The Classical Quarterly 67.2 460–484 © The Classical Association (2017)
doi:10.1017/S0009838817000519

GREEK LOCAL HISTORIOGRAPHY AND ITS AUDIENCES*

In the ninth book of his Ἀτθίς the Athenian historian and religious expert Philochorus related an omen about which he had himself been consulted in the late fourth century B.C.E. (*FGrHist* 328 F 67).[1]

When this year was done and the next was beginning, there occurred on the Acropolis the following prodigy: a female dog, having entered the temple of Athena Polias and made its way into the Pandroseion, 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 on the Acropolis. Around the same time, a star was evident for a while even in the daytime sky, when the sun was out and the weather was clear. And when we were asked about what the portent and the phenomenon meant, we said that both predicted the return of the exiles and that this would happen not as a result of a political change but rather in the existing *politeia*. And this interpretation actually came to pass.[2]

* I am grateful to Nino Luraghi, Michael Flower, John Dillery and John Tully for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper and to the audience that heard an embryonic version of this material at the American Philological Association's 2013 Annual Meeting in Seattle, whose thoughtful questions helped me to hone my argument. Since then, I have benefitted from conversations with David Stromberg about authors and audiences and from the generous and judicious criticism of Andrew Morrison and the three anonymous reviewers at *CQ*. Any errors or infelicities, however, are my responsibility alone.

[1] For Philochorus' religious activity at Athens, see *FGrHist* 328 T 1 (= *Suda* s.v. Φιλόχορος [Φ441 Adler]): Φιλόχορος· Κύκνου Ἀθηναῖος, μάντις καὶ ἱεροσκόπος. The Ἀτθίς, which contained τὰς Ἀθηναίων πράξεις καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἄρχοντας, heads the long and varied list of books that the *Suda* ascribes to Philochorus. For the date of Philochorus' proclamation (most likely the beginning of 306/305 B.C.E.) and of the composition of the passage (at some point after 292/291 B.C.E.), see F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* IIIB *Suppl. Text* (Leiden, 1954), 345–6; L.C. Smith, 'Philochorus F 67 and the return of the exiles', *Phoenix* 19 (1965), 111–15; V. Costa, *Filocoro di Atene. I frammenti degli storici greci* (Tivoli, 2007[2]), 393–7; and now N.F. Jones, 'Philochoros of Athens (328)', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby* (henceforth *BNJ*) (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/philochoros-of-athens-328-a328), ad loc.

[2] = Dion. Hal. *Din*. 3: Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς ἱστορίαις περί τε τῆς φυγῆς τῶν καταλυσάντων τὸν δῆμον καὶ περὶ τῆς καθόδου πάλιν οὕτως λέγει· (F 66) 'τοῦ γὰρ Ἀναξικράτους ἄρχοντος εὐθὺ μὲν ἡ τῶν Μεγαρέων πόλις ἑάλω …'. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τῆς ὀγδόης. (F 67) ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐνάτῃ φησί· 'τοῦ δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ τού<του> διελθόντος, ἑτέρου δ' εἰσιόντος, ἐν ἀκροπόλει σημεῖον ἐγένετο τοιοῦτον· κύων εἰς τὸν τῆς Πολιάδος νεὼν εἰσελθοῦσα καὶ δῦσα εἰς τὸ Πανδρόσειον, ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἀναβᾶσα τοῦ Ἑρκείου Διὸς τὸν ὑπὸ τῇ ἐλαίᾳ κατέκειτο. πάτριον δ' ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις κύνα μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς ἀκρόπολιν. περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ χρόνον καὶ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ μεθ' ἡμέραν, ἡλίου τ' ἐξέχοντος καὶ οὔσης αἰθρίας, ἀστὴρ ἐπί τινα χρόνον ἐγένετο ἐκφανής. ἡμεῖς δ' ἐρωτηθέντες ὑπέρ τε τοῦ σημείου καὶ τοῦ φαντάσματος εἰς ὃ φέρει, φυγάδων κάθοδον ἔφαμεν προσημαίνειν ἀμφότερα, καὶ ταύτην οὐκ ἐκ μεταβολῆς πραγμάτων ἐσομένην ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ καθεστώσῃ πολιτείᾳ· καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἐπιτελεσθῆναι συνέβη.' The designation of the new year in F 67 deviates from the typical Philochorean formula (Jacoby [n. 1], 345), it is true, but there is little reason to suspect Dionysius of paraphrasis or interpolation —indeed, he tends to restrict personal asides, as here, to transitions between direct quotations.

The passage is typical of our fragments of Greek local historiography:[3] the subject is local, foregrounding the landscape of a particular locality and the customs of the occupying community; the outlook decidedly parochial, featuring an episode of significance for the focal community itself but of little obvious relevance for the outside world. Yet, because Dionysius of Halicarnassus cites these lines verbatim in his essay on the orator Dinarchus (3), we are able to look beyond content and scope and learn something about Philochorus' narrative voice. By taking care to locate an altar on the Acropolis and to expound Athenian taboo, Philochorus ideates an audience unfamiliar with the city and its inhabitants. This packaging of local material for nonlocals is itself typical of Greek local historiography, as a survey of other verbatim fragments will reveal:[4] in the Classical and the Hellenistic periods, Greeks tended to write about individual communities for the apparent benefit of outsiders.

By implying an external audience, it is true, a local historian could insinuate that his subject was of significance to the greater Greek world.[5] Local narratives were sometimes even geared explicitly for outside consumption, particularly, as Katherine Clarke has

[3] By Greek local historiography, I should say at the start, I mean narratives, written in Greek, that are focalized by the real or imagined territory of a single community, take that locality and its occupants as protagonists, and concern themselves in some way with the past, whether diachronically or episodically. The earliest extant narrative of this sort, Herodotus' Αἰγυπτιακά (the second book of the *Histories*), dates from the mid fifth century B.C.E., but no subsequent examples survive intact until the mid first century B.C.E., when Dionysius of Halicarnassus published his history of Rome. In order to get a sense of Greek local historiography in the Classical and the Hellenistic periods we must then rely on fragments—references to, summaries of and direct quotations from these lost works—, which are plentiful but frequently brief and inscrutable. In many cases, we have little more than a title. And because even a localized title does not on its own prove that a cited fragmentary work was a local history as defined above (see J. Marincola, 'Genre, convention, and innovation in Greco-Roman historiography', in C.S. Kraus [ed.], *The Limits of Historiography: Genre & Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* [Leiden, 1999], 281–324, at 295)—Jacoby certainly included a wide variety of texts in *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* III, the volumes devoted to what he called 'Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie)'—, I am considering here only those works whose focus and contents are clearly delineated by the surviving fragments and *testimonia*. The last few decades have seen the publication of a handful of excellent overviews of Greek local historiography, many of which address some of the difficulties of working with fragments: see especially D.P. Orsi, 'La storiografia locale', in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora and D. Lanza (edd.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* (Rome, 1994), 149–79; L. Porciani, *Prime forme della storiografia Greca: prospettiva locale e generale nella narrazione storica* (Stuttgart, 1991); G. Schepens, 'Ancient Greek city-histories. Self-definition through history-writing', in K. Demoen (ed.), *The Greek City from Antiquity to the Present: Historical Reality, Ideological Construction, Literary Representation* (Louvain & Sterling, Va., 2001), 3–26; P. Harding, 'Local history and Atthidography', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden, MA, 2007), 180–8; K. Clarke, *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis* (Oxford, 2008); and R. Thomas, 'Local history, polis history, and the politics of place', in G. Parmeggiani (ed.), *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography* (Washington, DC, 2014), 239–62.

[4] Because I am interested here in narrative voice, I am using as evidence only those fragments quoted by later authors ostensibly verbatim, either introduced by phrases such as οὕτως λέγει/φησίν (as in *FGrHist* 328 F 67 above), γράφων τάδε, κατὰ λέξιν and the like, or else written in a language, dialect or form other than that employed by the cover text. Such fragments are scarce, representing only a small portion of the thousands that Jacoby assembled in *FGrHist* III. Of the 230 fragments that Jacoby assigned to Philochorus, for example, just over 10% purport to have been preserved verbatim, with another 4% likely candidates. Yet, Philochorus was an important source for Didymus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who tended to quote rather than to paraphrase. Other local historians had less luck.

[5] As R. Fowler points out in 'Early historiē and literacy', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2001), 95–115, at 111.

emphasized, in the context of interstate diplomacy.[6] Yet, whatever the aspirations of its author, whatever its potential appeal to nonlocals, a local history was received in many cases by the members of the focal community themselves and was intended, at least in part, for them. And neither patriotism nor the exigencies of peer polity interaction can account for the striking exclusion of this intended local audience from the audience implied in the text.[7]

This paper explores the tension in Greek local historiography between these audiences.[8] Part One considers a local historian's implication of a nonlocal audience; whether his subject was a foreign community or, as was more often the case, his own—whether, that is to say, we can classify the text as etic or emic—, he aimed his narrative outward. Part Two argues that despite his posture a local historian actually frequently intended the focal community, keenly interested as it was in reading about itself and its collective past, as a principal audience. And Part Three proposes a reason for the discrepancy. It was less chauvinism, I argue, that led Philochorus to explain to knowledgeable Athenians the Athenian injunction against dogs on the Acropolis than the influence of ethnography.[9] Early etic local histories, whose authors wrote about

[6] For Clarke's discussion of local historians as 'supra-political ambassadors', see Clarke (n. 3), 304–69. See also, for the particular case of Magnesia, H.-J. Gehrke, 'Myth, history, and collective identity: uses of the past in ancient Greece and beyond', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2001), 286–313; for Gehrke's notion of 'intentional history', see n. 100 below.

[7] I am relying here on the rubric of W. Iser in *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore, 1978), 28, who distinguishes two levels of hypothetical reader, one (the intended) 'constructed from social and historical knowledge of the time', the other (the implied) 'extrapolated from the reader's role laid down in the text'. Both of these putative audiences must be distinguished from the actual audience, the group or groups that in fact received and responded to the work (although knowledge about this last category certainly helps to adumbrate an author's intended audience).

[8] Modern criticism of Greek local historiography, inaugurated by the publication of the Aristotelian Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία at the end of the nineteenth century, has largely avoided the issue of audience. Early studies were preoccupied with the reliability of local traditions (see in particular U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* I [Berlin, 1893], 17–33; M. Vogt, 'Die griechischen Lokalhistoriker', *Neue Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 27 [1902], 699–786; and R. Laqueur, 'Lokalchronik', *RE* 13.1 [1927], cols. 1083–110) and with the origins and development of the form (F. Jacoby, 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* 9 [1909], 80–123, at 49–62 and id. *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* [Oxford, 1949]). Later treatments (for which, see n. 3) have tended rather to focus on the bifurcation between local and universal approaches to the past or on the role of local history in the formation of political identity. A major exception is Clarke (n. 3), whose concern is primarily with intended audiences (although see 314 n. 35). General studies of nonlocal Greek historiography, on the other hand, do frequently explore the issue of audience: see e.g. A. Momigliano, 'The historians of the classical world and their audiences: some suggestions', *ASNP* 8 (1978), 59–75; J. Malitz, 'Das Interesse an der Geschichte: die griechischen Historiker und ihr Publikum', in H. Verdin, G. Schepens and E. de Keyser (edd.), *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven, 24–26 May 1988* (Leuven, 1990), 323–49; J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997), 19–33 and id. 'Ancient audiences and expectations', in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge, 2009), 11–23; and Fowler (n. 5), who actually touches briefly on local history (111–12); see also K.A. Raaflaub, 'Ulterior motives in ancient historiography: what exactly, and why?', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke and N. Luraghi (edd.), *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart, 2010), 189–210.

[9] The term 'ethnography' commonly refers to accounts of communities of which the author was not himself a member. Yet, such narratives can be productively considered a subset of local historiography when they are concerned with a territorial community and treat not only present praxis but also the collective past. Jacoby generally emphasized the overlap between what he called *Ethnographie* and

communities to which they did not belong for the benefit of other outsiders, provided a valuable model for Greeks setting out to write about their own communities: by distancing their intended audience and very frequently themselves from the focal locality, by reframing the esoteric as exoteric, native Greek local historians could meet the peculiar challenges involved in telling a community its own story.

I. THE IMPLIED AUDIENCE OF GREEK LOCAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

Greek local historiography of the Classical and the Hellenistic periods was by no means a unified phenomenon. No two communities conceived of the past in the same way; no two members of the same community recorded it alike.[10] Yet, whenever we have access, thanks to the assiduity of a later writer such as Dionysius, to the words of the historian himself (whether he wrote after Alexander or before, whether from the shores of the Ionian or the Black Sea), we hear a similar voice. Almost to a man, Greek local historians implied an uninformed and nonlocal audience.

Although they occasionally highlighted the native pronunciation of a particular toponym,[11] in the first place, Greek local historians generally avoided the local dialect, favouring as accessible an idiom as possible: initially Ionic and then, from the middle of the fourth century, the *koinē*.[12] When Philochorus situates the altar violated by the dog ὑπὸ τῇ ἐλαίᾳ, for example, he notably does not use the Attic word for olive tree, ἐλάα,[13] and elsewhere he eschews geminate tau (*FGrHist* 328 F 30).[14] By the same

Horographie (see in particular Jacoby [n. 8 (1949)], 100, 106, 112, 118 and 289 n. 110), as have more recent critics (e.g. C.W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* [Berkeley, 1983], 22; G. Shrimpton, *History and Memory in Ancient Greece* [Montreal, 1997], 197; and Harding [n. 3], 186–7); but his treatment of ethnographic texts was not entirely consistent (see A. Zambrini, 'Aspetti dell'etnografia in Jacoby', in C. Ampolo [ed.], *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby* [Pisa, 2009^2], 189–200; G. Schepens, 'Die Debatte über die Struktur der "Fragmente der griechischen Historiker"', *Klio* 92 [2010], 427–71; and J. Skinner, *The Invention of Greek Ethnography from Homer to Herodotus* [Oxford, 2012], 32–4).

