of indigenous Troizenian local historiography, that Troizenian cultural memory was subsumed by the Argive community. Aristotle’s *Politeiai* need not, of course, consistently overlap with the Greek communities that produced local histories *sua sponte*. In the case of Arkadia, where the historiographical community was the region of Arkadia, not any of its constituent *poleis*, Aristotle wrote a *Politeia* of Tegea (F608 Gigon; cf. F609). Nevertheless, it is worth noting that Hippys includes in his *Argolika* the data that Aristotle allegedly inserted into his work on Troizen. The only source to cite the work on Troizen, moreover, is the epitome of Athenaeus, who refers to the way these vines are called *παρὰ Τροιζηνίοις, ὡς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ αὐτῶν πολιτείᾳ*: a formulation that allows for the possibility that Athenaeus or his source knew that

---

73 There is no evidence for any Πολιτεία of Mykenai, Nauplia, Tiryns, or Epidauros, although Strabo 8.6.15 (= F498.1 Gigon) has been taken as evidence for an Epidaurian Πολιτεία.

74 See M. Hose 2002, 145-146.

75 Gigon follows Rose in assigning to the work on Troizen a reference from Plutarch’s Theseus (3 = F615 Gigon), although Aristotle may have cited the maxim ascribed to Pittheus (the legendary founder of Troizen) in any number of works, including his discussion of proverbs.
Aristotle had discussed the vines in the context of Troizen and misassigned the work to the *Politeia* in their name.

An older contemporary of Aristotle was Derkylos (*FGrHist* 305). Most striking about Derkylos is the fact that in all but two cases (FF5-6) he is cited alongside and directly after Agias—Agias, for his part, is cited alone only once (F1). It is not simply that both writers treated the same episodes in their respective Ἀργολικά; they seem in fact to have produced one text between themselves. Either they co-wrote the Ἀργολικά or, the more likely scenario, Derkylos (and he must be the later historian given the order of the names) revised or heavily relied upon Agias. Jacoby thought that Agias was a prose writer, in which case their relationship would be similar, we might say, to that between the two Thessalian historians, Medeios and Kyrsilos (*FGrHist* 129 and 130). But we actually know of an Agias, an epic poet from Troizen who wrote a five-book Νόστοι. The more economical solution, then, would be to equate the Argolikographer

---

76 A Derkyllos is cited several times by Pseudo-Plutarch (in both the *Parallelela Minora* and *De Flaviis*) as the author of numerous works: local histories, like Αἰτολικά (*FGrHist* 288 F1), Ἰταλικά (F2), and Κτίσεις (F3), as well as Περὶ λίθων (*FGrHist* 288 F4), Περὶ Ὁρῶν (FF5-6), and even Σατυρικά (F7). Alan Cameron has called this Derkyllos “one of Ps-Plutarch’s most trusty workhorses” (2004, 134). A Dercylus is also cited by Natale Conti as an authority for Greek mythology (FF9-12). As we have seen, such references are not evidence of the existence of these disparate texts; they may, however, suggest that the Derkylos who wrote about Argos was enough known as a source for ancient history to attract false mythological references.

77 That Agias is on occasion called Hagias (F7 and possibly F4) should give us no cause for concern.

78 Only *FGrHist* 305 FF1 and 3-4 actually provide a title, but others fragments (FF2, 7, 8, 8bis, and 9) must also belong to this work.

79 We will discuss the one verbatim fragment (F4) below; it is written in prose and introduced, καὶ Ἀγίας [καὶ Δερκύλος] ἐν τοῖς Ἀργολικοῖς φασί οὕτως.

80 *FGrHist* IIIB Text, 18. Wilamowitz had suggested something similar, although he posited that Agias was active before Hekataios (1935, Vol. 5, 60-1).

81 Agias (or Hagias) is mentioned in the epitome that Photios made of Proklos’s Χρηστομάθεια, which was itself an epitome of the epic cycle. Agias’s epic evidently dealt with Menelaos’s Egyptian sojourn, Neoptolemos in Thrace and among the Molossi, the murder of Agamemnon, and Orestes’ revenge (*Bibl*. 319A17). Clemens quotes a hexameter from Agias’s Νόστοι (6.12.7: the text reads Ἀγίας). On Agias and the Νόστοι, see A. Debsi 2004, 229-234. We actually know also of a Hegias of Troizen (*FGrHist* 606), whom Pausanias cites regarding Herakles, Theseus, and the Amazon Antiope (1.2.1= F1). His relation to Agias is unclear.
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with the Troizenian poet.\textsuperscript{82} Given the implausibility that Derkylos relied so extensively on Νόστοι for his history of Argos,\textsuperscript{83} however, we must imagine that the name of Agias was attached to several works. We do in fact have outside evidence that Agias was assigned at least one other poem, an Πλίον Πέρσοις,\textsuperscript{84} and we know of at least one other Ἀργολικά written in verse, that of Lykeas (\textit{FGrHist} 312). So it is not impossible that Agias wrote also Ἀργολικά.\textsuperscript{85} Yet if the tendency of the commentators to cite Agias along with Derkylos derives, as it must, from Derkylos’s own insistence that his Ἀργολικά was predicated on a previous work (\textit{e.g.} an epic written by an archaic poet from Troizen), we need not conclude that Agias actually did write Ἀργολικά: unlike Hippys, who is consistently cited independently of Myes, Agias is rather more easily read as a prop that enabled Derkylos to legitimize his historiographical venture. Derkylos’s alleged reliance on an archaic poet would not only help to explain the preponderance of poeticisms in his text but it also allow us better to understand his project as a glorification of a former phase of Argive history.

\textsuperscript{82} Wilamowitz suggested this (1884, 180 n. 26), and it is the conception followed by Susemihl 1891, 664ff. Jacoby doubts the association, in part because he thinks it unlikely that a Troizenian would have any business writing Ἀργολικά (\textit{FGrHist IIIB Text}, 18).

\textsuperscript{83} Much of the information for which Agias and Derkylos are cited—\textit{e.g.} sacred Argive sources of water (F4), King Minos of Crete sacrificing to the Kharites on Paros (F8)—seems not to be connected to the return of the Greeks from Troy. Moreover, Agias is once cited, as we have seen, alone as the author of Ἀργολικά (F1).

\textsuperscript{84} Athenaeus (13.91 610C) actually attributes it to an Argive poet whose name is corrupt—Codex A reads ΤΗΣΑΚΑΤΟΥ ΑΡΓΕΙΟΥ. Casuabon suggested that Sakadas was the author; but Hermann thought Hagias more likely, and this is the reading accepted by Kaibel (1890) and S.D. Olson (2011). See F. d’Alfonso 1995, 50-52, for a discussion of the crux. Incidentally, it is notable that the Troizenian Agias, if this is who is meant, is here called Argive by Athenaeus.

\textsuperscript{85} E. Schwartz distinguished two poets named Agias: one who wrote Νόστοι, and the other who wrote \textit{alte epische Stadtgeschichte} (1905, col. 243). But if we deny the connection between Agias of Troizen and the Agias cited for Argive matters, we would not be compelled to assume that Derkylos’s source would be a poet. There is in any case precedent for the translation of a \textit{polis} history from poetry to prose in the case of Eumelos’s Κοινωνικά (\textit{FGrHist} 451), although here both the prose (T1) and poetical (T2) version of the text are attributed to the same author. Making Agias a poet has the benefit of explaining why in some cases he is cited alone (the Homeric scholiast of F1 is looking at the original poetical version), while in other cases (in F5, where the prose dialect is the matter at hand) it is Derkylos who is named.
We cannot tell much about the form of Derkylos’s Ἀργολικά, but we know it was multivolume.\textsuperscript{86} If it continued into historical times, the text must have been very lengthy indeed, since it took three books to cover the years from Herakles to the Trojan War. But there is no evidence that it followed Argive history beyond the return of Agamemnon.\textsuperscript{87} In fact, if Derkylos did indeed claim to have based his text on an archaic poet, his Ἀργολικά may have deliberately steered clear of contemporary history.\textsuperscript{88} We do know something about the date of publication of Derkylos’s work, however, since Callimachus used it as a source for some of the Argive material in his Aitia (FF4, 8, and 8bis); it seems also to underlie some of Callimachus’s Fifth Hymn on the bath of Pallas.\textsuperscript{89} Derkylos may have written in the early third century; but the fact that Callimachus used his Ἀργολικά does not in itself suggest that Derkylos’s history was published recently.\textsuperscript{90} There is a hint, moreover, that Derkylos lies behind a passage from Aristotle’s Πολιτεία, viz. a curious incident in which King Minos hears of the death of his son Androgeos while sacrificing to the Muses on Paros (F8). To say nothing about the notable inclusion in Ἀργολικά of a Parian episode (involving a king of Crete!), the very obscurity of the story, known only to the two writers, suggests a connection.\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{86} A Homeric scholion mentions the first book of Agias’s Ἀργολικά (F1), and Clemens seems to refer to the third book when he cites Agias and Derkylos about the fall of Troy (F2): κατὰ δὲ τὸ ὀκτωκαιδέκατον ἔτος τῆς Ἀγαμέμνωνος Βασιλείας Ἰλιον ἑάλω . . . Αγίας δὲ καὶ Δερκύλος ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ μηνὸς Πανήμου ὀγδόηι φθίνοντος.

\textsuperscript{87} All nine of our fragments concern either mythological data or else expound peculiarities of Argive cult. This may, of course, only testify to the interests of the citators: commentators on Homer, Antimakhos of Kolophon, Euripides, and Callimachus’s Aitia.

\textsuperscript{88} On the other hand, Derkylos may have forged ahead into contemporary times after abandoning the crutch of Agias.

\textsuperscript{89} See A.W. Bulloch 1985. On Callimachus’s particular interest in Argos and Argive local historiography, see L. Lehnus 2004.

\textsuperscript{90} The most authoritative history is not necessarily the most up-to-date, nor are the other local historians whom we know Callimachus used as sources always recent; note, for example, Xenomedes of Keos, who supplied Callimachus with information about Akontios and Kydippe (F75 Pf. = FGrHist 442 F1) and whom Dionysios of Halicarnassus makes a contemporary of Hellanikos, Damastes of Sigeion, and Xanthos the Lydian (De Thuc. 5 = T1).

\textsuperscript{91} It is not impossible that Derkylos wrote in the early-fourth or even late-fifth centuries BCE, but the dialectal experimentation exhibited by the verbatim fragment (4) suggests otherwise. Regarding the connection with Aristotle, we must admit the possibility that it was Derkylos who borrowed from Aristotle and not the other way around. In this case, we could pinpoint Derkylos’s date between Aristotle and
One of the most distinctive features of Derkylos’s Ἀργολικά is his language. We have seen that it was a natural part of the task of local historiography to define, along with idiosyncrasies of local cult, features of the epichoric dialect. This phenomenon is most evident regarding the local pronunciation of place names. So the Thessalian local historian Kineas wrote Bodone for Dodone (FGrHist 603 F2c) and Krannous for Krannon (F1a); Armenidas in his Ἐλληνικά gave Ariartos for Haliartos (FGrHist 378 F7); and Philistos, the historian of Sicily, called Artemision Artemition (FGrHist 556 F63). But aside from call attention to these toponymic variants, there is no evidence that local historians made extensive use of local dialect. On occasion, however, we see that dialect could be employed as a literary device; we saw that Ionic could be used by archaizing historians or those emulating Herodotus, and Ionic was evidently not the only literary dialect so used. For we have a reference to a local history in Doric, specifically to a work Περὶ Ῥόδου by Epimenides, which we cannot date. It would of course be

Callimachus. Whether he wrote ca. 350 BCE or 290 BCE does not greatly affect my argument, however, about the import of his text.

92 See also Ion of Chios FGrHist 392 F3 for the use of a Chian word.
93 Our verbatim fragments allow us to conclude, as we have seen, that early local histories (e.g. Antiokhos in his Περὶ Τρακίω = FGrHist 555 F2) were written in Ionic. But by the middle of the fourth century, koine was the dialect of choice. So with Timaios of Tauromenion in his history of Sicily (FGrHist 566 e.g. FF11, 13, 16), Klytos in his history of his native Miletos (FGrHist 490 F1), and Kallixeinos of Rhodes in his history of Alexandria (FGrHist 627 FF1.2).

94 Doric prose, we should note, was not rare: Sicilians wrote in Doric as early as Athenians in Attic. The Souda tells us that Akron of Akrigas, a contemporary of Empedokles, wrote a medical treatise in Doric (α 1026), we hear of a cookbook writer, Mithaikos, who lived before Plato (Gorg. 518b) and wrote in Doric (Athen. 7.325 F), as did several early Pythagoreans, like Philolaos of Kroton, a contemporary of Thucydides, and Arkhytas of Tarentum, a contemporary of Plato (for which, see C. Vessella 2008, 305). On the prose of the Pythagoreans, see H. Thesleff 1961, 77-96. The so-called Διοσοὶ λόγοι, a philosophical dialogue appended to the works of Sextus Empiricus and dated ca. 400 BCE, was also written in Doric, as was an anonymous rhetorical treatise (P. Oxy. 410). And of course we have the mathematical treatises of Archimedes. Nor was Doric used only by the western Greeks. Diogenes Laertios alludes to Doric letters written by the likes of Kheilon of Sparta (1.73), Periander of Corinth (1.99-100), and Epimenides of Crete (1.112-113). These letters are probably all fictional, but their very invention lends credence to the phenomenon.

95 According to Diogenes Laertios (1.115)—he is here clearly relying on the work of Demetrios the Magnesian, to whom he has earlier referred in his biography of the Cretan Epimenides (1.113)—the author of the history of Rhodes is not to be confused with the Cretan, and both are distinct from the homonymous genealogist. Jacoby does not give the Rhodian historian his own FGrHist number; he treats him rather in his commentary to the Cretan (FGrHist 457 T1). It is possible that Epimenides’ Περὶ Ῥόδου is an
remarkable had Derkylos written his Άργολικά in Doric. But our one verbatim fragment (FGrHist 306 F4) shows something of equal import.96

Even before the publication of the verbatim fragment in 1935, we knew something about the way that Derkylos wrote. For the Etymologicum Magnum asserts that he made use in his history of what was called the εἶδος τῆς δασείας, whereby the loss of intervocalic sigma aspirated the resulting vowel, a trait that the Argives apparently shared with the Lakonians, Pamphylians, Eretrians, and Oropians (F5).97 But it is the verbatim fragment that best enables us to reconstruct the idiosyncrasies of Derkylos’s prose (FGrHist 305 F4). The fragment comes from a lacunose commentary on the poet Antimakhos of Kolophon (P. Cair. 6574.2.12-23), who is here compared to Callimachus, whose source (Derkylos) is quoted at some length.98 As A.C. Cassio points out, we can see from F4 an example of the intervocalic aspiration alluded to by the Etymologicum Magnum: λοχεύται, equivalent to Attic λοχεύσῃται. And we are also immediately aware of Doricisms—the verb φέροντι and the genitive singular τὰς λοχείας. But other forms also stand out: λοετρά,99 for example, τῶν δμωίδων,100 and πάτος. These are

---


97 This phenomenon is treated by F. Bechtle 1921, 462-4, and C.D. Buck 1955, 55-6. The examples provided by the lexicon, perhaps appearing in Derkylos’s history, are ποιηματος for ποιησηματος, Βουνό for Βουνοσα, and ματια for μουσια.

98 As A.C. Cassio points out, we can see from F4 an example of the intervocalic aspiration alluded to by the Etymologicum Magnum: λοχεύται, equivalent to Attic λοχεύσῃται. And we are also immediately aware of Doricisms—the verb φέροντι and the genitive singular τὰς λοχείας. But other forms also stand out: λοετρά,99 for example, τῶν δμωίδων,100 and πάτος. These are
neither Doric nor Argive forms but poeticisms, which ought to be connected to Derkylos’s touted reliance on the poet Agias. This mélange of Doric/Argive and poetic forms may not actually be unique to Derkylos. Cassio draws our attention to a fascinating papyrus written in a similar dialect, which describes an exchange between Amphiaros and Alkmeone before the expedition of the Epigoni to Thebes (PSI 1091). Pointing to the subject matter as well to the preponderance of historical presents, Cassio plausibly suggests that the text be considered a new fragment of anonymous Ἀργολικά. If he is correct, we may be able to see Derkylos’s project as part of a larger trend. But Derkylos’s interest in advertising Argos’s connection to ancient epic as well as the idiosyncrasies of epichoric speech nevertheless reveals a singular use of localization. In part, this may be related to the fact that during the years of Derkylos’s activity Argos was in the process of negotiating a position in relation to Macedon, a self-proclaimed Doric community and a putative Argive colony, to boot.

Derkylos’s accentuation of Argos’s Doric roots may well have been aimed at Philip, but his marked localism would certainly have appealed to his fellow Argives. That he intended his own community to read his history is further suggested by his use of Argive month names to date events of panhellenic significance. This trait is clearest in Clemens’ discussion of the fall of Troy, where Agias and Derkylos are cited for having dated the event to “the twenty-third of Panemos” (FGrHist 305 F2). It is true that Panemos is attested as a Macedonian month, but this is no reason to assume, with K. Clarke, that Derkylos was availing himself of “borrowed time” by forwarding the “Macedonian equivalent for the Athenian month Thargelion.” For not only is Panemos
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101 Examples of Doricisms in this manuscript include the infinitive διαμόνομονεύεν and λελαβήκειν; examples of poeticisms, φάτις and the phrase θέσφατον ἦμεν.
102 1989, 268.
103 Even as early an Argive writer as Akousilaos apparently allowed the occasional Doric form; in his Genealogy, we note the Doric infinitive τεκέν just beside the Ionic πολεμέεσκε (FGrHist 2 F22).
a well-attested Argive month (as Panamos),\textsuperscript{105} but we know that Derkylos elsewhere names a local month, Arneios (\textit{FGrHist} 305 8bis).\textsuperscript{106} Derkylos was not the only Argive local historian to use local month names. In Plutarch’s discussion of the heroism of Argive women, we read that the Spartan attack on Argos after the Battle of Sepeia took place on the “seventh day of the month that is now known as ‘Fourth’ but was formerly called Hermaios by the Argives” (\textit{De mul. Virt.} 4 245C-F); the synchronism most likely comes from Sokrates, whom Plutarch has just cited regarding the participation of Demaratos in this venture (\textit{FGrHist} 310 F6).\textsuperscript{107}

C) THE THIRD CENTURY

We can date two local historians of Argos to the third century BCE: Istros and Deinias. Istros’s \textit{Ἀργολικά} (\textit{FGrHist} 334 F39) is cited much less often than his numerous other works;\textsuperscript{108} in fact, only Athenaeus and Stephanos mention it, both with reference to the same material, the former name of the Peloponnesos, Apia (F39a and 39b). Istros was active in the mid-third century; he is often named \textit{ὁ Καλλιμάχειος} (\textit{e.g. TT}2, 6) and is once even described as a slave of Callimachus (T1); his interest in Argos


\textsuperscript{106} Dionysios, too, very probably mentioned Arneios in his \textit{Ἀργολικά} (\textit{FGrHist} 308 F2).

\textsuperscript{107} Clemens also cites the Argolikographer Dionysios, according to whom Troy fell in the eighteenth year of Agamennon’s rule and the first year of the rule at Athens of Demophon, son of Theseus, on the twelfth day of Thargelion (\textit{FGrHist} 308 F1). Given the abridgement evident in Clemens’ citation, Jacoby may be right that Dionysios’s original synchronism also included the Argive month (\textit{FGrHist IIIB Text}, 20). The same can be said about a fragment of Deinias, where the assassination of Agamemnon is dated to the thirteenth of Gamelion (\textit{FGrHist} 306 F2). The Argive months, according to this thesis, would have been passed over by the citer as strictly unnecessary for his readers. This would be a better example of K. Clarke’s concept of borrowed time (2008, 217-220); but it is only a hypothesis. Indisputable, however, is Dionysios’s dating of the fall of Troy by way of another Argive system of chronology, namely Agamennon’s rule: \textit{κατὰ δὲ τὸ ὀκτωκαιδέκατον ἔτος τῆς Ἀγαμέμνονος Βασιλείας Ἰλιον ἑάλω, Δημοφῶντος τοῦ Θησέως βασιλεύοντος Ἀθήνησι τῶι πρώτωι ἔτει, Θαργηλιῶνος μηνὸς δευτέραι ἐπὶ δέκα, ὡς φησὶ Λυδίουσι ὁ Ἀργεῖος} (\textit{FGrHist} 308 F1).

\textsuperscript{108} Istros is credited with \textit{Ἄτακτα} (\textit{FGrHist} 334 FF17-22), \textit{Σύμμικτα} (F57), \textit{Ὑπομνήματα} (F58), \textit{Ἀττικαὶ Λέξεις} (F23), \textit{Ἀπόλλωνος Ἐπιφανεία} (FF50-52), and \textit{Ἡερακλέους Ἐπιφανείαι} (F53), as well as titles that better justify for us the application of the term \textit{συγγραφεύς} (T1, T6): \textit{Αἰγυπτίων Ἀποκίαι} (FF43-460), \textit{Ἀττικαί/Συναγωγή} τῶν Ἀττιδίων (FF1-16), \textit{Ἡλιακά} (FF40-42), \textit{Συναγωγή} τῶν Κρητικῶν Ὑσιῶν (F48), and \textit{Περὶ Πτολεμαίδος} (F47).
may well have derived from Callimachus. If Istros’s Ἀργολικά was at all similar to his treatments of Athens and Elis, we can expect that it was lengthy and perhaps also compilatory. His history of Attica seems, as we have said, not to have ventured into historical times; and the same may then have been the case with the Ἀργολικά. Istros was certainly able to write about contemporary history, as his two-book Ptolemais shows (F47), but his interests, like those of his mentor, seem to have been a curious mix between contemporary Egypt and ancient Greece.

The only other historian who certainly belongs to the third century is Deinias, to whom two works are attributed, an Ὀρεστεία of at least two books (FGrHist 306 F3bis Mette) and an Ἀργολικά of at least nine (F3). His history of Argos must have been considerably longer than nine books, however, since the seventh deals only with the sack of Troy (F2). Deinias evidently split his massive work into two installments, for a scholion to Euripides’ Orestes cites from the ninth book τῆς πρώτης συντάξεως (F3). The scholiast claims actually to have had access to the ninth book τῆς πρώτης συντάξεως, ἐκδόσεως δὲ δευτέρας, which suggests that when Deinias finished the second σύνταξις, he published it with a re-edition of the first. One possible point of division between the two συντάξεις would be the Return of the Herakleidai or a similar event that could have served to usher in the spatium historicum; for Deinias is one of a handful of local historians whose fragments actually do touch on historical events. We know, for example, that he recounted the archaic struggles for Peloponnesian hegemony, retaining a Delphic oracle to Megara about the preeminence of Argos (F6) and
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109 See FGrHist 334 FF3, 5, 9, 13-15 for the title Συνεγωγή (τῶν Λατίδων). His work on Athens was at least fourteen books in length (FF10-11), his work on Elis at least five (F41).
110 In Books Thirteen and Fourteen, Istros is still dealing with Theseus (FF-F10).
111 The focus of which was the Egyptian polis Ptolemais, founded by Ptolemy I.
112 This fragment, embedded in Herodianos’s discussion of proper names ending with –νος, was not included in Jacoby’s collection: τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ φήσι καὶ Δεινίας ὁ Ἀργολικός [καὶ Ἀγαγόν . . . ἐν β’ τῆς ἐπιγραφομένης Ὀρεστείας. It is possible that the so-called Ὀρεστεία was a part of the Ἀργολικά, but this would render problematic the designation of a book number.
forwarding an eccentric account of the “Battle of the Fetters” between Sparta and Tegea (F4). Of perhaps even greater import is the fact that Deinias wrote also about the third-century Peloponnesos (for, as rare as it is to have a fragment of local historiography that pertains to the archaic or Classical age, fragments describing the Hellenistic world are even less common): he seems to have recounted the murder of Abantidas, tyrant of Sikyon, in 252/1 (T1), and, as Plutarch tells us, he certainly told of the assassination of the tyrant of Argos, Aristippos, in 235 BCE (F5).

This last event provides a terminus post quem for the final ἔκδοσις of Deinias’ Ἀργολικά. But we may be able to pinpoint the date of publication with a little more precision. First, if it is our Deinias whom Agatharkhides once cites (F6), the Ἀργολικά must have appeared by the middle of the second century BCE. Second, the historian may be connected to the homonym who killed Abantidas, tyrant of Sikyon, in 252/1 BCE (T1). Plutarch is our main source for the murder of Abantidas; in fact, he narrates it in the same text (the Aratos) in which he refers to Deinias’s Ἀργολικά (29.5). Deinias and Aristotle the Dialectician, he says, used to give lectures in the agora of Sikyon, where one of their frequent auditors was the tyrant Abantidas; the two philosophers, in fact, allegedly encouraged his attendance in order to facilitate their coup (3.4). Plutarch tells us nothing more about Deinias or the subject of his disputations. Nor, for that matter, do we know anything certain about his provenance—his presence in Sikyon says nothing against an Argive origin, inasmuch as Sikyon may only have been

---

113 In the De Mar. Erythr., Agatharkhides refers to οἱ περὶ Κλεινίαν ἱστορικοί, which Reinesius emended to οἱ περὶ Δεινίαν.
114 For Agatharkhides, see S. Burstein 1989. He was connected to Kinnaios, who worked under Ptolemy VI, and to Herakleides Lembos, who was involved in the Egyptian venture of Antiokhos IV’s in 169 BCE.
115 For the equation between the historian and the tyrant-killer, see J. Beloch 1927, 613; W.W. Tarn 1913, 361; and F.W. Walbank 1933, 16ff. E. Schwartz is skeptical (1901, col. 2389). Jacoby tentatively favors the identification. Plutarch, it is true, certainly does not go out of his way to identify the historian with the tyrant-killer.
116 Jacoby suspects that the historian was Argive (FGrHist IIIB Text, 25). If it is Deinias who is meant in a scholion to Pindar (Isthm. 4, 104g = FGrHist 306 F8)—we read that an Αἰνείας ὁ Ἀργεῖος assigned to Herakles and Megara five sons—Deinias’s connection to Argos is even stronger. Herodianos calls Deinias
In any case, if Deinias was giving lectures in 252/1 and also alive to write about the murder of Aristippos in 235, he was likely born in the first quarter of the third century. For the majority of Deinias’s life, then, Argos was under the sway of pro-Macedonian tyrants.

Deinias’s act of tyrannicide should not in itself imply that he was by principle against the institution of Sikyonian tyranny; Sikyonian tyrants had long predicated their rules on the murder of a predecessor. Nor would an act against a tyrant of Sikyon axiomatically imply antagonism toward tyrants in other poleis, like Argos. For that matter, Deinias’s role in the murder says very little about either his stance toward Macedon—Aratos, after all, was a sometime tyrant-killer (even of allegedly pro-Macedonian tyrants, like Nikokles) but was nevertheless not above seeking support from Macedon. Yet there are hints of a relationship between Deinias and Aratos. For one

Ἀργολικός (F3bis Mette), which seems to mean that he wrote Argolic history not that he was himself from Argos or the Argolid—if this is what he meant, he would likely have used the ethnic, Ἀργεῖος, not the ktetikon Ἀργολικός. For, as Herodiano himself elsewhere said, ὅτι τὸ κτητικὸν ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτοκρατορῶν λαμβανόμενον καὶ ἐπὶ τεθνηκότων θέλει λαμβάνεσθαι οἷον βοότος κεφαλῆ ή τοῦ τεθνηκότος βοός, οὐ γάρ ἄν ἐπὶ ζώντος εἶποι τις τούτῳ (Περὶ κτητικῶν ὄνοματών), suggesting that he does not intend with such an adjective to describe the person of Deinias. (On ktetika, see S. Levin 1950, 145; see also P. Chantraine 1956, 110-111, regarding the use of such adjectives to describe non-citizens). It is likely that Herodiano simply did not know where Deinias was from. Pausanias, we should note, attributes the murder of Abantidas to ἐπιχώριοι (3.8.2), but he may mean nothing more by this than at the time of the tyrant’s murder Deinias and Aristotle were living at Sikyon. For what it is worth, if Aristotle’s designation as ὁ διαλεκτικός is meant to include him among the so-called Megarian Dialecticians, Pausanias is rather imprecise with the term ἐπιχώριος. See below, though, for the suggestion that Aristotle was in fact Argive.

If he was at all associated with the Dialectical School, which may be implied with his association with Aristotle ὁ διαλεκτικός, academic activity close to the Isthmus would be natural.

As Plutarch tells us, the tyrant Kleon was killed by Kleinias, who Aratos insists was not a tyrant (but Aratos’s judgment, given the fact that he is discussing his father, is not unimpeachable); Kleinias was killed by Abantidas, who assumed control of Sikyon; Abantidas was replaced by his father Paseas, who was in turn killed by Nikokles; and Nikokles ruled as tyrant until he was expelled from the city by Aratos (Plut. Arat. 2-3).

Deinias and Aristotle may even have been motivated less by politics than by personal enmity inasmuch their action did nothing to end the tyranny at Sikyon (in fact, Abantidas’s father took up the reins after his son’s murder).

We can suspect that Abantidas had supported Antigonos, since Macedon’s victory in the Chremonidean War left him in power. But this tells us nothing of Deinias.

According to Plutarch, in fact, Aratos appealed to Antigonos Gonatas even when planning his coup against Nikokles (Arat. 3.4); and Polybius asserts that Aratos sought the support Antigonos Doson in the face of the Spartan threat (2.48-50).
thing, it is probable that Aratos is Plutarch’s source for Deinias’s assassination of Abantidas, and Aratos likely got this information from Deinias’s own Αργολικά. Second, it may be possible to equate Deinias’s co-conspirator in Sikyon, Aristotle ὁ διαλεκτικός, with a character that turns up sixteen years later in Argos, Aristotle ὁ Ἀργεῖος, whom Polybius (2.53.1) and Plutarch (Arat. 44.2; Kleom. 20.6) describe as a friend of Aratos and leader of the Argive revolt against Kleomenes in 224 BCE. If this is so, and if we can make a similar connection between Deinias and Aratos, we may be entitled to read Deinias’s local history in part as a justification both of the League itself and of Argos’s inclusion therein. This inference, as we shall see in the following section, is supported by Deinias’s broad conception of Argos; by including Peloponnesian history in his Αργολικά, Deinias makes a claim for Argos’s important role among the other Peloponnesian poleis of the Achaelean League.

The production of local historiography at Argos was constant, with Αργολικά composed both under democracy and tyranny, both during periods of autonomy and after Argos had been subsumed by the Achaelean League. In fact, as we saw in the case of Thessaly, where the domination of Macedon (and, for a time, of Epeiros) was itself connected to the production of local history, some Αργολικά may even have been

122 See Jacoby, FGrHist IIIB Noten, 14 n.11. W.W. Tarn, without justification, considers Deinias a close friend of Aratos (1931, 430).
123 Jacoby FGrHist IIIB Noten, 23 n.8. Just before discussing Deinias’s murder of Abantidas, Plutarch cites Aratos’s Υπομνήματα (Arat. 3.3 = FGrHist 231 T6).
124 Deinias surely wrote about his own involvement in the assassination of Abantidas; local historians generally went out of their way to work themselves into their histories—note the involvement of Deinias’s contemporary, Nymphis, in his history of Herakleia (FGrHist 432 TT3-4) and Philokhoros’s appearance in his Αρτικ (FGrHist 328 F67). Aratos may well have known about the murder of Abantidas also through other means. Nevertheless, the level of detail with which Plutarch is acquainted, brief though his account is, suggests that the ultimate source of the anecdote was intimately involved in the proceedings.
125 Aristoteles is not an uncommon name, and it is certainly possible that there were two Peloponnesians so called who were involved in similar political maneuvers. And it may be said against the association that Plutarch refers to the tyrannicide by his philosophical school and to the revolutionary by his ethnic. On the other hand, it makes some degree of sense that Plutarch’s two adjectives should reflect the two different roles assumed by this Aristotle, first as lecturer and then as patriot. Nor is it Plutarch’s habit, as we saw in the case of Deinias, to refer pro- or analeptically to a minor character who makes multiple appearances in a text.
written in response to loss of autonomy. Argive local historiography was also an indigenous phenomenon. The earliest Ἀργολικά, as in the case of all local histories of mainland Greece, were written by non-natives, viz. Hellanikos and Hippys, and we know also of other foreign local historians (Aristotle and Istros). But at least two local historians (Dionysios and Sokrates) are explicitly said to be Argive and three more (Deinias, Derkylos, and Lykeas) almost certainly were. These historians by no means advanced a consistent formation of the Argive past. Some, like Sokrates, focused predominately on matters of cult; others, like Deinias, on the military history and political developments of the Peloponnesian poleis. But one attribute stands out in all of Argive local historiography: Argos’s wide expanse.

2.2.4.3 The Bounds of Ἀργολικά

One of our earliest fragments of Argive local historiography, our sole reference to Hellanikos’s Ἀργολικά (FGrHist 4 F36), describes the first division of the territory of Argos. At the death of King Triopas of Argos, his son Agenor received the cavalry, while Agenor’s brothers split the land: Pelasgos was allotted τὰ πρῶτα Ἑρασῖνον ποταμόν, where he founded Larissa (the citadel of the polis of Argos); Iasos took τὰ πρῶτα Ἡλιν. But what could Hellanikos have intended as the extent of Triopas’s kingdom? If Pelasgos’s half actually included the acropolis of Argos and abutted the

126 About Anaxikrates, Damen, Demetrios, and Telesarkhos, however, we can draw no conclusions. As in the case of Deinias, Herodianos identifies Damen as an Ἀργολικὸς συγγραφεὺς (Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, s.v. Damen), and Damen is similarly described in Epimerismi Homerici—ἐστὶ δὲ Ἀργολικὸς συγγραφεὺς ὁ Δαμήν (see A. Mori 2012). This seems to mean, here too, that the historian wrote Ἀργολικά, not that he was himself from Argos.

127 The fragment comes in the A scholia to the Iliad, expounding Argos’s epithet ἱππόβοτος (3.75). There is a similar citation to Hellanikos in Eustathios, also at Il. 3.75, but no title is given to the referenced work. Eustathios’s version differs on several counts, most dramatically in that Phoroneus, not Triopas, is named as the father. On the principle of lectio difficilior, Hellanikos probably wrote Triopas, not the better-known Phoroneus, to whom Hellanikos dedicated a special work (see the discussion of J. Hall 1995, 591). This, to say nothing of the explicit reference to Ἀργολικά, suggests that the original provenance of the fragment was not the Φορωνίς (contra K. Von Fritz 1967 I, 487).
Erasinos River in the south, Lerna would be excluded, and this is surprising.\textsuperscript{128} Perhaps, then, Hellanikos is being somewhat vague: \(\tau\alpha\ \pi\omicron\sigma\omicron\varsigma\ 'E\omicron\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\) may simply mean “in the direction of Erasinos,”\textsuperscript{129} \textit{i.e.} the part of the territory that includes Argos \textit{polis} and the south. But what is more remarkable is that Hellanikos described Iasos’s lot in terms of Elis.\textsuperscript{130} This is not of course the most direct way for him to have referred to “the Inakhos valley as it winds its way northwestward from the Plain,” if this is what he meant.\textsuperscript{131} The natural conclusion, rather, is that Hellanikos’s ideation of the original extent of Argos spanned much of the northern Peloponnesos.\textsuperscript{132} The emphasis on Elis may well represent a tradition according to which this region was actually included in the kingdom of Phoronis and Triopas,\textsuperscript{133} a tradition later embraced by Ephoros (\textit{FGrHist} 70 F115), who connects Pheidon’s attack on Elis and his consequent celebration of the Olympic Games to his alleged attempt to reclaim the \(\lambda\eta\zeta\varsigma\iota\varsigma\ \Theta\iota\mu\epsilon\sigma\nu\).\textsuperscript{134} In his travels around Argos at the end of the fifth century, we might say, Hellanikos picked up on Argive rhetoric about the original extent of the Argive territory, and this influenced the way he wrote his history of Argos.

No local history is entirely centripetal: we have had the opportunity to observe how local narratives (Livy’s \textit{Ab Urbe Condita} is a good example) often recount the exploits of the subject community even outside of the focalizing locality. So when the Atthidographers discussed Theseus, they made requisite mention of his journey to

\textsuperscript{128} Strab. 8.6.2; Paus. 2.36.6-2.38.1.  
\textsuperscript{129} This is how J. Hall understands the expression (1995, 592).  
\textsuperscript{130} According to Jacoby (\textit{ad.loc.}), Wilamowitz suggested that Hellanikos actually wrote that the northern boundary was the River Inakhos, not Elis; but this emendation is bold and elsewhere unsupported.  
\textsuperscript{131} As J. Hall suggests (1995, 592).  
\textsuperscript{132} If we are permitted to see Hellanikos behind a scholion to Euripides’ \textit{Orestes} (932), which retains a lengthy segment of Argive genealogy—and the fact that the scholiast forwards Triopas as the father of Pelasgos and Iasos may confirm this—we can better understand how Hellanikos understood the extent of the Argive realm. For here, we encounter the regal progression Inakhos, Phoroneus, Niobe, and Argos; and included among the sons of Argos are the eponymous Epidauros and Tiryns.  
\textsuperscript{133} It is notable that Hellanikos retrojects the cohesiveness of Argos well before the advent of the Heraklid Temenos; for Triopas was thought to have ruled only four generations after Phoroneus, the first man (Paus. 2.16.1).  
\textsuperscript{134} An incident alluded to also by Herodotus (6.127.3) and Pausanias (6.22.2).
Crete, just as Thessalian local historiography followed Jason to the Black Sea and Armenos to Armenia. Such a phenomenon is evident especially in the treatment of contemporary history: Philokhoros described the actions of Kharidemos in the Hellespont and Khares at Olynthos (FGrHist 328 FF49-51), while Memnon, in his history of Herakleia, incorporated all battles in which the Herakleiotai had participated, as far away as Macedon (FGrHist 434 F1.8) and Rome (F1.21). Sometimes, in fact, local histories narrate non-local events in which the focal community does not play a role: Androtion discusses the Spartan raid on Thebes (FGrHist 324 F50), and Memnon offers a fairly lengthy digression on the rise of Rome (FGrHist 434 F18). So it is not at all surprising that we should find in the fragments of the Ἀργολικά references to events that took place outside of the polis Argos. Nevertheless, non-Argive material takes up a remarkable amount of space in the fragments of the Ἀργολικά; rarely, in fact, do our fragments deal directly with the polis of Argos itself.

Jacoby contended that the greater a community’s “importance,” the more it was affected by events “in the surrounding world.” But the attention that a community pays in its local historiography to the outside world is not always commensurate with its actual role in international affairs. Fantasies about Argive authority in the Peloponnesos had repercussions on the way that the Argive community imagined and wrote its collective past; and the irredentism of Argive policy, with a view to Sparta in the late-fifth and early-fourth centuries and to Arkadia and the Achaean League in the third, was

---

135 e.g. Hellanikos (FGrHist 323 F14), Kleidemos (FGrHist 323 F17), Demon (FGrHist 327 F5), Philokhoros (FGrHist 328 FF17, and 111).
136 See FGrHist 269 F11 and FGrHist 129-130.
137 The poet Lykeas narrated the death of Pyrrhos (FGrHist 312 F1) and mentions the grave of Ariadne under the Temple of Dionysus (F4), while Deinias referred to the grave of two lovers, Melagkhros (?) and Kleometreas, in the city center (FGrHist 306 F3). To be precise, Deinias says that the lovers’ grave was on a mound “now called Pron” where the Argives give judgment. This is probably to be connected with the same law court that Pausanias locates (but does not name) near the temple to Kephisos and the theater (2.20.7), but it is worth noting that aside from this reference, the only place called Pron that we know of is a mountain near Hermione on the Saronic Gulf (Paus. 2.34.11, 2.35.4, and 2.36.1-2).
reflected in the *Argolika*. Not only in the foundational period did local historians make Argos far exceed the bounds of the future *polis*, but even in historical times they considered a history of Argos an appropriate venue for treating the history of the Peloponnesos *in toto*.

Since by the mid-fifth century Argos had conquered the *poleis* of the surrounding plain, it may not be surprising to find these perioic communities incorporated in the Ἀργολικά. Derkylos drew both Mideia and Tiryns into the early history of Argos (*FGrHist* 305 F9);139 Demetrios has the eponym Argos dedicate the famous140 pear-wood statue of Hera not within the *polis* Argos but at Tiryns (*FGrHist* 304 F1);141 and Deinias once even defines the territorial extent of Argos by way of Tiryns.142 Nemea, too, was incorporated: Lykeas, for example, writes that it was when the Argives were sacrificing to Zeus at Nemea that the strongman Biton lifted a bull onto his shoulders (*FGrHist* 312 F2).143 But the Ἀργολικά also narrate events that took place in the Akte. One of our earliest Ἀργολικά, in fact, that of Hippys of Rhegion, embraces two of Argos’s major rivals: Epidauros (*FGrHist* 554 F2) and Troizen (F4).

---

139 The scholion to Pindar actually attributes the tale of Likymnios’s death to Dera and Derkylos, which Böckh had emended to Deinias and Derkylos. Deinias, it is true, might well have written about Likymnios, but given the association with Derkylos, Drachmann’s Agias should be accepted. The scholiast here cites Argive local historians explicitly regarding the unintentional murder of Likymnios by Tlepolemos (for which, see also Zenon of Rhodes *FGrHist* 523 F1). But it is not unlikely that the other information contained in the scholion also derives from the Ἀργολικά: the names of the six children of Elektryon, for example, and the etymology of Mideia ἐκ Φρυγίας Μιδέας. We should not press the scholion too much, but note the claim that Mideia was a *polis* in Argos (not in the Argolid), suggesting that Argos itself was considered a polypolity.

140 The statue’s celebrity was also included in the epic Φορωνίς (F4 Davies).

141 Pausanias (2.17.4-5) says that the statue was dedicated by the son of Argos, Peirasos. We cannot tell whether Demetrios or indeed any Argolikographer mentioned the antagonism between Argos and Tiryns discussed by e.g. Akouilaos *FGrHist* 2 F28 (= Apoll. 2.4.4) and Paus. 2.16.3 (for which, see K. Dowden 1989, 71-95; cf. J. Hall 1997, 93-17). We should note that Herodotus was himself aware of these early Argive claims on Tiryns: he defines a grove on the outskirts of Tiryns sacred to the eponymous Argos (6.78-80).

142 He preserves a Delphic oracle, given he says to the Megarians, in which so-called Pelasgian Argos is depicted as stretching between Tiryns and Arkadia (*FGrHist* 306 F6).

143 The prowess of Biton, often connected to that of his brother Kleobis, was known of course even to Herodotus, who has the brothers carry their mother, a priestess, some 45 stades (1.31) for a festival in honor of Hera (he must mean that they were going to the Heraion, not to Nemea, although this is not clear). Biton’s prowess, was preserved in other anecdotes (cf. Paus. 2.19.5 and 2.20.3).
We saw that Hippys wrote about an event (a cure of tapeworms) that occurred at Epidauros. What is surprising is not Hippys’ interest in the god or his evident use of epigraphy but his reliance, in his Ἀργολικά, on data from Epidauros; for he could well have dealt with Asklepios by way one of the three sanctuaries to Asklepios located in the polis of Argos itself.\textsuperscript{144} We saw that Hippys picked up his account of the miracle during a visit to the sanctuary, and this suggests a premeditated connection between Epidauros and Argos. If we can see Hippys as a contemporary of Hellanikos, he may well have written his Argolika against the backdrop of the war between Argos and Epidauros (419 BCE). But whenever he wrote, if Hippys let the concerns of his subject community dictate the bounds of his study, his incorporation of one of Argos’s principal enemies, Epidauros, could not have been without significance. Asklepios played a large role in subsequent Ἀργολικά,\textsuperscript{145} we should note, and given the precedent of Hippys, it is not unlikely that this was also in connection Epidauros.\textsuperscript{146}

Another prominent Aktean polis, Troizen, also found itself incorporated into Hippys’ Ἀργολικά. For Troizen was evidently the homeland of Pollis, whom Hippys made king of the Syracusans and the conduit of a celebrated varietal of wine, the Bibline, which traveled from the Peloponnesos to southern Italy and thence to Sicily (\textit{FGrHist} 554 F4).\textsuperscript{147} The citation to Hippys comes from the epitome of Athenaeus’s first book

\textsuperscript{144} For which see Paus. 2.21.1, 2.23.2, 2.23.4.
\textsuperscript{145} See Telesarkhos on the death of Asklepios (\textit{FGrHist} 309 F2) and Sokrates of Argos on Asklepios’s upbringing and education (\textit{FGrHist} 310 FF11-14).
\textsuperscript{146} On the intricate historical connection between Argos and Epidauros, see M. Piérart 2004.
\textsuperscript{147} This fragment comes from Athenaeus: Ἰππύς δ’ ὁ Ῥηγῖνος τὴν εἰλεὸν καλουμένην ἁμπέλον βιβλίαν φησὶ καλεῖθαι, ἣν Πόλλιν τὸν Ἀργεῖον, δὲ ἐρευνόντες Συρακουσιῶν, πρῶτον εἰς Συρακούσας κομίσει ἐξ Ίταλίας, εἰ δὲ σύν ὁ παρὰ Σικελιώταις γλυκὺς καλούμενος Πόλλιος ὁ Βιβλίνος οἶνος. For Pollis, see A. Holm 1870, 346; E.A. Freeman 1891, 421-433; and T.J. Dunbabin 1948, 93-94. The other authorities for the Bibline vine adduced in this passage are the fifth-century Eretrian tragedian Akhaios, the comedians Philyllios and Epikharmos, and Armenidas, who claims (in his Θηβαιακά?) that Biblia was in fact a region in Thrace (\textit{FGrHist} 378 F3). References to this wine actually abound in Greek literature—Hesiod even recommends drinking it during a summer siesta (\textit{Works} 589), and see Aelian \textit{V.H}. 12.31—and we can infer from the entries on the Bibline in Stephanos and the \textit{Etymologicum Magnum} (197.32) that its original provenance was much debated: so Epikharmos (Sicilian though he was) apparently said that the Bibline wine came from Thrace (F 70 K-A), while the Delian historian Semos (\textit{FGrHist} 296 F13) forwarded a Naxian origin. It is understandable, then, that the Rhegian
Hippys of Rhegion says that the so-called eileon vine was called Biblian, which the Argive Pollis, who ruled the Syracusans, first brought to Syracuse from Italy. Bibline wine, then, would be the sweet wine that the Sikeliotai call Pollios.”

In the epitome, the reference to Hippys is followed directly by an oracle, “Drink wine full of lees, since you don’t dwell in Anthedon or holy Hypera, where you used to drink filtered wine” and then by the reference to Aristotle from his Politeia, about the vine called Anthedonias and Hypereias, named after two men, Anthos and Hyperos (F613 Gigon).

Although it is not made explicit in Athenaeus, we know from Plutarch that Aristotle was responsible for the information both about the vine and about the oracle (Plut. Gr. Ait. 19 = F614 Gigon). In fact, Plutarch tells us that Aristotle derived the name of the vine from the island Anthedonia and Hypereia and, more important, that he equated this island with Kalaureia, which was off the coast of Troizen. Since the oracle in Aristotle is directed at someone who once lived near Kalaureia and since in Athenaeus it follows the reference to Hippys, Aristotle must also have made Pollis the oracle’s recipient. A muddled section of Pollux’s Onomastikon confirms at any rate that Aristotle did know of Pollis (6.16): “Pollian wine was sweet and came from Syracuse, having been first prepared by the Argive Pollis, after whom it was named; or perhaps it was named after Pollis the king of Syracuse, as Aristotle says.” Pollux, understandably uncomfortable with an Argive

---

Hippys would have derived the famous vine from his homeland in southern Italy (πῖν’ οἶνον τρυγίαν, ἐπεὶ οὐκ Ἀνθηδόνα ναέεις/ οὐδ’ ἱερὰν Ἅπεραν, δόθ γ’ ἀτρυγον οἶνον ἐπινεῖς).

Ἅππυς δ’ ὁ Ῥηγῖνος τὴν εἰλεὸν καλούμενην ἀμπέλον βιβλίαν φησὶ καλεῖσθαι, ἣν Πόλλιν τὸν Ἀργεῖον, ὃς ἔβασιλευσε Συρακουσίων, πρῶτον εἰς Σικελίαν κομίσαι ἐξ Ἰταλίας. εἰ δὲν οὖν ὁ παρὰ Σικελίωταις γκλικεὺς καλούμενος Πόλλιος ὁ Βίβλινος οἶνος. The other authorities for the Bibline vine adduced in this passage are the fifth-century Eretrian tragedian Akhaios, the comedians Philyllios and Epikharmos, and Armenidas, who claims (in his Θηβαιακά?) that Biblia was in fact a region in Thrace (FGrHist 378 F3). References to Bibline wine actually abound in Greek literature—Hesiod recommends drinking it during a summer siesta (Works 589; cf. Aelian. V.H. 12.31)—and we can infer from the entries on the Bibline in Stephanos and the Etymologicum Magnum (197.32) that its original provenance was much debated: so Epikharmos (Sicilian though he was) apparently said it came from Thrace (F 70 K-A), while the Delian historian Semos (FGrHist 296 F13) forwarded a Naxian origin. It is perhaps understandable, then, that the Rhegian Hippys would have derived the famous vine from his homeland in southern Italy.

