Histos Supplement 6 (2017) 211–39

7

COMEDY AND HISTORY, THEORY AND EVIDENCE IN DURIS OF SAMOS*

Christopher Baron

Abstract: This paper offers a brief investigation of what the fragments of the third-century BCE author Duris of Samos reveal about the relationship between comedy and history. I argue that his citations of comic poetry match his stated concern for vividness in historical narrative. I also consider the light shed on Greek historical writing in the fourth and third centuries by Duris' practice of using comedy as historical evidence. Given his interest in multiple genres and his connection to the Peripatetics, it would not be surprising if Duris turned to comedy more frequently than his predecessors had done.

In the *Life of Thucydides* attributed to Marcellinus, the author notes three other figures who shared that name.[1] These are Thucydides, son of Melesias (Pericles' rival); a Pharsalian Thucydides, son of Meno, mentioned by Polemon; and an Athenian poet named Thucydides, son of Ariston, from the deme Acherdous, mentioned by

* Many thanks to Emily Baragwanath and Edith Foster for organising the original 'Clio and Thalia' CAMWS panel and inviting me to participate. Audiences for variant versions of this paper in Iowa City and at the University of Buffalo gave valuable feedback. Emily, Edith, and the anonymous reviewers for *Histos* helped greatly by encouraging me to strengthen my arguments; they bear no responsibility for any remaining weaknesses.

[1] Abbreviations not found in LSJ: *BNJ* = I. Worthington, ed., *Brill's New Jacoby* (Brill Online, 2007–); *BoC* = J. Rusten, ed., *The Birth of Comedy: Texts, Documents and Art from Athenian Comic Competitions, 486–280* (Baltimore, 2011); Jacoby [vol.] = commentary or notes for *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 3 vols. with multiple parts (Leiden and Berlin, 1923–58); *PCG* = Rudolf Kassel and Colin Austin, edd., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 vols. (Berlin, 1983–). Translations are mine unless noted.

Androtion in his *Atthis*.[2] But the biographer then concludes by specifying that the historian Thucydides

> *συνεχρόνισε δ', ὥς φησι* Πραξιφάνης *ἐν τῷ* Περὶ Ἱστορίας, Πλάτωνι *τῷ κωμικῷ*, Ἀγάθωνι *τραγικῷ*, Νικηράτῳ *ἐποποιῷ καὶ* Χοιρίλῳ, *καὶ* Μελανιππίδῃ. *καὶ ἐπεὶ μὲν ἔζη* Ἀρχέλαος, *ἄδοξος ἦν ὡς <ὁ> αὐτὸς* Πραξιφάνης *δηλοῖ, ὕστερον δὲ δαιμονίως ἐθαυμάσθη.*
>
> was a contemporary, as Praxiphanes says in his *On History*, of Platon the comic poet, Agathon the tragic poet, Niceratus the epic poet as well as Choerilus, and Melanippides. And while Archelaus was alive, he (sc. Thucydides) was unknown for the most part, as the same Praxiphanes makes clear, but later he became greatly admired.[3]

[2] Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 28: *μὴ ἀγνοῶμεν δὲ ὅτι ἐγένοντο* Θουκυδίδαι *πολλοί, οὗτός τε ὁ* Ὀλόρου *παῖς, καὶ δεύτερος δημαγωγός,* Μελησίου, *ὃς καὶ* Περικλεῖ *διεπολιτεύσατο· τρίτος δὲ γένει* Φαρσάλιος, *οὗ μέμνηται* Πολέμων *ἐν τοῖς* Περὶ Ἀκροπόλεως, *φάσκων αὐτὸν εἶναι πατρὸς* Μένωνος· *τέταρτος ἄλλος* Θουκυδίδης *ποιητής, τὸν δῆμον* Ἀχερδούσιος, *οὗ μέμνηται* Ἀνδροτίων *ἐν τῇ* Ἀτηίδι, *λέγων εἶναι υἱὸν* Ἀρίστωνος. The Greek text can be found after the preface in the Jones-Powell Thucydides OCT (1942); for a brief discussion of the work and an English translation of varying reliability, see Burns (2010).

[3] Marcellin. *Vit.Thuc.* 29–30. I hesitate to begin an article by disagreeing with both Felix Jacoby and Charles Fornara, but it seems clear to me that in the passage quoted here Marcellinus does in fact refer to the historian Thucydides, not the fourth man listed by that name (the Athenian poet mentioned by Androtion). Four factors: (1) the initial δέ in chapter 29 does not correspond to any *μέν* and thus could mark a transition. This is abrupt, but that is a common feature of Marcellinus' prose. (2) In chapter 28 (above, n. 2), Marcellinus mentions each of the other Thucydideses, then appends a short relative clause; this pattern would be broken if the lengthy roster of poets in chapter 29 belonged to the last Thucydides in the list. (3) The fragment of Androtion (*BNJ* 324 F 57) must end before *συνεχρόνισε*, since Androtion cannot have cited Praxiphanes, who lived two generations later. (4) The poet Thucydides never became famous, as far as we can tell; even if he did, why would Praxiphanes bother with this information (including the elaborate synchronism) in a work *On History*? (*pace* Jacoby IIIb II.145–6 (n. 704 online), who is correct to note that we are dealing with a

In 1878 Rudolf Hirzel argued that this particular list of figures results from the fact that Praxiphanes' treatise took the form of a dialogue, with all these authors—Thucydides included—as characters. This helps to explain the otherwise odd reference to Archelaus, king of Macedon from 413 to 399, whose court would have served as the dramatic setting. The suggestion gains added strength from the fact that Praxiphanes, a pupil of Theophrastus, wrote at least one other dialogue.[4]

If Hirzel was correct, this sole surviving reference to Praxiphanes' *On History* opens up several intriguing avenues for those wishing to explore the relationship between history and comedy. The most fascinating, if least discoverable, is to wonder what Thucydides and Platon might have had to say to each other.[5] This comic poet enjoyed a long career, roughly contemporaneous with Aristophanes. We would love to know more about his political comedy, given some of the attested titles: *Ambassadors*, *Greece* or *Islands*, *Metics*, *Symmachia*, in addition to a series of so-called 'demagogue-comedies' in which (like Aristophanes' *Knights*) a single Athenian politician was ridiculed. Unlike Aristophanes,

digression, but does not consider the structural clues indicating that the digression is confined to chapter 28; cf. Fornara (1983) 131–2). Burns (2010) 18 leaves the identification ambiguous, though his translation of δαιμονίως, 'as divine,' certainly implies Thucydides the historian: cf. Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 2–3, where his lineage is traced back to Zeus.

[4] Hirzel (1878); accepted by Brink (1946), Wehrli (1957, with further comments). In the course of a long article the previous year, Wilamowitz (1877) had shown that the list of figures did not derive from a chronographical synchronism, but he had tried to argue for a historical stay at Archelaus' court (353–61). As Hirzel pointed out (46), it is difficult to see why Praxiphanes' treatise would have mentioned such an 'event'. The anonymous *Vita* of Thucydides (also found in the Codex Palatinus (E) with Marcellinus) states that Thucydides spent his time in exile on Aegina, where it is said he wrote his history (7); later, however, the author notes one tradition that Thucydides died in Thrace (10). For the evidence concerning Praxiphanes, see Wehrli (1957) 93–115; Brink (1946).

