

## HONOUR, FEAR, AND BENEFIT— IN THAT ORDER: THE INTERPOLATION OF TIMH IN 1.75.3 OF THUCYDIDES’ SPEECH OF THE ATHENIANS AT SPARTA\*

---

*Abstract:* The triad of motives for Athenian action in 1.76.2 is preceded at 1.75.3 by the much-quoted listing of the same three items, in a different order and with too many list-markers, both sequential and preferential. Thucydides’ consistent usage of these markers reveals *καὶ τιμῆς* and *μάλιστα μὲν* to be insertions. The motive for the interpolation of *τιμῆ* (to make the first list match the second) is easy to understand, *μάλιστα μὲν* being added to ‘clarify’ the interpolation on the mistaken analogy of 1.32.1. The restored text eliminates the need to locate ‘fear’ in 75.3, since security and benefit are first introduced in 75.4–5 (after ‘honour’ has been highlighted in the Persian war). The final, full list in 1.76.2 reaches back to 1.73.4 to sum up the whole sequence of allegedly exculpatory human motivations—honour, fear, and benefit—behind Athens’ actions.

---

*Keywords:* Thucydides, textual criticism, honour, fear, Athenian Empire

### I. The Problem

Thucydides’ quartet of pre-war speeches at Sparta (1.67–81) includes an anomalous interruption by Athenian ambassadors who happen to be present on other unspecified business. They ignore the complaints of Sparta’s allies about Athens’ actions at Corcyra and Potidaea (not to speak of Megara and Aegina) and set forth the initial version of the ‘Athenian thesis’:<sup>1</sup> its service in saving Greece (especially Sparta) in the Persian war (1.73.2–74.4), justification of the growth of their hegemony and alliance into an empire (1.75.1–77.6), and a warning against breaking the thirty years’ peace and the dangers of war (1.78). In the second they excuse their actions as a natural human response (1.76.2):

\* All translations are my own; details of Thucydidean vocabulary and interpretation are derived from the *Thesaurus linguae graecae* (<https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>) and the *Thuc. Lex.* project at <https://lexeis.org>. I am indebted to Tim Rood for knowledge of Enoch Powell’s unpublished work and to the Churchill Archives Centre for access to it; and to Hunter Rawlings and the readers of *Histos* for improving the argument. This study is offered to the memory of an indefatigable and insightful Thucydidean, Dan Tompkins.

<sup>1</sup> Orwin (1994) 46–7. Later versions will be the Athenian ambassadors at Melos (5.84–113) and Euphemus’ speech to potential allies at Camarina (6.82–7), studied as a group by Strasburger (2009), Rengakos (1984), Heath (1990).

οὐδ' ἡμεῖς θαυμαστὸν οὐδὲν πεποιήκαμεν οὐδ' ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρωπέου τρόπου, εἰ ἀρχὴν τε διδομένην ἐδεξάμεθα καὶ ταύτην μὴ ἀνεῖμεν ὑπὸ τῶν μεγίστων νικηθέντες, τιμῆς καὶ δέους καὶ ὠφελίας

... nor have we done anything astonishing or departing from human character if we accepted the ἀρχή (= command, rule, or empire) that was offered and did not give it up, conquered by the greatest things, honour, fear, and benefit<sup>2</sup>...

But shortly before, in one of the three most popularly quoted statements in Thucydides,<sup>3</sup> they have made a more problematic version of the same admission (1.75.3):<sup>4</sup>

ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἔργου κατηναγκάσθημεν τὸ πρῶτον προαγαγεῖν αὐτὴν ἐς τόδε μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ δέους, ἔπειτα<sup>5</sup> καὶ τιμῆς ὕστερον καὶ ὠφελίας.

A temporary and literal translation, strictly following the word order, might be:

but in consequence of the act itself [i.e., 'taking this [command] itself αὐτὴν τήνδε ἐλάβομεν above] at first we were compelled to extend [the empire] to this point<sup>6</sup> especially by fear, then also by honour, and later also by benefit'.

Many have noticed that the list of these supposedly ineluctable influences is not only in a different order than 1.76.2, but in a more complex enumeration, employing τὸ πρῶτον, μάλιστα μὲν, ἔπειτα and ὕστερον. Hans-Peter Stahl suggested that the text as we have it combines two different kinds of lists, expressing 'both the historical sequence and the relative degree of urgency'.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>2</sup> On the shifting meanings of ὠφελία in the course of the argument see n. 33 below.

<sup>3</sup> Tompkins (2009), who notes the other two as 1.23.6 (Spartan fear as the cause of the war) and 5.89 (the strong do what they can, the weak suffer what they must).

<sup>4</sup> The repetition of points at short intervals with slight variation (not in this case 'ring composition') is a distinctive characteristic of this speech (1.72.1 ≅ 73.1 ≅ 73.3; 73.4 ≅ 74.4; 75.1 ≅ 75.5; 75.3–4 ≅ 76.2).

