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Particularly in the Eighties of the nineteenth century the Quellenforschung on Polyaenus burst out and lots of works were written on this subject with different interpretations, that underlined each time a pre-eminent role of the primary sources (above all of the fourth and third century BC) or the mediation of following collections.\footnote{See e.g. Knott 1884: 49-96; Schirmer 1884 (who pointed out the pre-eminence of Nicolaus Damascenus); Melber 1885: 417-688. For an undervaluation of the primary sources, see e.g. Martin Garcia 1980. For a status quaestionis see Schettino 1998: 127 ff.}

In the course of time, this trend to section the whole text of Polyaenus, in order to follow the tracks of previous works, has lost its strength and of course I don’t mean to propose it again here. Neither do I intend to dwell on the problem, as a whole, of the relationship of Polyaenus with Ephorus, the fourth century historian from Cyme, that has already been investigated and deepened by many and great scholars,\footnote{See e.g. Knott 1884: 83 ff; Melber 1885: 422 ff; Barber 1935: 62 ff.} but I would like to point out some specific cases, pertaining to the third book of the Stratagems of war.

Up now to, in fact, in the studies on Ephorus as a source for Polyaenus, most of all the relationship with the first book of his work has been deepened, where the consonances are indeed considerable and revealing.\footnote{See e.g. Knott 1884: 93 ff; Melber 1885: 422 ff; Phillips 1972: 297-298; Schettino 1998: 157.} On the contrary the analysis of the Ephorean influence on the third book is less frequent, whereas I believe that also here the importance of the cuman historian as a source can be emphasized and I will choose some passages that could confirm such hypothesis.

This book mostly deals with Athenian strategoi and it shows a rather well-defined and organic inner structure;\footnote{Among only 16 chapters (this is the book which reports the least number of figures) and 115 total stratagems, 100 pertain to fourth century strategoi. Already Melber thought of a unitary view of this book (1885: 583).} it seems possible not only to trace back to Ephorus, as usual,\footnote{See above all Knott 1884: 94.} chapter 3 on Tolmides, the Athenian general whose sly recruitment of men is related on the occasion of the circumnavigation of the Peloponnesus in the year 456, but also many other stratagems of the fourth century strategoi Iphicrates, Timotheus and Chabrias (chapters 9-11).\footnote{About the great room for these Athenian strategoi, see also Melber 1885: 565 ff.}
To give a complete picture, however, it’s better to begin with Tolmides, about whom Polyaeus tells:

 läπλιδες, Λησυναίων ψηφισμένων αὐτῷ δοθήνη κατάλογον ἀνθρώπων χιλίων, ἐκάστῳ προσώπῳ τῶν νέων ἔρχοντο, ὡς μᾶλλον καταλείποντες αὐτῶν, ὡς ἔδει ἡμῖν ἔκοψαι στρατεύεται. τρεχόντας μὲν ἀπειρήματα ἐκόνες, ὡς λοιποὶ δὲ οὐκ ἐπιθύμουσιν. Τολμίδης ἐκ τῶν μὲ πεποιθημένων κατέλεξε τούς χιλίους καὶ πεντήκοντα τριήρες ἐπλάγας ἀντὶ χιλίων τετρακισχιλίων ἀνθρώπων.

When the Athenians voted that Tolmides could draft one thousand men, he approached each of the young men and said that he was going to draft him, but that it would be better for him to volunteer. Three thousand volunteered; the rest were not persuaded. Tolmides drafted the one thousand from those who were not persuaded, and filled fifty triremes with four thousand rather than one thousand men.

(Polyaeus, Stat. 3. 3)7

The most evident echoes of this stratagem are in Diodorus:

7 All quotations from Polyaeus are based on Krentz/Wheeler 1994.
he added, for him to go as a volunteer than be thought to have been compelled to
to serve under compulsion by enrolment. When by this scheme he had persuaded
more than three thousand to enrol voluntarily and saw the rest of the youth showed
no further interest, he then enrolled the thousand he had been promised from all
who were left.  (Diodorus 11. 84. 3 ff.)^8

These two texts are revealing: clearly Polyaeus is summing up the same source
and since Diodorus’ books 11-15 are usually supposed to be widely based on
the Cuman historian,^9 it is therefore usual to connect these two passages and to
think that here Polyaenus too can trace back to Ephorus.

Less renowned are instead the similarities with some passages pertaining to
Iphocrates, Chabrias and Timotheus, the three most famous Athenian generals
of the fourth century. These three strategy are in fact very important in Polyae-
enus’ work and they form a kind of triad, already evident in many other ancient
authors;^10 moreover, they are the same three strategy to whom Cornelius Nepos
dedicated a Life and we must not forget that it’s possible to highlight also many
points of contact between Nepos and Ephorus or Diodorus.11

Unfortunately, in order to examine Ephorus’ influence, we must often rely
on the mediation of other sources, in particular of Diodorus, because the frag-
mentary tradition, through which the historian reached us, doesn’t offer in fact
many firsthand information.

