

262 Charon of Lampsakos

Paola Ceccarelli (Cambridge)

BJN	Charon Lampsacenus	Charon of Lampsakos
Historian Number:	262	

262 T 1 - (I 32) Suda s. Χάρων·	meta[[id="262" type="T" n="1" sourcework(level1="Suda" level2="" level3="Lexicon" level4="" level5="" level6="- Χάρων")]]
Subject: biography Historical Work: n/a Source date: 10th C AD Historian's date: 5 C BC Historical period: n/a	Translation
Λαμψακηνός, υἱὸς Πυθοκλέους· γενόμενος κατὰ τὸν πρῶτον Δαρεῖον, ὁθ' ὀλυμπιάδι· μᾶλλον δὲ ἦν ἐπὶ τῶν Περσικῶν κατὰ τὴν ὁἴᾳ ὀλυμπιάδα· ἱστορικός· ἔγραψεν Αἰθιοπικά· Περσικά ἐν βιβλίοις β· Ἑλληνικά ἐν βιβλίοις δ· Περὶ Λαμψάκου β· Λιβυκά· Ὀρους Λαμψακηνῶν ἐν βιβλίοις δ· Πρυτάνεις [ἢ ἄρχοντας] τοὺς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων (ἔστι δὲ χρονικά)· Κτίσεις πόλεων ἐν βιβλίοις β· Κρητικά ἐν βιβλίοις γ (λέγει δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ Μίνωος τεθέντας νόμους)· Περίπλους τῶν ἐκτὸς τῶν Ἡρακλέους στηλῶν.	Of Lampsakos, son of Pythokles; born under Dareios the first (521–485), during the 79th Olympiad (464/1); or rather, during the Persian wars, at the time of the 75th Olympiad (480/79); historian; wrote <i>Aethiopian histories</i> ; <i>Persian histories</i> in two books (F 3); <i>Greek histories</i> in four books; <i>On Lampsakos</i> in two books; <i>Libyan Histories</i> ; <i>Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi</i> in four books; <i>Prytaneis [or Archons] of the Lakedaimonians</i> - these are chronological; <i>Foundations of Cities</i> in 2 books; <i>Cretan Histories</i> in 3 books - he enumerates also the laws laid down by Minos; and <i>Voyage past the Pillars of Herakles</i> .

262 T 1 Commentary

The *Suda* opens with the usual information on the place of birth, Lampsakos (confirmed by numerous other authors) and the father's name, Pythokles (unattested in this form elsewhere; the only other author who mentions Charon's father, Pausanias, gives a slightly different name, Pythes, F 4). The name of the father may have figured in the proem of one of Charon's works – the majority of the early prose proems known to us give only the name of the author and the place of birth (so Hecataeus, Herodotus, Thucydides), but Alcmaeon of Croton, writing a work with a specific audience in mind, gave his father's name in the proem ('Alcmaeon of Croton, son of Peirithous, said the following to Brotinus, Leon and Bathyllus...', DK 24, B1). In the case of Charon the most likely place for such a proem is a work connected with local history: the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* (cf. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 2).

What follows is problematic, because the *Suda* offers a set of internally inconsistent dates, and because it lists a high number of books, which, with the exception of the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* and of the *Persika*, are otherwise unattested.

Dates first. The statement that Charon was born under Dareios I is followed by what appears as a further precision – but birth under Dareios’ reign is not reconcilable with a precise date of birth in the 79th Olympiad, 464/1 BC. γενόμενος here is best taken to mean ‘born’; ‘active under’, also possible and defended by C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* I (Paris 1841), xvi, would create even worse problems; discussion, with examples of γένομενος with the meaning of ‘born’, in F. Jacoby, ‘Charon von Lampsakos’, *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 (1938), 208 n. 4 = H. Bloch (ed.), *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtschreibung von Felix Jacoby zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag* (Leiden 1956), 178-9 n. 4. Scholars have proposed to render the two indications compatible by changing either the numeral or the name of the king (list of proposals in Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 208 n. 4 = *Abhandlungen*, 178-9 n. 4; G. Ottone, *Libyka. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Rome 2002), 36). Another possibility is to take the date of 464/1 BC as referring to Charon’s *akme*: a birth under Dareios I would be compatible with an *akme* in 464/1 BC, and with the indications that can be gleaned from some of the fragments (see L. Pearson, *Early Ionian historians* (Oxford 1939), 140). As for the second, alternative (and ‘better’) date proposed by the *Suda*, 480/79, it does nothing to solve the chronological difficulty; most likely, it is to be explained as an inference from the fact that Charon wrote *Persika*.

Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 208 = *Abhandlungen* 178-9 interpreted the first set of dates as a Hellenistic, ‘scientific’ (chronographic) dating, based on the combination of the chronological framework offered by the Persian regnal lists and the information preserved by F 11, the arrival of Themistokles at the Persian court in 465/4 at the court of Artaxerxes I, which gives a *terminus post* for the publication of one at least of Charon’s works. Working backwards from the accession to the throne of Artaxerxes I, the Hellenistic chronographers came up with a date of birth in the middle year of the reign of Dareios (504/3 BC), and as a result an *akme* at the age of 40, in 464/1 BC. The alternative date, to the time of the Persian wars, represented instead (so Jacoby) the ‘rough, pre-scientific synchronism’ of content of the work (*Persika*, here understood as the culmination of the Persian wars) and life of the author. On this basis, Jacoby proceeded to discredit both sets of dates. Jacoby’s interpretation of the way in which the two sets of dates were arrived at is plausible; but the fact that the dates reflect the ways in which they were arrived at does not have to mean that they are necessarily wrong. At any rate, one thing is clear: for the *Suda* and the entire ancient tradition (cf. T 3a, 3b, 3c and 3d), starting with the Hellenistic pinakographers on whom ultimately the ancient tradition depends, Charon’s activity fell in the first half of the fifth century.

As for the list of works, it comprises a large number of books on very diverse topics:

- a ‘Greek history’, *Hellenika*; it might have covered the archaic period, or the period known as Pentekontaetia. On the shape Charon’s *Hellenika* might have had, and on what exactly the term ‘Hellenika’ might have meant in the fifth century, see Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 229-231 = *Abhandlungen* 195-196, who proposes comparison with the *περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι γενομένων* attributed to Damastes of Sigeum (writing at the end of the fifth century? See discussion in *BNJ* 5 T 1); for the larger picture see C. Tuplin, ‘Continuous Histories (*Hellenica*)’, in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden 2007), 171-179.
- regional histories, of Persia in two books (the title *Persika* is also attested in F 3), of Aethiopia, Libya, and Crete, the latter including an excursus on the legislation of Minos (discussion in Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 219-220 = *Abhandlungen* 187-188). The one fragment we have

that comes certainly from the *Persika* shows that the work covered events linked to the Persian wars; the definition ‘regional history’ may thus not be appropriate for this work (more below, Biographical essay). *Aethiopika*, *Libyka* and *Kretika* are entirely lost. A. Chaniotis, ‘The great inscription, its political and social institutions and the common institutions of the Cretans’, in E. Greco and M. Lombardo (eds.), *La Grande Iscrizione di Gortyna. Centoventi anni dopo la scoperta* (Athens 2005), 175–176 proposes that the positive picture of Minos in the fourth century and the belief in the homogeneity of Cretan institutions are Charon’s invention, and that Charon’s work, which he believes to have been composed around 400 BC, influenced heavily the political theorists’ vision of Crete. This is of course entirely hypothetical; but it is an intriguing idea, all the more since the *Suda* specifically singles out the enumeration of Minos’ laws in Charon’s work, and it fits well in the ‘debate’ about Minos that seems to have taken place at the end of the fifth–beginning of the fourth century (see E. Irwin, ‘The politics of precedence: first historians on first thalassocrats’, in R. Osborne (ed.), *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy and Politics 430–380 BC* (Cambridge 2007), 188–223).

- local history of his city, Lampsakos, in the form of a work in four books bearing the title *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* (not necessarily structured in an annalistic form; see further on F 1), and of a work *On Lampsakos* in two books (possibly a Hellenistic epitome of the former, as we know happened with Xanthos of Lydia). It is worth noting that the *Suda* has the title as ὄροι Λαμψακενῶν, ‘Borders of the Lampsakenoi’, which might be borne out by the reference to the borders of the Lampsakene territory in F 13; the correction to ὄροι, ‘Chronicles’, is however guaranteed by Athenaios’ reference to the title of the work in F 1 and 2.

- *Foundations of cities*, a genre well attested in the fifth century: Ion of Chios, a contemporary of Herodotus, wrote an ‘Origin of Chios’ (BNJ 392 T 2 and F 13); Hellanikos and Damastes wrote *Origins of peoples and cities* (BNJ 4 F 66–70) and *Catalogue of peoples and cities* (BNJ T 1 and E 1) respectively. Among Charon’s fragments, F 7a and b, and perhaps also F 8, concern the origins of cities.

- a universal chronicle, if the title *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians* is to be interpreted in this sense, with the magistrates forming the chronological framework. The surprising use of ‘prytaneis’ to indicate Spartan magistrates (whether kings, or ephors and kings) has prompted proposals to alter the title of the work in *Prytaneis of the Lampsakenoi* (so first A. Westermann, in his annotated edition of G. I. Vossius, *De historicis Graecis libri tres*, I (Leipzig 1838), 21, n. 63, based on the fact that there were prytaneis in some Ionian cities, but not in Sparta; for his part, A. von Gutschmid, ‘De rerum Aegyptiacarum scriptoribus Graecis ante Alexandrum Magnum’, *Philologus* 10 (1855), 523–525, imagining a confusion between the titles of two of Charon’s works, proposed that we should think of *Horoi Lakedaimonion* and *Prytaneis Lampsakenon* – a proposal that unsurprisingly has not found followers). The case for the emendation has been recently resurrected (although with a question mark) by R. Fowler, ‘Herodotos and his contemporaries’, 67, and ‘Herodotus and his prose predecessors’, in C. Dewald and J. Marincola (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge 2006), 40. It is worth noting that prytaneis are attested in Phocaea, the mother-city of Lampsakos. Moreover, an inscription of the 1st century BC, *I. Lampsakos* 7, shows that at least at that date the eponymous magistrate in Lampsakos was the prytanis: see R. Sherk, ‘The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities IV: The Register: Part III: Thrace, Black Sea Area, Asia Minor (Continued)’, *ZPE* 93 (1992), 23–24.

The correction met with the strong disapproval of E. Schwartz, 'Charon 7,' in *RE* III/2 (Stuttgart 1899), 2180 (no arguments given; the implicit point is possibly that *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians* is a *lectio difficilior*, for a book written by an author from Lampsakos: why would a title such as *Prytaneis of the Lampsakenoi* have been altered?). Schwartz further assumed the *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians* to be a recent book by some author other than Charon. Jacoby, 'Charon', 218-219 = *Abhandlungen* 187, and more in depth in *FGrH* 3a, 3-4, argued for his part that the gloss 'archontes' in the *Suda* (and probably already in its source) secured *Prytaneis* for the title, and that the addition ἔστι δὲ χρονικά, 'it is a universal chronicle', inspired confidence in the scope of the work; he moreover considered the use of the Ionian term 'prytaneis' typical of a relatively early writer (by which he meant, active at the end of the fifth century). A title such as Πρυτάνεις Ἐρέσιοι is however attested for Phainias of Eresos, a colleague of Theophrastos (see on this work, and on its potential connections to Charon's chronicle, J. Engels, *JCIV* 1012 F 7); it is rather the inappropriate use of the Ionian term πρυτάνεις for Spartan 'magistrates' (including kings) that implies a relatively early writer. However, it not so easy to accept that someone writing at the end of the fifth century, when Spartan harmosts were found all over Greece, would have used the inappropriate term 'prytaneis' to refer to the Spartan authorities – unless the term was chosen on purpose to gloss over unpleasant aspects of Spartan power?

Acceptance of the transmitted title implies trying to understand it. 'Prytaneis' may have meant simply 'all members of the royal household' (so K. M. T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta. A Reexamination of the Evidence* (Manchester 1949), 335-337; Chrimes goes as far as to suggest that the Eurypontid king Πρύτανις, mentioned in the Spartan king-lists of Herodotus, 8. 131 and Pausanias, 3. 7, was invented by Charon); in this case, we should expect a work composed in the genealogical tradition. But if by 'prytaneis' we understand both ephors and kings, as W. den Boer, *Laconian Studies* (Amsterdam 1954), 33-35 has argued, then Charon's work may have been an attempt at 'ending the monopoly of the Spartan king lists as the basis for Spartan chronology'; 'Charon wished to get rid of the genealogical pattern by including the ephors who were bearers of an annual office' (den Boer, *Laconian Studies*, 34; den Boer refrains explicitly from proposing a date for the work). Whether Charon really attempted to link the royal genealogical chronology to an annalistic list must remain uncertain: see A. Möller, 'The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*', in N. Luraghi, *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford 2001), 249-50; and note the attractive suggestion of M. Wećowski, Hippias *BNJ* 6 F 2, that the *Prytaneis of the Lacedaemonians* (or possibly *Prytaneis of the Lampsakenoi*) might have been Charon's response to Hellanikos' *Priestesses of Argos* (see below, Biographical Essay, for the possibility that Thucydides might have alluded to both in his exact dating of the beginning of the war, at 2. 2).

- finally, a *periplous* concerning the region outside the Columns of Herakles. For Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 3 and 5, this is unlikely to be an alternative name for the geographical/ethnographical books, and it is certainly not the work of a Carthaginian (on Charon of Carthage (*FGrH* IV 1077), see below).

It has been argued that such a wide-ranging activity is impossible in an author of the first half of the fifth century (a good synthesis in K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung I* (Berlin 1967), 520). Three positions have been taken in this respect (thorough *status quaestionis*, with indication of the positions taken by various scholars, starting from the eighteenth century, in Ottone, *Libyka*, 35-45):

1) some scholars have argued that we should accept the *Suda* article as it stands, and that it is possible that Charon wrote, in the first half of the fifth century, before or at the same time as Herodotus, books covering the range of those listed by the *Suda*. Thus, in the context of a comprehensive reassessment of Jacoby's views on the development of Greek historiography, R. L. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 67 accepts for Charon a date in the first half of the fifth century; so also e.g. W. Blösel, *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 2004), 43–44. There are small differences between the various positions, both in terms of chronology (often the date preferred for Charon's activity is extended to include the second and third quarters of the fifth century) and in terms of the range of works attributed to Charon. Some consider that at least the *Voyage beyond the columns of Herakles* must be due to some other writer, but S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* I (Bari 1965/66), 561 and von Fritz, *Griechische Geschichtsschreibung*, I, 521–522 both maintain that this work would actually fit the profile of an early writer, active in the first half of the fifth century, better than that of a later author, writing when the Carthaginians had the full control of the straits of Gibraltar. L. Antonelli, *Traffici focei di età arcaica: dalla scoperta dell'occidente alla battaglia del mare Sardonio*, *Hesperia* 23 (Roma 2008), 75 also accepts an early date for Charon; he considers that the *Voyage beyond the columns of Herakles* fits both the Phocaeans' Mediterranean network and Charon's interest in colonization (cf. F 7). That a *periplous* might fit the profile of someone active in the first half of the fifth century is true; it is worth noting here however that the Carthaginian control will not have been total, and that acceptance of Charon's paternity of this work cannot be used also to argue for an early date for the author.

2) others have accepted that Charon was writing in the first half of the fifth century, but have denied him the authorship of most of the book titles listed by the *Suda*. This seems to be, in the relatively recent literature, the position of R. Drews, *The Greek accounts of Eastern history* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973), 24–26; M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persika, II: Carone di Lampsaco', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 7 (1977), 6; S. Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e Carone', in *VIII Miscellanea greca e romana* (Roma 1982), 28–33 = *Scritti minori* III (Roma 1990), 1261–1264. Indeed, only two of the titles are attested elsewhere, the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* (below, F 1 and 2 – actually, in the short form *Horoi*, 'Chronicles') and the *Persika* (below, F 3); moreover, all the extant non-attributed fragments of Charon can be comfortably assigned to one of these two works. Thus, apart from the list of the *Suda*, we have no trace whatsoever, in all of the ancient tradition, of the other works. On this basis, Schwartz, 'Charon 7', 2180, advanced what remains the most radical solution: for him, Charon's only work was the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*; *On Lampsakos*, *Foundations of cities*, *Persika* and possibly *Hellenika* too were to be understood as adapted excerpts of Charon's work; all the other titles belonged to other authors (so also K. von Fritz in 1942: cf. his important review of Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, in *AJP* 63 (1942), 115–116). Along similar lines, Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, 140–141, considered that the fragments provided sufficient evidence for the existence of *Persika* and *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*; as for the other works, while admitting that any decision about the titles preserved by the *Suda* must be arbitrary, Pearson considered that the *Hellenika* might have been a section of the *Persika*, and that the *On Lampsakos* might have been the same work as the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*. The difficulty inherent in the difference in the number of the books (according to the *Suda*, the *Hellenika* comprised four books, but the *Persika* two; the *Chronicles of Lampsakos* four books, the *On Lampsakos* two) was solved by admitting an error, or by supposing that the shorter work either was a part of the larger one, or that it was a Hellenistic epitome of the larger work; the remaining titles could be attributed to some other author named Charon.

The *Suda* actually lists two other homonymous historians, not attested elsewhere, one from Naukratis, one from Carthage. Charon of Naukratis (*FGrH/BNJ* 612) wrote ‘priests in Egypt... and what happened under each one of them’, as well as other works concerning Egypt; to this (Hellenistic?) Charon numerous scholars have proposed the attribution of some (or most) of the titles attributed to Charon of Lampsakos by the *Suda*. This is a possibility. And yet, as pointed out by Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 215–216 = *Abhandlungen*, 185, while books on Egypt are reasonable for a Charon of Naukratis of whom nothing else is known, geographical proximity is not sufficient to justify the attribution of *Libyka* to this Charon; even worse is the case for attributing to him the *Foundations of cities*, the *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians* and the *Cretan histories*.

As for Charon of Carthage (*FGrH* IV 1077), a writer of late Hellenistic or, as seems more likely, of Roman imperial times, he composed biographies (*Tyrants in Europe and Asia*, *Lives of Famous Men* in four books, *Lives of Women* also in four books): the attribution to him of works of an annalistic or geographical character seems inherently unlikely (see J. Radicke, in *FGrH* continued part IV, Charon 1077, introduction). A few other possibilities that would explain the confusion in the *Suda* are discussed by Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, 141; they involve Chares the friend of Apollonius of Rhodes, mentioned in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios, II 1054 (see below under ‘erroneously attributed fragment’); Chares the historian of Alexander; Chaereas, mentioned once by Polybius, 3.20.5; and the geographer Xenophon of Lampsakos, mentioned in Pliny, *Natural history* 4.95. But on the whole, it is difficult to get rid of the titles attributed by the *Suda* to Charon of Lampsakos (see the forceful – and convincing! – discussion of Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 215–217 = *Abhandlungen* 184–186).

3) finally, some accept a late date for Charon’s activity, putting it at the end of the fifth century, in which case the list of titles becomes unproblematic. This is the position defended by Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 207–242 = *Abhandlungen*, 178–206, and *FGrH* 3a, 1–2; it has been accepted among others by A. Momigliano, ‘The place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography’, *History* 43 (1958), 5 = *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Roma 1960), 34. Jacoby argued that the majority of these titles made better sense when viewed in the context of the Spartan supremacy at the end of the fifth century. Indeed, many of Charon’s titles can be related to Spartan interests: apart from the obvious *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians*, the *Libyka* and the *Kretika* can also be brought within the Spartan sphere, the former because of Kyrene and the direct links between the two cities, the latter because of the commonly accepted notion of a closeness between the Cretan constitution and the Spartan one (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 4–5). Moreover, a comparison between the works of Hellanikos and those of Charon permitted Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 219–220 = *Abhandlungen* 187–189 to point out an almost uncanny dovetailing of interests and regional areas. Hellanikos wrote chronography, using Argos for his chronological grid (the *Priestesses of Argos*); foundations of peoples and cities; a local chronicle of Athens (the *Atthis*); and numerous ethnographic logoi, *Skythika*, *Lydiaka*, *Persika*, and a book on Egypt—but none on Libya, Crete, or Aethiopia; Hellanikos’ interests appear linked to the mainland Greece regions of Athens, Argolis and Arkadia. Charon too wrote chronography, but on a Spartan grid; he also composed foundations of cities, a local chronicle of Lampsakos, *Persika* (as Hellanikos, although the character of Charon’s fragments seems slightly different), and the ethnographic works *Libyka*, *Kretika*, *Aithiopika*, which gravitate in a Laconian sphere of interest (with the possible exception of the *Aithiopika*). The presence of Charon in Sparta, made likely by F 2, was also brought to bear by Jacoby on the overall interpretation of Charon’s activity. A date c. 400 BC is also given without discussion by K. Braswell and M. Billerbeck, *The grammarian Epaphroditus. Testimonia and Fragments* (Bern 2008), 189. For a recent restatement of Jacoby’s

view of the development of Greek historiography, and consequently of a date of Charon's activity in the second half of the fifth century, see A. Rengakos, 'Historiographie, vii. 1 (Gattungsgeschichte)-2 (Die Anfänge der Historiographie)', in B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike, I: Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit* (München 2011), 328–330, and 336 specifically for Charon.

And yet, plausibility is not proof. Sparta had played an extremely important role in Greek affairs already before the Persian wars; much of Jacoby's construction relies on the thesis of a Spartan focus to his works, and thus on the *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians*. The title has however been doubted; if the proposal to emend it to *Prytaneis of the Lampsakenoi* hits the mark, the nice ensemble of writings focusing on the Laconian sphere loses its centre. Jacoby's construction, fascinating as it is, remains a construction.

What we know of Charon is so uncertain, and what we have of his work is so little, that some issues are best left open (the non-relevance of Thucydides 1. 97. 2 and the possible use of Charon in Thucydides' excursuses on Pausanias and Themistokles, 1. 128-138, and on the Peisistratids, 6. 59. 3-4, are briefly discussed below, Biographical essay). However, two further points related to the *Suda* notice are worth considering here.

a) Jacoby has been criticized, notably by Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persika II', 5-6, for fully accepting one part of the *Suda* entry (the list of works), and then using it to deny credibility to the other part of the entry: Moggi argues that it is methodologically incorrect to consider the second part of a document as fully reliable, and then use this second part to show that the first part is not reliable. Such criticism is not really justified. Jacoby considers that the dates of the *Suda* reliably reflect the conclusions of the Hellenistic chronographers, but thinks that such conclusions were based on mechanisms that cannot produce a correct date: he actually explains how the chronology proposed in the *Suda* could have been arrived at. Similarly, he considers that the list of titles in the *Suda* reflects fairly closely, although not exactly, the list established by Hellenistic librarians (there must have been problems, because the order is not alphabetical). In the case of the list, the errors, certainly present, are mechanical: accidental intrusion of extraneous titles, or loss of original titles, at some stage in the tradition. The *Suda* entry presents data that have been put together, in the Hellenistic period, through two different processes, and it is acceptable to trust the second process, while criticizing the first.

b) In considering that Charon, whom he dated to the first half of the fifth century, had written at most two works, *Horoi Lampsakenon* and *Persika*, E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* iii (Stuttgart² 1937), 208–209 n. 1 made the excellent point that the lack of titles in the ancient literature will have increased the confusion. This means that rolls dealing with various regions or periods might have been considered, later, as separate books. However, from a historiographical point of view, this should not make any real difference to the way we look at Charon: because rolls (or *logoi*) could not have been so neatly divided into distinct books, if the work had been conceived as a unit.

262 T 2 - Strabo 13, 1, 19 p. 589	meta[[id="262" type="T" n="2" sourcework(level1="Strabo" level2="" level3="Geographica [Vide: Apollodorus et Eratosthenes apud Strabonem]" level4="" level5="" level6="13, 1, 19, 589")]]
Subject: Historical Work: n/a Source date: in. 1st C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC	Translation

Historical period: n/a	
ἐκ Λαμψάκου δὲ Χάρων τε ὁ συγγραφεὺς καὶ Ἀδείμαντος καὶ Ἀναξιμένης ὁ ῥήτωρ (72 T 2) καὶ Μητρόδωρος ὁ τοῦ Ἐπικούρου ἑταῖρος....	From Lampsakos were Charon the writer of history and Adeimantos, Anaximenes the rhetor and Metrodoros the friend of Epicurus...

262 T 2 Commentary

From a list of illustrious Lampsakenoi.

262 T 3a - Dionysios of Halicarnassos Peri Thouk. 5 (s. 1 T 17)	meta[[id="262" type="T" n="3" n-mod="a" sourcework(level1="Dionysius Halicarnassensis" level2="" level3="De Thucydide" level4="" level5="" level6="5")]]
Subject: Greek historiography Historical Work: n/a Source date: second half of 1st C BC Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: n/a	Translation
.... ἀρχαῖοι.... συγγραφεῖς πρὸ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου.... Εὐγένων τε ὁ Σάμιος (III 3).... καὶ Ἑκαταῖος ὁ Μιλήσιος (1) ὃ τε Ἀργεῖος Ἀκουσίλαος (2) καὶ ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς Χάρων.... ὀλίγωι δὲ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν καὶ μέχρι τῆς Θουκυδίδου παρεκτείναντες ἡλικίας Ἑλλάνικός τε ὁ Λέσβιος (4)	Ancient... writers of historical works... before the Peloponnesian war... Eugeon of Samos ... and Hekataios of Miletos, and Akousilaos the Argive and Charon of Lampsakos ... then, those born slightly earlier than the time of the Peloponnesian war and whose activity extended down to the time of Thucydides, Hellanikos of Lesbos and ...

262 T 3a Commentary

In this paragraph of the *On Thucydides* Dionysios of Halicarnassos expounds his views on the development of ancient historiography. Dionysios' model has been discussed more than once (among recent contributions see S. Gozzoli, 'Una teoria antica sull'origine della storiografia greca', *Studi Classici e Orientali* 19–20 (1970–71), 158–211; W. K. Pritchett, *Dionysios of Halicarnassus: On Thucydides* (Berkeley - Los Angeles 1975), 50–57; D. L. Toye, 'Dionysios of Halicarnassus on the First Greek Historians', *American Journal of Philology* 116 (1995), 279–302; R.L. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62–87; L. Porciani, *Prime forme della storiografia greca. Prospettiva locale e generale nella narrazione storica* (Stuttgart 2001), 28–63, and specifically for the position of Charon within the list 35–36, 60–62; A. Rengakos, 'Historiographie, vii. 1 (Gattungsgeschichte)-2 (Die Anfänge der Historiographie)', in B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike, I: Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit*, (München 2011), 328–330). The reliability of Dionysios' information is uncertain. Jacoby dismissed it entirely, because it did not fit his overall scheme of the evolution of Greek historiography, and because of internal contradictions (besides his commentary to the various historians mentioned in the passage, see *Atthis* (Oxford 1949), 176–185). Toye, 'Dionysios', and Fowler, 'Herodotos', argue that Dionysios' dates for these authors rest on a good, solid tradition that goes back to Theophrastos, and that they should be accepted. The Theophrastan origin of the list has been convincingly

disputed by Porciani, *Prime forme*, 35-38, who shows that the list is in contrast with both its immediate context and with *On Thucydides* 23, which certainly goes back to Theophrastos. Porciani concludes that Theophrastos probably mentioned only Hekataios, Akousilaos, Hellanikos, Pherekydes and Herodotus, and that in his view, genealogical writing came first, followed by local histories and, almost at the same time, by the 'great' history. As for the list of *On Thucydides* 5. 2 (our passage), according to Porciani it goes back to an Alexandrian commentary on Thucydides: it relies thus on pinakographic data, based upon more or less informed guesswork.

