

COLLECTING QUOTATIONS BY TOPIC:  
DEGREES OF PRESERVATION AND TRANSTEXTUAL  
RELATIONS AMONG GENRES\*

*Abstract:* This paper aims at exploring many issues concerning the difficult task of collecting quotations and text re-uses of lost historians. The subject is addressed not by author or by work, but focusing on a topic and discussing sources that belong to different genres and are characterized by different degrees of preservation. The test-case is constituted by the sources on the revolt of Samos (440-439 BC).

The aim of this paper is to address some questions concerning the difficult task of collecting fragments — i.e. quotations and textual re-uses — of lost texts of Classical prose writers. With this goal in mind, I am not going to talk about a fragmentary author or about a modern edition of fragments, but I will present my reflections focusing on a topic and gathering ancient sources about it. The rationale for this choice is to collect evidence that belongs to different genres and is characterized by different degrees of preservation. The ultimate purpose is to explore connections among sources and point to a *relation type perspective*, which is one of the most challenging issues when dealing with quotations<sup>1</sup>.

This comparative analysis is the first step in examining three basic aspects of fragments of ancient works, combining both an endotextual and an exotextual approach: (1) the contribution of fragments to our knowledge of a certain topic, (2) the reasons for quoting them, and (3) their role inside the context of transmission<sup>2</sup>. This means investigating their level of distance from the original text, which is lost, and the intention of the author who has selected, excerpted, and quoted a portion of the original text in a new (con)text. At the same time, gathering ancient sources by topic enables us to put together fragments that modern editors have been forced, for more or less compelling reasons, to collect and classify into distinct categories, although the differences among their supposed genres are often not so evident and therefore definable.

\* I express my warmest thanks to Guido Schepens and Stefan Schorn for giving me the opportunity to discuss with them the contents of this paper and for their precious suggestions. I am also very grateful to Thomas R. Martin and D. Neel Smith for a preliminary discussion about the role of new editors of fragments of ancient literature.

<sup>1</sup> See Berti (2012a) and (2012b).

<sup>2</sup> On the concept of ‘cover-text’ of historical fragments, see Schepens (1997a) 166-168.

This kind of research provides also the opportunity to explore some aspects of the fate of Classical sources through the centuries, which is due not only to the fortunes and misfortunes of their preservation, but also to changes in the formation and dissemination of the canon at different times<sup>3</sup>.

With this research I hope to make a small contribution to the stimulating questions about the meaning of ‘fragment’, which is a very misleading and confusing term, and to recall issues and tasks for future editors of collections of fragmentary authors<sup>4</sup>. I agree that we can be less optimistic than earlier generations on the possibilities of reconstructing and supplementing lost works, but I also think that we have many reasons for being optimistic, because we are now able to go beyond those unsurpassed results and pose new questions, in order to represent our sources with a special focus on their ‘multi-textual’ features and the indefiniteness of their textual boundaries<sup>5</sup>.

\* \* \*

The test-case of my research are the sources on the revolt of Samos, which broke out in 440 BC when a group of Samian oligarchs rebelled against the democratic government imposed by Athens on the island. After nine months of siege, the Athenians succeeded in crushing the revolt and the Samians were forced to surrender on very harsh terms by razing their walls, giving hostages, delivering up their ships, and arranging to pay the expenses of the war by installments<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> For all these topics about fragmentary texts of lost authors, see the papers collected in Most (1997). Cf. also Brunt (1980); Schepens (1998); Schepens (2000); Lenfant (2007); Ambaglio (2009); Schepens & Schorn (2010); Vanotti (2010).

<sup>4</sup> It is very difficult to find a proper term for defining such a complex phenomenon. Anyway, given that ‘fragment’ recalls something material and implies the preservation of an original text that is in fact lost, I prefer to use the expression ‘text re-use’. On this terminological aspect see Berti (2012a) 444-446.

<sup>5</sup> The concept of multitext is the result of work conducted by the *Homer Multitext Project* of the Center for Hellenic Studies, which aims at producing a new digital representation of the textual tradition of the Homeric poems. According to the editors of the *Homer Multitext Project*, collecting multiple critical editions of the same text means building a multitext, which is a “network of versions with a single, reconstructed root”, so that scholars can compare different textual choices and conjectures produced by philologists. For a definition of multi-text in Classical sources see Dué & Ebbott (2009) and Smith (2010). On the application of ‘multi-text’ to fragments of lost work, see Berti (2012b). On the problem of defining the beginning and the end of a fragment in an edition see Lens (1992).

<sup>6</sup> This research is part of a project funded by the Department of Classics at the College of the Holy Cross: see *demo.fragmentarytexts.org*. For a preliminary report see Berti (2012a).

The main sources on the revolt are Thucydides (1.115.2-117), Diodorus Siculus (12.27-28), and Plutarch, *Life of Pericles* (25-28). These extensive accounts are accompanied by other sources on different aspects of the revolt<sup>7</sup>: two Athenian inscriptions on the expenses of the Samian war and the text of the treaty between Athens and Samos, which includes the names of the generals of 439/38<sup>8</sup>; a passage from Athenaeus, who quotes Ion of Chios about an episode that involved Sophocles, who was appointed general for the war<sup>9</sup>; an entry from the lexicon of Harpocration with information on the responsibility of Aspasia for the outbreak of the war<sup>10</sup>; and finally, an excerpt from Photios' lexicon about the tattoos inflicted on both the Athenian and Samian prisoners<sup>11</sup>.

Seven fragmentary authors reported information connected to the revolt of Samos: Ion of Chios, Stesimbrotos of Thasos, Androtion, Ephoros, Douris of Samos, Lysimachos of Alexandria, and Alexis of Samos. These authors have been collected by Felix Jacoby in his massive edition of Greek fragmentary historians and are currently being re-edited as part of the *Brill's New Jacoby* project. As a matter of fact, these 'historians' are very versatile writers whose works don't strictly pertain only to the domain of historiography, but cover many other genres such as poetry, literature, aesthetics, literary criticism, biography, mythography, grammar, and antiquarian literature, demonstrating therefore a first aspect of intertextuality at the level of relations among textual categories. Felix Jacoby himself was compelled to distribute and repeat the fragments of these authors in various parts of his huge collection

<sup>7</sup> For a complete list of sources on the revolt of Samos see Hill (1897) 137-146; Hill (1951) 346.

