

5. Daimachos of Plataia

SALVATORE TUFANO – Sapienza Università di Roma, Roma
 salvotufano@gmail.com

5.1. The Two Daimachi: Analysis of TT 1-2 and [TT] 3-5

T 1 (= *BNJ* 65 T 1a; *FGrHist* 65 T 1a [Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 10.3.3 p. 464b Mras]).

“καὶ τί γὰρ Ἐφόρου ἴδιον”, <ἔφη>, “ἐκ τῶν Δαιμάχου καὶ Καλλισθένους καὶ Ἀναξιμένους αὐταῖς λέξεσιν ἔστιν ὅτε τρισχιλίους ὅλους μετατιθέντος στίχους;”

1 ἔφη Stephanus 2 ὅλους BN

“And what does really belong to Ephoros, then’ – he went on, ‘who literally copied, without exceptions, three thousand lines from those writings of Daimachos, Kallisthenes, and Anaximenes?’” (tr. S. Tufano).

T 2 (= *BNJ* 65 T 1b; *FGrHist* 65 T 1b [Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 10.3.23 p. 467d Mras]).

ἀλλ’ ἵνα μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς κλοπῆς ἄλλους αἰτιώμενος κλέπτῃς ἀλῶ, τοὺς πραγματευσαμένους τὰ περὶ τούτων μηνύσω. Λυσιμάχου μὲν ἔστι δύο Περὶ τῆς Ἐφόρου κλοπῆς· Ἀλκαῖος δέ, ὁ τῶν λαιδῶρων ἰάμβων καὶ ἐπιγραμμάτων ποιητῆς, παρώιδηκε τὰς Ἐφόρου κλοπὰς ἐξελέγχων.

“So that I myself might not be found guilty of plagiarism, while accusing other people, I will mention all those authors who focus on this topic. First, there are two books by Lysimachos *On Plagiarism*; then, Alkaios (that poet of railing

iambes and epigrams), confuted and made fun of Ephoros' plagiarisms." (tr. S. Tufano).

T 3 (= *BNJ* 716 T 1; *FGrHist* 716 T 1 [Str. 2.1.9 C 70]).

ἅπαντες μὲν τοίνυν οἱ περὶ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς γράψαντες ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ ψευδολόγοι γεγόνασι, καθ' ὑπερβολὴν δὲ Δηίμαχος, τὰ δὲ δεύτερα φέρει Μεγασθένης [...] ἐπέμφθησαν μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὰ Παλίμβοθρα ὁ μὲν Μεγασθένης πρὸς Σανδρόκοττον, ὁ δὲ Δηίμαχος πρὸς Ἀμιτροχάδην τὸν ἐκείνου υἱὸν κατὰ πρεσβείαν, ὑπομνήματα δὲ τῆς ἀποδημίας κατέλιπον τοιαῦτα, ὅφ' ἦς δὴ ποτε αἰτίας προαχθέντες.

2 φέρει Radt λέγει mss. ἄγει Aly 4 Σανδρόκοττον Κοραῖς ἀνδρόκοττον Λ ἀνδρόλοτον BCE Ἀμιτροχάδην Lassen ἄλλι- mss.

"Sure, all the authors of works *On India* have generally been lying, but Daimachos exceeded them all, and then comes, in second place, Megasthenes. [...] They were both sent as ambassadors to Palimbothra: Megasthenes, to the court of Sandrocottos, Daimachos to that of Amitrochades, Sandrocottos' son. They left us *Commentaries* of such a (bad) sort, moved by mysterious grounds." (tr. S. Tufano).

T 4 (= *BNJ* 716 T 2; *FGrHist* 716 T 2 [Str. 2.1.19 C 76]).

πάλιν δ' ἐκείνου τὸν Δηίμαχον ἰδιώτην ἐνδείξασθαι βουλομένου καὶ ἄπειρον τῶν τοιούτων.

"And also, when he wants to show that Daimachos is a layman and has no expertise of these subjects." (tr. S. Tufano).

T 5 (= *BNJ* 716 T 3; *FGrHist* 716 T 3 [Str. 2.1.4 C 68-9]).

πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀπόφασιν ταύτην ὁ Ἴππαρχος ἀντιλέγει διαβάλλων τὰς πίστεις. οὔτε γὰρ Πατροκλέα πιστὸν εἶναι δεῖν ἀντιμαρτυρούντων αὐτῶ, Δηϊμάχου τε καὶ Μεγασθένου, οἱ καθ'οὺς μὲν τόπους δισμυρίων εἶναι σταδίων τὸ διάστημά φασι τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ μεσημβρίαν θαλάττης, καθ'οὺς δὲ καὶ τρισμυρίων· τούτους τε δὴ τοιαῦτα λέγειν καὶ τοὺς ἀρχαίους πίνακας τούτοις ὁμολογεῖν.

2 οὐδέ Meineke δυοῖν B 3 τε Korais γε mss.

“Hipparchos answers by disproving these causes. Because Patrokles was not reliable, as he is contradicted by two witnesses, Daimachos and Megasthenes, who say that the distance from the southern sea is, at some points, twenty thousand stadia, in others, thirty thousand. He says that they mention these numbers and that the ancient maps confirm them.” (tr. S. Tufano).

5.1.1. The Namesakes: Two Biographies

Our witnesses on Daimachos as a historian can hardly all be connected to the same figure. A first group of sources (TT 1-2) revolves around information ascribed by Eusebius to Porphyrios, who probably read Lysimachos of Alexandria (cp. *infra*). Another series of passages in Strabo’s *Geography* refers to an ambassador who wrote on India. Strabo also mentions him along with Megasthenes: Strabo’s probable intermediary source was Eratosthenes, who could probably still read Daimachos and Megasthenes.¹¹⁰⁹

The first Daimachos was plagiarized by Ephoros in his *Histories* (*BNJ* 70 T 17), which means that Daimachos finished his work by 340 BCE, the date of the siege of Perinthos,

1109 TT 3-5. Cp. *BNJ* 716 F 3. For the origin from Eratosthenes of the quotes from Daimachos and Megasthenes, see Dognini 2000: 100 and Roller 2010: 138-9.

the last event personally touched upon by Ephoros in the composition of his work.¹¹¹⁰ The second consequence of this tradition is that Daimachos was coterminous with Anaximenes (BNJ 72 T 28) and Kallisthenes (BNJ 124 T 33), the other two writers of Ἑλληνικά who are mentioned in the same context. In fact, we must consider that Ephoros had all these books available when he finished the draft of the first twenty-nine books of his *Histories*: this gives us a *terminus ante quem* of around 330 BCE.¹¹¹¹

There is a high degree of homogeneity in the list of Anaximenes, Kallisthenes, and Daimachos, if we consider their dates and the characteristics of their production. Despite the impossibility that Daimachos also wrote the *Hellenica of Oxyrhynchos*,¹¹¹² as suggested by Jacoby (1924; 1950), the detail on the plagiarism of Ephoros is explicit in defining Daimachos' work on the same level as that of the other names that occur with him.

Since no witness explicitly mentions Daimachos' Ἑλληνικά, the existence of this title has been strongly suspected, but this is not enough to doubt the value of Lysimachos' comparison: this author, in his *On the Plagiarism of Ephoros* (BNJ 382 F 22), was probably comparing Daimachos with two other universal historians (T 2) and not contrasting a

1110 The suggestion of later dates for the completion of this part of the work does not take into account the fact that both Aristotle and Lykourgos used Ephoros. We infer from an observation by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.139.3 = BNJ 70 F 223), that Ephoros probably meant to deal with events until 335 BCE, but the project was interrupted from a lack of time (Breglia 1996: 63–4; Prandi 2013b: 684–5).

1111 Davies 2013: 59 and n.11. On Ephoros' method and on his work in general, see Barber 1935, Schepens 1977, Parmeggiani 2011, and the essays edited by de Fidio – Talamo 2013 (among which, Landucci Gattinoni 2013 confirms the main date which I follow in the text).

1112 To respect the structure of the *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, J. Engels (2011a), editor of Daimachos of Plataia for Brill's *New Jacoby* (65), re-quotes the *Hellenika of Oxyrhynchos* as a fifth fragment (BNJ 65 F 5), despite discrediting Jacoby's trust in this authorship (1924). However, it now seems better to align it with the few certain data we possess on Daimachos and deny him this work, as G.L. Barber first suggested (Barber 1935: ix n.1; for a critical overview, cp. Camacho Rojo 1994: 537–40, *spec.* 537–8). We still lack positive evidence on the authorship of the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*; see, at least, Grenfell – Hunt 1909; Meyer 1909; Gigante 1949; Jacoby 1950; Bartoletti 1959; Bruce 1970; Accame 1978; Canfora 1988; McKechnie – Kern 1988; Chambers 1993; Bianchetti – Cataudella 2001; Behrwald 2005; Bleckmann 2006; Cuniberti 2009, and Occhipinti 2016. It is sometimes forgotten what H. Bloch (1940: 303–76, *spec.* 344) and R. Nicolai (2006: 693–720, *spec.* 708 and n.53) rightly observed, i.e. that Dionysius of Halikarnassos (*Thuc.* 9) does not know any historian who, like the author of the *Hellenika*, organized their subject matter for military campaigns: this means that he might as well be a writer whose name is completely obscure to us.

local historian, Daimachos, with different figures.¹¹¹³ If, moreover, it is uncertain whether these authors are listed by Porphyrios in chronological order (Daimachos > Anaximenes > Kallisthenes),¹¹¹⁴ the witnesses on Anaximenes (ca. 380–20 BCE; *BNJ* 72)¹¹¹⁵ and on Kallisthenes (ca. 370–27 BCE; *BNJ* 124)¹¹¹⁶ confirm that these two wrote before Ephoros.¹¹¹⁷

This same Daimachos was quoted by Athenaeus Mechanicus in a passage, which consists in a series of sources: according to Jacoby (1926a: 4) and to Zecchini (1997: 192–3), the names are registered in chronological order,¹¹¹⁸ even though the section (F 5) is textually troublesome and it is not completely certain whether Daimachos worked after Aineas Tacticus, whose *Poliorketika* were written in the first half of the fifties of the fourth century BCE.¹¹¹⁹ This fragment was not considered a witness, in previous scholarship, because of doubts that still exist on the authorship of the mentioned work (cp. *infra*) and on the chronological criterion behind the list.¹¹²⁰

The second Daimachos wrote a treatise on India¹¹²¹ as a result of his mission in the region. Daimachos was sent by a Seleukid king, probably Antiochos I,¹¹²² to Palimbothra (skr.

1113 Dognini 2000: 103–4. Cp., from a different point of view, Zecchini (1997: 192): “Dalla testimonianza di Lisimaco [...] si può [...] ricavare che [...] Daimaco dovette scrivere un’opera analoga a quelle di Callistene e di Anassimene, con cui è citato, cioè *Elleniche*.”

1114 For the suggestion of a chronological disposition of these names, see Zecchini 1997: 192. However, it is not completely certain whether Anaximenes actually lived long before Kallisthenes.

1115 On Anaximenes, see *infra* in text.

1116 Prandi (1985; 2013b, *spec.* 692–3) confirmed both the plausibility that Kallisthenes’ work was known and usable by Ephoros, and his chronological precedence (cp., on the precedence of Daimachos and Kallisthenes over Ephoros, Niese 1909: 175 n.2). Therefore, it should no longer be repeated that Ephoros lived and operated before Kallisthenes (Parmeggiani 2011: 62 n.125).

1117 For this reason, Dognini (2000: 101) suggested that Daimachos was born ca. 370 BCE.

1118 The passage is discussed as Daimachos’ F 5 (=Ath. Mech. 5.11–6.1).

1119 On the date of Aeneas Tacticus, see Bettalli 1990: 5 and the scholarship mentioned by Zecchini 1997: 198 n. 39. Zecchini considers the production of Aeneas Tacticus a “certissimo *terminus post quem* per la composizione dell’opera” (*ibid.* 193), because he credits the first Daimachos with the Πολιορκητικά.

1120 Cp. Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 3: he is skeptical on the documentary value of this list, whereas Primo (2009: 82 n.128) and Jacoby (1926a: 4: “deutlich chronologisch”) believe that the order is chronological.

1121 The transmitted titles are ὑπομνήματα (*BNJ* 716 T 1), Περὶ Ἰνδικῆς (F 1) and Ἰνδικά (F 4: probably the original title: Schwarz 1969: 296; Primo 2009: 82–3; I doubt, however, that the variation ὑπομνήματα, in Str. 2.1.9.70, has the goal of diminishing the work, because, in the same context, two despised authors like Daimachos and Megasthenes are credited with a περὶ Ἰνδικῆς).

Pāṭaliputra, today Pāṭnā)¹¹²³ to visit Bindusāra/Amitraghāta,¹¹²⁴ a Maurya king, who was the son of the founder of this Indian dynasty, Çandragupta/Sandracottus.¹¹²⁵

Bindusāra was Ashoka’s father, a kinship which partially helps us date this Mauryan king, because Ashoka is better known, thanks to an important series of bilingual edicts, discovered and published in the last century.¹¹²⁶ On the basis of the date of king Bindusāra’s death (273 BCE), he succeeded to the throne sometime between 301 and 298 BCE.¹¹²⁷ Since Daimachos’ embassy was planned by Antiochos I (on the throne since 281/0 BCE), we should imagine the trip to India in the first half of the seventies.¹¹²⁸

1122 On this Daimachos, see Schwartz 1901; Schwarz 1969, *spec.* 295 and n.12; Meister 1990: 142; Dognini 2000; Primo 2009: 82-5; Engels 2011b; Kosmin 2014: 34-5 and 267.

1123 For an introduction to the history of this city, capital of the Maurya kingdom, see Kosmin 2014: 21-2 (on Megasthenes’ description as of *BNJ* 715 F 27b) and Lahiri 2015: 43-65 (with due consideration of the non-Greek sources).

1124 The second name is a military epithet, whence the Greek rendering Ἀμιτροχάτης/-δης. See Karttunen 1997: 264 and Kosmin 2014: 34-5 on this name and on the variations in Sanskrit, *Amitraghāta/-khāda*. Radt printed Ἀμιτροχάδην (T 3), with a conservative attitude in the second part of the personal name, despite the variant Ἀμιτροχάτης of Hegesandros, *FHG* 43 = Ath. 14.67.652F; the mu in the first part is based on the intervention of Lassen, because the transmitted Ἀλλιτροχάδης cannot be accepted, since it would add an otherwise unattested *Allitrochades (considered likely by Dognini 2000: 96-7). The form must be a mistake in the passage from the capital to the minuscule writing, from an M read as ΛΛ. There are no clear indications on the reign of Bindusāra, since we only know that he succeeded to the throne 24 years after his father Çandragupta, but this event is subject to strong variations in our sources (324/ 317/ 312 BCE); a second ambiguity concerns the length of his kingdom, from 24 to 27/8 years, according to the available sources.

1125 The founder Σανδρόκοττος already received the visit of Megasthenes, according to our T 3. This king had a positive relationship with Seleukos I Nikator, and the two kings signed a treaty (known as the “Treaty of the Indus”) in 305 BCE. This treaty may be considered “a constitutive act of the Hellenistic state system” (Kosmin 2014: 33): as a result, Seleukos received 500 elephants and recognized the annexion of the Paropamisos, the Arachosia and the Gedrosia to the Mauryan kingdom (Str. 15.2.9.724; App. *Syr.* 282; Just. *Epit.* 15.4; Plut. *Alex.* 62.4). On this event, see Skurzak 1964; Karttunen 1989: 199 and 260-1; Wheatley – Heckley in Yardley – Wheatley – Heckley 2011: 291-6; Kosmin 2014: 32-7.

1126 On these inscriptions, cp. Pugliese Carratelli – Garbini – Tucci – Scerrato 1964 and Pugliese Carratelli 2003; on Ashoka, see Lahiri 2015.

1127 See, on these chronological issues, Dognini 2000: 97; Kosmin (2014: 362) and Lahiri (2015: 25) suggest the extremes of 298/7 and 273/2 BCE.

1128 The tradition on this embassy (T 5) has been considered the historical background of the anecdote assigned by Athenaeus (14.67.652 F-653A) to the grammarian Hegesandros of Delphi, according to whom Bindusāra wrote to Antiochos to ask for sweet wine, dry figs, and a philosopher. Antiochos only declined the last request, because it was against Greek habits. The anecdote probably derives from actual contacts between the Seleukids and the Maurya (Karttunen 2001: 173), but on its own does not prove, as maintained by Dognini (2000: 97-8), that Daimachos was sent

It is therefore impossible that the first Daimachos, who lived in the central decades of the fourth century BCE, also wrote *Indika*.¹¹²⁹ We can only concede a kinship tie between the two namesakes, on the basis of the few occurrences of the name in Boiotia (grandfather and nephew?).¹¹³⁰ The origin of Plataia is certain for both namesakes: the first Daimachos is

to India by Antiochos I and not by Seleukos (Primo 2009: 20-1. 83-4, after Virgilio 2003: 84, thinks that the story might be an autoschediasm from Daimachos' works, which is hardly demonstrable based on the fragments; on the story, see shortly Kosmin 2014: 35). On the level of cultural contact between these reigns, see Schwarz 1969: 303-4 and, in general, Tarn 1938; Schwarz 1966; Karttunen 1989 and 2001; Primo 2009; Bianchetti – Bucciattini 2014 and Kosmin 2014. On a second level, this plausible chronology is confirmed by the fact that Daimachos' mission seems to have been later than Megasthenes' one (T 3). Megasthenes' mission is usually imagined after 305 BCE (Zambrini 1985), even if Bosworth (1996) suggests that we might anticipate his presence in India, on the basis of Arr. *Ind.* 5.3 (BNJ 716 T 2b), where Megasthenes is credited with a visit to Sandrokottos and to Poros, who died in 318 BCE (cp. Roller 2008 *ad loc.*). This witness, however, is ambiguous and may not refer to a trip to the predecessor of Çandragupta (Zambrini 2014: 244-5): in fact, even if there is no reason to change the text of Arrian, it is more likely that the first travel was to Sandrokottos after 305 BCE (Roller 2008; Zambrini 2014). This scenario confirms, then, the posteriority of Daimachos (Primo 2009: 82) and definitely excludes that the second Daimachos, later than Megasthenes, may be the same source of Ephoros.

1129 The incompatibility of the first witness (T 1) with the traditions on the second Daimachos has long been perceived by scholars like Clinton, who preferred correcting Eusebius (cp. Stemplinger 1912: 47-8 and Gudeman 1928: 36, with previous scholarship). The existence of a single Daimachos was once suggested by Voss (1624: 60-1), who was replying to Casaubon (1583: 11, where Casaubon assigns to the first Daimachos of Diog. Laert. 1.30 [F 3] the historical work, the siegecraft and *On Piety*). The thesis was then revived in the nineteenth century (Müller *FHG* II 440-2) and found new arguments with Schwartz (1901; 1909: 405-6). Recently, the inexistence of a Daimachos of the fourth century BCE has been repeated by Parmeggiani (2011: 62-3 and n.125), according to whom “che sia veramente esistito un Daimaco di Platea predecessore di Eforo e autore di una *Zeitgeschichte*, diverso dal Daimaco di Platea autore di *Indika* nel III sec. a.C., è una certezza solo per Jacoby” (62). Eusebius (*FGrHist* 65 T 1a-b), however, was not the only basis on which Jacoby (1926a: 4) built his subdivision, and we should take into account that Athenaeus *Mechanicus* (F 5) quotes Daimachos in a context of authors of the fourth century (for this reason, too, Bayle 1740: 363 n.C had to admit that “il est sûr que celui qu’Athénée cite avoit fait une Relation des Indes” and that Ephoros lived until the middle third century BCE). There is now, moreover, a growing appreciation of Ephoros' original contribution to historiography: it is this new reading of his method that should reassure us on the possible reliability of these witnesses, with all due consideration of their excesses, despite Parmeggiani's criticisms of these philological attacks on Ephoros (*ibid.* 61-2). Hornblower 1995: 672: “It certainly seems that history-writing was something of a family tradition among the Daimachi.” On the reuse of personal names in Boiotia, cp. *supra* 4.7.3. *ad* Ἀνάξανδρος.

1130 Since he came from Plataia, the original form of the personal name must be Δάμαχος and not, as in Strabo, Δημάχος. The personal name Δάμαχος has only five occurrences in Boiotia: three come from Plataia, namely the two historians and Eupompidas' son (Thuc. 3.20.1); the other two lived in Tanagra (*IG* 7.882: first century BCE *ex.* – first century CE *in.*) and in Thebes (*IG* 7.2557: a Δάμαχος who may have lived in the fifth century BCE). The greatest number of figures with this name comes from the Peloponnese from the early fourth century BCE (in Triphylia: *SEG* XXXV 389,8) to the middle of the third century BCE (in Sparta: *IG* 4.1.².96,30). In other regions, there are sparse and limited occurrences: in Asia Minor, Megara (third century BCE), and Pergamon (145 BCE: *LGPN* V A s. v.), whereas an inscription from Oropos (*I.Oropos* 170,3: second half of the third century BCE) recalls a Δημάχος from Phaselis, in Lycia. On the basis of evidence collected in *LGPN* III A, we know that there were four Daimachi in total, considering

claimed as Plataian only in our F 4, where Plutarch calls him Πλαταιεύς; the other occurrence of the ethnic, in a fragment on the Seven Wisemen, is only valid if we accept the correction Πλαταιικός suggested by Casaubon (1583), but the transmitted Πλατωνικός can actually be kept (F 3).¹¹³¹

An explicit confirmation of this family tradition comes from a character mentioned by Thucydides among the Plataian exiles, namely Eupompidas, Daimachos' son (3.20,1: τοῦ Δαϊμάχου: according to Hornblower, an important informer of Thucydides on the siege of Plataia).¹¹³² Since Thucydides shows an exceptional knowledge of the siege, it could be that he got his information from Eupompidas, who may then be the father of the historian who worked in the fourth century BCE.¹¹³³ If we compare this prosopography with Plutarch's clear mention of the origin of the historian Daimachos as being from Plataia (F 4), we can gather that there was a family in Plataia that can claim two historians between the fourth and third centuries, and that they occupied the higher echelons of the city.¹¹³⁴

5.1.2. Works and Authorship

On the basis of the previous discussion of the respective chronology of the two Daimachi, we can only be certain that the first one wrote a universal history, used by Ephoros, and that the second one wrote a monograph on India. The main issues concern the other titles assigned by our witnesses to a Daimachos: Jacoby (*FGrHist* 65) maintained that the first Daimachos wrote on siegecraft and the *On Piety*, whereas Engels (2011a *BNJ* 65), while confirming this picture, is more doubtful on its subdivision.

Only three (FF 5–7) of the seven fragments, in fact, include the title (Πολιορκητικά and Περὶ εὐσεβείας), whereas the other four cases are not assigned to any specific work. A

Western Greece (in Aitolia [*Syll.*³ 499,2: 232/228 BCE] and, maybe, in Ambracia [*SEG XXXV* 665 A 1.5; 665 B 23]), Magna Graecia (Tarentum: *LGPN* III A s.v. (9)), and Sicily (a Syracusan, mentioned by Polyaeus, *Strat.* 1.43.1).

1131 See *infra* 5.4.1.

1132 Hornblower 1991: 405–6; Hornblower 1995: 672–3 [=2012: 124–5]; Hornblower 1996: 136.

1133 Trevett 1990: 417, according to whom Daimachos was also Apollodoros' source on the Plataian siege, the real author of [Dem.] 59.

1134 I would therefore not share Zecchini's skepticism (1997: 192) of Daimachos' origin from Plataia, which probably derives from the uncertainty of this scholar (*ibid.* 198 n.40) on the ascription of F 3.

scrutiny of these fragments will confirm their likely provenance from a universal history, because the disparate character of the themes depends on the agendas of the witnesses. Moreover, the chronological distance between the subjects, from the traditions on Aitolos (F 1) to Achilles (F 2) and the Seven Wisemen (F 3), does not necessarily mean that this was a local history, since the geographical horizon is too vast.¹¹³⁵ The case of Aristophanes, who covered both myths and the so-called *spatium historicum* in his *Boiotian Histories* and in the *Theban Annals*, shows how universal history can also imply such a variety, if it found a place in such a different genre.

Much more problematic is the situation concerning the other two writings attributed to Daimachos (FF 5-7): first of all, the list where Athenaeus Mechanicus (5,11-6,1 = F 5)¹¹³⁶ quotes Daimachos, author of a treatise on siegecraft, before Diades, Carias,¹¹³⁷ and Pyrrhos,¹¹³⁸ might not be enough to date the Πολιορκητικά to the second half of the fourth century BCE (excluding, in this way, that they were written by the second Daimachos). After Jacoby, a few scholars have therefore tried to assign the work on siegecraft and the *On Piety* to the second Daimachos.¹¹³⁹ It will be shown that, in the absence of compelling proof that the siegecraft treatise belongs to the second Daimachos, it is wiser to assign it to his homonymous predecessor.

1135 Dognini 2000: 103-4; Prandi 2013b: 691 n.35.

1136 The passage is textually vexed and the name of Daimachos is a correction to the transmitted διηνέχου; for a discussion of the main issues, see Gatto 2010: 262 and *infra* 5.6.1.

1137 Diades is considered Alexander's assistant during the siege of Tyre (Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 3) and is generally associated with Carias, with whom he might have written on siegecraft (Whitehead – Blyth 2004: 71-2). However, there are no precise details on their chronology, apart from their placement at the end of the fourth century BCE, and from their participation in Alexander's campaigns; see *infra* (5.6.1) for the possibility that Carias is not actually quoted by Athenaeus.

1138 Most certainly, the king of Epirus and Macedonia (319-272 BCE; cp. Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 3; Whitehead – Blyth 2004: 72 on his writings on siegecraft and his *Hypomnemata* [BNJ 229]).

1139 Engels 2011a, for example, follows Jacoby's subdivision, with strong skepticism. Gärtner 1964 and Schwarz 1969 assigned the Πολιορκητικά and the Περὶ εὐσεβείας to the second Daimachos, while Dognini 2000 thinks that the ambassador only also wrote an *On Piety*. Gatto (2010: 500) seems to assign to the second Daimachos *Indika* and *Poliorketika*. For example, Schwarz (1969: 297-8) suggested that a work on siegecraft would better suit a courtisan than an ambassador who wrote on India: this is not enough to ascribe it to the second Daimachos, especially because the circular argument ends with a completely hypothetical relationship between the military innovations of the Maurya and the arrival of Daimachos. If the second Daimachos could be a typical Hellenistic writer of many genres, the same hypothesis should be considered for his predecessor (Hornblower 1995: 673).

The production of works quoted as *On Piety* is attested from the beginning of the history of Greek philosophy: it continues until the first Hellenistic period, and manifests a constant interest in the motif of εὐσεβεία.¹¹⁴⁰ Any visiting Greek would have been impressed by the connection that the edicts of Ashoka assume between the Indian concept of *dharma* and the Greek *eusebeia*.¹¹⁴¹ Yet, if we only consider Theophrastos' earlier Περὶ εὐσεβείας (written around 315/4 BCE),¹¹⁴² we understand the risks of a teleological reconstruction, where every argument is meant to show the presumption that visiting or being in India necessarily elicits certain interests, or justifies the writing of certain works.¹¹⁴³ In the middle of the fourth century BCE, there may already be a strong interest in themes like the *hereumata*,¹¹⁴⁴ which invites us to use some prudence on the nature and authorship of *On Piety*. It is methodically wise to assign to the first Daimachos the works on siegecraft and *On Piety*, if, prudently, because we should eventually consider the further existence of

1140 On the popularity of this topic, see Schwarz 1969: 298-303; on the writings Περὶ εὐσεβείας, see shortly *infra* 5.8.3 (the title does not necessarily assume a treatment of εὐσεβεία).

1141 Schwarz 1969: 301-3 (on a possible analogy between the two concepts, see already Pugliese Carratelli 1953; however, the concept of *dharma* is extremely complex, as was observed by Karttunen 2001: 175, who recalls how, on some Greek coins of the first century BCE, the adjective *dharmika* is translated δίκαιος).

1142 Theophr. FF 580-8 Fortenbaugh. On the fragments of this essay, possibly a dialogue (Fortenbaugh 2011: 57 n.177), see Pötscher 1964 and Ditadi 2005 (with Fortenbaugh 2007).

1143 Dognini (2000: 102), who follows Schwarz, adds that the testimony of Pliny the Elder further demonstrates that the second Daimachos wrote an *On Piety* (*HN* 69.149, on the prediction of Anaxagoras, which is also the subject of Daimachos' F 7). Since the Latin author claims to have read and known the writings of Hipparchos, a mathematician and astronomer of the second century BCE (Dicks 1960; Repellini 1984; Bianchetti 2001; Shcheglov 2005, on the connection with Daimachos), and this Hipparchos praised and liked the writings of the second Daimachos (Hipparchos F 12 Dicks = Daimachos *BNJ* 716 T 3), Hipparchos could only have known the second Daimachos, to whom we must owe the indirect anecdote of Plin. *HN* 69.149. This argument fails to consider, however, the richness of the cultural interests of Hipparchos: from what we know, this mathematician turned to a variety of sources, and cannot simply be considered an imitator or follower of Daimachos on the basis of one fragment (Shcheglov 2005). It is therefore hard to imagine how many and whether there were many admirers of the second Daimachos: another potential risk comes from the consideration of Str. 2.1.17.74 (Dognini 2000: 100-1), which refers to οἱ περὶ Δημάχων. The expression does not qualify his followers or admirers, because περὶ with the accusative of a personal name can also be used as a periphrasis for the name of a single person, and this is certainly the case, for example, in Str. 2.1.18.75: κατὰ τοὺς περὶ Δημάχων (cp. the translations of Aujac 1969: 23 and Radt 1980: 53; on this use of περὶ, see *LSJ s.v. περὶ* C I.2; Kühner – Gerth 1898: 269-70; Radt 1980: 48; Radt 1988).

1144 Fortenbaugh 2011: 136-42. It should also be noted that the Indian production of *Dharmaśāstras*, writings on the idea of *dharma* meant as a royal homage, actually began in the same years, if not slightly later, as Daimachos' trip to India. The ascetic and ritual ideal of *dharma* was especially developed under the Maurya dynasty, and, more specifically, after Aśoka's implementation of Imperial theology (on this, see Olivelle 2009).

more namesakes and it would be ultimately unfair to ascribe to the second Daimachos, clearly and always attached to the works on India, all the other titles.