262 T 3b - Dionysios of Halicarnassos ad Pomp. 3, 7 (II 234, 1 UR)	meta[[id="262" type="T" n="3" n-mod="b" sourcework(level1="Dionysius Halicarnassensis" level2="" level3="Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum (Usener H.-Radermacher L., 2)" level4="" level5="" level6="3, 7; p. 234, 10")]]
Subject: Greek historiography Historical Work: n/a Source date: second half of 1st C BC Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 5 C BC	Translation
<p>οὐ μὴν Ἡρόδοτος γε τοῦτο ἐποίησεν (sc. τὸ διασύρειν τὰ παλαιὰ ἔργα), ἀλλὰ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων γενομένων Ἑλλανίκου τε καὶ Χάρωνος τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόθεσιν προεκδεδωκότων οὐκ ἀπετράπετο, ἀλλ' ἐπίστευσεν αὐτῷ κρείσσον τι ἐξοίσειν ὅπερ καὶ πεποίηκεν.</p>	<p>Certainly Herodotus did not do this (sc. belittle the ancient achievements), but even though the writers who preceded him, Hellanikos and Charon, had already written on the same subject, he was not deterred, but trusted that he would produce something better; which he also did.</p>

262 T 3b Commentary

This statement is made in the context of a comparison between Thucydides and Herodotus: Dionysios argues that, unlike Herodotus, Thucydides downplayed the importance of the Persian wars and in general of the period preceding the Peloponnesian war, in order to stress the significance of the events he proposed to narrate. The importance of this passage lies in the fact that Dionysios clearly assumes that the activity of Hellanikos and Charon preceded that of Herodotus. Problematic is however that Dionysios is not entirely coherent with the statements made in the *On Thucydides* (above, T 3a): there, Charon was part of the earlier group of *archaioi syngrapheis*, but Hellanikos was classified as a contemporary of Thucydides, active after Herodotus; here, Charon is paired with Hellanikos, and both are considered predecessors of Herodotus. The incoherence is discussed in F. Jacoby, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 (1938), 209-210 = H. Bloch (ed.), *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtschreibung von Felix Jacoby zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag* (Leiden 1956), 179-180. The pairing of Hellanikos and Charon is extremely interesting, in light of the dovetailing of their interests (see above, on T 1; and below, Biographical essay).

262 T 3c - Plutarch De Herod. mal. 20	meta[[id="262" type="T" n="3" n-mod="c" sourcework(level1="Plutarchus" level2="" level3="De Herodoti malignitate" level4="" level5="" level6="20, 859ab")]]
---------------------------------------	---

Subject: literary criticism, Greek historiography Historical Work: Persika ? Source date: end 1st C AD - beginning 2nd C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 5th C BC	Translation
#@262 F 9@#F 9@#.	Cf. F 9

262 T 3c Commentary

In comparing the accounts offered by Herodotus and Charon of the capture of Paktyes by Cyrus in c. 540 BC, Plutarch introduces Charon as ‘ἀνὴρ πρεσβύτερος’, a more ancient witness (than Herodotus). Although the statement is often accepted at face value (so e.g. by R. Drews, *The Greek accounts of Eastern history* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973), 25-26), the reliability of Plutarch on such an issue must remain uncertain, since it is unclear on what information he could rely (so e.g. already L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 139: ‘such remarks are untrustworthy, since they may simply reflect the opinion, common in later times, that all logographers were earlier than Herodotus’). See commentary at F 9.

262 T 3d - Tertullianus De an. 46	meta[[id="262" type="T" n="3" n-mod="d"]]
Subject: literary criticism; women; dream; kingship Historical Work: n/a Source date: c. 210 - 213 AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 5th C BC	Translation
#@262 F 14@#F 14@#.	Cf. F 14

262 T 3d Commentary

In relating the story of Mandane’s dream, Tertullian quotes Herodotus as his source, but adds that Charon too narrated the story, ‘Herodoto prior’: for Tertullian (as for Plutarch and Dionysios), Charon’s activity is earlier than that of Herodotus. For this statement, also accepted at face value e.g. by R. Drews, *The Greek accounts of Eastern history* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973), 25-26, the same qualifications advanced for T 3c apply: Tertullian simply accepted the date that had imposed itself, and certainly did not have independent evidence (again, cf. L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 139). See further on F 14.

262 F 1 - (9) Athenaios Deipnosophistae 12, 19 p. 520 D–F	Meta[[id="262" type="F" n="1" sourcework(level1="Athenaeus" level2="" level3="Deipnosophistae" level4="" level5="" level6="12, 19, 520df")]]
Subject: military history, tactics Historical Work: Horoi book 2 Source date: 2nd C AD-3rd C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 6 C BC?	Translation

τὰ ὅμοια ἰστόρησε καὶ περὶ Καρδιανῶν ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς Χάρων ἐν δευτέρῳ Ὠρων γράφων οὕτως· #quote# «Βισάλται εἰς Καρδίην ἐστρατεύσαντο καὶ ἐνίκησαν. ἡγεμῶν δὲ τῶν Βισαλτέων ἦν Νάρις. οὗτος δὲ παῖς ὢν ἐν τῇ Καρδίῃ ἐπράθη, καὶ τινὶ Καρδιηνῶι δουλεύσας κορσωτεὺς ἐγένετο. Καρδιηνοῖς δὲ λόγιον ἦν ὡς Βισάλται ἀπίξονται ἐπ’ αὐτούς, καὶ πυκνὰ περὶ τούτου διελέγοντο ἐν τῷ κορσωτηρίῳ ἰζάνοντες· καὶ ἀποδρὰς ἐκ τῆς Καρδίας εἰς τὴν πατρίδα τοὺς Βισάλτας ἔστειλεν ἐπὶ τοὺς Καρδιηνοὺς, ἀποδειχθεὶς ἡγεμῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Βισαλτέων. οἱ δὲ Καρδιηνοὶ πάντες τοὺς ἵππους ἐδίδαξαν ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις ὀρχεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν αὐλῶν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπισθίων ποδῶν ἰστάμενοι τοῖς προσθίοις <ὥσπερ χειρονομέοντες> ὠρχοῦντο ἐξεπιστάμενοι τὰ αὐλήματα. ταῦτ’ οὖν ἐπιστάμενος ὁ Νάρις ἐκτίησάτο ἐκ τῆς Καρδίας αὐλητρίδα· καὶ ἀφικομένη ἡ αὐλητρίς εἰς τοὺς Βισάλτας ἐδίδαξε πολλοὺς αὐλητάς, μεθ’ ὧν δὲ καὶ στρατεύεται ἐπὶ τὴν Καρδίην. καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ μάχη συνειστήκει, ἐκέλευσεν αὐλεῖν τὰ αὐλήματα ὅσα οἱ ἵπποι τῶν Καρδιηνῶν ἐξεπισταῖατο· καὶ ἐπεὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ ἵπποι τοῦ αὐλοῦ, ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπισθίων ποδῶν καὶ πρὸς ὀρχησμὸν ἐτράποντο. τῶν δὲ Καρδιηνῶν ἡ ἰσχὺς ἐν τῇ ἵππῳ ἦν, καὶ οὕτως ἐνίκηθησαν» #.

Stories similar (to those recounted by Aristotle in the *Constitution of the Sybarites*, fr. 583 R. = 600. 1 Gigon) have also been recorded by Charon of Lampsakos, who concerning the Cardians writes as follows, in the second book of the *Chronicles*: “the Bisaltai made a military expedition against Cardia and won. The leader of the Bisaltai was Naris. When a child, he had been sold in Cardia, and being slave to one of the Cardians he became a barber. There was an oracle for the Cardians, stating that the Bisaltai would attack them; and often sitting in the barber-shop they would discuss it. And having run away from Cardia to his own country he sent the Bisaltai against the Cardians, having been designated as commander by the Bisaltai. All the Cardians had trained their horses to dance at the music of the aulos in the symposia; standing on their hind legs they danced with their fore leg, as in a *cheironomia*, being thoroughly familiar with the music. Naris, knowing this full well, bought a pipe-girl from Cardia; and the pipe-girl, when she arrived among the Bisaltai, trained many pipe-players, with whom he then set out against Cardia. And as the battle was on, he ordered to play those songs which the horses of the Cardians knew; and once the horses heard the pipe, they stood on their hind legs and began to dance. But the strength of the Cardians was in the cavalry, and in this way they were beaten.”

262 F 1 Commentary

This is the longest fragment of Charon. The long verbatim quote gives an idea of the style of Charon’s narrative, as well as of its artful compositive structure: ‘a fine example of the straightforward Ionian narrative style’ (L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 143). C. Schick, ‘Studi sui primordi della prosa greca’, *Archivio glottologico italiano* 40 (1955), 99-100 notes the ring-composition of the story, Homeric forms such as ἰζάνω, the use of verbal derivatives such as κορσωτεὺς and κορσωτήριον not attested elsewhere, or only in much later prose, and the awkwardness caused by the change of subject in two sentences coordinated by καὶ (in καὶ ἀφικομένη ἡ αὐλητρίς εἰς τοὺς Βισάλτας ἐδίδαξε πολλοὺς αὐλητάς, μεθ’ ὧν δὲ καὶ (Naris) στρατεύεται ἐπὶ τὴν Καρδίην). K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung I*

(Berlin 1967), 521, characterizes the style as slightly less archaic than that of Akousilaos. A. Hurst, 'Prose historique et poésie: le cas de Charon de Lampsaque', in Fischer Iancu (ed), *Actes de la XIIe Conférence internationale d'Études classiques Eirene, Cluj-Napoca, 2-7 octobre 1972* (București - Amsterdam 1975), 231-237, offers a detailed analysis of the compositional structure, again emphasizing ring-composition. His positive assessment contrasts strikingly with the very different account of W. R. M Lamb, *Clio enthroned, a study in prose-form in Thucydides* (Cambridge 1914), 94-95, for whom the narrative betrays 'no command of effective order'. It should at this point be noted that according to A. Hepperle, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *Festschrift O. Regenbogen zum 65. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg 1956), 67-76 (*non vidi*), Charon's fragment was reworked in Hellenistic times...

According to Athenaios, the fragment comes from the second book of the *Horoï* (*Chronicles*, or *Annals*): notwithstanding the short title (on which see discussion below, F 2), these should be the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* mentioned by the *Suda*. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 5 defines them as a 'true local chronicle of the motherland' ('echte lokalchronik der eignen heimat'), dated by local eponymous magistrates; he compares with Hdt. 3. 59. 4: 'And for the first time the Samians, when Amphikrates was king of Samos, making a naval expedition against Aigina caused great evils for the Aiginetans'. But as he admits, any such explicit indication is absent from Charon's fragments (a critique in A. Möller, 'The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*', in N. Luraghi, *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford 2001), 250).

The story itself is a merry tale: as W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen 1921), 219 memorably put it, one can hear the fun at the expense of the neighbour. And yet: whose neighbour? Cardia is in the Chersonese, on the other side of the Dardanelles from Lampsakos, while the Bisaltai are a Thracian tribe, established in the area around the lower part of the Strymon: thus, the subject matter is not directly pertinent to Lampsakos. We face thus an alternative (cf. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 7): either the *Chronicle* had a larger scope and covered also the Troad, the Chersonese and the Propontis, or the events were somehow directly linked to Lampsakos. In the latter case, the situation of the city of Kallipolis, founded by the Lampsakenoi as a bridge-head on the Chersonese, or the conflicts between the tyrants of Lampsakos (cf. Herodotus 4. 138 and Thucydides 6. 59) and the Athenian rulers of the Chersonese, Miltiades and Stesagoras, narrated in Herodotus 6. 36-38, would offer a good context: Cardia played an important role in the conflict (further details in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 7-8, who concludes that there are also other possibilities, including an excursus in the context of the story of the foundation of Lampsakos: 'es gibt eine ganze reihe von möglichkeiten').

While the story is told so as to make fun of the Cardians, dancing horses are not something extraordinary, if we understand with 'dancing' the particular training which some horses may undergo, including the ability of rearing on their hind-legs and advancing in this way: cf. Xenophon, *On the art of horsemanship*, 11, with J. K. Anderson, *Ancient Greek Horsemanship* (Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1961), 121-127, and compare modern dressage (including the 'airs above the ground', as practiced in the *Spanische Hofreitschule* of Vienna). But it is worth spending a few moments on the context of this fragment. Athenaios cites it within an ample discussion of the luxurious life of the Sybarites, right after a very similar story concerning the dancing horses of the Sybarites, for which the source is Aristotle (fr. 583 Rose = 600. 1 Gigon). This story is shorter and simpler: the Crotoniates are aware of the fact that the Sybarites have trained their horses to dance; when they move to attack, their pipers strike up the dance tune, with the result that the horses not only dance, but desert to

Croton with their riders on their backs (Athenaios 12. 520cd). The story attributed to Charon has the added complication of the slave who becomes a barber, hears about the oracle, runs away to freedom, becomes a general, buys a flute-girl and has her instruct flute-players; but the main lines and the outcome are identical. The closeness between the two stories is such that it seems unlikely that they are independent: rather, one must have been modelled on the other (interestingly, the chronological horizon of the events narrated is the same in both stories). On the whole, the anecdote attributed to Charon is probably the model, as Sybaris seems to offer a better context for an adaptation: one can see how a story about the Cardians, luxury and dancing horses might have been adapted to a new context, while the contrary move is more difficult to imagine. This applies all the more, as there is an entire set of stories concerning Sybaris, luxury, and horses, in which this specific one could have been fitted. Dancing horses are mentioned in F 7 K.-A. of Metagenes' *Thuriopersai* (to be dated probably at the end of the fifth century BC, and preserved in Photius p. 591, 9 = *Suda* τ 672): someone, probably indicating the chorus, asks: "what kind of horses are they? How they dance in barbarian fashion!" (τίς τρόπος ἵππων; ὡς δ' ὀρχοῦνται τὸν βαρβαρικὸν τρόπον οὗτοι.) The title of the play and the very few remaining fragments support an interpretation according to which traditions on Persian richness and luxury were transported into the region of Sybaris, and/or amalgamated with local traditions on luxury. (On Athenaios' treatment of the traditions on the *tryphe* of the Sybarites, see R. J. Gorman and V. B. Gorman, 'The Tryphê of the Sybarites: A Historiographical Problem in Athenaeus', *JHS* 127 (2007), 38-60). Also pertinent in this context may be a tradition recorded by Strabo 6. 1. 13, according to which the water of the Sybaris rendered horses timid. Finally, immediately after the story of the Cardians' horses, without any transition, Athenaios (12. 521a) goes back to Sybarite horses, with an anecdote that shows a remarkable degree of luxury (and humanisation) in the treatment of horses by the Sybarites (a man has a bed made on board ship for his horse). The story of the Cardians' dancing horses is thus sandwiched by Athenaios between two stories, one very similar, the other less so, both concerning peculiarities in the Sybarites' treatment of their horses.

The name Naris is extremely rare: unattested in other literary texts, it is found for a female in an inscription from Thasos, dated to the first century BC - first century AD (IG XII (8) 467), and in an inscription from Lete of the second century AD (*Makedonika* 2 (1951) p. 619 no. 42 θ: Ἀγάθων Νάρεως): see *LGPN* 1 and 4, s.v. In terms of the geographical area, this fits the indications of Charon (his Naris is located in between the other two).

262 F 2 - (11) Athenaios Deipnosophistae 11, 49 p. 475 BC	Meta[[id="262" type="F" n="2" sourcework(level1="Athenaeus" level2="" level3="Deipnosophistae" level4="" level5="" level6="11, 49, 475bc")]]
Subject: myth, mythical past Historical Work: Horoi Source date: 2nd C AD-3rd C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: mythical past	Translation
Χάρων δ' ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς ἐν τοῖς Ὀροῖς παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις φησὶν ἔτι καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν δείκνυσθαι τὸ δέπας τὸ δοθὲν Ἀλκμήνῃ ὑπὸ Διός, ὅτε Ἀμφιτρύωνι εἰκάσθη.	Charon of Lampsakos in his <i>Chronicles</i> says that among the Lacedaemonians even to his time the cup was shown, which was given to Alkmene by Zeus when he disguised himself as Amphitryon.

262 F 2 Commentary

This passage comes from the long list of cups in Athenaios' book 11, and specifically from the paragraph dedicated to the cup called *karchesion*, a tall drinking cup, with handles reaching from the bottom to the top: see J. Boardman, 'The Karchesion of Herakles', *JHS* 99 (1979), 149–151, and J. Boardman, *An Archaeology of Nostalgia* (London 2002), 88–90 and T 53. The citation from Charon comes at the very end of the paragraph; it elaborates on information that has been given at the beginning, where Athenaios quotes Pherekydes (*BNJ* 13a) and Herodoros of Herakleia (*BNJ* 31 F 16) for the information that the *karchesion* was given to Alkmene by Zeus, claiming that he was Amphitryon. (See R. Fowler on Pherekydes *BNJ* 3 F 13a, and S. Blakely on Herodoros *BNJ* 31 F 6; an allusion to the story is also in Anaximander the younger, *BNJ* 9 F 1, also quoted by Athenaios). Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 8) may thus well be right that this is an addition made by Athenaios to the lexicographical source that transmitted information on the *karchesion*, all the more since Charon himself did not use that word to indicate the cup, but *depas*. Even though Charon did not use the term *karchesion*, the point of Athenaios' addition would have been to support the earlier statements on the antiquity of this cup, by pointing out that the object, and the traditions concerning it, were already known to Charon (δέπας is the term for a goblet or cup in epic poetry).

Athenaios gives as title of the work *Chronicles tout court*. Such a title is not among those listed by the *Suda*; more generally, a title *Horoi*, without any further detail, does not really make sense. Because of the subject matter, it has been proposed that we should emend the title into (or understand it as equivalent to) *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians*, one of the titles attested by the *Suda* for Charon (so C. Müller, *Historicorum graecorum fragmenta* I (Parisii 1841), xiii and 35 F 11, following in the footsteps of von Gutschmid and Creuzer.); but such a correction requires a relatively heavy and unjustified intervention. Most scholars, especially after Jacoby's powerful demonstration, accept that *Chronicles* here corresponds to the title given by the *Suda* as *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*. The difference is not a small one: the *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians*, if such was indeed the title of the work, are described in the *Suda* as *chronika*, i.e. a universal chronicle anchored on the chronological grid offered by the Spartan magistrates; a reference to Alkmene's cup might easily have figured in such a work. A title such as *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* is usually taken to imply a work of (probably) annalistic form, whose chronological structure relies on local dates, and mainly focused on local events (but see A. Möller, 'The Beginning of Chronography: Hellenicus' *Hiereiai*', in N. Luraghi, *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford 2001), 239–254, for the lack of an annalistic pattern in the earliest Greek historiography). If the cup given to Alkmene by Zeus was discussed by Charon in his *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*, then the latter work was open to digressions: presumably a narrative concerning Herakles offered the chance for mythographical information of this kind. See further Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 8–9, who mentions as likely possibilities for such a digression Herakles' expedition against the Amazons and the connected landing in the Troas (cf. F 13), his dealings with the Bebrykes (cf. F 7–8, with L. Antonelli, *Traffici focei di età arcaica: dalla scoperta dell'occidente alla battaglia del mare Sardonio*, *Hesperia* 23 (Roma 2008), 153–160 for the connection between Charon's narrative of the foundation of Lampsakos, Phocaeen *ktisis* traditions, the Bebrykes, and Herakles), and his voyage with the Argonauts; and V. Parker, 'Pausanias the Spartiate as depicted by Charon of Lampsacus and Herodotus', *Philologus* 149 (2005), 5, who compares Herodotus' ability to insert digressions at pertinent places.

S. Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e in Carone di Lampsaco', *VIII Miscellanea Greca e*

Romana (Roma 1982), 41-43 = S. Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e in Carone di Lampsaco', *Scritti minori* III (Roma 1990), 1271-1272 wonders whether Charon touched on the cup in narrating the return of the Herakleidai (Alkmene is Herakles' mother), and tentatively connects this with Herodotus' pointed refusal to tell why and because of what achievements the descendants of Perseus won the kingship over the Dorians, 'on grounds that others have already told of this' (ἄλλοιοι γὰρ περὶ αὐτῶν εἴρηται, 6. 55). Who these 'others' may have been it is impossible to say; but this is certainly a striking statement. W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus II, books V-IX* (Oxford 1928), 84 state: 'Possibly the writer of the epic 'Aegimius', more probably the logographers, e. g. Charon of Lampsacus' (cf. also W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus I, books I-IV*, 23-4). But the possibilities are numerous (both Hekataios, *FGrH* 1 F 21, and Hellanikos, *FGrH* 4 F 59, had discussed Perseus: cf. G. Nenci, *Erodoto. Le Storie, libro VI* (Milano 1998) 222-223).

Jacoby's proposal (*FGrH* 3a, 8) — to link this passage and more generally the attention paid to Alkmene's cup to the attempted repatriation of the contents of Alkmene's tomb (a stone in lieu of the bones, a bronze bracelet and two pottery urns) by Agesilaos (Plutarch, *On the Daimonion of Socrates* 5. 577E - 578 C, cf. Plutarch, *Life of Lysander* 28. 9), which must have also implied a cult — is tempting. However, the earliest possible moment for such a repatriation, if effected by Agesilaos, is 394 BC, a date that would imply a very low chronology for Charon's work, at the turn of the fifth century BC. Whatever the specific connection, this passage shows that by the end of the fifth century at the latest Sparta had begun laying claim to the woman who was at the origin of the two royal houses, Alkmene, a claim based on the display of relics. See Boardman, *The Archaeology of Nostalgia, passim*, for examples of how this cup and similar objects could evoke an imagined past, while legitimizing the present; also A. Hartmann, *Zwischen Relikt Und Reliquie: Objektbezogene Erinnerungspraktiken in Antiken Gesellschaften* (Berlin 2010), 577 and n. 480, who sees in the cup a sign of the Spartan appropriation of the Heraklids. As Jacoby says, this claim fits the period of the early Spartan hegemony (around 404 BC); but stories of repatriation of bones and relics begin much earlier, in Sparta and elsewhere, and an earlier context is perfectly possible. The cup in particular was famous, and had already been depicted as a gift to Alkmene on the Chest of Kypselos, dedicated at Olympia at the latest around c. 600 BC: Pausanias 5.18.3 says that it represented Zeus as Amphitryon, bearing a cup in his right hand and a necklace in the left, and Alkmene receiving both (see on the passage A. B. Cook, *Zeus. A Study in ancient religion, III: Zeus god of the dark sky* (Cambridge 1940), 507, with reference to further relics of Amphitryon; also Hartmann, *Zwischen Relikt Und Reliquie*, 577 n. 480, who mentions Jacoby's low date for Charon, but stresses that the story itself was ancient).

On the phrase καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν (Charon will have said καὶ εἰς ἐμέ, 'even until my time'), a typical Herodotean marker, which 'shows the historian researching and establishing the links that exist between past and present' (R. L. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 71) see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 8, who compares with Herodotus' reaction to the *Kadmeia grammata* (Hdt. 5. 59); Fowler, 'Herodotos and his contemporaries', 62-87, 71 and 73 for this passage in particular, sets the sentence within the context of early historiography. See also Parker, 'Pausanias the Spartiate', 4-5, who emphasizes that this implies a common mode of argumentation that both historians derived from the Ionian intellectual culture. Very Herodotean likewise is the appeal to the monument (L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 143). Appeal to the monument and chronological marker together here imply that Charon must have travelled: he can have learnt of this only in Sparta.

262 F 3a - (3) Athenaios Deipnosophistae 9, 51 p. 394 E	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="3" n-mod="a" sourcework(level1="Athenaeus" level2="" level3="Deipnosophistae" level4="" level5="" level6="9, 51, 394e") tgroup="2, 1"]]
Subject: Military history, navy, Persian wars Historical Work: Persika Source date: 2nd C AD-3rd C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 492 BC	Translation
<p>Χάρων δ' ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς ἐν τοῖς Περσικοῖς περὶ Μαρδονίου ἱστορῶν καὶ τοῦ διαφθαρέντος στρατοῦ Περσικοῦ περὶ τὸν Ἴθω γράφει καὶ ταῦτα: #quote# «καὶ λευκαὶ περιστερὰὶ τότε πρῶτον εἰς Ἑλληνας ἐφάνησαν, πρότερον οὐ γιγνόμεναι» #.</p>	<p>In his <i>Persian Stories</i> Charon of Lampsakos, giving an account of Mardonios and the Persian army destroyed around Mount Athos, writes this too: “and then for the first time white doves appeared to the Greeks, while before there had not been any”.</p>

262 F 3a Commentary

See below, on F 3b.

262 F 3b - Aelianos Varia Historia 1, 15	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="3" n-mod="b" sourcework(level1="Aelianus (Claudius)" level2="" level3="Varia historia" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 15") tgroup="2, 2"]]
Subject: Military history, navy Historical Work: Persika Source date: early 3rd C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 492 BC	Translation
<p>Χάρων δὲ ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς περὶ τὸν Ἴθω φανῆναι περιστερὰς λευκὰς λέγει, ὅτε ἐνταῦθα ἀπώλοντο αἱ τῶν Περσῶν τριήρεις περικάμπτουςαι τὸν Ἴθω.</p>	<p>Charon of Lampsakos says that white doves appeared around Mount Athos, when the triremes of the Persians were destroyed there, while circumnavigating Mount Athos.</p>

262 F 3b Commentary

These two passages concern an event of 492 BC: the expedition of Mardonios, which ended with the destruction of the Persian fleet, caught in a storm as it was circumnavigating Mount Athos. Athenaios begins with a paraphrasis, but then proceeds to offer a literal quote.

The indication ‘in the Persian stories’ in Athenaios is usually taken as confirming that Charon had written a work *Persika*, probably in two books, as the *Suda* affirms. K. von Fritz, in his review of L. Pearson, *Early Ionian historians*, *AJP* 63 (1942), 116, suggested however that ἐν τοῖς Περσικοῖς cannot be considered as sufficient evidence for the *Persika*, since it might mean ‘in that part of the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* which deals with the period of the Persian wars’ (similarly, W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen*

Zeitgenossen (Göttingen 1921), 216 had spoken of ‘angeblichen *Persika*’). Von Fritz further compared this with the way Plutarch referred to Charon ἐν τοῖς περὶ Πακτύην (below, F 9), and proposed that the *Suda* might depend for the title *Persika* on Athenaios, and not on independent information. He thus concluded that all fragments could find a place in the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*. While it is important to bear in mind the fragility of our information, it seems to me difficult to deny the existence of a work *Persika* by Charon; Plutarch does not have the same objectives as Athenaios in giving his sources, and the *Suda* actually knows that the *Persika* were in two books, something that Athenaios does not say (von Fritz himself modified his position in *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* I (Berlin 1967), 519–522; but it is worth noticing that even in the later work he nowhere discusses the *Persika*). As a result of his view of the organization of his *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Jacoby, who accepted that Charon had written *Persika*, printed Charon 262 F 3a and b also among the ‘writers of Oriental histories’, as Charon of Lampsakos 687b F 1a and b.

This fragment conclusively shows that Charon’s *Persika* descended in time at least to 492 BC, and that they covered the first encounters between Greeks and Persians; how far in time they descended (and what was then the topic of the *Hellenika*) must remain uncertain (speculations in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 9–10). F 14, on the dream of Astyages, shows that Charon’s work included the Median empire, and possibly more on the earlier history of Asia.

