

VII

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED FRAGMENTS OF EPHORUS, AND THEIR BEARING ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *HELLENICA OXY-* *RHYNCHIA* AND ON THE STYLE OF EPHORUS

I THANK you very much for the nice things you have said about Oxford. As I am going to lecture about Oxford to-morrow night, I will not say anything about Oxford this afternoon.

I want to apologize for my subject, because I am afraid that it is highly technical, and I am afraid that most of the time I shall be speaking in Greek. But there is one thing I want to suggest, coming here to an Institute where up to the present, I think, it is the scientific side that has been chiefly developed, and that is this: Evidence must be much the same, the conditions of proof much the same, whether we are dealing with a historical subject or a subject in physics or chemistry. Of course, the subject matter is not the same. The nature of the evidence is not precisely the same. The same degree of proof that would satisfy a mathematician is hardly to be expected from a historian. But for all that, historical investigation which is not scientific is worthless.

Now, to make my subject intelligible, I must begin with some history which is not ancient. Early in the year 1908 a fragment of a Greek historian was published which had been recovered from the rubbish heaps of an Egyptian country town, Oxyrhynchus by name, by two old pupils of mine, who for many years past have been my colleagues, Grenfell

and Hunt. The discovery gave rise to a very animated controversy all over Europe as to the authorship of the fragment. The view which was put forth as the authoritative view by the leading German scholars—because in Germany they are nothing if not authoritative, particularly at Berlin—was the view that this was a fragment of a work of the historian Theopompus, one of the most famous historians of the fourth century B.C. In August, 1908, there was an international historical congress at Berlin, at which about fourteen hundred members were present, and a very large number of these were especially interested in Ancient History. I had contributed an article to a German periodical which deals especially with ancient history,¹ and that number came out just in time to be discussed at the congress. In this article I ventured to call in question this view, so generally held in Germany, that the author of the fragment was the historian Theopompus. Subsequently I gave a course of eight lectures before the University at Oxford upon this subject, and I afterwards published them under the title of "*Hellenica Oxyrhynchia: its authorship and authority.*" In these lectures I attempted first of all to disprove the theory which had received the *imprimatur* of such great names as those of Wilamowitz-Möllendorff and Eduard Meyer, that the author was Theopompus, and I endeavored to establish the positive position that it was a fragment of the eighteenth book of the historian Ephorus, the great rival of Theopompus in the fourth century B.C.

Now, when two hypotheses are put forward upon any subject, in the long run the test which decides between them is this: If new evidence turns up, which of the two hypotheses does the new evidence support? Does it support hypothesis A? Or does it support hypothesis B? When

¹ *Klio*.

another fresh piece of evidence turns up, once more the question has to be asked, Does this support A? Or does it support B? And if all the new evidence that turns up goes to support hypothesis B, and not hypothesis A, then it becomes very clear that hypothesis B is the correct hypothesis, and hypothesis A is the wrong hypothesis. Since my lectures were published new evidence has turned up, and my object this afternoon is to try and convince you that this new evidence is practically conclusive in favor of the hypothesis that I ventured to put forward, the hypothesis that the work was the work of Ephorus, and not of the hypothesis that the work was the work of Theopompus.

I cannot, indeed, claim originality for the theory that the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* was the work of Ephorus. This was first definitely put forward by the German scholar, Judeich; and, although the arguments that he advanced in favor of it were obviously extremely unconvincing, he deserves great credit for being the first to state quite plainly that he believed Ephorus to be the author.

What does the new evidence consist of? And why do I call it new? It consists of two fragments, or, rather, one fragment in one case, and a number of fragments in another, which have been identified, not only since 1908, but since my lectures were delivered at the end of 1912. The former was edited by Grenfell and Hunt, jointly; the latter set of fragments by Grenfell alone. Hunt, like most of our professors, exchanged the professorial gown for the soldier's uniform, and he has been doing, first, regimental, and afterwards staff work for the last four years.

The first of these fragments was edited and published in Volume XI of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, in 1913. It is but a short fragment, consisting of only 195 words; and I call it new, because it was identified, not only since the discovery

of the original fragment, but since the congress at Berlin, and since the publication of my lectures. As to the other fragment, certainly no one can question its claim to be new, because when I left the shores of England it had not been published, and I am not sure whether it has yet been published;¹ but I have the proof-sheets of it here, and I was in constant communication with Prof. Grenfell while he was editing it. This is a much longer fragment. About one hundred lines of it are intelligible. There are a great number of individual fragments in all, some of them not bigger than a quarter-of-a-dollar piece, but there are sixteen that are intelligible, and can be pieced together.

