

# The Delimitation of Fragments in Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Some Examples from Duris of Samos

*Christopher A. Baron*

FELIX JACOBY'S *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* provides an indispensable tool for the study of Greek historical writing in all periods and for nearly every historian.<sup>1</sup> The authority and convenience of Jacoby's collection remain unparalleled, as evidenced by the fact that his seventeen volumes of texts, commentary, and notes are now available in two online versions, including the ongoing *Brill's New Jacoby* project (*BNJ*).<sup>2</sup> While his volumes make it easier to

<sup>1</sup> On Jacoby's work see most recently Carmine Ampolo (ed.), *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby* (Pisa 2006); John Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* I (Malden 2007) 5–7; and the relevant essays in Glenn Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen 1997). That Jacoby accomplished what he did before the existence of the TLG and searchable databases is incredible, and humbling; that it took several decades and an international team of scholars to re-commence the project after his death in 1959 shows the enormity of his achievement. His original project continues under the auspices of Guido Schepens and Jan Bollansée: see Schepens' "Prolegomena" in *FGrHist* IV A 1 (1998) vii–xxi. At the same time, an Italian project is underway to publish a new collection of Greek historical fragments, led by Eugenio Lanzilotta (<http://frammstorgr.uniroma2.it>); five volumes have been published to date.

<sup>2</sup> In 2006 Brill converted Jacoby's original work (with apparatus criticus and German commentary and notes) to an online format: Brill Online *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. *Brill's New Jacoby* presents itself as a new edition of Jacoby's work with a side-by-side English translation of the fragments; translators for *BNJ* provide their own new commentary on individual fragments, along with a biographical essay and a select bibliography

study fragmentary historians, they do not make the task unproblematic, and Jacoby was well aware that his selection and arrangement of fragments did not represent a definitive text of lost historical works.<sup>3</sup> The many issues involved in studying fragmentary historians were first raised in a systematic way thirty years ago by P. A. Brunt. In his seminal article, Brunt offered a number of examples to illustrate the basic (yet often unacknowledged) point that most historians' "fragments" are indirectly preserved—not pieces broken off from a work, but rather citations of it by a later author—and that, as a result, we must take great care in judging a lost historian on the basis of these fragments.<sup>4</sup>

With the exception of a few texts preserved on papyrus

---

for their author: *Brill's New Jacoby*, Editor in Chief Ian Worthington. *BNJ* began to appear in 2007, and 2013 is the target date for completion.

<sup>3</sup> Nor is *FGrHist* a typical collection of fragments, as Nino Luraghi has pointed out: its arrangement, both as a whole and within individual authors, reflects Jacoby's "conception of the development of Greek historiography," and the volumes represent "the colossal torso of a monumental history" of that subject rather than a mere catalogue of evidence (Nino Luraghi, *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* [Oxford 2001] 5.) Fundamental to understanding the work is Jacoby's 1909 paper introducing the project, which can be found in Felix Jacoby, *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leiden 1956) 16–64; it is also reprinted at the end of Ampolo, *Aspetti*.

<sup>4</sup> P. A. Brunt, "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes," *CQ* 30 (1980) 477–494: "in actual fact every collection of 'fragments' abounds in mere allusions, paraphrases, and condensations, which are often very inadequate mirrors of what the lost historians actually wrote" (477). Important contributions since 1980 include Wesley E. Thompson, "Fragments of the Preserved Historians—Especially Polybius," in *The Greek Historians: Literature and History. Papers Presented to A. E. Raubitschek* (Saratoga 1985) 119–139; Michael A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1994); Guido Schepens, "Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Problems, Methods, Prospects," in Most, *Collecting Fragments* 144–172; C. B. R. Pelling, "Fun with Fragments: Athenaeus and the Historians," in David Braund and John Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and His World* (Exeter 2000) 171–190; Guido Schepens and Jan Bollansée (eds.), *The Shadow of Polybius: Intertextuality as a Research Tool in Greek Historiography* (Leuven 2005); Dominique Lenfant (ed.), *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens* (Paris 2007).

scraps or stone, fragments are mediated through the work of a later author, what Guido Schepens has called a “cover-text.”<sup>5</sup> Thus any collector of such fragments faces the issue of determining where a fragment begins and ends. It is well known that ancient authors’ citation habits differed from ours, because of their different attitudes and concerns as well as the formatting possibilities available to them.<sup>6</sup> Authors were not concerned with documenting their sources in the same way we are, and therefore the surviving fragments of an ancient historian do not allow us to reconstruct his work in the same way we would restore an inscription: there are large gaps in the text, but we do not know their exact placement, their length, nor even whether the text that does survive is completely faithful to the original. Since Athenaeus, for example, did not know of such things as quotation marks and block quotes, we often must ask, “Where does Athenaeus end and Author X begin?”—and vice versa.<sup>7</sup>

This basic question is one Jacoby faced thousands of times, and far more often than not he was correct.<sup>8</sup> In this article,

<sup>5</sup> Schepens, in *Collecting Fragments* 166 n.66; Schepens and Bollansée, *Shadow of Polybius* x.

<sup>6</sup> See Hermann Strasburger, “Umblick im Trümmerfeld der griechischen Geschichtsschreibung,” in his *Studien zur Alten Geschichte* I–III (Hildesheim 1982–1990) III 167–218, at 189–190; Brunt, *CQ* 30 (1980) 479; Pascal Payen, “Les citations des historiens dans les traités rhétoriques de Denys d’Halicarnasse,” in Catherine Darbo-Peschanski (ed.), *La citation dans l’antiquité* (Grenoble 2004) 111–133, at 114–119.

<sup>7</sup> For excellent general comments on the problems posed by Athenaeus’ preservation of historical fragments see Katherine Clarke, *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World* (Oxford 1999) 132–137. Delfino Ambaglio, “I deipnosofisti di Ateneo e la tradizione storica fragmentaria,” *Athenaeum* 78 (1990) 51–64, examines Athenaeus’ citations of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. Monica Berti has recently announced a project on “Representing Citations in the Deipnosophists of Athenaeus,” which will conduct a systematic survey of Athenaeus’ citations and “build a fully comprehensive repository of [his] quotation schemes” (<http://www.fragmentarytexts.org/2010/01/representing-citations-in-the-deipnosophists-of-athenaesus>).

<sup>8</sup> Jacoby himself was aware of the many problems posed by collecting

however, I will show that for a number of the fragments of Duris of Samos (*FGrHist* 76), Jacoby included either too much or too little. In the case of two fragments (F 69 and F 13), the true end point differs from that which Jacoby chose—in one case, not including all the material that belongs to Duris, and in the other, attributing too much to him. I will also argue that Jacoby's decisions on such matters hold consequences beyond the technical accuracy of his collection. My examination of a third fragment (2) will demonstrate that failure to consider the role of the cover-text author (specifically, his ability to interpolate his own comments into a citation) skews our overall judgment of a lost historian. These three revised fragments of Duris will reveal that his interest in material outside political/military history should be viewed in a more Herodotean light; in addition, a key piece of evidence for his commonly-claimed bias against Athens will disappear.

