Journal of Hellenic Studies 136 (2016) 113–120 doi:10.1017/S0075426916000082
© The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies 2016

HERODOTUS, POLYCRATES – AND MAYBE STESIMBROTUS TOO?

CHRISTOPHER PELLING
*University of Oxford**

Abstract: The late fifth-century or sixth-century AD writer Fulgentius appears to quote Stesimbrotus of Thasos for a grisly detail of the death of Polycrates, describing how his corpse was carried away on a stretcher. Fulgentius is not a source to command confidence, and Jacoby dismisses this fragment as 'unecht' without further discussion. There is a case for being more cautious. It is not impossible that Stesimbrotus described Polycrates' death, and, if so, Herodotus may be setting himself against that narrative when he says that Polycrates was killed 'in a way which does not bear mentioning'. There may be a broader sense too in which both Herodotus and Thucydides are 'defining their narratives against' the work of Stesimbrotus among others.

Keywords: Fulgentius, Stesimbrotus, Herodotus, Thucydides, Polycrates

> Fulg. *Exp. Serm*. 1 p.111, 7 Helm: *sandapilam antiqui dici voluerunt feretrum mortuorum, id est loculum, non in quo nobilium corpora, sed in quo plebeiorum atque damnatorum cadavera portabantur; sicut Stesimbrotus Tasius de morte Policratis regis Samiorum descripsit*[1] *dicens: posteaquam de cruce depositus sandapila etiam deportatus est.*
>
> (Stesimbrotus *FGrH* 107 F29, marked by Jacoby as 'unecht')
>
> *T[h]asius* edd. *stasius* Fulg.
> *Sandapila* was the ancients' word of choice for a stretcher used for the dead, that is a small coffin used for bearing not the bodies of nobles but the corpses of commoners and of condemned criminals: as Stesimbrotus of Thasos [the manuscripts have Stasos] described in the case of the death of Polycrates king of Samos, saying: after he was taken down from the cross he was even carted off on a *sandapila*.

I.

Editors of historical fragments do well to be cautious. Over the years since Felix Jacoby's great *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* we have become increasingly aware of all the uncertainties: the difficulties of separating out what is quotation, what is paraphrase and what is comment or extraneous detail interpolated by the quoting authors themselves; the ways in which those quoting authors can garble or misunderstand or manipulate for their own purposes; the degree to which the interests of those later writers, indeed of whole later generations, can give a wholly misleading impression of the original source's texture. Hermann Strasburger once recommended the exercise of collecting what Athenaeus quoted from or said about Herodotus and reflecting on the impression we would have of his text if it had not survived: 'Time required: two to three hours.'[2] Something like that exercise was then carried out, very illuminatingly, and extended to other authors by Dominique Lenfant.[3] In a neighbouring genre, Jackie Elliott's recent book shows tellingly how different an impression of Ennius we form if we consider the fragments preserved by, say, Cicero and then those preserved by the commentators on Virgil.[4] The editors of the new *Fragments of the*

* chris.pelling@chch.ox.ac.uk. Thanks to John Marincola, Philomen Probert, Alan Griffiths, Simon Hornblower, and the two *JHS* referees for very helpful comments.

[1] Jacoby prints *scripsit*, presumably by a slip (there is no note in his apparatus criticus), but the editions of Helm and Pizzani suggest that the manuscript reading is clearly *descripsit*. The difference in nuance is important, similar to that between the English 'he wrote' (suggesting the actual words) and 'he described' (with more emphasis on the content): cf. *OLD* s.v. *describo* 4.

[2] Strasburger (1977) 22.

[3] Lenfant (1999). On the way one 'citing' source (Nicolaus of Damascus) can distort the impression of an original (for example Ctesias), see Toher 1989.

