

## EXCHANGE

L. PORCIANI AND C. J. JOYCE

Leone Porciani, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, writes:

Qualche breve osservazione sul lavoro di Joyce intitolato ‘Was Hellanikos the First Chronicler of Athens?’ (*Histos* 3 [1999] 1–17). L’autore sostiene, nella prima parte dell’ articolo, che 323a FF 25-6 sono insufficienti a provare un’ articolazione annalistica dell’ *Atthis* di Ellanico. Ma la parte finale di F 25 fa chiaramente capire che la narrazione dell’ *Atthis* era di tipo annalistico: lo scolio ad Ar. *Ran.* 694 cita da Ellanico *διεξιῶν τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀντιγένους*, ovverosia ‘nel percorrerre/ esporre i fatti dell’ arcontato di Antigene’; piuttosto naturale sembra inferirne che gli avvenimenti trattati nell’ *Atthis* erano collegati alla menzione del rispettivo arconte. Joyce sembra sospettare che le cose possano stare così (n. 22), ma non è accettabile la soluzione che propone (*διεξιῶν* may be a scholiastic gloss’: ma tutto il frammento e una glossa scoliastica! e in ogni caso, anche se *διεξιῶν* non fa parte—ovviamente—del testo di Ellanico, lo scoliasta che ha scritto la frase aveva presente certamente una struttura annalistica dell’ *Atthis*). Va aggiunto che F 26 va nella stessa direzione di F 25: *τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτει* va con *φῆσι* almeno altrettanto che con *κοπήσαι*. Quindi: ‘All’ anno precedente, quello di Antigene, Ellanico’ etc. Cioè: nell’ *Atthis* le notizie erano collocate sotto questo o quell’ arconte. Quale indizio più chiaro di una struttura annalistica?

Alla n. 21 Joyce scrive: ‘It is less obvious that an entire word like *δευτεροι* should be lost, only to be replaced by its first letter (*δ*), subsequently interpreted as a numeral’. Ma non è in questione una corruzione del testo, bensì l’ ambiguità della sigla numerica ‘*δ*’ che poteva esser letta 4/quarto (sistema numerico alfabetico) o anche 2/secondo (sistema acrofonico) Scambi 2-4 sono infatti spesso ipotizzati (per limitarci agli ordinali, cfr. Megastene, 715 F 1a [app.] e Arist. *Ath.* 14.1 (*τέταρτοι* Bauer]; per i cardinali, cfr. Th. 2.2.1 [*τέσσαρας* Krueger], sch. Ar. *Av.* 13a [*δ’* Dobree], Beloch *GG* III.2.60, 241). Ma comunque, la correzione di Jacoby non è indispensabile, è risponde solo al bisogno di conciliare il giudizio di Tucidide (brevità della *Αττική ξυγγραφή*) con l’ estensione dell’ opera attestata dalle fonti: quattro libri, da questo punto di vista, sono un po’ troppi. Il contesto cronologico del frammento in questione, d’ altra parte, non è affatto sicuro, e dunque non è detto che il pur sempre ipotizzabile quarto libro dell’ *Atthis* contenesse eventi ‘from the middle of the fifth century’.

L'opera di Istro non ha come titolo Ἀτθίς—significativamente—ma bensì Ἀττικὰ, Συναγωγή Ἀτθίδων/Ἀτθίδος/Ἀττικῶν.

Non è corretto dire che D. Hal. *Th.* 9 manca nelle testimonianze di *FGrHist* su Ellanico; non c'è in 323a T, ma c'è in 4 T (11). Evidentemente per Jacoby non concerne l'Ellanico storico locale, ma—dobbiamo pensare—l'etnografo/periegeta. Peraltro penso che lo stesso Ellanico, questa volta l'autore dell'*Atthis* e altre storie locali, sia incluso da Dionigi nella successiva menzione degli storici locali che preferiscono l'organizzazione cronologica secondo liste di re, sacerdoti etc. Nel capitolo 5, infatti, Ellanico è incluso appunto nella categoria degli storici locali. Il fatto che sia nominate a parte, insieme a Erodoto, fra gli autori che dividono la narrazione κατὰ τόπους non basta a escludere che, per altri aspetti della sua opera, potesse rientrare fra quanti preferivano un' articolazione κατὰ χρόνους.

C. J. Joyce, Durham, replies:

Professor Porciani (hereafter 'Porciani'), who does not accept my thesis that the *Atthis* of Hellanikos was not a chronicle, raises objections both to my interpretation of key passages in the ancient texts and to other, more technical, details in my presentation, which, he feels, invalidate my general case. I would like, first, to thank Prof. Porciani for his criticisms, some of which I believe to be fair, and, second, to take this opportunity to reply to the substantive points which he raises.