The earlier of the two fragments in point of publication, that published in 1913, relates to the early history of Sicyon; and the remarkable thing about it is that it fits on precisely to a fragment of Diodorus, one of the excerpts from the Eighth Book (viii, 24). The newly discovered fragment picks up the story just where it breaks off in the excerpt from Diodorus. The story in the excerpt of Diodorus is as follows: An oracle was given to the people of Sicyon to the effect that their city should be subjected to the régime of the lash (*μαστιγονομηθήσεσθαι*), for a period of one hundred years, and the oracle warned them, when they returned from Delphi to their city, to take notice of the first person to whom it was announced after their landing that he was in the happy position of being the father of a boy. The new fragment fits on exactly to this, and there can be only two possibilities as to its authorship. Either it is a fragment of the *Polity, or Constitution, of Sicyon* by Aristotle (we know he wrote such a work), or it is a fragment of the historian Ephorus. There is no third alternative. Against the

¹ It has now been published, with a full introduction and commentary, in Vol. XIII of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 1919.

theory that it is by Aristotle is the extreme improbability of such an obscure work as this on the *Constitution of Sicyon* being copied out in the second century of our era. On the other hand, Ephorus was one of the most famous writers of antiquity, and if any historian was likely to be copied out it would be he. But there is a much more conclusive argument. It is one of the most certain results of historical criticism that the work of the historian Diodorus Siculus, down, at any rate, to the reign of Philip of Macedon, is based upon, or copied from, the work of the historian Ephorus. Now, the mere fact that the fragment fits on precisely to this passage in Diodorus, which must come from Ephorus, is fairly conclusive evidence that this is a fragment of Ephorus. And further than that, there are striking coincidences between the fragment and the excerpt from Diodorus. In both there is mention of Andreas, the father of a certain *tyrannus*. In both the oracle is given from Delphi. In both the fragment and the excerpt there is an individual who is described as μάγειρος, that is, a butcher, whose business it was to cut up the animal for the sacrifice. Thus the coincidences are as close as they well could be. Demonstrably, it is the same story by the same writer. Therefore, I do not think it admits of reasonable doubt that this fragment is a fragment of Ephorus. I can, indeed, conceive of a critic maintaining that it is not Ephorus, and maintaining that it is from Aristotle's *Constitution of Sicyon*. But if he did maintain this, he would present an extraordinarily weak case. Such a hypothesis is conceivable, but it is barely conceivable. The probabilities are overwhelming on the side of the other hypothesis that we have here a fragment of Ephorus.

Now, for the other and newer fragment. It is far more important, not merely because it is much longer, but for

other reasons that will subsequently appear. What is the evidence that it is by Ephorus? I will anticipate my conclusion and say that I am convinced, if I am convinced of anything, that when this fragment is published there will be no competent scholar in the whole world who will be prepared to deny that it is from the pen of Ephorus. The case for Ephorus is as conclusive as it is possible to make a case. First of all, this fragment, which, like the other fragment, was written about the year 200 A.D., comes from the same site, the town of Oxyrhynchus in Egypt. It relates to the period of something like fifteen years that followed the great Persian war, a period, roughly speaking, between 479 and 464 B.C. The sixteen individual fragments that can be identified fall into three groups. The first of these relates to Themistocles, and contains an appreciation of his character. The second contains an account of the exploits of the Athenian general Cimon, from his taking up the command of the fleet at Byzantium. The third relates to a plot to assassinate Xerxes, King of Persia. The proof that all this comes from Ephorus is threefold. In the first place, there are several statements made in this series of fragments which we know from Plutarch to have been statements made by Ephorus, and statements to some extent peculiar to him. Firstly, Plutarch says that according to Ephorus the name of the commander of the Persian land forces at the battle of the Eurymedon was Pherendates, and in the fragment we have Pherendates given as the name. Secondly, we know from Plutarch that certain Greek historians represented Themistocles, when he took refuge in Persia, as coming to the court of Xerxes. That was an error. Xerxes was dead at the time, and really it was Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, to whom he fled; but Ephorus is mentioned as one of the writers who brought him to Xerxes and not to Arta-

xerxes, and in the fragment it is to Xerxes, not Artaxerxes, that he comes. Thirdly, the number of the Persian fleet was given by Phanodemus as six hundred, but Plutarch says that it was stated by Ephorus to have been three hundred and fifty, which is the number given in the fragment. You have, therefore, in the short space of one hundred lines three statements which we know from external authority to have been made by Ephorus, and to some extent to have been peculiar to him.

The second piece of evidence is this. We know that there were certain of the later writers who had, at first or second hand, derived their information from Ephorus, and there were certain writers who had derived their information, not from Ephorus, but from other writers. Two of the most important writers who derived their information ultimately from Ephorus were the Roman historian Justin and the Greek writer Polyænus, who composed a work on the stratagems employed by generals in warfare. Now, there is one passage in this papyrus fragment which we can trace in Justin.¹ There is another which we can trace in Polyænus.² That is exactly what we should expect, if the fragment is from Ephorus. The papyrus, on the other hand, shows no agreement, no coincidences, with other writers, such as Plutarch,³ who did not use Ephorus. That is the second piece of evidence.

