

CYME AND THE VERACITY OF EPHORUS

DEBORAH HOBSON SAMUEL

York University

Strabo tells us that whenever Ephorus, in writing about historical events, had nothing particular to report about his native town, Aeolian Cyme, he simply said, "at about the same time the Cymaeans were at peace" (Str. 13.3.6). G. L. Barber, in his book, *The Historian Ephorus*, says that "Ephorus' first defect is pride in his native town," and he decries "the extent . . . to which he allowed this local patriotism to pervert the truth."¹

The extant fragments of Ephorus' writings do not attest to the historian's inclination to write about Cyme; only four fragments, in addition to the above quotation from Strabo, involve Cyme, and all of them are geographical descriptions, in which some other city is located with reference to Cyme.² No fragments preserve descriptions—distorted or otherwise—of the activities of the inhabitants.

Since we have no direct evidence of Ephorus' treatment of his home town, an investigation into the question of his "local patriotism" relies on the best secondary evidence available, the history of Diodorus Siculus. It is generally assumed that Diodorus used Ephorus as one of his main sources for Greek history in the period between the return of the Heracleidae and the siege of Perinthus (Diod. 16.76.5). It is not always clear exactly where and how Ephorus' history is the source of Diodorus' account, except in those instances when the Cymaeian historian is specifically credited with information.³ Wherever Diodorus includes any mention of Cyme, it is commonly believed that his ultimate source is Ephorus.⁴ Because we know from Strabo

¹ G. L. Barber, *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge 1935) 86.

² Jacoby, *FGrH* 70 F10, 39, 72, 163; Strabo 13.3.6 = *FGrH* 70 F114.

³ E.g. Diod. 13.40.3, 54.4, 60.6, 80.5; 14.11.1 ff., 22.2, 54.6; 15.60.5.

⁴ Schwartz, for example, in *RE* 5 (1905) s.v. "Diodorus," cites the number of references to Cyme as a strong indication, if not positive proof, of Diodorus' use of

that Ephorus liked to write about Cyme, Barber and others are ever ready to use Ephorus' local pride as justification for discounting Diodorus' information about Cyme when it is not specifically corroborated by another source.⁵

A close examination of all the references to Cyme in the history of Diodorus reveals that Ephorus has been unjustly condemned, and Diodorus' account has therefore been too readily dismissed. In no case does Diodorus' information about Cyme contradict any other source, and in several instances Diodorus' account is either explicitly or implicitly corroborated by other sources. Although the text of Diodorus certainly reflects a Cymaeon viewpoint, and probably an exaggerated sense of Cyme's importance, there is no evidence of fabrication.

First of all, on a purely statistical level Diodorus' history does not reflect excessive attention to Cyme. The town is involved in only thirteen independent incidents,⁶ a smaller number in proportion to the total extant corpus of Diodorus than the seven mentions of the same town to be found in Herodotus' history,⁷ or the five occurrences in Thucydides' work.⁸

Particularly characteristic of the difference in orientation between Diodorus (Ephorus) and the other sources is Diodorus' description

Ephorus. The question of Diodorus' use of Ephorus is also treated by Schwartz, *RE* 6 (1909) s.v. "Ephorus"; Barber (above, note 1); Silvio Accame, "Le fonti di Diodoro per la guerra Decelica," *Rend. Accad. Lincei*, ser. 6, vol. 14 (1938) 347-451; H. Bloch, "Studies in Historical Literature of the Fourth Century B.C.," *Athenian Studies Presented to W. S. Ferguson*, *HSCP* Supp. 1 (1940) 303-76; R. Drews, "Diodorus and his Sources," *AJP* 83 (1962) 383-92; E. Auccello, "Sulla tecnica narrativa in Diodoro Siculo," *Helikon* 3 (1963) 454-60; R. Drews, "Ephorus and History Written *kata genos*," *AJP* 84 (1963) 244-55.

⁵ See, for example, G. Grote, *History of Greece* (New York 1869) 8.153; Accame (above, note 4) 388-99. A similar prejudice is implied by all those who follow without hesitation the account of Xenophon when Diodorus' version appears to contradict: e.g. Swoboda, *RE* 12.2 (1925) s.v. "Leon" no. 13, and *RE* 13 (1927) s.v. "Lysias" no. 7; P. Cloché, "L'affaire des Arginuses," *RH* 130 (1919) 5-68; M. Valetton, "De praetoribus Atheniensium qui victoriam reportaverunt apud Arginusas Insulas," *Mnemosyne* n.s. 48 (1920) 34-79.