Porciani regards it as obvious from *FGrHist* 323a F 25 that the schematic rubric of Hellanikos' *Atthis* was annalistic. He states (paragraph 1): 'Ma la parte finale di F 25 fa chiaramente capire che la narrazione dell' *Atthis* era di tipo annalistico: lo scolio ad Ar. *Ran.* 694 cita da Ellanico διεξιὼν τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀντιγένους, ovvero sia "nel percorrerre/espore i fatti dell' arcontato di Antigene". He then criticises n. 22 of my article, in which I argue that the information supplied by the participial phrase introduced by διεξιὼν in the scholion to Ar. *Ran.* 694 is not conclusive proof of an annalistic structure, as it may result from a scholastic gloss. Porciani reminds me that 'tutto il frammento è una glossa scoliastica', a fact of which I am (of course) well aware. My point, however, is that the citation cannot *alone* prove that Hellanikos wrote annalistically, simply because it is unclear to what extent the scholiast might have distorted or misrepresented the original context of Hellanikos' material. Ordinarily, we would have felt no difficulty in assuming that the work cited was annalistic. The problem, in this case, is that we have other testimonia from antiquity, most notably the famous allusion of Thucydides (1.97.2), which, on a careful interpretation, must imply that Hellanikos' *Atthis* was not a chronicle. Given the inherent liability of fragments

to mutation, corruption, and false contextualisation—a question with which I deal in my forthcoming doctoral work on Philochoros (cf. the notorious examples of *FGrHist* 328 F 30 and 149a)—I am not persuaded by one citation from an unknown portion of the *Atthis* that the entire work was organised on the methodological principles postulated by Jacoby. In short, I do not deny that F 25 is problematic for my thesis; my concern is that the scholion *itself* may be—and indeed from the point of view of the totality of the evidence, *must* be—misleading, because it conflicts with much more valuable testimony which, hitherto, has been either underplayed or misinterpreted.

Porciani likens the case of *FGrHist* 323a F 26—the allusion to the minting of gold coinage in the year 407/6—to F 25, and concludes: ‘Va aggiunto che F 26 va nella stessa direzione di F 25: τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτει va con φησι almeno altrettanto che con κοπήσαι. Quindi: “All’ anno precedente, quello di Antigene, Ellanico” etc. Cioe: nell’ *Atthis* le notizie erano collocate sotto questo o quell’ arconte. Quale indizio piu chiaro di una struttura annalistica?’

A number of points can be made in reply.

First, though F 26 does suggest—as Porciani observes—that Hellanikos dated the event described by reference to an Athenian archon, it *does not* further commit us to the view that the work from which it is taken was a chronicle: note, for the sake of comparison, Herodotos’ dating of the Persian occupation of Attica to the archonship of Kalliades (Hdt. 8.51.1).

Second, the proximity of φησι to τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτει in the wording of the citation does not suggest that Hellanikos rather than the scholiast elucidated the chronological gap between the event described and the production of Aristophanes’ *Frogs*: on any natural interpretation, this is surely an inference of the scholiast, who was concerned to gloss the chronological relationship between the production of the play and one of its historical allusions.

Third, and most importantly, Porciani thinks nothing of the discrepancy between FF 25 and 26 and the remaining fragments, which, except on a very strained reading, *cannot* be worked into the context of a chronicle: e.g. Harpokration attests that Hellanikos had given a genealogy of the hierophants, sacred officials connected with the mystic cult at Eleusis (F 8); a scholiast on Plato’s *Symposium* cites Hellanikos for the genealogy of Kodros, one of the more famous kings of Attica (F 23); Plutarch states that Hellanikos had traced the ancestry of Andokides back to Odysseus (F 24b), and a scholiast on Euripides’ *Oresteia* gives the impression that Hellanikos had used an artificial system of generation-counting to calculate chronological intervals between the famous mythical trials conducted on the Areiopagos (F 22). As I indicated in my article, the great majority of fragments attested from the *Atthis* militate against the doctrine that its format was annalistic, but, unless FF

25 and 26 are falsely attributed (as suggested by Toye: cf. article cited below), we must find some other explanation for their existence. One possibility, which has since occurred to me, is that the archonship of Antigenes constituted a base date from which chronological intervals could be calculated: certainly, if F 22 offers any model of comparison, we might think that reckoning time by generations would require some temporal frame of reference defined, perhaps, by the year of an archon. This, of course, is pure speculation, but it does not seem to me coincidental that, of all the fragments attributed to Hellanikos, the only two to supply an archontic date *refer to the very same year*. As a working hypothesis, I suggest that the year of Antigenes' archonship had a special meaning and function within the narrative as a whole and that Hellanikos reckoned time not in absolute but in *relative* terms, using as his fundamental point of reference a base date defined by the year of a local magistrate.

