Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 67 (2022)

Artikel: The so-called Zeitgeschichte : a reassessment
Autor: Schepens, Guido
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1055052

I

GUIDO SCHEPENS

THE SO-CALLED *ZEITGESCHICHTE*: A REASSESSMENT

ABSTRACT

When, in 1909, Jacoby described his plan for a new edition of the fragments of the Greek historians, he put (*griechische*) *Zeitgeschichte* at the centre stage as overarching notion for "the most important volume of the collection". The works presented under this label focus on contemporary events but often include vast swathes of history of the past, going back even to primeval times. Jacoby's concept of *Zeitgeschichte* presents a double problem: the modern German term fails to map onto ancient terminology and it is also used with an unstandardized large meaning that is different from the now agreed upon understanding of this notion as history or history writing of one's own time. In order to understand the specious meaning of *Zeitgeschichte* in its application to ancient history writing, I argue (1) that it was introduced in the realm of Classical Studies at a unique juncture in the history of historiography when, after the *Sattelzeit*, the actual writing of *Zeitgeschichte* was out of order; (2) that E. Schwartz and U. von Wilamowitz inspired Jacoby to choose the term, which (3) at his hands, as a principle for ordering his collection, acquired the meaning of 'history in time'. The conspicuously unclear generic status of the works brought together under this construct was sharply criticized by Fornara: he rejected Jacobian *Zeitgeschichte* as "inapplicable to the greater number of Greco-Roman historians". It is my view that the notion, if understood as 'history in time', may continue to make sense within Jacoby's taxonomy for designating a whole *class* of works in contradistinction to locally focused history writing, but hardly as a self-contained *genos*; and, as far as the narrower sense of contemporary history ("*Zeitgeschichte* im engeren Sinne") is concerned, it will benefit historiographical analysis if we approach it as a practice cutting across various genres. Jacoby has bequeathed us an

unfortunately duplicitous concept but, with his fragment collection, also an indispensable resource for looking at the larger picture of Greek historiography. In it the recording of the history of one's own time, far from being solely dignified as proper history, should be valued as a significant option among many others that were valid.

On the occasion of the *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, held in August 1979, dedicated to *Les études classiques aux XIX^e^ et XX^e^ siècles : leur place dans l'histoire des idées*, Arnaldo Momigliano read a paper entitled "The Place of Ancient Historiography in Modern Historiography". He raised the double question as to why the ancient historians had lost their former relevance, first, in inspiring themes and approaches in the modern study of the ancient world and, second, as writers themselves of works that may have contributed to shaping the Western historiographical tradition.[1] As these questions have not lost their relevance today, I thought it worthwhile to briefly recall Momigliano's answers by way of introduction to the present *Entretiens* on the significance of contemporary history writing within ancient historiography. His first question received a relatively straightforward answer: if the ancient historians are no longer our recognized guides in the exploration of the historical world they lived in, it is because they did not ask the many questions that prompt historical study today. "If Thucydides was not aware of a crisis of parental authority in Athens, perhaps Aristophanes was": a witty phrase to strikingly bear out the narrow political and military focus of the 'writer' of the Peloponnesian War. While stating that this would not be a good reason for throwing the classical historians out of the window, Momigliano admits that the answer to give to his second question is more delicate. A problem, new in our time, he observes, is the existence of important currents of thought which relativize all historians – not just those belonging to the classical world – and tend to

[1] MOMIGLIANO (1980) 147-150.

deprive them "of any value in the search for truth".[2] Opposing such a trend, he insists on an idea that is dear to him: the role that historians play as transmitters or discoverers of truth depends on the value of the critical methods they use in getting to know the facts and on the principles of organization they choose for representing them.[3] In this respect, Momigliano concludes, Thucydides was better than Herodotus and Livy, who also ventured to write about times in which they were not yet born.

Thucydides' decision to write about events he lived through can, indeed, in the still predominantly oral culture at the time, be seen as the safest possible historiographical choice. And according to a view which still largely prevails, his choice may also have oriented history writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity, and beyond, towards the recording of political and military events that either fall within or are, at least, near to the historian's own lifetime. In the second half of the previous century, not least also through the posthumous publication of his *Sather Classical Lectures*, Momigliano has been the authoritative advocate of the view just outlined. In his characteristically binary approach to the study of ancient historiography he stressed the importance of making a distinction between the 'Thucydidean' option for writing history, perceived as 'proper history', and a whole bunch of historiographical works, which, allegedly, could never aspire to the full dignity of history.[4] This, quite obviously, is a view which tends to confine the writing of history in Antiquity, both thematically and methodologically, within narrow confines. I will return, by way of conclusion to the present paper, to this peculiar vision; for now, though, the need to review it critically should not prevent us from acknowledging that the argument of the pre-eminence of contemporary history

[2] The challenge of history writing in "an age of ideologies" is also addressed in MOMIGLIANO (1984).

[3] To develop methods for separating truth from falsehood is also key to the difference between rhetoricians and historians; see MOMIGLIANO (1985).

[4] MOMIGLIANO (1990) 29-53, 54-79; also (1966), (1972), (1978).

writing in the Greco-Roman world has a respectable scholarly pedigree, one that can be traced back to the works of Eduard Schwartz, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, and Felix Jacoby.

By the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the previous century these renowned scholars grounded the scientific study of ancient history writing. They introduced notions and interpretative frameworks that for the greater part still orient investigations into the nature, function, and history of ancient historiography. We owe them notably also the concept of *Zeitgeschichte*. When, in 1908, Jacoby announced and described his plan for a new edition of the fragments of the Greek historians, he put (*griechische*) *Zeitgeschichte* at the centre stage as the overarching notion for what he saw as "the most important volume of the collection".[5] In the definitive layout of *FGrHist* it retained this prestigious place as heading of part II. In it one finds the fragments of the following types of historical works: "Universalgeschichte und *Hellenika*" (IIA: 64-105); "Spezialgeschichten, Autobiographien, Zeittafeln" (IIB: 106-261).

1. Historical context

The seminal lectures and publications of Schwartz, Wilamowitz, and Jacoby can virtually all be dated to the first decennium of the previous century. By then, the time-honoured tradition of contemporary history writing had become an apparently extinct species of historical reporting.[6] With the rise of historicism, a radical paradigm shift had taken place. The contemporary historian, it was argued, lacked reliable evidence as well as historical distance. Johann Gustav Droysen (1808-1884), in

[5] In a paper delivered at the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Berlin; published as JACOBY (1909) and now also available in English translation by CHAMBERS / SCHORN (2015).

[6] ERNST (1957) succinctly surveys the long history of *Zeitgeschichte*.

particular, exploded the authority of the *autoptês*-historian.[7] To experience the events yourself and cross-question eyewitnesses no longer counted as trustworthy and had to make room for the written records, preferably to those stored in the archives. Proximity to the event, which had always been considered an advantage, was now a drawback.[8] By the end of the so-called *Sattelzeit*, around 1870, the new institutionalised and academicized historical science had discarded both the idea and the practice of *Zeitgeschichte* as a serious scientific endeavour. It remained during roughly the following eighty years out of order. Around the middle of the previous century H.C. Hockett still rehearsed what Bernheim and Feder, or Seignobos, had codified in their textbooks: "History is not a science of *direct* observation … Historical method is, strictly speaking, a process *supplementary* to observations, a process by which the historian attempts to test the truthfulness of the reports of observations made by others."[9]

The writing of contemporary history was to be resumed only, and somewhat reluctantly at first,[10] in the aftermath of the Second World War. In 1953, Hans Rothfels, in an epoch-making paper entitled "Zeitgeschichte als Aufgabe", called upon his colleagues in the historical profession to take up what he saw as their moral and political duty, urging them to deal in a historically responsible way with the events of their own time, termed *Epoche der Mitlebenden*.[11] In Germany and all over the

[7] DROYSEN ([7]1972) 70, 134, 137. As "a penetrating methodologist" (GADAMER [1990] 213, 216) Droysen played a crucial role in the emergence of the modern *science* of history. For a general assessment, see ASSIS (2014). For the imputations to the eyewitness-historian, in particular, see LURAGHI (2014b).

[8] Cf. NÜTZENADEL / SCHIEDER (2004); DEN HOLLANDER (2011).

[9] HOCKETT (1958) 7-8. Cf. BERNHEIM ([6]1908) 227-228 and FEDER ([3]1924) 85. More ample discussion in SCHEPENS (1980) 1-14; SPOHR READMAN (2011). SCHEPENS (1975) explores the difference between ancient and modern 'source theory'.

[10] In this connection, it may be recalled that, in 1957, one of our most outstanding students of ancient historiography, Hermann Strasburger, intervened as dean in Wiesbaden to reverse the refusal of the Ministry of Education to establish an extraordinary chair for contemporary history; see HAMMERSTEIN (2017) 38-39, and, more generally, BERNSTEIN / LEPPIN (2013).

[11] ROTHFELS (1953).

world 'Institutes of Contemporary History' are now common features of the huge and variegated historiographical landscape; they testify to the scientifically acknowledged status, need and enduring importance of the revived tradition of "writing the history of one's own time".

The foregoing also means that Schwartz, Jacoby and Wilamowitz shaped their ideas on history writing in the ancient world, and on the special attention given by the Greco-Roman historians to narrating the events of their own time, at a unique juncture in the history of historiography: in the midst of a historiographical vacuum as far as the actual writing of *Zeitgeschichte* is concerned.[12] If, in particular, Jacoby has used this notion with an import and an amplitude that scarcely relate to its agreed upon understanding in today's reinstated practice of contemporary history, we are perhaps entitled to look at the issue through the historicising lens of the time in which this very type of history was out of order.[13]

When considering the subject of our study we will, first, turn to Schwartz, Jacoby and Wilamowitz in order to clarify their understanding of *Zeitgeschichte* in its application to ancient historiography. An attempt will be made at delineating its different layers of meaning. We will then ask what is distinctive about *griechische Zeitgeschichte* in relation to the other historiographical genres in Jacoby's taxonomy. As various attempts to define it as a self-contained *genos* seem to fail, it is but a logical further step to raise the question whether it could not be more beneficial, for

[12] *Zeitgeschichte* was not fully (re)established until after 1945. This is not to say that the *idea* was absolutely silenced. In 1915 Justus Hashagen, in a short textbook *Das Studium der Zeitgeschichte* (Bonn 1915), problematised its terminology and methodological peculiarities but equally pointed out the many possibilities of exploring contemporary history as a kind of "prehistory that is near the present state of affairs". At the end of World War I, he called on German historians to lift *Zeitgeschichte* out of its oppressed position and do their "duty arising from the war": a remarkable initiative that then still failed to meet with success: see GROSSE KRACHT (2004).

[13] On the need to historicize the history of historiography, see PAUL (2011) and Hervé Inglebert's contribution to the present *Entretiens*.

purposes of historiographical analysis, to look at the writing of contemporary history as a *practice* with a significant presence in various forms of history. By way of conclusion, we will try to assign to contemporary history writing its proper place within ancient historiography.

2. Origin of the Jacobian concept of (*griechische*) *Zeitgeschichte*

E. Schwartz was the first to introduce *Zeitgeschichte* as a pivotal notion in his analytical and interpretative work on Greco-Roman historiography. In a series of contributions to Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, covering Greek historians beginning with the letters A to E, he repeatedly called attention to their privileged treatment of present-day events. Occurrences of their own lifetime were covered much more extensively than those of earlier times. In those works, Schwartz posited, the less detailed account of past events functioned as a kind of introduction to the story of the all-important present or nearly present time. In order to account for this disparity of the narrative he devised the normative concept *Gesetz der Zeitgeschichte*. This law, in his eyes, succinctly expressed and sealed the narrow bond between history writing and politics. Key to Schwartz' view of both the development and character of ancient historiography is the nexus between *Geschichte* and *Geschichtsschreibung*. Writers of history, he insisted, got their impetus from the actual political situation: in addition to explaining their privileged treatment of present times this provided them also with the perspective in which they recovered the past.[14] The following

[14] Appositely highlighted by BLECKMANN (2015) 79, 82-85 and *passim*. For SCHWARTZ (1928) the bond between *Geschichtsschreibung* and *Geschichte* is the hallmark of Greek historiography; cf. CANFORA (1999) 90. FORNARA (1983) 52-54 warns for overestimating the political role played by the Greek historians. In turn CHANIOTIS (1988) 124-125 calls attention to the politically active citizens who engaged in writing the history of their own cities. For the political relevance of local history writing see SCHEPENS (2000); CLARKE (2008); THOMAS (2014a), (2014b), (2019). The figure of the 'politician-historian' is dealt with in

statements make clear how adamant Schwartz was in upholding the validity of his law for the whole of ancient historiography.

"So unsicher manches bleibt, das für die gesamte griechische Historiographie gültige Gesetz, daß die Zeitgeschichte den breitesten Raum einnimmt, tritt auch bei Ephoros scharf und deutlich hervor." (Schwartz [1907] 6). "Für sie (die Historiographie) vornehmlich gilt das Gesetz, daß der Stoff der Geschichtsschreibung die Zeitgeschichte ist, wobei [...] die Grenzen nicht allzu eng gezogen werden dürfen." (Schwartz [1928] 15). "Unverbrüchlich gilt für die Historiographie des Altertums das Gesetz, dass sie in Zeitgeschichte ausläuft." (Schwartz [1909] 490).[15]

What Schwartz means with the phrase *Gesetz der Zeitgeschichte* should primarily be understood as law of 'contemporary history' not as law of contemporary history *writing*.[16] While these two notions of history may in historiographical praxis somehow interrelate, it is important to note the distinction. In the present quotes the references to *Zeitgeschichte* all denote *res gestae*. It was left to Felix Jacoby to make, in the scholarly discourse on *Zeitgeschichte* in Greek historiography, the shift from *res gestae* to *historia* rerum gestarum. Whereas, of course, the term retained the twofold meaning it intrinsically shares with 'history' – referring to historical reality *or* its recording in works of history –, the latter gained prominence in the context of his life's work on the monumental collection of the fragments of the Greek historians. For arranging the materials Jacoby had decided to adopt the principle of the different *types* of history writing in the chronological sequence in which they gradually came into existence.[17] In his well-known view of the development,

SCHEPENS (2010c). The specific historical temporality involved in 'presentist' history writing is broached in GABBA (1990) 46 and the central issue explored in the essays of HARTOG (2005).

[15] Quotes borrowed from BLECKMANN (2015) 63 n. 52.

[16] SCHWARTZ (1928) 15 explicates what the "law of contemporary history" prescribes, namely "daß *der Stoff der Geschichte* die Zeitgeschichte ist" (my italics).

