

## REVIEW–DISCUSSION

Simon Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, Volume II: Books IV–V.24. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1996. Pp. xvi, 520. ISBN: 019-814881-X.

## I

[Reading Thucydides offers] “the agreeable feeling as of turning a lock with a key: a gradual, reluctant giving way, but always functional, always achieving its end,” said Friedrich Nietzsche in *Wir Philologen*, (1875, transl. Arrowsmith 1990: 347). One needs not only the right key for this complex lock, but several keys to open it, and sometimes the lock, or the key, or both seem rusty. Exegetes from antiquity have struggled with this occasionally maddening, often difficult author. The suffering scholiast, reaching the narration of Cylon, Pausanias, and Themistocles at 1.126–138, seems stunned to find that Greeks could read this *passus* as if it were (ordinary) classical Greek. He famously comments on its clarity (*σαφηνεία*) that “here the lion smiled.” Thucydides wanted to make his reader work to understand his difficult thoughts about puzzling political sequences and barely conceivable military disasters, as in Sicily. The historiography replicates the history by not re-presenting the path as clear *ex eventu*. Events are wayward, sudden and unexpected, even contrary to sound reason, he comments more than once with a general’s fury or a historian’s satisfaction (*ἀπροσδόκητον* 2.91.4, *ἀμαθῶς*, 1.140; *ἄλογος*, κ.τ.λ.). He avoids some types of simplification. My teacher A. E. Raubitschek once wrote on an elegant reconstruction of mine, *Papier ist geduldig*. Thucydides, however, resists the reader, his expectations, and he demands utmost efforts. This appears to have been conscious.

Lorenzo Valla, Thomas Arnold, Poppo and Stahl, Classen and his *Bearbeiter* Steup, and Arnold Gomme, to mention but a few modern stalwarts, have elucidated the text of Thucydides, the historian from the Attic deme Halimous. Eschewing the suspect word “historian” and others of similar ilk, the *συγγραφεύς* or “data-collecting composer,” an unpretentious and misleading neologistic misnomer for the author of what is shortly to come, has become an important thinker, for historians, for philologists, for political philosophers, and for students of literature. He was insightful, methodical, and unique in his challenging idiom. The complexities of his austere syntax and thinking deliberately lead to further complexities, and every happy discovery leads to two or more new problems. Following Justus Lipsius (quoted by Marchant in his “school edition” of *Thucydides Book II* (1891: lxiv), both the author of this commentary and your reviewer would say: *de Thucydidis senten-*

*tia nostra: Thucydides, qui res nec multas nec magnas nimis scripsit palmam fortasse praeripit omnibus qui multas et magnas. Quem quo saepius legas, plus auferas; et numquam tamen dimittat te sine siti.*

It startled me to learn, some years ago, that the learned and energetic Simon Hornblower planned to produce a full “historical and literary” commentary on Thucydides’ surviving work and that the Oxford University Press would publish it. Not that Arnold Gomme’s Oxford commentary was above reproach, or addressed and resolved all questions. Rather it seemed that Thucydides stood less in need of such a re-examination in English than, say, Herodotus. (Herodotus is still poorly served by commentaries on the part and the whole, because only a numerous committee of experts can adequately comment on his more varied clock, map, and mixed matter.) And Homer, despite the gravest alterations in approaches to oral epic, had to wait nearly a hundred years after Leaf (1900-02) published his commentary before G. S. Kirk and colleagues through the Cambridge Press and Heubeck, Russo, *et ceteri* through the Oxford Press, rescued him from a truly antiquated (poetics, archaeology, linguistics, etc.) Anglophone exegetical scholarship. While it is correct to state that part of Gomme’s commentary is more than fifty years old (volume I of five appearing in 1945), it is equally correct to note that the Oxford scholars who finished it, Antony Andrewes and Kenneth Dover, published the last volume in 1981—only ten years before Hornblower, Volume I, and only sixteen years before this Volume II. So, is this new volume necessary and is it a significant improvement? The author’s defensiveness is understandable, perhaps required, since students of antiquity are reluctant to part with large chunks of their small salaries.

It was odd, also, that when H.’s first volume appeared, he provided no general introduction on the level of the commentary’s intended audience. (H.’s helpful, earlier free-standing study *Thucydides* [1987] serves some of that purpose, but for students at a more elementary level, and with the intent of providing his “intellectual setting.”) That omission is now somewhat rectified by 145 pages divided into seven sections preceding a commentary of 375 pages on one and one-quarter books of Thucydides’ peculiar and disturbing record of a devastating war, an uncivil war. H. originally planned his commentary on a smaller scale, predicting two volumes. He now predicts three (I), but I anticipate four or five, since his comments per item are obviously more frequent and/or lengthier than in volume I, really twice as expansive (548 pp. for the first three books compared to 520 pp. for the next one and one-quarter books). The rest of book V presents tortured problems raised by compositional questions concerning the “rawish” texts of treaties and the negotiations for Melos (including epigraphical complications), VI and VII offer many opportunities to a commentary that wishes to address literary issues (as Gomme claimed not to wish), and book VIII has never received the

literary analysis that its unmined riches demand. Analyst critics cheerfully washed their hands of its literary issues after pointing out the compositional problems (early, late, finished, unrevised?). Furthermore, appendices long ago promised by H. in Volume I, and more to boot, are yet to appear. Commentaries tend to grow more, not less, expansive (as a glance at Gomme's incomplete *opus* confirms).

H.'s work veers toward metacommentary. Oscillating between supplement and respectful disagreement, it has an uneasy relationship with both Oxford University Press' *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* by the Glaswegian A. W. Gomme (1956 ff.) and the Oxfordian Benjamin Jowett's far from satisfactory translation. (H. has edited but not yet published the latter [1881, 1899] for the Oxford University Press's *World's Classics* series.) H. is always impressively fair about raising objections to his own points ("It may be objected that..., so I am making a trivial claim," 130) and answering them fairly. References to others' translations are welcome, since translators are the underappreciated preservers of history and civilization for most educated adults today. H.'s habit of colloquially referring to one of the better competitors as "the Penguin," however, draws a smile from one-time readers of *Batman* comics. Why should the honorable (once of Wadham College, Oxford) Rex Warner receive less credit when his version is cited (and when his name appears, e.g., 280, no reference to the book), than the Master of Balliol, whose versions of Plato have often been mocked? Hobbes' and Crawley's versions are also worthy of at least occasional quotation.

The Introduction has seven sections. The first justifies H.'s new commentary by a list of Gomme's strengths and weaknesses (Andrewes and Dover's continuation is not mentioned in this section). On the credit side, H. admires Gomme's textual judgment, and knowledge of topography, and his attention to ancient finance. In each of these areas, however, the praise is undercut by significant criticism (4-7).

For debits, H. first faults Gomme for not translating lemmata and Greek in the notes. He argues that this deficiency not only hinders Greekless students of a major thinker, but sometimes suggests that Gomme did not see a real problem. I find this plausible enough, but the bookflap's claim (*cui malo?*) that H. "for the first time allows readers with little or no Greek to appreciate the detail of Thucydides' thought" implies an embarrassing naïveté about the transparency of translation. The unsupportable allegation overstates the usefulness of detached stones or phrases for understanding a very intricate architecture.

