

Chabrias at Corinth

Wesley E. Thompson

SOMETIME AFTER DESTROYING the Spartan *mora* Iphicrates was replaced as leader of the mercenary corps in Corinth by Chabrias.¹ On the basis of the scholia to Aelius Aristides, Kirchner has written that Chabrias then led his army to victory at Phlius and Mantinea,² but Parke, regarding the scholia as a “doubtful source,” says that “we find no positive references to successes on Chabrias’ part, unless the garbled references of the Scholiast . . . can be trusted.”³ Paradoxically, I would argue that the scholia do provide valuable information, but that Kirchner’s account is without foundation.

After describing Athenian victories in the Corinthia during the Corinthian War, Aristides continues: ἦλθον δὲ εἰς Ἀρκαδίαν καὶ μέχρι τῆς Λακωνικῆς, κατέκλεισαν δὲ τοὺς ἐν Φλιούντι, καὶ τῶν ἐπεξελθόντων τρόπαιον ἔστησαν, καὶ Μαντινέων πάλιν καὶ Σικωνίων αὐθις ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ καὶ τῶν συμμαχῶν.⁴ The scholiast’s explanation of this passage has come down to us in two versions, only one of which (AC) ascribes the victory at Phlius to Chabrias. By printing this text in full while mutilating the other (BD), Dindorf has misled Kirchner.⁵

The two traditions agree up to a point but then diverge. Here the two versions need to be juxtaposed:

τὰ μετὰ Κορινθίων αὐτοῖς λέγει γενόμενα πρὸς τῷ Τρικάρανῳ, καὶ τὸ κατὰ Φλιασίων τρόπαιον, στρατηγούντος Ἰφικράτους. Φλιούς δὲ πόλις Πελοποννήσου. Φλιασίους οὖν, φίλους ὄντας Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐπολιόρκησαν καὶ ἐπεξελθόντας ⁶ αὐτῶν τινας ἐνίκησαν.	τινας αὐτῶν ἐπεξελθόντας διέφθειραν, στρατηγὸν ἔχοντες Χαβρίαν.
καὶ Μαντινέων πάλιν] ὅτε ἐν Κορίνθῳ πελτασταὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐνίκων, στρατηγούντος Χαβρίου. Σικωνίων	ἐκράτησαν δὲ καὶ Σικωνίων καὶ Μαντινέων, στρατηγὸν ἔχοντες Διότιμον (AC).
δὲ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ οὗτοι Λακεδαιμονίους	

¹ Diod. 14.91.2–92.2; cf. also Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.11–17, 4.8.34, and 5.1.10.

² Johannes Kirchner, *RE* 3 (1899) 2018 s.v. “Chabrias (1)”; *PA* 15086.

³ H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers* (Oxford 1933) 56f.

⁴ *Panath.* 282 Dind. (291 Behr; 207 Oliver).

⁵ 172.3 and 172.4. All citations of the scholia to the *Panathenaicus* follow Dindorf’s numbering (except for his misprints).

⁶ **B** reads ἐξελθόντας.

συνεμάχουν, Διότιμος δὲ Σικυωνίων
καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἐκράτησεν ἐν τῷ
πεδίῳ (BD).

The BD version is consistent, while AC seems to contradict itself. Surely the trophy marks the killing of the Phliasians who came out to oppose the invader; but AC attributes the victory first to Iphicrates, then to Chabrias. Again, it is easy to see how AC is a corruption of BD, but not vice versa. Thus, when the two versions are laid alongside each other, it becomes apparent that the words ὅτε ἐν Κορίνθῳ πελτασταὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐνίκων have dropped out of the ancestor of AC when the copyist's eye skipped from ἐνίκησαν to ἐνίκων.⁷ In the next step of the tradition a scribe took στρατηγούντος Χαβρίου with καὶ ἐπεξελθόντας αὐτῶν τινὰς ἐνίκησαν and recast the sentence accordingly.

