

EPHORUS AND ALEXANDER THE GREAT

(*FGRHist* 70 F 223)*

Abstract. Scholars have long maintained that Ephorus began work on the *Histories* in the middle years of the fourth century, and so place its genesis and most of its composition before the reign of Alexander the Great. A fragment that mentions Alexander’s crossing into Asia (*FGrHist* 70 F 223) has long been dismissed, but this article argues that it accurately reflects the content of the *Histories* and most likely appeared in Book 1, which suggests that Ephorus was composing this work decades later than generally thought, during the reign of Alexander.

Keywords: Ephorus, Alexander the Great, chronography, composition date, Return of the Heraclids, *diabasis*

Introduction

There is a clear scholarly consensus that Ephorus began work on the *Histories* in the middle years of the fourth century, but had not yet finished it when he died around 330 BCE.¹ These dates place both the genesis of this work and most of its composition well before the reign of Alexander the Great. There are, however, two fragments from the *Histories* that not only mention Alexander, but show an awareness of his epochal career. One almost certainly appeared in a later portion of the work and so presents no inherent contradiction to the prevailing consensus (*FGrHist* 70 F 217).² The other attributes to Ephorus a calculation of the span of time that separated the Return of the Heraclids and Alexander’s crossing, or *diabasis*, into Asia (F 223), and it may have appeared as early as Book 1. Despite its potential significance, this fragment has never received thorough examination. Proponents of the *communis opinio* routinely dismiss it in short order.³ Even those few who cite this

* I would like to thank Chris Baron, Alden Mosshammer, Tim Rood, Mark Thatcher, and *Histos*’ anonymous reviewers for their many helpful comments; all remaining errors are, of course, my own.

¹ For the dates, see Jacoby (1926) 22–5, Barber (1935) 2–13, Mazzarino (1966) 402, Meister (2004) 1035, Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 Biographical Essay I and IIA, Parmeggiani (2011) 27 and 720 n. 29, Landucci Gattinoni (2012), Prandi (2012a) 321–2, Davies (2013) 59, de Fidio (2013) 22 and 40, and Rocchi (2014) 610–11. For the unfinished nature of the work, see below, pp. 122–4. All dates are BCE unless otherwise noted.

² For more on the likely position of F 217 within the *Histories*, see below, pp. 124–5.

³ See, for example, Schwartz (1909) 489, Jacoby (1926) 24–5, Barber (1935) 8–9, and Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 F 223. Parmeggiani (2011) 184 n. 106 and 603 is open to the

fragment in support of a later date spend little time examining the fragment itself.⁴ Yet, the case for a later date can be much strengthened by such an examination, since (as I argue below) there is no good reason to doubt that the fragment accurately reflects the content of Ephorus' *Histories* and that it did appear in Book 1. This conclusion suggests that Ephorus composed the bulk of his *Histories* decades later than commonly thought (in the 330s and 320s), which would make it a product, not of the chaotic years of the mid-fourth century, but of the age of Alexander.

F 223 is attested by Clement of Alexandria in the first book of the *Stromata*. Clement hopes to persuade his fellow Christians of the ongoing utility of classical learning (philosophy in particular). In the course of his wide-ranging discussion, he provides an extensive digression on the relative antiquity of the Greek and Hebrew traditions, to show that the former was later than and borrowed heavily from the latter (and so retained some ongoing value for his Christian readers).⁵ It is here that he attributes to Ephorus a calculation of the time that separated the Return of the Heraclids and Alexander's *diabasis* into Asia (I.139.3–4 = *FGrHist* 70 F 223):

ἀπὸ Τροίας ἀλώσεως ἐπὶ τὴν Ἡρακλειδῶν κάθοδον ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἢ ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα. ἀπὸ τούτου ἐπὶ Εὐαίνετον ἄρχοντα, ἐφ' οὗ φασιν Ἀλέξανδρον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβῆναι, ὡς μὲν Φανίας ἔτη ἑπτακόσια δεκαπέντε· ὡς δὲ Ἐφωρος ἑπτακόσια τριάκοντα πέντε, ὡς δὲ Τίμαιος καὶ Κλείταρχος ὀκτακόσια εἴκοσι, ὡς δὲ Ἐρατοσθένης ἑπτακόσια ἑβδομήκοντα τέσσαρα, ὡς δὲ Δοῦρις ἀπὸ Τροίας ἀλώσεως ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου εἰς Ἀσίαν διάβασιν ἔτη χίλια.

From the capture of Troy to the Return of the Heraclids is 120 or 180 years. From the latter to the archonship of Euaenetus, when they say that Alexander crossed over to Asia, is 715 years according to Phantias, but 735 according to Ephorus; 820 according to Timaeus and Cleitararchus; and 774 according to Eratosthenes. According to Duris, it is 1,000 years from the capture of Troy to the crossing of Alexander into Asia.⁶

possibility that the figure did appear in the *Histories*, but he too ultimately spends little time considering its implications; see 720 n. 29.

⁴ Niese (1909), Meyer (1909) vii, Judeich (1911) 102 n. 2, and Laqueur (1911) 336; see also Mühl (1936). After Jacoby's influential rejection of Niese's thesis (see Jacoby (1926) 24–5), only Stylianou (1998) 110–13 has mounted a defense of a later date. Davies (2013) 57 n. 3 recognises that the case for a later date demands greater attention than it has been given, but he ultimately accepts the early date.

⁵ Molland (1938) 40–69, Lilla (1971) 31–2, Droge (1989) 144–6, Ridings (1995) 37, and Mortley (1996) 145–6.

⁶ All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

At first glance, the case for a later date would seem strong. Clement attributes to Ephorus awareness of an event that occurred in the spring of 334. He does not provide a book number, but mention of the Return of the Heraclids raises the distinct possibility that it appeared in Book 1.⁷ Ephorus famously began his *Histories* with that event (TT 8, 10), and our surviving fragments suggest that it was treated in some detail in the first book.⁸ Advocates of an earlier date have cast significant doubt on these conclusions, arguing that the figure and its endpoint were either products of the long chronographic tradition which were subsequently and erroneously attributed to Ephorus or, if to some extent Ephorean, then cited from a later book. A thorough examination of the fragment itself sustains neither argument, however. Our first task is to establish whether and to what extent Clement's citation accurately reflects the content of Ephorus' *Histories*, then to consider its likely context within that work.⁹ Finally, I turn to the question that has largely driven previous discussions of this fragment, its relationship to the other evidence for the *Histories*' date of composition.

The Content of F 223

It stands to reason that we proceed on the assumption that our cover texts supply reasonably accurate citations of the authors they name unless there are positive indications that they have failed to do so. Otherwise, the resulting scepticism would make even the most modest conclusions about fragmentary texts like the *Histories* impossible.¹⁰ Three reasons have been cited for rejecting the content of F 223: (1) that Diodorus contradicts Clement; (2) that Ephorus exclusively used generation counts to calculate time and so would not have provided any such figure in his text; and (3) that Clement or his own sources have mischaracterised the content of the fragment in some way. I examine each reason below and demonstrate that none gives adequate grounds for rejecting Clement's attribution.

Diodorus does provide a different figure and periodisation when he summarises Ephorus' work after recounting the siege of Perinthus by Philip of Macedonia in 341/0 (D.S. 16.76.5 = *FGrHist* 70 T 10):

⁷ Niese (1909) 174 suggests one of the first three books; Stylianou (1998) 110, I think rightly, specifies the general introduction to Book 1 as the likeliest location (see below, pp. 120–7).

⁸ See Parker (2011) at Biographical Essay IIB and Parmeggiani (2011) 181–200.

⁹ See Schepens (1997) 168.

¹⁰ Lenfant (2013) 302–3.

τῶν δὲ συγγραφέων Ἐφορος μὲν ὁ Κυμαῖος τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐνθάδε κατέστροφεν εἰς τὴν Περίνθου πολιορκίαν· περιείληφε δὲ τῇ γραφῇ πράξεις τὰς τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν καθόδου· χρόνον δὲ περιέλαβε σχεδὸν ἑτῶν ἑπτακοσίων καὶ πεντήκοντα, καὶ βίβλους γέγραφε τριάκοντα, προοίμιον ἑκάστη προθεῖς.

But of writers Ephorus of Cyme ended his history here with the siege of Perinthus. His work encompassed the deeds both of Greeks and non-Greeks starting with the Return of the Heraclids. He covered a time-span of nearly 750 years and wrote 30 books, each with a proem (tr. Parker).

Diodorus implies that Ephorus dated the Return of the Heraclids 750 years before the siege of Perinthus and so approximately 20 years before the date cited by Clement.¹¹ If Diodorus were correct, we would have good reason to doubt Clement,¹² but he is not correct. His figure is suspiciously round (750 v. Clement's 735), which should come as no surprise given that he is quite candid that his figure is only an approximation (σχεδόν).¹³ More importantly, Clement's figure has a strong independent claim to accuracy. In his treatment of Leuctra and its aftermath, Diodorus refers to the timespan of Spartan hegemony as 500 years.¹⁴ Nicolaus of Damascus cites the same figure when considering the beginnings of Spartan hegemony under Lycurgus (*FGrHist* 90 F 56.4).¹⁵ Given the extent to which both relied on Ephorus for the archaic and classical periods, it stands to reason that they found the figure there. Counting back from Leuctra (371/0) yields an approximate date of 870 for Lycurgus. Strabo, citing Ephorus explicitly, notes that Lycurgus lived in the sixth generation after the Return of the Heraclids (10.4.18 = *FGrHist* 70 F 149.18). Here, we enter the murky waters of converting generation counts to

¹¹ Jacoby (1926) 101–2 attempts to bring the two figures into approximate agreement by correcting the 750 years that appears in our MSS of Diodorus to 730 (see also Asheri (1983) 61 and Porciani (2013) 211 n. 42), but there is no textual basis for this emendation, which is driven rather by a desire to harmonise Diodorus with Clement. Against this emendation, see Prakken (1943) 76 n. 13, Parmeggiani (2003) 202 n. 5 and (2011) 184 n. 105, Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 T 10, and Prandi (2012a) 310 n. 7.

¹² Barber (1935) 9; Schwartz (1909) 489 leaves the question open as to which figure is in fact correct.

¹³ Prakken (1943) 76 n. 13 and Parmeggiani (2003) 202 n. 5 and (2011) 184 n. 105 draw due attention to the approximate nature of the figure cited by Diodorus.

¹⁴ This figure appears twice in Book 15 and is associated both with the battle itself (D.S. 15.1.3) and the resulting Theban attack on Laconia (15.65.1).

¹⁵ See Jacoby (1926) 247 and Favuzzi–Paradiso (2018) at *BNJ* 90 F 56. In his discussion of Lycurgus' reforms, Diodorus defines the period as 400 years (7.12.8), an almost certain error for 500; see Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 F 223.

years, but both Jacoby and Parmeggiani, although they approach the question quite differently, nevertheless conclude that the figure provided by Strabo equals 200 years, which would place the Return of the Heraclids *ca.* 1070; that is, within a reasonable margin of error of 735 years before Alexander's *diabasis*.¹⁶ The figure Diodorus cites in connection with the siege of Perinthus is, as he himself states, a mere approximation, likely one that his own intermediate source derived from the more accurate figure cited by Clement.¹⁷

Jacoby, despite confirming the accuracy of the figure we find in Clement, still maintains that it could not have come from Ephorus since he only calculated time with generations.¹⁸ There are, of course, several passages that bear ample witness to Ephorus' tendency to use generation counts to establish date,¹⁹ but to go an additional step and claim that he would never use a numeric figure instead of or in addition to a generation count is an indefensible conclusion in light of how little of the full work survives to us. Parmeggiani has further exploded this objection by pointing out numerous indications that Ephorus did in fact use a variety of methods to compute the passage of time.²⁰ Nor should his findings come as a surprise. Our surviving historians were not

¹⁶ Jacoby (1926) 101 converts Strabo's six generations into a span of 200 years, on the assumption that every three generations equals 100 years; see also Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 F 223. Parmeggiani (2003) 204 and (2011) 184 n. 108 calculates the span differently, seeing here four full generations (those between the Return and Lycurgus) and portions of two other generations (that of the Return and Lycurgus), which he works out to roughly five generations. But Parmeggiani (2003) 201–5 favours a generation of 40 years. Ironically, the distance between the Return of the Heraclids and Leuctra is the same regardless of the argument, 700 years. That Ephorus supposed a 700-year span from Leuctra to the Spartan occupation of Laconia gains some additional support from Isocrates, who notes this same figure three times (6.12, 8.95, and 12.204), but Parmeggiani (2011) 184 n. 106 is right to express caution regarding the possibility that Ephorus took the number directly from that source, since it is just as likely that the figure had broader purchase at the time.

¹⁷ For more on Diodorus' source for this passage, see below, pp. 120–2. Parmeggiani (2011) 183–5 raises the possibility that Diodorus' figure is referring to a different event within the long sequence of events that constituted the Return of the Heraclids—the reign of Aristodemus who died on the eve of the final and successful Heraclid attempt to return to the Peloponnese. The two dates are essentially twenty years apart (735 years counting from 335/4 versus 750 years counting from 341/0), and while it is possible that this is the event Diodorus' source has in mind, it seems far more likely that the figure is an approximation of the 735 years we find in Clement, given that Diodorus himself identifies it as an approximation. The Return of the Heraclids was, indeed, a long affair, but its popular use as a chronographic reference would almost require that the phrase 'Return of the Heraclids' was associated with a fixed and consistent point within that extended course of events.

