

CHAPTER FOUR

Ephorus's *History*



Although his work does not survive, Ephorus of Cyme (*FGrHist* 70) exerted a large influence on succeeding historians.¹ He was apparently a prolific writer. The work he is best known for is a *History* in thirty books (T 1, FF 7–96, 201–36). Its title is variously given in our sources in both the singular and the plural, perhaps because the work originally had no title, as the *Suda* entry appears to indicate (T 1). For ease of reference, I shall follow Strabo (13.3.6=T 2) and use the singular. In addition to his *History*, Ephorus is attested to have written a local history (Ἐπιχώριος λόγος) (FF 1, 97–103), a treatise on style (Περὶ Λέξεως) (FF 6, 107–8), and an *On Inventions* (Περὶ Εὐρημάτων) in two books (T 1, FF 2–5, 104–6). The *Suda* indicates that Ephorus's work also included a work *On Virtues and Vices* (Περὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν) in twenty-four books and a *Marvels* (Παραδόξων) in fifteen (T 1). Since neither of these works has left any traces in later sources, it is likely they were later collections of excerpts from Ephorus's *History*.² The fact that later sources were able to draw twenty-four books containing edifying material on virtues and vices and

1. Charles William Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), 44–46.

2. E. Schwartz, "Ephoros," *RE* 11 (1907), 1–16, and Kenneth S. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 26 n. 7.

fifteen books of marvels from Ephorus's larger historical work illustrates the latter's overall moralizing nature (even if the books of excerpts were much smaller). Ephorus was the first to write a universal history,³ the topics of which were arranged thematically (*kata genos*) (T 11), probably geographically.⁴ For both these attributes, his *History* has gained many successors.

In his *History*, Ephorus decided to avoid the "mythological period,"⁵ because of its difficulty (*δυσχέρεια*), as Diodorus tells us (4.1.2=T 8). We can infer from Harpocration (s.v. ἀρχαίως=F 9) that for Ephorus, the difficulty in discussing the ancient past involved the unreliability of details preserved over so long a period of time. Accordingly, Ephorus began his work with the Return of the Heracleidae,⁶ a choice that may well have been determined because it formed the termination of Hellanicus's mythographical work,⁷ and concluded it with the siege of Perinthus in 341/0. The large scope of his *History* would have offered Ephorus fertile material for the moralizing interests that the collection of excerpts entitled *On Virtues and Vices* dictates he had.

Because Ephorus's *History* does not survive, it is necessary first to examine to what extent the distortions imposed by the fragmentary nature of the extant portion of his work impede us from an accurate knowledge of his purpose and methods.⁸ Then, with these limitations in mind, we shall

3. τὰ καθόλου (Polybius 5.33.2=T 7), κοινὰ πράξεις (Diodorus 4.1.3=T 8, 5.1.4=T 11); cf. J. M. Alonso-Núñez, "The Emergence of Universal Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.," in *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek History from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.*, Studia Hellenistica 30, ed. Herman Verdin, Guido Schepens, and Els de Keyser (Louvain: n.p., 1990), 173–92.

4. Robert Drews, "Ephorus and History Written κατὰ γένος," *AJP* 84 (1963): 244–55 and "Ephorus' κατὰ γένος History Revisited," *Hermes* 104 (1976): 497–98. Pietro Vannicelli ("L'Economia delle storie di Eforo," *RFIC* 115 [1987]: 165–91), however, believes that Ephorus had more systematic structural ambitions.

5. Diodorus 4.1.3=T 8: ". . . he passed over the mythological period and, having set in order events that took place after the Return of the Heracleidae, he made this the beginning of his history" (. . . τὰς μὲν παλαιὰς μυθολογίας ὑπερέβη, τὰ δ' ἀπὸ τῆς Ἡρακλειδῶν καθόλου παραθέντα συνταξάμενος ταύτην ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο τῆς ἱστορίας).

6. Diodorus 4.1.3=T 8 and 16.76.5=T 10; the *Suda* (s.v. Ἐφιππος=T 1), however, states that Ephorus began his *History* from the Trojan War, about eighty years before the Return of the Heracleidae, according to Greek tradition (Thucydides 1.12.3). Diodorus, who clearly worked closely from Ephorus's history, is the more likely of the two to be correct.

7. F. Jacoby, "Hellanicus," *RE* 8 (1913), 148–50, and *FGrHist* IIC, 25–26; and Fornara, *The Nature of History*, 8–9.

8. For the difficulties of working with fragments, see the salutary remarks of Lionel Pearson ("Lost Greek Historians Judged by Their Fragments," *G&R* 12 [1943]: 43–56 [with special attention to the extant fragments of Hecataeus, Ephorus, and Philochorus]);

examine Ephorus's self-presentation as an accurate researcher, his most obvious deviations from his goal of accuracy, the moral virtues with which he appears most particularly concerned, and the methods by which he imparted them to the readers of his *History*. In conclusion, there will be an assessment of the extent to which Ephorus's moralizing priorities influenced his interpretation of the past.

Before turning to an investigation of the moralizing characteristics of the fragments themselves, it would be wise to examine whence the fragments are derived, with two questions specifically in mind. First of all, how accurate are these later authors in their citations of Ephorus? And second, do these fragments give a representative view of the *History* of Ephorus, or are they skewed by the interests and prejudices of the later writers who cite him? Unfortunately, as Ephorus's *History* is not extant, with the possible exception of what is preserved on papyrus,⁹ we are forced to rely solely upon the passages that later writers cite under the name of Ephorus (fragments) and the judgments these writers make of him (*testimonia*). The sources of the fragments of Ephorus's *History* compiled by Jacoby are a varied lot. It is unfortunate that we do not have for Ephorus the equivalent of an Athenaeus, who, as we shall see, has preserved for posterity long passages of Theopompus, often quoting the writer directly. Athenaeus does, however, preserve eight of the extant fragments from Ephorus's *History* (FF 11, 29, 48, 54, 71, 96, 180, and 183). All of them are brief, but four appear to give longer extracts of Ephorus's own words (FF 29, 54, 71, and 96), rather than short paraphrases. Descriptions of decadence and debauchery, of which Athenaeus

P. A. Brunt ("On Historical Fragments and Epitomes," *CQ* n.s., 30 [1980]: 477–94 [a good general account]); Wesley E. Thompson ("Fragments of the Preserved Historians—Especially Polybius," *The Greek Historians: Papers Presented to A. E. Raubitschek* [Saratoga, Calif.: ANMA Libri, 1985], 119–39); and Mark Toher ("On the Use of Nicolaus' Historical Fragments," *CLAnt* 8 [1989]: 159–72)].

9. *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* 1610 has been included in *FGrHist* 70 as F 191, particularly on the basis of its correspondence with Diodorus 11.56–69, who is supposed to have based this section of his *Bibliothēke* closely upon Ephorus. Despite the doubts of, e.g., Thomas W. Africa, "Ephorus and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1610," *AJP* 83 (1962): 86–89, and Robert Milns, "Some Critical Observations on Ephorus: Fragments 119, 111, and Testimony 23 (Jacoby)," *Vindex Humanitatis: Essays in Honor of John Huntly Bishop*, ed. Bruce Marshall (Armidale, New South Wales: University of New England, 1980), 46–57, at 56–57, the identification of this fragment as Ephorus remains the most likely possibility (see Catherine Reid Rubincam, "A Note on Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1610," *Phoenix* 30 [1976]: 357 and n. 2). Another papyrus fragment (*FGrHist* 105 F2), which has not been included in *FGrHist* 70, is likely to be Ephorus (cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIC, 337–38). Full discussion of its contents will appear below.

found such an abundance in Theopompus, are conspicuous by their absence, which indicates that these topics were less of a concern to Ephorus.

Perhaps as a result of the geographical diversity to be found in Ephorus's *History*, two writers with a special interest in geography provide us with the greatest number of fragments. Stephanus of Byzantium preserves over fifty of the fragments extant from the *History*. Because most of these fragments are single-line geographical entries, they do not give much of an indication as to the character of the original. Furthermore, Stephanus's background as a grammarian and his lack of geographical knowledge impede his ability to reproduce his own sources exactly, making him a less than perfectly dependable authority for what Ephorus actually wrote.¹⁰

Although Strabo comes second in the actual number of fragments he preserves,¹¹ the extracts he does provide are often long and continuous. There seem mostly to be summaries, but Strabo sometimes does reproduce Ephorus's own words, apparently for emphasis.¹² It is important to note that, in the places where Strabo's citation of Ephorus can be verified, he appears to give a faithful reproduction of his source. Strabo 9.3.12 (=F 31b) is particularly instructive because Theon's citation of the same passage of Ephorus (*Progymnasmata* 2=F 31a) employs the same adjectives to describe Tityus, violent (βίαιος) and lawless (παρᾶνομος). Likewise, the anonymous author of a *Periplus* of the Euxine Sea (=F 158) paraphrases all the essential material contained in Strabo's citation of Ephorus's description of the Nomad Scythians (8.3.9=F 42).¹³ Thus, Strabo's citations of Ephorus, particularly when they can be checked against other sources, can be trusted.

Aside from various scholiasts and grammarians who use Ephorus as an

10. Catherine I. Reid [Rubincam] ("Ephoros Fragment 76 and Diodoros on the Cypriote War," *Phoenix* 28 [1974]: 123–43) discusses the question of the reliability of Stephanus's lexicon (128–32).

