

WAS HELLANIKOS THE FIRST CHRONICLER OF ATHENS?¹

In 1893, Wilamowitz argued that the author of the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, whom he took to be Aristotle, drew his knowledge of Athenian history chiefly from local chronicles, called *Atthides* (singular *Atthis*), which related the history and antiquities of the Athenian state in strict annalistic sequence² and which survive today in small fragments. On his hypothesis, the first *Atthis* was published sometime around 380 B.C. by a board of sacred officials known as *ἐξηγηταί*, who had maintained historical records (*ὑπομνήματα*) stretching back to remote antiquity. Wilamowitz' theory was modeled on that of Th. Mommsen, who argued that the Roman annalists drew on annual records kept by the *pontifex maximus*, consisting of the names of the Roman magistrates of each year and a summary of the most important events which had taken place. On the assumption that the chronicles of Athens drew on a comparable body of material, Wilamowitz argued that a complete literary narrative of Athenian history, arranged by eponymous archons, became available in the second decade of the fourth century and served as the fundamental source of all subsequent chronicles of Athens.

In 1949, Wilamowitz' former disciple, Felix Jacoby, showed that the *ἐξηγηταί* consisted not of one board but of three and that their function was not what Wilamowitz had conceived it to be.³ At most, they expatiated on special aspects of sacred law, particularly on matters involving purification, and there is little sign that they possessed, at any stage of their existence, historical records extending beyond their own narrow areas of expertise. Jacoby suggested instead that the first chronicler of Athens was a non-Athenian, active in the late fifth century, called Hellanikos of Lesbos, whose *Atthis* became the literary model and archetypal historical source of all subsequent chronicles of Athens. Jacoby's essential disagreement with Wilamowitz concerned the identity of the first *Atthis* and the reasons for

¹ This is an edited version of a paper delivered at Birkbeck College, London, on 20th March 1999, and is written *a propos* my doctoral thesis entitled *Philochoros and the Origins of Attic Chronicle*. I would like to thank Dr E. Dench for the invitation to speak at the *Annual Conference for Ancient Historians*, as well as my doctoral supervisor, Professor P. J. Rhodes, for his acute corrections of detail, and Professor J. L. Moles, for removing many errors from an earlier draft and suggesting many improvements both of substance and of presentation. All remaining imperfections and misinterpretations are, of course, my own.

² U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin 1893), vol. II, 260-90.

³ F. Jacoby, *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Athens* (Oxford 1949), ch. 1.

which the genre of Atthidography (literally ‘*Atthis*-writing’) was perpetuated. On the question of origins, he pointed out that the ‘anonymous *Atthis* of c. 380’ is unattested and must, for chronological reasons, exclude Hellanikos from the tradition, notwithstanding plain evidence of an Attic history under his authorship. As to the purpose of the genre, he insisted that an Attic historian wrote not merely for the sake of supplementing earlier accounts with more contemporary narrative but rather to recast traditional material in line with a partisan interest. Kleidemos, he suggested, had democratic leanings, while Androtion was a conservative and Philochoros a moderate; each treated with different political attitudes the same recorded facts.⁴

Jacoby’s polemic seemed so powerful that virtually nobody since has taken issue with the creeds which it established. It is true that in recent times, Phillip Harding has questioned the doctrine that the *Atthides* were politically motivated,⁵ and his criticisms have been adopted in a more moderate form by P. J. Rhodes.⁶ Yet the most important conclusion of Jacoby’s study—namely, that Hellanikos was the first chronicler of Athens—has scarcely been challenged.⁷ This is surprising, since the claim rests on highly questionable evidence and, besides, has profound implications for our understanding of the historical tradition underlying not only the chronicles of the fourth and third centuries but also, and perhaps more significantly, the *Pentekontaetia* of Thucydides. For some modern scholars see Thucydides’ *Pentekontaetia* as a polemical response to Hellanikos’ work, and polemical precisely because, they believe, Hellanikos had already provided a detailed (but in Thucydides’ view, mistaken) chronology of the period.⁸

⁴ *op. cit.* ch. 2.

⁵ P. Harding, ‘Androtion’s view of Solon’s *Seisachtheia*’, *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 282-9; id., ‘Atthis and Politeia’, *Historia* 26 (1977) 148-60; id., *Androtion and the Atthis* (Oxford 1994), *passim*.

⁶ P. J. Rhodes, ‘The Atthidographers’, in H. Verdin, G. Schepens, E. de Keyser (edd.), *Purposes of History*

⁷ R. J. Lenardon (‘Thucydides and Hellanikos’, in G. S. Shrimpton and D. J. McCargher (edd.), *Classical Contributions in Honour of M. F. McGregor* (New York 1981) 59-70 has suggested that Hellanikos did not give dates for the *Pentekontaetia*. More recently, D. L. Toye (‘Dionysios of Halicarnassos on the first Greek historians’, *AJP* 116 (1995) 279-302) has argued that Hellanikos was not a chronicler of any description. Toye bases his objections to Jacoby on a crucial passage of Dionysios (*Thuc.* 5-7), which I myself discuss in section II of the present paper. For other recent expressions of scepticism over Jacoby’s model see W.K. Pritchett, *Greek Archives, Cults and Topography* (Amsterdam 1996) 42-48, J. P. Sickinger, *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens* (Chapel Hill and London 1999) 179, and Marincola’s article cited in n. 25 below.

⁸ The idea that Thucydides wrote the *Pentekontaetia* in response to Hellanikos’ *Atthis* has been stated in varying degrees by (e.g.): J. Scharf, ‘Noch einmal Ithome’, *Historia* 3 (1954) 155; A. W. Gomme, *An Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1945-1981) I.6, n. 3; J.

