

INTRODUCTION:
COLLECTIVE MEMORY IN ANCIENT GREEK
CULTURE: CONCEPTS, MEDIA, AND SOURCES*

Maria Fragoulaki

1. Memory Studies and the Present Volume

Cultural or collective memory defies a stable definition. It can be viewed as an interdisciplinary space where different and at times overlapping terms, media, and methodologies speak to each other, casting new light on the multifaceted phenomenon of collective remembering or ‘the interplay of present and past in socio-cultural contexts’.¹ In the study of ancient societies this interdisciplinary dialogue can be particularly illuminating in exploring the dynamic and negotiable character of the memory of the past. Memory can be better observed through the symbiotic relationship of a variety of media (texts, objects, places, forms) and through different periods and genres, as a process of constant redefinition and reconfiguration, based not only on storing, inscribing and recording, but also on forgetting, effacing, destroying, and losing for ever.

The chapters of the present volume explore aspects of the shaping (and reshaping) of collective memory in ancient Greece, viewing it as a holistic cultural phenomenon, mobile, transformative and transformable. The volume contains different types of sources, media of memory and theoretical approaches, exploring boundaries, dialogues and interactions: literary works (Homer, Pindar, Herodotus, Thucydides, and significant intertexts), oral traditions and folktale, inscriptions, material culture, funerary epigrams and statues, ethnography. Its chronological scope encompasses the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods. Some chapters (Pelling, Fragoulaki, Agócs, Baragwanath, Shear) zoom into a specific source (literary work or inscription), whereas others (Skinner, Low) provide more general and all-encompassing discussions. Themes and frameworks of memory explored in this volume are: *kleos* (‘fame’) and commemoration; praise as memory and media of praise; intertextuality and/as memory; the relationship between historiography, mythography, and ethnography; the interaction between

* I use the following abbreviations: *CT I–III* = Hornblower (1991–2008); *PMG* = Page (1962).

¹ Erll (2008) 2.

textual and physical places of memory; and the centrality to ethnicity of collective memory.

This introduction does not provide a systematic charting of the rich theoretical field of memory studies and its application to the study of ancient societies and cultures. Major points of reference to one or another extent in all discussions in the field are figures such as Maurice Halbwachs, Paul Ricoeur, Jan Assmann, Pierre Nora, or Arjun Appadurai, and the chapters of this volume are no exception. In addition to this theoretical stratum, the present volume is also, like other recent studies in the field of Classics, informed by memory studies.²

Here, I would only like to pause at the centrality of myth and the mythistorical perspective of the past in Greek culture—an overarching methodological premise of this volume—, making a brief mention of Aleida and Jan Assmann’s distinction between ‘communicative’ and ‘cultural memory’.³ ‘Communicative memory’ is associated with non-institutionalised forms of memory and is more limited chronologically, covering about eighty to a hundred years, consisting of the historical experiences of contemporaries. It is a memory framework based primarily on forms of everyday interaction, in which everyone is considered equally capable of remembering the common past. ‘Cultural memory’, on the other hand, ‘comprises that body of reusable texts, images, and rituals specific to each society in each epoch’⁴ and is central to a group’s identity, sense of belonging, and collective knowledge. This memory framework is primarily ceremonial, ritualistic, consisting of fixed contents and meanings, whose sources are often specialists and figures of intellectual or religious authority, such as priests, professors of history, or poets. Foundational narratives of a past recognised ‘as ours’, festivals, symbols, and institutions cohabit and construct cultural memory. That said, ‘communicative’ and ‘cultural memory’ are interdependent, and distinctions are far from unambiguous. For example, as has been pointed out, ‘in the age of the Internet and formats such as Wikipedia there is an increased blurring of the distinction between specialists and laymen of the Cultural Memory’.⁵ Among the Assmanns’ features-parameters of cultural memory, events of a mythical/primordial past and ancient history hold pride

² More recently, Castagnoli–Ceccarelli (2019), with bibliography. For the study of the relationship between memory and history, Simon Price’s (2012) four contexts—objects and representations, places, ritual behaviour (and associated myths), and textual narratives—are illuminating. Foxhall–Gehrke–Luraghi (2010) and the concept ‘intentional history’ have been seminal in describing the constantly evolving perceptions of the past in the light of the present.

³ Assmann (2008); Erll (2011) 27–37. For the distinction in the context of Homeric poetry, see Minchin (2012). Communicative memory is at times also referred to as ‘social memory’, although distinctions between these terms are too complicated to pursue, and vary across different schools of thought.

⁴ Assmann (1995) 132.

⁵ Erll (2011) 31, and, more generally, 27–37 on the Assmanns’ work on cultural memory.

of place. In the words of Jan Assmann ‘[i]n the context of cultural memory, the distinction between myth and history vanishes’.⁶

In connection with ancient Greek culture, a mythistorical perspective does not mean that the Greeks were uncritical of myth, or that they did not distinguish between mythical and historical time or between fiction and ‘truth’/‘facts’.⁷ Rather, a mythistorical perspective suggests that the Greeks used mythical narratives to construct a sense of Self and to unlock understanding of their historical past and present. Myth was a cognitive tool and a constantly active comparandum, by means of which the past could be remembered, processed, and described. An important feature of myth was its performative character, and its association with social and political institutions. Suffice it to think of myth’s embeddedness in contexts such as the symposium, festivals, education, courtroom, political thought and debate. At the same time, Greek mythical narratives are inherently messy and non-hierarchical, as they are multi-medial, multi-vocal, and dynamic: they inhabit different media, fragmented or extant, and appear in variants, which may contradict or supplement one another. Myth, like memory itself, undergoes constant shaping and reshaping, and its study throws into relief a wider methodological need in the study of our sources: extant or fragmentary works of literature or inscriptions, graffiti, visual representations, architectural structures, archaeological sites, coins, objects of everyday use, are all important in illuminating the kaleidoscopic and polysemantic character of cultural memory.

This introduction aims to facilitate the reader in following the thematic threads across the chapters of this volume, shared concepts, questions, methodologies, and understandings, touching on some literary sources which do not enter the focus of the authors’ contributions or do not feature elsewhere in the volume. Some of these sources have not received enough attention so far in relation to the theme of memory, whereas others have been extensively discussed, but it is hoped that their integration into the present introduction warrants a revisiting. The final part of this Introduction is an overview of the seven chapters of the volume.

⁶ Assmann (2008) 113.

⁷ E.g., Veyne (1988).

2. Memory in Homer

... Ναυσικάα δὲ θεῶν ἄπο κάλλος ἔχουσα
 στῆ ῥα παρὰ σταθμὸν τέγεος πύκα ποιητοῖο,
 θαύμαζεν δ' Ὀδυσῆα ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὄρωσα
 καὶ μιν φωνήσασ' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα· 460
 'χαῖρε, ξεῖν', ἵνα καὶ ποτ' ἐὼν ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ
 μνήσῃ ἐμεῖ', ὅτι μοι πρώτη ζωάγρι' ὀφέλλεις.
 τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 'Ναυσικάα, θύγατερ μεγαλήτορος Ἀλκινόοιο,
 οὔτω νῦν Ζεὺς θεΐῃ, ἐρίγδουπος πόσις Ἥρης, 465
 οἴκαδέ τ' ἐλθέμεναι καὶ νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ ἰδέσθαι·
 τῶ κέν τοι καὶ κεῖθι θεῶ ὡς εὐχετοῦμην
 αἰεὶ ἡμᾶτα πάντα· σὺ γάρ μ' ἐβιώσασο, κούρη.'

Nausicaa, gifted with beauty by the gods, stood by the door-post of the well-built hall, and she marvelled at Odysseus, as her eyes beheld him, and she spoke, and addressed him with winged words: 'Farewell, stranger, and hereafter even in your own native land may you **remember me, for to me first you owe the price of your life.**' Then Odysseus of many wiles answered her: 'Nausicaa, daughter of great-hearted Alcinous, so may Zeus grant, the loud-thundering husband of Here, that I may reach my home and see the **day of my return.** Then will I even there **pray to you as to a god all my days,** for you, girl, have given me life'.

(Hom. *Od.* 8.457–68; trans. A. T. Murray)⁸

This is a farewell scene between a young girl at marriage age and a mature man, Nausicaa and Odysseus, combining subtle individual characterisation and psychological brilliance. It rounds off the two interlocutors' encounter, which opened with Odysseus' supplication to the girl, where he wondered whether she was a god or a mortal (*Od.* 6.149). The farewell scene (and the Odysseus–Nausicaa encounter more generally) is not often discussed in connection with collective memory, probably because it is too private to be considered 'socially' or 'historically' significant. Yet this private moment deserves attention in relation to the public sphere too, on account of the social roles of the young woman and the man, who are a princess and a king, respectively.⁹ It is a moment when both private and collective identities intersect.

The young princess who knows that the day of her marriage approaches realises that the handsome stranger that Odysseus has become after their

⁸ All translations may have small changes.

⁹ On character speech and its social context, see Pelling, below, Ch. 1, p. 26 on Nausicaa's speech: 'delightfully characterising of her [...] trying to be so very mature'.

initial encounter was not meant to be her husband.¹⁰ Nausicaa's character combines shyness and 'feelings unsaid',¹¹ conventional for her age and situation, with wisdom and exercise of power in the handling of the ethical, political, and gender dynamics of this relationship, unconventional for her age and gender. The disappointment of the unfulfilled potentiality of erotic and matrimonial union with Odysseus is balanced by an astonishing degree of female agency. By reminding Odysseus that she has saved his life after capturing him alive (ζωάγρι' ὀφέλλεις, *Od.* 8.462), Nausicaa uses memory as a means of reciprocal exchange; she asks Odysseus to remember her, when he returns to his country, impressing on him that gratitude for his life is owed to her 'first', that is, before everyone else (μνήσῃ ἐμεῖ', ὅτι μοι πρώτη, 8.462).¹²

With psychological and social shrewdness, Odysseus affirms the gratitude owed to Nausicaa ('for you, girl, have given me life', 8.468), promising to pray to her as if to a goddess for all his days (8.467–8). It might be suggested that, owing to the socially prominent status of Odysseus, what is implied by his words is not merely personal or familial memory (what the Assmanns call 'communicative memory'), but a ritual with wider implications for the collective memory of the Ithacan community. With some daring, the trace of an aetiology cult on Ithaca might be seen here. In any case, the prayer by the leader of a community introduced 'for the rest of his days' suggests permanency and possible institutionalisation, constitutive of cultural memory (again according to the Assmanns' categorisation).¹³

The *Odyssey* is a poem of memory, not by being preoccupied with heroic *kleos* on the battlefield in the sense that the *Iliad* is, but by exploring the boundaries of individual, *oikos*, and collective memory, as in the Nausicaa–Odysseus scene. It is the memory of Ithaca that keeps Odysseus' desire for return (*nostos*) to his fatherland alive (1.57–9): 'she [= Calypso] charms him to forget (ἐπιλήσεται) Ithaca. Odysseus, however, wanting to catch sight even of smoke leaping up from his land, is longing to die (θανέειν ἰμείρεται). *Nostos* itself is memory, since one must be able to remember to long for return.'¹⁴

¹⁰ Nausicaa's marriage with Odysseus is an expectation of both herself (*Od.* 6.244–6) and her father Alcinous, king of the Phaeacians (*Od.* 7.313).

¹¹ De Jong (2004) 212–13.

¹² De Jong (2004) 213 "'a guest will remember his host at home" motif. Ζωάγρια (not a frequent word in our sources) is used in a strikingly similar manner in Hdt. 3.36, in a context of reciprocal exchange and negotiating power through saving the life of a king. The king in Herodotus is Croesus, who is saved by slaves.

¹³ In the poem's narrative, Odysseus has not yet revealed his identity to the Phaeacians (this happens at 9.19), so the social significance of Odysseus' promise is shared with the audience of the *Odyssey* and not Nausicaa herself, still unaware of Odysseus' identity. Meister (2020) 131–8 reads 'praying as if to a god' (τῷ κέν τοι καὶ κείθι θεῶ ὡς εὐχετοπόμην, *Od.* 8.467) in the light of Eupolis, fr. 384 K–A (οἷς ὡσπερὲι θεοῖσιν ἠνχόμεσθα), ritual contexts, and power dynamics.