Appreciation of Charon’s work, and of the genre of *Persika*, is very much dependent on how this passage is read; and conversely, readings of this passage have been influenced by one’s notion of Charon’s position within the development of ancient Greek historiography. Starting from the premise that the work of Charon was a very simple chronicle, H. Fränkel, ‘Eine Stileigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur’, *Göttinger Gelehrte Nachrichten* 1924, 92 = *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (München³ 1968), 66–67, assumed that shipwreck and appearance of the doves were two independent events, registered under the same year. But, as pointed out by Jacoby, the wording of F 3a shows that the connection established by Charon between the two events (the shipwreck and the appearance of white doves) was not just one of chronological coincidence; Jacoby went on to argue that there was in Charon’s work a sense of divine agency (see F. Jacoby, ‘Charon von Lampsakos’, *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 (1938), 226–229 = H. Bloch (ed.), *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung von Felix Jacoby zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag* (Leiden 1956), 193–195, as well as Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 10). While the text of the fragment does indeed support a connection between the Persian fleet and the appearance of the doves, such a connection need not necessarily imply a prodigy: the hypothesis of L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 148, that the white doves, linked to the cult of Astarte, were brought over to Greece by Phoenicians in the Persian fleet maintains the connection between the two events, but deprives such a connection of any historiographical implication (so already H. Stein, *Herodotos I* (Berlin⁵ 1883), 162, *ad Hdt.* 1. 138; Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle*, 216; cf. Jacoby’s disagreement, in ‘Charon’, 227 n. 67 = *Abhandlungen*, 194 n. 67).

The issue is compounded by the fact that it is not clear how much we can trust Aelian’s wording. The narrative in Aelian is shorter and less detailed (no book-title, no reference to Mardonios); on two points however it is more specific. Aelian mentions the destruction of ships (triremes) around Mount Athos, while Athenaios has simply the ‘Persian army’; and in Aelian the white doves appear at Mount Athos (and not in Greece in general). Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 227–228 = *Abhandlungen*, 193–194, considers Aelian’s precise localization of the event an error (so also in *FGrH* 3a, 10). And indeed, according *e.g.* to I. Schweighaeuser, *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas V* (Argentorati 1804), 176–177, Aelian in his

chapter on doves (*Varia historia* 1. 14) depends on Athenaios – so this would have to be an inference. However, the relationship between the two texts (Athenaios’ and Aelian’s) is intriguing. Athenaios’ excursus on doves is rather long; the part that interests us (9. 394c-395a) opens with Aristotle on the difference between *peristera* and *peleias* (dove and pigeon), followed by details on procreation; the Dorian word for dove is mentioned next, with the example of Sophron; this is followed by Callimachos on four different types of doves; by Alexander of Myndos on some peculiarities of these other kind of doves; by a reference to Daimachos, who in his *Indian history* records that yellow pigeons occur in India; by Charon on Mardonios and the doves; by another reference to Aristotle on the young of the doves; and by a detailed account of how doves disappear on Mount Eryx in Sicily, when the goddess embarks for Libya at the festival of the *Anagogia*, to reappear only nine days after, at the *Katagogia*. As for Aelian, he opens with Aristotle on the difference between *peristera* and *peleias* (dove and pigeon); he then moves to Callimachos on types of doves; to Indian *logoi* stating that Indian doves are of a yellow colour; to Charon and Mount Athos; and to the disappearance of doves when Aphrodite at Eryx embarks for the *Anagogia*. The sequence is the same, but Athenaios has some additional material (Alexander of Myndos is particularly interesting here, as he might well be the source of the entire block); he can give the name of Daimachos; and when mentioning Charon, he knows the title of the work, can refer to Mardonios, and can even produce a quote. However, Athenaios not only lacks the reference to Mount Athos; in his account of the *Anagogia/Katagogia*, Aphrodite is not named (he speaks simply of a goddess, and gives moreover a slightly erroneous name for the festival, *Anagogas* rather than *Anagogia*); moreover, the wording of F 3a and 3b is quite different (ὅτε ἐνταῦθα ἀπώλοντο αἱ τῶν Περσῶν τριήρεις περικάμπτουςαι τὸν Ἴθω, Aelian; τοῦ διαφθαρέντος στρατοῦ Περσικοῦ περὶ τὸν Ἴθω, Athenaios). Of course it is possible to assume that the precision concerning Aphrodite, the correct name for the festival, and the mention of Athos are all inferences of Aelian, and that the differences in wording result from a free paraphrase; but it is also possible that Aelian used here the same intermediate source employed by Athenaios, in which case the detail on Athos and the use of τριήρεις, as in F 10 below, could go back to Charon (for a recent discussion of the relationship between Athenaios and Aelian, touching on issues similar to the above, see R. J. Gorman and V. B. Gorman, ‘The Tryphê of the Sybarites: A Historiographical Problem in Athenaeus’, *JHS* 127 (2007), 46-7).

At any rate: if one accepts, as Jacoby does, that the two events (wreckage of the Persian ships at Mount Athos and appearance of the white doves) are intimately connected, and that they are a marker of divine agency, it might make sense to assume that the doves appeared around Athos: so M. Moggi, ‘Autori greci di Persiká II: Carone di Lampsaco’, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 7 (1977), 19.

If the appearance of the white doves is to be interpreted as a prodigy, its exact meaning is difficult to ascertain (at issue here is also the point of view, Greek or Persian). C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* I (Paris 1841), xviii, A. Hauvette, *Hérodote historien des guerres médiques* (Paris 1894), 165-166 and Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 227 n. 3 = *Abhandlungen* 194 n. 67 have interpreted the appearance of the doves as a bad omen, announcing to the Persians the disaster that would overtake the expedition (Herodotus 1. 138. 1-2 implies that the Persians connected white doves with leprosy; cf. D. Asheri, in D. Asheri, A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus books I-IV* (Oxford 2004), 170-171). But a prodigy presupposes a divinity. Doves were sacred to the Syrian goddess Astarte, the ‘celestial Aphrodite’ of Askalon (Asheri, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 155). As dove-goddess, Aphrodite-Astarte descends directly from the Anatolian Kupapa, as she is named in the Hittite hieroglyphs (the

sitting dove of the goddess, preceded by the determinative for ‘god’, and accompanied by one or more phonetic signs, denotes the syllables ‘kupapa’: E. Grumach, ‘The Cretan Scripts and the Greek Alphabet’, in E. Pulgram (ed.), *Writing without letters* (Manchester 1976), 48–49, with earlier bibliography); this goddess would later be known as Kubaba and Kybele. It may thus be significant that in F 5 Charon mentions Kybele, identifying her with Aphrodite: the two fragments might be connected.

The shipwreck of Mardonios’ expedition around Athos is narrated also in Herodotus, 6. 43–45, who however does not mention white doves or prodigies. This is interesting, as Herodotus tends to give ample space to prodigies and divine signs in his narrative; some (e.g. Hauvette, *Hérodote*, 166; Moggi, ‘Autori greci di Persiká II’, 20 n. 83) have inferred from this that Herodotus did not know the work of Charon, because otherwise he would have mentioned the prodigy. Jacoby, ‘Charon’, 228 = *Abhandlungen*, 194–194 refrains from this conclusion, arguing rather that Herodotus will have chosen from the available material what could be fitted into his plan. As for the stylistic difference between Herodotus’ rich account and Charon’s apparently rather bare presentation of the same event, Jacoby explains it not in terms of evolution, but rather in terms of the scope of the work: Charon narrates what he knows in chronological order, while Herodotus presents the contrast between Greeks and Persians as an organic narrative.

262 F 4 - (5) Pausanias 10, 38, 11	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="4" sourcework(level1="Pausanias" level2="" level3="Graeciae descriptio" level4="" level5="" level6="10, 38, 11")]]
Subject: literary criticism Historical Work: unknown Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 7th/6th C BC	Translation
<p>τὰ δὲ ἔπη τὰ Ναυπάκτια ὀνομαζόμενα ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων ἀνδρὶ ἐσποιοῦσιν οἱ πολλοὶ Μιλησίῳ, Χάρων δὲ ὁ Πύθειώ φησιν αὐτὰ ποιῆσαι Ναυπάκτιον Καρκίνον. ἐπόμεθα δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ τοῦ Λαμψακηνοῦ δόξει· τίνα γὰρ καὶ λόγον ἔχοι ἂν ἔπεσιν ἀνδρὸς Μιλησίου πεποιημένοις ἐς γυναῖκας τεθῆναί σφισιν ὄνομα Ναυπάκτια;</p>	<p>The majority attributes the epic poem called by the Greeks <i>Naupactia</i> to a Milesian, but Charon son of Pythes says that Karkinos of Naupaktos composed them. And we shall ourselves follow the opinion of the Lampsakene: for what reason could there be in giving the name of <i>Naupactia</i> to a poem about women composed by an author from Miletus?</p>

262 F 4 Commentary

The *Naupaktia* (or *Naupaktika*) is an archaic epic poem concerning women, and thus presumably structured in a form similar to the Hesiodic *Ehoiai*, with genealogies taking various heroines as their starting point (*Naupactia* and *Ehoiai* are mentioned side by side as potential sources of information on the children of Polykaon and Messene by Pausanias 4. 2. 1 = *Carmen Naupactium* F 11 West = *Carmen Naupactium* F 12 Bernabé = *Naupactia* T 3 Davies); the Argonaut myth seems to have been a major theme. The poem was thus not particularly focused on Naupaktian matters (its content actually fits better the notion of a Milesian authorship); the title may imply circulation in the area of Naupaktos, or belief in an origin from that area. G. L. Huxley, *Greek epic poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London 1969), 69 proposed on this basis a rather complex scenario: ‘The Milesian authorship doubted by

Pausanias may therefore be genuine to this extent, that a wandering Milesian poet came to Naupaktos and performed an Argonautic poem there, perhaps in competition with local poets such as Karkinos'. See further V. J. Matthews, 'Naupaktia and Argonautika', *Phoenix* 31, 3 (1977), 189-207; M. L. West, *Greek Epic fragments* (Cambridge, Mass. 2003), 33; J. Latacz, 'Naupaktia', in *Brill's New Pauly* 9 (Leiden - Boston 2006), 545-546; and the detailed discussion of A. Debiasi, *L'epica perduta: Eumelo, il Ciclo, l'occidente* (Roma 2004), 62-69, who points out that the content of the poem may have accommodated Milesian as well as Locrian interests, and that in these conditions the attribution of the poem to the Naupaktian Karkinos need not be seen as necessarily clashing with an anonymous Milesian authorship.

Even though we have a dozen or so fragments of the poem, they all quote either the poem's title, or use the phrase 'the author of the *Naupaktia*': this passage of Pausanias is the only text giving some details on the presumed author. Nothing else is known of an epic poet Karkinos of Naupaktos; and one wonders in what context Charon mentioned him and his work. Other fragments of Charon may betray an interest in antiquities and literary issues: so F 2, on Alkmene's cup; so also F 16 on the origins of tragedy, if it belongs to Charon. As Jacoby says (*FGrH* 3a, 10), it is not possible to know whether Charon simply stated the origin of the author of the *Naupaktia* while quoting a passage from the poem, or whether he took a position when discussing the authorship, as Herodotus does in 2. 117 concerning the authorship of the *Cypria*. Charon might have argued on grounds of common sense, just as Pausanias does; but one may wonder whether he was driven by aversion towards Miletos (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 10 and 14-15, who compares the fragments 7 and 8 with evidence in Strabo for a Milesian foundation of Lampsakos, against the Phocaeen origin asserted by Charon).

262 F 5 - (IV 627) Photios Lexicon s. κύβηβος:	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="5" sourcework(level1="Photius" level2="" level3="Lexicon (N.: Naber S.; R.: Reitzenstein R., Anfang)" level4="" level5="" level6="- Κύβηβος N.")]]
Subject: language; religion Historical Work: unknown (first book) Source date: 9th C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 6th/5th C BC	Translation
ὁ κατεχόμενος τῆι μητρὶ τῶν θεῶν θεοφόρητος. Χάρων δ' ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς ἐν τῆι πρώτῃ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ὑπὸ Φρυγῶν καὶ Λυδῶν Κυβήβην λέγεσθαι.	The person possessed by the Mother of the gods: carried by the god. Charon of Lampsakos in his first book states that Aphrodite is called Kybebe by the Phrygians and Lydians.

262 F 5 Commentary

This passage may come from the first book of the *Horoi*, and refer to a local cult: Strabo 13. 1. 17 mentions a sanctuary sacred to the Mother of the gods with the epiclesis of Tereia, located some forty stades distant from Lampsakos on a hill, the so-called 'Mountain of Tereia', also mentioned in Homer, *Iliad* 2. 289.

But the *Persika*, and in particular the narration of the Ionian revolt, are also a possibility: Herodotus 5. 102. 1 states that the rebels burned Sardis and the temple of the local goddess Kybebe, and Charon's remark might come from a similar narrative context. The two options are set out and discussed in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 10-11; see also M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di *Persika*

II: Carone di Lampsaco', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 7 (1977), 22, who favours the *Persika*. Because he assumed that this fragment came from the *Persika*, and as a result of his view of the organization of the whole work, Jacoby printed this fragment twice, here and in the section of the work dedicated to 'writers of Oriental histories', as Charon of Lampsakos 687b F 3; there, he proposed to see in the fragment an allusion to the events of 546 BC, that is, Cyrus' conquest of Sardis.

A further possibility, also hinted at by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 11, is to connect this fragment to F 11 on Themistokles' arrival in Persia, for according to a story narrated in Plutarch, *Life of Themistocles* 30. 1, Themistokles found in the temple of the Meter in Sardis a statue that he had dedicated in Athens and that had been stolen by the Persians, and he asked for it to be returned. The story, however, is unlikely to be ancient. Also interesting is the proposal by S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* I (Bari 1965), 559 n. 124, that we should link the appearance of the white doves, mentioned in Charon's F 3, with this passage: the sitting dove represent the Anatolian goddess Kupapa. F 3 certainly comes from the *Persika*, but the exact book (whether the first or the second) is not specified; F 5 comes from the first book of an unknown work. If F 3 and F 5 are to be read closely together, then F 5 might have been part of an excursus enriching the narrative of Mardonios' shipwreck and giving more details on the doves—this would mean that the first book of the *Persika* comprised events at least until 492, leaving the space for a detailed narrative in the second book. Alternatively, F 3 might have been a flash forward in the context of a discussion of Persia and the cult of the Meter — this seems to me unlikely. Certainty on this point would have implications for our understanding of Charon's work; but it must remain a hypothesis, as we do not know whether F 3 and F 5 appeared together and in the same work.

Intriguingly, even though Herodotus is usually fond of comparing foreign and Greek perspectives on divine names, in 5. 102 he does not give information on other names of the goddess. This might thus count as one of those instances where Charon says something more than Herodotus (see F. Jacoby, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 (1938), 211 and n. 13 = H. Bloch (ed.), *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtschreibung von Felix Jacoby zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag* (Leiden 1956), 181 and n. 13, as well as *FGrH* 3a, 11; and Moggi, 'Autori greci di *Persika* II', 22, who in n. 99 suggests that this might be one further argument against a low date for Charon – I fail to see why; the argument of Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* I, 559 n. 124, that the need felt by Charon to give precision as to the identity of the goddess implies an early date is hardly a solid one).

On Kybebe (or Kybele), an Anatolian Earth- and Mother-goddess, see above, ad F 3, and also L.E. Roller, *In Search of God the Mother: The Cult of Anatolian Cybele* (Berkeley - Los Angeles 1999), 124 who sees in Kybele and Kybebe two originally distinct goddesses, a Lydian and a Phrygian one, later confused by the Greeks, as well as M. Munn, *The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the tyranny of Asia* (Berkeley - Los Angeles 2006), 120-125, who considers that both names refer to the goddess known as Kubaba (so in cuneiform and hieroglyphic Luwian; Lydian Kuvava, Phrygian *Matar Kubileya/Kubeleya*). In Charon, the goddess is identified with Aphrodite (so also Hesychios s.v. Κυβήβη; text and further references in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3, 10); but in Greek art and literature, Kybele is usually linked to Artemis, the Artemis of Ephesos (see further Munn, *Mother of the Gods*, 163-169).

262 F 6 - (IV 627) Photios Lexicon s. ὄστακός

meta[[id="262" type="F" n="6" sourcework(level1="Photius" level2="" level3="Lexicon (N.: Naber S.; R.: Reitzenstein R., Anfang)" level4="" level5="" level6="- 'ὄστακός N.")]]

Subject: foundation Historical Work: unknown Source date: 9 C AD Historian's date: 5 C BC Historical period: end of VIII- beginning of VII C BC	Translation
<p>οἱ δὲ ἀστακός· καράβου εἶδος· καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ᾽Αστακὸν ᾽Οστακὸν ᾽Ιῶνες· καὶ ὁ Χάρων #quote# «᾽Οστακὸς ἐκτίσθη ὑπὸ Χαλκηδονίων»·#</p>	<p>And some <i>astakos</i> (the smooth lobster): a kind of cray-fish. And the city Astakos the Ionians call Ostakos; so also Charon: 'Ostakos was founded by the Chalkedonians'.</p>

262 F 6 Commentary

The fragment is cited as an instance of the Ionian form of the name of the city (cf. Athenaios 3.65, and the personal masculine name ᾽Οστακός attested six times in Delian inscriptions, cf. P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, *Lexicon of Greek Personal names I* (Oxford 1987), s.v.). Its brevity makes it impossible to advance guesses as to the work it came from: the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* seems the most likely bet, but *Foundations of cities* or *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians* are also possible. Similarly, the fact that the snippet of text we have does not mention the re-foundation of the city by the Athenians in 435 cannot be construed into a *terminus ante* for Charon's work (on all this, see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 11). The fragment's importance rather lies in the fact that it highlights the limits of our information on ancient colonization: for the ancient tradition unanimously names Megara as the metropolis of Astakos (so for instance Memnon, *BNJ* 424, F 1, 12.2). Moreover, the dates Eusebios gives for the foundations of Astakos (second year of the 17th Olympiad, i.e. 711/10; Memnon has 712 BC) and Chalkedon (fourth year of the 23rd Olympiad, first year of the 24th, i.e. 685/3) make a foundation of Astakos by Chalkedon impossible (again, see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 11, for all references and detailed discussion). Charon is thus isolated against the rest of the tradition.

262 F 7a - (6) Plutarch <i>Mulierum virtutes</i> 18 p. 255 A–E	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="7" n-mod="a" sourcework(level1="Plutarchus" level2="" level3="Mulierum virtutes" level4="" level5="" level6="18, 1-5, 255ae") tgroup="2, 1"]]
Subject: trade; military history; foundation myth; religion Historical Work: unknown Source date: end 1 -beginning 2nd C AD Historian's date: 5 C BC Historical period: c. 654 BC	Translation
<p>Ἐκ Φωκαίας τοῦ Κοδριδῶν γένους ἦσαν ἀδελφοὶ δίδυμοι Φόβος¹ καὶ Βλέψος, ὧν ὁ</p>	<p>From Phocaea were two twin brothers of the family of the Kodridai, Phobos and</p>

¹ The manuscripts of Plutarch have Φόβος, maintained by G. N. Bernardakis, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* (Leipzig 1889) and F. C. Babbitt, *Plutarch. Moralia* iii (Cambridge, MA 1931); W. Nachstädt, *Plutarchi moralia*, vol. 2.1 (Leipzig 1935), corrects the text and prints here and below Φόξος, as in Polyainos. So do also B. Bravo, 'Commerce et noblesse en Grèce archaïque', *DHA* 10, 1984, 155 n. 40, who finds Φόβος 'impossible', and at the same time a 'banalisation de Phoxos', and L. Antonelli, *Traffici focei di età arcaica* (Roma 2008), 76; Phobos is defended by Ph. Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical methods. An Analysis of the Mulierum Virtutes* (Cambridge, Mass. 1965), 23–4. I prefer (with Jacoby) to stick to the manuscript tradition; see discussion of the names below.

Φόβος ἀπὸ τῶν Λευκάδων πετρῶν πρῶτος ἀφῆκεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς θάλασσαν, ὡς Χάρων ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς ἰστόρηκεν. ἔχων δὲ δύναμιν καὶ βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα παρέπλευσεν εἰς Πάριον ἰδίων ἔνεκα πραγμάτων· καὶ γενόμενος φίλος καὶ ξένος Μάνδρωνι, βασιλεύοντι Βεβρύκων τῶν Πιτυοεσσηνῶν προσαγορευομένων, ἐβοήθησε καὶ συνεπολέμησεν αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν προσοίκων ἐνοχλουμένοις. (2) ὁ δὲ Μάνδρων ἄλλην τε πολλὴν ἐνεδείξατο τῷ Φόβω φιλοφροσύνην ἀποπλέοντι καὶ μέρος τῆς τε χώρας καὶ τῆς πόλεως ὑπισχνεῖτο δώσειν, εἰ βούλοιο Φωκαεῖς ἔχων ἐποίκους εἰς τὴν Πιτυόεσσαν ἀφικέσθαι. πείσας οὖν τοὺς πολίτας ὁ Φόβος ἐξέπεμψε τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἄγοντα τοὺς ἐποίκους. καὶ τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῦ Μάνδρωνος ὑπῆρχεν αὐτοῖς, ὥσπερ προσεδόκησαν, ὠφελείας δὲ μεγάλας καὶ λάφυρα καὶ λείας ἀπὸ τῶν προσοίκων βαρβάρων λαμβάνοντες ἐπίφθονοι τὸ πρῶτον, εἶτα καὶ φοβεροὶ τοῖς Βέβρυξιν ἦσαν. ἐπιθυμοῦντες οὖν αὐτῶν ἀπαλλαγῆναι, τὸν μὲν Μάνδρωνα, χρηστὸν ὄντα καὶ δίκαιον ἄνδρα περὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας, οὐκ ἔπεισαν, ἀποδημήσαντος δ' ἐκείνου παρεσκευάζοντο τοὺς Φωκαεῖς δόλῳ διαφθεῖραι. (3) τοῦ δὲ Μάνδρωνος ἡ θυγάτηρ Λαμψάκη παρθένος οὔσα τὴν ἐπιβουλήν προέγνω, καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἐπεχειρεῖ τοὺς φίλους καὶ οἰκείους ἀποτρέπειν καὶ διδάσκειν ὡς ἔργον δεινὸν καὶ ἀσεβὲς ἐγχειροῦσι πράττειν, εὐεργέτας καὶ συμμάχους ἄνδρας, νῦν δὲ καὶ πολίτας ἀποκτιννύντες. ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἔπειθε, τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἔφρασε κρύφα τὰ πραττόμενα καὶ παρεκελεύσατο φυλάττεσθαι· οἱ δὲ θυσίαν τινὰ παρασκευασάμενοι καὶ Θοίνην ἐξεκαλέσαντο τοὺς Πιτυοεσσηνοὺς εἰς τὸ προάστειον, αὐτοὺς δὲ διελόντες δίχα τοῖς μὲν τὰ τείχη κατελάβοντο, τοῖς δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀνεῖλον. (4) οὕτω δὲ τὴν πόλιν κατασχόντες τὸν τε Μάνδρωνα μετεπέμποντο συμβασιλεύειν τοῖς παρ' αὐτῶν κελύοντες, καὶ τὴν Λαμψάκην ἐξ ἄρραωστίας ἀποθανοῦσαν ἔθαψαν ἐν τῇ πόλει μεγαλοπρεπῶς, καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀπ' αὐτῆς Λάμψακον προσηγόρευσαν. (5) ἐπεὶ

Blepsos, of whom Phobos was the first to throw himself into the sea from the Leucadian Rocks, as Charon of Lampsakos has recorded. Phobos, having influence and princely rank, sailed to Parion on business of his own; and having become the friend and guest of Mandron, who was king of the Bebrykes called Pityoesseni, he aided them, and fought on their side when they were harassed by their neighbours. When Phobos left, Mandron expressed the utmost regard for him, and, in particular, promised to give him a part of their land and city, if Phobos wished to come to Pityoessa with Phocaeon colonists. Having persuaded his citizens, Phobos sent out his brother with the colonists. And what Mandron had promised was at their disposal, as they expected; but as they were making great gains for themselves through the spoils and booty which they took from the neighbouring barbarians, they were first an object of envy, and later also an object of fear to the Bebrykes. As a result, they desired to be rid of them, but they could not persuade Mandron, who was a fair and just man in his treatment of the Greeks; but when he had gone away on a journey, they prepared to destroy the Phocaeans by treachery. But the daughter of Mandron, Lampsake, a virgin, learned of the plot beforehand, and first tried to dissuade her friends and relatives and to point out that they were undertaking to carry out a terrible and impious deed in murdering men who were their benefactors and allies, and now also fellow-citizens. But when she could not persuade them, she secretly told the Greeks what was afoot, and warned them to be on their guard. And they, having arranged a sacrifice and banquet just outside the city, invited the Pityoesseni to come to it; then, dividing themselves into two parties, with one they took possession of the walls, and with the other made away with the men. Having gained control of the city in this manner, they sent for Mandron, proposing that he be king jointly with one of them; and as Lampsake had died because

<p>δ' ὁ Μάνδρων προδοσίας ὑποψίαν φεύγων τὸ μὲν οἰκεῖν μετ' αὐτῶν παρηιτήσατο, παῖδας δὲ τῶν τεθνηκότων καὶ γυναῖκας ἤξιωσε κομίσασθαι, καὶ ταῦτα προθύμως οὐδὲν ἀδικήσαντες ἐξέπεμψαν καὶ τῇ Λαμψάκῃ πρότερον ἠρωικὰς τιμὰς ἀποδιδόντες ὕστερον ὡς θεῶι θύειν ἐψηφίσαντο· καὶ διατελοῦσιν οὕτω θύοντες.</p>	<p>of an illness, they buried her within the city most magnificently, and called the city Lampsakos after her. When Mandron, endeavouring to avoid any suspicion of treachery, refused to live with them, but asked to take away with him the children and wives of the dead, they sent them willingly, without harming them, and they at first rendered heroic honours to Lampsake; later they voted to offer sacrifice to her as to a goddess, and so they continue to do.</p>
--	--

262 F 7a Commentary

See below, commentary to F 7b.

<p>262 F 7b - Polyainos Strategemata 8, 37</p>	<p>meta[[id="262" type="F" n="7" n-mod="b" sourcework(level1="Polyaenus" level2="" level3="Strategemata" level4="" level5="" level6="8, 37") tgroup="2, 2"]]</p>
<p>Subject: trade; military history; foundation myth; religion Historical Work: unknown Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: 5 C BC Historical period: c. 654 BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Φωκαεῖς Φόξον ἡγημόνα ἔχοντες Μάνδρωνι βασιλεῖ Βεβρύκων συνεμάχησαν ὑπὸ τῶν προσοίκων βαρβάρων πολεμουμένωι. Μάνδρων ἔπεισε τοὺς Φωκαεῖς ἐποικεῖν, μέρος τῆς χώρας καὶ τῆς πόλεως λαβόντας. ἐπεὶ δὲ πολλάκις μὲν ἐν ταῖς μάχαις ἐνίκων, πολλὰ δὲ λάφυρα ἐκτῶντο, ἐπίφθονοι τοῖς Βέβρυξιν ἐγένοντο, ὥστε ἀποδημοῦντος Μάνδρωνος λόχωι καὶ δόλωι τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐβουλεύσαντο διαφθεῖραι. Μάνδρωνος θυγάτηρ Λαμψάκη παρθένος μαθοῦσα τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν ἀποτρέπειν ἐπειράτο· ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἔπειθε, κρύφα τοῖς Ἕλλησι μηνύει τὰ κατ' αὐτῶν βεβουλευμένα. οἱ δὲ θυσίαν παρασκευάσαντες λαμπρὰν ἔξω τειχῶν καλοῦσι τοὺς βαρβάρους εἰς τὸ προάστειον. οἱ μὲν δὴ κατακλιθέντες εὐωχοῦντο, οἱ δὲ Φωκαεῖς δίχα διελόντες αὐτοὺς οἱ μὲν τὰ</p>	<p>The Phocaeans with Phoxos as their commander fought on the side of Mandron king of the Bebrykes, who was attacked by the neighbouring barbarians. Mandron persuaded the Phocaeans to come as colonists, taking a part of the territory and of the city. But as they often won in the battles, and acquired much booty, they became objects of envy for the Bebrykes, to the point that when Mandron was away on a journey they plotted to destroy the Greeks through a deceptive ambush. The virgin daughter of Mandron, Lampsake, having learnt the plot tried to dissuade them; but as she did not persuade them, she revealed covertly to the Greeks what was being planned against them. And they prepared a splendid sacrifice outside the walls and invited the barbarians to the suburb. And they banqueted reclining, but the Phocaeans having divided themselves</p>

<p>τείχη κατελάβοντο, οἱ δὲ τοὺς εὐωχουμένους ἀνείλον καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτοὶ κατέσχον. τὴν δὲ Λαμψάκην μεγαλοπρεπῶς ἐτίμησαν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς Λάμψακον <προσ> ηγόρευσαν.</p>	<p>occupied the walls with one group, while the others killed those who were banqueting; thus they took the city. They honored Lampsake magnificently, and from her gave to the city the name Lampsakos.</p>
--	--

262 F 7b Commentary

This is a story that has played (and continues to play) an important role in the debate concerning the formation of traditions concerning the Greek ‘colonization’, the actual modalities of the overseas settlements, and the role played by aristocratic exchanges (an instance is the debate between B. Bravo, ‘Commerce et noblesse en Grèce archaïque. À propos d’un livre ‘Alfonso Mele’, *DHA* 10, 1984, 99-160, and specifically on Phocaea and Lampsakos 126–128, and A. Mele, ‘Pirateria, commercio e aristocrazia: replica a Benedetto Bravo’, *DHA* 12, 1986, 67–109, and in particular 91–93 for Charon). And yet, for various reasons, it is a very problematic text.