Since the main aim of the present investigation is to study the development of local Boiotian historiography, and the place of Daimachos is as a representative of a different and new approach,¹¹⁴⁵ I will follow the prudent option to only exclude Indian ethnography. It will be assumed that the first Daimachos very likely wrote the three works considered here.

5.1.3. Eusebius and Literature on Plagiarism

The most important witness on Daimachos claims that the historian was a plagiarist. The information comes from Eusebius' *Praeparatio euangelica* (312–25 CE), written as a prelude to his *Demonstratio Euangelica*. The *Praep. evang.* represents the summa of the previous Christian apologetic literature: the overall project of the author is mostly a positive demonstration of the greater validity of the new faith, as opposed to previous pagan culture.¹¹⁴⁶ The text has been read as a library in prose because, through the long quotes from pagan, Jewish, and Christian sources, Eusebius recalls his own activity as a librarian; he was trying to put forward a new model, ideologically conceived, from his perspective, to reflect the greater prestige of Christian culture.¹¹⁴⁷

1145 Jacoby 1955a: 152: “[W]ährend in Athen die epichorischen nachfolger des Hellanikos dabei bleiben die geschichte Athens in der lokalen form der *Atthis* zu schreiben, wählen jetzt böotische historiker – Daimachos (no. 65), Anaxis (no. 67), Dionysodoros (no. 68) die panhellenische form der *Hellenika*.” Anaxis (*BNJ* 67) and Dionysodoros (*BNJ* 68) are little more than names to us, as they are only mentioned once by Diodorus (15.95.4), who claims that their works extend to 361/0 BCE; apart from a further fragment of Dionysodoros on Samothrace (*BNJ* 68 F 1), the vast debate on their works exclusively concerns assumptions, which cannot often be substantiated (Engels 2008 *ad BNJ* 68 T 1; on these historians, cp. also *supra* 1.2.4).

1146 For this reading, cp. Inowlocki 2011: 221. Eusebius pursues this aim by showing an articulated and ample knowledge: after refuting pagan culture (books 1–6), he goes on to defend Jewish culture in books 7–9 and then directly addresses the weaknesses of pagan philosophy (books 10–15). On the structure of the *Praeparatio*, and on its relationship with *Demonstratio*, see Morlet 2011, *spec.* 124–5.

1147 Cp. Inowlocki 2011 for this interpretation of the text (*ibid.* 201: “In the *Praeparatio*, the extensive number of citations calls up the image of a collection of books, not only because of the quantity of authors quoted, but also because of the large size of the quotations”).

The subcontext of the witness on Daimachos is a quote from Porphyrios' *Φιλόλογος ἀκρόασις* (FF 408–10 Smith): in this work, Porphyrios described a banquet held in Athens at Longinus' place. Longinus, the dedicatee of the treatise, was the teacher of Porphyrios and was executed in 273 CE.¹¹⁴⁸ Eusebius knows Porphyrios' *Φιλόλογος ἀκρόασις* quite well, and does not always refer to it with a polemical vein:¹¹⁴⁹ in fact, he sees a valid witness in Porphyrios, who, as a pagan, was aware of the limits of his own culture.¹¹⁵⁰ The first part of the discussion of Porphyrios is on Ephoros and Theopompos,¹¹⁵¹ in contrast to the main tendency of contemporary rhetorical treatises, where historians of the fourth century BCE were generally ignored; older and Classical names like Herodotus and Thucydides were more popular in the third century CE.¹¹⁵²

Ephoros and Theopompos were often accused of plagiarizing their predecessors, but, as the same characters of the dialogue admit, an almost literal quote from a previous work was a habit that crossed many literary genres beyond historiography (F 410 Smith). The peripatetic Proxenes concedes to his fellow neo-Platonicians that Plato extensively copied Protagoras, as a long tradition of criticism towards Plato had repeated for centuries.¹¹⁵³

As a guest at the banquet, Porphyrios adds a series of Classical loci, to show the popularity and the diffusion of this habit. Replying to him, the wise Caustrios signals the impressive case of Ephoros, who transcribed three thousand lines from Anaximenes, Kallisthenes, and Daimachos. Caustrios' source for this was the *On Plagiarism of Ephorus* by Lysimachos (BNJ 382 F 22), who was among the first authors who systematically organized observations on the plagiarisms of a single writer into a monograph. A further, but less likely, source for this material is represented by the work of the poet Alkaios, who

1148 On this figure, see Männlein-Robert 2003.

1149 Cp. Carriker 2003: 115–23.

1150 Eusebius' entire production has been read as that of an "Anti-Porphyrios", although there are many possible criticisms of this simplistic view; see Morlet 2011 and, for his use of Porphyrios, Hofsky 2002: 273.

1151 Porph. F 408 Smith = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 10.3,1–15.

1152 Stemplinger 1912: 46. According to Männlein-Robert (2003: 271–2) and Parmeggiani (2011: 58 and n.113), the choice of Theopompos derives from the accusations that this historian acted against Plato (see Morison 2014 *ad* BNJ 115 F 338) and in general from his hostility towards the philosopher.

1153 Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 10.3.24–5. On the allegations of plagiarism against Plato, see Brisson 1993 and Roscalla 2006b: 82–102.

probably did not write a book exclusively devoted to this subject, but only accused Ephoros in his verses.¹¹⁵⁴

Both Lysimachos and Ephoros, anyway, were to pave the way on this topic.¹¹⁵⁵ This Lysimachos is probably the same author of *Thebaika Paradoxa* and *Nostoi* (BNJ 382),¹¹⁵⁶ generally dated somewhere from the beginning of the second century to the middle of the first century BCE; he may come before other authors who lived at the beginning of the Imperial period and gave rise to an actual scholarship on plagiarism – a “Tendenz”, which answered to a new stance towards this behaviour.¹¹⁵⁷

Originally, plagiarism and imitation may have also be seen as neutral hommages, signs of the fortune of an author or of a work; with the contraposition of Asianism and Atticism, deflexed as an antithesis between the acceptance of linguistic innovations *vz.* a conservative classicism, a new negative judgment started to gain fame. It was by no chance that a negative stance developed on this aptitude of revival and mimicry.¹¹⁵⁸

1154 Cp. Stemplinger 1912: 33. Some scholars claim that the poet Alkaios was inspired by Lysimachos in his accusation of Ephoros (Gudeman 1928: 34; Ziegler 1950: 1980; Männlein-Robert 2001: 279; Parmeggiani 2011: 59 n.118). However, it is not certain whether Lysimachos preceded Alkaios (Schachter 2010), because this Lysimachos may have lived later (cp. *infra* and Meliadò 2010): the date of this poet between the third and the second centuries BCE, would make the two names almost contemporary, even if we accept an early date for Lysimachos (see on this problem Bonsignore 2015: 4-5).

1155 Ragone (2013: 190-1) suggests that such traditions lay behind the scommatic literature on Ephoros, finally echoed by Strabo (13.3,6.623), who recalls such accusations when dealing with the difficult relationship between Ephoros and Kyme (BNJ 70 F 36).

1156 As maintained by Schachter (2010), there are doubts on the exact authorship of the *Returns* (cp. Jacoby 1955a: 165-7): it is probable that the Lysimachos who wrote *Nostoi* and *Thebaika Paradoxa* is not the same writer of *Aigyptiaka* (BNJ 621; on the contrary, Bar-Kochva 2010: 307-16 has argued for the existence of only one Lysimachos). In both cases, despite the uncertainties on his chronology, the work *On the Plagiarism of Ephorus* is an expression of the Alexandrine philology and, in its method, does not contrast the picture we gather from the Lysimachos who wrote *Nostoi*.

1157 “Tendenz”: Peter 1911: 450; see Stemplinger 1912: 36-8 for the reasons and the forms of this change.

1158 On plagiarism in Classical literature, see Peter 1911; Stemplinger 1912; Hosius 1913; Ziegler 1950; Ackermann 2003; Roscalla 2006 and McGill 2012 (on Latin literature). Given the semantic closeness to the area of the theft in both Classical languages (κλοπή, *furtum*: on the Latin *surrripio*, more frequent than *furor*, see McGill 2012: 8-9), the reuse of a previous source, without the acknowledgement of the debt, was not always appreciated, despite some reconstructions on the topic (Engels 2011a *ad* BNJ 65 T 1ab, who recognizes the limits of our evidence; only μίμησις, as shown by Stemplinger 1912: 30-1, was never considered a possible allegation). In the history of the theoretical approaches to this topic, in fact, the beginning is represented by the frequent accusations of indebtedly copying predecessors, first in comedy (Sonnino 1998), and then among different philosophical schools (cp. e.g. Brisson 1993 and Roscalla 2006b).

The accusations against Ephoros are not very different, in their hatred, from the assumed plagiarism, which Malone denounced in his edition of Shakespeare in 1790, where Malone identified the literal copy of 1771 verses from contemporary or preceding playwrights. The parallel was suggested by Stemplinger (1912: 33), who noticed the great attention of Classical sources to the theme of plagiarism: such a comparison is all the more compelling, once we observe how Ephoros' work appears as a wise rereading of, and literary dialogue with, a number of sources. These could be literally quoted, but also reorganized and matched in an original way in a historiographical program. Ephoros' outlook was characterized by polycentrism, which is among the brands of his age: the explicit use of written sources, with a verbatim quote, is one of the main features of this literary period.¹¹⁵⁹

When Ephoros used or mentioned a source, however, he was not hiding his authorial persona in order to plagiarize the source without mentioning it: for example, it has been shown that, in the description of the participation of the Naxians in the Battle of Salamis, Ephoros drew on Herodotus, but also critically interacted with this relevant predecessor.¹¹⁶⁰ The fourth century historian is aware of the idiosyncracies of Herodotus' text and contrasts him with local historiographical traditions to provide the reader with a wider historical

passim; this first moment of the history of ancient plagiarism theories was partially neglected by Stemplinger 1912: 12–6 and has been recently reconsidered by Roscalla 2006b). These first attacks were mostly “ritualised insults” (Heath 1990: 152) and they slowly gave way to a more varied production, in the later period, which not only focused on the demerits of the alleged plagiarist (see, for instance, Stemplinger 1912: 6–10, on the single works and on their not necessarily derogatory intent). This scholarship moved from a series of titles that systematically studied literal reprises (Stemplinger 1912: 17–8 recalled how Eratosthenes nicknamed his pupil Andreas βιβλιαγισθος, because, just like the fraudulent Aigisthos, he published Eratosthenes' writings under his name) and the parallels (e.g. Aristophanes of Byzantium's *Παράλληλοι Μενάνδρου τε και ἀφ' οὗ ἐκλεψεν ἐκλογαί* [F 376 Slater]: see Sonnino 1998: 24 n.28); furthermore, there was an interest in apparently casual overlappings (e.g. the *Περὶ συνεμπτώσεως* of Aretades, *ap.* Porph. F 409 Smith, who will hardly coincide with the namesake historian Aretades [BNJ 285; see Ceccarelli 2011a]). Ephoros' work is an intermediate stage between the two periods, since his reuse of his predecessors is not a proper form of pseudepigraphy, or a sign of admiration.

¹¹⁵⁹ Stemplinger (1912: 34–5) suggested that Lysimachos' interest in Ephoros was inspired by his personal research into the characteristics of a perfect historical work. On the overall use by universal historians of preceding authors, as a general new historiographical method, useful comments in Marincola 2007b: 178–9.

¹¹⁶⁰ Vannicelli 2013b. For other examples of Ephoros' commitment with these sources, see Stemplinger 1912: 47.

picture to enlarge the perspective.¹¹⁶¹ The reuse of Ephoros, then, is an indirect homage to the quoted authors, with a critical approach to them, because,

“nella letteratura antica [...] il confine tra plagio ed influsso è tenue: tutto dipende dalla volontà di chi accede all’opera dell’autore preso a modello o come punto di riferimento.”¹¹⁶²

This critical engagement with the sources must also be assumed for the association with Anaximenes, Kallisthenes, and Daimachos, who are mentioned together, because they all dealt with contemporary events. Anaximenes of Lampsakos studied in Athens with Diogenes the Cynic¹¹⁶³ and learned rhetoric from Zoilos of Amphipolis;¹¹⁶⁴ he later had a strong connection with the Macedonian court, first with Philip II, and then with Alexander.¹¹⁶⁵ He also wrote rhetorical works, like the *Τρικάρανος* and a *Rhetoric to Alexander*,¹¹⁶⁶ and histories (*Ελληνικά*, *Φιλιππικά* in more than eight books, and *Τὰ περι Αλεξάνδρου*).¹¹⁶⁷ His *Ελληνικά* in twelve books covered the period from the origins of mankind to the Battle of Mantinea, and they therefore anticipated a “new” concept of universal history, if he worked in the second half of the forties, as outlined by Ephoros in his *Histories*. His rhetorical expertise and an indirect suspicion raised by Didymos of Alexandria, the scholar of Demosthenes (*BNJ* 72 F 11a), support the ascription to

1161 Cp. the analogous case of the traditions on the battle of Thermopylai, such as how Ephoros differs on it, compared with Herodotus (Flower 1998).

1162 Roscalla 2006b: 86.

1163 *BNJ* 72 T 3.

1164 Anaximenes *BNJ* 72 T 1; Zoilos *BNJ* 71 T 7 and F 15 Friedländer. Zoilos is also nicknamed Ὀμηρομάστιξ for his Homeric scholarship, because he vehemently attacked Homer in the *Κατὰ τῆς Ὀμήρου ποιήσεως*. He wrote *Histories* in three books (*BNJ* 71 T 1), from the Theogony to the death of Philip II of Macedon (cp., however, the skepticism of Ferrucci 2010: 163), a monograph *On Amphipolis* (*ibid.*), and a series of epideictic speeches, whose independence from the other works is debated (Regali 2008). As a consequence, Zoilos seems to anticipate the variety of the production of Anaximenes and, more specifically, both Anaximenes and Ephoros, as an author of universal history (on this point, see Jacoby 1909: 23 and *ibid.* 43 n.75 on the role of the rhetorical education, in the selection of his material).

1165 On Anaximenes in general, see Canfora 2006, Ferrucci 2010 and Williams 2013 (*BNJ* 72).

1166 *Τρικάρανος*: *BNJ* 72 FF 21-2. The three polemical goals of this work were Sparta, Athens, and Thebes; from Pausanias (6.18.5 = *BNJ* 115 T 10a), in fact, we learn that the *Trikaranos* was once ascribed to Theopompos, who was an adversary of Anaximenes. This ascription has sometimes been accepted by contemporary scholarship (see a summary of the debate in Morison 2014 *ad BNJ* 115 T 10a and Ferrucci 2010: 175-6). *Rhetoric to Alexander*: this book is transmitted in the corpus of Aristotle, but there are very few doubts on its actual authorship (Chiron 2002).

1167 On the last work, cp. Jacoby 1923b.

Anaximenes of two pseudo-Demosthenic speeches, the *Reply to Philip's Letter* (Dem. [11]) and *Philip's Letter* (Dem. [12]): it has been argued, in fact, that these two speeches were originally written by Anaximenes, who inserted them in the seventh book of his *Φιλιππικά*, in the absence of the actual speeches delivered in the crucial year of 340 BCE.¹¹⁶⁸

Kallisthenes of Olynthos, the son of a nephew of Aristotle and a direct disciple of this cognate philosopher, wrote a register of the winners of the Pythian games with Aristotle, a panegyric for Hermias, and three historical works: *Ἑλληνικά* in ten books, a monograph on the Third Sacred War, and *Ἀλεξάνδρου Πράξεις*. His *Histories of Greece* covered the period from the King's Peace (387/6 BCE) to the outbreak of the Third Sacred War (357 BCE): they partially follow the model of the historical cycle, in their aim to follow Thucydides and complete the chronological span; at the same time, it seems that Kallisthenes was particularly interested in the aftermath of the liberation of Thebes (379 BCE).¹¹⁶⁹ Whereas Ephoros was not able to include the Third Sacred War in his work, for a lack of time (see n.1190), Kallisthenes deliberately engaged with this conflict in a monograph; this choice preludes to a new development in the genre of the *Hellenika*, and, at the same time, seems to betray the acknowledgment of a new turn in Greek history.

A recent reconsideration of Porphyrios' witness offers useful parallel passages on the way in which Ephoros referred to his predecessors in his treatment of the contemporary age.¹¹⁷⁰ Anaximenes comes alongside Ephoros in two other sources, who confirm their affinity in the handling of the Battle of Koroneia,¹¹⁷¹ and in the tendency to indulge in prolixity in the discourses before a battle.¹¹⁷² Furthermore, Diodorus usually associates Anaximenes to

1168 On the universal history of Anaximenes, see Mazzarino 1965: 405–6. On the hypothesis that Anaximenes originally wrote the two pseudo-Demosthenic speeches, see Canfora 1974: 72–3 and Canfora 2006.

1169 Kallisthenes as disciple of Aristotle: *BNJ* 124 T 7. For this coauthored work with Aristotle, a list of winners and participants of the Delphic Games, Kallisthenes and Aristotle were honoured in Delphi (Tod 187, a decree destroyed after Alexander's death: Rhodes 2001b: 137; on the *Pythionikai*, see Christesen 2007: 180–91). For his panegyric of Hermias, see *BNJ* 124 FF 2–3. On Kallisthenes in general, see Prandi 1985; Stylianou 1998: 94 n.249; Nicolai 2006: 711–2; Tuplin 2007: 163–4; Rzepka 2016.

1170 Prandi 2013b: 689–92.

1171 Ephoros, *BNJ* 70 F 94.

1172 Ephoros, *BNJ* 70 T 21.

Ephoros for the continuous treatment of the deeds of Greeks and barbarians.¹¹⁷³ As far as Kallisthenes is concerned, Ephoros quoted the interpretation given by this predecessor on a comet that appeared in the sky around 373/2 BCE, even if Ephoros probably gave a different interpretation of such a phenomena.¹¹⁷⁴ Ephoros also shared Kallisthenes' interest in Theban hegemony and in Messenian history.¹¹⁷⁵ Consequently, we see how the use and knowledge of an author, even via a quote, does not negate an original contribution by Ephoros.

The indication of this behaviour may be a sign of Ephoros' critical comparison with these previous sources, and not necessarily of an unpaid debt. In the case of Daimachos, Prandi (2013b: 692 and n.41) notices, for example, that both the authors were particularly interested in the history of Aitolia (cp. Daimachos F 2). Moreover, we should consider the possibility, already suggested by the use of Kallisthenes (BNJ 70 F 212), that Ephoros was also reading Daimachos for his other work *On Piety* (F 7), where Daimachos mentioned the appearance of a meteor, sixty years before the battle of Aigospotami.

The extreme variety of subjects touched on in the current FF 1-4, indirectly confirms the high probability that Daimachos may have chosen a universal perspective for his work: this openness should call for great prudence before we credit Daimachos with every piece of information on Boiotian history in the fourth century BCE that reached later sources, like Diodoros or Plutarch, simply because of his provenance from Plataia.¹¹⁷⁶ Moreover, we should carefully take into account that Lysimachos immediately juxtaposed Daimachos, without further details, as the provenance to the other names: the parallel and opposite

1173 Diod. Sic. 16.25.5 (= BNJ 70 T 10) and 15.89.3 (= BNJ 72 T 14).

1174 Stylianou 1998: 104-5. 376-8. 381-2; Prandi 2013b: 691 n.36 (*contra* Jacoby 1930: 423). Only in Ephoros (BNJ 70 F 212) does the comet split into two stars before its destruction, whereas Kallisthenes mentions only one star (BNJ 124 FF 19-21). Ephoros will probably have drawn, at the same time, on Herakleides Pontikos and on Demokritos (Stylianou 1998: 105). Daimachos' astronomical theories, on the basis of our F 7, were also different from those accepted by Aristotle, and probably inspired by fifth century approaches: see in particular 5.8.2.

1175 Prandi 1985: 40-2. 55-8; Prandi 2013b: 691.

1176 For instance, we should probably credit Kallisthenes, and not Daimachos, with the similarity of information between Diodorus (15.67.3-4, after Ephoros) and Plutarch in his *Life of Pelopidas* (27-8), on Pelopidas' actions in Macedonia and in Thessaly, which may come from a common knowledge of Kallisthenes (see Westlake 1939: 11-2; Sordi 1958: 103-4; Georgiadou 1997: 15-24; Stylianou 1998: 105).

stance of Athenaeus, who tends to specify the ethnic of namesakes, might illude us,¹¹⁷⁷ but Lysimachos probably did not feel a necessity, as the later Porphyrios/ Eusebius did, to explain to which Daimachos he was referring.

The witness can then substantiate the existence of a historian who certainly focused on contemporary history too, even though we are not in a position to decide whether his was a universal history or a work of *Hellenika*, extending until the middle fourth century BCE.¹¹⁷⁸ The hyperbolic number that quantifies the plagiarism of Ephoros (three thousand lines) hardly needs to be taken at face value:¹¹⁷⁹ we cannot rule out that it is a parodic exaggeration from a verse of Alkaios, and not from Lysimachos himself.¹¹⁸⁰ The verb μετατίθημι, nonetheless, is explicit and forces us to see it from only one point of view, the forms and means of this plagiarism.¹¹⁸¹ Ephoros (or his son?)¹¹⁸² copied the three historians, not necessarily for the contemporary period. It is impossible to claim that Ephoros'

1177 Cp. Jacob 2000: 97 on Athenaeus' habit to distinguish among namesakes through details such as provenance. Since Athenaeus specifies the work (*Indika*) of the Daimachos he quotes (*BNJ* 716 F 4= Ath. 9.51.394E), this could mean that this Daimachos was sufficiently (only?) known for his Indian ethnography; the same principle applies to Harpocration, a rhetor who lived in the second century CE, who also needs to clarify the work of Daimachos (*BNJ* 716 F 1 = *Lex. in dec. or. att. s.v. ἐγγυθήκη*). Jacoby (*ibid.*) also remarked that Athenaeus knew two studies on homonymous poets and authors, one by Demetrios of Magnesia, a friend of Atticus mentioned by Cicero (*Att.* 4.11.1-2; 8.11.7, 12.6; 9.9.2), and another written by Herakleides of Mopsuestia, a grammarian only known from Athenaeus and Stephanus of Byzantium (μ 225, *s.v.* Μόφου ἐστία). It is not rare, in fact, to detect, in the *Learned Banqueters*, a quest for clarity and to enlighten ambiguities on an author (cp. 14.15.648D-E); since Strabo is the only witness of the second Daimachos who does not always record the title, and he knows Daimachos through Eratosthenes, the absence of a disambiguation in the witnesses on the other Daimachos, may depend on a minor need of disambiguation (maybe because he was better known?).

1178 The real uncertainty on the context of his fragments does not allow us to exclude that he also touched upon contemporary matters, as does Stylianou (1998: 106).

1179 Zecchini (1997: 191) recalls how this quantity roughly equates the extent of a book of Thucydides.

1180 Parmeggiani 2011: 59. A further perplexing aspect, mentioned by Prandi (2013b: 692), is that the number of the books of Anaximenes and Kallisthenes was, in any case, much lower than that of Ephoros.

1181 Cp. Dickey 2007: 247 on the technical use of this verb. Μετατίθημι represents, unlike other strongly negative verbs like κλέπτειν and ὑφαίρεισθαι, a more neutral voice. As such, it is used in alternative with μεταφέρω (on the lexicon of plagiarism, see Ziegler 1950).

1182 Demophilus, Ephoros's son, is traditionally considered the author of the thirtieth and last book of Ephoros' *Histories* on the Third Sacred War (Diod. Sic. 16.14.3 = *BNJ* 70 T 9; Prandi 2013b: 686; *contra* Parmeggiani 2011: 590-605). Since Demophilus used his father's notes, which remained drafts because Ephoros preferred to follow his narrative on themes and events external to that conflict, it has been assumed that these "bibliographical" references from Anaximenes, Kallisthenes, and Daimachos were casually transcribed by the son, and not by his father (Cavaignac 1932: 156; Schepens 1977: 106 and n.65; Vannicelli 1987: 171; Prandi 2013b: 685). Parmeggiani (2011: 61) claims that only Demophilus might have known all three authors, even if he assumes that Daimachos is the writer of *Indika* (*ibid.* 62-3).

excerpts were interspersed in the works of others, or that, vice versa, sections of their works were improperly put inside Ephoros’ *Histories* without anybody noticing before Lysimachos.¹¹⁸³ This is an unnecessary hypothesis that only derives from a refusal to recognize that Ephoros had the time, the way, and the will to use Anaximenes, Kallisthenes, and Daimachos.¹¹⁸⁴

5.2. Daimachos F 1

Previous editions: *BNJ* 65 F 1; *FGrHist* 65 F 1 (Schol. T Hom. *Il.* 13.217–8 [III 441 Erbse]).

ὅς πάση Πλευρῶνι <καὶ αἰπεινῇ Καλυδῶνι/ Αἰτωλοῖσιν ἄνασσε>: Αἰτωλὸς ὁ Ἐνδυμίωνος, Ἡλεῖος τὸ γένος, Ἄπιν ἀκουσίως τὸν Φορωνέως ἀνελὼν φεύγει εἰς τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ Αἰτωλίαν προσαγορευθεῖσαν, ἴσχει δὲ παῖδα Πλευρῶνα, οὗ ἐγένοντο Κούρης καὶ Καλυδῶν, ἀφ’ ὧν αἱ πόλεις. οὕτω Δηίμαχος.

1 *lemma Erbse supplevit* 2 ἔνδυμιονος T Ἐνδυμίωνος Maas *collato* schol. D *Il.* XIII 218/Z^s van Thiel *probante* (cf. *PSI* 1000,2) ἠλεῖος Eust. *ad Il.* XIII 218, p. III 462,3 van der Valk αἰτωλός T “manifesto errore” (Erbse)

“[Thoas] who ruled over all Pleuron and on lofty Kalydon,/ and on the Aitolians’. Aitolos is Endymion’s son, Elean of birth. After involuntarily killing Apis, Phoroneus’ son, he flees to the region currently called ‘Aitolia.’ He has a son, Pleuron, whence Koures and Kalydon were born (from them, the [homonymous] cities). So Daimachos” (tr. S. Tufano),

1183 Parmeggiani 2011: 62.

1184 On Ephoros’ use of contemporary sources, see *BNJ* 70 F 9 and Parker 2011 *ad loc.*; Marincola 2007b: 173; Clarke 2008: 101–3; Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 T 1a; Prandi 2013b *passim*.

5.2.1. Textual Transmission and Context

This scholium belongs to the scholia on the *Iliad* of manuscript **T** (= Townleianus, XI c.): this manuscript inherits a scholarship on the poem, whose first nucleus is a commentary of Late Antiquity. This alleged original commentary, defined by the editor Erbse with **c**, further developed into two branches: the first branch is represented by the codex **T**, which presents a more detailed commentary on the verses and preserves details, like this final ascription to Daimachos; the second branch is constituted by the descendants of a lost manuscript, **b**, which offered a shorter version of the same material.¹¹⁸⁵

The verse of the *Iliad* here commented upon (13.218) centers on Thoas, an Aitolian warrior who is often praised in the *Iliad* for his military virtues.¹¹⁸⁶ The present commentary does not prioritize the quest for possible historical or mythical echoes of Boiotian history, only because Daimachos came from Plataia. While Aristophanes of Boiotia was certainly a local historiographer, the paucity of details on the general features of Daimachos' work does not support any link either with the treaty between the koina of the Boiotians and of the Aitolians (370 BCE),¹¹⁸⁷ or with the help given by Epameinondas to the Aitolians during his third expedition to the Peloponnese (366 BCE), when he returned control of Naupaktos and Kalydon to them.¹¹⁸⁸ If we accept, then, that such

1185 A telling parallel of the degree of analysis preserved by the Townleianus, is offered by a short excerpt on a papyrus (PSI VIII 1000), which only presents the name of Endymion next to that of Pleuron (l.2). For a short presentation of these scholia, see Dickey 2007: 19–20; on the exegetical scholia, Schmidt 1976 is still useful. Cp. Montana 2013: 11 n.3 on later scholarship.

1186 Hom. *Il.* 9.529 and 549; 23.633. Thoas has been seen as a prototype of the Homeric hero by Antonetti (1990: 45); in the *epos*, he is praised for his military virtues, as the Aitolians generally are in the Classical period (cp. Thuc. 3.94.4 and the observations by Bearzot 2014: 47 on their status vs. the world of the *poleis*). As far as Thoas is concerned, there was also a heroic cult, as some literary sources indicate (Antonetti 1990: 267–8).

1187 Antonetti 1994: 126; Zecchini 1997: 193; Antonetti 2005: 59; Antonetti 2010: 165. Diodorus (15.57.1), in truth, only claims that the Boiotians “later, having made friends of the Phocians, Aitolians, and Locrians, returned to Boeotia again” (tr. C.L. Sherman). Xenophon presents a partially different list of Boiotian allies, gained between 371 and 370 BCE (*Hell.* 6.5.23; *Ages.* 2,24: Arcadians, Argives, Eleans, Euboians, Lokrians, Acarnanians, Enyans, Malians, and Thessalians), probably through the use of a different source. Despite the lexicon used by Diodorus, which might suggest an effective military alliance, the better-known case of the Phokians indicates that it was more likely a defensive union (Buckler 1982 = Buckler 2008: 134–5); Aitolian participation has been doubted (Stylianou 1998: 411).

1188 Jacoby 1926a: 4; Zecchini 1997: 192–3; Antonetti 2005: 59; 2010: 165 and n.11. The tradition of this restitution depends on scholium B to the *Iliad* (2.494: Καλυδῶνα μὲν Αἰτωλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο ἀμφισβητοῦσι πρὸς Αἰολέας, μνησθεὶς αὐτῆς ἐν Αἰτωλῶν καταλόγῳ, “Kalydon was granted to the Aitolians, who fought against the Aiolians for it, because he [Epameinondas] recalled that it was present in the Catalogue of the Aitolians”; tr. S. Tufano). Wilamowitz (1921)

references to Boiotian history need not be necessary, we can concentrate our analysis on the three main topics of the fragment, namely, (1) the origin of Aitolos from Elis, (2) the reason for his escape from this region to Aitolia, and (3) his begetting of Pleuron, the father of Kalydon and Koures.