[10] For the diverse chronological frameworks through which individual Greek communities articulated their respective pasts, see D. Tober, 'Greek local history and the shape of the past', in W. Pohl and V. Wieser (edd.), *Historiographies of Identity*, vol. 1: *Historiographies as Reflection about Community: Ancient and Christian Models* (Turnhout, forthcoming 2017). For the distinctive ways in which individual local historians of a particular locality, viz. Athens, interpreted the past, see n. 54 below.

[11] Cineas, a local historian of Thessaly, wrote Krannous for Krannon (*FGrHist* 603 F 1a) and Bodone for Dodone (F 2c); Armenidas in his Θηβαϊκά gave Ariartus for Haliartus (*FGrHist* 378 F 7); and the Syracusan Philistus referred to Artemision as Artemition (*FGrHist* 556 F 63).

[12] See Fowler (n. 5), 111–13. Ionic was used by early local historians, such as Ion of Chios in his history of Chios (*FGrHist* 392 F 3) and Antiochus of Syracuse in his work Περὶ Ἰταλίης (*FGrHist* 555 F 2), although we should be wary of giving an early date to historians (such as Armenidas the writer of Θηβαϊκά [*FGrHist* 378 F 6] and Aethlius [*FGrHist* 536 F 2], who wrote Ὧροι Σάμιοι) solely because they used Ionic. We cannot assume that all cover-texts or manuscripts thereof have retained a local historian's original orthography, but some certainly have: Dionysius, for example, preserves not only Philochorus' *koinē*, as we have seen, but also Antiochus' Ionicisms (*Ant. Rom.* 1.12.3, 1.73.3 = *FGrHist* 555 FF 2 and 6).

[13] See, for example, Lys. 7 (*passim*) and Theophr. *Hist. pl*. (Book 1, *passim*). Both ἐλάα and ἐλαία, it is true, crop up in Attic decrees, which may suggest that the distinction was not always strictly observed; but Philochorus nevertheless notably opts for the unmarked form. The Attic νεών that we note in Philochorus, *FGrHist* 328 F 67, incidentally, appears also in contemporary non-Attic historians, which suggests that it had already lost its Attic flavour by Philochorus' day.

[14] = *Lex. Rhet. Cant.* s.v. ὀστρακισμοῦ τρόπος (p. 354.1 Nauck): Φιλόχορος ἐκτίθεται τὸν ὀστρακισμὸν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ γράφων οὕτω· '… ὅτε δ' ἐδόκει, ἐφράσσετο σανίσιν ἡ ἀγορά …'. Philochorus seems also to have preferred γίνεσθαι to the Attic γίγνεσθαι (*FGrHist* 328 F 6 = Harp.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

token, we find the Syracusan historian Philistus curbing his Doric tongue when he wrote his history of Sicily about a century earlier (*FGrHist* 556 F 5).[15] There are several exceptions to this linguistic ecumenism,[16] one of the most conspicuous being the Ἀργολικά of Dercylus (*FGrHist* 305), which features a curious farrago of Argive and Doric forms.[17] But Dercylus may have had other aims than expressly to localize his audience,[18] and by and large Greek local historians went out of their way to efface local markers.

So too did local historians, in their narrative voice at any rate, avoid using words such as 'ancestors', 'forefathers' and 'fatherland',[19] as well as first-person and second-person verbs and pronouns.[20] Indeed, there is only one fragment from a Greek local history that preserves a first-person plural pronoun explicitly with reference to the focal community. And this passage, from a history of Thespiae of debated authorship (*FGrHist* 386 F 1), is corrupt and likely quite late and so little affects the picture.[21]

s.v. κοβαλεία); and it is worth noting, again on the subject of orthography, that Harpocration, who quotes Philochorus here, retains the Attic form when quoting the Attic orator Isaeus elsewhere (s.v. παλίνσκιον = Isae. F 35 Forster).

[15] = Dion. Hal. *Pomp.* 5.4. See also *BNJ* 556 F 56a. For Philistus' style, see U. Schindel, 'Der Historiker Philistos von Syrakus und die rhetorische Figurenlehre', in M. Janka (ed.), ΕΓΚΥΚΛΙΟΝ ΚΗΠΙΟΝ *(Rundgärtchen): zu Poesie, Historie und Fachliteratur der Antike* (Munich/Leipzig, 2004), 163–9. Local historiography manifested itself uniquely among the Greek communities of Sicily, we should note, where narratives tended to be restricted not by an individual *polis* but by the island, or indeed by Magna Graecia, as a whole. For the Σικελικά, see R. Vattuone (ed.), *Storici Greci d'Occidente* (Bologna, 2002) and id. 'Western Greek historiography', in Marincola (n. 3), 189–99, as well as Clarke (n. 3), 230–43 and C. Baron, *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography* (Cambridge, 2013), 202–31.

[16] Diogenes Laertius, for example, once refers to a history of Rhodes written in Doric by a certain Epimenides (1.115, a reference that Jacoby addresses in the context of *FGrHist* 457 T 1); for Doric historiography in general, see A.C. Cassio, 'Lo sviluppo della prosa dorica e le tradizioni occidentali della retorica greca', in A.C. Cassio and D. Musti (edd.), *Tra Sicilia e Magna Grecia* (*AION* 11) (Pisa, 1989), 137–57.

[17] For the lexical peculiarities of this text, see A.C. Cassio, 'Storiografia locale di Argo e dorico letterario: Agia, Dercillo ed il Pap. Soc. Ital. 1091', *RFIC* 117 (1989), 257–75 and Cassio (n. 16).

[18] In all but two cases (*FGrHist* 305 FF 5–6), Dercylus is cited alongside and directly after a certain (H)agias, who is himself cited alone as author of an Ἀργολικά once (F 1). Despite F. Jacoby's misgivings (*Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* IIIB *Kommentar* [Text] [Leiden, 1955], 18), this Agias is best equated to the homonymous epic poet from Troezen (a locality often included in the ambit of the Ἀργολικά), whose work could well have been exploited by Dercylus as a means of authenticating and legitimizing his own historiographical enterprise. For the dates of Dercylus and Agias, see J. Engels, 'Agias and Derkylos (305)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/agias-and-derkylos-305-a305).

[19] On the rare occasion that πατρίς does appear in a verbatim fragment with reference to the focal locality (see e.g. Demon, *FGrHist* 327 F 1 and Nymphis, *FGrHist* 432 F 10), it belongs to the viewpoint not of the narrator but of a particular character. Greek local histories are sometimes given the title *Patria*, it is true, but not before the third century C.E. (see Orsi [n. 3], 59).

[20] In this way, as Marincola (n. 8 [1997]), 287–8 notes, Greek local historians differed markedly from their Roman counterparts.

[21] = Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀφόρμιον: τόπος Θεσπιέων. Ἀφροδίσιος ἤτοι Εὐφήμιος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς πατρίδος. ὅθεν καὶ τὸν κυβερνήσαντα τὴν ναῦν τὴν Ἀργὼ Τίφυν γενέσθαι. 'καὶ λόγος παρ' ἡμῖν τῆς νεὼς ἀφορμησάσης ἐντεῦθεν μετὰ τῶν ἀριστέων † ἀφ' οὗπερ ἀπέπλευσεν ἡ ναῦς'; ὁ ποιητὴς Ἀφορμιεύς. For the date of the text, see Jacoby (n. 18), 181; see also A. Ganter, 'Aphrodisios (386)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/aphrodisios-386-a386). If the author of the work on Thespiae did indeed write in verse, as is suggested by ὁ ποιητὴς Ἀφορμιεύς, the use of the phrase παρ' ἡμῖν would be explicable (see below for poetic treatments of local tradition). But we should perhaps read τοπίτης instead (see M. Billerbeck, J.F. Gaertner, B. Wyss and C. Zubler [edd.], *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, vol. 1 A-Γ [Berlin, 2006], 310). In any case, the context of the quotation is unclear, and the παρ' ἡμῖν may have belonged

The excerpt from Philochorus' Ἀτθίς with which we began, meanwhile, does preserve a first-person verb but in such a way as to confirm the rule. According to Philochorus, after the dog was observed on the Acropolis and the star in the daytime sky, 'we were asked about what the portent and the phenomenon meant', and 'we said that both predicted the return of the exiles'. The 'we' here is exclusive and refers not to the Athenians *en masse* but rather to Philochorus himself[22] or else to the select group of religious authorities to which he belonged.

Local historiography's treatment of local tradition is thus very different from that of early verse, which tends to integrate narrator and audience into the action of the narrative: a line from Mimnermus' *Nanno* on the foundation of Smyrna, for example, uses the first-person plural to describe the eastward migration of the Pylians (*FGrHist* 578 F 3),[23] and Tyrtaeus adopts what seems to be an analogous stance in his *Eunomia* elegy (*FGrHist* 580 FF 2, 4, 6).[24] It is oratory, however, that offers (in the case of Athens, at any rate) the best benchmark. For, like the Atthidographers, the Attic orators related episodes from Athenian cultural memory, but they generally did so by incorporating themselves into the community as a whole and by establishing a clear link between their contemporary audience and the events of the past. They frequently articulated notions of patrilineage—Andocides mentions 'your fathers' who freed 'the fatherland' from the Peisistratids (1.106–7), Isocrates the attack of the Peloponnesians and Eurystheus against 'our ancestors' (12.194) and the demolition of the walls 'of the fatherland' at the end of the Peloponnesian War (15.319)—and availed themselves of the first and the second persons. About the Athenian capitulation to Sparta, in fact, Isocrates here remarks that 'we saw the democracy twice overthrown and the walls of the πατρίς torn down'.[25] The orators used the first and the second persons also to recount events in which they and their audience certainly were not personally involved: peace negotiations with Sparta in the mid fifth century (Aeschin. 2.172),[26] the tyranny of the Peisistratids (Lyc. 1.61), even the parturition of the first Athenians (Isoc. 4.24).

originally to a character's speech. There are other verbatim fragments where a local historian uses a first-person verb or pronoun evidently in his own voice, but in no case can we derive them securely from a work of local history or construe them as perforce referring to the focal community alone: Cleidemus, *FGrHist* 323 F 27 comes most likely from the Ἐξηγητικόν not the Ἀτθίς; Ephorus, *FGrHist* 70 F 97 from the so-called 'epichoric' treatise (mentioned explicitly at *FGrHist* 70 F 1; see n. 77 below), which seems originally to have been an encomiastic oration (F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* IIC *Kommentar* [Leiden, 1926], 39). In Philochorus, *FGrHist* 328 F 35a, meanwhile, a gloss on ὁμογάλακτες that does certainly come from the Ἀτθίς, the first-person plural stands in for the passive voice, a substitution not uncommon in onomastics (cf. Semos, *FGrHist* 396 F 8).

[22] With the so-called plural of modesty, as M. Flower suggests (*The Seer in Ancient Greece* [Berkeley, 2008], 203).

[23] = Strab. 14.1.4 634C = F 9 West. There is, however, some debate about the speaker of these lines, whether it is the narrator himself (see e.g. A. Allen, *The Fragments of Mimnermus: Text and Commentary* [Stuttgart, 1993], 81) or a character within the text (B. Gentili, 'Mimnermo', *Maia* 17 [1965], 379–85, at 382–3).

[24] *FGrHist* 580 F 2 = Strab. 8.4.10 362C = F 2 West; *FGrHist* 580 F 4 = Paus. 4.6.2 = F 5 West; *FGrHist* 580 F 6 = Strab. 6.3.3 279 = F 5 West. See G.B. D'Alessio, 'Defining local identities in Greek lyric poetry', in R.L. Hunter and I. Rutherford (edd.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge, 2009), 137–67, at 154.

[25] … ἐπείδομεν … ἔτι δὲ τὴν δημοκρατίαν δὶς καταλυθεῖσαν καὶ τὰ τείχη τῆς πατρίδος κατασκαφέντα. For πατρίς, see also Isoc. 4.25 and 4.46; Dem. 14.32; Aeschin. 3.134; Lyc. 1.26; and Hyp. 6.35–7.

[26] Aeschines actually borrowed his problematic account of this period from Andocides (3.3), who also uses the first person.