πῖν’ οἶνον τρυγίαν, ἐπεὶ οὖκ Ἀνθηδόνα ναέεις/ οὐδ’ ἱερὰν Ἅπεραν, δόθ γ’ ἀτρυγον οἶνον ἐπινεῖς.

As Müller saw, 1848, Vol. 2, 136
king of Syracuse, concluded that there must have been two different Pollides. According to Aristotle, then, Pollis was originally from Troizen, where he drunk lee-less Anthedonian wine; moved to Italy, where he discovered the Bibline varietal; and went thence to Syracuse, where he became king.

Hippys seems to have had a similar sequence in mind. His idiosyncratic reference to the vine as *eileos*,¹⁵¹ in fact, is surely a reference to Eileoi, a *khorion* between Troizen and Hermione (Paus. 2.34.6).¹⁵² Hippys was not being brash in including Troizen in his Ἀργολικά. I suggested above that it was possible for a local historian from Troizen, namely the epic poet Agias, to write Ἀργολικά, or at any rate have such an epic attributed to him, and Agias would certainly not have ignored his hometown in this work. The natural locus for the exploration of Troizenian history was precisely the Ἀργολικά. For this reason, Hippys calls Pollis Ἀργεῖος, not reserving the word for citizens of the *polis* Argos alone.¹⁵³ In fact, aside from Aristotle’s *politeia*, whose title I have questioned above, we have no evidence for an indigenous local historiography of Troizen or Epidaurus.¹⁵⁴ It is not that these *poleis* lacked local traditions (indeed Pausanias and Aristotle show us that this was not so), but these traditions did not crystallize into a discrete brand of local historiography; as local historiography, we might say, Troizenian and Epidaurian community autobiography was subsumed by the *Argolika*.

¹⁵¹ Related perhaps to the ἔλεοι grape that Hesychios lists in his lexicon.
¹⁵³ Thucydides mentions a Pollis, we may note, whom he designates as Ἀργεῖος. This Pollis on his own initiative went to Persia to ask for financial help and was for this reason executed by the Athenians (2.67). Cf. IG 4. 728; O. Peek Asklepieion 43. For Pollis, see A. Holm 1870, 346; E.A. Freeman 1891, 421-433; and T.J. Dunbabin 1948, 93-94.
¹⁵⁴ Jacoby thinks that Herophanes of Troizen (*FGrHist* 605 F1) wrote a local history of Troizen, but this is not at all clear from Pausanias, the sole source to name him (2.34.4); the same can be said about Hegias of Troizen (*FGrHist* 606 F1), also cited only by Pausanias (1.2.1). Aside from these two historians, who may actually have written Ἀργολικά, it is only Aelian who attests to the existence of Τροζήνιοι Λόγοι (*V.H.* 11.2 = *FGrHist* 607 F2), and this seems to mean nothing other than the oral traditions of the Troizenians (cf. Paus. 1.22.1; 1.27.7; 2.30.5; 2.31.3; 5.10.7). The poem Περὶ τῶν Ἐρμιόνης ἱερῶν by Aristotle/Aristokles (*FGrHist* 436 F1) is clearly not a local history of Hermione.
Even *poleis* outside of the Argolid and the putative Lot of Temenos seemed fair game for Ἀργολικά. So Corinth, about which the Argolikographer Anaxikrates is cited for the name of the daughter of King Kreon (*FGrHist* 307)\textsuperscript{155} and Hippy for information about Medeia’s Corinthian sojourn (*FGrHist* 554 F8).\textsuperscript{156} Corinth’s appearance in the Ἀργολικά must be linked to Argos’s quasi-annexation of Corinth at the beginning of the fourth century. I do not mean to suggest that both Anaxikrates and Hippy wrote their histories in the late 390s; rather the rhetoric about Argive claims on Corinth, rhetoric that led to political action only in 392, had already pervaded, and would continue to pervade, the historiographical construction of the past. Even more surprising, however, is the fact that Derkylos’s Ἀργολικά actually reaches beyond Corinth into the isthmus, describing the foundation of Tripodiskos, one of the constituent villages of Megara, as an Argive colony (*FGrHist* 306 F8bis); he seems to have linked its foundation to the Argive custom of killing dogs during the month of Arneios (FF26-31 Pf.).\textsuperscript{157} We know from Sokrates of Argos that it was possible to elucidate the Argive custom of canicide without recourse to Megara (*FGrHist* 310 F4); so Deinias was taking a marked stance by casting so far north his Argive net.

For Strabo, Argos could refer equally to the *polis* and to the Peloponnesos. This is a claim seconded at least by Istros, the sole fragment of whose Ἀργολικά (*FGrHist*

\textsuperscript{155} The scholiast to Euripides’ *Medeia* (19) alludes to a debate about the name of Kreon’s daughter. It is decidedly odd that the two sources for her identity are an Argolikographer and an Atthidographer: Klei(to)demos (*FGrHist* 323 F19). Kleidemos sees Kreoussa as the wife of Xouthos, i.e. in the context of Athens, not Corinth; Anaxikrates, on the other hand, does not appear to read Glauc as an Argive lens. Glauc, we may note, is the name of Kreon’s daughter also in Diodoros (4.54), in Apollodoros (1.9.28), and in Athenaeus (13.10 560D).

\textsuperscript{156} The scholiast to Euripides’ *Medeia* does not actually name the work in which Hippy treated Medea at Corinth, but the Ἀργολικά seems the likeliest source, contra Jacoby (*FGrHist* IIIB Text, 485-486), who thought that Hippy must have treated Medea in his chronography (in an excursus on the Argonauts) or in his Sicilian history (in a digression about Syracuse’s metropolis).

\textsuperscript{157} For we are told that Callimachus drew on these Argolikographers for his *Aitoum* of Linos and Koroibos. For a fuller version of this Argive account of the foundation of Tripodiskos, see Konon *FGrHist* 26 F1.19. On Tripodiskos in general, see Thuc. 4.70.102; Plut. *Gr. Quest*. 17; Paus. 1.43.8; Steph. Byz. *s.v. Τριποδίσκος καὶ Τριποδίσκοι*. For a discussion of the differing accounts of the *ktisis* of Tripodiskos, see K.J. Rigsby 1987, esp. 97.
339 F39) derives the name of the Peloponnesos, Apia, after the pears (ἄπια) that grew at Argos.\textsuperscript{158} And it is a claim generally supported by the Αργολικά, which treat the history not only of the Argolid and the poleis to the north but also of the entire Peloponnesos. Both Agias (\textit{FGrHist} 305 F1)\textsuperscript{159} and Telesarkhos (\textit{FGrHist} 309 F1) had recourse to treat the sojourn of Herakles in Pylos and his interactions there with Neleus; Telesarkhos even attaches three more of Herakles’s labors to Pylos. We would of course expect Αργολικά to make mention of Herakles—not only does Herakles naturally find his way into the histories of many disparate communities who sought inclusion in the Greek world, but the Argolid would have an especial claim to the hero, inasmuch as it was a king of Tiryns who was responsible for Herakles’ labors.\textsuperscript{160} Yet two of our Argolikographers notably latch onto Pylos, not Argos, as a means of inviting Herakles into Argive local historiography.

It is in the \textit{Argolika} of Deinias that the Peloponnesos assumes its largest role. The \textit{polis} Argos is completely absent from Deinias’s treatment of the famous “Battle of the Fetters” between Tegea and Sparta,\textsuperscript{161} (\textit{FGrHist} 306 F4). Deinias is cited for the otherwise unknown anecdote that when the Lakedaimonians were captured and forced to work the Tegean plain alongside the river Lakhas, it was a woman who ruled Tegea: Deinias calls her Perimede, but he says that most people know her as Khoira. Pausanias also mentions Khoira with reference to the period of Lakedaimonian attack, but he says that her real name was Marpessa, and he thinks of her not as a dynast but as a Tegean

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{158} For further evidence for the connection between pear trees and Argos, see Plutarch \textit{Gr. Ait.} 51, very possibly derived from Istros (S. Jackson 1998). Rhianos also made the connection between Apis and Argos (\textit{FGrHist} 265 F1), but he claimed that Apis was the son of Phoroneus, and he inserted the etymology in his history of Achaea.

\textsuperscript{159} He claimed in fact that Nestor received the kingdom of Pylos as a consequence of his father’s criminal seizure of the Cattle of Geryon. It is unclear if the citation to Agias alone is significant here.

\textsuperscript{160} For Herakles’ role in the Αργολικά, see Deinias \textit{FGrHist} 306 F8 and \textit{FGrHist} 690 F2-1 (treated under Deinon in IIIC) and Sokrates \textit{FGrHist} 310 FF10 and 15. Note that Hegias of Troizen includes an episode from the Herakles story, as likely, as I have said, in Αργολικά as Τεούζηνικά (\textit{FGrHist} 606 F1).

\textsuperscript{161} For which see Hdt. 1.66.
\end{flushleft}
general (8.47.2; 8.48.5).\textsuperscript{162} It is very possible that Deinias saw the shield of Khoira that Pausanias mentions was hung on the wall beside the famous fetters in the Temple of Athena Alea in Tegea (Paus. 8.47.2), and that he made the connection, unknown before him, between the two objects.\textsuperscript{163} That is to say, it may very well have been Deinias who first interjected a woman into the battle between Sparta and Tegea. And he might have been prompted to do so by a tradition that saw the Argive poetess, Telesilla, assuming an important martial role in the Battle of Sepeia, another archaic confrontation that resulted from Spartan aggression.\textsuperscript{164} In fact, we can note in general Argive local tradition a prominent military role given to local women; for Plutarch, and he is very probably relying here on Ἀργολικά (of Sokrates of Deinias?),\textsuperscript{165} it is at the hands of an Argive mother’s missile that Pyrrhos dies (Pyrrh. 34).\textsuperscript{166} In sum, Deinias’s description of the Battle of the Fetters reveals not only that his Ἀργολικά comprised general Peloponnesian events but also that he infused other Peloponnesian communities with his conception of the Argive past.\textsuperscript{167}

Deinias’s expansive comprehension of the material that he thought apposite for his local history must to some extent reflect the changing role of Argos in the third century BCE, when the polis was in the process of establishing its position with relation to the Achaean League and its Peloponnesian neighbors. His historiographical “annexation” of Arkadia and his imposition of Argive historical constructs onto the

\begin{footnotes}
\item Deinias shows that there was some amount nominal uncertainty in his own day (οἱ πλείστοι ἀκάλοφους Χοίραν). Polyainos, for what it is worth, asserts that during this battle Arkadia was ruled by a King Elnes (Strat. 1.8).
\item See D.M. Leahy 1958, 151-152.
\item Telesilla’s contribution seems to have been emphasized in Sokrates’ account of Sepeia (FGrHist 310 F6).
\item The amount of detail present in Plutarch’s account of Pyrrhos’s last stand is remarkable. On the thread of prominent women in these Argive stories, see P. Stadter 1968, 45-53; Stadter emphasizes Herodotus’s oracle (6.77) as representing a pre-Telesilla phase in the tradition but one that nevertheless highlights the important role of women. We should also note, with reference to Argive interest in heroic women, Athenaeus’s insistence that the Olympic victor Bilistikhe was claimed as Argive by the writers of Ἀργολικά (13.70 596E = FGrHist 311 F1); cf. Paus. 5.8.11 for her Macedonian provenance.
\item Lykeas treats this episode but attributes the tile to Demeter herself (FGrHist 312 F1).
\item For Perimede serving as a “doublet” of Telesilla, see M.P. Nilsson 1941, 48-9 and Leahy 1958, 151-152.
\end{footnotes}
Tegean past can be correlated with the fact that both Megalopolis (since 235) and Argos (since 229) were members of the Achaean League, and that Megapolitan interests tended not always to be aligned with those of Argos or other League members. Deinias was surely not arguing that Tegea was ever part of the polis Argos—indeed he stipulated (by way of a Delphic oracle) that the original territory of Argos was the area between Tiryns and Arkadia (FGrHist 306 F6)—like King Alfred’s annexation of England through the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Deinias authorized the Argive claim to the northern Peloponnesos by making Argos the focalizer of Peloponnesian history, establishing it at the same time as a major player in the League. The wide reach of Deinias’s Ἀργολικά is extreme, but it is not abnormal. All Argive local historiography was focalized by a locality not coterminous with the boundaries of the civic community.

We have seen that the *Thessalika*, as the local history of a region, and the *Argolika*, as the local history of a polis with aspirations of empire, took different approaches to determining the limits of their focal locality. But there were other ways aside from delineating territory through which a local history could define its focal community. In the following section, our final test case, we shall turn to Pontic Herakleia and observe how the community, a Greek colony, constructed its identity primarily in opposition to the histories and behavior of neighboring, non-local, communities.

---

APPENDIX I: A NOTE ON THE DATE OF HIPPYS OF RHEGION (FGrHist 554)

Even those who believe in the authenticity of Hippys tend to mistrust the Souda’s early date.\textsuperscript{169} There are three reasons for doing so, none in itself convincing. The first is the breadth of Hippys’ alleged literary output, thought to be more typical of a Hellenistic historian; for the Souda reports that Hippys wrote not only a three-book Ἀργολικά and the five-book Σικελικά or Σικελικαὶ Πράξεις, but also Κτίσις Ἰταλίας, Χρονικά in five books, and even parodies and choliambics. But if we excise the poetic innovations,\textsuperscript{170} Hippys’ oeuvre begins to look very similar to that of his potential contemporary Hellanikos.\textsuperscript{171} The second argument against an early date has to do with the apparent absence of Hippys from the tradition of the Σικελικά: Diodoros, Dionysius, Strabo, and Pausanias never address Hippys in their discussions of early Sicilian history, although they do cite Antiokhos. But early works of history sometimes do fail to make the cut—such seems to have been the fate, as we have seen, of one of the earliest historians of Thebes, Armenidas (FGrHist 378)\textsuperscript{172}—and it is worth pointing out that Hellanikos’s history of Athens, certainly the first of its kind, is similarly overlooked by later historians who write about Athens (like Diodoros, Strabo, and Pausanias), whom we

\textsuperscript{169} See e.g. L. Pareti 1959. Some recent Italian studies have been more credulous: see A. Momigliano 1938, col. 736-737, G. De Sanctis 1957, 1-8; E. Manni 1957 and 1989, M. Giangiulio 1992 and 1994, and G. Vanotti 2002, which gives fuller bibliography (51). But R. Fowler puts it bluntly (2000, xxxvi): “Maurizio Giangiulio has made the best case that can be made for Hippys of Rhegion as an early author, but his arguments do not suffice to move him back to the fifth century.”

\textsuperscript{170} Küster plausibly assigned them to Hipponax (I 588).

\textsuperscript{171} See Souda E 739 = FGrHist 4 T1. A scholiast to Euripides incidentally speaks of Hellanikos and Hippys in the same breath (FGrHist 554 F8). We should note that an early date for Hippys is implicitly supported by other witnesses, like Stephanos, who claims that he was the first one to call the Arkadians Proselenoi (F7).

\textsuperscript{172} His early date is suggested by Ionicisms in a verbatim fragment (F6). On the lack of attention given to Armenidas despite his priority, see G. Zecchini 1997.
would expect to cite him. More problematic, perhaps, is the absence of Hippys from Timaios, prone as he was to criticize, or at any rate engage with, his predecessors. Timaios’s apparent ignorance of Hippys, however, may only be a mirage; for if Hippys were unknown to Plutarch and Hus, they would be less inclined to cite any Timaian passages that mentioned Hippys. More to the point, the fragments of Timaios do not explicitly engage with other earlier writers of Σικελικά, like Athanis of Syracuse (FGrHist 562) or Hermeias of Methymna (FGrHist 558), to say nothing of Alkimos the Sicilian (FGrHist 560), evidently unknown also to Plutarch or Diodoros.

The last and most serious objection to an early date for Hippys is the synchronism attributed to him by the paradoxographer Antigonos of Karystos (F3): Hippys allegedly dated some foundation at Palikoi in Sicily to the time when Epainetos was basileus in Athens, during the 36th Olympiad (636/3), when Arytamas the Lakonian won the stadion (F3). There are many oddities of this formulation—for one thing, as far as we know it was the Athenian Phrynon who won the stadion in the 36th Olympiad, and there is no Epainetos in the Athenian archon list—but it is the very fact that we find an Olympiad used as a chronological rubric that has led many to assume that Hippys must come after Timaios, the first historian who employed the numbered Olympiads as a framework for a historical narrative. It is not at all clear, first of all, that one chronological marker of

---

173 R. Fowler seems to suggest that Plutarch’s evident ignorance of Hippys—when Plutarch mentions the Rhegian historian (F5), he defines him as the one οὗ μέμνηται Φανίας ὁ Ἐρέσιος—casts further doubt on Hippys’s early date (2000, xxxvi); but Plutarch, who incidentally is also apparently unaware of Antiokhos, if such arguments from silence hold water, cited only those historians of Sicily who wrote about the events in which he was interested (e.g. Philistos and Timaios).

174 So for example in the quotation from Josephus that we discussed above, Timaios is said to have disagreed with Antiokhos, Philistos, and Kallias, but Hippys is nowhere to be seen (C. Ap. 1.17 = FGrHist 311 T1).

175 The manuscript actually calls him Hippon, but the ethnic strongly supports the emendation.

176 This is why Jacoby proposed that something fell out of the text here (1949, 307 n. 44): instead of ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ἐπαινέτου, he suggests, ἐν Ἁθήναις ἐν θυσίας τοῦ δείνα, ἐν Συρακούσαις ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ἐπαινέτου.

177 Many fragmentary historians are dated precisely by their use (or non-use) of Olympiads; see, for example, Jacoby’s dating of the Spartan Sosibios (FGrHist 595 Text, 635-636 and Noten, 368-369), or the Sicilian Hippostratos (FGrHist 668 FF4-5).
this sort by itself implies that Hippys used the Olympiads as a backbone for his historical work. Single synchronisms can be attached by local tradition to discrete events without any indication of a coherent chronographical system; Herodotus, after all, was able to date Xerxes’ arrival in Attica by the archonship of Kalliades (8.51.1), and he certainly did not use the Athenian archons as general organizational principle for his *Histories*. More to the point, the western Greeks went out of their way to integrate themselves into the Hellenic community by way of synchronizing Sicilian events with that of the mainland. And this tendency is manifest in the local historians of Sicily from the very start. Timaios may have gotten the most mileage out of the Olympic Victor List, but we note an Olympic date in the historiography of the Syracusan local historian Philistos (*FGrHist* 556 F2), who certainly preceded Timaios. Indeed, if Hippys was born at the time of the Persian Wars, as the *Souda* suggests, he would be a rough contemporary of Hellanikos and only somewhat older than Hippias, both of whom were to make significant advances in the field of chronography; there is no reason then to deny him the same impulse by which his contemporaries were stimulated. Yet, if we are still

---

178 See Jacoby 1949, 360 n.49.
180 Antiokhos (*FGrHist* 555) is often considered the source for the dates at the beginning of Thucydides’ sixth book (cf. *e.g.* E. Wölfflin 1876, 1-21; K.J. Dover 1953 and 1970, 195-210), and this is possible, given Antiokhos’s evident interest in the foundation of the Sicilian poleis (cf. FF1, 9-13). See N. Luraghi 1991, which shows that Antiokhos lies behind some, but certainly not all, of Thucydides’ Sicilian *Arkhaiologia*.
181 And it is furthermore impertinent, it seems to me, to mistrust a chronological bent explicitly attested in a mid-fifth century Sicilian historian (Hippys) only to apply it to his younger contemporary (Antiokhos). This is a skepticism especially misplaced in R. Fowler (2000, xxxvi), who is famously not averse to positing Herodotoi before Herodotus on far flimsier grounds (1996). The fact that Hippys’ seems to have been relying on an Olympic Victor list different from the canonical one employed by Eusebios, incidentally, can be explained by positing either an early lack of standardization (see L. Moretti 1957, no. 58) or else errors of transmission (*e.g.* Arytamas may have been victorious in that year but in some other event). The appeal to an Athenian magistracy, on the other hand, is more problematic, but Hippys’ idiosyncratic decision to name the *basileus* and not the eponym, if this is what is meant by the text, if nothing else points to the work of a chronographer still finding his feet. But note the possibility that the
uncomfortable with the use of Olympiads and Athenian magistrates in this fragment of Hippys, we can account for it in a different way without questioning the fifth-century date. For if we trust the Souda’s claim about the epitome, the synchronism can be understood as a chronographic gloss added by Myes to Hippys’ original text.\textsuperscript{182} Indeed, we may make a similar conjecture even without recourse to Myes. Xenophon’s Hellenika seems to have suffered the same fate, in fact, with many temporal indicators, including data drawn from the Olympic Victor List, superimposed on the narrative.\textsuperscript{183} In all, I see little reason to deny that Hippys could have been a contemporary of Hellanikos.

\textsuperscript{182} See Jacoby 1949, 307 n. 44.
\textsuperscript{183} Xen. Hell. 1.1.37, 1.2.1-3, 1.3.1, 1.5.21, 1.6.1, 2.1.8, 2.1.10, 2.2.24, 2.3.1-2). As Müller noted (FHG Vol. 2, 14), Diodoros (2.32.3) claims that Deiokes came to the throne in Olympiad 17.2 “as Herodotus says,” apparently indicating another example of such chronological interpolation. It may in fact have been this chronological patina that led to the rechristening of Hippys’ history of Sicily as a chronography, if these two titles do indeed refer to the same work. That the Souda assigns five books both to the Σικελικά and to the Χρονικά may suggest this, as well as the fact that the only explicit reference to Hippys’ chronography (in Zenobios = F1)—the title given here is actually Περὶ Χρόνων—has to do with the foundation of Kroton.
Although it was on the fringes of the Greek world, Pontic Herakleia was well known to mainland communities, thanks in part to the diaspora of its citizens in the fourth century BCE. Aristotle, among whose colleagues were a handful of Herakleiotai (the philosopher Herakleides, the tyrant Klearkhos, and the high-minded tyrannicide Khion) and whose own student was the polymath Khamaleon, sprinkled his *Politics* with exempla from the Herakleian past (*Pol.* 5.4.2-3 1304 b31-39; 5.5.2-5.5.5 1305b5-1305b39; 5.5.10 1306a38-1306b3; 7.6.8 1327b); Ephoros discussed Herakleia’s *ktisis* (*FGrHist* 70F44); Theopompos treated the tyranny of Klearkhos (*FGrHist* 115 F181), which by the time of Polybius had evidently become a hackneyed theme (*Polyb.* 38.6.2); and Menander wrote the *Halieis* about a group of Herakleote exiles (*PCG* 6.2, 57 no. 25= 3.10.21-23 Kock). Yet there is no secure evidence for a local history of Herakleia until the first quarter of the third century BCE, when the exile Nymphis took it upon himself to record his community’s past. The subsequent tradition of local historiography at Herakleia is obscure, but the phenomenon was certainly long-lived: after the *polis* had been incorporated into the Roman empire as part of the province of Pontus, and perhaps not long after it was made a Roman *colonia* in the mid-first century BCE, Memnon wrote a detailed history of Herakleia.

The fragments of the histories of Nymphis and Memnon, along with those of the four additional works *Περὶ Ἡρακλείας* that cannot be dated, allow for several observations about local historiography at Herakleia. First, Herakleia did not engender a horographic representation of the past; time was measured not by the year but by the reigns of native tyrants and foreign kings. Second, as is clear from the *Epitome* composed in the mid-ninth century CE by the Patriarch Photius, Memnon felt no compunction to reproduce previously written local histories; indeed, like the chroniclers of Medieval

---

1 There is no evidence that Aristotle ever wrote a *Politeia* of Herakleia (*cf.* Gigon no. 56, p. 639).
Europe, he seems to have envisioned his task as one of commemorative collation and augmentation. Third, local histories of Herakleia were not simple accounts of growth and maturation; Memnon’s emphasis on loss and decline makes his narrative decidedly tragic. Fourth, as in the case of the Ἀγγόλικα, local histories of Herakleia are not strictly accounts of the polis tout court; Herakleia served rather as a lens through which to focus a broader history of the Pontic region. And last, the historiographical cohesion of the Herakleian community was actuated not so much by emphasizing idiosyncratic commonalities of cult, politeia, and topography as through Herakleia’s interaction with non-local communities and its reaction to external stimuli. After a brief account of Herakleian history, we shall examine first the local history of Nymphis and of Memnon and then address this last phenomenon, the extroversion of Herakleian local historiography, which I shall argue is a result first and foremost of Herakleia’s colonial identity.

2.2.5.1 A BRIEF HISTORY OF PONTIC HERAKLEIA

According to Strabo’s précis of Herakleian history, the polis, initially autonomous, fell to tyrants for a time, gained its freedom again, was subject to the rule by kings when it came under Roman control, received a Roman colonia, and then became part of the province of Pontos, which was soon joined to Bithynia (12.3.6 543). Strabo’s summary, despite its inaccuracies, provides a good framework on which to hang our other sources for Herakleian history: passing remarks made by Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Ephoros, Theopompos, Pseudo-Skymnos, Aristotle, and Diodoros; the detailed excursus in Book 16 of Justin’s Epitome of Pompeius Trogus; and Photius’s

---

2 ἦν τε αὐτόνομος, εἶτε ἐτυραννήθη χρόνους τινάς, εἶτε ἠλευθέρωσεν ἑαυτὴν πάλιν· ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐβασιλεύθη γενομένη ἑαυτῆς ἐπὶ μέρει τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς χώρας ἐπὶ τῆς Ποντικῆς ἐπαρχίας τῆς συντεταγμένης τῇ Βιθυνίᾳ.

3 Strabo seems to be implying that Herakleia was ruled by the Pontic Kings when it fell under Rome’s sway, but this is not borne out, as we shall see, by the evidence (see A.H.M. Jones 1971, 152-153, with 420 n.13).
invaluable Epitome of a portion of Memnon’s history of Herakleia. Because Photius’s summary follows Herakleian history to the death of the Brithagoras in 47 BCE, and because Memnon’s history will be a primary focus of this chapter, this prefatory historical sketch will extend into the first century BCE.

It was some conglomeration of Megarians and Boiotians who founded Herakleia on the southern coast of the Black Sea, one day’s sail, Xenophon tells us, from the Bosporos and two from Sinope (Anab. 6.1.2, 4.2; Pseudo-Skylax 91). Pseudo-Skymnos (1016-1019) synchronizes the ktisis with Cyrus’s conquest of Media (i.e. ca. 560), over a century, that is to say, after Megara’s first foray into the Pontos. The new settlers

---


5 Xenophon, our earliest source, says that it was the Megarians alone who founded Herakleia (Anab. 6.2.1)—and he is followed, perhaps directly, by Apollonius (2.844-50), Diodoros (14.31.3), and Arrian (Peripl. 13.3). While Herakleia may have come to identify itself most closely with Megara (see K. Hanell, 141-1142, 152-155 and S.M. Burstein 1976, 15), many ancient sources mention a prominent Boiotian role: so Ephoros (FGrHist 70 F44a), Pausanias (5.26.7), and Stephanos (s.v. Panelos). In fact Euphorion—or, according to Jacoby et al., Ephoros (= FGrHist 70 F44b)—says that it was a wholly Boiotian venture, albeit with a Megarian oikistes, Gnesiokhos by name (F177 Powell), while Justin, who gives the fullest account of the foundation (16.3.4-8), based primarily, as we shall see, on Nymphis, says nothing of Megara at all. Justin’s account, as we shall see, is almost certainly derived from Nymphis. Pausanias (5.26.7) identifies Tanagra as the driving force of the colonial venture, while Herakleides Pontikos apparently claimed that the oikistes, his ancestor no less, was a Theban (F2 Wehrli). See S.M. Burstein 1976, 17, for evidence of Boiotian involvement (e.g. the prominence of the cult to Herakles and a tribe Thebais), and I. Malkin 1987, 73-77. Regarding Boiotia’s role in the colonization of the Black Sea, see J.M. Fossey 1999. Strabo, we may note, actually refers to Herakleia as a Milesian colony (12.3.4 542), perhaps, as Jacoby (FGrHist IID Text, 400), D. Asheri (1972, p. 12), and S.M. Burstein 1976 (105 n. 15) suggest, relying on Theopompos. Miletos was one of the most energetic colonizers of the Black Sea coast—see Ephoros (FGrHist 70 F183), Strabo (14.1.6 635), and Pliny (NH 5.112); for a good discussion of the dates of the foundation of Istrôs (657), Borysthenes (647), and Sinope (631), see S. Hind 1999—and it is not impossible that Miletos had made an earlier attempt to colonize the region that would become Herakleia. As Burstein notes, Sinope, Amisos, and Kyzikos also seem to have been founded twice (1976, 14). But Burstein is probably correct ultimately to discount Strabo’s testimony (cf. M. Polito 2010).

6 Megara was an even earlier presence in the region than Miletos, founding Astakos allegedly in the late-eighth century (Eusebios gives 711 BCE; see Strabo 12.4.2, Pompon. 1.100; Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.12.20; but cf. Kharon FGrHist 262 F6), Khalkedon in 685 (Eus. Khron. 93b; cf. Thuc. 4.75.2) and Byzantium in 658 (cf. Herodotus 4.144.1; Pseudo-Skymnos 717, for which see B. Bravo 2009, and Vell. Pat. 2.7.7). On these early Megarian foundations, see K. Hanell, 141-142, 152-155, and S.M. Burstein 1976, 15.
quickly spread into the Lykos valley to the south, and before long they were founding colonies of their own, a trend that was to continue well into the next century: Kallatis on the western coast of the sea, Khersonesos on the northern, and the small island of Thynia near the Bosporos (Ps.-Skylax 92; Ps.-Skymnos 1026). The colonists did not find the site of Herakleia unoccupied, however; and while relations with the habitant Mariandynoi began well, Herakleia’s expansionism led to a brief period of warfare (Justin 16.3.7-8) and then to the subjugation of the natives.

We can only guess at the relationship between the nascent colony and the Lydian king, Croesus, who ruled the region when the Megarians arrived, or, for that matter, the first Persian King, Cyrus, who conquered the area some fifteen or twenty years later. Strabo, as we have seen, claims that Herakleia remained autonomous until the tyranny of Klearkhos (12.3.6 542), but this may mean only that it had its own politeia not that it was

---

7 Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.34.2.
8 We are told that one of the original Boiotian colonists, Panelos, went on to found an eponymous colony (Steph. s.v. Panelos), whose location is unknown.
9 On Kallatis, see Strabo (7.6.1 and 12.3.6) and Memnon (FGrHist 434 F1.21). Pseudo-Skymnos (761-763) dates the colony to the reign of Amyntas of Macedon, most often taken to be Amyntas I (ca. 540-498); but see J. Hind 1998, 139, for arguments in favor of Amyntas III (394/3-369 BCE). See also E. Amato 2007, who identifies the Lampos/Lampon mentioned by Favorinus (de Ex. 24.3) as the founder of Kallatis.
11 The island is later called Apollonia and Daphnousia (Plin. NH 6.32; Ptol. Geog. 5.1.3). See S.M. Burstein 1976, 68.
12 See S.M. Burstein 1976, 10.
13 Herodotus speaks of the Mariandynoi as paying tribute to the Persian King in the early fifth century (1.28; 3.90; 7.72), and both Justin (16.3.8) and Pausanias (5.26.7) describe a period of warfare between Herakleia and the Mariandynoi. So the subjugation was apparently not immediate (see also Theopomp. FGrHist 115F388 and Poseidonios FGrHist 87 F8). Aristotle (7.5.7 1327b 7-13) actually seems to divide the subservient population into two groups (περιοίκων καὶ τῶν τὴν χώραν γεωργούντων); for a discussion of the distinction, see S.M. Burstein 1976, 29-30. It is not surprising that the Mariandynoi were equated to the Penestai of Thessaly or the Helotai of Lakonia (Strab. 12.3.4. 542), although the Herakleiotai seem themselves to have preferred the term Dorophoroi; see Euphorion F78 and Kallistratos FGrHist 348 F4 (= Athen. 6.84 263DE); cf. Pollux 3.83.
14 S.M. Burstein 1976 (16) suggests that Lydia directly asked Thebes to found a colony in Mariandynia in order to help control the region.
15 Herodotus tells us that at the time of his expedition against the Skythians Dareios collected tribute from the Mariandynoi (3.90.2), who we know ended up contributing to Xerxes’ expedition in 480 (Hdt. 7.72.2). See Ktesias FGrHist 688 F13.22 for a reference to the activity of Datis in the Pontos before the Battle of Marathon.
exempt from paying tribute; Justin for his part reports that during the fifth century Herakleia enjoyed amicitia with the Persian Kings (16.3.9). Herakleia’s relations to Athens in the early fifth century are similarly obscure. At some point in the 440s, perhaps in response to the growing threat posed by the Skythians and Odrysians, Perikles made an expedition to the Black Sea, where he was said to have performed benefactions for the Greek poleis (Plut. Per. 20.1-2), but we have no indication that he ever visited Herakleia. The first incontestable interaction between Herakleia and Athens comes only in 425, when the polis appears for the first time on the tribute lists and, extraordinarily, refused to pay (Justin. 16.3.9). In response to this recalcitrance, Justin tells us, Lamakhos led ten triremes into the Pontos and proceeded to ravage Herakleia’s territory (16.3.9-12). But when a sudden storm destroyed his fleet, the Herakleiotai curiously chose to help the Athenians make their way through Bithynia back to the Bosporos. Justin’s explanation is that the Herakleiotai wanted to take advantage of this opportunity to turn foes into friends (16.3.11-12), but other motives may also have been at work.

---

16 See S.M. Burstein 1976, 27, on the comparison between Herakleia and Sinope, which Strabo also calls autonomous (12.3.11 545).
17 It is possible, then, that Herakleia was among the Pontic poleis that contributed ships to Xerxes expedition in 480 (Diod. 11.2.1; Hdt. 7.95.2).
18 See S.M. Burstein 1976, 31: cf. Hdt. 4.78-80, Thuc. 2.97, Theopomp. FGrHist 115 F389, Strabo 12.4.2 563, and Memnon FGrHist 434F1.12.3.
19 Plutarch says that Perikles freed Amisos from the rule of the Kappodokian king and ridded Sinope of its tyrant.
20 The hostility assumed by some scholars (e.g. E. Meyer 4.1, 726) between Herakleia and Athens seems in any case unfounded (see S.M. Burstein 1976, 31).
21 Herakleia is one of the few legible names listed under the heading “from the Euxine” (IG I 71, line 127).
22 Both Thucydides (4.75.2) and Diodoros (12.72.4) also allude to this venture—they have Lamakhos anchoring his ships at the mouth of the Kales river—but say nothing as to Lamakhos’s purpose.
23 Thucydides (4.75.2) and Diodoros (12.72.4) mention the storm, the destruction of the fleet, and Lamakhos’s expedition to the Bosporos, but not the role of the Herakleiotai.
24 S.M. Burstein (1976, 33-34) connects this change of heart to a democratic revolution at Herakleia (see below).
We cannot tell to what extent Herakleia was henceforth an active member of the Delian League, but it does appear to have enjoyed a good relationship with Athens,\(^{25}\) which would soon host a substantial contingent of Herakleioti emigrants.\(^{26}\) In the mid-fourth century, a *proxenos* named Lykon walked in the same circles as Isocrates’ friend Kallippos (Ps.-Demosth. 52.5); Plato counted among his students Herakleides (FF7-8, 42 Wehrli);\(^{27}\) Amyklas/Amyntas,\(^{28}\) the future tyrant Klearkhos; and his kinsman and killer, Khion;\(^{29}\) and the prolific Khamaileon studied at the Lykeion.\(^{30}\) And this phenomenon may have extended back into the late-fifth century as well; the Herakleioti Spintharos seems even to have been producing his tragedies at Athens in the 420s (*Souda, s.v. Spintharos; Diog. Laert. 5.92*). There were also Athenians at Herakleia: Anytos, Sokrates’ accuser, for example, the mathematician Theaitetos, and, in the mid-fourth century, Isocrates’ ward, Autokratos (7.11).\(^{31}\)

By the end of the fifth century, Herakleia had evidently become a prosperous *polis*. This can be inferred in part from Xenophon’s description of his sojourn there, when Herakleia was able to offer his soldiers three thousand *medimnoi* of barley, two thousand jars of wine, twenty cows, and one hundred sheep (*Anab. 6.2.2-16*). As Stanley M. Burstein points out in his history of Herakleia,\(^{32}\) Xenophon’s frequent references to ship traffic (*Anab. 5.1.11-12, 16, 7.15*) suggest that Herakleia was at the time also

---

\(^{25}\) Good relations can be inferred from a proxeny decree for Sotimos (*IG I² 74 = Walbank 46*) dated to 424/3 (although we cannot be certain that Sotimos is a Herakleioti from the Pontos!). Regarding Herakleia’s membership in the League after about 410/09, see S.M. Burstein 1976, 35.

\(^{26}\) For a good account of the Herakleioti exilic community at Athens, see J. Mikalson 1998.

\(^{27}\) Herakleides was even head the Academy during Plato’s Sicilian sojourn (*Souda, s.v. Herakleides*).

\(^{28}\) See *Adam. Phil. Ind. 6.1-2; Diog. Laert. 3.46; Aelian 3.19*.

\(^{29}\) It is also possible that Bryson, the son of Herodoros, studied under Sokrates or with Plato before affiliating himself with Eukeles of Megara (*Souda, Π 3238; Σ 829 Adler* cf. Ephippos (in Athen. 11.120 509c); *Plat. Epist. 13.360c*; and *Aristot. Post. Analyt. 75b40*).

\(^{30}\) See E. Wendling for the evidence.

\(^{31}\) For Anytos, whom the Herakleiotai apparently stoned to death because of his leading role in the prosecution of Sokrates, see *Diog. Laert. 2.43* and *Themistios 20.239C* For Theaitetos, see *Souda (Θ 93 and 94)*. While it is true that the first entry says only that Theaitetos taught in Herakleia, the fact that the second entry treats Theaitetos not as an Athenian but as a Herakleioti, suggests that he was closely associated with the Pontic *polis* (see K. von Fritz 1934, col. 1351-1352).

\(^{32}\) 1976, 41.
benefiting from active trade. The *polis* was at any rate well equipped for trade, since it was able in the early fourth century to send a fleet of forty triremes around the Bosporos to buy up supplies of grain, oil, and wine (*Oikonom.* 2.2.8 1347b3-15). It is not surprising then that according to Aristotle the Herakleian *perioikoi* (he must mean the Mariandynoi) were often employed as sailors (*Pol.* 7.6.8 1327b). Until the tyranny of Klearkhos, at which point the invaluable account of Memnon picks up, Herakleia’s history is difficult to reconstruct with any certainty. We know little, for example, about its relationships to Persia after the Peloponnesian War. Polyainos mentions a war with the Spartokidai, who ruled on the northern coast of the Pontos, where Herakleia had founded Khersonnesos (5.23, 5.44, and 6.9.3-4; *cf.* *Oikonom.* 2.2.8 1347b3-15); presumably the issue was the grain supply, but the details are out of our reach.

Thanks to Aristotle, however, we do know something about Herakleia’s *politeia:* the democracy under which the colony was founded was quickly undermined by the insolence of the demagogues. This caused the nobles, who had previously been dishonored and driven out of the *polis,* to band together and overthrow the *demos* (*Pol.* 5.4.2-3 1304 b31-39). The resulting oligarchy seems to have been particularly prone to factionalism: Herakleia is one of Aristotle’s examples of an oligarchy that suffered *stasis* as a result of disagreement among the *εὖποροι* themselves; the requirements for the magistracies, he tells us, were too restrictive. Unlike at Istrus, where such a condition

---

33 For Herakleia’s participation in the grain trade, see IG II² 117.20-23; IG II² 360-35-40 *cf.* IG II² 408. As we shall see, the Herakleian navy makes important appearances in several battles between the Diadokhoi (see W.M. Murray 2012, 171-172, 175, 177).

34 See S.M. Burstein 1976, 42.

35 According to Polyainos, the key players were the Herakleiotae general Tynnkhos and the Spartokid ruler Leukon. See also schol. ad Dem. 20.53. On the war between Herakleia and the Spartokidai, the outcome of which, let alone its date, is difficult to determine given our sources, see S.M. Burstein 1976 42-45 and 1974b; *cf.* M.I. Rostovtzeff 1993, 124. On the Spartokidai and their role in the grain trade, see A. Moreno 169-206.

36 It is true that Aristotle is not explicitly referring to Pontic Herakleia; but as we shall see this scenario jibes with the events that he explicitly ascribes to Pontic Herakleia. On the original *politeia,* see Burstein 1976, 23-24, H.-J. Gehrke 1985, 70-72, and E. Robinson 1997, 111-113.

37 Again it is not certain which Herakleia he means, however.
led from oligarchy to democracy, at Herakleia the ruling class was broadened to include six hundred citizens (5.5.2-4 1305b5-13). Aristotle also names Pontic Herakleia as a *polis* where oligarchic demagogues tried to curry favor with the crowd in order to affect the results of trials (5.5.4-5 1305b22-39). We know that democracy was reestablished at some point in the late-fifth or early-fourth century, and Burstein may be correct in connecting this to Herakleia’s change in policy toward Lamakhos in 424. How long the democracy lasted is also difficult to determine. From the accounts of Klearkhos’s coup provided by Justin and Polyainos, at any rate, it seems clear that in the mid 360s, although the *demos* could be called into an assembly (Just. 16.4.12-16), power was essentially in the hands an anti-democratic *boule* of three hundred. When the *demos* grew restless, smarting, Justin tells us, from debt and want of land, the *boule* sought protection from without, first to no avail from the Athenian Timotheus and the Theban Epameinondas (16.4.1) and then in 364 from one of its own: the former exile Klearkhos.

Klearkhos had studied in Athens under Plato and for four years with Isocrates (Justin 4.4-5.18; Memnon *FGrHist* 434 Fl.1; *Souda*, s.v. Klearkhos), who considered him at the time to have been ἐλευθεριώτατος, πραότατος, and φιλανθρωπότατος

---

38 One χρόνος of particular friction, Aristotle says elsewhere, was Eurytion’s trial for adultery (5.5.10 1306a38-1306b3). But there is no basis for Burstein’s claim that Eurytion was “the founder of democracy” (1976, 37 and 50).
39 Aineias Taktikos (11.10a) describes an attempt by οἱ πλούσιοι to overthrow the *demos* and the subsequent response of οἱ προστάται τοῦ δήμου to restructure the Herakleiot tribes in order better to disperse the rich for guard duty and other tasks: in the place of three tribes and four so-called ἕκατοστύες, they instituted a system of sixty ἕκατοστύες. Because Aineias claims to be listing his historical exempla in chronological order, and because this episode falls between a stasis at Argos (probably the skylatismos of 370 BCE) and one at Corcyra in 361, we must imagine this attempted oligarchic coup to have occurred at some point in the 360s (see Burstein 1976, 125 n. 62).
40 1976, 33-34.
41 Justin has Klearkhos here refer to the saevitia of the senatus toward the populous.
42 Polyainos retains three anecdotes about Klearkhos. In one, Klearkhos pretends that he intends to dismiss his personal guard and reinstate the power of the *boule* of three hundred (2.30.2).
43 Diodoros synchronizes his advent and the tyranny that followed with the death of Pelopidas in 364 and with Timotheus’s sieges of Torone and Potidaia and assistance to Kyzikos (15.81.5-6).
44 See S.M. Burstein 1976, 47-65 and A. Bittner, 25-34.
It may have been this Klearkhos, in fact, who formed a close relationship with Timotheus, another student of Isocrates, and who as a consequence received Athenian citizenship (Dem. 20.84). Our fullest biography comes in the Souda, which ultimately must derive from the account of one of Herakleia’s local historians (most likely Nymphis). While Justin says that it was the council (senatus) that recalled Klearkhos in order to stave off the demos (Just. 16.4.1-4), the Souda refers to a stasis affecting the Herakleiotai in general; and it is the Souda that preserves the interesting detail that the boule appointed Klearkhos as ἔφορος τῆς ἀὐθις ὀμονοιας. Whatever his formal position, Klearkhos portrayed himself at first as a democrat and friend of the people (Justin 16.4.10), but it did not take him long to reveal his true intentions. In fact, Klearkhos’s plans were certainly laid before his recall; for he entered Herakleia not only

45 In a letter to Klearkhos’s son, the tyrant Timotheus, Isocrates admits that Klearkhos was at one point a model student and gentleman.
46 Demosthenes says that the grant of citizenship came when the Athenians were honoring Timotheus (Τιµόθεῳ διδόντες τὴν δοσιαν), most likely after his exploits at Corcyra in 375 BCE. Perhaps, as H.W. Parke suggests, Klearkhos even served with Timotheus as a mercenary in the campaign (1933, 97, n.5). As evidence in support of the connection, we may note that Klearkhos names one of his children Timotheus.
47 The Souda’s entry for Klearkhos is probably derived from Aelian (F89 Domingo-Forasté), who elsewhere has reproduces Nymphis’s discussion of the tyrant Dionysius (VH 9.13). After a stint as a philosopher, the entry runs, Klearkhos heeded the advise of a dream; ὁρᾷ ὁ Κλέαρχος γυναῖκα τινα, λέγουσα πρὸς αὐτόν: ἀπευρασθεία αὐτῆς: ὃς γὰρ πρὸς σὲ ἔχθιστον; the rebuke, we should note, is connected elsewhere in the Souda (E 1994, s.v. ἐπαύρασθαι) to Klearkhos of Soloi. He thus returned to a military career. When exiled from Herakleia—a reason is not given other than that he possessed an excess of φθόνος; note that Justin also alludes to but does not explain his exile (16.4.3)—he sought refuge with a Mithridates (cf. Justin 16.4.7), probably the son of the Persian satrap of Phrygia, Ariobarzanes (see S.M. Burstein 1976, 126, n. 7 for the identification).
48 See E3955 (s.v. ephebos), where this line is quoted again. It is certainly possible that ephors had been a regular feature of the Herakleote politeia prior to the recall of Klearkhos, but this seems to be an extraordinary position: Justin says that Klearkhos was recalled “ad tutelam patriae” (16.4.5) and later describes him as a latter-day Solon “velut arbiter civilis discordiae” (16.4.9).
49 According to the Souda, his epiphany once again came in a dream; here Euopion, allegedly a former tyrant of Herakleia, urges Klearkhos to follow his lead. Euopion has sometimes been equated, without grounds it seems to me, with Eurynias (see H. Berve 1, 315). We nowhere else hear of Euopion, and, while it is possible that Herakleia had experimented in the past with tyranny, Memnon (FGrHist 434 F1.1) and Nymphis (FGrHist 432 F10) emphasize Klearkhos’s priority as a tyrant—Athenaeus begins his citation of Nymphis as follows: Νύμφις γοῦν ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης . . . Διονύσιος φησίν, ὁ Κλεάρχου τοῦ πρώτου τυραννίσαντος ἐν Ἡρακλείᾳ υἱὸς καὶ αὐτὸς τῆς πατρίδος τυραννίσας κτλ. Jacoby (FGrHist IIIIB Text, 263) nevertheless thinks that such parenthetical remarks come only from the excerptor who was Athenaeus’s source (see too on F9). For Klearkhos in the context of fourth century Greek tyranny, see C. Mossé 1962, 6-9.
with financial backing, perhaps extorted, from Mithridates (Justin 16.4.7-9), but also with a body of μισθόφοροι and δορύφοροι (Polyain. Strat. 2.30). After inflaming the demos against the oligarchs (Justin 16.4.11), Klearkhos was granted summum imperium (Justin 16.4.16); he fortified the acropolis (Poly. 2.30.1) and dismissed the boule (Poly. 2.30.2), imprisoning those bouleutai who chose not to flee (Justin 16.4.17).  

Klearkhos’s subsequent tyranny, which initiated a dynasty stretching essentially to the Battle of Koroupedion, attracted all of the familiar topoi of violence and savagery. Klearkhos was also said to have advertised his own divinity: Memnon (FGrHist 434 F1.1) and Justin (16.5.8) report that he claimed to be the son of Zeus; while the Souda mentions that he dressed like an Olympian, commissioned self portraits, and demanded godlike honors. Other than his excesses, we know little about his rule: he apparently made war on Astakos, founded a library—he was, according to Memnon, the first tyrant to do so (FGrHist 434 F1.1)—and was the victim of several assassination attempts. The plot that finally succeeded, twelve years after his coup, was hatched by

50 The oligarchs who did manage to escape accordingly made war against Klearkhos—Justin says that they were able to attract a few neighboring poleis to their side (16.5.1)—but Klearkhos bolstered his own cause by freeing the slaves (the Mariandynoi?). Justin even claims that Klearkhos arranged marriages between these freed slaves and the oligarchs’ wives (16.5.2-4); see D. Asheri 1972.

