

## 1. Introduction

---

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

### 1.1 Local Historiography in Boiotia as a Historical Problem

#### 1.1.1 The Limits of Literary Perspective

Greek local historiography includes those works dealing with the history of specific local traditions (cults, festivals), cities, and/or with other bigger political realities (e.g. *ethne* and kingdoms, among others). The genre was often studied in relation to Herodotus and Thucydides, to see whether the works of these two authors preceded or postdated local historiography.<sup>1</sup> On the one hand, Herodotus shared many communication strategies and stylistic features with local historians, judging from what we can read from authors who are generally dated between the second half of the fifth century and the first half of the fourth century.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, a series of uncertainties plague a number of the historians coterminous with Herodotus: the chronology of many fragmentary historians is fraught with difficulties, and some dates have been blindly accepted, even if the only rationale behind them was the application of the evolutionary principle of Jacoby (1909). According to this scholar, local historiography developed after Herodotus. In the absence of clear witnesses, he applied the principle where any local historian most likely postdates Herodotus.

This consideration would solve the issue of the reciprocal relationship between local and universal history, as there are no compelling arguments against both genres being

---

1 On the relationship between “great historiography” and local historiography, and on the critical debate following the seminal article published by Jacoby in 1909, see Appendix 1 for more details.

2 Cp. e.g. Fowler 1996; Fowler 2006.

coetaneous.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, the preexistence of an “historical thought” is another argument which adds to this view, along with the perception of the historiographical potential of the poetic Archaic foundational works.<sup>4</sup> These works contributed to the formation of local imagery, as will be exemplified by the range of poetic texts coming from and dealing with Boiotian myths. As a consequence, more studies have been devoted to specific aspects of the various local contexts and to local epic cycles.<sup>5</sup> As far as historiography is concerned, a re-evaluation of the dating systems in Classical historiography allowed Clarke (2008) to reassert the links between local historiography and universal history: in other words, there cannot be a local narrative without a consciousness of the contemporary association with a larger Mediterranean horizon.<sup>6</sup> This is intended as a common cultural reference to a world of myths and historical references. From the second part of the fourth century BCE, universal history explicitly engaged with local chronologies.<sup>7</sup>

These literary approaches to the style, date, and internal chronological methods of the historians slowly shifted the perspective away from Jacoby. It seemed appropriate to focus on technical terminology and on ancient reflections, without a blind acceptance of the sources. In fact, other studies recognized the ancient perception of local historiography as a genre with its own label and definition.<sup>8</sup> There is no ancient unambiguous label for local

---

3 This approach, however, is aporetic, since it forces the meaning of the points of contact between Herodotus and the local historians, or, sometimes, the weight of the local perspectives, into authors who mainly focus on other subjects.

4 Think of Ion's *Χίου κτίσις*, despite a growing belief that this actually was an elegy. A recent discussion in Federico 2015: 46–51; cp. Thomas 2014b: 163.

5 For instance, we may recall the recent start (2015) of an international research project, led by H. Beck and P. Funke, on *The Parochial Polis. Localism and the Ancient Greek City-State*.

6 Local history can also be seen as an instrument and an achievement of Mediterranean networks (on these networks, and their impact on local societies, see Malkin 2011 and, more to the point, Clarke 2008: 198). Connections among the Mediterranean coasts, in fact, can be detected through the exchange of goods, but these ties found expression also in the cultural sphere. It might not be coincidental that the supporters of a Phoenician origin, that of the myth of Kadmos, saw a confirmation of their supposition in 1963, when Babylonian cylinders were found on the Kadmeia in Thebes. The strongest advocate of an oriental origin of Kadmos was R.B. Edwards (1979); see 2.2.2 ad *ὡς οὐχ εὐρήκει αὐτήν...* for an overview of the problem.

7 Cp. Clarke 2008: 177. For instance, it has been suggested that Ephoros' point of view might be described as glocal, for the intertwining of the geographical plans (Nicolai 2013).

8 See Camassa 2010: 35–6, for the view that Clarke's position resembles the previous scheme of Jacoby.

history.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, the adjective ἐπιχώριος is frequently applied to local contexts and the tradition has preserved titles (*Boiotian, Theban, or Argive Histories*), which are distinct from those we commonly associate with universal histories. Annulling any distance between the two genres would therefore mean forgetting that such a difference was perceived by ancient critics and readers.

Local sources are very rarely indicated or isolated with the use of the adjective ἐπιχώριος: the adjective has few attestations in this general sense.<sup>10</sup> More often, it is used to distinguish and signal a tradition in the broader discourse of the author. In other words, defining a tradition as “local (*epikhorios*)” in the Greek world of the *poleis* and of the *ethne*, on the one hand, implied granting dignity to the *vox loquens*, so that there was a strong identification with the country of origin, as Thucydides does when he refers to ἐπιχώριος. On the other hand, in authors like Herodotus, defining a tradition as ἐπιχώριος marks it as distinct from the author’s Panhellenic voice and perspective; it sets it apart as a secondary stream of the tradition, so as to communicate these different layers to the reader.<sup>11</sup>

To sum up, Herodotus and the other (for us) fragmentary historians arguably partook in the same method and phraseology, despite their different goals and approaches to what we usually call “historiography”. We cannot therefore conjecture too much on the chronological relationship between Herodotus and the other Boiotian historiographers, simply because they might sometimes look similar in their *modus operandi*. In researching these ideas, the scholar can only aim to improve a partial understanding of these common aspects. Any assertion of a hierarchy, or of an imitation process, would be hazardous.

---

9 The expression “*terminus technicus*” (Jacoby 1909: 109 n.2 = 1956: 49 n.89 = 2015: 49 n.89) is actually imprecise. The term Jacoby applied it to, ὠρογραφία, only occurs in relatively late sources (Diod. Sic. 1.26.5: τὰς κατ’ ἔτος ἀναγραφὰς ὠρογραφίας προσαγορεύεσθαι; Hesych. *s.v.* ὠρογραφοί; *Et. M. s.v.* ὄρος; Diodorus arguably first refers to the ἀναγραφαί and his reflection; this is not immediately concerned with local history: Thomas 2014b: 149-50). However, it seems that the adjective ἐπιχώριος signals the local origin of the tradition, together with λόγος, in Hdt. 7.197.1 (Ambaglio 2001: 18; Vannicelli 2017 *ad loc.*). More than the composite noun with ὄρος, then, ἐπιχώριος was seen as the most congenial, for the strong distinction it conveys between a Panhellenic plan and a tradition held at a local level (see *supra* in text). This seems to apply both to written references and to oral memories, such as in Joseph. *Ap.* 1.27 (περὶ ἱστορίας...τῆς περὶ τῶν ἐκάστοις ἐπιχωρίων) and Paus. 2.30.1 (τὰ εἰς αὐτὴν ἐπιχώρια). Interesting occurrences already appear in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 2.49.4; 61.3; 56.4). For this terminology, see especially Ambaglio 2001: 18-20 and Thomas 2014b *passim*.

10 See Ambaglio 2001: 8-9.

11 For this analysis, see Goldhill 2010: 52-3 and Vannicelli 2017 *ad Hdt.* 7.197.1.

A more fertile outlook is one which focuses on the full context of the local perspectives that underlay these local historians. We need to ask ourselves what the particular conditions were in both the single regions and in the *poleis*, and try to see in which historical situations a local, historical discourse comes to light. This is a common approach for Athens (and at times, of Sparta), partially as a result of the relatively greater amount of information we have on these cities.<sup>12</sup> The historical context was permeated by a longing for a return to the *patrios politeia*: a conservative agenda that blossomed from the interest of intellectuals. Here, the emergence of local historiography coincided with an oligarchic agenda, as a recent study has suggested.<sup>13</sup> Most of all, Atthidography is a phenomenon which occurs in Athens without the necessary influence of the Herodotean work, needing no catalyst from the outside, despite the presence of Herodotus in the *polis* and the impact his work had in other genres of literature produced in Athens.

In the model proposed by Musti (2001a), great historiography with a general topic (for instance, Herodotus) was first followed by great historiography with a local topic and, lastly, by two kinds of local history, one with a local topic and another one with a general one. The second step of this development was *locally* dependent on the importance of the place and on preexisting conditions. The case of Charon of Lampsakos, in Ionia, therefore, even if he lived in the first half of the fifth century BCE, would be of no relevance for a reconstruction of the development of local history in other Greek regions.<sup>14</sup> In other areas of the Greek world, there were other specific conditions which enhanced the development

---

12 Hellanikos was the first local historian of Athens, even though it must be admitted that his Ἀττική ξυγγραφή was sensibly dissimilar from Androtion's work, which is now considered to be the first Atthidography. On Spartan local historiography, see the discussions by Thommen 2000 and Tober 2010; on the role of the local audiences, cp. Tober 2017. On Hellanikos, cp. the overview by Ottone 2010.

13 Camassa (2010: 38–41) remarks that the possible repercussions of the double political fracture in Athens are represented first by the oligarchic *coup d'état* of 411 BCE and, secondly, by the events around the end of the Peloponnesian War.

14 Ionia had a cultural and political history, between the second half of the sixth century BCE and the following century, that was generally different from that of other regions of Greece and Asia Minor. When the Ionian philosophers started coming to Athens, there was a new phase of Ionic thought and of the history of Athens, but it would be preposterous to link the two areas, despite undeniable contacts, in a general history of the prose genres and of historiography. What can be positively ascertained is that, at its origins, historiography and what we now call “mythography” was an Ionic phenomenon with which the prose writers of the fifth century BCE interacted. The conception of this link with the Ionic world is already present in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who underlines (*Thuc.* 23) that Herodotus' predecessors wrote in the Ionic dialect.

of local historiography. The case of Charon only sheds light on his region of Ionia; thenceforth, his chronology is of little help when we try to uncover the chronological relationship between great and local historiography in regions other than Ionia.<sup>15</sup>

Boiotia, just like any other region, had its own autonomous development before local history. This is particularly relevant, in light of the numerous titles that the witnesses credit Hellanikos with; it could have been Hellanikos, who came to Athens from Aeolic Lesbos and certainly wrote the first local history of a city, Athens, where he was a foreigner (and, politically, in a dependent position at that time).<sup>16</sup> Every region, therefore, should be considered with due respect to its political development, because a “political motivation”<sup>17</sup> inspired the writing of local history.

### 1.1.2 Local Historiographers and Local Imagery

This study investigates the early stages of the development of local historiography in Boiotia and suggests an answer to the existence of a significant epichoric production in the region. Whenever we talk about Boiotian local historiography in Boiotia, we are referring, on the one hand, to the authors from Thebes and from other Boiotian towns, who wrote about Thebes or about Boiotia. On the other hand, we also need to include those authors of different geographical origins, who dealt with the same areas.<sup>18</sup> Local historiography directly addressed the historical past of the community under investigation in a narrative form. As such, it represents only one of the literary genres which contributed to its representation and, at the same time, to the development of a sense of regional (Boiotia), local (sanctuaries, areas of contact), and civic identity.

---

15 This observation may have consequences for the meaning of the treatment of historical subjects in Asia Minor, by the ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφεῖς of Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 5.2, as is correctly underlined by Breglia (2012: 282–4).

16 See Hornblower 1994: 23.

17 Thomas 2014b: 165 and Thomas 2019: 391. In Argos, indeed, Hellanikos seems to have introduced a local perspective, which was made easier by the existence of civic, temple, and family memories; Musti 2001a: 517: “[S]u un tema così tipicamente locale, così specificamente argivo, come le *Sacerdotesse di Argo*, spina dorsale della memoria storica e della cronologia argiva, sarà un iniziatore Ellanico di Mitilene, che, come è il primo degli autori di una storia locale attica, il primo degli Attidografi, è anche il primo, potremmo dire, degli ‘Argografi’, nel senso di una prospettiva locale.”

18 This corpus is therefore based on the definition of Boiotian local historiography provided by Jacoby (1955a: 151–3).

Among the other literary genres that engaged in this expression of identity of place was, first of all, local epic poetry. This genre reflected the emergence of a national conscience in the centuries of Late Archaism. Pindar, in the early fifth century BCE, was aware of and interacted with this tradition.<sup>19</sup> Not only, in fact, as will be argued in the rest of this work, was Boiotia particularly rich in local historiographers, but the poetic sources for the study of regional ethnogenesis are numerous and various: ancient historians have long been able to work and profit from the Panhellenic and the local production of Pindar,<sup>20</sup> whose local horizon remains fundamental as a source on the internal perception of Theban and Boiotian audiences. We will see, for instance, how Pindar drew on a local tradition concerning a Theban site, on which a number of varieties coexisted during the fifth century BCE.<sup>21</sup>

We can easily imagine local historiographers at the end of the fifth century BCE being confronted with a variety of local traditions in verses, to which they reacted in a different way from Pindar. Another text which probably circulated in the region was the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Herakles*, which may have a Theban origin. The verses concerning the shield of the hero and myths as important as the birth of Herakles or his fight with Kyknos, are the longest and best-preserved insights on local narratives in the city, since they can be dated to the middle of the sixth century BCE (local epics being largely preserved in fragments, and often epitomized).<sup>22</sup>

Another poetic tradition which coexisted with local epics, the *Shield of Herakles*, and Pindar, and actually overcame all of them for its Panhellenic impact, was the list of the two armies (the Boiotian and the Orchomenian one) presented in the *Catalogue of Ships* in the second book of the *Iliad*. One reason why we need to read and study Boiotian local historiography is that this corpus of fragments gives us a view from within Boiotia itself of

---

19 See the complete commentaries on Theban local epics by Bethe 1891, Huxley 1969, and Davies 2015. Specifically on the *Thebaid*, Torres-Guerra (2015: 241-3) argues that the oral diffusion of this text may precede the actual composition of the *Iliad*. In fact, the *Iliad* seems to assume a previous knowledge of Theban myths as it was conveyed in the *Thebaid*. However, it seems that the written transcription of the *Thebaid* followed that of the *Iliad*, and it is argued that this happened in the context of the reorganization of the Nemean Games in 573 BCE.

20 See Olivieri 2011 for a systematic study of the meaning of Theban local traditions in Pindar.

21 Cp. Armenidas F 3. Here and afterwards, I refer to these fragments with their number in this collection; see the *Conspectus Fragmentorum* and the single titles for their places in the previous editions.

22 See *infra* 4.9.2 on this text.

the debate that those catalogues instigated in single Boiotian towns, centuries before the recollections of geographers and philologists interested in those texts. The two lists pertaining to Boiotian geography are documents of tremendous relevance on two levels: firstly, as a classified repertoire of regional geography; being listed there or not mattered in terms of the antiquity of single cities. More broadly, the list is also considerable for the alleged pivotal role it seems to tribute to the Boiotians in the Trojan expedition. If we accept the “ipotesi di lavoro” that this text reflects a *forma mentis* of the seventh century BCE, it becomes an important piece in the reconstruction of the meaning of “Boiotian culture” in the Archaic period.<sup>23</sup>

Finally, a more problematic place is occupied in the poetic realm of local traditions by Korinna. The chronology of the poetess may raise issues on her inclusion in a study on the Archaic and the Classical periods, but there can be no doubt on the relevance of the preserved materials for the appreciation of Boiotian local imagery. All these poetic texts (Homer, local epics, the *Shield of Herakles*, Pindar, Korinna) will be duly considered with reference to local historiographers, in order to investigate the way in which these genres interact with both each other and their audience. As Olivieri (2011) showed for Pindar, however, there is still a lot of work to be done on single authors. One of the goals of this volume is to focus on the local historiographers, who, for a long time, have only been considered as a side to Boiotian poetic sources.

This limit also applies to that other vast group of prose authors who wrote centuries after the early development of Boiotian local historiography but are nonetheless inescapable sources to understanding and contextualizing the genre under scrutiny. No study of

---

23 “Ipotesi di lavoro”: Prandi 2011: 241, after Musti 2006: 108-9 (on the overwhelming literature on the *Catalogue*, see the useful overview of Dickinson 2011). The isolation of the army from Orchomenos and from Aspledon, in the second part, may derive from the historical experience of the Orchomenian hegemony, which was interrupted by Thebes at the end of the eighth century BCE. At the same time, this bipartition may mark a phase of decadence for Orchomenos in the middle Archaic age (Bearzot 2011: 272; cp. Beck – Ganter 2015: 134). In general, on the Boiotian army in the *Catalogue of Ships*, two starting points are Hope Simpson – Lazenby 1970: 19-29 and Visser 1997: 239-363. The verses on the Boiotians have been used to prove the existence of a form of federalism in the region before the fifth century (Bearzot 2014: 43 and 85; on the Boiotian army in the *Catalogue*, see further Vannicelli 1996). The debate centers on the function of the Boiotian section in the general *Catalogue*, as well as on the relationship with the so-called “Smaller *Catalogue*” of the thirteenth book of the *Iliad*. It is also debated what we should infer from the absence of some centers and from the description of Thebes as Ὑποθήβαι. See helpful overviews in Kühr 2006: 54-70; Larson 2007: 32-41; and Prandi 2011: 240-1.

Boiotian local imagery can ignore the weight of the biographies of single figures from this region, either mythical or historical (think of Plutarch). Herakles is certainly one of the first names in this field,<sup>24</sup> based on the importance that the figure gained in the work of Aristophanes of Boiotia in the early fourth century BCE (FF 8; 9A–B). At the same time, one of the advantages of local historiography is that it gives a literary and historical resonance to politicians like Anaxandros (Aristophanes F 6), who would have otherwise gone almost unnoticed in an historical reconstruction often limited to the more relevant names of the Theban fourth century BCE.

