

# WAS THERE DUAL AUTHORSHIP IN GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY? A CRITICAL OVERVIEW OF THE EPIGRAPHIC AND LITERARY EVIDENCE FROM ARISTOTLE TO PAMPHILE OF EPIDAUROS\*

---

*Abstract:* This paper discusses jointly written works in ancient literature. Although this topic has received little attention, there is sufficient evidence, particularly from epigraphic sources, that informs us about dual authorship in Greek historiography. The main aim of this paper is to present those examples and to explore what influence dual authorship might have had on the content of those historiographical works. In this context, it will also be discussed why this phenomenon is encountered only sporadically in antiquity.

---

*Keywords:* Aristotle, Callisthenes, Delphi, *Lindian Chronicle*, Herodotus, Agias, Pamphile of Epidaurus, dual authorship

‘... the myth of single authorship ... is thoroughly embedded in our culture and our ordinary practices, including the ordinary practices of criticism and interpretation’  
Stillinger (1991) 187

## Introduction

To ask whether dual authorship existed in Greek historiography seems anachronistic at first glance, because it contests the notion of stand-alone authorship, which is deeply rooted in our perception of authorship in antiquity. Although we know that authors received help while revising and finishing off their manuscripts,<sup>1</sup> it nevertheless seems that com-

\* I am thankful to the Fondation Hardt in Geneva which gave me the opportunity through a bursary to write this paper in a leisurely and erudite environment during my stay in November 2022. The translations of the inscription from Delphi, of Clement of Alexandria, and of Photius are my own; in the case of the *Lindian Chronicle* I have used with slight modifications the translation of Higbie (2003); the epigraphical sources are cited following the second version of GrEpiAbbr of AIEGL (<https://aiegl.org/grepiabbr.html>). For helpful comments and for improving my English I am thankful to Lawrence Kim (Trinity), Marian Helm (Münster), Markus Hafner (Graz), Alexander Free, and Henry Heitmann-Gordon (both Munich). I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for *Histos* for their detailed and insightful critiques.

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Woodman (2015) 45–7.

posing works in tandem was not a common practice in Greek and Roman literature. An intriguing glimpse of ancient practices is provided by the imperial grammarian Iulius Pollux in the preface to the seventh book of his lexicon *Ἵονομαστικόν*, where he states that he was unable to find a colleague (*συνεργός*) to share the work-load, because such a person would have had to be of the same mind as himself<sup>2</sup>—according to Pollux, such a match would have been highly unlikely and also have diminished his reputation as an erudite writer. In contrast, we know that dual authorship was not uncommon in ancient epistolography. For example, we are informed by Cicero that Atticus sent him letters written by him alone as well as those written in conjunction with others (*communiter cum aliis*),<sup>3</sup> and several letters of the Apostle Paul may have been the product of co-authorship.<sup>4</sup> What seems true for epistolary literature does not necessarily apply to the rest of ancient literature, but there are, of course, a few exceptions like the *Apology for Origen* written by Pamphilus of Caesarea and Eusebius of Caesarea during their imprisonment.<sup>5</sup> In this sense, dual authorship involves two people working together to produce a written document, which is very different from other forms of collaborative writing or co-authorship.<sup>6</sup> In particular, we have some evidence, although rare

<sup>2</sup> Poll. 7.βι.: τοῦδε εἴνεκα οὐδὲ συνεργὸν ἐδυνάμην εἰς πάντα παραλαβεῖν οὐδένα. οὔτε γὰρ εἶχον ὅτῳ πιστεῦσαιμι ἐοικότι, καὶ ἔδει πάντως ἐκάστῳ προσεῖναι τὸ ἐμοί δοκοῦν.

<sup>3</sup> Cic. Att. 11.5.1: *equidem ex tuis litteris intellexi et iis quas communiter cum aliis scripsisti et iis quas tuo nomine, e.q.s.*

<sup>4</sup> On co-authorship in the Pauline Epistles and with further epistolary examples especially from the papyri see Prior (1989) 37–45; on the role of ancient pupils, excerptors, and copyists as co-authors see Bonollo (2021) 151–64; on collaborative authorship in ancient family workshops see Hafner (2022) 341–66; instructive on the collaboration of two people, but in Greek sculpture, is Brommer (1950) 85–95.

<sup>5</sup> According to Phot. *Bibl.* 118 both wrote the first five books together; the sixth and final book, on the other hand, was written by Eusebius alone after Pamphilus was executed: τόμοι δὲ τὸ βιβλίον 5', ὧν οἱ μὲν ε' Παμφίλῳ τὸ δεσμοτῆριον οἰκοῦντι συμπάροντος Εὐσεβίου ἐξεπονήθησαν, ὁ δὲ ἕκτος, ἐπεὶ ὁ μάρτυς ξίφει τοῦ ζῆν ἀπαχθεὶς ἀνέλυσε πρὸς ὃν ἐπόθει Θεόν, Εὐσεβίῳ λοιπὸν ἀπαρτίζεται. Another possible testimony for dual authorship is a work on signal fires, which, according to the Suda, was written by Cleoxenus and Democleitus (Suda, s.v. Κλεόξενος (K 1726 Adler): Κλεόξενος καὶ Δημόκλειτος ἔγραψαν περὶ πυρσῶν ὧν τὴν πραγματείαν ἐπέξεργάσατο Πολύβιος ὁ Μεγαλοπολίτης, ὡς λέγει ἐν τοῖς ἱστορουμένοις); however, this passage is based on Polybius (10.45.6), who states only that Cleoxenus and Democleitus had invented a new method for signal fires and that he himself had improved it: ὁ δὲ τελευταῖος τρόπος, ἐπινοηθεὶς διὰ Κλεοξένου καὶ Δημοκλείτου, τυχῶν δὲ τῆς ἐξεργασίας δι' ἡμῶν.

<sup>6</sup> For example, the collaboration of Aristotle and his team of authors for the 158 *Πολιτεῖαι πόλεων* (Diog. Laert. 5.27: Πολιτεῖαι πόλεων δυοῖν δεούσαιν ρξ' <κοινὰ> καὶ ἴδιαι, δημοκρατικαί, ὀλιγαρχικαί, ἀριστοκρατικαὶ καὶ τυραννικαί; on the work of Aristotle and his

and especially through inscriptions, that informs us about dual authorship in Greek historiography. Therefore, the first aim of this study is to present the genuine examples—the *Pythian Victors* of Aristotle and Callisthenes as well as the *Lindian Chronicle* of Tharsagoras and Timachidas—and to discuss what influence dual authorship could have had on the content of those historiographical works. Aside from these two examples, there also exist ambiguous cases of dual authorship. In those instances, the collaboration between the two historians remains partially obscure. Thus, the second aim of this study is to examine those possible examples, which are, first, the *Argolica* of Agias and Dercylus, and, second, the *Historical Commentaries* of Pamphile and Socratidas. Taken together, these four cases will help us to understand a rare form of authorship in ancient literature and especially in Greek historiography.

### Genuine Case I

#### Aristotle and Callisthenes: *Pythian Victors*

In 1898 the director of the French School at Athens, Théophile Homolle, published a small fragment of a marble slab found ‘dans un puits au Sud-Est de la maison Pappaïoannou’ bearing thirteen lines of fifteen letters per line in *στοιχηδόν*. It is a fragmentary honorary inscription for Aristotle and his nephew and disciple Callisthenes:<sup>7</sup>

[.....]  
 [.συ]νέ[ταξαν πίνακ]-  
 α] τῶν ἀπ’ [αἰῶνος νεν]-  
 ικηκό[τ]ων τὰ [Πύθλια]  
 4 καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀρχ[ῆς τὸ]-  
 ν ἀγῶνα κατασκ[ευσ]-  
 σάντων, ἐπαινέ[σαι]  
 Ἄριστοτέλην κα[ὶ Κ]-

‘équipe’, see Polito (2010) 127–9). The Septuagint is assumed to have been translated collectively; for the more symbolic value of the selection of the Elders, whether seventy-two or seventy, in the *Letter of Aristeas* see Honigman (2003) 56–8. Several compilers are attested for the commissioned *Codex Iustinianus* (for the commissions see the prefaces *Cod. Iust. const. Haec* §1, issued on 13 February 528 AD; *const. Summa* § 2, issued on 7 April 529 AD; and *const. Cordi* §2, issued on 16 November 534 AD).

<sup>7</sup> Here the Greek text is from *CID IV 10*; see as well *F.Delphes III 1.400* (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 275); *FGrHist* 124 T 23; further Homolle (1898) 260–70; Chanotis (1988) 195–6, 214–15, 293–6; Haake (2007) 237–40; Christesen (2007) 179–202.

- 8 αλλισθένην καὶ [στ]-  
 εφανῶσαι, ἀνα[θεῖν]-  
 αι δὲ τὸν πίν[ακα το]-  
 ὺς ταμίας [ἐν τῶι ἰε]-  
 12 ρῶι με[ταγεγραμμέ]-  
 νον [εἰς στήλην ...]

... they put in order together a *pinax* of those who won the Pythian games from the beginning and of those organising the *agon* since ancient times, praise Aristotle and Callisthenes and crown them. The *tamiai* will set up the *pinax* in the sanctuary, being copied on a *stèle* ...

According to the decree, Aristotle and Callisthenes were honoured with a wreath and the erection of a *stèle* in the sanctuary of Apollo for having compiled the victors of the Pythian games and their organisers since their founding in the form of a *πίναξ*. Responsible for setting up the decree was the newly established college of *ταμῖαι* in the autumn of 337 BC.<sup>8</sup> This cannot have taken place later than the archonship of Caphis in the autumn of 327 BC,<sup>9</sup> due to the inscription of the expenses of the Delphic temple from that year. In this year a certain Deinomachus was commissioned by the *ἱερομνήμονες* to engrave for two minas a *Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφὴ*<sup>10</sup>—yet the completion of the stone version was delayed for several years and not finished until the archonship of Theon in 324/3 BC.<sup>11</sup> Hence, the honorary decree for Aristotle and Callisthenes was probably erected between 337 and 327 BC.

That the *Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφὴ* mentioned several times in the accounts of the expenses of the Delphic temple must be the same work as the one listed in the decree for Aristotle and Callisthenes results from a passage in Plutarch's *Life of Solon*, in which a *Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφὴ* is quoted.<sup>12</sup> In Plutarch, however, only Aristotle is cited as the author—and the same applies to all other known fragments of the work.<sup>13</sup> The name of his co-author Callisthenes disappeared from the literary tradition; even in the lists of Aristotle's works, preserved by

<sup>8</sup> *CID* II 74, col I, l. 1–21.

<sup>9</sup> *CID* II 97, l. 12.

<sup>10</sup> *CID* II 97, l. 42–3: Δεινομάχῳ[ι] τῶμ Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφῆς, κελευσάντων | [τ]ῶν ἱερομνημόνων, μνᾶς δύο.

<sup>11</sup> *CID* II 102, l. 44–5: Δει]νομάχῳ γραμμάτω[ν] | [ἐ]γκοπῆς τῶν Πυθιονικῶν ...; cf. *CID* II 98 B, l. 5; 99 A, l. 9–10.

<sup>12</sup> Plut. *Sol.* 11 = F 412 Gigon.

<sup>13</sup> *Schol. vet. in Pind. Ol.* 2.87e and *Isth.* 2, inscr. = F 410 and 411.1 Gigon; Hesych. β 893 s.v. Βοῦθος περιφοιτᾶ = F 413.1 Gigon.

Diogenes Laertius and by Hesychius of Miletus, the name of Callisthenes does not appear, although Hesychius records a *Πυθιονίκας βιβλίον α'* and Diogenes names several works on Pythian matters.<sup>14</sup>

Regardless of this literary silence concerning Callisthenes, the honorary decree proves that he compiled a list of Pythian victors together with Aristotle. It remains unclear how their collaboration functioned, such as whether they shared the labour equally or the disciple merely assisted his teacher. However, we do have some further information on the content of their work. It included both winners of both athletic and musical contests. Some are known by name, such as a certain Bouthus, whose name was later associated with the behaviour of a dull and slow-thinking person.<sup>15</sup> In another possible fragment we are told that the citharode Terpanthus won the Pythiad four times in a row.<sup>16</sup> Other successful participants were the two brothers, Xenocrates and Theron of Acragas, who won the horse race at the twenty-fourth Pythian games.<sup>17</sup> In this context, it is noteworthy that one of three relevant fragments found in the Pindar scholia states that Aristotle included only (*μόνος*) Theron in the *Pythian Victors* and omitted Xenocrates, either because Aristotle wanted to be brief or because Xenocrates won with Theron's horses and Aristotle only named the owner of the horses.<sup>18</sup> The other two fragments of the Pindar scholia do not mention this case; rather, Xenocrates is cited there as the victor in the hippic agon of the twenty-fourth Pythiad as if there was no doubt about his mention in the *Pythian Victors*.<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine if the different references to Xenocrates as Pythian victor represent an un-commented correction by the scholiast or a glimpse of the original working methods of the two authors.

