

THE FOURTH-CENTURY AND HELLENISTIC RECEPTION OF THUCYDIDES*

How well known was Thucydides' history in the fourth century BC and the hellenistic period? Gomme, with an eye on Polybius, once wrote of the 'nearly complete silence about Thucydides in what remains to us of ancient writers before the age of Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus'¹. This is startling at first and has to my knowledge led to the misconception that Thucydides virtually disappeared after his own time. Gomme was however referring merely to specific mentions or discussions of Thucydides by name: he went on to speak of the 'silent compliment paid him by Kratippos, Xenophon, Theopompos, and Philistos'. Even this is far from a complete list, and Gomme's possibly misleading paragraph can serve as my starting-point.

My own treatment essentially stops after such second- and early first-century BC figures as Polybius, Agatharchides and Posidonius. This may seem a mad terminal date in view of such rich evidence for Thucydidean reception as is provided by Dionysius, Plutarch, Lucian and Cassius Dio, not to mention even later figures. But the importance of Thucydides in the Imperial period (and after) is not in dispute. My chosen period is, by contrast, still a relatively dark corner and it is worth trying to light it up. To cover all three periods—fourth-century, hellenistic, Imperial—would need a book not an article. I deal mainly with the Greek historians of the period, but I look also at e.g. the orators, the poliorcetic writer Aeneas Tacticus, the philosophers Plato and Aristotle, and the poets Callimachus and even Lucretius.

In this article I hope to show that post-classical knowledge of Thucydides was never negligible. I do *not* propose to go to the opposite extreme. Such transparent and accessible charmers as Herodotus and Xenophon were widely read and known in the fourth century and early hellenistic periods, in a way that the difficult Thucydides was surely not.²

The questions, how well known was Thucydides, and what influence did he have and why did he not have more, are worth pursuing for their own sake. But I have a further motive for pursuing it. In 1987, I suggested³ that the speeches in Thucydides might have influenced fourth-century treatises like the Aristotelian *Rhetoric to Alexander*. The assumption that there is a relationship of some kind is surely plausible, and lies behind the Thucydidean insights of Macleod who pointed out parallels between things said by Thucydidean speakers and things advocated by fourth-century handbooks. My 1987 suggestion was intended as a caution: if I was right, the evidential value of the handbooks, for the elucidation of Thucydides' speeches, is reduced—though not eliminated.⁴

* I thank Christopher Pelling for correspondence, and Rosalind Thomas for conversation, about the subject of this paper; Fergus Millar for comments on a draft; Christian Habicht for comments on the nearly-final version; and Peter Parsons for help over the papyri (n. 74).

¹ *HCT* iii 523 with 733 (cf. *More essays* (Oxford 1962) 126), discussing Hermocrates' speech at Th. iv 59-65 and the problem, why does Polybius xii 25k criticise Timaeus' account of this speech without mentioning Th.? Polybius does not make against Timaeus the obvious points that Timaeus' version differed from Th.'s, therefore one or the other, and more likely Timaeus, must be wrong. This raises the question whether Polybius knew Th.'s work, cf. below p. 49 with n. 10.

² Herodotus: O. Murray, 'Herodotus and Hellenistic culture', *CQ* xxii (1972) 200-213; Xenophon: K. Münscher, 'Xenophon in der griechisch-römischen Literatur', *Philologus. Supp.* xiii (2) (1920). Note also J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford 1981) 196-201, in real life, Eumenes of Cardia influenced by Xenophon's writings; also D.M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden, 1977) 149-52. Knowledge of Th. as evidenced by the papyri: n. 74.

³ S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London 1987) 47-50; *Comm. ...Th.* i (Oxford 1991) 75 f.

⁴ C. Macleod, *Collected essays* (Oxford 1982) esp. chs. 10, 11 (Mytilene, Plataea debates).

I need to show that an influence in the direction I postulate was at least possible. The author of a recent study of justice in Thucydides' speeches has challenged my suggestion, asking 'why should we suppose that fourth-century theory was uniquely influenced by Thucydides?'⁵ I do not actually need to show that theory was *uniquely* influenced by Thucydides, but I certainly ought to show that such influence could indeed have been exerted. I am here concerned to knock away a possible counter-argument from the reception, or rather alleged non-reception, of Thucydides by the fourth century in general and by the Aristotelians in particular, i.e. Aristotle himself and authors closely connected to him.