Another important source for the reconstruction of the locale is represented by two texts that directly address the region, despite their respective differences: Strabo's ninth book (9.1.2)<sup>25</sup> and Pausanias' ninth book offer a unique holistic approach to the Boiotian region and to the multiformity of its traditions. In particular, Pausanias can be considered an avid gatherer of local traditions, in light of the frequent “ἐπιχώριοι-zitate” (“quotes from local sources”), which constellate Pausanias' *Periegesis*, a tremendous collection of traditions otherwise unknown.<sup>26</sup> These statements, however, should never be taken at mere face value because they are part of a complex creation of a “third space”. The idea of *third space* implies, as will be made clearer in the conclusions (6), that the picture provided by Pausanias on single Boiotian centres is not a pure denotative description, but the result of three levels of descriptions (denotative, connotative, and the combination of these plans).

To these late observers, any Boiotian centre was inevitably the result of three dimensions: the original function of the centre, be it a sanctuary or a theatre; the meaning this had and its cultural impact; finally, the combination of those encounters between the observer and the observed space, and thus its literary and emotional aura. The difference between a study on Pausanias' or Strabo's Boiotia and the Boiotia of the early Boiotiographers lies in the fact that, while all these authors provide us with a “third-space” depiction of the area, the local historiographers seem to be less influenced by external literature and political

---

24 For a picture of Thebes under the symbolic and instrumental figure of Herakles, see still Demand 1982.

25 On Strabo, see Wallace 1979.

26 “Ἐπιχώριοι-zitate”: Jacoby 1955a: 153. We should be careful to avoid always referring, in Pausanias, “meccanicamente [...] a una fonte orale e locale ogni notizia introdotta da un “dicono” (Musti 1982: XLII). See also Pretzler 2005: 245–6, Gartland 2016b on Pausanias, and Luraghi 2001b for a study of the “λέγουσι” (“they say”)-quotes in Herodotus.

agendas. The view of local historiography presents an internal discourse, living after and in conjunction with the aforementioned poetical sources, but probably independent of what was being said about Boiotia, Thebes, and Chaironeia in Athens and beyond in the same decades.

### 1.1.3 Structure of the Book and Role of Local Historiography in Boiotian Studies

The present study focuses on the first stage of Boiotian local historiography, from the end of the fifth century BCE (Hellanikos' lifespan), to the age of the Theban hegemony, where we can very reasonably date Daimachos of Plataia. This universal historian represents a transitional figure towards a new phase of the genre and was consequently chosen as a *terminus post quem*. The choice to prioritize an emic perspective and a specific genre, often ignored or insufficiently used in the study of ancient Boiotia, distinguishes this book from the previous single studies on the other sources: what existed before (poetry) and after (Pausanias, Strabo) will be included in a bottom-up approach.<sup>27</sup> It is necessary to read Armenidas with the help of Pindar, and not the other way around.

It is also important to highlight the relevance of Boiotian audiences and their own experiences of the land. From this point of view, this investigation will be in line with current scholarly work that considers the central role of local audiences in the reception of local historiography.<sup>28</sup> It now seems less safe to place the development of a cultural phenomenon in a mere philological/literary perspective, as if the so-called “great historiography” justified and prompted the promotion and the very need of a local historiography. As a consequence, an emic outlook is useful, when applied to Boiotia, for a specific and verifiable approach to the birth of the genre.

In order for this emic perspective to be fully appreciated and gathered, it is necessary to closely reconsider a series of problems that pertain to the nature of the evidence under investigation. For this reason, this work is also a philological study of the fragments of the genre belonging to Hellanikos, Armenidas, Aristophanes of Boiotia, and Daimachos. The

---

<sup>27</sup> Cp. the previous paragraph.

<sup>28</sup> See e.g. Tober 2017.

philological approach is combined with an historical commentary on the fragments. The uneven treatment of these texts in the available collections has hindered a full appreciation of their impact on the historical landscape of Boiotia. Lastly, the conclusions place the results of this research in the wider spectrum of Boiotian history and society, in order to understand how this local culture improves our knowledge of Theban and Boiotian society in the fourth century BCE.

The conclusions will provide a general synopsis of themes dealt with in the fragments, such as the original population of the region (6.1.1), or the foundation traditions of cities like Thebes, Chaironeia, and Orchomenos (6.1.2). This quick exemplification shows a potential variety of topics, which could also directly include contemporary events (6.1.4), even though the commentary tends not to highlight extensively the potential reference to present events.

We benefit today from a renewed attention both to problems of cultural history and to Boiotia as a fertile laboratory for the historical issue of localism. Since the important publication of a *kioniskos* in 2006,<sup>29</sup> meaningful epigraphic discoveries have redefined our entire picture of the history of the region from the Archaic to the Classical Age. The proceedings of two important conferences on Boiotia held in 2011 and in 2012 made available new documents and analyses on the history of the region from the Archaic to the Roman period. As a result of these discussions, the idea that Boiotia was an area without any regional institution in the first half of the fifth century is rejected.<sup>30</sup> The explicit mention of federal magistracies, whose citation in the literary sources was subject to excessive scepticism in the past, deserves further thinking, in view of a necessary new history of both the region and Thebes.<sup>31</sup> We are slowly beginning to become better acquainted with a number of characters of Classical Thebes who had only been mentioned once in our literary sources. From now on, for instance, it will be hard to read the well-

---

29 Aravantinos 2006.

30 The first conference, “The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Developments” was held in Berkeley in 2011 (proceedings: Papazarkadas 2014a); the second conference, “Boeotia in the Fourth Century BC”, was held in Oxford in 2012 (proceedings: Gartland 2016a).

31 Cp. Beck – Ganter 2015.

known *daphnerikon* of Pindar (F 94b S.-M.) without identifying his Agasikles with the namesake boundary-commissioner mentioned by an inscription only recently published.<sup>32</sup>

The present research on localism in Boiotia also profited from the different studies by Angela Kühr (2006) and Stephanie Larson (2007), which were both momentous in redefining new perspectives on the birth of the Boiotian *ethnos* in the Archaic age. These monographs took advantage of a series of new anthropological and political trends in classics, such as studies on ethnicity,<sup>33</sup> intentional history,<sup>34</sup> and discursive theory.<sup>35</sup> We generally define “ethnogenesis” as a complex process whose artificiality should not be overstressed. Local historians, for instance, seem to have had a critical approach in the field of cultural contacts between Boiotia and Thessaly. In other words, the local population was engaging in a critical way with these traditions and did not blindly believe in one-way migration theories.<sup>36</sup>

In addition, Daniel Berman (2015) expanded our picture of the real and imagined topography of Thebes, putting together the diverse strands which contributed to its description in the literary sources. The current study proposes a different perspective, drawing on a specific class of evidence to see what locales are studied and how they are described, instead of beginning from a “Thebanocentric” outlook. For this very reason, we must remember the studies on ancient federalism: after the relevant legacy of the last century,<sup>37</sup> new outlooks have drawn a more nuanced description of the relationship between the hegemonic city and the confederate cities.<sup>38</sup>

While it is impossible to study Classical Boiotian history and historiography without acknowledging the central place of Thebes, other cities and stances gain prominence when we include new approaches on ancient federalism in our methodology. It is worth noting how, compared with the Thebanocentric administration of the League born after

---

32 Papazarkadas 2018.

33 On this influence, see the debate between McNerney (2008) and Zahrnt (2008).

34 See Foxhall – Gehrke – Luraghi 2010 for an introduction to this approach.

35 Consider the influence of philosophers like Bourdieu (1972) on Skinner (2012); on this matter, cp. Tufano 2014.

36 See *infra* ch. 6.

37 Sordi 1958; Moretti 1962; Larsen 1968; Aigner Foresti 1994; Beck 1997.

38 Bearzot 2004; Bearzot 2014; Beck – Funke 2015, presented as the “New Larsen”, which provides a comprehensive and updated study on Greek federalism. See *infra* on conflicting perceptions of Theban hegemony in the sources.

379 BCE,<sup>39</sup> in the same years the Boiotian historiographers were prioritizing other cities and traditions in the region. This divergence might reflect the simple reception of different traditions, but it is important to include this world and these options before excluding the “other Boiotians” from a history of these years. Tanagra, based on what we can see from Aristophanes’ fragments (FF 1-2), was still a powerful city and any political decline it may have suffered does not seem to have impeded the survival of a lively civic identity.

For all these reasons, recent developments in the study of the region require a renewed interest in fragments of Boiotian local historiography, because the light they shed on the region can now be better understood and contextualized. In the tradition of studies on Greek local historiography, this literary genre as an expression of localism has not attracted the necessary attention, with only a few recent contributions on the relationship between universal and local historiography.<sup>40</sup> The success of studies on mythography, exemplified by the two volumes of text and commentary of the early Greek mythographers by R. Fowler (*EGM I and II*), focused primarily on literary and cultural aspects. More relevance, for instance, could be given to the historical context.

In the specific case of Boiotian local historiography, this might be due to the lack of scholarship on the development of local historiography in Boiotia, with the notable exception, after the observations by F. Jacoby, of an overview by Zecchini (1997). Sparta, for instance, has attracted more interest, and its local historiography has received a number of relevant studies.<sup>41</sup> A second reason for the reduction of local historiography to a “literary issue”, was the idea of the local historians being contemporary with and sharing crucial methodological points with Herodotus. This presumption shifted the focus of the discussion, which tended to deal with the political use of this literary genre, or with the complicated relationship between regional and poleic histories. Scholars were mostly

---

39 On the non-democratic character of this League, see, with further scholarship, Rhodes 2016.

40 Cp. Tober 2010; Thomas 2014a; Thomas 2014b; Tober 2017.

41 See Tober 2010, with previous scholarship.

attracted by Atthidography,<sup>42</sup> while some partial exceptions generally limit themselves to the history of single *poleis*.<sup>43</sup>

## 1.2. Boiotian Early Historiography in Context

### 1.2.1. The Tools of the Historian

By giving priority to the local and to the political perspective, we scrutinize both the historical frame and the local picture of a specific region that is the object of a historiographical work. This allows for a better understanding of the development of the genre and of the required prerequisites. This approach works for the Boiotian case: here, there is an interesting coincidence between the political upsurge of the Boiotian *koinon* in the late fifth century, after the battle of Koroneia (447 BCE), and the sudden emergence of several local historiographers, among whom we can count a foreigner, Hellanikos. This coincidence might be related, as will be argued in the next paragraph, to the demand of the audience and, at the same time, to the necessity to transcribe and fix a number of regional traditions, whose development in the realm of single areas had not yet found a compact regional framework. To briefly sum it up, while the idea of Boiotia was almost two centuries old, when the first local historiographers wrote *Boiotian Histories*, there existed a Boiotian League that had transferred that social construction into something more tangible to the same audience.

In fact, there is something concrete behind the formation of a cultural phenomenon like Boiotian local historiography. Despite the probable preexistence of a political and cultural regional entity, a political frame was necessary to foster attention to public archives and to their reorganization. This constitutes a premise for the birth of local historiography.

---

42 Political use of the literary genre: Fowler 1996. Relationship between regional and poleic histories: Fowler 2014a. Atthidography: Harding 2007.

43 See *supra* for the advantages and the limits of this literary perspective.

Aristophanes the Boiotian reportedly referred to lists of archons (T 2),<sup>44</sup> but we are poorly informed on where and how these structures were organized in Thebes. Civic reasons, namely rights of citizenship, and then religious administration and justice,<sup>45</sup> were the rationale behind the slow formation of an archival culture in ancient Greece: the phenomenon is attested from the seventh century BCE,<sup>46</sup> and reached Athens in the second half of the sixth century.<sup>47</sup> We can now prove the existence of public figures, in the function of secretaries, from the end of the sixth century:<sup>48</sup> sculptures understood as depictions of public γραμματεῖς seem to represent these public secretaries in Athens<sup>49</sup> and in Thebes (see a small statue now in the Louvre Museum, CA 684, showing a sitting scribe).<sup>50</sup>

Local historiography in Boiotia was therefore later than Herodotus, not as a reaction to his *Histories*, but for different reasons. The choice to limit the study to Hellanikos, Armenidas, Aristophanes, and Daimachos is due to three considerations: first, these were the first authors who dealt with Boiotian local history. Second, a reappraisal of the evidence allows us to date them between the second half of the fifth century and the age of the Theban hegemony. In fact, we need to consider the new epigraphic habit in Boiotia in this period. The scanty linguistic evidence of the fragments can be linked to a general acceptance of the Ionic dialect and script in the years of the Theban hegemony. We cannot rule out the possibility that this regional evolution had an impact on other features of these works of Boiotian local historiography.<sup>51</sup> Lastly, after Daimachos, Boiotian historiography seems to significantly differ from this phase (see *infra* 2.5 on this stage).

---

44 Cp. 4.1.

45 On the civic function of the archives, see in general Pébarthe 2013.

46 See Lazzarini 1997.

47 Sickinger 1999: 35–92; Rhodes 2001a: 33–44. As argued by Thomas (1989: 38–94), a primary instinct of conservation was caused by a documentary mindset, i.e. an appreciation and use of archive documents. According to Rhodes (2001b: 139), these conditions were effective in Athens – and, it would seem, in Thebes too – only from the last quarter of the fifth century.

48 Cp. the ποιnikaστᾶς Spensithios in Crete (Effenterre – Ruzé n.22).

49 Three items on the Akropolis (530–20 BCE): cp. Boffo 2003: 9 and n.12; Faraguna 2005b: 68 and n.3.

50 See Sirat 1987, *spec.* 46–8.

51 See *infra* 1.2.2.

Although we would like to know more about local literary prose, for the time being the only evidence comes from epigraphic texts. The epichoric script survives until the second half of the seventies, when it is slowly superseded by the Ionic-Attic alphabet, perhaps as a result of the cultural tradition it was attached to. Scholars are now inclined to date this transition to the seventies.<sup>52</sup>

Another recent development in Boiotian studies, which must be taken into account, concerns the reason underlying this pattern change from the epichoric script to the Ionic-Attic alphabet. The common view is that its introduction, probably imposed by Thebes, was the result of the democratic stance of the new leaders and institutions of the Boiotian *koinon*.<sup>53</sup> A further explanation, however, might consist both in Thebes' desire to assert itself as a Panhellenic power by means of a medium of high readability and, probably, in direct concurrence with the epigraphic habit of Thebes' main hegemonic rival in these years, namely, Athens.<sup>54</sup> We should also consider the circulation of Herodotus' *Histories*: we lack exact evidence of this, but time must be a factor of consideration so that his work could circulate and gain a potential influence in regions other than Attica.

This work therefore aims at an improvement and at an enrichment of our knowledge in two areas: in the first place, it is an original in-depth study on the history of Boiotia in a crucial age, when a lively political evolution was combined with an historiographical production, attracting external (Hellanikos) and internal voices. Secondly, the Boiotian case study shows how a different approach to the problem of the relationship between local *vs.* universal history (which gives dimension to the historical processes happening in the region dealt with by the historians) allows us to address, and possibly solve, the problem from a local point of view, without having to lean on the greater, better known historians.

---

52 See Knoepfler 1992; cp. Vottéro 1996, Iversen 2010, and the profile *infra* on Armenidas (1.3.2).

53 Iversen 2010: 262–3; Mackil 2012: 337–9.

54 Cp. Papazarkadas 2016.

### 1.2.2. Boiotian History and Historiography: The Birth of an Audience

To exemplify the impact of the first local historiographers in the region, we need to look to later sources that occasionally offer glimpses on the intellectual milieu of Thebes and Boiotia in the period under investigation. Among these sources, attention is often paid to notable figures who were considered the architects of Theban hegemony, such as Epameinondas:

[T]hat man is not a philosopher, and he has not enjoyed any remarkable or special education, like your brother Epaminondas. But you see that he is naturally guided by the laws to do the honourable thing [...]. Epameinondas, on the other hand, [...] regards himself superior to all the Boeotians because he has been educated for virtue.<sup>55</sup>

This passage comes from Plutarch's *On the Daimonion of Socrates*, a short text which continues to fascinate us on many points:<sup>56</sup> this interesting narrative, composed as a dialogue on the liberation of Thebes in 379 BCE, interplays with Plato but also with other works by Plutarch, such as his *Life of Pelopidas* and, possibly, the lost *Life of Epameinondas*.<sup>57</sup> This eulogy of Epameinondas originates from one of the characters of the dialogue, Theocritus, who contrasts Chanor with Epameinondas: this second is marked as a philosopher, a man distinguished for his studies and his *paideia*.

It is now accepted that the real influence exerted by Pythagoreanism on Epameinondas was, when we carefully study the sources, cosmetic at best.<sup>58</sup> However, despite the exaggerations of the sources, the focus on Epameinondas' distinction in the Theban elites is an interesting observation. Plutarch had a good knowledge of Boiotian local historiography, even if his distortions and his agenda might mislead a modern reader. The cultivated milieu of the liberators of Thebes, in the *De genio Socratis*, is a probable reflection of the kind of learned men who listened to, and sometimes produced, history in Thebes in the first half of the fourth century BCE. These are the groups of people who,

---

55 Plut. *de Gen.* 3.576e-f; tr. D.A. Russell.

56 See the recent commentaries by Nesselrath 2010 and Donini 2017.

57 See Geiger i.p. for the possibility that Plutarch echoed arguments expressed in this lost biography.

58 Bucker 1993: 108. Buckler's article rebutted a previous contribution by Vidal Naquet and Lévêque (1960).

we can imagine, were around Herodotus during his short visit to Thebes in the previous century, retold by Aristophanes of Boiotia (F 5).