However, we can estimate that the fourth century occupied a wide portion
of Ephorus’ universal history, since, in a period that covers more than seven
hundred years in thirty books, we consider related to the age of these strategy
the books from 18th on.12 Nearly the half of the work, therefore, is given to a
tenth of the time taken into consideration in his History, but this is understand-
able, since it concerned that Zeitgeschichte which was so important at that time.

---

8 Loeb translation by C. H. Oldfather 1956.
9 Many scholars are in favour of a strong relationship between Ephorus and
Diodorus’ 11-15 (perhaps even 16), see e.g. Schepens 1977: 102; Hornblower 1994:
10 Often these three strategy all together assume an indistinct form: see e.g. Demosth.
Syntec. 22; Aristoc. 198; Aesch. Ctesiph. 243; Din. Demosth. 75; Plut. De gloria Ath.
11 For Nepos’ sources and his preference to great authors such as Ephorus and
between Nepos and Diodorus see also Ambaglio 1995: 83.
12 Although outdated, the starting point for Ephorus is always Barber 1935; see then
Meister 1997: 98-103 and for the last studies e.g. Marincola 2007: 171-179; and the
congress on Ephorus held in Salerno (10-12/12/2008): “Eforo di Cuma nella storia
della storiografia greca” (Proceedings, ed. by P. de Fidio, in press).
Unfortunately such material is today lost for the most part, as we can see in the Jacoby collection, where only 18 fragments are ascribable to books 18-27 (those which seem to deal mostly with Greek events of that period: \(^{13}\) FGrHist 70 FF 71-88); moreover, we can add 13 further fragments (FF 205-217) that don’t report the number of the book, but that note down events of this same space of time.\(^{15}\)

From this short presentation, the state of extreme shortage of news in which we move is evident, but the analysis of these few fragments allows to point out the great importance that seems given here to single personalities. It could be an accident, perhaps, but what seems to emerge from Ephorus’ fragments is a fourth century history centered on well-known figures, in particular great strategoi, to such an extent that we can suppose a sort of biographical interest ‘melted’ in history.\(^{16}\)

Talking about biographical interest in Ephorus, of course I don’t mean the existence of a genre or an organic reflection about the ethos of a figure, but I consider very convincing the hypothesis of the existence of a biographical attitude, already present in fourth century historiography.\(^{17}\) That the fourth century history in Ephorus is mostly done by individual personalities seems to me a confirmation of a possible initial blend between biography and history, that has interesting implications also for the material that Polyaeus could have found in Ephorus.

---

13 This was Jacoby’s interpretation of the expression kata genos as geographical areas, see also Drews 1963: 244-255; Drews 1976: 497-498; Schepens 1977: 116. For a wider interpretation of this expression Vannicelli 1987: 165-191.

14 Among these 18 fragments, five describe military events with the record of the generals’ names, such as for example Thibron and Dercyllidas (F 71), Hieronymos (FF 73-74), Chabrias (F 80), Kephisodoros and Agesilaus (F 85), one reports Mantinea’s dioikismos (F 79), the others are scanty geographical lemmas coming from Stephanus Byzantinus (FF 72, 75-78, 81-84).

15 Among the further 13 fragments that don’t report the number of the book, one is the famous F 216 on Taras’ foundation, three are devoted to Lysander (FF 205-207) and the others mainly pertain to military clashes (e.g. F 208: between Arravexes and Cyrus, F 211: between Dionysius and the Athenians, F 209: between Athenians and Spartans, or the battles at Cnidus and Leuttra, T 20 and F 213) or to Epaminondas (F 213), Iason (F 214), Philippus (F 217) and so on.

16 I’m pleased here to use an expression of our colleague Ambaglio (1995: 87), unfortunately recently departed; the remarks on these topics start from two important points in Diodorus (10. 12. 1-2; 20. 43. 7). About the non-existence of a juxtaposition between history and biography already Mazzarino (1966: 138) and Piecirelli (2000: 112-118).

17 Cf. Ambaglio forthcoming, with bibliography.
Among few surviving tracks, we have at least one lucky case, where we can find a direct echo of the relationship between these two authors.

In fact, a small papyrus fragment has been found, even though full of lacunae (and still unknown in Melber’s times), which reports the occurrence of a οἰονομήμα, a wine distribution, in a context where also the expression “Ἀλάδε μύσται” recurs (that is “initiates to the sea”).

This was the cry with which, at dawn of the fourth day of the Eleusinian Mysteries, the initiatives were invited to purify themselves in the water of the sea, but that, according to the homonymous lemma in Hesychius’ lexicon, denoted also the whole day of these celebrations. In the papyrus fragment, then, it is explicitly attested the reference to Ephorus’ book 21, which is usually thought to cover the period from 380 to 372.