Before we begin, it is essential to clarify the relevant critical terminology. ‘Chronicler’, ‘chronographer’, and ‘annalist’ are often applied interchangeably by modern scholars to authors whose narratives are organised according to some salient chronological rubric. An example of this tendency can be found in Mosshammer’s otherwise excellent study, entitled *The Chronicle of Eusebius and the Greek Chronographic Tradition*, which includes within the broad category of ‘chronography’ works of vastly different character and aim.⁹ I shall be using the term ‘chronicle’ to refer to a genre of historical writing whose purpose was to re-tell the past in a continuous and coherent narrative organised with strict attention to a fixed chronological scheme: this could embrace lists of annual magistrates, athletic victor lists, or any system of temporal reckoning calculated in intervals from a fixed point of reference. ‘Chronography’, on the other hand, properly designates a field of research whose chief aim is to synchronise different chronological systems and relate them to a single universal standard. The clearest example from antiquity of a ‘chronographic’ work is the *Chronological Canons* of Eusebios, which synchronises lists of kings, emperors, priests, magistrates and athletic victors and ties them down to a basic standard of reckoning computed in decennial intervals from the birth of Abraham.¹⁰ ‘Chronicle’, in the sense in which I have defined it, is best exemplified by the *Attic Histories* (or *Atthides*) of Androtion

de Romilly, *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism* (Oxford 1963) 35; R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 445; A. Andrewes, *An Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. V, 381; H.I. Immerwahr, ‘Historiography’, in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, (Cambridge 1985) vol. I, 443; E. Badian, *From Plataea to Potidaea* (Baltimore 1993) 76-8; J. H. Schreiner, *Hellankos, Thukydides and the Era of Kimon* (Arrhus 1998). For a different, more organically literary, perspective see P. A. Stadter, ‘The form and content of Thucydides’ Pentecontaetia (1.89-117)’, *GRBS* 34 (1993) 35-73, and T. Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford 1998) 225-48, for both of whom the allusion to Hellanicus, while integral, is of strictly secondary importance to the general explanatory function of the *Pentecontaetia*. More detailed argument on similar lines can be found in J. Moles, ‘Narrative Problems in Thucydides I’ (forthcoming on *Histos* {now in C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola and C. Pelling, edd., *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman* (Oxford 2010) 15-39}). Jacoby, for his part, while convinced that Hellanikos presented a detailed chronology of these years, held that the main contents of Thucydides’ *Pentekontaetia* had already taken shape by the time Hellanikos published the *Atthis*. The issue necessarily involves the relative dating of Thucydides and Hellanicus, a question on which scholars sharply disagree (cf. n. 14).

⁹ A. A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and the Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Leuven 1979), esp. ch. II.

¹⁰ For a good summary of the very complex problems surrounding the transmission of Eusebios, cf. Mosshammer, *op. cit.* ch. 1.

and Philochoros, who lived in the fourth and third centuries respectively.¹¹ The contents of these works were arranged in strict chronological order, using as their organisational principle a list of eponymous archons originally published in the last third of the fifth century. The *Attic History* of Hellanikos, while classified as an *Atthis* by scholiasts and lexicographers of the Hellenistic and Roman periods,¹² is generally thought nowadays to have operated according to a similar rubric. The main question addressed by this paper is precisely whether such an assumption is justified.

1. The fragments of Hellanikos

Let us begin with the fragments of Hellanikos himself. The only two which might suggest an annalistic arrangement are preserved in scholia to Aristophanes' *Frogs*, pertaining to events of the archontic year 407/6.¹³ Jacoby used these not only for the purposes of dating Hellanikos—a theoretical quagmire¹⁴—but for estimating the nature and format of his *Attic History*. At *Frogs*

¹¹ Cf. n. 4. Jacoby's discussion of Androtion and Philochoros can be found in *FGrHist* IIIb (Suppl. vol. I) 85-106 and 220-55. For Hellanikos, cf. *op. cit.* 1-21.

¹² *FGrHist* 323a FF 3-12.

¹³ *FGrHist* 323a FF 25, 26. The fragments are quoted by schol. RV Ar. *Ran* 694 and schol. V. Ar. *Ran*. 720.

¹⁴ Dating Hellanikos is extraordinarily difficult, as all the evidence conflicts (cf. Gell. *N.A.* 15.23; *vit. Eur.* p. 2, 5 Schwartz; Euseb. *ap. Hieron. Chron.* ol. 70.1; Sud. s.v. Ἑλλάνικος). A *terminus ante quem* is supplied by Thucydides (1.97.2), who alludes to the Ἀττικὴ ξυγγραφή of Hellanikos (in a famous passage of the *Pentekontaetia* which I myself discuss more fully in part III of the present paper). The value of this *terminus* is diminished by the fact that we do not know precisely when Thucydides composed this portion of the *History* and there is of course a scholarly controversy as to whether the *Pentekontaetia* was itself a later insertion. But three main possibilities arise: (1) the allusion to Hellanikos at 1.97.2 is a later insertion into the text, the main portion of which was composed before the publication of the *Atthis*: cf. K. Ziegler, 'Der Ursprung der Excuse im Thukydides', *RM* 78 (1929) 66 n. 2; Jacoby, *op. cit.* 95; F. E. Adcock, 'Thucydides in book I', *JHS* 71 (1951) 11; O. Lendle, 'Die Auseinandersetzung des Thukydides mit Hellanikos', in H. Herter (ed.), *Thukydides* (Darmstadt 1968) 678; H. D. Westlake, *Essays on the Greek Historians and Greek History* (Manchester 1969) 42; G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London 1972) 315; (2) 1.97.2 is integral to Thucydides' text and the *Pentekontaetia* was composed in response to the *Atthis* of Hellanikos: cf. Schreiner (*op. cit.* n. 8); (3) the two fragments attributed to Hellanikos by the scholiasts on Aristophanes' *Frogs* are bogus, and Hellanikos, as the chronographic testimonia imply, published the *Atthis* sometime prior to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War: cf. D. L. Toye (*art. cit.* n. 7), who argues that Dion. Hal. *de Thuc.* 5-7 contains reliable dates and that Hellanikos was active before 430. (1) seems unlikely, as the allusion to Hellanikos at 1.97.2 fits naturally into the context of Thucydides' statement of purpose: he wrote the *Pentekontaetia* precisely because no au-