Our vague perception of the chronology of the historians limits any further attempt at contextualization. If Jacoby's succession is not completely challenged by the reconsideration of the witnesses, then an overlap of Aristophanes' lifetime with the decades coinciding with the death of the Classical Boiotian *koinon* (386 BCE) and the Theban hegemony (371-62 BCE) must not be excluded. The fragments restore a sense of the variety of civic traditions and convergences, which challenge and, at the same, confirm two commonly accepted prejudices on Classical Boiotia: the first being the mere acceptance of external narratives, be it from Homer or from the Athenian stage, and the second, the perennial strife, internal and external, as the common thread of the Boiotian Classical age.

Despite doubts on the exact chronology of these authors, their texts speak clearly about those idiosyncracies that were recognized long ago by Jacoby, in his introduction to Boiotian local historiography:

Die boeotische literatur zeigt [...] eigenheiten, die sich vor allem aus der politischen organisation der landschaft erklären, aus den spannungen zwischen dem für griechische verhältnisse straffen bund nominell gleichberechtigter städte und den ansprüchen Thebens auf die führende stellung im bunde (Jacoby 1955a: 151).

This general observation may still be considered valid, if we limit its extent to the first phase of the genre. Boiotian local historiography has a particular vitality during the decades which extend from the end of the fifth century BCE to the years of the Theban hegemony: during these years, the Boiotian *koinon* observes a number of transformations that depend both on the strengths and on the weaknesses of its federal institutions. The Classical *koinon* (447-386 BCE) represents the creation of a "Superstate" (Cartledge 2000), but the tendency of single cities to resist the hegemonic status of Thebes, and the recurrent re-emergence of different political agendas inside the *koinon*, confirms that this federal

institution was subject to constant political turbulence. Herodotus had already remarked on the limits of a monolithic view of Boiotian medism, insofar as single cities had chosen to partake or not to partake in an alliance with the Persians.<sup>59</sup> In Thucydides,<sup>60</sup> we observe how internal tensions still existed in the *koinon* as a result of oligarchic groups plotting against Thebes (424 BCE), despite the likelihood of previous support of the Theban siege of Plataia (431 BCE) on behalf of the Boiotians (two boiotarchs at Plataia: Thuc. 2.2.1).

Later events confirm this political entropy. During the years between 386 and 382 BCE, different political factions shared power in the local administration of Thebes, as exemplified by the fact that, in 382 BCE, both Leontiadas and Hismenias were polemarchs.<sup>61</sup> According to the *Hellenica of Oxyrhynchos*, these men were two of the most important men of two different parties in Thebes.<sup>62</sup> The disruption of the Classical *koinon* preserved their influence in town, before the Spartans occupied the Kadmeia and inaugurated an oligarchic government between 382 and 379 BCE. These are the years when the Leitmotiv of *autonomia* is variously declined by political actors on the international scene: Leontiadas pleads the rightfulness of the Spartan occupation of Thebes, on the grounds that Thebes might be trying to restore the old *koinon* and, therefore, attack the autonomy of single Boiotian towns (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.34). These paradigmatic events speak of a perennial tension that has been summarized in these terms:

All'orientamento democratico od oligarchico all'interno corrisponde una diversa visione del federalismo, peraltro fortemente condizionata dalle scelte politiche e ideologiche di Sparta sul tema dell'autonomia, e una diversa posizione nello scenario internazionale (Bearzot 2008: 213).

---

59 Hdt. 7.132.1: τῶν δὲ δόντων ταῦτα [sc. γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ] ἐγένοντο οἶδε [...] καὶ Θηβαῖοι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Βοιωτοὶ πλὴν Θεσπιέων τε καὶ Πλαταιέων.

60 Thuc. 4.76. Thucydides is referring to the plans of a group of Boiotians who were hoping to ally with the Athenians to change the internal constitution of the League: ῥαδίως ἠλπίζον, εἰ καὶ μὴ παραυτίκα νεωτερίζοιτό τι τῶν κατὰ τὰς πολιτείας τοῖς Βοιωτοῖς (4.76.5).

61 Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.25: στασιαζόντων δὲ τῶν Θηβαίων, πολεμαρχοῦντες μὲν ἐτύγχανον Ἰσμηνίας τε καὶ Λεοντιάδης, διάφοροι δὲ ὄντες ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἀρχηγὸς ἑκάτερος τῶν ἐταιριῶν.

62 *H.Oxy.* 20.1 Chambers: ἐν δὲ ταῖς Θήβαις ἔτυχον οἱ βέλτιστοι καὶ γνωριμώτατοι τῶν πολιτῶν, ὥσπερ καὶ πρότερον| εἶρηκα, στασιάζοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους. ἤγουντο δὲ| τοῦ μέρους τοῦ μὲν Ἰσμηνίας κα[ι] Ἀντίθεος καὶ| Ἀνδροκλ<εῖδα>|, τοῦ δὲ Λεοντιάδης καὶ Ἀσίας| καὶ Κο<ιρα>τάδας.

This different reading of the federal principles also led to a different declension of the principle of autonomy and, therefore, of the very necessity to respect and preserve local communities.<sup>63</sup> After the dissolution of the *koinon*, what occurred in Thebes likely occurred in all the other cities of the region: a return to the “world of the *polis*”.<sup>64</sup> Despite the perennial existence of a push to autonomy and independence in the single Boiotian poleis, in the fourth century BC they had reached a strong feeling of a regional unity. This had been facilitated by the development of ethnicity in the archaic period. For these reasons, it was easier to periodically reunite around a political, regional structure such as the *koinon*: “[t]he true value of the federal venture was that the *ethnos* and *koinon* had become one” (Beck – Ganter 2015: 144). The fascinating result of this complex process was that it allowed the survival of parochial worlds alongside the emergence of a perceived regional world. The birth of the Boiotians did not mean the death of single towns that had contributed to the birth of Boiotos and of the regional culture.

This is the cradle of Boiotian local historiography, because the very concept of a “Boiotian” historiography necessitates both the preexistence of a Boiotian identity and the full emergence of all its nuances. The texts confirm that these authors struggled to shift between local identities and a wider *Traditionskern*: while the tensions resulting from the “vertical diversion of power” (Beck 2001) in Boiotia remained strong even under the centralized *koinon* born after 379 BCE, a common need for a national history, despite all its limits, had already developed. Boiotian local historiography took its first steps in the years of the Classical *koinon*, which differed from the Archaic *koinon* because of its arithmetic structure, and from the *koinon* of the fourth century because of the different power held by Thebes. This political climate explains the relevance of traditions concerning Tanagra,<sup>65</sup> the Tilphossion,<sup>66</sup> or the Encheleis<sup>67</sup> as part of an historical moment when Thebes is not at the political core of the Boiotian *koinon*. The fact that Thebes still looms large in the extant

---

63 There is considerable debate on the existence of federal thought in the fourth century; cp., with further scholarship, Funke 1998; Beck 2001; Bearzot 2004.

64 According to the *Hellenika of Oxyrhynchos*, already in 395 BCE, Theban contrasts reflected in the other cities of the region: διακε[μ]ένων δὲ τῶν ἐν [ταῖς Θήβαις οὕτω] κ|αὶ τῆς ἑταιρείας ἑκατ[έρ]ας ἰσχυ[ρο]ύσης -- --]τα| [..πρ]οῆλθον πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς [πόλεσι ταῖς] κ|α|[τὰ τῆ]ν Βοιωτίαν κα|[ι] μετέ[σ]χον ἐκ[α]τέρας| τῶν ἐ| ταιρειῶν ἐκείνοις (20.2 Chambers).

65 Aristophanes FF 1-2.

66 Aristophanes F 11.

67 Hellanikos F 1.

fragments depends on the nature of the witnesses and on the fact that the later political evolution forced any external observer to delve more into this material.<sup>68</sup> To give an example of the interaction between the preexisting poetic traditions, as listed in the previous section, and the Theban culture of these decades, we can consider here a well-known passage of Pindar (*Ol.* 6.82–91, tr. A. Verity):

My mother's mother was Stymphalian Metope,  
fair as a flower, who bore Thebe, driver of horses,  
from whose enchanting spring I shall drink  
while I weave an intricate song for spear-warriors.  
Now, Aeneas, exhort your companions  
first to proclaim Hera Parthenia,  
and then to see if my truthful words  
can deflect that ancient jibe, "Boiotian pig";  
for you are an upright envoy,  
a message-stick of the fair-haired Muses,  
a sweet mixing-bowl of loud-echoing songs.

---

68 An interesting parallel comes from the slow formation of the local historiography of a modern country, Switzerland. Here, the oral songs on local battles and official chronicles had, for a long time, a parochial perspective: these traditions did not anticipate the existence of a Swiss community before the actual birth of the Confederation (1291, as the result of the common rebellion of Uri, Schwyz and Unterwald). After that moment, as single communities entered the Confederation, traditions of a regional resonance and the perception of a common Swiss past slowly entered local history. A proper "Schweizergeschichte", however, only developed between the fifteenth and the sixteenth century. Only in the first printed text, the *Kronica von der loblichen Eydgnoschaft* by Petermann Etterlin (1507), did the Roman past officially enter the regional memory of the Swiss federate cities. Unlike in Boiotia, then, the feeling of a common belonging postdated the birth of a regional perspective, as established with the political union. At the same time, the continuity of local traditions, as outlined in Boiotia, for instance, by the production on Thespiiai until the third century BCE, is a fact that local historiography of federate realities never eliminates. For an introduction to Swiss historiography, see Im Hof 2004.

This passage is commonly seen as the first attestation of the ancient reproach that the Boiotians were an uncultivated, rude population,<sup>69</sup> with Pindar confirming that the Boiotians were aware of this tradition. This fact is in line with Aristophanes of Boiotia's remarks on the rudeness of the Thebans (F 5). Such a reading is confirmed by the context, because Pindar is inviting Aeneas not to underestimate the poetical virtues of the Boiotians and, more particularly, of Pindar himself.

The scholiasts (148ab) suggest, however, that there is an indirect reference to the ancient "Υαντες of Boiotia, from whose name the common saying Βοιωτία ὕς was derived and made its way down to Pindar. The Hyantes were a pre-Kadmean population of Boiotia: Pliny (*NH* 4.26) and Pausanias (9.5.1) relate that they were expelled by Kadmos and the Phoenicians, and that they were autochthonous (Pliny: *Boeotos Hyantas antiquitus dixere*). This suggestion might provide another aition for the etymology of the region, because it assumes that the ancient "Swines" had become "Boiotians" and thus lost their boorishness. The scholium to Pindar and further secondary sources confirm that even when the readers of Pindar connected the saying with this population, they felt the need to describe the population as uncivilized. The Hyantes are imagined like the Encheleis, mentioned by Hellanikos (F 1, *History of Boiotia*). The name of the Hyantes vividly recalls a characteristic with which the Boiotians were identified by external observers (namely of being uncivilized pigs, ὕς); so did the ancient Encheleis ('Eel-men') include a reference to the fame of the Boiotian eels abroad.<sup>70</sup> This external, derogating fame was therefore deconstructed and rationalized: it was set in the past, where it could not enact its negative impact on the contemporary Boiotians.

Thus, Pindar indirectly anticipates the later tendencies of Boiotian historiography and the formation of a historical conscience in Thebes and in Boiotia. His focus on his own persona links the poet with Thebes and the whole region at the same time: Metope, the daughter of the Arcadian river Ladon, married the Boiotian river Asopos and gave birth to

---

69 On this passage and on its connection with the later saying "Boiotian swine", see, as starting points, Burzacchini 2002; Giannini in Gentili 2013: 467-9; Adorjányi 2014: 282-3. Cp. Müller 2013: 275-6 on Polybius' reprisal of this accusation: in the view of this historiographer, the idea of a "Boiotian pig" is strongly associated with the decadence of the region, as outlined in Pol. 20.4-7.

70 It is possible that behind the tradition of the Boiotian Encheleis, there is a rewriting of the connection with the eels: see commentary *ad* Hellanikos F 1.

twelve daughters, among whom was Thebe.<sup>71</sup> Pindar is therefore “a son of Thebes” in more than one sense, because he is alluding to his Theban and Boiotian identity. The regional horizon returns a few lines later through the apparently generic mention of the Muses. The epithet “fair-haired” (ἠυκόμων) is actually epic, but it could also imply that Aeneas, as the leader of the choir (σκυτάλα),<sup>72</sup> becomes both a general messenger of poetry and of Pindar, as a disciple of the Muses. In other words, the passage shows the complex intertwinings between regional and local identities in Boiotia, through the production of a local voice.

Even before the birth of a regional historical production, expressed outside in the materials collected by Hellanikos and inside in Armenidas, the Thebans started their own recollections of the past. With reference to more recent events, it seems that local reflections on the Persian Wars were fostered by the survival of the families that obtained the highest ranks in that focal decade. During the years of the composition of Thucydides’ *History*, and before, the Thebans still went to the gymnasium to meet the descendants of Anaxander, a ruling figure in the year of the battle of Thermopylai.<sup>73</sup> Rethinking about the past was not an easy task, as the likely expulsion of Herodotus from Thebes reminds us.<sup>74</sup> The historians knew, however, that a variety of explanations and meanings was always possible. It was perhaps in this way that a certain view began, according to which an oligarchy had forced Thebes to medize.<sup>75</sup>

The Thebans were willing to question the meaning of places such as the Seven Pyres.<sup>76</sup> Their acropolis, apparently a static *lieu de mémoire*, was open to new explanations, as the vagueness of the Theban Isles of the Blessed confirms.<sup>77</sup> Boiotian and Theban historians, moreover, do not seem afraid to question Panhellenic tenets such as the heroic status of

---

71 Cp. Diod. Sic. 4.72.1 and Apollod. 3.12.7.

72 On the complex interpretation of this noun, see Adorjányi 2014: 285–8.

73 Aristophanes F 6: see the commentary for the relationship with the Anaxander mentioned by Thuc. 8.100.3.

74 Aristophanes F 5.

75 Thuc. 3.62.3. The Thebans reject, here, in their debate with the Plataians, a collective responsibility: ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ ἡ πόλις τότε ἐτύγχανεν οὔτε κατ’ὀλιγαρχίαν ἰσόνομον πολιτεύουσα οὔτε κατὰ δημοκρατίαν. The medism of many Boiotians is described as an *akousion medismos* (3.64.5).

76 Armenidas F 3.

77 Armenidas F 4.

Herakles,<sup>78</sup> or the origins of the Aitoloi,<sup>79</sup> and therefore give the impression of a lively and rich atmosphere of cultural debates.

We also need to rethink our views on Boiotian patriotism, as it seems that the full inclusion of external traits, such as foreign characters in the genealogical tree of Boiotos,<sup>80</sup> challenges our current ideas of “national purism”. Thebes was not the only regional power in Boiotia, as centres like Tilphossa<sup>81</sup> and Chaironeia<sup>82</sup> interacted with the rest of the region in a fascinating remolding of their past. In Plataia, despite the long history of friendliness of this city with Athens and Athens’ influence on the city, Solon was not considered a military hero,<sup>83</sup> whereas people would willingly listen to what the Aeolian Mytileneans, their kin, had to say about Pittacus.<sup>84</sup> It is not clear when these traditions were diffused in Plataia by our source on them, Daimachos: his fatherland, Plataia, was destroyed in 373 BCE and refounded in 338 BCE<sup>85</sup>, and yet his date in the fourth century BCE can be confirmed. Amphion,<sup>86</sup> possibly a Boiotian hero who was contrasted to the Theban Kadmos, preceded the Theban Pindar as the local founder of a certain poetic style.

Boiotian local history, then, collected and gave a systematic space to several polyphonic traditions. Take, for example, the undeniable idea that the Tanagrans<sup>87</sup> would want to know more on the background and the etymology of their fighting cocks, a source of local pride. The people living on the shores of Lake Kopais, who exported its famous eels, might have found it fair enough in a *Boiotian History* to see a gap in the past occupied by a group of “Eel-men”<sup>88</sup> who had preceded the very Boiotians in the region. In Orchomenos, in the meantime, the success of the Homoloia required some reflection on the prehistory

---

78 Aristophanes FF 9A and 9B.

79 Daimachos F 1.

80 Armenidas F 1.

81 Aristophanes F 11.

82 Aristophanes F 7.

83 Daimachos F 4.

84 Daimachos F 3.

85 *LACP* n.216.

86 Armenidas F 2.

87 Aristophanes F 2.

88 Hellanikos F 1.

of the festival:<sup>89</sup> part of the duty of Boiotian local historiography was also to comment on these moments of contact among the Boiotians.

