5

WRITING CULTURE: HISTORIOGRAPHY, HYBRIDITY, AND THE SHAPING OF COLLECTIVE MEMORY [*]

Joseph E. Skinner

Abstract: This chapter explores the relationship between early historiographical enquiry and identity, using theoretical frameworks developed by Homi K. Bhabha and Stuart Hall. In doing so it argues that historiographical enquiry formed part of an ongoing process that was constitutive of identity. 'Culture work' of this nature needs to be fully integrated into scholarly consideration of both the manner and the means by which a sense of Hellenic self-consciousness and, by extension, collective memory came into being. The enquiries of the fragmentary Greek Historians are shown to be intimately bound up in wider discourses of identity and difference: coins, elegiac poetry, painted pottery, epigraphy, sculpture and historiographical prose were equally tied up in the 'making' of Greek identity.

Keywords: Cultural hybridity, Greek Historiography, Greek identity, enquiries/*historiē*

1. Introduction

Attempts to explain precisely how, when, and why an 'imagined community' of Greeks came into being typically place greatest stress upon the experience of intercultural contact, whether as a result of Archaic mobility/trade/overseas settlement or the Persian Wars.[1] The pre-

---

[1] For imagined communities, see Anderson (1991). The significance of factors such as Homeric epic and the emergence of Panhellenic games and sanctuaries are also acknowledged.

cise circumstances surrounding the emergence of this shared sense of identity (or *identities*) cannot be fully understood unless we also take account of the mechanisms through which these experiences were translated and enshrined within collective memory. Recent research charting the relationship between localism and globalism in the Graeco-Roman Mediterranean has greatly advanced this endeavour by directing our attention towards the 'cultural work' that helped create a sense of 'difference yet connectedness', citing cults and festivals held in common by way of examples, but also geography, mythography, and ethnography, together with local and universal histories.[2] Unfortunately, only a very small percentage of this historiographical writing survives, whether as fragments or testimonia supplied by later authors. It is worth remembering, therefore, that this material represents merely the tip of the iceberg when compared to the amount of ideas and information in circulation overall at any one time.[3]

In order to fully appreciate the nature and significance of this 'cultural work' we need to look some way beyond written prose to the interests and ideas that lie at the root of treatises labelled 'historical' or 'ethnographic'. These found expression in other media long before they were incorporated into prose and continued to circulate in a wide variety of non-literary formats thereafter.[4] This makes it difficult—perhaps even inadvisable—to consider any aspect of Greek historiography in isolation (e.g. treatises on mythographical or genealogical themes) even if the precise relationship between these and the stories, songs, material objects, and (now mostly lost) prose works that made up their wider intellectual and cultural milieu remains largely a matter of conjecture.[5] Far from being mere epiphenomena, these enquiries into (often local) topics and concerns were equally tied up in the 'making' of Greek identity.

It is with these points in mind that this chapter sets out to explore the relationship between early historiographical enquiry and identity, drawing upon theoretical frameworks developed by Homi K. Bhabha and Stuart Hall. In doing so it ventures some way beyond conventional approaches to Greek identity and historiography by suggesting that historiographical enquiry formed part of an ongoing process that was itself *constitutive* of identity and that 'culture work' of this nature needs to be fully integrated into scholarly consideration of both the manner and the means by which a sense of Hellenic self-consciousness came into being. The enquiries of the fragmentary Greek prose authors were intimately bound up in wider

---

[2] See Woolf (2010) 191. For the application of globalisation theory to the study of the ancient world, see Vlassopoulos (2013a) 19–25, 226–34.

[3] Woolf (2010) 191.

[4] On this see Grethlein (2010) 3. Grethlein's book considers the representation of the past in 'non-historiographical Media of Memory'. The term encompasses a range of literary genres including epinicia, elegiac poetry, tragedy, and oratory.

[5] For comprehensive treatment, see Fowler (2000–13).

discourses of identity and difference that transcended media and genre.[6] Coins, elegiac poetry, painted pottery, epigraphy, sculpture and historiographical prose all played an active role in identity-construction—both at a local or regional level and throughout the length and breadth of the 'Greek' Mediterranean.

Certain sub-sections of Greek historiography are, of course, already widely associated with matters of identity. It has become commonplace, for example, to view the description of foreign manners and customs as a discrete mode of enquiry predicated upon the juxtaposition of 'Self' and 'Other', reinforcing a sense of (Greek) connectedness in the face of the difference of 'Others'.[7] However, there's also Great Historiography (i.e., narrative history), whose purpose, as conceived by Herodotus, was 'to preserve the fame and remarkable achievements of both Greeks and Barbarians' (Hdt. 1 *praef.*)—who of course break down into a kaleidoscope of peoples and nations, each of them with a distinctive set of *nomoi* (i.e., customs, practices, or laws), way of life, and material culture that distinguishes them from their neighbours—whether Greek or non-Greek.[8] Local or polis histories have also been placed under the spotlight thanks to studies such as Clarke's exploration of the way in which shared notions of time and shared histories were variously negotiated and constructed in a manner that both reflected and helped constitute a collective sense of Hellenic identity.[9]

This chapter seeks to both build and significantly expand upon recent work on this topic by examining historiographical enquiry 'in the round'— as opposed to homing in on one body of inquiry in particular. My point of departure will be ethnography—described as an intrinsically etic practice by the anthropologist James Clifford. My only reason for doing so, however, is to illustrate the problems inherent in imposing such categories on early Greek prose. I have argued elsewhere that James Clifford's definition of ethnography as 'thinking and writing about culture from the point of view of an outsider' can reasonably be applied to a far greater range of material than that which has in the past been referred to as the ancient 'ethnographic tradition'.[10] However, even this broad-brush formulation fails to capture the diverse ways in which cultural difference can be represented or described—

[6] For discourses of identity and difference, see J. Skinner (2012).

[7] Almagor and Skinner (2013a) 2. For *Nostoi* as another form of cultural work through which a sense of difference yet connectedness was created, see Malkin (1998); Hornblower and Biffis (2018).

[8] For adroit analysis of the proem and its relationship to Herodotus' *Histories* as a whole, see Vasunia (2012), together with Rood (2010). For Herodotus' treatment of foreign peoples, see Redfield (1985); Nenci and Reverdin (1990); Munson (2001); Rood (2006); Baragwanath above, ch. 4.

[9] Clarke (2008). See also Porciani (1991); Orsi (1994); Schepens (2001); Harding (2007); Thomas (2014a) and (2014b); Tober (2010) and (2017).

[10] Clifford (1988) 9.

a fact borne out in the work of twenty-first century ethnographers for whom the formulaic description of a particular group or set of cultural practices from an 'etic' perspective now represents just one option amongst many.[11] Images too, can play a role, in what is now referred to by practitioners as 'aesthetic' or 'visual ethnography', but also transcripts of interviews that place the dialogical nature of ethnographic enquiry centre-stage.[12] A similar diversity of formats and representational modes is arguably apparent where Greek historiography is concerned.[13] Although some indication as to how this might work in practice will be found below, such a vast topic can only be dealt with summarily in a book chapter (this is something that I will return to elsewhere). My goal in what follows is not to chart the rise to prominence of a particular Greek author, mode of enquiry, or even the development of the Greek historical consciousness *per se* but a history of knowledge and ideas that explores the relationship *between* historiography (writing culture), hybrid identities and the shaping of collective memory.

In order to prepare the ground for what is to follow I will first offer a brief (and unashamedly partial) summary of where we stand with regards to modern approaches towards ancient Greek identity.[14] I will then attempt something similar for Greek historiography, highlighting the extent to which classical scholarship remains tightly wedded to the theories and paradigms expounded by Felix Jacoby despite the at least partial dismantling of his model of the origins of Greek historiography. I will then introduce an alternative approach to the study of ancient Greek identity, one that is grounded in Culture theory (Hybridity). The second half of this chapter will be devoted to testing how such ideas might be applied in practice. In doing so I will suggest that the writing, reception, and wider circulation of historical prose was intimately bound up with, and at times impossible to disentangle from, that of ethnographic knowledge, mythographical works, and epinicia, not to mention coins, inscriptions, and other aspects of material culture, and that all of this helped create a sense of what it meant to be Greek in the first place.

---

[11] See J. Skinner (2012); Almagor and Skinner (2013a) 2–9.

[12] See contributions to Clair (2003); Pink (2013); Vlassopoulos (2013b) 49–75.

[13] This is not, by any means, an original point: see Grethlein (2010) 2–4. However, whilst reference is made to a variety of media that might act as 'bearers of memory' (2)—e.g., dance or material artefacts including votives—the analysis that follows remains tightly focused on literary materials and a phenomenological approach to the 'idea of history'.

[14] The broad contours of the debate on how Greek identity came into being have been widely rehearsed so I will aim be to be as brief as possible. See J. Skinner (2012) for more detailed treatment together with Siapkas (2003).

2. Modern Approaches Towards Ancient Greek Identity

Mainstream Classics has only recently begun to grapple with the fact that ancient 'Greekness' constituted a bewildering variety of identities that were at once socially constructed and historically contingent. Modern notions of ancient 'Greekness' can therefore appear loosely articulated and imprecise in contrast to those encountered in specialist literature where questions of context or chronology are the primary focus. This reticence can be further exacerbated by institutional and/or cultural factors that privilege the acquisition of specialist knowledge in a relatively narrow subject-area, iconographic analysis, for example, or textual criticism. Whilst in many ways unsurprising and/or understandable, the net result has been a steady divergence between scholarship of a more traditional nature and those works committed to pursuing more theoretically informed approaches that result in new lines of enquiry.[15]

The last decade or so has nonetheless witnessed a pronounced shift in the way in which some—but by no means all—classicists and archaeologists think about Greek identity (by which I mean those thinking and writing about Greek identity itself). Now increasingly described in terms that emphasise its inherent complexity, Greek identity has gone from being conceived as a primarily static, homogenous and monolithic entity whose existence could be taken largely for granted to: 'an extremely complex and fluid construction, or rather a system of constructions, [that] included multivocalities and ambiguities'.[16] Such views were initially tabled in work with a western Mediterranean focus, most notably Magna Graecia and Sicily, leading many to believe that the region's long back-history of inter-cultural contact and interaction made it somehow unique. The idea that other areas of the Greek world might not have experienced similar levels of interaction is, on one level, understandable; Sicily and Magna Graecia certainly provided a backdrop for sustained contacts between Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Greeks, and groups variously labelled as Elymaean, Sicel, etc., from at least the eighth century BCE onwards.[17] We should, however, be

[15] See Moyer (2011); Vlassopoulos (2013a); Mac Sweeney (2013); Demetriou (2012); Fragoulaki (2013). This attempt to provide a concise summary of scholarly trends is not intentionally polemical; however, frank discussion of such matters is both important and necessary since they have a clear impact on the way we think and write about the past. For detailed and thought-provoking analysis of the discursive structures underpinning Classics, together with their implications, see Vlassopoulos (2007); Siapkas (2014). For wider discussion of disciplinary frameworks, see Humphreys (1978) and (2004).

[16] Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 140. Cf. Lomas (2004) 2 for the view that Greek ethnicity/Hellenicity were: 'multi-layered, constantly changing, and culturally constructed, concepts'. See also Malkin (2001) and Fearn (2011) 3 stressing the diversity of fifth-century culture.

[17] This in part may be explained by ideas about the western Greeks in general. See Ceserani (2012). The apparent singularity of western Mediterranean cosmopolitanism was arguably something of a mirage: the result of a surge of publications detailing the results of

wary of the assumption that other parts of the Greek world were comparatively insulated from contact with foreign peoples prior to what has traditionally been regarded as the watershed moment in Greek-barbarian interactions: the Persian Wars. Whilst it may be true that the polyglot host that descended on Greece was exceptional in terms of both its size and diversity, high levels of contact and interaction between a wide variety of groups can in fact be demonstrated in numerous locations across the Greek world prior to the Persian invasions—albeit to varying levels and degrees—together with the discourses of identity and difference that these engendered.[18]

In fact, it is now increasingly common for region-based studies to downplay the significance of the barbarian paradigm where their particular part of the Greek world is concerned.[19] Such arguments feature prominently in Naoise Mac Sweeney's ground-breaking study of Ionian foundation myths but also recent work on interaction between Scythians and Greeks in and around Olbia.[20] This, coupled with critique of the Greek-barbarian paradigm offered by Kostas Vlassopoulos, raises the question as to whether similarly detailed probing of the foundation myths and early settlement history of other parts of the *oikoumenē* would tell much the same story.[21] Further work is undoubtedly required for such hypothesising is to have any degree of credibility. For the time being we must remain open to the fact that such complexities were in fact the norm and that it is discrete, inward-looking communities which should be regarded as exceptional. Paradigmatic examples of insularity were already familiar to Greek audiences: the Libyan tribes who purportedly conducted mute exchanges with Herodotus' Carthaginian traders or the Cyclopes are two notable examples of groups that were represented as standing outside both the normal ebb and flow of history and the accepted norms of civilised society in which culture-contact was the norm, whether this came in the form of an encounter with someone

---

problem-based fieldwork at a time when similar data for elsewhere in the Mediterranean was largely unavailable.

[18] See Hdt. 7.60 with due allowance for inflated numbers. The evidence for an early interest in and engagement with foreign peoples prior to the Persian Wars is entirely compelling: see J. Skinner (2012).

[19] Crude stereotyping is, in such cases, invariably disavowed in favour of more positive/inclusive attitudes towards those of different outlook and culture, e.g., Guldager Bilde and Petersen (2008) 10. For a far more positive reappraisal of ancient attitudes in general, see Gruen (2010).

[20] Mac Sweeney (2013) 202 (and *passim*) demonstrates that the meticulous scrutiny of the material record and literary sources combined reveals a complexity that has previously been overlooked or ignored entirely; but see also Thomas (2000) who draws contrasts between the world of Ionian science and 'official' attitudes of Athens (e.g., Thomas (2000) 29, 95, 113, 273). For earlier work stressing links with Anatolia, see Greaves (2010). For discussion of ethnic constructs, see Crielaard (2009). For Olbia see e.g. Petersen (2010).