11. John Wickersham (*Hegemony and Greek Historians* [Lanham, Md.: Rowan & Littlefield, 1994], 120 n. 4) has calculated that 59 of the 272 entries in *FGrHist* 70 come from Stephanus's *Ethnica*, and 48 from Strabo.

12. Pace Milns, "Some Critical Observations on Ephorus," 47–49.

13. Also, Strabo 8.8.5 (=F 18b) can be checked against Theon (*Progymnasmata* 2=F 18a) and [Scymnus] 516 (=F 18c), Strabo 1.2.28 (=F 30a) against a Christian geographical writer (=F 30b) and [Scymnus] 167–82 (=F 30c), Strabo 8.3.9 (=F 42) against a scholiast to Apollonius Rhodius 1.1276 (=F 42a), Strabo 12.3.21 (=F 114a) against Stephanus of Byzantium (s.v. Ἀλιζῶνες=F 114b), Strabo 4.4.6 (=F 131a) against [Scymnus] 183 (=F 131b), Strabo 5.4.5 (=F 134a) against [Scymnus] 236 (=F 134b), Strabo 6.2.2 (=F 137a) against [Scymnus] 264 (=F 137b), Strabo 6.1.7–8 (=F 138a and 139) against [Scymnus] 264 (=F 138b), and Strabo 10.4.16–22 (=F 149) against Polybius 6.45.1–10 (=F 148).

authority for all sorts of often obscure details (anonymous scholiasts preserve over forty citations of Ephorus), numerically the next best represented source for fragments of Ephorus is Plutarch, who preserves sixteen fragments, most of which consist of at least five lines in Jacoby's compilation. Plutarch drew upon a wealth of reading for each of his *Lives*, with sources including narrative historians, comedy, political documents, philosophers, orators, oral tradition, and personal observation;¹⁴ it is important to note that he especially preferred historiographical material as sources for his *Lives*.¹⁵ When engaged in selecting and arranging this mass of material, however, he was forced to rely often on his notes or memory.¹⁶ Given this method of work, Plutarch is unlikely to have reproduced the actual words of his sources and probably resorted to paraphrasing or otherwise adapting his material.¹⁷ Furthermore, his purpose was to provide the reader with edifying information on the characters of great men (*Alexander* 1). Because his main reason for consulting his sources was to derive anecdotal material providing information on the characters of the subjects of his *Lives*, naturally Plutarch was less interested in verifying the details of his citations from them than in recording the main point. It is perhaps for this reason that of Plutarch's sixteen citations of Ephorus, only one (F 189), quotes its source directly. There is no evidence, however, for Plutarch's altering the words of his sources to express the opposite of the original intent.¹⁸ Therefore, it is necessary to keep in mind that Plutarch's citations from Ephorus may have preserved the spirit but not necessarily the letter of the original.

A thornier problem is the extent to which Ephorus is reflected in the *Bibliothèque* of Diodorus Siculus. It was considered an established fact for nearly a century that Diodorus used Ephorus as his main authority for books 11 through 16, with the exception of most of the Sicilian

14. For the wide range of Plutarch's reading, see Konrat Ziegler, "Plutarchos," *RE* 21.1 (1951), 911–14, and D. A. Russell, *Plutarch* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1972), 42–62.

15. Barbara Scardigli (ed.), introduction to *Essays on Plutarch's Lives* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 2–7.

16. A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1945), 54–84; and C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives," *JHS* 99 (1979): 74–96; reprinted with new material in *Essays on Plutarch's Lives*, 265–318.

17. C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch's Adaptation of His Source-Material," *JHS* 100 (1980): 127–40; reprinted in *Essays on Plutarch's Lives*, 125–54.

18. Gordon Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991), 176 and n. 36.

narrative.¹⁹ Until the middle of this century, it was generally assumed Diodorus was capable of no more than mechanically reproducing the words of his sources and that as a result, all the moralizing sentiments contained in books 11 through 16 belonged by rights to Ephorus.²⁰ Recently, however, the reputation of Diodorus has undergone something of a renaissance, and it is now conceded that he was indeed able to formulate his own moral agenda to which he adhered consistently throughout the *Bibliothekē*.²¹ As a result of this reassessment, it can no longer be assumed that whenever Diodorus names no source in books 11 through 16 of the *Bibliothekē*, he is automatically reproducing Ephorus. We are thus left with the eleven citations compiled by Jacoby where Diodorus cites Ephorus by name. Nevertheless, Diodorus's use of Ephorus in these eleven specific citations is instructive, for in seven, he either criticizes Ephorus or includes him under the rubric of "other authorities."²² If his usual practice is to name Ephorus in cases of disagreement, it is very possible that he borrowed anonymously in other places, although we cannot use Diodorus's narrative as evidence for what Ephorus actually wrote in the absence of concrete proof of authorship. Furthermore, since he never quotes directly from Ephorus, we must assume that Diodorus is either paraphrasing or condensing his source. In the one instance where Diodorus's explicit citation of Ephorus can be checked against that of other sources, he can be shown to have preserved the essence of his argument.²³ Thus, it seems likely that Diodorus preserves an accurate report of the substance of Ephorus's *History* in the places where he specifically cites it, but we must be

19. This assumption began with C. A. Volquardsen (*Untersuchungen über die Quellen der griechischen und sicilischen Geschichten bei Diodor, Buch XI bis XVI* [diss., Kiel, 1868]) and was widely disseminated by E. Schwartz ("Diodoros" *RE* 5 [1903], 679).

20. See, e.g., G. L. Barber's treatment of Diodorus as a mere mouthpiece of Ephorus (*The Historian Ephorus* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935; repr. Chicago: Ares, 1993]), esp. 21–22 and 103 (this is the only monograph on Ephorus but is now very outdated).

21. Recent and detailed discussions of this question can now be found in Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, chapters 1 and 2, and Wickersham, *Hegemony and Greek Historians*, 150–77.

22. Diodorus contradicts Ephorus twice in his own persona (1.39.7–8=F 65e and 1.9.5=F 109) and cites him five times in cases of disagreement between authorities (1.3.54.5=F 201, 1.3.60.5=F 202, 1.3.80.5=F 203, 1.4.54.5=F 204, and 1.5.60.5=F 214). It should be noted, however, that the first four of these cases concern Sicilian affairs, for which the case for Ephorus as the main authority was never established.

23. Diodorus 1.37.4 (=F 65e) can be checked against the citations of five other authorities (F 65a–d, f).

careful not to impute any explicit moral judgments to Ephorus, since they may belong to Diodorus himself.

In our attempt to discover the extent to which Ephorus was willing to misrepresent history for the purpose of moral instruction, we must bear in mind that Strabo provides the most trustworthy citations for the earlier part of Ephorus's *History*, while the most reliable sources for the later sections appear to be Plutarch and Diodorus. It is important to remember, however, that few citations of Ephorus are verbatim and that most authorities provide paraphrases of the original. In order to gain insight into the tone of the work, it is necessary to turn to the comments that later writers have made (*testimonia*). On the whole, his style is described as supine and loose (ὑπτιον καὶ ἀνεμμένον),²⁴ and he seems to have earned a reputation for dullness, the most famous expression of which can be found in the quip (considered apocryphal by those scholars who do not believe in the student/teacher relationship) from his teacher Isocrates, that Ephorus needed the spur whereas Theopompus required the rein.²⁵ Duris of Samos criticizes both Ephorus and Theopompus for the lack of *mimesis* and pleasure (ἡδονή) in their writing, claiming that they were concerned only with the act of writing (τὸ γράφειν) (*FGrHist* 76 F 1 = *FGrHist* 70 T 22 and *FGrHist* 115 T 34). Vivienne Gray has recently demonstrated that by *mimesis* Duris means an imitative style, which he opposes to an artificial, epideictic “written” style.²⁶ The implication is that Ephorus did not vary his style in any significant way, which would naturally lead to a failure to imitate. In any case, it is perhaps because of Ephorus's dull style that few verbatim citations survive.

Despite their limitations, the extant fragments clearly indicate that Ephorus presented himself as a careful researcher. First of all, he appears to have been most assiduous in his gathering of information. The extant fragments indicate Ephorus's wide use of other historians as source material for his *History*, as well as of poets, playwrights, political treatises, epigraphical texts, oracles, and various linguistic materials.²⁷ Polybius (12.27.7 = F 110)

24. Dio Chrysostom 18.10 (=T 25). The *Suda* concurs (s.v. Ἐφορος Κυμαῖος καὶ Θεόπομπος Δαμασιστράτου = T 28a): “. . . supine, dull, and without intensity” (. . . ὑπτιος καὶ νοθρός καὶ μηδεμίαν ἔχων ἐπίτασιν).