Thus there is no evidence to suggest that Chabrias had a victory at Phlius, and there can be little doubt that Aristides and the scholiast are talking about the invasion of Phlius by Iphicrates that Xenophon describes (*Hell.* 4.4.15). In recounting Iphicrates' exploits with his band of peltasts, Xenophon begins with his Phliasian campaign: εἰς Φλειοῦντα ἐμβαλὼν καὶ ἐνεδρευσάμενος, ὀλίγοις δὲ λεηλατῶν, βοηθησάντων τῶν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἀφυλάκτως, ἀπέκτεινε τοσοῦτους ὥστε . . . οἱ Φλειάσιοι . . . καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν ἄκραν φυλάττειν αὐτοῖς (the Spartans) παρέδωκαν. He continues with Iphicrates' incursion into Arcadia, where he ravaged up to the very walls of the cities, for the native hoplites were so afraid of the peltasts that they would not come out to oppose them (4.4.16).

Any discrepancies between Xenophon and Aristides are more apparent than real, and result from each man's special concern: the historian is interested in the tactical innovations Iphicrates brought to warfare, but such tricks, which do nothing to augment *la gloire de la patrie*, find no place in Aristides' recital. We should not take κατέκλεισαν in Aristides to signify a formal investment; it probably describes the same thing Xenophon says happened in Arcadia, *i.e.*, the Phliasians were too frightened to take on the peltasts. Perhaps, then, Iphi-

⁷ At 120.6 D, reporting the events of 509, closes a sentence with the word "Cleisthenes." The next includes a genitive absolute about Cleomenes' attempt to destroy the boule. Somewhere in the transmission a scribe wrote "Cleisthenes" for "Cleomenes," so that A and C absurdly have Cleisthenes trying to destroy the boule (119.19). At 173.7 the BD version correctly has Timotheus defeat the Spartans at Alyzia and later, "while the Spartans were besieging Corcyra," has Iphicrates destroy the ships that Dionysius sent to assist them. The scribe of AC, not noticing the reference to Dionysius' ships, makes Iphicrates defeat "the Spartans."

crates first invaded in full force and cowed the enemy. Then he lured them out to fight by exposing a portion of his corps to a sally from the city. But it would be a mistake to jump to the conclusion that Aristides is narrating in chronological sequence.⁸ He may be putting Iphicrates' accomplishments in order of importance, impressed (perhaps) like Xenophon by the consternation the peltasts inspired in their victims. If so, Iphicrates in the first stage managed to make the Phliasians think that he had only a small force which they could successfully oppose; only after the ambush did he pen them up in fear.⁹

The scholiast makes a single contribution, the reference to the mountain, Tricaranum, on the border between Phlius and Argos, a place which the Argives fortified in the 360's as part of their successful effort to deny the Phliasians the use of their own territory.¹⁰ Whether the scholiast means that Iphicrates used the mountain as his base or that the ambush occurred there is not clear.

Not only is there no evidence for Chabrias' victory at Phlius, there is none for any triumph at Mantinea. The scholiast believes that he defeated the Mantineans at Corinth. But did he actually defeat them anywhere, at any time? When Aristides says in his exordium that he must measure up against his predecessors, the scholiast explains that this means, for instance, to tell τὰ Ἑλληνικά better than Xenophon and τὰ Μηδικά better than Herodotus.¹¹ This surely means that the scholiast himself regards Xenophon as the prime authority for the early fourth century, and much of what he reports about the Corinthian War can be derived from the *Hellenica*.¹² We must believe,

⁸ Aristides mentions the defeat of the *mora* and the elimination of the Spartan forts in the Corinthia before the expeditions against Phlius, Arcadia, and Sicyon (281f Dind.; 290f Behr; 207 Oliver), but Xenophon makes it clear (*Hell.* 4.4.14–17 and 4.5.11–19) that the actual order was just the reverse. (He is silent about Sicyon.) Diodorus (14.91.2f) also puts Phlius and Sicyon (no mention of Arcadia) after the *mora*, indicating that his source, probably Ephorus, reviewed the accomplishments of the peltasts in a digression following his account of the attack on the *mora*.