<sup>5</sup> ἔπειτα δὲ ABEFM, δὲ om. CG, the only textual variant in this sentence.

<sup>6</sup> Pericles in 1.144.5 uses a version of the same phrase for the same idea (developing Athens's command into the empire of his own day): ἐς τὰδε προήγαγον αὐτά.

<sup>7</sup> Stahl (2003) 46.

But these two list-types cannot be easily combined: τὸ πρῶτον can only be the beginning of a chronological list, but it is directly followed by μάλιστα which can only begin a preferential list,<sup>8</sup> which is then followed by ἔπειτα which can continue either kind of list, but then comes ὕστερον which can only be chronological. It looks as if the text has been disturbed, perhaps by the combination of two alternative list-types (πρῶτον/ἔπειτα/ὕστερον and μάλιστα μέν/ἔπειτα δέ), or even by ancient ‘emendations’ in the form of insertions. Maurer describes such insertions: ‘Deliberate additions tend to be small; they most often occur when someone fails to understand the construction, and tries to clarify it, not always happily, by inserting some particle, connective, preposition, noun, verb or pred. adj’. He suggests that such interpolations, if they are skillful, are usually hidden from us, and sets four conditions for diagnosing an interpolation, which I will address below: ‘(a) The mechanics of the original error must be clear. (b) The interpolator’s (or annotator’s) motive must be intelligible. (c) The gain in sense, or in concinnity, given by emendation [i.e., the removal of the interpolation] should be drastic. (d) The change [i.e., the removal of the interpolation] should be demonstrably towards, not away from, that which is “Thucydidean”’.<sup>9</sup>

## II. The Test of Thucydides’ Usage

Since Thucydides is an extremely difficult author himself, difficulty alone is nothing to judge by. The best test is to compare his usage elsewhere, since his style is not only extremely eccentric, but also very internally very consistent.

Classen and Steup and H.-P. Stahl had thought that τὸ πρῶτον was most suspect;<sup>10</sup> but an examination of Thucydides’ usage in such lists tells a different story. Just as surely as it indicates that ἔπειτα and ὕστερον continue from τὸ πρῶτον,<sup>11</sup> equally strongly does it rule out that either one can look back to μάλιστα μέν, even though that seems the only possibility with the text as it stands.

<sup>8</sup> Pace Romilly (1963) 251 ‘three feelings which act successively ... (μάλιστα μέν—ἔπειτα δέ—ὕστερον καί)’.

<sup>9</sup> Maurer (1995) 5.

<sup>10</sup> Classen and Steup (1919) 212; Stahl (2003) 62 n. 23.

<sup>11</sup> In Thucydides both τὸ πρῶτον and adverbial πρῶτον without the article are used of the first item in any sequence, see the listings in *Thuc. Lex.* s. v. πρῶτος.

Thucydides' usage of (τὸ) *πρῶτον* with *ἔπειτα* and *ὑστερον*:

- (τὸ) *πρῶτον* opens a list with *ἔπειτα* (δέ) sixteen times, and with *ὑστερον* (δέ) three times.<sup>12</sup>
- (τὸ) *πρῶτον* opens a list with *both ἔπειτα and ὑστερον* four additional times, apart from here;<sup>13</sup> but unlike 1.75.2, the two words always belong *together* ('then later'), refer to the *same* item and are in the same clause.
- In addition, even in the six instances when *ἔπειτα* and *ὑστερον* appear together without any previous introductory adverb, they still refer to the same item and are in the same clause: 3.94.1, 6.88.9 (*ἔπειτα ὑστερον*); 5.61.4, 6.60.3, 7.82.2 (*ἔπειτα δ' ὑστερον*); 4.102.4 (*ἔπειτα δέ ... ὑστερον*).<sup>14</sup>

Thucydides' usage of *μάλιστα μὲν* is limited to statements of preference:

- Nine times in the construction *μάλιστα μὲν ... εἰ δὲ μὴ* ('preferably ... otherwise ...').<sup>15</sup>
- Once it is followed by *ἔπειτα δέ* in a statement of preference (6.11.4).<sup>16</sup>
- It never occurs in lists with *πρῶτον* and *ὑστερον*.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>12</sup> τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ... ἔπειτα 5.41.3, 5.81.1, 5.84.2, 7.34.4, 8.6.5; τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ... ἔπειτα μέντοι 3.93.1, 3.111.3, 8.75.1; τὸ πρῶτον ... ἔπειτα 1.131.2, 4.26.8, 5.30.2; πρῶτον ... ἔπειτα δέ 1.32.1 (*μάλιστα μὲν ... εἰ δὲ μὴ* here is only within the *πρῶτον* item), 7.23.1; τὸ πρῶτον ... ἔπειτα δέ 5.43.2, 6.66.3; πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα 4.111.2. Also three times τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ... ὑστερον δέ 3.66.2, 6.4.5; τό τε πρῶτον ... καὶ ὑστερον 1.69.1.