[21] Vlassopoulos (2013a).

from the adjacent deme, island, or somewhere further afield.[22] It should, however, be pointed out that the existence of ideologies and stereotypes predicated upon the perceived inferiorities of various types of 'foreigners' is not/cannot be disproved by studies which draw attention to the complexity and long back-history of intercultural contact and interaction. The recent tendency to either downplay the overall salience of the barbarian paradigm or disavow negative stereotyping more generally is something of which we should be wary if we want to avoid a rose-tinted perspective on antiquity.[23]

For better or for worse, the encounter with the Barbarian (the Persian Wars) is still widely perceived as marking a watershed between the hazy and ill-defined Greek identities of the Archaic period and a more clear-cut sense of cultural identity predicated upon the juxtaposition of two antithetical categories: Greek and Barbarian. This argument was initially championed by Edith Hall in a hugely influential study that saw the barbarian stereotype as a specifically Athenian invention that found its first coherent expression in Attic drama (i.e., Aeschylus' *Persians*).[24] This model of a transition from loosely-defined identity to an oppositional identity based on a polarity of opposites was effectively duplicated by Jonathan Hall, when he argued that the mid-sixth century BCE saw the emergence of an ethnic or 'aggregative' Hellenic identity, articulated via fictive claims to kinship,[25] which then gave way to an identity predicated upon the Greek-barbarian dichotomy following the clash with Persia.[26] Hyun Jin Kim and Lynette Mitchell have since argued that shared notions of collective panhellenic identity are more likely to have emerged somewhat earlier and in a slightly different context, directing our attention towards the late sixth and fifth centuries BCE when

---

[22] Hdt. 4.94 (Carthaginians); cf. Hdt. 1.65 (Sparta). For discussion see Harrison (2007) 59–60. For Homer's Cyclopes, see Hom. *Od.* 9.105–15, 131–9. For discussion and references see Dougherty (2001); Hartog (2001). Examples such as these suggest that insularity was one of the most abiding characteristics of alterity in ancient Greek thought. For comprehensive treatment of the related concept of island insularity, see Constantakopoulou (2007).

[23] The need for a 'warts and all' approach to such matters is convincingly argued by Harrison (2002) 14.

[24] E. Hall (1989), which drew upon two seminal texts: Said (1978) and Hartog (1988). Although the latter was originally published in French in 1980, it was the translated edition, combined with Hall's study, that prompted what was effectively a paradigm shift within the Anglo-American academy.

[25] J. Hall (2002). This took the form of 'putative subscription to a myth of common descent and kinship, an association with a specific territory and a sense of shared history': J. Hall (2002) 9. This is in contrast to both previous broad-based definitions of ethnicity and arguments that saw the initial flowering of Hellenic identity as having occurred either in opposition to the threat posed by Achaemenid Persia in the fifth century BCE, or as a result of the experience of colonisation from the eighth century BCE onwards. For detailed analysis of ideas surrounding kinship, see Fragoulaki (2013).

[26] J. Hall (2002) 12. For responses, see Dench (2005); Sourvinou-Inwood (2005); Gruen (2010); Demetriou (2012); Fragoulaki (2013); and the contributions to McInerney (2014).

the Greek city-states of Ionia were coming under increasing pressure from Achaemenid Persia.[27]

The emergence of a sense of Hellenic self-consciousness has equally been linked to the increase in population mobility, trade, and settlement overseas during the early Archaic period. However, aside from Irad Malkin's work on network theory, the precise mechanisms by which this came to pass have received comparatively little attention.[28] Those arguing for the early emergence of a collective sense of Greek identity, whether through 'definition through difference' or some other mechanism, are faced with the problem of explaining the chronological gap that separates the initial encounters with foreign peoples that resulted from steadily increasing levels of mobility from the eighth century onwards and the first evidence for ethnogenesis in the mid-sixth century BCE.[29] Perhaps the most abiding problem from a methodological point of view, however, is the tendency to see Greek identity as a fixed point towards which Archaic Greek society was moving inexorably—something that happened in spite of cultural and political disunities, not because of them: an end point as opposed to a process that was essentially ongoing and would have meant different things at different times to different people.[30]

Scholarly discussion of the extent to which historiographical enquiry might have played a role in this process of ethnogenesis has focused primarily on narrative accounts of the Persian Wars or—in the case of Edith Hall—the provenance of the raw data from which the tragedians fashioned their 'Oriental' stereotypes.[31] By either reckoning, it provides a start-point for the systematic juxtaposition of binary oppositions between Greeks and foreigners—deemed largely absent from the Homeric epics.[32] The fact that Greek identity already existed as a stable and coherent entity by the time

---

[27] Both adhere to the established orthodoxy of a radical shift between fuzzy 'archaic' and 'classical' identities: see Kim (2009); Mitchell (2007).

[28] See Malkin (2011); Collar (2014) deals with this only in passing.

[29] Celebrated examples include the institutionalisation of the circuit of Panhellenic crowned games, the founding of the Hellenion, a shrine dedicated to 'the gods of the Hellenes' at Naucratis in Egypt, and the construction of Hellenic genealogies. See Malkin (2003) and (2011). On Panhellenic games, see Hornblower and Morgan (2007a). On the Hellenion see Sourvinou-Inwood (2005) 52–6; J. Hall (2002) 130; Möller (2000); Höckmann and Möller (2006); Demetriou (2012). On the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, see West (1985); Fowler (1998); Hunter (2005).

[30] J. Skinner (2018). Cf. Frank Walbank's (1951) classic exploration of the Greeks' failure to achieve lasting unity.

[31] See E. Hall (1989). Note, however, Woolf (2010) 200: 'But as soon as history, ethnography and other prose genres began to emerge, so too did a sense of the local and the universal. Local knowledge grows with the expansion of Greek intellectual activity …'. Cf. Pelling (1997); Luraghi (2008).

[32] See E. Hall (1989) 14. For barbarian stereotypes in Homer, see Winter (1995); Mackie (1996); Ross (2005); Kim (2013). For overall discussion see J. Skinner (2012).

Greek prose came into being, i.e. late sixth/early fifth century BCE, is also taken for granted. The assumption being—perhaps not unreasonably—that reference to τὸ Ἑλληνικόν ('the Greek thing') by Herodotus (8.144.2) is indicative of this shared sense of identity, albeit one formulated amidst the internecine strife of the Peloponnesian War when the leading Greek states were locked in combat.

Although now problematised and questioned to some extent, the Athenian ambassadors' declaration of loyalty to the Greek cause in Herodotus (8.144.2) is still widely regarded as providing the definitive statement of what it meant to be Greek,[33] the bases upon which a comparatively small number of Greeks united against the Persian juggernaut are enumerated in succession: blood, language, temples, and gods all held in common—and a shared obligation to avenge the desecration of temples and statues.[34] In fact, there are other ways of looking at this as we shall see. Greek identity is by no means as stable or fixed in the *Histories* as is commonly assumed. Instead, there is a general problematising of Athenian claims to autochthony with tales of Pelasgian origins (1.57–8), hints that Athens could indeed collaborate with Persia or was at least ready to contemplate such things (8.136; 9.7–8), gloomy signs of tyranny to come as the captured Persian commander Artaÿctes is nailed to a tree overlooking the Hellespont (9.120), or reports of Greeks who went native in Scythia but still worship Greek gods in the Greek manner and speak a mixture of Scythian and Greek (4.108). Ionian claims to pure-blood ancestry are skewered and dismissed (1.146), whilst the proem juxtaposes the Greek-barbarian binaries of Herodotus' opening statement with a series of tales that show such distinctions to be largely arbitrary (1.1–5).[35] In short, there is a sense that Greeks are more than capable of changing their customs (*nomoi*) and that everything is in a state of flux.

Herodotus' apparent 'playfulness' when it comes to identity matters has been attributed by Tom Harrison to the fact that Herodotus consciously set out to *evoke* a wider sense of Greek community through his writing in response to a fractured, bitter, and bloody present.[36] Although the Peloponnesian War must have imposed restrictions upon the freedom with which goods and

---

[33] See Zacharia (2008). The recent tendency to see this as something approaching a statement of methodology should be resisted: see, e.g., Knapp (2014) 35.

[34] Zacharia (2008). See Polinskaya (2010) but with caveats: the distinction drawn between the gods that Greeks appealed on a day-to-day basis and the 'abstract' deities they encountered in myth and poetry is perhaps a little too rigid to be convincing (*ibid.* 61). It is hard to square the mythographical enquiries of Hecataeus and others with the assertion that 'there is little indication in our textual sources that ancient Greeks perceived that they constituted one religious group by virtue of acknowledging the same undifferentiated group of any and all Greek gods' (*ibid.* 67).

[35] See Vasunia (2012).

[36] Harrison (2008). I am grateful for permission to cite this material.

individuals circulated throughout the Greek world, Herodotus persists in making asides directed at an imagined panhellenic audience who will in all likelihood be familiar with the layout of the territory of the Iapygians on Italy's heel if the topography of Cape Sunion is beyond their ken (4.99.4–5).[37] The idea of a wider sense of solidarity uniting fellow Greeks may well have appeared something of a forlorn dream to Herodotean audiences; however, Harrison's argument that Herodotus' statement of cultural unity (8.144.2) needs to be seen in the context of both a wider emphasis on unity and disunity, and their at times momentous consequences, is undoubtedly correct. The invention of a wider Greek identity that transcended the internecine rivalries and jealous hatreds of the present may well have provided the platform for a new 'style' of imagining both Greek historiography and identity combined.[38]

3. Approaches to Greek Historiography and Felix Jacoby

It is now time to tease out some of the implications which ensue from this shift in perspective. A willingness to take such allusions to the fluid and contested nature of identity at face value and to then factor them into our analyses places one on a somewhat different trajectory from scholars who do not subscribe to such views but have nonetheless played a pivotal role in shaping the study of Classical antiquity. One such example can be found in a scholar now regarded as 'the undisputed master of Greek historiography of our time', Felix Jacoby.[39] Although both Jacoby's scholarly method and overarching thesis have been subject to (increasingly) critical scrutiny in recent years, this has in many cases served merely to illustrate both his extraordinary command of the sources and the magnitude of his achievement.[40] Jacoby devoted himself to resolving a problem that bedevilled scholarship of his day, namely how best to catalogue and analyse the fragmentary Greek historians—it being widely acknowledged that the most recent attempt by Carl and Theodore Müller possessed numerous shortcomings.[41] Seemingly undeterred by the vast nature of this undertaking, the precocious young Jacoby tabled a new schema for organizing and classifying the fragmentary Greek authors based on the evolution of literary and stylistic forms which was subsequently published in *Klio* in 1909.[42]

---

[37] Ibid. See also J. Skinner (2018).

[38] Harrison (2008). Cf. Anderson (1991) 6: '*Imagined Communities* are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined'.

[39] Fowler (2000–13) I.v–vii.

[40] See Fowler (1996); Schepens (1997); Clarke (1999) and (2008); J. Skinner (2012).

[41] Müller and Müller (1841–70).

[42] Jacoby (1909/2015). Further elaboration upon this idea can be found in Jacoby's (1913) magisterial entry on Herodotus for *RE*. See Fornara (1971) 4. This section was re-worked in

Jacoby's model placed him at odds with a *communis opinio* variously predicated upon Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *de Thuc.* 5.1 and Cicero's *de Orat.* 2.52 in which the great historical works of Herodotus and Thucydides were seen to be preceded by local histories that owed much to priestly chronicles when it came to both their content and style of delivery. Jacoby posited instead that 'Great Historiography' evolved out of earlier genres of historical writing by a different process altogether.[43] Stand-alone treatises devoted to a single land or people were thought to have evolved 'naturally' from the ethnographic excursuses embedded in Hecataeus' *Periodos Gês*. Meanwhile, Herodotus' monumental excursus on Egypt encouraged the perfectly logical supposition that this was an earlier piece of work composed according to an already well-established set of conventions.[44] The catalyst for Herodotus' transformation from virtuoso ethnographer to the world's first historian was his encounter with the intellectual ferment of Athens and the Persian Wars. Jacoby's developmental schema for the emergence of historiographical enquiry required that the 'undifferentiated sphere of early Greek prose' be sub-divided and ordered into discrete sequentially-ordered genres—all viewed as sub-species of historical enquiry.[45] The start-point was a volume containing testimonia to Hecataeus' *Genealogies* and *Description of the World* (vol. I), followed by:

> Genealogy/mythography (vol. II)
> Ethnography (vol. III)
> Contemporary history (*Zeitgeschichte des Griechischen Volkes*) (vol. IV)
> Chronography (vol. V)
> Horography (vol. VI)
> Biography/Literary History (vol. VII)
> Geography (vol. VIII)[46]

The combined impact of Jacoby's work on the study of Greek historiography was nothing short of colossal; however, there were significant costs in terms of both the overall rigidity of the framework that he devised and the

---

the light of helpful comments by Simon Hornblower stressing the logic underpinning the developmental hypothesis. See now Rood (forthcoming).

[43] See Jacoby (1909/2015) and (1913).

[44] See Jacoby (1913) 330. The region's geography, customs, wonders, and political history were to be presented in succession; in cases where these were found to be paltry or lacking, a note would be made lest the audience think that something had been omitted, e.g. Hdt. 1.93, 4.82.

[45] Murray (2000) 330.