[17] According to the plan set out in JACOBY (1909); on his struggle with this plan, see SCHEPENS (2010a).

Greek historiography, after have gone through the stages of *Genealogy* and *Ethnography,* revealed by the end of the 5th century BC its true nature in the appearance of "die Gattung … die nun dauernd die vornehmste und wichtigste bleibt, … die *Zeitgeschichte*."[18]

We must now try to answer the question why Jacoby gave, or rather ended up with giving a German name to his main and most representative type of history writing in Antiquity. First of all, one is, of course, entitled to suppose that Schwartz' *Gesetz der Zeitgeschichte* was not alien to this choice. At the threshold of the 20th century Eduard Schwartz was the towering figure in the field of study of ancient historiography; his views inform Jacoby's foundational paper of 1908/09 throughout.[19] This can be endorsed with a later statement of Jacoby, in which he declares that both Wilamowitz and Schwartz had a strong influence on his drawing up "the intended arrangement of the new collection of the fragments of the historians". Actually, what he states is that he was "then too much" under their spell.[20] I intend to return at the end of my talk to this remarkable introspective note. This being said, it would be a mistake to think that choosing the label *Zeitgeschichte* was a matter of course for Jacoby. The principle he upheld for establishing his taxonomy of Greek historical writing was to adopt, where possible, the *generic* terms used by the ancient writers themselves.[21] Yet, there was no such term available for "all authors who … narrated general Greek history of their own time, or down to their own time, without limitation to any locality". Jacoby discusses the problem in a lengthy footnote,[22] starting from the observation that many of the works destined for this category simply bear the title Ἱστορίαι, deemed "too imprecise, because

[18] JACOBY (1909) 98.

[19] See, for instance, the explanation he gives, with reference to Schwartz, for Ephorus' more detailed treatment of the history of his own time (p. 104 n. 1).

[20] JACOBY (1949) 382 n. 10.

[21] JACOBY (1909) 83.

[22] JACOBY (1909) 96-97 n. 1.

this term can refer to all forms of historical writing" (including *Genealogies* and *Local Histories*). Nor does the practice of the Greek historians, he goes on to argue, show that Ἱστορίαι would be preferred to designate *Zeitgeschichte* rather than historical literature in general. Yet, what we are given to understand is that the main reason for not retaining the title *Histories* for the group of works in question was that it would carry the implication that the other genres were something other or less than 'history'. In Jacoby's view, all historiographical genres together add up to what constituted 'history' for the Greeks.

At this point, I may be forgiven for making a little aside on the use of the terms 'genre' and 'subgenre' in modern discussions of Jacoby's views. It was this scholar's great ambition (even for solving the practical problem of the best possible, and at the same time, 'scientific' arrangement of his fragment collection) to trace the gradual development of history. To that end he did not work 'top down', setting out from some abstract notion of history that, with time and in the practice of history-writing – with authors choosing various subjects responding to changing historical situations as well as to the various expectations of their intended audiences – would gradually materialize and diversify into sub-genera.[23] It suited Jacoby's purpose better to follow a 'bottom up' approach, one which looks for the building blocks that emerge from history being written in various forms and which, joined together, constitute the historical *genos* as a whole. Whereas the top-down approach raises the question of who may have been credited, at the start, with 'inventing' the overarching idea of history, Jacoby's view leaves room for the idea that no form of historiography succeeds or can ever succeed in capturing *Clio* completely. Subgenres take shape as particular 'literary forms', for instance as *Hellenica*, Universal histories, and *monographs* within the category or 'Gattung' *Zeitgeschichte*. In the same way are the *Atthides* a 'subspecies' of the genre of local history.

[23] Cf. MURRAY (2000) 330: history emerged from the "undifferentiated sphere of early Greek prose".

Jacoby does not state any specific reason as to why he eventually settled the question of the appropriate name for the works now collected in *FGrHist* II in favour of *Zeitgeschichte*. Schwartz may have inspired him but employed the term primarily to denote historical interest in present events and not in the sense in which Jacoby intended to utilize it to characterize a particular type of history writing. In this connection the larger picture of the history of historiography may be relevant as well: at the beginning of the previous century the writing of *Zeitgeschichte* had ceased to be practiced as a scientifically respectable form of doing history; *historiographically* thus, the concept was out of order and free for possible (re)use in another context. It is my submission that Jacoby must have realised that the idiosyncratic German compound had some interesting potential for being employed with an import that seemed tailored to the practical demands of classifying the indistinctive group of works, many of which were simply named Ἱστορίαι. *Zeitgeschichte* typically illustrates the capability of the German language to combine two nouns into a single concept. The second item, called the 'primary word' establishes the general category ('history'), whereas the first, the 'determiner', defines the specific subcategory ('time'). On the one hand, *Zeitgeschichte* carried the meaning of 'contemporary history' established by the centennial tradition of the well-known figure of the chronicler who used to report *historia temporis sui*.[24] Insofar it proved fit to describe the 'off-spring' of Thucydides: the historians who continued his incomplete *History of the Peloponnesian War* and, thereby, started the writing of *Zeitgeschichte*.[25] On the other

[24] See ERNST (1957) 138 n. 2: "Zeitgeschichte is als Abkürzung aus 'Geschichte der eigenen Zeit' (*historia temporis sui*) im Sinne der zeitgenössischen Geschichte entstanden und seit etwa 1800 … in allgemeinerem Gebrauch." Ernst prefers the noun 'Gegenwartschronistik' as a more adequate counterpart to 'Vergangenheitsgeschichte'.

[25] For JACOBY (1909) 97 *Zeitgeschichte* begins not with Thucydides but with his 'continuators'. He singles out Cratippus and the Oxyrhynchus historian as "die ältesten Darsteller der Zeitgeschichte, die Vertreter des Hellenikatypus im engeren Sinne." In a similar vein FORNARA (1983) 32-34 calls them "children of the monograph". The *Hellenica* of Cratippus (who in my view is most probably

hand, as a compound designating *Geschichte* with *Zeit* as foremost determining element the term presented itself with a broad and flexible enough range for accommodating works without specific theme but of varying chronological scope.[26] Whatever the grounds for Jacoby's choice, the fact is that in the presentation of his plan, in 1908, *Zeitgeschichte* appears as a key term in the two senses just outlined: with the more restrictive meaning of 'contemporary history' and, far more frequently, in the more general sense of histories recording events within a chronological framework. Mostly the context makes it clear how to understand 'history-in-time'. Where this is required for clarity's sake, Jacoby helps himself, and his reader, by making a distinction between *Zeitgeschichte* and *echte* or *reine Zeitgeschichte* or by adding the phrase "im engeren Sinne".[27]

3. *Zeit-geschichte* as history-in-time

For Jacoby, the distinguishing features of the historiographical genre are: "(1) that it perceives the main duty of the historian in the description of the time that he himself has lived through,

the author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*), Xenophon, and Theopompus varied from one another in content, scope and political orientation: see SCHEPENS (1993) and (2007b) 65-77. NICOLAI (2006), (2014), LURAGHI (2017) and MARINCOLA (2017) 105-106 highlight Xenophon's innovative writing at a time when history was not yet fixed as genre.

[26] In this larger acceptation *Zeitgeschichte* is an artificial construct. The now agreed upon meaning is either "geschichtliche Gegenwart u. jüngste Vergangenheit" or "Geschichte der gegenwärtigen u. gerade vergangenen Zeit" (see DUDEN, *Das große Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, Bd. 10, Mannheim ^{3}1999, 4602).

[27] The uniform rendering of *Zeitgeschichte* as "contemporary history" in the otherwise excellent English translation of Jacoby (1909) by CHAMBERS / SCHORN (2015) fails to convey its ambivalent historiographical coverage. CHAMBERS (1990) 206 names the class of writings assembled in *FGrHist* II "histories limited in time" and repeats this in his *BNJ* online biography of Jacoby. It is an excellent paraphrasis for Jacoby's idiosyncratic notion. For this key concept *Brill's New Jacoby* uses – *horresco referens* – the term 'Chronography', which is, of course, disastrously misconceived and historiographical nonsense that demands rectification.

no matter whether he describes this age alone or begins at some earlier time of his own choosing; (2) that it takes its standpoint on the side of the Greeks; (3) that this standpoint is in no way limited to any locale but is pan-Hellenic, world-historical."[28] Whereas the first feature defines *Zeitgeschichte* on the axis of time, the two latter criteria delineate it as to content and focalization against respectively 'Ethnography' (which takes the non-Greek vantage point) and 'Horography' (which deals with the history of a given place).

In spite of the fact that no ancient name covered this whole class of historical writing, Jacoby emphasized that "in comparison with the other genres it was perceived as a unity".[29] The clause "in comparison with the other genres" is significant. It intimates that *Zeitgeschichte* as a whole and in its three literary forms – monograph, universal history, *Hellenika*-type – is basically only definable *per negationem*, that is to say, by the absence of the specific features that constitute the essence of the other genres.[30] It applies to works which are not thematically configured or at least not primarily thematically configured around notions of place (*polis*, island, *ethnos*) or specific great deeds (performed by either kings, generals or cities) or any other well-defined subject (such as a particular war), but merely across time.[31] In an interesting case study devoted to the 'Continuous Histories (*Hellenica*)' C. Tuplin plainly reveals the difficulties involved in the exercise at positive genre definition.[32] His considered review of all possible criteria – literary texture, chronological scope, title,

[28] JACOBY (1909) 98.

[29] JACOBY (1909) 96.

[30] Cf. BIANCO (2015).

[31] For a penetrating overall criticism of the criteria adopted by Jacoby for defining his 'genre' concept, see MARINCOLA (1999), (2018).

[32] TUPLIN (2007). Similar attempts at genre definition, with comparable inconclusive results, have been made by ROOD (2007) for the war monograph, and TULLY (2014) for universal history. We have it on the authority of POLYB. 5, 33, 2 that "Ephorus was the first and only who undertook the writing of a universal history". Tully's attempt to destroy this belief has some good points but ultimately fails: see WEAIRE (2021).

geopolitical and thematic focus – which individually or collectively establish genre membership, runs into the conclusion that none proves necessary or sufficient to neatly singularize this very subset, valued, though, by Jacoby as ideal type, almost exchangeable with the concept *Zeitgeschichte* itself.[33]

Coverage of events falling within one's own lifetime (irrespective of the point of time from which the account begins) is Jacoby's first and absolutely required criterion for assigning the label *Zeitgeschichte* to a work. However, the treatment of contemporary events, though essential, is not in itself a sufficient determinant. It is the combination of this very criterion with the other two that makes up the generic propriety of the *Gattung*. This point has been very well made by Fornara, where he observes that the "presence of contemporary history" defines these works *less essentially* than the fact that they have a common subject [Greek history], purpose [general], and methodology [*Primärforschung*, *i.e.,* personal experience and cross-questioning of eyewitnesses].[34] Fornara hits home the critical historiographical weakness in the Jacobian notion of *Zeitgeschichte*. Because time is a factor common to *all* history-writing, any attempt to use this notion as a basically determining generic criterion is bound to run into difficulties.

As all history deals with time, what precisely is meant by the time of *Zeitgeschichte*? A possible singularisation vis-à-vis other genres lies in the limitation of the timespan covered to the period that is contemporaneous or quasi-contemporaneous with the author of the work. This most obvious solution, however, clashes with the peculiar clause that *Zeitgeschichte* need not be restricted to one's own lifetime or to the period for which living memory is still available. On the strength of Jacoby's definition, a general Greek history, which may begin at

[33] JACOBY (1909) 96-97: "Innerlich berechtigt [as title for the genre as a whole] wäre die Bezeichnung als Ἑλληνικά." See also, *ibid.* 100-101. But the term is apparently not wide enough to also include 'universal histories' dealing with Greeks and non-Greeks.

[34] FORNARA (1983) 3 (my italics).

any arbitrary point in the past, can be categorized as *Zeitgeschichte*, provided only that it brings the narrative down to the historian's own time. Schwartz too had observed that for *Zeitgeschichte* as the subject-matter of history, "die Grenzen nicht allzu eng gezogen werden dürfen".[35] Needless to say, such provisions add a stunning element of complexity to the exercise in definition and makes a positive conclusion virtually impossible. How this can lead to confusion and misrepresentation of the impact of contemporary history writing will briefly be discussed below. First, we must try to explain *why* so much of the history of the more distant past – even of the remotest periods – can conceivably be included in Schwartz' and, above all, Jacoby's understanding of *Zeitgeschichte*.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's "thoughts about the growth and the nature of historical writing in Greece", set forth in his Oxford Lecture of 1908, procure insight into the historico-theoretical rationale that underlies not only the preference given to contemporary history writing but also the large time-span that can be covered by *Zeitgeschichte*. Sharply focused on the epistemic limitations inherent in the still underdeveloped concept of history and historical method in Hellenic culture, the Berlin professor pointed out that "in general, what we call historical criticism was not only not attained, but not so much as sought after".[36] Self-consciously he declared: "We have over the Greeks the advantage of possessing a science of history."[37] In the reworked German version of this paper, published almost two decades later, he speaks out his mind even more clearly: "Historische Kritik kann erst an der *Geschichte der Vergangenheit* geübt werden."[38]

The conviction that the Greeks had no or hardly any interest in the past as such and were unable to develop methods for its critical study, presents a complex and multi-layered problem

[35] SCHWARTZ (1928) 15.
[36] WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (1908) 14.
[37] WILAMOWITZ -MOELLENDORFF (1908) 25.
[38] WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (1926) 223 (my italics).

that one cannot aim to properly discuss in passing.[39] Let me just state that it is a largely anachronistic and unexamined axioma that I had to bring up because, for my present purposes, it can explain the two ways in which history of the past gets incorporated within the realm of *Zeitgeschichte*: either subordinated as a preamble to the treatment of the historian's own time; or, especially in works with a large chronological scope, as a compilatory or rhetorical 'backward extension' to what really matters: the treatment of contemporary events. Whatever option an individual historian may choose, such presentist historical temporality establishes the privileged status of *Zeitgeschichte* as solely representing true history.

Both Wilamowitz and Jacoby have illustrated their case with Ephorus' *Koinai Historiai*. This historian, viewed by Polybius as the first and only one who before him attempted the writing of 'universal history', began his work with the 'Return of the Heraclids' and reached to the siege of Perinthus in 340 BC. Wilamowitz, infamous for his sharp condemnation of this "utterly thoughtless" historian who ventured to write about the past and, hence, incorporated all that is objectional in history writing, makes his point as follows, in a judgment that is more revealing of his presumptions than of the real disposition of Ephorus' narrative: "Gegenüber der Ausführlichkeit, mit der er die Zeitgeschichte behandelte, war das freilich nicht viel mehr als eine Einleitung."[40] Jacoby's justification of the inclusion of the *Histories* among the works of *Zeitgeschichte* (*FGrHist* 70)

[39] How historiography articulates the past/present relationship depends first and foremost on the individual choices made by the historians. That one 'law' would apply to all reveals more of Schwartz' thinking than of the rich variety of historical works in Antiquity and the disparate achievements of the historians. For Schwartz, "Wahrheitsforschung" in historical study amounts to uncovering the "Gesetze des Werdens": see REBENICH (2014) 408-409. For all major problems at issue here, see MARINCOLA (2009). On the research methods of the Greek historians, see SCHEPENS (2007a).