<sup>13</sup> (after τὸ πρῶτον) 1.131.2 (*ἔπειτα διαπραξάμενος ὑστερον ἐξῆλθε*), 2.9.2 (*ἔπειτα δὲ ὑστερον*); (after πρῶτον alone) 3.94.1 and 6.88.9 (*both ἔπειτα ὑστερον*). In addition, *ἔπειτα* and *ὑστερον* appear referring to the same item without any previous introductory adverb six times: 3.94.1, 6.88.9, (*ἔπειτα ὑστερον*); 5.61.4, 6.60.3, 7.82.2 (*ἔπειτα δ' ὑστερον*); 4.102.4 (*ἔπειτα δέ [six words] ὑστερον*). For 'pleonastic' *εἶτα ὑστερον* and *μετέπειτα ὑστερον* commonly referring to a single item in other authors see Regenbogen (1934) 92, and n. 30 below.

<sup>14</sup> The three times *ἔπειτα* and *ὑστερον* refer to two different items they are not after any previous adverb, and occur either in different clauses twenty words apart (3.7.3) or in two entirely different sentences (1.134.4, 4.54.2).

<sup>15</sup> 1.32.1, 1.35.5, 1.40.4, 2.72.1, 4.63.1, 4.104.5, 5.21.3, 6.34.9, 8.91.3.

<sup>16</sup> A different configuration uses X *μὲν μάλιστα, ἔπειτα* Y in statements of decreasing quantity with 2.54.5 (frequency of plague), 6.16.5 (amount of envy), 6.67.2 (amount of troop-support).

<sup>17</sup> Once (1.32.1) *μάλιστα μὲν* follows *πρῶτον* and is followed by *ἔπειτα δέ* as in 1.75.2, but it is not constructed with them (we will return to this passage below).

### III. The Presumed Original and its Coherence with the Context

In short, Thucydides very often lists chronological sequences with *τὸ πρῶτον* ... *ἔπειτα* and several times adds *ὑστερον* as well, but if the latter two words both occur they are never applied to two separate items as here. On the other hand, *μάλιστα μὲν* ... *ἔπειτα* (*δέ*) is limited to statements of preference ('at best X, but otherwise Y') or (with *μὲν μάλιστα*) decreasing quantity ('most greatly X, but to a lesser degree Y'), and never used in lists with *πρῶτον* and *ὑστερον*. The suspect words are therefore *μάλιστα μὲν* and whatever separates *ἔπειτα* and *ὑστερον*, i.e., *καὶ τιμῆς*. Let us see what happens if we imagine a text without them:<sup>18</sup>

*ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἔργου κατηναγκάσθημεν τὸ πρῶτον προαγαγεῖν αὐτὴν ἐς  
τόδε μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ δέους, ἔπειτα καὶ τιμῆς ὑστερον καὶ ὠφελίας*

We can now replace the literal translation with an accurate one, taking account of Thucydides' penchant in his speeches for hyperbaton (*προαγαγεῖν αὐτὴν ἐς τόδε* displaced forward for emphasis) and zeugma (*κατηναγκάσθημεν* with (*ὑπὸ*) *ὠφελίας*):

And in consequence of the act itself we were compelled initially<sup>19</sup> by fear, then later by benefit also,<sup>20</sup> to extend [our command] to this point [i.e., today's empire].

Doesn't the excision of *τιμῆς* produce nonsense by comparison with 1.76.2? On the contrary, we shall see that in addition to 1) restoring regular Thucydidean usage, it also eliminates the problems of 2) the variation in the order of the 'trinity'; and 3) the place of 'fear' and 'honour' in Athens' exposition; and it also 4) supplies an obvious motive for the interpolation.

<sup>18</sup> For a similar proposal (but not as an interpolation) made in an unpublished work by Enoch Powell, see IV below.

<sup>19</sup> Thucydides' frequent usage of *τὸ πρῶτον* followed by *ἔπειτα* and *ὑστερον* (see nn. 12–13 above) strongly favours taking it with the first list-item *ὑπὸ δέους* rather than the single item *κατηναγκάσθημεν*, 'felt constraint for the first time'. It is definitely not to be taken with *προαγαγεῖν ἐς τόδε* (as do Classen and Steup (1919) 212), which has been displaced forward to separate the passive verb from its agents in a common Thucydidean hyperbaton; for an even more extreme example, also with zeugma (see next n.) compare *μήτε* ... *προυφειλομένης* in the beginning of the Corcyreans' speech in 32.1 (quoted for other reasons in section IV below).

<sup>20</sup> The extension of *κατηναγκάσθημεν* from *ὑπὸ δέους* to the less suitable *ὠφελίας* is a zeugma frequent in Thucydides, repeated with the parallel *νικώμενοι* 1.76.2 below.