[5] On Platon, see Pirrotta (2009); *BoC* 333–53; Sommerstein (2000); Rosen (1995).

however, Platon attacked his targets as themselves, without disguise, for we have fragments from three such plays: *Peisander*, *Hyperbolus*, and *Cleophon*.[6] The last of these three figures came to prominence only after the point at which Thucydides' history ends, but we might imagine Praxiphanes' Platon asking the historian why he chose to diminish the role played by Hyperbolus, especially the occasion of his notorious ostracism in the years between the Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition.[7] A fragment from Platon's *Peisander* presents an even more intriguing potential scene for the dialogue:

> *γυνὴ γάρ, ἢν μὲν αὐτήν*
> *ἀεὶ κολάζῃς, ἐστὶ πάντων κτημάτων κράτιστον,*
> *ἐὰν δ' ἀνῇς, ὕβριστόν <ἐστι> χρῆμα κἀκόλαστον.*

> For a woman, if you keep on punishing her, is the greatest of all possessions; but if you let up, she's an insolent and unbridled thing.

As Sommerstein has noted, the husband here could represent Athens and the wife his empire. He further points out that these lines may allude to a sentiment which Thucydides puts into the mouth of Cleon during the Mytilenean debate, that 'a man naturally despises one who is subservient, but marvels at one who does not yield.'[8] This can only remain speculative, but perhaps Praxiphanes used

[6] Sommerstein (2000) 439 credits Platon with taking this crucial step, and he also notes (443) that Platon was apparently the only comic poet to write more than one piece of this type.

[7] Thucydides mentions Hyperbolus only once, for a notice of his death in 411 (8.73.3); Hornblower (2008) 969 notes the various means by which Thucydides expresses his contempt, including the possible echo of Aristophanes' *μοχθηρός* (*Eq.* 1304). Plutarch cites Platon twice (*Alc.* 13.9, *Nic.* 11.6 = *PCG* V F 203) for the *bon mot* that in this case the punishment of ostracism did not deserve the victim: see Pirrotta (2009) 308–9.

[8] Platon, *PCG* V, F 105; Thuc. 3.39.5; Sommerstein (2000) 440. Cf. Pirrotta (2009) 227–9.

echoes between Platon and Thucydides as pivots upon which to turn a discussion of how history and poetry go about representing the words and deeds of men.[9]

The notice concerning Praxiphanes reminds us that by the early third century, Greek intellectuals were explicitly theorising about the writing of history and, especially, its position within the constellation of literary genres (both poetry and prose). Indeed, although our extant classical historians engaged in this activity very rarely, the fragments of the fourth-century historians Theopompus and Ephorus already reveal serious thought about history as a genre.[10] Praxiphanes' treatise shows that the question was now being dealt with outside historiography, as a stand-alone topic for investigation.[11] Since almost nothing survives of this work other than brief notices, we can best pursue our own investigation by asking whether this sort of theorising had any effect on the contemporary writing of history. Thucydidean historical writing had never been the only game in town. Praxiphanes' choice of Thucydides as his representative historian was partially dictated by dramatic-setting concerns, but it must also hold some significance for his definition of and attitude toward historical writing itself. Furthermore, such theorising took place within the context of even larger intellectual projects in Athens and Alexandria. Praxiphanes was a Peripatetic, and though it is best not to think in terms of a 'Peripatetic school' of historical writing, Aristotle and his pupils encountered the problem of investigating the past in numerous works (e.g. the series of *politeiai* of various cities), and their thoughts on the matter may have had some impact on authors outside

[9] Platon himself may have been useful to Praxiphanes (again, beyond the dramatic-setting concerns) if his *Laconians* or *Poets* did indeed include poets championing their own genres: see *BoC* 341–2.

[10] See especially Vattuone (2014) on Theopompus; Parmeggiani (2014a) and (2011) 99–146 on Ephorus.

[11] Theophrastus too wrote a work *On History*, in one book (Diog. Laert. 5.47), but no secure fragments survive: see Podlecki (1985); Wehrli (1947) 69–71. On Aristotle and history, see Bertelli (2014); Fornara (1983) 93–8; Walbank (1960) 216–20.

the school.[12] In fact, we know that Callimachus wrote a work *Against Praxiphanes*, and it has been suggested that the relationship between poetry and history was a theme in their argument.[13]

Our inquiry is made more difficult by the fragmentary nature of the evidence. Not only do we have next to nothing from the theoretical treatises themselves, but very little continuous historical narrative survives from the mid-fourth until the first century BCE, despite the flourishing of historical writing during this period.[14] Fortunately, later extant authors provide enough quotations and paraphrases of these lost historical works to allow us to gain some insight into the relationship of history and comedy. This is especially the case for the third-century historian Duris of Samos. As we will see shortly, his fragments reveal a particular interest in poetry generally. Furthermore, we can place him squarely within the same intellectual milieu in which Praxiphanes and others were debating the question. In this paper, I will offer a brief investigation of what the fragments of Duris reveal about comedy and history. In addition, I will consider how Duris' practice of using comedy as historical evidence sheds light on the changing methods of Greek historical writing in the fourth and third centuries.

Duris' historical works include a Macedonian history, which seems to have run from 370 (the death of the Macedonian king Amyntas, father of Philip) to the battle of Corupedium in 281, a history of the Sicilian tyrant Agathocles (r. 317–289), as well as a local history of Samos. Like most of the Hellenistic historians, he has had a mixed reception at best. Cicero referred to him as *homo in historia*

[12] Walbank (1960), responding to the attempt of Fritz (1958) to revive the notion of a Peripatetic theory of 'tragic history'. For Theophrastus' 'historical' work, see Podlecki (1985).

[13] Fuhrer (1996) 119; on the work, Brink (1946).

[14] Strasburger (1977) for overview. To top it off, only some of the work of two comedic poets survives intact, and the representativeness of both Aristophanes and Menander has increasingly come into question in recent scholarship (see n. 41 below).

diligens—though in the context of pointing out an error he made. Didymus wrote that Duris was unable to prevent himself from telling marvels, even as he recorded one such story.[15] Scholars at various points of the twentieth century made Duris a central figure in the modern chimera of 'tragic history'. But Frances Pownall and others have recently tried to show that there was more to Duris than simply eliciting strong emotions from his readers.[16] Rather than emotional response, one of the concerns Duris highlighted was that of the vividness of the historian's account. In his most well-known fragment, preserved by the Byzantine patriarch Photius, Duris criticises Ephorus and Theopompus for the lack of *mimesis* and pleasure in their work, complaining that they cared only for the writing itself. Vivienne Gray has convincingly argued that Duris here does not elevate entertainment over the truth, but rather calls for historical narrative to possess a mimetic quality, a vividness which impresses the reality of events on the reader's mind.[17] Poetry could be especially helpful in moving beyond a bare recounting of the facts, because it not only created a more exciting and entertaining narrative but also allowed the historian to set the scene with more detail.[18] We can see this in at least two fragments of Duris.

[15] Cic. *Att.* 6.1.18 = *BNJ* 76 F 73. Did. *in D.* 12.50 = *BNJ* 76 T 7.

[16] Pownall *BNJ* 76 ad F 1; Baron (2013) 247–55; Knoepfler (2001). Already Strasburger (1966) 78–85 = (1982–90) II.996–1003 had called for Duris' attempt to formulate a 'theory of history' to be taken seriously. For a full-scale study of the historical fragments, see Landucci Gattinoni (1997); Naas and Simon (2015) contains a range of essays on Duris' life and literary output.