The third, and the most conclusive, piece of evidence is the correspondence between the papyrus and Diodorus. That is the center of gravity of the whole question. It has

¹ Justin, iii, 1. Xerxes . . . quippe Artabanus præfectus eius in spem regni adductus=Fr. 15. *αυτος κατασχειν την βασιλειαν βουλομενος.*

² Polyænus, I, 34, 1. *και πολλὰ σκάφη βαρβαρικὰ ἐλῶν*=Fr. 9, 10. *πολλας μεν . . . βαρβαρικον νεῶν διέφθειρεν.* Fr. 12, 13. *προς τας ναυς εφευγον υπολαμβανοντες αυτοις ειναι φιλιας*=Poly. *τὸν στόλον ὡς φίλιον ὑποδέχονται.*

³ Though Plutarch refers to statements made by Ephorus, he does not follow him as one of his authorities.

long been a matter of certainty that Diodorus, who was a writer of the reign of Augustus, derived his history from Ephorus, but hitherto we did not know the precise method that he employed; in what manner he excerpted Ephorus; how much he took from him, and how much he left out; nor did we know to what extent the style of Ephorus survives in Diodorus; *i.e.*, how far Diodorus followed the actual language of Ephorus, as well as his statements. For the first time we are in a position to answer these two all-important questions.

I have already pointed out that the first of our two fragments begins exactly where Diodorus leaves off. For this very reason we cannot compare it with Diodorus, because the part of the fragment which we should compare with the excerpt from Diodorus is lost. But the longer fragment, the one most recently discovered, most fortunately covers the ground which is covered by Diodorus, and comparison is therefore possible—comparison both of the subject matter and of the style. I shall presently go in more detail into the question of style. For the moment it may suffice to say that the correspondence in point of style is so remarkable—again and again there are whole sentences in Diodorus which are identical with sentences in the papyrus, or identical except for the alteration of a word or two—that no one in his senses could question that what we have here is the writer whom Diodorus excerpted. Therefore I have ventured to call both of them new fragments of Ephorus.

Now, if those are new fragments of Ephorus, the question at once arises, what light do they throw upon the problem raised in the controversy about the authorship of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*? Do they tend to support the view that Ephorus was the author of that work, or do they tend to disprove it? There are three questions to be considered

here. At the start, when I set out to prove the hypothesis that the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* was the work of Ephorus, I found myself confronted with two assumptions that had hitherto been generally accepted. The first was that the scale of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* was far too elaborate, the treatment of the subject far too detailed, for it to be part of a universal history, a history from the beginning of Greek history down to the historian's own days, such as was the history of Ephorus. It was argued that that at once ruled the claims of Ephorus out of court, because the treatment of the subject in the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* is a detailed treatment which, it was argued, you could not expect to find in a universal history. The second assumption, which was based on a passage in Diodorus,¹ was that Ephorus in his treatment of history treated it κατὰ γένος. He took a subject—we will say, the exploits of Cimon—and he treated it as a whole, and when he had finished it he went on to a new subject. That is to say, he did not write, to use the technical term, synchronistically. In my lectures I endeavored to disprove both those assumptions. I endeavored to prove, firstly, that the scale of Ephorus was far more elaborate than had been supposed, and, secondly, that as far as the history of the fourth century, the period dealt with in the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, is concerned, his method there was not κατὰ γένος, but synchronistic.

What light, then, do these two fragments shed upon these two questions? First, as to the question of scale. Here the first fragment is important, because it shows conclusively that Ephorus treated this incident, this period of Greek history, the rise of the *tyrannis*, not concisely, but fully. The treatment is very full. More than that, it is entirely independent of our main authority for early Greek history,

¹ Diod., v, 1.

Herodotus. It was already known that Ephorus had a great deal of material for the earlier Greek history which was not to be found in Herodotus; it is now clear that he made full use of it. The fragment, so far as it goes, tends to confirm the contention that the scale on which Ephorus wrote was not what had been assumed; that his treatment was not concise, but full.

Still more clearly does this conclusion follow from the second fragment, because if we compare that fragment with the corresponding passages in Diodorus, we find that while Diodorus sometimes followed Ephorus very closely, he at other times omitted whole subjects which were treated of by Ephorus. We have two or three conclusive proofs of this in this papyrus. One of the incidents referred to is the capture of the island of Scyros. Diodorus dismisses that in about five words, but it is clear from one of the fragments that Ephorus in dealing with this incident dealt with it at some length. The story of the recovery of the bones of Theseus from the island is to be found at length in Plutarch's *Life of Cimon*. It is quite clear from one of these fragments that that story was included in Ephorus. Thus a whole passage of considerable length in Ephorus has been omitted in Diodorus. Similarly, the first fragment, relating to Themistocles, is omitted in Diodorus, there being nothing at all corresponding to it in his narrative. Again, there are in the smaller fragments indications of passages that do not correspond to anything that may be found in Diodorus. They were passages in Ephorus which were simply omitted by Diodorus. It is, therefore, perfectly clear that Ephorus treated that period of Greek history far more fully than Diodorus did; that his scale was far more elaborate than that of Diodorus. The combined evidence of the two new fragments on this question of scale goes a long way to con-

firm and establish what I maintained in my lectures as to the scale of Ephorus' work.