25. T 28. See also Hortensius's remark (*FGrHist* 115 T 40): “What can be found that is more succinct than Philistus, more bitter than Theopompus, or more mild than Ephorus?” (*quid . . . Philisto brevius aut Theopompo acrius aut Ephoro mitius inveniri potest?*)

26. Vivienne Gray, “*Mimesis* in Greek Historical Theory,” *AJP* 108 (1987): 467–86.

27. Guido Schepens (“Historiographical Problems in Ephorus,” *Historiographia Antiqua* (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1977), 95–118 at 103 and nn. 38–53) provides references to particular fragments.

records Ephorus to have said that if it were possible for a historian to be present at all events, this would be by far the best source of information. As Guido Schepens brings to our attention, this statement shows that Ephorus is aware that personal observation of all the events he describes is an impossible feat; he is much more explicit than either Herodotus (2.99) or Thucydides (1.22.2) on the limits imposed by autopsy.²⁸ Isocrates (12.149–50) expresses a similar sentiment, which lends further credence to a direct relationship between the two. Since Ephorus began his *History* with events long before his own day, it was impossible to obtain information from firsthand witnesses for the first half of the work.²⁹ Nevertheless, even in the sections of his history for which firsthand information was not available, Ephorus seems to have made a conscious effort to choose the most direct sources possible.³⁰

Not only was Ephorus careful in his choice of source to follow, but the extant fragments show he had (or at least professed to have) some concern for accuracy. Strabo tells us (9.3.11=F 31b) that Ephorus criticized those who were fond of legends in their historical writing and praised truthfulness (ἐπιτιμήσας γούν τοῖς φιλομυθοῦσιν ἐν τῇ τῆς ἱστορίας γραφῇ καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπαινέσας). According to Diodorus (4.1.2–3=T 8), Ephorus avoided the legendary and passed over the mythological period in his *History* (τὰς παλαιὰς μυθολογίας ὑπερέβη). Notably, Isocrates also professes awareness of the unreliability of the mythological tradition,³¹ which again may indicate the existence of a direct relationship between him and Ephorus. Since Ephorus claimed to strive for accuracy, it would be useful to examine those passages in which he deviates from his stated historiographical aims to see whether he does so in a moralizing context.³²

Ephorus's most obvious deviation is one for which he is criticized by Strabo in two places (9.3.11–12=F 31b and 10.3.2–4=T 15 and F 122). Despite his stated intention not to include the mythological period, Epho-

28. Guido Schepens, "Éphore sur la valeur de l'autopsie (*FGrHist* 70 F 110=Polybe XII 27.7)," *Ancient Society* 1 (1970): 163–82.

29. Jacoby (*FGrHist* 70, 27–30) gives a tentative reconstruction of Ephorus's thirty books.

30. Schepens, "Historiographical Problems in Ephorus," 113.

31. See, e.g., 9.66 and 12.1, with the comments of S. Perlman, "The Historical Example, Its Use and Importance as Political Propaganda in the Attic Orators," *SH* 7 (1961): 150–66, at 158–59.

32. He allegedly also had a patriotic bias in favor of his native town of Cyme (F 236), but see Deborah Hobson Samuel, "Cyme and the Veracity of Ephorus," *TAPA* 99 (1968): 375–88.

rus does lapse into a discussion of it at the beginning of his *History*, perhaps because the first five books formed a prologue to the main narrative. The most noteworthy feature of our first example, an account of the foundation of the Delphic oracle, is the apologetic tone with which he introduces his discussion. According to Strabo (9.3.11–12=F 31b), Ephorus himself seems to have been somewhat self-conscious about breaking his own principle and prefaces his account with the explanation that it would be absurd (ἄτοπον) to tell the truth about all other matters but to pass on untrustworthy and lying stories about the most truthful of all oracles. He proceeds to show how Apollo and Themis (whom he rationalizes into a woman) established the oracle in order to help human beings by summoning them to civilization and by making them self-controlled (εἰς ἡμερότητα προὔκαλεῖτο καὶ ἐσωφρόνιζε). Strabo records Ephorus as having recounted Apollo's journey from Athens to Delphi, slaying Tityus on the way, who is rationalized to be a violent (βίαιος) and lawless (παράνομος) mortal, a ruler of Panopeus; Theon (*Progymnasmata* 2=F 31a) confirms the substance of this section of Strabo's quotation. Upon Apollo's arrival at Delphi, Ephorus says he civilized the original inhabitants by teaching them agriculture and other things beneficial to human life. He also slew a nasty fellow named Python, nicknamed Dracon (the Serpent), described as beastly (θηρωώδης), who undergoes a rationalization similar to that of Tityus, another detail confirmed by Theon (F 31a).

It seems Ephorus not only broke his stated principle of avoiding the mythological period but also gave an edifying version when non-edifying ones were available to him.³³ Even his rationalizations of the Tityus and Python myths seem to have a moral motivation. Ephorus makes it very clear that Apollo destroys Tityus and Python precisely because they are immoral and uncivilized. Moreover, Ephorus makes Apollo into a culture-hero, very similar to Isocrates' Evagoras (with the repeated use of the root ἡμερο-, there is also a verbal echo with the Isocratean passage).³⁴ Like Evagoras, not only does Apollo civilize those whom he conquers, who are portrayed as barbarians, but he also endows them with knowledge of

33. Homer (*Odyssey* 11.576–81) gives the unrationalized version of Tityus, a son of Gaia, who was punished in the underworld for having assaulted Leto. Joseph Fontenrose (*Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and Its Origins* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959], esp. 13–22) distinguishes five entirely separate versions of this story (21). In what became the most common version of the myth, Apollo slew a male serpent named Python in order to establish his oracle at Delphi.

34. Cf. Strabo 9.3.11 and 12 (=F 31b) with Isocrates 9.67.

the *technai*. Notably, Ephorus refers to Python as beastly (θηριώδης), a word commonly used to describe human life before the development of the *technai* in a number of fifth-century texts, including the Sisyphus fragment.³⁵ Thus, both Isocrates and Ephorus transform the *topos* of Greek *Kulturgeschichte* into the moral realm. But as we saw above, Isocrates presents Evagoras as a culture-hero in order to disguise his imperialism, and certainly, despite its veneer as a moral exemplum, Ephorus's version of Apollo's arrival at Delphi could be read in the same way.

Strabo refers to Ephorus's discussion of the Delphic oracle when he levels a similar criticism at him for breaking his own principle of avoiding the distant past (10.3.3=T 15, F 122a).³⁶ In this section, Strabo paraphrases his account of the foundation of the Aetolian nation, citing Ephorus as saying that the Aetolian nation remained unconquered due to the rough nature of the terrain and the training in warfare of the people. He then criticizes Ephorus for proceeding to narrate how the Epeians under Aetolus came from Elis and took over the country, expelling the indigenous Curetes. Ephorus is very apologetic for his lapse into mythology, for Strabo records him to have concluded this section by claiming that he is accustomed to providing an accurate discussion, whenever some matter is either entirely unknown or gives rise to false opinions.³⁷ It becomes apparent from Strabo that one of the mistaken notions Ephorus was attempting to correct is that the Eleans were colonists of the Aetolians. This, even Strabo has to admit, Ephorus does disprove.

The main point of Ephorus's discussion is that the Aetolian nation remained unconquered throughout its history due to Aetolus's own personal valor (ἀρετή) and the Aetolian people's continued excellence in warfare. The obvious inference is that if the Aetolians had not been willing to live in a rugged country and work hard at military training, they would have been conquered themselves, just as they had conquered the Curetes. Therefore, the moral lesson underlying the degeneration is that valor and lack of concern for the comforts of life lead a society to continued freedom. Just as in the case of the foundation of the Delphic oracle, Ephorus goes out of

35. Charles H. Kahn, "Greek Religion and Philosophy in the Sisyphus Fragment," *Phronesis* 42 (1997): 247–62, at 258.

36. Despite his criticism of Ephorus, however, Strabo admits (10.3.5=F 122a): "Although he has this flaw, Ephorus is nevertheless better than others . . ." (τοιούτος δ'ὢν Ἐφορος ἑτέρων ὅμως κρείττων ἐστίν . . .).

37. διακριβοῦν εἰώθαμεν, ὅταν ἢ τι τῶν πραγμάτων ἢ παντελῶς ἀπορούμενον ἢ ψευδῆ δόξαν ἔχον.

his way to record an event before the Return of the Heracleidae, and a moral exemplum emerges.

The occasion for Ephorus's discussion of Aetolus is his discussion of the partitioning of the Peloponnese after the Return of the Heracleidae in book 1 (FF 18 and 115). Presumably his account of Aetolus's descendant, Oxylus, and his triumphant return to Elis gave Ephorus the excuse to elaborate upon the Aetolians' original departure from Elis. Similarly, his decision to begin his *History* with the Return of the Heracleidae permitted him to embark upon the exploits of Heracles in book 1. Two of these lapses into mythology can be worked fairly easily into the context of the return of Heracles' descendants to the Peloponnese, for they stress benefits to them in return for favors done by Heracles in the past (FF 15 and 16). Although these discussions do have a moral point, in that they advocate the traditional Greek virtue of reciprocal generosity, they also have some relevance to this section of Ephorus's narrative.

In book 4 of the *History*, Ephorus returns to Heracles' exploits, according to Theon (*Progymnasmata* 2.8=F 34). Ephorus says the men who dwelt in Pallene, which was formerly called Phlegra, were cruel, sacrilegious, and cannibalistic, and named Giants, presumably for these very traits. Heracles turned his attention to them after the capture of Troy and conquered them with a small force, although they were many, because they were impious. Strabo (7 frs. 25 and 27) gives an almost identical account and probably derives this section from Ephorus, as fr. 27a indicates. Just as in the case of Apollo's slaying of Tityus and Python, Ephorus gives a rationalized version of the story, because usually Heracles' opponents are supernatural giants, and not just unusually nasty mortals called Giants.³⁸ By means of this rationalization, Ephorus brings the Giants' punishment from the supernatural to the human realm and, by doing so, provides a more tangible example of the results that impiety and uncivilized behavior can bring human beings.

