

The Ancient History Bulletin

VOLUME TWENTY-NINE: 2015

NUMBERS 1-2

Edited by:

Edward Anson ✦ Michael Fronda ✦ David Hollander
Timothy Howe ✦ Joseph Roisman ✦ John Vanderspoel
Pat Wheatley ✦ Sabine Müller



ISSN 0835-3638

ANCIENT HISTORY BULLETIN

Volume 29 (2015) Numbers 1-2

Edited by:

Edward Anson, Michael Fronda, David Hollander, Sabine Müller, Joseph Roisman, John Vanderspoel, Pat Wheatley

Senior Editor: Timothy Howe

Editorial correspondents

Elizabeth Baynham, Hugh Bowden, Franca Landucci Gattinoni, Alexander Meeus, Kurt Raaflaub, P.J. Rhodes, Robert Rollinger, Victor Alonso Troncoso



Contents of volume twenty-nine

Numbers 1-2

- 1 John Walsh, *Antipater and the Lamian War: A Study in 4th Century Macedonian Counterinsurgency Doctrine*
- 28 Nikos Karkavelias, *The End of the Four Hundred Regime*
- 57 Eloisa Paganoni, *Bithynia in Memnon's Perì Herakleias: A Case Study for a Reappraisal of Old and New Proposals*

Review Article

- 80 Thomas Scanlon, *Satan's Business or the People's Choice: The Decline of Athletics in Late Antiquity*

NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBSCRIBERS

The Ancient History Bulletin was founded in 1987 by Waldemar Heckel, Brian Lavelle, and John Vanderspoel. The board of editorial correspondents consists of Elizabeth Baynham (University of Newcastle), Hugh Bowden (Kings College, London), Franca Landucci Gattinoni (Università Cattolica, Milan), Alexander Meeus (University of Leuven), Kurt Raaflaub (Brown University), P.J. Rhodes (Durham University), Robert Rollinger (Universität Innsbruck), Victor Alonso Troncoso (Universidade da Coruña)

AHB is currently edited by: Timothy Howe (Senior Editor: howe@stolaf.edu), Edward Anson, Michael Fronza, David Hollander, Sabine Müller, Joseph Roisman, John Vanderspoel and Pat Wheatley.

AHB promotes scholarly discussion in Ancient History and ancillary fields (such as epigraphy, papyrology, and numismatics) by publishing articles and notes on any aspect of the ancient world from the Near East to Late Antiquity. Submitted articles should normally be in English, but the journal will consider contributions in French, German, Italian or Spanish.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

AHB adheres to the usual North American editorial policies in the submission and acceptance of articles but imposes no House Style. Authors are, however, asked to use the abbreviations of *L'Année philologique* (A ϕ) for journals, and of the *Thesaurus linguae latinae* (TLL) for Latin authors. Please send submissions to the editor most closely identified with your field of enquiry or, in case of doubt, to Timothy Howe (howe@stolaf.edu). Articles must be submitted in electronic format, preferably generated by MS Word. Greek font or other special characters must convert such to Unicode and should be accompanied by a PDF version. Authors will receive PDF offprints of their contributions. Copyright is retained by the author. Books for reviews and enquiries concerning book reviews should be directed to Joseph Roisman (jsroisma@colby.edu).

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The subscription rate for individual and institutional subscribers is USD 25.00. Detailed instructions about subscriptions and access to digital content can be found on the AHB website: <http://ancienthistorybulletin.org>

PAYMENT

Payment may be made via the subscription portal on the AHB website: <http://www.ancienthistorybulletin.org/subscribed-users-area/membership-levels/>

Cover image courtesy of The Nickle Arts Museum, University of Calgary

Bithynia in Memnon's *Peri Herakleias*: A Case Study for the Reappraisal of Old and New Proposals*

Eloisa Paganoni

Memnon's *Peri Herakleias*, dealing with the history of Heraclea Pontica in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, is considered the best-preserved Greek local history, although just Photius' summary of Books 9-16 is extant.¹ The debate about this work raises many questions, most of them still open. However, until the appearance of Billows' commentary on Nymphis of Heraclea in *Brill's New Jacoby* (2012), scholars had agreed that Memnon used Nymphis' *Peri Herakleias* as a source for the Classical and Hellenistic sections of his work.² This assumption was based on Memnon's double quotation of Nymphis³ and the similar judgement both the authors provide about the tyrant of Heraclea, Dionysius.⁴ According to Memnon, Nymphis was a democratic politician. He returned to Heraclea with the other

* An early version of this paper was presented at the conference *Looking Back, Looking Forward: Ancient Perspectives on the Past and the Future* (King's College, London, 2nd-3rd June 2015) with the title *History of a Polis, History of a Kingdom. The Account on Bithynia in Memnon's Peri Herakleias*. I ought to express my gratitude to Professors Franca Landucci, Luisa Prandi and Thomas Corsten, who discussed many aspects of this research and provided enlightening suggestions. I also thank the anonymous reviewers of *AHB* for their constructive remarks. Greek texts and translations are from *Brill's New Jacoby* with slight changes for uniformity.

Abbreviations:

ANRW = *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, Berlin – New York 1972-1996.

BNJ = I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby* <<http://0-referenceworks.brillonline.com./browse/brill-s-new-jacoby>>.

EAH = R.S. Bagnall et al. (edd.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, Malden 2013.

Jacoby, *FGrHist* = F. Jacoby (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Leiden 1923-1972.

Müller, *FHG* = K. Müller (ed.), *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*, vols. I-V, Paris 1841-1879.

NP = *Der Neue Pauly*, Stuttgart – Weimar 1996-2003.

OCD³ = S. Hornblower – A. Spawforth (edd.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed., Oxford 1996.

RE = *Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart – Weimar 1893-1972.

¹ DESIDERI 1991: 12, WIEMER 2013: 4132. On Heraclea Pontica, see BURSTEIN 1976, SAPRYKIN 1997, BITTNER 1998.

² Müller, *FHG* III: 525, Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 255, 259-261, 267, JANKE 1963: 8-13, DESIDERI 1967: 389-391, BITTNER 1998: 4, MEISTER 1999: 1205-1206, DUECK 2006: 49-50, DESIDERI 2007: 47, GALLOTTA 2009: 444-445, HEINEMANN 2010: 238, DAVAZE 2013: 58-65, MUCCIOLI 2013: 4426-4427, GALLOTTA 2014: 68-69, cf. SANTANGELO 2004: 249 and n. 10. LAQUEUR 1926: 1100-1101 supposes that Memnon's Books 9-10 depend on Theopompus of Chios, and Books 11-14 on Nymphis, *contra* Jacoby, *FGrHist* XXIV. Herakleia am Pontos, *Commentary*: 254-255, JANKE 1963: 9-11, DESIDERI 1967: 391 n. 123. On the influence of Theopompus on the Heracleian historiography, see now DAVAZE 2013: 65-63 who suggests that Nymphis might have used Theopompus. On Theopompus of Chios, see PÉDECH 1989: 19-254 SHRIMPTON 1991, FLOWER 1994, POWNALL 2004: 143-182. On Nymphis, see Müller, *FHG* III: 12-16, Jacoby, *FGrHist* 432, *Commentary*: 259-265, LAQUEUR 1937, DESIDERI 1967: 378-416, SEIBERT 1967: 62-63, MEISTER 2000, GALLOTTA 2009: 441-445, HEINEMANN 2010: 14-43, 196-215, 259-265, Billows, Nymphis BNJ 432, *Commentary and Biographical Essay*.

³ Memnon BNJ 434, F 1, 7, 3; 16, 3 = Nymphis BNJ 432, TT 3, 4.

⁴ Nymphis BNJ 432, F 10, Memnon BNJ 434, F 1, 4, 7-8. For a commentary on these passages, see HEINEMANN 2010: 28-43, 96-102, DAVAZE 2013: 228-231.

democratic exiles after Lysimachus' death in 281 BC⁵ and took part in the political life of the city: in 250 BC, for example, he negotiated with the Galatians who were attacking Pontus.⁶ Memnon also records that Nymphis was a historian,⁷ and an entry of the Byzantine lexicon *Suda* informs us about his work:

[Νύμφιδος] Ξεναγόρου, Ἡρακλεώτης ἐκ Πόντου, ἱστορικός. Περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν Διαδόχων καὶ Ἐπιγόνων βιβλία κδ· Περὶ Ἡρακλείας βιβλία ιγ· ἔχει δὲ μέχρι τῆς καθαιρέσεως τῶν τυράννων † τὰ μετὰ τοὺς Ἐπιγόνους καὶ μέχρι τοῦ τρίτου Πτολεμαίου.

[Nymphis] son of Xenagoras of Heraclea Pontica, was a historian; he wrote *On Alexander, the Diadochi, and the Epigoni* in 24 books, and *Peri Herakleias* in 13 books. He continued to the removal of the tyrants † after the Epigoni and down to the accession of Ptolemy III.⁸

According to this lemma, Nymphis wrote the general history, *On Alexander, the Diadochi, and the Epigoni* in 24 books and the local history, *Peri Herakleias* in 13 books. Only one fragment of the former work and fewer than twenty fragments of the latter survive. The information about the end of Nymphis' work(s) is usually related to Nymphis' local history and the *lacuna* is considered irrelevant for the meaning of the text.⁹ Therefore, Nymphis' *Peri Herakleias* is supposed to have dealt with the history of Heraclea from mythic times to Ptolemy III's accession (246 BC¹⁰). So, the first part of Memnon's work—namely (the lost) Books 1-8 and Books 9-13 (or 14),¹¹ in other words, Photius' Chapters 1-17—would depend on Nymphis' *Peri Herakleias*.¹²

Billows challenges this *communis opinio* with a new interpretation of the *Suda*'s passage.¹³ In his opinion, the two phrases of the *Suda*'s entry, introduced by the preposition μέχρι, refer to Nymphis' two works. On these grounds, he claims that Nymphis' *Peri Herakleias* dealt with the history of the city until the removal of the tyrants (281 BC), while Nymphis' *On Alexander, the Diadochi, and the Epigoni* ended with the beginning of Ptolemy III's reign (246 BC).¹⁴ This reading is consistent with the grammatical structure. It also takes into consideration both the different significance of the events mentioned by the *Suda* and the different character of Nymphis' works. Clearly, the removal of tyrants from a city in Asia

⁵ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 7, 3 = Nymphis *BNJ* 432, T 3.

