Histos 14 (2020) 230–54

ΤΗΝ ΕΚΒΟΛΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΥ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΑΜΗΝ: THUCYDIDES' CHRONICLE IN THE *PENTEKONTAETIA* (1.97–117) IS NOT A DIGRESSION*

Abstract: Τ*ὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην* (1.97.2) means not 'I made a digression in my narrative' but is rather a periphrasis for *τὸν λόγον ἐξέβαλον*, 'I have discarded my *logos*' (here 'plan'). It sets aside the Corcyra starting-point announced at 1.23.5–6, interrupted by listing the empire's much earlier military actions following the league's foundation.

Two old objections are reconsidered. (1) '1.88 begins the flashback, so 1.97.2 is not a break'. 1.88–96 is, however, an orderly digression linked to Sparta's war-vote, extending Herodotus 9.102–12 to the Delian League. 1.97.2 refuses to return to the main narrative. (2) '1.97.2 is a jumble of unrelated statements.' Yet every sentence references *τοσάδε/αὐτά*, the upcoming content. This first-person preface reflects both its purpose in itself (filling a large gap, replacing Hellanicus) and within Book 1 (changing plan, documenting empire).

After the chronicle Thucydides retraces his steps: 1.118 concatenates segments totaling fifty years, repeats 1.97.2, then 1.88, finally resuming 1.87.6 where his initial narrative broke off. 1.97.1 and 1.118 resemble 5.26, where the narrative-period is again extended, another gap filled, and multiple narratives again concatenated.

1.97.2 need not prove a later stage of composition: 'Spartan fear' of Athens is prominent (but not to be narrated) in 1.23.6 and later (unless we implausibly remove these as later insertions also).

Keywords: Thucydides, *Pentekontaetia*, digressions

1. The Third Preface of Thucydides Book 1

Discussions of Thucydides' first-person authorial prefaces always include 1.1 (his opening sentence explaining his choice of this war to write), 1.22–3 (the complex of statements explaining the difference between his standards for speeches and for narratives of actions, his desired readership, and his choice of pre-war narrative), and 5.26 (the argument for

* My thanks to the participants at a workshop on digressions in Thucydides at Cornell in March 2017 (among them Elizabeth Irwin, Kyle Khellaf, Tim Rood, Philip Stadter) and subsequently to Edith Foster, the reviewers for *Histos*, and especially Hunter R. Rawlings III. More detailed discussions of vocabulary and interpretations are in some cases to be found in the nascent Thucydides lexicon project at http://lexeis.org (to whose articles on key words reference is made below using the abbreviation *Lex. Thuc.*) and to my commentary on Thucydides Book 1 in preparation for the 'Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics' series. All translations (including those of modern secondary literature) are my own.

ISSN: 2046-5963 15 November 2020

the war's continuity and recalculation of its length which restarts the narrative after the Peace of Nicias). There is however another first-person preface, also giving his reasons for pursuing a new narrative, that is difficult to integrate into the plans of the first two prefaces, and placed particularly strangely after the account of the formation of the Delian League (1.88–96), in itself already a new narrative and flashback (1.97.2):[1]

> *ἔγραψα δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην διὰ τόδε, ὅτι τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἅπασιν ἐκλιπὲς τοῦτο ἦν τὸ χωρίον καὶ ἢ τὰ πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν Ἑλληνικὰ ξυνετίθεσαν ἢ αὐτὰ τὰ Μηδικά· τούτων δὲ ὅσπερ καὶ ἥψατο ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ξυγγραφῇ Ἑλλάνικος, βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήσθη. ἅμα δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπόδειξιν ἔχει τῆς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν οἵῳ τρόπῳ κατέστη.*
>
> I have written them *καὶ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην* for the following reason: this area has been neglected by all before me, and they have composed either Greek events before the Persian wars or just the Persian wars; and the man who actually touched on them in his *Attic Composition*, Hellanicus, mentioned them briefly and without chronological accuracy; and also they contain an enumeration of the character in which the Athenian Empire had become established.

Scholars who have discussed this preface have often found its combination of statements difficult to reconcile.[2] I propose to reconsider one phrase here which has never been found problematic at all, yet has not only been misinterpreted but whose correct translation can ultimately clarify Thucydides' own view of the relation between 1.97–117 and the rest of Book 1.

2. Τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην ≠ 'I Made a Digression in my Narrative'

One of the few things in the so-called 'Pentekontaetia'[3] about which there is universal agreement is the meaning of *ἐκβολή* in 1.97.2. But why does everyone assume that *ἐκβολή* here means 'digression?' It is not that the other

[1] On this problem see §5 below.

[2] See the quotations from Hammond and Harrison in §6 below.

[3] The convention (already in Σ 89–118a and Σ 118.2a (Kleinlogel–Alpers (2019) 412 and 444 respectively)) is to refer to 88–118 as the 'Pentekontaetia', which is wrongly derived from 1.118.1–2, where 'fifty years' sums up not only 88–117, but all of Book 1 starting with chapter 24, including the stories of Corcyra and Potidaea. It would be better if we could call 97–117 something as distinctive as its style and focus deserve: I use 'the Chronicle' below.

occurrences of ἐκβολή in Thucydides lead to this conclusion, since unlike 1.97.2 these are prepositional phrases whose derivation from the verb ἐκβάλλειν, 'throw out', is clear.[4] Rather, it is the context alone of the statement 'I have made an ἐκβολή of my λόγος', coming just before a major shift in style, focus and subject, that has inevitably prompted the translation 'I have composed a digression from my narrative' (or 'a digression consisting of a narrative'), and so it is universally translated today. Krüger compares ἐκβολή to other words for digression (παρέκβασις, παρενθήκη, προσθήκη, ἔκβασις)[5] with which later lexicographers glossed Thucydides' usage here, and observes that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, Appian, Arrian, and Dio used ἐκβολή in this sense.

But a closer look brings out that βάλλω is not in fact present in the any of the common classical or Hellenistic Greek words for 'digression'.[6] Furthermore, the ancient authors cited for the meaning 'digression' are not independent confirmation, but all intimately acquainted with Thucydides; the plausible deduction mentioned above has been made not only by modern scholars, but ancient writers also, and so provides us with testimonia for an interpretation of the text rather than independent parallels for its fifth-century meaning.

It is especially surprising that Krüger of all people did not emphasise that ἐκβολήν here is the object not of ποιεῖν but ποιεῖσθαι, which not only puts it in a different category than the other occurrences of ἐκβολή in Thucydides, but also quite different than the active ποιεῖν ἐκβολήν, as Krüger's own grammar observes in its original edition, and then much more fully in the expanded version of Cooper.[7] Simply put, ποιεῖν ἐκβολήν, if it should occur, might well mean 'to make an ἐκβολή', but a verbal noun with ποιεῖσθαι is more

[4] Mouth(s) of a river 7.35.2 (Hylios in Sicily), 2.102.3 (Achelous), cf. ποταμός ἐκβάλλει (εἰς) e. g. Plat. *Phaed.* 113 a, Pol. 16.17.5, Str. 4.6.9. (Herodotus and Thucydides prefer εἰσίημι); 4.1.1 περὶ σίτου ἐκβολήν for the emission of an ear of grain from its sheath used as a time-indication, cf. ἐκβαλεῖν τὸν σῖτον Liban. *Or.* 25.38, τὸν στάχυν Eur. *Bacch.* 747, Joh. Chrys. *Scr. Ecc.* vol. 63, p. 523 line 14. Similar indications of grain-growth stages (always relating to invasions intending crop-damage, since the best time to devastate the crop was before it could be harvested and stored: Hanson (1998) 33, 35) are 2.19.1, 2.79.1, 3.1.1, 4.6.1. ἐκβάλλειν in Thucydides is used exclusively for tossing out of cities either political enemies or foreign garrisons.

[5] Krüger (1860) *ad* 1.97.2. Less common words for 'digression' are ἐκδρομή, ἐκτροπή, ἐκφορά.

[6] Although παρεμβολή can mean 'insertion' or 'interpolation', and if it had any plausibility as an emendation would be a more interesting reading here (although not with λόγου).