¹⁸ Jacoby (1926) 101; see also Barber (1935) 171–2, Mosshammer (1979) 328 n. 24, Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 F 223, and Porciani (2013) 211 n. 42; *contra* Parmeggiani (2011) 603 n. 309.

¹⁹ See below, p. 126.

²⁰ Parmeggiani (2011) 170–9; see also Clarke (2008) 105–6.

as particular in this regard as Jacoby and others argue Ephorus must have been. Both Herodotus and Thucydides used numerous methods of measuring the passage of time in their histories.²¹ In a particularly apposite example, Herodotus observes that, in the case of Lydia, the Heraclids ‘governed for twenty-two generations, 505 years, handing down the rule from father to son until it reached Candaules, son of Myrsus’ (1.7.4, tr. Purvis). Something similar may well have appeared in the passage to which Clement is referring. Indeed, if Ephorus had provided a count by generations only, Clement’s figure is not what we would expect to see. Conversions from generation counts would produce approximations, not the exact figure that appears in Clement. It remains possible that the conversion was later made with a figure for the average length of a generation that happened to produce the correct date when multiplied by the number of generations, but that would be quite serendipitous.²² In all probability, Ephorus provided the figure we find in Clement, perhaps (but not necessarily) accompanied by a generation count.

Finally, Schwartz and Barber argue that the content of the fragment, particularly the appearance of Alexander’s *diabasis*, has been erroneously attributed to Ephorus.²³ Both find it suspicious that the same chronological endpoint would have appeared in so many authors and conclude that it has been imposed by Clement himself or an intermediate source. Clement is an

²¹ For Herodotus’ use of various chronological techniques within his history, see Lateiner (1989) 114–25. Thucydides dealt with chronology more systematically by the summers and winters of each year (see 2.1 and 5.20.2 with Stadter (2012) 44–5), but we should not forget that he too employed other methods on occasion, most notably to mark the beginning of the war (2.2.1), where we see range dates (from the Thirty Years’ Peace and the battle of Potidaea) and three officeholders (the priesthood of Hera, the Spartan ephorate, and the Athenian archonship). While this is the only passage in which Thucydides uses officeholders to date events, he elsewhere uses range dates (e.g., 1.13.2–3, 1.87.6, 5.20.1, 6.2.5, and 6.4) and even loose generation counts (1.14.1 and 2.68.2–5).

²² Prakken (1943) 95–101 and Panchenko (2000) 37 do indeed suggest that Ephorus used just such a figure, generations of 35 years, which resolves Clement’s 735 years into 21 generations. Jacoby and Parmeggiani, however, conclude that Ephorus used a different figure (see above, n. 16). It is also worth remembering that Herodotus and Thucydides both seem to have employed various average generation lengths in their respective histories; see Mitchel (1956), A. E. Samuel (1972) 241–5, and Ball (1979). There is no good reason to conclude that Ephorus was any more consistent. Prakken’s solution would also require us to assume that both Ephorus and whoever later converted his generation counts into years were using the same figure for the length of a generation, which seems improbable in light of the fact that our sources rarely spelled out the number of years that equals a generation; see Ball (1979) 276.

²³ Schwartz (1909) 489 and Barber (1935) 8 and 171; see also Prakken (1943) 78–9, Mosshammer (1979) 328 n. 24, Asheri (1983) 61–2, and Porciani (2013) 211 n. 42. Parmeggiani (2003) 202, (2011) 184 n. 106 and 603, and (2014a) 310 n. 33 raises the possibility, but leaves the question open.

unlikely candidate. He does have an overriding interest in proving the greater antiquity of the Hebrew tradition, and frequently mentions Inachus, whom he synchronises with Moses.²⁴ He also brings several calculations up to his own time with the death of Commodus.²⁵ But there is no indication that he took care to alter or standardise the intervening calculations. Indeed, Clement provides four different summaries of Greco-Roman chronology here.²⁶ One focuses on the mythological period, beginning with Inachus and ending with the first Olympiad (1.136–7). Another simply records the epochal dates used by Eratosthenes, starting with the Sack of Troy and ending with the death of Alexander the Great (1.138.1–3 = *FGrHist* 241 F 1a). A third picks up with the first Olympiad, but focuses largely on Roman events and ends with Commodus (1.138.4–139.2). The fourth, which includes F 223, begins with Cecrops and ends again with the death of Commodus (1.139.3–5). Only here does Clement note Alexander's *diabasis*. If he has imposed this terminal point on his sources, his motives are wholly inscrutable.

If Ephorus has been mischaracterised, the erroneous material must have already appeared in the immediate source Clement consulted.²⁷ In weighing this possibility, it will be helpful to consider F 223 within its larger context, Clement's fourth summary of Greco-Roman chronology (1.139.3–5):²⁸

Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ ἀπὸ Κέκροπος μὲν ἐπὶ Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Μακεδόνα συνάγουσιν ἔτη χίλια ὀκτακόσια εἴκοσι ὀκτώ, ἀπὸ δὲ Δημοφῶντος χίλια διακόσια πεντήκοντα, καὶ ἀπὸ Τροίας ἀλώσεως ἐπὶ τὴν Ἡρακλειδῶν κάθοδον ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἢ ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα.²⁹ ἀπὸ τούτου ἐπὶ Εὐαίνετον ἄρχοντα, ἐφ' οὗ φασιν Ἀλέξανδρον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβῆναι, ὡς μὲν Φανίας ἔτη ἑπτακόσια δεκαπέντε, ὡς δὲ Ἐφωρος ἑπτακόσια τριάκοντα πέντε, ὡς δὲ

²⁴ *Strom.* 1.101–2, 1.136.3–4, and 1.147.4 as well as 1.79.5 with Droge (1989) 145, Merino Rodríguez (1996) 44, Mortley (1996) 144, Burgess (2006) 34–5, and Wallraff (2011) 549. This particular synchronisation predates Clement, however, and had already played a role in the apologetic work of Tatian, whom Clement mentions explicitly at the beginning of his chronological digression (1.101.2). See Adler (2008) and Wallraff (2011) 543–4 for more on the history of the Moses–Inachus synchronism.

²⁵ *Strom.* 1.139.2, 139.5, 140.6, 140.7, 144.3, 144.5, 145.5, and 147.4.

²⁶ Clement shows a similar tendency to provide alternative calculations in his summary of Hebrew chronology; see Molland (1938) 59.

²⁷ For more on the nature of this intervening tradition generally, see Mosshammer (1979) 157–68.

²⁸ For the even larger context of Clement's extensive chronographic digression (*Strom.* 1.101–47), see Burgess (2006) 34–5.

²⁹ The second figure is often corrected to 80 years (the figure set by Eratosthenes for the length of time between the Sack of Troy and the Return of the Heraclids), but there is no compelling reason to assume that Clement's source has that figure in mind here: see Mazzarino (1966) 333 and Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 103 n. 92.

Τίμαιος καὶ Κλείταρχος ὀκτακόσια εἴκοσι, ὡς δὲ Ἐρατοσθένης ἑπτακόσια ἑβδομήκοντα τέσσαρα, ὡς δὲ Δοῦρις ἀπὸ Τροίας ἀλώσεως ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου εἰς Ἀσίαν διάβασιν ἔτη χίλια. ἐντεῦθεν ἐπὶ Εὐαίνετον τὸν Ἀθήνησιν ἄρχοντα, ἐφ' οὗ θνήσκει Ἀλέξανδρος, ἔτη ια'. ἐντεῦθεν ἐπὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν Γερμανικοῦ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος ἔτη τριακόσια ἐξήκοντα πέντε, ἀφ' οὗ χρόνου δῆλα γίνεται καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τὴν Κομόδου τελευτὴν ἔτη, ὅσα γε συνάγεται.

There are some who calculate 1,828 years from Cecrops to Alexander of Macedonia; from Demophon, 1,250; and from the capture of Troy to the Return of the Heraclids 120 or 180 years. From the latter to the archonship of Euaenetus, when they say that Alexander crossed over to Asia, is 715 years according to Phantias [*FGrHist* 1012 F 9], but 735 according to Ephorus; 820 according to Timaeus [*FGrHist* 566 F 126] and Cleitarchus [*FGrHist* 137 F 7]; and 774 according to Eratosthenes [*FGrHist* 241 F 1d]. According to Duris [*FGrHist* 76 F 41], it is 1,000 years from the capture of Troy to the crossing of Alexander into Asia. From then to the archonship of Euaenetus [*sic*] at Athens, when Alexander died, is eleven years. From then to the reign of Germanicus Claudius Caesar, is 365 years, from which time the years summed up to the death of Commodus are manifest.

There can be no question that Clement has consulted an intermediate source or perhaps more rightly a tradition that stands between him and the centuries-old sources he names in this passage.³⁰ There can also be no question that errors have crept into the text. The dates for Cecrops and Demophon are both much too high.³¹ The figure of 774 years attributed to Eratosthenes is incorrect and should read 770.³² The MS repeats the name of the archon Euaenetus for

³⁰ For Clement's use of earlier compilations, see Mosshammer (1979) 159, van den Hoek (1996) 224, and Engels (1998) 314.

³¹ Both the Marmor Parium (*FGrHist* 239 A 1 and A 25) and Castor of Rhodes (*FGrHist* 250 F 4) provide dates for Cecrops and Demophon that are roughly six and four centuries lower, respectively.

³² The 774 years attributed here to Eratosthenes does not agree with the figure that can be calculated from those provided by Clement when he summarises the major points of the former's chronology (*Strom.* 1.138.1–3 = *FGrHist* 241 F 1a), and is routinely corrected. Schwartz (1909) 489 n. 2 and Panchenko (2000) 36 suggest that the number is accurate and that it is the endpoint that is in error, but such a mistake seems, on its face, far less likely. Both Schwartz and Panchenko point to possible events in the life of Alexander that the original figure might refer to, but in such a momentous career, almost any minor error would terminate in or near a year in which something significant occurred.

two different years.³³ All three are obvious slips that may have appeared in the source Clement was using, but could have also emerged subsequently in the manuscript tradition of the *Stromata*.³⁴ They cannot, in themselves, justify the rejection of the basic content attributed to Ephorus (a range date from the Return of the Heraclids to Alexander's *diabasis*), especially since the accompanying figure in this case appears to be correct.³⁵ Rather, we need evidence that the intermediate tradition intentionally misrepresented its sources. The exact nature of that tradition is, of course, impossible to recover in detail, but the organisation of the passage offers some important clues.³⁶

Clement cites Ephorus within a debate that presupposes a particular periodisation of Greek history, one that runs from the Return of the Heraclids to Alexander's *diabasis*. The Return of the Heraclids remained an influential point of reference in Greek chronography, but Alexander's *diabasis* did not.³⁷ It was, of course, cited to date synchronous events,³⁸ but as a fixed point for figuring long stretches of time, it appears only here and in the first two books of Diodorus (1.26.1; 2.31.9, and 39.4). The heyday of this periodisation seems to have been early and limited. All the authors that Clement cites wrote within about a century of each other from Ephorus and Phantias in the second half of the fourth century to Eratosthenes in the late third.³⁹ In fact, Eratosthenes is

³³ The second date refers to the archon year of Hegesias and is generally emended to reflect that fact; see, for example, Merino Rodríguez (1996) 339.

³⁴ The third error is a simple matter of repeating the first archon name by accident. The second is less natural. We might rather expect an error resulting from dropping a four rather than adding a four, but the sheer number of figures Clement includes in his extended chronological digression surely raises the possibility that his attention (or that of an intermediate source or indeed a later copyist) slipped. The same could be said of the mistaken figures for Cecrops and Demophon. None of these errors can be strained to support Panchenko (2000) 35–9, who argues that Clement has confused the Return of the Heraclids for the Trojan War or Alexander's *diabasis* for his birth or accession.

³⁵ I set aside the question of the archon dates, since they could have easily been added by a subsequent chronographer.

³⁶ It would press the evidence too far to speculate overmuch about the identity of Clement's source, but the use of the reign of the emperor Claudius as a temporal marker brings to mind the little-known first-century chronographer, Claudius or Julius Polybius (*FGrHist* 254), perhaps a freedman of the emperor. The basic facts about this author are, however, highly debatable; see Williams (2010) at *BNJ* 254 Biographical Essay.

³⁷ *Contra* Clarke (2008) 73, who notes the expedition of Alexander as 'a major hinge in Greek history, in relation to which other events could be placed'; see also Clarke (2008) 67, 79, 164, 218 n. 219, 231 n. 277, and 238, as well as Engels (1998) 314 and (2015) 41 n. 6. The evidence cited by these authors to support this claim is treated below.

³⁸ The practice began almost immediately and continued for centuries (e.g., Aeschin. 3.238, D.S. 16.74.2, Str. 10.1.8, Plut. *Mor.* 331d, and Arr. *Anab.* 1.12.9).