⁶ Diod. 3.55.6; 7.10; 11.2.3, 8.5, 27.1; 13.73.3 ff., 97.3, 99.6, 100.4; 14.35.7, 79.3; 15.2.2, 18.2. In this enumeration I do not count the two instances in which Ephorus is designated as being of Cyme (4.1.3; 16.76.5), nor do I count multiple occurrences of the words Cyme and Cymaeon within a single incident.

⁷ Hdt. 1.149, 157-60; 4.138; 5.37-38, 123; 7.194; 8.130.

⁸ Thuc. 3.31; 8.22, 31-32, 100, 101.

of the location of the Arginusae Islands. He says that they lie between Mitylene and Cyme (13.97.3), whereas Xenophon, describing the same islands in connection with the same episode, says that they lie opposite Mitylene (*Hell.* 1.6.27).⁹ The two statements are equally correct, depending on one's viewpoint. Cyme is almost due south of Mitylene, and the Arginusae Islands lie along the coast, about nineteen miles north of Cyme and about fifteen miles south of Mitylene. Thus, if one's point of reference is Mitylene, it is accurate to say that the islands are opposite that city, since they do lie on a straight line southeast of it. But since Cyme is almost the same distance southeast of Arginusae as Mitylene is northwest, it is also accurate to say that the islands lie between those two cities.¹⁰ Xenophon does not think in terms of Cyme, and Diodorus (Ephorus) does. This difference of orientation, when applied to historical events, causes Diodorus to record activities in Cyme which are not relevant to, or possibly are unknown to, the other historians of the same events. He is not on that account less accurate than the other sources, and his information should not be discredited simply because Cyme is mentioned.

Diodorus' account of the founding of Cyme (3.55.6) cannot be invoked as evidence of Ephorus' treatment of his native town, since it is derived from another source. In a general discussion of the Amazons, Diodorus states that Myrina, the Amazon queen, founded various cities in Asia Minor which she named after herself and the women who held the most important commands under her. One such city was Cyme. Diodorus attributes his account of the Amazons to a certain Dionysius, and elsewhere (4.1.3) he berates Ephorus for not including the old myths in his history.¹¹

Diodorus' history includes two Cymaeen episodes which are purely local matters and are not described by any other extant sources. The first of these (7.10.1) is a brief account of a tyrant of Cyme named Malacus, who is not otherwise known. It is unlikely that his existence was invented, since there is no way in which he glorifies the Cymaeans.

⁹ Thucydides 8.101 also describes the location as opposite Mitylene.

¹⁰ Geographical information throughout this paper is derived from the British War Map of Turkey, Sheet E2, August 1943, 1:200,000. The islands which I identify with the Arginusae are called Garip and Kaledmedas.

¹¹ Strabo (13.3.6 ff.) gives the same aetiology for Cyme as Diodorus.

A record of his tyranny was probably available to Ephorus locally. A second reflection of the Cymaeon background of Diodorus' source is in the account (15.18.2) of a dispute between Cyme and Clazomenae in 383 B.C. over which should be the master of the newly founded city of Leuce. Xenophon does not record this dispute, but nevertheless even Barber seems to believe that it actually took place. He criticizes Diodorus for devoting a whole chapter "to the details of a totally insignificant struggle between Cyme and its neighbor Clazomenae over the disputed possession of a tiny hamlet situated between the two towns."¹² The charge here is irrelevance, but not invention. The absence of these two episodes from other sources is explained by the fact that both are of too little importance to Greek history as a whole to fall within the range of any extant work. They are preserved only because of the Cymaeon orientation of Diodorus' source.

The remaining nine incidents involving Cyme are of particular importance in determining whether or not Diodorus reflects Ephorus' distortion of historical fact to exalt Cyme. In each instance the event is described by a second major ancient source, and Diodorus' version, allegedly transmitting Cymaeon bias, can be compared closely with a less partial account.