¹⁴ Cf. Montiglio (2003) for the close relation between the memory of return and the memory of wandering in Homeric Odysseus. Cf. Malkin (2018) 86: 'Others have noted that

The episode of the Lotus-Eaters (*Od.* 9.82–104) is a mythical illustration of the close connection between memory, identity, and emotion. The desire to return home can only be generated by the recollection of what individuals and groups experience and recognise as home. The episode of the Lotus Eaters is narratologically framed by the war with the Cicones (9.39–61) that precedes it and the visit to the cave of the Cyclops (9.105–566) that follows it. Both of these violent and bloody encounters claim the lives of Odysseus’ companions and come into contrast with the shorter visit to the land of the Lotus-Eaters, which is not overtly violent. But although the encounter with the Lotus-Eaters does not involve physical annihilation and death, it poses another deadly threat: forgetfulness of return (*νόστου λαθέσθαι*, 9.97), which would result from eating the lotus fruit. The episode’s position in the narrative forms a triad of dangerous encounters (Cicones—Lotus-Eaters—Cyclops), suggesting that loss of memory and identity is nothing less than a form of death.¹⁵

The sorrow of constant longing is a dominant feature in Homeric Odysseus, as his first appearance in the poem demonstrates: ‘She [= Calypso] found him on the shore, and his eyes were never dry of tears, and his sweet life was ebbing away, as he longed mournfully for his return’ (*Od.* 5.151–3). Calypso’s address to Odysseus confirms his constant sorrow and suffering (starting with *κάμμορε* ‘unhappy man’, 5.160, one of the adjectives used for Odysseus in the poem). Penelope’s character too is constructed on longing for Odysseus, steadfastness in grief for his absence, and the painful memory of past happiness. Her first character speech in the poem demonstrates it: ‘an **unforgettable grief** (*πένθος ἄλαστον*) affects me heavily. I long for a person so dear, **remembering** always that man whose **fame** is wide through Greece and middle Argos’ (*τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ποθέω μεμνημένη αἰεὶ | ἀνδρός, τοῦ κλέος εὐρὸν καθ’ Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος*, 1.343–4).¹⁶ The social dimension of Penelope’s speech must not be missed, as she

the cognate of *nostos* is *noos*, “mind”, with its implications of memory of the self, namely, “identity”. For what is “remembering” if not “returning” in one’s mind?, citing Frame (1978).

¹⁵ Cf. de Jong (2004) 229, on the ‘Iliadic flavour’ of the episode of the Ciconians, opposing it with the non-violent ‘forgetting-remembering motif’ of the Lotus-Eaters episode, which ‘is nevertheless a danger’ (231). For memory in Homer as ‘inability to forget’, see Minchin’s entry on ‘Memory’ in Finkelberg (2011).

¹⁶ ἄλαστον, ‘unforgettable’ (< privative *a* + *λαθ-* aor. stem of *λανθάνομαι*, ‘forget’). For the oppositional relation between *mnēs-* and *lath-* in the discourse of remembrance in Homer, see Bakker (2005), ch. 8; cf. Nikannen (2012). Later in the poem in the significant meeting between Penelope and the ‘unknown guest’ (Odysseus still in disguise), Penelope’s painful longing for Odysseus appears again (‘longing for dear Odysseus, I pine away in my heart’, Ὀδυσσῆ ποθέουσα φίλον κατατήκομαι ἦτορ, *Od.* 19.136). The description of the purple mantle and the golden brooch (*Od.* 19.225–7), which she had given to her husband, initiates a web of shared memories between the two interlocutors, which culminates in their recognition

situates her personal grief and family tragedy within the frame of Odysseus' heroic status and panhellenic fame, that is, within the frame of the collective memory of Odysseus' name and deeds.

Both spouses' personal grief, memory, and longing for each other have wider implications, beyond their *oikos* and marriage. Odysseus' absence from Ithaca lasts twenty years, of which ten years are occupied by his adventurous *nostos*; during the latter he makes wars and ties of friendship with individuals and communities, such as those with the Phaeacians. The intimate and personal aspect of Penelope's memories and longing have a social and public dimension as well, related to the royal status of her missing husband and the social norms of Ithacan society. During Odysseus' long absence her position has become socially untenable. After their son Telemachus' coming of age, Penelope's prolonged stay in Odysseus' household is perceived by her entourage as a social anomaly, and she is urged by both her parents and her son to leave Odysseus' home and join another household after marrying one of the suitors (*Od.* 19.158–60, 530–4).

The suitors themselves are intricately bound with acts of memory in the poem. As has been noted, probably from early on in the history of the word, *mnēmē* can also mean 'love' (including sexual love, *erōs*).¹⁷ The Greek word for suitor *mnēstēr* (μνηστήρ) is in fact a cognate of *mnēmē*, denoting someone who is courting or wooing (being 'mindful' of) a much sought-after woman (*polymnēstē*: πολυμνήστην τε γυναῖκα, *Od.* 14.64). But the suitors' courting and 'mindfulness' is less about Penelope and more about plundering unlawfully her absent husband's household ('they will not woo righteously (δικαίως μνᾶσθαι), nor go back to their own, but at their ease they waste our substance insolently', 14.90–1). In the bow contest, Antinous, the leading suitor, in a short speech full of dramatic irony and false modesty, claims that he remembers Odysseus (μνήμων εἰμί, 21.95).¹⁸ Although Penelope finally decides to set up the bow contest, which would result in her marriage to one of the suitors, this prospect is hateful to her (19.571–2). She is incapable of fathoming her future in a new marriage: either in the poetic narrative or in her own words, there is no hint at an expectation of a new life. In fact the only future she is capable of visualising is a permanent daydream state of nostalgic remembrance of her life in Odysseus' house: 'I think I shall ever remember even in my dreams' (τοῦ ποτὲ μνησέσθαι οἴομαι ἔν περ ὄνειρῳ, 19.581; 21.79).

and reunion (*Od.* 23.205–87). Cf. *Od.* 7.215–21 for the poignant association of grief and memory in Odysseus' own words.

¹⁷ Krell (1990) 298.

¹⁸ For the subtle semantics of memory in the *Odyssey*, in the context of critical dialogue with Jacques Derrida's *Mémoires* (1989), see Krell (1990) 298; for the bow-contest scene, Fernández-Galiano ap. Russo, et. al. (1992) 156–7, and 132 on indications that Antinous' words (and lines 80–100) are by the hand of B; M. L. West (2014) 279: 'may be a secondary expansion'.

Memory is also central in another marriage and a private scene taking place in the *Iliad*, between Hector and Andromache (*Il.* 6.392–502), in which the future of their family and its position in collective memory are explored. Prompted by the painful memory of the loss of her paternal family in Thebe under Plake by Achilles (6.413–28), Andromache visualises Hector’s death and the dark fate of hers and their son that is bound to follow (6.407–10). If Penelope is fixed on her past, Andromache is fixed on her grim future. After her encounter with Hector, she goes back to her home in the Trojan palace and together with her waiting-women does not return to the loom and the spindle, a domestic female occupation of everyday normality (as urged by Hector, 6.490–2). Instead she abandons herself to lament, a ritual of death and commemoration (‘so in his own house they made lament for Hector, while yet he lived’, 6.500).¹⁹ This is a lament of displaced temporality, as it does not happen posthumously, but it anticipates the death of the person being mourned for. Andromache lives in future time, mourning Hector, coping with the pain of his loss, and preserving his memory—at personal and collective levels—before his death.

Hector too is fixed on the future (‘projected “memory”’).²⁰ Like Andromache, Hector visualises the fall of Troy and his wife’s captivity (*Il.* 6.440–65), wishing his own death before he lives to see these events (6.448, 454–65). But Hector’s personal and domestic grief (*ἄλγος*, 6.450, 462) interlocks with, and is subordinate to, his aspiration of shaping not only the memory of the Trojans but of the Achaeans as well (6.456–61), so of humanity at large (cultural memory in the strongest sense, in Assmann’s categorisation).²¹ He thinks in terms of ‘so people will say in the future’ (*ὡς ποτέ τις ἐρέει*, 6.462 and 7.91), typical of the epic hero’s concern for memory (see 4.182 for the same phrase used by Agamemnon; cf. 4.176).²² In his own visualisation of a painful future, which he shares with his wife, Andromache will still be known as the wife of Hector, the man who ‘excelled in battle’ (*ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι*, 6.460). Hector is driven by the famously archaic mixture of duty and shame, which also entails preserving and expanding his and his father’s great glory (*μέγα κλέος*, 6.445–6), handing over the baton to the next generation: he prays to Zeus that the memory of his royal *oikos* will be perpetuated through his son (*ἀγαθόν*, 6.478), whose excellence Hector hopes will surpass his own (6.476–81).

¹⁹ On ritual lament, see M. Alexiou (2002).

²⁰ Minchin (2012) 93. ‘Hector and Andromache are pretty twin souls’, as Chris Pelling points out to me, to whom I also owe the comparative point about Andromache and Helen below.

²¹ See Minchin’s illuminating reading of the scene against Assmann’s theoretical background on memory: Minchin (2012), esp. 91–4.

²² Echoed in *Hdt.* 6.77, in the hexameters of an oracle engaged with a Sparta-related war, *κῶδος* (another fame-related word), and ‘future generations’ (*ἐπεσσομένοι ἄνθρωποι*), with Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 195; for the Spartans’ heroic characterisation, see below, §5.

One is tempted to probe more into gender aspects of memory, turning the focus to Helen for a moment, a woman whose engagement with memory is different from that of Andromache and Penelope, in the *Iliad* and beyond. Helen's first appearance in the poem takes place inside Priam's palace, where she weaves on a 'big web' (μέγαν ἰστόν, *Il.* 3.125) the struggles (ἀέθλους) of war, suffered by both Trojans and Achaeans 'for her sake' (3.128). Weaving is a typically female activity, as said already, but this woman's narrating through weaving men's deeds and suffering, of which furthermore she herself appears to be the cause, is far from typical. The absence of a reference to singing in these lines, which often accompanied domestic occupations such as weaving, has been viewed as another indication of the scene's distinctiveness.²³ 'Deeds of men' (κλέα ἀνδρῶν, *Il.* 9.185–9) and 'works of men and gods' (ἔργ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, *Od.* 1.338) are sung in the epic by the men themselves, including the poet, as the Muse(s)' medium (*Il.* 1.1, 2.484–93).

Helen's centrality ('for her sake') to the suffering caused by the very war she weaves on the cloth goes well beyond the standard intersection of the domestic and public spheres and a woman's role in it. Whether so much destruction and suffering were caused by Helen's own will and participation or came from somewhere outside is arguably the biggest question pertinent to causation and blame in Greek literature. The exploration of this open-ended question can be recognised also in the historians' complex and multivocal manner of exploring causes and responsibility.²⁴

3. Memory and Historiography: Herodotus and Thucydides

Kleos and heroic memory are big interests that join poetry and historiography. As Pelling notes in the opening chapter of this volume, the historians are concerned with war and suffering, and this is probably why their material and outlook are so close to those of the *Iliad*, the archetypal narrative of suffering. The memory of the past and its preservation was a central aim for Herodotus and Thucydides. This aim emerges clearly in the proem of Herodotus' *Histories* (*praef.*):

Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέως ἱστορίας ἀπόδειξις ἦδε, ὡς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά,

²³ Nagy (1996b) 64–5 n. 23 on weaving words into fabric as a metaphor for singing and a 'substitution of content for form', in connection with Helen's weaving the Trojan War; *ibid.* n. 25, on Philomela as another woman associated with narrating her sad story through weaving (*Ov. Met.* 6.412–674).

²⁴ On Helen's lasting legacy in apportioning blame in Homer, Herodotus, Greek tragedy, and beyond, see up-to-date discussions in Pelling (2019).

τὰ μὲν Ἑλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάρουσι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεᾶ γένηται, τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ <δὴ καὶ> δι' ἣν αἰτίην ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι.