[46] The monumental task of organising and classifying the fragmentary Greek authors was undertaken in the face of great adversity. For full details of Jacoby's life and career, see Chambers (2006). For discussion of subsequent amendments to this plan and their implications, see Zambrini (2006); Schepens (2010); J. Skinner (2012) 30–4.

extraordinary resilience of the various categories and genres that he identified—largely as a matter of convenience.[47]

Although predicated in part upon Polybius' critique of 'parochial' local histories, Jacoby's work also bears all the hallmarks of his wider intellectual and cultural milieu. With the benefit of hindsight we can also see that Jacoby's thesis came with a lot of cultural baggage: a set of shared assumptions regarding both the way identities might be approached and/or conceptualised and the history of ideas. The latter would prove instrumental not only in defining the categories into which the fragmentary Greek historians were ordered but also in governing the way in which these were in turn received by contemporary audiences.[48] Language, culture, society, and state had by this time been subsumed into a mystical and unassailable unity, the nation state, whilst humanity's evolution and history were seen increasingly in terms of developmental sequences of racially differentiated categories.[49] The magnificent range and scope of Jacoby's work is itself symptomatic of a contemporary penchant for organising and classifying vast bodies of materials and knowledge whilst Greek identity and civilisation were conceived as both homogenous and distinct. This made it possible to distinguish between the genres of horography (local history) and ethnography (the study of foreign people) purely on the basis of their subject matter alone: one pertained to Greeks and the other did not.[50] The extent to which Jacoby's conception of 'Greekness' played a significant role in structuring his analyses can be clearly discerned in his discussion of the origins of Athens' local history:

> The statement that the *Atthides* contain the history of Athens is of course a truism (though the statement that they give that history in a certain form may not be such). The name (not differing from Ἀττικά as to its sense) expresses the fact, and it is the nature of local history and of

---

[47] Jacoby himself noted—on more than one occasion (see Jacoby (1949) 289 n. 110; 305 n. 22)—that the relationship between genres such as history and ethnography was 'not clearly distinguished in ancient terminology'. For additional evidence of the internal wrangling concerning the ordering and classification of materials see Schepens (2006a) and (2006b) and now Tober (2017).

[48] The late nineteenth-early twentieth century was not only an age of empire that witnessed widespread enthusiasm and interest in foreign lands and peoples, but also one in which nationalist sentiment was becoming increasingly dominant. See Penny and Bunzl (2003); Qureshi (2011).

[49] See Wolf (1982) 13–19, stressing the role of anthropology in demarcating culture groups as bounded systems.

[50] Cf. Lloyd (2002) 17. The point is made explicit by Prontera (1984) 194, as noted by Clarke (2008) 152 n. 222.

ethnography (which is related to it) to give history: Περσικά tell the history of Persia, and Λαμψακηνῶν Ὧροι the story of Lampsakos.[51]

Whereas the nature and significance of local history has attracted considerable comment, the distinction between local history and ethnography has gone largely unquestioned in subsequent scholarship debating the origins of the local histories of Athens and horography more broadly.[52] Arnaldo Momigliano's sweeping assertion that local histories fell outside the historical mainstream due to the parochiality of their antiquarian interests, together with chronography, genealogy, and ethnography,[53] has been successfully refuted by first Schepens and then Clarke. Schepens demonstrated the degree to which supposedly antiquarian topics such as a polis' foundations story and cult aetiologies could play an important role in inter-state diplomacy,[54] whilst Clarke argued that city histories are anything but parochial in outlook, since they invariably presuppose a high degree of interconnectedness between *poleis* and interest on behalf of outsiders.[55] The question as to how we should approach Greek local histories in general has been further developed and problematised in recent discussion of the way in which the authors of local histories sought to position themselves vis-à-vis their audiences.[56] These are important points to which we will return below; however, it is worth emphasising for the meantime that the authors of such polis histories[57] were often outsiders and that external audiences were eager consumers of knowledge regarding what are effectively the habits and customs of fellow Greeks.

[51] Jacoby (1949) 100. Fornara (1983) 21 argued that local histories such as the *Atthis* were a result of annalistic records being augmented with antiquarian material. For related discussion, see Clarke (2008) 175–86.

[52] See, however, Clarke (2008) 152–3 and now Tober (2017).

[53] Momigliano (1990) 59. Attention has focused primarily on the relationship between 'Great Historiography' and local history and whether these works and their authors were as detached as some have suggested.

[54] Schepens (2001). For the historical importance of intercommunal kinship, see Jones (1999) and now Fragoulaki (2013) on Thucydides.

[55] Clarke (2008) 181–2 and *passim*. As well as drawing attention to the way in which cut-down versions of local histories might have circulated—public performances but also more intimate settings, e.g., symposia—Clarke also highlights the fact that many of these individuals were working on commission, although much of the material is of a later date and intended primarily (but not exclusively) for local audiences.

[56] Tober (2017).

[57] For honours paid to these individuals see Chaniotis (1988) 365–82; Clarke (2008).

4. Hybridity Theory and Greek Identity

Having discussed the factors that helped shape Jacoby's intellectual and cultural milieu and the impact this had upon his analyses, it is now time to explore the implications of a new approach to the study of identity and culture to which students of antiquity are increasingly turning.[58] Theoretical studies of identity from outside the discipline have, over the years, enriched our analyses by demonstrating the manifest complexities of social identities together with the processes by which they are variously constructed and find expression. The work of the cultural theorist Homi K. Bhabha on hybridity is a notable—if not uncontroversial—example of this phenomenon. Bhabha has defined hybridity as the 'Third Space' of enunciation, translation, and negotiation that exists between coloniser and colonised.[59] It goes without saying that both Bhabha's arguments and the circumstances that he set out to both document and theorise are historically situated and that we should therefore be extremely cautious when it comes to applying such concepts to the ancient world. It should be noted, however, that both Bhabha and S. Hall, another cultural critic, are explicit when it comes to articulating the 'situatedness' of their writings.[60] The elaborate framework of ideas that they have developed in response to a particular set of power relationships can still serve as a useful model for thinking about identity matters more broadly.

Whilst notions of cultural hybridity have recently come to the fore in material culture-based studies of the ancient Mediterranean, the manner in which they are applied varies markedly. A particularly effective and insightful example can be found in Grant Parker's study of 'Hellenism' in Afghanistan; however, this is not the way in which the term is typically applied in archaeological studies.[61] This may in part be attributed to the fact that Bhabha's writings possess a complexity that makes them difficult to fathom, leaving the way open for divergent opinions as to both the potential remit and wider implications of hybridity theory *as formulated by Bhabha*. In order to circumvent at least some of these problems I will also be drawing

---

[58] Bhabha (1994); S. Hall (1990). Cf. Mitchell (2007); Antonaccio (2003); van Dommelen (2002); Jiménez (2011); van Dommelen and Knapp (2011); Reger (2014).

[59] Bhabha (1994) 55–6.

[60] Bhabha (1994) 56: 'It is significant that the productive capacities of this Third Space have a colonial or postcolonial provenance.' See also S. Hall (1990). Cf. White (1991) 52: 'The middle ground depended on the inability of both sides to gain their ends through force …' Matters changed, however, as these new systems of meaning and exchange were entirely predicated upon the huge profits to be made from the European fur trade. A dramatic escalation in trapping ultimately sent wildlife populations into irreversible decline, whereupon the middle ground 'withered and died' (*ibid.* 523).

[61] E.g., Parker (2007).

upon ideas expounded (with, it must be said, far greater clarity) by the theorist Stuart Hall.[62]

If we return to the archaeological mainstream, allusions to hybrid objects, identities and cultures are typically accompanied by a nod in the direction of authorities such as Bhabha and discussion of the various contexts in which 'hybridity' might function as either a term of analysis (e.g., biological sciences, in which genetic hybrids are routinely described) or abuse ('half-caste', 'mongrel', etc.). In fact, far more attention is paid to drawing a line between discourses of race prevalent during the late nineteenth-early twentieth centuries and an intellectual environment in which biological descent, language, and culture are no longer perceived as immutable characteristics than assessing the broader implications which notions of cultural hybridity pose for the study of antiquity.[63] Such uses of hybridity theory have (rightly) been singled out for critique, whether because of their lack of scholarly rigour[64] or ethical considerations.[65] But what if we pursue the idea that hybridity theory might be applicable to any or all identities in general, as opposed to a rather more limited range of contexts that might loosely be called 'colonial'? If one is prepared to accept this premise then the heuristic value of the concept is, I would argue, greatly enhanced.

If this is to become a reality then we need to lay aside any lingering doubts and insecurities and simply take this distinction between 'old' and 'new' hybridities as read. Having done so, we need to spend some time 'thinking through' the wider implications of cultural analysis. Bhabha's hybridity represents a significant advance on earlier usage of the term/concept, insofar as it is posited not on ideas of multiculturalism nor the diversity of cultures, but on the fact that all cultures are *intrinsically* hybrid.[66] This makes it

---

[62] For limited use of S. Hall's work, see Mitchell (2007).

[63] E.g., Shapiro (2007) 216. For a rather more detailed overview, see Young (1995) (although with reservations). For the destabilisation of biological criteria in constructions of kinship and relatedness, and the anthropological framework, see Fragoulaki (2013) 22–5.

[64] This cannot, however, be said of van Dommelen (2002) or Parker (2007). For critique of hybridity's application in archaeological scholarship see Meyer (2013) 306–7: 'The focus on agency and cultural perceptions presents serious problems for the term's application in archaeological studies of cultural interaction. In such non-literate contexts, the identification of hybrid creations more often than not rests on simplistic morphological distinctions between the supposed archaeological cultures of the colonists and the natives'.

[65] See Malkin (2014) 289–90. Cf. the assertion that use of the term is methodologically unsound by virtue of its perceived ahistoricity—and that the application of biological metaphors associated with domesticated plants and animals to human cultures and societies is something that should be resisted. See Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 7; Malkin (2008). For an alternative view, see Parker (2007) 184.

[66] Bhabha (1994) 56: 'For a willingness to descend into that alien territory where I have led you—may reveal that the theoretical recognition of the split-space of enunciation may open the way to conceptualizing an *international* culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the *diversity* of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's

inappropriate to use 'hybridity' as a convenient shorthand for a 'mix of cultures' that can implicitly exist in a 'virgin' or 'pure' state at other times and in other places.[67]

If we turn to the work of S. Hall matters are rather more straightforward. Hall sees identity as a *production* as opposed to an already accomplished fact, as such, it is never complete, indeed, it is 'always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation'.[68] In problematising 'the very authority and authenticity to which the term, "cultural identity", lays claim',[69] Hall's arguments are highly significant for the way in which we study ancient identities, shifting the emphasis from preconceived notions of unitary cultures to identity as a 'work in progress'—always changing in focus and subject to an ongoing play of culture, power, and knowledge.[70] Talk of a sense of Greek cultural identity becoming somehow 'fixed' in the fifth century BCE, or indeed at any other time, sounds a lot less convincing in this light.

Having briefly introduced hybridity theory, I will now outline how this can be applied to Greek identity. S. Hall is keen to stress the 'play' of difference—a metaphor suggestive of instability and a lack of any final resolution discernible in all fields of cultural production, in his case the varieties of Caribbean musics, in ours the various spheres in which Greek difference is deemed to be self-evident: silver coinage, praise poetry, vase painting, etc. This cultural play cannot be represented in terms of simple binaries (which is not to say that dichotomies between 'Greek' and 'Barbarian' do not abound). Time and space do not allow for a detailed account of the way in which S. Hall appropriates and modifies the work of Jacques Derrida, in order to pinpoint the relationship between what is termed the play of signification and identity.[71] The basic gist of it is that representation/signification—so, in short, everything from Aeschylus' *Persae* to vase painting and temple sculpture—is necessarily a 'cut' of identity, part of a wider (and ongoing) process of positioning, rather than something that can be fixed in anything other than an arbitrary or contingent manner. A

hybridity'. Cf. Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 12 and Gosden (2004) 69: 'Hybridity and creolisation imply, to me at least, that there were relatively fixed forms of identity that met and mixed'.

[67] Cf. Young (1995) 23: 'without the emphasis on the active, disjunctive moments or movements of homogenization and diasporization, it can easily be objected that hybridization assumes, as was often the case with the nineteenth-century theorists of race, the prior existence of pure, fixed and separate antecedents'. Meyer (2013) 307–8 follows Curtis (1986) in tracing the intellectual genealogy of the term back to Nietzschean thought as communicated to Mikhail Bakhtin when studying in St Petersburg under Zieliński.

[68] S. Hall (1990) 222.

[69] Ibid.

[70] S. Hall (1990) 225. Cf. Clifford (1988) 344: 'what if identity is conceived not as a boundary to be maintained but as a nexus of relations and transactions actively engaging a subject? The story or stories of interaction must then be more complex, less linear and teleological'.

[71] S. Hall (1990) 230.

token example can be found in the two figures depicted in the tondo of a red-figure cup attributed to Douris (see Fig. 1).[72] In the foreground, a young (i.e., unbearded) hoplite is shown running barefoot right to left bearing a shield carrying a lion's head blazon. The helmeted youth wears a cuirass over his tunic. He is equipped with greaves and carries a spear. His pose is mimicked by another figure which is shown running at his side. Whilst partially obscured by the hoplite some details of the latter's costume are nonetheless visible: a floppy pointed hat with long lappets characteristic of Scythian or Amazon riders, rider costume (a long-sleeved jerkin and trousers decorated with horizontal bands), and a gorytus (bow case/quiver). In truth, this image could be read in a wide variety of ways depending on the viewer, time or context.[73] It is part of that cultural 'play' rather than an accurate reflection of how Greek identity actually worked in practice.

Fig. 1. Kylix attributed to Douris, Greek, 500–490 BCE, The Johns Hopkins Archaeological Museum, JHUAM B8. Image courtesy of the Johns Hopkins Archaeological Museum.

http://archaeologicalmuseum.jhu.edu/the-collection/object-stories/attic-red-figure-vases-in-the-johns-hopkins-archaeological-museum/attic-red-figure-kylix-attributed-to-douris-jhuam-b8-500-490-bce/

[72] The fact that both figures are clean-shaven means that this could equally be interpreted as a scene depicting two Amazons. For discussion of 'Scythian' imagery and its wider significance, see Vos (1963); Lissarrague (1990) and (2002); Miller (1991); Ivantchik (2005); Osborne (2004); Bäbler (2005); J. Skinner (2012).

[73] This may, in all fairness, have been at least implicit in the views espoused by members of the 'Paris School', but the manner in which these were taken up by the Anglo-American academy rapidly descended into tired cliché. See Davidson (2002).

