

## THE DATE OF THE UNION OF CORINTH AND ARGOS

In 1950<sup>1</sup> G. T. Griffith proposed a solution of the problems surrounding the unification of Corinth and Argos during the Corinthian War which has continued to command a good deal of support.<sup>2</sup> His thesis was that the unification happened in two stages: (i) the establishment of *isopoliteia* between Corinth and Argos in 392 (following the Corinthian stasis of c. March 392);<sup>3</sup> (ii) complete unification some time in 390/389, by which Corinth was swallowed up in an enlarged Argos. This thesis involves the suppositions that Xenophon was on the whole mistaken about the matter; that the real truth emerges from Andocides iii (which yields a *terminus post quem* of 392/391 for complete unification) and Diodorus 14. 92. 1 (who puts the unification shortly before Iphicrates' removal from Corinth – therefore, at the earliest, after the campaigning season of 390: Xen. *Hell.* 4. 5. 11 f., 19; Diod. 14. 91. 2–3); and that, despite Xenophon's generally erroneous treatment of the affair, his remarks about Iphicrates' removal (4. 8. 34) afford some confirmation of a late date (so he was not only mistaken but self-contradictory as well), while his account of the unification at 4. 4. 6 provides hints in favour of the thesis of an intermediate period of *isopoliteia*. Griffith's hypothesis is certainly neat. But doubts supervene. I propose to argue the view that Xenophon gives the correct answer to the question of when the union occurred and that any errors involved in the matter are in the interpretation of Andocides and in Diodorus.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Historia* 1 (1950), 236–56, esp. pp. 242–50.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. T. T. B. Ryder, *Koine Eirene* (Oxford, 1965), p. 26; N. G. L. Hammond, *History of Greece*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1967), p. 460; R. Sealey, *History of the Greek City-States c. 700–338 B.C.* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1976), p. 397; C. D. Hamilton, *Sparta's Bitter Victories* (Cornell, 1979), pp. 268 ff. R. J. Seager, *JHS* 87 (1967), 104 n. 87, G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London, 1972), p. 161 n. 189 imply acceptance. R. A. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid* (London, 1972), pp. 130 ff., hesitates a bit about the date, but eventually accepts a two-part process, though he explains the first part not in terms of *isopoliteia* but as analogous to the fifth-century arrangements between Argos, Tylissos and Knossos (Meiggs-Lewis no. 42). For dissenters, see n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Date based on the reference to the Eukleia (Xen. *Hell.* 4. 4. 2), which is generally thought to have fallen in c. March (Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* 3<sup>2</sup> (Berlin/Leipzig, 1922), ii. 219; Jessen, *RE*, vi. 996 f.; Judeich, *Philol.* 81 (1926), 144 n. 4). All references to Xenophon are to *Hellenica*.

<sup>4</sup> Xenophon's context for the unification was commonly accepted in the older books: e.g. G. Grote, *History of Greece* (London, 1872), p. 499; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* 5 (Stuttgart/Berlin, 1921), §863; Beloch, op. cit. (n. 3), i. 79; ii. 219; M. Cary, *CAH* (Cambridge, 1927), vi. 48; G. Glotz, R. Cohen, *Histoire Grecque* (Paris, 1936) iii. 88; J. B. Bury, *History of Greece*<sup>3</sup> (London, 1951), p. 546. (P. Treves, *RFIC* n.s. 15 (1937), 125, speaks of a partial synoecism of Corinth and Argos in spring 392; this however is not an anticipation of Griffith – Treves has no second, less partial stage – but merely a way of expressing his view of the nature of the union. I am not sure I understand his remarks about Andoc. iii. 27.) Since 1950 Xenophon's context for unification has been accepted by D. Kagan, *Hist.* 11 (1962), 453 f. (with no mention of Griffith's article, although the same author knows of it in *Par. di Pass.* 16 (1961), 337 n. 38); H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte*<sup>2</sup> (Munich, 1960), p. 260 (with no argument and a bare ref. to Griffith's article); S. Accame, *Ricerche intorno alla guerra corinzia* (Naples, 1951), pp. 107 f. (with only brief counter-arguments and leaving Andocides iii out of account); N. di Gioia, *Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia Antica* (Milan, 1974), ii. 36 f. S. Perlman, *CQ* n.s. 14 (1964), 69 n. 5, also appears to doubt Griffith's reconstruction but merely refers to Accame's arguments.

## A. XENOPHON

The relevant passages are 4. 4. 6, 4. 5. 1, 4. 8. 13, 15, 4. 8. 34, 5. 1. 34, and I shall deal with them in turn.