5.2.2. Commentary

Αἰτωλὸς ὁ Ἐνδυμίωνος, Ἠλεῖος τὸ γένος: There was a very old tradition of kinship ties between the regions of Aitolia and Elis.¹¹⁸⁹ Ephoros (*BNJ* 70 FF 115 and 122a–b) is the first literary witness of this tradition, which is characterized by a philo-Elean stance, since it granted them priority in the historical tradition. Before Ephoros, however, we have clear indications that the story was already being diffused during the Archaic Age.¹¹⁹⁰ The Aitolians were originally Eleans, because the Eleans were the first ones to occupy and colonize Aitolia (thence, the philo-Elean nature of the tradition): the migration followed a crime committed by the Elean Aitolos, Endymion’s son from Selene. In this version of the story, Endymion represents the Elean ruling family:¹¹⁹¹ after a variable number of

claimed that this tradition came from Ephoros, and this same interpretation was endorsed by later scholars (Jacoby 1955a: 8–9; Bommeljé 1988: 302–3; Breglia 1991–4: 138–9; Antonetti 2005: 59 and n.22). The assignment of Kalydon to the Aitolians is echoed by Diodorus (15.75.2), where he mentions the actions of Epameinondas against the Achaeans and the liberation of Dyme, Naupaktos, and Kalydon (Δύμην δὲ καὶ Ναύπακτον καὶ Καλυδῶνα φρουρουμένην ὑπ’ Ἀχαιῶν ἠλευθέρωσεν). However, it is not entirely probable, as noted by Stylianos (1998: 481) and Engels (2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 1: “this suggestion [the reference of Daimachos to the liberation of Kalydon by Epameinondas] is incapable of proof”).

1189 On this mythical kinship, Antonetti 1990: 58–61; Antonetti 1994, *spec.* 128–30; Taita 2000; Nafissi 2003; Möller 2004; Gehrke 2003 = Gehrke 2005; Roy 2009; Antonetti 2010: 165 n.9; Patterson 2010: 132–7; Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 1.

1190 On the philo-Elean nature of this tradition, see particularly Ulf 1997. Bilik (1998–1999) was the first to suggest that Ephoros was following the philosopher Hippias of Elis on this subject; the theory was further developed by Taita (2000: 156), who saw the lifespan of Hippias as a reference point for the spread of the traditions on the Aitolian institution of the Olympic games. According to this scholar, such traditions were “miranti ad associare l’elemento etolico non più, soltanto e genericamente, all’Elide, ma, più specificamente, all’ambito olimpico” (161). However, the sources on the arrival of Oxylos and on the foundation of the Olympic games antedate Hippias by at least two centuries (see *infra* in text); for the philo-Elean source of Ephoros, Nafissi (2003: 29 n.59) signals the complexity of the potential sources, speaking of “elementi di origine disparata.”

1191 See Taita 2000: 153–4 and Möller 2004: 259–60 on these discrepancies. While Pausanias (5.1.3) claims that the father Aethlios reigned first, Apollodoros (1.56), despite following the same genealogy, has Endymion found Elis, where he reigns first, because his parents were in Thessaly.

generations,¹¹⁹² Oxylos, a descendant of Aitolos, guided a group of Aitolians back to Elis and re-colonized this region, where he founded the sanctuary of Olympia.

I. Aitolos' birth from Endymion was only one of the four different genealogies that developed around him.¹¹⁹³ When Aitolos is Endymion's son, Endymion is the son of Kalyx and Aethlios: this parentage links him, through his father Aethlios, with the family of Deukalion (father of Protogenia, Aethlios' mother), and, through his mother Kalyx, to the branch of Aiolos, as Kalyx was his daughter. This complicated family tree is based on the combination of two fragments from the *Catalogue of Women* (FF 10a, 58-60 and 245 M. – W.) with a passage of Apollodoros' *Library* (1.56: probably deriving, like other passages of this book, from the same *Catalogue*). By claiming that he was Endymion's child, Daimachos would therefore seem to have followed this version on the father of Aitolos, who was thus perfectly intertwined, via Deukalion and Aiolos, in the family of Hellen.

Since the connection Endymion-Aitolos was already alluded to in the *Catalogue of Women* (directly, in the fragments, and indirectly, in Apollodoros), this means that the idea already circulated in the Middle Archaic. This is the likely date of the formation of the *Catalogue of Women*, which cannot be earlier than the second half of the seventh century BCE: this is therefore a *terminus post quem* for the traditions on the kinship between the Eleans (through Endymion) and the Aitolians.¹¹⁹⁴ Aitolos' "duplice ascendenza deucalionide",¹¹⁹⁵

1192 Ephoros, *BNJ* 70 F 122a (=Str. 10.3,2.463: ten generations, according to the epigram shown at Thermos [Page, *FGE* 1516-9]); Apollod. 2.175 (four generations); Paus. 5.3,6 (eight generations); on these discrepancies, see Taita 2000: 155 n.20.

1193 See Antonetti 1994: 131-3 for a general overview of the four genealogies of Aitolos.

1194 One would therefore disagree with the later dates suggested, the year 580 BCE and the Elean War, fought at the end of the fifth century BCE (ca. 402-400 BCE). The first date (580 BCE) was espoused by Taita (2000), on the basis of the alleged defeat of Pisa in this year: in her view, after an initial attempt by the Eleans to prove their antiquity, especially through Endymion, they further stressed these traditions from the end of the fifth century when they gained exclusive control of the sanctuary (only then did the Eleans argue that Aitolos also founded the Olympic games: Taita 2000: 174-5). A reconsideration of the sources on Pisa and on its war with Elis, suggests that this nucleus of stories only started after the Elean-Arcadian war (365-2 BCE: Roy 1971; Roy 2000: 135). In this war, Pisa was helped by the Arcadians and therefore promoted a new national story where the ancient administration of the Olympic Games played a pivotal role (for this late dating of the tradition, originally proposed by Niese 1910, see Nafissi 2003, Möller 2004, and Roy 2009, with some corrections; even if Ruggeri [2004: 181-3] accepts the date of 580 BCE, she acknowledges the development of Pisan propaganda between 365 and 363/2 BCE). The second *terminus post quem* that has been suggested for the development of kinship ties between Aitolia and Elis, is the Elean War, when Pisa was defeated: Jacoby 1926a: 5; Sordi 1991: 35; Sordi 1994. This later date seems unlikely, because, even if we want to deny any relevance to the Archaic

moreover, links Aitolos to the Aiolians and to Endymion, and these characters were already imagined in Elis by Ibykos (sixth century BCE).¹¹⁹⁶

Another proof of the antiquity of this tradition of kinship ties, as hinted by the mention of Aitolos' father, is the association of Oxylos, the descendant of Aitolos, with the traditions on the return of the Herakleidai, the descendants of Herakles. Oxylos was considered the leader of the Herakleidai in a series of sources, which date back to at least the middle seventh century BCE (the same period, as we saw, of the early literary fixation of the relationship between Aitolos and Endymion).¹¹⁹⁷

The historiographical and philosophical thought of the fourth century further underlines and draws on this philo-Elean tradition by representing peaceful relationships between the Aitolian conquerors and the Eleans, who had never moved, and by describing Oxylos as a paradigmatic lawgiver.¹¹⁹⁸

Daimachos, therefore, limits himself, from this point of view, to drawing on a consolidated tradition of kinship diplomacy in the fourth century BCE. This heritage was publicly

witnesses of the mythic kinship, the epigrams quoted by Ephoros (BNJ 70 F 122a) are not a mere homage to the military virtue of the Aitolians, or to the outcome of a joint campaign. The texts draw on typical features of mythical founders, especially for Aitolos (Antonetti 2012: 189-91). Finally, Funke (1985: 18 and nn.51-2; Funke 2015: 92) isolated the year 471 BCE as a starting point, because in this year Elis' synoecism occurred; however, Roy 2009 remarked on the preexistence of the *polis*. In truth, the *longue durée* of these contacts between Aitolia and Elis is sometimes accepted even by those scholars who concentrate on single events (cp. Funke 2015: 92 n.14).

1195 Antonetti 1994: 132. The descent from Deukalion is the only detail that puts the four family trees of Aitolos on the same plan.

1196 Ibyc. Davies, *PMGF* 284: Ἡλιδος αὐτὸν βασιλεῦσαί φησι. This very short fragment does not explicitly deny the possibility that Ibykos knew the genealogy where Endymion is Aethlios' son and Aitolos' father, as is claimed with excessive skepticism by Taita 2000: 159-61. Gehrke (2005: 31-2) objected, in fact, that Ibykos may be aware of the same relationships accepted in the *Catalogue of Women* (FF 10a and 245 M. – W.): if the written fixation of this text can be reasonably posited in the central decades of the sixth century BCE (cp. the same Taita 2000: 161 and 170-3, after West 1985: 136), it is almost certain that the oral circulation, in the entire Greek Mediterranean, was a process present in Ibykos' poetry (which does not, at the same time, mean that a date as early as the beginning or the end of the eighth century BCE is entirely possible, as suggested by Antonetti 1994: 30 and n.70, and Patterson 2010: 135).

1197 See Paus. 5.3.6; Apollod. 2.175; schol. Theoc. *Id.* 5.83b-c, with Prinz 1979: 307; Gehrke 2005: 29-30; Antonetti 2010: 165 n.9 for the date.

1198 Arist. *Pol.* 1319a12; on this aspect of Oxylos, cp. Gehrke 2005: 42.

broadcast by two epigrams, quoted by Ephoros and written under two statues, Aitolos in Thermos (A= Page, *FGE* 1516–9) and Oxylos in Elis (B= Page, *FGE* 1520–3):¹¹⁹⁹

A

χώρης οἰκιστῆρα, παρ' Ἀλφειοῦ
 ποτε δίνειαι
 θρεφθέντα, σταδίων γείτον'
 Ὀλυμπιάδος,
 Ἐνδυμίωνος παῖδ' Αἰτωλοὶ
 τόνδ' ἀνέθηκαν
 Αἰτωλόν, σφετέρας μνημ'
 ἀρετῆς ἔσοραῶν

“Founder of the country, once reared/ beside the eddies of the Alpheios, neighbor of the race-courses of Olympia,/ son of Endymion, this Aitolos has been set up/ by the Aitolians as a memorial of his valor to behold.”

B

Αἰτωλός ποτε τόνδε λιπῶν
 αὐτόχθονα δῆμον
 κτήσατο Κουρητίν γῆν δορὶ
 πολλὰ καμῶν.
 τῆς δ' αὐτῆς γενεᾶς
 δεκατόσπορος Αἴμονος υἱός
 Ὄξυλος ἀρχαίην ἔκτισε τήνδε
 πόλιν

“Aitolos once left this autochthonous people,/ and through many toils took possession with the spear of the land of Kouretis;/ but the tenth scion of the same stock, Oxylos,/ the son of Haimon, founded this city in early times.”

The interest shown by Ephoros and Daimachos echoes the historical background of their century, as this kinship was initially promoted especially in Elis,¹²⁰⁰ so that some sources of

1199 *BNJ* 70 F 122a (=Str. 10.3.2.463–4). On these texts, see Antonetti 2012. The translation is that of H.S. Jones for the *LCL*, with slight revisions.

1200 There have been suggestions to pinpoint the genesis of this tradition to a specific moment, such as the alleged victory of the Pisates in 580 BCE (Taita 2000: 171; *contra*, in light of a reconsideration of the chronology of the *Catalogue of Women*, Möller 2004: 260 n.60). It seems, nonetheless, that despite the constant contact between Aitolia and Elis and the possible, actual origin of the Eleans from the North, there were more advantages for the Eleans to perpetuate this tradition. For example, the epigram on Oxylos displayed in Elis insists on the autochtony *topos* (Ephoros *BNJ* 70 F 122, vv. 1–2: Αἰτωλός ποτε τόνδε λιπῶν αὐτόχθονα δῆμον/ κτήσατο Κουρητίν γῆν, δορὶ πολλὰ καμῶν); on the philo-

the fifth century BCE only stress the Aitolian origins of the Eleans.¹²⁰¹ In other words, only later would the original travel of Aitolos become part of the typical narrative of this kinship, and it is therefore likely that the Elean side previously developed a stronger historical tradition on this.

In the fourth century, the Aitolian *koinon* was more and more interested in international affairs: it took steps in the Peloponnese against Sparta, and in 367 BCE Athens addressed the Aitolians in a complicated affair that entailed the release of two hostages.¹²⁰² It was probably this new international perspective that made the summing up of preexisting kinship ties necessary. This necessity found its way in public acts, such as the realization of statues of mythical figures. It is not by chance that the first of these statues, the one with Aitolos, precludes the important, later personification of Aitolia, which was shown in

Elean character of the kinship motif between Aitolia and Elis, cp. Antonetti 1990: 61, who argued that the Aitolians accepted “une histoire nationale qui n’était pas la leur”; Taita 2000: 168; Gehrke 2005: 32-3).

1201 The choral lyrical poets stress the Aitolian origin of some figures and elements of the Olympic games (Pind. *Ol.* 3.9-13, on the rightful judge, who is an Αἰτωλὸς ἀνὴρ; Bacchyl. 8.28-9, on the prize, a γλαυκὸν Αἰτωλίδος ἄνδρῳ ἑλαίας; on both these passages, see Taita 2000: 147-51). Herodotus (8.73.2) only mentions the Aitolian origin of the Eleans. The references to the Olympic games have been considered as evidence of the participation of the Aitolians in the Olympic Amphiktyony, “in virtù di una designazione oggettiva ed ufficiale [...] di tutto l’apparato agonistico come ‘etolico’” (Taita 2000: 151 and *passim*), but this hypothesis seems confuted by the more probable Elean administration of the sanctuary in the first part of the fifth century BCE (cp. e.g. Gehrke 2005: 43 and Roy 2009; the persistence of the Aitolian nomenclature, however, may actually depend on a historical common cultural *koine* of the northwest, on which see Taita 2000: 163-8 and Gehrke 2005: 34-8, who argues for the permanence of a *Traditionskern*). In the second half of the century, then, Hellanikos (*BNJ* 4 F 195) and Damastes (*EGM* I F 5) remember the presence of the Epei in Aitolia, without mentioning the inverse direction of the colonization; it is plausible that single elements were isolated by the sources, even if they were aware of a double colonization (on the Epei, see Taita 2000: 155 n.20; for the possibility that Herodotus and the lyric poets assume a double colonization, cp. Parker 2011 *ad BNJ* 70 F 122a).

1202 *SEG* XV 90 = *RO* 35. In this text, the Athenian *boule* decides to send a herald to demand the liberation of two ambassadors, who had been sent to demand a sacred truce in reference to the Eleusian mysteries: they were imprisoned by the Triconians, and the Aitolians were ultimately held responsible for this act. The inscription may be read either as a *terminus post quem* for the development of the Aitolian *koinon* (Sordi 1953b; Landucci Gattinoni 2004: 107-8, at 107: “un sicuro e definitivo *terminus ante quem* per la fondazione del *koinón* stesso”; Bearzot 2014: 44; Lambert – Rhodes 2017), or as a sign of the federal evolution of this institution (Funke 1997b: 150); see a discussion of these interpretations in Antonetti 2010: 173-7 and Mackil 2012: 76-7.

Thermos: here was the main central Aitolian cult, and the ethnic festival of the *Thermika* testifies to the importance of the city for the Aitolians from an emic perspective.¹²⁰³

II. Daimachos might have dealt with this matter before Ephoros, who probably just drew on, and gave order to, a preexisting narrative of colonization from the south to the north and vice versa. In the same century of Ephoros, in fact, Aristotle (F 560 R.) and Pseudo-Scymnus (588-90) offer a different genealogy for Aitolos;¹²⁰⁴ Ephoros (*BNJ* 70 F 122a), in the same years, ascribed two children to Aitolos, Pleuron and Kalydon, and distinguished himself by adhering to the widespread tradition, in contrast to Daimachos (Aitolos > Pleuron).

III. The other two genealogies of Aitolos were respectively quoted by Pausanias (5.1.3; 8) and by Hekataios of Miletos (*BNJ* 1 F 15). The first author claims that Endymion had four children: Paeon, Epeus, Aitolos, and Eurycida: this last offspring, a girl, begot Eleus, in a tradition that probably aimed to explain the discrepancy between the presence of the Eleans in Homer, in historical Elis, and the later presence of Eleans in this part of the Peloponnese.¹²⁰⁵ The learned character of this genealogy suggests a late development,

1203 This statue was the first personification of the eponymous figure of a federal union and it was probably erected at the beginning of the third century BCE; see on it Knoepfler 2007; Antonetti 2012; Mackil 2012: 212-3. On Thermos and its central role, see briefly Bearzot 2014: 48 and Funke 2015: 91-2 and 110.

1204 Cp. Steph. Byz. φ 116, s.v. Φύσκος; here, Aitolos is the son of Amphiktyon as well as Deukalion's nephew. Aitolos, then, is Physkos' father and becomes related to the western Lokrians (Antonetti 1994: 131; cp. Antonetti 1990: 114-8 on the relationship between the Aristotelian *Constitutions* and the development of local historiography in the region). This tradition may be due to the attempts in Aitolia to associate "their" Aitolos with the Lokris of the years of Aitolian expansion in central Greece. This reading is further supported by the location of the meeting between Endymion and Selene in Aitolia, in Nikander's *Aitolika* (*BNJ* 271-2 FF 6a-b and, if written by the same author, *Ther.* 214-5; cp. Antonetti 1990: 117-8). Other authors, in fact (and, not surprisingly given the diverse perspective, the same Nikander in his *Europaia*: *BNJ* 271-2 F 18), agree on placing the event in a cave of Latmos, in Caria. The myth of Selene's love for Endymion was widespread in the Archaic and Classical periods and many other sources mention the eternal sleep of Endymion (cp. e.g. Sappho F 199 L.-P.; Akousilaos *BNJ* 2 F 6; Pherekydes *BNJ* 3 F 121; Pl. *Phad.* 72C; Pisandros *BNJ* 16 F 7 and the commentary by Ceccarelli 2011c, for a detailed analysis); it seems that the Aitolians only profited from this preexisting memory outside of Greece in the third century BCE. An inscription of this period (*FD* III 3,144) is the basis for this assumption, because here the Aitolians publicly recognize a kinship tie with Herakleia on the latmos (l. 4: τ]ὰν συγγένειαν ἀνευώσαντο): Robert (1978: 479) already remarked how such a tie may be explained by imagining that Herakleia was founded by the Aitolian Endymion (further on this text, see Robert 1978; Antonetti 1990: 58-9; Curry 1995: 31-2; Patterson 2004 and Patterson 2010: 132-7).

1205 On the different strategies of the Eleans and on their ethnic name, which probably derives from their connection with the land (Ἡλεῖοι < φαλεῖοι, "the men from the valley"), see Gschnitzler 1955: 125 and Gehrke 2005: 25-9.

probably in the Imperial Age, since the main progression is also in Conon (*BNJ* 26 F 1 *narr.* 14): Conon is nevertheless different in his reworking of the original genealogy, because he explicitly emphasizes the kinship tie with the Eleans (Elis, here, is Aitolos' nephew, from Aitolos' sister Eurypile).

IV Hekataios (*BNJ* 1 F 15) is the only source where Aitolos is a descendant of Oineus, the main character of the Kalydonian boar hunt story, and not a forefather as in other traditions. This myth provided further occasions for the organization of the genealogy on the single implied figures in Aitolia.¹²⁰⁶ Finally, only Pliny the Elder (*HN* 7.201) claimed that Aitolos was Ares' son, i.e. of one of the most important Aitolian deities.¹²⁰⁷ This genealogy, like the previously mentioned one from Hekataios, is probably the fruit of a local reflection on Aitolos that offers an alternative to (or maybe independently of) the kinship ties.

On the one hand, then, Daimachos shares many similarities with Classical traditions on the origins and genealogy of Aitolos. On the other hand, he may have been among the first authors who were interested in the exact nature of the events immediately before and after his travel from Elis to Aitolia. In the very rich network of genealogies and connections activated through Aitolos, Daimachos offers an interesting insight into the early stages of this process: fourth century Aitolians were just beginning to write the history of their eponymous hero.

Ἄπιν ἀκουσίως τὸν Φορωνέως ἀνελῶν. Daimachos is our first source, who insists on the circumstances that allowed Aitolos' flight to Elis. The other sources are Pausanias (5.1.8),¹²⁰⁸ Apollodoros (1.57),¹²⁰⁹ and a scholium on the third *Olympian Ode* of Pindar (22c

1206 On this fragment, see Antonetti (1990: 59-60) and Fowler (2013: 135-6), who underline the artificial character of the figures between Deukalion and Aitolos; they would be “figures of folklore and cult, useful as buffers between him and Deukalion” (Fowler *ibid.* 136).

1207 Antonetti 1990: 100.

1208 Αἰτωλῶ [...] συνέπεσεν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου φυγεῖν, ὅτι αὐτὸν οἱ Ἄπιδος παῖδες ἐφ' αἵματι ἀκουσίῳ δίκην εἶλον· Ἄπιν γὰρ τὸν Ἰάσονος ἐκ Παλλαντίου τοῦ Ἀρκάδων ἀπέκτεινεν Αἰτωλὸς ἐπελάσας τὸ ἄρμα τεθέντων ἐπὶ Ἀζᾶνι ἄθλων. ἀπὸ μὲν Αἰτωλοῦ τοῦ Ἐνδυμίωνος οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀχελῶν οἰκοῦντες ἐκλήθησαν φυγόντος ἐς ταύτην τὴν ἥπειρον, τὴν δὲ Ἐπειῶν ἔσχεν ἀρχὴν Ἥλεϊος (“Aitolos [...] was forced to flee from Peloponnese, because the children of Apis tried and convicted him of unintentional homicide. For Apis, the son of Jason, from Pallantion in Arcadia, was run over and

Drachmann).¹²¹⁰ These later texts only diverge on single details and, more importantly, on the immediate consequences of the gesture.

The only common grounds are the casual murder of Apis and the context, a chariot game in memory of Azan, the son of Arcas (Paus. 7.4.5), i.e. of the eponymous hero of Arcadia. There are two main variants: first, the identity of the father of the victim Apis: Apis is the son of Phoroneus in Daimachos and in Apollodoros, whereas Pausanias claims that Apis was born of Jason of Pallantion, in Arcadia. Second, our sources diverge on the later fate of Aitolos: in Apollodoros and in the scholium to Pindar, Aitolos goes to the Kouretis (still in the Peloponnese), before his arrival to Aitolia, while Pausanias and Daimachos directly mention the final destination.

The first discrepancy may possibly be clarified by the consideration that there were four Apis' who were in the Peloponnese: they all suffered a violent death and they can be compared to the Pelasgians, because an "Apis" often appears in those places, which do not yet have an explicit ethnic identity before the arrival of Pelops.¹²¹¹ As the son of Phoroneus, Apis is imagined in Argos by Apollodoros, who claims that Apis was violently killed by the Telchines and by Telxion, and then avenged by his nephew Argos¹²¹² (I); Pausanias (5.1.8), instead, mentions Apis as Jason's son and locates him in Arcadia, in Pallantion (II), but he also knows an Apis in Sikyon (2.5.7) (III); Aeschylus (*Supp.* 262-70),

killed by the chariot of Aitolos at the games held in honor of Azan. Aitolos, son of Endymion, gave to the dwellers around the Achelous their name, when he fled to this part of the mainland"; tr. W.H.S. Jones, with slight revisions). Cp. Paus. 8.4.5, with the same explanation.

1209 Ἐνδυμίωνος δὲ καὶ νηίδος νύμφης, ἣ ὡς τινες Ἰφιδάσσης, Αἰτωλός, ὃς ἀποκτείνας Ἄπιν τὸν Φορωνέως καὶ φυγὼν εἰς τὴν Κουρήτιδα χώραν, κτείνας τοὺς ὑποδεξαμένους Φθίας καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος υἱούς, Δῶρον καὶ Λαόδοκον καὶ Πολυποίτην, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν χώραν Αἰτωλίαν ἐκάλεσεν ("Endymion had by a Naiad nymph or, as some say, by Iphianassa, a son Aitolos, who slew Apis, son of Phoroneus, and fled to the Curetian country. There he killed his hosts, Dorus and Laodocus and Polypoetes, the sons of Phthia and Apollo, and called the country Aitolia after himself"; tr. J. Frazer). On this passage, see Parker 1983: 375.

1210 Αἰτωλὸς ἀνήρ] ὁ Ἥλεϊος, ἥτοι ἀπὸ Αἰτωλοῦ τοῦ Ἐνδυμίωνος, ὃς ἦν Ἥλεϊος, ἀποκτείνας δὲ Ἄπιν ἐν τοῖς ἐπ' Ἀζᾶνι ἄθλοις ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πρότερον Κουρήτιν, Αἰτωλίαν δὲ ὕστερον ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κληθεῖσαν. ἢ ἀπὸ Ὀξύλου, ὃς ἦν Αἰτωλὸς τοῦ Ἀνδραίμονος, διεῖλε δὲ τοῖς Ἡρακλείδαις τὴν Πελοπόννησον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδωρήσαντο αὐτῷ ἐξαιρετον τὴν Ἥλιν ("The Aitolian man]: the Elean, either from Aitolos, Endymion's son, who, after killing Apis in the games for Azan, fled to the contemporary Kouretis, then called Aitolia after him; or from Oxylos, who was an Aitolian man, son of Andraimon, and shared the Peloponnese among the Herakleidai, and was then given the chosen Elis"; tr. S. Tufano).

1211 See the general overview by Wernicke 1894.

1212 Apollod. 2.1; schol. *MTAB* Eur. *Or.* 932 and 1246.

finally, knows an Apis who is the son of Apollo and comes from Naupaktos, before naming “Apia” the ancient Peloponnese (IV). The commonality between all these different stories is that Apis can only die or exist before something more important than him occurs.

These diverse genealogies cannot and must not be rationalized to find either an agreement or an artificial harmony between them, because their only common ground is the desire to place Apis in the Peloponnese. Daimachos could hardly have been behind any of the previously mentioned sources, because we do not know exactly where he placed the murder; we can only ponder on the fact that he thought that Apis’ father was Phoroneus.

This might not be a minor detail, because Pausanias’ specification on the origin of Apis from Pallantion¹²¹³ may then be more significant than his birth from Jason. Pausanias needed to clarify that “this” Apis was not the same son of Telchines, who lived in Sykion (2.5.7). We can then imagine and justify placing Apis in Arcadia, for the dedicatee of the games, Azan, was Arcas’ son, and secondly because Apis was profoundly rooted in the Peloponnese and in Arcadia.¹²¹⁴ The scholium on Pindar also presents an interesting resemblance to the fragment of Daimachos.¹²¹⁵

The main difference between these two versions consists in the fact that Daimachos focuses on the (not)voluntary murder (ἀκουσίως) of Apis, which is hardly an ancient version of this myth connected to Aitolos.¹²¹⁶ The topical and usual element of the story is,

1213 *IACP* 289. Pallantium was inhabited by the Menelians; an initial plan, later abandoned, was to include Pallantium in the synoecism of the new capital Megalopolis (Paus. 8.27.3).

1214 According to Sakellariou (1980: 213 n.2), the kinship between Apis and Phoroneus derives from the greater probability that the Apis killed by Aitolos was Jason’s son.

1215 Scholium: ἀπὸ Αἰτωλοῦ τοῦ Ἐνδυμίωνος, ὃς ἦν Ἥλειος, ἀποκτείνας δὲ Ἄπιν ἐν τοῖς ἐπ’ Ἀζάνι ἄθλοις ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν πρότερον Κουρήτιν, Αἰτωλίαν δὲ ὕστερον ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ κληθεῖσαν; Daimachos: Αἰτωλὸς ὁ Ἐνδυμίωνος, Ἥλειος τὸ γένος, Ἄπιν ἀκουσίως τὸν Φορωνέως ἀνελὼν φεύγει εἰς τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ Αἰτωλίαν προσαγορευθεῖσαν, ἴσχει δὲ παῖδα Πλευρῶνα, οὗ ἐγένοντο Κούρης καὶ Καλυδῶν,

1216 The episode has either been considered the memory of “una fase molto antica della civiltà greca” (Antonetti 1994: 131 and n.64; Hiller von Gaertringen 1894: 1129), or, more precisely, the echo of an Indoeuropean model (Sakellariou 1980: 211–3; Antonetti 1990: 62). Only Gehrke (2005: 40 n.6) suggests the possibility that this tradition developed in the context of the Arcadic–Elean War, without hypothesizing, however, that the episode present in Pausanias (5.1.8) may already be in Daimachos.

more probably, the understanding of the colonization as a result of an expiation that followed an involuntary crime.¹²¹⁷

The epigrams mentioned by Ephoros on the kinship ties between the Aitolians and Elei, show an initial convergence on the necessary fight that was implied by the conquest of future Aitolia. The texts, nonetheless, ignore the motif of the involuntary murder, which causes the departure.¹²¹⁸ Since, right after Daimachos, only Ephoros¹²¹⁹ recalls another version of the escape of Aitolos (the expulsion by Salmoneus, king of the Epeans and of the Pisates),¹²²⁰ it is not unlikely that, in the fourth century, there was a richer development of traditions on this specific moment of Aitolos' mythical life.

On the one hand, we have, in Ephoros, the voice of a representative of philo-Elean traditions. He specifically mentioned Salmoneus, king of *the Epeians and of the Pisates*, i.e. of the Eleans, alongside the Homeric nomenclature (Epeans/ Epei), and the community, the Pisates, which, after their precocious hostility towards the neighbours of the *koile Elis*, came to a short stable political unity in the sixties of the fourth century. This is documented both by the existence of public acts and by the diffusion of eponymous characters, like Pise¹²²¹ and Pisos,¹²²² who were promptly associated with Arcas.¹²²³ Ephoros, then, confirms the original expulsion of Aitolos from Elis, in a way that agrees with the

1217 Aitolos shares this necessity of expiation with his descendant Oxylos (Paus. 5.3.7); the motif is usually linked to the foundation of a heroic cult (Antonetti 1990: 62).

1218 Antonetti (2012) suggests that we date the two texts to the end of the fourth century BCE on the basis of their lexicon, even if the rest of the scholars generally date them to a century before. Indeed, the later chronology is further determined by the three features that distinguish Aitolos in the epigram at Thermos (athletic virtues, oecistic status, and kingship), which are central in the other traditions of the fourth century on Aitolos, like the one in Daimachos.

1219 Ephoros, *BNJ* 70 F 115: "Εφορος δέ φησιν Αἰτωλὸν ἐκπεσόντα ὑπὸ Σαλμωνέως, τοῦ βασιλέως Ἐπειῶν τε καὶ Πισατῶν, ἐκ τῆς Ἠλείας εἰς τὴν Αἰτωλίαν ὀνομάσαι τε ὑφ' αὐτοῦ τὴν χώραν καὶ συνοικίσαι τὰς αὐτόθι πόλεις κτλ. ("Ephoros says that Aitolos was driven out of Elis into Aitolia by Salmoneus, the King of the Epeians and the Pisates. He named Aitolia after himself and collected the cities there into a large one"; tr. V. Parker, with slight modifications).

