REVIEW–DISCUSSION
A MAJOR COLLECTION ON EPHORUS

Pia de Fidio and Clara Talamo, edd., with the collaboration of Luigi Vecchio, *Eforo di Cuma nella storia della storiografia greca. Atti dell'Incontro Internazionale di Studi Fisciano-Salerno, 10–12 dicembre 2008*, 2 vols. (*La Parola del Passato* vol. 1 (LXVIII): fasc. 388–93, and vol. 2 (LXIX): fasc. 394–9). Naples: Macchiaroli Editore, 2013–14. Pp. 989. ISSN 0031-2355.

This two-volume collection of essays contains twenty-six contributions, most in Italian (with two in English, one in Spanish, and one in French), which developed out of a conference on Ephorus held at Salerno in 2008. At that time, as John Davies puts it in his *prolusione*, Ephorus could indeed be described as 'the great black hole of Greek historiography', despite his importance for the genre and for (as Davies explicates) the very notion of 'Greek history'.[1] But since then, light has begun to escape from that black hole, not in faint rays, but in massive bursts. During the years in which these edited volumes were taking shape, two extended treatments of Ephorus emerged: Giovanni Parmeggiani's 700-plus-page *Eforo di Cuma* (Bologna, 2011) and Victor Parker's commentary on Jacoby's fragments for the online *Brill's New Jacoby* (*BNJ* 70, October 2011). I have reviewed Parmeggiani's book elsewhere, with some remarks on Parker as well; at the end of that review I noted that the last word on Ephorus had not been spoken—though I must admit I did not think I would be reading so many more of them so soon.[2] In the span of three years, we went from having the fairly thin and clearly outdated monograph of G. L. Barber to confronting a great mass of commentary and discussion on one of the most important ancient Greek historians and, arguably, a central figure in the development of the genre, or at least in the Greek historical tradition (that is, what the Greeks knew or believed about their own past). I do not think I am going out on a limb by saying, again, that there will be more to come on Ephorus, because now the scholar's task lies in digesting the material provided by Parmeggiani, Parker, and the authors in these volumes: many of the papers were completed without being able to incorporate

[1] I.68. Cf. Victor Parker in his *Brill's New Jacoby* commentary ('Ephoros (70)', Brill Online, ed. Ian Worthington, 2011), at 'Biographical Essay' II.D.: 'one must admire his courage in taking on a full review of all of Greek history from the Return of the Heraclids on down … While he relied heavily on what Herodotos had already done, Ephoros wanted to do more.'

[2] *Gnomon* 84.6 (2012): 492–6.

ISSN: 2046-5963 Copyright © 2016 Christopher Baron 26 April 2016

Parmeggiani's arguments, and Parker's commentary was unknown to most of their authors.[3] Any future work on Ephorus will require a triangulation of the three. I have not attempted that in any systematic fashion, but I have tried to signal some key differences where they affect our overall picture.

De Fidio's introduction (I.13–49) outlines the trajectory of judgments on Ephorus in modern scholarship before providing brief overviews of each piece. (There are also abstracts of each essay at the end of volume II—in English for the Italian and English contributions, but in French and Spanish, respectively, for those two.) Each essay includes full bibliographical references at the end. There is no comprehensive bibliography, but the back-matter of volume II contains an Index Locorum and an Index of Names (and important terms).

The essays are divided into three parts over the two volumes: 'Biographical starting points and historical/cultural context' (I), '*Koinai praxeis* between regional histories and "universal" history' (II), and 'Ephorean echoes in the later historiographical tradition' (III). I will deal with the essays in the order in which they appear, with one exception: since Giuseppe Ragone presents what is essentially a short monograph (122 pages) on a central issue in our interpretation of Ephorus—his supposed partiality toward his native city of Cyme in Aeolia—I will start there and deal with it at extra length.[4]