1. 4. 4. 6. Xenophon describes the reactions of the oligarchic/pro-Spartan party after the stasis of March 392 and the subsequent amnesty. The amnestied oligarchs see that (a) the *polis* is being destroyed by the removal of boundary stones; (b) Corinth is being called 'Argos'; (c) they are compelled to share in Argive citizenship, while having less power in the city (Corinth) than metics. Some of them accordingly decide to attempt to turn their fatherland back into 'Corinth' (cf. (b)) and to make it free, cleansed of the pollution of murder and subject to *eunomia* (the catchword is a clear hint that we are dealing with oligarchs). Two points should be made.

(i) There is no reason whatsoever to regard the contents of (a)–(c) above as merely proposals to be enacted at some future date (at least, it is not obvious that that is what Xenophon's language means).<sup>5</sup> Griffith admits this (243, 246).

(ii) He suggests, however, that *πολιτείας...δυνάμενοι* fits the supposition that what occurred in 392 was the establishment of *isopoliteia*. But it is just as suitable to the context in which Xenophon is apparently putting it, the merging of Corinth into Argos. The comment about metics, in particular, fits either situation. For Griffith (247) it is the comment of native Corinthian oligarchs who are politically swamped by democratic Argive 'comers-in' ('metics' to the oligarchic group). But if what had happened, or was in the process of happening (but cf. n. 5), was complete unification, the 'Corinthian' oligarchs (as they continued to think of themselves as being) would be (a) politically powerless, (b) foreigners ('Corinthians') residing in what was to them a foreign state ('Argos') and (c) lacking even metic privileges (their view of the matter is, of course, highly biased and contemptuous). Alternatively, we can, like Griffith, think that the *metoikoi* are new 'Argives' (mere foreigners in a state that the oligarchs continue to think of as 'Corinth') and regard the oligarchs as simply making the point that they are outnumbered. In any case, nothing *requires* the hypothesis that *isopoliteia* is involved.

*Infine*: there is no cause to doubt that Xenophon is simply saying that the unification of the two states was at least in process and probably completed not long after March 392; nothing more and nothing less.

2. 4. 5. 1: *the Isthmia of summer 390*. οἱ Ἀργεῖοι αὐτοῦ ἐτύγγανον τότε ποιοῦντες τὴν θυρίαν τῷ Ποσειδῶνι ὥς Ἀργους τῆς Κορίνθου ὄντος. The terminology is parallel to that of 4. 4. 6: Corinth is Argos. (The circumstance that this point is made in a ὥς + participle clause is no comfort to the view that the real situation was something less than full union, e.g. *isopoliteia*).<sup>6</sup> Griffith (pp. 246–7) observes that Xenophon

<sup>5</sup> At best he is describing a process of change actually going on at the time; but even that reading is not entirely satisfactory. The removal of all boundary stones might be a process occupying some (though hardly much) time; but the naming of Corinth 'Argos' is not – you either do it or you do not. That is, unless Xen. is synchronizing the oligarchs' observations with the precise moment of the assembly-meeting at which the Corinthians decided on union and the alteration of name, he is describing a completed process.

<sup>6</sup> ὥς + pres. (or past) part. can express, not a true state of affairs, but a clearly explicable pretence by the main verb agent (cf. 1. 7. 8, 2. 1. 5, 4. 3. 14, 5. 3. 5, 1. 25, 4. 3. 6, 2. 27, 4. 31. 35, 7. 5. 20). But in the present case there is no manifest reason why the Argives should decide to pretend that Corinth is Argos if that is not the case ('in order to celebrate the Isthmia' does not answer the question). It is more natural to take ὥς...ὄντος to cast no doubt on the proposition that 'Corinth is Argos' or at least on the Argives' belief in that proposition (I count 37 relevant examples in *Hell.*); and in the latter case the non-Argive opinion need only be that the enforced union did not 'count' (not that e.g. *isopoliteia* did not make Corinth Argos).

cannot have conjured the events of 4. 5. 1 *ex nihilo*. Indeed not (and Diod. 14. 86. 5 confirms the existence of a quarrel about the Isthmia, though not, unfortunately, the precise nature of that quarrel).<sup>7</sup> But, that admitted, we must also admit that what Xenophon says at 4. 5. 1 is entirely consistent with what he says at 4. 4. 6 and that the two stand (or fall) together.