Of modern studies of the reception of Thucydides, the most obvious and nowadays usually cited is, because of its omissions, not satisfactory, namely the final section ('Nachwirkung') of Luschnat's 1971 *Realencyclopädie* article.⁶ Better, in many ways, is an older work, an intelligent Munich dissertation of 1935 by Strebel.⁷ This not only provides valuable supplementation on some of the authors Luschnat deals with, but discusses authors wholly absent from Luschnat, such as Callisthenes, Ephorus, Timaeus and Agatharchides. (We can add that Aeneas Tacticus and—in effect—the Atthidographers are regrettable absentees from both Luschnat and Strebel). Yet we shall see that Callisthenes contains one of the two most precious texts for anyone interested in the fourth-century reception of Thucydides' speeches; the other is in Aeneas Tacticus. Strebel does not exaggerate the importance of Thucydides in the hellenistic period; on the contrary he notes⁸ a falling-off of interest in Thucydides and accounts for this, plausibly no doubt, in terms of changes in stylistic taste. I return to this below. Strebel's dissertation is however itself short and incomplete and the whole question bears re-opening.

My article falls into two main parts. In (I) I give the evidence. This is selective. To 're-do' Luschnat from the ground up would be absurd, because there is naturally much valuable material in Luschnat about the (regrettably few) authors whom he does treat, such as the continuators of Thucydides; Philistus; Isocrates; Plato; Aristotle. Logically an attempt to re-do Luschnat would require repeating what he does say, plus a lot more: the result would be a very long article. I confine myself to (a) giving material relevant to or found in the authors treated by Luschnat, only where Luschnat has omitted it or it is specially illuminating; and (b) discussing more fully the authors Luschnat does not treat. In (II) I broaden things out and offer more general (and speculative) reflections on the way in which Thucydides and his period were viewed by educated post-classical Greeks. (III) is a brief conclusion.

The aim of (II) needs expanding. Having I hope established in (I) that neglect of Thucydides was far from total, I still need to explain, in (II), *why* he was neglected—if only partially and relatively; and to say what he meant to those who still read him. Only a handful of the later Greek historians proclaimed themselves Thucydides' imitators (a slippery notion, n. 60), or can be so described with confidence: Philistus (imitation certain, and explicitly attested), Hieronymus of Cardia (influence very probable); Agatharchides of Cnidus (imitation explicitly attested, but attestation ambiguous). Philochorus has in modern times been compared to Thucydides (whom he knew, if only *via* Androtion) and there are indeed features in common. Phylarchus shared Thucydides' interest in Sparta and continued Hieronymus—but he also continued the frothier Duris of Samos (*FGrH* 76), and modelled himself more on the latter than

⁵ M. Heath, 'Justice in Thucydides' Athenian speeches', *Historia* xxxix (1990) 385-400, at 396 n. 21.

⁶ O. Luschnat, 'Thukydides der Historiker', *RE* suppl. xii (1971) 1085-1354, esp. 1266-97, 'Die Nachwirkung'. (Luschnat).

⁷ H.G. Strebel, *Wertung und Wirkung des Thukydideischen Geschichtswerkes in der griechisch-römischen Literatur* (Diss. Munich, 1935). (Strebel.)

⁸ Strebel 26.

on the former. Polybius is problematic but influence is certain, if only at the level of methodology. This list is short and we shall have to ask why it is not longer. Some of the material in (I) is Thucydidean material from authors not (as far as we can see) profoundly influenced by Thucydides; I include it because the factual question of awareness is basic. There is however an important distinction to be made between awareness of an author and imitation of that author. So we may wish to say Philochorus knew Thucydides, if only at second hand, and resembled or even imitated him; whereas Androtion, who knew him at first hand, resembled him less. It is the profounder question of perspective and 'world view' which I discuss in (II).