Historiography can thus be seen as one aspect of a wider process of recollection and reformulation of the past, which extensively characterizes Boiotia in the early fourth century BCE. The attention paid in many centres of the region to monuments of war that commemorate military successes, points to the apt definition of the region as the “dancing floor of Memory”, which also applies to the later Hellenistic period.<sup>90</sup> The military aspect does not dominate in the local literary sources, which must, however, be considered to appreciate the cultural history of the region in this period. Local authors tended to accept external phenomena, in terms of the language they used, and recovered a number of civic memories, harmonized in regional histories where Thebes resonates as only one of the many voices of fourth century Boiotia. It was a genre destined to slowly diminish in intensity and variety of interests in the following centuries, but it was surely not up to chance that the success of Thebes, in the polycentric Greece of the years after the Corinthian War, would be accompanied by a small, cultural, local revolution.

### **1.2.3. A History of Boiotian Historiography from Hellanikos to Aristophanes of Boiotia**

Among the authors of Boiotian local historiography, Hellanikos is the first one whose chronology is relatively well-known. Armenidas and Aristophanes may have been coterminous with him, if not slightly before his time (in the absence of explicit proof indicating that this is impossible). If the independent existence of Hellanikos' Βοιωτικά can be maintained, the Boiotian case may be paralleled with Argos.<sup>91</sup> In Boiotia, local historiography was a post-Herodotean phenomenon, if not contemporary with the first spread of the *Histories*, but this does not, however, imply a causal relationship, as previously stated.

---

89 Aristophanes F 3.

90 “[D]ancing floor of Memory”: Kalliontzis 2014: 367, after Plut. *Marc.* 21 (on Boiotia as the “dancing floor of Ares”, in Epameinondas’ words).

91 Cp. Musti 2001a.

Aristophanes of Boiotia has been considered the most convincing proof of a post-Herodotean genesis of local historiography in Greece,<sup>92</sup> even though Jacoby himself recognized the peculiarities of Boiotia. This region is the only one where (unlike in the other local histories) there is a meaningful difference in the production between Βοιωτικά and Θηβαϊκά.<sup>93</sup> In other regions, the most important city either orientated the genre from the very title (like the case of the Ἀργολικά), or ceded, also in the light of this specific case, to the vaster toponym (Ἀτθίδες). The Boiotian distinctiveness consists, therefore, in the coexistence of two models: (1) the *polis* histories, from whose chronicles came the “*terminus technicus*” used by Jacoby, *Horographie*, which became an alternative to *local history / historiography* for the English readership;<sup>94</sup> and (2) the histories of people and regions of the Greek world. Despite a necessary caution in the acceptance of the transmitted titles, such a distinction seemed to be programmatic in Boiotia.

There can be no doubt that, from the very titles, Boiotian local histories have a uniqueness which derives from the aforementioned singularity of the history of the region, often permeated by the hegemonic plans of Thebes. Boiotian uniqueness is a side of the historical and historiographical problem that comes from the necessity to take into account the local perspective.<sup>95</sup>

The highly problematic status of these local traditions already surfaces in Herodotus’ and Thucydides’ references to the history of the region in the period preceding the Persian Wars. The Battle of Keressos,<sup>96</sup> for instance, is subject to controversial dating, which may

---

92 The vast relevance of Jacoby’s studies in the field of Greek historiography certainly played a role in this belief; see his own presentation of Aristophanes in his seminal article published in 1909: “Der Lokalpatriotismus trat hier wie so oft der grossen historiographie entgegen. Das bekannteste Beispiel sind die Θηβαίων ἔργοι des Boioters Aristophanes, die jedenfalls nicht später sind, als die Zeit von Thebens politischen Aufschwung. [...] Der deutliche Gegensatz gegen Herodot ist nicht etwa erst von Plutach hineingetragen” (Jacoby 1909: 118 = 1956: 59 = 2015: 63-4).

93 Jacoby 1955a: 151.

94 This lexicographical problem also derives from the necessity to recognize a specific characterization in the genre of *polis history*: see Schepens 2001; Clarke 2008: 173 n. 16, and Thomas 2014b: 146-8. On this *terminus technicus*, see *supra* n.9.

95 Cp. Jacoby 1955a: 151, quoted *supra* at 1.2.1.

96 Plut. *Cam.* 19.4; *de Hdt. mal.* 33.4. The heated debate on the date of this event, which is commonly dated either to 570 BCE or to the years between the two Persian Wars, also centers on its political significance. It is unclear, in fact, whether the Thessalians were directly attacking Thebes or Thespiæ; see an overview of the discussion in Larson 2007: 196-8; Bearzot 2011: 274; van Wijk 2017: 193 n.47.

echo the repeated conflicts between the Boiotians and the Thessalians in the sixth century BCE. This impression is supported by its instrumental use in Plutarch's account of Thermopylai (*de Hdt. mal.* 33.4). Moreover, it seems that the fight did not really entail or relate to the foundation of the Archaic League.<sup>97</sup> More probably, the tradition might relate to a specific moment of regional tension in Boiotia, in a moment when regional borders were fluid. The fragility of a national memory before the end of the fifth century BCE also concerns another event, which has often troubled ancient historians: namely, the fight around Plataia in 519 BCE.<sup>98</sup> The battle of Keressos, and this episode, anticipate two features of Boiotian history that are worth stressing in order to better understand the evolution and the nature of Boiotian historiography: on the one hand, the history of the region is characterized by profound internal rivalries,<sup>99</sup> which will be resolved, in different times, through the dominance of a single hegemonic centre. There appears to be tension on the northern (Keressos) and southern (Plataia) borders that reflects a moment when the conscience of an ethnic community does not coincide with a clear regional identification. The hegemonic stance of Thebes was contrasted not only by Orchomenos and Plataia, but also by the fierce animosity of these two cities towards Thebes, of which we are very informed.<sup>100</sup>

On the other hand, the debate on the origin of Boiotian federalism echoes a contemporary interest, which is explained by the internal contradictions of the first sources and by the necessity to understand how far back in time we can predate the main line of the constitution of the Boiotian *koinon* reproduced in the *Hellenika of Oxyrhynchos* (19.2-4 Chambers). The political framework described by P, the anonymous author of *Hell. Oxy.*,

---

97 On this reading of the battle, see Schachter 2016: 50.

98 Cp. Buck 1979: 112-4 and, with a good discussion of the sources, van Wijk 2017.

99 We can recall, here, the anecdote retold by Herakleides Kritikós (F I 14 Arenz). The author speaks of the vigorous quarrelsomeness of the Thebans, ἀδιάφοροι πρὸς πάντα ξένον καὶ δημότην καὶ κατανωτισταὶ παντὸς δικαίου, (“indiscriminately violent towards anyone, stranger and local, and they despise all justice”, tr. S. Tufano); in general, it seems that the anti-Boiotian topic has a strong influence on this passage, on which see Arenz 2005: 204-5.

100 Cp. Bearzot 2014: 81-99 for a comparison with other federal situations and on how these internal tensions were seen differently in the fourth century BCE: “[...] [L]a dialettica polis/koinon genera fazioni con diversi orientamenti interni e diversi schieramenti internazionali, come nel caso delle lotte civili cittadine. La questione della ‘vertical diversion of power’ [Beck 2001: 370] costituisce così, in contesto federale, un grave fattore di instabilità, che va ad accentuare i problemi di convivenza tra poleis che caratterizzano la scena politica internazionale greca” (Bearzot 2014: 99).

was definitely in place only after 447/6 BCE (and it is possible, indeed, that the description is the result of a long process).

Whereas contemporary scholarship is increasingly skeptical about the presence of an actual federal government in the region in the decades of Late Archaism in the beginning of the fifth century BCE,<sup>101</sup> there is a growing understanding that a strong regional association was already in existence in Boiotia in the age of the Persian Wars. It is assumed that a form of political cooperation went further than regional religious meetings and participation in a common cultural milieu. This cooperation was able to express regional polities (and political offices), even if this was probably only for limited periods of time. A good example is provided by the early regional coinage with a “Boiotian shield”. The interpretation of this symbol has long connected it with the existence of a federal body that demanded its issue, but, in fact, these issues may have been more an example of “cooperative coinage”.<sup>102</sup> In other words, the existence of a regional habit does not necessarily indicate a regional body, since the coins may have been mere facilitators in a series of trades, without further implications.

It could even be argued that in Boiotia there was a form of pre-federalism for the period that goes from the first conflicts with Athens to the end of Athenian domination of the region. Without the premise of this pre-federal experience, it would be almost impossible to imagine such a compact and politically complex development, since it emerges from the institutional architecture of the Boiotian *koinon* in the second half of the fifth century BCE. In various ways, the Boiotians were starting to act as a common group and, as will be shown in the commentary on Aristophanes F 6, there is evidence that regional policies could be sought and implemented. Only in the latter half of the fifth century BCE, however, can we be certain on the existence of a federal organisation in Boiotia. The coincidence with the contemporary appearance of local historiography is striking. It can be argued that the literary genre needed the impulse and the slow formation both of the national feeling and, as exemplified by Pindar, of the formation of a regional culture.

---

101 Cp. recently Beck – Ganter 2015.

102 Mackil – van Alfen 2006. On the limits of these coins, see also Martin 1985: 233 n.27 and Schachter 2016: 50 n.53.

If we associate, then, the development of local historiography only to the formation of a regional identity, it might be legitimate to postulate that the genre of local historiography was born in Boiotia at the beginning of the fifth century. Judging from the few fragments of these local historians, however, and from Hellanikos' activity (third quarter of the fifth century),<sup>103</sup> the last quarter of the fifth century is a more likely scenario for the development of the genre. Between the thirties and the twenties, Athens saw the arrival of groups of Theban and Plataian refugees, with the important addition of Plataians who permanently stayed in Athens from 427 BCE.<sup>104</sup> This second situation, in fact, could make it less coincidental that the city saw the circulation and the success of anti-Theban traditions. Hellanikos certainly had trustworthy sources on Boiotia. He applied to the material they offered the same principles he had followed in his non-horographical works, distinguished by a strong chronological structure and an unvarnished prose-style. This consistency in his organizational principle suggested to Fornara that it was “externally and internally applied –applied, that is, in large and in small”.<sup>105</sup>

While this explains Hellanikos' place in the history of Boiotian local historiography, it remains to be seen how this context made space for local production. From the point of view of Boiotia, the birth of local history in the last third of the fifth century BCE can be understood as a concert of external (Athens) and internal impulses: the opposition to Thebes, and general opposition among the centres, elicited a number of local discourses and prompted a political interest in the writing of local historiography in Boiotia.<sup>106</sup>

We might use the same symbolic date (446 BCE) of the Battle of Koroneia, when the Athenians were expelled from Boiotia, to describe the centripetal forces of Boiotian figures. On the one hand, victory was soon perceived as a collective achievement that

---

103 Third quarter of the fifth century BCE: Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 T 1.

104 See Buck 1994: 14–5 on the groups of Thebans and Plataians in Thebes. It is uncertain whether the Plataians who came to Athens in 427 BCE were made actual citizens. The most important sources are two passages of Thucydides (3.55.2; 63.2) and a chapter of Apollodoros' *Contra Neaeram* ([Dem.] 59.104), which quotes the alleged document (τὸ ψήφισμα) associated to the granting of citizenship. This second source may be the reformulation of an original decree (Prandi 1988: 113), but its authenticity has been criticised (Canevaro 2010).

105 Fornara 1983: 21. For this methodological constant in Hellanikos' work, see Fowler 2001: 97 (Ottone 2010: 55 stresses the varied features of his production).

106 Cp. Thomas 2014b: 164–5, for a reaction to the excessive weight given only to literary considerations in some of Jacoby's dates.

marked a new era in the internal regional discourse. A victory trophy was erected on the spot<sup>107</sup> and the Thebans are represented by Thucydides as claiming that, on that occasion, they had freed Boiotia.<sup>108</sup> Only then – so Xenophon – did the Boiotians find that the pride and the relationships between Attica and Boiotia had really changed (*Mem.* 3.5.4). On the other hand, the expulsion of the Athenians and the return of the exiles meant the end of pro-Athenian regimes that, to our knowledge, had not been managed or directly influenced by Athenian politicians on location in Boiotia. We know, for example, that between 382 and 379, in the Thebes occupied by Sparta, the politicians were pro-Spartan Thebans, such as the aforementioned Leontiadas. More concise notes on the returning exiles of 446 BCE define these people as “Orchomenizers” (see Aristophanes F 6) and clearly underline how the so-called “liberation of Boiotia” was an action perpetuated from the outside, from these external groups (so Thuc. 1.113.2 and Diod. Sic. 12.6.2).

Xenophon mentions the Athenian version of the clashes between Boiotians and Athenians (*Mem.* 3.5.4). He refers to the battles of Koroneia and of Delion (424 BCE) a turning point in the relationship between Attica and Boiotia, in the same way in which Koroneia is used in the debate between the Thebans and the Plataians in the third book of Thucydides. However, in the fictional dialogue of the *Memorabilia*, Xenophon states that one of the weaknesses of the Boiotians (i.e., by the time of Xenophon’s work, of the Boiotian League) is the selfishness of the Thebans, which makes the Boiotians less united than “the Athenians” (read: the Delian League).<sup>109</sup> In Boiotia, different traditions on the same battle could awaken both different sentiments and opposite tensions, namely, of being one and the same Boiotians while simultaneously being in single groups that developed out of violence with other groups. These specific traditions probably elicited the lively activity of

---

107 Plut. *Ages.* 19.1-2. On the national importance of this battle, cp. Mackil 2012: 193-4 and Schachter 2016: 72.

108 Thuc. 3.62.5; 67.3; 4.92.6.

109 Xen. *Mem.* 3.5.2: Βοιωτῶν μὲν γὰρ πολλοὶ πλεονεκτούμενοι ὑπὸ Θηβαίων δυσμενῶς αὐτοῖς ἔχουσιν, Ἀθήνησι δὲ οὐδὲν ὀρῶ τοιοῦτον (on the anti-Theban implication of this passage, which might indicate the existence of “antithebanischen Ressentiments einiger Poleis”, see Jehne 1994: 54 n.43). It is generally assumed that the *Memorabilia* were written after the Battle of Leuktra, because Xenophon’s picture of Theban manpower (3.5) seems to allude to the Spartan defeat (cp. also Xen. *Eq. mag.* 7.3 and Dorion in Bandini – Dorion 2011: 295 nn.2 and 8). For this reason, there might be anachronisms in this work, given the fact that Socrates is alive in the dialogue. At the same time, the generic representation of the distance between the Thebans and the other Boiotians does not refer to specific cities, and it is therefore equally true for the League of the fourth century BCE and for the likely tensions which occurred after 446 BCE (on the date of the *Memorabilia*, see Dorion in Bandini – Dorion 2000: CCXL-CCLII and Bevilacqua 2010: 25-34).

the local historiographers who needed to work with this conflicting memory of the past. To be more precise on the beginning of this moment, we need to know more concerning the dates of Aristophanes and Armenidas, and about their connection with the spread of the Ionian alphabet in Boiotia. This phenomenon probably occurred in the seventies of the fourth century.<sup>110</sup> All in all, their similarity with post-Herodotean historiography, also from a stylistic point of view,<sup>111</sup> cannot be denied; especially the vagueness of the links with the Ionic of Herodotus (see Armenidas F 3), which indicates that there is no need to imagine these historians as necessarily inspired by him.

This connection between the history of the region and the emergence of the genre is based both on the content of the fragments and on the inclusion of the respective authors in a specific political climate. The historiographical description of single cities and their sanctuaries as “third spaces” may be seen as the literary result of a combination of lived and cultural experiences, which forces us to be extremely careful when we overstate any mythical reference. It is also hard to accept that the age of Theban hegemony represented, as in Jacoby’s reconstruction of the genre, a second stage in Boiotian local historiography. According to the scholar, after a first period characterized by a strong interest in mythical and antiquarian subjects, there was now a fertile terrain for the production of Ἑλληνικά.<sup>112</sup>

It is hard to believe that only now did it seem possible to narrate a story of the Greek world from a Boiotian point of view. The short life of the Theban hegemony<sup>113</sup> was paralleled, for Jacoby, by the limited span of this phase. After the Battle of Mantinea, the absence of a *Constitution of the Boiotians* in the corpus of the Aristotelian constitutions, and the coexistence of works on single centres of the region, such as Orchomenos, Thespias, and Plataia, reflects the fate of Thebes, destroyed in 335 BCE. Between the third and the second century BCE, local antiquarian historians granted new attention to the myths and to the peculiarities of the region.

---

110 For the possible relationship with this phenomenon, see *infra* 1.2.2 and 3.3.3.

111 On the style of these fragmentary historians, useful insights in Lilja 1968 and in Fowler 1996.

112 Cp. Jacoby 1955a: 152.

113 From this point of view, a careful consideration of the sources has allowed us to abandon the idea of a city profoundly poor and weak after the Battle of Mantinea (Schachter 2016: 113–32).

Since the present work concentrates on the first four characters of Boiotian local historiography (Hellanikos, Armenidas, Aristophanes, and Daimachos), a systematic rebuttal of the previous scheme would be preposterous and outside the scope of this study. That being said, the limits of the reconstruction appear blatant, on the basis of the complex characteristics of early production: the connection with the evolution of the *koinon* and with the fixation of a federal body did not impede, but rather, elicited the representation, survival, and revision of single poleic traditions of the region. Boiotian historiography was born with and without Thebes and, once we accept that Boiotian histories were also created to focus on single cities, there is no need to believe that the disappearance of the *koinon* coincided with a direct and fast consequence on the genre. Moreover, we need to consider the limited knowledge of so many figures and of the content of their works.