H. proclaims a "possibly reactionary view" (2-3) in his reasonable defense of the genre of commentary against critics of its "inert atomistic" fashion of proceeding and its alleged suitability to "the British mind." He, however, should find facile optimism expressed about the virtues of literal trans-

lations truly “old fashioned.” (This recurrent term in the commentary rings offkey for H, a commentator on an ancient historian who cherished certain old-fashioned ways, and a commentator scrupulously aware of debts to his predecessors).

Translating Attic Greek and its culture into contemporary comprehensible English for children of the World Wide Web is no easy task. Translating an author whose eccentric Greek gave headaches to his ancient readers poses additional hurdles. The muscular, angular, and elliptical prose regularly baffles the best trained Hellenists. Pericles’ *epitaphios* for the fallen Athenians, the description of *stasis* in Corcyra, the experimental “Melian Dialogue” repeatedly confound the usual protocols of Attic syntax. No translation dares to preserve all the heart-stopping angularities. “Difficult animals to drive is a sheep; one man, many of them, very.” This profound parody of Thucydides’ style is more informative for the *cognoscenti* than acerbic Grundy’s anonymous British, somehow charming racist quotation (*Thucydides and the History of his Age*, 1911: 52 n.1). Grundy with lip-smacking regret, in a book now apparently assigned to the dustbin of historiography, alleged that a lecturer once asseverated that Thucydides’ corrupt Greek “at its best was only good Thracian.” (Daniel Tompkins reported to me that Adam Parry thought Richard Shilleto invented the parodic sentence. The last man’s truncated Cambridge commentary on I-II [1872, 1880] is hard to obtain in the American Midwest, but his tone is otherwise sufficiently cranky to contain such a statement. I have not found the remark in Shilleto but I am still searching.)

Those people referred to on the book jacket who cannot bother, or have not bothered, to learn to read Attic Greek, especially historiographical Greek texts (I mean Ionic, Attic, Polybian, and Koine), as well as Thucydidean Greek, perhaps can better buttress their profound thoughts on history and philosophy and political science from non-Greek sources. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, no dummy or slouch in trying to understand Thucydides’ locutions, said (*de Thucydidis idiomatibus* 51 [Englished by me]): “You can count on one hand those few who are able to understand all of Thucydides, and not even these can do so without some grammatical explanation.”

Secondly, H. notes as deficiencies that Gomme’s work is obsolete on Amphipolitan (and other) archaeology and the previous author had no chance to employ computerized data-bases (*TLG*, epigraphy, etc). H. thirdly faults Gomme for relative inattention to religion, a characteristic for which the earlier commentator may have chosen in the first place his text and its author. (Classical scholars are loath to admit their personal motives in selecting topics for study. Syme and his style notoriously resemble Tacitus and his mode of writing in uncanny ways.) Battle sacrifices, sanctuary lay-out, and

inscriptions having to do with cult are barely treated by Gomme, but, H. argues, they are not absent from, or unimportant for, the ancient text.

The fourth, final drawback concerns Gomme's *historical* commentary, that is, the alleged (but not thoroughgoing) disregard of literary issues. He means allusions, deliberate echoes and pre-echoes that refer back and forth across the text (beyond the rare explicit ones), contemporary developments in argumentation, organization and presentation of material, personal intrusions, focus on telling a story from one or more perspectives (narratology), authorial intrusion, and similar matters.

Gomme preferred examination of reported details in the text to structural studies of the author's oeuvre (16). This earlier commentary, like most, is wedded to words and phrases, texts and topography, facts and acts, in the positivist manner that believes some facts—like some rocks—are demonstrably real. H. hopes to bridge the gulf “opened up between literary and historical approaches” (17). This pre-post-modern goal is admirable enough, but H. fails to reach it, for he remains too firmly planted in the historical garden. For praiseworthy instances of his extension of historiographical reach, he examines “what if” or “if X had not” episodes that explore the unrealized hypothetical event, a topic, even a *topos*, intensively studied for the text of Homer by Lang, Louden, Morrison, and Nesselrath. He examines focalization, the point of view from which an action is reported. This approach has been theorized and applied by Irene de Jong (*Narrators and Focalisers*, 1987) to Homer, although scholars interested in Thucydidean bias have examined elements of it before (e.g., Woodhead, Gomme, and Westlake pioneered re-evaluation of Thucydides' attitude(s) towards Cleon). In this volume, one literary question requiring response is whether iv-v.24 is a “finished and experimental work of art” or a “fragment needing further work ...which it never got” (19). Focalization, authorial intrusions, and degree of finishedness are three worthwhile issues that a literary and structural critique can address, although the commentary form, by its very nature, inhibits generalization. H, in fact, at the end of his introduction, argues for (122) coherence in this section of the *History* that he describes as “innovatory, and exciting and late, though never wholly revised.”

The critical approaches that envision Thucydides as engaged, passionate, or partisan encourage the line-by-line re-consideration of the text. Robert Connor (in the *Classical Journal* 1978 and in his 1984 book, *Thucydides*) recognized the emergence of a “post-Modernist Thucydides.” The shift in Thucydidean studies, a development that Cornford (*Thucydides Mythistoricus*, 1907) erratically anticipated in various elements, produced in the 1960's and later a Thucydides, our Thucydides, who is not always—rather, rarely—objective, infallible, or Olympian. His narratological *persona* suggests cool detachment, from the third-person narrator on, but the construction of the

Athenian disaster (as we philo-Athenians choose to view it) and the regretful asides on the decline of political civility inside and outside the *polis* suggest engagement. *Thukydides: Die Stellung des Menschen im geschichtlichen Prozess*, the influential 1966 argument of Hans-Peter Stahl, deserves more credit for this quantum leap and more discussion than H. gives it here, only an occasional reference and dignified entry in the list of abbreviations. Stahl's fruitful re-consideration of the role of reason and strategy has also produced a unitarian awareness of resonances across speeches, events, books, etc. The analysis deserves more frequent incorporation into the discussions that a historian or an academic admirer of *Realpolitik* is likely to pick up.

Certainly more people, perhaps most of them with little or no Greek, are now hefting and praising Thucydides as a political philosopher (many but not all of them acolytes, direct or indirect, of the late Leo Strauss). The nasty and brutish Hobbes (whose dedication to Greek was very serious and whose first publication in 1629 was a virile translation of our author) opined: "For the principal and proper work of history being to instruct and enable men, by the knowledge of actions past, to bear themselves prudently in the present and providently towards the future: there is not extant any other (merely human) that doth more naturally and fully perform it, than this of my author [Thucydides].... Thucydides is one, who, though he never digress to read a lecture, moral or political, upon his own text, nor enter into men's hearts further than the acts themselves evidently guide him is yet accounted the most politic historiographer that ever writ." This problem of Thucydides' knowledge of others' hearts and minds provided a problem more complex than Hobbes realized, as readers of Westlake and de Jong will note. H. ironically remarks (188, echoing Stahl), à propos of the general Demosthenes, that few men in Thucydides ever learn anything.

