Craterus and the Use of Inscriptions in Ancient Scholarship*

Carolyn Higbie
Harvard University

Throughout his biographies, Plutarch makes frequent passing references to his sources. He cites predecessors in order to confirm an opinion, to show that the evidence is contradictory, or to rebut the arguments of earlier writers. In doing so, he reveals himself to be widely read, which is perhaps part of his purpose, for he names historians of all centuries in both Greek and Latin, poets in all genres, authors of memoirs, geographers, and philosophers, as well as grammarians and rhetoricians.

If frequency of citation indicates the depth of his dependence, Plutarch makes much greater use of these literary sources than he does of documentary evidence such as inscriptions. He does occasionally, however, draw on such materials, as he makes clear in the opening of his biography of Nicias, when he claims that he has gathered evidence not often exploited by others. He argues that sources such as votive offerings or ancient inscriptions provide insights into character not otherwise available. Plutarch's primary interest in this material is how it can reveal the character and nature—ἦθος καὶ τρόπος—of his subject (1.5):[1]

> τὰ διαφεύγοντα τοὺς πολλούς, ὑφ' ἑτέρων δ' εἰρημένα
> σποράδην ἢ πρὸς ἀναθήμασιν ἢ ψηφίσμασιν εὑρημένα παλαιοῖς
> πεπείραμαι συναγαγεῖν, οὐ τὴν ἄχρηστον ἀθροίζων ἱστορίαν,
> ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸς κατανόησιν ἤθους καὶ τρόπου παραδιδούς.
>
> I have tried to collect texts, found either on votive offerings or in
> ancient decrees, which have escaped most authors and which are cited

[1]For Plutarch's interest in character (τὸ ἦθος), see his opening remarks in the biographies of Alexander (ch. 1) and Aemilius Paulus (ch. 1). See also Stadter 1988, Pelling 1988.

> by some only rarely. I have not put together a narrative without purpose,
> but present it for the understanding of character and way of life.

Plutarch may also emphasize his use of this material in order to bring something new to his biography of Nicias, since he opens with an acknowledgement of Thucydides' brilliance in the portrayal of that Athenian.[2]

Although Plutarch recognizes certain advantages of documentary sources, he also understands their limitations. He argues that it is especially difficult to be accurate about the chronology of the earliest eras, in part because documents have been lost or destroyed, because of possible forgery, and because previous scholarly work on these early years has not always been of a very high quality.[3] In his biography of Numa, for example, Plutarch observes (1.6):

> τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους ἐξακριβῶσαι χαλεπόν ἐστι, καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς
> ἐκ τῶν Ὀλυμπιονικῶν ἀναγομένους, ὧν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ὀψέ
> φασιν Ἱππίαν ἐκδοῦναι τὸν Ἠλεῖον, ἀπ' οὐδενὸς ὁρμώμενον
> ἀναγκαίου πρὸς πίστιν.

> It is difficult to be accurate about the dates, especially those arising
> from the list of Olympic victors, of whom they say Hippias of Elis
> published a list, but there is no trustworthiness inherent in his work.

Variations of this lament over chronology can be found in Plutarch's biographies of Lycurgus (1) and Solon (27.1).[4]

Plutarch's criticism of documentary evidence and his infrequent use of it are typical of ancient authors, with only a very few exceptions. This attitude may reflect either that ancient historians generally did not regard such sources

---

[2]Stadter 1988: 286 discusses the preface to Plutarch's *Nicias*.

[3]Momigliano is, I think, too optimistic in his assessment of Greek historians' evaluation of their sources when he says (281): "Methods had existed since the fifth century B.C.—that is, since the beginning of historiography in Greece—of getting correct information about the remote past. These methods were critical, in the sense that the user, after reflection and study, was satisfied as to their reliability." As Finley 202, building on another essay by Momigliano, more pessimistically, but more accurately, observes, Greek historians "failed to develop techniques of source criticism or ways of dealing satisfactorily with derivative authorities."

[4]Such problems do not, however, prevent Plutarch and others from filling the void, as Plutarch says in the next sentence of his biography of Numa (1.7): ἃ δὲ παρειλήφαμεν ἄξια λόγου περὶ Νομᾶ, διέξιμεν ἀρχὴν οἰκείαν λαβόντες ("whatever we have found worthy of note concerning Numa we shall go through, starting at a suitable point"). Finley 203 remarks: "ancient writers, like historians ever since, could not tolerate a void and they filled it one way or another, ultimately by pure invention."

of much value or that they were difficult to obtain. The truth probably lies in both possibilities: the surviving evidence suggests that historians did not often seek out inscriptions and, even if they did, the stones they sought might not have been preserved. Not unexpectedly, inscriptions on metal tablets or on valuable votives did not survive when sanctuaries came under attack and were looted.[5] Some inscriptions on stelae, indeed, even stated the conditions under which they were to be destroyed or other inscriptions were to be taken down.[6] Nicely finished stelae and other such stones made good building materials, especially in times of crisis,[7] and might not have had much chance of surviving intact during wars, depending on the size of the stone and whether it was in a sanctuary and thus understood to be consecrated to a god, as, for example, the Athenian tribute lists. If there was a copy in an archive, that might be available to someone interested; similarly, someone might simply quote from an earlier scholar's transcription of the document.

In his remarks on his documentary and literary sources, Plutarch presents himself as one who has done his homework, who has left no stone unturned in his research. From his references to researchers like Hippias of Elis, however, Plutarch seems to have done most of his research indoors while some of his predecessors—or their assistants—worked outside and did, indeed, stumble over their evidence.[8] Only rarely, as in his life of Nicias, does he even suggest that he has seen an inscription. More typically, he shows in his citations that he

[5]See, for example, Herodotus' description of the destruction carried out or intended by the Persians throughout Greece: the temple of Apollo at Abae (8.33); the Athenian acropolis (8.53.2); and the troops instructed by Xerxes to loot specific objects from Delphi (8.35). Apellicon of Teos was remembered as a different sort of looter: he was said to have collected the libraries of philosophers such as Aristotle and the originals of inscriptions in the Metroon of Athens and in the collections of other cities (Ath. 5.214d–e).

[6]See, for example, the decree about silver coinage in Athens, 375/4 B.C.E. (lines 55–56): εἰ δέ τι ψήφισμα γέγραπταί πο ἐστήληι πα[ρὰ τ]-/όνδε τὸν νόμον, καθελέτω ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς βολ[ῆς] ("if any decree is inscribed on a stele which contradicts this law, the clerk of the Boule is to tear it down"); see Stroud 1974. Compare IG 1³.106.21–23, instructions to erase part of a text on a stele on the Athenian Acropolis, or Tod no. 123.31–35, the charter of the Second Athenian Confederacy.

[7]See, for example, the defensive wall built in Athens in 479 B.C.E. largely from tombstones and other blocks, as described by Thucydides (1.90.3, 93.1) and confirmed by archaeology; also the wall built in 338 B.C.E., as presented in speeches by Lycurgus (*Against Leocrates* 44) and Aeschines (*Against Ctesiphon* 236).

[8]See Frost; Wardman; Pelling 1979 discusses Plutarch's approach to biography and uses of sources for his Roman lives.

is dependent on earlier scholars for documentary evidence. Twice, at least, Plutarch draws on the elusive Craterus of Macedon as a source of inscriptions.

Craterus and the Archives of Athens

Most important among those who used inscriptions, though little recognized by historians ancient or modern, was Craterus of Macedon (*FGH* 342). His work, which gathered together public inscriptions from Athens with some sort of commentary linking them, was later referred to as περὶ ψηφισμάτων, τῶν ψηφισμάτων, or συναγωγὴ τῶν ψηφισμάτων. There is a debate whether he should be identified with either of two Macedonians prominent in Alexander's circle: Craterus I (c. 370?–321 B.C.E.) was one of Alexander's generals and successors who died early in the fight for power, but not before he left a son, born to Phila, daughter of Antipater. This son, Craterus II (321–c. 255 B.C.E.), became a talented general who was loyal to his slightly younger half-brother, Antigonus Gonatas, and served him as ruler of Corinth and Euboea. If Craterus II is the collector of the συναγωγὴ τῶν ψηφισμάτων, as is generally accepted by scholars,[9] his antiquarian interests may have been inspired by Aristotle, and perhaps the Macedonian was part of the philosopher's circle during the years Aristotle spent as tutor to Alexander the Great.

In the title συναγωγὴ τῶν ψηφισμάτων both the nature of Craterus' work and the link between it and Plutarch become clear, as Plutarch declared his efforts to gather together—συναγαγεῖν—documents useful to his biographical purposes (*Nic.* 1.5). The intellectual bond between the two authors becomes even clearer from the fact that the longest fragments of Craterus' work survive precisely because Plutarch quotes them. But there is, however, an important difference between the two: Craterus himself or an assistant probably gathered the documents in situ or from Athenian archives, while Plutarch researched in the more comfortable setting of a library, abstracting material assembled by Craterus and others over the centuries.[10]

The value of Craterus' work to Plutarch is revealed in the two instances in which the biographer cites Craterus because he runs into difficulties from either a lack of evidence or conflicting evidence. In his biography of Cimon, Plutarch narrates events as though the Peace of Callias were genuine and undisputed, then interrupts the tale briefly to discuss this controversy. He gives

---

[9]Jacoby 1923– does not agree; see *FGH* IIIb.94–95. On these figures, see Hammond and Griffith 396, 402; Hammond and Walbank 250, 270–74, 288–89, 300.

[10]See Plu. *Dem.* 2.1–2 on the difficulties of obtaining materials in a small town.

Callisthenes' view that the peace was not the result of a formal document but rather something developed in practice and he also refers to the belief that the Athenians built an altar to Peace in commemoration and voted honors to Callias, the negotiator. Plutarch introduces into this discussion the authority of Craterus' work (*Cim.* 13.5 [= *FGH* 342 F13]): ἐν δὲ τοῖς ψηφίσμασιν ἃ συνήγαγε Κρατερὸς ἀντίγραφα συνθηκῶν ὡς γενομένων κατατέτακται ("in the decrees Craterus collected, there are copies of treaties arranged as though they were enacted"). His remarks show that the presence of the document in Craterus' collection meant that Plutarch believed the treaty had been formally concluded and his presentation of events underlines that view. For unexplained reasons, perhaps because he simply trusts Craterus, Plutarch either does not believe that the document might have been forged or he does not consider that possibility.[11]

In contrast, the lack of documentation in Craterus' collection about Aristides' final days prompts Plutarch to dismiss a version of events told by Craterus himself. Plutarch begins his description of Aristides' last years by summarizing two conflicting versions (*Arist.* 26.1 [= FGH 342 F12]): οἱ μὲν...φασὶν...οἱ δ'... ("some say..., but others..."). Then Plutarch narrates a third version, prefacing it with this statement (26.1): Κρατερὸς δ' ὁ Μακεδὼν τοιαῦτά τινα περὶ τῆς τελευτῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς εἴρηκε ("Craterus the Macedonian has told some such story about the man's end"). After this summary of Craterus' version, Plutarch evaluates it and uses Craterus' own practices to condemn his narrative (26.4 [= F12]):

> τούτων δ' οὐδὲν ἔγγραφον ὁ Κρατερὸς τεκμήριον παρέσχηκεν, οὔτε δίκην οὔτε ψήφισμα, καίπερ εἰωθὼς ἐπιεικῶς γράφειν τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ παρατίθεσθαι τοὺς ἱστοροῦντας.
>
> Of these things Craterus has offered no written evidence, neither a court judgment nor a decree, although he customarily and properly records such things and sets forth his written sources.

---

[11]Plutarch is well aware that documents may be forged, as he shows in his remarks that open the biography of Numa (1.1–2). He does not, however, suggest that the so-called Congress Decree, which he paraphrases in *Per.* 17, may be a forgery. Seager 1969 argues on the basis of language and historical context that the decree may be forged, but others, such as Cobet 1873: 112–14, Meiggs 1972: 512–15, and Stadter 1989: 201–9, suggest that Pericles has found a genuine document, perhaps in a collection of Pericles' decrees (see *Per.* 8.7) or in Craterus' collection, although Plutarch does not cite that historian here. Meiggs 1972: 514 also suggests in passing that Craterus could have come across this decree in the Metroon archives. See n. 18 below on the Metroon.

Plutarch's criticism of Craterus in this instance suggests what he expected to find in that source—not only a narrative of events, but also documentary evidence to support that interpretation.

The other surviving ancient scholars who excerpted Craterus fall into two categories. Those commenting on Athenian orators and comedians used his collection to elucidate historical references (e.g., *FGH* 342 F14–16), while grammarians and lexicographers drew from it exotic names and examples of early Attic linguistic habits or vocabulary (e.g., F2). Typical of such excerpts are two cited by Stephanus:

> F1: Δῶρος· πόλις Φοινίκης...ἔστι καὶ Καρίας Δῶρος πόλις, ἣν συγκαταλέγει ταῖς πόλεσιν ταῖς Καρικαῖς Κρατερὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ψηφισμάτων Γ "Καρικὸς φόρος· Δῶρος, Φασηλῖται."

> F2: Καρήνη· πόλις Μυσίας...τὸ ἐθνικὸν Καρηναῖος, ὡς Κρατερὸς Γ περὶ ψηφισμάτων "Γρυνεῖς (?), Πιταναῖοι, Καρηναῖοι."

> F1: Dorus: a city of Phoenicia...there is also Dorus, a city of Caria, which Craterus catalogues together with the Carian cities in the third book of περὶ ψηφισμάτων "Carian tribute: Dorus, Phaselitae."

> F2: Carene: a city of Mysia...the ethnic Carenian, as Craterus, Book 3 of περὶ ψηφισμάτων "Gruneis (?), Pitaneans, Carenians."