[4] Elliott (2013).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426916000082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Roman Historians are rightly being praised in the first reviews for their caution and conservatism, reminding us repeatedly how little we in fact know.[5]

Still, caution tells both ways. We do need to identify those cases where past certainties may not, after all, be true; there is also sometimes a case for suspecting that something may, after all, not be false. One example, again focused by the publication of *FRHist*, is that of the *Origo gentis Romanae*: its citations were dismissed out of hand by Hermann Peter and excluded from his *Historicorum Romanorum fragmenta* as forgeries, but the new editors are much more judicious, despite all the errors and the suspicions that attach to individual cases.[6]

Similar issues arise with the fragment of the fifth-century writer Stesimbrotus cited at the beginning of this paper. It is the only one from this author that Jacoby dismisses as 'unecht', and does so without further ado and without even a note. It may not be breathtaking to raise a fragment from spuriousness to the giddiness of mere dubiety; but the implications are interesting enough to be worth some pursuit.[7]

II.

Few authors are as shadowy as Stesimbrotus.[8] He is said to have been a contemporary of Pericles and of Cimon (Plut. *Cim.* 4.5; Ath. 13.589d = *FGrH* 107 [1002] TT1–2, FF4, 10a). We have fragments of a work *On the Mysteries*, normally taken to be specifically (or at least predominantly) the Mysteries of Samothrace; several other fragments treat Homeric problems, and it is usually assumed, not unreasonably, that these come from a separate further work. Most of our knowledge relates to a work whose title is given by Athenaeus (13.589de = F10a) as *On Themistocles, Thucydides* [presumably Thucydides son of Melesias] *and Pericles*,[9] and hence he is most often discussed, along with Ion of Chios, as one of the fifth-century precursors of biography. Nearly all the fragments of that work are preserved in Plutarch's *Lives* of Themistocles, Cimon and Pericles, and give the impression of a taste for gossip, sensation and scandal. This in turn gave Plutarch, so knowledgeable about the fifth century, the opportunity to indulge his own taste for correcting his distant predecessors. We just do not know what else Stesimbrotus wrote. If the questionable fragment were to be genuine, the temptation would be to assume that he wrote something like a *Life* of Polycrates, either in isolation or, as with his *Themistocles, Thucydides and Pericles*, as part of a multiple work on several earlier figures (perhaps tyrants).[10] If so, it would be unsurprising that we should know nothing of it. After all, Plutarch did not write a *Life* of Polycrates, nor (interestingly) of any other Greek tyrant, even Peisistratus.

[5] *FRHist* = Cornell (2014). See the online working-paper reviews (2014) by J. Marincola, L.V. Pitcher and S.J.V. Malloch, with an introduction by myself.

[6] See the discussion by C.J. Smith and T.J. Cornell at *FRHist* 1.96–101, together with Smith's earlier treatment (2005).

[7] Very occasional doubts have been expressed about Jacoby's lack of doubt: Pizzani (1968) 59 ad loc.; Coletti (1974–1975) 111–2; and, more recently, Vanotti (2010) 130 n.8, 146 with n.53. Before Jacoby, the fragment was accepted as authentic by K.O. Müller (*FHG* ii.56–57).

[8] *FGrH* 107. He reappears as nr. 1002 in *FGrH* iv.1A (1998) 50–77, with FF1–11 re-edited by J. Engels with commentary. Engels mentions the present fragment at p.70 n.75, but continues to regard it as spurious and excludes it from his treatment. The treatment in *Brill's New Jacoby* is by S. Dmitriev, keeping Jacoby's numeration.

[9] 'Naturally not the original title', said U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff ((1877) 361 = (1969) 35); so also Carawan (1989) 159–60; Tsakmakis (1995) 139–40; Vanotti (2010) 160. Still, Athenaeus is explicit about the title in his own day ('a work bearing the title …'), and it would be bad luck if even that stray piece of information were incorrect, though it may capture the theme-setting phraseology of the first sentence rather than the 'title' (archaic prose titles are often unstraightforward). Without such a prompt it is unlikely that a later cataloguer or librarian would fasten on Thucydides rather than the more famous Cimon. We should not find it disturbing in itself that so many of our fragments relate to Cimon: that is simply because Plutarch wrote a biography of the one man and not the other. It is not necessary to assume that it was organized into three sequential parts rather than being a single continuous work on Athens' Big Men.