On one level such arguments are relatively uncontroversial—perhaps just plain common sense. We are all accustomed to the idea that ancient Greeks were all manifestly different and yet the same; that difference exists within identity. The question is, how can classicists and historians best put such ideas into practice? For if we combine it with S. Hall's broader conception of identity as 'the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past' we are presented with a unique vantage point from which to survey the fragmentary Greek historians—and much else besides.[74] In what remains of this chapter, I will attempt to illustrate how such a shift in perspective and approach might allow us to say new and interesting things about the role that historiography played in the dissemination of knowledge and ideas concerning the histories, manners, and customs of Athenians, Aitolians, Chians, and Thasians against the backdrop of a world defined by fluctuating levels of mobility and exchange. This is a world in which connectedness was the norm and attempts at isolationism a bizarre trait, associated with the most alien/eccentric of polities (e.g., Sparta).[75]

The link between historiography, other forms of literary (not to mention non-literary) materials, and material culture is something that deserves to be reiterated; my interest is in tracing the wider circulation of knowledge and ideas as opposed to what is simply 'fixed' in texts. This approach builds upon earlier work tracing the way in which knowledge concerning people of different outlook or culture (real or imagined) was relayed via passing quips, epic poems, vase painting, and temple sculpture both prior to and following the earliest prose descriptions of foreign peoples. This information was both 'out there' *and* on the move or, to use Irad Malkin's formulation, people carried it 'in their heads'.[76] A history of ethnographic knowledge must somehow seek to incorporate material such as the statue of Paris in 'Scythian' costume from the Aphaia temple pediment[77] or the grave stele of 'Getas' from the Athenian Ceramicus (Kerameikos) which depicts the image of a quiver (γωρυτός), or be considered incomplete.[78] The same must surely be

---

[74] S. Hall (1990) 225.

[75] The movement of goods and people has as much a role to play in this, as we shall see; a point already made, to some extent, by Clarke (2008), esp. ch. 6, when commenting on the peripatetic wanderings of local historians.

[76] Malkin (1998) 33 and *passim*.

[77] Trojan archer ('Paris') from the west pediment of the Temple of Aphaia, Aegina, Marble, ca. 505–500 BCE (Munich, Glyptothek W–XI).

[78] Grave stele, Pentelic marble, from the area of the Ceramicus ca. 450–425 BCE (Athens National Museum 2611). The gorytus is depicted immediately below the name of the deceased (presumably a 'Scythian' archer, whether slave or free, or someone who wished to be identified and remembered as such). The traditional interpretation is that the individual named beneath, one Aristomedes, was responsible for freeing the deceased (… Γέτο. Ἀριστομήδης ἐπέθηκεν): *IG* I³ 1376; *SEG* 53.2194; cf. *SEG* 55.79, *SEG* 51.15. *LGPN* II.92, s.v. Γέτας. See Bäbler (1998) 180–1, cat. 90. Full description of the image can be found in Bäbler

said for historiography as a whole. It is only by allowing the (modern) epistemological boundaries to collapse that we will gain some limited impression of the sea of knowledge and ideas into which poets, artists, logographers, and sculptors all dipped for ideas and information. I will now offer some examples as to how this might work in practice emphasising the extent to which *historiê*—enquiries—form part of a wider whole. As such, they should be neither studied in isolation nor omitted from any wider discussion of the origins and nature of Greek identity.

5. Theory into Practice: Memory and Identity in 'Cultural Works'

i. Epinicia

First, I would like to turn to lyric poetry and epinicia in particular. Epinicia provided an important mechanism for thinking about people and place, but also the past more generally.[79] Likened by Pindar to the choice commodities of the sort commonly traded by Phoenician merchantmen, songs commemorating the exploits of wealthy aristocrats or their ancestors were a highly mobile medium that circulated widely in quantities that bear no relation to the pitifully small number that have survived from antiquity.[80] Avidly consumed by contemporary audiences and commissioned at great expense, their primary function was to celebrate the *laudandus*, his *oikos*, and the community from which they originated. This invariably involved an elaborate process of positioning in relation to both the narratives of the past and other people—to use S. Hall's formulation. Poets such as Pindar and Bacchylides composed odes that tied their subjects into the foundation stories and charter myths of their native poleis (Pindar's odes celebrating victors from Cyrene are perhaps the most celebrated example; however, one might also cite those relating to the tyrants of Syracuse and Rhegion who famously depicted victorious charioteers on their coinage).[81] Their songs of praise

---

(2005) 119–20 (but here thought to be fourth-century in date). For discussion of the significance that can be attributed to the name 'Getas', see the multi-period study by Dana (2004); Tsetskhladze (2008).

[79] References to the curve-bowed Medes (Persia), Carthaginians, and Etruscans are fairly transparent allusions to contemporary politics: P. *P.* 1.72; 75–9; *N.* 9.28; *I.* 5.49. Cf. *Paean* 2.59–70 for campaigns against the Paeonians in Thrace and an allusion to the re-foundation of Teos by Abdera following its destruction by the armies of Darius in 499 BCE (29–30). For further links between epinician and identity, see Hornblower (2004); Burnett (2005); Fearn (2007). For the role of epinicia as 'non-historiographical media of memory', see Grethlein (2010).

[80] P. *P.* 2.67; Hornblower and Morgan (2007a) 1. For the circumstances surrounding performance/re-performance of Pindaric odes, see Currie (2005) 16–18; Carey (2007).

[81] P. *P.* 4; 5; 9. For coins see below, but also K. Morgan (2015) 61–7 for detailed discussion of Deinomenid coinage including the observation that the aristocratic *gamoroi* who had

exhibit a palpable concern for the preservation of memory, drawing analogies to either fabled or historical events from the past such as Sparta's conquest of Amyklae.[82] The latter features in a list of events in which 'blessed Thebe' might have taken delight in an ode celebrating a victory in the pancratium by Strepsiades of Thebes. There follows an injunction to celebrate Strepsiades' success in song for:

> … ἀλλὰ παλαιὰ γὰρ
> εὕδει χάρις, ἀμνάμονες δὲ βροτοί,
> ὅ τι μὴ σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον
> κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν ἐξίκηται ζυγέν.

> … for the ancient
> splendour sleeps; and mortals forget
> what does not attain poetic wisdom's choice pinnacle
> yoked to glorious streams of verses.[83]

Within the first twenty or so lines of *Isthmian* 7 we find references to wars of conquest and colonisation, genealogical links connecting Thebes and Sparta (the Aegeidae), but also atypical cultic practices (Demeter of the ringing bronze, as opposed to Cybele) and myths of origin (Spartoi of the unwearied spears). The 'glorious stream of verses' evidently carried a rich variety of information: a cascade of knowledge that was often organised in terms of an opposition between the known or familiar (*oikeion*) and the foreign (*allotrion*), as Simon Hornblower has pointed out.[84] Another example of what might reasonably be described as 'cultural work' can perhaps be found in *Isthmian* 5, in which Pindar describes Theban festivals and cult in the light of those performed at Argos, Sparta, and Aegina. In this instance, the differences between Aetolia, Sparta, and Argos are surveyed from a Theban viewpoint in verses that evoke a (common) mytho-heroic past with which the audience is assumed to be conversant:

> ἐν μὲν Αἰτωλῶν θυσίαισι φαενναῖς
> Οἰνεΐδαι κρατεροί,
> ἐν δὲ Θήβαις ἱπποσόας Ἰόλαος

---

previously held sway in Syracuse had likewise favoured images of chariot racing (61–2). When viewed more broadly Morgan's book offers detailed and illuminating commentary on Pindar's efforts to present Deinomenid monarchy favourably to Panhellenic audiences.

[82] P. *I.* 7.13–15.

[83] P. *I.* 7.16–19. Trans. W. H. Race.

[84] Hornblower (2004) 117. The spatial characteristics of epinician poetry and the manner in which it is structured around the *oikos* and an attendant theme of homecoming have been greatly elucidated by Leslie Kurke (and others). See Kurke (1991) and now Grethlein (2010) emphasising human fragility.

γέρας ἔχει, Περσεὺς δ᾽ ἐν ῎Αργει, Κάστορος δ᾽ αἰχμὰ
Πολυδεύκεός τ᾽ ἐπ᾽ Εὐρώτα ῥεέθροις.
ἀλλ᾽ ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ μεγαλήτορες ὀργαὶ
Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε …

In the splendid sacrifices of the Aetolians
the mighty sons of Oineus have their honour
while in Thebes it is the horse-driving Iolaos;
it is Perseus in Argos, and the spearmen Castor and
Polydeuces by the streams of the Eurotas;
but in Oenona it is the great-hearted spirits
of Aeacus and his sons …[85]

References designed to 'speak' to an imagined community of Hellenes must, however, be considered in the light of the ubiquity of the term ξένος, used throughout the odes to denote 'foreigners'—who are nonetheless Greek.[86] Material of this nature is likely to have played an equally important role when it came to creating a sense of difference yet connectedness. It also raises interesting questions concerning the extent to which prose authors might have drawn upon poets other than Homer for information.[87]

Perhaps one of the most celebrated (and enigmatic) cases in which the worlds of poetry and historiography can be seen to collide occurs during an anecdote recounted by Herodotus in order to demonstrate that Cambyses' alleged abuses of Egyptian religion were the actions of a madman.[88] Herodotus describes an incident in which another Great King, this time Darius, attempted to persuade two peoples from the opposing ends of his empire to adopt each other's funerary customs: the Greeks, who customarily cremated their dead, were asked to practice anthropophagy whilst the Calliatae, an Indian tribe, were asked to dispose of their dead in the Greek

---

[85] P. *I.* 5.30–5, trans. W. H. Race. In other cases we have references to little known local deities centre-stage such as Theia of many names, Mother of the Sun (P. *I.* 5.1), and Apollo Derenus (P. *Paean* 2.5), for which see von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1922) 319–21; Rutherford (2001) 257–75. I am very grateful to Simon Hornblower for pointing me in the direction of both the Derenus reference and the related scholarship.

[86] See: *O.* 8.29; 9.67; *I.* 6.70 and *passim*; cf. Zeus Xenios: *O.* 8.21; *N.* 11.8; cf. *O.* 10.14 for strictness at Locri.

[87] Cf. Hornblower (2004). Elsewhere, Theban cult, myths of origin (Σπαρτοί) and cult buildings are all variously alluded to, although Pindar appears to refrain from direct comment on forms of government or constitution. See *P.* 9.82; *I.* 1.30, 7.10; fr. 29 (Thebes, Cadmus, and the Spartoi); *N.* 4.24; *I.* 4.61–2 (cult buildings), and Hornblower and Morgan (2007a) 5, 39. The reliance of Herodotus and others on Homer is well-documented.

[88] E.g., by flogging priests, desecrating tombs, and stabbing the Apis calf (Hdt. 3.16, 27–9). For adroit discussion and further references, see Harrison (2010). For Herodotus' interaction with poetry and the literary tradition, see Marincola (1997); id. (2006); Pelling (2006).

manner rather than eating them. The experiment did not get very far, however, as the king's query as to how much money it would take before they were willing to swap customs was met with outright refusal.[89] As if to ram home the point the historian then cites a passage from Pindar which appears to have been so well-known as to have attained the status of an aphorism:

Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς
θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων
ἄγει δικαιῶν τὸ βιαιότατον
ὑπερτάτᾳ χειρί.

Law, the king of all,
of mortals and immortals,
guides them as it justifies utmost violence
with a sovereign hand.[90]

This not only supports the idea that epinicia may have acted as a mine of information relating to custom (νόμος) but also suggests that Herodotus and Pindar had far more in common in terms of shared interests and sources than we had hitherto imagined.

Discussion of both the fragment and its narrative context primarily focuses on the extent to which it reflects a relativistic view of custom, as formulated by the sophists and fifth-century luminaries, whether on the part of Pindar or Herodotus, and exactly how νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς should be interpreted.[91] Whilst it is essentially unclear whether Herodotus' citation refers to Pindar Fr. 169a 1–4, a fragment from an otherwise lost paean, or another fragment in which similar sentiments are expressed (ἄλλα δ᾽ ἄλλοισιν νόμιμα, σφετέραν δ᾽ αἰνεῖ δίκαν ἀνδρῶν ἕκαστος, 'Customs vary among men, and each man praises his own way', fr. 215a), it is surely significant that Pindar chose to make such an utterance, and that this became sufficiently

---

[89] Hdt. 3.38; Christ (1994).

[90] Fr. 169a 1–4; cf. Hdt. 3.38.4. See Hornblower (2004) 56–8 and *passim*. For knowledge of Pindar amongst fifth-century authors, see Irigoin (1952) 11–20. Cf. Pindar's apparent assertion that Ephesus celebrated cult to Artemis (we have it on Pausanias' (7.2.7) good authority that the poet attributed its foundation to the Amazons, although the Pindaric text itself is lost). For discussion of the wider significance of the passage, see Mac Sweeney (2013) 137–56. The name 'Calliatae' may derive from the Sanskrit kala ('black'). They were already known to Hecataeus (*BNJ* 1 F 298), perhaps via the enquiries of Scylax of Caryanda.

