

## EPHOROS FRAGMENT 76 AND DIODOROS ON THE CYPRIOTE WAR

CATHERINE I. REID

FOR A HUNDRED YEARS the *Bibliothèque Historique* of Diodoros has been a favourite subject for *Quellenforschung*, and this has been the main focus of Diodoran studies. In view of the nature of the work and the incompleteness of the corpus of Greek historical writing, that is hardly surprising. For such a general textbook of world history could only be composed on the basis of an extensive tradition of primary historiography, consisting of specialized histories of particular peoples and periods written by a multitude of earlier writers. And the task of identifying Diodoros' sources and elucidating his methods of adapting them was rendered the more difficult by the almost complete disappearance of so many of the historical works that he might have used. However, in the last 25 years or so there have been some signs of a realization that the *Bibliothèque* perhaps deserves to be examined as something more than a collection of putative fragments of lost historians;<sup>1</sup> and these new approaches to the work have led certain scholars to call for a reassessment of some of the more extreme conclusions of the *Quellenforscher*.<sup>2</sup>

This paper is a contribution to this new direction in Diodoran studies. It will concentrate on the correspondence between a section of Diodoros' text and a fragment of Ephoros, one of the lost authors from whom Diodoros is believed to have drawn large parts of his narrative (cf. E. Schwartz, *RE* 5 [1903] 679). A study of this pair of texts from a fresh point of view leads to an emendation of the text of the fragment, as well as throwing some light on the details of Diodoros' methods of reworking

<sup>1</sup>See J. Palm, *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodor von Sizilien* (Lund 1955), who found the style of the *Bibliothèque* to be uniform and consistent, and that Diodoros did not as a rule copy exactly from his sources save when a particular rhetorical flourish caught his fancy. Although Palm stated (13) that he did not wish to question any of the results of traditional source-criticism, still he drew some unorthodox conclusions (e.g., on Diodoros' use of Thucydides: 63). R. Drews, "Diodorus and his sources," *AJP* 83 (1962) 383–392, pointed out the general moralizing interest to be discerned throughout the *Bibliothèque*. Cf. also R. K. Sinclair, "Diodorus Siculus and the writing of history," *PACA* 6 (1963) 36–45, and "Diodorus Siculus and fighting in relays," *CQ* 16 (1966) 249–255; and W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur, und Götter* (Basel 1959).

<sup>2</sup>Most eloquently E. Badian in a review of V. LaBua, *Filino-Polibio, Sileno-Diodoro* (Palermo 1966), *RivFC* 1968, 203–211, especially 207–211. E. N. Borza, "Cleitararchus and Diodorus' account of Alexander," *PACA* 11 (1968) 25–45 (especially 43–45) pleads for a reassessment of the traditional assumptions about the composition of Book 17.

his material and thus providing some reason to re-evaluate the accuracy of a section of the *Bibliothēke*.

Diodoros 14.98.2 describes some of the activity in the cities of Cyprus during the contest for the island between Euagoras of Salamis and Artaxerxes, king of Persia, in the early fourth century B.C. Diodoros calls it ὁ Κυπριακὸς πόλεμος, and says it lasted almost 10 years in all, although most of that time was taken up with preparations, so that there were really only two years of all-out conflict (15.9.2). In fact he seems to report the opening of hostilities under the year 391/0 (14.98.1), and the end of the war under 385/4 (15.9.2), an apparent confusion in chronology for which an explanation will be suggested later (see below, 135–138). He divides his account of the war into four sections altogether (14.98.1–3; 14.110.5; 15.2.1–4.2; 15.8.1ff.), the last section leading on to the overtures of Glos, the Persian admiral, to Sparta, and the trial of Tiribazos.

The part of the narrative that concerns us here comes from the first section, in which Diodoros records the initial decision of Euagoras to win control over the whole island of Cyprus. Euagoras came from the family of the founders of Salamis, and had spent some time in exile early in his career (14.98.1ff.). However, he later returned with a few partisans to oust the Tyrian ruler of Salamis and make himself king of the city instead. For a while he was content to rule Salamis alone, but then his increasing wealth and power inspired him with an ambition to “make the whole island his own.”

τῶν δὲ πόλεων ἃς μὲν βίᾳ χειρωσάμενος, ἃς δὲ πειθοῖ προσλαβόμενος, τῶν μὲν ἄλλων πόλεων ταχὺ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν παρέλαβεν, Ἀμαθούσιοι δὲ καὶ Σόλιοι καὶ Κιτιεῖς ἀντέχοντες τῷ πολέμῳ πρέσβεις ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην τὸν τῶν Περσῶν βασιλέα περὶ βοηθείας. (14.98.2)

The ambassadors accused Euagoras of killing a king allied to Persia, and promised to help him to get possession of the island. Artaxerxes, fearing to lose Cyprus to Euagoras, accepted the proffered alliance and instructed his coastal satraps to prepare for war.

The particular interest of this passage for the study of Diodoros' methods of composition lies in the correspondence that has been noted between the words underlined in the above quotation from Diodoros and the text of fragment 76 of Ephoros (Jacoby, *FGrHist* 70 F 76). This fragment of Ephoros has been preserved, like so many others, in Stephanos of Byzantium's geographical lexicon (*Ethnika*). The entry in question reads as follows:

᾽Ωτιεῖς· μοῖρα Κυπρίων· Ἐφορος ἡ· Ἀμαθούσιοι δὲ καὶ Σόλιοι καὶ ᾽Ωτιεῖς ἀντέχοντες ἔτι τῷ πολέμῳ.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup>This is the text offered by Meineke's edition of Stephanos (Stephan von Byzanz, *Ethnika*, ex recensione Augusti Meinekii [Graz 1958, reprint of the original publication,

It will be observed that Stephanos' quotation from Ephoros agrees exactly with the underlined words in the text of Diodoros, save in the addition of *ἐν* after *ἀντρέχοντες*, and in the name of the third city (or rather, its inhabitants): *ᾠτιεῖς* instead of Diodoros' *Κιτιεῖς*.

This comparison therefore presented scholars with a tantalizing problem. Given the correctness of Volquardsen's hypothesis—which almost all subsequent scholars have accepted—that Ephoros' *History* was the sole narrative source from which Diodoros compiled the Greek history of books 11–15 of his *Bibliothēke*,<sup>4</sup> this pair of passages seemed to show to a particularly striking degree the fidelity (sometimes termed more harshly the "slavish dependence"<sup>5</sup>) with which Diodoros reproduced what he found in his source. That he should have omitted *ἐν* from his version troubled no one; but how could the divergence between *ᾠτιεῖς* and *Κιτιεῖς* be accounted for?