[10] Thus Müller in *FHG* (ii.57) suggests that it figured in a book along the lines of the *Revenge Killings of Tyrants* of Phanias (or Phaenias) of Eresos, an author quoted several times by Plutarch in *Themistocles*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426916000082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Admittedly, that might be quite wrong. *We* think of Stesimbrotus as, above all, a biographer or proto-biographer, but that is thanks to Plutarch and his citations; the earliest testimonies rather place him as a Homerist (Pl. *Ion* 530c–d; Xen. *Symp.* 3.6 = TT 3–4),[11] which brings out how misleading it can be to pigeonhole these early prose writers generically. He might well have discussed different words and modes for carting the dead in that book on Homeric problems, for at *Il.* 18.236 Patroclus' body is borne on a φέρτρον, the same word as Fulgentius uses here (*feretrum*) to explain *sandapila.* The Greek word is very rare, and could readily invite a gloss. But it is certainly possible that it figured in a continuous narrative, possibly a sixth-century one or possibly in the context of Pericles' Samian expedition of 440–439,[12] where it might have served as precedent for the Athenians' own famously uncompromising treatment of the Samians.

III.

Herodotus describes Polycrates' grisly end:

> Polycrates arrived at Magnesia and there died a horrible death, one which neither he nor his grand plans deserved. After all, leaving aside the Syracusan tyrants, there is no Greek tyrant who bears comparison, for his magnificence, to Polycrates. Once he had killed him – in a way which does not bear mentioning – Oroetes crucified the corpse. (Herodotus 3.125.2–3, tr. Waterfield)

He goes on to describe how the corpse was rained on and then how the sun made moisture ooze from it, thus fulfilling his daughter's warning dream in which he was washed by Zeus and anointed by the sun. He was killed 'in a way which does not bear mentioning': the Greek is οὐκ ἀξίως ἀπηγήσιος, literally 'in a way that is not worthy to relate', and Robin Waterfield's translation gets the tone about right. It cannot mean that the mode of death is too trivial to recount or that Herodotus does not care: in that case, why not just say 'he killed him'? As H. Stein saw,[13] what Herodotus is presumably pointing to is some sort of horrific way of killing, perhaps along the lines of the way Cyrus' mother Parysatis is said to have killed the man (Bagapates) who had decapitated her son: she flayed him alive, took off all his skin and then crucified him – or so at least Ctesias said, for what that is worth (*FGrH* 688 F16.66); Plutarch relates a version, also perhaps from Ctesias, of the same woman killing someone who claimed to be Cyrus' killer by torturing him for ten days, then gouging out his eyes and pouring molten bronze into his ear (*Artax.* 14.10); then there was the particularly nasty way of killing that Plutarch a few chapters later calls 'boating' (*Artax.* 16).[14] If it was anything like that, then Herodotus is presumably distancing his narrative from that sort of description: Polycrates, he suggests, deserves better than to have that sort of humiliation set on record. He will only go into the detail that he has to, and the soaked then oozing body needs to be there because it fulfils the daughter's dream. It sounds as if some alternative version or versions showed no such restraint, but for Herodotus Polycrates deserved better than that, and he gestures towards that alternative without dignifying the author(s) with a name.

So who might the other author or authors be? If that fragment is genuine, then the answer might well be Stesimbrotus, perhaps among others: for if he described the end of the story, that carting away of the corpse on a common stretcher, he could easily have described the even more gruesome preliminaries of the execution itself.

The evidence, it has to be admitted, is not of the best, and one can understand Jacoby's scepticism. It is time to go into the detail of the fragment a little more.

[11] *Cf.* Engels in *FGrH* iv.1A (n.8), 52, 56–57.

[12] So Coletti (1974–1975); Dmitriev in *BNJ* also entertains that possibility. On the relevance of that 440–439 campaign to Herodotus' presentation of Samos, see Pelling (2011) 5–7, 15–16.

[13] Though he put it enigmatically, saying that the Bagapates case 'allows the sense of οὐκ ἀξίως ἀπηγήσιος to be divined' (Stein (1893) ad loc.).

[14] For more on what Greek sources say about Persian torturing and killing, see R. Rollinger in Jacobs and Rollinger (2010) 559–666.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426916000082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

IV.