⁹ Polyaeus (3.9.49 and 54; cf. Frontin. *Str.* 1.6.3), who does not derive his stories from the same tradition as Diodorus, Aristides, and the scholiast, relates an episode in which Iphicrates fends off a Phliasian attack on his men as they march through a narrow pass. This may well have happened on his return from Arcadia. (Frontinus places the action in Thrace.)

¹⁰ Xen. *Hell.* 7.2.1; cf. W. K. Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography* II (Berkeley 1969) 103–05. The scholiast's ἐπολιόρκησαν need not mean a formal siege: cf. Thuc. 7.28.3.

¹¹ *Panath.* 151 Dind. (3 Behr; 3 Oliver), with scholium, 93.2.

¹² The destruction of the *mora* and the Spartan forts in the Corinthia (171.20–172.1), the exploits of Thrasybulus (172.5–7, where his reconciliation of the Thracian rulers [Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.26] has been transmitted corruptly), and the Peace of Antalcidas (168.6 and 172.8). Xenophon is cited for his characterization of Agesilaus as “very warlike” (173.13).

then, that the scholiast's victory of peltasts over the Mantineans at Corinth is the same as Xenophon's victory of peltasts over the Mantineans at Corinth (*Hell.* 4.4.17). Scholars generally take it for granted that Iphicrates commanded the peltasts in this skirmish, but Xenophon does not actually say so, nor does he mention the incident to illustrate the development of new infantry tactics. He introduces it to show why the Spartans had contempt for their allies, who allowed themselves to be beaten by light-armed troops. For this purpose it simply does not matter who commanded them.

Although the scholiast is not contradicted by Xenophon, his statement appears to be in conflict with the testimony of Harpocration (*s.v.* ξενικὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ) that Conon first established the mercenary corps in Corinth, παρέλαβε δ' αὐτὸ Ἴφικράτης ὕστερον καὶ Χαβρίας· ᾧ χρησάμενοι τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων μῶραν κατέκοψαν στρατηγούντος αὐτοῖς Ἴφικράτους καὶ Καλλίου, καθά φησιν Ἀνδροτίων τε καὶ Φιλόχορος.¹³ The defeat of the Mantineans occurred before the destruction of the *mora* by Iphicrates, and thus would fall into his term as leader of the hirelings.

Still it is difficult to ignore the scholiast, who had access to informed sources that have not reached us: he quotes Ephorus and Androtion¹⁴ and, in addition, presents material not found in Xenophon but transmitted by Diodorus and Nepos. Thus, the scholiast mentions the number of ships sunk at Naxos,¹⁵ Chabrias' relief of Abdera,¹⁶ the establishment of the cult of Peace at Athens,¹⁷ and the escape of Conon from imprisonment by the Persians.¹⁸ Sometimes he is able to provide information that goes back centuries but has not been preserved by our historical-biographical sources. He goes beyond Nepos, who reports the tradition that Conon escaped, to add

¹³ *FGrHist* 324F48 and 328F150. Although it would help my case to argue that Harpocration intends to say that Iphicrates and Chabrias took over jointly, I take this passage to mean that they succeeded, one after the other, just as Diodorus (14.92.2) says. Surely the Athenians are the subject of κατέκοψαν.

¹⁴ 177.20 (*FGrHist* 70F211), cited from Ephorus to justify Aristides' remark (291 Dind.; 313 Behr; 221 Oliver) that Dionysius was calling upon the King of Persia to help him attack Greece; 172.20 (*FGrHist* 324F50), where Androtion says that four hundred Thebans fled to Athens. Xenophon (*Hell.* 5.2.31) and Diodorus (15.20.2) speak of three hundred.

¹⁵ 173.16; *cf.* Diod.15.35.2. They agree on the sinkings but differ on the number captured.

¹⁶ 173.17 (also at 172.7 through scribal error); *cf.* Diod. 15.36.1–4.