We come next to the treatment of the subject matter. In my lectures I had maintained, as against Judeich, the view of most scholars, that for this particular period of Greek history, the period between the Persian and the Peloponnesian wars, *i.e.*, the period covered in part by the fragment, Diodorus was perfectly correct in his statement that the method of Ephorus was *κατὰ γένος*; in other words, that his method was not synchronistic. The correctness of this view has been proved up to the hilt by the papyrus. Exactly what had been anticipated is found there. The proof could not conceivably be more complete; and that, I think, indicates that the method of proof was a sound method, because the result arrived at is verified by the papyrus.

But I also endeavored to prove, as against the view of almost all scholars, that the method of Ephorus for the next century of Greek history, the fourth century, the period covered in part by the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, was synchronistic. My method was in both cases precisely the same, because in both cases I based my contention upon an examination of the narrative of Diodorus. From an examination of his narrative of the earlier period I endeavored to prove that the method of Ephorus was *κατὰ γένος*. From an examination of Diodorus' history for the period of the fourth century I endeavored to prove that the method of Ephorus for that period was synchronistic. What I venture to maintain is this: that if my method was unsound for the fourth century, it would have been unsound for the fifth. It has been proved to be sound for the fifth; and if it has been proved to be sound for the fifth, I venture to contend that it is sound for the fourth. But if the conclusion I had arrived at, that the method of Ephorus in dealing with the fourth century was

not κατὰ γένος but synchronistic, is true, the main argument against the attribution of the authorship of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* to Ephorus disappears.

Now let us come to the third point, the question of style. In dealing with the claim of Ephorus to be regarded as the author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, the positive evidence consisted very largely, though not entirely, of the argument from style. The style of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* corresponded to all that the ancients told us about the style of Ephorus. It was diffuse; it was tame; it was dull. But while we knew in general terms that these were the characteristics of the style of Ephorus, we knew at first hand practically nothing about the style of Ephorus, because hardly a single one of the fragments had come down to us in his own words. There were but one or two, and these were too short for any argument to be based upon them. Nor were we at that time in a position to assert that we could discover the style of Ephorus from the language of Diodorus. We are now in a position to make this assertion, and consequently the whole case is altered. We now can argue with confidence from the style of Diodorus to the style of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. We can say when we discover a coincidence between the style of Diodorus and that of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, that it is a coincidence not merely between Diodorus and the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, but between the latter and Ephorus. I hope by the time the lecture is over to convince you that the evidence on that head is conclusive.

Let us turn, then, first of all, to the question of the style of the first papyrus, the papyrus about Sicyon. As that consists of only 195 words, we must not expect too much. I do not think that any of you will expect that we shall be able to prove a conclusive case with regard to style on a basis of 195 words; but the surprising thing is, not that we can prove so

little, but that we can prove so much. We can prove a great deal. If we turn to that fragment of only 195 words in length, we can discover at once certain peculiarities in the style of the author of that fragment. The first is his fondness for the genitive absolute. Of course, that is a very common construction in Greek, but he actually manages to use it six times in 195 words. When we turn to the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, we find that there is nothing more characteristic of its style than the frequency of the genitive absolute. The two fragments have so much in common, at any rate.

Another peculiarity in the style of this fragment is the repetition of the article after the substantive, of which we will take some examples. Instead of saying ὁ τῶν Σικυωνίων δῆμος, the writer says ὁ δῆμος ὁ τῶν Σικυωνίων. Of course, that is very common construction, but its frequency in the fragment is remarkable. There are no less than five instances of it in this fragment relating to Sicyon: τῆς τυραννίδος τῆς μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι; διὰ τὴν ἀνδρείαν καὶ τὴν εὐτυχίαν τὴν κατὰ πόλεμον; τὴν τε χώραν τὴν οἰκίαν; ὁ μὲν δῆμος ὁ τῶν Σικυωνίων, twice. In the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* this construction is excessively common. That is the second point.