Although many of these names seem to have come from Craterus' copies of the Athenian tribute lists, none of the surviving Greek historians exploited Craterus as a source about fifth century Athens itself. The fragments of the so-called tribute lists culled from Craterus, however, were invaluable to the modern editors of these important financial and political documents. Thus, for example, only from Craterus are Δῶρος (F1) and the Καρηναῖοι (F2) known to have been assessed.[12]

From all the surviving citations, it seems that Craterus organized his collection of Athenian tribute lists and laws in nine books, for the most part

[12]See Meritt et al. 1939: 203–4; 1950: 9–10, 22–28; Meiggs 1972: 420–21. As Tarn 243 remarks, Craterus "produced a work both of great value in itself and astoundingly modern in conception." Meiggs 1966, in his opening sentence, provides an example of this modern attitude: "The study of Athenian history in the fifth century, and particularly in the period between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, derives much of its flesh and blood from inscriptions, but most inscriptions lose their full value if they cannot be dated."

chronologically, with the latest inscription from the end of the fifth century.[13] The sources do not mention how Craterus obtained the documents he collected, working two centuries after they were inscribed, but it is possible that he or an assistant copied some from stelae and others from various Athenian archives.[14] Historians who believe that Craterus must have depended solely on archives cite the destruction of Athens at the end of the fifth century as a reason, arguing that in those violent years many inscriptions must have been destroyed. Yet the evidence suggests a more complex picture.

The tribute lists, perhaps the center of Craterus' work, were displayed somewhere on the Athenian acropolis and recorded 1/60 of the tribute that was dedicated as first-fruits to Athena. Both the monumental size of the stones and their divine protection perhaps helped them survive for Craterus to inspect.[15] Other inscriptions of interest to Craterus might have been destroyed; for copies of some, he perhaps turned to archives, but for others, he might have been able to consult stelae which were re-inscribed for political reasons. The most complete is a renewal of a grant of proxeny given some time before the thirty tyrants ruled Athens. The relevant part of the stone, inscribed after 403/2 B.C.E., states (*IG* 2^2.6.11–16 [= Tod 98]):[16]

[13]Meritt et al. 1950: 91–92 argue that fragments from both the first and last assessments of tribute were included by Craterus, but so little of any tribute list is preserved in Craterus that it is difficult to be convinced by their argument. Nor is the date of the final assessment agreed upon by all: see Jacoby 1923–; Chambers; Meritt et al. 1950: 91–92.

[14]See below on Aristotle, who may have depended on Callisthenes and others to do some of his collecting, and also the practices of the Peripatetics. The epithet στηλοκόπας—"stele picker"—given to Polemon may reflect the fact that he himself, rather than any assistant, actually poked around in sanctuaries and cities for inscriptions (Ath. 6.234d).

[15]As Pritchett 1971: 118–19 observes, the *lapis primus* weighed some four tons and was ca. 3.7 x 1.11 x 0.37m in size, so it might have been a freestanding monument. See also Miles 229.

[16]The other surviving inscriptions are not nearly so well preserved as this and must be restored to a great extent, but, so far as one can tell, they all preserve grants of proxeny. They are most easily studied in Walbank. In addition to the one quoted (no. 61 in Walbank), see also nos. 26, 66, 72, and 79. The appendix to no. 63 has a slightly different formulation:

[...ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἦν ὁ πάππος αὐτ]-
5   [ὁ Ξ]άνθιππος [πρόξενος, τὴν δὲ προξενί]-
[αν] οἱ Τριάκο[ντα καθεῖλον, ἀναγράψαι]
[τ]ὸν γραμματ[έα τῆς βολῆς ἐμ πόλει ἐν]
[σ]τήληι λιθί[νηι προξένος καὶ εὐεργ]-
[έ]τας Ἀθηναί[ων...

...Since his grandfather, Xanthippus, was a *proxenus* and the Thirty cancelled his *proxeny*, the secretary of the Boule is to inscribe on a stone stele on the acropolis that he is a *proxenus* and benefactor of the Athenians.

ἐπειδὴ καθηιρέθη
ἡ στήλη [ἐ]πὶ τῶν τριάκοντ-
α ἐν ἧι ἧ[ν α]ὐτοῖς ἡ προξεν-
ία, ἀναγράψ[αι] τὴν στήλην
τὸγ γραμμα[τ]έα τῆς βολῆς
τέλεσι τοῖς Εὐρυπύλο·

Since the stele on which their proxeny was [inscribed] was destroyed
during the time of the Thirty, the secretary of the Boule is to inscribe a
stele at the expense of Eurypylus.

The cancellation of the proxeny grant has either been accomplished or
accompanied by the destruction of the stone, just as its re-inscription signifies
its reactivation. Although these stelae are in some sense copies of earlier
decrees, they are neither identical to the earlier inscriptions, nor are they
forgeries. They thus provide a partial parallel for documents like the decree of
Themistocles, known only from a fourth century B.C.E. inscription with
anachronistic features. Ancient attitudes toward copies and word-for-word
transcription seem to have been very different from modern ones.

The political upheavals in Athens at the end of the fifth century may have
prompted the city to develop a more formal system of archives than had
previously existed.[17] Up until that time, various fifth-century officials preserved
records of matters they dealt with in their terms of office. Thus we might
imagine that some sort of list of victors in drama contests was kept in the Stoa
Basileios, the office of the archon basileus who was in charge of these contests.
Similarly, priests and other officials of sanctuaries kept records of votive
offerings and financial transactions involving the funds dedicated to the god, as
various inscriptions reveal. At the end of the century, Athenians may have been
prompted to organize these probably somewhat casual record-keeping
procedures and even to establish formally a main archive in the building that
came to be known as the Metroon.[18] This development in record keeping was

---

The only such inscription not included in Walbank's study was published by Schweigert as
no. 30.

[17]On the development of archives in Athens see Boegehold 1972 and 1990; Sickinger; W.
C. West; Thomas. Posner has written a survey of archives in the ancient Mediterranean, but
his chapter on Greece (91–117) portrays city and sanctuary archives and officials
anachronistically. I would like to thank John Camp and T. Leslie Shear, Jr., for discussing the
question of the destruction in fifth century B.C.E. Athens with me.

[18]See Wycherley 150–60 for the Metroon. In 406/5 B.C.E., the two bodies responsible for
sanctuaries on the acropolis, the Treasurers of Athena and the Treasurers of the Other Gods,

accompanied by a sporadic revision of the law code. Although the nature of that revision is debated, the efforts of those involved seem to have made some more aware of the documents inscribed around the city and their potential as sources of information about the past.[19] Along with these events in Athens, during the second half of the century an interest in the more recent past developed among the intellectuals of Greece, together with a desire to establish a chronology for it, as attested in the works of figures like Hellanicus, Hippias of Elis, Herodotus, and Thucydides. To these new interests perhaps belongs the inscription of the archon list.[20]

Historians like Craterus, then, could have consulted either a stele or studied a document stored in an archive; but Craterus' collection of inscriptions was not much used and little imitated in antiquity, to judge by the surviving fragments and lack of references to him in later sources. One of the few who may have taken the same approach as Craterus was the little-known Melanthius (*FGH* 326), identified as the author of an Atthis and περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι μυστηρίων, but nothing more is known of him, not even the century in which

---

were amalgamated into a single body. See Harris 11–22 for a brief history of those responsible for the valuables on the Athenian acropolis.

[19]Most of the evidence for these events, especially the work of Nicomachus, comes from a hostile source, Lysias. The latter attacks Nicomachus for his methods, the length of time he held the office, his openness to bribery, his parentage, etc., in short, on any conceivable grounds, which should make us very wary in our interpretation of the speech. See Todd; Rhodes 1991; Robertson.

[20]For the evidence for the inscription of archon lists, see Cadoux. Plommer argues that the first trustworthy date on the list is the Great Panathenaea of 514 B.C.E. A list of archons could not have been constructed solely from the headings of decrees, since that information was not regularly included at first. See Stroud 1978 for a discussion about the documents available to ancient historians of Athens, although I think he may be a bit optimistic about both the quantity of such documents and the uses to which they were put at an early age, especially the list of archons. When Socrates asks Hippias what the Spartans want to hear him perform, Hippias replies (Pl. *Hp. Ma.* 285d6–e1): περὶ τῶν γενῶν, ὦ Σώκρατες, τῶν τε ἡρώων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν κατοικίσεων, ὡς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐκτίσθησαν αἱ πόλεις, καὶ συλλήβδην πάσης τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας ἥδιστα ἀκροῶνται ("Socrates, they most like to hear about the generations both of heroes and of men, and also of colonization, when cities were established in the past; in short, about all archaeology"). Socrates then remarks that it is just as well that the Spartans do not enjoy hearing him list the Athenian archons beginning with Solon, but Hippias asserts he can do fifty names easily, though he has only heard them once. Perhaps this interest in the foundation of cities and the chronology of events lies behind the kind of research Craterus and others afterward undertook. Hellanicus, for example, wrote a work or works called κτίσεις ἐθνῶν καὶ πολέων (*FGH* 4 F70), or περὶ ἐθνῶν (F69), or ἐθνῶν ὀνομασίαι (F67), and perhaps a separate work, περὶ Χίου κτίσεως (F71).

he lived.[21] In the scholia on Aristophanes *Birds* 1073, Diagoras of Melos is identified as one whom the Athenians charged with impiety and offered a reward for his capture or death. First Craterus is cited for the decree passed by Athens (1073b)—καθάπερ Κρατερὸς ἱστορεῖ. Then the scholion states (1073c):[22]

> Μελάνθιος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ μυστηρίων προφέρεται τῆς χαλκῆς στήλης ἀντίγραφον, ἐν ᾗ ἐπεκήρυξαν καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς ἐκδιδόντας Πελλανεῖς, ἐν ᾗ γέγραπται καὶ ταῦτα· "ἐὰν δέ τις ἀποκτείνῃ Διαγόραν τὸν Μήλιον, λαμβάνειν ἀργυρίου τάλαντον· ἐὰν δέ τις ζῶντα ἀγάγῃ, λαμβάνειν δύο."

> In his περὶ μυστηρίων, Melanthius offers a copy of the bronze stele on which they condemned both him and those from Pellane who surrendered. On this stele it is also inscribed: "If anyone should kill Diagoras the Melian, he shall have a talent of silver; if anyone should bring him in alive, he shall have two talents."

As Dunbar notes in her commentary on the play, although both Craterus and Melanthius seem to know the stele and even quote from it, the scholion does not preserve any indication of the date the decree was passed, assuming that either source recorded it.[23]

The documents gathered by both Melanthius and Craterus are characterized as ἀντίγραφα by those who cite them.[24] Orators often refer to ἀντίγραφα—"copies"—of two different kinds of documents. In cases concerning inheritance and similar financial matters, these ἀντίγραφα are very often of wills (e.g., Lys. 32.7; D. 45 *passim*). In speeches on public matters, orators cite ἀντίγραφα of public documents inscribed on stelae. Demosthenes, for example, in his attack on Leptines, has ψηφίσματα—"decrees"—read aloud (20.35), then comments (20.36): τούτων δ' ἁπάντων στήλας ἀντιγράφους ἐστήσαθ' ὑμεῖς κἀκεῖνος, τὴν μὲν ἐν Βοσπόρῳ, τὴν δ' ἐν Πειραιεῖ, τὴν δ' ἐφ' Ἱερῷ ("of all these [decrees] you and that man have erected stelae as copies, one in the Bosporus, another in the Piraeus, and a third at Hierum"). Later in his speech, in a variant on the formulaic ἀκηκόατ' ἐκ

---

[21]Pearson 91 notes that there are several Athenians named Melanthius who appear in inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E., some of whom serve as priests, "but without external evidence it is idle to attempt an identification."

[22]I have quoted these as they are printed in Holwerda's edition of the Aristophanes scholia. Jacoby 1923– gives somewhat different texts in *FGH* 326 F3a–b.

[23]Dunbar *ad loc.*

[24]See, for example, Plu. *Cim.* 13.5 and *FGH* 326 F3b.

τῶν ψηφισμάτων ("you have heard from the decrees" [20.36]), Demosthenes concludes the reading of a law (νόμος) by saying (20.128):[25] ἀκούετε τῶν ἀντιγράφων τῆς στήλης, ὦ ἄνδρες ᾿Αθηναῖοι ("listen to copies of the stele, Athenians").[26] Public documents themselves might also refer to ἀντίγραφα, as the ψήφισμα preserved by Andocides does (1.79): καὶ εἰ ἀντίγραφόν που ἔστι, παρέχειν τοὺς θεσμοθέτας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχάς ("and if there are any copies anywhere, the lawgivers and the other officials are to provide them").[27] A mid-fourth-century B.C.E. inscription concerning the Chalkotheke directs the secretary of the Boule to carry out this task (*IG* 2^2.120.22–24):

> ...ποιήσασθαι δὲ τὸγ γραμματέα τ[ῆς]
> [β]ουλῆς ἀντίγραφα ἐκ τῶν στηλῶν τὰ ἀναγεγραμμένα [πε]-
> ρὶ τῶν ἐν τῆι Χαλκοθήκει.

> The secretary of the Boule is to make copies of the inscriptions from
> stelae around the Chalkotheke.

Thus, references by Plutarch and others to ἀντίγραφα found in Craterus are consistent with other uses of the term.

---

[25]See also D. 58.18. Either the ἀντιγραφεύς ("clerk") or γραμματεύς ("secretary") was perhaps the official who provided the stonemason with a copy of the document to inscribe. Tracy 234–36 concludes that at a typical assembly meeting two or three measures would be passed and require inscribing. He suggests that the secretary probably sought out masons for the work soon after, but would not give several measures to just one cutter, since that would delay the inscription of all documents other than the first. Tracy does not see any evidence of masons who acted as official or semi-official inscribers of documents (227). Presumably the same system was used in earlier centuries.