This is the exposition of the enquiries made by Herodotus of Halicarnassus, in order that the accomplishments of men may not become extinct, nor the great and wonderful deeds of Greeks and barbarians lack renown, and especially the reason why they fought one another.²⁵

Although the actual word ‘memory’ (*mnēm-*) does not appear in this programmatic statement, memory is presented as a twofold struggle against the forgetfulness which results from the passing of time: the first and more general aim of Herodotus’ work is to prevent the fading and erasure of human events from memory; so memory as preservation. A second and more targeted aim is not mere preservation, but fame and immortality (*kleos*), applying to actions (or doings) of ‘great’ and ‘admirable’ (‘remarkable’) quality, among the totality of human events. Another parameter in the latter aim is that the celebration and immortalisation of remarkable human actions relate to collective entities on the map of human geography, consisting of two large groups: the Greeks and the Others (‘barbarians’), both of whose actions deserve *kleos*. Herodotus’ ‘exposition of enquiry’ (*historiēs apodexis*) therefore covers human events at universal scale, bestowing *kleos* on what the author finds remarkable among them. At the same time Herodotus’ *apodexis* is a remarkable human doing itself, which secures the author’s own *kleos*, by bestowing *kleos* on remarkable human doings (cf. in the same context *apodechthenta*—of the same root with *apodēxis*—used for remarkable ‘barbarian’ deeds). Finding out causes (*αἰτίην*) is vital to Herodotus’ and all historians’ claim to fame.²⁶

The memory of the past, and its role in the collective consciousness of the Greeks, is central to Thucydides also. Unlike Herodotus, Thucydides does use the Greek word for ‘memory’ (*mnēm-*) in his methodological chapters (Thuc. 1.20–2). Although for a modern reader there is nothing remarkable in a methodological statement at the start of a book, at that early time of history writing, Thucydides’ decision to explain how he worked was nothing

²⁵ Trans. by D. Asheri, in Asheri–Lloyd–Corcella (2007) 7. Herodotus’ ἐξίτηλα (1.1; also 5.39) is poetic. He is the earliest prose author to use the word, which is also found in Aeschylus and Euripides (*TLG* search). Later Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses the word in a memory context (‘the man’s memory did not become extinct’ οὐ γέγονεν ἐξίτηλος ἢ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἢ μνήμη, *AR* 8.62), probably under the influence of Herodotus (cf. *Pomp.* 3.3, where he praises Herodotus citing this phrase in his proem). For the ‘inscriptional’ and ‘genealogical’ dimensions of Herodotus’ ἐξίτηλα, see Moles (1999), esp. 49–53.

²⁶ On Herodotus’ proem and its interaction with poetry, see, e.g. Asheri *et al.* (2007) 7–9; Bakker (2002). Nagy (1987) 183 draws an analogy with Ibycus’ claim to fame, as a poet, through Polycrates’ κλέος ἀφθιτον as subject of his poem (*PMG* 282.47–8). Cf. *aphthiton onoma* (‘immortal name’) in Theognis, below, pp. xxxv–vii.

less than revolutionary.²⁷ In a manner similar to that of Herodotus, Thucydides acknowledges that one of the challenges with which the historian is confronted is the forgetfulness resulting from the passing of time (*χρόνω ἀμνηστούμενα*, ‘forgotten by time’, 1.20.3).²⁸ He also acknowledges the shortcomings of human memory (his own and that of others) when one tries to remember the speeches delivered: ‘it was difficult to remember accurately the words uttered’ (*χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτῆν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι*, 1.22.1). Below the surface of this statement, one might be tempted to read the Homeric dead metaphor (*ἔπεα πτερόεντα*, ‘winged words’; remember Nausicaa’s ‘winged words’ to Odysseus (Hom. *Od.* 8.460), earlier in this chapter) and a reference to the elusive nature of utterances. But it is not only the accuracy of speeches that is difficult to pin down, Thucydides adds, but also that of ‘the events that took place in the course of the war’ (*τὰ ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ*, 1.22.2). The challenge here was that the reports of the eye-witnesses for the same events differed ‘depending on each one’s loyalty or memory’ (*ὡς ἐκατέρων τις εὐνοίας ἢ μνήμης ἔχοι*, 1.22.4); and, in the context of the plague, Thucydides returns to the adjustable and malleable nature of human memory in the light of the experiences of the present: ‘Men shaped their memories according to their present suffering (*οἱ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς ἃ ἔπασχον τὴν μνήμην ἐποιούντο*, 2.54.3).²⁹ Thucydides’ presentation of Nicias’ motives for sending a letter to the Athenians from Sicily, rather than an oral report delivered by a messenger, echoes very similar concerns, suggesting the superiority of the written word as a medium of memory and truth: ‘Fearing that his message might be distorted by his emissaries, through incompetence at public speaking, failure of memory (*μνήμης ἐλλιπέως*), or adjustments to suit the mood of the masses (*τῷ ὄχλῳ πρὸς χάριν τι λέγοντες*), he wrote a letter’ (7.8.2).³⁰

Like Herodotus, Thucydides battles against forgetfulness. But unlike Herodotus, whose aim was to preserve human actions (*ἔργα*) of the (distant and more recent) past, Thucydides sharpens his focus onto the recent past and noteworthy events of it, at least for the most part of his work, using different criteria of historical selectivity. He sets as his aim to describe the ‘greatest and most remarkable war of those that preceded it’ (*μέγαν τε [...] καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων*, 1.1 and 1.23.1), devoting textual space and energy to demonstrate the validity of his claim in a polemical

²⁷ Marincola (2017a) on Thucydides’ and other ancient historians’ legacy on the theory of history-writing and their engagement with memory.

²⁸ *ἀμνηστούμενα* (< v. *ἀμνηστεῖν*) is a *hapax* in Thucydides and a rare word in general.

²⁹ Hornblower (*CT* I.327) rightly sees ‘a touch of irony’ here; a contemplative, even empathetic, sort of irony, it might be added, relating to Thucydides’ wider concern for observing human nature in moments of crisis.

³⁰ Trans. M. Hammond (with minor modifications). Greenwood (2006) 76–82 for Nicias’ letter as ‘a fascinating commentary on the methodological chapter in Book 1’ (81) and the letter’s superior claim to truth and clarity, being a written medium.

manner. Immediately from the start Thucydides identifies the war as the type of noteworthy human actions and events in which he is interested. And being acutely aware of the limitations of human memory, he finishes his methodological chapters with his famous statement, reflecting his ambition:³¹ ‘I shall be content if it [= my history] is judged useful by those who will want to have a clear understanding of what happened—and, such is the human condition, will happen again at some time in the same or a similar pattern. It was composed as an everlasting possession, not a show-piece for a single hearing’ (κτῆμα ἐς αἰεὶ ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν ξύγκειται, 1.22.4). So Thucydides’ *History* was intended not only (or mainly) to record and preserve the events of the Peloponnesian War, but also to become a useful manual for identifying similarities and patterns in future time and for understanding human history. He introduces his work neither as a collection or compilation of remarkable events and actions nor as a rhetorical showpiece; rather he is submitting it to posterity as a cognitive tool of historical interpretation.³² The very use of the aorist tense in the opening of his *History*, ‘Thucydides the Athenian wrote’ (Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε, Thuc. 1.1.1) suggests a reader in future time.³³ This is a grand vision and a very purposeful and ambitious engagement with the historiographic genre and its role in shaping the memory of the past.

4. Intertextuality and/as Memory of a Text

The memory of a text is its intertextuality.³⁴

When literature is considered in the light of memory it appears as the mnemonic act par excellence. Literature is culture’s memory [...] ‘Intertextuality’ is the term conceived in literary scholarship to capture [the] interchange and contact, formal and semantic, between texts—literary and non-literary.³⁵

Renate Lachmann’s important work on literature as mnemonic act, a process by which a culture constantly rewrites and redefines itself, provides

³¹ For meta-history (i.e., statements on ‘how to do history’) in the ancient historians, see Grethlein and Krebs (2012).

³² On the interaction between the particular/concrete and the general as a means of searching for causes and instructing, see Kallet (2006); for example, in the sections of the Great Plague in Athens (2.48.3) and the *stasis* at Corcyra (3.84.2), the description of the specifics provides opportunities for making more general points about human nature (ἀνθρωπεία φύσις) and its inferred inclinations (εἰωθυῖα) (3.84.2) in moments of crisis.

³³ Bakker (2002) 31 n. 68. At the same time his statement suggests that ‘he sat down to record a set of events which were still in the future’, *CTI*.5.

³⁴ Lachmann (1997) 15.

³⁵ Lachmann (2008) 301.

an appropriate theoretical space to situate intertextuality in this volume. The ‘interchange and contact between texts’ is pursued through both form and meaning; that is, it is not only similarity of language and form that is pursued in the intertextual observations in this volume, but also similarity of semantic potential and cultural experience. Such an approach to intertextuality ‘construes intertextual bonds between literary and non-literary texts’,³⁶ being particularly apt for the study of the affinities between the historians and the poets. For example, the worlds of Herodotus and Thucydides interact with that of Homer in important ways, with immortal fame (*kleos*) being central to the war narratives of all three authors. The word *kleos* itself is rooted in history and memory. Clio (Κλειώ), whose name is derived from *kleos*, was the daughter of Mnemosyne (Μνημοσύνη), the Memory goddess,³⁷ in a later period she was assigned history as her province. But the referential potential of *kleos* in both historians lies not in the actual presence of the word *kleos* in Herodotus and Thucydides, but in tropes and cultural parameters, which activate interrelations between the historians and Homer (and other poetic intermediaries, not least tragedy), and between the historians themselves, as texts that ‘participate, repeat and constitute acts of memory’.³⁸

The word *kleos* is not frequently used in either Herodotus or Thucydides. It appears only four times in Thucydides; never in the narrative of the war, but in passages engaging with an epic theme or in the heroic-panegyric rhetoric of the Funeral Oration.³⁹ Considering the obvious poetic overtones of the word and Thucydides’ professed distance from the poets and the mythical quality of their stories (Thuc. 1.21.1), such a scarcity is probably not surprising. But in the most Homeric Herodotus one would have expected the word to crop up more frequently; the presence of the word ἀκλεᾶ in the opening statement of the *Histories* could encourage this expectation. Yet neither *kleos* nor its cognates appear frequently in Herodotus either. In addition to ἀκλεᾶ in the proem, there are only five further mentions, interestingly all in the context of Spartan history, illuminating Herodotus’ use of the epic register as a means of heroic characterisation of the Spartans.⁴⁰ There is no doubt that each time Herodotus or Thucydides used

³⁶ Lachmann (2008) 306.

³⁷ For Mnemosyne and the Muses, see Castagnoli–Ceccarelli (2019) 8–12 on the ‘divine and transtemporal power of memory’, and §5 below, on *mnēmosynon/a*.

³⁸ Lachmann (2008) 305.

³⁹ Thuc. 1.10.2 (κλέος, Lacedaemonian context); 1.25.4 (κλέος, Corcyraean-Phaeacian context); 2.44.4 εὐκλεία (for the dead of the war), 2.45.2 (for women, through male focalisation). On panegyric rhetoric in relation to Isocrates’s *Evagoras* see below, §6.

⁴⁰ κλέος in Herodotus (6 mentions): ἀκλεᾶ, 1.1; ἀκλεῶς, 5.77.1; κλέος, 7.220.2 and 220.4 (Thermopylae); κατὰ κλέος, 9.48.3; 9.78.2. Cf. Hornblower’s (2013) comment on 5.77.1: ‘a very strong word for that most unusual event, a Spartan military setback, though not an actual defeat’. Thermopylae is another Spartan military setback-turned-into-victory of panhellenic proportions, where again *kleos* is used to underscore its heroic characteristics

the word, they did it in full awareness of its cultural overtones and its effect on their audiences.

5. The Thermopylae Episode in Herodotus: Catalogues and ‘Leaving Behind Words as Memorials’ (ἔπεα μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι)

The Thermopylae narrative in Herodotus is a section with acknowledged Homeric influences.⁴¹ The battle of Thermopylae was one of the ‘Great battles’, which became a defining moment for the collective memory of the Greeks and other nations, a milestone in world military history, and a symbol of physical and moral courage.⁴² Soon after it took place (480 BC) it acquired the dimensions of myth through its commemoration in various sources. Simonides of Keos (6th/5th century BC) had written a lyric poem of which only a fragment survives (*PMG* 531, cited in *D.S.* 11.11.6), and it is no accident that Herodotus’ narrative of the battle is intensely engaged with epic tropes, the archetypal genre of heroism, and especially Homer. In Herodotus’ account of the battle, Simonides appears as the poet of the funerary epigram commemorating the death of the seer Megistias, one of the three epitaphs in total cited by Herodotus (7.228.4).⁴³

Genealogy is one of the epic tropes with which Herodotus engages in this episode.⁴⁴ In the preliminaries to the battle we are provided with the genealogy of the king of Sparta, Leonidas, a descendant of Heracles and Zeus, and a short note about the circumstances in which Leonidas became king after Cleomenes’ death (7.204–5).⁴⁵ It is in the Thermopylae narrative that two of the six mentions of the word *kleos* in the whole of Herodotus appear, before and after the hexameter oracle foreseeing Leonidas’s death (7.220.2

and symbolism. On the relative scarcity of the word *kleos* in Herodotus, more recently Darbo-Peschanski (2019) 164–5.