H. dedicates forty-two pages in the introduction and its annexes to Thucydides' relationship to Herodotus. The topic deserves lengthy study, but the treatment is largely polemical (responding to a 1994 *Chiron* article by Ronald Stroud and J. J. Kennelly's *Thucydides' Knowledge of Herodotus* [Brown University diss. 1994; *non vidi*] that reacted to earlier publications of H). The angry approach is frustratingly limited because it narrows the ground that H. could cover. The worthy point made is that Thucydides' speeches rarely refer to any past event that cannot be found in Herodotus' text (123). Further, H. suggests that discrepancies do not prove independence, but may indicate silent corrections. But many issues are not mentioned, much less addressed. The list of parallel passages (136 of them) can serve as a basis for a study, but H. has not yet written the study. The issue of when the text of the Ionian historian became available to Thucydides and others is not a "pseudo-problem" (p.28). Questions about the date(s) of Herodotus' "publication" may previously have been improperly phrased or impossible of solution, but

no one denies Thucydides was aware of his predecessor. A list of vocabulary and phraseology that appear in Herodotus and Thucydides but nowhere else in the fifth century would be welcome. How does one define the two historians' techniques of indirect characterization and how do their accounts of pivotal battles differ? The list of issues worthy of attention is long, but H.'s awareness of Herodotus' importance as Thucydides' predecessor deserves more systematic treatment than we find here. The debt involves much more than speeches, even if elsewhere (colonization, myth, geography) in his history Thucydides ranged further in his sources. The very fact that Herodotus is never mentioned by name requires attention. Hellanicus is named, after all. What can we read into that isolated citation (see Parke, *Hermathena* 1946)?

This frequent problem of Thucydides' silences compounds the quandary of deciding what Thucydides "takes for granted" (Gomme's unpacked phrase). Thucydides suppresses, ignores, or takes for granted details of finance, epigraphical evidence (for the most part), contemporary scandals, seventh-century history, even the Ionian revolt, and the First Peloponnesian War. In addition to what Thucydides "takes for granted," he remains silent about many other topics for reasons (we can only guess) of relevance or seamliness, and geographical or chronological inaccessibility. Some of this haughty disregard seems a defect by standards of modern relevance (women, finance, contemporary sexual or bribery scandals; the Ionian revolt [only 4.102 and 6.4.5], a name for a defining set of events germane to books v and viii, at least; cult and oracles). As Müller-Strübing observed: "Thucydides ist gross im Verschweigen."

Thucydides has his own preoccupations as well (127), but a list of these is not provided, and no comparison with Herodotus'. Of course, no commentator can touch upon everything, but too often H. grasps a nettle only to drop it—understandable but disappointing for nettle-grasper watchers. The discussion of Brasidas' leadership and genius seems inconclusive, for instance, or the passages in which "irrelevant notes" and the "geographical tradition" appear (e.g., 4.120.1; cf. Westlake, *Essays* 1969: 1-38; Pearson, *CQ* 1939). Thucydides can be universalist ("possession for ever") or assume audiences that are parochial, as when he informs the reader (2.93.1) that "the Peiraeus is the port of Athens", but when and why does he don which garment? Where is Thucydides coming from?

Hornblower rightly repeats the easily forgotten point that Thucydides' polemical strictures need not be directed against Herodotus, since other authors in poetry and prose also handled some events that the earlier historian also mentions. For instance, in the case of the comments on the notorious Delian earthquake, it seems that the two authors pass each other in the night—oblivious to the specifics that the other has mentioned. H. remarks Herodotus' superior skepticism in, e.g., the matter of Minos' thalassocracy

(125), but does not explore this point that has been proudly privileged by Herodotean scholars. He wittily refers (125 n. 6) to the “alarming deference to Thucydides’ authority” often shown by archaeologists and historians who are not conversant with recent developments in Thucydidean studies. Hornblower is on the whole widely read and generous in extending credit to others’ hypotheses and discoveries.

The third section of the introduction discusses Brasidas. Following an article by G. Howie published in modern Greek (*Parnassos* 1992; *non vidi*), H. argues that “Thucydides was ... seduced by his own romantic picture” of the Spartan commander. Consequently he adjusts Thucydides’ creation to Homer’s Achilles whom he sees as a parallel, “a sort of loner or outcast” (60). As elsewhere, H.’s sharp observations of detail have led to an extravagant and unjustified conclusion, one reductive of the richness of both characters.

The obedient and successful appointed general of the highly regimented, classical Spartan army was entirely unlike the isolated and independent Phthian baron Achilles. The idiosyncratic and eventually condemned Athenian Alcibiades seems more like that sulky and willful Thessalian Achaean, should we feel need to force a Thucydidean actor into a Homeric character mould. The mythical warrior left a legendary Trojan war behind; the historical general fought his Peloponnesian war to the death. That the Spartan commander is a doer of deeds as well as a competent speaker (4.81.1 and 84.2) won’t prove or even sufficiently suggest the parallel. Many (besides Woodhead, *Mnem.* 1960) would grant some warping of Thucydides’ judgment in the cases of Brasidas and Cleon, enemies of each other and of the historian, both of whom helped in different ways to bring about, it seems, Thucydides’ exile. Many agree that Thucydides admired this Spartan for his atypical (but still, let Athenophiles admit, Spartan) skills. This does not make him into the narrative’s exemplar, hero, or protagonist, however, much less a tragic or epic hero. A better case could be made for Themistocles or Alcibiades.

His domination of this section of the war and thus this section of Thucydides’ account cannot be gainsaid (where would the evidence be found?). Brasidas was a liar and a singular word-twister when strategy called for it (4.108.5). This was Thucydides’ considered judgment of a key player and a judgment that must lead to his accurately reporting promises made (a point well made by H), however we translate the slippery phrases of 1.22.1. Crawley’s English has Thucydides state that Thucydides writes his individuals’ speeches, “of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said.” [Find that reassuring “of course” in the Greek, if you can!] Consequently, since Brasidas misrepresents situations for gain, Brasidas’ *arete* (whatever we may imagine that capacious term to include) does not



concern justice, ethics, or “honourable conduct” (*sic* H, 56), except as they are useful to achieve his devious goals. He abandoned communities whose trust he had gained to suffer terrible consequences, as a campaigning general in so vicious a war sometimes must. He, like Themistocles, gains commendation for ξύνησις because both brought friends and enemies around to their intelligent political and strategic perceptions. His *arete* as a military commander refers to his ability to carry out those perceptions and related policies. When Brasidas commends a line of action to his Lieutenant Clearchidas, “Be a good man,” he means: “be good at what you are trained for” and that is threatening, capturing, and killing, not Socratic ethics. Dealing justly is part of the portfolio and tool-kit of diplomats and commanders in war. Like threats, which Brasidas also brandished, and deceit (another tool in the Laconian’s armory), assertions of truthfulness and fidelity are useful word-machines. (H. at iv.108.4 rightly refers to language perversion in the Corcyrean *stasis* and the Athenians’ arguments at Melos.) In Thucydides’ history, fair promises are often abandoned when another approach seems more effective or cheaper. The historian may regret this, but he does not close his eyes to it. Thucydides presents no reason to think of Brasidas as a white knight, much less a Don Quixote. H.’s view is different. He rhapsodizes (60) that “Thucydides was indeed infatuated, up to a point, by the literary Brasidas that he had created,” and that Brasidas “enabled [him] ... to spread his artistic wings and soar over the whole epic sky.” Our old companion Gomme would roll over in his grave.