3. 4. 8. 13, 15: *the Peace Conference at Sardis* (I follow the view that this is datable to 393/2). Xenophon says two things: (a) there were ambassadors from Corinth and from Argos; (b) the Argives did not like the autonomy clause. οἱ τ' Ἀργεῖοι, οὐδ' ἐπεθύμουν, οὐκ ἐνόμιζον ἂν τὴν Κόρινθον δύνασθαι ὡς Ἄργος ἔχειν τοιαύτων συνθηκῶν καὶ σπονδῶν γενομένων (15). (b) is perhaps ambiguous. The desideratum Κόρινθον ὡς Ἄργος ἔχειν *might* still be in the future and expected to be incapable of fulfilment if the peace is made. But equally, and I suspect more probably, it could be that the holding of Corinth as 'Argos' is already going on and that the Argives' fear is that they will not be allowed to continue to hold it.<sup>8</sup> (a) does not rule out this second interpretation, since Xenophon speaks of 'Corinthians' after the unification-context of 4. 4. 6 (cf. 4. 4. 9, 13; 4. 5. 3, 11, 13) and indeed even after the date at which Griffith thinks unification occurred (5. 1. 34).<sup>9</sup> It is, I suppose, at least possible that Xenophon did not remember very clearly whether the Sardis conference preceded or followed the events of 4. 4. 1 ff., but in any event we are not entitled to *assume* that the conference followed those events<sup>10</sup> and that Xenophon's description in 4. 8. 13, 15 indicates that unification actually came later than that conference; for although 4. 8. 13, 15 *might* be taken as showing that unification had not yet happened (adopting the first interpretation of (b)) the date of the conference is quite open.

4. 4. 8. 34. This passage, which refers in the same breath to the removal of Iphicrates and the Argives 'making Corinth Argos', was regarded by Griffith as confirming Diod. 14. 92. 1 f. (cf. Section C below) and indicating that the true date of unification was after the campaigning season of 390 B.C. Since Xenophon's terminology here (τὴν Κόρινθον Ἄργος ἐπεποίητο) is not discernibly different from that used/implied in 4. 4. 6, 4. 5. 1, this would mean that Xenophon had contradicted himself. Now 4. 8. 34 is certainly somewhat tricky to understand, with its two consecutive γὰρ and apparent shift of interest from Iphicrates' peltasts to Iphicrates himself. But I suggest that the force of the passage can be fairly rendered as follows: 'The explanation of this is that, after the Argives had made Corinth Argos, they said that they had no need of the peltasts, since Iphicrates had killed some of the *argolizantes*. So Iphicrates had gone home to Athens and was there at the time (sc. of the Hellespont expedition).' The cause of Iphicrates' departure was his action in killing some of the *argolizantes*, not the fact of Argive/Corinthian union, which is only a general *terminus post quem*, reference to which, moreover, has a substantive point: for it explains why the *Argives* were able to have Iphicrates removed for killing *argolizantes*.<sup>11</sup> The expression of thought may

<sup>7</sup> I see nothing much in favour of Accame's view (op. cit. (n. 4) 106) that the Isthmia of Diod. loc. cit. is the one of 392 (and I do not know how he reconciles it with his view that the capture of Lechaemum occurred in c. August 392, i.e. after the Isthmia).

<sup>8</sup> I note that Griffith, 243 n. 28, admits that 4. 8. 15 'if other evidence were lacking, might well suggest that the Argives had already got possession of Corinth at this date'.

<sup>9</sup> It is hardly surprising that this should be so; after all, his prejudices on the matter of the union would be akin to those of the Corinthian oligarchs – and one might wonder how easy even an impartial outside observer would have found it to start thinking of e.g. Timolaus as 'T. the Argive' instead of 'T. the Corinthian'.

<sup>10</sup> As Griffith does (243).

<sup>11</sup> If Xenophon had wished to say that the expulsion followed closely on unification, one might have expected ἐποίησαν rather than ἐπεποίητο.

be a little clumsy and misleading (but see below A 5 *sub fin.*), but I do not think that Xenophon is unwittingly revealing that he sometimes knew the truth about the unification-date to be different from what he had written in 4. 4. 6, 4. 5. 1.

5. 5. 1. 34: *the termination of union as a result of the King's Peace*. Curiously Xenophon is less explicit here than previously about the fact of unification. He speaks of the Argive garrison in Corinth (which, of course, *per se* carries no constitutional implications), and his description of the upshot (καὶ αὐτὴ ἐφ' αὐτῆς ἡ τῶν Κορινθίων πόλις ἐγένετο) might, in isolation, be taken as referring to the restoration of autonomy by virtue of the garrison's removal, with no further implications.<sup>12</sup> It is, I suppose, barely possible that the situation was that the Argives and 'Corinthians' had sworn to the peace terms (it is only Thebes that is explicitly mentioned as not doing so), so that theoretically the union had been terminated with the recognition of the re-establishment of the political unit 'Corinth', and that the retention of an Argive garrison was the only outstanding issue. In that case Xenophon would be using the slightly unusual formula αὐτὴ ἐφ' αὐτῆς to indicate that with the removal of the garrison Corinth really and finally became 'by herself', autonomous not only in having her own *nomoi* but also in being, as we should say, independent. However, it seems more probable that the unusual formula refers to the whole 'event' of de-unification and garrison removal and was chosen just because this event was not quite parallel to, for example, αὐτονόμους ἀφέντες τὰς Βοιωτίας πόλεις just before. In this case Xenophon depends on his reader's recollection of 4. 4. 6, 4. 5. 1 and 4. 8. 34 to enable him to understand what he is talking about (and, incidentally, if he could do that here he could do it in 4. 8. 34 – i.e. he could be expecting his reader to understand that passage in the light of 4. 4. 6 and not to be misled into misdating the union).