694, Aristophanes alludes obliquely to the enfranchisement of Athenian slaves. The scholiast, citing Hellanikos as his authority, glosses the line as a reference to a decree passed in the archonship of Antigenes, which proclaimed freedom and enrolment on the citizen register for all slaves who had fought on the Athenian side against Sparta.¹⁵ Later, at line 720, Aristophanes refers to newly minted gold coinage, which, according to Hellanikos, had been struck in the year of Antigenes' archonship.¹⁶ Of the entire collection of Atthidographic fragments, these are the only two which supply a date. Jacoby took this as confirmation of his theory, altogether preconceived, that the *Atthis* was composed annalistically. Far more striking, I would argue, is the fact that, of the twenty-six fragments pertaining to the *Atthis*, only two relate with any certainty to the so-called historical period or give chronological information.¹⁷ It is unreasonable to infer, on the strength of these two

thor before him, with the possible exception of Hellanikos, treated the events of this period (see my discussion in Part III of the present paper). (3) is superficially attractive in that it avoids intricate questions concerning the composition of Thucydides' *History* but relies on the unprovable and hazardous assumption that FF 25 and 26 have suffered false attribution. On balance, I am prepared to accept (2), though for reasons completely different from those of Schreiner. Though Thucydides states at the outset (1.1) that he began writing the *History* at the outbreak of war, one has to suppose from passages which reveal knowledge of later events (e.g. 2.65.11-12; 5.22) that the *History* was subject to continuous revision before its completion was cut short by Thucydides' death sometime after 403. The *Pentekontaetia* was, in my view, composed relatively late and incorporated by Thucydides into his narrative at a late stage. It is only fair to add that some literary interpreters of Thucydides hold that the allusion to Hellanikos is integral, yet relatively trivial as an explanation for Thucydides' composition of the *Pentekontaetia*: see e.g. Stadter, Rood and Moles (as cited in n. 8); while disagreeing with Jacoby in this respect, for Jacoby held that the allusion to Hellanikos must reflect a late revision of the text, they agree with him in holding that the *Pentekontaetia* was not written as a 'response'.

¹⁵ cf. n. 13. '... and immediately they are Plataians and, instead of slaves, masters.] Hellanikos states that those slaves who had fought on the [Athenian] side were freed and, being enrolled on the citizen register as Plataians, enjoyed equal citizenship with them, explaining the events of the archonship of Antigenes which preceded that of Kallias.'

¹⁶ cf. n. 13 '...both to the old coin and the new gold one]. The year before, in the archonship of Antigenes, Hellanikos says that they struck gold coinage. And Philochoros [says] that the coin was made from golden *Nikai*.'

¹⁷ I anticipate the objection that the only two fragments pertaining to the historical period do indeed supply dates and that Hellanikos must have dated events on a more regular basis for events subsequent to the Persian Wars. I do *not* wish to deny that Hellanikos gave dates or even that he did so with fair frequency in dealing with more contemporary history. The real question is whether the *form* of his narrative was annalistic. Unfortunately, the distribution of the fragments give no indication as to how the *Atthis* was organised. It is just as likely as not that Hellanikos alluded to more contemporary events in passing and that whatever dates he supplied were scattered haphazardly throughout the work. If my interpretation of Thuc. 1.97.2 is justified (cf. part III of this paper), Hel-

fragments alone, that Hellanikos organised his entire narrative according to a schematic rubric defined by the archon list. One piece of evidence, indeed, tells strongly against such a notion. Harpokration, a lexicographer of the second century A.D., quotes from the fourth book of the *Atthis* historical material whose precise context is difficult to surmise.¹⁸ Jacoby assumed, on the basis of the allusion to Megara and the Springs, that the citation came from an entry relating to the Megarian alliance with Athens and the Delian League in c. 460. The fundamental problem is Harpokration's attribution of the fragment to a fourth book. If, as Jacoby believed, the attested fragments from Book II pertained to the battle of Mounychia in 512/1, the reforms of Kleisthenes in 508/7, and the profanation of the Mysteries in 415,¹⁹ the very existence of a fourth book containing events dating from the middle of the fifth century must undermine the supposition that the *Atthis* was, from beginning to end, arranged in strict annalistic sequence. Jacoby extricated himself from this difficulty by supposing that the letter 'delta', which appears in the MSS of Harpokration, was not a numerical representation of the fourth ordinal but the first letter of the word *δευτεροι*—'second', whose remaining letters had dropped out of the text.²⁰ While conceding that numerals, especially those which appear in grammarians, are frequently corrupt,²¹ I find Jacoby's emendation question-begging. The provision of two archontic dates from an unknown portion of the *Atthis* tells us nothing about the gen-

lanikos only touched upon his own age and devoted no particular portion of the *Atthis* to contemporary events. Furthermore, had he provided a systematic chronology of the *Pentekontaetia*, we would have expected a different kind of response from Thucydides and we would also have expected more frequent citation of Hellanikos from later historians and scholars.

¹⁸ *FGrHist* 323a F 7. Harpokr. s.v. 'Andokides in the speech *On the Peace*, if genuine. The Springs is a place in Megara, as Hellanikos states in the fourth [or second??] book of the *Atthis*'.

¹⁹ *FGrHist* 323a FF 5, 6, 8. Cf. *FGrHist* IIIb (Suppl. Vol. I), pp. 27-31. There is, on the strength of the citations alone, no special reason to suppose that the fragments come from annalistic entries. Jacoby's assignment of the fragments to the years mentioned is wholly *a priori*.

²⁰ *FGrHist* IIIb (Suppl. vol. I), pp. 12, 30-31. For doubts about Jacoby's emendation, cf. already K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (Berlin 1967) 499.