[7] Krüger (1875) 155 (§52.8.1); Cooper (1998) I.589–90 (§52.8.1.A).

likely a periphrasis for performing the action designated in the accusative object, so that it means *ἐκβάλλειν*.[8]

This periphrastic construction is a favourite of Thucydides, 'often with objects that seem coined for the purpose'.[9] He frequently uses objects in *-σις* to fashion new transitive verbs to which he can add an objective genitive, thus:

> 6.46.3: *ξενίσεις ποιούμενοι τῶν τριηριτῶν* (entertaining the trireme crews);
> 4.47.3: *ἐξέτασιν ὅπλων ἐποιήσαντο* (they inspected the weapons);
> 1.43.5: *τήν τε ὀλόφυρσιν μὴ οἰκιῶν καὶ γῆς ποιεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ τῶν σωμάτων* (not to lament houses and land, but lives);
> 3.53.1: *τὴν … παράδοσιν τῆς πόλεως … ἐποιησάμεθα* (we surrendered our city).

Therefore the phrase must be a periphrasis for *ἐξέβαλον τὸν λόγον*. What might that mean? There are two relevant uses of *ἐκβάλλειν* with *λόγος* or the like, which might be called 'contranyms', in that a single phrase can have two opposite senses according to context: as in English, one can 'toss out' an idea for consideration by others, or 'toss out' an idea that has been rejected.

The first is already in Homer (*Il.* 18.324; *Od.* 4.503), of letting speech escape from one's mouth (implied it should have been kept inside),[10] also Aesch. *Ag.* 1663, Eur. *Ion* 929, Pl. *Republic* 473e; LSJ s.v. III). This usage 'say impulsively' does not seem in place here.

The second is derived from the more basic meaning of *ἐκβάλλειν*, 'throw away, discard' (LSJ IV), and found with *λόγος* not in the sense of verbal speech, but of something believed or argued, as well as *δόξα*, several times in Plato:

> *Crit.* 46b: *τοὺς δὴ λόγους οὓς ἐν τῷ ἔμπροσθεν ἔλεγον οὐ δύναμαι νῦν ἐκβαλεῖν, ἐπειδή μοι ἥδε ἡ τύχη γέγονεν.*
>
> I cannot discard the arguments I used to make previously, now that this circumstance [my impending execution] has come upon me.

[8] Cooper (1998) observes *λόγον ποιεῖν* = 'compose a speech' but *λόγον ποιεῖσθαι* = *λέγειν*, and Ros (1938) 129 notes the inceptive imperfect *φυγὴν ἐποιεῖτο* followed by the simple past *ἔφυγον* in Thuc. 8.16.2–3. It occurs already in Hom. *Od.* 21.70–1 where *οὐδέ τιν' ἄλλην | μύθου ποιήσασθαι ἐπισχεσίην* = *ἄλλον μῦθον ἐπέχειν* 'present/offer any other speech' (from Alan Nussbaum).

[9] Wolcott (1898) 138, 140; Bétant (1848) 336–8; LSJ s.v.; Powell (1938) 311 under III (122 examples) 'with abstract noun = verb from noun'; Kühn–Fleischer (1989) 671 III 1 c. acc. ('saepe in constr. Periphrastica'). Cock (1981) and Allan (2003) do not discuss the construction.

[10] Powell (1938) 'blurt out' *ad* Hdt. 6.69.5.

Rep. 3.412e: δοκεῖ δή μοι τηρητέον αὐτοὺς εἶναι ἐν ἁπάσαις ταῖς ἡλικίαις, εἰ φυλακικοί εἰσι τούτου τοῦ δόγματος καὶ μήτε γοητευόμενοι μήτε βιαζόμενοι ἐκβάλλουσιν ἐπιλανθανόμενοι δόξαν τὴν τοῦ ποιεῖν δεῖν ἃ τῇ πόλει βέλτιστα.

τίνα, ἔφη, λέγεις τὴν ἐκβολήν;

I think we must watch them (our guardians) carefully at all ages to see whether they are guardians of this conviction and that neither under magic spells nor compulsion do they forget and discard their belief that they must do what is best for the city.

He [Glaucon] said, 'What do you mean by discarding?'

Soph. 230a: ταύτης τῆς δόξης ἐπὶ ἐκβολὴν ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ στέλλονται.

… they address themselves to the discarding of this opinion [i.e., the belief by their students that they are already wise] in another way.

If we apply this sense to τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην in 97.2, the phrase 'I have discarded my λόγος'[11] is not likely to refer here to a philosophical belief or opinion, so what other meaning of λόγος in Thucydides is suitable? Thucydides' usage of λόγος is well-defined and consistent:[12]

I. Speech: A. speaking, talking; B. a speech, oration; C. discussion, negotiation (mostly plural); D. account, report;
II. Content of speech: A. proposal B. plan of action C. argument

From this classification we can see that one meaning which might have tempted us, the famously Herodotean sense of a unit of narrative,[13] is unexampled in Thucydides, who notoriously does not name his narrative of the war as a separate entity, but always 'this war' (1.21.2) or τὰ ἔργα or αὐτά.[14]

But there are other passages that help us judge Thucydides' meaning here. First, two passages give us the *opposite* of 'I have discarded my logos', when people notably 'cling to' a λόγος (in this case an argument in a dispute):

4.66.2: οἱ δὲ φίλοι τῶν ἔξω … φανερῶς μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἠξίουν τούτου τοῦ λόγου ἔχεσθαι.

[11] The first-person verb and the article with λόγος suggest it should be translated 'my'.

[12] For a detailed listing see *Lex. Thuc.* s.v. λόγος.

[13] Powell (1938) s.v. 4e (31 occurrences). Herodotus notes that his λόγος is friendly to digressions (4.30.1: προσθήκας μοι ὁ λόγος ἐδίζητο ἐξ ἀρχῆς).

[14] See Edmunds (2009) 101; Loraux (1986).

> The friends of those outside insisted on clinging to this proposal [sc. the return of those exiled] more openly than before

> 5.49.5 Ἠλεῖοι δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου εἴχοντο
>
> The Eleans kept clinging to the same argument [sc. that the Spartans had violated the Olympic truce]

Even clearer is the same construction with *γνώμη* which emphasises not the spoken nature of a plan but a policy presented by a politician in the assembly:

> 1.140.1 (Pericles): τῆς μὲν γνώμης, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, αἰεὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἔχομαι
>
> Athenians, I always cling to the same policy [not to make concessions to Sparta]

> 8.81.1 [Thrasybulus] αἰεί γε τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης ἐχόμενος
>
> always clinging to the same policy [to recall Alcibiades]

And once for Thucydides himself on his political speeches (1.22.1):

> ἐχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων
>
> clinging as closely as possible (in the speeches) to the overall policy of what was actually said

Of the Thucydidean meanings of *λόγος* that he as an author may be discarding (or clinging to), the most suitable to consider in the context of 1.97.2 would seem to be 'plan' (IIB in the listing above). Note especially 2.61.2 (Pericles) καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον ἐν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἀσθενεῖ τῆς γνώμης μὴ ὀρθὸν φαίνεσθαι, 'and [it has befallen you that] in your state of mental weakness my plan does not seem to you correct', and the frequent expressions *κατὰ λόγον* 'according to plan' and *παρὰ λόγον* 'contrary to plan'.