In two cases Diodorus' treatment of Cyme is fully corroborated by another source. In the first instance Diodorus states (11.27.1) that the Persian fleet, after its defeat at Salamis, wintered at Cyme. Herodotus (8.130) gives us the same information. Diodorus cannot be accused of passing on a false account of Cyme's role.

Similarly, Xenophon (*Hell.* 3.4.27) confirms Diodorus' involvement of Cyme (14.79) in Agesilaus' campaigns in Asia Minor in 396/5. The two accounts differ in giving greater or less detail for the events before and after the battle of Sardis. Diodorus, describing Agesilaus' movements before the battle, reports that he set out from Cyme to plunder Phrygia. Xenophon does not mention Cyme at this point (*Hell.* 3.4.12), but includes it in his description of events after the battle, saying that Agesilaus stopped in the plain above Cyme before continuing on toward Phrygia. It is clear from the two accounts that Agesilaus was using Cyme as his base for the operations

¹² Barber (above, note 1) 87.

against Phrygia, and it is equally clear that Ephorus has not arbitrarily included his town in these events.

The next three references to Cyme in the history of Diodorus all involve the Cymaeon-Phocaeon coastline. In two cases a Persian fleet is said to have assembled at Cyme and Phocaea, although no other source mentions this.

Diodorus reports (II.2.3) that Xerxes commanded his admirals to assemble the ships at Cyme and Phocaea, preparatory to crossing the Hellespont to Greece, while he himself mustered the land forces at Susa and marched to Sardis. Herodotus does not state where the naval forces assembled, and asserts that the land forces assembled at Critalla in Cappadocia and marched from there to Sardis (7.26). The two sources agree that the land forces gathered in Sardis and marched north from there to the Hellespont, but they differ as to the point of origin of these forces. Herodotus describes the activities of a group of ships, apparently a small fraction of the fleet,¹³ sent ahead to dig a canal and build a bridge which would enable the Persians to cross the Hellespont (7.22). He does not mention the whole fleet until Xerxes reaches Abydos, when Herodotus says that he looked with satisfaction upon his entire armament, naval and military (7.44).

Diodorus does not contradict Herodotus in reporting that the Persian fleet assembled at Cyme and Phocaea; he simply supplies a detail which is omitted by Herodotus. There is no difficulty in fitting this detail into Herodotus' account, particularly since, as I have already noted, Herodotus, like Diodorus, gives Cyme as the place to which the fleet retreated after its expedition to Greece. The coastline between Phocaea and Cyme is almost directly west of Sardis, the city from which, both sources agree, the land expedition started north. If the plan of the Persian commander was to have both land and sea forces cross into Greece at the same time, it would be practical to have the two wings travel north in roughly parallel positions. Since the fleet was not under the command of Xerxes himself, its exact location at a given time was of less importance than that of the troops under the command of the King. Therefore Herodotus does not bother to mention where the fleet

¹³ Only 674 triremes and fifty-oared ships are accounted for in this operation (Hdt. 7.36), whereas the naval forces credited to Xerxes when he crossed the Hellespont are 1207 triremes (7.89) and 3000 other ships (7.97).

assembled, but does follow closely the entire march of the land army.¹⁴ The fleet is only mentioned when it is of direct concern to Xerxes, on whose actions Herodotus' account centers.¹⁵ On the other hand, from the viewpoint of the Cymaeans, the highlight of the episode would have been the fact that the Persian naval forces had gathered on the Cymaean coastline before embarking on a major campaign. Diodorus, therefore, reflecting a Cymaean source, includes this point. The difference between the two sources is one of outlook, not of fact.

The circumstances of the campaign of Artaxerxes against Evagoras of Cyprus in 386 B.C. are similar. Diodorus reports (15.2.2) that the Persian King assigned Orontes to command the land forces, and Tiribazus the naval troops; they took over the forces in Phocaea and Cyme, and from there went to Cyprus by way of Cilicia.¹⁶ Isocrates records this campaign (*Evagoras* 64 ff.), and Xenophon, although he does not mention the campaign itself, does confirm Diodorus' description of the Persian-Spartan hostilities in Asia Minor at this time. The gathering of Persian forces at Phocaea and Cyme would be in perfect accord with the disposition of troops in the Aegean at the time, but perhaps only a Cymaean would have thought it worth mentioning. The assumption of transmission through a Cymaean source may also explain Diodorus' precision of information concerning commanders. Diodorus' account is consistent with, though not duplicated by, the other extant sources, and there is no obstacle to accepting it.