Most editors who considered the problem started from the assumption that the two texts undoubtedly refer to the same incident, and that it would have been in Diodoros' normal manner to copy the names exactly, as he apparently copied the general cast of the phrase. The only person who questioned the first part of this assumption was Peter Wesseling, the great Dutch editor and commentator on Diodoros, who rejected the

---

Berlin 1849]). Jacoby, however (*FGrHist* 70 F 76), prints the book number as *θ'*, as also does Müller (*FHG* 1.271, Ephorus, frag. 134), and an earlier edition of Stephanus (*Stephanus Byzantinus, cum annotationibus L. Holstenii, A. Berkelii, et Th. de Pinedo* 1 [Leipzig 1823] 478), as well as Wesseling in his note on the parallel passage of Diodoros (vol. 6.582 of the Eyring edition [below, note 6]). None of these editors indicates that the figure is disputed; each seems to assume that what he prints is the reading of the mss and correct. Beloch, however (*Griechische Geschichte* [Berlin and Leipzig 1923] 3.2.10), commenting on Ephoros' treatment of the events of the early fourth century, assigns this fragment (*FHG* 134) to book 18, and remarks, "*FHG* 1.271, fr. 134 ist die Buchzahl falsch angegeben." The problem is obviously important for the reconstruction of Ephoros' book divisions. But as most authorities seem to believe that both book 18 and book 19 dealt with the same general area of history (viz., Graeco-Persian affairs in the early fourth century), the dividing line between them being one of time rather than of subject-matter, the point is perhaps less crucial. Thus Jacoby (*FGrHist* 2 C 28) offers the opinion that books 18–19 treated the war of Sparta against the Persians and the Corinthian War; and in his dating of numbered fragments (*FGrHist* 2 A 63) he appears to assume that these two books overlapped slightly at about the year 395/4. So also Barber, *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge 1935) 33–34 and 173–174. Beloch, on the other hand (3.2.10), who accepts the assignment of fragment 76 to book 18, merely extends that book to include both the Spartan expeditions to Asia and "a part of the Korinthian War," leaving for book 19 "the Korinthian War down to the King's Peace." See further below, 135–138, on the chronology of Diodoros' account of the Cypriote War.

<sup>4</sup>C. A. Volquardsen, *Untersuchungen über die Quellen der Griechischen und Sicilischen Geschichten bei Diodor, Buch XI bis XVI* (Kiel 1868); cf. also Schwartz, *RE* (above, 123) 679.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Palm (above, note 1) 11, and the publications he lists in his note 1.

suggestion that emendation was necessary to make the two passages identical with the plea: "*Unde enim edocebor, de eadem re Ephorum egisse illis verbis?*"<sup>6</sup> Others have generally accepted the assumption that the names ought to be identical, and have therefore been forced to emend. The most cautious was perhaps K. Müller, who, after quoting the passage of Diodoros as an obvious parallel to the fragment of Ephoros (no. 134 in his collection, *FHG* [Paris 1841]), went on to comment:

*Vides alterum locum ex altero corrigendum esse. Quare Meursius in Cypro I. 10, p. 33, adstipulante Marxio, in Diodoro pro Κιτιεύς probabiliter scribit '᾽Ωτιεύς.*<sup>7</sup>

Jacoby, in his more recent and now definitive edition of the fragments of Ephoros (*FGrHist* 70 F 76; commentary in 2 C 58), accepts Meursius' suggestion without further comment, quoting the passage of Diodoros with the reading '᾽Ωτιεύς and relegating the readings of the manuscripts of Diodoros (κίτρεϊς PA, κίτιεύς cett.) to the apparatus criticus.

None of these scholars explains in more detail his reasons for so emending Diodoros.<sup>8</sup> But since the purpose of the textual critic should be to restore the text as nearly as possible to what the author wrote, whether correct or not, rather than what the editor believes he ought to have written, one can only presume that they believed that the original text of Diodoros read '᾽Ωτιεύς, dutifully copied from Ephoros, which reading was later corrupted by a copyist because it was unfamiliar. Such a corruption would, of course, be easy enough to credit. Proper names are especially liable to corruption, as context often exerts no restraint on carelessness or imagination.<sup>9</sup> And paleographically speaking, the corruption of "ω" into "κί" would be fairly easy in some minuscule hands.<sup>10</sup>

I wish to suggest, however, that this emendation is wrong, and, furthermore, that it is an instructive example of the unfortunate results of treating Diodoros too rigidly as a derivative author.

Let us look in more detail at the Diodoros passage. Note first of all that, were it not for the accidental preservation of the fragment of

<sup>6</sup>*Diodori Siculi Bibliothecae Historicae Libri Qui Supersunt*, e recensione Petri Wesselingii etc. (Strassbourg 1793) 6.582 (this edition, of N. Eyring, reprints the critical comments of a number of earlier editors, including those of Wesseling in his edition of the *Bibliothèque* [Zweibrücken 1746]).

<sup>7</sup>The reference is to Jo. Meursius (Johannes Meurs), *Creta, Cyprus, Rhodus* (Amsterdam 1675).

<sup>8</sup>I have not been able to consult the work of Meursius.

<sup>9</sup>Note the minor variant κίτρεϊς for κίτιεύς in some manuscripts of Diodoros here.

<sup>10</sup>None of the discussions I have seen (see above, note 8) has considered the paleography of the alleged corruption; but examples could be found of scripts that would facilitate it; cf., for example, that illustrated in R. Devrèsse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs* (Paris 1954), plate VIII (Vat. Gr. 1660 of 916 A.D.).

Ephoros, no one would ever have suggested that the text required emendation. The manuscript tradition is not unanimous, to be sure: two of the best manuscripts read not *Κιτιεύς*, but *Κιτρεῖς*. But no one could doubt which of these must be correct (no such people as *Κιτρεῖς* are elsewhere attested; whereas Kition is a well-known and important Cypriote city), or hesitate long over how the corruption happened ("P" is written in many scripts with a very small head, which renders it hardly distinguishable from "I"). Furthermore the mention of Kition here, as one of the three cities that chose to resist, with Persian help, Euagoras' attempt at annexation, agrees very well with what Diodoros reports of the later stages of the war (at 15.3.4 he described how Euagoras provoked a serious naval battle by attacking τοῦ βασιλικοῦ στόλου παραπλέοντος εἰς Κίτιον), as well as what we know otherwise of the history and probable sympathies of Kition (it was the oldest Phoenician settlement on the island, and was consistently ruled by a Phoenician dynasty save for a brief period—usually dated 388/7 and attributed to a temporary success of Euagoras in this war—under a Greek called Demonikos<sup>11</sup>). In fact, if Diodoros did not mention Kition's attitude to Euagoras in 14.98, this would be most surprising. As an important centre, near Salamis, and handily placed to the coast of Syria and Phoenicia, it was bound either to submit to Euagoras or to make trouble for him. And when we find it being used a few years later as a base for the Persian fleet (15.3.4; no one seems to have suggested emending this passage!), we would naturally assume that it had from the first been a centre of resistance to Euagoras.

Thus all the evidence concerning both the historical situation, as generally reconstructed, and the internal consistency of Diodoros' own narrative supports the correctness of his text. And Hill, looking at the matter from the historian's point of view, had no doubt that *Κιτιεύς* was the correct reading, not only in Diodoros, but also in Ephoros.<sup>12</sup> Students of historiography, however, do not seem to have asked whether there is any reason to believe in the existence of a people called "Otieis" on Cyprus. It is, of course, notoriously difficult to prove a negative; but there appears to be no other record of the name apart from this one item in Stephanos' lexicon. And it is surely hard to believe that Ephoros credited an otherwise unknown city with having the strength and initiative to resist Euagoras, while failing (apparently) to mention the resistance of the well-known city of Kition. Should we not rather believe that *ᾠτιεύς* is a corruption of the well-known name *Κιτιεύς*, as Hill did.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus* 1 (Cambridge 1940) 133–134; and below, 139.

<sup>12</sup>Hill (above, note 11) 134, note 2, citing the relevant passages of both authors as sources for his account of the early stages of Euagoras' war of annexation, and commenting on the latter, "... for *ᾠτιεύς* the emendation *Κιτιεύς* is certain, bringing the passage into verbatim agreement with Diodorus."

It cannot be a matter of a simple corruption in the text of Stephanos, for the quotation is given under the lemma *ᾠτιεῖς*, which must be what Stephanos wrote (or close to it), in view of its alphabetical position in the lexicon, between the entries *ᾠτηνῇ* and *ᾠφθίς*. Is this an insuperable difficulty?