⁶ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 16, 3 = Nymphis *BNJ* 432 T 4. This information dates Nymphis' political activity to the first half of the 3rd century BC. Thus, scholars suppose that he was born in about 310 BC (Jacoby *FGrHist* 432, *Commentary* 259, GALLOTTA 2009: 441, Billows, Nymphis *BNJ* 432, *Biographical Essay*).

⁷ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 16, 3 = Nymphis *BNJ* 432, T 4.

⁸ *Suda*, s.v. Νύμφις = Nymphis *BNJ* 432, T 1.

⁹ Müller, *FHG* III: 12, Jacoby, *FGrHist* 432, T 1, *Commentary*: 261, LAQUEUR 1937: 1608-1610.

¹⁰ For the date of Ptolemy III's accession, see e.g. NADIG 2013.

¹¹ It is impossible to establish the content of each book of Memnon because Photius usually treats several books together. However, with regard to Books 13 and 14, DESIDERI 1967: 390 n. 118 observes: "Fozio dà l'indicazione cumulativa dei ll. 13 e 14, ma certo la fine di Nymphis e l'inizio della trattazione dell'epoca romana dovevano rappresentare un'ottima occasione per passare da un libro all'altro."

¹² Jacoby (*FGrHist* 432, *Commentary*: 259-260) assumes that Books 1-9 of Nymphis' *Peri Herakleias* described the history of Heraclea from the mythical period to the beginning of the tyranny (365/4 BC), Books 10-11 from Clearchus' tyranny to 338/7 BC and Books 12-13 from the end of the tyranny to 246 BC. Consequently, Memnon's Books 9-13 (or 14) would preserve in part Nymphis' Books 10-13.

¹³ Billows, Nymphis *BNJ* 432, T 1, *Commentary* and *Biographical Essay*.

¹⁴ MATHISEN 1978: 71 also proposes this reading.

Minor was less important than the accession to the throne of a Ptolemaic king. Since historical works usually came to an end with an event meaningful in respect to their topic, why would Nymphis have concluded his local history with an event not directly linked with the Heracleian affairs, such as the accession of a Ptolemaic king? As Billows says, more likely Nymphis' *Peri Herakleias* ended with the removal of the tyrants, which was an important stage both for Heraclea¹⁵ and for Nymphis himself: indeed, in 281 BC he and the other democratic exiles were allowed to return to their hometown. The beginning of Ptolemy III's reign was, instead, the end Nymphis' *On Alexander, the Diadochi, and the Epigoni*. In this view, Ptolemy III's rise represented for Nymphis the passage from the era of Alexander and his Successors to a new one. Consequently, according to Billows, Photius' Chapters 1-7 depend on Nymphis' *Peri Herakleia* and Chapters 8-17 on his general history. The scholar supports this assumption with several arguments, of which the most relevant is the perspective change in Memnon's work. The former passages are characterised by a local perspective focused on the Heracleian domestic affairs, whereas the latter shows a general view, which devotes wide room to other political entities in Asia Minor.¹⁶

Billows' proposal is a benchmark in studies on Memnon and Nymphis and their interrelation. But the issue about Memnon's sources is not definitively resolved. Which work(s) did Memnon use for the events after 246 BC? To look for an answer, we reconsider Memnon's passages about the Hellenistic period. As we will see, Memnon's *Peri Herakleias* is a local history "with many protagonists." Among them, the kingdom of Bithynia stands out in terms of the number of references. For this reason, it can serve as a suitable and original *fil rouge* for our investigation.¹⁷ However, before dealing with our main purpose, a short introduction of the main issues about Photius-Memnon relationship is necessary.

1. Photius to Memnon: a Backwards Look

In *Codex 224* of his so-called *Bibliotheca*, the ninth-century patriarch Photius preserves a long summary of Memnon's *Peri Herakleias*, as well as two short notes about the author and his work.¹⁸ This is all we have of Memnon, whose work is usually quoted according to the entry 434 of Jacoby's *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* or *Brill's New Jacoby's* editions.¹⁹ These fully correspond with the edition of Photius' *Bibliotheca*, except for the arrangement of Photius' notes about Memnon's work. They are located before and after the summary in Photius' edition²⁰ and constitute a single *testimonium* in Jacoby and *Brill's New Jacoby*.²¹ In the first part of this *testimonium*, Photius introduces Memnon's summary with these words:

¹⁵ Cf. BURSTEIN 1976: 90: "Two eighty-one marked the beginning of a new era for Heraclea."

¹⁶ Similar remarks in MATHISEN 1978: 72-73. Already Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, F 11, *Commentary*: 276 assumes that Memnon used Nymphis' general history for some episodes (cf. DAVAZE 2013: 357).

¹⁷ On the kingdom of Bithynia, see VITUCCI 1953, HANNESTAD 1996, SCHOLTEN 2007, MICHELS 2009, KLEU 2013, MICHELS 2013.

¹⁸ On Photius and his *Bibliotheca*, see ZIEGLER 1941, HENRY 1959: IX-LII, TREADGOLD 1980: 1-15, WILSON 1992: 13-51, IMPELLIZZERI 1993: 340-365.

¹⁹ About Memnon's editions before Jacoby's, see JANKE 1963: 3-5, DESIDERI 1967: 366 n. 1, SANTANGELO 2004: 248-249 n. 7, DAVAZE 2013, pp. 37-38.

²⁰ Phot. 224, 222b 1-7, Phot. 224a 1-11.

²¹ Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, T 1, Memnon *BNJ* 434, T 1.

Ἄνεγνωσθη βιβλίον Μέμνονος ἱστορικὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ θ̄ λόγου ἕως τς̄. ἡ δὲ πραγματεία ὅσα περὶ τὴν Ποντικὴν Ἡράκλειαν συνηρέχθη σκοπόν, ἀναγράψαι προτίθεται, τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ τυραννήσαντας ἀναλεγομένη καὶ πράξεις αὐτῶν καὶ ἦθη, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλων βίου, καὶ τὰ τέλη οἷς ἐχρήσαντο, καὶ ὅσα τῶν εἰρημένων ἐξήρηται.

A historical work of Memnon was read from the 9th Book to the 16th. The treatment proposes to place on record a survey of the events which occurred in Heraclea Pontica, dealing with those who held tyranny there, both their actions and characters and the lives of others, the powers which they used and all matters connected with what has been said.²²

In the second section, Photius praises Memnon's style²³ and concludes the *Codex* with a sentence, which raised a lively debate about the structure of Memnon's work and its possible continuation after Book 16:

τὰς δὲ πρώτας ἡ ἱστορίας καὶ τὰς μετὰ τὴν τς̄ οὕτω εἰπεῖν εἰς θεῶν ἡμῶν ἀφιγμένας ἔχομεν.²⁴

This passage has been interpreted in many ways. According to some scholars, Photius claims to have at his disposal only a part of Memnon's work and to know nothing about the others,²⁵ while according to others, Photius assents to know of other books.²⁶ As far as we can see, the patriarch summed up only the books he read.²⁷ We do not know if books after 16 existed,²⁸ but we may assume that Books 1-8 were already lost at Photius' times.

²² Memnon *BNJ* 434, T 1.

²³ Memnon *BNJ* 434, T 1: ἔστι δὲ ἡ συγγραφὴ νουνεχῆς μὲν καὶ τὸν ἰσχνὸν μεταδιώκουσα χαρακτῆρα, οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τοῦ σαφοῦς ἀμελοῦσα, εὐλαβουμένη δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐκβολάς, πλὴν εἰ μὴ πού τις ἀνάγκη συνυφαίνειν καὶ τὰ ἐξωθεν ἐγκελεύεται τῆς προθέσεως· οὐδὲ πρὸς ταύτην δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συχνὸν ἀποκλίνει, ἀλλὰ τὸ κατεπεῖγον ἐπιμνησθεῖσα ἔχεται πάλιν εὐεπιστρόφως τῆς προτεθείσης αὐτῇ κατ' ἀρχὰς γνώμης. καὶ λέξεσι δέ, εἰ μὴ που σπανίως ἐξαλλαττούσαις, ταῖς συνήθεσι χράται ("This work is sensible and follows a plain style. Nor is it neglectful of clarity. It is circumspect with regard to digressing unless perhaps some necessity urges it on to weave in matters extraneous to its purpose. Nor does it turn off to that detour for long but it recalls what is pressing and returning easily back, clings to the proposition it had in the beginning. It employs a normal vocabulary except for sparing changes of sense"). For remarks on the adjectives describing Memnon's style, see DESIDERI 1967: 368-370. However, no conclusion on the style of the original work may be drawn on the grounds of Photius' summary (Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 271, DUECK 2006: 45. *Contra* YARROW 2006: 109-110).

²⁴ Memnon *BNJ* 434, T 1.

²⁵ Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, T 1, *Commentary*: 267.

²⁶ DESIDERI 2007: 46 ("[Photius] termina il riassunto dicendo: «dei primi otto libri e di quelli successive al sedicesimo non sono ancora in grado di parlare, perché non sono pervenuti alla mia vista»). DUECK 2006: 45 proposes this translation: "we have not found a copy to read of the first eight books, or of anything after the sixteenth book." Keaveney and Madden in *Brill's New Jacoby's* edition translate: "We cannot say at all that the first eight books and those which follow the sixteenth have come into our view" (cf. Keaveney – Madden, Memnon *BNJ* 434, T 1, *Commentary*). According to DESIDERI 1967: 372, "All'inizio di esso (i.e. of the *testimonium*) Fozio dichiara di avere letto le Storie di Memnone dal nono al sedicesimo libro ... alla fine conclude dicendo di non essere ancora in grado di fornire il riassunto dei libri antecedenti al nono e successivi al sedicesimo che pure egli ha visto"; *contra* SANTANGELO 2004: 247-248 n. 3.

²⁷ DESIDERI 2007: 46 ("il patriarca vide e riassunse solo quelli [i.e. the books] dal nono al sedicesimo").