Let us turn to the background and motive for composing the list of Pythian victors. In the Hesychian *Vita Aristotelis* or *Vita Menagiana* (named after the first editor G. Ménage), the title *Πυθιονίκας βιβλίον α'* is followed by the remark *ἐν*

<sup>14</sup> Diog. Laert. 5.26: *Πυθιονίκαί <α', Περὶ> μουσικῆς α', Πυθικὸς α', Πυθιονικῶν ἔλεγχος α'*.

<sup>15</sup> Hesych. β 893 s.v. Βούθος περιφοιτᾶ (= F 413.1 Gigon): *παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν εὐήθων καὶ παχυφρόνων, ἀπὸ Βούθου τινὸς μετενεχθεῖσα τοῦ Πύθια νικήσαντος, ὃν ἀναγράφει καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης νενικηκότα*. See in addition F 413.2 and 4 Gigon, in which not Aristotle, but the *Cheirones* of Cratichion are cited (cf. without indication of the source used F 413.3 Gigon).

<sup>16</sup> F 414 Gigon.

<sup>17</sup> F 410 and 411.1–2 Gigon.

<sup>18</sup> Schol. vet. in Pind. Ol. 2.87c: *κατὰ δὲ τοὺς Ἀριστοτέλους Πυθιονίκας μόνος Θήρων ἀναγράφεται· ἦτοι οὖν συλληπτικῶς εἴρηκεν, ἢ ἐπεὶ Θήρωνος ἵππους ὁ Ξενοκράτης ἐνίκησε, διὸ καὶ συνανεκήρυξε Θήρωνα*.

<sup>19</sup> F 411.1–2 Gigon.

ὧ Μέναιχμον ἐνίκησεν. While it is possible that the defeat of this Menaechmus denotes a properly advertised competition for the making of the *Pythian Victors*, it is equally likely that the publication of the list of winners replaced an older version by a Menaechmus, who has been identified with the fourth-century BC historian Menaechmus of Sicyon, author of a *Πυθικός*.<sup>20</sup> Although we cannot determine which scenario occurred, in both cases a competitive spirit seems to have motivated the writing of the victors of the Pythian games. In addition to the probable competitive character of the *Pythian Victors*, Menaechmus also dealt with famous kitharodes and their achievements.<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, one of the Pythian works in the Aristotelian list by Diogenes Laertius bears the same title as the writing of Menaechmus, namely *Πυθικός*, and the title *Πυθιονικῶν ἔλεγχος* in the same catalogue can be understood as a reply. Of course, the form and extent of such a critical response remain unknown to us.

It seems that the work of Aristotle and Callisthenes contained more than only a list of all the victors of the Pythiad. The fragment from the already mentioned *Life of Solon* suggests that historical events played a pivotal role in the *Pythian Victors*.<sup>22</sup> Plutarch writes that Solon received great appreciation from his contemporaries after he had convinced the Amphictyons to aid the Delphians against the Cirrhaeans and to wage war against them—he allegedly found this piece of information on Solon’s leading role at the beginning of the First Sacred War in the *Pythian Victors*.<sup>23</sup> Although Aristotle is the only author mentioned in this context, we nevertheless know that Callisthenes also dealt with the Cirrhaeans in his work on the Third Sacred War (*Περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πολέμου*).<sup>24</sup> A historical reference to the First Sacred War was also assumed in the case of the honorary decree: instead of the ἀπ’ [αἰῶνος] a fixed point along the lines of ἀπ’[ὸ Γυλίδα] was proposed. Under the Delphic archon Gylidas of 591/0 BC, the Cirrhaeans were defeated and the first Pythiad was established from the spoils.<sup>25</sup> Because of the overlap between the subjects of the works, it

<sup>20</sup> See *FGrHist* 131 T 3 and F 2; cf. Chaniotis (1988) 296; Haake (2007) 239.

<sup>21</sup> *FGrHist* 131 F 5: τὴν δὲ ψιλὴν κιθάρισιν πρῶτόν φησιν Μέναιχμος εἰσαγαγεῖν Ἀριστόνικον τὸν Ἀργεῖον, τῇ ἡλικίᾳ γενόμενον κατὰ Ἀρχίλοχον, κατοικήσαντα ἐν Κορκύραι; and F 6: Δίωνα δὲ τὸν Χίον τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου σπονδείον πρῶτον κιθαρίσαι Μέναιχμος.

<sup>22</sup> Chaniotis (1988) 214–15, cf. Franchi (2020) 515–16.

<sup>23</sup> Plut. *Sol.* 11: πεισθέντες γὰρ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ὤρμησαν οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες, ὡς ἄλλοι τε μαρτυροῦσι καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ τῶν Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφῇ Σόλωνι τὴν γνώμην ἀνατιθείς.

<sup>24</sup> *FGrHist* 124 T 25 and F 1.

<sup>25</sup> This is recorded on the so-called Marmor Parium (*IG* XII.5 444, l. 52–3): [ἀφ’ οὗ Ἄ]μ[φικτ]ύ[ονες] ἔθ[υ]σαν κ[αταπολ]λημήσα[ν]τες Κύρραν, καὶ ὁ ἀγὼν ὁ γυμνικὸς ἐτέθη χρηματίτης ἀπὸ τῶν λαφύρων, ἔτη ΗΗ[Η]ΔΔΠΙΙ, ἄρχοντας Ἀθήνησιν Σίμω[ν]ος; according

was suggested that the jointly written text and the independent historical work of Callisthenes were close to each other in terms of their dates of composition; both were probably completed before Callisthenes' departure for Asia Minor, where he accompanied Alexander the Great on his campaign against the Persians.<sup>26</sup> The *Pythian Victors* thus offered a list of the victors as well as some information on historical events, which may have been presented and edited separately.<sup>27</sup>

In any case, their relationship with the Macedonian royal house earned both authors the accusation of pro-Macedonian tampering with history.<sup>28</sup> Although there are no traces among the surviving fragments of the *Pythian Victors* to substantiate this critique, it is very probable that they faced resentment from the opponents of Philip II and Alexander the Great. In this context, a letter of Aristotle to Antipater, which is preserved in Aelian, is instructive since it mentions that the former was unconcerned about the removal of his honours by the Delphians.<sup>29</sup> It therefore seems likely that the present fragmentary condition of the inscription, as well as the find spot in the fountain, can be traced back to a wilful destruction of the decree after the annulment of Aristotle's honours at Delphi.<sup>30</sup> This probably did not happen before Alexander's death,<sup>31</sup> by which time Callisthenes had been dead for a

to the fourth account of the origin of the Pythiad in the Ὑπόθεσις Πυθίων of the Pindar Scholia, Gylidas was archon in Delphi in the same year as Simon in Athens (τὸν Πυθικὸν ἀγῶνα διέθηκεν Εὐρύλοχος ὁ Θεσσαλὸς σὺν τοῖς Ἀμφικτύοσι τοὺς Κιρραίους καταπολεμήσας ὁμοῦς τινας ὄντας καὶ βιαζομένους τοὺς περιοίκους, ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Δελφοῖς μὲν Γυλίδα, Ἀθήνησι δὲ Σίμωνος); more detailed on the date of the first Pythiad Miller (1978) 127–58; Sánchez (2001) 75–7.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Haake (2007) 238; Franchi (2020) 517; Bosworth (1970) 409, on the other hand, argued that Callisthenes left the completion to Aristotle after his departure: 'That would explain why both men are commended on the Delphian inscription but only Aristotle is accredited with the Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφή.' In this sense, a thematic overlap does not necessarily prove that the two works were written close together; for example Strabo's two works were composed with some distance apart (see *Geog.* 11.9.3 for the citation of his historical work).

<sup>27</sup> Chaniotis (1988) 295 suggested that the list was accompanied by an introduction explaining the historical events of the foundation of the games. On the available material see Mari (2013) 136: 'Probably we have to admit that the sources available to the two scholars were *ab origine* mixed and of very uneven character and quality.'

<sup>28</sup> Sánchez (2001) 263: 'Aussi, quand on connaît les liens particuliers qui unissaient le roi Macédoine à Callisthène et à Aristote, on est en droit penser que ces *Pythioniques* ont été commandées par Philippe lui-même.' See further Lehmann (1980) 242–3.

<sup>29</sup> Ael. *VH* 14.1.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Haake (2019) 5; Low (2020) 240.

<sup>31</sup> Chaniotis (1988) 295; Haake (2007) 239–40; id. (2019) 5.

couple of years. In any case, thanks to the Delphic inscription we know that Aristotle and Callisthenes wrote a historical work together, for which, however, only Aristotle received full recognition from later authors.

## Genuine Case II

### Tharsagoras and Timachidas: The *Lindian Chronicle*

Unlike the work of Aristotle and Callisthenes, the second example of dual authorship is almost completely preserved. It is an inscription on a marble stele found below the sanctuary of the Lindian goddess Athena during a Danish excavation in March 1904. The stele was re-used in the floor of the Byzantine church of St Stephanus with the inscribed surface facing upwards. The lower part of the inscription was effaced, the result of years of wear by the feet of congregants, whereas the upper part of the inscription is lightly weathered but well preserved apart from two secondary carved square holes.<sup>32</sup>

The inscription begins with a decree (A) that takes up the entire width of the stele and dates from the year 99 BC.<sup>33</sup> Three columns follow (B–D). The first is headed *τοῖδε ἀνέθηκαν τᾷ Ἀθάναι*, followed by a list of offerings to Athena, which continues in the second column. In the last column a new section begins, headed *ἐπιφάνειαι*, where several accounts of manifestations of the goddess are gathered. In total, the catalogue of offerings consisted of 45 votives, of which only the votive entries 1–17 and 23–42 have survived; of the presumably four reports on the divine appearances the first two are complete, with only the end missing from the third. The single entries of offerings and each epiphany are separated by short horizontal lines and blank spaces. In addition, subheadings have been added to the individual accounts of manifestations (the second one is introduced by *ἑτέρα*, the following two by *ἄλλα*). On the whole, the catalogue and the epiphanies have strong historiographical and mnemopoetic elements that qualify the *Lindian Chronicle* as historical writing.<sup>34</sup>

In the opening decree the proposer Hagesitimus, son of Timachus and citizen of Lindos, presents the background and motive for this historical work. Two men were to be chosen to compile a list of all dedications (*ἀναθήματα*) to

<sup>32</sup> Further Blinkenberg (1915) 3; id. (1941) 149–50; Higbie (2003) 156–7; Barbera (2014) 31.

<sup>33</sup> The Greek text is from Higbie (2003) 18–50; see also *I.Lindos* 2 (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 725); *FGrHist* 532; on the *Lindian Chronicle* fundamental are: Blinkenberg (1915); id. (1941); Higbie (2003); further, Chaniotis (1988) 52–7, 126–8; 267–70; Wiemer (2001) 27–32; Bresson (2006) 527–51; Ampolo–Erdas–Magnetto (2014).

<sup>34</sup> On the epigraphic mnemopoetic as a concept between the construction of memory and historical writing see Chaniotis (2014) 132–69.

the temple and manifestations (ἐπιφάνειαι) of the goddess by using letters, public records, and other testimonies. It became necessary to carry out such a collection, because many of the votives and their inscriptions had been destroyed since the founding of the temple. Both the compilation and the decree were to be carved on a stele of Lartian stone. For this task they received a payment of at least 200 drachmas, and for the erection of the stele they obtained help from other city officials. In the final section of the decree a fine is imposed and the date of erection is terminated—the stele was placed at its destination in the next month.<sup>35</sup> Following the decree, the names of the two men chosen for this task are revealed: Tharsagoras, son of Stratus, from Ladarma and Timachidas, son of the proposer Hagesitimus and citizen of Lindos.<sup>36</sup>

Since the discovery of the inscription, many scholars have attempted explanations for the division of labour between the two authors. It is generally assumed that Timachidas of Rhodes, known as a grammarian, glossographer, and commentator, is identical with Timachidas, son of Hagesitimus. Hence the Lindian Timachidas, in contrast to the otherwise unknown Tharsagoras, must have been primarily responsible for the compilation of the chronicle.<sup>37</sup> In contrast, it has been pointed out that Tharsagoras is named first in the inscription and thus cannot have had an insignificant role during the composition of the text.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, Timachidas must have been a young man at this time since his father was still politically active, which might indicate that the chronicle was one of his earlier literary works.<sup>39</sup> In the end, it must remain open how they actually collaborated, because the decree gives us no insight into that specific topic. Nevertheless, focusing on their collaborative

<sup>35</sup> The decree was passed on the twelfth of the month Artamitios (Ἄρτα]μιτίου δωδεκάται, A, l. 1) and the stele was to be erected in the coming month of Agrianios (ἐν τῷ εἰσιόντι Ἀγριανίῳ, A, l. 11).