Honigmann, in his article on Stephanos in Pauly-Wissowa, discusses in some detail how reliable Stephanos was, and how his particular interests affected the format of his work. He concludes that, in general "... waren die geographischen Kenntnisse des S[tephanos] recht gering, und seine Studien beschränkten sich meist auf die grammatischen Fragen, die mit geographischen Dingen zusammenhingen."<sup>13</sup> This ignorance of, and lack of interest in, the facts of geography led him to give erroneous or vague locations for a considerable number of places, and to mix ancient place-names with those of his own time indiscriminately, so that "... es wäre vergebliche Mühe, wollte man nach den Angaben seines Lexikons eine Karte mit den Landschaftsgrenzen zur Zeit bzw. im Sinne des S[tephanos] konstruieren" (*RE*, art. cit. [above, note 13], 2389). He also sometimes gives two entries for a single place, under marginally different forms of the name, or manufactures a proper name where none was written by a misunderstanding of the syntax.<sup>14</sup> In general, Honigmann agrees with the judgment of Stemplinger that Stephanos "kümmert sich nicht darum, ob die Städte usw. wirklich existieren oder existierten, sondern ob er sie mit einem Zitat aus einem Autor belegen kann."<sup>15</sup> There seem, therefore, to be ample grounds for a general distrust of Stephanos' accuracy.

Even more relevant to our particular problem, however, is the detailed evidence for false listings in Stephanos' text. Honigmann notes that these are found frequently (*RE*, art. cit. [above, note 13], 2391) and cites as examples the three articles *Δανούβιον*, *Λωμεντός*, and *Λύλη*. The first name is clearly a misreading of *Λανούβιον* (for Lanuvium), which city fits Stephanos' description as a *πόλις περὶ τὴν Ῥώμην*.<sup>16</sup> No entry survives in our by no means complete text of the *Ethnika* under the correct form of the name.<sup>17</sup>

*Λωμεντός πόλις Ἰταλίας* is likewise a misreading of *Νωμεντός* (for Nomen-tum). Here, however, we have also an entry under the correct form of the

<sup>13</sup>*RE* "Stephanos (Byzantios)" 3 A 2 (1929) 2389.

<sup>14</sup>Examples are cited in *RE*, art. cit. (above, note 13), 2390–2391.

<sup>15</sup>*Philologus* 53 (1928) 618; this passage is quoted by Honigmann, *RE*, art. cit. (above, note 13), 2390.

<sup>16</sup>The full text of the entry in the lexicon is: *Δανούβιον· πόλις περὶ τὴν Ῥώμην· τὸ ἔθνικόν Δανούβιος ἢ Δανουβιεύς*. Meineke noted the corruption and its probable source in the apparatus criticus to his edition (above, note 3).

<sup>17</sup>On the sources of our texts of the *Ethnika* and its incomplete preservation, see *RE*, art. cit. (above, note 13), 2374–2379.

name, which gives a different collection of information.<sup>18</sup> The information given under *Λωμεντός*, concerning the proper way to accent names of this particular type, can be shown to come from the grammarian Herodian, whose work Stephanos frequently used as an authority on such lexicographical questions.<sup>19</sup> The information under the correct form of the name, however, comes, as Stephanos says, from Dionysios of Halikarnassos' *Roman Antiquities*: hence the two entries, drawn from two different works. Thus one source of confusion and error for Stephanos was the occurrence in some manuscripts of corrupt forms of names, which he would take down in his notes, and which would later get worked up into erroneous entries in the finished product. Sometimes he was on his guard, and spotted that the peculiar name he had taken down was in fact only a corrupt form of a better known name. Thus under *Νεανδρεία*· πόλις Τρωάδος ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ, he notes: ἐν τισὶ δὲ Λεάνδρος γράφεται διὰ τοῦ λ κακῶς. Here was an incipient invented name, whose origin Stephanos luckily recognized while putting his work together. That he was well aware of the problem of badly copied manuscripts, which might contain or give rise to corrupt readings, can be clearly seen from his comments in certain articles: under Ἀδουλις· πόλις Αἰθιοπῶν he notes, καὶ τὰμοῦ βιβλία (obviously here his own copy of Herodian, as shown by the latter part of the entry) Ἀδουλι δίχα τοῦ σ· σφάλμα δέ ἐστιν; similarly under Γάργαρα· πόλις τῆς Τρωάδος, he comments, Ἑλλάνικος δὲ Γάργασον ἔφη τὴν πόλιν διὰ τοῦ σ, ἀλλ' οἶμαι σφάλμα εἶναι; and under Γεδρωσία χώρα καὶ Γεδρώσιοι ἔθνος Ἰνδικόν, he notes that Alexander Polyhistor gave a form beginning with "κ", Κεδρωσία, which he thinks must be a mistake, for ἦν ἀδιόρθωτον τὸ βιβλίον. In fact we have reason to believe that neither Ἀδουλι nor Κεδρωσία is a corrupt form due to a copying error—both are probably genuine alternative forms—but that does not affect the significance of these examples as an indication of Stephanos' alertness to the problem of manuscript error.<sup>20</sup>

A third example of an erroneous name in Stephanos, conjured up from a misreading, is the following article: Ἀύλη· πόλις Ἀρκαδίας· Ἀλέξανδρος δευτέρῳ περὶ Λυκωρείας· τὸ ἐθνικὸν Λυλαῖος. This puzzled scholars for a long time, as no one had ever heard of any such polis as Lyle in Arkadia;

<sup>18</sup>The complete texts are as follows: *Λωμεντός*· πόλις Ἰταλίας, ὀξυτόνως, καὶ ὅσα εἰς τὸς τῇ ἐν συλλαβῇ παραλήγει. ἦν καὶ Λωρεντόν φασι μετὰ τοῦ ρ (this last comment is another mistake of Stephanos [or possibly of Herodian]: he thinks *Λωμεντός* and *Λωρεντός* must be variants of a single place-name); and: *Νωμεντός*· πόλις οὐ πόρρω Ῥώμης· τὸ ἐθνικὸν Νομεντανός· Διονύσιος ἐν δευτέρῳ Ῥωμαϊκῆς Ἀρχαιολογίας.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. the note in Meineke's apparatus criticus (above, note 3) under *Λωμεντός*, and *RE*, art. cit. (above, note 13), 2380.

<sup>20</sup>These examples are among many cited in *RE*, art. cit. (above, note 13), 2391, where also Pliny *HN* 6.170 is mentioned as another example of this awareness that texts might contain corruptions.

and yet the name could not simply be emended, because it fell in the correct alphabetical position, between *Λυκώρεια* and *Λυρκέιον*. A convincing solution was found by Maass in 1879:<sup>21</sup> *Δύλη* was a misreading of *ἄλλη*, the offending entry being in fact a continuation of the previous article in the lexicon, that on *Lykoreia*. The misreading cannot be attributed to a later copyist, because of the additional note at the end, *τὸ ἐθνικὸν Λυλαῖος*, which no mere scribe would have bothered to add, whereas the generation of the ethnic from the polis-name is exactly in Stephanos' manner (cf. the typical form of an article like: *Χάλαιον· πόλις Δοκρῶν· τὸ ἐθνικὸν Χαλαῖος· Θουκυδίδης γ'*). Thus the mistake must be Stephanos' own (cf. *RE* 13.2 [1927] 2467). And it must, I think, have been made by misreading not the full text of the author being excerpted, but a lexicographical notice, either one of the many that Stephanos took over from previous compilations, or, perhaps, a rough preliminary note of his own.

It thus transpires that there are not only ample grounds for scepticism about the general accuracy of Stephanos' lexicon, but also several exact parallels for the kind of error that I think occurred in the article *ᾠτιεῖς*.