Porciani takes issue with my statement at n. 21 that 'it is less obvious that an entire word like *δεύτεροι* should be lost, only to be replaced by its first letter ( $\delta$ ), subsequently interpreted as a numeral'. The passage in dispute is a fragment of Harpokration, in which—until Jacoby—the letter  $\delta$  was interpreted as putting events dating from the middle of the fifth century in a fourth book of Hellanikos' *Atthis*. Jacoby, however, wished the 'delta' to convey 'second' and commented (*FGrHist* IIB vol. 1 Text, p.31): 'the corruption of *δεύτεροι* to " $\delta$ " is so frequent that I do not hesitate to place F 7 among the fragments of the second book and to assign it to the first Peloponnesian War'. Against Jacoby, I argued: 'it is less obvious that an entire word like *δεύτεροι* should be lost, only to be replaced by its first letter ( $\delta$ ), subsequently interpreted as a numeral'. This argument may be felt to have some force against Jacoby's precise formulation, but Porciani is quite right to point out that the delta could be understood not as a truncated corruption of *δεύτεροι* but as an 'acrophonic' representation of it. The point simply had not occurred to me.

Nevertheless—whether we regard  $\delta$  as an acrophonic representation or as a corruption—the assumption that it stands for *deuteroi* is vulnerable to two objections: first,  $\delta$  *can* and usually *does* represent 'fourth'; second, our particular author, Harpokration, seems to have used alphabetic numerals, not 'acrophonic' ones (cf. e.g. *FGrHist* 324 FF 10, 11, 19, 23, 24, 33; *FGrHist* 328 FF 6, 8, 13, 14, 16, to take just a handful of examples)—Porciani's examples from other authors of acrophonic usages are therefore irrelevant.

Further, Porciani insists that the difficulty in reading the  $\delta$  as 'fourth' resides solely in the evidence of Thuc. 1.97.2: 'quattro libri, da questo punto di vista, sono un po' troppi', i.e. he takes Thucydides to imply that Hellanikos' *History* was short, though this is not in fact what Thucydides says: Thucydides specifically states that Hellanikos alluded to *these events* (viz. of the fifty

years between Salamis and the attack on Plataia in 431) in a brief and chronologically imprecise fashion, and his objection would have been just as valid if the *Atthis* had contained thirty books as if it had contained only two. The complaint in Thucydides concerns not the length of the *Atthis* so much as Hellanikos' brief and inaccurate treatment of the fifty-year period. The real reason why Jacoby read Harpokration's placing of mid-fifth-century events in Book 2 of the *Atthis* rather than in Book 4 was, as I argued in my paper, that their position in Book 4 would severely disrupt his hypothesis of an orderly annalistic narrative. Porciani's only response to this is the statement: 'il contesto cronologico del frammento in questione non è affatto sicuro.' No, indeed, but one has to try to make sense of such data as there are—as Jacoby did in this instance—and my concern was to indicate the severe difficulties for his reconstruction of an annalistic *Atthis* posed by this fragment.

Porciani complains that the work of Istros 'non ha come titolo Ἀθίς—significativamente—ma bensì Ἀττικά, Συναγωγὴ Ἀθίδων/Ἀθίδος/Ἀττικῶν' (paragraph 3). This is unconvincing. Harpokration, in his entry for λαμπάς, cites from a τῶν Ἀθίδων of Istros (*FGrHist* 334 F 2a), proving that Istros' work also went under the title of Ἀθίς in antiquity. I do not accept the criticism (which I anticipate) that Ἀθίδων appears here in the plural and must, in consequence, stand as the objective genitive after an implied συναγωγῆς. The use of the plural Ἀθίδες to refer to one Ἀθίς is well attested—I mention *FGrHist* 324 F 4, 328 FF 12, 19, 20 as a few examples—and there is no reason why τῶν Ἀθίδων in this instance should be anything more than a variant upon τῆς Ἀθίδος. This, indeed, is no surprise, considering that the noun ἱστορία (the noun understood with the adjectival *Atthis*) can itself be used in the singular or plural even with reference to single historical works. Besides, even if Istros' work was not regularly cited under the title of *Atthis*, we can find other examples of works which were, even though, as Jacoby himself acknowledged, they could not have been chronicles: note the *Atthides* of Amelisagoras (*FGrHist* IIIB 330) and Hegesinous (*FGrHist* IIIB 331), relegated by Jacoby to the (arbitrary) category of 'Pseudepigrapha'. So my point stands that Dionysios' pronouncement in *Ant. Rom.* 1.8.3 is inapplicable to every known case.