[40] WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (1926) 226-227; cf. ID. (1908) 10-11. SCHWARTZ (1907) 6-7 differentiates between "Zeitgeschichte" and "kompilatorische Darstellung". "Beide Hälften des Werks sind gesondert zu betrachten, sind auch dem historischen Wert nach verschieden."

typically bears the stamp of his concern with historiographical taxonomy. He begins with pointing out that it would be wrong to separate Ephorus' universal Greek history from monographs and *Hellenica*, which together constitute the "rein zeitgeschichtlichen Gruppen", because "an essential difference between them was not felt and in fact does not exist". From those ideal types Ephorus' work only differs by the fact that it is "nach oben hin zur Vollständigkeit erweitert", *i.e.,* chronologically expanded backward until the narrative, as envisaged by the author, was complete. For the rest, it too exhibits the feature that "the narrative of the writer's own time always surpasses, in breadth of treatment and importance, the older parts, which usually have the character of a compilation and claim merit only for their style. In these men, … artistic sensitivity simply ranks higher; not for nothing are they without exception rhetoricians or at least actively interested in rhetoric".[41]

Ephorus' *Zeitgeschichte* covered in total some seven and a half centuries of history. While he had, mainly for evidentiary reasons (cf. Diod. Sic. 4, 1), excluded the mythological period from his project, other writers of universal histories were less sceptical and produced historical narratives with an even larger chronological scope. Critical concerns were, apparently, not an obstacle to the 'orator and philosopher' Zoilus of Amphipolis (*FGrHist* 71) to write a history in three books, starting with the theogony and ending with the death of Philip II. His pupil Anaximenes of Lampsacus (rhetor, but also teacher of Alexander the Great, whom he reportedly accompanied in his military campaigns) wrote Ἑλληνικά (*FGrHist* 72 T 14) in twelve books, beginning from the theogony and the first generation of men – ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ θεογονίας καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων – down to battle of Mantinea and the death of Epaminondas in 362 BC (T 4).[42] By the same criteria Asinius

[41] JACOBY (1909) 103-104, and with due reference also to Schwartz' "Gesetz der Zeitgeschichte" (104 n. 1).

[42] JACOBY (1909) 103-104 and n. 2. The work was also referred to as Πρῶται Ἱστορίαι (F 3), which, within the work with 'gesamttitel' Ἑλληνικά may only

Quadratus' survey of "One Thousand Years of Roman History" (*ab urbe condita* (?) down to the author's own time qualifies for inclusion under the heading *Zeitgeschichte* (*FGrHist* 97).[43]

Before we go on, let us dwell for a minute on the reasons Jacoby adduces for publishing, under the heading *Zeitgeschichte*, the fragments of a history which starts with the birth of the gods and the first generation of men. Technically, Anaximenes' work fulfils the criteria laid down for being called a *Zeitgeschichte*. His focus is general and Greek and he carries the narrative down to his own time. The battle of Mantinea constituted in several respects an epochal historical event: it marked the inconclusive end of the long ongoing inner-Greek struggle for hegemony and pointed forward to the loss of freedom and independence for the Greek world. But can one really contend that the coverage of the past from its earliest beginnings – something on which the reception of his work has been focusing when in the tradition it is also referred to as Πρῶται Ἱστορίαι (F 3) – was only there as an introduction to narrating the contemporary events? In the present case, this conclusion seems to be prompted more by a blanket application of the 'law of *Zeitgeschichte*' than by any relevant evidence at our disposal.[44] Anyhow, with his profile of a professional rhetor, Anaximenes' foray into the remotest past is a priori scorned as purely rhetorical in character: the

designate the section dealing with primal history. The Πρῶται Ἱστορίαι, so Jacoby (*FGrHist* IIC, Berlin 1926, 106-107) "bilden die einleitung zur zeitgeschichte". LURAGHI (2014a) interestingly suggests that Ephorus may possibly have reacted against such a far extension of the *spatium historicum*. According to T 4 (DIOD. SIC. 15, 89, 3) the first *syntaxis* in twelve books "included practically all the doings of the Greeks and non-Greeks" and should be seen as a 'universal history'; but he characterizes the work as *Hellenica*. We can only speculate about what kind of conceptual unity underlied Anaximenes' 'universalistic' history; on account of the tradition which connects Anaximenes with cynic philosophy, the theory of the equality of all human beings could be a likely option: see MAZZARINO (1966) 338-339.

[43] As a 'universal history'. See JANISZEWSKI (2006) 27-39 and 85-91 for his contemporary history writing in the form of the 'war monographs' *Parthica* and *Germanica*.

[44] Next to nothing of this work has survived but it would be methodologically improper to regard this as an indication of intrinsic inferior quality or minor importance: see SCHEPENS (1997) 145.

historically valuable part, if there was any in this work, was concerned with narrating the events of his own time.[45]

These examples show how far "Ergänzungen nach oben hin" can go. In how capacious a notion of *Zeitgeschichte* this eventually results is perhaps even more strikingly illustrated in the following statement made by Jacoby with regard to works composed in a climate of alleged further political and cultural decline at the end of the Hellenistic period: "Auf allen Gebieten erscheinen die grossen *Kompilationen*: in der Mythographie die Handbücher, in der Ethnographie die Exzerptenwerke Polyhistors, in der Chronographie das Sammelwerk Kastors, *in der Zeitgeschichte Diodor Nikolaos Pompeius Trogus*."[46] One is surprised to see these universal histories to be reckoned as *Zeitgeschichte*; formally, they fulfil the criteria laid down for being included in the group. We may note, however, that the attribution of such a label tends to inflate the size and significance of this branch of history writing in proportions that would decidedly also seem odd to ancient standards.[47]

The virtually illimited stretching of the time covered by *Zeitgeschichte* is, of course, like the concept itself a modern scholarly idea. We may ask ourselves whether such a construct has any chance of meeting the thinking and practices of the ancient historians. How far would they expect or allow a writer of a work dealing with contemporary history to go back in time? Polybius provides an answer to this question in the context of his reflection on where to begin his *Histories*:

> "I shall adopt as the starting-point of this book the first occasion on which the Romans crossed the sea from Italy. This is just where the History of Timaeus left off; and it falls in the 129th Olympiad. I shall accordingly have to describe what the state of

[45] More recent research tends to rehabilitate him from Jacoby's unjust criticism: see PARMEGGIANI (2009); FERRUCCI (2010); GOUKOWSKY (2017) 255-264; and M.F. WILLIAMS, *Anaxamines of Lampsakos* (*BNJ* 72).

[46] JACOBY (1909) 107 (my italics).

[47] As to how Zoilus' and Anaximenes' 4th century contemporaries viewed past and present and the relationship between old and recent times, see, for instance, GRETHLEIN (2014).

> their affairs in Italy was, how long that settlement had lasted, and on what resources they reckoned, when they resolved to invade Sicily. For this was the first place outside Italy in which they set foot. The precise cause of their thus crossing I must state without comment; for if I let one cause lead me back to another, my point of departure will always elude my grasp, and I shall never arrive at the view of my subject which I wish to present. As to dates, then, I must fix on some era agreed upon and recognised by all: and as to events, one that admits of distinctly separate treatment; even though I may be obliged to go back some short way in point of time, and take a summary review of the intermediate transactions. For if the facts with which one starts are unknown, or even open to controversy, all that comes after will fail of approval and belief. But opinion being once formed on that point, and a general assent obtained, all the succeeding narrative becomes intelligible."[48]

The choice of a good starting point is a question of great importance to contemporary history writing. Dionysius of Halicarnassus discusses it as a key issue in his treatise *On Thucydides*. For Polybius a good beginning should be uncontroversial and known; one that is agreed upon and recognized by all, otherwise one ends up always going back further from cause to cause … What is implied is that there is a point beyond which a writer of a contemporary history cannot go further back without compromising the character of the work one has chosen to write. I value this as an ancient ruling that dismisses the whole idea that a work of contemporary history could have its start from any point in the distant past. Polybius takes the ground away from under the rationale for stretching the notion *Zeitgeschichte* beyond reasonable chronological limits.

4. *Zeitgeschichte*: an independent *genos*?

We have been looking up to now mainly at the problems of generic delineation of the specific forms of history writing

[48] POLYB. 1, 5 (trans. SHUCKBURGH); cf. POLYB. 5, 31.

that are subsumed under the family concept *Zeitgeschichte*. Jacoby's basically inconclusive genre definition, the bricolage with extensions or the need to specify its meaning for the sake of clarity, would all seem to indicate that *Zeitgeschichte* has at the very best only a tenuous claim as a self-contained historical genos. That such genre concept would once be met with fundamental criticism is less surprising than the fact that it came only late. In 1983, Fornara stated his view on Jacobian *Zeitgeschichte* in the first pages of "The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome" frankly as follows: "the term is inapplicable to the greater number of Greco-Roman historians."[49] Coming from a scholar who shows himself, in principle, well disposed to work with Jacoby's *genos*-theories, this is a telling statement. I cannot but repeat and fully agree with his view that the presence of 'contemporary history' in all the works united by Jacoby under the umbrella *Zeitgeschichte* defines them "less essentially than their common subject, purpose, and methodology". In his seminal paper "Genre, Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography" John Marincola has, in turn, exposed the deeper scope of this criticism by extending it to all historiographical genera in Jacoby's 'system'.

While I concur with Fornara's censure, I part company with the double solution he proposed to the problem. For one thing, and contrary to what Fornara states, Jacoby, by allegedly substituting in the place of history the term *Zeitgeschichte*, was *not* depriving the Greeks "of the genre they named history and regarded as the quintessential historical form".[50] This imputation is bound up with an "un'inaccettabile forzatura"[51] of Jacoby's observation according to which there has absolutely never been

[49] FORNARA (1983) 3.

[50] In order not to add to the confusion, I have omitted, in the context of this discussion, Fornara's misleading dubbing of the term *Zeitgeschichte* as 'contemporary history'. A habit that is, unfortunately, widespread in today's historiographical studies.

[51] See DESIDERI (1996) 957-958.

"eine streng unserer 'Geschichte' entsprechende, bestimmt auf die Erforschung und Darstellung geschichtlicher Ereignisse der fernen oder näheren Vergangenheit begrenzte, selbständige Wissenschaft im Altertum".[52] This statement does not deprive the ancient Greeks from the genre *they* named 'history' – it only means to say that their conception of it was not comparable to the modern, institutionalised science of history. Insofar, Fornara's reinstatement of the term *Historiai* for the incriminated *Zeitgeschichte* attempts a solution to a nonproblem. More fundamentally, still, the view which underlies his argument that at least one of Jacoby's five 'forms' of historical writing should be recognized as 'history' itself, fails to carry conviction. As already noted, in Jacoby's opinion, all five historical genres together embody what history writing was to the Greeks. No genre can claim to represent history exclusively; such view seems perfectly aligned to Polybius' repartition of history writing in three τρόποι, which are all considered μέρη τῆς ἱστορίας.[53] Secondly, by assigning the general term *Historiai* to the genos called *Zeitgeschichte* by Jacoby, Fornara is committed to putting all other genres in a status "related to History", whatever that may mean.[54]

Our exploration of the notion of *Zeitgeschichte* has now reached the point at which it becomes clear that the various difficulties in which one runs in attempting a definition or in working with the concept as a heuristic or hermeneutic tool, cannot adequately be solved by proposing another name for the contested *genos*. Whereas it should not be denied that the system of categories devised by Jacoby for ordering the *amethodos hylê* of historical literature and for studying its characteristics has its merits, we cannot look away from the very serious problems it poses, in particular for the two genres, *Zeitgeschichte* and Ethnography

[52] JACOBY (1909) 83.
[53] POLYB. 9, 1-2.
[54] As also MARINCOLA (1999) 284 n. 11 noted, Fornara's 'solution' "is not without its own problems".

without correspondent ancient name.[55] The logical further step is to raise the question whether it could not be more beneficial, for purposes of historiographical analysis, to look at the writing of contemporary history as a *practice* with a significant presence in various forms of history rather than as a genre in its own right.[56] In this, I follow the approach recommended by Ludmilla Jordanova in her book with the telling title *History in Practice* (London 2000). She sets out from the belief that the discipline of history is best understood "as a set of practices, rather than as, say, a constellation of beliefs or theories, or a stable body of subject matter. History is indeed about what historians do. This formulation", she argues, "is not circular, as might at first sight appear. Rather it signals that there is no essence of the discipline, which is made up of what members of the community agree will count as such." Such an approach – the polar opposite of measuring up the ancient historians against the standards of 19th century historical science as if it were the quintessence of history – seems particularly adapted to the challenge of studying ancient historiography. As Strasburger rightly pointed out, the best of the ancient historians' theory was invested in their actual working methods. If, then, we ask about their theories, we must, for the greater part, derive them from their practices.[57]

And the study of these practices should not be confined, on the strength of a genre definition, to just one supposedly particular set. The truth is that the actual 'writing of contemporary' in Antiquity cuts across various genres. Many historians, who have not found their place in the group of authors listed in *FGrHist* II *Zeitgeschichte*, because as writers of historical works on cities and countries they were assigned to other parts

[55] MARINCOLA (1999) 295-296. For ethnography, in particular, see ALMAGOR / SKINNER (2013).

[56] Here, some striking resemblances could be made to the statements that result from today's inconclusive debates about what 'contemporary history' really is. Thus, DUBOIS / HUDEMANN (2016) 9 write: "La *Zeitgeschichte* apparaît ainsi aujourd'hui comme une 'pratique' mouvante, propice aux débats historiographiques et aux querelles conceptuelles …."

