Aineias and History: the purpose and context of historical narrative in the Poliorketika

Maria Pretzler

Aineias Tacticus' work includes a lot of historical material, usually short accounts which are meant to illustrate and support his advice on how to cope with a siege. Anybody who has ever tried to extract specific historical information from the *Poliorketika* will know how problematic these passages usually are. They offer tantalising glimpses of historical information, even some details which are not known from other sources, but it is very difficult indeed to contextualise this information and to put it to good use as historical source material. From a historian's perspective, Aineias' approach to historiography (if we can call it that) can cause more problems than it solves; in fact, questions concerning the identification and date of specific events mentioned in the *Poliorketika* take up considerable space in commentaries, and yet many problems remain. But, as Burliga has recently demonstrated,[1] the value of these historical passages must not be seen merely in the information they convey to us. In this article, I investigate what Aineias can tell us about attitudes to history in the mid-fourth century BC and about the role such narrative material could play outside the narrow confines of 'proper' historiography.

Small, paragraph-sized historical narratives are a common feature in ancient Greek literature. We might call such passages 'historical vignettes': the term can remind us that, just as in looking at a miniature painting, we are invited to notice the care with which these short narratives have been shaped and consider the thought processes involved in reducing the story without losing its essential features. Historical vignettes are particularly familiar from texts connected to the Second Sophistic, the Greek cultural revival of the Roman imperial period. Such works, for example Pausanias' *Periegesis* and, particularly relevant in this context, Polyainos' *Strategemata*, have shaped our approach and expectations in handling historical vignettes, particularly when if comes to mining ancient texts for historical information.[2] These later texts will therefore provide comparative material for this discussion, especially to illustrate how different Aineias' pioneering approach is, in spite of some superficial similarities, from the well-honed literary habits of the Second Sophistic some five hundred years later.

In spite of their widespread use in ancient literature and their importance as historical source material, historical vignettes are hardly ever considered for their own merit as a literary feature. The standard question is whether we can extract historical information from them, and how accurate this material is likely to be. There is no question that this kind of analysis is important, but if we want to appreciate the full potential of these bite-sized histories, we have to consider their purpose within the text and the intentions of the author: most historical vignettes were clearly not created with the prime purpose of preserving unique historical details for later historians.

This chapter starts with an evaluation of Aineias' approach to these historical vignettes. I focus first on the historical context he provides in part of his narrative passages, namely chronological (in the widest sense) context, geographical information and references to historical characters. This is followed by a discussion of Aineias' sources and an investigation of how he adapts his material for the *Poliorketika*. The second part of the chapter looks at narrative passages which have little specific historical context, and uses these

---

[1] Burliga (2008).
[2] Cf. Pretzler (2010).

to analyse Aineias' aims as a didactic writer. Finally, I focus on historical vignettes as a means of enhancing the author's credibility.

Even in Aineias' time, small, paragraph-sized narratives which digress from the main text were nothing new: they are an integral part of Homeric story-telling, and by the classical period, they were also firmly established in prose texts. Herodotos' numerous digressions include many which might qualify as historical vignettes, and by the fourth century, historical examples were a standard ingredient of rhetoric, particularly in a political context.[3] Nevertheless, in this as in several other aspects of ancient literature Aineias shows himself as an innovative author: assuming that he was not following a template which is now entirely lost to us, we see him experimenting with an entirely new kind of didactic literature and with ways in which historical examples could be used to enhance practical or technical advice. The historical vignettes, inserted to illustrate and instruct, are therefore a crucial aspect of his innovation.

At this point we need to pause and reconsider our own perspective. Most comments on Aineias' historical vignettes have been focusing on the expectations of historians mining the text for information. For this purpose, it is crucial to identify historical events accurately, so that Aineias' reports can be compared with alternative source material; we need to assess the accuracy of his accounts and, if possible, identify the sources of Aineias' historical material. These issues are important and deserve extensive discussion, but this strictly utilitarian historian's approach does not do justice to Aineias' original aims: how did *he* want these passages to be read? How did Aineias approach his historical material, and how did he assess its purpose within the work? We have to remember that through a long history of the reception of ancient literature, modern scholarly approaches are significantly informed by ancient literary trends which were perhaps just beginning in Aineias' time, but which became dominant only decades later and continued to define ancient Greek literature for centuries. I am referring to developments of the Hellenistic period, particularly linked to intellectual work at the Library of Alexandria, which meant that writers were increasingly aware of the heritage of Greek history and literature and began to find ever more creative ways of using it in their works. Postclassical authors often employed partial or covert references to historical events as a kind of elaborate game for the highly educated.[4] They could rely on their readers' knowledge of a shared literary canon which would allow them to contextualise events immediately. These authors interact with the literary tradition, and since they themselves were used to mining texts for information, the details offered in historical vignettes were carefully crafted for an audience wanting to do the same.[5]

For example, the stratagems in Polyainos' work are presented in a roughly historical/ethnographical framework, rather than grouping together stratagems which illustrate a particular area of military expertise.[6] The *Strategemata* are therefore arguably of more use to those wanting to discover and consider historical details within a new context, rather than to those in need of military instruction. Since postclassical authors and their readers were themselves so familiar with the process of gathering historical information from a variety of texts, their approach to writing historical vignettes often responds well to a reader's need to identify sources and contexts, and these texts – apart from Polyainos particularly the works of Plutarch and Pausanias – have served modern scholars well in providing historical

---

[3]Attic orators: Worthington (1994), Harding (1987), Perlman (1961), Pearson (1941); cf. Baragwanath (2008) 17-22, Gould (1989) 55-8,

[4] Bowie (1974), Swain (1996) 79-87, Whitmarsh (2001) 26-9,

[5] Bowie (1974) 170-4, Anderson (1993) 69-85, Swain (1996) 89-100; Specific examples: Pretzler (2007) 73-90 (Pausanias), Pretzler (2008) (Polyainos).

[6] Krenz and Wheeler (1994) vii-viii, Schettino (1998) 39-43, 191-278.

information through such passages. This learned and consciously secondary approach to historical material made the works of many postclassical authors eminently suitable for the purposes of modern scholarship, and their works therefore had a particularly strong influence on what scholars today expect of (apparently) factual narratives embedded in ancient literary texts.

Aineias, however, wrote before Greek education and intellectual activity became so focused on the literary tradition. If Aineias wants to increase his readers' knowledge of specific events, he does not do so for the sake of their literary or historical education, but in order to make up for their lack of military experience. This may sound self-evident, but in the light of the large volume of post-classical literature, and the strong influence it has had on the reading habits of classical scholars, it is worth spelling out just how different Aineias' basic assumptions are. Despite superficial similarities of form, we need to interpret historical vignettes in the *Poliorketika* in their own context, independent of what later literary tradition has taught us to expect.