³⁹ The *Suda* (s.v. Φανίας ἢ Φανίας (Φ 73 Adler) = *FGrHist* 1012 T 1) places Phantias' acme under the reign of Alexander the Great, and he likely lived to ca. 300 (Sollenberger (2015);

the latest author by far and in any case introduced a different periodisation that came to dominate the Greek chronographic tradition—one that ran, not from the Return to the *diabasis*, but rather from the Sack of Troy to Alexander's death.⁴⁰ If we remove Eratosthenes, the use of this earlier periodisation contracts still further. Diodorus, writing in the first century BCE, initially seems to stand out, but there is good reason to conclude that in each case he is citing an author writing in the third century and so at the same time as the authors Clement names.⁴¹ Indeed, Diodorus himself preferred the more popular periodisation, defining a considerable segment of his own massive history as falling between the Trojan War and the death of Alexander (1.4.6). Too many Hellenistic authors have been lost to be categorical, but our surviving evidence suggests that within a century, Alexander's death replaced his *diabasis* as the key point of chronographic reference in common use.

The appearance of this early and somewhat obscure periodisation in Clement does not suggest that our intermediate tradition has misrepresented its sources, but rather that it has taken some care to preserve the terms of an older debate. Indeed, the indices of Eratosthenes' more popular periodisation (the Sack of Troy and the death of Alexander) are also present, but the authors who made up Clement's intermediate tradition have opted not to bring their

see also Engels (1998) 290 and Fortenbaugh (2015) 102–3 and 113). Duris wrote his *Histories* (or *Makedonika*) at some point after the battle of Corupedium in 281 (*FGrHist* 76 F 55 with Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 60–2 and Pownall (2009a) at *BNJ* 76 Biographical Essay). Timaeus lived *ca.* 350–260 and completed his *Histories* late in his life (Baron (2013) 17–22 and 39). Cleitarchus' dates are less certain and range from the late-fourth to the mid-third century: see Parker (2009) and Prandi (2012b). Eratosthenes' principal works were almost certainly composed later in his life (Fraser (1970) 198 and Geus (2002) 57), which extended down to the late-third or perhaps early-second century (*FGrHist* 241 T 1 with Geus (2002) 7–15).

⁴⁰ Pfeiffer (1968) 163, Fraser (1970) 198, Mosshammer (1979) 159–60, Geus (2002) 315, Möller (2005), and Pownall (2009b) at *BNJ* 241 F 1a. Eratosthenes surely dated Alexander's *diabasis* and so supplied the necessary information to provide the reference in Clement, but that event does not appear to have played a significant role in his own periodisation, as is suggested by its absence from Clement's summation of his chronology (1.138.1–3 = *FGrHist* 241 F 1a).

⁴¹ Two of the passages have been cautiously attributed to Hecataeus of Abdera's *Aegyptica* (1.26.1 = *FGrHist* 264 F 25, with Jacoby (1954) 76, Murray (1970) 145, and Lang (2012) at *BNJ* 264 F 25) and Megasthenes' *Indica* (2.39.4 = *FGrHist* 715 F 4 with Roller (2008) at *BNJ* 715 F 4, Parker (2009) 41, and Stoneman (2022) 85). There is also a strong chance that the third passage (2.31.9) can be similarly dated. Parker (2009) 45–6 argues that at least one portion of Diodorus' account of Babylon (2.1–34), which is explicitly attributed to Ctesias, likely came from Cleitarchus; see also Prandi (2012b) 19. Parker is thinking specifically about D.S. 2.10, but it raises the possibility that the reference to Alexander's *diabasis* in this section, which obviously could not have come from Ctesias, may have come from Cleitarchus as well.

sources into conformity with those indices. This decision entails the inclusion of chronological bridges between the Sack of Troy and the Return of the Heraclids and between Alexander's *diabasis* and death. The second is particularly notable since the figure was not in debate and entailed a mere eleven years, by far the shortest span of time included by Clement's source.⁴² The tradition even retained Duris' exceptional use of the Sack of Troy and Alexander's *diabasis*. This does not seem the work of an intermediate tradition that misrepresented its sources—far from it. Rather, Clement's fourth and final chronology of Greco-Roman history gives every indication of being derived from a strong tradition that, despite copying errors, took some care to represent its own sources accurately.

The doubts raised by Schwartz and Barber are unfounded. Alexander's *diabasis* was included by the many authors Clement cites because it enjoyed significant popularity as a chronological point of reference at the time. The possibility that Ephorus was the first to use it in a periodisation along with the Return of the Heraclids cannot be dismissed.⁴³ Ephorus, even if his work on the *Histories* is downdated, was almost certainly the earliest author to whom this periodisation is attributed.⁴⁴ Such a periodisation would also fit the work quite well, provided that we leave aside any assumptions about its date of composition. We know that Ephorus famously began with the Return of the Heraclids (*FGrHist* 70 TT 8, 10), and although his historical narrative did not reach later than the siege of Perinthus in 341/0 (T 10), his surviving fragments bear independent witness to his interest in Alexander's subsequent career (F 217). Moreover, each of the later authors Clement cites made use of Ephorus' *Histories* and on occasion criticised him by name.⁴⁵ Obviously, none of them needed Ephorus to understand the inherent significance of the temporal

⁴² The next shortest span is the 120 years cited as the lower possible figure for the distance between the Sack of Troy and the Return of the Heraclids.

⁴³ Mazzarino (1966) 333; Prakken (1943) 78–9 recognises the essential probability of this conclusion, but ultimately argues against it. Students of Phantias commonly assume that he took the periodisation from Ephorus; see Engels (1998) 315 and Cooper (2015) 264.

⁴⁴ See above, n. 39.

⁴⁵ In the case of Timaeus and Duris, we have explicit testimony that these authors named and criticised Ephorus in their works (*FGrHist* 70 TT 30a, 30b, F 111, and F 218 for Timaeus and T 22 for Duris). The use that Phantias, Cleitarchus, and Eratosthenes made of Ephorus can be inferred from their decision to follow him in claiming that Themistocles fled in exile to Xerxes (*FGrHist* 70 F 190 = Plut. *Them.* 27.1), not Artaxerxes as Thucydides had said (1.137.3). The agreement of Cleitarchus is noted here by Plutarch explicitly (*FGrHist* 137 F 33). The agreement of Phantias (*FGrHist* 1012 F 20) and Eratosthenes (*FGrHist* 241 F 27), whom Plutarch goes on to mention (*Them.* 27.2–5), is rightly accepted by Jacoby (1926) 90, Mosshammer (1975) 232, Cooper (2015) 254 and 264, Geus (2002) 75, and Pownall (2009b) at *BNJ* 241 F 27, though Engels (1998) 337 sounds a more cautious note with regard to Phantias.

indices they employed, but it must remain a possibility that each was, at least in part, inspired to include his own calculation as an implicit or explicit correction of Ephorus'. This debate (or perhaps just difference of opinion) was later included in a chronological handbook that preserved the original periodisation upon which it was based.

The Context of F 223

If we concede that Ephorus included the calculation attributed to him, there remains the critical question: its original context. Much turns on this point. Most have argued that Clement is citing a later Book, either 27 on the early years of Philip of Macedonia's reign or perhaps even 30, which was completed after Ephorus' death by his son Demophilus.⁴⁶ Such a conclusion would neatly resolve the problem. If Ephorus wrote up to his own death *ca.* 330 and his son completed Book 30 sometime after that, then mention of Alexander's *diabasis* in either book would present no contradiction to the prevailing consensus about the date at which the *Histories* was composed. The trouble is that placement of the fragment in a later book is neither the simplest solution nor does it provide a sufficient explanation for the material Clement attributes to Ephorus.

It is worth beginning this discussion by stating the obvious. The most likely context for any fragment, absent a book number, is established by the content of the fragment itself. Our fragment notes two events: the Return of the Heraclids and Alexander's *diabasis*. Since Ephorus' historical narrative ended with the siege of Perinthus and never reached Alexander's reign, we are left with the Return of the Heraclids, which Ephorus treated in Book 1.⁴⁷ It has been argued that Diodorus supplies positive evidence for an alternative when he provides his own figure for the span of time from the Return of the Heraclids. The figure of 750 years cited there is, as noted above, an approximation, but we might still argue that Diodorus' placement of it in his own text preserves the original context of Clement's more accurate figure (735 years) and temporal indices (the Return of the Heraclids and Alexander's *diabasis*)—

⁴⁶ See Schwartz (1909) 489 and Prakken (1943) 75 for Book 30; Jacoby (1926) 24 rejects that conclusion on the grounds that Book 30 only covered the events of the Third Sacred War, and suggests instead Book 27; Parmeggiani (2011) 603 prefers Book 30, but admits the possibility of an earlier book.

⁴⁷ Asheri (1983) 62 raises the possibility that Demophilus extended his father's account down to Alexander's *diabasis* and included the figure cited by Clement when the narrative reached that point, but there is no evidence that Demophilus did indeed extend the narrative to that point.

that is, the siege of Perinthus, narrated at the end of Book 30.⁴⁸ As such, it is worth quoting the passage again in full (D.S. 16.76.5 = *FGrHist* 70 T 10):

τῶν δὲ συγγραφέων Ἐφορος μὲν ὁ Κυμαῖος τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐνθάδε κατέστροφεν εἰς τὴν Περὶνθου πολιορκίαν· περιείληφε δὲ τῇ γραφῇ πράξεις τὰς τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν καθόδου· χρόνον δὲ περιέλαβε σχεδὸν ἑτῶν ἑπτακοσίων καὶ πεντήκοντα, καὶ βίβλους γέγραφε τριάκοντα, προοίμιον ἑκάστη προθεῖς.

But of writers Ephorus of Cyme ended his history here with the siege of Perinthus. His work encompassed the deeds both of Greeks and non-Greeks starting with the Return of the Heraclids. He covered a time-span of nearly 750 years and wrote 30 books, each with a proem (tr. Parker).

Diodorus provides support for connecting F 223 with the siege of Perinthus to the extent that he is here responding to the specific content of Book 30, but in this case he is almost certainly following his chronographic source, from which he culled several similar notices about various historians.⁴⁹ Those notices routinely mention the point at which a history began, its endpoint, its contents, the number of books into which it was divided, and the total number of years included.⁵⁰ This information does not necessarily derive from the narrative

⁴⁸ See Schwartz (1909) 489, who presupposed that it was still an open question which author (Diodorus or Clement) accurately reflected Ephorus' original calculation. The fundamentals of his argument remain sound, however, even if we concede that Diodorus was mistaken (as Schwartz himself adds). Asheri (1983) 61–2 and Porciani (2013) 211 n. 42 also raise the possibility that Clement's citation originally appeared in connection with the siege of Perinthus, but the former finds it likely only if Ephorus intended to end his history at that point (on that possibility, see below). For the book in which Ephorus narrated the siege itself, see Parmeggiani (2011) 590–601 with earlier bibliography.

⁴⁹ Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 T 10 and Parmeggiani (2011) 357–8; see also Stylianou (1998) 31. Schwartz (1909) 489 is aware of this fact, but nevertheless assumes that his chronographic source was inspired to include this calculation because it appeared at the end of the *Histories*. Barber (1935) 9 must be following a similar logic since he too is fully aware that Diodorus is not here following Ephorus.

⁵⁰ See notices for Herodotus (D.S. 11.37.6), Antiochus of Syracuse (12.71.2), Thucydides (13.42.5), Xenophon (13.42.5 and 15.89.3), Theopompus (13.42.5, 16.3.8, and 16.71.3), Philistus (13.103.3 and 15.89.3), Hermeias of Methymna (15.37.3), Anaximenes (15.89.3), Athanas of Syracuse (15.94.4), Dionysodorus and Anaxis of Boeotia (15.95.4), Demophilus (16.14.3), Callisthenes (16.14.4), and Diyllus (16.14.5 and 16.76.6). Diodorus' notice for Ephorus is, therefore, quite conventional and so gives us no reason to suspect that he approached it differently from the other notices. Even the added detail about the overall structure of Ephorus' *Histories* (προοίμιον ἑκάστη προθεῖς) finds parallels elsewhere. Diodorus

context in which the notice appears. The events of 411, for example, inspire Diodorus to note that Xenophon's *Hellenica* began at this point and that it covered 48 years in total (13.42.5), but no such figure appears at the beginning of that work.⁵¹ The fact is hardly surprising. Diodorus is no more trying to abbreviate the beginning of Xenophon's *Hellenica* there as he is the end of Ephorus' *Histories* here. Rather, in both cases, he is manifestly offering a summary of the entire work. Although Diodorus (or his source) is ultimately citing Ephorus' *Histories* for the approximate figure he notes, its presence here provides no basis for connecting it with the siege of Perinthus.

Even without explicit evidentiary support, however, we might still maintain that the end of Book 30 is an intrinsically probable location for F 223 if Ephorus (or Demophilus) intended to end the entire *Histories* with the siege of Perinthus. This possibility has recently been raised by Parmeggiani, who argues that the contemporary significance of that event has long been overlooked.⁵² That the siege was in fact thought sufficiently significant to serve as the endpoint for the *Histories* is open to debate.⁵³ A more critical objection,

often provides additional information about disputed book divisions (13.42.5 and 15.37.3), lost books (16.3.8), and the contents or style of specific books (15.94.4 and 16.71.3).