[17] Phot. *Bibl.* 176 = *BNJ* 76 F 1. Above all see Gray (1987) with previous bibliography, despite the reservations of Halliwell (2002) 289–90. Cf. Strasburger (1966) 78 = (1982–90) II.996: 'Wir können mutatis mutandis von "Realismus" sprechen'; Fornara (1983) 124–34; Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 51–5; Knoepfler (2001) 35 ('la représentation la plus concrète et vivante possible de la réalité'); Cozzoli (2004); Baron (2016).

[18] Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 131 writes of Duris employing poetry 'per integrare e arrichire' his narrative; Halliwell (2002) 291 finds *mimesis* for Duris to be 'partly a matter of contextual coherence … an important means for drawing the reader, whether of history or poetry, into a

Athenaeus cites the third-century historian Democharesas a witness for the Athenians' flattery of Demetrius Poliorcetes. However, he then turns to Duris for a verbatim quotation of the ithyphallic hymn they composed for the king around 290 BCE. I take this to mean that Duris was not satisfied simply to describe the Athenians' obsequious behaviour (like Democharesperhaps), but that he quoted the hymn itself, in order to (in part, at least) create a more vivid scene for the reader.[19] On another occasion, Athenaeus cites Duris for a long and detailed description of the luxurious lifestyle of Demetrius of Phalerum (despite the sumptuary laws he imposed upon the Athenians). At the end of the passage, Duris quoted two lines from a dithyramb composed by a poet of the time showing that the tyrant was addressed as 'sun-like'. The lines in this case were perhaps not just illustrative but may have subtly mocked Demetrius, either for allowing such ridiculous flattery or through play on the adjective *heliomorphos* (literally 'sun-shaped', in which case Demetrius' round shape, a product of his gluttony, may have been the target).[20] It is easy to see how Athenian comedy would have been attractive to a historian with such working methods.

There is no evidence that Duris himself was a pupil of Theophrastus, as is often claimed; the only direct connection rests on an unnecessary emendation of Athenaeus.[21] Duris' brother Lynceus, however, was a student at the Lyceum at Athens, thus it would not be surprising if Duris' thought-world circled in the same orbit. As it turns out, Lynceus was, among other things, a comic poet and a

heightened visualisation and grasp of the force of the situations depicted'. Cf. Pédech (1989) 258, Duris worked in 'scènes et tableaux'; Strasburger (1961) 29–31 = (1982–90) II.817–19; Wehrli (1947) 63, stressing the striving for *psychagôgia*.

[19] Ath. 6.253d–f = *BNJ* 76 F 13; Baron (2011) 100–4; Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 126–9.

[20] Ath. 12.542c–e = *BNJ* 76 F 10, with Pownall's commentary; Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 122–5.

[21] Pointed out by Dalby (1991), accepted by Pownall *BNJ* 76 T 1 and F 1; see also Baron (2011) 91–3.

student of the genre. Athenaeus preserves almost all our evidence for Lynceus, including the only securely attested fragment of his comedy, from a play entitled *Centaur* (4.131f); elsewhere, he records that Lynceus wrote a treatise on Menander in at least two books (6.242b–c).[22] Unfortunately, Athenaeus' citation of the latter work does not touch upon Menander's comedy but rather describes two Athenians who achieved a reputation for being funny by different means.[23] Thus, we do not know what, if anything, Lynceus had to say about comedy as a genre. But we can conclude that he had a broad array of literary interests and, as Dalby notes, he was associated closely with the development of three new genres (the literary letter, philosophical and scientific literature, and the anecdote).[24]

A general sense of broad interests and a willingness to operate in different literary genres also emerge from the surviving material from Duris. History, in fact, was just one part of his scholarly output: Jacoby's fragments include evidence for a number of specialised treatises, including works with titles such as *On Tragedy*, *On Euripides and Sophocles*, and *Homeric Problems*.[25] This interest in poetry carried over into Duris' historiography—if that is the correct way to think about the relationship. The first table below gives the fragments which definitely or likely derive

[22] On Lynceus see Funaioli (2004), Dalby (2000). *Centaur*: *PCG* V, pp. 616–17 = Ath. 4.131f (Dalby, F 1, *BoC* 573). On the Menander treatise: Lowe (2013) 346. Link of Lynceus to school: Ath. 8.337d = Dalby, F 32.

[23] Dalby F 35. Note also one of Lynceus' letters, addressed to the comic poet Posidippus (Ath. 14.652c = Dalby, F 17), and an anecdote concerning the comic poet Alexis (8.344c = F 33).

[24] While most of the fragments centre around food, this is at least in part due to Athenaeus. Even through this culinary haze, we can see that Lynceus' work included historical figures (Ptolemy II, Demetrius Poliorcetes, Demosthenes), and it reveals some of the same interests we find in local history (i.e. the culinary information is in a sense ethnographic). Funaioli (2004) fully investigates the evidence for Lynceus' comedic output.

[25] The last of which is cited by name in the Homeric scholia once (F 30), but may be the source of five other fragments (88–92).

from his historical works *and* contain citations of poetry. The second table lists other fragments of Duris which concern poetry in some manner (these not necessarily from the historical works).

Fr.	Work	Cover-Text	Content
10	*Macedonica*	Athenaeus	quotes a line of poetry from Seiron (? perhaps Castorion) of Soli, describing Demetrius of Phalerum as *heliomorphos*
13	*Macedonica*	Athenaeus	quotes the ithyphallic hymn composed by Athenians for Demetrius Poliorcetes
15	*Macedonica*	Athenaeus	cites two passages from Homer for ancient kings' drinking habits
22	*Samian Annals*	Diogenes Laertius	cites lines of Pherecydes concerning wisdom and Pythagoras
23	*Samian Annals*	Porphyry	cites an inscription on a dedication of Arimnestus, son of Pythagoras, at Samos
35	(*Macedonica*?)	Athenaeus	cites lines of a fourth-century comic poet Heraclides
38	(*Macedonica*?)	Plutarch	cites a two-line oracle inscribed on a figurine found at Chaeronea before the battle
60	(*Samian Annals*?)	Athenaeus	cites poetry of Asius to explain customs at Samos
66	(*Samian Annals*?)	Photius (Lex.)	offers an explanation for a phrase concerning Samians found in Aristophanes' *Babylonians*
71	(*Samian Annals*?)	Plutarch	may cite the beginning of a paean to Lysander

Table 1. Fragments from Duris' historical works which cite poetry.

This constellation of fragments is striking, considering that only 96 survive in total from Duris' works. We see that Duris: (1) cited poetry as evidence for, or in conjunction with, historical facts; (2) commented on poetry or its use by others; (3) was cited by others in their comments on poetry.