Before tackling these more comprehensive questions we need to take a closer look at Aineias' way of writing historical vignettes: what did he consider necessary in order to present short historical narratives effectively? The table at the end of this chapter provides an overview of all passages which have been considered for this purpose: there are 64 in all, and the table also indicates why any given passage has been included. The lines between historical vignette and general advice are sometimes blurred, and I have been inclusive wherever possible. As a basic requirement for inclusion, a passage had to convey a sense, however slight, that Aineias is dealing with specific events or circumstances.

The minimum one would expect from any historical account is that it provides at least a few specific details which allow the audience to recognise the passage as a historical event and ideally also to locate the story in a specific context. Quite a few of the passages in the *Poliorketika* do not actually offer sufficient detail, and I shall return to these later. In the first instance, we need to observe how Aineias introduces information that might help us to locate a story in history, focusing, in turn, on chronology, geography and finally on named participants. Polyainos, for example, collects hundreds of historical vignettes for his collection of stratagems, and he is remarkably consistent in providing these crucial details for all but a few exceptional passages.[7] Aineias is a lot less systematic or reliable in supplying specifics. In fact, a number of his historical vignettes include so little information that even the best informed ancient readers would not have been able to reconstruct the historical context, unless they already knew the story in question and managed to identify it by specific details in the narrative; Readers today, with only fragmentary information at our disposal, are in an even more difficult position: perhaps, in some cases, he wanted readers to understand more than we can know now.

For example, Aineias tells the famous story of Histiaios' message to Aristagoras which was tattooed onto the shaved head of a slave and concealed once the hair had grown back.[8] Aineias never mentions that the secret message was sent on a journey which took about three months,[9] all the way from Susa to Miletus, although this particular method would be of little use for communications which could not wait for such a long period; presumably he was counting on his readers' previous knowledge of Herodotos' story and merely decided to jog their memory with a short reference among the many examples provided in chapter 31. On the whole, such extreme brevity in summarising the narrative and a focus on the most relevant details is typical of Aineias' method: usually he firmly sticks to his purpose of illustrating the

---

[7] Schettino (1998) 97-115, Pretzler (2010) 95-6.
[8] Ain. Tac. 31.28-9; cf. Hdt. 5.35.3.
[9] Hdt. 5.52-3.

theme he is discussing in each chapter. If he does provide more information than is strictly necessary in the immediate context, the additional details still contribute to the didactic purpose of the work. For example, his discussion of the Theban attack on Plataia in 431 BC combines points about assembling and organising troops in an emergency with details about organising the defence against an enemy who already controls the city.[10] Aineias' chapter on pre-arranged passwords includes an example which illustrates the danger of enemies sawing through the bar which secured the city-gates, a topic which is discussed in more detail later in the Poliorketika.[11]

Where Aineias offers any kind of chronological information, this is never very detailed, but at least serves the function to emphasise the notion that we are dealing with a specific event, perhaps even one the reader is expected to have heard of. There is no attempt to follow any of the dating conventions which were being developed in this period: if I say chronological, I really mean any kind of reference which allows us to connect a historical event to a specific time period. Some of these references are fairly easy to recognise, even today, when knowledge of events in Aineias' day is severely limited. For example, he describes the defence measures adopted in the city of Sparta against a Theban attack; although the Thebans invaded Laconia twice, the fact that the city is shown under direct threat suggests that this refers to 362 BC.[12] A number of Aineias' vignettes come with similarly specific information, but often we, as modern readers, do not have enough alternative evidence to identify them with any certainty: for example, he describes Chalcedon under siege, and although we are not told who the aggressor is, we hear that the city is also under threat from a mercenary garrison supplied by a friendly but controlling Kyzikos.[13] The details seem specific enough, but the comparison between this passage and the Spartan example above illustrates that the reader requires additional information, preferably previous knowledge of the event, in order to identify it and to appreciate its full context – and this is true even for passages such as these, where Aineias is relatively generous with specific information.

Occasionally Aineias presents readers with historical details which presuppose quite detailed knowledge, for example when he refers to the 'second coup against democracy in Argos', probably in 370 BC.[14] Did he expect his readers to know the history of civil unrest in Argos well enough to identify the event correctly? How much local history of cities and regions other than their own could Greeks be expected to know in the late Classical period, especially if those events were not covered in the few historiographical works which were already widely known at the time? There is no clear answer to this question, since we have little evidence, beyond Aineias, of how current events and recent history were received in the Greek world outside Athens.

Even if readers were able to identify a specific event from Aineias' short descriptions, it is yet more doubtful whether they would have been able to fit these events into a more exact chronology and to synchronise them with historical developments elsewhere in the Greek world. Establishing the relative dates of different events was a difficult task. Great minds of the late fifth century were trying to tackle the problem – for example Hellanicus, who investigated local histories and chronological lists of officials,[15] Hippias of Elis, whose list of Olympic victors would eventually allow scholars to create a widely understood system of

---

[10] Ain. Tac. 2.3-6, cf. Thuc. 2.2-6.
[11] Ain. Tac. 4.1-4; discussion of gates: Ain. Tac. 19.1-20.5.
[12] Ain. Tac. 2.2.; cf. Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.9-10, Plut. *Ages.* 34, Polyain. 2.3.10; Buckler (1980) 210-11.
[13] Ain. Tac. 12.3; possibly in the late 360s, see Hunter and Handford (1927) 142-3, but the evidence is not conclusive; cf. Whitehead (1990) 134.
[14] Ain. Tac. 11.7.
[15] Hellanicus *FGrHist* 323a (Attic History, organised by archons), *FGrHist* 4 F 74-84 (List of priestesses of Hera at Argos), *FGrHist* 4 85-6 (*Karneonikai*); Jacoby (1913) 138-48.

chronology based on numbered Olympiads,[16] and Thucydides with his reckoning by winters and summers.[17] But even much later, if Pausanias can give us any indication of historical thinking outside expert circles, exact chronology probably remained the realm of specialised scholarship, while many continued to depend on historical parallels established through great events or relations between individuals and calculation by generation to establish rough chronological sequences, rather than insisting on an exact calendar of numbered years in order to synchronise events in different places more exactly.