We should perhaps note here the recent suggestion of Klaus Meister that Ephorus's *History* is characterized by its rationalizing tendency.³⁹ According to Meister, this rationalizing tendency is manifested in five aspects: (1) his decision to pass over the mythological period and begin with the Return of the Heracleidae (T 8); (2) rationalisms in the Hecataean style, such as that of

38. Apollodorus (1.6.1-3) gives the fullest version of the fight between the gods and the Giants.

39. Klaus Meister, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung: Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1990), 88.

Python into a man with the nickname of Dracon (F 31); (3) the substitution of Fortune (*Tyche*) for the divine; (4) the construction of false connections, such as the tradition that simultaneity of the battles of Salamis and Himera was the contrivance of Xerxes (F 186); and (5) the frequent use of the stylistic device of the doublet. Meister's first point, as we have seen, is not really a rationalization, for Ephorus does occasionally lapse into the mythological period, although often with an apologetic statement. As for Meister's third point, no references are given; it may be that he is reading a later, Hellenistic tendency (perhaps from Diodorus?) into Ephorus. As evidence for his fifth point, Meister cites Polybius's criticism (6.46.10=F 148) that Ephorus gives almost identical descriptions of the Spartan and Cretan constitutions; Meister appears instead, however, to mean doublets of the notorious Diodorean type, for which there are no examples extant from Ephorus's *History*. As we shall see from our discussion, even Ephorus's rationalizations are techniques by which he expounds an exemplum and are therefore subordinated to his desire to moralize.

Another digression, on the Argonauts, appears in book 9. His account differs from that recorded by Apollonius Rhodius (1.937–1077), in which the Argonauts are attacked by the friendly Doliones by mistake, for, according to a scholiast to Apollonius (1.1037=F 61), Ephorus says that the Doliones attacked the inhabitants of Thessaly and Magnesia because they had been driven out by them.⁴⁰ Another unplaced fragment, provided again by a scholiast to Apollonius (1.974=F 184), probably belongs to this digression, for it records the lineage of Cleite, the wife of Cyzicus, the king of the Doliones. According to Apollonius, the results of this battle were the total destruction of the Doliones at the hands of the Argonauts and the suicide of Cleite upon hearing the news. The result of the change in Ephorus's version is that instead of the battle's arising out of a tragic mistake, the Doliones become the aggressors. The implication then, is that, as such, they are responsible for their own destruction. By choosing (or inventing) this version of the myth, Ephorus makes a moral lesson out of an otherwise senseless loss of life.

Another fragment, on the Pelasgians, may be connected to this digression on Cyzicus and the Argonauts, because Ephorus explicitly says the Doliones are Pelasgians.⁴¹ Strabo records Ephorus to have said (5.2.4=F

40. The scholiast adds that Callisthenes says that the Doliones attacked the Argonauts by night out of hate (*FGrHist* 124 F 6).

41. Jacoby places this fragment in books 1 to 3 of Ephorus's *History*, although he concedes (*FGrHist* IIC, 64–65) that it may be connected with the Cyzicus fragment (F 61).

113) that because of their military lifestyle, the Pelasgians not only gained great glory but also spread all over Greece, including Crete, Thessaly, the Peloponnese, and even farther afield. On the authority of Hesiod, Ephorus states that the Pelasgian race originated in Arcadia. The Arcadians were known by the Greeks of the classical period as “acorn-eaters” (Herodotus 1.66), because the rugged nature of their land left them physically isolated from the more advanced cultures of the rest of Greece. Given this explicit connection with Arcadia, it is likely that Ephorus believed the Pelasgians, like the Arcadians, initially refrained from luxuries and practiced a simple lifestyle. This simplicity, as well as their military lifestyle, allowed the Pelasgians, like the Aetolians, to acquire such great glory and conquer so great an amount of territory. Both Censorinus (*De die natali* 17.3=F 112a) and Pliny (*Naturalis Historia* 7.154=F 112b) confirm that Ephorus viewed the Arcadians as superior to other races, for they record him to have said that the ancient Arcadian kings sometimes lived for three hundred years. By the time of the Argonauts' encounter with them at Cyzicus, however, the Pelasgians had declined from their previous strength. It seems likely that Ephorus's discussion of the ancient Arcadians and Pelasgians was motivated by the desire to show that a military lifestyle, bringing with it the avoidance of luxuries, leads to both security and glory.

His desire to make a moral point leads Ephorus to deviate on occasion not only from his intention to say little on the mythological past, but also from his concern for accuracy. Naturally, not all of Ephorus's alleged inaccuracies can be attributed to a moral cause. For example, Diodorus (1.37.4 and 1.39.7–8=F 65e and 1.39.13=T 16) complains about Ephorus's inaccuracy on the subject of the behavior of the Nile, saying that he had neither visited the region himself nor sought reliable second-hand information. It seems Ephorus wanted to try his hand at this oft-debated topic in antiquity but met with no greater success than his predecessors. Nevertheless, there are some instances in which Ephorus's seeming lack of concern for accuracy can be attributed to his desire to moralize.

Seneca (*Quaestiones Naturales* 7.16.2–3=T 14b and F 212) questions his reliability in the matter of the comet that allegedly presaged the destruction of the Peloponnesian cities of Helice and Bura. According to Seneca, Ephorus claims the comet split into two stars as it departed, a fact he alone reports. It is interesting to note that the comet was associated, by contemporary sources, with the destruction of Helice and Bura by earthquake and tidal wave (Callisthenes *FGrHist* 124 FF 20 and 21, and Aristotle, *Meteorologica* 343b, 344b, and 368b). Aristotle (343b) dates the comet (and hence

the destruction) to the archonship of Asteius in 373/2 (Diodorus, never very reliable for his dates, records a comet in his entry for the following year), so theoretically all three of the fourth-century authorities, if not of an age to have been eyewitnesses to the event themselves, would have at least been able to question eyewitnesses. Since many authorities link the natural disasters, which resulted in the destruction, to some act of sacrilege committed by the citizens of the doomed cities,⁴² it is reasonable to infer that Ephorus mentions the comet to point out the moral lesson provided by the disaster. A heavenly portent that twinned would provide a much clearer presage of the fate of the two cities and would also indicate it was heaven-sent, as a result of some misdeed committed by their inhabitants. Diodorus (15.48.4) makes the distinction between natural scientists (οἱ μὲν φυσικοί), who attribute the disaster to natural causes, and those piously disposed toward the divine (οἱ δ' εὐσεβῶς διακείμενοι πρὸς τὸ θεῖον), who believe the gods were responsible for the disaster as punishment for sacrilege. It seems likely that Ephorus's sympathies lie with those of the second group, like Diodorus himself, who, although he is careful to preserve a judicious tone, indicates his true feelings by means of a cross-reference to the divine retribution incurred by those guilty of sacrilege at Delphi in the so-called Third Sacred War (16.61–64). It is natural for Seneca to question the accuracy of Ephorus's report, which indicates the portentous nature of the event more clearly than those of his contemporaries.

Strabo too chides Ephorus for being less than accurate on occasion. One explicit criticism is for Ephorus's contention that the Scythian Anacharsis was the inventor of the bellows, the two-fluked anchor, and the potter's wheel (7.3.9=F 42). As Strabo points out, Ephorus is clearly wrong, since the potter's wheel was known in Homer's day (*Iliad* 18.600). Strabo also tells us that Ephorus numbered Anacharsis among the Seven Sages (an enumeration confirmed by Diogenes Laertius 1.41=F 182), on account of his thrift, self-control, and intelligence. Herodotus (4.76–77) provides the only extant earlier account of Anacharsis, whom he dates to the middle of the sixth century,⁴³ presenting him as a man of great knowl-

42. Diodorus (15.49.3), Heracleides of Pontus (Strabo 8.7.2), Pausanias (7.24.6), and Aelian (*NA* 11.19) all claim that the citizens brought disaster upon themselves by an act of sacrilege, but disagree as to what precisely the sacrilege was. Diogenes Laertius (3.20), on the authority of Favorinus, even attributes the destruction of ten Spartan ships that happened to be anchored nearby (Aelian 11.19) to their commander's mistreatment of Plato!

43. Anacharsis is killed by the father of Idanthyrsus, who rules Scythia at the time of Darius's invasion at the end of the sixth century (4.120).

edge who traveled to many parts of the world. Ephorus seems to have followed a tradition similar to that of Herodotus, who says (4.76.2) Anacharsis brought much wisdom to the Scythians, which may indeed have included civilizing influences such as the invention of the bellows, the two-fluked anchor, and the potter's wheel. Once again, it seems, we find Ephorus emphasizing a culture-hero who brought the knowledge of the *technai* to a previously barbarian population.