<sup>36</sup> A, l. 12: ἀ<ι>ρέθεν Θαρσαγόρας Στράτου Λαδά[ρμιος καὶ] Τιμαχίδας Ἀγησιτίμου Λινδοπολίτας.

<sup>37</sup> E.g., Blinkenberg (1915) 7; id. (1941) 155–7, already rejected by Chaniotis (1988) 56, 127, and now with further literature Matijašić (2014a) 92: ‘... l’idea che Timachidas fosse il solo autore della *Cronaca* è divenuta canonica ... solo recentemente questa opinione è stata rivista’. On Timachidas and his other works see Matijašić (2014b) 113–85.

<sup>38</sup> Especially Chaniotis (1988) 56, 127–8; id., in *SEG LXIV* 728: ‘The longest and more telling narratives (the epiphanies) may be the work of Tharsagoras.’

<sup>39</sup> Blinkenberg (1941) 155: ‘Comme Timachidas a dû être relativement jeune en 99, l’étude des traditions lindiennes marque probablement le début de sa carrière littéraire ...’ (cf. Blinkenberg (1915) 7); Chaniotis, in *SEG LXIV* 728: ‘... the “Anagraphe” may well be the work of a young Timachidas’.

working method seems a promising way to add some new elements to the interpretation of the *Lindian Chronicle*.

At first glance the text of the chronicle shows that two narrative patterns have been chosen, while retaining one form of source citation. The entries in the catalogue exhibit a certain pattern: first the dedicator, then the form, the material, and the number of offerings are recorded; followed, if extant, by the votive inscriptions and by the references to the historiographical, epistolary, or archival evidence. Furthermore, the catalogue is subdivided into groups which are thematically and chronologically ordered.<sup>40</sup> In contrast to the catalogue, the epiphanies are historical narratives, but they share with the votive entries the same diligence in citing sources. A coherent approach in dealing with the available material is also visible in the reproduced controversies.<sup>41</sup> Within this framework, the differences and similarities may indicate that the chronicle was written by two people. In this sense, one of the two authors was perhaps responsible for the catalogue, the other for the appearances of the goddess.

There are further differences between the two parts which suggest a separate working method: whereas the catalogue draws on the full range of the available material such as letters, official records, and literary works, the section on the epiphanies of the goddess uses only literary works. Furthermore, citations of votive inscriptions appear only in the catalogue. In this context, it was observed that a change from *ἐπεγέγραπτο* to *ἐπιγέγραπται* occurs in the last six votives. One possible explanation is that this change is related to the destruction of the offerings of the temple in the course of a fire in 391 BC. The use of the pluperfect thus stands for the destroyed objects, the perfect for the

<sup>40</sup> According to Chaniotis (1988) 55, there are six thematic groups: (1) dedications of mythical figures (B 1–B 8); (2) offerings in connection with the Trojan War (B 9–B 14); (3) votives of individual Lindians or of the community of Lindos (B 15–B 17, C 23); (4) dedications of foreign persons from the archaic period to the fifth century BC (C 24–C 33); (5) offerings of the Lindians after the foundation of the Rhodian state in the fourth and third centuries (C 34–C 37); (6) votives of famous rulers (C 38–C 42). Within these groups only the dedication of Alexander the Great (C 38, 331/0 BC) breaks the chronological order, because it comes after the offerings of the Lindians from the third century BC (C 37); on this see also Higbie (2003) 132.

<sup>41</sup> Such controversies appear in the catalogue entries of the dedications of Menelaus and Teucer (B 10 and 14), of the pharaoh Amasis (C 29), of the unknown Persian general (C 32), and in the first epiphany (D 1); on the last three offerings see below; in both dedications of Menelaus and Teucer the counter-stories are from Theotimus and his work *Against Aielurus*; the military-historical work of Aielurus, however, is not mentioned in those two entries, as one would assume, but in the entry on the dedication of Heracles (B 5); on these two see further below n. 49.

still preserved dedications.<sup>42</sup> Although no autopsy is directly mentioned, it nevertheless seems likely due to two allusions: both inscriptions on the suits of armour dedicated by Alexander the Great and Pyrrhus are absent from the text, perhaps because they could still be read.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, it is striking that in the accounts of the epiphanies the Rhodian priests of Helios have been utilised for dating events rather than the priesthood of the Lindian Athena.<sup>44</sup> A former Lindian priest named Callicles is mentioned in the third epiphany, but as a historical figure to whom the goddess appeared in several dreams.<sup>45</sup> Even if both ways of dating events are not unusual in Lindos,<sup>46</sup> it is remarkable that the Lindian priesthood is used only for dating the votive inscriptions of the catalogue entries.<sup>47</sup>

A clear separation of responsibilities between the two authors may have occurred, but seems doubtful given their research method and the conception

<sup>42</sup> See on this Higbie (2003) 132–3, 174, 257; in the first epiphany the destruction of the temple by a fire is dated in the year when Eucles son of Astyanactidas was the priest of Helios in Rhodes (D 1, l. 39–42: ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἱερέως | τοῦ Ἀλίου Εὐκλεῦς τοῦ Ἀστυανακτίδα | ἐμπυρισθέντος τοῦ ναοῦ κατεκαύσθη | μετὰ τῶν πλείστων ἀναθεμάτων); the name of Eucles is inscribed in the fragmentary list of the Rhodian priests of Helios, according to which he held the office in 391 BC (see Badoud (2015) no. 1, l. 18: [Εὐ]κλῆς Ἀστυανακτίδα). Chaniotis (1988) 268 considers the group of the lost inscriptions as historical or mythological forgeries; cf. Chaniotis (2015) 676, 680–2.

<sup>43</sup> C 38, l. 109 (Alexander the Great): ἀν[έ]θηκε δὲ καὶ [ὄ]πλα, ἐφ' ὧν ἐπιγέγραπται; and C 40, l. 140–1 (Pyrrhus): ἐπιγέ[γραπ]ται δ[ὲ] ἐπὶ τῶν ὄπλων.

<sup>44</sup> D 1, l. 39–40: ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἱερέως | τοῦ Ἀλίου Εὐκλεῦς τοῦ Ἀστυανακτίδα; D 2, l. 61: ἐπ' ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀλίου Πυθαννᾶ τοῦ Ἀρχιπόλιος (on Eucles see above, n. 42; on the problematic dating of the priesthood of Pythannas in the gap between 367 to 333 BC see Badoud (2015) 163, 251).

<sup>45</sup> D 3, l. 96–8: ... [Κα]λλικλῆς ὁ εἰκὼς ἐκ τᾶς | ἱερατείας τᾶς Ἀθάνας τᾶς Λινδίας ἔτι | διατρίβω[ν] ἐν Λίνδῳ ...; Blinkenberg (1941) 109–10, assumes that Callicles was priest of Athena in 306 BC, even though the inscriptional list of priests for this period has not been preserved.

<sup>46</sup> Higbie (2003) 52: 'After the synoecism in 408 BC, Lindians seem to have used both the local priesthood of Athena and that of Helios in the city of Rhodes as well to date events'. E.g., *I.Lindos* 233, l. 1–3; 419, l. 3–4.

<sup>47</sup> In the votive inscription of Alexander the Great, the name of the priest of Athena from 330 BC Theugenes (C 38, l. 104–7: βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξαν[δ]ρος μάχαι κρατήσας Δαρρέιον καὶ κύριος γε[ν]όμενος τᾶς Ἀσίας ἔθυσσε τ[ᾶ]ι Ἀθάναι τᾶι [Λι]νδίαι κατὰ μαντείαν | ἐπ' ἱε[ρ]έως Θευγέν[ε]υς τοῦ Πιστοκράτεως'), and in the votive inscription of Ptolemy I the priesthood of Athanas son of Athanagoras was engraved (C 39, l. 111–3: βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος | ἔθυσσε Ἀθά[ν]αι Λινδίαι ἐπ' ἱερέως Ἀθ[α]νᾶ τοῦ Ἀθαναγόρα'); for the dating of Theugenes see *I.Lindos* 1 frg. B, l. 10: Θευγένης Πιστοκράτε[υς]; like the name of Callicles, the name of Athanas is missing in the fragments of the list of priests; Blinkenberg (1941) 109–10, places him in the year 304 BC.

of the entire work. As already mentioned above, *ἐπιστολαί* and *χρηματισμοί* were only cited in the catalogue of the dedications;<sup>48</sup> on the other hand, no additional literary sources were used for the epiphanies.<sup>49</sup> Thus, the same literary works are used in both parts of the chronicle, which points to collaborative editing, unless several copies of the same works were available.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>48</sup> The letters used are by Gorgosthenes (a priest of Athena of the fourth century BC, who wrote a letter to the boule, quoted in B 1, B 2, B 4, B 5, B 6, B 8, B 9, B 10, B 11, B 12, B 13, B 14; cf. *FGrHist* 529); and secondly by Hieroboulus (he too was a priest of Athena from the fourth century BC and addressed his letter to the Mastroi, quoted in B 1, B 2, B 4, B 5, B 6, B 8, B 9, B 10, B 11, B 12, B 13, B 14, C 29; cf. *FGrHist* 530); it has been assumed that the two compilers did not use the letters of Gorgosthenes and Hieroboulus first-hand but instead took their information from Gorgon's book *About Rhodes*; this can be contradicted by the fact that in B 15 the work of Gorgon is quoted without the two letters and in C 29 the letter of Hieroboulus is cited alone. The public records of the Lindians are mentioned in C 38, C 39, C 40, C 41 and C 42.

<sup>49</sup> Those are: **(1)** Xenagoras, *Χρονικὴ σύνταξις* (*FGrHist* 240): from the first book in B 4, B 5, B 8, B 10, B 12, B 14, B 15, B 17, C 24, C 25, C 26, C 27, C 28, C 29, C 30, C 31, C 33; the fourth book in C 29, D 1; the eleventh book in B 16, C 34; and from an unknown book in D 2; **(2)** Polyzelus, *Ἱστορίαι* (*FGrHist* 521): always from the fourth book in B 3, C 23, C 29, C 32, D 1; **(3)** Eudemus, *Λινδιακός* (*FGrHist* 524): B 10, C 32, D 1, D 2; **(4)** Timocritus, *Χρονικὴ σύνταξις* (*FGrHist* 522): from the first book in C 23, C 32, D 1; the second book in C 35; the third book in D 2; and the fourth book in C 37; **(5)** Hieron, *Περὶ Ῥόδου* (*FGrHist* 518): from the first book in C 29, C 32, D 1; the third book in C 35; (and maybe in B 7); **(6)** Aristion, *Χρονικὴ σύνταξις* (*FGrHist* 509): from the first book in C 29, C 32; and from an unknown book in D 1; **(7)** Aristonymus, *Συναγωγή τῶν χρόνων* (*FGrHist* 510): C 29, D 2; **(8)** Onomastus, *Χρονικὴ σύνταξις* (*FGrHist* 520): from the first book in C 29; and the second book in D 2; **(9)** Myron, *Ῥόδου ἐγκώμιον* (*FGrHist* 106): from the first book in C 32; and the eleventh book in D 1; **(10)** Hieronymus, *Ἡλιακά* or *Ἡλιακά* (on the title see Higbie (2003) 126): from the first book in C 32; and the second book in D 1; **(11)** Ergias, *Ἱστορίαι* (*FGrHist* 513): from the third book in C 35; and the fourth book in D 1.

<sup>50</sup> Higbie (2003) 187 with n. 54 (a total of eleven works is cited in both parts; this number alone makes it unlikely that a copy of each was available; on the situation of book collections on Rhodes in the second century BC see Rosamilia (2014) 325–62); apart from the two letters of Gorgosthenes and Hieroboulus, a total of twenty-two works were used, the other eleven are (continuing the count of n. 49): **(12)** Gorgon, *Περὶ Ῥόδου* (*FGrHist* 515): from the first book in B 4, B 5, B 6, B 8, B 10, B 11, B 12, B 13, B 14, B 15; the second book in B 16, C 26; and from the eleventh book in B 1, B 2, B 9; (in B 18 and B 20 only his name is still legible); **(13)** Nicasyllus, *Χρονικὴ σύνταξις* (*FGrHist* 519): from the third book in B 5; **(14)** Hegesias, *Ῥόδου ἐγκώμιον* (*FGrHist* 142): B 5, B 10; **(15)** Aielurus, *Περὶ τοῦ ποτὶ τοὺς Ἐξαγιαδάς πολέμου* (*FGrHist* 528; on the possible readings of *Ἐξαγιαδάς* see Higbie (2003) 79): B 5; **(16)** Phaennus, *Περὶ Λίνδου* (*FGrHist* 525): B 5; **(17)** Theotimus, *Κατὰ Αἰελούρου* (*FGrHist* 470): from the first book in B 10 and B 14; **(18)** Herodotus, *Ἱστορίαι*: from the second book in C 29; **(19)** Hagelochus, *Χρονικὴ σύνταξις* (*FGrHist* 516): from the second book in C 40; the ninth book in C 36; and from the eleventh book in C 29; **(20)** Zenon, *Χρονικὴ σύνταξις* (*FGrHist* 523): from the second book in C 40; and from an unknown book in C 35; **(21)**

In doing so, they must have selected the literary sources quite consciously, which can be shown by looking at their usage of Herodotus.