⁵¹ We might say something similar of Diodorus' statement that Thucydides' history covered 22 years, noted at the point in the narrative where the latter's history breaks off (13.42.5). There is, however, an interpolation at the end of Book 8 that reads, ὅταν ὁ μετὰ τοῦτο τὸ θέρος χειμῶν τελευτήσῃ, ἐν καὶ εἰκοστὸν ἔτος πληροῦται (8.109.2). It is not certain when the interpolation first appeared in the tradition (Hornblower (2008) 1053), but it is at least possible that its appearance in a manuscript known to Diodorus or his source did indeed prompt the reference to the total number of years included in the work, here augmented by one to account for the contents of Book 1. For other references in Diodorus to the number of years included in a work or portion of a work, see also Theopompus' *Hellenica* (13.42.5) and *Philippica* (16.71.3), Philistus' *First and Second Syntaxis of Sicily* (13.103.3 and 15.89.3), and Athanas' *Deeds of Dion* (15.94.4). To this list we might cautiously add Demophilus' continuation of Ephorus' *Histories* (16.14.3), in whose notice the total length of the Third Sacred War (the subject of Demophilus' work) is mentioned, but Parmeggiani (2011) 598 is quite right to add that it is the war that is so described, not the historical work itself.

⁵² Parmeggiani (2014a) suggests that the siege of Perinthus may have marked either the end of an individual book, as yet to be completed upon Ephorus' death, or perhaps the end of the entire work. In support of Perinthus as the intended ending of a book, see also Hammond (1937) 86 and Drews (1963) 254; as the intended ending of the entire work, see Porciani (2013) 210–11 and Tully (2014) 180. For our purposes, only the second possibility is relevant.

⁵³ Parmeggiani (2014a) 305–10 assembles several references to the siege of Perinthus, to demonstrate its contemporary importance, most notably two Demosthenic speeches, the histories of Philip by Anaximenes and Theopompus, and finally Arrian's *Anabasis*. Of the two Demosthenic speeches—the *Fourth Philippic* (10.31–4) and the *Response to Philip's Letter* (11.2–6)—only the latter actually mentions Perinthus, and (as Parmeggiani well knows) it was not written by Demosthenes, but by the historian Anaximenes. How the historian

largely ignored by Parmeggiani, is that the *Histories* did not include the entire siege narrative, but rather broke off in the middle of it.⁵⁴ Our only source for the ending of the work is the historiographical notice quoted above, and Diodorus inserts that notice before he finishes his account of the siege, which does not end until the next year in 340/39 (16.77.2–3). Moreover, Diodorus signals the fact in his notice, adding that Ephorus ‘ended his history here with the siege of Perinthus’ (τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐνθάδε κατέστροφεν εἰς τὴν Περίνθου πολιορκίαν). The significance of ἐνθάδε in this passage is easily missed, but it is in fact quite notable. When Diodorus otherwise intends to indicate that a historical work ended at a particular point, he uses a form a καταστρέφειν with εἰς,⁵⁵ but only here does he feel the need to clarify that the work ended, not

presented the siege outside of that speech, in his own authorial voice, cannot be known. The siege also appears in Theopompus’ fragments (*FGrHist* 115 FF 217, 222, and 292), but here too we lack sufficient context to say what emphasis he gave that event. Indeed, as historians of Philip’s reign, we would expect both Anaximenes and Theopompus to mention it at the very least. Finally, Parmeggiani notes that Perinthus appears among Alexander’s justifications for the invasion of Persia in his letter to Darius (Arr. *Anab.* 2.14.4–5), which likely reflects contemporary propaganda: see Yates (2019) 210 with earlier bibliography. But Parmeggiani presses the point too far when he concludes that the Persian intervention at Perinthus appears there ‘come *arche* del contrasto e *aitia* ufficiale della *diabasis* antipersiana’ (2014a) 310. The centrepiece of Alexander’s justification in the letter, for both Greeks and Macedonians, was the Persian invasion of Greece almost 150 years earlier (οἱ ὑμέτεροι πρόγονοι ἐλθόντες εἰς Μακεδονίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα κακῶς ἐποίησαν ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν προηδικημένοι: 2.14.4), just as it was in his overall propaganda campaign: see Yates (2019) 202–48. Perinthus does indeed appear later in the letter, but among more recent and manifestly secondary wrongs. The siege of Perinthus was an important part of the chain of events that led to Chaeronea and ultimately Alexander’s *diabasis*, but that it would have presented itself as the natural conclusion for a multi-century, universal history and implicitly as an event on par with the Return of the Heraclids cannot be considered a settled question.

⁵⁴ The possibility is not addressed in Parmeggiani (2014a), but it does appear in a footnote in Parmeggiani (2011) 591 n. 253, where it is summarily dismissed: ‘non mi sembra possibile negare che le Storie includessero tutta la descrizione dell’assedio di Perinto (contra Müller, *FHG* I, p. 275b, ad fr. 157 [= T 10])’. See Tully (2014) 179–80 for a similar assumption. Müller (1841) 275, however, rightly observed that ‘itaque usque ad initium obsidionis historiam Ephorus perduxisse videtur’; see also Drews (1963) 254–5 and Stylianou (1998) 95.

⁵⁵ The content of the prepositional phrase varies. For a single event, see the notice for Theopompus’ treatment of Sicilian matters (κατέστρεψεν εἰς τὴν ἔκπτωσιν Διονυσίου τοῦ νεωτέρου: D.S. 16.71.3); for two events, often occurring at effectively the same time, see Herodotus (καταστρέφει ... εἰς τὴν περὶ Μυκάλην μάχην τοῖς Ἑλλησι πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας καὶ Σησοῦ πολιορκίαν: 11.37.6), Anaximenes (κατέστροφε δ’εἰς τὴν ἐν Μαντινείᾳ μάχην καὶ τὴν Ἐπαμεινώνδου τελευτήν: 15.89.3), and Callisthenes (κατέστροφεν εἰς τὴν κατάληψιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ παρανομίαν Φιλομήλου τοῦ Φωκέως: 16.14.4); for the year, see Antiochus of Syracuse (εἰς τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν κατέστρεψεν: 12.71.2), Hermeias of Methymna (εἰς τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν κατέστροφε: 15.37.3), and Dionysodorus and Anaxis of Boeotia (εἰς τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν κατέστροφασιν: 15.95.4); for the year and an event, see Philistus (εἰς τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν κατέστροφεν, εἰς τὴν Ἀκράγαντος ἄλωσιν: 13.103.3) and Xenophon (εἰς τοῦτον τὸν

simply with the siege of Perinthus, but specifically ‘here’ (ἐνθάδε).⁵⁶ Diodorus must mean that the *Histories* ended with the events of 341/40, perhaps with the specific events narrated immediately before the notice. If we take Diodorus at his word (and we have no reason not to), Book 30 ended with the fate of Perinthus still uncertain and the success of the operation now, or soon to be, staked on a simultaneous siege of its close ally, Byzantium. The critical fight for that city, the formal break with Athens, and the ultimate failure of both sieges still lay in the future. It is one thing to argue that Ephorus may have intended to conclude his massive history with the end of the siege that would see Macedonia at war with Athens and one step closer to the invasion of Persia; it is quite something else to suggest that he intended to end it in the middle of that narrative. Parallels for such an ending in contemporary historiography are lacking,⁵⁷ with the obvious exception of Thucydides, whose work was famously left unfinished (8.109). If Ephorus’ *Histories* was similarly unfinished (as scholars have long suspected),⁵⁸ then we have no reason to posit that the treatment of Perinthus would have included anything like the contents of F 223. The only positive indication for its placement remains the Return of the Heraclids in Book 1.

We can, of course, create additional alternatives by noting (rightly) that Ephorus was fond of proleptic digressions and may have opted to date Alexander’s *diabasis* within one.⁵⁹ We might consider (*ex hypothesi*) the birth of Alexander himself, which we know Ephorus treated from a citation in

ἐνιαυτὸν κατέστροφεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐπαμεινώνδου τελευτήν: 15.89.3); see also the notice for Theopompus’ *Hellenica* (13.42.5), where Diodorus substitutes καταλήγειν for καταστρέφειν (καταλήγει ... εἰς τὴν περὶ Κνίδου ναυμαχίαν). In the case of Diyllus, he uses a different phrase entirely (μέχρι τῆς Φιλίππου τελευτῆς: 16.76.6).

⁵⁶ The word itself is quite rare in Diodorus, appearing only four other times in the entire extant work (6.5.3, 12.40.6, 21.21.11, and 33.4a), and one of those is a quotation from Aristophanes (12.40.6 = *Pax* 611).

⁵⁷ Parmeggiani (2014a) 311–12 rightly notes that Greek historians often ended their works at a point that looked forward to subsequent events. He cites Herodotus’ *Histories*, Xenophon’s *Hellenica*, and Theopompus’ *Hellenica* explicitly, and while each work ends at a point of considerable transition (the siege of Sestos, the second battle of Mantinea, and the battle of Cnidus respectively), it is worth noting that both of the extant examples completed the narrative of the events in question (Hdt. 9.121 and Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.26), and there is every reason to assume the same of Theopompus.

⁵⁸ Niese (1909) 172–3, Schwartz (1909) 483–4, Judeich (1911) 117 n. 2, Jacoby (1926) 29, Barber (1935) 10–11, Prakken (1943) 82–3, Drews (1963) 254, Stylianos (1998) 95, Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 T 9a, and Prandi (2012a) 311; see also Parmeggiani (2011) 600–1, who in his earlier book also concluded that the work was likely unfinished. In this scenario, we would have to imagine that Demophilus felt reluctant to move beyond his father’s notes chronologically and restricted himself largely to the account of the Third Sacred War, which Ephorus had omitted (*FGrHist* 70 T 9a).

⁵⁹ Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 F 223.

Tertullian's treatise *On the Soul*. No Book number is given, but a later Book that dealt with the birth of Alexander in 356 seems reasonable (*FGrHist* 70 F 217):⁶⁰

Philippus Macedo, nondum pater, Olympiadis uxoris naturam obsignasse viderat annulo. leo erat signum. crediderat praeclusam genituram; opinor, quia leo semel pater est. Aristodemus vel Aristophon coniectans imo nihil vacuum obsignari, filium et quidem maximi impetus portendi. Alexandrum qui sciunt, leonem annuli recognoscunt. Ephorus scribit.

Philip the Macedonian, not yet a father, had seen the womb of his wife Olympias sealed with a ring; a lion was the sign. He had thought her precluded from bearing a child, I assume, because the lion is a father only once. Aristodemos or Aristophon conjectures instead that nothing meaningless was indicated—a son, and one of the greatest import, was presaged. Those who knew Alexander recognised the lion on the ring. So Ephorus writes (tr. Parker modified).

It is just possible that Ephorus did not stop with his general remarks here, but went on to describe Alexander's subsequent actions in some detail, and when reaching his *diabasis* into Asia, noted the time that had passed since the Return of the Heraclids. We might also consider the possibility that this proleptic digression was prompted, not by an event, but a place. Either Book 3, which touched on the Aeolian migration to the Troad, or Book 5, which dealt with the geography of Asia generally, could have inspired Ephorus to expand on the future history of the place where Alexander would later cross into Asia.⁶¹ But all of this requires an unwarranted degree of speculation. We must essentially conjure a point of reference within the text that is not mentioned by the fragment, but that could have provided a plausible point of departure for Ephorus to include its content. I have mentioned only the most obvious conjectures from the evidence we have. With so little of Ephorus' work extant, the total number of purely hypothetical possibilities is staggering. But Occam's Razor dictates that the solution with the fewest conjectures is best. That leaves us with the one event that the fragment mentions and we know Ephorus treated in some detail—the Return of the Heraclids in Book 1.

⁶⁰ Schwartz (1909) 488–9 prefers Book 30; Laqueur (1911) 336, Jacoby (1926) 24 and Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 Biographical Essay IIB prefer Book 27; Parmeggiani (2011) 603 is open to either possibility.

⁶¹ It is worth noting in this context that Strabo's account of Aeolia, which might very well derive from Ephorus (see Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 F 163b), notes the Granicus River, both as a boundary (13.1.2) and in connection with Aeolian colonisation (13.1.3).

Quite apart from its speculative nature, the placement of F 223 in a later book provides, at best, an inadequate explanation for the content we find in Clement. His citation is one of several fragments in which Ephorus dates an event with reference to the amount of time that had elapsed since another more ancient event (otherwise calculated by generations). The earlier event is often the Return of the Heraclids,⁶² but dates from the life of Heracles and the Trojan War are also attested.⁶³ The most recent endpoint (excluding Clement's citation) dates to the eighth century.⁶⁴ Given the antiquity of the events Ephorus chose to date in this manner, there is no reason to doubt that the overt function of these notations was to provide a relative chronological position for events whose antiquity had created uncertainty.⁶⁵ Within this group of fragments, Clement's citation stands out since it purports to date a near-contemporary event—in fact the latest event noted within the surviving fragments. Whatever Ephorus' purpose, it could not have been a straightforward desire to provide a sound date for Alexander's *diabasis*. At the most basic level, contemporaries would not have needed it, and even if Ephorus believed they did, a numeric count from the distant and debated Return of the Heraclids could not have presented itself as the most natural way to do so.⁶⁶ Indeed, the reference to the Heraclids here works in reverse from the other fragments that provide similar time spans; by anchoring the Return of the Heraclids to a contemporary event that everyone within the Greek world would know, it serves to secure in the minds of the readers the date of the earlier event, not the later one.