Brasidas is different in Thucydides because he was different in fact (a position that our sources do not allow us to prove or disprove, but no study regards him as the clone of dilatory Alcidas or any other Spartan). H. recognizes this fortuitous, *sui generis* fact (89) but still insists that Thucydides “wishes to accord special treatment to Brasidas.” The Spartan’s “campaign” *spiel* to a sequence of Athenian allies in the North Aegean, varied according to circumstances, is handled by the ancient writer in a typically economical way: theme in full, then minor variants in a sequence that fits particular and peculiar circumstances. (The synoptic procedure echoes his own method, partly adumbrated in the difficult chapter on method for speeches in general [I.22.1]. No other character in the *History* is given the opportunity to make the same case on several occasions, although some surely did, in historical fact. For instance, Spartans frequently engaged in persuading Ionians to revolt near the war’s end).

The fourth section emphasizes the historian’s interest in kinship terminology, one small part of the significant religious factor that Gomme did not explore and that H. thinks O. Curty has not adequately accounted for (*MH* 1994, 1995). An exploration of the semantics of ξυγγενής, οἰκέλος and οὐκ ἄλλότριος allows H. to conclude that such relationships were important to

Thucydides as they were to Herodotus. Real and fictitious racial descent were motives and sentiments to conjure with in the decision-making of the polis. Gomme receives some hard lashes for his treatment of cities “flagged” as colonies. These are brief notices in the narrative of mother-daughter relationships between cities (“sketchy, arbitrary, unhelpful, particularly inadequate,” all on 76). H. makes the worthwhile point that Thucydides *uncharacteristically* mentions that Scione was settled by Achaean returnees from the Trojan War (4.120.1). The hint of legend is more suggestive than Gomme realized, but, maddeningly, H. does not follow up beyond mentioning the best parallel at 6.2.3. H. notes perceptively that the Athenian *boule* plays a small role in this history [118]; I hoped to find some explanation (or speculation) after this fine observation. H. had already remarked that “it is (it may be said) easy to find fault with a commentator’s distribution of attention” (78). The excuse does not address issues like this where H. has drawn our attention to the problem.

“Speeches, direct and indirect in iv-v.24” with attention to the “old problem, that of authenticity” sounds promising, but this section is uncharacteristically short. H. believes speeches were given to entire armies before battle. This *opinio quasi universalis* has only recently been challenged by M. Hansen [*Historia* 1993: 161-80]. Hansen’s strict construction of pre-battle exhortations (*Feldherrnreden*)—one extended speech at the battle-site, delivered but once to all the soldiers, assembled and marshalled for battle—affects relatively few, astonishingly few, of Thucydides’ recorded speeches. It excludes brief, repeated clichés as the commander moves down the line and *sylogoi* speeches to the army collected as an assembly *prior* to battlefield deployment. The net result is that Hansen credits Thucydides with *inventing* a genre (173), but it turns out to be close to a null set. Hansen’s article claims much less than it appears to, and never claims, as H. says (396), that Thucydides provides words where none were spoken. Hansen readily demolishes a modern misconception about the conditions of commanders’ exhortations but only by limiting his investigation to a tiny sub-set of Thucydides’ longer speeches, harangues in combat contexts. (*N.B.* there is none in Herodotus.) Up close, Hansen’s mountain of a claim reduces itself to a fascinating molehill, at most, and H. should have said so. Pritchett’s exhaustive and entertaining refutation (*Essays* 1994: 27-109) demolishes Hansen’s case, but H. seems to remain uncertain.

H. surely overuses the modifier “surely,” an irritating and sloppy word herein generally used just where one cannot be sure. For example, H. believes that the echoes (not repetition) of events or basic ideas from Thucydides’ account of the *Pentekontaetia* in Hippocrates’ speech near Delion (1.108.3, 4.95.3) “surely do tell against the authenticity of the relevant section of a speech” (85). I don’t think such banal references to one earlier event

twice, or even thrice later, do any such thing. In any case, the supposedly very close verbal echoes would argue only for Thucydides' use of historically appropriate battle encouragements. Echoes might also argue against the position that Thucydides reports his speakers' *ipsissima verba*, but this is a position that not even quasi-fundamentalists (on the issue of the veracity of his speeches), such as I, hold. This observation about verbal parallels is not to deny Thucydidean anticipations and pre-echoes, or echoes and resonant confirmations, but rather seeks to void the sloppy logic of arguments that hold that similarities between author's and speakers' statements prove that the historical speaker did not speak as Thucydides reports him to have done.

Two vaguely related topics, epigraphy and personal names, are scrunched together in the sixth section of the introduction. H. thinks (following Lisa Kallet-Marx) that the Athenian Tribute Lists are less useful for supplementing Thucydides or understanding Greek history than their editors (an adventuresome and imaginative bunch including Benjamin Merrit, H. Wade-Gery, and M. MacGregor, 1939-53) or even the unenthusiastic epigrapher Gomme believed (96). One consequence of this conclusion is that economic issues are repeatedly downplayed in this commentary, and Thucydides' minimalist fiscal information seems less inadequate than it may be. This view is convenient for those who fear getting lost in endless and difficult to follow epigraphical controversies, but I am not persuaded by this discussion that, e.g., the reassessment decree of 425/4 (*IG I<sup>3</sup>.71*) was ineffective psychologically and financially.

Even if the legislated increase in Athenian revenues had been a flop, Thucydides is as interested in spectacular imperial and military failures as in spectacular successes. Witness his rhetorical and strategic attention to the catastrophic Athenian expedition against Syracuse or the earlier aborted Peloponnesian attack on the Peiraeus (7.87.5-6; 2.93-94). How then do we explain Thucydides' blind spot for the imperial purse? One facile answer: despite his rhetorical flourish about not writing to please the hearing of the multitude, Thucydides realized that ledger-book economic history in many volumes would not survive himself, much less 'for ever'. Another answer: no historian until two generations ago thought any audience would care to hear about tax collection results, and precious few actually do—even today. All this having been said, H. generously refers to relevant epigraphical documents.

H. notes Gomme's lack of interest in personal names (102), although this criticism is later adjusted to "feeble" interest. H. does not make clear what the text's preservation of historical names, sometimes verified by epigraphy, tell us beyond the fact that Thucydides bothers to record them and get them right. H. does try to follow the best mss. (and D. Lewis) on names of persons and places, as with the toponym Solyg{e}ia. Sometimes the copyists seemed

to have mistaken what Thucydides wrote, or at least what the era regarded as standard (200, following Lewis, diss. 1952, *non vidi*). Later, in Annex A (134-37), H. compares Thucydides' to Herodotus' use of and interest in names, and here notes the Athenian's lesser interest (in *nomen-omen*, e.g., Hegesistratos). This section is most interesting, although H. fails to signal the pun in the name of the leader (Eupompidas) of the Plataean break-out in Thucydides. A promising discussion of name-suppression (e.g., the Spartan commander and the five Spartan judges at Plataea [3.5.2] and other anonymous speakers) never is developed.