1220 On Salmoneus' *hybris*, see Frazer 1921: 81 n.3; Antonetti 1994: 131 and n.65; Scarpi 2010: 466-7.

1221 Pise may be the Elean answer to the Pisatan traditions, because she is Endymion's daughter, and, therefore, sister to Aitolos and Epeus (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.28d Drachmann; schol. *Rec. Theoc. Id.* 4.29-30b). The Eleans would then be trying to accept, in their family tree, the Pisates (cp. Taita 2000: 176-7; Möller 2004: 260).

1222 Pisos is either a son (Paus. 6.22.2) or a nephew (schol. *Theoc. Id.* 4.29-30b) of Perieres, the son of Aiolos who reigned over the Messenians. Pisos then married Olympia, Arcas' daughter (*Etym. Magn. s.v.* Ὀλυμπία, p. 623,12 Gaisford and *s.v.* Πίσσα, p. 673,13 Gaisford); cp. Nafissi 2003: 33 and Möller 2004: 258 and n.50; 259. On the recent character of the genealogies of Pisos and Pise, see Gehrke 2005: 42-3.

1223 For the genesis of these traditions on Arcas in the years 365-2 BCE, see Roy 2000: 144.

ideological propaganda of the Eleans in the middle fourth century BCE: this propaganda was probably a reaction to the existing Pisatic one, which already developed a tradition on the original Pisatic management of the Olympic games.¹²²⁴ In fact, the expulsion is both associated with a king, Salmoneus, who was known for his arrogance, and was explicitly linked to Elis, whose relationship with Messenia *predated* the addition of the king to Pisos' family tree.¹²²⁵ The same environment might explain the tradition, which was trying to accommodate the family tree of the Eleans, where a central spot is occupied by Endymion, by making Pise one of his daughters.¹²²⁶

On the other hand, Daimachos may be the first literary representative of a tradition where the traditional motif of the escape of Aitolos, after an involuntary murder, is corroborated by external events, such as the games for Azan, Arcas' son, and the link between Apis and Arcadia. If this reconstruction can be traced back to Daimachos, it might betray the political implication of the new actors of the time (the Arcadians and, in an anti-Elean position, the Pisates). This may also be the reason underlying the isolated tradition of a wife for Endymion, Hyperhype, who is Arcas' daughter.¹²²⁷ This impression is further corroborated by the later detail on the settlement in a region without previous dwellers, or not inhabited by the Kouretes, associated with the Koures who is Aitolos' nephew.

Πλευρῶνα, οὗ ἐγένοντο Κούρης καὶ Καλυδῶν, ἀφ' ὧν αἱ πόλεις: A tradition attested by Apollodoros (1.57) and the *Catalogue of Women* (FF 10a and 257 M. – W.) imagined Aitolos as the father of Pleuron and Kalydon. Daimachos distinguishes himself, since he describes Kalydon as Pleuron's child and he adds the figure of Koures (Aitolos' nephew, in this tree). The three figures of this genealogy come from much different realities, for only the centres of Pleuron and Kalydon are historically attested, despite the deceiving language

1224 For this hypothesis, see Gehrke 2005: 42: “Daß der Aiolos-Sohn Salmoneus als König der Epeier und Pisaten den Aitolos von Elis nach Aitolien vertrieben hat, [...] setzt die Herkunft des Aitolos aus Elis, also ein älteres Element elischer intentionaler Geschichte, bereits voraus, in der der Weggang des Aitolos anders erklärt wurde.”

1225 On the arrogance of the king, cp. Diod. Sic. 4.68.1; Apollod. 1.89. See Möller 2004: 259 on this chronological reconstruction.

1226 Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.28d Drachmann; schol. Theoc. *Id.* 4.29–30b; cp. Taita 2000: 176–7 (“Il nome di Pisa rinvia comunque ad un'eroina afferente ad un gruppo di tradizioni pisati originariamente estranee ed anzi concorrenti rispetto alle genealogie di ambito epeo-eleo-etolico”) and Nafissi 2003: 33.

1227 Paus. 5.1.4. Cp. Gehrke 2005: 40 n.6.

of the scholium (ἀφ’ ὧν αἱ πόλεις); the tradition on a city *Kourion* is late and probably derived from Daimachos.¹²²⁸

Pleuron¹²²⁹ and Kalydon¹²³⁰ were on the coast of central southern Aitolia, to the east of river Acheloos. The two cities respectively open and close the short list of the five Aitolian cities led by Thoas in the *Catalogue of Ships* of the *Iliad* (2.638–40), and they are the only two Aitolian cities, at the end of the Classical Age, to have reached a degree of urbanization, confirmed by their regional importance (other forms of settlement, on a minor scale, still coexisted in Aitolia). When Thucydides (3.102.5) tells of the joint attack of the Spartans and Aitolians at Naupaktos in 426 BCE, he claims that Eurylochus retired “towards the region which is now called Aiolid, namely Kalydon and Pleuron”: this redenuation suggests that the cities of Kalydon and Pleuron enjoyed relatively high autonomy in their physical region: “forse dovevano sentirsi, in virtù di un’antica frequentazione, molto più vicine ai dirimpettai Achei/Epei che non agli Etoli del retroterra.”¹²³¹ The complex ethnicity of the Aitolians, once they were ready to accept a kinship with the Eleans, also implied and offered them the opportunity to see themselves as closely connected with this Aiolian enclave in their own territory.

Hellanikos may have been the first one to underline these kinship ties, when he specified that the Kouretid, considered the original settlement occupied by Aitolos and his fellows, was close to Pleuron.¹²³² It is not impossible that Hellanikos was drawing on the location of the Kouretoi in the region of Pleuron, already suggested by a fragment of the *Catalogue of Women* (F 25,13 M. – W.). This location is then twice symbolic, because it implies the reference to a tradition where Aitolos initially arrives in the Kouretid, and the defeat of the local population (Hom. *Il.* 9.529–32), which is also behind the local Kalydonian cycle of Meleagros.

1228 Steph. Byz. κ 195, *s.v.* Κούριον.

1229 *IACP* 153; Antonetti 1990: 281–2.

1230 *IACP* 148; Antonetti 1990: 241–69.

1231 Antonetti 2005: 68; on the redenuation, see also Antonetti 2010: 169.

1232 Lasserre (1971: 35 n.2; cp. Antonetti 2005: 57 and *passim*) first suggested that this detail, mentioned by Strabo (10.2.6.451), actually comes from Hellanikos.

The Archaic traditions on Pleuron and Kalydon, then, clearly connected the centres with the Kouretid, to locate, in the same area, central motifs of the archaeology of the Aitolians. This description was then both a homage to the Homeric representation of this nation and to those local cycles on which we are poorly informed. Daimachos innovates from two points of view, as he seems to echo an Aitolian answer to the Elean myth of Aitolos as father of Pleuron and Kalydon.

Kalydon's later position in this genealogy, after Pleuron, might echo, *e converso*, the real reciprocal relationship between the historical centres in the fourth century.¹²³³ Kalydon was a politically relevant center in the Aitolian league both for the role it played in the Panhellenic *epos* and for the regional sanctuary of the Laphrion (not incidentally, apart from Thermos, the only place where international decrees were exposed). Whereas Thermos is more open to a Panhellenic context, Kalydon may be considered as a second, moral capital of Aitolia, and it slowly replaced Pleuron as the main reference in the Kouretid.¹²³⁴ Pleuron is mostly known for its kinship diplomacy with Sparta, through Thestios, either the grandfather or father of Leda, the mother of Castor and Pollux;¹²³⁵ nevertheless, this interesting kinship tie, which is attested already in Asius (F 6 West, *GEF*) and Ibykos (Davies, *PGMF* 304), before Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 9), is significantly reread by Hellanikos (*BNJ* 4 F 119), who calls Leda “Kalydonian.”¹²³⁶

Giving Pleuron a son, Koures, implies both a reversal of the usual greater importance of Kalydon before Pleuron, and a negative backdrop on the ethnic distinction of the Aitolians towards the Kouretes: these were notously defeated by the Aitolians,¹²³⁷ but, following this genealogical tree, they become related to them. This kinship also means that the Kouretes were not barbarians, if they descend from the Aitolians.¹²³⁸ Among the alternative etymologies on the Kouretoï, some of them, like the one by Archemachos of Euboia (*BNJ*

1233 See Antonetti 2005: 68-9 on the relationship between the two centres.

1234 Cp. Antonetti 2012: 193-4, on their “bipolar functionality”. By 389 BCE, both Kalydon and Naupaktos were occupied by the Achaians; after their liberation in 366 BCE, however, only Kalydon remained Aitolian and resisted new attacks from the Achaians (on the chronological problems, see Merker 1989).

1235 Asius F 6 West, *GEF*; Eumelos F 25 West, *GEF*.

1236 Cp. Antonetti 2005: 69 and Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 119.

1237 On these traditions and on their use to confirm the Greekness of the Aitolians, see Antonetti 1990: 64-6.

1238 On the chronological implications of this Homeric tradition, see Antonetti 1994: 122-4 and Parker 2011 *ad BNJ* 70 F 122a.

414 F 9), highlighted their fame in other Greek areas, such as in Chalkis.¹²³⁹ This genealogy conveyed by Daimachos is the only one where the eponymous hero Koures descends from Aitolos,¹²⁴⁰ and has, then, a secondary effect on the debate concerning the Greekness of the Aitolians and on their “dangerous” connections.¹²⁴¹

5.2.3. Aitolos in the Fourth Century BCE

This fragment distinguishes Daimachos from the contemporary debate on Aitolos, as described by Ephoros, since Daimachos only shares with his contemporaries the birth from Endymion and the origin of the character from Elis. Among the differences, the peaceful settlement, which may derive from the extreme conciseness of the quote, is juxtaposed with the infamous motif of the departure from the Peloponnese. In fact, Daimachos is probably the first one who accused Aitolos of involuntarily murdering Apis during the games for Azan: this tradition cannot coexist with an expulsion, through Salmoneus. The motif of the founder who looks for purification after an involuntary murder might be topical,¹²⁴² but the degree of detail on the causes of Aitolos’ departure must refer to a recent reconsideration of the myth.

If we accept an Arcadian context for this modification, we can think of a genesis or an emphasis in connection to the Arcado-Elean war, when the Arcadians profited from their eponymous hero as an instrument of kinship ties to tighten the connection with the Pisates, who were their allies against the Eleans. Since the tradition of a kinship tie between the Aitolians and the Eleans likely has an Elean origin and, despite this, was

1239 On the different settings of the Kouretoi, see Str. 10.3.1–6.463–5: even if Strabo depends, in this tenth book, on Apollodoros’ commentary on the *Catalogue of Ships*, he is aware of non-Homeric traditions (Antonetti 1994: 123).

1240 Strabo (10.3.6.465, whence Steph. Byz. α 153, *s.v.* Ἀκαρνανία) mentions a tradition, where Acarnanians and Kouretoi took their names from eponymous heroes. Since he depends, in this tenth book, on Apollodoros of Athens (Antonetti 1994), it could be that Daimachos was privy to this source who worked in the second century BCE.

1241 On the Greekness of the Aitolians, and on the related debate of the fourth century BCE, see Antonetti 1990 *passim*.

1242 See Parker 1983: 116–7; 375–6 on the *akousios phonos* and on the necessity of purification. Also, Achaeus goes to the Peloponnese after an involuntary murder (Str. 8.7.1.383). The conventional translation “involuntary” for ἀκούσιος is an approximation, because of the problematic nature of “voluntarity” in the Greek criminal code. We are slightly better informed in Athens, where Drakon introduced the distinction between voluntary and involuntary murder: on this complex and debated issue, see Gagarin 1981; Pepe 2008; Phillips 2008: 59–61.

publicly accepted in Aitolia, where it became a “tradition officielle” (Robert 1978: 489), any tradition that overshadowed or invalidated Aitolos’ behaviour assumes an anti-Aitolian and anti-Elean subtext.

This interpretation also subsumes a chronological and valorial inversion of Kalydon and Pleuron, both *lieux de mémoire* for the Aitolians, and the relationship between the Kouretoi and the Aitolians. This kinship, in fact, hinders the use of the Homeric tradition in the fight between the Aitolians and the Kouretoi for the conquest of territory. At the same time, it complicates the status of the “Greekness” of the Aitolians, even if it does not go so far as to define them as barbarians (Aitolos is always Elean).

Daimachos was therefore engaging in an anti-Elean and anti-Aitolian tradition, probably local in its origin. This does not make him, however, a local historian, despite an undeniable interest in Aitolian history. The complexity of the relationship between Panhellenic myths and local strands, as the same *Histories* of Herodotus show, suggests prudence on the nature of Daimachos’ work, on the basis of fragments like the current one. We could make space for a contextual adhesion to a variety of traditions.

5.3. Daimachos F 2

Previous editions: *BNJ* 65 F 2; *FGrHist* 65 F 2 (Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.558 [p. 48 Wendel]).

διαπεφωνήκασι δέ τινες καὶ περὶ τῆς Ἀχιλλέως μητρός, καθάπερ Λυσίμαχος ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν Νόστων κατὰ λέξιν λέγων· ‘Σοῦιδας γὰρ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ περὶ Εὐβοίας πεπραγματευμένος καὶ ὁ τοὺς Φρυγίους λόγους γράψας καὶ Δαίμαχος καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Χαλκιδεὺς οὐ τὴν περὶ Ἀχιλλέως διεσπαρμένην ἀφείκασιν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ χώρας δόξαν, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον οἱ μὲν ἐκ Θέτιδος αὐτὸν νομίζουσι γεγονέναι τῆς Χείρωνος, Δαίμαχος δὲ ἐκ Φιλομήλας τῆς Ἴακτορος’.

“Others even disagree on Achilles’ mother, as is recalled by Lysimachos in the Second Book of his *Returns*, when he says, with these exact words, ‘Because

Souidas, the Aristotle who wrote on Euboia, the author of *Phrygian Stories*, Daimachos and Dionysios of Chalkis did not accept the widespread tradition on Achilles, such as it is common among us: on the contrary, some of them think that Achilles was the son of Thetis, Cheiron's daughter, whereas Daimachos says that he was the son of Philomela, Actor's daughter" (tr. S. Tufano).

5.3.1. Daimachos, Lysimachos, and the Traditions on Achilles

The scholium comments on the mention of Achilles' father, Peleus, in Apollonius Rhodius (1.558): this passage offers an opportunity to record two main variations on the name and identity of the hero's mother. The main source on this was the philologist Lysimachos (*BNJ* 382 F 8), whose production and date are much debated, even if it is safe to date his activity to the end of the third century BCE.¹²⁴³ Lysimachos focused, in his *Returns*, on the traditions of the heroes who were coming back home from Troy.¹²⁴⁴

The mention of Achilles immediately alludes to Thessaly, a region where Achilles was a national hero and embodied all the pan-Thessalian qualities, until the Imperial period.¹²⁴⁵ His genealogy is always linked to this region, despite many variations, so that it is not necessary to assume that quoting him must mean a specific interest in Thessalian matters.¹²⁴⁶ Furthermore, Thetis and Cheiron are also constantly located in Thessaly, just like the Actorids implied by the version followed by Daimachos, so that it might be misleading to force the evidence to infer a specific, strong interest in Thessalian history

1243 On these hypotheses, see Meliadò 2010 and *supra* 5.1.3.

1244 The work could not have been longer than two books; a fragment which quotes from its eleventh book is extremely doubtful (*BNJ* 382 F 12b: the doubts concern both the tradition of the number and the fact that in this fragment Lysimachos is talking about much later events, such as the destiny of Helen): cp. Schachter 2010 *ad BNJ* 382 F 12b.

1245 Westlake 1935: 43; Bouchon – Helly 2015: 248-9.

1246 On this current view, see e.g. Dognini 2000: 103 and Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 2. In particular, Zecchini (1997: 193) claims that Daimachos might have stressed this Thessalian tradition to support Pelopidas' Thessalian venture, which was strongly opposed in Thebes by the circle of Menekleidas (on this internal debate, see Buckler 1980: 145-50). The limited circulation of this version, in the absence of further evidence, however, does not authorize a contextual application to a Theban scenario.

and myths in Daimachos' work.¹²⁴⁷ The common denominator of the last two variants mentioned in the scholium is the mortal genealogy of Achilles, because Achilles can only be considered half-divine if his mother Thetis is Nereus' daughter, and thus a goddess.¹²⁴⁸ Against this διεσπαρμένην [...] δόξαν, Lysimachos presents his reader with two variations on Achilles' mother, the first of which can be reasonably assigned, on the basis of the text, to all the authors different from Daimachos, namely Soudas, Aristotle, the author of *Phrygian Histories*, and Dionysios of Chalkis. A brief consideration of their profiles might help us contextualize the place of Daimachos in this list of sources.

Soudas of Thessaly wrote *Thessalika* (BNJ 602 F 7) and possibly engaged in other literary genres; we have no direct evidence for the period of his activity.¹²⁴⁹ The only possible *terminus ante quem* before Strabo, who quoted Soudas, may be Lysimachos, who may have lived between the third and the second century BCE, but much lower estimates of Lysimachos' lifespan, not sensibly distant from Strabo, are considered by some scholars.¹²⁵⁰ Soudas' local history presents Cheiron as the mortal father of Thetis, because Soudas thought of all the centaurs as born of Ixion and as brothers of Peirithous (BNJ 602 FF 1ab).¹²⁵¹ This tradition is in line with the general rationalistic approach to myth in the fragments by "Suda" and may have a local origin of Thessaly, if it was recorded in his *Thessalian History*;¹²⁵² however, it may also have been present in his other works.

Aristotle of Chalkis' *Περί Εὐβοίας* (BNJ 423 F 2) is a further example of local history, which might surprise the contemporary reader, insofar as the detail on Thetis as Cheiron's daughter appeared in an essay on a different region than Thessaly, i.e. Euboea. The date of Aristotle is likewise unknown, but the available *terminus ante quem* is slightly earlier,

1247 Aston 2006: 350 and Aston 2009.

1248 This divine nature is debated, however: cp. Engels 2011a *ad* BNJ 65 F 2.

1249 Jacoby (1955a: 677) assigned to Soudas a work on universal history, on the basis of the current BNJ 602 F 2. This scholar also suggested the existence of a *Genealogy* (cp. BNJ 602 F 4), but Williams (2013) is now skeptical on the presence of titles other than his *Thessalian Histories*.

1250 Str. 7.7.12.329 (= BNJ 602 F 11a); Str. *Epit.* 2,72 Kramer (= BNJ 602 F 11b).

1251 Cp. Jacoby 1955a: 678, who signals the novelty of Soudas in this context: Pindar was already aware of a tradition where Cheiron was the son of Ixion (*Pyth.* 2.35-7). Ixion reigned over the Thessalian Lapiths as a mortal (BNJ 602 F 1b). For this reading, see also Engels n.d. *ad* JC IV 1773 F 12.

1252 For this interpretation of the production of Soudas, see Williams 2013. Jacoby (1955a: 679) doubted the presence of a "blosser rationalismus", since he suggested a logical organization among diverse genealogies. Information in the *Thessalian History*: Zecchini 1997: 193.

because it appears that Archemachos of Euboeia, who worked in the first half of the third century BCE, drew on a tradition already produced by our Aristotle.¹²⁵³ We can possibly accept the suggestion of Sprawski (2010 *ad BNJ* 423 F 2) that a decisive role was played by the short distance between Euboea and Magnesia, the Thessalian region that possessed both a Hellenistic cult of Cheiron¹²⁵⁴ and the Promontory of Sepias, sacred to Thetis and to the Nereids.¹²⁵⁵

Lysimachos' reference to an anonymous "Author of *Phrygian Histories*"¹²⁵⁶ indirectly supports the rationalistic reading of Achilles' lineage. A recent reconsideration of the writings transmitted with the title *Φρύγιοι λόγοι* has shown how they are characterized by a series of recurring features: they refer to an anonymous or pseudo-epigraphic literature, which never deals with Phrygian history or culture. Rives (2005) noticed that, first of all, these writings always record or support an allegorical and/or euhemeristic interpretation of the myth, by humanizing gods and semidivine heroes¹²⁵⁷ (as in the current fragment, on a mortal Achilles); secondly, these Phrygian writings may have received their name from the alleged antiquity of the Phrygians, who were known as the first men, as shown at its best by the well-known experiment of Psammetichus in Herodotus (2.2).¹²⁵⁸

The first witness of a *Phrygian Poem* was Dionysios Scitobrachion, who lived in the third century BCE and assigned the fictitious authorship of Timotheus of Troy to the poem;¹²⁵⁹ unfortunately, we cannot sensibly infer consequences from this, but we can determine, in

1253 See Sprawski 2009 and Sprawski 2010 *ad BNJ* 423 F 3, after Wilamowitz 1895: 91–2. Sprawski notes that Archemachos might depend on Aristotle for the tradition of a migration of Abantes from Thrace to Euboea, when the Boiotians were contextually moving from Thessaly to Boiotia (*BNJ* 424 FF 1 and 8).

1254 Cp. Aston 2006: 355–8 on this cult.

1255 Hdt. 7.191, with Aston 2006: 358 and Vannicelli 2017: 537–8. According to a tradition that Pindar may already know, there was an actual cult place, the *Thetideion*: Pherekydes, *BNJ* 3 F 1a; Suidas, *BNJ* 602 F 6; Str. 9.5.6.431; Pol. 18.20.6; Plut. *Pel.* 31–2.

1256 *BNJ* 800 F 12 (ὁ τοὺς Φρυγίους λόγους γράψας). This fragment does not confirm that Aristotle also wrote *Phrygian Histories* (so Susemihl 1892: 385 and Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 1). The list strongly distinguishes between Aristotle, whose apposition is ὁ περὶ Εὐβοίας πεπραγματευμένος, and ὁ τοὺς Φρυγίους λόγους γράψας: this second periphrasis emphasizes the anonymous character of much of this production.

1257 On these tendencies, cp. Rives 2005: 236–7.

1258 Rives 2005: 239–41. On Herodotus' chapter, see Vannicelli 1997 and Gera 2003: 68–111.

1259 Diod. Sic. 3.67.5: τὴν Φρυγίαν ὀνομαζομένην ποιήσιν; on this quote, see Rives 2005: 224–5, also for a date of Dionysios *ca.* 270–20 BCE.

the present fragment, that Lysimachos' quote represents in itself a *terminus ante quem*¹²⁶⁰ for a text which probably mentioned Thetis. However, this work can not be understood as a local history of Phrygia, since the books corresponding to these characteristics were generally assigned different titles; Rives' suggestion excludes that these *Phrygian Stories* may immediately refer to the region.¹²⁶¹

Dionysios of Chalkis is no less obscure than the other figures: his suggested dates range from the fifth to the second century BCE.¹²⁶² This historian may coincide with a man who was honoured in Samos at the end of the fourth century BC.¹²⁶³ Moreover, this period aligns with an identification with the Dionysios who lived in the years of Roxane and Callippus, according to Syncellus.¹²⁶⁴ Despite the vast spread of this personal name, we have no explicit contrary indications against an early date. For our scope, it is important to remark on both the vast variety of topics covered in his fragments and their probable early date: this chronological scenario puts Dionysios on a potentially coterminous stage with the Aristotle who wrote a *Περί Εὐβοίας*.

Daimachos is quoted, then, among authors who, despite the uncertainties surrounding their date, were placed from the end of the fourth century BCE to the end of the third century (if we include the earlier lifespan hypothesized for Lysimachos). The general characteristics of the list indirectly infer a possibly strict chronological order in Lysimachos, even though it is not enough to conclude more on the exact lifespan of Daimachos.¹²⁶⁵ The characteristics of the production of these authors, finally, indicate that

1260 Rives 2005: 225.

1261 Rives 2005: 234-5: "A number of scholars have taken it for granted that any work described as "Phrygian" must have something to do with the cult of Cybele, but almost nothing in the evidence itself suggests any connection either with the goddess herself or with her attendants and associates such as Attis or the Korybantes."

1262 *JC* IV 1773 F 12 = *FHG* IV 394, F 6. Fifth century BCE: Rühl 1888: 119-21. Second century BCE: cp. Korenjak *ad JC* V 2048 (Dionysus is quoted at v. 115 of Pseudo-Scymnius' *Periegesis*). See the general overview by Engels n.d., "Einleitung" *ad JC* IV 1773.

1263 Text of the inscription: McCabe – Brownson – Ehrman 1986: 12 (n.27). Same historian: Habicht 1957: 198-9; Schachter 2012b *ad BNJ* 382 F 9.

1264 Syncellus 520,11-2 = *JC* IV 1773 T 6. Engels (n.d. *ad loc.*) is skeptical on this identification and prefers equating this Dionysus with the Dionysus of Corinth who wrote *Aitia*.

1265 Cp. e.g. Engels n.d. (*ad JC* IV 1773 F 12): "Die Apollonios-Scholien haben uns [...] ein wahres Zitatennest überliefert [...], wenn es freilich auch sehr schwer ist, aus dieser Passage präzisere Rückschlüsse auf die chronologische Verortung des Dionysios zu ziehen."

the only possible common ground was the euhemerizing representation of Achilles and not the fact that they were all local historians. Consequently, we must read the tradition conveyed by Daimachos in a context where all these authors see Thetis as a mortal woman and understand this variation.

5.3.2. Philomela as the Mother of Achilles

The same tradition on Achilles as the son of Peleus and the Actorid was retold by Staphylos of Naucratis (*BNJ* 269), an ethnographer who wrote *On Thessaly* before Apollodoros of Athens (second century BCE).¹²⁶⁶ Staphylos claimed that Peleus married two daughters of Actor: from his first wife, Eurydike, he had a daughter, Polydora (*BNJ* 269 F 5);¹²⁶⁷ Achilles was born of Philomela, his second wife, despite the general belief that his mother was Thetis (*BNJ* 269 F 4). Staphylos claims that Cheiron acted as an intercessor in Peleus' wedding:

“And Staphylos in the third book of *On Thessaly* says that Cheiron, being wise and skilled in astronomy, since he wanted to make Peleus illustrious, sent for Philomela, the daughter of Actor the Myrmidon, and put around a rumour that Peleus was going to marry Thetis and that Zeus would give her to him, and that the gods would come with rain and storm. Having spread this rumour, he awaited the time in which there would be much rain and violent winds, and gave Philomela to Peleus. And thus the rumour prevailed.”¹²⁶⁸

1266 On the different Philomelas, see Fowler 2013: 537-9. For the relationship between Staphylos and Apollodoros of Athens, cp. Str. 10.4.6.475-6 (= *BNJ* 269 F 12), which must come from Apollodoros, even if Pitcher 2008 prudently observes that “his [Staphylus’] date is a matter of speculation”. The title of his *On Thessaly* is variously transmitted (*BNJ* 269 FF 4-6: Περὶ Θεσσαλίας, Θεσσαλικά and Περὶ Θετταλῶν), and it is hard to know which variant was the original one: Pitcher 2008, *ad* F 6, leans towards an original Π. Θετταλῶν, on a comparative basis. Staphylos also wrote Περὶ Ἀθηνῶν (F 1), Περὶ Αἰολέων (F 2) and Περὶ Ἀρκάδων (F 3).

1267 Staphylos, *BNJ* 269 F 5. Polydora is already mentioned as Peleus' daughter in the *Iliad* (16.175), whereas Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 62) presents her as Actor's nephew.

1268 *BNJ* 269 F 4, tr. L.V. Pitcher, with slight modifications. For Cheiron's intervention, cp. the central layer of the François vase, the notorious Attic crater (first quarter of the sixth century BCE) found in Chiusi and created by Kleitias and Ergotimos (among the overwhelming scholarship, see Torelli 2007 and the contributions in Shapiro – Iozzo – Lezzi

As suggested by Jacoby (1926a: 5), the starting point of these local traditions was the mention of Polydora as Peleus' daughter in three verses of the *Iliad* (16.173-5, on Menesthius, the son of Polydora and Spercheius). For the Archaic period, the iconography of the François vase concentrates on other events of Peleus' life and only emphasizes the union with Thetis, whereas the *Catalogue of Women* may anticipate the idea of a double union, possibly under necessity to explain the fatherhood of Polydora.¹²⁶⁹ It seems that here Peleus met his first wife in the Phthia,¹²⁷⁰ and the mother of Polydora committed suicide (to allow/give space for a second union?) before Peleus married Thetis and begot Achilles from the nymph.¹²⁷¹

Despite some probably irrelevant variations on the genealogical relationship between the first mortal woman and Actor,¹²⁷² the association between Polymela and the Thessalian man is constant in the fifth century BCE: Pindar, for instance, imagines Polydora as the daughter of Polymela, Actor's nephew,¹²⁷³ whereas Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 FF 61 abc) gives a

– Hafter 2013; for the place of the wedding in the figurative program of the vase, see still Stewart 1983, despite the contemporary refusal of Stewart's comparison with Stesichoros).

1269 The *Cypria* (FF 3-4 West, *GEF*) also touched the wedding of Peleus and Thetis and the interception of Cheiron. On the description of the event in the *Catalogue of Women*, see March 1987: 7, who comments on FF 209 and 213 M. – W. In the first case, we should infer that Peleus comes to Iolkos from Phthia, because Hesiod allegedly mentioned his daughter Polydora, called Kleodora solely by the Homeric philologist Zenodotus; in the second scenario, we learn that Acastus purified Peleus. This action was necessary after the voluntary killing of Eurytion, Actor's son, during a hunt in Phthia (Pind. F 48 S. – M.; Xen. *Cyn.* 1; Apollod. 3.163).

1270 Phthia is quoted for the first time by Hom. *Il.* 1.155. It cannot be considered a city or a centre, nor does it seem that the site, maybe a region at the beginning, has any historical settlement (see Decourt – Nielsen – Helly 2004: 678 n.4, who include it among the Thessalian toponyms, which cannot be studied in the *IACP*). Consequently, Phthia is mostly an imagined place, linked with Thetis (cp. e.g. Pind. *Nem.* 4.81), and its association with Achilles does not justify an identification with Pharsalos (Westlake 1935: 11-2; Williams 2012 *ad BNJ* 602 F 6).

1271 The present reconstruction, with the suicide, is a hypothesis that has no specific correspondence in the extant fragments of the *Catalogue* (March 1987: 20), but it assumes that the *Catalogue* lies behind the version of Apollodoros' *Library* (3.164-5). Here Astydamia, the wife of Peleus' guest, Akastos, falls in love with Peleus, but her love is not returned; she then lies to Peleus' wife, Antigone (Actor's nephew, as in Pherekydes *BNJ* 3 FF 61b-c: see sequent n.), by telling her that Peleus is going to marry Sterope, Acastus' daughter. Consequently, Antigone hangs herself.