The Atthidographers, on the other hand, opted always for the third person: for Philochorus it is not 'we' but 'the Athenians' who 'liberated the Oreitians' (*FGrHist* 328 F 159)[27] and 'made an alliance with the Olynthians' (*FGrHist* 328 F 49),[28] 'the *dēmos*' who voted for war with Philip (*FGrHist* 328 F 55a).[29] And in this regard the Atthidographers behave similarly to other native Greek local historians. The Ephesian Creophylus records in his history of Ephesus how 'the Ephesians' founded the *polis* (*FGrHist* 417 F 1);[30] the Erythraean Hippias in his history of Erythrae how 'the Erythraeans' helped overthrow a tyrant during a 'festival of the Erythraeans' (*FGrHist* 421 F 1);[31] and the Delian Semos in his Δηλιάς how 'the Delians' once offered gifts to visiting Delphians (*FGrHist* 396 F 7).[32]

A local historian implied a nonlocal audience not only by employing an unmarked dialect, by expunging terms such as 'ancestors' and 'fatherland', and by referring to his protagonists by way of the third person; he also chose to relate information ostensibly familiar to the focal community as if it was unknown. This is clearest in the case of topography. When Philochorus describes the itinerary of the trespassing dog, for example, he is careful to position the altar 'under the olive tree'. This is not to differentiate it from other altars to Zeus Herkeios nearby; it is rather to locate the structure for the benefit of an audience unacquainted with the lie of the land. A passage from Cleidemus' Ἀτθίς, composed several generations before that of Philochorus, reveals a similar concern (*FGrHist* 323 F 1). Here Cleidemus identifies the location of a shrine of Eileithyia, which he situates 'in the direction of Agra', and of an altar of Poseidon Heliconius, which he places atop a hill 'now called Agra but formerly commonly known as Helicon', and he does so in the first book, in what seems in fact to have been an introductory chorography designed to orient his readers.[33]

[27] = Didym. *Dem.* col. 1.13–18: [… Φιλο]χόρῳ μαρτυρεῖ. περὶ μ(ὲν) γ(ὰρ) τῆς πρὸς [Ὠρεὸν ἐξελθ]ο̣ύ̣σ̣ης βοηθείας προθεὶς ἄρχοντα Σωσ[ι]γέ[νη φησὶ ταῦ]τα· 'κ(αὶ) σ(υμ)αχίαν Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς Χαλκιδεῖς ἐποι[ήσαντο, κ(αὶ)] ἠλευθέρωσαν [Ὠ]ρ<ε>ίτας μ(ετὰ) Χαλκιδ<ε>έων μηνὸς [Σκιροφο]ριῶνος, Κηφισοφῶντος στρατηγοῦ[ντο]ς …'.

[28] = Dion. Hal. *Amm.* 9: οὗτος δ' ἐπὶ Καλλιμάχου γέγονεν ἄρχοντος, ὡς δηλοῖ Φιλόχορος ἐν ἕκτῃ βύβλῳ τῆς Ἀτθίδος κατὰ λέξιν οὕτω γράφων· 'Καλλίμαχος Περγασῆθεν· ἐπὶ τούτου Ὀλυνθίοις πολεμουμένοις ὑπὸ Φιλίππου καὶ πρέσβεις Ἀθήναζε πέμψασιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι συμμαχίαν τε ἐποιήσαντο …'.

[29] = Dion. Hal. *Amm.* 11: δηλοῖ Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ ἕκτῃ τῆς Ἀτθίδος βύβλῳ. θήσω δ' ἐξ αὐτῆς τὰ ἀναγκαιότατα. '… ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἀκούσας τῆς ἐπιστολῆς … ἐχειροτόνησε τὴν μὲν στήλην καθελεῖν …' (cf. *FGrHist* 328 F 55b = Didym. *Dem.* col. 1.67–2.2).

[30] = Ath. *Deipn.* 8.62 361c–e: Κρεώφυλος δ' ἐν τοῖς Ἐφεσίων Ὅροις '… καὶ διαβάντες οἱ Ἐφέσιοι ἐκ τῆς νήσου, ἔτεα εἴκοσιν οἰκήσαντες, τὸ δεύτερον [εἴκοσι] κτίζουσι Τρηχεῖαν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ Κορησσόν …'.

[31] = Ath. *Deipn.* 6.75 258f–259f: Ἱππίας δ' ὁ Ἐρυθραῖος ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν Περὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἱστοριῶν διηγούμενος ὡς ἡ Κνωποῦ βασιλεία ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκείνου κολάκων κατελύθη φησὶν καὶ ταῦτα '… Ἱππότης ὁ Κνωποῦ ἀδελφὸς μετὰ δυνάμεως ἐπελθὼν ταῖς Ἐρυθραῖς, ἑορτῆς οὔσης τῶν Ἐρυθραίων προσβοηθούντων, ἐπῆλθε τοῖς τυράννοις …'.

[32] = Ath. *Deipn.* 4.74 173e: Σῆμος δ' ἐν δ Δηλιάδος 'Δελφοῖς' φησὶ 'παραγινομένοις εἰς Δῆλον παρεῖχον Δήλιοι ἅλας καὶ ὄξος καὶ ἔλαιον καὶ ξύλα καὶ στρώματα'.

[33] The fragment is quoted verbatim in a ninth-century lexicon (see now I.C. Cunningham [ed.], *Synagoge*, Συναγωγὴ Λέξεων Χρησίμων [Berlin, 2003], 533). Jacoby's text for F 1 differs slightly, and he suggests several cogent emendations in his apparatus: Ἄγραι· χωρίον ἔξω τῆς πόλεως Ἀθηνῶν, οὗ τὰ μικρὰ τῆς Δήμητρος ἄγεται μυστήρια… . Πλάτων Φαίδρῳ (229c)· ᾗ πρὸς τὸ τῆς Ἄγρας διαβαίνομεν. καὶ Κλείδημος ἐν πρώτῳ Ἀτθίδος· 'τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄνω <ταῦ>τα τοῦ Ἰλισοῦ. πρὸς Ἄγραν <δ'> Εἰλείθυια. τῷ δ' ὄχθῳ πάλαι ὄνομα τούτῳ ὃ νῦν Ἄγρα καλεῖται, Ἑλικών, καὶ ἡ ἐσχάρα τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος τοῦ Ἑλικωνίου ἐπ' ἄκρου.' For Cleidemus' date, see now W.S. Morison, 'Klei(to)demos of Athens (396)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/kleitodemos-of-athens-323-a323), commentary to F 8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Athenians could certainly write in such a way as to concede in their audience a general awareness of Athenian topography. The Attic orators, once again, provide a good point of comparison,[34] as in fact does Plato. The ninth-century lexicon that preserves Cleidemus' survey of Agrae actually juxtaposes the Atthidographer's objective account to a passage in the *Phaedrus* (229c), where Socrates uses the Attic terrain to localize a specific event, explaining that the Athenian princess Oreithyia was snatched away alongside the Ilissus River near 'where we cross to the [Temple of Artemis] Agra'.[35] Not every Athenian, it is true, would have known every altar in Attica—indeed, Plato's Phaedrus here confesses that he has never noticed an altar to Boreas at the spot where Oreithyia allegedly disappeared[36]—, but Plato and the orators nevertheless generally limn the city of Athens as a familiar landscape.

Not so the Atthidographers; and in their detached approach to local topography they typify Greek local historians at large. When Callias of Syracuse, a historian closely associated with the tyrant Agathocles, has recourse in his history of Sicily to mention the settlement Eryce, 'formerly a *polis* of the Sicels', he locates it as if for the benefit of foreign visitors: it is 'about ninety stades from Gela', he writes, 'near the so-called Delli'. In defining the Delli as 'two craters that the Siceliotae [Sicilian Greeks] consider to be brothers of the Palici' (*FGrHist* 564 F 1), moreover, Callias distinguishes his readers and indeed himself from this local group (to which he at any rate categorically belonged).[37] We can note a similar gesture in a passage from the Ἀργολικά of the Argive Deinias,[38] quoted verbatim in a scholium to Euripides' *Orestes* (872): 'Having quickly overpowered Melanchrus and Cleometra,' Deinias writes, 'they killed them by pelting them with stones, and they show their grave still to this day atop the so-called Pron, a hill where the Argives have their court' (*FGrHist* 306 F 3).[39] Here again, topography is directed at a foreign audience; like Callias in his description of the Delli, Deinias defines the promontory, no doubt an important landmark for the Argive community, as the 'so-called' Pron.[40]

[34] See e.g. Andoc. 1.45; Dem. 54.7–8; and Lyc. 1.112.

[35] ἢ πρὸς τὸ τῆς Ἄγρας διαβαίνομεν. The introduction to the *Lysis* (203a) offers another good example of Plato's use of Athenian topography to set a dialogue's scene.

[36] Herodotus, however, knew of the altar (7.189).

[37] Macrob. *Sat.* 5.19.25: Callias autem in septima historia de rebus Siculis ita scribit: ἡ δὲ Ἐρύκη τῆς μὲν Γελώιας ὅσον ἐνενήκοντα στάδια διέστηκεν. ἐπιεικῶς δὲ ἐχυρός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ *** τὸ παλαιὸν Σικελῶν γεγενημένη πόλις, ὑφ' ᾗ καὶ τοὺς Δέλλους καλουμένους εἶναι συμβέβηκεν. οὗτοι δὲ κρατῆρες δύο εἰσίν, οὓς ἀδελφοὺς τῶν Παλικῶν οἱ Σικελιῶται νομίζουσιν, τὰς δὲ ἀναφορὰς τῶν πομφολύγων παραπλησίας βραζούσαις ἔχουσιν. hactenus Callias. For Callias' provenance, see *FGrHist* 564 TT 2 and 3. For his connection to Agathocles, see D.W. Roller, 'Kallias of Syracuse (564)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/kallias-of-syracuse-564-a564). For a similar passage, see *FGrHist* 376 F 1, from Nicocrates' work on Boeotia, along with the commentary of A. Schachter, 'Nikokrates (376)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/nikokrates-376-a376).

[38] Deinias was very possibly Argive himself and perhaps even the assassin of the tyrant of Sicyon in 252/251 B.C.E. (see Jacoby [n. 18], 25, but cf. H. Tell, 'Deinias of Argos [306]', in *BNJ* [http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/deinias-of-argos-306-a306]).

[39] λέγεται δέ τις ἐν Ἄργει Πρών, ὅπου δικάζουσιν Ἀργεῖοι. ἱστορεῖ δὲ περὶ τοῦ χωρίου Δεινίας ἐν θ̄ τῆς πρώτης συντάξεως, ἐκδόσεως δὲ δευτέρας, γράφων οὕτως· 'ταχέως δὲ κυριεύσαντες τὸν Μέλαγχρον καὶ τὴν Κλεομήτραν βάλλοντες τοῖς λίθοις ἀπέκτειναν. καὶ τὸν τάφον αὐτῶν δεικνύουσιν καὶ νῦν ἔτι ὑπεράνω τοῦ καλουμένου Πρωνὸς χῶμα † παντελῶς, οὗ συμβαίνει Ἀργείους δικάζειν.'

[40] For a similar application of the participle καλούμενος to a local toponym, see *FGrHist* 424 F 2a, from the Εὐβοϊκά of the Euboean Archemachus, and *FGrHist* 417 F 1, from Creophylus' history of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As with local topography, so with local praxis. For Deinias, Pron is not simply a hill but in fact also the place 'where the Argives have their court'. How many Argive citizens did he think would not know this, would consult his work in order to find out just what it was that the Argives did on the Pron? How many Argives, for that matter, did Dercylus expect would turn to his Ἀργολικά in order to understand how exactly 'the maidens who are called Heresides' and 'the maidens who are called Locheutriai' honoured Hera at Argos (*FGrHist* 305 F 4)?[41] Some Argives, it is true, might not have had the opportunity to observe first-hand the portage of sacred water into the Heraion. But this was nevertheless knowledge assumed to be generally available to the Argive community. Like Deinias, Dercylus thus intentionally pitches his account of Argive activity to an audience of outsiders. The same can be said of Comarchus, who deigned to point out, when he wrote up the affairs of the Eleans, that the Olympic Games began at the new moon of the month 'that is called Thosythias in Elis' (*FGrHist* 410 F 1),[42] or of the Delian Semos, whose Δηλιάς brimmed with exegesis of Delian behaviour. Semos explains, for example, that, when worshipping the goddess Brizo, 'Delian women bring her little bowls full of all sorts of good things except for fish' (*FGrHist* 396 F 4),[43] and that on the nearby island of Hecate 'the Delians sacrifice to Iris so-called βασυνίαι, viz. boiled wheat cakes made of flour with honey, and so-called κόκκωρα, which consist of a dried fig and three nuts' (*FGrHist* 396 F 5).[44]

Philochorus deals similarly with Athenian behaviour, as we have seen, following his account of the wayward dog with the comment 'it is an ancestral custom of the Athenians that no dog go up on the Acropolis'. It is true that the injunction might not have been widely known among Athenians, that Philochorus is speaking here as a religious authority in possession of arcane knowledge about outdated Athenian superstition. Yet, he stipulates that the taboo is shared by, and thus known to, 'the Athenians' as a whole. Once again, it is worth contrasting his approach to that of the Attic orators, for whom the Areopagus, say, is not 'a hill where the Athenians have their court' but an

Ephesus. For related phrases, see *FGrHist* 378 F 6 from the Θηβαϊκά of Armenidas and *FGrHist* 323 F 7 from Cleidemus' history of Athens.

[41] = Schol. on Antimach. = *P.Cairo* 6574.2.12–23: καὶ Ἀγίας [καὶ Δερκύλο]ς ἐν τοῖς Ἀργολικοῖς φασὶν οὕτως· 'ὑδ[ρεύονται ἐ]κ μὲν τοῦ Ἡ[ραίου παρ]θένο[ι αἳ] καλοῦνται Ἡρεσίδες, καὶ φέ[ροντι τὰ] λοετρὰ τ[ᾶι Ἥραι τᾶι] Ἀκρεί[αι]· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Αὐτοματείου φέ[ρουσαι ὑ]δρεύονται π[αρθένοι αἳ] καλοῦ[ν]ται Λοχεύτριαι, ἐπεὶ κέ τις τ[ῶν γυναικῶν] λοχεύητ[αι τῶν δμ]ωίδω[ν]. ἰδία<ι> δ' ἀπὸ τᾶς λοχείας φέρον[τι …….] λοετρά.' For this passage, see Engels (n. 18) and Fowler (n. 5), who notes that 'though the Argives did not need to be told this they might have enjoyed being told' (112 n. 29).