I

First, a general remark about the method we should employ in this more factual section. Gomme was strictly right to talk of 'silence' about Thucydides, if by that we mean that there is a post-classical dearth of specific references to Thucydides by name. To put that another way, an IBYCUS search for the name 'Thucydides' might mislead us into thinking that Thucydides was indeed not much read after his own time. This would be a mistake: 'not mentioned' is not the same as 'not read'. Even in the fifth century BC the same principle applies: it would be wrong to argue that, merely because Thucydides does not mention Herodotus by name, he did not know Herodotus' work well.⁹ When dealing with a period like the fourth century, and especially the hellenistic period when our literary evidence survives in such tatters (even Polybius is far from complete), it is even more true that we must proceed indirectly, and be ready to detect oblique influences, influences exerted in ways which do not immediately jump on to computer screens. (I stress 'immediately'; I realise that computers can do more sophisticated jobs than looking for the name 'Thucydides'). In all periods of ancient history the ordinary problems of intertextuality are made more acute by the habits of ancient authors like Polybius when using each other's works. I discuss these questions elsewhere.¹⁰ Ancient methods of book-production and 'information retrieval' may explain some of the oddities, as may the insight of Momigliano that there were senses in which ancient texts were transmitted orally long after the advent (tendentious word) of literacy; this last consideration also helps to explain the instability of some of our texts.¹¹ But not all anomalies can be explained. Strabo and Plutarch were 'well-read', whatever we mean by that; but they did not behave like Schwartz or Jacoby. Modern ancient historians, trained in rigorous *Quellenforschung*, occasionally forget this. It is however true that once we leave the safe ground of explicitly attributed quotations or 'fragments' in the special sense used by Jacoby and Diels/Kranz, matters become subjective. One reader may detect influence which another denies. Jacoby's principle, notably applied to Diodorus, was to refuse to assign to a historian material for which attribution evidence was indirect.¹² Thus there is surely more Posidonius in Diodorus than Jacoby prints under his

⁹ S. Hornblower, 'Thucydides' use of Herodotus', in J.M. Sanders (ed), *ΦΙΛΟΛΑΚΩΝ* (London 1992) 141-54; C.R. Rubincam, 'The Theban Attack on Plataia: Herodotus 7.233.2 and Thucydides 2.2.1 and 5.8-9', *LCM* vi (1981) 47-9.

¹⁰ See S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek historiography* (Oxford 1994) 54-72, esp. 60 f. for Polybius' knowledge of Th. See now A.M. Eckstein, *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius* (Berkeley, 1994) 60.

¹¹ A. Momigliano, 'The historians of the classical world and their audiences: some suggestions', *Sesto contributo* (Rome 1980) 361-76; R. Thomas, *Literacy and orality in ancient Greece* (Cambridge 1992) 123.

¹² For Jacoby's principle, and an acknowledgment that he often broke it, see Vorrede to *FGrH* ii.A at v; cf. *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* ed. H. Bloch (Leiden 1956) 16-64 at 60 n.114. Cp. P.A. Brunt, 'On historical fragments and epitomes', *CQ* xxx (1980) 477-94 = J.M. Alonso-Núñez (ed.) *Geschichtsbild und Geschichtsdanken im Altertum* (Darmstadt 1991) 334-62.

no.87; the question is, how much?¹³ In what follows, there is much subjectivity. But at least some relevant texts will have been aired.

Let us return to the specific problem of the reception of Thucydides.

I do not linger on the continuators of Thucydides, considered in that capacity only, *viz.* Cratippus, Theopompus, Xenophon in the *Hellenica*, the Oxyrhynchus Historian.¹⁴ Two, at least, were not slavish continuators. Thus the Oxyrhynchus historian seems to have overlapped with Thucydides, or to have covered some of the same ground by way of what narratologists call analepsis (flashback).¹⁵ As for Xenophon in the *Hellenica*, it says something about his attitude to Thucydides that he ‘continues’ him without a methodological introduction, but equally it says something that he does not *quite* continue him; there is a short gap. That is a mild distancing device.