<sup>8</sup> The text with the expenses of the war is *IG I<sup>3</sup> 363* = M-L 55 (441/40 and 440/39 BC). The sums given in this text can be compared with those given by Isocrates (*Antid.* (15) 111), Diodorus Siculus (12.28.3), and Cornelius Nepos (*Timoth.* 1.4-11). The text of the treaty between Athens and Samos is *IG I<sup>3</sup> 48* = M-L 56 (439/38 BC). As far as concerns the names of the generals, we have another evidence preserved by a scholion to Aelius Aristides (46.485, 135.18 Dindorf), who quotes a passage of the Atthidographer Androtion (*FGrHist* 324 F38) with a list of the Athenian generals at Samos. For Androtion's list see Lenz (1941); Harding (1994) 143-148; Develin (1989) 89 (441/40 BC).

<sup>9</sup> Athen., *Deipn.* 13.81 (603e) = Ion, *FGrHist* 392 T5b and F6 (= *BNJ* 392 T5b and F6).

<sup>10</sup> Harpocr., *Lex.* s.v. Ἀσπασία (Dour. Sam., *FGrHist* 76 F65 = *BNJ* 76 F65; Theophr., *Polit.* 4; Aristoph., *Acharn.* 527-528).

<sup>11</sup> Phot., *Lex.* s.vv. Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος (Lysim., *FGrHist* 382 F7 = *BNJ* 382 F7; Dour. Sam., *FGrHist* 76 F66 = *BNJ* 76 F66) and Τὰ Σαμίων ὑποπτεύεις.

under different subsections, including universal history, local history, ethnography, mythography, *etc.*<sup>12</sup>

The first source that I am going to analyze is Plutarch, who has included a long account of the revolt of Samos in his *Life of Pericles*, focusing on different aspects of the war and commenting other authors. It is possible to examine the text of the biographer pointing out six kinds of quotations that describe different types of textual re-uses by ancient writers<sup>13</sup>:

- gossip quotations
  - authoritative quotations
  - quotations as demonstrations
  - unnamed quotations *vs.* named quotations
  - memorable sayings and statements
  - quotations inside quotations
- *Gossip quotations.* Plutarch opens his report of the revolt of Samos with a quick reference to the alleged reason for the outbreak of the war. He doesn't mention his sources, but simply writes that Pericles was

<sup>12</sup> Ephoros (*FGrHist* 70) and Douris of Samos (*FGrHist* 76) are in the section *Universal- und Zeitgeschichte*, even if their fragments include also works pertaining to other genres. Moreover, they are also referred to in the section *Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie)*, under Cyme and Samos respectively, for their works Ἐπιχώριος and Σαμίων ὄροι. The fragments of Stesimbrotos (*FGrHist* 107), which comprise also the Περὶ Ὀμήρου and Περὶ τελετῶν, are in the subsection *Über die Zeit bis auf Philippos und Alexandros* of the section *Spezialgeschichten und Monographien*. The fragments of the work *On Themistocles, Thucydides, and Pericles* and the Περὶ Ὀμήρου are now part of the section *Biography and Antiquarian Literature* of the continuation of Jacoby's collection (*FGrHistCont* 1002). In spite of their multiform and complex production, Androtion (*FGrHist* 324), Lysimachos of Alexandria (*FGrHist* 382), Ion of Chios (*FGrHist* 392), and Alexis of Samos (*FGrHist* 539) are in the big section *Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie)*, under the respective places covered in their works: Athens, Boeotia, Chios, and Samos. Lysimachos is also referred to in the first *FGrHist* section called *Genealogie und Mythographie*, because of the Νόστοι (in the subsection *Monographien. Romane. Schwindelliteratur*). In the big section *Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie)*, Androtion is in the subsection including the authors who wrote *Attiden*. On reasons, problems, and prospects connected to the arrangement of Jacoby's collection, see Schepens (2006a), (2006b) 357-381, and (2010). On the debate about the structure of Jacoby's collection see Chávez Reino (2009).

<sup>13</sup> The aim of the classifications proposed in this paper is not to neologize concepts and enrich the already long list of categories of citation types, but to simplify in this paper the presentation of complex phenomena connected to the study of quotations and textual re-uses of lost texts. I am also fully aware that many concepts could be expressed with different or similar words by other scholars. Cf. Trillini & Quassdorf (2010).

accused of getting the decree for the war approved at the request of Aspasia, who was acting on the behalf of the Milesians (*Per.* 25.1: τὸν δὲ πρὸς Σαμίους πόλεμον αἰτιῶνται μάλιστα τὸν Περικλέα ψηφίσασθαι διὰ Μιλησίους Ἀσπασίας δεηθείσης). This story was well-known gossip from fifth-century Athenian history, as is revealed by Harpocration's entry on Aspasia, where the lexicographer says that the woman was considered the cause (αἰτία) of two wars, the Samian and the Peloponnesian, according to Aristophanes, Theophrastos, and his pupil Douris of Samos<sup>14</sup>.

We are not surprised to find a reference to this story in Plutarch, but it is interesting to focus on its function in the text of the life of Pericles, given that it is reported twice, the first time just before the paragraphs presenting a short biography of Aspasia (*Per.* 24.1) and the second at the beginning of the account of the Samian war (*Per.* 25.1). Plutarch doesn't feel the need to name his sources and this allusion can be considered an example of *unnamed* (or *impersonal*) *quotation* (see below). The biographer reports the gossip without any comments, simply embedding it in two strategic positions in the text and therefore influencing readers' judgments and affecting the accounts of Aspasia's life and the Samian war.

In the work *On the Malice of Herodotus* (855f-856a), Plutarch reproaches authors who cast charges such as those against Aspasia and defines them as examples of hostile and ill-disposed writers (δυσμενεῖς and κακοήθεις). It is possible that in the life of Pericles he didn't reply to this accusation just because he believed that it was not worth responding. Anyway, it is interesting to notice that in the two passages of Pericles' life he doesn't mention Douris of Samos, who was his main target of criticism about the Samian war (see below) and one of those accusing Aspasia of responsibility for the war<sup>15</sup>.

– *Authoritative quotations.* In his account of the Samian war Plutarch briefly mentions Thucydides twice. In the first case the Athenian historian is named with Ephoros and Aristotle in a long passage about the atrocities that, according to Douris of Samos, Pericles committed against

<sup>14</sup> Harpocr., *Lex.* s.v. Ἀσπασία (= Dour. Sam., *FGrHist* 76 F65 = *BNJ* 76 F65; Theophr., *Pol.* 4; Aristoph., *Acharn.* 527-528). For a discussion of this evidence and other sources that could possibly refer to the same charge against Aspasia, see Henry (1995) 72 and Podlecki (1998) 126.