'Described', *descripsit*, and 'saying', *dicens*, need not in themselves suggest a verbatim citation,[15] and it is just possible that Fulgentius means only that Stesimbrotus was referring to that sort of vulgar stretcher; but he is after all explaining the word *sandapila*, and so one would naturally infer that Stesimbrotus himself used the word or at least that Fulgentius was implying that he did. If so, that takes some believing. *Sandapila* is a perfectly good word, but in Latin: its etymology is uncertain,[16] but the word is not found in Greek. Still, we cannot be sure that it is an impossible Greek word, given that the language has other perfectly good σανδα- compounds: indeed, all the other Latin words in *sand-* are borrowings from Greek – *sandalis*, *sandalium*, *sandaraca*, *sandastros*, *sandyx* and their compounds and diminutives.[17] There is no obvious Greek etymology, but it may have been borrowed into Greek (other Greek words in σανδ- are typically loanwords)[18] and then either borrowed independently into Latin or borrowed from Greek into Latin.[19]

More worryingly, Fulgentius is not a source to generate conviction. He is a late fifth-century or sixth-century writer, possibly from North Africa.[20] The relevant work is his *Expositio Sermonum Antiquorum*, which explains obsolete Latin words, giving many citations. Some of these seem wholly wild, with fictitious or at least highly dubious authors and works; some are spot-on; some are somewhere in between, for instance quoting Plautus but attributing a line to the wrong play.[21] How far this is mischief and how far muddle, as Christopher Smith puts it, is unclear.[22] His proem talks of doing his best 'as far as my store of memory could help me', using the appropriately recherché word *enteca* for 'store'; it may well be that his memory sometimes let him down, though someone who comes up with 'Tacitus' joke-book' would have memory problems indeed (p.125, 8 Helm). That, admittedly, is an extreme example, and nothing precludes the present instance from being an accurate quotation – 'we must allow that, if Fulgentius sometimes sets out to deceive, he also sometimes tells the truth'[23] – even if nothing guarantees it either. One should not be too negative: in very broad terms, rather more than half of Fulgentius' citations seem likely to be based on something genuine, but rather fewer get the material exactly right. Still, 'dubiety' is the most one could possibly claim.

Yet this quotation – the first of the work, so one where one might expect him to be on his best behaviour – is so very odd that, paradoxically, this makes it more likely that there is something behind it. After all, if Fulgentius were going to make up something completely, he might at least have chosen an author writing in the right language.[24] His next entry (p.58, 10 Helm), also on

[15] *Cf.* n.1: Jacoby's *scripsit* is here misleading, as is his prejudging the issue by printing the *posteaquam ... deportatus est* between quotation marks.

[16] A. Ernout and A. Meillet (1951) simply say 'sans doute emprunté' in the *Dictionnaire étymologique*, which is not much help. Possible etymologies are discussed in the note ad loc. of Pizzani (1968) 57–58.

[17] Cf. *OLD* s.vv. My thanks to a *JHS* referee for this point.

[18] See Chantraine (1968) 977, suspecting in each case an 'oriental' origin.

[19] I am grateful for advice here from Philomen Probert, who observes that, if the orthography *sandapila* is right and if the middle -a- is short, the borrowing into Latin is unlikely to be an early one: in this position a short -a- would regularly become an -i- by Latin vowel weakening. Still, that does not help us on the dating of any earlier borrowing into Greek.

[20] On Fulgentius, see now Smith in *FRHist* 1.69 and his earlier discussion in Smith (2005) 97–136 at 109–10, together with his Appendices 5–6 at pp.125–28. The traditional identification with Bishop Fulgentius of Ruspe now seems unlikely: see especially Hays (2003).

[21] They are helpfully listed and analysed by Baldwin (1988). Pizzani's commentary (1968) also has much useful material.

[22] Smith in *FRHist* 1.69. Another Fulgentius passage that raises some similar problems is Cincius Alimentus *FRHist* 2 F11, again touching on Greek material, this time concerning the old-age debility of Gorgias of Leontini. The *FRHist* commentators there (T.J. Cornell and E.H. Bispham) raise the possibility of muddle – the wrong Cincius – rather than mischief: *cf.* Baldwin (1988) 43.