[26]Thomas shows how, during the fourth century B.C.E., orators in both courts and assemblies made greater use of documents as sources of arguments or rhetorical devices (83–93). Aeschines in particular drew on inscriptions in novel ways, prompting Demosthenes to attack him for this more than once (69–71, 88). Curiously, although orators drew on documents to a somewhat greater extent, historians did not follow their example very far, but continued instead to cite speeches, as Finley 205–8 discusses.

[27]On this decree and the way it refers to documents, see Boegehold 1990. He suggests (162):
> The decree of Patrokleides is a landmark in a way. At Athens the uses of documentation have increased to a point where they require and impose order. Athenians now name documents with due attention to their kind, for tablets, *stelai*, wooden planks, and the like, need to be identified. And the reason for this scrupulousness—we can imagine—is that the collecting, storing, and publication of records of one sort or another has become complicated and therefore necessarily systematic: someone must pay attention to the order in which these functions are carried out.

Historians like Craterus, then, could have consulted either a stele or studied a document stored in an Athenian archive. In turn, later historians such as Plutarch occasionally used authors like Craterus. We cannot always be sure where figures like Craterus read documents, but sometimes the researcher declares that he has seen a monument or makes a remark about letter shapes[28] or the material on which the document is inscribed or the location of the inscription which suggests, at the least, that he has seen the original.[29] It seems that while citizens and public officials were largely indifferent to the presence of such monuments, except, for example, when they needed them in lawsuits or were serving as ἀναγραφεῖς to revise the laws, from the end of the fifth century researchers gradually began to use epigraphical evidence. This increased during the fourth century with the investigations of Aristotle and his successors into traditions at sanctuaries, constitutions of Greek cities, and the customs of foreigners. Scholars at Alexandria, later travellers, and antiquarians depend to varying extents on inscriptions as sources.[30]

Ancient Historians from Acusilaus to Philochorus

Near the beginning of his essay *On Thucydides* Dionysius of Halicarnassus puts the Athenian historian of the Peloponnesian War into context. Dionysius lists some dozen predecessors of Thucydides—of whom only Hecataeus, Acusilaus, Charon, Hellanicus, and Xanthus are anything more than names—then

[28]See below on Theopompus and Panaetius (Plu. *Arist*. 1.6). See also Harp. s.v. Ἑρμαῖ: ...ἐφ' ἑνὸς δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπιγέγραπται γράμμασιν ἀρχαίοις...("'Herms'...on one of them there is inscribed in ancient letters...").

[29]We do not have to take at face value statements of autopsy, but some who have written on this have been excessively hesitant to accept authors' statements. Habicht provides ample evidence to support Pausanias' descriptions and quotations of monuments; on Pausanias' use of inscriptions, see 64–94, 149–51. See also the controversy over Herodotus' statements as debated by Fehling, S. West, and Pritchett 1993. See below for a discussion of Thucydides' use of inscriptions.

[30]See, for example, Turner 106. There is also the anecdote told of Apellicon of Teos (see above, n. 5). An unexpected result may have been documents like the inscription known as the Chronicle of Lindos, which was compiled from various sources. As the introductory lines from this inscription state, many of the offerings and dedicatory inscriptions to Lindian Athena have been destroyed διὰ τὸν χρόνον (A.4)—"through time"—and it is the task of the compilers to gather information about these ancient offerings, then to inscribe a list of them on a stele (A.5–12). The inscription cites its sources, including Gorgon, Gorgosthenes, and Hierobulus (B.3–8, 12–14, for example). See Blinkenberg; also Chaniotis 52–57.

characterizes their methodology. He declares that they shared a single purpose (ch. 5):[31]

> ὅσαι διεσῴζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνῆμαι κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις, εἴ τ' ἐν ἱεροῖς εἴ τ' ἐν βεβήλοις ἀποκείμεναι γραφαί, ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἁπάντων γνῶσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν, οἵας παρέλαβον, μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτε ἀφαιροῦντες·

> Whatever records were preserved by the locals, both within tribes and within cities, whether the documents were stored in sacred or public places—these, such as the [researchers] received, they brought to the public attention of all, neither adding anything to them nor taking anything away.

While Dionysius' remarks do not seem to us to reflect accurately the methodology of Thucydides' predecessors, they do provide a useful starting point for this survey of historians before Craterus and their citation of sources. Beginning, in a small way, in the fifth century B.C.E., those interested in certain kinds of research, particularly historical, used inscriptions, although they never exploited them in the same way that modern scholars do. This developing use of inscriptions seems to have followed a similarly developing awareness of the value of inscribing documents on the part of cities, sanctuaries, and individuals. Use of inscriptions by historians became increasingly important throughout the fourth century B.C.E. with the wide-ranging work of Aristotle and his successors.

Acusilaus of Argos is perhaps the earliest surviving figure to provide any information about his sources, though he is not first on Dionysius of Halicarnassus' list.[32] According to the Suda, Acusilaus compiled his γενεαλογίαι from bronze tablets dug up by his father in their garden (*FGH* 2 T1):

> Ἀκουσίλαος· Κάβα υἱός· Ἀργεῖος ἀπὸ Κερκάδος πόλεως οὔσης Αὐλίδος πλησίον. ἱστορικὸς πρεσβύτατος. ἔγραψε δὲ γενεαλογίας ἐκ δέλτων χαλκῶν, ἃς λόγος εὑρεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ὀρύξαντά τινα τόπον τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ.

> Acusilaus—son of Cabas—Argive, from the city Cercas, very near Aulis—oldest historian. He wrote genealogies from bronze tablets that,

---

[31]In ch. 7 Dionysius summarizes this analysis of Thucydides' predecessors. See also Str. 1.2.6 (C17–18), where he gives a brief survey of historical writing in Greek.

[32]Josephus places Acusilaus shortly before the Persian Wars, but offers no reason for this dating (*Ap.* 1.13 [= *FGH* 2 T3]).

> according to the story, his father found when he was digging someplace
> in his house.

No more description than this remains of these bronze tablets, which seem suspiciously convenient as a source for Acusilaus. That they were bronze is significant, suggesting at once a reason for their survival and a link with the past, as bronze was understood by the Greeks to be the metal of heroes.[33]

A pair of historians identified by Dionysius of Halicarnassus as predecessors of Thucydides (ch. 5) devoted themselves, at least in part, to the collection of names and their organization into lists. Charon of Lampsacus compiled a Spartan king list (*FGH* 262 T1) and Hellanicus produced lists of priestesses at the Argive Heraion (*FGH* 4 F74–84) and of victors at the musical competitions of the Carnea (F85–86). There was also a list of eponymous archons in Athens inscribed on stone at some time between 435 and 415 B.C.E., perhaps used by Hellanicus to organize his history of Athens (*FGH* 323a), although Thucydides criticizes him for his inaccuracy in dating events of the Pentecontaetia (1.97.2): βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήσθη ("he records dates both briefly and inaccurately").[34] Hippias of Elis, not on Dionysius' list, gathered names of Olympic victors in the *stadion*, but his work did not inspire confidence, according to Plutarch (*Num.* 1.6).[35]

Although Dionysius of Halicarnassus praises Herodotus for the scope of his work, both geographically and chronologically, as well as his style (ch. 5),[36] he does not comment on his sources. Herodotus often refers to votive offerings and monuments, but cites or quotes any inscriptions on them only occasionally. When he does, with a very few notable exceptions, he does not say that he has

---

[33]See, for example, Plu. *Alex.* 17.4, where Alexander receives a prophecy by way of a bronze tablet washed up from a spring near Lycia; on this bronze tablet were ancient letters (δέλτον...χαλκῆν, τύπους ἔχουσαν ἀρχαίων γραμμάτων). See also Plu. *Thes.* 36.2, Paus. 3.3.7–8, and [Arist.] *Mir. ausc.* 133.

[34]*IG* 2².4960, inscribed at the beginning of the fourth century B.C.E., is a chronicle of the Asklepieion dated by eponymous archons. See Stroud 1978: 32–35; Thomas 287–88; Jacoby 1949: 171–76. Jeffery 60 includes among early Laconian inscriptions two name lists found at Sparta and two at Geronthrae (nos. 44–47 in Laconian catalogue; pp. 195, 201). She dates them to perhaps the second half of the sixth century B.C.E. and speculates that, if they are indeed lists of victors in athletic events, there may have been similar documents for the Carnea, which Hellanicus could have used.

[35]Quoted above, p. 2.

[36]Compare Strabo's rather more critical remarks about Herodotus (11.6.3 [C507–8], 12.3.21 [C550]).

read the inscription himself nor does he make any remarks about its lettering or condition to suggest that he has actually seen it. He refers to the dolphin dedicated by Arion (1.24.8), for example, but neither mentions any inscription nor says anything to show he has seen it, although later authors who refer to this votive quote both a hymn and an epigram.[37] When Herodotus lists the votives given by Croesus to Delphi, he notes in passing a controversy over an inscription on a gold *perirrhanterion* that identifies it as a Spartan gift. Herodotus disagrees and even asserts that he knows the Delphian who forged the inscription, though he refuses to name him (1.51.3–4). Nonetheless, nothing Herodotus says implies that he has seen the votive itself.[38]

Very occasionally, Herodotus does assert that his discussion of an inscription is based on his own observation. Twice he describes stelae erected by Sesostris as victory monuments, giving not only the inscription but also a description of the carved reliefs, which vary depending on whether the town yielded voluntarily to Sesostris or only after fighting (2.102.4–5). About a stele in Palestine he declares (2.106.1): ἐν δὲ τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Συρίῃ αὐτὸς ὥρων ἐούσας [στήλας] καὶ τὰ γράμματα τὰ εἰρημένα ἐνεόντα καὶ γυναικὸς αἰδοῖα ("in Palestinian Syria, I myself saw the stelae, the letters said to be on them, and the female genitalia").[39] These remarks occur in a section of his text that is punctuated by Herodotus' comments on his sources: he opens his treatment of the Egyptian rulers by stating that instead of depending on his own experience, as he has until this point (μέχρι μὲν τούτου ὄψις τε ἐμὴ καὶ

---

[37]Pausanias describes what is to be seen at Taenarum, including a statue of Arion on a bronze dolphin (3.25.7). Aelian (*HA* 12.45) cites the story as evidence that dolphins are by nature lovers of music, then quotes an epigram on the statue and a hymn to Poseidon, both of which he attributes to Arion. Dio Chrysostom tells the story of Arion, but with some different details (37.1–4). The composition of these verses may suggest both an interest in the monument and the desire to preserve the story, known only in oral tradition. It may also be possible that they are a later creation to explain the statue.

[38]Other objects mentioned by Herodotus include the statue of Aristeas with his name inscribed (4.15.4), the columns of Darius with inscriptions in Assyrian and Greek (4.87.1; see also 4.91.1), the picture and verse inscription dedicated by Mandrocles to Hera (4.88), and the boundary stone of Croesus (7.30.2).

[39]S. West 300 argues that the monument which Herodotus describes can be identified with the Karabel reliefs, "though no serious scholar appears to have found on them anything like female αἰδοῖα"; Fehling 134–36 makes the same unwarranted assumption (see 135 n. 6). It seems to me incorrect to assume that something Herodotus describes is to be identified with these surviving reliefs on so little evidence, then to base criticism of Herodotus' methodology on that identification.

γνώμη καὶ ἱστορίη ταῦτα λέγουσά ἐστι [2.99.1]), he now depends on what he has learned from the priests (2.99.2, 100.1, 102.2, 107.1, 142.1).

I do not doubt that Herodotus saw something on the stele in Syria, but am not convinced that he interpreted it according to our expectations, since some of his other interpretations of non-Greek monuments seem farfetched (1.93.3, 187)[40] and he does not seem to have read any language other than Greek. Nevertheless, he does, rightly or wrongly, identify foreign scripts as Αἰγύπτια (2.125.6), either ἱρά or δημοτικά (2.36.4, 106.4), and Ἀσσύρια (4.87.1–2). He seems often to depend on priests or other sources,[41] but only once does he specifically mention a translator, in his description of Cheops' pyramid and the costs of its construction (2.125.6): καὶ ὡς ἐμὲ εὖ μεμνῆσθαι τὰ ὁ ἑρμηνεύς μοι ἐπιλεγόμενος τὰ γράμματα ἔφη, ἑξακόσια καὶ χίλια τάλαντα ἀργυρίου τετελέσθαι ("as I well remember what the translator reading to me said, that they [the vegetables for the workmen] cost 1600 talents of silver"). Although we can only speculate on the reliability of such sources, the remarks of another traveller, Pausanias, some centuries later cast doubt on their expertise.[42]

In his discussion of the origins of writing in Greece, Herodotus asserts in unequivocal terms that he has seen tripods at the Ismenion and that the shape of the "Cadmean letters" inscribed on them resembles that of Ionian characters (5.59):

> εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς Καδμήια γράμματα ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Ἰσμηνίου ἐν Θήβῃσι τῇσι Βοιωτῶν ἐπὶ τρίποσι τρισὶ ἐγκεκολαμμένα, τὰ πολλὰ ὅμοια ἐόντα τοῖσι Ἰωνικοῖσι.

> I myself saw the Cadmean writing in the temple of Ismenian Apollo in Boeotian Thebes; they were inscribed on three tripods and most were similar to letters in the Ionic alphabet.

---

[40]See also his naive remarks about names in Persian and Greek (1.139) and festival names (1.148.2). He states that Greeks write from left to right, without mentioning *boustrophedon* inscriptions or those which are written right to left (2.36.4), but this may be because he is distinguishing between current practices of Egyptians and Greeks. In this same passage, he states that Egyptians have two forms of writing, rather than three.

[41]Herodotus refers to priests as sources some forty times throughout his discussion of Egypt and also at Tyre (2.44.2). Three times he names his sources: Archias the Spartan, whom he met in Pitane (3.55.2); Tymnes, employed by the Scythian king Ariapeithes, with whom Herodotus speaks in Olbia (4.76.6); and Thersander of Orchomenus (9.16.1). See Plu. *Mor.* 394d–409d for a description of information given by guides at Delphi.