This attitude towards local Boiotian historiography resembles the same stance held in the pioneering work by Head (1881) on Boiotian coinage: experimental data (in our case, the fragments) are forced into a fascinating model, which is simply an application to a single case of an overarching theory.<sup>114</sup> A partial reconsideration of Jacoby's theory was at the core of the only study which has tried, so far, to revise some of those assumptions, as far as Boiotia is concerned.<sup>115</sup> While restating the undeniable prominence of Hellanikos,<sup>116</sup> further observations were made on the place of Armenidas and of Aristophanes in the evolution of the genre. It is not completely unlikely that Aristophanes' works still circulated in the second century CE.<sup>117</sup> However, this fact may not necessarily place him in a higher position than Armenidas, whose *Θηβαϊκὰ* enjoyed minor fame. The fact that the content of Armenidas' work that is transmitted to us is limited to mythical subjects,<sup>118</sup> does not allow us to rule out that these *Theban Histories* might also have touched upon contemporary history. Indeed, the model of Herodotean historiography was not the only one present at the emergence of local historiography, but there was also the impact of

---

114 For a reconsideration of the chronology of the Boiotian coins suggested by Head 1981, see Larson 2007: 68–73.

115 Zecchini 1997.

116 Zecchini 1997: 189: “Ellanico dovette dissodare un terreno vergine.”

117 In fact, Zecchini (1997: 190–1) gave new space to the thesis (Jacoby 1955a: 160; *contra* Wilamowitz 1922: 194 n.1), that Plutarch directly read Aristophanes. In any case, I would reconsider the reason why Plutarch referred to Aristophanes' works and whether the demonstrative function of his *De Herodoti malignitate* prompted a distorting picture of Aristophanes' original intent.

118 On the scarce fortune of Armenidas, and on the general tone of his fragments, cp. Zecchini 1997: 189–90.

Thucydides (note that nothing speaks against dating Armenidas to the beginning of the fourth century BCE). Furthermore, the ethnographic production beyond Hellanikos included names like Dionysios of Miletos, Charon, and Damastes, who could also have exerted an influence.<sup>119</sup>

Hellanikos' Βοιωτικά and Armenidas' Θηβαϊκά had to encompass the *spatium historicum*. Granting that it is hard to formulate a convincing suggestion on the chronological span covered in these titles, the tradition acts like a distorting mirror: the isolation of erudite observations on subjects like the original populations of Boiotia, or the mythical topography of Thebes, may be due to the overwhelming authorial weight of concurrent sources on evenemential topics, such as Herodotus and Thucydides. In sum, it can be hard to believe that, albeit in a biased way, Hellanikos and Armenidas, unlike Aristophanes (who may have cared more about this), narrated with completeness of detail the history of Boiotia and of Thebes. At the same time, it cannot be denied that when contemporary history found its space in ethnography (a genre not structurally different from local history), this attention also attracted early local historians of Boiotia.<sup>120</sup>

The relatively major reception of Aristophanes of Boiotia, who must not have lived after the second quarter of the fourth century BCE, is not necessarily a consequence of the transitional role played by him.<sup>121</sup> Writing at a local level about the Persian Wars in the fourth century, independently of where this happened, automatically implied facing Herodotus, both from a historical and from a literary point of view.<sup>122</sup> Nevertheless,

---

119 Zecchini (1997: 189) himself observes that the “assenza di tradizione scritta” in the region does not necessarily correspond to the absence of mythical traditions of high relevance, as Armenidas could exploit a “materiale ancora grezzo, ma ricco e stimolante.” The genesis and the material of these local historical traditions can be found in this sector of the oral tradition. Despite the uncertainties which still surround the dates of Dionysios and of Charon (see n.1537), recent approaches (Skinner 2012) show how the existence of an isolated premise is not a mandatory premise for the formation of an ethnographic horizon.

120 On the similarity of titles between ethnography and local history, see Jacoby 1909: 109-10 n.2. Cp. Tober 2017: 481: “[T]hey [*sc.* local historians] actually approached their own communities ethnographically.”

121 Zecchini 1997: 191.

122 For a general view of the literary Ionic dialect, see Cassio 1996 and cp. *infra* Armenidas F 3. Herodotus, among others, is praised for the sweetness of his style by the obscure Heracleodorus, a critic quoted by Philodemos in the Περὶ ποιημάτων (F 10 Janko), and by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (in the chapter of the *De Thucydide* [23], dedicated to the style of Classical historiography). As far as the well-known definition of Herodotus as Ὀμηρικώτατος ([Longinus] *Subl.* 13.3) is concerned, we must turn to an important inscription found in 1995 in Kaplan Kalesi, known as the “Salmakis inscription” (Isager 1998; further bibliography in Priestley 2014: 187 nn.1-2 and Santini 2016). The text is dated between

believing that this relationship had to entail a polemical tone or an outright rebuttal, means relying too much on the reading of Plutarch: we need to remember the explicitly rhetorical texture of the *De Herodoti malignitate*.<sup>123</sup>

#### 1.2.4. Writing History after Leuktra: Boiotian and Theban Histories

The Thebans refashioned, in profoundly different ways, their medism in the second Persian War. During their debate with the Plataians in Athens in 427 BCE (Thuc. 3.62), and in the ambassador's speech in Susa in 367 BCE (Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.34–5), they were able to provide pictures of the Persian Wars that were politically and ideologically convenient to those single occasions.<sup>124</sup> In the same years, furthermore, there were internal divisions in the ruling elites of Thebes, with Pelopidas and Epameinondas representing just one example and one faction among these aristocratic families.<sup>125</sup> At a regional level, it is important to recall the tensions within the *koinon*, arising from a Theban desire to impose a foreign policy on behalf of the other Boiotians.

In the Congress of Sparta (summer 371), which preceded the battle of Leuktra, the Theban envoys first signed a common peace with the other Greeks, before asking, the day after, for a change: they wanted to sign not as “Thebans”, but as “Boiotians”.<sup>126</sup> This would have

---

the second and the first century BCE and it was found close to the Salmakis fountain in the modern site of ancient Halikarnassos (Str. 14.2.6.656: ἡ Σαλμακίς κρήνη; Vit. 2.8.12). On the second column of this long text, we read that the city was proud for having “sown” (ἤροσεν) Herodotus, τὸν πειζὸν ἐν ἱστορίαισιν Ὀμηρον (2.43–4). This description confirms an important, local precedent for the literary definition to be found later in the treatise *On the Sublime* (*loc. cit.*). See Priestley 2014: 187–219 for a general review of the stylistic fortune of Herodotus.

123 On this treatise, see *infra* 4.6.1.

124 For an analysis of the meaning of these passages in Thucydides and in Xenophon, and for the reconstruction of the relationship between Athens and Thebes in the fourth century, see Steinbock 2013: 149–54; cp. concisely *infra* at 4.7.4. It has been suggested that the choice to erect a lion in Chaironeia, possibly thirty or fifty years after the battle of 338, was justified by the parallel lion erected at Thermopylai: the fallen Thebans, buried on the spot, were thus expiating the fault of their ancestors, and in fact the Thebans who fell at Chaironeia had also fought for Greek freedom (so Ma 2008: 85).

125 The reconstruction of two main factions in the internal politics of Thebes in the sixties of the fourth century BCE is not immediately easy, considering the scarcity of direct evidence in the sources. See Buckler 1980: 130–50, on the group around Meneklidas, a strong political adversary of Pelopidas and Epameinondas (*ibid.* 145–50; on political factions in Boiotia in these years, see Cook 1988; Landucci Gattinoni 2000; Lenfant 2011). It seems that the failed plot of the “Orchomenian men” in 364 BCE derived from internal opposition to these two men, as is argued by Bertoli 2005.

126 Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.19.

implied, at a Panhellenic and, given the characteristics of the *koine eirene*, at an international level, the official acknowledgement of the Boiotian *koinon*, a violation of the principle of autonomy stated by the Peace of Antalkidas in 386 BCE.<sup>127</sup> A number of historical problems concern the fact that, at that same congress, the Spartans signed as Λακεδαιμόνιοι on behalf of their allies without objection.<sup>128</sup> Moreover, during the previous common peace of 375 BCE, the Thebans did not ask for the right to sign as “Boiotians”, probably being listed as allies of the Athenians in the Naval League.<sup>129</sup> It is interesting, with reference to the external political resonance of the ethnics, that very often during the sixties, the Thebans would describe and present federal decisions and policies as “Theban” acts, in contradiction with their previous conduct at Sparta.<sup>130</sup>

The situation might betray a political debate concerning the choice of what national adjective to use abroad, on how to describe oneself in the years of Theban hegemony. We may recall here doubts concerning the date of an inscription which imposes the leadership of the war (ll. 3–4: ἡγεμονία| -ν [...] τῷ πολέμῳ) of the Thebans to the Histiaians.<sup>131</sup> The editors suggest two dates, one connected with events between the two cities in the years 378/7 BCE, the other one in the decade 371–62 BCE. The second date rests on the isolation of the Thebans as representatives of the whole *koinon*, a habit which is not infrequent in the so-called years of the hegemony. In the absence of certainty, this document, together with the literary witnesses of the common peace of 371 BCE, testifies to an inconsistency in the external representation of the Thebans as leaders of the league, and, consequently, to a possible internal uneasiness over the choice between “Theban” and “Boiotian”. A parallel problem is represented by our ignorance of the existence of territorial subdivisions in this period. Not every scholar, in fact, agrees with the idea that the seven Hellenistic *tele*, i.e. the seven units which formed the backbone of the Hellenistic

---

127 On the Congress of Sparta and on this common peace, see, with previous scholarship, Jehne 1994: 65–74 and Bearzot 2004: 93–107.

128 Cp. Buckler 1980: 51–2.

129 See Bearzot 2004: 96 and n.6.

130 See a list of these instances in Aravantinos–Papazarkadas 2012: 249 and nn.53–8.

131 Aravantinos–Papazarkadas 2012. The fact that hegemony is explicitly linked to war confirms, from a new perspective, what Bakhuizen (1994) argued with reference to the *synteleia*, the fiscal centralization which may coincide with a form of hegemony, but maintains, in theory, a different process of merging.

*koinon* attested in the third century BCE, can be attributed to this period.<sup>132</sup> One might actually suggest that, from a fiscal point of view, the entire region was assimilable to a unique “telos”, and that the persistence of the various cities was not reflected in a proportional element of the administration of the *koinon* of these years.<sup>133</sup> In a way, there was only now a form of political realism in defining as “Theban” what external observers would have defined as a “Boiotian” decision, since the institutions attested for this period are merely a board of boiotarchs and an assembly that was definitely controlled and influenced by Thebes.<sup>134</sup>

When one transposes this vagueness to the realm of local historiography, one sees how relevant the persistence of *Boiotian* and *Theban* histories might have been before and after Leuktra, if we can trust the witnesses on the titles of these works. With his annalistic work (*The Annals of Thebes*), therefore, more than with his Βοιωτικά, whose autonomy can be preserved, Aristophanes was offering a different perspective on the history of his region. Our fragments do not give explicit indications on how he judged Herodotus’ picture,<sup>135</sup> but, if Aristophanes wrote two works, this might imply that he wanted to specify different content through their titles.

One should also reconsider, perhaps, the very idea of a profound chronological distance between Aristophanes and the later authors of *Hellenika*, in view of the uncertainties which surround the dates of Armenidas and, especially, of Aristophanes. It can be assumed, in fact, that Anaxys (*BNJ* 67), Dionysodoros (*BNJ* 68), and Daimachos (*BNJ* 65) all wrote *Hellenika* and were active between the sixties and the forties of the fourth century, since they were all used by Ephoros for his *Histories*:<sup>136</sup>

---

132 The suggestion, raised by Knoepfler 2000: 359–60, is discussed and redefined by Müller 2011: 265–6. We lack direct evidence that the seven boeotarchs of the seventies and sixties of the fourth centuries BCE could represent diverse territorial interests.

133 See Müller 2011: 266 for this suggestion.

134 For a recent discussion of the institutions of the Boiotian League in the period 378–38 BCE, see Rhodes 2016.

135 As a matter of fact, we can imagine, from F 5, that as a local historian Aristophanes was willing to admit and even accept what was normally considered external prejudices towards Thebes. Priestly (2014: 43) has recently tentatively suggested that this fragment may betray an assertion of Boiotian pride for Aristophanes, but she recognizes the limits of the available evidence to support this.

136 Cp., on Daimachos, T 1 (see 5.1.3).

τῶν δὲ συγγραφέων Διονυσόδωρος καὶ Ἄναξις οἱ Βοιωτοὶ [τὴν τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἱστορίαν] εἰς τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν κατεστρόφασι τὰς συντάξεις.<sup>137</sup>

Since we are in the same years of composition of Xenophon’s *Hellenika*<sup>138</sup> (even if one does not know when the historical work of Anaxys and Dionysodoros started<sup>139</sup>), these local intellectuals may simply belong to the more general trend of completing Thucydides’ text. Anaxys and Dionysodoros ended with the Battle of Mantinea, which had also been chosen as an ending point by Xenophon for his *Hellenika*. This coincidence, however, probably implies more about the common acknowledgement of the historical value of this military event than the forced promotion to a Panhellenic level of a local, irrelevant episode. Moreover, one should also consider Xenophon’s stance, not always particularly benevolent towards Thebes.<sup>140</sup>

It is therefore more appropriate to speak about the emergence, in fourth-century Boiotia, of a Panhellenic historiography *parallel* to the local production of Aristophanes, than to imagine a regional development of the genre in just one direction. If an inference can be drawn from their titles, the new works of Anaxys, Dionysodoros, and Daimachos mark the confluence in a new genre of the local perspective, one which could leave a sign, similar to how Xenophon’s personal character and political experience influenced his output. It is hard to infer any more about the internal ideological view of these “böotischen Hellenika”, as Thebes was characterized by a lively and conflictual internal politics in the years of the

---

137 Anaxys *BNJ* 67 T 1 = Dionysodoros *BNJ* 68 T 1 [Diod. Sic. 15.95.4]: “among the historians, the Boiotian Dionysodoros and Anaxis followed the story of the Greeks until this year.”

138 The date of composition of Xenophon’s *Hellenika* is a debated issue, especially for the distinct character of the first two books: see briefly Badian 2004: 42–52. It is generally assumed that they were finished by the end of the fifties.

139 Assuming that it was one and the same book, and that the two authors were not separate figures: cp. Engels 2008.

140 Xenophon’s hostility towards the Boiotians expresses itself in the omission of important military successes of the Boiotian League. Since these were reported by Diodorus in his fifteenth book (whose main source is Ephoros), it was once believed (Stern 1877) that through Ephoros and Kallisthenes, the rich Boiotian local historiography on this period had found its way into Diodorus, as opposed to Xenophon’s philospartan attitude. The causes of this critical stance have been identified, most of all, in Xenophon’s personal relationship with the Spartan king Agesilaos, and, more generally, with Sparta (Buckler 1980; Cartledge 1987; Schepens 2005). However, it has also been recognized that the scale of this enmity should be judged with more prudence. In fact, in a few instances in his *Hellenika*, Xenophon acknowledges the military merits of the Thebans (6.4.10: praise of the Theban cavalry in Leuktra; 7.1.16; 5.8 and 19, for an exaltation of the capacity of respecting the order, which is also appreciated in *Eq. mag.* 2.1 and 4.10). It has also been suggested that Xenophon simply wanted to underline the structural limits, because Thebes could gain a lasting ἡγεμονία (Sterling 2004).

hegemony.<sup>141</sup> Pelopidas' expansion towards the north of Greece and Epameinondas' moves in the south and on the sea experienced a lot of dissent in Thebes. We also know that the destruction of Thespiiai (371 BCE)<sup>142</sup> and of Orchomenos (364 BCE)<sup>143</sup> confirms the persistence of a regional rivalry and of a hostility to the Theban hegemony and that this complicates the acceptance of a simple judgment, especially when we cannot read fragments that are clearly focused on political events.

One cannot say more on the political views of Anaxys and Dionysodoros, mentioned at the end of the fifteenth book of Diodorus, because Diodorus' witness of these two authors is too general to argue that Ephoros, his main source here in the fifteenth book, explicitly referred to them.<sup>144</sup> Despite the parodistic exaggeration, Lysimachos' remarks on Ephoros as a plagiarist, based on him copying Anaximenes, Kallisthenes, and Daimachos, is an indication of a historiographical debt.<sup>145</sup> But does this relationship exclude that Ephoros first, and then Diodorus, did not follow an independent line?

This Daimachos of Plataia, a universal historian, must certainly be another Daimachos than the namesake who wrote *Indian stories* in the third century. He was definitely “la più interessante figura storiografica della Beozia nel momento del suo apogeo” (Zecchini 1997: 193). However, the fragments of his Ἑλληνικά are not enough to make him a close supporter of Pelopidas and Epameinondas.<sup>146</sup> He puzzles the contemporary scholar, because, from a literary point of view, he was the first Boiotian prose writer who engaged in diversified production: he also wrote in a variety of genres characteristic of this age,

141 “[B]öotischen Hellenika”: Jacoby 1955a: 153; cp. Zecchini 1997: 191–3.

142 For the sources on this date, cp. Roesch 1965: 45; Buckler 1980: 21 [373 BCE]; Hansen 2004: 457. On the epigraphic habit of the city in the fourth century, from 371 to 335 BCE, see Papazarkadas 2016: 122–6.