“[H]ere at last [115!] I come clean about the main theme of this Introduction.” H. believes that Thucydides is innovating in this section of his *Ἐυγγραφή* rather than in the hypothesis that it is a draft and incomplete. The final section of the introduction discusses iv-v.24 “as a work of art,” and its degree of finish. D. Babut's and Robert Connor's defenses of the regulated structure (*Bull G. Budé* 1981; 1984) are admired, and the loose ends at the end of iv and at the beginning of v are defended (rightly) as Thucydidean habit (112). The included documents are accepted as among the intentional innovations, and the existence of “a stylistic law prohibiting ... such documents” is sensibly denied. It is true, as H. neatly says, that “one may ... feel the documents are cards that can take any trick” (117), but Thucydidean criticism will always be hobbled by an author who values variety. Who can say what Thucydides never might dare to do? Thucydides' narrative is not homogeneous; nor is his style, however well one can parody it. These statements are (surely?) true. I agree with H.'s conclusion that “incoherence theory” helps us less than its opposite. Any theory of imperfections serves as an heuristic *cul de sac* and a mirror of contemporary modern taste, as Homeric studies have shown us. The purple-prose panegyric, however, of i.8, viii.108, and v.1 as a “handsome ring ... [with] a deliberate and centrally placed precious stone,” 122) goes beyond acceptable idolatry. This Introduction has no single focus but offers a congeries of seven interesting essays. They do not comprise or equal the general introduction that H.'s *Thucydides* (1987; corr. 1994) provided.

H. believes in “symptotic recitation” of significant chunks of the *Histories* (e.g., 120) and suggests that the *stasis* in Corcyra passage, narrative and analysis, qualifies as a candidate. I don't know about Oxford drinking parties (or Athenian or Ohioan, really), but using Plato's *Symposium* as the friendliest witness to higher-level confabulation, I'd say that the hiccoughing, self-promoting, and name-calling hoplites, the hip-wagging flute-girls and pitcher-boys, and the generality of slumping heads—not to mention *kottabos*-games, lollygagging, throwing up, and general raucous clamor of non-Platonic venues in Corinth, Miletus, up-scale Athens and downhome Thrace—render this difficult and Ur-academic scenario unlikely, even if we

allow for the dedicated friendship of Thucydides' small circle of friends and an awesome tolerance for Thucydides' agonized syntax. A labyrinthine passage, such as III.82-83, is hard to parse on the tenth go-round of the *krater* extended by boys and girls in *deshabillé*.

I have tarried so long on the introduction because (a) it occupies 28% of the volume; (b) it supplies more coherent presentations of the commentator's views, necessarily, than phrase-by-phrase commentary can; (c) it pertains to both Hornblower's volumes so far published; and (d) a consideration limited to selected notes would seem, or be, tendentious in a review of a lengthy and mature volume. We turn now to selected comments in this ambitious and challenging work.

## II

Reviewers criticize more frequently than praise their specimens. H. is the well-known author of significant articles and a useful book on Thucydides, the editor of collections of essays, and co-editor and organizer of the impressive third edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1996, to which helpful reff. can be found here). He shows wide knowledge of, and interest in, geography, topography, federalism, onomastics (iv.87.3, good comment on ship names and Athenian values), toponyms, and prosopography (iv.3.2, v.19.2), epigraphy (less in numismatics), focalization (e.g., Cleon's ad v.7.5), and narrative dislocation (Andrewes' "breaches of chronological order," e.g., iv.50.3). He writes clear, although sometimes long and involved, sentences about his varied concerns and his comments are always intelligent.

This commentary, however, too often consists of Greek lemma and English translation, sometimes followed by no more than a cross-reference to one or more of his own works (some of them not yet available and not soon to be so) or others' books and articles. At iv.54.1, for instance, H. refers us to his much fuller enumeration and discussion ("Narratology and Narrative Techniques in Thucydides" in *Greek Historiography* [1994: 162 and n. 81]) of "called" and "so called" places, etc., but a commentary on this generous scale ought to be comprehensive and self-contained. At iv.55.1, lemma and translation are followed by no more than a "Lit." comment (= literally rendered = Jowett modified the Greek), that is, [not "at Sphakteria" but] "on the island." Such "lit." comments refer either to self-evident facts or point to a significant ambiguity or error, in which case H.'s accurate translation could have silently replaced Jowett's decently motivated attempt to clarify the referent.

Those of us not in Oxbridge or Berkvard (a useful neologism, I think and hope) rarely have the financial and bibliographical resources at home or

in local libraries to consult all the books and articles that Hornblower can and does. It would help us if he would more often summarize or even repeat himself and synopsise others' arguments (esp. those appearing in nineteenth-century German dissertations), so that we could use this commentary by itself standing alone, or after Gomme's. As matters now appear, H. does not seem to envision readers using his work without the *opera omnia* (not merely the commentary on Thucydides) of Gomme as well as the works of the two men named Stahl, Connor, Kallet-Marx, Malkin, and Lewis' Princeton dissertation (never published) on the shelf and at the ready. But the reader no longer needs the estimable Bloomfield, Krüger, Forbes, and Grundy, *inter alia*, if one may judge by their absence from the notes.

Gomme's commentary without English translations often seems to me more easily understandable to the historian with or without Greek. In brief, although readers with "little or no Greek" are here given translations, they cannot evaluate, they cannot comprehend, many of the arguments based on "natural" Greek (whatever that means in the case of Thucydides) word order or idiom. Further, why depend on Jowett's translation? While it may be "eloquent" (cf. the learned but neglected W. H. Forbes of Balliol's attestation [1895] and Louis Lord's [1945]), it misleads the reader about the historian's style and train of thought. It strays farther from the "broken symmetry" and dramatic syntax than intense Crawley's and further from the sublime and enigmatic simplicity than Rex Warner's. (I mention, *per contra*, Adam Parry's unsympathetic evaluation of two "Penguin" translations, Warner's and de Sélincourt's [now revised by John Marincola], "Herodotus and Thucydides," *Arion* 1968: 409-16; repr. in *Language of Achilles and Other Papers*, 1989.)

Other translators such Thomas Hobbes and the Reverend Dale [in the Bohn series] have noteworthy virtues and their own inspired moments but are never cited. In a post-modern commentary so alert to certain Thucydidean stylistic peculiarities and persuasive strategies, it surprises us to find that H. has chosen a translation that makes the gnarly prose flow gently. Sentences are freely rephrased, quantitative adverbs added at whim (e.g., iv.43.3 *μόλις*, "difficulty" becomes "some difficulty;" a city wall [iv.51, sing.] becomes "walls"; iv.108.4 on men's customary optimism is very loose). Rough-hewn sentences should retain that frustrating, indeed irritating, texture. Once (462 on v.16.1) H. rightly objects to Thucydides' one "monstrously long (20-line) sentence" (four in Jowett, and reasonably so). The choice of Jowett's Victorian curiosity requires explanation. At one point (386), even H. wonders candidly whether Jowett has slipped (Shilleto ad 1.126.6 reprimands his "very grave blunder") or whether he himself is unfamiliar with Jowett's Victorian English idiom. Jowett has followed a reasonable policy, but it is not contemporary practice.

iv.1-41: Thucydides lavished unique detail on the Pylos campaign. A commentary as interested as this one properly is in Peloponnesian topography should provide maps of the Pylos vicinity (and the Thraceward region), not to mention maps of smaller areas. At, e.g., iv.8.5, H.'s detailed comments cry out for a sketch, at least; at iv.123.1, a map of Mende and the Khalkidike is wanted. One map, of Amphipolis, graces this entire volume, itself a \$125 installment of what is intended to be the commentary of choice. Gomme's commentary has many maps (and perhaps H. expects all readers to have Gomme at hand). Warner's Penguin translation has a countour map of the Pylos region. C. E. Graves' serviceable edition (1888) of book IV did not, nor does my Oxford Clarendon edition of Jowett (1900), but these are obvious defects, one partly corrected in Graves' recent reprint. J. B. Wilson's *Pylos 425 BC* (1979) discusses that campaign aided by four maps and photographs, too. The new and noteworthy *Landmark Thucydides* (1996), ed. R. B. Strassler (Crawley translation, annotations, appendixes), offers many maps—seventeen for book iv alone.