### I

Duris of Samos in the third century B.C. wrote three historical works: *Makedonika*, covering affairs of the Greek world from 370 to 281; *Ta peri Agathokleous*, a work on the deeds of Agathocles, tyrant of Syracuse from ca. 317 to 289; and a *Samiôn Horoi*, a history of Duris' native island.<sup>9</sup> A proper under-

---

fragments (and very familiar with the cover-texts), but for reasons of space and format he could not always express his concerns on the face of the fragment; rather, he relied on his commentary, where one often finds explanations for his choices, alternatives not chosen, and cautions about the final product. His marginal notes and headings, another important component of the printed volumes, include references to related fragments, alternative possibilities for the placement of fragments, and suggested historical contexts.

<sup>9</sup> On Duris, along with Pownall's commentary for *BNJ* (below), see above all Franca Landucci Gattinoni, *Duride di Samo* (Rome 1997); also Leonardo Ferrero, "Tra poetica ed istoria: Duride di Samo," in *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni* (Turin 1963) 68–100; Robert Kebric, *In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos* (Wiesbaden 1977); Charles Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley 1983) 124–134; Paul Pédech, *Trois historiens méconnus: Théopompe, Duris, Phylarque* (Paris 1989) 255–

standing of Duris' fragments is important for three reasons. First, he is often viewed as the archetype of the "tragic historian," a designation which continues to bedevil the study of Hellenistic historiography. Thus any re-evaluation of his historical output has consequences for the broader study of post-Classical Greek historical writing. Secondly, a substantial amount of his material survives in a range of authors, allowing us to compare the images we receive of him through these different filters. Finally, Duris was not just a historian; rather, in good Hellenistic fashion, he wrote treatises on a number of subjects. This brings into play the issue of whether a fragment is historical or not, a decision which both affects and is affected by our assessment of the author as a historian.

Jacoby's fragments of Duris were published on *BNJ* in the summer of 2010, with translation and commentary by Frances Pownall.<sup>10</sup> Overall, Pownall's commentary is thorough and judicious. In two instances, in fact, she alerts the reader to alternative delimitations of a fragment which Jacoby either ignored or dismissed. I will discuss one of these, F 57 (from Book 1 of Athenaeus), in more detail below. The other is F 71, a passage in which Plutarch (*Lys.* 18.5) cites Duris for the statement that Lysander was the first mortal to receive divine honors. Plutarch follows this with the opening lines of a hymn to Lysander—which Jacoby included as part of the fragment—then a long series of anecdotes concerning poets in Lysander's retinue which Jacoby did not print, giving his reasons for doing so in his commentary.<sup>11</sup> If this subsequent passage were seen as

---

389; and Denis Knoepfler, "Trois historiens hellénistiques: Douris de Samos, Hiéronimos de Cardia, Philochore d'Athènes," in *Colloque "Histoire et historiographie dans l'Antiquité"* (Paris 2001) 25–44.

<sup>10</sup> Frances Pownall, "Duris of Samos (76)," *Brill's New Jacoby*. See Dominique Lenfant, "Jacoby Online," *CR* 59 (2009) 395–398, for an important review of *BNJ* (n.b. Pownall's contribution had not yet appeared at the time of the review). Lenfant notes the potential benefits of the project but also expresses serious concerns about some of the texts and translations, as well as the lack of attention to methodology in some entries.

<sup>11</sup> Jacoby ad F 71 (p.128). He felt that the opinion of Plato expressed in

deriving from Duris, it would represent one of the longer fragments we have from his work. Since the problem cannot be solved on the basis of our available evidence, Pownall notes that this remains a question and directs the reader to a recent treatment of it.

Perhaps the most important contribution Pownall makes is to point out, in her commentary, the misleading text that Jacoby printed for T 1, an example which shows most dramatically the importance of the proper delimitation of a fragment.<sup>12</sup>

*τοῖς χρόνοις μὲν . . . κατὰ Λυγκέα καὶ Δοῦριν τοὺς Σαμίους,  
Θεοφράστου δὲ τοῦ Ἐρεσίου μαθητάς.*

In the time . . . of the Samians Lynceus and Duris, pupils of Theophrastus of Eresus.

It is not unusual for Jacoby to cut and paste in this fashion to produce the testimonia, since his purpose was to provide an entry for each specific facet of the historian's biography (birth, family, education, output, etc.). Unfortunately, he wielded the scissors too aggressively in this case, leaving out vital material that gives the passage an entirely different import. First, the (incomplete) sentence has been removed from its basic context: the subject and the main verbs are missing.<sup>13</sup> The beginning of the sentence in Athenaeus (the opening of Book 4) actually reads as follows in modern editions (with Jacoby's text in bold):

*Ἰππόλοχος ὁ Μακεδών, ἐταῖρε Τιμόκρατες, τοῖς χρόνοις μὲν  
γένετο κατὰ Λυγκέα καὶ Δοῦριν τοὺς Σαμίους, Θεοφράστου δὲ τοῦ Ἐρεσίου μαθητάς, συνθήκας δ' εἶχε  
ταύτας πρὸς τὸν Λυγκέα...*

Hippolochus of Macedon, my friend Timocrates, lived **at the time of the Samians Lynceus and Duris, pupils of Theophrastus of Eresus**, and he [sc. Hippolochus] had this agreement with Lynceus . . . .

the Plutarch passage conflicted with one attributed to Duris by Proclus (F 83 = Procl. *In Tim.* I 90 Diehl).

<sup>12</sup> *FGrHist* 76 T 1 = Athen. 4.128A (transl. mine).

<sup>13</sup> Landucci Gattinoni, *Duride* 36–38.

Note that Jacoby even printed a misleading period after *μαθητάς*. He did, however, include in his apparatus criticus a key textual note concerning that word: the plural form is a modern conjecture, suggested by A. Korais in the early nineteenth century and adopted by editors since then.<sup>14</sup> The Maricianus manuscript (**A**) reads *μαθητήης*, and this reading, as Andrew Dalby writes, is the “*lectio* slightly *difficilior*, since it agrees with a singular noun quite a long way back in the sentence.”<sup>15</sup> The modern emendation creates no better balance in the sentence, as it attempts to correlate the brothers’ status as “Samians” and “pupils” without matching the two phrases to the *μέν/δέ*. The sentence as it stands in the manuscript balances the chronological reference (“at the time of Lynceus and Duris”) with the description of Hippolochus’ status as a pupil of Theophrastus, and the *μέν/δέ* corresponds to these two clauses. Thus, Athenaeus’ text actually reads:

Hippolochus of Macedon, my friend Timocrates, lived at the time of the Samians Lynceus and Duris, and (he was) a pupil of Theophrastus of Eresus; he had this agreement with Lynceus ...