Many of Aineias' historical vignettes do have a geographical setting: usually, Aineias merely gives the name of a city. A generous count produces 39 of such references, including examples which might be called broadly ethnographical, since they are dealing with specific institutions or customs of a *polis*, rather than one-off historical events. A simple toponym is often enough to give a narrative a more 'historical' feel, indicating that we are dealing with a specific situation. Aineias' selection of cities illustrates his own assumptions about his readership and their previous knowledge: most named locations are all large and well-known *poleis*. Only rarely does Aineias consider it necessary to offer extra information to define a city more closely: he tells us that Teos is 'a Ionian city of considerable size'; he also refers to 'Parion on the Hellespont', and 'Apollonia on the Pontus'.[18] The fact that all events he mentions should have occurred in well-known cities has to raise suspicion: did he just omit the name if a place seemed to obscure? One conspicuous example, where he refers to 'a city in the district of Achaia' without giving the individual name,[19] suggests that he was indeed happy to spare his readers the names of lesser known places. Educated Greeks at the time presumably had a sense of the location of at least the bigger cities in the Greek world, and Aineias' selection cannot have presented too much of a challenge.[20]

Just over half (25) of all the vignettes which are attached to a particular place also include some chronological information. In many cases, we are dealing with mere hints: the text included in the table of Aineias' historical vignettes represents this information in its entirety. There are twenty-two passages which provide a narrative of what seem to be unique events, but without a specific context, with neither time nor place indicated, although three of these examples include a reference to a famous individual.

Naming some of the protagonists also can help the reader with fitting a story into its historical context, and Aineias' text includes about twenty names in all. These names can be crucial for identifying an event correctly: for example, at 11.13, a mere reference to an impending oligarchic coup at Korkyra might have pointed at a number of similar incidents, especially the famous *stasis* described by Thucydides,[21] but the involvement of Chares suggests that the date is 361 BC, a reference to an incident much closer to the period when Aineias wrote his book.[22]

While historical precedents were evidently important to Aineias, it is striking that he hardly relies on the names of famous individuals to recommend his suggestions to his readers. A few of the famous generals who later gained some reputation for stratagems are mentioned: for example, Polyainos managed to collect whole lists of stratagems attached to Dionysios I, Dionysios II and particularly Iphikrates, while Aineias offers just one short example for

---

[16] Plut. *Numa* 1.4; Mosshammer (1979) 87-8.
[17] Thuc. 5.20.2-3.
[18] Ain. Tac. 18.13, 28.6, 20.4.
[19] Ain. Tac. 18.8.
[20] This can also be seen in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, as Roy (1972) demonstrates specifically for Arcadians and individual cities in Arcadia.
[21] Thuc. 3.70-83.
[22] Cf. Diodorus 15.95.3; cf. Pritchett (1974) 57-8, Gehrke (1985) 96.

Iphikrates, and one or two for Dionysios I.[23] This comparative absence of great leaders is in line with Aineias' attitude to the politics of warfare: he is firmly focused on the collective, namely the city as a community with its elected leaders. In Aineias' *polis*, anybody who makes a name for himself is more likely to earn suspicion as a potential threat to community cohesion rather than deserving more attention or admiration.[24] The largest group among Aineias' named historical characters are tyrants, followed by commanders of mercenary forces, and he also names a few Persians.[25] Many of these named individuals appear not as the problem-solvers, but as aggressors against whom the city has to be defended. This is very different from the attitudes of Aineias' close contemporaries Isokrates and particularly Xenophon, although both were grappling with the same problems of discord and political uncertainty in Greece which provide the poignant context for Aineias' efforts. Unlike Aineias, however, these writers express special admiration for larger-than-life characters and great leaders. It seems that Aineias deliberately avoided giving credit to some of the great men of his age: for example, he avoids any reference to Agesilaos, even when he relates an incident where the Spartan king acted as commander.[26] Aineias' approach to history, just like his work as a whole, is firmly rooted in the small-town politics which was increasingly under threat in this period, not least from larger-than-life characters with more power than most small *poleis* could usually bestow.

Looking at Aineias attitude to chronological and geographical detail as well as his handling of historical characters, we see rather clearly that he did not consider it necessary to offer historical specifics with any consistency, and we have to assume that he did not expect his readers to identify all those rather vague episodes, either, let alone to understand more exactly where they fitted into a grand narrative of Greek history. At the same time, there are clearly historical vignettes which have links to better known events, and later on in this chapter, I shall return to the question what might be behind Aineias' decision to jog his readers' memories at least occasionally. But what would those readers actually remember? Most of Aineias' specific examples were more recent than the periods covered by established historical accounts, primarily Herodotos and Thucydides, and it is unlikely that by the 350s BC, when Aineias was writing, he was able to rely on a widely known literary narrative which could have served as an authoritative frame of reference for the period after the Peloponnesian War, let alone the more recent decades after the King's Peace of 386 BC which are the context for many of Aineias' examples. Even if parts or all of Xenophon's *Hellenika* or the *Hellenika of Oxyrhynchos* were available at the time, it is unlikely that such recent works were as widely known as the influential histories written two generations earlier.

This brings us to the question about Aineias' sources: again, this issue has been discussed before,[27] and I do not intend to pursue arguments about specific passages or sources in the *Poliorketika*. While *Quellenforschung* often involves hunting for literary sources to the exclusion of all else, experts have long agreed that Aineias relied on oral history, too, especially because many of the events which we can identify were relatively recent when he

---

[23] Ain. Tac. 24.16 (Iphicrates), 10.21-2 (Dionysius I), 40.2-3 (Dionysius I?), cf. 31.30-1 (probably Dionysius II, mentioned in a sample message).

[24] See Pretzler on *Stasis* below, p.000.

[25] Tyants: Ain. Tac. 4.8-12 (Pisistratus), 5.2 (Leukon of Bosporus) 10.21.2 (Dionysius I), 28.5 (Python of Clazomenae, probably a tyrant), 28.6-7, (Iphiades of Abydus), 31. 30-1 (Dionysius II), 31.33 (Astyanax of Lampsacus), 40.2-3 (Dionysius I?); mercenary commanders: Ain. Tac. 11.13-15 (Chares), 18.13-19 (Temenus the Rhodian, probably a mercenary commander), 24.3 (Charidemus of Oreus), 24.10 (Athenodorus of Imbros), 24.16 (Iphicrates); Persians: 31.25-7 (Artabazus), 31.35 (Glous the Persian Admiral), 40.4-5 (Datames).

[26] Ain. Tac. 2.2., cf. Xen. *Hell*. 7.5.9-14.