A third point—a characteristic of all diffuse styles—is the habit of coupling together two words, sometimes adjectives, sometimes adverbs, sometimes verbs, which are more or less connected in meaning, as, for instance: ὡς ἄνδρα δημότην καὶ φαῦλον; υἱὸν ὄντα μαγείρου καὶ τοῦ τυχόντος; ᾠκειῦτο καὶ προσήγετο. While the words are similar in meaning, two words are used where one would be enough. This again is a marked characteristic of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. There are, in addition, two or three coincidences of a more special kind. I do not want to make too much of them, but I give them to you for what they are worth; coincidences in actual

words and phrases. Here is one: πολλὰ κακὰ τοὺς πολεμίους ποιήσαντος. Compare with this *Hell. Oxyr.*, xiii, *ad fin.*: Βοιωτοὶ μὲν πολλὰ κακὰ ποιήσαντες τοὺς Φωκέας. Here is another: τὸν ἄνθρωπον παρημέλησε. Compare *Hell. Oxyr.*, xv, 3: τοῦ δὲ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ Καρπασέως. In both passages the word ἄνθρωπος is used in a contemptuous sense. Or again: διετέλεσε διαιτώμενος. Compare *Hell. Oxyr.*, xi, 3: διετέλουν διοικούμενοι. While these last three instances do not come to very much, perhaps—and you cannot expect very much in 195 words—taking it all in all, the coincidences between the fragment and the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* are remarkable.

When we come to the longer fragment, the direct coincidences of style between the fragment and the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* are neither numerous nor remarkable. They are indeed singularly few. But there are one or two words that occur in the new fragment, one of them more than once, which are favorite expressions of the author of the *Hellenica*. The verb ὑπολαμβάνειν is one (fr. 4, 5, and 12); and again, the verb σπουδάζειν is another (fr. 2; cf. *Hell. Oxyr.*, xiii, 1). There is also the use of διατελεῖν with a participle (fr. 12, διετέλουν ὄντες). Such coincidences are, of course, far too slight to base any case upon. But the important point is this, that when we turn from the direct to the indirect evidence, the case becomes, instead of weak, strong, and overwhelmingly strong. By the indirect evidence I mean the comparison of the style of Diodorus with the style of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*.

Of course, the last thing in the world I should maintain is that if you find a word, a phrase, a sentence in Diodorus, you can be sure that it comes from Ephorus, because again and again you can prove that it is a construction that could not have been used by a Greek writer of the fourth century B.C., but that it belongs to a later period. But our new

fragment proves conclusively that Diodorus did to a large extent incorporate the actual words, phrases, and sentences of his authority, Ephorus. To establish this contention it is only necessary to exhibit side by side the fragments and the sentences in Diodorus that correspond to them.

Fr. 2. [τις] δε τοσούτοις [δια] των εργαων

=Diod. xi, 59, 2. τίς δὲ τοῖς ἔργοις ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὴν πατρίδα
δυνατὴν κατεσκεύασε τοιούτοις;

Fr. 3. εκεινον μεν υπο της πολεως ητιμασμενον, την δε πολιν
δια τας εκεινου πραξεις της μεγιστης τιμης υπο των Ελληνων
αξιωθεισαν

=Diod. xi, 59, 3. ἐκείνον μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἠτιμασμένον,
τὴν δὲ πόλιν διὰ τὰς ἐκείνου πράξεις ἐπαιρομένην.

Fr. 4. σοφωτατην και [δικαι]οτατην . . . τατην και χαλεποτα-
την [γενομενη]ν προς εκεινον . . . υπολαμβανουσι

=Diod. l. c. σοφωτάτην καὶ ἐπικεικεστάτην χαλεπωτάτην πρὸς
ἐκείνον εὐρίσκομεν γεγενημένην.

Fr. 6, 7, 8. οθεν παρεξεβημεν. Αθηναιοι δε Κιμωνος του Μιλ-
τιαδου στρατηγουντος εκπλευσαντες εκ Βυζαντιου μετα των
συμμαχων Ηιονα την επι Στρυμονι Περσων εχοντων ειλον και
Σκυρον ην νησον . . . αυ[του δε προ]ς Δυκο[μηδην τον β]ασι-
λεα . . . πρω . . . μαν . . . θησι . . . παραθαλαττιων καλου-
μενων [πολεων σο]αι μεν εκ τ[ης Ελλα]δος ησαν απωκισμεναι
π[αρα]χρημα συν[επεισε]

=Diod. xi, 59, 4; 60, 1, 2, 4. περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς Θεμιστοκλέους
ἀρετῆς εἰ καὶ πεπλεονάκαμεν παρεκβάντες . . . Ἀθηναῖοι
στρατηγὸν ἐλομενοὶ Κίμωνα τὸν Μιλτιάδου . . . οὗτος δὲ παρα-
λαβὼν τὸν στόλον ἐν Βυζαντίῳ, καὶ καταπλεύσας ἐπὶ πόλιν τὴν
ὀνομαζομένην Ἰόνον, ταύτην μὲν Περσῶν κατεχόντων ἐχει-
ρῶσατο, Σκύρον δὲ Πελασγῶν ἐνοικούντων καὶ Δολόπων ἐξε-
πολέμησε . . . τῶν παραθαλαττίων πόλεων ὅσαι μὲν ἦσαν ἐκ

τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπῳκισμένοι ταύτας παραχρήμα συνέπεισεν ἀποστῆναι τῶν Περσῶν.