6. The overall conclusion to be drawn about Xenophon is simply this, that he has one consistent view on the date at which unification occurred, that that view is different from Griffith's and that it cannot give any rational comfort to the latter. If Griffith is right about what happened, then Xenophon is quite wrong and that is all there is to it. To put the matter another way: it may or may not be reasonable to believe on grounds outside Xenophon that the unification occurred in 390/389; if it is, then Xenophon should be abandoned and the extra detail that there had been an intermediate era of *isopoliteia* must be marked down as pure hypothesis not justified by anything in Xenophon (or elsewhere) – except to the extent that one might make the supposition that Xenophon's definite error was the result of confusion between union and *isopoliteia*. But one might as well say that Xenophon was misled by Corinthian oligarchic sources who liked to remember the unification-crisis as having happened earlier than it did because this put the treachery of Pasimelus and Alcimenes in a better light.<sup>13</sup>

No doubt the conclusion reached so far is essentially negative, though none the worse for that. If, of course, any reason can be shown for thinking the evidence outside Xenophon unreliable, then our negative conclusion might be transformed into a positive one, namely that Xenophon is right and should take precedence over that outside evidence.

<sup>12</sup> αὐτὴ ἐφ' αὐτῆς simply connotes independence of outside interference (cf. Thuc. 6. 40; Xen. *An.* 2. 4. 10; Pl. *Prt.* 326d. Also Thuc. 2. 63).

<sup>13</sup> Thus G. L. Cawkwell in R. Warner (tr.), *Xenophon: A History of My Times* (Harmondsworth, 1979) 208 n., 209 n.

## B. ANDOCIDES iii

I accept the view that this speech is to be associated with the context of Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 149 and dated to 392/391, after the Spartan capture of Lechaenum (§18) and before the Spartan invasion of the Argolid (§25). If we were to believe that the union of Corinth and Argos occurred in 392 we should not expect to find anything in Andocides iii that presupposed the reverse. Griffith claims that that is just what we do find.

1. First two general points. (i) It is true that Andocides says that the Argives are arguing that Athens should *κοινῇ μετὰ σφῶν καὶ μετὰ Κορινθίων πολεμεῖν* (§27) and that *πάρεσι... Ἀργεῖοι καὶ Κορίνθιοι διδάξοντες ὡς ἄμεινόν ἐστι πολεμεῖν* (§41). But one need not accord these passages any more weight than is due to Xenophon's similar illogical references to 'Corinthians' (see above, A3 and n. 9). I also note that, despite the presence of 'Corinthians', it is the Argives alone who appeal to Athens (§24: *περὶ ὧν ἡμᾶς Ἀργεῖοι προκαλοῦνται*; §27: *τοὺς Ἀργείων λόγους*). There are no separate representations from the Corinthians, and throughout §§24–7 (the passage dealing with matters relating to Corinth/Argos) Corinth is of more interest as a strategic locality than as a political unit. This is consistent with the proposition that unification has occurred. (ii) While it might be true that Andocides nowhere absolutely unequivocally states that Argos has swallowed Corinth up, it is equally true that he does not refer to *isopoliteia* either. There is little comfort for that thesis in the speech. Griffith might retort that the audience knew the background anyway. Indeed so; but if the background was that Argos and Corinth had unified, then that fact too would have been notorious, and one might not be surprised to find that Andocides' references to Corinth and Argos presumed (even, presumed on) knowledge of the fact and were rather elusive. That is, any ambiguities that may emerge might legitimately be decided in favour of consistency with the belief that unification occurred in 392 – or as legitimately as in favour of consistency with the opposite hypothesis.

