

## THREE FLEETS OR TWO?

Vivien Howan (Massey University)

Did the Athenians send two fleets to Cyprus during the Corinthian War of 395 to 387/6, as is commonly believed, or did they send three, as has been argued by Peter Stylianou?<sup>1</sup> Two fleets sent to Cyprus appear in Xen. *Hell.* (4.8.24 and 5.1.10), and one in Lys. 19. Each fleet consists of ten ships. It is customary to identify Lysias' fleet with one or other of Xenophon's; for the most part scholars choose the earlier of the two. Stylianou rejects this approach, arguing that the circumstances of the speech do not fit either of Xenophon's expeditions. He places Lysias' expedition at the beginning of a series of three. While certainty is not possible, there are indications that Stylianou's proposal is not the perfect solution to the puzzling aspects of the situation, but that it is probably preferable to revert to the usual conclusion. At the very least, there is no real barrier to identifying Lysias' fleet with the first mentioned by Xenophon, while it is awkward to relegate Xenophon's first fleet to second place.

Throughout the Corinthian War the Athenians had a connection with King Evagoras of Salamis in Cyprus. Evagoras had welcomed the Athenian commander Conon after the disastrous battle at Aegospotami near the close of the Peloponnesian War (Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.29), and had introduced him some years later to the Persian satrap Pharnabazus (Diod. Sic. 14.39.1). From this introduction, Conon gained a naval command against the Spartans and, along with Pharnabazus, won an important naval victory at Cnidus at the beginning of 394/3 (Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.10; Diod. Sic. 14.83.4-7; Lys. 19.28).<sup>2</sup> A few years later, in the archonship of Nicoteles (391/0), according to Diod. Sic. 14.97-98, the inhabitants of three cities in Cyprus asked the Persian king for help against attacks from Evagoras. We are told that the king responded favourably to their request, ordering Hecatomnus of Caria to cross over to the island (Diod. Sic. 14.14.98.2-4). According to Theopompus, Autophradates was also instructed to go.<sup>3</sup>

Both Xenophon and Lysias indicate that the fleets they mention were intended to bring help to Evagoras. In a speech written for an unnamed defendant in a lawsuit, Lysias mentions ambassadors that had come from Cyprus asking for help (19.21) and an Athenian decision to send ten warships. A precise date for this is not easy to reach, but it has been tempting to see it as connected with the Persian king's plans to launch an attack on Evagoras. Of the two fleets mentioned by Xenophon as having been sent by the Athenians to help Evagoras, the second is easier to date than the first. It is led by Chabrias, who first takes his ships to Aegina and wins a victory there (*Hell.* 5.1.10-13). This follows a defeat experienced by Eunomus, the previous commander at Aegina, in 388/7 (*Hell.* 5.1.6-9).<sup>4</sup> Therefore, Chabrias' fleet went to Cyprus no earlier than 388/7. Other circumstances ensure that it could not have been any later,<sup>5</sup> but the

---

<sup>1</sup> Stylianou (1988) 463-71.

<sup>2</sup> Xenophon's mention of a solar eclipse at the time when Agesilaus found out about the battle allows us to date it to August 394. This eclipse appears also in Plut. *Ages.* 17.2. Lys. 19.28 shows that the Athenian year was 394/3 (the archonship of Eubulides).

<sup>3</sup> As indicated in *FGrH* 115, F 103, Photius' summary of the contents of Book 12 of the *Philippica*.

<sup>4</sup> The year is determined by the fact that his encounter with the Spartan Gorgopas took place just after Antalcidas, the nauarch for the Spartan year 388/7, had been escorted by Gorgopas to Ephesus (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.6-7).

<sup>5</sup> Chabrias waged war successfully there before peace negotiations brought the war to an end (see the next paragraph). More telling is the fact that the Athenians experienced some benefits as a result of

important point is that it was clearly several years after the date indicated by Diodorus for the start of Evagoras' problems. How much earlier Xenophon's other fleet set sail is not easy to work out, and there are varying opinions on the matter.