51 Memnon calls him ὁμός, μαμφόνος, πάντα βιαιός τε καὶ τὰ ἀτόπα τολμηρός (FGrHist 434 F1.1) and noted eccentricities of dress and cosmetic. According to Justin, “nullus locus urbis a crudelitate tyranni uacat. Accedit saeuitiae insolentia, crudelitati adrogantia” (16.5.5). Theopompos referred to Klearkhos’s penchant for akoniton (FGrHist 115 F189A-C); Polybios casually to τὰ Κλεάρχου παραθενωμένα κατὰ τὸν Πόντον (38.6.2); and Diodoros claims that Klearkhos modeled himself explicitly on the Syracusan Dionysius (15.81.5); for what it is worth, Klearkhos did name one of his sons Dionysius.

52 cf. Justin 16.5.9-10. If we doubt these claims, we should recall that Greek tyrants had advertised divine links long before Philip and Alexander of Macedon, and there are certain elements of this narrative, such as the fact that Klearkhos named one of his sons Keraunos (Souda, s.v. Klearkhos; Justin 16.5.11; Plut. Mor. 338B), that are indeed idiosyncratic.

53 Polyainos (2.30.3) actually says the main purpose of this expedition was to kill off the Herakleiot citizenry by exposing them to disease. The campaign was evidently not a success, whatever Klearkhos’s actual motives.

54 Memnon alludes to frequent ἐπιβουλαί (FGrHist 434 F1.3); Plutarch claims that Klearkhos slept in a chest as protection (ad Princ. In. 718DE); while the Letters of Khion even preserve a name of a would-be assassin, Silenos (13.1). I. Düring doubts the existence of Silenos (16, 97)—Memnon mentions a Silenos at the time of Sulla (FGrHist 434 FF27.5), but see S.M. Burstein 1976, 133, n. 122, who thinks that the letters preserves a genuine tradition.

55 It is Diodoros who gives the length of Klearkhos’s reign (16.36.3).
a kinsman and fellow Platonian, Khion, although other prominent Herakleiotai also took part (Demetrios of Magnesia claims, probably erroneously, that Herakleides Pontikos even had a role). The details can be gleaned from Diodoros (16.36.3), Memnon (FGrHist 434 F1.4), Justin (16.12-16), the Souda, and from the so-called Letters of Khion, which, although pseudonymous, may have drawn on contemporary sources. The assassination was successful only in its short-term objective: Klearkhos died from his wounds. But the tyranny persevered: Klearkhos was immediately replaced by his older brother, Satyros, as guardian of his two sons, Timotheus and Dionysius. Satyros’s first official act was to punish the conspirators and their families.

Our main source for Satyros, who ruled until 346 BCE, is Memnon (FGrHist 434 F1.2), and Photius’s epitome is far more interested in the gruesome details of his death by some sort of inguinal cancer than in any details of his rule, except for the fact that he was far crueler than his brother and far less keen on philosophy. An inscription from Sinope (I.Sinope 1.1) attests to a symmakhia between that polis and Satyros and his nephews, stipulating a defensive alliance (and implying that Herakleia still very much saw itself operating in the Persian sphere). Upon Satyros’s death, the tyranny passed easily to Timotheus, a model ruler according to Memnon (FGrHist 434 F1.3): he was democratic

---

56 See Diog. Laert. 5.89, who is skeptical of Herakleides’ inclusion in the plot. If he were involved, he would have been killed in 346, which makes study with Aristotle slightly difficult to accommodate. See S.M. Burstein 1976, 134 n. 128.

57 For this interesting text, see I. Düring 1951, D. Konstan and P. Mitsis 1990, P.-L. Malosse and J. Schamp 2004, J. Stenger 2005, M.B. Trapp 2006, and J.L. Penwill 2010. It is generally assumed that although the letters are not authentic, they nevertheless attempt to be as realistic as possible. Diodoros and Memnon claim that Khion and his associate Leon, perhaps in conscious emulation of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, chose to launch their attack when Heraklea was celebrating a festival (the Dionysia according to Diodoros). Justin imagines that the blow was struck when Khion and Leonides (sic) were in private audience with the tyrant (the Souda names a third conspirator: Antitheos).

58 Memnon also says that Satyros did his best to preserve his brother’s lineage, refusing to engage in any activities that might lead to any children of his own (cf. Hdt. 1.61 for Peisistratos’s similar move). We may perhaps infer (see below) that Memnon’s original narrative (and thus perhaps that of Nymphis, too) discussed a relationship of some sort between Satyros and the Spartan King Arkhidamos (FGrHist 434 F1.2.5), but we know nothing about the details.

59 The inscription also contains an interesting clause stipulating that exiles from Sinope and Herakleia (perhaps those bouleutai exiled by Klearkhos) be allowed to remain ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι. See A. Avram et.al., 957 for interpretation: perhaps Herakleioite exiles were at this time in Sinope and vice versa.
in temperament, so much that the Herakleiotai called him not tyrant but εὐεργέτης and σωτήρ; he paid off individual debts from his own pocket; he provided loans without interest; and he released the innocent (and even the guilty) from jail. Such magnanimity is also the impression we gain from Isocrates’ letter to Timotheus, evidently sent not long after the tyrant’s accession (7). Regarding Timotheus’s external affairs, we know only that he participated bravely in several wars, unspecified as to location and outcome (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.3.2).

Photius’s summary of Memnon is particularly full regarding Dionysius, who assumed power at the death of his brother in 337. Dionysius was remembered for his corpulence—Nymphis takes great pleasure in describing the course of acupuncture necessary to keep him from falling sleep and the length of the needles required by his rolls of fat (FGrHist 423 F10); and three fragments from Menander’s Halieis (=PCG 6.2, 57 no. 25= 3.10.21-3 Kock), perhaps preserved by Nymphis himself, center around Dionysius’s girth—and for his wealth as well: he was apparently able to buy up the belongings of his namesake, the deposed tyrant of Syracuse. Dionysius’s rule was threatened by the disturbances to the Persian empire caused by Alexander’s campaign. One of his first tasks, in fact, was to repel a group of Herakleiotic exiles who had approached Alexander to effect their repatriation and the reestablishment of η πάτριος δημοκρατία (FGrHist 434 F1.4.1); to counter this, Dionysius concentrated on boosting

---

60 S.M. Burstein suggests (1976, 71-72. 135 n.9) that these appellations, as well as Timotheus’s lavish funeral—Memnon says that Dionysius held horse races, athletic, choral, and tragic competitions in honor of his brother (FGrHist 434 F1.3)—indicate a deification along the lines of the Ptolemies.

61 The foundation of the Herakleiotic settlement on the island of Thynias can be assigned to Timotheus’s rule (see S.M. Burstein 1976, 68).

62 Diodoros says merely that after fifteen years of Timotheus’s rule (six of which had been under his uncle’s regency), Herakleia passed to his brother, Dionysius (16.31.3). Timotheus had explicitly made Dionysius his co-ruler and appointed him as successor, perhaps, as H. Berve posits (1967 Vol. I, 319), even striking a series of coins advertising the joint rule.

63 If he did so directly after the Syracusan tyrant’s exile, i.e. in 343 BCE, it was while his brother was still in power.

64 As the fragments from Menander’s Halieis indicate, the issue of the exiles was of considerable importance at this time.
his popularity at home and even made an alliance with Alexander’s sister, Kleopatra. As it turns out, Alexander did not live to actualize the exiles’ demands.\textsuperscript{65} Dionysius was apparently so relieved by his death that he dedicated a statue to \textit{Euthymia} herself upon hearing the news (Memnon \textit{FGrHist} 434 F1.4.2). But Dionysius’s mistrust of Macedon went beyond his dislike of Alexander: an Athenian decree, probably from 326/5 and proposed by the anti-Macedonian Polyeuktos of Sphettos, honors Dionysius for his gift of grain.\textsuperscript{66}

The defeat of Persia and the growing power of the Diadokhoi made strict anti-Macedonianism a difficult stance to maintain, however. Dionysius quickly insinuated himself into the Antigonos/Krateros faction,\textsuperscript{67} and he managed to garner two remarkable marriage alliances: for himself, the niece of Dareios II, Amastris, the recent widow of Krateros (Memnon \textit{FGrHist} 434 F1.4.4);\textsuperscript{68} for his daughter,\textsuperscript{69} Antigonos’s nephew Ptolemaios, at that time in nominal control of the Hellespont. With these ties secured, Memnon says, Dionysius took the step, perhaps even anticipating Antigonos himself, of proclaiming himself king (\textit{FGrHist} 434 F1.4.6). His metamorphosis from \textit{tyrannos} to \textit{basileus} was reinforced by his decision at his death to entrust the rule of Herakleia to his wife, his three children being too young (Memnon \textit{FGrHist} 434 F1.4.8). Despite the excesses of his rule, Memnon tells us that Dionysius was well liked by his subjects: they called him \textit{Χρηστός} and mourned his death in 305.\textsuperscript{70} In part, this adulation may be result

\textsuperscript{65} As S.M. Burstein points out, Alexander could not himself have enforced the motion until he returned from the east in 324; the exiles’ appeal to Perdikkas after Alexander’s death Memnon affirms (\textit{FGrHist} 434 F1.4.2) was in vain.

\textsuperscript{66} \textit{IG} 2\textsuperscript{2} 363. See B.D. Meritt 1964, 213-217 and S.M. Burstein 1976, 137, n.39, for the date of 334 (against 324 BCE); C.J. Schwenk 327-329, and D.V. Tracy 1995, 31-32, prefer the year 326/5.

\textsuperscript{67} See E. Will 1979, 34-5.

\textsuperscript{68} Krateros, to whom Amastris had been married, had been obliged to divorce the Persian princess in order to marry Antipater’s daughter, Phila.

\textsuperscript{69} Evidently from a previous marriage.

\textsuperscript{70} Some (H. Berve 1967 Vol. I, 322; 2, 688 and S.M. Burstein 1976) have seen in Memnon’s description of Dionysius’s death indications of his deification (\textit{FGrHist} 434 F1.4.8-9).
of his success in maintaining, and even increasing, Herakleia’s influence and territory in the face of Alexander and the Diadochoi: it was probably under Dionysius, in fact, that the four Paphlagonian katoikiai (Sesamos, Kytoron, Kromna, and Tieion) were incorporated, settlements that would come to make up the polis Amastris (Strabo 12.3.10). Indeed, Memnon sees Dionysius as less a tyrant of the polis of Herakleia than king of a Herakleian empire, referring to his realm as Ἡρακλείας ἡ ἀρχή (FGrHist 434 F1.5.5).

Diodoros maintains that at Dionysius’s death, his two sons claimed the tyranny and ruled for seventeen years (20.77.1). According to Memnon, however, Dionysius’s children and the citizens of Herakleia were tended first by Antigonos (FGrHist 434 F1.4.9) and then, when Antigonos turned his attention elsewhere, by Lysimakhos, who even married Dionysius’s widow Amastris and took charge of affairs. By the time that Amastris accompanied her new husband to Sardis, Klearchos II was old enough to rule Herakleia on his own (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.5.1). He and his brother Oxathres by no means enjoyed the popularity of their father (FGrHist 434 1.5.2). In part this may have had to do with their desultory campaigns in the 290s: Klearchos accompanied Lysimakhos on his unfortunate expedition against the Getai in 292, which led his imprisonment by the Getan king (Memnon FGrHist 434 F.1.5.1); and he may well have had a hand in Lysimakhos’s similarly disastrous campaign against King Zipoites of

---

71 For Heraklea’s trade, and in particular Herakleian amphorai (with englyphic stamps) found all over the Black Sea, see V. Cosma 1973, S.M. Burstein 1976, 140 n. 108, C. Sægebarth 1989, A. Bittner 1998, N. Pavlichenko 1999, and V.I. Kac 2003. See A. Avram et al., 957, for the proxeny decrees at Olbia and grave stelai at Nymphaion. Among Heraklea’s exports were nuts (Athen. 2. 53b-54c), fish (Athen. 6. 331c; Pliny NH 9.176-178), and boxwood (Strab. 12.3.10 and Cat. 4).

72 Memnon begins his chapter on Dionysius (FGrHist 434 F1.4) by emphasizing his territorial gains: Τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν διαδεχόμενος Διονύσιος ἡ ἀρχὴ ταύτην. See S.M. Burstein 1976, 74, 83, and 138, n. 59 on the extent of Heraklea’s territory at this time.

73 Specifically when Arsinoe wrests rule from Lysimakhos.

Bithynia (see Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.6.3 and 12.5). But when Amastris returned to Herakleia in the mid 280s—Lysimakhos had swapped her for Ptolemy’s daughter Arsinoe—she took control of Herakleia and revived the spirits of her subjects. One of her first acts, Memnon says (FGrHist 434 F1.4.9), was to found an eponymous city some 84 miles east along the coast of the sea (Strabo 12.3.10). The earliest coins issued by the new polis bear the legend ἌΜΑΣΤΡΙΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΗΣΣΗΣ, in fact, a testament to her self-portrayal. But her return inconvenienced her sons. And when she died in a boating accident, the blame was swiftly laid at their feet. Lysimakhos at any rate seems to have used the incident as a means to reassert his presence in the region: he disposed of the alleged matricides (FGrHist 434 F1.5.3) and, while ostensibly granting the Herakleiotai license to govern themselves democratically (Mem. FGrHist 434 F1.5.5), placed the polis under his control. When he left for Europe he handed Herakleia and Amastris to his new wife Arsinoe, and she in turn sought the services of Herakleides of Kyme (Mem. FGrHist 434 F1.5.5), as unpopular and tyrannical a ruler as ever Herakleia had known.

Yet the Herakleiotai gained some confidence at the death of Lysimakhos at Koroupedion in 281—he was killed, it was said, by a Herakleiote (FGrHist 434 F1.5.7)—and they bribed Herakleides’ guards to quit the polis (FGrHist 434 F1.6.1), destroyed his fortress, and found themselves, for the first time since 364, without a ruler.

---

75 At this time, we should note, Herakleia also contributed ships to Lysimakhos’s fleet (FGrHist 434 F1.6.1).
76 See S.V. Dmitriev 2007, 144, for the dating.
77 According to Polyainos, Amastris was the mother of Lysimakhos’s son Alexander (Strat. 6.12); but cf. Jacoby FGrHist IIIB Text, 273.
78 αἰ καταλιποῦσαν τοῦτον καταλαβεῖν τὴν Ἡράκλειαν. Ἐγείρει δὲ αὕτη παραγενομένη κτλ. (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.4.9).
79 Strabo says that Ticion rebelled soon after the synoicism (12.3.10). There is no indication, incidentally, that Amastris left Herakleia to live in her new settlement (contra S.M. Burstein 1976, 83).
80 See W.H. Waddington et.al., 1925 Vol. I. 135, nos. 1-3. Note also that when Lysimakhos returned to at Herakleia after the death of Amastris, it was in order to deal with the succession of her sons (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.5.3), an indication, as S. Dmitriev points out (2007, 144) that she was nominal ruler. And when Memnon has him sing the praises of Amastris to his new wife, Arsinoe, he refers to Amastris as in full control of Herakleia (FGrHist 434 F1.5.4).
81 Memnon says they employed a trick ship. See M. Janke 1963, 7 on the connection between this narrative and that of Tacitus on Nero’s nautical matricide (Ann. 1.14.3-5).
This freedom evidently caused some anxiety, for they wasted no time in appointing their townsman Phokritos as ἐπιμελετής (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.6.2). At about the same time (281 or 280 BCE), the exiles were finally welcomed back. This may in part have been a result of the diplomacy of the historian Nymphis, himself an exile, who convinced his associates to renounce any claims on their ancestral property. At last, Memnon says, very likely here drawing on Nymphis’s own words, Herakleia regained ἡ παλαιὰ εὐγενεία τε καὶ πολιτεία (FGrHist 434 F1.7.4). The workings of Herakleia’s politeia between the fall of Herakleides of Kyme and the destruction of the polis by the Romans are particularly opaque because of the nature of Memnon’s narrative. We do know that during the Mithridatic Wars, a Herakleiote named Lamakhos is described as “in control the politeia” (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.29.3), while Memnon allegedly preserves a letter from Scipio Africanus that is addressed to the boule and demos of the Herakleiotai (18.8).

Herakleia found itself adrift in this post-Lysimakhian world. Ships were promptly dispatched to aid Ptolemaios Keraunos against Antigonos (FGrHist 434 F1.8.5), while relations with Seleukos, which had apparently been cordial and perhaps even positive before Lysimakhos’s death,82 soured after the ousting of Herakleides. At this point, Seleukos’s dioiketes Aphrodisios charged Herakleia with insubordination (Memnon FGrHist 434 F17.1). Two embassies were sent to Seleukos, the first in vain (FGrHist 434 F1.6.2)83 and the second actually making matters worse: when the Herakleiote ambassador, the well-known peripatetic philosopher Khamaileon, spoke by way of a pun—Ἡρακλῆς κάρρων Σέλευκε—Seleukos grew angry. Memnon’s reason is that he

82 Malakon, the Herakleiote who killed Lysimakhos, was fighting in Seleukos’s army, and directly after Koroupedion Herakleia sent an embassy to Seleukos, who had taken over Lysimakhos’s lands (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.6.1-2). Memnon also says that the Bithynian king, Zipoites, was hostile towards Herakleia because of its connections first to Lysimakhos and Seleukos (FGrHist 434 F1.6.3).
83 S.M. Burstein suggests that the reason for Aphrodisios’s worry had to do with Herakleia’s independent appointment of a Herakleiote as ἐπιμελετής (1976, 88).
did not understand the Doricism (FGrHist 434 F1.7.1).\textsuperscript{84} Seleukos’s son, Antiokhos, maintained this hostility toward Herakleia; at some point early in his rule (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.9.1-3) he ordered his general P特rokles to attack Herakleia directly, but the polis managed to persuade the attackers to withdraw. The antagonism between Herakleia and the Seleukids evidently continued well into the third century—it is one explanation for the benefactions bestowed on Herakleia by Ptolemy III (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.17)\textsuperscript{85}—but by the time of Antiokhos III, it seems to have cooled, and Herakleia even tried (in vain) to broach a peace between the Seleukid King and the Roman invaders.\textsuperscript{86}

When Herakleia was rebuffed by Seleukos in the months after Koroupedion, embassies were promptly sent elsewhere, to Mithridates the Pontic King, to Byzantium, and to Khalkedon, this time with far more positive results (FGrHist 434 F1.7.2): an anti-Seleukid alliance, the so-called “Northern League” (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.9.3).\textsuperscript{87} The new Bithynian king, Nikomedes, managed to benefit considerably from the League

\textsuperscript{84} See Müller FHG III, 533, P. Desideri 1967, 407, A. Bittner 1998, 57-8, and U. Heinemann 2010, 193. Khamaileon seems to have had a line of Sophron in mind: Ἡρακλῆς τεοῦς κάρρων ἦς (F59 Kaibel). It is frankly hard to understand how Seleukos could have misunderstood a word like κάρρων, or, more to the point, what he thought he heard that would have caused him more offence. Seleukos’s anger must have been aroused first and foremost by Khamaileon’s attempt to assert Herakleian independence. It is important in any case that Herakleiotai here speak Doric; this is actually seconded by the inscriptions, late though they are (e.g. IK 13, 15, 47). Note that the anonymous Periplous Ponti Euxini (GGM Vol. 1) calls Herakleia a Doric polis.

\textsuperscript{85} Memnon says that Ptolemaios bestowed a huge supply of grain on Herakleia and helped to rebuild the temple of Herakles on the Acropolis (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.17). On these gifts, see A. Avram \textit{et al.} 2004, 839-831. According to the chronology of Memnon’s narrative, these benefactions seem to have taken place after 250 BCE and so under the reign of Ptolemaios III. This is the opinion of Jacoby FGrHist IIIB Text, 278 and e.g. E.R. Bevan 1902, 189-205, and U. Heinemann 2010, 235 n. 851. Some, however, have read this as a reference to the year after Koroupedion, when the Northern League was arming itself against Antiokhos; in this case Ptolemaios II would be meant (so D. Magie 1, 310; C. Habicht 1970, 116-21, A. Bittner, 89 n. 545; and B.C. McGing, 19). On Ptolemaic encroachments in the area, see P. Desideri 1967, 412-413 n.263 and especially Z. Archibald 2007. The primary sources are Theokritos \textit{Id.} 17.89, Apollonius of Aphrodisias (FGrHist 740 F14), who wrote in his καρικά about the rout from Ankyra of the Egyptians by the Gauls, and Clemens Protr. 4.48.2.

\textsuperscript{86} P. Desideri suggests that Herakleia was willing to patch things up with Antiokhos since it faced far greater threats from Bithynia and the Galatians (1970-1971, 497-498).

Herakleia sent him thirteen triremes when he was preparing for battle against Antiokhos I (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.10.2), and it helped him wrest control of Bithynia from his belligerent brother Zipoites soon thereafter (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.9.5 and 11.5; cf. Livy 38.16.2-8). It must have been around this time that Herakleia managed to buy back Kieros, Tieion, and Thynia (*FGrHist* 434 F1.9.4), which had presumably been taken by Nikomedes’ father, Zipoites. Nikomedes’ attitude toward Herakleia was anomalous for a Bithynian, however. His father was an enemy, as was his brother; and his grandson, Prousias I, after allying himself to Philip V against Rome ca. 211 BCE, would succeed in conquering much of Herakleia’s territory, including Kieros, which he renamed Prousias, and Tieion (Polyb. 15.21.3; 18.3.12, 4.7; Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.19.1). And Prousias even began, around 188 BCE, a long and nearly fatal siege of the city itself (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.19.2-3).

The alliances of the Northern League explain why, when Herakleia was attacked by Nikomedes’ estranged brother in the years after Koroupedion, an allied force came to its aid and drove the invaders away (*FGrHist* 434 F1.9.5). It also explains why Herakleia sent four thousand gold staters to Byzantium to help ward off the Gallic invasion in 280/79 BCE (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.11.1). Even the Gauls were soon invited, at Nikomedes’ bidding, into the League, and they proceeded to provide support to Bithynia

---

88 Memnon tells us, in fact, that the war between Nikomedes and Antiokhos was actually a consequence of actions that Herakleia had taken against Hermogenes, who had been assigned to the region by Antiokhos’s general Patroklos (*FGrHist* 434 F1.9.1-3). In response to Hermogenes’ attack, Herakleia sent an embassy to convince him (surely, given Herakleia’s tendency, a bribe was involved) to march instead through Phrygia to Bithynia. And it was in response to Hermogenes’ death at the hands of the Bithynians that Antiokhos launched his invasion.

89 When Nikomedes died (ca. 250 BCE), he even made Herakleia (along with Ptolemaios Philadelphos, Antigonos, Byzantium, and Kios) guardians of his sons (Mem. *FGrHist* 434 F1.14.11).

90 A certain Eumenes had control of Amastris at this time but had handed it over to Ariobarzanes, the Pontic King (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.6.2).

91 Fortuitously, a well-aimed stone forced him to abandon the siege and earned him at the same time the sobriquet Χωλός. On the dating of the siege, see S. Dmitriev 2007.

92 See S.L. Ager 1996, no. 34, 108-109. Herakleia’s alliance with Byzantium also explains its position of neutrality in the war (ca. 260 BCE) between Byzantium and the Herakleite colony Kallatis over the emporion Tomis (Mem. *FGrHist* 434 F1.13.1). On the so-called “Monopoly War” between Byzantium and Kallatis, see A. Avram et al. 2003.
and its allies (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.11.2). According to Memnon, in fact, the Gauls actually helped the Greek *poleis* maintain democratic *politeiai* in the face of the anti-democratic “Kings” (*FGrHist* 434 F1.11.4). But relations between Herakleia and the Gauls began to sour when they found themselves supporting opposite factions in the Bithynian civil war in the early 250s, and the Gauls consequently ravaged Herakleia up to the Kales river (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.14.2). During a later sally (ca. 250 BCE), the historian Nymphis was sent to negotiate with the marauders; he managed to bribe the Gauls to leave, offering them five thousand gold staters and an extra two hundred for each general (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.16.1). At some point in the following half-century, however, the Gauls were back; this time they attacked Herakleia directly, and this time they were driven away by force and not by bribery (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.20).

We know little about Herakleia during the second half of the third century BCE, aside from this undated Gallic siege and the aggression of Prousias I. This is largely a reflection of Photius’ epitome of Memnon’s history, which jumps from Nymphis’s embassy ca. 250 BCE to the embassy to the Roman generals in Asia ca. 191-190 BCE (*FGrHist* 434 F1.18.6). According to Polybius, Herakleia had a role in the treaty between the Attalids and Pontic Kings, alongside Mesembria, Khersonnesos, and Kyzikos (Polyb. 25.2.13), but we know very little about the consequences of the alliance. When Memnon picks up again, it is with reference to the Romans: he claims that after crossing over into Asia, the Romans (specifically Publius Aemilius, perhaps a mistake for L. Aemilius Regillus) wrote Herakleia a letter proffering the friendship of the Roman senate (*FGrHist* 434 F1.18.6). Herakleia soon sought to renew what Memnon calls ἡ ὑμολογημένη φιλία (*FGrHist* 434 F1.18.7) with Scipio Africanus and tried also to

---

93 For the date of this embassy, see K.J. Beloch 1927, 214-217.
94 This episode is dated only very vaguely. It is narrated after the siege of Prousias I (probably in the 180s BCE) but is said to have occurred οὔτω τῶν Ῥωμαίων εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβεβηκότων.
negotiate a peace between the Romans and Antiokhos. Both Scipiones, Memnon asserts, wrote to reaffirm the εὔνοια between Rome and Herakleia, offering to put an end to hostilities with Antiokhos (FGrHist 434 F1.18.8)—Memnon allegedly cites Publius’s reply verbatim⁹⁶—and, after Antiokhos’s defeat, the two cities concluded a treaty:⁹⁷ he says that copies were inscribed on bronze plaques and erected in the respective temples of Zeus/Jupiter in each city (FGrHist 434 F1.18.10). Concord between the two poleis persevered, since Herakleia apparently contributed two triremes to Rome in the war against Perseus (Livy 42.56.6), and two more somewhat later during the Social War (FGrHist 434 F1.21).⁹⁸

But relations with Rome deteriorated during the Mithridatic Wars. Memnon takes pains to absolve Herakleia from any fault, claiming that the polis had aimed for neutrality but was compelled by Mithridates VI to join his cause. He mentions that Herakleia had even come to the aid of Khios against Mithridates ca. 86 BCE by overtaking Pontic ships transporting the captive Khians onboard (FGrHist 434 F1.23).⁹⁹ Several years later, both Mithridates and Murena sent envoys to Herakleia to ask for an alliance, and Herakleia took no side (FGrHist 434 F1.26.2).¹⁰⁰ It was only when Mithridates’ commander seized two Herakleiotai, Silenos and Satyros, and held them hostage that the polis provided the Pontic king with five triremes (FGrHist 434 F1.27.5). Henceforth, Herakleia was the enemy of Rome, and publicani (δημοσιονομοι) were swiftly dispatched to collect taxes.

The Herakleiotai, having now enjoyed a freedom from rule for over two hundred years,

---

⁹⁶ See Jacoby FGrHist IIIB Text, 278; A. Scafluro 35; E. Gruen 1984, 736; and S. Ager no. 93, 256-258.
⁹⁷ See E. Gruen 1984, 736-737 for the date. See also M. Janke 1963, 30-1, and A. Bittner 1998, 96.
⁹⁸ Memnon strangely locates the Marsi, Paeligni, and Marrucini in North Africa; he says that the Herakleiotai remained on campaign in Italy for eleven years.
⁹⁹ From Memnon we know something about Herakleia’s earlier relations with the Kingdom of Pontos. Herakleia sent an embassy to Mithridates I soon after the death of Lysimakhos, although it is not clear that any alliance resulted (Memnon FGrHist F1.7.2), and at the death of the next King, Ariobarzanes, ca. 250 BCE, it sent grain to Amisos to relieve the young new ruler, Mithridates II (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.16.1). Herakleia’s relations with the Kingdom of Pontos in the second half of the third century and for most of the second century are very obscure. See S.M. Burstein 1980, esp. 10, and B.C. McGing 1986, 29-30.
apparently equated the implications of this demand to a kind of slavery (ἀρχήν τινα δουλείας), and rather than complain to the Roman senate, they were persuaded by a demagogue’s jingoism to kill the tax collectors then and there (FGrHist 434 F1.27.6). Fearful of a Roman reaction, Herakleia invited ca. 73 BCE a Pontic garrison of four thousand soldiers to protect the polis; Memnon of course insists that the garrison was secretly imposed and was the work of only one Herakleiot, the crooked friend of Mithridates, Lamakhos (FGrHist 434 F1.29.3-4). A Roman invasion swiftly followed (FGrHist 434 F1.29.5), culminating in a siege with devastating consequences. Not only did the Roman general M. Aurelius Cotta allow the Romans to ravage much of the plain of Lykaia (FGrHist 434 F1.34.2), but the Pontic garrison commander, Konnakorex, unleashed just as much brutality on the Herakleiotai from within (FGrHist 434 F1.34.4). The polis was able to man (albeit not fully) thirty triremes to combat the fleet of Lucullus’s legate, C. Valerius Triarius, but it lost fourteen ships in the encounter (FGrHist 434 F1.34.7).

Worse still, Konnakorex, working closely with Lamakhos’s successor as leader of the pro-Mithridatic faction at Herakleia arranged two years into the siege to betray the polis to Triarius (FGrHist 434 F1.35). Herakleia was looted, Herakleiotai indiscriminately slaughtered: according to Memnon, in fact, the Romans killed even those who had sought refuge in temples and at altars (FGrHist 434 F1.35.5). And Herakleia became part of the province of Pontus. Feeling excluded from the booty, Cotta managed to take for himself some of Herakleia’s most prized possessions, including the statue of Herakles in the agora and its lustrous accoutrements (FGrHist 434 F1.35.5-36.1). But upon his return to Rome as Ponticus Imperator he quickly became an object of envy. As a result, the Herakleiotai prisoners were freed (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.39;

101 In vain, Herakleia sent envoys both to its colonies asking for supplies and to the Bosphoran Kings (FGrHist 434 F1.32.2 and 34.6).
102 Memnon describes this statue and its pediment in great detail (FGrHist 434 F1.36.8). Alas, the ships that bore off Herakleia’s treasures sank not far offshore.
Dio. 36.40.3-5), and one, a certain Thrasymedes, lost no time in attacking Cotta before the senate. Cotta was expelled, the Herakleiotai restored to their territory (τὴν τε χώραν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τοὺς λιμένας), and Herakleia became a civitas libera.\(^{103}\) Photius’s Epitome of Memnon ends with the return to Herakleia of three prominent Herakleiotai: Thrasymedes, Brithagoras, who was one of the most prominent opponents of Lamakhos’s pro-Mithridatic party, and Brithagoras’s son Propylos. In an attempt to rejuvenate the polis, they were able to collect eight thousand settlers—Herakleia had evidently been almost completely depopulated by the Roman attack. Some years later, Brithagoras and Propylos, keen perhaps to advance Herakleia as a civitas foederata, sought an audience with Caesar and remained with him, apparently as close friends, for the next twelve years (\textit{FGrHist} 434 F1.39). The mission, despite this friendship, would not be a success: soon after the death of Brithagoras in 47 BCE, Caesar made Herakleia a Roman \textit{colonia},\(^{104}\) and some years later Antony assigned the Greek portion of the \textit{polis}\(^{105}\) to Adiatorix, the son of the Galatian tetrarch Domneikleios. Because of an ill-advised revolt just before the Battle of Actium, Adiatorix was captured and forced to march in Augustus’s triumph at Rome. Herakleia was now part of the reorganized province of Bithynia et Pontus. Its fate in the early empire is inscrutable. Pliny, for what it is worth, calls it an \textit{oppidum} (\textit{NH} 6.1.4).

2.2.5.2 Local Historians of Herakleia

Six historians wrote \textit{Περὶ Ηηρακλείας}: Promathidas (\textit{FGrHist} 430), Amphitheos (\textit{FGrHist} 431), Nymphis (\textit{FGrHist} 432), Domitios Kallistratos (\textit{FGrHist} 433), Memnon (\textit{FGrHist} 434), and Timogenes (\textit{FGrHist} 435). Only one, Nymphis, can be dated with any precision, to the first half of the third century, when Herakleia was essaying to find a

\(^{103}\) See M. Janke 1963, 128.
\(^{105}\) Strabo says that the \textit{colonia} did not take up the entire site of Herakleia (12.3.6).
place for itself among the powers of Black Sea. There are secure termini in the case of two other historians: Promathidas, whose history, used as it was by Apollonius, was in circulation by the mid-third century;\textsuperscript{106} and Memnon, who wrote at some point after 47 BCE, since the last book (Sixteen) ends with Caesar’s return to Rome. But secure dates for the other historians are out of reach. Kallistratos was likely active before the early first century CE and certainly before Stephanos;\textsuperscript{107} Amphitheos before Harpokration,\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{106} Promathidas is cited four times in the scholia to Apollonius (FGrHist 430 FF1-4), once explicitly as Apollonius’ source (F4 = T1). Apollonius certainly did not cite Promathidas by name, so we must infer from the scholiast only that poet and the historian forwarded the same account about Sthenelos and that the historian was generally assumed to be earlier. Yet the tradition is probably sound, especially since much of the Quellenforschung reproduced by the Apollonius scholia seems to go back to a commentary written by Apollonius’ own student, Khures (see F. Susemihl 1891, Vol. II, 151; Jacoby, FGrHist IIIB Noten, 168 n. 7; A. Cameron 2004, 63). That Athenaeus once names Promathidas as a student of Dionysius Thrax (F8), the grammarian who flourished in the early first century BCE, suggests that there were multiple homonyms—indeed Athenaeus also mentions a Promathidas who wrote hemiamboi (7.47 29cA-C = F7)—not that the scholiasts to Apollonius erred in their chronology (see Jacoby, FGrHist IIIB Text, 256, and P. Desideri 1967, 381 n.71). It is true that Athenaeus cites the poet Promathidas (7.47 296) for a genealogy of Glaukon that is reproduced in the scholia to Apollonius (1.1310), but this does not mean that the scholiasts were using the same source as Athenaeus or, if they were, that they could not have used both the historian and the poet. It is not clear, incidentally, which Promathidas Alexander Polyhistor cites (FGrHist 273 F74) regarding the name of people who lived along the Gallos river (FGrHist 430 F5). Dating Promathidas before the mid-third century BCE, however, implies nothing about his relationship to Nymphis, contra Desideri (1967, 390-391). Desideri has most recently and forcefully suggested that Promathidas lies behind the portion of Nymphis’ history up to the rule of Dionysius. He notes a change in style in Phortius’ epomé of Memnon between the tenth and eleventh books, from a series of tyrant biographies to a more universal and inclusive narrative. One of Desideri’s reasons for believing Promathidas to have been earlier than Nymphis has to do with the number of Argonauts that each historian made die at Herakleia (392): Promathidas is only (explicitly) cited for the death of Idmon (FGrHist 430 F2), Nymphis for the deaths of both Idmon (F15) and Tiphys (F16). We cannot know for certain what Promathidas said about Tiphys—Herodoros, it is true, had him die on the return from Kolkhis (FGrHist 31 F54), but there is no reason to believe Promathidas followed suit—nor would such an augmentation, if it could be proved, indicate anything about the relative chronology of these two writers.

\textsuperscript{107} We know very little about Domitos Kallistratos (FGrHist 433), to whom Stephanos of Byzantium (on seven occasions) attributes a work Περὶ Ἡρακλείας (FF1, 4-9)—the scholia to Apollonius once refer to the work as Τὰ καθ’ Ἡρακλείαν (F2). That Kallistratos appears in the scholia both to Aeschylus’ Persai (F3a) and to Apollonius (2, 3b) may provide a terminus ante quem of the first century CE. Dionysius of Halicarnassus sought information about the origin of the Roman Penates from a work Περὶ Στίμουθες written by a Kallistratos (A.R. 1.68.2 = F11). An identification with our historian would help to pinpoint a date—W. Ameling, for example, thinks that Dionysius’ position of Kallistratos in the text between Cassius Hemina and Varro allows for a relative date (1995, 373-374); cf. U. Heinemann 2010, 242-243—but it is a purely hypothetical link (see Müller FHG, IV 353 and P. Desideri 1970-1971, 495 n. 30). Müller surmised (FHG, IV 353) that Kallistratos earned the gentilicium Domitos from his status as Roman freedman, in much the same way that the Milesian Alexander Polyhistor (FGrHist 273) picked up the name Cornelius when he became a slave and then tutor for Cornelius Lentulus. Perhaps, he suggested, Kallistratos was taken captive, just like Polyhistor, in the Mithridatic Wars. On this reading, Kallistratos would be a contemporary of Brithagoras, the Herakleote whose death concludes Photius’ epitome of Memnon. Ameling (1995, 374), emphasizing the prevalence of the name Domitos in Bithynia, sees a
and Timogenes before the *Souda*. But that is all we can say. Despite Jacoby’s confidence, then, there is no evidence that any history of Herakleia was written in the fourth, let alone fifth, century BCE. Herodoros, who can be dated around the turn of the fourth century, may have retained some local traditions about his *polis*, but he did not do so in the form of local history; nor is there any suggestion that Aristotle’s thorough connection rather to Domitius Ahenobarbus, whom Antony placed in charge of Bithynia ca. 38-35 BCE (App. BC. 5.137). In any case, the addition of the gentile Domitios would give only a *terminus post quem*, since there is no indication that Kallistratos was the first of his family to carry this name. A “Roman” date for Kallistratos is also sometimes inferred by the fact that he had recourse to discuss in the seventh book of his history the Ilyrian *polis* Olympe (F9)—Jacoby suggested (*FGrHist* IIIB Text, 267) that the context was Rome’s crossing of the Ionian sea before the battle with Perseus (see Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F1.4.1). But the supposition that Kallistratos lies behind Memnon and was the conduit through which Nymphis passed is difficult to defend (Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIB Text, 270; see also Desideri 1967, 390 n. 119; and 1970-1971, 495-496, 537; and, for healthy skepticism, Ameling, esp. 375 n.17). For what it is worth, Kallistratos and Nymphis retain different accounts of the death of the Mariandynian prince Titias (F3b), which suggests that Memnon did not follow both traditions, or if he did, that he engaged with them in such a way as to problematize his relationship to his sources. Note that Desideri dates Kallistratos early, seeing him as the source for Memnon’s Roman digression, which he situates not long after 168 BCE (2007, 47-48).

108 Harpokration refers only once to Amphitheos as author of a work Περὶ Ἡρακλείας of at least two books (s.v. Σαξιοί = *FGrHist* 431 F1a); in fact, he is so named in only one of the four full manuscripts of the lexicon (ms. A reads Αμφιβότος, while B gives Αμφιβάλους and CG Αμφιβάλος), which led both Dindorf and Müller to read the reference as a misattribution to Nymphis. Jacoby, on the other hand, collated this passage with a reference in the Aristophanic scholia (*Birds* 874) to an unnamed native historian of Herakleia who wrote about the god Sabazios (= *FGrHist* 431 F1b)—and surmised that the name Αμφιβότος had fallen out through haplography. But of the resulting historian, if he be authentic, we know nothing. Jacoby wondered whether Amphitheos could be connected to the Herakleote philosopher Antitheos who the *Souda* claims (s.v. Klearkhos) assisted Khion and Leonides in the assassination of Klearkhos (*FGrHist* IIIB Noten, 168 n. 1). But there are no grounds for this intriguing suggestion.

109 About Timogenes, we are similarly in the dark. The *Souda* is even unsure about his name: Τιμαγένης ή Τιμαγένης, Μιλήρος, Ιστορικός καὶ ὕπτως. Περὶ Ἡρακλείας τῆς ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ καὶ τῶν ξε αὐτῆς λόγων ηὐθύνων ἀνδρῶν ββίλα γ, καὶ ἐπιστολάς. By way of lectio difficilior, the name was probably the less common Timogenes (M. Cuypers, *BNJ* 430 *Biographical Essay*). Cuypers wonders, in fact, whether the historian can be identified with the Timogenes who epitomized the *Iliad* and was censured by Apollonius in his *Homeric Lexicon* (s.v. harpuiai), which would suggest a date before the late-first century CE. It is hard to know to what extent his work on Herakleia was a local history rather than a series of biographies of famous Herakleiotai. It may have been akin to Nikander’s work Περὶ τῶν ἐν Κολοφώνοις ποιητῶν (*FGrHist* 271/2 F9-10) or the thirty-book long work Περὶ πόλεων καὶ οὗς ἐπίσταται αὐτῶν ἐνδυόσεως ἔγραψε written by Philon of Byblos (*FGrHist* 1060). Timogenes’ *logioi* Herakleiotai probably included philosophers (e.g. Khion, Bryson, Herakleides, Khamaileon, and Dionysios Methathemos), local historians, and other intellectuals, like Herodoros (*FGrHist* 31), Philon, who wrote about marvels in response to Nymphis (*FGrHist* 432 T6), and the poets Pherenikos and Damagetos.

110 *FGrHist* IIIB Text, 254.

111 A scholion to Apollonius, however, citing Herodoros for the death of Idmon, claims that περὶ τοῦ Ἐδμωνος ἐν Μαριανδύνοις γενομένου θανάτου καὶ Ἡρακλείας ἱστορεῖ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἡρακλείας καὶ Προμάθιδος ἐπέ. καὶ Νύμφις ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἡρακλείας ὡς ὁ Ἐδμων ὑπὸ σῶς ἐπλήγη (*FGrHist* 31 F50). This is the only reference to a separate work on Herakleia, and the phrase may well have been transposed from the context of Nymphis. The most natural solution is that Herodoros dealt with the death of Idmon, just as would Apollonius, in his *Ἀργοναυτικά* (FF5-10), although there is possibly some confusion here with Herodoros’s work on Herakles, ὁ καθ’ Ἡρακλέα λόγος (FF1, 4), or τὰ καθ’
knowledge of fourth-century Herakleian political history was due to anything other than his acquaintance with several prominent Herakleiotai.

We know that Nymphis was Herakleiote (which means, in his case, that he was descended from Herakleiotai and moved to the polis as an adult), but there is no indication of provenance for the others—patriotism is not enough to prove nationality, of course—and at least one, Timogenes, was Milesian (FGrHist 435 F1).\textsuperscript{112} I will be focusing here on the two historians, Nymphis and Memnon, about whose works we know most. We will take up the fragments of the other historians in the final section on the interaction of the local and non-local in Herakleian historiography.

A) \textsc{nymphis}

According to the \textit{Souda}, the Herakleiote Nymphis was the son of Xenagoros\textsuperscript{113} and author of two histories: \textit{Περὶ Ἡρακλείας} in thirteen books and \textit{Περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν διαδόχων καὶ ἐπιγόνων} in 24 books (T1).\textsuperscript{114} The local history was well known—it is cited by Plutarch (F7), Athenaeus (FF5b, 9-10), Stephanos (FF1-2), and, most frequently, by the scholia to Apollonius (FF3-5a, 8, 11-16); the general history less

---

\textsuperscript{112} Promathidas the historian (\textit{FGrHist} 430 FF1-6) is not provided with a provenance, if he be distinct from the Herakleiotai poet Promathidas (FF7-8). And it is not Amphitheos, but an unnamed historian, whom the Aristophanic scholia deem Herakleiotai (\textit{FGrHist} 431 F1b), and this may well be, as Müller thought, really a reference to Nymphis. The nationalities of neither Domitios Kallistratos nor Memnon are anywhere given.

\textsuperscript{113} Jacoby (\textit{FGrHist} IIIB 240 T1) entertained the idea that this Xenagoras was himself a historian, since a Xenagoras is frequently cited by the Lindian Chronicle (\textit{FGrHist} 240 FF2-18, 21-25) as the author of a \textit{Χρονικὴ Σύνταξις} and elsewhere as the author of \textit{Χρόνοι} (\textit{FGrHist} 240 FF1, 20). A book \textit{Περὶ Νῆσων} is also attributed to a Xenagoras by scholia to Lykophron (\textit{FGrHist} 240 F26a), Lucian (\textit{FGrHist} 240 F28a), and Harpokration (\textit{FGrHist} 240 F27a), and it is to this work that Pliny must be referring in his several references to Xenagoras (\textit{FGrHist} 240 T2a, FF26b and 30). It is possible that Nymphis’s father wrote a book on islands, less likely, it seems to me, a chronicle that detailed the dedications made to Hera at her temple at Lindos on Rhodes.

\textsuperscript{114} Athenaeus, who three times cites Nymphis’s \textit{Περὶ Ἡρακλείας} (12.50 536AB = F9; 12.72 549A-D = F10 and 14.11 619F-630A = F5b), elsewhere refers to a Nymphis (\textit{FGrHist} 432 F) who wrote a \textit{Περὶ Ἑλλάδος Αἰσθήσεως}. Although F. Susemihl (1891, 621) and R. Laqueur (1937, col. 1611) equated these references, both Kaibel and Wendel attributed the geography to Nymphodoros (\textit{FGrHist} 576 F2), elsewhere cited by Athenaeus as the author of a \textit{Periplous} (13.89 609E).
so, if at all. The *Souda* tells us that Nymphis recorded events up to the ascension of Ptolemy III Euergetes (T1), which means that he was alive ca. 247 BCE. From Photius’s *Epitome* of Memnon, moreover, we learn that Nymphis wrote about his own political role about the same time as an ambassador sent to negotiate with the Gauls who were pillaging the Herakleian *khora* (T4). Since Nymphis appears elsewhere in Photius’s *Epitome* with reference to the repatriation ca. 281 of a group of exiles, among whom he appears to have assumed a prominent position (T3), he was probably born no later than 310 BCE and perhaps somewhat earlier. He was possibly raised at Herakleia, in which case he was either exiled himself at a very early point in his career or else emigrated at a young age along with his father. But it is more likely that he was born abroad, since Memnon speaks of the exiles’ desires in 281 BCE to reclaim the property of their ancestors (ὅν οἱ πρόγονοι ἀπεστέρηντο). Perhaps he came of age in one of the Greek communities around the Black Sea, like Sinope, or even at Athens, where he would have found a formidable group of expats, such as Khamaileon and an elderly Herakleides. Although his family’s exile is probably best associated with the tyranny of Klearkhos or Satyros, this should not in itself signal that a general opposition to tyranny

---

115 It is perhaps cited by Aelian (*N.A. 17.3 = F17*), although he actually refers to the ninth book τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαίου λόγων—Jacoby suggests that a better reading would be, ἐν τῷ τῶν λόγων (Ἰστοριῶν) περὶ Πτολεμαίου λέγων (*FGrHist* IIIB Noten, 169 n. 14). The subject matter, in any case, is snakes and tortoises in the land of the Troglydotes. As we have said, Aelian (*VH 9.13*) elsewhere preserves a discussion of the tyrant Dionysius very similar to the verbatim quotation from Nymphis’s local history retained by Athenaeus (*F10*). If we are to give any weight to the citation about Ptolemy, then, Aelian seems to have had access to both the local and general history (or else the discussion of snakes among the Troglydotes actually comes from the *Περὶ Ἡσαλείας*).

116 Memnon places the embassy to the Gauls after Ariobarzanes’ accession to the Pontic Throne (*FGrHist* 434 F1.16.1-3). For the dating, see K.J. Beloch 1929, Vol. 2.4.2, 214-217 and E. Olshausen 1978, col. 401. It is possible (but unlikely, it seems to me) that the historian Nymphis who was sent to the Gauls ca. 250 was the son of the Nymphis who led the group of exiles back to Herakleia (this is the opinion of H.P. Clinton 1934, 23). The text of the *Souda* actually begins, Νύμφις Νύμφιδος Ξεναγόρου, Ἑράκλεωτης ἐκ Πόντου, ἱστορικός, but the genitival form of Nymphis has been bracketed by Müller and Jacoby.

117 On this occasion, in fact, Memnon actually calls Nymphis ἱστορικός, from which we can conclude not only that the ambassador and historian were one and the same but also that Memnon took this episode, and hence probably also the story of the exiles’ return, from Nymphis’s own work: like e.g. Deinias (*FGrHist* 306 F4) and Philokhoros (*FGrHist* 328 F67), Nymphis inserted himself into his narrative.

118 See I Sinope 1.
Nymphis runs through his work.\textsuperscript{119} It tells us only of the position of his family not of his political views,\textsuperscript{120} and what we know about his career as a diplomat and historian already ensures his membership in the εὔποροι.

Of the two historical works, Nymphis wrote the local history first. The \textit{Souda} is our testimony for this, although the text is difficult.\textsuperscript{121} The entry says on the one hand that Nymphis’s \textit{Περὶ Ἡρακλείας} covered events up to the dissolution of the tyranny (this probably refers to the year 281/0, when Lysimakhos was killed at Koroupedion and Herakleides of Kyme was exiled),\textsuperscript{122} on the other hand that it treated events “after the Epigonoi and until Ptolemy III” (\textit{i.e.} until 247/6 BCE). Either the chronology is vague or erroneous, inasmuch as it gives as the culmination of the work two discrete events some forty years apart, or else we must imagine that Nymphis himself designated two separate conclusions to his work.\textsuperscript{123} He may, for example, have planned to make the death of

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{119} If we can extrapolate Nymphis’s attitude towards the tyrants from Memnon’s text (see below for Memnon’s use of Nymphis), he was evidently critical of some (like the two Klearkhoi) and delighted at the reinstallation of the \textit{patrios politeia} in 281 but rather well disposed towards Timotheus and Dionysius (see Jacoby \textit{FGrHist} III, 269 and P. Desideri 1967, 394-397).