Such a difficult fragment, however, can be easily connected to the context of the naval battle of Naxos, won by the Athenian Chabrias against the Spartans in 376, thanks to the comparison with some passages of Plutarchus and Polyaeus. From Plutarchus (Life of Phocion 6.7) we know that Chabrias every year in memory of this victory offered a wine distribution during the great mysteries, whereas from Polyaeus we know that Chabrias fought in Naxos choosing this day of feast, so that his men could feel the divinity as an ally (3.11.2):

Χαβρίας παρὰ Νάξου καμαχὼν, ἐκάρπη Βοηδρομίωνος ἔτην ἐπὶ δέκα ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιτήρησεν τῇ καμαχώι κράνος, ὅτι ἦν μία τῶν μυστηρίων, εὑρὼ γὰρ τοι καὶ Θεμιστοκλῆς τοῖς Πάρσις εναμάχῃ παρὰ Σαλαμίνα, ἀλλὰ οἱ μὲν παρὶ Θεμιστοκλῆς σύμμαχον ἔσχην τὸν Ἰππίκου, τοὶ δὲ παρὶ Χαβρίαν τῷ Ἀλάδε μύσται.

While fighting a naval battle at Naxos, Chabrias won on the sixteenth of Boedromion, judging this day favorable for a naval battle, since it was one of the days of

---

18 FGrHist 70 F 80: εἰς οἰονομήμα, ὅταν ἦν Ἀλάδα μύσται, οἱ καταστάματοι | μυστηρίων... οἰονομήμα,... | this fragment comes from a lexicon to Demosthenes’ 23 oration (Against Aristocrates), whose §198 reports a comment on the exaggerated importance granted in the fourth century to single personalities, instead of the whole polis, and remembers the cases of Timotheus after the battle of Corecyra, Iphicrates after the destruction of a Spartan morn and Chabrias after Naxus’ victory.

19 Cf. Hesych. Ι. Ε. Ἀλάδα μύσται, ἤμαρτα τις τῶν Ἀθηναίων μυστηρίων. See also Etym. Magn. Ι. Ε. εἰσαὶ θάνατος, οὗ τοι ἴδον ἐκ τοῦ Ἐλευσίνα ἄγουσα, ἄν έπαθε ὁ μύσται ἄβαδο.

20 For the analysis of the possible distinction of Ephorean books, see e.g. Barber 1935: 26 ff.; Stylianou 1998: 93 ff.

21 Plut. Phoc. 6.7: ἔτην μὲν μεγάλοις μυστηρίων, καὶ παρακεῖν ὀἰονομήμα Χαβρίας σιδηράες | Ἀθηναίως καθ’ ἐκατέρτυον τῇ ἐκτῇ ἐπὶ δέκα τοῦ Βοηδρομίωνος (“This battle was won during the celebration of the great mysteries and Chabrias, in commemoration of it, annually treated the Athenians with wine on the sixteenth day of the month of Boedromion”).
the Eleusinian Mysteries. Undoubtedly in this way Themistocles fought the Persians at Salamis. But Themistocles’ men had Iacchus as an ally, while Chabrias’ men were the initiates who went to the sea. (Polyen. Strat. 3. 11. 2)

In Plutarchus there is the word οἶνοχόημα, in Polyaenus the expression Ἀλεξάδε μύσται (and this is the only case where this specific expression recurs in connection with Chabrias), therefore the concurrence of the account is sure and contributes also to assume a connection between the Ephorean original text and these passages.

This is the only lucky example of a direct relationship, but several are those mediated by other sources (and not only Diodorus, as we will see), that can be considered perhaps equally reliable.

For example, among the seventeen stratagems attributed to Timotheus, five deal with the famous naval battle won by the Athenian strategos against the Spartans in 375, that Polyaenus says to be happened in Leucades. Among the historians who report this account, Xenophon introduces only a spare report of this Timotheus’ victory, and he supports that it was achieved near Alyzeia, a city of the Acauanian coast. In Diodorus, on the contrary, the fundamental importance of this event is emphasized and there is the name of Leucades, the more famous island in front of Alyzeia. Therefore it is possible that both Diodorus and Polyaenus used a source that celebrated such victory and brought this geographic indication, that could supply a sort of lector facilior, instead of the less famous Alyzeia. And this source may be Ephorus.

Further five stratagems of those pertaining to Timotheus show his great competence in economic and financial field, dealing with particular solutions to situations of money shortage during some military campaigns. Of these stratagems on the occasion of the shipments to Corcyra or Samos or Amphipolis, we have meaningful echoes also in the second book of the pseudo-aristotelian Oeconomica (chapter 23 = 1350a), where already Lellia Cracco Ruggini more than forty years ago has showed Ephorus’ presence, as a source of section 1-30.