The revised text clarifies that this sentence (unlike 1.76.2) does not sum up the previous story, but uses the assumption of command to introduce the explanation of fear and benefit that follows the Persian war. First, fear (1.75.4):

*καὶ οὐκ ἀσφαλὲς ἔτι ἐδόκει εἶναι τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀπηχθημένους καὶ τινων καὶ ἤδη ἀποστάντων κατεστραμμένων, ὑμῶν τε ἡμῖν οὐκέτι ὁμοίως φίλων, ἀλλ' ὑπόπτων καὶ διαφόρων ὄντων, ἀνέντας κινδυνεύειν· καὶ γὰρ ἂν αἱ ἀποστάσεις πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐγίγνοντο.*

And we thought it no longer safe, after we had become hated by most of them, and some had revolted already and been subdued, and you were no longer our friends as before but suspicious and estranged, to risk giving it away, since any allies who defected would be joining you instead.

Then, benefit (1.75.5–76.1):

*πᾶσι δὲ ἀνεπίφθονον τὰ συμφέροντα τῶν μεγίστων πέρι κινδύνων εὖ τίθεσθαι. ὑμεῖς γοῦν, ὧ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, τὰς ἐν τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ πόλεις ἐπὶ τὸ ὑμῖν ὠφέλιμον καταστησάμενοι ἐξηγεῖσθε· καὶ εἰ τότε ὑπομείναντες διὰ παντὸς ἀπήχθεσθε ἐν τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ, ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς, εὖ ἴσμεν μὴ ἂν ἦσσαν ὑμᾶς λυπηροὺς γενομένους τοῖς συμμαχοῖς καὶ ἀναγκασθέντας ἂν ἢ ἄρχειν ἐγκρατῶς ἢ αὐτοὺς κινδυνεύειν.*

And in cases of extreme danger, it can subject no one to resentment to arrange well what is to one's advantage. You Spartans, for instance, are the leaders of the cities of Peloponnese after configuring them to your benefit, and if back then you had persevered and become hated in your leadership as we have, we know well that you would have become no less grievous to your allies and had no choice but to govern by force or to court danger yourselves.

Neither *δέος* nor *ὠφελία* is repeated verbatim, but the related word-groups *ἀσφαλές/κίνδυνος/κινδυνεύειν* and *ξυμφέροντα/εὖ τίθεσθαι/ὠφέλιμον* abundantly foreground the underlying concepts. The Athenians now detail how they were focused first on fear (of their rebellious allies and then of hostile Spartans as a rallying-point for revolts), then on benefit (to themselves as a reward for the risks they were running). But of *τιμή*, which we encounter both

earlier and later, they do not make the slightest mention here, and most certainly not as a motive occurring in between fear and benefit.<sup>21</sup>

#### IV. The Motives and Sources of the Interpolation

Thus, to the textual reason are added contextual ones for assuming that only *δέος* and *ὠφελία*, and not *τιμή*, were originally listed in 1.75.3. There is of course the obvious objection that *τιμή* is present, indeed in first position, when the list is given again in 1.76.2. But this actually offers an obvious motivation for the interpolation: a meddlesome reader of the threefold list 1.76.2 found it irresistible to add the missing *τιμή* to the earlier list as well.<sup>22</sup> The same impulse lies behind a modern interpolation, the insertion of <τριῶν> by Herwerden in 1.76.2 on the analogy of the same numeral in 1.74.1 (also 3.40.2), which is not at all compelling (why should it have been deleted?), yet universally printed by editors.<sup>23</sup>

Let us assume, then, that *καὶ τιμή* is an insertion, what of the other strongly suspected words (also because of a conflict with Thucydides' usage), *μάλιστα μέν*? If these too were interpolated, it must have been as a consequence of adding *τιμή*, to give a starting-point for the augmented list-elements, perhaps because after the hyperbaton of *προαγαγείν αὐτήν ἐς τόδε* there seemed too much distance between *πρῶτον* and *ἔπειτα*. But as noted, *μάλιστα μέν* cannot introduce a chronological sequence. What then gave the interpolator this idea? It might simply be a complete improvisation; but its source could lie in a passage which he would have read earlier in Book 1, in the Corcyrean speech asking for an alliance at Athens, the only place apart from 1.75.3 where *πρῶτον*, *μάλιστα μέν*, and *ἔπειτα δέ* occur together (1.32.1):

δίκαιον, ὧ Ἀθηναῖοι, τοὺς μήτε εὐεργεσίας μεγάλης μήτε ξυμμαχίας προυφειλομένης ἤκοντας παρὰ τοὺς πέλας ἐπικουρίας, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς νῦν, δεησομένους ἀναδιδάξαι πρῶτον, μάλιστα μέν ὡς καὶ ξύμφορα δέονται, εἰ δὲ μή, ὅτι γε οὐκ ἐπιζήμια, ἔπειτα δέ ὡς καὶ τὴν χάριν βέβαιον ἔξουσιν· εἰ δὲ τούτων μηδὲν σαφὲς καταστήσουσι, μὴ ὀργίζεσθαι ἦν ἀτυχῶσιν.