2. I now turn to the two key passages, §§26 and 27.

(a) §26. Andocides asks what is the purpose of fighting Sparta in support of Argos and replies *ἵνα ἡττώμενοι μὲν καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν χώραν ἀπολέσωμεν πρὸς τῇ Κορινθίων, νικήσαντες δὲ τὴν Κορινθίων Ἀργείων ποιήσωμεν*. Griffith's view presumes this to mean that in the event of Athenian defeat the Spartans will capture Corinth and her territory and invade Attica,<sup>14</sup> while in the event of Athenian victory Argos will annex Corinthian territory. But if Argos and Corinth had already unified, the second part of Andocides' answer could be interpreted by his audience as meaning that Athenian victory over Sparta in support of Argos would have no more result (or, as Andocides maliciously puts it, purpose) than to secure Argive possession of Corinth, i.e. the reinforcement of an existing undesirable *status quo*. The form of words by which the Athenians are said to *make* Corinthian territory Argive is chosen not to suggest that Corinthian territory is not yet Argive but to underline the futility of Athens' continued participation in the war.<sup>15</sup>

(b) §27. *ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πολέμου χρονισθέντος Κόρινθον ἐλεῖν προσδοκῶσι, κρατήσαντες δὲ τούτων ὑφ' ὧν αἰεὶ κρατοῦνται καὶ τοὺς συννικῶντας ἐλπίζουσι παραστήσεσθαι*.<sup>16</sup> This above all is the passage that has been taken to indicate that

<sup>14</sup> For fear of invasion of Attica, cf. Xen. 4. 4. 18 (392/1).

<sup>15</sup> The formal parallel with *ἀπολέσωμεν* (which *does* refer to a hypothetical future event) is largely a rhetorical trick – though, since an Athenian victory would be a decisive future event, confirming an existing *status quo* certainly but by virtue of that confirmation making a decisive new contribution to that *status quo*, it is not *mere* rhetoric.

<sup>16</sup> *παραστήσεσθαι* is Reiske's emendation of the codices' *ἀποστήσεσθαι*. Some word expressing active Argive ingratitude to her allies is clearly what is wanted.

unification did not occur until after 392/391. Things are not however quite as simple as they may at first sight appear.

(i) In the second half of the sentence the words *τούτων...κρατούνται* refer, of course, to the Spartans; Andocides is claiming that in the event of Argive victory over Sparta the Argives will subdue their fellow-victors (i.e. the Athenians, on the assumption that they decide to continue fighting). There is nothing here about Corinth.

(ii) *ἐκ...τοῦ πολέμου χρονισθέντος*. What is the force of this phrase? Theoretically, two answers might be suggested: (a) '(as a result of) a decision to prolong the war' (*χρονίζεσθαι* being used of the act of prolongation consisting in the refusal to make peace), or (b) '(as a result of) the war having lasted a further period of time' (*χρονίζεσθαι* being used in reference to the passage of a period of time at the completion of which something happens). Interpretation (a) yields a neat contrast with *κρατήσαντες κτλ.* (which certainly refers to the termination of the hypothetically prolonged war). On the other hand such parallels for *χρονισθέντος* as come to hand perhaps rather support interpretation (b).<sup>17</sup> These parallels are not formally quite exact, since in Andocides that which is *χρονισθείς* is not the subject of the main verb; so we could perhaps stick to interpretation (a). But even if we do not, we could still understand *ἐκ...χρονισθέντος* to mean '(as a result of) the war's having lasted longer than it would if peace were made now' and still perceive a contrast with the second half of the sentence; the latter would be expressing what the Argives will do by virtue of having beaten the enemy, the first half of the sentence would be expressing what will happen simply because at some future date a state of war still exists. In other words, although *χρονισθέντος* may mean that the event of the main verb occurs after a further period of war, it need not mean that it occurs at the end of the war. This particular version of interpretation (b) could in practice come very close to interpretation (a), to the extent that what the Argives achieve in respect of Corinth has very much more to do with the fact of peace not being made than with the fortunes of war.

(iii) We must now, at last, consider the words *Κόρινθον ἐλεῖν προσδοκῶσι*, from which the conclusion is usually drawn that Argos has not yet got Corinth. (a) In isolation *Κόρινθον ἐλεῖν* ought to refer to the physical acquisition of Corinth by act of war, with or without the assistance of treachery. This, however, is the one thing that it is very difficult for it to mean here, firstly because later on (§32), while describing the choice between support of Argos and support of peace, Andocides refers to the Argives as *Κορινθίων οἱ νῦν ἔχοντες τὴν πόλιν*,<sup>18</sup> and secondly because there is no *logical* (as opposed to contingent) connection between the mere continuation of war (cf. B2(b) (ii)) and a new *acquisition* of Corinth. (b) There is also a linguistic problem. Where *προσδοκᾶν* is not used either absolutely or with an accusative much the most