Diodorus specifies the Cymaean-Phocaeen coastline a third time, after the battle of Arginusae, when he says the coast was strewn with corpses and wreckage (13.100.4).¹⁷ Although Xenophon says nothing about the area covered by the debris, he agrees closely with Diodorus about the number of ships destroyed in the battle—approximately one hundred.¹⁸ It can well be imagined that one hundred ships would create a good deal of wreckage in the surrounding area, particularly

¹⁴ The cities mentioned by Herodotus (7.42) show that the route followed by the land army took it very close to Cyme.

¹⁵ Thus the detachment involved in digging the canal through Mount Athos is of interest to Herodotus in terms of Xerxes' motivations (see 7.24).

¹⁶ Schaefer, *RE* 6 A2 (1937) s.v. "Tiribazus," follows Diodorus' account.

¹⁷ Barber (above, note 1) 87 mentions this with disdain, implying that it is invented.

¹⁸ Diodorus has 25 Athenian ships and 77 Peloponnesian; Xenophon (*Hell.* 1.6.34) has 25 Athenian, 9 Laconian, and more than 60 ships of the allies.

since, as both sources report, a storm arose right after the battle which would have spread the debris around. A north wind would have blown the ships south, from Arginusae to Cyme.

In each of the three episodes just discussed, the account of Diodorus seems to supplement, rather than contradict, that of the other sources. We accept, since Herodotus confirms it, Diodorus' statement that the Persian fleet wintered at Cyme after the battle of Salamis. No less probable, then, is Diodorus' assertion that the Persian fleet gathered there before sailing around to Cyprus. Cyme's location at the head of a large harbor, close to the coastal route between Asia and Europe, clearly suited it for the accommodation of a large military force. Equally credible is it that a storm, so severe that it prevented recovery of the dead, would have strewn around the Cymaeon coastline the wreckage from a battle to the north.

Finally, there are four episodes in which Diodorus involves Cyme, whereas an apparently parallel source for the same event does not. These afford the best opportunity for determining whether Cyme's rôle in Greek history has been created by Ephorus.

First, Diodorus reports (11.8.5) that when the Persians had been repelled in their initial encounters with the Greeks at Thermopylae, a Trachinian offered to lead Xerxes through a pass by which Leonidas' army could be approached from the rear. A certain Cymaeon member of the Persian army named Tyrrhastidas deserted from the Persian camp and reported Xerxes' plan to Leonidas.

Herodotus (7.213) confirms the statement that a Trachinian offered his services to Xerxes, and gives his name as Ephialtes son of Eurydemus.¹⁹ Herodotus adds that others claim that those who offered to lead the Persians through the pass were Onetes of Carystus and Corydallus of Anticyra, but Herodotus himself is quite definite about attributing the action to Ephialtes (7.214). Thus he agrees with Diodorus in the first part of the story.

Explaining how Leonidas learned of the Persian advance, Herodotus says: first, that a seer Megistias foresaw death for the Greeks in the coming morning; second, that deserters came from the Persians during

¹⁹ Herodotus calls him a Trachinian in 7.214, and a Malian (the more general term) in 7.213.

the night with news of the route being followed by Xerxes' army; and finally, that Greek scouts spotted the Persians at dawn. The second explanation given accords with Diodorus' account, except that Diodorus mentions only one deserter. The two agree that the deserter(s) arrived in the Greek camp at night. Diodorus names the deserter, and Herodotus names the Trachinian. The two accounts are alike in general and complementary in detail. There is no reason to suspect that Diodorus (Ephorus) would have invented either the name of the man or his place of origin. Local tradition is suggested by the description of Tyrrhastidas as *φιλόκαλος δὲ καὶ τὸν τρόπον ὦν ἀγαθός*, or by the failure to mention any other deserters. That this man was Cymaeon is not of much interest to us, nor is it particularly important for the event; it is nevertheless entirely credible.