Fr. 9, 10. [Κίμων πυνθανομενος το]ν τ[ων Περσων στολο]ν περι [την Κυπρον συ]ντετα[χθαι διακοσι]αις πεν[τηκοντα π]ρ[ος] τρια[κοσιας] και τετταρα[κοντα] παραταχθειςας δε πολυν χρονον πολλας μεν των κινδονευουσων βαρβαρικων νεων διεφθειρεν· εκατον δ αυτοις αηδρασιν ειλε ζωγρησας τον . . .
 =Diod. xi, 60, 6. Κίμων δὲ πυνθανόμενος τὸν στόλον τῶν Περσῶν διατρίβειν περὶ τὴν Κύπρον, καὶ πλεύσας ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους, ἐναυμάχησε διακοσίαις καὶ πεντήκοντα ναοὶ πρὸς τριακοσίας καὶ τετταράκοντα . . . καὶ πολλὰς μὲν τῶν ἐναντίων ναῦς διέφθειραν, πλείους δὲ τῶν ἑκατὸν οὖν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἀνδράσιν εἶλον.

Fr. 11. [τον με]ν [στρατηγο]ν αυτων [Φερενδατη]ν αδελ[φιδουν οντ]α του βασ[ιλεως εν τη]σκηνη
 =Diod. xi, 61, 3. Καὶ τὸν στρατηγὸν τῶν βαρβάρων τὸν ἕτερον Φερενδάτην, ἀδελφιδοῦν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τῇ σκηνηῖ καταλαβόντες ἐφόνευσαν.

Fr. 12, 13. διετελουν οντες· ωστε νομιζοντες απο της ηπειρου την εφοδον αυτοις γεγογεναι των πολεμιων προς τας ναυς εφευγον υπολαμβανοντες αυτοις ειναι φιλιας ου δη πολλοι μεν υπο των καταλειφθεντων εκει φυλακων απεθνησκον εν τη νυκτι πολλοι δε ζωντες ηλισκοντο περιπιπτοντες τοις Ελλησιν δια την αποριαν οπου τραποιντο και τον . . .
 =Diod. διὸ καὶ νομίσαντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἡπείρου τὴν ἐπιφορὰν εἶναι τῶν πολεμίων, πρὸς τὰς ναῦς ὡς πρὸς φιλίας ἔφευγον. τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς οὔσης ασελήνου καὶ σκοτεινῆς συνέβαινε, τὴν ἄγνοιαν πολὺ μᾶλλον αὔξεσθαι καὶ μηδένα τάληθές δύνασθαι ἰδεῖν.

Now, the question arises: What are the passages in Diodorus in which we should expect to find the actual words of Ephorus? The more concise the passage in Diodorus,

the more probable it is that he is not using the language of Ephorus, because the more he cuts him down, the more he would depart from his actual words. On the other hand, the fuller the treatment of Diodorus is, the greater is the probability that you have there a good deal, at least, of the language of Ephorus. But we can go beyond that. It was pointed out some few years ago by a German scholar, Laqueur, that the προοίμια, or prefaces, which Diodorus prefixes to each Book of his History, must have been copied out from Ephorus, on the ground that when Diodorus gets beyond the part of his history that he took from Ephorus, and consequently has to compose προοίμια of his own, they are lamentable stuff. Hence we may look for the actual words of Ephorus in these prefaces. Again, when Diodorus is dealing with a political situation, with a question of policy or a political stratagem, or something else of the kind, there is a strong probability that in the main he will give us the language of Ephorus, because, being a writer of very mean intelligence (I am not sure that he was not the most stupid man that ever wrote history), he was much too stupid to conceive for himself a political situation. Therefore, the more difficult the situation, the greater the probability that we have Ephorus and not Diodorus. Once more, there are the appreciations of character, *e.g.*, that of Aristides (Diod. xi, 44-47), which we know to have been a marked feature in Ephorus' work. These are the kind of passages which we should expect to come from Ephorus, and in which we should expect to find coincidences of style between Diodorus and the *Hellenica*.

Now let us turn to the actual coincidences, and see what we have. At the very end of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, in a passage in which the author is speaking of the breadth of Asia Minor, the following words occur: ἀκούων ταύτην τὴν χώραν διατείνειν ὡσπερ ταινίαν στενὴν ἀρξαμένην ἀπὸ τῆς Ποντικῆς

θαλάττης μέχρι Κιλικίας καὶ Φοινίκης. In Diodorus (xii, 50, 2) we find an exactly similar phrase: ἡ μὲν γὰρ παραθαλάττιος αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀβδηριτῶν χώρας τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχουσα διέτεινε μέχρι τοῦ Ἰστροῦ ποταμοῦ.