Fr.	Work	Cover-Text	Content
17	Agathocles	Photius and Suda	a scholiast to Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1035 cites Duris for the story of Lamia
20	Agathocles	Suda	explains why 'Eurybatos' referred to a scoundrel by referencing Homer's *Odyssey*
26	(*Samian Annals*?)	Athenaeus	mentions a paean to Lysander sung at Samos (no lines quoted, but cf. F 71)
27	*Peri Nomôn*	Etymologicum Magnum	explains the poetic verb *thôrêssesthai*, 'to make/get drunk' (cf. Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1134)
47	?	Scholia to Apoll. Rhod.	reason for Prometheus' punishment; perhaps arguing against the Hesiodic version, which the scholiast cites first
58	(Agathocles?)	Scholia to Theocritus	reason why Polyphemus established a sanctuary to Galateia; criticises Philoxenus' account
65	(*Samian Annals*?)	Harpocration	Aspasia was the cause of two wars, as can be learned from Duris and Theophrastus and Aristophanes' *Acharnians*
72	?	Athenaeus	Plato always had the mimes of Sophron in his hands
73	(*Samian Annals*?)	Cicero	told the story of Alcibiades throwing Eupolis overboard on the way to Sicily
83	?	Proclus	Plato was not a good judge of poets

Table 2: Other fragments of Duris which concern poetry in some way (content or cover-text)

Unfortunately, only six of these fragments take us directly to the particular poetic genre of comedy, and three of these do not give us much with which to work. Two such fragments survive through scholia on Aristophanes. One (F 17) concerns the figure of Lamia, the legendary Libyan half-woman/half-monster who ate other women's children after a jealous Hera killed hers. She must have come up in the course of Duris' discussion of Agathocles' campaigns in

North Africa, as the citation indicates.[26] The question is how the commentator on Aristophanes' *Wasps* ended up turning to Duris for information on Lamia. Given the prevalence of poetry in his historical fragments, it is not out of the realm of possibility that Duris referred to Aristophanes, who mentions Lamia several times, but we cannot be certain.[27] The other fragment in this category (F 27) reveals that Duris provided an explanation of a poetic verb for drinking, which is found in Aristophanes. But the scholiast attributes this to one of Duris' minor works, so it tells us little about his historical method.[28] The third such fragment survives in Cicero, who cites Duris for the erroneous notion that Eupolis died at the hands of Alcibiades on the way to Sicily (F 73).

However, the remaining three fragments seem to indicate that Duris did more with comedy than merely liven up his account. In the first (F 65), we may see Duris turning to the Athenian comic tradition for evidence to support an anti-Periclean narrative of Athenian history. Under his entry for 'Aspasia', the second-century CE lexicographer Harpocration states:

> δοκεῖ δὲ δυοῖν πολέμων αἰτία γεγονέναι, τοῦ τε Σαμιακοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ, ὥς ἐστι μαθεῖν παρά τε Δούριδος τοῦ Σαμίου καὶ Θεοφράστου ἐκ τοῦ δ′ τῶν Πολιτικῶν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀχαρνέων.
>
> It seems that she (Aspasia) was responsible for the outbreak of two wars, the Samian and the Peloponnesian, as one can learn from Duris of Samos,

[26] Duris either wrote a separate work on Agathocles or dedicated a number of books of his Macedonian history to events in the West: see Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 133–68.

[27] Ar. *Vesp.* 1035, 1177; *Pax* 757 (lines repeated from *Wasps*); *Ec.* 76–8. The Old Comedy poet Crates wrote a *Lamia* (*PCG* IV, FF 20–25), as did Euripides (a satyr-play?).

[28] θωρήσσεσθαι, Ar. *Ach.* 1134.

> from Theophrastus in Book 4 of his *Politics*, and from the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes.[29]

Whatever her historical role, Pericles' Milesian wife was a favourite target of Athenian comic poets, and her relationship with the statesman aroused the Greek male predilection for blaming wars on women. Eupolis called her 'Helen', and in the *Acharnians* Dicaeopolis includes her as one of the causes of the Peloponnesian War.[30] The structure of Harpocration's citation makes it difficult to know exactly what use Duris made of Aristophanes, and whether it was he or Theophrastus who expanded Aspasia's mischievousness to include the Samian revolt against Athens in 440 (though the next fragment, as we will see, leans the scales toward Duris).[31] But, given the nature of these Attic lexica, the collocation of the three authors is unlikely to be the work of Harpocration. This increases the possibility that Duris himself cited Aristophanes as evidence for his version of events.

In F 66, an entry in the Photian Lexicon, three different explanations are given for a phrase from Aristophanes' lost *Babylonians*, 'How marked with letters the Samian people are'.[32] Duris' explanation, as reported by the lexicographers, is that the Athenians tattooed their Samian prisoners of war with an owl—a symbol of Athenian power, and a practice normally reserved for slaves. Plutarch, with some variations (*Per.* 26.4), refers to the story—though not citing Duris—as part of the Samian revolt of 440 which was put down with

[29] *BNJ* 76 F 65 = Harp. s.v. 'Aspasia', with Pownall, *BNJ* ad loc.

[30] Olson (2002) 210. Eupolis: *PCG* V, F 267; Ar. *Ach.* 525. Duris elsewhere recounted a tradition blaming the Third Sacred War on a Theban woman named Theano (*BNJ* 76 F 2 = Ath. 13.560b). On Aspasia, see now Kennedy (2014) 68–96.

[31] As does Plut. *Per.* 24–5, where Duris may lie behind the narrative. Cf. Jacoby IIC.127; Olson (2002) 210 postulates a lost play of Old Comedy as the source of Aspasia's responsibility.

[32] *PCG* III.2, F 71. On the play, see Fois (1998), Welsh (1983) with further bibliography.

great difficulty by Pericles and the Athenian fleet.[33] The lexicographers' entry makes it clear that the phrase used by Aristophanes was well-known but also the subject of debate. We do not know whether Duris entered that debate. But it seems likely, as Jacoby suggested, that Duris used the line of Aristophanes as contemporary evidence to support his narrative of Athenian brutality against Samos.[34] That narrative survives in Plutarch, who rejects it as overly dramatic and biased, but nonetheless describes how, according to Duris, Pericles had the participants in the Samian revolt crucified in the agora at Miletus for ten days before executing them and leaving their bodies unburied.[35] Although only this one fragment survives, Duris may have found Aristophanes, and the *Babylonians* in particular, more broadly useful for constructing a narrative critical of Athenian treatment of her allies.[36] We see clear evidence of such a procedure—citing poetry with the express purpose of proving his point—in F 60, where Athenaeus introduces the citation by stating explicitly that Duris 'cites the poems of Asius as evidence that …'.[37]

Duris' use of Aristophanes to buttress his historical narrative is striking, especially if we consider the silence of

[33] See Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 228–33; Stadter (1989) 249–50.

[34] Jacoby IIC 127 ('als Beweis'); cf. ibid. 126, on F 60, where Jacoby writes that Duris 'gibt gern dichterische Belege', though he places this unnecessarily in a Peripatetic context. On F 58 (126), he also notes that poetic evidence adds an interesting element to the typical rationalisation of myth found in Duris, taking him beyond arguments based on *εἰκός*.

[35] *BNJ* 76 F 67 = Plut. *Per.* 28.1–3. Duris probably did exaggerate Pericles' brutality (or reported a tradition which had done so), since survival for ten days on the cross is highly unlikely, but see Stadter (1989) 258–9; Shipley (1987) 116–17. Fois (1998) 115 n. 18 notes the judgements of some eminent scholars.

[36] Cf. Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 232–3; Lewis (1988) 45–9.