Ephorus had the reputation, according to Strabo, of forcing his hometown of Cyme into the narrative (F 236), and scholars have often read the entire corpus through this lens.[5] Ragone sets out to show that this tendency to treat Ephorus as *campanilista* (parochial-minded) is unwarranted, not only because it is based on ancient interpretations preserved in just a handful of fragments, but because those ancient comments have their origin in a ridiculing of Cymaeans in general, not in evaluations of Ephorus as historian.[6] Through a de-

[3] De Fidio, at the end of her introduction (I.49), points to the work of both scholars. Among the contributors, Ottone engages most directly with Parmeggiani and also cites Parker once; Bianco takes note of specific arguments from both scholars multiple times; Camassa notes both at the beginning of his piece, but it is difficult to see their influence on it. In general, the bibliographic coverage is somewhat inconsistent across the individual essays.

[4] 'Eforo "campanilista": lo spazio storico di Cuma eolica nei frammenti dell'*Epichorios* e delle *Storie*' (I.95–216).

[5] Strabo (13.3.6) reports that Ephorus was mocked because, when narrating the (great) deeds of other cities, he did not want Cyme to go unmentioned, and so included the tag, 'during the same time, the Cymaeans were at peace' (κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν Κυμαῖοι τὰς ἡσυχίας ἦγον).

[6] I.96; cf. 110. Parker generally implies skepticism of the extreme reading of Ephorus as *campanilista*, noting at several points the possibility of parody in what Strabo reports (*ad* F 236), or that Ephorus himself was attempting to fight back against the stereotype of the Cymaean dullard (*ad* F 1). In his overall appraisal (Biographical Essay II.D and E) Parker

tailed examination of the relevant set of fragments, Ragone argues that Ephorus, like most other ancient historians, is shown to be 'a selector of variants' rather than 'an inventor and interested propagator of previously unknown localizing versions favorable to his native city'.[7]

Much of Ragone's discussion revolves around the *Epichorios* (F 1), since the one fragment explicitly attributed to this work stands at the center of the picture of Ephorus' *tendenza campanilistica*. Ephorus claimed Homer as a Cymaean; but as Ragone points out, such a claim was not unusual, and Homer had already been linked to Cyme by Hippias of Elis. Furthermore, the Homeric scholia contain numerous arguments for the Cymaean derivation of certain ritual and sacrificial practices, and Ragone argues that this too reveals that Ephorus may have been responding to previous traditions. 'Therefore, Ephorus' laborious demonstration is reduced in essence to a pure and simple selection of a pre-existing tradition, already argued by others and in a certain manner "vulgate": in other words, it involves a *choice*, equivalent at worst, in its degree of "parochialism", to what other authors had done or would do' in claiming their homeland as Homer's birthplace.[8]

While Ragone's non-locally concerned explanations are all plausible (that Ephorus was simply taking a position on details of chronology, genealogy, etc.), this approach does leave him arguing that the *one* fragment attested for a work on local history did *not* have a local bias. Indeed, the same problem affects a number of Ragone's arguments. Thus on F 97, where Ephorus records Cyme's reputation for 'well-ordered laws', Ragone attempts to downplay local bias by interpreting this as the Cymaeans merely having a concern for preserving archaic features of their legal apparatus (I.130–1). But Parker's comments (*BNJ* 70 F 97) seem closer to the point: the Cymaeans here actually stand at the end of a list of much more powerful and famous cities and regions, and thus Ephorus 'clearly meant this seriously even if to the non-Kymaian the effect must have been one of ludicrous bathos'. Ragone's treatment of F 236 is similarly uncompelling; but what is noteworthy is the context of Strabo's report, which is that Ephorus—like his fellow Cymaeans—was also (*kai*) mocked, in their case for their dullness, in his case for his tagline to major events, that 'during

does not linger on the issue: Ephorus' bias toward Cyme is placed in the context of all historians' inclination to write *cum ira et studio* and mentioned alongside his other partialities (towards Athens and within Athenian politics). Cf. however III.A, on the *Epichorios*: 'Local historians strove to make their hometowns seem as important as possible, and Ephoros was clearly no exception as this striving becomes manifest in the *Histories* also (F 236).'

[7] I.109. The fragments treated in most detail include 1, 10, 39, 97, 114, 134, and 236.