Xenophon's two fleets experienced different fortunes. The first, led by Philocrates son of Ephialtes, was captured by the Spartan commander Teleutias<sup>6</sup> (*Hell.* 4.8.24), who had recently been sent from his post in the Corinthian Gulf to the Aegean (*Xen. Hell.* 4.8.23), but the other evidently arrived safely at its destination. Demosthenes mentions trophies erected by Chabrias in Cyprus (*Dem.* 20.76), and Cornelius Nepos mentions success for Chabrias there (*Chabrias* 2.2).

The outcome of the expedition of Lysias 19 is not specifically stated, but we are given other information. Ambassadors from Evagoras requested help, and their request was supported by Aristophanes, an Athenian (*Lys.* 19.21-22). Aristophanes received encouragement from his father Nicophemus, who was currently living in Cyprus (19.23, 36, 44). We are told that Aristophanes was so keen on helping Evagoras that he used all his own money and then borrowed from others (19.22-23). At some stage after the expedition, Aristophanes and Nicophemus were executed in mysterious circumstances (19.7), possibly in Cyprus,<sup>7</sup> and Aristophanes' property in Athens was confiscated, seemingly on the motion of one Aeschines.<sup>8</sup> From comments made in the speech, it emerges that Aristophanes' relatives by marriage were suspected of having taken some of the property (19.8-11, 32-33), so a case was brought against the unnamed speaker's father, and, on his death, against the son (19.1, 9-10, 56, 60-62).

At one time there was debate about which of Xenophon's fleets was the fleet of Lysias 19, but most concluded that it was the earlier of the two, the one that had been captured by Teleutias.<sup>9</sup> Its failure to achieve its mission would supply a motive for Athenian anger against Aristophanes and Nicophemus.<sup>10</sup> Besides, as pointed out by Robin Seager, Eunomus is named as a witness for the defence in the current trial (19.23).<sup>11</sup> He is also named in another connection (19.19).<sup>12</sup> He had obviously not yet suffered the defeat in relation to Aegina that took place in 388/7, shortly before Chabrias had enjoyed success on Aegina, on his way to help Evagoras. Eunomus is

---

Chabrias' victory on Aegina (*Xen. Hell.* 5.1.13) before Teleutias, also in 388/7, regained the advantage for Sparta in the Saronic Gulf (*Hell.* 5.1.14-24). The point about a gap between Chabrias' victory on Aegina and Teleutias' return there is made by Funke (1980) 99 n. 99.

<sup>6</sup> Teleutias was the brother of King Agesilaus. In 391 he had helped his brother in a successful attack on the allies based at Corinth (*Xen. Hell.* 4.4.19), Teleutias being responsible for the naval warfare.

<sup>7</sup> This was argued Tuplin (1983) 173-175. Stylianou (1988) 464 regards it as probable. S.C. Todd (2000) 200 n. 2 comments that 'it would be easier to understand the details in, e.g., 19.7, if the execution took place in Cyprus'. Other writers have tended to assume execution in Athens. An example is Strauss (1986) 151. The warship mentioned in 19.24 but not identified is sometimes interpreted as either the *Paralos* or the *Salaminia* sent to arrest the pair, as in Gernet and Bizos (1955) 45. Tuplin (1983) 174 objects to this idea, saying of the speaker: 'He is simply assuming his audience's knowledge of the circumstances'. In other words, this need not be a special trireme.

<sup>8</sup> Aeschines' initiative is deduced from a mention by Harpocration of a speech by Lysias that is now lost. Harpocration's entry is printed in Medda (1995) 475. The title refers to a prosecution speech against Aeschines in relation to the confiscation of Aristophanes' property. The prosecution must have been unsuccessful, as the confiscation went ahead.

<sup>9</sup> As noted by Tuplin (1983) 172.

<sup>10</sup> Gernet and Bizos (1955) 37 suggest that the charge was that of having deceived the people.

<sup>11</sup> Seager (1967) 113 n. 182.