[27] Sources are discussed in detail in the various commentaries on Aineias' work, e.g. Hunter and Handford (1927), Dain and Bon (1967), Bettalli (1990), Whitehead (1990), Vela Tejada and García (1991); see also Vela Tejada (1991) 37-43, Burliga (2008). Studies of specific aspects: e.g. Brown (1981), Luraghi (1988) 166-7, David (1986) 120-2.

was writing.[28] These stories may have circulated among men with military interests as instructive examples of successful stratagems; in fact, it is possible that Aineias' vague sense of historical context was already a feature of some of his source material. The literary evidence suggests that military anecdotes could become attached to different individuals or contexts: for example, one of Aineias' suggestions for dealing with panic among the troops echoes an incident in Xenophon's *Anabasis* and then resurfaces in Polyainos' work as a stratagem of Iphikrates.[29] It is impossible to determine how these three accounts relate to each other, but some stratagems may have circulated as free-floating narratives remembered for a remarkable turn of events rather than for their specific context, and were ready to be attached to different personalities or to be deployed in different narrative settings.[30] We cannot rule out that Aineias himself contributed new material based on his own military experience, an approach which provides plenty of material for Lane Fox's chapter above – but it is unlikely that all 64 historical vignettes, or even a large proportion of this number, are based on Aineias' own career, and we have to ask in any case how such a collection of anecdotes may have been put together.

Was any of this material written down for military instruction before the 350s BC, and before Aineias' wrote his work? A few names have been identified as possible writers on military theory and practice before Aineias, but, as so often on a quest for putative lost writers, it is highly doubtful whether they could have served as a major source for Aineias (e.g. Simon of Athens on horsemanship) or, in fact, whether they were indeed writers of the classical period (Demokritos, Daimachos).[31] In 11.2. Aineias himself apparently refers to a literary source, a book which contained stories of plots, presumably exactly the kind of historical vignettes under investigation here. It is not clear whether this was a collection by another author or one of Aineias' own works which also contained historical examples. The stories in this particular chapter are, in any case, qualitatively similar to what we see elsewhere in Aineias' work, and they also include events which probably happened in the 360s BC and were therefore still relatively recent. Although it is often impossible to trace Aineias' histories back to specific texts, especially because he does not name his sources, there are some passages which are clearly based on Herodotos[32] and one is taken from Thucydides.[33]

We do not have a lot of comparative material to work with, but where we have these parallels, it is possible to observe how the material was adapted to serve its new purpose: the language is close enough to suggest direct borrowing, but the narrative is abridged, and where necessary, Aineias also inserted short remarks to allow better understanding of specific military details. Most intriguingly, he was also ready to add new details which are not in the original, and these examples are particularly instructive for our understanding of Aineias' approach to adapting historical material. For example, he adapted Thucydides' report of the Theban attack on Plataia in 431 BC: the passage is abridged, but echoes the original in many details, as Aineias reports how the Plataians secretly organised concerted action by breaking through walls between houses.[34] Thucydides' account does, however, not answer a crucial question: how did the Plataians find the time to carry out this plan? Aineias adds details of his own to tackle this problem, reporting that the magistrates were delaying the Theban intruders

---

[28] Hunter and Handford (1927) xxxvi, Marinovic (1988) 201, Whitehead (1990) 38-9,
[29] Ain. Tac. 27.11; cf. Xen. *Anab*. 2.2.19-21, Polyain. 3.9.4; cf. Schettino (1998) 124-6, 215-18.
[30] Hunter and Handford (1927) 193; cf. Whitehead (1990) 176-7, Brown (1981) 388.
[31] Burliga (2008) 94-5; cf Whitehead (1990) 36-8.
[32] Ain. Tac. 31.9 ~ Hdt. 6.4; Ain. Tac. 31.14 ~ Hdt. 7.239; Ain. Tac. 31. 25-7 ~ Hdt. 8.128; Ain. Tac. 28-9 ~ Hdt. 5.35; Ain. Tac. 37. 6-7 ~ Hdt. 4.200; cf. Brown (1981).
[33] Ain. Tac. 2.3-6 ~ Thuc. 2.2-6; Ain. Tac. 38.2. repeats an opinion on military matters expressed by Brasidas in Thuc. 5.9.8.
[34] Ain. Tac. 2.3-6, based on Thuc. 2.2-6. Hunter and Handford (1927) 107-9, Celato (1967/8) 60, Losada (1972) 100, Lehmann (1980) 71, Brown (1981) 388, Gehrke (1985) 132, Whitehead (1990) 102-3.

with negotiations. It seems unlikely that Aineias actually had access to additional material which would have added authentic historical information to Thucydides' report: he is less concerned with keeping his narrative as truthful as possible, than he is with explaining to his readers how his example might work in practice. In another passage, he paraphrases an episode from Herodotos' report of the Persian siege of Potidaia. The attackers shoot arrows with messages for collaborators inside the city, but the plan goes wrong when one of the arrows hits a Potidaian and the message is discovered.[35] Aineias' adds his own speculation about why the arrow may have gone astray: after all, this is the kind of practical detail which he wants his readers to contemplate. Both these stories have a clear historical context, and well-educated men of the mid-fourth century may well have known the original texts. Aineias' treatment of these narratives, however, does not shrink from adding details which are not in the original, as long as these additions enhance the didactic value of the example, while any other details provided by the original source are ruthlessly shortened or omitted if they do not serve the primary purpose of the work.

Aineias usually adapts his historical vignettes very narrowly to illustrate the theme of the chapter in hand. The story is reduced to the bare bones necessary to get the point across. There is usually very little, if any, information about the consequences of the actions he is reporting: where mistakes lead to defeat a short comment might explain the consequences or highlight the lessons which should be drawn from the example,[36] but Aineias is not one to boast about the successes of stratagems he is suggesting: victory is usually merely implied or entirely left to the reader's imagination. Within the story, any information beyond what is strictly necessary in the immediate context, tend to contribute in some way to the general purpose of the work, for example by offering relevant material for another part of the book. For example, his discussion of the Theban attack on Plataia in 431 BC combines points about assembling troops in an emergency with details about organising the defence against an enemy who already controls the city.[37] Aineias' chapter on pre-arranged passwords includes an example which illustrates the danger of enemies sawing through the bar which secured the city-gates, a topic which is discussed in more detail later in the *Poliorketika*.[38]

Aineias' himself states in 28.7. that the didactic value of historical examples is uppermost in his mind:

> I have thought it best to collect these precepts to show the several precautions which should be taken at the various times, that no-one may be too ready to accept anything without due examination.[39]

A few of Aineias' historical vignettes explicitly include comments, usually at the end, which emphasise the essential lesson of the story.[40] The focus of all these narrative passages is strictly on technical details which can illustrate his point. We might dispute in some cases that he was entirely successful in communicating his views clearly, but on the whole, these examples do support his arguments, and at times they are indeed vital to illustrate what he is trying to suggest. For example, the story of a coup accomplished by smuggling weapons into a city[41] does not just offer an exciting and entertaining account, it also invites the reader to think about the various dangers inherent in importing apparently harmless merchandise, and perhaps alert them to the potential dangers which might be lurking in every market place. Aineias' story and vivid description, down to the daggers pushed into melons and the spears