To begin with, both the relationship between F 7a and F 7 b, and their relationship to Charon’s work, are uncertain. Let us start with the second point. At the very beginning of the story, Plutarch (F 7a) gives as source Charon. Plutarch probably knows the story through an intermediary source (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 12; A. J. Domínguez Monedero, ‘Lámpsace (Plut. *Mul. Virt.* 18 = *Mor.* 255 AE), Lámpsaco y Masalia’, in C. Schrader, V. Ramón, J. Vela (ed.), *Plutarco y la historia* (Zaragoza 1997), 145; K. Ziegler, ‘Plutarchos (2)’, *RE* 21. 1 (1951), 912–913 and 924 = *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart 1964), 275–77 and 287); but as Plutarch mentions Charon more than just once (twice in his *On the malignity of Herodotus*, cf. F 9 and 10, and once in his *Life of Themistocles*, cf. F 11), each time on a different issue, and as in two instances he actually quotes Charon’s own words (F 9 and F 10), it is just possible (although in my opinion extremely unlikely) that he may here be using Charon’s own work.

Even so, the fact that Plutarch may have consulted Charon does not of itself imply that all of the narrative of F 7 goes back to Charon. Strictly speaking, Plutarch refers explicitly to Charon only for the jump of Phobos from the Leukadian rocks, while the rest of the narrative concerns Phobos’ brother and Lampsake (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 12). Thus Domínguez Monedero, ‘Lámpsace’, 146 has recently argued that only the first lines, concerning the jump of Phobos from the rock of Leukas, go back to Charon, and that the rest is a Hellenistic foundation story. The assumption that the entire passage depends on Charon receives some support from the fact that the inhabitants of the land which would later be occupied by Lampsakos are called Bebrykes in F 7, but also in F 8, which certainly goes back to Charon (Domínguez Monedero, ‘Lámpsace’, 146–7 remarks however that, unlike F 8, in F 7 the city is called Pityoessa and the name ‘Bebrykia’ is not used for the region). It is also plausible to assume that Charon narrated the origins of the city in his work on Lampsakos. Thus, Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 11–14 and P. Stadter, *Plutarch’s Historical Methods. An Analysis of the Mulierum Virtutes* (Cambridge, Mass. 1965), 98 accept the Charonian paternity of the story, while adding significant qualifications (Jacoby in particular emphasizes that, in the light of the richness of alternative traditions, it cannot be assumed that the intermediary, and then Plutarch, have preserved unaltered the narrative of Charon). While Jacoby has often been followed in his assumption of Charon as the source for

the entire passage, his reservations concerning the closeness of the narrative to the original version of Charon have mostly been ignored.

As for the second issue, the relationship between F 7a and F 7b: Polyainos (F 7b) does not state his source, but the story is so similar to the one recounted by Plutarch that it is necessary to admit that either both texts depend on a common source (whether Charon himself or an intermediary author), or that Polyainos depends directly on Plutarch. The latter position has been argued in detail by Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical Methods*, 13-29, whose conclusions on this point are accepted by Domínguez Monedero, 'Lámpsace', 146. Indeed, the story as told in F 7b is a relatively simple, linear one, as could result from a summary of the main points of 7a; the main difficulty with the assumption of a direct dependance of Polyainos upon Plutarch is the fact that in Polyainos the hero (no twins in Polyainos, but then the function of the first brother in Plutarch's version was anyway limited) is named Phoxos, not Phobos or Blepsos (hence the attempts of editors to correct the text; more on the names later). As for F 7a, it offers tantalizing and at times problematic details that are however not entirely unexpected in a foundation story. The main points are: why twins, and why Kodridai? Why does the first twin, Phobos, disappear, leaving the rest of the story to the second, Blepsos? Is it an accident that Blepsos' name appears only at the beginning of the story, and that from then onwards he is referred to as 'the brother'? Why does the first twin jump from the Rock? And what are the implications of the fact that the overall narrative presents striking correspondences with other stories of Phocaeen foundations?

Before moving to a detailed analysis of these issues, let us sketch the general picture (the ancient sources on Lampsakos are conveniently collected in P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos* (Bonn 1978), 103-157, and 107-111 specifically for the foundation of the city; importantly, there were divergent accounts of it).

- F 7 preserves a foundation story, in which the heroine gives her name to the city; Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical Methods*, 98, emphasizes that the narrative is fundamentally historical, and that Charon 'is not describing the mythological foundation of a city' (on the way in which such traditions may reflect the experiences of the first colonists see also Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 14-15; P. Guzzo, 'Intorno a Lampsake: ipotesi di un modello «foceo»', *Incidenza dell'Antico* 8 (2010), 197-210). The same derivation of the name is attested (without further details) in Stephanos of Byzantion, s.v. Lampsakos, who however gives as source for the information Dei(l)ochos, *BNJ* 477 F 3 (πόλις κατὰ τὴν Προποντίδα, ἀπὸ Λαμψάκης ἐπιχωρίας τινὸς κόρης, ἔστι δὲ Φωκαέων κτίσμα, πάλαι Πιτύουσα λεγομένη, ὡς Δηίοχος ὁ Κυζικηνός, 'city in the Propontis, from Lampsake, a local girl. It is a foundation of the Phocaeans, and was anciently named Pityousa, as Deiochos of Kyzikos says'). As pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 12, this is slightly problematic, because it is certainly possible that both Charon and Dei(l)ochos narrated the foundation of Lampsakos in exactly the same way; but it is also possible that F 7a, after its reference to Charon, preserves what was basically the narrative of Dei(l)ochos, or at any rate a version heavily coloured by it (note that the earlier name of the city, Πιτύουσα/Πιτυόεσσα, is attested in Dei(l)ochos and in F 7; but F 8, which certainly goes back in its entirety to Charon, gives only the names of Bebrykia and Bebrykes, so that we cannot be absolutely certain that Pityoessa was in Charon).

- another foundation story derived the name of the city from a supernatural light or a flash of lightning, which, according to an oracle, indicated to the Phocaeans the place where they should establish themselves: thus the grammarian Seleukos (*Etymologicum genuinum* λ 29

Alpers: ὅτι τοῖς Λαμψακηνοῖς χρησμὸς ἐδόθη, ὅπου ἂν αὐτοῖς λάμψη, ἐκεῖ πόλιν κτίσαι), as well as Mela, *Chorographia* 1.97: *Lampsacum Phocaeis appellantis nomen ex eo traxit quod, consulentibus in quasnam terras potissimum tenderent, responsum erat, ubi primum fulsisset, ibi sedem capesserent* (cf. B. K. Braswell and M. Billerbeck, *The grammarian Eraphroditus. Testimonia and Fragments* (Bern 2008), 189-90).

However much they may differ in the actual story of the foundation, these two narratives concur in indicating Phocaea as the mother-city of Lampsakos.

- The connection between Phocaea and Lampsakos, implied in both of the above-mentioned foundation stories, is well-attested: see Ephoros *BNJ* 70 F 46; Dei(l)ochos, *BNJ* 471 T 1 and F 3; Mela 1.97; and Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Λάμψακος, as well as s.v. Ἄβαρνος, where the Phocaeans and not the Phocians are meant (cf. W. Leaf, *Strabo on the Troad* (London 1923), 94). It was actually the official tradition: it is reflected in a decree from Lampsakos that mentions the Massaliotai as brothers, *Syll.*³ 591 (Massalia itself is a Phocaeian colony). But there were also dissenting voices. According to Eusebius, Lampsakos was founded in 654 BC by Milesians. And without giving any details, Strabo affirms in speaking of Paisos that it was a Milesian colony, 'as was Lampsakos too', where the Paisians moved after their city was destroyed (Strabo 13. 1. 19, C 589: οἱ δὲ Παισηνοὶ μετώκησαν εἰς Λάμψακον, Μιλησίων ὄντες ἄποικοι καὶ αὐτοί, καθάπερ οἱ Λαμψακηνοί). See however the remarks of F. Bilabel, *Die ionische Kolonisation* (Leipzig 1920), 49-50, cf. 239 and 245, who considers this a mistake, and argues for a Phocaeian origin, on the base of the calendar, and because of the above-mentioned inscription; similarly N. Ehrhardt, *Milet und seine Kolonien* (Frankfurt am Main - Bern - New York 1983), 35-36, and Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos*, 108. On the Milesian claims see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 14-15, who considers them as an attempt by the Milesians to widen their control. Note however that R. Körpe and M.Y. Treister, 'Rescue excavations in the necropolis of Lampsacus', *Studia Troica* 12, 2002, 429 accept that Lampsakos was a Milesian colony, as does G.R. Tsetschladze, 'Revisiting ancient Greek colonisation', in G.R. Tsetschladze (ed.), *Greek colonisation. An account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas* I, (Leiden 2006), lxx.

- A further foundation story need not concern us overmuch: according to Stephanos of Byzantium s.v. Λάμψακος, a certain Demosthenes, active in the third or second century BC and writer of *On Foundations*, named Priapos the son of Aphrodite and Dionysos as ktistes of the city (*BNJ* 699 F 16). This version placed the foundation of the city in mythical times (it did not involve the Phocaeans), and thus did not necessarily concurrence the other versions (Charon might have mentioned this version too in his *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*, or not; cf. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 12).

How to evaluate the relationship between the story of Lampsake, and that according to which the city derives its name from a flash of light? Most scholars consider that the story narrated in F 7 is the ancient, early one, because of the reference to Charon; the other account, involving an oracular response, would have been created at a later time. This assumption has been recently disputed by Domínguez Monedero, 'Lámpsace', 148-149, who argues that on the contrary the oracular story is the ancient one, elaborated in Lampsakos, and even suggests that this version might have stood in Charon. His reason is the fact that Plutarch, who is otherwise very interested in oracles, nowhere mentions this particular one: thus, the story of Lampsake must have been the the official one at his time, and there must have been no traces of the other version. This in turn implies (so Domínguez Monedero) that the oracle story must have been earlier, and that it was obliterated by the other account. If this is so, one wonders where Mela and Seleukos found their version. Domínguez

Monedero thus proposes that only the initial part of F 7, on Phobos' jump from the rock of Leukas, goes back to Charon, and that the rest of the story of Lampsake is a Hellenistic fabrication, based on other, similar, stories of Phocaeen foundations.

It is indeed true that there are striking similarities between the story of the foundation of Lampsakos and the foundation narratives of other Phocaeen colonies. Numerous scholars (most recently A. Brugnone, 'In margine alle tradizioni ecistiche di Massalia', *La Parola del Passato* 50 (1995), 46-66; Domínguez Monedero, 'Lámpsace', 150-155; L. Antonelli, *Traffici focei di età arcaica: dalla scoperta dell'occidente alla battaglia del mare Sardonio*, *Hesperia* 23 (Roma 2008), 75-81 and 149-53) have highlighted in detail the structural similarities between the story of Lampsake, and the various narratives concerning the foundation of Massalia, more specifically the wedding of the Phocaeen Euxenos and the daughter of the local king Nannos (Aristotle, *Constitution of the Massalioi*, fr. 549 Rose, quoted in Athenaios 13. 576ab), and the wedding between the Phocaeen Protis and Gyptis, daughter of the king of the Segobrigii Nannos (Justin's *Epitome of the Philippic histories* of Trogus, 43, 3-4). Importantly, Justin's version has a follow up to the wedding: some time after the death of king Nannos, a Ligurian made use of an apologue to convince Comanus, the son of the king, that the colonists would one day attempt to take over control of all the territory; as a result, Comanus tried through a stratagem to infiltrate Massalia and kill all Phocaeen colonists. The stratagem failed, because a woman (whose name is not given, but she was a relative of the king) informed her Greek lover of the danger the Greeks were facing.

These stories are used by Brugnone to reconstruct a Phocaeen model of colonization, based on *prexis* (commerce) as a peculiar characteristic of the Phocaeans' activity overseas (cf. Herodotus 1. 163: the Phocaeans were the first Greeks to make long sea voyages, and reached Tartessos, where the king Arganthonios offered them the chance to settle wherever they wanted on his land); she further argues that Charon is our earliest source for this model. However, stories of an initial agreement between a local king and a Greek adventurer, including a wedding, are attested also for non-Phocaeen settlements, such as those at Megara Hyblaea and Lokroi Epizephyrioi; as a result Guzzo, 'Intorno a Lampsake', 204-205 proposes to see the Phocaeen specificity in the initial establishment of *emporía*, which then changed into *poleis*. Here, we should distinguish between the historical issue, and the formation and circulation of traditions. Concerning the latter, Brugnone, 'In margine alle tradizioni ecistiche', 64-66 suggests that the tradition on the foundation of Massalia was modeled on Charon's version of the foundation of Lampsakos by Phocaeen colonists (see already A. Momigliano, *Alien wisdom* (Cambridge 1971), 51: 'The story was told in detail by a descendant of these settlers, the historian Charon, who, being one of the earliest Greek historians, was in a position to set up a model'), and emphasizes that according to the *Suda* Charon had produced a *Periplous of the sea outside the columns of Herakles*, that is of an area that had been explored by the Phocaeans. Brugnone further suggests that the second part of the tradition on the foundation of Massalia, in which a local king compares the presence of the Greek colonists to that of a pregnant bitch who is first given a place to stay, and then claims it as her own, echoes the story of the usurper Cyrus, brought up by a woman called Κυνώ, a story narrated in Herodotus, but possibly also present in Charon (cf. F 14) – this is much less convincing. Antonelli, *Traffici focei di età arcaica*, 75-81 and 149-153, offers a thorough discussion, and endorses the idea that the story narrated by Charon, because of its 'epic colour', might derive from the epic poem *Phocais* (whose existence is attested by a reference in the *Vita Homeri herodotea* 15: see A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici graeci* I (Berlin 1987), 117); so already F. Càssola, 'De Phocaeide carmine, quod Homero tribui solet, commentatio', *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 26 (1952), 141-148.

However, while on the whole the story fits indeed a model of identity and relationship with the locals which may not have been exclusive to Phocaea, but which plays an important role in Phocaean narratives (cf. also A. J. Domínguez, ‘Greek identity in the Phocaean colonies’, in K. Lomas (ed.), *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean. Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton* (Leiden 2004), 432-449), a number of issues have led Domínguez Monedero, ‘Lámpsace’, 145-160, to turn this interpretation on its head, and to consider (a) that the reference to Charon concerns only the initial part of the narrative, while the rest derives from some Hellenistic author; (b) that the Lampsakenoi reworked their foundation story to make it similar to that of Massalia, possibly at a moment when Lampsakos needed help from Massalia for its dealings with Rome (here Domínguez Monedero refers to *I. Lampsakos* 4, relating the embassy of Hegesias in c. 196 BC). The main stumbling block for Domínguez Monedero’s thesis is the reference to Charon: for while it is true that there is no guarantee that the entire story goes back to Charon, it is also impossible to prove the opposite—actually, some foundation story must have figured in Charon’s work on Lampsakos.

Let us look in more detail at the following specific features of the story: 1) the names of the Phocaean founders; 2) the reference to the Kodridai; 3) Phobos’ death from the Leukadian rocks, and the scapegoat and/or love motif that runs through many stories similar to that of Lampsake; 4) the name of the girl and of her father, the help given to the enemies by the girl, and her heroisation and later divinization; 5) the earlier name of the city.

1) The names, Phobos, Blepsos, and Phoxos, are intriguing. One of the Neleid kings of Miletos was called Φόβιος (so Aristotle, fr. 556 Rose, Alexander Aetolos, fr. 3 Powell, and the writers of *Milesiaka*, all cited in Parthenius, *Love stories* 14, ‘Antheus’; on the Neleid aspect of the story see J. L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford 1999), 457); as we saw, Miletos too laid claims to Lampsakos, and the Kodridai are of course Neleidai. Blepsos’ name is associated with ‘sight’, although vision does not seem to play a role in the story. Phoxos could also be associated with vision: in discussing the Homeric description of Thersites, in *Iliad* 2. 219, φοξὸς ἔην κεφαλὴν (‘and he had a pointed head’), Athenaios comments: καὶ ἔστιν οἶον φαοξός, ὁ πρὸς τὰ φάη ὄξυς ὀρώμενος, ‘and this is as to say ‘phaoxos’, that is someone who is sharp around the eyes’ (11. 480d): a false etymology, of course, but interestingly associated with vision, and one wonders where Athenaios came across it – or whether he invented it; Athenaios is followed by Eustathius, *Commentary to Homer’s Iliad*, 1. 316. 6 van der Valk and by some of the *Etymologica*, but this interpretation seems unique. At any rate: two out of the three names transmitted may have carried an association with sight. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 15 may have been right in thinking that the assonance ‘Phobos/Blepsos’ renders Phobos more likely as the original name than the also theoretically possible Phoxos. But it is worth pointing out that although scholars have tended to consider the names Phobos and Phoxos as alternatives, assuming an error in the manuscript tradition, in fact Phobos plays no role in the actual foundation; Phoxos in Polyainos corresponds to Blepsos in Plutarch. Interestingly, vision also played a role in the other tradition on the foundation of Lampsakos, which linked the name to a flash of light (ὅτι λάμψη). At any rate: the names, the Kodrid ascendancy, and possibly also the presence of twins (a fact unimportant from the point of view of the story as we have it, since the brothers never act together), show that notwithstanding the historical colouring of the story, expected in a κρίσις, these are mythical figures. They may reflect a remote Ionian past (further details in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 15); but the choice of twins may also be a Hellenistic attempt to reflect the legend of Rome. On twins and their meanings in Greek and Roman mythology see the rich discussion of F. Mencacci, *I fratelli amici. La rappresentazione dei gemelli*

nella cultura romana (Venezia 1996). Mencacci does not discuss the Phocaeen twins, but she offers a fascinating discussion (at 126–192) of the naming of twins: names are important, as they are the one element that makes it possible to distinguish the twins' somatic identity. Mencacci finds that twins' names often are semantically or phonically related, or also express in various ways a parity (note instances of imbalance, where the name of one twin suffices to indicate the other). See also V. Dasen, *Jumeaux, jumelles dans l'Antiquité grecque et romaine* (Zürich 2005), who does not mention our twins; and R. Rathmayr, *Zwillinge in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Vienna 2000), 102, who mentions the Phocaeen twins in the context of practices of assigning power to the eldest twin and finding solutions for the other, which often imply death, the prime example being that of Romulus and Remus. What is so striking in the Phocaeen case is that death is not needed, as the younger twin is sent to lead the colony, leaving the field free for the older one to continue reigning in Phocaea.

The other attestations of these names show that in and of themselves the names Phoxos and Blepsos are normal, if unfrequent. Phoxos was, according to Aristotle, *Politics* 1304a29, the name of a tyrant of Chalkis, overthrown possibly around the mid-sixth century; the name is also found once in Acarnania (*LGPN* vol. 3a, second century BC) and twice in Boiotia (*LGPN* vol. 3b; note in particular the presence of the name in a fifth-century inscription from Thespiiai, as well as the further instance of Φόξων from Orchomenos and the numerous instances of Φοξίνοϲ, both from Boiotia and Thessaly, mostly from the third–second century BC; Φοξίας is found at Herakleia Pontica in the fourth century BC, cf. *LGPN* vol. 5a). Blepsos is attested twice in Gorgippia on the Cimmerian Bosphoros (*LGPN* vol. 4, third century BC); it is not found in Ionia, apart from the narrative of Plutarch, but one might compare with Βλέπων, attested in Sinope and Ephesos respectively in the late fifth and fourth centuries (*LGPN* 5a); note further the nine instances of Βλεψίας, Βλεψίδης, and Βλεψίων (*LGPN* vols. 1, 2a, and 3a), among which notable are the Blepsidai of Aigina mentioned in Pindar, *Olympian* 8, 75. As for Phobos, it is only attested as a name in Plutarch's narrative (cf. *LGPN* vol. 5a); the composed Epiphobos is attested once only, in seventh/sixth century BC Thera (*LGPN* vol. 1), while Aphobos fares slightly better, with four occurrences, 3 in Attica, and one of second century date from Elea (respectively *LGPN* vols. 2a and 3a).

2) In F 7a, the twins are said to be Kodridai, from Phocaea. The tradition that the Ionian migration was led by the sons of Kodros, who had arrived to Athens from Pylos (a story mentioned for instance in Herodotus 1. 145–147, in Strabo 14. 1. 3, and in Pausanias 7. 2. 1–4), can be traced back in some form at least to the mid-sixth century and the Peisistratids (against the radical thesis advanced by M. Sakellariou, *La migration grecque en Ionie* (Athens 1958), 29–37, for whom this tradition postdated the Ionian revolt, being a result of the Athenian attempt to extend patronage and control over the cities of Asia Minor; see rather A. Momigliano, 'Questioni di storia ionica arcaica', *Studi italiani di filologia* n.s. 10,4 (1933), 259–297 = *Quinto Contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, 1 (Roma 1975), 369–402). Charon's reference to the Kodridai (certain, as it takes place at the very beginning of the fragment) may have implied a specific positioning in respect to Athens (compare F 10, with the singling out of the Athenians in the attack on Sardis). Pausanias remembers a story concerning Phocaea, according to which the city was received into the Panionion only after she accepted members of the Kodridai for election as rulers (Ἴώνων δὲ οὐ δεχομένων σφᾶς ἐς Πανιώνιον πρὶν ἢ τοῦ γένους βασιλέας τοῦ Κοδριδῶν λάβωσιν, οὕτω παρὰ Ἐρυθραίων καὶ ἐκ Τέω Δεοίτην καὶ Πέρικλον λαμβάνουσι καὶ Ἄβαρτον, Pausanias 7. 3. 10). An inscription of the Roman period from Lampsakos (Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos*, no. 10) shows that there was in the city a φυλὴ Περικλειδῶν, which evidently derived its name from that of Πέρικλος, one of the three kings of the race of the Kodridai that the Phocaeans

received from Erythrai and Teos. All this attests to the continued importance of the tradition concerning the Kodridai for Lampsakos.

An intriguing piece of information is preserved in a fragment of Ephoros, *FGrH* 70 F 25, quoted by Stephanos of Byzantion s.v. Λάμψος: ‘this (Lampsos) was the name of a part of the territory of the Klazomenians, from a certain Lampsos son of †Kodrides, as Ephoros says in his third book’. While it is difficult to detach entirely this Lampsos from Lampsake, there are no obvious connections between this snippet of information and the traditions on Lampsakos (Sakellariou, *La migration grecque en Ionie*, 223 proposes that we should connect Lampsos with a homonymous place in Thessaly).

3) The death of Phobos from the Leukadian rocks is a further interesting element— moreover, this part too goes certainly back to Charon, if possibly through an intermediate source. There were various Leukadian Rocks, whose associations differed. A Leukadian Rock is mentioned in the *Odyssey*, 24. 11–12, as located past the streams of Okeanos and marking the limits between the living and the dead; in Anacreon (*PMG* 376), the jump from the rock of Leukas is a metaphor for falling in love: ‘Once again taking off from the rock of Leukas I dive into the grey wave, intoxicated with love’, while the reference to the Leukadian rocks in Euripides’ *Cyclops* 166 points to the oblivion caused by wine; further, according to Athenaios, 14. 619d–e, who quotes Aristoxenos as his source, Stesichoros composed a song called *Kalyke* from the name of the heroine who, because of her unrequited love for young Euathlos, threw herself from the Leukadian rocks (and presumably died). The story is thus ancient, and often, although not necessarily, linked to love and oblivion (see G. Nagy, ‘Phaethon, Sappho’s Phaon, and the White Rock of Leukas’, *HSCPh* 77 (1973), 137–148 = *id.*, *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca 1990), 223–234; but also U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin 1913), 25–33). References to jumping from the Leukadian rocks multiply in the Hellenistic period. According to Menander, as quoted by Strabo (Strabo 10. 2. 9 = Menander, *Leucadia*, fr. 1 Arnott, fr. 258 Körte-Thierfelder), Sappho was the first to leap from the rock, in her pursuit of Phaon; but Strabo adds that for others, more versed in the most ancient traditions (ἀρχαιολογικώτεροι), the first to take the plunge was Kephalos son of Deioneus, because of his love of Pterelas. (In this same context, Strabo also mentions a very ancient ritual, by which every year a criminal was thrown down from the rock to avert evil, as a φαρμακός; the love-motif is not the only one, although in our sources it appears as dominant.) For Ovid, the first human to jump from the rock of Leukas is Deukalion (*Heroides* 15, 167); Ptolemaios Chennos (by way of Photios’ *Bibliotheca*, 192f) has a long list of people who, out of love, jumped from the White Rocks, a list headed by Aphrodite, who took the plunge because of her love for the dead Adonis. The idiosyncratic character of the list of Ptolemaios Chennos is obvious: Phobos does not figure among those who took the leap, but neither do Sappho and Phaon, Kephalos, or Kalyke. More important is that Strabo too does not seem aware of the story of Phobos, or at any rate, does not consider it a ‘first’, even though he derives his information from sources ‘well versed in ancient histories’. A solution may be to imagine that Phobos was the first to throw himself in the sea from some specific White Rocks located either in the vicinity of Lampsakos, or close to Phocaea, rather than from the famous Leukadian rocks. Thus, Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides*, 28–9, gave a list of Mediterranean ‘White rocks’, among which he included a place Λευκαί close to Phocaea; he favoured, however, the Λευκή Ἀκτὴ located close to Chalcedonia, at the entrance to Propontis from the Black sea, and mentioned in Strabo 7. 6. 2. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 16, points out that Phobos first returned home and then leaped from the Rock; this makes the Λεύκη closer to Phocaea more appropriate.