\textsuperscript{120} It is worth pointing out that the clearly fictitious Thirteenth Letter of Khion (addressed to Khion’s father Matris) mentions a Nymphis who is both a friend of Khion and a kinsman of Klearkhoi. The author of the \textit{Letters} may well be guilty of anachronism by inserting the historian Nymphis into an episode that would have taken place half a century before his birth. On the other hand, the letter may be drawing here on real knowledge of a homonymous Herakleiotē who had a hand in the assassination of Klearkhoi or was at any rate one of Khion’s confidants. He may even have been the grandfather of our Nymphis (see R. Billows, \textit{BNJ} 432 T2.). If so, Nymphis’s father would have been one of the early victims of Satyros (Memnon \textit{FGrHist} 434 F1.2.1), and the exile could be dated to 353 BCE. R. Laqueur surmised that the connection was in fact between Nymphis and Klearkhoi II (1937, col. 1606) and concluded that Nymphis was an enthusiastic supporter of Lysimakhos, Ptolemaios Keraunos, and most of all Amastris, but there is very little evidence for such a stance (see Jacoby \textit{FGrHist} III, 269 n. 10; cf. U. Heinemann 2010, 57-61).

\textsuperscript{121} Νύμφις [Νύμφιδος], Ξεναγόρου, Ἡρακλείωτης ἐκ Πόντου, ἱστορικός. \textit{Περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν διαδόχων καὶ ἐπιγόνων βιβλία καὶ \textit{Περὶ Ἡρακλείας}} βιβλία \textit{ετης ἕχει δὲ μέχρι τῆς καθαράσεως τῶν τυράννων} \textit{ετης μεχρὶ τοῦ τρίτου Πτολεμαίου.}

\textsuperscript{122} For it is at this point that Memnon says that Herakleia regained its freedom after 84 years of tyranny (334 F1.6.1); and it is here, at the death not of Klearkhoi II but of Lysimakhos, that the exiles were able finally to return (434 F1.7.3).

\textsuperscript{123} Another explanation for the \textit{Souda} passage has been advanced by H. F. Clinton (Vol. 3 1841, 23), A. Primo (2009a, 376-377), and R. Billows in his recent \textit{Commentary} to Nymphis (\textit{BNJ} 432 T1): the \textit{Souda} may actually be designating the ending points of each of Nymphis’s histories, claiming that the local history concluded in 281, the general history in 247/6. Not only does this scenario assume rather a large lacuna in the text of the \textit{Souda}, but it also introduces problems of its own. How, for example, could Nymphis’s general history be both \textit{Περὶ Ἐπιγόνων} and cover \textit{τὰ μετὰ τοὺς Ἐπιγόνους}, and can Ptolemaios III really to be considered one of the Epigonoi? Billows (\textit{BNJ} 432 \textit{Biographical Essay}) thinks
\end{footnotesize}
Lysimakhos the culmination of the narrative but then decided to issue an addendum toward the end of his life (ca. 246) that followed the history of Herakleia from his nostos up to the present day.¹²⁴ Such a scenario would not be extraordinary. Livy planned to end his work at the death of Cicero in 43 BCE but continued to record the next 34 years of Roman history. And Deinias’s Ἀργολικά, we saw, was published in two installments, the second of which included a reissuing of the entire work (FGrHist 306 F3). This explanation actually helps to make sense of the fact that the last book of Nymphis’s local history evidently treated more than twice the amount of material of each of the previous twelve.¹²⁵ It also explains how Apollonius could have consulted Nymphis’s local history when composing his Ἀργοναυτικά (ca. 260 BCE),¹²⁶ which is what the scholia assert (FGrHist 432 T5 = F6).¹²⁷ If the local history was originally intended to end in 281, we

that “Epigonoi” may have been a flexible category, designating the generation(s) that followed the Diadochoi; for this view, see also A. Primo 2009b. In any case, this interpretation would mean that Memnon used Nymphis’s local history up to the fall of the tyranny but the general history for everything afterwards (and that Nymphis certainly wrote his local history first, since a conclusion to his general history in 246 would give him little time, assuming a birth at the latest ca. 310, to begin a new project), that Memnon had two works of Nymphis available to him, and that Nymphis included his nostos and embassy to the Gauls in his general history. While this it not inconceivable that a historian would work himself as a character into his own Zeitgeschichte, we know of no other examples. The phenomenon is far better attested in local historiography. Lastly, there is an evident break in the narrative of Memnon (who, as we shall see, used Nymphis heavily) not at 281, which we would expect had Memnon used two different works with two different aims, but rather at ca. 246.

¹²⁴ See R. Laqueur 1937, col. 1609-1610.

¹²⁵ The first twelve books, as we shall see, treated somewhere between 21 and 26 years each; the thirteenth book, on the other hand, stretched from the death of Dionysius in 306/5 to the accession of Ptolemy III. This imbalance is also evident (and in the same proportion) in Memnon’s history, for which Nymphis was an important source.

¹²⁶ We don’t know, of course, when Apollonius published his Argonautika or, for that matter, whether he also issued it in two editions, but it is most likely that he set to work on the poem after he left his post at Alexandria ca. 260. For some attempts to sort out the chronology, see R. Hunter 1989, 1-9, and M.M. DeForest 1994, 1-17.

¹²⁷ Nymphis is frequently cited in the scholia to Apollonius (FGrHist 432 FF5-8, 11-16). Jacoby’s suggestion (FGrHist IIIIB Text, 261) that Apollonius only used Nymphis’s first book, which could have been released well in advance of the rest of the history, is neither implausible nor possible to prove—note that T5 actually says that Apollonius “seems” (ἔοικε) to draw on Nymphis. In any case, it is the scholiast, not Apollonius, who mentions Nymphis. And while Khares and the other scholiasts are to some extent reliable, we can entertain the possibility that Nymphis is actually drawing on Apollonius or that each is relying on a common source: Herodoros comes to mind, of whom the scholia to Apollonius are quite fond (FGrHist 31 FF5-11, 15, 24, 30-31, 38-55, 61, 64).
should place the publication of the first edition not long afterwards. For it is exceedingly rare for a native local historian to follow the history of his community into contemporary times but not up to the present day. And if he published the local history around this time, it is unlikely he would in his young age already have had the time two write a 24-book history of the Diadokhoi.

It is no surprise that Nymphis chose a local history as his first project. He would have had exposure to numerous examples of the type. To say nothing of Herakleiotai, like Promathidas and Amphitheos, who may have written in the fourth century, Pontic and Propontic local historians abounded: Kharon, among whose numerous works is a history of his homeland Lampsakos (FGrHist 262 T1, F1-2); Deiokhos (FGrHist 471) and Neanthes (FGrHist 84), Kyzikenoi who wrote on Kyzikos; and Leon of Byzantium, whose history of Philip II focused on his homeland (FGrHist 132 FT1), among others. Nymphis probably knew also of the Περσικά of Dionysius of Miletos (FGrHist 687), Hellanikos (FGrHist 687a), Kharon (FGrHist 687b), Ktesias (FGrHist 688), and Herakleides of Kyme (FGrHist 689). And he would probably have been aware, especially if he had spent some of his youth at Athens, of the contemporaneous works of Philokhoros and Timaios. Soon after his reintegration into Herakleiotie society,

128 There is no reason to assume that just because Nymphis published his local history after his repatriation to Herakleia he necessarily began working on it after 281; he could well have conceived of and begun the project somewhat earlier.
129 As Jacoby suggested (FGrHist IIIa Text, 23), Nymphis may actually have cited Kharon (the text reads Ἀκαρίωνα) regarding the etymology of the Bosporos (FGrHist 434 F11).
130 We know of many other local historians of the region whom we are not able to date: among historians of Kyzikos are Polygnostos (FGrHist 473) and the Kyzikenes Agathokles (FGrHist 472) and Diogenes (FGrHist 424). Bithynian histories are attributed to Artemidoros of Askalon (FGrHist 698) and Demosthenes the Bithynian (FGrHist 699). Dionysius of Olbia (FGrHist 804) wrote on his homeland, as did Demetrios of Odessos (FGrHist 808) and Syriskos of Khersonesos (FGrHist 807). Note also Agathon (FGrHist 801) and Andron of Teos (FGrHist 802), each of whom wrote a Periplus of the Black Sea; Polemon of Ilion, who wrote a treatise on the poleis of the Pontos; and Apollodoros (FGrHist 803) and Diophantos (FGrHist 805), who wrote Pontika. See M. Dana and D. Dana (2007) for a discussion of the historians of the Pontic communities.
131 Nymphis appears to have been well read. He seems at any rate to have quoted three lines from Menander’s Halieis (in F10 = PCG 6.2 (1998), 57 no. 25 = 3.10.21-3 Kock), albeit a play whose plot centered on Herakleiotie exiles. And the Etymologicum Magnum once refers to Nymphis as φιλόσοφος (FGrHist 432 F19). The lexicon in fact refers to Nymphias (not Nymphis), which led Jacoby to consider it.
however, Nymphis embarked on a new project (he could not, of course, continue writing a local history if he had already more or less caught himself up with contemporary times): a lengthy history of Alexander and his successors. One stimulus may have been the recent work of Hieronymos of Kardia (FGrHist 154), another Propontic historian, whose account of events “after Alexander” (FGrHist 154 T1), variously known as αἱ Ἱστορίαι, αἱ τῶν Διαδόχων Ἱστορίαι, and Περὶ τῶν Ἑπιγόνων, was published at some point after 272, and perhaps even somewhat later. We know nothing certain of Nymphis’s general history, so we cannot tell to what extent he had Heironymos in mind as a model to emulate or criticize, but the similarities in title and subject matter are suggestive. Another inspiration for undertaking a general history may have been the roughly contemporary work of the Samian Douris. Like Nymphis, we may recall, Douris spent his youth in exile, and like Nymphis he found himself in a position of political power upon his return. Like Nymphis, moreover, Douris wrote both a local history of his homeland and a general history, which, very likely also in 24

---

132 It seems unlikely to me that the general history went as far in time as the thirteenth book of the local history; according to the Souda, it dealt with Alexander, the Diadokhoi, and the Epigonoi (contra R. Billows, BNJ 432 F17).
134 This is how Diodoros usually refers to the work (18.50.4, 19.44.3, 19.100.1-3 = FGrHist 154 TT4-6).
135 As Diodoros once says, regarding a treaty between Eumenes and Antipater in 320 BCE (18.42.1 = FGrHist 154 T3; cf. 1.3.3. = T10).
136 Dionysius of Halicarnassus refers to the history in this way with reference to Pyrrhos’s campaigns against the Romans (1.5.4 = FGrHist 154 F13).
137 Hieronymos mentions the death of Pyrrhos (FGrHist 143 F15), while F7 may refer to the death of Mithridates I Küstes in 266 BCE (see J. Hornblower, 243-247).
138 Again, the one fragment that appears to be from this work speaks of large snakes in the land of the Troglydotes (FGrHist 432 F17).
139 It is worth noting moreover that Hieronymos gave an unflattering account of Lysimakhos, especially regarding his behavior in destroying Epeirote tombs in his war with Antigonos (FGrHist 154 T11 = F9); Pausanias reckons that Hieronymos’s biases stemmed from Lysimakhos destruction of Kardia and his foundation there of Lysimakeia (1.9.8).
140 U. Heinemann 2010, 262-263.
141 For Douris’s tyranny, see FGrHist 76 TT4-5.
books, covered events from 370 BCE to Koroupedion (F55). For Nymphis, the local and general histories were not mutually exclusive. His general history certainly made mention of Herakleia, if it did not give it pride of place, while his local history was preoccupied with Herakleia’s position among its neighbors. After completing the 24 books of this general history, which perhaps ended with the death of Ptolemy Keraunos or Pyrrhos or else continued until the death of Ptolemy II Philadelphos, Nymphis chose in the early 240s to rework this material to provide an up-to-date edition of his local history: the thirteenth book. This appendix would have given him an opportunity to assess the changes that Herakleia had undergone in years since Koroupedion and, more important, to discuss his own recent contribution to the affairs of his polis.

Nymphis focused the first book of his Περὶ Ἡρακλείας on the pre-ktisis visitations of Greek heroes, like Phrixos (F1), Herakles (F2), and the Argonauts

---

142 The influence may have gone the other way, if Nymphis’s history belonged to the beginning of his career and Douris’s to the end.  
143 It is probable, as we shall see, that Pompeius Trogus took his detailed information about Herakleia (16.3-5) from Nymphis’s general history of the Diadokhi. For the tendency of local historians to insert local digressions in non local works, recall that Strabo (12.3.6) pokes fun of Ephoros for inserting in his general history irrelevant remarks about his homeland (FGrHist 70 F236): σκόπτεται δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἐφορος ὃς τῆς πατρίδος ἔργα οὐκ ἔχων φράζειν ἐν τῇ διαρθύμησὶ τῶν ἄλλων πράξεων, οὐ μὴν οὐδ’ ἐμνημόνευτον αὐτὴν εἶναι θέλων, οὕτως ἐπιφωνεῖ· κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν Κυμαῖοι τὰς ἰσχίας ἴγον.  
144 Similarities between Trogus and Memnon, specifically regarding the deaths of Lysimakhos (17.1-2) and Keraunos (24.5), suggest that Nymphis was also Trogus’s source for the non-Herakleian sections of the history of the Diadokhi. Because Trogus in this section goes on to discuss Pyrrhos’s death at Argos, Nymphis probably also included this material. Jacoby suggested, without explanation, that the general history went up to 246 BCE (FGrHist IIIB Text, 259).  
145 Five fragments (FF1-5) come explicitly from the first book, with six others almost certainly belonging to the same context.  
146 Stephanos says merely that Nymphis spoke about a harbor named Phrixos in the first book of his local history. We have no way of knowing the actual context, but it is likely that he derived the name of the harbor from Phrixos, son of Athamas, the Boiotian responsible for first hanging the golden fleece on the tree of Kolkhis. His story was well known already in the fifth century—see Pindar Pyth. 4.159-161, Aeschylus Athenas (TGF F1-4a Radt), Sophocles (TGF FF1-10 Radt), and Euripides, Phrixos (TGF F819-937 Nauck)—and it was naturally treated by Herodoros (FGrHist 31 FF9, 38-39, 47). Another fragment (11), preserved without reference to a book number, shows that Nymphis wrote about the etymology of the Bosporos and suggests that bull-headed ships passing through the Strait into the Black Sea may have been the cause of the name. F12, about the Kolone hill, may also be linked to the Phrixos story, since the scholiast cites Nymphis to explicate Apollonius’s linking of the hill to Athamas, Phrixos’s father.
(FF4), as well on the native peoples of the region, like the Mysoi (F2) and the Mariandynoi (FF5a, 5b, 14). In Book Two, he had recourse to discuss the particularities of a contingent of the Persian bodyguard, the Orosangai (F6), perhaps in connection to the advent of the Persians in the region—their conquest of Lydia (ca. 530 BCE)—but the context is unclear. From Book Four comes an explanation as to why the Xanthians structured their genealogy matrilineally (F7). Jacoby thought that the Persian conquest of Lykia would have provided an apposite link, but it is hard to believe that Nymphis was still discussing the beginnings of the Persian state in his fourth book. In the sixth book, at any rate, Nymphis had moved on to the immediate aftermath of the Persian Wars, narrating an incident involving the Spartan Pausanias at Byzantium (F9): out of arrogance and love of luxury, Nymphis says, the general claimed to have dedicated a bronze krater that he found there. And in Book Twelve, Nymphis dealt with the death of the tyrant Dionysius in 305 BCE (F10). Four or five books covering the eighty years from the foundation of the polis to the end of the Persian Wars, six books covering the 180 years from the end of the Persian Wars to the death of Dionysius: Nymphis’s pace was clearly not uniform. Such a variation would not be impossible even for an

---

147 Again, given the fragment’s source (Stephanos), we have little sense of the context; we know only that Nymphis said that the Mysoi lived in the Hypia mountains. Herakles was thought to have subdued this people during the course of his eastern venture (see Apoll. 2.780-83b, 786-787a).
148 F4, from the scholia to Apollonius, treats Lykos, King of the Mariandynoi at the time of the Argonauts’ expedition. F15, in which Nymphis links Idmon’s death to a wild boar, probably also belongs to Book One, along with F16 about the death of Tiphys.
149 FGrHist IIIB, Text, p. 263.
150 He also had recourse in Book Six to discuss a temple to Hekate in Paphlagonia founded by Medea (F8).
151 Likely the same krater mentioned by Herodotus (4.81.3).
152 This fragment, evidently cited verbatim by Athenaeus, is a character study of the tyrant Dionysius. Because, as we shall see, it does not describe a particular event or betray an underlying chronological frame but only emphasizes the fame and consequences of the tyrant’s corpulence, and because it ends with a summation of Dionysius’s life, it seems originally to have belonged to an obituary notice. Athenaeus actually says that Nymphis described Dionysius’s tumidity in his second book, but Müller naturally emended it: as Jacoby says (FGrHist IIIB Text, 265, cf. 260), “Muellers änerung der buchzahl ist so gut wie sicher”). But cf. P. Desideri (1967, 390 n. 117).
153 We may be able to speak in more detail about the structure of Nymphis’s history by way of Memnon; for Memnon appears to have arranged the first thirteen books of his own history with Nymphis’s model in mind (see below n. 158 and Appendix 2 on the relationship between Memnon and Nymphis). And Memnon, we know, wrote in greater detail about some periods: Books Six through eight treated about forty
annalistic local history, but it is certainly understandable for a history, like that of Nymphis, that betrays no such underlying chronology. For, as is clear from F10, a verbatim quotation of Nymphis preserved by Athenaeus, even an important event like the death of the tyrant Dionysius was not dated by any fixed and local system: ἀπέθανεν δὲ βιώσας ἕτη πέντε πρὸς τοῖς πεντήκοντα, ὄν ἐτυφάννησεν τρία καὶ τριάκοντα. The metronome for Nymphis’s history, at least in his coverage of the second half of the fourth century, seems to have been the reigns of Herakleia’s rulers.

We can learn more about the contents of Nymphis’s history from Justin’s epitome of Pompeius Trogus (16.3-5). For Justin inserts a miniature history of Herakleia at the point in his narrative of the Diadokhoi where Lysimahkos takes control of areas of the Black Sea: “Inde Thraciae ac deinceps Heracleae bellum intulerat [Lysimachus], cuius urbis et initia et exitus admirabiles fuere.” What Justin means by this phrase, “et initia et exitus,” is not immediately clear, since his account, which begins with the kinesis, breaks off just after the succession of Satyros. But the so-called Prologoi to Trogus’s individual books (which have survived separately from Justin’s epitome) reveal that Trogus’s original text actually traced the history of Herakleia all the way to Lysimakhos’s assassination of Klearkos II and Oxathres, exactly the point in the narrative, that is, from which he had digressed. Since none of the sources on which we know Trogus relied for Books 13-15 (e.g. Timagenes of Alexandria, Heironomos, Douris, Kleitarkhos, and

---

154 The Periokhai for Livy, for example, show us that while each successive decade in general covered fewer and fewer years (i.e. that he became more and more detailed) as he moved toward his own day, the pace fluctuated: so the seventh decade covered over thirty years (122-91 BCE), the eighth only five (91-86); book 70 covered six years (97-91), book 71 less than a year (91).
155 On the relationship between Nymphis’s history and Justin 16.3-5, see also Jacoby, FGrHist IIIB Text, 255 and 260 and P. Desideri 1967, 391 n. 123 and 392.
156 “Sexto decimo volumine continentur haec. . . . Ut Lysimachus in Ponto captus ac missus a Dromichaete rursus in Asia civitates, quae sub Demetrio fuerant, et in Ponto Heracleam occupabit. Repetitae inde Bithyniae et Heracleoticae origines, tyrannique Heracleae Clearchus et Satyrus et Dionysius, quorum filiis interfectis Lysimachus occupavit urbem.”
Diyillos devoted such attention to Herakleia, Trogus probably drew on Nymphis, especially since there is considerable overlap between Justin’s account of Herakleia and that of Memnon (who certainly did use Nymphis). Regarding the assassination of Klearkhos, for example, both Trogus (Just. 16.4) and Memnon (FGrHist 434 F1.1) begin with a summary of Klearkhos’s cruelty, his tyrannical behavior, and his self-divinization (he called himself the son of Zeus and wore elegant clothes), before moving on to the plot hatched by his relative Khion. Regarding Lysimakhos’s behavior before Koroupedion, moreover, both Trogus (Just. 17.1) and Memnon (FGrHist 434 F1.5.6) emphasize the crucial role of Arsinoe in the murder of Lysimakhos’s son Agathokles. And both Justin (17.1) and Memnon (FGrHist 434 F1.5.7) claim that the murder of Agathokles was one of the reasons for the war between Lysimakhos and Seleukos.

Aside from his account of Herakleia, Trogus frequently provided epichoric excursus. And while he may have culled these from individual local histories, looking

---

157 For Trogus’s sources in Books 13-15, see R. Schubert 1914; see J.C. Yardley and R. Develin 1994, 30-34, and J.C. Yardley and W. Heckel 1997, 3-8. Trogus could not have used Theopompos, who we know had something to say about Herakleia, since Theopompos did not live to record the deaths of Dionysius’s sons.


159 Justin specifies that he wore purple clothes, a golden crown, and boots “like those of kings in tragedies,” and he says that he named his son Keraunos “to mock the gods.” Memnon, on the other hand adds the detail that he painted his face.

160 There are some discrepancies: in Justin, Khion has one accomplice, Leonides; in Memnon, two are named, Leon and Euxenos, among “many others.” In Justin, Klearkhos was assassinated during a private meeting in his citadel, in Memnon the act occurs during a sacrifice. But neither Justin’s version nor that of Memnon is mutually exclusive (i.e. Memnon nowhere says that Klearkhos was publicly assassinated, and Trogus nowhere says that the murder did not take place during a public festival). The variations can be attributed to the fact that we are here dealing with two epitomes, of Justin and of Phiotius.

161 cf. the Prologus to Trogus Book Seventeen. Again, there are minor discrepancies. Justin says merely that Lysimakhos killed Agathokles with poison, using Arsinoe as ministra; Memnon, on the other hand, says that under Arsinoe’s influence Lysimakhos first tried to poison his son secretly but then imprisoned him on the charge of attempted murder and had his brother-in-law Ptolemy Keraunos kill him. But, again, these can be explained by way of the act of epitomization.

162 He gives the history of Skythia, for example, at the beginning of Book Two (2.1-3); of Athens, from Kekrops to Peisistratos and into the early fifth century, vis-à-vis the Persian invasion (2.6); of Sparta, viz. Lykourgos’s Politeia and the Messenian Wars, just before the Peloponnesian War (3.2); of Kyrene at its conquest by Ptolemy I (13.7); and of the Jews in the context of Antiokhos (36.2-3). Other local histories take up entire books: Sicily (Book Four); Macedon (Book Seven); Rome and Masillia (Book Forty-Three).
to *e.g.* Philokhoros for Athenian history, Zenon for Rhodian history, and Nymphis’s Ἡφασκλείας for Herakleian history, a more reasonable assumption is that he found these local digressions already embedded in the general histories on which he relied. By this reasoning, Trogus was more likely to have used Nymphis’s history of Alexander and his successors.¹⁶³ This would explain why Trogus’s history of Herakleia ends at 281, not at 246. For Nymphis, who had been working on his general history of the Diadokhoi since the early 270s, would have considered Lysimakhos’s capture of Herakleia a natural point to insert a *logos* on his hometown, especially since his own twelve-book local history had concluded at precisely this point, and he would easily have composed the digression by summarizing his earlier work. *Exitus*, as Justin uses the word here, must mean the “endpoint” not of the life of the *polis* but of the potted local history on which Trogus drew.

If Nymphis’s general history does lie behind Trogus, and if the general history did indeed summarize the local history, we can get a far better sense of how Nymphis approached the early history of his homeland. For unlike the scholia to Apollonius, which are interested solely in the early visitations of the Greeks, Trogus’s précis of Herakleian history begins with the *ktisis*. In his version (16.4-7), Herakleia was a purely Boiotian initiative. In the throes of a plague, the Boiotians seek the advice of Delphi and are told to found a colony in the Pontos sacred to Herakles. Reluctant to undertake the journey, the Boiotians ignore the oracle’s advice, stick out the plague, and find themselves promptly attacked by Phokis. Again, they inquire at Delphi and learn that a Pontic colony will help them ward off both the ongoing plague and the war. This time they acquiesce. They raise a group of colonists and sail to the Pontos where they build

¹⁶³ See P. Desideri 1967, 391 n. 123, and F. Landucci Gattinoni 1992, 17-24, for the idea that Trogus was using Nymphis’s general history.
the *polis* Herakleia, fated to become a powerful presence in the region. From the testimony of Xenophon (*Anab.* 6.21), who thought that Herakleia was a Megarian settlement, and from Ephoros, who saw it as a joint venture (*FGrHist* 70F44), we know that Nymphis had several options available to him for describing the foundation of his *polis*, so his decision to emphasize the Theban role is surely not accidental. In this light, it is instructive to recall that Nymphis’s older contemporary, Herakleides, claimed that he was descended from the Theban who led the colonization of Herakleia.

We know, moreover, that according to Nymphis the first Greek to visit the Black Sea was the Boiotian Phrixos (*FGrHist* 432 F1). Perhaps it better suited the purposes of Nymphis and Herakleides to categorize Herakleia by way of a Boiotian rubric: Herakleia was not a mere *polis* but a region and in possession of a bona fide ἀρχή (see Memn. *FGrHist* 434 F1.5.5). This conception of Herakleia’s territory was even more appropriate after Kieros, Tieion, and Thynia were reacquired in the early 270s BCE (*FGrHist* 434 F1.9.4). But constructing Herakleia by way of Thebes, not Megara, complicates Herakleia’s relationship to the three Megarian colonies that took part alongside it in the anti-Seleukid Northern League: Astakos, Byzantium, and Khalkedon. Nymphis’s emphasis on the Boiotian initiative may have been part of his project to underscore Herakleian autonomy: although Herakleia’s interests were aligned with the policies of the other Pontic *poleis*, Nymphis preferred to conceptualize the resulting association not as a League but a series of individual alliances.

Justin glosses over the early history of Herakleia—“Multa deinde huius urbis aduersus finitimos bella, multa etiam domesticae dissensionis mala fuere” (16.3.8)—choosing to devote attention only to one of the many magnifica: the behavior of the Herakleiotai in the face of Lamakhos’s demand for tribute. Thucydides had already
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164 F2 Wehrli = *Souda*, E461 Adler. See J. Fossey 1999 for a study of Boiotian interactions in the Pontos. We should note that Memnon’s digression on Nikomedia (12), which probably also comes from Nymphis, describes the foundation of that *polis* as a Megarian project but asserts that the settlement itself was named after one of the Theban Spartoi.
written about Lamakhos’s Pontic venture, but he said nothing about the actions of the Herakleiotai (4.75.2). Trogus gives far more context: it was the Herakleiotai alone who refused Athens’ requests for contributions; the reason, he says, was *amicitia regum Persicorum*. So Lamakhos sailed into the Pontos to exact the stipulated tax and began to ravage the *agri Heracleensium*. But when a storm destroyed his fleet and much of his army, he found himself unable to return to Athens by sea and reluctant to face so many hostile peoples with so small an army. The Herakleiotai intervened on his behalf, thinking it a more honorable opportunity for a good deed than for revenge. They sent the Athenians away with provisions and auxiliary troops, considering the destruction of their lands a good price to pay for the resulting friendship. Again, Nymphis emphasizes Herakleian autonomy; the *polis* does not become a tributary member of the Delian League but a friend of Athens, remaining an ally of Persia to boot.

Justin moves directly from the expedition of Lamakhos to Klearkhos’s tyranny. How Nymphis dealt with the intervening 60 years can be guessed by way of the condensed phrase, “passi sunt inter plurima mala etiam tyrannidem” (16.4.1).165 But Justin’s narrative of Klearkhos’s coup is particularly detailed (16.4.1-5.6). First the background: a riotous and needy *demos* calling for an abolition of debt and the redistribution of the lands of the rich; overtures made by the *bouleutai* to an Athenian, Timotheus, and a Theban, Epameinondas—representatives of the two Greek *poleis* of greatest import to Herakleia, the first as ally, the second as *metropolis*; and then the dangerous recall of an exile, Klearkhos. Next the machinations of Klearkhos: the interview with and consequent bribery and betrayal of Mithridates, Herakleia’s erstwhile enemy; Klearkhos’s abandonment of the *bouleutai* for the *demos*, which granted him full authority to fight on its behalf; his acquisition of the acropolis and a force of mercenaries;

165 A reference surely to the civil dissent and tensions with neighboring communities with which he had characterized early Herakleian history (cf. 16.3.8).
his imprisonment and murder of the 60 bouleutai who remained at Herakleia. Then the cementation of his power: his forced marriage between the wives/daughters of the bouleutai and their slaves and the noble behavior of the women; the battle between Klearkhos and the escaped bouleutai; and the blossoming of the tyrant’s cruelty. And finally his assassination. The antagonist of this narrative is clear; so too the heroes: not the demos, of course, who clamor for what is not theirs and then are hoodwinked, like Mithridates, into a trap, but rather the elite, the bouleutai, who fight for the freedom of their homeland and whose wives prefer suicide and mariticide to the shame of living under the new regime. The only mistake the boule had made, of course, was allowing Klearkhos a position of power in the polis from which he had been exiled. One wonders, then, how Nymphis imagined this exemplum would have been interpreted by his countrymen who, directly after the expulsion of Herakleides of Kyme, had appointed the Herakleite Phokritos as epimeletes.

The first edition of Nymphis’s work traced the history of Herakleia from the early reception of the Greek heroes in Mariandynia and the foundation of the polis by the Boiotians through the rise of Persia, the Athenian empire, the dynasty of Klearkhos, Alexander, and Lysimakhos. It was a story of struggle, initially as a fragile colony—as Justin says, “Multa deinde huius urbis aduersus finitimos bella, multa etiam domesticae dissensionis mala fuere” (16.3.8)—then under native tyrants—“passi sunt inter plurima mala etiam tyrannidem” (16.4.1)—and finally against foreign powers. Nymphis presages this struggle by underlining the hesitation with which the original colonization was undertaken; the Boiotians apparently preferred plague to emigration. It is no wonder. For according to Nymphis, Herakleia was the very entrance to Hades (432 F3); this was the place, as Herodoros had said, where Kerberos surfaced to vomit bile, and here from

166 Note that Justin characterizes Klearkhos’s flip from a supporter of the boule to democrat as a move from ally to enemy (16.4.10): “atque ut in illo (Mithridato) subitum se ex socio fecit hostem, sic ex defensore senatoriae causae repente patronus plebis euasit.”
this discharge grew the first deadly akoniton (FGrHist 31 F31).\textsuperscript{167} A good portion of Nymphis’s first edition, moreover, focused on the actions of Klearkhos and his family, who came to power after the expulsion of the εὐποροὶ, and the narrative thus turns a polis history into an account of a dynasty. Yet Nymphis’s twelfth book, the last of his first edition, repositioned the polis front and center: it ended on a note of hope, with the death of Lysimakhos at the Battle of Koroupedion, at the hands no less of the Herakleiothe Malakon, the absorption of his kingdom by Seleukos, and the liberation of the polis. If Nymphis began (or even completed) his history in exile, we may view his work in part through his own attempts to return home, reading his repatriation as an echo of the original Boiotian colonization. Just as the successful first foundation of Herakleia depended upon the bravery of the original colonizers, so too did the difficult metamorphosis of Herakleia from fiefdom (the property of the tyrants Klearkhos, Lysimakhos, and Arsinoe) to a resurgent polis in its own right require the contribution of Nymphis and his fellow exiles, descendants of the noble bouleutai who had lost their lives and property as a result of Klearkhos’s coup. The first act of this rebirth had been accomplished by Malakon (an exile himself?); now remained the problem of the politeia. For Herakleia to flourish, it had to remember how to behave as an independent polis, how to exist among the powers of the Pontos while maintaining its autonomy.

When Seleukos first appears in Memnon’s narrative at the end of the twelfth book, he is portrayed positively, the antithesis of the corrupted Lysimakhos; it was under his auspices, after all, that the Herakleiotai won their freedom (Malakon was in Seleukos’ employ).\textsuperscript{168} Yet there is a change in Seleukos at the beginning of the thirteenth book, when Aphrodisios accuses Herakleia of hostility and Khamaileon’s embassy is rejected.

\textsuperscript{167} See also Xenophon (Anab. 6.2.2), Mela 1.19 and Pliny NH 4.27.2.3. Nymphis may have been the source for Plutarch’s account of the Spartan regent Pausanias visiting the Herakleian cave (Mor. 555c and Kimon 6). See G. Busolt, Vol III.1, 89 and R. Billows BNJ 432 Commentary to F3.

If Memnon’s treatment of this episode is indeed based on Nymphis’s history, as is suggested by the appearance in the narrative of Nymphis himself (FGrHist 434 F1.7.2), the attitudinal shift toward Seleukos occurred after the publication of the first edition of his local history, permeating the general history on which he now started to work and eventually spilling over into the final book of the local history. Nymphis’s hostility was likely due both to the militancy of Seleukos’s son, Antiokhos (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.9.1, 9.3, and 10.1-2), which tainted Nymphis’s account of Seleukos himself, and to Seleukos’s treatment of the Herakleiote embassy after the liberation of the polis. We cannot divine Khamaiileon’s original intent in misquoting in the presence of Seleukos a line of dialogue from Plato’s favorite poet, Sophron—Ἡρακλῆς κάρρων Σέλευκε (for Ἡρακλῆς τευχῆς κάρρων ἢς). What stands out in Nymphis’s account of the embassy is Seleukos’s uncouth rudeness: he recognized neither the allusion nor the dialect! Nymphis used such anti-intellectualism also to characterize other enemies of Herakleia: before setting out on a life of tyranny Klearkhos notably rejected Philosophy and intellectual pursuits; and Satyros was completely uninterested in learning (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.2.2).

Yet Nymphis’s jibe at Seleukos, with its subtle accusations of barbarism, should not suggest that Nymphis portrayed Seleukos superficially. Andrea Primo has recently seen a reflection of Seleukid court tradition in the sequel to this episode, where an old Seleukos, struck with nostalgia for Macedon, leaves his kingdom to his son and heads west, where he is promptly murdered by Keraunos (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.8.1). It

169 According to Plutarch, Pyrrhos is able to understand the Spartan Mandrokleidas’s retort, “αἱ μὲν ἐσσὶ τὰ γέ θεός, οὐδὲν μὴ πάθωμεν ὁ γὰρ ἄδικα ἢ καὶ ἀνθρώπος, ἐσσεται καὶ τεῦ κάρρων ἄλλος” (Pyrrh. 26.11). One would expect the same linguistic sensitivity from Seleukos.

170 This anecdote, as we have said, is related both by the Souda and by Aelian; and because Aelian elsewhere reproduces almost what Athenaeus quotes about the tyrant Dionysius and cites Nymphis’s general history, it is not unlikely that his source for Klearkhos’s rejection of philosophy was also Nymphis.

171 2009a, 112-113.

172 According to A. Primo (2009a, 114 and 117), Nymphis was the conduit of this official tradition, and it was Nymphis himself who influenced the account in Appian (Syr. 59-61) and Pausanias (1.19).
is unclear to what extent Nymphis meant to cast Seleukos in a sympathetic light by retaining the story of his unsuccessful nostos, but it can hardly be separated from the event that immediately preceded it: Nymphis’s own repatriation (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.7.3). Whereas Nymphis was welcomed home by his polis ἐν ὀμοίαις ἡδοναῖς καὶ εὐφροσύναις, his new fellow citizens embracing him πλοφρόνως and ensuring that he and his companions be well taken care of, and whereas Nymphis’s return led to the re-establishment of the ancestral politeia at Herakleia (434 F1.7.4), Seleukos found his homecoming crowned only by his death. Nymphis succeeded because he returned to a polis that had recently rediscovered its liberty and freed itself from tyranny; Seleukos, on the other hand, could not escape his life of regents and regicide.

The second edition of Nymphis’s Περὶ Ἡρακλείας followed the history of Herakleia from the return of the exiles through the rise of the Seleukids, Bithynia, and, most important, the Gauls. The last event he narrated was Nymphis’s successful diplomatic exchange with the Gauls and the beautification of the polis by the euergetic Ptolemy III. By this point, Herakleia has indeed established itself, thanks in no small part to Nymphis himself, as an autonomous entity alongside its Pontic neighbors. Yet in the thirteenth book another theme emerges: the success of Herakleia depends far less on martial prowess than on diplomacy, often involving the exchange of money. As we see from Memnon, as protection against the Gauls, Herakleia gave 4,000 staters to Byzantium (11.1) and later a gift of grain to Mithridates (16.2); it manages to reclaim Kieros, Tieion, and Thynia not through might but by spending a good deal of money.

173 What is incontestable is the importance that Nymphis gave to Seleukos in the narrative of his city’s history: see A. Primo 2009a, 112-113 for the relative lack of attention given to Seleukos in the accounts of Douris, Euphantos of Olynthos, and Agatharkhides (112-113).

174 Herakleia periodically makes heroic efforts to help one of its allies, but a battle rarely results: when it sends thirteen triremes to fight on behalf of Nikomedes against Antiokhos, for example, the two navies do not engage in battle (10.2-3); and even the forty triremes that Herakleia sends to Byzantium against Antiokhos II comes to naught (15).
and Nymphis succeeds in ridding Herakleia of the Gauls only through bribery (16.2).176 According to Nymphis, moreover, the Herakleiotai had withstood the Athenian Empire through diplomacy not through violence (Just. 16.3). And in the Monopoly War that broke out in the mid-third century among Byzantium, Kallatis, and Istria (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.13), Herakleia’s immediate response was arbitration. Kallatis paid no heed to Herakleia’s suggestions, as it turns out, persevered in its attempt to gain control of the emporion Tomis, and, as a result, succumbed to its enemies. The exemplum provided by the ruin of Herakleia’s own colony had a clear message. Herakleia’s path from vassal state to independent power would depend not only on its finances but on its flexibility as well.

B) MEMNON

Thanks to Photius’s lengthy epitome,177 we know more about Memnon’s local history than almost any other lost historiographical work; about Memnon, however, we know nothing. For it is only Photius who makes any mention of the historian or his history, and Photius, elsewhere not averse to providing biographical information about his authors, is here completely silent. This is because Memnon would naturally have revealed details about his own life in his preface, a part of the work to which Photius had no access: “I have read the historical book of Memnon,” Photius tells his brother, “from the ninth logos to the sixteenth (FGrHist 434 T1).”178 Some conclusions about Memnon

175 Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Ἑρακλεώται τὴν τε Κίερον καὶ τὴν Τἰον ἀνεσώσαντο καὶ τὴν Θυνίδα γήν, πολλὰ τῶν χρημάτων δαπανήσαντες.
176 Indeed, when Seleukos’s general Hermogenes attacks not long after Koroupedion and Herakleia makes a “pact” with him (9.2), money surely exchanged hands: τῶν δὲ Ἑρακλεωτῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν προσβεβευσμένων τῆς χώρας ἀναχωρεῖ καὶ φιλίαν συντίθεται.
177 On Photius’s methods and the criteria according to which he selected particular works to epitomize for his brother, see e.g. J. Klinkenberg 1913, G.L. Kustas 1953, W.T. Treadgold 1980, and D. Mendels 1986. His Epitome of Memnon is one of the longest; other lengthy epitomes are of Konon (186), Ktesias’ Persika (72), Olympiodorus (80), and Theophylaktos (65).
178 Whenever Photius had access to this prefatory material, he included biographical data. So in the case of Appian (57) Photius repeats information found at the end of the preface to the Roman History (Prol. 62),
can be inferred from the text itself. He was undoubtedly Greek. This was the language in which he wrote, after all; he describes the temple on the Roman Capitoline as dedicated to Zeus (18.10); and tellingly deems βάρβαροι several groups of non-Greeks (and non-Romans), the Gauls (FGrHist 434 F1.11.2, 11.5, 24.4), the Pontic Kings and their armies (24.4, 29.9), and the citizens of Kabeira (30.2). He is also clearly knowledgeable about the Black Sea region; this may only be a consequence of his sources, but it can be matched, I think, with a general ignorance of the geography of the West. On several occasions, too, Memnon betrays a lack of familiarity with Rome and Roman history. Explanations of well-known personages, like Sulla, may only be a reflection of what Memnon took to be the knowledge base of his audience, ostensibly his and for Diodorus (70), he retains the brief autobiographical comment from the end of the preface (1.4.4). In some cases, Photius is explicit about his reliance on such authorial statements: see his epitome of the history of Praxagoras (62), for example, and of Kephalion (68), who, he regrets, said nothing as to his family or provenance “as he ought to have done.” Photius’s comment about Memnon’s history, that η δὲ πραγματεία έσα περί την Ποντικῆν Ἰανδράκειαν συμνηνέθη σκοπον, ἀναγράψας προτίθεται, does not (contra P. Desideri 1967, 373) suggest that Photius had read Memnon’s preface (before inexplicably losing access to the first eight books)—indeed Photius’s observation could well have been based solely on a perusal of the contents of Books Nine through Sixteen of Memnon’s history—nor, for that matter, does his judgment on Memnon’s digressions, viz. οὐδὲ πρὸς ταύτην (πρόθεσις) δὲ ἐπά το συχνόν άσκολλήνει, ἀλλὰ το κατεπέσεν επαμνηθεία ἐγήσα πάλαν ενεπιστροφός τῆς προτεθέος αὐτήν κατ’ ἀρχάς γνώμης, since “κατ’ ἀρχάς” refers to the beginning not of the work but to the digression. Photius’s Epitome does, however, preserve one geographical error about the Pontos, but this is the fault of Photius not Memnon: for we read that Triarius led his army from Prousias Epithalassios, which was at one point the polis Kieros and the location where the Argo landed, Hylas disappeared, and Herakles commenced his search (28.6). Prousias Epithalassios was formerly called Kios, not Kieros; and Memnon knew this (19.1; 32.1). For Prousias, Prousias on the Hypios, and Prousias Epithalassios, see Strabo 12.4.3; Jacoby, IIIB Noten, 281 ad. loc.; M. Janke 1963, 93-94; and G. Cohen 1995, 403-409. When Herakleia dispatches two triremes in the late 90s BCE to help the Romans against their allies, the Marsi, Paeligni, and Marrucini, these tribes are described as living in Libya on the borders of Gadez (21). Jacoby finds this ignorance unimaginable for a writer living in the early Empire (FGrHist IIIB Noten, 173 n. 30). But it is far more difficult to see this as Photius’s mistake; for he was clearly interested in the Social War, and his epitome of Diodoros on the Marsic War—where he gets the location correct (244)—is quite detailed. On Photius’s apparent interest in the Marsic War, see D. Mendels 1986, 206.
fellow countrymen, but he also exhibits ignorance about Roman institutions. He describes Scipio Africanus, allegedly in an official document, as ἀνθύπατος (proconsul), and he appears to use “Italians” interchangeably with “Romans” (22.13, 27.7, 28.5, 37.2). In addition, Memnon has Thrasymerides supplicate the Romans not in the Senate, as we would expect, but before the assembly, and it is before the assembly, too, that Cotta is tried (39.2). It is not an unreasonable assumption, then, that Memnon was himself a Herakleiotē. Neither his access to previous local histories of Herakleia (of Nymphis certainly and perhaps also of Kallistratos) nor the praise he continually heaps on Herakleia and its citizens can help illuminate his nationality. His local patriotism, along with his attempt to excuse Herakleia from any fault during the Mithridatic Wars, can only help identify his intended audience.

---

183 He takes pains to explain why Sulla would be afraid at Marius’s return from exile: τῶν ἀντιστασιωτῶν γὰρ ἐκεῖνος (25.1). But Photius had little reason to explain to his brother the identities of Sulla and Marius, given his earlier summary of Appian’s book on the Civil War, where he says without further comment, ἔμπειρεξέται δὲ τοῖς ἐμφυλίοις πρῶτον μὲν τὰ περὶ Μάριον καὶ Σύλλαν ἄλληλου ἐκπολεμημένους. Cf. Livy 34.43.
184 As L. Yarrow points out (2006, 141-142).
185 His local patriotism is focused in particular on the role of the polis on the international stage: it is a Herakleiotē in Seleukos’s army who kills Lysimakhos at Koroupedion (F1.5.7); the Herakleiotai army fights most bravely in the war against the Bithynian Zipoites and manages to secure the retrieval and proper burial of their dead (9.5); and they prove themselves heroic in the Bithynian civil war fighting against the pretender Zelas (14.2). The contribution of Heraklea’s navy, meanwhile, chiefly the eight-banked Ἀσσυρακός, contends with signal prowess on behalf of Antigonus against Ptolemaios Keraunos (8.5-6); two Herakleian triremes are praised for their eleven-year contribution to Rome during the Social War (21); and Herakleiotai attack Pontic ships and rescue the Khian captives onboard (23); and Herakleian ships, albeit only partially manned, manage to sink a Rhodian navy, which had the reputation of surpassing others εμπειρία τε καὶ ἀνδρεία (34.7). Heraklea also succeeds in repelling two difficult sieges, that of Proussias I of Bithynia—the Herakleiotai are responsible even for maiming him (19.2-3)—and that of the Gauls (20); and it manages to withstand the Roman siege for two years, succumbing only after a betrayal from within (34). Heraklea is furthermore able to negotiate a treaty between Rome and Antiochus III (18.8, 10); it is a Herakleiotē, Thrasymerides, who convinces the Roman Senate of Cotta’s misbehavior in the East (39) and a Herakleiotē, Brithagoras, who manages to become a close friend and constant companion of Julius Caesar himself (40.3-4); last, Heraklea’s agora was graced with one of the most celebrated statues in all the world, Herakles atop a pyramid replete with golden club and quiver of arrows (35.8).
186 He maintains that the polis had tried to remain neutral but was compelled to provide supplies to Mithridates (27.5); the murder of the Roman δημοσιῶν is really the fault of only one very rash citizen (27.6); and the polis opened its doors to the Pontic garrison only after internal betrayal—the leader of the pro-Mithridatic party, Lamakhos, threw a big feast outside the city walls, got everyone drunk, and convinced them to leave open the gates (29.3-5). Memnon goes on to argue that the Romans were unaware
Memnon’s date is as difficult to determine as his provenance. He clearly wrote at some point between the death of Brithagoras in 47 BCE, the last event described in Photius’s epitome, and the floruit of Photius in the ninth century CE, after Nymphis, and probably after Promathidas and Domitios Kallistratos as well.\textsuperscript{189} If Book Sixteen was his last book and the death of Brithagoras the culminating event, a date in the late-first century BCE would be plausible.\textsuperscript{190} Yet we do not know the original length of Memnon’s history. Photius says that he had read only Books Nine through Sixteen, but the phrase with which he concludes the \textit{Epitome}, τὰς δὲ πρώτας η'/ιστορίας καὶ τὰς μετὰ τὴν ι'/ούπω εἰπεῖν εἰς θέαν ἡμῶν ἀφιγμένας ἐχομεν, is ambiguous. Still, if he were certain that the original work exceeded sixteen books, he would likely have said so; we must then conclude that Photius simply did not know whether the sixteenth was the last book, that the final event described in Book Sixteen failed to suggest a fitting end to the work as a whole.\textsuperscript{191} This is not surprising: very few extant Greek histories conclude in such a way as to signal categorical finality.\textsuperscript{192} Yet there is nothing anticlimactic about the honorable death of a leading Herakleioc politician (and friend to Caesar)—Memnon thought the event an appropriate ending for Book Sixteen after all\textsuperscript{193}—and when viewed

\textsuperscript{189} For, as Müller noted, Memnon is completely absent from the scholia to Apollonius, which do allude to Promathidas, Nymphis, and Domitios Kallistratos \textit{(FHG} III, 525; see Jacoby \textit{FGrHist} IIIB \textit{Noten}, 172 n. 6).\textsuperscript{190} Although even secure knowledge would provide only a terminus post quem. I have said earlier that, as far as we can tell, local histories written by natives tend to culminate in the recent past, \textit{i.e}., the era of the historian himself. This cannot of course be a consistent rule, nor do we know if Memnon was indeed a native historian. We may recall the case of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who wrote his local history of Rome under Augustus \textit{(AR} 1.7.2) but chose as a concluding date the beginning of the First Punic War \textit{(AR} 1.8.2).\textsuperscript{191} See Appendix I to this chapter\textsuperscript{192} Hence, to say nothing of Thucydides, even the histories of Herodotus and Xenophon have sometimes been thought incomplete and their final paragraphs endlessly debated.\textsuperscript{193} As we shall see, Memnon did not end his books arbitrarily: Book Ten, for example, ended with the death of the tyrant Timotheus (F1.3.3); Book Twelve with the death of Lysimakhos (5.7); and Book Fourteen with the treaty of friendship between Herakleia and Rome (18.10). Note that the last event of Livy’s local history is the death of Drusus \textit{(Per}. 142).
as the culmination of the local history, as we shall see, Brithagoras’s expiration does offer a certain symmetry.  