<sup>21</sup> The related words for *τιμή* (*ἐπαινέσθαι*, *ἄξιος*, *ἀδοξία*, *ἔπαινος*) do not reappear until 1.76.2–4.

<sup>22</sup> This was done in the only spot that seemed available, between *ἔπειτα* and *ὑστερον*, in ignorance of the fact that this very placement (above n. 13) would betray it as non-Thucydidean.

<sup>23</sup> Herwerden (1877) 69, cf. Weil (1878) 92. It is accepted in the editions of Hude (1898–1901), Stuart Jones and Powell (1942), and Alberti (1972–2000).

It is lawful, Athenians, for those who seek a rescue by others, as we do now, although there is no great good deed previously owed nor an alliance, to explain first preferably why this will be in their best interests, or at least not cause harm, next that their gratitude will be certain; and if they cannot make this clear, to accept failure without anger.

This might have seemed to him a parallel to 1.75.3, but it is a false one. Despite occurring in the same sequence as 1.75.3, the structure of the list markers is obviously entirely different, since *πρῶτον* looks forward to *ἔπειτα δέ* as usual,<sup>24</sup> and *μάλιστα μέν* does not correlate to either one, but looks forward to *εἰ δὲ μή* as most often in Thucydides,<sup>25</sup> both being entirely contained in the *πρῶτον* clause—it is a preferential listing inside of a sequential list.

As for the variant *ἔπειτα δέ* in ABEFM (*δέ* om. CG) at 1.75.3, there are parallels for its use with *πρῶτον* (see the listings in nn. 12–13 above), but the addition of *δέ* seems especially likely after the interpolation of *μέν* along with *μάλιστα*. Thus the absence of *δέ* in one manuscript group might be an indication that *μάλιστα μέν* was not originally present in it either, since the inserted *μέν* would have seemed to necessitate the addition of *δέ* following *ἔπειτα*, as *πρῶτον ... ἔπειτα* does not.

Why was none of this observed earlier? The interpolated words clearly diverge from Thucydides' usage—but only to someone with access to the TLG's proximity searches, *Thuc. Lex.*, and other digital tools to detect any departures from Thucydides' customary practice.<sup>26</sup> Lacking these, the interpolated text has seldom attracted special attention—certainly not compared to the assumed original, lacking *τιμή*, that would have cried out for intervention by an ancient Herwerden to make it match the triad in 1.76.2. But even so the superfluity of list-markers, and the inconsistency of a list in *πρῶτον ... ὕστερον* with one in *μάλιστα*, made critics uncomfortable: Stahl observed 'one would normally expect *τὸ πρῶτον* to be in the place occupied by *μάλιστα*'.<sup>27</sup> And Enoch Powell, in an unpublished dissertation of 1934, actually suggested that *μάλιστα μέν*, *τιμή*, and even *ὠφελία* were all subsequent insertions, but by Thucydides himself.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Although here it introduces not a list of emotions, but a sequence of arguments.

<sup>25</sup> See n. 15 above.

<sup>26</sup> The pattern of list-markers in section II above does not seem to exist in any other classical author.

<sup>27</sup> Stahl (2003) 62 n. 23.

<sup>28</sup> Powell (1934) 81. On this and other Thucydidean studies of Powell in the 1930s see Matijašić (2022).



As originally conceived, 75,3 would simply have run: ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἔργου κατηναγκ. τὸ πρῶτον προαγ. αὐτὴν ἐς τόδε ὑπὸ δέους; but Thucydides, as he proceeded, characteristically modified his intention, so as to include the secondary motives of ambition and profit. This led him to insert μάλιστα μὲν and to overlook a certain inappropriateness of κατηναγκάσθημεν and ὑπὸ as applied to τιμή and ὠφελία.<sup>29</sup> That δέος and ὠφελία stand in order of importance, cannot be doubted, despite the reversal of that order in 76,2 [*sic*]: between ‘especially’ and ‘afterwards’ there would be no intelligible contrast.

Powell saw that μάλιστα μὲν followed by ὕστερον was impossible, and that fear (of the allies and Sparta in the following sentence) is the primary point here, but attributes the intervention not to a reader’s desire for consistency with 1.76.2, but forgetful revisions by Thucydides himself; if Powell could have determined that the changes are in themselves un-Thucydidean, he might have preferred interpolation.<sup>30</sup>

### V. Reading 1.73.4–76.2 after the Correction

Faced with explaining the chronological order ‘fear, honour, benefit’ in the interpolated text of 1.75.3, modern commentators had to pinpoint the occurrence of fear before the other two. That was an impossible task, since Athenian fear is completely absent from the preceding Persian War narrative, 1.73.4–75.1;<sup>31</sup> this first section focuses rather on the τιμή they won from Salamis,<sup>32</sup> which will be accordingly listed chronologically first in the final

<sup>29</sup> I.e., zeugma, see n. 20 above.