[42]See, for example, Paus. 2.23.6, 6.26.1–2. Habicht 145–46 discusses his attitude toward local guides and antiquarians.

Whatever it is which Herodotus in fact saw—and again I accept his statement that he saw something—he made a judgment about it based on his perception of the letter shapes.[43]

In his essay *On Thucydides*, Dionysius of Halicarnassus praises Thucydides for his choice of subject and use of evidence and distinguishes him from his predecessors, including Herodotus, on both grounds. Dionysius says that Thucydides did not depend on casual witnesses (ἐκ τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων ἀκουσμάτων [ch. 6]) for his material, but drew on his own experience and that of the best informed witnesses (παρὰ τῶν ἄριστα γινωσκόντων [ch. 6]). Dionysius also quotes Thucydides' famous words (1.22) about his own sources and purpose (ch. 7).[44] We might expect that Thucydides would make even more use of inscriptions than did his predecessors, but he does not. He cites a tomb inscription once, quotes from a votive, and uses three pieces of epigraphical evidence, including another epitaph, but otherwise refers only to treaties as inscriptions and does not make much of them as evidence. We can be even less sure than we are with Herodotus that Thucydides examined the inscriptions he does mention, because nothing in his account must be understood to mean that he saw the stones himself.

Treaties are cited by speakers in the text and Thucydides himself quotes treaties at length, though only in a section of his work considered by some to be unrevised.[45] In the one case where a surviving stone (*IG* 1^3.83) contains one of

---

[43]If his statement that the tripods are inside the temple of Apollo (ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος) is accurate, they might not have been easily examined, given the lack of light in such buildings, for example. Herodotus' remark about the "Cadmean letters" has a parallel in one of the earliest offerings catalogued in the Lindos Chronicle (B.15–17): Κάδμος λέβητα χά[λ]κεον φοινικικοῖς γράμμα-/σι ἐπιγεγραμμένον, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Πολύζα-/λος ἐν τᾶι Δ̄ τᾶν ἱστοριᾶν ("Cadmus [dedicated] a bronze *lebes* inscribed with Phoenician letters, as Polyzalos records in Book 4 of his investigations"). S. West 290–93 takes Herodotus to task for many reasons, including his purpose in this discussion and what she sees as his many failures—to consider the possibility of forgery, to comment on the lack of change in Greek over the centuries, and to do further research in Tyre—but these criticisms illustrate West's assumptions, not Herodotus'. Fehling's biases are similarly revealed when he begins his discussion of this passage by remarking (138), "there is no clearer case of falsification than this." In his analysis, Pritchett 1993: 116–21, 162 remarks on the role of temples as preservers of the past, with their collections of dedications, both genuine and not.

[44]As Finley 207 observes, "Thucydides notoriously failed to make any reference to documents in his statement of method."

[45]The Corcyraeans, for example, argue before the Athenians that their treaty with Sparta will not be voided if the Athenians allow them to join the Delian League (1.35), while the Corinthians in their reply argue strenuously that the spirit, if not the letter, of the treaty would

the treaties quoted by the historian (5.47), we can see slight differences in wording and forms in the two texts.[46] Thucydides also notes a significant addition to the Athenian inscription of their treaty with Sparta, after the Argives complained that the Spartans had violated its terms (5.56.3): Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ Ἀλκιβιάδου πείσαντος τῇ μὲν Λακωνικῇ στήλῃ ὑπέγραψαν ὅτι οὐκ ἐνέμειναν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοῖς ὅρκοις ("When Alcibiades persuaded them, the Athenians inscribed at the bottom of the Laconian stele that the Spartans had not maintained their oaths"). This anecdote does not depend on Thucydides' having examined the stone, but it is possible that he did, especially since he quotes the clause of the treaty that specifies the placement of the inscription in Athens on the acropolis beside Athena—τὴν [στήλην] δὲ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐν πόλει παρ' Ἀθηνᾷ ("the [stele] in Athens on the acropolis beside Athena" [5.23.5]). This Athenian action shows that the city did not wish to nullify the treaty completely, for otherwise it might have had the stele removed, and also means that the Athenians' copy was no longer identical to other copies, if, indeed, it ever had been.[47]

    In his other infrequent citations of monuments or inscriptions, Thucydides does not state in so many words that he has seen them himself, though some of his remarks may be interpreted in that way. In his digression on the Pisistratids, which contains his most concentrated citation of inscriptions, Thucydides describes the sanctuary of the Pythion dedicated by Pisistratus, grandson of the tyrant, and quotes the elegiac couplet inscribed on it, with this introductory observation (6.54.7): τοῦ δ' ἐν Πυθίου ἔτι καὶ νῦν δῆλόν ἐστιν ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασι λέγον τάδε ("and even now with unclear letters it is apparent that [the inscription] on the Pythium says this"). What does Thucydides mean when he characterizes the letters of the inscription as ἀμυδρά? Pausanias' description of a victor's statue at Olympia may provide a parallel. Pausanias observes that

---

be violated if that were to happen (1.40.2). Treaties are quoted in 4.118; 5.18–19, 23–24, 47, 77, 79. Gomme, at the end of his note on 5.47, suggests that Thucydides intended to edit these long quotations out of his text but did not do so. Hornblower 89 seems to disagree, suggesting that Thucydides quotes treaty documents "not just because a written treaty was the culmination of numerous small acts of diplomacy, but because the *text* of a treaty or agreement was itself an important and influential fact, provoking arguments like those between Sparta and her allies after the peace of 421."

    [46]Does this mean that Thucydides is working from a draft copy of the treaty, a copy in the archives, a copy belonging to one of the subscribers other than Athens—or that he simply is not quoting it precisely? As Gomme observes on 5.47, there does not seem to have been an insistence on exact transcriptions of such documents.

    [47]Gomme *et al.* compare Ar. *Lys.* 513 with 5.56.3. See also Plu. *Ages.* 28.2–3.

the statue of Eutelidas, victorious in both boys' wrestling and pancration in 628 B.C.E., has suffered from the effects of time (6.15.8): ἔστι δὲ ἥ τε εἰκὼν ἀρχαία τοῦ Εὐτελίδα, καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῷ βάθρῳ γράμματα ἀμυδρὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου ("there is also an ancient statue of Eutelidas and the letters on the base have become unclear because of age"). Thucydides may be making the same point about the inscription put up by Pisistratus, though it is also possible, as some have suggested, that the letters have lost the red paint that would have made the cuttings much more visible.[48]

Although it is unusual for Thucydides to cite inscriptions, much less quote them, he does not make much of this evidence but continues his argument with a discussion about the relative ages of Pisistratus' sons (6.55.1) and then cites a new source, the stele on the acropolis about the wrongdoing of the tyrants (ἡ ἐν τῇ 'Αθηναίων ἀκροπόλει σταθεῖσα [6.55.1]). His argument is based on likelihood—most probably, according to him, the eldest son would marry first—and on two pieces of information from the stele (6.55.1-2):

> ἐν ᾗ [στήλῃ] Θεσσαλοῦ μὲν οὐδ' Ἱππάρχου οὐδεὶς παῖς γέγραπται, Ἱππίου δὲ πέντε, οἳ αὐτῷ ἐκ Μυρρίνης τῆς Καλλίου τοῦ Ὑπεροχίδου θυγατρὸς ἐγένοντο· εἰκὸς γὰρ ἦν τὸν πρεσβύτατον πρῶτον γῆμαι. καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ στήλῃ πρῶτος γέγραπται μετὰ τὸν πατέρα....
>
> On the stele no son of Thessalus nor Hipparchus is inscribed, but there are five of Hippias, who were born by Myrrhine, daughter of Callias, son of Hyperochides. For it is likely that the eldest married first. And on this same stele he is inscribed first after his father...

Thucydides' language, the repetition of γέγραπται, and his reference to the placement of the stele on the acropolis suggest, but no more than that, that he has seen the inscription.

Thucydides closes this historical digression by reminding his reader of Pisistratid ties with the Persian king Darius: Hippias married his daughter, Archedice, to the son of the tyrant of Lampsacus, because that family was

---

[48]See Tod no. 8; Meiggs and Lewis no. 11; Jeffery 75. Some epigraphists have been troubled not only by the clarity of the inscription when it was excavated but also by the seemingly late date of the letter forms. Meiggs and Lewis are not worried by the apparent lateness of the forms and suggest (20) "that Pisistratus chose a craftsman who was ahead of most of his contemporaries." Cf. Winters on the difficulties and dangers of dating by letter form. See also Pausanias' description of Odysseus' journey to the Underworld as painted by Polygnotus at Delphi (10.28.1).

connected to Darius. Thucydides quotes without comment the verse epitaph on the grave of Archedice in Lampsacus (6.59.3).[49] Presumably, he cites it as proof of his assertion about the link between the Athenian tyrant and Persian king, but he does not offer any commentary on the epitaph itself nor does he explain how he knows the inscription.

The only other place in his narrative where Thucydides uses inscriptions is in his biography of the Spartan king Pausanias. In describing his downfall, Thucydides tells the story of the inscription, erasure, and re-inscription of the serpent column in Delphi (1.132.2–3), but does not offer his own interpretation of events and does not suggest that he has seen the monument.[50] Thucydides then cites an inscription in his tale about Pausanias' death. He reports that, commanded by an oracle from Delphi, the Spartans reburied Pausanias where he had died, then remarks (1.134.4): καὶ νῦν κεῖται ἐν τῷ προτεμενίσματι, ὃ γραφῇ στῆλαι δηλοῦσι ("and now he is buried in the front of the *temenos*, which the stelae with an inscription reveal"). This statement suggests, but no more than that, that Thucydides had seen the stelae.[51]

After Thucydides, two fourth-century historians, Theopompus of Chios and the Athenian Philochorus, seem to have made some use of inscriptions, though the evidence is fragmentary and thus difficult to interpret. Theopompus

---

[49]Aristotle identifies the epitaph as composed by Simonides (*Rh.* 1367b20–21).

[50]See Meiggs and Lewis no. 27. Herodotus does not even refer to this story of Pausanias' couplet and its erasure, though he does mention both the column (9.81.1) and the downfall of Pausanias (8.3.2). Plutarch praises Thucydides in contrast to Herodotus when he remarks that Thucydides does not have the Athenians charge the Corinthians with treason or desertion during the battle of Salamis (cf. Th. 1.73.2–74.4) and states that it would have been a foolish argument for the Athenians to use when they could see Corinth's name engraved in third place on the serpent column (*de Her. mal.* 39 [= *Mor.* 870e]): ἣν τρίτην μὲν ἑώρων μετὰ Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἐγχαραττομένην τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν Βαρβάρων ἀναθήμασιν ("they saw them inscribed in third place after the Spartans and after themselves on the votives from the barbarians"). This suggests that Plutarch has seen the column at Delphi, which would not be surprising.

[51]Six centuries later, in his tour of Sparta, the traveller Pausanias sees two tombs opposite the theater, one of the king Pausanias and the other of Leonidas (3.14.1). As with the stele on the Athenian acropolis denoting the crimes of the Pisistratids, we may wonder why Sparta has preserved the memory of a king who behaved in so un-Spartan a manner, but one clue is contained in the traveller Pausanias' observation that the tomb of Leonidas is nearby: in their public space, Spartans have visible reminders of behavior to emulate and to avoid. Compare Pausanias' description of the *Zanes* set up at Olympia with the fines paid by athletes convicted of wrongdoing in the games (5.21.2–8, 15) and the statues erected by victors (Book 6 *passim*).

(*FGH* 115)[52] bases part of his argument about the historicity of the Peace of Callias on the lettering of the inscription. He believes that it is a forgery foisted on the Greeks by the Athenians (F153) and, if the surviving fragments of his argument are correctly summarized by the excerptors, he may have based at least part of his case on having seen the stone itself (F154):

Θεόπομπος δ' ἐν τῇ κε τῶν Φιλιππικῶν ἐσκευωρῆσθαι[53] λέγει τὰς πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον συνθήκας, ἃς οὐ τοῖς 'Αττικοῖς γράμμασιν ἐστηλιτεῦσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῶν 'Ιώνων.

Theopompus says in the twenty-fifth book of the *Philippica* that the treaties with the barbarian were forged—they were inscribed not in the Attic alphabet but in the Ionic.

Theopompus seems to have argued against the authenticity of the inscription, and therefore the Peace of Callias, on the grounds that it was carved in the Attic epichoric alphabet rather than the Ionic. Theopompus also observes (F155):

τοὺς δὲ 'Αθηναίους ἔπεισε χρῆσθαι τοῖς τῶν 'Ιώνων γράμμασιν 'Αρχῖνος [δ' 'Αθηναίοις] ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Εὐκλείδου [403/2 B.C.E.]... περὶ δὲ τοῦ πείσαντος ἱστορεῖ Θεόπομπος.

Archinus persuaded the Athenians to use the Ionic alphabet in the year Euclides was archon....Theopompus records his persuasion.

In Theopompus' view, this chronological impossibility meant that the stone was a forgery.

Although Theopompus does not say so in the surviving fragments, we must assume, I think, that he was describing a stone he had seen in Athens, rather than referring to a copy of a document he found in a collection of texts or in another author. He believes he is able to distinguish between the Attic and Ionic alphabets and is correct that the Ionic alphabet was only officially adopted in Athens in 403/2 B.C.E., but either overlooks the existence of documents carved in Ionic letters before that date or does not know that there were any.[54]

[52]On Theopompus, see Connor; Flower.

[53]See Connor 91–92 for a discussion of the range of meanings of this word; "forged" may be somewhat misleading.