⁴¹ Boedeker (2003); Pelling (2006); Foster (2012); de Jong (2015); Carey (2016); Marincola (2017b); Vannicelli (2017); Pelling (2019) 203–4: ‘The most Homeric battle of all is Thermopylae’.

⁴² Cartledge (2006); Carey (2019).

⁴³ The fourth-century historian Ephorus too was occupied with the battle; he must have been the source of the later Diodorus (1st c. BC).

⁴⁴ Thomas (1989), on the oral and written contexts of lists of names and genealogies, as frameworks of memory; Fowler (1998) on Greek genealogical thinking, alerting against sharp divisions between oral and written modes of cognition. Lists of names (priests and officials) are attested as early as the sixth century, often being compilations of earlier lists: Thomas (1992) 66 with n. 52 on early lists of names from Laconia (second half of 6th c. BC), perhaps lists of victors. For lists and catalogues as repositories of memory and their performative potential, see Minchin (2001). On ‘memory and archives’, see Castagnoli–Ceccarelli (2019) 13–17.

⁴⁵ For a Homeric analogy, whereby the divine descent of the heroes killed in battle magnifies their honour, see the genealogy of the two sons of Diocles, descendants of the river-god Alpheios, killed by Aeneas (*Il.* 5.541–9).

and 220.4), reinforcing the poetic-heroic tenor of the episode. The lion-theme makes its appearance in the oracle referring to the Persian attack, which ‘neither the might of bulls nor yet that of lions will check’ (7.220), evoking the Homeric epic, where the lion simile is used for the prowess of the fighting heroes, often in combat (e.g., *Il.* 5.136–43, 476, 554–60, 12.298–308). Leonidas’ own name and the stone-lion monument that was erected to commemorate Leonidas’ illustrious death at the battle are two further evocations of the lion theme (Hdt. 7.225.2). The oracle itself is more likely to have been fabricated after the event, as part of the Spartans’ recasting their defeat into a victory, shaping panhellenic memory and their own ‘predestined’ and special role in it.⁴⁶ By securing the immortality of the Spartan ‘great deed’ at Thermopylae, Herodotus secured the memory of his own work too. Let us look more closely at his authorial strategies of memory, concentrating on two instances.

The first instance is the non-naming of the Three Hundred Spartans who fought and fell at Thermopylae on the side of their leader Leonidas, which the historical narrator presents as deliberate, since he emphatically claims that he had been able to retrieve all the names: ‘distinguished Spartans, whose names I was told as men of valour, and I was told the names of all the Three Hundred’ (*ὀνομαστοὶ Σπαρτιητέων, τῶν ἐγὼ ὡς ἀνδρῶν ἀξίων ἐπυθόμην τὰ ὀνόματα, ἐπυθόμην δὲ καὶ ἀπάντων τῶν τριηκοσίων*, Hdt. 7.224). Whether Herodotus had or had not been able to retrieve all the names of the Three Hundred is an insoluble problem, touching on key questions, such as naming and non-naming practices, access to oral and written sources, and the role of catalogues and genealogies in his work. If we assume that he had retrieved all or some of the names, he must have done so through oral enquiry (*ἐπυθόμην* bears ‘oral’ overtones, but does not exclude other types of enquiry), or through consultation of written sources (e.g., an inscription on the Spartan acropolis or other record), or more likely through a combination of both.⁴⁷ An attractive suggestion is that Herodotus’ statement could have been the trace of a missing catalogue of the fallen, which existed in a previous version of his text, intended for performance in Sparta or other Doric cities in the Peloponnese and Magna Graecia.⁴⁸

However, as has been pointed out, ‘anonymity can be as effective a strategy as naming’,⁴⁹ and, independently of whether Herodotus had the names or not, what is of interest for our discussion is authorial agency and

⁴⁶ Cf. Carey (2019) 140–1.

⁴⁷ Paradiso (2011) for a good discussion of possibilities; more recently Vannicelli (2018). Herodotus’ claim is discussed in the light of Pausanias’ later statement (3.14.1) that he had seen a *stèle* in Sparta with the names of those who fought at Thermopylae inscribed on it. As has been persuasively argued (Low (2011) 6), the monument Pausanias saw in the Roman period most probably did not contain the original list of names.

⁴⁸ Ball (1976).

⁴⁹ Hornblower (2013) 30.

the way it is being proclaimed. In the narrative of the battle of Salamis a similar assertion is being made: ‘I could **list** the names of many Ionian trierarchs (ἔχω ... καταλέξαι) who captured Greek ships, but I will restrict myself to mentioning only two Samians’, accompanied by a justification of this decision (Hdt. 8.85.2–3). Herodotus’ more general habit to state omission of information has been noticed; catalogues of names of warriors and military forces are prominent examples (e.g., 7.96).⁵⁰ Catalogues of forces in the *Histories* point to the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships* in the *Iliad* in an obvious and specific manner, but catalogues in Herodotus more generally should be considered in the context of his selective interaction with the epic. For example, Leonidas’ genealogy is a small-scale catalogue, which reinforces the heroic-epic tenor of the Thermopylae episode. Yet it might be argued that a much longer catalogue of three hundred personal names and patronymics would have interrupted the historical narration substantially, by interposing a characteristically poetic-mythical means of narration in an obvious and overwhelming manner, which would have had important consequences for Herodotus’ work. Whilst being a powerful mnemonic act of performative-poetic potential, such a long list of names would have blurred the boundaries between poetry and prose far too much, dimming the distinctiveness of Herodotus’ historical narrative.

As in the Salamis passage (Hdt. 7.96.1), in the Thermopylae episode too it is as if the historical narrator says: ‘I could have cited these names had I chosen to, but I did not’. Knowing the names and not sharing them might appear mean-spirited, even ‘malicious’ (if we are to think of Plutarch and his attack against Herodotus on grounds of what he called ‘maliciousness’, κακοήθεια). But it is certain that this act secures the audience’s involvement in historical enquiry and the investigation of a series of questions, which are bound to emerge in perpetuity: What were the names of the fallen Three Hundred? Did the historian really have access to all, some, or none of those names? If he did, why might he have held these names back? Ancient audiences, especially in Sparta and the Dorian world, would have been tempted—and freer—to produce their own lists of the fallen, using resources of memory within their grasp (stories of private, family, or epichoric nature, or local written records; communicative or social memory, in Assmann’s categorisation).⁵¹ Modern audiences have different resources at their disposal to investigate questions of ancient prosopography and identities, such as databases of digitised ancient sources and software, where different levels of memory interlock in sophisticated ways. But in all cases questions about this authorial choice remain open.

⁵⁰ Lateiner (1989) 74–5; Darbo-Peschanski (2019) 166 on Hdt. 8.85.2–3, as departure from epic memory and *kleos*.

⁵¹ Cf. Hdt. 7.197 on Herodotus’ access to, and selection of, local history (ἐπιχώριον λόγον). On local memories, memorials, and histories see Thomas (2019).

The authorial twofold claim of knowing the names of the Three Hundred and not stating them unites these individual heroic deaths into a single heroic act of collective distinction and courage, which, together with the few named individuals in the episode, above all their illustrious leader, Leonidas, creates a *lieu de mémoire*, a distinct textual space of everlasting significance in the cultural memory of not only the Spartans but also the Greeks as a whole. At the same time Herodotus' deliberate anonymisation of the Three Hundred is a process of monumentalisation of his own work too, aiming to create a place for itself along with other cultural means and institutions of commemoration: statues and epitaphs, such as those mentioned by Herodotus, and works of literature before him, such as Simonides' poem.

The second instance is another case of monumentalisation and concerns the short anecdotal story of Dieneces, one of the Three Hundred. Amidst the anonymisation of the Three Hundred Spartans, Dieneces, by being one of the few Spartans to be named in the episode, is automatically placed in a conspicuous position. The anecdote is a piece of oral tradition (ἔπος, 7.226.1; φασί, 7.226.1, 226.2), which Herodotus selects among other stories about the battle and includes in his panhellenic narrative, saving it for posterity. According to this story, before the battle Dieneces was alerted by a non-Lacedaemonian (a man of Trachis) to the vast superiority of the Persian numbers in comparison with those of the Greeks at Thermopylae: if the Persians were to shoot their arrows all together, they could hide the sun. Dismissive of the Persian foe, Dieneces is said to have replied that if the Persians could hide the sun, so much the better, since the battle could take place in the shade (7.226). A story-telling statement by the historical narrator to his audience concludes the vignette: 'Such and similar words, it is said, that the Lacedaemonian Dieneces left behind as memorials' (ταῦτα ... καὶ ἄλλα τοιουτοτρόπα ἔπεά φασι Διηνέκεα τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον λιπέσθαι μνημόσυνα, 7.226.2).

The use of the word *mnēmosynon* in this episode has not escaped attention, in relation to the use of *ergon* in the *Histories* (appearing already in the proem ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θαυμαστά, *praef.*), written and oral media of posthumous commemoration, and Herodotus' Homeric intertextuality in the handling of individual and collective *kleos*.⁵² But the point must be pressed further, as it is remarkable that the structure *μνημόσνον/α (κατα)λείπεσθαι* ('leaving behind as memorial/s') is found nowhere else in the whole corpus of our sources until Late Antiquity, except for Herodotus, where it crops up several times.⁵³ The semantics of the phrase itself and even more so its uniqueness

⁵² Immerwahr (1960); Steiner (1994) 140–1; Pelling (2019) 203–4. Bakker (2002) 26–7: 'The desire to leave *mnēmosuna* is mirrored and answered by Herodotus' wish to record them as *erga megala apodekhthenta*'.

⁵³ Passages retrieved from *TLG* search. I have used square brackets for either the passages where the verb (κατα)λείπομαι is *not* used or for 2.135.3, where the semantically similar *μνημήμιον* features in the same structure: 1.185.1: μνημόσυνα ἐλίπετο; 186.1: μνημόσνον ...

in our sources throw into relief the agency of the character of Dienece and of the historical narrator in shaping collective memory.

Mnēmosynon in Herodotus is used more frequently for memorials of significant technological achievements and monumental architecture or sculpture. Such is the case of the painting and inscriptions which the Greek architect Mandrocles commissioned to commemorate his bridging of the Bosphorus for the Persian king Darius and had them dedicated to the Heraion in his native island of Samos (Hdt. 4.88.2, *bis*); one of the rare instances where the word stands alone, unaccompanied by (κατα)λείπεσθαι. Another example is the major technological innovations and construction works of the Egyptian queen Nitocris. This is the first time the phrase *μνημόσυνον* / *α* (κατα)λείπομαι appears in Herodotus, in a statement which also poses the question of memory in relation to the materiality/immateriality of historical discourse: ‘she left memorials which I will narrate’ (*μνημόσυνα ἐλίπετο τὰ ἐγὼ ἀπηγήσομαι*, 1.185.1).

But there are also a few cases in which the word *μνημόσυνον* is used for immaterial things or concepts. On the eve of the battle of Plataea, one of the Persians banqueters at the banquet taking place in Thebes (speaking in Greek (Ἑλλάδα γλώσσαν), as Herodotus notes) predicts the Persian disaster, wishing to leave his thoughts as memorials (*μνημόσυνά τοι γνώμης τῆς ἐμῆς καταλιπέσθαι θέλω*, Hdt. 9.16.2). Again, on the eve of the battle of Marathon, another major event in the collective memory of the Greeks, the idea of ‘leaving behind as memorial’ one’s own correct decision-making and immortal association with the freedom of Athens becomes part of the Miltiades’ rhetorical persuasion of the polemarch Callimachus to cast the correct vote, which would determine the fate of his city. Adding symbolic capital to strategic considerations, Miltiades brings the immortal memory of Harmodius and Aristogeiton into his argument (6.109.3):

The future of Athens lies in your hands now, Callimachus. You can either cast us down into slavery or win us our freedom—and thereby ensure that you will be remembered as long as there are people alive on this earth (*μνημόσυνον λιπέσθαι ἐς τὸν ἅπαντα ἀνθρώπων βίον*), with a higher reputation even than Harmodius and Aristogeiton.⁵⁴

ἐλίπετο; [2.101.2]; 2.110.1: *μνημόσυνα ... ἐλίπετο*; 2.121.1: *μνημόσυνα ἐλίπετο*; [2.135.3 *μνημῆμον ... καταλιπέσθαι*]; 2.136.3: *μνημόσυνον ... λιπέσθαι*; 2.148.1: *μνημόσυνα ... λιπέσθαι*; 4.81.6: *μνημόσυνον ... λιπέσθαι*; [4.88.2, *bis*]; 4.166.1: *μνημόσυνον ... λιπέσθαι*; 6.109.3: *μνημόσυνον λιπέσθαι*; 7.24: *μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι*; 7.227: *λιπέσθαι μνημόσυνα*; 9.16.2: *μνημόσυνα ... καταλιπέσθαι*.