[8] I.133, emphasis original. It is instructive to compare Parker's take (*ad* F 1): 'Many places in the Greek world claimed to be "Homer's" birth-place, and Ephoros, striving to make his home town seem as important as possible, not surprisingly seized upon the view of some (see esp. Hippias of Elis, *BNJ* 6 F 13) that "Homer" hailed from Kyme.'

the same time, the Cymaeans were at peace'. So, it is likely that polemic lies behind the accusation, and with polemic there is always the possibility of distortion.

More convincing is Ragone's discussion of whether Ephorus exaggerated Cyme's role in Greek colonization of the Mediterranean. On Kebren in the Troad (F 10), Ragone highlights a papyrus reading which places this fragment in the fifth rather than first book of the *Histories* (I.165; not noticed by Parker), which reduces the likelihood of Ephorus' forcing Cyme into the narrative. On Ainos in Thrace (F 39), Ragone shows that Harpocration's verbatim citation 'allows us to verify, in this specific case, the absolute brevity and "objectivity" of the mention of Cyme, which invalidates the usual rebuke of the historian's *Lokalpatriotismus*' (I.172).

The opening paper by John Davies, 'The Historical and Cultural World of Ephoros' (I.55–70), briefly outlines the political and cultural changes of the 370s and 350s which affected the environment in which the historian was educated and began composing his work. Davies notes the importance of the enormous growth in written literature along with the 'institutionalization' of Greek education, as a result of which Ephorus 'would have had access to an intoxicating and ever-increasing array of material'. The collision between the opportunities of this new world and the older ways of learning is evident, among other places, in Plato's dialogues, and Davies finds in Ephorus' fragments signs of 'the stupendous effort which he had made to reconcile old and new within an integrated framework' (I.64).

Franca Landucci Gattinoni, 'Sulle tracce di Eforo di Cuma: Appunti biografici' (I.71–94), takes a closer look at the scholarship surrounding the 'facts' of Ephorus' life. She points out the weaknesses of the tradition that Ephorus was a pupil of Isocrates, while leaving the question open, and concludes that we can in fact know very little about his life. She goes further (I.91), arguing that the paucity of notices on Ephorus indicate a lack of participation in political affairs, and thus most likely a 'storico da tavolino'. This stands, I think, in contradiction to her notion that his affinity for his home town of Cyme put him in an 'oecumenical' orbit (especially open to Persian influence) which helps explain his choice to write a universal history.

Roberto Nicolai, 'La storiografia di Eforo tra paideia retorica e identità greca' (I.217–40), probes the tag applied to Ephorus of 'universal historian'. Ephorus is really interested in Greek identity, which necessitates investigation into origins; but given the contemporary political situation of Greece, that 'universal' history must be tackled piecemeal, by looking at the smaller localities into which the Greeks are disunited. Thus Nicolai considers Ephorus the author of 'glocal history', in which general history is the sum of local and partial histories (I.235).

Gabriella Ottone, '"In corsa nello stadio della storia": Eforo e Teopompo secondo Fozio' (I.241–88), takes aim at the tradition of Ephorus and Theopompus as pupils of Isocrates. Her starting point is Photius' notice on Theopompus (*Bibl.* 176), in which he reports that 'they say that' Isocrates assigned the two men their historical topics based on their divergent natures; Photius then claims that a comparison of the proems of their works reveals similarities in purpose and other respects, 'as if both were running out onto history's racetrack from the same starting line' (F 7, trans. Parker). But since Photius gives no summary of Ephorus' work, he was probably not reading Ephorus directly. Furthermore, Ottone points to a contradiction in the tradition of the two historians as Isocrates' pupils: 'in some versions, the contrast between the compositions they produced led Isocrates to observe the necessity of a corrective to their character defects; in others, the corrective to their character defects consisted, pragmatically, in the assignment on the part of Isocrates of contrasting compositional tasks'.[9] Ottone sees the development as having started in stylistic judgments which saw similarities between the writing of both historians and Isocrates, over time coming to be used as proof of the personal relationship; by at least the first century BCE, the personal relationship was considered fact. Given the intertwined nature of the ancient biographical tradition, literary criticism, and the attribution of *bons mots* to multiple speakers, it cannot be ruled out that Photius' comparison of the proems has nothing to do with the actual texts, and results instead from the transfer of a general stylistic judgment to a specifically historiographical context.[10]