If we reject the unnecessary modern conjecture, we see that the only reason for Duris’ presence in the sentence is as the brother of Lynceus and, along with him, as a chronological marker—not in any connection to Theophrastus. The correct

<sup>14</sup> Since *BNJ* does not include an apparatus criticus, one only comes across the textual problem by reading the commentary. It should also be emphasized that although *BNJ* claims, at least, to provide “updated” Greek texts where relevant, the fragments themselves remain exactly as Jacoby chose and arranged them. Lenfant, *CR* 59 (2009) 396–397, states that she was unable to find any updated texts and concludes that “[a]ny comparison will generally be in favour either of the old Jacoby or of more recent editions” rather than *BNJ*.

<sup>15</sup> Andrew Dalby, “The Curriculum Vitae of Duris of Samos” *CQ* 41 (1991) 539–541, at 541. Neither Gulick’s nor Olson’s Loeb notes that it is a conjecture, and thus Olson’s recent translation still reads that Lynceus and Duris were pupils of Theophrastus.

reading in this passage is crucial for our biography of Duris, because Korais' emendation is the only testimony that directly links Duris and Theophrastus.<sup>16</sup> This supposed link, which would connect Duris to Peripatetic theories of tragedy and history, provided one of the cornerstones for the modern edifice of "tragic history."<sup>17</sup> As Pownall states, once we consider this passage of Athenaeus in its proper context, any relationship between Duris and the Peripatetics dissolves, and with it the foundation for a notion which has for over a century obscured our view of Hellenistic historiography.<sup>18</sup>

## II

I have found three other fragments of Duris for which, I believe, Jacoby's delimitation is incorrect, and where Pownall's commentary does not address the issue.<sup>19</sup> But before consider-

<sup>16</sup> Dalby, *CQ* 41 (1991) 540 n.10. Two other passages sometimes cited in this regard—*Suda* s.v. "Lynceus" and Athen. 3.100E—in fact link only Lynceus (a well-known poet in his own right) and Theophrastus. And in Athenaeus 8.337D, where Lynceus and Duris are both mentioned, only the former is described as Theophrastus' pupil (μέγ) while Duris (δέ) is Lynceus' brother, the author of a history, and the tyrant of Samos.

<sup>17</sup> On so-called "tragic history," in addition to the works cited by Pownall in her commentary on F 1, see Valérie Fromentin, "L'histoire tragique a-t-elle existé?" in Alain Billault and Christine Mauduit (eds.), *Lectures antiques de la tragédie grecque* (Lyon 2001) 77–92; John Marincola, "Beyond Pity and Fear: The Emotions of History," *Anc.Soc* 33 (2003) 285–315. For similar misreadings affecting our notion of a lost historian see Flower, *Theopompus* 42–62, on the relationship between Isocrates and his supposed pupils Ephorus and Theopompus.

<sup>18</sup> Pownall, *BNJ* "Duris of Samos (76)" ad F 1. However, as the project's guidelines mandate, in *BNJ* the text of T 1 stands exactly as Jacoby printed it, with its misleading ellipses and unnecessary modern emendation (and now with an English translation reflecting the *incorrect* reading!). Pownall's commentary sits immediately adjacent, and one assumes that scholars will read it. But this situation serves to remind us that, despite the new commentary and translations, these remain Jacoby's fragments—chosen, delimited, and arranged according to his views.

<sup>19</sup> In general, Pownall shows awareness of the importance of considering the cover-text: see for example her statements near the end of the "Bio-



ing these, I wish to examine in more detail a fragment concerning which Pownall mentions in passing that the material from Duris may be more limited than it appears. This citation from Athenaeus presents the possibility that Jacoby both cut from and added to a fragment. The following is the text of Athenaeus; Jacoby included everything in bold as F 57 of Duris (attributing it to the *Ta peri Agathokleous*):<sup>20</sup>

ἐθαυμάζετο δὲ καὶ **Ξενοφῶν ὁ θαυματοποιός**, ὃς μαθητὴν κατέλιπε Κρατισθένη τὸν Φλιάσιον· ὃς πῦρ τε αὐτόματον ἐποίει ἀναφύεσθαι καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ φάσματα ἐτεχνᾶτο, ἀφ' ὧν ἐξίστα τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν διάνοιαν. τοιοῦτος ἦν καὶ **Νυμφόδωρος ὁ θαυματοποιός**, ὃς προσκρούσας **Ῥηγίνοις**, ὡς φησι **Δοῦρις**, εἰς δειλίαν αὐτοὺς ἔσκωψε πρῶτος.

**The magician Xenophon** was also much admired. He left behind a student, Cratisthenes of Phlius, **who could make fire flare up spontaneously and created many other illusions that allowed him to baffle people's minds. The magician Nymphodorus resembled him; according to Duris, he got angry with the Rhegians and was the first person to mock them for cowardice.**

Jacoby evidently took the first relative clause, which he omitted from the fragment, as an interruption of the main sentence, as if the antecedent of both relative pronouns were Xenophon. However, there is no reason why the second relative clause cannot refer to the nearer subject—Cratisthenes, a pupil of Xenophon. In fact, both Loeb translators of Athenaeus (Gulick and Olson) read the sentence in this way, treating Cratisthenes as the one who made fire flare up and created illusions. Karl Müller printed the text which Jacoby omitted (*FHG* II 480), but his Latin translation (like the Greek) leaves it uncertain how he

graphical Essay” that, owing to the interests of Athenaeus and Plutarch, our fragments of Duris may not provide a representative sample of his historical output.

<sup>20</sup> *FGrHist* 76 F 57 = Athen. 1.19E–F (transl. Olson). I use the text as printed by Jacoby for fragments in his collection.

read the sentence (, *qui* ..., *qui*). The issue is further complicated by the fact that this section of the *Deipnosophistai* survives only in an epitome, which could explain the lack of a clearer syntactical structure. Geoffrey Arnott has described how the “much inferior Epitome ... haphazardly omits, abridges and paraphrases quotations” from Athenaeus’ original text.<sup>21</sup>

In a case such as this, perhaps it is better to restrict ourselves to determining what Duris is responsible for only in a general sense, rather than attempting to carve up neatly an already-abridged sentence. Indeed, the question of which magician did what could become even more academic if Hullemann was correct in restricting the Duris fragment to the final sentence, the notice on Nymphodorus.<sup>22</sup> In this view (which Pownall notes as a likelihood), the “according to Duris” refers only to Nymphodorus’ relationship with the Rhegians, not his resemblance to one of the other magicians. This fits better into the context of Athenaeus’ work. The section beginning at 1.19B and extending through 1.20A concerns men honored by the Greeks for their “manual skill” rather than intellectual achievements: musicians, magicians, puppeteers, mimic artists, etc. It is a long list of brief references to obscure figures (and highly condensed, since we have only the epitome of this part of Athenaeus’ text), and not all of them are accompanied by a source citation. It seems to me that the best way to proceed is to limit any fragment-attributions to the immediate reference, especially if, as is likely, Athenaeus was working from a previously-compiled collection of such figures.<sup>23</sup> In fact, the words of comparison, *τοιούτους ἦν καὶ*—the only possible evidence for Duris as the source of the notices on Xenophon and Cratisthenes—could just as easily be the work of Athenaeus, or the

<sup>21</sup> Geoffrey Arnott, “Athenaeus and the Epitome: Texts, Manuscripts and Early Editions,” in *Athenaeus and His World* 41–52, at 42.