<sup>30</sup> Powell himself seems to have forgotten the order of δέος and ὠφελία in 1.76.2 (or did he mean to write ‘δέος and τιμή’?). He also (in a footnote on the same page) rejects the possibility of taking ἔπειτα and ὕστερον together, adding ‘for though Regenbogen has proved that such a pleonasm is Greek (*Hermes* (1934) 92), I do not believe that it is Thucydidean’, unaware of the ten passages found digitally in nn. 13–14 above.

<sup>31</sup> Powell (1934) 80: ‘According to half the commentators, δέος means fear of Persia. This cannot be true.’ Fear is felt only by the Spartans (1.74.3) and linked with Athens only in a contrary to fact condition (1.74.4) on the premise that it felt *no* fear. κίνδυνος in this section (1.73.4, 1.74.2, 1.74.3) is not associated with δέος as later in 1.75.5, but with προθυμία (1.73.5, 1.74.2). For unpersuasive attempts to locate fear anyway see Romilly (1963) 253, Raubitschek (1973) 41, Stahl (2003) 46 and many others. Warner (1972) actually inserts ‘of Persia’ after ‘fear’ into his translation, which has deceived interpreters without Greek.

<sup>32</sup> Hornblower (1991) 120: ‘at 95 and 96 below, Thucydides speaks of appeals to Athens by the allies, to respond to which would be a matter of honour and advantage, not fear; and of desire for revenge on Persia—honour and advantage again, one would have thought’.

summary in 1.76.2. The intervening section, 1.75.3–76.1, starting once Athens has assumed the ἀρχή, obviously does not refer backwards but marks a transition to a new topic (see III above), so that δέος and ὠφελία in 1.75.3 introduce its new motivations for dealing with the allies they subsequently commanded. At this point Athens, hitherto full of προθυμία and τολμηροσύνη against Persia, now switches to acting under constraint, initially (τὸ πρῶτον) out of fear of the allies it commands, and subsequently also feels justified to develop the empire for ὠφελία in a new sense, not military aid to others but financial benefit to itself,<sup>33</sup> as later traced in the *Pentekontaeteia*.<sup>34</sup>

A second problem, namely the supposedly different order in which the three factors are listed in 1.75.3 and 1.76.2, is of course removed with the recognition that τιμὴ in 1.75.3 is interpolated: underlying both is the same sequence of motives, but in 1.75.3 the first item, τιμὴ, is not named because it has already been described in 1.73.4–75.1, whereas 1.75.3 initiates the influence of δέος and self-centred ὠφελία. Finally, 1.76.2 concludes this part of the speech by repeating all three influences in chronological order: honour (from its *aristeia* against Persia and the offer of sole command), fear (of its own new allies) and benefit (from its exertions in maintaining control).

Finally, the relation between the section on Athens in the Persian War (1.73.4–74.4) and its empire (1.75.1–76.2) is now more clearly seen to be an emotional as well as chronological sequence.<sup>35</sup> Athens' recognised achievement at Salamis, forcefully presented with eight superlatives in 1.74.1–2, was rewarded with the sole command of the allies, and pride in that glory is the reason it accepts the command (1.75.1–2). But the acceptance itself (ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἔργου) starts a different phase, and with the advent of δέος and ὠφελία their 'whole story' (73.1–2, cf. 72.1) takes a curious turn. In the deployment of their new possession (ἔχομεν ἃ κεκτήμεθα 1.73.1 above),<sup>36</sup> a passive Athens is now 'conquered' (νικηθέντες 1.76.2, strikingly repeated from Xerxes νικηθείς 1.73.5), and the victors are now vanquished by their own previously unfelt anxieties and desires. They use the language of exculpation, their actions being 'not abnormal' and 'not alien to human character', and rather than being ἄξιοι

τιμὴ occurs earlier (ἐτιμήσατε 1.74.2, προτιμήσατε), as does ὠφελία (1.74.1, 1.74.3) although in a meaning which shifts in 1.75.3 (n. 33 below).

<sup>33</sup> Not noted in Anastasiadis (2013) 60–2, but see Tompkins (2009) and Pouncey (1980) 62–3.

<sup>34</sup> 1.97.2 τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπόδειξιν ἔχει τῆς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν οἴῳ τρόπῳ κατέστη, see especially 1.99.3, and 1.121.5, and later 3.13.6, cf. further Kallet (2013) 56. Omitted in that narrative are other events that are possibly alluded to here as ὠφελία, viz. the movement of the league treasury to Athens in the 450s, and the manipulation of tribute levels for individual allies.

<sup>35</sup> Previous discussions of this question in Romilly (1963) 249, Raubitschek (1973) 36–7.