3. In What Sense Does 1.97–118 'Discard a Plan'?

The end of the previous preface might be said to announce and justify Thucydides' plan for the pre-war narrative (1.23.4–24.1):

> ἤρξαντο δὲ αὐτοῦ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Πελοποννήσιοι λύσαντες τὰς τριακοντούτεις σπονδὰς αἳ αὐτοῖς ἐγένοντο μετὰ Εὐβοίας ἅλωσιν. διότι δ' ἔλυσαν, τὰς αἰτίας προύγραψα πρῶτον καὶ τὰς διαφοράς, τοῦ μή τινα ζητῆσαί ποτε ἐξ ὅτου τοσοῦτος πόλεμος τοῖς Ἕλλησι κατέστη … αἱ δ' ἐς

> *τὸ φανερὸν λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι αἵδ' ἦσαν ἑκατέρων, ἀφ' ὧν λύσαντες τὰς σπονδὰς ἐς τὸν πόλεμον κατέστησαν.*
>
> (1.24.1) *Ἐπίδαμνός ἐστι πόλις ἐν δεξιᾶι ἐσπλέοντι ἐς τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον· … ταύτην ἀπώικισαν μὲν Κερκυραῖοι …*

> The Athenians and Peloponnesians began it [the war] after they dissolved the thirty years' truce that was made by them after the capture of Euboea. As to *why* they dissolved it, I have first written the accusations[15] and disputes *so that no one need ever ask in consequence of what thing* such a great war came into being among the Greeks[16] … the publicly alleged accusations of the two sides that preceded the dissolution of the truce and the start of the war were *as follows*.
>
> Epidamnus is a city on the right as one sails into the Ionian gulf. This city was a colony of the Corcyreans …

The form of this statement—one-sentence summary of the upcoming contents, first-person statement of writing, why it is included, a deictic pronoun pointing to the following narrative (which begins in asyndeton)—resembles the basic elements of 1.97.2:

> *τοσάδε ἐπῆλθον πολέμῳ τε καὶ διαχειρίσει πραγμάτων μεταξὺ τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τοῦ Μηδικοῦ … ἔγραψα δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην διὰ τόδε, ὅτι τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἅπασιν ἐκλιπὲς τοῦτο ἦν τὸ χωρίον καὶ ἢ τὰ πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν Ἑλληνικὰ ξυνετίθεσαν ἢ αὐτὰ τὰ Μηδικά· …*
>
> (1.98.1) *πρῶτον μὲν Ἠιόνα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι Μήδων ἐχόντων πολιορκίαι εἷλον καὶ ἠνδραπόδισαν, Κίμωνος τοῦ Μιλτιάδου στρατηγοῦντος.*

> Between this war and the Persian war [Athens] took *the following additional steps* both militarily and administratively … I have written them and discarded my plan *for the following reason*: *because* this area has been neglected by all before me, and they have composed either Greek history before the Persian wars or just the Persian wars. …

[15] Despite the famous Herodotean *δι' ἣν αἰτίην ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι* of the preface, *αἰτία* in these Thucydidean passages always means 'accusation' (not 'cause' which is *αἴτιον*; see the full listing in *Lex. Thuc.* s.v. *αἰτία*) and refers to Corcyra-Potidaea and other alleged violations of the thirty-years' truce. On *πρόφασις* see below, n. 28.

[16] I omit for the moment the interrupting *μέν* clause containing the 'truest *prophasis*'; it is discussed in connection with 1.88.1 in §5 below.

> It was Eion on the Strymon river, occupied by Persians, that they first captured and sold into slavery, under the command of Cimon son of Miltiades.

In this case, the second statement of plan, to narrate the years of Athens' growth after the foundation of the Delian League, supersedes the first one, the 'accusations and disputes' (Corcyra and Potidaea and the complaints of the allies in 1.24–87), even though the first one has not yet been completed. When the two statements are compared, 'I have discarded my plan' is tolerably clear as acknowledging a significant disruption in the plan of Book 1.

4. The 'Chronicle' in 1.98–118

The narrative following this preface is quite unlike anything else in Thucydides' work, being different in scale, style, and focus. First, at 3000 words it is both too long compared to its surroundings and too short considering it spans 36 years. It achieves this coverage by limiting itself exclusively to military engagements[17] which involve Athens, told for the most part very briefly.[18] Its chronology is relative to events before and after indicated formulaically (*πρῶτον*, *ἔπειτα*, *μετὰ ταῦτα*, expressions with *χρόνος*). The subject of the verbs is almost always 'the Athenians' (commanders occur only in genitive absolute), allied forces and troop and ship strengths are sometimes noted, the formulaic repeating verbs designate victory and defeat, conquest or submission (*κρατεῖν*, *νικᾶν*, *ἐλασσοῦσθαι*/*ἔλασσον ἔχειν*, *ὁμολογεῖν*/*ὁμολογία*, *διαφθείρειν*). Sentences are simple, the few long ones (105.1–2 and 109.3) elaborated with simple *καί* in a style Stadter calls 'archaic' and Trenkner 'primitive'.[19]

It is not surprising, then, that many readers of Thucydides have strong opinions about this narrative. Not only is it part of the disruption of the basic narrative of Book 1 as Thucydides seems to admit, but it does not conform to the template of historical narrative we expect from him in the rest of his work, even in chapters 24–87 of Book 1. Its extremely narrow focus and resulting

[17] The only exceptions are 98.4–99.3 (analysis of the template for suppression of 'revolts'; cf. Hermocrates in 6.76.3) and Ithome which narrates no fighting but a diplomatic break (100.2–103.3).

[18] Apart from the concluding repression of the revolt of Samos (115.2–117, 403 words, Węcowski (2013)), the longest are the humiliation of Corinth at Cimolia (105.3–106.2, 259 words) and the near annihilation of the Egyptian campaign (109–10, 274 words).

[19] Stadter (1993) 41–2; Trenkner (1960) 11 n. 5.

omissions,[20] repetition, and style have led to its being viewed most charitably as a first draft that would have been replaced, at worst an incompetent failure.

The latter is surely wrong. Within its own terms it is defined and executed with notable austerity, consistency and impact, and represents a style that we might have deduced would occur in early Greek historiography, but is nowhere attested.[21] In contrast to the rest of Thucydides' narrative, we might call 98–117 a 'Chronicle', not in the literal definition of a dated list,[22] but inspired by the definition of Walter Benjamin: 'The chronicler, who recounts events without distinguishing between the great and small, thereby accounts for the truth, that nothing which has ever happened is to be given as lost to history'.[23]

Scholars have sometimes been influenced by the narrow focus, incomplete coverage, and 'primitive' style, as well as the need to collect information not about contemporary events but those of the 470s–440s, in judging this a very early composition.[24] There is, however, a problem with this hypothesis. The work mentioned in the preface, the 'Attic composition' of Hellanicus of Lesbos has a fragment (*FGrHist* 4 F 176 = 323a F 26) that covers the battle of Arginusae in 406 (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7), giving a *terminus post quem* of 405 for Thucydides' statement here. Would that not indicate that the preface in 97.2 and the following narrative are one of the *latest* sections of the history? This and other problems in 97.2 we must defer to consider in §6 below.

5. The Framed Digression (88–96) *Before* the Preface of 97.2

First we must consider a problem not raised by the new translation but exacerbated by it, since it highlights even more the interruption of 97.2. Why

[20] Categorised by Stadter (1993) 62–9. To discuss the objections made to it by historians (and resisted by Thucydidean scholars) on grounds of omission, accuracy, and prejudice is beyond the scope of this study.

[21] Compare Acusilaus, *FGrHist* 2 F 22. For an appreciation of the style see especially Stadter (1993) 38–42.

[22] For stricter definitions see Burgess (2017), s.v. 'The Question of Genre'.

[23] Benjamin (1996) 290.

[24] Gomme (1956) 362 (quoted by Stadter (1993) 36 n. 3) said 'that the excursus is an early essay, provisional, unfinished, and never properly adapted to its present position, is to me clear'. Ziegler (1929) thought it one of several very early specimens of Thucydides' historical writing before he made the decision recounted in 1.1 to take up 'this war'. Schadewaldt (1971) 30 had also speculated that before the war Thucydides was a 'historicising sophist', but this was attacked (Tsakmakis (1995) 5 n. 20) and he would later retract it (*Nachwort* 101); and Jacoby (Introduction to *FGrHist* 323a (Hellanicus) n. 47) called Ziegler's theory 'absurd'. On the other hand, Westlake (1969) 43 considers that the Chronicle shows Thucydides 'was very inadequately informed about Athenian activities' and dates it to his exile.

is the third preface not placed where the first narrative is actually interrupted, in 1.88? In between (89–96), we have the story of how Themistocles (skilfully) and Pausanias (blunderingly) empowered Athens, ending with its new fortifications and the formation of the Delian League. Like 97–117, this narrative moves back in time and deals with the years between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, and in terms of chronology 89–96 is directly continued in chapters 98–117. As a result, Stadter and Rood consider 88–117 a single unit and follow Gomme[25] in calling 88 and 97 the 'first and second prefaces' (despite the absence of first-persons in the former) of a unified 88–118. Stadter calls 97.2 a 'transitional passage' and Rood concludes that its function is 'to highlight the difference in scale' between the two parts of the *Pentekontaetia*.[26]

But others have considered 88–96 separate from the Chronicle, and for this there are five reasons: (1) its form (the way it is attached to the preceding narrative); (2) its style (highly characterised and detailed); (3) its relation to Herodotus (continuing his story in a similar style); (4) the re-emergence of the Pausanias and Themistocles stories in another context in 1.128–38; and (5) the transformation of the alliance and Athenian military objectives between 1.96 and 1.97.