⁵⁴ Trans. R. Waterfield. Hornblower–Pelling (2017) 247: ‘just as there will be material “memorials” dotted around the plain of Marathon and as Kallimachos will have his own monument on the Acropolis [...] Hdt.’s work will play its own part in such memorialising [...]. The middle *λιπέσθαι* emphasises “leaving for yourself”’.

It can be suggested that the role of the word *mnēmosynon* in the *Histories* is revelatory of memory's centrality to ethnicity: Dieneses' anecdote, the Persian symposiast's words spoken in Greek, and Miltiades' rhetoric are immaterial entities, related to the Greek struggles for freedom and self-determination. Among the memorable deeds of human history, Herodotus' selectivity juxtaposes the technological achievements and architectural sites of monumental scale associated with non-Greeks with the Greeks' immaterial achievements. The Greeks' monuments are memorable words and deeds, which are to be preserved and memorialised in his own historical narrative. It is the dissemination of the historical work through the cultural technology of writing and performance that will transform Dieneses' *epea* (in the phrase ἔπεα ... λιπέσθαι μνημόσυνα) from 'winged words' into a monument of panhellenic history, inscribing them into the collective memory and identity of the Greeks.⁵⁵ In this context the episode arguably functions as a sort of historiographic *sphragis* ('seal') of the author's ambition to deliver his work as a lasting memorial of history writing,⁵⁶ all the more so in an episode with strong epic tenor.

Like the word κλέος, the word ἔπος itself (repeated twice, framing the Dieneses vignette: Hdt. 7.226 and 227) is in obvious dialogue with Homer. In terms of speech-act patterning, the position of the story in the narrative before 'joining battle with the Mede' (7.226) bears resemblance to bravura utterances in the *Iliad* (boast speeches, in Martin's typology), by which the Homeric heroes, just like Dieneses, challenge the enemy and boost morale before entering battle.⁵⁷ Hector's threatening speech-act reported by Agamemnon (just as Dieneses' speech is reported by the historical narrator) is a case in point: 'I fear that mighty Hector may really make good his word (ἔπος) and the threats with which once he menaced us as he spoke among the Trojans, that he would not return to Ilios from the ships till he had burned the ships with fire and slain the men as well' (*Il.* 14.44–7). We first hear of the same threat from Hector himself in his exhortation to the Trojans, in which memory plays a key role: 'be men, my friends, and take thought of furious valour (μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς) [...] but whenever it is that I come close to the hollow ships, then see that consuming fire be not

⁵⁵ In the whole of the *TLG* corpus this is the only time that the combination of the words ἔπος and μνημόσυνον appears. On μνημόσυνον and (κατα)λείπομαι, see above n. 53.

⁵⁶ Bakker (2002) 30–1: 'Herodotus' first words thus become an implicit version of the *sphragis* of the corpus of Theognidean elegy'. On Theognis, see below, pp. xxxv–vii.

⁵⁷ Such threats (*apeilai*) are typical speech-acts of heroic discourse in the *Iliad*, discussed along with other categories of speeches in Martin (1989). Perhaps Martin's schema draws too rigid a distinction between *epos* and *mythos*, taking *mythos* to denote an authoritative speech-act and *epos* to designate any utterance in the *Iliad* (p. 46), both terms describing speech-acts (cf. Griffin (1991), for reservations).

forgotten (*μνημοσύνη τις ἔπειτα πῦρος δηΐοιο γενέσθω*) (*Il.* 8.174 and 181).⁵⁸ The word *mnēmosyne* appears in the *Iliad* only in this passage (*Il.* 8.181), as a common noun.⁵⁹ This is a poetic example which illustrates further the special connection between memory (*mnēm-*) and the act of narration, suggested above. Suffice it to remember the Homeric narrator's repeated invocations of the Muses, daughters of Mnemosyne, as (re)sources of memory and inspiration, and guarantors of every bard's everlasting glory (*kleos*).⁶⁰

Both Hector's and Dienece's utterances precede illustrious heroic action in battle which follows immediately afterwards (cf. *Hdt.* 7.226.1, 'It is said that before he joined battle with the Medes [Dienece] said these words'): "word" and "deed" becomes a merismus, expressing an ideal totality by reference to the extremes which shape it'.⁶¹ The Iliadic 'speaker of words and doer of deeds' (*μύθων τε ῥητῆρ' ἔμειναι προκητῆρά τε ἔργων*, *Il.* 9.443) fits Dienece's heroic character, as he is one of the Three Hundred Spartans who fell on the battlefield, remaining steadfast in the commands they had received. The epitaph commemorating their death celebrates consistency between word and deed too: 'Stranger, tell the people of Lacedaemon | that we who lie here obeyed their commands' (*ῥήμασι*, *Hdt.* 7.228.2). This was one of the three funerary epigrams inscribed on *stelai* erected sometime after the events to commemorate the dead at Thermopylae, together with architectural structures and physical forms, such as Leonidas' lion statue (still

⁵⁸ For the Homeric *μνήσαθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς* as a call to action, see Castagnoli–Ceccarelli (2019) 4 ('prospective memory'). Dodds' discussion of the verb *οἶδα* ('know') and *νόος* ('mind' or 'heart') explores the relationship between action, cognition, and ethics, 'explaining character or behaviour in terms of knowledge' (Dodds (1951) 16): e.g., *Il.* 24.41: *λέων δ' ὡς ἄγρια οἶδεν* 'knows wild things like a lion' (cf. *Il.* 16.72–3: *εἴ μοι ... ἦπια εἰδέειη* 'if he had a kindly mind (or: *understanding*) towards me'); *Il.* 16.35: *νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνῆς* 'a merciless *understanding*'. The knowledge-based approach to character and action prompts an analogy with Hector's *μνήσαθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς* as cognitive-based action, informed by memory and heroic ethics.

⁵⁹ The word also appears in the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes* as the mother of the Muses (line 429); see also above, p. xxi; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 54. But 'remembering' as a verb (*μυμνήσκω/ομαι*) is very frequent in Homer: see Martin (1989) 78ff. on its semantics in the *Iliad*, especially in speeches, with reference to the work of J.-P. Vernant and M. Detienne, on 'the interactions among Greek notions of memory, persuasion, truth and time' (78 n. 55).

⁶⁰ Nagy (1996a) 126: '*mnē-* [...] means not just "remember" but something like "narrate from memory"', connecting it with mythical thought, as an 'essence of being [...] beyond sensible reality' and a truth which is mastered by the poet. 'Mnemosyne' has had huge transferrable potential and resonance in later periods, like the Trojan myth and the Homeric text itself. We may recall Aby Warburg's (1866–1929) *Mnemosyne Atlas*, a work of iconographic memory, meant to represent art as a mnemonic record of complex 'exchanges' and 'migrations'. On Warburg's importance for social memory, see Gombrich (1970) (referring to Warburg as 'a theorist of social memory'), in Olick, et al. (2011) 104–9.

⁶¹ Martin (1989) 27. Definition of 'merismus' in *OED*: a form of synecdoche in which two (or, in early use, sometimes more) contrasting or complementary parts are made to represent the whole.

standing in place in Herodotus' time: 7.225.2). As in his narration of the 'memorials' (*μνημόσυνα*) that the Egyptian queen Nitocris had left behind (see above, p. xxvi), in the Thermopylae episode Herodotus inscribed words, deeds, and monuments into cultural memory. The materiality of his written account—the materialisation of his own aim to 'leave behind words as memorials' (*ἔπεα λιπέσθαι μνημόσυνα*)—proved more resilient than the materiality of inscribed monuments.⁶²

6. Memory and Praise: Isocrates' *Evagoras*

The superiority of speeches in relation to other media of commemoration is an overarching idea in Isocrates' *Evagoras*, a prose encomium (speech of praise) that belongs to the genre of panegyric (epideictic) oratory. In the speech Isocrates claims to have been a pioneer of prose praise (9.8), and indeed *Evagoras* is the earliest prose encomium surviving in our sources, though not the earliest one known to us (Arist. *Rhet.* 1368a17). The speech was written and delivered soon after the death of Evagoras, king of Salamis in Cyprus, in 374 BC, as part of the memorial event-festival organised in honour of the dead king by his son Nicocles, who succeeded him to the throne.⁶³ Let us take a closer look at the opening paragraphs (9.1–4).⁶⁴

[1] ὄρων, ὦ Νικόκλεις, τιμῶντά σε τὸν τάφον τοῦ πατρὸς οὐ μόνον τῷ πλήθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει τῶν ἐπιφερομένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ χοροῖς καὶ μουσικῇ καὶ γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν, ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τούτοις ἵππων τε καὶ τριήρων ἀμίλλαις, καὶ λείποντ' οὐδεμίαν τῶν τοιούτων ὑπερβολήν, [2] ἡγησάμην Εὐαγόραν, εἴ τίς ἐστιν αἴσθησις τοῖς τετελευτηκόσι περὶ τῶν ἐνθάδε γιγνομένων, **εὐμενῶς μὲν ἀποδέχεσθαι** καὶ ταῦτα, καὶ **χαίρειν** ὄρωντα τὴν τε περὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τὴν σὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν, **πολὺ δ' ἂν ἔτι πλείω** χάριν ἔχειν ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἄπασιν, εἴ τις δυνηθείη **περὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν κινδύνων ἀξίως διελθεῖν τῶν ἐκείνῳ πεπραγμένων** [3] εὐρήσομεν γὰρ τοὺς φιλοτίμους καὶ μεγαλοψύχους τῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐ μόνον ἀντὶ τῶν τοιούτων **ἐπαινεῖσθαι** βουλομένους, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τοῦ **ζῆν ἀποθνήσκειν εὐκλεῶς αἰρουμένους**, καὶ μᾶλλον **περὶ τῆς δόξης** ἢ τοῦ βίου σπουδάζοντας, καὶ

⁶² On the materiality of texts, see Petrovic–Petrovic–Thomas (2018); S. West (1985) on Herodotus' use of inscriptions.

⁶³ Attack (2020) 123 situates this and the other two related Cypriot orations of Isocrates (*Nicocles* and *Ad Nicoclem*) in the context of the Greek discourse of monarchy, also identifying intellectual and generic interactions. On the speech, see E. Alexiou (2015), with further bibliography; id. (2010); Too ap. Mirhady–Too (2000) 139–40; Gera (1993) 7; Race (1987), on Isocrates' debt to Pindar. On 'tools' of memorialisation and heroization in the fourth century BC, see Ferrario (2014).

⁶⁴ For the translation of the *Evagoras*, I have used Too ap. Mirhady–Too (2000) and Van Hook (1945).

πάντα ποιούντας, ὅπως ἀθάνατον τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν μνήμην καταλείψουσιν.
 [4] αἱ μὲν οὖν δαπάναι τῶν μὲν τοιούτων οὐδὲν ἐξεργάζονται, τοῦ δὲ
 πλούτου σημείον εἰσιν· οἱ δὲ περὶ τὴν μουσικὴν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀγωνίας
 ὄντες, οἱ μὲν τὰς δυνάμεις τὰς αὐτῶν, οἱ δὲ τὰς τέχνας ἐπιδειξάμενοι, σφᾶς
 αὐτοὺς ἐντιμότερους κατέστησαν· ὁ δὲ λόγος εἰ καλῶς διέλθοι τὰς ἐκείνου
 πράξεις, αἰμίμηστον ἂν τὴν ἀρετὴν τὴν Εὐαγόρου παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις
 ποιήσειεν.