Herodotus is cited just once in the chronicle, namely in the dedication of a linen corslet by the Egyptian pharaoh Amasis. According to the chronicle, Herodotus reports this in the second book of his *Histories*, as does Polyzelus in the fourth book of his *Histories*.<sup>51</sup> Two different versions follow: according to the first, Amasis consecrated not only a linen corslet but also two golden statues—this is attested by Hieron in his work *On Rhodes*, by Aristonymus in his chronography, and by Hagelochus, Aristion, and Onomastus in their chronicles.<sup>52</sup> In the second version, the offerings consisted of not only the linen corslet and the two statues, but also of inscriptions and of ten *φιάλαι*, as Xenagoras stated in the first and fourth books of his chronicle and Hieroboulus in his letter to the Mastroi.<sup>53</sup> An examination of Herodotus, however, shows that he mentioned not only the linen corslet, but also the two statues.<sup>54</sup> The catalogue entry thus neglects to mention that Herodotus was well aware of the *δύο ἀγάλματα λίθινα*. Yet in Herodotus these are made of stone and not of gold as in the majority of the authors, which may be the reason why this was omitted.<sup>55</sup> This working method is matched by the way in which the two compilers also ignore Herodotus' work in the entry on the dedication of the Lindian founder of Gela. Although Herodotus also treated the foundation of Gela in his seventh book, he is not quoted. His report of the events was probably too vague, because he only mentions that Antiphamus founded the

Hagestratus, *Χρονικὴ σύνταξις* (*FGrHist* 517): from the second book in C 35, C 40, C 41; (22) unknown author, *Χρόνοι* (see on this Higbie (2003) 195): C 41.

<sup>51</sup> C 29, l. 36–9: Ἄμασις Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεὺς θώρακα λίνεον, | οὗ ἑκάστα [ἀρ]πεδόνα εἶχε στά[μ]ονας τξ', | περὶ οὗ μ[αρτ]υρεῖ Ἡρόδοτος [ὁ Θ]ούριος ἐν τῷ β' | τῶν ἱστο[ρι]ῶν, | Πολύζαλος ἐν τῷ δ'.

<sup>52</sup> C 29, l. 39–45: Ἰέρω[ν δὲ] | ἐν τῷ [α' τῶν Π]ερὶ Ῥόδου φατὶ ἀναθέμειν α[ὐτὸν] | μετὰ τοῦ θώρακος καὶ ἀγάλματα χρύσεια [δύο, | Ἀγέλοχος] ἐν τῷ α' τῆς χρονικῆς συντάξι[ος], | [Ἀρι]στιῶν ἐν τῷ [α' τ]ῆς χρονικῆς συντάξι[ος], | Ἀριστώ[ν]υμος ἐν τῷ Συναγωγῶν τῶν χρόνων, | Ὀνόμασ[τ]ος ἐν τῷ α' τῆς χρονικῆς συντάξι[ος].

<sup>53</sup> C 29, l. 46–55: Ξεναγόρας δὲ ἐν τῷ α' καὶ δ' τῆς χρονικῆς | συντάξι[ος] λέγει μετὰ τοῦ θώρακος ἀναθέμειν αὐτὸν καὶ μετ[ὰ] τῶν δύο ἀγαλμάτων φιάλας δέκα, ἐπιγεγράφθαι δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων | στίχους δύο, ὧν τὸν μὲν οὕτως ἔχειν· Ἀιγύπτου | βασιλ[εὺς] τηλέκλυτος ὄπασ' Ἄμασις, τὸν δὲ ἔτερον ἐπιγεγράφθαι διὰ τῶν παρ' Αἰγυπτίους καλλομένων ἱερῶν γραμμάτων. Ἱεροβούλος δὲ | καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει ἐν τῷ ποτὶ τοὺς μαστροὺς | ἐπιστολῶν.

<sup>54</sup> Hdt. 2.182.

<sup>55</sup> Differently Chanotis (1988) 150–1: 'Ihre Abhängigkeit von ihren Quellen ging so weit, daß sie auch Bücher zitieren (z.B. das Werk Herodots), die sie nicht benutzten, die sie aber in ihren Quellen zitiert fanden.'

city of Gela together with ‘Lindians from Rhodes’.<sup>56</sup> Apparently, the information in Herodotus was not significant enough when compared with the cited work of Xenagoras, whose chronicle seems to have included not only the name of Antiphamus, but also the name of the Lindian founder Deinomenes as well as his offering and its inscription.<sup>57</sup>

This conscious approach in using the sources’ material is also reflected in the arrangement of the content of the chronicle. Evidence suggests that the two parts of the chronicle, the catalogue and the section with the accounts of manifestations, were harmonised with one another. This can be exemplified by comparing the three cases of Persian dedications in the *Lindian Chronicle*. Two of those are included in the catalogue, the other in the epiphanies. The text of the first catalogue entry runs as follows (C 32, l. 65–74):

[..<sup>10–12</sup>..ὁ στ]ραταγὸς τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως  
 [..<sup>13–15</sup>..]α καὶ στρεπτὸν καὶ τιάραν καὶ ψέ-  
 [λια καὶ ἀκινάκαν κα]ὶ ἀναξυρίδας, ὡς φασι Εὐδήμος  
 [ἐν τῷ Λινδιακῷ, Μύ]ρων ἐν τῷ α’ τοῦ Ῥόδου ἐγκωμίου,  
 Τ[ι]μό[κριτος ἐν] τῷ α’ τῆς χρονικῆς συντάξις. [Ἰ]ερώ-  
 νυμος δὲ ἀποφαίνεται ἐν τῷ α’ τῶν Ἡλιακῶν μετὰ  
 τούτων ἀναθέμειν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀρμάμαξαν, περὶ ἃς  
 λέγει καὶ Πολύζαλος ἐν τῷ δ’ τῶν ἱστοριῶν καὶ  
 Ἀριστίων ἐν τῷ α’ τῆς χρονικῆς συντάξις,  
 Ἰέρων ἐν τῷ α’ τῶν περὶ Ῥόδου.

... the general of the king of the Persians ... and a torque and a Persian cap and armllets and a Persian curved short sword and trousers, as Eudemus states in his work *Lindian Oration*, Myron in the first book of his *Encomium of Rhodes*, Timocritus in the first book of his *Chronicle*. But Hieronymus declares in the first book of his *Heliaca* that along with these things he dedicated also a covered carriage, about which Polyzelus also

<sup>56</sup> Hdt. 7.153.1: ἐς δὲ τὴν Σικελίαν ἄλλοι τε ἀπίκατο ἄγγελοι ἀπὸ τῶν συμμάχων συμμύξοντες Γέλωνι καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων Σύαγρος. τοῦ δὲ Γέλωνος τούτου πρόγονος, οἰκῆτωρ ὁ ἐν Γέλῃ, ἦν ἐκ νήσου Τήλου τῆς ἐπὶ Τριοπίῳ κειμένης· ὃς κτιζομένης Γέλης ὑπὸ Λινδίων τε τῶν ἐκ Ῥόδου καὶ Ἀντιφῆμου οὐκ ἐλείφθη.

<sup>57</sup> C 28, l. 29–35: Δεινομένης ὁ Γέλωνος καὶ Ἰέρωνος καὶ Θρα|συβούλου καὶ Π[ο]λυζάλου πατὴρ Λίνδιος ὑπάρχων | καὶ συνοικίξα[ς] Γέλαν μετὰ Ἀντιφάμου Γοργόνα | κυπαρισσίαν [λ]ίθινον ἔχουσαν τὸ πρόσωπον, ἐφ’ ἃς | ἐπεγέγραπτο· ‘Δεινομένης Μολοσσῶ [ἀνέθηκ]ε | τῷ Ἀθαναίῳ τῷ Λινδίῳ τῶν ἐκ Σικελίας [δεκάτ]αν’, ὡς | ἱστορεῖ Ξενα[γ]όρας ἐν τῷ α’ τῆς χρονικ[ῆς] συντάξις.

speaks in the fourth book of his *Histories* and Aristion in the first book of his *Chronicle*, and Hieron in the first book of his work *About Rhodes*.

Due to the lacuna at the beginning of this first Persian dedication, the names of the Persian king and general remains unknown.<sup>58</sup> In regard to the name of the king it is generally believed that only Darius can be meant here<sup>59</sup> since he is mentioned in the first epiphany and also because the catalogue entry shares great similarities with the first account of the manifestation of the goddess Athena. For this reason, the complete text of this epiphany is reproduced below (D I, l. 1–59):

ἐπιφάνειαι. | Δαρείου τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως ἐπὶ καταδουλώσει | τῆς  
Ἑλλάδος ἐκπέμφαντος μεγάλας δυνάμεις, | ὁ ναυτικὸς αὐτοῦ στόλος  
ταῦται ποτεπέλασε | πράτα<ι> τῶν νάσων. καταπλαγέντων δὲ τῶν κατὰ |  
τὴν χώραν τὴν ἔφοδον τῶν Περσῶν καὶ συνφυγόντων μὲν ἐς πάντα τὰ  
ὄχυρώματα, τῶν | πλείστων δὲ ἐς Λίνδον ἀθροισθέντων, ποθειδρεύσαντες  
ἐπολιόρκευν αὐτοὺς τοὶ | βάρβαροι, ἔστε οὐδὲ διὰ τὴν σπάνιν τοῦ ὕδατος τοὶ  
Λίνδιοι θλιβόμενοι διανοεῦντο | παραδιδόμενι τοῖς ἐναντίοις τὴν πόλιν. |  
καθ' ὃν δὴ χρόνον ἂ μὲν θεὸς ἐνὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐπιστάσα καθ' ὕπνον  
παρεκάλει | θαρσεῖν ὡς αὐτὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αἰτησευμένα τὸ κατεπεῖγον  
αὐτοὺς ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ τὴν | ὄψιν ἰδὼν ἀνάγγειλε τοῖς πολίταις τὴν πολιτίταξιν  
τῆς Ἀθήνας. οἱ δὲ ἐξετάξαντες | ὅτι εἰς πέντε ἡμέρας μό[νο]ν ἔχοντι  
διαρκεῖν, ἐπὶ τοσαύτας μό[νο]ν αἰτήσαντο | παρὰ τῶν βαρβάρων τὰς  
ἀνοχάς, λέγοντες | ἀπεστάλκειν τὴν Ἀθήναν ποτὶ τὸν αὐτῆς | πατέρα περὶ  
βοαθείας, καὶ εἴ κα μὴ παραγένηται κατὰ τὸν ὠρισμένον χρόνον,  
παραδωσεῖν ἔφασαν αὐτοῖς τὴν πόλιν. vac. | Δᾶτις δὲ ὁ Δαρείου ναύαρχος  
παραχρήμα | μὲν ἀκούσας ἐγέλασε, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐν τῇ | ἐχομέναι ἡμέραι  
γνόφ[ο]υ μείζ<ο>νος | περὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν συστάντος καὶ πολλοῦ  
καταραγέ[ν]τος ὄμβρου κατὰ μέσον | ο[ὔ]τ<ω>ς παραδόξως τοὶ μὲν  
πολιορκεύμενοι δασιλὲς ἔσχον ὕδωρ, ἃ δὲ Περσικὰ δύναιμις ἐσπάνιζε,  
καταπλαγεῖς ὁ βάρβα[ρος] | τὴν τῆς θεοῦ ἐπιφάνειαν κα[ὶ ἀφελ]όμενος  
αὐτοῦ τὸν περὶ τ[ὸ σ]ῶμα κόσμον εἰσέ[πεμψε ἀνα[θ]έ[μ]ειν τὸν τε φαρεὸν  
καὶ σ[τ]ρε[π]τ[ὸν] καὶ ψέλια, ποτὶ δὲ τούτοις τῆσαν τε | καὶ ἀκινάκαν, ἔτι  
δὲ ἀρμάμαξαν, ἃ πρότερον μὲν διεσώιζετο, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἱερέως | τοῦ Ἀλίου

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Higbie (2003) 122: 'I do not see from the evidence available to us that we are able to decide how the lacuna should be filled.'

<sup>59</sup> Baslez (1985) 138–41 has suggested that the name of king Artaxerxes III be inserted instead of Darius (... σ[τ]ραταγὸς τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως [Ἀρταξέρξου ...], cf. SEG XXXVI 747; see also Higbie (2003) 121–2).