<sup>15</sup> On Douris as a source of Plutarch's *Pericles* see Stadter (1989) lxxvi-lxxvii. On Plutarch's habits to remain rather silent or vague on his sources see Lenfant (2003).

the Samians<sup>16</sup>. The position of this quick reference is effective for determining the evaluation of the whole story. Plutarch writes that Douris gave a tragic version of the events (ἐπιτραγωδεῖ) accusing Pericles and the Athenians of great cruelty against the Samians and evidencing something that was recorded neither by Thucydides, nor Ephoros, nor Aristotle. Just after the mention of these three authors, Plutarch goes on quoting the brutalities described by Douris and comments on them as not true and being the result of someone who had a private and personal interest (ἴδιον πάθος) in giving a false account of the story<sup>17</sup>. The quotation of the three *authoritative* sources is fundamental in affecting the whole passage and strengthening the malevolence of Douris and the final judgment by Plutarch. The biographer doesn't add any words to the quotation, but simply inserts this reference as a sort of reminder to the reader and as an implied assertion of his thoughts about Douris.

A similar effect is perceivable in the second mention of Thucydides, even if with a different result. In this case Plutarch names the Athenian historian following a quotation from Ion of Chios, who wrote that Pericles had a great sense of pride for his subjugation of Samos and that he considered himself even better than Agamemnon, who conquered a barbarian city in ten years while he overcame the Samians, who were the most powerful people of Ionia, in just nine months<sup>18</sup>. Plutarch writes that this boast was not unjust because the Samian war brought with it much uncertainty and great peril, as testified by Thucydides, who said that Samos was about to strip from Athens her power on the sea (cf. Thuc. 8.76.4). This quotation ends the Plutarchean account of the revolt and it serves not only as a reply to the negative assessment of Pericles by Ion, but also as a sort of *authoritative* seal put by the biographer on the whole episode of the Samian war.

– *Quotations as demonstrations*. After describing the siege of Samos, Plutarch recounts a decision by Pericles who decided to sail off from the island for an expedition into the wider sea. According to the biographer

<sup>16</sup> Plut., *Per.* 28.1-3 (= Dour. Sam., *FGrHist* 76 F67 = *BNJ* 76 F67; Ephor., *FGrHist* 70 F195; Aristot., fr. 578 Rose<sup>3</sup>). See Karavites (1985) 48-53.

<sup>17</sup> Stadter (1989) lxxvi-lxxvii: "Plutarch's judgment on Duris' history is based on familiarity with his work, although he may not have read it for the *Pericles*: the three incidents he used from Duris (Aspasia's responsibility, the tattooing, and the executions) were all such as to be easily remembered or recorded in notes".

<sup>18</sup> Plut., *Per.* 28.5-6 (= Ion Chius, *FGrHist* 392 F16 = *BNJ* 392 F16). Cf. also Plut., *De glor. Athen.* 350e.

this was a bad decision, because it allowed the Samians to attack the Athenians left on the island and win a victory under the command of Melissos (*Per.* 26.1-2). At this point Plutarch quotes Aristotle, who said that Pericles himself was defeated by the Samian general in a battle that preceded the attack upon the Athenians<sup>19</sup>. This kind of reference partially overlaps the type of *authoritative quotations* examined above, but in this case the authority of Aristotle is not used for contradicting other authors, but for *demonstrating* the mistake made by Pericles and therefore the correctness of Plutarch's judgment<sup>20</sup>.

– *Unnamed quotations vs. named quotations*. One of the most problematic questions to be dealt with when working with fragments of lost works is the case in which ancient authors don't quote their sources, but generally refer to a widespread tradition or authority, or to a group of people/writers stating something. Ayelet Haimson-Lushkov has recently classified this example as a kind of *anonymous citation*, which can be expressed in *impersonal* and *pronominal* forms<sup>21</sup>. The *impersonal citation* “includes vague or generic references to a tradition, in whatever form” and in Greek sources it can be represented with verbs as *δοκεῖ, φασί, λέγεται, λέγουσι, etc.* “Such references can act as a marker of a particular tradition, existing in tension with the surrounding allusions, which expose the scholarly debate underlying the tradition [...]”. The *pronominal citation* “acknowledges a source, or a group of sources, but without, or instead of, assigning individual names”. In Greek texts it can be explicit with phrases such as *οἱ πλεῖστοι, οἱ πλείους, οἱ ἄλλοι, etc.*, or by setting one group beside the other with *οἱ μὲν* and *οἱ δέ*<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> Plut., *Per.* 26.3 (= Aristot., fr. 577 Rose<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>20</sup> Probably Plutarch founded many “unusual details” on the Samian war in the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Samians*: see Stadter (1989) lxxiv.

<sup>21</sup> See A.H. Lushkov, ‘Citation and the Dynamics of Tradition in Livy's *AUC*’. This paper was presented at a seminar organized by John Marincola at the American Philological Association meeting held in San Antonio in 2011 (*Allusion and Intertextuality in Classical Historiography*). I'm grateful to John Marincola for allowing me to participate in the seminar and putting at my disposal the papers of the contributors, which are now available on the website of the electronic journal *Histos*: <http://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/> (working papers).

<sup>22</sup> The broad category of *anonymous citations* includes a great variety of expressions that can be used in many different contexts and with many different purposes, as for example the reference to a widespread tradition that corroborates what the author is stating. At the same time, the classification proposed by Haimson-Lushkov underlines one of the most interesting roles played by this kind of citation in ancient texts.

The sources on the revolt of Samos preserve many instances of this kind of *unnamed quotation* or *impersonal citation*<sup>23</sup>. Among these cases, we can recall the generic accusation of Aspasia's responsibility for the outbreak of the war, when Plutarch reports the tradition attributing it to unnamed sources (δοκεῖ and αἰτιῶνται in *Per.* 24.1 and 25.1). On the other hand, we can also mention the passage in which the biographer refuses the evidence of Stesimbrotos of Thasos about Pericles' strategy, by comparing it with the version of the majority of writers (οἱ πλεῖστοι)<sup>24</sup>.