In the next incident to be examined, Diodorus reports (14.35.7) that Tissaphernes plundered the territory of the Cymaeans, laid siege to the city, and on the approach of winter released the captives and raised the siege, having been unable to capture the city. Xenophon does not mention the siege of Cyme, but says (3.1.3 ff.) that Tissaphernes demanded that all Ionian cities be subject to him. The Ionians refused to admit him to their cities, and sent ambassadors to Sparta asking for help. The Spartans therefore sent Thibron as governor, with an army of one thousand emancipated Helots and four thousand other Peloponnesians. Thibron asked in addition for three hundred Athenian cavalry, and when they arrived in Asia Minor he received troops from the Greek cities. Thereafter his strategy was to keep the particular territory where he was from being ravaged; after the men from Cyrus' expedition, including Xenophon himself, had joined him, Thibron was able to get possession of various cities.

Diodorus records the Ionian embassy to Sparta, but says that the Spartans promised aid, and meanwhile sent ambassadors to Tissaphernes to warn him not to commit any act of aggression against the Greek cities. Tissaphernes, however, advanced against Cyme anyway. In the following chapter (14.36) Thibron's appointment is reported.

The two accounts are not incompatible. Diodorus treats events before Thibron's arrival, whereas Xenophon omits them, either because he does not know about them or because he does not regard them as

important. Xenophon did not have first-hand information until the point at which Cyrus' expedition joined with Thibron, and Tissaphernes' activities would not have been of special concern to him until the time when he was among those having to cope with the Persian. The Spartans with Thibron, from whom Xenophon probably received an account of the events before his own arrival, might well have been unaware of any military actions which had occurred before their own appearance on the scene. A siege of Cyme prior to their arrival would have been of little moment to Thibron's forces. To the besieged, on the other hand, the episode would have been memorable. Thus it is understandable that the siege is recorded by Diodorus but not by Xenophon.

Xenophon's account, by omitting the siege of Cyme, offers no explanation for Tissaphernes' apparent lack of action between the time of his demand that the Ionian cities be subject to him and the arrival of Thibron. The Ionian cities sent to Sparta for help when they learned that Tissaphernes was advancing in their direction. In the time required for the embassy to reach Sparta and for Thibron to bring aid, Tissaphernes must have continued in his course. This lapse of time is accounted for by the siege of Cyme.

The final two Cymaeon episodes to be discussed involve the circumstances surrounding the battle of Arginusae. First, Diodorus says (13.73-74) that after the battle of Notium, Alcibiades sailed from Samos to Cyme and "threw false charges at the Cymaeans, since he wished to have a pretext for plundering their territory." At first he got many captives from the city, but eventually the citizens fought back, forcing the Athenian troops to their ships. Alcibiades summoned his hoplites from Mitylene and tried to lure the Cymaeans into battle, but no one came out of the city, so finally he ravaged the territory and sailed away. The Cymaeans therefore sent an embassy to Athens to denounce Alcibiades for having ravaged an allied city. Other charges were brought against him by some of his own soldiers at Samos, who accused him of favoring the Spartan cause and of being too friendly with Pharnabazus. These complaints brought two immediate results: first the people chose ten new generals, and then Alcibiades went into voluntary exile because popular hostility had caused numerous lawsuits to be filed against him.

Xenophon reports none of these details, attributing the replacement of Alcibiades to the fact that people felt he had lost the ships at Notium through neglect of duty (*Hell.* 1.5.16). Diodorus, in Chap. 71, includes the defeat at Notium too, but seems to give priority to the bad treatment of the Cymaeans as a factor in Alcibiades' downfall.

Grote dismisses Diodorus' account here by saying that it was "probably copied from the Cymaeian historian."²⁰ As if this indictment were sufficient to discredit the information completely, Grote proceeds to rely almost exclusively on Xenophon's version, referring to Diodorus only where there is no possible contradiction of Xenophon. Similarly, Barber relates Diodorus' version, and then says, "The story has been given in full, because it illustrates how Ephorus went out of his way to mention Cyme without, in this instance, the slightest provocation. The silence of the other records is sufficient proof of its fictitious character."²¹ A less extreme, but also sceptical position is taken by Accame,²² who allows for the possibility that Ephorus' source might have contained a mention of some attempt by Alcibiades to reduce Cyme to obedience, which provided Ephorus with the opportunity to "distort" it in this way. On the other hand, Accame finds the complaints of the garrison at Samos completely believable, despite the fact that Xenophon is as silent about this as about Cyme. In other words, uncorroborated information about Cyme in the history of Diodorus is more suspect than equally unconfirmed information about other locations. It can be said that Accame's prejudice against Diodorus is greater than Ephorus' alleged prejudice in favor of Cyme.