[23] Smith (2005) 110; *cf.* Pizzani (1968) 10: 'in ogni caso, non di invenzioni si tratta, bensì, più semplicemente, di travisamenti e alterazioni di dati di per sé genuini'.

[24] Pizzani (1968) 59 also observes that Stesimbrotus is not an author cited or mentioned by any other Roman author: had Fulgentius wanted to add authority, would he not have gone for someone better known? That argument however cuts both ways: the obscurity would make any fiction harder to detect.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426916000082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

funeral matters and explaining the word *uispillones* ('one employed to bury those too poor to afford a funeral', *OLD*), quotes the extremely obscure authors Antidamas of Heraclea (*FGrH* 152) and the poet Mnaseas of Patara: the Antidamas citation is dubious,[25] but in the case of Mnaseas he probably got it right.[26]

That is not to say that he consulted Stesimbrotus at first hand, and he might well have been following a Roman author who cited Stesimbrotus but, whether or not Fulgentius realized it, who was substituting his own Latin word for the stretcher. Stesimbrotus himself may just have said φέρτρον or φέρετρον.[27] One intriguing possibility is that the intermediate author was commenting on the passage of Suetonius – an author in whom Fulgentius was interested[28] – which describes how Domitian's body was carted away on 'an ordinary *sandapila* by *uispillones*' (*Dom.* 17.3). That could then be the source both of the Stesimbrotus citation and the immediately following ones of at least Mnaseas and perhaps of Antidamas too.

V.

The implications would indeed be interesting, as this would not be the only passage where we may suspect that Herodotus and Thucydides too are responding to figures that we normally regard only as the precursors of 'biography'. In particular, it has long been suspected that Thucydides may have Stesimbrotus in his sights in his famous treatment of Themistocles' exile and summary of his talents (1.136–8). E. Carawan has argued that in detail: not all of his argument is cogent,[29] but he does show that there seem to be incompatibilities between the versions of Themistocles' movements given by Plutarch, quoting and criticizing Stesimbrotus, and by Thucydides. There may well be more. Particularly striking is Thucydides' odd stress that Themistocles coped so well 'from his own natural intelligence, without any previous or subsequent learning' (οἰκείᾳ γὰρ ξυνέσει καὶ οὔτε προμαθὼν ἐς αὐτὴν οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἐπιμαθών, 1.138.3). Whatever we make of that enigmatic phrase about 'subsequent learning', the stress on his lack of *previous* learning is also remarkable in so laudatory a passage. It is not unreasonable to relate it to a fifth-century debate on the man's education that has also left its traces on the early chapters of Plutarch's *Themistocles*, especially chapter 2,[30] and that a fragment of Aeschines of Sphettus now reveals as continuing into the fourth century.[31] Stesimbrotus was clearly a key player in this debate, stressing that the man was a student of the philosophers Anaxagoras and Melissus (*FGrH* 107 [1022] F1 = Plut. *Them.* 2.5). Plutarch there takes Stesimbrotus to task for his chronology: it was absurd, he says, to represent Themistocles as a student of those two later figures. Yet it is hard to believe that this is all there was to it, as Stesimbrotus was after all talking about contemporaries and must have known better. One suspects some garbling on the part of Plutarch or an intermediate source:

[25] Jacoby was equally dismissive about the two Antidamas fragments preserved by Fulgentius: 'offenbare schwindelzitate' (note on *FGrH* 152). Still, there too we might not be so confident as Jacoby in assuming *Schwindelhaftigkeit*: Pizzani (1968) ad loc. is more open-minded, as is Cappelletto (2003) in his note on Mnaseas fr. 9.

[26] *Cf.* Pizzani (1968) ad loc; Baldwin (1988) 48–49. Cameron (2004) 309–10 is similarly inclined to accept the validity of Fulgentius' other reference to Mnaseas in his *Mitologiae* (p.58. 10 Helm) and both are accepted as genuine by P. Cappelletto in his edition of Mnaseas (2003): he prints them as *On Europe* frs. 1 and 9.