I now glance at the evidence for specific knowledge of Thucydides in Xenophon. First, the *Hellenica*. The list of the places destroyed by Athens in the war, thoughts of which caused Athenian insomnia after Aegospotami, is perhaps derived from common knowledge, rather than from Thucydides. (*Hell.* ii 2.3. The places are Melos, Histiaea, Scione, Torone and Aegina). True, all feature in Thucydides, and the reference to the Melians as ‘colonists of the Spartans’, Μηλίους τε Λακεδαιμονίων ἀποίκους, echoes Thucydides (v 84.2). And the coverage Xenophon gives to Melos (whose conquest after siege is also mentioned in the relevant sentence), as contrasted with the other places which are merely a string of names, corresponds *in parvo* to the Thucydidean ratio between the elaborate Melian Dialogue and the briefly reported destruction of Scione etc. Nevertheless it would be rash to insist that Thucydides must be in Xenophon’s mind. Melos and Scione were bracketed as *the* great fifth-century Athenian outrages by Isocrates (iv 100, cp. Arr. *Anab.* i 9.5 with n. 29 below), and this hardly reflects Thucydides’ balance. There are other possible echoes of Thucydides, e.g. *Hell.* vi 2.9 recalls Th. i.36, advantages of Corcyra; *Hell.* iv 7.5 might (or might not) owe something to the athlete comparison at Th. iv 121.1; *Hell.* ii 4.17 may recall Th. ii 43, the Funeral Speech; and δοκῶν in Derkylidas’ introduction (*Hell.* iii 1.8) perhaps suggests Archidamus’ at Th. i 79.2.

Xenophon’s other writings naturally offer less; and I cannot here discuss the Pseudo-Xenophontic *Athenaion Politeia*, the *Old Oligarch*, a text normally thought to be earlier than Thucydides. The *Anabasis*¹⁶ offers one particularly intriguing text, from Xenophon’s speech

¹³ Posidonius: I. Kidd, *Posidonius vol. ii: the commentary* i (Cambridge 1988) 295: ‘There is still no control over the possible extent and fidelity of this use [sc. Diodorus’ use of Posidonius], nor has there been any recent study on Diodorus and Posidonius on the scale of Jane Hornblower for Hieronymus of Cardia, and there is still no alternative between printing the whole of Diodorus as Posidonius, or none of him apart from the sentence in [Diod. book] 34’. Cp. J. Malitz, *Die Historien des Posidonius* (Munich, 1983).

¹⁴ H. Bloch, ‘Studies in the historical literature of the fourth-century BC’, *Ath. Studies ... Ferguson, HSCP* supp. i (1940) 303-76 at 303-41. Cratippus disliked Th.’s speeches (*FGrH* 64 F1)—but evidently read them!

¹⁵ G. Schepens, *Anc. Soc.* xxiv (1993) 169-203 at 202 says Th.’s continuators are really his discontinuators. Oxyrhynchus Historian (*HO*): see the ref. to Pedaritus at ch. v line 40 Bartoletti-Chambers (Leipzig 1993). H.T. Wade-Gery ap. *HCT* v (1981) 84 ingeniously suggested that Pedaritos formed part of a disquisition by *HO* on the private empire-building of successive Spartan commanders. Note the explicit reference to Th., also at v line 40 of the Florentine fragment of *HO*, πε]ρὶ ἧς καὶ Θουκυδίδης εἶρηκε. This is remarkable as the only explicit reference to Th. in the surviving *HO* but as Andrewes observes (*HCT. loc. cit.*) it is ‘peculiarly frustrating that we cannot make out this reference’. (For U. Schindel’s guess at a supplement see Chambers’ apparatus). Cp. Luschnat 1267.

¹⁶ The *Old Oligarch* has many parallels to Th., see J. de Romilly, ‘Le Pseudo-Xénophon et Thucydide: étude sur quelques divergences de vues’, *RPh* xxxvi (1962) 225-41. She omits the most striking, *OO* i 8, cp. Th. iii 45.6 ἐλευθερος εἶναι καὶ ἀρχειν, cp. Th. iii 45.6 ἐλευθερίας ἢ ἄλλων ἀρχῆς. It is often held (see e.g. A. Momigliano, *Secondo contributo* 59) that Th., especially in his early chapters on sea-power, knew of and was responding to the *Old Oligarch*. Not plausible. I shall return elsewhere to the intertextual relationship between the two works.