⁶² *FGrHist* 70 F 115 and F 149.18 (in addition to F 223); see also F 122a, where the actions of Oxylyus in connection with the Return of the Heraclids are noted as occurring in the tenth generation after the conquest of Aetolia by Aetolus.

⁶³ *FGrHist* 70 F 137a–b for the Trojan War; F 173 for Heracles.

⁶⁴ The other people/events dated in this way are Pheidon of Argos, (*FGrHist* 70 F 115), the foundations of Naxos and Megara Hyblaea (F 137a–b), and Lycurgus (F 149.18 and F 173); for more on the vexed question of Pheidon's date, see Parmeggiani (2003) with earlier bibliography.

⁶⁵ Parmeggiani (2011) 172–3. See Mosshammer (1979) 92 for the chronological work demanded by what he calls 'events of the unsystematised past'; *pace* Andrewes (1949) 73 who suggests that Ephorus did not provide genealogical notations primarily for chronological purposes, but rather 'for their own sake'.

⁶⁶ For debates over the date of the Return of the Heraclids and other similarly ancient events, see below, n. 68. The full scheme by which Ephorus dated the events in his work is obscured by the scarcity of evidence, but Parmeggiani (2011) 170–9 has shown that Ephorus would have employed more precise and sophisticated methods as his history approached the present; see also Prakken (1943) 77–8, Mitchel (1956) 53, and Clarke (2008) 105–6. As a result, the reader would know the chronological point the narrative had reached and could therefore be informed about future events more easily with reference to the narrative present than the distant past.

As a chronological notation, F 223 serves no real purpose in a later book. The more recent date is in no need of confirmation and hardly secured by the method employed; the earlier date benefits from confirmation, but that benefit is much reduced when situated within a digression 27 or more books after Ephorus treated the Return itself. His decision to provide this span of time in a later book would have to be motivated, not by the need for chronological precision, but rather by a desire to forge a programmatic connection between Alexander and the Heraclids. Attributing this motive to Ephorus is not in itself problematic, but the method he used to achieve it then becomes inexplicable. We would have to conclude that Ephorus felt the need to emphasise with chronology a point that was easily made manifest by the rather obvious fact that Alexander was a direct descendant of the Heraclid Temenus. Moreover, the additional effort of working out the exact count of the years (as opposed to a simple count of generations) would be thereby rendered superfluous. Indeed, if a connection between Alexander and his own ancestors was the sole purpose of the reference, a count by generations would seem particularly appropriate.

I am not suggesting that the link Ephorus drew between Alexander's *diabasis* and the Return of the Heraclids did not serve a programmatic function, but surely a more satisfying placement of the fragment would reserve for the calculation some legitimate chronographic function as well. Book 1 provides just such a context. As noted above, Ephorus established the relative chronology of the intermediate past by counting generations forwards from fixed points in the distant past, most frequently the Return of the Heraclids.⁶⁷ Such a system would seem to demand that the author first establish with some precision the distance between those fixed points and his own present, especially when (as here) those distances were subject to debate.⁶⁸ Otherwise claims that Lycurgus lived in the sixth generation after the Return of the Heraclids (*FGrHist* 70 F 149.18) would be ambiguous at best. For this purpose, the selection of a very recent, very prominent event makes perfect sense. So too does the inclusion of a precise count of the years between the events. The passage would still serve a powerful programmatic function, but one that would now be more artfully embedded within its overt chronological function.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ See above, p. 126.

⁶⁸ For the variety of opinion concerning the date of such early events in Greek history, see Asheri (1983), Burkert (1995), Möller (2005) 249–50, and Kokkinos (2009).

⁶⁹ Book 1 would also make the most sense of the possible influence Ephorus' calculation and its temporal indices continued to have on subsequent authors (see above, pp. 119–20). We might still maintain that such an influential passage was buried in a digression and pulled into prominence by Phantias, but it is more likely that each subsequent author felt obliged to dispute Ephorus' findings (if indeed they did) precisely because they were prominently located at the beginning of that work.

The Evidence for the *Histories*' Publication Date

A thorough analysis of F 223 suggests that the *Histories* included a numeric calculation of the passage of time from the Return of the Heraclids to Alexander's *diabasis* in Book 1. This conclusion opens up a range of possibilities. At one end, we might say that Ephorus did not begin work on the *Histories* until after 334; at the other, that F 223 was a later insertion, added either by Ephorus himself or perhaps even by his son, Demophilus. Between these extremes, we can hypothesise different degrees of completeness the work may have reached by 334.⁷⁰ We could, for example, say that the composition of the *Histories* was in progress, but was then revised in light of Alexander's career or that Ephorus had collected extensive notes, but had not yet begun the process of crafting those notes into a narrative.⁷¹ Although it is tempting to take a conservative view and conclude that much of the work was already completed by this point, it is worth noting that only the strength of the evidence for an early date of composition could warrant such a conclusion, and that evidence is not particularly strong. Space does not permit a full examination, but I append here a brief review of four notable arguments for an early date: (1) that the biographical tradition supports one; (2) that there are *termini ante quem* in the surviving fragments; (3) that Aristotle made use of Ephorus' *Histories* in the 330s; and finally (4) that Ephorus' digression on the geography of Asia took no account of the new discoveries of Alexander's campaign. None is sufficiently persuasive, in my opinion, to compel us to limit the implications of F 223 unduly.

In defence of an earlier date, Parmeggiani notes that our biographical tradition for Ephorus tends to place him in the middle years of the fourth century and that none of our sources count him among the Alexander

⁷⁰ Among those who both support and reject the *communis opinio* regarding the *Histories*' composition date, there is disagreement about the earliest date that Ephorus could have said what Clement attributes to him. Essentially, we need a date at which Alexander's success was such that his *diabasis* recommended itself as an epochal event. Landucci Gattinoni (2012) 291 argues for a relatively early date after the battle of Granicus; see also Prandi (2012a) 322 and de Fidio (2013) 22 and 40. It should not, however, be forgotten that a year later Demosthenes at least was quite convinced that Alexander would be defeated by Darius at Issus (Aeschin. 3.164), and he was not alone. Athens and other Greek states had sent embassies to Darius before the battle, presumably on that very assumption (Arr. *Anab.* 2.15.2). Even up to Gaugamela, political calculations in Greece were still being made on the strong possibility that Alexander's campaign may yet fall to defeat. In light of these uncertainties, Stylianou (1998) 110 suggests a later date, after *ca.* 330, but it would be difficult to insist on anything more precise than the late 330s.

⁷¹ Rubincam (1987) 324–6 suggests such a working method for Diodorus on analogy with Cassius Dio who stated that he conducted research for ten years and wrote for twelve (73.23.5).

historians.⁷² Our biographical tradition is extremely unreliable, however. Only the *Suda* speaks directly to Ephorus' date: 'he was born (or flourishing?) when there was no archon in Athens (404/3), in the 93rd Olympiad (408–405), so that he lived even before the reign of Philip of Macedonia (360/59)' (*ἦν δὲ <τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὴν ἀναρχίαν Ἀθηναίων> ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνενηκοστῆς τρίτης ὀλυμπιάδος, ὡς καὶ πρὸ τῆς Φιλίππου βασιλείας εἶναι τοῦ Μακεδόνοιο*: *FGrHist* 70 T 1, tr. Parker modified). The correlation between this entry and that of Theopompus (*FGrHist* 115 T 1) has long presented a problem, since it suggests that the dates provided (whether referring to birth or *floruit*) have no basis in fact and emerge rather from the tradition that linked the two authors, perhaps supplemented by inferences derived from the *Histories* itself.⁷³ Neither source inspires confidence.⁷⁴ Parmeggiani finds additional support for a mid-fourth century *floruit* in Diodorus, who dates a host of intellectuals to the year 366/5, among whom are 'Isocrates the orator and those who became his students' (15.76.4, tr. Sherman). But the focus here is Isocrates. Passing mention of his students generally cannot be pressed to yield a reliable date for Ephorus specifically. Even if we insisted that Diodorus did have Ephorus in mind, it would be worth noting that the intellectuals he mentions in this passage range in date from Plato (d. 347) to both Aristotle (d. 322) and Anaximenes, who lived long enough to write a history of Alexander the Great.⁷⁵ Consequently, almost any realistic date for the lifetime of Ephorus could comfortably fit within the ample chronological confines of this notice.⁷⁶ Finally, Ephorus' failure to be classed among the Alexander historians would seem to prove only that he did

⁷² Parmeggiani (2011) 27 n. 2 and 720 n. 29, although he is also keenly aware of the overall weakness of the evidence in this case.

⁷³ On Theopompus' date, the *Suda* states: *γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὴν ἀναρχίαν Ἀθηναίων, ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνενηκοστῆς τρίτης ὀλυμπιάδος, ὅτε καὶ Ἔφορος*. The agreement between the two was strong enough to convince Jacoby to supplement Ephorus' entry with material from Theopompus' (*<τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὴν ἀναρχίαν Ἀθηναίων>*), though we obviously need not accept that supplement. For discussions of the various questions of interpretation and reliability surrounding Ephorus' dates in the *Suda*, see Schwartz, *RE* VI.1 (1907) 1–2, Jacoby (1926) 22, Barber (1935) 2, Parmeggiani (2011) 27 n. 2, and Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 T 1 and Biographical Essay I. For similar doubts about the accuracy of the *Suda*'s dates for Theopompus, see Flower (1994) 14–15 and Morison (2014) at *BNJ* 115 T 1. In light of these difficulties, Schwartz and Jacoby rightly pronounce the *Suda*'s dates for Ephorus 'wertlos'.

⁷⁴ Indeed, the surviving fragments of the *Histories* speak to Ephorus having been a manifestly younger man than the *Suda* entry suggests (*ὡς καὶ πρὸ τῆς Φιλίππου βασιλείας εἶναι τοῦ Μακεδόνοιο*). If these dates ultimately derive from the *Histories*, we must conclude that they did not derive from a very close reading of it and were perhaps unduly influenced by its incomplete nature (see above, pp. 122–4).

⁷⁵ See *FGrHist* 72 TT 3, 6, and FF 15–16 with Williams (2013) at *BNJ* 72 Biographical Essay.

⁷⁶ For more on this difficult passage, see Stylianou (1998) 489–90 and Vial (2002) 156.

not treat the life and career of Alexander in any detail, not that he belonged to an earlier generation. For what it is worth, Plutarch thought that Ephorus had turned down an invitation from Alexander to join his expedition (*Mor.* 1043d = *FGrHist* 70 T 6). This and other testimonia (TT 8 and 17) also claim that Ephorus was a contemporary of Callisthenes, himself certainly an Alexander historian (*FGrHist* 124). We need not credit these claims, but clearly the tradition was not unanimous in dating Ephorus significantly before the reign of Alexander or his earliest historians.

There are also two fragments that have long been thought to contain demonstrable *termini ante quem* that point to a date before the 330s, but neither holds up to scrutiny. In a discussion of Boeotia, Strabo cites Ephorus for his criticism of the Thebans who failed to cultivate education in anything other than warfare, adding that: ‘if they ever had success, it only lasted for a short time—as the example of Epaminondas shows. For as soon as he died, straightaway they lost the hegemony (τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀποβαλεῖν εὐθύς), having but tasted it’ (*FGrHist* 70 F 119, tr. Parker). Barber cites this passage, along with another that refers to Philip’s foundation of Philippi *ca.* 356 (F 37), to suggest that Ephorus may have begun work on the *Histories* in the 350s.⁷⁷ But it seems clear that the historian knows more than just the outcome of the second battle of Mantinea. His certainty that Epaminondas’ death doomed Theban hegemony betrays a foresight that escaped Xenophon, who was in fact writing in the 350s and was moreover no friend of Thebes.⁷⁸ Even after the ruinous Third Sacred War, politicians at Athens continued to think of Thebes as an estimable power.⁷⁹ Indeed, it is hard to imagine that either state would have taken the field at Chaeronea if the question of hegemony was thought beyond dispute. It was ultimately not until the Macedonian victory there that the seal

⁷⁷ Barber (1935) 12; see also Jacoby (1926) 24, Parmeggiani (2011) 720 n. 29, and Davies (2013) 59.

⁷⁸ Xenophon remarks that after the battle of Mantinea ‘both sides claimed victory, but it cannot be said that with regard to the accession of new territory, or cities, or power either side was any better off after the battle than before it’ (*Hell.* 7.5.27, tr. Warner).