[91] For divergent views, see Heinimann (1945); Rutherford (2001) 387–9, esp. 388: 'Prima facie, this is a statement of a relativistic theory of νόμος of the sort that one would associate with the sophists'. Cf. Thomas (2000) 124–9, whilst Romm (1998) 98–9 discusses some of the problems associated with divining Herodotus' views. For further discussion and references, see J. Skinner (2012) 15–16.

well known as to assume the status of a proverb.[92] We are left none the wiser as to how Herodotus' Pindar garnered such knowledge as he had concerning other peoples and their customs, whether Greek or non-Greek, but his status as a cultural critic is clearly implied in much the same way as Hecataeus' appearances in the *Histories* constitute tacit acknowledgment of his status as an authority on matters both genealogical and geographical.[93]

Another particularly notable—if puzzling—case in which the worlds of the praise poet and the historian can be seen to intersect results in a different outcome altogether. Herodotus' account of the Lydian king Croesus' fall from grace following his ill-fated attempt to neutralise the threat posed by an increasingly restless Persia constitutes an equally famous case of *non-citation* of a poetic source. The latter is all the more surprising given Herodotus' willingness to incorporate conflicting accounts of a particular episode at other points in his narrative. On this occasion, however, his account of the fall of Sardis in 547 BCE sticks closely to a version of events attributed to the Lydians without making any allusion to others known to have been current at the time or whose existence might reasonably be inferred (e.g., that king Croesus was in fact burnt alive, whether in an act of self-immolation or at the hands of his Persian captors). One version at least must have been relatively well-known since it featured in Bacchylides' *Olympian Ode* of 468/7 BCE; here the Lydian monarch and his daughters meet with the (equally improbable but far happier) fate of being spirited away by Apollo to dwell amongst the Hyperboreans as a reward for Croesus' piety. Instead, Herodotus (1.87) relates that a miraculous rainstorm extinguished the flames, thereby allowing the once proud monarch to assume the role of advisor to the Great King rather than being burnt alive along with the fourteen Lydian boys destined to meet the same fate (what happened to them is unclear). The relationship between these tales and the scene depicted on a celebrated red-figure amphora attributed to Myson in which an attendant (named in a graffito as Eutymos) stoops to ignite a pyre upon which the lone figure of Croesus is depicted enthroned and in full (Greek) regalia—crowned, bearing a sceptre, and in the very act of pouring a libation—remains a matter of conjecture (Fig. 2).[94] Although the scene is unique from an iconographic

[92] Ferrari (1992) 77 asserts that Herodotus was mistaken and meant to cite fr. 125a instead. The fragment appears to have attained the status of a proverb regardless; allusions, direct quotes, and occasional paraphrasing of Pindar's statement regarding *nomos* appear sporadically throughout Plato's oeuvre, e.g., *Gorg.* 484b–c 3, 488b 2–6; *Laws* 690c 1–3, 714e 6–715a 2; *Prot.* 337c 5–d2 and *Epist.* VIII 354c 1–2. The full extent of Plato's engagement with Pindar's—by then—gnomic pronouncement was brought to my attention by Theodora Hadjimichael in a Classics Seminar delivered at Newcastle University on 26th February 2014: 'The Platonic Dialogues and the Canonical Nine: Positioning the Lyric Poet'.

[93] See Hdt. 2.143 (his encounter with the Egyptian priests); 5.36.2–3 (advice offered to Ionians at the outset of their doomed revolt against Persia).

[94] See Hdt. 1.84–8; Bacch. *Olymp.* 3.21–62; Attic red-figure amphora attributed to Myson, *c.* 500 BCE from Vulci. Louvre (G 197). Cf. passing reference to Croesus at P. *P.* 1.94. For

Fig. 2. Athenian Red-figure amphora attributed to Myson, c.500–490 BCE. Paris, musée du Louvre G197. Photo (C) RMN-Grand Palais (musée du Louvre) / Tony Querrec.

further discussion and references, see Asheri (2007) 141–2 together with Annalisa Paradiso's (2011) discussion of *BNJ* 768 F 7c.

point of view, the fact that only Croesus and a servant feature as protagonists means that this may well depict an act of self-immolation (there being no sign of coercion—although the pouring of a libation may well signal divine intervention of some sort). Either way, the existence of alternative traditions concerning the events following Croesus' capture is readily apparent. This makes it all but inevitable that a significant portion of Herodotus' audience(s) would have been aware of these also and that the *Histories* were composed with precisely this in mind.[95]

If we look beyond the world of Pindar and epinicia, it is now widely acknowledged that elegiac poetry could also be used to commemorate historical events, as argued by Ewen Bowie and then amply demonstrated by the now not-so-New Simonides.[96] Here too the worlds of the poet and the historian can be seen to overlap—even if we lack sufficient evidence to chart this in detail. The poems recited at public festivals or symposia touched on topics ranging from battles between gods and giants to feats of valour that see their perpetrators elevated to the status of heroes.[97] They undoubtedly had a variety of uses but it is their importance as a repository of ideas and information that is perhaps most pertinent in this context. Far from being a value-free exercise, the exchange of such ideas and information was actually constitutive of both collective memory and identity.[98]

ii. Inscriptions

Inscriptions provided another important mechanism for thinking about community and place, but also the past more generally. Although far less mobile than epinicia (it being in the nature of public inscriptions to remain static, at least during their primary phase of use), their position in (typically) prominent locations within the urban city-scape meant they could be viewed and read by relatively large numbers of passers-by. As such, the information they conveyed can equally be described as something contemporaries would have carried in their heads.

---

[95] See J. Skinner (2018).

[96] Bowie (1986) and (2001). The commemoration of wars and conquests can also be discerned in earlier references to the conquest of Messenia, for example, or the seizure of Smyrna from the Aeolians 'by god's will'. See Tyrtaeus fr. 5 (Messenia); Mimnermus fr. 9 (Smyrna), and Luraghi (2008). See Grethlein (2010) for the importance of elegiac poetry in the preservation of historical memory.

[97] See Grethlein (2010) for discussion and further references relating to the tendency to organise elegy into two sub-genres, the 'sympotic' and 'narrative/historical', but also Clarke (2008) 342–3.

[98] Following Irwin's (2005) study of early Greek poetry, the performance of exhortative elegy is now increasingly seen as a form of positioning on behalf of members of *polis* communities seeking to bolster their social standing and further consolidate their sense of group identity.

The relationship between inscriptions and historiography is now well-documented;[99] however, scholarship has focused on what Chaniotis has termed 'monumental historiography' dating from the Hellenistic era (the period in which the most famous examples of this genre appear to cluster).[100] When seeking to access the overall significance of epigraphy in this wider 'play' of identities and difference we should try to account for the experience of encountering and engaging with such material on a day-to-day basis—an exchange of such ideas and information was actually constitutive of both collective memory and identity. Inscriptions set up in an agora, sanctuary, or burial ground could provide a point of reference which could help cement a community's sense of self by anchoring it in a common locale or an event which took place at a known point during a polis' history.[101] They might equally attest to links connecting the community to other places via ties of kinship, perhaps in *nomima* shared in common,[102] supposed hegemony, or both,[103] or prompt further reflection of a group's place within a wider community of Hellenes by virtue of their physical proximity to other stelae/monuments referencing other Greek poleis. One further factor to consider is the countless votive inscriptions that one might encounter in sanctuaries. Dedicatory inscriptions of this nature are often fairly sparing when it comes to the level of detail supplied; however, these were also construed—whether correctly or no—as tangible links to particular groups or events.[104]

iii. Coinage

A similar blurring of boundaries is also apparent if we turn to coinage. By way of a token example, let us take the coins of Croton which depict the image of a tripod from the earliest issues. The tripod is most commonly understood to be that upon which the Pythia sat to deliver prophecies and, as such, a visual allusion to the foundation story of Croton, in which

---

[99] Key studies include Boffo (1988); Chaniotis (1988).

[100] Chaniotis (2005) 221.

[101] E.g., Athenian casualty lists relating to the Sicilian debacle (*SEG* 52.60). For related discussions see also Low and Shear, below, Chh. 6 and 7.

[102] E.g., *SEG* 18.722 (a decree from Euesperides which reference *ephors* and *gerontes*, thereby signalling its cultural ties to Cyrene and, ultimately, Sparta). See Fragoulaki (2013) 187 noting the absence of a *gerousia* on Thera. For *nomima* in general see Malkin (2003) and (2011).

[103] E.g., a gold phiale recovered from Olympia dating from the sixth/seventh century BCE carrying the inscription 'The Cypselids dedicated this from Heracleia' (*SEG* 1.94). For discussion and further references, see Fragoulaki (2013) 74 n. 118.

[104] See Thonemann (2016) for a case in which such links were misconstrued (Hdt. 1.49): an inscribed dedication from the sanctuary of Apollo Ismenios at Thebes dated to ca. 500 BCE (Papazarkadas (2014)).

Myscellus of Rhypes eventually acted on the god's instructions to the Achaeans after some prevarication as to whether it would be better to settle the site of Sybaris, which was already inhabited by that time (the traditional date for Croton's foundation being 709/8 BCE).[105] The link conferred prestige but also legitimacy on both the city and its inhabitants in the eyes of neighbouring communities, whether Greek or non-Greek, and perhaps some claim to divine protection. It has been suggested that the image of a tripod could also be read as a veiled allusion to the mineral wealth to which Croton had access, or alternatively that it referenced Bronze Age notions of value associated with a shared mythical-heroic past that the Achaean cities of southern Italy held in common.[106] Such attempts to actively recall the past via symbolic imagery are a timely reminder of the role that non-literary materials could play in shaping collective memory, whether through reference to a foundation story, shared heritage and values (rooted in Homeric epic if not a shared Bronze Age heritage per se), or a combination of the same.

Coins bear more than a passing similarity to historiographical enquiry, when it comes to their monumentality and links to shared notions of identity, ideas about the past, together with possible links to the world of lyric poetry.[107] They are also just as difficult to classify when it comes to the information they convey: elements of local history, mythography, geography, and ethnography are all arguably apparent.[108] The link between non-literary media, such as Greek coins and historiographical enquiry, might at first sight appear altogether tenuous; however, in a world where knowledge and ideas moved freely, 'texts' of this nature were every bit as important as what got 'fixed' in prose—not least because direct engagement with the latter was in all likelihood an elite activity from which members of the lower orders were largely excluded.[109] If we compare coins to other media—texts but also

---

[105] *BNJ* 555 F 10. Ephorus (*BNJ* 70 F 140) alleges that Croton was originally inhabited by Iapygians. See also *BNJ* 554 F 1; Pseudo-Skymnus 323–5; Diod. 8.17; D. Hal. *A.R.* 2.59.3 for the date of 710 BCE. The tradition that Heracles was in some way involved in the city's foundation is equally compatible with tripod-imagery. See Diod. 4.24, Iamb. *Vita Pythagorae* 50, Ov. *Met.* 15.12–59. Giangiulio (2010) 130 argues that the oracle which provided the Crotonians with a divine mandate to found their *polis* was in all likelihood part of a local tradition developed 'in the context of the network of relations between the *poleis* [*sic*] and Delphi'. It is now widely accepted that the 'colonial' foundations of the so-called New World were sufficiently sensitive to their humble origins in comparison to *poleis* in the 'Old World' that they went on to adopt foundation stories involving gods and heroes.

[106] Papadopoulos (2002).

[107] For interconnections between the coins of Cyrene and praise poetry, see J. Skinner (2012) 136–9.

[108] Cf. Murray (2000) 330.

[109] That said, we envisage numerous circumstances in which what appear, to all intents and purposes, to have been highly literate audiences might have encountered such works via public recitation at festivals, symposia, etc. See Clarke (2008). Jibes at Herodotus embedded in Attic comedy imply a far wider 'readership'. Rupestral inscriptions recorded

painted pottery or sculpture—it might at first seem a little peculiar to argue that an image stamped upon a piece of weighed silver had the potential to tell stories since Greek coins rarely bear anything more than a genitive ethnic naming the community for whom they were minted together with, in highly exceptional cases, an artist's signature or moneyer's mark.[110] It is important to bear in mind other factors, however, such as the high degree of continuity in designs when it came to the coin type—a point of which contemporaries must have been aware—creating a sense of tradition and collective identity. A change in coin type might equally reflect a political or historical event; take, for example, the sudden influx of refugees from Messene which is commonly linked to the appearance of a front-facing lion's head on the coins of Rhegium.[111] The change itself told a story. How far this would have travelled beyond the minting community is of course a matter of speculation but it is not unreasonable to suppose that the widespread awareness of the deep-seated cultural significance of such images would have meant that the switch from an earlier type depicting a man-headed bull would have prompted enquiries into its meaning.

Coins minted by the polis of Thasos present us with an intriguing example of the intersections between individual coin types and wider discourses of identity and difference. From approximately the end of the fifth century onwards Thasos minted a series of coins depicting the head of Dionysus with an image of Heracles loosing an arrow on the reverse.[112] The pairing is widely interpreted as a reference to the Near Eastern-style door-jamb reliefs that flanked the city gates where the two 'guardians of the polis' stood watch—alongside their human counterparts—from ca. 510–500 BCE on the road linking the Sanctuary of Heracles (located south of the agora) to that of

---

by Langdon on Mt. Hymettus point to an astonishing level of literacy, e.g., *SEG* 49.2; Langdon (2005).

[110] The possessive element of the genitive ethnic ('of the *x* people/polis') anticipates the possibility that people who needed some reminder of this fact might also view the coin. Butcher (2005) 145 draws attention to the use of genitive ethnics as a means of marking out different communities as well as more technical differences such as the size and shape of flan, generating 'a feeling of distinction among the users'. For general discussion relating to coinage and identity, see J. Skinner (2010) and (2012) 134, 139. For ethnics on coins, see Fraser (2009) 69 and Appendix 2. See, however, Stansbury-O'Donnell (1999) 9: 'Structurally and mechanically it is possible for the visual arts to present stories. Understanding how an ancient viewer might have participated and understood a pictorial narrative, however, is a difficult task'.

[111] The whole question of 'ancient history from coins' is of course highly problematic, but this does not mean to say that some changes cannot be linked to historical events.

[112] See Grandjean and Salviat (2000) 306–13, figs. 271–83. Later issues depict the hero standing, e.g., a copper alloy coin of ca. 200–100 BCE depicting a bust of Artemis (crowned) (on the obverse) and on the reverse Heracles draped in a lion skin advancing right with bow drawn (BM 1926, 0422.5).