Giorgio Camassa, 'Sacralizzazione e semplicità incompromessa delle antiche leggi: due poli del pensiero storiografico di Eforo' (I.289–302) examines the notion of lawgivers claiming a divine source for their laws (FF 147, 149) as a window into Ephorus' thinking about contemporary affairs. He connects the (re)appearance of this theme to times when the close link between political and religious affairs—essential to the Greek *polis*—was ruptured. In F 139, Camassa sees the criticism of Thurii's over-legislating as being aimed at the fourth-century Athenian democracy.

Anna Maria Biraschi, 'Eforo e Omero' (I.303–30), reviews the fragments in which Homer appears in the hope that Ephorus' relationship with the poet can help explain some aspects of his historical method and of his attitude toward tradition. While the historian's choice to begin with the return of the

[9] I.255. Ottone overall is sceptical of the historical reality of studies under Isocrates: see her notes at 256–7, and her comparison with the tradition of Demosthenes as a student of Plato (259–60).

[10] I.270; cf. 279: behind the interpretation of the similarity of the proems 'sta una tradizione parabiografica di stampo aneddotico, sostanziata da un certo tipo di critica stilistica'. Ottone also suggests that Caecilius of Caleacte played an important role in this process.

Heraclidae precludes a continuous narrative of the Trojan War, Homer maintains vital importance for him in another area: geography, especially given the wide range of his universal history. The relationship runs in two directions: Biraschi sees Ephorus as possibly the inventor of the tradition of Ethiopians in Iberia, by which he attempted to explain a Homeric passage (*Od.* 1.23–4, F 128); but Ephorus also used Homer to support his own arguments, as for example the existence of milk-drinking Scythians who are the most just of all peoples (F 42). Since he is neither grammarian nor exegete of Homer, Ephorus brings a different functionality and sensibility to his reading of the poet, informed by Isocrates and his own Aeolian origin.

Antonio L. Chávez Reino, 'La "idealización" de los escitas en Éforo: un replanteamiento general (en torno a *FGrHist* 70 F 42 = Estrabón VII 3, 9)'[11] (I.331–72), emphasizes the importance of studying in detail the context of the Ephorean fragment—in this particular case, one preserved by Strabo in the course of his own polemic against those who would impugn the geographical knowledge of Homer—rather than seeking confirmation of pre-established, supposed tendencies of the historian. That is, previous scholarship has read Ephorus as idealizing the Scythians, whether simply influenced by current philosophical debates or (and) setting them up as a moral paradigm. Through a close reading of F 42, Chávez Reino convincingly resuscitates Fornara's argument[12] that *παραδείγματα ποιεῖσθαι* there means 'proofs, illustrations' rather than 'moral exempla'. He shows the close relationship between F 42 and F 158, which reveals that the latter is much smoothed over by the cover-text (ps.-Scymnus); this in turn further highlights the layers which Strabo preserves in the former (citations of the poets, staking out a position, delineation of argument). In addition, F 42 reveals the same argumentative structure as other fragments (including 31b, 122, 65). In sum, these passages show Ephorus following a similar pattern in taking a position on disputed or controversial issues in his geographical books, critiquing the statements of other authors and insisting on the importance of the truth. Thus F 42 is not about conveying a moral exemplum or adopting a philosophical commonplace; it is about historiographical method and correcting false opinions. It also illuminates how Ephorus responded to an already existing tradition with a critical-historical attitude.

The first paper of Part II, 'L'Atene arcaica di Eforo' by Luisa Breglia (I.373–412), reviews what Ephorus has to say about ancient Athens especially in his third book, in order to see which moments of the Athenian past he chose and to what extent they reflect components of Athenian identity constructed in the fifth and fourth centuries. Although several of the fragments explicitly

[11] 'The "idealization" of the Scythians in Ephorus: a general reconsideration.'