Another interesting example is the story about the tattoo inflicted on the Athenian prisoners by the Samians, as revenge for the tattoo that the Athenians had forced on the Samian captives (*Per.* 26.3-4). Plutarch writes that "to these brand-marks, they say (λέγουσι), the verse of Aristophanes made riddling reference: For oh! How lettered is the folk of the Samians!" (Σαμίων ὁ δῆμὸς ἔστιν ὡς πολυγράμματος; Aristoph., *CAF* I, fr. 64). Photios comments on this verse of the *Babylonians* of Aristophanes, reporting different interpretations of it, and ends his entry by referring to some (οἱ δέ) who say that the verse arose from the affair of the tattoos of the Samian war. The lexicographer also labels the story as a fiction (πλάσμα) made up by Douris of Samos<sup>25</sup>. We don't know if Photios included Plutarch among his sources and if his judgment depends on him, but it is interesting to remember that the biographer reported the episode without mentioning Douris or indirectly criticizing his false account<sup>26</sup>.

– *Memorable sayings and statements.* Ancient sources on the revolt of Samos include a kind of textual re-use that can be classified in the large field of memorable sayings and statements. Plutarch says that Pericles

<sup>23</sup> Plut., *Per.* 24.1; 25.1; 25.2; 26.1; 26.4; 27.2; 28.5; Harp., *Lex.* s.v. Ἀσπασία; Phot., *Lex.* s.v. Τὰ Σαμίων ὑποπτεύεις.

<sup>24</sup> Plut., *Per.* 26.1 (= Stesimbr., *FGrHist* 107 F8 = *FGrHistContin* 1002 F8).

<sup>25</sup> Phot., *Lex.* s.v. Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος (= Dour. Sam., *FGrHist* 76 F66 = *BNJ* 76 F66). Cf. also *ibid.*, s.v. Τὰ Σαμίων ὑποπτεύεις (where we have a reference to the atrocities committed by the Athenians against the Samians); *Suda* [Σ 75, 77], s.vv. Σάμη, Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος. Photios recounts the story reversing the two symbols of the tattoo as reported by Plutarch (cf. Ael., *VH* 2.9).

<sup>26</sup> On the tattoos and their symbols see Stadter (1989) 249-251, part. 250: "Jacoby (*FGrHist* ad loc.) thinks that P. did not use Duris directly here, but that Duris may have quoted the verse from Aristophanes. On the other hand, P. may have found the citation to Duris in a grammarian's commentary to Aristophanes. But other combinations are possible"; Karavites (1985) 54-56; Jones (1987) 149-150.



didn't leave any writings except for decrees, and that only a few of his memorable sayings were preserved (ἔγγραφον μὲν οὖν οὐδὲν ἀπολέλοιπε πλὴν τῶν ψηφισμάτων: ἀπομνημονεύεται δ' ὀλίγα παντάπασιν: *Per.* 8.5). In the same passage the biographer quotes Pericles' famous reference to Aegina as an "eye-sore of the Piraeus" and recalls what the Athenian said to Sophocles about his love for young boys, when they were both generals in the Samian war ("it is not his hands only, Sophocles, that a general must keep clean, but his eyes as well"). Plutarch reports other memorable sayings of Pericles in the context of the revolt of Samos, including the sentences pronounced in the funeral speech for the fallen, his famous reply to Elpinice when she criticized him for having declared war against an allied island, and Pericles' self comparison to Agamemnon<sup>27</sup>. Plutarch's quotations reveal that these sayings were preserved by fifth-century writers like Stesimbrotos of Thasos and Ion of Chios, and traces of them are still identifiable in Aristotle (*Rhet.* 3.1407a) and Cicero (*De offic.* 1.144)<sup>28</sup>.

– *Quotations inside quotations.* Plutarch devotes a part of his account to Artemon, the engineer who designed the machines employed in the siege of Samos, and quotes Ephoros as his source<sup>29</sup>. Inside this reference, Plutarch puts a quotation from Herakleides Pontikos, who rejected the explanation of Ephoros about the origin of the nickname of Artemon. According to Herakleides, the nickname Periphoretos was first given to one Artemon who lived many generations before the Samian war and was mentioned in the poems of Anacreon<sup>30</sup>. Another example is provided by the verse of Archilochos quoted by Pericles when replying to Elpinices' criticism<sup>31</sup>. In this case we don't have the reference source for the anecdote, but only an *unnamed quotation* expressed with the verb λέγεται, and the citation of the verse of Archilochos appears as a *named quotation* inside an *unnamed* one.

\* \* \*

<sup>27</sup> Plut., *Per.* 8.6 (= Stesimbr., *FGrHist* 107 F9 = *FGrHistCont* 1002 F9) and 28.5 (= Archil., F205 West; Ion Chius, *FGrHist* 392 F16 = *BNJ* 392 F16).

<sup>28</sup> On the possible existence of a collection of speeches of Pericles see Podlecki (1998) 124-125.

<sup>29</sup> Plut., *Per.* 27.3 (= Ephor., *FGrHist* 70 F194).

<sup>30</sup> Plut., *Per.* 27.3-4 (= Heracl. Pont., F60 Wehrli = F45 Schüttrumpf; Anacr., *PMG* fr. 27). On the complexity of this passage and on the debate on the origin of the nickname Periphoretos, see Stadter (1989) 253-254 and Parmeggiani (2011) 426.

<sup>31</sup> Plut., *Per.* 28.5 (= Archil., F205 West).

The second evidence concerning the revolt of Samos, which is crucial for exploring the citation habits of ancient authors, is an extensive quotation from the *Epidemiai* of Ion of Chios preserved by Athenaeus in the *Deipnosophists*<sup>32</sup>. In this passage the Chian writer describes his participation in a symposium that took place on the island of Chios when Sophocles stopped there on his way to Lesbos as a general for the Samian war. The fragment is quoted by Athenaeus as an amusing anecdote to demonstrate Sophocles' love of boys<sup>33</sup>. On that occasion the tragedian was invited by Hermesilaos, who was a Chian friend of his and proxenus of Athens, and the whole scene at the symposium revolves around a young and handsome wine-pourer who is the object of Sophocles' attraction. This fact gives the symposiasts an opportunity to display their knowledge and the passage is filled with literary quotations by Sophocles and an anonymous schoolmaster (γραμματέων διδάσκαλος) who was present at the banquet. The scene ends with a joke by Sophocles, who answers to Pericles' reproaches concerning his being an excellent poet but not a good general.