Given the difficulty of drawing conclusions about Memnon’s date from Photius’s personal remarks, clues may be sought from the body of the Epitome itself. For, although Memnon’s original text is unrecoverable, some of his language has undoubtedly been retained by Photius, whose habit, in the lengthier of the epitomes at any rate, was not simple periphrasis. In the case of Memnon, moreover, Photius was particularly attuned to matters of style. “The history is sensible,” he says at the end of his summary of Book Sixteen, “and it follows a plain style, with attention given to clarity . . . And it employs a conventional vocabulary, although occasionally varying the idiom.” And Photius clearly took pains to record verbatim apothegmata preserved by Memnon—the remark of Khamalileon to Seleukos (F1.7.1), of Tigranes about the size of the Roman forces (F1.38.4), and of Carbo to Cotta before the Roman Senate (F1.39.3)—as well as certain diplomatic exchanges, like Cornelius Scipio’s letter to the Herakleiotai (18.8) and that of Tigranes to Lucullus (F31.3). He preserved many of the names of individuals, some of whom surely meant very little in ninth-century Constantinople (names of Herakleiotai,  

194 I do not agree with L. Yarrow that this makes for an “awkward” conclusion (2006, 355). It is true that if Memnon had lived to observe the brief rule of Adiantorix and Herakleia incorporated into the Roman Empire as the province Bithynia et Pontos (Strab. 12.3.6), we would expect him to have said so (and thus to have done so in a subsequent book). But Memnon may well have published his history between 47 BCE and the Battle of Actium. This is the opinion of R. Laqueur (1927, col. 1098), which Jacoby considers “sicher falsch” (FGrHist IIIB Noten, 172, n.6). Of course, Memnon’s task, like that seemingly of Thucydides or indeed of Livy, may also have been interrupted by his death.  

195 This is clear in his epitomes of extant historical works, like the Arkhaiologiai of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (83) and Josephus (238) and the History of Theophylaktos Simokattes (65).  

196 ἕστι δὲ ἡ συγγραφὴ νουνεχής μὲν καὶ τοῦ ἱσχυροῦ μεταδόθης χαρακτήρα, οὐ μὴν οὖδὲ τοῦ σαφοῦς ἁμέλουσα . . . καὶ λέξεις δὲ, εἰ μὴ ποιοῖς ἐξαλλάττουσας, τὰς συνήθεις χρᾶται. By (λέξει) εἰ μὴ ποιοὶς ἐξαλλαττοῦσας, Photius must mean that Memnon at times uses unidiomatic expressions; this is how Aristotle uses the word ἐξαλλάττω (Rhet. 1406a15, 1404b8), and it is supported by other occurrences in Photius, in particular in his description of Klearhkos’s sartorial choices (F1.1).  

197 Γράφει δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς Λεύκολλον τοὺς εἰρημένους λόγους ἔχουσαν, ἣς παρώξυνε τὸν δεξάμενον· οὐ γὰρ ἐνέγραψεν αὐτὸν ἀυτοχρότορα, ἐγκαλῶν ὅτι μηδὲ αὐτὸς ἐκείνον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς βασιλέα βασιλέων προφηγόρευεν.  

198 Aside from the tyrants (Klearhkos, Satyros, Timotheus, Dionysius, Amastris, Klearhkos II, and Oxathres) and those Herakleiotai renowned for their literary and intellectual pursuits (Khion, Nymphis, and Khamalileon), Photius preserves the names of Khion’s associates, Leon and Euxenon (1.3), Malakon, who
of the rulers around Black Sea and their commanders, and also of numerous Romans) and Memnon’s precise figures, as well: numbers of years of rule and life (F1.1.4, 2.5, 4.8, 6.1, 12.4-6, 22.2, 35.9, 38.1; 40.40), sizes of troops (F1.21, 22.6, 22.13, 27.3, 29.4, 29.8, 29.9, 38.1, 38.4), of fleets (F1.10.2, 15, 27.2, 27.5, 33.1, 34.6-7), number of the dead or captured (F1.22.9, 22.7, 28.1, 34.9), amounts of money or gifts of grain (F1.16.3, 17, 34.8), and distances (F1.29.1).

It is very likely then that some words, phrases, and sentences from the Epitome are Memnon’s own. Several passages more readily suggest themselves as candidates: the thick descriptions of Satyros’s cancer (2.4), for example, and Dionysius’s fat-piercing needles (3.7), both probably ultimately from Nymphis; the wounding of Prousias (15.3); and the accoutrements of the famous statue of Herakles looted in Cotta’s siege (35.8). Certain words, especially technical vocabulary, notably

199 Photius preserves not only the well-known names of the Diadokhoi, but also the names of Aphrodisios, Seleukos’s dioiketes (7.1); Patroklos, Antiokhos’s general (9.1); and Hermogenes, who worked under Patroklos (9.1). He also retains the names of two Gallic leaders, Leonnorios and Luturios (11.3), a Eumenes who at one point had control of the polis Amastris (9.4), and a series of Bithynian kings, Doidalsos, Boteiras, Bas, and Zipoites (6.3), Nikomedes (12.4-5), Zeilas (14.1-2), Prousias (19.1), and then Nikomedes, son of Nikomedes and Nysa, whom the Romans appointed as king (22.5). Along the way, we read of the estranged brother of Nikomedes I, Zipoites (9.3), and his wife, Etazeta (14.1). Of the Pontic kings, we hear of Mithridates, with whom the Herakleiotai formed an alliance soon after the death of Lysimakhos (7.2); his son, Ariobarzanes (9.4), and grandson Mithridates II (16.2), and then, of course, the Mithridates against whom the Romans so bitterly fought (22.1 and passim), along with his own sons Mithridates (24.4) and Makhares (37.4). Photius preserves the names of Mithridates’ brother-in-law Ariarathes and his nephew Arathes (22.1); his allies, like the Armenian Tigranes (22.4) and the Kresatas whom he tried to set up as a rival to Nikomedes as the king of Bithynia (22.5); and his generals, like Arkhelaus (22.6), Menophanes (22.7), Taxilles (22.12), Dorylaus (23.1), Diophantos (24.4), Menander (24.4), Hermiaios (28.3), Marius (?) (28.3), Konnakorex (29.4), Leonippos (37.1), Seleukos (37.1), and Kleokhares (37.1).

200 In the précis of early Roman history, we hear of Camillus fighting the Gauls (18.1) and Lucius Cornelius Scipio (18.3), while in the body of the history itself, Photius names Publius Aemilius (18.6), Lucius Cornelius Scipio (18.7), Publius Cornelius Scipio (18.8), Sulla and Marius (22.6), Manius (Aequilius) (22.7), Lucius Hortensius (22.13), Valerius Flaccus (24.1), C. Flavius Fimbria (24.1), L. Licinius Murena (26.1), M. Aurelius Cotta (27.1), L. Lucullus (27.1), Barba (28.5), C. Valerius Triarius (28.5), M. Pompeius (30.2), App. Claudius Pulcher (31.2), Censorinus (37.2), C. Papirus Carbo (39.5), and Julius Caesar (40.3). Some of these names, of course, would have been well known to Photius; others appear only in Memnon.

201 See H. Janke 1963, 139-144, and D. Dueck 2006, 49. Other categories of numbers included the quantity of rowers accommodated by the large Herakleiotri triremes (F1.8.5), the seventeen leaders of the Gauls (F1.11.3), and the 8,000 settlers who resettle Heraklea after it’s the Roman rout (F1.40.1).
appear in Photius only in his *Epitome* of Memnon and his *Lexicon*. And some words, finally, are used in the *Epitome* of Memnon with a unique sense. In one case, as Liv M. Yarrow has recently suggested, this eccentricity may help to date Memnon. For the word αὐτοκράτωρ with reference to Roman generals is quite extraordinary, even in the Greek East, after the reign of Augustus. And it is a word that Photius so uses only in his epitomes of Memnon and Diodoros everywhere else, it is the Emperor who is intended (*e.g.* Bibl. 64, 65, 71, 80, 94, 216, and 217). If this argument stands, and given the lack of any firm evidence suggesting a later date, I am inclined to see Memnon as a contemporary of Diodorus, to see the death of Brithagoras as the intended conclusion, or at any rate the terminal event of Memnon’s local history.

Photius begins his epitome by characterizing the contents of Books Nine through Sixteen: ἡ δὲ πραγματεία ὡσα περὶ τὴν Ποντικὴν Ἡράκλειαν συνιηνέχθη σκοπόν, ἀναγράψαι προτίθεται (T1). Memnon’s task to record “what happened in Pontic Herakleia,” as Photius goes on to note, is largely biographical: τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἑπακτρίς, used for a skiff (40.1); χελώνη, the name of a tortoise-shaped siege-work (34.1); and the abstract noun δημοσιωνία (27.5-6). Indeed this word is exceedingly rare, appearing, so far as I can tell, only twice in Memnon and in two inscriptions dated roughly to the period that Memnon is here describing, one from Ephesos (Ephesos 4.5) and the other from the Troad (IMT Skami/Neb Taeler 254).

So φοράδην, used when the wounded Prousias withdraws from the siege of Herakleia (an adverb defined in the *Lexicon* as ὁρμητικῶς φερόμενος); γωρυτός, used in the description of the statue of Herakles (in the *Lexicon*, θήκη τόξων); and κέρκουροι, used to describe a contingent of Mithridates’ fleet (27.2), which in the *Lexicon* is defined as εἶδος πλοίου οὕτως καλοῦσιν. And when some of the ships laden with loot from Herakleia are driven into shallows on their way to Rome (36), the North Wind is called ἀπαρκτίας (although everywhere else Photius uses “Boreas”; see codices 63, 166, 230, 245, 250)—in his *Lexicon*, he gives this as the correct word for the North Wind—and the shoals are τὰ τενάγη (which in his *Lexicon* he defines as: διάβροχοι· κάθυγροι· πηλώδεις· ἐπιπολάζοντος ὑδάτων· καὶ βοτάνης ἐπιφαινομένης τῶ ὕδατι).

Could the phrase with which Memnon describes Brithagoras’s attempts to persuade Caesar (οὐκ ἀφίστατο μέντοι γε Βριθαγόρας, ἀλλὰ περὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ὀικουμένην αὐτός τε καὶ Πρόπυλος συμπεριαγόμενος τὸι Καίσαρι ἐβλέπετο παρ’ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐπισημειώμενον τὸν αὐτοκράτορα τῆς λεπρῆσεως αὐτὸν ἀποδέχονται) suggest that Memnon had actually seen such fawning in person?
Indeed, while Herakleiotai in Memnon at times act en masse, it is individuals who most frequently advance the action of the narrative. This is clearest in the first part of the Epitome (Books Nine to Thirteen), where the narrative is structured around the reigns of the tyrants, but even in the period after the fall of the tyranny Memnon emphasizes the contributions of leading politicians, like Khamailon and Nymphis. This trend continues in Books Fourteen to Sixteen (where Memnon cannot have followed Nymphis): it is the kidnapping of Silenos and Satyros by Arkhelaos that leads to Herakleian support for Mithridates (27.5); one Herakleiote, Lamakhos, betrays Herakleia to Mithridates (29.3); Thrasymedes alone obtains the freedom of the Herakleiote captives (39.2); and along with Brithagoras (35.3 and 40) and his son Propyllos (40.1 and 3), it is Thrasymedes who boosts Herakleia’s fortune after the Roman invasion. Just as Photius observes, moreover, Memnon narrated the deaths as well as the lives of many of these individuals. Non-Herakleiote individuals also make an important contribution to the action, in some cases with biographical detail: Nikomedes (9.3, 10.1-2, 11.2, 11.5, 12.1-6, 14.1), for example, Prousias I (19.1) and, most prominent, Mithridates, whose early life and career is given especial attention (22 and passim).

208 The text here is not as straightforward as we would like. Photius may mean that Memnon described the actions, characters, deaths, and sayings of both tyrants and other prominent Herakleiotai—this, after all, is supported by the content of the epitome itself—but this is not quite implied by the Greek. Photius says that Memnon’s πράγματες recounted the tyrants of the polis, their actions and their characters, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους βίους, the deaths that they experienced and their sayings. This is why Müller suggested that the correct phrase was in fact καὶ τοὺς αὐτῶν βίους. We know in any case that Memnon narrated the lives and deaths and characters of non-Herakleioti individuals.

209 Notably, it is the Herakleiotai who recover their confidence after the death of Lysimakhos (6.1) and who regain their former nobility (7.4), who help to form the so-called Northern League (7.1), who recover Kieros, Ticion, and Thynia (9.4) and who send triremes to Nikomedes (10.2), to Byzantium (14.2), and then to Rome (21).

210 He provides details about the deaths and funerals of the tyrants (Klearkhos, Satyros, Timotheus, Dionysius, Amastris, Klearkhos II, and Oxathres), the deaths of Lamakhos from plague (34.8), and Brithagoras from exhaustion (40.4).

211 Although the death of Mithridates, as we shall see, is notably passed over.
As Photius appreciates, furthermore, Memnon’s portraits of individuals reveal an interest not only in action but also in character. 212 Many of the prominent individuals are categorically good or bad. The χρηστῶι 213 (among whom are Khion, Timotheus, Dionysius, Thrasymedes, and Brithagoras) tend to be μεγαλόφρωοι, 214 φιλάνθρωοι, 215 and πρᾶος, 216 and they are marked first and foremost by the boon they provide to Herakleia and the Herakleiotai. So Timotheus eradicates debt and offers interest-free loans; empties the jails of the innocent, and fights bravely against his enemies (3.1-3); 217 Dionysius secures Herakleia’s position in the face of the Diadokhoi, his marriage connections bringing the polis great wealth and εὐδαιμονία (4); Thrasymedes does all he can to regenerate Herakleia after its destruction by the Romans, leaving the polis αὐξομένη (40.1-3); and Brithagoras spends twelve years dogging Caesar in an attempt to boost the city’s fortunes (40.3-4). And when they die, the good are mourned: πόθος and πένθος are aroused by the passing both of Timotheus (3.2)—his brother Dionysius pours tears from his eyes and lamentations from his heart and prepares for him an elaborate funeral of great expense and pomp (3.3)—and of Dionysius himself (4.8), while Brithagoras’s passing provokes μέγα πένθος τῇ πατρίδι (40.4). 218

The κακοί, on the other hand, among whom are Klearhos, Satyros, Klearhos II, Oxathres, Ptolemaios Keraunos, Mithridates, Lamakhos, Konnakorex, and Cotta, are

212 See D. Dueck 2006, 46-48. Memnon’s emphasis on biography may not in fact have been unique in Herakleian local historiography. The Souda refers to Timogenes’ history, after all, as Περὶ Ἁρακλείας τῆς ἐν τοῖς Πόντοις καὶ τῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς λογίων ἀνδρῶν (FGrHist 435 T1).

213 The word is applied only explicitly to Timotheus (3.1) and Dionysius (4.8), however.

214 Khion (1.3) and Timotheus (3.2), notably.

215 Satyros is marked by the absence of this trait (2.2), while his nephew Timotheus twice receives the praise (3.1, 3.2).

216 Timotheus (3.1) and Dionysius (4.8).

217 Of all characters in Photius’s Epitome of Memnon’s history, Timotheus receives the highest praise (3.1-2).

218 The Herakleiotai seem on the whole rather a lamentative and histrionic bunch: Brithagoras pleads to Konnakorex μετὰ πολλῆς οἰκτισαμένου δεήσεως (35.3), Thrasymedes before the Roman senate μετ’ οἰμωγῆς καὶ δακρύων, while his fellow Herakleiotai lugubriously proffer olive branches (39.3).
marked by cruelty and savagery. They commit unnatural acts—Lysimakhos murders his son (5.6); Klearkhos and Oxathres their mother (5.3); Mithridates his parents and brother (22)—exhibit ἀλαζονεία; and reveal a disinterest in intellectual pursuits.

And the bad suffer terrible deaths. Klearkhos dies πικρῶς from the wounds inflicted by Khion and his associates (1.3), in torment for two days from πικρῶν ἀλγηδόνων (1.4). Satyros wastes away gradually from a disease χαλεπώτατος (2.4)—Memnon, perhaps following closely the text of Nymphis, describes in unpleasant detail the cancer that spread between his groin and scrotum towards τὰ ἔνδον, pouring forth ἱχῶρες . . . δύσοιστον πωέουσαι so vile as to drive even the doctors from his side and endures συνεχεῖς ὁδύναι καὶ δριμεῖα. Even Lamakhos, the Herakleiote who betrayed Herakleia to Mithridates, suffers a long and painful death from the plague: ἐν οἷς καὶ Λάμαχος πικροτέρῳ καὶ μακροτέρῳ τῶν ἄλλων ὀλέθρῳ διέφθαρτο (34.9).

Memnon in fact views the deaths of bad individuals as comeuppance for their crimes in life. Klearkhos is tormented at the moment of his death by visions of his victims: τοοούτων φασόματων—εἰδώλα δὲ τὰ φαντάσματα ἦν ὄν ἐκεῖνος μιαφόνως ἀνηιρήκει (2.4). At Satyros’s death, we read, ἐδίδου μὲν καὶ οὗτος, ὡσπερ καὶ Κλέαρχος, τελευτῶν τοὺς ἄρμοις ἐννοεῖν δίκας ἀναιτεῖσθαι ὃν ὃς μᾶς καὶ παρανόμως τοὺς πολίτας διέθεσαν (2.4). And, just as Klearkhos II and Oxathres arranged for the murder of their mother by a μηχανή δεινή (5.2), so too are they killed

---

219 Klearkhos is ὦμός, μιαφόνος, βιαιός (1); Satyros is κακιστός and defined by his excessive ὠμότης (2); Klearkhos II and Oxarthes exhibited κακονομία and committed the μιαρώτατον ἔργον (5.2); Ptolemaios Keraunos by his own hands committed the μίασμα of Agathokles’ murder (5.6), is κακος (8.3), perpetrated πολλά παράνομα, and is marked by ὠμότης (8.8); Mithridates was φονικώτατος since boyhood (22.2); Konnakorex was marked by βία (24.4); and Cotta acted μετὰ πάσης ὠμότητος (35.7) and δι’ ὠμότατος (39.2).
220 Recall, too, the strange behavior of Satyros (reminiscent of the Athenian tyrant Peisistratos) to avoid at all costs begetting a child with his wife (2.3).
221 Klearkhos (1.1) and Mithridates (22.3).
222 We can recall that it was Klearkhos’s one redeeming deed to have founded the first library at Herakleia (1), that Satyros is described as even worse than his brother because he was καὶ μαθημάτων τῶν τε κατά φιλοσοφίαν καὶ τῶν παντὸς ἐλευθερίου ἄλλος παντελῶς υπάρξῃ ἀπαράδεκτον. and that Seleukos is criticized for not understanding Khamaileon’s Doricism (7.1).
by Lysimakhos διὰ πολλῶν τε μιχανῶν καὶ τῶν τοῦ λανθάνειν στρατηγικῶν—he feigns fatherly love in order to carry out the assassination—and μητρικῆς ἀπαιτήσας μιαφονίας δίκας (5.3). The same thing applies to non-natives, as well. After arranging the murder of his own son, Lysimakhos finds that this act has earned him the hatred of his subjects and leads directly to his own death at Koroupedion (5.7). Ptolemaios Keraunos, who effected the murder of Agathokles and then of his own patron, Seleukos, is killed by the Gauls in a manner that befitted his own wickedness (8.8). When Zipoites, the King of Bithynia, attacks Herakleia just after Koroupedion, his army suffers as much harm as they bring (6.3); the Gauls lose two-thirds their force in their siege of Herakleia (20); and it is the Pontic garrison at Herakleia who succumbs most to the plague, losing one-third of its number to the disease (34.9). Even when spared from death, maltreatment of Herakleia brings punishment: Prousias is crippled during his attempted siege of Herakleia (19), and Cotta is expelled from the senate as a result of his (39.3). 223 Even the ships procured to carry Herakleia’s treasures off to Rome end up sinking in the sea (36).

Yet Memnon’s characterizations avoid stereotype. Wealth and luxury, for example, are not in themselves morally charged: his affluence makes Dionysius fat and lazy but not a bad ruler (4.5). Nor does Memnon avail himself of the trope whereby a dynasty grows more corrupt with each successive generation. The two “good” tyrants of Herakleia, Timotheus and Dionysius, are the sons of one of the worst, Klearkhos; while the sons of Dionysius are themselves murderous and poor managers of the polis. The Bithynian king, Zipoites, meanwhile was a staunch enemy of Herakleia (6.3), while his son Nikomedes was an ally and a great help in the face of external threat (9.3), and he even made the Herakleiotai joint guardians of his children at his death (14.1). For that

223 Given Memnon’s evident interest in crime and punishment and the inheritance of guilt, he missed out on a gem in the subsequent fate of C. Papius Carbo, who tried Cotta before the senate. As Dio records (36.40.3ff; cf. Bal. Max. 5.4.4), Cotta, who had previously tried P. Oppius for bribery, was consequently tried by Carbo, who became governor of Bithynia, behaved just as wrongly as had Cotta, and was tried (and convicted) by Cotta’s son (ca. 58 BCE).
matter, Memnon’s characters tend not to remain static. Lysimakhos first appears in the narrative as an ally, fighting the Getai alongside Kleitarkhos II (5.1) and avenging the murder of Amastris (5.3); and when he assumes power after the assassination of Klearkhos II and Oxathres, he even allows the citizens to rule themselves democratically. But in his old age he is corrupted by his wife, Arsinoe, turning a blind eye to the crooked Herakleides; and it is under Arsinoe’s influence (and that of her brother, Ptolemaios Keraunos) that he kills his own son. His rule is described as a tyranny (6.1), and his death at Koroupedion by way of a Herakleian spear brings joy and freedom to the oppressed polis. And Seleukos, as we have seen, comes on to the scene first as the agent of Herakleian liberty, but grows suddenly hostile and rebuffs Herakleia’s attempts at negotiation. The Gauls, for their part, appear first as allies, even protectors of the Black-Sea democracies (11.2, 4), but then become marauders (14.3 and 16.2-3) and then besiegers (20.1-2). And of course the Romans, once allies of Herakleia (18.6-8), become enemies (27.5-6) and besiege (32, 34) and destroy the polis, even murdering Herakleiotai who had taken refuge in the temples and by the altars (35.5).

The last aspect of Memnon’s history on which Photius comments is narrative structure. The συγγραφή takes care, Photius says, to avoid digressions, and its detours do not last long; ever mindful of the matter at hand, the historian quickly redirects his narrative to its initial purpose (T1). Photius’s observation is borne out by his epitome. Memnon’s digressions—most often, as we shall see, they are themselves local histories—dispatch their business with economy; but on the whole, the action proceeds chronologically, from the tyranny of Klearkhos in 364 to the death of Brithagoras in

---

224 At times, however, Memnon will pursue a particular thread beyond the chronological bounds of his narrative. So, for example, after following Seleukos to Macedon, he narrates the brief reign of Ptolemaios Keraunos (to his death in 279) before returning to Herakleia ca. 281 (F1.8); and we can note a similar pattern in Memnon’s history of the Bithynian kings (12.6), the attack of the Gauls on Herakleia (20), and the actions of a group of Herakleiotai during the eleven years that they fought on behalf of Rome during the Social War (F1.21).
47. It is of paramount importance, and a notable counterexample to Jacoby’s dictum, that Memnon’s history, like that of Nymphis, was not horographic: there are no dates in accordance to eponymous magistracies or priesthods. The one Olympiad date that Photius does preserve—it comes in the digression on the history of Nikomedieia and probably thus goes back to Nymphis—is actually connected with Megara’s foundation of Astakos (12.2) and must be part of local tradition there (many Black Sea colonies dated their foundations panhellenically, by way of an Olympiad) and not an indication of a cohesive chronological system.

The metronome of Memnon’s narrative is not the year. Time is marked, as in the Ἱερονυμία, by monarchs’ reigns and by durational and relational chronological markers. Klearkhos lived for 58 years and was tyrant for twelve (1.4); Satyros lived for 65 years and was tyrant for seven (2.5); Dionysius lived for 55 years and was tyrant for thirty (4.8); the tyranny lasted in toto 84 years (6.1).226 Events happen ὑστερον (1.5., 3.3., 4.1, 4.9, 5.1, 13.1, 18.7, 21.6, 23.2, 28.10, 30.4, 33.2), μετά ταῦτα (18.8, 22.1), or μετ’ οὖ πολὺν χρόνον (2.4; 4.9; 11.2; 16.1, 18.9, 22.2, 27.1, 37.9); after many years (40.3), after some years (40.1), in the eleventh year (21), in the thirteenth year (22.2), τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ (34.2), and even δευτεραίᾳ (1.4). On occasion, things happen “before” others: shortly before the Herakleiotai asked their colonies for provisions during the Roman siege, Triarius set sail from Nikomedieia (33.1); and the Gauls besieged Herakleia at a time when the Romans had not yet crossed into Asia (20).227 Relational temporal indicators like this tend to overlap with another chronometric category, the synchronism. So, for

225 As we have seen, Jacoby contended that a locality told its history annalistically wherever there was a list of eponymous officials (1949, 87-89; cf. 99). He did suggest, however, that Herakleia was possible an exception (FGrHist IIIB, Text, 256).
226 Memnon reports, moreover, that Boteiras the Bithynian king lived for 76 years; Bas for 71 years, ruling for 50; Zipoites for 76 years ruling for 48 (12.4-5); the siege of the Romans lasted two years (35.9); Mithridates stayed in Armenia for one year and eight months (38.1); Brithagoras remained at Caesar’s side for twelve years (40.4).
227 On the importance of the Roman crossing into Asia as a temporal marker, see Jacoby, FGrHist IIIB Noten, 172 n. 14.
example, Mithridates ordered Arkhelaos to lead an army against Bithynia at the time when Marius and Sulla were vying for control over the Roman politeiai (22.60). There are three extraordinary synchronisms in Photius’s Epitome of Memnon: Klearkhos’s tyranny is dated to the rules of the Persian Kings Artaxerxes and his son Okhos (1.4); Satyros’s tyranny to the kingship of Arkhidamos at Sparta (2.5); and the zenith of the polis Astakos to the tenure of the Bithynian king Doidalso (12.2). If these synchronisms do go back to Memnon, this is yet a further indication that he marked time by the rule of tyrants and kings.

Photius does not of course provide an epitome of Memnon’s first eight books. But since both Memnon and Nymphis took thirteen books to reach the accession of Ptolemy III, and since both eulogized Dionysius at the same place, around the beginning of the twelfth book, it is very likely that Memnon followed Nymphis’s structure. In this case, he too would have devoted the first book to legendary material (the early visitations of Phrixos, Herakles, and the Argonauts), and Books Two through Eight to the period from the foundation of the polis to the coup of Klearkhos. The Epitome does reveal much about the contents of Books Nine through Sixteen, however.

Books Nine and Ten dealt with the 27 years in which Klearkhos, Sathyros, and Timotheus

---

228 It may have been Photius who collated these synchronisms from an external chronography, or, more likely, that they result from Photius’s compression of Memnon’s history. In his narrative of Klearkhos, that is to say, Memnon may simply have recounted interactions between the tyrant and the Persian Kings, and rather than describe in summary fashion the diplomatic exchanges, Photius shortens the notice to a synchronism. We may imagine that he followed the same principle in the case of Sathyros, although here we have no indication of how Arkhidamos entered into Herakleian history.

229 In the case of Nymphis, we know this from the testimony of the Souda FGrHist 432 T1; in the case of Memnon, we can infer it from the fact that there is a natural break in the middle of Photius’s summary of Books Thirteen and Fourteen, which covers the period between 281 and 190, just after a note about Ptolemy, FGrHist 434 F1.18.1)

230 The manuscript of Athenaeus actually says that Nymphis treated Dionysius’s death in his second book (FGrHist 432 F10), but this was easily emended by Müller, whose correction, Jacoby said, was “so gut wie sicher” (FGrHist IIB Text, 265; cf. 260). We know that at some point in the unit of Books Eleven and Twelve, Memnon dealt with Dionysius’s weight, acupuncture, and death and that the episode comes in the middle of Photius’s summary, so likely either at the end of the eleventh book or at beginning of the twelfth (Memnon FGrHist 434 F1.9.1).

231 On Memnon’s use of Nymphis, see Jacoby FGrHist IIB Text, 269-271, and P. Desideri 1967, 378-381 and 389-390; cf. R. Laqueur 1937, col. 1621-1623, who thought that Memnon was relying much less on Nymphis than on Theopompos. See Appendix 2 to this chapter on Memnon’s use of Nymphis.
held power (from 364-337); Books Eleven and Twelve covered a longer period of time, embracing the rules of Dionysius, Amastris, Klearkhos II and Oxathres, and Lysimakhos, and concluding with the Battle of Koroupedion (337-281). Book Thirteen, like that of Nymphis, most likely treated the 35 years from 281 to 246; while Book Fourteen, the first to depart from Nymphis’s template, comprised the 56 years from 246 to ca. 190. In fact, Book Fourteen does not seem to have directly followed the end point of the previous book; it apparently began with the digression on Rome, from the migration of the Trojans to the War with Antiokhos, and then narrated diplomatic exchanges between Rome and Herakleia in the 190s BCE. Book Fifteen covered the longest period of time, the years between Prousias’s siege (in the early 180s BCE?) and Mithridates’ flight to Tigranes ca. 70, but it too does not appear to have covered this period thoroughly; it narrates two sieges of Herakleia, by the Gauls and then by Prousias I of Bithynia, and then moves forward to narrate the beginning years of the Mithridatic Wars. Book Sixteen, finally, treated the 24 years from Cotta’s siege on Herakleia ca. 70 to the death of Brithagoras in 47, just before Caesar’s triumphant return to Rome.

Like Nymphis, Memnon clearly did not give the same attention to all periods of Herakleian history. The books devoted to Klearkhos, Satyros, and Timotheus cover roughly 14 years each; those devoted to Dionysius and his sons and the last book roughly 23 years each. The narrative between Koroupedion and the Second Mithridatic War, meanwhile, was far less detailed and probably not even cohesive. Any assessment of Memnon, however, must be filtered through Photius, who had his own distinct interests. Photius quickly dispatches with the most detailed parts of Memnon’s history—Books Nine and Ten in a little over 900 words (1-3), and Books Eleven and Twelve in almost 1200 words (4-5)—while Books Thirteen, Fourteen, and Sixteen are more than twice as detailed (6-18, 32-40); and to Book Fifteen, which covers the largest spread of years in

Memnon, he devotes nearly 3600 words (19-31). Photius’s disproportionate interest in the Mithridatic Wars must not then be translated to Memnon. In fact, Memnon seems to have passed over the death of Mithridates, an event that he ought to have recorded were his aim to offer a complete account of the Mithridatic Wars.

Our survey of Memnon’s history reveals that the polis Herakleia was barely visible in his narrative between 246 and the installation of Mithridates’ garrison in 70. Aside from its spotty diplomatic exchanges with Rome, we know only of two sieges, that of the Gauls and that of Prousias in the 180s BC; and Photius strangely treats the Gallic siege, which took place, as Memnon says, “before the Romans crossed into Asia,” after they crossed into Asia. There are in addition two large lacunae: between the end of Book Thirteen (i.e. 246 BCE) and Rome’s war with Antiokhos III in the late 190s; and between the siege of Prousias (in the 180s) and Herakleia’s activity during Rome’s Marsic War. While these may be the fault of Photius’s epitomization, such brevity does not jibe with the rest of the Epitome, or indeed the Bibliotheca as a whole. Photius did not, as we have seen, ignore those parts of Memnon’s history that attracted him least (like the years of the tyranny). Nor is he only interested in the history of Herakleia after the advent of Rome, as his thorough summary of Book Thirteen indicates. And he certainly does not find his enthusiasm for his project waning as his epitome progresses. The simplest explanation is that Memnon himself glossed over certain periods of Herakleia’s past. This claim is supported by the phrase with which Photius introduces Memnon’s digression on early Roman history. After recounting the euergetism of Ptolemy III, Photius says, Μέχρι τούτου φθάσας ὁ συγγραφεὺς εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἐπικράτειαν τὴν ἐκβολὴν ποιεῖται (18.1). And the digression on Rome leads directly to the next episode of the narrative, the diplomatic contact between...

---

234 This is Jacoby’s stance (FGrHist IIIB Text, 270 and Noten, 172-173 nn. 25-26).
235 For the idea that these gaps ultimately go back to Memnon, see R. Laqueur 1927, col. 1099-1101; cf. P. Desideri 1967, 377 n. 50 and 1970-1971, 488 n. 3.
Herakleia and Rome: Τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἁρχῆς μέχρι τοῦδε δίεισιν ὁ συγγραφέας ἀναλαβὼν δὲ γράφει ὅπως Ἡρακλεώται διαπρεσβευσάμενοι πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβεβηκότας (18.6). In other words, Memnon used the Roman digression to bridge the end of Nymphis’s narrative with the next event he was able to discuss.

Memnon’s lacunose narrative thus informs us about the material he had at his disposal. Aside from Nymphis, Memnon evidently had access to an account of the rise of Rome up to the defeat of Perseus by Paullus in 168 (18.4); this is the latest event comprised by his digression on the origins of Rome, although the digression itself concludes with a reference to Rome’s wars against Antiokhos, over twenty years earlier, which allows for a segue into its interactions with Herakleia. Memnon’s reference to the Third Macedonian War, strictly outside the bounds of his digression as it is, may have been aimed to foreshadow Herakleia’s own fate in breaking its treaty with Rome (FGrHist 434 F1.18.4). But it in any case suggests that his source had been published not long after 168 BCE, for otherwise there is no obvious reason why he would not have followed Roman intervention in the West further, especially if he was using these episodes as a retrojected warning to Herakleia. The second source to which Memnon

---

236 When a lacuna is due to Photius, on the other hand, he tends to include a summatory phrase as a link. So, after narrating the release of the Herakleiot prisoners at Rome in the middle of the Third Mithridatic War, Photius skips ahead to 59 BCE, to the next episode that interested him in that war, with the following phrase, καὶ διαγεγονότων μὲν πολλῶν ἕτον, ἤδη δὲ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας εἰς ἕνα περισταμένης ἄνδρα Γαίον Ἰούλιον Καύσαρα (4.3). Some episodes, it is true, lack a connective phrase; a notable example is Herakleia’s contribution during the Social War, which floats without temporal link between the sieges of Prousias and the Gauls and the Mithridatic War (21).

237 Strictly speaking, the goal of Memnon’s digression was to give an account of Rome up to its war with Antiokhos, where we rejoin the narrative of Herakleia. In fact, since the first event that Memnon narrates upon resuming his history is Herakleia’s attempt to broker peace between Antiokhos and the Romans, he ought really to have stopped his digression even earlier, at the point that the Romans crossed into Asia, before πρὸς Ἀντίοχον τὸν Σωρίας καὶ Κομαγήνης καὶ Ἰουδαίας βασιλέα δυοὶ μάχαις νικήσαντες τῆς Εὐρώπης ἔξωβλαν (18.5).


239 If the source did proceed beyond 168 BCE, we would expect Memnon to have mentioned other instructive comparanda: the second Battle of Pydna, for example, Mummnius’s sack and looting of Corinth, or the Sack of Carthage, the event with which Polybius ended his history of Rome.
had access dealt particularly with the Mithridatic War. The narrative, at least Memnon’s reworking of it, is not obviously sympathetic to the Roman cause. At times, in fact, Romans are roundly chastised. Nor is his treatment of the wars in any way local; its focus is the complicated power play between Mithridates, Tigranes, and the Romans; and we owe to it the details not only about Cotta’s siege of Heracleia but also about the Roman siege of Khalkedon and Amisos and Mithridates’ siege of Kyzikos. Here too, just as in the case of his digression on the rise of Rome, Memnon shows signs of following his source beyond what was strictly necessary for the purposes of his narrative. So, after the capture of Heracleia (35.9) and the sinking of the ships laden bearing Heracleia’s treasures to Rome (36)—a fitting conclusion, we might think, to the siege—Memnon treats in some detail the subsequent dispute between Mithridates’ generals, Kleokhares and Seleukos, the sieges and falls of Sinope and Amaseia (37), Mithridates’ flight to Armenia and his interactions there with Tigranes, and Tigranes’ subsequent negotiations with the Romans (38).

Memnon’s partial retention of the post-siege narrative shows that the source on which he drew for information about the Mithridatic Wars was probably not a local history of Herakleia. What about the source on which he based his digression on the rise of Rome? We could certainly imagine a text “Περὶ Ἡρακλείας” that narrated Herakleia’s early history by way of Nymphis and added a fourteenth book tracking events to ca. 168 BCE. This putative local history would not itself have constituted a cohesive narrative (it would have skipped from the mid-third century BCE directly to the advent of Rome in order to narrate Rome’s early diplomatic interactions with Herakleia.

240 We may note the ambiguity of the sentence with which Photius begins the account of the war: Μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ ὁ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους βαρὺς Μιθριδάτη τῶι Πόντου βασιλεῖ συνέστη πόλεμος, φαινομένην λαβὼν αἰτίαν τὴν τῆς Καππαδοκίας κατάληψιν (22.1). I do not understand why L.M. Yarrow (143) thinks that this sentence “gives the impression that the war is to be considered from a Roman point of view” (143).

241 Rome did not abide by the terms of the peace that Sulla had arranged with Mithridates, and πολλάς γὰρ ὑπέθεσαν τῶν πόλεων ἐδοξουλώσαντο (25.2).
and the ineffectual sieges of the Gauls and of Prousias), but it would have provided a fitting coda to Nymphis’s history, continuing the theme of Herakleia’s struggle for independence in the face of ongoing external threats and ending, like Nymphis, with the ousting of the Gauls. A further possibility, however, is that Memnon’s source for the rise of Rome was a local history not of Herakleia but of Rome (by C. Acilius? A. Potumius Albinus?), which tied the diplomatic overtures between Rome and Herakleia and the two thwarted sieges to the Mithridatic Wars. Cotta’s siege of Herakleia would in this scenario have provided the context for an excursus on the relationship between Rome and Herakleia (i.e. the first contacts, the treaties, Herakleia’s assistance during the Marsic Wars) and also on previous, and unsuccessful, sieges of Herakleia (by the Gauls and by Prousias).  

But there is a further possibility still. Perhaps we can credit Memnon with more responsibility for weaving together the threads of his local history. Could it not have been his own decision to extend Nymphis’s history of Herakleia to its sack by Cotta and beyond? A narrative of the Mithridatic Wars would have helped to provide context for the siege—for all we know, Memnon’s account of the siege and of Cotta’s trial at Rome may have come from first-hand experience—and his own research into previous interactions between Rome and Herakleia would have provided a link with the more distant past; inasmuch as the record of the relationship between Rome and Herakleia is solely diplomatic, moreover, Memnon may well have relied on his own research (at Rome, even, if he was himself one of the Herakleiotai taken prisoner at the end of the Mithridatic War) in order to flesh out his narrative.

However we understand the sources on which Memnon drew, whether it is easier to posit an intermediary text that had already teased out the early interactions between

---

242 This may explain why Memnon is apparently ignorant of Herakleia’s contribution in the First Battle of Pydna—Livy says that Herakleia sent two triremes to fight (42.56.6). The detail ought not to have missed a contemporary local historian of Herakleia but might well have been overlooked by a Roman historian (without Livy’s acumen).
Rome and Herakleia or we attribute to Memnon alone the connection between his local project and the rise of Rome, we owe ultimately to Memnon the final form of his history. Rather than construct a continuous narrative of Herakleian history from the point where Nymphis left off to the present day (whenever that was), Memnon bridged the gap with Rome: the letters from the Scipiones, the Marsic War, the Mithridatic Wars, and the denouement, Cotta’s siege. His approach to his sources reveals, aside from the fact that strict continuity was not an integral component of his historiography, that he placed considerable weight on the preservation of earlier local histories. For over three quarters of his work, once again, Memnon seems to have relied on Nymphis’s history. We cannot know whether he ever explicitly outlined his method, whether he mentioned Nymphis as a source, that is, or preferred implicit plagiarism. What is important is that he considered an important part of his task to retread worn paths as far as possible before verging off into the brush.

A similar principle is evident in many Medieval local chronicles—we may recall the compilatory Liber Eliensis—although some chroniclers, like the Greek writers of Ελληνικά, extended rather than reproduced earlier works (in the way, say, that Nymphis himself appended a final book onto his already circulated local history). The process of reworking or reproducing an earlier history is not, however, unknown in Greek local historiography; something similar is discernible in Philokhoros, who borrowed heavily from his predecessor, Androtion. But Philokhoros felt a certain degree of

---

243 Says William of Malmesbury at the end of the preface of his Gesta Regum (1.3), “Si quis vero, ut ille ait, si quis haec quoque captus amore leget, sciat me nihil de retroactis praeter cohserentiam annorum pro vero pacisci, fides dictorum penes auctores erit. Quicquid vero de recentioribus setatibus apposui, vel ipse vidi, vel a viris fide dignis audivi.” The additions of Filippo and Matteo Villani onto the Nuova Cronica of Giovanni are good examples of this trend. So too the work of the Genoese Oberto Nasello, which continued the annals of Caffaro di Rustico, and of Ottobono Scriba, which continued Oberto. Machiavelli’s use of the Villani Chronicle is perhaps a more apposite counterpart to Memnon’s use of Nymphis. On the phenomenon of continuation in Greek historiography (in particular Zeitgeschichte), see J. Marincola 1997, 237-257.

244 As Jacoby says, Philokhoros used Androtion’s Attis, “especially for the historical time, to such a degree that we can almost call that part of his Attis a revision of the corresponding books of Androtion” (FGrHist
freedom in adding his own contributions and diverging, at least in scale, from his predecessor’s narrative.\textsuperscript{245} Memnon, on the other hand, does not appear to have supplemented Nymphis’s account with new information, digressions, and etiology. We can perhaps connect Memnon’s dependence on Nymphis to the gulf that separated the two historians. Like Thrasymedes, whose goal was to rejuvenate Herakleia in the shadow of Rome and who to this end gathered all exiled Herakleiotai whom he could find, Memnon’s auctitive historiography made a similar appeal to Herakleian historians. His regurgitation of Nymphis’s history not only linked Memnon to his predecessor; it also linked contemporary Herakleia, an underpopulated \textit{polis} and a constituent of a Roman province, to its glorious past. At once Memnon could authenticate his own historiographical task and the project of the Herakleian renaissance.

While Memnon’s history does not appear to have been continuous, it was certainly not incoherent. Memnon takes pains to expand certain themes hinted at in Nymphis’s text: the significance of crime and punishment for enemies of the state, for example, and of exile and return for Herakleiotai (Klearkhos, Nymphis, and Thrasymedes). Like Nymphis, Memnon also emphasizes the value of diplomacy for Herakleia’s preservation—as Nymphis had narrated Herakleia’s arbitration between Byzantium and Kallatis (13), Memnon recounted the (also ultimately ineffectual) peace that Herakleia arranged between Rome and Antiokhos III (18.8-9)—and also of fiscal conservatism. The Herakleiotai manage to overcome the Gallic siege because the Gauls are themselves poorly supplied (20.2); and Mithridates’ army nearly succumbs to the Romans because of poor husbandry (22.12). Herakleia is able to withstand the Roman

\textsuperscript{245} While Androtion had already moved into the fifth century by his second book (324 F6), Philokhoros was still treating the “Archaeology” in his second book (Kleidemos, meanwhile, had dealt with Kleisthenes in his third book, 323 FF7-8). Again, in his seventh book Androtion was writing about the year 350 BCE (324 F30), while Philokhoros dealt an event from 349/8 in his sixth book (328 FF149-151). See Jacoby, \textit{FGrHist IIIb Suppl.} Text, 250.
siege for so long, in fact, because it is able to benefit from support of its colonies and colleagues; it only falls when Triarius manages to block the port (34.5). In addition, Memnon takes care to echo earlier events from Nymphis’s history. In Nymphis, for example, Klearkhos establishes his rule by ruse, installing his garrison with the help of a deceived Mithridates (here the son of Ariobarzanes, satrap of Phrygia); the second garrison at Herakleia, meanwhile, which Memnon described in his fifteenth book, is that of Mithridates’ more celebrated namesake some three hundred years later, and it too comes by way of ruse, this time at the behest of Lamakhos.

Another thread that ties Memnon to Nymphis is the frequency of digressions on the histories of neighboring communities, Astakos/Bithynia (12.1-6), Prousias/Kios (F1.28.6-7), Nikaia (F1.28.8-11), and Rome (F1.18.1-4), that replay in miniature some of the themes emphasized in the larger history. Memnon’s digression on Astakos (12.1-6), which crops up in the narrative of the rise of Nikomedes I (11.5), very likely originated with Nymphis.246 Astakos was founded by Megarians, we read, in the 17th Olympiad (712/11 BCE); it was named after one of the original autochthonous Spartoi of Thebes;247 it was continually weakened by the numerous attacks of its neighbors until the Athenians sent settlers to join the Megarians; and it reached great fame and strength at the time that Doidalsos ruled the Bithynians. At this point, the history of Astakos is abandoned for a list of the Bithynian kings: Doidalsos is followed by Boteiras and Boteiras by Bas, who defeated one of Alexander’s generals (Kalas); next comes Zipoites, who killed one of Lysimakhos’s generals, defeated Lysimakhos and Antiokhos I, and founded an eponymous city; and finally our Nikomedes, who strengthened Bithynia largely by his overture to the Gauls, and then proceeded to found the city that bears his name, Nikomedeia. The potted history of Astakos mirrors on in miniature the local history of

---

246 See FGrHist IIB Text, 276 with Noten, 172 n. 20 for Jacoby’s confidence.
247 Or a descendent of one of the Spartoi, the text is unclear: Ἀστακὸν ἐπίκλην κατὰ χρησμὸν θέμενοι ἀπὸ τινὸς τῶν λεγομένων Σπαρτῶν καὶ γηγενῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν ἐν Θῆβαις.
Herakleia: a colony with a connection to Megara and Thebes (again, it is unclear to what extent Nymphis and Memnon involved Megara in the *ktisis* of Herakleia), immediately subject to attacks from surrounding peoples, and henceforth largely dependent on the actions of the Pontic kingdoms. And like the grand narrative of Herakleian history itself, the local history of Astakos is soon overwhelmed by the non-local, namely Bithynian regal history. Just as Astakos is defined first and foremost by Nikomedes’ refoundation, moreover, the history of the Bithynian kings is itself structured around the actions of nonlocals. Each king is characterized solely by his efforts against the Greeks: Alexander, Lysimakhos, and Antiokhos.

Memnon’s excursus on Prousias, meanwhile, performs a similar function to the digression on Astakos, and it does not ultimately come from Nymphis; along with the digressions on Nikaia and Rome, then, it reveals that Memnon adopted a rubric that he had found in Nymphis and applied it more generally to the second part of his history. It comes at the point in the narrative of the Mithridatic Wars when Triarius arrived at the *polis* with his army (1.28.6-7), a situation that clearly mirrors Cotta’s contemporaneous march on the Pontic-held Herakleia. Photius, who gives only the barest outline, has clearly compressed what was in Memnon a more detailed discussion: Kios, we read, was the location of many events, including the arrival of the Argo, the disappearance of Hylas, and the wandering of Herakles. Here too, we note parallels with Herakleia, another of the Argo’s famous ports of call and the site of another notable lamented disappearance, that of the Mariandynian Bormos. But Prousias sets itself apart from Herakleia by immediately recognizing the authority of the Romans; for at the Roman approach, Prousias drives out the Pontic soldiers and warmly welcomes Triarius. The excursus on the history of Nikaia, also tied to Triarius’s campaign, immediately follows

---

248 Again, Photius actually has written Kieros, but Kios is meant.
249 See below for a discussion of Bormos.
that of Prousias (28.9.11). Just as at Prousias, Mithridates’ soldiers swiftly withdraw from Nikaia when they realize that the townspeople are inclining toward the Romans. And like Prousias, Nikaia offers an instructive counterexample to Herakleia’s shortsighted decision to retain the Pontic garrison. For Nikaia, Memnon offers the following etymology: it was named after the Naiad Nikaia, the daughter of Kybele and Sangarios, who was plied with wine and seduced by Dionysus. But Memnon intertwines this etymology with another: Nikaia was founded by a contingent of Alexander’s army that had come from the homonymous polis in Eastern Lokris. This mainland Nikaia, Memnon says, had been conquered after numerous battles with its neighbor Phokis, and its citizens, deprived of their homeland, made the decision to join the Macedonian army. Nikaia’s history thus parallels that of Herakleia: initial danger from Phokis led to the foundation of a new polis. But Nikaia’s fate in the Mithridatic Wars was markedly different from that of Herakleia.

The most elaborate of Memnon’s digressions is that on Rome. Like Polybius, Memnon ostensibly seeks to describe the rise of the Romans, explaining their origins, settlement in Italy, and foundation of Rome. After recounting the first rulers of Rome, Memnon turns to the people against whom the Romans fought; the appointment of kings; and the change from monarchy to the consulship. He describes how the Romans were defeated by the Gauls and how the city would have been captured had it not been for Camillus; and then how Alexander, having crossed into Asia, sent a letter to Rome suggesting that if they could not themselves rule over others, they submit to more powerful forces, and how the Romans in response sent Alexander a hefty gold crown.