When Diodorus' account is examined in terms of its reflection of a Cymaeian embassy to Athens, it becomes clear why Diodorus devotes a whole chapter to the description of popular sentiment against Alcibiades. A Cymaeian embassy to Athens, dispatched specifically to make a complaint against Alcibiades, would certainly have returned home with a full account of its success, and would obviously have been attentive to any other complaints made against the Athenian leader. This information would have been preserved at Cyme and transmitted to Ephorus, and thence to Diodorus, through local sources. Native pride

²⁰ Grote (above, note 5) 153.

²¹ Barber (above, note 1) 86.

²² Accame (above, note 4) 388-89.

undoubtedly accounts for the exaggerated emphasis on the importance of the Cymaeon complaints in bringing about Alcibiades' dismissal. But it is one thing to exaggerate the importance of an incident, and quite another to invent it.

There is a further point of interest to be derived from a close examination of Diodorus' Cymaeon embassy. Certainly an embassy sent to Athens to present complaints would have remained in Athens until some action was taken on those complaints. In this case, the action was the removal of Alcibiades from his command, and the election of the new generals. Xenophon and Diodorus agree quite closely in reporting the selection of ten new generals at this time, and in the subsequent exile of Alcibiades. The assumption of Diodorus' (Ephorus') veracity in recording a Cymaeon embassy perhaps explains the remarkable similarity in the order of the names of the generals as given by the two sources. Xenophon (*Hell.* 1.5.16) lists Conon, Diomedon, Leon, Pericles, Erasinides, Aristocrates, Arcestratus, Protomachus, Thrasyllus, and Aristogenes. Diodorus has Conon, Lysias, Diomedon, Pericles, Erasinides, Aristocrates, Arcestratus, Protomachus, Thrasybulus, and Aristogenes. Two names are given differently: Xenophon has Leon and Thrasyllus where Diodorus has Lysias and Thrasybulus. Thrasybulus in Diodorus is universally accepted as an error for Thrasyllus. The alternation between Leon and Lysias in the two historians is somewhat more complicated, and no attempt is made to adjudicate here.²³ What is significant for the present purpose is that Xenophon has Diomedon/Leon where Diodorus has Lysias/Diomedon. Otherwise the two lists are identical. Nowhere else in the two narratives of these events are the generals listed in similar order,²⁴ nor are there other occasions when the ten generals for a given year are listed together. The similarity may possibly be explained by a common origin, in Athens, at the time of the election. Xenophon himself was very likely in Athens at the time, or at least had access to Athenian records. If

²³ The problem of Leon and Lysias is possibly textual, since the MSS of Diodorus give *Λυσανίαν* for the proper accusative *Λυσίαν*. Possibly a later scribe noticed that Lysias appeared subsequently in the battle, and therefore altered an original Leon to Lysias. The appearance of the incorrect accusative form as well as a different name from that of Xenophon suggests some confusion as to the name of the general.

²⁴ Cf. Diod. 13.101.5 and Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.1.

Diodorus derives his list from the Cymaeian source, his information also originates from the event itself.²⁵

The final passage to be examined here is Diodorus' report (13.99.6) that after the battle of Arginusae some of the Peloponnesians fled to Cyme and Chios. Xenophon, reporting the same event, names Chios and Phocaea (*Hell.* 1.6.33). The discrepancy is not great: three instances have already been noted in which Diodorus refers to the neighboring coastal towns of Cyme and Phocaea as though to a single locality. The distinction as to which sheltered the refugees would hardly have been possible for a witness to their departure, who could have observed only that some headed southwest (toward Chios), and others southeast (toward Phocaea or Cyme). But to those at the destination the distinction would have been natural. The Peloponnesians may well have found protection along the coastline of both cities, or between the two. Xenophon's statement may be as accurate as Diodorus', but there is no reason to suppose that Cyme's inclusion is deceptive.

It seems improbable that the Peloponnesian refugees were actually received into the town of Cyme, an Athenian ally. However, if these men took shelter in the harbor, it would have been possible for the Cymaeans to learn from them the outcome of the battle. There is some evidence in Diodorus' account to suggest that this happened.