²⁸ According to LAQUEUR 1926: 1098-1099 (cf. MOMIGLIANO 1934: 829), Book 16 was the end of Memnon's *Peri Herakleias*. He supposes that Memnon interrupted his work with Book 16 because Heraclea lost its political relevance after the mid-1st century BC. Against such a proposal there are literary sources (Strabo 12.3.6), archaeological remains and inscriptions, which outline the inclusion of Heraclea in the province of Pontus-

As usual for local histories, Memnon's work is supposed to be a history of Heraclea from its foundation to the author's own time.²⁹ It is difficult to situate this time precisely because no biographical information about Memnon survives.³⁰ There is only a *terminus post quem*, which is the latest event quoted in Photius' summary, dating back to the mid-1st century BC.³¹ The hypotheses cover a wide time span from the Caesarian era to the 2nd century AD. According to some scholars, Memnon lived contemporaneously to the latest events of Book 16 and his work went on a little after that moment (unless it did not go on at all).³² According to some, he lived in the 1st century AD,³³ but according to others he lived in the 2nd century AD on the basis of presumed stylistic similarities with Plutarch.³⁴ In the end, someone brands every proposal as speculative.³⁵

Independently from these issues, Photius' summary allows us to identify the chronological frame covered by the events of Books 9-16. Books 9-10 (Photius' Chapters 1-3) dealt with the tyrants who ruled Heraclea from 364 to 337 BC. Books 11-12³⁶ (Photius' Chapters 4-5) covered the period from Alexander's campaign to the battle of Curupedium (334-281 BC). Books 13-14 (Photius' Chapters 6-18) dealt with the historical context of the first half of the 3rd century BC.³⁷ Book 15-16 (Photius' Chapters 19-40) described some local episodes of the 2nd century BC, the Roman wars against Mithridates VI and contained a reference to the Caesarian age.³⁸ Photius' summary provides (at least apparently) a continuous account articulated in accordance with the original numbering of Memnon's books, from the late Classical period to the mid-1st century BC.

One might conclude, then, that *Peri Herakleias* survives in a fairly good state of preservation, all in all, and consequently, one would expect studies enquiring about the Photius-Memnon correlation. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Photius did not sum up the works in the *Bibliotheca* with a single *ratio*. In the letter presenting his work to his brother Tarasius, published before *Bibliotheca*'s text in modern editions, Photius himself claims to have summed up the books he read in the order he remembered and to devote to them as much room as the subject warranted, if it was rare.³⁹ Thus, every codex is a *unicum*.

Bithynia and show its great cultural and economic flourishing in the 1st-2nd century AD (SANTANGELO 2004: 250-251, YARROW 2006: 355-356, DESIDERI 2007: 58-59).

²⁹ Müller, *FHG* III: 525, Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 267, JANKE 1963: 9-10, DUECK 2006: 45, YARROW 2006: 90, MUCCIOLI 2013: 4426-4427, GALLOTTA 2014: 66.

³⁰ Nothing is known about Memnon, not even his birthplace. Nevertheless, he is supposed to be from Heraclea or to have lived there (Müller, *FHG* III: 525, JANKE 1963: 7).

³¹ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 40, 3; see below.

³² LAQUEUR 1926: 1098-1099, MOMIGLIANO 1934: 829, MAZZARINO 1974: 538-540 n. 484, BITTNER 1998: 4, YARROW 2006: 357.

³³ JANKE 1963: 11, BITTNER 1998: 4, DUECK 2006: 45, 59 n. 13, GALLOTTA 2014: 66.

³⁴ Müller, *FHG* III: 525, Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 267-268, HENRY 1965: 177, McDONALD – SACKS 1996: 955, MEISTER 1999: 1205-1206, DESIDERI 2007: 46-47, WIEMER 2013: 4132.

³⁵ Cf. SANTANGELO 2004: 247, Keaveney – Madden, Memnon *BNJ* 434, *Biographical Essay*, MUCCIOLI 2013: 4426-4427.

³⁶ Precisely, the text mentions only Book 12, but these chapters give an account of both books (JANKE 1963: 5, 11 n. 1).

³⁷ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 6-17.

³⁸ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 21-40.

³⁹ Phot. *Letter to Tarasius*.

It implies that the relation between Photius' summary and the original work may be analysed *only* when the latter survives.⁴⁰

With regard to historical works, Photius' information is reliable, independently from how and how much he shortened the original work.⁴¹ On these grounds, it is not surprising that the most relevant works about Memnon are historical commentaries.⁴² They focus on the historical information, neglecting philological issues and the insoluble problem of Photius-Memnon correlation.

2. The Kingdom of Bithynia in Memnon

The commentaries on Memnon deal with passages concerning the kingdom of Bithynia from a historical perspective. They focus on dating and development of events and use Memnon's information to depict a consistent historical framework. According to a "historiographical" approach, we draw attention to passages in themselves, i.e. to their narrative features and setting in Photius' summary.⁴³

The first mention of Bithynia is in Photius' Chapter 6, which was originally part of Memnon's Book 13.⁴⁴ Describing Heraclea's politics after Lysimachus' death, Memnon tells about the attack by the first king of Bithynia, Zipoites (328-ca. 280 BC) on Heraclea. The report stresses both Zipoites' aggressive behaviour and the brave struggle of the Heracleans, according to the patriotic attitude characterising Memnon's whole narrative.⁴⁵ After two chapters devoted to the Heracleian affairs, Photius' Chapter 9 informs us about Zipoites' victory over Antiochus I's general, which is last known event of the Bithynian king's reign.⁴⁶ The account continues with the situation of Heraclea and the Bithynians in the early 270s BC.⁴⁷ According to Memnon, Antiochus I attacked Zipoites' son and successor Nicomedes I (ca. 280-ca. 255 BC), who asked Heraclea for support. Then there are two events that are said to occur at the same time of the alliance between Nicomedes and the

⁴⁰ DESIDERI 1967: 368-372, YARROW 2006: 110. For comparisons between Photius' *codices* and original texts, see the examples in HÄGG 1975, SCHAMP 1987, SCHAMP 2000, AMERIO 2006. It worth noticing that Photius seems to intervene in original works even in those *codices* supposed to preserve the original text word-by-word. An example is *Codex 243* preserving Himerius' work: the comparison with the original text reveals that the patriarch made slight changes to improve the understanding of the text (COLONNA 1951: 100).

⁴¹ YARROW 2006: 110.

⁴² JANKE 1963, Keaveney – Madden, Memnon *BNJ* 434, DAVAZE 2013.

⁴³ For the historical commentary on quoted passages the implicit reference is to the mentioned commentaries *ad loc.*

⁴⁴ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 6, 3: Ζιποίτης δέ, ὁ Βιθυνῶν ἐπάρχων, ἐχθρῶς ἔχων Ἡρακλεώταις πρότερον μὲν διὰ Λυσίμαχον, τότε δὲ διὰ Σέλευκον (διάφορος γὰρ ἦν ἑκατέρωι), τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν ἐπιδρομὴν, ἔργα κακώσεως ἀποδεικνύς, ἐποιεῖτο οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τὸ αὐτοῦ στράτευμα κακῶν ἀπαθεῖς ἔπραττον ἄπερ ἔπραττον, ἔπασχον δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ὧν ἔδρων οὐ κατὰ πολὺ ἀνεκτότερα ("Zipoites, ruler of the Bithynians, who was hostile to the Heracleans, earlier on account of Lysimachus, but then on account of Seleucus [for he was in disagreement with each of them], making a display of maliciousness made an attack against them. On the other hand his troops did not conduct their campaign without indeed suffering harm; they themselves suffered things not much more tolerable than those they were carrying out").

⁴⁵ Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 271, DESIDERI 1967: 376-377, SANTANGELO 2004: 261, YARROW 2006: 93-94, 138-141, 220.

⁴⁶ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 9, 2.

⁴⁷ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 9-11.

city. The first is the reconquest by Heraclea of some lands it had temporarily lost. The second is the Heracleian victory over Zipoites, Nicomedes I's brother, who was trying to oust the legitimate king.

Photius' Chapter 10 opens with the expression "at the same time" (κατὰ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους) and deals with Antiochus I's attack to Nicomedes I and the latter's request to Heraclea for help. Without any doubt, it is the same episode described above: not only the protagonists are the same, but almost of all these events are said to be contemporaneous to each other. The expressions "about the same time" and "at the same time" are the only chronological references linking these pieces of information.⁴⁸ Lack of absolute chronological references is a mark of Memnon's narrative⁴⁹ and here it contributes to makes the account unclear. This lack of clarity may be the consequence of Photius' intervention: he supposedly shortened excessively Memnon's narrative, which evidently described a more complex *scenario*.⁵⁰ In fact, Photius' Chapters 9-10 describe intertwined events, which had Nicomedes I as protagonist: in front of Antiochus I's and Zipoites' threats, he asked Heraclea for military help.

Photius' Chapter 11 deals with the alliance of Nicomedes I and the Galatians against Zipoites and ends with Nicomedes I's final victory over his brother, thanks to the new allies and the Heracleians. Most of the chapter concerns the clauses of the agreement with the Galatians, which have the formulaic style of the official documents.⁵¹ The quotation of archive documents is typical of local histories,⁵² and the formulaic style highlights that Memnon was close to Nymphis, his source for these events. It also certifies that Photius remained close to Memnon. It is just the opposite of what he did in the former chapters, where, as mentioned earlier, the excessively shortened account causes confusion.

Photius' Chapter 12 is a long digression on Bithynia, which begins from the foundation of Astacus as Nicomedia by Nicomedes I.⁵³ Then, it shortly describes the early history of Astacus until the foundation by the Athenians and continues with the list of the dynasts ruling Bithynia from the late 5th century BC to Zipoites:

⁴⁸ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 9, 5: ὑπὸ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους, Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 10, 1: Κατὰ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους.

⁴⁹ Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 271, DUECK 2006: 48-49. Usually in Memnon events are said to have occurred before, at the same time or after another. There are some synchronisms, but the Olympic system is used only to date the foundation of Astacus by the Megarians (Memnon *BNJ*, 434 F 1, 12, 2). This single usage of the Olympic system suggests that Memnon employed absolute dating only occasionally. Otherwise, and highly unlikely, we have to conclude that Photius deleted all other absolute dates systematically.

⁵⁰ DAVAZE 2013: 335-336.

⁵¹ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 11, 2: αἱ δὲ συνθηκαὶ Νικομήδει μὲν καὶ τοῖς ἐκγόνοις αἰεὶ φίλα φρονεῖν τοὺς Βαρβάρους, καὶ τῆς γνώμης τοῦ Νικομήδους χωρὶς μηδενὶ συμμαχεῖν τῶν πρὸς αὐτοὺς διαπρεσβευομένων, ἀλλ' εἶναι φίλους μὲν τοῖς φίλοις, πολεμίους δὲ τοῖς οὐ φιλοῦσι· συμμαχεῖν δὲ καὶ Βυζαντίοις, εἴ που δεήσοι, καὶ Τιανοῖς δὲ καὶ Ἡρακλεώταις καὶ Καλχηδονίοις καὶ Κιερανοῖς καὶ τισὶν ἑτέροις ἔθνων ἄρχουσιν ("The treaty: the barbarians must always be kindly disposed towards Nicomedes and his descendants; and they must not, without the approval of Nicomedes, be an ally of any of those who send embassies to them; rather they must be friends to his friends but enemies to those who are not his friends; likewise they must be allies of the Byzantines, should the need arise anywhere, and of the Tians, but also of the Heracleians and the Chalcedonians and the Cierians and of some other rulers of peoples"). MITCHELL 1993: 16, DUECK 2006: 49, TOMASCHITZ 2007: 568, ARSLAN 2011: 391-392, DAVAZE 2013: 353.