Porciani rightly criticises me (paragraph 4) for omitting to mention *FGrHist* 4 T 11, and I fully admit that I have distorted the extent to which Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 9 has been neglected. But I stick to my argument that its implications have not received adequate attention. Jacoby's reason for *not* including the testimonium in *FGrHist* IIIB 323a originates in the doctrine (first expressed in *Klio* 9, 1909, republished in H. Bloch, ed., *Abhandlungen*, 1956, esp. p. 21) that Hellanikos' *Atthis* was fundamentally different in nature

from his ethnographic and genealogical works. Thus, according to his implicit reasoning, the statement that Hellanikos composed *κατὰ τόπους* rather than *κατὰ χρόνους* is not relevant to the *Atthis*. My point, simply, is that this begs the question. I do not regard the exaggerated generic statement of Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.8.3 as sufficient to distinguish the form of the *Atthis* from that of other works of Hellanikos, for reasons which I expressed in my article. We know that Hellanikos did compose a chronographic work, viz. *The Priestesses of Hera*, and this might deflate total confidence in Dionysios' assessment at *Thuc.* 9. But in the case of the *Priestesses*, it is abundantly clear that not only the form but also the scope of the work was totally different from that of the majority of works attributed to Hellanikos. In the case of the *Atthis*, on the other hand, this is by no means clear, and Jacoby's grounds for differentiating the *Atthis* from the ethnographic/periegetic tradition as represented by the other works are slender.

In paragraph 4, Porciani states: 'Peraltro penso che lo stesso Ellanico, questa volta l'autore dell' *Atthis* e altre storie locali, sia incluso da Dionigi nella successiva menzione degli storici locali che preferiscono l'organizzazione cronologica secondo liste di re sacerdoti, etc. Nel capitolo 5, infatti, Ellanico è incluso appunto nella categoria degli storici locali. Il fatto che sia nominato a parte, insieme a Erodoto, fra gli autori che dividono la narrazione *κατὰ τόπους* non basta a escludere che, per altri aspetti della sua opera, potesse rientrare fra quanti preferivano un'articolazione *κατὰ χρόνους*'. This analysis seems to me very defective. On the basis of ch. 5 (in my text ch. 6), which includes Hellanikos among the local historians of Greece, Porciani assumes that the passage when read in its totality does not exclude Hellanikos from the companionship of those who composed *κατὰ χρόνους*. Underlying his reasoning is the unspoken assumption that authors use their chosen terminology in a consistent and unvaried way, regardless of context. Against this assumption, I have already tried to show that Thucydides' use of *ἀκριβές* in Book 5 is quite different from his use of *ἀκριβῶς* in Book 1—we cannot, as Jacoby did, try to infer the meaning of *Thuc.* 1.97.2 by analogy with 5.20.2. Similarly, though Dionysios does indeed equate 'local historians' with 'chroniclers' in ch. 9, the passage when read as a whole indicates that Dionysios' application of the term 'local historians' in other contexts cannot refer exclusively to chroniclers (see the astute observations of D. L. Toye, *AJP* 116, 1995, 279-302). Unlike ch. 9, the force of the allusion in ch. 6 is to emphasise the *substantive* scope of Hellanikos' inquiry—i.e. (with the omitted exception of the *Priestesses*). Hellanikos did not write literary *Histories* whose subject matter exceeded the narrow bounds of a single city. If 'local historian' were commensurate with 'chronicler' in this specific context, we would find the designation 'local historian' strange, especially when we consider (as I think Porciani would agree) that Hellanikos was, in most cases

at very least, anything but an annalist. So I doubt that the earlier allusion to Hellanikos can be used to modify the later one, and ch. 9 stands as very strong proof that Dionysios positively dissociated Hellanikos from those historians who wrote *κατὰ χρόνους*.

Let me conclude by expressing my gratitude to Professor Porciani for his comments, which have prompted me (I hope) to clarify my positions. If my arguments are still unpersuasive, I trust they will at least be clearer and more accessible.