[57] STRASBURGER ([3]1975) 11-12.

of the fragment collection, have often within their compass given special weight to the history of their own times. The Athenians Androtion (*FGrHist* 324) and Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328) were both politically active and wrote *Atthides* which became increasingly detailed as they approached their own time. R. Thomas concluded that they "devoted so much of their *Atthis* to events of their own lifetime that they are effectively contemporary historians".[58] In the same breath R. Thomas notes that this holds true as well for Zeno (*FGrHist* 523) and Antisthenes, historians of Rhodes.[59] Thanks to Polybius, who critically engages with their patriotic accounts of contemporary history – they seem to have unjustly claimed that the Rhodians were victorious in the sea battle of Lade against Philip V of Macedon (ca. 201/200 BC) –, we get a glimpse of the larger scope of their narratives. We also learn from Polybius that they wrote their accounts with literary ambitions in the style of 'great' history. That is just one more reason for acknowledging to what extent genre distinctions, which may make sense from one point of view can become really blurred from another.[60]

5. Felix Jacoby: "point of reference or focus for disagreement"?

By way of conclusion, I would like to place the previous critical analysis in a somewhat broader, and for Jacoby, also fairer perspective with a bit of history of classical scholarship. What I intend to argue is that Jacoby himself was quite aware of the inherently problematic nature of the evolutionist and generic ordering principle for assigning to all historians a place – their place? – in *FGrHist*.

In order to understand the daunting magnitude of the ask which Jacoby had to face with the arrangement of all the materials

[58] Thomas (2019) 341-353.
[59] Thomas (2019) 46-49.
[60] Polyb. 16, 14, 5 -15; 16, 17, 9; see Lenfant (2005).

in his collection,[61] several factors are important. To begin with, two closely related basic facts must be acknowledged: first, that "data are messy", *in casu* an ἀμέθοδος ὕλη[62] of piecemeal remains of more than a thousand 'writers' known to us at least by name and who, between the 5th century BC and the 5th century AD, have produced altogether a multiple of a thousand works in different historical genres; second, that there is no ready-made formula of presentation available that would be wholly satisfactory and/or capable to meet the diverse expectations of users of such a collection.[63] On top of that come the difficult genesis of the project and the troubled times under which it had to be carried out: H. Bloch, on occasion, aptly evoked both with the phrase "the fate of the historians".[64] In what follows I recall some of the main points dealt with in an earlier paper focusing on Jacoby's life-long struggling with the question of how best to organize the collection.[65]

In spite of all adversity the big historiographical categories which Jacoby put in place for organising his new fragment collection prove, in retrospect, to be remarkably resilient. His conception of the development of Greek historiography and its division into five main types of history writing provided for the past century the dominant paradigm for research in this field of classical studies.[66] In the introduction to his book *The Invention of Greek Ethnography*, J. Skinner seems to speak for many students of Greek historiography when he observes that it would be hard to overemphasize Jacoby's impact. His study critically explores the

[61] With his wide definition of 'history', Jacoby had a problem of organisation rather than of selection.

[62] SEXT. EMPIR. *Adv. gramm.* 1, 254.

[63] In his "Entwurf" for *FGrHist* IV one sees Jacoby "at a loss to settle the many problems he gets involved in": see SCHEPENS (1997) 148-149; and, more recently, SCHORN (2021). Enlightening discussion also in DONOHUE (2013).

[64] In his letter of May 17, 1948, answering Jacoby's invitation to continue his work in case he should not be able to complete it: cf. SCHEPENS (2010b) 428 n. 5. For Jacoby's biography, see WITTRAM (2004).

[65] SCHEPENS (2010b). Paper read on the occasion of the Berlin Jacoby commemoration fifty years after his death and written mainly on the basis of data in the Jacoby *Nachlass* – including documents which Jacoby kept carefully for himself.

[66] BARON (2013) 202-203.

concept of 'Ethnography'; next to *Zeitgeschichte* it is, in Jacoby's taxonomy, the other main category which fails to map onto ancient terminology. Skinner's view that the notion was created "largely as a matter of convenience" for organizing the fragment collection bears resemblance to what I have been arguing here with regard to Jacoby's appropriation, mainly for classification purposes, of the notion of *Zeitgeschichte*.[67]

It may well be worth remembering what O. Murray stated more generally on the continuing importance of Jacoby "whether as point of reference or as focus for disagreement", for all subsequent students of ancient Greek historiography. "For better or for worse we cannot escape that inheritance. It would be a true revolution if we could be persuaded to cease from either repeating or contradicting the views of Jacoby; but I remain sceptical whether that is yet possible."[68] Still, can we not try to receive Jacoby's scientific legacy with some more understanding, maybe even responsiveness, if we realise that he has been himself the first and, at some point, even the sharpest critic of the notorious Berlin 1908/09 blueprint?

In these *prolegomena* to the new collection Jacoby had characterized the alphabetical order as convenient for the editor and easy-going for the occasional user, but also the most primitive and the least scientific. But his chief reason for outright rejecting it as *main* ordering principle was that it would downright "block the way towards solving all the questions that we wish to answer with the help of a collection of fragments. For this collection is not an end in itself, but only a means toward a goal."[69] Jacoby's ambitious plan engendered a fierce discussion.[70] Immediately after the event the Byzantinist Paul Marc published in his review a powerful critical comment that goes directly to the

[67] Skinner (2012) 30-32.
[68] Murray (2001) 319.
[69] Jacoby (1909) 81.
[70] See Chávez Reino (2008) for an attempt at reconstruction of the debate.

heart of the problem. It is the first piece of the puzzle we have to put together.[71]

> "Die Disposition nach entwicklungsgeschichtlichen Gesichtspunkten zeigt in ihrer individuellen Bedingtheit und mit ihren zahlreichen Kompromissen am deutlichsten die schweren Gefahren eines solchen Einteilungsprinzip für ein Werk, das in erster Linie praktisch und objektiv sein muss; für die Nachschlagwerke ist die äusserlichste Anordnung, in diesem Fall die alphabetische, stets die beste, weil sie die unzweideutigste und allgemeinverständlichste ist."

Totally unexpected it took Jacoby only a few years to agree with all the objections formulated here. We know this from a letter he sent to Eduard Meyer. In it he points out the dangers of subjectivity and arbitrariness that are involved in the adoption of a developmental principle. Jacoby clarifies this view with reference to the ordering principle Hermann Diels had chosen for his *Vorsokratiker*: "er giebt eine ordnung, die die geschichte der philosophie widerspiegln soll. Jetzt kommt Reinhardt u. will die grundlage in ganz wesentlichen punkten erschüttern."[72] That mistrust was one of the reasons why Jacoby had been drawing up an alternative plan built on other principles. The plan is dated to November 17, 1915 and bears the title "Plan einer Sammlung der Griechischen Historischen Tradition".[73] It is introduced with the following statement:

> "Der von mir auf dem Berliner Internat. Histor. Kongress vorgetragene plan (s. Klio IX) hat insofern eine änderung erfahren, als ich den wünschen auf möglichst mechanisch bequeme benutzbarkeit der sammlung entsprechen will, ohne das aufzugeben, was ich für wesentlich erachte, die vorlage des gesamten materials nach antiken gesichtspunkten geordnet."

[71] MARC (1909).

[72] Jacoby's letter to Eduard Meyer (April 14, 1917), published by LANSKY (1991) 64.

[73] For a presentation of this plan, including full transcription and photographs, see SCHEPENS (2009), (2010b). This alternative plan remained hidden until after Jacoby's death. In fact, it was never destined to be known to anybody, not even to Herbert Bloch. We found it, to our great surprise, in the Jacoby *Nachlass*.

The plan provided for an edition of all fragmentary historians in alphabetical order, in a first part, for an edition of all texts related to ancient Greek historical theory and method, in a second part, and, in a third part, for a complete survey of "the historical tradition". That most important part III would be structured, Jacoby wrote, "essentially according to the principles which I formerly elaborated" and all fragmentary materials, edited in part I, would be re-integrated in it.[74]

This was a truly imposing plan focused on presenting the whole of the historiographical tradition, the fragmentary remains of which constituted only the smallest, difficult to interpret and often disappointing part – a point Jacoby, now famous for his fragment collection, was wont to emphasize! The arrangement of the fragmentary historians in alphabetical order is one of its remarkable and interesting features because it liberated the editor of a precarious and practically insoluble problem inherent in his original plan: the conflict, namely, that constantly arises

[74] When Jacoby states – wesentlich nach den von mir seinerzeit entwickelten prinzipien –, he intends an ordering according to the principles of *genos* and *development*. Yet, this purpose is somewhat tempered by "wesentlich". In fact, the proposed arrangement puts, for the first time, ethnography and the histories of the Greek poleis together in one category entitled "Geschichte κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις". Their union within one section compromises the developmental principle. One may ask why, already at this early stage (between 1909 and 1915), Jacoby decided to remove 'local history' from the place he had assigned to it in his *Klio*-plan; there it is in 'Band V' which also includes the 'antiquarian' writings of the grammarians. SCHORN (2021) perceptively proposes an answer. His analysis is mainly based on Jacoby's handwritten notes on both *recto* and *verso* of the well-known 1909 plan in ten sections; a photograph and transcription of this document in the *Nachlass* is added in *Appendix* I (p. 50-52). The notes, written at various moments between 1909 and 1915, show Jacoby's uneasiness with the combination of the local historians with the antiquarians and his constant wavering over the question of a suitable nomenclature for the group. Since he did not succeed in fittingly describing the relationship of *Horography* to the (other) branches of antiquarian writing, he removed the local historians from this realm. The alternative plan of 1915 shows the first result of this operation. His survey of the whole of the historiographical tradition provides for a section (III 3) that was to be devoted to local histories of non-Greek peoples and of Greek cities alike. For an overview of the successive schemes Jacoby drafted for *FGrHist*, see SCHEPENS (2010b).

between a classification according to type of historical work and the principle of keeping all works written by one author together. At the same time, the alternative plan didn't renounce the generic and evolutionary principles: they remained (essentially) operative within the project but were removed to the presentation of the historical tradition, a section not organized by authors but by historical works; and within this survey the works written by individual authors would be included at the place or places where they had contributed to the establishment of the tradition.

The title "Plan einer Sammlung der Griechischen Historischen Tradition" no longer presents the undertaking as a *fragment* collection, and could, therefore, surely also from a historical point of view be valued as a potentially very useful one. Probing whether he should go ahead with it, Jacoby submitted, in 1917, this newly drafted plan to Eduard Meyer. He probably expected to get his approval but was disappointed in that. Meyer abhorred the presentation of the historians in alphabetical order so strongly, that, I suppose, the remainder of the plan was hardly discussed. The day after he had his conversation with Jacoby, he promptly wrote him a letter with a counter-proposal for an edition project that would keep the fragmentary historians together according to groups[75] and should primarily, instead of trying to embody historiographical principles, cater to the practical need of its users. Jacoby could not afford to ignore Meyer's views. It would have been impossible to start the publication without the financial support that the latter, as administrator of the fund "Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft", could procure.

In retrospect, we may perhaps consider it unfortunate that this plan did not find a favourable reception. Jacoby, somewhat reluctantly, returned to his original plan, the essence of which

[75] Meyer's mainly thematic groups are composed according to a mixture of criteria: ancient "geschlossene Gruppen" such as the "Logographers" or the "Peripatetics"; political historians together according to period; geographical criteria for cities and regions, …).

he now combined to some extent with Meyer's ideas and to which a number of changes were made. The Jacoby *Nachlass* preserves a drafted version of this re-arranged plan. It prefigures the new structure that is presented in the Preface to *FGrHist* I (1923).[76]

It has often been noted[77] that Jacoby does not provide any reason as to why he made the changes to his original plan. He just adds a brief comment, saying that the arrangement is not ideal but rather one that he had decided to adopt "after all" (*schließlich doch*). Something must have bothered him. I suggest that he might have been dissatisfied in particular with the fact that the new structure did no longer, at least not in all its parts, articulate the successive stages in which Greek historiography developed.

In the period leading up to 1923, Jacoby had himself, as we have seen, come to believe that ethnography and Greek local history should be combined in one unit. As part of his plea that Jacoby should adopt a more thematic arrangement E. Meyer had equally insisted on editing together in one group the histories of peoples and cities.[78] Meyer and Jacoby certainly agreed on this point and, for the latter, the combination ought not to have created any problem within the framework of his alternative plan of 1915: Jacoby's draft actually already provided for a section "Geschichte κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις" within the survey of the whole of the historiographical tradition (III 3). However, since this plan was cancelled and Jacoby had returned to his 1908/09 plan of publishing *only* the fragmentary historians, he now faced the problem of how to fit the group in into a structure that was supposed to reflect his view of the development of Greek historical writing. In accordance with this view, writers of 'ethnography' should, be dealt with before *Zeitgeschichte* and writers of local history after it. Wherever he inserted the

[76] SCHORN (2021) 17-18 discusses it briefly, photograph and transcription in Appendix 2 (53-54).

[77] Even by himself: see JACOBY (1949) 382 n. 10.

[78] "so dass man den Bestand dieser unendlich reichen Literatur übersehn kann" (letter to Jacoby of April 12, 1917).

histories κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις,[79] they subverted the idea of an arrangement that would convey his historico-developmental view. The impossibility to provide a solution to this quandary resulted in a demotion of the value of this principle which in the *Klio* article played such a prominent role as a tool for creating order within the collection.[80]

At such a state of affairs, it made no theoretical difference to Jacoby whether he would assign "Ethnographie und Horographie" a place either before or after *Zeitgeschichte*. The fact that the ethnographers and local historians constitute part III of the final plan, after Genealogie (I) and *Zeitgeschichte* (II), must eventually have resulted from practical considerations, in other words from what Jacoby established for himself as the most feasible work plan to complete his project. He was aware of the fact that the editing of and commenting upon all fragmentary works in the category "Geschichte von Völkern und Städten" would give him incomparably more work than the "Mythographers" and the authors of *Zeitgeschichte*.[81] In order to ensure the steady progress of the publication, it was recommended to do the 'Mythographers' and the writers of *Zeitgeschichte* first and only then to embark on the daunting task of editing the many historians κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις.[82]

[79] He actually tried the two options; see the scheme of 1915 compared to one of 1917 in SCHEPENS (2010b) 447.

[80] In fact, only a chronological order (chosen by Müller), not one according to *genre*, is really suited to convey development. Tellingly, the notion *Entwicklungsgeschichte* does no longer appear, in the published volumes of *FGrHist*, in any discussion concerning the arrangement or structure of the collection.

[81] Jacoby had nearly finished with *Zeitgeschichte*, when he wrote, in a letter to E. Meyer, dated to August 5, 1928, that the prospect of having to deal soon with the third part ("Horographie und Ethnographie") caused him a certain anxiety, "da er sehr umfangreich wird". See LANSKY (1991) 67.