[1] Nicocles, as I saw you honour your father's tomb not only with a multitude of beautiful gifts, dances, songs, and gymnastic contests, and in addition, with competitions involving horses and triremes, leaving no room for anyone to outdo you in these matters, [2] I thought that, if the dead know anything about what occurs here, Evagoras **gladly receives** these tributes and **rejoices** in seeing your concern for him and your lavish expenditure, **but he would be thankful above all else** if someone could give **a deserving account of his activities and of the dangers he undertook**. [3] We shall discover that ambitious and noble men not only wish to be praised for such things but that **they prefer to die gloriously rather than to live**, that they are concerned about honour rather than livelihood, and that they do everything possible to leave behind an **immortal memory** of themselves. [4] Expenditures produce none of these things but are (merely) a sign of wealth. Those who participate in music and other contests—some demonstrating their powers, others their skills—gain more recognition for themselves. **But a fine speech that recounts Evagoras' deeds would make his excellence ever-remembered among all men.**

The proem is structured as a double *priamel* (1–2 and 3–4), a rhetorical figure where one element is extolled by comparison to others, through a paratactic order (A, B, C are good, but D is even better/the best; Pind. *Ol.* 1.1–7 is a poetic example). The commemorative event comprised athletics, choral and musical performances, chariot-races, naval competitions involving triremes, religious rituals with offerings, organised with care to the utmost degree, and all the indicia of royal magnificence. But what is presented as a superior and novel medium of memorialisation is a speech praising the achievements, thoughts, and character of Evagoras ('but [...] a deserving account', 2; and 'but a fine speech', 4). The postulated emotions (pleasure and gratitude) of the dead king as a result of the honours bestowed on him by his living son relate to a wider theme in ancient Greek literature, namely, the communication of the world of the dead with the world of the living, a sense that 'the ancestors are watching'.⁶⁵ The speech is singled out as the best

⁶⁵ For the glory bestowed to dead ancestors through the illustrious deeds of the living, see Alcibiades' speech in Thuc. 6.16.1 (in relation to his Olympic victories; cf. Archidamus

means by which the deeds and career of the dead king can be immortalised (ἀείμνηστον τὴν ἀρετὴν, 9.4; cf. 40, 74), through the artistry of the orator, thus providing the dead with the greatest pleasure.

In the proem of the *Evagoras*, men of ambition and nobility are identified as key recipients of this lesson of statesmanship and morality. Among these men are also Evagoras' son, Nicocles, and Nicocles' own sons, who are urged to study and imitate the virtues of Evagoras and follow his example (Isoc. 9.35, 76–7)—that of a king who had 'preferred to die gloriously (ἀποθνήσκειν εὐκλεῶς) rather than to live' (9.3).⁶⁶ A similar desire is expressed by Hector in his prayer to Zeus, when Hector wishes that his son continue his father's royal dynasty among the Trojans, surpassing him in excellence (*Il.* 6.476–81). And in the Thermopylae episode a glorious-death event is the ground for praising Leonidas and the Three Hundred. A glorious death is the ticket to posthumous fame and praise, and such an exit from life would have befitted Evagoras' life and career. Yet as we know from Diodorus (15.47.8), Evagoras' death was anything but noble or heroic, as he was killed by a eunuch who had organised a plot against the king, and for this reason we get no mention of the king's death in the speech, as we would have expected ('eulogistic obscurity').⁶⁷

The hybrid quality of the *Evagoras*, combining the epideictic-funerary and the didactic dimensions, are reminiscent of earlier rhetorical experiments, such as Thucydides' Funeral Oration. That speech is a eulogy of the anonymous Athenian soldiers who died in the first year of the Peloponnesian War (431–430 BC), and, like Isocrates' rhetorical experiment, it too innovates in that it is not so much a eulogy of the fallen, as of the Athenian democratic constitution and way of life. In that speech the word *kleos* makes two of its four appearances in the whole of Thucydides (see above), and words related to memory (*mnēm-*) abound, as for example in the phrase ('glory eternally remembered' δόξα ... αἰείμνηστος καταλείπεται, Thuc. 2.43.2). In the Funeral Oration and other speeches put in the mouth of Pericles (cf. 'posterity will remember' μνήμη καταλείψεται, 2.64.3), memory is part of a nationalistic discourse, aiming to boost morale and create a sense of superiority and distinctiveness of the Athenians vis-à-vis the Spartans, the main enemy in a destructive war among the Greeks.⁶⁸

in Thuc. 2.11.9), with Hornblower's note (*CT* III.342) on Thuc. 6.16.1, about 'messages to the underworld' and poetic analogies (e.g., Pind. *Ol.* 14.20–5; *Ol.* 8.77–84; *Pyth.* 5.98–103).

⁶⁶ Marincola (2014), on the historical function and value of *exempla* in Isocrates. To what extent Nicocles was indeed a virtuous and just ruler as described in Isocrates' encomium is unknown. External sources point to the rather default portrait-stereotype of the oriental despot with a taste for excess and debauchery (e.g., Theopompus, *FGH Hist* 115 F 114; see Maier (1994) 328).

⁶⁷ E. Alexiou (2010) 47–8; Cannavò (2015) 235–6.

⁶⁸ For a comparison between Thucydides' Funeral Oration and Isocrates' *Evagoras* concerning the combination of lament and consolation, see E. Alexiou (2010) 31.

If democracy provided the ideological and constitutional framework for the Athenians' collective elitism and politics of hegemony, in fourth-century BC Cyprus, it was Evagoras' enlightened kingship, according to Isocrates' speech, that provided the constitutional and ideological framework of the promotion of Hellenic identity and 'freedom from barbarism', as unifying factors for the mixed ethnic and cultural environment of the island (consisting of Persian, Phoenician, and indigenous-Eteocypriot elements). Evagoras was a successful local ruler (often called a 'tyrant' in the speech, E.g. Isoc. 9.32, 34) with claims of Greek nobility rooted in myth, who managed to install himself to the kingdom of Salamis and in a short period of time present the Persian king with the threat of a unified Cyprus under his rule.⁶⁹ The figure of the wise king is an overarching theme in Greek literature from Homer onwards, and in the *Evagoras* kingship is called 'the greatest, noblest, and most intensely coveted of divine and mortal goods' (9.40). The orator's claim that 'this man possessed it in the finest way' is also a way of returning to the theme of the 'fine speech' of the proem: 'which poet or inventor of speeches could find praise worthy of his actions?' (τὸν δὴ τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ὄντων κάλλιστα κτησάμενον τίς ἂν ἢ ποιητῆς ἢ λόγων εὐρετῆς ἀξίως τῶν πεπραγμένων ἐπαινέσειεν; 9.40; see also Isoc. *To Philip* 5.144 for the same pairing of poets with inventors of speeches).

As an inventor of speeches, while being occupied with praise just like the poets, in fact taking the baton from them, Isocrates proclaimed his distance from them (E.g. 'such devices do not exist for prose writers', 9.10), who in the same passage are referred to as 'attracting and guiding the souls of their listeners' (ψυχαγωγῶσι τοὺς ἀκούοντας). Proclaiming distance from the poets, while at the same time doing the same as them, is a wider strategy of prose genres, employed by the Greek historians too. Typical examples are Thucydides and Polybius, who, often in programmatic passages, underscore the didactic value of their works, in practical and moral terms, presenting them as historical lessons, meant to be juxtaposed to the emotionality and pleasure of poetic genres.⁷⁰ But like the historians, Isocrates too has affinities with the themes and tropes of poetry, and especially the epinician.

Myth and its comparative potential are important mechanisms of two coordinated functions: praise and historical interpretation; the *Evagoras* is no exception. The mythicisation of historical events and personalities, such as Cyrus the Great and Evagoras himself (9.37–9) is a feature shared with

⁶⁹ It is notoriously difficult to identify the meaning of *τύραννος* and *τυραννίς* in Greek political vocabulary. Evagoras' noble genealogy bears overtones of divine legitimation to power typical of kings (cf. τὸ μὲν παλαιὸν ἀπὸ Διός, Isoc. 9.81). Cf. D.S. 14.98, using *ἐβασίλευσε* for Evagoras' accession to the kingdom of Salamis first and then to the rest of Cyprus. Atack (2020) 132 draws a comparison with the mythical king of Athens Theseus, noting that tyrant might be a more accurate classification. For the history of Cyprus in the years of Evagoras' reign, see Maier (1994) 312–16.

⁷⁰ Marincola (2014), on Isocrates' relationship to rhetoric and historiography.

poetry.⁷¹ The presentation of Evagoras' achievements is poised between the danger of appearing to exaggerate (*μείζω λέγων* (48); cf. the reference to *hyperbolē* in the proem, 9.1) and the need for proof, according to the conventions of rhetoric (*μέγιστον τεκμήριον*, 51). In Cyprus' turbulent history in the fourth century BC and its complicated geopolitics, the presentation of Evagoras' effective leadership, and his military successes against the Great King, border on the realm of myth: 'The most marvellous thing of all is that the city, which Evagoras had taken from another despot with fifty men, could not be defeated by the Great King who had so much power' (9.64). The orator wonders: 'Which of the heroes will be found to have accomplished such deeds if we take away the myths (*μύθους*) and examine the truth (*ἀλήθειαν*)?' (9.66). Evagoras and his greatness are taken to have been responsible for the 'everlasting fame of the Cypriot war', as Evagoras' efforts to unify the island under his rule are named, adding grandeur (*ἀείμνηστον γεγενῆσθαι τὸν πόλεμον τὸν περὶ Κύπρον*, 9.67): this is the second (and last) time the word *ἀείμνηστος* appears in the *Evagoras* after the proem (see above).

The process of mythicisation of the Greek struggles for freedom and self-determination against the Persian Empire is a distinctive feature of the literary and visual narratives of the Greeks, immediately after their victory at Plataea marking the end of the wars (479 BC), which shaped the Greeks' collective memory and sense of identity. Within just a hundred years, that is, about the time when *Evagoras* was delivered, the heroic status and fame (*kleos*) of figures who played a leading role in battles against the Persians were hardly distinguishable from that of the Homeric Achilles.⁷² In the *Evagoras*, Achilles is not just part of the 'default' comparative background of mythical heroes, typical of contexts of praise, but he is a kinsman of Evagoras and his royal house, who claimed descent from Teucer, mythical oikist of Salamis in Cyprus, named after Salamis off the shores of Attica. According to myth, Teucer was brother of the Greater Ajax, son of Telamon, brother of Peleus, Achilles' father (9.12–19).

At the end of the *Evagoras* (73–5), the orator returns to the 'skillfully produced speeches' and the overarching idea, launched in the proem, that speeches are superior media of memory, juxtaposing statues and speeches/words: 'while effigies of the body are fine memorials (*μνημεῖα*), yet likenesses of deeds (*πράξεων*) and of the character (*διανοίας*) are of far greater value, and these are to be observed only in discourses composed according

⁷¹ On the interaction of myth and history in Evagoras' praise, see Atack (2020) 132–4. Evagoras is deemed to have been the most noble, splendid, and pious of all mortals, demi-gods, and gods, who have ever held royalty (Isoc. 9.39). The tripartite division of all beings into mortals, demi-gods (or heroes), and gods is typical of both prose and poetic contexts of praise: e.g., Pind. *Ol.* 2.2: *τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν*; Antiph. 1.27: *οὔτε θεοὺς οὔθ' ἥρωας οὔτ' ἀνθρώπους*, with E. Alexiou (2010) 123.

⁷² On the ideological and cultural impact of the Persian Wars from the fifth century BC onwards, see Bridges–Hall–Rhodes (2007).

to the rules of art' (*ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ... τοῖς τεχνικῶς ἔχουσι*) (73–4). Then we are presented with the reasons for which speeches are to be preferred to statues. The first reason is that 'honourable men (*καλοὶ κάγαθοί*) pride themselves not so much on bodily beauty as they desire to be honoured for their deeds (*ἔργοις*) and their wisdom (*γνώμη*)' (74). The second reason relates to the speeches' ability to travel far and wide (*ἐξενεχθῆναι*) in Greece (*εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα*) and be disseminated (*διαδοθέντας*) in gatherings of men of good sense (*ἐν ταῖς τῶν φρονούντων διατριβαῖς*);⁷³ the mobility of word (oral and written) points to the didactic dimension of prose praise and the elite environment of the symposium, where such speeches were circulated and performed, further anchoring the speech and its subject of praise, a Cypriot dynast, into the cultural and institutional framework of Greece.⁷⁴ A further advantage of the speeches is that they afford the possibility of imitation of the character and thoughts of those who are represented in them, whereas no one is able to make their own body resemble a statue or a painting. Imitation is another aspect reminiscent of the performative potential of speeches, and, through it, their ability to instruct.