A still more striking coincidence is to be found in the passage in which the prosperity of the Thebans during the Peloponnesian War is described as follows (*Hell. Oxyr.*, xii, 3): ἐπέδοσαν οἱ Θηβαῖοι πολὺ πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν ὀλόκληρον. With this we may compare Diodorus xii, 1, 4, a passage in the προίμιον to Book xii: πολλὴν ἐπίδοσιν ἔλαβεν ἡ Ἑλλάς πρὸς τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν. The word ὀλόκληρον occurs at the beginning of this same passage. Again, at the very beginning of the *Hellenica* we have the phrase κοινωσάμενος ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ τῇ βουλῇ. To this there is a parallel twice over in Diodorus (xi, 39, 5; xi, 42, 5): εἰ ἀπορρήτοις τῇ βουλῇ προεῖπεν. As both these are passages dealing with a political situation, we can be sure that the phrase comes from Ephorus.

Again, we have the adjective ἀδρότατα used in a figurative sense at the beginning of Chapter 4 of the *Hellenica*. In Diodorus we find ἄδρος, in the positive degree, similarly used in a figurative sense more than once. That is not a very common use of the term.

Or again, Τιμοκράτει διελέχθησαν (*Hell. Oxyr.*, ii, 2). With this we may compare διελέχθησαν Ἰπποκράτει (Diod., xii, 69, 1). In both passages διαλεχθῆναι is used in the same sense of "conferring with" or "intriguing with."

Again, twice over in the *Hellenica* we have the word ἐξετασμός, a review of troops, in place of the more usual ἐξέτασις. It occurs in Diodorus three or four times.

Another phrase that meets us in the second line of the *Hellenica* is οὐ μετὰ τῆς τοῦ δήμου γνώμης. Its equivalent, ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ δήμου γνώμης, is frequent in Diodorus in passages describing a political situation.

Let us now turn to an interesting group of words, because they belong to the terminology of politics. In the *Hellenica* (i, 2), the conservative party at Athens is described as ὄσοι γνώριμοι καὶ χαρίεντες ἦσαν. Χαρίεντες was noted at once, when the fragment was discovered, as a new term—an unusual term—but you have it in Diodorus, two or three times over (xiii, 104, 6, and xiv, 5, 7), though in the comparative degree. In the same passage in the *Hellenica* (i, 3), ἐπικεικίς is used with a political connotation. This use is found in Diodorus (xiii, 53, 1).

Φρονεῖν τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων (*Hell. Oxyr.*, xii, 1) is thoroughly Diodorean, and ἐταιρεία, in the same passage, is also found in Diodorus. Though μέρος, in the sense of a political party, is not found in Diodorus, μερίς is. With συντελούτων εἰς τὰς Θήβας (xi, 3) we may compare συντελεία, in the sense of a confederacy, which is common in Diodorus.

If we turn from the terminology of politics to that of warfare we find the following words common to the *Hellenica* and Diodorus: δηοῦν, πορθεῖν, λεηλατεῖν, ἐνεδρεύειν, κατὰ κράτος ἐλεῖν, συντεταγμένοι. All of these are, of course, common enough words. Among other words or phrases which are found both in the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* and Diodorus we may point to σκάφος, προέχειν, ἀλλοτριῶς or δυσμενῶς ἔχειν or διακεῖσθαι, παραθαλαττίδιος, καθ' ὑπερβολήν, and ἀντιπράττειν. Τοῦτο τὸ τέλος ἔλαβεν, the phrase with which the revolution at Rhodes is dismissed, is constantly used by Diodorus for the purpose of concluding an episode. Το ἀμφισβητήσιμος χώρα (*Hell. Oxyr.*, xiii, 3) there is a sufficiently close parallel in Diodorus (xi, 79, 1): περὶ χώρας ὁμόρου ἀμφισβήτησις. Finally, there are words such as σπουδάζειν, παροξύνειν, ὑπολαμβάνειν, καταπλαγεῖς, προθυμία, which are great favorites with both writers.

I venture, therefore, to think that when you consider the material afforded by the two new fragments in regard to the question of scale, of treatment, and of style, you will find the evidence in favor of the hypothesis that Ephorus is the author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* to be overwhelming.