Immediately before the statement that the Peloponnesians fled to Cyme and Chios, Diodorus mentions that although the right wing of the Peloponnesians was in flight after the defeat of Callicratidas, the Boeotians, on the left, continued to fight, since they and the Euboeans who were fighting with them, as well as other Greeks who had revolted from the Athenians, feared that if the Athenians ever did regain sovereignty they would all be punished for having rebelled. This bit of motivation is not given by Xenophon, nor does he mention the participation of the Boeotians. Furthermore, it will be noted that in giving the disposition of the troops, both Xenophon and Dio-

²⁵ The significance of the order is difficult to determine. Accame (above, note 4) 402-3 points out that they are not in the usual tribal order, and that the order given by Xenophon at the time of the election follows that of the battle-order given by Xenophon in 1.6.29. But if Diodorus does not follow Xenophon—and there is too much divergence between the two accounts to imagine that Diodorus might have used Xenophon here—then we have no explanation for the similarity between Diodorus' election list and that of Xenophon.

dorus concur in assigning Callicratidas to command of the right wing, but Xenophon does not add, as Diodorus does, that the left wing was entrusted to the Boeotians under the command of Thrasondas the Theban. One cannot imagine that such a particular would be a fabrication; that it is mentioned by Diodorus and not by Xenophon is easily explained by the assumption that the Peloponnesians fled to the vicinity of Cyme after the battle. Information from the Peloponnesians, perhaps among them some Boeotians who were emphasizing their own rôle, was incorporated into the Cymæan record of the event and thereby transmitted through Ephorus to Diodorus.²⁶ Thus Diodorus gives the otherwise unknown name of the Boeotian commander along with his specific assignment, although he does not give the individual commands of the Athenian army, as Xenophon does.²⁷

Having examined in turn every occasion on which the town of Cyme appears in the history of Diodorus, I have found not a single case in which another source disproves the veracity of Diodorus and his source. There is no mention of Cyme which is unacceptable, and which would not be completely accepted if it were not found in a history which is

²⁶ The term "Peloponnesians" here, as elsewhere, is used to describe anti-Athenian forces, and in this sense includes the Boeotians.

²⁷ This might also be explained by supposing that Ephorus used a Boeotian history as a source for this battle. But this explanation ignores the connection between Diodorus' statement that the Peloponnesians fled to Cyme, and the nature of Diodorus' account of the battle. In any case, if the Boeotians are Diodorus' ultimate source of information about the battle, numerous discrepancies between Diodorus' account and that of Xenophon can be explained without supposing invention on one part or the other. For example, the disposition of Athenian forces is described differently by the two sources. Xenophon gives a very detailed accounting, with an assignment for each general. Diodorus gives only three names: Thrasylus, Pericles, and Theramenes. The latter was, as he says, not a general that year, but participated as a private citizen. Of the other two, Thrasylus is given as commander of the right wing, though Xenophon says that Protomachus commanded the right, with Thrasylus beside him. Pericles, son of the Athenian hero of that name, is on the right wing with Thrasylus, as is Theramenes. None of the other generals is named, nor is the left wing mentioned. The Boeotians were on the Peloponnesian left wing, and would therefore have confronted in battle the right wing of the Athenians. Their description of the battle would have been based on their own experience with the Athenian right. The only Athenians named in Diodorus' account are the most famous ones; one explanation for this would be Diodorus' desire to focus upon noble and memorable characters, in keeping with his general aims in writing history. Another possible reason might be that these would have been the names most familiar to the Boeotians.

known to have used a Cymaeon source. The conclusion I draw after investigating Diodorus' treatment of Cyme is that Ephorus' local pride is manifested only in the sense that he records, and perhaps overemphasizes, episodes about Cyme which are relatively unimportant to the main course of Greek history. Strabo's comment about Ephorus²⁸ has been misinterpreted by those who dismiss Diodorus' evidence wherever Cyme is mentioned. Strabo does not accuse Ephorus of distorting historical fact in order to glorify Cyme; he only alludes to the ridicule of the historian for mentioning his native town when it had done nothing worth noting. Ephorus did not invent Cyme's rôle; he merely included it, where a disinterested historian would have omitted it.

²⁸ See above, p. 375.