143 “The *andrapodismos* visited on the city in 364 B.C. by Thebes [...] stands as the single most brutal act ever to have been exacted by one Boiotian community against another” (Gartland 2016c: 155). Cp. Diod. Sic. 15.79.3–6 (with Buckler 1980: 183 and Stylianos 1998: 497–8); Paus. 9.15.3; Plut. *Comp. Pel. et Marc.* 1.3. Orchomenos was punished, contrary to Epameinondas' will, who allegedly defined the decision to destroy the city as (Paus. 9.15.3). Three hundred Orchomenian knights plotted to turn the Boiotian League into an aristocratic institution (Diod. Sic. 15.79.3: εἰς ἀριστοκρατικὴν κατάστασιν). The moment was favourable, for both Epameinondas, who was then in the Aegean Sea, and Pelopidas, who was in Thessaly, were absent from Thebes. See Bertoli 2005: 129–30, who also claims that this plot reveals the internal divisions in the leading classes of Thebes in the years of the hegemony.

144 Cp. Stylianos 1998: 106, skeptical on the use, by Ephoros, of Dionysodoros and Anaxys.

145 Especially on Ephoros' use of Kallisthenes, see e.g. Prandi 1985: 128–9; Stylianos 1998: 104–7; Prandi 2013: 689.

146 Cp. Zecchini 1997: 192–3.

such as his work on siege machines and a piece named *On Piety*.<sup>147</sup> Maybe he was isolated by Lysimachos, along with Anaximenes and Kallisthenes, as a perfect foil to Ephoros (T 1). It is obvious that, since the *Histories of the Greeks* generally focused on recent years,<sup>148</sup> Daimachos had to represent an interesting local voice on those years, especially if his origin from Plataia implies hostility to Thebes.

### 1.2.5. Boiotian Hellenistic Historiography: Erudition and the Emergence of Thespiat

Among the Hellenistic authors of Boiotian local historiography, the majority belong to what may be defined as “Hellenistic antiquarianism”, or are obscure to us. The most interesting names are Aristodemos (*BNJ* 383), Nikander of Kolophon (*BNJ* 271–272) and Lysimachos (*BNJ* 382). They shared a lively philological interest in the past and were part of the Alexandrian milieu. Aristodemos lived in the third century BCE and wrote on Pindar and *Θηβαϊκὰ ἐπιγράμματα*. His vast production represents an erudite phase: while Armenidas was still working with the same imagery of Pindar, interacted with it, shared, and remoulded the same “Theban third space”, Pindar had, at this time, become a classical source to study and understand: a literary source.<sup>149</sup> Nikander and Lysimachos also wrote

---

147 See *infra* (5.1.1) for the existence of two namesake historians; on the first Daimachos as author of three projects, see 5.1.2; on the literary genre of the *περὶ εὐσεβείας*, 5.8.3.

148 *Greek Histories* were similar, in this respect, to universal stories, as Jacoby saw, before they were wrongly separated. The title of these works may be deceiving (Tuplin 2007: 161), because the continuous histories *On Greece* (Ἑλληνικά) were a subgenre of universal history (*Zeitgeschichte*, in the definition proposed by Jacoby 1909: 34–5, who wanted to avoid possible overlaps with the ancient use of ἱστορία), which dealt with a period contemporary with the author’s life in a coherent and chronologically limited way. These works on a limited period of time can carry a title different from Hellenika (just think, for instance, of Diyllos’ ἱστορία, *BNJ* 73, on the events of the period 357– 297 BCE). At the same time, there are Ἑλληνικά, like the ones by Anaximenes, which started from the origins and then continued as similar to the more general universal histories, to the point that Anaximenes, after Zoilos, may be considered the founder of universal history. The distinction between ἱστορία and Ἑλληνικά, in fact, is very hard to discern and even when we try to exactly define the genre of universal history (Tuplin 2007), apart from highlighting the turning point of Thucydides as a promoter of a “ciclo storico” (Canfora 1971), we are faced with new exceptions to the rule (cp. Nicolai 2006 on the meaning of this prosecution). We should therefore speak of different degrees of “universality”, distinguishing, in other words, whether the dimension of the subject lies in the spatial dimension or in the temporal one (Marincola 1999; Marincola 2007b). If we use these categories, Kallisthenes and Anaximenes belong to different categories of universal historiography, and Daimachos may have dealt with myths: we read in his FF 1–2, in the initial part of his work, if this started from the origins.

149 On the grammatical activity of Aristodemos, see Novembri 2010 and Poerio 2014. For an overview of Hellenistic Theban historiography, see Poerio 2017.

in a variety of genres and posit chronological problems which cannot be completely addressed here. Their Theban interests appear, on the line of those of Aristodemos, as one sector of a more global philological approach to the past.<sup>150</sup>

In the third century BCE, Psaon of Plataia (*BNJ* 78) continued Diyllos' *Hellenika*, but his participation in a chain of authors of Greek histories (as if there had been no Anaxys, Dionysodoros, or Daimachos) implies an independent choice. In particular, the irrelevance of the regional criterion is shown by the choice to continue Diyllos, from 297/6 BCE (the date of the death of Kassandros: *BNJ* 78 T 1). Diyllos, moreover, started from 357 BCE (*BNJ* 73 T 1), the end of Kallisthenes' work, so that Psaon would be improperly ascribed Boiotian historiography. Anaxys and Dionysodoros closed their work with the Battle of Mantinea, but this choice was not followed in the region. For the same reason, the individuation of the end of Psaon's work with the death of Kassandros should not indicate a specific weight of the character in connection with his activity in Thebes, despite the association of Kassandros with the refoundation of Thebes.

Boiotian local historiography, therefore, had a short life from Hellanikos to Daimachos, going through Armenidas and Aristophanes. Not only did these four authors represent the beginners of a highly productive genre, but they were the only representatives of a historiographical interest for and in Boiotia. This interest would later assume forms different from local historiography: either merging in works of a different structure and inspired by another agenda, such as Psaon's *Hellenika*, or constituting one side of a greater learned project, to study myth and the past, most often with an eye towards the understanding of literary texts. If we were looking for phases in this varied production, we must first isolate a moment of undeniable liveliness, which we find in Hellanikos' early attempts to reach the richness of Daimachos' production, followed by a later age of refolding and deepening. The floruit of historiography coincided with the peak of the Boiotian *koinon* in the Classical period.

From the third century BCE, it looks as if the origin of an author from Boiotia is without consequence on his works. Moreover, the subjects studied are not seemingly evenemential. A possible infraction to this tendency might be represented by Lykos' Περὶ Θηβῶν, which

---

150 On Nikander, see *infra* 4.1.2; on Lysimachos, see *infra* 5.3.1.

Schachter (2011b) recently dated to the first quarter of the third century BCE. There are more concerns than that of the date of the work, however, as its title might actually suggest a different structure from that of the previous species of local history, like Armenidas' *Θηβαϊκά*. Based on the five extant fragments, Lykos shares many interests with the first authors of Boiotian historiography, such as the connection of Dionysos with Thebes (*BNJ* 380 F 1),<sup>151</sup> the figures of Itonos and Boiotos (FF 2 and 4),<sup>152</sup> and the mythical spring where Kadmos founded Thebes (F 5).<sup>153</sup>

In the other cases of *Βοιωτικά* or of *Θηβαϊκά*, it is either hard to prove the existence of the authors<sup>154</sup> or to consider them historiographers in the first place.<sup>155</sup> Among the many names considered by Jacoby (1955a) in the section on Boiotia in *FGrHist* III B, we are left with very few candidates. First of all, we have Kallippos of Corinth (*BNJ* 385), who is quoted only by Pausanias (9.29.1-2; 38.9-10), and wrote an *Εἰς Ὁρχομενίου συγγραφή*, which Pausanias claims to have read.<sup>156</sup> In this text, there were some verses of Hegesinos

151 Cp. Armenidas F 4 and Aristophanes F 4

152 Cp. Armenidas F 1.

153 Cp. Hellanikos F 1.

154 Other *Βοιωτικά* are assigned to two *Schwindelautoren* (Jacoby 1940), quoted by Pseudo-Plutarch in the *Parallela minora*, Ktesiphon (*BNJ* 294) and Menyllos (*BNJ* 295 F 1). Only Menyllos, however, according to Ceccarelli (2011b), seems to be an actual figure: it was once believed that there were two figures, *Μένυλος / Μένυλλος* ([Plut.] *Parall. min.* 26.312b = *BNJ* 295, author of *Ἰταλικά*), and *Μέρυλλος* ([Plut.] *Parall. min.* 14.309b = *BNJ* 295 F 1, author of *Βοιωτικά*), but the second name was corrected in *Μένυλλος* by Xylander and identified with the first one from the *FHG* (IV 452) on. If the *consensus codicum* on the second name forces us to print it with the *rho*, in the text of the Pseudo-Plutarch (de Lazzer 2000: 70-1 n.281), we should keep in mind, however, the general method of the author known as “Pseudo-Plutarch”: Ceccarelli also repeated that, in fact, it could be one and the same historian (while de Lazzer follows the textual tradition, Boulogne [2002: 254] prints, at *Parall. min.* 14.309B, the correction *Μένυλλος* by Guarinus, despite the *consensus* on *Μέρυλλος*). Two other names that should be recalled, despite the uncertainties on their date, are Menelaos of Aigai (*BNJ* 384), a poet who composed a *Θηβαίς*, sometimes quoted as *Θηβαϊκά*, but hardly a local historiographer; and Timagoras, author of *Θηβαϊκά* (*BNJ* 381; see Poerio 2017: 9-38). On the basis of the content of our 3 fragments, Timagoras mostly focused on the Spartoi. We do not know anything on the historical persona (Kühr 2014b), so he remains a complete exception to us.

155 Demetrios of Phaleron wrote a *Βοιωτικός* (*FGrHist* 228 T 4 = F 80 Stork – van Ophuijsen – Dorandi), which must have been a dialogue set in this region, as maintained by Jacoby (1955b: 104 n.4). Among the other doubtful cases, it is now assumed that, in the voice of the *Suda* on the writer Paxamos (*BNJ* 377 T 1), the transmitted *Βοιωτικά* should be corrected, with Hemsterhuys, in *Βιωτικά*: the known content fits better with the characteristics of the content of the other titles (this Paxamos was a famous writer of cookbooks of the first century BCE: Schachter 2011d ad *BNJ* 377 T 1).

156 Cp. Lupi 2011: 344-5, for the hypothesis of an actual reading.

(*BNJ* 331 F 1), who wrote an *Atthis* and is almost unknown, and of Chersias, who must have been another Archaic poet.<sup>157</sup>

In the second place, we should include a group represented by Ἀφροδίσιος ἤτοι Εὐφήμιος. This author is only mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium, in a lemma on a harbour of Thespiiai, Aphormion.<sup>158</sup> Aphrodisios or Euphemios wrote about Thespiiai in his *Περὶ τῆς πατρίδος*, but Jacoby (1955a: 181) argued that there may have been two authors, Aphrodisios and Euphemios, and that the second one continued his predecessor's work. On the other hand, we know that, in his *Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἑλικῶνι Μουσείου*, Amphion of Thespiiai (*BNJ* 387 F 1) seems to have sponsored the refoundation of this festival on Mount Helikon, if we accept Schachter's assumption that Nikocrates, another local author (*BNJ* 386), was contemporary with the refoundation of the games on the Helikon in the last thirty years of the third century BCE. Probably at the end of the third century BCE,<sup>159</sup> this Nikocrates, a Boiotian author who was an expert in Thespiiai, wrote a book on Boiotia whose title is either *Περὶ Βοιωτίας* (*BNJ* 376 F 1) or *Βοιωτικά* (F 2). The inspiration came from a profound reorganization of the festival of the Mouseia, an event which is also behind an elegy to the Egyptian Arsinoe III, transmitted on papyrus.<sup>160</sup> Moreover, Nikocrates may have also written a *Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἑλικῶνι ἀγῶνος*, which would suggest that this work, with a historical section, was part of a narrative of contemporary propaganda. It would then be appropriate to ascribe it wholly to the category of "local historiography", because this variety of texts did not sensibly differ from the "sacred histories".<sup>161</sup>

Aphrodisios, Nikocrates, and Amphion give the impression of a lively Thespian production at the end of the third century.<sup>162</sup> In a few years, a number of local historians

---

157 See Debiasi 2010 and Schachter 2012c *ad BNJ* 385 F 2.

158 *BNJ* 386 F 1 = α 557, *s.v.* ἀφόρμιον.

159 On this date, see Schachter 2010–1 and Schachter 2011c.

160 Cp. Barbantani 2000 on this elegy. It is also possible that the local theatre was renovated, in the same context (Germani 2015: 355).

161 See Dillery 2005 on the idea of sacred history and Schachter 2011c on the link between Nikocrates and historical propaganda.

162 See Schachter 2010–1; Schachter 2011c; Schachter 2012a. The Thespians actively participated in the destruction of Thebes in 335 BCE (Diod. 17.13.5), and during the third century their city was resettled (see *IACP* n.222). On the

engaged in the same activity, reflecting what seems to have been a prosperous moment for the city. In the Hellenistic *koinon*, in fact, Thespiiai was one of only three Boiotian cities, together with Thebes and Tanagra, that formed a *telos* on its own in seven subunits of the territorial organization of the *koinon*.<sup>163</sup> These subunits were probably formed, as outlined by Knoepfler, in order to respect a demographic balance, so that it would be legitimate to assume an equality of resources among them. While we lack direct proof that in the third century BCE, Tanagra attracted or elicited a similar interest in historiographical production, Thespiiai did in fact gain primacy in this field. Thebes, on the other hand, inspired a different kind of production. On the basis of the extant fragments, titles like the *Collection of Theban Epigrams* by Aristodemos suggest works with a weaker link to territory.

On a similar line, we know that, among his periegetic works, Polemon of Ilion (202-181 BCE) wrote a Περὶ τῶν Θήβησιν Ἡρακλείων (*FHG* III F 26), where he focused on the Theban festivals for Herakles. Other traditions assigned to Polemon are general writings on Boiotian matters (*ibid.* F 25).<sup>164</sup> This author certainly had a philological approach towards the region, which should not be considered alongside previous local historiography. Polemon may have preferred a literary perspective on the region and may have followed prejudices that were well-spread from the Classical period, since he is contemporary to Heraclides Criticus, the author of a *Periegesis*.<sup>165</sup> The date of this author is much debated, but, on the basis of the description of Thebes and of the rest of Boiotia, one can agree with Christel Müller in defining his work as “an assemblage of clichés and sketches about the Boiotians” (2013: 271).

All one can say concerning these later figures are mere hypotheses. We will never know how lively or productive these local traditions were, even if it is in itself remarkable that Thespiiai had a local production, which must be appreciated in comparison with other cities like Thebes or Athens. Kallippos, Aphrodisios, and Amphion gave a new outlook to

---

Boiotian third century BCE as a period of general prosperity, see, against the idea of decadence suggested by Pol. 20.4-7 and substantially accepted by Feyel 1942, Knoepfler 1999; Müller 2008: 32-3; Müller 2011; Müller 2013.

163 On the seven *tele* of the Hellenistic *koinon*, see Corsten 1999: 38-47; Knoepfler 1999; Knoepfler 2001.

164 On this variety of works among Polemon's titles, see Engels 2014: 75-6. On the Theban festivals for Herakles, and on their presence in Pindar, see Olivieri 2014: 42-4.

165 On Herakleides Kritikos, see Arenz 2006.

local historiography, which assumed new forms different from the ones it had taken at the beginning of its development. Amphion, in particular, can be associated with those local Greek historians, who used cults as the main focus of their work, adopting an alternative criterion, which underlied his monograph on the agons of the Helikon.<sup>166</sup> This new variety of authors abandons the goal of writing a *History of Boiotia*. Despite the success of the new *koinon* in the third century BCE, the civic traditions retain the capability of attracting the interests of the single historians and mark this period as a new phase, incomparable with the Boiotian historiography of the Classical period.

### 1.3. The First Boiotian Historiographers: A Profile

The general profile of the first authors of Boiotian local historiography differs from later ones: later works, in fact, detach themselves from Hellanikos or Armenidas. The new historical background after the destruction of Thebes (335 BCE) and its refoundation (316 BCE) did not elicit the same kind of historiography. Thus, there is a sense of unity among the first four authors, who form an isolable block, whereas the later Hellenistic *koinon* did not inspire or allow a similar or analogous experience. As seen in the section on the development of the genre (1.2), new interests and internal structures superseded the kind of histories produced between the late fifth and the early fourth century BCE.

The following commentary on single fragments will be preceded by a series of general and systematic profiles of the authors considered. This biographical prelude aims at introducing the chronological span of Boiotian local historiography and partially anticipates the results of the study of the witnesses, with the exception of Hellanikos (1.3.1). For this author, the variety and complexity of the materials, together with the advanced status of the research, suggests that an overview to introduce the writer is sufficient.

---

<sup>166</sup> Thomas 2014b: 161: “[C]ult details connected to local places were an important way of patterning and structuring local histories.”