<sup>12</sup> Although Caven (1990) 126 regards the Eunomus mentioned there as 'probably a Syracusan resident at Athens', most identify him with the Eunomus who has presented testimony for the speaker and who at a slightly later date was defeated at sea as an Athenian general.

evidently in favour at Athens, so an earlier date than his naval defeat of 388/7 appears to be required.<sup>13</sup> This cuts Chabrias out of the picture, as his expedition came later.

Dissatisfied with the identification of the fleet of Lysias 19 with that led by Philocrates, Stylianou proposed that the fleet of Lysias 19 was additional to those mentioned by Xenophon, and set sail before either of the others.<sup>14</sup> Stylianou sees two objections to identifying the fleet of Lysias 19 with that captured by the Spartans. Firstly, there is the fact that the speaker states that those who had lent money to Aristophanes for the expedition were paid back (Lys. 19.24). He takes this as signifying a successful voyage, removing the opportunity for the speaker to claim that the money was lost through enemy action. Secondly, there is the assumption that Aristophanes arrived in Cyprus. Stylianou disagrees with the idea that, as an ambassador, Aristophanes would have travelled separately from the main expedition. For this he gives four reasons: (1) that Aristophanes was too closely associated with the expedition to miss the opportunity of sailing with it; (2) that there would be safety in sailing with the fleet, as Aristophanes would have realized after experiencing hazards on an embassy to Dionysius I of Syracuse, probably in 393 (19.19-20); (3) that it would be more cost-effective to send ambassadors with the rest; and (4) that no personal costs incurred in the process are noted, in contrast to the 100 minas spent on the embassy to Dionysius (19.43).<sup>15</sup>

Stylianou also argues that the fleet of Lysias 19 was the first of the series, partly because of his opinion that Philocrates sailed in 389, whereas an indication of crisis in the speech (19.24) is seen as pointing to the beginning of the Cypriote War for Aristophanes' expedition: in other words, 391/0 by Diodorus' dating. It is agreed that Chabrias' expedition took place later, so this means that Aristophanes' would be the first of the three.<sup>16</sup> The speaker mentions four or five years after the battle of Cnidus (394/3) for considerable expenditure engaged in by Aristophanes, ranging from outlays on extensive public services to the purchase of expensive real estate (Lys. 19.28-29). Stylianou takes these four or five years as ending with the deaths of Aristophanes and Nicophemus, which he places in 390/89. Also in 390/89, before summer 389, which is when he places the sailing of Philocrates, come the trials mentioned in the speech: that leading to the confiscation of property and the current one against Aristophanes' brother-in-law. This is because the wording of Lysias at one point (19.43) suggests to him that the speaker knew of only one expedition, so, on his interpretation, that of Philocrates must belong after the trials.<sup>17</sup>

While this proposal may appear to resolve difficulties associated with identifying Aristophanes' expedition with that of Philocrates, it conflicts with the views of various scholars on the chronology of certain events of this part of the Corinthian War. Philocrates' fleet left Athens very close in time to forty ships under Thrasybulus of Steiria that were originally intended for Rhodes but headed north (Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.25). Although Cawkwell's date of 391 for Thrasybulus' expedition<sup>18</sup> has sometimes been considered too early, many have been happy to accept Seager's 390,

<sup>13</sup> Some have assumed a date as late as 387 for the trial represented by the extant speech, basing this on a mention of Diotimus as general in 19.50. One example is Medda (1995) 129; another is Lamb (1930) 416. While Diotimus is known to have served as an Athenian general in 388/7, this need not be his first generalship. Lists of generals for the period are far from complete, so Diotimus' generalship of 388/7 is not significant for dating the trial.

<sup>14</sup> Stylianou (1988) 463-471.

<sup>15</sup> Stylianou (1988) 465-466.

<sup>16</sup> Stylianou (1988) 468-469.

<sup>17</sup> Stylianou (1988) 469.

<sup>18</sup> Cawkwell (1976) 273-274.

still in the same archon year (391/0).<sup>19</sup> This is a year too early for Stylianou's dating of Philocrates' expedition to summer 389.