1272 Antigone, Eurytion's daughter, i.e. Actor's nephew: Hes. *Cat.* F 213 M. – W., but see *infra* in text; Pherekydes, *BNJ* 3 FF 61bc; Apollod. 3.163. Eurydice, Actor's daughter: Staphylos, *BNJ* 269 F 5. Polymela, Actor's daughter: Pind. F 48 S. – M., but see *infra* n.1273; Eust. *ad Il.* 2.684, p. I 499,18 van der Valk. Only the scholium T on *Il.* 16.175c, which starts from these traditions, recalls a Polydora as Laodamia's daughter and Aktaion's nephew (Suidas *BNJ* 602 F 8a).

1273 Pind. F 48 S. – M. Pindar's fragment is quoted by Aristides (*Or.* 2.168, with the corresponding scholium [3.463-4 Dindorf]: on the textual problems, see van der Kolf 1938 and Zwicker 1952), but it is not entirely clear: it may even assume that Achilles and Polydora had the same mother. This is the text edited by Snell – Maehler: τὸν Εὐρυτίωνα, τὸν

different name for the mother, Antigone, but also claims that Polymela was Actor's nephew. The overall tendency, however, i.e. a mortal woman (Polymela) followed by a divine one (Thetis) with children of a different nature, remains constant.

Daimachos, then, accepted a rare genealogy for Achilles' mother and, in doing so, he may have preceded Staphylos. The true innovative trait is the consideration of an Actorid not as the first wife of Peleus, but as the second figure, the mother of Achilles. For this reason, Staphylos' anecdote on the deification of Philomela, once paralleled with Peisistratos' ruse of Phye in Athens (Hdt. 1.60.4–5),¹²⁷⁴ invites us to investigate the reasons why the Actorids had become so attached and intertwined with Achilles' genealogy.

On the basis of the occurrence of Philomela in local history, like Staphylos' *On Thessaly*, this focus on the genealogical relationship between Achilles and Actor draws our attention to the Thessalian area. The kinship tie was enhanced through a duplication of its grounds, as Staphylos explicitly claims, by claiming that both Peleus' first wife, Eurydike, and the second one, Philomela, were Actor's daughters. We have no means to prove whether Daimachos anticipated Staphylos concerning Peleus' wife, but this possibility must be considered, because Peleus is constantly associated with an Actorid in his first wedding.

5.3.3. Daimachos, Thessaly, and a Universal History

Achilles' birth from Peleus and Philomela does not necessarily refer to Thessaly, if we consider the complex web of events linked to Peleus and his son. In fact, a possible link with the previous fragment of Daimachos (F 1) is Peleus' participation in the Kalydonian boar hunt, an event which preceded his wedding with Thetis and is often associated with

τοῦ Ἴρου τοῦ Ἄκτορος παῖδα, ἕνα ὄντα τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν, συνθηρεύοντα ἄκων ἀπέκτεινε Πηλεΐς [...] συγγενὴς τούτου ἦν. Πηλεΐς γὰρ πρὸ Θέτιδος θυγατέρα Ἄκτορος τὴν Πολυμήλαν εἶχε γυναῖκα (“During a communal hunt, Peleus involuntarily killed Eurytion, one of the Argonauts and son of Iro and of Actor [...]; he was his relative, because Peleus had a wife, before Thetis, namely Polymela, Actor's daughter”, tr. S. Tufano). It is interesting to remark how the historian Pisander (BNJ 16 F 2) says that Polydora gave birth to two Argonauts, Idas and Lynceus.

1274 For this option and other possible parallels to the models implied by the anecdote in Staphylos BNJ 269 F 4, cp. Pitcher 2008 *ad loc.* and Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 1; Engels n.d. *ad JC* IV 1773 F 12.

this union in the figurative and literary sources on Peleus.¹²⁷⁵ The mention of Kalydon in F 1 may be linked to this myth, because Peleus is always mentioned in the hunt, both in the literary and in the iconographic sources. Alternatively, we may recall here the curious diffusion in Elis of Thessalian toponyms and characters,¹²⁷⁶ even if this second option remains relatively less solid (both local contexts are equally valid).

In the second place, we might indicate another scenario, connected with the vast fame of Peleus' wedding to Thetis. This event was an inexorable part of Peleus' myth, and, as such, was probably present in Daimachos' work, maybe in an explanation of the new name of Philomela. Philodemus, for instance, dealt with this myth in his *Περί εὐσεβείας*, in a fragment where he lingers on the reasons for the initial refusal of Thetis to marry Zeus. Peleus' characterization often centered on his devotion and piety:¹²⁷⁷ when he is chosen to marry Thetis in the *Iliad*, this decision is a compromise between Zeus, who is angry at Thetis for her refusal to have sexual intercourse with him, and Hera, who is benevolent towards Thetis and wants the best for her,¹²⁷⁸ i.e. the mortal Peleus.¹²⁷⁹ These features may suggest a possible, original location of this material in Daimachos' *On Piety* (F 7).

Uncertain as this second hypothesis might sound, it must be remembered that the unifying characteristic of Lysimachos' *Zitatennest* is that *all* these authors humanized Achilles, whereas the other four writers cannot be reduced to a single literary genre. Finally, we can claim that, as hard as it may be to imagine an original context for the fragment in Daimachos' work, the author probably innovated by accepting and reproducing a quite rare version on Achilles' cradle. This version enforced the usual Thessalian ties of Achilles and Peleus, while offering a different perspective on the Homeric hero.

1275 Literary sources constantly associate Peleus, Meleagros, and Athalas (Vollkommer 1994: 252; Kreuzer 2013: 110 n.29). They occupy an important position in the figurative program among the twenty-two participants of the hunt who are represented on the François vase (Torelli 2013: 90); on the representation of Peleus as a participant to this event, cp. Brommer 1973 (vases A1, A5, A7, and A14; doubtful A2); March 1987: 38; Vollkommer 1994: 254-5.

1276 Among the Thessalian figures, Actor is a friend of the immortal king Augias (Ruggeri 2004: 86).

1277 Philodemus, B 7241-50 Obbink. Cp. Pind. *Isthm.* 8.27-45 and March 1987: 9-10.

1278 Hom. *Il.* 18.249-34; 24.59-61; *Cypria* F 3 West, *GEF*; [Hes.] F 210 M.-W. On these passages, cp. March 1987: 8-9.

1279 Despite the reluctant reaction of the goddess, a detail correctly underlined by Larson 2001: 71-2.

5.4. Daimachos F 3

Previous editions: *BNJ* 65 F 6; *FGrHist* 65 F 6 (Diog. Laert. 1.30).

Δαίμαχος δ' ὁ Πλατωνικός καὶ Κλέαρχος φιάλην ἀποσταλῆναι ὑπὸ Κροίσου
Πιπτακῶι, καὶ οὕτω περιενεχθῆναι

1 Δαίμαχος δ' ὁ Πλαταιῖκός Dorandi Δαίμαχος Casaubon Jacoby Δαίδοχος Wehrli (1948)
δαίδαχος BPF¹ δαίδαλος F² πλατωνικός Wehrli (1948) Πλαταιῖκός Casaubon Jacoby Engels
πλατωνικός BPF Κλέταρχος B

“The Platonic Daimachos and Clearchos say that the bowl had been given to Croesus by Pittakos, and that it had been sent around in this way” (tr. S. Tufano).

5.4.1. Textual Transmission and Context

The current fragment comes from the *Life of Thales* by Diogenes Laertius (1.22–44); the link with the tradition here recalled is provided by the association of Thales with the Seven Wisemen. The name of the first source mentioned on this detail is variously transmitted, but the correction Δαίμαχος, which allows us to include it in our material, does not seem particularly invasive or disrespectful of the textual tradition.¹²⁸⁰ The ensuing adjective has raised more issues despite the fact that πλατωνικός is unanimously transmitted by our codices. Casaubon suggested that we correct it with Πλαταιῖκός and Wehrli accepted this

1280 The name was first read as *Δαίδοχος by Wehrli (1948), who was trying to find an alternative to the transmitted *Δαίδαχος, also otherwise unknown. In the second edition of the fragments of Clearchos, however, Wehrli (1969a) opted for the correction Δαίμαχος, already suggested by Casaubon (1583: 11): this slight conjecture is not invasive and should be accepted. The unlikely Δαίδαλος, introduced by the reader F² (XIII c. *ex.* – XIV c. *in.*) on manuscript F (=Laur. 69,13; XIII c.), was probably elicited by the general poor quality and superficiality of the original hand of ms. F. Curiously enough, Cobet (1850) printed Δαίδαλος δ' ὁ Πλατωνικός, probably because of his penchant for codex F (cp. Dorandi 2013: 14–5). On this manuscript and on its characteristics, see Dorandi 2009: 67–78 and Dorandi 2013: 3.

correction in his second edition of the text as a fragment of Clearchos (Wehrli 1969a). In his previous edition of Clearchos, however, Wehrli maintained the transmitted πλατωνικός (Wehrli 1948). Jacoby simply followed Casaubon, who believed it necessary to correct the form to Δαίμαχος ὁ Πλαταικός (with one iota). Casaubon’s view was that this Daimachos had to be the same author

cuius auctoritate vititur Plutarchus, in extremo vitarum Solonis & Poplicolæ, eiusque est apud Athenæum¹²⁸¹ mentio (Casaubon 1583: 11).

However, the fragment in Plutarch’s *Lives* presents Daimachos as a Πλαταιεύς. Even if the quote most probably refers to the same Daimachos who wrote history in the fourth century BCE, it would then seem methodically invasive to also intervene on the transmitted πλατωνικός,¹²⁸² an adjective also used elsewhere by Diogenes Laertius.¹²⁸³ Another problem with Casaubon’s correction is that the ethnic πλαταικός, used to describe an origin from Plataia, is controversial and generally rarer than πλαταιεύς.¹²⁸⁴ The correction continues to be successful (see Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 6), for the difficulty caused by a definition of Daimachos as “Platonic”: this may result, according to Engels, from the contrast with the close mention of the well-known peripatetic Clearchos of Soloi (F 70 Wehrli).

This description does not literally mean that Daimachos was a pupil of Plato, even if, on a mere chronological basis, this were not entirely absurd, since, if Daimachos preceded

1281 I.e. our F 4 and F 5.

1282 Plut. *Comp. Sol. et Publ.* 27.1 = Daimachos, F 7. Dorandi (2013 *ad loc.*) mentions a written note by von der Muehll, according to whom “*sed considerandum num Δαίδαλος ὁ Πλατωνικός verum sit (sic Cobet).*” After Wehrli’s first edition (1948), this is the last modern defence of the transmitted πλατωνικός, even if it is unlikely that Δαίδαλος can be preserved.

1283 Hermodoros (1.2) and Pamphilos (10.14) are two notable cases.

1284 Only twice is this adjective used to describe the provenance of a person (Lys. 3.5; Aeschin. *In Ctes.* 162), whereas the other instances of πλαταικός more probably describe the attachment to Plataia or a collocation (Hdt. 9.25.1; Philaemon *PCG* F 115,4 K. – A.; Plut. *Arist.* 11.6; Paus. 4.27.10; Poll. *Onom.* 10.182). The adjective is also rarely used to define the speeches on Plataia written by Isocrates (*Rhetorica anonyma de inventione* 7.54 Walz; cp. section **Tit.** in Mandilaras 2003: 72) and by Hyperides (F 10 Burt = Plut. *De glor. Ath.* 8.350B); Herodotus also uses τὰ Πλαταικά to mean “what happened in Plataia” (8.38.2; 126,1; cp. Plut. *de Hdt. mal.* 35.868F: Ἡρόδοτος [...] ἐν τοῖς Πλαταικοῖς). These occurrences would then substantiate Stephanus’ use of the adj. in the identification of ἡ χώρα Πλαταική (π 176, s.v. Πλαταιαί).

Ephoros (T 1), he would have had time to attend Plato’s lectures (427–347 BCE).¹²⁸⁵ The definition of Daimachos as “Platonic” probably dates back to Diogenes Laertius, either through his immediate source, who already associated Daimachos to Clearchos, or as a result of Diogenes’ own assumption.¹²⁸⁶ Moreover, Clearchos was widely known as Aristotle’s pupil¹²⁸⁷ and the restitution of his name, next to Daimachos’ one, is an irrefutable fact.¹²⁸⁸

5.4.2. Daimachos and The Tradition on the Seven Wisemen

The Seven Wisemen were legendary and historical characters, associated by a tradition that set their meeting in a symposium where they uttered wise sayings and participated in an internal contest to determine who was the wisest among them.¹²⁸⁹ This contest consisted of an exhibition of demureness, a progressive refusal of every figure to receive a precious gift (a tripod or a cup), as the prize for the wisest man in the world. Finally, most sources assume that this gift came back to the first receiver, who dedicated it to Apollo.¹²⁹⁰

The tradition, in its first nucleus, may have developed in Delphi in the sixth century BCE, since the final dedicatee is Apollo and the earliest references in Herodotus hint at this ideological climate.¹²⁹¹ Herodotus, in fact, remembers this meeting of σοφισταί,¹²⁹² who

1285 So Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 6; in fact, the adjective does not necessarily imply a direct discipleship.

1286 The second alternative is less likely, for the doxographical character of the *Lives*, which depend on previous collections of materials for this subject (cp. Busine 2002: 55–6 and Engels 2010: 34–5).

1287 Clearchos’ discipleship and his origin from Soloi are among the few details we possess on his historical figure. See the recent discussion of Tsitsiridis 2013: 1–8, including the inscription from Ai-Khanoum of the early third century BCE (*editio princeps*: Robert 1968), where Clearchos is described as a scribe of wise sayings.

1288 We cannot know for certain whether, as Wehrli (1969a) suggested, Clearchos’ fragment belonged to his two books of *Sayings* or to another of his 16 titles. Busine (2002: 80–1) alternatively suggested, as a possible context, Clearchos’ Περὶ βίων, because Clearchos may have presented the Seven Wisemen as exemplary figures to follow (other pupils of Aristotle, moreover, introduced them in similar works).

1289 This present outline follows, in its simplest scheme, the general patterns recognized by Engels 2010: 9–13 (sayings, anecdotes as the one on the ἀγών σοφίας and the symposium). However, there were many variations that extended beyond the mere identity of these Seven men: a concise synopsis of them can be seen in a table at Busine 2002: 57.

1290 There is abundant scholarship on this subject; see at least Busine 2002 (*ibid.* 11–4, on previous scholarship) and Engels 2010.

1291 The Delphic origin of this myth was first put forward by Wilamowitz (1890: 198), and further developed by Busine 2002: 37–8; Engels 2010: 11–2; Leão 2010: 405–6. Herodotus recalls the meetings of Croesus and Solon (1.29–33)

were summoned by Croesus, the king of Lydia (1.29–33).¹²⁹³ Even if, therefore, only the first Platonic dialogues explicitly confirm this tradition and the reciprocal connection among these characters,¹²⁹⁴ the story might have been much earlier and widespread before the beginning of the fourth century BCE. Indeed, other sources before Herodotus seem to assume a competition among these figures, as a passage by Herakleitos on the superiority of Bias' σοφία over other people might confirm.¹²⁹⁵

At the beginning of the fourth century BCE, Plato tried to order this material: in his *Protagoras* (342E–343B), he offers a list of the Seven Wisemen;¹²⁹⁶ in his later *Timaeus* (20D), he probably adopts an Athenian strand, for the greater role played here by Solon (ὁ τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφώτατος Σόλων).¹²⁹⁷ Andron of Ephesos, a pupil of Plato, then, mentioned the agon motif in his *Tripod* (*JC* IV 1005 F 2), which may be both the first literary occurrence of the passage of the tripod among the Seven characters, and of Periander in the list. Andron's version differs from the later ones, because the symbolic

and of Croesus and Thales (75); Biantes and Pittakos were questioned by Croesus on the military condition of the Greek islands (27). Periander, the tyrant of Corinth, might be absent for the negative traditions on the Cypselids (Busine 2002: 21–2), whereas the seer Chilon, who utters a prophecy against Peisistratos (Hdt. 1.59), may be the victim of a Lacedaemonian stance against him (Busine 2002: 24–5).

1292 On the vague semantics of σοφιστής in the second half of the fifth century BCE, see *supra* 4.6.2 *ad* χρήματα μέν αιτήσας.

1293 On this meeting, where Herodotus only focuses on the dialogue of Croesus and Solon, see Busine 2002: 17–9.

1294 Pl. *Hp. mai.* 281C (Pittakos, Biantes, and Thales); *Prt.* 343A (Thales, Pittakos, Biantes, Solon ὁ ἡμέτερος, Kleoboulos, Myson, and Cheilon). Therefore, Fehling (1985: 9–13) argued that Plato created the story of this meeting, but this date contrasts both with the hints in previous sources and with the prudent consideration of the coexistence of written and oral culture in the fifth century BCE.

1295 Herakleitos, DK 22 B 39 (= F 100 Marcovich, Diog. Laert. I 88): ἐν Πριήνῃ Βίας ἐγένετο ὁ Τευτάμεω, οὗ πλείων λόγος ἢ τῶν ἄλλων, “Biantes, the son of Teutames, was born in Priene and his fame is vaster than that of the others” (tr. S. Tufano). Engels (2010: 11) accepted an agonistic reading of this fragment, as if the other Wisemen were alluded to, but I would not exclude a simpler reference to the other citizens of Priene; all we can positively assume is that it represents an “esempio di πολυμαθία positiva” (Fronterotta 2013: 178).

1296 In the list of the *Protagoras*, the otherwise obscure Myson of Chen probably substitutes the tyrant Periander: so Engels (2010: 14; cp. Leão 2010: 410–1), after Diod. Sic. 9.7 and Paus. 10.24.1. It could be, as argued by Engels, that the absence of Periander was due to Plato's hostility towards tyrants; however, the presence of Cleoboulos would indicate that it was more likely a specific negative stance against Periander. Moreover, Busine (2002: 35) suggested that Plato inserted Myson, because Hipponax (F 65 Degani) claimed that Apollo declared Myson to be the wisest man (καὶ Μύσων, ὄν ὤπόλλων/ ἀνεῖπεν ἀνδρῶν σωφρονέστατον πάντων). However, we must consider that the *Protagoras* is strongly indebted to an Athenian reading of this traditional nucleus, and Myson may be generically present without a specific secondary meaning.

1297 Cp. Busine 2002: 36 and Leão 2010: 412–3.

acknowledgement of wisdom does not come from a king but rather, is a common decision made by the Argives: only later would the prize be a casual finding of the fishers.¹²⁹⁸

In the fourth century BCE, different traditions circulated on this common legend: Aristotle and his school, for example, seem to have been particularly interested in the study of the Seven Wisemen and of their world.¹²⁹⁹ This interest may be partially explained by the role of Thales in the Aristotelian reconstruction of the history of philosophy and with the fascination for a model of gnomic and Delphic wisdom, in contraposition to the views expressed by the Sophists and by Plato.¹³⁰⁰ The composition of *Politeiai* on the whole oikoumene, besides, meant the gathering of local traditions where the weight of a single figure, as is shown by Solon in Plato's *Timaeus* or by Aristodemos in Andron, reveals how much an originally Panhellenic story can echo and reverberate in local audiences.¹³⁰¹

Likely before Clearchos, Dikaiarchos of Messene signalled the constant presence of Thales, Biantes, Pittakos,¹³⁰² and Solon, despite the still ambiguous and fluctuating status of this list.¹³⁰³ In the same years, Demetrios of Phaleron put forward what would later become the paradigmatic list of the Seven Wisemen, and argued that the Seven men met in Delphi during the archonship of Damasias in Athens in 582/1 BCE.¹³⁰⁴ It is then clear that Pittakos

1298 This version, where the gift is a fortuitous finding by the fishers (see e.g. Plut. *Sol.* 4.3–8), seems to draw on Archaic narrative models (compare, for instance, the story of the accidental discovery of Polykrates' ring in Hdt. 3.39–43). Nevertheless, it is not impossible that its origin dates back to the fourth century, according to Busine 2002: 43–4, *spec.* 44: “La légende fut également remplacée, toutes proportions gardées, dans un monde archaïque idéal. À cette occasion, la *syllogè* récupéra d'anciennes légendes locales à son propre compte et hérita d'un fonds moral primitif déjà ancré dans la mentalité grecque à l'époque d'Hésiode”.

1299 Cp. F 8 R. of Aristotle, from his *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας*; Busine 2002: 49–52. Also his *Πυθιονικαί*, written with Kallisthenes, may deal with the Seven (Engels 2010: 18).

1300 The contraposition between the cultural model conveyed by the Seven Wisemen and the sophists is already in Plato (Busine 2002: 34; Leão 2010: 407). For this interpretation of the peripatetic interest in this topic, see Engels 2010: 18–9.

1301 On how local audiences engage with this story, see briefly Busine 2002: 37–8 and 59–60.

1302 Pittakos, Biantes, and Thales are already together in a short list of the *Hippias Maior* (281C), considered a “proto-list” of the Seven Wisemen by Busine 2002: 31–2.

1303 Dikaiarchos F 38 Mirhady = Diog. Laert. I 41. In the same moment, Ephoros (*BNJ* 70 F 181) excluded Thales from the meeting with Croesus, maybe on chronological grounds (Parker 2011 *ad loc.*), and included for the first time a foreigner, Anacharsis (F 182).

1304 Paradigmatic list: F 87 Stork – van Ophuijsen – Dorandi = Stob. *Anth.* 3.1.172. Encounter of the Seven in Athens: F 93 Stork – van Ophuijsen – Dorandi = Diog. Laert. 1.22= *FGrHist* 228 F 1: καὶ πρῶτος σοφὸς ὠνομάσθη ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Δαμασίου, καθ' ὃν καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ σοφοὶ ἐκλήθησαν, ὡς φησι Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀρχόντων

was generally considered one of the Seven Wisemen, despite the hostility towards him by figures as diverse as Simonides and Alkaios.¹³⁰⁵

Alkaios' vehemence towards Pittakos, described as a *κακοπατρίδης τύραννος* (F 348,1 V.), probably found its roots in a rivalry among aristocratic clans, since Pittakos' political experience (*ca.* 650–570 BCE) cannot be described as an effective tyranny.¹³⁰⁶ His ten years as *αἰσυμνήτης* (597/6–587/6 BCE),¹³⁰⁷ in fact, originated from a request from some Lesbian aristocratic families after a long phase of internal strifes.¹³⁰⁸ He was chosen as an arbiter and an intermediate figure between opposite political factions. Pittakos decided to end his mandate after the regular period: Diodorus (9.11.1) and Aristotle (*Pol.* 1274b18–23) confirm that, apart from his laws against the abuse of alcohol, Pittakos freed Mytilene from the three great evils of the civil war, from conflict, and from tyranny.

Traditionally, moreover, Pittakos was seen both as one of the Seven Wisemen and as one of the famous lawgivers, like Solon and Carondas, who lived between the seventh and the sixth centuries BCE. Aristotle actually mentions Pittakos in the final chapter of the second

ἀναγραφή, “[Thales] was the first to be called ‘wise’, during Damasius’ archonship in Athens, when the Seven men were also called, as is attested by Demetrios of Phaleron in his *List of the Archons*” (tr. S. Tufano). See Busine 2002: 40–1 on this fragment. Demetrios allegedly collected, for the first time, all the sayings of the Seven Men together with the obscure Sosiades, in his *Τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα* (Stob. 3.3.173; on these anthologies, see Busine 2002: 65–9; Funghi 2004; Maltomini 2008).

1305 Simonides F 260,11 Poltera. Simonides' position does not represent real hostility, but probably more of a dissent, according to the principle of the *χαλεπὸν ἔσθλὸν ἔμμεναι* (13); this saying by Pittakos (*τὸ Πιττάκειον*) is actually defined *σοφοῦ παρὰ φωτὸς εἰρημένον* (12–3: “the word of a wise man”; on the *Πιττάκεια*, see Engels 2010: 48 and Hölkeskamp 1999: 220, for their diffusion in the sixth century BCE). On Alkaios' hostility, see still Page 1959: 161–97.

1306 Aristotle defines *aisymnesy* as an *αἰρετὴ τυραννίς*, a “chosen tyranny” (*Pol.* 1284a31–2; 1285b26), since it is a monarchy different from the other four kinds, summarized in *Pol.* 1284b35–1285b32. The *aisymnetes* can be elected for life, for a limited period, or until he reaches a specific goal; the resulting scenario is confirmed by Alkaios' fragment, quoted by Aristotle in this context (F 348 V.): *τὸν κακοπάτριδα/ Πίττακον [...] ἐστάσαντο τύραννον μέγ' ἐπαινέοντες ἄλλες*, “they made Pittakos, a plebeian, a tyrant, wholly and highly praising him” (tr. S. Tufano). The use of *ἄλλες* supports an interpretation of the institute as favourable to the *demos* (see Meyer 1937: 588 and Gehrke 1985: 370 n.5), despite the different opinions of Berve (1967 I: 94) and Page (1959: 161–97). More generally, the *αἰσυμνήτης* is attested in the Archaic period in Megara, in the Megarian colonies, and in Ionia: the overall picture configures a public magistrate, associated with conflict resolution and lawgiving, with a possible commitment to musical performances, but many local differences must be taken into account. Cp. Faraguna 2005a and, on Aristotle, Visconti 2012.

1307 On this decade, see shortly Caciagli 2011: 305–6.

1308 Pittakos belonged to the Pentylids, who identified figures who ruled Mytilene, such as the tyrant Penthilos (Alkaios F 70 V.; Arist. *Pol.* 1311b27–30; Diog. Laert. 1.81, on Pittakos, as Penthilos' nephew).

book of his *Politics*,¹³⁰⁹ when he lists famous Archaic lawgivers, whereas Diogenes Laertius (1.79) draws on a tendency to align all of them to Solon's rich personality.¹³¹⁰ If we accept the possibility that Herodotus actually echoes the tradition, it is meaningful that Pittakos already goes to Croesus in the *Histories* and thus attests to the relevance of Croesus, both as a political figure and as a wiseman.

We cannot know whether Daimachos, before Ephoros, included the Scythian Anacharsis among the Seven men as a result of the strong interest of fourth century historiography in these θεοὶ ἄνδρες, marginal figures who, though external to the Greek world, were considered worthy of respect and partially admired.¹³¹¹ If, however, the list with Kallisthenes and Anaximenes has any value to Daimachos (T 1), we may signal here how Anaximenes dealt with this group of men (*BNJ* 72 F 22), by mentioning that they had all been considered poets – and Pittakos was among them, because, apart from a prose *On the Laws*, he allegedly wrote 600 verses. From this point of view, we detect another common interest among these three universal historians, whose works were amply exploited by Ephoros.

The isolation of the tradition accepted by Clearchos and Daimachos suggests a particular relevance for Pittakos, namely of his homeland, Mytilene. During the fourth century BCE, the city contributed to the liberation of Eresos and Antissa from the Spartans (380/89 BCE),¹³¹² before advocating for and entering into the Second Athenian League, where Mytilene was among the founding members, along with Rhodes, Chios, Methymna, and

1309 Arist. *Pol.* 1273b27-1274b28: Pittakos allegedly wrote laws but did not establish an organic and stable constitution (1274b18-23, *spec.* 18-19: ἐγένετο δὲ Πιττακὸς νόμων δημιουργὸς ἀλλ' οὐ πολιτείας). Diodorus (9.11.1) defines him as a νομοθέτης, but Hölkeskamp 1999: 221-6 diminished the relevance of these witnesses, since the approved laws would simply comply to a general moderation of the excesses of the local aristocracy.

1310 Busine 2002: 42-3. Diogenes Laertius also attributes Pittakos with an *On Laws* and a poem of 600 verses. On Pittakos as a poet, cp. also *Suda* π 1660, *s.v.* Πιττακός. His association with other Archaic lawgivers is underlined by Hölkeskamp 1999: 220.

1311 Camacho Rojo 1994: 538-9.

1312 Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.28-9; Diod. Sic. 14.94.3-4; Paus. 8.52.4 (the event may be chronologically closer to the battle of Knidos of 394 BCE: Gehrke 1985: 121). On the history of Mytilene, see at least Spencer 2000 and Caciagli 2011: 305-6; more specifically on the fourth century, after the general study on the fourth century Lesbos by Pistorius (1913) and the short overview by Gehrke (1985: 121-3), the only systematic overview is in the *IACP* (n. 798) by Hansen – Spencer – Williams (2004: 1026-8; on the democratic period, see shortly Robinson 2011: 178-9).

Byzantium.¹³¹³ Athens actually signed a treaty with Mytilene.¹³¹⁴ In these decades, the city had a democratic constitution, which was shortly interrupted by an oligarchy. Between the end of the fifties and the beginning of the following decade, this oligarchy was substituted by the tyranny of Kammys.¹³¹⁵ At the end of the forties, however, the city returned to the status of an Athenian ally.¹³¹⁶

The paucity of Daimachos' fragments and the contextual reception of an Athenian tradition in F 4 hinder our comprehension of the way in which this special relationship between Mytilene and Athens in the fourth century BCE may shed further ideological or political meaning to Pittakos' role. We can only appreciate the learned character of the presence of Mytilene in this Panhellenic legend.

Finally, the object given by Croesus, a φιάλη, naturally has an aristocratic meaning: even if the term for this gift varies in our sources, the drinking vessel hints at a sympotic environment. The association of these aristocratic men with the passage of a drinking cup recreates the social institution of the symposium.¹³¹⁷ The summoning at Croesus' place recalls other moments of gathering among aristocrats, such as the wedding of Agariste,

1313 RO 22,80 (=IG 2².43,80); Mytilene is included in the first group of allies, who were already members of the alliance, before the vote on the Aristotle decree at the beginning of 377 BCE (Cargill 1981: 38).

1314 IG 2².40 (autumn 378 BCE). A later decree (IG 2².107: 368 BCE) confirms military cooperation between Mytilene and Athens, for the previous decade (ll. 38–9: συν[διε-] πολέμη[σα]ν); see, however, Dreher 1995: 27–9 for a reconsideration of the meaning of the verb in this inscription).