²¹ Note, for example, Harpokration's attribution of a twelfth book (*ιβ'*) to Androtion (*FGrHist* 324 F 33), where the context, *viz.* the foundation of Ennea Hodoi, must belong to the second book (*β'*) of the *Atthis*. Numerical corruptions of this kind, however, are easy to detect. It is less obvious that an entire word like *δευτεροι* should be lost, only to be replaced by its first letter (*δ*), subsequently interpreted as a numeral.

eral scheme of the narrative or whether it followed a broad annalistic pattern. For all we know, the information supplied was entirely incidental.²²

II. The evidence of Dionysios of Halicarnassos

To estimate Hellanikos' place within the Attidographic tradition, we must first consider the evidence of Dionysios of Halicarnassos, historian, literary critic and important source of information on earlier Greek historians. A significant piece of secondary evidence lies in the preface to Dionysios' *Antiquitates Romanae* (1.8.3), which states:

‘As to the form I give this work, it does not resemble that which the authors who make wars alone their subject have given to their histories, nor that which others who treat of the several forms of government by themselves have adopted, nor is it like the annalistic accounts which the authors of the *Atthides* have published (for these are single-genred [μονοειδεῖς] and soon grow tedious to the reader), but it is a combination of every kind’²³

On the basis of this testimony, Jacoby postulated an equation between *Atthis* and chronicle and inferred, on the strength of title alone, that the first chronicle of Athens was the *Atthis* of Hellanikos.²⁴ Yet it is unclear precisely whom Dionysios meant when referring to ‘the authors of the *Atthides*’.²⁵ Thu-

²² cf. n. 17. The wording of the scholion to Ar. *Ran.* 694 (F 25) might, indeed, indicate an annalistic entry for the archonship of Antigenes (407/6). Yet it is not clear that the dating comes from Hellanikos rather than the scholiast himself. As far as we can tell, Hellanikos is cited for his allusion to the enrolment of the freed slaves on the citizen register, and the participial phrase introduced by *διεξιῶν* may be a scholastic gloss. The matter cannot be decided with any certainty, one reason why we cannot base our understanding of Hellanikos on decontextualised citations.

²³ Cary's Loeb translation, except that I have translated *μονοειδεῖς* by ‘single-genred’ rather than ‘monotonous’, which fails to convey the essential point.

²⁴ Jacoby, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 86-7.

²⁵ Certainly, Jacoby's claim (*op. cit.*, n. 3 79) that ‘the *Atthides* were felt to constitute a unity as to their contents, and as to their form, if not a species in itself, still a group (sub-species)’ correctly represents Dionysios' implication but it is precisely the implications of that implication that I am here disputing. Indeed, if the title *Atthis* originated with the *Pinnakes* of Kallimachos, as Jacoby insists (*op. cit.* 84), one would expect it to represent not a rigid generic category so much as an expression of bibliographic convenience applicable to works sharing loosely recognisable characteristics. On the misrepresentations inherent in the rigid application of generic terminology as an analytical tool, cf. J. Marincola's important paper ‘Genre, literary convention and innovation’ (forthcoming in C. S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden 1999), which engages thoroughly with all aspects of Jacoby's reconstruction of Greek historiog-

cydides, who gives the first extant allusion to the *Atthis* of Hellanikos, actually uses the title Ἀττικὴ ξυγγραφή (1.97.2 [discussed in section III below]), and there is no particular reason to think that the local histories of Attica bore a uniform heading.²⁶ Even if Hellanikos' *Attic History* was known more commonly as an *Atthis* by Dionysios' time, we need not suppose that the vague reference to 'the authors of the *Atthides*' embraced each and every historian whose work had acquired the scholarly designation of *Atthis*.²⁷ Indeed, there are *Atthides* from the third century, like that of the historian Istros, which, as Jacoby acknowledged, cannot have been a chronicle.²⁸ It is quite conceivable that Dionysios' judgment of the *Atthides* was governed, perhaps with distorting consequences, by his close acquaintance with the work of Philochoros.²⁹ The implied equation between *Atthis* and chronicle looks like a generalisation, employed by Dionysios, above all, for immediate convenience, that of distinguishing his own work from other people's as sharply as possible.³⁰ We cannot extrapolate from this passage the implication that each and every work bearing the title of *Atthis* was composed annalistically.

raphy. I am grateful to Professor Marincola for making an advance text of this paper available to me.

²⁶ Thus, for example, the *Atthis* of Kleidemos (*FGrHist* 323) is frequently cited under the title of *Protogonia* (cf. FF 5a, 7); that this must be the same work as the *Atthis* is demonstrated by the citations of Athenaios (*Deipn.* 14.79, p. 660 ab; 14.80, p.660 de; 10.26, p. 425e).

²⁷ Jacoby, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 1. The term 'Atthidographer', as coined by Jacoby, comports a judgment not only of fact but of value: as opposed to an antiquarian, who dealt with the history of Athens in a neutral, 'scholarly' fashion, an Atthidographer recorded history with a vested political interest. For a full exposition of Jacoby's view, cf. *op. cit.* (n. 3) 71-9. The seven as it were 'canonical' Atthidographers, in turn, are: Hellanikos (*FGrHist* 323a), Kleidemos (*FGrHist* 323), Androtion (*FGrHist* 324), Phanodemos (*FGrHist* 325), Melanthios (*FGrHist* 326), Demon (*FGrHist* 327), and Philochoros (*FGrHist* 328).

²⁸ *FGrHist* 334. For Jacoby's remarks, cf. *op. cit.* (n. 3) 81-2; *FGrHist* IIIb (Suppl. vol. I), pp. 618-627, esp. 624-5.

²⁹ Of all later authors who cite Philochoros, Dionysios of Halikarnassos is by far the most accurate and reliable. That Dionysios had first-hand access to Philochoros' *Atthis* is clear from his *verbatim* quotations; cf. *FGrHist* 328 FF 49-51 (Dion. Hal. *ad Amm.* 9). Philochoros' is the only *Atthis* which Dionysios cites, and it is even possible (albeit unprovable) that he based his understanding of the less well-known *Atthides*, including that of Hellanikos, on secondary information.

³⁰ Jacoby, in his analysis of this passage, supposed that, because Attic chronicles fell under the generic heading of *Atthides*, all *Atthides* must, by definition, have been chronicles. A logical leap of this kind is quite unwarranted. Dionysios at most implies that *some* authors of *Atthides* (he does not specify who) wrote annalistically. Whether he regarded Hellanikos as a chronicler is quite uncertain from the context.