⁷⁹ There can be no doubt that the Third Sacred War had much depleted Thebes’ strength and reputation (Munn (1997) 94–102), but see Isoc. 5.50, Dem. 19.112 and 141–2, and Aeschin. 3.80 for more favourable views of its position in the aftermath of that war. It is perhaps notable in this context that even as late as 341, although Demosthenes could give specific numeric ranges for the lengths of Athenian and Spartan hegemony (73 and 29 years respectively), he did not do so for the Thebans, whose hegemony is defined as occurring ‘in these most recent times after the battle of Leuctra’ (τουτουσὶ τοὺς τελευταίους χρόνους μετὰ τὴν ἐν Λεύκτροις μάχην: 9.23). Theban power is noted dismissively (ἴσχυσαν δέ τι καὶ Θεβαῖοι), and Demosthenes later juxtaposes the earlier hegemonies of Athens and Sparta with Philip’s rise over the past 13 years (9.25), but nowhere does he suggest that Theban hegemony had been definitively lost, much less that its loss had occurred over twenty years before.

was set on Theban decline.⁸⁰ We might still point to the absence of any explicit mention of the subsequent destruction of Thebes in 335, but we must then assume that Ephorus would have felt obliged to mention it in this context explicitly if he knew it and further that Strabo would have included it if mentioned.⁸¹ Neither proposition can be pressed. The only conclusion that can be drawn from F 119 is that it was definitely written after Mantinea and perhaps not until much later.⁸²

The second alleged *terminus ante quem* suffers from similar uncertainties. Here Ephorus implies that Naupactus was a Locrian town, despite the fact that it had been transferred to Aetolian control by Philip in 338 (*FGrHist* 70 F 121).⁸³ Yet, Strabo, the author of the cover text, goes on to mention the very detail Ephorus is thought to have omitted (9.4.7). Most have concluded along with Jacoby that the final line represents an addition by Strabo himself,⁸⁴ but

⁸⁰ In 330 Aeschines could still recall Theban hegemony, partially and unequally shared with Athens, on the eve of Chaeronea (3.143). Diodorus suggests an even later date when he, here likely following Hieronymus of Cardia, reflects on Theban history at its refoundation under Cassander, saying that the Thebans ‘wrangled over the leadership of the Greeks until Alexander, son of Philip, took the city by storm and destroyed it’ (19.53.8).

⁸¹ Jacoby’s *FGrHist* 70 F 119 ends with a brief summary of Theban history from the Persian War to the Third Sacred War. This does not, however, supply any positive evidence that Ephorus was ignorant of subsequent events. Jacoby printed this material in petite font, indicating that he did not consider it part of the Ephorean fragment, and rightly so; see also Milns (1980). Indeed, it is hard to imagine that any educated Greek (much less Strabo himself) would have needed to do extensive research to produce the rather bald summary of later Theban history we find there.

⁸² Milns (1980) 48 and Stylianos (1998) 110–11.

⁸³ The basic facts of this transfer were questioned by Bosworth (1976) on the strength of his own interpretation of two fragments from Theopompus (*FGrHist* 115 FF 235a and b), in which Philip is said to have been involved in the slaughter of the garrison there either with the approval or through the agency of the Achaeans. Bosworth suggests that the garrison in question would have been Aetolian and that Philip’s intended transfer of Naupactus to Aetolia (as anticipated by Demosthenes 9.34 and alluded to in Strabo 9.4.7) was never finalised and was indeed resisted by Philip and the Achaeans when the Aetolians attempted to force the issue. Rzepka (2004), however, has persuasively argued that the proverbial slaughter of the garrison in Naupactus became proverbial precisely because the Achaeans were compelled to authorise and perhaps even participate in the slaughter of their own garrison when they failed to surrender the town in the wake of their defeat at Chaeronea. Our Theopompus fragments do not, therefore, contradict Strabo, but provide a different perspective on the same event, the forced transfer of Naupactus to Aetolian control. For more on the history of Naupactus in the fourth century generally, see Merker (1989).

⁸⁴ Jacoby (1926) 24, Barber (1935) 12, Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 F 121, and Parmeggiani (2011) 226 n. 362 and 720 n. 29. In so doing, Jacoby was following Müller (1841) 236 and Marx (1815) 104 who also excluded the sentence. Stylianos (1998) 112 expresses doubts about this reading of the fragment, but never explains those doubts. Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 F 121 sees additional support for Jacoby’s position in Diodorus’ designation of Naupactus as

when he was writing, Naupactus was Achaean, not Aetolian.⁸⁵ Strabo is in error, and the likeliest cause of his error is the source he was following at the time.⁸⁶ Much turns on whether Strabo was consulting Ephorus directly or through an intermediary.⁸⁷ If directly, the passage becomes a *terminus post quem* (as Parmeggiani rightly notes);⁸⁸ if indirectly, we might attribute the notice about Aetolian control to a Hellenistic author, writing when Naupactus was in fact Aetolian, but that solution would not exclude the possibility that the intermediate author himself found the reference originally in Ephorus.⁸⁹ Only our presumption about the latter's publication date could shed light on the question, which brings us to the essential problem. It is our understanding of the date that informs the fragment and not the other way around. The same could be said of F 119 on Thebes. Neither provides any firm basis for either an early or late date.

Much has also been made of the possibility that Aristotle and his school had access to Ephorus' *Histories* when writing the *Politics* and the various

Locrian (14.34.2), but it is hardly surprising that Ephorus would have identified the town this way when narrating events that took place when it was in fact Locrian. Ephorus, fond of proleptic digressions though he was, surely felt no obligation to note the current state of affairs every time a prior state was mentioned. Nor does Diodorus' silence constitute strong evidence that he failed to do so on this occasion. Diodorus provides, at most, a creative abbreviation of Ephorus' original text; see Parmeggiani (2011) 349–94 and (2014b). Arguments from silence, dubious at the best of times, are impermissible in such circumstances.

⁸⁵ Recent work on Strabo's own date of composition points to the early years of Tiberius' reign, roughly between 18 and 24 CE: see Potheary (1997) 245, Dueck (1999), and Potheary (2002). Our best evidence suggests that Naupactus (along with much of the surrounding area) was placed under the control of Achaean Patrae soon after the creation of a Roman colony there in the wake of Actium in 31: see Rizakis (1996) 279–85 and (1998) 28. We can, of course, dispute the dates of both Strabo's composition and the transfer of Naupactus to Patrae (see Dueck and Rizakis above with earlier bibliography), but even if we drew those events closer together, Strabo otherwise shows an awareness of the key facts here: the foundation of Patrae (8.7.5) and the transfer of territory on the northern shore of the Corinthian Gulf to its control (10.2.21). These passages, one occurring before his treatment of Locris and another after, suggest that when Strabo discussed Naupactus, he was fully aware that it was no longer associated with Aetolia and likely had not been for almost 50 years.

⁸⁶ For more on Strabo's tendency to follow his own source material into error, see Syme (1995) 361 and Lindsay (1997) 496 and 506.

⁸⁷ For more on the relationship between Strabo and Ephorus generally, see Prandi (1988) and Filoni (2014).

⁸⁸ Parmeggiani (2011) 720 n. 29.

⁸⁹ Pseudo-Scymnus follows Ephorus closely (*FGrHist* 70 F 144) and, like Strabo, acknowledges Naupactus as an Aetolian town (ll. 473–82), but here too it is not clear whether the information came directly from Ephorus or through an intermediary.

Politeiai in the 330s and 320s.⁹⁰ Such a conclusion would presuppose that Ephorus began at some point earlier than this and furthermore that some portions of his work were already in circulation. There is a close relationship between Ephorus and Aristotle. There are overlapping themes and interests in the *Politics*; the *Politeiai* contain verbal echoes.⁹¹ But the nature of that relationship is much less clear. The composition and publication dates for Aristotle's *Politics* and the *Politeiai* are themselves debatable. The latest reference in the *Histories* (Alexander's *diabasis*) is later than the latest reference in the *Politics* (Philip's assassination: 1311b), and other parts of that work may have been written much earlier.⁹² A version of the *Athenaion Politeia* was circulating by the second half of the 330s,⁹³ and there is no good reason to assume that it was the first *Politeia* published.⁹⁴ If (for the sake of argument) Ephorus began work in the late 330s, he could have easily had access to several of the *Politeiai* by the time he turned to his discussion of the foundations, ethnographies, and constitutions that seem to have played so large a role in his geographical excursus in Books 4 and 5. Attempts have been made to show that this or that passage definitively points to Aristotle's use of Ephorus, but each must be interpreted quite generously to exclude the possibility that Ephorus used Aristotle or that both were looking to common sources.⁹⁵

⁹⁰ Davies (2013) 59; see also Peretti (1961) 6–7, Nafissi (1983/84), Cuniberti (2000) 107, Bertelli (2004) 12, and Moggi (2014).

⁹¹ For overlapping themes between Ephorus and Aristotle's *Politics*, see Perlman (2005); for verbal echoes, see the discussion of Cretan pederasty in Ephorus (*FGrHist* 70 F 149.20–1 = Str. 10.4.20–1) and the summary of the *Politeia of the Cretans* by Heraclides Lembus (15) with Perlman (2005) 312–13. We might also consider the discussion of the Corinthian tyrant Periander (*FGrHist* 70 F 179 and Heraclides 20), but in this case our cover text for Ephorus (Diog. Laert. 1.98) cites both Ephorus and Aristotle, and it cannot be proven that his wording here reflects the former and not the latter.

⁹² Schütrumpf (1994) 326–8 concludes that the research behind Books 2, 7, and 8 derived from work done in the Academy ca. 350 in connection with Plato's *Laws*, and it is Book 2 that provides the most notable overlaps with Ephorus. For more on this possible dating of Aristotle's research, see Huxley (1972) 163, Schütrumpf (1991) 108, and Perlman (2005).

⁹³ Keaney (1970) and (1992) 9 and Rhodes (1981) 51–8 and (2017) 28–31.

⁹⁴ Düring (1966) 51 and Keaney (1992) 182 speculate that some of the research for the other *Politeiai* may well have been conducted between Aristotle's first and second stays at Athens (347–334). Ottone (2002) 80 concludes that the *Politeia of the Cyrenaeans* was being composed slightly before the likely publication date of the first edition of the *Athenaion Politeia*, between 338 and 335; the fragments of the other *Politeiai* lack sufficient clues to hazard a conclusion in any specific case.

⁹⁵ Nafissi (1983/84) and Moggi (2014). See, however, Wilamowitz (1893) 305–7 and Jacoby (1969) 307 in support of a shared source; Parmeggiani (2011) 244 n. 453 suggests that the shared source in question might be Ephorus' own earlier work, *On Inventions*. Only Niese (1909) 178 and Perlman (2005) 302 seriously consider the possibility that Ephorus used Aristotle.

Moreover, such attempts inevitably presuppose that Ephorus published his *Histories* serially—a common assumption to be sure, but one for which there is no evidence.⁹⁶ It is best to conclude with Parmeggiani that the uncertainties surrounding the publication dates of Aristotle’s relevant works are simply too great to prove helpful in fixing Ephorus’ own uncertain publication date.⁹⁷

A fourth argument against a later date has recently been raised by Parmeggiani himself, who observes that Ephorus, though often cited for geographical matters, is never cited for the geography of Asia outside of Asia Minor.⁹⁸ The most likely explanation is that the new information emerging from Alexander’s conquests made his treatment obsolete because he took no account (or perhaps just insufficient account) of it.⁹⁹ The explanation is sound, but it does not follow that Ephorus must then have written his discussion of Asian geography in Book 5 before Alexander’s *diabasis*. Alexander did not move far from the Mediterranean until the middle of 331, and even after that we should not necessarily assume that accurate information was being disseminated within the Greek world in real time. Both Aeschines in 330 and Dinarchus in 323 betray elementary misunderstandings of Asian geography as well as the position of Alexander’s army within it.¹⁰⁰ This should come as no surprise, nor should we assume that the situation improved as early accounts

⁹⁶ In support of serial publication, see Meyer (1909) 138, Jacoby (1926) 25, Barber (1935) 13–14, and Schepens (1977) 115; against serial publication, see Niese (1909) 178. Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 Biographical Essay IIA rightly identifies either possibility as pure speculation.

⁹⁷ Parmeggiani (2011) 244 n. 453; see also Jacoby (1926) 25 and Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 F 179 and F 183 for similar doubts about the probative value of arguments based on Aristotle’s possible use of Ephorus.

⁹⁸ Parmeggiani (2011) 720 n. 29 is thinking about Strabo’s use of Ephorus specifically. We might add that Stephanus of Byzantium cites Ephorus for an alternate spelling of the Syrian/Phoenician town of Simyros or Simyra (*FGrHist* 70 F 168), but Parmeggiani’s larger point stands. Simyra was near the Mediterranean coast and so well within the orbit of the Greek world prior to Alexander’s campaigns.

⁹⁹ For more on the impact of Alexander’s campaigns on Greek notions of geography, see Gehrke (2015).