[54]See also Plutarch's argument over whether the Aristides identified as choregus on some tripods in the sanctuary of Dionysus is the same as the famous political leader. Plutarch argues against the identification, using as part of his argument this observation (*Arist.* 1.6): ὡς ἐλέγχει τὰ γράμματα, τῆς μετ' Εὐκλείδην ὄντα γραμματικῆς ("as the lettering in the alphabet after Euclides proves"). On this opening chapter in the life of Aristides, see below.

Nor does he take into consideration the possibility that the inscription he saw was a later recopying of the treaty earlier inscribed. Although Theopompus seems to have had some knowledge about Athenian public inscriptions and employed them in his historical arguments, he does not appear to have had a complete understanding about the inscription of documents in that city.[55]

It is even more difficult to decide from the surviving fragments of his works whether the Athenian historian Philochorus (c. 320–260 B.C.E. [*FGH* 328]) used inscriptions. Among the titles preserved for him in the Suda (T1), for instance, is περὶ τῶν ᾿Αθήνησιν ἀρξάντων ἀπὸ Σωκρατίδου καὶ μέχρι ᾿Απολλοδώρου, from which we may infer that Philochorus extended to 318 B.C.E. someone else's earlier work on archons which ended with Socratides in 374/3 B.C.E., but nothing suggests he gathered the names from inscriptions. Other suggestive titles in the list include ἐπιγράμματα ᾿Αττικά, περὶ τῶν ᾿Αθήνησι ἀγώνων, and ᾿Ολυμπιάδας, but nothing other than titles survives for these works, so there is no way to determine whether he gathered the material from inscriptions.[56]

More likely to have come from seeing an inscription are Philochorus' comments about the choregic monument erected by an Athenian above the theatre of Dionysus (F58)—

> Αἰσχραῖος ᾿Αναγυράσιος ἀνέθηκε τὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεάτρου
> τρίποδα καταργυρώσας, νενικηκὼς τῷ πρότερον ἔτει
> χορηγῶν παισί, καὶ ἐπέγραψεν ἐπὶ τὴν κατατομήν[57] τῆς πέτρας.

For the use of the Ionic alphabet in Athens during the fifth century B.C.E., see Threatte 26–51. As he states (27), "the Ionic alphabet had long been familiar at Athens before 403 B.C., as numerous instances of its use in public and private texts testify."

[55]It is also possible that the choice to use the Ionic alphabet for a public document may reflect political affiliation: the accounting of the treasurers of Athena in 411 B.C.E., during the reign of the Four Hundred, was in the Ionic alphabet (*IG* 1[3].373), but was inscribed in the Attic in the following year (*IG* 1[3].375), after the fall of the Four Hundred. This has prompted Threatte to suggest that the government of the Four Hundred may have introduced the Ionic alphabet into Athens in 411 B.C.E. (29, 30). F285 may also reflect Theopompus' use of an inscription from Corinth, but he may have taken the epigram from a literary source.

[56]Jacoby 1949: 170 assumes that Philochorus did collect inscriptions for the ἐπιγράμματα ᾿Αττικά. It is entirely possible that the piece on Athenian contests was an excerpt of Philochorus' ᾿Ατθίς and not a separate work. An epigram quoted by Harpocration (F40) is identified as coming from the ᾿Ατθίς, but Philochorus could have gathered this from a literary source.

[57]κατατομή is the term for the rock face high on the south slope of the acropolis above the Theatre of Dionysus. It had been smoothed out during Lycurgus' reconstruction of the theatre. See Travlos 562.

> Aeschraeus of Anagyrus dedicated the tripod (which he had silverplated) above the theater when he won in the previous year as choregus of boys and he inscribed on the *katatome* of rock.

or the remarks preserved in a manuscript of Philodemus which suggest Philochorus quoted an inscription put on a votive statue (F59). Also possibly derived from an inscription is this statement from an unknown work of Philochorus, quoted in the scholia to Aristophanes' *Birds* 766:[58]

> εἴη δ' ἄν τι συμπεπραχὼς τοῖς ἑρμοκοπίδαις ὁ Πεισίου, οἵτινες—ὡς Φιλόχορός φησιν—ἐπὶ Χαβρίου θανατόν τε κατεγνώσθησαν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν ἐστηλιτεύθη καὶ ἐδημεύθησαν, καὶ τῷ κτείναντι κατ' ἄνδρα ἐκηρύχθη τάλαντον.

> The son of Peisias may have been part of the Hermocopidae who—as Philochorus says—were sentenced to death during the archonship of Chabrias, and their names were inscribed on a stele, and their possessions were sold at public auction, and a talent was proclaimed to the killer of any of them.

There is nothing more than the implication, however, that Philochorus may have seen the inscription. He is quoted in the scholia to Aristophanes' *Plutus* 1146 about the decree which was part of the reconciliation of Athens at the end of the civil war (F143), but again there is only a possibility that Philochorus worked from primary sources, since he neither states that he examined the stones nor identifies any author from whom he might have taken documents.

Aristotle's Use of Inscriptions

Although today we celebrate Aristotle as a polymath, we do not generally pay much attention to his antiquarian interests or the kind of evidence he used in exploring them.[59] But the lists of Aristotle's works in Diogenes Laertius (5.22–27) and elsewhere suggest that some of the philosopher's historical interests prompted him to do fieldwork (or have it done for him) at Olympia, Delphi, Athens, and many other Greek cities, and to use inscriptions as sources. These works include 'Ολυμπιονῖκαι, Πυθιονῖκαι, Πυθιονικῶν ἔλεγχοι, νῖκαι

---

[58] I have quoted this scholion as it is given in Holwerda's edition (766a). Jacoby 1923– prints a somewhat different text as *FGH* 328 F134.

[59] George Huxley is an exception; see Huxley 1973 and 1979. See also Chroust's assessment of the importance of historical materials for Aristotle (I.242–43); Düring.

Διονυσιακαί,[60] περὶ τραγῳδιῶν, διδασκαλίαι, πολιτεῖαι πόλεων δυοῖν
δεούσαι ρ̅ξ̅, κατ' ἰδίαν δημοκρατικαὶ καὶ ὀλιγαρχικαὶ καὶ ἀριστοκρατικαὶ
καὶ τυραννικαί and περὶ τῶν Σόλωνος ἀξόνων.[61] Many of these were
complex collections of documents culled from archives and public inscriptions,
while others were lists of names arranged in chronological order. For these lists
of victors in athletic, musical, and drama contests, the information had to be
gathered from votives and buildings in the cities or sanctuaries themselves—
Olympia, Delphi, and Athens—whether by Aristotle himself or by some
assistant, unless someone else had already done the preliminary collecting. If
that had previously been done, then Aristotle might only have had to update or
revise the collection before putting it to other uses, if he desired to.

Whether Aristotle ever visited Delphi is not stated in any surviving
evidence, but he clearly took an interest in the sanctuary. His earliest
connection may have occurred in 342/1 B.C.E. when, after the death of his
father-in-law, Hermias, the tyrant of Atarneus, Aristotle dedicated at Delphi a
statue and composed a hymn in his honor.[62] Diogenes Laertius, who quotes both
the dedicatory inscription and the hymn (5.4, 6–8), also comments that the
dedication may have led to Aristotle's being charged with ἀσέβεια and that
the hymn prompted Theocritus of Chios to mock the philosopher (5.11). No
later visitor, including Pausanias, refers to this statue, which may have been
destroyed either by the Delphians themselves after Alexander the Great's death
or in another period of destruction for the sanctuary.[63]

Various sources record that Aristotle drew up a list of victors in the
Pythian games. Plutarch, typically, mentions in passing that Aristotle compiled
one—καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ τῶν Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφῇ Σόλωνι τὴν
γνώμην ἀνατιθείς ("and Aristotle in the collection of Pythian victors offered

---

[60]According to Hesychius, the title of this work was νικῶν Διονυσιακῶν ἀστικῶν
καὶ Ληναίων.

[61]The last work does not appear in Diogenes Laertius' list, but is in the *Vita Menagiana*
catalogue of Aristotle's books. See Stroud 1979: 14. On Aristotle and these works, see
Chroust; Düring. Not much of these works survives: there are scattered fragments only from
the Πυθιονῖκαι (frr. 615–17) and διδασκαλίαι (frr. 618–30); a lengthy fragment from the
Athenian constitutional history alone; and a reference only perhaps to the Ὀλυμπιονῖκαι.

[62]Diogenes Laertius preserves many derogatory tales about Hermias (5.3–4, 11), which
may reflect the confused politics of this era as cities changed their policies toward Macedonia,
as well as differing attitudes toward Aristotle. See Chroust's analysis: I.38–44, 173–74.

[63]See Wormell; Edmunds 383–86 on Aristotle's hymn to ἀρετή; Bowra.

his judgment about Solon" [*Sol.* 11.1 = fr. 615])—but says no more than that.[64] Otherwise, in the literary evidence, Aristotle's work survives in only two other brief citations, in Hesychius (...ὃν ἀναγράφει καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης νενικηκότα ["whom also Aristotle catalogues as a victor"]) and in a scholion to Pindar, *Isthmian* 2 (= fr. 617 Rose): ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια τὴν εἰκοστὴν τετάρτην Πυθιάδα, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἀναγράφει ("but also the Pythian games, the twenty-fourth Pythiad, as Aristotle catalogues").

This scanty literary evidence can be expanded by two fragmentary inscriptions from Delphi to give a greater sense of Aristotle's undertaking. In the first, he and his relative Callisthenes, who also wrote on the First Sacred War, are thanked for their efforts in compiling a list of Pythian victors (*Fouilles de Delphes* 3.1.400 = Syll³.275):[65]

<div style="text-align:center">

[ἐπεὶ]
['Αριστοτέλης Νικο-]
[μάχου Σταγιρίτης]
[καὶ Καλλισθένης Δ-]
5   [αμοτίμου Ὀλύνθιο-]
[ς συ]νέ[ταξαν πίνακ-]
[α] τῶν ἀ[πὸ Γυλίδα νεν-]
ικηκ[ότ]ων τὰ [Πύθια]
καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀρ[χῆς τὸ-]
10   ν ἀγῶνα κατασκ[ευα]-
σάντων, ἐπαινέ[σαι]
'Αριστοτέλην κα[ὶ Κ]-
αλ[λι]σθένην καὶ [στ-]
εφανῶσαι· ἀνα[θεῖν]-

</div>

[64]Later in the same chapter, Plutarch observes (*Sol.* 11.2): ἔν τε τοῖς τῶν Δελφῶν ὑπομνήμασιν Ἀλκμαίων, οὐ Σόλων, Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς ἀναγέγραπται ("in the records of the Delphians, Alcmaeon, not Solon, is catalogued as general of the Athenians"). Jacoby 1949: 356 n. 22 states that Plutarch has taken this from Aristotle (see also 281 n. 47) and he may have, although there is no explicit evidence. See also Mosshammer.

[65]This fragment was found in a well in 1896 near house 291, approximately thirty feet west of the temple and near the southwest corner of the precinct. Complete only on the left side, it was inscribed in *stoichedon*, with fifteen letters per line. Its opening was restored, *exempli gratia*, by the excavator, Th. Homolle. If the *stoichedon* pattern is consistently maintained, then line 7, as restored, is one letter too long, although the restoration would date the starting point of the tablet to the reorganization of the Pythian games after the First Sacred War. Miller suggests that ἀ[φ' Ἱππίου] may be the correct restoration (150). See Tod no. 187; Bosworth.

15   αι δὲ τὸν πίν[ακα το-]
      ὺς ταμί[ας ἐν τῶι ἱε-]
      [ρῶ]ι με[ταγεγραμμέ]-
      νο[ν εἰς στήλας...

> Since Aristotle, son of Nicomachus and of the town Stagira, and
> Callisthenes, son of Damotimus and of the town Olynthus, compiled a
> tablet of victors at the Pythian games from the time of Gylidas and of
> those who oversaw the festival from its beginning, commend and offer
> a crown to Aristotle and Callisthenes. The financial officers are to put
> up a tablet in the temple with the inscription on stelae...

If the very fragmentary opening is restored at all accurately, the two are thanked
with a crown and an inscription for producing a list of victors at the Pythian
games and of the festival's organizers from its earliest days.

The second surviving inscription records payment Δεινομάχω[ι] τῶμ
Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφῆς, κελευσάντων / [τ]ῶν ἱερομνημόνων, μνᾶς δύο
("to Dinomachus for the catalogue of Pythian victors, as the priests ordered, two
mnas" [*Fouilles de Delphes* 3.5.58 =Syll^3.252]); the size of the payment
suggests that this monument must have been very large.[66] The fragmentary state
of the inscription and uncertainty in Delphic chronology prohibit dating it
precisely, but it must have been done at some time in the four or five years prior
to 327 B.C.E., when Callisthenes died in disgrace on the expedition with
Alexander the Great.[67]

In the lists of his works, Aristotle's Πυθιονῖκαι seems to have a parallel in
Ὀλυμπιονῖκαι, although no fragment of the latter survives. Thus, for instance,
we cannot know whether Aristotle relied on Hippias of Elis' list of victors in the
Olympic *stadion* or whether they both drew on some combination of oral

---

[66]See Bousquet. For a possible reconstruction of the monument, see Miller 149–50.