(1) *Form*. Chapters 88–96 do not, despite being a flashback, break off the narrative of 'accusations and disputes', but are closely attached to it as an orderly digression.[27] The digression's introduction in 88 requires us to go back to part of the original plan in 23.4–6 that I skipped over in the text and translation in §3 above, a *μέν* clause with an alternate justification for the war that Thucydides adds in dramatic fashion, only to submerge it again in favour of his preferred narrative:

> *τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀληθεστάτην πρόφασιν, ἀφανεστάτην δὲ λόγῳ, τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἡγοῦμαι μεγάλους γιγνομένους καὶ φόβον παρέχοντας τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀναγκάσαι ἐς τὸ πολεμεῖν· αἱ δ' ἐς τὸ φανερὸν λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι αἵδ' ἦσαν ἑκατέρων, ἀφ' ὧν λύσαντες τὰς σπονδὰς ἐς τὸν πόλεμον κατέστησαν.*

[25] Stadter (1993) 39, 41; Rood (1998) 230; Gomme (1956) 363 n. 1.

[26] Even Schwartz (1929) 157–8 viewed the entire last third of Book 1 as a unity, illustrating Thucydides' late mannerism of complex interlaced construction.

[27] By an orderly digression I mean one that does not switch to the authorial first person, but turns to the reader with *γάρ*, moves back to the past, and begins and ends with framing statements linking it to the containing narrative: an example of all three in 2.15 (early Athens and Attic countryside), of the second and third in 2.29.2 (Teres) and 3.104.3–6 (Delian games).

> For while I consider the professed justification (*prophasis*)[28] that was truest, but most invisible in speech, to be that the Athenians, by becoming large and inciting fear among the Spartans, compelled them to go to war, nevertheless the publicly alleged accusations of the two sides that preceded the dissolution of the truce and the start of the war were as follows.

Thucydides briefly interrupts the announcement of his narrative plan to undermine it, by revealing that the truest professed justification for war was not the legalistic accusation of breaking the treaty, but Sparta's fear of Athens' growth in power, the verb *ἀναγκάσαι* expressing the reluctance with which Sparta moves against what Thucydides says is an existential threat. As Dionysius of Halicarnassus objected, why would Thucydides not narrate this cause instead?[29] Because he must admit he can find no explicit evidence that this justification was actually voiced by anyone—it is only his own opinion (*ἡγοῦμαι*, only here in the first person of the historian himself). So he proceeds to the narrative of the second cause, because for the truest one there is nothing to narrate.

But after the Spartans have voted that the treaty was broken, at the beginning of his digression in 1.88.1, Thucydides recalls *both* the *μέν and* δέ clauses in 23.5–6, but *reverses the order of the two justifications*:[30]

> *ἐψηφίσαντο δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰς σπονδὰς λελύσθαι καὶ πολεμητέα εἶναι οὐ τοσοῦτον τῶν ξυμμάχων πεισθέντες τοῖς λόγοις ὅσον φοβούμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους μὴ ἐπὶ μεῖζον δυνηθῶσιν, ὁρῶντες αὐτοῖς τὰ πολλὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑποχείρια ἤδη ὄντα.*
>
> The Spartans voted that the treaty had been broken and that they must go to war not so much because they had been persuaded by their allies'

[28] *Πρόφασις* normally has the meaning of 'professed justification' (sometimes false, sometimes true). Thucydides clearly implies that 'the truest *prophasis*' here is more profound than the 'accusations and disputes'; and Rawlings (1975) argues for elevating the word (with a different etymology) here into a more objective causal concept as of the plague in 2.49.2. I prefer to take both *αἰτία* and *πρόφασις* here has having human subjects (the Spartans could have advanced their fear as a justification, but did not), and the first as a subcategory of the second. The Mytilenaeans' justification for revolt is summed up as their *αἰτίαι καὶ προφάσεις* (3.13.1), and later in Book 1 *πρόφασις* includes Corcyra and Potidaea at 118.1, and Epidamnus and Corcyra at 146.1. For discussion see *Lex. Thuc.* s.v. *πρόφασις*.

[29] D.H. *Thuc.* 11: 'for nature demanded that earlier things precede later ones and true things be said before false ones, and the start of his narrative would have been much stronger if it had been arranged in this way'.

[30] The formulation 'not so much x as y' is used again for authorial pronouncements on historical causes at 1.11.1 (the length of the Trojan war) and 2.65.11 (the defeat in Sicily).

> speeches[31] as because they feared the Athenians might become more powerful, observing that much of Greece was already under their power'.

At this point, for 1300 words, the 'accusations and disputes' of the speeches in 1.24–87 will take a back seat to the 'truest but least visible' professed justification, Spartan fear of Athenian growth. Thus 88–96 do not break with the original plan of 23.4–6, but deepen it temporarily by announcing (*τρόπῳ τοιῷδε*) an account not of Spartan speeches about their fear—there were none—but of the two leaders who put Athens into a position to attain its power. It was Themistocles' strategy that put Athens on a collision course with Sparta, and Pausanias whose failure was responsible for their acquisition of hegemony.

The digression has a clear endpoint with the end-frame *τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ* in 96.1:

> In this way the Athenians took over the command at the allies' own initiative because of their hatred for Pausanias. They directed which cities must provide money, and which must provide ships, to fight the barbarians, on the pretext of taking revenge for what they had suffered by devastating the king's lands.

After the closing frame we should expect a return to the breakoff point, the Spartan vote, and its preparations for war in 87.6, but in our current text this is not found until the resumptive *μὲν οὖν* in 118.3, after the chronicle in 97–117 has ended (see §7 below).

(2) *Style*. Its first episode is nominally about Athens' new walls but really about the brilliance of Themistocles, and the discomfiture of the Spartans: in 'Walls I' (89.3–93.1) the Spartans are duped by Themistocles' fast-talking in a series of exchanges in indirect statement where the detail in 1.89.5 verges on the comic; 'Walls II' (93.3–93.8) contrasts the quick-and-dirty circuit wall with the elaborate walls of Piraeus as the material manifestation of a long-planned Themistoclean project for power and empire.[32] In the next stage (94–6) the Spartans continue the inept passivity they showed against Themistocles in their dealings with Pausanias and the Ionian allies, while the Athenians, once

[31] The accusatory speeches of Corinth (1.69.6) and the other allies (*ἐγκλήματα*, 1.67.4) are part of the *ἐς τὸ φανερόν λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι* that he announced in 1.23.6 he would narrate.

[32] Stadter (1993) 43–5: after highlighting Themistocles' verbal talents in 89–93.1, in 93.3–8 Thucydides 'enters into the mind of Themistocles'. On the mass of indirect statement see Stadter (1993) 43 n. 31, and for its concentration in the character of Themistocles in both Herodotus and Thucydides, Scardino (2012).

Themistocles is no longer directing them, become leaderless at precisely the moment they assume hegemony: the league is presented as the idea of Athens itself in its own interest (95.2, 96.1). Even the assignment of tribute, ascribed to Aristides at 5.18.3 and other sources, is here the work of the unnamed *Hellenotamiai* (96.2).