<sup>36</sup> When stockpiled κτήματα are later deployed for use, the Greek verb is not 'use' but 'have', ἔχειν (Thuc. 1.141.1, 2.63.3, and Jebb (1900) on Soph. *Antig.* 1278, Eur. fr. 417).

and better than other cities against Persia, Athens' behaviour now is at best *ἀνεπίφθονον*,<sup>37</sup> merely no worse than others. Their honour has only been a foil to this unfortunate decision, or rather the bait for it, and this command is presented as the sole (*αὐτὴν τήνδε*, 'just this') acknowledgment of their merit.

## VI. Further Questions on the Athenians' Speech at Sparta

The textual change at 1.75.3, helpful as it is, does not remove all the interpretative problems in the earlier (before 1.73.4) and later (after 1.76.2) parts of the speech. This is not the place for a detailed study of these peculiarities, but they include:

- Athens' constant and seemingly counterproductive critiques of Sparta's past behaviour,<sup>38</sup> which Grant and Guelfucci attribute to the frankness of closed-door diplomacy between peers, but Romilly assumes are addressed not to Sparta, but the reader.<sup>39</sup>
- The obscure reference to courts for allies and especially the interpretation of 1.77.1.<sup>40</sup>
- The omission of the arguments promised in the introductions (1.72.1, 1.73.3) to dissuade Sparta from war,<sup>41</sup> which Guelfucci thinks are contained in Athens' subtext, while Romilly thought they showed that 1.75.2–77.6 on the empire was a postwar insertion at the same time as the *Pentekontaeteia*.<sup>42</sup>

Even less can we consider the massive bibliography by political theorists (starting with Hobbes) that appropriates Thucydides' so-called 'trinity' of fear, honour, and self-interest (almost always preferring the sequence of 1.75.3 over 1.76.2), even though the close comparison of the two passages above can only increase one's discomfort that a very problematic bit of Greek has been snatched from its context to make an English catchphrase. Our analysis above aligns well with the plausible argument of Tompkins, that international

<sup>37</sup> 'Not subject to resentment', Raubitschek (1973) 37 on the influence of Hdt 7.139.1, and 43 for the 'note of apology'; on *ἀνθρώπειος* 'human' used apologetically by speakers cf. Thuc. 3.45.7, 3.84.2, and *ἀνθρώπινον/humanum* to attempt to excuse rape in Greek and Roman New Comedy (Donatus on Ter. *Adelphoe* 471: *hoc* (i.e., *humanum*) *dicere solemus ubi peccatum quidem non negamus, sed tolerabile esse dicimus*). Strasburger (2009) 204 observes that all three Athenian speeches show a degree of candour unlikely in actual diplomacy.

<sup>38</sup> Crane (1998) 265–9.

<sup>39</sup> Grant (1965) 264–5, Guelfucci (2018) 758; Romilly (1963) 243.

<sup>40</sup> Most recently Parmeggiani (2021) 6–7 and Liberman (2017) 210–11.

<sup>41</sup> Westlake (1973) 101–2.

<sup>42</sup> Guelfucci (2018) 766; Romilly (1963) 268–71.

relations scholarship has mistranslated as a universal ‘trinity’ motives that Thucydides presents as culture-specific to Athens: not quite ‘fear’ but rational apprehension (*δέος* as opposed to Spartan *φόβος*), not quite ‘honour’ but imperial ambition (among Spartans only in Brasidas),<sup>43</sup> not quite ‘self-interest’ but benefit (Athenian *ὠφελία* introduced as altruism toward Greeks, then extended as altruism toward themselves).

But at least with the recognition of the interpolation, Athens’ initial version of its emotional journey, from its pride after Salamis to its assumption of command and subsequent metamorphosis into an imperial state, emerges clearly. Different perspectives on the development of the empire, from Thucydides himself in the *Pentekontaeteia* (1.99), the rebellious ally Mytilene (3.13.6), Hermocrates (6.76.3–4), and the final bizarre twist by Euphemus (6.76.3),<sup>44</sup> are still to come.

*Cornell University*

JEFFREY S. RUSTEN  
jsr5@cornell.edu

<sup>43</sup> Tompkins (2009). See also Zilincik (2021) and especially Wees (2022), tracing *τιμή* throughout Thucydides for Athens, but also observing ‘honour has its limits in explaining the outbreak and course of the Peloponnesian or any other war, partly because there are obviously always also other factors in play, and in part because the ideology of honour serves legitimating purposes and is never a merely analytical concept that adequately explains behaviour’.