Stylianou endeavours to prove the correctness of his date through an examination of a sequence of Spartan nauarchs, but he argues himself that we cannot be certain that Xenophon supplies the names of all of these, or that all he labels as nauarchs were actually official nauarchs.<sup>20</sup> A crucial area of conflict is over Ecdicus, who was relieved of his position by Teleutias not long before the capture of Philocrates' ships. Was he nauarch for 390/89, as Stylianou thinks,<sup>21</sup> or 391/0, as Cawkwell thinks?<sup>22</sup> Cawkwell suggests Chilon for 390/89.<sup>23</sup> Stylianou refers to Cawkwell's suggestion, commenting: 'Cawkwell ... suggests for that year the otherwise unknown Chilon'.<sup>24</sup> Cawkwell, however, did not invent Chilon, but obtained him from Aeschines. 2.78. Aeschines labels him a nauarch, and the mention of a naval battle against the Athenian Demaenetus presumably puts him in the Corinthian War period, as the dates of Demaenetus' known activities range from 397/6 to 387/6.<sup>25</sup> Most commentators assume that Aeschines has been careless in his statement of the facts in naming Chilon as the opponent and assigning him the rank of nauarch, and then describing the encounter as a naval battle.<sup>26</sup> The reason for the scepticism is the almost universal assumption that Aeschines is really talking about an incident mentioned by the Oxyrhynchus historian, in which Demaenetus escaped from Milon, the harmost of Aegina, while fleeing with a ship that he had intended for Conon's use against the Spartans (*Hell. Oxy.* London fragments 6.1, 8.1-2).<sup>27</sup> Cawkwell objects to the changing of Chilon's name to Milon and his status from nauarch to harmost, and the changing of the nature of the encounter to fit the circumstances of 397/6. He prefers to take Aeschines at his word and slot Chilon in as the missing nauarch for 390/89. An alternative offered by Figueira, who accepts the usual changes made to Aeschines' account, is to have Ecdicus as nauarch in 391/0, in this agreeing with Cawkwell, but to have Teleutias as his successor.<sup>28</sup> Importantly, both writers see a gap of a year (390/89) between Ecdicus and Hierax, who was nauarch for 389/8. Some of Thrasybulus' activities and his death are placed by them in 390/389.

<sup>19</sup> Seager (1967) 109 n. 27. 'Early in spring 390' Teleutias receives the command to sail to the Aegean, according to Seager (1994) 113. An example of the acceptance of Seager's position is Strauss (1986) 150 and 167 n. 1. Some regard either late 391 or spring 390 as possible. Among these is Buck (1998) 112.

<sup>20</sup> Stylianou (1988) 467-468.

<sup>21</sup> Stylianou (1988) 468.

<sup>22</sup> Cawkwell (1976) 272 n. 14.

<sup>23</sup> Cawkwell (1976) 272 n. 14.

<sup>24</sup> Stylianou (1988) 468 n. 20.

<sup>25</sup> The earliest date at which he is attested is supplied by the Oxyrhynchus historian. McKechnie and Kern (1988) 132 state: 'We cannot tell with what events the author synchronises Demaenetus' expedition. The only clue is provided by the reference (7.1) to Pharax, the former nauarch. He commanded the Spartan forces that supported Dercyllidas' military operations in Caria, and his command seems to have ended in autumn 397, thus placing Demaenetus' activities in winter 397/6 or spring 396.' The latest reference to him shows him as one of the Athenian generals at the end of the Corinthian War (*Xen. Hell.* 5.1.25-26).

<sup>26</sup> An example is Bruce (1967) 50-51.

<sup>27</sup> As the Athenians were still officially at peace with Sparta at the time, and still evidently felt vulnerable, when the attempt was discovered they decided to inform Milon (*Hell. Oxy.* London fragments 6.2-3), who then gave chase.

<sup>28</sup> Figueira (1990) 28-29 and 34.