<sup>22</sup> J. G. Hullemann, *Duridis Samii quae supersunt* (Utrecht 1841) (*non vidi*: cited by Landucci Gattinoni, *Duride* 162, who accepts his view).

<sup>23</sup> S. Douglas Olson (ed.), *Athenaeus* I (Loeb 2006) xv–xvi.

epitomator. Perhaps a more literal translation helps to separate the notices: “Also such a man was the magician Nymphodorus, who becoming angry at the Rhegians, as Duris says ...” The placement of the attribution—buried in the relative clause—might support such a delimitation.

This may seem a minor issue, but the extent of the fragment affects our entire outlook on Duris. If the whole passage (all three magicians) belongs to him, we might attribute to Duris not just an interest in magicians, but a willingness to indulge this passion (and get “off track”) in the course of a history of Agathocles’ deeds. Duris has in fact been judged in this manner: Louis Okin, for example, believes that the mythical material in the historical works was often included as “entertaining digressions.”<sup>24</sup> I do not wish to deny that Duris, like other Hellenistic authors, had a wide-ranging curiosity about the past which occasionally appeared in the form of digressions within a historical work. Instead, what I claim is that, just as we would say about Herodotus, these digressions were not mere entertainment.<sup>25</sup> In this instance, if we limit F 57 to the notice on Nymphodorus, it can in fact take on a more Herodotean feel: perhaps the occasion for Duris’ mention of this magician is

<sup>24</sup> L. A. Okin, “A Hellenistic Historian Looks at Mythology. Duris of Samos and the Mythic Tradition,” in Stanley Burstein and L. A. Okin (eds.), *Panhellenica. Essays in Ancient History and Historiography in Honor of Truesdell S. Brown* (Lawrence 1980) 97–118, at 97. Cf. Kebric, *In the Shadow* 81, who concludes that “myth, anecdote, moral lessons, marvelous stories ... dominated his works” to a greater degree than other ancient authors. Pédech, *Trois Historiens* 258, describes Duris above all as a historian who worked in “scènes et tableaux.” Knoepfler, in *Historie et historiographie* 33, takes a more sensible approach, noting with regret that citations of Duris “portent le plus souvent sur des questions mineures, qui n’autorisent guère à porter un jugement sur la valeur” of the historian and his work. See A. E. Wardman, “Myth in Greek Historiography,” *Historia* 9 (1960) 403–413, for discussion of the ways in which Greek historians put myth to use.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Brunt, *CQ* 30 (1980) 485 n.26: given the length of Duris’ *Makedonika* (23 or 24 books) and his reputation as reported by Cicero (T 6), it “cannot have been filled simply or chiefly with the trivia of most of the ‘fragments.’”

Rhegium, and the proverbial cowardice of its citizens. Rhegium was a key location in the affairs of Agathocles and certainly would have arisen on numerous occasions in Duris' narrative. Jacoby himself must have sensed this possibility, since the only reason for assigning the fragment to the work on Agathocles, as he did, is this geographical indicator.<sup>26</sup> But, in this case, Jacoby included too much information, potentially skewing our judgment of Duris' performance as a historian.

### III

Duris' F 69 comes from Plutarch's *Life of Agesilaus*. Jacoby printed the beginning of chapter 3, where Plutarch describes the circumstances surrounding Agesilaus' accession to the throne (400 B.C.):<sup>27</sup>

βασιλεύοντος δὲ Ἄγιδος ἦκεν Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐκ Σικελίας φυγὰς εἰς Λακεδαίμονα· καὶ χρόνον οὐπω πολὺν ἐν τῇ πόλει διάγων, αἰτίαν ἔσχε τῇ γυναικὶ τοῦ βασιλέως, Τιμαίᾳ, συνεῖναι. καὶ τὸ γεννηθὲν ἐξ αὐτῆς παιδάριον οὐκ ἔφη γινώσκειν ὁ Ἄγης, ἀλλ' ἐξ Ἀλκιβιάδου γεγονέναι. τοῦτο δὲ οὐ πάνυ δυσκόλως τὴν Τιμαίαν ἐνεγκεῖν φησι Δοῦρις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψιθυρίζουσιν οἴκοι πρὸς τὰς εἰλωπίδας Ἀλκιβιάδην τὸ παιδίον, οὐ Λεωτυχίδην, καλεῖν·

When Agis was king, Alcibiades came from Sicily as an exile to Sparta; he had not yet spent much time in the city when he was accused of sleeping with the wife of the king, Timaea. And the child she gave birth to, Agis refused to recognize, saying that it was Alcibiades'. Timaea was not at all discontent with this,

<sup>26</sup> One of Duris' non-historical works could have provided this anecdote—the *Peri nomôn*, for example, if this work concerned customs, as Müller thought (*FHG* II 486, translating the title as *De Moribus et Institutis*). Jacoby, on the other hand, interpreted this title as representing a history of music (ad F 27, p.122). Landucci Gattinoni believes we have insufficient evidence to decide between the *Ta peri Agathokleous* and one of Duris' minor "erudite" works (*Duride* 163–164). Pownall notes the possibility of a derivation from a non-historical work (*BNJ* ad F 57).

<sup>27</sup> *FGrHist* 76 F 69 = Plut. *Ages.* 3.1–2 (transl. mine). Jacoby prints a period after καλεῖν.

Duris says, but in fact whispering at home to her Helot maids she called the child Alcibiades, not Leotychides;

In *FGrHist* (and now *BNf*), the fragment ends there; but Plutarch's text continues the accusative and infinitive construction:

καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην αὐτὸν οὐ πρὸς ὕβριν τῇ Τιμαίᾳ φάναι πλησιάζειν, ἀλλὰ φιλοτιμούμενον βασιλεύεσθαι Σπαρτιάτας ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ γεγονότων.

moreover, (Duris says) that Alcibiades himself also declared that he had not been driven by lust to consort with Timaea, but rather because he aspired to have the Spartans ruled over by his own progeny.