(3) *Relation to Herodotus.* Thucydides starts his digression by recapitulating without repeating the end of Herodotus' history (1.89.2 references Hdt. 9.102–21), and then continues the story up to the creation of the Delian League and tribute (1.96) which Thucydides seems to regard as the proper end of Herodotus' story, as Jacoby and Wilamowitz suggested. But Jacoby argued that thereafter his goal is different: 'He did *continue* Herodotus, but he *replaced* Hellanicus'.[33]

(4) *Later Continuation.* Towards the end of Book 1 Thucydides contrives to complete the stories of the two men he begins here, in the same lively Herodotean style.[34] The story of Pausanias even overlaps at several points, as if Thucydides has distilled from his career what was relevant to the rise of Athens in 88–96, and his fall and death in 128–38. Each essence is then placed into a digression dominated by a different topic, the first (89–96) as a lead-in from the vote at Sparta to the list-chronicle of the Pentekontaetia, the second (128–38) as an appendage to the Spartan demand to expel Pericles as polluted by his ancestors' treatment of Cylonian conspirators. But the closing sentence of 1.138 (as Schwartz noted)[35] betrays their underlying unity as an experiment in the biographical romance of parallel lives.

(5) *Continuity and Contrast between 96 and 97.1.* Thus while there is a seamless chronological *continuity* between the end of the digression in 96 and the Chronicle which is launched from it in 98 (and 1.97 stands in the midst of this), there is a strong formal *separation* between the key role of individuals, the lively style, Herodotean connections, and digressive frame in 88–96 and the austere

[33] Jacoby (2015) 35 n. 66, asserted even more forcefully by Wilamowitz (1893) I.26–7; see also Liberman (2017) 129 n. 2.

[34] For Herodotean influence see Jacoby and Wilamowitz (prev. n.); for Herodotean style see Munson (2012) 251–4.

[35] Schwartz (1929) 154–5. Pausanias is mostly useful narratologically, his behaviour is the pretext for the Delian alliance (1.95.1–2), then his guilt provides a path back to Themistocles once more (1.135.2) before Book 1 closes with Pericles' first speech. Similarly, when Themistocles is in the picture, the emphasis is on him rather than the Athenians in general, but for Pausanias the emphasis is less on him than the Spartans.

impersonal list and archaic style of 98–117—and between these two stands the preface of 97.1–2.[36]

Between chapters 96 and 97 there is a transformation that seems intended to be shocking. The initial (*πρῶτος* 2x) configuration of the alliance in 1.96 is exemplary: freely offered (*παραλαβόντες … ἡγεμονίαν … ἑκόντων*), solely against Persia and defensive/retaliatory (*πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον*, *ἀμύνεσθαι ὧν ἔπαθον δηιοῦντας*), though with hints of a hidden aim (*πρόσχημα*)[37] and changes to follow (imperfects *ταμιεῖον … Δῆλος ἦν αὐτοῖς*, *καὶ αἱ ξύνοδοι ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν ἐγίγνοντο*). The same language is repeated, even strengthened, in the opening words of 97.1 (*ἡγούμενοι δὲ αὐτονόμων τὸ πρῶτον τῶν ξυμμάχων καὶ ἀπὸ κοινῶν ξυνόδων βουλευόντων*). But this time 'at first' has a twist, as the participial clause turns out to be concessive: '*although* at first they were leaders of allies who were autonomous and participated in planning based on joint assemblies …'. Thereafter, every important word of this and the previous sentence is suddenly transformed in the rest of chapter 97.1, which gives an abstract of the upcoming chronicle, and the end of 97.2:

τὸ πρῶτον/τοσάδε, 'at first[38] . . . the following', looks not backward (96.1 *τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ*) but forward.

ἀμύνεσθαι/ἐπῆλθον mark not self-defence or initial steps to power (*ἦλθον* 1.89.1 of the preceding digression) but additional ones.[39]

πρός τὸν βάρβαρον … καὶ πρὸς τοὺς σφετέρους ξυμμάχους νεωτερίζοντας καὶ Πελοποννησίων τοὺς αἰεὶ προστυγχάνοντας: expansion of military actions from Persia to Athens' own allies and the Peloponnesians.

[36] Liberman (2017), who postulates that they belong to different stages of composition (below, n. 65), contrasts the connectedness of the two sections thus (132–3): 'if we remove chapters 89–96, there would be a gap in the continuity in the text of Thucydides. But without chapters 97–118, there would not be any gap'.

[37] Rawlings (1977).

[38] The Mytilenaeans similarly note a brief initial period of genuine Athenian leadership (3.10.2): '*At first* our alliance with Athens was made … And as long as *they led us as equals*, *we were dedicated followers*; but … the allies, *unable to combine to defend themselves because of the diluted votes*, were in fact enslaved, except for ourselves and Chios. And since *we were nominally autonomous and free*, we joined them on campaigns. But we no longer trusted Athenian leadership …' See also the passages in n. 28 above.

[39] *ἐπῆλθον*, 'make additional moves', with acc. as Plat. *Polit.* 279c; cf. the three neologisms with *ἐπί-* applied to Athens at 1.70.2.

ἡγεμονίαν, ἡγούμενοι δὲ αὐτονόμων … καὶ … βουλευόντων/τῆς ἀρχῆς … ἐν οἵῳ τρόπῳ κατέστη: Hegemony becomes empire (see also below, §6 under 'Documenting the Empire')

Far from being merely transitional or signalling a shift, one might say with Struve that chapter 97 is driven 'like a wedge' into the narrative thus far.[40]

6. The Five Statements in 97.2

Let us turn to the collection of statements in 97.2, given special prominence because Thucydides switches to the first person to describe his own actions and their reasons. The sentences may seem vaguely connected with triple ambiguous δέ, and the points they make unrelated. Harrison called them 'temporary and makeshift sentences which never received the final hand', and Hammond said the paragraph was 'irrelevant, its removal would not impair the argument'.[41] Many scholars[42] have found them so contradictory as to reveal the awkward junction-point of a later insertion of 98–117.

1. *Writing*
ἔγραψα δὲ αὐτά

Continues *τοσάδε* in the previous sentence, which are specifically actions of Athens—he is not promising a general history of Greece.

As noted in §3 above, this statement is roughly parallel to 1.23.5 *τὰς αἰτίας προύγραψα πρῶτον καὶ τὰς διαφοράς* of the narrative now broken off.[43]

2. *Discarding*
καὶ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην

Already discussed (above, §§1–2); another first-person statement which goes beyond describing his act to interpret its significance.

3. *Filling a Gap*
διὰ τόδε, ὅτι τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἅπασιν ἐκλιπὲς τοῦτο ἦν τὸ χωρίον καὶ ἢ τὰ πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν Ἑλληνικὰ ξυνετίθεσαν ἢ αὐτὰ τὰ Μηδικά·

[40] Struve (1878) 13, quoted by Liberman (2017) 138.

[41] Harrison (1912); Hammond (1940) 149.

[42] Ziegler (1929) 65–6, Steup ap. Classen–Steup (1919) 442–3; Schwartz (1929) 221; Gomme (1956) 362; Canfora (2011) 381; and Liberman (2017) 131 n. 10. See below, §8.

[43] The aorist (or perfect) is his standard tense for verbs of writing; *ἔγραψα* and *ἐποιησάμην* here and elsewhere are epistolary: Liberman (2017) 21 n. 10, citing Cooper (1998) 667 (§53.10.1), already in Krüger (1875) 174, correcting Rusten (2015), where I wrongly argued that they might imply a completed work that has been lost.

Strong objection was taken to this statement by Hammond: 'Now this is a reason for writing a history of the period 479–439 BC; but it is not a reason for incorporating it in the history of the Peloponnesian War'.[44] He is correct that at this point there is no specific connection with his current war. But the statement is formally parallel to 23.5 *τοῦ μή τινα ζητῆσαί ποτε ἐξ ὅτου τοσοῦτος πόλεμος τοῖς Ἕλλησι κατέστη*. In *both* cases, his stated motive seems rather mundane, merely to spare effort to others;[45] there is no explicit statement of the intrinsic value that he implies elsewhere for his narrative in 1.1 or 1.22.4.[46]

Note that with *τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον* he still refers to *αὐτά* = *τοσάδε* = the actions of *Athens*. The subsequent mention of *τὰ Ἑλληνικά* is an argument *a fortiori*; since no one has written about Greek history at all during this time, they certainly have not written about Athenian history.[47]

Hornblower[48] notes that even within this addition he has left us a 'great gap' of the years after the siege of Samos to the story of Epidamnus (439–*c.* 434), not to speak of the five-year gap between the Thirty Years' Peace and Samos (446–440).