The question of materiality and immateriality of media of memory, and the difficulty in drawing a sharp line between written and oral word, reverberates in Herodotus' 'leaving behind memorials' (*μνημόσυνον / α καταλείπομαι*), as we saw. Thucydides' famous aspiration to deliver his work as 'an everlasting possession' (*κτῆμά ἐς αἰεὶ*, 1.22.4) arguably evokes a literary monument or 'memorial', and has been situated also in poetic contexts where literature is monumentalised, such as Horace's 'more lasting than bronze my monument shall be ... I shall not wholly die' (*Odes* 3.30.1–6) and Pindar's 'a Pythian victor's treasury of songs has been built' (*Pyth.* 6.6–7).⁷⁵

The contrast between static statues and mobile speeches in Isocrates' *Evagoras* travelling through space is surely reminiscent of a similar contrast between statues and song, in the opening of Pindar's *Nemean* 5, praising the victory of a boy pancratiast, Pytheas of Aegina:⁷⁶

*οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργάζεσθαι ἀγάλματ'
ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος*

⁷³ E. Alexiou (2010) *ad loc.* notes that *διαδοθέντας* (< *διαδιδόναι*) suggests some form of publication of Isocrates' speeches (as does *ἐκδιδόναι*). I think 'disseminated' is a safer translation, also encompassing semantic overtones of *ἐκδιδόναι*. Van Hook (1945) translates *διαδοθέντας* as 'having been spread', Too ap. Mirhady–Too (2000) as 'published'.

⁷⁴ The Greek struggles against the Persians in the fifth century were a *topos* of praise in rhetorical exercises, public orations, or display speeches that were to continue into Roman Imperial times. See, e.g., Vasunia (2003) on Plutarch's *On the Glory of the Athenians*, where Isocrates makes an appearance being preoccupied with writing artful speeches on Athens' 'glorious past'.

⁷⁵ Moles (1999), esp. 33–7.

⁷⁶ E. Alexiou (2010) 177.

ἔσταότ'· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας ὀλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ, γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά,
 στείχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ', ὅτι
 Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενῆς
 νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον ...

I am not a sculptor, so as to fashion stationary statues that stand on
 their same base.

Rather, on board every ship and in every boat, sweet song,
 go forth from Aigina and spread the news that

Lampon's mighty son Pytheas

has won the crown for the pancratium in Nemea's games ...

(*Nem.* 5. 1–5; trans. W. H. Race)

Like Isocrates' prose encomium, in Pindar's *Ode* the statues, standing heavy on the restricted and concrete space of their pedestals, are contrasted with the mobility and immateriality of 'sweet song' which travels through space on the watery paths of the sea.⁷⁷ The empowering effect of song through its ability to travel over the sea securing the eternal memory of mortal men is also found in the elegiac verses of Theognis of Megara (237–52):⁷⁸

σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ πτέρ' ἔδωκα, σὺν οἷσ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον
 πωτήσῃ, κατὰ γῆν πᾶσαν ἀειρόμενος
 ῥηϊδίως· θοίνης δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνησι παρέσση
 ἐν πάσαις πολλῶν κείμενος ἐν στόμασιν,
 καὶ σε σὺν αὐλίσκοισι λιγυφθόγγοις νέοι ἄνδρες
 εὐκόσμως ἐρατοὶ καλά τε καὶ λιγέα
 ἄσσονται. καὶ ὅταν δνοφερῆς ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης
 βῆς πολυκωκύτους εἰς Ἄϊδαο δόμους,
 οὐδέποτ' οὐδὲ θανῶν ἀπολείς κλέος, ἀλλὰ μελήσεις
ἄφθιτον ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων ὄνομα,
 Κύρνε, καθ' Ἑλλάδα γῆν στρωφόμενος, ἦδ' ἀνὰ νήσους
 ἰχθυόεντα περῶν πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον,
 οὐχ ἵππων νώτοισιν ἐφήμενος· ἀλλὰ σε πέμφει
 ἀγλαὰ Μουσάων δῶρα ἰοστεφάνων.
 πᾶσι δ', ὅσοισι μέμηλε, καὶ ἐσσομένοισιν ἀοιδή
 ἔσση ὁμῶς, ὄφρ' ἂν γῆ τε καὶ ἥλιος.

⁷⁷ The 'song as journey' can be found in the poetic motif of song-path (*οἴμη*); cf. Agócs, below, pp. 94–5.

⁷⁸ Hunter and Rutherford (2009) 7: 'The itinerancy, both real and imagined, of poets is intimately tied to the ambitions of and for their poetry to enjoy fame and reception all over the world. Theognis' claim to his beloved Kyrnos is perhaps the most celebrated instance of this idea'. The problems of the Theognidean collection (*syllogē*) are many, but do not affect my point: Hubbard (2007), with further bibliography.

I have given you wings with which you will fly, soaring easily, over the boundless sea and all the land. You will be present at every dinner and feast, lying on the lips of many, and lovely youths accompanied by the clear sounds of pipes will sing of you in orderly fashion with beautiful, clear voices. And whenever you go to Hades' house of wailing, down in the dark earth's depths, never even in death will you lose your fame, but you will be in men's thoughts, your name ever immortal, Cynrus, as you roam throughout the land of Greece and among the islands, crossing over the fish-filled, undraining(?) sea, not riding on the backs of horses, but it is the splendid gifts of the violet-wreathed Muses that will escort you. For all who care about their gifts, even for future generations, you will be alike the subject of song, as long as earth and sun exist.

(trans. D. E. Gerber)

The educational-erotic atmosphere of symposium is unmissable in these lines, evoking an aristocratic code of heroism and male homoerotic intimacy. But the Theognidean corpus, and elegy more generally, is also preoccupied with wisdom and advice related to the public sphere (27-32):⁷⁹

σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ εὖ φρονέων ὑποθήσομαι, οἷά περ αὐτός,
 Κύρν', ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν παῖς ἔτ' ἐὼν ἔμαθον·
 πέπνυσο, μηδ' αἰσχροῖσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασι μηδ' ἀδίκουσιν
 τιμὰς μηδ' ἀρετὰς ἔλκεο μηδ' ἄφενος.

It is with kind thoughts for you that I shall give you advice such as I myself, Cynrus, learned from noble men while still a child. Be sensible and do not, at the cost of shameful or unjust acts, seize for yourself prestige, success, or wealth. (Gerber, tr.)

These lines come from an earlier elegy of the sequence of Cynrus-poetry (19–30), which has attracted much attention, because they are related to the problem of the authenticity of the 1,400 lines of the corpus, and the question of the relationship between oral and written form and transmission. It contains what is known as the *sphragis* ('seal'), where the poet has included his name in a gesture of securing immortalisation. The possibility of the poet's identity being forgotten appears to be no option in these assertive lines (*λήσει δ' οὐποτε*), emphatically hammering home the poet's aspiration by *οὐδέ τις, πᾶς τις, πάντας* (19–22):

Κύρνε, σοφιζομένῳ μὲν ἐμοὶ σφρηγὶς ἐπικείσθω
 τοῖσδ' ἔπεσιν, λήσει δ' οὐποτε κλεπτόμενα,
 οὐδέ τις ἀλλάξει κάκιον τοῦσθλοῦ παρεόντος,

⁷⁹ Bowie (1986) for elegy's potential contexts of performance.

ὦδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἔρεῦ· Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη
τοῦ Μεγαρέως· πάντας δὲ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός'.

For me, a skilled and wise poet, let a seal, Cyrnus, be placed on these verses. Their theft **will never** pass unnoticed, nor **will anyone** take something worse in exchange when that which is good is at hand, but **everyone** will say, 'They are the verses of Theognis of Megara, and he is famous **among all men**'. (Gerber, tr.)

In general, oral poetry is associated more easily with performance, rather than written compositions, which tend to be associated with reading. Theognis' 'seal' is certainly a nod to the written medium and its own power of transmission and crystallisation. But the poet's use of the cultural technology of writing and its possibilities should not be taken to suggest a dichotomy between the written and oral modes of wisdom and their performative potential. Symptotic contexts illustrate well the co-existence and harmonious combination of oral and written word: 'Every aristocratic male who sits on a banquet couch reciting one of these elegies becomes another Theognis, and the handsome youth beside him becomes another Cyrnus'.⁸⁰ Ethical and political wisdom were transmitted and performed in such contexts over a considerable span of time from the archaic period until the Late Antiquity, accommodating both poetry and prose. Fourth-century *Evagoras* belonged to this long tradition of performed wisdom, characteristic of symptotic contexts. It was a polished funeral panegyric, aiming to 'disseminate' its political and ethical advice 'in gatherings of men of good sense' and among 'noble men' (9.74).

In practice mobility/immobility and materiality/immateriality are qualities shared by most media of memory which have come down to us from antiquity. The literary texts and inscriptions that we possess have travelled a long distance in space and time, before they come to our hands, often in very fragmentary states; and part of our job is to fill in the gaps with the help of other materials from the past and modern methodologies. The same applies to ancient statues, objects of art or everyday use, and architectural structures: they survive in fragments or in reconstructed or severely damaged states, most of them detached from their physical and social contexts, having travelled from one location or museum collection to another. The most monumental structures among them, if they manage to survive war and natural or other disasters, travel in their viewers' travel logs, drawings, paintings, photographs and videos. Last but not least digitisation has helped texts and objects to travel long distances virtually and be shared simultaneously by individuals and communities of experts and others, often in interactive and global environments. The advent of the World Wide Web

⁸⁰ Hubbard (2007) 212.

(www) in the mid-1990s has created a globally interconnected world, adding new dimensions to the memory of the past and its reception. It has revolutionised the tools and methodologies of intertextuality and provided new understandings and experiences of mobility/immobility and materiality/immateriality.

7. The Present Volume

Epic and historiography as ‘literature of suffering’⁸¹ is the subject of Pelling and Fragoulaki, who concentrate on the historians’ debt to Homer in shaping memory. Pelling (Ch. 1) explores the complexities of causation in the Greek historians and their Homeric blueprints, with special attention to speech-exchanges in Homer, their societal background, and the intersection of the divine and human levels in the epic. Central to Pelling’s discussion is the acknowledgement that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* reverberated with a web of stories with which Homer’s initial audiences construed meanings. These echoes went beyond verbal similarities to encompass themes and plot. Pelling demonstrates that such an acknowledgement is useful for the study of the historians’ debt to Homer, and can be referred to as a broadened sense of intertextuality. Through a similar approach to a broadened sense of ‘text’, Fragoulaki (Ch. 2) turns the focus to a specific piece of literature of suffering, the episode of Mycalessus in Thucydides (7.29–30), as Thucydides’ nod to Homer. This nod, it is argued, was more intelligible to fifth-century audiences, who were steeped in what is called the ‘Homeric experience’, that is, the audience’s familiarity with the Homeric texts as living tradition and culture, through interlocking performative, mythological, religious-cultic, and educational contexts. Modern audiences’ relationship with Homer and Thucydides is a very different one and, it is suggested, so is their perception of Thucydides’ Homeric interactions. Narratives of identity (Greek/non-Greek, panhellenic/local) are important parameters in this intertextual quest of memory.

Myth and identity are central to *ktisis* (‘foundation’) stories, the theme of Agócs’ and Baragwanath’s chapters, which concentrate on the foundation story of Cyrene in north Africa and its two major narratives in our sources: a victory ode (a choral poem) (Agócs on Pindar’s *Pythian 4*), and a piece of historical prose (Baragwanath on the Libyan *logos* in Herodotus’ *Histories*). Agócs (Ch. 3) explores the relationship between poetic form and political ideology and what has been called the ‘alliance between power and memory’.⁸² He does this through a close narratological reading of Pindar’s *Pythian 4*, contextualised in pre- and post-Pindaric sources and modern anthropological theory on oral traditions. Agócs argues for oral-tradition tropes, also suggesting that a vista of divine intention behind Cyrene’s

⁸¹ Pelling, below, p. 26.

⁸² Baragwanath, below, p. 88.

history, conjured up by the poem's configuration of mythistorical strata, can be helpfully illuminated by biblical hermeneutics and the concept of 'typology'.

Baragwanath (Ch. 4) concentrates on the close connection of ethnography and historical narrative in Herodotus' *Histories*, showing the deep embeddedness of the Libyan *logos* in the *Histories* (4.145–205) and the section's contribution to Herodotus' probing of cause and responsibility. Discussion of related concepts, such as blame, vengeance, justice, punishment, and gender norms offer further opportunities to observe Herodotus' interaction with the world of the epic and his 'work's dialogic and culturally relativistic program'⁸³ by challenging the opposition between 'Greeks' and 'barbarians'. Ethnography as a tool of historical explanation is shown to be a major means by which Herodotus embeds his work in Greek cultural memory.