As Franca Landucci Gattinoni has pointed out, Müller (*FHG* II 484) included this latter passage as part of the Duris fragment. The syntax—clearly continuing the indirect discourse dependent on *φησι Δουρις*—favors Müller's decision, further supported by the fact that only in these two phrases does the accusative and infinitive construction occur in this chapter.<sup>28</sup> Why did Jacoby omit the last sentence of the fragment? He commented: "D[ouris] wird nur für den einzelzug (wiederholt Alkib. 23; De tranq. an. 6 p. 467F) zitiert, von dem die sonstige überlieferung gelegentlich der diskussion der nachfolgerfrage bei Agis' Tod (Xenoph. Hell. III 3, 1ff.; Plut. Lys. 22; Paus. 3.8.7) nichts weiß."<sup>29</sup> The *Einzelzug* ("individual touch") is Timaea whispering her name for the child, Alcibiades, to her maidservants. The detail is marked by the verb *ψιθυρίζω*, a form of which appears in all three of Plutarch's notices of the incident (listed by Jacoby).<sup>30</sup> In his commentary, then, Jacoby

<sup>28</sup> Landucci Gattinoni, *Duride* 240.

<sup>29</sup> Ad F 69, p.128. Plutarch notes Leotychides' disputed paternity without the detail of Timaea's whispering.

<sup>30</sup> Presumably Duris himself used the verb, but it appears in three different forms in Plutarch's three citations. The same scenario could apply to the term Plutarch uses here for the Helot maids: Jacoby remarks that *είλωτίδας* is "more exact" than those in the other two passages (*φίλας καὶ ... ὀπαδοῦς Alc. 23, θεραπαινίδας De tranq. an. 6*). This appears to be the only instance of

states as bald fact that Duris was only cited for this detail, which is missing from the other tradition surrounding the succession to Agis. We must infer that Jacoby thought Plutarch was using a source other than Duris for his Agesilaus biography and that, having found the detail about Timaea's whispering in Duris, he added it to his narrative of Agesilaus' accession to the throne. This scenario depends on the (very reasonable) argument that Plutarch could not have been using Duris for the larger narrative, since Duris had no reason to go into the succession intrigue.<sup>31</sup> The fragment—dealing with events during the Peloponnesian War—must come from the *Horoï*, rather than the *Makedonika*, which started with events of 370 B.C. In addition, it is thought that Duris discussed Alcibiades in some detail in the *Horoï*, and in fact Plutarch reports that Duris claimed to be descended from the famous Athenian.<sup>32</sup> Just with this small fragment, we get a sense of the effort required to decipher Jacoby's reasoning (usually persuasive), on account of

*εἰλωρίς* in the surviving Greek corpus, but its inclusion in Pausanias Atticist shows that the word occurred in Attic oratory.

<sup>31</sup> Plutarch's sources in this *Life* were most likely Xenophon's *Hellenika* and *Agesilaus*: D. R. Shipley, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Life of Agesilaos* (Oxford 1997) 47. For discussion of Plutarch's working method(s) in the *Lives* see C. B. R. Pelling, *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* (Swansea/London 2002) 11–26. In the Roman lives, at least, Plutarch seems to have followed one source for his basic narrative (reshaping and re-arranging it) and to have added details from other authors or oral tradition. His practice in the Greek lives may have been different, given his wide-ranging and life-long knowledge of Greek history and literature (as Pelling points out), but the *Agesilaus* does seem to rely primarily on Xenophon. Does he cite Duris here from memory or from immediate consultation? From the multiple occurrences of the anecdote in Plutarch's work, I think the former more likely; the story seems to have been especially linked with Duris. Cf. Tim Duff, *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford 1999) 8; A. W. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides I* (Oxford 1945) 81–84.

<sup>32</sup> For the starting date of the *Makedonika*: *FGHist* 76 T 5 = Diod. 15.60.3–6. For Duris and Alcibiades see F 70 = Plut. *Alc.* 32.1–3, as well as T 3 from the same source; F 68, concerning the Herm of Andocides, may also derive from an Alcibidian context.

the brevity necessitated by the vast scope of his project. One need only read his *Atthis* to see the level of detail at which his arguments could operate if given the space.

Jacoby's reconstruction of Plutarch's working methods makes sense with regard to chapter 3 as a whole—it is in fact unlikely that he would have turned to Duris for the basic outlines of Agesilaus' story.<sup>33</sup> But if that is the case, Alcibiades' comment on his motives at the beginning of 3.2, reported by Plutarch in indirect speech, must also come from Duris, since “the other tradition ... knows nothing” (Jacoby's words) of this comment either: neither Xenophon nor Pausanias reports it. Alcibiades' claim does, however, appear in conjunction with the anecdote of Timaea's whispering in chapter 23 of Plutarch's *Alcibiades*. Therefore, if the *Einzelzug* about Timaea's whispering belongs to Duris, Alcibiades' comment must also belong to him; and, again, the collocation of these two details is supported by the fact that both are reported in indirect discourse in the *Agesilaus*, and thus set off from the rest of the chapter. We can only conclude, therefore, that the omission of the second half of Plutarch *Agesilaus* 3.2 resulted from an oversight on Jacoby's part, and that this sentence should also be considered part of F 69 of Duris.<sup>34</sup>

#### IV

Athenaeus' methods of citation commonly raise the problem

<sup>33</sup> As Shipley points out (*Commentary* 81), we should not assume that Duris is the source for the statements made *before* the detail about Timaea's whispering. Jacoby's commentary implies agreement with this view, and we might guess that he included these previous sentences to provide context. But Jacoby had ways of signaling this fact, most notably his use of a smaller font for contextual material which he felt did not belong to the fragmentary author.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Ferrero, in *Miscellanea* 74 n.31; Landucci Gattinoni, *Duride* 240–241. Note that the new edition of the fragment in *BNJ* does not contain any clues for the Greek-less reader of what the syntax of the Greek clearly indicates, or what Müller had already chosen to do with the passage. Thus its reprinting of the fragment—with the accompanying translation—serves to concretize Jacoby's omission.

of how to attribute the many poetic passages he preserves.<sup>35</sup> Fortunately, on some occasions, he is explicit that his historical source cited the lines. But even then, we still encounter the problem of delimitation. While discussing flattery, Athenaeus cites the third-century historian Demochares (the nephew of Demosthenes) for the Athenians' obsequious treatment of Demetrius Poliorcetes. He then turns to Duris and quotes the ithyphallic hymn composed by the Athenians, probably in 291/0, on the occasion of the king's visit. After the hymn, Athenaeus' text contains this statement:<sup>36</sup>

ταῦτ' ἦδον οἱ Μαραθωνομάχαι οὐ δημοσία μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατ' οἰκίαν, οἱ τὸν προσκυνήσαντα τὸν Περσῶν βασιλέα ἀποκτείναντες, οἱ τὰς ἀναρίθμους μυριάδας τῶν βαρβάρων φονεύσαντες.

These words the victors at Marathon sang, not only in public, but even at home—those who executed the man who had prostrated himself before the Persian king, those who had slaughtered countless thousands of barbarians!