[42] = Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 3.33a: καὶ Κώ(μαρχος) ὁ τὰ περὶ Ἠλείων συντάξας φησὶν οὕτως· 'πρῶτον μὲν οὖν παντὸς περίοδον [Ἡρακλῆς] συνέθηκεν † ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἄρχειν νουμηνίαν μηνὸς ὃς † Θωσυθιὰς ἐν Ἥλιδι ὀνομάζεται …'. Despite the textual difficulties of this passage (for which, see now G. Anderson, 'Komarchos [410]', in *BNJ* [http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/komarchos-410-a410]), by specifying in a work about Elis the name of an Elean month Comarchus (perhaps himself Elean) implied an audience of nonlocals.

[43] = Ath. *Deipn.* 8.12 335a–b: καὶ γὰρ ἐν Δήλῳ φησὶ Σῆμος ὁ Δήλιος ἐν β̄ Δηλιάδος, ὅταν θύωσι τῇ Βριζοῖ—αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν ὕπνῳ μάντις· βρίζειν δ' οἱ ἀρχαῖοι λέγουσι τὸ καθεύδειν· ἔνθα δ' ἀποβρίξαντες ἐμείναμεν ἠῶ δῖαν—, ταύτῃ οὖν ὅταν θύωσιν αἱ Δηλιάδες, προσφέρουσιν αὐτῇ σκάφας πάντων πλήρεις ἀγαθῶν πλὴν ἰχθύων διὰ τὸ εὔχεσθαι ταύτῃ περί τε πάντων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν πλοίων σωτηρίας. For Semos' provenance, see *FGrHist* 396 T 1 and FF 1, 3–4 and 11. For his date, see L. Bertelli, 'Semos (396)', in *BNJ* (http://reference works.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/semos-396-a396).

[44] = Ath. *Deipn.* 14.53 645b: Σῆμος ἐν β̄ Δηλιάδος, ἐν τῇ τῆς Ἑκάτης [φησὶν] νήσῳ τῇ Ἰριδι θύουσι Δήλιοι τοὺς βασυνίας καλουμένους—ἐστὶν δὲ ἐφθὸν πύρινον, σταῖς σὺν μέλιτι—καὶ τὰ καλούμενα κόκκωρα, ἰσχὰς καὶ κάρυα τρία.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

institution 'most venerable and peculiar to us' (Dem. 23.65),[45] who boast of the Eleusinian mysteries that 'we still today reveal them each year' to new initiates (Isoc. 4.29),[46] who allege that 'we are the only Greeks to hold ostracisms' ([ps.-]Andoc. 4.6).[47] Even regarding little-known *nomoi*, the orators by and large attempt to affiliate their audience, involving them in the passing of decrees, no matter how obscure,[48] and conceding a general local awareness of local custom.[49]

Alongside local topography and praxis, finally, local historians presented episodes from the focal community's cultural memory, even the most celebrated and renowned, as if they were unknown. They might report events as if they had learned them second-hand—'It is said', writes Philochorus about the aftermath of the famous Pylos campaign, 'that when Cleon opposed the reconciliations the assembly fell into factions' (*FGrHist* 328 F 128a).[50] Or they might simply fail to acknowledge their audience's likely familiarity with a particular episode. Regarding the notorious end of the Erechtheid dynasty, for example, the Atthidographer Demon (a younger contemporary of Philochorus) writes simply that 'Apheidas, while king of Athens, was killed by his younger brother Thymoetes, who, although illegitimate, became king himself' (*FGrHist* 327 F 1);[51] and, in his history of Heraclea, the Heracliote Nymphis introduces the tyrant Dionysius, whose rule at Heraclea had ended just about a generation before, by identifying him as 'tyrant' and the son of Clearchus, who was (as every Heracliote well knew!) 'Heraclea's first tyrant' (*FGrHist* 432 F 10).[52]

Now, Greek local historians undoubtedly considered as part of their task the collation and evaluation of various accounts of the past, as well as the excavation of information forgotten or hitherto unknown. Antiochus began his history of Italy by emphasizing just this aspect of his work, alleging that he had culled what was most credible and clear from 'the ancient *logoi*' (*FGrHist* 555 F 2).[53] Historians of a given locality would

[45] πολλὰ μὲν δὴ παρ᾽ ἡμῖν ἐστὶ τοιαῦθ᾽ οἷ᾽ οὐχ ἑτέρωθι, ἓν δ᾽ οὖν ἰδιώτατον πάντων καὶ σεμνότατον, τὸ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ δικαστήριον … . See also Lys. 1.30.

[46] καὶ τὰ μὲν ἔτι καὶ νῦν καθ᾽ ἕκαστον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν δείκνυμεν ….

[47] ῥᾴδιον δὲ καὶ ἐντεῦθεν γνῶναι τὸν νόμον πονηρὸν ὄντα· μόνοι γὰρ αὐτῷ τῶν Ἑλλήνων χρώμεθα.

[48] See e.g. Dem. 19.87 and 59.104; and Aeschin. 3.14 and 3.158.

[49] See e.g. Dem. 20.100 and 37.18. Sometimes shared knowledge is suggested simply by way of a particle such as δήπου (see e.g. Dem. 20.18 and 21.32).

[50] = Schol. RV on Ar. *Pax* 665: Φιλόχορος φησὶν οὕτως· '… Κλέωνος δὲ ἀντειπόντος ταῖς διαλύσεσι στασιάσαι λέγεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ἐρωτῆσαι δὲ συνέβη τὸν ἐπιστάτην· ἐνίκησαν δὲ οἱ πολεμεῖν βουλόμενοι.' For the implications of this λέγεται, see Jacoby (n. 1), 502–3. For a similar formulation, see Aristophanes of Boeotia, *FGrHist* 379 F 3 (= Steph. Byz. s.v. Χαιρώνεια): κέκληται ἀπὸ Χαίρωνος· Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Βοιωτικῶν β̄, 'λέγεται δ᾽ οἰκιστὴν γενέσθαι τοῦ πολίσματος Χαίρωνα.'

[51] = Ath. *Deipn.* 3.50 96d–e: Δήμων ἐν δ̄ Ἀτθίδος, Ἀφείδαντα, φησί, 'βασιλεύοντα Ἀθηνῶν Θυμοίτης ὁ νεώτερος ἀδελφὸς νόθος ὢν ἀποκτείνας αὐτὸς ἐβασίλευσεν.' For Demon's date, see N.F. Jones, 'Demon (327)' in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/demon-of-athens-327-a327).

[52] = Ath. *Deipn.* 12.72 549a–d: Νύμφις γοῦν ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν τῷ <ι>β̄ Περὶ Ἡρακλείας Διονύσιος φησὶν 'ὁ Κλεάρχου τοῦ πρώτου τυραννήσαντος ἐν Ἡρακλείᾳ υἱὸς καὶ αὐτὸς τῆς πατρίδος τυραννήσας.' See Jacoby ([n. 18], 264) for the possibility that this explanatory phrase was not part of Nymphis' original text.

[53] = Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.12.3: Ἀντίοχος δὲ ὁ Συρακούσιος, συγγραφεὺς πάνυ ἀρχαῖος … Οἰνώτρους λέγει πρώτους τῶν μνημονευομένων ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικῆσαι, εἰπὼν ὧδε· 'Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίης ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα· τὴν γῆν ταύτην, ἥτις νῦν Ἰταλίη καλεῖται, τὸ παλαιὸν εἶχον Οἰνωτροι.' For Antiochus, see N. Luraghi, 'Antiochos of Syracuse (555)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/antiochos-of-syracuse-555-a555).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not have hesitated to disagree with one another, sometimes openly, about matters of chronology and interpretation,[54] nor would readers of a local history necessarily already have been aware of every detail they encountered in the text, in particular since historians aiming for narrative continuity may well have invented episodes omitted from a community's cultural memory. Yet, local historians nevertheless framed the entire past as if it were unfamiliar, while other purveyors of local tradition, such as the Attic orators, went out of their way to recognize audience awareness of and even involvement in local events.[55]

This contrast is made all the clearer when we are in the position to juxtapose an Atthidographer's treatment of a particular episode (preserved verbatim) with that of an orator. Both Philochorus and Demosthenes, for example, refer to the exile of Athenian ambassadors who had voted for peace with the Persian king in 392/391. Philochorus uses the third person and assumes in his audience no prior knowledge of the event: 'The ambassadors who gave their assent in Lacedaemon were exiled on the motion of Callistratus; and Epicrates of Cephisia, Andocides of Cydathenaeum, Cratinus of Sphettus and Eubulides of Eleusis did not await the trial' (*FGrHist* 328 F 149a).[56] Demosthenes, on the other hand, recalls nearly half a century after Callistratus' decree that 'you, men of Athens, condemned these ambassadors to death, among whom was Epicrates, a man who was, as I hear from our elders, most patriotic' (19.277).[57] Or, to take another example, Demosthenes reminds his audience of recent friction between Athens and Megara, mentioning the decree that 'you passed against the accursed Megarians when they appropriated the sacred Orgas between Athens and Megara' (13.32).[58] Philochorus takes a different tack, explaining that, when

[54] The point was made most forcefully by Jacoby specifically about Atthidography ([n. 8 (1949)], 72–9); see also A. Bauer, *Die Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte* (Munich, 1899), 180–1; J. McInerney, 'Politicizing the past: the 'Atthis' of Kleidemos', *ClAnt* 13 (1994), 17–37; and G. Camassa, 'L'attidografia nella storia degli studi', in C. Bearzot and F. Landucci (edd.), *Storie di Atene, storia dei Greci: studi e ricerche di attidografia* (Milan, 2010), 29–52. For reactions to this view, see P. Harding, 'Androtion's political career', *Historia* 25 (1976), 186–200 and 'Atthis and *politeia*', *Historia* 26 (1977), 148–60 and P. Rhodes, 'The Atthidographers', in H. Verdin, G. Schepens and E. de Keyser (edd.), *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven, 24–26 May 1988* (Leuven, 1990), 73–81. But to downplay the centrality of party politics in Jacoby's conception of Atthidography does not mean denying that a historian intimately involved in the daily affairs of his community infused his writings with beliefs about the past that did not perforce jibe with those of his predecessors.

[55] See e.g. Andoc. 3.8 and Lycurg. 1.93 and 1.112. For the Attic orators' tendency to involve their audience in the collective Athenian past, see L. Pearson, 'Historical allusions in the Attic orators', *CQ* 36 (1941), 209–29, at 212–18; see also Clarke (n. 3), 245–303 and B. Steinbock, *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse: Uses and Meanings of the Past* (Ann Arbor, 2013), especially 94–9. Orators might implicate their audience also by pointing to the communicative role of oral tradition (see e.g. Dem. 22.13, Din. 1.75, [ps.-]Dem. 60.10, Hyper. 6.2 and Thuc. 2.36.4).

[56] = Didym. *Demosth*. col. 7.11–28: ταύτην γ(ὰρ) οὐ μ[όνον οὐκ ἐδέξαντο] Ἀθ[η]ν[αῖοι], ἀλλὰ κ(αὶ) πᾶν τοὐν[αντίον τὰ διδόμ(εν)]' αὐτοῖς ἀ[πε]ώσαντο παρ' [ἧ]ν ᾳ[ἰτίαν Φιλό]χορος ἀφη[γεῖ]ται αὐτοῖς ὀνό[μ]ασι, πρ[οθ]ε̣ὶς ἄρχοντα Φιλοκ[λέ]α Ἀναφλύ[σ]τιον· '… ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺ[ς πρέσ]βεις τοὺς ἐν Λακεδαίμονι συγχωρήσα[ντας] ἐφυγάδευσαν, Καλλιστράτου γράψαντος, κ[αὶ οὐ]χ ὑπομείναντας τὴν κρίσιν, Ἐπικράτην Κηφισιέα, Ἀνδοκίδην Κυδαθηναιέα, Κρατῖνον Σ[φ]ήττιον, Εὐβουλίδην Ἐλευσίνιον.' See P. Harding, *Didymos: On Demosthenes* (Oxford, 2006), 164–85.

[57] κατὰ τουτὶ τὸ ψήφισμ', ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τῶν πρέσβεων ἐκείνων ὑμεῖς θάνατον κατέγνωτε, ὧν εἷς ἦν Ἐπικράτης, ἀνήρ, ὡς ἐγὼ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀκούω, σπουδαῖος καὶ πολλὰ χρήσιμος τῇ πόλει … .

[58] οἷον ἃ πρὸς τοὺς καταράτους Μεγαρέας ἐψηφίσασθ' ἀποτεμνομένους τὴν ὀργάδα, ἐξιέναι, κωλύειν, μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν … .

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Apollodorus was archon, 'the Athenians entered into a dispute with the Megarians about the boundaries of the sacred Orgas and invaded Megara with Ephialtes as general' (*FGrHist* 328 F 155).[59]

Our survey of verbatim fragments confirms that Greek local historians very seldom made use of the local dialect; avoided referring to the focal locality as a fatherland, to the focal community by way of the first or the second persons, and to their protagonists as ancestors; and treated as if unknown matters of local topography and custom as well as episodes, however hackneyed, from the focal community's cultural memory. In so doing, they implied an external audience, with native local historians at the same time sometimes taking pains also to distinguish themselves from the focal community. Did local historians accordingly expect a predominately nonlocal readership? Did they overlook or undervalue the possibility of local readers? In the following section, I answer both questions in the negative. No matter how often Greeks had the opportunity or initiative to read histories of communities to which they did not belong, local histories were received first and foremost by the focal community itself; and it was primarily for this restricted audience that a local historian intended his work, whatever hopes he may have had that it would appeal to the greater Greek world.