⁵² WIEMER 2013: 4131.

⁵³ On digressions in Memnon's work, see YARROW 2006: 141-142, DUECK 2006: 49.

ἐκτροχωθεῖσα, Ἀθηναίων αὐτὴν μετὰ Μεγαρέας ἐπωικηκότων, ἔληξέ τε τῶν συμφορῶν καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα δόξης καὶ ἰσχύος ἐγένετο, Δοιδαλοῦ τηνικαῦτα τὴν Βιθυνῶν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντος. οὗ τελευτήσαντος ἄρχει Βοτείρας, ζήσας ζ καὶ ὀ ἔτη. τοῦτον διαδέχεται Βᾶς ὁ υἱός, ὃς καὶ Κάλαν τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου στρατηγόν, καίτοι γελίαν παρεσκευασμένον πρὸς τὴν μάχην, κατηγωνίσαστο, καὶ τῆς Βιθυνίας παρεσκεύασε τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἀποσχέσθαι· τούτου βίος μὲν ἐγγόνει ἐτῶν ᾱ καὶ ὀ, ὧν ἐβασίλευσε ν̄. οὗ παῖς τῆς ἀρχῆς διάδοχος Ζιποίτης, λαμπρὸς ἐν πολέμοις γεγινώς, καὶ τοὺς Λυσιμάχου στρατηγοὺς τὸν μὲν ἀνελῶν, τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ μήκιστον τῆς οἰκείας ἀπελάσας ἀρχῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῦ Λυσιμάχου, εἶτα καὶ Ἀντιόχου τοῦ παιδὸς Σελεύκου ἐπικρατέστερος γεγινώς, τοῦ τε τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλεύοντος καὶ τοῦ Μακεδόνων, κτίζει πόλιν ὑπὸ τῷ Λυπερωῖ (?) ὄρει τῇ αὐτοῦ κλήσει ἐπώνυμον. οὗτος βιούς μὲν ἔτη ζ καὶ ὀ, κρατήσας δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἧ καὶ μ̄, καταλείπει παῖδας δ̄.

When the Athenians had gone to it (i.e. Astacus) as colonists after the Megarians, its misfortunes ceased and it became great in renown and power (435/4 BC). At that time Doidalsos was ruling over the Bithynians. When he died Boteiras ruled. He lived for seventy-six years. He was succeeded by his son Bas who even defeated Calas, Alexander's general, although he was prepared to a high degree for the battle and he ensured that the Macedonians kept away from Bithynia. This man lived for seventy-one years and for fifty of these he was king. His son and successor in the rule, Zipoites, became illustrious in war and of the generals of Lysimachus, killed one and drove the other as far as possible from his own realm. But after he had also gained the upper hand over Lysimachus himself and then over Antiochus, son of Seleucus, ruler of Asia and the Macedonians, he founded a city named after himself at the foot of Mount Luperos. He lived for seventy-six years, ruled over his realm for forty-eight and left behind four children.⁵⁴

As the Athenians intervened in Astacus in 435/4 BC, we may establish with some accuracy when these Bithynian dynasts lived and ruled. Aside from historical implications, this passage exemplifies Memnon's use of synchronisms, which is another feature of his chronological system.⁵⁵ The digression shows the "biographic" approach also characterising the chapters about the tyrants of Heraclea⁵⁶ and focuses on the military successes of the Bithynians dynasts, the duration of their rules and foundations of cities. We cannot say whether Memnon's account was focused on these elements, or what we see is the result of Photius' intervention. However, a detail suggests that Photius selected the information: according to the summary, Bas "*even* defeated Calas." So Memnon may have related other episodes of Bas' rule that Photius decided to not sum up.

The digression ends with a clear assessment of Nicomedes I's reign:

τοῦτον ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῶν παίδων Νικομήδης διαδέχεται, τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς οὐκ ἀδελφὸς ἀλλὰ δήμιος γεγινώς, ἐκρατύνατο μέντοι καὶ οὗτος τὴν Βιθυνῶν ἀρχὴν, μάλιστα γὰρ τοὺς Γαλάτας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν διαπεραιωθῆναι συναράμενος, καὶ πόλιν, ὡς προεῖρηται, τὴν αὐτοῦ προσηγορίαν ἀνέστησε φέρουσαν.

Nicomedes the elder of the children succeeded him (i.e. Zipoites) and became to his brothers not a brother but a public executioner. However, this man also strengthened the kingdom of the Bithynians especially, at any rate, after he had

⁵⁴ Memnon BNJ 434, F 1, 12, 4-5.

⁵⁵ DUECK 2006: 48, and cf. above.

⁵⁶ Memnon BNJ 434, F 1, 1-4, cf. DUECK 2006: 46.

assisted the Galatians to cross into Asia. And, as has been mentioned previously, he built a city bearing his own name.⁵⁷

As with the former rulers, Memnon mentions the main steps of Nicomedes I's reign and concludes the *excursus* by quoting the foundation of Nicomedia again, in a sort of ring composition.⁵⁸ Yet, Nicomedes' military successes are moved to the background in respect to the crime he committed against his own brothers. Memnon condemns Nicomedes as he condemns Clearchus for the assassination of his own mother.⁵⁹ These are the most representative examples of Memnon's moralistic attitude, which brands the crime against parents and relatives as the most terrible.⁶⁰

Photius' Chapter 13 relates the war involving the Heracleian colony Callatis over the *emporion* of Tomis. Chapter 14 deals with the struggle of Ziaelas (ca. 255-230 BC) for the throne of Bithynia. According to Memnon, he was the son born to Nicomedes I by his first wife and subsequently refuted by him. At the death of his father, Ziaelas opposed his will and fought against the guardians of his second wife's sons. We find again two features of Memnon's narrative. First, the use of a relative system of dating. The account of the war over Tomis and the one of the Bithynian crisis are linked by the general phrase "after a very brief lapse of time."⁶¹ Second, the patriotic approach. The author exalts the Heracleians, who were among the guardians of Nicomedes I's sons, with these words: "the Heracleians distinguished themselves in battle and in the treaty gained an advantage."⁶²

With this chapter the section preserving information about Bithynia comes to an end and Bithynia "reappears" only later, in Chapter 19. Photius' Chapter 15 relates a war between Antiochus II⁶³ and Byzantium very shortly. Chapter 16 deals with an episode occurring "not long afterwards" and commonly dated to about 250 BC: the Heracleian embassy to the Galatians pillaging the kingdom of Pontus.⁶⁴ This passage is well-known because it mentions Nymphis among the ambassadors. Photius' short Chapter 17 records a donation to Heraclea by a king Ptolemy, who is identified either with Ptolemy II (282-246 BC) or Ptolemy III (246-221 BC).⁶⁵ These chapters further exalt Heraclea's deeds, representing one of the best examples of patriotic attitude in Memnon.

So far, Photius proposes a continuous chain of events that arrives at the second half of the 3rd century BC. Afterwards, there is a section of a few chapters that are very difficult to interpret, which sum up part of Memnon's Books 14-15. Photius' Chapter 18 is a long

⁵⁷ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 12, 6.

⁵⁸ On the ring composition in Memnon's digressions, see Keaveney – Madden, Memnon *BNJ* 434, FF 12, 20, *Commentary*.

⁵⁹ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 5, 3.

⁶⁰ For Memnon's moralistic tendency, see DUECK 2006: 47-49 with further examples.

⁶¹ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 14, 1: Οὐ πολλοῦ δὲ πάνυ ῥυέντος χρόνου.

⁶² Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 14, 2: Ηρακλεωτῶν ἐν ταῖς μάχαις ἀριστευόντων κὰν ταῖς συμβάσει τὸ συμφέρον καταπραττόντων.

⁶³ See the historical commentaries on Memnon *ad loc.* *Contra* GRAINGER 1997: 35-36 identifying the king with Antiochus Hierax.

⁶⁴ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 16: μετ' οὐ πολὺ. For the date, see BITTNER 1998: 86 as well as the historical commentaries on Memnon *ad loc.*

⁶⁵ About the identity of the king, see the *status quaestionis* in Keaveney – Madden, Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 17, *Commentary* (with bibliography).

digression on Rome, which aims to introduce one of the protagonists of the last chapters.⁶⁶ The first part is a sort of *archaiologia* of Rome beginning from its foundation and focusing on the stages of its rise in the Mediterranean. The second part deals with the Roman intervention in Asia against Antiochus III in 192 BC. In this section, the patriotic tendency emerges again: the narrative indeed exalts the Heracleans' deeds against the enemy of Rome.

According to Photius' Chapter 19, the information presented hitherto was originally part of Memnon's Books 13-14; from that point on, the patriarch sums up Memnon's Book 15. For the first episode of this book, Photius recounts the attack to Heraclea by Prusias I of Bithynia (230-ca. 182 BC). The report focuses on the serious accident for which the Bithynian king gained the nickname "the cripple."⁶⁷ This taste for anecdotes should be connected with Memnon's biographical interest, which emerges, for instance, in the *excursus* about the Bithynian rulers. Like other passages, this one contains no reference to an absolute system of dating: the accident is said to have taken place a few years before Prusias I's death, i.e., supposedly in the 180s BC.⁶⁸

Photius' Chapter 20 describes very shortly the attack of the Galatians on Heraclea "before the Romans had crossed into Asia," that is, before 192 BC.⁶⁹ The only element that these three chapters have in common is the explicit or implicit reference to the arrival of the Romans, which is the chronological benchmark of this section. The chapters about the two sieges of Heraclea show a local perspective, emerging also in Photius' Chapter 21. As short as the two former chapters, it concerns a later event: the Heracleian intervention in the Social War in the early 1st century BC.