Since the present book focuses on the early stages of local historiography in Boiotia, it must be clear which period is assumed by considering Hellanikos, Armenidas, Aristophanes, and Daimachos. The last three authors have almost no meaningful witnesses (with the exception of Daimachos) and Armenidas' personal name may actually benefit from a reconsideration of its Ionic suffix.<sup>167</sup> As far as Hellanikos is concerned, the present section focuses on the main output of the research on his chronology. Only Hellanikos and Daimachos can be positively dated, whereas we can only suggest plausible deductions on Aristophanes and Armenidas. By and large, if we include Hellanikos and Daimachos, we may consider Armenidas and Aristophanes as historians who lived in the period between these two figures, with Armenidas possibly closer to Hellanikos. We are therefore considering a period which goes from the last quarter of the fifth century BCE to the middle fourth century BCE.

### 1.3.1. Hellanikos

It might sound paradoxical that we are so uncertain about the exact chronology of an author who was among the historians mostly interested, during his lifetime, in problems of chronography and in defining new dating systems.<sup>168</sup> All we can positively maintain is that Hellanikos was still active after 407/6 BCE<sup>169</sup> and that Thucydides must have used him in the early stages of the composition of his work. When Thucydides mentions a date based on the office of the priestess of the Argive Heraion (Thuc. 2.2.1), he likely derives this piece of information from Hellanikos' *Priestesses*.<sup>170</sup>

---

167 The codices of Photius which transmit Armenidas' F 5, have the form Ἀρμένιδας, which may be his original name. Ἀρμενιδας might then be the version of the literary sources, under the influence of the Ionic dialect (see *infra* 3.5.1). Here and elsewhere, however, I adopt the commonly accepted variation, despite the high probability of the form Armendas. I wish to thank here Prof. A.C. Cassio for the useful suggestion on this topic.

168 Cp. Möller 2001.

169 This view is based on the events which are alluded to in our *BNJ* 4 FF 171-2 = 323 FF 25-6.

170 Thuc. 2.2.1: ἐπὶ Χρυσίδος ἐν Ἄργει τότε πενήτηκοντα δυοῖν δέοντα ἔτη ἱερωμένης, “under the forty-eighth year of the priesthood of Chrysis in Argos” (tr. S. Tufano). It is generally assumed that Thucydides is referring to Hellanikos' *Priestesses of Hera* here; moreover, Fantasia (2003: 225) and Pownall (2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 74, with further scholarship) suggest that the later mention of this same priestess (Thuc. 4.133,2-4) is another debt that Thucydides has to Hellanikos (Gomme 1956: 2 already linked the two passages, but did not argue for a second mention of Hellanikos). The fragments of Hellanikos' *Priestesses of Hera* are *BNJ* 4 FF 74-84.

In itself, the relationship between Thucydides and Hellanikos is a controversial matter upon which we are forced to limit ourselves to suggestions. The main problem is our scarce knowledge of Hellanikos' works.<sup>171</sup> A partial exception is represented by a passage (Thuc. 1.97.2) where Thucydides arguably shows skepticism of the author of the *Atthis*, with an explicit mention of the name of the source, Hellanikos, and the title of his work (ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ξυγγραφῇ):

I have written the following account and made this excursus because all of my predecessors have omitted this period: their histories are either of the Greek world before the Persian invasion or of the Persian War itself. The only one to touch on this subject is Hellanikos in his *History of Athens*, but his treatment is brief and the chronology is imprecise (tr. M. Hammond).<sup>172</sup>

This explicit mention may be taken to mean both a tribute to his predecessor, because Hellanikos is the only historian quoted by Thucydides, and the acknowledgement of the importance of that work to Athens.<sup>173</sup>

Any further clarification on Hellanikos' lifespan, apart from single references in his fragments, seems questionable, or might prove debatable under closer scrutiny. The most explicit indication on his date of birth, may be what Gellius says on the subject. Aulus

---

171 Discussion and further references: Ottone 2010: 74-88.

172 = *BNJ* 4 T 16. It has been claimed that Thucydides' reference does not echo the exact title of Hellanikos' work, for it would be impossible that Hellanikos assigned a precise title to it (Jacoby 1949: 81-2; Ambaglio 1980a: 43 n.157; Harding 1994: 2; Sánchez Jiménez 1999; Nicolai 2010: 12; Ottone 2010: 56-9). Some scholars who support this view (e.g. Sánchez Jiménez 1999: 278) accept, however, that the work had a title, namely the one used by other sources, Ἀτθίς. The choice of giving a title might have had the purpose of isolating this text from the rest of his production. In general, it is believed that the forms of circulation of the historical works, in this period, are irreconcilable with the existence of a title for them (Ottone 2010: 57-8; Thomas 2014b: 157). The absence of an agonal context, nonetheless, may coexist with the necessity of choosing a title for a written work to signal it as different from the other works: for this reason, and for the undeniable chronological relevance of Thucydides as a witness, it is not impossible to seriously consider the possibility that Ἀττικὴ ξυγγραφὴ was the title of Hellanikos' *Athenian History*.

173 According to Hornblower (1991: 147-8), it is tempting to wonder whether the recent publication of Hellanikos made necessary a reference to a preexisting version of the text. Unfortunately, apart from the fact that we know that Hellanikos' *Athenian History* dealt with events of 407/6 BCE, we have no further indications on the moment when this work spread.

Gellius, in the second century CE, is drawing his date from Pamphila,<sup>174</sup> a historian of the first century CE. However, neither of them was the source of this calculation: it is extremely likely that the first to suggest this succession of authors was the chronographer Apollodoros (third century BCE).<sup>175</sup> It was Apollodoros, then, who was the first to assert that Hellanikos was born in 496/5 BCE, from the basis of his being 65 years old at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War:

“Hellanikos, Herodotos, and Thucydides, writers of historical works, were in their prime and enjoyed great renown at almost the same time and were not terribly far apart in age. Hellanikos seems to have been sixty-five years old at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, Herodotos fifty-three, and Thucydides forty. This is written in the eleventh book of Pamphila” (tr. F. Pownall).<sup>176</sup>

A scholarly tradition has also tried to infer a *terminus post quem* for Hellanikos’ date of birth based on his name: the literal meaning, with reference to a Greek victory, reflects a date in 480 BCE or in that span of time, to celebrate the victory over the Persians.<sup>177</sup> In fact, it was alleged that Hellanikos and Euripides were both born on the day of the battle of Salamis.<sup>178</sup>

---

174 Pamphila was a historian: Photius (*Bibl.* 119b20-7) credits her with Συμμίκτων ιστορικῶν ὑπομνημάτων λόγοι, in 8 books, whereas the *Suda* (π 139) records a different number of books (33: probably the exact number, according to Cagnazzi 1997: 32), and another title, Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα. From the same lemma of the *Suda* we learn that Pamphila also wrote “an *Abridged Version* of Ctesias, in three books, many *Epitomai* of histories, and of other books; *On the Quarrels*; *On Sex*; and many more titles” (tr. S. Tufano). Pamphila lived under Nero, but it is hard to speak much about her, because of the ancient prejudice towards the ability of a woman to write history (Ath. 10.44.434C; Marcell. 43; cp. Cagnazzi 1997: 108-9). We have 10 fragments of historical subject, apart from the summary in Photius’ *Library*; an overview of the witnesses is offered by Cagnazzi 1997: 31-102 and by Ippolito 2006.

175 For the origin of this chronological section from Apollodoros, see Jacoby 1902: 277-84; Apollodoros might also be behind the current F 2 Cagnazzi of Pamphila (Cagnazzi 1997: 58 and 85; Ippolito 2006). In general, however, we lack strong evidence that she worked with chronologically ordered materials (Cagnazzi 1997: 43-4).

176 BNJ 4 T 3 (Gell. 15.23 = EGM I T 3 = F 7 Cagnazzi). (*Hellanicus, Herodotus, Thucydides, historiae scriptores, in isdem temporibus fere laude ingenti floruerunt et non nimis longe distantibus fuerunt aetatibus. Nam Hellanicus initio belli Peloponnesiaci fuisse quinque et sexaginta annos natus videtur, Herodotus tres et quinquaginta, Thucydides quadraginta. Scriptum hoc est in libro undecimo Pamphilae*). See, on this witness, Cagnazzi 1997: 83-6 (who believes in its reliability, especially for Thucydides).

177 It was Kretschmer (1894: 184) who first suggested that Ἑλλάνικος might come, as per haplology, from Ἑλλανόνικος. However, any inference from Hellanikos’ personal name might be excessive, since we are not sure about the length of

As far as the chronology of Pamphila/Apollodoros is concerned, the value of this tradition needs to be considered with suspicion. It may suffer from the usual Hellenistic approach to look for a substantial and chronological sequence among authors of the same genre: Hellanikos' date of birth, in this reconstruction, deliberately coincides with the *akme* of Hekataios and the voice of the *Suda*, which also derives from an Apollodorean tradition, imagining Hellanikos as the successor of Hekataios.<sup>179</sup> Another possible interpretation of Pamphila's synchronisms is that the real focus was on king Alexander I from Macedon:<sup>180</sup> starting from the belief that Hellanikos and Herodotus both attended the Macedonian court,<sup>181</sup> there was a backward chronological parallelism with the kingdoms of Amyntas' predecessors. From a different perspective, the alleged *akme* (at 40 years old) of Hellanikos in 456 BCE has been read as a forced coincidence with the first victory of Euripides on the stage, or as the central year of the *pentekontaetia* (whose bad treatment as a period is censured by Thucydides, in 1.97, where he mentions Hellanikos).<sup>182</sup>

It must be admitted that none of the aforementioned hypotheses are really more convincing than the others. First of all, nothing strongly determines the placement of the *akme* of Hekataios in 496/5 BCE, and not, for instance, in 499 BCE, if the starting point of this was the occurrence of the figure in the *Histories* of Herodotus. The role played by Hekataios in the Ionian upheaval, according to Herodotus, also located him firmly in the

the iota in the suffix *-νικος*: only if this iota is long, would it support an etymological link with *νικάω* and, therefore, with the Persian Wars. Fowler (2013: 682-3) observed that the form \**Ἑλληνικός* is never attested, which is in itself curious, "if it was really connected to (pan-)Hellenic ethnicity or victory" (683); all we have are some later forms like *Ἑλλάννικος* (*CIG* 4300), which cannot be used to strongly support a causal relationship with the event.

178 *BNJ* 4 T 6 (Sat. *Vit. Eur.* 2; Diog. Laert. 2.45). Apart from doubts on the etymological inferences of this suggestion (on which, see *infra* in text), it is doubtful that the battle of Salamis may be considered the final and definitive victory of the Greeks over the Persians in this war. Schmid – Stählin 1934: 680 n.10, for example, suggest that a similar impression, especially for a Lesbian, might have been provided by the battle of Mikale, where the Lesbians were also fighting (*Hdt.* 9.106; *Diod. Sic.* 11.37).

179 *BNJ* 1 T 1 F: after Hekataios, Hellanikos; then, Herodotus, and so on. Mosshammer 1973: 7-9. The present reconsideration of biographical information on Hellanikos owes much to Porciani 2001a: 135-8 and Fowler 2013: 682-3. 180 Porciani 2001a: 137: "Non mi sembra [...] impossibile che Apollodoro (o già altri prima di lui: Eratostene?) abbia determinato la nascita di Ellanico in relazione al regno di Alessandro I di Macedonia, facendola coincidere con il suo inizio."

181 *BNJ* 4 T 1 (σὺν Ἡροδότῳ παρὰ Ἀμύντῃ: a plausible tradition, but ultimately unverifiable; Herodotus at Alexander's court: Hammond – Griffith 1979: 98-9).

182 Cp. Fowler 2013: 682 n.4.

first stages of the war.<sup>183</sup> As a consequence, this idea of a linear succession among historians, suggested by Mosshammer (1973), has its weaknesses and its importance should not be overestimated.

On the other hand, a number of doubts concern the years 496/5 (or, more precisely, 495 BCE), as the beginning of the kingdom of Alexander I. The beginning of this kingdom, in fact, and the moment when Alexander succeeded his father are an uncertain matter. For instance, a case has been made, not necessarily less cogent, that Alexander was ruling as of 498 BCE.<sup>184</sup> On the other hand, the parallelism with Euripides' career might be an autoschediasm, developed from the belief that the two authors were born on the day of the battle of Salamis (*BNJ* 4 T 6). In fact, the inclusive method of Apollodoros, if we take the year 431 BCE as the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, would force us to consider the year 457/6 BCE as the *akme* of Hellanikos (which would remove it from coinciding with the victory of Euripides). In sum, the use of the extremes of the *pentekontaetia* and the idea that the *akme* of Hellanikos coincided with the central year of the period are still likelier, if we consider a possible mistake by Apollodoros.

The previous observations deliberately omit other debated relationships, such as the one with Damastes.<sup>185</sup> In general, one is left in the realm of intertextuality, with all the limits of an excessive use of later sources. One might suggest that the biographical tradition concerning Hellanikos in the fourth century BCE must have been generally poor.<sup>186</sup> Since Alexander I was renowned for his efforts at presenting himself and his dynasty as belonging to and benevolent to the Greek culture, the presence of Hellanikos at his court

---

183 Porciani 2001a: 135-6.

184 See Porciani 2001a: 135-8. On the problem of Alexander I's accession to throne, see briefly Sprawski 2010.

185 Mazzarino (1966: 204) first suggested considering Damastes as being earlier than Hellanikos, despite an ancient tradition that Damastes had actually been his pupil. However, a prudent consideration of Hellanikos' lifetime supports the opposite view, if Damastes was active in 431 BCE, since, at this time, Hellanikos may have already started his works (Fowler 2013: 644). Moreover, since Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 9 presents them as contemporaries, the same Classical sources appear uncertain on the actual chronological relationship between the two figures (Ottone 2010: 93). On Damastes, see in general Gallo 2004 and Fowler 2013: 644-6.

186 It will be no coincidence that only rarely does Hellanikos appear in a literary canon (Nicolai 1992: 208-9), because he was probably considered, in general, "a mythmonger, not a historian" (Fowler 2013: 689). The same Fowler assumes that it is quite hard to appreciate how much Hellanikos was used and present in the work of the later Atthidographers.

may derive from a philomacedonian tradition (especially since Hellanikos is mentioned with Herodotus).<sup>187</sup>

Apollodoros' chronography, similarly, was probably influenced by the passage where Thucydides quotes Hellanikos (1.97.2). These ancient suggestions do not sound sensibly different from, or scientifically sounder than, other contemporary approaches on this theme. All our witnesses on Hellanikos introduce him with another figure, as if, in the absence of a set of traditions, an early autoschediastic activity developed around him. These deductions associate him with other great names (Euripides, Herodotus, and Thucydides), and Apollodoros was likely following this trend in making his own calculations. In sum, dating Hellanikos to the second half of the fifth century BCE, and accepting, as a consequence, that he was coterminous both with the later production of Herodotus, and with Thucydides, is the least slippery and most probable scenario for his lifespan.

The information on Hellanikos' production is inversely proportional to the opacity of the biography of the character. He wrote 23 books in prose and, according to a passage in the *Suda* (BNJ 4 T 1), also poems. His Βοιωτικά (FF 1-2) belong to a series of works on Greek regions and *poleis*.<sup>188</sup> These attest to the originality of Hellanikos, both as an early local historian, and as a scholar interested in an impressive variety of places, from Argos to Athens. The fact that a citizen of (or at least coming from) Lesbos would work on such a range of local areas, is in itself noteworthy, and should be considered in parallel with the activity of those sophists who worked on the constitutions and, in general, on Greek and barbarian *nomima*.

---

187 BNJ 4 T 1. See Vannicelli 2013a: 67-81 on Herodotus' description of this character; for his kingdom as a period characterized by “una prima collocazione culturale e politica della Macedonia all'interno del mondo greco” (*ibid.* 67), cp. Musti 2006: 588. Apart from this isolated witness, only one other feeble tradition of an alleged plagiarism directly links Hellanikos and Herodotus (BNJ 4 T 17 = Porph. F 409 Smith = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 10.3.16). Porphyrios accused Hellanikos of plagiarizing Herodotus, but it is uncertain whether this was his own deduction or if the authors really reported the same content without knowing each other (Fowler 2013: 683): “it is difficult to know whether his [Hellanikos'] work was available to Herodotus or viceversa” (Pownall 2016 *ad* BNJ 4 T 1).

188 The known titles are: Αιολικά (BNJ 4 FF 32 and 32a), Λεσβι(α)κά (BNJ 4 FF 33-35a and 35c), Αργολικά (BNJ 4 F 36b), Περί Αρκαδίας (BNJ 4 F 37), Βοιωτικά (BNJ 4 FF 50-1) and Θετταλικά (BNJ 4 F 52). A mere comparison of the number of preserved fragments shows the relatively bigger reception of Ἀτθίς (BNJ 4 FF 38-48).

Apart from this production, Hellanikos also engaged with ethnography<sup>189</sup> and with a work on foundations, which we know under three different titles<sup>190</sup> but might be better understand as only one entity. Finally, he is credited with four works of mythography (*Phoronis*, *Deukalioneia*, *Atlantis*, and *Troika*), whose reciprocal relationship is much debated. Over two centuries of scholarship have not been able to reach a unanimous perspective on the previous points.<sup>191</sup> A stabler consensus has been attained on Hellanikos' contribution to chronography, and on the reasons behind such interest: his *Priestesses of Hera in Argos* has either been traced back to oriental annalistic models, or to the general scientific context of the end of the fifth century BCE.<sup>192</sup> This approach, however, may be arguable for the *Atthis*, but it would be preposterous to apply it to Boiotia: in Attica there is a strong interest in the systematization of chronological information, since two fragments from the *Atthis* are explicit on its annalistic framework.<sup>193</sup> This is not demonstrable for the *Boiotian Histories*.