Stylianou's position implies a later date for Thrasybulus' death: that is, 388.<sup>29</sup> This, however, results in a very tight timetable for events in the later stages of the Corinthian War. In particular, on this theory, Chabrias would need to return from Thrasybulus' expedition, presumably after the latter's death in 388,<sup>30</sup> assume command of the peltasts at Corinth (Diod. Sic. 14.92.2), perform actions there that caused his leadership of the peltasts to be remembered (Harp. *Lexicon s.v.* 'Mercenary Force in Corinth',<sup>31</sup> Dem. 4.24), sail to Aegina, apparently after some prior naval appointment (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.10), defeat the Spartan Gorgopas on Aegina and then proceed to Cyprus, all before spring 387, the latest possible time for Teleutias to go to Aegina after Chabrias' success there.<sup>32</sup> In view of this congestion, there needs to be some compelling reason to accept such a late date for Thrasybulus' death.

If Ecdicus was the Spartan navarch for 391/0 instead of 390/89, Stylianou's chronological scheme collapses, and the first expedition becomes that of Philocrates. Stylianou correctly states: 'Teleutias was sailing to Rhodes having relieved Ecdicus of his command when he fell in with and captured the squadron of Philocrates',<sup>33</sup> but his date of summer 389 would need to be changed to 390. According to Stylianou, this is when Aristophanes probably set sail: in fact, he suggests spring of that year.<sup>34</sup> In this situation, the only way that a third fleet can be salvaged is by placing it second chronologically. This would have one attraction. It has always been regarded as difficult to reconcile the four or five years of expenditure after Cnidus with a 391/0 sailing, as it is usually presumed that Aristophanes and Nicophemus died shortly after the expedition.<sup>35</sup> The problem becomes more acute if we treat seriously the redating of the end of the Cypriote War to 381 proposed by van der Spek<sup>36</sup> and regarded as certain by Rhodes.<sup>37</sup> As there is general acceptance of the statements in Diod. Sic. 15.9.2 and Isoc. 9.64 to the effect that this was a ten-year war, Cawkwell's date (391) for Thrasybulus' and Philocrates' sailings would suddenly look more attractive. It could be argued that after the failure of their first effort the Athenians had some more ships built and sent out a second fleet, before the sailing of Chabrias in 388/7.

At this point, however, another matter needs to be considered: the number of warships the Athenians could afford to build in the course of just a few years, after

<sup>29</sup> This is on the usual assumption that Thrasybulus left Athens in spring or summer, spent winter in the north Aegean and started heading south in the following spring.

<sup>30</sup> Chabrias is known to have accompanied Thrasybulus' final expedition as a result of inscriptional evidence that assigns him a role in the reconciliation of the Thracian kings that is attributed to Thrasybulus by both Xenophon and Diodorus (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup> 21; Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.26; Diod. Sic. 14.94.2).

<sup>31</sup> This is the translation of Harding (1985) 35.

<sup>32</sup> Teleutias' activities in the Saronic Gulf precede the return in spring or summer 387 of the Spartan Antalcidas from his visit to Persia.

<sup>33</sup> Stylianou (1988) 468-469.

<sup>34</sup> Stylianou (1988) 469.

<sup>35</sup> This concern was expressed long ago by Rehdantz (1845) 35 n. 25. More recently, Todd (2000) 200 n. 1 comments: 'In 19.28-29 Aristophanes' death is placed "four to five years" after Cnidus, which in context is likely to be a conservative figure, as the speaker is trying to minimize the time period for his expenditures.'

<sup>36</sup> Van der Spek (1998) 239-256 examines extracts from Babylonian diaries, which survive in fragmentary form. The first he looks at dates to 381 and concerns some major event relating to the king of Salamis in Cyprus, who must be Evagoras. There are two possibilities: the naval battle at Citium and the end of the war. By placing Citium in 386, van der Spek is able to conclude that the war ended in 381.