Dionysus.[113] Thasos was famous for its wines so the Dionysian imagery was already well established and requires little by way of explanation; however, the image of a bearded Heracles is rather more complicated. The (somewhat atypical) civic cult focussed on the god-hero Heracles played a key role in defining what it meant to be Thasian as well as providing an important point of contact between people of different outlook and culture.[114] Contemporary audiences would have been all too aware not only of the central role that Heracles played in the life of the *polis* but also the strong cultic ties that connected Thasos with the city of Tyre.[115] The figure depicted on the coins was just one of the many representations of Heracles-Melqart that were in circulation at the time: that same sea of ideas and images through which Herodotus had navigated whilst making his enquiries (see Hdt. 2.43–4). Any attempt to reconstruct the thought world of local historians and mythographers needs to take into account the increasingly compelling evidence for cultural interaction between Phoenicians, indigenes, Parian settlers, and others during the earliest phases of settlement on Thasos, whether in the form of toponyms, onomastics, cult practice, or material culture. The images of the archer Heracles are as much a part of this as the fragmentary literary references suggestive of Levantine connections, past or present.[116]

6. Between Myth and History: Origins, Returns, Foundations

Although preserved only in fragments, early logographers present vivid insights into the interests and concerns of their day—not to mention those of later authors who quoted their work, however loosely, and thus preserved it for posterity. A cursory glance will reveal that the vast bulk of the material is mythical in nature and, as such, arguably bound up in a wider continuum of thought encompassing Homeric genealogies, tales relating to the returning heroes (*Nostoi*), aetiologies, and foundation stories. Attempting to divide these fragments into prose genres considered either rational or 'scientific' (i.e., geography or ethnography) or 'mythological' (mythography) is unlikely to

[113] Only the relief depicting Heracles survives. Clothed in a chiton and wearing a lion skin, the hero is depicted drawing a bow whilst in a kneeling position (ca. 71 cm x 100 cm, Istanbul Archaeological Museum 718). An associated inscription reads: 'The sons of Zeus, of the long-veiled Semele and Alcmene, stand as guardians to the city' (*IG* XII 8.356). See Walsh (2009).

[114] The Thasians advertised their devotion to the hero by dedicating a monumental bronze statue of him at Olympia (Paus. 5.25.12). For the Sanctuary of Heracles on Thasos, together with associated evidence for ritual feasting from which women were excluded, see Grandjean and Salviat (2000); *SEG* 41.720; *IG* XII Suppl. 414. The name Ἡρακλείδης was not uncommon amongst the island's inhabitants whilst wine stamps of the mid-6th century depict Heracles (e.g., Thasos 1703). See Stafford (2012) together with Garlan (1999).

[115] See Malkin (2005).

[116] For contact/interaction on Thasos, see important work by Sarah Owen (2000) and (2006).

produce anything other than a false dichotomy since distinguishing between mythic and historical pasts appears to have been little more than a rhetorical strategy for early writers.[117] Such material is better approached holistically if we are to gauge its nature and significance in relation to wider discourses of identity and difference.

The diverse (and often inherently contradictory) range of opinions that ancient authors express as to what constituted *mythos* and what the term itself implied has left modern scholarship struggling to arrive at a workable definition of Greek myth.[118] That supplied by a recent discussion of Herodotus' treatment of myth will, however, more than suffice for the purposes of this study: Greek myth is essentially a broad category defined in terms of its divine or heroic subject matter, traditional nature, and collective significance.[119] This collective significance derives in no small part from its explanatory value.[120] The study of Greek myth should not on any account be seen as an abstract or obscure mode of enquiry. These stories had direct implications for the lives of groups and individuals: the festivals they chose to celebrate and the rituals they performed on a day-by-day basis, the images they saw on their coins, and the gods and heroes to whom they offered cult.

Whilst we should perhaps resign ourselves to the lack of a secure and universally applicable definition of myth, a fascination for aetiology, etymology, and 'origins' in general is readily apparent throughout the sources.[121] The question of origins is addressed in works recounting the founding of cities such as those attributed to Hellanicus of Lesbos and Charon of Lampsacus.[122] The myths and aetiologies upon which Charon and others

---

[117] For the argument that whilst insisting that the modern tendency to see the relationship between *mythos* and history in dichotomous terms should be resisted, see Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012) 40.

[118] For discussion, see important work by Kirk, e.g. (1970) or (1974) 13–29. Cf. Buxton (1994); Harrison (2000) 196–8, 206–7; Csapo (2005) 1–9. Attempts to arrive at a blanket definition include a 'traditional tale' that carries relevance in the present, e.g., Bremmer (1987) 1; Burkert (1979a) 23 and (1979b).

[119] Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012) 40. Attention is drawn to Herodotus' explicit awareness and conscious manipulation of a 'spectrum of certainty' (*ibid.*) when dealing with his sources.

[120] In Herodotus' case, myth 'helps contextualise the historical narrative and convey its importance and meaning to readers' providing 'a tool to engage readers in thinking more deeply and reflectively about past history but also the present' (*ibid.* 46). For Herodotus' engagement with myth in the Libyan logos, see Baragwanath, above, ch. 4.

[121] Cf. Charon of Lampsacus' note that Phobus was the first to throw himself into the sea from the Leucadian Rocks (*FGrHist* 262 F 7a); Acusilaus' assertion that rites in Samothrace were initiated in honour of the Cabeiri (*FGrHist* 2 F 20). For discussion of 'firsts' in Herodotus, see Harrison (2000) 182–207. Against a developmental approach of Herodotus' work in relation to his intellectual and literary environment, Fowler (1996) and (2006).

[122] Pearson (1939) 150 noted that Charon 'liked to present parallel legends and for that reason might be classed as an elementary student of folk-lore'. Most scholars have followed the traditional approach of viewing Charon and his contemporaries according to a

drew were viewed by Pearson as a significant departure from both Homeric and Hesiodic traditions insofar as they were explicitly local in origin. In terms of their content they are not dissimilar to those surrounding the so-called 'colonial' foundations such as Syracuse or Cyrene. These commonly invoke elements of local topography and landscape in the form of river gods and nymphs, with the seduction or rape of the latter providing a mythical analogue for power relationships between indigenous populations and Greek colonists. Such tales need to be seen alongside stories concerning the expulsion of the Pelasgian Doliones from the land later occupied by Cyzicus (*FGrHist* 471 F 8a) or the treatment meted out to the prior inhabitants of Lampsacus, the Bebryces (*FGrHist* 262 FF 7a, 7b, 8).[123]

If one surveys the work of the fragmentary Greek historians, an interest in identity and origins per se is widely apparent: explaining the link between people and place was obviously important to both them and their audiences. The hitherto marginal nature of many of these authors meant that such debates have been largely overlooked. In certain cases we can point to individuals who, far from being dry antiquarians or parochially-minded scribblers, appear to have been held in high esteem within their communities; Ion of Chios being perhaps the most notable example.[124] The fragmentary remnants of their writings are surely indicative of wider debates and concerns and even if much of the material we possess represents educated hypothesising as opposed to 'genuine' local traditions, they are nonetheless the product of the same intellectual milieu, the same desire to investigate and explain difference. The extent to which such tales figured prominently in everyday discourse is impossible to establish with any degree of certainty; however, they are unlikely to represent idle speculation for its own sake and would in many cases have referenced, or at the very least resonated with, stories associated with local cults, statues, images on coins, etc.[125]

The interest in establishing the origins or 'First Finder' ($\pi\rho\hat{\omega}\tau\sigma\varsigma$ $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\dot{\eta}\varsigma$) of various cults and institutions, apparent in Hecataeus' work and elsewhere, raises inevitable questions as to what, if anything, such interests imply. Robert Fowler asserted that, at the time of Hecataeus' researches, myth

---

developmental framework: 'His fragments, such as they are, suggest that his method resembled that of Herodotus …; they exhibit … a love of digression …, a taste for the curious tale and aetiology, combined with a desire to write serious history' (*ibid.*). Cf. now Thomas (2014a) 242–3.

[123] Cf. on colonial myth: Pherecydes of Athens on the population of Ionia prior to Ionian colonisation under Androclus, founder of Ephesus (*FGrHist* 3 F 155).

[124] For related discussion, see Chaniotis (1988) and, more recently, id. (2009); Clarke (2008); Thomas (2014a) 239–40. For Ion, see Jennings and Katsaros (2007).

[125] The manner in which tales told about the past—invented traditions—could form the basis of a shared sense of identity is now widely acknowledged. See Gehrke (2001) and Flower (2002). Hdt. 1.24 with its reference to a bronze man on a dolphin is a tempting example.

constituted 'the currency of cultural debate'.[126] Whose culture? And to what end? In fact, enquiries into matters such as the origins of cults and rituals arguably played an important role in explaining difference.[127] As such, they played an important role in creating this growing sense of 'difference yet connectedness'—a new 'style' of imagining an imagined community of Greeks.

Aetiology, in particular, offers an important bridge into the world of objects, monuments and the memories that they both evoked and helped constitute, as Kowalzig has argued:

> Aetiology creates a religious world that is tied to visible localities and lived local customs. It is always engrained in the physical world, linked with the tangible reality of cults and rituals, shrines and objects of cult … [It] … has a share in everyday religious practice; and it creates social explanations of items in use by a community of myth-tellers.[128]

It is in no way surprising therefore that aetiological myths attached to objects and monuments should make their way into the prose enquiries of the fragmentary Greek authors whose awareness of the past was forever being reaffirmed or prompted by, to take a few well-known examples, the conscious archaising of Athenian silver coinage or panathenaic amphorae, or the self-conscious display of 'Cyclopean' masonry below the bastion supporting the Athena Nike temple on the Periclean acropolis.

The tattered remnants of the fragmentary Greek historians also preserve tantalising evidence of the complex processes of positioning that went into the 'making' of Greek identities.[129] The aetiologies, myths, and fables of the sort that Hecataeus introduces for 'Mycenae' and 'Oineus' (*BNJ* 1 FF 22, 15) are an important mechanism for understanding both local identities and the past. These stories come from somewhere. They were devised, we must assume, with a specific purpose in mind and as such are shot through with politics.[130] Hecataeus' apparent assertion that the wealthy *polis* of Chios was

---

[126] Fowler (2001) 97. Cf. Malkin (1998) and (2005).

[127] For the relationship between aetiological myth, ritual, and the creation of imagined pasts and identities, see Kowalzig (2007) 25: 'aetiology is the narrated form of diversity in Greek religion. In accounting for diversity, giving an identity to a place and a community of myth-tellers, lies aetiology's greatest potential for acting as a tale of social relevance'.

[128] Kowalzig (2007) 25. See ibid. for related discussion of the view that aetiology functioned as a form of primitive scientific explanation.

[129] Cf. S. Hall's (1990) 225 description of identities as 'the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within the narratives of the past'. For the significance of names in particular, see Fraser (2009).

[130] Cf. Ion of Chios on 'Chios' (*FGrHist* 392 F 1) or the tale relayed by Charon of Lampsacus concerning Arcas and the hamadryad nymph which provides an aetiological myth for the Arcadians (complete with oak trees) and could easily be read as an account explaining the origins of Arcadia and Arcadians (*FGrHist* 262 F 12b). For whether one can reasonably

an Erythraean foundation (*BNJ* 1 F 141) is an excellent case in point. It is not altogether clear how much should be read into Hecataeus' telegraphic reference; however, it has recently been asserted that it reflects a Chian source and that the link to Erythrae places the city outside the web of myths linking Ionian cities to Athens.[131] Since relations between Chios and Erythrae appear to have been less than cordial (control of both territory on the mainland and the straits dominated by the Oenussae islands were a popular bone of contention)[132] it seems equally possible that the 'source' came from Erythrae as it would place Chios in a subordinate position to her neighbour.[133]

Chios appears to have promulgated its own version of its foundation myth from circa the mid-sixth century onwards asserting its independence from the other Ionian cities by stressing links with Euboea and Crete.[134] Evidence for the latter comes in part from Pausanias who appears to paraphrase a sizeable chunk of 'On the Foundation of Chios'—just one of the large number of works with which the polymath Ion is credited.[135] Ion maintains that the eponymous hero Chios was born during a snowstorm after Poseidon had his way with a nymph. After this initial 'foundation' Chios was then settled by a Cretan culture hero, Oinopion, the bringer of wine, together with his sons, after which reference is made to a further one or two waves of settlers. These were Carians and Abantes from Euboea together with Amphiclus of Histiaea who subsequently became king having been prompted to make the original journey to Chios by an oracle from Delphi.[136] Amphiclus' descendant, king Hector, is then credited by Ion with the decision to align Chios with the city-states of Ionia by joining them in their sacrifices to the god at the Panionion. Persuasive analysis of the story by Mac Sweeney has stressed the degree to which this tale stresses the agency of the

---

distinguish between etymology as a scientific method and popular etymology, see Fowler (1996) 72 n. 77; Immerwahr (1966). Kowalzig (2007) 26 takes an alternative approach in arguing that aetiology abolishes history by denying change through time. For the enduring interest in myths of origin in fourth-century Ionia see now Thomas (2014a) 250–8.

[131] For comprehensive discussion, see Katsaros' (2009) erudite commentary on *BNJ* 392 F 1 (= *FGrHist* 392 F 1). No mention is made of Erythrae's origins but we know from Hellanicus that Erythrae's foundation was attributed to Neleus son of Codrus (*FGrHist* 4 F 48). Cf. *BNJ* 1 F 228.

[132] Hdt. 1.18 mentions a war in which Chios was aided by Miletus.

[133] For the importance of war in relations between Ionian city-states, see Mac Sweeney (2013) 78, 194–7.

[134] See *I. Délos* 9.3: Μέλα[ν]ος Πατρώιον ἄστυ. Cf. *SEG* 19.510; 33.633.

[135] Paus. 7.4.8–10 (*FGrHist* 392 F 1).

[136] Ibid. It is tempting to infer that the link between Athens and Chios was tentatively acknowledged when Oinopion was made a son of Theseus; however, this would not be enough to have compromised Chian independence: see Olding (2007).