What is the meaning of Phobos' leap? W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen 1921), 218, has attempted to explain it by unrequited love for Lampsake. But love does not have a role in the affair (unlike the other foundation stories discussed above): Lampsake acts out of respect for the promise made by her father, and dies of illness, not love. Antonelli, *Traffici focei di età arcaica*, 152-153, posits a connection between the leap of Phobos from the White Rocks and rituals of killing a *pharmakos* through stoning or *katapontismos*, widespread in the Phocaeen traditions. (For background on such rituals see J. Bremmer, 'Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece', *HSCP* 87 (1983), 299-320; on *katapontismos* see besides O. Schultess, s.v. 'Katapontismos', *RE* 10, 2 (1919), col. 2480-2482, C. Gallini, 'Katapontismos', *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 34, 1 (1963), 61-90). An instance is the story of the foundation of Phocaea, as narrated by Nicolaos of Damaskos, *FGrH* 90 F 51 = *Excerpta de insidiis* p. 17, 18: refugees from Phokis arrived in the neighbourhood of Aiolian Cymae, but their attempts at establishing themselves there were thwarted by the local tyrant Mennes. Ouatias however, the brother of the tyrant, became their friend and promised them a marriage agreement and land on which to establish themselves, if they overthrew the tyrant. The Phocians, with the help of Ouatias and a part of the Cymaeans, managed to overthrow the tyrant: they stoned him, and proceeded to found Phocaea. This story presents both matrimonial agreement and the stoning of a *pharmakos*. Another instance of purification through the ritual of the *pharmakos* is the tradition according to which the philosopher Zenon was responsible for the stoning of the tyrant Nearchos of Elea (Antisthenes of Rhodes, *FGrH* 508 F 11 = Diogenes Laertius 9. 27; Valerius Maximus 3. 3.2). Stoning also appears in the story of the Phocaeans who survived the battle of Alalia and were stoned at Agylla (Hdt. 1. 167). Moreover, Lampsake herself, the woman who betrays her compatriots, saves the Phocaeans, and then dies (although here because of illness), might be seen as a sort of *pharmakos*: so Brugnone, 'In margine alle tradizioni ecistiche', 59-63; Antonelli, *Traffici focei di età arcaica*, 152-156, who further compares the story of Lampsake, daughter of the king of the Bebrykes, and that of Pirene, also daughter of the king of the Bebrykes of Spain, who died as a result of her encounter with Herakles (cf. Strabo 4. 1. 3, Silius Italicus 3. 417-41). The death of Phobos from the Leukadian Rock could be understood in the context of a ritual of *katapontismos* linked to the foundation of the city (Strabo 10. 2. 9 closes his discussion of the Leukadian Rock with a reference to the ancestral custom of the Leukadians, to throw some criminal from the rock every year at the sacrifice performed in honor of Apollo, 'for the sake of averting evil'; men would be stationed below the rock in fishing-boats, to take the victim in and get him safely outside their borders; we have here an explicit connection between *katapontismos* and expulsion of a *pharmakos*). Antonelli concludes from this survey that these stories are part of a traditional Phocaeen heritage, already established when Charon wrote his *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*. He may well be right; but it should be noted that rituals of expulsion of the *pharmakos* are widespread in the ancient world, that there is no tight correspondence between the various instances, and that the potential for the development and modification of such and similar stories in the Hellenistic period should not be underrated.

4) The earlier name of the city is in F 7 said to have been Πιτυόεσσα, 'place of the pine-trees'; its inhabitants are the Bebrykes 'who are called Pityoessenoi' (the area is indeed covered with pine trees). Variants of the name exist, such as Πιτυούσσα (the more often attested name, cf. Strabo 13. 1. 18, who confirms the earlier account of Dei(l)ochos of Kyzikos or Prokonnesos, *BNJ* 471 T 1 and F 3); the grammarian Epaphroditus identified Lampsakos with the Homeric Πιτύεια (Homer, *Iliad* 2. 892), again so-called because of the many pine-trees (both Deiochos and Epaphroditos are preserved in Stephanos of Byzantium,

s.v. Lampsakos; cf. Braswell and Billerbeck, *The grammarian Epaphroditus*, 188–192). See also, for both Πιτύουσα and Πιτύεια, the scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios 1. 932-933b and the *Etymologicum genuinum* s.v. Πιτύεια (= *Etymologicum magnum* 673, 43-45 Gaisford). As pointed out by Guzzo, ‘Intorno a Lampsake’, 198-199, the toponym is part of a larger family of names in -oussa/ai attested in the archaic period all over the Mediterranean, which were often replaced by new denominations. Pityoussa is actually attested for a few other ‘historical’ cities: according to Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Miletos, the city which later became Miletos was initially called Lelegeis because of its original inhabitants, the Leleges; it then changed its name to Pityoussa, because of the pine-trees growing there (εἶτα Πιτύουσα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖ πιτύων καὶ ὅτι ἐκεῖ πρῶτον πίτυς ἔφυ), before being called Anaktoria and then, finally, Miletos. Similarly, an earlier name Pityoussa is again attested by Stephanos for the city of Phaselis, s.v.; such a change also took place in Chios (Strabo 13. 1. 18).

A passage of Herodotus which puns on the earlier name of Lampsakos has been often used to assess the relationship between Charon and Herodotus. In a flashback on events in the Chersonesos in the mid-sixth century, Herodotus narrates that Croesus forced the Lampsakenoi to free Miltiades, threatening, in case of refusal, to cut them down like a pine-tree (πίτυος τρόπον ἀπέιλεε ἐκτρίψειν, 6. 37. 1). Apparently the Lampsakenoi could not understand what Croesus meant, until someone pointed out that the pine is the only tree that does not regrow once it has been cut (the implied contrast is with the Athenian olive tree, which will send forth a shoot immediately after the sack of the Acropolis by the Persians, Hdt. 8. 55: so rightly E. S. Shuckburgh, *Herodotos VI. Erato* (Cambridge 1889), 110). As W. W. How and J. Wells, *Historical Commentary to Herodotus* (Oxford 1912), II 76 note, no inhabitant of Lampsakos could have missed the pun on the name of their city; and it is unlikely that Herodotus knew it and purposely omitted it. This means that Herodotus ignored the ancient name of Lampsakos, and thus was also not aware of Charon’s work (note however that D. Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto 1989), 106 lists this and Hdt. 1. 107 as passages for which Charon might have been the source). Since the story concerns Miltiades, Herodotus may have learnt it in Athens: this would explain both his ignorance of the ancient name of Lampsakos, and the precision of the measurements he gives for the isthmus, which will have been measured at the time of the Athenian resettlement in c. 447 (Plutarch, *Pericles* 19. 1).

5. Let us move to the names of the girl and her father. Mandron is a local, pre-Greek divine name widespread in Asia Minor; numerous personal names and place-names are derived from it. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 15-16 gives as instances Aphrodite Mandragoritis, mentioned without further information in Hesychius, s.v., and Mandrolytos, the king whose daughter Leukophrye out of love betrayed her city to Leukippos, in a coda added to the main story narrated in Parthenius, *Love stories*, 5 (discussion in J. L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford 1999), 396-412). The city is not mentioned in Parthenius, but it must have been Magnesia: for the long inscription in which the inhabitants of Magnesia on the Maeander narrate their foundation includes an oracle from Delphi naming Leukippos as the founder, while the place he will found is called ‘house of Mandrolytos’ (*I. Magnesia* 17, of c. 221/20 BC, ll. 46-51). For the relatively numerous personal names in Mandro-, particularly present in the Aegean islands and in coastal Asia minor, see the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, esp. vols. 1 and 5a.

Similarly, the name of the heroine is also non-Greek and local (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 14; note the existence of a place Lampsos in the area of Klazomenai). Leaf, *Strabo on the Troad*, 95 remarks that ‘no trace of Lampsake occurs in the abundant coinage of the state’. This is

true, in the sense that no certain identification is possible; but silver coinage of Lampsakos from the archaic period onwards (from c. 500 until the third quarter of the fourth century) presents a female janiform face on the obverse, and an Athena with Corinthian helmet to the right on the reverse; the janiform female (one of the 'distinctive badges' of the Lampsakene mint) might be identified with Lampsake (discussion of the janiform silver coins in A. Baldwin, 'Lampsakos: the gold staters, silver and bronze coinage', *American Journal of Numismatics* 53, 3 (1924), 57-65 with pl. V and VI; Baldwin does not attempt identifications, but see Jacoby *FGrH* 3a, 14). There is also, on Lampsakene gold staters of a group dated to the third quarter of the fourth century, a female head without attributes for whom the identification with the eponymous heroine Lampsake has been proposed (see Baldwin, *Lampsakos*, 17-18, and 27 n. 27, 42, with pl. II, 28 and 29).

Lampsake's part in the foundation narrative has given rise to various interpretations. Jacoby sees in her a local goddess (even in the narrative we have, she is not the 'founder' of the city, but rather its protrectress); he suggests that her characterization as παρθένος, as well as the marked progress in the honours, first heroic, then divine, are the result of a process of rationalization of the story, that led to the transformation of a local divinity into a young woman honoured with heroic honours first, and then with divine honours again. For his part, Domínguez Monedero, 'Lámpsace', 156-157, stresses that Lampsake, not being the 'founder' of the city, should not receive honours at all, and certainly not divine ones; he thus considers her divinization as another element speaking for the late date of this story. However, the name will not have come to the city from nowhere; and it is a non-Greek name. On Lampsake and her role of heroine and eponymous goddess, see E. Kearns, 'The nature of heroines', in S. Blundell and M. Williamson (eds.) *The sacred and the feminine in ancient Greece* (London 1998), 106, who proposes a comparison with the Amazons founders of other Asian cities (even so, her divinization remains problematic, unless we accept Jacoby's model of a local goddess, rationalized and woven into the foundation story).

One interesting aspect is Lampsake's virginity. As we saw, the Phocaeen narratives of the foundation of Massalia all include love and a wedding between the young local woman and the Phocaeen visitor; and nothing is said of a death of the woman. However, there are numerous stories (the best known being that of Tarpeia) of young princesses who fall in love with the enemy commander, betray their countrymen, and are punished with death (see W. Burkert, *Greek Mythology and Ritual* (1979), 72-77, with the remarks of J. L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford 1999), 131-2). In F 7a, however, love would seem to have been 'displaced' onto the other twin, who jumps off the Leukadian rock, while no reason is given for Lampsake's betrayal of the Bebrykes; the heroine dies, as she must, to protect the city, but through an illness. Possibly virginity was an important aspect of the local goddess on whom Lampsake may have been modelled. But, more importantly, we should avoid the temptation of bringing back slightly different stories to one unique model. This had been emphasized already by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a (Kommentar), 12: 'man sollte überhaupt nicht zu viel vom 'novellentyp' reden und vor allem nicht die einzelnen geschichten eines solchen 'typs' über einen leisten schlagen' – he was attacking Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle*, 218, who had compared the story of Skylla, who betrays father and city (e.g. Aeschylus, *Libations bearers* 613-622), and that of the Parian temple-servant Timo, who unsuccessfully helped Miltiades against Paros (Hdt. 6. 134-5). As pointed out by E. Kearns, 'Saving the city', in O. Murray and S. R. F. Price, *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990), 323-344, numerous types of marginal figures die in various ways to save the city.

Any conclusion is bound to remain hypothetical. While the story may well be an ancient one, while a version of it may have figured in Charon's *Horoi*, and while it does indeed fit a 'Phocaeen model', we must bear in mind the likelihood of extensive reworking / modification in the Hellenistic period. It is at any rate interesting to see that in the part that certainly goes back to Charon, the beginning, we find mention of a 'first', which chimes with the readiness of Herodotus and Hellanikos to single out 'first inventors' (a point made by L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 145); it is also interesting to note that this particular 'first' is isolated against the rest of the tradition, which has other 'first jumpers'. As for the rest, Charon will have discussed in some detail the Ionian colonization; what we have in Plutarch is probably a reworked and compressed account, adjusted to make it fit the schemes typical of the treatises on women. See further on all this the detailed commentary of Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 10-17; note also that A. Hepperle, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *Festschrift O. Regenbogen zum 65. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg 1956, 67-76 (*non vidi*), has argued that F 7a, as also F 1, were reworked in the Hellenistic period.

262 F 8 - (7) Scholia ad Apollonium Rhodium 2, 2	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="8" sourcework(level1="Scholia" level2="ad Apollonium Rhodium" level3="Argonautica" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 2")]]
Subject: colonization; Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 5 C BC Historical period: 7th C BC	Translation
<p>τῶν Βεβρύκων ἐβασίλευσεν Ἄμυκος, τῆς Βιθυνίας τὰ τε ἄλλα κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους καὶ τὰ παραθαλάσσια κατεχόντων. κατώικησαν δέ τινες αὐτῶν καὶ περὶ τὴν Λυδίαν ἐν τοῖς πλησίον Ἐφέσου τε καὶ Μαγνησίας τόποις. Χάρων δέ φησι καὶ τὴν Λαμψακηνῶν χώραν πρότερον Βεβρυκίαν καλεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν κατοικησάντων αὐτὴν Βεβρύκων. τὸ δὲ γένος αὐτῶν ἠφάνισται διὰ τοὺς γενομένους πολέμους, καθάπερ καὶ ἄλλων ἔθνων.</p>	<p>Amykos was the king of the Bebrykes, who at that time controlled all the rest of Bithynia as well as the coastal region. Some of them established themselves in Lydia too, in the region close to Ephesus and Magnesia. But Charon says that the land of the Lampsakenoi was also earlier called Bebrykia from the Bebrykes who occupied it. However, their race has disappeared because of the many wars, as happened also for other peoples.</p>

262 F 8 Commentary

The source followed initially by the scholiast locates the Bebrykes in Bithynia and in Lydia; but the scholiast proceeds to qualify the information by adding that according to Charon also the region around Lampsakos was occupied by the Bebrykes. On the geographical distribution of the Bebrykes see now F. Prêteux, 'Priapos Bébrykès dans la Propontide et les Détroits: succès d'un mythe local', *REG* 118 (2005) 246-265. Bebrykes are also mentioned in F 7, as the population established at the place that later became the city of Lampsakos. F 7 and 8 may thus come from the same work, and on the whole a provenance from the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* seems likely. Charon will have mentioned the earlier name of the Lampsakene territory, Bebrykia; mention of this name may have led to the recounting of some of the stories connected with the travels of the Argonauts (so L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 143-144: "for it would be quite in the manner of a logographer to point out the association of his native city with the ancient legend; Hecataeus in the

Periegesis was in the habit of indicating such associations, and it is to be expected that Charon would deal with them more fully in a special work on Lampsacus.”)

<p>262 F 9 - (1) Plutarch De Herod. mal. 20 p. 859 AB</p>	<p>meta[[id="262" type="F" n="9" sourcework(level1="Plutarchus" level2="" level3="De Herodoti malignitate" level4="" level5="" level6="20, 859ab")]]</p>
<p>Subject: War Historical Work: Persika? Source date: end of 1st - beginning 2nd C AD Historian's date: 5 C BC Historical period: c. 546 BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Πακτύην δ' ἀποστάντα Κύρου φησὶ (Herodot. 1, 156–160) Κυμαίους καὶ Μυτιληναίους ἐκδιδόναι παρασκευάζεσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον «ἐπὶ μισθῶι <ᾧ> οὐ γὰρ ἔχω <τοῦτό> γε εἰπεῖν ἀτρεκέως» (εὖ τὸ μὴ διαβεβαιουῖσθαι πόσος ἦν ὁ μισθός, τηλικούτο δ' Ἑλληνίδι πόλει προσβαλεῖν ὄνειδος, ὡς δὴ σαφῶς εἰδότα), Χίους μέντοι τὸν Πακτύην κομισθέντα πρὸς αὐτοὺς «ἐξ ἱεροῦ Ἀθηναίης πολιούχου» ἐκδοῦναι, καὶ ταῦτα ποιῆσαι τοῦς Χίους τὸν Ἀταρνεά μισθὸν λαβόντας. καίτοι Χάρων ὁ Λαμψακηνός, ἀνὴρ πρεσβύτερος, ἐν τοῖς περὶ Πακτύην λόγοις γενόμενος τοιοῦτον οὐδὲν οὔτε Μυτιληναίοις οὔτε Χίοις ἄγος προστέτριπται, ταυτὶ δὲ κατὰ λέξιν γέγραφε· #quote# «Πακτύης δ' ὡς ἐπύθετο προσελαύνοντα τὸν στρατὸν τὸν Περσικόν, ὥιχετο φεύγων ἄρτι μὲν εἰς Μυτιλήνην, ἔπειτα δ' εἰς Χίον· καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐκράτησε Κῦρος». #</p>	<p>He (Herodotus) says that when Paktyes revolted from Cyrus, the Cymaeans and the Mytileneans were prepared to deliver the man ‘for a certain payment; for I cannot say the amount with certainty’ (brilliant, not to be positive on the amount of the payment, but to cast such a shame at a Greek city, as if knowing it for a certainty), and that the Chians when Paktyes was brought to them delivered him ‘from the sanctuary of Athena protectress of the city’, and that the Chians did this having received as payment Atarneus. And yet Charon of Lampsakos, an older man, when he arrives to the narrative concerning Paktyes did not charge the Mytileneans nor the Chians with such pollution, on the contrary he wrote these very words: ‘When Paktyes learnt that the Persian army was approaching, he fled first to Mytilene, then to Chios; and there Cyrus overpowered him’.</p>

262 F 9 Commentary

This passage refers to the first encounter between the Ionians and the Persians led by Cyrus: after the fall of Sardis and Cyrus’ conquest of Lydia in (probably) 546 BC, Cyrus left for Ecbatana (for the chronological problems see P. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: a History of the Persian Empire* (Winona Lake, IN 2002), 34–36). The city of Sardis was entrusted to Tabalos, and Paktyes was put in charge of transporting the gold (Hdt. 1.153). Paktyes however revolted, and Cyrus sent Mazares the Mede to subdue the revolt and capture Paktyes (cf. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 37–38). Plutarch here contrasts the accounts of Herodotus (1. 153-161) and Charon; he even offers a textual quotation from the latter (so also in F 10). Of Herodotus’ narrative however Plutarch offers only a very biased summary. Herodotus actually states that the Cymaeans were uncertain over what to do with Paktyes and consulted the oracle three times; the impressive final answer of the oracle of Branchidai, as reported by Herodotus, would not have fitted Plutarch’s agenda, and is

omitted. As a result of their consultation, the Cymaeans decided not to deliver Paktyes, and sent him to Mytilene, and thence to Chios when Mytilene seemed not to offer safety enough (on the version of Herodotus see M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di *Persika* II: Carone di Lampsaco', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 7 (1977), 13-15, and D. Asheri, in D. Asheri, A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus books I-IV* (Oxford 2004), 181-183).

Even Plutarch's biased summary cannot hide the fact that Herodotus is much richer in details; Charon omits any mention of Cymae, and offers a bare factual report, in which Paktyes flees to Mytilene and then Chios. In its bare bones, Charon's narrative does not contradict Herodotus; if Plutarch had to be content with material of this kind, which does not really fulfil his agenda, it must be because Charon's work did not offer him more (so already Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 17).

If the fragment comes from Charon's *Persika*, as seems most likely (see Moggi, 'Autori greci di *Persika* II', 15 n. 54 for a convincing argument), then we must conclude that this work presented the traits of concision typical also of the chronicle. As Moggi, 'Autori greci di *Persika* II', 16 further points out, if this is a good sample of Charon's *Persika*, then the issue of the chronological anteriority of Charon over Herodotus loses much of its importance: because clearly Herodotus had nothing to learn or gain from Charon's work, even had he known it.

262 F 10 - (2) Plutarch De Herod. mal. 24 p. 861 A-D	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="10" sourcework(level1="Plutarchus" level2="" level3="De Herodoti malignitate" level4="" level5="" level6="24, 861ad")]]
Subject: War, Ionian revolt Historical Work: <i>Persika</i> ? Source date: end of 1st - beginning 2nd C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 498-7 BC	Translation
<p>ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐφεξῆς τὰ περὶ Σάρδεις διηγούμενος ὡς ἐνήν μάλιστα διέλυσε καὶ διελυμήνατο τὴν πρᾶξιν, ἃς μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι ναῦς ἐξέπεμψαν Ἴωσι τιμωροὺς ἀποστᾶσι βασιλέως «ἀρχεκάκους» τολμήσας προσειπεῖν ..., Ἐρετριέων δὲ κοιμῆθι μνησθεῖς ἐν παρέργῳ καὶ παρασιωπήσας μέγα κατόρθωμα καὶ αἰδίμον. ἤδη γὰρ ὡς²</p>	<p>And in what follows, relating the events of Sardis (Herodotus 5. 99–102), he diminished and discredited the matter as much as he could, daring to call the ships which the Athenians sent to the assistance of the Ionians who had revolted from the king 'beginning of evils' (5. 97. 3)..., and making mention of the Eretrians only by</p>

² The text here is corrupt: according to the apparatus of P. A. Hansen, *Plutarchi de Herodoti malignitate* (Amsterdam 1979), after ὡς the manuscript B has a five-letter lacuna, E a three-letter lacuna. Hansen considers this a 'locus desperatus', and thinks that besides the lacuna indicated by the manuscripts it is necessary to postulate two further lacunae, one after προσπλέοντες, the other after κατεναυμάχῃσαν; he dagers the text from ἤδη to κατεναυμάχῃσαν. Muret and then Wytttenbach proposed τῶν for the lacuna indicated in the manuscripts; this is accepted by G. Lachenaud, *Plutarque. Traités 54-57* (Paris 1981), 156, and by A. J. Bowen, *Plutarch. The malice of Herodotus* (Warminster 1992), 122–123, who takes the ὡς with the two participles, as giving them causal meaning. I follow here Bowen's text. Tuplin, in *BNJ* 426 F 1, accepts the supplement and correction ἤδη γὰρ ὡς <ἐπύθοντο τὰ> περὶ τὴν Ἴωνίαν συγκεχυμένα, proposed by Cobet and accepted by Jacoby; the meaning of the passage is not altered.

<τῶν> περὶ τὴν Ἴωνίαν συγκεχυμένων³ καὶ στόλου βασιλικοῦ προσπλέοντος, ἀπαντήσαντες ἔξω Κυπρίου ἐν τῷ Παμφυλίῳ πελάγει κατεναυμάχησαν, εἴτ' ἀναστρέψαντες ὀπίσω καὶ τὰς ναῦς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καταλιπόντες ἐπέθεντο Σάρδεσι καὶ Ἀρταφέρνην ἐπολιόρκουν εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν καταφυγόντα, βουλόμενοι τὴν Μιλήτου λῦσαι πολιορκίαν. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἔπραξαν καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους ἀνέστησαν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν φόβῳ θαυμαστῷ γενομένους, πλήθους δ' ἐπιχυθέντος αὐτοῖς ἀπεχώρησαν. ταῦτα δ' ἄλλοι τε καὶ Λυσανίας ὁ Μαλλώτης ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἐρετρίας (III B) εἶρηκε ὁ δὲ (5, 112) καὶ κρατηθέντας αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων φησὶν εἰς τὰς ναῦς καταδιωχθῆναι, μηδὲν τοιοῦτο τοῦ Λαμψακηνοῦ Χάρωνος ἱστοροῦντος ἀλλὰ ταυτὶ γράφοντος κατὰ λέξιν· # quote# « Ἀθηναῖοι δ' εἴκοσι τριήρησιν ἔπλευσαν ἐπικουρήσαντες τοῖς Ἴωσι· καὶ εἰς Σάρδεῖς ἐστρατεύσαντο καὶ εἶλον τὰ περὶ Σάρδεῖς ἅπαντα χωρὶς τοῦ τείχους τοῦ βασιλείου· ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ἐπαναχωροῦσιν εἰς Μίλητον». #

the way (5. 99. 1; 5. 102. 3), and passing over in silence a great and memorable action of theirs. For when all Ionia was in confusion and the King's fleet approached, they met the Cypriots outside in the Pamphylian Sea and beat them in a sea-fight, then turning back and leaving their ships at Ephesos they attacked Sardis and besieged Artaphernes who had fled to the acropolis, desiring to raise the siege of Miletos. And this indeed they effected, causing the enemies to move their camp from there, having put them in an extraordinary terror; but then being set upon by a multitude, they retired. This has been related by several writers, among which in particular Lysanias of Mallos in his *On Eretria*. ... but he says that they were defeated by the barbarians and pursued to their ships, even though Charon of Lampsakos has no such thing, but writes thus, word for word: "The Athenians set forth with twenty triremes to the assistance of the Ionians, and going to Sardis, took all thereabouts, except the King's wall; which having done, they returned to Miletus."

262 F 10 Commentary

This is the second fragment of Charon quoted by Plutarch in his *On the malice of Herodotus*. The context this time is the Ionian revolt; the presentation of Plutarch is again rather tendentious. Plutarch begins by reproaching Herodotus for qualifying the ships that the Athenians sent to Ionia as 'beginning of evils', ignoring the fact that the epic parallel might here function simply as the marker of great events to come (see A. J. Bowen, *Plutarch. The Malice of Herodotus* (Warminster 1992), 122: the allusion is to the ships of Alexander that brought Helen to Troy, Homer, *Iliad* 5. 63). Plutarch further protests that Herodotus mentioned the Eretrians only in passing, ignoring their great deed, a naval victory at Cyprus, narrated in the history of Eretria by Lysanias of Mallos, before the attack on Sardis; it is also Lysanias, 'with many other writers', who is mentioned as source for the notion that the attack on Sardis has the purpose to free Miletos from siege. The narrative of Lysanias indeed differs from that of Herodotus (for a detailed commentary, and a skeptical assessment of the value of Lysanias' narrative, see Tuplin on *BNJ* 426 F 1; P. Tozzi, 'Plutarco e la rivolta ionica', *RSA* 6-7, 1976-77, 75-80); there is no other mention of this battle in extant literature.

As for Charon, he does not really contradict Herodotus: he rather says less. He states that

³ συγκεχυμένων is the proposal of Muret and Wyttenbach, accepted by G. Lachenaud, *Plutarque. Traités 54-57* (Paris 1981), 156, and Bowen, *Plutarch. The malice of Herodotus* (Warminster 1992), 122-123; according to Hansen, the manuscript E has συγκεχυμέν followed by a lacuna of one or two letters and ν; B has συγκεχυμένην, 'e coniectura ut puto' (Hansen, *Plutarchi de Herodoti malignitate* (Amsterdam 1979), 23).

the Athenians sent 20 ships to the Ionians, just as Herodotus does in 5. 97.3, but omits to mention the five ships sent by the Eretrians (Herodotus 5. 99. 1). He then goes on to say that they (presumably Athenians and Ionians) took Sardis, except the King's wall— Herodotus 5. 100–102.1 says the same, giving more details (Herodotus speaks of 'Ionians', but he has mentioned the Athenians' arrival in Ionia just before, in 5. 99. 1). Charon however closes his account stating simply that afterwards they returned to Miletos. Here Herodotus' account differs: immediately after the capture of Sardis there is a problematic chapter, in which a defeat near Ephesos is mentioned, after which the Ionians disperse themselves to their own cities, and it is to this passage that Plutarch refers. In Herodotus, the narrative resumes at 5. 103 with a recapitulative sentence, followed by the decision of the Athenians to leave ('thus they fought then; and then the Athenians...', τότε μὲν δὴ οὕτω ἡγωνίσαντο· μετὰ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι...). Next come the events of Cyprus (Hdt. 5. 104–5. 116); it is only after the Cypriots have been subdued that the focus shifts back to Ionia.

The defeat near Ephesos mentioned in Hdt. 5. 102 is problematic for two reasons. First, it seems to contrast with Charon's narrative. Second, it does not make historical sense: why would the revolt have expanded to include even Cyprus, if the Ionians, right after the conquest of Sardis, had been badly defeated in Ephesos? Two types of explanation have been advanced.

Some authors consider that Charon left out events damaging for the Greeks, either simply because his work was the first and very synthetic description of the Persian wars (so E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* part 4, vol. 3 (Berlin - Stuttgart² 1915), 304, who assumed that Charon was writing some time after 464 BC), or because of an ideological choice (so S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* I (Roma-Bari 1965), 107, who proposed that Charon had glossed silently over an event that damaged the Greeks' reputation because he was still writing in the cultural atmosphere which had led to Phrynichos' punishment over the representation of the *Capture of Miletos*). As Jacoby, *FGH* 3a, 17, has pointed out, a number of other details present in Herodotus and not damaging to the Greeks are also left out, so ideological choice cannot be the only explanation.