[67]Some time after this stele was erected, perhaps as early as the anti-Macedonian reaction
in Phocis to the news of Alexander's death in 323 B.C.E., the inscription was broken up and
this fragment ended up in the well where it was found. The Delphians may even have voted to
take away Aristotle's honors, as this remark in a letter from Aristotle to Antipater, if genuine,
shows (Ael. *VH* 14.1): ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν Δελφοῖς ψηφισθέντων μοι καὶ ὧν ἀφῄρημαι νῦν
οὕτως ἔχω ὡς μήτε μοι σφόδρα μέλειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν μήτε μοι μηδὲν μέλειν
("concerning the honors voted me in Delphi and of which I have been deprived, now I can say
that neither are they much of a concern to me nor are they of no interest at all to me"). For
discussions of chronology, see Spoerri and the references he cites. Tod suggests that Aristotle
may have done some of the work at Delphi in 343 B.C.E., since ca. 342/1 he honored Hermias
of Atarneus with a statue and epigram at the site (no. 187).

tradition and written documents in their work at Olympia. Plutarch, however, may refer to this work in his life of Lycurgus. He opens the biography with a discussion about the difficulties in establishing any sort of chronology for the Spartan lawgiver and observes that some, including Aristotle, credit Lycurgus and Iphitus with the Olympic truce (*Lyc.* 1.2): ὧν ἐστι καὶ 'Αριστοτέλης ὁ φιλόσοφος, τεκμήριον προφέρων τὸν 'Ολυμπίασι δίσκον, ἐν ᾧ τοὔνομα τοῦ Λυκούργου διασῴζεται καταγεγραμμένον ("among whom there is also Aristotle the philosopher, who offers as evidence the disk at Olympia on which is preserved the inscribed name of Lycurgus"). Plutarch does not state that he is citing Aristotle's 'Ολυμπιονῖκαι, but Plutarch's phrasing, especially his word τεκμήριον, suggests that Aristotle was interested in establishing a chronology either of the Olympic games or of Lycurgus' life and that he did use epigraphical evidence in his work.[68]

At both Olympia and Delphi, Aristotle perhaps drew on the statues and inscriptions commemorating the athletes who were victorious or, at Olympia, convicted of cheating. Most of these monuments are known today not from Aristotle's work but only because Pausanias wrote detailed descriptions of the sanctuaries. He devotes most of Books 5 and 6 to a catalogue of monuments in the Altis at Olympia: generally, he describes the statues and summarizes the inscriptions, adding information from other sources, though occasionally he does quote an epigram (eg, 6.4.6, 8.2, 10.7).[69] His description of Delphi in Book 10 is much briefer, because he has already covered the athletes worthy of note in his section on Olympia, as he explains (10.9.1–2). Indeed, in describing monuments at Olympia, Pausanias often adds that an athlete was also victorious at Delphi (or Nemea or the Isthmus), though he does not always state whether that information came from the inscription or from another source (e.g., 6.10.3).

Pausanias, who lived some five centuries after Aristotle, never cites the philosopher as a source or predecessor of sorts, but may nonetheless be

---

[68]This disk is probably referred to in two other sources. Pausanias describes briefly many votive offerings, including ὁ 'Ιφίτου δίσκος inscribed with the truce proclaimed at Olympic festivals (5.20.1): ταύτην [τὴν ἐκεχειρίαν] οὐκ ἐς εὐθὺ ἔχει γεγραμμένην, ἀλλὰ ἐς κύκλου σχῆμα περίεισιν ἐπὶ τῷ δίσκῳ τὰ γράμματα ("it does not have the truce inscribed in a straight line, but the letters go around the disk in the shape of a circle"). Pausanias earlier refers to an inscription that perhaps concerns Iphitus, though he does not characterize it as a disk (5.4.5–6). Phlegon, a freedman of Hadrian, who composed some sort of chronicle of Olympiads from their beginning through 140 C.E. (*FGH* 257 F1), may also refer to this votive. See Jeffery 59, 217.

[69]See how he explains his focus at 6.1.1–2.

indebted to him at a couple of points. At the beginning of his tour of the Apollo sanctuary at Delphi, Pausanias summarizes the history of competitions and victors (10.7.2–8). His account opens with only vague chronological references—μνημονεύουσι (10.7.2, twice), λέγεται (10.7.2, 3), and φασί (10.7.3)—but then his presentation switches, becoming much more annalistic in style and content (10.7.4-5):

> τῆς δὲ τεσσαρακοστῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ ὀγδόης, ἣν Γλαυκίας ὁ Κροτωνιάτης ἐνίκησε, ταύτης ἔτει τρίτῳ ἄθλα ἔθεσαν οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες κιθαρῳδίας μὲν καθὰ καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, προσέθεσαν δὲ καὶ αὐλῳδίας ἀγώνισμα καὶ αὐλῶν· ἀνηγορεύθησαν δὲ νικῶντες Κεφαλλήν τε †ὸς λάμποιτ† κιθαρῳδίᾳ, καὶ αὐλῳδὸς Ἀρκὰς Ἐχέμβροτος, Σακάδας δὲ Ἀργεῖος ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐλοῖς· ἀνείλετο δὲ ὁ Σακάδας οὗτος καὶ ἄλλας δύο τὰς ἐφεξῆς ταύτης Πυθιάδας. ἔθεσαν δὲ καὶ ἄθλα τότε ἀθληταῖς πρῶτον, τά τε ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ πλὴν τεθρίππου καὶ αὐτοὶ νομοθετήσαντες δολίχου καὶ διαύλου παισὶν εἶναι δρόμον.

> In the third year of the forty-eighth Olympiad, which Glaucias the Crotoniate won, the Amphictyons held contests for harp playing just as always from the beginning, but they added competitions for *aulos* playing and singing to the *aulos*. Proclaimed as victors were...from Cephallene for the harp, Echembrotus from Arcadia for singing to the *aulos*, and Sacadas of Argos for his *aulos* playing. This Sacadas carried away prizes for the next two Pythiads. At that time they also established for the first time contests for athletes, just as at Olympia, except for the four-horse chariot, and the Delphian officials added for boys foot-races of the long and the double course.

It is just possible that one source of Pausanias' information in this summary history is the inscription engraved at Delphi as a result of Aristotle and Callisthenes' work. Pausanias' brief narrative of the founding and refounding of the games at Olympia similarly opens with references to oral tradition—οἱ τὰ ἀρχαιότατα μνημονεύοντες (5.7.6), φασιν (5.7.7)—then changes into citations of Olympiads, years, and victors (5.8.6–), but no inscription or any other kind of evidence survives to suggest that Aristotle's work lies behind Pausanias' chronological survey of Olympia. If Aristotle's Ὀλυμπιονῖκαι has left any traces either in Pausanias or in the sanctuary of Olympia itself, then it may only be apparent in monuments put up or re-inscribed long after the victors they commemorate.[70]

---

[70]See Pausanias 6.7.8, 10.9, 13.2, 13.6, 13.10, 14.12.

Ancient sources indicate that Aristotle lived in Athens for long periods of time at least twice (367/6–347, 335/4–323 B.C.E.), so it is easily possible that he was able to collect information for his work on Athenian drama contests.[71] But the chronological relationship between his research and the inscribed διδασκαλίαι (*IG* 2².2318–23) is unclear: it is uncertain whether the inscriptions were erected after his work (whether independently or as a result) or whether they came before.[72] Part of the problem is that so few fragments survive of any of these Aristotelian texts: there are no fragments from either the νῖκαι Διονυσιακαί or the περὶ τραγῳδιῶν, while just a few scraps remain of his διδασκαλίαι (frr. 618–30 Rose).[73] The twelve surviving fragments of Aristotle's διδασκαλίαι clearly show the interests of those who excerpted them, as many identify poets and public figures or discuss titles of plays by authors of the fifth and early fourth centuries B.C.E. This focus makes it difficult to recover any sense of Aristotle's work, its breadth and arrangement, or what other information he included. If *IG* 2².2318–23 were available to Aristotle, his research must have been relatively easy; if they were not, then he faced greater challenges.

If we assume that Aristotle did not have inscriptions like *IG* 2².2318 to draw upon, what was available to him as evidence? Some sort of official Athenian archive seems to have existed, though it is not clear how possible it would have been for someone to undertake research in it.[74] We may imagine Aristotle collecting names and dates from the choregic monuments erected by Athenians victorious in the many drama festivals or from documents kept by officials in charge of the festivals. Unfortunately, three of the four choregic

---

[71]On the chronology of Aristotle in Athens, see Chroust I, chs. 7, 11–12.

[72]See Pickard-Cambridge. He cites all the choregic and didaskalic inscriptions known at that time and believes that Aristotle's work must be kept separate from the inscriptions (70, 103–25).

[73]Rose lists some fragments as coming from Aristotle's διδασκαλίαι (frr. 618, 620–23, 626–27), but in them Aristotle is not specified and the source is identified only as διδασκαλίαι, in contrast to the other fragments which use phrasing like Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν ταῖς διδασκαλίαις ("Aristotle in his *didaskaliae*" [fr. 619, 624, 629]) or ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης διδασκαλίαι ("as Aristotle, *didaskaliae*" [fr. 628]). Cf. fr. 630: ...φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης ὅτι σύνδυο ἔδοξε χορηγεῖν τὰ Διονύσια τοῖς τραγῳδοῖς καὶ κωμῳδοῖς ("Aristotle says that it seems there were two choregoi for the Dionysia in tragedies and comedies").

[74]Thomas 81–82 observes: "Athens was extending the use of the written word and its preservation during the first half of the fourth century. The two elements are facets of the same phenomenon. Sophisticated use of the documents once they are kept as 'records' seems to become evident in the mid-fourth century." A parallel development was the use of inscriptions by orators to develop their arguments.

monuments which survive today post-date either the time at which Aristotle is understood to have been in Athens or his death in 322 B.C.E.: the monument of Nikias (*IG* 2².3055) and that of Thrasyllus (*IG* 2².3056) are both 320/19 B.C.E., and that of Thrasykles is 271/70 B.C.E. (*IG* 2².3083). The earliest surviving monument, that of Lysicrates, is 335/4 B.C.E. (*IG* 2².3042), the very year in which Aristotle returned to Athens. All four choregic monuments are securely dated because their inscriptions refer to the eponymous archon under whom the victory was won. We know from Pausanias' description of the street of the tripods (1.20.1–2), however, that other such monuments existed for later visitors to see, though we do not know their dates.[75]

The elaborate choregic monuments from the end of the fourth century B.C.E. were not the only inscribed record of drama contests. At least one archon basileus at the beginning of the century commemorated his year in office by erecting a herm with this inscription (Agora I.7168):[76]

Ὀνήσιππος Αἰτίο Κηφισιεὺς βασιλεὺς ἀνέθηκε[ν]
ο[ἴδ]ε Ὀνησίππο βασιλεύοντος χορηγõντες ἐνίκων
    κωμωιδῶν   τραγωιδῶν
Σωσικράτης ἐχορήγε χαλκοπώλης Στρατόνικος ἐχορήγε Στράτωνος
Νικοχάρης ἐδίδασκε   Μεγακλείδης ἐδίδασκε

Onesippus son of Aetius from Cephissa, as king-archon, dedicated [this].
These men, when Onesippus was king-archon, as choregoi were victorious:
    comedies   tragedies
Sosicrates the bronze-dealer was choregus Stratonicus son of Strato was choregus
Nicochares was the poet   Megaclides was the poet

Aristotle might well have seen this inscription and others like it as he gathered information for his διδασκαλίαι, but there would have been at least one difficulty in using it: he would have had to correlate the name of the archon

---

[75]Plutarch also refers to choregic monuments that he believes can be accurately dated: in his discussion about Aristides' wealth, he joins a seemingly long debate about the identification of an Aristides who was a victorious choregus and dedicated some tripods. Plutarch says that the tripods stood even in his own time (καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς [*Arist.* 1.3]). He then supports the arguments of Panaetius about who this Aristides was, as opposed to those of Demetrius of Phaleron (1.8–9). Plutarch also mentions a choregic monument of Nicias which he believes still stood in his own day—καθ' ἡμᾶς (*Nic.* 3.3).

[76]See Shear (the inscription is on pp. 256–57); Camp; Edmonson; Develin 225. Edmonson discusses in detail the oddities of this inscription, including the naming of the choregoi and the date of the dedication.

basileus to that of the archon eponymous who gave his name to the year. How might he have done this?[77]

Other Aristotelian works do not offer many clues as to his possible sources. Only in a brief comment in the *Politics* does Aristotle use evidence that he would have had to draw from such inscriptions. Discussing the place of music in education, he remarks about the popularity of the *aulos* and refers in passing to a tablet dedicated by a choregus (1341a33–36):

> καὶ γὰρ ἐν Λακεδαίμονί τις χορηγὸς αὐτὸς ηὔλησε τῷ χορῷ, καὶ περὶ Ἀθήνας οὕτως ἐπεχωρίασεν ὥστε σχεδὸν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἐλευθέρων μετεῖχον αὐτῆς· δῆλον δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πίνακος ὃν ἀνέθηκε Θράσιππος Ἐκφαντίδῃ χορηγήσας.

> For in Lacedaemon some choregus himself played the *aulos* for the chorus and this became so popular around Athens that almost the majority of freemen did this; this is clear from the tablet which Thrasippus dedicated when he was choregus for Ecphantides.

But Aristotle never cites choregic monuments in the surviving pages of the *Poetics*.

The other relevant titles of Aristotle—νόμοι συσσιτικοί, πολιτεῖαι πόλεων, and περὶ τῶν Σόλωνος ἀξόνων[78]—show his interest in the constitutional history of Greek city-states, although little survives of these today.[79] Aristotle's approach to this subject and the value he placed on epigraphical evidence, either what he and his colleagues collected for themselves or what they found in previous work, may be illustrated by his research into the laws of Solon. But for Aristotle the assembly of such evidence was only one step in a larger project, as he makes clear in his conclusion to the *Nicomachean Ethics*, which sets up his work in the *Politics*. Aristotle declares (*EN* 1181b17–20): εἶτα ἐκ τῶν συνηγμένων πολιτειῶν θεωρῆσαι τὰ ποῖα

---

[77]The earliest surviving list of all the archons for each year (*IG* 2².1706) was inscribed at the end of the third century B.C.E. The remaining fragments begin with the year 229/8 B.C.E. and list the archon eponymous, the basileus, the polemarchus, and then the six thesmothetai, always in that order, for some twenty-two years. The list seems to extend no further into the past than 230/29 B.C.E. See Dow; Cadoux; Bradeen; Plommer; Develin.

