Thyrsis und in den Monolog des Daphnis eingebettet ist und die gesamte räumliche Vernetzung des Gedichtes charakterisiert. Dem gegenüber steht die durch die Musen sanktionierte, über den Tod hinaus reichende Wirkung der Dichtung, die sich auf der Ebene der Poetik abspielt. Diese Gegenüberstellung wirkt auf das ganze Gedicht ein und bringt seine bukolische Fiktion zustande.


Erfurt

Marios Skempis


A re-evaluation of Ephorus was long overdue, given that nearly eighty years have passed since the last monograph devoted to this fourth-century author of the first Greek ‘universal’ history was published.1 But the wait was worthwhile. Only recently could the project have been done properly, now that, in the study of ancient historical writing, old notions of rigid generic categories and positivist methodology have broken down. In addition, the work of Guido Schepens and Riccardo Vattuone (among others) has revealed the importance of studying lost historical works not in the isolation of the fragment collection, but in the context of the cover-texts through which they are mediated.2 Thus we must be grateful that Parmeggiani, a student of Vattuone, took on the task and did so when he did. His book appears at the same time that Victor Parker has published an English translation of and commentary on the fragments of Ephorus in ‘Brill’s New Jacoby’.3 Together, these new resources provide a firm basis for all future work on one of the most important historians from the ancient Greek world.

A full evaluation of the 239 fragments Jacoby collected for Ephorus (FGrHist 70) presents a massive undertaking, and Parmeggiani’s treatment is rich and comprehensive – as one would hope, given its more than 700 pages. His approach is simple and straightforward: to consider solely the explicitly attested testimonia

---

2 For the term ‘cover-text’, see Guido Schepens, Jacoby’s FGrHist: Problems, methods, prospects’, in Glenn W. Most, ed., Collecting Fragments/Fragmente sammeln (Göttingen, 1997), 166 n. 66.
3 Victor Parker, ‘Ephoros (70)’, Brill’s New Jacoby. Editor in Chief: Ian Worthington (University of Missouri). Brill Online.
and fragments, in their full and proper context, and to do so without preconceived notions of how history 'should' have been written or in the framework of a putative historiographical decline after Thucydides. He pays close attention to Jacoby's commentary, apparatus, marginal notations, editorial decisions, and views on the development of Greek historical writing, all of which affect the shape Jacoby gave the fragments (and therefore our interpretation of them, if viewed in isolation: 30–33). One very useful and noticeable feature of the book is that in quoting the fragments Parmeggiani includes the larger passages from which they derive, marking Jacoby's selections in bold. His footnotes contain exhaustive references, including a great deal of nineteenth-century German work.

Chapter 1 examines, through a number of the more important testimonia, the notion of ‘rhetorical history’ and Ephorus’ relationship with Isocrates. In Chapters 2 through 4, Parmeggiani attempts to flesh out Ephorus’ statements on historical method as found in material which probably derives from the preface to the work, especially FF 7–9. Three very long chapters (5, 7, and 8) present in detail the structure of the Histories, with a pause in Chapter 6 to consider the question of how much of Diodorus’ text we can reliably treat as Ephorus. In Chapter 9, Parmeggiani revisits the issue of historical method, now examining Ephorus’ practice in the surviving fragments and delineating his place in the Greek historiographical tradition. Chapter 10 offers concluding comments, followed by a full bibliography and two detailed indexes.

Scholars will need to evaluate Parmeggiani’s readings of individual fragments on a case-by-case basis. Comparison with Parker’s BNJ commentary is often instructive. For example, Parmeggiani wishes to place F 34, on Heracles’ defeat of the Phlegraean giants, in the context of fourth-century Macedonian politics (52, 621). Parker’s explanation, that Ephorus here as elsewhere was rationalizing a myth, is much simpler and more plausible, given the fragment’s attribution to Book 4.1 Like Vattuone on Timaeus, Parmeggiani is concerned with ‘recontextualizing’ the fragments in Ephorus’ original work (although he does not use the term).2 In my opinion, this leads him to spend too much time attempting to reconstruct lost passages. Thus we read four pages (87–91) on how F 8, in which Ephorus is recorded as describing music as a form of deceit, might have been found in a discussion of poetry as evidence for antiquity, at the end of which Parmeggiani admits that this is just one possible context. But this imagined passage later forms the framework for an examination of other methodological statements (139–146), and the reader cannot help but worry about the stability of this reconstructed Ephorean edifice. Sticking to a demonstration of the main features of the work would have reduced the amount of speculation and helped highlight the excellent and important results of his investigation.3 In any case, I