Others have taken a radical line and suggested that such a battle never took place: its mention in Herodotus would be due to his profound dislike for the revolt (so J. Beloch, *Griechische geschichte* (Berlin-Leipzig 1927²), 11 and G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Greci, dalle origini alla fine del secolo V* (Firenze 1939), 11). This is simply impossible, when one considers the richness of details that Herodotus gives (in particular, the death of the Eretrian general Eualkides, and the further information on the fact that Simonides had sung of his victories in competitions, Hdt. 5. 102.3).

A third interpretation has been put forward by L. Piccirilli, 'Carone di Lampsaco ed Erodoto', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 5 (1975), 1239-1254, namely, that the battle mentioned in 5. 102 is the same as that mentioned in 5. 116 which took place in 497/6BC, after the Persians reconquered Cyprus: for Piccirilli, in 5. 102. 1-3 Herodotus presents a summary of the events which followed. Indeed, Hdt. 5. 116 recalls explicitly the destruction of Sardis: Daurises, Hymaies and Otanes 'pursued those Ionians who had marched to Sardis, and drove them to their ships. After this victory they divided the cities among themselves and sacked them' (ἐπιδιώξαντες τοὺς ἐς Σάρδις στρατευσαμένους Ἴώνων καὶ ἐσαράξαντες σφεας ἐς τὰς νέας, τῇ μάχῃ ὡς ἐπεκράτησαν, τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν ἐπιδιελόμενοι τὰς πόλεις ἐπόρθουν: see Piccirilli, 'Carone di Lampsaco', 1247–1248 for the verbal echoes between the two passages). That the two passages referred to the same battle had been suggested also earlier, e.g. by W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus II* (Oxford 1912), 63, who however thought that the event was to be dated right after the battle of Sardis, and before the revolt on Cyprus.

Piccirilli's interpretation has been accepted by M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di *Persika* II: Carone di Lampsaco', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 7 (1977), 17–18, S. Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e Carone', in *VIII Miscellanea greca e romana* (Roma 1982), 26–28 = *Scritti minori* III (Roma 1990), 1260–1261), and G. Nenci, *Erodoto. Le Storie, libro V* (Milano 1994), 310. If Charon does not mention the battle of Ephesos, it is not because of any bias, but simply because he is talking of the conquest of Sardis, which was not immediately followed by the disaster of Ephesos; Moggi, 'Autori greci di *Persika* II', 18 and Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e Carone', 1261 both think that Charon might have talked of the battle of Ephesos slightly later, with Plutarch not noticing (the question then arises of the extent of Charon's work available to Plutarch).

This may be so, or not; the Herodotean narrative of the Ionian revolt is beset with problems. But for what concerns Charon, one thing is clear: Plutarch, in his desire to accuse Herodotus, makes conflicting use of his two sources, Lysanias and Charon. The former mentions the Eretrians alone, the latter ignores the Eretrians and focuses on the Athenians (the contradictions between these two authors have been pointed out by Tozzi, 'Plutarco', 76–79; see also C. Schrader, 'La batalla naval de Panfilia y el fragmento 1 de Lisania (=Plutarco, *De Herodoti malignitate* 24', in J. García López and E. Calderón Dorda (eds.), *Estudios sobre Plutarco: Paisaje y Naturaleza*, Madrid 1991, 124 n. 43). So Jacoby's conclusion stands: 'the also factually unjustified polemic simply shows that Plutarch found very little in Charon that he could use against Herodotus; this gives us a sense of the scope of the materials provided by Charon' ('die hier auch sachlich unberechtigte polemik zeigt nur, dass Plutarch bei Charon wenig fand was sich gegen Herodotos verwenden liess; und das erlaubt schluss auf den umfang des von Charon gebotenen materials', *FGrH* 3a, 17; see further his discussion, 17–18).

Note that Herodotus, when talking of the Athenian navy before the Persian wars, throughout (in 5. 97. 3 for the twenty ships sent to Ionia; in 6. 132, for the 70 ships with which Miltiades made his expedition against Paros; and in 6. 89 for the ships they equipped against Aegina) speaks of νέες without further precisions (although he also affirms, 6. 39. 1 and 41. 1, that the Peisistratids sent Miltiades to the Thracian Chersonese with a trireme in 515 BC); Charon states that the ships sent to help the Ionian rebels were triremes, τριήρεις. This has of course implications as to the power of the Athenian navy just before the Persian wars (discussion in W. Blösel, *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 2004), 77–78). But it might be a linguistic choice: see also F 3, where, if we are to trust Aelian's wording, the same difference in the use of νέες (Herodotus) versus τριήρεις (Charon) obtains, but this time in respect to the Persian fleet of 492 BC.

Remains of monumental terracing walls in Lydian limestone and sandstone, brought to light just below the top of the north side of the Acropolis of Sardis, can be related to Charon's reference to a 'King's wall', which the Athenians could not take: there was a palatial structure on the acropolis (see G. M. A. Hanfmann, 'On Lydian Sardis', in K. DeVries (ed.), *From Athens to Gordion: the papers of a Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young* (Philadelphia 1908), 104–105).

262 F 11 - (5) Plutarch Them. 27, 1	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="11" sourcework(level1="Plutarchus" level2="" level3="Themistocles" level4="" level5="" level6="27, 1-2")]]
Subject: Historical Work: unknown	Translation

Source date: end of 1st - beginning 2nd C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: c. 465 BC	
<p>Θουκυδίδης μὲν οὖν καὶ Χάρων ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς ἱστοροῦσιν τεθνηκότος Ξέρξου πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τῶι Θεμιστοκλεῖ γενέσθαι τὴν ἔντευξιν· Ἔφορος δὲ καὶ Δείνων καὶ Κλείταρχος καὶ Ἡρακλείδης ἔτι δ' ἄλλοι πλείονες πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφικέσθαι τὸν Ξέρξην. (2) τοῖς δὲ χρονικοῖς δοκεῖ μᾶλλον ὁ Θουκυδίδης συμφέρεσθαι, καίπερ οὐδ' αὐτοῖς ἀτρέμα συνταττομένοις.</p>	<p>Thucydides (1. 137. 3) and Charon of Lampsakos record that after Xerxes was dead, Themistokles had his audience with the latter's son; but Ephoros (70 F 190), Deinon (BNJ 690 F 13), Kleitarchos (BNJ 137 F 33), Herakleides (BNJ 689 F 6) and many more beside have it that he came to Xerxes himself. Thucydides seems to correspond best with the chronological records, though even these are not firmly in accordance with one another.</p>

262 F 11 Commentary

Notwithstanding his record in the Persian wars, Themistokles was first banished from Athens, and then, pursued by both Athenians and Spartans, finally found refuge at the court of the Great king. Under dispute here is whether the king was still Xerxes I (485-465 BC) or Artaxerxes I (465-425 BC). The two fifth-century authors, Thucydides and Charon, agree on Artaxerxes I; so also Idomeneus of Lampsakos, writing c. 300 BC, *FGrH* 338 F 1, and Nepos, *Themistocles*, 9.1, the latter on grounds that Thucydides was closest to the events and came from the same city as Themistokles (Nepos does not mention Charon). But the fourth-century historians, from Ephoros onwards, could probably not resist the dramatic effect of imagining an encounter between Themistokles and Xerxes (see V. Parker, on Ephoros *BNJ* 70 F 190; J. L. Marr, *Plutarch: Life of Themistocles* (Warminster 1998), 149-150; F. J. Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles. A Historical Commentary* (Princeton 1980), 213-214 for a complete list of those who followed the one or the other version). Plutarch states his agreement with Thucydides, because it corresponds best with the χρονικά (chronological records), although 'even these are not firmly in accordance with one another': indeed, the date of Themistokles' travels constitutes one of the thorniest problems of the Pentekontaetia. This may implicitly mean that Charon's account was briefer, possibly limited to an indication of Themistokles' arrival at the king's court (his work might be one of the χρονικά mentioned by Plutarch).

Charon could have had first-hand information on this issue, since Lampsakos is one of the cities that the king gave to Themistokles 'for his bread, wine, and fish' (Plutarch, *Life of Themistocles* 29. 11: the others were Magnesia and Myous, and possibly, according to Neanthes and Phantias, also Perkote and Palaiskepsis). Themistokles established himself at Magnesia; as Lampsakos and Myous feature in the Athenian tribute list of 454 BC, it has been suggested that their gift to Themistokles was purely nominal. This may have been the case, especially for Myous; however, Themistokles and his family are a 'presence' at Lampsakos, or must have become part of the city's traditions early on: an inscription dated to c. 200 BC attests an annual festival in honour of Themistokles, and mentions benefits enjoyed by his descendants (P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos* (Bonn 1978), 9-14, n° 3, ll. 12-15; compare the slightly different positions of Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles*, 219-224, and Marr, *Plutarch: Life of Themistocles*, 154-155; and I. Malkin, *Religion and colonization in ancient Greece* (Leiden 1987), 226-228).

In what work of Charon this information appeared is anyone's guess. E. Schwartz, 'Charon 7', *RE*, III/2 (Stuttgart 1899), 2179 thought that it was part of the *Chronicles of Lampsakos*, and that it actually constituted the terminus post quem for the publication of that work. This is certainly possible, because of the close links between the city of Lampsakos and Themistokles; a short notice at the appropriate moment would fit perfectly what we see of the fragment. But depending on one's view on the list of titles transmitted by the *Suda*, the *Persika*, the *Prytaneis* and even the *Hellenika* are in theory possible. If the passage appeared in the *Hellenika*, it would imply that this work was published after the end of the Peloponnesian war – otherwise the statement of Thucydides in 1. 97, that no one had narrated the Pentekontaetia before him, would become difficult to explain (further discussion in 'Biographical essay').

W. Blösel, *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 2004), 350–354 attempts, in the context of a discussion of the change of the image of Themistokles in the fifth century, to retrieve Charon's own view of Themistokles. His argument is the following: the massive accusations of corruption, present in the (lost or fragmentary) literature of the mid-fifth century, disappear almost entirely from the narratives of Herodotus and Thucydides, and are also absent in later authors; the reason is that Herodotus' work imposed itself. But Charon, who was active before Herodotus, and who must have given some place in his work to the man who had become so important in Lampsakos, could have presented Themistokles as a traitor. Blösel suggests that Thucydides relied on Charon's work, and in particular that Charon, who living close to Daskyleion was well aware of the Persian official style, composed the false letter of Themistokles to Artaxerxes (Thucydides, 1. 137. 4) as a damning accusation. Thucydides, in order to support his own positive view of Themistokles, modified the text of the letter, inserting a sentence that made his previous dealings with Xerxes understandable as an attempt to trick the king (same argument also in W. Blösel, 'Thucydides on Themistocles: a Herodotean narrator?', in E. Foster and D. Lateiner, *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford 2012), 226–229, and in part. 228: 'We can, however, surely assume that the author of the purportedly Themistoclean letter, probably Charon, in the passage which Thucydides replaced with his insertion, originally had Themistocles expressly confess his treason in sending a secret message from Salamis'). However, Blösel's account is hardly free from difficulties. It is true that the letters in Thucydides' first book (those concerning Pausanias, and the one by Themistokles) are problematic: they can hardly be authentic, and one wonders where Thucydides found the information. But Blösel's overall explanation implies accepting that Thucydides relied for his excursus on Themistokles on an Athenian tradition circulating in the 420s and favourable to Themistokles (Blösel, 'Thucydides on Themistocles', 220–221), while at the same time taking 'the bulk of the two excurses verbatim from Charon' (228), an author that according to Blösel offered a very negative judgment on Themistokles. However, one can hardly imagine Thucydides silently modifying the implications of the letter, if Charon's work containing the 'original' document had been circulating. The image of Themistokles in the source containing the letter may have been already a relatively positive one – in which case Charon (if he was the source – a point that is entirely hypothetical, see below, Biographical essay) and the Athenian tradition circulating in the 420s do not have to be strictly distinguished; but Charon then becomes a writer publishing in the 420s or possibly even later. More importantly, all this does not really fit the profile of Charon, as it emerges from the fragments.

We have very little of Charon, but the little we have shows an author who explores the past amply enough, but whose narrative of comparatively recent events is extremely sparse. (Unless we assume that the distinction runs along the lines of the type of work, with ample digressions in the *Chronicles*, and sparse factual account in the *Persika*). Moreover, would someone from Lampsakos and writing before Herodotus, i.e. before the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, take such a virulent anti-Themistoklean stance? Why? On the whole, the case for bringing back to Charon the anti-Themistoklean tradition, and for considering him as the source of Thucydides, as formulated by Blösel in *Themistokles bei Herodot* and in 'Thucydides on Themistocles', opens up fascinating possibilities, but remains non proven, and in the way it is presented, unlikely.

<p>262 F 12a - (12–13) Scholia ad Apollonium Rhodium 2, 476/83a</p>	<p>meta[[id="262" type="F" n="12" n-mod="a" sourcework(level1="Scholia" level2="ad Apollonium Rhodium" level3="Argonautica" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 476-483a")]]</p>
<p>Subject: myth, mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 5 C BC Historical period: mythical past</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>(Et. Gen. p. 18, 11 Rei; Et. M. p. 75, 26): Ἀμαδρυάδος νύμφης · Ἀμαδρυάδας νύμφας Μνησίμαχος φησι διὰ τὸ ἅμα ταῖς δρυσὶ γεννᾶσθαι· ἢ ἐπεὶ δοκοῦσιν ἅμα ταῖς δρυσὶ φθειρεσθαι, νήμφαι Ἀμαδρυάδες λέγονται. Χάρων γὰρ ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς ἱστορεῖ ὡς ἄρα Ῥοϊκός, θεασάμενος δρῦν ὅσον οὐπω μέλλουσαν ἐπὶ γῆς καταφέρεισθαι, προσέταξε τοῖς παισὶν ὑποστηρίξει ταύτην. ἢ δὲ μέλλουσα συμφθειρεσθαι τῇ δρυὶ νύμφη ἐπιστᾶσα τῷ Ῥοϊκῷ χάριν μὲν ἐφάσκεν εἶδέναι ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας, ἐπέτρεπεν δὲ αἰτήσασθαι ὅ τι βούλοιο. ὡς δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἠξίου συγγενέσθαι αὐτῇ, ἐπιζήμιον μὲν <οὐκ> ἔλεγεν εἶναι τοῦτο, φυλάξασθαι δὲ ὅμως ἐτέρας γυναικὸς ὁμιλίαν, ἔσεσθαι δὲ μετὰ αὐτῶν ἄγγελον μέλισσαν. καὶ ποτε πεσσεύοντος αὐτοῦ παράπτато ἢ μέλισσα· πικρότερον δὲ τι ἀποφθεγξάμενος εἰς ὄργην ἔτρεψε τὴν νύμφην, ὥστε πηρωθῆναι αὐτόν. καὶ Πίνδαρος δὲ φησι περὶ νυμφῶν ποιούμενος τὸν λόγον «ἰσοδένδρου τέκμαρ αἰῶνος λαχοῖσα». ὁ οὖν τοῦ Παραιβίου πατήρ ἐκκόπτων δρῦν παρεκαλεῖτο ὑπὸ νύμφης μὴ τεμεῖν αὐτήν· συγγεγεννημένη γὰρ οὖσα ἂν ἐκκοπῆι, παραιτίαν αὐτῇ ἔσεσθαι θανάτου· ἀπιθήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ νεμεσῆσαι τὸ δαιμόνιον αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς ἐγγόνοις</p>	<p>Mnesimachos (FGrH 841 F 3) says that the Hamadryad nymphs are so called because they were born at the same time as the oaks; or because they appear to die together (<i>hama</i>) with the oaks (<i>dryes</i>), for that reason they are called nymphs Hamadryads. Well, Charon of Lampsakos narrates that once Rhoikos, having seen an oak tree which was on the verge of falling to the ground, ordered his servants to redress it. The nymph who was going to die with the tree appeared to Rhoikos and said that she was grateful for having been saved, and invited him to request whatever he wanted. And when he asked to become her lover, she said that he would not be punished for that, but that he should avoid consorting with another woman, and that a bee would be the messenger between them. And once as he was playing draughts the bee flew around him; he exclaimed sharply and provoked the anger of the nymph, so that he was blinded. Pindar too says, when speaking of the nymphs (<i>fr. inc.</i> 252 + 165 S.-M.), 'having received a length of life equal to the tree'. But as the father of Paraibios was cutting an oak, a nymph begged him not to cut it;</p>

καὶ κακῶν γενέσθαι παραίτιον.	for as they had been born at the same time, if the tree was cut, it would cause her death too. But he was not persuaded, and the divinity took revenge on him and on his descendants, and became a cause of evils.
-------------------------------	--

262 F 12a Commentary

See below, commentary to F12b.

262 F 12b - Tzetzes Ad Lycophronem 480	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="12" n-mod="b" sourcework(level1="Tzetzes (Joannes)" level2="ad lycophronem [Vide: schol. ad Lycophronem]" level3="Alexandra (Scheer E.)" level4="" level5="" level6="480")]]
Subject: myth Historical Work: unknown Source date: 12th C AD Historian's date: 5 C BC Historical period: mythical time	Translation
<p>ἐκγόνων δὲ δρυός· ἐπεὶ Ἄρκας [[ὁ Διὸς/ ἢ Ἀπόλλωνος / παῖς καὶ Καλλιστοῦς τῆς Λυκάονος θυγατρὸς // ὡς φησι Χάρων ὁ Λαμψακηνός]] κυνηγῶν ἐνέτυχέ τινα τῶν Ἀμαδρυάδων νυμφῶν κινδυνεύουσι καταφθαρήναι, τῆς δρυός, ἐν ἣ ἦν γεγονυῖα ἢ νύμφη, ὑπὸ χειμάρρου ποταμοῦ διαφθαρείσης, ὃ δὲ Ἄρκας τὸν ποταμὸν ἀνέτρεψε καὶ τὴν γῆν χῶματι ὠχύρωσεν. ἡ δὲ νύμφη [[Χρυσοπέλεια τὴν κλῆσιν κατ' Εὐμηλον (F 8B Fowler)]] συνελθοῦσα αὐτῷ ἔτεκεν Ἐλατον καὶ Ἀμφιδάμαντα, ἐξ ὧν εἰσιν οἱ Ἀρκάδες [[ὡς φησιν Ἀπολλώνιος (2, 475/8) «ἀλλ' ὃ γε πατρὸς ἐοῖο – μύθωι»]].</p>	<p>Descendants of an oak: Arkas [son of Zeus or Apollo and of Kallisto the daughter of Lykaon, as Charon of Lampsakos says,] met while he was hunting one of the Hamadryad nymphs, who was in danger of being killed, as the oak tree, in which the nymph had been born, was being carried away by a torrential stream. But Arkas diverted the river and steadied the foundation by piling a mound of earth against it. And the nymph [according to Eumelos, she was called Chrysopeleia] united herself to him and gave birth to Elatos and Amphidamas, from whom the Arkades descend (as Apollonios says: but his father – myth).</p>

262 F 12b Commentary

Ample discussion of F12a in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 20-22; see also the synthesis of O. Höfer, 'Rhoikos (3)', in W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* IV (Qu-S) (Leipzig 1909-15), 120-121; and L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 148-149. For the overall context as well as for specific points concerning the myths of Erysichthon, Paraibios, Rhoikos, and Arkas, see J. L. Larson, *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore* (Oxford 2001), 73-78. In the context of a study of regulations about cutting trees in sanctuaries, M. P. T. J. Dillon, 'The Ecology of the Greek Sanctuary', *ZPE* 118 (1997), 113-127, and esp. 119 mentions the mythological narratives.

Let us begin with F 12a (present also, until the reference to Pindar, in the *Etymologicum magnum* and the *Etymologicum genuinum*, who however both omit any mention of

Mnesimachos). The scholiast to Apollonios introduces the story of Rhoikos in the context of a discussion of the story of Paraibios' father, alluded to by Apollonios Rhodios. That story also involved a nymph, an oak-tree, and a man, and it also ended with ruin for the man; but it began with the opposite decision, as the father of Paraibios cut the tree down. Jacoby supposes with some likelihood that the source of the scholiast here was the work of Mnesimachos of Phaselis (*FGrH* 841), mentioned as authority both here, at the beginning of *F* 12a, and again, with a reference to the specific title of the work, *διάκοσμοι* (*Ordering of the world*), in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios, 4. 1412, where it is clear that the *Diakosmoi* treated the various types of nymphs in detail. Charon's text would thus be mediated by Mnesimachos. It is at any rate extremely unlikely that the reference to Pindar's verses in the second part of *F* 12a goes back to Charon; rather, Mnesimachos will have put together information from various sources. As L. Pearson, *Ancient Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 150 points out, these stories "are of the particular romantic variety that appealed to Alexandrian taste, not in the Homeric nor precisely in the Hesiodic tradition".

From Mnesimachos' *Diakosmoi* might also derive the information preserved anonymously in a scholion to Theocritus, *Idyll* 3.13c: "the humming bee: a certain Rhoikos, Knidian by birth, saw in Niniveh of Assyria a well-grown tree bent, on the verge of falling because of its age; and having fixed it with poles caused it to remain standing longer. The nymph who saw this felt grateful to him; for she said she was equal in age with the plant. And she ordered him to ask whatever he wanted; but he asked to become her lover; and she answered that 'a bee coming to you shall announce the moment of the union'. Perhaps Theocritus mentions this story because the bee ministers to erotic desires" (the Greek text is also in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 20). This story ends without references to a punishment; there is moreover a rather puzzling combination of Near Eastern setting (Assyria) and Knidian origin (what was a Knidian doing in Assyria?) Furthermore, the relationship between tree and nymph appears slightly different: the nymph is not part of the tree, she is simply of the same age (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 20). The scholion to Theocritus may simply be giving more details from Charon's story, without naming his source; but it is also possible that a poet (Hellenistic? Jacoby compares the swift exchange between Muses and narrator on the connection of nymphs and oaks in Callimachos, *Hymn to Delos*, 81–85) reworked an old story, just as Apollonios Rhodios inserted the story of Paraibios in the *Argonautics*, and that we have here a variation on the story originally told by Charon.

A fragment of Pindar (165 + 252 Maehler) may also refer to the same story. As we have seen, Pindar in a poem narrated of a nymph being assigned a length of life equal to that of a tree (see above, *F* 12a = *F* 165 Maehler). Another Pindaric fragment, preserved only in the Latin translation of Plutarch's *Natural questions*, 36 (= fr. 252 Maehler), mentions bees in connection with adultery (the Plutarchan question is 'Cur apes citius pungunt qui stuprum dudum fecerunt', 'Why will bees sooner sting those who have recently committed adultery?'). Plutarch gives as the reason that the bee likes cleanliness. He then quotes a passage from Theocritus, *Idyll* 1. 105-7, in which the shepherd sends Aphrodite to Anchises, on Mount Ida, where 'the bees hum melodiously among their hives' (see A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus*, vol. II (Cambridge 1950), 93–94, and R. Hunter, *Theocritus: A selection: 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13* (Cambridge 1993), 96–97: bees might be mentioned because notoriously chaste, or possibly also because they might have been the instrument of Anchises' punishment when he revealed that he had slept with Aphrodite); Plutarch closes with a reference to Pindar and Rhoikos: 'et Pindarus: parvula favorum fabricatrix, quae Rhoechum pupugisti aculeo, domans illius perfidiam', 'small builder of honeycombs, who pricked with your sting Rhoikos, punishing his perfidy'.

Thus we have at least three stories giving prominence to a Hamadryad nymph, a young man named Rhoikos, and a bee; however, (a) the location of the story and the origin of the young man are not necessarily the same in the three stories; (b) in the second story, told by the scholiast to Theocritus, there is no mention (yet) of punishment; (c) in the third story, the Pindaric one, the bee punishes adultery, while in the first story she had only punished rude behaviour. Most interpreters (so also Snell and Maehler) follow Bergk and Wilamowitz (*Philologische Untersuchungen* 18: *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* (Berlin 1906), 230–235) in assuming that the third (and second) stories are versions of the story also told by Charon. This is in a sense certainly true; but it is at the same time difficult not to share Jacoby's doubts as to the possibility – and wisdom – of reconstructing an archetypal story (on these three versions see also J.L. Larson, *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore* (Oxford 2001), 73–74): encounters between a nymph (or goddess) and a mortal all tend to have problematic conclusions. Compare the story narrated in Parthenius, *Love Stories* 29 (according to the manchette, from Timaios, *BNJ* 566 F 83—but the translation given at *BNJ* 566 F 83 is imprecise) of the herdsman Daphnis, who broke the promise he had made to the nymph Echenais not to consort with other women, and was blinded as a punishment (the bees play however no role in this story, nor are trees as prominent as with the Hamadryads); compare also the story of Anchises and Aphrodite, in an early version of which the bee may have played a role, but where the punishment ensues not because of adultery, but because the beloved cannot keep silent (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 21, with reference to Servius' comments on Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1, 617; 2, 35; 649; 687; Jacoby goes as far as to state that 'we have in Charon one of the vernacular predecessors of the epicised story of Anchises').

The mismatch in Charon's story, between the nymph's request that Rhoikos should not frequent another woman, and the action that brings Rhoikos' ruin (his rudeness while playing draughts), has been variously interpreted. While the nymph's request falls within a range of similar requests, such as the prohibition to ask questions or to look at the nymph, Rhoikos' reaction, which highlights the sensitivity of the nymph, is specific to Charon. It is possible that a text containing a detailed narrative with variants, as Mnesimachos' work certainly was, was clumsily shortened, so that the wrong request was preserved; or else, the discrepancy between request and conclusion may attest to the antiquity of the story, in which the request, no longer organic, would be a survival (the two possibilities are discussed by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 21).

C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* I (Parisii 1841), 35 thought (after Creuzer) that the stories narrated in F 12a and 12b might come from the *Foundations of cities*: local histories are often linked to mythological narratives (in his introduction to Charon, however, Müller also hypothesized that F 12 might have been part of the *Persika*, which would have in this case gone back to Ninus, xviii, comparing the beginning set by Hellanikos to his own *Persika*). But such stories could be introduced in almost any context; those who choose to emphasize the closeness between the story of Rhoikos in Charon and that of Anchises may prefer to assume, on the basis of geographical contiguity, that the story was narrated in the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*. The name Rhoikos is not exceedingly rare: it is attested twice in Cyprus, for two kings, one possibly active in the fifth century BC, the other mentioned by Eratosthenes, *BNJ* 241 F 25; twice in Samos, at an early date (seventh–sixth century BC); once each in Ikaros and Delos, at a later period (35 AD and 99–93 BC respectively); and on coinage from Aeolian Cymae of c. 350–250 BC (see *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* vols. 1 and 5A, Oxford 1987 and 2010, s.v.). It could have been used of a mythical character in Lampsakos (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 21–22). If however one chooses to believe that the story in the scholion to Theocritus 3.13c reflects the original version of

Charon, then Rhoikos becomes a Knidian based in Niniveh, in which case one could think of the *Persika* (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 22, who rightly concludes that the localization in Niniveh is most likely a transposition of the Hellenistic period).