II. THE INTENDED AUDIENCES OF GREEK LOCAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

No Greek who wrote a work of local history would have envisaged a completely homogeneous audience.[60] For one thing, local histories were read by other historians, local and nonlocal alike; and while Philochorus could not have foreseen that some two hundred years after his death his Ἀτθίς would be epitomized and translated into Latin (*FGrHist* 328 T 8), there is little doubt that he expected his work to appeal to his professional peers—he had himself carefully read the Ἀτθίδες of Androtion and Demon, after all—and that he thus intended it in part for them.[61] The same can be said, especially in the later Hellenistic period, of academics such as Didymus or highbrow

[59] = Didym. *Demosth*. col. 13.42–58: ὅτι μνημονεύει [Δημοσθένης] τῶν πραχθέντων Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς Μεγαρέας περὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς Ὀργάδος. γέγονε δὲ ταῦτα κατ' Ἀπολλόδωρον ἄρχοντα, καθάπερ ἱστορεῖ Φιλόχορος οὑτωσὶ γράφων· 'Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πρὸς Μεγαρέας διενεχθέντες ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὁρισμοῦ τῆς ἱερᾶς Ὀργάδος εἰσῆλθον εἰς Μέγαρα μετ' Ἐφιάλτου στρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν …'.

[60] See above (n. 8) for modern discussions of Greek historiography's audiences. Polybius offers the clearest ancient testimony about historiography's audiences (9.1.1), but he is not thinking here specifically of local history.

[61] Philochorus allegedly wrote a direct response to Demon's Ἀτθίς (*FGrHist* 328 T 1 and F 72), and he relied heavily on Androtion (cf. *FGrHist* 324 F 30 and 328 F 155, for which see Jacoby [n. 1], 249–50 and P. Harding, *Androtion and the* Atthis [Oxford, 1994], 125–7). To look outside the Ἀτθίδες, we know that Memnon based the first thirteen books of his history of Pontic Heraclea on the history of Nymphis (*FGrHist* 432 T 3–4, for which see Jacoby [n. 18], 269–71 and P. Desideri, 'Studi di storiografia Eracleota I', *SCO* 16 (1967), 366–416, at 378–81 and 389–90). Regarding the use of local histories by nonlocal historians, Thucydides certainly read Hellanicus' recently published history of Athens (1.97.2 = *FGrHist* 323a T 8); Polybius the Rhodian histories of his older contemporaries Zeno (16.14–20 = *FGrHist* 523 TT 3–5 and FF 4–6) and Antisthenes (16.14–15 = *FGrHist* 508 T 1 = F 1), as well as the Σικελικά of Timaeus (e.g. 1.5.1, 12.3.7–12.4.5, 12.5.1–12.11.5 and 12.25.1–12.25.5 = *FGrHist* 566 T 6a, FF 3, 12, 28b); Dionysius of Halicarnassus the works of Philistus (e.g. *Pomp.* 5.4 and *Ant. Rom.* 1.22.3–4 = *FGrHist* 556 FF 5 and 46), Philochorus (e.g. *Amm.* 9 and 11, *Din*. 3 and 13 = *FGrHist* 328 FF 49–51, 53–6, 66–7, 152–4 and 158), and Ariaethus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.49.1 = *FGrHist* 316 F 1); and Diodorus those of Antiochus (12.71.2 = *FGrHist* 555 T 3) and Zeno (5.55 = *FGrHist* 523 F 1) as well as a handful of Κρητικά (5.64–80 = *FGrHist* 457 F 17, 458 F 1, 461 T 2 and 462 T 1).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

poets such as Callimachus and Apollonius, whose industry led them to probe hidden corners of the Greek world and earned for them a reputation for the recondite.[62] But did a Greek local historian imagine that his work would appeal to nonlocals outside of the intellectual elite?

This is the supposition of one of our earliest commentators on Greek local historiography, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who maintained in the introduction of his wide-ranging essay on Thucydides that local historians generally endeavoured to bring epichoric traditions and texts 'to the common knowledge of all' (*Thuc.* 5).[63] And it is a hypothesis that has persisted, although in a modified form, to the present day, with local historiography often promoted as the preferred means through which individual communities asserted themselves before the wider Greek world. Through local history, Felix Jacoby succinctly put it, Greeks following in Herodotus' wake could 'secure for their native town a place in the Great History of the Greek people, both for the mythical time and for the recent national contest against Persia'.[64] But Dionysius' claim must be taken with a grain of salt, since it reflects his idiosyncratic conception of the evolution of Roman historiography[65] as well as his particular aims as a Greek writing a history of Rome for the benefit of other Greeks. Jacoby's reformulation, meanwhile, quite apart from its prioritization of Herodotus as a spur for the proliferation of Greek local historiography,[66] suffers from its reliance on a hypothetical Panhellenic past, an amalgamated national narrative to which various constituent communities fancied themselves contributing: a model perhaps better suited to the Europe of Jacoby's own day than to Classical or Hellenistic Greece.

[62] Didymus, we know, read several Ἀτθίδες (*FGrHist* 324 FF 30 and 53; 325 F 17; 327 F 7; 328 FF 55b, 56b, 144–5, 149a, 151, 155, 157 and 159–61), as well as Theotimus' history of Cyrene (*FGrHist* 470 F 1), Creophylus' history of the Ephesians (*FGrHist* 417 F 3), and the works of Philistus (*FGrHist* 556 F 49) and Timaeus (*FGrHist* 566 FF 18, 39b, 93b, 96, 145) on Sicily. Callimachus, meanwhile, read Xenomedes on the history of Ceos (*FGrHist* 442 F 1) and Dercylus on Argos (*FGrHist* 305 FF 4, 8 and 8bis), and he was familiar also with the Samian history of Aethlius (*FGrHist* 536 F 3 with *Ait.* F 100 Pf.). And Apollonius evidently used several historians of Pontic Heraclea as sources for his *Argonautika*, including Promathidas (1.1126–31; 2.815, 2.844–7a, 2.911–14, 2.928–9 = *FGrHist* 430 FF 1–4) and Nymphis (2.729–35a = *FGrHist* 432 T 5 = F 3).

[63] … ὅσαι διεσῴζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνῆμαι κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις, εἴ τ' ἐν ἱεροῖς εἴ τ' ἐν βεβήλοις ἀποκείμεναι γραφαί, ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἁπάντων γνῶσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν … . For this important passage, see Jacoby (n. 8 [1949]), 79, 86, 136, 147, 178 and 201; S. Gozzoli, 'Una teoria antica sull'origine della storiografia greca', *SCO* 19–20 (1970–1971), 158–211; H. Verdin, 'La fonction de l'histoire selon Denys d'Halicarnasse', *AncSoc* 5 (1974), 289–307; W.K. Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: On Thucydides* (Berkeley, 1975), 50–7; D.L. Toye, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the Greek historian', *AJPh* 116 (1995), 279–302; R. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87, at 62–8; and L. Porciani, 'La storia locale in Grecia secondo Dionigi d'Alicarnasso', in C. Bearzot, R. Vattuone and D. Ambaglio (edd.), *Storiografia locale e storiografia universale: forme di acquisizione del sapere storico nella cultura antica* (Como, 2001), 287–98.

[64] Jacoby (n. 8 [1949]), 289 n. 111. For the term 'Great History', see also 1–2, 118, 185 and 201.

[65] *Ant. Rom.* 1.73.1, 1.74.3; see Cic. *De or.* 2.52 for a similar contemporary viewpoint. What stands out about Roman historiography, aside from its belated appearance, is the priority of the local framework, which prevailed until just about Dionysius' own day.

[66] For criticism of Jacoby's theory of the development of local historiography, see Fowler (n. 63); S.C. Humphreys, 'Fragments, fetishes, and philosophies: towards a history of Greek historiography after Thucydides', in G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente Sammeln* (Göttingen, 1997), 186–205; Marincola (n. 3); L. Porciani, 'Il problema della storia locale', in C. Ampolo (n. 9), 173–84, at 175–6; and P. Funke, 'Einige Überlegungen zur Genese der antiken griechischen Lokalgeschichtsschreibung', in *Geographia Antiqua* 23–24 (2014–2015), 179–86. For a good overview of the issues, see N. Luraghi, 'Introduction', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2001), 1–15.

An individual Greek community was certainly aware, as Clarke has written in her stimulating study *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the* Polis (2008), that its past 'ran alongside and often in conjunction with that of other *poleis*',[67] and individual local historians may well have tailored their histories to appeal to 'wider, politically influential, audiences'.[68] But what is remarkable about our surviving fragments of Greek local historiography is that so few of them have anything to do with Greece *in toto*. What comes across is not a community's cosmopolitanism but its provincialism. Even major cities and cultural centres such as Athens and Argos produced decidedly introverted narratives, thick enough with local detail to discourage casual external reception. How many Sicyonians or Corinthians, after all, would be interested in the peculiar activity of the Argive maidens worshipping Hera that Dercylus so painstakingly describes? How many Megarians or Boeotians did Philochorus actually expect would want to read about an ornery Athenian dog and a noontime star? Present-day evidence is instructive, inasmuch as local histories seldom find their way today into the hands of nonlocals who are not themselves historians or academics;[69] indeed, in the nineteenth century, during the flowering of the local history industry in the United States, town histories were often printed through subscription or at any rate in proportion to the population of the focal locality.[70] In Greek local histories, it is true, nonlocal characters do on occasion crop up, but they have been pulled into very epichoric contexts[71]—those locals who have conversely been propelled into the ulterior world predominantly inhabit the foundational period[72]—; and while some local histories had recourse to include events that took place beyond the bounds of the focal locality[73] as well as pan-local events such as the

[67] Clarke (n. 3), 109.

[68] Clarke (n. 3), 174. Clarke's related contention that local historians tried to mitigate excessive parochialism by appropriating dating systems from other communities is harder to corroborate (see D. Tober, 'Review of K. Clarke, *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the* Polis [2008]', *Storia della Storiografia* 58 [2010], 147–54).

[69] See H.P.R. Finberg, 'How not to write local history', in H.P.R. Finberg and V.H.T. Skipp (edd.), *Local History, Objective and Pursuit* (Newton Abbott, 1967), 71–86 and G. Elan, 'How to write a dull town history', *Yankee Magazin*e (March 1986), 169–70.

[70] See D. Russo, *Keepers of Our Past: Local Historical Writing in the United States, 1820s–1930s* (New York, 1988), 42–4. Similar phenomena are evident elsewhere: see R. Davis, *Palestinian Village Histories: Geographies of the Displaced* (Stanford, 2011), 36–8, 64–6 and 94–6 and P. Papailias, *Genres of Recollection: Archival Poetics and Modern Greece* (New York, 2005), 49–50. Local historiography's parochialism, it is important to note, does not make it in ancient Greece, as Momigliano once wrote, a 'minor' branch of historiography ('Tradition and the classical historian', in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* [Oxford, 1977], 161–77, at 170–1). The myriad Greek communities that produced local histories and the astounding number of Greeks who chose to direct their historiographical impulses at particular localities suggest that the phenomenon was anything but minor (see Orsi [n. 3]).

[71] In his Ἀρκαδικά, for example, Ariaethus of Tegea brings Aeneas from Troy to Orchomenus (*FGrHist* 316 F 1), and Dieuchidas in his Μεγαρικά buries Adrastus in Megara (*FGrHist* 485 F 3). In fact, Megarian local histories and the traditions on which they drew seem to have gone out of their way to foreground the nonlocal dead (see D. Tober, 'Megarians' tears: localism and dislocation in the *Megarika*', in H. Beck and P.J. Smith [edd.], *Megarian Moments: The Local World of an Ancient Greek City-State* [*Teiresias Supplements Online* 1] [forthcoming 2017]).

[72] The Ἀτθίδες send Theseus to Crete (*FGrHist* 323a F 17, 327 F 5, 328 FF 17 and 111) and to the Black Sea (*FGrHist* 328 F 110), the Θεσσαλικά send Jason to Armenia (*FGrHist* 129 F 1 and 130 F 1), and the Spartan Πολιτεῖαι send Lykourgos to Iberia, Libya and India (*FGrHist* 591 F 2).

[73] Some of the surviving fragments of the Ἀτθίδες, in particular of Philochorus' Ἀτθίς, show Athenians in the Classical period venturing outside of the *polis* (*FGrHist* 324 F 48; 328 FF 49–51, 144–5, 150, 162); and Memnon in his history of Heraclea discussed battles in which the Heracliotae participated far away from the homeland (*FGrHist* 434 F 1.21).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Persian Wars,[74] the focus always remains home. It is thus difficult to see why Greek communities would have chosen local historiography as the apposite medium for rectifying Herodotus' record and for inserting themselves into a putative Panhellenic collective memory that they deemed deficient.[75] For historians wanting to reach a wide audience, other avenues were available. Both Duris of Samos and Nymphis of Heraclea, we should note, wrote general in addition to local histories, in some cases repackaging episodes from the local work for broader appeal.[76] And it was in his general history, not solely in his city panegyric, that Ephorus sought to vaunt his homeland, interweaving into that sprawling narrative (and with apparently risible frequency) references to his native Cyme (Strab. 13.3.6).[77]

It is not my interest, however, to deny the possibility that Greeks read or heard recited histories of communities to which they did not belong, or indeed that a historian wrote about one community under the pretence that his text would appeal to members of another. My aim, rather, is to foreground the receptive role of the local community itself, the one group that is unequivocally excluded from local historiography's implied audience. To illuminate this local response, however, we must rely primarily on indirect evidence, since in the surviving fragments local historians seldom explicitly recognize their audiences, intended or actual.[78]

Local reception is suggested, first of all, by the identities of the local historians themselves. For aside from those few historians who tackled multiple localities and those who focussed on non-Greek lands,[79] most Greek local historians identifiable beyond mere name not only wrote about the communities of which they were

[74] In his history of Boeotia, for example, Aristophanes names the Theban commander at the Battle of Thermopylae (*FGrHist* 379 F 6).