---

22 Cf. §§ 4, 12 and 17 (where there is the name of the locality), 6 and 16 (where the episode can be identified, although no explicit reference). In particular § 12 reveals a very good source, that could be Ephorus according to Melber 1885: 573.
23 Cf. Xenoph. Hell. 5. 4. 65-66.
24 Cf. Diod. 15. 36. 5.
25 Cf. §§ 1 and 14 (for the campaign against Perdiccas), 5 and 10 (for the campaign to Samos), 11 (perhaps to Corcyra).
The fact that there are many differences between Polyaeus’ tradition and the author of the Oeconomica is a confirmation of the fact that this cannot be the direct source on which Polyaeus relied, whereas a common source could be Ephorus, then revised by both heirs.

In one of these stratagems (3. 10. 5), moreover, we find a very interesting notation: telling the precautions that Timotheus adopted during the siege of a city, not allowing his soldiers to ravage the chorai, Polyaeus reports that by this strategy above all he gained goodwill from the enemies:

When Timotheus invested a city, he set apart a place where his soldiers would go to forage. The rest of the country side and whatever was useful in it, he sold. Nor he did permit the soldiers to raze houses or dwellings, or even to cut down cultivated trees, but only to take the fruit. His cleverness achieved the following results: if he won, he could impose higher taxes, and if the war dragged on, he would have sufficient provisions and accommodations. And what is still more important, he sought goodwill from the enemy.

(Polyen. Stat. 3. 10. 5)

Goodwill, in Greek euōnia: such ability does not seem to be part of the typical virtues that Polyaeus usually attributes to a good commander, such as for example courage, astuteness, lack of superstition, and so on. On the contrary, this is the distinctive feature that the orator Isocrates attributes to the figure of Timotheus. The strategos is in fact one of his main and preferred students, and the orator shows his affection in the long digression devoted to him in the Antidosis (oration 15. 101-139).

In this speech Isocrates proclaims an apology of his own acts, pretending to defend himself against the charge of corrupting his disciples: as a new Socrates, he tries to prove that his eloquence has always aimed to exhort the Athenians to great enterprises, as Timotheus’ example can confirm. Thus he covers the whole career of the strategos, evidencing many benefits that he procured to his

---

27 See e.g. 1. 32. 2; 41. 1; 2. 3. 8, etc. There are more or less ten other occurrences of the word euōnia in Polyaeus, not only towards enemies, but above all towards subordinates, q.v. 1. 30. 3; 4. 3. 1; 5. 11. 1; 14. 1; 7. 23. 2; 8. 23. 23; 23. 28; 23. 31; 29. 1.

28 See e.g. Isocr. Antid. 101-139; Ps. Dem. Emt. 46; Schol. ad Aesch. Citrph. 243 (530 b Dilt); Ps. Plut. V. L. X. unit. 837 C; 838 D; Cic. De or. 3. 139; I examined this relationship in Bianco 2007: 61 ff.
native land; among these merits, above all he managed to gain the goodwill of the other Greeks.

About the “political importance of creating goodwill” already Jacqueline de Romilly has pointed her attention,29 but I would like to underline now another interesting aspect for polyaeic scholars, namely that the orator calls this *eunoia* a *stratēgêma*. These are in fact Isocrates’ words:

> ἡπιστατέο γὰρ τοῖς τα δεδομένα ἃτις μέσον δι' οὗ ἢν τὸν τούτο παράπληθος υπηχύνωσι, τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ μὲν τὴν φιλιάν τῆς τῶν ἄλλων εὐθαμονεστήσατο καὶ μεγάτην γενόμενην, διὰ δὲ τὸ μόνον μορφῶν ἀποικισάμενα τῷ μή τοις ἐσχάτας συμφοράς περιστερακοῦν. ἢν ἐνθομάζομεν τῇ μὲν δυνάμει τῇ τῆς πόλεως τοὺς πολλοὺς καταπράξεω, τῇ δ' ἢ μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τὴν εὐνοίαν τῆς τῶν ἄλλων προσέχητο, νομίζων τούτῳ στρατήγημα μείζον εἶναι καὶ κάλλιον ἢ πολλὰς πόλεις ἔλειν καὶ πολλάς νοσήσαι μυχόμενον… ἢ δὲ τόχοι καθορμισθέσις πρὸς τὴν χάριν, οὐκ ἂν ἐξήκας τοῖς συμπάθεσις ἠμαζόμεν καὶ κλάαται καὶ πορθηθὲ τὰς οἰκίας, ἀλλὰ τοσοοίνοι εἰθὲν ἐπιμελέσαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδὲν γενέσθαι τοιοῦτον, οὐχὶ τις δὲν εἰσπίσται τῶν χρημάτων.