The *Anabasis* of Xenophon does not feature in Luschnat. As J.K. Davies notes, *APF* xxix n.1, the inferior mss of *Anab.* vii 1.27 have 400 triremes. Davies also notes that Aeschines (ii 175) also has 300, or rather ‘not fewer than

to his troops at Byzantium (vii 1.27). This rhetorical statement of Athens' financial and naval resources in 431 seems loosely dependent on the Thucydidean Pericles' account of resources (ii 13; note esp. Xenophon's 300 triremes, cp. Th. ii 13.8).

But Xenophon's knowledge of Thucydides has never been seriously questioned. The greatest single debt is the arrangement by campaigning seasons in the more obviously Thucydidean of the two parts of the *Hellenica* (i 1.1-ii 3.10, after which there is a stylistic break). This chronological arrangement, the so-called Thucydidean διαίρεσις, has been discussed in relation to the identity of the Oxyrhynchus Historian,¹⁷ who used the same διαίρεσις; yet Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*On Thuc.* ix= Usener-Radermacher 336) says nobody used it after Thucydides. This is a puzzle: it ignores not only the Oxyrhynchus Historian (whom Dionysius might not have known) but also Xenophon (whom Dionysius surely knew) and Hieronymus of Cardia (below). We are not here concerned with the bearing of this on the identity of the Oxyrhynchus Historian (who, it has been said, cannot be Cratippus or Theopompus in view of Dionysius' statement). More relevant for our purposes is the impression given by Dionysius that historians after Thucydides turned their backs on him. But surely this was not entirely true. Dionysius evidently forgot Xenophon or for some reason failed to mention him when discussing διαίρεσις. So one famous back was turned, that of Xenophon; not to mention the Oxyrhynchus historian—and Hieronymus.¹⁸ The point about arrangement by campaigning seasons is important: historians who used it committed themselves to a military conception of history. Xenophon in the *Hellenica* did turn his back on Thucydides, but only after the 'stylistic break'. That does not mean there is no fighting after that point, but the work thereafter takes on a character of its own.¹⁹

We shall find, when we move away from διαίρεσις to other features of Thucydides' history, that here too, backs were not completely turned. The speeches of Thucydides are the hardest part of the work. They are however only one of *four* component elements of his work. The second is narrative proper. The third is material on method. The fourth is constituted by the disquisitions (e.g. on *stasis* at iii 82-3) and the other digressions (including the *Archaeology* and the *Sikelika*, i 1-20 and vi 2-5). Some of these disquisitions and digressions, perhaps because of their outré subject-matter and difficulties of vocabulary, evoked imitations in unexpected places. For instance we shall see that after Philistus' early and notable effort (Diod. xiv 70.4-

300'; so again (cp. above on the *Hellenica*) we must reckon with common knowledge, cf. *Ar.Ach.* 545.

C.T.H.R. Ehrhardt, 'Retreat in Xenophon and Thucydides', *AHB* viii (1994) 3 f. suggests Xenophon 'stylised his own narrative [of the 10,000's retreat] to some extent as a response to Thucydides'; but at 4 he wonders—heretically, from the composition point of view—whether Th. wrote his account of the Athenian retreat after news of the escape reached Greece.

¹⁷ Bloch (n. 14) 308-16; *contra*. G. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the historian* (Montreal 1991) 190 f.

¹⁸ For Hieronymus, J. Hornblower (n. 2) 101. Shrimpton (n. 17) notes that Bloch overlooked Xenophon, then tries to save Dionysius' credit by saying 'the fact that Thucydides spawned a few slavish imitations need not detain Dionysius and does nothing to undermine his main point: the style quickly died out'. But Shrimpton in his turn overlooks Hieronymus. Dionysius used Hieronymus (*FGH* 154 F 13, the Roman *archaiologia*) but said you could not read him right through (T12).

¹⁹ C.J. Tuplin, *The failings of empire: a reading of Xenophon Hellenica 2.3.11- 7.5.27*, *Historia Einzelschrift* lxxvi (1993), for *Hellenica* 'Part Two'. Xenophon surely wrote i 1.1-ii 3.10 before the rest; for the opposite idea, that he wrote this section last, having discovered Th. late in life, G. de Sanctis, *Studi di storia della storiografia greca* (Florence 1951) 127-61; P. Krentz, *Anc.W.* xix (1989) 15-18. See also W.P. Henry, *Greek historical writing* (Chicago 1967) esp. 46 (sceptical, on whether Xenophon had Th. in mind in his reference to Melos, but not allowing sufficiently for the verbal chime, see my text); also H. Breitenbach, *RE* ix A (1967) 1669-1680. (Breitenbach incidentally is not much interested in traces of Th. in *Hellenica* iii-vii, which he treats at 1680-1701, though at 1688 he notes the parallel Xen. *Hell.* vi.2.9/Th. i.36, see above, p. 50).