---

[35] Ain. Tac. 31.25-7; Hdt. 8.128.
[36] E.g. Ain. Tac. 2.6, 4.12, 23.5, 28.5.
[37] Ain. Tac. 2.3-6, cf. Thuc. 2.2-6.
[38] Ain. Tac. 4.1-4; discussion of gates: Ain. Tac. 19.1-20.5.
[39] Ain. Tac. 28.7; "Δοκεῖ δέ μοι συναγαγόντι δηλωτέον τίνα δεῖ φυλάσσεσθαι καὶ ἐν οἷς καιροῖς ἕκαστα, ἵνα τις μηδὲν εὐήθως ἀποδέχηται."
[40] Ain. Tac. 17.4, 18.21.
[41] Ain. Tac. 29.3-10.

wrapped up in wickerwork, helps him make this point much more effectively than a theoretical discussion of the same issues might have done. This unusual thoroughness has been used as evidence that this must be one of Aineias' own adventures[42] – but as we have already seen, he adds details to his material to enhance its didactic value, and this, too, may be a didactic embellishment of a fairly straightforward story, adding a range of important details (from experience, imagination, or both) to make the reader think more carefully about necessary security measures. For all we know, Aineias could simply have invented the whole incident, or extended a much simpler story, to illustrate the different methods of secretly providing weapons for a coup. If we want to grant our author some literary sophistication, we should not automatically conclude that more vivid details in a historical vignette can only come about as personal reminiscence, particularly if the narrative appears to be an effective vehicle for delivering a whole range of didactic details.

The discussion will now turn to those among Aineias' stories which do not include specific information about their historical context: they, too, can tell us something about Aineias' intentions, and particularly about his efforts to enhance his didactic writing. Twenty-two such passages have been identified for this study (see table): they were included because Aineias explicitly distinguishes them from generic advice by presenting them as references to actual events or specific circumstances. Due to a lack of contextual information, these passages might be considered of little use as historical source material, but they can provide more insight into Aineias' way of dealing with narrative. These 'a-historical' vignettes vary widely in their approach to narrative detail: from short summaries which only offer the most crucial details, to tantalisingly elaborate accounts which seem to call for more historical background. The most notable example is the story discussed above, where weapons and a commander are smuggled into a city to aid a coup, and the many details in the account seem to demand an explicit historical setting. A warning against ill-considered sorties is illustrated by a report of a complex plot in another anonymous city;[43] again, there are many specific details and the whole story seems to depend on a particular topographical setting, namely a location by the sea. Some of Aineias' examples are presented without a reference to a specific place, but nevertheless have close parallels in events known from other literary works. Thus, one story about a messenger who betrays a plot to the governor of an anonymous city essentially retells an episode of the Ionian revolt as recorded by Herodotos;[44] and when Aineias describes how secret messages can be concealed under the wax on a writing tablet, he was probably thinking of the letter in which the deposed king Damaratos warned the Spartans of a Persian attack – again, the source is probably Herodotos, although (yet again!) some details have been added to the story.[45] We should therefore note that in some cases, Aineias was probably able to provide more information about time, place and historical context, but chose not to do so.

While some of those 'free-floating' stories can be quite detailed and specific, there are others which lack any defining characteristics: these passages appear to be generic and are usually rather vague. In fact, some examples look like general advice recast as a narrative, for example 23.3, where Aineias relates in very general terms how the citizens of an unnamed city simulate civil unrest which allows them to stage a sortie and to overwhelm their enemies.

---

[42] Hunter and Handford (1927) 198, Dain and Bon (1967) 64, n.1.
[43] Ain. Tac. 23.7-11.
[44] Ain. Tac. 31.9, cf. Hdt. 6.4.
[45] Ain. Tac. 31.14, cf. Hdt. 7.239.

> The following device has been employed in making a sally. The citizens made a plausible pretence of sedition within the city, watched their opportunity for a sally, and made a surprise attack on the enemy with complete success.[46]

It is important not to impose artificial categories on Aineias' historical vignettes: just as some passages which come without a context can be very specific in narrative detail, some of the examples where he is at his most generic and vague actually have some contextual information attached to them, for example 31.6:

> Again, a message was brought to Ephesus in the following way. A man was sent with a letter written on leaves, the leaves being bound on a wound in his leg.[47]

This passage may be set in Ephesos, but how much historical information does it really offer? The story about this message has no specific feature which would link it to any particular event or period in history. Nevertheless, the place name seems to anchor it in real history.

In fact, the difference between generic advice and specific example can become rather blurred in the *Poliorketika*, and occasionally Aineias himself seems to be confused about this distinction, for example in 31.2:

> A message was once sent in the following manner. A book or some other document, of any size and age, was packed in a bundle or other baggage. In this book the message was written …[48]

Aineias is telling his story while also trying to explain that there is some flexibility in such a scheme for secret messages: this has an impact on the narrative, making it rather irregular. If this was a unique event, as the text seems to suggest, the book cannot have been 'of any age or size', because we are dealing with a specific object. It may be pedantic to point out this small discrepancy, but it seems very significant that the boundaries between specific example and general advice could become blurred in Aineias' own mind as he was striving for clarity and perhaps also variety.

We find more very generic narrative examples illustrating Aineias' advice on dealing with the bolt of a locked gate: he discusses a range of methods which are presented as short narratives: 'Once a gatekeeper cut a notch into the bolt… tied string around it and pulled it up again by the string; another prepared a fine net, pushed home the bolt enclosed by the net and afterwards drew it up…' – and so forth.[49] Were all the examples mentioned in this chapter real events? Some of them may have been, but it seems more likely that at least a part of these short descriptions of relevant techniques are the result of methodical analysis, trying to predict how the gate could be manipulated and how one might prevent such activities, rather than relying on actual precedents for each example. The examples could just as well have been presented as general advice: 'Here are a few methods to remove the bolt if you do not have the key: cut a notch into the bolt, tie a string around it and use it to pull up the bolt…'. It seems clear from the way in which these stories are presented that Aineias himself did not necessarily think of them as very specific historical examples: when he reports that 'bolts

---

[46] Ain. Tac. 23.3. "Ἐποιήσαντο δέ τινες καὶ τοιόνδε τεχνάσαντες·Στασιασμοῦ προσποιητοῦ μετὰ προφάσεως εὐλόγου γενομένου παρ' αὐτοῖς, καιρὸν τηρήσαντες καὶ ἐπεξελθόντες ἐπέθεντο παρ' ἐλπίδα τοῖς πολεμίοις καὶ κατώρθωσαν."

[47] Ain. Tac. 31.6. "Εἰς Ἔφεσον δ' εἰσεκομίσθη γράμματα τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. Ἄνθρωπος ἐπέμφθη ἐπιστολὴν ἔχων φύλλοις ἐγγεγραμμένην, τὰ δὲ φύλλα ἐφ' ἕλκει καταδεδεμένα ἦν ἐπὶ κνήμην."