Dionysios' treatise *On Thucydides* is also noteworthy.³¹ Chapters 5-9 discuss the early historians of Greece, prominent among whom was Hellanikos. At chapter 9, Dionysios makes a clear distinction between those who divided their works topographically (*κατὰ τόπους*) and those who employed a chronological method of division (*κατὰ χρόνους*), structuring their narratives around lists of kings, priests, Olympiadic victors, or annual magistrates. Importantly, chapters 5-9 are not, as Jacoby himself recognised,³² devoted exclusively or even principally to annalistic writers, and Dionysios explicitly relegates Hellanikos to the category of those who wrote *κατὰ τόπους*:

He [*sc.* Thucydides] took neither the places in which events occurred as the basis of division [*κατὰ τόπους*], as Herodotus, Hellanikos and some of his other predecessors had done; nor time [*κατὰ χρόνους*], as the local historians preferred, dividing their records according to the accession of kings and priests, or by the periods of the Olympiads, or by the appointment of civil magistrates to annual office.

As the passage shows, Dionysios compared the literary methods of Hellanikos with those of Herodotos and did not envisage similarities with histo-

³¹ Cf. Toye (*art. cit.* n. 7), but I hope to improve on his arguments (cf. also n. 14 above).

³² *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 178: 'For Ionia as for Athens, direct attestations of, or proofs for, the pre-literary keeping of a chronicle are lacking, even for a chronicle in the modest form of annotations in the lists of eponymous officials. The famous passage in Dionysios of Halikarnassos, which is ever and again quoted in this context, is not such an attestation: Dionysios (or his source Theophrastos) is dealing not with local chronicles alone or even primarily, but with the earliest historical writings generally, which means for him with books that are, or seem to be, earlier than Herodotos and Thucydides. According to him the activity of these earliest historians consists in collecting and publishing the material existing in some places. This material ... consists in ὄσαι διεσάζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνήμαι κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις, εἰ τ' ἐν ἱεροῖς εἰ τ' ἐν βεβήλοις ἀποκείμεναι γραφαί, ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἀπάντων γνῶσιν ἐξενεγκέιν, οἷας παρέλαβον, μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτε ἀφαιροῦντας· ἐν αἷς καὶ μῦθοί τινες ἐνήσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ πεπιστευμένοι χρόνου καὶ θεατρικαί τινες περιπέτεια πολὺ τὸ ἡλίθιον ἔχειν τοῖς νῦν δοκοῦσαι. What Dionysios describes here obviously is the composing of *literary* local chronicles each beginning with the foundation of a city and treating the 'archaeology' in particular in detail, viz. *Horoi* and *Atthides*, etc.'

Jacoby's analysis of the passage is, to my mind, very strange. Though his aim is to refute the view of Laqueur ('Lokalchronik', *RE* 13, 1927, cols. 1083ff.) that the *History* of Herodotos presupposes a series of 'preliterary' chronicles, he adduces a passage which, if anything, appears to support the very view under attack, viz. that the first historians drew upon certain *γραφαί* maintained ἐν ἱεροῖς and ἐν βεβήλοις. More importantly for our purposes, he appears to contradict himself by stating, at one moment, that Dionysios 'is dealing not with local chronicles alone or even primarily' and, at the next, that the subject under consideration is 'the composing of literary chronicles'.

rians such as Androtion or Philochorus. This testimony was curiously neglected by Jacoby in his general reconstruction when he assumed on faith that Hellanikos, as author of an *Atthis*, followed the methods of the later Athenian chroniclers. Yet Hellanikos, at least in Dionysios' estimation, was an historian of quite a different ilk from those who wrote *κατὰ χρόνους*. Jacoby's undervaluing of this important passage is evidenced by the fact that it does not appear in his collection of testimonia pertaining to Hellanikos, even though it counterbalances the evidence from the *Roman Antiquities* and shows that, if Dionysios knew of the *Attic History* of Hellanikos, he viewed it as quite different in nature and form from the *Atthides* of the fourth and third centuries.

That 'if' is important. For there is admittedly a problem in the way in which Dionysios sets up his antithesis between those who wrote *κατὰ τόπους* and those who wrote *κατὰ χρόνους*. Dionysios was of the definite opinion that local histories followed the literary format of chronicles. His assertion, if accurate, must imply that the normal method of composing local history was by correlation with lists of kings, priests or magistrates.³³ If so, we would expect a work whose primary focus was the history and antiquities of Attica, to have been composed annalistically. Dionysios, however, clearly believes that Hellanikos did not compose *κατὰ χρόνους*. How, then, if his equation of local history and chronicle is to be taken seriously, are we to reconcile the fact that Hellanikos wrote a local history with the remark which clearly differentiates him from chroniclers?

Two possible solutions come to mind. The first simply is that Dionysios was unfamiliar with Hellanikos' *Attic History* and based his opinion of Hellanikos on other works of broader scope. The second possibility is that Dionysios had a very restricted notion of 'local history' and was thinking of works, like those of Androtion and Philochoros, which treated the history of a single city in a strict and methodical fashion. If so, it is less problematic

³³ Diod. 1.26.5; Censorinus *Deor. Nat.* 19.6; Hesych. s.v. ὄρογράφοι; *Etymol. Magn.* s.v. ὄρος. The only source which might at first sight be taken to imply an identity between ὄροι and local histories is the *Etymologicum Magnum*, but a close reading does not warrant such an interpretation. At most, the lexicographer states that ὄροι were local histories written annalistically, not that *all* local histories fell under this designation. Diodoros, Censorinus and Hesychios say nothing of local histories, merely that ὄροι were antiquated names for chronicles. Taken together, the evidence implies that ὄροι constitute a sub-species of *τοπικαὶ ἱστορίαι*, not that the two categories were equivalent. Jacoby was aware of this in his article entitled 'Ueber die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie' (republished by H. Bloch in *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung von Felix Jacoby* (Leiden 1956) 49, n. 89 [where the above *testimonia* are cited]), but still assumed that the local historians of Greece who succeeded Herodotos were chroniclers (*art. cit.* in Bloch, *op. cit.*, 49-59). Cf. the astute remarks of Toye (*art. cit.* n. 7 285).

than might initially appear that Dionysios classifies Hellenikos with historians such as Herodotus, even if the scope of the *Attic History* was nothing like as extensive as the work of his better known contemporary. For the essential focus of Dionysios' investigation is narratological method, a consideration by which—if we can trust Dionysios—Hellenikos was far closer to Herodotus than to those of local historians who wrote annalistically. It is *a priori* likely that Dionysios, by associating local histories with chronicles, indulged in a generalisation whose purpose was to illustrate an overarching principle but which was factually inapplicable to every case in question.