After this apparently inconsistent series of disconnected episodes, ideally covering the period from the second half of the 3rd century to the early 1st century BC, but in fact focusing on the Roman intervention in Asia Minor, the narrative comes back to providing a continuous account. Photius' Chapters 22-40, which summarise Memnon's Books 15-16, deal with the Mithridatic Wars.⁷⁰ This section is different from the former ones for narrative structure and perspective. Previously, each chapter is a unity: it recounts a single event or presents a single historical situation. Thus, the narrative looks like a series of juxtaposed and, in themselves, completed accounts. Now, the chapters are part of a long, consistent and organic narrative from about 100 BC down to the late 60s BC. As for perspective, as observed earlier, the first part of Photius' summary shows a local approach focusing on Heraclea and Northern Anatolia. From Photius' Chapter 22, the protagonists are Rome and Mithridates VI: they are the poles around which the whole narrative pivots.⁷¹ Consequently, the other players in this historical scene "disappear" almost completely: they are mentioned seldom and always in connection with the Romano-Pontic deeds. Even the references to Heraclea are fewer in number and related to events of the conflict against Mithridates.

⁶⁶ DUECK 2006: 50.

⁶⁷ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 19, 3.

⁶⁸ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 19, 3. For the date of this episode, as well as the commentaries on Memnon *ad. loc.*, see DMITRIEV 2007.

⁶⁹ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 20: οὐπω τῶν Ῥωμαίων εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβεβηκότων.

⁷⁰ On this section, see DESIDERI 1970-1971, SANTANGELO 2004: 250-261, DUECK 2006: 50-59, DESIDERI 2007: 47-59.

⁷¹ DESIDERI 1967: 377, DESIDERI 1970-1971: 487-495, SANTANGELO 2004: 255-256, YARROW 2006: 144-145, 258-259.

Here, again, Bithynia serves as a good analytic tool. There is no reference to its involvement in the Cappadocia affair, where Nicomedes III (127-94 BC) with certainty played a relevant role.⁷² The only mention of a Bithynian king by name is in Photius' Chapter 22,⁷³ which deals with Mithridates VI's attempt to extend his power over Bithynia by using Socrates, the brother of Nicomedes IV (94-74 BC), as his *longa manus*. Afterwards, Bithynia no longer appears as a political entity, but only as a geographical one, i.e., as the scene of Mithridates VI's deeds. As far as we can see from Photius' summary, Memnon wholly neglects the role of Bithynia in the Mithridatic Wars, when Nicomedes IV was repeatedly expelled from his kingdom by Mithridates VI. The only allusion to these events is in the peace agreement of Dardanus (85 BC), in Photius' Chapter 25.⁷⁴ Here, there is a hint at the return to the throne of the legitimate king of Bithynia. Even more surprisingly, Memnon makes no apparent reference to the events after Nicomedes IV's death, when Rome inherited the kingdom.

3. Memnon's Sources. Confirmations and News

Narrative structure and perspective changes allow us to divide Photius' summary into three sections. The first ends with Photius' Chapter 17 and corresponds to the portions of Memnon's account that rely on Nymphis.⁷⁵ As said, the most recent analysis concerning this section comes from Billows, who argues convincingly that Memnon used both Nymphis' works and distinguishes the section depending on Nymphis' local history (Photius' Chapters 1-7) and the one on his general history (Photius' Chapters 8-17). As we have seen above, an examination of Memnon's information concerning Bithynia confirms Billows' proposal. Except for Zipoites' attack on Heraclea in Photius' Chapter 6, most of the references to Bithynia are in the section depending on Nymphis' *On Alexander, the Diadochi, and the Epigoni*. It is likely that this information on the kingdom bordering Heraclea was originally part of a work focusing on Northern Anatolia, such as Nymphis' general history.

Memnon is commonly considered an essential source for the history of Bithynia on the grounds of the rich and detailed information he provides. In view of this, Davaze suggests that Memnon wrote for a Bithynian audience.⁷⁶ And yet, as highlighted above, the information on Bithynia does not occur in Memnon's whole work in the same manner, but rather concentrated in the section that derives from Nymphis. So, it is Nymphis, rather than Memnon, who had a particular interest in this kingdom and thus, perhaps, a Bithynian audience. The use of a contemporary source, such as Nymphis, explains not only the extremely detailed information on the early Hellenistic period, but also the character of the only political assessment reported by Photius. In the account of Nicomedes I's alliance with the Galatians, Memnon says about their passage to Asia:

⁷² Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 22. The Cappadocian campaign of Nicomedes III is known to us by Just. 38.1.2-10. On this episode, see GLEW 1987.

⁷³ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 22, 5-8. For sake of completeness, Memnon (*BNJ* 434, F 1, 32) records a foundation by Prusias I.

⁷⁴ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 25, 2.

⁷⁵ Whether Photius' Chapter 17 is part of this section or not depends on the identification of king of Egypt it mentions. If he is Ptolemy II, the source is Nymphis' general history, which finished with the accession of Ptolemy III (246 BC), but if he is Ptolemy III, the chapter possibly does not depend on Nymphis.

⁷⁶ DAVAZE 2013: 42-43.

αὕτη τοίνυν τῶν Γαλατῶν ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν διάβασις κατ'ἀρχὰς μὲν ἐπὶ κακῶι τῶν οἰκητόρων προελθεῖν ἐνομίσθη, τὸ δὲ τέλος ἔδειξεν ἀποκριθὲν πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον· τῶν γὰρ βασιλέων τὴν τῶν πόλεων δημοκρατίαν ἀφελεῖν σπουδαζόντων, αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον ταύτην ἐβεβαίουν, ἀντικαθιστάμενοι τοῖς ἐπιτιθεμένοις.

Moreover, this very passage of the Galatians to Asia was at first considered to have tended to the detriment of the inhabitants but finally the event proved to have ended to their advantage, for while the kings were eager to take democracy away from the cities, the Galatians themselves strengthened it, being opposed to those who were attacking it.⁷⁷

In this deeply negative judgment, Hellenistic kingdoms are in contrast with *poleis*—the “natural location” of democracy. Such an opinion seems not to be attributable to Memnon, who lived after the rise of the Roman Empire in the East when the words “*polis*” and “kingdom” had lost their ideological value. Instead, such terms better fit Nymphis, who was witness to the irreversible rise of the Hellenistic kingdoms, which meant the end of “the era of *poleis*.” As democratic politician, Nymphis still hoped for the survival of the *polis* as the dominant political pattern. And so, he might have considered the Galatians as the historical factor, which could stop the rise of the kingdoms.⁷⁸ Surprisingly, even through two “filters” (Memnon and Photius), we still can detect traces of the original source (Nymphis). Indeed, Photius’ summary seems to offer an outline for Nymphis’ lost general history. The special interest on Bithynia may suggest that the author dealt with this kingdom extensively, and possibly presented it as the protagonist of Northern Anatolia. Assuming that it make sense to uses the conventional tags “local historian” and “(general) historian” (i.e. author dealing with broad history), the “survival” of Nymphis’ general history in Memnon leads to a new evaluation of Nymphis’ production. So far, indeed, scholars have portrayed him as a local historian, considering his general history completely lost.

The second section is comprised of Photius’ Chapters 18-20 and probably Chapter 21, i.e., the digression on Rome and the very short narratives on the two sieges of Heraclea at about the time of the Roman intervention in Asia (192 BC) and the Social War. These chapters are the only discussion we see in Photius for the long time span from the late 3rd century BC to early 1st century BC. Ideally, they should be the connection between the two most developed sections, that about the Classical and early Hellenistic periods and that about the Mithridatic Wars. And yet, they seem to be “isolated” from the rest of the narrative and from each other.⁷⁹ There is no explicit link among them, beyond the recurring reference to the arrival of the Romans in Asia, which constitutes a sort of chronological benchmark. Chapters 19-20 deal with two local episodes according to the perspective characterising both the former section and the following Chapter 21, which

⁷⁷ Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 11, 4.

⁷⁸ Also TOMASCHITZ 2007: 568-569 and DAVAZE 2013: 54 stress that the passage presents the Galatians positively. It is the only case: elsewhere Memnon portrays them as violent and warlike (DAVAZE 2013: 54-55). On the Galatians in Asia Minor in the Hellenistic and Roman period, see STROBEL 1996, MITCHELL 2003, ARSLAN 2004, STROBEL 2007, STROBEL 2007a, CUŞKUN 2011, CUŞKUN 2013. According to DUEK 2006: 48, there are traces of “some political awareness” in Memnon’s portrait of Timosthenes (Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 3, 1). The scholar attributes this to Memnon, but these traces, such as the evaluation about the historical role of the Galatians, should be attributed to Nymphis (DESIDERI 1967: 397).

⁷⁹ Scholars (Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 268-269, DESIDERI 1967: 375, DESIDERI 1970-1971: 493, YARROW 2006: 143) highlight the existence of two temporal gaps after Photius’ Chapter 17 and 20 respectively. Yet as noticed above, it is not possible to include Chapters 17 and 21 to one of the section with certainty.

deals with the involvement of Heraclea in the Social War and shares with the previous chapters the juxtaposed narrative structure.

The third section, preserved in Photius' Chapters 22-40, is an organic account relating to the about 30 years of the Mithridatic Wars with a "Roman-Pontic" focus. Here, Photius' account is not homogenous, with nearly half of the chapters devoted to this relatively short time span and treating the earlier events in abbreviated fashion.⁸⁰

Some scholars explain this situation by assuming Photius has selectively reported Memnon.⁸¹ Thus, Photius would only have provided a hurried summary of the second-century-BC events and would have dealt with the Mithridatic Wars extensively and organically because he was interested in the rise of Rome in the East.⁸² But the first section of his summary (Chapters 1-17) is the main argument against this proposal. If Photius aimed to focus on the Roman affairs, he did not need to deal with the Classical and Hellenistic material so extensively. As the passages about Bithynia reveal, some marks of Photius' intervention are indeed visible—he seems to abbreviate some parts (see above)—but in the end remains very close to Memnon's text, such as the discussion of the alliance agreement between Nicomedes I and the Galatians. This confirms Yarrow's conclusions about Photius' method in summarising Memnon: "he (i.e. Photius) alternates between apparently brief summarization and what seems to be a collage of original sentences and phrases."⁸³ Furthermore, it is worth highlighting that Photius preserves two long digressions on the Bithynian rulers and on Rome. In Memnon's work, both of them had a clear narrative function, but the former is totally unneeded to the summary if we assume any kind of selection by Photius.

On these grounds, what we read is somehow affected by Photius' summarising method, but there is no point to assume that Photius deviated from the original text. He probably summed up more or less extensively what he found in Memnon.⁸⁴ Thus, Memnon presented the information from Nymphis in detail, dealt with the 2nd century BC hurriedly, and devoted to the Mithridatic Wars part of Book 15 and the whole Book 16—i.e., almost a quarter of what Photius read. We may also assume that Memnon himself nourished a special interest in the Mithridatic Wars and so provided an account not only detailed but also organic and, in general terms, better structured than the previous sections.