It is hard to imagine that anyone could read *KITIEIS* as *ΩΤΙΕΙΣ* if he had before him a manuscript of Ephoros written in some form of the clear majuscule hand that was usually employed for literary works in the time of Stephanos and earlier.<sup>22</sup> (I accept the estimate of Honigmann and others that the *Ethnika* appeared under Justinian I.<sup>23</sup>) But in the cursive script that was the forerunner of later minuscule hands, which was used in copying "texts intended as working copies" as well as for

<sup>21</sup>*De Sibyllarum indicibus* (Diss. Berlin 1879) 62; cf. *RE*, art. cit. (above, note 13), 2391, and also *s.v.* "Lyle," 13.2 (1927) 2467–2468.

<sup>22</sup>Good examples are to be found in R. Devr  sse (above, n. 10) plate 1, and p. 399 (Codex Marchalianus, Q, of the 6th century A.D. = Vat. Gr. 2125), and C. H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands, 350 B.C.–A.D. 400* (Oxford 1955), plates 3a (mid-3rd century B.C.) and 11b (early 1st century B.C.). E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford 1971), Introduction, 1–5, argues that the common classification of scripts as "book hands" or "cursive hands" is too rigid and takes no account of the occurrence of cursive features in some scripts that were used to make formal copies of books, or of the professional beauty and regularity to be observed in many private letters and other documents. He prefers to define a book hand as one "in capitals strictly or roughly bilinear [i.e., placed between notional parallels that determine the height and size of the letters, as he explains on page 3], usually made slowly" (4). It is this style of writing that was generally used to make formal copies of standard literary texts; and in such texts abbreviations would not normally be used: cf. Turner 17: "The reader will observe for himself that abbreviations are not used in writing the text of a well-written literary work. . . . A developed system of abbreviation by suspension of a large part of the word, or by using a symbol, is tolerated only in texts intended as working copies . . . , especially in hypomnemata . . . or in extensive marginal annotation. . . ."

<sup>23</sup>*RE* 3 A 2 (1929) 2372–2373.



scholarly notes,<sup>24</sup> a confusion of “κ” with “ω” is readily conceivable.<sup>25</sup> It might be further assisted by the normal habit of such writers of abbreviating *καί*.<sup>26</sup> If this is what happened, then either (1) the manuscript of Ephoros which Stephanos used was an informal copy of the work, written in something closer to a business hand than to a book hand,<sup>27</sup> or (2) it was a copy made from such an edition,<sup>28</sup> or (3) Stephanos took the name from an entry in a previous lexicographical work, such as that of Herodian,<sup>29</sup> or (4) Stephanos misread and miscopied his own preliminary note of the Ephoros quotation, which would probably have been written (whether by Stephanos himself or an assistant) in a typical “hypomnemata” hand.

This last possibility may seem less likely to some, since the quotation is given under the lemma of the supposedly corrupt word. But whatever the method followed by ancient lexicographers—what did they use for index-cards?—, it is hard to imagine that there was not an intermediate stage between the excerpting of literary works and the compiling of the alphabetical list of words to be glossed. It would certainly be interesting to know whether Stephanos compiled an article on Kitíon, and, if he did, what it contained; but this we cannot discover, as the articles between *Κέλαιθρα* and *Κόρακος πέτρα* are not preserved in our far from complete editions of the *Ethnika*. In any case, the *Λωμεντός*/*Νωμεντός* example given above (129) shows that Stephanos was quite capable of writing one article on Kitíon and another on “Otion.” Furthermore, the process by which *ἄλλη* became *Δύλη* (discussed above, 129) lends some support to the hypothesis that mistakes were sometimes made between the original transcription from a literary text and the final production of the lexicon.

<sup>24</sup>Turner (above, note 22) 17.

<sup>25</sup>Cf. Turner (above, note 22) text no. 59 (=Ann Arbor, *PMich* Inv. 622; abstracts of contracts). Note especially the writing of *εἰσκαταβρωματα* in line 14 and of *Ἀλκιμος* *ὡς* in line 17.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. Turner (above, note 22), 4 and 17 (quoted above, note 22) on the general difference in style of writing and habit of abbreviation that distinguishes writing done for essentially private or scholarly purposes from texts made for general public use. He cites his no. 60 (Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia* = BM Pap. 131) as an example of a “privately commissioned text, in a hand not unlike those used for hypomnemata” (102), and his nos. 58 and 61 as showing a similar script used for hypomnemata. These three texts display also a similar use of some standard abbreviations for common words and parts of words (chiefly prepositions and particles), including *καί*.

<sup>27</sup>Turner (above, note 22) text no. 60.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. Turner (above, note 22) 20, note 1: “The errors that are found in a copy of Plato, *Phaedo* of i/ii A.D. published by W. Schubart in *᾿ΓΡ* iv (1950), p. 83 make it clear that it was copied from an exemplar written in a business cursive (*ειωθες* for *είωθός*, *οντα* for *οὔσα*, *παις* for *τούς*, *εγπυοντοπυ* for *ἐγένοντο ἐν*).”

<sup>29</sup>Cf. the entries *Λωμεντός* and *Νωμεντός*, the former taken from Herodian, the latter from Dionysios of Halikarnassos (discussed above, 128–129).

If I am right in regarding the name 'Ἰππιδῆς in Ephoros fragment 76 as a false reading (however produced) of Κιτιεῖς, there is no reason to alter the text of Diodoros 14.98.2; the reading Κιτιεῖς there is clearly right. One might perhaps ask why some scholars were so ready to emend this apparently unexceptionable part of Diodoros' text. The answer, I suspect, is that they were convinced first that wherever some part of the text of Ephoros appeared to parallel Diodoros, the correspondence between them must be made as perfect as possible,<sup>30</sup> and second that, where they differed, the text of Ephoros was much more likely to be right than that of Diodoros. This second conviction surely represents a confusing and invalid intrusion of the principles of historical source-criticism into the field of textual criticism. And a brief perusal of any discussion of the deficiencies of Stephanos' lexicon, on which we depend for the text of 55 out of 217—more than any other single source—of our fragments of Ephoros' *History*,<sup>31</sup> will quickly shatter any false confidence that we have here an unimpeachable authority for what Ephoros wrote.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup>Compare the method followed by Grenfell and Hunt in restoring the text of the "Ephoros papyrus" (*POxy.* 1610; see B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 13 [London 1919]), which in some places gave results that can scarcely be read as reasonable Greek. T. S. Brown noted the dubiousness of this procedure of restoration, whereby lacunae in the papyrus were filled "by industriously borrowing from the text of Diodorus," in *AJP* 73 (1952) 343. I discussed this point in my unpublished Harvard dissertation, *Diodoros and His Sources* (1969).

<sup>31</sup>Although Stephanos preserves more fragments than any other source—Strabo contributes the next largest number, 44—most of his fragments (both quotations and citations) are very short, so that the total volume of Stephanos' contribution to our knowledge is less than one might expect from these figures.