Also in this case it is possible to focus on different examples of quotation types that describe textual re-uses by ancient authors:

- multi-framed quotations
- cross-genre quotations
- erudite quotations and reference collections of quotes

– *Multi-framed quotations*. The long fragment of Ion is a good example of a very effective recontextualization of a quotation inside a new text<sup>34</sup>. We don't know the original context of the fragment, but the latter suits Athenaeus' purposes very well, given that Ion's passage reproduces the same multi-framed structure of the *Deipnosophists*, which describes a banquet hosted by Publius Livius Larensis with erudite men who discuss many different topics by quoting a huge collection of literary texts<sup>35</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> Athen., *Deipn.* 13.81 (603e) = Ion Chius, *FGrHist* 392 T5b and F6 = *BNJ* 392 T5b and F6.

<sup>33</sup> For other sources on Sophocles' strategy see Cic., *De off.* 1.144; Plut., *Per.* 8.5; Strabo 14.1.18; Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 3.6.12-13; Aristod., *FGrHist* 104 F1 (15.4) = *BNJ* 104 F1 (15.4); *Vita Soph.* 1; *Suda* [M 496], s.v. Μέλιτος; *Schol. in Aristoph. Pac.* 697c. Cf. also Webster (1936).

<sup>34</sup> This passage is the longest extant quotation from Ion. See A. Katsaros in *BNJ* 392 F6; Jennings & Katsaros (2007) *passim*.

<sup>35</sup> On the structure of the *Deipnosophists* and the role of Larensis, see Braund (2000); Wilkins (2000); Jacob (2001).

A similar multi-framed structure is described in the anecdote preserved by Ion, where we have learned protagonists debating philological questions during a historical symposium hosted by Hermesilaos at Chios. In this case the *historical frame* opens and closes the scene with the reference to Sophocles' mission and the final joke about Pericles' reproach, which brings us back to the historical context of the event. Inside this frame, Ion builds two other interconnected frames: the *symptotic frame* focused on the scene around the handsome wine-pourer, and the *literary frame* with the competition between Sophocles and the anonymous schoolmaster. This last frame is the core scene of the episode and includes quotations from Phrynichos, Simonides, and Pindaros, who are cited not only as an evidence of erudition, but also for extending the time of the symposium and amplifying the pleasure of contemplating the young, good-looking boy<sup>36</sup>.

– *Cross-genre quotations.* As we have seen above, the literary frame of the fragment of Ion includes quotations from Phrynichos and Simonides, and an unnamed verse of Pindaros. In addition to them, the schoolmaster introduces a comparison between literature and painting and discusses the way in which a painter should have represented the red cheeks of the young wine-pourer serving at the symposium. Sophocles sharply replies to the man and debates the weakness of his argument, by showing the difference among expressive tools used by poets and painters for representing and describing human beauty. In this case we don't have a direct reference to a specific picture, but the tragedian certainly had in mind examples of Greek masterpieces, and therefore the discussion enriches the literary frame with cross-genre allusions that include different media, such as textual and visual works of poetry and painting.

It is also worth remembering that the whole passage drawn from the work of Ion is an example of cross-genre quotation and can accordingly be classified as a fragment both about history and literature. Ion is able to merge different levels of reality by describing distinct aspects of Sophocles' personality on the background of the Athenian war against Samos: the first aspect is the office of the tragedian as a general and the description of his stay at Chios during the mission to Lesbos; the second aspect is the role played by Sophocles in the symptotic context, where he

<sup>36</sup> Phryn., *TrGF* 3 F13; Sim., *PMG* fr. 80; Pind., *Ol.* 6.41. Cf. Davidson (2000) 302-303.

not only displays his knowledge and resorts to a stratagem to approach the young boy and kiss him, but also shows his great artistic skills by giving an impressive lesson about literary criticism and aesthetics<sup>37</sup>.

– *Erudite quotations and reference collections of quotes.* The passage of Ion certainly suited Athenaeus' needs not only for the anecdote about Sophocles, but also because it is an example of a small collection of quotes from Greek poetry, reproducing in an abridged form the main characteristic of the *Deipnosophists*, which is a huge 'library' of citations of Classical texts<sup>38</sup>. Symptotic knowledge and its description by authors such as Ion and Athenaeus raise questions about information management in ancient times. It is indeed plausible that there was an availability of reference tools for retrieving and quoting passages of literary texts, with a precision that wouldn't have been otherwise possible if authors had to recall them by heart. It is therefore mostly probable that scholars like Athenaeus — and possibly also the learned protagonists depicted by him — had at their disposal working tools as glossaries, lexica, collections of quotes, private notes and other learning aids that gathered textual passages and word commentaries, so that they could accurately cite and argue about them in different contexts like symposia or literary works<sup>39</sup>.

\* \* \*

The last source that I am going to consider is a quotation from the *Samian Chronicles* (Ἔθροι Σαμιακοί) of Alexis of Samos. The fragment is preserved in the *Deipnosophists*, in a context concerning *hetairai* and their festivals. In this context there is a passage concerning the sanctuaries of Aphrodite, and Athenaeus mentions Alexis because he reported the existence of a Samian shrine of this goddess that was dedicated by the Athenian *hetairai* who accompanied the army of Pericles when he was besieging Samos<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Leurini (1987). On the linguistic aspects of the episode see Ricciardelli Apicella (1989). On the difficulties of classifying many fragments of Ion of Chios belonging to unnamed works, see Leurini (1980).

<sup>38</sup> See Jacob (2000) and (2001) xi-cxvi, part. lxxiv.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Blair (2010) 19 for a comparison between the method of Athenaeus and those used by scholars and humanists in early modern Europe. On this aspect of the work of Athenaeus see also now Berti (2013a).

<sup>40</sup> Athen., *Deipn.* 13.31 (572f) = Alex. Sam., *FGrHist* 539 F1 = *BNJ* 539 F1. Cf. Henry (2000) 504-507.

The “frustrating brevity” of this quotation is a great limit for reconstructing the meaning of the information provided by Alexis, but at the same time it can be significant for saying something about its transmission and probably also about its original context. Athenaeus is very careful in giving us the book number and the title of the work of Alexis (ἐν δευτέρῳ Ὀρων Σαμιακῶν), and it is possible that he is quoting at least some of the original words of the author, even if it is not clear whether the epithets of Aphrodite must be considered part of the quotation<sup>41</sup>. This accuracy reinforces our hypothesis about the possibility that ancient authors like Athenaeus — and the learned men represented by him — had at their disposal reference tools for quoting passages from literary texts about many different topics. In this case, probably the episode narrated by Alexis was excerpted and collected as part of other information concerning Aphrodite and her numerous epithets and places of worship.