Chians.[137] Ion's claims for his city appear to go somewhat further, however, by claiming that Athamas, the founder of a fellow Ionian city, Teos, was actually Oinopion's son.[138] The (highly plausible) suggestion that Oinopion could easily have been a gloss for another hero, Oineus, raises the possibility that Ion's writings also advanced similar claims regarding Samos since Oineus was already acknowledged as both great-grandfather of the eponymous hero Samos and father-in-law of Samia by the epic poet Asius of Samos in the sixth/early fifth century BCE.[139]

Stories surrounding Chios' foundation demonstrate the importance of fictive kinship and genealogy in ancient identity-construction. Genealogical thinking was an effective mechanism for thinking about collective identities and, as such, all-pervasive.[140] The latter is now widely acknowledged following the work of Jonathan Hall who famously linked the emergence of a wider sense of Hellenic identity to the *Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, or *Ehoiai*, listing the descendants of the mythical king Hellen. It is surely no coincidence that a concern for descent and genealogy is readily apparent throughout Greek historiography more generally, whether in tracing the origins of various mythological races, for example Phaeacians and Giants in Acusilaus, or the lineage of various aristocratic or priestly clans such as the Homeridae on Chios.[141]

The invention of prose writing is rightly viewed as a new form of technology that facilitated critical self-reflection on behalf of both author and audience. It is now clear, however, that this invention was not the abrupt rupture previously envisaged—a point also made by Clarke in her work on chronography and local history: the boundaries separating different forms of discourse were every bit as permeable and our distinctions between different modes of enquiry are ultimately somewhat arbitrary. One thing is certain: the relationship between historiography (writing culture), hybrid identities, and the shaping of collective memory is both nuanced and complex. The tattered remnants that have been handed down to us in the form of the fragmentary Greek historians are not mere epiphenomena that can be neatly parcelled up into discrete realms of enquiry—some of which relate to identity and some not—subject to intense scrutiny in some cases, but languishing in comparative neglect in others. Instead, what we are presented with forms part of a wider whole: discourses of identity and difference, knowledge and

---

[137] Later authors found fault with this tale, e.g., Pausanias (7.4.10) who notes that no reason is given as to why the Chians should be considered Ionian.

[138] Cf. Pherekydes for 'Teos' (*FGrHist* 3 F 102). See Mac Sweeney (2013) 85–90.

[139] Mac Sweeney (2013) 91–102. For dating Asius, see Bowra (1957) 391–401.

[140] Mythical heroes provide the eponyms for both Greeks and barbarians, creating considerable confusion, as we have already seen. Woolf (2010) 198 has recently questioned whether such thinking reflects the concerns and preoccupations of communities or merely those of an aristocratic elite, from which the vast majority of our authors hailed.

[141] *FGrHist* 2 FF 4, 35, 2.

ideas that played an active role in deciding what it meant to be Greek in the first place.

7. Conclusions

This paper began with the argument that historiographical enquiry was not only inextricably tied up in wider processes of identity-construction but also constitutive of identity.[142] Its 'embeddedness' means that it cannot be studied in isolation as to do so would be to divorce it artificially from the other forms of 'cultural work' of which it formed a part. Discussion of both Greek historiography in general and the fragmentary Greek historians in particular would be greatly enhanced if we took modern debates surrounding the nature and origins of Greek identity into account from the very outset. Whilst the study of the latter continues to be dogged by a 'mythology of coherence',[143] to use Quentin Skinner's formulation, the study of Greek historiography has been equally constrained by the tendency to divide it up into the various sub-genres devised by Jacoby. The knock-on effect of these categories becoming progressively institutionalised was that vast swathes of information were relegated almost entirely to the sidelines, the preserve of a small band of dedicated experts. Whilst the questions that we pose are still in many ways a response to the framework devised either by Jacoby or the ancient critics which he set out to refute,[144] the advent of Brill's *New Jacoby*, has made it far easier to navigate between hitherto inaccessible material and to work across genres, generating fresh and interesting perspectives in the process.[145]

My aim in embarking on this discussion was to demonstrate the importance of studying historiography 'in the round'. If culture is best understood, in the words of Bhabha, as an intrinsically hybrid entity,[146] then the discursive interplay of ideas of identity and difference emerges as a

---

[142] See now Thomas (2014a) 240: 'surely it is a fact … that writing down a history of a particular *polis* was a major step in cementing or crystallizing a particular vision of that *polis*, its past and therefore its present character, its "identity". Whatever memories and local knowledge had existed before in people's minds, traditions and memories vaguely passed down, and everyday habits, the sheer fact of having a written *polis* history will have done something to create a new entity'.

[143] Q. Skinner (1969) 18.

[144] Scholarly consideration of the fragmentary Greek authors has largely followed the path laid down by Jacoby, at times creating the impression that these fields of enquiry were somehow divorced from the bigger picture or that what really matters is where they fit in the grand narrative describing how Great Historiography came into being: e.g., Clarke's case (2008) for re-jigging the chronology so that local histories can return to their rightful place in the chronological schema: no longer an offshoot of Great Historiography, but part of a wider intellectual and cultural milieu (although this in no way does justice to the scope of Clarke's book).

[145] See now Thomas (2014a) and (2014b); Tober (2017).

[146] Bhabha (1994) 56.

thoroughly mundane activity: a reflexive positioning that could find expression in any area of cultural production, as opposed to one that was restricted solely to prose or, indeed, specific genres. The richness and diversity of Greek historiography reflects the complexities of the socio-cultural milieu from which it emerged: knowledge of all kinds was inextricably bound up with understanding the past, the construction of identities, and the process of enshrining both within collective memory.

Joseph.Skinner@newcastle.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almagor, E. and J. Skinner (2013a) 'Introduction', in id., edd. (2013b) 1–22.

——, edd. (2013b) *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches* (London).

Ampolo, C., ed. (2006) *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby. Seminari Arnaldo Momigliano, Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa 18–19 Dicembre 2002* (Pisa).

Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*² (London and New York).

Antonaccio, C. (2003) 'Hybridity and the Cultures within Greek Culture', in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, edd., *The Cultures within Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration* (Cambridge) 57–74.

Asheri, D. (2007) 'Book I', in D. Asheri, A. Lloyd, and A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV* (Oxford) 57–218.

Bäbler, B. (1998) *Fleissige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen: Nichtgriechen im klassichen Athen und ihre archäologische Hinterlassenschaft* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).

—— (2005) 'Bobbies or Boobies? The Scythian Police Force in Classical Athens', in Braund (2005) 114–22.

Baragwanath, E. and M. de Bakker (2012) 'Introduction', in id., edd., *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford) 1–56.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994) *The Location of Culture* (London and New York).

Boffo, L. (1988) 'Epigrafi di città greche: un espressione di storiografia locale', in E. Gabba, ed., *Studi di storia e storiografia antiche* (Como) 9–48.

Bowie, E. L. (1986) 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106: 13–35.

—— (2001) 'Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry?', in Luraghi (2001) 45–66.

Bowra, C. M. (1957) 'Asius and the Old-Fashioned Samians', *Hermes* 85: 391–401; repr. in id., *On Greek Margins* (Oxford, 1970) 122–33.

Braund, D. ed. (2005) *Scythians and Greeks: Cultural Interactions in Scythia, Athens and the Early Roman Empire (Sixth-century BC–First century AD)* (Exeter)

Bremmer, J. (1987) 'What is a Greek Myth?', in id., ed., *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London) 1–9.

Burkert, W. (1979a) *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).

—— (1979b) 'Mythisches Denken. Versuch einer Definition an Hand des griechischen Befundes', in H. Poser, ed., *Philosophie und Mythos: ein Kolloquium* (Berlin) 16–39.

Burnett, A. P. (2005) *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina* (Oxford).

Butcher, K. (2005) 'Information, Legitimation, or Self-Legitimation? Popular and Elite Designs on the Coin Types of Syria', in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert, and A. Burnett, edd., *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford) 143–56.

Buxton, R. (1994) *Imaginary Greece: The Contexts of Mythology* (Cambridge).

Carey, C. (2007) 'Pindar, Place, and Performance', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007b) 199–211.

Ceserani, G. (2012) *Italy's Lost Greece: Magna Graecia and the Making of Modern Italy* (New York and Oxford).

Chambers, M. (2006) 'La vita e la carriera di Felix Jacoby', in Ampolo (2006) 5–29.

Chaniotis, A. (1988) *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften. Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie* (Stuttgart).

—— (2005) *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History* (Malden, Mass. and Oxford).

—— (2009) 'Travelling Memories in the Hellenistic World', in R. Hunter, and I. Rutherford, edd., *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge) 249–69.

Christ, M. (1994) 'Herodotean Kings and Historical Inquiry', *ClAnt* 13: 167–202.

Clair, R. P., ed. (2003) *Expressions of Ethnography: Novel Approaches to Qualitative Methods* (Albany, N.Y.).

Clarke, K. (1999) *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World* (Oxford).

—— (2008) *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis* (Oxford).

Clifford, J. (1988) *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Collar, A. C. F. (2014) 'Networks and Ethnogenesis', in McInerney (2014) 97–111.

Constantakopoulou, C. (2007) *The Dance of the Islands: Insularity, Networks, the Athenian Empire and the Aegean world* (Oxford).

Crielaard, J. P. (2009) 'The Ionians in the Archaic Period: Shifting Identities in a Changing World', in T. Derks and N. Roymans, edd., *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition* (Amsterdam) 37–84.

Csapo, E. (2005) *Theories of Mythology* (Malden).

Currie, B. (2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).

Curtis, J. (1986) 'Michael Bakhtin, Nietzsche, and Russian Pre-Revolutionary Thought', in B. G. Rosenthal, ed., *Nietzsche in Russia* (Princeton) 335–48.

Dana, D. (2004) 'Étude sur les porters du nom Γέτας', *Studii Clasice (2001–2003)* 37–39: 85–102.

Davidson, J. (2002) 'Too Much Other? François Hartog and the Memories of Odysseus', *TLS*, 19 April.

Demetriou, D. (2012) *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean: The Archaic and Classical Greek Multiethnic Emporia* (Cambridge).

Dench, E. (2005) 'Review of Hall (2002)', *CR* 55: 204–7.

Dewald, C. and J. Marincola, edd. (2006) *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge).

van Dommelen, P. (2002) 'Ambiguous Matters: Colonialism and Local Identities in Punic Sardinia', in C. L. Lyons and J. K. Papadopoulos, edd., *The Archaeology of Colonialism* (Los Angeles) 121–47.

—— and B. Knapp, edd. (2011) *Material Connections in the Ancient Mediterranean: Mobility, Materiality and Mediterranean Identities* (London and New York).

Dougherty, C. (2001) *The Raft of Odysseus: The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's Odyssey* (New York and Oxford).

Fearn, D. (2007) *Bacchylides. Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition* (Oxford).

—— (2011) 'Aegina in Contexts', in id., ed., *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford) 1–28.

Ferrari, F. (1992) 'Dileggio e rispetto dei nòmima nel fr. 215M. di Pindaro', *Atti Accademia Peloritana dei Pericolanti Classe di Lettere, Filosofia e Belle Arti* 67: 71–82.

Flower, M. (2002) 'Invention of Tradition in Classical and Hellenistic Sparta', in A. Powell, and S. Hodkinson, edd., *Sparta: Beyond the Mirage* (London and Swansea) 191–218.

Fornara, C. W. (1971) *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford).

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

Fowler, R. L. (1996) 'Herodotus and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116: 62–87.

—— (1998) 'Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's Catalogue and the Creation of the Hellenes', *PCPS* 44: 1–19.

—— (2000–13) *Early Greek Mythography*, 2 vols (Oxford).

—— (2001) 'Early Historiē and Literacy', in Luraghi (2001) 95–116.

—— (2006) 'Herodotus and his Prose Predecessors', in Dewald and Marincola (2006) 29–45.

Foxhall, L., H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luragi, edd. (2010) *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart).

Fragoulaki, M. (2013) *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative* (Oxford).

Fraser, P. M. (2009) *Greek Ethnic Terminology* (Oxford).

Garlan, Y. (1999) *Les timbres amphoriques de Thasos, i: Timbres protothasiens et thasiens ancient* (Paris and Athens).

Gehrke, H.-J. (2001) 'Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond', in Luraghi (2001) 286–314.

Giangiulio, M. (2010) 'Collective Identities, Imagined Past, and Delphi', in Foxhall–Gehrke–Luraghi (2010) 121–35.

Gosden, C. (2004) *Archaeology and Colonisation: Cultural Contact from 5000 BC to the Present* (Cambridge).

Grandjean, Y. and F. Salviat (2000) *Guide de Thasos*² (Paris).

Greaves, A. (2010) *The Land of Ionia: Society and Economy in the Archaic Period* (Chichester).

Grethlein, J. (2010) *The Greeks and their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge).

Gruen, E. S. (2010) *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton).

Guldager Bilde, P., and J. H. Petersen (2008) 'Preface', in id., edd., *Meetings of Cultures: Between Conflicts and Coexistence* (Aarhus) 9–12.

Hall, E. (1989) *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford).

Hall, J. (2002) *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago).

Hall, S. (1990) 'Cultural Identity and Diaspora', in J. Rutherford, ed., *Identity: Community, Culture Difference* (London) 222–37.

Harding, P. (2007) 'Local History and Atthidography', in J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, 2 vols (Malden, Mass. and Oxford) I.180–8.

Harrison, T. (2000) *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford).

—— (2002) 'General Introduction', in id., ed., *Greeks and Barbarians* (Edinburgh) 1–15.

—— (2007) 'The Place of Geography in Herodotus' *Histories*', in C. Adams and J. Roy, edd., *Travel, Geography and Culture in Ancient Greece and the Near East* (Oxford) 44–66.

—— (2008) 'Greek Identity and the Origins of History' (unpublished paper, Classical Association Conference).

—— (2010) *Writing Ancient Persia* (London).

Hartog, F. (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London); Eng. trans. by J. Lloyd of *Le miroir d'Hérodote: essai sur la représentation de l'autre* (Paris, 1980).

—— (2001) *Memories of Odysseus: Frontier Tales from Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh); Eng. trans. by J. Lloyd of *Mémoire d'Ulysse* (Paris, 1996).

Heinimann, F. (1945) *Nomos und Physis: Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts* (Basel).

Höckmann, U. and A. Möller (2006) 'The Hellenion at Naukratis: Questions and Observations', in A. Villing and U. Schlotzhauer, edd., *Naukratis: Greek Diversity in Egypt: Studies in East Greek Pottery and Exchange in the Eastern Mediterranean*, (London) 11–22.

Hornblower, S. (2004) *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry* (Oxford).

—— and C. Morgan (2007a) 'Introduction', in id. (2007b) 1–45.

——, edd. (2007b) *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire* (Oxford).

—— and G. Biffis, edd. (2018) *The Returning Hero:* Nostoi *and Traditions of Mediterranean Settlement* (Oxford).

Humphreys, S. C. (1978) *Anthropology and the Greeks* (London).

—— (2004) *The Strangeness of the Gods: Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion* (Oxford).