Εὐκλεῦς τοῦ Ἀστυανακτίδα | ἐμπυρισθέντος τοῦ ναοῦ κατεκαύσθη | μετὰ τῶν πλείστων ἀναθεμάτων. αὐτὸς | δ[ἐ] ὁ Δάτις ἀνέζευξε ἐπὶ τὰς προκειμέ[ν]ας πράξεις φιλίαν ποτὶ τοὺς πολιορ[κ]ηθέντας συνθέμενος καὶ ποταποφω[ν]ήσας, ὅτι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τούτους | θεοὶ φυλάσσουσι. περὶ τούτων ἀποφαίνεται Εὐδήμος ἐν τῷ Λινδιακῷ, Ἐργίας | ἐν τῷ δ' τῶν ἱστοριῶν, Πολύζαλος ἐν τῷ δ' | τῶν ἱστοριῶν, Ἰερώνυμος ἐν τῷ β' ναο. | τῶν Ἡλιακῶν, Μύρων ἐν τῷ λ' τοῦ Ῥόδου | ἐγκωμίου, Τιμόκριτος ἐν τῷ α' τῆς χρονικῆς συντάξις, Ἰέρων ἐν τῷ α' τῶν περὶ Ῥόδου. Ξεναγόρας <δ> λέγει ἐν τῷ δ' | τῆς χρονικῆς συντάξις τὰν μὲν ἐπιφάνειαν γεγόνειν, Μαρδονίου μέντοι ἔξαποσταλέντος ὑπὸ Δάτιος. λέγει δὲ περ[ὶ] τῆς | ἐπιφανείας καὶ Ἀριστίων ἐν [τῷ]ι . [τ]ῆς | χρονικῆς συντάξις.

Epiphanies. When Darius king of the Persians sent out great forces for the enslavement of Greece, his naval expedition landed on this one first of the islands. When throughout the land people became terrified at the onset of the Persians, some fled together to the most fortified places, but the majority were gathered at Lindos. The enemy established a camp and besieged them, until, on account of the lack of water, the Lindians, being worn down, were of a mind to surrender the city to the enemy. During this time, the goddess, standing over one of the magistrates in his sleep, asked him to have courage, since she was about to ask her father for the much-needed water for them. After he had seen the vision, he announced to the citizens the command of Athena. They, reckoning that they had enough to hold out for five days only, asked only for a truce of that many days from the enemy, saying that Athena had sent away to her own father for help, and if there was nothing forthcoming in the allotted time, they said that they would hand the city over to them. Datis, the admiral for Darius, when he heard this, immediately laughed. But when on the next day a great dark storm cloud settled over the acropolis and a big storm rained down across the middle, then, paradoxically, the ones being besieged had abundant water, but the Persian force was in need. The enemy was astounded at the manifestation of the goddess and took off his own accoutrements covering his body; he sent for dedication the mantle and torque and armlets, and in addition to these the Persian cap and Persian curved short sword, and moreover a covered carriage, which had previously survived, yet during the priesthood of Halius [held] by Eucles the son of Astyanactidas, when the temple was burnt, it was burnt up with most of the dedications. Datis himself broke up his quarters because of the events aforementioned, made a treaty of friendship with the besieged people, and proclaimed additionally that the gods protect these people. These things Eudemus reveals in his work *Lindian Orations*, Ergias in the

fourth book of his *Histories*, Polyzelus in the fourth book of his *Histories*, Hieronymus in the second book of his *Heliaca*, Myron in the eleventh book of his *Encomium of Rhodes*, Timocritus in the first book of his *Chronicle*, Hieron in the first book of his work *About Rhodes*. But Xenagoras says in the fourth book of his *Chronicle* that the epiphany happened after Mardonius had already been dispatched by Datis. Aristion also speaks about the manifestation in the ... of his *Chronicle*.

Based on the description in the first epiphany, it has been assumed that the unknown *στρατηγός* in the catalogue must have been either Datis, a Mede and general of Darius, or Artaphernes, brother of Darius. Both were sent out by Darius in 490 BC to wage war against Athens and Eretria.<sup>60</sup> In this context, it has been argued that Datis' name is too short for the lacuna and that he is referred as *ὁ Δαρείου ναύαρχος*.<sup>61</sup> However, inserting Artaphernes' name is also fraught with difficulty,<sup>62</sup> since it would mean that both compilers attributed the same event to two different persons—this seems unlikely given how meticulous they were in working with the documentary material. Mardonius, another Persian general and brother-in-law of Darius, has also been proposed; according to the first epiphany, he was 'dispatched' by Datis in 490 BC,<sup>63</sup> but we do not know where. This, however, was rejected, because it was not credible that Mardonius, after his removal as supreme commander of the Persian forces, would have subordinated himself to the command of Datis and Artaphernes.<sup>64</sup> On the other hand, the word used to dispatch Mardonius, *ἐξαποστέλλω*, may also refer to a dismissal, in which case Mardonius would not have been directly relieved from his office by Darius, but Datis would have brought him the news of his removal.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Hdt. 6.94.

<sup>61</sup> To fill the lacuna Heltzer (1989) 87–97 argued that Datis' ethnonym 'Mede' be included, as in Hdt. 6.94 (likewise Bresson (2006) 529: 'la restitution [Δάτις ὁ Μῆδος] ... est probablement la bonne'); critical Higbie (2003) 122.

<sup>62</sup> Especially Blinkenberg (1941) 194–8 preferred Artaphernes whose name is long enough for the gap: ... Ἀρταφέρνης ὁ στ]ρατηγός τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως [Δαρείου ...

<sup>63</sup> See, e.g., Heltzer (1989) 93–4, and Higbie (2003) 147: '... the Chronicle ... seems to preserve a version of events in which he [sc. Mardonius] may have accompanied Datis as a subordinate commander and was sent on ahead of the main fleet to Greece, perhaps to transport the horses as quickly as possible.'

<sup>64</sup> Blinkenberg (1941) 197: 'Il faut avoir l'imagination vive pour se figurer Mardonios, gendre du roi, comme sous-chef de Datis.'

<sup>65</sup> Thus, we do not have to assume an error at this point, according to which τοῦ Δαρείου and not ὑπὸ Δάτιος should have been written. Furthermore, this does not contradict the Herodotean tradition, which informs us about the removal of Mardonius by Datis and

Overall, it does not seem plausible that the catalogue entry and the first epiphany describe the same event. In addition, there are further disparities between the two accounts: first, in the catalogue entry a torque, a tiara, bracelets, an *acinaces*, and trousers are dedicated to the goddess (-]α καὶ στρεπτὸν καὶ τιάραν ψέ[λια καὶ ἀκινάκαν κα]ὶ ἀναξυρίδας). The votives in the epiphany are almost identical: a mantle, a torque, armlets, a tiara, an *acinaces*, and a covered carriage are listed (τόν τε φαρεὸν καὶ σ[τ]ρε[πτ]ὸν καὶ ψέλια, ποτὶ δὲ τούτοις τιάραν τε καὶ ἀκινάκαν, ἔτι δὲ ἀρμάμαξαν). A carriage is also mentioned in the catalogue entry, a particular piece of information that is not found in all the authors cited. Only Hieronymus in the first book of his *Heliaca*, Polyzelus in the fourth book of his *Histories*, Aristion in the first book of his *Chronicle*, and Hieron in the first book of his history *On Rhodes* know about this ἀρμάμαξα. Neither Eudemus in his *Lindian Oration* nor Myron in the first book of his *Encomium on Rhodes*, nor Timocritus in the first book of his *Chronicle* mention the carriage. The existence of the ἀρμάμαξα in the epiphany, on the other hand, is not questioned, only the date of the epiphany has been a controversial subject. In addition, with Xenagoras and Ergias there are two additional authors cited in the first epiphany. Furthermore, in the cases of Hieronymus and Myron two other books are quoted, namely the second book of the *Heliaca* and the eleventh book of the *Encomium on Rhodes*. At least in these two works the epiphany under Datis is placed at a later point than the offering in the catalogue entry.

That the votives of the Persian commander in the catalogue represent an independent event is further supported by the second catalogue entry of Persian dedications (C 35, l. 85–93):

Artaphernes (Hdt. 6.94). Herodotus, however, does not specify how and where the removal took place (e.g., by a personal dismissal at the royal court or elsewhere by the delivery of a message). A few years earlier Mardonius received the supreme command of the Persian army in a similar way: see Hdt. 6.43; there too we are only informed that the king dismissed all other commanders. On the use of envoys to deliver Darius' messages see Hdt. 6.46.1 (ἄγγελος) and 6.48.1 (κῆρυκες). That the removal of Mardonius may have taken place via a message from the king is further given credence by the objection of Xenagoras at the end of the first epiphany: the latter rejects the account of the majority of authors who place the dismissal of Mardonius after the events at Lindos under Datis; he, on the other hand, argues that the dismissal must have taken place before Datis arrived at Lindos. In both cases it remains unclear where this happened. We know only that, after the destruction of the Persian fleet by a storm at Athos and severe setbacks during the defeat of the Brygi in Thrace, Mardonius returned to Asia in 492 BC; where he stayed exactly is unknown (cf. Hdt. 6.44–5).

ὁ δᾶμος, οἷς ἐτίμασε αὐτὸν βασιλεὺς Περσῶν Ἀρταξέρ-  
 ξας, στρεπτὸν χρύσ[εο]ν, τιάραν, ἀκιν[άκ]αν λιθόκολ-  
 λον μᾶλα, ποτ' αὐτῶι ψέλια χρύσεια λιθόκολλα, τὰ  
 πάντ[α] ἄγοντα χρυσοῦς χιλίους τριακοσίους ἑβδο-  
 μ[ά]κοντα πέντε, καὶ τὰν βασιλικὰν στολάν, ὡς φατι  
 Ἔργ[ίας ἐν] τῆι γ' βύβλωι τῶν [ἱσ]τοριῶν, Ζήνων ἐν  
 τῆι [. τᾶς χρ]ονικᾶς συντάξι[σ], Τιμόκριτος ἐν τῆι β'  
 τᾶς [χρονικᾶ]ς συντάξι[σ], Ἰέ[ρ]ων ἐν τῆι γ' τᾶ[ν π]ερὶ Ῥό-  
 δου, Ἀγ[έ]στρατος ἐν τῆι β' τᾶς χρονικᾶς [σ]υντάξι[σ].

The demos (dedicated the objects), with which Artaxerxes, king of the Persians, honoured him, a golden torque, Persian cap, Persian curved short sword with much inlay work, together with it golden armlets with inlay work, all weighing 1375 [*mnas*] of gold, and the royal garment. As Ergias states in the third book of his *Histories*, Zenon in the ... of his *Chronicle*, Timocritus in the second book of his *Chronicle*, Hieron in the third book of his work *About Rhodes*, Hagestratus in the second book of his *Chronicle*.

As in the other two Persian dedications, several objects are listed. These are a golden torque, a tiara, an *acinaces* with many ornaments, golden bracelets with ornaments, and royal garments (στρεπτὸν χρύσ[εο]ν, τιάραν, ἀκιν[άκ]αν λιθόκολλον μᾶλα, ποτ' αὐτῶι ψέλια χρύσεια λιθόκολλα ... καὶ τὰν βασιλικὰν στολάν). King Artaxerxes III gave those offerings to the Lindian demos, who in turn dedicated them to the goddess. This catalogue entry clearly refers to a later event as indicated by the name of the Persian king and the book numbers. Only the *Chronicle* of Timocritus and Hieron's work *On Rhodes* are cited in all three instances; the dedication of the Persian general and the epiphany under Datis are each taken from their first book, while the episode about Artaxerxes is taken from the second book of Timocritus and the third book of Hieron.

Considering the different offerings and quoted book numbers it can be argued that the catalogue entry with the votives of the Persian commander should be separated from the first epiphany and placed chronologically before the year 490 BC. A possible and previously suggested candidate is Mardonius. After being elected strategos in 492 he led his army and fleet to Cilicia and from there to Ionia at the Hellespont.<sup>66</sup> According to Herodotus, Mardonius sailed along the coast of Asia and replaced the tyrants in the Ionian cities along

<sup>66</sup> Hdt. 6.43.1–2.

the way with democracies.<sup>67</sup> During this journey Mardonius may have stopped first in Lindos, just as Datis would later, who landed at Lindos before arriving at Samos.<sup>68</sup> It should not be surprising that Herodotus fails to mention this, since he does not describe the siege of Lindos by Datis.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, the name of Mardonius followed by the article and the first two letters of *στραταγός* nicely fills the lacuna of *ca.* 13–15 letters at the beginning of line 65 in the second column:

[Μαρδόνιος ὁ στ]ραταγός τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως  
[Δαρείου,..<sup>6-8</sup>..-]α καὶ ...