iv.3.3, 28.5, 40.2, 84.1: H. is good on laughter in Thucydides and his general absence of humor—"least ludic of writers." This remark at iv.92.4 is quite mistaken, however, when applied to word-play. For example antithesis, false antithesis, alliteration, echoes, and rhyming sounds abound, as one expects from a writer who heard and learned much from Leontine Gorgias. The antithesis word-deed appears eighteen times in the *Epitaphios* alone. Irony and paradox in Thucydides' thought and word-order give the ancient syntax-shifter that texture that H. admires, but H. perhaps is thinking here of set-up one-line jokes and shaggy-dog stories. H. refers to his useful 1987: 191 n. 1 on Thucydides' "humourlessness" and other defects which appears in that book's concluding discussion of his virtues.

iv.4.1: discussion of *ὄρμη* (impulse) is inadequate on the philological, psychological, and literary (e.g., Cornford's hypothesis of tragic form) issues. The same applies to his discussion of other programmatic words, e.g., *ὑβρίσαντες* at iv.18.2, and even the fuller treatment of *πλεονεκτεῖν* at iv.61.5.

iv.8.8: "free ascription of motive" is a semi-technical term in need of explanation.

iv.12.1: "from the shop [slip for *ship*] to the shore": a rare misprint; the standards of proofreading are very high in the Greek and English.

iv.17-20: H. has some admirable *bon mots* such as this one on the Spartan offer: "The wrapping-paper needed to be fancy because there was not much inside." I have no objection to occasional slang, sometimes insular (e.g.,

iv.18.3: When H. translates *τῶν προσγεγενημένων*, [the things added] as "your empire," he loses the wonderful rhetorical contortion and avoidance of reality confected by the Spartan ambassadors. He multiplies the error by calling the phrase "almost a euphemism." What could a euphemism say that

was more euphemistic than this avoidance of terms for conquest, extortion, and the systematic exploitation of oppressed satellites? When H. then literally and correctly (if obliquely) translates the Greek as “the things added to [the city],” I wonder whether his commentary has done more than damn the Jowett translation (which is typically lucid but at the cost of accuracy and characterization), confuse the issue of names and realities, and ignore the rhetorical double-speak.

iv.19.4: “his [Thucydides’] general blackening of Spartan acts and motives”: H. does not entirely endorse but intermittently adopts the posture of E. Badian’s *From Plataea to Potidaea* (1983). Badian produces a ferocious brief against Thucydides’ historical objectivity, allegedly exposing Thucydides’ pro-Athenian rhetoric, omissions, inventions, and *Tendenz*. (Badian’s prosecutorial language favors “desperate suppression, plausible fiction, disinformation, misleading interpretations foisted upon the reader, activist journalism,” etc.) Too often I wonder just where H. stands on important, pervasive issues like this one of a major historian’s historical trustworthiness.

iv.21.3: H. notes that *δημαγωγός* is *hapax*, but not, and more interestingly, that the same passage’s superlative *πιθανώτατος* occurs only thrice and significantly for Cleon twice and otherwise only for the Syracusan demagogue Athenagoras, arguably a Sicilian clone of Cleon (vi.35.2). H. does not comment on Gomme’s note ad loc. that the term “demagogue” is at this time and here not derogatory, but oddly cites (*contra* Dover) Xen. *Hell.* v.2.7. This passage reports the capture of Mantinea in 385 and the expulsion of demagogues there and then, as if the cosmopolitan Xenophon writing sixty years later proves something about Thucydidean and/or Attic usage. Xenophon’s Greek is also *sui generis*. But H. notes other worthwhile *hapaxes*, e.g. iv.108.3 *πρώτης*, iv.108.5 *έφολκά*.

iv.24.5: “the scholiasts’ time, whenever that was”: this possibly justifiable dismissal does not suffice for a discussion of the value of the scholia for Thucydides which are rarely cited (no other ref. in the indexes to the first two volumes, but see iv.60.1, third note).

iv.28.3: on crowd behavior, H. notes V. Hunter’s *CJ* 1988/89 article but not her “Thucydides, Gorgias and Mass Psychology,” *Hermes* 1986 which discusses fear and anger, and the *intellectual* relation of Thucydides to Gorgias, an element that needs as much elucidation as the rhetorical.

iv.30.1: “Demosthenes is one of the few men in Thucydides who is said to profit from previous mistakes”: a nice point and one worth making.

iv.58: “Thucydides has in a sense failed to report ‘what was actually said’”: H. makes the remark concerning the Gela conference where Thucydides reports that “many other opinions were voiced on both sides.” The serious issue of the element of invention in the speeches (elsewhere H. makes a contribution) is poorly served by this scandalous carping. Nowhere does



Thucydides claim to report every speech delivered in public during the Ten Years' War, and let us be thankful. At iv.83.5, the student learns that "some speeches in Thucydides are more authentic than others." This observation seems more elementary than most of the commentary (e.g., comments on Athenian tribal order in inscriptions). Although certainly true, no argument is presented or reasons given. H. continues discussion of authenticity and individuality [iv.85-87, Brasidas' words]. At iv.86.1, H. perhaps suggests that some scholars think that *all* parts of all Thucydides' speeches are *entirely* invented, a position that I can logically imagine, but I do not think anyone actually defends this view, even Virginia Hunter in *The Artful Reporter* (1973), who calls Thucydides "the least objective historian." Similarly, no one maintains that all the speeches contain only words that were actually spoken.

iv.63.1 provides daggered Greek, translation, and a reference to Maurer 1995 but never identifies the textual issue (much less explains the corruption).

iv.73.4: "Brasidas and co.," "on all fours with"), but non-native speakers may be frustrated by such locutions in a commentary. Also, can they or the undergraduates of the present epoch decipher the phrase (ad iv.85.6): "the Penguin has 'unreal'"?

iv.78.3: "Thucydides was well versed in oligarchic theory": obscure referent. Did such theory, beyond a practiced ideology, even exist? The reference to vol. I cites only the so-called *Old Oligarch*, not a theoretician.

iv.78.6: "nothing earlier than the fourth cent." A recent report on Macedonian Dion (*Archaeology* 49.2 [1996] 28) relates Pandermalis' discovery of stone Demeter sanctuary buildings dated ca. 500 BCE, the oldest cult buildings in Macedonia.

iv.80.4: "Th uses no distancing formula such as 'it is said'": I commend H. for noting absences as well as presences; these are not easy to notice (also at iv.88.1). H. often marks one of Thucydides' signature neologisms, *-σις* verbal nouns (e.g., iv.81.2) following Smith (*TAPA* 1900), but apparently unaware of Sihler (*PAPA* 1881), Wolcott (*TAPA* 1898), Browning (*Philol.* 1958). More valuable, if less accessible, than all of these is the dissertation of Joseph Patwell, *Grammar, Discourse, and Style in Thucydides Book 8* (University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1978), that considers Thucydides' deployment of abstract verbal nouns and "personal and authorial comments."

iv.81.3: ἐλπίδα...βέβαιον is translated as firm "conviction" along with Jowett, Crawley, and Warner, rather than the confident "hope or expectation" that LSJ<sup>9</sup> supply. Hobbes and Dale [1855] write "an assured hope." An issue concerning Thucydides' optimism and pessimism lurks here.