[48] Ain. Tac. 31.2. "Εἰς φορτία ἢ ἄλλα σκεύη ἐνεβλήθη βυβλίον ἢ ἄλλο τι γράμμα τὸ τυχὸν καὶ μεγέθει καὶ παλαιότητι. Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ γέγραπται ἡ ἐπιστολὴ …"

[49] Ain. Tac. 18.5-6 (extracts).

already in position are said to have been undone by pouring sand into the socket…'[50] we are still given the notion that this did actually happen in some place, at some time, perhaps even more than once – but in this case Aineias does not give his readers the impression that he really minds whether this was indeed a real event. These borderline cases of 'historical' narrative suggest strongly that Aineias was willing to cross the boundary between didactic prose and narrative, and perhaps even found the distinction rather blurred already.

This part of the text strongly suggests that for Aineias, narrative was not just a straightforward means of reporting true events: he avoids a potentially monotonous list by presenting some of his technical advice as stories of specific events. This does not only allow him more variety of expression, it also helps the author to convey the seriousness of the threats which his instructions are meant to counter: 'these are not just theoretical possibilities', he seems to be saying, 'this can happen, and it has happened'. It is a common feature of traditional classical scholarship that writers (such as Aineias Tacticus) whose prose is considered inferior are also assumed to be rather naïve in their writing, combined with the assumption that little thought went into shaping their text effectively. The way in which Aineias handles the boundary between technical advice and illustrative examples would however suggest that he was by no means naïve about the use of narrative in his work: The *Poliorketika* is not a straightforward combination between advice and illustrative examples. Narrative is clearly used to shape the specifically didactic parts of the text as well, and we have to assume that the difference between the two categories is by no means clear-cut. As we have seen, Aineias probably introduced some narratives to enhance what might otherwise have been fairly dull lists, probably even just by adding that vital 'this once happened' to otherwise generic advice, and at the same time, he took existing historical episodes and added technical details to the story in order to emphasise the message he wanted to convey to his readers. This is not good news for historians desperate to extract otherwise unknown historical information from the *Poliorketika*.

Aineias was one of the earliest authors, if not the earliest, in prose at least, to grapple with historical examples in a didactic context, which means that he had to work out for himself how to combine advice and narrative. These were the early days of didactic literature, and historical examples evidently were not an indispensable ingredient of treatises offering practical advice, since Xenophon, Aineias' close contemporary, managed without them.[51]. Aineias' pioneering role in developing historical vignettes in a new context is easily overlooked and underappreciated, since later developments in ancient literature make this mix between report and instruction seem so natural that it is difficult to pay attention to it. Thus we see Aineias experimenting with this new combination between narrative and didactic prose, and evidently more concerned with literary effect and didactic impact than with maintaining a strict separation between historical information and generic advice. Unlike in later periods with a stronger focus on a (by then) more substantial and revered literary tradition, there was perhaps also little to worry about being 'caught out' inventing or adapting a historical episode. Some of Aineias' 'historical examples', especially many of those which do not include any clear historical reference points, might have more to do with literary expediency than with an interest in reporting events which actually happened.

How did Aineias expect his work to be read, and particularly, how did he expect his readers to react to his historical vignettes? The readership, it is implied, are men who can expect to be in a leading position in their city at some point in their lives, and who might turn to the *Poliorketika* for practical instruction.[52] Aineias makes no assumptions about the exact nature of such readers' authority or their position in relation to the *polis* they might be

---

[50] Ain. Tac. 18.3.
[51] Burliga (2008) 95-7.
[52] Whitehead (1990) 39-42.

defending (or perhaps, in fact, attacking). It is impossible to tell whether many, if any, of Aineias' readers would have matched even this very vague implicit profile, but we have to assume that, whatever their own practical needs, they would have been willing to engage with the overt didactic aims of the book. The book could be instructive even if such readers were not able to link Aineias' historical vignettes to specific events, but at the same time, they may have been exactly the kind of people who engaged with a contemporary tradition about clever strategems. Although we cannot tell how much detailed knowledge of crucial events during the previous two or three decades could be expected of any reasonably educated reader in this period, Aineias' historical examples arguably have a different effect if the reader recognises at least some of them.

One crucial effect of telling 'real' stories is that they could enhance Aineias' authority: such examples would give his advice more credibility as practical solutions which could be useful in the 'real world' of a Greek *polis* under threat. We can observe that, at least since the fifth century BC, historical examples and parallels played an increasingly important part in political persuasion, philosophy and historiography.[53] Aineias introduces this method of enhancing the credibility of an argument to a new genre. This was not an inevitable choice, as Xenophon shows when, in his own didactic works, he prefers to convince on the basis of his own authority as an expert rather than relying on historical examples. In the introduction to the *Peri Hippikēs*, Xenophon explicitly refers to his long experience of the subject.[54] *Poroi* deals with specifically Athenian issues, and the *Hipparchikos* was probably also aimed at an Athenian audience. These works were written late in Xenophon's life, when he was already well known and, despite his long exile, probably also respected in his native city.[55] We do not know whether Aineias, too, was widely known as an expert who could simply rely on his audience's respect. Since he does not state his credentials, at least not in the work as we have it, he seems to expect his readers to judge his advice on merit. This means that Aineias probably had to work a lot harder to establish his authority than Xenophon towards the end of his eventful life.

The selection of historical examples was important for this purpose: although I have spent the last few pages focusing on 'a-historical' vignettes, even suggesting that some may be entirely artificial constructs, I do think that the selection of those with an identifiable historical context does matter. It is striking just how many of Aineias' examples were so very recent: here he differs significantly from later authors for whom historical examples were enhanced by a respectable literary pedigree and a venerable age. Aineias relies on history in its raw form: things that happened, or were said to have happened, whether they were recorded in writing or not. Most of his historical vignettes were so recent – a few years, at most one or two decades before he wrote them down – that readers would judge their authenticity by first-hand memory, however hazy, rather than by the authority of a respected writer. Aineias appeals to readers' memories of actual events: the desired reaction would be 'I remember hearing about it when it happened', rather than 'oh yes, that's mentioned in Thucydides, too', which is the effect later authors would usually aim for. This approach also explains why geographical information and a preference for well-known cities was much more important to Aineias than chronological accuracy: he is using details that were most likely to jog his readers' memories.[56] Resonance with the audience's own personal memories would then also make the example, and the advice attached to it, seem more relevant and immediate. Aineias was not alone among his contemporaries in preferring recent historical examples to illustrate their point: Athenian rhetoric of the period demonstrates particularly

---

[53] Pearson (1941), Perlman (1961), Harding (1987), Worthington (1994).
[54] Xen. *Peri Hippikēs* 1; cf. *Poroi* 1-2, where he emphasises his own perspective.
[55] Diog. Laertius 2.54-5; Breitenbach (1967) 1576-7, Anderson (1974) 193-4, Higgins (1977) 131-9.
[56] Pearson (1941) 215-9, Harding (1987) 37-8; e.g. Demosthenes 18.168-70.

well that recent history could have a strong emotional effect as orators drew on their audience's personal memories to enhance the impact of their arguments.[57] Aineias' recent but usually vague historical examples place his advice firmly in a reality which could appear consistent with his readers' own knowledge. Just as in Athenian assembly speeches, historical accuracy is not a priority: it is the persuasive effect that matters.