<sup>32</sup>It is interesting to note that certain other attempts to emend the text of Diodoros in the cause of consistency or accuracy have been recognized in more recent years to be misguided. A case which, like that discussed above, involves the comparison of a section of Diodoros' text with a fragment of Ephoros, is that of Diodoros 15.62.2 and 15.67.2, two passages that refer to the activities of a group of soldiers under the command of the Mantineian general Lykomedes as τοὺς καλουμένους ἐπιλέκτους (62.2; τοὺς ὀνομαζομένους ἐπιλέκτους, 67.2). A comparison of certain passages in Xenophon (*Hell.* 7.4.22, 33, 34, 36, and 5.3) which refer to a special corps of fighting men in the army of the Arkadian League known as ἐπαρίτοι, with the entry in Stephanos' lexicon s.v. ἐπαρίται suggested to some that at the points where we have ἐπιλέκτους in our text of Diodoros, Ephoros (who probably served as Diodoros' source for these events) had written ἐπαρίτους. In that case either Diodoros had changed what he found in his source or his text had been corrupted. The second alternative was championed by Unger (cf. the apparatus criticus to the Teubner edition). Jacoby, however, rejected the emendation of Diodoros' ἐπιλέκτους to ἐπαρίτους, arguing that Diodoros deliberately avoided using the more unusual name (*FGH Hist* 2 C 99). If he is right, as I think he is, then here is a case where Diodoros, summarizing a standard account of the history of Greece with the needs of the general reader in mind, altered a technical term that he found in Ephoros in favour of a more general synonym. A slightly different, but no less interesting, case of what I take to be mistaken emendation of Diodoros is to be found at 13.65.2. This passage describes a battle fought between Athenians and Megarians at a

We may now return to the original point of this enquiry, namely the comparison of Diodoros 14.98.2 with Ephoros fragment 76. The solution I have proposed, of treating the strange proper name 'Ωτιεύς in the fragment as a misreading of Κιτιεύς (made by Stephanos or someone before him in either the lexicographical tradition or the textual tradition of Ephoros' *History*) removes the problematic discrepancy between Diodoros and his presumed narrative source. Can any useful conclusions then be drawn from the comparison of these two passages about how Diodoros treated his sources? It is an unfortunate fact that, although the number of fragments preserved from the parts of Ephoros' *History* that parallel Diodoros' account of Greece from 480 to 362 (Books 11–15 of the *Bibliothēke*) is not negligible, very few of them consist of Ephoros' own words, and almost none are of any length.<sup>33</sup> Therefore in attempting to

place known as τὰ Κέρατα on the border between their two states. The battle is dated in Diodoros' year 409/8, although it may well have taken place in the preceding year (cf. I. A. F. Bruce, *A Historical Commentary on the Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* [Cambridge 1967] 28). The narrative appears to be confused, for in the first part (section 1) Diodoros mentions that the Megarians were assisted by some Sicilians, whereas later on he twice refers to the activities of Lakedaimonioi in the fighting. This discrepancy led Vogel to conjecture that Σικελιωτῶν and Σικελιώτας should be substituted for Λακεδαιμονίων and Λακεδαιμονίους respectively in 13.65.2 (cf. the apparatus to his Teubner text). The discovery of the Florence fragment of the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*, however, provided for the first time a parallel account of this battle (it is not mentioned by Xenophon), which proved to be, in fact, the ancestor of Diodoros' narrative (cf. Bruce 4 and 20–22). The papyrus fragment in question (col. 1), which has many lacunae, begins in the middle of the battle narrative, and mentions no Sikeliotai; but Lakedaimonioi appear in line 6 and again in line 14. Thus Diodoros' mention of Lakedaimonioi as taking part in the fighting is vindicated; and Vogel's proposed emendation ruled out (as Bruce notes [29]), although because we have not the complete account of the battle as it once stood in the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*, we do not know what part the Sikeliotai played in it. It is not hard to imagine, however, how Diodoros might have created such an obscurity in carelessly and perhaps too ruthlessly compressing a considerably longer and more detailed narrative. In fact, Ephoros may be partly responsible for the confusion if one can rely on Polybios' criticism of his abilities as a military historian (Pol. 12.25f). (See also D. Lotze, "Lysander und der Peloponnesische Krieg," *AbhLeipzig, philol.-hist. Kl.* 57 [1964] 20–22, whose reconstruction of the battle of Notion presumes a similar kind of confusion-in-condensation by Diodoros.) Even without the final proof now provided by the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*'s parallel account of the battle, this explanation of the confusion in Diodoros' narrative should surely have recommended itself to anyone who considered the task Diodoros had set himself (to put together out of the hotch-potch of histories dealing with particular places and peoples a compendious textbook of "world history") as much more likely than the assumption of unmotivated substitution of names by a manuscript copyist.

<sup>33</sup>Of the 217 fragments of Ephoros' *History* collected by Jacoby (*FGrHist* 70 F 7–96 and 109–236) only 42 (viz., nos. 65, 67, 71–73, 75–79, 81–88, 186–195, 197, 198, 200, 205–213, 215, 216) can usefully be compared with Diodoros books 11–15, inasmuch as they relate to events in Greece between 480 and 362, and are preserved independently of Diodoros himself (a necessary condition if one is trying to discover how closely

elucidate the methods of Diodoros we must make use of even the smallest scrap of evidence.

What we have here quite clearly shows, first and most obviously, just how much Diodoros sometimes took from his source. This looks like a clear example of what he has so often been criticized for, namely producing not an intelligently generalized, and therefore summary, modification of a long and detailed narrative, but rather a somewhat arbitrary selection of specific details, taken from his source without much change.

But there remains one difference between the Ephoros fragment and Diodoros' text, which may tell us more: where Ephoros had ἀντέχοντες ἐτι τῷ πολέμῳ, Diodoros omitted the ἐτι. In fact, the fragmentary half-sentence that Stephanos quotes from Ephoros reads like a resumption of a thread of narrative: Ephoros would not have written "... the people of Amathous, Soloi, and Kition, however, *still* continuing their war of resistance..." unless he had previously mentioned the start of that resistance. It looks as though Ephoros described the war (as one might expect) in much greater detail than Diodoros, and divided his attention at this point between the resisting cities and someone else, presumably Euagoras and the cities which he did manage to subjugate. Diodoros obviously compressed the story very much, for he packed everything from Euagoras' return from exile to the beginning of his campaign of annexation into 98.1. As a result he mentioned the resistance of the three cities only once, and to write ἀντέχοντες ἐτι τῷ πολέμῳ would have made no sense. In omitting ἐτι he was quite sensibly adapting Ephoros' sentence to suit his own narrative.

His telescoping of Ephoros' fuller narrative did, however, leave the reference to τῷ πολέμῳ without adequate explanation. Ephoros presumably described how war broke out between Euagoras and the three cities which did not immediately accede to his demands. Diodoros leaves this to be deduced from the brief summary he gives of Euagoras' first and most successful campaign of annexation (τῶν δὲ πόλεων ἃς μὲν βίῃ χειρωσάμενος, ἃς δὲ πειθοῖ προσλαβόμενος, τῶν μὲν ἄλλων πόλεων ταχὺ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν παρέλαβεν . . . , 14.98.2).

Diodoros followed Ephoros when not expressly citing him or quoting from his work). Of those 42 only three (76, 189, and 191) both correspond significantly in content with the relevant parts of Diodoros and embody the actual words of Ephoros. And fragment 191 (the so-called "Ephoros papyrus") is problematic, first because the author's identity is not certain (cf. T. W. Africa, *AJP* 83 [1962] 86ff.), and second because of the amount of reconstruction that has to be done before anything can be made of the text. For the pieces of papyrus are all small and rather badly mutilated; there are no external indications of the order in which they should be put together (cf. Grenfell and Hunt [above, note 30] 99); and the editors inevitably drew heavily on the text of Diodoros 11.59–62 (the parallel narrative) in restoring the papyrus (see the comments cited above [note 30]) of Africa and Brown.

These deductions, that Diodoros' account of the rise of Euagoras may well be misleadingly summary, and that the hostilities between Euagoras and the more powerful among his Cypriote neighbours may have begun a year or so before 391/0, perhaps shed some light on the notorious chronological problems of the Cypriote War.<sup>34</sup> It is well known that, although he says in his summary statement at the end (15.9.2; under the year 385/4) that the war lasted about 10 years (*δεκαετής σχεδόν γεγενημένος*), Diodoros actually distributes his notices of events relating to the war among only four years, namely 391/0, 387/6, 386/5, and 385/4, the first and last of which span (by inclusive reckoning) not 10 but 7 years. It has become customary to assume that Diodoros located the beginning of the war in 391/0, correctly, and that he was mistaken in putting its end in 385/4. I wish to suggest that a careful study of his narrative of the war shows reason to doubt both that he located its beginning in 391/0, and that it in fact began in that year, while on the other hand his dating of its end to 385/4 is both well motivated and probably correct.