Ethnography is the focus of Skinner's discussion (Ch. 5) too, of shared memories, juxtapositions, and the co-existence of 'Self' and 'Other'. Skinner advocates for the methodological need to cross generic and epistemological boundaries, also touching on overarching themes of the present volume, such as the interconnectedness between myth and history, and the close relationship between history, ethnography, and geography. A variety of extant and fragmentary narratives of the past—textual and material—are selectively cross-examined, against theories of identity (Homi K. Bhabha on hybridity, and Stuart Hall on fluidity and relativity/positioning). Herodotus' diffused world and ethnographic material, poetry (not least Homer and epinician), and inscriptions play an important role in this holistic approach of the 'culture work',⁸⁴ constitutive of Greek self-consciousness in the culturally dynamic environment of the Graeco-Roman Mediterranean.

Low and Shear turn the focus to a specific city, Athens, and the role of inscriptions in (re)shaping collective memory. Both discussions reveal the interplay between the static and fixed nature of inscribed monuments, at least at the time of their erection, and their fluid and malleable nature, when one follows their 'adventures': their mental travels through the eyes of the beholders and the travels of the inscribed monuments themselves in time and space. Low (Ch. 6) discusses a number of inscriptions from classical Athens, concentrating on practices of destruction, erasure, and reconstruction, reflecting the Athenians' changing views of the past. Important questions in Low's treatment are the negotiation of individual and collective memories within Athens' democratic decision-making, and the relationship between written and unwritten memory. As Low shows, literary texts are important for the exploration of these questions. In the final chapter of the volume (Ch. 7) Shear concentrates on a specific inscription from Hellenistic Athens, namely the honorary decree of Phaedrus of Sphettus (*IG II² 682*), unravelling

⁸³ Below, p. 157.

⁸⁴ Below, p. 190.

the complexities of an erasure made on the inscription (a case of *damnatio memoriae*). This action is discussed in detail in the light of the Athenians' complicated history in the third century BC and their change of heart towards the Antigonids in *c.* 200 BC. The inscribed monument's position in the commemorative space of the city and its juxtaposition with other monuments are important parameters in both Shear's and Low's epigraphic discussions.

Bibliography

- Alexiou, E. (2010) *Der Euagoras des Isokrates : Ein Kommentar* (Berlin and New York).
- (2015) ‘The Rhetoric of Isocrates’ *Evagoras: History, Ethics, and Politics*, in Bouchet and Jovannelli-Jouanna (2015) 47–61.
- Alexiou, M. (2002) *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*², revised ed. by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos (Lanham, Md.).
- Asheri, D., A. Lloyd, and A. Corcella (2007) *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV* (Oxford).
- Assmann, J. (1995) ‘Collective Memory and Cultural Identity’, *New German Critique* 65: 125–33.
- (2008) ‘Communicative and Cultural Memory’, in Erll–Nünning (2008) 109–18.
- Atack, C. (2020) *The Discourse of Kingship in Classical Greece* (London and New York).
- Bakker, E. J. (2002) ‘The Making of History: Herodotus’ *Apodexis*’, in id., I. J. F. de Jong, and H. Van Wees, edd., *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne) 3–32.
- (2005) *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics* (Hellenic Studies 12; Washington, DC): <https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/5165.egbert-j-bakker-pointing-at-the-past-from-formula-to-performance-in-homeric-poetics>
- Ball, R. (1976) ‘Herodotus’ List of the Spartans Who Died at Thermopylae’, *Museum Africum* 5: 1–8.
- Boedeker, D. (2003) ‘Pedestrian Fatalities: The Prosaics of Death in Herodotus’, in P. Derow and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 17–36.
- Bouchet, Chr. and P. Giovannelli-Jouanna, edd. (2015) *Isocrate: entre jeu rhétorique et enjeux politiques* (Lyon).
- Bowie, E. L. (1986) ‘Early Greek Elegy, Symposium, and Public Festival’, *JHS* 106: 13–35.
- Cannavò, A. (2015) ‘Les Teucrïdes de Chypre au miroir d’Isocrate’, in Bouchet and Giovannelli-Jouanna (2015) 235–47.
- Carey, C. (2016) ‘Homer and Epic in Herodotus’ Book 7’, in A. Efstathiou and I. Karamanou, edd., *Homeric Receptions across Generic and Cultural Contexts* (Berlin and Boston) 71–89.
- (2019) *Great Battles: Thermopylae* (Oxford).
- Cartledge, P. (2006) *Thermopylae: The Battle that Changed the World* (London and New York).
- Castagnoli, L. and P. Ceccarelli, edd. (2019) *Greek Memories: Theories and Practices* (Cambridge).
- Darbo-Peschanski, C. (2019) ‘The Place and Nature of Memory in Greek Historiography’, in Castagnoli–Ceccarelli (2019) 158–78.

- Dodds, E. R. (1951) *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Erll, A. (2008) 'Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction', in Erll–Nünning (2008) 1–15.
- (2011) *Memory in Culture* (Hampshire and New York); trans. by S. B. Young of *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen* (Stuttgart, 2017).
- and A. Nünning, edd. (2008) *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (Berlin).
- Ferrario, S. (2014) 'The Tools of Memory: Crafting Historical Legacy in Fourth-Century Greece', in Parmeggiani (2014) 263–88.
- Finkelberg, M., ed. (2011) *The Homer Encyclopedia*, 3 vols (Chichester).
- Foster, E. (2012) 'Thermopylae and Pylos, with Reference to the Homeric Background', in ead. and D. Lateiner, edd., *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford) 185–214.
- Fowler, R. (1998) 'Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's *Catalogue*, and the Creation of the Hellenes', *PCPhS* 44: 1–19.
- Foxhall, L., H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, edd. (2010) *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart).
- Frame, D. (1978) *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic* (New Haven).
- Gera, D. (1993) *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique* (Oxford).
- Gombrich, E. (1970) *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography* (London).
- Greenwood, E. (2006) *Thucydides and the Shaping of History* (London).
- Grethlein, J. and C. B. Krebs, edd. (2012) *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge).
- Griffin, J. (1991) 'Speech in the *Iliad* [Review of Martin (1989)]', *CR* 41: 1–5.
- Hornblower, S. (1996–2003) *A Commentary on Thucydides*, 3 vols (Oxford).
- , ed. (2013) *Herodotus: Histories Book V* (Cambridge).
- and C. Pelling, edd. (2017) *Herodotus: Histories Book VI* (Cambridge).
- Hubbard, T. (2007) 'Theognis' *sphrêgîs*: Aristocratic Speech and the Paradoxes of Writing', in C. Cooper, ed., *Politics of Orality* (Leiden and Boston) 193–215.
- Hunter, R. and I. Rutherford, edd. (2009) *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality, and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge).
- Immerwahr, H. R. (1960) 'History as a Monument in Herodotus and Thucydides', *AJPh* 81: 261–90.
- de Jong, I. (2004) *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge).
- (2015) 'Leonidas "The Best of the Achaeans": How Herodotus Anchors Prose via Poetry', *Oikos: Proceedings of Anchoring Innovation in Antiquity*, 17–20 December 2015: 1–11.
- Kallet, L. (2006) 'Thucydides' Workshop of History and Utility Outside the Text', in A. Rengakos, and A. Tsakmakis, edd., *Brill's Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden and Boston) 335–68.
- Krell, D. F. (1990) *Of Memory, Reminiscence and Writing: On the Verge* (Bloomington and Indianapolis).

- Lachmann, R. (1997) *Memory and Literature: Intertextuality in Russian Modernism* (Minneapolis); trans. by A. Sellars and R. Wall of *Gedächtnis und Literatur: Intertextualität in der russischen Moderne* (Frankfurt am Main, 1990).
- (2008) ‘Mnemonic and Intertextual Aspects of Literature’, in Erll–Nünning (2008) 301–10.
- Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto).
- Low, P. (2011) ‘The Power of the Dead in Classical Sparta: The Case of Thermopylae’, in M. Carroll and J. Rempel, edd., *Living through the Dead: Burial and Commemoration in the Classical World* (Oxford) 1–20.
- Maier, F. G. (1994) ‘Cyprus and Phoenicia’, *CAH²* VI.297–336.
- Malkin, I. (2018) ‘Returning Heroes and Greek Colonists’, in S. Hornblower and G. Biffis, edd., *The Returning Hero: Nostoi and Traditions of Mediterranean Settlement* (Oxford) 83–104.
- Marincola, J. (2014) ‘Rethinking Isocrates and Historiography’, in Parmegiani (2014) 33–58.
- (2017a) *On Writing History from Herodotus to Herodian* (Harmondsworth).
- (2017b) ‘Ὀμηρικώτατος? Battle Narratives in Herodotus’, in E. Bowie, ed., *Herodotus: Narrator, Scientist, Historian* (Berlin and Boston) 3–24.
- Martin, R. (1989) *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca and London).
- Meister, F. J. (2020) *Greek Praise Poetry and the Rhetoric of Divinity* (Oxford).
- Minchin, E. (2001) *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey* (Oxford).
- (2012) ‘Memory and Memories: Personal, Social and Cultural Memory in the Poems of Homer’, in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis, edd., *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (Berlin) 83–99.
- Mirhady, D. and Y. L. Too, trans. (2000) *Isocrates I* (Austin).
- Moles, J. (1999) ‘Ἀνάθημα καὶ κτῆμα: The Inscriptional Inheritance of Greek Historiography’, *Histos* 3: 27–69.
- Montiglio, S. (2003) ‘Odysseus’ Return and the Memory of Wandering’, *Gaia* 7: 215–23.
- Nagy, G. (1987) ‘Herodotus the “Logios”’, *Arethusa* 20: 175–84.
- (1996a) *Homeric Questions* (Austin).
- (1996b) *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge).
- Nikannen, A. (2012) ‘A Note on Memory and Reciprocity in Homer’s *Odyssey*’, in *Donum natalicium digitaliter confectum Gregorio Nagy septuagenario* <https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/4616>.
- Olick, J. K., V. Vinitzky-Seroussi, and D. Levy, edd. (2011) *The Collective Memory Reader* (New York and Oxford).
- Page, D. L., ed. (1962) *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford).
- Paradiso, A. (2011) ‘Herodotus’ List of the Three Hundred’, in H. Cavanagh, W. Cavanagh, and J. Roy, edd., *Honouring the Dead in the Peloponnese:*

- Proceedings of the Conference held in Sparta 23-25 April 2009* (CSPS Online Publication 2; Nottingham) 521–35.
- Parmeggiani, G., ed. (2014) *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography* (Washington, D.C.).
- Pelling, C. (2006) ‘Homer and Herodotus’, in M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, edd., *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin* (Oxford) 75–104.
- (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin).
- Petrovic, A., I. Petrovic, and E. Thomas, edd. (2018) *The Materiality of Text: Placement, Perception, and Presence of Inscribed texts in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden and Boston).
- Price, S. (2012) ‘Memory and Ancient Greece’, in B. Dignas and R. R. R. Smith, edd., *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World* (Oxford) 15–36.
- Race, W. H. (1987) ‘Pindaric Encomium and Isocrates’ *Evagoras*’, *TAPhA* 117: 131–55.
- Russo, J., M. Fernández-Galiano, and A. Heubeck (1992) *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey, Vol. III: Books XVII–XXIV* (Oxford).
- Steiner, D. T. (1994) *The Tyrant’s Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece* (Princeton).
- Thomas, R. (1989) *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).
- (1992) *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- (2019) *Polis Histories, Collective Memories and the Greek World* (Cambridge).
- Van Hook, L. R. (1945) *Isocrates III* (London and Cambridge, Mass.).
- Vannicelli, P. (2017) *Erodoto, Le Storie: Libro VII, Serse e Leonida* (Milan).
- (2018) ‘I nomi dei Trecento Spartiati alle Termopili’, in F. Camia, L. Del Monaco, and M. Nocita, edd., *Munus Laetitia: Studi miscellanei offerti a Maria Letizia Lazzarini* (Roma) 155–65.
- Vasunia, P. (2003) ‘Plutarch and the Return of the Archaic’, in A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik, edd., *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden and Boston) 369–89.
- Veyne, P. (1988) *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination* (Chicago); trans. by P. Wissing of *Les grecs ont-ils cru à leur mythes? Essai sur l’imagination constituante* (Paris, 1983).
- West, M. L. (2014) *The Making of the Odyssey* (Oxford).
- West, S. (1985) ‘Herodotus’ Epigraphical Interests’, *CQ* 35: 278–305.