And now, F 12b, on the kinship of Arcadians and oaks. A textual problem needs to be addressed. The commentary of Tzetzes to Lykophron mention as authorities Charon for the central part, concerning the tree and Eumelos for the name of the nymph, Chrysopeleia; Tzetzes closes with a quote from the very passage of Apollonios Rhodios 2. 475-478 to which F 12a is a commentary. However, the scholia vetera to Lykophron, which formed the basic material on which Tzetzes worked, lack the genealogy of Arkas with its source-reference to Charon, lack the name of the nymph and the source-reference to Eumelos, and lack the reference to Apollonios (see, besides E. Scheer, *Lycophronis Alexandra* vol. II *scholia continens*, (Berlin 1908) 172, P. A. M. Leone, *Scholia vetera et paraphrases in Lycophronis Alexandra* (Galatina 2002), 93, *ad Lyc. Alex.* 480: ἐκγόνων δὲ δρυός). For this reason, U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Isyllos von Epidauros* (Berlin 1886), 81 n. 54, suspected Tzetzes of having introduced here the name of Charon as source, ‘lifting’ him from the scholia to Apollonios (“Nach dem ausdrücklichen zeugnis des Tzetzes zu Lyc. 480 müsste man die arkadische genealogie sammt Elatos auf Charon von Lampsakos zurückführen. Aber das ist ein schwindel des Tzetzes, der zu warnendem exempel gerügt sei. Das scholion zu dem Lykophronverse hat keinen autornamen und man glaube ja nicht das Tzetzes ihn einer vollständigeren handschrift entnahm. Er hat ihn aus schol. Apoll. Rhod. II 477, wo Charon eine ganz ähnliche geschichte erzählt”). As for Eumelos and the name Chrysopeleia, Tzetzes may have found them in Apollodoros, *Library* 3, 9, 1. Thus, Tzetzes in his commentary to Lykophron would have added to the information contained in the scholia vetera (a) the genealogy of Arkas, taking it from Apollodoros’ *Library*, 3. 8.2 (100); (b) Charon as source, taking it from the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios (F 12a), which he is known to have used (he refers to the very passage of Apollonios at the end); (c) the name of the nymph, Chrysopeleia, and the source reference, Eumelos, taking them again from Apollodoros’ *Library*, 3. 9. 1 (102). This has been accepted by Jacoby (cf. his apparatus, *FGrH* 3A); so also A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta, pars I* (Leipzig² 1996), 113, Eumelus F 15, and implicitly M. L. West, *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (London 2003), since he simply omits Tzetzes’ commentary to Lykophron from the fragments of Eumelos. On the other hand, both M. Davies, *Epicorum graecorum fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), 100 (Eumelus F 11) and R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* (Oxford 2000), 108 (Eumelus Corinthius pseudepigraphus F 8 a and b) print the text without any marks (although Fowler does provide in apparatus a good description of the situation, and of how it has been interpreted by Wilamowitz); see also M. Fusillo, in M. Fusillo, A. Hurst, G. Paduano, *Licofrone. Alessandra* (Milano 1991), 212.

It is not so important to be certain of where Tzetzes found his information concerning Eumelos, because Tzetzes’ material almost exactly duplicates that contained in Apollodoros’ *Library*. In the case of Charon however, Tzetzes, misled (?) by the similarities of the two stories (here too a tree, again an oak, is in danger of falling; here too the hero supports it, earning the gratitude of the nymph attached to the tree; the hero, here Arkas, unites himself happily to the nymph) would have combined information present in Apollodoros’ *Library* with a source reference to Charon, creating the impression that Charon discussed the genealogy of Arkas—hence Wilamowitz’ annoyance. Are we justified in attributing such a confusion to Tzetzes? Tzetzes had access to information of good quality, not present in the scholia vetera: discussion of one instance in P. Ceccarelli and M. Steinrück, ‘A propos de schol. in Lycophronis Alexandram 1226’, *Museum Helveticum* 52 (1996), 77-89. Yet in this

particular case it must be admitted that Wilamowitz' suspicions seem difficult to disprove (see the very balanced assessment of D. Toye, on *BNJ* Eumelos 451 F 9). And so, we may have to leave it open whether Charon did, possibly as an excursus to the story of Rhoikos, also mention the very similar story of Arkas. It is however worth noting as part of this network of stories that Callimachos, *Hymn to Artemis*, 221, and then Apollodoros, *Library*, 3. 9. 2 and Aelian, *Historical Miscellany* 13. 1, mention an Arcadian centaur, Rhoikos, who was killed by Atalanta for having attempted to rape her: there is a connection of sorts between a Rhoikos and Arcadia. J. E. Skinner, *The invention of Greek Ethnography: from Homer to Herodotus* (Oxford 2012), 129–31, considers that 'Charon was indeed aware of variant traditions'; he further suggests that Charon's interest in these stories is due not to 'simple' interest in mythology, or to love for romantic stories, but in the importance of such stories for the construction of local identities.

The stories of Rhoikos and Arkas are narrated one after the other by Natale Conti, *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri X* (Venice 1567), 5. 11, in his chapter on the Oreads (cf. J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe, AZ 2006), vol. 1, 387–388), and both are attributed to Charon of Lampsakos; the story of Paraibios, with a quote from Apollonios Rhodios, and with further references to Mnesimachos and to Tzetzes' commentary to Lykophron, is sandwiched in between the two accounts. Natale Conti clearly relies on the scholion to Apollonios Rhodios (F 12a) and on the scholia to Lykophron (F 12b) for his version, and he says as much; but although he follows these texts closely, there are some imprecisions. The most significant one is that in recounting the story of Rhoikos, Natale Conti gives him a Knidian origin, and locates the story 'in Nineveh, one of the Assyrian districts': clearly, Conti has combined the account of the scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios with that of the scholiast to Theocritus. Interestingly, if he mentions the bee, Conti leaves out any references to punishment.

262 F 13 - (8) Strabon 13, 1, 4 p. 583	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="13" sourcework(level1="Strabo" level2="" level3="Geographica" level4="" level5="" level6="13, 1, 4, 583")]]
Subject: geography Historical Work: unknown (Chronicles?) Source date: 1 C AD Historian's date: 5th C BC Historical period: 5th C BC	Translation
<p>εὐθὺς γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Προποντίδα τόπων ὃ μὲν Ὅμηρος ἀπὸ Αἰσήπου τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖται τῆς Τρωάδος. Εὐδοξος (V) δὲ ἀπὸ Πριάπου καὶ Ἀρτάκης συστέλλων ἐπ' ἔλαττον τοὺς ὄρους. Δαμάστης δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον συστέλλει ἀπὸ Παρίου. καὶ γὰρ οὗτος μὲν ἕως Λεκτοῦ προάγει· ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλως. Χάρων δ' ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς τριακοσίους ἄλλους ἀφαιρεῖ σταδίου, ἀπὸ Πρακτίου ἀρχόμενος (τοσοῦτοι γὰρ εἰσιν ἀπὸ Παρίου εἰς Πράκτιον), ἕως μέντοι Ἀδραμυττίου πρόεισι. Σκύλαξ ἀπὸ Ἀβύδου ἀρχεται. ὁμοίως δὲ τὴν Αἰολίδα Ἐφορος μὲν λέγει ἀπὸ Ἀβύδου μέχρι Κύμης· ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλως.</p>	<p>For in reference to the places on the Propontis, Homer (<i>Il.</i> 2. 825) makes the Troad begin immediately at the Aisepos river; Eudoxos makes it begin at Priapos and Artake, ... contracting thus its limits. Damastes (<i>BNJ</i> 5 F 9) contracts them still more, making the region begin at Parion; and, in fact, he carries them as far as Lekton, while others do differently. Charon of Lampsakos on the one hand diminishes its extent by three hundred stadia, making it begin at Praktios (for that is the distance from Parion to Praktios), but on the other, he goes as far as Adramyttion. Skylax ... makes it begin at Abydos. And similarly</p>

Ephoros (70 F 163) says that the Aiolis extends from Abydos to Kyme, while others define its extent differently.
--

262 F 13 Commentary

In the context of a discussion of the topography of Troy and the Troad, Strabo cites the views of a number of authors concerning the limits of the area (see the commentary of W. Leaf, *Strabo on the Troad. Book 13, cap. 1* (Cambridge 1923), 46–7, who points out that the differences result from the different points of view, and from the confusions between ethnic, linguistic, political and geographical boundaries). The *Iliad* (2. 835) mentions the inhabitants of Praktion among the Trojan allies; but at 13. 1. 21 Strabo, following Demetrios of Skepsis, states that “there is a river Praktios, but a city of that name does not exist, as some have thought”. We do not know what Charon thought; but clearly for him the city (or the river) Praktios formed the limit of the territory of Lampsakos to the south–west, separating Bebrykes and Trojans (and in historical times separating the territories of Lampsakos and Abydos), just as the Hermaion (see F 17) formed the boundary between Lampsakos and Parion to the north. The fragment must have come from the *Chronicles* (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 22; see his commentary for further references).

262 F 14 - (4) Tertullianus De anima 46	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="14" sourcework(level1="Tertullianus" level2="" level3="De anima" level4="" level5="" level6="46")]]
Subject: dream; kingship Historical Work: unknown (Persika?) Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: third century BC Historical period: c 570/50 BC	Translation
Astyages Medorum regnator quod filiae Mandanae adhuc virginis vesicam in diluvionem Asia fluxisse somnio viderit, Herodotus refert; item anno post nuptias eius ex isdem locis vitem exortam toti Asiae incubasse. hoc etiam Charon Lampsacenus Herodoto prior tradit.	Herodotus narrates (1. 107-108) that Astyages king of the Medes saw in a dream a flood that inundated Asia issuing from the womb of his daughter Mandane, still a virgin; and again, in the year that followed her marriage, he saw a vine growing out from the same part of her person, which overspread the whole of Asia. Charon of Lampsakos, active before Herodotus, tells the same story.

262 F 14 Commentary

This is, among all of Charon’s fragments, the earliest snippet of Persian history; it concerns an event roughly datable to c. 570 BC. Because of his overall conception of the *Fragmente*, Jacoby also printed this text in the section concerning ‘writers of Oriental histories’, as Charon of Lampsakos 687b F 2.

The importance of F 14 lies in the fact that it shows that Charon’s *Persika* were not limited to the Ionian revolt or the Persian wars, but discussed the Persian empire from the moment of its formation: Astyages’ dreams about Mandane (Herodotus 1.107-108) are part of the Herodotean *logos* concerning the ascent of Cyrus and the rise of Persia over the Medes.

Tertullian's wording implies that Charon must have told the story in a way similar to Herodotus; D. Asheri, in D. Asheri, A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus books I-IV* (Oxford 2004), 157, seems however to think that only the second dream was in Charon. Famously, Herodotus claims to have followed for the story of Cyrus's rise a trustworthy Persian source, even while being aware of three other ways in which the story could be told (1. 95. 1, with Asheri, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 147-148; see also L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939), 147, who supposes that one of the three other ways known to Herodotus may have been Charon's); and indeed, Ctesias (*FGrH* 688 F 9) relates a different story, in which Cyrus and Astyages are not related; see also Nicolaos of Damascus, *FGrH* 90 F 66, for whom Cyrus' mother is a shepherdess of the Mardioi, named Argoste; moreover, in Nicolaos Cyrus' mother dreams of the flood, while in Justin, 1. 4. 1-2 the second dream takes place before the wedding of Mandane.

We do not know whether Charon relied/claimed to rely on Persian sources, as Herodotus did, for the story of Cyrus; in the case of Herodotus, it seems clear that he was relying on stories of Persian or Median origin, already re-elaborated by Greeks (but not necessarily put down in writing): the name Mandane at any rate is probably a speaking one, from *manda*, 'the Median woman' (Asheri, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 147). The interpretation of the two dreams, and of the story in general, has been much discussed: while in terms of imagery the dreams are perfectly at their place in a Near Eastern context, their relation to the actions of Astyages has seemed unclear; moreover, their similarity in terms of meaning has paved the way to suspicions of their being doublets. See M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persiká II: Carone di Lampsaco', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 7 (1977), 7-13; Asheri, *A commentary*, 157-9; and C. Pelling, 'The Urine and the Vine: Astyages' Dreams at Herodotus 1.107-8', *CQ* ns 46 (1996), 68-77, for a defense of the coherence of the narrative with two dreams.

Those scholars who believe that Herodotus relied for his work on earlier writers, and in particular on Charon, have considered Tertullian's statement a confirmation of their thesis (so for instance S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* I (Roma-Bari 1965), 561-562). But as Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persiká II', 13 points out, the fact that both writers told the story of the dream does not in itself prove that Herodotus used (or even knew) Charon; a similar conclusion is reached by S. Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e Carone', in *VIII Miscellanea greca e romana* (Roma 1982), 26-28 = *Scritti minori* III (Roma 1990), 1260-1261); see also Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 22-23.

<p>262 F 15 - (4) Iohann. Logothet. zu Hermog. Π. μεθ. δειν. (Rh. M. 63, 150)</p>	<p>meta[[id="262" type="F" n="15" sourcework(level1="Joannes Logotheta" level2="ad Hermogenem [Vide: Gregorius Corinthius, schol., Sopater & Syrianus ad Hermogenem]" level3="Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος (Rabe H., Rhetoren)" level4="" level5="" level6="p. 150, 3")]]</p>
<p>Subject: literary criticism Historical Work: unknown Source date: 10th C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 540–520 BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>ἄμφω δὲ (sc. κωμωιδίαν καὶ τραγωιδίαν) παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἐφεύρηται, καθάπερ Ἀριστοτέλης (IV) φησὶν τῆς δὲ τραγωιδίας πρῶτον δράμα Ἀρίων ὁ</p>	<p>Both (i.e. comedy and tragedy) were invented at Athens, as Aristotle says... Arion of Methymna introduced the first performance of tragedy, as Solon (fr. 30a</p>

Μηθυμναῖος εἰσήγαγεν, ὡσπερ Σόλων ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγραφομέναις Ἑλεγεῖαις ἐδίδαξε. Δράκων δὲ ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς δρᾶμά φησι πρῶτον Ἀθήνησι διδαχθῆναι ποιήσαντος Θέσπιδος. τρυγωιδία δὲ κέκληται διὰ τὸ τρύγα δοθῆναι τὰ πρῶτα τοῖς νικήσασιν ἔπαθλον (τρύγα δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸν νέον οἶνον ὠνόμαζον)· ἦν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο κοινὸν καὶ κατὰ τῆς τραγωιδίας καὶ τῆς κωμωιδίας φερόμενον, ἐπεὶ οὐπω τὰ τῶν ποιήσεων διεκέκριτο, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν οἱ νικῶντες τρύγα τὸ ἄθλον ἐλάμβανον.

West = fr. 39 G.-P. = TrGF 1 T 9) asserted in the *Elegies* ascribed to him. But Drakon of Lampsakos says that drama was first produced in Athens, by Thespis. It is called Trugoidia because initially new wine was given as prize to the winners (the ancient called the new wine 'tryx'); this name was common and applied both to tragedy and comedy, since these genres of poetry were not yet distinguished, but the winners in both received as prize new wine.

262 F 15 Commentary

The attribution of this fragment to Charon is very unlikely. It was first proposed by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Kleine Schriften* 1 (1908), 281 and again *Neue Jahrbücher* 29, 1912, 470, mainly because a Drakon does not figure in Strabo's list of famous people from Lampsakos, T 3. But as Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 23) has pointed out, these catalogues are rarely complete, and neither the fact that we do not know of a Drakon of Lampsakos, nor the fact that Charon seems to have had literary interests (F 4), may serve as arguments. Moreover, the statement that drama was first performed in Athens, if it does indeed go back to Charon, contrasts with the Spartan, Cretan, or local focus of the other works attributed to Charon (even his universal chronicle *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians*, the only attested work of Charon's in which F 15 could have appeared, was written using Spartan magistrates as a chronological framework). Thus, a Hellenistic grammarian named Drakon is a very real possibility – as Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 23 says, the alignment with the Attic vulgata, which by the Hellenistic period had imposed itself, might speak for such a solution. More recently, H. Patzer, *Die Anfänge der griechischen Tragödie* (Wiesbaden 1962), 29-30, has proposed that we should read 'Straton' instead of 'Drakon': Straton of Lampsakos succeeded to Theophrastos in the direction of the Lyceum. The same had been suggested by M. P. Nilsson, *Opuscula selecta* 1, (Lund 1960⁴; first publication 1911), 65; Nilsson however thought this unlikely, because of the character of Straton's writing, mainly on physics. However, as pointed out by Patzer, *Die Anfänge*, 29, among Straton's writings is also a *List of inventions* (εὐρημάτων ἔλεγχοι): an information such as the one above would fit perfectly such a work.

Whether we stick to the transmitted text and read Drakon (as the majority of scholars still do: both J. Leonhardt, *Phalloslied und Dithyrambos. Aristoteles über den Ursprung des griechischen Dramas* (Heidelberg 1991), 65 and G. Ieranò, *Il ditirambo di Dioniso* (Pisa - Roma 1997), 31 for instance print Drakon), or whether we modify it in either Charon or Straton, we need not attribute to this author more than the information that drama was first produced in Athens by Thespis. (And indeed both Ieranò, *Il ditirambo di Dioniso*, 31 and G. Else, *The Origin and Early Form of Tragedy* (Cambridge, Mass. 1965), 105, who also discusses the passage in an appendix, cut the text at the mention of Thespis). As for the content of the rest of the note, the reliability of Johannes Diaconus (John the Deacon) has been much discussed. For G. Else, *The Origin and Early Form of Tragedy* (Cambridge, Mass. 1965) 17, this is all 'a farrago of nonsense'; a more positive evaluation in Patzer, *Die Anfänge*, 29. See further Ieranò, *Il Ditirambo di Dioniso*, 183-184 for a thorough discussion and bibliography.

Rhodium 2, 168	level1="Scholia" level2="ad Apollonium Rhodium" level3="Argonautica" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 168")]]
Subject: myth, mythical past Historical Work: unknown Source date: 2nd c AD Historian's date: 5th c BC Historical period: Mythical time	Translation
περὶ τοῦ Βοσπόρου ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς διαφόρως λέγεται. Νύμφις μὲν γάρ φησι ἱστορεῖν Ἀκαρίωνα ὡς ἄρα Φρύγες διαπλευσαὶ βουλόμενοι τὸν πορθμόν, κατεσκεύασαν ναῦν ἔχουσαν ἐγκεχαραγμένην προτομήν ταύρου [[ὡςπερ καὶ ὁ Φρίξος ἐπὶ κριοπρώρου σκάφους ἔπλευσεν]] ⁴ . διαπλευσάντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴδους τοῦ περὶ τὸ σκάφος προσαγορευθῆναι τὸ πέλαγος Βόσπορον. Ἐφορος δὲ	The story of the Bosporos is narrated differently by the ancients. Nymphis (BNJ 432 F 11) says that Akarion records that at one time the Phrygians, desiring to sail across the strait, built a ship decorated with a bull's protome [just as Phrixos too sailed on a ram-prowed vessel]; and having sailed through, they called the sea 'Bosporos' ['Crossing of the Bull'] from the appearance of their vessel. But Ephoros (BNJ 70 F 156), etc.

262 F 16 Commentary

No Akarion is known; as first proposed by J. A. Weichert, *Über das Leben und Gedicht des Apollonius von Rhodus: eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung* (Meissen 1821), 253–254, the name may hide a reference to Charon of Lampsakos, who is mentioned two other times in the scholia to Apollonios (above, F 8 and F 12a), without any indication of the intermediary source (that the scholiast consulted Charon directly is unlikely in the extreme). But there are other possibilities (cf. G. Lachenaud, *Scholies à Apollonios de Rhodes* (Paris 2010), 224 n. 56): C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* II (Paris 1848), vol 2, 3449 for instance proposed Andron of Teos (cf. Jacoby, *FGrH* 802 F 4; the three other extant fragments of Andron of Teos are all from the scholia to Apollonios of Rhodes); M. Schmidt, 'Miscellen', *Philologus* 1 (1846) 640–641 suggested Aischrion of Samos (or Mytilene: see E. Robbins, s.v. Aeschrion, *Brill's New Pauly* 1 (Leiden–Boston 2002), 244), an epic author, writer of iambic verses, and companion of Alexander the Great; but it is difficult to find much in support of such a hypothesis.

The rationalising tendency of the passage fits with what is known of Nymphis; less so with what is known of Charon. Whether this fragment is of Charon or not does not help with the issue of the date of Charon's activity, since an author quoted by Nymphis need only be earlier than the first quarter of the third century; in terms of topic, this narrative could fit the *Chronicles*. Unexpected is however the rationalising tendency, which, if it were Charon's, would indeed show a new facet of his work (cf. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 23). For a general discussion see also R. Billows' commentary on BNJ 432 F 11.

262 F 17 - (10) Polyaeos Strategemata 6, 24	meta[[id="262" type="F" n="17" sourcework(level1="Polyaenus" level2="" level3="Strategemata" level4="" level5="" level6="6, 24")]]
---	--

⁴ This, as Jacoby says (*FGrH* 802 F4, in apparatus) must have been at some point a note in the margin: it is found here in P, but after Βόσπορον in L. Even if possibly ancient, it was probably not part of the text attributed to 'Akarion'.

Subject: sacrifice Historical Work: unknown Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: 5 C BC Historical period: c. 6th C BC? late 5th C BC?	Translation
<p>Λαμψακηνοὶ καὶ Παριανοὶ γῆς ὀρίων ἀμφισβητοῦντες συνέθεντο, ἡνίκ' ἂν ὄρνιθες αἰσωσιν πρῶτον, πέμψειν ἄνδρας ἐξ ἑκατέρας πόλεως πρὸς ἀλλήλους· ὅπου δ' ἂν οἱ πεμφθέντες ἀπαντήσωσιν, τοῦτον ἀμφοτέροις ὄρον τῆς γῆς γενέσθαι. ἐπειδὴ ταῦτα ἔδοξεν, οἱ Λαμψακηνοὶ τῶν ἐν <τούτοις> τοῖς τόποις θαλασσοῦργῶν ἐπεισάν τινας, ὅταν ἴδωσι τοὺς Παριανούς παριόντας ἰχθῦς ἀφθόνως ἐπιβάλλειν τῶι πυρὶ καὶ οἶνον πολὺν ἐπισπένδειν ὡς Ποσειδῶνι θύοντας, καὶ παρακαλεῖν αὐτούς μετ' εὐφημίας τιμῆσαι τὸν θεὸν σπονδῶν κοινωνήσοντας. οἱ μὲν ἀλιεῖς <ταῦτα ἐποίησαν>, οἱ δὲ πεισθέντες τοῖς ἀλιεῦσι συνήσθιον καὶ συνέπιον τὸ σπουδαῖον τῆς πορείας ἀνέντες. Λαμψακηνοὶ δὲ συντείναντες ἐπὶ τὸ Ἑρμαῖον φθάσαντες ἦλθον. τοῦτο δὲ Παρίου μὲν ἀπέχει στάδια ἑβδομήκοντα, Λαμψάκου δὲ διακόσια. τοσαύτην γῆν ἀπετέμοντο τῇ τέχνῃ Λαμψακηνοὶ Παριανῶν μεθόριον στησάμενοι τὸ Ἑρμαῖον.</p>	<p>The Lampsakenoi and the Parians, having a dispute about the boundaries of their territories, agreed to dispatch a certain number of persons from one city to the other, when the birds should first sing; and wherever the people sent should meet, that place should become the common boundary between their territories. Once this had been decided, the Lampsakenoi persuaded some of the fishermen, who were employed in that area, to put abundant fish on the fire, when they should see the Parians passing, and to make plentiful libations of wine, as if sacrificing to Poseidon; and then they should ask the Parians to honour the god and share with them in the sacrifice. The fishermen did this, and the Parians, persuaded, ate and drank with the fishermen, neglecting the seriousness of their travel. The Lampsakenoi however, urging on strenuously, arrived first at the Hermaion. This place is at a distance of seventy stadia from Parion, but two hundred from Lampsakos. Such a large territory did the Lampsakenoi gain by this trick from the Parians, establishing the Hermaion as boundary.</p>

262 F 17 Commentary

Whether this fragment derives from Charon is uncertain. Polyainos does not name his source. Because another story preserved in the *Stratagemata*, the story of Lampsake (F 7b), derives possibly from Charon, and because this is the kind of story that might have been at its place in a *Chronicle of the Lampsakenoi*, Jacoby prints this passage among the fragments of Charon, with the remark: “dass bei Polyäen Ch.’s Ὄροι vorliegen, scheint so sicher wie dass sie auch hier nicht direkt benutzt sind (zu F 7)” (“that Charon’s *Horoι* are present in Polyainos seems as certain as the fact that here too they are not consulted directly (see F 7)”, *FGrH* 3a, 23). The argument holds as long as we accept that Plutarch and Polyainos took their versions of the story of Lampsake from a common source, which might have been Charon, or an intermediary source quoting Charon: if Polyainos was using Charon then, he might have done so here too. But if Stadter is right when he argues that Polyainos (F 7b) depends directly upon Plutarch (F 7a) for the story of Lampsake, then there is no reason to imagine that Charon’s work, even in a mediated version, was used by Polyainos.

As for the story itself: Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 23 points out that it is very similar to other disputes concerning boundaries, in particular the one between Klazomenai and Cymae, dated by Diodoros 15. 18 to 383 BC, and the more ancient one opposing Kyrene and Carthage, narrated in Valerius Maximus 5. 6, ext. 4. For the geographical situation of Lampsakos, Parion, and Hermaion see W. Leaf, *Strabo on the Troad* (Cambridge 1923), 97–101, who thinks that Hermaion cannot have been located along the coast, because by the coast the distance between Parion and Lampsakos is only c. 200 stades, and not 270 stades. Leaf thus proposes to locate Hermaion inland, and follows Kiepert in identifying it with Hermotos, the place at which Alexander halted before arriving at Granikos (Arrian 1. 12. 6; the identification is accepted in the Barrington Atlas, 52A4, cf. C. Foss, R. Talbert, T. Elliott, S. Gillies, ‘Places: 511274 (Hermoton/Hermaion)’, in *Pleiades*, <http://pleiades.stoa.org/places/511274>). Slightly problematic for such an identification is however the fact that fishermen play a role in detaining the Parians: one would imagine this happening along the coast. Leaf further suggests that if the identification is accepted, then the story in Polyainos, ‘if historical at all’, should be connected with the absorption of Paisos by Lampsakos mentioned by Strabo (13. 1. 19), an event that must be dated after the dissolution of the Delian league, since Paisos was assessed independently for 1000 drachmai (cf. R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 544-5: Paisos assessed for 1000 frachmai between 451 and 429). In this case, either we must accept a late date for Charon, or we must admit that the story does not derive from him at all.

A fragment erroneously attributed to Charon (already not included in FGrH):

In his *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri X* (Venice 1567), 7. 1 Conti, in narrating the deeds of Herakles, refers to Charon of Lampsakos for information concerning the Stymphalian birds. Conti narrates that in some versions the Stymphalian birds were not killed by arrows, but, driven away by the sound of bronze rattles that Athena had given to Herakles, they settled on an island called Aretia (this is clearly a mistake for Areia, the island of Ares, which was inhabited by birds who used their feathers as arrows: see *BNJ* Peisandros 16 F 6). Conti then gives his sources: Peisandros of Cameiros, Seleukos in his *Miscellanies*, and Charon of Lampsakos (‘ut sensit Pisander Camirensis, et Seleucus in *Miscellaneis*, et Charon Lampsacenus’); he continues saying that these birds were also called ‘ploidae’. The story is actually found in Pausanias 8. 22. 4, who mentions Peisandros of Cameiros, while a scholion to Apollonios Rhodios, 2, 1052/7a (Wendel) mentions one after the other Seleucos’ *Miscellanies* and a certain Chares, friend of Apollonios and author of a commentary on the *Argonautica*, as authorities for an alternative name of these birds, ‘ploidae’, used also by Apollonios (cf. *BNJ* Seleukos of Alexandria 341 F 3, and J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti’s Mythologiae* (Tempe, AZ 2006), vol. 2, 575 and n. 22). In stating that Charon was the source for the information Conti was misled by the fact that in the first edition of the scholia, based on the *recensio florentina* (Ἀπολλωνίου Ἀργοναυτικά. ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ 1496, edited by J. Lascaris: cf. C. Wendel, *Die Überlieferung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos* (Berlin 1932), 18) and in Stephanus’ subsequent edition (*Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon libri IV. Scholia vetusta in eosdem libros ... cum annotat. Henrici Stephani*, Parisiis 1574), which was reprinted as authoritative until the 18th century, the name of the ‘friend’ was actually given as ‘Charon’ (a conjecture of Lascaris? See C. Wendel, *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera* (Berlin 1935), xvii).