[82] The structure of *FGrHist* may therefore show, at the face of it, a lack of coherence "tra fondamento teorico e raccolta dei frammenti", as argued by ZAMBRINI (2006) 196. But one should not jump to the conclusion that Jacoby, after he had, allegedly, not been able to historically pinpoint where exactly ethnography functioned as a link between the Hecataean *Periegesis* and the historiography of Herodotus, eventually gave up this whole theory. Nothing could be farther from the truth. JACOBY (1949) 199-201 restates his historico-developmental

Although Jacoby had set aside his alternative plan, he remained intellectually attached to it, and increasingly so as he grew older. In nearly all *Prefaces* of the volumes of *FGrHist* he emphasizes the necessity of supplementing the edition of the fragments themselves with an overview of the entire historical tradition. From time to time Jacoby also vents his frustration that one cannot write a *proper* commentary on an individual historian if he is severed from the tradition as a whole: in one such passage he exclaims: "Ich war drauf und dran meinen alten plan wieder auafzunehmen."[83] Something else too needs to be pointed out. As soon as he realized that he would never get around to the project of collecting the entire historical tradition, Jacoby took steps towards realizing that ambition, at least in part, within the framework of the collection he was trying to complete. He made a habit of placing in "Anhänge" more or less comprehensive parts of the historical tradition that could not be attributed to one or the other individual historian.[84] In doing so, he violated his most fundamental self-imposed rule for compiling the fragment collection. Although not at ease with it, he did not want to resist breaking that principle and even refused to apologise for it. In the Preface to *FGrHist* IIIA (1940), p. 6* he declares to have a good reason for transgressing his stated principle, but without revealing what precisely this reason is: "these are matters that are too personal".

view, with "Ethnography" at its 'proper' place. SKINNER (2012) 34-39, and (2019) unfortunately builds on Zambrini's "entirely ground-breaking" paper. In an overly generous understatement ROOD (2020) 27-29 qualifies Skinner's thesis of Jacoby's effective abandonment of the evolutionary principle as "slightly too strong".

[83] In his letter to Bloch of August 17, 1939.

[84] As a supplement to his edition of the fragments of the writers on 'Egypt' (*FGrHist* 608a-664) Jacoby brings together in a huge *Anhang FGrHist* 665 more than 200 relevant parallel historical, geographical, and ethnographical texts (p. 214-277). This he also saw as an attempt to reconstruct an ancient 'idealethnographie' of Egypt. ENGELS (2015) lxxx-lxxxi, in his review of ALMAGOR / SKINNER (2013), rightly points out, with reference to this *Anhang*, that there is some need to qualify the verdict according to which Jacoby did not (yet) have a proper understanding of 'ethnography'.

Thanks to what we discovered in the *Nachlass* we can read this phrase as a veiled, but deep-felt allusion to the discarded 'old plan':

> "anders der zweite punkt, der wie ein schuldbekenntnis klingt und auch als solches gelten mag, da ich über das was mir an diesem bande im tiefsten grunde unbefriedigend erscheint, hier nicht sprechen und es nicht entschuldigen kann oder will: es sind zu persönliche dinge. dass ich den kommentar ausführlicher gestaltet habe als in den beiden ersten teilen, ist mit bewusstsein und in erfüllung mir vielfach geäusserter wünsche geschehen, obwohl ich mir klar war, dass er damit auch seinen charakter ändern und stellenweise zu einer reihe von einzeluntersuchungen werden musste. das lässt sich sachlich bei der behandlung von fragmenten wohl rechtfertigen. aber es ergab ein missverhältnis im umfang von text und kommentar, das bedenklich ist."

In one of the footnotes of his famous study *Atthis*, the 72 years-old Jacoby incidentally looks back, in a little retrospective aside, at a period in his scholarly life (1908-1923) when he laid the groundwork for his monumental new edition of the fragments of the Greek historians.[85] The comments on how his collection came into being, make for a good read not devoid of irony. He points out how, in a first moment, the *Klio*-article was essentially devoted to explaining the intended arrangement of the collection – "intended", because it was not implemented; "der *Klio*-aufsatz war eben nur ein plan".[86] Conversely, in a second moment, at the very start of the project in 1923, the *Preface* to the volume supplied "a new arrangement, without giving detailed reasons". Part and parcel of this note focused on the problem of the arrangement of *FGrHist*, is the following statement: "Concerning the form I was then too much under the influence of Wilamowitz and Schwartz." With this observation Jacoby seems to intimate, in the present context, that at the time when he was drawing up his first plan for *FGrHist*, he

[85] JACOBY (1949) 382 n. 10.
[86] So Jacoby in a letter to H. Bloch (1954, 25 Nov.).

looked so much up to them that he misapprehended the writers of local history as mere chroniclers and, hence, put them in a category with antiquarian writers (section VI of the *Klio*-plan). By way of conclusion to this note he claims the credit for having rectified this: "the preface to *FGrHist* I (1923) … supplied a new arrangement which introduced local chronicles into the sphere of historiography by combining the history of individual cities with that of individual peoples."

This brief text brings one more illustration of Jacoby's ability to look back critically at his own work, and we, his critics, can perhaps learn from it that it does no harm to put the programmatic text of 1909 in perspective. Particularly interesting for our present purposes is the fact that Jacoby himself brings confirmation of the decisive influence that both Schwartz and Wilamowitz exerted on him at the beginning of his career. Regarding *Zeitgeschichte* we have been able to show to what great extent he has, indeed, been drawing on both Schwartz' and Wilamowitz' ideas for placing this type of history writing at the very heart of his fragment collection. By contrast, the teleological view of the development of Greek historiography bears his individual stamp.

In Jacoby's theory the development of history reaches its zenith and 'natural' *telos* – τὴν αὑτῆς φύσιν – already by the end of the 5th century BC in the work of Thucydides.[87] The inevitable corollary of such a view is the beginning of decay right after Thucydides. In Jacoby's model survey "Griechische Geschichtsschreibung", the 4th century BC and the Hellenistic period are quickly disposed of with a few sweeping statements about history's decline at the hands of authors who, for lack of intellectual power and critical *acumen* to engage with the facts, turned it into a literary pursuit.[88] Hermann Strasburger has raised the question whether Jacoby, at the end of his life,

[87] JACOBY (1926) 24; cf. JACOBY (1909) 97-98.

[88] JACOBY (1926) 24-29. This view is fortunately increasingly countered in more recent studies; see, e.g., PARMEGGIANI (2014).

informed by his unrivalled knowledge of the rich variety of Greek historiography, would still have stood by that harsh judgement passed in 1926.[89]

In this case, to raise the question is to answer it.[90] It is already on the face of it unlikely that Jacoby, with his unrivalled research experience in all branches of Greek historiography, would over all those years have remained constant in his appreciation. There is plenty of evidence for his changing views in his writings; we have called attention to some of them. And Strasburger rightly goes on to observe that Jacoby's casting review of post-thucydidean historiography must have been rather based a on dogma that was already in force before him, namely the unexamined assumption of the norm-setting validity of Thucydides as the master of political historiography: a standard introduced in modern times, not by the Greeks themselves, and one that does serious damage not only to the fair appreciation of the Hellenistic historians, but even to that of Herodotus.

The idea that the 'thucydideïzation' of Greek historiography cannot but do injustice to Herodotus gives me the appropriate occasion to return for a moment to the statements made by Momigliano, referred to at the beginning of my paper: those statements oppose Thucydides' safe choice of contemporary history to the risk Herodotus took by venturing to write about a time when he was not yet born. In Momigliano's view Herodotus' choice would have earned him, in antiquity, the reputation of being a liar. He states it succinctly as follows:

> "As long as readers were told that Herodotus was a liar and Thucydides was the truth, Thucydides was bound to remain the ideal representative of history. Lucian stated this in words which Ranke must have known well. It was Thucydides, according to Lucian, who gave history its law – the law of saying ὡς ἐπράχθη,

[89] STRASBURGER (1997) 8-9.

[90] Jacoby and Strasburger knew each other very well and met several times for 'fruitful' discussions (letter to Bloch of 13 September 1953). Among the many scholars reviewed in Jacoby's correspondence, no one is held in higher esteem than Strasburger.

> what had been done (25, 41). Lucian added that Thucydides enacted this law against Herodotus."[91]

It should be pointed out that Momigliano's thesis of Thucydides' repudiation of Herodotus is pivotal to his theory of the distinction between 'proper history writing' and antiquarianism in the historiographical culture of the Greeks. "If Herodotus had remained the model historian", so Momigliano, "there would never have been any antiquarians."[92]

I do not intend to repeat here what I have argued elsewhere,[93] namely that in spite of all his attempts, Momigliano never succeeded in putting together a fairly convincing case for the view already referred to above that "authors of local history, chronography, genealogy, erudite dissertations, ethnographical works, whatever their merits, did not rank a true historian". This is, for instance, plainly contradicted by Polybius' repartition of history writing in three τρόποι, which are all considered μέρη τῆς ἱστορίας.[94] Thucydidean-style historiography was, indeed, not the only study of the past recognized as historiography.[95] And the real history of ancient historiography cannot be written unless the paternity of Herodotus and his continuing influence is fully acknowledged. Recent research has abundantly demonstrated this; but, let me state it with what Jacoby wrote in one of his very last letters to H. Bloch: "Für mich ist H(erodot) in erster linie immer das was er ist und nach seinen eigenen worten sein will – der erste wirkliche historiker."[96]

To acknowledge the dual legacy of Herodotus and Thucydides is fundamental and will prove stimulating also to anyone who, wanting to get to know Greek historiography in its full breadth and diversity, ventures into the ruined but plural fields of history writing that are out there in Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. As O. Murray once wrote, Jacoby was

[91] Momigliano (1990) 48.
[92] Momigliano (1990) 59.
[93] Schepens (2006), (2010a).
[94] Polyb. 9, 1-2.
[95] Cf. Schorn (2021) 22-29; Gabba (1981), (1991) 72.
[96] The letter dates to September 30, 1959.

right in his central insight to include in his fragment collection a broad range of non-fiction prose writings, not just works about the deeds of men, but also mythography, ethnography, chronography, biography, literary history, and geography. The true history of Greek historiography needs to be written on the basis of all those works. That new narrative will be one that breaks out of the narrow 'Thucydidean' constraints that for too long have been valued as dominating the whole of history writing in Antiquity. In it, the recording of the history of one's own time will be valued not as the type of history solely dignified as proper history writing but as a significant option among many others that were valid. Together these practices of history in Jacoby's five main genres embody, without rigid distinctions, hierarchies or dichotomies, the 'conglomerated' whole of ancient historiography.

Works cited

ALMAGOR, E. / SKINNER, J. (eds.) (2013), *Ancient Ethnography. New Approaches* (London).

AMPOLO, C. (ed.) ([2]2009), *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby* (Pisa).

ASSIS, A. (2014), *What is History for? Johann Gustav Droysen and the Functions of Historiography* (New York).

BARON, C.A. (2013), *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography* (Cambridge).

BERNHEIM, E. ([6]1908), *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (Leipzig).

BERNSTEIN, F. / LEPPIN, H. (eds.) (2013), *Wiederanfang und Ernüchterung in der Nachkriegszeit. Dem Althistoriker Hermann Strasburger in memoriam* (Göttingen).

BIANCO, E. (2015), "'Ελληνικά, storie o fatti dei Greci, *Elleniche*", *LHG&L* 3, 111-119.

BLECKMANN, B. (2015), "Eduard Schwartz und sein Bild der antiken Historiographie", in U. HEIL / A. VON STOCKHAUSEN (eds.), Crux interpretum. *Ein kritischer Rückblick auf das Werk von Eduard Schwartz* (Berlin), 51-95.

CANFORA, L. (1999), *La storiografia greca* (Milan).

CHÁVEZ REINO, A. (2008), "Felix Jacoby aux prises avec ses critiques : lettres, comptes rendus et *scholia jacobiana*", in C. BONNET / V. KRINGS (eds.), *S'écrire et écrire sur l'Antiquité* (Grenoble), 281-300.

CHAMBERS, M. (1990), "Felix Jacoby. 19 March 1876 -10 November 1959", in W. BRIGGS / W. CALDER III (eds.), *Classical Scholarship. A Biographical Encyclopedia* (New York), 205-210.
CHAMBERS, M. / SCHORN, S. (2015), trans. F. JACOBY, "On the Development of Greek Historiography and the Plan for a New Collection of the Fragments of the Greek Historians. The 1956 Text with the Editorial Additions of Herbert Bloch" = *Histos Supplements* 3 (Newcastle upon Tyne).
CHANIOTIS, A. (1988), *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften. Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie* (Stuttgart).
CLARKE, K. (2008), *Making Time for the Past. Local History and the Polis* (Oxford).
DEN HOLLANDER, J. (2011), "Contemporary History and the Art of Self-distancing", *H&Th* 50, 4, 51-67.
DESIDERI, P. (1996), "Scrivere gli eventi storici", in S. SETTIS (ed.), *I Greci. Storia, cultura, arte, società.* I, *Noi e i Greci* (Turin), 955-1013.
DONOHUE, A. (2013), "History and the Historian of Classical Art", *Journal of Art Historiography* 9, 1-19.
DROYSEN, J.G. ([7]1972), *Historik. Vorlesungen über Enzyklopädie und Methodologie der Geschichte*, hrsg. von R. Hübner (Darmstadt).
DUBOIS, M. / HUDEMANN, R. (2016), "La *Zeitgeschichte* dans l'historiographie européenne : introduction", *Histoire, Économie et Société* 35, No. 2, 4-13.
ENGELS, J. (2015), review of ALMAGOR / SKINNER (2013), *Histos* 9, lxxx–lxxxvii.
ERNST, F. (1957), "Zeitgeschehen und Geschichtsschreibung: Eine Skizze", *Die Welt als Geschichte* 17, 137-189.
FEDER, A. ([3]1924), *Lehrbuch der geschichtlichen Methode* (Regensburg).
FERRUCCI, S. (2010), "Il retore: Annassimene di Lampsaco", in ZECCHINI (2010), 155-179.
FLOWER, M. (ed.) (2017), *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon* (Cambridge).
FORNARA, C. (1983), *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley).
FROMENTIN, V. *et al.* (eds.) (2010), *Ombres de Thucydide. La réception de l'historien depuis l'Antiquité jusqu'au début du XXe siècle. Actes des colloques de Bordeaux, les 16-17 mars 2007, de Bordeaux, les 30-31 mai 2008 et de Toulouse, les 23-25 octobre 2008* (Bordeaux).
GABBA, E. (1981), "True History and False History in Classical Antiquity", *JRS* 71, 50-62.
— (1990), "Modelli interpretativi nella storiografia antica", in V. ORIOLES (ed.), *Modelli esplicativi della diacronia linguistica* (Pisa), 45-55.
— (1991), *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome* (Berkeley).