An element of Photius' summary was certainly already present in Memnon: the perspective change distinguishing the first and second section from the third one. As Billows rightly observes in respect to the information depending on Nymphis,⁸⁵ a perspective change may indicate a change of source. Consequently, we should look for two

⁸⁰ Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 268, DESIDERI 1967: 371 n. 28, 374-375, YARROW 2006: 109.

⁸¹ DESIDERI 1967: 370-372, DESIDERI 1970-1971: 493, MENDELS 1986, DUECK 2006: 44-45, ARSLAN 2007: X-XI, DAVAZE 2013: 33, cf. YARROW 2006: 143.

⁸² Photius would have collected the historical works in his *Bibliotheca* to compose a universal history. If so, each work should describe a discrete period of human history. In such a plan, Memnon's work would have the Roman conquest of Asia Minor, the symbol of the future Byzantine conquest at Photius' eyes (DESIDERI 1967: 370-372, MENDELS 1986, DESIDERI 1991: 7-8 n. 2, DUECK 2006: 44-45, ARSLAN 2007: X-XI, DAVAZE 2013: 33).

⁸³ YARROW 2006: 109.

⁸⁴ JANKE 1963: 137-139, cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 268-269, DESIDERI 1967: 375 n. 46, SANTANGELO 2004: 255.

⁸⁵ Billows, *Nymphis BNJ* 432, *Biographical Essay*.

sources for Photius' Chapters 18-40. They should differ for perspectives and quality of information. To deal with them, it is useful to start from the common view on the sources after Photius' Chapter 17.

Scholars unanimously agree that Memnon used only one source after Nymphis⁸⁶ and that it was a Heracleian historian. As well as Nymphis and Memnon, three other Heracleian historians are known to us: Promathidas,⁸⁷ Amphytheos⁸⁸ and Domitius Callistratus.⁸⁹ We have no information about them and the few surviving fragments preserve nearly exclusively mythical or geographical information.⁹⁰ For Domitius Callistratus, scholars accept the hypothetical biography suggested by Müller. Noticing that the *nomen* Domitius occurs only in some of the nine fragments attributed to this author, Müller assumes that his life story was similar to that of Alexander *Polyhistor*: he was taken to Rome as a slave during the Third Mithridatic War, was freed by his owner and thus acquired the latter's *nomen*.⁹¹ In support of a dating to the 1st century BC, Domitius Callistratus is also identified with Callistratus, who wrote a *Peri Samothrakias* according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus.⁹²

Since writing a *Peri Herakleias* and supposedly living in the 1st century BC, Domitius Callistratus is considered Memnon's source after Nymphis,⁹³ though some reject this assumption as based on speculative arguments.⁹⁴ Even if this remark is *stricto sensu* correct, the proposal remains appealing. It explains the detail of Memnon's account by the use of an author, who lived during the Mithridatic Wars and presumably had first-hand information.⁹⁵

⁸⁶ Cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 270-271, DESIDERI 1970-1971: 494-496, AMELING 1995: 374-375, BITTNER 1998: 4, MEISTER 1999 a, SANTANGELO 2004: 251, DESIDERI 2007: 47, HEINEMANN 2010: 216, 265-268, DAVAZE 2013: 58-65.

⁸⁷ Müller, *FHG* III: 201-202, Jacoby, *FGrHist* 430, *Commentary*: 256-258, DESIDERI 1967: 381, 391-395, DESIDERI 1991: 12-13, MEISTER 2001, GALLOTTA 2009: 440-441.

⁸⁸ Jacoby, *FGrHist* 431, *Commentary*: 258, DESIDERI 1967: 379 n. 57, GALLOTTA 2009: 436, Cuypers, Amphytheos (?) of Heraclea *BNJ* 431, *Commentary and Biographical Essay*.

⁸⁹ Müller, *FHG* IV: 353-356, Jacoby, *FGrHist* 433, *Commentary*: 265-267, JACOBY 1919, DESIDERI 1970-1971: 495-497, AMELING 1995, MEISTER 1999 a, GALLOTTA 2009: 436, HEINEMANN 2010: 239-257.

⁹⁰ Cf. CLARKE 2008: 197-198.

⁹¹ Müller, *FHG* IV: 353. On Alexander *Polyhistor*, see TROIANI 1988, Blakely, *Alexandros Polyhistor BNJ* 273, *Commentary and Biographical Essay*.

⁹² Dionys. Hal. *AR* I, 68, 2, Jacoby, *FGrHist* 433, *Commentary*: 265, JACOBY 1919, HENDERSON 1937: 224 n. 1, FROMENTIN 1998: 266 n. 294. *Contra* AMELING 1995: 373-374.

⁹³ Jacoby, *FGrHist* 434, *Commentary*: 270-271, DESIDERI 1970-1971: 494-496, AMELING 1995: 374-375, BITTNER 1998: 4, MEISTER 1999 a, SANTANGELO 2004: 251, DESIDERI 2007: 47, HEINEMANN 2010: 216, 265-268, DAVAZE 2013: 58-65.

⁹⁴ DUECK 2006: 50, YARROW 2006: 144 n. 19. BALLESTEROS PASTOR 2013: 40-46 argues that the Roman section of *Peri Herakleias* depends on Trogus' *Philippic Histories*. Even if these works have some element in common, he does not take into consideration that *Peri Herakleias* was a local history, while the *Philippic Histories* was a universal one. It is unlikely that Memnon, a Greek local author, might have used a Latin universal historian. The analogies are possibly due to a common source tradition, but this does not imply any kind of direct dependence. On Trogus/Justin, see FORNI – ANGELI BERTINELLI 1982, ALONSO NÚÑEZ 1987, DEVELIN [–YARDLEY] 1994: 1-11, HECKEL 1997: 1-41, BALLESTEROS PASTOR 2013: 1-15, BECK 2013, POPOV-REYNOLDS 2013, BORGNA 2014. For recent achievements about particular aspects of this work, see also BEARZOT – LANDUCCI 2014, BEARZOT – LANDUCCI 2015.

⁹⁵ Cf. DESIDERI 1970-1971: 494, who claims: "l'autore di questa parte (i.e. of the Roman section) aveva vissuto le Guerre Mitridatiche."

Independently from whether Memnon drew from Domitus Callistratus or not, assuming that Memnon used a different source for the Mithridatic Wars has another, more relevant consequence. It entails that Book 16 was not the end of his work. As with every local history, Memnon's work probably finished with the account about the author's time. If all that we have through Photius depends on a source (no matter which), what did Memnon compose *originally*? Or, in other words, what was Memnon's *personal* contribution to the history of Heraclea?⁹⁶ The issue is strictly connected with the problem of Memnon's dating. As noted earlier, there is only a *terminus post quem*: a reference to a Heracleian appeal to Caesar in mid-1st century BC.⁹⁷ And the only argument for a possible continuation of Memnon's work after Book 16 lies in Photius' unclear words at the end of his *Codex*.

We may examine Photius' last chapters to understand if they could be, at least theoretically, the end of Memnon's *Peri Herakleias*. Photius' Chapter 39 relates the Heracleian embassy to Rome after the conclusion of the Third Mithridatic War (63 BC). Its purpose was to ask good conditions for the city, guilty of having supported Mithridates VI. The embassy succeeded and Heraclea obtained the status of *civitas liberata*.⁹⁸ According to the following Chapter 40, after the negotiations, three ambassadors, Thrasymedes, Brithagoras and his son Propylos, remained in Rome for some years to handle unspecified matters, probably concerning Heraclea. Then, they came back to their hometown and did their best to promote the rebirth of the city.

From this point on, the narrative focuses on Brithagoras, who becomes the only protagonist of the last lines. As Photius notes, when the rebirth of the city had already begun,⁹⁹ Brithagoras addressed Caesar to obtain the freedom of Heraclea, i.e., the status of *civitas foederata*.¹⁰⁰ This embassy is dated to about 47 BC, before Caesar's return to Rome.¹⁰¹ Brithagoras's efforts resulted in a half-success: he obtained a promise from Caesar to act, but not in fact the freedom of the city, because, according to Photius, Caesar was not in Rome at that time. The summary continues, mentioning Brithagoras' long travels with Caesar and his close friendship with him, and it ends describing the sorrow of the Heracleians for Brithagoras' death some years later.

Some scholars claim that this cannot be the end of Memnon's *Peri Herakleias*, for the account breaks off in an "unsuitable" moment, when the destiny of Heraclea was not sure and the rebirth had not taken place yet.¹⁰² They stress that the rebirth of Heraclea occurred in the next decades when literary and archaeological evidence testifies to the resurgent

⁹⁶ On local history as a result of a collective creative process, see DESIDERI 2007: 46.

⁹⁷ See below.

⁹⁸ JANKE 1963: 127-128, Keaveney – Madden, Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 39, *Commentary*.

⁹⁹ Memnon 434 F 1, 40, 3: ἤδη τῆς πόλεως αὐξομένης ("when the city was already growing").

¹⁰⁰ JANKE 1963: 128, Keaveney – Madden, Memnon *BNJ* 434, F 1, 40, *Commentary*. According to MAZZARINO 1974: 539-540 n. 484, the text refers to Augustus and not Caesar; *contra* SANTANGELO 2004: 250 n. 12.

¹⁰¹ JANKE 1963: 128, YARROW 2006: 355, DESIDERI 2007: 58, Keaveney – Madden, Memnon *BNJ*, 434 F 1, 40, *Commentary*.

¹⁰² SANTANGELO 2004: 249-250 ("il codice si interrompe, in effetti, nel momento che, da un punto di vista storico, sarebbe meno logico attendersi"), YARROW 2006: 355-356 ("The death of the senior Heracleian statesman, Brithagoras ... seems to be an awkward moment to drop the curtain on a history of Heraclea. Memnon must have known about some of the Roman decisions, which deeply affected Heraclea over the next generation"), DESIDERI 2007: 58 ("Quale interesse ci poteva essere a raccontare una storia che terminava con una situazione di stallo...?").

cultural and economic prosperity of the city in Imperial times.¹⁰³ In view of this, they assume that Memnon *must* have described this new phase in the history of Heraclea. However, the point is not to demonstrate that Memnon possibly had material to continue his history, but to understand if he *aimed* to do so.