This possibility opens the much-discussed question about the original structure and goals of local chronicles, such as those written by Alexis and his fellow countryman Douris of Samos<sup>42</sup>. In this example, we don’t know if the chronological aspect of the quotation is due to the annalistic nature of the *Samian Chronicles* of Alexis or if it depends on an *intermediate quoter*, who extracted from the original text only the essential information about the chronological and historical context of the dedication of the shrine of Aphrodite. *Intermediate quotations* certainly had an important role in the preservation and transmission of works of local history, as I have already argued in my commentary on the Athenian fragments of Istros the Callimachean<sup>43</sup>.

The *frustrating brevity* of the quotation, the possible role of an *intermediate quoter*, and the needs of the *final quoter* (i.e., Athenaeus) are some of the many issues to be addressed when working with *completely decontextualized quotations* of lost works. In this case, things are remarkably challenging because we don’t know anything about Alexis, except for his provenance from Samos, the title of his work, and two fragments preserved by Athenaeus in the *Deipnosophists*<sup>44</sup>. Many conjectures are therefore possible, and the mention of the *hetairai* of

<sup>41</sup> D’Hautcourt (2006).

<sup>42</sup> Pédech (1989) 274-288; Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 205-223.

<sup>43</sup> Berti (2009) 11-22.

<sup>44</sup> A. D’Hautcourt in *BNJ* 539. Pédech (1989) 275 considers Alexis “certinement postérieur” of Douris, but without proposing a chronology.

Pericles' army could have occurred in many different contexts, such as surveys of religious or architectural and archaeological information about Samos, or a historical account of the war brought by the Athenians against the island<sup>45</sup>.

\* \* \*

This brief analysis of the sources on the revolt of Samos has drawn attention to some of the manners and habits displayed by ancient authors when excerpting, quoting, transforming, re-adapting, and re-contextualizing information gathered from a wide variety of works and documents. As I mentioned at the beginning of the paper, recent tendencies in scholarship reveal the necessity of a *relation type perspective* when dealing with textual re-uses of lost works. This perspective leads us to go beyond the three fundamental relationships involved in every occurrence of quotations of lost texts: (1) *quotation – quoter*, (2) *quotation – quoting text* (*cover-text* or *target text*), and (3) *quotation – original text* (this kind of relation is comparable to the *archetype* reconstruction of manuscript traditions). Digital media and cross-disciplinary studies enable us to describe and represent other textual relationships that are implied when working with quotations of lost texts:

– *Relationship with other genres*. This relation was the most challenging one when Felix Jacoby designed his great plan for the structure of *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, and it is still one of the main concerns of the editors of the continuation of Jacoby's work<sup>46</sup>. Besides genre classification, large collections of fragments have also adopted a conventional distinction between *fragmenta* and *testimonia*, whose characteristics are nevertheless very difficult to define and keep separate<sup>47</sup>.

These criteria for arranging fragments in modern editions are part of a debate about digital libraries of classical sources, where meta-data can

<sup>45</sup> Some scholars have seen in this text a hidden attack against Aspasia and her responsibility for the outbreak of the Samian war, given that she was said to train young *hetairai* (παιδίσκας ἑταιρούσας τρέφουσιν: Plut., *Per.* 24.3): Stadter (1989) 235-236; Podlecki (1998) 125; D'Hautcourt (2006) 315-316.

<sup>46</sup> Schepens (1998), (2006a) and (2006b).

<sup>47</sup> Schepens (1997a); Laks (1997). It is also worth recalling the *Imitationen* adopted by Diels and Kranz in their collection of fragments of Presocratic philosophers, by which they meant works that take an author as a model. On the difficult task of collecting and editing philosophical fragments see Grilli (1981).

express the complexity of genre classifications<sup>48</sup>. A dynamic and multi-layer structure of digital data covers many types of information, including categories and typologies devised by editors. Such a structure allows scholars to represent ancient sources according to many different principles, while not scattering and repeating the same text inside a collection. Moreover, an accurate representation of meta-data can produce multiple print layouts and indexes of concordances, so that Classicists don't have to renounce their tradition of multi-genre classifications, but can rather enrich and represent it in a more efficacious and flexible way, avoiding strict and definitive boundaries that are very misleading and not applicable to ancient sources.

– *Relationship with other writers and other quotations.* Collecting fragments in the 21st century means also creating a structure in which fragmentary authors can 'talk' with each other, revealing their different attitudes and perspectives. A recent effort has been made by Philip Harding, who has edited a book on the story of Athens with a collection of fragments of the Atthidographers arranged by topic and date, and not by author<sup>49</sup>. Such an experiment is useful for comparing behaviors and positions of fragmentary historians, adopting a criterion that is alternative to the one that privileges single authors and genre classifications<sup>50</sup>. Once again, digital tools are a further help for arranging quotes of ancient writers, allowing editors to focus on a certain topic and select the authors who have dealt with it in their works. In the case of the story of Athens, such a possibility would include not only the Atthidographers, but also other sources that have addressed the same subject even though not belonging to the same literary genre.

– *Relationship with non-citations.* Simon Hornblower has defined *non-citations* as those cases in which “an author gives a fact in a form which leads us to suspect that he has used some earlier writer, not mentioned”<sup>51</sup>. *Non-citations* can be therefore considered as an extreme form of those *unnamed* or *impersonal quotations* that have been discussed above. In this case our possibilities are limited and every editor should be very

<sup>48</sup> Berti (2012b).

<sup>49</sup> Harding (2008).

<sup>50</sup> This problem was already addressed by Felix Jacoby when he devised the plan of his collection of fragments: see Schepens (2010).

<sup>51</sup> Hornblower (1994) 58 ('Intertextuality and the Greek historians').

careful when hypothesizing their existence. Nevertheless, we can't skip the question on how to deal with them and how to describe and represent them both in traditional print publications and new digital collections<sup>52</sup>.

– *Relationship with readers*. When working with fragments of lost texts, we should always ask *why* and *how* ancient authors quoted other writers, texts, and documents. Of course we can have many different answers to such a question, but at least some of them should address the relationship between authors and their readers (or listeners). As we have seen with *gossip* and *authoritative quotations*, and with *quotations as demonstrations*, there are many examples in which ancient authors quote other sources not just for the sake of collecting information or arguing with other writers and defending their position, but also for affecting readers's judgments and provoking a reaction on their part. This kind of relationship should be explored in a deeper way and find a wider space in the commentaries included in collections of fragmentary authors.