[75] As Fornara has pointed out (n. 9), 20–1. For the idea that there were Panhellenic versions of events circulating orally around the Greek world already in the early fifth century, see Shrimpton (n. 9), 144–5.

[76] In addition to his Σαμίων Ὧροι (*FGrHist* 76 FF 22–6, along probably with FF 45, 60–71, 74–7 and 96), Duris wrote Τὰ Περὶ Ἀγαθοκλέα (FF 16–21 and perhaps also FF 56–9) and a work called either Ἱστορίαι (*FGrHist* 76 FF 1–2, 10, 12–15) or Μακεδονικά (FF 3–4, 6, 9, 11), which recorded in at least twenty-three books, and without apparent geographical restriction, events from the death of Amyntas in 370/369 (T 5) at least to the Battle of Coroupedium in 281 (F 55). Nymphis, for his part, wrote not only a history of Heraclea but also a work on Alexander, the Diadochi and the Epigoni (*FGrHist* 432 T 1). Although we have only one fragment, fairly abstruse, that may come from this work (F 17), it was most likely on the general history that Pompeius Trogus relied (see Jacoby [n. 18], 255 and 260; Desideri [n. 61], 391 n. 123; and F. Landucci Gattinoni, *Lisimaco di Tracia: un sovrano nella prospettiva del primo ellenismo* [Milan, 1992], 17–27), and a reading of Justin's potted history of Heraclea (16.3–5) alongside passages from Nymphis (*FGrHist* 432 F 10) and Memnon (*FGrHist* 434 F 1.1–8) suggests that Nymphis inserted an abridgement of his local history at the point in his general history where Lysimachus took control of the Black-Sea region.

[77] = *FGrHist* 70 F 236: σκώπτεται δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἔφορος διότι τῆς πατρίδος ἔργα οὐκ ἔχων φράζειν ἐν τῇ διαριθμήσει τῶν ἄλλων πράξεων, οὐ μὴν οὐδ' ἀμνημόνευτον αὐτὴν εἶναι θέλων, οὕτως ἐπιφωνεῖ· 'κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν Κυμαῖοι τὰς ἡσυχίας ἦγον.' For the encomium on Cyme (*FGrHist* 70 FF 1 and probably 97), see n. 21 above.

[78] Strabo, it is true, once chides a certain Souidas for trying to gratify (προσχαριζόμενος) the Thessalians by advancing certain claims in his Θεσσαλικά (7.7.12 C329 = *FGrHist* 602 F 11a), but for the most part such explicit statements are rare.

[79] Included in this group are Hellanicus (*FGrHist* 4, 323a, 601a, 608a, 645a, 687a); Aristotle, to whom are attributed some 158 Πολιτεῖαι; Baton of Sinope (*FGrHist* 268); Rhianus of Bene (*FGrHist* 265); and Staphylus of Naucratis (*FGrHist* 269). There are in addition many other, lesser known, historians of this category, who, as Clarke has shown, frequently inhabit the world of Hellenistic interstate diplomacy ([n. 3], 246–363; see also A. Erskine, 'O brother, where art thou? Tales of kinship and diplomacy', in D. Ogden [ed.], *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives* [London, 2002], 97–115 and I. Rutherford, 'Aristodama and the Aetolians: An itinerant poetess

themselves members but also enjoyed in those communities positions of political or religious authority.[80] Philistus of Syracuse, who wrote a much-admired history of Sicily, was a military commander and close adviser to the Dionysii (*FGrHist* 556 TT 1–13); the Megarian Dieuchidas, who wrote Μεγαρικά (*FGrHist* 485), represented his community as Naopoios at Delphi in the decade leading up to the completion of the temple;[81] Duris of Samos, the author of Σαμίων Ὧροι, ruled his island as tyrant in the early third century B.C.E. (*FGrHist* 76 TT 2 and 4); the Heracliote historian Nymphis led a group of exiles back to his fatherland and went on to assume a significant role in Heraclea's struggle for autonomy in the first half of the third century B.C.E. (*FGrHist* 432 TT 1, 3–4); the Rhodian historians Zeno and Antisthenes, Polybius tells us, were deeply engaged in Rhodian affairs (16.14 = *FGrHist* 508 T 1 = *FGrHist* 523 T 3); and of the Atthidographers several were active in Athenian public life, an involvement that led to exile in the case of Androtion and to death in the case of Philochorus.[82]

Such public participation is not in itself, of course, proof of intended audience. For writers of nonlocal history, such as Thucydides and Polybius, who explicitly intended their works for a general Greek audience, also sometimes played critical roles in their home communities.[83] Yet, for many Greeks, as Polybius suggests in his critique of Zeno and Antisthenes (16.14),[84] writing a local history went hand in hand with local politics. Local historiography allowed a Greek if not to influence the behaviour of his countrymen at any rate to authorize, like the memoirs and autobiographies to which

and her agenda', in R. Hunter and I. Rutherford [edd.], *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism* [Cambridge, 2009], 237–48).

[80] See B. Meißner, *Historiker zwischen Polis und Königshof: Studien zur Stellung der Geschichtsschreiber in der griechischen Gesellschaft in spätklassischer und frühhellenistischer Zeit* (Göttingen, 1992), 215–315.

[81] *CID* 2.32, 75, 76, 78, 96 and 98. As G. Roux has shown, the men chosen from the Amphictyonic *poleis* as Naopoioi were very frequently from families locally well positioned and well connected (*L'Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IVe siècle* [Lyon and Paris, 1979], 107–8). The correlation between the historian Dieuchidas and the Naopoios, while not certain, is strengthened first by the rarity of the name Dieuchidas and second by the fact that the Naopoios' father happens to share a name (Praxion) with another Megarian local historian (*FGrHist* 484). For father–son pairs of historians, not so uncommon a phenomenon in the Greek world as it turns out, see P. Liddel, 'Biographical essay' in 'Praxion of Megara (484)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/praxion-484-a484).

[82] For Androtion and his exile, see *FGrHist* 324 TT 1–14 with Harding (n. 61), 13–25; for Phanodemus' career, see *FGrHist* 325 TT 2–5; and for Philochorus' death, see *FGrHist* 328 T 1 with Jacoby (n. 1), 220–5 with Costa (n. 1), 6–10. Cleidemus, too, may have had a prominent religious role at Athens (see *FGrHist* 323 FF 14 and 28 with Jacoby [n. 8], 56–7).

[83] For Thucydides' audience, see 1.20.3–1.21.1 with R.T. Ridley, 'Exegesis and audience in Thucydides', *Hermes* 109 (1981), 25–46; J. Marincola (n. 8 [1997]), 21–2; N. Luraghi, 'Author and audience in Thucydides' "Archaeology". Some reflections', *HSPh* 100 (2000), 227–39; P. Debnar, *Speaking the Same Language: Speech and Audience in Thucydides' Spartan Debate* (Ann Arbor, 2001); J.V. Morrison, *Reading Thucydides* (Columbus, OH, 2006), 172–98; and E. Greenwood, *Thucydides and the Shaping of History* (London, 2006), especially 7–17 and 37–47. For Polybius' audiences, see, along with 9.1.2–5, F.W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley, 1972), 3–6; K.S. Sacks, *Polybius on the Writing of History* (Berkeley, 1981), 178–86; C.B. Champion, *Cultural Politics in Polybius's Histories* (Berkeley, 2004), 30–66; and B.C. McGing, *Polybius' Histories: Oxford Approaches to Classical Literature* (Oxford, 2010), 66–75.

[84] εἰσὶ δ' οὗτοι Ζήνων καὶ Ἀντισθένης οἱ Ῥόδιοι. τούτους δ' ἀξίους εἶναι κρίνω διὰ πλείους αἰτίας. καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς γεγόνασι καὶ προσέτι πεπολίτευνται καὶ καθόλου πεποίηνται τὴν πραγματείαν οὐκ ὠφελείας χάριν ἀλλὰ δόξης καὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος ἀνδράσι πολιτικοῖς.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Roman politicians would later be drawn,[85] an idiosyncratic version of the past through which he might reject elements of the *politeia* or validate the status quo, all the while justifying his own behaviour and confirming his membership in, and even leadership of, the community whose cultural memory he was purporting to inscribe. Athens offers an especially clear illustration of the interface between a politician's public agenda and his historiographical construction of the past,[86] as in fact does Sparta,[87] but the phenomenon is widespread. Duris, whose father had seized control of Samos not long after the dissolution of the Athenian cleruchy in 322/321, validated his own exalted position in the *polis* in part by echoing in his history of Samos the anti-Athenianism of his fellow repatriates (*FGrHist* 76 T 4 and FF 65–7, 96).[88] His contemporary Nymphis maintained his indispensability to Heraclea by inserting himself at least twice into his historical narrative—he mentioned his prominent role in the return of exiles after the death of Lysimachus in 281 (*FGrHist* 432 T 3), as well as in the peace he skillfully arranged with marauding Gauls a quarter of a century later (*FGrHist* 432 T 4)[89]—, and at the same time he used the past to substantiate particular policies toward neighbouring powers, grounding a distrust of Antiochus I, for example, in a deleterious portrait of his father, Seleucus (*FGrHist* 434 F 1.7.1).[90] In Sicily, meanwhile, Philistus seems to have had an even narrower audience in mind, hoping to effect his restoration to Syracuse by whitewashing the crimes of his onetime patron Dionysius I (*FGrHist* 556 T 13a). Would so many Greeks of high status have been drawn to write histories of their own communities had they not expected some degree of local readership?

A related indication that local historians intended the focal community as a primary audience is the frequency with which we find patronymics preserved for native historians, information of little consequence to nonlocals. We know, for example, that Philochorus' father was Cycnus (*FGrHist* 328 T 1); that Nymphis was the son of Xenagoras (*FGrHist* 432 T 1); that the Alexandrian historian Nicanor was the son of Hermias (*FGrHist* 628 F 1); and that Dionysius, the author of a Rhodian history, was the son of Musonius (*FGrHist* 511 T 1).[91] While in the case of politically active

[85] See T. Cornell, 'Cato and the origins of Roman autobiography', in C. Smith and A. Powell (edd.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography* (Swansea, 2010), 15–40; J.M. Candau, 'Republican Rome: autobiography and political struggles', in G. Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity* (Leiden, 2011), 121–60; and J. Tatum, 'The Late Republic: autobiographies and memoirs in the age of the Civil Wars', in G. Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity* (Leiden, 2011), 161–88.

[86] See n. 54 above.

[87] See D. Tober, '*Politeiai* and Spartan local history', *Historia* 59 (2010), 412–31.

[88] For Duris and his career, see J.P. Barron, 'The tyranny of Duris of Samos', *CR* 12 (1962), 189–92; R.B. Kebric, 'Duris of Samos: early ties with Sicily', *AJA* 79 (1975), 89 and id. *In the Shadow of Macedon, Duris of Samos* (Wiesbaden, 1977); A. Dalby, 'The curriculum vitae of Duris of Samos', *CQ* 41 (1991), 539–41; and F. Landucci Gattinoni, *Duride Di Samo* (Rome, 1997), 9–38.

[89] These two episodes, it is true, come from Photius' summary of Memnon's history of Heraclea, which was written perhaps in the late first century B.C.E. But because Memnon based the first part of his history very closely on the work of Nymphis (see n. 61 above), both references to Nymphis as an actor in Heraclean history ultimately must come from Nymphis' own work, especially since in the context of the embassy to the Gauls Memnon refers to Nymphis as ἱστορικός.

[90] For Nymphis' attitude toward Seleucus and Antiochus, see Desideri (n. 61), 406–12; A. Primo, *La Storiografia sui Seleucidi: da Megastene a Eusebio di Cesarea* (Pisa, 2009), 109–18; and D. Tober, 'Ἡρακλῆς κάρρων, Σέλευκε: resistance and history in Pontic Herakleia', in P. Kosmin and I. Moyer (edd.), *The Maccabean Moment* (Berkeley, forthcoming 2018).

[91] The *Suda*, meanwhile, is able to name the father of Charon of Lampsacus (*FGrHist* 262 T 1), among whose many works is attested a four-book history of Lampsacus (*FGrHist* 262 FF 1–2).

historians such information was sometimes available in the preambles of decrees,[92] a likelier conduit through which it reached our citing sources is the incipits of the histories themselves. Indeed, our only fragment that records verbatim the opening words of a work of local history suggests that a historian might very well advertise his connection to the local community in just this way: 'Antiochus, son of Xenophanes, wrote the following things about Italy' (*FGrHist* 555 F 2).[93] Historians such as Hecataeus, Herodotus and Thucydides, who intended a more general audience, preferred geographical to genealogical markers,[94] as presumably did those historians who wrote about multiple localities.[95]

By far the best confirmation of the focal community's response to local historiography, however, is the frequency with which local historians were honoured by the community about which they had written in acknowledgement of their historiography alone.[96] We are told, to name just a few examples, that in the mid fourth century B.C.E. the Athenians crowned Cleidemus after the publication of his Ἀτθίς (*FGrHist* 323 T 2); that in the early third century Tauric Chersonessus commended its native son Syriscus upon the recitation of his local history (*FGrHist* 807 T 1); and that the Samian *dēmos* dedicated at the Heraion a statue in honour of the Samian historian Leon (*FGrHist* 540 T 1).[97] There is in addition a secondary order of local reception. For communities could use previously published local histories as a means of self-assertion. One of the clearest illustrations of this process comes in the context of a long-standing territorial dispute between Samos and Priene, when in the early third century B.C.E. each party submitted for arbitration a series

[92] This is certainly the case for some of the Atthidographers, such as Phanodemus son of Diyllus (*FGrHist* 325 TT 2–4 = *IG* ii^3 1.306, 1.349, 1.348 and 1.355) and Androtion son of Andron (*FGrHist* 324 TT 7 and 12 = *IG* 12.7.5 and *IG* ii^3 1.298), as well as for Syriscus son of Heracleidas of Chersonesus (*FGrHist* 807 T 1 = *IOSPE* i^2 344), Leon son of Ariston of Samos (*FGrHist* 540 T 1 = *IG* 12.6.1, 285) and Xenophon son of Aristus of Samos (*FGrHist* 540a T 1 = *IG* 12.6.308). On ancient historians' use of patronymics, see Marincola (n. 8 [1997]), 271–5.