This tag at the end of the poem, a sarcastic comment on how far the Athenians had fallen from their former glory, is included by Jacoby as part of the Duris fragment (although he did not consider it verbatim, since he did not use the spaced [*gesperrt*] letters with which he marked such quotations).<sup>37</sup> A number of scholars cite the comment as Duris' own words, and thus it is seen as part of his bias against the Athenians of his

<sup>35</sup> For an example from Duris see F 35 = Athen. 12.532D–F, with Pascale Giovanelli-Jouanna, "Les fragments de Duris de Samos chez Athénée," in Lenfant, *Athénée* 215–237, at 220.

<sup>36</sup> *FGrHist* 76 F 13 = Athen. 6.253D–F (transl. mine).

<sup>37</sup> Jacoby employed different font sizes as an explanatory tool, a unique feature of his collection which disappears in *BNJ* (and, partially, in the online *FGrHist*). For explanation of the fonts, see Schepens' "Prolegomena" in *FGrHist* IV A 1 (1998) xiii–xiv. For comments on Jacoby's use of the fonts, see Catherine Darbo-Peschanski, "La citation et les fragments: les *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* de Felix Jacoby," *La citation dans l'antiquité* (Grenoble 2004) 291–300.



day.<sup>38</sup> Athenaeus does imply that Duris introduced the poem in order to demonstrate the Athenians' flattery of Demetrius. But if we examine the structure of the larger section of Athenaeus' text in which he records the hymn, we find that the sarcastic comment after the poem was not part of Duris' work.

The section begins at 252F, where Athenaeus states that "the Athenian people were notorious for their use of flattery." This is followed by a sentence, containing the postpositive conjunction  $\gamma\omicron\upsilon\delta\nu$ , which introduces a verbatim citation of Demochares (*FGrHist* 75 F 1) on Athens' flattery of the friends of Demetrius (252F–253B). Next comes a citation (paraphrase) of Polemon (fr.15 Preller) concerning Theban flattery of the Macedonian king, to which Athenaeus appends an explanation. The next sentence can only be a comment by Athenaeus: since the Athenians "flattered flatterers"—this refers back to the Demochares fragment he has just cited—why is it odd, he asks, that they would write and sing hymns for Demetrius himself? (253B) This comment serves to introduce the next piece, another verbatim citation of Demochares (F 2), again prefaced by  $\gamma\omicron\upsilon\delta\nu$ , on the Athenians' flattery of Demetrius (253B–D). At 253D Athenaeus notes that ( $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ ) this is what Demochares says on the issue; there follows ( $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ) the citation of the ithyphallic hymn from Duris' work: the  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu/\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  contrast thus appears to refer merely to the omission versus inclusion of the hymn itself in the two historians' works (253D–F).<sup>39</sup> At the end of the hymn, there stands the sarcastic comment quoted above about how low the victors at Marathon had sunk, those who had executed "the

<sup>38</sup> Kebric, *In the Shadow* 23; Landucci Gattinoni, *Duride* 128–129; Okin, in *Panhellenica* 101, all of whom cite the fragment explicitly as evidence of Duris' anti-Athenian attitude. Müller also included the tag as part of the fragment (*FHG* II 477).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Olson, *Athenaeus* III 162 n.262: the Demochares fragment "is a prose summary of some of the more crudely panegyric elements of the hymn quoted below, which Demochares—whose distaste for all this is palpable—chose not to reproduce. Duris clearly felt no such reluctance to preserve the details of what is indeed a singularly embarrassing incident in Athenian history."

man who had prostrated himself before the Persian king,” etc. (253F). In 254A, for the third time, *γοῦν* introduces a verbatim citation, lines of the comic poet Alexis (fr.116). After these lines comes a final comment—clearly from Athenaeus himself—“This, then, is what the Athenians became when the brutal beast flattery injected madness into their city” (254B, transl. Olson).

Three features of this passage point to Athenaeus himself as the author of the comment at the end of the hymn. First, note how the first and second instances of *γοῦν* follow directly upon what are clearly authorial comments and serve to introduce another citation. If the third *γοῦν* performs the same function, the sarcastic tag at the end of the hymn must be authorial comment as well. Thus we can see Athenaeus’ procedure: an authorial comment introducing the topic; *γοῦν* introducing a citation (one or more); and finally another authorial comment rounding out the topic (and introducing the next).<sup>40</sup> Further support for attributing the tag at the end of the hymn to Athenaeus comes from the fact that it contains a reference to an episode he describes earlier in Book 12: “the man who had prostrated himself before the Persian king” is Timagoras, whose story appears at 251B, just one page before the section on Athenian flattery. Finally, the reference within the tag to the Athenians engaging in flattery even at home (*καὶ κατ’ οἰκίαν*) has nothing to do with the hymn recorded by Duris, but instead refers *forward* to the lines of Alexis quoted by Athenaeus (254A), which portray a sympotic toast overladen with praise of the Macedonian kings. It is highly unlikely that these statements which serve as internal references within Athenaeus’ text were coincidentally present in Duris’ work, and thus the most likely source of the sarcastic comment on the Athenians is Athenaeus himself.

<sup>40</sup> Pelling, in *Athenaeus and His World* 176–177, finds a slightly different use of *γοῦν* at 12.541B–C: not introducing a citation, but still marking its sentence as “Athenaeus’ text and nobody else’s.”

This conclusion does not necessitate rejecting the notion of Duris' bias against the Athenians, although it weakens the case.<sup>41</sup> It does mean, however, that Duris' purpose in recording the hymn may not have been to embarrass the Athenians (which is how Athenaeus uses it). He may have included it to prove a different point, as part of an argument that has been lost to us.<sup>42</sup> Whatever the case may be, Athenaeus has imposed his own framework (excessive flattery) on the evidence for Duris' work. This conclusion agrees with what Dominique Lenfant finds, that Athenaeus does not simply quote a string of authors; he adds introductory words or comments in the passage itself "which aim to integrate the extract into a thematic sequence."<sup>43</sup> But for anyone simply reading the text of Duris' fragment in Jacoby's format (or now in *BNJ* with an English translation), none of this will be apparent.<sup>44</sup>

## V

We find a similar instance of Athenaeus' interests and concerns affecting our interpretation of Duris' historical work in F 2:<sup>45</sup>

. . . ὅτι καὶ οἱ μέγιστοι πόλεμοι διὰ γυναικας ἐγένοντο. ὁ Ἰλιακὸς δι' Ἑλένην, ὁ λοιμὸς διὰ Χρυσήϊδα, Ἀχιλλέως μῆνις διὰ Βρισηίδα, καὶ ὁ ἱερός δὲ καλούμενος πόλεμος δι' ἑτέραν γαμετήν, φησὶν Δούρις ἐν δευτέρῃ Ἱστοριῶν, Θηβαίαν γένος,

<sup>41</sup> Okin, in *Panhellenica* 101 nn.49 and 50, also cites FF 10, 24, and 67.