250 For the story of Nikaia, see Nonnos Dion. 15.169ff and 16.403-5; see Dio Khrys. 39.8, who calls Dionysus the προπάτωρ of Nikaia but Herakles the oikistes (7.1)
251 Sangarius is the name of a river in the region beside which Lucullus and his army were camped (27.8)
252 From Photius, Memnon does not seem to have questioned the coincidence of men from Lokris near Thermopylae settling on the site of an Asian polis already named Nikaia from a local nymph.
253 Cf. Justin 16.3.
254 Like Astakos, moreover, although Photius does not emphasize this similarity, Nikaian history was dominated by interactions with neighboring Bithynia.
Next comes the war against Tarentum and Pyrrhos, in which Rome suffered reverses but was ultimately victorious; the war against the Carthaginians and Hannibal; the successes in Iberia under Scipio, to whom the Iberians offered kingship; and the defeat and exile of Hannibal. Last, Memnon describes how the Romans crossed the Ionian Sea, how Perseus broke his father’s treaty and was defeated by Paullus; and how the Romans defeated Antiokhos and drove him out of Europe. The digression on Rome is a perfect reflection in miniature of the larger narrative about Herakleia. Like Herakleia (and like Astakos, Prousias, and Nikaia), Rome is a colony, and the early part of its history is the struggle of a transplanted people in an already occupied land. Like Herakleia, moreover, Rome’s history is a record of its confrontations with various foreign peoples (the Gauls, the Carthaginians) and with Alexander and his successors (Pyrrhos, Antiokhos III, and finally Perseus). With Camillus, who saves Rome from the Gauls, we can pair Nymphis. With Pyrrhos, Rome’s Diadokhic would-be conqueror, we can pair Lysimakhos. But here the similarities end, for Rome crossed the Ionian Sea into Europe and thence came to Asia, and Herakleia was compelled to add Rome to its long list of aggressors. While Rome was able to make the transition from besieged to besieger, Herakleia remained a victim.

Despite the struggles he recounted, Nymphis told the triumphant tale of Herakleia’s emergence as a Pontic power. Memnon, on the other hand, wrote a desperate tragedy. This is not simply a consequence of circumstance, viz. Rome’s capture of Herakleia. Nor does it depend merely on the point at which Memnon’s history happens to cease, viz. the death of Brithagoras. For Herakleia’s decadence is a theme on which Memnon has continually harped. The polis has already lost much of its former strength and glory, he says, by the time the Gauls attacked Herakleia before the Romans crossed over into Asia: πολὺ γὰρ τῆς παλαιᾶς ὴμης ὑφεῖτο καὶ πρὸς τὸ καταφρονούμενον ὑπέρρει (20.3). Thrasymedes’ heroic efforts after the Roman siege, meanwhile, do little
to revive the *polis*: ἀλλὰ πάντα πράττων μόλις εἰς ὀκτακισχιλίους, ἀμα τοὺς οἰκετικοὺς σώματι, συλλεγήναι κατεπράξατο (40.2). Nor is Brithagoras ever able to convince his dear friend Caesar to grant Herakleia the autonomy it deserves: Γνωσθεὶς οὖν τῷ Καίσαρι Βριθαγόρας καὶ διαφραξάμενος ἐγγυτέρω τῇ φιλίᾳ προσελθεῖν δὴ ὑποσχέσεως ἐγένετο όῳ μὴν ἐξ ἐφόδου γε λαβεῖν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν Ἦδυνήθη, ἀτε δὴ οὐκ ἐν τῇ Ἶτη Ὀμη ἄλλ' ἐφ' ἔτερα τοῦ Γαίου περιτρέχοντος. Brithagoras would have been successful, Memnon implies, had Caesar stayed at Rome, where he could influence policy. His death is thus all the more tragic since it occurred just before Caesar’s return to Rome, καὶ περὶ τῆς εἰς Ὁμη ἐπανόδου τοῦ Καίσαρος διανοομένου, ύπο τοῦ γῆρου καὶ τῶν συνεχῶν πόνων κατατρυχωθεὶς Βριθαγόρας τελευτᾷ (40.4).

The decline of the *polis* in Memnon’s history is matched by the despondency of his protagonists. In Nymphis, we may recall, the hopes of the Herakleiotite exiles were disappointed after the deaths first of Alexander and then of Perdikkas—αἱ τῶν φυγάδων ἐλπίδες ἐσβέννυντο (4.3); but a generation later, under Nymphis’s own leadership, the exiles manage to accomplish their goal. In Memnon’s narrative, on the other hand, hope seldom bears fruit. After their successful repulsion of the Gallic besiegers, the Herakleiotai hope to restore their *polis* to its former glory and prosperity: Ἐκ δὲ τοῦ κατορθῶματος πάλιν εἰς τὴν προτέραν εὐκλείαν καὶ εὐδαμονίαν ἐλπίδας ἐλάμβανον ἀναβῆναι (20.3). But Herakleia is razed by the Romans and depopulated (21). Later, when ThrasyMedes manages to gather 8,000 Herakleiotai to refound the *polis*, when conditions seem at last to be improving, Brithagoras begins to hope that he could raise the *demos* to liberty: Ἦδη τῆς πόλεως αὐξομένης, ἐλπίδας ἐποιήσατο πρὸς ἐλευθερίαν τὸν δήμον ἄνευγκεῖν (40.3). And despite Caesar’s continued absence from Rome, Brithagoras remained ever hopeful—οὐκ ἀφίστατο μέντοι γε Βριθαγόρας (40.3). But all for naught. He dies, he is mourned, the book ends. It is not surprising
given Memnon’s consistent foregrounding of the individual that the success of Herakleia’s resurgence would have rested on the shoulders of one man. His failure and his death thus mark the death of the polis itself.

Some critics have concluded from the pessimism with which Memnon ends his sixteenth book that this could not have been the culmination of the entire history: who would have pleasure, asks Paolo Desideri, in reading a story like this? 255 But the act of reading a local history need not be pleasant, nor is the task of a local historian always to please. Memnon’s narrative of decline is not in fact unique among local histories. Livy famously begins his first pentad with a foreshadowing of Roman decadence, and a similar stance is evident in several important post-Classical local histories. 256 At times, defunct communities even engender local historiography with plot structures by nature decrescent. Such communities, we have seen, may actually be no longer extant, as in the case, say, of Palestinian village; in this case the goal of the historian is often to promote the act or remembrance, what Georges May has called the testimonial rationale behind autobiography. 257 Communities may also be only symbolically obsolete, however; here the narrative of decline serves almost as a call to arms. 258 A local historian in exile has just such a relationship to his community: so long as he is not part of it, it is lost to him; his act of historiography is thus an act of commemorative reconstruction. Sometimes it is the very trauma of exile that motivates this act of community autobiography. So it is not a surprise that several prominent Greek local historians appear to have written in exile:

256 We may note the severe pessimism of Matteo Villani, in contradistinction to his brother’s attitude, that permeates his contribution to the chronicle. “Whereas for Giovanni Villani,” writes Louis Green (52), “history had been the vindication of justice, for his brother it was the chronicle of the evil and the woes of man” (see, in general, 44-52).
257 For other works of this type, see The Life and Death of a Polish Shtetl (1951), edited by F. Bisberg-Youkelson and R. Youkelson; There once Was a World: A 900-Year Chronicle of the Shtetl of Eishyshok (2009) by Y. Eliach; and Jewish Lublin: A Cultural Monograph (2009) by A. Cimet. As R.A. Davis writes of Palestinian local histories (53-54), “...the village book authors document what existed previously, precisely because it has changed. ...the explicitly stated goal of these books and their authors is to pass on knowledge of the village, of its land, and of the greater Palestinian homeland.”
258 We can recall Nikitas Niphakos’s History of the Whole Mani, its Customs, Villages, and Produce.
Nymphis, of course, as well as the Atthidographer Androtion,\(^{259}\) the Sikelikographers Philistos\(^{260}\) and Timaios,\(^{261}\) and possibly even Douris;\(^{262}\) and we have already had recourse to note that the phenomenon of Thessalian local historiography was in part motivated by the Thessalian experience abroad. Nymphis and Androtion, however realistic their expectations, had the option of remaining hopeful about their return. If I am correct to locate Memnon at Rome in the mid-first century BCE, such optimism would have been difficult, especially after the failure of Thrasymedes and the death of Brithagoras. Memnon must have intended Herakleiotai to read his history, hoping perhaps to demonstrate that their former policy toward Rome had led to the present state of affairs, that a better course of action would have been (and should henceforth be) to follow the compliant path of Nikaia and Astakos/Nikomedeia; in addition, he may also have wanted to show that contemporary Herakleia was linked to its glorious past in the same way that he was himself linked to Nymphis. But the local history that resulted was nevertheless a story not of liberty but of loss.

\(^{259}\) See Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIb Suppl. Text, p. 103 for the role of Androtion’s exile in his historiography.

\(^{260}\) *FGrHist* 556 T5a-d.

\(^{261}\) *FGrHist* 566 T4a-e.

\(^{262}\) Douris was almost certainly born in exile (*FGrHist* 76 T4) and may have spent some time at Athens (T1), but we have no means to date the publication of his local history. Exile (forced or voluntarily, from within or without) was certainly a motivation for non-local historians, as well—Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Theopompos, Polybius, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, to name a few—to whom the very rejection from a local community may even have granted a sort of authority (A. Momigliano 1978, 9). The phenomenon has recently been addressed by J. Dillery (2007, 68). On the importance of exile as a motivation for historiography, with particular reference to Jewish historians of the Medieval age, see Y.H. Yerushalmi 1982, 57-75: “In effect, the primary stimulus to the rise of Jewish historiography in the sixteenth century was the great catastrophe that had put an abrupt end to open Jewish life in the Iberian Peninsula at the end of the fifteenth” (58-59).
2.2.5.3 The Local and Non-Local in Histories of Herakleia

In her recent treatment of non-Roman historians of the late Republic, Liv M. Yarrow rightly emphasizes that Memnon’s history of Herakleia “was concerned with far more than just the events which took place in Heraclea or directly involved the citizens of that city” (144); a close parallel, she offers, is Livy’s history of Rome, which also viewed world history though the lens of “one city,” incorporating “widespread events as they became of interest to the inhabitants of that city.” (145). But in Livy’s history, as in Deinias’ Ἀργολικά, it is the widening aperture of a community’s historiographical scope that augments the local. In Herakleian historiography, on the other hand, embrace of broader narratives come not from any expansion of the focus but from the encroachment and intersection of non-local communities: the Mariandynoi; Persia and Athens; the Seleukids and the Ptolemies; the Gauls, Bithynia, Pontos, and finally Rome.\(^{263}\) In part, this may be a historiographical response to circumstance, to the real and constant threats of foreign powers, or to Heraklea’s fantasies about its economic position, its role as a conduit of communication and conductor of regional trade in the Hellenistic world. But the importance of outside communities in Herakleia’s local historiography is due first and foremost, I argue, to Heraklea’s colonial experience. Founded amid various groups of non-Greeks, the polis forged a path to autonomy marked by anxiety about aboriginal peoples and neighboring kingdoms, and this anxiety engendered an extroverted tradition of local historiography.

Local histories of Herakleia certainly dealt with the polis and its khora—we read about the river Lykos, the Kolone hill (Nymphis 432 F12), the Akherousian headland and spring, the cave through which Hades could be reached (Nymphis 432 F3), and the

\(^{263}\) See Jacoby 1949, 104 for the fact that in the Athides, non-Athenian groups enter the narrative only as immigrants to Attika or in relation to events that took place in Attica.
ancient tombs of Agamestor in the city center and Sthenelos on the coast (Promathidas 430 FF3-4). Like the Ἀγολικά, works Πετοί Ἡθοπλείας also had recourse also to treat events that took place outside of the polis: in Nikomedea (Memnon 434 F1.12, from Nymphis?), Khalkedon (Nymphis 432 F1),264 Byzantium (Nymphis 432 F9), Phrygia (Promathidas 430 F6; Nymphis 432 FF11 and 14),265 Bithynia (Kallistratos 433 FF5 and 7; Nymphis and Memnon passim),266 Paphlagonia (Nymphis 432 F8),267 Skythia (Kallistratos 433 F4),268 Lykia (Nymphis 432 F7),269 Persia (Nymphis 432 F7),270 Galatia (Memnon 434 F1.11.6 from Nymphis),271 and even Illyria (Kallistratos 433 F9).272 Memnon’s narrative of the Mithridatic Wars focuses in addition on Nikaia (434 F1.28.8-11), Prousias (F1.28.5-7), Kappodokia (F1.22.1, 25-27, 29), Armenia (F1.30, 38), and, of course, Pontos (passim). Once again, a wide ambit is a noteworthy feature of many Greek local histories; it is not unique for Herakleia. What is surprising, however, is the interest of historians of Herakleia in the affairs and habits of non-local populations.

The first to receive such attention were the Mariandynoi, the natives whom the Greeks encountered on their arrival.273 Herakleia is certainly not unique in inviting

---

264 Nymphis describes the harbor at Khalkedon through which Phrixos sailed.
265 Promathidas mentions the Gallos river in Phrygia and the people who lived on its banks, whom he called the Potamogallenoi. Nymphis records that the Phrygians sailed through the Bosporos in a bull-headed ship (and thereby named the straits) and also that the Phrygians were later subdued by the Mariandynoi.
266 Kallistratos mentions the Psilion river in Bithynia (F5) and a polis called Mokata (F7).
267 Nymphis mentions a temple that Medea purportedly founded in Paphlagonia to Hekate.
268 Kallistratos retains an interesting etymology of Taphrai on the Maiotis harbor (433 F4), perhaps derived from Herodotus (4.1): during the long war between the Skythians and Thracians, he says, the Skythians’ slaves intermingled with their mistresses, but the link between this indiscretion and the ditch that they dug is obscure.
269 Nymphis records an episode about Bellerophon in Xanthia and his successful, although unrewarded, hunt for a wild boar.
270 A description of a band of bodyguards called the Orasangai.
271 Galatia was originally a divided, Memnon says, between the three Gallic tribes, the Trogmoi (who founded Ankyra), Tolostobogioi (who founded Tabia), and Tektosages (who founded Pessinos).
272 All we know is that Kallistratos said that Olympe was a polis in Illyria (he perhaps linked this, as we have said, to the Illyrian War).
273 In his Ἀργοναυτικά, Herodoros gave the genealogy of the king Lykos (F49) and wrote about Idmon’s death ἐν Μαριανδυνοῖς (F50). Apollonius also featured the Mariandynoi. In second book of his Ἀργοναυτικά, he defines Mariandynia as containing the entrance to Hades and the river Akheron, which flows upon the Akherousia headland, and as the future site of Herakleia: Apollonius says that the Nisaian Megarians named the Akheron river Σωσαντηῖς, since they took refuge there when they were on their way.
primordial populations into its local history; Thessalian local historiography, we have seen, paid considerable attention to the Pelasgoi and Kentauroi, and probably also to interloping Boiotians. But in the case of Herakleia, the Mariandynoi were a real and indeed continual presence. Alongside the eponym, Mariandynos (Kallistratos 433 F2), historians of Herakleia had recourse to write about his son Titias (Promathidas 430 F1; Nymphis 432 F5a and 5b; Kallistratos 433 FF2-3), and Titias’s sons Priolas (Kallistratos 433 F3), Mariandynos (Kallistratos 433 F3), and Bormos (Nymphis 432 F5; Kallistratos 433 F3), as well as a later king, Lykos, who came from different stock. They were interested not only in rulers but also in Mariandynian culture and belief. Promathidas reported that the Herakleiotai, unable to identify a certain grave in their polis, considered its occupant to have been an epichoric, pre-Greek, hero, possibly Agamestor. A far clearer example of this interest in non-Greek tradition involves the celebrated Mariandynian dirges, the origin of which both Nymphis and Kallistratos connect to the

to settle the Mariandynian land (2.746-748). According to Apollonius, when Daskylos was king of the Mariandynoi, Herakles came through the region, killed the strongman Titias in a boxing match, and then proceeded to help the Mariandynoi against their belligerent neighbors. Herakles subdued the Mysoi, who had killed Daskylos’s son Priolas, the Phrygians, and the Paphlagonians, and he conquered for himself the tribes of Bithynia (2.774-791). By the time that the Argonauts arrive, Lykos (here, a son of Daskylos), is king of the Mariandynoi. He receives the Greeks with hospitality because, thanks to their help and in particular Polydeuketes’ defeat of Amykos, the Mariandynoi are now able also to subdue the Bebrykes.

Promathidas is cited for preserving the detail that the Herakleiotai claim to have in their polis center the grave of a local, i.e. pre-Greek, hero, about whose identity they are unclear. On Agamemnon and Apollonius, see K. Hanell, 128-129; 171; D. Asheri 1972, 15-16; and I. Malkin 1994, 135, n. 112.

The threnoi of the Mariandynoi were apparently known enough to Aiskhylos, who alludes in the Persai to τὰν κακοφατίδα βοάν, κακομέλετον ἢν Μαριανδυνοῦ θρηνητήρος (735-740). A proverb retained...
disappearance of Titias’s son Bor(i)mos. According to Nymphis (F5b; cf. 5b)—and the passage is quoted verbatim by Athenaeus in a general discussion of threnody (14.11 619F-620A)—Titias was a particularly wealthy and noble Mariandynian landowner and Bormos a youth of outstanding beauty; one day while overseeing work in his fields, Bormos took it upon himself to satisfy the thirst of his reapers. Walking off in search of water he promptly disappeared. According to Kallistratos, on the other hand, Titias was himself a ἥρως ἐγχώριος, either the son of Zeus or the eldest of the children of Mariandynos, who was himself apotheosized after he helped to make the ethnus strong and prosperous (433 F2). Titias, Kallistratos continues, had three sons, Priolas, Mariandynos, and Bormos; and Bormos died while hunting (FGrHist 433 F3a; cf. 3b).

Nymphis and Kallistratos both agree that the communal lament born from Bormos’s disappearance was of continued importance to the contemporary Mariandynoi. According to Nymphis, “the men of the place, they say, looked for him with some sung lament, which all of them they still even today use” (F5b); according to Kallistratos, “even up to today, the Mariandynoi sing a threnos to him” (F3a). In fact, Nymphis says that the Mariandynoi sing the lament κατὰ τινα ἐπιχωριαζομένην παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς <έφοτήν> (F5b), while Kallistratos specifies that the festival took place ἀχμὴ θέρους (F3a). Kallistratos also explains that the dirge was associated with flutes, that it was Mariandynos (presumably Bormos’s brother, not his grandfather) who developed ἡ θρηνητικὴ αὐλῳδία—he claims, in fact, that Mariandynos was the teacher of Marsyos’s father—and that the Mariandynian flutes are particularly dirgeworthy.277

As Athenaeus’s citation shows, moreover, Nymphis wrote extensively about the Mariandynoi: “Nymphis in the first book Περὶ Ἡρακλείας speaks in great length

by the scholiast to Aiskhylos, who also cites Kallistratos (Pers. 940 = 433 F3), is further evidence for the fame of the Mariandynian lament: Μαριανδύνου μεμνημένη θρηνητήρος.
277 He cites the line, αὐλῇ Μαριανδύνως καλάμος κρούων Ἰαστί = Carm. Pop. 32, although this may come from the hand of the scholiast, not Kallistratos.
about the Mariandynoi.”  

The quotation about Bormos actually begins in medias res (ὅμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν ὕδων ἐνίας κατανοῆσειν ἂν τις κτλ.), suggesting that it was an excerpt from a much longer discussion. More notable is Nymphis’s affected assumption of the vantage point of an ideal and extrinsic viewer: “and one may learn some of these songs, which they sing in some festival customary among them, invoking one of their ancestors, addressing him Bormos.”  

Both Nymphis and Kallistratos apparently conducted research in the field. When Nymphis writes, “They say that Bormos was the son of a rich and famous man,” the subject of the sentence is neither parenthetical nor general but refers rather to the Mariandynoi themselves. Nymphis even draws a parallel between the story of Bormos and the Egyptian Maneros. That he looks to Egypt, and not e.g. to Kios, where Hylas was abducted, may shed light on the cultural literacy of his implied audience—Nymphis ended his history, we recall, with a nod to the euergetism of Ptolemy III. On the other hand, Nymphis may be thinking primarily of Herodotus, who linked Maneros and the dirge sung on his behalf to the Greek songs for Linos (2.79). The interest of Nymphis and Kallistratos in explaining Mariandynian custom can be read against similar tendencies in post-classical local histories, like eighteenth and early-nineteenth century histories of New England, which prefaced their narratives with detailed descriptions of Native American cult and custom, or histories

---

278 Νύμφις δ’ ἐν πρώτῳ Περὶ Ἡρακλείας περὶ Μαριανδυνῶν δηγούμενος φησιν.
279 καὶ τῶν ὕδων ἐνίας κατανοῆσειν ἂν τις, ἃς ἐκεῖνοι κατὰ τινὰ ἔχωροι ἀξιομένην παρ’ αὐτοῖς <ἐνθοσύνη> ἱδοντες ἀνακαλοῦνται τινα τῶν ἀρχαίων, προσαγορεύοντες Βῶρμον.
280 τοιοῦτος δ’ ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις καλούμενος Μάνερως.
281 As Memnon knew (434 F1.28.7); for Hylas, and the suitability of the parallel, see Strabo 12.4.3. Hesykhios preserves yet another story about Bormos’s disappearance, drawing the parallels with Hylas even tighter in claiming that he was snatched by a nymph (s.v. Βόρμος).
282 cf. Plut. De Osid. 16-17). Pollux (4.54-55) interestingly defines Borimos as the dirge itself, sung by Mariandynian farmers, and he too compares Mariandynian practice to that of the Egyptians, naming Maneros, and the Phrygians, naming Lityersas. Pollux calls Borimos the son of King Oupios and the brother of Iollas and Mariandynos and links the song to the time of the summer reaping. See, too, the Souda (A 626).
283 See, for example, Daniel Neal’s History of New England (1720), which begins with a lengthy discussion of the natives’ origins, customs, manners religion, and government; or Samuel William’s A Natural and
of the Spanish colonies in North America. We cannot tell if a similar anxiety caused the local historians of Herakleia to retroject, like Apollonius, a cooperative state between the Greeks and Mariandynoi. Yet some residual guilt can perhaps be glimpsed behind Nymphis’s account of Bormos, particularly in the fact that his Bormos took good care of his servants and vanished as a result of his kindness toward them.

The inclination of Herakleian local historiography to think non-locally extends beyond the treatment of the enslaved. So Nymphis discussed the Xanthians’ concept of matrilineal descent (432 F7), attributing it to the fact that the Xanthian women once assuaged Bellerophonetes (angry that the Xanthians had not thanked him properly after he rid them of a rampant wild boar) and thus won safety for the city. Nymphis also shows an interest in Persian custom, outlining features of the royal bodyguard; the so-called Orosangai, he says, held the greatest honors and are called κατὰ γλῶτταν “Royal Guest-Friends.” Here again, Nymphis signals an interest in non-locals that goes beyond a mere recitation of their confrontation with Herakleiotai. A similar ethnographical impulse can be seen behind some portions of Memnon’s history. So when Nikomedes invites the Gauls into the Northern League, we read that they had 17 leaders, of whom the most prominent were Leonnoria and Luturios (434 F1.11.3); and later we are told that they consisted of three tribes, the Trogmi, Tolostobogii, and Tektosages, distinct enough so that when they settled in Asia each founded its own polis. And when the Bithynians come onto the scene, Memnon took pains to record the king-list from Doidalsos to

---

285 See above, 1.2.2.12. See also the Historia de la Nueva México (1610) of Gaspar Pérez de Villagrá, which begins with an account of Aztec culture and history, interpreting it by way of Roman myth.

286 Nymphis does record (FGFrHist 432 F14) that the Mariandynoi conquered the Phrygians, but he does not attribute the act to any Greek.

287 Plutarch cites Nymphis here in his discussion of the action of the Lykian women (Mul. Virt. 9 348F). Herodotus also mentions the peculiarities of Lykian genealogical thought (1.173.4-5).

288 Cf. Livy 38.16.
Nikomedes (*FGrHist* 434 F1.12.1-3). Memnon also devoted considerable attention to the early history of Rome, of course; he is interested not only in the events that brought the Romans to Europe and to Asia but also in their *ethnos*, their migration, their kings and their consuls, and their wars (*FGrHist* 434 F1.12.4-5). There is nothing comparable in Philokhoros, so far as we can tell, about, say, the Macedonian kings.

We have had opportunity already to note the frequency with which local histories embrace events that take place outside of the focal territory. In some cases, the context is unclear, but often we are fortunate to find preserved some indication of how this material was linked to the main narrative. In the case of Argos, for example, the inclusion of episodes from Epidaurus, Troizen, and Arkadia was related to Argive irredentism and the retrojection of a territorial ideal. In Memnon, on the other hand, much of the non-local material comes in digressions. Lysimakhos’s seizure of Herakleia after his murder of Klearkos II and Oxathres leads to an episode about Lysimakhos’s dysfunctional family life, his murder of his son, and his death (*FGrHist* 434 F1.5.6-7), just as Seleukos’s awkward conference with the Herakleite envoy is followed by a discussion of his own personal history, his nostalgia and his death (*FGrHist* 434 F1.7.1-2). The list can be extended: the murder of Seleukos is followed by a discussion of the career of Ptolemy Keraunos (F1.8.1-3), Herakleian aid to Byzantium in the face of a Gallic sack by a discussion of the Gauls’ settlement in Asia (F1.11.1-7), while diplomacy with Rome in the early second century BCE leads to a digression about the development of Roman power (F1.18.1-5).

---

289 Kallistratos clearly discussed Bithynia in some detail, as well, mentioning the Psilion river in his third book (433 F5) and the *polis* Mokata in the fourth (F7).

290 Philokhoros did say that Perdikkas ruled for 23 years (*FGrHist* 328 F126), but this information belongs clearly to a death notice and in any case betrays no excursus on the kings or even on Macedon.

291 We can recall the discussion of Agias and Derkylos about King Minos at Paros (*FGrHist* 305 F5).

292 Memnon sometimes embraces non-local material without so clear a connective. After the war between Herakleia and Zipoites (F1.9.5), for example, we read that “at about the same time, there arose a war between Antiokhos, son of Seleukos, and Antigonos, son of Demetrios” (F1.10.1). And a lengthy
The most egregious example of the inclusion of non-local material is Memnon’s long narrative about the Mithridatic Wars. Only a small portion of this account, as we have said, directly involves Herakleia: the polis interfered with Mithridates on behalf of Chios (F1.23); it refused to align itself with either Murena or Mithridates (F1.26.2); it contributed five triremes to Mithridates after the capture of Silenos and Satyros (F1.27.5); it authorized the murder of publicani (F1.27.6); it received a Mithridatic garrison (F1.29.3-4); and it was besieged by Cotta (F1.32, 34-36). The brunt of the narrative of the war, even granted Photius’s act of epitomization, takes place well outside of Herakleian territory and without Herakleian participation. Memnon defines the war, in fact, as waged between Rome and Mithridates (F1.22.1), his account tracing the movements in the Black Sea region of the Pontic and Roman forces. To some extent, as we have said, this tendency may be a result of the sources to which Memnon had access. But the tendency toward cosmopolitanism was also evident in earlier portions of Nymphis’s local history, where Persia, Athens, and Alexander played prominent roles.\textsuperscript{293} In Nymphis and Memnon, the narrative is frequently propelled by the contribution of non-locals: the Phokians were the cause of the original act of colonization; Cotta the cause of Herakleia’s fall; and Caesar the potential source of its salvation.

Herakleia’s construction of community autobiography by way of non-local populations and narratives is related, I have suggested, to its status as a colony. The initial act of colonization would naturally have created concern about the boundaries and security of the polis, and this concern would have been transferred onto Herakleian historiography through the eversion of the local narratives. We see hints of this outward turn, in fact, also local histories of other colonies. The Khersonesian Syriskos (FGrHist

\textsuperscript{293} As Justin says, “urbem Heracleam considerunt, et... breui tempore magnas opes parauere. Multa deinde huius urbis aduersus finitimos bella” (16.3).
for example, is praised by his *polis* (a colony of Herakleia, no less) for having written up the epiphanies of the Parthenos and recorded events “concerning the *poleis* and the kings of the Bosporos.”

The work is described precisely by way of the contribution of non-local actors: other *poleis* and foreign kings. Syriskos’s history, honored as it was by his countrymen, must have had as its central premise the history of Khersonnesos; but the narrative was articulated with recourse to neighboring communities.

A clearer example of this tendency comes in the late-sixth century CE local history of Byzantium composed by the Milesian Hesykhios Illoustris (*FGrHist* 390 F7). The text, which survives under the title Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, is particularly instructive since it does not survive in fragmentary form but rather is an excerpt or abridgement of a longer work. After a preface in which Constantinople is equated to Rome, Hesykhios outlines in some detail several possible foundation narratives (emphasizing the putative role of the Argives or to the Megarians) before settling on the story of Io’s grandson, Byzas. The first of Byzas’s acts, according to Hesykhios, was his fight with Melias, the Thracian king, and even before he was able to found his eponymous *polis*, Hesykhios describes a neighboring settlement, Khrysopolis (11).

Hesykhios does offer a fairly detailed description of the foundation of Byzantium (12-16), but once Byzas has finished constructing the urban center, he is back to dealing with the barbarians (17), obliged to repel an invasion led by the barbarian Haimos, tyrant of Thrake (17).

---

294 On Syriskos see A. Chaniotis 1988, 300-301; J. Dillery 2005, 521; K. Clarke 2008, 344-245; and M. Cuypers *BNJ* 807. This Syriskos may perhaps be connected to an homonymous magistrate who lived in the first decades of the third century (and was thus a contemporary of Nymphis) (see V.A. Anokhin 1980, 236-237).

295 *SGDI* 3086. ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῦτα εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ διωικήσατο πόλιν, ἐχὼν δὲ λοιπὸν τοὺς ἐπίστας ἀποθεοῦσα βαρβάρους AA
Henceforth, Byzantine history is the expression of the city’s actions against attacking powers. After the threat of Haimos comes Byzas’s battle with Odryses, the Skythian king (18), and then his war with his own brother Strombos. During this war, Byzas receives the support of the Rhodians and of Dineos, the tyrant of Khalkedon, and this leads into a brief digression on the history of Khalkedon (21). Dineos manages now to wield political power at Byzantium and is named as *strategos* (23). And suddenly we are in the mid-fourth century, with the strategos Leon at the helm (26). His rule is described, just like that of Byzas and the Bithynian kings in Memnon’s local history, only by way of his interaction with invading forces; it was under Leon’s tenure that Philip III besieged the city (26-27). When Leon dies, Hesychios narrates the assistance given by the Athenian Khares (28)—he seems also to have held the office of *strategos* at Byzantium—and thence the consecutive tenures as *strategos* of Protomakhos (31), Timesios (32), and Kalliades (34). Protomakhos and Kalliades each contribute to the narrative in their resistance to external threats, the former against the Thracians, the latter πρὸς τοὺς ὀθνείους τε καὶ ἐμφυλίους πολέμους ἁγωνισάμενος, and the narrative surrounding Timesios’s office is marked by an excursus on the local history of Ephiasiates (32-33). After the death of Kalliades, Rome swiftly arrives on the scene (35), and in a blink we are in the reign of Severus (36) and Constantine (39).

Like Memnon, Hesychios draws parallels between Byzantium and Rome: the founder Byzas fights against and conquers his brother (20); Leon’s repulsion of Philip’s siege, wherein the Byzantines are roused to repel the attacking Macedonians by the barking of dogs (27), recalls Camillus’s success against the Gauls; like Augustus, finally, the *strategos* Timesios adorns and rebuilds temples that had fallen into ruin (33). As in

---

297 Hesychios does not only describe external stimuli: so Kalliades fights bravely in wars but also dedicates the famous statue of Byzas by the Basilike (34); Timesios spends a good deal of effort beautifying the *polis* (32-33); and Khares buried his mistress and wrote for her a touching epigram (30).

298 Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς εἰρημένοις Δίνεω τοῦ στρατηγοῦ μεταλαξαντος, Λέων τὴν τῶν Βυζαντίων ἀριστοκρατίαν ἐδέξατο.
the case of Memnon, Hesykhios’s history is not continuous but a string of discrete episodes linked to the activity of various foreign powers (Thrace, Macedonia, Athens, and Rome). Like Memnon, furthermore, the historiographical construction of the focal community is the negative space left in the wake of these non-locals.

The obsession of Greek colonies with situating themselves in relation to their neighbors is not unique to the Greek polies of the Pontos. One of the clearest examples of the historiographical manifestation of colonial insecurity comes in the Σικελικά. In fact, cosmopolitanism is so strong in these works that they are often classified not as local histories at all, but rather western versions of the Ἑλληνικά.299 As in the case of Herakleia, Khersonnesos, and Byzantium, Sicily’s history is dominated by non-local actors: the Carthaginians, the Athenians, the Corinthians. Indeed, the Souda (Ε 361 Adler) describes Philistos’s Σικελικά as an account of τὰ πρὸς Ἑλληνας αὐτοῖς πραχθέντα διαφόρως; like Syriskos’s history, Sicilian history is here categorized by way of its enemies.300 This may be an accident of circumstance. Sicily was an insular region that contained a multitude of poleis, so a pan-localism would naturally pervade its autobiography. Yet the same tendency toward universalism cannot be detected in, say, the local histories of Arkadia, Boiotia, or Thessaly. Or we might say that the Σικελικά told history by way of confrontations with foreign powers because these invasions actually did take place. But, once again, what we are interested in here is what a historian chose to report and how he chose to report it. And what is evident in the fragments of Sicilian local historiography is not merely an extroversion but also a real interest in ethnography.

These works devote considerable attention, first of all, to the natives who inhabited the island before the coming of the Greeks, the Sikeloi and Sikanoi, as is clear

300 This is, admittedly, a difficult phrase, inasmuch as the Sicilians were self-consciously Greeks; but I do not think that it can be translated, as e.g. C.W. Fornara translates it: Sikélika “are [the account of] hostile activities of Greek against Greek” (1983, 38).
from Antiokhos (*FGrHist* 555 F2-6), Philistos (*FGrHist* 556 FF1, 45), and Timaios (*FGrHist* 566 F38 = Diod. 5.6.1). The ethnographical impulse is directed not only at the pre-Greeks but, like the histories of Herakleia, at other populations as well. Timaios treated the proclivity of luxury among the Etruscans (F1b, 62), Sybarites (FF9, 47-50), and the inhabitants Siris (FF51-52); he detailed the flora and fauna of Corsica and claimed that the Corsicans were occupied only with hunting (F3); at Sardinia, he notes a strange custom of euthanasia (F64); and he discusses not only the foundation of Rome (FF59-61) but also the history of its coinage. Timaios’s history of Sicily embraces locales and customs even further afield: Iberia (67), Galatia (69), Massalia (71), the Celts (FF72-73), Britain (74), Corecyra (79), Pontos (85), and the Bosporos (FF86-88). As Momigliano has shown, Timaios may be a special case;\(^{301}\) but he is not the only Sicilian historiographer interested in such excursus. Even Kallias, a contemporary of Nymphis who wrote a circumscribed account on the rule of Agathokles, had recourse to treat Rome and the myths of the Roman foundation (*FGrHist* 564 F5a and 5b). This is not the place to address the idiosyncrasies of the Σικελικά. I want only to emphasize that the trait so evident in Herakleian local historiography, whereby a local community engenders historiographical cohesion not only through the iteration of commonalities of cult and topography but also through a preoccupation with non-local groups, is unique neither to Herakleia nor to the Pontic *poleis* but a feature of colonial localities in general.

\(^{301}\) 1959. See now C.A. Baron 2013.
APPENDIX 1: HOW LONG WAS MEMNON’S HISTORY?

At the end of his *Epitome* of Memnon’s history, Photius explains why he read only Books Eight through Sixteen: τὰς δὲ πρώτας ἡ ἱστορίας καὶ τὰς μετὰ τὴν ἑπταννότητας ἔχομεν. The phrase is difficult and is sometimes interpreted to mean that Photius knew that Memnon’s work was longer than sixteen books. Paolo Desideri, for example, supports an interpretation of this phrase forwarded some time ago by Martin Vogt, *viz.* that Memnon’s original work was divided into three octads comprising one roll each, the first and last of which Photius did not have. According to Desideri, in fact, Photius is here admitting that he had once seen all 24 books but that he is not currently able to describe the first or last octad because he had somehow lost access to them.

Part of the difficulty of the phrase is the function of the adverb οὔπω, which Desideri applies only to the main verb and not to the participle—“I am not (yet) able to describe the first eight books and those following the sixteenth, although they have come into my sight.” But it is far more natural to apply the adverb both to the main verb and to the participle: “I am not (yet) able to describe the first eight books or those following the sixteenth because they have not yet come into my sight.” Nor, for that matter, does the adverb mean that Photius believes he will one day have access to all the books. In some cases, it is true, in particular when he speaks about events in the past, Photius uses οὔπω to imply that the opposite state of affairs will necessarily follow; so elsewhere in his *Epitome* of Memnon, he says that the Gauls besieged Herakleia οὔπω τῶν Ῥωμαίων εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβεβηκότων (20). But in most cases, οὔπω only mitigates the negative by alluding to a future possibility. So in his prefatory note to the *Bibliotheka*, Photius

---

302 M. Vogt 1904, 717; P. Desideri 1967, 373-374, with n. 39, and 2007, 46. Advocates of the octad theory tend to place Memnon’s activity in the mid-second century CE; They are understandably, but without justification, excited by the appearance of a Herakleiote Memnon in an inscription from Tauric Khersonnesos dated to the reign of Antoninus Pius (*IosPe* I 2 362).

303 1967, 393-394.
describes his project as an attempt to summarize the works that his brother did not have the opportunity to read in his company: ἅμα δὲ καὶ ὅν οὐποί εἰς ἀξοας ἷμῶν ἄνέγνως (p). And in his epitome of a work On the Universe by (Ps.-)Josephus (48), he reports that a work on the same subject was written by Gaius, but, Εἰ δ' ἐτερος καὶ οὐχ οὔτὸς ἐστιν, οὐποί μοι γέγονεν εὐδηλον—here he only imagines the possibility that a distinction could be made between the two works. Our conclusion must be that Photius simply did not know whether or not he would ever read more of Memnon’s history.

In support of this reading, we should note that the definite article in the phrase τὰς μετὰ τὴν ζ' functions as an extension of the article as applied to the first eight books, which he knew existed, and should not be taken as an indication that Photius is referring to a known group of eight books.304 More to the point, if Photius had indeed had access at one point to the complete text of Memnon, he would certainly have said so, or at least given a reason as to his sudden aporia. Desideri’s support for his interpretation is the Epitome of Philostorgios (40), where Photius claims that six additional books of the history were discovered after he had already read six books; but this situation is not analogous to Desideri’s reconstruction of Photius’s relationship to Memnon, where Photius offers no explanation.

When Photius intends to say that he has only read a portion of a book, moreover, as he does in the case of Philostorgios, he is explicit. In his epitome of Apollonius (14), for example, he says, λέγεται δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔτερα συγγράμματα ἀξιομνημόνευτα εἶναι, οἷς οὔπω ημεῖς ἐνετύχωμεν. So too in the case of Phlegon’s chronography (97) Photius admits that while the work went from the first Olympic Games all the way to the time of Hadrian, he only read the first five books, up to the 177th Olympiad (i.e. 72-67

304 Photius’s use of the plural of ἰστορία to refer to groups of historical books does not seem problematic to me (contra P. Desideri 1967, 373), since he employs the word similarly elsewhere in the Epitome. At the conclusion of his account of the ninth and tenth books, for example, he writes, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἡ ὅ καὶ ἦ τοῦ Μέμνονος, ὡς ἐν ἐπιδρομῇ φάναι, διαγράφει ἰστορία (F1.3.3); at the conclusion of the fifteenth, ἐνταῦθα μὲν καὶ ἡ πεντεκαιδεκάτη καταλήγει ἰστορία (31.3); and at the beginning of the sixteenth, ἰστορία δὲ ἡ ἐφεξῆς τάδε ἀφηγεῖται (32.1).
BCE). Note also his epitome of Zosimos, where he supports his supposition that there were two editions to the work with evidence, \((Δοξεί δὲ μοι καὶ οὗτος δύο ἐκδόσεις . . . \) . 

We must conclude that Photius simply did not know the length of Memnon’s original work. He clearly had access to a manuscript that provided book numbers, since he knows that the first book available to him was the ninth and is able to give a breakdown of the narrative by book (or book groups), but the sixteenth book evidently did not end in such a way as to suggest finality, and Photius left open the possibility that it continued.

\(305\) Note also Photius’s discussion of Theopompos’s history (176): \(Διαπεπτωκέναι δὲ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν τινες ἐφησαν τὴν τε ἕκτην καὶ ἑβδόμην καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν ἐνάτην καὶ εἰκοστὴν καὶ τὴν τριακοστὴν. Αλλὰ ταύτας μὲν οὐδ’ ἡμεῖς εἴδομεν, Μηνοφάνης δὲ τις τὰ περὶ Θεοπόμπου διεξιών (ἀρχαῖος δὲ καὶ οὐκ εὔκαταφρόνητος ὁ ἀνήρ), καὶ τὴν δωδεκάτην συνδιαπεπτωκέναι λέγει καίτοι αὐτὴν ἡμεῖς ταῖς ἄλλαις συνανέγγυωμεν.\)
We have seen that Memnon very likely followed Nymphis’s structure for the first thirteen books of his history. Our one verbatim fragment of Nymphis (FGrHist 432 F10), a description of the tyrant Dionysius taken from Athenaeus’s discussion of obesity and hedonism, proves that in at least one place Memnon followed Nymphis quite closely. “From luxury and daily gluttony,” Nymphis wrote, “Dionysius unawares grew excessive in flesh (ἔλαθεν υπερσαρκήσας), with the result that because of his thickness he suffered from breathing difficulty and choking.” Next, he recounts the consequences of Dionysius’s bulk: the long needles with which doctors pierced his ribs and stomach whenever he happened to fall into a deep sleep; his lack of sensation; and the box behind which he spoke in order to obscure his unsightly midriff. After citing three caustic lines from Menander’s Halieis, a comedy devoted to the plight of Herakleite exiles, the fragment ends with a death notice: “he died having lived 55 years, of which he ruled for 33 years, having surpassed all in mildness and clemency.” The passage is a general character analysis without reference to any particular event aside from the tyrant’s death; and because it includes data about the length of his life, the most natural context is an obituary.

In Photius’s Epitome of Memnon, meanwhile, the counterpart to this passage clearly also belonged to an obituary, since it follows the narrative of Dionysius’s actions as ruler. After Memnon described Dionysius’s ascent following the death of his brother

306 Aelian, as we have said, preserves a discussion of Dionysius (VH 9.13) very similar to FGrHist 432 F10.
307 ἀπέθανεν δὲ βιώσας ἕτη πέντε πρὸς τοῖς πενήντοις, ὦν ἐτυφάννησεν τρία καὶ τριάκοντα, ἅπαντων τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ τυφάννησον προφήτητα καὶ ἐπευκείαις διενηχοῖς.
308 Such post-mortem character descriptions are not rare in historiography. Pompeius Trogus wrote obituaries for Philip II (9.7), Alexander (12.16), and Pyrrhus (25.5), and the form abounds in Roman historiography, especially for the emperors. In his Histories, Tacitus inserts an obituary at the death of Galba (Hist. 1.49.1-2), and we find something similar for Otho (Hist. 2.50), Vitellius (Hist. 3.86), and even Flavius Sabinus (Hist. 3.75); and in the Annals, we find eulogies at the deaths of Germanicus (2.73) and Tiberius (6.51) with eulogies. The practice is most evident in Ammianus Marcellinus (cf. 14.11.23-28; 21.15.4-21.16.20; 25.4.2-23; 25.10.112-17; 30.7.1-31.14.3), who seems to be drawing on a separate tradition, which is evident also in Eutropius and Aurelius Victor.
(FGrHist 434 F1.4.1) and his attempt to deal with the problem of the Herakleite exiles (FGrHist 434 F1.4.3) and to negotiate the power dynamic between the Diadokhoi (FGrHist 434 F1.4.3). At this point, like Nymphis Memnon assumes a more generalizing and achronological mode, remarking on Dionysius’s wealth, his assumption of the title king (FGrHist 434 F1.4.6), and his physique: φόβων δὲ καὶ φροντίδων ἐλευθεριάσας καὶ ταῖς καθημεριναῖς τρυφαῖς ἐκδιαιτηθεῖς ἐξωγκώθη τε τὸ σῶμα καὶ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν πολὺ πλέον ἐλιπάνθη (FGrHist 434 1.4.7). Next come the needles, the only cure for his torpor and insensibility (ἐπειδὰν ἀφυπνώσει, βελόναις μακραῖς τὸ σῶμα διαπειρόμενος, τούτο γὰρ ἄκος μόνον τοῦ κάρου καὶ τῆς ἀναισθησίας ὑπελείπετο), his difficulty sleeping (μόλις τῆς κατὰ τὸν ὑπόν καταφορὰς ἐξανίστατο), his progeny, and his death notice (βιοὺς μὲν ἔτη ε'/ καὶ ν', ὅν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τι/ ἐγνωρίζετο, πραγμάτατος ἐν αὐτῷ, ὡς εἰρήται, γεγονός καὶ τὸ Χρηστὸς ἐπίκλησιν εἶκ τῶν ήθῶν ἐνεγκάμενος, καὶ πολὺν πόθον τοῖς ὑπὸ χείρα καὶ πένθος λιπῶν (FGrHist 434 F1.4.8). We can immediately note the similarities between the structures of the obituaries in Nymphis and Memnon. There are differences in vocabulary, of course, which indicate that Memnon was not a mere copyist: \(^{309}\) compare Nymphis’s ὑπερσαρκήσας with Memnon’s ἐξωγκώθη, or Nymphis’s βελόνας λεπτὰς τῷ μήκει διαφερούσας with Memnon’s βελόνας μακραῖς; so too Memnon’s use of ἀναισθησία for Nymphis’s ἐνεποίει τὴν αἴσθησιν.\(^{310}\) But the resonances are undeniably strong.

---

\(^{309}\) As we shall see, it is likely that Photius retained some amount of Memnon’s original vocabulary.

\(^{310}\) See Heinemann, 28-43, for a good comparison of Nymphis 432 F10 with Memnon 434 F1.4.7-8. There are certainly omissions in Memnon’s account—the quotations from Menander are a good example, if these do indeed go back to Nymphis—but these more probably stem from Photius’s epitomization than from Memnon himself.
It would be a mistake to read Memnon as mere metonymy for Nymphis; nevertheless, we may see Nymphis’s prose lurking elsewhere behind Photius’s *Epitome*. The anatomical precision behind Memnon’s account of Satyros’s fatal illness (*FGrHist* 434 F1.5.4), for example, is likely a product of the same pen that recorded the rolls of flesh through which Dionysius’s needles penetrated (Nymphis *FGrHist* 432 F10), and the same thing may be said both about Memnon’s judgment of Satyros, *viz.* that he outdid not only Klearkhos but indeed all tyrants in his cruelty (*FGrHist* 434 F1.2.1), and about his high praise of Timotheus (*FGrHist* 434 F1.3). Our conclusion in any case is not that everything in the first half of Photius’s *Epitome* of Memnon derives form Nymphis but rather that Memnon had no qualms with reworking, in some cases quite closely, a local history of Herakleia that was published at least two hundred years before: part of his task, that is to say, was repetition and reiteration.

---

311 For this approach, see notably P. Desideri 1967, 389-393; A. Primo 2009a, 110; and now U. Heinemann 2010, *passim*. There is no evidence, we should say, that Memnon consulted Nymphis directly; there might well have been an intermediary (Desideri suggests Domitios, 390 with n. 119).