¹⁰⁰ Aeschines, in an attempt to deride Demosthenes for his failure to support the Spartan king Agis’ revolt the year before, claimed that Alexander ‘had withdrawn to the uttermost regions of the north, almost beyond the borders of the inhabited world’ (3.165, tr. Adams). He was in fact almost certainly in the area of Persepolis. Dinarchus, when he too referred to this same event in his own prosecution of Demosthenes years later, could claim that ‘Alexander, as some were saying, was in India’ (1.34). Both Aeschines and Dinarchus have a rhetorical interest in presenting Alexander as being quite distant from Greece. Their point is that Demosthenes had ample opportunity to support Agis’ revolt. Nevertheless, these claims would have been hard to sustain if accurate geographical information about Alexander’s campaigns were filtering back to Greece as he proceeded through Asia. Indeed, Dinarchus’ telling phrase ‘as some were saying’ (*ὡς οἱ λέγοντες*), suggests that there was as much misinformation as real information about Alexander’s whereabouts.

of Alexander's campaigns began to circulate. Strabo, echoing Eratosthenes, laments that so many of those who wrote these accounts distorted the geography of the lands conquered to magnify Alexander's reputation (11.5.5 and 11.7.4).¹⁰¹ It would be difficult to expect more from the oral reports that must have preceded them. Ultimately, Ephorus' apparent ignorance of the new geographical discoveries afforded by Alexander's conquests does not shed significant light on when he composed the *Histories*. We could easily suppose that he was working on Book 5 as late as 330 and still conclude that he would have had no firm information that would convince him to alter the received notion of Asian geography. We could, of course, argue that Ephorus would never have undertaken a general geography that included the Asian interior during Alexander's campaign, but that would be to accept as a premise the very thing that Parmeggiani is attempting to prove.¹⁰²

I have been intentionally brief, but the few examples provided above are sufficient to suggest that the case for an early date is not so well founded that we are compelled to explain away F 223 as a later insertion. Rather, it is better to reconsider the entire issue afresh and give serious thought to the possibility that Ephorus wrote all or at least a substantial part of his work when our fragment suggests—during the reign of Alexander the Great. Such a conclusion would entail no improbable lifespan or work pace. The testimonia repeatedly claim that Ephorus was a contemporary of Theopompus.¹⁰³ The claim cannot be trusted in detail, but we need believe nothing more revolutionary than that to accept that Ephorus lived throughout Alexander's lifetime.¹⁰⁴ If (for the sake of argument) we assumed that he began work on the *Histories* as late as 333, after Alexander's victory at Issus, and stopped just before Alexander's death in 323, we could easily carve out a period of about ten years for the composition of the 29 books of the *Histories* Ephorus finished. Slightly less than three books a year is not an impossibly or even improbably fast pace. Livy seems to have worked at something like that speed in composing the *Ab*

¹⁰¹ That Strabo made extensive use of Eratosthenes, see Molina Marín (2017); that he is following Eratosthenes in this case, see Str. 15.1.7–8 and Arr. *Anab.* 5.3.1–4 with Geus (2002) 93–4.

¹⁰² The premise itself would come perilously close to Schwartz's (1909) 490–1 argument that Ephorus could not have helped but write about Alexander had he lived during the lifetime of the great man, which Parmeggiani (2011) 720 n. 29 rightly rejects. It would also presuppose that Ephorus knew in advance what only Alexander's campaign could prove, that the existing Greek notion of geography was indeed flawed.

¹⁰³ Diodorus (4.1.3 = *FGrHist* 70 T 8) and the Suda (s.v. Θεόπομπος (Θ 172 Adler) = *FGrHist* 115 T 1) make the claim explicitly; many others imply it when they treat the two as contemporaries (*FGrHist* 70 TT 3a, 3b, 5, 28a, and 28b), while still more pair the two with no implication that they lived at the same time (TT 2c, 17, 22, and 24b). Talk of Ephorus as an 'older' contemporary of Theopompus is an unfounded conjecture: see Meyer (1909) 138.

¹⁰⁴ Theopompus himself died sometime after Alexander the Great (*FGrHist* 115 T 2).

Urbe Condita, and Cassius Dio appears to have completed his own history of Rome at an even faster pace.¹⁰⁵ Ephorus' reputation as a slow writer might give us pause, but that reputation has no basis in the evidence.¹⁰⁶ Indeed, there are good reasons to conclude that Ephorus was in a position to compose his work expeditiously. He had already been long engaged in historical research with the publication of at least two works (his *Local History of Cyme* and *On Discoveries*),¹⁰⁷ whose content demonstrably overlap with the surviving fragments of the *Histories*.¹⁰⁸ It should also be remembered that, like Livy, Ephorus

¹⁰⁵ For Livy, see Syme (1959) 39, Luce (1965) 210 and 230, and (1977) 139, Badian (1993) 18, Kraus (1994) 5 n. 19, Oakley (1997) 109, and Burton (2000) 443; Dio himself claims to have completed the 80 books of his *Roman History* in 22 years, ten years on the research and another twelve composing the work (73.23.5). These figures yield an average work pace (research, plus composition) of over three and a half books a year. Diodorus does claim a much slower pace in the composition of his own work—30 years for a work of 40 books (1.4.1), which comes out to a pace of just over a book a year. It is worth noting, however, that Diodorus immediately goes on to state that he undertook extensive travels in both Europe and Asia as part of his research. It is impossible to say how much time he consumed in this endeavour, but at least two authors (Polybius and Diodorus himself) strongly imply that Ephorus undertook no such travels for his own work (*FGrHist* 70 T 20 and F 65e, respectively).

¹⁰⁶ Barber (1935) 12 suggests that Ephorus wrote one book per year. Our testimonia do include an anecdote in which Isocrates claims that Ephorus needed the goad and Theopompus the bit (*FGrHist* 70 TT 28a and 28b), and it could be interpreted as a comment on their relative speed of composition, as Prakken (1943) 80, Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 T 28b, and Prandi (2012a) 311 n. 13 seem to suggest. But such an interpretation would presuppose that the originator of the anecdote, which is almost certainly apocryphal (Whitehead (2007)), had accurate biographical information about the two authors. It would also seem to miss the point of the anecdote, which our more detailed version (T 28b) preserves. Ephorus did not go into enough detail in matters that demanded it (and thus needed the goad), while Theopompus lingered overlong on irrelevancies (and thus needed the bit). Cicero, who was quite fond of the anecdote, seems to have understood it similarly (*de Orat.* 3.36; see also *Brut.* 204 and *ad Att.* 6.1.12). The point of contrast is style, not speed.

¹⁰⁷ Three additional works are attributed to Ephorus: *On Good and Bad Things*, *Unexpected Things Everywhere* (*FGrHist* 70 T 1), and *On Style* (F 6). Of these, only the last is likely an independent work by Ephorus. The other two are thought to be later compilations of material drawn from the *Histories* that eventually circulated separately: see Parker (2011) at *BNJ* 70 T 1.

¹⁰⁸ Ephorus was criticised in antiquity for making too much of his own hometown of Cyme in his *Histories* (*FGrHist* 70 F 236), and that criticism finds ample support in the surviving fragments (FF 10, 39, 72, 99, 114a, 134b, and 163b with Breglia Pulci Doria (1996) 45–6), and indeed in those portions of Diodorus' account that likely rely on Ephorus (D. H. Samuel (1968)); *pace* Ragone (2013) who argues that too much has been made of this alleged focus on Cyme. Inventions are also frequently noted in fragments attributed to the *Histories*: see Nafissi (1983/84) 350 n. 19 and Davies (2013) 58–9. The supposed inventions of Anacharsis were discussed in Book 4 (FF 42 and 42a), while Book 6 included a discussion of the Mantinean invention of what Ephorus describes as the old style of Greek armour (F 54).

leaned heavily on the research (and allegedly the wording) of earlier historians for most of his 29 books.¹⁰⁹ Nor was Ephorus considered a prolix writer, but was in fact criticised in antiquity for truncating topics thought worthy of more ample exposition.¹¹⁰ There is, in short, nothing in the biography of Ephorus that would prohibit us from accepting the implications of F 223 and concluding that a significant portion (if not all) of the *Histories* was composed during the reign of Alexander the Great.

Conclusion

Clement's citation of Ephorus for the span of time between the Return of the Heraclids and Alexander's *diabasis* has long been dismissed, but there is ultimately no good reason to do so. F 223 is an estimable piece of evidence, whose implications must be addressed. Errors and additions were not uncommon in the chronographic tradition, but Clement's report here is accurate and seems to derive from good intermediate sources. In all likelihood, Ephorus included a numeric calculation of the time between these points in his *Histories*. Its placement within the work is inevitably less certain, but the simplest solution (Book 1) best explains the content. This interpretation of F 223 suggests that Ephorus was actively working on the *Histories* decades later than is generally thought. We could retain the *communis opinio* by arguing that Clement's citation indicates merely that Ephorus made minor revisions to his work in the late 330s, but that would be an extremely conservative reaction, given the weakness of the evidence for an early date of composition. We

A further three fragments (FF 105a/105c, 115, and 149) are not explicitly assigned to a work and so could come from either the *Histories* or *On Inventions*, but given the detailed historical narratives that appears in FF 115 and 149, the latter two almost certainly derived from the *Histories*. There Ephorus mentions the Aetolian invention of the sling and Pheidon's invention of the Pheidonian weights and measures in F 115 and Thales' invention of Cretan rhythms and the Cretan invention of Spartan customs in F 149. FF 105a and c note Cadmus' invention of letters, but the context provided is not substantial enough to determine which work our cover texts are citing. Despite the prominence of these inventions, we need not assume, along with Niese (1909) 176, that elements of this work were incorporated directly into the *Histories* to conclude that the research that stood behind it would have served Ephorus well in his later work.

¹⁰⁹ Parmeggiani (2011) 720 n. 29 is absolutely right to observe that the *Histories* 'non furono un'opera di pura e poco mediata compilazione'; see also Schepens (1977) 105–6. That said, it cannot be denied that Ephorus' extensive use of written sources would have presented him with a task (and timetable) manifestly different from those who assembled first-hand accounts from eyewitnesses.

¹¹⁰ *FGrHist* 70 T 28b places this criticism into the mouth of Isocrates. The anecdote itself is surely apocryphal (see above, n. 106), but it may nevertheless preserve a valid reaction to the overall style and tempo of the *Histories*.

cannot, of course, know when Ephorus began collecting notes or in what order he worked through his material, but the likely presence of F 223 in Book 1 suggests that the *Histories* (or at least a substantial portion of it) was composed and intended to be read in the light of Alexander's epochal career. Indeed, such a placement has clear programmatic implications and suggests that the connection was far from implicit in Ephorus' text. The terminal point of this chronographic notice would also lend support to the idea that Ephorus intended to end his work with Alexander's *diabasis*.¹¹¹ These possible lines of inquiry go far beyond the bounds of the present study, but I hope I have shown that the question of when Ephorus was writing the *Histories* and, along with it, our fundamental understanding of the work's purpose and shape are far from settled.

Millsaps College

DAVID C. YATES
yatesdc@millsaps.edu

¹¹¹ See, for example, Stylianou (1998) 110 and Prandi (2012a) 311. *Pace* Schwartz (1909) 490–1, it is not unlikely that Ephorus would have opted to avoid contemporary events. Herodotus looks forward to, but manifestly does not treat, the Athenian Empire or the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. Diodorus announces in Book 1 his intention to end with the beginning of Caesar's campaign in Gaul, despite knowing the manifest significance of that campaign and its aftermath (1.4.7). For more on this trend in Greek historiography, see Parmeggiani (2014) 311–12. An intended endpoint at Alexander's *diabasis* might also explain the testimonia that Ephorus refused to accompany Alexander on his campaign (see above, p. 130). The story is certainly apocryphal, but might have its origin in Ephorus' plan (implicit or explicit in the text) to end the *Histories* at that point.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, W. (2008) 'Moses, the Exodus, and Comparative Chronology', in P. Gray and G. R. O'Day, edd., *Scripture and Tradition: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay* (Leiden) 47–65.
- Andrewes, A. (1949) 'The Corinthian Actaeon and Pheidon of Argos', *CQ* 43: 70–8.
- Asheri, D. (1983) 'Il millennio di Troia', in D. Ambaglio, D. Asheri, and M. Domenico, edd., *Saggi di letteratura e storiografia antiche* (Como) 53–98.
- Badian, E. (1993) 'Livy and Augustus', in W. Schuller, ed., *Livius: Aspekte seines Werkes* (Konstanz) 9–38.
- Ball, R. (1979) 'Generation Dating in Herodotus', *CQ* 29: 276–81.
- Barber, G. L. (1935) *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge).
- Baron, C. A. (2013) *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography* (Cambridge).
- Bertelli, L. (2004) 'La Sparta di Aristotele: Un ambiguo paradigma o la crisi di un modello?', *RSA* 34: 9–71.
- Bosworth, A. B. (1976) 'Early Relations between Aetolia and Macedon', *AJAH* 1: 164–81.
- Breglia Pulci Doria, L. (1996) 'Eforo: L'ottica cumana di uno storico "universale"', in P. Carlier, ed., *Le IV^e siècle av. J.-C.: Approches historiographiques* (Paris) 41–55.
- Burgess, R. W. (2006) 'Apologetic and Chronography: The Antecedents of Julius Africanus', in M. Wallraff, ed., *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik* (Berlin and New York) 17–42.
- Burkert, W. (1995) 'Lydia between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus', in J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, edd., *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule* (Austin) 139–48.
- Burton, P. J. (2000) 'The Last Republican Historian: A New Date for the Composition of Livy's First Pentad', *Historia* 49: 429–46.
- Clarke, K. (2008) *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis*. (Oxford).
- Cooper, C. (2015) 'Phainias' Historiographical and Biographical Method: Chronology and Dramatization', in Hellmann–Mirhady (2015) 253–71.
- Cuniberti, G. (2000) 'Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτεία: Priorità e originalità nel dibattito sulle *politeiai*-modello di Sparta e Creta', *SIFC* 18: 99–111.
- Davies, J. (2013) 'The Historical and Cultural World of Ephoros', in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) I.55–70.
- de Fidio, P. (2013) 'Introduzione', in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) I.13–54.
- , C. Talamo, and L. Vecchio, edd. (2013/14) *Eforo di Cuma nella storia della storiografia greca: Atti dell'Incontro Internazionale di Studi Fisciano-Salerno, 10–12 dicembre 2008, La Parola del Passato*, vols. 68 (2013) and 69 (2014).
- Drews, R. (1963) 'Ephorus and History Written *κατὰ γένος*', *AJPh* 84: 244–55.