1315 On Mytilene's democratic institutions, see IG 12.2.4,3; IG 2².107. The city was under a probouleutic democracy (sources and discussion in Hansen – Spencer – Williams 2004: 1028), but it is uncertain whether it enjoyed independence from Athens (Robinson 2011: 189). We infer from a series of passages by the Athenian rhetors (Dem. [13.8]: ὁ Μυτιληναίων δῆμος καταλέλυται; Dem. 15.19; Isoc. [Ep.] 8 *passim*), that by 353/2 BCE there was an oligarchic regime in Mytilene (the most certain *terminus ante quem* is 351/0 a.C.: Pistorius 1913: 52; Gehrke 1985: 122 e n.29). Kammys is mentioned by Dem. [40.37] (Καμμῦ τῶ τυραννοῦντι Μυτιλήνης; his tyranny has been dated to 349/8 BCE (Pistorius 1913: 53; Berve 1967 I: 336). He was probably expelled by the Athenian *strategos* Phaidros (Gehrke 1985: 122).

1316 Probably already from 347/6 BCE: IG 2².213. Despite the new, short lived tyranny of Diogenes, *ca.* 333 BCE (Arr. *Anab.* 2.1.5), we have many sources on the restoration of democracy between the forties and thirties; on some documents, we even have the noun δαμοκρατία (SEG XXXVI 750,3).

1317 See also Busine 2002: 60–4 on the possible comparison with the symposium and Gagné 2016 on the “sympotic symbol” of the *ekptomatiks*. In Phoenix of Kolophon, the object is a πελλίς (F 4,3 Powell, *Coll. Alex.*: the πελλίς is a cup, most often made of wood, as in Hom. *Il.* 16.642, and therefore Phoenix adds that this one was χρυσῆ); it is a ποτήριον for Eudoxos of Knidos (F 371 Lasserre = *JC* IV 1006 F 1) and Euanthes of Miletos (*FHG* III 2). Leandrios of Miletos, who, according to Diogenes Laertius (1.28), was Callimachus' source, used the same term φιάλη, but Callimachus (F 191,65–77 Pf.) speaks of an ἔκπωμα, a poetism (Polito 2006: 266). We can agree that “every sympotic vessel can embody the symposion by itself” (Gagné 2016: 212).

where the invited guests convened and disputed as part of a dialogue among peers (Hdt. 6.126–30): even if all the figures connected with the list of the Seven are not distinguished by their political commitments, their aristocratic stance is consistent and crosses all possible 23 candidates with the title of “Wiseman”, recalled by Diogenes Laertius in the first book of his *Lives*.¹³¹⁸

The tripod is an alternative to the *φιάλη* and signals a link, probably original, with the Delphic sanctuary.¹³¹⁹ Later, however, other Apollinean cults were associated with the tradition, including the Theban centre of Apollo Ismenios and that of Didyma.¹³²⁰ The very search of a chronological relationship between these two variations on the nature of the prize, might be idle and pointless because of the nature of these fluid traditions. It is wiser to indicate how Daimachos draws on and is inspired by a specific representation of the event, which resembles that of a symposium, already echoed in Herodotus, when Croesus invites the guests and creates a group of learned banqueters.¹³²¹

5.5. Daimachos F 4

Previous editions: *BNJ* 65 F 7; *FGrHist* 65 F 7 (Plut. *Comp. Sol. et Publ.* 27.1.111A).

τῶν μέντοι πολεμικῶν Σόλωνι μὲν οὐδὲ τὰ πρὸς Μεγαρεῖς Δαίμαχος ὁ Πλαταιεὺς μεμαρτύρηκεν, ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς διεληλύθαμεν

“Daimachos of Plataia does not actually credit Solon among his military ventures with the war against Megara, such as we have recounted it” (tr. S. Tufano).

1318 Cp. Engels 2010: 38 on this calculation.

1319 For the different meaning of these objects, cp. Sato 2012 *ad BNJ* 492 F 18.

1320 Busine 2002: 58–9.

1321 Busine 2002: 61–3. The Herodotean model works in Ephoros, despite a few discrepancies in the composition of his list (*ibid.* 72–3).

5.5.1. Solon versus Megara in Plutarch

Plutarch's *Life of Solon* is centered on the motif of σοφία,¹³²² since there are many traditional *topoi* and gnomic traditions in this life. Plutarch probably had in mind, here, commonplace books, a genre particularly beloved during the Second Sophistic.¹³²³ This specific philosophical allure also depends on the scarce historical knowledge of Solon, even if we consider the weight of the Attidographic production, unfortunately lost to us.¹³²⁴

Moreover, Plutarch availed himself to further sources in this Life, which integrated his reading of local Athenian historians. First of all, at least from the end of the fifth century BCE, the same verses of Solon were reread and used to speculate on the life and events of the historical lawgiver.¹³²⁵ This process of autoschediasm started as an antecedent of Classical democracy, when the slow construction of the democratic myth of Solon made him an appealing and contemporary topic.¹³²⁶ Second, we must consider Plutarch's knowledge of the *Constitution of Athens* written by Aristotle and, very probably, what Plutarch knew about Solon from local historiography written in other regions. Plutarch, in fact, appears to know some traditions that began as a response to the Athenian narrative of Solon.¹³²⁷ Finally, it is possible to infer knowledge of the literature on the Seven Wisemen in more than one passage of the *Life of Solon*:¹³²⁸ Plutarch probably knew the work of Hermippos of Smyrne,¹³²⁹ and Hermippos might be present even in the absence of an explicit mention.¹³³⁰

1322 Cp. e.g. Pelling 2004: 16.

1323 For this reading of the text, see Fernández-Delgado 2002 and de Blois 2006. Cp. *supra* 4.6.1 for the presence of literary genres of the Second Sophistic in Plutarch's *De Herodoti malignitate*.

1324 Piccirilli (1975: 68) suggested, in particular, the reading of Androtion and of Hermippos.

1325 On the meaning of this debate on the verses, see Rhodes 1981: 24.

1326 On the "democratic myth" of Solon, see Ruschenbusch 1958; Hansen 1989; Nicolai 2007: 14-5 and the contributions edited by Nagy – Noussia – Fantuzzi 2015.

1327 A meaningful quote is one from Hereas of Megara (Plut. *Sol.* 10,5 = *BNJ* 486 F 4), who may be dated to the end of the fourth century BCE, if we accept both that his life was in the years of Demetrios of Phaleron, and the identification with a *theoros* mentioned on an inscription of the early third century BCE (*IG* 7.39; cp. Liddel 2008 and, on Hereas' production, Tober 2018 *passim*).

1328 Cp. e.g. Plut. *Sol.* 3.8-4 (Solon among the Seven Wisemen and the ἀγῶν σοφίας); 12.7 (Epimenides among the Seven); 14.7 (comparison of different models of tyranny, between Pittakos and Solon); 27.1 (reliability of the tradition of a meeting between Solon and Croesus).

1329 Hermippos *JC* IV 1026 FF 14a (= *Sol.* 2.1) and b (= *Sol.* 1.2); 15 (= *Sol.* 11.1-2); 16b (= *Sol.* 5.2-3); 17 (= *Sol.* 6.1-7).

1330 On the sources of the *Life of Solon*, with skepticism on the use of intermediate authors, see Nicolai 2007: 11.

Jacoby (1926a: 3–4) therefore suggested that Daimachos dealt with this subject in a section on the Seven Wisemen, whose existence is confirmed by our F 3 on the delivery of the cup to Pittakos. The likely origin of the fragment of Daimachos from a doxographic work on the Seven, however, may cause a distortion in our appreciation of this fragment: Daimachos was more likely focusing on the debated issue of Solon’s role in the conquest of Salamis, as the use of τὰ πρὸς Μεγαρεῖς, “the wars against Megara”, clearly shows.

Plutarch is our more detailed source on the alleged conquest of Salamis by Solon at the beginning of the sixth century BCE.¹³³¹ He offers two versions of this event, which must be briefly reconsidered. In the first version, Solon challenges the ban to mention the Athenian loss of Salamis, which probably occurred around the middle of the seventh century BCE:¹³³² he pretends to be insane and publicly utters a long elegy of 100 verses, whose title is *Salamis*,¹³³³ to persuade the Athenians to restart military action against Megara (Plut. *Sol.* 8.1–3). Together with Peisistratos,¹³³⁴ then, Solon sends a fake deserter to Salamis to exort the citizens to kidnap the Athenian women who usually sacrifice to Demeter at Cape Colias (8,4); here, in the meantime, disguised men substitute the women, wait for the Salaminians, and finally defeat them, thus obtaining possession of the island (8.5–6).

In another version of the story (9), Solon was inspired by the Delphic oracle, which elicited a sacrifice to the heroes Periphemos and Kychreus of Salamis.¹³³⁵ Solon, then, carried out his attack twice: first, he lured the Megarians into an inlet, in front of Euboeia

1331 Other sources on Solon’s conquest of Salamis: Ael. *VH* 7.19; Polyaeus, *Str.* 1.20.2; Arist. [*Ath.Pol.*] 17.2 (if our interpretation is valid: see *infra* 5.5.2). According to the internal development of Plutarch’s *Life*, the war should be dated to around 600 BCE, but prudence is demanded on these relative chronological inferences (Lavelle 2005: 46).

1332 Plut. *Sol.* 8. This prohibition is probably in itself part of the narrative and hardly has a historical basis (Legon 1981: 101; Lavelle 2005: 35; Nicolai 2007: 5–6 n.8).

1333 Solon F 2 G. – P.² = FF 1–3 West, *IE*², on these fragments and on their performance, see Nicolai 2007: 11–4 and Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010: 203–16.

1334 The role of Peisistratos in this first version is generally undervalued, but he is introduced as the strongest advocate of the necessity of this commitment after the performance of the elegy (Plut. *Sol.* 8.3: μάλιστα δὲ τοῦ Πεισιστράτου τοῖς πολίταις ἐγκελευομένου καὶ πανορμῶντος πεισθῆναι τῶ λέγοντι); together, the men weigh anchor for Cape Colias (*ibid.* 8.4).

1335 P. – W. 326: the oracle is considered fictitious by Parke (in Parke – Wormell 1956 I: 110).

(9.3: πρὸς τὴν Εὐβοίαν),¹³³⁶ to seize the Megarian ship that came in reconnaissance (9.4). In a second instance, this captured ship was manned with Athenians and travelled to Megara to conquer it; there was a land fight (9.4-5), and this story, according to Plutarch, was confirmed by a ceremony that took place in Salamis (9.6-7).

In both cases, the Athenians gains Salamis through Spartan arbitration (10), which ceded to Athenian claims on the basis of more arguments: first of all, the alleged kinship between Ajax of Salamis and the Athenian phalanx;¹³³⁷ secondly, Peisistratos' ties, through the *genos* of the Phileids, with Phileus, one of Ajax's children (10.3). The Athenians further claimed an ancient kinship between them and the Salaminians through the common orientation of the burials, which was the same in Athens and on Salamis, but not at Megara (10.4: ἰσχυρίσασθαι περὶ τῶν νεκρῶν), and the Ionic nature of Salamis, confirmed by a series of Pythic responses (10.6).

Modern scholarship has generally doubted the historical authenticity of this conquest of Salamis by Solon.¹³³⁸ The event should be set, more probably, in the sixties of the sixth century under the leadership of Peisistratos, as the following three arguments indicate.¹³³⁹

1336 The mention of Euboia is not completely clear in this context. Even if we agree with Lavelle (2005: 273 n.188) on the refusal of the corrections Νίσαιαν and Θυματιίδα accepted by Martina (1968: 349), it is hard to accept at face value the toponym on the basis of the proximity of Euboia to the *diakria* of the oriental Attic coast, associated with the *demos* of Brauron, which belonged to the Peisistratids (*ibid.* 63). This may be a case of toponomastic misunderstanding, with a possible reference to two islets to the south-east of Salamis and between Salamis and Attica, namely Lipsokutali and Ayios Yeoryios: these close islets are the main candidates for the Psytalia of Hdt. 8.76.2 and the Atalante of Str. 9.1.14.395 (cp. Asheri – Vannicelli 2010: 275; Strabo's passage is, however, textually troublesome, and it is not certain whether there is mention of the homonymy of Atalante with other islands close to Euboia and Lokris: Radt 2004: 16).

1337 Plutarch (*Sol.* 10.2) considers two verses of the *Iliad* relevant (2.557-8: “And Aias led from Salamis twelve ships, and stationed them where the battalions of the Athenians stood”, tr. A.T. Murray), on whose authenticity there was a lively debate, already in the Hellenistic period. In particular, both Solon and Peisistratos were accused of having interpolated them (Str. 9.1.10.394; see Lavelle 2005: 61 and Patterson 2010: 72-3). Plutarch might have gathered this information from Dieuchidas of Megara, who credited Solon with this intervention (*BNJ* 485 F 6; see Manfredini – Piccirilli 1977: 136-7). Despite strong doubts on the date of Dieuchidas, whose chronology varies from the fourth to the second centuries BCE (Liddel 2007), it is more likely that Hereas was the source of the interpolation, in light of the contextual mention of his name in the fragment (*BNJ* 486 F 4).

1338 The origin for this ascription might be a temporary victory of Solon, in the context of a long ongoing conflict for the island; a further basis was the existence of the elegy, reread under this shortlived success (F 2,1 G.-P.²: ἴομεν ἔς Σαλαμίνα μαχησόμενοι περὶ νήσου: it is hard to believe that this element, and the verse, was only inserted later to confirm the events: Lavelle 2005: 45-6 and 269 n.124).

1339 See e.g. Mühl 1956; Podlecki 1987; Taylor 1997: 28-34; Lavelle 2005: 45-65; Nicolai 2007 and Patterson 2010: 70-4; 165-9.

First of all, the first version in Plutarch, with the disguise motif of the Athenians, is analogous to the narrative of other sources, which deal with Peisistratos' conquest of the Megarian harbour of Nisaia in the sixties of the sixth century BCE.¹³⁴⁰ The two-pronged attack of the second version may actually be an historical military task performed by Solon, without permanent results.¹³⁴¹ Secondly, Spartan arbitration at the beginning of the century is hard to imagine, whereas at the end of the sixth century it becomes extremely likely as a result of the diplomatic relationship between Peisistratos and Sparta.¹³⁴² Indeed, since some of the names of the five Spartan judges mentioned by Plutarch (*Sol.* 10.6) return in Herodotus,¹³⁴³ scholars have used an inscription which organizes the land of Salamis at the end of the sixth century (*IG* 1³.1), to support the possible conquest of the island around 510 BCE.¹³⁴⁴

Reflections on the arguments used by the Athenians sheds light on the initial context of this tradition and on the actual characters of this event. It was Kleisthenes, in fact, who first developed the nomenclature of the Philaids, probably to strongly signal a detachment from the tyrannical association with the deme of Brauron.¹³⁴⁵ Consequently, Peisistratos himself would hardly have used this argument concerning the Philaids in the context of an event in the sixties. Finally, in light of the popularity of the motif of burial uses at the end of the fifth century BCE, it seems better to date the value assigned to the proof of the direction of

1340 Cp. Aen. Tact. 4.8-12; Just. *Epit.* 2.8.1-5; Frontin. *Str.* 2.9.9. All these sources stress Peisistratos' shrewdness, at the detriment of internal coherence, on his strategy and on topography (Lavelle 2005: 52-6); the definitive conquest of the Nisaia harbour coincided with the acquisition of Salamis: the event cannot be too close to the first rise to power of Peisistratos (561/0 BCE), but probably happened in the previous decade, between 573 and 563 BCE (Lavelle 2005: 48).

1341 Cp. Lavelle 2005: 64 and Patterson 2010: 165-6. The first version has many traditional characters, like the motif of the ruse, similar to the Macedonian symposium at the Macedonian court planned by Alexander I (*Hdt.* 5.20): on the contrary, the second seems less traditional, in its narrative, contrary to what was argued by Taylor 1997: 35-40.

1342 *Hdt.* 5.90.1. See Lavelle 2005: 62.

1343 Kleomenes is usually identified with the Spartan king mentioned by Herodotus in the *Histories*, whereas Amompharetus should be the insubordinate official of Plataia (*Hdt.* 9.53-7); however, Lavelle 2005: 273 n.173 claimed that "there is no reason to think [...] that there was but one Kleomenes and one Amompharetos or to discount earlier Spartan arbitration."

1344 Beloch 1913: 313-4. However, the inscription may simply introduce a new definition of duties on a territory that was previously in Athenian hands.

1345 Association of Peisistratos with the deme of Brauron and Kleisthenes' detachment: Lewis 1963: 26-7. On this deme, see further Patterson 2010: 74. Nicolai (2007: 11 n.26), following Whitehead (1986: 11 n.30), observed that it should be an artificial deme.

the corpses in the graves to this period.¹³⁴⁶ The little we know of Hereas of Megara,¹³⁴⁷ who argued against this last proof, confirms that this part of the story was later added to the original plot. The use of a Homeric interpolation, conversely, was particularly common in Athens under the Peisistratids;¹³⁴⁸ also the contraposition between Ionians and Dorians became particularly meaningful in Athens in the second half of the sixth century BCE,¹³⁴⁹ which confirms that Peisistratos was originally the winner before Spartan arbitration.

Plutarch therefore witnesses a phase where the ascription to Solon is part of a more general attempt at backdating the conquest of Salamis for the prestige of Athens.¹³⁵⁰ This was contextual to the development of the fame of Solon in the democratic field, which was trying to anticipate a series of conquests and progressions to exalt their historical meaning. Plutarch's narrative of these events recalls those traditional wars, reiterated in time, but almost never definitive,¹³⁵¹ and this further corroborates the ascription to Peisistratos.

5.5.2. Daimachos and the Fourth Century Debate on Solon and Peisistratos

Daimachos of Plataia was not the only author in the fourth century BCE, who questioned Solon's participation to the war against Megara. The starting point was probably a conflation of Solon and Peisistratos in the traditions of an Athenian victory against Megara, since the possible length of the conflict between Athens and Megara, and the

1346 The motif is notably attested by Thucydides, for example in his *archaiologia* (1.8.1); cp. Nicolai 2007: 11: "La sua origine si può forse far risalire ai primi interessi antiquari emersi nell'ultimo quarto del V secolo." The argument will have looked particularly apt to Peisistratos, whose purification of Delos coincided with a ritual uncovering of the burials (Hdt. 1.64.2; Thuc. 3.104.1; Lavelle 2005: 62).

1347 Hereas, *BNJ* 486 F 4. Cp. *supra* n.1329.

1348 Pl. [*Hipparch.*] 228B; Cic. *De or.* 3.34 and 137; Hsch. β 1067 (Βραυρωνίους); Pfeiffer 1968: 6-8; West 2000: 29; Irwin 2005: 277-8 (on the different authorship, in Athens, of the interpolations).

1349 Cp. Connor 1993 and Patterson 2010: 72.

1350 Patterson 2010: 70.

1351 On this reading, see Nicolai 2007.

growing fame of Solon, opened a debate, importantly echoed by Aristotle in his *Constitution of Athens*.¹³⁵²

Herodotus and Aristotle only mention that, when he first came to power, Peisistratos previously enjoyed fame granted by his military successes against Megara, namely the conquest of Nisaia, and not of Salamis.¹³⁵³ Probably circa twenty years before Aristotle (assuming the *Athenian Constitution* was written in the thirties of the fourth century), Aeneas Tacticus (4.8-12) also dealt with the conquest of Nisaia and added the detail of the disguise of the Athenians (which ultimately arrived in Plutarch's first version of the conquest by Solon). However, later on, Aristotle feels the necessity to accuse "those who claim that Peisistratos was Solon's lover and acted as a *strategos* (στρατηγεῖν)¹³⁵⁴ in the war against Megara for Salamis"; these people –according to Aristotle– "are blatant liars" ([*Ath.Pol.*] 17.2: ληροῦσιν),¹³⁵⁵ for chronological reasons (οὐ γὰρ ἐνδέχεται ταῖς ἡλικίαις).

Despite Aristotle's criticism, this tradition reached Plutarch, who opens his *Life of Solon* (1.4-5) with a series of observations on the paederotic relationship between Solon and Peisistratos and recognizes, if in an ancillary position, Peisistratos' role in the first Solonian version (*Sol.* 8.4: μετὰ τοῦ Πεισιστράτου), the so-called vulgata (τὰ [...] δημῶδη τῶν λεγομένων).¹³⁵⁶ Not only, then, had what Aristotle saw as a minor tradition gained popularity, but it had become part of a section of the story not subject to variations in Plutarch's time. Aristotle's predecessors, who had first named Peisistratos, may be

1352 Cp. Patterson 2010: 70-1 for this hypothesis on the starting point.

1353 Hdt. 1.59.4: "He asked the Athenian people to provide him with personal guards; he had already won their respect as a military commander during the campaign against Megara [ἐν τῇ πρὸς Μεγαρέας γενομένη στρατηγίῃ], during which not the least of his important achievements was the capture of Nisaia" (tr. R. Waterfield); Arist. [*Ath.Pol.*] 14.1: "Peisistratus, being thought to be an extreme advocate of the people [δημοτικώτατος], and having won great fame in the war against Megara [ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μεγαρέας πολέμῳ]" (tr. H. Rackham). On the relationship between these passages, see Rhodes 1981: 199-200.

1354 If we accept the historicity of this function, it should be as a temporary task for foreign missions (Rhodes 1981: 224), but it may also be a specification of Peisistratos' στρατηγίῃ in Hdt. 1.59.4. Rhodes (*ibid.*) bases his argument on the later effective development of the strategy (501/00 BCE): hence, either Herodotus has been accused of using an anachronism for Solon, or a pre-Cleisthenic and different strategy has been admitted; the most prudent –and probably advisable– position is that of Lavelle (2005: 46-7), according to whom, in Herodotus, the substantive generically indicates a military office.

1355 This verb denotes an unusual vehemence in Aristotle (Rhodes 1981: 224).

1356 Aelian's *Varia historia* draws on this same tradition, which differs from the later reaffirmation of Peisistratos' role; cp. Ael. *VH* 7.19 (battle for Salamis, fought by Solon), and 8.16 (παιδικά between him and Peisistratos).

Atthidographers or writers of siegecraft treatises, since the disguise ruse, even if ascribed to Peisistratos in the context of the middle of the sixth century, may be present in Aeneas Tacticus (8.4–12).¹³⁵⁷ In this same genre, we should not forget the relevant witness of Polyaeus (1.20.2), who also credits Solon with the conquest of Salamis, just like Aelian and Plutarch, and recalls the ruse of the disguise as a paradigmatic moment of his career.

In the fourth century BCE, then, there may have already been an early debate that first attached the motif of the disguise to the common view of Peisistratos' role.¹³⁵⁸ Later, the confusion with Solon, attested in Aristotle, may explain how these traditions entered the biography of this lawgiver, as in Plutarch, despite the undeniable reference of many materials to Peisistratos.¹³⁵⁹ After Peisistratos' initial, historical commitment against Salamis, Solon was considered responsible for this victory, during the years of his great fame among Athenian democrats. However, the concurrent realization of other victories against Megara by Peisistratos allowed a different view in the fourth century BCE that ascribed the conquest to Peisistratos. This would remain minor, however, as Plutarch's eulogy of Solon as victorious against Salamis confirms.

The refusal of Daimachos may then imply an adhesion to this fourth century BCE innovation, also attested in Aeneas, for whom the merits belonged to Peisistratos. If we consider a common military source for Aeneas Tacticus, Pompeus Trogus/Justin (*Epit.* 2.8.1–5), and Frontinus (*Str.* 2.9.9),¹³⁶⁰ who all agree on Peisistratos' achievement, we may conclude that it was Daimachos who first offered this version in his work.¹³⁶¹ Moreover, no evidence argues against the mention of the episode in a work other than his universal history, such as his *Poliorketika*. The complexity of the documentary evidence confirms the necessity to distinguish the primary source where Plutarch found Daimachos, possibly a

1357 See Lavelle 2005: 60 on the possible role of the Atthidographers in the diffusion of these versions that credit Solon with Peisistratos' action.

1358 On these "competing traditions", cp. also Lavelle 2005: 271 n.156.

1359 On the role of Atthidography in this period, see Patterson 2010: 168–9

1360 This common source was certainly not Ephoros (Bettalli 1990: 323), since the writing of the Πολιορκητικά in the early fifties (*ibid.* 5) hinders such use.

1361 We ignore too much of his work, in fact, to exclude that Daimachos himself may have adhered to previous sources, as suggested by Lavelle (2005: 268 n.123: the only scholar who hypothesised a possible conflation of Solon and Peisistratos in Daimachos).

doxography on the Seven¹³⁶² or an Atthidography, from the original characteristics of the quoted work. From Plataia, Daimachos gathered a minor tradition on Athenian history, which may have been reactionary to the Athenian exaltation of Solon.

5.6. Daimachos F 5

Previous editions: *BNJ* 65 F 3; *FGrHist* 65 F 3 (Ath. Mech. 32-5 Gatto¹³⁶³ [5.11-6.1 Wescher]).

κατανοήσῃ δ' ἂν τις τοῦτο ἀκριβέστατα ἐκ τῶν Δηϊμάχου Πολιορκητικῶν καὶ τῶν Διάδου <...> ἀκολουθησάντων Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ ἔτι ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπὸ Πύρρου τοῦ Μακεδόνοσ γραφέντων Πολιορκητικῶν ὀργάνων

1 κατανοήσοι L¹ L⁸ P⁸ κατανοήσῃ *cett.* Δηϊμάχου Wescher διενέχου MPP² _m διηνέχου *cett.* Πολιορκητικῶν Droysen Schneider Περσικῶν Wescher B_m¹ D_c E² F_m² L_m² P⁵ P⁷ P⁸ P⁹ P¹⁰ V_m¹ περσητικῶν K_m περσιτικῶν T περσετικῶν ἴσως περσικῶν πορθητικῶν L² L_m³ ἴσως περσικῶν A F² πορθητικῶν B_m¹ L_m² *fortasse recte* σετικῶν V¹ περσετικῶν *cett.* 2 καὶ τῶν δι' αὐτοῦ ἀκολουθησάντων *codd.* καὶ τῶν Διάδου καὶ Χαρίου τῶν Schwartz *malim tantummodo* Διάδου τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ L¹ P² Ἀλεξάνδρῳ *cett.* ἔστι N N¹ ἔστιν P⁷ V¹ -V⁴ ἔτι V_m¹ V_m⁴ *et cett.* 2-3 τῶν ὑπὸ Πύρρου Wescher ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπὸ M P P_c² ὑπὸ *cett.* 3 Μακεδῶνος B¹ D H¹ K L² L⁸ O² P¹⁰ P¹¹ Μακεδόνοσ *cett.* Πολιορκητικῶν F² P⁴ Πολιορκτικῶν B¹ D E² L² L³ P⁵ P⁷ Πολιορκικῶν Thévenot *cett.*

1362 For instance, we know that Hermippos of Smyrna, one of Plutarch's sources on the Seven Wisemen, also included information on Solon's military expeditions (*JC* IV 1026 F 15).

1363 Here and afterwards I follow the new lines of the text in the edition by Gatto (2010): the previous subdivision in chapters was set by Wescher (1867).

“One could best understand this from the *Siegecraft* of Daimachos and from the (works?) of Diades and <...>, who followed Alexander; or, still, from the *Siegecraft Equipment* of Pyrrhos the Macedonian” (tr. S. Tufano).

5.6.1. Textual Transmission and Context

Athenaeus Mechanicus wrote his *Περὶ μηχανημάτων*¹³⁶⁴ before 23/2 BCE: the author can be identified with the philosopher from Seleukia who died in this year and had come to Rome, where he belonged to the well-known circle of Maecenas.¹³⁶⁵ In this same circle, he met that Marcus Claudius Marcellus (42–23 BCE), Augustus’ brother-in-law and nephew, to whom the treatise is dedicated (Ath. Mech. 2).¹³⁶⁶ The writing belongs to a tradition of

1364 The present profile of the work depends on Whitehead – Blyth (2004) and on Gatto (2010). Both these studies confirm a date for this essay to the end of the first century BCE, already inferred, in modern scholarship, by de Rochas d’Aiglun (1884) and by Cichorius (1922). Gatto’s main innovation consists in the new critical edition of the text, which includes a consideration of all 34 witnesses (among which, the ones from Turin and from Madrid are now lost and need to be reconstructed from the edition of Wescher 1867; there are, furthermore, three manuscripts *desaparecidos* which were once held at the Biblioteca Escorial of Madrid; Gatto 2010: 102). Another novelty is represented by the weight of B. Baldi’s *Vite de’ matematici* (1595), who was the first modern scholar to correctly identify the author of this technical treatise (even if he thought that this Athenaeus was the same Athenaeus of the *Learned Banqueters*).

1365 Athenaeus is mostly known from what we read in Str. 14.14.5.670 (Radt 2009: 115). He was a peripatetic philosopher who ruled his own city and was the pupil of an engineer, Hagesistratus (cp. Ath. Mech. 61), who is also quoted by Vitruvius in his *De architectura* (7 *praef.* 14: see, however, Gatto 2010: 65 and n.27). Vitruvius’ treaty has a long section in common (10.13–6) with Athenaeus’ *Περὶ μηχανημάτων* (74–267), to the point that it is generally believed that the two authors draw on the same source (see sequent n.). Athenaeus defended himself in Rome in 23 BCE, together with his friend Varro Murena (Maecenas’ brother-in-law), because he had been accused of plotting against Augustus. After having been found innocent, he came back to his homeland, where he died from the unexpected collapse of his own house.

1366 Since the work often mentions machines to use against rebellious nations, Cichorius (1922: 274–5) suggested that the dedicatee might be putting down an uprising, namely the Cantabrian Wars fought by Marcellus between 27 and 25 BCE; besides, according to Cichorius the *σεμνότητος* of Ath. Mech. 2 may echo the *σεμνότης* assigned to his mother, Octavia, by Plutarch (*Ant.* 31). Octavia must have been Athenaeus’ and Vitruvius’ patroness (Marsden 1971: 5; cp. Vit. *De arch.* 1 *praef.* 2), and Gatto (2010: 50–1), after Cichorius (1922: 275–7) and Marsden (*ibid.*), tributes importance to the public library, opened by her after the death of Marcellus (Liv. *perioch.* 140; Plut. *Marc.* 30.11; Suet. *Gram et rhet.* 21; the building was destroyed by fire in 80 CE and rebuilt by Domitian, if we accept that it is among the libraries mentioned by Suet. *Dom.* 20.1, but we ignore the exact place and its relationship with the *porticus Octaviae*: Viscogliosi 1999: 141). The identification of the dedicatee with Marcellus and, therefore, the availability of such an important library through Marcellus’ mother, would explain why Athenaeus and Vitruvius were using the same sources, especially Hagesistratus (so Thiel 1895, even if Gatto 2010: 64–5 objects that Vitruvius does not credit a lot Hagesistratus’ work).

siegecraft treatises, which started in the middle of the fourth century BCE by Aeneas Tacticus.¹³⁶⁷ Those were the years when siege techniques and the use of specific machines to win sieges became particularly momentous in war.¹³⁶⁸ This implementation is shown, for instance, by the new techniques deployed by Dionysius the Elder in Syracuse.¹³⁶⁹ Siege techniques were particularly advanced during the campaigns of Alexander the Great, and the phenomenon accelerated and elicited a literary interest in military treatises: in this field, the focus slowly shifted from strategies to exit a siege, still prevalent in Aeneas Tacticus' work, to the description of the instruments and of the machines, which were used more and more to win a siege.¹³⁷⁰

If we take into account the short extension of Athenaeus' treatise (369 lines, in Gatto's edition), the proem occupies a relatively large section (Ath. Mech. 1-50): it starts with an exhortation to the reader, a man of action, the profile of the dedicatee, not to waste time in noxious studies. In particular, the author first recalls the verbose and excessively theoretic writings of Straton, Estiaeus, Archytas, and Aristotle (*ibid.* 24-5),¹³⁷¹ and then argues that there were still a few exceptions among Greek writers.¹³⁷² This fact (τοῦτο), namely, the value of treatises which can be concise, is best demonstrated (ἀκριβέστατα) by Daimachos and by the authors who are quoted in the present fragment.