(Timotheus) made it the object of his thought and of his actions to see to it that no one of the cities of Hellas should be afraid of him, but that all should feel secure accepting those which did wrong; for he realized that men who are afraid hate those who inspire this feeling in them and that it was due to the friendship of the other cities that Athens rose to great power and prosperity, just as it was due to their hatred that she barely escaped the most disastrous fate. Bearing in mind these facts, he used the power of Athens in order to subdue her enemies, and the force of his own character in order to win the good will of the rest of the world, believing that this is a greater and nobler kind of generalship than to conquer many cities in battle.

… And if he happened to harbor his fleet in any place he would never permit his soldiers to plunder and pillage and sack the people’s houses, but took as great precautions to prevent such an occurrence, as the owners would take to guard their own possessions.

(Isocrates 15. 122 ff.)30

Here the concurrences between Isocrates’ and Polyaeus’ texts are fascinating, but it is not necessary to assume a direct relationship; we can in fact suppose again a mediation of Ephorus, since we find this same characterization of Timotheus also in Diodorus, who moreover reveals a marked interest for the word *eunoia*, that recurs 173 times in his work.

Whereas in fact Xenophon usually puts the accent on a rather hard interpretation of Timotheus’ acts, as a definitely imperialist *strategos* (for example, about Corcyra he supports that the island was submitted),31 Diodorus prefers to

---


30 From the Loeb translation by G. Norlin (1962).

insist on his diplomatic activity\textsuperscript{32} and he follows the whole course of his political and military career with great attention and favour.

The positive attitude that Diodorus reveals everywhere in his work towards Timotheus could be the sign of a deep influence of the Isocratean tradition, passed on mainly through the mediation of Ephorus, who probably gathered the great favour of the teacher towards his beloved disciple.

Although, in the last years, the Ephorus-Isocrates connection has been discussed,\textsuperscript{33} I think that the existence of many ancient occurrences and many echoes and similarities, that can be perceived in following sources, proves nothing but a strong relationship between the two intellectuals of the fourth century. Of course, this tie must not be overdone, supposing a too binding discipleship, but certainly there must have been a great influence of the orator, that through the historian survived in the course of time, until Polyaenus too.

Coming back now to the triad of the Athenian \textit{strategoi}, I would like to say something also about Iphicrates, the general to whom Polyaenus confers great attention, since he attributes to him 63 stratagems, the highest number for a single figure in his whole work.

Neither Alexander, nor Caesar deserved the same space in Polyaenus’ \textit{Stratagems}, nor we can find anything similar about Iphicrates in other sources survived,\textsuperscript{34} and Polyaenus’ evidence, that on the whole seems well grounded on this subject, is worth being upvalued.

For example, it is due to Polyaenus if the development of the Athenian operations in the Straits during the Corinthian war in 387 can be clarified: from Xenophon’s \textit{Hellenica} (5. 1. 25 ff.), we know that Iphicrates was in Abydus, in order to block the Spartan fleet, when the enemies passed in advantageous position thanks to Antalcidas’ arrival, who, pretending to be called in aid of

\textsuperscript{32} See for example 15. 36. 5-6, where under the year 376/375 Diodorus tells that Timotheus “sailed to Cephalenia, won over the cities there, and likewise persuaded the cities of Acarnania to come over to Athens. After he had made a friend of Alcetas, king of the Molossians, and, speaking generally, had won over the areas belonging to the cities of those regions, he defeated the Lacedaemonians in a naval battle off Leucades. All this he accomplished quickly and easily, not only persuading men by his eloquence, but also winning battles by courage and good generalship. Consequently he won great acclaim, not only among his own fellow citizens but also among the Greeks at large. Thus stood the fortunes of Timotheus” (from the Loch translation by Sherman 1952).

\textsuperscript{33} On the contrary they were well attested in ancient times, see e.g. Ps. Plut. \textit{V/lt. X} \textit{orat.} 839 A; Suda \textit{s. v. Θεοπόμπος}; Phot. \textit{Biblioth.} 121 a 23-24. Cf. Barber 1935: 75 ff. Against this discipleship, see e.g. Vattuone 1998: 183-198; Parmeggiani 1999: 107-125 and at last Parmeggiani \textit{forthcoming}, with bibliography.

\textsuperscript{34} Even in Frontinus, anyway, Iphicrates is described as the most important Athenian \textit{strategos}, cf. Schettino 1998: 215.
Calchedon, on the contrary waited in ambush and succeeded in removing the Athenians from the area and even destroying a group of eight ships. But in Xenophon we lack a key point in order to understand the situation, because Iphicrates seems stationary in Abydus and he is not mentioned among the tricked strategoi who set off in pursuit of Antalcidas; moreover, the reason of the false intervention of the Spartans in aid of Calchedon is not clear.

All is clarified if we consider a neglected stratagem of Polyaeus (2. 24), who tells us that Iphicrates had left Abydus in order to besiege Calchedon and that the other strategoi, when they knew that the Spartans were going there, moved in order to give him aid and they had been tricked and attacked by the enemies. Only thus the events are clear and they take sense.