[78]Plutarch may be drawing on this work when he quotes from Solon's laws and cites their locations on the *axones* (*Sol.* 19.4) or when he cites Aristotle for the name κύρβεις (*Sol.* 25.1), though the latter remark may refer to *Ath.* 7.1. See Stroud 1979: 13.

[79]Aristotle refers frequently throughout the *Politics* to the constitutions and laws of many Greek cities, including, for example, Sparta and Crete (1263b40–64a1), Locri and Leucas (1266b19–24), Epidamnus (1267b17–19), and Cyme (1269a1–3). See also his remarks at *Rh.* 1360a18–37 and *Pol.* 1260b27–36.

σῴζει καὶ φθείρει τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ ποῖα ἑκάστας τῶν πολιτειῶν, καὶ διὰ τίνας αἰτίας αἳ μὲν καλῶς αἳ δὲ τοὐαντίον πολιτεύονται ("then from the collected constitutions to see what sorts of things preserve or destroy cities and what sorts of constitutions are in each and on account of what reasons cities are well governed or the opposite"). Unfortunately, Aristotle never explains how those constitutions were gathered.[80]

Certain clues about his sources remain embedded in the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεῖα. In his analysis of Athenian constitutional history, Aristotle dates events both by archons and by relationship to other events. Typical are his references to events in 478/7 B.C.E. (*Ath.* 23.5)—ἔτει τρίτῳ μετὰ τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν ἐπὶ Τιμοσθένους ἄρχοντος ("in the third year after the sea battle off Salamis when Timosthenes was archon"), or to events in 453/2 B.C.E. (*Ath.* 26.3)—ἔτει δὲ πέμπτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους ἄρχοντος ("in the fifth year after these things when Lysicrates was archon"). His earliest citation of an archon to date an event is tentatively assigned to the year 621/0 B.C.E. (*Ath.*. 4.1). He does the same for a few events in the sixth century (*Ath.* 13.1, 13.4, 14.1, 17.1, 19.6, 21.1), then dates events consistently by archon, sometimes in conjunction with other events, some sixteen times, throughout the fifth century.[81] Four of the archons named by Aristotle, all of whom appear in the early part of the history, are not known from any other source. This may suggest that Aristotle was working from primary documents, perhaps also an archon list.[82]

Aristotle seems to have been using primary documents or Atthidographies based, at least in part, on such documents. He comments that the early Athenian law against tyranny was very mild, then perhaps quotes part of it (*Ath.* 16.10): νόμος γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἦν ὅδε· θέσμια τάδε Ἀθηναίων ἐστὶ καὶ πάτρια· ἐὰν τινες τυραννεῖν ἐπανιστῶνται [[ἐπὶ τυραννίδι]] ἢ συγκαθιστῇ τὴν τυραννίδα, ἄτιμον εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ γένος ("for this is their law: these are customary laws of Athens and also ancestral; whenever anyone attempts to

---

[80]Note the verb—συνηγμένων—which we have seen before in the title of Craterus' work and in Plutarch. I discuss below what evidence there is for Aristotle's collecting of materials.

[81]There is only one event in the second half of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεῖα given a date, by reference to the eponymous archon (329/8 B.C.E. [54.7]). Rhodes 1993 *ad loc.* regards the date as a later addition to the text.

[82]Aristaechmus (621/0? [4.1]), Hermocreon (501/0? [22.2]), Telesinus (487/6 [22.5]), Hypsichides (481/0 [22.8]). See Cadoux and Plommer. Develin incorporates Aristotle's evidence in his annual listing of Athenian officials but offers no discussion of Aristotle's scholarship.

establish a tyranny or aids a tyranny, he is to be disenfranchised, both he and his family"). Using very similar language, he paraphrases a law which established the Four Hundred in Athens (*Ath.* 29.2): ἦν δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦ Πυθοδώρου τοιόνδε· τὸν δῆμον ἑλέσθαι μετὰ τῶν προϋπαρχόντων δέκα προβούλων ἄλλους εἴκοσι ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ τεττεράκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων ("this was the decree of Pythodorus: together with the ten probouloi, the *demos* is to choose twenty others from those beyond the age of forty"). In his discussion about this law, he identifies Pythodorus as from the deme Anaphlystus (29.1), so perhaps Aristotle has seen an inscription of the law, whether in an archive or in the city, that has this information as part of its heading.[83]

Aristotle's discussion of the Solonian divisions of Athenian classes provides us with an opportunity to examine his use of sources. In explaining the class of those able to provide three hundred bushels, he explicates thus (*Ath.* 7.4):

> ὡς δ' ἔνιοί φασι τοὺς ἱπποτροφεῖν δυναμένους. σημεῖον δὲ φέρουσι τό τε ὄνομα τοῦ τέλους, ὡς ἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος κείμενον, καὶ τὰ ἀναθήματα τῶν ἀρχαίων·

> As some say, they are able to maintain a horse. They offer as evidence both the name of the class as being derived from the fact and the votive offerings of the ancients.

Aristotle's phrasing shows that he is drawing on unnamed sources—ἔνιοι—and he cites as well what they use as evidence (σημεῖον δὲ φέρουσι). But immediately after this he continues (*Ath.* 7.4):

> ἀνάκειται γὰρ ἐν ἀκροπόλει εἰκὼν Διφίλου, ἐφ' ᾗ ἐπιγέγραπται τάδε·
>> Διφίλου Ἀνθεμίων τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεοῖς
>> θητικοῦ ἀντὶ τέλους ἱππάδ' ἀμειψάμενος.
> καὶ παρέστηκεν ἵππος ἐκμαρτυρῶν, ὡς τὴν ἱππάδα τοῦτο σημαίνουσιν.

> For there stands on the acropolis a statue of Diphilus, on which are inscribed these verses:

---

[83]Although Ostwald 1955: 106–8 and MacDowell 28–29 disagree about some of the details of Aristotle's language in *Ath.* 16.10 and 29.2, they recognize in these passages Athenian legal language as abstracted by Aristotle. See also Ostwald 1986: 8 n. 19. Aristotle also records that the Thirty removed the laws of Ephialtes and Archestratus about the council of the Areopagus from the Areopagus hill (35.2). In the second half of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία he refers to various kinds of inscriptions: ephebe lists (53.4); eponymoi (53.7); public records (54.3, 54.8).

> Diphilus' son Anthemion dedicated this to the gods,
> when he exchanged the status of thete for that of knight.
> And the horse stands beside [him] as evidence that they interpret this as
> the class of cavalry.

He identifies a statue of a man with a horse, inscribed with a pair of pentameter verses and placed on the Athenian acropolis. But which man? Aristotle's introductory sentence suggests Diphilus, but the verse says Anthemion, son of Diphilus. Perhaps the phrase εἰκὼν Διφίλου is an easy slip of a copyist created by seeing Διφίλου as the first word in the inscription.[84] Aristotle's sources and, perhaps, Aristotle himself sought out this statue and inscription on the acropolis.

Can we determine, however, whether Aristotle worked either with the inscriptions themselves or drew on previous research for the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία and the other city-state constitutions? There is nothing conclusive on one side or the other. He does not say that he has himself seen the statue of Anthemion on the Athenian acropolis, though he does use the verb ἀνάκειται when introducing his description of it. I would suggest that this at least implies that Aristotle has seen the statue, although Rhodes argues "the present ἀνάκειται does not guarantee that *AP* has checked the evidence, but we may presume that a statue which was standing when his source wrote was still standing when he wrote."[85] Nor does his quotation and paraphrase of laws require that Aristotle worked from the inscriptions themselves; similarly, nothing credits Aristotle specifically with using inscriptions in his work at Delphi, Olympia, or on the dramatic contests in Athens, although much suggests that he did.

If Aristotle did use epigraphical evidence in his various antiquarian projects or studies of the constitutional history of Greek city states, he might to some extent have depended on others to gather the information for him. One of his circle, Clytus, for example, is recorded as compiler or author of a work, περὶ Μιλήτου, which may have been a source for Aristotle's comparative πολιτεῖαι.[86] Alexander the Great's expedition to the east may also have been

---

[84]Rhodes 1993 *ad loc.* also notes that "editors' suspicion has been aroused by the pair of pentameters," which are rarer than elegiac couplets. But examples of pentameters do exist.

[85]Rhodes 1993 *ad loc.*

[86]See Jacoby 1949: 359 n. 30. Athenaeus refers to Clytus as ὁ 'Αριστοτελικός ("the Aristotelian" [12.540c]), ὁ Μιλήσιος, 'Αριστοτέλους δὲ μαθητής ("the Milesian, Aristotle's pupil" [14.655b]), and ὁ περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος ("the Peripatetic philosopher" [14.655e]), and quotes from his work on Miletus. Arrian tells and dismisses a

another source for many of Aristotle's projects, though the evidence is very fragmentary. Callisthenes, who accompanied Alexander as official historian until his execution, was recorded in a remark by Porphyry as having sent Aristotle astronomical observations of vast antiquity from Babylon (*FGH* 124 T3).[87] We may imagine Callisthenes forwarding other materials to his relative, if they perhaps had worked in tandem at Delphi. Theophrastus, an intellectual heir to Aristotle in many ways, also seems to know of observations made about plants in the sea by some on Alexander's expedition to India (*HP* 4.7.3). Strabo refers to Patrocles' claim that those who travelled with Alexander acquired a superficial knowledge about many things, while Alexander himself carried out detailed investigations (ἀκριβῶσαι), but Strabo does not remark that any of these projects were initiated by or forwarded to Aristotle (2.1.6 [= C69]).[88]

Perhaps most tantalizing is this anecdote recorded of Heraclides of Pontus, a contemporary of Aristotle who seems to have known both him and Plato when he lived in Athens. According to Proclus (*Tim.* 28c):[89]

> Ἡρακλείδης γοῦν ὁ Ποντικός φησιν ὅτι τῶν Χοιρίλου τότε
> εὐδοκιμούντων Πλάτων τὰ Ἀντιμάχου προυτίμησε καὶ αὐτὸν
> ἔπεισε τὸν Ἡρακλείδην εἰς Κολοφῶνα ἐλθόντα τὰ ποιήματα
> συλλέξαι τοῦ ἀνδρός.

> Heraclides of Pontus says that although the works of Choerilus were
> then very popular, Plato preferred those of Antimachus and he
> persuaded Heraclides who was going to Colophon to collect the works
> of that man.

If there is any truth to this story, then we might imagine it as a rare surviving example of something which may have been fairly routine in the ancient world.

---

story preserved in Aristus and Asclepiades that Alexander the Great in the last year of his life was visited by, among others, Roman envoys and that the Macedonian not only predicted their future greatness but also investigated their governmental system (περὶ τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἅμα διαπυνθανόμενον—"at the same time [he] investigated the form of government" [*An.* 7.15.5]).

[87]Bosworth suggests that this could be an inference mistakenly drawn from Arist. *Cael.* 292a7–9 (410–11).

[88]Plutarch, in a chapter on Aristotle's effect on Alexander, notes that the philosopher prompted his interests in medicine, philosophy, and books, and that when Alexander while on campaign in Asia Minor ran out of reading material, he had Harpalus send more. But Plutarch does not mention that Alexander sent anything back to Aristotle and even describes in this chapter the loosening of bonds between the two men (*Alex.* ch. 8).

[89]For the fragments of Heraclides, see Wehrli 1953.

A friend or connection travelling to another city might be asked to undertake some small commission.[90]

Aristotle's Successors

Aristotle's successors, the Peripatetics, pursued many of his historical and anthropological interests and developed some of their own.[91] In addition to his relative Callisthenes, two men in particular, Theophrastus and Demetrius of Phaleron, continued Aristotle's research into the constitutional and legal history of Greek cities, although very little of their work in these areas survives. Of Theophrastus' work (see the list in Diogenes Laertius 5.42–50), two titles in particular stand out as revealing interests in common with Aristotle: νόμοι, a collection in eighteen books of the laws and traditions of Greek cities; and δικαιώματα, a similar collection of legal decisions.[92] From the surviving fragments of the former, it is apparent that Theophrastus could have drawn on the same mass of material that Aristotle used in his constitutions of Greek cities, but arranged it very differently. Where Theophrastus organized the evidence by subject, so that all of the laws on property, for example, were gathered together in one place, Aristotle organized it by city, so that these same laws would be scattered throughout, presented in the context of the city which used them.[93]

   Demetrius of Phaleron was a much more flamboyant public figure who appeared before Athenians in a variety of guises. His legislative work in Athens seems to have been informed by an historical perspective, if Diogenes Laertius is right in attributing the no longer extant works περὶ τῆς ᾿Αθήνησι νομοθεσίας and περὶ τῶν Αθήνησι πολιτειῶν to him (5.80).[94] He is also credited with a list of archons—ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή—which does not

----

[90]See above, n. 5 on Apellicon of Teos, a Peripatetic, who collected Aristotle's library and ancient inscriptions. See also Starr 1987, esp. 216–19, for a discussion of how Romans obtained copies of earlier works.

   [91]See Podlecki.

   [92]See Keaney and Bloch 1940a.

   [93]Another of Aristotle's successors, Heraclides of Pontus (who may have been asked by Plato to gather the poems of Antimachus [see above]), excerpted his collection of Greek constitutions. Of Heraclides' work, ἐκ τῶν ῾Ηρακλείδου περὶ πολιτειῶν, fragments from forty of the constitutions survive. For a text, translation, and brief discussion, see Dilts. See also Gottschalk; Bloch 1940b.

   [94]See Dow and Travis for a discussion about the relationship between Demetrius' philosophical and historical interests and his work on Athenian laws. They argue that the title νομοθέτης should be restored on IG 2^2.1201.11, a decree of an Athenian deme honoring Demetrius (153–56). See also Stroud 1979: 14.

survive, but is mentioned twice in passing by Diogenes Laertius (1.22, 2.7),[95] again in the *Life of Thucydides* 32 (=*FGH* 228 F1–3), and perhaps used by Plutarch in his life of Aristides (1.8-9, 5.9–10).