The narrative about the Mithridatic Wars is a consistent block ending with the account about the 60s BC (Photius' Chapters 22-40, 2). Then, we have a short appendix about the 40s BC, which seems isolated from the former passages, both in terms of chronology and content. Here, Memnon's admiration for the Heracleian hero Brithagoras shines through Photius' words. He stresses the obstinacy of the Heracleian politician, who, even though aged, spent his last years travelling to gain the freedom of his hometown. In fact, these lines may be defined as a commendation for Brithagoras.¹⁰⁴

The narrative is, strictly speaking, complete with the return of the Heracleian ambassadors. *This* would have been an "unsuitable" moment to conclude the work, because, at that time, the rebirth of Heraclea was just a wish. And indeed it was not the end. As far as we see in Photius, the author did not recount the following historical developments, but "jumped" ahead to the 40s BC. At that time, the rebirth was already ongoing, as Photius himself records, and Brithagoras received the promise of freedom for Heraclea by Caesar. Brithagoras' achievement seems to be the final step of the rebirth of the city in the author's eyes. It concluded the phase of transition, which had begun after the end of the Mithridatic Wars. The commendation of Brithagoras, the man who obtained such a goal, may have been the acme of Memnon's work. The end of Photius' summary does not require a continuation. On the contrary, it looks like the perfect conclusion for a history of a city: what is better than the celebration of a politician as a civic hero? In the light of this, it is likely that Memnon's work came to an end with Book 16.

If so, Memnon did not use a source for the account of Photius' Chapters 22-40, but he himself collected materials and arranged information originally. Three other arguments speak in favour of this assumption. Firstly, the wide room devoted to the Mithridatic Wars. As is well known, in local histories the closer to the author's time, the more detailed the account becomes both because the author is supposed to be particularly interested in events he witnessed and because he has rich information at his disposal. This remark leads us to the second point: information. As Desideri observes, the account of the Roman section may depend on archive documents completely.¹⁰⁵ Thirdly, narrative development. The care in composing this section may be another mark of Memnon's particular interest in this subject, and it may be easily explained if this section dealt with his own times.

Admitting that Memnon composed the last part of his work on his own provides, by implications, the dating of his activity. At any rate, it leaves open the issue about the source for Photius' Chapters 18-21. In view of the local perspective, they may depend on a

¹⁰³ Strabo 12.3.6, cf. bibliography in the previous note.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. SANTANGELO 2004: 261.

¹⁰⁵ As for the source of Photius' Chapters 18-40, DESIDERI 1970-1971: 494 claims that "si potrebbe anche sostenere che una tale fonte non sia esistita e che l'autore si sia servito solo di documenti ufficiali," and he adds (DESIDERI 1970-1971, p. 494 n. 21): "Questa conclusione si potrebbe ricavare dal fatto che, di tutte le (poche) notizie che figurano nella sezione 'romana' di Memnone, anteriori all'epoca delle guerre mitridatiche, le sole che in qualche modo richiedono una precedente narrazione storiografica sono quelle contenute nei capp. 19 e 20; le altre, contenute nel cap. 18, 6-10, a rigore potrebbero essere state ricavate semplicemente da documenti d'archivio o epigrafici (18, 1-6 contiene l'exkursus su Roma, che potrebbe anche essere stato composto in un momento qualsiasi)."

Heracleean historian. If so, Domitius Callistratus might be a good fit, but, given the information we have, this is a little more than a guess.

4. Conclusion

The results of the current investigation show that Book 16 may be the actual end of Memnon's *Peri Herakleias*, and shed a new light on the sources of the second part of Photius' summary (Chapters 18-40). For Chapters 18-21, Memnon drew from a source, which may be tentatively identified as Domitius Callistratus. Memnon also seems to have based the account of the Mithridatic Wars on his direct knowledge of the facts, which implies that Memnon was witness to the latest event he recounts, and so was active in about the mid-1st century BC.

In my opinion, Memnon's work is particularly relevant to the issue of the relation between general and local history. Scholars often consider local history a "minor genre" in contrast with general history.¹⁰⁶ This reductive assessment is mostly due to the character of local histories emerging from the extant fragments. Most of them concern mythic episodes and geo-ethnographic information, but just a few contain historical accounts.¹⁰⁷ At first sight, these works look like anything but histories.¹⁰⁸ And yet, they *were* histories and dealt with the history of a city, an *ethnos* or a region from the origin down to the author's time. What we see from our distant position is the consequence of *testimonia* selection, and this has nothing to do with the original, actual character of the lost works.¹⁰⁹ Memnon's *Peri Herakleias* proves that local histories dealt primarily with historical events, and that, if surviving, they would have given an inconceivable contribution to our understanding of the ancient history. While we might greatly regret the loss of the local histories, we should at the same time highlight the importance of Memnon, not only for the history of Heraclea, but also for the study of local histories. Indeed, Photius' summary of Memnon's work is the only document preserving how a local history worked. In the end, Memnon deals with the history of the Heraclea but places it in a broader context, which allows us to understand many aspects of general history.

ELOISA PAGANONI

UNIVERSITY OF PADOVA

¹⁰⁶ With regard to the local histories surviving in inscriptions, MILLAR 1985: 102 speaks of "composizioni letterarie minori"; against this definition, BOFFO 1988: 18. GABBA 1982: 33 says that "uno di questi 'minori' filoni storiografici è rappresentato dalla storiografia 'locale'." On local history, see LAQUEUR 1926, GABBA 1982, ORSI 1994, DANA – DANA 2001-2003: 93-94, SCHEPENS 2001; CLARKE 2008: 168-244, WIEMER 2013.

¹⁰⁷ This emerges from a quick reading of the surviving fragments of local histories. It is worth mentioning that the most recent and extended treatise on local histories (CLARKE 2008: 168-244) focuses on mythic episodes.

¹⁰⁸ GABBA 1982: 33 claims that local history: "si presentò come una storia di origini e di fondazioni, legata alle genealogie, divine e umane; e anche come storia di fondazione etnica, e quindi connessa con i tradizionali interessi geografici e etnografici greci."

¹⁰⁹ Dealing with the local histories of Heraclea, CLARKE 2008: 198 observes that the *testimonia* "may distort the picture" of these works.

Bibliography

- Alonso Núñez J.M. (1987), *An Augustan World History. The Historiae Philippicae of Pompeius Trogus*, G&R 34, 56-72.
- Ameling W. (1995), *Domitius Kallistratos*, FGrHist 433, «Hermes» 123, 373-376.
- Amerio M. L. (2006), *Appiano in Fozio*, QS 64, 303-309.
- Arslan M. (2004), *Galater. Die vergessenen Kelten*, Scheidegg.
- Arslan M. (2007), *Memnon. Herakleia Pontike Tarihi (περί Ἡρακλείας)*, Birinci Baskı.
- Arslan M. (2011), *Küçük Asya Yerel Historiograflarına bir Örnek: Heraclea Pontike'li Memnon ve Eseri*, «OLBA» 19, 383-405.
- Ballesteros Pastor L. (2013), *Pompeyo Trogo, Justino y Mitrídates. Comentario al Epítome de las Historia Filípicas (37, 1, 6 - 38, 8, 1)*, Heildesheim – Zürich – New York (Spudasmata 154).
- Bearzot C. – Landucci F. (edd.) (2014), *Studi sull'Epítome di Giustino. Dagli Assiri a Filippo II di Macedonia*, Milano (Contributi di Storia Antica 12).
- Bearzot C. – Landucci F. (edd.) (2015), *Studi sull'Epítome di Giustino. Da Alessandro Magno a Filippo V di Macedonia*, Milano (Contributi di Storia Antica 13).
- Beck H. (2013), *Pompeius Trogus*, EAH, 5408.
- Billows R., *Nymphis* BNJ 432, *Commentary and Biographical Essay*, <<http://0-referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/nymphis-432-a432>>.
- Bittner A. (1998), *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft in Herakleia Pontike. Eine Polis zwischen Tyrannis und Selbstverwaltung*, Bonn (Asia Minor Studien 30).
- Blakely S., *Alexandros Polyhistor*, BNJ 273, *Commentary and Biographical Essay*, <<http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/alexandros-polyhistor-273-a273>>.
- Boffo L. (1988), *Epigrafi di città greche: un'espressione di storiografia locale*, in *Studi di storie e storiografia antiche per Emilio Gabba*, Pavia, 9-48.
- Borgna A. (2014), *Uno sguardo originale intorno a Roma: Pompeo Trogo e Giustino*, «La Biblioteca di CC» 1, 52-77, <<http://www.classicocontemporaneo.eu/PDF/116.pdf>>.
- Burstein S.M. (1976), *Outpost of Hellenism: The Emergence of Heraclea on the Black Sea*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.
- Clarke K. (2008), *Making Time for the Past. Local History and the Polis*, Oxford – New York.
- Colonna A. (1951), *Il testo di Imerio nella Biblioteca di Fozio*, in *Miscellanea G. Galbiati, II: Archeologia, storia, filologia classica e bizantina, filologia orientale, glottologia*, Milano, 95-106.
- Cuşkun A. (2011), *Galatians and Seleukids: a Century of Conflict and Cooperation*, in K. Erickson – G. Ramsey (edd.), *Seleucid Dissolution: the Sinking of the Anchor*, Wiesbaden, 86-105.
- Cuşkun A. (2013), *The Galatians in the Graeco-Roman World*, in S.L. Ager – R.A. Faber (edd.), *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World*, Toronto – Buffalo – London, 73-95.