<sup>42</sup> See F 15 (Athen. 12.546C–D) and F 60 (12.525E–F) for examples where Athenaeus cites poetic passages and states that Duris introduced them to support an argument he was making.

<sup>43</sup> Dominique Lenfant, "Les 'fragments' d'Hérodote dans les *Deipnosophistes*," in *Athénée* 43–72, at 60. Cf. Pelling, in *Athenaeus and His World* 184–188, on Athenaeus' use of "strategic misquotation"; see Giovanelli-Jouanna, in *Athénée* 226–229, on distortion resulting from the "total reinterpretation" of a passage by Athenaeus (or, perhaps, one of the speakers in his dialogue).

<sup>44</sup> The attribution to Duris is in fact reinforced in *BNJ* by Pownall's reference to "Duris' use of the title *Marathonomachai*" near the end of her commentary on F 13.

<sup>45</sup> *FGrHist* 76 F 2 = Athen. 13.560b (transl. mine).

ὄνομα Θεανώ, ἄρπασθειῶσαν ὑπὸ Φωκέως τινός. δεκαετῆς δὲ καὶ οὗτος γενόμενος τῷ δεκάτῳ ἔτει Φιλίππου συμμαχήσαντος πέρας ἔσχεν· τότε γὰρ εἶλον οἱ Θηβαῖοι τὴν Φωκίδα.

... that even the biggest wars have started on account of women: the Trojan War because of Helen, the plague because of Chryseis, the wrath of Achilles because of Briseis; and the so-called Sacred War on account of another woman, as Duris says in the second book of his *Histories*, a Theban named Theanô, who had been carried off by some Phocian. This war also lasted ten years, but in the tenth year when Philip entered into an alliance it came to an end; for then the Thebans captured Phocis.

According to Lenfant's proposed criteria for Athenaeus' citations, this should be a direct quote since it is introduced by *φησὶν Δουρίς*.<sup>46</sup> But if we examine the structure of the whole passage, the evidence seems to dictate otherwise. First, we must note that the opening statement—"... that even the biggest wars have started on account of women"—clearly belongs to Athenaeus, not Duris. Jacoby's starting point implies that Duris' work included this statement. But in fact these are Athenaeus' words, since the paragraph begins, "*I do not think that any of you, my friends, is unaware that even the biggest wars ...*" (οὐδένα δὲ ὑμῶν ἀγνοεῖν οἶομαι, ἄνδρες φίλοι...). Jacoby's decision to omit these opening words and replace them with an ellipsis obscures the presence of the cover-text and its potentially distorting filter. Fortunately, Pownall has re-inserted the missing phrase as a parenthetical opening to her *BNJ* translation.<sup>47</sup>

Next, the position of the δέ, which introduces not ὁ Ἰλιακὸς but the Sacred War, indicates the beginning of a new thought or statement.<sup>48</sup> In addition, the phrases at the end of the passage sound more like summaries than sentences taken directly

<sup>46</sup> Lenfant, in *Athénée* 51.

<sup>47</sup> Müller (*FHG* II 469–470) included the introductory clause, thus clarifying what belongs to Athenaeus and what to Duris; Landucci Gattinoni (*Duride* 89) does the same in her translation.

<sup>48</sup> Gulick's punctuation (a colon) implies this as well.

from Duris' text ("This war also lasted ten years, but in the tenth year when Philip entered into an alliance it came to an end; for then the Thebans captured Phocis"). Until the words "it came to an end," such a sentence could conceivably occur in Duris' introduction to the narrative of the war; but the rest of the sentence more likely represents the brief description offered to someone who is not familiar with the war and who does not have the text in front of him. Compare the similarity between the structure of this passage and that of the Callisthenes fragment immediately following in Athenaeus' text:<sup>49</sup>

καὶ ὁ Κρῖσαικὸς δὲ πόλεμος ὀνομαζόμενος, ὡς φησι Καλλισθένης ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Πολέμου, ὅτε Κιρραῖοι πρὸς Φωκεῖς ἐπολέμησαν, δεκαέτης ἦν, ἀρπασάντων Κιρραίων τὴν Πελάγοντος τοῦ Φωκέως θυγατέρα Μεγιστὴν καὶ τὰς Ἀργείων θυγατέρας ἐπανιούσας ἐκ τοῦ Πυθικοῦ ἱεροῦ. δεκάτῳ δὲ ἔτει ἔαλω καὶ ἡ Κίρρα.

And again, the war called Cirrhaean, as Callisthenes says in his book *On the Sacred War*, at the time when the men of Cirrha went to war against the Phocians, lasted ten years, the Cirrhaeans having carried away Megistō, daughter of the Phocian Pelagon, as well as the daughters of Argives who were on their way home from the Delphic shrine. But in the tenth year Cirrha also was overcome.

This fragment clearly consists of a summary of the war which Callisthenes narrated, not a verbatim quotation from his work. The similarity in the progression of ideas and clauses should lead us to consider whether the same might be true of the preceding Duris fragment.

Finally, there is the issue of Chryseis and Briseis. In a list of four women, the use of the adjective *ἐτέραν* is odd, since this should mean "the second of two women."<sup>50</sup> Jacoby believed he

<sup>49</sup> Callisthenes *FGrHist* 124 F 1 = Athen. 13.560B–C (transl. Gulick). Note that this citation is introduced with *ὡς φησι*, which makes it a paraphrase rather than verbatim according to Lenfant's guidelines. Is it possible that a *ὡς* has dropped out of the Duris passage?

<sup>50</sup> Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1956) §1271;

had solved this problem, noting in his commentary that “ὁ λοιμὸς – Βρισηίδα ist Zusatz des Athenaios” and therefore printing this stretch of words in small font in the text of the fragment.<sup>51</sup> According to this view, it was Duris who likened the situations involving Helen and Theanô, and Athenaeus has inserted the reference to two women from Book 1 of the *Iliad*. One might argue that the phrasing later in the passage supports this scenario, since the Sacred War is described as “also” lasting ten years (δεκαετῆς δὲ καὶ οὗτος γινόμενος). This can only be a comparison to the Trojan War, not the plague or the wrath of Achilles; thus, if this were a verbatim quotation, it would mean that Duris made that comparison. But if we will allow that Athenaeus could add Chryseis and Briseis to the middle of a sentence, with no explicit notice of having done so, how much faith should we put in the literal accuracy of καί?<sup>52</sup> Or, for that matter, the literal accuracy of ἑτέραν? The “conflicts” instigated by Chryseis and Briseis do create an odd interruption, perhaps to the point where they could be ignored grammatically when Athenaeus reached his main point: that Duris recorded a second war of ten years started by a second

<sup>51</sup> §1271a notes that “ἕτερος is sometimes used loosely for ἄλλος, but always with a sense of *difference*” (emph. orig.).