Plutarch preserves a sense of Demetrius' approach to historical questions in the opening to his life of Aristides. The biographer remarks that writers disagree about Aristides' wealth and status, and cites three pieces of evidence used by Demetrius in a volume called Σωκράτης: Demetrius points to Aristides' service as archon eponymous, his ostracism, and choregic tripods dedicated as votive offerings in the sanctuary of Dionysus. Plutarch, who believes that Aristides was not wealthy, works to invalidate each of these three, devoting most of his attention to the tripods. About them, he observes (*Arist.* 1.3): οἳ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐδείκνυντο, τοιαύτην ἐπιγραφὴν διασῴζοντες "'Ἀντιοχὶς ἐνίκα, Ἀριστείδης ἐχορήγει, Ἀρχέστρατος ἐδίδασκε" ("these [tripods] were on display even in our time and they preserve this inscription: 'the tribe Antiochis was victorious, Aristides was choregus, Archestratus was the poet'"). Plutarch then uses an argument against Demetrius—namely that Demetrius incorrectly identified the Aristides who dedicated the tripods as the son of Lysimachus—with which he credits Panaetius. Panaetius seems to have depended on a list of victorious choregoi to make his case and also to have built his argument, falsely perhaps, on the Ionic lettering of the inscription. Plutarch adds a further point about the identification of the two choregoi named Aristides victorious in the fifth century (*Arist.* 1.6): ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν Ξενοφίλου πατρός, τὸν δὲ χρόνῳ πολλῷ νεώτερον, ὡς ἐλέγχει τὰ γράμματα, τῆς μετ' Εὐκλείδην ὄντα γραμματικῆς, καὶ προσγεγραμμένος ὁ Ἀρχέστρατος, ὃν ἐν τοῖς Μηδικοῖς οὐδείς, ἐν δὲ τοῖς Πελοποννησιακοῖς συχνοὶ χορῶν διδάσκαλον ἀναγράφουσι ("but the one's father is Xenophilus and the other is younger by many years, as the letters, being in the alphabet which is post-Euclides, prove, as does the last-written Archestratus, whom no one catalogues as poet of choruses in the Persian Wars, but many do in the Peloponnesian War"). The biographer wholeheartedly endorses Panaetius' argument about the tripods, then turns his attention to Aristides' service as archon and his ostracism. Plutarch uses Demetrius' own work against

---

[95]Although Diogenes Laertius does not include this list in his catalogue of Demetrius' works (5.80–81); see also 2.44. For a collection of all the surviving fragments of Demetrius of Phaleron's works, see Wehrli 1949.

him when he remarks that Demetrius himself dated Aristides' archonship to after the battle of Plataea (*Arist.* 1.8).[96]

And here I return to my starting point, Craterus of Macedon, for it is possible that he, also interested in history and the evidence available to examine historical questions, should be included in this Aristotelian circle, although only suggestion links him with the philosopher and his followers. If Craterus was, indeed, either part of Aristotle's school or influenced by his work, then he applied the philosopher's interest in inscriptions to Athenian political history, perhaps focusing on the development and finances of the Delian League.

Conclusion

During the fifth century B.C.E., some cities and sanctuaries began to display more documents in public places. At the end of that century and during the fourth, historians and philosophers developed an interest in Greece's immediate past, rather than its far distant history. They asked the kinds of questions about their immediate past that could be answered in part by inscriptions. Men like Hippias of Elis, for example, realized that inscriptions provided a means to date events more precisely than Herodotus' τρίτη δὲ γενεῇ μετὰ Μίνων τελευτήσαντα ("in the third generation after Minos' death" [7.171.1; see also 3.48.1, 4.105.1]) or Thucydides' ἑξηκοστῷ ἔτει μετὰ Ἰλίου ἅλωσιν ("in the sixtieth year after Troy was taken" [1.12.3]). These researchers collected information from the headings of public decrees, sacred documents, victory monuments, and statue bases which enabled them to construct lists of names in a chronological order. Other writers then used these lists of priests, priestesses, victors, and officeholders as a structuring device for their narratives of the past; Hellanicus' *Atthis* may have been an early example. Some scholars, Craterus most famously, may have devoted themselves to collecting such documents, while others, such as Aristotle, do not seem to have been satisfied with only gathering them, but then used the information to study comparative or historical topics. With the establishment of the Mouseion in Alexandria, scholars continued to refine chronographical systems (e.g., Eratosthenes, Apollodorus), to resolve chronological questions about past peoples and events (e.g., the date of the Trojan War, the dates of poets), and to use such evidence in more literary studies (e.g., Euripides, Pindar). Centuries later, in the Roman empire, two near contemporaries, at work in very different genres, benefitted from this scholarly tradition. Plutarch wrote his biographies based on reading he did in libraries,

---

[96]See Develin 57 for a brief discussion about the identification of Aristides.

though he used inscriptions taken from secondary sources only occasionally for small matters of interpretation. Pausanias wrote his guide to the antiquities of Greece, visiting the sites himself and quoting or summarizing inscriptions he found there.

Works Cited

Blinkenberg, Chr. 1912. *La Chronique du Temple lindien.* Vol. VI. Copenhagen.

Bloch, H. 1940a. "The Historical Literature of the Fourth Century." *HSCP* Suppl. 1: 355–76.

———. 1940b. "Herakleides Lembos and his *Epitome* of Aristotle's *Politeiai.*" *TAPA* 71: 27–39.

Boegehold, A. L. 1972. "The Establishment of a Central Archive at Athens." *AJA* 76: 23–30.

———. 1990. "Andokides and the Decree of Patrokleides." *Historia* 39: 149–62.

Bosworth, A. B. 1970. "Aristotle and Callisthenes." *Historia* 19: 407–13.

Bousquet, J. 1984. "Delphes et les 'Pythioniques' d'Aristote." *REG* 97: 374–80.

Bowra, C. M. 1938. "Aristotle's Hymn to Virtue." *CQ* 32: 182–89.

Bradeen, D. W. 1963. "The Fifth-Century Archon List." *Hesperia* 32: 187–208.

Cadoux, T. J. 1948. "The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides." *JHS* 68: 70–123.

Camp, J. McK. 1971. "Greek Inscriptions: Tragedies Presented at the Lenaia of 364/3 B.C." *Hesperia* 40: 302–7.

Chambers, M. 1957. Review of Jacoby, *FGH* 3. *CP* 52: 130–32.

Chaniotis, A. 1988. *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften.* Stuttgart.

Chroust, A.-H. 1973. *Aristotle: New Light on his Life and on Some of his Lost Works.* 2 vols. London.

Cobet, C. G. 1873. "Miscellanea Philologica et Critica." *Mnemosyne* 1: 97–142.

Connor, W. R. 1968. *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens.* Washington, D.C.

Develin, R. 1989. Athenian Officials 684–321 B.C. Cambridge.

Dilts, M. R. 1971. *Heraclidis Lembi: Excerpta Politiarum.* Durham, N.C.

Dow, S. 1933. "The List of *Archontes, IG* 2^2.1706." *Hesperia* 2: 418–46.

———, and A. H. Travis. 1943. "Demetrios of Phaleron and his Lawgiving." *Hesperia* 12: 144–65.

Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes*, Birds. Oxford.

Düring, I. 1957. *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition.* Göteborg.

Edmonson, C. N. 1982. "Onesippos' Herm." *Hesperia* Suppl. 19: 48–50.

Edmunds, L. 1971. "The Religiosity of Alexander." *GRBS* 12: 363–91.

Fehling, D. 1989. *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention, and Narrative Art.* Trans. J. G. Howie. Leeds.

Finley, M. I. 1983. "The Ancient Historian and his Sources." In E. Gabba, ed., *Tria Corda: Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano.* Como. 201–14.

Flower, M. A. 1994. *Theopompus of Chios.* Oxford.

Frost, F. 1961. "Some Documents in Plutarch's Lives." *C&M* 22: 182–94.

Gomme, A. W., A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover, eds. 1945–. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides.* Oxford.

Gottschalk, H. B. 1980. *Heraclides of Pontus.* Oxford.

Habicht, Chr. 1985. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece.* Berkeley.

Hammond, N. G. L., and G. T. Griffith. 1979. *A History of Macedonia.* Vol. II. Oxford.

———, and F. W. Walbank. 1988. *A History of Macedonia.* Vol. III. Oxford.

Harris, D. 1995. *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion.* Oxford.

Holwerda, D. 1991. *Scholia in Aves.* Vol. II.3. Groningen.

Hornblower, S. 1987. *Thucydides.* Baltimore.

Huxley, G. 1973. "Aristotle as Antiquary." *GRBS* 14: 271–86.

————. 1979. "Historical Criticism in Aristotle's *Homeric Questions*." *PRIA* 79: 73–81.

Jacoby, F. 1923–. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin.

————. 1949. *Atthis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford.

Jeffery, L. H. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*. Rev. ed. by A. W. Johnston. Oxford.

Keaney, J. J. 1974. "Theophrastus on Greek Judicial Procedure." *TAPA* 104: 179–94.

MacDowell, D. M. 1978. *The Law in Classical Athens*. London.

Meiggs, R. 1966. "The Dating of Fifth-Century Attic Inscriptions." *JHS* 86: 86–98.

————. 1972. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford.

————, and D. M. Lewis. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. Rev. ed. Oxford.

Meritt, B. D., H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor. 1939. *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. Vol. I. Cambridge, MA.

————. 1950. *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. Vol. III. Princeton, N.J.

Miles, M. M. 1989. "A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous." *Hesperia* 58: 131–249.

Miller, S. G. 1978. "The Date of the First Pythiad." *CSCA* 11: 127–58.

Momigliano, A. 1972. "Tradition and the Classical Historian." *History and Theory* 11: 279–93.

Mosshammer, A. A. 1979. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*. Lewisburg, PA.

Ostwald, M. 1955. "The Athenian Legislation against Tyranny and Subversion." *TAPA* 86: 103–28.

————. 1986. *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law*. Berkeley.

Pearson, L. 1942. *The Local Historians of Attica*. Philadelphia, PA.

Pelling, C. B. R. 1979. "Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives." *JHS* 99: 74–96.

————. 1988. "Aspects of Plutarch's Characterisation." *ICS* 13: 257–74.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1968. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. 2nd ed. Rev. by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis. Oxford.

Plommer, W. H. 1969. "The Tyranny of the Archon List." *CR* 19: 126–29.

Podlecki, A. J. 1969. "The Peripatetics as Literary Critics." *Phoenix* 23: 114–37.

Posner, E. 1972. *Archives in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA.

Pritchett, W. K. 1971. "The Location of the *Lapis Primus*." *GRBS* 8: 113–19.

————. 1993. *The Liar School of Herodotos*. Amsterdam.

Rhodes, P. J. 1991. "The Athenian Code of Laws, 410–399 B.C." *JHS* 111: 87–100.

————. 1993. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian* Athenaion Politeia. Rev. ed. Oxford.

Robertson, N. 1990. "The Laws of Athens, 410–399 B.C.: the Evidence for Review and Publication." *JHS* 110: 43–75.

Schweigert, E. 1940. "Greek Inscriptions." *Hesperia* 9: 309–57.

Seager, R. 1969. "The Congress Decree: Some Doubts and a Hypothesis." *Historia* 18: 129–41.

Shear, Jr., T. L. 1971. "The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1970." *Hesperia* 40: 241–79.

Sickinger, J. P. 1994. "Inscriptions and Archives in Classical Athens." *Historia* 43: 286–96.

Spoerri, W. 1988. "Epigraphie et littérature: à propos de la liste des Pythioniques à Delphes." In D. Knoepfler, ed., *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque*. Neuchâtel. 111–40.

Stadter, P. A. 1988. "The Proems of Plutarch's *Lives*." *ICS* 13: 275–95.

————. 1989. *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles*. Chapel Hill, N.C.

Starr, R. J. 1987. "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World." *CQ* 37: 213–23.

Stroud, R. S. 1974. "An Athenian Law on Silver Coinage." *Hesperia* 43: 157–88.

————. 1978. "State Documents in Archaic Athens." In *Athens Comes of Age: from Solon to Salamis*. Princeton, N.J. 20–42.

————. 1979. *The Axones and Kyrbeis of Drakon and Solon*. Berkeley.

Tarn, W. W. 1913. *Antigonos Gonatas*. Oxford.

Thomas, R. 1989. *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.

Threatte, L. 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*. Vol. I. Berlin.

Tod, M. N. 1948. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. 2 vols. Oxford.

Todd, S. 1996. "Lysias against Nikomachos: the Fate of the Expert in Athenian Law." In L. Foxhall and A. D. E. Lewis, eds., *Greek Law in its Political Setting: Justifications not Justice*. Oxford. 101–31.

Tracy, S. V. 1990. *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.* Berkeley.

Travlos, J. 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*. London.

Turner, E. G. 1968. *Greek Papyri: an Introduction*. Oxford.

Walbank, M. B. 1978. *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century B.C.* Toronto.

Wardman, A. E. 1971. "Plutarch's Methods in the *Lives*." *CQ* 21: 254–61.

Wehrli, F. 1949. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Vol. IV. Basel.

———. 1953. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Vol. VII. Basel.

West, S. 1985. "Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests." *CQ* 35: 278–305.

West, W. C. 1989. "The Public Archives in Fourth-Century Athens." *GRBS* 30: 529–43.

Winters, T. F. 1995. "The Dates of the Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis." *ZPE* 107: 282–88.

Wormell, D. E. W. 1935. "The Literary Tradition concerning Hermias of Atarneus." *YCS* 5: 57–92.

Wycherley, R. E. 1957. *The Athenian Agora: Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*. Vol. III. Princeton, N.J.