Aineias therefore plays an active part in a significant literary trend of his time which led to a rethinking of the meaning, shape and uses of history. Rhetoric probably led the way as writers experimented with new ways of presenting the past; Xenophon offers a number of innovative approaches, from the travelogue/adventure story that is the *Anabasis*, to biography (*Agesilaos*) and historical fiction (*Kyroupaideia*). Aineias' contribution to the diversification of historical writing seems a lot more modest, but we should appreciate his work particularly for its low key approach to history in a context where references to the past had not yet become an indispensable aspect of learned discourse. The *Poliorketika* demonstrates just how important history, especially recent history, was to Greeks in the fourth century and how it could be used in a new literary setting. In a political context, such as Demosthenes' assembly speeches or Isocrates' political pamphlets, references to previous events are essential, but Aineias is experimenting with historical examples to enhance his arguments in a context which was not explicitly historical or political.

To conclude, I am going to focus on three basic questions about historical vignettes in the *Poliorketika* – the answers have been emerging throughout the chapter, but they deserve to be summarised more explicitly.

First, we need to ask why Aineias decided to include these short narrative passages at all: as we have seen, didactic literature in this period was still being developed and could do without them. The answer emerging from the *Poliorketika* is not straightforward. On one hand, we see Aineias using narrative to enhance his prose, and we should not rule out the possibility that at times he turned to narrative to convey some general advice, saying 'this happened at one time, and this was done to avoid it where 'this might happen; you should do the following to avoid it' might have been a more straightforward way of giving instructions. This allows for more variation, especially where long lists of possible stratagems are involved. Even if the historical context was left vague, the weight of precedent would also enhance his argument: something which had happened before, a stratagem which had been used already, was surely more credible than a piece of advice which was potentially no more than the theoretical idea of the author. On the other hand, Aineias does refer to specific historical events as well. Just as contemporary orators where appealing to their audience's memories to enhance an argument, these historical references are used as a device to enhance Aineias' credibility as an advisor. If some of the episodes appear (quite possibly truthfully!) as if they might be based on personal experience, this would enhance his authority even further.

Second, it is worth considering how Aineias chose his examples. Here the main criterion is clearly their relevance to the advice he is trying to give: relevance to the theme of the chapter is the main selection criterion. In later ancient literature there is often a separate motive to showcase the writer's acquaintance with the literary canon. There is little evidence in the *Poliorketika* that Aineias had similar concerns: his authority stems from military expertise, not scholarly erudition. Where specific historical details are involved, one crucial criterion for selection of a historical example, or for the decision to enhance a narrative passage with a specific historical context in the first place, may have been the question whether his readers would be able to recognise the story. Thus the places he chooses to name

---

[57] Loraux (1981) 118-73.

tend to be better known cities, and the events he highlights were relatively recent and more likely to resonate with readers' personal memories of current events in their own lifetime. Some examples are taken from earlier writers, Herodotos and Thucydides – again, these were probably widely read already in this period.

The third question is how Aineias adapted his examples to fit his purpose. There are few where we can compare his version with an original source, and in those cases, we see that he ruthlessly cut details which did not fit his specific purpose, but not only that, in his attempt to explain how exactly a certain outcome was achieved, he actually added technical details which cannot be found in the original. These additions are probably based on his own attempt to imagine how the reported result could be brought about. As with the selection of the examples, the main purpose is indeed didactic: Aineias shapes his historical vignettes to serve his immediate need to illustrate his points.

Despite this single-minded focus on didactic purpose, Aineias' selection of examples, particularly their geographical spread, can tell us more than his distinguished Athenian contemporaries about the shape of history and supraregional politics as they were perceived and discussed by people around the Greek world. This view of Greek history is more universal: it includes large cities from Sicily, Asia Minor and the Black Sea region, and refuses to give particularly large roles to Athens or Sparta. Aineias also offers a glimpse at the way in which events were remembered. We should observe (rather than merely criticise) the fact that many of Aineias' historical examples seem vague and perhaps quite moveable: these historical memories are hardly ever given a clear place within a general chronological framework, and there is no emphasis on the deeds of great men. Many of these stories could just as well be told about another place, time or political context: Aineias seems to be concerned with conveying a sense of history in order to exploit the value of precedents, but at the same time, he does not seem to be particularly worried about accuracy or an emphasis on specific privileged events.

Aineias' attitude to history also represents a calculated rejection of the conventions of historiography, as is quite appropriate for a writer pioneering a new and very different genre. The use of historical examples in deliberative or forensic rhetoric of the period is a better parallel: history becomes a means of persuasion, as the author tries to play on the memories of his audience to give his arguments and suggestions more credibility. While Attic orators usually expected to speak to the members of a well-defined community with collective memories, Aineias' audience was potentially a lot more diverse and had fewer predicable common reference points.

Because so much of classical literature is dominated by Athens, the *Poliorketika* almost looks like a deliberate distancing from this one city and its increasingly dominant cultural influence. But Aineias' conception of a Greek world with many places of interest is perhaps much more representative for anybody from the period who had no close links with Athens: at this point, it was still possible to use the whole Greek world as a reference point because Athenian literature was not yet dominating the memory of recent events, as it did later, when Attic Greek had become the defining characteristic for the Classical literary canon. This different viewpoint is exactly what makes Aineias' unorthodox handling of history so valuable. When we try to understand classical historiography, we should not just compare it with other examples of the genre: Aineias offers an important alternative perspective on how contemporary events were remembered and interpreted in the fourth century BC, and how historical narrative began to be employed in new literary contexts.

Aineias Tacticus: 'Historical Vignettes'

- List of passages which convey some sense of a specific setting and/or a specific event.
- The text summarises all information which defines the narrative as a specific event, or places it in a specific context. Passages which provide any form of historical specifics are presented in Italics, all personal names are in bold.
- Dates are based on Whitehead's commentary.