[37] *BNJ* 76 F 60 = Ath. 12.525e–f: *παρατίθεται ὅτι* (see LSJ s.v. *παρατίθημι*, B.5); Giovanelli-Jouanna (2007) 222. Other fragments may indicate similar operations on the part of Duris, again with poetry more generally, but their lack of context restricts this to speculation: FF 15, 23, 71.

earlier historians of Athenian events. Thucydides completely avoids citing Athenian drama, even where it might have supported him—say, referring to Aristophanes' *Acharnians* for the hardship felt by Attic country-dwellers as a result of Pericles' evacuation order, hardship which Thucydides goes out of his way to address.[38] We may consider his avoidance of comedy as strict adherence to his stated methodology—since lines composed by Aristophanes and uttered on the Athenian stage represent neither the deeds nor the words of generals or politicians during the war—or, more critically, as reaction to the muddier picture painted of Pericles in Athenian comedy.[39] But a modern historian operates just as Duris did. Our portrayals of men like Cleon and Alcibiades would be incomplete without reference to Aristophanes. How much more might we be able to say about Pericles' policies and reputation if we had a full play of Cratinus (*Dionysalexandros*)?[40] Or about the middle years of the Peloponnesian War if we could read Eupolis (*Demes*)? Or about Hellenistic Athens if long

[38] Thuc. 2.14–17. In the same vein, one could imagine a historian using Aristophanes' *Frogs* to complement the picture of Alcibiades in the final years of the Peloponnesian War—but comedy is absent from Xenophon too. Herodotus presents a different situation for comedy, at least, which was not officially produced until 487/6 (*BoC* 16–18). But in this case too, I find it striking that as broad as his notion of evidence was, Herodotus does not refer directly to Aeschylus' *Persians* when recounting the battle at Salamis, nor to the poetry of Simonides for the battle at Plataea; nor does he actually cite Phrynichus' famous tragedy for the historical event of the Persian destruction of Miletus (as noted by Ford (2007) 817). That is, notwithstanding Herodotus' relationship, familiarity, and engagement with poetic traditions, he does not cite *literary* poetry as historical evidence for the events of the Persian Wars. On Herodotus' use of poetry, see Chiasson (2012); Boedeker (2001); Verdin (1977).

[39] Biles (2016) examines the portrait of Cleon in Aristophanes and Thucydides; see in particular 127 n. 52 for brief comments on the issue I deal with here.

[40] See e.g. McGlew (2002) 42–56, combining the fragmentary evidence from Cratinus with Plutarch's biography in order to examine opposition to Pericles' policies.

stretches of Philippides survived?[41] Duris was not breaking new ground here. Ephorus appears to have explicitly cited the comic poets Aristophanes and Eupolis to buttress his claims about the power of Pericles' oratory; if Diodorus was using him in the way most scholars believe he was, Ephorus did so not as part of a digression, but in his explanation for the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.[42] It has also been suggested that Theopompus, in his famous digression on Athenian demagogues in Book 10 of his *Philippica,* was influenced by the political comedy of Aristophanes, Eupolis, and others, though unfortunately there is no direct evidence to confirm this.[43] But given the evidence for Duris' interest in multiple genres, his explicit statement about the need for vividness in historical writing, and his connection to an intellectual community engaged in theoretical discussion of generic relationships, it would not be surprising if he turned to comedy more frequently than his fourth-century predecessors had done.

My final example combines the two issues of narrative vividness and historical evidence. It also introduces a new element to the discussion of comedy and history by showing

[41] Even through the highly fragmentary evidence we can see that political and topical humour persisted in Middle and New Comedy, and it is possible that neither Aristophanes nor Menander are as representative as they are often portrayed. See Webster (1970) 24–34, 37–49, 100–10; Philipp (1973); Habicht (1993); Dobrov (1995); Olson (2007) 223. Examples of political content in Middle and New Comedy from Olson (2007): C2 ('an allegorical play about contemporary events' by Heniochus), E29 (Platon, F 201, probably early 380s), E30 (Eubulus, F 106.1–9), E31 (Timocles), E32 (Philippides). Lape (2004) demonstrates the political role of even Menander's comedy.

[42] Diod. 12.40.6 = *BNJ* 70 F 196. See Parmeggiani (2014a) and Parker *ad loc* (Comm. II) for Ephorus' introduction of the comedic evidence. On Diodorus and Ephorus, see Sacks (1990) 9–22; Parmeggiani (2011) 357–73; cf. Parker, *BNJ* 70, 'Biographical Essay' section 2.F. In his overview of comedy's impact on Greek historical writing in terms of literary portraiture, Strasburger (1961) 16 = (1982–90) II.804 argues that the historians of the fourth century and later turned to Old Comedy due largely to the lack of biographical details in Thucydides.

[43] See Lenfant (2003) 399 with n. 61; Connor (1968) 102–3.

that Duris drew upon Middle Comedy in addition to the fifth-century comic poets.

The *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus, composed around 200 CE, represents a gold mine for fragments of Attic comedy—especially Middle Comedy—as well as a major source for lost Hellenistic historians.[44] A passage in Book 12 brings these two fragmentary genres together, thus requiring a brief analysis of Athenaeus' text in order to try to delineate what Duris wrote:[45]

> ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ τοῦ Θεοπόμπου συγγράμματι Περὶ τῶν ἐκ Δελφῶν Συληθέντων Χρημάτων, Χάρητι, φησί, τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ διὰ Λυσάνδρου τάλαντα ἑξήκοντα, ἀφ' ὧν ἐδείπνισεν Ἀθηναίους ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ θύσας τὰ ἐπινίκια τῆς γενομένης μάχης πρὸς τοὺς Φιλίππου ξένους. ὧν ἡγεῖτο μὲν Ἀδαῖος ὁ Ἀλεκτρυὼν ἐπικαλούμενος· περὶ οὗ καὶ Ἡρακλείδης ὁ τῶν κωμῳδιῶν ποιητὴς μέμνηται οὕτως·
>
> Ἀλεκτρυόνα τὸν τοῦ Φιλίππου παραλαβὼν
> ἀωρὶ κοκκύζοντα καὶ πλανώμενον
> κατέκοψεν· οὐ γὰρ εἶχεν οὐδέπω λόφον.
> ἕνα κατακόψας μάλα συχνοὺς ἐδείπνισεν
> Χάρης Ἀθηναίων τόθ'· ὡς γενναῖος ἦν.
>
> τὰ αὐτὰ ἱστορεῖ καὶ Δούρις.

> Theopompus says in his treatise *On the Money Stolen from Delphi*, 'Sixty talents went to Chares the Athenian via Lysander. With this money he entertained the Athenians at a victory feast in the marketplace after the battle with Philip's mercenaries. Adaeus, called the

[44] Middle Comedy: Nesselrath (2010) 434. On Athenaeus and the Hellenistic historians, see Gorman and Gorman (2007); Lenfant (2007); Zecchini (1989).

[45] Ath. 12.532e–f (Theopompus, *BNJ* 115 F 249; Duris, *BNJ* 76 F 35; Heraclides, *PCG* V.558–9, F 1); the translation is that in *BoC* (572), except that they omit the reference to Duris at the end. On the difficulties in delineating fragments of lost historians, see Baron (2011). Athenaeus is by far the most important source of Duris fragments: see Giovanelli-Jouanna (2007).