4. *Hellanicus*

τούτων δὲ ὅσπερ καὶ ἥψατο ἐν τῇι Ἀττικῇι ξυγγραφῇι Ἑλλάνικος, βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήσθη.

The initial genitive plural refers back *not* to *τὰ Ἑλληνικά* but once again to *αὐτά*, the actions of *Athens*, as shown by the single title given (out of many works by Hellanicus relating to Greek history).

That his coverage was cursory is also implied by both *βραχέως* and *ἥψατο*.

The precise meaning of *τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς* can only be explained by its repetition and expansion in 5.20.2, defending his calculation for the total years of the war:[49]

> *σκοπείτω δέ τις κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους καὶ μὴ τῶν ἑκασταχοῦ ἢ ἀρχόντων ἢ ἀπὸ τιμῆς τινὸς τῆι ἀπαριθμήσει τῶν ὀνομάτα ἐς τὰ προγεγενημένα*

[44] Hammond (1940) 149.

[45] Canfora (2011) 379 on 97.2.

[46] Although it is perhaps implicit since 'this war' is one of his two boundaries for the period.

[47] In a justly famous article, Canfora (2011) 382 nevertheless misreads this passage in taking *Ἑλληνικά*, 'general history of Greece', to be the main point of 97–117, even though this is strictly applied only to the pre-Persian war; he is, however, correct that in 118.2 the whole fifty years (including Corcyra and Potidaea) are summed up in *ταῦτα δὲ ξύμπαντα ὅσα ἔπραξαν οἱ Ἕλληνες πρός τε ἀλλήλους καὶ τὸν βάρβαρον*.

[48] Hornblower (2011) 109–12.

[49] Chambers (2003) 190.

σημαινόντων πιστεύσας μᾶλλον. οὐ γὰρ ἀκριβές ἐστιν, οἷς καὶ ἀρχομένοις καὶ μεσοῦσι καὶ ὅπως ἔτυχέ τῳ ἐπεγένετό τι.[50]

> One should examine (the war's events) according to the time periods (*κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους*, later specified as summers and winters) and not relying instead on the enumeration of those who indicate names, either of the contemporary archons or of some office, in relation to past events. For it is not accurate (*οὐκ ἀκριβές*) for (officeholders) when an event occurred either as they started or were in the middle or however it chanced (to occur) for someone.

One might object that in 98–117 Thucydides is not yet using the year/season system, so that he is not even as accurate as Hellanicus; but Smart, followed by Rood, suggests that Thucydides' 'improvement' might consist in giving intervening days to link related events (notably Tanagra and Oenophyta 108.2, but also the Megarid 105.6 and Samos 117.1) which Hellanicus may have had to split into different years, since the eponymous archon took office in Hekatombaion (July).[51]

As noted above (§4 ad fin.), the latest event known from this work is the battle of Arginusae (406), giving a *terminus post quem* of 405 for Thucydides' statement here, and the statement might seem contradictory to the preceding one. But Rood[52] plausibly points to similar 'progressive corrections' that Thucydides makes at 2.51.1 and 8.66.2.[53]

5. *Documenting the Empire*

ἅμα δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπόδειξιν ἔχει τῆς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν οἵῳ τρόπῳ κατέστη.

The subject of *ἔχει* is once again *αὐτά*.[54]

[50] I give the text of Alberti (1992) here, which includes emendations by Schütz (*τῇ ἀπαρίθμησει* for *τὴν ἀπαρίθμησιν*) and Lendle (1960) (*τῶν ὀνόματα* for *τῶν ὀνομάτων*). The Oxford Classical Text adopts a wholesale transposition of text by Arnold to produce a similar sense.

[51] Smart (1986) 30; Rood (1998) 235.

[52] Rood (1998) 230 n. 16

[53] Two other attempts at solving the Hellanicus problem: Gomme thought there might have been an earlier edition of Hellanicus (dismissed by Jacoby: see Smart (1986) 22 n. 17), and Ziegler (1929) 66 n. 2 and Liberman (2017) 132 n. 15 think Hellanicus is a later insertion (within an insertion!), not only as contradictory of the preceding sentence but also (Ziegler) as interrupting the natural continuation *αὐτά/τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον* as subject of *ἀπόδειξιν ἔχει* (but *αὐτά* is referenced in *τούτων* in the Hellanicus-sentence).

[54] For the switch to present see Edmunds (2009) 99, who compares the switch to futures *δηλώσει* at 1.21.2 and *ἕξει* 1.22.4, in both cases referring to the upcoming narrative.

Perhaps this is a parallel reason to 'filling the gap', with ὅτι understood again (so in the diagram in Schadewaldt),[55] or perhaps τόδε above limits the paragraph to only a single object for διά, and this is a separate statement of fact.

Note that for the first time ἀρχή of Athens is 'empire' (outside of 1.67.4 and the Athenian speech at Sparta where it occurs frequently 1.75–7); just above (1.97.1) it was a ἡγεμονία of ξύμμαχοι.

ἅμα δὲ καί[56] need not necessarily indicate a climax, but its final position before the narrative begins and the switch to ἀρχή after ἡγεμονία and ξυμμαχία above suggests its overriding importance among these five statements.

ἀπόδειξις is of course famously Herodotean, but in view of the following style seems here used rather in its well-known sense of list-making.[57]

It is important to note the difference between the simple modals with τρόπῳ used of *how* Athens grew in 89.1, 93.1, 93.8, 96.1, and the use with ἐν here = 'the *state*, *character* in which it was established'.[58]

Thucydides has already given a short, favourable description of the Peloponnesian and Athenian alliance (not called an empire) in 1.18.3, which is adapted in [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 24. By contrast, the Athenians' speech at Sparta has justified in advance Athens' acquisition of empire (1.76–7)[59] and treatment of its allies, and thrown the Spartans' passivity in their faces (1.75.2, 77.6)

Despite their variety of reference, it is surprising to find that the statements are grammatically unified by a single pronoun, the initial αὐτά derived from the emphatic τοσάδε of 97.1: the object of ἔγραψα, it is restated in τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον, the antecedent of τούτων, and the subject of τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπόδειξιν ἔχει. Each of the diverse statements is made about the same narrative, reflecting its variety of significant properties in itself (a neglected gap in the story, a chronological sequence) and its relation to the entire history (a different plan, a documentation of the brutal character of empire).

[55] Schadewaldt (1971) 96.

[56] Van de Maele (1990) (cf. Stadter (1993) 39 n. 17) implies that ἅμα δὲ καί, far from an afterthought, is regularly used to indicate what is in fact of supreme importance, but that is not supported by its other occurrences.

[57] On the term see Kirk (2014). On the list-making of 97–117 see McNeal (1970) 312–18 and Wick (1982).

[58] Winton (1981) 151; cf. 1.8.4.

[59] Schmid (1943) 15–26.

7. Having 'Discarded' his Plan at 1.97, How Does He Return to It in 118?

Having departed from his plan in multiple stages over 1.87–117, Thucydides returns to it very quickly in five sentences in chapter 118, but still revisits all three earlier stages of his departure. He first returns to the beginning of the Chronicle, 97.1–2:

> (a) It was not many years after this that there occurred the fighting at Corcyra and Potidaea described previously and other things that turned into a professed justification (*πρόφασις*) for this war. (1.118.2) All these things that the Greeks undertook against each other and the Persians happened in the approximately fifty years between the departure of Xerxes and the beginning of this war. In this time the Athenians made their empire stronger, and they themselves reached the height of power.