iv.90.1: H. observes on the Delion campaign that it was unusual for metics to be used "for fighting outside of Attica," but previously has argued

that “the main battle was fought (as Thucydides himself appears to accept at 91) in the Oropia, on Attic soil (iv.89-101).”

iv.92.1: Pagondas’ speech at Tanagra, delivered to the Boeotian army in its constituent units (λόχοι, 91), before proceeding to the battlefield, opens with scathing criticism of the Boiotian high command. H. opines “Perhaps a sign of inauthenticity?” *Au contraire*, this *captatio benevolentiae* (?) is two-edged since an unexpected indication of strategic controversy in the upper echelons is arguably (and logically) less likely to be freely composed by the historian (in his “study” working on one of his 141 speeches) than included only and precisely because it supplied a surprising element of the actual exhortation. The *a priori* improbability of this officer’s particular wording seems contrary to a normal attempt to marshal hoplite courage. It certainly does not conform to the notorious formulation at i.22.1: “my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions,” as Crawley renders it. If one believes, as I do, that Thucydides is not a barefaced (and extremely clever) liar or purveyor of whole-cloth fictions, Pagondas’ words make rhetorical sense. They constitute a sign of unexpected but refreshing candor. Or, possibly, they are an accurate characterization of another backward Boiotian speaker stumbling into a rhetorically clumsy opening gambit. To his Boiotian credit, whatever his knowledge of Gorgianic and Attic figures of thought and language, Pagondas won this major battle near Delion. H. (82, following Pritchett 1994) is correct to remove this bibliographically deprived speech from Hansen’s self-deconstructing list (167-68) of *battlefield* exhortations. It was delivered before the army marched towards the battle near Delion.

To what extent do echoes of narrative in speeches or echoes of speeches in other speeches “weaken belief in the authenticity of the relevant section” (ad iv.95.3)? Echoes of the first sort are attested in all periods of history (politicians refer to the past), and echoes of the second sort (two generals or politicians simultaneously referring to the same fact or situation) are not surprising. H, commenting on iv.126 and v.9, espouses a sensible position, in my view, that allows the historian a fundamental integrity. That is, speeches were made, Thucydides heard them or reports of them, and his *History* preserves substantial elements of the speeches that were indeed delivered.

iv.93.4: an impressive note on the organization of the Boiotian league with observations on the notable vocabulary and bibliography.

iv.94.1 concerns Thucydides’ “non-Athenian readership,” a topic elsewhere touched upon that deserves more systematic treatment.

iv.96.5: A committed post-modernist (or reader of Stahl’s influential monograph) would rarely allege that Th’s effect is “to enhance our sense that he [Pagondas] is completely in control of events (as indeed he was,...).” Stahl’s 1966 Thucydides emphasizes how rarely his historical participants

accurately perceive what is going on in, much less correctly anticipate, diplomatic affairs, internal assembly debates, and military confrontations. “Control of events” seems an unduly romantic concept, as we approach in exhaustion the end of another era (cf. V. Hanson, *The Western Way of War* 1989; also 1991; on unpredictability in hoplite warfare).

iv.97.2-99 discusses “a deliberate experiment,” the Boiotian-Athenian exchange concerning the “Delion” battle’s dead. H. cites Cl. Orwin, *The Humanity of Thucydides* 1994, who flags this “neglected passage.” H. chastises Gomme *HCT* for ignoring it; cf. my “Heralds and corpses in Thucydides,” *CW* 1977.

iv.101.5: Sitalkes’ death notice is “oddly Tacitean,” but then *not* Tacitean in that “it does not come at [the collection of various data found at] the end of a year.” What is the relevance of this observation on the annalistic method of an author half a millennium later in a different language and culture? If the point is that Tacitus copies Thucydides’ manner, we need more argument, or references to ancient passages and modern authorities, and may wonder why we find it in a commentary on Thucydides. Further, H. continues, “As Tacitus says (*Ann.* iv.33 [.3]), the deaths of famous men refresh the mind.” Tacitus’ mordant excursus on historiography in the painful reign of Tiberius seems wildly irrelevant and distracting to a reader of Thracian obituaries. (The same judgment applies to a sentence that fishes up Tacitus at iv.133-34.)

iv.102.2 observes the clustering of the verb ἐκκρουειν at the end of book iv. But is clustering “an ‘oral’ feature in Thucydides” [a slippery phrase, that] or, as H. wrote earlier (ad iv.59.1): “Thucydides (like the rest of us) sometimes gets certain phrases [here, ἐς κοινόν] into his head and they whirl around for a while.” In the same note H. correctly marks a phrase as “reminiscent of the language of Athenian official decrees,” but other examples are not indicated here and no explanation or speculation about the bare fact is offered.

iv.105.1: “Presumably Th.’s property was unaffected by his exile i.e. he continued to be rich.” These unpunctuated and untestable presumptions suggest the following line of thought: “Thucydides wrote a big book about a long time; he must have had independent means to do so; therefore, his Thracian mining investments and licenses held good for the next two decades after he was exiled from Athens and its empire.” The speculation seems less probable than others. Were the workings of the industry not disturbed by the regular and irregular warfare in Thrace? Would the bullion and cash-starved Athenians not wish to take over these mining “rights,” if they could? I think they would, but I can’t prove that they did. H.’s presumption does not advance the discussion.

Same note: “surely the two men talked between 424 and 422.” Thucydides and Brasidas may have enjoyed some Mendaian or Thasian *vino*, or a good Havana cigar (had they the opportunity), but this is the stuff of fiction, not sober commentary. I confess that I once wrote a poem about Thucydides’s exile; indeed, Grundy (1948: II) wrote 22 quatrains about Thucydides’ oeuvre: “He told of Brasidas the brave; / And at the great magician’s touch / He rises once more from the grave / The knight *sans peur et sans reproche*.” N.B. G. B. Grundy painted a better Spartan than H.’s failure (ad iv.123.2) “mistaken was the enthusiasm for Brasidas” and (ad v.18.8, quoting Bosworth) “utter ruin in two short years.” Once again, the word “surely” in historical works adds nothing, as undergraduates in history should be taught.

iv.108.1: H. catalogues six digressions on morale (cf. 109), a useful topic, although he does not fully mine them for Thucydides’s rhetorical, structural, and dramatic techniques.

iv.110.1: H. offers welcome bibliography to 1994 on the Torone excavations.

iv.112.1: H. notes, without statistics, Thucydides’ fondness for the word *ἐκπληξίς*. It occurs 16 times as noun (Bétant) and 19 times as verb. He might refer to ii.94.1 and viii.96, where Thucydides pauses to ponder psychological surprise.

iv.118.11: “his [Thucydides’s] general impatience with constitutional procedures.” I never had surmised this attitude, and H. needs to argue the case for such anarchistic yearnings or illegal methods of government. Another confession: An underground coterie believes that Thucydides admired the Athenian democracy (before Cleon, anyway) and considered the Athenian tyrants and the Spartan, Corinthian, and Theban oligarchies less efficient, less inspiring, and less effective forms of government both internal and external.