¹⁷ 178.5; *cf.* Isoc. 15.109f; Didymus *in Dem.* 7.66–71, citing Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328F151); Nep. *Timoth.* 2.2. The manuscripts (B and D) here credit Iphicrates with the victory off Leucas that led to the foundation of the cult, but at 173.17 the BD version correctly has it that Timotheus defeated the Spartans; *cf. supra* n.7.

¹⁸ 170.7; *cf.* Nep. *Conon* 5.4.

the detail that he then returned to Cyprus (170.7). Scholars generally believe that an incidental remark of Lysias confirms this.¹⁹ Again, when Aristides says that the Athenians banished those who persuaded them to accept the Peace of Antalcidas, the scholiast explains that Epicrates is meant.²⁰ Before the discovery of the Didymus papyrus, we had no confirmation; but we now know that Philochorus recorded the banishment of Epicrates and his fellow ambassadors for agreeing to the terms of the Peace.²¹

Since, then, there is every likelihood that the scholiast was as well informed as Harpocration, it behooves us to reconcile the two. The solution, I suggest, is the usual one: the doublet. Not two battles against the men of Mantinea, but two commanders on the Athenian side. The way Xenophon characterizes the leaders of the assault on the *mora* (Καλλίας τε ὁ Ἴππονίκου, τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὀπλιτῶν στρατηγῶν, καὶ Ἴφικράτης, τῶν πελταστῶν ἄρχων) has suggested to some that Iphicrates held a subordinate position.²² I would propose that prior to the appointment of Callias, it was Chabrias who was the chief of the Athenian forces at Corinth, while Iphicrates, as archon of the peltasts, was training his men in their new tactics and leading them in occasional skirmishes, such as the engagement with the Mantineans.²³

There is in general, I think, a certain artificiality in the scholiast's reporting of military affairs. He names Diotimus, for instance, as the commander of the expedition against Sicyon; surely this is the man

¹⁹ Lys. 19.39–41; cf. H. Swoboda, *RE* 11 (1922) 1333 s.v. "Konon (3)."

²⁰ 283 Dind. (293 Behr; 208 Oliver), with scholium, 172.15.

²¹ Didymus in *Dem.* 7.17–28 (=Philoch. *FGrHist* 328F149a). There are difficulties in understanding this text (cf. I. A. F. Bruce, "Athenian Embassies in the Early Fourth Century B.C.," *Historia* 15 [1966] 272–81), but they do not diminish the scholiast's value.

²² See especially Parke (*supra* n.3) 52. If the report is true that Iphicrates was quite young at the time (*Just. Epit.* 6.5.2; *Oros. Adv. Pag.* 3.1.21), his age would help explain his rank. Parke's theory requires that Xenophon is making a nice distinction that later writers (Harpocration, the scholiast, and possibly Diodorus) fail to make.

²³ On my theory, Chabrias first appears in history as commander of hoplites at Corinth; some years later he returned as leader of the mercenaries. The very perceptive referees of this paper have suggested that in saying that the Athenians recalled Iphicrates and sent out Chabrias ἀντ' αὐτοῦ στρατηγόν, Diodorus (14.92.2) means that Iphicrates the strategos was replaced by Chabrias the strategos, and that each man had control of the total Athenian contingent at Corinth. If so, one would suppose that Iphicrates had been rewarded for crushing the *mora* by election to the strategia. In fact, one could combine *Dem.* 4.24 (Polystratus commanded the mercenary corps at Corinth) with *Dem.* 20.84 (because of Iphicrates, Polystratus was honored by the demos) and hypothesize that Polystratus became archon of the peltasts when Iphicrates became general. For other interpretations see Parke (*supra* n.3) 50. In Xenophon there is no further Spartan move against Corinth after the defeat of the *mora*, and thus the Athenians may have taken the opportunity to recall their hoplites and end the division of command.

who served with Iphicrates at the Hellespont.²⁴ But Diodorus gives the credit for the triumph at Sicyon to Iphicrates (14.91.3). Likewise, during the Thebans' war for independence Athens sent them assistance under the command, according to the scholiast, of Chabrias and Demeas, who is otherwise unattested.²⁵ Other sources, including Diodorus, mention only Chabrias, whom the demos honored with a statue for his success in this campaign.²⁶