The Scythians associated with Anacharsis, however, were not ordinary barbarians, possibly as a result of his culture-bringing mission. An anonymous author of a *Periplus* cites Ephorus for the statement that Anacharsis was one of the Nomad Scythians, who are especially pious.⁴⁴ According to Ephorus, the Nomad Scythians were not cannibalistic and fierce like some of the other Scythians, but rather drank mare's milk and surpassed all others in justice (Strabo 7.3.9=F 42 and [Scymnus]=F 158). Moral rectitude and abstention from wine often go together in the portrayal of the "noble savage" in earlier Greek literature.⁴⁵ Strabo (7.3.9=F 42) tells us Ephorus appealed to the epic tradition to support his claim that these Nomad Scythians were the most just, and then proceeded to an explanation of their superior justice:

Having a simple way of life and not being money-grubbers with one another, they have good laws, having everything in common, including their wives, children, and the whole family. They are unconquerable and invincible to others, for they have nothing for which they can be enslaved.⁴⁶

The Scythians' lack of material wealth, then, is a direct cause of their justice and their invincibility. This too is a *topos* found in earlier Greek literature; in Herodotus, for example, those who practice simpler lifestyles in rugged countries often are more secure from external threat than are richer peoples.⁴⁷ Ephorus differentiates himself from his predecessors,

44. [Scymnus] (=F 158): καὶ τὸν σοφὸν δὲ Ἀνάχαρσιν ἐκ τῶν Νομαδικῶν φησὶ γενέσθαι τῶν σφόδρα εὐσεβεστάτων.

45. See, e.g., Herodotus 1.71.3, 1.216.4, and 3.23.1, with Stewart Flory, *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 81–118.

46. διότι ταῖς διαίταις εὐτελεῖς ὄντες καὶ οὐ χρηματισταὶ πρὸς τε ἀλλήλους εὐνομοῦνται, κοινὰ πάντα ἔχοντες τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τέκνα καὶ τὴν ὅλην συγγένειαν, πρὸς τε τοὺς ἑκτὸς ἄμαχοί εἰσι καὶ ἀνίκητοι, οὐδὲν ἔχοντες ὑπὲρ οὐ δουλεύσουσι.

47. See, e.g., 3.22, 4.23, and 9.122, and James Redfield, "Herodotus the Tourist," *CP* 80 (1985): 97–118.

however, by prefacing his description of the Scythians with the claim that while the other writers tell of the dreadful and the marvelous for their shock value, he believes it necessary to tell the opposite too and to hold these up as moral examples (δεῖν δὲ τᾶναντία καὶ λέγειν καὶ παραδείγματα ποιεῖσθαι). Charles Fornara has argued that Ephorus is not providing a moral paradigm but rather giving examples to correct an imbalance in the ethnographical tradition.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, as F. W. Walbank remarks,⁴⁹ the Greek does not allow Fornara's interpretation, because τᾶναντία must be the object of both λέγειν and ποιεῖσθαι. Furthermore, there is no reason why the Greeks should not be given the example of the Nomad Scythians as a pattern of conduct, because, according to Strabo (7.3.9=F 42), Ephorus states they surpass all others in justice (τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ πάντων διαφέρειν). Finally, this fragment should not be used to suggest that Ephorus provided only models of virtuous behavior;⁵⁰ as we shall see, he frequently uses negative exempla, which must surely be designed as cautions against certain types of behavior.

Strabo makes it clear that Ephorus specifically claimed the tradition of the "most just" Nomad Scythians was not just an invention of Homer but a common report (κοινὴ φήμη) that was deserving of belief. In this way, Ephorus uses the epic tradition buttressed by common report as evidence for his moral point, instead of trying to obtain information about the Nomad Scythians from a reliable source. In doing so, he openly disregards his own principle that if autopsy is not possible, information should be sought from as direct a source as possible. Furthermore, he commits a breach of historical good faith by presenting a tale of Homer as established fact.⁵¹ It should be noted that both Strabo (7.2.1=F 132) and Josephus (*Contra Apionem* 1.67=F 133) accuse Ephorus of attributing customs to certain tribes, which they did not have. It is possible he was somewhat overzealous in his assigning of virtuous traits in order to strengthen his moral case.

From the preceding investigation, it is clear Ephorus was willing to stray from his stated historical principles and, what is more, that at times

48. Fornara, *The Nature of History*, 110–12.

49. F. W. Walbank, Review of Fornara in *JHS* 105 (1985): 211.

50. As does Sacks (*Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, 27–29), based on Isocrates' practice.

51. Michael A. Flower ("Simonides, Ephorus, and Herodotus on the Battle of Thermopylae," *CQ* 48 [1998]: 365–79, esp. 378–79) argues that part of Ephorus's method was to correct standard historical sources with poetic texts.

he did so on purpose, to make a moral point. Moreover, these deviations also shed some light upon Ephorus's moral viewpoint. The simplicity and lack of interest in wealth of the Nomad Scythians (F 42) led directly to their remaining unconquered by others. Similarly, one can infer from Ephorus's statement (F 122a) that the Aetolians remained unconquered due to their military valor, lived in a rugged territory, and practiced a simple way of life, unattractive to the would-be conqueror. Ephorus seems to have endorsed virtues such as military valor, civic harmony, avoidance of luxury, and justice, which naturally lead to a free, strong, and peaceful society; excess wealth is to be avoided as detrimental to this goal. While the avoidance of flaunted wealth and excessive consumption may appear at first sight to be part of the democratic ideology of equality, it arises rather from the aristocratic viewpoint that individuals should not appear to be superior to others of their class.⁵²

Let us now examine other fragments (that is, those containing neither digressions nor inaccurate statements) to see if we can learn anything further about Ephorus's moral views. The desire to praise military valor may also lie behind Ephorus's attribution of the invention of hoplite warfare to the Mantineans. Athenaeus (4.154d–e=F 54) cites Ephorus as the authority for the statement that the Mantineans and (other) Arcadians used to be skillful in warfare and this is why the ancient military garb and armor were called Mantinean. Everett Wheeler attributes a ban on the use of missiles in the Lelantine War, which he shows to be ahistorical, to Ephorus as the common source of Polybius (13.3.2–4) and Strabo (10.1.12).⁵³ He suggests Ephorus invented this prohibition to protest against fourth-century artillery and to advocate a return to the ideal type of agonistic warfare. If Wheeler is correct, Ephorus's discussion of the etymology of Mantinean armor may have a moral basis, because the ancient Mantineans presumably practiced the more civilized and humane warfare of old, of which Ephorus approved.

Given his emphasis on military valor, it is not surprising that for Ephorus the epitome of a good social order was that of the Spartans. Although the Spartans had been sensible (*σώφρονες*) right from the beginning, which is the opposite of what Herodotus (1.65) and Thucydides (1.18)

52. Christian Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, trans. Deborah Lucas Schneider (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 55.

53. Everett L. Wheeler, "Ephorus and the Prohibition of Missiles," *TAPA* 117 (1987): 157–82.

say about the early history of Sparta,⁵⁴ the improvements of Lycurgus's codification allowed them to gain their preeminent position in Greece (Strabo 8.5.5=F 118). In this way, Ephorus attributes the development of the excellent Spartan constitution to the semilegendary Lycurgus, who is supposed to have obtained it from the Cretans, getting also Apollo's sanction at Delphi on the way home.⁵⁵ Both Rhadamanthys, who is alleged to have been the originator of the Cretan constitution, and Minos, who is said to have developed it further, claimed to have received their instructions from Zeus,⁵⁶ so the Spartan constitution is sanctioned by divine approval thrice over.

In a passage that has been preserved as a separate fragment (Strabo 10.4.16=F 149), Ephorus details the chief features of the Spartan social order, as established by Lycurgus. He lays particular emphasis upon the freedom enjoyed by the Spartans, attributing it to harmony (ὁμόνοια), which arises from the elimination of dissension caused by greed (πλεονεξία) and luxury (τρυφή) in favor of a communal lifestyle. Their moderate lifestyle includes rigor and deprivations designed to foster courage (ἀνδρεία). Moreover, the Spartans are not permitted by the terms of their constitution to own privately coined gold or silver, on punishment of death (Plutarch, *Lysander* 17=F 205). Even in times of civil strife, the Spartans manage to settle their affairs peacefully (Strabo 6.3.3=F 216). With this emphasis on moderation, courage, and harmony, Ephorus describes the Spartan lifestyle in terms remarkably similar to his description of the Scythians.

Polybius remarks that Ephorus describes the constitutions of both Sparta and Crete in such similar terms that at any given moment the reader must look at the proper name in order to see which he is discussing (6.45.10=F 148). In this same passage (6.45.1), Polybius includes Ephorus in a group of authors whom he criticizes on two counts: for saying, first, that the Cretan constitution is similar to or identical to the Spartan and, second, that it is praiseworthy. The two constitutions are not at all alike, according to Polybius, because the Cretans, unlike the Spartans, are money-grubbers and democratic. Polybius's criticism of Ephorus *inter alios* on these grounds appears to be somewhat unfair, since Strabo quotes him as praising the Cretans of older times (Strabo 10.4.9=F 33) and as saying

54. As noted by Wickersham, *Hegemony and Greek Historians*, 123.

55. Strabo 10.4.19=F 149 and Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 1.170=F 174.

56. Strabo 10.4.8=F 147 and 10.4.19=F 149 and Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 1.170=F 174.

(5.4.2=F 113) that the Pelasgians, whose military lifestyle Ephorus appears to have admired, settled Crete, as Homer attests (*Odyssey* 19.175). Strabo also cites Ephorus as saying specifically that the Cretan constitution of his day had evolved into the complete opposite of the one the Spartans had imitated (10.4.17=F 149). Presumably, this love of money was one reason why Ephorus considered the Cretan constitution to have changed for the worse. As for the Spartans, so long as they retained the Lycurgan constitution, they retained the hegemony of Greece (such, at least, is the implication of F 118), and it is surely no coincidence that Sparta's loss of hegemony at Leuctra coincided with reforms made to the Lycurgan constitution in the early fourth century (Plutarch, *Lysander* 17 and 30=FF 205 and 207).⁵⁷

One can infer that military valor and civic concord, coupled with a lack of greed, were the elements necessary to maintain freedom. These elements in the (earlier) Cretan and the Spartan societies evidently appealed to Ephorus, and so he linked the two together as the examples par excellence of a (once) good social order. Both, however, do fall in the end, and the implication is that they do so as the result of the desire for wealth and luxury, which results in turn in a loss of hegemony.