My conclusion is that Dionysios' evidence must be read with extreme caution. Dionysios was doubtless a learned man, whose knowledge of early Greek historiography was evidently extensive, yet, as with the statement in the *Roman Antiquities*, the rigid categorisations employed in the treatise *On Thucydides* seem to have been driven by convenience and by a need for definitional clarity, unencumbered by counterexamples. We must not, as Jacoby did, place uncritical faith in a single remark from the *Roman Antiquities* and allow it to govern an entire theory concerning an ancient genre and its defining characteristics. As will (I hope) become clear from my treatment of Thucydides' evidence (section III below), such faith can have fatal consequences for our reading of more contemporary testimony, which, if read without prejudice, indicates that Hellenikos was anything but a chronicler.

III. The evidence of Thucydides

Positive reasons for doubting Jacoby's attribution of an annalistic rubric to Hellenikos emerge when we consider the famous statement of Thucydides in Book I of the *History*. At chapter 97, he justifies his attempt to narrate the years intervening the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars with the following statement (Thuc. 1.97.2):

I wrote a history of these years [*viz.* the *Pentekontaetia*] and made a digression in my narrative for this reason, that the period under consideration is omitted by all my predecessors, whose narratives pertain either to Greek affairs prior to the Persian Wars or to the Persian Wars themselves. He who touched upon these years in his *Attic History*, Hellenikos, alluded to them briefly and without precision as to chronology.

And in Book V, when accounting for his own narrative technique, he states (5.20.2): 'One must reckon according to seasons and not according to a list of names of local officials or of those who, thanks to some office, mark past

events, believing it better. For it is imprecise in showing whether an event occurred at the beginning of the year or in the middle or at the end'.³⁴

Taking 5.20.2 as a point of comparison, Jacoby explained 1.97.2 as an objection to the method of dating by archons. Since the passage in Book V criticises local dating schemes as inaccurate, he argued that the charge against Hellanikos in Book I must, thanks to verbal similarity, have entailed the particular chronological method which he adopted—namely, an annalistic scheme arranged by archontic years.³⁵ Yet, in spite of Jacoby's claims, the two passages can only be compared in the broadest sense, namely that in each case Thucydides contrasts other people's lack of chronological precision with his own chronological precision. But the contexts in which these contrasts operate are quite different. Thucydides at 5.20.2 commends his year datings on the merits of the chronological precision which they afforded. 1.97, on the other hand, justifies a narrative of the years intervening the repulse of Xerxes and the attack on Plataia in 431 on the grounds that the period in question had been treated by no previous historian, with the partial exception of Hellanikos, whose account had been anything but complete or systematic. Surely Thucydides was not complaining that Hellanikos had failed to clarify whether events occurred in the months of Hekatombaion, Metageitnion or Skirophorion. The point, clearly, is that Thucydides was filling a gap: nothing comparable to a systematic narrative of these years, much less one which employed a careful chronological format, had ever yet been undertaken. 1.97.2 does not represent a polemic against archon-dating, nor is it obvious that, in writing the *Pentekontaetia*, Thucydides set up a chronological scheme rivalling that of a predecessor. The phrase

³⁴ Section 5: 'Herodotos of Halikarnassos carried his choice of subject-matter to greater and more estimable heights, electing to write the history not of one city or tribe but to draw together in a single narrative the many and varied affairs of Europe and Asia, etc.'

³⁵ *FGrHist* 323a (Suppl. Vol. I) 16-18. For Jacoby, the critique of Hellanikos was trivial in the sense that only his method, not the substance of his narrative, came under attack. The view recently maintained by Schreiner (cf. n. 8) that Thucydides attacked Hellanikos' actual chronology was not entertained by Jacoby, who believed that the main portion of the *Pentekontaetia* was composed prior to the publication of Hellanikos' *Atthis* (cf. n. 14). Jacoby's reading of this passage was based on that of G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia*, III.1: *Die Pentekontaetie* (Gotha 1893) 153, who argued that Thucydides took issue not with Hellanikos' dates but with his chronological method. Similar views have been held by A. A. Mosshammer, 'Themistocles' archonship in the chronographic tradition', *Hermes* 103 (1975) 234, and M. Buonocore, 'L'impostazione cronologica della pentecontaetia tucididea.', in *Settima miscellanea greca e romana*, 59-75. Cf. also the opinions of Westlake (n. 14) 42; O. Luschnat, 'Thukydidēs der Historiker', *RE Suppl.* 12, 1971, cols. 1085-1354; P. A. Stadter, 'The form and content of Thucydides' pentecontaetia', *GRBS* 34 (1993) 64.

τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς most naturally means not that Hellanikos had got his dates wrong or even that he used a parochial dating scheme but rather that, in alluding to contemporary events, he paid no consistent attention to chronology.³⁶

Notwithstanding 1.97.2, as here interpreted, many scholars since Jacoby have assumed that the *Pentekontaetia* of Thucydides presupposes an annalistic account of Athenian history. Most noteworthy among them is Schreiner, who, in a recent monograph, contends that chapters 89-117 of the first book of Thucydides' *History* were designed to rectify dates provided by Hellanikos in the *Atthis*.³⁷ Mosshammer, too, accepts the notion of an 'Hellanikan' or 'Atthidographic' chronology but he is more skeptical than Schreiner as to its historical value.³⁸ Each, however, makes a test case of Thuc. 1.93, which, they argue, implies the existence of a previous annalistic source.