The interpretation of Diodoros' annalistic scheme has always been a problem. It is quite clear that he frequently assigned events to the wrong years, and that he had probably not enough information, and certainly not enough application, to compose an accurately annalistic narrative from non-annalistic sources. In fact, some of the very formulae of time which he uses betray a totally unannalistic way of thinking.<sup>35</sup> In some places it is not difficult to see what he has done. Thus 14.98 begins with a summary account of the career of Euagoras, which quite clearly refers to events that long preceded the year (391/0) under which Diodoros narrates them: the exile and reinstatement of Euagoras as king of Salamis, for example, we know from other sources must have happened before about 410 B.C.;<sup>36</sup> and he actually notes that the exile fell *ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις* (98.1). Here, then, no one is misled by finding his record of the whole early career of Euagoras under 391/0; and even if we had no independent witness to the dates of these events, we should probably not be inclined to take Diodoros' record of them under this year very seriously. But it is often hard to see where the flashback ends and contemporary events begin: we do not know how long the hostilities between Euagoras and his rivals on Cyprus had lasted before they appealed to Persia. And we perhaps assume too readily that Diodoros' narrative should be treated as

<sup>34</sup>See *RE* 6 A (1909) 825–826 for a summary of the many different schemes proposed, and the difficulties involved.

<sup>35</sup>To pass from the list of eponymous magistrates that heads each year into the narrative of events he seems to employ indiscriminately precise formulae such as *τούτων δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν παρειληφότων* . . . (e.g., 14.12.2, 38.2) and vague formulae much more suited to unannalistic history, such as *περὶ δὲ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους* . . . (e.g., 14.19.2, 85.2).

<sup>36</sup>Cf. Hill (above, note 11) 127.

annalistic unless there is some obvious and definite reason to think otherwise.

In fact, if one reads Diodoros' reports concerning Euagoras independently of the years to which he assigns them, it is possible to discern the general outlines of the account of the war which he was trying to adapt to his annalistic arrangement. It consists basically of two sections of narrative, the first (14.98.1-4) describing the early career of Euagoras and how his growing ambitions brought him into collision with the Great King, the second (15.2.1-4.3 and 8.1-9.2) summarizing the events that led to the defeat of Euagoras at the end of the war (14.110.5 merely reports, in a different context, some of the details given at 15.2.1 ff.; on this see just below). 15.2.1 was fairly clearly the beginning of a new section of Cypriote narrative in Ephoros: the whole of this chapter is resumptive, describing the preparations made by both sides for the major fighting that occupied the last two years of the war. Whether Ephoros too made a break between Euagoras' departure for Egypt to ask help from Akoris during the siege of Salamis (15.4.3) and his return from this mission (15.8.1) we cannot know. It would perhaps be a natural point at which to break up a long sequence of narrative, but 15.8.1 picks up and continues the account of the war smoothly, without any of the telltale flashbacks that occur at 15.2.1.

Thus Ephoros' account was far from being annalistic, and Diodoros had set himself an impossible task in trying to make it so. He did the best he could by paying attention to such indications as he found of how events in different theatres were related. One reason why Artaxerxes delayed for so long to take action against Euagoras was his preoccupation with events in Greece and Asia Minor, to which the Peace of Antalkidas put a temporary end in 387. Diodoros used this statement, together with the report that all the serious fighting in the Cypriote War was concentrated in only two years (15.9.2 and 2.1), to assign the King's offensive against Euagoras to the years immediately following the Peace (386/5 and 385/4); and he inserted after his report of the Peace a short cross-reference pointing out that it freed the King to prepare his attack on Cyprus, and that Euagoras had profited in the meantime from the King's preoccupation with the West to annex almost the whole island (14.110.5).<sup>37</sup>

<sup>37</sup>A realization of the essentially unannalistic nature of Diodoros' account of the Cypriote War may enable us to explain a notorious problem in his narrative of its early stages. The statement that Hekatomnos actually took a force to Cyprus soon after Artaxerxes decided to go to war against Euagoras (14.98.4, given by Diodoros under his year 391/0) has been generally disbelieved (cf. Hill [above, note 11] 132, note 6), chiefly because Diodoros nowhere reports what Hekatomnos did after arriving on Cyprus with his "strong force," and later mentions that Hekatomnos sent Euagoras a sum of money with which to hire mercenaries (15.2.3). And his summary statement (15.9.2) that, although the war lasted approximately 10 years in all, the serious fighting fell only in

Diodoros' narrative of the Cypriote War thus makes good sense in detail, if one allows for a few obscurities caused by the difficulty of greatly abridging a much longer account, and of dividing up an essentially unannalistic narrative to fit his own overall annalistic scheme. And his indications of time, both absolute and relative, are mutually consistent and sensible. He says the war lasted "close to 10 years" (δεκαετὴς σχεδὸν γεγενημένος, 15.9.2), and ended in 385/4. Most of the 10 years, however, were taken up with preparations, so that the serious fighting between Euagoras and the Persians filled only the last two years (τὸ πλεόν τοῦ χρόνου περὶ παρασκευὰς ἀσχοληθεῖς [sc. ὁ πόλεμος], διετὴ χρόνον τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι συνεχῶς

---

the last two years, after much time had been spent on preparations, makes it hard to believe that a large Persian armament actually crossed to Cyprus as early as 391/0. In fact, however, the text that makes Hekatomnos the subject of the final sentence is an emendation by Vogel (οὗτος for the αὐτός of the mss). On reading the emended sentence, one is surprised to discover that Hekatomnos must have been in Susa when the command was given to him, if he then "traversed the cities of the upper satrapies" before crossing over to Cyprus. But were the "upper satrapies" on the route that led from Susa to the coast? The phrase αἱ ἄνω σατραπείαι is not much used by Diodoros save in the history of Alexander and the Successors, but in books 17–20 of the *Bibliotheke* it occurs frequently, denoting no absolutely fixed group of satrapies, but referring generally to the eastern and north-eastern parts of both the Persian Empire and the empire of Alexander and the Successors. In its broadest sense it embraces all those satrapies that have no outlet to the sea (i.e., everything east and north-east of Syria and Phoenicia; cf., for example, 17.37.1; 19.100.3 and 4); elsewhere it refers more specifically to the further eastern provinces (from Media, Sousiane, and Persis to the Indian border: so, e.g., 17.64.1; 18.39.6, 73.2 and 4; 19.14.4). But in no case is anyone travelling from East to West described as going *to* the upper satrapies, as opposed to coming *from* them. Furthermore, when Diodoros wants to say that someone left Susa or Babylon and came to the Mediterranean Coast, he says it in the normal way (e.g., 14.81.4, Κόνων . . . κατέβαινεν εἰς τὴν θάλατταν). It seems to me, therefore, that there are great difficulties in the way of accepting Vogel's text and taking it to mean that Hekatomnos came down from Susa to the sea. And if we interpret this text in its natural sense, to mean that Hekatomnos went East, into the traditional "upper satrapies," we have a local dynast of Karia apparently on some sort of recruiting expedition in the hinterland of Persia! If, on the other hand, we keep the mss text, with the reading αὐτός, which makes not Hekatomnos, but Artaxerxes, the subject of the sentence, what are we to make of the assertion that the King "crossed over to Cyprus with a strong force"? We have no reason to believe that the King ever went near Cyprus during the whole war with Euagoras. But perhaps this is a confused reference to the campaign that was eventually launched after several years of preparation by Orontes and Tiribazos (15.2.1). If this is correct, then what Diodoros found in his source, and carelessly abridged, was a list of a number of different steps taken by the Persian king to prepare for the attack on Euagoras which he promised his Cypriote allies he would launch: he (1) wrote letters instructing the coastal cities and satraps to prepare ships and supplies, (2) sent to Hekatomnos (in Karia) a commission to begin the war, (3) collected troops from the upper satrapies, and (4) finally (when all was ready) crossed over to Cyprus with a large force. This final statement must then be merely a careless way of referring to the campaign made on behalf of the King by his generals.