> Cock, was their leader.' Heraclides the poet of comedy mentions him thus:
>
> Catching Philip's Cock
> crowing at the wrong time and wandering astray,
> he cut him in pieces; for the Cock didn't yet have his crest.
> Having cut up a single bird, Chares entertained
> a great throng of Athenians then. That's how noble he was.
>
> Duris too relates the same things.

A historical event of the 350s BCE—Chares' victory over Philip's general Adaeus—is recorded in an author of the second century CE, with the help of three intermediary sources: two contemporary with the event (the comic poet Heraclides and the historian Theopompus), one a couple generations later (Duris). At what point did the history and the comedy first come together? Four possibilities arise:

> 1. Theopompus told the story and adduced the lines of Heraclides—Duris included this whole package in his work—Athenaeus quoted Duris;
> 2. Theopompus told the story and adduced the lines of Heraclides—Duris included this whole package in his work—Athenaeus quoted Theopompus, and noted that he had also read Duris;
> 3. Theopompus told the story—Duris included that story and added the lines of Heraclides—Athenaeus quoted Duris (or both historians);
> 4. Theopompus and Duris each told the story—Athenaeus quoted Theopompus, added the lines of Heraclides, and noted that he had also read Duris.

Option 1, though it would easily explain the end of the passage ('Duris too says the same things'), appears unlikely for two reasons: Athenaeus' usual practice, and the immediate context. Antonio Chávez Reino and Gabriella Ottone have argued that Athenaeus gathered material from Theopompus by reading his works directly. They point to

the specificity of most of Athenaeus' citations of the latter—including title and book number—and the fact that the few occasions where such specificity is lacking are also marked by the presence of an intermediary source, with a specific citation, in the immediate vicinity.[46] In our current example, Athenaeus cites a minor work of Theopompus by name, while he seems to tack on Duris at the end (but see below). For comparison, when Athenaeus reports the story of Arcadion the Achaean and Philip (6.249c–d), he writes, 'Theopompus includes him in his narrative, as does Duris in the fifth book of his *Macedonica*', a procedure which seems to indicate direct use of Duris, who had mentioned Theopompus in his text. To this general impression of Athenaeus' working methods we can add local contextual clues. Our passage about Chares and Adaeus 'the Cock' follows three other citations of Theopompus, the last of which also deals with Chares. Thus the most economical interpretation is that the first part of our passage, at least—up to the mention of Heraclides—forms part of a cluster of Theopompus citations.[47] If so, two questions remain: who introduced the lines of Heraclides to the story? And why does Athenaeus mention Duris?

Option 4—that Athenaeus himself has done the work of adding the lines of Heraclides to a citation of Theopompus (and reference to Duris)—also appears unlikely, even given the presence of *οὕτως*, which Lenfant has argued indicates a

[46] Chávez Reino and Ottone (2007) 154–6 (use of Theopompus), 156 n. 56 (examples of differing modes of citation). Although he does not address the issue explicitly, comments throughout Flower (1994) indicate that he envisions Athenaeus consulting Theopompus directly: see e.g. 19, 36 n. 41, 85.

[47] Beginning at 531e: Theopompus FF 31, 105, 213, and 249. See Pelling (2000) 174–5 on fragmentary clusters in Athenaeus. His other citation of Theopompus' work *On the Money Stolen from Delphi* also lessens the likelihood of Athenaeus' taking the additional detail of Heraclides' poetic lines from it: Jacoby comments that Athenaeus 'ein stark verkürztes Exzerpt, eigentlich nur eine Reihe von Notizen gibt' (IIB.389, on FF 247–8 = Ath. 13.604f–605d).

verbatim citation.[48] We cannot prove or disprove Athenaeus' direct use of Middle Comedic texts, but Nesselrath thinks it most likely that he relied on 'the great lexica and glossaries of the early empire' such as Favorinus and Zopyrion-Pamphilus.[49] That seems almost certain in this instance, since these are the only lines known from the comic poet Heraclides. If it had still been possible to read an entire play of his in the Severan age, it would be an incredible stroke of misfortune if these five lines were the only piece to make its way into the mass of Greek literature which survives from the Roman imperial period.

At the same time, the lines of Heraclides are clearly meant to illustrate how extravagantly the Athenian general Chares celebrated his victory. If the odds are against Athenaeus himself making this connection, then we must decide between Theopompus (Option 2) or Duris (Option 3). Though Option 2 is possible and could find support in the seemingly tacked-on reference by Athenaeus—'Duris too relates the same things'—in my opinion this points

[48] Lenfant (2007) 46–53. Jacoby leaned in this direction, ending Theopompus' fragment with the mention of Adaeus (*FGrHist* 115 F 249) and, in the apparatus criticus for Duris (*FGrHist* 76 F 35), printing 'Zusatz des Athenaios?' with regard to the lines of poetry. *BoC* follows this reading, at least implicitly: they omit the reference to Duris and put the first part of the passage in quotation marks, as if Athenaeus added the lines of Heraclides to his citation of Theopompus. Pownall also seems to follow this track, stating that Athenaeus cites Duris here 'only as a secondary authority' (*BNJ* 76 ad F 35). Olson wisely avoids the issue in his Athenaeus Loeb edition by not printing any quotation marks at all; Gulick, on the other hand, in the previous Loeb edition had ended Theopompus' quotation at 'mercenaries', implicitly attributing to Athenaeus (or Duris) the introduction of Adaeus 'the Cock' into the story of Chares' military victory. Only Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 94 argues as I do, though for different reasons (see below, n. 54).

[49] Nesselrath (1990) 66–79, quote at 79; Nesselrath (2010) 424–8; Olson (2007) 30. Note that this necessitates envisioning different relationships with different authors and genres on Athenaeus' part, a conclusion I am perfectly prepared to accept. Just because Athenaeus relied on previous compilations for his knowledge of Middle Comedy does not mean the same must be true for well-known historians such as Theopompus and Duris.

rather to Option 3.[50] If the lines of Heraclides were already in Theopompus, it is difficult to explain why Athenaeus mentions Duris here at all. The reference does not move the conversation forward, since the following anecdote is taken from a different historian and concerns archaic Athens. Moreover, we have already seen the direct evidence for Duris' use of comedy. On the other hand, among the more than 400 surviving fragments of Theopompus, not a single one preserves him citing comedy; this includes the 54 fragments provided by Athenaeus, all but a handful deriving from Theopompus' historical works, and in more than half of which Athenaeus quotes the historian verbatim.[51] For Duris, meanwhile, four out of the twenty-four other times Athenaeus cites him, lines of poetry are included (see Table 1). Overall, then—despite the ambiguous nature of Athenaeus' citation—Duris is more likely than Theopompus to have added the lines of comedy. We can imagine a plausible scenario: Athenaeus read Theopompus and excerpted the anecdote about Chares' victory and feast; later, he found the same story in Duris, with the lines of Heraclides added, and made a note of this in his Theopompus excerpts; when he composed the *Deipnosophistae*, he cited his 'main source'—Theopompus—with the addition of the poetry and alluded to Duris with the note about 'the same things.' Again, the story of Arcadion and Philip mentioned earlier provides a nice parallel.[52]

[50] Giovanelli-Jouanna (2007) 219–21 classifies this reference as 'allusion'—as opposed to verbatim citation or reformulation (paraphrase or summary)—but does not further analyse this category and leaves the delimitation of the fragment open. Cf. Zecchini (1989) 75–6: Athenaeus' reference to Duris marks either verification, or the fact that he was writing from memory.