As other scholars have remarked, Ephorus views Greek history as a diadochy of hegemonies.⁵⁸ A passage of Strabo (8.5.5=F 118) cites Ephorus as saying the hegemony of the Thebans succeeded that of the Spartans, and it seems likely, although none of the fragments explicitly state it, that the Cretans, under their former (good) constitution, held the hegemony at some point prior to the Spartans. The Thebans, however, do not retain their hegemony for long. The point of Ephorus's digression on the early history of Boeotia, preserved by Strabo (9.2.2–5=F 119), is to show that the Boeotians were unable to attain hegemony, despite the natural advantages offered by the terrain, because they did not concern themselves with education (ἀγωγή) and culture (παιδεία). The Thebans did enjoy a short period of hegemony under the leadership of Epaminondas (that is, between Leuctra and Mantinea), but lost it again after his death (Strabo 9.2.2; cf.

57. See Wickersham (*Hegemony and Greek Historians*), who notes (154–58), with proper skepticism on the use of Diodorus to fill in gaps in Ephorus's narrative, that passages from Diodorus (esp. 7.12.5 and 8) state explicitly that the Spartans lost their hegemony through greed, with the introduction of coined money.

58. See Arnaldo Momigliano, "L'egemonia tebana in Senofonte e in Eforo," *Atene e Roma*, ser. 3, 2 (1935): 101–17; reprinted in *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, vol. 1 (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1966), 347–65; and Wickersham, *Hegemony and Greek Historians*, esp. 119–24.

9.2.5=F 119). The reason Ephorus gives for the short duration of the Theban hegemony is that they did not pay sufficient attention to discourse (λόγοι) and close association (ὄμιλία) with one another, but attended only to military valor (ἢ κατὰ πόλεμον ἀρετή). As the short-lived Theban hegemony demonstrates, if civic harmony and cultural excellence are not present, then military prowess will ultimately prove unsuccessful.⁵⁹

The absence of any certain reference to the fifth-century Athenian hegemony in the extant fragments is surprising. Although it is possible that none of the surviving sources saw fit to cite Ephorus on fifth-century Athens, for which a great deal of information was available elsewhere, F 118 seems positively to exclude an Athenian hegemony from Ephorus's diadochy, for here he states the Spartans held the hegemony from the time of Lycurgus until they were superseded by the Thebans.⁶⁰ Now, the restored text of *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* 1610 (F 191), which has tentatively been identified as Ephorus on the strength of its correspondence with Diodorus 11.56–69 (see above, n. 9), does make two references to Athenian hegemony acquired by Themistocles (frs. 3 and 4–5). In both cases, however, the crucial word *hegemony* (ἡγεμονία) has been almost entirely restored on the basis of Diodorus 11.59.1, where Themistocles is credited with depriving the Spartans of the naval hegemony during the Persian Wars. We cannot therefore accept *POxy* 1610 as proof that Ephorus did include the fifth-century Athenian hegemony in his diadochy, especially in contradiction to his statement in F 118. Perhaps he did not consider a maritime hegemony to count in the succession, or perhaps he did not care to attribute any good qualities to the fifth-century Athenians to justify their acquisition of the hegemony from the Spartans. In any case, with or without the presence of an Athenian hegemony, Ephorus's reduction of Greek history to a succession of diadochies is overly simplistic.

As the preceding survey has shown, the moral virtues with which Ephorus appears chiefly concerned are military valor and civic harmony, achieved through a simple lifestyle, on the one hand, and education and culture on the other. It seems that two influences in particular contribute toward the formation of Ephorus's moral views. One is the approval of a rigorous, military rule exemplified stereotypically by the (earlier) Spartans,

59. On Ephorus's account of the Theban hegemony, see Wickersham, *Hegemony and Greek Historians*, 124–46. For the influence of Ephorus's presentation of the Theban hegemony on later literature, see G. S. Shrimpton, "The Theban Supremacy in Fourth-Century Literature," *Phoenix* 24 (1971): 310–18.

60. As noted by Wickersham, *Hegemony and Greek Historians*, 120 and 144.

in which a taste for luxury, once it creeps into a society, spells its downfall. This concept is similar to the transformation of “hard peoples” into “soft peoples” in Herodotus.⁶¹ The other emphasizes the importance of education and culture, without which a society will not prosper. Here we see the same sort of moral virtues espoused by Isocrates,⁶² with the same pragmatic basis. For Ephorus, however, a successful rule must combine elements from both camps.

The question now arises of the methods by which Ephorus instilled these moral virtues in his readers. The most obvious method of doing so was to indicate approval and disapproval, but because almost all of the extant fragments from Ephorus's *History* consist of citations from later sources, we cannot distinguish with certainty the various ways in which he may have done so.

Nevertheless, it is clear Ephorus uses praise more frequently than blame in the extant fragments. As we have seen in his discussions of the foundation of the Delphic oracle, the Aetolians, the Nomad Scythians, and the Spartan and Cretan constitutions, he praises groups and institutions of which he approves, often at great length. To the examples already examined can be added his praise of the decent way in which Jason of Pherae treated his subjects (F 214), and of the celebrated words of Nausicaa to Odysseus (Homer, *Odyssey* 6.244), which he considered to be those of someone naturally disposed toward virtue (F 227). Plutarch (*Dion* 36=F 220) says Ephorus praised Philistus but does not specify on what grounds. The only other fragment relating to Philistus (*Dion* 35=F 219) says that he committed suicide rather than be captured by the Syracusans, whereas Timonides records him to have been captured alive. In this case, Philistus exemplifies the same kind of warrior ethic practiced by the Spartans, and for this reason perhaps deserves praise.

The fragments extant from Ephorus's *History* preserve few examples of explicit blame on moral grounds. An exception is his hostile treatment of the Athenian politician Pericles, whom he accuses of starting the Peloponnesian War in order to take attention away from his embezzlement of the finances of Athens (Diodorus 12.38–41=F 196). The occasion presented itself readily when the people of Athens began to attack Pericles' friends, the sculptor Pheidias and the philosopher Anaxagoras, and implicated the statesman himself in these attacks. At that point, Pericles thought it best to

61. Redfield, “Herodotus the Tourist.”

62. Wickersham, *Hegemony and Greek Historians*, 135–43.

involve the city in a great war so that it would not continue these attacks against him or have the leisure to conduct any kind of audit of his management of financial affairs. If Diodorus provides an accurate reflection of what he said, Ephorus's discussion of the outbreak of the war did not include what Thucydides terms "the complaints and quarrels" (αἱ αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραί), the Corcyraean and Potidaean affairs, which precipitated the hostilities, or "the truest cause" (ἡ ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις), Spartan fear of Athenian imperialism (1.23.5–6).⁶³ Instead, Ephorus attributes the war to shallow personal motives on the part of Pericles, the same sort of slander found in comedy or political oratory. These, of course, were probably his sources. As K. J. Dover has recently argued, Ephorus's account of the causes of the Peloponnesian War reveals that he, like most writers who had not been raised in classical Athens, failed to understand the nature of political comedy of Aristophanes' time. This inability to deal with the evidence of comedy, along with an alienation from politics and a lack of concern for the boundary between historical truth and fiction, leads to an overreliance upon anecdotes, gossip, and scandal as sources of historical fact.⁶⁴

Ephorus is also recorded to have criticized Lysander, whom he reports to have attempted to bribe the priestesses at Delphi and Dodona and the priests of Ammon as well (Plutarch, *Lysander* 25=F 206). Although he was later prosecuted for bribery, Lysander was acquitted. The Libyans reproached the Spartans for their lack of justice in the case. Another implicit condemnation may be contained in Ephorus's report that Agesilaus wanted to condemn Lysander's speech on the constitution (Plutarch, *Lysander* 30=F 207), in which he allegedly argued the Spartans ought to abolish hereditary kingship, thereby changing the Lycurgan constitution Ephorus so admired. Ephorus does not condemn the speech explicitly but does mention that one of the ephors, a certain Lacratidas, whom he describes as sensible (φρόνιμος), dissuaded Agesilaus from publishing the speech upon its discovery, on the grounds it was so persuasive and wicked. Moreover, Plutarch (*Lysander* 17=F 205) uses Ephorus as a source for the name of the Spartan who tried to oppose the introduction of coined money into Sparta by Lysander. Plutarch refers to Lysander's opponents on this issue as the most sensible people in Sparta (οἱ φρονιμώτατοι), a term with which

63. For a discussion of the meanings of these words, see Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, 1:153–54.

64. K. J. Dover, "Anecdotes, Gossip and Scandal," in *The Greeks and Their Legacy: Collected Papers*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), 45–52.

Ephorus would have agreed, even if he cannot be proved to have been its source, since the influx of coined money would make Sparta into the sort of money-grubbing society he considered ripe for downfall.