[12] C. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983) 110–12.

attributed to Book 3 concern the Ionian colonization of Asia Minor, Breglia argues that what we can tell of the structure of the first two books points to the third in fact focusing on Athens, including its 'pre-history' and most ancient institutions—relatively little of this survives because of the subsequent flourishing of the *Atthis* genre. Through her close reading of FF 23 and 24 Breglia attempts to pull out every possible thread, sometimes leaving a difficult tangle for the reader to navigate. But her examination does reveal the genealogical and mythological variants Ephorus already had before him, and suggests possible factors in the choices he made.

Pia de Fidio, 'Eforo e le tradizioni sulla Messenia arcaica' (I.413–506), tries to establish Ephorus' role in the transmission of the mythical and historical material pertinent to Messenia, with three objectives. Is it possible to find a coherent thread concerning Messenian history among the fragments? What influence did contemporary events have on his picture, especially the reordering of power in the Peloponnese? What were his sources, and what do they reveal about the ideological considerations which affected his choices? The scarcity of fragments—primarily FF 116 and 216, though both substantial—requires reliance on the indirect tradition (Diodorus Siculus 15.66.2–7, Nicolaus FF 31–4) and perhaps an excessive amount of speculation about what Ephorus might have read and written. De Fidio finds a shift in the historian's attitude to the topic which reflects the establishment of an independent Messenia over the middle years of the fourth century.

Volume II begins with two papers devoting attention to the context of historical fragments.[13] Riccardo Vattuone, in 'Eforo in Diodoro XI' (II.507–28), calls, as usual, for caution in simply equating the two authors even in instances where Diodorus' dependence on Ephorus seems clear. Thus, for example, in Ephorus F 186 and Diodorus Book 11 we find the story of a Persian-Carthaginian alliance in 481/0. But Vattuone argues that the only certain point in common is the placement of the Greco-Persian war in a larger (universal) context, and he notes 'the impression that Diodorus does not reproduce Ephorus *sic et simpliciter*, or that the Ephorean perspective is not exhausted in the brief pages Diodorus dedicates to the Greek-barbarian conflict' which we know spanned two books of Ephorus' *Histories* (II.516). We are reminded again of the complexity of the ancient tradition, many branches of which remain invisible to us: Ephorus had more than just Herodotus before him, Diodorus had more than just Ephorus (and those other authors—Timaeus for example—were themselves responding to Ephorus). Vattuone discusses FF 186–92 briefly and concludes with comments on the necessity of taking seriously the account(s) of

[13] Bianco (below) also recognizes the limitations of the fragmentary context. In my opinion, however, the papers of Ambaglio, Bearzot, and Daverio move too far away from that context and tend to treat Diodorus as an undistorted reflection of Ephorus. See also below, on Parmeggiani.

fifth-century history found in Ephorus and Diodorus as alternatives to Thucydides.

Pietro Vannicelli, 'Eforo e la tradizione sulle guerre persiane: il caso di Democrito di Nasso (*FGrHist* 70 F 187)' (II.529–44), examines a fragment deriving from Plutarch's *De Herodoti malignitate* which concerns the intentions of the Naxians at the Battle of Salamis. Vannicelli offers some excellent observations on the Plutarchan context and the epigram attributed to Simonides cited therein. He also proposes a further emendation of the already highly wrought text of Plutarch, which—if accepted—would seem to show Ephorus correcting Hellanicus on a minor point at the same time as he uses local traditions to oppose Herodotus' account of the Persian Wars.[14]

An essay from the late Delfino Ambaglio, 'Il contributo di Eforo per la *Pentecontaetia*' (II.545–60), addresses the larger question of how much and in what way Diodorus' *Bibliotheca* reflects Ephorus' work, through an examination of material relating to the run-up to the Peloponnesian War. Three fragments pertaining to the years 450–431 (FF 193–5) are compared with the first thirty-seven chapters of Diodorus' Book 12. Ambaglio presents a tentative case for this entire block (or nearly so) deriving from Ephorus, including the lengthy digressions on the lawgivers Charondas and Zaleucus (12.9–23) and the comments on the entire world being at peace in the (our) year 442 BCE (12.26). While fewer scholars today than even ten years ago will find this picture of Diodorus compelling, Ambaglio's discussion raises intriguing questions about Ephorus' approach to this period, including periodization, narrative structure, and selection of material.