GADAMER, H.-G. (1990), *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik* (Tübingen).
GOUKOWSKY, P. (2017), *Les filles de Thucydide. Étude sur la naissance d'un genre : les* Helléniques (Nancy).
GRETHLEIN, J. (2014), "The Value of the Past Challenged: Myth and Ancient History in the Attic Orators", in J. KER / C. PIEPER (eds.), *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World* (Leiden), 326-354.
GROSSE KRACHT, K. (2004), "Kriegsschuldfrage und zeithistorische Forschung in Deutschland. Historiographische Nachwirkungen des Ersten Weltkriegs", *Zeitgeschichte-online*, Mai 2004, <https://zeitgeschichte-online.de/themen/kriegsschuldfrage-und-zeithistorische-forschung-deutschland>
HAMMERSTEIN, N. (2017), "Das Historische Seminar der Frankfurter Universität", in E. BROCKHOFF *et al.* (eds.), *Frankfurter Historiker* (Göttingen), 15-58.
HOCKETT, H. ([3]1958), *The Critical Method in Historical Research and Writing* (New York).
JACOBY, F. (1909), "Ueber die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente", *Klio* 9, 80-123 = *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. BLOCH (Leiden, 1956), 16-64.
— (1926), "Griechische Geschichtsschreibung", *Die Antike* 2, 1-29 = *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. BLOCH (Leiden, 1956), 73-99.
— (1949), *Atthis. The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford).
JANISZEWSKI, P. (2006), *The Missing Link. Greek Pagan Historiography in the Second Half of the Third Century and in the Fourth Century AD* (Warsaw).
JORDANOVA, L. (2000), *History in Practice* (London).
KRAUS, C. (ed.) (1999), *The Limits of Historiography. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden).
LANSKY, J. (1991), "Fünf Briefe Felix Jacobys an Eduard Meyer", *WZBerlin* 40.9, 61-69.
LENFANT, D. (2005), "Polybe et les 'fragments' des historiens de Rhodes Zénon et Antisthène (XVI 14-20)", in SCHEPENS / BOLLANSÉE (2005), 183-204.
LURAGHI, N. (2014a), "Ephorus in Context", in PARMEGGIANI (2014), 133-152.
— (2014b), "The Eyewitness and the Writing of History: Ancient and Modern", in A. RÖSINGER / G. SIGNORI (eds.), *Die Figur des Augenzeugen. Geschichte und Wahrheit im fächer- und epochenübergreifenden Vergleich* (Konstanz), 13-26.
— (2017), "Xenophon's Place in Fourth-Century Greek Historiography", in FLOWER (2017), 84-100.

MARC, P. (1909), "Mitteilung", *ByzZ* 18, 615.
MARINCOLA, J. (1999), "Genre, Convention and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography", in KRAUS (1999), 281-324.
— (ed.) (2007), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. 2 vols. (Oxford).
— (2009), "Ancient Audiences and Expectations", in A. FELDHERR (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge), 214-230.
— (2017), "Xenophon's *Anabasis* and *Hellenica*", in FLOWER (2017), 103-118.
— (2018), "Ancient Writers on Generic Distinctions in Classical Historiography", in R. ROLLINGER (ed.), *Conceptualizing Past, Present and Future* (Münster), 239-260.
MAZZARINO, S. (1966), *Il pensiero storico classico*, I (Bari).
MOMIGLIANO, A. (1950), "Ancient History and the Antiquarian", *JWI* 13, 285-315 = *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome, 1955), 67-106.
— (1955), "Sullo stato presente degli studi di storia antica (1946-1954)", in *X Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche* (Roma, 4-11 settembre 1955). Vol. VI, *Relazioni generali e supplementari*, 3-40 = *Secondo contributo*, 319-353.
— (1956), "Discussion", in *Histoire et historiens dans l'Antiquité* (Vandœuvres-Genève), 21-37.
— (1957), "Erodoto e la storiografia moderna", *Aevum* 31, 74-84 = *Secondo contributo*, 45-56.
— (1966), *Studies in Historiography* (London).
— (1972), "Tradition and the Classical Historian", *H&T* 11, 279-293 = *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1975), 3-31.
— (1975), "Popular Religious Beliefs and the Late Roman Historians", in *Studies in Church History*, vol. 8 (Cambridge), 1-18 = *Quinto Contributo*. I (Rome, 1975), 73-92.
— (1978), "Greek Historiography", *H&T* 17, 1-28.
— (1980), "The Place of Ancient Historiography in Modern Historiography", in W. DEN BOER (ed.), *Les études classiques aux XIX^e^ et XX^e^ siècles. Leur place dans l'histoire des idées. Huit exposés suivis de discussions, Vandœuvres-Genève 20-25 août 1979. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*, 24 (Geneva), 127-158.
— (1984), "Considerations on History in an Age of Ideologies", in *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome), 253-269.
— (1985), "History between Medicine and Rhetoric", *ASNP* 15, 767-780 = *Ottavo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1987), 14-25.

— (1990), *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley).
MOST, G.W. (ed.) (1997), *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen).
MURRAY, O. (1972), "Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture", *CQ* 22, 200-213.
— (2000), "History", in J. BRUNSCHWIG / G. LLOYD (eds.), *Greek Thought. A Guide to Classical Knowledge* (London), 328-338.
— (2001), "Herodotus and Oral History Reconsidered", in N. LURAGHI (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford), 16-44.
NICOLAI, R. (2006), "Thucydides Continued", in A. RENGAKOS / A. TSAKMAKIS (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden), 693-719.
— (2014), "At the Boundary of Historiography: Xenophon and his Corpus", in PARMEGGIANI (2014), 63-87.
NÜTZENADEL, A. / SCHIEDER, W. (eds.) (2004), *Zeitgeschichte als Problem. Nationale Traditionen und Perspektiven der Forschung in Europa* (Göttingen).
PARMEGGIANI, G. (2009), "Anassimene ritrovato da Pausania (Paus. VI 18, 2-6 = *FGrHist* 72 T6)", in E. LANZILLOTTA *et al.* (eds.), *Tradizione e trasmissione degli storici greci frammentari in ricordo di Silvio Accame* (Tivoli), 213-233.
— (2011), *Eforo di Cuma. Studi di storiografia greca* (Bologna).
— (ed.) (2014), *Between Thucydides and Polybius. The Golden Age of Greek Historiography* (Cambridge, MA).
PAUL, H. (2011), "Fathers of History: Genealogies of the Historical Discipline", *SStor* 59-60, 224-230.
REBENICH, S. (2014), "Eduard Schwartz und die Altertumswissenschaften seiner Zeit", *Hyperboreus: studia classica* 20, 406-435.
ROOD, T. (2007), "The Development of the War Monograph", in MARINCOLA (2007), 147-158.
— (2020), "From Ethnography to History: Herodotean and Thucydidean Traditions in the Development of Greek Historiography", in T. HARRISON / J. SKINNER (eds.), *Herodotus in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge), 20-45.
ROTHFELS, H. (1953), "Zeitgeschichte als Aufgabe", *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 1, 1-8.
SCHEPENS, G. (1975), "Some Aspects of Source Theory in Greek Historiography", *AncSoc* 6, 257-274 = J. MARINCOLA (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford, 2011), 100-118.
— (1993), "L'apogée de l'ἀρχή spartiate comme époque historique dans l'historiographie grecque du début du IV[e] siècle av. J.-C.", *AncSoc* 24, 169-203.

— (1980), *L'"autopsie' dans la méthode des historiens grecs du V^e siècle avant J.-C.* (Brussels).
— (1997), "Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Problems, Methods, Prospects", in MOST (1997), 144-172.
— (2000), "Ancient Greek City Histories: Self-definition through History Writing", in K. DEMOEN (ed.), *The Greek City from Antiquity to the Present. Ideological Construct, Literary Representation* (Leuven), 3-25.
— (2006), "Storiografia e letteratura antiquaria: le scelte di Felix Jacoby", in AMPOLO ([2]2009), 149-171.
— (2007a), "History and *Historia*: Inquiry in the Greek Historians", in MARINCOLA (2007), 39-55.
— (2007b), "Tucidide in controluce: 'La guerra del Peloponneso' nella storiografia greca del IV secolo a.C.", in L. SANTI AMANTINI (ed.), *Il dopoguerra nel mondo greco. Politica, propaganda, storiografia* (Rome) 59-99.
— (2009), "Il carteggio Jacoby-Meyer: Un piano inedito per la struttura dei *FGrHist*", in AMPOLO ([2]2009), 357-395.
— (2010a), "Thucydide, législateur de l'histoire ? Appréciations antiques et modernes", in FROMENTIN *et al.* (2010), 121-140.
— (2010b), "Die Debatte über die Struktur der 'Fragmente der griechischen Historiker'", *Klio* 92, 427-461.
— (2010c), "L'homme politique, historien dans le monde grec", in ZECCHINI (2010), 11-34.
SCHEPENS, G. / BOLLANSÉE, J. (eds.) (2005), *The Shadow of Polybius. Intertextuality as a Research Tool in Greek Historiography* (Leuven).
SCHEPENS, G. / BOLLANSÉE, J. (2008), "La difficile structure de *FGrHist*: F. Jacoby et E. Meyer s'écrivent à propos d'un plan inédit de 1915", in C. BONNET / V. KRINGS (eds.), *S'écrire et écrire sur l'Antiquité* (Grenoble), 261-279.
SCHORN, S. (2021), "Historians, Antiquarians, Grammarians: Methodological Problems in the Classification and Structuring of *FGrHist* IV", *ASNSP* serie 5, 13, 11-62.
SCHWARTZ, E. (1907), art. "Ephoros 1", in *RE* 6, 1-16 = SCHWARTZ (1959), 3-26.
— (1909), "Die Zeit des Ephoros", *Hermes* 44, 481-502.
— (1928), "Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichte bei den Hellenen", *Antike* 4 = *Gesammelte Schriften* I (Berlin, 1938), 67-87.
SKINNER, J. (2012), *The Invention of Greek Ethnography from Homer to Herodotus* (New York).
— (2019), "Writing Culture: Historiography, Hybridity, and the Shaping of Collective Memory", in C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU / M. FRAGOULAKI (eds.), *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece. Poetry,*

Historiography, and Epigraphy (Histos Supplement 11, 2020) (Newcastle upon Tyne), 189-234.

SPOHR READMAN, K. (2011), "Contemporary History in Europe: From Mastering National Pasts to the Future of Writing the World", *Journal of Contemporary History* 46, 506-530.

STRASBURGER, H. ([3]1975), *Die Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung* (Wiesbaden), 47-96 = *Studien zur Alten Geschichte.* II (Hildesheim, 1982), 963-1016.

— (1997), "Umblick im Trümmerfeld der griechischen Geschichtsschreibung", in *Historiographia Antiqua. Commentationes Lovanienses editae in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii* (Leuven) 352 = *Studien zur Alten Geschichte* III, 167-218.

THOMAS, R. (2014a), "Local History, Polis History, and the Politics of Place", in PARMEGGIANI (2014), 239-262.

— (2014b), "The Greek Polis and the Tradition of Polis History: Local History, Chronicles, and the Patterning of the Past", in A. MORENO / R. THOMAS (eds.), *Patterns of the Past. Epitēdeumata in the Greek Tradition* (Oxford), 145-172.

— (2019), *Polis Histories, Collective Memories and the Greek World* (Cambridge).

TUPLIN, C. (2007), "Continuous Histories (*Hellenica*)", in MARINCOLA (2007), 159-170.

TULLY, J. (2014), "Ephorus, Polybius, and τὰ καθόλου γράφειν: Why and How to Read Ephorus and his Role in Greek Historiography without Reference to 'Universal History'", in PARMEGGIANI (2014), 153-195.

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. von (1908), *Greek Historical Writing and Apollo. Two Lectures Delivered before the University of Oxford, June 3 and 4, 1908* (Oxford).

— (1926), "Hellenische Geschichtsschreibung", in *Reden und Vorträge von Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.* Vol. II (Berlin), 216-246.

WEAIRE, G. (2021), "Revisiting τὰ καθόλου and κατὰ μέρος in Polybius", *CP* 115, 26-44.

WITTRAM, A. (2004), *Fragmenta. Felix Jacoby und Kiel. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kieler Christian-Albrechts-Universität* (Frankfurt am Main).

ZAMBRINI, A. (2006), "Aspetti dell'etnografia in Jacoby", in AMPOLO ([2]2009), 189-200.

ZECCHINI, G. (ed.) (2010), *Lo storico antico. Mestieri e figure sociali* (Bari).

DISCUSSION

J. Marincola: One of the things that makes Jacoby's collection unusual is that he conceived of its overarching structure by the types of historical writing (as he saw them) but then he actually arranges fragmentary works not by the work itself but by author, choosing the category in which to place the author by his dominant/most important work. So already with Hecataeus he has under a single author two different types of historical writing, the Γενεαλογίαι and the Περίοδος Γῆς.

What effect do you think this has on the collection as a whole, and do you think it blunts the main purpose of the collection, which is, as Jacoby himself called it, "das entwicklungsgeschichtliche Prinzip"?

G. Schepens: You are right to point out that the generic-developmental principle is at loggerheads with the principle of keeping together the materials attributed to each author. The issue was already discussed right after Jacoby's oral delivery of his plan in 1908. At the very end of the published version of his *Prolegomena* Jacoby comes back to that discussion. For him it is one of the practical editorial questions which will be dealt with in the actual carrying out of the project, namely "wie man sich verhalten soll, wenn ein Autor, was ja in der hellenistischen Zeit häufig ist, in mehreren Gattungen tätig ist" (Jacoby [1909] 122). The solution he proposes is to opt *a parte potiori* for the category in which to place the author. As to the other sections where the author could possibly have been placed, his virtual presence in them, Jacoby argues, will be signalled by using cross-references. He illustrates this way of proceeding with a few cases and concludes that "one can achieve a great deal by references in different places (thus Arrian's name will appear at

least four times), through the general index and the catalogues of authors in the individual volumes; in general, through the whole external organisation". From time to time, of course, one must not shy away from hacking through some Gordian knots. This technical solution to the problem has been actually implemented in the collection as we know it. Characteristic of Jacoby's handling of the issue, in 1908, is that he tends to downsize it to a practical problem to be resolved by technical means.