Sometimes Ephorus resorts to a mixture of praise and blame with the use of contrast. For example, the great justice of the Nomad Scythians (F 42 and F 158) is emphasized by contrast with the savage, perhaps even cannibalistic, nature of the other Scythians. Likewise, Ephorus contrasts the simplicity of the Spartans with the duplicity of the Asians. Athenaeus (11.500c=F 71), purportedly quoting Ephorus's own words, cites him as saying the Spartans sent Dercylidas on campaign against the Asians, who were so different in nature from themselves, precisely because he was so un-Spartan, being very wicked (πανούργος) and beastly (θηριώδης). It is interesting to note Theon's citation of Ephorus contains the same adjective (θηριώδης) applied to Python (F 31a). Also, Ephorus is said to have recorded nicknames for both men, Dracon for Python and Sisyphus for Dercylidas.⁶⁵ Xenophon refers to Dercylidas' nickname of Sisyphus (*Hellenica* 3.1.8), but in a clearly positive context.⁶⁶ Perhaps, for Ephorus, Dercylidas' un-Spartan nature was a clear condemnation, for he considered the Spartans to be both militarily and morally superior until Leuctra (F 118). Xenophon, on the other hand, perceived cracks in the Spartans' moral superiority already by this time (notoriously at *Hellenica* 5.4.1) and was willing to concede that behavior untypical of a Spartan was not necessarily a bad thing. In any case, by the use of contrasts of this sort, the example that ought to be followed is made clearer to the reader.

Another method Ephorus uses to indicate blame is negative exempla, perhaps because, like Xenophon, he seems to have preferred not to blame directly. Athenaeus (12.523e=F 183) cites Ephorus's statement that the Milesians, so long as they did not live in luxury, were able to defeat the Scythians and to found large and prosperous cities. Strabo (14.1.6=F 127) gives Ephorus as the source for the statement that the first Miletus was a Cretan foundation. Since we have seen that Ephorus appears to have approved of the ancient Cretan social order, it is a natural inference the Cretans were able to wrest the land from the Leleges, its previous inhabitants, as a result of their strong and harmonious society. As we have seen already, once a society loses its simplistic lifestyle, the end is not far off. This

65. Note, however, that Sisyphus is Reiske's emendation (from Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3.1.8) for the reading of Σκύφος in the manuscripts.

66. John Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of His Times* (London: Routledge, 1995), 271 n. 35.

is the case with Miletus, for Athenaeus then turns to Aristotle, to whom he attributes the statement that when the Milesians succumbed to luxury, the strength of the city ended. The context for this fragment in Ephorus's *History* appears to be an account of the repeated sufferings of Miletus in the late Archaic period.⁶⁷ Herodotus records stasis in Miletus in the mid-sixth century (5.29), which left widespread ruin. At the time of the Ionian revolt, the Milesians not only suffered a severe military loss to the Persians (5.117–21) but, upon the capture of Miletus, most of the men were killed, the women and children were sold into slavery, and the city was burnt to the ground (6.18–21). In view of Ephorus's opinions on the debilitating influence of wealth, one can infer he agreed with Aristotle that the Milesians' yielding to luxury was responsible for their inability to maintain a strong society and their consequent destruction.

Similarly, Ephorus implies that the desire for luxury in the case of both Datus (F 37) and the Myndones (F 90) led eventually to their loss of freedom. Harpocraton (s.v. Δάτος=F 37) gives Ephorus and Philochorus as his authorities for the fact that Datus changed its name after its conquest by Philip of Macedon. Earlier in his note, Harpocraton characterizes Datus as very prosperous. Knowing Ephorus's attitude toward wealth, one can infer his implication that Datus's riches left it open to conquest by Philip. Similarly, Stephanus (s.v. Μύνδωνες=F 90) cites Ephorus in his own words as having said the Myndones, a Libyan tribe, had a very rich livelihood. E. Schwartz suggests the occasion for their appearance in Ephorus's *History* is the Libyan revolt from Carthage, which Diodorus dates to 379/8 (15.24).⁶⁸ Since Diodorus remarks about the Carthaginians putting down the Libyans quickly, one wonders whether the wealth of the Myndones had anything to do with their swift subjugation.

Likewise, those guilty of violent and impious behavior do not escape unscathed. We have already seen that Tityus's and Python's destruction at the hands of Apollo is attributed directly to their violent behavior (F 31). Similarly, Heracles destroys the men of Pallene, called Giants, who were savage, sacrilegious, and cannibalistic, and triumphs over foes who are more numerous as well as impious (F 34). The Phocian commanders, who stole the offerings to Apollo at Delphi, meet ironically appropriate fates (Athenaeus 6.232d=F 96).⁶⁹

67. Jacoby hazards a guess of 495.

68. E. Schwartz, "Die Zeit des Ephoros," *Hermes* 44 (1909): 481–502, at 485.

69. F 96 is from the thirtieth book of the *History*, which some authorities attribute to Ephorus's son Demophilus (Diodorus 16.14.3 and Athenaeus 6.232d=T 9a and b; cf. T 1).

The perpetrators of other offenses also come to a bad end in Ephorus's *History*. A scholiast on Plato's *Euthydemus* (292e=F 19) cites Ephorus as a source for the origin of the expression Διὸς Κόρινθος, which is applied to those who are overly arrogant but end up badly and wretchedly (τῶν ἄγαν μὲν ὑπερσεμνυνομένων, κακῶς δὲ καὶ πονηρῶς ἀπαλλαττόντων). Ephorus then narrates an anecdote in which the arrogant Corinthians are defeated by the Megarians, in supposed recompense for their oppressive behavior.

A scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius (2.965=F 60a) cites Ephorus as the authority for the Amazons' revenge for their mistreatment (ὑβριζόμεναι) at the hands of their husbands. When their husbands went away to war, the Amazons killed those who had been left behind and did not allow those who had gone away to return. In this way, the violent end of the Amazons' husbands appears deserved.

A papyrus fragment, which could be attributed to Ephorus (*FGrHist* 105 F 2), tells of the accession of the Orthagorid tyranny at Sicyon. It begins with the disregarding of an oracle from Delphi. The Sicyonian embassy follows the other commands of the god but despises that regarding the coming tyranny (τῆς δὲ τυραννίδος τῆς μελλούσης κατε[φρό]νησεν). As a direct result of the negligence of the embassy, Orthagoras is overlooked and duly becomes tyrant despite his humble birth. The fragment emphasizes that Orthagoras achieves his fated glory as a direct result of his courage and military valor, which Ephorus considers important virtues.

Pheidon of Argos offers an example of what can happen to those who have become corrupt with power. First of all, he took control of the Peloponnese in an attempt to gain the whole Heraclid patrimony (Strabo 8.3.33=F 115). Just as Strabo indicates that in terms of external power-mongering, Pheidon exceeded the estate allotted to him by attempting to seize the domain of Temenos, Aristotle (*Politics* 1310b) describes Pheidon, in terms of internal power-mongering, as a king who exceeded his hereditary powers and became tyrant. It is a little uncertain whether Ephorus refers to Pheidon's external or internal ambition, but his description of him as having exceeded his contemporaries in power (δυνάμει δ' ὑπερβεβλημένον τοῦς κατ' αὐτόν) allows both interpretations. Second, Ephorus tells us that Pheidon forcibly took control over the festival at Olympia from the Eleans. Herodotus (6.127.3) explicitly comments that Pheidon's celebration of the Olympic Games was an act of outstanding hubris; it seems likely Ephorus would agree. Ephorus also attributes the invention of coined silver in Greece to Pheidon of Argos (FF 115 and 176), but he is

unlikely to be right, for the various dates given for Pheidon in the ancient sources predate the earliest coins.⁷⁰ Ephorus's attribution of coinage to him may be due to a confusion with Pheidon's development of a standard of weights and measures⁷¹—or perhaps due to a moral motive, for he seems not to have approved of Pheidon, and may for that reason have made him the creator of what he considered a most pernicious invention, coined money. In any case, the upshot of Ephorus's narration of Pheidon's tyranny is that the Spartans joined the Eleans and together they overthrew him, as a result Sparta regained control of the Peloponnese. A. Andrewes proposes in book 1 that Ephorus "presented the contrast between the three Heraklid kingdoms, the degeneration and downfall of the Argive and Messenian Heraklids as opposed to the salvation of the Spartan state by Lykourgos."⁷² Pheidon, the first certifiably historical figure in the succession of kings, represented an interruption in the process by temporarily robbing Sparta of her hegemony, and his downfall ushered in a new phase in history for the Spartans.

Another method Ephorus used to convey the moral virtues that he considered important was his use of prefaces, for Diodorus tells us that each book of his *History* began with its own preface (16.76.5=T 10). Unfortunately, nothing with certainty survives that can be identified as derived from the prefaces to individual books. We do have two references to the preface of Ephorus's entire work. Polybius tells us that Ephorus in this preface asserts music was introduced among humans for the purpose of deceiving and casting spells (4.20.5=F 8).⁷³ The references to deception and magic are reminiscent of Gorgias's claim that these techniques lead to successful persuasion (DK 82 B 11), and it seems likely Ephorus is alluding disapprovingly to it.⁷⁴ It is possible Ephorus used his preface to

70. Colin M. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London: Methuen, 1976), 313.

71. Herodotus 6.127.3; Tod 2.140.80–87; and Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, 313–315.

72. A. Andrewes, "Ephoros Book I and the Kings of Argos," *CQ* n.s., 1 (1951): 39–45; quotation from 39.

73. On the central role of music in Greek education and its perceived capacity to effect social and political change, see Robert W. Wallace, "Private Lives and Public Enemies: Freedom of Thought in Classical Athens," in *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*, ed. Alan L. Boegehold and Adele C. Scaufuro (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 127–55, at 140–42.