2.2.	Sparta	*When the Thebans broke into their city, the Lakedaimonians ...*		362
2.3-6.	Plataia	*The Plataians, when they discovered during the night that some Thebans had entered their city ...*	Thuc. 2.2.6	431
4.1-5	Chalkis	Chalkis on the Euripos was captured by an exile who started from Eretria …		? 357/6
4.8-12	Athens	***Peisistratos**, when general at Athens ...*		560s
5.2	Bosporus	***Leukon**, tyrant of Bosporus …*		c.389-49
10.21-2	Syracuse	*It was thus that **Dionysios (I)** dealt with his brother **Leptines**, when he saw that he was in high favour with the people of Syracuse.*		c.388-6
10.25		It has happened before now that when people's attempts to revolt and intrigue with the enemy were completely baulked ….		
11.3-6	Chios	When Chios was on the point of being betrayed, a magistrate who was in the plot … it was peace time …		?
11.7-10	Argos	*In Argos the following measures were taken against the revolutionary party ... the second attempt against the democracy…*		370
11.10a-11.	Herakleia Pontica	At Herakleia Pontica, when under a democratic regime the wealthy party was plotting against the people and contemplating an attack …		before 364
11.12	Sparta	A similar incident is said to have occurred <u>long ago</u> at Sparta …		C8th?
11.13-15	Korkyra	*At Korkyra, when a revolt of the wealthy oligarchs against the people was impending (**Chares the Athenian**, who was stationed there with a guard, was in sympathy with this revolt) …*		361.60
12.2-4	Chalkedon	*The people of Chalkedon during a siege received a garrison from Kyzikos, which was then their ally;*		late 360s?
12.5	Herakleia Pontica	*The inhabitants of Herakleia Pontica ... called in too strong a mercenary force ...the mercenary captain made himself tyrant.*		364
15.8-10	Abdera	*A raid made by the Triballi into the country of Abdera … they lost more men, it is said, than any other city of the same size ever lost in so short a space of time.*		376/5
16.14-15	Cyrene, Barka	The people of Cyrene and Barka … when they sent relief expeditions over their long carriage roads, used carts and chariots.		N/A
17.2-4	Argos	*At Argos a public festival took place outside the city, ... armed procession ... conspirators made ready and joined in the demand for arms to carry in the procession ...*		417
17.5-6.	Chios	When the people of Chios celebrate their Dionysiac festival …		N/A
18.3		One of them poured sand into the socket in the day-time…		
18.3-4		Bolts already in position are said to have been undone by pouring sand…		
18.5		Once, too, a gatekeeper who had been deputed by his general to fasten the bolt…		
18.6		Another prepared a fine net with a string attached …		
18.6		The bolt has also been removed by being knocked upwards…		
18.6		Again, it has been taken out with a small pair of pincers…		
18.7		Another traitor succeeded in turning round the cross-bar without being noticed…		
18.8-11	Achaia	At a city in the district of Achaia, where they were plotting		360s?

		secretly to let in mercenaries…		
18.12.		Once, too, the circumference of the bolt was measured …		
18.13-19.	Teos	*An agreement was once made to betray Teos, a Ionian city of considerable size, to* **Temenos the Rhodian**, *with the complicity of the sentinel at the gate.*		?
18.20-21.		Another way in which a city was betrayed by a gatekeeper was this.		
20.4-5	Apollonia (Pontos)	At Apollonia on the Pontos … the gates were so constructed as to be shut to the sound of a big hammer …		N/A
	Aigina	And the same thing was done at Aigina.		N/A
22.20.	Naxos?	*After the battle of Naxos,* **Nikokles**, *the commander of the garrison…*		376

23.3.		The citizens made a plausible pretence of sedition within the city … and made a surprise attack on the enemy with complete success.		
23.4-5.		In another city the besieged surprised the enemy by sally…		
23.7-11		I will mention here a scheme originated by certain magistrates …		
24.3-14	Ilion	*I will give as an instance what happened in Aeolis to **Charidemos of Oreos**, after he had captured the town of Ilion by the following stratagem ... **Athenodoros of Imbros***		360
24.16		**Iphikrates** used even to say that rounds and sentries should not have the same password		N/A
24.18.	Thebes	*Thebes during the capture of the Cadmeia …*		379
27.7-10	Thrace?	***Euphratas**, the Spartan governor in Thrace, finding night alarms of very frequent occurrence in his army…*		
27.11.		While the camp was in an uproar one night, the herald called for silence …		
28.5.	Klazomenai	***Python of Klazomenai**, who had accomplices in the city... seized Klazomenai ...*		c. 386?
28.6-7.	Parion (Hellespont)	***Iphiades of Abydos** was trying to take Parion on the Hellespont*		362-59?
29.3-10		A trick once put into practice, which… resulted in the capture of a city during public festival.		
29.11-2.		On similar occasions men in want of shields… had recourse to importing osiers …		
29.12.	Sikyon	*The Sikyonians for instance suffered a great disaster from neglect of these precautions.*		369?
31.2.		A message was once sent in the following manner…		
31.6.	Ephesos	A message was brought to Ephesos in the following way…		?
31.8		Again, a letter containing an offer of betrayal was once conveyed by a traitor…		
31.9		Another man sent out a trooper with a note sewn up in his bridle rein.		
31.9		Here is another story about a letter. During a siege…	Hdt. 6.4.?	
31.14		Again, a man has before now poured wax on a writing tablet…	Hdt. 7.239	
31.23		Again, a note has been written on very thin papyrus…		
31.24	Ilion	The men round Ilion, after all this time, and in spite of their efforts, are not yet able to prevent the Locrian maidens from coming into their city …every year.		N/A
31.25-7.	Poteidaia	*In earlier years the following trick was once played. **Timoxenos** wished to betray Poteidaia to **Artabazos** ...*	Hdt. 8.128	479
31.28-9.	Miletos	*Again, when **Histiaios** wished to communicate with **Aristagoras** ... Miletos ...*	Hdt. 5.35	499
31.30-1		**DIONYSIOS (II) … HERAKLEIDAS**		357
31.32.	Epiros, Thessaly	Dogs were often used in Epiros in the following way… This method is used in Thessaly.		N/A
31.33	Lampsakos	*A letter was sent to **Astyanax, tyrant of Lampsakos**, containing information of the plot which proved fatal to him…*		?
31.34	Thebes,	*The same delay caused the capture of the citadel in Thebes…*		382
31.34	Mytilene	Something like this happened in Mytilene in Lesbos. …		?
31.35.	Persia	*When **Glous the Persian** admiral went up to see the king ...*		380?
37.6-7.	Barka	*There is an <u>old story</u> in this connexion, **Amasis**, while besieging Barka…*	Hdt. 4.200	c. 512
40.2-3	Syracuse ?	**Dionysios (I?)** once wished to occupy a city which he had conquered…		?
40.4-5.	Sinope	*The men of Sinope, when at war with **Datamas**…*		c.384-62