[27] The word is used of a dead boar on a stretcher at Polyb. 8.29.4: not, evidently, anything very grand. In the case of *Il.* 18.236 (cited in section II above), Achilles would have done the best he could, and perhaps any low associations were not yet felt; or perhaps this was just military necessity. But Ael. *VH* 12.64 undeniably suggests something grander.

[28] Baldwin (1988) 43, 46 and especially 55.

[29] Carawan (1989). Some fair criticisms are made by Tsakmakis (1995), but it is arguably more difficult to identify the Stesimbrotus elements in Plut. *Them.* 24–25 than either Carawan or Tsakmakis thought.

[30] The chapter is discussed by Duff (2008a) 3–11; *cf.* Duff (2008b); (2010) 47–49.

[31] Aeschines of Sphettus, *SSR* VIA F 48 (= Giannantoni (1990) 2.606–07); *cf.* Duff (2008a) 10 n.44. There Socrates tells a sceptical Alcibiades that Themistocles may have been deprived of education and horsemanship in his youth but later became cultured and horsey. But that 'later' does not there seem to be as old as old age, as Stesimbrotus may have suggested: see n.32.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426916000082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

perhaps it was originally a reference to Themistocles 'hearing' the figures in old age and having intellectual conversations with them.[32] In any case, Thucydides can be seen to be responding to the sort of tradition that, one way or another, also surfaces in Stesimbrotus.[33]

If we do posit this sort of fifth-century debate, we should not be fixated on the written word; doubtless the debate was partly in oral culture – perhaps in talk at symposia such as the one described by Ion of Chios, recounting how Themistocles himself admitted that he had never learned how to sing or play the lyre like Cimon but he did know how to make a city great and wealthy (Plut. *Cim.* 9.1 [cf. *Them.* 2.4] = *FGrH* 392 F13). But we should not neglect the possibility of a more specific response to Stesimbrotus himself. When Thucydides' book reached its final form Themistocles' great days were nearly a century in the past, and he had been dead for 60 years; we know that written works were going round, and Themistocles crops up in another of the small number of fragments of Ion's *Epidemiai* as well, with *FGrH* 392 F11 giving his daughter's name. Why not assume that Thucydides is responding to these written works, Stesimbrotus included, as well as to oral tradition, very likely without being able (or finding it important) to say himself what proportion of his knowledge was owed to each? The same goes for his irritation at what people were 'saying' about the expulsion of the Peisistratids (6.54.1): oral tradition, yes, but we know of at least one written text that treated it too, and that is Herodotus, even though Herodotus is certainly not his principal target there. So just as Thucydides is defining his own 'precision' (6.54.1 again) against those other stories, it is reasonable to assume that here too this emphasis on Themistocles' lack of education is a response to those alternative versions. Written accounts are even more likely with Carawan's example of the detail of Themistocles' exile, where the dispute concerned details of chronology and sequence whose discussion was unlikely to be anyone's idea of sympotic fun.

If Thucydides was responding in this way, why should Herodotus not be doing something similar in the Polycrates case, even if again Stesimbrotus' version might be no more than one among several, both oral and written? If the work in question was the *On Themistocles, Thucydides and Pericles* it would be very recent and topical indeed: the latest datable item in that (F11 = Plut. *Per.* 36.6) relates to 429, and Herodotus' work is normally (not very securely) thought to have reached its final form during the Archidamian War. F. Schachermeyr has indeed suggested the converse – that Stesimbrotus could himself have known Herodotus' work and be responding to him.[34] Both theses may be right, for with both Stesimbrotus and Herodotus 'publication' was doubtless a less clear-cut and more continuous business than its modern counterpart: influence could be mutual, with both responding to earlier oral performances.[35] But if the work was, say, a *Life of Polycrates*, that could be earlier anyway.

[32] As von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1877) 364–65; so also Schachermeyr (1965), 13–15 = (1974), 161–3, Carawan (1989) 158; Tsakmakis (1995) 142. Wilamowitz also suggests that this is the point of the 'subsequent learning' implied by ἐπιμαθών. This is less likely, as it is hard to see how later leisurely intellectual activity could be relevant to Themistocles' military and political insight in 480; something like 'without the application of hindsight' makes better sense, pointing to his not needing to learn from any mistakes.