One question which is of the utmost interest remains to be answered, and that is the question of the style of Ephorus. How far can we determine from Diodorus the style of Ephorus? There are certain passages that may be picked out, mostly from the eleventh book of Diodorus, where I think we may be as certain as we can be that we have before us the actual words of Ephorus, partly because in some places the style is much too good to have been invented by the brain of Diodorus. The passage (xi, 39 and 40) which describes the way in which Themistocles outwitted the Spartans when they wished to prevent the rebuilding of the walls of Athens, is one. I think that, if you will read that through, you will see that a great deal of the language which is used must come straight from Ephorus. Again, there is the story of the way in which Themistocles built the harbor of Piræus (xi, 41-43). The story is told at great length, and I am disposed to think that the whole passage has been taken from Ephorus, *verbatim et literatim*, with the alteration of a few words and phrases. Again, there is the passage in which he describes the transference of the hegemony from Sparta to Athens (xi, 50). Here, too, I think there can be no question that we have the actual Ephorus. The passage (xi, 54, 55) in which he describes the banishment of Themistocles is another instance from the same book. There is much, too, that comes from the pen of Ephorus in the account of the siege of Ithome (xi, 64). Two passages from later books are interesting. One (xii, 58) is the passage in which he describes the outbreak

of the plague at Athens, and explains its origin. The language is much too technical and much too good for Diodorus. Clearly he got the whole passage straight out of Ephorus. He certainly did not get it out of Thucydides. Finally there is a passage (xii, 38-40) which we know from Diodorus himself to be derived from Ephorus, the account of the causes of the Peloponnesian War, and the story of the advice given to Pericles by the young Alcibiades. This passage, if carefully examined, will, I think, give an excellent idea of the style of Ephorus.

If we read through these passages we shall find words and phrases which carry on the face of them the stamp and impress of his style. In the second passage (xi, 41-43) we have μετὰ τῶν δυναμένων καὶ βλάπτειν καὶ ὠφελεῖν τὰ μέγιστα—βούλεται γένεσθαι σύμβουλός τε καὶ εἰσηγητής—τούτους ὄρων ἀμιλλωμένους περὶ δόξης καὶ πρωτείων—τὴν δεινότητα καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνην τάνδρός—κἄν αὕτη κρίνη τὰ δυνατὰ λέγειν καὶ συμφέροντα. In the next passage (xi, 50) we find τούς τε τῶν ἰδιωτῶν οἴκους πολλὴν ἐπίδοσιν λήψεσθαι πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν—τῆς γερουσίας οὐνεδρευούσης περὶ τούτων—μὴ συμφέρειν γὰρ τῇ Σπάρτῃ τῆς θαλάττης ἀμφισβητεῖν. These last words afford an example of a construction, a clause in *oratio obliqua* introduced by γάρ, which is extraordinarily frequent both in the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* and in those passages in Diodorus which appear to have been taken from Ephorus with little change. In the next passage (xi, 54, 55) we have διελέγοντο δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους, παροξύνοντες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν (διελέγοντο and παροξύνοντες are both characteristic of the *Hellenica*)—μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα οἱ μὲν φοβηθέντες αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν, οἱ δὲ φθονήσαντες τῇ δόξῃ, τῶν μὲν εὐεργεσίῳ ἐπελάθοντο, τὴν δ' ἰσχὺν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ φρόνημα ταπεινοῦν ἔσπευδον (ἔσπευδον, again, is characteristic of the *Hellenica* and of the Ephorean passages in Diodorus). In the passage that relates to the siege of Ithome there is a

phrase that no one would think of attributing to the inventive powers of Diodorus—τὴν ἔχθραν ἐξεπύρρευον (xi, 64, 3). The passage in Book xii, which gives Ephorus' account of the causes of the Peloponnesian War, has probably suffered but little from the touch of Diodorus. Sections 2, 3, and 4 of Chapter 38 are possibly almost intact. These passages have been selected from two books only, and in these two books there are many more passages that have as good a claim as those selected to give us the actual words of Ephorus. The newest fragment affords indisputable evidence of the extent to which the language of his authority was reproduced by Diodorus in his appreciation of Themistocles (Diod. xi, 59 compared with fragments 2, 3, 4). It may safely be assumed that we have the genuine style of Ephorus in the ἔπαινος of Aristides and the βλασφημία of Pausanias (xi, 46, 47). Another passage in Book xi in which we may detect again and again the hand of Ephorus is one which, on the ground of its contents, may fairly rank among the most valuable contributions of Diodorus to our knowledge of this period of Greek history. It is the passage (xi, 79-83) in which the story of the battles of Tanagra and Cœnophyta is told, and the political conditions of Bœotia described. It is significant that the two passages in ancient literature which give us the fullest information as to the Bœotian League are this passage and the famous Chapter II of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. If any one will be at pains to work through the remaining books of Diodorus that are derived from Ephorus—xiii, xiv, and xv—on the lines that I have indicated for Books xi and xii, he will, I have little doubt, find it no impossible task to recover, in passage after passage, the *ipsissima verba* of the famous historian.