This is only an example, but in general we can assert that, even if in Xenophon too Iphicrates deserves attention and gratifying judgments (e.g. 6. 2. 32 and 39), seldom the accounts coincide with Polyaeus. Greater echoes are found, instead, in Diodorus again, who should always be read in parallel with Polyaeus.36

We can choose for example the account of the Persian campaign to Egypt to which Iphicrates took part as a mercenaries’ commander. The preparations of this shipment were long, since, according to Diodorus’ chronology (15. 41-43), Iphicrates was summoned in 377, three years before the actual departure in command of twenty thousand Greek mercenaries. In this long wait, we can find the beginning of those frictions with the Persian commander Pharnabazus, that carried to the successive failure of the campaign. In this context, it is useful to insert the events told by Polyaeus with accuracy in paragraphs 63 (which is about some clashes occurred in Phoenicia) and 56 and 59, that describe the attempts of insubordination of the mercenary soldiers, due to the lack of misthos.

The economical issues remind of Timotheus and we have seen that those stratagems could be connected to Ephorus, therefore it cannot be excluded that this could be a similar case. Anyway, if we remember to read Diodorus in parallel, we can integrate the various traditions with precious details; we can also better understand Polyaeus, avoiding for example the temptation to correct him. This has occurred for example in 3. 9. 56, where the expression ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ sometimes became ἐν Θρᾴκῃ, when the problem in hand is not at all the campaign in Thrace, but the less renowned zone of gathering in Phoenicia attested by Diodorus 15. 41.

36 Also Schettino has pointed out the consonance between Iphicrates’ portrait both in Polyaenus and Diodorus (1998: 174).
The last interesting event that I want to examine is the conclusive episode of the Social war, that saw Athens engaged to put down the rebellion of some allies between 357 and 355.\(^{37}\) In this war all the best men of Athens were called to arms: Chabrias (who died during one of the first battles, near Chius), Iphicrates, Timotheus and Chares.

After several clashes without particular results, at last a crucial moment arrived, about which Polyaenus gives us precious information (3. 9. 29); he is in fact the only one who reports the name, considered correct, of the locality near which the opposed fleets met, that is Embata, whereas Diodorus spoke more generically about Hellespont.\(^{38}\) The place of Embata could in fact correspond to τὸ Ἐμβατον, already present in Thucydides 3. 29. 2, where it indicates a strait near Erythrae; here Polyaenus reports the plural form, that in its general meaning of straits could have mislead Diodorus, who thought of the more famous straits of Hellespont.

Diodorus, in short, seems to use more superficially his source, misinterpreting it and preferring to give a more famous indication, whereas this precision of Polyaenus could be interpreted as a sign of a careful respect of his source, which is rich of details and precise. So, it is fascinating to suggest that it could always be Ephorus.

Anyway, in this place Chares intended to engage with the enemy, whereas Iphicrates and Timotheus, because of the adverse weather conditions for a seastorm, advised against the battle. It is not clear then what happened exactly, because only Nepos says that Chares nevertheless decided for the battle and lost many ships,\(^{39}\) whereas neither Diodorus, nor Polyaenus tell an actual clash.

---

\(^{37}\) Cf. Diod. 16. 21. 1; Nep. Tim. 3. This war has roused many problems of chronology, see e.g. Sealey 1955: 111-116; Cawkwell 1962: 34-49; Buckler 2003: 379 ff.

\(^{38}\) Nepos, on the contrary, gave another information, talking about Samos: Tim. 3. 3.

\(^{39}\) Nep. Tim. 3. 3-4: “When they had set out for Samos and Chares, having heard of their approach, was also proceeding thither with his force, lest anything should appear to be done in his absence, it happened that, as they drew near the island, a great storm arose, which the two veteran commanders, thinking it expedient to avoid, checked the progress of their fleet. But Chares, taking a rash course, would not submit to the advice of his elders, but, as if success depended on his own vessel, pushed his way for the point to which he had been steering, and sent orders to Timotheus and Iphicrates to follow him thither. But having subsequently mismanaged the affair, and lost several ships, he returned to the same place from which he had come, and despatched a letter to the government at Athens, saying that it would have been easy for him to take Samos, if he had not been left unsupported by Timotheus and Iphicrates. On this charge they were impeached.”
Polyaenus’ stratagem, in fact, reports:

‘... reports: Diodorus...
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And this is the account of Diodorus:

τοῦ δὲ Χάρητος παρὰ φύσιν βουλομένου ναυμαχεῖν καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἰορκάτην καὶ Τιμόθεον οικείους διὰ τὸ μέγαθος τοῦ κόσμου οὐ μὲν Χάρης ἐπίμαχοράς τοὺς στρατευότας δειδάλη τοὺς συνάρχοντας ὡς προδότας καὶ πρὸς τὸν δήμον ἐγέρσα περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς ἐγκαταλειπτοῦν ἐκκοιμεῖς τὴν ναυμαχίαν, οὐ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι παριπαθήνει τις καὶ κρίνει τῷ Ἰορκάτη καὶ Τιμόθεῳ πριγνόντες ἐξημείσαν αὐτοὺς πολλὰς ταλαντάς καὶ τῆς στρατηγῆς ἀπέστησαν.