Hunter, R., ed. (2005) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge).

Immerwahr, H. R. (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland).

Irigoin, J. (1952) *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris).

Irwin, E. (2005) *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation* (Cambridge).

Ivantchik, A. I. (2005) 'Who Were the "Scythian" Archers on Archaic Attic Vases?', in Braund (2005) 100–14.

Jacoby, F. (1909/2015) 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Histori-ographie und den Plan einer neue Sammlung der griechischen Historiker-fragmente', *Klio* 9: 80–123; Eng. trans. by M. Chambers and S. Schorn, 'On the Development of Greek Historiography and the Plan for a New Collection of the Fragments of the Greek Historians', *Histos* Suppl. 3 (Newcastle upon Tyne): https://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/documents/SV03JacobyOnTheDevelopment.pdf.

—— (1913) 'Herodotos', *RE* Suppl. II, 205–520.

—— (1923–58) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, vols. I–III (Berlin).

—— (1949) *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford).

Jennings, V. and A. Katsaros, edd. (2007) *The World of Ion of Chios* (Leiden).

Jiménez, A. (2011) 'Pure Hybridism: Late Iron Age Sculpture in Southern Iberia', *World Archaeology* 43: 102–23.

Jones, C. P. (1999) *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Katsaros, A. (2009) 'Ion of Chios (392)', *BNJ* (online publication).

Kim, H. J. (2009) *Ethnicity and Foreigners in Ancient Greece and China* (London).

—— (2013) 'The Invention of the "Barbarian" in Late Sixth-Century Ionia', in Almagor and Skinner (2013b) 25–48.

Kirk, G. S. (1970) *Myth: Its Meaning and Function in Ancient and Other Cultures* (Cambridge).

—— (1974) *The Nature of Greek Myths* (Harmondsworth).

Knapp, B. A. (2014) 'Mediterranean Archaeology and Ethnicity', in McInerney (2014) 34–49.

Kowalzig, B. (2007) *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Oxford).

Kurke, L. (1991) *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca and London).

Langdon, M. K. (2005) 'A New Greek Abecedarium', *Kadmos* 44: 175–182.

Lissarrague, F. (1990) *L'autre Guerrier: archers, peltastes, cavaliers dans l'imagerie attique* (Paris and Rome).

—— (2002) 'The Athenian Image of the Foreigner', in Harrison (2002) 101–24.

Lomas, K. (2004) 'Introduction', in ead., ed., *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean* (Mnemosyne Supplement 246; Leiden) 1–14.

Lloyd, G. E. R. (2002) *The Ambitions of Curiosity: Understanding the World in Ancient Greece and China* (Cambridge).

Luraghi, N. (2008) *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory* (Cambridge).

——, ed. (2001) *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford)

Mac Sweeney, N. (2013) *Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia* (Cambridge).

Mackie, H. (1996) *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the* Iliad (Lanham).

Malkin, I. (1998) *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).

—— (2001) 'Introduction', in id., ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Washington, D.C.) 1–28.

—— (2003) 'Networks and the Emergence of Greek Identity', *MHR* 18.2: 56–75.

—— (2005) 'Herakles and Melqart: Greeks and Phoenicians in the Middle Ground', in E. S. Gruen, ed., *Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity* (Stuttgart) 238–57.

—— (2008) 'Review of H. Hurst and S. Owen edd., *Ancient Colonizations. Analogy, Similarity and Difference* (London, 2005)', *BMCR* 2008.11.08.

—— (2011) *A Small Greek World: Networks and the Ancient Mediterranean* (New York and Oxford).

—— (2014) 'Between Collective and Ethnic Identities: A Conclusion', in C. Müller and A.-E. Veïsse, edd., *Identité ethnique et culture matérielle dans le monde grec* (*DHA* Supplement 10) 283–92.

Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge).

—— (2006) 'Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past', in Dewald and Marincola (2006) 13–28.

McInerney, J. ed. (2014) *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Malden, Mass. and Oxford).

Meyer, C. (2013) *Greco-Scythian Art and the Birth of Eurasia: From Classical Antiquity to Russian Modernity* (Oxford).

Miller, M. C. (1991) 'Foreigners at the Greek Symposium?', in W. J. Slater, ed., *Dining in a Classical Context* (Ann Arbor) 59–83.

Mitchell, L. (2007) *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Swansea).

Möller, A. (2000) *Naukratis: Trade in Archaic Greece* (Oxford).

Momigliano, A. (1990) 'The Rise of Antiquarian Research', in id., *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London) 54–79.

Morgan, K. A. (2015) *Pindar and the Construction of Syracuse Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.* (New York and Oxford).

Moyer, I. (2011) *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism* (Cambridge).

Müller, C. and T. Müller (1841–70) *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, 4 vols (Paris).

Munson, R. V. (2001) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (Ann Arbor).

Murray, O. (2000) 'History', in J. Brunschwig and G. E. R. Lloyd, edd., *Greek Thought: A Guide to Classical Knowledge* (London) 328–38; Eng. trans. under the direction of C. Porter of *Le savoir grec* (Paris, 1996).

Nenci, G. and O. Reverdin, edd. (1990) *Hérodote et les peuples non grecs* (*Entretiens Hardt* 35; Vandœuvres-Genève).

Olding, G. (2007) 'Ion the Wineman', in Jennings and Katsaros (2007) 139–54.

Orsi, D. P. (1994) 'La storiografia locale', in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, and D. Lanza, edd., *Lo spazio letterario della Grecian antica 1: la produzione e la circolazione del testo, Tomo III: I greci e Roma* (Rome) 149–79.

Osborne, R. (2004) 'Images of a Warrior: On a Group of Athenian Vases and their Public', in C. Marconi, ed., *Greek Vases: Images, contexts and controversies* (Leiden) 41–54.

Owen, S. (2000) 'New Light on Thracian Thasos: A Reinterpretation of the 'Cave of Pan', *JHS* 120: 139–43.

—— (2006) 'Mortuary Display and Cultural Contact: A Cemetery at Kastri on Thasos', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 25: 257–70.

Papadopoulos, J. K. (2002) 'Minting Identity: Coinage, Ideology and the Economics of Colonization in Akhaian Magna Graecia', *CAJ* 121: 21–55.

Papazarkadas, N. (2014) 'Two New Epigrams from Thebes', in id., ed., *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects* (Leiden) 223–51.

Paradiso, A. (2011) 'Anonymous, On Lydia', *BNJ* 768. (Accessed 12 June 2018 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a768).

Parker, G. (2007) 'Hellenism in an Afghan Context,' in H. Prabha Ray and D. T. Potts, edd., *Memory as History: The Legacy of Alexander in Asia* (New Delhi) 170–91.

Pearson, L. (1939) *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford).

Pelling, C. B. R. (1997) 'East Is East and West Is West—Or Are They? National Stereotypes in Herodotus', *Histos* 1: 51–66; https://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/documents/1997.04PellingEastIsEast5166.pdf; revised version in R. Munson, ed., *Herodotus*, 2 vols (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies; Oxford, 2013) II.360–79.

—— (2006) 'Herodotus and Homer', in M. Clarke, B. Currie, and R. Lyne, edd., *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford) 75–104.

Penny, H. G. and M. Bunzl, edd. (2003) *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire* (Ann Arbor).

Petersen, J. H. (2010) *Cultural Interactions and Social Strategies on the Pontic Shores. Burial Customs in the Northern Black Sea Area c. 550–270 BC* (Aarhus).

Pink, S. (2013) *Doing Visual Ethnography*² (London).

Polinskaya, I. (2010) 'Shared Sanctuaries and the Gods of Others on the Meaning of 'Common' in Herodotus 8.144', in R. M. Rosen, and I. Sluiter, edd., *Valuing Others in Antiquity* (Leiden) 43–70

Porciani, L. (1991) *Prime forme della storiografia greca: prospettiva locale e generale nella narrazione storica* (Stuttgart).

Prontera, F. (1984) 'Prima di Strabone: Materiali per uno studio della geografia antica come genere letterario', in id., ed., *Strabone: Contributi allo studio della personalità e dell'Opera I* (Perugia) 189–256.

Qureshi, S. (2011) *Peoples on Parade: Exhibitions, Empire, and Anthropology in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago).

Redfield, J. (1985) 'Herodotus the Tourist', *CPh* 80: 97–118.

Reger, G. (2014) 'Ethnic Identities, Borderlands, and Hybridity', in McInerney (2014) 112–26.

Romm, J. S. (1998) *Herodotus* (New Haven and London).

Rood, T. (2006) 'Herodotus and Foreign Lands', in Dewald and Marincola (2006) 290–305.

—— (2010) 'Herodotus' Proem: Space, Time and the Origins of International Relations', Ἀριάδνη 16: 43–74.

—— (forthcoming) 'From Ethnography to History: Herodotean and Thucydidean Traditions in the Development of Greek Historiography', in T. Harrison and J. Skinner, edd., *Herodotus and the Long Nineteenth Century: Ethnography, Nationalism and Disciplinary Formation*.

Ross, S. A. (2005) '*Barbarophonos*: Language and Panhellenism in the *Iliad*', *CPh* 100: 299–316.

Rutherford, I. (2001) *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford).

Said, E. W. (1978) *Orientalism* (London and New York).

Schepens, G. (1997) 'Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Problems, Methods, Prospects', in G. W. Most, ed., *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen) 144–73.

—— (2001) 'Ancient Greek City Histories', in K. Demoen, ed., *The Greek City from Antiquity to the Present: Historical Reality, Ideological Construction, Literary Representation* (Leuven) 3–25.

—— (2006a) 'Storiografia e letteratura antiquaria: la scelte di Felix Jacoby', in Ampolo (2006) 149–71.

—— (2006b) 'Il carteggio Jacoby–Meyer: un piano inedito per la struttura dei *FGrHist*', in Ampolo (2006) 357–81.

—— (2010) 'Die *Debatte über die Struktur der* "Fragmente der griechischen Historiker"', *Klio* 92: 427–61.

Shapiro, A., ed. (2007) *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece* (Cambridge).

Siapkas, J. (2003) *Heterological Ethnicity: Conceptualizing Identities in Ancient Greece* (Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 27; Uppsala).

—— (2014) 'Ancient Ethnicity and Modern Identity', in McInerney (2014) 66–81.

Skinner, J. E. (2010) 'Fish Heads and Mussel-Shells: Visualizing Greek Identity', in Foxhall–Gehrke–Luraghi (2010) 137–60.

—— (2012) *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus* (New York and Oxford).

—— (2018) 'Herodotus and his World', in T. Harrison, and E. Irwin, edd., *Interpreting Herodotus* (Oxford) 187–222.

Skinner, Q. (1969) 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *H&T* 18: 3–53.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2003) 'Herodotus (and Others) on Pelasgians: Some Perceptions of Ethnicity', in P. Derow, and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 103–44.

—— (2005) *Hylas, the Nymphs, Dionysos and Others: Myth, Ritual, Ethnicity* (Stockholm).

Stafford, E. (2012) *Herakles* (London).

Stansbury-O'Donnell, M. D. (1999) *Pictorial Narrative in Ancient Greek Art* (Cambridge).

Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).

—— (2014a) 'Local History, Polis History, and the Politics of Place', in G. Parmeggiani, ed., *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography* (Washington, D.C.) 239–62.

—— (2014b) 'The Greek Polis and the Tradition of Polis History: Local History, Chronicles, and the Patterning of the Past', in A. Moreno and R. Thomas, edd., *Patterns of the Past: Epitedeumata in the Greek Tradition* (Oxford) 145–72.

Thonemann, P. (2016) 'Croesus and the Oracles', *JHS* 136: 152–67.

Tober, D. (2010) '"Politeiai" and Spartan Local History', *Historia* 59: 412–31.

—— (2017) 'Greek Local History and its Audiences', *CQ* 67: 460–84.

Tsetskhladze, G. (2008) 'Pontic Slaves in Athens: Orthodoxy and Reality', in P. Mauritsch, W. Petermandl, R. Rollinger, C. Ulf, I. Huber, and J. P. Thuillier, edd., *Antike Lebenswelten: Konstanz, Wandel, Wirkungsmacht: Festsschrift für Ingomar Weiler zum 70. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden) 309–20.

Vasunia, P. (2012) 'Between East and West: Mobility and Ethnography in Herodotus' Proem', *History & Anthropology* 23.2: 183–98.

Vlassopoulos, K. (2007) *Unthinking the Greek Polis: Ancient History beyond Eurocentricism* (Cambridge).

—— (2013a) *Greeks and Barbarians* (Cambridge).

—— (2013b) 'The Stories of the Others: Storytelling and Intercultural Communication in the Herodotean Mediterranean', in Almagor and Skinner (2013b) 49–75.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. (1922) *Pindaros*, (Berlin; repr. 1996).

Vos, M. F. (1963) *Scythian Archers in Archaic Attic Vase-Painting* (Groningen).

Walbank, F. W. (1951) 'The Problem of Greek Nationality', *Phoenix* 5: 41–60.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. (2008) *Rome's Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge).

Walsh, J. (2009) 'Exchange and Influence: Hybridity and the Gate Reliefs of Thasos', in P. Schultz and R. von den Hoff, edd., *Structure, Image, Ornament: Architectural Sculpture in the Greek World* (Oxford and Oakville) 174–87.

West, M. L. (1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure and Origins* (Oxford).

White, R. (1991) *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (Cambridge).

Winter, I. J. (1995) 'Homer's Phoenicians: History, Ethnography, or Literary Trope?', in J. P. Carter, and S. P. Morris, edd., *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule* (Austin) 247–71.

Wolf, E. R. (1982) *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley).

Woolf, G. (2010) 'Afterword: The Local and the Global in the Graeco-Roman East', in T. Whitmarsh, ed., *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World* (Cambridge) 189–200.

Young, R. (1995) *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (London).

Zacharia, K. (2008) 'Herodotus' Four Markers of Greek Identity', in ead., ed., *Hellenisms: Culture, Identity, and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity* (Aldershot) 21–36.

Zambrini, A. (2006) 'Aspetti dell'etnografia in Jacoby', in Ampolo (2006) 189–201.