1367 Aeneas is usually considered as being at the beginning of the genre, but we should be aware, as noted by Traina (2002: 427), of the previous sources that Aeneas himself quotes (26.12; 27.1); other texts to consider, in a history of ancient polemology, are Demokritos' *Taktikon* (DK B 28b) and Xenophon's *Hipparchicus*. Other material comes, of course, from non-technical texts, like historians (as, e.g., Herodotus: Vela Tejada – Sánchez Mañas 2013-4), but not only historians (Traina 2002; Vela Tejada 2004; Benedetti 2010: 855-6).

1368 The history of ancient siegecraft coincides with the growing relevance of these instruments, such as catapults and the helepolis, from the fourth century BCE on. In the previous period, most of our knowledge concerns the Peloponnesian War and indicates the great role of contravallations: the besiegers would erect a circuit of walls around the city, which was then taken through capitulation because of the prolonged siege (see shortly, on this, Benedetti 2010: 856). On ancient siege warfare there is now a vast bibliography: see at least Marsden 1969; Marsden 1971; Garland 1974, Traina 2002 and the titles mentioned by Gatto 2010: 3-37.

1369 Cp. Le Bohec – Bouhet 2000 (on the fourth century as a turning point); Benedetto 2010: 857-8, and Gatto 2010: 12-5 (on Dionysius).

1370 On Alexander's siege warfare, see Garland 1974: 200-69 and Kern 1999: 221-6.

1371 Hestaios of Perinth is known as a pupil of Plato (Diog. Laert. 3.46); see *infra* in text (5.6.2) on the other names of the list and, in general, Whitehead – Blyth 2004: 68-9.

1372 For this interpretation, which assumes praise of Daimachos and of the other authors, cp. Whitehead – Blyth 2004: 70 and Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 3.

Our passage is textually troublesome, and not entirely perspicuous. The first issue concerns the name of Daimachos, who is quoted in an Ionic form: the transmitted variations, however, do not posit particular doubts on the reconstruction of the name.¹³⁷³ The second problem concerns the title: Wescher's conjecture for this word, περσικῶν, may have been influenced by the previous mention, in Athenaeus' treatise (29–32), of a saying by the Indian Kalanos.¹³⁷⁴ However, this form Περσικῶν (*Persian Histories*) implies the existence of Περσικά, which are nowhere assigned to any known Daimachos, even if it is present on some codices of the so-called *abridged version* of Athenaeus; this variation probably resulted from the necessity to make sense of an obscure title.¹³⁷⁵

The other main conjecture for the title was πολιορκητικῶν: this option was based on the later mention of Pyrrhos' work and was recently accepted by editors of the text.¹³⁷⁶ The general title *Siegecraft* (*treatise*) also agrees with the text of our F 6, Stephanus' lemma on Λακεδαίμων, where Daimachos is credited with this same title.¹³⁷⁷ However, the conjecture πολιορκητικῶν is strongly invasive and we might want to consider, with greater attention, the singular form Πορθητικῶν, which is attested on some codices of the family Y (that with the abridged version of the text), on its own or with integrations that

1373 The correction dates back to a conjecture of Wescher (1867), who was trying to make sense of two senseless variants (διενέχου, διηνέχου): Wescher imagined that, behind these variations, was the name of the Daimachos quoted by Strabo (2.1.4.68–9 = *BNJ* 716 T 3), to whom Wescher assigned the siegecraft treatise. We can accept the personal name in the Ionic form Δηίμαχος, on the basis of the various lessons, because they do not vary immensely from this form, and we can suppose a corruption in the initial diphthong and in the nasal.

1374 Kalanos was a Brahman who followed Alexander after 326 BCE, according to Plut. *Alex.* 65; two years later, he committed suicide by throwing himself into a pyre. There is a letter by Kalanos to Alexander, which shares some characteristics with the short mention in the text of Athenaeus. On Kalanos, see shortly Gatto 2010: 502–3.

1375 Gatto (2010: 147–87) evinced the existence of two families of codices, which both draw on a subarchetype α : the first family (X) is represented by the sole mss. **M** (=Par. suppl. gr. 607, tenth century) and **F** (=Ms. phil. gr. 120 Nessel, sixteenth century), which present a complete version of the text. The second family (Y) is constituted by the codices which share the *grande lacuna* at ll. 143–96: it then presents an *abridged version* of the text (on this terminology, see Gatto 2010: 104–6). From the three main branches of the second family (ϵ , η , and ζ), we have all the other thirty-two witnesses of the text. The most important ones are, for this second family, **B**¹ (=Basil. A.N. II 44, fifteenth/sixteenth century), **V**¹ (=Vat. gr. 219, fourteenth century *in*) and **P**² (=Par. suppl. gr. 2435, sixteenth century). This last manuscript is one of the witnesses of the form Περσικῶν, which is directly transmitted by six manuscripts (**E**² **P**⁵ **P**⁷ **P**⁸ **P**⁹ **P**¹⁰) of the family Y. It may be a banalisation of an alternative form, as would result from the periphrasis περσετικῶν ἴσως περσικῶν πορθητικῶν (**L**² **L**³_m).

1376 Droysen 1877 I: 292 n.1; Schneider – Schwartz 1912; Whitehead – Blyth 2004: 71; Gatto 2010: 262.

1377 Cp., on a similar position, Zecchini 1997: 192–3.

may be glosses.¹³⁷⁸ The adjective πορθητικός is linked to the verb πορθέω, “destroy, ravage”, and it therefore means, together with the noun μηχανή, “sambuca”,¹³⁷⁹ in the glossary of Pseudo-Cyrill.¹³⁸⁰ The sambuca was a covered ladder used to win sieges both on land and on sea (its most famous use was in the siege of Syracuse in 213/2 BCE).¹³⁸¹ Despite the potential risk of this adjective, which is the same of the variant περσικά, the absence of works with this title explicitly assigned to Daimachos, makes us wonder whether the original title of the siegecraft treatise would not effectively stress the focus on these machines. The only other fragment from that work, that in Stephanus (F 6), does not explicitly deny this possibility.

The following article τῶν, which depends on the preposition ἐκ, might either refer to another title of a siegecraft treatise, or, as the close participle ἀκολουθησάντων suggests, to the indication of more authors. The editors of the text have long followed this second option, from Schwartz (1901: 2008–9) on. For this reason, Whitehead – Blyth (2004: 71–2) focus on the names of Diades and Charias,¹³⁸² two engineers who followed Alexander and are often quoted together, to the point that some scholars wonder whether they were the joint authors of a single work.¹³⁸³ The second option seems more likely, because Athenaeus

1378 The scribe of L² (= Voss. gr. F 3, 1550–60) seems perplexed and glosses περσετικῶν ἴσως περσικῶν πορθητικῶν, maybe from the original πορθητικῶν, which is relegated as a marginal correction on B¹.

1379 The use of πορθητικός in the meaning of “obsidional, connected to a siege, easily conquerable” is quite late and generally attested in Byzantine texts or scholarship, as in the scholia on Hes. *Theog.* 635 (f), to gloss ἀλώσιμον, or in a passage of Anna Comnena’s *Alexiad* (14.2.8: ὁ δὲ διὰ τινῶν μηχανημάτων πορθητικῶν τὴν τε πρώτην καὶ δευτέραν ζώνην καθείλε καὶ τῆς τρίτης ἀπεπειρᾶτο, “He had already destroyed the first and second belt by means of machines of destruction and was at work on the third”, tr. E.A.S. Dawes).

1380 This Greek-Latin glossary is assigned to a Cyrill, who might have some relationship with the actual Cyrill of Alexandria; the work comes from the Alexandrian area and was probably composed between the fifth and the sixth centuries CE (Burguière 1970). The witnesses are a papyrus of the seventh century CE (*P. Nass.* 8; Maas 1951) and a series of manuscripts, dating from the third quarter of the ninth century. The lemma Πορθητικὴ μηχανή: *sambuca* (CGL II 413,44), signalled in the posthumous edition of M. Martini’s *Lexicon Philologicum* (s.v. “Sambuca” II, 1701), is, for instance, on the important manuscript Laon 444, of the third quarter of the ninth century (f. 195r.). There is no critical edition of the text; some fragments of it are edited by Cramer 1839–41 and Drachmann 1936; a partial edition is in the CGL (II 215–483). I would like to thank Dr. Claudio Giammona for precious indications on this text.

1381 Pol. 8.4.4. From this passage, we infer that the instrument took its name from the namesake musical instrument. On sea and land sambucas, see Gatto 2010: 432–46 and Fiorucci 2010.

1382 Berve 1926 n.267 and n.821.

1383 Diades and Charias are mentioned together by Vitruvius (*De arch.* 10.13.3) and by the author of the *Παραγγέλματα πολιορκητικά* (30.1–3; 32.2–3; 36.2; 38.21 Sullivan), an anonymous Byzantine handbook of siegecraft, written under Constantinus Porphyrogenitus (tenth century *in.*). This text was once assigned to Heron of Byzantium,

also quotes Diades elsewhere (Ath. Mech. 94; 145), whereas Charias is mentioned only once (93-4), and the restitution of his name depends on circular reasoning, namely its “common” association with Diades.¹³⁸⁴

Diades followed Alexander the Great in his expedition, wrote a treatise on mechanics,¹³⁸⁵ and proved essential in the siege of Tyre in 332 BCE. Berve (1926: n.267), followed now in the *LGPN* (III B *s.v.*), once believed that Diades came from Thessaly, because he included Diades among the disciples of Polyidos (Ath. Mech. 93: “The Thessalian Polyidos, whose disciples followed Alexander”). He is more likely associated with the Lycian area, or, more generally, with Asia Minor, since the only other Diades known to us founded a town in Lycia, named Dias after him.¹³⁸⁶

In the last edition of the text, Gatto (2010: 262-3) highlighted this hardship, and suggested that we accept the transmitted lesson δι’ αὐτοῦ; he argued that Athenaeus wanted to generally refer to Alexander’s followers. The ensuing interpretation, however, is not completely perspicuous:

“ciò si potrebbe desumere dal confronto degli scritti poliorcetici di Deimaco e di coloro che, tramite lui, hanno seguito Alessandro [...]” (tr. M. Gatto).

This instrumental use of the preposition διὰ, however, does not explain how and why Daimachos should act as an intermediate source for the engineers who followed Alexander (an obscurity, which probably led Schwartz to correct the transmitted text in the first place). On the contrary, the correction Διάδου from δι’ αὐτοῦ fits in with the relevance of this figure and is not textually invasive. At the same time, it is excessive to introduce a

but Heron was only an owner of one of the manuscripts of the *Paragelmata*, between the fifteenth and the sixteenth century (see edition and commentary on the work by Sullivan 2000). The author of the *Paragelmata* used Athenaeus’ *Περὶ μηχανημάτων*: see a list of *loci paralleli* in Gatto 2010: 88-98. Diades and Charias co-authors: Garlan 1974: 209; Whitehead – Blyth 2004: 71. Romano 2002: 71 thinks of two different works.

1384 Cp. Gatto 2010: 263 e 279-80.

1385 Ath. Mech. 94: ἐν τῷ μηχανικῷ [...] συγγράμματι. This must have been a collection of paintings and illustrations (Gatto 2010: 501).

1386 Steph. Byz. δ 74, *s.v.* Διάς. One wonders whether this figure was not an eponym of the name of the city, whose location is unknown and might be found in the area of Kragos (Hellenkemper – Hild 2004: 517). Garlan (1974: 208) and Gatto (2010: 500-1) consider a Lycian origin.

further name, that of Charias, next to him, even if he was “universally” known as being present at Alexander’s court, because Charias is not known elsewhere to the author of the *Περὶ μηχανημάτων*: if we want to postulate on him, we must imagine a lacuna in the subarchtype, which is the only one that may explain the plural number of the participle before the name of Alexander (ἀκολουθησάντων). Since this last verb comes before the dative of a personal name, it remains clear and does not present particular issues: consequently, we could posit a lacuna, but the plural number of the participle must not be corrected, because it is confirmed by the previous plural article.

After the mention of the followers of Alexander, Diades and an unknown name, Athenaeus mentions Pyrrhos of Macedonia, who must be the famous king of Epirus (319–272 BCE). The ethnic might surprise us, because the actual rule of Macedonia only lasted three years¹³⁸⁷ and the other sources generally call Pyrrhos Ἡπειρώτης.¹³⁸⁸ More than one commenter has observed that Athenaeus’ use may derive from the previous protectorship of Macedonia over Epirus and by the generic superficiality of Athenaeus in this field.¹³⁸⁹ Pyrrhos’ literary production (*BNJ* 229) encompassed military treatises, among which we can include Ὑπομνήματα and this pamphlet: Athenaeus quotes it elsewhere with a different title (Πολιορκητικά: *Ath. Mech.* 293–4). From the following praise, it seems that the siegecraft treatise particularly excelled among the considered sources.

5.6.2. Daimachos and Siegecraft Treatises

Athenaeus’ list might represent an indirect indication of Daimachos’ date, if we assume that the succession of names is chronological (Daimachos – Diades – followers of Alexander – Pyrrhus).¹³⁹⁰ The only serious obstacle to such a hypothesis is the possibility that the first Daimachos might coincide with the second author of the third century BCE, since there is an undeniable precedence of the followers of Alexander over Pyrrhos:¹³⁹¹

1387 Probably between 287 and 285 BCE (Hammond – Walbank 1988: 229–38).

1388 Cp. e.g. *Diod. Sic.* 22.4.1; *Aen. Tact.* 1.2.

1389 Cp. Whitehead – Blyth 2004: 72; Gatto 2010: 507–8, against Schneider – Schwartz 1912: 54.

1390 Doubts on the chronological order have been expressed by Engels (2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 3), whereas Jacoby (1926a: 4) and Zecchini (1997: 192–3) believe that the list may be used to date Daimachos.

1391 See Zecchini 1997: 192.

nothing excludes, however, that such a list was conceived with a general chronological succession in mind.

A possible objection to this understanding might be that the previous list, in Athenaeus' proem (24–5), starts with Strato (*ca.* 328–267 BCE), who was the second scholarch of the peripatetic school, but then continues with the names of Archytas from Tarentum (first half of the fourth century BCE), and, in the end, Aristotle (384–22 BCE).¹³⁹² This same research of a systematic order, indeed, might be preposterous; if the second list is “more” ordered than the previous one, it is by chance or, more probably, it follows a different, axial order, based on the judgment of Athenaeus on these authors.

It must be remembered that, in order to assign a siegecraft treatise to the first Daimachos, we must add further arguments; what is certain is that, on its own, the first list includes figures who, apart from Strato, can be set in the fourth century BCE, while the second list goes from Alexander to Pyrrhos and presents a wider oscillation. Consequently, we can affirm, on the basis of the current fragment quoted by Athenaeus, that Daimachos of Plataia, who lived in the middle of the fourth century BCE, wrote on siegecraft (*On the Sambucas?*), probably in the same years as when Aeneas Tacticus¹³⁹³ was engaging in the same subject.

5.7. Daimachos F 6

Previous editions: *BNJ* 65 F 4; *FGrHist* 65 F 4 (Steph. Byz. λ 19, *s.v.* Λακεδαίμων).

Steph. Byz. λ 19, *s.v.* Λακεδαίμων: [...] καὶ οὐδέτερον τὸ Λακωνικὸν σιδήριον· στομωμάτων γὰρ τὸ μὲν Χαλυβδικόν, τὸ δὲ Σινωπικόν, τὸ δὲ Λύδιον, τὸ δὲ Λακωνικόν. καὶ <ὅτι> Σινωπικόν καὶ Χαλυβδικόν εἰς τὰ τεκτονικά, τὸ δὲ

1392 On Strato, see Wehrli 1969b. Archytas was born between 435 and 410 BCE, and died after 355 BCE; the dates are very unclear. See Huffman 2005: 5–6, for an introduction to the problem.

1393 Aeneas' activity must be placed in the first half of the fifties, according to Bettalli (1990: 5).

Λακωνικὸν εἰς ῥίνας καὶ σιδηροτρύπανα καὶ χαρακτῆρας καὶ εἰς τὰ λιθουργικά, τὸ δὲ Λύδιον καὶ αὐτὸ εἰς ῥίνας καὶ μαχαίρας καὶ ξυρία καὶ ξυστῆρας, ὥς φησι Δαίμαχος ἐν Πολιορκητικοῖς ὑπομνήμασι {λέγων}.

1 σιδήριον PN σίδηρον RQ 2 στομώτατον *ex* στομάτων R Χαλυβδικόν QPN χαλκιδικόν R 4 σιδηροτρύπανα PN τρύπαντα RQ 6 Πολιορκητικοῖς QPN πολιορκητηκοῖς R λέγων RQ *secl.* Billerbeck (*mon.* Meineke “*ipsa scriptoris verba videntur excidisse*”) λῆ PN

“None [of the previous uses of ‘Laconian’] is the Laconian silver. In fact, among the different steels, there are Chalybdian, Synopikos, Lydian, and Laconian. Synopikos and Chalybdian are apt for carpentry, Laconian for rasps, iron drills, chisels, and masonry; Lydian is also useful for rasps, blades, razors, and scrapers, according to what Daimachos says in his *Observations on Siegecraft*” (tr. S. Tufano).

5.7.1. Textual Transmission

In this passage of his lemma on Λακεδαίμων (λ 19),¹³⁹⁴ Stephanus addresses a particular possessive form (καὶ κτητικὸν λακωνικός), which could refer, on its own, to a sandal (εἶδος ὑποδήματος), to circular dancing (ὄρχησις), to specific whips (μάστιγες), or to a key (εἶδος κλειδὸς Λακωνικῆς). After these four cases, Stephanus adds, with a pronoun which distinguishes quite clearly the different use of the aforementioned key (οὐδέτερον), that there was also an iron, the “Laconian” iron.

This lemma is our only explicit witness on the existence of Daimachos’ Πολιορκητικά, even though it is hard to infer from this passage which Daimachos wrote this treatise. It has been suggested that Stephanus found in Daimachos this juxtaposition of different kinds

1394 The passage has no relevant textual difficulties. The only slight difficulty concerns the final expunction of the participle λέγων, which was suggested by M. Billerbeck in the last edition of the text (2014). Since our text of the *Ethnika* is actually a summary of the original text, any observation on Stephanus’ use of *verba dicendi* might be misleading; all we can infer from the transmitted text is that this author never refers to a further participial form of a *verbum dicendi*, after the formula ὥς φησι X. The expunction, therefore, can be accepted, and we cannot agree with Meineke (1849), that there was an original direct quote from Daimachos’ text.

of iron; it would be reductive and against the common use of Stephanus to imagine that Daimachos is only quoted on the Lydian variety.¹³⁹⁵

5.7.2. Commentary

σιδήριον. The tradition is split between the forms *σιδήριον* and *σίδηρον*; we can agree with the last editor of the text, M. Billerbeck, in preferring the form with the iota: this is attested in Eustathius (*ad Il.* 2.581, p. 1.453,26 van der Valk), who knew Stephanus and generally uses him with few integrations. The noun *σιδήριον* mostly indicated, from the fifth century BCE on, an instrument made of iron.¹³⁹⁶ If the form in the lemma does not depend on the intermediate source, Daimachos may be the only author to choose *σιδήριον* (*LSJ s.v. II*) to indicate the metal and not an instrument.¹³⁹⁷ In light of the lexical precision displayed in the final part of the fragment, it may be posited that Daimachos was looking for more technical terminology, which also resulted from these choices in spelling.

στομώτατον [...] *Χαλυβδικόν*. The word *στόμωμα* already means “steel” in Cratinus;¹³⁹⁸ we infer this meaning from the notion of *στόμωσις*, the procedure of hardening iron, through which steel was made in Antiquity.¹³⁹⁹ This alloy of iron and carbon can be obtained in three ways: accidentally, through a fusion process, as recorded by the author of the pseudo-Aristotelian *On Marvellous Things Heard* (48);¹⁴⁰⁰ more often, the process was

1395 Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 4.

1396 Cp. e.g. Hdt. 7.18.1 (ἔδόκει Ἀρτάβανος τὸ ὄνειρον [...] θερμοῖσι σιδηρίοισι ἐκκαίειν αὐτοῦ μέλλειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, “Artabanos had the impression that the dream was about to burn his own eyes, with hot irons”); 9.37.2 (ὡς γὰρ δὴ ἐδέδετο ἐν ξύλῳ σιδηροδέτῳ, ἐσενειχθέντος κως σιδηρίου ἐκράτησε, “as he [Hegesistratos] was bound to an iron-bound of stocks, he got an iron instrument, which was there by chance”; both tr. S. Tufano). These two examples indicate that *σιδήριον* can refer to very different objects.

1397 In general, the simple form *σίδηρον*/*σίδηρος* can also be adopted to indicate an instrument: cp. Hom. *Il.* 4.123 (νευρὴν μὲν μαζῶ πέλασεν, τόξῳ δὲ σίδηρον, “he drew the bowstring to his breast, and brought the arrowhead to the bow”); 18.34 (δεΐδιε γὰρ μὴ λαϊμόν ἀπαμήσειε σιδήρῳ, “for he feared that he cut his throat with a blade”; both tr. S. Tufano).

1398 Cratinus *PCG* F 265 K. – A. (= Poll. *Onom.* 10.186): *Χαλυβδικόν στόμωμα* (from the *Cheirones*).

1399 On the *στόμωμα*, cp. Blümner 1886: 343–4.

1400 “It is said that the origin of Chalybian and Amisenian iron is most extraordinary. For it grows, so they say, from the sand which is borne down by the rivers. Some say that they simply wash this and heat it in a furnace; others say that they

deliberately activated through cementation or carburisation of a mass of wrought iron. The transformation could only happen if the iron came from strands that contained manganese or limonite (an iron porous ore, found in lakes or ponds).¹⁴⁰¹

The variant Χαλυβδικόν,¹⁴⁰² which was banalized in χαλκιδικόν, refers to the Chalybes, a population known as iron workers. They were generally set in northern Asia Minor, between the internal regions and the coast, and on the southern coast of the Black Sea.¹⁴⁰³ The Chalybes were so famously associated with iron craftsmanship that Virgil placed them on Elba island, another centre well-known for the use of minerals and metals.¹⁴⁰⁴ The tradition was already proverbial in the fifth century BCE, when Aeschylus and Cratinus give this population this association.¹⁴⁰⁵

τὸ δὲ Σινωπικόν [...] Λύδιον: Sinope (*IACP* 729) was founded by the Milesians on the southern coast of the Black Sea at the beginning of the seventh century BCE: it then founded three other colonies. One of these colonies, Kerasous (*IACP* 719), was considered to be in the land of the Chalybes, which represents a convenient link with the previous geographical reference. Sinope was known as an important harbour in the Black Sea and was shortly occupied by the Athenians between 436 BCE (*Plut. Per.* 20) and 411 or 405 BCE (Tsetskhladze 1997); in general, however, it remained loyal to the Persians and often contributed financially to the Persian empire.

Sinope, in particular, did not have a strong tradition that linked the city to ironworking, whereas Lydia is a better option for two reasons: first, it is noted that the region had many

repeatedly wash the residue which is left after the first washing and heat it, and that they put into it a stone which is called fire-proof; and there is much of this in the district. This iron is much superior to all other kinds. If it were not burned in a furnace, it would not apparently be very different from silver. They say that it alone is not liable to rust, but that there is not much of it” (tr. W.S. Hett).

1401 On accidental production of steel in Antiquity, see Healy 1978: 235–6.

1402 The lexicographical sources confirm the use of a possessive adjective, despite the obscurity of the dental consonant.

1403 The main sources are Hekataios *BNJ* 1 F 203; *Hdt.* 1.28; *Xen. An.* 4.6,5; 4.5,34. Cp. Griffith 1983: 216–7 and Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 4.

1404 Verg. *Aen.* 10.174. Cp. Aesch. *Sept.* 728, Χαλυβος Σκυθᾶν ἄποικος, a kenning for “iron” (with Podlecki 2005: 171).

1405 Aesch. *PV* 714–5; Cratinus, *PCG* F 265 K. – A. See Farioli 1996: 96. For a consideration of the lexical similarities between Aeschylus and Cratinus, cp. Bianchi 2017: 182–4.

metallurgical spots and shared a general fame with other places of Asia Minor.¹⁴⁰⁶ Secondly, and more generally, Lydia was known both as the cradle of coins and as their inventor (Hdt. 1.94).¹⁴⁰⁷

εἰς τὰ τεκτονικά [...] εἰς τὰ λιθουργικά: These two nominalised adjectives probably refer to two distinct kinds of craftsmanship. Since τέκτων generally describes “l’artigiano, del legno o dei metalli o di altro materiale,”¹⁴⁰⁸ τεκτονικά may indicate carpentry, which concerns the establishment of the load-bearing structures of a building, be they either in wood or in iron.¹⁴⁰⁹ Technically, τεκτονικά can also be a synonym for λιθουργικά to indicate construction work, but the contextual association of λιθουργικά with a series of precision tools suggests a differentiation: on the one hand, we have the sinopic and chalybdic varieties used for connections and hard structures (τεκτονικά);¹⁴¹⁰ on the other hand, the laconic and the lydian steels are used for high precision work, where the hardness of the metal mattered less than its incision and cutting ability (λιθουργικά).¹⁴¹¹ I therefore translate here λιθουργικά with the generic “masonry”, to indicate the process of chiselling, resulting from the use of the tools which precede λιθουργικά.

εἰς ῥίνας καὶ σιδηροτρύπανα καὶ χαρακτῆρας: The rasp (ῥίνη) is a long metal tool, tapered in its upper part, used on leather, or on wood, to obtain shavings. It has a similar use to the

1406 Cp. Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 4.

1407 On this immense historical problem, see, as a starting point, Schaps 2004 and Musti 2006: 258–65.

1408 Romano 2002: 67. The ἀρχιτέκτων certainly had a different role from his coworkers, even though he was not a mere theoretical contributor (Gros 1983); however, there was a relative specialisation of competences on the construction site, both in Greek construction habits and in the Roman world (Giuliani 2006: 247–8). One of the possible tasks of the τέκτονες was the measuring of single materials, and the eventual constructions of machines; Di Pasquale (2002: 77–9) therefore associated them to the *corpus mensorum machinariorum*, an institution known from a marble inscription of the late second century CE, now lost (*CIL* VI 9626). A generic meaning of “layman, unqualified worker” is also attested for λιθουργός (Blümner 1884: 3).

1409 Actually, Diogenes Laertius (3.100.3) maintains that metallurgy should be indicated with another noun: ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ σιδήρου ἢ χαλκευτικὴ ὄπλα ποιεῖ, ἢ δὲ τεκτονικὴ ἐκ τῶν ξύλων αὐλοὺς καὶ λύρας (“for the smith’s art produces instruments from iron, whereas carpentry makes flutes and lyres from wood”). For these nouns, then, the immediate context is always particularly relevant.

1410 Iron and steel could also be used in the construction of a building, for the realization of iron wedges to lift stone blocks (Di Pasquale 2004: 199–200).

1411 Cp. the specific σιδήρια λιθουργικά in Poll. *Onom.* 7.125.

Latin *lima*, which is its proper translation: as such, it can be applied on wood, as well as on minerals, on gems, and on pieces of gold (Blümner 1879: 228-9).

The applications of the tools inhibit us from accepting Blümner’s proposal (*ibid.* 225 n.4), that the σιδηροτρύπανα were drills to work metals. The attributive function of the first part of the word, σιδηρο-, may actually refer to the material with which these objects were built. Their use does not differ sensibly from the contemporary one, but the immediate context invites us to put their use on wood as primary.¹⁴¹²

The χαρακτήρ mainly indicates the minting die; Daimachos (or Stephanus) seems to be isolated, in this meaning of the word, to denote a chiselling tool. The etymology of χαρακτήρ resembles that of other cutting instruments, such as the γλυπτήρ and the ξυστήρ (better known: cp. *infra.*).¹⁴¹³ The noun is also attested as a *nomen agentis*, to refer to an engraver (*LSJ s.v.* I 1), but the verb whence it comes, χαράσσω, does not allow us to definitely clarify the exact nature of the characteristics of the item.

καὶ μαχαίρας καὶ ξυρία καὶ ξυστήρας: Lydian steel had four possible fields of application. First of all, the μάχαιραι, which could be mere blades, could be added to military machines or understood as part of a dagger: in fact, the μαχαιροποιός mentioned by Aristophanes (*Av.* 442) is a simple cutler;¹⁴¹⁴ it could also be that Daimachos, here, simply mentions and focuses on the civil applications of these metals.

We cannot say much on the reasons for the use of the diminutive ξυρίον for ξυρόν, “razor”, that can refer to the daily object and not necessarily to an application on wood. The ξυστήρ was used to smooth a surface, like a modern plane, but its size was probably smaller: since the technical word for the ancient plane was ῥυκάνη (Blümner 1879: 227), the best translation for “ξυστήρ” is “scraper”, a small utensil for working smaller surfaces.

1412 Drills were also used for surgical operations and in the fine arts (Cacopardo 2010).

1413 Χαρακτήρ as minting die: Pl. *Plt.* 289B. Γλυπτήρ: *A.P.* 6.68.