312 Cf. Memnon on Satyros (καὶ μετὰ χρόνον οὐ πολίν ἀνώτατον πάθει καὶ χαλεπωτάτῳ συσχεθείς – καρκίνωμα γὰρ μεταξὺ βουβῶν ὑποφυὲν τὴν νομὴν πρὸς τὰ ἑνόν ἐπέδιδοι πικρότερον, ἕως ὅτι ἕξερρεον βαρὺ καὶ δύσοιστον πνέουσαι, ὡς μηκέτι μήτε τὸ ἐπηρετούμενον μήτε τοὺς ἱατροὺς τὸ τῆς σηπεδόνος στέγειν δυσῶδες καὶ ἀνυπόστατον. καὶ συνεχεῖς δὲ ὡς θάνατος καὶ δριμεῖα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα κατάσκευα εἰς ἑνὸν ἐπερηφότερον) with Nymphis on Dionysius (ὁ Κλεάρχου τοῦ πρώτου τυραννήσαντος ἐν Ἑλλάδι καὶ αὐτὸς τῆς πατρίδος τυραννήσας ἐπὶ τρυφῆς καὶ τῆς καθ’ ἑμέραν ἀδηφαγίας ἔλαθεν ὑπερσαρκήσας, ὅταν δὲ μνήμης ἐν δυσπνοίᾳ εἰς τὸν καθαρὸ τόπον ἠκινητός ὑπεροχὴν, τότε διηγείρετο). Nymphis, if both passages do indeed go back to him, was evidently intrigued by insomnia, by the distinction between flesh and pith, by piercing.
CONCLUSION: COMMUNITY IDENTITY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

3.1 SYNOPSIS

Because our investigation of local historiography in Classical and Hellenistic Greece has ranged widely, it will be helpful to summarize the argument thus far. In Part One, we looked broadly at the phenomenon of local historiography. In the first section, “Community and Community Autobiography,” we saw that sociologists tend to distinguish landed, cohabitational communities from larger, “artificial” aggregates, like the nation or society. The histories of these little communities are often counterpoised to “national” history and interpreted as miniature distillations thereof, if not as lenses through which national issues are filtered. This dichotomy has accordingly been carried over into Greek world, where poleis are treated as components of Greece in toto and local histories are juxtaposed to what Felix Jacoby called “Great History.” But this model, I argued, is problematic, in particular its application to ancient Greece: a history is local first and foremost if it is focalized by locality; communities of ancient Greece were not compelled to construct their identity with recourse to some putative conglomerate to which they possibly belonged. Also in the first section of Part One, we distinguished local historiography from other manifestations of cultural memory. Greek communities could generate lengthy narratives of collective action expressed through epideictic oratory or poetry, but local historiography emerged only when these autobiographical impulses began to be filtered through the technology of prose.

In the second section of Part One, “Local Histories,” we defined local history as a narrative that treated a particular landed community and its past. We listed various types of community that engender local histories, and we distinguished intrinsic from extrinsic local histories, the former locally-sourced, the latter composed by foreigners on their own
volition and for an outside audience but nevertheless offering insight into a community’s own ideation of its past. Next, we surveyed numerous examples of local histories, from the ancient world to the present day, in order to demonstrate that local historiography is a natural response of all landed, literate communities. We looked here at twenty primarily intrinsic local histories: (1) Herodotus’s history of Egypt; (2) Livy’s history of Rome; (3) Dionysius’s history of Rome; (4) Chang Qu’s history of his native Sichuan; (5) Miyake no Omi Kanatari’s history of his native province of Izumo; (6) the anonymous Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which tracked the history of England through the lens of Wessex; (7) Cosmas’s chronicle of the Bohemians focalized by the territory of his native region of Bohemia, his city of Prague, and his cathedral; (8) Kalhana’s history of his native Kashmir; (9) Ibn Funduq’s history of his native Bayhaq; (10) the anonymous, intrinsic history of the Isle and monastery of Ely; (11) Giovanni Villani’s history of his native Florence; (12) the anonymous, intrinsic history of Tlatelolco in present-day Mexico; (13) Sir William Dugdale’s history of his native Warwickshire; (14) Thomas Prince’s history of New England; (15) Justus Möser’s history of his native Osnabrück; (16) Nikitias Niphakos’s history of the Mani; (17) Josiah H. Temple’s history of Whately, Massachusetts; (18) Carl C. Reindorf’s history of the Gold Coast and Asante; (19) Ibrahim Syukri’s history of the Malay Kingdom of Patani; and (20) Saqr, 'Abd al-'Aziz Muhammad’s history of his village Salama.

In the third section of Part One, “Local History and Community Autobiography,” we began by outlining some commonalities of the local histories in our database. Although these works vary in structure and in content, we were able to list several common characteristics. Most local histories preserve similar sets of data: a delineation of the focal locality, a treatment of the focal community’s collective past as well as its customs; and a prioritization of the foundational period, the ktisis. Most local histories, moreover, were written by men of the ruling classes or associated therewith. And finally
the production of local histories tends to be more pronounced in periods of perceived social upheaval. We concluded our discussion by arguing that local historiography can productively be read as community autobiography. On the one hand, the natural human tendency to construct life narratives explains the easy transference of the autobiographical mode from the individual to the community; on the other hand, like an individual’s autobiography, local historiography often arises from a need of self-assertion and preservation. Like personal autobiography, local histories tend to be (a) therapeutic or “emotional,” thereby helping a community process disturbance and disorder; or (b) “rational,” apologetic (seeking to defend a community’s actions) or testimonial (attempting to preserve a community’s shared memories, which are in perceived danger of decay).

In Part Two, we turned to local historiography in Classical and Hellenistic Greece. In the first section, “τοπικὴ ἱστορία,” we saw that local historiography was an indigenous category of historical writing in Greece. Already by the early-fourth century BCE, local historiography was distinguished from genealogy; and by the time of Augustus, critics could refer to it by way of specialized terminology. The very earliest non-local Greek historians, moreover, sometimes inserted potted local histories into their narratives, in the process recognizing the autonomy of the form. Greek local histories assumed a variety of structures: some focused on the early period (arkhaiologia/ktiseis), some on later times (praxeis), many tracked the focal community from its origins to the historian’s own day. But in all its shapes, local historiography was a prevalent and indeed almost default mode of historiography in Classical and Hellenistic Greece.

We looked next at the reception of Greek local historiography from Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Josephus, through the humanists, on into the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. We concentrated on the arguments of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf and Felix Jacoby, and we evaluated some of the problems inherent in
Jacoby’s path-breaking approach: too much emphasis on so-called “Great History,” which assumed that communities in Greece carved out a history for themselves with reference to the nation of Greece in toto; an unfounded equation between local, or at any rate polis, history with horography and, more specifically, between local history and Atthidography; and lastly a complicating ambiguity between local history and ethnography. The revolution in the mid-fifth century BCE, we suggested, entailed not the application of historiography to individual communities—for Greek historiography first emerged, as Dionysius saw, as accounts of specific localities (primarily eastern kingdoms)—but rather the application of historiography to Greek communities. This came with the recognition of the suitability of prose, a form through which a historian discussed matters with which his intended audience was unfamiliar, as a filter for the autobiographical impulse, previously channeled only through poetry and epideictic oratory.

The second section of Part Two demonstrated the variety of local historiography in Classical and Hellenistic Greece. We acknowledged that, while Greeks belonged to several spheres of community at once, the focalization of local histories was determined by the community of greatest common denominator—a citizen of a polis in Arkadia or Thessaly, that is to say, wrote regional, not civic, history. Next, we explored in detail the local histories of four communities: Samos, Thessaly, Argos, and Pontic Herakleia. Each of these localities (an island, a mainland region, and two poleis) responded differently to the autobiographical impulse, and each engendered a tradition of local historiography in accordance with the idiosyncrasies of its communal identity. (1) Through Samian local historiography we saw that individual Greek communities not only communicated cultural memory in distinctive ways but also relied on unique types of sources to construct local historiography. The community of Samos derived particular cohesion from its central cult site, the Heraion. For this reason, much Samian cultural memory
was preserved and transmitted with reference to the Heraion (especially through the medium of cult dedications), and Samian local historiography accordingly foregrounded the Heraion as a source for information about the past. In addition, Samian local historiography made particular use of the proverb as a source; and this, I argued, was in part a reflection of the role that native philosophers played in the construction of Samian identity. (2) Thessaly, like other regions in mainland Greece, appears to have produced local histories that concentrated on the *kitisis* and foundational period; only in the case of Boiotia, it seems (a region that was temporarily dominated by a single *polis* and whose local histories as a result were sometimes focalized by *polis*), did local histories embrace the more recent past. Although the region of Thessaly comprised a plurality of autonomous and at times antagonistic *poleis*, it nevertheless advanced a historiography whose emphasis on territory, namely the formation of the central Thessalian plain, reinforced the imagined cohesion of the region. In some cases, we saw, the retrojection of Thessalian communal organization even led to the designation of early Thessaly as a single *polis*. But the promotion of an idealized focal locality is not unique to regional historiography, nor, for that matter, are the mechanisms through which regions produce local histories categorically different from those employed by smaller civic centers. (3) Argive local historiography, which first emerged at the end of the fifth-century, of a time when Argos was attempting to assert itself in the face of Sparta and the Peloponnesian League, took as its focal locality not the *polis* of Argos or even the Argolid plain but much of the Peloponnesos itself. Just as King Alfred’s kingdom of Wessex could claim the entire island of England as its territory by using it as a focalizer of its local history, Argos’s fantasies about the extent of its territory found historiographic expression. (4) While local histories prioritize events attached to the territory of the focal locality itself, local narratives not infrequently relate interactions with external communities. Some communities, however, engender decidedly centrifugal local narratives. So with Pontic
Herakleia, whose histories are preoccupied with non-Greek populations: *e.g.* the Bithynians, the Gauls, the Romans, and the aboriginal population, the Mariandynoi. The local histories of Herakleia actually behave very similarly to those of other colonies. It was the anxiety provoked by the colonial experience, I argued, that predisposed these communities to take a historiographical interest in the non-local.

Our four case studies revealed that Samos, Thessaly, Argos, and Herakleia responded differently to the autobiographical impulse, that the concerns and characteristics of individual Greek communities dictated their respective approaches to the past and their consequent composition of local historiography. The idiosyncrasies of Greek communities manifest themselves in local historiography in a variety of ways, only several of which we have had the opportunity so far to address. One variable that we have touched upon only in passing is the articulation of time. In the following section, I shall extend my analysis by taking a closer look at the different chronological frameworks by which a community might structure its local histories. In a final section, I shall look at issues of audience and return to the problem of the origins of Greek local historiography.
3.2 The Shape of the Past

In 1676, the Bishop of Samos and Ikaria, Joseph Georgeirënēs, a recent émigré to London and the founder of England’s first Greek Orthodox Church, wrote an account of his former diocese. He begins with the island of Samos, his home for the past six years. “Samos, is one of the greatest, and most remarkable Islands of the Archipelago,” he begins, in the words of the English translation published the following year by Henry Denton, “situate near the Continent of Asia.” And then he offers the following historical précis:

It is well known that this was the Country of Pythagoras, and once was Govern’d by Kings of her own, and has made stout resistance against Athens, what time they both liv’d under a Democratical Government. The ruins which yet are to be seen there are a Testimony of her former greatness and wealth. But this Island hath been subject to great changes and revolutions, even to utter desertion of Inhabitants for many Years. Yet it being my main intent to give an account of its present State, I shall wave the former Transactions of Ancient times . . . and proceed to a survey of its condition in these Modern Times, under the Turkish Empire . . . It is certain, that what time it pleas’d God for our sins to permit the Turks to subdue Constantinople, and the Archipelago, the Island of Samos was totally dispeopl’d. Afterwards on Kilitch Aly Basha arrived here, and Landing with small Company to Hunt, was so taken with the place, that he was resolv’d to ask leave of the Grand Signior, to re-people the Island: Which having done, he transported several Families from all the Voisinage especially from Metelyne, so that by degrees, it became full of Inhabitants, and now counts to the number of 18 Town and Villages, which I shall now describe according to their Situation.

In Bishop Georgeirënēs’ potted history of Samos, there is Pythagoras, tyranny, a revolt, and there are desertions; an ancient depopulation and its modern rhyme. What is interesting about his punctuation of the past, especially in light of the fact that there is considerable debate both about the authenticity of the Turkish “dispeopl’ing” in 1476 and

---

1 See A.J. Papalas 2005, 7-13 for background information about Bishop Georgeirënēs, the future founder of the first Orthodox Greek church in London.
2 Περιγραφή της παρούσας κατάστασης της Σάμου, Ικαρίας Πάτμου και Αθώνος (“Description of the Present State of Samos, Nikaria, Patmos, and Mount Athos”).
about the state in which Ali Pasha found the island when he visited a century later, is that this alternation between desolation and reoccupation actually echoes an ancient rubric for narrating the Samian past. The Bishop is in fact employing a framework that had structured histories of Samos written in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE; and he is in the process extending it to cover more recent events.

Our fullest and most coherent ancient history of Samos is Aristotle’ Politeia of the Samians. We have already had recourse to examine its remains in full, but it will be worthwhile to look once again at Herakleides’ epitome.

It is said that in the beginning Samos, being desolate (ἐρήμη), contained a multitude of beasts with very loud voices. The beasts were called Neides, the island Parthenia—later it was called Dryusa. Anakios ruled them; . . . Pherekydes of Syros died in Samos after having been devoured by lice; when Pythagoras came in, he showed him through a hole his finger stripped of flesh. At that time Aesop the storyteller was popular. He was Thracian by birth, and he was freed by Idmon the wise, but he was at first the slave of Xanthos. The politeia of the Samians was made desolate (ἠρήμωσεν) by Syloson, from which derives the proverb, “On account of Syloson, (there is) open space.” And Theogenes, a certain Samian well born but otherwise dissolute and wicked, fled his fatherland and spent time at Athens at Euripides’. After corrupting his wife, he took him as an accomplice and persuaded the Athenians to send two thousand men to Samos. When these men arrived, they exiled everyone.

It is not unusual, as we have seen, for a Greek local history to begin with the condition of the locality before the arrival of the first humans. But in Herakleides’ epitome, we have three episodes of desolation: the initial prehistoric phase, when only wild animals roamed the land; the late-sixth century, when the island was emptied of people by the tyrant Syloson; and finally during the cleruchy, when the Athenians made the unprecedented decision in 365 to establish a colony on Samos. The cleruchy, as we saw, was undoubtedly a traumatic experience: the Athenians remained on Samos for over forty years, replenishing their numbers at least twice; while the Samians scattered to nearby islands, the coast of Asia Minor, and as far away as Sicily, until they regained control of

---

3 See G. Shipley 1987, Appendix 9.
their homeland after the death of Alexander the Great.\(^4\) So it is possible that Aristotle himself retrojected this fourth-century Samian exile into the earlier history of the island as a precedent. For local histories (and the local traditions on which they are based) frequently substantiate present circumstances though ancient, often foundational, precedents. The same phenomenon, in fact, might also explain Xenophon’s contention in the *Hellenika*, a text written before Aristotle’s *Politeia* but nevertheless during the cleruchy,\(^5\) that at the end of the Peloponnesian War the Spartan general Lysander exiled all Samian citizens (2.3.6-7).\(^6\)

Yet we have evidence that this leitmotif of desertion animated Samian tradition prior to the cleruchy. For as we saw Herodotus, who spent some time on Samos in the 440s while researching his *Histories*, emphasized the depopulation of the island during the reign of Syloson. He says that after the Persians captured the region, they swept the island clear of men and handed it over to the tyrant—actually, the metaphor he uses is of a drag net culling fish (3.149)\(^7\)—but that soon afterwards, a Persian general, prompted by a dream and some inguinal disease, took it upon himself to repopulate Samos. Given Herodotus’s language and his penchant for paroimiology, it is likely that he had in mind here the same proverb that Aristotle would later cite about “broad Samos,” and that he encountered this proverb during his Samian sojourn. If so, desertion and repopulation were on the Samians’ minds even in the mid-fifth century. In fact, Euagon, Herodotus’s (perhaps slightly older) contemporary, began his history of Samos with a description of the prehistoric beasts whose loud cries rent the countryside (*FGrHist* 535 F1). Later

\(^4\) For the evidence, see *IG* 12.6.1.262; *SIG*\(^2\) 276A = *SEG* 18.200, 29.458, and 1442.11.89-91; Isoc. 15.11; Dem. 15.9; Aristot. *Rhet*. 2. 1384b32-35; Phil. *FGrHist* 328 F154; Diod. Sic. 18.18.9; Strab. 14.1.18 638; and Schol. Aesch. 1.53.

\(^5\) The last part of the *Hellenika* was certainly written after the Battle of Mantinea (362 BCE), and there are reasons to believe that the entire text was not published until the 350s, well after the cleruchy was established (see V.J. Gray 1991).

\(^6\) For the probable historical inauthenticity of these traditions, see G. Shipley 1987, 131-133.

\(^7\) The proverb, as we saw, was well known. It is retained by Strabo, who explains that Syloson ruled so harshly that the *polis* was depopulated (14.1.17) and by Zenobios, who includes it in his collection with a similar explanation (3.90 = 591.2 Gigon).
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sources, we saw, claim that the Samians used to point out the bones of these animals—probably mastodons in fact—still embedded in cliff-faces and even displayed at the Heraion. So the initial absence of humans on Samos was an important element not only of fifth-century Samian cultural memory but also of Samian local historiography. Indeed, since Aristotle used Euagon’s history as a source for his Samian Politeia, it is not unlikely that Euagon had himself included some of the other episodes preserved in Aristotle’s narrative, such as Syloson’s depopulation. All this to say, while the epitome of Aristotle’s Politeia most clearly reveals how Samian history was punctuated by periodic desertions and depopulations, Aristotle was himself employing a pre-existing and indigenous rubric for organizing the past.

There is no question that Samian history actually was marked by several traumatic depopulations. But rather than elide or ignore these crises, the Samians explicitly preserved and incorporated them. On the one hand, depopulation was made an integral part of stories about the ktisis and the foundational period. In addition to the strident prehistoric beasts, we can note several similar traditions: that not long after the Ionian migration the Samians were driven to the mainland by the neighboring Carians (Paus. 7.4.2-3); that the mythical founder of Ephesos exiled the Samians and took possession of the island (Paus. 7.2.8); and that in accordance to an oracle the Samians at one point voluntarily left their home for ten years (Plut. Gr. Ait. 55). The Samians’ anxieties about the permanence of their community on the island, we might add, are also reflected in Menodotos’s history, where the statue of Hera is nearly forcibly exiled from the island—it makes it as far as the shore—before it returns to its rightful position at the Heraion. On the other hand, certain events were recast in order to accommodate the pattern: Samos

---

8 In the reign of the mythical King Leogoros, son of Prokles who led the Ionian migration.
9 To Anaia on the mainland, which sheltered Samian exiles (Thuc. 1.115; cf. Vit. Soph.).
10 W.R. Halliday (1928, 206-207) thinks that Plutarch’s anecdote relates to Pausanias’s story of Androklos.
was allegedly completely depopulated as a result of the Persian conquest, the Spartan conquest, and much later of the Turkish conquest.

We saw in Part One that while shared memories frequently are articulated by way of discrete episodes, communities also have opportunities to express more coherent local narratives. I want to suggest that even when a community did not actually enunciate such an autobiography, it nevertheless had access to a way of telling its own story, to a unique sociomnemonic structure or epichoric rubric by which it would articulate and organize discrete episodes from its shared past. For one thing, the *ktisis*, which serves as the earliest node of a community’s shared memory, naturally varies from community to community. For another, individual communities possess idiosyncratic calendars, measuring the passage of months and years in diverse ways: some used magistrates as a metronome, for example, others religious officials. And these various chronologies inform the way individual communities organize local historiography: for those *poleis*, like Athens, that appointed a magistrate annually, local historiography might mark the passage of each year and thus tend toward horography; for other communities, like Pontic Herakleia, narratives were more easily divided by broader chunks of time, corresponding for example to the reigns of local tyrants or dynasts. But aside from these different chronological scaffoldings on which local tradition and local histories were hung, individual communities seem also to have given idiosyncratic shapes to their autobiographies and to their local histories.

The Samian community evidently saw itself as subject to continual resets; the sociomnemonic structure by which it organized its autobiography, then, was cyclical. I

---

12 What Y. Zerubavel has called in the context of twentieth-century Israel a “master commemorative narrative, which “focuses on the group’s distinct social identity and highlights its historical development” (1995, 7); see also R. Bellah *et al.* 1985, 153.
13 See K. Clarke 2007, Chapter One and *passim*.
14 On “circles and rhymes” in historical narrative, see E. Zerubavel 2003, 23-25. Much Greek local historiography, it is true, extrapolates narratives about the past by way of etiology of local ritual. To the
do not mean to suggest that Samos’s emplotment of the past ignored the passage of time. Several Classical and Hellenistic histories of Samos, of course, were explicitly known as Ὄροι. But the Samian community shaped its past with recourse to repetition. It may be no accident that it was a Samian, Pythagoras, who first enunciated the idea of eternal recurrence, claiming that “whatever happens will occur again according to certain cycles.” This pattern may be a manifestation of the anxiety, likely based to some extent on real experience, that Samians felt about their fragile tenure of the island. But it is important to note that such a conception promoted territory as a primary means of cohesion. It was occupancy of the island, that is to say, that linked various iterations of the Samian community; and Samian local historiography as a result tracked the history of the island even when there were no Samians on it. The cyclical pattern of the past may thus have given the Samians some confidence about their claim to the land: like Polycrates’ ring, exiled Samians, like Douris, would find their way back to shore. On the other hand, for those Samians on the island, the rubric through which Samians narrated their autobiography hinted always at potential doom. As we read in Book Three of the Sibylline Oracles, a text dating from the second or first century BCE (363-366), just as Delos will become invisible (ἀδήλος) and Rome but a single street (ῥύμη), so too is Samos fated to return to sand (ἄμμος).

The shape of Samian cultural memory and local historiography may be juxtaposed to a more familiar paradigm: a progressive and evolutive narrative, such as...
that employed at Athens. For quite apart from the fact that several prominent Athenian local historians, notably Androtion in the mid-fourth century and Philokhoros in the early third, wrote horography, structuring at least the more recent past by way of eponymous magistrates, Athenian local tradition and historiography promoted a developmental organization of community autobiography. Again, a good place to start is with Aristotle’s *Politeia*, especially since in the case of Athens we are happily able to supplement stray fragments and Herakleides’ epitome with a nearly complete version of the text. The treatise can be roughly divided into two sections, the first a diachronic narrative of Athenian history from the *ktisis* to the end of the Peloponnesian War, the second a synchronic exegesis of the mechanisms of the Athenian constitution. In the first half, Aristotle very deliberately tracks the development of the Athenian state from monarchy to democracy: the division of the kingdom by Pandion, its reunification by Theseus, the coup of Cylon, the legislation and Solon, the tyranny of Peisistratos, the revolution of Kleisthenes, the growth of the Athenian empire under Aristeides, the ascendancy of Perikles, the political stasis in 411, the rule of the Thirty, and finally the restoration of democracy in 403. In several places, in fact, Aristotle emphasizes that his narrative describes the evolution of the Athenian political community and the flowering of democracy: Τότε μὲν οὖν μέχρι τοῦτο προῆλθεν ἡ πόλις, ἅμα τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ κατὰ μικρὸν αὐξανομένη (23.1). And after the reforms of Kleisthenes, we read,

---

18 Again, the *Souda* says that Philokhoros’s *Atthis* embraced the affairs of the Athenians and their kings and archons up to the last Antiochus surnamed Theos (περιέχει δὲ τὰς Ἀθηναίων πράξεις καὶ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἀρχοντάς, ἓναν Ἀντιόχου τοῦ τελευταίου τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος θεοῦ). And there are numerous fragments that show his horographic arrangement; for dating of early Athenian history by reigns of kings see e.g. FF8 and 13; for dating by way of archon, see FF202, 119, 121-123, 53-56, 66-67 (cf. Dionys. Hal. AR 1.8).

19 The division is not total: Aristotle often pauses in the first part to expound various laws and organs of state and in the second part mentions certain changes to the *politeia*, the last of which occurred in 329/8 BCE (*Ath.Pol*. 54.7); although see P. Rhodes 1981, 55-56 for the contention that this date is a later insertion.

Every event that Aristotle narrates, moreover, affects the running of the polis, and all of Aristotle’s characters contribute to the action only insofar as they modify the politeia. We see this most clearly in the list that he inserts in the middle of the first section, where “leaders of the demos” are arranged in chronological order as a series of opposing pairs, one democratic and the other aristocratic (28.2), whose dialectic propels the development of the Athenian political community. Aristotle’s dynamic and cumulative conception of Athenian history is exemplified by the summary with which he concludes the historical section (41). Here, Aristotle represents the Athenian past as a series of eleven changes, all of which relate to the Athenian politeia: first there was the Ionian Migration, “when the Athenians were divided into the four tribes;” second, Theseus’s slight deviation from strict monarchy; third, Solon’s foundation of democracy; fourth, the tyranny of Peisistratos; fifth, the constitution of Kleisthenes after the overthrow of the tyrants, which was even more democratic; and so on, all the way to the eleventh and final change, the overthrow of the oligarchy at the end of the fifth century.

Given the characteristics of Aristotle’s Samian Politeia, his formulation of Athenian history cannot merely be due to a personal interest in politics, nor can the idea of progress and development simply be a consequence of his peculiar teleology. As we have seen, we have evidence that in his politeiai Aristotle relied wherever possible on indigenous sources and traditions. In the case of Samos, one of his main sources was the local historian Euagon, whom he used to the exclusion of Herodotus. In the case of
Athens, his primary source was the Atthidographer Androtion, who published his eight-book history of Athens in the late 340s. And the prominent role that Aristotle gives to the Athenian state and its evolution is indeed reflected in the fragments of Androtion’s *Atthis*: we know, for example, that the Atthidographer discussed the powers of the Areiopagos (*FGrHist* 324 FF3-4, 16), the legislation of Solon (F34), the tyranny of Peisistratos, the reforms of Kleisthenes (F5), and the oligarchies of the late-fifth century (F10). The evolutive shape of the Athenian past is reflected, in fact, in all Athenian local Atthidography. It is clearest in the numerous fragments from Philokhoros’s *Atthis*, but it is present even a century beforehand in the history of Kleidemos (see e.g. *FGrHist* 323 F8). Several verbatim Atthidographic fragments, in fact, describe by way of imperfect verbs a defunct stage in Athens’ political development, implicitly foregrounding development. As natural as this may seem, it is exceedingly rare to find such an acknowledgment of change among the fragments of local historiography; in most cases, in fact, local praxis is described by way of the present tense. Of course, there is a good deal about cult and ritual among the Atthidographers, to say nothing of Athenian military action outside the bounds of the *polis*, but a thread that runs through each *Atthis* is the evolution of the *politeia*.

The conception of Athenian history as the gradual development of the political community is evident also in local Athenian discourse. We see it, for example, in some of the orations of Isocrates, notably in the *Panathenaikos*, published just before the Battle

---

25 The last book mentioned in the fragments, that is to say, is the eighth (*FGrHist* 324 F32); the reference to the twelfth book (F33) is likely a mistake (see F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIb Suppl. Noten, 102 n.36).

26 For Androtion as a source for Aristotle’s *Athenaion Politeia*, see F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIb Suppl. Noten 100; P. Harding 1977, 159 n. 68; P. Rhodes 1981, 15-30; P. Harding 1994, 51-2; and G. de Ste Croix, 277-307. Compare *FGrHist* 324 F6 with *Ath.Pol.* 22.3-4; and *FGrHist* 324 F43 with *Ath.Pol.* 29.2. But Aristotle clearly had other sources at his disposal, to say nothing of his own considerable abilities as a researcher, and this explains some of the contradictions between his account and that of Androtion, notably of Solon’s *Seisakhtheia* (cf. *FGrHist* 342 F34 and *Ath.Pol.* 6.1, 10).

27 See Kleidemos’s description of describes the Pnyx (*FGrHist* 323 F7); Philokhoros on the antiquated procedure of ostracism (*FGrHist* 328 F30); and his account of the changing functions of the theoric fund (*FGrHist* 328 F33) and the Areiopagos (*FGrHist* 328 F196).
of Chaironeia in 338 BCE: a good encapsulation of Isocrates’ ideation of the kinetic Athenian politeia comes in section 114: Καί μηδείς ύπολάβη με ταύτ’ εἰρηκέναι περὶ ταύτης τῆς πολιτείας, ἣν ἄναγκασθέντες μετελάβομεν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς τῶν προγόνων, ὥς οὐ καταφρονήσαντες οἱ πατέρες ἵμων ἐπὶ τὴν νῦν καθεστώσαν ὄρθιαν κτλ. And our earliest extant discussion of Athenian history, that of Herodotus, is framed in very much the same terms. While Herodotus nowhere provides a cohesive account of early Athens, he nevertheless preserves a number of key episodes, and these he disperses chronologically throughout his narrative. The first time he adduces Athens is with reference to Solon, “who,” he says, “made laws for the Athenians” (1.29); then, thirty chapters later, he describes the tyranny of Peisistratos (1.59-64); and in the fifth book he narrates the fall of the tyranny (5.55-56; 65) and the subsequent legislation of Kleisthenes (5.66; 68-70, 72). Herodotus, who spent some time at Athens just around the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, has clearly absorbed indigenous ways of talking about Athenian history. Here was a community who sought to promote cohesion through an appeal to evolving political institutions.

We may speculate as to why it was that Athens preferred this model, linking the rubric perhaps to the democratic revolution at the end of the sixth century and seeing it as a reaction to an earlier aristocratic formulation of the past. In fact, there were times,

---

28 Athens, he says, enjoyed monarchical rule (12.119) from Kekrops (12.126) to Theseus, who relinquished his control of affairs to the populace (12.129) and thereby established the fundaments of democracy. Henceforth the politeia was continually modified: magistrates began to be allotted rather than elected (145), and during the Peloponnesian War the franchise was extended in order to preserve Athens’ naval hegemony (12.114). Although, as in Aristotle’s Politeia, not every change is toward democracy—the tyranny of Peisistratos marked a regression (12.148)—Athenians in Isocrates contribute to Athenian history insofar as they affect the politeia.

29 The literature on Herodotus and Athens is enormous: see e.g. F. Jacoby 1913, H. Kleinknecht 1940, H. Strasburger 1955, C.W. Fornara 1971, 37-58, and S. Forsdyke 2001.

30 He also treats en passant the early kings, the Kodridai (5.65) and the conspiracy of Kylon (5.71).

31 Democracy, as de Tocqueville long ago noticed, engendered a historiography markedly different from aristocracy. He is talking about modern democracy, of course, and not at all about ancient Athens, but his observations are nevertheless illuminating.

32 For this democratic reading of polis history, see R. Thomas 1989, 196-237; see also P. Harding 1977 and J. McInerny 1994.
in particular during the last decade of the Peloponnesian War, when oligarchs controlled
the *polis*; and during these periods, Athens experimented with other sociomnemonic
structures. Many of the leading politicians at this time actually forwarded a static
account of the Athenian past, the so-called Ancestral Constitution, which gave pride of
place to a system allegedly instituted at the very birth of the Athenian political
community. It is not a coincidence that the exponents of this view were all pro-Spartans.

The last model I want to consider, then, is the rubric adopted by Spartan tradition
and local historiography, a monoeidic past centered on only one event: Lykourgos’s
foundation of the Spartan *politeia*. Once again, Aristotle is a good place to begin. Of the
fifteen fragments that remain from his *Politeia of the Lakedaimonians*, fourteen have to
do with Lykourgos, his legislation and his life (FF533-545 Rose).\(^33\) We get a similar
picture from Herakleides’ epitome. Nearly the entire summary concerns Lykourgos:\(^34\) his
youthful journey to Crete, the lawlessness and tyranny that greeted him on his return
home, and his subsequent creation of the Spartan state, not only the organs of
government, like the ephorate and the kingship, but also various customs, like sumptuary
laws and the Spartan educational system.

Just as in the case of Samos and Athens, Aristotle has not invented his
formulation of the Spartan past out of whole cloth. For one thing, many of his
contemporaries advanced similar conceptions. In Isocrates’ *Panathenaikos*, we find a
static Sparta counterpoised to a progressive and incremental Athens. According to

\(^33\) He discussed Lykourgos’s date (F533), his visit to the oracle at Delphi (F535), his foundation of the
gerousia (536-537) and the ephors (539), and of various laws and customs still practiced in Aristotle’s own
day. F532 Rose has to do with Sparta’s conquest of Amyklai. We might assume that Aristotle’s *Lak.Pol.*
did, in fact, cover Spartan history from the Dorian migration, through Lykourgos, and on into archaic and
classical times, but that later writers cared predominately about the times of origins, or (in the case of
grammarians and lexicographers) had little reason, when culling exempla, to read a work through to the
end. It is true that an important source of fragments for Aristotle’s *Lak.Pol.* is Plutarch’s *Lykourgos*, which
naturally retains only those references that had to do with Lykourgos. But Plutarch, we saw, was able to
read the *Politeiai* in full (Mor 1093c), and this suggests that they were extant at least at the end of the 2\(^{nd}\)
century CE, and so available, in their entirety, to Herakleides Lembos, whose summary should therefore be
considered an accurate paraphrase.

\(^34\) Aside from a brief nod to the two Spartan poets, Alkman and Terpander.
Isocrates, “Students of Spartan affairs assert that the Lakedaimonians were more distracted by political strife than any other Greeks” (12.177) until Lykourgos (12.204), who, taking his cue from Crete (12.152), established a politeia that finally brought order (12.152) and has remained in force ever since. And this blueprint—Lykourgan legislation flanked by disorder and order—is evident also in the historians Ephoros and Thucydides, who says at the beginning of his History that although the Spartans were subject to stasis for a remarkably long time, they nevertheless very early on came to enjoy eunomia and so continuously managed to avoid tyranny: “for more than four hundred years,” Thucydides concludes, “they enjoyed the same politeia, and because of it they became powerful and were thus in a position to arrange affairs in other poleis” (1.18). This template for the past is discernible as early as Herodotus (1.65). For whereas Herodotus has recounted Athenian history piecemeal and as a work in progress, his account of early Sparta is entirely one-dimensional. The Spartans were long ago the worst governed of nearly all the Greeks, he says, “but they changed to eunomia in the following way”: Lykourgos instituted laws that he had borrowed from Crete, and he established the foundation of Sparta’s military system, as well as the ephorate and gerousia, the council: a politeia that has persevered to the present day.

The stereotyped shape of the Spartan past that we find in Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates, Ephoros, and Aristotle—and if we looked further, we could see it also in Polybius (6.12.48) and in the Augustan writers, Dionysius (A.R. 2.23), Strabo (8.5.5), and

---

35 Ephoros discussed Lykourgos’s genealogy, his journey to Crete and to Egypt, the implementation of his politeia, and his subsequent visits to Delphi (FGrHist 70 FF118 and 149). It is possible that he also recounted the pre-Lykourgan stasis (see Strabo 8.5.5); but cf. J. Wickersham 1994, 123. On Ephoros’s comparison between the Spartan and the Cretan politeiai, see also FGrHist 70 F33.

36 Herodotus, it is true, does not only recount traditions about the politeia. When he discusses the early history of the Spartiates, he does so by way of the Dorian migration (6.52 and 8.31, 43, 73, 114), and when he speaks of individual Spartans, he can provide lengthy genealogies traced all the way back to Herakles. There are in addition stories connected with the early monarchy, like the explanation of fifth-century Agiad prominence (6.62), an etiology slotted into the period just after the Spartiate migration and traditions about Sparta’s archaic territorial expansion in the Peloponnesos: the war with Tegea, for example (1.65-68), and the so-called “Battle of the Champions” against Argos (1.82). But when he talks about the early history of the polis of Sparta, there is only Lykourgos.
Pompeius Trogus (Just. 3.2-3)—is not merely the uninformed response of outsiders to an opaque and inscrutable community; rather, it reflects indigenous Spartan discourse about the past. Herodotus actually explicitly claims to be basing his account of early Sparta on local sources; he reproduces what he considers authentic Spartan tradition about the role of Crete (1.65.4; cf. 6.52.1), for example, and uses specialized vocabulary to address Lykourgos’s military system (1.65.5). But, more to the point, his conception mirrors indigenous Spartan historiographical structures. Around the turn of the fourth century BCE, a generation or so before Athenians started writing Athenian history that is, several influential Spartan politicians published local histories of Sparta in the form of politeiai: there was Thibron (FGrHist 581), a general sent to Asia Minor in 399 and subsequently exiled for misconduct, whose well-known work, Aristotle says, praised Lykourgos for

37 We can thus infer some level of familiarity in his audience; the Spartan politeia was a topic of conversation among Lakedaimonians and non-Lakedaimonians alike.

38 See. D. Tober 2010. Some of these texts, it is true, used Lykourgos’s politeia in order to justify particular political agendas. Thibron, for example, was a proponent of Spartan imperialism, which he substantiated by rooting it at the moment of kinesis (see E.N. Tigerstedt 1965, Vol. 1, 110 and S. Cataldi 1996, 63-83); Lysander argued for the extension of the kingship to all descendants of Herakles, claiming that this had been Lykourgos’s original intention; and King Pausanias evidently tried to prove that the ephorate was not a legitimate part of the Spartan state (Pol. 5.1301b19; see E. Meyer, 1892, 244-250 and K.J. Beloch, 1912, Vol. 1.2, 158; 3.1, 71 n.4). But this sort of political engagement in no way undermines the status of these works as historiography. King Pausanias clearly did research, citing in his Politeia oracles that he had culled from other treatises (V. Ehrenberg 1924, 25), poetry (see Meyer, 1892, 244-50; cf. Pol. 5.1306 b39), and other sorts of documents (for the idea that Pausanias cited the Great Rhetra, see Tigerstedt 1965, Vol. 1 285; E. David 1979, 112; and van Wees 1994, 17; but cf. M. Kõiv, 2003, 242; cf. Kõiv 2000). Lysander apparently also cited oracles and perhaps the same verses of Tyrtaios as Pausanias, as van Wees suggests (1994, 13). These politeiai were certainly considered historiography by Aristotle, who used Pausanias and Androtion respectively when he wrote his politeiai of Sparta and Athens.

39 We know nothing more about this Thibron, save that he evidently lived before Leuktra (had he written after Leuktra, Thibron would hardly have used Sparta’s “empire” as a means of praising Lykourgos). The author of the work on Sparta is nowhere explicitly equated to the harmost (for whom, see Xen. Hell. 3.1.4; 4.8.18; Anab. 7.6; and Diod. 14.36), but there is no reason to doubt the link (see Jacoby, FGrHist 581). It may well have been during his exile that he wrote his treatise, perhaps to convince the Spartans who exiled him of his merit. Jacoby (FGrHist 581 ad loc.) suggests that Thibron may have written his treatise to recommend the Spartan state to rulers of Asia Minor or to show the ephors who had exiled him that they were not part of the proper Lykourgan politeia.

40 Aside from the fact that Aristotle cites Thibron first and foremost here in his discussion of Sparta’s politeia and certainly used him when he wrote his own Politeia, Thibron’s text lurks behind Xenophon’s own treatise on the Spartan constitution. In Chapter 14, for example, Xenophon claims that the Spartans are in fact disobeying the laws of Lykourgos in their imperialism, by living abroad, by interacting with foreigners, and by allowing themselves to be corrupted by greed and flattery. Xenophon also makes disparaging remarks here about harmosts, and in his Hellenika he explicitly refers to Thibron as a harmost.
equipping the Spartans to rule over many (Pol. 7.1333b12); and there was King Pausanias,\textsuperscript{41} who also wrote his \textit{Politeia} in exile in the 390s and who, according to Ephoros, actually attacked\textsuperscript{42} Lykourgos’s laws (\textit{FGrHist} 582); we hear also of a “\textit{logos about the politeia}” written (or commissioned) by the general Lysander.\textsuperscript{43} And there were many others: Aristotle identifies an entire group of “writers of Spartan \textit{Politeiai},” and we have fragments of numerous works of this sort, many composed by native Spartans, like Hippassos (\textit{FGrHist} 589), whose \textit{Politeia} was five books long,\textsuperscript{44} and Aristokrates (\textit{FGrHist} 591),\textsuperscript{45} whose four-book \textit{Politeia} contained a very elaborate account of Lykourgos’s travels around the world.\textsuperscript{46}

Unlike the dominant Athenian tradition, where the \textit{politeia} developed, democracy emerging gradually through the legislation of various politicians from the late-seventh century onward, the Spartans conceived of a \textit{politeia} that appeared in a flash.\textsuperscript{47} Their insistence on the immutability of their state, we might add, remained even as Sparta changed. For Sparta was, in the words of Lévi-Strauss, a “cold society,”\textsuperscript{48} a community that did not internalize its history, that in fact excluded change as a means of continuity. Such communities tend to choose what Jan Assmann has designated as a “cold option” of

\textsuperscript{41} The reference to Pausanias’s contribution comes from Strabo (8.5.5 c366), who is paraphrasing Ephoros (\textit{FGrHist} 70 F118).
\textsuperscript{42} For the difficulties of this word, \textit{κατά}, see E. David 1979, 94-116 and J. Ducat 2006, 42-44 (cf. E. Meyer 1892, 233-4).
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{τὸ βιβλίον, ἐν ὧ γεγραμμένος ἢν ὁ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας λόγος (FGrHist} 70 F207 = Plut. Lys. 30).
\textsuperscript{44} We know very little about this work, except for Hippasos’s apparent interest in Spartan amusements (F1). He was evidently known to Demetrios the Magnesian, but this provides only a \textit{terminus ante quem} of the mid-first century BCE and says nothing against placing Hippasos considerably earlier.
\textsuperscript{45} We know that Aristokrates wrote at some point after 189 BCE because he mentions Philopoimen’s slaughter of 350 Spartiates in that year (F4 = Plut. \textit{Phil.} 16.4).
\textsuperscript{46} According to Aristokrates, Lykourgos visited Crete, Egypt, Spain, and even India. We also know of the Spartan Molpis (\textit{FGrHist} 590), who said something about Spartan dinners (F2c), and Nikokles (\textit{FGrHist} 587), as well as writers of uncertain provenance, like Aristokles (\textit{FGrHist} 586), Polykrates (\textit{FGrHist} 588), Phaistos (\textit{FGrHist} 593), and Dioskourides (\textit{FGrHist} 594).
\textsuperscript{48} For the term, see C. Lévi-Strauss 1966, 232-3. For Sparta as a cold society, see N. Luraghi 2008, 75.
collective memory, cohering through the act of remembering and contemporizing a timeless and static kosmos.\textsuperscript{49}

The sociomnemonic structure through which a community organized its autobiography and local historiography was transmitted not merely through local historiography but also orally—Herodotus, we may recall, wrote about Sparta in much the same way as Spartans would in the following generation—and it likely traveled in tandem with the narratives themselves, perhaps, if Isocrates is any indication, in the context of public festivals. In the case of Athens, the Panathenaia comes to mind as just such an occasion, but other civic festivals, like the ephebeia, may also have played a role.\textsuperscript{50} In the case of Hellenistic Sparta, we know, it was the custom for the ephors each year to read out to the Spartan youths the Politeia that had been composed by the celebrated Aristotelian Dikaiarkhos (Souda, Δ1062). Such a repetition would have ensured that subsequent iterations of Sparta’s autobiography employ the same shape.

In many cases, then, the sociomnemonic patterns behind local historiography turn out to be remarkably stable. This is not to say that a Greek community’s shared memories did not change over time—for they certainly did. In the case of Sparta, we can observe the ways in which Lykourgos’s career was embroidered by successive historians and how, as the Greek world grew larger with Alexander’s conquests, so too did Lykourgos travel further afield: to Egypt, Spain, and even India. And local historians certainly could advance very different interpretations of the same event; Atthidography offers an especially clear example of this type of revision, as do the competing versions of Lykourgos's politeia advanced in the early fourth century. Nevertheless, as we can see from the shape that Bishop Georgeirēnēs gave in the seventeenth century to the Samian past, a shape employed also by Aristotle and Euagon, whose texts had long been lost, the

\textsuperscript{49} See 1992, 68-70; and 2006, 11-14.
\textsuperscript{50} For the educative role of the ephebeia in the latter Hellenistic period, see É. Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 51-52.
structures through which a community organized and articulated its past resist change. The Bishop in fact himself demonstrates an awareness of the conservatism of Greek cultural memory, when in his preface to his history he claims to have written “nothing, but what he saw, or what he receiv’d from the constant Tradition of the places.”
3.3 Greek Local Historiography and Its Audiences

Since fortunes are not made by writing local history, the writer's impulse can only proceed from a genuine enthusiasm for the subject, and the rule is: TO ASSUME AN EQUAL ENTHUSIASM IN THE READER. In his single-minded devotion to the genius loci, the historian finds an endless fascination in every aspect of his chosen theme, and he takes it for granted that his readers will approach it in the same spirit; or rather, in his modesty, he assumes that nobody will read his narrative unless he cares about the place at least as much as the writer does. This assumption is usually correct; and it has the further merit of being immensely labour saving.

H.P.R. Finberg, “How Not to Write Local History” (1967)

In the ninth book of his history of Athens, Philokhoros recounted an omen about which he was himself consulted towards the end of the fourth century BCE. “At the beginning of the year,” Philokhoros writes, “a dog entered the temple of Athena Polias. After making its way into the Pandroseion, it got up on the altar of Zeus Herkeios, which is under the olive tree, and lay down. It is an ancestral custom among the Athenians that no dog go up onto the Acropolis” (FGrHist 328 F67). The subject is typical of our fragments of Greek local historiography: a record of a remarkable occurrence and an explication of local topography and cult. The fact that Dionysius of Halicarnassus has here quoted Philokhoros’s exact words, however, enables us to look beyond subject matter to learn something about the historian’s ideation of audience. We have seen both in our survey in Part One and in our four test cases from Part Two, that local histories

---

2 1967, 71.
3 For the date (306/5 or 292/1 BCE) see F. Jacoby, FGrHist 328 IIIb Suppl., 345-346., L.C. Smith 1965, and V. Costa 2007, 393-397.
4 ἐν δὲ τῇ ἑνάτῃ (Φιλόχορος) φησὶ· τοῦ δ’ ἑναυτοῦ τοῦ<του> διελθόντος, ἐπέρου δ’ εἰςβάντος, ἐν ἀφρο-πόλει σημείων ἑγένετο τουύτων· κύνων εἰς τὸν τῆς Πολλάδος νεὼν εἰσέλθουσα καὶ δύσα εἰς τὸ Πανδρόσειον, ἐπὶ τὸν βοιμόν ἀναβάσα τὸν Ἐρχειον Δίος τὸν ύπὸ τῇ ἑλάιᾳ κατέχειτο. πάτριον δ’ ἐστὶ τοῖς Αθηναίοις κύνα μὴ ἄναβαινεν εἰς ἀφρόπολιν.
may be composed by native and non-native historians—most historiographical communities of Greece, in fact, attest to both types. Those histories that are composed by non-natives are usually extrinsic, based perhaps on local sources and traditions but nevertheless aimed for an outside audience. The earliest local histories, written as they were in Greek and about non-Greek communities, were extrinsic. Yet, as is clear from this fragment from Philokhoros and others like it, even when a local historian took up the subject of his own community, he wrote from the position of an outsider communicating to other outsiders: his implied audience, the group that we can extrapolate from the role of the audience delineated in the text itself, was external. It has been plausibly argued that this device allowed a local historian to boost the prestige of his subject community by implying that it was a matter of interest to the greater Greek world. My concern in this final section, however, is less the consequences of this narrative mode than its origins, and these I argue are connected not to local patriotism but to literary form.

Verbatim fragments of Greek local historiography reveal that a local historian generally avoided the local dialect. He may well have taken pains to emphasize the local pronunciation of toponyms as a means of exalting the singularity of his community, but a local historian generally employed the koine in his narration, at least from the mid-

---

5 I am basing my terminology on that of W. Iser, who distinguishes between two levels of hypothetical reader, one “constructed from social and historical knowledge of the time” and the other “extrapolated from the reader’s role laid down in the text” (1978, 28). Related are the four categories of audience outlined by P.J. Rabinowitz: the actual audience; the authorial audience, which is “the hypothetical group for whom the author writes—the group that shares the knowledge, values, prejudices, fears, and experiences that the author expected in his or her readers”; the narrative audience, “the audience that receives the narrator’s text”; and the ideal narrative audience, the audience “for which the narrator wishes he were writing” (see Rabinowitz 1977, 134 and J. Phelan and Rabinowitz in D. Herman, et.al. 2012, 6). Rabinowitz’s terminology has the benefit of clarifying the interaction between the hypothetical and actual audience. In his scheme, actual readers tend to join the authorial audience and pretend to join the narrative audience: “the narrative audience is a role that the actual reader takes on while reading” (2012, 7).

6 See R. Fowler 2001, 111; Fowler is actually addressing Pherekydes here, but his comments also apply to what he says about the local historians (111-113).


8 So, for example, we know that the Thessalian local historian Kineas wrote Krannous for Kranon (FGrHist 603 F1a) and Bodone for Dodone (F2c); Armenidas in his Θηβαικά gave Ariartos for Haliartos (FGrHist 378 F7); and the Sikelikographer Philistos called Artemision Artemition (FGrHist 556 F63).
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fourth century onwards. There are, as we have seen, several notable exceptions to this linguistic panhellenism among the local historians of Greece, for the most part involving the use of Ionic and Doric. One of the most remarkable counterexamples is the *Argolika* of Derkylos, which employed diverse Argive forms; but there are other explanations for Derkylos’s lexicon, and his primary goal does not seem to have been localization of his implied audience. The point in any case remains: most local historians favored a dialect that was not locally marked. So, in the Philokhoros passage with which we began, we can note the form ἐλαία for olive tree, not what we would find in the Athenian orators: ἐλάα. Other features of high Attic, like geminate tau, are also absent from the Atthidographic fragments.

My primary interest, however, is less this inclusive gesture than its corollary: the dissociation of the local community itself. One way that a local historian expressly turned his text away from his local audience is through his mode of reference to the focal locality. For, unlike the Athenian orators, no Greek local historian used the term...

---

9 The *koine* was not of course used by early Greek local historians, who wrote in Ionic—so Antiokhos in his Περὶ Ἰταλίας (*FGrHist* 555 F2), Aethlios in his Σαμίων Ύροι (*FGrHist* 536 F2), and Ion of Chios (*FGrHist* 392 F3).