[33] This is one of the possibilities discussed by von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1877) 364–65, followed by Jacoby in his commentary on *FGrH* 107 F1 p.345. They prefer to think that Stesimbrotus was the one doing the responding, obviously not to Thucydides himself who wrote a generation later, but to the stress on his lack of learning that later surfaced in Thucydides. Both make it a negative point on Stesimbrotus' part: that is particularly implausible, as it would be such a feeble riposte ('don't keep praising him for being so naturally gifted! In fact he'd studied a lot!'). Wilamowitz also wonders if it was some sort of barbed joke, in the style of Old Comedy. If so, it does not sound very funny.

[34] Schachermeyr (1965) 13, 22–23 = (1974) 161, 170–71. Schachermeyr prefers (10 = 158) to push Stesimbrotus' publication date down to 420, on the grounds that Athenaeus' description 'a contemporary of Pericles and one who had seen him' (Ath. 13 589 d = T2, F10a) would make better sense if some time had elapsed since Pericles' death. Still, these are Athenaeus' words, not Stesimbrotus' own, and it is unlikely that Athenaeus knew Stesimbrotus' dates so precisely. Stesimbrotus himself could easily have stressed his eyewitness knowledge of Pericles without any such implication.

[35] I have suggested something along these lines for Herodotus' relation to Ion of Chios at Pelling (2007) 86

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426916000082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If Herodotus and Thucydides do have Stesimbrotus in view, the implications are even bigger. We are used to talk of later biographers defining themselves and their work against the bigger neighbouring genre of historiography – writing 'non-history', as Andrew Wallace-Hadrill put it in the case of Suetonius.[36] Might Herodotus and Thucydides be defining their own works, not doubtless as 'non-biography' as that would posit more firm a 'genre' of biography than is yet realistic, but at least against the sort of writings about the great individuals that Stesimbrotus and Ion had been producing – perhaps even, at the time when Herodotus' text took its final form, were producing still?[37]

That is too large a theme to pursue here,[38] but yes, they might. And 'might' is very much the catchword for most of this short paper, though in the case of the Fulgentius fragment I would go as far as a 'might well', perhaps even to a 'more likely than not'. Still, we cannot be sure that any of this is true; we know too little of Stesimbrotus to be confident and we know enough about Fulgentius to be doubtful. But we cannot be sure that any of it is false either, and the implications are worth more consideration than they have received for a century.

Bibliography

Baldwin, B. (1988) 'Fulgentius and his sources', *Traditio* 44, 37–57
Cameron, A. (2004) *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford)
Cappelletto, P. (2003) *I frammenti di Mnasea* (Milan)
Carawan, E. (1989) 'Stesimbrotus and Thucydides on the exile of Themistocles', *Historia* 38, 144–61
Chantraine, P. (1968) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris)
Coletti, D. (1974–1975) 'Il valore storico dei frammenti di Stesimbroto', *Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia di Perugia* 12, 63–125
Cornell, T.J. (general ed.) (2014) *Fragments of the Roman Historians* (3 vols) (Oxford)
Duff, T.E. (2008a) 'Models of education in Plutarch', *JHS* 128, 1–26
— (2008b) 'The opening of Plutarch's *Life of Themistokles*', *GRBS* 48, 159–79
— (2010) 'Plutarch's *Themistocles and Camillus'*, in N. Humble (ed.), *Plutarch's Lives: Parallelism and Purpose* (Swansea) 45–86
Elliott, J.M. (2013) *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales* (Cambridge)
Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. (1951) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (3rd edition) (Paris)
Ferrucci, S. (2001) 'ἅπαξ λέγειν. Il λογογράφος tra storia e oratoria', *SemRom* 4, 103–26
Giannantoni, G. (1990) *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae* (4 vols) (Naples)
Grethlein, J. (2004) '*Logographos* und Thuk. 1.21.1', *Prometheus* 30, 209–16
Hays, G. (2003) 'The date and identity of the mythographer Fulgentius', *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 13, 163–252
Jacobs, B. and Rollinger, R. (eds) (2010) *Der Achämenideshof. Akten des 2. Internationalen Kolloquiums 'Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und orientalischer Überlieferungen'. Basel, 23–25. Mai 2007* (Wiesbaden)
Lenfant, D. (1999) 'Peut-on se fier aux "fragments" d'historiens? L'exemple des citations d'Hérodote', *Ktèma* 24, 103–21

n.46. *Cf*. Vannicelli (2004) for a similar suggestion that 'two traditions', one found in Herodotus and one in Stesimbrotus, 'must have interacted' (205).