<sup>17</sup> Aesch. Ag. 727 (*χρονισθείς δ' ἀπέδειξεν ἦθος τὸ πρὸς τοκέων*); Arist. Resp. 475b5 (*διὸ καὶ ἐν τέφρᾳ χρονισθέντα ἀνίσταται*); idem, Mem. 451a30 (*τὸ δὲ μνημονεύειν καθ' αὐτὸ οὐχ ὑπάρχει πρὶν χρονισθῆναι*). For the pres. pass. of *χρονίζειν* cf. Aesch. Sept. 54; Arist. Rh. Al. 1424b7; Eth. Nic. 1167a11; HA 574b11; Pr. 907b22, 927a31; Col. 794b26, 795a12, 797b5, 798a9. *χρονίζεσθαι* never occurs in Attic orators (outside And. 3. 27) or comedians, Xenophon, Thucydides, Herodotus, Euripides, Sophocles, lyric poetry or presocratic philosophy, and *χρονίζειν* only in Hdt. 3. 61. 1, Thuc. 8. 16, Eur. Med. 624, HF 619, 930, IT 1219, fr. 453 Nauck<sup>2</sup>, and a number of times in Aristotle.

<sup>18</sup> I am sure that Andocides is not referring to the *Corinthians*, in whose separate views/actions he shows no interest (cf. B1 (i)). Griffith, p. 243 n. 28, thinks the phrase a disparaging reference to the Corinthian democracy. But although Andocides could afford to be disparaging about Argive possession of Corinth (even though that possession favoured the maintenance of democracy) he would hardly have wished, before an Athenian audience worried about its own democracy (cf. §§1–12), to disparage an independent Corinthian democracy as an interloper.

common Attic construction after it is c. fut. infin. or c. acc. + fut. infin. Less commonly one also finds constructions c. pres. infin.,<sup>19</sup> c. acc. + pres. infin.,<sup>20</sup> c. acc. + aor. infin. + ἄν,<sup>21</sup> c. acc. + pres. infin. + ἄν,<sup>22</sup> and c. acc. + perf. infin.<sup>23</sup> (in many of these examples the sense of *προσδοκᾶν* is more ‘think’, ‘consider’ than ‘expect’). For *προσδοκᾶν* c. aor. infin. without ἄν I find three parallels: Aesch. *Ag.* 675f (*Μενέλεων . . . / πρῶτόν τε καὶ μάλιστα προσδόκα μολεῖν*), Philem. fr. 175 Kock (*ὥς γὰρ πέφευγας* (sc. death) *προσδόκα καὶ μὴ φυγεῖν*) and Isae. 7. 32 (*πῶς ἂν προσεδόκησεν αὐτός . . . τυχεῖν τῶν νομιζομένων ὑπ’ αὐτῶν*).<sup>24</sup> Of these only the third is a prose example, and since there is already an ἄν in the context I am inclined to think that Isaeus regarded it as going with both *προσεδόκησεν* and *τυχεῖν* – so that the example is a ‘sport’ and not truly parallel to Andocides, loc. cit. Since the usage of Aeschylus and Philemon is not *prima facie* the most reliable guide to likely Andocidean usage, one is tempted to think that something is wrong with the transmitted text. Stahl added <ἄν> before *ἐλεῖν* and is followed in this by Albini.<sup>25</sup> There is still no exact parallel for this, since the cases of *προσδοκᾶν* with an infinitive and ἄν in notes 21 and 22 above involve acc. + infin. constructions, and Isaeus loc. cit. has a nomin. + infin. construction (‘how could he expect that *he* would receive *ta nomizomena* from his female cousins when the latter’s *brother* had been badly treated by them?’). But, even if it passes muster formally, is it a plausible reading? In the second half of the sentence under consideration Andocides makes a statement about Argive intentions that is in no way hedged about with qualifications: ‘they hope to subdue their fellow-victors’, not ‘they think they would be able to subdue their fellow-victors’. What one would expect in the first half of the sentence (if Griffith’s view is to be correct) is *αἰρήσειν προσδοκῶσι*. <ἄν> *ἐλεῖν προσδοκῶσι* is not *equivalent* to that, but admits a higher degree of hypothesis in the speculation in question, i.e. ‘they expect that they would capture Corinth (sc. if they tried)’. Why should Andocides allow for the possibility that they might not try when he allows for no such possibility in the second half of the sentence? Accordingly, although the addition of ἄν is palaeographically very easy, I am not convinced that it is the right emendation, if emendation is to be attempted.