Fifteen years later, however, when the first volume of the collection is published, the belief that 'externalities of the system' can offset the misleading effect created by the chosen arrangement, does not seem to have survived intact. The whole preface to *FGrHist* I (Berlin 1923) is written in a different tone and, as I have pointed out in more detail in my paper, Jacoby makes no effort to hide his unease or even dissatisfaction with the 'new' arrangement that is being proposed. In my opinion, he wrote this text with in the back of his mind the radically different plan that he had drafted in 1915. In the years following upon the announcement made in 1908/1909, Jacoby had, indeed, given serious thought to a whole range of objections that had been raised against the proposed arrangement. He drew up a new, radically different plan that provided, among other things, for a *substantive* solution of the quandary that we are discussing here: the edition of the historians, in alphabetical order, would be separated from the collection of the historical tradition, presented in an arrangement that did not set out from the names of authors – "nicht von autornamen", as Jacoby duly recalls in the *Preface* (p. VII) – but from the subject matter, ordered in a way similar to the divisions of *FGrHist* : "in der gleichen teilung nach sagen-, zeit-, lokal- und erdgeschichte". As has been explained, E. Meyer prevented the execution of this plan. Left with no other choice than to return to the *Klio*-plan, Jacoby resorted, within these contours, to the old solution. The *Preface* of 1923 reproposes the cross-referencing for dealing with the problem that one cannot, of course – "selbstverständlich" – tear apart the historiographical output of an individual

historian. Tellingly, this procedure now prompts the remark: "Ganz ohne gewaltsamkeiten geht das nicht ab". The problem that bedevilled his undertaking from the very start, was obviously still there. While the arrangement of the fragmentary works by author continued to detract from the logic of "Entwicklungsgeschichte", this very principle was in the plan presented in 1923 further disturbed by the fact that the generically akin histories κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις were kept together in one category. By that time, Jacoby was under no illusion that he could still uphold the idea that the sequentially-ordered genres would convey the history of their emergence. It must be acknowledged, but rather with than against Jacoby, that the *prolegomena* to the project in *Klio* 1909, with their focus on "Entwicklungsgeschichte", have lost a great deal of their programmatic value. Jacoby himself later looked back at this text as the 'intended' arrangement of the new collection. "Der *Klio*-aufsatz war eben nur ein plan", as he put it in a letter (25 Nov. 1954) to H. Bloch in answer to latter's question as to how and when he really started working on the great project.

B. Bleckmann: Wenn Autoren, die von den Anfängen bis zur eigenen Gegenwart schreiben, zu den Zeithistorikern gerechnet werden, dann liegt das nicht nur daran, dass dieses letzte Stück besonders ausführlich sein kann, sondern dass es durch Primärforschung erarbeitet ist und damit gewissermaßen als höherwertig gilt, als die vorangehenden aus der Kompilation von Quellen erarbeiteten Passagen zur älteren Geschichte. In diesem Sinne „versagt" dann auch Ephoros als Zeithistoriker, weil er selbst für die Geschichte der letzten beiden Generationen keine Primärforschung betreibt, sondern umfangreiche zeithistorische Darstellungen benutzt.

G. Schepens: Many thanks for making the observation that there is indeed an important methodological factor involved in the bias of many ancient historians to preferably deal with the events of their own times or close to their own times. Their

view of the greater trustworthiness of the methods for getting informed about those events – the means summarized as "Primärforschung": autopsy and the cross-questioning of direct witnesses – allowed a fuller, more detailed historical narrative. Ephorus engaged in a metahistorical reflection on precisely this point (*FGrHist* 70 F 9). The fact that you drop his name is suitably targeted.

What you point out, however, is not concerned with Ephorus' theory but with the methods he put in practice for elaborating his large-scale work. You correctly observe that for composing his account of contemporary or near-contemporary history Ephorus used essentially the same method as for recounting the history of the earlier periods: for both periods he draws his information from accounts that had previously been written by the then contemporary historians. Thus, for recounting the events of the 4th century BC, the major sources for him were the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, Callisthenes, Daemachus. The details of his actual method cannot be discussed here, but so much is clear that he did not engage in any significant "Primärforschung". One can endorse this with Polybius' testimony; he knew Ephorus' work very well, appreciated him greatly for various qualities, notably also for his expert treatment of the remotest periods in the history of Hellas, but criticizes him rather harshly for his accounts on the battles of Leuctra and Mantinea (Polyb. 12, 25f: ὅταν δὲ τὴν περὶ Λεῦκτρα μάχην ἐξηγῆται … ἢ τὴν ἐν Μαντινείᾳ …, γελοῖος φαίνεται καὶ παντελῶς ἄπειρος καὶ ἀόρατος τῶν τοιούτων ὤν. That Ephorus did not engage in much original research is still more poignantly 'documented' in the accusation of plagiarism raised against him by some ancient critics (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 10, 3).[1] Although the charge is to be taken *cum grano salis*, it puts Ephorus' substantial borrowings from the works

[1] See MEEUS, A. (2017), "Compilation or Tradition? Some Thoughts on the Methods of Historians and Other Scholars in Antiquity", *Sacris erudiri* 56, 395-413, esp. 403-406.

of his colleagues Daemachus, Callisthenes, and Anaximenes in evidence.

Having said this, there remains, in my opinion, margin for debate as to whether we should conclude that Ephorus failed as "Zeithistoriker". Without going into details, I would like to make the following observations. First, the notion "Zeithistoriker", applied to Ephorus, needs to be put in perspective. In his *Histories* the account about the events of his own time is but the last part of a work on a huge time scale, encompassing 750 years of history. Ancient tradition has it that Isocrates assigned him as historical subject τὰς μὲν ἄνω τῶν χρόνων, while Theopompus was instructed to write about Greek history after Thucydides: τὰς μετὰ Θουκυδίδην Ἑλληνικάς (*FGrHist* 70 T 3a). Whatever the historical value of this anecdote, it shows what Ephorus' *Histories* really are: a historical work with a focus on the past. The ancient reception history highlights this as well and makes the modern labelling of this work as *Zeitgeschichte* all the more incomprehensible. For Ephorus, history plays on a field that is much larger than one can recover by being present to the events and the cross-questioning of eyewitnesses. This is what he himself set out to explain, when he made his statement on the superior value of "being personally present at all events" (*FGrHist* 70 F 110) in a contrary-to-fact mode (εἰ δυνατὸν ἦν). Second, and closely related to the first point, Ephorus treated events over a larger geographical area than Thucydides. According to Polybius he was the first historian to attempt 'universal' history. Such large-scale works can only be written on the basis of the 'spadework' that has been done by previous historical writers. The so-called compilatory method is the normal way of working for composing this type of historical work.[2] Third, and last but not least, Ephorus should not be seen as a *mere* compiler. The time that Wilamowitz, Schwartz, and Jacoby did running battle against him is definitely

[2] See BUTTERFIELD, H. (1969), "Narrative and the Spade-Work Behind It", *History* 53, 165-180 and MEEUS (2017).

over. One of the striking features of Ephorus' historical method is his extensive use of documents.[3]

N. Luraghi: I want to return to Professor Bleckmann's remark regarding the importance of historiography based on "Primärforschung" in Jacoby's views of what characterized *Zeitgeschichte*. Momigliano, whose work on early Greek historiography was profoundly influenced by Jacoby's ideas, also insisted on the difference between historiography based on the works of previous historians and historiography based on first-hand experience and the evidence of eyewitnesses. As Koselleck showed in his famous essay *Standortbildung und Zeitlichkeit*, the crisis of the notion of the eyewitness as an ideal source of historical evidence goes back to the middle of the 18th century – he traces it to the work of Johann Martin Chladenius. In the middle of the 19th century, Droysen's *Historik* has scathing remarks on the value and authority of the eyewitness. This is the intellectual background against which Jacoby articulated his notion of *Zeitgeschichte*, in the footsteps of Schwartz and Wilamowitz, as you have shown us. Now, in the case of Wilamowitz one may wonder whether his idea that the Greeks focused on the very recent past as the best subject matter for historiography because they were not really interested in the distant past might not have been indebted to a scholar whose influence Wilamowitz would certainly never acknowledge, namely Nietzsche. I wish our mutual friend Albert Henrichs were still here to help with this question. In any case, Jacoby did think that Thucydides represented the high point of Greek historiography, after which there had been only decadence. I suppose my question would be, to what extent was Jacoby's idea of

[3] See SCHEPENS, G. (2003), "L'apport des documents dans la méthode historique d'Éphore", in A.M. BIRASCHI *et al.* (eds.), *L'uso dei documenti nella storiografia antica* (Perugia), 331-365. For Ephorus' rehabilitation in general, see PARMEGGIANI (2011) and the numerous contributions in DE FIDIO, P. / TALAMO, C. (eds.) (2013), *Eforo di Cuma nella storia della storiografia greca* (= *PP* 68-69) (Napoli).

the *Zeitgeschichte* of the Greeks based on methodology, namely on the opposition between primary and derivative historiography, and to what extent, along the lines of Wilamowitz, on the mentality of the Greeks, on their notions of temporality and historicity, such as they might have been.

G. Schepens: Like all students of ancient historiography Momigliano owed a great debt to Jacoby. It was certainly from him, as you suggested, that he picked up the idea that the development of history writing in Greece reached its zenith in Thucydides' work, and that from then on, *Zeitgeschichte* was prevalent during the whole of ancient historiography. Regarding Jacoby himself, however, I have my doubts whether he was still fully behind such a view later in his career, especially when he got intensely involved in studying the demonstrably popular and extremely numerous Greek local histories.[4] Looking back, in *Atthis* (1949, 382 n. 10), at the early stage in his career when he was drawing up the conceptual framework for his fragment collection, he points out that he "was then too much under the influence of Wilamowitz and Schwartz". Already in his commentary on Ephorus Jacoby distanced himself from Schwartz' conviction that *Zeitgeschichte* was for all historians the really important thing: "derartige verallgemeinerungen schaden nur", he observed (*FGrHist* IIC, Berlin 1926, 30). With regard to Wilamowitz' view, incorporated as conceptual freight into his notion of *Zeitgeschichte* – "was wir historische forschung und kritik nennen, kennt das altertum nicht" – he later remarked that "Wilamowitz starts from the modern concept of historical criticism … thus failing to recognize that very element which in Hellas produced the phenomenon of the individual historian" (Jacoby [1949] 381 n. 6). In this connection, it may also be worth noting that Jacoby, in his Oxford years, no longer uses the duplicitous and untranslatable term *Zeitgeschichte* and refers to the historical works in question as 'Great historiography'

[4] THOMAS (2019).

or, sometimes *Hellenica*. The new nomenclature puts this whole class of writings, with reference to another (and in my opinion, more appropriate) parameter, in contradistinction to the 'particular' but not therefore less important city- or region-based forms of history writing.

With regard to Momigliano's reception of the notion of *Zeitgeschichte*, I would be rather inclined to emphasize that he did very much his own thing with Jacoby's legacy.[5] I cannot enter into details here, but I want to make two observations. Jacoby, in spite of the statements made in "Griechische Geschichtsschreibung" (1926), never tended to position *Zeitgeschichte* as history 'proper' in contradistinction to 'antiquarianism' and at the expense of the other historiographical genres. Nor would he ever have thought of playing down the influence of Herodotus on subsequent Greek history writing by trying to include him in the narrow and unilateral Thucydidean paradigm of contemporary political and military history writing.[6]

The question you raise with regard to the possible, unacknowledged, influence Nietzsche might have had on Wilamowitz' presentist view of Greek history, sounds somewhat surprising to me, but is certainly worthy of consideration. Diffuse influence is not, a priori, unlikely and through Wilamowitz it might have affected Jacoby as well. To the best of my knowledge, however, Jacoby nowhere makes any reference to Friedrich Nietzsche's *Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen*. And it would, in my opinion, have been curious if he had looked for inspiration in that direction. Nietzsche privileged *Zeitgeschichte* for reasons that are at odds with the academic discourse of the historians who, in the *Sattelzeit*, defined the notion and the field of history in terms that excluded the reporting on contemporary events from 'scientific' history. Speaking about Nietzsche, I would suggest that a possibly more meaningful connection to him could be made over the idea of "Klassische Philologie" as

[5] More detail in SCHEPENS (2006) and (2010).
[6] See MOMIGLIANO (1978).

"Leitwissenschaft". This is a view which Nietzsche, Wilamowitz and Jacoby certainly had in common. Jacoby made a principled stand of being regarded, particularly in his work on the Greek historians, as a classical philologist. The year after he had arrived in Oxford, he wrote in a letter to Bloch (August 17, 1939): "man hält mich hier auch für einen historiker, was ich nicht bin"; in this context we also learn about the subject that he would have preferred, above Greek history, for his first semester course: "über die eigene arbeit philologie treiben und dichter lesen." His trust in what could be achieved through systematic text interpretation was undoubtedly great. We may see that reflected in the assurance with which he proposed to use the genre definitions derived from his own analysis of the literary form of the variegated types of history writing, as "the only truly scientifically founded" ordering principle for his collection of the fragments (Jacoby [1909] 83): a bold choice which met, especially in Italy, with a certain amount of scepticism.[7]

Momigliano admired Jacoby's fragment collection as the greatest *philological* achievement of the 20th century. As an interpreter of historiography, however, Jacoby had, in his opinion, been too less concerned which seeking to determine the religious, moral, political and social views of ancient historians.[8] This may be true, but it should, in all fairness, be noted that one cannot really expect these views to be explored within the framework of a fragment collection. Jacoby always maintained, and with good reason, that his edition of and commentary on the fragments was only meant to be "vorarbeit" for the in-depth study of Greek historiography in all its aspects. He

[7] On the part of G. DE SANCTIS, *RFIC* 6 (1928) 532-541; cf. DI DONATO, R. (2009), "Lo Jacoby di Arnaldo Momigliano", in AMPOLO ([2]2009) 31-43. Cf. also MOMIGLIANO (1966) 248: "When I was a student it seemed almost inconceivable that Felix Jacoby should have organized his collection of the fragments of the Greek historians not in chronological order, but by literary genres. How could a historian of historiography ignore the principle of chronology in assembling his material?"

[8] DI DONATO (2009) 38-40.

deliberately left to others the writing of such monographs. As we do not have at our disposal Jacoby's synthetic and mature answers to the questions you ask about his views on the Greek historians' methods for writing original and derivative histories, on their mentality, notions of temporality and historicity, I prefer to leave them unanswered. It would moreover be impossible to discuss them in a nutshell.

E.-M. Becker: Thank you for an inspiring paper. If you were to provide to us a preliminary definition of *Zeitgeschichte* from your point of view of looking at the Jacoby-Meyer controversy on the one hand, and your reading of ancient historians on the other: what definition would you propose? You yourself have suggested to see *Zeitgeschichtsschreibung* as a kind of a practice. How would a more precise definition look like, and how would such a concept of *Zeitgeschichte* be different from contemporary history/"histoire contemporaine"?

