EPHORUS(?) ON THE SPARTAN CONSTITUTION

Herodotus 1.67–8 tells of how Sparta gained the upper hand over Tegea, in the third quarter of the sixth century B.C., after locating and retrieving what were believed (or claimed) to be the bones of Orestes. The individual responsible for the discovery, Lichas,[1] is described as 'one of the Spartans called *agathoergoi*' (*τῶν ἀγαθοεργῶν καλεομένων Σπαρτιητέων*: 1.67.5), and the term is immediately explained as follows:

> the *agathoergoi* [literally good-service men] are the five oldest citizens who leave the *hippeis* each year; this year after leaving the *hippeis* is one of constant missions for them, wherever required, on the Spartan state's behalf.
>
> *οἱ δὲ ἀγαθοεργοί εἰσι τῶν ἀστῶν, ἐξιόντες ἐκ τῶν ἱππέων αἰεὶ οἱ πρεσβύτατοι, πέντε ἔτεος ἑκάστου· τοὺς δεῖ τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτόν, τὸν ἂν ἐξίωσι ἐκ τῶν ἱππέων, Σπαρτιητέων τῷ κοινῷ διαπεμπομένους μὴ ἐλινύειν ἄλλους ἄλλῃ.*[2]

Besides Herodotus, no other classical writer is known for certain to have mentioned these Spartan *agathoergoi*; instead, the word was taken up by lexicographers and scholiasts. Some of them simply respond to the Herodotus passage (for example, Hesychius, *Lexicon* α 251: *οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἱππέων ἐξιόντες πέντε ἑκάστου ἔτους, ὡς Ἡρόδοτος ἱστορεῖ*), but others give or include a summary gloss which is notably different from anything that Herodotus either says or implies. Whereas in Herodotus five ex-*hippeis* become the year's *agathoergoi* as, it seems, an automatic consequence of their age and seniority, this alternative strand of explanation asserts that the *agathoergoi* were selected on merit, *αἱρετοὶ κατὰ/κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν*. Thus, for example, Timaeus, *Lexicon Platonicum* α 971a15 (on which see further below), and Photius, *Lexicon* α 79. And more significantly still, for present purposes, two lexica add something further:

> Eudemus, *Περὶ λέξεων ῥητορικῶν* (Niese) folio 2b.13: *ἀγαθοεργοὶ αἱρετοὶ κατὰ ἀνδραγαθίαν ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων.*
>
> Suda α 115 (Adler): *ἀγαθοεργοί· αἱρετοὶ κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν.*
> *ἐκ τῶν Ἐφόρων.*

Adler, as indicated, punctuated (and paragraphed) this Suda entry after *ἀνδραγαθίαν*. She also, in the section of her apparatus there concerned with sources and parallels, called the words *ἐκ τῶν Ἐφόρων* a '*locus dubius*'.[3] Substantively speaking, too, that adjective applies. In Hdt. 1.67.5 the *agathoergoi* come from the *hippeis*, not from the ephors; and the notion of selecting five men from five others[4] is of course fatuous in itself.

So far so good in a negative vein, but is there anything positive to be extracted from this material? I wish to suggest that there is.

[1] He is PB no. 491 (otherwise unattested, but surely an ancestor of the well-known no. 492, L. son of Arkesilas).

[2] I have left the term *hippeis* untranslated; though it literally means horsemen, one only encounters them serving on foot, as royal bodyguards, and, more generally, as an élite corps of hoplite infantrymen. See summarily W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1912), 1.91.

[3] Adler's capitalization of *Ἐφόρων* is not significant in itself; she does the same, for no discernible reason, under ε 3955 (*Περικλῆς τοὺς Ἐφόρους τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν συμπείσας κτλ*), but is happy with lower case elsewhere.