πολεμηθείς, 15.9.2). The reason for this delay in operations was the King's preoccupation with events in Greece and Asia Minor, which ended (temporarily) only with the Peace of Antalkidas, in 387/6 (14.110.5). By the time the King turned his attention to Cyprus after the Peace, Euagoras had profited by his inaction to get control of almost the whole island (14.110.5, cf. 15.2.4) and of Tyre and other cities of Phoenicia (15.2.4), and he had collected a large army and navy, assisted by such allies as Hekatomnos of Karia and Akoris of Egypt (15.2.3), as well as other opponents of the King. These successes of Euagoras and his allies therefore fell, according to Diodoros, in the years leading up to the Peace of 387/6. The war began, apparently, in a small way, with Euagoras' gradual encroachments on his Cypriote neighbours, perhaps as early as 394/3 (the tenth archon-year before its end in 385/4). It is these proceedings that Diodoros summarizes so briefly in 14.98.2. In 391/0, however, the most powerful of the Cypriote cities that Euagoras had been trying to win over appealed to Persia for help in the war they were fighting for their freedom. Artaxerxes agreed to intervene, but, being unable for the moment to commit a large force on Cyprus, simply issued orders to the dynast of nearby Karia to take charge of the war with what troops could be obtained in Asia Minor.<sup>38</sup>

This picture of Euagoras' fortunes accommodates satisfactorily the few brief indications given by Xenophon. In 390 or 389 an Athenian squadron was intercepted by the Spartans at Rhodes on its way to Cyprus ἐπὶ συμμαχίᾳ τῇ Εὐαγόρου, who was then at war with the King (*Hell.* 4.8.24). Another squadron, led by Chabrias, set out in 388 or 387 βοηθῶν Εὐαγόρᾳ (*Hell.* 5.1.10). Both Demosthenes (20.76) and Cornelius Nepos (12.2.1 ff.) mention the success of this second expedition in cataloguing the great deeds of Chabrias, its commander; and Nepos goes so far as to say, *neque prius inde discessit* [*sc.* Chabrias], *quam totam insulam*

<sup>38</sup>The sequence of events will then be as follows:

ca 394/3–392/1: Euagoras begins, by a combination of force and diplomacy, to make himself master of Cyprus; war with Amathous, Soloi, and Kition, who resist.

391/0: these three cities appeal for Persian aid; Artaxerxes declares war, commissions Hekatomnos to take it in hand, and issues orders for preparation of forces in Asia Minor.

391/0–387/6: Hekatomnos does nothing; Euagoras profits from Persian inactivity to extend his conquests over almost all of Cyprus, and into Phoenicia, and to build up his army and navy with the help of various allies.

387/6: Peace of Antalkidas frees Artaxerxes from preoccupation with Greece; expedition finally organized by Tiribazos and Orontes against Euagoras.

386/5–385/4: Euagoras, after some initial successes, defeated in major naval battle off Kition, and shut up in Salamis under Persian siege; after various attempts to force Persians to withdraw (by sowing dissension between the commanders, etc.), Euagoras wins the reward of his resourcefulness in a settlement that leaves him as tributary king of Salamis.



*bello devinceret* (12.2.2). It is usually said that Athens recalled Chabrias from Cyprus after a Persian complaint that his presence violated the Peace of Antalkidas, just as they had later to recall him from Egypt (Diod. 15.29.2-3; see Hill [above, note 11] 133 and 135).

This evidence concerning Athenian support of Euagoras thus fits into the sequence of events described by Diodoros, according to which his greatest triumphs preceded the Peace of 387/6, and the Persian campaign that ended his wide dominion began in 386/5. Diodoros' account also fits in well with the numismatic evidence that Euagoras actually managed in 388/7 to force on Kition an Athenian ruler (Demonikos). This man's power appears to have lasted only a year or less (the gap in the dated series of coins of the Phoenician king of Kition, into which the coins of Demonikos fall, is only one year long); and it would be natural to connect his overthrow with the beginning of the Persian counter-offensive after the Peace, although one can attribute it simply to the withdrawal of Athenian support, which followed on the Peace (see Hill [above, note 11] 133-134, and note 6).

The other evidence concerning the Cypriote War is found in the *Euagoras* (9) and the *Panegyricus* (4) of Isokrates. In the *Euagoras*, the eulogy written some time after that king's death in 374/3, Isokrates makes much, as one would expect, of the heroic struggle between the upholder of Greek culture, with his small resources, and the crushing might of the barbarian king. But if one makes due allowance for encomiastic magniloquence, such details as he gives of the war are perfectly consistent with Diodoros' account. He says the war lasted 10 years (9.64), as compared with Diodoros' "close to 10 years" (15.9.2). But a look at the context of this statement at once explains this. Isokrates is stressing how long it took Artaxerxes to put down Euagoras, by contrast with the mere 3 years in which he had put an end to Spartan hegemony (64); and he actually goes on to compare Euagoras to the heroes of the Trojan War, who fought for 10 years against a single city (65). Euagoras' war, therefore, must also be a 10-year war, and Isokrates does not trouble to note, as Diodoros did, that only the last two years saw any real fighting between Euagoras and the Persians.

The same desire to magnify the war can be detected in Isokrates' statements that Artaxerxes began to make war on Euagoras *μεταξὺ ἐν πάσχωιν*, i.e., before Euagoras had done him any harm (58), and that he took action against Euagoras not because of what he had done already, but from fear of what he might do in the future (60). These statements refer, I believe, to the declaration of war which Artaxerxes made, according to Diodoros, in 391/0 (but followed with no action until several years later), and which preceded the extension of Euagoras' conquests beyond Cyprus in the period 391/0 to 387/6. Isokrates chose to maintain that, so long as

Euagoras operated only on Cyprus, to which he had some rights of sovereignty, Artaxerxes had no legitimate complaint against him, although it seems highly unlikely that Euagoras still paid tribute himself to Persia at this point, or permitted his allies and vassals to do so. The same determination to put the blame on Artaxerxes can be seen also in 62, where Isokrates says Euagoras *ἡναγκάσθη πολεμεῖν* (cf. *RE* 6 A [1909] 822–823).

The few more specific details contained in this speech agree well with Diodoros' fuller account. Thus Isokrates describes the final agreement between Euagoras and the Persians in more eulogistic terms, but with no essential differences from Diodoros (Isokrates 9.63 and 64, cf. *Diod.* 15.9.2). His list of the successes of Euagoras (62) differs from that in Diodoros (15.2.3–4) only in adding the revolt of Cilicia. Diodoros says nothing of this, but he does note (15.2.2) that the troops for the invasion of Cyprus were mustered at Phokaia and Kyme, not in Cilicia, which would have been the most convenient place from which to launch the invasion. This perhaps shows that the fuller account which he was using did report a revolt of Cilicia, which he omitted in his abridgement.