But just at the time when the naval battle was about to take place a great wind fell upon them and thwarted their plans. When Chares, however, though the elements were against him, wished to fight, but Iphicrates and Timotheus opposed on account of heavy sea, Chares, calling up his soldiers to bear him witness, accused his colleagues of treason and wrote to the assembly about them, charging that they had purposely shirked the sea-fight. And the Athenians were so incensed that they indicted Iphicrates and Timotheus, fined them many talents and removed them from the generalship.

(Diodorus 16. 21. 4)⁴⁰

So, these two accounts are again very revealing and have many points of con-
tact, attesting that there was no battle. Nevertheless, since later on Chares,

through Aristophon, impeached the other stratēgos for treason, many scholars

believed to the version of Nepos,⁴¹ interpreting this charge as an attempt to

prevent a possible charge of incompetence and rashness after a defeat, but I
believe that the version of Polyaeus (confirmed also by Diodorus) should be

preferred.

⁴⁰ From the Loeb translation by Sherman 1952.
Only if the Athenians did not engage in battle, it becomes more understandable why Chares, forced to give up a clash that he considered conclusive, accused his colleagues and he even won. Athenian demos could be prone to believe to a lacked victory, less to an evident defeat. As to this trial, it is interesting to highlight the inexplicable result: in fact, although Diodorus says that all the strategoi were found guilty, we know from many other sources that only Timotheus was sentenced, whereas Iphicrates and his son Menestheus were acquitted, as Polyaeus attests too.

On the contrary, the responsibility had to be shared, as Isocrates rightly points out, when in his Antidosis he asks how such disparity of treatment could have happened (15. 130).

Only Polyaeus tries to explain such acquittal (and not only in 3. 9. 29, but also in 15), supporting the hypothesis that it was extorted out of the judges through the fear aroused by the strategos himself and a group of his young hetaira, who encircled the court, showing hidden daggers. This interpretation is often considered not reliable and I do not want to support it at all costs, but certainly something inexplicable must have happened during this trial and this could also be a possible hypothesis.

It is important to underline also that only Diodorus reports a verdict less unfavorable for Timotheus, since he joins all the strategoi in the same fine. On the contrary, both Polyaeus and above all Isocrates clearly distinguish their destiny and they seem much more reliable; but it’s difficult to say whether this account is a Diodorus’ mistake or whether it can be traced back to his source.

As we said, the positive attitude of Diodorus towards Timotheus is even too evident and this is not the only case where the historian invents a favorable solution for the strategos. Nearly shameless is in fact the description of the shipment that the Athenians voted in aid of Corcyra in 374/373 under Timotheus’ orders (15. 47. 2-3). After the delays before leaving, that caused the dismissal of the strategos, then Diodorus pretends that he was reinstated in his post and that he left with Iphicrates; so it’s clear that he wanted to save him from the shame of the dismissal, but, since he couldn’t hide it, at least he tried to mitigate it, pretending that the demos repented of this decision.

In particular see Isocr. Antid. 129, but also Nepos (Tim. 3. 5): “The people, violent, suspicious, fickle, and unfavourable to them, called them home; and they were brought to trial for treason. On this charge Timotheus was found guilty, and his fine was fixed at a hundred talents; when, compelled by the hatred of an ungrateful people, he sought a refuge at Chalcis”. About Nepos and Timotheus, cf. Bianco 2007: 113-120.

The existence of an Iphicrates’ hetaira is considered unlikely by Longo Pecorella 1971: 64-66. Many are the problems roused by this process, above all from the chronological point of view, which I have already studied in Bianco 2007: 55 ff. (with bibliography).
This account is in striking contrast with all the other sources, that absolutely exclude his reinstatement: suffice it to read Xenophon, or the author of the 49th oration of the corpus Demosthenicum § 9 of the Against Timotheus for debts, probably Apollodorus, who generally speaking reveals strong bitterness, but also great precision in historical details), or even Polyaeus, who remembers a stratagem during this campaign in Corecyra where the only protagonist is Iphicrates (3. 9. 55).

This error of substance is probably due to the influence of the tie Timotheus-Isocrates-Ephorus-Diodorus, but I think that it could have been exasperated by Diodorus himself. It seems difficult, in fact, to believe that the contemporary Ephorus could falsify in such a glaring manner recent events, that many people could still remember. Moreover, we have seen that Polyaeus didn’t follow this tradition, but the Isocratean, and this could also be the true Ephorean.