If we accept this restoration and the historical contextualisation of the entry in the year 492 BC, then this would considerably alter our understanding of the entire work. Basically, the two compilers found three different reports of Persian dedications during their research. Apparently, they decided to put the offering of the Persian commander and the gifts of Artaxerxes III to the demos in the catalogue. The votives of Datis to the Lindian temple, on the other hand, were not included in the catalogue, because of the appearance of the goddess during the siege. Thus, both the structure and the content of the catalogue and of the epiphanies were harmonised. Consequently, the previous assumption, that Tharsagoras and Timachidas collected and treated the material separately, does not do justice to their applied method. This, however, does not rule out the possibility that the two authors, who jointly researched the

<sup>67</sup> Hdt. 6.43.3: ὡς δὲ παραπλέων τὴν Ἀσίην ἀπίκετο ὁ Μαρδόνιος ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην, ἐνθαῦτα μέγιστον θῶμα ἐρέω τοῖσι μὴ ἀποδεκομένοισι Ἑλλήνων Περσέων τοῖσι ἐπτὰ Ὀτάνεα γνώμην ἀποδέξασθαι ὡς χρεὸν εἶη δημοκρατέεσθαι Πέρσας· τοὺς γὰρ τυράννους τῶν Ἰώνων καταπαύσας πάντας ὁ Μαρδόνιος δημοκρατίας κατίστα ἐς τὰς πόλεις.

<sup>68</sup> According to Hdt. 6.95, Datis and Artaphernes sailed from Cilicia with 600 ships towards Ionia, but they did not want to pass the Hellespont and Thrace to reach Attica. Therefore, they decided to take the route from Samos through the Icarian Sea passing from island to island. In this context Herodotus wrote that the first island the Persians wanted to attack was Naxos (Hdt. 6.96: ἐπὶ ταύτην γὰρ δὴ πρώτην ἐπέιχον στρατεύεσθαι οἱ Πέρσαι ...). Thus, the two authors of the *Lindian Chronicle* clearly disagree with the Herodotean account, since they explicitly state in the first epiphany that Lindos was the first island where Datis landed with his fleet (D 1, l. 4–5: ὁ ναυτικὸς αὐτοῦ στόλος ταῦται ποτεπέλασε | πράτα<ι> τῶν νάσων).

<sup>69</sup> Chaniotis (1988) 118, considers the siege of the city by Datis fictitious. Comparable is the mention of λευκαὶ περιστεραί in the *Περσικά* of Charon of Lampsacus, when he describes the destruction of the fleet of Mardonius at Mount Athos (*FGrHist* 262 F 3a–b); Herodotus does not mention white doves, only wild animals in the sea around the mountain (Hdt. 6.44.3: ὥστε γὰρ θηριωδεστάτης εἰούσης τῆς θαλάσσης ταύτης τῆς περὶ τὸν Ἄθων, οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων διεφθείροντο ἀρπαζόμενοι).

sources and conceived the work, were responsible for different sections. Therefore, the *Lindian Chronicle* seems to have been composed with a conjoint conception, which took into account the special requirements of the catalogue and the epiphanies.<sup>70</sup>

### **Possible Case I** **Agius and Dercylus: *Argolica***

In contrast to the two previous cases, there is no epigraphic evidence for the third and fourth examples that confirms the existence of dual authorship beyond doubt. Having to rely solely on the literary tradition creates a number of methodological problems, such as cases of conflicting citation. This can be seen in the following example of a now lost local history entitled *Ἀργολικά*, which was already used by Callimachus.<sup>71</sup> It consisted of at least two books and the majority of ancient authorities quote as authors two (probable) Argives called *Ἀγίας* and *Δερκύλος*.<sup>72</sup> Yet, there are also fragments where only one of them is cited.<sup>73</sup> For this reason, it was assumed that two different works with the same title existed and that Agias was the older one, because his name stands always before Dercylus' name. It was thought most likely that in early Hellenistic times Dercylus republished or continued a local history of Argos written by his predecessor Agias.<sup>74</sup> Against this background, some have attempted to connect the two authors with literary figures of the same or similar name. Thus, it has been considered that Agias is the epic poet from

<sup>70</sup> This makes it unlikely that the two authors waited with their research until the decree was passed (with regard to the literary sources see Ryan (2008) 455–70, who holds a different view); that they began beforehand is indicated by the wording of Hagesitimus in his proposal, who was already aware of both the variety of the source material and of the division of the chronicle into a catalogue and accounts of epiphanies.

<sup>71</sup> On Callimachus' use of the *Argolica* see *BNJ* 305 T 1a = F 4; T 1b = F 8a; F 8b.

<sup>72</sup> They are mentioned together in *BNJ* 305 T 1a = F 4; T 1b = F 8a; F 2–3; F 7 and F 9; on their possible origin from Argos see *BNJ* 305 and Engels' statement in the biographical essay: 'There is no clear testimony on Agias' and Dercylus' place of birth. Probably both of them were born in Argos, but we are not told so explicitly ...' Regarding the number of books, one reads in *BNJ* 305 F 2: *Ἀγίας δὲ καὶ Δερκύλος ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ...*, which has been interpreted as a reference to a third book.

<sup>73</sup> See below n. 79.

<sup>74</sup> Over time, three theories have been discussed in regard to the relationship between Agias and Dercylus: the first—that Dercylus' main source was the work of Agias of Troezen (in favour see now Tober (2017) 464 n. 18—and the second—that Dercylus used an old epic city-history of Agias (for this see Schwartz (1903) 243)—were rejected by Jacoby in his introduction to *FGrHist* 305, followed by Engels in his biographical essay to *BNJ* 305.

Troezen of the eighth century BC known for his poem *Νόστοι*.<sup>75</sup> Dercylus, in turn, was equated with the *Δέρκυλλος* who was an author of several mythographical, historiographical, and geographical works known primarily through Pseudo-Plutarch.<sup>76</sup> Apart from these reconstructions, it was never considered that Agias and Dercylus might have written the *Argolica* together as a pair.<sup>77</sup>

Even if this hypothesis cannot be proven with the surviving testimonia and fragments, the reception of the work offers some slight evidence that the *Ἀργολικά* may have been composed by two individuals: while in the earliest fragments from imperial times Agias and Dercylus are still mentioned as a pair,<sup>78</sup> in the medieval tradition both authors are no longer cited together. The detail of dual authorship seems to have lost credibility in the course of the later reception and, therefore, some medieval writers ascribed the work either only to Agias or only to Dercylus.<sup>79</sup> Thus, it is impossible to equate Agias to the homonymous epic poet from Troezen or Dercylus to *Δέρκυλλος*. Taking these elements together, then, the *Argolica* would have been a jointly written work of early Hellenistic times.

According to the few preserved fragments, the work focused on mythology, the Argolis, and Argive cults. Whether the content was prepared by Agias and Dercylus separately or in cooperation cannot be inferred from those fragments. Nevertheless, both authors seem to have dealt with controversial topics, since some of the fragments derive from within a context of literary

<sup>75</sup> On (H)agias of Troezen see Bethe (1912) 2205, who argues against an identification with the author of the *Argolica*.

<sup>76</sup> *Δέρκυλλος* wrote an *Αἰτωλικά* (BNJ 288 F 1), *Ἰταλικά* (F 2), *Κτίσεις* (F 3), *Περὶ λίθων* (F 4), *Περὶ ὀρώων* (FF 5–6), *Σατυρικά* (F 7), and a book *On the Names of Cities and Places* (F 12: *liber de nominibus urbium et locorum*); for the unlikely identification of Dercylus with *Δέρκυλλος* see BNJ 288 and Ceccarelli's discussion in the biographical essay.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Wietzke (2017) 368 n. 91: 'The fragmentary historians Agias and Dercylus are cited together in most testimonia and fragments ... But we can surmise little about the two beyond their Argive associations and dates (not necessarily concurrent) before Callimachus; scholars have assumed, however, a successive rather than collaborative relationship.' On pairs who are cited together see, for example, Tisias and Corax, who were, according to Cole (1991) 65–84, a single person (Tisias) with a nickname (Corax for 'crow'). On the other hand, clearly distinct authors like Hellanicus of Lesbos and his pupil Damastes of Sigeum are repeatedly cited together in the preserved fragments: see, e.g., BNJ 4 F 5b = BNJ 5 F 11b).

<sup>78</sup> So in two papyri from the second century AD, BNJ 305 T 1a = F 4 and T 1b = F 8a; in Clement of Alexandria, BNJ 305 F 2; and in Athenaius, BNJ 305 F 3.

<sup>79</sup> In the *Etymologicum Magnum*, BNJ 305 T 2 = F 5 (only Dercylus); in the *Iliad* commentary of Eustathius of Thessalonica, BNJ 305 F 1 (only Agias); and in the scholia of the Euripidean *Phoinissai*, BNJ 305 F 6 (only Dercylus). In the scholia of the Euripidean *Troades*, in contrast, both authors are quoted: BNJ 305 F 7.

quarrels. Perhaps by working together, they sought to claim greater credibility in such disputes or to demand greater authority among the many authors of Argive histories.<sup>80</sup> Indeed, a passage preserved in the *Stromateis* of the second-century Christian theologian Clement of Alexandria suggests that Agias and Dercylus reacted to writers who dealt with the history of Argos (*Strom.* 1.21.104.1–2):<sup>81</sup>

κατὰ δὲ τὸ ὀκτωκαιδέκατον ἔτος τῆς Ἀγαμέμνονος βασιλείας Ἴλιον ἔαλω,  
 Δημοφῶντος τοῦ Θησέως βασιλεύοντος Ἀθήνησι τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει,  
 Θαρρηλιῶνος μηνὸς δευτέρα ἐπὶ δέκα, ὡς φησι Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀργεῖος.  
 Ἀγίας δὲ καὶ Δερκύλος ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ, μηνὸς Πανήμου ὀγδόῃ φθίνοντος·  
 Ἑλλάνικος δὲ δωδεκάτῃ Θαρρηλιῶνος μηνός·

During the eighteenth year of Agamemnon's rule Ilium was taken, when Demophon, son of Theseus, was king at Athens in his first year, on the twelfth day of the month Thargelion, as Dionysius of Argos says. However, Agias and Dercylus (say) in the third, (it was) on the twenty-third of the month Panemon. But, Hellanicus (says it was) the twelfth of the month Thargelion.

At the close of the fifth century BC, Hellanicus of Lesbos authored an *Ἀργολικά*,<sup>82</sup> and Dionysius of Argos was probably a contemporary of Agias and Dercylus, who treated Argive and Athenian topics in his historical work.<sup>83</sup> In the passage both Hellanicus and Dionysius agreed on the day and month of the capture of Troy. According to Clement, Agias and Dercylus objected to this dating and proposed another day as well as another month for the fall of Troy. Hence, Agias and Dercylus used the context of a local history to participate in a famous literary quarrel. This does not of course mean that they worked together solely with the purpose of discarding the opinions of others, but in the strongly contested field of local historiography collaboration may have strengthened one's authority. As already mentioned, the exact method of

<sup>80</sup> *Ἀργολικά* were written by Demetrius of Argos (*FGrHist* 304 T 1 and F 2), Deinias of Argos (*FGrHist* 306, cf. FF 1 and 2), Anacricrates (*FGrHist* 307 F 1), Telesarchus (*FGrHist* 309 F 1), Socrates of Argos (*FGrHist* 310 F 1; differently titled in T 1 as *Περιήγησις Ἀργους*), Timotheus (*FGrHist* 313 F 1), Istrus the Callimachean (*FGrHist* 334 F 39a and b), and by Hippys of Rhegium (*FGrHist* 554 T 1); Lyceas (of Argos) described the Argolid in poetry (cf. *FGrHist* 312); for the dating of the single authors see Thomas (2019) 419.

<sup>81</sup> *FGrHist* 305 F 2; cf. *FGrHist* 4 F 152a (Hellanicus); *FGrHist* 308 F 1 (Dionysius of Argos).

<sup>82</sup> *FGrHist* 4 F 36b: ἱστορεῖ Ἑλλάνικος ἐν Ἀργολικοῖς.

<sup>83</sup> On this see *B&J* 308 and Mori's discussion in the biographical essay.

cooperation between Agias and Dercylus remains unclear. Nevertheless, joined to the cases of Aristotle/Callisthenes and Tharsagoras/Timachidas we can say now that local histories especially were particularly suitable in Greek historiography for dual authorship.

## Possible Case II

### Pamphile and Socratidas: *Historical Commentaries*

As we have seen with the pairs Aristotle/Callisthenes and Agias/Dercylus, a reliance solely on the literary tradition creates methodological problems when we are dealing with dual authorship. Aside from one-sided and conflicting citations another problem is disputed authorship. This applies to the case of Pamphile of Epidaurus, who lived under the emperor Nero and whose authorship of the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* in thirty-three books is doubted by the ancient literary tradition.<sup>84</sup> The fact that Pamphile is not undisputedly regarded as the author of a work of history may be related to ancient prejudices against female authors.<sup>85</sup> In this particular case, the recording of the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* also seems to have been closely connected to her marital life. The specific background of the work's composition is reported by the ninth-century Byzantine patriarch Photius (*Bibl.* 175):<sup>86</sup>

<sup>84</sup> On Pamphile of Epidaurus, the fragments of the work, and her disputed authorship see Regenbogen (1949) 309–28, and especially Cagnazzi (1997) 29–112; see further De Cicco–Canfora (2016) 537–9; and generally on ancient mixed-gender author couples see Hose (2001) 323–33.