[4] On the recurring number five in Spartan constitutional arrangements, see generally P. A. Cartledge, *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta* (London, 1987), 431.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi023 Published online by Cambridge University Press

First, it seems probable that at least one other classical writer besides Herodotus had occasion to mention the *agathoergoi* —and declared that they were chosen on the basis of 'manliness' (*andragathia*). This is not, to reiterate, what Herodotus says, but it might nevertheless have been true by the fourth century. So Plato, perhaps? Timaeus' *Lexicon* was *Platonicum*, after all. Unfortunately, Timaeus' word-search, while it certainly maintained a heavy concentration on Plato, did not absolutely confine itself to Plato; rather, other authors too are cited under Plato-generated entries, and (crucially) there are also occasional entries where the word or phrase in question does not occur in the extant works of Plato at all.[5] And a further complication is the difficulty of establishing whether Timaeus, who belongs anywhere between the second and the fifth century A.D., comes before or after Eudemus, who has been tentatively dated to the second century—and who in any case encompassed a wider range of authors than the title *Περὶ λέξεων ῥητορικῶν* would warrant.

It is therefore impossible to say whether the words *ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων* were added by Eudemus to an original *αἱρετοὶ κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν* in Timaeus or were suppressed/ignored by Timaeus as he quarried Eudemus. Nevertheless, if one adheres to the substantive point that, even after any possible change of appointment-criteria (from mere seniority to individual merit),[6] the *agathoergoi* simply did not come, and could not legitimately be described as coming, 'from the ephors', that phrase must either be jettisoned as the worst kind of uninformed ignorance or else turned into something that does make sense. One possibility for the latter would be *ὑπὸ τῶν ἐφόρων*, selection *by* the ephors, but I should like to canvass another, which builds on Adler's view that the phrase is grammatically separate from what has gone before it: *ἐκ τῶν Ἐφόρου*, 'from the (histories) of Ephorus'.[7]

If this suggestion be entertained, we have here a tiny 'fragment' of Ephorus overlooked by Jacoby (for *FGrH* 70) and his predecessors. Had Ephorus, like Herodotus, mentioned the *agathoergoi* in connection with the bones of Orestes episode and differed there—in his (?)sixth book[8]—even tacitly from Herodotus' statement on how they were appointed, the resulting disagreement would be likely to have left some trace in the record. Without such a trace, it becomes more probable that the Ephoran passage occurred somewhere else, indeterminable, and attracted lexicographic attention for the phrase *αἱρετοὶ κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν* (or other words to that effect).[9] But whether this could, in consequence, be treated as serious evidence for

[5] To quantify 'occasional': a rapid check of the first hundred entries turns up five others that belong in this category; see 971b18 (*ἀγνωμόνως*), 972b19 (*ἀγχώμαλος*), 973a7 (*αἰξωνεύεσθαι*), 974a4 (*ἀλίπεδον*), 974b27 (*ἄμυνα*). (I exclude 971b18, *ἀγίαν· τὸν ἡγούμενόν τινος*, which is surely corrupt; compare Hesychius, *Lexicon* α 696, *ἄγοντα· ἡγούμενον*.) Theoretically they could of course come from lost works of Plato, but it is at least equally likely that other material has crept in.

[6] For *andragathia* in a Spartan context, see e.g. Hdt. 5.39.1 and 42.1; Xen. *Lac.* 4.2, *Ages.* 9.6, 10.2; Plut. *Lyc.* 14.3, *Agis Cleom.* 16.5.

[7] The idiom is too commonplace to require extensive parallels, but see e.g. *FGrH* 70 T17 (Ephorus himself, from Porphyry *ap* Eusebius, *Praep.Ev.* 10.3): *καὶ τί γὰρ Ἐφόρου ἴδιον ἐκ τῶν Δαιμάχου καὶ Καλλισθένους καὶ Ἀναξιμένους αὐταῖς λέξεσιν ἔστιν κτλ*;.

[8] G. L. Barber, *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge, 1935), 30–1 gives a general survey of the likely coverage of Book 6.