<sup>44</sup> On Euphemus see Strasburger (2009) 209–10, Rawlings (1981) 120–1. Herodotus 8.3 had already characterised Athens’ initial motives as more calculating.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Alberti, I. B. (1972–2000) *Thucydides Historiae* (Rome).
- Anastasiadis, V. I. (2013) *Interest and Self-interest in Ancient Athens* (Hildesheim).
- Classen, J. and J. Steup, edd. (1919) *Thukydides, Erster Band: Einleitung; Erstes Buch*<sup>5</sup> (Berlin).
- Crane, G. (1998) *Thucydides and the Ancient Simplicity: The Limits of Political Realism* (Berkeley).
- Grant, J. R. (1965) ‘A Note on the Tone of Greek Diplomacy’, *CQ* 15: 261–6.
- Guelfucci, M.-R. (2018) ‘La parole diplomatique et l’ambassade athénienne de 432 av. J.-C. à Sparte (Thucydide, I, 72–78)’, in A. Queyrel-Bottineau and M.-R. Guelfucci, edd., *Conseillers et ambassadeurs dans l’Antiquité* (Dialogues d’Histoire Ancienne. Supplément, 17; Besançon) 745–70.
- Heath, M. (1990) ‘Justice in Thucydides’ Athenian Speeches’, *Historia* 39: 385–400.
- Herwerden, H. von (1877) *Θουκυδίδου Ξυγγραφή vol. I (lib. I)* (Utrecht).
- Hornblower, S. (1991) *Commentary on Thucydides, vol. 1: Books 1–3* (Oxford).
- Hude, C. (1898–1901) *Thucydides historiae ad optimos codices denuo ab ipso collatas* (Leipzig).
- Jebb, R. C. (1900) *The Plays of Sophocles: Antigone* (Cambridge).
- Kallet, L. (2013) ‘The Origins of the Athenian Economic *Arche*’, *JHS* 133: 43–60.
- Liberman, G. (2017) *Les préliminaires de la guerre: Prolégomènes à la lecture du premier livre de Thucydide* (Collection *Scripta Antiqua*; Bordeaux).
- Matijašić, I. (2022) ‘John Enoch Powell, Thucydides, and Historical Analogy’, in L. Iori and I. Matijašić, edd., *Thucydides in the ‘Age of Extremes’ and Beyond: Academia and Politics (History of Classical Scholarship, Supplementary Volume 5; Newcastle upon Tyne and Venice)* 89–124.
- Maurer, K. (1995) *Interpolation in Thucydides* (Leiden and New York).
- Orwin, C. (1994) *The Humanity of Thucydides* (Princeton).
- Parmeggiani, G. (2021) ‘Athens Struggling with Her Allies. A Note on Thucydides 1.77.1’, *Ancient Society* 51: 1–14.
- Pouncey, P. R. (1980) *The Necessities of War: A Study of Thucydides’ Pessimism* (New York).
- Powell, J. E. (1934) *The Moral and Historical Principles of Thucydides and their Influence in Later Antiquity. Fellowship dissertation*. Churchill Archives Centre, Churchill College, Cambridge, Unpublished manuscript, 162pp., POLL 1/6/24.
- Raubitschek, A. E. (1973) ‘The Speech of the Athenians at Sparta’, in Stadter (1973) 32–48.
- Rawlings, H. R. III (1981) *The Structure of Thucydides’ History* (Princeton).

- Regenbogen, O. (1934) 'Theophrast-Studien I. Zur Analyse der *Historia Plantarum*: I. Über Buch I und II', *Hermes* 69: 75–105.
- Rengakos, A. (1984) *Form und Wandel des Machtdenkens der Athener bei Thukydides* (Stuttgart).
- Romilly, J. de (1963) *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism* (Oxford).
- Stahl, H.-P. (2003) *Thucydides: Man's Place in History* (Swansea).
- Stadter, P., ed. (1973) *The Speeches in Thucydides: A Collection of Original Studies with a Bibliography* (Chapel Hill).
- Strasburger, H. (2009) 'Thucydides and the Political Self-Portrait of the Athenians', in J. S. Rusten, ed., *Thucydides, Oxford Readings in Classical Studies* (Oxford) 191–219; translation of 'Thukydides und die politische Selbstdarstellung der Athener', *Hermes* 86 (1958) 17–40.
- Stuart Jones, H. and J. E. Powell. (1942) *Thucydides Historiae* (Oxford).
- Thuc. Lex.* = J. S. Rusten, G. Storey, et al., edd., *A Thucydidean Lexicon* <http://lexeis.org/thucydides> (2018–) Accessed 10 September 2024.
- Tompkins, D. (2009) 'Honor, Fear and Profit: Non-Universal Terms in Thucydides', *Abstracts: American Philological Association 140th Annual Meeting*. 196.
- Warner, R., trans. (1972) *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War* (Harmondsworth).
- Wees, H. van (2022) 'Honour and Profit in International Relations', abstract from a conference of the ERC project 'Honour in ancient Greece', Edinburgh, 10–12 June 2022: <https://research.shca.ed.ac.uk/honour-in-greece/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2022/04/HCG-Workshop-Hans-van-Wees.pdf>. Accessed 10 September 2024.
- Weil, H. (1878) 'Observations critiques', *Revue de Philologie* 2: 84–92.
- Westlake, H. D. (1973) 'The Settings of Thucydides' Speeches', in Stadter (1973) 90–108.
- Zilincik, S. (2021) 'Why the "Fear, Honour, and Interest" Trinity Harms Our Understanding of War', *Royal United Services Institute for Defense Studies* 166: 10–17.