<sup>37</sup> Rhodes (2006) 224. It should be noted, however, that not all scholars are convinced that the battle of Citium took place in 386. For example, Ruzicka (1999) 27-28 n. 11 argues against this. Ruzicka, though, does not cite van der Spek. His arguments are directed at Shrimpton (1991) 1-20. Similarly, Tuplin (1996) 9-15 disagrees with Shrimpton.

being confined to twelve following the Peloponnesian War (Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.20). The forty under Thrasybulus and the ten under Philocrates are the earliest mentioned by Xenophon, and they were soon followed by an unknown number at Oeniadae (Xen. *Hell.* 4.6.14). This was a big undertaking. Part of the concern that led to the trials of some of Thrasybulus' fellow-commanders after his death may have been the damage sustained in a storm by twenty-three of the forty ships involved in that enterprise (Diod. Sic. 14.94.3).<sup>38</sup>

Changing Stylianou's order of events, moreover, clashes with a point that he raises. He comments on Lys. 19.21-24, detecting a note of urgency, appropriate to the beginning of the war. This is one of his arguments for regarding Aristophanes' expedition as earlier than that of Philocrates. On the other hand, it could be argued that Xenophon treats Philocrates' expedition as earlier when he remarks on the strange behaviour of both the Athenians and the Spartans. The Athenians, who were allied to the Persians, were sending help to a king who was at war with Persia, while the Spartans, who were at war with the Persians, were preventing a force hostile to Persia from reaching its intended destination.<sup>39</sup> Xenophon here gives the impression that the Athenian initiative is something new.<sup>40</sup>

Three fleets are not actually needed for the evidence to make sense. Stylianou's objections to identifying that of Lysias 19 with that of Philocrates are not insuperable. That the money borrowed by Aristophanes had been paid back could have been a fact, regardless of the success or failure of the expedition. The loans had been raised from friends and family (19.22), and the speaker specifically mentions guarantees made to friends. Later in the speech the speaker argues that Nicophemus would have kept most of his wealth in Cyprus (19.36-37). If he is right in this claim, Nicophemus could have met Aristophanes' financial obligations as a matter of honour, not to mention political wisdom.

By drawing attention to the loans the speaker reinforces the argument that Aristophanes would not have left any wealth behind in Athens (19.22-27). Partway through the passage testimony is produced to prove that the loans were made and were paid back. Interestingly, the speaker also claims at a later stage that the seven minas borrowed from his own father were not repaid, and that his sister's dowry had not been repaid (19.32). By this time, his focus has changed to his father's and his own integrity in guarding the property of Aristophanes once it had been confiscated, to ensure that it was kept intact (19.31). He then moves on to his personal plight (19.33). The mention of the financial losses comes between these two messages, reinforcing both. So far from having any part of Aristophanes' estate, he is owed two sums of money from it (19.32). Could there be anything worse than to lose one's own property and to be regarded as having that of others? Not only that, he is now faced with the prospect of bringing up his sister's children, possibly after having his own

---

<sup>38</sup> Lysias 28, a supplementary prosecution speech against Ergocles, who was on that expedition, refers to the deterioration of the fleet (Lys. 28.2, 4), while not admitting that this was caused by a storm, as seen in Diodorus' account. The speaker was, after all, aiming for a conviction. He insinuates that the money that should have been spent on the maintenance of the ships has gone into the pockets of the accused and his friends.

<sup>39</sup> With regard to the strange behaviour, Tuplin (1996) 12 suggests that the passage of Xenophon may have been written in hindsight, and that the early years of the war were not initially seen as a conflict between Evagoras and Persia, but between Evagoras and other Cypriotes. Cawkwell (1976) 274 makes a similar point.

<sup>40</sup> While it is true that the incident is probably related to highlight the paradox, the point loses some of its impact if this is the second in a series of three fleets.

property confiscated, depending on the outcome of the present trial (19.33).<sup>41</sup> If he is telling the truth, not all the lenders have been repaid. Perhaps family members had not been offered guarantees. Alternatively, the speaker's father might have tried to distance himself from his in-laws, just as his son tries to distance his father from them in the course of the speech (19.18). These examples of alleged non-payment undermine the idea that the speaker's claims show that the fleet of Aristophanes must have arrived safely in Cyprus.