[36] Wallace-Hadrill (1983) 10.

[37] At 1.21.1 Thucydides contrasts his own work with the inaccuracies of the *logographoi*: he cannot quite mean Stesimbrotus (or Ion) here, as they did not deal with the distant material that is his focus in the Archaeology, but both may still lurk in the background: *cf*. Tsakmakis (1995) 150–52; Pelling (2007) 87–88. Grethlein (2004) argues that *logographos* there means 'orator', but allows that Herodotus might be included as an extra target because of his presumed oral delivery (216 n.23); oral delivery is also the focus of the different interpretation of *logographos* in Ferrucci (2001). If Herodotus can be described as a *logographos*, the same might – yet another 'might' – be true of Stesimbrotus and Ion.

[38] I floated this idea in Pelling (2007); I return to it in Pelling (forthcoming).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426916000082 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Malloch, S.J.V. (2014) '*The Fragments of the Roman Historians*: conventions and opportunities', *Histos Working Papers* 2014.07, http://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/Histos_WorkingPapers.html
Marincola, J. (2014) 'First thoughts on the new edition of the *Fragments of the Roman Historians*', *Histos Working Papers* 2014.05, http://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/Histos_WorkingPapers.html
Pelling, C. (2007) 'Ion's *Epidemiai* and Plutarch's Ion', in V. Jennings and A. Katsaros (eds), *The World of Ion of Chios* (Leiden and Boston) 75–109
— (2011) 'Herodotus and Samos', *BICS* 54.1, 1–19
— (2014) '*FRHist* and OUP', *Histos Working Papers* 2014.04, http://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/Histos_WorkingPapers.html
— (forthcoming) 'Fifth-century preliminaries' in K. de Temmerman (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Biography* (Oxford)
Pitcher, L.V. (2014) '"We will gather up the fragments that remain": first thoughts on *FRHist*', *Histos Working Papers* 2014.06, http://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/Histos_WorkingPapers.html
Pizzani, U. (1968) *Fabio Planciade Fulgenzio: Definizione di Parole Antiche* (Rome)
Schachermeyr, F. (1965) 'Stesimbrotos und seine Schrift uber die Staatsmänner', *SB Akad. Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse* 247. 5, 1–23 (= *Forschungen und Betrachtungen zur gr. und röm. Geschichte* (Wien 1974) 151–71)
Smith, C.J. (2005) The *Origo Gentis Romanae*: facts and fictions', *BICS* 48, 97–136
Stein, H. (1893) *Herodotos* III (4th edition) (Berlin)
Strasburger, H. (1977) 'Umblick im Trümmerfeld der gr. Geschichtsschreibung', in *Historiographia Antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* (Leuven) 3–52
Toher, M. (1989) 'On the use of Nicolaus' historical fragments', *ClAnt* 8, 159–72
Tsakmakis, A. (1995) 'Das historische Werk des Stesimbrotos von Thasos', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 44, 129–52
Vannicelli, P. (2004) 'Whose Side are you on?', in V. Karageorghis and I. Taifacos (eds), *The World of Herodotus. Proceedings of an International Conference held at the Foundation A.G. Leventis, Nicosia, September 18–21, 2003* (Nicosia) 199–207
Vanotti, G. (2010) 'A proposito di Stesimbroto di Taso in Suda [A 2681 Adler]', in G. Vanotti (ed.), *Il lessico Suda e i frammenti degli storici greci. Atti dell'Incontro internazionale di studi, Vercelli, 6–7 novembre 2008* (Rome) 129–62
von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1877) 'Die Thukydideslegende', *Hermes* 12, 326–67 (= *Kl. Schr.* 3 (Berlin 1969) 1–40)
Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1983) *Suetonius* (London)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426916000082 Published online by Cambridge University Press