The context is the construction of the Peiraieus under the direction of Themistokles. Thucydides states (section 3) that the Peiraieus project was begun ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ἀρχῆς ἧς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν Ἀθηναίοις ἦρξε), which at first sight (and as in fact I accept) alludes to the year of Themistokles' archonship—that is, 493/2 according to the archon list.³⁹ The context of the passage, however, is the early 470s, following the defeat of the Persians at Salamis and the tribute assessment of Aristides. Many have been disposed to doubt that the building project could have been begun before the time of Marathon, only to be abandoned and resumed nearly two decades later.⁴⁰ Thus Gomme argued that 1.93.3 alludes not to the annual archonship but to some more recent magistracy which Themistokles must have held over a period of years.⁴¹ His arguments were developed by Fornara,⁴² who pointed out that the vulgate edition of Eusebios' *Chronicle* dates the construction of Pei-

³⁶ This is a reading which Schreiner (*op. cit.* n. 8, 13-16) fails to consider because he, like Jacoby before him, is locked into the assumption, based on their interpretation of Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.8.3, that the *Atthides* followed a narrow set of formal criteria and that Hellanikos, the first 'Atthidographer', laid down a chronological 'schedule' which influenced all subsequent accounts.

³⁷ Cf. n. 8.

³⁸ *art. cit.* n. 35; *op. cit.* n. 9, esp. ch. II.

³⁹ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.49.1. Among those who accept that Themistokles was eponymous archon in 493/2 are: R. J. Lenardon, 'The archonship of Themistokles, 493/2', *Historia* 5 (1956) 401-19; D. M. Lewis, 'Themistokles' archonship', *Historia* 22 (1973) 757-8; W. W. Dickie, 'Thucydides 1.93.3', *Historia* 22 (1973) 758-9; R. Develin, *Athenian Officials 684-321 B.C.* (Cambridge 1989) 55.

⁴⁰ Though there are those who believe that it was: cf. Lenardon, *art. cit.* n. 42; M. Ostwald, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd ed., vol. IV, 343-4.

⁴¹ Gomme 261-2.

⁴² C.W. Fornara, 'Themistocles' archonship', *Historia* 20 (1971) 534-40.

raieus to the Olympiad 480-476. Mosshammer observed that the Armenian edition of Eusebios dates the project's inception to the year 497/6 and argued that the original entry in Eusebios' text, now lost, must have been both 493/2, the year of Themistokles' archonship, and 480-476. Eusebios' sources, he contended, evince two traditions, the first of which originated with Hellanikos, who, on the basis of the archon list, naively dated the project to 493/2, the second with Thucydides, who, as Gomme and Fornara reckoned, dated it to a later period when Themistokles supposedly held some kind of extraordinary magistracy. Thucydides, on Mosshammer's view, implicitly corrects an annalistic source which assigned the project's inception to the year 493/2.⁴³

Schreiner, in contrast, while agreeing that Thucydides presupposes Hellanikos, held not only that the date of the naval project implied at 1.93.3 is the year of Themistokles' archonship but that the ultimate provenance of this information is the *Atthis* of Hellanikos.⁴⁴ Two problems arise from this reading: (1) Thucydides also alludes to the shipbuilding programme in 1.14.3 and this allusion is consistent with a date of 483/2 and shows that Thucydides, or the source on which he drew, dated the naval project later than Themistokles' archonship;⁴⁵ (2) the arguments advanced by Themistokles must have been delivered prior to the construction of the harbour and, if 1.93.3 belongs to the context of the 470s, seem to imply that construction was begun at that time.⁴⁶ Schreiner circumvented the first difficulty by supposing

⁴³ *art. cit.* 36. Mosshammer's view has been followed by M. H. Chambers, 'Themistocles and the Piraeus', *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday* (1984), 43-50. Cf. also the remarks of A. J. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles* (Montreal and London 1975) 195.

⁴⁴ 'Thucydides 1.93 and Themistokles during the 490s', *SO* 46 (1969).

⁴⁵ The date of 483/2 for the shipbuilding programme is supplied by *AP* 22.7. That Thucydides conceived of the project as occurring between Marathon and Salamis is clear from the sequence of his narrative at 1.14.3: 'For these were the last fleets in Greece worthy of note before the expedition of Xerxes. For the Aiginetans and the Athenians, and some others, possessed small ones, and these comprised mostly pentekonters; and sometime after that Themistokles persuaded the Athenians, when they were fighting the Aiginetans, and while the barbarian was expected, to build ships with which they also fought; and these did not yet have fittings throughout'.

⁴⁶ Thuc. 1.93.3: 'Themistokles persuaded them [*viz.* the Athenians] to build the rest of the Peiraeus (for part of it had been begun earlier during his magistracy which he held among the Athenians for a year, thinking that the place was good, having three natural harbours, and that, once they had become sea-worthy, a great opportunity would present itself to acquire power (for he was the first to speak of the sea, how it should be seized), and immediately began preparing the empire.' I quote here the passage as punctuated by H. S. Jones in the *OCT*. If the clause ὑπήρκετο ... ἤρξε is inserted within parentheses, as Jones has it, the subject of νομίζων becomes *Themistokles*, *viz.* the subject of the main clause introduced by the verb ἔπεισε.

that Thucydides drew on two contradictory traditions, one of which influenced the *History* of Herodotos and deliberately suppressed Themistokles' achievements in the period before Marathon, the other of which, relying on sources friendly to Themistokles, emphasised his political prominence in the 490s and found expression in Hellanikos' *Atthis*. Thucydides, he argued, not fully appreciating the discrepancy, passively reproduced both traditions. In response to the second difficulty, he re-arranged the standard punctuation so that the arguments put into Themistokles' mouth at 1.93.3 belong not to the 470s but to the year of his archonship.⁴⁷