---

1 Cf. too their respective interpretations of F 187 and the issue of whether Ephorus used Simonides’ epigram directly (Parmeggiani 340–341, 649–650; Parker, BNJ 70 ad loc).
3 Some amount of speculation is inevitable, of course, when dealing with fragmentary historians. I have tried to strike a safer balance in my forthcoming book, Timaeus of Tau-
have no doubt that Parmeggiani’s general points hold true, and they are crucial for advancing our understanding of Greek historical writing after the fifth century. These points are the following:

1) Ephorus did not engage in ‘rhetorical history,’ nor does that term have any meaning. All history is rhetorical, since historians intend to persuade their audience of the truth, accuracy, or reliability of the narrative. This fact has, to be fair, received recognition by now for ancient historical writing in general; but a detailed refutation with regard to the fragmentary historians, and Ephorus in particular, was greatly needed due to the amazing persistence of the notion and its continued use as a generic category or hermeneutical framework for ‘post-Thucydidean’ historiography. In Chapter 1 Parmeggiani demolishes the concept of rhetorical history and casts serious doubt upon Isocrates’ supposed influence on Ephorus as an historian (34–66). Thus we cannot evaluate Ephorus under the assumption that his goal was to use history as a fount of moral paradigms, that he was a writer unconcerned with investigation, autopsy, and truth.

2) Ephorus was not a Stubengelehrter, dependent solely on written texts and interested only in antiquarian detail. Through a focus on the evidence for the proems to individual books and/or the general preface to the work (Chapters 2–4), Parmeggiani reasserts Ephorus’ concern for accuracy and investigation, which he shows to include a number of intriguing echoes of Thucydides (see especially on FF 9, 110, 111). He also argues that, when viewed in light of Polybius’ comments on Ephorus, this material indicates that the latter meditated seriously on how to write history (146). Statements do not always translate into practice, and one wonders how much value we should place on Polybius’ claims, since he employs Ephorus as a counterweight to his nemesis Timaeus. Later, in Chapter 9, Parmeggiani indeed examines how Ephorus dealt with the great variety of material he had to confront as a universal historian: he was not a compiler of previous authors, as Jacoby believed, but actively sought accurate evidence on, and engaged in (re)shaping, the past. In fact, Parmeggiani proposes that Ephorus was the first systematically methodological historian (755). But the claim that he was consistently perceptive and critical in his use of evidence remains open to debate.

3) Ephorus’ concern for the oikonomia of his work is not a sign of style over substance, rhetoric over research: it is a necessary precondition of the immense and unprecedented project he had undertaken. The proems to the individual books are not poorly integrated rhetorical flourishes, but organizational devices necessary for the new, universal history in which he engaged (82–83). In Chapters 5, 7, and 8, Parmeggiani lays out in detail the structure of the Histories and argues against the dominant, Jacobian paradigm that Ephorus organized his work according to geographic units. That view derives from the beginning of Diodorus’ Book 5, which he entitled On Islands. There, he states that Ephorus ‘made

romenium and Hellenistic Historiography (Cambridge), but different readers will have different comfort levels.
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each of his books deal with events kata genos’, a phrase which has produced much discussion. While most previous scholarship emphasizes the geographic context, Parmeggiani views the polemic with Timaeus as an interpretative key. What Diodorus admires in Ephorus is the lack of digressions, something for which he and others criticized Timaeus. Thus the unity of each book of Ephorus is not geographical, but thematic: more specifically, the goal is harmony between the narrative and the theme established in that book’s proem. Diodorus, then, uses kata genos as a synonym for ‘order’ or ‘coherence’, not as a way of describing the overall structure of Ephorus’ work (160–164).

Once this insight is revealed – again, by reading the testimonium in context and recognizing Diodorus’ immediate purpose – we can examine the evidence of the fragments without feeling it necessary to force them into a strictly geographically-driven organization. What Parmeggiani finds is, instead, «la tendenza sostanziale del racconto a rispettare la linearità cronologica» (175). This does not eliminate the likelihood that Ephorus dealt with events in different areas of the world in discrete units, as Polybius did later. But it should, according to Parmeggiani, change our image of Ephorus as a ‘universal’ historian. The organization of the work is designed to help the reader see how and why events happened as they did: in Polybian terms, a sympleke (weaving together), a convergence of history in different parts of the world into a single narrative. For Parmeggiani, it makes perfect sense that Polybius specifies Ephorus as ‘the first and only universal historian’ before him (711–719).