If we do not attempt emendation, what sense can be made of the paradoxis? Denniston and Page on *Agamemnon* 676 remark that *προσδόκα μολεῖν* (in that line) ought to mean ‘expect that he *arrived*’ (their italics). That sense can be accommodated in the context, with a slight emendation in the following line. Read: *Μενέλεων . . . | . . . προσδόκα μολεῖν. | εἰ γοῦν (δ’ οὖν, codd.) τις ἀκτὺς ἡλίου νιν ἰστορεῖ | καὶ ζῶντα καὶ βλέποντα . . . | ἐλπὶς τις αὐτόν . . . ᾗξειν* (‘as for Menelaus, regard him first of all and particularly as having arrived. At least, if the sun looks on him alive (which is possible: cf. 671 f.) there is hope that he will come back home’. The messenger is urging maximum optimism).<sup>26</sup> In Philem. loc. cit. the sense will be ‘reckon that you did not really escape (because assuredly you will die some time)’, which is entirely acceptable.<sup>27</sup> Approaching Andocides’ text along these lines we could interpret the orator’s sense

<sup>19</sup> Eur. *Alc.* 1091; Anaxil. fr. 22 Kock (line 29).

<sup>20</sup> Xen. *An.* 6. 1. 16; Dem. *Ep.* 3. 41; Pl. *Pol.* 262d; *Resp.* 376d; *Leg.* 803e; *Soph.* 243c.

<sup>21</sup> Aeschin. 2. 151; Dem. 15. 19; 23. 15; Pl. *Leg.* 625a; *Resp.* 486c; *Cra.* 438e; Xen. *Resp. Lac.* 1. 3; Ar. *Ran.* 556. <sup>22</sup> Dem. 21. 9. <sup>23</sup> Pl. *Prot.* 275a.

<sup>24</sup> In Isoc. 4. 59 (*Εὐρυςθεὺς δὲ βιάσασθαι προσδοκήσας*) it is easy to make the emendation *βιάσασθαι* (Morus; accepted in the Budé Isocrates). Cf. n. 27.

<sup>25</sup> *Andocide: De Pace* (Florence, 1964).

<sup>26</sup> For γοῦν in ‘part proof’, cf. J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1954), pp. 451 f.

<sup>27</sup> If *βιάσασθαι* were retained in Isoc. 4. 59 (cf. n. 24) the sense could be that Eurystheus was so confident (wrongly as it turned out) that he considered that by merely marching out he had already coerced Athens.

as (roughly): 'with the war prolonged the Argives reckon themselves as having (really) taken Corinth', i.e. a past act of annexation holds good so long as war continues (but if peace were made the autonomy clause would put a stop to it). If, on the other hand, we feel disquiet about an Andocidean usage paralleled only in Tragedy and New Comedy and prefer emendation, we might quite easily read ἔχειν for ἐλεῖν: 'with the war prolonged the Argives consider that they have Corinth' or 'expect to go on having Corinth'.

In either event, the acquisition of Corinth is a past not a future event, and there is a neat contrast between the two halves of the sentence: provided peace does not break out the Argives will (a) keep what they already have and (b) (after victory) hope to get more.

3. To sum up: I suggest that Andocides iii, so far from being inconsistent with the proposition that unification had occurred in 392 as Xenophon says it did, may actually support that proposition. I would also make one other point. Griffith's view of the matter seems to attribute to Andocides a high degree of prescience. On that view the Argive union with Corinth did not come until 390/389, two years after the speech. Why did the Argives wait that long if their plans were already so obvious? Conversely, if there was no plan two years in advance, why did Andocides think that Argos would seize Corinth? Would the establishment of *isopoliteia*, for example, be a good enough reason?<sup>28</sup> Of course, one can say that Andocides is flinging accusations around regardless and just happened to hit lucky with one of them. But, in general terms, the supposition that the victorious Argives would mistrust their allies is a more reasonable 'wild' accusation (i.e. one with more precedents) than the suggestion that she would incorporate Corinth (and τὴν Κορινθίων (sc. χώραν) Ἀργείων ποιήσωμεν in §26, not an ordinary sort of phrase to express one state's subjection to another, surely shows that incorporation is what Andocides has in mind). Naturally worry about Andocides' apparent prescience cannot be a decisive point; but it is a worry none the less.

### C. DIODORUS

Here there is just one relevant passage, 14. 92. 1–2. Diodorus relates two events: (a) a full-scale Argive expedition to Corinth leading to the seizure of the acropolis, the securing of the city as Argive property and the rendering of Corinthian territory Argive; (b) Iphicrates' plan to seize the city (πόλιν, Dindorf, χώραν, codd.) and his resignation after opposition from the *demos*.<sup>29</sup> Both events come after the campaigning season of 390 (Diod. 14. 91. 2–3; Xen. 4. 5. 11 f., 19). (a) certainly refers to the act of unification, and as things stand it is certainly dated to 390/389. I make just one comment. If it appeared that there was no other reason to date unification as late as 390/389 (and the arguments of sections A and B amount to the assertion that this is the case), we could explain Diodorus' evidence as deriving from a misunderstanding of a 'flashback' in Ephorus' narrative.<sup>30</sup> That Ephorus engaged in such flashbacks can be perceived from Diodorus' accurate reproduction of them elsewhere; for example, the treatment of events concerning Oreus, Neogenes, Jason and Therippides (? = Herippidas) in 15. 30. 3 f. or the account of Epaminondas' exclusion from the

<sup>28</sup> At first sight this is what Griffith believes (245–6). Yet he also thinks that the Argive seizure of Corinth is explained by Iphicrates' abortive attempt to do the same (p. 245 n. 33). Can he have it both ways? Cf. n. 32.