– *Relationship with libraries*. By *libraries* we mean the relationship of every fragmentary author with his own knowledge, his access to public archives, collections of books, research centers, and the availability of working tools for aiding memory and gathering heterogeneous materials. As for the relationship with readers, this aspect should also be explored in a wider context, keeping in mind the cultural environment in which every author lived and worked<sup>53</sup>.

– *Relationship with reality*. John Marincola has recently addressed some theoretical issues surrounding historiographical studies of allusion and intertextuality<sup>54</sup>. He has focused attention on the peculiarity of historiography and the necessity of determining if such phenomena should be identified and analysed in it in a way different from in literature, where allusion and intertextuality were initially developed and employed. The reason for this question is that when studying historical texts we deal

<sup>52</sup> On this aspect see already Jacoby (1909) 120, who distinguishes three different cases for his collection of fragments: 1) *namentliche Fragmente*, 2) *kollektive Zitate*, and 3) *die ohne Quellenangaben zitierten Daten*. The last one is very similar to the concept of non-citations expressed by Hornblower.

<sup>53</sup> On this aspect cf. Berti (2013b).

<sup>54</sup> J. Marincola, 'Intertextuality and Exempla', presented at the seminar that he organized at the American Philological Association meeting held in San Antonio in 2011 (*Allusion and Intertextuality in Classical Historiography*): see note 21.



with “works that claim (or that we think claim) to have some relationship to the real world of history”. Therefore our reflections on relationships among fragmentary authors shouldn’t be focused only on a textual and literary level, but should also include a level of “intertextuality of real life”, which is a basic component of historiographical works and interferes with a presentation of reality mediated by literature. Our small collection of fragmentary sources on the revolt of Samos includes a significant example of intertextuality of real life in the quotation from the *Epidemiai* of Ion of Chios. The Chian writer is able to create a mixture of literary and historical elements that constantly interrelate with two real aspects of Sophocles’ life, namely his role as a general for the Samian war and his extraordinary skills as a poet and sympotic entertainer.

Tufts University

Monica BERTI  
monica.berti@tufts.edu

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambaglio (2009): Delfino AMBAGLIO, ‘Nelle pieghe dei frammenti degli storici greci, tra falsificazioni e plagi’, in: E. Lanzillotta, V. Costa & G. Ottone (eds.), *Tradizione e trasmissione degli storici greci frammentari in ricordo di Silvio Accame*. Atti del II Workshop internazionale. Roma, 16-18 febbraio 2006, Tivoli (Roma) 2009, p. 543-562.
- Berti (2009): Monica BERTI, *Istro il Callimacheo. Testimonianze e frammenti su Atene e sull’Attica*, Tivoli (Roma) 2009.
- Berti (2012a): Monica BERTI, ‘Citazioni e dinamiche testuali. L’intertestualità e la storiografia greca frammentaria’, in: V. Costa (ed.), *Tradizione e trasmissione degli storici greci frammentari*, II. Atti del Terzo Workshop Internazionale. Roma, 24-26 febbraio 2011, Tivoli (Roma) 2012, p. 439-458.
- Berti (2012b): Monica BERTI, ‘Representing Fragmentary Texts’, in: N. Filatkin, Cl. Moulin & M.-S. Ortola (eds.), *Exploring Formulaic Knowledge through Languages, Cultures, and Time*, Nancy 2012 (forthcoming).
- Berti (2013a): Monica BERTI, ‘Ateneo fruitore di Istro: echi di critica storiografica e cultura bibliotecaria’, in: M. Berti & V. Costa (eds.), *Ritorno ad Alessandria. Storiografia antica e cultura bibliotecaria: tracce di una relazione perduta*. Incontro Internazionale di Studi, Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata, 28-29 novembre 2012, Tivoli (Roma) 2013 (forthcoming).
- Berti (2013b): Monica BERTI, ‘Istro alla scuola di Callimaco. Produzione e diffusione della ricerca nella Biblioteca di Alessandria’, in: F. Gazzano & G. Ottone (eds.), *Giornate di studio sulla storiografia greca frammentaria*

- III edizione. Gli storici greci frammentari e le età della trasmissione: Alessandria, Roma, Bisanzio*, Università degli Studi di Genova, 29-30 maggio 2012, Tivoli (Roma) 2013 (forthcoming).
- Blair (2010): Ann M. BLAIR, *Too Much to Know. Managing Scholarly Information Before the Modern Age*, New Haven-London 2010.
- Braund (2000): David BRAUND, 'Learning, Luxury and Empire: Athenaeus' Roman Patron', in: D. Braund & J. Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, Exeter 2000, p. 3-22.
- Brunt (1980): Peter A. BRUNT, 'On Historical Fragments and Epitomes', *CQ* 30.2 (1980), p. 477-494.
- Chávez Reino (2009): Antonio L. CHÁVEZ REINO, 'Felix Jacoby alle prese con i suoi critici: lettere, recensioni e *scholia jacobiana*', in: E. Lanzillotta, V. Costa & G. Ottone (eds.), *Tradizione e trasmissione degli storici greci frammentari in ricordo di Silvio Accame*. Atti del II Workshop internazionale. Roma, 16-18 febbraio 2006, Tivoli (Roma) 2009, p. 731-762.
- Davidson (2000): James DAVIDSON, 'Pleasure and Pedantry in Athenaeus', in: D. Braund & J. Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, Exeter 2000, p. 292-303.
- Develin (1989): Robert DEVELIN, *Athenian Officials 684-321 BC*, Cambridge 1989.
- D'Hautcourt (2006): Alexis D'HAUTCOURT, 'Alexis, les prostituées et Aphrodite à Samos', *Kernos* 19 (2006), p. 313-317.
- Dué & Ebbott (2009): Casey DUÉ & Mary EBBOTT, 'Digital Criticism: Editorial Standards for the Homer Multitext', *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 3.1 (2009).
- Grilli (1981): Alberto GRILLI, 'Sui criteri per l'edizione di frammenti filosofici', in: E. Flores (ed.), *La critica testuale greco-latina, oggi. Metodi e problemi*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 29-31 ottobre 1979), Roma 1981, p. 111-134.
- Harding (1994): Peter HARDING, *Androton and the Atthis*, Oxford 1994.
- Harding (2008): Peter HARDING, *The Story of Athens. The Fragments of the Local Chronicles of Attika*, London-New York 2008.
- Henry (1995): Madeleine H. HENRY, *Prisoner of History. Aspasia of Miletus and Her Biographical Tradition*, Oxford 1995.
- Henry (2000): Madeleine HENRY, 'Athenaeus the Ur-Pornographer', in: D. Braund & J. Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, Exeter 2000, p. 503-510.
- Hill (1897): George F. HILL, *Sources for Greek History Between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars*, Oxford 1897.
- Hill (1951): George F. HILL, *Sources for Greek History Between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars*, A new edition by Russell Meiggs & Anthony Andrewes, Oxford 1951.
- Hornblower (1994): Simon HORNBLOWER, *Greek Historiography*, Oxford 1994.
- Jacob (2000): Christian JACOB, 'Athenaeus the Librarian', in: D. Braund & J. Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, Exeter 2000, p. 85-110.