It is not easy to discern the reason for the inclusion of a short piece by Luciano Canfora, 'Tra Cratippo e Teopompo' (II.561–8), which consists of a series of notes on the relationship between Theopompus' *Hellenica* and the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, and on the identity of the Cratippus cited by Plutarch in *De gloria Atheniensium*. The texts and passages under discussion pertain to *koinai praxeis*, though this is not emphasized, and Ephorus makes no appearance.

Cinzia Bearzot, 'Eforo e Teramene' (II.569–90), seeks to discover the image of the Athenian politician Theramenes in Ephorus' work, a difficult task given that he is not mentioned in the surviving fragments; thus she turns her attention to Books 13 and 14 of Diodorus, where Theramenes is portrayed—uniquely among our sources—as a democrat through and through. Bearzot elucidates this pro-Theramenes narrative in three episodes: the fall of the 400, the trial of the victorious generals after Arginusae, and the rule of the Thirty, in each instance comparing Diodorus with the accounts found in Thucydides,

[14] At 869a, ἑλεῖν for ἐλθεῖν, which would match the language in the Simonides epigram (869c). In regard to the latter, I find Vannicelli's solution to the meaning of *tritos* ('together with two other trierarchs') compelling, not least because it helps explain Plutarch's mention of *three* Naxian ships, rather than the four we find in the manuscripts of Herodotus 8.46.3.

Lysias, Xenophon, or Aristotle. However, the only support she offers for the idea of Diodorus' version deriving from Ephorus is the influence of Isocrates on the latter (II.584), itself a disputed notion (see Landucci and Ottone earlier in the volume).

Elisabetta Bianco, 'Eforo e la tradizione sugli strateghi ateniesi del IV secolo a.C.' (II.591–608), takes up a notion proposed by previous scholars of a loose 'biographical' interest in Ephorus' portrayal of fifth-century Greek history and tests its application to the fourth century: that is, the possibility that Ephorus organized his narrative around the exploits of individual military leaders. She examines the evidence for four Athenian generals, namely, Hieronymus (F 73), Chabrias (F 80), and two individuals not named by a rather confused scholiast to Aelius Aristides (F 211), probably Iphicrates and Timotheus. She concludes, on the basis of this admittedly sparse evidence, that Ephorus paid close attention to even lesser-known military leaders, but as part of a general concern for political-military narrative rather than a strictly biographical interest.

Giovanna Daverio Rocchi, 'Eforo, Senofonte e la storia del loro tempo' (II.609–42), compares their respective accounts of the fourth century, down to 363/2. In the first half of the essay, she gives a general overview of the two authors' contrasting approaches in three areas: narrative framework and methodology (especially as it relates to sources), the place and role of speeches, and selection of material. The second half examines key themes in the accounts of the period found in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and in Book 15 of Diodorus. Though Daverio offers the appropriate notes of caution in using Diodorus in this manner, her analysis still rests on the assumption that he provides an unproblematic recording of what Ephorus wrote.[15] Her conclusion that Ephorus, in contrast to Xenophon, downplayed the peace treaties of the period in favor of shifting hegemonies within the *longue durée*, makes sense given the larger framework of the *Histories*; but since we cannot completely remove Diodorus from the picture, it is difficult to say that this analysis adds anything to our knowledge of Ephorus. Her argument concerning a new model of hegemony shared by Xenophon and Ephorus, in the wake of the Thebans' defeat of Sparta, is stronger since it is based on an attested fragment (F 119).