74. Following a suggestion of Pohlenz, F. W. Walbank, "Profit or Amusement: Some Thoughts on the Motives of Hellenistic Historians," in *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.*, *Studia Hellenistica* 30, ed. Herman Verdin, Guido Schepens, and Els de Keyser (Louvain: n.p., 1990), 253–66, at 253–54 and n. 3.

take aim at the amoral use of rhetoric of the sophists, replacing it with a new sort of persuasiveness through instruction from history, which provides less seductive moral improvement. Since Polybius adds that this statement was not characteristic of Ephorus, it does not shed much light upon his use of prefaces, except perhaps for the suggestion that he used them to express sentiments for which there was no context in the body of his work.

Photius (F 7) says Ephorus's preface to his *History* was very similar to that of Theopompus (apparently in his *Philippica*), especially in intention. The chief features of Theopompus's preface seem to have been criticism of other historians (*FGrHist* 115 FF 24 and 25), and a statement of his historiographical principles (FF 25 and 26) and of the moral reasons that compelled him to write about Philip (F 27). Jacoby includes under the heading of *prooimion* the fragment from book one of Ephorus's *History* preserved by Harpocration (F 9), in which Ephorus explains his historiographical principles. It is certainly possible the preface contained other Theopompan features too, perhaps even polemical ones against other intellectuals, which makes it even more likely that the disapproving comment on deception was in fact directed at Gorgias.⁷⁵

Ephorus's use of digressions to make a moral point is more provable from the extant fragments. Like Theopompus, Ephorus seems to have been known in antiquity for his digressions, and Polybius comments that they were one of the strongest features of his work (12.28.10=T 23). Not only did Ephorus's *History* cover a vast subject, but little of his work survives. As a result, it is difficult to tell when he is digressing at any particular point; nevertheless, there does exist one method. Since Ephorus decided to say little on the mythological period and began his *History* with the Return of the Heracleidae, whenever Ephorus narrates the exploits of a god or hero from before this period, it follows that he must be digressing. We have already seen many of Ephorus's digressions into the mythological past, such as his discussions of the foundations of the Delphic oracle and the Aetolian nation, the exploits of Heracles, the voyage of the Argonauts, Odysseus and Nausicaa, and the Amazons did in fact have a moral purpose.

75. The approach to Ephorus via Diodorus that dominated scholarship until relatively recently has led scholars to assume that Diodorus's prefaces are Ephorus's rather than Diodorus's own. R. Laqueur ("Ephoros," *Hermes* 46 [1911]: 161–206) argued for the Ephorean origin of Diodorus's prefaces, although he partially recanted this view nearly half a century later ("Diodorea," *Hermes* 86 [1958]: 289). Kenneth S. Sacks ("The Lesser Prooemia of Diodorus Siculus," *Hermes* 110 [1982]: 434–43) makes a convincing case for Diodorus's authorship of all the prefaces in the *Bibliothèque*, although he admits that it is possible that Diodorus was influenced by some of the sources he used.

In the same passage in which he praises Ephorus for his use of digressions (12.28.10=T 23), Polybius also praises him for his use of aphorisms (γνωμολογίαι). Unfortunately, gnomic remarks are not well represented in the extant fragments; in fact, there is only one that could even be classified as such. Aelian (*Varia Historia* 13.23=F 175) says Ephorus uses Lycurgus to illustrate how those who wish one thing obtain another. Lycurgus wished to make the Spartans just and was treated badly by those whom he wished to help; he endured hunger and died in exile. This is the closest thing to a gnomic remark that survives from Ephorus's *History* and reveals a certain disillusionment on the subject of the "vanity of human wishes."

Another way in which Ephorus is likely to have expressed his moral views is by the use of speeches. Unfortunately, none of the extant fragments preserves any speeches, and their existence is recorded only by the *testimonia*. Polybius records Ephorus to have spoken very pleasingly and persuasively about the relationship between history and oratory (12.28.11=F 111). F. W. Walbank suggests Polybius's remark indicates only that Ephorus was concerned with the generic distinction between history and oratory.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, Ephorus's frequent use of praise and blame and exempla does indicate that he borrowed some of the techniques for persuasion from the sophists' use of rhetoric, but, as his implied criticism of Gorgias reveals, he turned them to a moral, rather than an amoral, purpose. Moreover, Plutarch's criticism of Ephorus (*Praecepta rei publicae gerendae* 803b=T 21), along with Theopompus and Anaximenes, for the rhetorical elements he includes in his descriptions of the marshaling of armies, however, indicates that he did include speeches within his narrative.⁷⁷ Moreover, if there were no speeches in Ephorus's *History*, it is strange that no authority mentions their absence, as is the case with Pompeius Trogus (Justin 38.3.11),⁷⁸ inasmuch

76. F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957-79), 2: 411.

77. Concerning the rhetoric and periods of Ephorus, Theopompus, and Anaximenes, which they execute after arming and marshalling their armies, it is possible to say: "No one near a weapon talks this nonsense," (ἐπι δὲ τῶν Ἐφόρου καὶ Θεοπόμπου καὶ Ἀναξιμένους ῥητορειῶν καὶ περιόδων, ἅς περαινουσιν ἐξοπλίσαντες τὰ στρατεύματα καὶ παρατάξαντες, ἔστιν εἰπεῖν· οὐδεὶς σιδήρου ταῦτα μωραίνει πέλας.). Note that the references cited by LSJ for ῥητορεία all indicate oratory.

78. And perhaps (by implication) in the case of Cratippus, for he is said to have criticized the use of speeches in a history (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Thucydide* 16). For defense of the view that Cratippus is a fourth-century historian, see W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: On Thucydides* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California

as the inclusion of speeches became a commonplace of the historiographical tradition after Thucydides.⁷⁹ Plutarch's specific mention of the marshaling of armies also implies that his criticism of Ephorus, Theopompus, and Anaximenes was for the commanders' harangues, inserted into their narrative. The absence of speeches in the extant fragments may indicate no more than that they contained only very trite moral sentiments, not considered worthy of preservation by later authorities.

Ephorus's primary purpose in writing his *History* seems to have been the moral instruction of his readers, to show how the collective moral behavior of a society leads to its remaining strong and free, which he achieved through the use of praise and blame, negative exempla, prefaces, digressions, aphorisms, and speeches. Occasionally, however, Ephorus's preoccupation with moral instruction causes him to break his own very sensible rule not to write on the mythological period or subjects for which it was impossible to obtain accurate information. Diodorus, perhaps following the example of Ephorus, decided to include myths in his historical work because of their morally edifying content, although he knew the mythological period did not permit the same level of accuracy (4.1.1–4).⁸⁰ By breaking this rule, Ephorus passes off the fantastic tales of the poets as accurate accounts of the past. This practice may bring the moral point closer to home, but at the same time it is insidious, for it disguises the mythical roots of a legend or tradition by presenting it as an objectively verifiable account of the past. Also, Ephorus was willing to choose a less accurate but morally edifying version of an event when more accurate but non-edifying ones were available to him. Finally, Ephorus's view of history as a succession of hegemonies, each falling as the result of moral failure to be replaced by another, is somewhat over-schematic. Despite its flaws as an accurate historical document, however, Ephorus's *History* was extremely influential, and his use of the past as an explicitly moralizing tool was widely emulated by his successors.

Ephorus was also very much a product of his time. On the one hand, he was quite willing to borrow some of the techniques for persuasion, particularly the use of praise and blame, from the rhetoric of the sophists. On the other hand, his insistence on the importance of autopsy, his statements on

Press, 1975), 67; and Phillip Harding, "The Authorship of the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*," *AHB* 1 (1987): 101–4.

79. See Fornara, *The Nature of History*, 143.

80. Catherine Rubincam, "The Organization and Composition of Diodoros' *Bibliothēke*," *EMC/CV* n.s., 6 (1987): 313–28, esp. 315–16.

the unreliability of the mythological tradition, his pragmatic view of virtue, his placement of civic virtue above individual virtue, his use (and occasional manipulation) of *paradeigmata* for moral improvement, and his fondness for the *topos* of the civilizing mission of culture bringers (although this last, of course, existed in earlier Greek literature and was popularized by the sophists) are very similar to sentiments expressed by Isocrates. Taken in isolation, each of these items might not signify more than shared intellectual views, but in their totality these similarities point to a direct relationship between Ephorus and Isocrates. Whatever else Ephorus may have derived from Isocrates, however, he certainly did not subscribe to the Athenian's political views. Whereas Isocrates was content to appear to remain politically in the mainstream of the Athenian democracy, Ephorus seems closer to the pro-Spartan sentiments of many Athenian dissidents, including Xenophon and others in Socrates' circle. In any case, not enough survives from his *History* to be able to tell with any certainty what he thought of Athens, although his criticism of Pericles, his apparent failure to include the fifth-century Athenian empire in his sequence of hegemonies, and his disapproval of Pheidon suggest he drew a link between imperialism and corruption. In spite of the intellectual influences of the sophists and Isocrates, however, Ephorus's *History* was widely regarded as a highly original work and exerted an enormous influence in both form (universal content) and content (moralizing history) on subsequent historiography.