<sup>85</sup> Such prejudices are encountered, for example, with the female historian Nicobule (see *FGrHist* 127 T 1: *Νικοβούλη δὲ ἢ ὁ ἀναθεῖς ταύτη τὰ συγγράμματα*); little is known about her and about her work, but it seems to have had a focus on Alexander the Great (cf. *FGrHist* 127 FF 1 and 2; see further Cagnazzi (1997) 9–28). In another example, the probably late antique writer Marcellinus reports in his biography of Thucydides that the mediocre style of the eighth book on the Peloponnesian War was attributed by some to the fact that it was a forgery, while others presumed it was the work of Xenophon or of Thucydides' daughter. Marcellinus rejects the latter: first because it would be not in the female nature to imitate such art; and second, because a daughter of Thucydides would probably not have remained anonymous and would have left behind further books (Marcell. *Vit. Thuc.* 43: *οὐ γὰρ γυναικείας ἦν φύσεως τοιαύτην ἀρετὴν τε καὶ τέχνην μιμήσασθαι· ἔπειτα, εἰ τοιαύτη τις ἦν, οὐκ ἂν ἐσπούδασε λαθεῖν, οὐδ' ἂν τὴν ὀγδόην ἔγραψε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ κατέλιπεν ἂν, τὴν οἰκείαν ἐκφαίνουσα φύσιν*; Cagnazzi (1997) 116–19). Photius' assessment of the plain style of Pamphile, which he regarded as appropriate for a woman, can be placed alongside these examples (see Phot. *Bibl.* 175).

<sup>86</sup> The Greek text is from Henry (1960).

ἀνεγνώσθη Παμφίλης συμμίκτων ἱστορικῶν ὑπομνημάτων λόγοι η'. αὕτη ἀνδρὶ μὲν συνώκει, ὡς καὶ αὕτη τῶν ὑπομνημάτων προοιμαζομένη ἐπισημαίνεται· ᾧ καὶ ἰγ' ἔτη ἐκ παιδὸς συμβιοῦσα ἤδη τῆς ὑπομνηματικῆς ταύτης συγγραφῆς λέγει ἀπάρξασθαι, συγγράψαι δὲ ἅ τε παρὰ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς μάθοι, τὰ ἰγ' ἔτη συνεχῶς αὐτῷ συνοῦσα καὶ μηδ' ἡμέραν μηδ' ὥραν ἀπολειπομένη, καὶ ἅ παρ' ἄλλου τινὸς ἀκοῦσαι συνέβη τῶν παρ' αὐτὸν ἀφικνουμένων (πολλοὺς δὲ φοιτᾶν ὄνομα καὶ δόξαν ἔχοντας ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ) καὶ δὴ καὶ ὅσα βιβλίων αὕτη ἀνελέξατο. ταῦτα δὲ πάντα, ὅσα λόγου καὶ μνήμης αὐτῇ ἄξια ἐδόκει, εἰς ὑπομνήματα συμμιγῆ καὶ οὐ πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ὑποθέσεις διακεκριμένον ἕκαστον διελεῖν, ἀλλ' οὕτως εἰκῆ καὶ ὡς ἕκαστον ἐπῆλθεν ἀναγράψαι, ὡς οὐχὶ χαλεπὸν ἔχουσα, φησί, τὸ κατ' εἶδος αὐτὰ διελεῖν, ἐπιτερπέστερον δὲ καὶ χαριέστερον τὸ ἀναμειγμένον καὶ τὴν ποικιλίαν τοῦ μονοειδοῦς νομίζουσα. χρήσιμον δὲ τὸ βιβλίον εἰς πολυμαθίαν· εὔροι γὰρ ἂν τις καὶ τῶν ἱστορικῶν οὐκ ὀλίγα ἀναγκαῖα, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀποφθεγμάτων καὶ ῥητορικῆς διατριβῆς ἔνια καὶ φιλοσόφου θεωρίας καὶ ποιητικῆς ιδέας, καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ἐμπέσοι. Αἰγυπτία δὲ τὸ γένος ἢ Παμφίλη, ἠκμασε δὲ καθ' οὓς χρόνους Νέρων ὁ Ῥωμαίων ἠκμαζεν αὐτοκράτωρ. ἢ δὲ φράσις, ὡς ἔστιν ἐκ τῶν προοιμίων συλλαβεῖν, καὶ ἐν οἷς ἄλλοθί που ἴδιόν τι λέγει, καὶ μάλιστα κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν, οἷα δὴ καὶ γυναικὸς ἔκγονον οὖσα, τῆς ἀφελοῦς ἐστὶν ιδέας, οὐδὲ τῇ λέξει πρὸς τὴν ιδέαν ἀλλοτριουμένη. ἐν οἷς δὲ τὰ τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων ἀπομνημονεύουσα λέγει, ποικιλώτερον αὐτῇ καὶ οὐ καθ' ἓν εἶδος σύγκειται ὁ λόγος.

Read the *Miscellaneous Historical Notes* by Pamphile in eight books. She was a married woman, as she allows us to understand in the preface of these commentaries. She had lived thirteen years with her husband from her youth when she began the composition of these memoirs; she says that she relates what she learned from her husband in the course of a common life of thirteen years which was uninterrupted neither by a day nor an hour, what she had heard from anyone who visited her husband (many visited him who had gained a name and glory for their erudition) and what she had taken from books. All these data, which seemed to her worthy of being quoted or retained, she combined in the notes, without assigning to each its place in relation to the appropriate subjects, but at random and in the order in which each presented itself. There would have been no difficulty, she says, in organising them according to a plan, but she thought that the mixture and variety is more pleasant and more gracious than uniformity. This book is useful for erudition. For one finds in it many necessary things on history, on sayings, some on rhetorical study, on philosophical speculation, on poetic form and randomly on similar subjects. Pamphile was of Egyptian provenance, she flourished

during the time of Nero, emperor of the Romans. Her style—as it can be grasped from the prefaces and when she speaks elsewhere on her own, and especially in the thought, as it is natural for that which comes from a woman—is of a simple kind; even the vocabulary does not deviate from this. In the passages where she speaks recounting older writers, her style has more variety and is not composed according to a single format.

Apparently, Photius only read eight books and several prefaces to get an impression of the whole work. In the preface, as he tells us, Pamphile explained that she began working on the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* after living with her husband for thirteen years without a day of separation. During these years, she made notes of what she learned from him, his numerous guests, and of what she had found in books. She recorded everything that seemed worth telling and remembering without ordering the collected material. If we want to follow this statement about the origin and the arrangement of her notes, then this would mean that a good part of her information came from Socratidas and his conversations with his visitors.

The high educational content as well as the range of topics is particularly praised by Photius. On her style, he reports that her line of thought and language stands in stark contrast with those passages that do not belong to the proem or are written in the first-person. According to Photius, the style in the reproduced sources was completely different from Pamphile's. Hence, it seems that she refrained from imposing her plain style on the *ὑπομνήματα* and decided to stick to the original wording, which can be observed in some of the few surviving fragments of the work. For instance, in one of the fragments a longer *ἀνιγμα* of Cleoboulus was recorded, while in others we find sayings of, e.g., Socrates and Pittacus.<sup>87</sup> Whether she also used this method to record the information of Socratidas and the conversations of his guests must remain an open question. However, their (in)direct influence on the shape of the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* should probably not be underestimated.

Pamphile's authorship is questioned in three biographical notes in the *Suda*, one of which was reused for a short biography of her in the *Violarium* of Pseudo-Eudocia.<sup>88</sup> Her authorship seems to have become a topic of discussion

<sup>87</sup> On these fragments see *FHG* III.521, F 4 = Diog. Laert. 1.90 (Cleoboulus); *FHG* III.521, F 3 = Diog. Laert. 1.76 (Pittacus); and *FHG* III.521, F 6 = Diog. Laert. 2.24 (Socrates).

<sup>88</sup> *Suda*, s.v. Παμφίλη (Π 139 Adler); s.v. Σωτηρίδας (Σ 875 Adler) (husband) and s.v. Σωτηρίδας (Σ 876 Adler) (father); Ps.-Eudoc. *Viola*. 826, Περὶ Παμφίλης τῆς φιλοσόφου. One problem with the *Suda* entries for Pamphile's father and her husband is that both are

already in the imperial period. According to the *Suda*, the Hadrianic grammarian Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the thirtieth book of his *History of Music*, ascribed the work to the father of Pamphile.<sup>89</sup> Other contemporaries and later writers, however, did not share this view: Aulus Gellius and Diogenes Laertius, who both quote from different books of the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα*, name only Pamphile as the author.<sup>90</sup> Even Sopater of Apamea (early fourth century AD) presumably cited only the name of Pamphile when he used her work for the second book of his encyclopaedic *Ἐκλογαὶ διάφοροι*.<sup>91</sup> In her *Suda* entry, in turn, her husband is likewise considered as a potential author.<sup>92</sup> Apart from the father's possible authorship of the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα*, further literary works are attributed to Socratidas but also to Pamphile.<sup>93</sup>

registered with the same name *Σωτηρίδας*; this is probably a mistake, because in Pamphile's *Suda* entry her husband is called *Σωκρατίδας*.

<sup>89</sup> *Suda*, s.v. Παμφίλη (Π 139 Adler): ... θυγάτηρ Σωτηρίδου, οὗ λέγεται εἶναι καὶ τὰ συντάγματα, ὡς Διονύσιος ἐν τῷ λ' τῆς Μουσικῆς ἱστορίας ...; *Suda*, s.v. Σωτηρίδας (Σ 876 Adler): Ἐπιδάυριος, πατήρ Παμφίλης, ἧς τὰ ὑπομνήματα ἐπέγραψεν, ὡς ὁ Διονύσιος ἐν λ' τῆς Μουσικῆς ἱστορίας, βιβλία γ'; on the Dionysius of Halicarnassus from the time of Hadrian see Cohn (1903) 986–91.

<sup>90</sup> All known fragments of the work derive from them, collected in *FHG* III. 520–2: F 1 = Diog. Laert. 1.24; F 2 = Diog. Laert. 1.68; F 3 = Diog. Laert. 1.76 (from the second book); F 4 = Diog. Laert. 1.90; F 5 = Diog. Laert. 1.98 (from the fifth book); F 6 = Diog. Laert. 2.24 (from the seventh book); F 7 = Gell. *NA* 15.23 (from the eleventh book); F 8 = Diog. Laert. 3.23 (from the twenty-fifth book); F 9 = Gell. *NA* 15.17 (from the twenty-ninth book); F 10 = Diog. Laert. 5.36 (from the thirty-second book).

<sup>91</sup> See Phot. *Bibl.* 161: ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἔκ τε τῶν Σωτηρίδα Παμφίλης ἐπιτομῶν πρώτου λόγου καὶ καθεξῆς μέχρι τοῦ δεκάτου ...; whether the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* are meant here is not clear; Pamphile wrote an epitome of the work of Ctesias, but in three, not in ten books (see below n. 93).

<sup>92</sup> *Suda*, s.v. Παμφίλη (Π 139 Adler): ... ὡς δὲ ἕτεροι γεγράφασι Σωκρατίδα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς; cf. *Suda*, s.v. Σωτηρίδας (Σ 875 Adler): γραμματικός, ἀνὴρ Παμφίλης, ἧ καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας περιῆψεν.

<sup>93</sup> *Suda*, s.v. Σωτηρίδας (Σ 875 Adler) (husband): ... ἔγραψεν Ὀρθογραφίαν, Ζητήσεις Ὀμηρικὰς, ὑπόμνημα εἰς Μένανδρον, Περὶ μέτρων, Περὶ κωμωδίας, εἰς Εὐριπίδην; s.v. Παμφίλη (Π 139 Adler): ... Ἐπιτομὴν τῶν Κτησίου ἐν βιβλίοις γ', ἐπιτομὰς ἱστοριῶν τε καὶ ἐτέρων βιβλίων παμπλείστας, Περὶ ἀμφισβητήσεων, Περὶ ἀφροδισίων καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν. According to Euseb. *PE* 10.3.23, Valerius Pollio wrote an *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Σωτηρίδαν Περὶ τῆς Κτησίου κλοπῆς*; either this letter was addressed to an otherwise unknown Soteridas or it was written against an author named Soteridas about his forgery of Ctesias. In the latter case, the father of Pamphile might be meant. Not to him, but to his daughter an *Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν Κτησίου ἐν βιβλίοις γ'* is attributed (for the father see *Suda*, s.v. Σωτηρίδας (Σ 876 Adler): Ἐπιδάυριος, πατήρ Παμφίλης, ἧς τὰ ὑπομνήματα ἐπέγραψεν, ὡς ὁ Διονύσιος ἐν λ' τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας, βιβλία γ').