4) Finally, the thorny issue of Quellenforschung, which Parmeggiani tackles in Chapter 6. Scholars since the early 1800s have treated some or all of Books 11–16 of Diodorus’ Bibliotheka as a more-or-less faithful excerpt of Ephorus. If true, this theory would provide valuable additional material for the study of Ephorus’ historical writing, and many scholars do not hesitate to equate the two authors. But Parmeggiani offers the most detailed criticism I have seen (357–373). He summarizes the claims of the major nineteenth-century proponents of the theory, Cauer and Volquardsen, pointing out that both assume the very fact which needs to be proven, that Diodorus only followed one source at a time.2 He goes on to examine six passages where we can be certain that Diodorus was relying on Ephorus in order to demonstrate the likelihood that he utilized other sources as well (374–386).

In Parmeggiani’s first example, Diodorus preserves Ephorus’ account of Alcibiades’ death, which differed from the standard version (F 70). He introduces it as follows (paraphrasing): ‘Pharnabazus, in order to curry favor with the Spartans, seized and killed Alcibiades. But since Ephorus has given different reasons for the plot, I do not think it useless to set forth this writer’s account’ (Diod. Sic. 14.11.1). Of course, Ephorus must have noted the common story of Alcibiades’ death before arguing for an alternate version (thus Jacoby and Parker), and Diodorus could have found the former in his text. But as Parmeggiani points out, if Diodorus was only reading Ephorus, why would he offer the standard ver-

1 T 11 = Diod. Sic. 5.1.4. Parker, BNJ ad loc, also questions the purely geographical interpretation of the phrase.

2 A claim further weakened if, as Parmeggiani and others argue, Diodorus’ prefaces are not direct copies of Ephorus’ proems (148); Kenneth S. Sacks, Diodorus Siculus and the First Century (Princeton, 1990), 9–22.
sion first as a simple statement of fact, and then give Ephorus’ variant as a matter of his own choosing (‘I do not think it useless . . .’)? On the other hand, Parmeggiani presents no evidence to lead us to believe that Diodorus did not find the notice on the death of Jason of Pherae (F 214 = Diod. Sic. 15.60.5) in a chronographical source. That is clearly its context in Diodorus, and there is no reason that he cannot have taken over the men/de construction from his source. In general, however, Parmeggiani illustrates well that the different dimensions of the two works preclude Diodorus having copied out long stretches of Ephorus.

It is here that Parmeggiani and Parker differ most, as the latter restates the case for Diodorus being ‘an epitome of Ephorus’ and treats him as such in his commentary.¹ The issue is not whether Diodorus used Ephorus in composing his own work – obviously he did – but whether he did so in a way that left Ephorus’ words, attitude, and structure sufficiently intact to allow us to gain a clear picture of his historical writing (and whether we can confidently identify such portions of Diodorus’ text). This last question is the sticking point. The papyrus text Jacoby classified as F 191 (P. Oxy. 13.1610) certainly shows Diodorus retaining some verbatim language from his source – but even here we see abridgment and alteration. It is then an enormous leap to conclude that, for much of five entire books, he copied his sole source so faithfully that he produced a «long fragment of Ephorus» (Parker). That could only be true if Diodorus were a truly lazy writer, and we have no independent means of confirming or denying that judgment. In the end, no amount of argumentation will ever move the ‘findings’ of Quellenforschung beyond conjecture. Thus, in my view, it is poor methodology to base an evaluation of a fragmentary historian on such hypotheses.²

Parmeggiani has performed a great service to the field. By considering the context in which the fragments are preserved at length and in detail, he corrects the distorting influence of the fragmentation process, even if one cannot accept all his conclusions. His book will not be the last word on Ephorus, but it is to be hoped that his careful and sensible approach to the evidence, in conjunction with Parker’s commentary on individual fragments, will provide a new impetus for further research on and greater appreciation for a major figure in Greek historiography.

South Bend

Christopher Baron

¹ Parker, BNJ 70, ‘Biographical Essay’ section 2.F.
² It should be noted, however, that Parker’s commentary on the attested fragments remains careful and judicious, with proper concern for the cover-texts. He also recognizes the distortion of Ephorus that occurs through Diodorus’ use of him (ibid., section 2.D).