Christopher Tuplin, 'Ephorus on post-Herodotean Persian history' (II.643–82), reviews in detail the evidence for the Persian dimension of Books 11–27 of the *Histories*, from the 470s to the 340s. Topics include the possible sources used by Ephorus; a review of the directly attested fragments, including

[15] Thus, in a paragraph which begins by noting that Diodorus' omission of several of the peace-talks after Leuctra does not necessarily mean Ephorus left them out, she goes on to write, 'According to Ephorus …' and 'Ephorus says that …' when she cites Diodorus (II.630–1).

extended comments on the fascinating F 211; examination of the indirect tradition (that is, Books 11–16 of Diodorus), and the general narrative of Persian history found there as compared to other surviving sources (Thucydides, Plutarch, Xenophon, Nepos); and the extent to which Ephorus shared an Isocratean notion of panhellenism. While anyone seeking new, definitive answers to the question of Ephorus' treatment of Persia will be disappointed, that is in fact the benefit of this essay: throughout, Tuplin draws attention to the multitude of problems one must face in attempting to decide what Ephorus said on a given topic or event. Overall, Tuplin does find evidence for a largely Hellenocentric conception of universal history in Ephorus.

Luisa Prandi, 'L'ultimo Eforo' (II.683–704), considers the last ten books of the *Histories*, covering the period from 386 to 341, especially in relation to what we know of some other fourth-century historians (Callisthenes, Anaximenes, Daimachus, Philistus). Most of the actual fragments pertaining to this section of the work consist of little more than brief geographical notices, thus Prandi approaches the topic in more indirect fashion. She sees Books 26–9 as covering the years 356–346 (or 341) in other areas, then Book 30 coming back to mainland Greece to do the same; the siege of Perinthus would thus have been related for the first time at the end of Book 27, with Ephorus' son Demophilus perhaps also appending notes on the years 345–341 at the end of Book 30 (as she points out, this differs from Parmeggiani's recent conclusion on the matter). She also favors a fairly early 'publication' date for the work, in the mid-330s.

Part III begins with Mauro Moggi on 'Eforo e Aristotele' (II.705–22). Ephorus appears only in five fragments of the philosopher—in other words, the two are cited in close proximity five times—and Moggi's brief review of this evidence shows that there is little to work with. Thus he turns to more promising material: first, each author's comments on the constitutions of Crete and of Sparta, where he finds it probable that Aristotle drew on Ephorus, though not uncritically; second, their thoughts on the position of historical writing as a genre. Here, Moggi notes that both authors separate history from rhetoric.

Marina Polito, 'Eforo e la scuola di Aristotele sulla *τρυφή* dei Milesi' (II.723–50), provides a close study of F 183 of Ephorus along with the other passages cited by Athenaeus (12.523e–524c) on the topic of the luxury of the Milesians, from Aristotle, Heraclides Ponticus, and Clearchus. Polito begins by addressing fully the various issues we confront with a cover-text like Athenaeus. She argues that Athenaeus found this entire block of text in Clearchus, the last author cited, rather than stitching it together himself. Furthermore, and with an importance beyond anything to do with Ephorus, Polito's essay responds to the arguments of Robert and Vanessa Gorman concerning Athenaeus' role in the articulation of the effects of luxury on Greek communities

(II.729–35).[16] She concludes that Ephorus and Aristotle shared a similar attitude toward the destructive power of luxury, but from different perspectives, namely, historical as opposed to political analysis.

Serena Bianchetti, 'Aspetti di geografia eforea nei *Giambi a Nicomede*' (II.751–80), surveys the eleven fragments and one testimonium of Ephorus included by Jacoby as deriving from the geographical poem of Pseudo-Scymnus ('A.' in this essay, for Anonimo).[17] Finding Ephorus in this text is complicated by a number of factors, but she concludes that while the information on the western end of the Mediterranean (notably the Pillars of Heracles) fits well into an Ephorean framework, the passages on Lake Maeotis do not. One explanation for this is that the poet, writing in the late second/early first century BCE for a Bithynian king, felt compelled to utilize more recent information on the eastern part of the Greek world. Nonetheless, Ephorus remained the model for a historical-geographical approach to the world.