[93] Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίης (see n. 53 above). This is evidently how Pausanias (10.11.3 = *FGrHist* 555 T 1) and Hesychius (s.v. Χώνην = *FGrHist* 555 F 3b) knew the name of Antiochus' father. Antiochus notably does not name his provenance in the opening of his local history, although this was widely assumed to be Syracuse (see *FGrHist* 555 TT 1–3, F 2).

[94] Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται (*FGrHist* 1 F 1); Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος/Θουρίου ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε (1.1.1); Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον … (1.1.1). A nonlocal historian might, moroever, change the way in which he advertised his provenance (for the case of Herodotus, see N.G. Wilson, *Herodotea: Studies on the Text of Herodotus* [Oxford, 2015], 1–2).

[95] The *Suda* lists three possible names for the father of Hellanicus, an indication that the information was not explicitly preserved in any of his texts (s.v. Ἑλλάνικος [E739 Adler] = *FGrHist* 4 T 1). Yet, it tells us also that Hellanicus was the father of a certain Scamon, who did, in fact, write a local history of Lesbos (*FGrHist* 476 F 1) and who would likely have advertised his lineage in the incipit to this work. While the *Suda* knows a lot about Rhianus, meanwhile (s.v. Ῥιανός [P158 Adler] = *FGrHist* 265 T 1a), it does not name his father. Nothing is known of Staphylus except for his association with Naucratis (*FGrHist* 269 FF 10 and 13).

[96] See A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften: Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie* (Stuttgart, 1988), 290–353; see also L. Boffo, 'Epigrafi di città greche: un'espressione di storiografia locale', in E. Gabba (ed.), *Studi di storia e storiografia antiche* (Pavia, 1988), 9–48 and Clarke (n. 3), 338–46.

[97] Samos paid similar homage to the historian Xenophon (*FGrHist* 540a T 1). Local historians of the modern day, despite the beating they took in the early twentieth century from the academy, continue to be honoured by their local communities. As J.A. Amato writes about contemporary local historians of the Midwest (*Rethinking Home: A Case for Writing Local History* [Berkeley, 2002], 186), '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.'

of local histories written over the past several centuries as evidence for the priority of its claims.[98] Another well-known example is the use of local histories by certain members of the Lindian community on Rhodes to construct a narrative that augmented, at the time of Roman domination (99 B.C.E.), the authority of the Temple of Athena Lindia.[99] Or we can think of the Parian history of the Parian Demeas (*FGrHist* 502), which served as the basis for the so-called *Monumentum Archilochi* in the mid first century B.C.E. (*IG* 12.5.445). Such preserved community reactions, in conjunction with the testimony afforded by the public careers of Greek local historians, their mode of self-identification and the parochialism of their projects, confirm the critical receptive role of the focal community and suggest that a local historian had this group very much in mind as he composed his text.

Communities are naturally compelled to enunciate their constitutive narratives, along the way highlighting idiosyncrasies of local topography and custom.[100] These narratives, autobiographical inasmuch as they are produced by a community about itself, function in some ways like personal autobiography: their aims may be therapeutic (helping process change, disturbance and disorder), testimonial (preserving memories in perceived danger of decay),[101] or indeed apologetic,[102] with self-glorification a constant objective, as critics from Georg Misch to Mikhail Bakhtin have emphasized in their respective treatments of personal autobiography;[103] all the while, like personal autobiography they work to formulate and articulate self-identity (which in the case of communities promotes social cohesion). It is not surprising that in literate communities we find versions of these communal autobiographies recorded, recited and circulated, with individuals exploiting such texts, as we have said, to authenticate their membership in the group and to legitimize their peculiar formulations of the past.

[98] See *IPriene* 37 for the use made of the Samian histories of Euagon (*FGrHist* 535 F 3), Olympichus (*FGrHist* 537 F 2a and 2b), Duris (*FGrHist* 76 F 25) and Ouliades (*FGrHist* 538 F 1); see *IG* 12.6.1.155 (= *IPriene* 500) for the respective histories adduced by the Prienians. The exchange is well treated by O. Curty, 'L'historiographie hellènistique et l'inscription 37 des Inschriften von Priene', in M. Piérart and O. Curty (edd.), *Historia Testis: Mélanges d'Épigraphie, d'Histoire Ancienne et de Philologie Offerts à Tadeusz Zawadzki* (Freibourg, 1989), 21–35.

[99] See C. Higbie, *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past* (Oxford, 2003), in particular 242–88.

[100] For a community's 'constitutive narrative', see R.N. Bellah, R. Madsen, W.M. Sullivan, A. Swidler and S.M. Tipton (edd.), *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (Berkeley, 1985), 153. The concept overlaps with Y. Zerubavel's 'master commemorative narrative' (*Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition* [Chicago, 1995], 7) and to some extent also with Gehrke's useful category of 'intentional history', viz. what 'a society knows and holds for true about its past', which directly influences its '*imaginaire*, … its inner coherence and ultimately its collective identity' ([n. 6], 286; see also H.-J. Gehrke, 'Bürgerliches Selbstverständnis und Polisidentität im Hellenismus', in K.-J. Hölkeskamp [ed.], *Sinn (in) der Antike* [Mainz, 2003], 225–54; and id. 'Greek representations of the past', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke and N. Luraghi [edd.], *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* [Stuttgart, 2010], 15–33, as well as that volume in its entirety).

[101] For a good account of the various aims of personal autobiography, see G. May, *L'autobiographie* (Paris, 1979), 40–1.

[102] The 'deepest intentions' of autobiography, G. Gusdorf famously wrote, 'are directed toward a kind of apologetics or theodicy of the individual being' ('Conditions and limits of autobiography', trans. and repr. in J. Olney [ed.], *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical* [Princeton, 1980], 28–48, at 39).

[103] See G. Misch, *The History of Autobiography in Antiquity Part I* (London, 1950), especially 19–20, 24, 36–7 and 166 and M. Bakhtin, 'Forms of time and chronotope in the novel', in M. Holquist (ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin* (Austin, TX, 1981), 84–258, at 132–3.

What is striking is not the popularity of local historiography among the Greeks but the tendency, as our verbatim fragments indicate, for local historians, even and particularly native ones, to exoticize the epichoric and to separate from the focal community all local readers, who made up a significant portion of their intended and actual audiences. While such a move no doubt enabled a community in receipt of a work of local history to imagine itself an object of interest and indeed serious study to the outside world, this cannot be the entire explanation, especially given the extent of the phenomenon in the Greek world and the fact that cultural memory could very well be packaged (through the media of oratory and poetry, as we have seen) expressly for local consumption.

It is possible that a local historian's impulse to preserve information about a community's territory, behaviour and collective past led him to postulate a future audience that was external not physically but temporally. Yet, because a local historian could very well distinguish past from present praxis,[104] would he not have used a past tense to account for customs not predicted to persist? Indeed, local historians actually preferred the present tense to describe local behaviour—Semos writes that the Delians 'sacrifice' (not 'used to sacrifice') βασυνίαι and κόκκωρα, Dercylus that the Heresides 'carry' water from the Heraion, Philochorus that it 'is' an Athenian custom to forbid dogs on the Acropolis—, and this suggests that they generally envisaged a contemporary audience, not to mention an overall stability to epichoric behaviour that would problematize a putative future iteration of the local community that behaved differently. To posit such an ignorant future audience, finally, does not on its own explain a local historian's flagrant alienation of his contemporary local readers. What, then, can explain the disjuncture between a local historian's implied and intended audiences?

III. SELF-ETHNOGRAPHY

We can arrive at an answer, I suggest, by considering the background against which emic local historiography developed in Greece, in particular the anteriority of etic paradigms. For among the first texts to make use of the technology of prose were geographical surveys: general Περιηγήσεις, such as those of Hecataeus (*FGrHist* 1) and Scylax of Caryanda (*FGrHist* 709),[105] as well as monographs on particular localities and kingdoms on the periphery of the Greek world, such as the Περσικά of Dionysius

[104] Philochorus, for example, notably uses imperfect-tense verbs in his discussion of ostracism at Athens (*FGrHist* 328 F 30, for which see n. 14 above), clearly indicating that the procedure was by his day defunct.

[105] For a recent overview of Hecataeus' output, see F. Pownall, 'Hekataios of Miletos (1)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/hekataios-of-miletos-1-a1). For Scylax, see P. Kaplan, 'Skylax of Karyanda (709)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/skylax-of-karyanda-709-a709). For the development of prose, see S. Goldhill, *The Invention of Prose* (Oxford, 2002); J. Grethlein, 'The rise of Greek historiography and the invention of prose', in A. Feldherr and G. Hardy (edd.), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing,* vol. 1 (Oxford, 2010), 148–70; and L. Kurke, *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose* (Princeton, 2011). Prose was tied in its inception to a new intellectualism that sought to elucidate the unknown and unfamiliar (see R. Thomas, *Herodotus in Context* [Cambridge, 2001], 219 and 270 and R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography*, vol. 2: *Commentary* [Oxford, 2013], xii); as such, it became the medium of choice for a Greek imparting information (about the distant past or indeed a distant land) to which he purported to have an especial claim.

of Miletus (*FGrHist* 687)[106] and the Αἰγυπτιακά of Herodotus.[107] These narratives, it is important to note, entailed descriptions not only of foreign lands but also of the foreign peoples who resided there, their customs and their deeds.[108] They also actuated a divide between a knowledgeable author and his ignorant audience on the one hand and between a foreign author and his indigenous subject on the other. When prose established itself as an ideal medium for exploring localities and their occupants, Greeks began to use it to inscribe the constitutive narratives of Greek communities, frequently even their own. In so doing, they naturally availed themselves of the blueprints supplied by Περσικά, Αἰγυπτιακά and the like.[109] The innovation of the mid fifth century B.C.E., then, was not the invention of local historiography in and of itself (this had come earlier with the invention of prose) but the acceptance of the etic template as the standard mode for writing about all communities and localities.[110] Emic local historiography, whose authors presented themselves not simply (like most prose writers) as experts educating the ignorant but in fact also as outsiders enlightening other outsiders, accordingly found its first footing in Greece as self-ethnography.

It may be objected that the adoption of historical prose in and of itself explains local historiography's externalization of author and audience. For nonlocal historians also avoided local dialects and seldom admitted any correspondence between audience and protagonists. The fundamentally dissociative nature of historiography[111] is especially clear in the context of Greek epigraphy, where we find as the subjects of civic decrees, intended though they were primarily for local consumption, the *dēmos*, the *boulē*, the local citizenry in the third person, seldom 'we' or 'you'. The Athenian

[106] For Dionysius, see E. Almagor, 'Dionysios of Miletos (687)', in *BNJ* (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/dionysios-of-miletos-687-a687).

[107] Because the Egyptian *logos* is so disproportionately long 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 text appears to have been composed separately and perhaps quite early (see F. Jacoby, 'Herodotos', *RE Suppl.* 2 [1913], cols. 205–520, at 330–3; C.W. Fornara, *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* [Oxford, 1971], 1–3 and 20–1; and A.B. Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II* [Leiden, 1975], 66–70). 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 (see O. Murray, 'Herodotus and Hellenistic culture', *CQ* 22 [1972], 200–13, at 202–6).

[108] The amalgam is evident in the early Περιηγήσεις of Scylax (*FGrHist* 709 FF 5, 7b, 9, 11–12) and Hecataeus (*FGrHist* 1 F 100, 115a–b, 119, 127–8, 154, 284, 292a)—and it is worth emphasizing that Hecataeus at any rate seems to have divided his Περιήγησις κατὰ τόπους (see e.g. *FGrHist* 1 FF 139 and 226)—as well as in Herodotus. Book II commences with a detailed description of the territory of Egypt (2.5.2–2.18.3), surveys the customs and religious practices of Egyptians (2.37–98) and offers a particularly comprehensive record of Egyptian history (2.99–182), which in fact extends beyond anecdotes about the individual dynasts and touches upon the Egyptian community as a whole (2.123, 2.128 and 2.164–8).

[109] Local histories could certainly be written in verse (see, for example, the output of Rhianus *FGrHist* 265); but in the case of Greece such poems were largely a learned and Hellenistic response to prose local histories. Archaic verse treatments of local tradition by e.g. Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus and Semonides, who wrote an Ἀρχαιολογία τῶν Σαμίων in the late seventh or early sixth century B.C.E. (*FGrHist* 534 T 1a), do indeed appear to have retained episodes of a community's cultural memory, even extended narratives thereof, but their approach to the focal community, as we have seen, differs from that of the prose writers at issue here.

[110] I do not mean to suggest that particular etic local histories motivated their emic counterparts, as Jacoby surmised, for example, that Hellanicus' Ἀττικὴ ξυγγραφή helped engender Atthidography ([n. 8 (1949)], 68–9 and 87–8; see also id. 'Hellanikos', *RE* 7.1 [1912], cols. 104–53). It was, rather, the structure of etic local histories itself that provided an apposite channel for a Greek community's natural autobiographical impulse.