- Jacob (2001): Christian JACOB, 'Ateneo, o il dedalo delle parole', in: L. Canfora (ed.), *Ateneo. I Deipnosofisti. I dotti a banchetto*, 4 voll., Roma 2001, p. xi-cxvi.
- Jacoby (1909): F. JACOBY, 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* 9 (1909), p. 80-123.
- Jennings & Katsaros (2007): Victoria JENNINGS & Andrea KATSAROS (eds.), *The World of Ion of Chios*, Leiden-Boston 2007.
- Jones (1987): Christopher P. JONES, 'Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity', *JRS* 77 (1987), p. 139-155.
- Karavites (1985): Peter KARAVITES, 'Enduring Problems of the Samian Revolt', *RhM* 128 (1985), p. 40-56.
- Laks (1997): André LAKS, 'Du témoignage comme fragment', in: G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente Sammeln*, Göttingen 1997, p. 237-272.
- Landucci Gattinoni (1997): Franca LANDUCCI GATTINONI, *Duride di Samo*, Roma 1997.
- Lenfant (2003): Dominique LENFANT, 'De l'usage des comiques comme source historique: les Vies de Plutarque et la Comédie Ancienne', in: G. Lachenaud & D. Longrée (eds.), *Grecs et Romains aux prises avec l'histoire. Représentations, récits et idéologie. Colloque de Nantes et Angers, 2*, Rennes 2003, p. 391-414.
- Lenfant (2007): Dominique LENFANT (ed.), *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens. Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (16-18 juin 2005)*, Paris 2007.
- Lens (1992): Jesús LENS, 'Problems concerning the Edition of the Fragments of the Greek Historians', *SIFC* 85 (1992), p. 739-746.
- Lenz (1941): Friedrich LENZ, 'The Athenian *Strategoí* of the Years 441/40 and 433/32 BC', *TAPA* 72 (1941), p. 226-232.
- Leurini (1980): Luigi LEURINI, 'Annotazioni su alcuni frammenti di Ione di Chio ("TrGF" 19 Ion F 53c, 62 e 65 Snell)', *QUUC* 6 (1980), p. 117-126.
- Leurini (1987): Luigi LEURINI, 'Pedanti a confronto. A proposito di Ione di Chio fr. 8 Bl.', *QUCC* 25 (1987), p. 131-139.
- Most (1997): Glenn W. MOST (ed.), *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente Sammeln*, Göttingen 1997.
- Parmeggiani (2011): Giovanni PARMEGGIANI, *Eforo di Cuma. Studi di storiografia greca*, Bologna 2011.
- Pédech (1989): Paul PÉDECH, *Trois historiens méconnus: Théopompe, Duris, Phylarque*, Paris 1989.
- Podlecki (1998): Anthony J. PODLECKI, *Perikles and His Circle*, London-New York 1998.
- Ricciardelli Apicella (1989): Gabriella RICCIARDELLI APICELLA, 'Poesia e realtà. Ancora a proposito di Ione di Chio (fr. 8 Bl.)', *QUCC* 32 (1989), p. 113-117.
- Schepens (1997a): Guido SCHEPENS, 'Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Problems, Methods, Prospects', in: G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente Sammeln*, Göttingen 1997, p. 144-172.

- Schepens (1997b): Guido SCHEPENS, 'Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F28 Revisited: Fragmenta or Testimonia?', *Simblos* 2 (1997), p. 71-83.
- Schepens (1998): Guido SCHEPENS, 'Prolegomena', in: G. Schepens (ed.), *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Continued, Part IV, IVA1, VII-XXI*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 1998.
- Schepens (2000): Guido SCHEPENS, 'Probleme der Fragmentedition. (Fragmente der griechischen Historiker)', in: Chr. Reitz (ed.), *Vom Text zum Buch*, St. Katharinen 2000, p. 1-29.
- Schepens (2006a): Guido SCHEPENS, 'Storiografia e letteratura antiquaria. Le scelte di Felix Jacoby', in: C. Ampolo (ed.), *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby*, Pisa 2006, p. 149-171.
- Schepens (2006b): Guido SCHEPENS, 'Il carteggio Jacoby-Meyer. Un piano inedito per la struttura dei *FGrHist*', in: C. Ampolo (ed.), *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby*, Pisa 2006, p. 357-395.
- Schepens (2010): Guido SCHEPENS, 'Die Debatte über die Struktur der "Fragmente der griechischen Historiker"', *Klio* 92.2 (2010), p. 427-461.
- Schepens & Schorn (2010): Guido SCHEPENS & Stefan SCHORN, 'Verkürzungen in und von Historiographie in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit', in: M. Horster & Chr. Reitz (eds.), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, Stuttgart 2010, p. 395-433.
- Smith (2010): D. Neel SMITH, 'Digital Infrastructure and the Homer Multitext Project', in: G. Bodard & S. Mahony (eds.), *Digital Research in the Study of Classical Antiquity*, Farnham 2010, p. 121-137.
- Stadter (1989): Philip A. STADTER, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles*, Chapel Hill-London 1989.
- Trillini & Quassdorf (2010): Regula H. TRILLINI & Sixta QUASSDORF, 'A "Key to All Quotations"? A Corpus-Based Parameter Model of Intertextuality', *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 25.3 (2010), p. 269-286.
- Vanotti (2010): Gabriella VANOTTI (ed.), *Il lessico Suda e gli storici greci in frammenti*. Atti dell'incontro internazionale. Vercelli, 6-7 novembre 2008, Tivoli (Roma) 2010.
- Webster (1936): Thomas B.L. WEBSTER, 'Sophocles and Ion of Chios', *Hermes* 71 (1936), p. 263-274.
- Wilkins (2000): John WILKINS, 'Dialogue and Comedy: the Structure of the *Deipnosophistae*', in: D. Braund & J. Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, Exeter 2000, p. 23-37