G. Schepens: Trying to describe what *Zeitgeschichte* meant to the ancient historians, we must, in my view, make a clear distinction between Jacoby's delineation of the concept, on the one hand, and what our actual reading of the ancient historians reveals, on the other. In so far, the observation that the term (which Jacoby himself ceased using in his later years!) proves "inapplicable to the greater number of Greco-Roman historians" (Fornara [1983] 3) seems appropriate. As I have argued in my paper, Jacoby's *Zeitgeschichte* is a self-coined term created for the purpose of organizing his fragment collection and one with an indeterminate large timespan that is at odds with the agreed upon meaning of the concept in modern contemporary history writing. Applied to ancient historiography the term as used by Jacoby often requires on the part of the student a counterintuitive understanding; it would therefore be helpful if, in modern publications which discuss Jacoby's notion, we should stop the widespread blanket glossing of *Zeitgeschichte* as contemporary history. It also seems preferable to me to

approach *Zeitgeschichte* as a practice of the ancient historians rather than a genre, because one finds treatment of the historian's present time as a fixture across different historiographical genres, in 'ethnographies' for instance, and, quite significantly in local histories, some of which were written with a broader scope. Refusing to consider contemporary history as a separate genre enlarges the field for research and yields important potential for fresh perspectives and enhanced historiographical understanding, not least also of the blurring boundaries of genre.

You ask me how a more precise definition of *Zeitgeschichte* would look like if we examine the practices of the ancient historians. Thinking of what R. Koselleck once wrote – "*Zeitgeschichte* is a nice word but a difficult concept"[9] – it may be tricky to try to answer your question briefly and regardless of the varying practices. Even now, sixty years after the resumption of research activities in the field of modern *Zeitgeschichte*, there still is among theoreticians of history no generally accepted consensus on its epochal delimitation, thematic profile or methodological foundation. Any attempt at delineating 'current history' proves difficult: one way or another, it always amounts to pinning down a moving target with a notional existence between the past and the future.

What I can do is briefly mention the two principles which in the practices of the ancient historians are operative in their delineation of the timespan or field of contemporary history. In a manner that is not really different from what today practitioners of *Zeitgeschichte* do, they constitute contemporary history as a field by either putting forward principles of method or focusing on the special importance of the events that make it into a distinct period of time. In practice, of course, the criteria of the higher reliability of the sources and of the special importance attributed to the events closely operate together and

[9] KOSELLECK, R. (2000), *Zeitgeschichten. Studien zur Historik* (Frankfurt a.M.), 246.

often overlap. Polybius illustrates this in the motivation he presents for his choice of subject:

> "It falls within my own and the preceding generation, so that I have been present at some of the events and have the testimony of eyewitnesses for others. It seemed to me indeed that if I comprised events of an earlier date, repeating mere hearsay evidence, I should be safe neither in my estimates nor in my assertions. But my chief reason for beginning at this date, was that Fortune had then so to speak rebuilt the world." (Polyb. 4, 2, 2-3)

For extending his narrative with ten more books Polybius gives a comparable justification but with the difference that he lets the methodological argument about his personal involvement in the events (not just as an eyewitness but as an active participant, even in a leading role) prevail over the disturbance and upheaval that make the events leading up to the Roman destruction of Carthage and Corinth particularly noteworthy (Polyb. 3, 4, 12-13).

H. Inglebert: Ma question sur ta communication complète celle d'Eve-Marie : si l'histoire doit être définie par ses pratiques, quelles sont celles de l'écriture de l'histoire du temps présent dans l'Antiquité, qui permettraient de distinguer, à partir de Ernst 1957, la *Zeit/Gegenwarts-Geschichte* et la *Vergangenheitsgeschichte* ?

G. Schepens: What does impel an ancient author to write not just history but history of the present? The two main reasons for that have already been outlined indirectly in my previous answer to E.-M. Becker's question: because in the ancient world that segment of history tended to be valued as distinctive both as a *period* and as a *methodology*.

As to historical method first, it does no longer need to be argued that Greco-Roman historians held the view that occurrences of their own times or close to their own times could be narrated with greater reliability compared to those of more remote times. To put it in the terms of H. Strasburger's

"Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung", the ancient historians were masters in the "Kunst der *Primär*forschung": historical fieldwork, the collection of information firsthand, by autopsy travel and inquiry qualitatively prevails over the "*Sekundär*arbeit nach schriftlichen Quellen". This tradition of making a distinction, essential to historical method, between direct and indirect or derivative sources of information was established early on in the Greek world in the still predominantly oral culture at the end of the archaic period and the beginning of classical era. I have discussed this topic since my dissertation on autopsy, in several papers and, for a succinct overview I may refer to "History and *Historia*: Inquiry in the Greek Historians" published in J. Marincola's great *Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Since the relationship between historiography's claim to truth and its critical method was fundamental to ancient history writing,[10] half of your question has been answered, in a general way at least.

We still have to look at the substantive part of the question as to why ancient historians considered it important or even necessary to write history of their own time. Polybius, always intent on clarifying and justifying his working methods and choices, is my guide for an answer in four points, the first three of which are formally adduced by himself.

We take our start from συμπλοκή. This well-known cornerstone of Polybius' historiographical theory is key to his view of the difference between the 'present' and the 'past'. The 'present time' of his *Histories* detaches itself from previous historical

[10] Splendidly confirmed by *P. Oxy.* 4808: see SCHORN, S. (2013), "Überlegungen zu *POxy* LXXI 4808", *RFIC* 141,105-122, with my supplement "Die Rolle der Wahrheit und der aktiven Teilnahme des Geschichtsschreibers am historischen Geschehen". On the efforts in the search for truth, see MEEUS, A. (2020), "Truth, Method and the Historian's Character: The Epistemic Virtues of Greek and Roman Historians", in A. TURNER (ed.), *Reconciling Ancient and Modern Philosophies of History* (Berlin), 83-122. *Pace* MOMIGLIANO (1972) 282 the principles of method put forward by the historians in motivation of their choice should not be belittled as "merely an additional motive".

time by the convergence of events and peoples of the known world. This becomes for the first time manifest in the 140th Olympiad (220-216 BC) and it is at that point, when the contours of his own time began to take shape, that Polybius cuts into the course of events and separates *Gegenwartsgeschichte* from *Vergangenheitsgeschichte*. He gives his reason for the beginning of his narrative as follows:

> "Up to this time (ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς πρὸ τούτων χρόνοις) the world's history had been, so to speak, a series of disconnected (ὡσανεὶ σποράδας) transactions, as widely separated in their origin and results as in their localities. But from this time forth (ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων τῶν καιρῶν) history becomes a connected whole: the affairs of Italy and Libya are involved (συμπλέκεσθαί) with those of Asia and Greece, and the tendency of all is to unity. This is why I have fixed upon this era as the starting-point of my work." (Polyb. 1, 3, 3-4)

Telos of history's new beginning is the unexpected and amazing establishment, after only 53 years, of the supremacy of Rome.

In the Preface to book IX Polybius highlights with the verb καινοποιεῖσθαι the importance of the *original* work done by the contemporary historian: he writes to meet the need for record. "Because new events are constantly occurring, new narratives need to be written." To make his point Polybius even uses the devastatingly simple argument that the ancients could not yet narrate events subsequent to their time (Polyb. 9, 2, 4). At Polyb. 1, 4 it is more sensibly noted that important events need to be recorded so that they do not pass into oblivion. Yet, the real challenge, he proudly announces, is to compose new kind of history that would be up to the unique and amazing character of the events of the time in which he lived: a treatise of universal history.

Still another feature highlighted as "the special characteristic of his present age" (τοῦτο γὰρ ἴδιόν ἐστι τῶν νῦν καιρῶν) is the scientific and cultural progress that has been attained. Rome's conquest of the world has opened up every sea and every land:

especially for the Greeks, who are no longer politically active, this offers unprecedented possibilities for scientific research (Polyb. 4, 40, 2-3; 3, 58, 2 - 59, 3). Polybius reiterates this idea in 9, 2, 5 in the context of his argument in favour of his choice for contemporary history, stating that "progress" (προκοπή) significantly enhances the practical utility of such a history: formerly it already had the greatest utility of all types of history and pre-eminently so now (πάντων ὠφελιμώτατον αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ μέν, μάλιστα δὲ νῦν), "when the arts and sciences have advanced to such a degree that those who love learning can deal scientifically, one might say, with any emergency that arises" (trans. Marincola)[11]. Such history is much more useful than the repetition of history of the past (Polyb. 9, 2, 2).

To these reasons for prioritising the writing contemporary history over history of former times, one may add a fourth motive not put forward for rather obvious reasons by Polybius himself. In his paper "Polibio, straniero a Roma", P. Desideri has persuasively suggested that our Megalopolitan historian may also have composed his *Histories* in an attempt to come to terms with what had, so disruptively and dramatically at first, happened to him personally. Polybius represents the case of the political man converted, as a consequence of his deportation to Rome, into a historian: "con queste premesse l'attività storiografica, in quanto integrazione o complemento della politica, non può che essere rivolta verso il contemporaneo."[12]

R. Nicolai: Guido Schepens ha affermato giustamente che la storia contemporanea tucididea era una tra molte opzioni valide: è una prospettiva del tutto opposta a quella di Momigliano che in fondo svalutava tutte le altre forme di conservazione della memoria storica. Ed è una prospettiva che si avvicina a quella del *Pensiero storico classico* di Santo Mazzarino, un'opera che ha

[11] MARINCOLA, J. (2017), *On Writing History from Herodotus to Herodian* (Harmondsworth).

[12] DESIDERI, P. (2009), "Polibio, straniero a Roma", in S. CONTI / B. SCARDIGLI (eds.) (2009), *Stranieri a Roma* (Ancona), 15-35; esp. 21.

festeggiato poco tempo fa i cinquant'anni dalla pubblicazione e che rimane ancora una miniera di idee e di spunti.

Nella relazione è stata impiegata molte volte la parola 'genere'. Per questo motivo mi vorrei brevemente soffermare sul problema della nozione di genere letterario applicata a generi non legati a una specifica occasione di esecuzione, come erano le opere che trattavano la materia storica. In generale si può dire che la storiografia emerge nella seconda metà del V secolo a.C., quando si allentano i vincoli, le leggi, dei generi letterari: per questo motivo le forme con cui viene trattata la materia storica possono essere molto diverse tra loro, come si può riscontrare facilmente, ad esempio, nel *corpus* di Senofonte. Sulle leggi dei generi letterari il rinvio d'obbligo è allo studio epocale di Luigi Enrico Rossi, *BICS* 1971.

G. Schepens: First of all, many thanks for re-emphasizing once more that "ancient historiography is not a homogeneous whole, with a limited internal evolution".[13] I fully agree: we cannot do justice to the rich and varied practice of history writing in Antiquity by limiting ourselves to a few great historians regarded as canonical. In this connection you rightly recall the kaleidoscopic picture that Santo Mazzarino has drawn of ancient historiography. His study is based on the whole corpus of texts, made available among other things by the *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, yet without in fact being guided by Jacoby's framework in his approach or interpretation. His three volumes fittingly bear the notion "pensiero" in their title. In his attempt to grasp how history was thought about in the ancient world and how the historians contributed to shaping culture and literature, Mazzarino did not restrict himself to examining the evidence of what we strictly call 'historiography'; he thought it no less noteworthy to look for what poets or philosophers had to say. In line with this is, for instance, the

[13] See NICOLAI, R. (2007), "The Place of History in the Ancient World", in MARINCOLA (2007), 13-26.

likely suggestion that Anaximenes owed the inspiration for the idea of the unity of all men which possibly underlies his 'universalistic' approach to history-writing, to his connection with cynical philosophy.

In his own way Jacoby sharpened the focus on the diversity of Greek historiography by setting great store on the genre distinctions which, he believed, could be identified. As you observe, such an endeavour poses a particular challenge in the case of a literary genre that is not linked to a specific occasion of performance. Historical works were, as a rule, not written for a given occasion.[14] Yet, there were historians who travelled from city to city, one could almost say, in search for an occasion. On them Polybius makes the disparaging comment that they "gained their living by their pens" (Polyb. 12, 25e) and, to that end, made deliberate misstatements in the interest of the audiences by which they were, in several cases known to us, officially commissioned to compose and to perform their works.[15] Here the 'civic arena' provides the historian with a specific setting and purpose.[16] A specimen of such a work is the history of Philippus of Pergamon (*FGrHist* 95 T 1): it was possibly written and performed for a commemoration, at Epidaurus, of the disasters caused by the Roman civil wars at the end of the Republic. We know the author and the subject dealt with thanks to an honorific inscription that includes an epigram and the prologue of his work: it described "all kinds of suffering and continuous mutual slaughter through Asia and Europe and the nations of Africa and the cities of the islanders that have occurred in our

[14] As pointed out by MOMIGLIANO, A. (1978), "The Historians of the Classical World and Their Audiences: Some Suggestions", *ASNSP* serie III 8, 59-75.

[15] CHANIOTIS (1988) draws the fascinating panorama; see also CHANIOTIS, A. (2009), "Travelling Memories in the Hellenistic World", in R. HUNTER / I. RUTHERFORD (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture. Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge), 249-269; SCHEPENS, G. (2006), "Travelling Greek Historians", in M.G. BERTINELLI / A. DONATI (eds.), *Le vie della storia. Migrazioni di popoli, viaggi di individui, circolazione di idee nel Mediterraneo antico* (Rome), 81-102.

[16] THOMAS (2019) 56-73.

time (καθ' ἡμέας)" (trans. Jones)[17]. It is a striking example of a work of contemporary history (περὶ τῶν καινῶν πρήξεων ἱστορίην) concerned with telling the story of "the latest catastrophe".

If historical works were, nevertheless, in most cases not written for a special occasion, it remains an important and still understudied fact that the Greek historians wrote their *Histories* with a target audience in mind. Polybius mentions this in his introduction to book IX, where he discusses the options that are open to anyone wanting to write a historical work. His succinct conspectus divides historical literature into three great classes according to the interconnected criteria of the periods of history one can deal with (μέρη τῆς ἱστορίας), the corresponding types of historiographical works (τρόποι τῆς ἱστορίας) and the different interests of the readers/listeners (ἀκροαταί) that are associated with each of those periods and types of work. This is not the place for any detailed discussion of this highly interesting text but I cannot resist pointing out that Jacoby could have availed himself – to good effect, in my opinion – of this ready-made *ancient* classification for structuring his fragment collection. One may wonder why he showed no interest. I surmise that, at the time when he was drawing up his plan, the *systematic* arrangement proposed by Polybius failed to suit what was then his main purpose: to embody into the structure of *FGrHist* his own *historico-developmental* view of Greek historiography.

[17] JONES, C. (2020), "The Historian Philip of Pergamon", *JHS* 140, 120-127.