10 Ionic seems, as we have said, also to have been favored by later archaizing historians, like Nikandros of Kolophon in his Αἰτολιακά (*FGrHist* 271-272 FF2, 5), Philteas in his Ναχιακά (*FGrHist* 498 F2), and Agathokles in his Περὶ Κυζίκου (*FGrHist* 472 FF1a and 4). But the use of the Ionic dialect often serves as the sole means by which to date some local historians, and Jacoby, we have seen, is ambivalent in his application of the criterion.

11 Doric prose, it should be emphasized, was used by the Sicilians as early as Athenians used Attic (see H. Thesleff 1961, 77-96 and C. Vessella 2008, 305), but the phenomenon was evidently not restricted to the West: Diogenes Laertios alludes to Doric epistles written by the likes of Kheilon of Sparta (1.73), Periander of Corinth (1.99-100), and Epimenides of Crete (1.112-113), works whose very counterfeitiness indirectly supports the existence of the phenomenon. With respect to local historiography, we hear of a history of Rhodes composed in Doric by a certain Epimenides (Diog. Laert. 1.115)—Jacoby does not give him his own *FGrHist* number but treats him in his commentary to the Cretan homonym (*FGrHist* 457 T1).

12 κύων . . . ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἀναβόσα τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ Διὸς τὸν ὑπὸ τῇ ἐλαίᾳ κατέκειτο. For typical Athenian usage, see e.g. Lysias 7 on the *Olive Stump*.

13 e.g. *FGrHist* 328 F30 (ἴφροισσετο). The Atthidographers also prefer γιν- forms to the Attic γιγν- (see, for example, *FGrHist* 328 F6). The Attic declension νεών “temple” that we see here in Philokhoros 328 F67 (κύων εἰς τὸν τῆς Πολιάδος νεών εἰσελθόντοισι), actually crops up in non-Attic historians of the period and is not infrequently used by Polybius (4.35.2; 9.27.1; 10.4.4; 10.10.9, 16.1.5, 39.6.11).

“fatherland” or called his main characters “ancestors” or “forefathers.” On occasion, it is true, Greek local histories are given the title *Patria*, but it is not clear by whom, and in any case this citatory convention is not securely attested before the third century CE.

The Athenian orators, moreover, tended to refer to their main characters with the first- or second-person plural, even when narrating events that occurred in the past. So Andokides says that when Euboia was in revolt—he is referring to an incident that occurred some fifty years before—“we desired peace, and so we recalled Miltiades” (3.3); and Lycurgus can tell his Athenian audience in 331 BCE (1.61) that “we were freed” from the tyrannies of Peisistratos (at the end of the sixth century) and of the Thirty (at the end of the fifth). This direct relationship between a speaker and his audience, we might add, also actuates poetic treatments of local tradition. A line from Mimnermos’s *Nanno* on the foundation of Smyrna employs the first person plural to describe the

---

15 So, for example, Aiskhines asks his audience in his speech *On the False Embassy*, Ἐρωτῶ γάρ, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, εἰ δοξῶ ἂν ύμῶν πρός τῇ πατρίδι καὶ τῇ τῶν φίλων συνηθείᾳ καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ τάφων πατρίων μετουσίᾳ τοιούτῳ τοῖς πάντων ἁνθρώπων ἐμοὶ φιλότφων προδοίναι Γαλήπιον κτλ. (152). Sometimes, moreover, the orators mention ἢ δῇ ημετέρα πόλις even with reference to the past (cf. e.g. Aeskhin. 3.134).

16 There are numerous passages in which the Athenian orators refer to “our ancestors” or the like in describing past events. For good examples of this narrative mode, see Isokr. 12.193-196, where Eurystheus and the Peloponnesians attacked “our ancestors” (Πελοποννήσιοι δὲ μὲν Ἐυρυσθέως . . . στρατεύσας δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους προγόνους κτλ.) and 4.28, where Demeter gave “our ancestors” gifts (Δήμητρος γὰρ ἀφικμένης εἰς τὴν χώραν . . . καὶ πρὸς τοὺς προγόνους ἠμῶν εὐμενῶς διατεθείσης). Demosthenes, meanwhile, refers to a decree passed a century before as γράμματα τῶν προγόνων τῶν ἡμετέρων (9.41).


18 We would doubtless observe the same thing elsewhere in Greece had we more examples of non-Athenian oratory. We see it, for what it is worth, in the probably Thessalian *Peri Politeias* ascribed to Herodes Atticus.
eastward migration of the Pylians (FGrHist 578 F3), and Tyrtaios adopts a similar position in his Eunomia elegy (FGrHist 580 FF2, 4, 6).

Yet there is only one fragment from a Greek local history that preserves a first-person plural pronoun explicitly with reference to the focal community; this text, from a history of Thespiai of debated authorship (FGrHist 386 F1= Steph. Byz. s.v. Αφόρμιον), is corrupt and perhaps quite late and so little affects the picture. There are several other historiographical fragments that preserve a first-person verb or pronoun, but in no case can we derive them securely from a work of local history. Our verbatim fragments

---

19 = Strab. 14.1.4 634C = F9 West: ἵστερον δ᾽ ὑπὸ Αἰολέων ἐκπεσόντες (οἱ Σμύρναιοι) κατέφυγον εἰς Κολοφώνα, και μετὰ τὸν ἐνέδειν ἐπάντως τὴν σφατέραν ἀπέλαβον, καθάπερ καὶ Μίμενόις ἐν τῇ Ναυνοὺς φράζει, μηνθείς τῆς Σμύρνης ὅτι περιμάχεσθος ἂεί Λυτὴ < > τε Πύλων Νηλήμων ἀστυ ἐπέστρεφον. / ἴστερον τοὺς δὲν νησίν ἡμῶν ἀφάγαμα ἀπὸν ἐρυθράτες/ ἐξελέμοι, ἀγαλέην ἐβρίος ἠγήμων/ κείδειν ἀδιαστήντος ἀποροχήμαν ποταμοῦ/ θεῶν βουλῆσ Σμύρνην εὑρομένη Αἰολίδαι. There is, as we might expect, some debate about the speaker quoted by Strabo, whether he is the narrator himself (see e.g. A. Allen 1993, 81) or a character within the text (B. Gentili 1965, 382-3).

20 FGrHist 580 F2 = Strab. 8.4.10 362C = F2 West: αὐτὸς γὰρ Κρονίων, ἡκαλιστοφάνους τὸς Ἡρώς / Ζεὺς Ἡρακλείδας τίνις δέδωσε πόλιν, / οἰς ἰμα προλυστινές Εριδεάν ἤγιόντα / εὔρειαν Πέλοπος νήπον ἀφάγαμα. FGrHist 580 F4 = Paus. 4.6.2 = FGrHist 580 F6 = Strab. 6.3.3 279 = F5 West: αὐτος δὲ ὁ Θεότοκος ἢ καὶ ὁ πέρας ἐπείδης τοῦ πολέμου; μαρτυρεῖ δὲ μοι καὶ τὰ ἐλέγεια τῶν Τυρσαίων λέγοντα, ἡμετέρους βασιλή, θεοτις φίλοι Θεοτόκῳμι, / ὡν διὰ Μεσσήνην εὑρομέναν εὐρύχορον, FF4 and 6). See G.B. d’Alessio 2009, 154.

21 A late date is implied by the title given to the work. Patria: τόπος Θεσπεόν. Αφοροδίος ἤτοι Εὐφήμιος ἐν τῷ πείρα τῆς πατρίδος, ὃν καὶ τὸν κυβερνήσαντα τὴν ναὸν τὴν Ἀρχὸ Τίφε μνέσασι, καὶ λόγος περὶ ἡμῶν τῆς νεός ἀφομοίας ἐντατευχόμεν μετὰ τῶν ἀμωμίων ἄφθον περί ἀπεξέπεμεν ἡ ναός; “Aphormion: a place in Thespiae. Aphrodisios or Euphemios (mentioned it) in the (book) about his fatherland; from here (he said) that Tiphys, the helmsman of the ship Argo, originated. And there is a story among us that, since the ship departed from here with the aristoi, from where the ship sailed away.”

22 (1) Kleidemos FGrHist 323 F27, a citation from Photios’s Lexicon, contains a first-person plural verb— Ὁμῆρος: ἐπίδωσεν Διονύσου, ὃς Κλειδῆς, ἐπεδικότας (φημι) ἐπηλούησεν τῶς θεῶν αὐτῷ καθ᾽ ὠν ὁ θεός ἐπὶ χρόνον—yet this fragment most likely derives not from Kleidemos’s Athis but from his Exegetikon, a work that explicitly outlines cultic procedure, as is evident from FGrHist 323 F14 (cf. FGrHist 353 F1, from the Exegetikon of Autokleides; on these texts, see Jacoby 1949, 41, 75-76, 252 n. 70). In any case, Kleidemos is referring not to “us, the Athenians,” but to “us, the Athenian priests”— Philokhoros, as we shall see, does something similar (FGrHist 328 F67). There is also (2) a very interesting verbatim quotation from Ephoros in Stephanos of Byzantium (s.v. Βοιωτία = FGrHist 70 F97): ἔφορος δὲ θυμῆσθαν ὧν ἄθυταίς περὶ τὴν κυβερνήσαν δύναμιν, Θετελαίοι περὶ τῆς ἐπιμελείας, Βιωτικοὶ περὶ τῆς τῆς γνωσείας ἐπηλούησεν, Κυρηναῖοι περὶ τῆς διαφωτισμένης ἐπιστήμης ἡμῶν· ἰμής δὲ περὶ τῶν νόμων εὐναξεῖαν. The likeliest place for Ephoros to have inserted this priamel, as we have already said, is ἐν συντάγματι τῶν ἐπιστημονικῶν ἐπιστημονικῶν. Ἐπιστημονικών, a text devoted to his native Kyne that is mentioned only once (FGrHist 70 F1 = Ps. Plut. Vit. Hom. 1.2). Jacoby accordingly classified this text as a panegyric, a counterpart to the Athenian Epitaphios Logoi (FGrHist 70 F97 ad loc.), and hence not a local history. One final text to consider is (3) Philokhoros FGrHist 32 F35a, from Photios’s lexicon and the Souda (s.v. Oργέων), a passage that does come from a local history (the Athis)
reveal that local historians avoided directly implicating their audience in the action of their narration. The fragment of Philokhoros with which we began this section does in fact preserve a first-person verb, but in such a way as to confirm the rule. According to Philokhoros, at the time that the dog was sighted on the Acropolis a star was visible in the daytime sky; “When we were asked about the meaning of the omen and the phenomenon,” Philokhoros writes, “we said that they both foretold the return of the exiles.” The “we” here is exclusive and refers not to the Athenians en masse but rather to Philokhoros himself or else to a group of religious authorities to which he belonged.

When we are able to compare a fragment from the Attidographers directly with a passage from the Athenian orators, moreover, the historians’ resolute avoidance of the first and second person is made all the clearer. Both Philokhoros and Demosthenes, for example, refer to the exile of the Athenian ambassadors who had voted for peace with Sparta in 392/1 BCE. Philokhoros uses the third-person, writing, ἄλλα καὶ τοῦ[ζ πρέσβεις τοὺς ἐν Λακεδαίμονι συγχωρήσαντας ἔφυγάδευσαν, Καλλιστράτου γράψαντος, καὶ οὐχ ὑπομείναντος τὴν κρίσιν, Ἐπικράτην Κηφισοεῖα, Ἀνδοκίδην Κυδαθηναίεα, Κρατίνον Σφήττιον, Εὖβοιλίδην Ἐλευσίνιον but seems not to be using the first-person pronoun to refer specifically to the Athenians: περὶ τῶν ὀργεύοντος γεγραφέν καὶ Φιλόχωρος. τοὺς δὲ ἐπάναγες δέχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ὀργεύοντας καὶ τοὺς ὀμογάλακτας, οὐς γεννήτας καλούμεν. The fragment is retained in a slightly different form by Harpokration and elsewhere in the Souda (s.v. gennai), where we read: Φιλόχωρος δ᾽ ἐν τῇ ἐν τῇ Ἁθηνίδος φησί πρότερον ὀμογάλακτας νομάζεσθαι οὐς νῦν γεννήτας καλούσι ( = F 35b ). The phrase, οὐς γεννήτας καλούμεν, presumably cited verbatim by Photios, is Philokhoros’s own gloss on homogalaktes (or on both homogalaktes and orgeones). It is not clear whether he means “the homogalaktes, whom we (the Athenians) now call gennai,” or “the homogalaktes, whom we (the Greeks) now call gennai,” i.e. as equivalent to the passive. In support of this latter interpretation, cf. Isokr. 12.177: Ἔπειδὴ γάρ Δωρίδων οἱ στρατεύοντες εἰς Πελοπόννησον τριχὰ διελίπτο τὰς τε πόλεις καὶ τὰς χώρας . . . το δὲ τρίτον μέρος αὐτῶν, οὐς καλούμεν γνών Λακεδαιμονίους, στειαώσαε μὲν φασιν αὐτοῖς οἱ τάκτεις τῶν ἀναρίθμητες ὡς συνεδρώνοντες ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κτλ. See also Strabo 10.2.17: Καλεῖ δ᾽ ἀποφθέγματα Σάμου καὶ τὴν Θρᾴκην, ἢν νῦν Σαμοθράκην καλούμεν; here (and there are many other examples of this sort), Strabo is speaking as an outsider and certainly does not mean with the first-person verb to claim Samothracian nationality.

23 περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ μεθ᾽ ἡμέρας, ἤλιον τ᾽ ἐξέχοντος καὶ οὕσας αἰθίας, ἀστήρ ἐπὶ τὰν χρόνον ἐγένετο ἐκφαντῖς. ἡμές δ᾽ ἐρωτηθήσεται ὡς τὸ σημείον καὶ τοῦ φαντασμάτου εἰς ὃ φέροι, φυγάδων κάθοδον ἐφάμεν προσημαίνειν ἁμέτοχοτοι, καὶ ταύτην οὐκ ἐκ μεταβολῆς προγμάτων ἐσομενήν ἄλλ᾽ ἐν τῇ καθεστώτις πολιτείᾳ καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἐπιτελεσθήναι συνήβη.

24 With the so-called plural of modesty as M. Flower suggests (2008, 203).
Demosthenes, on the other hand, in his speech on the Embassy (19.277) delivered some two generations after the exile to which he refers has, Κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμ' ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναίοι, τῶν πρεσβεων ἐκείνων ὑμεῖς θάνατον κατέγνωτε, ὃν εἰς Ἰν Ἐπικράτης, ἀνήρ, ὡς ἐγώ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀκοῦω, σπουδαῖος καὶ πολλὰ χρήσιμος τῇ πόλει, καὶ τῶν ἐκ Πειραιῶς καταγαγόντων τὸν δήμον καὶ ἄλλως δημοτικός. “You condemned these men to death,” he says, “one of whom was Epikrates, a man who was, as I have on the authority of older men, most patriotic.”

A local historian aimed his narrative away from his countrymen also in his particular approach to the information he chose to communicate. For, while part of his task may well have been to fill in gaps in the local community’s knowledge of its past and to provide new interpretations of shared events, community autobiography by nature entailed frequent repetition and reiteration of known data. And rather than explicitly involve his audience by way of pronouns and verb forms in the past events that they narrated, in the manner of the orators, a local historian repeated known data as if it were unknown to his audience. To look again at Philokhoros’s account of the omen, note how he describes the altar of Zeus Herkeios on the Acropolis. He is careful to specify the location of the altar as “the one under the olive tree.” This is not to differentiate it from others to Zeus Herkeios nearby; it is rather to locate the structure for the benefit of an implied audience unfamiliar with the Acropolis. Another clear example of this sort of approach to topography comes from the Atthis of Kleidemos. At the beginning of his history (FGrHist 323 F1), the Atthidographer specified the locations of two shrines in Athens: that of Eileithyia, which he situates “in the direction of Agra;” and that of the

---

25 For other examples, compare Philokhoros FGrHist 328 F56a with Aiskhines 3.140 and Dem. 18.168; and Philokhoros F5a and b with Isokr. Pan. 28.
26 ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἀναβάσας τοῦ Ἐρκείου Διός τὸν ὑπὸ τῇ ἐλλάϊα κατέγνητο.
27 For Kleidemos’s penchant for topography, see Plutarch’s description of the Amazonian invasion in his Life of Theseus (FGrHist 328 F17a).
altar of Poseidon Helikonios, which he places atop the hill called Agra, formerly Helikon.\textsuperscript{28} Whatever the original context of this fragment,\textsuperscript{29} Kleidemos’s chorography here is certainly not mere parenthesis. He is not, that is to say, basing some episode from the Athenian past at Agrai,\textsuperscript{30} it is the location of the shrines themselves that concerns him.\textsuperscript{31}

It was perfectly possible for a writer to communicate topographical matters directly to his local audience. The source that has preserved Kleidemos’s survey of Agrai, a ninth-century lexicon,\textsuperscript{32} actually juxtaposes Kleidemos’s objective description to the more personal approach of Plato, who in his \textit{Phaedrus} (229c) has Socrates explaining to his companion that the Athenian princess Oreithyia was snatched away “near the spot on the Ilissos River where we cross to the Temple of Artemis Agraia.”\textsuperscript{33} Like the orators, Plato uses topography and monuments primarily to locate particular events.\textsuperscript{34} Not every Athenian, of course, would have been aware of the ἐσχάρα to Poseidon that Kleidemos places on Agra hill; in the passage of Plato to which the lexicon alludes, in fact, Phaedrus confesses that he was unfamiliar with a certain altar to Boreas at the spot where the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{28} Ἀγραίς χωρίον ἐξω τῆς πόλεως Αθηνῶν, οὐ τὰ μικρὰ τῆς Δήμητρος ἔγεται μυστήρια. ... Καί Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Ἀγραίας αὐτόθι τὸ ἱερόν. Πλάτων Φαίδρων Ἡ πρὸς τῷ τῆς Ἀγραιῶν ἀνθισμένευν. Καί Κλειδήμος ἐν α Ἀρτέμιδος. Τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄνω τοῦ Ἴλισσου. πρὸς Ἀγραίς ἐδιαβαίνομεν. \\
    \item \textsuperscript{29} The source that has preserved Kleidemos’s survey of Agrai, a ninth-century lexicon, actually juxtaposes Kleidemos’s objective description to the more personal approach of Plato, who in his \textit{Phaedrus} (229c) has Socrates explaining to his companion that the Athenian princess Oreithyia was snatched away “near the spot on the Ilissos River where we cross to the Temple of Artemis Agraia.”
    \item \textsuperscript{30} Like the orators, Plato uses topography and monuments primarily to locate particular events.
    \item \textsuperscript{31} Not every Athenian, of course, would have been aware of the ἐσχάρα to Poseidon that Kleidemos places on Agra hill; in the passage of Plato to which the lexicon alludes, in fact, Phaedrus confesses that he was unfamiliar with a certain altar to Boreas at the spot where the

\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
princess allegedly disappeared. But the Athenians were collectively expected to be familiar with the most conspicuous features of the Athenian landscape, as familiar, we might say, as they should have been with the main events of Athenian history. Through his narrative mode, then, Kleidemos not only separates himself from his own community but also excludes his knowledgeable fellow citizens from the uninformed audience implied by his narrative.

Such an attitude toward local topography is not unique to Atthidography. When Kallias of Syracuse, a court historian and apologist of the tyrant Agathokles, has recourse in his Sicilian history to mention the settlement Eryke (FGrHist 564 F1), formerly a polis of the Sikelois, he locates it about ninety stades from Gela near the so-called Delloi; more interesting for our purposes, he defines these Delloi as “two craters that the Sikeliotai [the Greek inhabitants of Sicily] consider to be brothers of the Palikoi.” Whatever the precise theme of Kallias’s history, he was undoubtedly a Sicilian writer in the employ of a Sicilian tyrant; by explaining local toponyms for the benefit of those allegedly unfamiliar with the lay of the land, he distances himself from the Sikeliotai, whom he at the same time severs from his implied audience. His local readers were thereby required to make a similar move; in order to join the implied audience of the narrative, they too had to dissociate themselves from their community.

---

35 Εἰπέ μοι, ὁ Σοκρατές, οὐκ ἐνθέντε μέντοι ποθὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἴλου σύ λέγεται ὁ Βορέας τῇ Ἀρεία ἀριστάσαι; (ΣΩ.) Λέγεται γὰρ. (ΦΑΙ.) Ἀρ' οὖν ἐνθέντε; χωρίζεται γοῦν καὶ καθαρὰ καὶ διαφανή τὰ ἴδατα φαῖνεται, καὶ ἐπιτήθεται κόραι παίξαν παρ' αὐτᾶ. (ΣΩ.) Οὔχ, ἀλλὰ κάτωθιν ὁσὸν δῦ' ἢ τρία στάδια, ἢ πρὸς τὸ ἐν Αἴγιοι διαβαίνομεν· καὶ ποὺ τὶς ἐςτι βομβός αὐτόθι Βορέου. (ΦΑΙ.) Οὐ πάνυ νενόηκα. The altar to Boreas, however, was known to Herodotus (7.189).

36 See FGrHist 564 T3 (= Diodorus 21.17.4) for Kallias’s provenance.

37 12.17.4 = FGrHist 564 T3; Diodorus was probably basing his criticism of Kallias’s sycophancy on Timaios (cf. FGrHist 564 T4).

38 Kallias is quoted by Macrobius (5.19.21): Callias autem in septima historia de rebus Siculis ita scribit: «η δὲ Ἐρύκη τῆς μὲν Γελώιας ὀσὸν ἐνενήκονται στάδια διέστημεν. ἐπειδῆς δὲ ἐγερός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ *** τὸ παλαιὸν Σικέλων γεγενημένη πόλις, ὑφ’ ἢ καὶ τοὺς Δέλλους καλουμένους εἶναι συμβιβασμένοις. οὕτω δὲ κρατήρες δύο εἰσίν, οὕς ἀδελφοὺς τῶν Παλαιῶν οἱ Σικελιώται νομίζουσιν, τὰς δὲ ἀναφοράς τῶν σωμφωλίγων παραληψιάς βραζούσας ἔχουσιν». hactenus Callias.

39 For, despite Macrobius’s claim to be citing from the Res Siculae, Kallias seems to have written a work specifically about Agathokles’ tyranny (FGrHist 564 T1, F2.5a).
Another example of a local historian’s approach to topography comes from the Ἀργολικὰ of the Argive Deinias, a passage preserved in a scholion to Euripides’ Orestes (872). After treating various anecdotes about the hill on which Orestes’ trial took place, the scholiast adduces Deinias about the murder of an otherwise unknown couple: “Having quickly overpowered Melankhros and Kleometra,” Deinias writes, “they killed them by pelting them with stones, and they show their grave (δεικνύουσιν) still to this day atop the so-called Pron, a hill where the Argives have their court” (FGrHist 306 F3). Here, again, topographical data is directed at an audience unfamiliar with the focal locality—the Argives did not, of course, need to be told where in the city they sat to give judgment. And here again, local behavior is detailed by way of a third-person subject. In fact, with the verb δεικνύουσιν, Deinias removes himself even further from the Argive community by imagining himself as a latter-day Herodotus, recording epichoric traditions imparted to him by local guides. For the sake of comparison, we can recall the way that Lysias refers to the Areiopagos in his speech on the Murder of Eratosthenes (1.30): “It is both an ancestral custom,” he says, “and a practice of our own day, to assign to the court of the Areiopagos homicide cases.” Orators were certainly not obliged only to reveal hitherto unknown facts to their audiences; but when they did communicate shared knowledge, they tended to implicate their community in the communicative process.

Several verbatim fragments survive from the history of Delos composed in the late-third century BCE by the Delian Semos. They reveal a similarly dissociative stance

---

40 For Deinias’s provenance, see above p.
41 ὅσον δ’ ὅλον στείχοντα καὶ θάσσοντα ἄκραν, ὥς φασί πρῶτον Δαναὸν Αἰγύπτω δέκας / διδόντ’, ἀθροίσα ξαν ἐς κοινός ἔδρας] . . . λέγεται δὲ τις ἐν ἄργῳ πρῶς, ὅπου δικαίως ἀργεῖοι, ἱστορεῖ δὲ περὶ τοῦ χωρίου Δεινίας ἐν τῷ μέσῳ των καταλαβέων, ἐκδοχέως δὲ δευτέρας ὁ λόγος τεσσάρως ταχέως δὲ κυριεύουσας τὸν Μέλαγχρον (?) καὶ τὴν Κλεομήτην βάλλοντες τοῖς λίθοις ἀπέκτειναι, καὶ τὸν τάφον αὐτῶν δεικνύουσιν καὶ νῦν ἔτι ὑποτενὰ τοῦ παλαιὸτάτου Πρωνός χώμα ἤπειρον, οὗ συμβαίνει ἀργείοις διακέισιν.
42 Ἀνάλογα, ὥς ἅπασι τῷ διακαταρχῷ τῷ Ἐξ Αὐρείου πάγου, καὶ πάσης ἐς τοῦ κόσμου τότες δικαίως διακέισιν, διαφάνεις ἐνδύοντο τοῦτού μή καταγγέλλατεν ἄρκος, ὡς ἐκ δάμας ταύτῃ ἐντούτου μοιχὰν λαβὸν ταύτῃ τὴν τιμωρίαν ποιήσατα.
43 For the date, see L. Bertelli BNJ 396. For his provenance, see FGrHist 396 T1, FF1, 3, 4, and 11,
in relation to the Delian community, in this case largely involving matters of local cult. As Athenaeus records in his ichthyology (8.12.335AB = FGrHist 396 F4), “Semos says in the second book of his Delias, ‘When (the Delian women) sacrifice to the goddess Brizos . . . in order to thank her for everything in particular for the safety of the fleets, they bring her little bowls full of all sorts of good things except for fish.’” Later, Athenaeus quotes again from same book, this time with reference to cakes (FGrHist 396 F5): “Semos says in the second book of his Delias, ‘On the island of Hekate, the Delians sacrifice to Iris so-called basyniai, viz. boiled wheat cakes made of flour with honey, and so-called kokkora, a dried fig and three nuts.’” Like Deinias’s description of Argive judicial practice, Semos here makes the Delians and their behavior objects of study from without. Even if we were certain that he had in mind a particular non-local audience at which to aim his history (e.g. Athens or even Pergamon), it seems to me implausible that a member of an important Delian family involved in the administration of his island at so charged a moment in time would not have intended his text also to be read and appreciated by his countrymen.

To return again to Philokhoros and the place from where we began our inquiry, the Atthidographer follows his account of the trespassing dog with the explanation that “it was an ancestral custom of the Athenians that no dog go up on the Acropolis.” There is no doubt that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, our citing source, is quoting the

---

44 καὶ γὰρ ἐν Δῆλῳ φησὶ Σῆμος ὁ Δήλιος ἐν β´ Δηλιάδος, ὅταν θύσωι τῇ Βριζοῖ—αὕτη δ᾿ ἐστὶν ἢ ἐν υἱόιοι μάντες βρέχειν δ᾿ οἱ ἁρχαῖοι λέγουσι τὸ καθέδρεν—ἐνάθα δ᾿ ἀποβιβάζοικες ἐμεὶνας ἡμὸ διὰ—, ταῦτῃ ὅλη ὅταν θύσωι αἱ Δηλιάδες, προσφέρουσιν αὕτῃ σκάφας πάντων πλήρεις ἁγαθῶν πλὴν ἵπθον διὰ τὸ εὐχερεθαί ταῦτῃ περὶ τὰ πάντα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν πλοίων σωτηρίας. Σῆμος ἐν β´ Δηλιάδος, ἐν τῇ τῆς Ἐσαύτης (φησὶ) νῆσῳ τῇ Ἰρίδι θύσωι Δῆλιοι τοὺς βασιναίας καλομεμένους—ἐστίν δὲ ἐφὸδον πῦριν, σταῖς σῦν μέλαι—καὶ τὰ καλομένα κόκκωρα, ἱσχεῖς καὶ κάρυα τρία.

45 Semos, we know, also wrote a work on Pergamon (FGrHist 396 T1); see Müller FHG, 4, p. 492, and Jacoby IIB, Text. 203.

46 cf. L. Bertelli BNJ 396.

47 πάτμιον δ´ ἐστὶ τοῖς Αθηναίοις κῦνα μὴ ἀναβάειν εἰς ἀκρόπολιν.
At thisographer verbatim here, and Dionysius’s citatory habits make it highly unlikely that the explanation of the omen is his own parenthetical addition. So, for whose benefit is Philokhoros elucidating this Athenian custom? It is perhaps possible that the injunction against dogs was not in fact widely known among Athenians, that Philokhoros is speaking as a religious authority in possession of arcane knowledge about outdated Athenian custom. But even in cases where an Athenian orator cited a little-known law, he tended to associate his audience epistemically or at any rate to explain their ignorance as a lapse of memory. Philokhoros, on the other hand, makes no such attempt; he writes about the Athenians from the position of an outsider speaking to other outsiders.

Greek local historiography’s implication of a non-local audience is particularly striking in light of the fact that the primary audience that a local historian would have expected to read his text, his intended audience, was his own community. I say “primary” because Greek local historians, as indeed all historians of any period and any language, did not envisage a completely homogenous readership. Local histories were certainly read by other historians, local—Philokhoros read the Ἀτθίς of Androtion, Memnon the Περὶ Ἡρακλείας of Nymphis—and non-local alike, a level of response sometimes following directly on the heels of the publication of the history. So Thucydides read Hellanikos’s recent history of Athens (1.97.2 = FGrHist 323a T8),

49 The opening words, it is true, inasmuch as they lack the normal yearly heading that we expect from Philokhoros, may have been altered (see Jacoby ad loc.), but the brunt of the fragment certainly preserves Philokhoros's original text.

50 Dionysius never interrupts verbatim quotations with personal asides unless he is transitioning between two distinct quotations, clearly not the case here.

51 Demosthenes sometimes claims that the laws he is citing are well-known and established—Ὁὔτοι πάντες οἱ νόμοι κεῖνται πολίν ἡδη χρόνον, ἢ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ πεῖσαν αὐτῶν πολλάς διδώκασι ὑπὲρ τιμήσεως μη ὑπερβαίνει· άντειπεν μὴ ὅτι καλῶς ἔχειν αὐτούς (24.24)—or involves his apparently ignorant audience in the passing of the law—Ἐνθυμεῖτε', ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, ὃ ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ νόμῳ κατὰ τὸν πεῖρα τὴν εὐθύνην ἀδικούντων ὡς τῆς προβολῆς, ἐν τούτῳ καὶ κατὰ τῶν τούς ὑπερμέρους εἰσπραττόντων ἢ καὶ ἄλλ' ὅποιν τὸν παραβάνοντον ἤ βιαζομένων ἐποίησετε τὰς προβολές (21.10).

52 cf. FGrHist 324 F30 and 328 F155; see Jacoby FGrHist IIIb Suppl. Text, 104-249-250, and P. Harding 1994, 3, 125-127.

53 FGrHist 432 T3-4.
Polybios the Rhodian history of his older contemporary Zenon, to name just two notable cases (16.14.5, 16, 18; 16.17.8, 20.5 = FGrHist 523 FF4-6, TT4-5). And while it is hard to imagine that Philokhoros, say, foresaw that some two hundred years after his death his history of Athens would be epitomized and translated into Latin by one Asinius Pollio, it is plausible given his own research practices that he wrote with the understanding that his work would be read by other historians.

Yet, aside from the suspicion that his history would be used by other historians, a local historian expected that his own community would be his primary readers. The only explicit statement that contradicts this assumption and claims native Greek local historians aimed their work at a general Greek audience comes from Dionysius of Halicarnassus—he says, once again, that historians who wrote separate accounts of ethne and poleis endeavored to bring local traditions “to the common knowledge of all” (de Thuc. 5). But we saw that Dionysius’s formulation must be taken with a grain of salt since it reflects his own practice as a Greek historian of Rome in the late first century. And even if Dionysius had access, as surely he did, to far more Greek local historiography than we do today, he drew his conclusions about audience predominately from the same data on which we must today rely: the authorial stance of local historians. It would have been natural for him, then, to equate the intended with the implied audience.

To demonstrate, contra Dionysius, the significant response of the focal community we may look first at the local historians themselves. For most of those historians identifiable beyond mere name and provenance actually played important

---

54 Polyb. 16.14, 17.8, 20.5. Polybios, in fact, was an avid reader of earlier local histories, as well: of Timaios (e.g. 1.5.1; 12.3.7; 12.5.1; 12.11.1; and 12.25-28; 39.8.4), for example, and Philinos (1.14.1-3; 1.15; 3.25); as were Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Diodorus. To name just a few examples, Dionysius cites Philistos (FGrHist 556 TT12, 15a, 16, FF5, 46), Philokhoros (FGrHist 328 FF152-154, 156) and Ariaithos (FGrHist 316 F1); Diodorus cites Laosthenidas (FGrHist 462 T1) and Antandros (FGrHist 565 TT1-5, F1).

55 Probably the freedman of the homonymous Roman historian (FGrHist 328 T8 and Jacoby, ad loc.).
political or religious roles in their home communities. So Philistos of Syracuse, who wrote a local history of Sicily, was a military commander and close advisor to the Dionysii; Douris of Samos ruled his island as tyrant in the early-third century; Nymphis led a group of exiles back to his fatherland and went on to assume an important role in Herakleia’s struggle for autonomy in the first half of the third century BCE (FGrHist 432 TT1, 3-4); and of the Atthidographers, at least four were active in the Athenian state, an involvement that led in one case to exile and, in the case of the great Philokhoros, to death. This is not in itself proof of audience, of course; for a good many non-local Greek historians, like Xenophon, Thucydides, and Polybius, played important political roles in their home communities too, even though they generally anticipated a non-local readership. Yet we have seen from our snapshots of local history that many local historians explicitly aimed their texts at their own communities and hoped in so doing both to stave off what they perceived as community decay and also to facilitate rejuvenation. And Greek local historians, as we have continually suggested, were no different. Even those who are inclined to downplay the centrality of politics in Jacoby’s conception of Atthidography would find it difficult to deny that a historian intimately involved in the daily affairs of his own community infused his writings with personal and political biases and expected in some way to influence the opinion of his fellow-citizens. Sparta offers an especially clear example of the connection between a politician’s agenda and his historiographical construction of the past.

A second indication that the focal community was a local historian’s principal intended audience is the parochialism and patriotism evident in so many of our fragments: Greek local histories would surely have had little intrinsic appeal to an

---

57 FGrHist 556 T1-13.
58 Kleidemos (FGrHist 323 FF14, 28(?), and see Jacoby 1949, 56-57), Androton (FGrHist 324 TT1-14; and see P. Harding 1994, 13-25), Phanodemos (FGrHist 325 TT2.5), and Philokhoros (FGrHist 328 T1).
59 Androton FGrHist 324 T14.
60 FGrHist 328 T1.
outsider who was not himself a historian. Even major cities and cultural centers like Athens and Argos engendered local histories thick enough with detail to discourage casual external readership. Present-day evidence supports this hypothesis, we might add, since local histories seldom find their way into the hands of non-locals who are not themselves historians; indeed, as Finberg notes in his facetious essay, “How Not to Write Local History” (1967), an excerpt of which we read above, contemporary local histories are often composed with this eventuality in mind. Again, in the nineteenth century local histories of American towns were often printed in proportion to the population of the focal locality; Palestinian village histories of the 1980s and 1990s tended to be distributed only to the members of that village’s historical society; and recent work on modern Greek local historiography suggests a similarly restricted audience. For historians wanting to reach a wider audience, there are other historiographical avenues available, and a local historian of Classical and Hellenistic Greece could very easily have written pan-locally: both Douris of Samos and Nymphis of Herakleia, we can recall, wrote general in addition to local histories, in some cases repackaging episodes from the local work for broader appeal.

A further clue that Greek local historians intended their own communities as their primary audiences is the preservation of information about the pedigree of particular local historians, data of little use or relevance to non-locals: Philokhoros’s father, we know, was Kyknos (FGrHist 328 T1); Nymphis was the son of Nymphis (FGrHist 432 T1); Nikanor, the author of a local history of Alexandria, was the son of Hermeias (FGrHist 628 F1); Zenon, who wrote a history of Sidon, was the son of Mousaios (FGrHist 791);

---

61 See also G. Elan’s humorous essay, “How to Write a Dull Town History” (1986, 169), where he cites a local history of Heath, Massachusetts as an example of local trivia: “September 14, 1885: Due to the increased price of the rental of telephones, Preston Baker, the Misses Maxwell and George Bemis had their taken out.”


63 See R. Davis 2011.

64 See P. Papailias 2005.
and Dionysius, the author of Rhodian ἱστορίας τοπικάς was the son of Mousonios and a priest of Helios (FGrHist 511). While such details may perhaps have been preserved in the context of honorary inscriptions—this was certainly so in the case of Syriskos—this cannot on its own explain the phenomenon. A likelier conclusion is that a local historian sometimes mentioned his father in his history’s incipit. We know that Antiokhos began his history of Italy in just this way: Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίης (FGrHist 555 F2). Historians who intended a more general audience, like Hekataios, Herodotus, and Thucydides, avoided such genealogical details, as did non-native local historians, like Hellanikos, Rhianos, or Staphylos.

But the best confirmation of the crucial receptive role of the local community is the frequency with which native local historians were honored by their fellow citizens in acknowledgment of their historiography alone. We are told, to name just a few examples, that in the mid-fourth century the Athenians crowned Kleidemos after the publication of his Attis, that in the early-third century Tauric Chersonessos commended its native son Syriskos upon the recitation of his local history, and that the Samian demos dedicated at the Heraion an inscribed statue in honor of the Samian historian Leon. There was in addition a second, latter-day, order of local reception. For communities could explicitly use local histories as a means of self-assertion. One of the clearest cases of this process, as we saw, comes in the context of the territorial dispute

65 Sicily, we have seen, is an unusual case, since the Sikelika tended to include vents that occurred in Magna Graecia; Antiokhos’s history of Italy, then, is best viewed as an intrinsic history.


67 FGrHist 323 T2 = Tertullian (De an. 52).

68 FGrHist 807 T1.

69 FGrHist 540 T1. Local historians of the modern day, despite the beating that local historiography took in the second half of the nineteenth century by the academy continue to be honored by their local communities. As J.A. Amato writes about local historians of the present-day Midwest, “Local history can even impart a certain level of regional celebrity to its writers. . . . Speaking engagements become common fare, as do chicken dinners and roast beef suppers on an “eat and talk” speaking tour. At some point, local historians can constitute regional voices and be asked to represent the entire state, or even a larger area—which means larger stipends and more radio and television appearances” (2002, 186).
between Samos and Priene, when each party submitted for arbitration local histories as evidence for the priority of its claims.70 Another well-known example is the use of local histories by Lindos on Rhodes in order to construct a narrative that augmented, at the time of the Roman domination, the authority of the Temple of Athena Lindia.71 A local historian was thus surely aware both of the potential immediate response of his community to his history and of the role his text might play for future generations.

I do not want to argue, of course, that a Greek local historian never expected a non-local readership; we have seen that this was not the case. My point, rather, is that he never explicitly aimed his narrative at the local community, which certainly did read his work. Communities enjoy being told how they are unique, and, as we have continually emphasized, iteration of local topography and praxis, both religious and political, is one way to promote communal cohesion. It is not surprising then to find epikhoria so frequently highlighted among the fragments of Greek local historiography. But, as our verbatim fragments reveal, native local historians chose to communicate this information ostensibly by disinvolving (and indeed dissolving) their own community. What can explain this phenomenon? Perhaps a local historian’s interest in preserving information about his community’s history and behavior led him to postulate a future audience, external not physically but temporally. But this is too artificial an explanation. In the first place, some verbatim fragments show us that a local historian could very well distinguish past from present praxis. In Philokhoros’s description of ostracism at Athens, for example, a verbatim fragment preserved in a late lexicographical work (FGrHist 328 F30),72 he uses a series of imperfect verbs, clearly indicating that the procedure was by his own day defunct. And even if a local historian imagined, as surely he did, that a

70 See IPriene 37 for the Samian historians Euagon (FGrHist 535 F3), Olympikhos (FGrHist 537 F2a and b), Douris (FGrHist 76 F25), and Ouliades (FGrHist 538 F1); see IG 12.6.1.155 (= IPriene 500) for reference to histories adduced by the Prienians.
71 The Lindian Chronicle is dated to 99 BCE (see C. Higbie 2003).
72 Namely the so-called Lexicon Rhetoricum Contabrigiense, which is preserved in scholia added to a 14th century text of Harpokration.
future iteration of his community would read his work, it would be extraordinary if he
denied at the same time any epistemic continuity between this putative group and his
contemporaries. To posit an ignorant future audience does not on its own explain a local
historian’s flagrant dissociation of his own community.

A better approach to the problem, I have suggested, is with recourse to literary
form. The texts engendered in the second half of the fifth century BCE were quite unlike
epideictic oratory or poetry. When Greek communities began to filter their
autobiographical impulses through historiography, the primary prototype available as a
model was “ethnography,” inquiries into communities to which the historian did not
himself belong. A historian choosing to write about his own community, then, naturally
approached it from the position of a Herodotus or Hellanikos; and local historiography
thus became self-ethnography. An alternative though related explanation for the peculiar
posture of the Greek local historian is that prose, the mode through which a writer
imparted information to which he alone was privy, required an imbalance between writer
and audience. It was his nomination of prose as a filter for his community’s
autobiographical impulse, that is to say, that compelled a local historian to distance
himself from his audience and thereby from his own community. We can observe the
role of prose in externalizing author and audience in the context of Greek epigraphy. For
the subjects of e.g. Athenian decrees, intended though they were for Athenian
consumption, are the demos, the boule, the Athenians in the third person; not “we” or
“you.” The phenomenon is particularly common in the complex historical narratives that
motivate honorary decrees. The Athenian decree in honor of Kallias of Sphettos (SEG

---

73 We saw already how Jacoby at times conflated local historiography and ethnography. I agree to some
extent with the contention of C.W. Fornara that “Horography was the Hellenic side of ethnography” (1983,
22), except for his equation of local history with horography and his assertion that both ethnography and
local history are products “of the same urge to codify the collective lives of disparate groups.” The origins
of local historiography are quite different. Ethnography did not motivate local historiography; it merely
provided an apposite channel for the autobiographical impulse.
to take only one example, recounts local events that occurred only about fifteen years before the bestowing of honors (270/69 BCE), and it does so without any indication that the readers of the decree participated, as some surely did, in the action described:

ENCYCLOPÆDIE ἢ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἔργων Κοντινόπουλον ἐν Κάλλια[ξ], γενομένης τῆς ἐπαναστάσεως ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἐπὶ τοὺς κοινῶς κατέχοντάς τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀστείου στρατιώτας ἐγκατέλοντος, τοῦ δὲ φρουρίου τοῦ ἐν τῷ Μουσείῳ ἐτὶ κατεχόμενον καὶ τῆς χώρας ἐμπέμφαν τῷ ὑπὸ τῶν ἑκ τοῦ Πειραέως, καὶ Δημητρίου παραγινομένου ἐκ Πελοποννήσου μετά τοῦ στρατοπέδου ἐπὶ τὸ ἀστείον, κτλ. The Athenians did not of course speak about themselves in the third person in the midst of their political debate; it was only at the point that the decision process became a historical event expressed through prose that the narrative was depersonalized.

To some extent, then, Greek local historiography behaves exactly like Greek historiography in general: a Greek local historian wrote detachedly because that was the way that all Greek historians wrote. What is remarkable, in this case, is that the constraints of historiography trumped a community member’s natural inclination to speak directly to his countrymen. So when Thucydides inserts at the beginning of Book Two a potted history of Athens in connection to Theseus’s original synoicism of Athens (2.15), it may have been natural that, as a historian, he excluded himself from his own community. But, once again, he is here specifying for his readers the locations of prominent temples on the Acropolis, not obscure altars atop mountains on the outskirts of the asty, and he describes Athenian praxis with an ethnographer’s eye (from the time of Theseus ἐτὶ καὶ νῦν, he says, the Athenians have celebrated the Synoikia, and the

---

74 For which see T.L. Shear, Jr.1978.
73 For a different approach to the narratology of Athenian decrees, see N. Luraghi 2011.
76 Moreover since the group for which he has geared his history comprises, as he says himself in his preface, “all those who wish to know clearly about the past” (1.22.4), and since one of his primary goals is objectivity: avowed membership in any one local community, especially Athens, would have compromised his project.
Athenians still use “to this day” the waters of the nine-spouted fountain for marriage ceremonies): whomever he intended to read his history, he takes pains to detach his fellow Athenians from his implied audience. We should recall at the same time that the elements included in this excursus are typical of Greek local histories. While Thucydides may be approaching his own community as would any Greek historian, then, he is at the same time self-consciously donning the hat of a local historian.

While the influence of the earliest Greek histories and the exigencies of Greek prose help clarify the distinctive pose of a local historian, they cannot be our only explanations. For non-Greek and indeed modern native local historians, often without exposure (either directly or indirectly) to Greek models, take a similar position with reference to their focal communities. We saw, for example, that although Dr. Samuel Johnson began his *History of The Yorubas from The Earliest Times to the Beginning of the British Protectorate* (1897) with an exhortation urging his countrymen to learn their own history, he nevertheless devoted his first chapter to an outline of Yoruba grammar. Such an ambiguity is palpable also in many nineteenth century New England town histories. The same year (1846) in which James Davie Butler called upon the members of the newly formed Vermont Historical Society to write the history of their state, the address with which we began our exploration of local historiography, saw the posthumous publication of *The History of Vermont with Descriptions* by the native Rev. Hosea Beckley. It was by no means the first history of the state. But for its eloquence and timeliness, Beckley’s history provides an apposite paradigm.

Beckley begins with a lengthy address “to the youth of Vermont,” a clear indication of implied audience and narratee: it would be a “transgression of order,” he exhorts, for the young men of Vermont “to close their eyes and stop their ears on the

77 in 1842 Zadock Thompson had published his *History of Vermont, Natural, Civil, and Statistical*; in 1828, Francis Smith Eastman published *A History of Vermont, from its first Settlement to the Present Time*; and in 1809, Samuel Williams published the first volume of *The Natural and Civil history of Vermont*. So the “deficiencies” that Butler noted in Vermont historiography may have been merely rhetorical.
objects, and to the sounds near and around them;” for the same reason, it is important for “the youth of a community to become acquainted first with the history of their native State; the time and circumstances of its settlement; by whom, and the difficulties encountered and overcome in doing it.” Only having done this, he warns, may they “extend their researches and inquiries to other states, and to the nation” (19-20). Despite these prefatory contentions, Beckley begins his history by describing his state’s topography. Since the focal locality is a state rather than a village or polis, the community as a whole cannot be expected to be familiar with the intricate landscape of the entire territory; nevertheless Beckley feels compelled to adopt the perspective of a traveler in order properly to provide a topographical overview of his subject. “The scenery around Manchester is delightful;” he says, “and to a stranger, very impressive. Indeed on visiting it for the first time, one is surprised that the inhabitants are apparently so unconscious of the unusual delineations of nature with which they are surrounded” (48). Or again, “In the sultry season of July and August, the traveler, returning from Saratoga Springs, crossing the Hudson near the battle ground at Stillwater; and passing through Unionville, has a delightful entrance into Vermont” (49). And Beckley similarly describes the characteristics of Vermonters from an outside perspective: “They are still a hardy people. They carry evidence of it in their appearance; and of this trait in a measure the tender sex partakes” (132); or, “Another trait of character in the Vermonters, is frankness. In their deportment at home, and abroad; in their intercourse with one another, and with strangers, you generally find them open and explicit” (139). He has opportunity even to comment on the physical attributes of Vermonters: “although Vermont is not a soil and climate which produces naturally dwarfs and pigmies, in either body or mind; it is not denied that sometimes those of dwarfish dimensions are found among its inhabitants” (136).
Beckley was certainly not influenced by Hekataios, Kharon, or Herodotus, nor can the distance from which he and other Vermont historians approached their focal locality be explained merely as a result of their application of the technology of prose. One of the reasons that a local historian is inclined to separate himself, and thus his audience, from his native community, I suggest, is the very awkwardness inherent in the task of writing community autobiography/ self-ethnography. For unlike most historiographical modes (and unlike personal autobiography), where the intended audience is generally distinguished from the historian by its putative ignorance of the data it is in the process of receiving, a local historian’s intended audience occupies his own epistemological state. Through the act of exteriorization, a native local historian may effectively counter the solipsism inherent in the act of communicating community autobiography to his own community, the only audience that, frankly, will deign to listen.

It is not simply an accidental consequence of its appropriation of the dissociative gesture of prose, then, that local historiography in Greece became an exercise in alterity. We might more accurately say that Greek local historians so readily and naturally adopted the technology of prose and the posture of an ethnographer in order to ease the tension implicit in their task: writing and reading the history of one’s own locality demands dislocation.78

---

78 See J. Skinner 2012, 245 for a similar conclusion: “Rather than seeing ethnography and history as two distinct areas of practice, we might instead see ‘thinking about culture from the point of view of an outsider’ as intrinsically bound up in explaining past events—and, by extension, the present.”
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