[51] The absence of comedy from Theopompus is especially striking given his treatment of Athenian demagogues in Book 10 of the *Philippica* (*BNJ* 115 FF 85–100).

[52] Ath. 6.249c–d (Theopompus, *BNJ* 115 F 280; Duris, *BNJ* 76 F 3; Phylarchus, *FGrHist* 81 F 37), trans. Olson (2006–12). Arcadion parodies Hom. *Od.* 23.269, replacing 'the sea' with 'Philip' (see Giovanelli-Jouanna (2007) 235).

> *ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἀρκαδίων ὁ Ἀχαιὸς κόλαξ ἦν· περὶ οὗ ὁ αὐτὸς ἱστορεῖ Θεόπομπος καὶ Δοῦρις ἐν πέμπτῃ Μακεδονικῶν· οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ἀρκαδίων μισῶν τὸν Φίλιππον ἑκούσιον ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος φυγὴν ἔφυγεν. ... ἔτυχεν δ' οὖν ποτε ἐν Δελφοῖς ἐπιδημοῦντος Φιλίππου παρεῖναι καὶ τὸν Ἀρκαδίωνα· ὃν θεασάμενος ὁ Μακεδὼν καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος, "μέχρι τίνος φεύξῃ", φησίν, "Ἀρκαδίων;" καὶ ὅς· "ἕς τ' ἂν τοὺς ἀφίκωμαι οἳ οὐκ ἴσασι Φίλιππον." Φύλαρχος δ' ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν γελάσαντα τὸν Φίλιππον ἐπὶ τούτῳ καλέσαι τε ἐπὶ δεῖπνον τὸν Ἀρκαδίωνα καὶ οὕτω τὴν ἔχθραν διαλύσασθαι.*
>
> Arcadion of Achaea, however, was no flatterer. The same Theopompus offers an account of him, as does Duris in Book 5 of the *History of Macedon*: This Arcadion hated Philip and went into voluntary exile from his native land. … It happened once, then, that Philip was visiting Delphi, and Arcadion was there as well. The Macedonian saw him and called him over, and said: 'How long are you going to remain in exile, Arcadion?' And he replied: 'Until I come to people who know nothing of Philip.' Phylarchus in Book 21 of his *History* reports that Philip laughed at this and invited Arcadion to dinner, and that this is how they ceased being enemies.

The lack of a specific citation of Theopompus here probably indicates that Athenaeus first recorded the story during his reading of Duris (who cited Theopompus); later, when reading Phylarchus, Athenaeus found the story again with an additional note about Philip's reaction.[53]

[53] Chávez Reino and Ottone (2007) 156 n. 56. Note that Athenaeus introduces the Phylarchus citation with no verb or adverb whatsoever. Such instances, in my view, should—without devaluing the painstaking work performed by the authors in that volume—caution against implementing the formulae in Lenfant (2007) too mechanistically.

To return to the lines of Heraclides: if Duris did cite them verbatim, there are several possible reasons for his doing so. They fit Duris' own prescription that the historian produce vividness in his narrative. As with F 13, discussed earlier, where Duris seems to have gone beyond another historian's bare narrative by quoting a poem verbatim, here he has improved upon Theopompus (one of his known targets for criticism in this area) by using lines from the comic stage to illustrate Chares' achievement. There is also perhaps an element of erudition, as with the dinner guests of Athenaeus' work. But we should not allow either of these factors to obscure how this fragment also matches the pattern of Duris introducing poetry as evidence.[54] In doing so, Duris followed a procedure strikingly similar to that of the modern historian, relying on contemporary literary evidence in order to document a historical event. His use of a poet of Middle Comedy reminds us that even though Aristophanes, Eupolis, and Platon were no longer excoriating politicians on the stage, comic poets of the fourth century could still allude to political events, and later historians and scholars considered them valuable evidence for Athenian affairs.[55]

Heraclides himself, while not writing history, was in his own way remembering the past, or describing the present using the terms in which he hoped it would be remembered. This brings us back to our starting point, Praxiphanes' imagined conversation between the historian and the comic poet, Thucydides and Platon, each exemplars of their generation. They differed in their aims, methods, forms of delivery, and audience expectations, but—at least in the case of political comedy—they shared similar subject

[54] Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 94 proposes that Duris introduced the lines merely for *variatio*.

[55] The same is true for New Comedy, as, for example, Plutarch's citation of Philippides' lines attacking Demetrius Poliorcetes help demonstrate: Plut. *Demetr.* 12.4 and 26.3 = Olson (2007) E32. Strasburger (1961) 17 = (1982–90) II.805 notes the possibility that 'the finer technique of type-portrayal in Middle and New Comedy' influenced contemporary historians.

matter: war and peace, citizen and polis, the power of words, the consequences of actions. In this sense, then, two genres which seem on the surface to have little in common may have had something to say to each other after all. While the theoretical treatises of Praxiphanes and others do not survive, we can at least glimpse the practices of Greek historians after the Classical period and see that comedy had its uses for those writing history.

cbaron1@nd.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baron, C. A. (2011) 'The Delimitation of Fragments in Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Some Examples from Duris of Samos' *GRBS* 51: 86–110.

—— (2013) *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography* (Cambridge).

—— (2016) 'Duris of Samos and a Herodotean Model for Writing History', in J. Priestley and V. Zali, edd., *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond* (Leiden) 59–82.

Bertelli, L. (2014) 'Aristotle and History', in Parmeggiani (2014b) 289–303.

Biles, Z. P. (2016) 'Thucydides' Cleon and the Poetics of Politics in Aristophanes' *Wasps*', *CPh* 111: 117–38.

Boedeker, D. (2001) 'Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea,' in ead. and D. Sider, edd., *The New Simonides* (Oxford) 120–34.

Braund, D. and J. Wilkins, edd., *Athenaeus and His World* (Exeter).

Brink, C. O. (1946) 'Callimachus and Aristotle: An Inquiry into Callimachus' ΠΡΟΣ ΠΡΑΞΙΦΑΝΗΝ', *CQ* 40: 11–26.

Burns, T. (2010) 'On Marcellinus' *Life of Thucydides*', *Interpretation* 38.1: 3–26.

Cavallini, E., ed. (2004) *Samo: storia, letteratura, scienza: Atti delle giornate di studio, Ravenna, 14–16 novembre 2002* (Pisa and Rome).

Chávez Reino, A. L. and G. Ottone (2007) 'Les fragments de Théopompe chez Athénée: un aperçu général',' in Lenfant (2007) 139–74.

Chiasson, C. C. (2012) 'Herodotus' Prologue and the Greek Poetic Tradition', *Histos* 6: 114–43.

Connor, W. R. (1968) *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens* (Washington, D.C.).

Cozzoli, A. T. (2004) 'Alcuni aspetti della storiografia di Duride di Samo', in Cavallini (2004) 379–98.

Dalby, A. (1991) 'The Curriculum Vitae of Duris of Samos', *CQ* 41: 539–41.

—— (2000) 'Lynceus and the Anecdotists,' in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 372–94.

Dobrov, G. W., ed. (1995) *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy* (Atlanta).

Flower, M. A. (1994) *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC* (Oxford).

Fois, L. (1998) 'I *Babilonesi* aristofanei: problemi interpretativi di una commedia politica', *Lexis* 16: 113–21.