Here he links the new years he has added to his story with those he narrated in the original plan (1.24–87). Then he returns to the beginning of the digression on Themistocles and Pausanias 1.88:

> (b) but the Spartans, though they perceived it, gave only feeble resistance, and for most of the time kept still, being even before this reluctant to enter into wars unless they were compelled, and there was also the fact that they were hindered by wars close to home, until the rising power of Athens was undeniable and started to affect their own alliance. Then they could endure it no longer but decided that they must oppose Athens' strength with the utmost dedication and, if they could manage, destroy it, by undertaking this war.

This repeats the focus on Spartan fear of Athenian power. Finally he comes to 87.4–6:

> (c) So it was concluded among the Spartans themselves that the treaty had been broken by Athens' criminal acts, and they sent to Delphi and inquired of the God if they should go to war …'

This resumes (*μὲν οὖν*) the last statement in the original narrative (begun at 1.23.5–6), the vote at Sparta and their next actions.

8. 1.97.2 and the Composition of Thucydides Book 1[60]

The clearest statement I know of the question is by Lewis:[61]

> There are some who think that the original design of Book I did concentrate on the *aitiai* and *diaphorai*, but that, after Sparta resumed war in 413 in a period of Corinthian weakness, Thucydides, needing wider causes for the whole war, inserted these three passages (1.23.6, 1.88, 1.118) and the account of the Fifty Years. Others see no need for such a hypothesis and find the '*truest prophasis*' omnipresent in the book.

Now to adopt 'I have discarded my plan' as the new translation in 97.2 might seem to vindicate the first theory, that 'Spartan fear' belongs exclusively to a later stage of composition.[62] But as Lewis notes, its proponents must also posit that 23.6 is a later insertion as well,[63] though it seems to many well-integrated into the announcement of the Corcyra narrative.[64] Their case becomes even less plausible if two further references to Spartan fear of Athenian growth closely embedded in the 'original' narrative of 24–87 have to be called later insertions as well: the statement by the Corcyreans (central characters in 'the original design') that Spartan fear of Athens will bring war (33.3), and the

[60] The rest of my argument ventures into areas that are contested hotspots between unitarians and analysts. I will reserve a fuller discussion of each approach to Book 1 to the Introduction of my commentary. Major discussions are Stadter (1993) and Rood (1998) from a unitarian perspective, and now Liberman (2017) from an analyst perspective, reviving many neglected studies to which my notes are much indebted.

[61] Lewis (1992) 372.

[62] That 1.98–118 is a later insertion is also supported by the fact that after chapter 118 Spartan fear is not treated again, only the accusations and disputes (*αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραί*), and even *πρόφασις* is limited in application only to Corcyra and even Epidamnus at the end.

[63] Especially Schwartz (1929), refined by Liberman (2017) 43 n. 31, ch. 5 *passim*, and 72 n. 32, who argues that originally Thucydides did not mention the 'truest *prophasis*' at all: this preface originally contained only up to 1.23.5, followed by the Corcyra-Potidaea narrative and the speeches of Corinth and Archidamus at Sparta. It was a later revision that added the contrast with the 'truest *prophasis*' in 1.23.6, along with 88–96 and 97–117 (in different stages), and the speeches of the Athenians and Sthenelaidas; and other sections besides were added. He also assumes (above, n. 53) that Hellanicus (97.2) is an insertion within what is already an insertion.

[64] Moles (2010) 26: 'The distinction between *aitiai/diaphorai* and *prophasis* is organic to the narrative … there is no case for 1.23.6's being a later insertion. The Pentecontaetia, presaged at 23.6, is also organic. No support here for different compositional strata.' It might also explain 'I wrote as a preface first' the earlier sentence in 23.5, although that might be simply redundant: note *πρῶτον* with *ἄρχομαι* by Pericles in 2.35.3 and 47.4.

injunction of Sthenelaidas (86.5) not to allow Athens to become greater (which seems closely tied to the Spartan vote for war).

But is the announcement of a different plan in 97.2 necessarily incompatible with these earlier statements? As we saw, 1.23.6 not only states the greater importance of Spartan fear as a motive for the war, but implies its absence in the immediately following narrative, 1.88 revisits the first statement, but undermines the second implication; then in 97.2 Thucydides announces a new start[65] *with no explicit mention of either set of motives*[66] *by the combatants*, rather a variety of motivations of his own and promised narrative features, the last of which is the documentation of the character of the Athenian Empire. So the new plan need not be to add fear—Thucydides had already done that (unless we remove it ourselves!)—but to add the narration of its object, Athenian aggressiveness, in a very different style and with a new starting point, the foundation of the Delian league and Athens' transformation into an empire.

I would propose that we make a space between the analysts' idea of a dramatic mid-work change in the war's entire basis on the one hand, and the unitarians' insistence on an unchanging grand design from the start on the other, to focus on the function of the Chronicle within the first Book, and compare it to the narrative following the second preface in Book 5. They both bridge a gap created by Thucydides' extension—whether as a new authorial insight, or merely a new revelation to the reader—of the time period he will narrate. 5.26 announces that the end of his history is *not* going to be the Peace of Nicias, but the capture of Athens in 404. In 1.97.2 the starting point for the war's background is *not* the recent violations of the Thirty Years peace,[67] the subject of the 'accusations and disputes', but the events behind Spartan fear of Athenian power, the aftermath of the foundation of the Delian League.

His new starting point, no longer Epidamnus and Corcyra, requires two adjustments to include it.[68] One adjustment is that, having reached the new crucial date of the Delian League's foundation via the Themistocles-Pausanias

[65] Among the analysts, Liberman (2017) 133 (see also above, n. 36) seems to accept that 89–96 and 97–118 are *separate* additions: 'we are confronted with one addition [88–96] to which another one [97–188] has been added, without the results obtained being in complete harmony. If they were, we would no longer be able to undertake the "archaeology" of the complex composition of this part of the work'.

[66] Lewis' objection ((1992) 372), 'Even if the growth of Athenian power is omnipresent, Spartan fear is not (only in 1.33.3)', should have to concede that Spartan fear that is not on display in 97–117 either.

[67] Thucydides is so uninterested in the rights or wrongs of these disputes from the start that the treaty on which they are based (115.1) is only narrated because it is part of the 'extension'.

[68] Canfora (2011) 318: 'the unity of the conflict (in Book 5) and "true cause" (Book 1 Pentekontaetia) are two parts of the same thought'. I would rather call them parallel thoughts.

digression after the Spartan vote for war, before returning to that vote he explains his reasons for narrating the intervening years (1.97.2),[69] and the subsequent narration (1.98–117) which, as we saw (above, §4), is very different from his usual mode. The interwar narrative of 5.25–116 is also designated as filling a gap,[70] and it too is a narrative very dissimilar to what comes before and after.[71]

The other adjustment is to reformulate in 118 the narrative he has departed from, by mentioning Corcyra and Potidaea but omitting *αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραί* and subsuming everything into a single *πρόφασις*, concatenating his three separate narratives (24–88, 89–96, 97–117) into a single real *πεντεκονταετία* (see above, n. 3), telling the single story of Sparta's reluctant path to war against the threat of Athens. This too happens in the 'second preface' to the whole work at 5.26: after justifying a later end-date for the war with numerous pieces of evidence (including an oracle), finally in 5.26.3 he concatenates the various periods that make up the full war.

If 1.98–118 were a digression it would not have needed this preface. It is *more* than a digression like 88–96 (from which it is launched); it is instead a composition that nominally performs the mundane task (as does 5.25–116) of filling a gap in the record, but exploits it to reveal the terrible transformation of Athens from *ξύμμαχος* to *ἡγεμών* to *ἄρχων*, and to document the fully-developed character of the newborn Athenian Empire.

JEFFREY S. RUSTEN
Cornell University jsr5@cornell.edu

[69] A revealing solecism in 97.2 (which he does not repeat in 1.118.2) is 'between this war and the Persian war'. His subsequent narrative will of course move forward, but at this point, in introducing it, he is thinking from the Corcyra-Potidaea narrative backwards.