iv.122.6: “It is most unusual for Thucydides to adjudicate emphatically...”. This important observation distinguishes this historian’s method from Herodotus’. Here differences about the date of Skione’s revolt is at issue, but the point deserves a catalogue of passages, discussion of relevant passages, and recent scholarship. H. refers to footnote 57 in his “Narratology and Narrative Techniques in Thucydides” (*Greek Historiography* 1994; cf. my “Tissaphernes and the Phoenician Fleet,” *TAPA* 1976). This is one of the commentary’s own significant *Beinahe-Episoden* (H. Nesselrath, *Ungeschehenes Geschehen...im Epos*, 1992), lost chances. So we can say, imitating the Athenian’s dramatic and arresting formula, “so near came H. to an advance beyond Gomme in literary analysis.”

iv.125.1: the formula *ὄπερ φιλεῖ* and its applications to crowd reactions provide another lost chance for insight into narratology, authorial intru-

sions, their placement, frequency, and extent (cf. H. on ii.65.4) This time, the inadequacy is still salvageable, at v.70, vi.63.2, vii.80.3, etc. The phrase (sometimes *οἶον φιλεῖ*, e.g., vii.80.3) often arises in connection with politically unfortunate, because irrational, behaviors, and therefore will propel us to examine one or more of Thucydides's sub-texts or his agenda.

iv.129.4: "favourite Thucydidean saved-by-a-whisker locution" offers good access to this Thucydidean dramatic technique. At iv.106.4, H. discusses the related "if...not" narrative technique with reference to the studies of Nesselrath and de Jong.

v.1: "a most unusual explicit, self-referential internal cross-reference in Thucydides's narrative," where "narrative" is an important qualification. H. is correct, although I would like to know what significance he assigns to the rarity of cross-references.

v.10.2: "This vivid detail" (of the feet of men and horses under Amphipolis' gate) made me hope for further notes on other, unexpectedly dramatic visualizations (e.g., of nonverbal behaviors, such as shaking bodies, gait and pace, unexpected silences and stupefaction, all of which occur in Thucydides).

v.10.9: a literary commentary which translates every lemma should at least once discuss tense usage in this historian. Why does Thucydides use imperfects and finite aorists and then suddenly switch to emphatic historical presents? In this commentary and the awaited "Oxford World Classic," Jowett/Hornblower translation, why do we find in this passage nothing but past tenses? ("Kleon had never intended to remain but fled at once, and was overtaken and killed" represents the Greek text's imperfect indicative, present participle [for imperfect], aorist passive participle, and present indicative.)

Thucydidean, indeed Greek historiographical, habits and shifts in verbal tenses and their proper English translation both need attention. This investigation would provide one element of a larger consideration of Thucydides' dramatic tactics (on the level of the word [lexical, aspectual, periphrastic, etc.], the clause, the sentence, the section, and the entire work). H. rightly observes that Thucydides is a good organizer and suspenseful writer, but H. overlooks that he is a deliberately disconcerting one, shifting unevenly and unexpectedly his focalizers, tenses, assignation of responsibility for specific acts or consequences, and readers' sympathies. The intelligent reader modifies repeatedly his/her views of individuals, groups, emerging tendencies, and even single events, as Thucydides recounts them. The simpleton's wish for "good guys and bad guys" crashes against Thucydides's zigging and zagging thought-mobile.

v.11.1 (pp. 449-56) H. provides a long and helpful discussion of Brasidas' post-mortem treatment in Thrace and Hagnon's "buildings." It is a relief to

see brute facts of Laconian achievements demolish the oft-mouthed clichés about Spartan hebetude and inarticulateness.

v.16.1: H.'s treatment of Cleon represents one nagging concern. H. refers repeatedly to one article (say, Mabel Lang's "Participial motivation in Thucydides," *Mnemosyne* 1995) while ignoring other relevant items by the same author, if not so recent ("Cleon as the anti-Pericles," *CPh* 1972). Similarly, on the book level, we have Connor's *Thucydides* (1984, a model of the application of one literary analysis of Thucydides, Iser's "reader response criticism") but not (unless I forgot an isolated reference) the same author's influential *New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens* of 1971. No one can cite, much less discuss, everything, but one uncomfortably intuits that recent works of favored authorities garner most mention, something not right for a Clarendon Press commentary. Important work of the last two decades on Athenian politics (e.g., Hansen, Ober's *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens*, Ostwald's *Popular Sovereignty...*, J. Roberts' *Accountability in Athenian Government*, Raaflaub's *Entdeckung der Freiheit*, Sealey) remain in the dark.

v.16.3: "We should be grateful that Thucydides gives us this much,..." concerns Thucydides' unexpected mention of dances and sacrifices celebrated at Sparta for Pleistoanax's return. In general, H. is refreshingly unworshipful of his author, an attitude hard to maintain in the face of this frightening Hellenic genius. There is much to criticize as well as praise in Thucydides' achievement. H. neither worships nor savages his subject, a point very much to his credit. The detailed twenty-page index anglicizes all Greek words.

### Conclusions

Gomme's *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* Volume III (1956) consumed 311 pages (cost: once 90 shillings for volumes II and III together; now out of print) and covered the same Thucydidean chapters and period (spring 425-winter 422/1, less than four years). Historian and commentators end the account of the Ten Years War with a verbatim record of a treaty and the historian's flourish discussing the nature and length of this war. Hornblower's *A Commentary on Thucydides* (the qualifying word "historical" is omitted) offers 520 pages (cost: U.S. \$125). Differences abound in the scope of the long introductions and in the content of the annotations.

One may laud H.'s attempt to include all the matters that Gomme discussed and topics, passages, and literary approaches that Gomme did not discuss, but the volume before us misses both stools. H. runs his commentary on a platform of Gomme and Andrewes (less of Dover), and *their* Thucydides. He stretches in other directions, many summarized by Connor in

his seminal article "A Post Modernist Thucydides?," *CJ* 72 (1977) 89-98. If the reader compares Connor's discussion (*Thucydides* 1984: 113-18) of the assembly in which Cleon promised to capture the Spartans on Pylos (iv.27-29) to Hornblower's (185-88), two possibilities emerge for dissatisfaction. Perhaps, the commentary format and lens are not as conducive as extended expository prose to analyze focalization, paradox and irony, explication of authorial bias, and structure. For example, Babut's 1981 essay is cited (e.g., at iv.15.2), but his thesis is nowhere clearly accepted or rejected (cf. H, 113). The discussion of style by snippets reveals the same problem. The influential Gorgias appears but once (220). H. seems to dismiss Gomme's cited observation (and Wade-Gery's and Denniston's) of his stylistic and rhetorical influence, intentional ambiguity, and analysis of motives. For example, Syracusan Hermocrates' speech (iv.61.2) jingles, alliterates, and juggles *polyptota, à la* Gorgias, but H. eschews comment. Alternatively, H. thinks comments on the historian's shaping of his materials not best made in a commentary. This hypothesis, however, contradicts his project's stated program.

Perhaps the size of the commentary prevented adequate attention to literary aspects, once the Gommean concerns were addressed. Connor's insightful analysis is applied to Hermokrates' anticipation of his later enemy Euphemos' words (iv.60.2/vi.86.2), but H.'s discussion is unfortunately reduced to a throw-away parenthesis. A literary commentary, on this desiderated level of the word, phrase, sentence, and section remains to be written. H.'s *Thucydides* book is more satisfactory, because its format is better suited to H.'s undoubted intelligence, energy, and acuity. This commentary, given its premises, although an immense effort, is not equal to the task that its author has set himself.