The last trial against Timotheus at the time of the Social war, finally, has also another important implication in the study of traditions, because, as I tried to prove previously, this could be the reason of the damnatio memoriae that hit the strategos Chares, after his charge against Timotheus.

From the orations De pace and Antidosis, in fact, Isocrates gave the way to the tradition that not only introduced favorably his disciple Timotheus, but continuously found a negative contrast in the strategos Chares. This same tradition, that opposed these two strategoi like white and black, has many echoes in the following centuries and again, it can be assumed, mainly by means of Ephorus.

Perhaps even Polyaeus acknowledges this, since his attention for Chares appears very scant: in fact, in chapter 13 of the third book, he devotes only three stratagems to him, that remember a campaign in Thrace perhaps connected to the operations in the Hellespont at the end of the '50s, told by Diodorus too (16. 34), but actually not so important for his career.

---

44 This receives confirmation also from the rasurae of the title strategus beside the name of Timotheus in the tabula curatorum navalium of the years 374/373 and 373/372: IG II² 1606, ll. 12, 25, 30, 70, 75, 87, IG II² 1607, l. 20; cf. Bianco 2007: 30 n. 95.
45 Xenoph. Hell. 6. 2. 13-14; 27-32.
46 The only result of this campaign, arrived too late to Corecyra, is in fact a clash against some ships sent by Dionysius of Sicily that were captured: Xenoph. Hell. 6. 2. 34-36; Diod. 15. 47. 7; Polyae. 3. 9. 55. There are also some links of this tradition with the Ephorean fragment 211, that I analyzed in a forthcoming paper on Ephorus.
47 Cf. Isocr. De pac. 50-55; Antid. 115 ff., see also Aristot. Rhet. 1418 a 32. A comment in Moysey 1987: 81-86.
48 See e.g. Aesch. De falsa leg. 70-73; Polyb. 9. 23. 6; Diod. 15. 95. 3; Nep. Chabr. 3. 4; Plut. Phil. 14. 4; Mor. 187 B-C, 188 B.
On the contrary, he was one of the protagonists of the inner and foreign Athenian politics in many years of activity, on a par with the other great stratēgoi. We can in fact assume that Chares held the strategy in at least half of the years comprised between 367/6 and 324/3, nevertheless, in most sources as well as in Polyaeus (and in modern scholars too), he seems to suffer from an obscuring, that begins just with Isocrates, because of the trial that provoked the political end and even the death of his beloved disciple Timotheus.

These are only some interesting examples, but many others points of contact between Ephoros and Polyaeus could be found. Some guide-lines can still be pointed out in conclusion: Polyaeus' third book reveals many signs of an accurate and detailed source on the history of the fourth century BC, with an athenocentric perspective, that often supplies interesting, precious and correct information. Such is mostly the consideration that Ephorus' work arouses.

The tradition that emerges about these stratēgoi confirms the existence of many points of contact with Diodorus and vice versa many divergences with Xenophon, which again carries to Ephorus. Praises for good men and blames for wicked and the belief that the example of the excellent men of the past pushed young people to aspire with greater ardor to the virtue were Isocratean topics (Eing. 5), perfectly coherent with Diodorus' attitude towards the men of the past. And this attitude probably reached Diodorus via Ephorus, as well as Polyaeus can have inherited it, but it's worth seeing it in the right perspective, since we can't find a specific research on the moral characteristics of these personalities. Moreover, an eminently political and military approach, concentrated on the battles lead by the

50 Cf. my analysis in Bianco 2002: 1-28; the most explicit attempt of rehabilitation of Chares' memory has been made by Parker 1986.
51 Among many negative criticisms see Moysey 1984-1985: 221-227; Salmond 1996: 43-53.
52 Already Melber 1885: 583. Obviously, this doesn't exclude the parallel presence of other historical sources, such as Theopompus, cf. Schettino 1998: 173 ff.; 221 for the athenocentric perspective of Ephorus (see also Barber 1935: 185 ff).
53 Already Barber 1935: 138 ff.; and now see the forthcoming proceedings of the Ephorean congress of Salerno.
55 See also Piccirilli 2000: 114.
56 It is important, however, to underline that in these fragments we have no moralistic judgments: it could be a coincidence, but here we don't find any ethical interest. This could go in the direction that many modern scholars are taking, when they assume that we must distinguish Diodorean moralism from the Ephorean. Ephorus is not simply Diodorus, as in the outdated interpretation of Laqueur 1911: 161-206, 321-354, sp. 343. See e.g. Sacks 1990: 5 ff.; Sacks 1994: 213-232; Pownall 2004: 113 ff.
strategoi, is always coherent with what we can actually find in the survived fragments of Ephorus’ history.

Although not only Ephorus, but many other historians, such as Theopompus, can be traced back in Polyaeus’ work, it seems interesting to underline such points of contact between these two authors, that help us, everyone in his own way, to reconstruct some details of the past, otherwise lost.
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