[70] *καὶ τὴν διὰ μέσου ξύμβασιν εἴ τις μὴ ἀξιώσει πόλεμον νομίζειν, οὐκ ὀρθῶς δικαιώσει.*

[71] 'his facility for mastering his material seems to have, to a large extent, deserted him', Westlake (2009) 296.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberti, I. B., ed. (1992) *Thucydidis Historiae*, vol. 2 (Libri iii–v) (Rome).
Allan, R. J. (2003) *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek: A Study in Polysemy* (Amsterdam).
Andrewes, A. (1959) 'Thucydides on the Causes of the War', *CQ* 53: 223–39.
Benjamin, W. (1996) 'The Concept of History', in M. W. Jennings and H. Eiland, edd., *Selected Writings 4: 1938–40* (Cambridge, Mass.) 389–400.
Bétant, E. A. (1843) *Lexicon Thucydideum* (Geneva).
Burgess, R. W. (2017) 'Chronicles', Oxford Bibliographies Online.
Canfora, L. (2011) 'The Historical "Cycle"', in J. Marincola, ed. *Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies; Oxford) 365–88; Eng. trans. by G. Trimble of 'Il ciclo storico', *Belfagor* 26 (1971) 653–70.
Chambers, M. (2003) 'Two Passages in Thucydides', in G. W. Bakewell and J. P. Sickinger, edd. *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold on the Occasion of his Retirement and his Seventy-fifth Birthday* (Oxford) 188–94.
Classen, J. and J. Steup, edd. (1919) *Thukydides, Erster Band: Einleitung; Erstes Buch*[5] (Berlin).
Cock, A. J. C. M. (1981) 'Sur les critères déterminant le choix entre l'actif ποιεῖν et le moyen ποιεῖσθαι', *Mnemosyne* 34: 1–62.
Cooper, G. L. and K. W. Krüger (1998) *Attic Greek Prose Syntax*, 2 vols (Ann Arbor).
Edmunds, L. (2009) 'Thucydides in the Act of Writing', in Rusten (2009) 91–113; orig. in R. Pretagostini, ed., *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica: Scritti … B. Gentili* (Rome, 1993) II.831–52.
Foster, E. and D. Lateiner, edd. (2012) *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford).
Gomme, A. W. (1956) *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1 (Oxford).
Hammond, N. G. L. (1940) 'The Composition of Thucydides' History', *CQ* 34: 146–52.
Hanson, V. (1998) *Warfare and Agriculture in Classical Greece* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
Harrison, E. (1912) 'Thucydides and the Fifty Years', *PCPhS* 91/93: 9.
Hornblower, S. (2011) *The Greek World, 479–323 BC*[4] (London and New York).
Jacoby, F. (2015) *On the Development of Greek Historiography and the Plan for the New Collection of the Fragments of the Greek Historians*, translated by M. Chambers and S. Schorn (*Histos* Supplements 3; Newcastle); orig. in *Klio* 9 (1909) 80–123, repr. in F. Jacoby, *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtschreibung; zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag am 19. März 1956*, ed. H. Bloch (Leiden, 1956) 16–64.
Kirk, A. (2014) 'The Semantics of Showcase in Herodotus' *Histories*', *TAPhA* 144: 19-40.

Kleinlogel, A. and K. Alpers, edd. (2019) *Scholia Graeca in Thucydidem, Scholia vetustiora et Lexicon Thucydideum Patmense* (Berlin).
Krüger, K. W., ed. (1860) *Θουκυδίδους ξυγγραφή*[3] (Berlin).
—— (1875) *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen*, vol. 2 (Syntax) (Leipzig).
Kühn, H.-J. and U. Fleischer (1989) *Index Hippocraticus* (Göttingen).
Lattimore, R. (1958) 'The Composition of the History of Herodotus', *CPh* 53: 9–21.
Lendle, O. (1960) 'Zu Thukydides 5, 20, 2', *Hermes* 88: 33–40.
Lewis, D. M. (1992) 'The Archidamian War', *CAH*[2]: 370–432.
Lex. Thuc. = J. S. Rusten, G. Storey, et al., edd., *A Thucydidean Lexicon*: http://lexeis.org/thucydides (2018–)
Liberman, G. (2017) *Les préliminaires de la guerre: prolégomènes à la lecture du premier livre de Thucydide* (Bordeaux).
Loraux, N. (1986) 'Thucydides a écrit la guerre du Péloponnèse', *Métis*: 139–61.
McNeal, R. A. (1970) 'Historical Methods and Thuc. 1.103.1', *Historia* 19: 306–25.
Moles, J. L. (2010) 'Narrative and Speech Problems in Thucydides I', in C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola, and C. Pelling, edd., *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman* (Oxford) 15–39.
Munson, R. (2012) 'Persians in Thucydides', in Foster–Lateiner (2012) 241–80.
Powell, J. E. (1938) *Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge).
Rawlings, H. R. (1975) *A Semantic Study of Prophasis to 400 BC* (Wiesbaden).
—— (1977) 'Thucydides on the Purpose of the Delian League', *Phoenix* 31: 1–8.
Rood, T. C. B. (1998) *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford).
Ros, J. G. A. 1938. *Die μεταβολή (Variatio) als Stilprinzip des Thukydides* (Nijmegen).
Rusten, J. S. (2015) 'Carving up Thucydides: the Rise and Demise of Analysis and its Legacy', in C. Lee and N. Morley, edd., *A Handbook to the Reception of Thucydides* (Chichester) 61–74.
——, ed. (2009) *Thucydides* (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies; Oxford).
Scardino, C. (2012) 'Indirect Discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides', in Foster–Lateiner (2012) 67–96.
Schadewaldt, W. (1971) *Die Geschichtschreibung des Thukydides und die thukydideische Frage*[2]; repr. of 1929 orig. with *Nachwort* (Berlin).
Schmid, W. (1943) *Zu Entstehungsgeschichte und Tektonik des ersten Thukydidesbuches* (diss. Tübingen).
Schwartz, E. (1929) *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*[2] (Bonn).
Smart, J. D. (1986) 'Thucydides and Hellanicus', in I. Moxon, J. D. Smart, and A. J. Woodman, edd., *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing* (Cambridge) 19–36.
Stadter, P. (1993) 'The Form and Content of Thucydides' *Pentecontaeteia* (1.89–117)', *GRBS* 34: 35–72.
Struve, O. (1878) *De compositi operis Thucydidii temporibus* (Halle).
Trenkner, S. (1960) *Le style καί dans le récit attique orale* (Assen).

Tsakmakis, A. (1995) *Thukydides über die Vergangenheit* (Tübingen).

Van de Maele, S. (1990) 'ἅμα δέ ou la 'raison véritable' dans l'œuvre de Thucydide', *Cahiers des études anciennes* 24: 341–6.

Węcowski, M. (2013) 'In the Shadow of Pericles: Athens' Samian Victory and the Organisation of the Pentekontaetia in Thucydides', in A. Tsakmakis and M. Tamiolaki, edd., *Thucydides between History and Literature* (Berlin) 154–66.

Westlake, H. D. (1969) 'Thucydides and the Pentekontaetia', in id., *Essays on the Greek Historians and Greek History* (Manchester) 39–60.

—— (2009) 'Thucydides and the Uneasy Peace: a Study in Political Incompetence', in Rusten (2009) 295–311; orig. *CQ* 21 (1971) 315–25; also in Westlake, *Studies in Thucydides and Greek History* (Bristol 1989) 84–96.

Wick, T. E. (1982) 'The Compositional Structure of Chapters 98–117 of Thucydides' Excursus on the Pentekontaetia (1.89ff.)', *AntCl* 51: 15–24.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. (1885) 'Thukydideische Daten', *Hermes* 20: 477–90; repr. in id., *Kleine Schriften III: griechische Prosa* (Berlin, 1969) 85–98.

—— (1893) *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin).

Winton, R. I. (1981) 'Thucydides 1,97,2: the "Arche of the Athenians" and "the Athenian Empire"', *MH* 38: 147–52.

Wolcott, J. D. (1898) 'New Words in Thucydides', *TAPhA* 29: 104–57.

Zahn, R. (1934) *Die erste Periklesrede (Thukydides I 140–144): Interpretation und Versuch einer Einordnung in den Zusammenhang des Werkes* (diss., Kiel).

Ziegler, K. (1929) 'Der Ursprung der Exkurse im Thukydides', *RhMus* 78: 58–67.