While recognising that the punctuation of ancient texts is problematic, I cannot agree with Schreiner on the implications of this passage for Hellanikos and for his supposed influence on Thucydides. My essential disagreement concerns the hypothesis of an annalistic source behind 1.93.3 and the suggested reasons why the passage seems to conflict with 1.14.2. Granted, 1.14.2 must relate to the 480s, not least because the construction of the Athenian fleet seems to anticipate Salamis. On the other hand, we need to look closely at the context to understand why Thucydides presents his material as he does. At 1.13-14, he lists a succession of Greek thalassocracies, all of which, rather strikingly, are synchronised with Achaemenid reigns: in the time of Kyros the leading naval power in Greece was the Ionians, in the time of Kambyses Polykrates of Samos, in the time of Dareios the Sicilians and Kerkyraians, and in the time of Xerxes the Aiginetans, who were supplanted by the Athenians. Whether Thucydides produced these synchronisms himself or drew on a chronographic source, there can be little doubt that the chronological parallels are artificial and reflect an attempt to present history in neat and tidy terms. Though I do not dispute Thucydides' assignment of the origins of Athenian naval power to the late 480s after the suppression of Aigina, I believe that his chronology stems not from informed historical research but from a tidy-minded and largely unhistorical chronographic schema. At 1.93.3, meanwhile, the assignment of the Peiraeus pro-

⁴⁷ Schreiner proposed that a semi-colon be placed after *οἰκοδομεῖν* and that the parentheses be removed from the clause *ὑπῆρκετο* to *ἦρξε*. The participial phrase introduced by *νομιζων* then depends not on *ἔπεισε* (which belongs to the 470s) but on *ὑπῆρκετο*, whose context is 493/2, and Themistokles becomes the subject of *ὑπῆρκετο*, with *αὐτοῦ* as object. Still, I can see neither historical nor syntactical force in Schreiner's interpretation. Historically, I see no reason why Themistokles should not have pointed out to the Athenians the geographical advantages of Peiraeus as a potential harbour after work had already been begun. After all, Thucydides is quite explicit that Themistokles had to persuade the Athenians to *complete* their unfinished work: why should he not have laid emphasis on its geographical assets? Syntactically, Schreiner's punctuation cannot work: Themistokles cannot be the implied subject of *ὑπῆρκετο* because of *κείνου*. *ὑπῆρκετο* must be an impersonal pluperfect passive.

ject to the year of Themistokles' archonship (which, I believe, must be the meaning of ἀρχῆς ἧς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν Ἀθηναίους ἦρξε)⁴⁸ is dictated not by authoritative chronological data but by Thucydides' characterisation of Themistokles as a farsighted statesman, a theme which recurs throughout the *Pentakontaetia* and culminates in the obituary of Themistocles at 1.138. The verbal plays on ἀρχή cannot be coincidental:⁴⁹ the Athenian ἀρχή ('empire') is echoed in the ἀρχή ('archonship') of Themistokles, which is seen as the ἀρχή ('beginning') of Athenian might. Thucydides, I suggest, dates the inception of the Peiraieus project as he does not because he drew on an annalistic source but because of a preconceived notion that Themistokles, the farsighted statesman, had long foreseen the advantages which such a location would confer. Historically, the assignment of the project to the year of his archonship may or may not be questionable, but artistically and linguistically it harmonises with the context and was chosen for that very reason. Importantly, we need not introduce Hellanikos, or any hypothetical pre-Thucydidean annalist, into the equation. Thucydides' narrative is wholly explicable on its own merits.

IV. Summary

I summarise my argument briefly. Jacoby's view that the first chronicler of Athens was Hellanikos of Lesbos is both theoretically and empirically groundless. Theoretically, it depends on a concept of Attic historiography, or 'Atthidography', as a single, identifiable genre with a limited set of defining characteristics, the most important of which was an arrangement of historical material annalistically under the names of annual archons. Empirically, it rests upon two decontextualised fragments from the *Atthis* and a single statement by Dionysios, which, as I have argued, must be taken with a pinch of salt. Most significantly, it conflicts with Thuc. 1.97.2, which, on my interpretation, must imply that Hellanikos did *not* compose a chronicle of Athens. Jacoby's theory is responsible for much confusion concerning not only the debt of later chroniclers, such as Androtion and Philochoros, to fifth-century historiography but also the literary influences underlying the *Pentakontaetia* of Thucydides. I submit that, by supposing Hellanikos to be a chronicler of any description, we create many more theoretical problems than we solve and make a nonsense of Thucydides' assessment of the *Attic History* and of his response to it. It is true that if we accept Dionysios' evi-

⁴⁸ Cf. the clinching arguments of Lewis and Dickie (n. 39).

⁴⁹ John Moles' forthcoming paper (n. 14) explores the implications of these and other verbal plays in the *Pentekontaetia* for the interpretation of 'the truest cause' (1.23.6).

dence concerning the early Greek historians before Thucydides, there were among them local chroniclers, so that the exclusion of Hellanikos from the category of chroniclers of Athens does not of itself preclude there being pre-Hellenic chroniclers of Athens. Nevertheless, this possibility effectively can be excluded, not only because of the lack of positive attestation of such chroniclers but because Thucydides' evidence is explicit that with the exception of Hellanikos no one had treated the period of the *Pentekontaetia* before himself. In place of Jacoby's reconstruction, I therefore suggest that the first chronicler of Athens was Androtion⁵⁰ and that Hellanikos' *Atthis* was little more than a rag-bag of local genealogy and myth. In the case of Athens, the writing of local chronicle marks not the beginning of antiquarian investigation into the history of the city but a methodological refinement within an already established tradition of local historical writing. In other cities, the pattern of development was different, but this difference serves only to highlight once again the profound inadequacy of Jacoby's evolutionary model when considering specific instances such as Attic historiography.

University of Durham

CHRISTOPHER JOYCE

⁵⁰ Androtion's is the first *Atthis* which, thanks to the disposition of the fragments, can be recognised as a chronicle with any certainty.