- Cuypers M., Amphiteos(?) of Herakleia BNJ 431, *Commentary and Biographical Essay*, <<http://0-referenceworks.brillonline/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/amphitheos-of-herakleia-431-a431>>.
- Dana D. – Dana M. (2001-2003), *Histoires locales dans le Pont-Euxin Ouest et Nord. Identité grecque et construction du passé*, <<Il Mar Nero>> 5, 91-111.
- Davaze V. (2013), *Memnon, historien d'Héraclée du Pont. Commentaire historique*, PhD Diss. Université du Maine 2013, <<https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00951324/document>>.
- Desideri P. (1967), *Studi di storiografia eracleota. I. Promathidas e Nymphis*, SCO 16, 366-416.
- Desideri P. (1970-1971), *Studi di storiografia eracleota. II. La guerra con Antioco il grande*, SCO 19-20, 487-537.
- Desideri P. (1991), *Cultura eracleota. Da Erdoto a Eraclide Pontico*, in B. Rémy (ed.), *Pontica I. Recherches sur l'histoire du Pont dans l'Antiquité*, Saint-Étienne, 7-24.
- Desideri P. (2007), *I Romani visti dall'Asia: riflessioni sulla sezione romana della Storia di Eraclea di Memnone*, G. Urso (ed.), *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Greci e Romani in Asia Minore*, Pisa, 45-59.
- Develin R. – Yardley J.C. (edd.) (1994), *Justin. Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*, Atlanta.
- Dmitriev S. (2007), *Memnon on the Siege of Heraclea Pontica by Prusias I and the War between the Kingdoms of Bithynia and Pergamum*, JHS 127, 133-138.
- Dueck D. (2006), *Memnon of Heraclea on Rome and the Romans*, in T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.), *Rome and the Black Sea Region: Domination, Romanisation, Resistance*, Aarhus (Black Sea Studies 5), 43-61.
- Flower M.A. (1994), *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric of the Fourth Century B.C.*, Oxford.
- Forni G. – Angeli Bertinelli M.G. (1982), *Pompeo Trogo come fonte di storia*, ANRW II 30.2, 1298-1362.
- Fromentin V. (ed.) (1998), *Denys d'Halicarnasse. Antiquités romaines. Tome I*, Paris.
- Gabba E. (1982), *Riflessione sulla «storiografia locale» antica (fino al II secolo d.C.)*, in C. Violante (ed.), *La storia locale. Temi, fonti e metodi della ricerca*, Bologna, 33-39.
- Gallotta S. (2009), *Introduzione ai Pontika*, in E. Lanzillotta et al. (edd.), *Tradizione e trasmissione degli storici greci frammentari*, Tivoli, 431-445.
- Gallotta S. (2014), *Appunti su Memnone di Eraclea*, «Erga - Logoi» 2, 65-77.
- Glew D.G. (1987), *The Cappadocian Expedition of Nicomedes III Euergetes, King of Bithynia*, ANSMusN 32, 23-55.
- Grainger J. D. (1997), *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*, Leiden – New York – Köln (Mnemosyne Supplements 172).
- Hägg T. (1975), *Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur. Untersuchungen zur Technik des Referierens und Exzerpierens in der Bibliothke*, Uppsala.
- Hannestad L. (1996), «*This Contributes in No Small Way to One's Reputation*». *The Bithynian Kings and the Greek Culture*, in P. Bilde – T. Engberg-Pedersen – L. Hannestad – J. Zahle

- (edd.), *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*, Aarhus (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 7), 67-98.
- Heckel W. (1997), *Justin. Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus. Books 11-12: Alexander the Great*, Oxford.
- Heinemann U. (2010), *Stadtgeschichte im Hellenismus. Die lokalhistoriographischen Vorgänger und Vorlagen Memnons von Heraclea*, München.
- Henderson J. (ed.) (1937), *Dionysius of Halicarnassos. The Roman Antiquities. Books I-II*, Cambridge (Mass.) – London.
- Henry R. (1959), *Photius. Bibliothèque. Tome I («codices» 1-84)*, Paris.
- Henry R. (1965), *Photius. Bibliothèque. Tome IV («codices» 223-229)*, Paris.
- Impellizzeri S. (1993), *La letteratura bizantina da Costantino a Fozio*, Milano.
- Jacoby F. (1919), *Kallistratos (39)*, RE 10, 1748.
- Janke M. (1963), *Historische Untersuchungen zu Memnon von Heraclea. Kap. 18-40, Fgr Hist Nr. 434*, Würzburg.
- Keaveney A. –Madden J.A., *Memnon BNJ 434, Commentary and Biographical Essay*, <<http://0-referenceworks.brillonline.com./entries/brill-s-new-jacob/memnon-434-a434>>.
- Kleu M. (2013), *Bithynia, EAH*, 1137-1140
- Laqueur R. (1926), *Lokalchronic*, RE 13, 1083-1110.
- Laqueur R. (1937), *Nymphis (4)*, RE 17, 1607-1628.
- Mathisen R.W. (1978), *The Activities of Antigonos Gonatas 280-277 B.C. and Memnon of Heraclea, Concerning Heraclea*, «The Ancient World» 1, 71-74.
- Mazzarino S. (1974), *Il pensiero storico classico*, vol. 2, 5th ed., Bari.
- McDonald A.H. – Sacks K.S. (1996), *Memnon (3)*, OCD³, 955.
- Meister K. (1999), *Memnon (5)*, NP 7, 1205-1206.
- Meister K. (1999 a), *Kallistratos (5)*, NP 6, 207.
- Meister K. (2000), *Nymphis*, NP 8, 1073.
- Meister K. (2001), *Promathidas*, NP 10, 401.
- Mendels D. (1986), *Greek and Roman History in the Bibliotheca of Photius. A Note*, «Byzantion» 56, 196-206.
- Michels C. (2009), *Kulturtransfer und monarchischer “Philhellenismus”. Bithynien, Pontus und Kappadokien in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen (Schriften zur politischen Kommunikation 4).
- Michels C. (2013), *Expansion und Transformation? Zur Einordnung der Stadtgründungen der Könige Bithyniens*, in E. Winter – K. Zimmermann (edd.), *Neue Funde und Forschungen in Bithynien*, Bonn (Asia Minor Studien 69), 5-31.
- Millar F. (1985), *Epigrafia*, in M. Crawford –E. Gabba – F. Millar – A. Snodgrass (edd.), *Le basi documentarie della storia antica*, Bologna, 85-137.
- Mitchell S. (1993), *Anatolia. Land Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. Volume I. The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of the Roman Rule*, Oxford.

- Mitchell S. (2003), *The Galatians: Representation and Reality*, in A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Malden – Oxford, 280-293.
- Momigliano A. (1936), *Memnone di Eraclea*, *Enciclopedia italiana*. Volume XII, Roma, 829.
- Muccioli F. (2013), *Memnon of Herakleia Pontica*, *EAH*, 4426-4427.
- Nadig P. (2013), *Ptolemy III Euergetes*, *EAH*, 5634-5635.
- Orsi D.P. (1994), *La storiografia locale*, in G. Cambiano – L. Canfora – D. Lanza (edd.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*. Volume I. *La produzione e la circolazione del testo*. Tomo III. *I Greci e Roma*, Roma, 149-179.
- Pédech P. (1989), *Trois historiens méconnus. Théopompe, Duris, Philarque*, Paris.
- Popov-Reynolds N.V. (2013), *Justin, Roman Historian*, *EAH*, 3666-3667.
- Pownall F. (2004), *Lessons from the Past. The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose*, Ann Arbor.
- Santangelo F. (2004), *Memnone di Eraclea e il dominio romano in Asia Minore*, «Simblos» 4, 247-261.
- Saprykin S.J. (1997), *Heracleia Pontica and Tauric Chersonesus Before Roman Domination (VI-I Centuries B.C.)*, Amsterdam.
- Schamp J. (1987), *Photios historien des lettres. La Bibliothèque et ses notices biographiques*, Paris.
- Schamp J. (2000), *Les Vies des dix orateurs attiques*, Fribourg.
- Schepens G. (2001), *Ancient Greek Histories. Self-Definition through History Writing*, in K. Demoen (ed.), *The Greek City from Antiquity to Present. Historical Reality, Ideological Construction, Literary Representation*, Leuven, 3-25.
- Scholten J. (2007), *Building the Hellenistic Bithynia*, in H. Elton – G. L. Reger (edd.), *Regionalism in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Bordeaux – Paris, 17-24.
- Seibert J. (1967), *Historische Beiträge zu dynastischen Verbindungen in hellenistischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden (Historia Einzelschriften 10).
- Shrimpton G.S. (1991), *Theopompus the Historian*, Montreal.
- Strobel K. (1996), *Die Galater. Geschichte und Eigenart der keltischen Staatenbildung auf dem Boden des hellenistischen Kleinasien*. Band 1. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und historischen Geographie des hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien*, Berlin.
- Strobel K. (2007), *Die Galater und Galatien. Historische Identität und ethnische Tradition im Imperium Romanum*, «Klio» 89, 356-402.
- Strobel K. (2007a), *Galatien, die Galater und die Poleis der Galater: Historische Identität und ethnische Tradition*, in H. Birkhan (ed.), *Kelten-Einfälle an der Donau. Akten des Vierten Symposiums deutschsprachiger Keltologinnen und Keltologen. Philologische – Historische – Archäologische Evidenzen. Konrad Spindler (1939-2005) zum Gedenken. (Linz/Donau, 17.-21. Juli 2005)*, Wien, 529-548.
- Tomaschitz K. (2007), *Die Literarische Evidenz zu den Kelteneinfällen in frühhellenistischer Zeit*, in H. Birkhan (ed.), *Kelten-Einfälle an der Donau. Akten des Vierten Symposiums deutschsprachiger Keltologinnen und Keltologen. Philologische – Historische – Archäologische*

Evidenzen. Konrad Spindler (1939-2005) zum Gedenken. (Linz/Donau, 17.-21. Juli 2005), Wien, 559-571.

Treadgold W.T. (1980), *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*, Washington.

Troiani L. (1988), *Sull'opera di Cornelio Alessandro soprannominato Polistore*, in L. Troiani (ed.), *Due studi di storiografia e religione antiche*, Como, 9-39.

Vitucci G. (1953), *Il regno di Bitinia*, Roma.

Wiemer H.-U. (2013), *Local Histories*, *EAH*, 4131-4133.

Wilson N.G. (1992), *Fozio. Biblioteca*, Milano.

Yarrow L.M. (2006), *Historiography at the End of the Republic. Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule*, Oxford.

Ziegler K. (1941), *Photius*, *RE* 20, 667-737.

Table 1. Passages concerning the kingdom of Bithynia in Photius' summary of Memnon's *Peri Herakleias*

Memnon's Books	Photius' Chapters	Perspectives	Narrative structure	Sources	Passages concerning Bithynia	
					Photius' Chapters	Content
9-10	1-3					
11-12	4-5	Local - Domestic		Nymphis' <i>Peri Herakleias</i>		
13-14	6		Juxtaposited		6	Zipoites' attack to Heraclea
	7-17	Local - Asiatic		Nymphis' <i>On Alexander, the Diadochi and Epigoni</i>	9-11	Nicomedes I's alliance with the Heracleans and the Galatians against his own brother and Antiochus I of Syria
	18		Juxtaposited		12	Digression on the Bithynian rulers
	19-21			?	14	Ziaelas' accession to the throne of Bithynia
15-16					19	Prusias I's siege of Heraclea
	22-40	General - Romano-Pontic	Organic narrative	(A contemporary source) Memnon himself?	22, 5-8	Mithridates VI's conquest of Bithynia