[111] See Skinner (n. 9), 245.

decree in honour of Callias of Sphettus (*IG* ii^3 911),[112] to take just one example, recounts in 270/269 B.C.E. local events that occurred only about fifteen years before, and it does so without acknowledging that a good many potential readers of the text had participated in the action described: 'Since', it begins, 'after the *dēmos* revolted against those who were occupying the *polis* and expelled the soldiers from the city … '.[113] The Athenians did not of course speak about themselves in the third person in the midst of political debate; it was only when an event became prosified, historicized, that the narrative was depersonalized.

Yet, it is not simply that local historians implied, like Herodotus and the drafters of honorary decrees, a general Greek audience; they actually explicitly approached their own communities ethnographically. In addition to *res gestae*, they treated toponyms, aetiologies, cult and custom (and this despite the fact that some also wrote treatises devoted solely to such matters),[114] and they did so explicitly by striking the pose of outsiders, tourists, περιηγηταί. 'They point out the grave of Melanchrus and Cleometra', writes Deinias as if recounting an exchange with local guides, 'still to this day (καὶ νῦν ἔτι) on top of the so-called Pron' (*FGrHist* 306 F 3).[115] Like the participle καλούμενος,[116] this phrase, καὶ νῦν ἔτι, immediately flags ethnographic discourse.[117] The Megarian Dieuchidas uses it twice in his Μεγαρικά, for example, to describe the ἀγυιεύς, a pointed column that was originally a 'dedication of the occupying Dorians' (*FGrHist* 485 F 2b).[118] 'Still today', writes Philochorus about the members of the *boulē*, 'they take their seats in accordance to the letter by which they were allotted' (*FGrHist* 328 F 140).[119]

Even when a nonlocal historian had recourse to record the customs of his own community, he followed the lead of local historians. In connection with the Spartan invasion of Attica in 431 B.C.E., for example, Thucydides introduces a potted history of Athens replete with topographical and cultic data (2.15), in the process switching registers so markedly that the passage has sometimes been suspected as an

[112] For which, see T.L. Shear Jr., *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.* (*Hesp. Suppl.* 17) (Princeton, 1978).

[113] Lines 11–18: ἔδοξεν τεῖ βουλεῖ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· Εὐχάρης Εὐάρχου Κονθυλῆθεν εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Κ̣αλλία[ς], γενομένης τῆς ἐπαναστάσεως ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἐπὶ τοὺς κατέχοντας τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως στρατιώτας ἐγβαλόντος … . For a similar passage, see Chremonides' decree in the early 260s B.C.E. (*IG* ii^3 1.912), lines 4–13.

[114] Alongside his Ἀτθίς, Cleidemus wrote an Ἐξηγητικόν (*FGrHist* 323 F 14), for which see Jacoby (n. 8 [1949]), 41, 75–6 and 252 n. 70; Phanodemus, meanwhile, wrote specifically on the Eleusinian Mysteries (*FGrHist* 326 FF 2–4), Demon on sacrifices (*FGrHist* 327 F 3), Philochorus on the art of divination (*FGrHist* 328 T 1, FF 76–9), sacrifices (T 1, FF 80–2) and festivals (FF 83–4). Androtion, too, may have written a work *On Sacrifices* (*FGrHist* 324 FF 70–1). For the phenomenon, see J. Dillery, 'Greek sacred history', *AJPh* 117 (1996), 217–54.

[115] For comparanda, see e.g. Paus. 10.12.8 on Cyme and Plut. *Thes*. 20, where the Naxians point out the grave of Ariadne.

[116] See n. 40.

[117] See e.g. Hdt. 2.99.3, 2.122.2 and 2.135.4 and Xen. *Lac.* 14 and *Cyr*. 7.1.45, as well as Strabo and Pausanias, *passim*.

[118] = Schol. V on Ar. *Vesp.* 875: περὶ τοῦ Ἀγυιέως Ἀπόλλωνος Διευχίδας οὕτως γράφει· ἐν δὲ τῷ † ἰατρῷ τούτῳ διαμένει ἔτι καὶ νῦν † ἐστι καὶ ὡς † Ἀγυιεὺς τῶν Δωριέων <τῶν> οἰκησάντων ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ἀνάθημα· καὶ οὗτος καταμηνύει ὅτι Δωριέων ἐστὶ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων. † τούτοις γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰς στρατιὰς † φάσματος οἱ Δωριεῖς ἀπομιμούμενοι τὰς ἀγυιὰς ἱστᾶσιν ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοὺς Ἀπόλλωνος.

[119] = Schol. on Ar. *Plut.* 972: φησὶ γὰρ Φιλόχορος 'ἐπὶ Γλαυκίππου καὶ ἡ βουλὴ κατὰ γράμμα τότε πρῶτον ἐκαθέζετο· καὶ ἔτι νῦν ὁμνῦσιν ἀπ' ἐκείνου καθεδεῖσθαι ἐν τῷ γράμματι ᾧ ἂν λάχωσιν.' See also Menodotus of Samos, *FGrHist* 541 F 1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interpolation and accordingly excised.[120] It was Theseus, Thucydides writes, who first united Attica:

> And from that time even up until now the Athenians have celebrated the Synoikia as a publicly financed festival for the goddess. 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, 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 the Pythion and the temples of Gē and of Dionysius in the Marshes, in whose honour the older Dionysia are celebrated in the month of Anthesterium just as the Ionian descendants of the Athenians are still to this day accustomed. Here, too, are other ancient temples and a spring now called Enneakrounos, after the way that the tyrants made it, but which formerly, when its waters were visible, was called Callirrhoe, and this they used for the most important purposes because of its proximity. And from ancient times even still to this day it is customary to use the water before marriages and for other ceremonies. And still to this day because of the ancient settlement there the Athenians call the Acropolis *polis*.[121]

Here, Thucydides specifies the locations of prominent temples on the Acropolis, not, as we saw in the case of Cleidemus' Ἀτθίς, obscure mountaintop altars on the outskirts of the ἄστυ, and here he explores Athenian praxis from without, peppering the passage with phrases such as ἔτι καὶ νῦν, καλουμένη, ὠνομασμένη. His etic approach to Athens is not simply a result of the fact that he geared his history, as he says in his preface, to 'all those who wish to know clearly about the past' (1.22.4); for we find such a concentration of ethnographic tags only in connection to Athens.[122] Rather, Thucydides goes out of his way when speaking about his own community to don the hat of a local historian—of a self-ethnographer—, severing his readers and indeed himself from the Athenian community that he so carefully describes.[123]

While the influence of the earliest Greek prose narratives helps to clarify the distinctive pose of a Greek local historian, something else may also be at work. For local historians outside of ancient Greece, often without exposure to Greek models, also tend to approach their own communities ethnographically. John Stow, to take a ready example, although addressing *A Survey of London* (1603) to London's mayor and 'to the Comminality, and Citizens of the same', although framing his project as 'a dutie, that I willingly owe to my native mother and Countrey, and an office that of right I holde my selfe bond in

[120] See S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1991), 259–69.

[121] 2.15.2–6 (Alberti): καὶ ξυνοίκια ἐξ ἐκείνου Ἀθηναῖοι ἔτι καὶ νῦν τῇ θεῷ ἑορτὴν δημοτελῆ ποιοῦσιν. τὸ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ ἡ ἀκρόπολις ἡ νῦν οὖσα πόλις ἦν, καὶ τὸ ὑπ᾽ αὐτὴν πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμμένον. τεκμήριον δέ· τὰ γὰρ ἱερὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀκροπόλει <***> καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ ἔξω πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἵδρυται, τό τε τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου καὶ τὸ Πύθιον καὶ τὸ τῆς Γῆς καὶ τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, ᾧ τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνι, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἀπ᾽ Ἀθηναίων Ἴωνες ἔτι καὶ νῦν νομίζουσιν. ἵδρυται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἱερὰ ταύτῃ ἀρχαῖα. καὶ τῇ κρήνῃ τῇ νῦν μὲν τῶν τυράννων οὕτω σκευασάντων Ἐννεακρούνῳ καλουμένῃ, τὸ δὲ πάλαι φανερῶν τῶν πηγῶν οὐσῶν Καλλιρρόῃ ὠνομασμένῃ, ἐκεῖνοί τε ἐγγὺς οὖσῃ τὰ πλείστου ἄξια ἐχρῶντο, καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου πρό τε γαμικῶν καὶ ἐς ἄλλα τῶν ἱερῶν νομίζεται τῷ ὕδατι χρῆσθαι· καλεῖται δὲ διὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ταύτῃ κατοίκησιν καὶ ἡ ἀκρόπολις μέχρι τοῦδε ἔτι ὑπ᾽ Ἀθηναίων πόλις.

[122] We may juxtapose, for example, the style of his excursus on early Sicilian history (6.1–6).

[123] Thucydides adopts a similar attitude to Athenian history in his digression on Cylon's coup (1.126), another passage of unusual tone: ἔστι γὰρ καὶ Ἀθηναίοις Διάσια ἃ καλεῖται Διὸς ἑορτὴ Μειλιχίου μεγίστη ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, ἐν ᾗ πανδημεὶ θύουσι πολλὰ οὐχ ἱερεῖα, ἀλλ᾽ <ἀγνὰ> θύματα ἐπιχώρια … (1.126.6). … τότε δὲ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ἔπρασσον (1.126.8). … καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου ἐναγεῖς καὶ ἀλιτήριοι τῆς θεοῦ ἐκεῖνοί τε ἐκαλοῦντο καὶ τὸ γένος τὸ ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνων (1.126.11).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press

love to bestow upon the politike body & members of the same',[124] nevertheless proceeds to distance himself and his implied audience from the local citizenry, outlining London topography and the behaviour and cultural memory of Londoners from the position of an interested visitor. He deals with the Tower of London as had Deinias with the Pron —'This tower is a Citadell, to defend or command the Citie: a royall place for assemblies, and treaties. A Prison of estate, for the most dangerous offenders'[125]—, and he concludes a long passage on the 'Sports and Pastimes' of Londoners by noting that 'Sliding upon the Ice is now but childrens play: but in hawking & hunting many grave Citizens at this present have great delight, and do rather want leisure than good will to follow it.'[126] The Vermonter Rev. Hosea Beckley, to take just one other example, dedicated his *History of Vermont* (1846) 'to the youth of Vermont', whose task it was to 'become acquainted … 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'. But he, too, tackles Vermont's landscape, customs and history as an outsider.[127] 'The scenery around Manchester is delightful', he writes, '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.'[128] He comments later that a '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'.[129] And he notices that despite Vermont's fertile soil, 'sometimes those of dwarfish dimensions are found among its inhabitants'.[130]

It is perhaps the discomfiture inherent in the task of writing local history that inclined a native Greek local historian, like some more recent practitioners of the form, to separate himself and much of his intended audience from the focal community. I suggested earlier that thinking about emic local historiography as community autobiography helps to illuminate some of the motives behind the enterprise. Yet, the analogy also clarifies the peculiar position of the native local historian. For autobiography, as Bakhtin observed, confounds the relationship between author and subject;[131] nominally united with his hero, an autobiographer in fact remains perforce 'outside the world he has represented in his work',[132] obliged to rely on an externalized self, a 'possible other', to narrate the past.[133] The act of autobiography, Bakhtin concludes, requires that a life (of a community, we might say, as much as of an individual) be 'constructed as a possible story that might be told about it by the other to still others'.[134] Local historiography differs from personal autobiography in several fundamental ways, of

[124] C.L. Kingsford, *A Survey of London by John Stow, Reprinted from the Text of 1603* (Oxford, 1908), vol. 1, xcvii–xcviii.
[125] Kingsford (n. 124), 59.
[126] Kingsford (n. 124), 95.
[127] *History of Vermont, with Descriptions Physical and Topographical* (G.S. Salisbury, 1846), 17–19.
[128] Beckley (n. 127), 48.
[129] Beckley (n. 127), 137.
[130] Beckley (n. 127), 136.
[131] For the author, as Bakhtin remarks, 'is a constitutive moment of the artistic whole, and as such he cannot coincide, within this whole, with the hero, who represents another constitutive moment of the whole' ('Author and hero in aesthetic activity', in M. Holquist and V. Liapunov [edd.], *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, trans. by V. Liapunov [Austin, TX, 1990], 4–257, at 151).
[132] Bakhtin (n. 103), 256.
[133] Bakhtin (n. 131), 152–3.
[134] Bakhtin (n. 131), 153.

course. For one thing, it is never the community as a whole that writes its story but a particular community member, always with his own incentives and objectives; and this author is accordingly only a component of and not coextensive with his subject. More to the point, the autobiographer, who implies and intends an audience separate from himself and his subject, creates a 'possible other' only for himself. A good portion of a local historian's intended audience, however, is the community to which he himself belongs and whose own story he purports to tell: he thus constructs a 'possible other' not only for himself as author but also for these local readers, obliging them, too, to detach themselves from the narrative's subject.

Through this act of exteriorization, of implying a communal 'other', a local historian counters the solipsism required by the act of communicating a community's autobiography to itself. It is not simply an accidental consequence of its appropriation of prose or its adoption of early ethnographic models that local historiography manifested itself in Greece as self-ethnography. We might more accurately say that Greek local historians so readily latched on to prose and assumed the posture of ethnographers in order to address the tension implicit in their task: writing and reading the history of one's own locality demands dislocation.

Fordham University

DANIEL TOBER
dtober@fordham.edu

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000519 Published online by Cambridge University Press