<sup>29</sup> 'The Athenian people' (Sherman, Loeb Diodorus). But may the *demos* not be the democratic government of Argos–Corinth?

<sup>30</sup> The possibility is considered, somewhat hesitantly, in Tomlinson, op. cit. (n. 2), pp. 132–3.



boeotarchy in 369/368 as a result of his behaviour in the Peloponnese in spring 369 in 15. 71–2 (in neither case do the events in question appear *suo loco* in Diodorus' narrative). Parallels for Diodorus being confused by such things can also, perhaps, be adduced.<sup>31</sup> In the present case events (a) and (b) are thematically linked by the topic of seizure of Corinth and I would have thought it by no means impossible that Ephorus spoke of the unification of 392 *à propos* of Iphicrates' designs on the city and that Diodorus misunderstood.<sup>32</sup>

#### D. SUMMARY

Granted the acceptability of the argument in section B the only clear contradiction in the evidence about the union of Corinth and Argos is that between Xenophon and Diodorus. What I have said about the latter may seem arbitrary and wilful. But I suggest that it is no less arbitrary and wilful to regard Xenophon's account of the matter as utterly wrong or, worse still, almost utterly wrong but with tinges of truth, and that we are quite entitled to give Xenophon, not Diodorus, the benefit of the doubt. I should also have thought that, *a priori*, unification is quite as likely to have occurred against the background of the violent political disturbances of c. March 392 as against that of the destruction of the Spartan *mora* and Iphicrates' successes elsewhere in 390.<sup>33</sup>

University of Liverpool

CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

<sup>31</sup> (i) The execution of Niceratus and the metics in 14. 5. 5 f. belongs *before* Theramenes' death (Xen. 2. 3. 39, 2. 3. 21); Diod. may have misinterpreted a back reference. (ii) The Spartan decree about Athenian exiles (14. 6. 1 f.) may well belong before Theramenes' death; at least, prominent men like Thrasybulus had already fled by then (Xen. 2. 3. 42, 44) and they were the object of the decree. The whole of 14. 5. 5–6. 2 may therefore be misplaced. (iii) The explanation of 15. 19. 2 f. may be that Diod. has mixed up a flashback to relations between Olynthus and Amyntas earlier on (cf. 14. 92. 3) and an account of Olynthian aggression in the 380s (Xen. 5. 2. 12 f.). (iv) The contradiction between 15. 20. 3 and Xen. 5. 2. 24. f. on when Eudamidas marched out may be due to Diod.'s misunderstanding of a note to the effect that Eud. had *already* set out. (v) Most of 15. 38–40 belongs in 372/1, 371/0; Diod. must have been confused by a forward reference. (vi) The mobilization of helots and arrival of external allies at Sparta in 370/69 (15. 65. 6 f.) did not occur after the Theban withdrawal (cf. Xen. 6. 5. 28 f., 7. 2. 2). (vii) On some views (e.g. Meyer, op. cit. (n. 4) §895), 15. 31. 1–2 (*sub anno* 377/6, actually 379/8) relates to a method of organization already extant in 382 (cf. Xen. 5. 2. 21).

<sup>32</sup> Griffith is himself constrained to believe that Diodorus is in some degree confused, since for him Iphicrates' attempted seizure preceded the union (Diod. has the reverse) (cf. n. 28 for the problems this causes). The real truth may be this: first Argos and Corinth unified; next, encouraged by military successes and sensible (as Andocides thought the Athenians ought to be) of the dangers for Athens of the union, Iphicrates attempted unsuccessfully to seize Corinth, killing some of the *argolizontes* (?perhaps 'people playing at being Argives' rather than 'supporters of Argos') in the process; thirdly the Argives installed a *permanent* garrison in Corinth (notice that the complaints in Xen. 4. 4. 6 do not include reference to a garrison, though there were Argives in the city from time to time, whereas a garrison is mentioned in 387/6; Xen. 5. 1. 34).

<sup>33</sup> Thanks are due to Robin Seager for reading a first draft of this paper.