In the *Panegyricus* the situation is more complicated. The object of the speech being to persuade the Greek cities (and especially Athens and Sparta) to cease quarrelling with one another and launch a joint expedition against Persia, Euagoras' war is introduced chiefly as an example of the weakness and inefficiency of the Great King's military operations (the point made in the *Euagoras*), and to show how sadly the Greeks neglect their own best interests when they serve as mercenary soldiers in Persian armies. There are four specific references to the Cypriote War (134, 141, 153, and 160–162). The most extensive passage is 160–162, where Isokrates, arguing that the present time is particularly opportune for an attack on Persia, lists various parts of the Empire which are not firmly in the King's power: Egypt and Cyprus are in revolt; Phoenicia and Syria are "turned upside down by the war"; Tyre has been seized by the King's enemies; most of the Cilician cities are held by those on the Greek side, and the rest can easily be won; Lycia has never been conquered by the Persians; and Hekatomnos of Karia, long a rebel in secret, will revolt openly at the convenience of the Greeks. Apart from the mention of Cilicia and Lycia, this looks very much like Diodoros' description (15.2.3–4) of the successes won by Euagoras in the period before the Persian assault of 386/5.

At 141, as one of his arguments for the weakness of Artaxerxes, Isokrates says:

Next, having launched an expedition against Euagoras, who is lord of only a single city, and who is to be given up to the King according to the Treaty, and who besides lives on an island, has suffered disaster at sea, and has now only 3000 peltasts with which to fight

for his country—still even so weak a power as his the King is not able to overcome in war, but he has now spent six years at it. . . .

This passage refers to some time after the Peace of Antalkidas, in which Cyprus was ceded to the King, and after a disaster at sea, which can only be the battle of Kition, described by Diodoros (15.3.4–6) under the year 386/5. According to Diodoros (15.4.1) the Persians followed up their victory at Kition by besieging Salamis. The siege reduced Euagoras' holdings to Salamis alone, so that his military resources were much contracted, although Isokrates' 3000 peltasts may be an exaggeration of his weakness. Here, then, Isokrates was writing of the period (386/5–385/4 by Diodoros' chronology) when Euagoras held only his own city, which, however, still continued to resist the Persian siege. In that case the 6 years that the King has spent in war would be counted from 391/0, when the King was first brought in by the Cypriotes' appeal; and Isokrates is again glossing over, as he did in the *Euagoras*, the fact that no Persian attack was actually mounted until the fifth of these six years.

Of the remaining two passages, one (153) is chronologically vague (it merely refers to the insulting treatment by the Persians of those Greeks who had joined the attack on Cyprus); the other (134) is a bitter observation that the presence of Greeks on both sides in the Cypriote War, fighting both for Euagoras and for Tiribazos in the siege of Salamis, shows a great blindness to their own national interests.

Thus all the passages in the *Panegyricus* that allude to the affairs of Euagoras fit in well enough with the version of the war given by Diodoros. But they create their own chronological problem. For the three passages that refer most specifically to the Cypriote War (viz. 134, 141, and 160–162) all claim to be alluding to contemporary events, whereas the situations they describe can hardly have existed at the same time. 134 and 141 clearly refer to the last year or so of the war, when Salamis was under siege, and Euagoras' power straitened. 160–162, on the other hand, picture the situation when he was still at the height of his power, and had extended his conquests and depredations beyond Cyprus itself, before the Persian counter-attack began. According to Diodoros' chronology, the former passages must have been written ca 386–384, and the latter ca 390–387.

The problem is compounded if one looks for other references to contemporary history in this speech. For whereas some passages (e.g., 136) mention as contemporary events which may be as early as 390–388, others clearly allude to events of the period 385–380 (e.g., 123 ff. and 176). These discrepancies can be explained only if Isokrates worked on the speech over a period of years, and neglected, when he published the final version, to bring all the allusions up to date. There is ample testimony from antiquity that Isokrates did work on this speech for years (cf. Plut.

*Mor.* 837f; Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 208), most notably the sarcastic remark of Timaios (ap. [Longinus] *Subl.* 4.2 ff.) that it took Isokrates more years to compose the *Panegyricus* than Alexander required to conquer Asia. And although some scholars have contended that Isokrates could not conceivably have published the speech without thoroughly revising it and bringing it up to date (e.g., Beloch [above, note 3] 3.2.227), evidence of such lack of revision seems to me plain in the text. Whether Isokrates issued the speech first at the Olympic festival of 384, and later revised it for republication,<sup>39</sup> or whether the first publication was in 380 is immaterial.

I have argued that Diodoros' account of the Cypriote War is both plausible in its details (apart from a few obscurities due to his abridgement) and chronologically consistent both in itself and with other events of the time; and that we should therefore accept it as our basic account of the war, to be supplemented but not supplanted by such details as can be pieced together from Isokrates' two speeches. What seems now to have become the preferred opinion<sup>40</sup> does the opposite. It argues from the references in the *Panegyricus* to events of the late 380's that that speech was published in 380, and then proceeds to locate the Cypriote War on the assumption that references to the siege of Salamis as still in progress must have been written in that year. Thus the war is said to have ended in 380/79, the two years of serious fighting are 381–380, and details pulled out of Diodoros' narrative are made to fit this scheme. And so it is concluded that Diodoros was mistaken in his dates for the Persian campaign on Cyprus (though not in the details of his narrative), but that he knew somehow that the war began in 391/0. There are two major difficulties with this view. First, if in fact the war lasted through 12 archon-years (391/0–380/79), would Diodoros have given its length as "close to 10 years," or Isokrates in his most magniloquent mood have rounded the figure off to less than the facts warranted? And second, given the chronological inconsistency between the references to Euagoras' power at its most contracted, during the siege of Salamis (*Paneg.* 134 and 141), and at its widest extension, before the Persians launched their attack (*Paneg.* 160–162), it becomes very difficult to use allusions in that speech as firm indications of date.

To sum up, the comparison of this small fragment of Ephoros (F 76) with the corresponding passage in Diodoros (14.98.2) shows that Diodoros sometimes reflected not only the general outline of events given by his sources, but also some details of wording. But it also shows him adapting

<sup>39</sup>This was the hypothesis of Engel, *De tempore quo divulgatus sit Panegyricus* (Progr. Stargard 1861).

<sup>40</sup>Cf. *RE* 6 A (1909) 826; Beloch (above, note 3) 226–229; G. Mathieu in the Budé edition (Paris 1961) vol. 2, page 5.

what he borrowed to suit his own account, an adaptation which indicates how greatly he must have compressed the much fuller narrative of Ephoros. The comparison provides in addition a point of departure for a look at the chronology of Diodoros' account of the Cypriote War, from which it transpires that not only the narrative details but also the dates that he gives are sensible and mutually consistent, and that a good case can be made for taking his dates as the foundation for our reconstruction of the war, rather than those that have sometimes been drawn from hypotheses concerning the publication of Isokrates' *Panegyricus*.

I conclude, then, that the more open-minded approach to Diodoros taken by a number of scholars in the last 25 years is a salutary development. A readiness to look at the *Bibliothèque* with a realistic idea of what it was meant to be, unconstrained by some of the rigid assumptions of traditional source-criticism, is sometimes rewarded with new insights concerning the working methods of Diodoros. In the present case a re-examination of the text of Diodoros 14.98.2 and Ephoros fragment 76 has given reason to reject a frequently championed emendation of Diodoros, and instead to remove from the Ephoros fragment the mysterious proper-name which so obviously spoiled the correspondence between the two passages. The implications of that correspondence proved to bear also on the chronology of the Cypriote War; and it was found that, in this section of his work at least, Diodoros should be defended against those charges of stupidity and inconsistency that are so often levelled against him.<sup>41</sup>

ERINDALE COLLEGE, TORONTO

<sup>41</sup>I am grateful to Marcia Weinstein and John Wickersham for comments on an earlier draft of this paper, and to Peter Derow for much invaluable assistance with its later stages.