Ford, A. (2007) 'Herodotus and the Poets', in R. B. Strassler, ed., *The Landmark Herodotus* (New York) 816–18.

Fornara, C. W. (1983) *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).

Fritz, K. von (1958) 'Die Bedeutung des Aristotles für die Geschichtsschreibung', in *Histoire et historiens dans l'Antiquité* (Entretiens Hardt 4; Vandœuvres-Génève) 85–145.

Fuhrer, T. (1996) 'Hellenistische Dichtung und Geschichtsschreibung: zur peripatetischen und kallimacheischen Literaturtheorie', *MH* 53: 116–22.

Funaioli, M. P. (2004) 'Linceo di Samo', in Cavallini (2004) 197–208.

Giovanelli-Jouanna, P. (2007) 'Les fragments de Douris de Samos chez Athénée', in Lenfant (2007) 215–37.

Gorman, R. J. and V. B. Gorman (2007) 'The *tryphê* of the Sybarites: A Historiographical Problem in Athenaeus', *JHS* 127: 38–60.

Gray, V. (1987) '*Mimesis* in Greek Historical Theory', *AJPh* 108: 467–86.

Habicht, C. (1993) 'The Comic Poet Archedikos', *Hesperia* 62: 253–6.

Halliwell, S. (2002) *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems* (Princeton and Oxford).

Hirzel, R. (1878) 'Die Thukydideslegende', *Hermes* 13: 46–9.

Hornblower, S. (2008) *A Commentary on Thucydides, Volume III: 5.25–8.109* (Oxford).

Jones, H. S. and J. E. Powell, edd. (1942) *Thucydidis Historiae* (Oxford).

Kennedy, R. F. (2014) *Immigrant Women in Athens: Gender, Ethnicity, and Citizenship in the Classical City* (New York and London).

Knoepfler, D. (2001) 'Trois historiens hellénistiques: Duris de Samos, Hiéronymos de Cardia, Philochore d'Athènes', in *Historie et historiographie dans l'antiquité. Actes du 11e colloque de la Villa Kérylos à Beaulieu-sur-Mer les 13 et 14 octobre 2000* (Paris) 25–44.

Landucci Gattinoni, F. (1997) *Duride di Samo* (Rome).

Lape, S. (2004) *Reproducing Athens: Menander's Comedy, Democratic Culture, and the Hellenistic City* (Princeton).

Lenfant, D. (2003) 'De l'usage des comiques comme source historique: les Vies de Plutarque et la Comédie Ancienne', in G. Lachenaud and D. Longrée, edd., *Grecs et Romains aux prises avec l'histoire. Représentations, récits et idéologie*, 2 vols. (Rennes) II.391–414.

——, ed. (2007) *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (16–18 juin 2005)* (Paris).

Lewis, R. G. (1988) 'An Alternative Date for Sophocles' *Antigone*', *GRBS* 29: 35–50.

Lowe, N. (2013) 'Comedy and the Pleiad: Alexandrian Tragedians and the Birth of Comic Scholarship', in E. Bakola, L. Prauscello and M. Telò, edd., *Greek Comedy and the Discourse of Genres* (Cambridge) 343–56.

McGlew, J. F. (2002) *Citizens on Stage: Comedy and Political Culture in the Athenian Democracy* (Ann Arbor).

Naas, V. and M. Simon, edd. (2015) *De Samos à Rome: personnalité et influence de Douris* (Nanterre).

Nesselrath, H.-G. (1990) *Die attische Mittlere Komödie* (Berlin and New York).

—— (2010) 'Comic Fragments: Transmission and Textual Criticism', in G. W. Dobrov, ed., *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy* (Leiden and Boston) 423–53.

Olson, S. D. (2002) *Aristophanes:* Acharnians (Oxford).

—— (2006–12) *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters*. 8 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. and London).

—— (2007) *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy* (Oxford).

Parmeggiani, G. (2011) *Eforo di Cuma: studi di storiografia greca* (Bologna).

—— (2014a) 'The Causes of the Peloponnesian War', in Parmeggiani (2014b) 115–32.

——, ed. (2014b) *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography* (Washington, D.C.)

Pédech, P. (1989) *Trois historiens méconnus: Théopompe, Duris, Phylarque* (Paris).

Pelling, C. B. R. (2000) 'Fun with Fragments: Athenaeus and the Historians,' in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 171–90.

Philipp, G. B. (1973) 'Philippides, ein politischer Komiker in hellenistischer Zeit', *Gymnasium* 80: 493–509.

Pirrotta, S. (2009) *Plato comicus: die fragmentarischen Komödien: Ein Kommentar* (Berlin).

Podlecki, A. J. (1985) 'Theophrastus on History and Politics', in W. W. Fortenbaugh, ed., *Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Work* (New Brunswick, N.J.) 231–49.

Rosen, R. M. (1995) 'Plato Comicus and the Evolution of Greek Comedy,' in G. W. Dobrov, ed., *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy* (Atlanta) 119–37.

Rusten, J., ed. (2011) *The Birth of Comedy: Texts, Documents and Art from Athenian Comic Competitions, 486–280* (Baltimore and London).

Sacks, K. (1990) *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton).

Shipley, G. J. (1987) *A History of Samos, 800–188 BC* (Oxford).

Sommerstein, A. H. (2000) 'Platon, Eupolis and the 'Demagogue-Comedy', in D. Harvey and J. Wilkins, edd., *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London) 437–51.

Stadter, P. A. (1989) *A Commentary on Plutarch's* Pericles (Chapel Hill).

Strasburger, H. (1961) 'Komik und Satire in der griechischen Geschichtsschreibung,' in *Festgabe für Paul Kirn, zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern* (Berlin) 13–45; repr. in id. (1982–90) II.801–33.

—— (1966) 'Die Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung' *Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt, Main* 5 (3): 47–96; repr. in id. (1982–90) II.963–1016).

—— (1977) 'Umblick im Trümmerfeld der griechischen Geschichtsschreibung', in *Historiographia antiqua. Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* (Leuven) 3–52 repr. in id. (1982–90) III.167–218.

—— (1982–90) *Studien zur Alten Geschichte*. 3 vols. (Hildesheim and New York).

Vattuone, R. (2014) 'Looking for the Invisible: Theopompus and the Roots of Historiography', in Parmeggiani (2014b) 7–37.

Verdin, H. (1977) 'Les remarques critiques d'Hérodote et Thucydide sur la poésie en tant que source historique', in *Historiographia antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* (Leuven) 53–76.

Walbank, F. W. (1960) 'History and Tragedy', *Historia* 9: 216–34.

Webster, T. B. L. (1970) *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*[2] (Manchester and New York).

Wehrli, F. (1947) 'Die Geschichtsschreibung im Lichte der antiken Theorie', in *Eumusia. Festgabe für Ernst Howald zum 60. Geburtstag am 20. April 1947* (Erlenbach and Zürich) 54–71.

—— (1957) *Die Schule des Aristoteles, Heft IX: Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes* (Basel and Stuttgart).

Welsh, D. (1983) 'The Chorus of Aristophanes' *Babylonians*', *GRBS* 24: 137–50.

Wilamowitz, U. von (1877) 'Die Thukydideslegende', *Hermes* 12: 326–67.

Zecchini, G. (1989) *La cultura storica di Ateneo* (Milan).