[9] For instances of Timaeus' *Lexicon* generating glosses from the primary passage in question, see α 971b7, *ἀγείρουσαν· ὡς ἱέρειαν περιερχομένην*, from *Resp.* 381D (*ὡς ἱέρειαν ἀγείρουσαν*); α 973b20, *ἀκταίνειν· γαυριᾶν καὶ ἀτάκτως πηδᾶν*, from *Leg.* 672C, *ὅταν ἀκταινώσῃ ἑαυτὸ τάχιστα, ἀτάκτως αὖ πηδᾷ*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi023 Published online by Cambridge University Press

procedural change, post Herodotus,[10] in respect of the *hippeis* and the *agathoergoi* is a question I leave for contemplation by experts in that area.

Queen's University, Belfast DAVID WHITEHEAD
d.whitehead@qub.ac.uk
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi023

ANTIPATER AFTER THE LAMIAN WAR: NEW READINGS IN VAT. GR. 73 (DEXIPPUS FR. 33)*

When the Greeks of the imperial era looked back to the golden age of their nation, it was mainly to the period between the Persian wars and Alexander that they looked. Although he caused the dissemination of Greek culture to a previously unknown extent, the Macedonian king, by putting an end to the freedom of the Greek poleis, at the same time marked the end of Hellas in its classical form. Accordingly, only two Greek historical monographs of the imperial period are known to deal with the events following his death.[1] The two works by Arrian and Dexippus containing *τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον* are both lost except for some excerpts. The former's work[2] has been summarized by Photius in the *Bibliotheca*, so that we know its general design. It seems that he started with the division of the huge empire immediately after Alexander died in 323. In Photius' (not necessarily very reliable)[3] account five of the ten books are largely filled by the Lamian War and other uprisings in Thrace and Cappadocia. Some further quotations in the *Suda* add nothing substantial to our knowledge of the work. The second work, that of Dexippus of Athens,[4] is also mentioned by Photius, who again lists the commanders of the Macedonian army and their share of the empire immediately after Alexander's death (F 8, with minor deviations from Arrian). Photius does not recount anything more, but states that the rest is in agreement (*σύμφωνα*) with Arrian's treatment. However, we have a number of fragments of this text in the *Excerpta de sententiis*, commissioned by Constantine VII of Byzantium (906–9) and transmitted in a palimpsest in the Vatican Library (Vat. gr. 73).

It has been almost a hundred years since Boissevain published the first (and still the only) edition of the text that meets modern standards.[5] He was able to give a far better text than the one Mai had published in the *editio princeps* of 1828.[6] However, portions of the *History after Alexander* were on folia that have not been preserved.

[10] A theoretical alternative is that the procedure Herodotus describes is plain wrong, i.e. that it was selection *κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν* all along; but in that event we could have expected the sort of stern correction, of Herodotean misconceptions about Sparta, famously meted out by Thucydides (1.20.3: the kings' votes and the Pitanate *lochos*).

* I would like to express my thanks to the editors of *CQ* and Professor Pelling for their suggestions, and the Franz-Marie-Christinen Foundation Regensburg for a grant for my trip to Rome.

[1] There is one other possible work on the successors, an abstract of which has been preserved (*FGrH* 155, the 'Heidelberger Epitome'). The period of its composition is, however, unknown. Other authors writing on this topic (Hieronymus of Cardia, Nymphis of Heracleia) lived in the fourth and third centuries B.C.

[2] References are to the edition of A. G. Roos and G. Wirth (Leipzig, 1968).

[3] P. A. Brunt, 'On historical fragments and epitomes', *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980), 477–94.

[4] The fragment numbers follow *FGrH* 100.

[5] Ursul Boissevain, *Excerpta historica iussu imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta.* 4: *Excerpta de sententiis* (Berlin, 1906).

[6] Angelo Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus* 2 (Rome, 1828).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi023 Published online by Cambridge University Press