The couple's lively literary activity, together with Photius' description of the background of the composition of the work, suggests that the controversy over the authorship of the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* may have originated from its collaborative composition. This, of course, cannot be said with any certainty, yet the question is worth considering, because the first two pairs of Aristotle/Callisthenes and Tharsagoras/Timachidas demonstrated how misleading the literary tradition can be in the case of jointly written historiographical works. The inscriptions helped to correct this skewed perspective, which, however, is not possible in the case of the authorship of the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα*. Admittedly, the preface of the complete work and also the prefaces of the first eight books had probably contained no traces of Pamphile and Socratidas being equally responsible for the work; otherwise Photius would have mentioned this, since he is familiar with the phenomenon of dual authorship.<sup>94</sup> This does not mean that Socratidas had no influence on the composition of the *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα*, since Pamphile herself pointed out in her introductory proem that he was one of her main sources of information and, moreover, that he had given her access to his circle of erudite friends for additional data. Thus, if we assume that Pamphile received a lot of material from her husband, or even quoted his notes exactly, it would mean that Socratidas would have to have been involved with the writing. Later authors may have taken in this form of involvement a pretext to deny Pamphile's authorship and ascribed it to Socratidas.

### Conclusion

After the supposed 'death of the author' and the continued importance of an 'author' for ancient literary history, it is appropriate to enquire into different forms of authorship in ancient literature.<sup>95</sup> The aim of this study has been to present all genuine and possible examples of dual authorship in Greek historiography in order to understand a little-known literary phenomenon. Even though it is not possible to say with certainty how the authors actually collaborated in practice, the way they handled their sources and arranged the content has allowed some conclusions about a joint working method to be drawn.

The *Pythian Victors* of Aristotle and Callisthenes contained a list of victors, but also dealt with historical events, which suggests that the work consisted of

<sup>94</sup> See above n. 5.

<sup>95</sup> On the unchanged relevance of the ancient author see Hose (2017) 46–59; on the concept of authorship and its diversity in antiquity see Berardi–Filosa–Massimo (2021).

two parts that might have been arranged separately. In any case, it was written with a political and a competitive spirit, shared by both authors. In the *Lindian Chronicle* of Tharsagoras and Timachidas also, one encounters two narrative patterns in the catalogue of offerings to the goddess Athena and the epiphanies of the goddess, which were jointly researched, as the continuous citation of literary sources demonstrates. How Agias and Dercylus actually worked together in the *Argolica* is unclear due to the limited evidence available, but it seems that they participated in literary quarrels to increase their authority. In the case of the *Historical Commentaries* attributed to Pamphile as well as to her husband Socratidas, it seems that their marital life had a significant impact on the shape of the work. For over thirteen years, Socratidas was one of the principal sources of information for the *ὑπομνήματα* of Pamphile. According to Photius she wanted to maintain the chronological order of her notes in the final version and did not replace it with the thematic schema of the *ὑπομνήματα*. In all cases the collaboration among the two authors differs slightly. At the same time, they share different relationships: Aristotle and Callisthenes were uncle and nephew as well as teacher and pupil, Pamphile and Socratidas a married couple. In contrast, Tharsagoras and Timachidas were apparently not related to each other and came from different places; Agias and Dercylus, on the other side, might be both from Argos, even if we miss a clear testimony.

Such results have serious consequences for our understanding of historiography. The fact that historical works were written by two people does not make them superior to individually written works, but the cooperation of two historians might have increased their credibility in the minds of their audience. As has been shown, it was especially local histories in list form with additional information, such as in the *Pythian Victors*, the *Lindian Chronicle*, and possibly the *Argolica* which seem to have been regarded as suitable for dual authorship—in part, probably, because the field of local historiography was so strongly contested. With this form of historiographical competition, genre, and authority in mind, it is clear that dual authorship is distinguished from other forms of historiographical writing, like the works of Herodotus or Thucydides, as well as from other forms of collaborative writing, such as the often anonymous masses of compilers, translators, and author-collectives. Even if these consequences are far from insignificant, we must be cautious, because all the differences we have observed, specifically regarding the structure, method, and content of the works, should not be overinterpreted as deriving solely from dual authorship, since divergent working methods within a historical work are not unusual.

In the end, the lingering question remains as to why dual authorship was so rare in antiquity. Although a conclusive answer cannot be given, the sparsity of the evidence can be partially explained: first of all, without the epigraphic

evidence of the decrees, as in the case of the pairs Aristotle/Callisthenes and Tharsagoras/Timachidas, we would not know that Aristotle wrote the *Pythian Victors* together with Callisthenes, and Tharsagoras would still be an unknown author. This discrepancy between the epigraphic evidence and later literary reception is related to the fact that the inscription is a snapshot of a precise moment in which both authors were honoured for their literary work. But such precision can be lost over the course of the work's reception, and doubts about dual authorship may surface over time. This type of growing scepticism resulted in only one author being cited, as in the case of Aristotle, or caused controversies to arise over authorship, as in the cases of Agias/Dercylus and Pamphile/Socratidas. These issues thus call for a more careful consideration when assessing the achievements of single authorship, one that takes the rare phenomenon of dual authorship in ancient historiography and literary history into account.

*University of Zurich*

JACK W. G. SCHROPP  
jack.schropp@uzh.ch

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ampolo, C., D. Erdas, and A. Magnetto, edd. (2014) *La gloria di Athana Lindia* (ASNP, ser. 5, 6/1; Pisa).
- Badoud, N. (2015) *Le temps de Rhodes: une chronologie des inscriptions de la cité fondée sur l'étude de ses institutions* (Munich).
- Barbera, D. (2014) 'Storia della Cronaca: considerazioni preliminari sui contesti archeologici della cosiddetta Cronaca di Lindo', in Ampolo–Erdas–Magnetto (2014) 31–62.
- Baslez, M.-F. (1985) 'Présence et traditions iraniennes dans les cités de l'Égée', *REA* 87: 137–55.
- Berardi, R., M. Filosa, and D. Massimo, edd. (2021) *Defining Authorship, Debating Authenticity: Problems of Authority from Classical Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Berlin and Boston).
- Bethe, E. (1912) 'Hagias', *RE* VII.2: 2205.
- Blinkenberg, C. (1915) *Die lindische Tempelchronik* (Bonn).
- (1941) *Lindos. Fouilles de l'acropole 1902–1914, II, Inscriptions, Tome I (Nos 1–281)* (Berlin).
- Bonollo, E. (2021) 'The "Co–Authorial" Role of Ancient Pupils, Excerptores, and Copyists in the Genuinely Menandrian Γνώμαι μονόστιχοι', in Berardi–Filosa–Massimo (2021) 151–64.
- Bosworth, A. B. (1970) 'Aristotle and Callisthenes', *Historia* 19: 407–13.
- Bresson, A. (2006) 'Relire la *Chronique du temple lindien*' [review of Higbie (2003)], *Τόποι* 14: 527–51.
- Brommer, F. (1950) 'Beiträge zur griechischen Bildhauergeschichte', *MDAI* 3: 80–98.
- Cagnazzi, S. (1997) *Nicobule e Panfila: Frammenti di storiche greche* (Bari).
- Chaniotis, A. (1988) *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (Stuttgart).
- (2014) 'Mnemopoetik: die epigraphische Konstruktion von Erinnerung in den griechischen Poleis', in O. Dally, T. Hölscher, S. Muth, and R. M. Schneider, edd., *Medien der Geschichte—Antikes Griechenland und Rom* (Berlin) 132–69.
- (2015) 'Archival Research, Formulaic Language, and Ancient Forgeries of Legal Documents', in A. Matthaïou and N. Papazarkadas, edd., *Ἀξων: Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud* (Athens) 669–90.
- Christesen, P. (2007) *Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History* (New York and Cambridge).
- Cohn, L. (1903) 'Dionysios (142)', *RE* V.1: 986–91.
- Cole, T. (1991) 'Who was Corax?', *ICS* 16: 65–84.
- De Cicco, P. and L. Canfora (2016) '175. Panfila, Miscellanea di note storiche, libri 8', in N. Bianchi and C. Schiano, edd., *Fozio: Biblioteca* (Pisa) 537–9.

- Franchi, E. (2020) 'The Ambivalent Legacy on the Crisaeans: Athens' Interstate Relations (and the Phocian Factor) in 4th-Century Public Discourse', *Klio* 102: 509–35.
- Haake, M. (2007) *Der Philosoph in der Stadt: Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in den hellenistischen Poleis* (Munich).
- (2019) 'Feiern, opfern, schänden, handeln, inszenieren ... Supralokale Heiligtümer in der griechischen Welt als Handlungsorte—ein Aufriss', in K. Freitag and M. Haake, edd., *Griechische Heiligtümer als Handlungsorte: zur Multifunktionalität supralokaler Heiligtümer von der frühen Archaik bis in die römische Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart) 1–30.
- Hafner, M. (2022) 'Fathers and Sons—and Daughters: Genealogical Co-authorship, Offspring Metaphors and the Language of Legitimacy', in U. Tischer, U. Gärtner, and A. Forst, edd., *Ut pictura poeta: Author Images and the Reading of Ancient Literature/Autorbilder und die Lektüre antiker Literatur* (Turnhout) 341–66.
- Heltzer, M. (1989) 'The Persepolis Documents, the Lindos Chronicle, and the Book of Judith', *PP* 44: 81–101.
- Henry, R., ed. (1960) *Photius: Bibliothèque, tome II ('codices' 84–185)* (Paris).
- Higbie, C. (2003) *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past* (Oxford).
- Homolle, T. (1898) 'Inscriptions de Delphes', *BCH* 22: 260–70.
- Honigman, S. (2003) *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London).
- Hose, M. (2001) 'Der Bischof und die Philosophin: über die Inszenierung eines Paares in den Briefen des Synesios an Hypatia', in A. Heitmann, S. Nieberle, B. Schaff, and S. Schülting, edd., *Bi-Textualität: Inszenierungen des Paares. Ein Buch für Ina Schabert* (Berlin) 323–33.
- (2017) 'Nekrophilie? Zur Literaturgeschichtsschreibung nach dem "Tod des Autors"', in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos, edd., *Griechische Literaturgeschichtsschreibung: Traditionen, Probleme und Konzepte* (Berlin) 46–59.
- Lehmann, G. A. (1980) 'Der "Erste Heilige Krieg"—eine Fiktion?', *Historia* 29: 242–6.
- Low, P. (2020) 'Remembering, Forgetting, and Rewriting the Past: Athenian Inscriptions and Collective Memory', in C. Constantakopoulou and M. Fragoulaki, edd., *Shaping Memory in Ancient Greece: Poetry, Historiography, and Epigraphy* (*Histos* Suppl. 11; Newcastle) 235–68.
- Mari, M. (2013) 'From Inscriptions to Literature (and Sometimes Back Again): Some Uses of the Epigraphic Sources in the Ancient Literary Traditions on Delphi', in P. Liddel and P. Low, edd., *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford) 125–47.
- Matijašić, I. (2014a) 'Timachidas di Rodi e la Cronaca di Lindo', in Ampolo–Erdas–Magnetto (2014) 91–112.

- (2014b) ‘Timachidas di Rodi: introduzione, edizione dei frammenti, traduzione e commento’, in Ampolo–Erdas–Magnetto (2014) 113–85.
- Miller, S. G. (1978) ‘The Date of the First Pythiad’, *CSCA* 11: 127–58.
- Polito, M. (2010) ‘Aristotele, Delfi e la storiografia locale: riflessioni sul fr. 611, 52 Rose’, in M. Polito and C. Talamo, edd., *La Politica di Aristotele e la storiografia locale* (Tivoli) 103–29.
- Prior, M. (1989) *Paul the Letter-Writer and the Second Letter to Timothy* (Sheffield).
- Regenbogen, O. (1949) ‘Pamphila (1)’, *RE* XVIII.2: 309–28.
- Rosamilia, E. (2014) ‘Biblioteche a Rodi all’epoca di Timachidas’, in Ampolo–Erdas–Magnetto (2014) 325–62.
- Ryan, F. X. (2008) ‘Breadth and Depth in the Account of the Dedications to Athana Lindia’, *SE* 20: 455–70.
- Sánchez, P. (2001) *L’Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes: Recherches sur son rôle historique, des origines au II<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère* (Stuttgart).
- Schwartz, E. (1903) ‘Derkylos (2)’, *RE* V.1: 243.
- Stilling, J. (1991) *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (Oxford).
- Thomas, R. (2019) *Polis Histories, Collective Memories and the Greek World* (Cambridge).
- Tober, D. (2017) ‘Greek Local Historiography and its Audiences’, *CQ* 67: 460–84.
- Wiemer, H.-U. (2001) *Rhodische Traditionen in der hellenistischen Historiographie* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Wietzke, J. (2017) ‘The Public Face of Expertise: Utility, Zeal and Collaboration in Ptolemy’s Syntaxis’, in J. König and G. Woolf, edd., *Authority and Expertise in Ancient Scientific Culture* (Cambridge) 348–73.
- Woodman, A. J. (2015) *Lost Histories: Selected Fragments of Roman Historical Writers* (*Histos* Suppl. 2; Newcastle).