1414 Blümner 1886: 362.

5.7.3. Daimachos' Technical Interests

Stephanus' lemma contains a highly erudite fragment, which lists four sorts of steel (chalybdic, synopic, lydian, and laconian), since the initial genitive *στομωμάτων* is partitive. It is interesting how a siegecraft treatise could not only deal with machines, a recurring topic in all the treatises of siegecraft, but also on their construction and on the material employed in this process. This aspect is generally considered in the treatises of military mechanics and civil uses, which have reached us, but such a richness in detail on the materials of the single parts of a machine remains puzzling.¹⁴¹⁵

The geographical area which results from the considered specialties may be the mere outcome of Stephanus' (or his source's) selection. The concentration of the toponyms in Asia Minor omits other Mediterranean areas famous in antiquity for the extraction of metals (Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 4). Still, it is not certain that the author really meant to offer a systematic and ordered catalogue of all the famous areas of metallurgy, like the one provided by Pliny the Elder.¹⁴¹⁶ The civil uses of these kinds of hardened iron may be a prerogative of the geographical types considered by Daimachos. The general inference is that Daimachos approached this subject differently from Vitruvius' committal with these problems in the *De architectura*, because Daimachos was more interested in daily instruments used by common workers and unskilled labourers. This high degree of specialization and interest confirms the quality of the activity of this man dotted with multifarious concerns.

1415 On these essays, see the general overview by Fleury 2002. On the basis of F 5, it is certain that Daimachos dealt with this subject; Athenaeus will hardly have praised him in the same place as Diades and Pyrrhos, if Daimachos' work was primarily concerned with theoretical aspects of a siege (as happened, for example, in Strato and in Hestieus, the bad examples).

1416 Plin. *HN* 34.142-50. On Pliny's description of metallurgy, see Healy 1999; in general on ancient metallurgy, cp. Ramin 1977, Healy 1978 and Tylecote 1992.

5.8. Daimachos F 7

Previous editions: *BNJ* 65 F 8; *FGrHist* 65 F 8 (Plut. *Lys.* 12.2.6–8).

(2) οἱ δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ λίθου πτώσιν ἐπι τῷ πάθει τούτῳ σημεῖόν φασὶ γενέσθαι· κατηνέχθη γάρ, ὡς ἡ δόξα τῶν πολλῶν, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ παμμεγέθης λίθος εἰς Αἰγὸς ποταμούς. καὶ δείκνυται μὲν ἔτι νῦν, σεβομένων αὐτὸν τῶν Χερρονησιτῶν [...] (6) τῷ δ' Ἀναξαγόραι μαρτυρεῖ καὶ Δαίμαχος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ εὐσεβείας ἱστορῶν, ὅτι πρὸ τοῦ πεσεῖν τὸν λίθον ἐφ' ἡμέρας ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ πέντε συνεχῶς κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἑώρατο πύρινον σῶμα παμμέγεθες ὥσπερ νέφος φλογοειδές, οὐ σχολάζον, ἀλλὰ πολυπλόκους καὶ κεκλασμένας φορὰς φερόμενον, ὥσθ' ὑπὸ σάλου καὶ πλάνης ἀπορρηγνύμενα πυροειδῆ σπάσματα φέρεσθαι πολλαχοῦ καὶ ἀστράπτειν, ὥσπερ οἱ διάιπτοντες ἀστέρες. (7) ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐνταῦθα τῆς γῆς ἔβρισε, καὶ παυσάμενοι φόβου καὶ θάμβους οἱ ἐπιχώριοι συνῆλθον, ὥφθη πυρὸς μὲν οὐδὲν ἔργον οὐδ' ἴχνος τοσοῦτου, λίθος δὲ κείμενος, ἄλλως μὲν μέγας, οὐθὲν δὲ μέρος ὡς εἶπεῖν ἐκείνης τῆς πυροειδοῦς περιοχῆς ἔχων. (8) ὅτι μὲν οὖν εὐγνωμόνων ὁ Δαίμαχος ἀκροατῶν δεῖται, δῆλός ἐστιν· εἰ δὲ ἀληθὴς ὁ λόγος, ἐξελέγχει κατὰ κράτος τοὺς φάσκοντας ἕκ τινος ἀκρωρείας ἀποκοπεῖσαν πνεύμασι καὶ ζάλαις πέτραν, ὑποληφθεῖσαν δ' ὥσπερ οἱ στρόβιλοι καὶ πέτραν, ὑποληφθεῖσαν δ' ὥσπερ οἱ στρόβιλοι καὶ φερομένην, ἣν πρῶτον ἐνέδωκε καὶ διελύθη τὸ περιδινησαν, ἐκριφῆναι καὶ πεσεῖν.

4 Δαίμαχος Xylander δάμαχος *codd.* 6 πύρρινον G 7 πολυπλόκους Xylander Ziegler πολύπλους L πολύπλους G πολυπλοῦς Reiske 8 ὥσθ' (ὥστε) Reiske ὡς τὰ *codd.* 9 πυροειδῆ G 10 παυσάμενος L¹ 12 τοσοῦτου G τοσοῦτον L 14 Δαίμαχος Xylander δάμαχος *codd.* ἀποκοπεῖσαν C ἀποκοπεῖσας L “*sed corr. m.1 in ἀποκοπέισης, quod habet G*” (Ziegler) 15 ὑπολειφθεῖσαν L

“Others say that there was an omen referring to this calamity, for, according to many people, a huge stone fell from the sky upon Aigospotami (they still show it, because the Chersonites revere it). [...] (6) In his books *On Piety*, Daimachos pleads for Anaxagoras’ theory, when he narrates that, before the stone fell, a huge and fiery body was observed in the sky for seventy-five days without interruption; it resembled a cloud in flames: never at rest, but following

complicated and flexuous trajectories, to the point that some fragments, like small flames, shattered by its plunging and erratic course, would move in every direction and hurl lightning, just like shooting stars. (7) As soon as it fell on that spot and the locals had gathered, after recovering from their panic and astonishment, there was no consequence or trace of that fire – just a stone, but of big dimensions, which showed no remnants, so to say, of that ensemble of flames. (8) It is no mystery that Daimachos requires indulgent readers: if, however, his account is true, he strongly refutes those who argue otherwise, that a rock, cut off from a mountain ridge by wind and storm, was drawn away and suspended like a spinning-top: it was then discharged and fell, where the whirling movement first yielded its energy and dissolved.” (tr. S. Tufano)

5.8.1. Plut. *Lys.* 12: A Possible Stratification

This passage from Plutarch’s *Life of Lysander*¹⁴¹⁷ has no relevant textual problems. These paragraphs are considered pertinent to Daimachos’ *Περὶ εὐσεβείας* from Jacoby on. In order to properly contextualize them, we should remember that, in a section of the *Life of Lysander* not quoted here, Anaxagoras’ theory on the meteorites referred to an event which occurred in 468/7 BCE: we know from other sources that the philosopher allegedly foresaw the fall of a meteorite in that year.¹⁴¹⁸ Consequently, Daimachos more likely refers to this same event, which, *a posteriori*, was considered a premonitory event of the battle fought at

1417 This *Life* is characterized by a “ritratto paradossale” of Lysander (La Penna 1976), as several scholars have noticed (Pelling 1988: 268–74; Stadter 1992; Candau Morón 2000). The main commentaries are the ones by Smits (1939) and Piccirilli (in Angeli Bertinelli *et al.* 1997).

1418 Anaxagoras’ theory: Plut. *Lys.* 12.3–4 = D. – K. 59 A 12. Tradition on his foretelling: D. – K. 59 A 11. The year 468/7 BCE comes from the combined reading of the *Marmor Parium* (57: ἐν Αἰγὸς ποταμοῖς ὁ λίθος ἔπεσε), which dates the event to Theagenidas’ archonship, and two later sources (Plin. *NH* 2.149: *Olympiadis LXXVIII secundo anno*; Hier. *Chron.*: 1551 years after Abraham, *Lapis in Aegon fluvium de coelo ruit*). Anaxagoras was born in Clazomenai at the beginning of the fifth century BCE; he then went to Athens where he lived for thirty years before being expelled for impiety. He spent his last years in Lampsakos (cp. D. – K. 59 A 1). A more precise chronology is extremely hard, since, for his thirty years in Athens, both early (480–50 BCE: Taylor 1917) and later extremes (460–30 BCE: Mansfeld 1979–80; Curd 2007: 131) have been suggested. Recently, Graham (2013) put forward new arguments for the first option, especially in light of Anaxagoras’ observations on the eclipse in 478 BCE and of the fall of the meteorite in Aigospotami ten years later; for a general overview of the witnesses, see Curd 2007: 130–7. The main commentaries on Anaxagoras’ fragments are Lanza 1966, Sider 2005, and Curd 2007.

Aigospotami in 405 BCE. The overall structure of this chapter of the *Life of Lysander* supports this interpretation and it is hard to believe that Daimachos was referring to a second meteorite fall: it was not uncommon, in the aftermath of a big event, to recollect very distant memories, especially when, as in this case, something extraordinary happened in the same spot.¹⁴¹⁹

Plutarch first narrates the final events of the battle of Aigospotami (*Lys.* 11.1-11), and then lingers on the global meaning of this fight, which marked the conclusion of the Peloponnesian War (11.12).¹⁴²⁰ As a result, the great military talent displayed by Lysander was read as divine intervention (11.13: θεῖον [...] τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον).¹⁴²¹ Chapter 12 illustrates this opinion and supports it by referring to two prodigies which happened before and during the event: in the first place, Plutarch quite concisely mentions the apparition of the Dioscuri as stars, a not infrequent event, during military fights.¹⁴²² His main interest, nonetheless, lies in the second omen, the falling of a big rock in Aigospotami (12.2:

1419 Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 8 prefers thinking of a second meteorite fall, which occurred in 405 BCE. Nonetheless, Plutarch only mentions a single fall when he reports Anaxagoras' theory (*Lys.* 12.2: τὴν τοῦ λίθου πτώσιν). It is probably better to adhere to the literal meaning of the text: if there is a normal tendency to look at portents, during momentous events, or in their aftermath, a recollection of a specific portent can become more and more relevant as a result (Flower 2008: 109).

1420 The main sources on the battle of Aigospotami are Xenophon (*Hell.* 2.1.27-9) and Diodorus (13.105-6), whereas the other authors do not add relevant details (*Lys.* 21.10-1; *Nep. Alc.* 8; *Frontin. Str.* 2.1.18; *Paus.* 9.32.9; *Polyaenus, Str.* 1.45.2). Plutarch (*Lys.* 10-1) mainly draws on the philo-Spartan version provided by Xenophon, but there are some verbal echoes from Diodorus as well (Bleckmann 1998: 115). On Lysander's victory, see Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 8, Fantasia 2012: 185-90, and Robinson 2014.

1421 *Plut. Lys.* 11.12: ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς εὐβουλία καὶ δεινότητι συνήρητο, "(the war) had reached an end, thanks to the wisdom and the bravery of just one man" (cp. furthermore the passages by Cornelius Nepos, Frontinus, and Polyaeus, quoted in the previous n.). On the pivotal character of this event for Plutarch's description of Lysander: Candau Morón 2000: 471.

1422 Lysander dedicated two golden stars in Delphi after the epiphany of the Dioskouroi (*Cic. Div.* 1.75; *Plut. Lys.* 18.1; *De Pyth. or.* 8.397F), and had two statues erected for them (*Paus.* 10.9.7-8; cp. Piccirilli in Angeli Bertinelli *et al.* 1997: 246 and Torelli in Torelli – Bultrighini 2017: 287-91 on the Nauarch Monument of the Spartans in Delphi). Many sources address the constant military and divine support of the Dioskouroi to the Spartans: the twins protected the kings in war (*Simon. F.* 11.24-34 West, *IE*² on the presence of Menelaus and of the Dioskouroi, close to Pausanias: it is the so-called "Plataian Elegy"; *Hdt.* 5.75), and the kings particularly revered them (*Paus.* 4.17.2). The Dioskouroi notoriously helped the Lokrians during the Battle of the Sagra, when the Lokrians were fighting against the Crotoniates (on this much debated battle, which took place in the sixth century BCE, cp. Nicholson 2016: 135-9 and Guzzo 1994 on the Dioskouroi in the Greek West); the Dioskouroi also appeared during the Battle of Lake Regillus at the very beginning of the fifth century (see Sordi 1972 for a comparison between these Italian battles, in relationship with the epiphany).

παμμεγέθης λίθος), that occurred more than sixty years before the battle but was understood as connected to it (ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τούτῳ).

It is generally assumed that, for this chapter, Plutarch referred to Spartan sources, especially in light of the high exaltation of the Spartan victory (BNJ 596 F 25a = *Lys.* 12.1–2). Scholars have tried to identify these specific sources in order to know whence Plutarch took his information on the omens and, consequently, the quotes from Anaxagoras and from Daimachos. Since Daimachos' *Περὶ εὐσεβείας* is quoted only here, we cannot exclude that Plutarch was actually referring to an intermediate source, be it Anaxandridas of Delphi, Theopompos, Ephoros, or Choerilus of Samos (this last name is actually more likely only for the mention of the Dioscuri).¹⁴²³ None of these names, unfortunately, can be considered a peripatetic voice, as the one we should posit here, since the way in which Plutarch draws on Anaxagoras in this chapter seems to betray a peripatetic elaboration (Lanza 1966: 22–4). Therefore, the τίνες [...] λέγοντες of *Lys.* 12.1 might indicate an intermediate source, such as one of the aforementioned ones, different from the second, intermediate source, implied by the parallel οἱ δέ [...] φασι of *Lys.* 12.2: this second expression opens the long excursus in the rest of the chapter, where the comparison between Anaxagoras and Daimachos, and the mention of other theories on the origin of the heavenly bodies, can be best explained with a recourse to a work like the Aristotelian *Meteorologica* (rather than, for instance, to a historiographical work, as the title of Daimachos' work also implies a philosophical matter).

5.8.2. The Meteorite of 467 BCE and Classical Astronomical Thought

The first two preserved shards of meteorites, which can be positively dated, respectively fell on Nogata, in Japan, in 861 CE and on Ensisheim, in Alsace, in 1492.¹⁴²⁴ Meteorite falls have often been understood as divine signs, from ancient times on: for instance, it is still

1423 Anaxandridas of Delphi: Smits 1939: 129; Piccirilli in Angeli Bertinelli *et al.* 1997: 246. Anaxandridas must have lived between the third and second centuries BCE (Rzepka 2009) and is quoted elsewhere in the *Life of Lysander* (18 = BNJ 404 F 2). Theopompos: Flower 1994: 73–4. Ephoros: Pownall 2004: 113. Ephoros, just like Theopompos, was considered a likely source for the attention he usually pays to supernatural events (cp. Flower 2008: 110). Choerilus of Samos: Kennell 2015 *ad* BNJ 596 F 25a, who also offers an introduction to this specific *Quellenkritik*.

1424 For a systematic reconsideration of the information on these two episodes, see concisely Marvin 2006: 16–7.

debated which meteorite was represented in Raphael's *Madonna of Foligno* (1511).¹⁴²⁵ Raphael's example is particularly useful, because it shows the difficulties and the skepticism with which astronomers generally consider every mention of a meteorite fall before the Nogata and the Ensisheim episodes. In the absence of concrete remains or of further pieces of evidence, only literary or artistic witnesses can offer a biased or unclear picture on these phenomena.

There are actual instances, where such a phenomenon was the rational explanation for an aniconic cult of stones, variously identified with a god. In these cases, in the impossibility of directly checking the addressed material, it is scientifically wrong to accept at face value any reference to an "extraterrestrial" material.¹⁴²⁶ From a list of all those episodes, which can *roughly* be equated with a meteorite rain or an asteroid fall, we infer that the episode of Aigospotami (468/7 BCE), on the eastern coast of the Hellespont, is the first event which left a considerable echo in the literary sources.¹⁴²⁷ These also report and connect the fall with the presence, in the sky, of an iron cloud. From a scientific point of view, it must be premised that the meteorite and the iron cloud do not necessarily have a direct relationship, and therefore the two phenomena can have different explanations (see *infra* in text on this).

The episode of Aigospotami was almost always associated to Anaxagoras by our sources, since the philosopher allegedly foresaw the fall of a stone in the area. Modern scholarship tends to understand this tradition as Anaxagoras seeing his theories proven by the

1425 In the past, it was believed that the painter referred to a meteorite rain that fell on Crema in the same year in which Raphael was working, and foretold the papal victory against the French army; more recently, and probably more to the point, it has been suggested that the depicted phenomenon is a childhood memory of Sigismondo de' Conti (commissioner of the painting), who saw a comet in 1465. On this painting, see particularly Newton 1897 and Antonello 2013.

1426 For the possible allusion to aniconic cults, see already Newton 1897; more nuanced, but open to comparisons among more cultures, Burke 1986. I wish to thank here Prof. M. Merafina (Department of Physics, Sapienza University of Rome) and Mr. Giovanni Palermo for the useful explanations on this technical subject.

1427 See D'Orazio 2007 for a complete list of the episodes. On Aigospotami, he remarks that "[t]his is by far the most famous, most cited and most reliable meteorite fall of antiquity" (216). Cp. Theodossiou *et al.* 2002: 138 for possible previous cases: most of these, nonetheless, include dates from theogonies or mythological frameworks, which are more likely the mere result of rationalization. If ancient historians should be aware of the literary dimension of these witnesses, scholars of science and astronomers have made the same mistake of accepting at face value the ancient sources, often read in translation.

meteorite fall, which was hardly his source of inspiration.¹⁴²⁸ He argued that the Sun, the Moon, and all the heavenly bodies are made up of rocky elements, and drawn, in a perennial rotational movement, by the aether; this movement was originally inspired and started by the universal Νοῦς. These bodies, other than the earth, tend to remain in their allotted part of the *kosmos*, but they are sometimes uprooted by turbulence or by a collision of bodies.¹⁴²⁹

Despite Plutarch’s impression that Daimachos’ description actually supports (μαρτυρεῖ) Anaxagoras’ theory, there are stronger affinities between Daimachos’ interpretation and the one of Diogenes of Apollonia.¹⁴³⁰ This philosopher lived in the second half of the fifth century BCE and described the same event that occurred in Aigospotami, with a lexicon – and a perspective – particularly similar to the one used by Daimachos. This is the fragment, as it is quoted by Aëtius (2.13.5 = T 26b Laks = D. – K. 64 A 12):

“Diogenes claims that the stars are like pumice stone, that they are the world’s vents, and that there are embers; and he maintains that stones, which are invisible (and for this reason are nameless), accompany the visible heavenly bodies in their revolutions; and that they often fall and are extinguished on the earth, like the heavenly body made of stone that fell burning at Aigospotami” (tr. A. Laks – G.W. Most, with slight modifications).¹⁴³¹

1428 It is debated how much the empirical method influenced this pre-Socratic philosopher (on his cosmology, see, in general, Graham 2006: 186–223; Curd 2007: 206–34; Graham 2013). Graham (2006: 209; 2013) has recently argued that the eclipse of 478 BCE and the later episode at Aigospotami confirmed previous intuitions: Anaxagoras’ contemporaries, and the following tradition, understood his reasoning as a prediction of these phenomena (it should be noted, incidentally, that nowadays it is assumed to be relatively possible to foresee an eclipse, whereas no causal relationship can positively be posited between the observation of heavenly bodies in the Earth’s atmosphere and a subsequent meteorite fall).

1429 Graham 2013: 146–7.

1430 Diogenes was Anaxagoras’ pupil and worked between 440 and 423 BCE (Gregory 2007: 133–6).

1431 Διογένης κισηροειδῆ τὰ ἄστρα, διαπνοᾶς δὲ αὐτὰ νομίζει τοῦ κόσμου, εἶναι δὲ διάπυρα’ συμπεριφέρεσθαι δὲ τοῖς φανεροῖς ἄστροις ἀφανεῖς λίθους καὶ παρ’ αὐτὸ τοῦτ’ ἀωνύμους’ πίπτοντας δὲ πολλάκις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς σβέννυσθαι, καθάπερ τὸν ἐν Αἰγὸς ποταμοῖς πυροειδῶς κατενεχθέντα ἄστέρα πέτρινον. On Diogenes, who advocated the coexistence of more *kosmoi*, see Laks 2008 and Dillon 2004 (on his possible influence on Euripides); more on his cosmology in D’Orazio 2007: 216 and Gregory 2007: 134–6.

Some elements of this aetiology of the event share some points in common with the theory of Anaxagoras, such as the description of the precipitation and the presence of *διάπυρα*, “embers”. On the other hand, there are also relevant affinities with the presentation offered by Daimachos. Particularly puzzling is the emphasis on the fiery nature of these stones and the shock of the first observers, which also emerges from the concise commentary by Diogenes: local people could not find any evidence of the fire, which allegedly formed these celestial bodies, because, by the time these shards fell on Earth, they were extinguished (*σβέννυσθαι*). Anaxagoras already insisted on the pivotal role of the fire in his own ontology, but Daimachos’ insistence on the existence and the formation of these aethereal particles of fire¹⁴³² is more similar to Diogenes’ description of the event, despite Plutarch’s understanding. The dominance of the fiery element in this cosmology might imply, in Diogenes, a return to pre-Anaxogorean cosmologies, especially because it seems that Anaxagoras insisted more on the lithic nature of the meteorites.¹⁴³³

Both Daimachos and Anaxagoras, however, share a detail which the first author may have read in the second one, namely, the duration of the meteorite in the sky (75 days, without interruption: Plut. *Lys.* 12.6). If we put aside this specific number, in itself probably (but not necessarily: see *infra*) exaggerated, it is remarkable that Pliny the Elder, while mentioning Anaxagoras’ committal with the experience, also repeats that a comet was seen, in the sky, for some nights: *comete quoque illis noctibus flagrante*.¹⁴³⁴ The same Plutarch, who does not agree with Anaxagoras and Daimachos, wonders whether it was not actual fire τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας (*Lys.* 12.9: “what appeared [in the sky] for so many days”).

It is likely that Daimachos was drawing on Diogenes’ theories, then on theories relatively outdated by the time of Daimachos’ activity. In this period, in fact, Aristotle and his disciples were advancing new interpretations of the meteorites, which were seen as earthly rocks, raised by the winds.¹⁴³⁵ Daimachos apparently refused or did not share this theory,

1432 Plut. *Lys.* 12.5: ἐπινέμησις αἰθερίου πυρός. The adj. αἰθέριος refers to the αἰθήρ, which indicates the higher vault of the sky, characterized by a brighter atmosphere (Casevitz 2003: 29).

1433 Cp. Graham 2013: 147 for the possibility that Daimachos returned to pre-Anaxogorean theories, and Simpl. *In Phys.* p.25,1-3 (P2 Laks – Most = DK 64 A 5). Anaxagoras’ cosmology: DK A 73 and 77.

1434 Plin. *N.H.* 2.149-50; Anaxagoras DK 59 A 11.

1435 Arist. *Mete.* 1.7.32.

even if there is a degree of risk in reconstructing his philosophy from this mere fragment. In particular, we should also consider the complex overlaying of sources behind Plutarch from an early stage (Anaxagoras/Diogenes/other?), through Daimachos, down to a probable intermediary source, until Plutarch. Nonetheless, it remains highly likely that Daimachos was adhering to an old-style scientific theory, during the composition of his *On Piety*.

5.8.3. Daimachos and Halley's Comet

The literature that went under the title *On Piety* (Περὶ εὐσεβείας) often reported omens and extraordinary natural phenomena, because this genre was characterized by a strong moralising vein. This understanding was shared by other genres, like didactic poetry. A good example of this tendency is offered by the telling digression on meteorites and on their meaning at the end of the second book of Manilius' *Astronomica* (2.815–921).¹⁴³⁶ In fact, this view of the phenomenon is a trend that went far beyond ancient treatises on piety: we find instances in meteorology and in polemology, and Greek literature offers examples from a relatively recent stage (most notably, in the astronomical observations of the *Works and Days*).¹⁴³⁷

More specifically, the Greek books *On Piety* were allegedly started as a literary tradition by Pitagoras.¹⁴³⁸ They could also have other titles, such as Περὶ θεῶν or Περὶ ὀσιότητος, and shared a rationalistic view of the world, whose physical structures and events do not

1436 Even if this poem does not properly belong to the literature to which Daimachos' treatise can be ascribed, it offers a useful summary of how the ominous power of these heavenly bodies was perceived: "Bright comets often communicate such disasters:/ mournings approach, with those torches, and threaten to the earth/ endlessly glowing flames", tr. S. Tufano (2.892–4: *talia significant lucentes saepe cometae:/ funera cum facibus veniunt, terrisque minantur/ ardentis sine fine rogos*; cp., later, Sen. *QNat.* 1.15). See further other passages listed by Feraboli – Scarcia in Scarcia *et al.* 2011: 277–8. For the theory reproduced by Manilius, who likely went back (through Theophrastos) to Aristotle's view of meteors as earthly exhalations, see Taub 2003: 139–41.

1437 For an introduction to this problem, see Taub 2003: 15–69, and the contributions in Cusset 2003. In Babylonian culture, moreover, there were specific anthologies of prodigies, like the extensive 7000 episodes collected in the *Enūma Anu Enlil*, a list of omens, where meteorology and astronomy are used to understand the earthly consequences of such observations. The nucleus of this collection dates back to the beginning of the second millennium BCE. The anthology proceeded until 194 BCE, according to the last datable document; see the general overview by Swerdlow 1998.

1438 On the genre, see an introduction in Obbink 1996: 82–3.

depend on the action of the gods. It is not by chance that, after a proliferation in the early Hellenistic period (Theophrastos and Herakleides Pontikos both wrote a *Περὶ εὐσεβείας*),¹⁴³⁹ the genre attracted the interest of very different authors, like Chrysippus, Perseus, and Diogenes of Babylonia, all mentioned by Philodemos in his *On Piety*, written in the first century BCE.

Daimachos probably referred to the same event described by Anaxagoras and by Diogenes, since there is a meaningful coincidence between the dimension of the rock that was observed by the inhabitants of the Chersonesos and the estimate given by Pliny (2.149: *magnitudine vehis*). This argument goes against the late dating of Daimachos' description, as if it described a second event of 405 BCE. This picture must nevertheless be considered with all these details to try to understand it in contemporary terms.¹⁴⁴⁰ It has already been assumed that the description might follow the common pattern of a meteorite fall in Classical sources. There are some details, however, which demand a more comprehensive historicization of the event. For example, the latest commentary on the fragment (Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 8) reports the following explanation, by an engineer:

“a comparatively small core of a comet or a loosely structured asteroid was drawn by a combination of the gravitation of the earth and the moon on an elliptical orbit. During a period of ca. seventy-five days this object several times touched the highest atmosphere of the earth thus causing the impressive phenomena of light ('flaming cloud.') In the course of this process several fragments of the object broke away in different directions and fell down [...] as big shooting-stars (so-called 'bolids'). Finally, the object again reached a parabolic orbit and--luckily--escaped the field of gravitation of the earth. A comparatively big fragment of this object, however, fell down as the described 'stone' and this gave an impulse to the main object strong enough to change slightly its orbit and to escape into space.”

The previous reconstruction does not completely conform to the actual observation of fragments in the sky, and from what we know about the consequences of such falls, since a

1439 T 17 (3) Schütrumpf.

1440 Later dating: Engels 2011a *ad BNJ* 65 F 8.

meteorite can either turn to dust or create large-scale damage in the surrounding area. A period of 75 days is more in line with the behaviour of comets, which can be observed in the sky for up to 80 days. It has been argued that the specific comet that was observed in 468/7 BCE was Halley’s comet, since it is very likely that a passage of this comet was recorded in a Chinese universal history written at the beginning of the first century BCE, the *Shǐjì* (*Records of the Grand Historian*), by Sima Tan and Sima Qian.¹⁴⁴¹ Interestingly, under the events of 238 BCE, during the rule of the First Emperor of Qin, it is recorded:

“A comet appeared in the west, then appeared again in the north, moving south from the Dipper for eighty days.” (*Shǐjì* 15; tr. B. Watson 1993)

This is only one of the four comets that were observed in China between 240 and 238 BCE.¹⁴⁴² Since this comet has a recurring period of 76 years, if we start from the earliest Chinese record (240 BCE) and multiply this period by three, we reach the date of 468 BCE, which is exactly the date of the assumed “meteorite” fall in Aigospotami.¹⁴⁴³ Daimachos, after Anaxagoras, would then be one of the first reporters of this event, even if he referred to an intermediate source: the stress on the bright light of the phenomenon derives from the more intense light of the comet in antiquity. The Chinese sources also insist on the bright dimension of the phenomenon. In general, one may claim that this long period (75/80 days) fits the appearance of a comet, or of a supernova (a second hypothesis which remains less likely, for the static character of these stellar explosions).

The hypothesis of Halley’s comet (or, in general, of a comet) is in line with the general date of 468/7 BCE of the literary sources, but still fails to explain the physical damage spotted by the observers, according to our sources. We may then assume that two episodes actually happened, namely, the appearance of the comet and a meteorite fall.¹⁴⁴⁴ An

1441 On the first Chinese sources on this subject, see Stephenson – Yau 1984 and Pankenier 2013.

1442 Further sources and references in Pankenier 2013: 506 n.305. It is not completely certain, nevertheless, to which of these descriptions Halley’s comet may be ascribed; the earliest date of 240 BCE also derives from astronomical calculations (Kiang 1972).

1443 Graham – Hintz 2010 also link the passage of Halley’s comet to Anaxagoras’ and Daimachos’ observations. Orbital period of the comet: Kronk 1999: 3.

1444 The different data have been traced back to two phenomena only by McBeath – Gheorghe 2005: 137 and Curd 2007: 132 and n.9. Since the colour of the object fluctuates between brown and black, and the dimension is compared to

observer between the fifth and the fourth century BCE would likely unify these phenomena, helped by his understanding that asteroids might be fiery objects.¹⁴⁴⁵

[i]f early Greek cosmological theories were weak in empirical content, the theorists could be opportunistic in finding evidence for them and testing them against whatever data they had at their disposal (Graham 2013: 152).

It cannot be positively confirmed that a meteorite fell, despite the repeated emphasis on the dimensions of the stone. Paradoxically, the naivety of Aristotle's explanation may hide an actual, "mere", if sensible, landslide. Daimachos' description of the event is only partially similar to other Classical sources that report a meteorite fall.¹⁴⁴⁶ An analysis of all the parts reveals, on the contrary, that the original episode may actually coincide with a passage of Halley's comet, which was considered, by popular belief, in accordance with another phenomenon in the area. It is highly unlikely that a real meteorite fell on the spot, and so, what remains, is the ominous power attached to this sequence of events.

a horse cart, Theodossiou *et al.* (2002: 137-8) suggested that it was an iron meteorite, which oxidized when it touched the soil.

1445 And, consequently, support the idea of Anaxagoras foreseeing the event (Curd 2007: 132 n.9).

1446 See a list in Pritchett 1979: 122-3 n.106.