- Droge, A. (1989) *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (Tübingen).
- Dueck, D. (1999) 'The Date and Method of Composition of Strabo's *Geography*', *Hermes* 127: 467–78.
- Düring, I. (1966) *Aristoteles: Darstellung und Interpretation seines Denkens* (Heidelberg).
- Engels, J. (1998) '1012. Phainias of Eresos', in G. Schepens, ed., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (Continued): Part Four, Biography and Antiquarian Literature* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne) 266–351.
- (2015) 'Phaenias of Eresus: The Sources, Text and Translation', in Hellmann–Mirhady (2015) 1–99.
- Favuzzi, A. and A. Paradiso (2018) 'Nikolaos of Damaskos (90)', *BNJ* (online).
- Filoni, A. (2013/14) 'Eforo e Apollodoro in Strabone', in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) II.847–926.
- Flower, M. A. (1994) *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC* (Oxford).
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. (2015) 'Two Eresians: Phainias and Theophrastus', in Hellmann–Mirhady (2015) 101–31.
- Fraser, P. M. (1970) 'Eratosthenes of Cyrene', *PBA* 56: 175–207.
- Gehrke, H.-J. (2015) 'The "Revolution" of Alexander the Great: Old and New in the World's View', in S. Bianchetti, M. R. Cataudella, and H.-J. Gehrke, edd., *Brill's Companion to Ancient Geography: The Inhabited World in Greek and Roman Tradition* (Leiden and Boston) 78–97.
- Geus, K. (2002) *Eratosthenes von Kyrene: Studien zur hellenistischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte* (Munich).
- Hammond, N. G. L. (1937) 'The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI', *CQ* 31: 79–91.
- Hellmann, O. and D. Mirhady, edd. (2015) *Phaenias of Eresus: Text, Translation, and Discussion* (New Brunswick and London).
- Hornblower, S. (2008) *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. III: Books 5.25–8.109* (Oxford).
- Huxley, G. L. (1972) 'On Aristotle's Historical Methods', *GRBS* 13: 157–69.
- Jacoby, F. (1926) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker: Teil 2, Zeitgeschichte—C. Kommentar zu Nr. 64–105* (Berlin).
- (1954) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker: Teil 3, Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie), A. Kommentar zu Nr. 262–296* (Leiden).
- (1969) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker: Teil 3, Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie), B. Kommentar zu Nr. 297–607* (Leiden).
- Judeich, W. (1911) 'Theopomps *Hellenika*', *RhM* 66: 94–139.
- Keaney, J. J. (1970) 'The Date of Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*', *Historia* 19: 326–36.
- (1992) *The Composition of Aristotle's Athenaion Politeia: Observation and Explanation* (New York and Oxford).

- Kokkinos, N. (2009) 'Ancient Chronography, Eratosthenes, and the Dating of the Fall of Troy', *AWE* 8: 37–56.
- Kraus, C. S. (1994) *Livy, Ab Urbe Condita: Book VI* (Cambridge).
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. (1997) *Duride di Samo* (Rome).
- (2012) 'Sulle tracce di Eforo di Cuma: Appunti biografici', *MedAnt* 15: 277–92; repr. in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) I.71–94.
- Lang, P. (2012) 'Hekataios (264)', *BNJ* (online).
- Laqueur, R. (1911) 'Ephoros 2: Die Disposition', *Hermes* 46: 321–54.
- Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto, Buffalo, and London).
- Lenfant, D. (2013) 'The Study of Intermediate Authors and Its Role in the Interpretation of Historical Fragments', *AncSoc* 43: 289–305.
- Lilla, S. R. C. (1971) *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism* (Oxford).
- Lindsay, H. (1997) 'Syme's *Anatolica* and the Date of Strabo's *Geography*', *Klio* 79: 484–507.
- Luce, T. J. (1965) 'The Dating of Livy's First Decade', *TAPhA* 96: 209–40.
- (1977) *Livy: The Composition of His History* (Princeton).
- Marx, M. (1815) *Ephori Cumaei Fragmenta* (Karlsruhe).
- Mazzarino, S. (1966) *Il pensiero storico classico*, vol. 1 (Bari).
- Meister, K. (2004) 'Ephorus', *BNP* IV.1035.
- Merino Rodríguez, M. (1996) *Clemente de Alejandría: Stromata I, cultura y religion* (Madrid).
- Merker, I. L. (1989) 'The Achaians in Naupaktos and Kalydon in the Fourth Century', *Hesperia* 58: 303–11.
- Meyer, E. (1909) *Theopomps Hellenika* (Halle).
- Milns, R. (1980) 'Some Critical Observations on Ephorus: Fragments 119, 111, and Testimony 23 (Jacoby)', in B. A. Marshall, ed., *Vindex Humanitatis: Essays in Honour of John Huntley Bishop* (Armidale) 46–57.
- Mitchel, F. (1956) 'Herodotus' Use of Genealogical Chronology', *Phoenix* 10: 48–69.
- Möller, A. (2005) 'Epoch-making Eratosthenes', *GRBS* 45: 245–60.
- Moggi, M. (2014) 'Eforo e Aristotele', in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) II.705–22.
- Molina Marín, A. I. (2017) 'Under the Shadow of Eratosthenes: Strabo and the Alexander Historians', in D. Dueck, ed., *The Routledge Companion to Strabo* (Abingdon and New York) 294–305.
- Molland, E. (1938) *The Conception of the Gospel in the Alexandrian Theology* (Oslo).
- Morison, W. S. (2014) 'Theopompus of Chios (115)', *BNJ* (online).
- Mortley, R. (1996) *The Idea of Universal History from Hellenistic Philosophy to Early Christian Historiography* (Lewiston).

- Mosshammer, A. A. (1975) 'Themistocles' Archonship in the Chronographic Tradition', *Hermes* 103: 222–34.
- (1979) *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewistown and London).
- Mühl, M. (1936) 'Zur Entstehungszeit der *Historien* des Ephoros', *Klio* 29: 111–13.
- Müller, C. (1841) *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. 1 (Paris).
- Munn, M. (1997) 'Thebes and Central Greece', in L. A. Tritle, ed., *The Greek World in the Fourth Century: From the Fall of the Athenian Empire to the Successors of Alexander* (London and New York) 66–106.
- Murray, O. (1970) 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship', *JEA* 56: 141–71.
- Nafissi, M. (1983/84) 'La controversia sulla priorità fra le *politeíai* di Sparta e Creta: Eforo e Pausania', *AFLP* 21: 343–66.
- Niese, B. (1909) 'Wann hat Ephoros sein Geschichtswerk geschrieben?', *Hermes* 44: 170–8.
- Oakley, S. P. (1997) *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X, vol. 1: Introduction and Book VI* (Oxford).
- Ottone, G. (2002) *Libyka: Testimonianza e frammenti* (Tivoli).
- Panchenko, D. (2000) 'Democritus' Trojan Era and the Foundations of Early Greek Chronology', *Hyperboreus* 6: 31–78.
- Parker, V. (2009) 'Source-Critical Reflections on Cleitarchus' Work', in P. V. Wheatley and R. Hannah, edd., *Alexander and His Successors: Essays from the Antipodes* (Claremont) 28–55.
- (2011) 'Ephoros (70)', *BNJ* (online).
- Parmeggiani, G. (2003) 'Ancora sul Fidone di Eforo: La cronografia arcaica delle *Storie*', *RSA* 33: 201–15.
- (2011) *Eforo di Cuma: Studi di storiografia greca* (Bologna).
- (2014a) 'L'assedio di Perinto (341/0 a.C.) nella percezione dei politici e degli storici contemporanei e la conclusione delle *Storie* di Eforo', *Ktèma* 39: 303–14.
- (2014b) 'Diodoro lettore di Eforo', in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) II.781–806.
- Peretti, A. (1961) 'Eforo e Ps.-Scilace', *SCO* 10: 5–43.
- Perlman, P. (2005) 'Imagining Crete', in M. H. Hansen, ed., *The Imaginary Polis: Symposium, January 7–10, 2004* (Copenhagen) 282–334.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford).
- Porciani, L. (2013) 'Eforo e i proemi di Diodoro: per una ridefinizione del modello storiografico', *ASNP* 5 (2013) 197–216; repr. in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) II.807–26.

- Pothecary, S. (1997) 'The Expression "Our Times" in Strabo's *Geography*', *CPh* 92: 235–46.
- (2002) 'Strabo, the Tiberian Author: Past, Present and Silence in Strabo's *Geography*', *Mnemosyne* 55: 387–438.
- Pownall, F. (2009a) 'Duris of Samos (76)', *BNJ* (online).
- (2009b) 'Eratosthenes of Cyrene (241)', *BNJ* (online).
- Prakken, D. W. (1943) *Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology* (Lancaster).
- Prandi, L. (1988) 'Strabone ed Eforo: Un'ipotesi sugli *Historikà Hypomnēmata*', *Aevum* 62: 50–60.
- (2012a) 'L'ultimo Eforo', *MedAnt* 15: 309–24; repr. in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) II.683–704.
- (2012b) 'New Evidence for the Dating of Cleitarchus (*POxy* LXXI, 4808)?', *Histos* 6: 15–26.
- Ragone, G. (2013) 'Eforo 'Campanilista': Lo spazio storico di Cuma eolica nei frammenti dell'*Epichorios* e delle *Storie*', in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) I.95–216.
- Rhodes, P. J. (1981) *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford, London, and New York).
- (2017) *The Athenian Constitution Written in the School of Aristotle* (Liverpool).
- Ridings, D. (1995) *The Attic Moses: The Dependency Theme in Some Early Christian Writers* (Göteborg).
- Rizakis, A. D. (1996) 'Les colonies romaines des côtes occidentales grecques: populations et territoires', *DHA* 22: 255–324.
- (1998) *Achaïe II—La cité de Patras: Épigraphie et histoire* (MEΛETHMATA 25; Athens and Paris).
- Rocchi, G. D. (2014) 'Eforo, Senofonte e la storia del loro tempo', in de Fidio–Talamo–Vecchio (2013/14) II.609–42.
- Roller, D. W. (2008) 'Megasthenes (715)', *BNJ* (online).
- Rubincam, C. (1987) 'The Organization and Composition of Diodorus' *Bibliothēke*', *EMC* 31: 313–28.
- Rzepka, J. (2004) 'Philip II of Macedon and "the Garrison in Naupactus": A Re-Interpretation of Theopompus *FGrHist* 115 F 235', *Tyche* 19: 157–66.
- Samuel, A. E. (1972) *Greek and Roman Chronology: Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity* (Munich).
- Samuel, D. H. (1968) 'Cyme and the Veracity of Ephorus', *TAPhA* 99: 375–88.
- Schepens, G. (1977) 'Historiographical Problems in Ephorus', in *Historiographia Antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* (Leuvan) 95–118.
- (1997) 'Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Problems, Methods, Prospects', in G. W. Most, ed., *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente Sammeln* (Göttingen) 144–72.
- Schütrumpf, E. (1991) *Aristoteles: Politik, Buch II–III* (Berlin).

- (1994) ‘Aristotle on Sparta’, in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson, edd., *The Shadow of Sparta* (London and New York) 323–45.
- Schwartz, E. (1909) ‘Die Zeit des Ephoros’, *Hermes* 44: 481–502.
- Sollenberger, M. G. (2015) ‘The Life and Times of Phaenias of Eresus’, in Hellmann–Mirhady (2015) 133–46.
- Stadter, P. A. (2012) ‘Thucydides as “Reader” of Herodotus’, in E. Foster and D. Lateiner, edd., *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford) 39–66.
- Stoneman, R. (2022) *Megasthenes’ Indica: A New Translation of the Fragments with Commentary* (London and New York).
- Stylianou, P. J. (1998) *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus, Book 15* (Oxford).
- Syme, R. (1959) ‘Livy and Augustus’, *HSCPh* 64: 27–87.
- (1995) ‘Appendix E: When Did Strabo Write?’, in id., *Anatolica: Studies in Strabo*, ed. A. Birley (Oxford) 356–67.
- Tully, J. (2014) ‘Ephorus, Polybius, and τὰ καθόλου γράφειν: Why and How to Read Ephorus and his Role in Greek Historiography without Reference to “Universal History”’, in G. Parmeggiani, ed., *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass.) 153–95.
- van den Hoek, A. (1996) ‘Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods’, *VChr* 50: 223–43.
- Vial, C. (2002) *Diodore de Sicile*, Bibliothèque Historique, *Livre XV* (Paris).
- Wallraff, M. (2011) ‘The Beginnings of Christian Universal History: From Tatian to Julius Africanus’, *ZAC* 14: 540–55.
- Whitehead, D. (2007) ‘The Rein and the Spur’, in N. V. Sekunda, ed., *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald* (Gdansk) 39–42.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. von. (1893) *Aristoteles und Athen*, vol. 1 (Berlin).
- Williams, M. F. (2010) ‘(C. Iulius) Polybios (254)’, *BNJ* (online).
- (2013) ‘Anaximenes of Lampsakos (72)’, *BNJ* (online).
- Yates, D. C. (2019) *States of Memory: The Polis, Panhellenism, and the Persian War* (Oxford and New York).