Stylianou's second point is not foolproof, either. Aristophanes' presumed arrival in Cyprus in spite of the fleet's capture by Teleutias is not inexplicable. It does seem a little unlikely, as Stylianou argues, that the Athenians would supply a separate ship just for the ambassadors,<sup>42</sup> unless they had to go ahead of the rest to make arrangements, but there is no evidence for this. Another, more likely, explanation is that Nicophemus ransomed Aristophanes and arranged transport for him to Cyprus. Tuplin perhaps hints at this in his statement: 'Aristophanes could not have reached Cyprus at all without securing his release from Teleutias ... and it is possible that suspicion attached to the circumstances in which he did so'.<sup>43</sup>

This brings us back to the possibility that Aristophanes' fleet and Philocrates' fleet may have been one and the same, in spite of the short interval between Cnidus and this expedition. The gap of four or five years after the battle of Cnidus may not be as problematic as is sometimes thought. Although the speaker of Lysias 19 was at pains to emphasise the extent of Aristophanes' expenditure in the interval between Cnidus and his death, the precise length of time was not as important as the amount spent. He had to attempt to prove that Aristophanes had nothing left for his in-laws to grab. He was also trying to minimise the size of the family fortune prior to Cnidus so that all he had to account for was what Aristophanes had acquired since. It may be that some of the enormous expenditure squashed into the roughly three or three-and-a-half years after Cnidus actually belongs before that battle, but the speaker has moved it to avoid focusing on the size of the estate owned beforehand. He maintains that all Aristophanes owned before Cnidus was a small estate at Rhamnous (19.28), incidentally saying nothing about what Nicophemus owned.<sup>44</sup> All the wealth and all the expenditure follow Cnidus (19.29). It might have seemed unbelievable that all of the activity mentioned took place in such a short period of time, so the period could have been extended a little, by means of a vague expression.<sup>45</sup>

There is, in fact, something a bit odd about the poverty and obscurity from which Nicophemus and Aristophanes had supposedly risen. Nicophemus was one of two Athenians that we know of to have been placed in responsible positions by Conon (Xen. Hell. 4.8.8; Diod. Sic. 14.81.4).<sup>46</sup> How did he attract Conon's attention? Lys.

<sup>41</sup> My paraphrase.

<sup>42</sup> Stylianou (1988) 465-466.

<sup>43</sup> Tuplin (1983) 175. A footnote (n. 31) refers to Dem. 23.116, which tells of an exchange of words between Philocrates son of Ephialtes and the Spartans that could relate to events following the capture of the fleet, although Demosthenes is rather vague on context. It is almost certainly the same Philocrates. While Philocrates was a common name, Ephialtes was not, and there are only two references in literature to a Philocrates son of Ephialtes.

<sup>44</sup> Todd (2000) 208 n. 16 comments: 'It is unclear (perhaps deliberately so) whether the property in question is that of Aristophanes alone, or of Aristophanes and his father Nicophemus together.' Edwards (1999) 117 observes: '... the speaker has good reason to exaggerate the poverty of his marriage-relations.'

<sup>45</sup> Tuplin (1983) 176-177 draws attention to the use of the same expression later in the speech (19.52) to refer to a period of a little more than four years. Here the same impression is no doubt intended, but the speaker could still be trying to deceive the hearers.

<sup>46</sup> Diodorus refers to Nicophemus as Nicodemus, but this certainly the same man.

19.13 describes Nicophemus and Aristophanes as *epieikeis*, a term that could be used to refer to aristocratic birth.<sup>47</sup> A prejudice against marrying those of low birth is, in fact, apparent from 19.15. Birth, according to the speaker, was a more important consideration to his father than money. By marrying one of his daughters to Aristophanes, the speaker's father has acted in accordance with his principles. Nicophemus and Aristophanes were not nobodies, and perhaps they were not poor, either.