Giovanni Parmeggiani, 'Diodoro lettore di Eforo' (II.781–806), presents a shortened version of the argument found in his 2011 monograph that, although Diodorus clearly relied extensively on Ephorus for Books 11–16 of the *Bibliotheca*, we cannot rely on a simple equation of the two authors ('Diodorus/Ephorus')—Diodorus was neither a faithful copyist nor an epitomator.[18] This is not just because Diodorus used other sources, but because his own historiographical goals differed from those of Ephorus. Parmeggiani examines a handful of examples to show this in detail (notably FF 70, 196, 214, and 119).

Leone Porciani tackles the topic of 'Eforo e i proemi di Diodoro. Per una ridefinizione del modello storiografico' (II.807–26) by considering the structural function of Diodorus' prefaces with regard to the work as a whole. Using the hexadic structure proposed by Catherine Rubincam, Porciani shows that the preserved prefaces of opening books (13, 19, and 37) look forward to 'macro-sequences'—i.e. beyond their own book—while those of closing books (12 and 18) actually look *backward*, thus serving an 'enclitic' purpose for that hexad. This hexadic scheme can also fit the evidence for Ephorus' *Histories*, where the divisions mark moments of historical significance (Greek colonization, the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, Cnidus in 394, Mantineia in 362). Since there appears to be no obvious chronological significance to Diodorus' divisions, Porciani concludes, he must have borrowed the idea of the preface as a nod to his model for writing universal history.

[16] In addition to the articles cited by Polito, see now *Corrupting Luxury in Ancient Greek Literature* (Ann Arbor, 2014).

[17] Not all of these passages explicitly cite Ephorus; for a number of them, Jacoby saw enough overlap with other attested fragments to include them. See Parker's comments ad F 129b.

[18] Giovanni Parmeggiani, *Eforo di Cuma* (Bologna, 2011) 349–94.

Édith Parmentier, 'Échos d'Éphore dans l'oeuvre de Nicolas de Damas, *Histoires* et *Recueil de Coutumes*' (II.827–46), focuses on the ethnographic fragments of Nicolaus preserved in Stobaeus, and deriving ultimately from Ephorus, concerning the peoples above the Black Sea, the Celts, and the Cretans. Although Nicolaus himself survives only in fragments and Byzantine extracts, the overlap between these passages and citations of Ephorus in other authors such as Strabo allows us to see a fairly close relationship between the two historians. Through this lens, Parmentier finds evidence for admiration on Ephorus' part of far-flung peoples both east and west, more in the tradition of Herodotus than of Thucydides or Isocrates.[19]

Finally, Andrea Filoni, 'Eforo e Apollodoro in Strabone' (II.847–926), is perhaps best taken as a test case or prolegomena for a systematic study of Strabo's approach to and use of Ephorus in Books 8–10 of the *Geography*, those on the Greek mainland. The task is complicated by Strabo's apparent heavy reliance in these books on a commentary on the Homeric catalogue of ships by Apollodorus of Athens (*FGrHist* 244), who also consulted Ephorus; Filoni presents the case for Strabo turning mostly to Ephorus for his regional histories (as opposed to individual communities). In any case, the bulk of the essay consists of a detailed argument for attributing to Ephorus Strabo's entire account of the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi (9.3.5–12), of which only the last two sections are considered a fragment by Jacoby (F 31b). Based on this attribution, Filoni highlights some elements of Ephorus' historical method.

In closing, I point out just three particular areas which have the potential for fruitful future work based on this large new scholarly output on Ephorus: the precise nature of Isocrates' presence and influence on his conception and writing of history; the structure of the *Histories* and Ephorus' notion of periodization; and the reception of Ephorus in antiquity.

CHRISTOPHER BARON
University of Notre Dame cbaron1@nd.edu

[19] The bibliography here seems especially sparse; for Nicolaus, in English one should now consult L. M. Yarrow, *Historiography at the End of the Republic. Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule* (Oxford, 2006).