<sup>51</sup> Jacoby ad F 2 (p.118). One must look very closely to notice the small font. Landucci Gattinoni (*Duride* 89) follows Jacoby. On Jacoby’s use of fonts, see supra n.37. In this case, there is no indication in the *BNJ* text of F 2 that Jacoby did not consider the words from λοιμὸς to Βρισηίδα to have come from Duris. Since there is no link to Jacoby’s commentary, and Pownall does not address the issue in her commentary, scholars consulting solely *BNJ* will be unaware of Jacoby’s original construction of the fragment.

<sup>52</sup> Lenfant, in *Athénée* 56, allows that the literal citations in Athenaeus may contain dialectical adaptations and “variantes susceptibles de remonter au processus de copie,” but she considers them largely faithful to the original author’s words. Given her emphasis on the various possibilities for distortion in Athenaeus’ other types of citation, as well as the general lack of a documentary ethos among ancient authors, I find it difficult to share her confidence.

woman, Theanô—second in the mind of Athenaeus, that is, not of Duris. Jacoby himself was not ready to go so far as to claim these sentences as a verbatim citation from Duris, since they are printed in regular font, not the *gesperrt* letters he used for literal quotations. Duris may indeed have compared the Trojan and the Third Sacred Wars; we need not be surprised that a war lasting ten years would be likened to the most famous ten-year war in the Greek past, and the trope of women causing wars was an old one. But in separating the fragment from its cover-text, we risk transferring the concerns of the later author to the lost historian. We have gone too far when we make the statement that Duris and Callisthenes “shared interests ... [in] wars which lasted ten years caused by women.”<sup>53</sup> It is not Duris and Callisthenes who have this interest, but Athenaeus. Only by reading Jacoby’s fragment in isolation can one conclude otherwise.

These decisions on what to include as part of a fragment of Duris hold significance because they help create the overall image we have of his work. One way to think about the effect the mediation of the cover-text author can have is to consider the references to a historian whose work does survive—in other words, to study what would be the “fragments” of this historian if we did not have his text. Hermann Strasburger envisioned such an exercise for Herodotus, and Lenfant has recently performed the experiment in part, examining the use Athenaeus makes of Herodotus in the *Deipnosophistai*.<sup>54</sup> Unlike Plutarch in his *De malignitate Herodoti*, Athenaeus had no axe to grind with Herodotus. Nevertheless, Lenfant’s detailed study has shown that, although severe distortions are rare, Athenaeus alters the meaning of Herodotus’ text in other ways.<sup>55</sup> Sometimes he

<sup>53</sup> Kebric, *In the Shadow* 44.

<sup>54</sup> Lenfant, in *Athénée* 43–72; Strasburger, *Studien* III 187–188.

<sup>55</sup> Overall, the *Deipnosophistai* “donnent un reflet très partiel et non représentatif de l’ensemble” of Herodotus’ work (Lenfant, in *Athénée* 66–67). Noting that Athenaeus “gives the impression that Herodotus paid particular attention” to animals, food, rivers, etc., she continues, “Au total, il s’agit

attributes a statement to Herodotus which the latter only reported as being said by someone else; at other times, the lack of any indication of the original context would greatly mislead us if we did not have Herodotus' work. And always, Athenaeus inserts citations into his own thematic framework, leading to a general "reorientation by juxtaposition."<sup>56</sup> To take just one example, Lenfant's no. 5, Athenaeus explicitly introduces a passage by saying that Herodotus noted the great benefit of figs, when in fact Herodotus puts these words in the mouth of the Lydian Sandanis, who is attempting to dissuade Croesus from attacking Persia.<sup>57</sup> Relying solely on Athenaeus, we might conclude that Herodotus had an interest in figs. Fortunately, since we have Herodotus' *Histories*, we can see the absurdity and banality of this statement. Herodotus had an interest in many things, and there is little that seems randomly placed. We should not assume that the Hellenistic historians, who—whatever their merits or demerits—wrote in the tradition of Herodotus and Thucydides, operated any differently.<sup>58</sup>

---

certes de matières abordées par l'historien, mais il ne faut pas en déduire que c'étaient là ses seuls centres d'intérêt, ni même ses principales pré-occupations." See also the remarks of Brunt, *CQ* 30 (1980) 479–480, on how distorted our image of Herodotus would be if based on Plutarch's treatise (which, as he notes, would be one of our main sources of information if the *Histories* did not survive).

<sup>56</sup> Lenfant, in *Athénée* 57–63 (quotation at 63). Note that Brunt (*CQ* 30 [1980] 480–481) portrayed Athenaeus' preservation of fragments as much less problematic and found him "fairly reliable" in general (while still recognizing his potential to skew the overall impression of a work [485]). As important as Brunt's article is, by his own admission it represented "a mere sketch with a few illustrations," a fact which necessitates further detailed studies such as that of Lenfant and the present article.

<sup>57</sup> Lenfant, in *Athénée* 60 n.72, on Hdt. 1.71 and Athen. 3.78E.

<sup>58</sup> For Herodotus and Thucydides as models in the Hellenistic period see Hermann Strasburger, "Die Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung," in *Studien* II 963–1016. For cautions against the assumption that the lost Hellenistic historians were "intrinsically inferior" to the surviving authors, see Knoepfler, in *Historie et historiographie* 25,



## VI

In conclusion, we have seen that in addition to the three instances noted by Pownall (T 1, F 57, F 71), three more of Jacoby's fragments of Duris (F 2, F 13, F 69) contain too little or too much material, and thus do not accurately represent what Duris wrote. These examples, from just one of the hundreds of fragmentary historians found in Jacoby's collection, show that examination of the cover-text is crucial for delimiting fragments in both a concrete sense (what did the lost author write?) and a conceptual sense (why and where and how did he write it?): our judgment of Duris changes along with the boundaries of his fragments. We have also seen the importance of consulting Jacoby's commentary and apparatus in order to determine with what degree of certainty he thought the material formed part of the work of the lost author and, in some cases, to correct his oversights, some of which remain in *BNJ* even after a very thorough treatment such as Pownall's on Duris.<sup>59</sup> As work continues on editing historical fragments, we must ensure that the methodological difficulties inherent in the process of studying fragmentary authors are not ignored as a result of the convenience offered by collections and translations of the evidence.<sup>60</sup>

October, 2010

Dept. of Classics  
 Univ. of Notre Dame  
 Notre Dame, IN 46556  
 cbaron1@nd.edu

---

and Guido Schepens, "Storiografia e letteratura antiquaria. Le scelte di Felix Jacoby," in Ampolo, *Aspetti* 149–171, at 168.

<sup>59</sup> With so many contributors to the project, the commentaries are bound to vary in quality. Lenfant finds that "many commentaries in the *BNJ* take into account neither the context of quotation nor the methods and intent of the transmitting author": *CR* 59 (2009) 397–398.

<sup>60</sup> I would like to thank W. Martin Bloomer and Jessica Baron for reading and commenting on earlier drafts, as well as the editor and anonymous reader for *GRBS*, whose advice on tightening my focus greatly improved the article.