262 Biographical Essay

The meagre data concerning Charon's life and works have already been discussed in connection with T1; I shall follow up from there. After rounding up the discussion of the Charon's chronology (1) I shall move to the character of the fragments preserved, and more generally to Charon's fortune (2). Next, I shall tackle the issue of the relationship between Charon's work and those of Herodotus (3) and (4) Thucydides: pinpointing the connections between the various authors would have a bearing on Charon's chronology, and, more importantly, on our understanding of the development of Greek historiography. Unluckily, I do not believe that it is possible to reach a firm position; the same applies to my last point (5), the question of whether the *Letters of Themistocles* preserve elements of a tradition that goes back to Charon.

1. Apart from the biographical information offered by T 1 to T 4, discussed above, an *argumentum e silentio* has played a large, if at times hidden, role in discussions of the chronology and activity of Charon. I refer here to the absence of references to Charon in the famous passage of Thucydides 1. 97. 2, in which the historian justifies his treatment of the Pentekontaetia on grounds that 'my predecessors have confined themselves either to Hellenic history before the Median War, or the Median War itself. Hellanikos, it is true, did touch on these events in his Athenian history; but he is somewhat concise and not accurate in his dates.'

F. Jacoby, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 (1938), 212–213 = H. Bloch (ed.), *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung von Felix Jacoby zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag* (Leiden 1956), 182–183, dated this passage to after 404 BC (see also S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides I* (Oxford 1991), 147–148 for discussion and bibliography on the issue), and deduced from it that if Thucydides knew of Hellanikos' work, but not of Charon's *Hellenika*, then the latter's work could not yet have been published. This is not a solid argument, and for more than one reason: Thucydides might have chosen not to name Charon for reasons of his own, even had he been aware of his work; Charon's *Hellenika* might have covered Greek history before the Persian wars (as Thucydides himself says: some of his predecessors τὰ πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν Ἑλληνικὰ ξυνετίθεσαν), in which case Thucydides would have had no reason to mention him in this context; finally, if Charon had been active in the first half of the fifth century, as the ancient sources assume, he simply could not have treated of the Pentekontaetia as a whole, for chronological reasons (see e.g. R. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 67, and especially L. Porciani, *Prime forme della storiografia greca* (Stuttgart 2001), 61–62). Jacoby himself must have realized the weakness of this argument, which does not figure with the same importance in his commentary to Charon, *FGrH* 3a, 1 (see again Porciani, *Prime forme*, 61–62). Attempts to turn the argument on its head and to consider the silence of Thucydides as implying an early date for Charon's activity are just as weak. While Thucydides 1.97 is important and must be mentioned in a discussion of Charon's place in ancient historiography, it ultimately cannot provide an argument either way.

We are thus left with an ancient tradition which dates Charon to the first half of the fifth century; with the knowledge that such a date does not rest on anything more solid than loose inferences and chronographic guesswork (Porciani, *Prime forme*, 62–63; A. Rengakos, 'Historiographie, vii. 1 (Gattungsgeschichte)-2 (Die Anfänge der Historiographie)', in B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike, I: Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit*, (München 2011), 328–330, with further bibliography); and with a list of works that on the whole might better fit the second half of the fifth century. I

find the pairing of Hellanikos and Charon in T 3b very attractive: even though not better founded than any other date, it underlines the similarities in approach. The points of contacts between the two authors have always been noticed: e.g. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 4, and Jacoby, 'Charon', 218–221 = *Abhandlungen*, 187–189, who also draws into this group Hippias and his *Catalogue of the Olympic winners*. In an important recent discussion of the intellectual context of the time, M. Weçowski, *BNJ* Hippias 6 F 2, has again suggested that the *Prytaneis of the Lacedaemonians* (or of the *Lampsakenoi*) might have been Charon's response to Hellanikos' *Priestesses of Argos*; K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* I (Berlin 1967), 522 had also accepted the connection, but in view of the problems concerning dates had left it open whether Hellanikos influenced Charon, or rather Charon Hellanikos. Numerous contributions by R. Fowler have, similarly, emphasized a common intellectual background; see e.g. 'Herodotus and his Predecessors', in C. Dewald and J. Marincola, *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge 2006), 29–45, where Charon is listed among the historians 'active during Herodotus' working life' (40). I would personally tend to see in Charon a younger contemporary of Herodotus; but it is probably best to accept the sensible statement with which K. Meister, 'Charon [3]', in *Brill's New Pauly* 3 (Leiden - Boston 2003), 203–204, closes his discussion of Charon's chronology: 'Unfortunately, the meagre fragments available do not permit a definitive resolution of the dating question'.

2. Character of Charon's fragments. Charon's work is quoted by numerous and diverse authors. References to him are found in Strabo (F 14) and in Dionysius of Halicarnassos (T 3); in Pausanias (F 4); in three different works of Plutarch (F 7a, 9, 10 and 11); in Athenaios (F 1–3a); in Tertullian (F 14); in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios (F 8 and F 12, as well as possibly F 16); and in Photios (F 5 and 6). As for Aelian (F 3b) and Polyainos (F 7b), they may have consulted directly Charon or an intermediate source; but it is more likely that they depend directly on Athenaios and Plutarch respectively. This is at any rate sufficient to show that some version of Charon's works, and at any rate of the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* and *Persika*, still circulated in the second century AD (cf. Jacoby, 'Charon', 214 = *Abhandlungen*, 184).

Of the 14 fragments securely attributable to Charon, two, F 1 and 2, preserved in Athenaios, pertain to the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*; F 7 may also have come from this work. Athenaios has likewise preserved the only fragment explicitly said to come from the *Persika*, F 3; their subject matter renders it likely that F 4 and 5 also belonged to this work. F 6 might also come from the *Persika*, as suggested by Jacoby, but origin from other works remains a possibility (see M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persiká II : Carone di Lampsaco', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 7 (1977), 7). All other fragments might have appeared in the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*, or in one of the other works attributed to Charon.

Charon's fragments seem to fall into two types. The longer fragments present the gracefully told stories that are typical of the earliest local history (the story of Rhoikos and the Hamadryad, F 11; of Mandron and his daughter, F 7; of the dancing horses of the Cardians, F 1). These fragments probably belonged to the local history of Lampsakos. The majority of the other fragments, and specifically those that probably belonged to the *Persika*, offer only brief reference to a historical event or terse comments (the story of Paktyes, the expedition of the Ionians against Sardis, that of Mardonios against Greece and the appearance of white doves, the arrival of Themistokles at the court of Artaxerxes). The contrast between local chronicle and *Persika* may be an illusion created by the accidents of transmission; still, it is interesting.

What was the shape of the two works for which we have some material, the *Persika* and the *Chronicles*? The *Persika* covered in two books the period from at least c. 570 BC (the dream of Mandane, leading to the formation of the Persian empire with the rise of Cyrus) to at least 492 (F 3, on the wreckage of the Persian fleet at the Athos); how much lower they went is uncertain (F 11, on Themistokles' arrival at the court of Artaxerxes in c. 465 BC, may have been narrated in the *Persika*; but it would also have been at its place in the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* or in the *Hellenika*). The coverage of such an ample time-span in two books ties in well with the brevity and dryness of the narrative; it coincides as well with what we know of Hellanikos' *Persika*, also in two books (FGrH 4 F 59–63) characterized by a very concise narrative style (cf. the ample discussion, including comparison with Dionysios of Miletos (FGrH/BNJ 687) by Jacoby, 'Charon', 212 and 224–241 = *Abhandlungen*, 182 and 192–204).

The interest of the fragments securely coming from Charon's *Persika* lies paradoxically in what they are not. Since Jacoby, it has been commonly accepted that the title *Persika* denotes ethnographic writings; yet, while the fragments of the *Chronicle of the Lampsakenoi* (F 1, F 7, and possibly F 11) betray an ethnographic interest (see below), the same cannot be said of the fragments certainly or probably from the *Persika* (F 3 to 6), which certainly do not present an ethnographic character (of course selection might have had something to do with that). This has been emphasized by R. Drews, *The Greek accounts of Eastern History* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973), 30–32, as part of his argument that the Persian wars were the event that stimulated the beginnings of historical writing; for an updated and balanced discussion of the genre of *Persika*, see now D. Lenfant, 'Greek historians of Persia', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden 2007), 200–209 (201 for Charon, and comparison with Hellanikos' *Persika* at 201–201). Much anyway depends on the sense attributed to the term 'ethnographic': see C. Fornara, *Herodotus* (Oxford 1971), 19 n. 25, and 25–26, for a view of the non-Herodotean *Persika* (among which, in particular, Charon's) as historical narratives, not necessarily 'ethnographic' *stricto sensu*, but simply relating events one after the other and not presenting an inner necessity, a thematic arrangement, as in Herodotus. Such a characterization would fit the fragments of Charon we have. On the whole Jacoby, FGrH 3a, 9 was probably right in stating that the certainty of a juxtaposition, of a distinction of *Persika* and *Hellenika* (as opposed to the seamless 'world history' of Herodotus) is more important than our inability to provide an answer to specific questions on the relationship and respective chronological limits of the two works.

As for the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi*: Jacoby imagined this work as a local chronicle, open to digressions, and structured on an annalistic grid provided by local eponymous magistrates (FGrH 3a, 5–6; cf. above, commentary to F 1). For Jacoby such local histories would have followed, in terms of development, Herodotus' work: *horographia* represented the reaction of communities who felt that not sufficient place had been given to them in Herodotus' work. The point about local chronicles, whatever their exact shape, being a reaction to Herodotus' work (or more generally to historiography of the Persian wars) is a disputed one. Drews, *The Greek accounts*, 42–43 and n. 91 for instance is happy to accept this aspect of Jacoby's overall view of the development of Greek historiography, because it ties in well with his own argument that history was born out of the Persian wars; as a result, Drews accepts that Charon wrote *Persika* before Herodotus, but considers that he may have composed his other works substantially later. For his part, von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* I, 93–98 thinks that local histories (which he sees as different from local chronicles, of which there are almost no traces) begin to appear in the mid-fifth century, that is, almost at the same time as Herodotus' work (he develops the example of Ion of Chios). At the other end of the spectrum, Fowler, 'Herodotus and his contemporaries', 65–66

considers that the existence of local histories before Herodotus would not be surprising. Part of his argument rests on the fact that the Greeks had, even before Herodotus, a sense of the past (Fowler mentions as an example *ktisis* poetry; see also along these lines the detailed analysis by F. Lasserre, 'L'historiographie grecque à l'époque archaïque', *Quaderni di Storia* 4 (1976), 113-420; see now A. Corcella, 'The new genre and its boundaries: poets and logographers', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis, *Brill's Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden Boston 2006), 33-56 for a careful discussion of similarities and differences; and P. Harding, 'Local History and Atthidography', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden 2007), 180-188. More important to our concerns is that there are no indications of annalistic structure in Charon's fragments (nor more generally in any of the fragments of the early historians: besides von Fritz, see A. Möller, 'The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*', in N. Luraghi, *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford 2001), 250); we may have to revise our expectations of the shape taken by a local chronicle (so already Fowler, 'Herodotus and his contemporaries', 66). Most recently, J. E. Skinner, *The invention of Greek Ethnography: from Homer to Herodotus* (Oxford 2012), 129-31, proposes to see in Charon and his contemporaries not so much chroniclers as writers interested in local traditions, aetiologies and variant traditions (and thus in ethnography) not per se, but as tools for understanding both local identities and the past. As for the fortune of Charon's work: even though the *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* seem to have been the only book fully focused on Lampsakos (there are no traces of an Aristotelian constitution), Stephanos of Byzantium s.v. Λαμψακός refers for material on Lampsakos to Deiochos and to Demosthenes, not to Charon. Jacoby, *FGH* 3a, 5-6, deduced from this that Charon's Ἔρωποι must have disappeared early.

3. Relationship to Herodotus' work. At times Charon offers less than Herodotus (so for F 9 and 10), at times he has details that are absent in Herodotus (so for F 3, F 5, and F 11; compare also the opacity of Croesus' menace to cut down the Lampsakenoi as a pine-tree, in *Hdt.* 6. 37.1, with Charon's awareness of the earlier name of Lampsakos, Pityoessa, in F 7): Jacoby, 'Charon' 210-212 = *Abhandlungen* 180-181, makes the good point that these differences are not to be explained in terms of priority of the one account over the other, but rather in terms of the different vision, plan and character of their work. Some scholars have argued that Herodotus was aware of the work of Charon and used it (so e.g. W. Blösel, *Themistokles bei Herodot*, *Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 2004), 44 and 350-355, and V. Parker, 'Pausanias the Spartiate as depicted by Charon of Lampsacus and Herodotus', *Philologus* 149 (2005), 3-11, both discussed below); a variant of this view, according to which Herodotus would have been aware of Charon's work, and would on purpose have taken his distance from it, has been defended by L. Piccirilli, 'Carone di Lampsaco ed Erodoto', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 5 (1975), 1239-1254. This is in my opinion unlikely (so also Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persika', 24). It is simply impossible to prove that Herodotus made use of Charon; and on the whole, close examination of the fragments makes it is rather unlikely. This is of course the position of all those who believe in a late date; but it is found also among some of those who accept the early date for Charon. To take just one instance, S. Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e in Carone di Lampsaco', *VIII Miscellanea Greca e Romana* (Roma 1982), 1-43 = S. Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e in Carone di Lampsaco', *Scritti minori* III (Roma 1990), 1243-1272 concludes after a detailed examination of the fragments (a) that Charon was not the source of Herodotus for the dream about Mandane, because of considerations concerning the immediacy of the Herodotean novelistic narrative (1260); (b) that the ample narrative of Pactyes in Herodotus is clearly independent from the succinct version of Charon, 1265, 'e si potrebbe tutt'al più supporre che Carone dipendesse da Erodoto, ma tale ipotesi è esclusa dalla cronologia. [Note

here the circularity]'. Accame closes this part of his analysis rather paradoxically with the statement that in the case of Pactyes the similarity of some expressions, if not due to the identity of events or to chance, may depend upon a common source [!]. But one cannot disagree with his overall conclusion: the ample and detailed narrative of Herodotus is clearly independent from the succinct version of events by Charon, at least in the version reported by Plutarch; this was already the conclusion reached by Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persika', 13–16).

However, this is possibly not the right way to put the question: we should rather ask, what difference would it have made, if Herodotus had been able to use Charon's work? Can we gain a better idea of Charon's work through comparing his work to Herodotus'? To the first question both those who accept the traditional high chronology (e.g. Moggi) and those who are inclined to follow Jacoby's path tend to give a similar answer: not much. As for the second question: Herodotus and Charon seem to have shared some intellectual tools, and even some 'historical' formulations; they may both have been interested in prodigies, and they both seem to have shared in the gusto of telling a good story (F 1); but we cannot know whether the stories told by Charon fitted into an overall plan. Similarly, considering the shortness of the fragments, speculations on Charon's ideological views, such as those advanced by S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* I (Roma-Bari 1965), 107, who thought that he could recognize a pro-Athenian stance in Charon, are best avoided.

A very interesting, if highly tendentious, attempt at understanding something more of the relationship between Charon and Herodotus, and something more of Charon himself, has been recently made by Parker, 'Pausanias the Spartiate', 3–11. But his approach is fraught with uncertainties and methodological problems. Parker compares the portrait of Pausanias offered by Thucydides, which he assumes to be for all purposes identical to Charon's (Thucydides is 'practically copying' Charon, 3), with that given by Herodotus; but, because Parker accepts that Charon was active before Herodotus, he treats Thucydides' account as if it was earlier than Herodotus', and reads Herodotus as an answer to Thucydides/Charon. This is simply too hypothetical to work: the reader is asked to accept that 'although Plutarch's quotations from Charon's *Persika* make clear that Herodotus did not depend on that work for his own narrative, on balance it seems far more probable that Herodotus knew of Charon's work than that he did not. Herodotus has too much in common with Charon for him not to have known his predecessor's work: the two authors overlap in subject matter, an uncanny ability to work amusing anecdotes into a story that ostensibly pertains to something else, and a similar mode of arguing' (Parker, 'Pausanias the Spartiate as depicted by Charon of Lampsacus and Herodotus', 5). Yet on the same page Parker admits that the approach of both historians stems from the same general Ionian intellectual culture! Furthermore, once one accepts, as Parker does, that 'even when he is incorporating material from others, Thucydides makes certain that it substantiates, or at least does not contradict, his views', very little of Charon must remain. True, some passages in Thucydides find a fascinating echo in Herodotus – but this can be explained assuming that Thucydides was reacting to Herodotus (for an Herodotean reading of the Thucydidean excursions on Themistocles and Pausanias see C. Patterson, 'Here the Lion Smiled', in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell, *Nomodeiktes. Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor 1993), 145–152). Significantly (and rather surprisingly), Parker, 'Pausanias the Spartiate', 10, after having argued that Charon wrote before Herodotus and that Herodotus not only knew, but reacted to him (which I consider unlikely), concludes saying that Momigliano's famous statement still stands: "We cannot say how much he owed to earlier writers. But we know enough about Herodotus' alleged predecessors—Cadmus of Miletus, Hecataeus, Dionysius of Miletus,

Charon of Lampsacus, Xanthus of Sardes—to state confidently that they did not do the work for him. There was no Herodotus before Herodotus” (A. Momigliano, ‘Herodotus in the History of Historiography’, in *Studies in Historiography* (London 1966), 129). It is on the whole unlikely that Herodotus made an important use of written sources: see D. Asheri, in D. Asheri, A. B. Lloyd, A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 18–20.

4. Relationship with Thucydides’ work. It has been suggested that Thucydides might have made use of Charon’s work for the excursus on Themistocles and Pausanias (1.128–138), for the excursus on the Peisistratids in book 6 (6.59.3–4), and possibly also for the exact date of the Theban attack in Sparta (Thuc. 2. 2). In the latter passage, Thucydides famously dates the beginning of the war in relationship to priesthood of Hera at Argos (‘in the forty-eighth year of Chrysis’ priesthood’), to a Spartan magistrate (‘when Ainesias was ephor’) and to an Athenian archon (‘when Pythodoros had still four months of his archonship in Athens’). The reference to the priesthood of Chrysis is usually understood in connection with the fact that Hellanikos had published a chronological work *On the priestesses of Hera at Argos*; it may well be that Charon’s *Prytaneis of the Lakedaimonians* lurk behind the reference to Ainesias (cf. S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1991), 238–239; Corcella, ‘The new genre and its boundaries’, 39).

The reason for thinking of Charon in the excursus on the Peisistratids is the fact that the daughter of Hippias Archedike was given in marriage to Aiantides, son of the tyrant of Lampsakos Hippokles, and that the inscription mentioned by Thucydides was in Lampsakos. A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* vol. 4 (Oxford 1970), 324 comment that ‘it is possible that Charon’s *Annals of Lampsakos* was available to Thucydides and threw light on this’. Indeed; but, as stressed by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 6, while this is possible, Thucydides might also have used the Lampsakene tradition on which Charon relied. Actually at 6. 55. 1 Thucydides makes quite a point of having made use of ἀκοή for this part of his narrative, even though he weaves into his account an argument based from inscriptions; see S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* III (Oxford 2008), 446–447, and in particular his remark at 451: ‘The idea that any of this section derives from, or is part of an argument with, the historian Charon (*FGrH* 262), just because of the coincidence that he was Lampsakene, is not compelling’; the epigram must anyway have been fairly famous, if it was attributed to Simonides. See also S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London 1987) 83–4 for the view that in this excursus Thucydides may have been polemicizing with Hellanikos, and that he might have come across descendants of the Peisistratids, e.g. in Chios. At any rate, this argument is too thin for any deductions as to the chronology and – more importantly – the character of Charon’s work.

More has been written on Charon as the source of the excursus of book 1. After highlighting the ‘Herodotean’ style of this part of the narrative, already noticed by an ancient scholiast, H. D. Westlake, ‘Thucydides on Pausanias and Themistocles. A written source?’, *CQ* 27 (1977), 95–110 tentatively proposed that Thucydides might here have been following a written Ionian source, in which case the best candidate would have been Charon (an idea also aired by P. J. Rhodes, ‘Thucydides on Pausanias and Themistocles’, *Historia* 19, 1970, 387–400, and A. J. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles: A Critical Survey of the Literary and Archaeological Evidence* (Montreal and London 1975), 64). But (a) Thucydides will certainly have tried to collect all the material he could (including Charon’s work, if it was available); (b) actually, there was abundant material (for Themistocles at any rate one can point e.g. to Stesimbrotos of Thasos’ pamphlet *On Themistocles, Thucydides, and Pericles*). Hence Hornblower’s objection (*A Commentary on Thucydides*, I (Oxford 1991), 211) that it does not make much sense to try to

pinpoint a specific source. In some recent contributions, Wolfgang Blösel and Victor Parker have tried to go beyond such generic indications. Parker's treatment of the excursus on Pausanias has been discussed above. W. Blösel has concentrated on the picture of Themistokles, arguing that Thucydides must have relied on Charon (see above, on F 11). But both the excursus on the Peisistratids and that on Pausanias and Themistokles are fully and integrally part of Thucydides' work; they cannot be used to retrieve aspects of Charon's. Nor are these passages any help towards establishing the date of Charon's activity, for a date as low as 420 BC for Charon's *Chronicles of the Lampsakenoi* would already be sufficient to make him a potential source of Thucydides, yet later than Herodotus; clearly, Jacoby, 'Charon', 212 = *Abhandlungen*, 182 was right, in saying that the question is best left by the side.

5. The Letters of Themistocles and Charon. R. J. Lenardon, 'Charon, Thucydides, and "Themistokles"', *Phoenix* 15 (1961) 28-40 has argued that some of the information preserved in the *Letters of Themistocles* may go back to Charon (a thesis accepted by Blösel, *Themistokles in Herodot.*, 162-163; see also the very prudent discussion of E. Culasso-Gastaldi, *Le lettere di Temistocle II: Il problema storico* (Padova 1990), 286-287). This is certainly possible, but again, because of all the intervening mediations, is of little help towards defining chronology and main character of Charon's work. Lenardon, 'Charon', 28 states that 'The letters confirm Thucydides' account of Themistokles because they include information that belongs to the Thucydidean tradition but is omitted by Thucydides himself; this tradition goes back ultimately to Charon of Lampsakos'. But such a statement is later qualified ('it is possible that the letters reflect Charon of Lampsakos, who was followed by Thucydides, and that we have here reflected a source (or sources) which used Charon, if indeed the letter-writer did not know Charon directly. That the letters bring us closer to what Charon related is a tempting conjecture.' ...'it may very well be that this letter [letter 20] contains historical facts derived ultimately from Charon and not related by any other extant source.', 39). Lenardon's conclusion leaves no doubt as to the hypothetical character of this construction: 'But we can only conjecture and some of this may be too fanciful', 40. The list of point of contact between the Thucydidean tradition, the fragments of Charon, and the *Letters* shows how thin the basis for such assumptions is. Thucydides, Charon and the *Letters* agree on the arrival of Themistokles at Artaxerxes' court (Thucydides 1. 137. 3, Plutarch, *Life of Themistocles* 27. 1 = Charon F 11, Pseudo-Themistokles, *Letters* 20. 32 and 34); Thucydides and the *Letters* agree on the encounter with the Athenian navy in front of Naxos and not Thasos: Thucydides 1. 137. 2; Pseudo-Themistokles, *Letters* 20. 16; the *Letters* may rely on Charon for unique information, such as Themistokles' landing at Kyllene (*Letters* 3. 3, 17. 1, and 20. 2-4), the exemption of Lampsakos from tribute (*Letters* 20. 39), the characterization σατράπης βασιλέως ἐπὶ τοῖς πρὸς θαλάσση ἔθνεσιν (*Letters* 16. 5), and the Assyrian letter of Dareios (*Letters* 21. 1): cf. Blösel, *Themistokles in Herodot.*, 163 n. 159, with bibliography on the various points. But ultimately this does not settle the issue of the priority of the two accounts, Charon's and Thucydides' (Charon could have written after Thucydides, adding what he thought were significant details: see the opposite positions of Culasso-Gastaldi, *Le lettere di Temistocle*, 286-287 and N. A. Doenges, *The Letters of Themistocles* (New York 1981; orig. diss. Princeton 1953), 454, with the further bibliography mentioned in Blösel, *Themistokles in Herodot.*, 163 n. 160), nor does it provide solid information beyond what we already knew from Plutarch, i.e. that both Thucydides and Charon stated that Themistokles arrived at the court of Artaxerxes and not Xerxes (see F 11).

I should like to thank Nicholas Horsfall for accepting to read the final draft of this entry, and in the process improving it beyond recognition.

262 Bibliography

- S. Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e in Carone di Lampsaco', *VIII Miscellanea Graeca e Romana* (Roma 1982), 1-43 = S. Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto e in Carone di Lampsaco', *Scritti minori III* (Roma 1990), 1243-1272.
- A. Brugnone, 'In margine alle tradizioni ecistiche di Massalia', *La parola del passato* 50 (1995), 46-66.
- C. Mueller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum I* (Parisii 1841), xvi-xx.
- R. Drews, *The Greek accounts of Eastern history* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973), 24-28.
- K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung*, vol. 1, 1967, 518ff.
- R.L. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 62-87, 73.
- P. Guzzo, 'Intorno a Lampsake: ipotesi di un modello «foceo»', *Incidenza dell'Antico* 8 (2010), 197-212.
- F. Jacoby, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 15 (1938), 207-242 = H. Bloch (ed.), *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung von Felix Jacoby zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag* (Leiden 1956), 180-206.
- A. Hepperle, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *Festschrift O. Regenbogen zum 65. Geburtstage* (Heidelberg 1956), 67-76.
- A. Hurst, 'Prose historique et poésie: le cas de Charon de Lampsaque' in *Actes de la XIIIe Conférence internationale d'Études classiques Eirene, Cluj-Napoca, 2-7 octobre 1972*, ed. Fischer Iancu (București - Amsterdam 1975), 231-237.
- D. Lenfant, 'Greek Historians of Persia', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden 2007), 200-209.
- K. Meister, 'Charon [3]', in *Brill's New Pauly* 3 (Leiden - Boston 2003), 203-204.
- M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persiká II : Carone di Lampsaco', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 7 (1977), 1-26.
- G. Ottone, *Libyka. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Rome 2002).
- V. Parker, 'Pausanias the Spartiate as depicted by Charon of Lampsacus and Herodotus', *Philologus* 149 (2005), 3-11.
- L. Pearson, *Early Ionian historians* (Oxford 1939).
- L. Piccirilli, 'Carone di Lampsaco ed Erodoto', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 5 (1975), 1239-54.
- L. Porciani, *Prime forme della storiografia greca. Prospettiva locale e generale nella narrazione storica*, Stuttgart 2001.
- A. Rengakos, 'Historiographie, vii. 1 (Gattungsgeschichte)-2 (Die Anfänge der Historiographie)', in B. Zimmermann (ed.), *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike, I: Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit*, (München 2011), 326-337 (on Charon, 336).
- C. Schick, 'Studi sui primordi della prosa greca', *Archivio glottologico italiano* 40 (1955), 89-135.
- E. Schwartz, 'Charon 7', in *RE III/2* (Stuttgart 1899), cols. 2179-2180.
- H. D. Westlake, 'Thucydides on Pausanias and Themistocles. A written source?', *CQ* 27 (1977) 95-110.