There is nothing impossible about identifying Xenophon's first fleet with that of Lysias 19, and there are several factors that support the identification. These include the impression of engagement in a new enterprise gained from the accounts of the two authors, the chronological difficulties resulting from a late date for Philocrates' expedition and the unlikelihood of investment in another fleet to go to Cyprus so soon after the first.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, C.D. (1919). *The Speeches of Aeschines*. London, and Cambridge Mass: William Heinemann Ltd, and Harvard University Press.
- Brownson, C.L. (1918). *Xenophon's Hellenica, Books I-V*. London, and New York: William Heinemann Ltd, and G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Bruce, I.A.F. (1967). *An Historical Commentary on the 'Hellenica Oxyrhynchia'*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Buck, R. J. (1998). *Thrasybulus and the Athenian Democracy*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Caven, B. (1990). *Dionysius I: War-Lord of Sicily*. New Haven, and London: Yale Univ. Press.
- Cawkwell, G.L. (1976). 'The Imperialism of Thrasybulus', *CQ* N. S. 26: 273-77.
- Edwards, M.J. (1999). *Lysias: Five Speeches*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Figueira, T.J. (1990). 'Aigina and the Naval Strategy of the Late Fifth and Early Fourth Centuries', *Rh.Mus.* 133: 15-51.
- Funke, P. (1980). *Homónoia und Arché*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Gernet, L., and M. Bizos, (1955). *Lysias, Discours*, vol. 2. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres'.
- Harding, P. (1985). *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Jacoby, F. (1962) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, vol. 2B. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Kirchner, J. (1974). *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Posterioriores*, vol. 1. Chicago: Ares Publishers Inc. (reprint of 1913 edition, published in Berlin).
- Lamb, W.R.M. (1930). *Lysias*. London, and New York: William Heinemann Ltd, and G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Mathieu, G., and É. Brémond. (1967). *Isocrate Discours*, vol. 2. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres'.
- McKechnie, P.R., and S.J. Kern, (1988). *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Medda, E. (1995). *Lisia Orazioni (XVI-XXXIV), Frammenti*. Milano: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli.
- Oldfather, C.H. (1954). *Diodorus of Sicily*, vol. 6. London, and Cambridge Mass.: William Heinemann Ltd, and Harvard University Press.

<sup>47</sup> This can be seen, for instance, in [Arist.] *Ath Pol.* 28.1. Strauss (1986) 109 translates *epieikeis* in *Hell. Oxy.* 1.3 as 'men of breeding'.

- Perrin, B. (1917). *Plutarch's Lives*, vol. 5. London, and Cambridge Mass.: William Heinemann Ltd, and Harvard University Press.
- Rehdantz, K.O. (1845). *Vitae Iphikratis Chabriae Timothei Atheniensium*. Berlin: E. H. Schroeder.
- Rhodes, P.J. (2006). *A History of the Classical Greek World 478-323 BC*. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ruzicka, S. (1999). 'Glos, Son of Tamos, and the End of the Cypriote War', *Hist.* 48.1: 23-43.
- Seager, R. (1994). 'The Corinthian War' in D. M. Lewis and others (eds.), *CAH* vol. 6 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 97-119.
- (1967). 'Thrasylbulus, Conon and Athenian Imperialism', *JHS* 87: 95-115.
- Shrimpton, G.S. (1991). 'Persian Strategy against Egypt and the Date for the Battle of Citium', *Phoenix* 45.1: 1-20.
- Strauss, B.S. (1986). *Athens after the Peloponnesian War: Class, Faction and Policy 403-386 BC*. London and Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Stylianou, P.J. (1988). 'How Many Naval Squadrons Did Athens Send to Evagoras?', *Hist.* 37.4: 463-71.
- Todd, S.C. (2000). *Lysias*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Tuplin, C.J. (1996). *Achaemenid History*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- (1983). 'Lysias XIX, the Cypriot War and Thrasylbulos' Naval Expedition', *Philol.* 127: 170-86.
- van der Spek, R.J. (1998). 'The Chronicles of the Wars of Artaxerxes II in the Babylonian Astronomical Diaries', *Achaemenid History* 11: 239-56.
- Vince, J.H. (1930). *Demosthenes I-XVII, XX*. London, and Cambridge Mass.: William Heinemann Ltd, and Harvard University Press.
- (1930). *Demosthenes XXI-XXVI*. London, and Cambridge Mass.: William Heinemann Ltd, and Harvard University Press.