For the Boiotian case, in fact, there were other historical conditions that inhibited the birth of a fixed, stable political unity, with a regional calendar, before the forties of the fifth century. We have proof of a regional conscience and the acknowledgement of a common ethnicity, but nothing speaks for the actual preexistence of a local historiography, or production in prose, which Hellanikos could have referred to in his commitment to this subject.

---

189 Secure titles of ethnography are: Αἰγυπτιακά (BNJ 4 TT 26 and 29; FF 53-4; BNJ 608a FF 1-3), Περσικά (BNJ 4 FF 59-63; BNJ 687a FF 1-4) and Σκυθικά (BNJ 4 FF 64-5). We do not know, however, what approach was followed as far as other regions are concerned, namely if Hellanikos' Περὶ Λυδίας and Κυπριακά (BNJ F 57) were independent works, because they are only mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium (*ss.vv.* Ἀζειῶται and Καρπασία). Finally, it is highly likely, as Jacoby (1913: 104-53: 129,53-8) first suggested, that his Φοινικικά, known only to Giorgius Cedrenus (I p.23 Bekker), derived from an inexact interpretation of a passage of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (1.108): here, however, Josephus only declares that Hellanikos wrote on the antiquity of barbarian populations.

190 It is quoted as Κτίσεις ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων, Περὶ ἐθνῶν, and Ἐθνῶν ὀνομασίαι (BNJ 4 FF 66-70) It should be distinguished from the monograph Περὶ Χίου κτίσεως (BNJ F 71; cp. von Fritz 1967 I: 490).

191 The main commentaries are: Müller 1841; Koehler 1898; Jacoby *FGHist* (4; 323; 608); Pearson (1939: 152-235; 1942: 1-26); Ambaglio 1980a; Caerols Pérez 1991; Fowler 2013: 682-98; Pownall 2016 BNJ 4.

192 Möller 2001.

193 Despite the skepticism of Joyce 1999, Clarke 2008 and Ottone 2010 have shown how more than a single chronological framework could be adopted in a historiographical work.

It is therefore better to stick to the general picture of the sources and accept that in the production of a prose author, generally known for his prolific activity,<sup>194</sup> there was space for a single monograph on Boiotia. The Boiotography starts, then, as a chapter in a wider historiographical framework, as if the original and vast spirit of the Ionic ἱστορίη gave rise to a development that went in many directions and used new methods.<sup>195</sup>

### 1.3.2. Armenidas

Armenidas has been seen as the real beginner of Boiotian local historiography, since, as a Theban, he dealt for the first time with the history of his own town.<sup>196</sup> More precisely, in only one case is he credited with a *Theban History* (F 1: Θηβαϊκὰ), even if the immediate context, on the Itonion of Koroneia, is not directly related to the city of Thebes. It is likely that Armenidas' work dealt extensively with other centres of the region, and a number of hypotheses have been put forward to explain this geographical extent. In particular, we need to be conscious of the fact that the title *Theban Annals* was preserved, despite the absence, in F 1, of an immediate connection with Thebes.<sup>197</sup>

As far as the origin of Armenidas is concerned, in the absence of explicit witnesses, one may suggest that his name is an Ionic form of an original Ἀρμένδας, which allows us to confirm a Boiotian origin. Without prosopographical indications, however, it is impossible to tell whether he was a Theban or a citizen of another Boiotian town. For

---

194 “Hellanikos composed too many works, it seems, for the *Suda* to provide a catalogue” (Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 T 1, after Jacoby 1912b: 112).

195 Even though it is not properly a collection of local histories, Critias' collections of *Constitutions* may be compared to the extent of Hellanikos' production, for the geographical horizon covered by this author. Critias wrote a *Constitution of Thessaly*, a *Constitution of Athens* and a *Constitutions of Sparta*; it seems that each of these texts was written both in prose and in poetry. For a commentary on this part of Critias' production, which centers on his philolakonism and might hint at his oligarchic thought, see Centanni 1997; Bultrighini 1999; Iannucci 2002; Centanni 2009. The *Constitution of Sparta* of Critias focused on the paradigmatic customs of the city, but may have also entailed some observations on its political institutions: Tober 2010: 419 n.46.

196 Jacoby 1955a: 155.

197 Schachter (2011a *ad BNJ* 378 F 1): “Since Armenidas' work seems to deal exclusively with Theban matters, we must assume that this passage comes from a description of the Boiotian sanctuary of Athena Itonia at Koroneia, and that the latter was somehow connected with an event in Theban legend.” Nonetheless, we cannot exclude that the details of other Boiotian centres may belong to excursuses indirectly or directly linked to Thebes (cp. 3.4.2).

Armenidas, just like for Aristophanes of Boiotia or other local historians, we should dismiss the myth of a recurrent and topical *Lokalpatriotismus*, which sometimes leads to wrong assumptions (as if only a Theban could write, for instance, a *Theban History*).

Armenidas' lifespan constitutes another possible conundrum. The aforementioned complete absence of details on his persona might represent, in itself, a hint of the scarce fortune of his text. Contemporary scholarship, then, has turned to the alleged direct quotes of Armenidas, in two (FF 3 and 6) of the seven<sup>198</sup> known fragments, because these quotes present isolated Ionic forms. These forms, however, are not enough proof of an early date for Armenidas: the ionisms in our F 3 are neither so typical, nor linkable to a specific moment of the literary development of this dialect. As I argue, with further details in the commentary, the status of the literary Ionic dialect was subject to such diachronic and diaphasic variations, that it is inappropriate to claim that the use of such forms implies a knowledge of Herodotus, more than that of, say, Ctesias, or other fragmentary historians of the fourth century BCE.<sup>199</sup> The contractions which we detect in Armenidas are already present in Herodotus, but they are also common in the so-called *Grossattisch* of the fourth century BCE, and they are not so peculiar as to suggest that all the text was originally written in the Ionic dialect. We could say more on this, if we had a better knowledge of the local (Boiotian) prose literature, but the only possible evidence that may be used for this problem comes from epigraphical sources.

As far as epigraphy is concerned, the growing predominance in Boiotia of the Ionic alphabet, from the second half of the seventies of the fourth century, after a relatively long survival of the epichoric alphabet, may indicate a general reception of the Attico-Ionic cultural tradition and, with it, one of its most characteristic registers, such as the literary Ionic dialect.<sup>200</sup> The recent publication of a treaty between Thebes and Histiaia, dated to 377/6 BCE, adds a piece of evidence to the debate on the introduction of the Ionic alphabet in Boiotia, as it shows the coexistence of epichoric characters with Ionic ones.<sup>201</sup>

---

198 An eighth fragment must be ascribed to another figure, Andromenidas: see the arguments at 3.8.2.

199 Cp. 3.3.3. On the literary Ionic dialect of the Hellenistic period, see Cassio 1996.

200 I wish to thank here Prof. N. Papazarkadas (*per litt.*), who provided immense help on this matter and wrote to me that he finds the scenario “definitely reasonable”. See *supra* on the relevance of the new discoveries for our understanding of Boiotian history.

201 Aravantinos – Papazarkadas 2012.

Whereas, therefore, the introduction of the Ionic alphabet in Boiotia must be posited in this period,<sup>202</sup> it is harder to agree with the traditional explanation: this phenomenon was not only due to the democratic ideas of the new leaders of the Boiotian League; the transition was not exclusively promoted by Thebes, given the previous acceptance of the Athenian epigraphic habit.<sup>203</sup>

As maintained by Papazarkadas (2016), in fact, the reception of the Ionic alphabet may betray the desire of Thebes to emerge as a Panhellenic power, through a writing form that had widespread readability. Furthermore, it can be argued that Thebes was deliberately challenging its main hegemonic rival, Athens: “[t]he form of the message now mattered as much as the message itself” (*ibid.* 139). For this reason the epichoric alphabet was abandoned, despite its strong identity value, as an indicium of ethnicity, and the “external” instrument was adopted since it was more functional to the internal political agenda.<sup>204</sup> In the same decades, we should also take into consideration the reception of Herodotus in Greece, even if, in the absence of clearer signals (apart from the sharing of some strategies) it would not be fair to infer that Boiotian authors were willingly mimicking Herodotus’ style and method.

This second hypothesis tries to see the feeble linguistic evidence under a different light, but it also lacks explicit indications in this direction. All we can positively claim on Armenidas’ date, is that he was known to Aristodemos, who was active in the middle third century BCE,<sup>205</sup> and that his prose was open to ionicising forms. I will therefore base the interpretation of F 4, as a possible reference to Epameinondas’ naval policy,<sup>206</sup> only on internal hints and without forcing external indications.

---

202 Unlike what has been suggested by Taillardat – Roesch (1966), who associates the diffusion of the Ionic alphabet with the Corinthian War, a down-dating to the seventies, first elicited by Knoepfler (1992; cp. Vottéro 1996; Knoepfler, in *BE* 2009 n.244; Iversen 2010; Papazarkadas 2016), is now accepted.

203 Iversen 2010: 262–3; Mackil 2013: 337–9. I follow the common contemporary approach in defining “democratic” as the new *koinon* established after the liberation of the Kadmeia (378/7 BCE), despite the good arguments of Rhodes (2016) against the ancient perception of this constitution as “democratic”, and its actual resemblance to the other democratic experiences of ancient Greece.

204 Cp. Luraghi 2010 on the relationship between epichoric scripts and ethnicity.

205 See the commentary *ad* Armenidas F 3.

206 Cp. *infra* 3.4.2 for this reading and 7.3. on the sea campaign.

### 1.3.3. Aristophanes of Boiotia

Aristophanes is the best-known local historian of Boiotia.<sup>207</sup> Since Plutarch used Aristophanes to criticize Herodotus, Aristophanes has automatically become an outright critic of Herodotus: he was thence considered a source, also for other sections of the *de Herodoti malignitate* where Aristophanes is not explicitly mentioned.<sup>208</sup>

The recent research on Boiotia, however, has promoted a more complex and nuanced appreciation of his production, which also benefited from a reconsideration of the textual tradition.<sup>209</sup> In fact, the witnesses of his persona are not explicit on his historiographical method, and it is still disputed whether he wrote one or two works of different character.<sup>210</sup> We depend on three pieces of information for the definition of his lifespan: first, the mention of Herodotus in his work (F 5) is a secure *terminus post quem* and we may assume that Aristophanes witnessed the arrival of Herodotus in Thebes.<sup>211</sup> Second, the use of the Theban archives, reported by Plutarch (T 2), prompted some scholars to date Aristophanes before 335 BCE, when Thebes, along with its public archives, was destroyed. Finally, he must have lived before Nikander of Kolophon (F 6), representing a *terminus ante quem* of the middle third century BCE. However, we know almost nothing on the exact lifespan of Nikander (BNJ 271-2), and the association of Aristophanes with Nikander might be due to Plutarch's own reckoning.

Now, the use of the archives, which apparently is the most helpful evidence to date Aristophanes, is the hardest fact to accept at face value. On the basis of the fragments, we know that Aristophanes might have written both *Theban Annals* (T 3: Θηβαῖοι Ἔωροι)<sup>212</sup>

---

207 He enjoyed notable attention in the scholarship on Greek historiography for the paradigmatic role played in Jacoby's seminal article of 1909 and in Chaniotis' book on itinerant historians in the Hellenistic period (1988: 290-1).

208 For instance, it is generally assumed that the passage on Leonidas' dream in Herakles' temple in Thebes derives from Aristophanes (Plut. *de Hdt. mal.* 31.865E-F; cp. Thomas 2014b: 154 n.28). It should be noted, nonetheless, that this anonymous tradition may be part of the more general narrative of the battle, which inspired manifold traditions in the Greek world (Bowen 1992: 132).

209 See Aristophanes F 1, a fragment on a papyrus published after the *FGrHist* and important for the light it sheds on the reception of Aristophanes.

210 TT 1-5, on which see 5.1.

211 We have internal and external sources on the presence of Herodotus in Thebes: see *infra ad* Aristophanes F 6.

212 I translate here and later Ἔωροι as "annals", for the richness of the echo of the Latin *annales*, because there are some cases, as maintained by Thomas (2014b: 120), where the Greek *Horoi* may have a similar structure. The *Theban Annals* may have had an annalistic framework, for the mention of some Theban officers: cp. F 6 (4.7.3 *ad στρατηγός*).

and *Boiotian Histories* (T 4: Βοιωτικά).<sup>213</sup> Especially in the first work, if we consider the recurrent stress on the use of *written* sources in other examples of Classical historiography, it is not impossible to think that this detail was emphasized as an inner quality. This does not mean, however, that the historian referred to this piece of evidence:<sup>214</sup> it is equally possible that, in the absence of a solid local tradition (either because Aristophanes ignored Armenidas, or because Armenidas lived afterwards), Aristophanes mentioned the κατ' ἄρχοντας ὑπομνήματα (T 2), because there were no other authors or internal sources on Theban history.

As for Armenidas, then, we are left in the field of hypotheses, even if probably, for Aristophanes, a date in the first half of the fourth century BCE seems to rest on stronger probabilities. If we can judge from the feeble linguistic forms in the existing fragments, we might infer a probable adhesion to a Boiotian and Theban cultural alignment to Athenian language and epigraphic habits. There could be, in other words, a formal re-management of local traditions (and a “Ionic trend” in Boiotian culture).<sup>215</sup>

It might not be surprising, then, that the toponym Ἀργύνειον, ascribed by Stephanus to Aristophanes (F 10), does not show definite local features in its vowels or consonants, especially because the form in /u/ survived, for a long period, with the alternative -ου-. By and large, this local historian must have worked on local topics, with approaches and styles that are not uncommon in other species of local history of the fourth century BCE, but, for this field, are possibly closer to the Ionian reception.

#### 1.3.4. Daimachos of Plataia

We have a relatively strong *terminus ante quem* for Daimachos of Plataia's lifespan, since Ephoros apparently used him in his *Histories* (T 1), and, therefore, he is generally dated to the years of the Theban hegemony. If we consider all the witnesses on the historiographer

---

213 The *Boiotian Histories* are also quoted by our witnesses, for the greater fortune of the previous work, with the title *Theban Histories* (T 5: Θεβαϊκά). The distinction between the two works, however, is not unanimously accepted: see e.g. Thomas 2014b: 154 and *infra* 4.1.1.

214 Cp. Porciani 2001a: 19–27.

215 Papazarkadas 2014b.

Daimachos, we can conclude that there were two namesakes between the fourth and the third century BCE: the second one surely wrote an ethnographic treatise on India, after an embassy to the Indian king Bindusāra, to whom he had been sent by Antiochus I in the beginning of the 270s.<sup>216</sup>

The starting point for dating Daimachos is a quote from Lysimachos' *On the Plagiarism of Ephoros* (BNJ 382 F 22). This treatise is particularly relevant, since Lysimachos was a versatile figure, who was still able to read many local historians of Boiotia.<sup>217</sup> This witness might certainly exaggerate the extent of Ephoros' plagiarism, but it is extremely useful, for the direct parallel it posits among Daimachos, Anaximenes, and Kallisthenes. These three historians are considered usable sources when Ephoros was writing his *Histories* (T 1). If Ephoros read them, Daimachos and the other two names must have lived in the same period, i.e. in the middle fourth century, judging from what we know on Anaximenes and Kallisthenes.

Moreover, we know from Diodorus (15.95.4) that Ephoros also referred to other universal histories, written by Anaxys and Dionysodoros, two Boiotian writers, who concluded their work with the Battle of Mantinea (362/1 BCE).<sup>218</sup> It has even been suggested that Anaxys and Dionysodoros supported a political tendency, opposite to the one represented by Epameinondas and Pelopidas, implicitly shown by Daimachos. This controversial hypothesis does not add much to the few certain facts we have: Ephoros probably read (and used) these universal historians from Boiotia and he communicates the idea that there was very lively activity in this region in the sixties of the fourth century.

Daimachos' originality rests on a variety of topics touched upon in his production, which also included a treatise on siegecraft machines<sup>219</sup> and an *On Piety* (F 7). The authorship of these two treatises has often been disputed, but it is methodologically wiser to assign them to our Daimachos and not to the later namesake, who is always associated with a work on India. Daimachos' *Greek Histories* may have dealt with a chronological period that was particularly long, and, for this reason, they, more so than the rest of the Ἑλληνικά, may

---

216 On this second Daimachos, see 5.1.1.

217 On the difficult issue of Lysimachos' chronology, see 5.1.3.

218 On Anaxys and Dionysodoros, see *supra* 1.2.4.

219 Cp. 5.6.1 for the possibility that the actual title was Πορθητικά and not, as is commonly held, Πολιορκητικά.

resemble more closely what contemporary scholarship defines as “universal history”. The themes that we reconstruct from the fragments are far from those which appear in other Ἑλληνικά of the fourth century BCE. However, one can hardly suggest a specific hypothesis on the exact extent of these *Greek Stories*; it seems better to focus on the “not-local” nature of this work, and how this novelty was adopted in an author coming from a city, Plataia, which had not produced previous historians. A new phase in the history of Boiotography, or maybe, more probably, a local perspective on universal history.

This page is left blank intentionally.



TE I R E S I A S  
S U P P L E M E N  
T S O N L I N E