As we have seen, the scholiast had access to an *Atthis*. Several fragments of Philochorus show that his military entries were quite short, naming the general, listing the number of troops, and telling the final outcome, but foregoing any description of battles and offering no analysis of tactics²⁷—in short, what he could derive from official archives: resolutions dispatching expeditions, honorary decrees for victorious generals, *etc.* In contrast, Diodorus for the period 404–362, as can be seen in several places,²⁸ depends on a historian whose interest in the details of battles led him to gather oral testimony. I would argue, then, that the strategoi (Chabrias, Diotimus, Callias)²⁹ came and went, while Iphicrates stayed on as captain of the mercenaries. Xenophon and Diodorus' ultimate source knew where to allocate plaudits for the accomplishments of the mercenary corps. The *Atthis*, on this theory, recorded the strategoi nominally in charge at Corinth and the sites of Athenian triumphs, but (with the exception of the famous defeat of the *mora*)³⁰ did not narrate the en-

²⁴ 172.3–4, discussed *supra*; cf. Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.25 and Lys. 19.50f. Diotimus probably served in later years under the command of Chabrias: cf. A. P. Burnett and C. N. Edmonson, "The Chabrias Monument in the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 39 (1961) 79–81. That particular monument is important for our topic since it carries an inscription that seems to show a commander of mercenaries functioning as the subordinate of an elected strategos.

²⁵ 173.11 and 13, where "Demades" is a variant. Some have proposed to emend to "Demophon," who led an expedition to Thebes in the preceding year (Diod. 15.26.2f). The scholiast (or his source) exaggerates the Athenian achievement, turning it into a rout of the Spartans.

²⁶ Diod. 15.32f; Nep. *Chabr.* 1.2f. Polyaeus (2.1.2) does give some credit to the Theban commander. Cf. J. K. Anderson, "The Statue of Chabrias," *AJA* 67 (1963) 411–13, and John Buckler, "A Second Look at the Monument of Chabrias," *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 466–74.

²⁷ *FGrHist* 328F49–51, 54, and 144f.

²⁸ 14.83.4–7 (a more serious attempt to explain Cnidus than Xenophon makes: *Hell.* 4.3.10–12), 15.34.3–35.2 (Naxos, scandalously neglected by Xenophon, *Hell.* 5.4.61), 15.64 (detailed invasion routes into Laconia), 15.69 (Theban defeat at Corinth, with major differences from Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.18f).

²⁹ Since there is no secure indication whether the victory at Sicyon preceded the defeat of the *mora* (*supra* n.8), we cannot be sure whether Diotimus or Callias was earlier.

³⁰ Even an abbreviated chronicle could hardly ignore Iphicrates' contribution. I am assuming that the scholiast learned from Xenophon that Iphicrates led the expedition

counters in detail, thus failing to convey the reality that Iphicrates was responsible for those victories.³¹

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
February, 1985

against Phlius. But if the scholiast derived all three names (Chabrias, Diotimus, Iphicrates) from the *Atthis*, the explanation would seem to be that the *Atthis* ignored Iphicrates when he was subordinate to the commander of hoplites at Corinth and Sicyon, and named him when he operated independently, without hoplites, at Phlius.

³¹ There is no point in postulating two victories at Sicyon. As an encomiast of Athens, Aristides would have every reason to mention both; and the scholiast, too, had he found references to two battles, would have needed to cite both. It is extremely unlikely that Diodorus should find a reference to a notable Athenian triumph that eluded an orator who displays a "thorough familiarity with the great historians, including Ephorus, as literary objects, and with the orators, poets, and Plato" (C. A. Behr in the Loeb *Aristides* I [1973] 4). All three late authorities had access to Ephorus. Since Diodorus describes a set battle, with the Sicyonians lined up in front of the city walls and suffering five hundred casualties, it may be that Athenian hoplites (under Diotimus) joined the peltasts (under Iphicrates).