Some of the chronological indicators in the early, 'Thucydidean', part of Xenophon may be interpolated: Lewis *CAH* v² (1992) 8 and n. 25. See also J.-C. Riedinger, *Étude sur les Helléniques* (Paris, 1991) 97-121.

71.4), the most strikingly Thucydidean ‘plague passage’, before Procopius or perhaps Cassius Dio, is not in a historian, but in the Roman poet Lucretius. I return to this general issue in (II); and in any case we shall see that some other disquisitions, e.g. that on *stasis*, did find imitators. Here in section (I) I am concerned with the factual issue of the reception of the four components: speeches, narrative, digressions, statements on method.

Before Aeneas and the historians, the orators. On Isocrates’ relation to Thucydides, Luschnat is full. I disagree, however, on the supposed connexion between Isocrates (iv 50) and Thucydides’ Funeral Oration (ii 41.1) on Athenian *paideia*. Thucydides’ Pericles does not have culture or education in mind at all.²⁰ This is important. In the fifth century BC Athens was an imperial, in the hellenistic age it was a university, city. Fourth-century Athens—the Athens of Isocrates’ *Panegyric*—is transitional: it had an empire of sorts, but also a developing awareness of the cultural past. The difference is the difference between Thucydides and Isocrates. By the time of the orator-politician Lycurgus (330’s and 320’s) this introverted emphasis on *paideia* had gone further: Humphreys notes the paradox that Lycurgus’ attempts to return Athens to the age of Pericles actually look from the perspective of history like an attempt to prepare Athens for its hellenistic role.²¹ Lycurgus knew his Thucydides (see e.g. *Leoc.* 128 f. on the death of Pausanias the Regent). But except for the admiration for Spartan stability (with *Leoc.* 12 on *eunomia* cp. Thuc. i 18), Lycurgus’ horizon is not that of Thucydides, the historian *par excellence* of the foreign entanglements which Lycurgus made it his life’s business to avoid. (I return to Thucydides’ admiration for Sparta below).

From the foreign affairs perspective, Demosthenes may seem a more promising pupil of Thucydides, and some influence has since antiquity been detected.²² The justification of past Athenian (and Spartan) imperialistic excesses in the Third Philippic (ix 30) is remarkable: roughly, the line is, those offences were bad, but they were at least committed within the Greek family, not by outsiders. This is certainly a novel way to read such passages of Thucydides as the *Melian Dialogue*.

Different issues are raised by the Pseudo-Demosthenic Apollodorus, whom Trevett has now put on the fourth-century literary map as a considerable orator in his own right.²³ Apollodorus displays, in the speech *Against Neaera*, an interesting relationship to Thucydides. In his Plataean digression (lix 94-106) he both uses and departs from Thucydides. Whether or not Trevett is right (and I think he is) to detect an authoritative written source behind the departures,²⁴ the detailed awareness of Thucydides is certain.

I shall not itemize every historical *exemplum* in an orator which could be derived from Thucydides: not all are rewarding. Thus Aeschines could have got his references to Tolmides or the Sicilian Expedition (ii 75-6) from Thucydides—or from someone else, or from general

²⁰ Luschnat 1276-84, esp. 1277; see my comm. on Th. ii 41.1, also Habicht there cited (see now, for a more accessible reprint, C. Habicht, *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit* [Munich 1994] 230). Th. anyway has παιδευσις not παιδεα.

²¹ S.C. Humphreys, ‘Lycurgus of Butadae: an Athenian aristocrat’, J. Eadie and J. Ober (eds.) *The craft of the ancient historian: essays in honor of C.G. Starr* (Lanham MD 1985) 199-252 at 219.

²² Strebel 12 cites A. Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* i 289 (= i² Leipzig 1885, 320 f.). Schaefer is right (cf. my text) to claim an ‘inner relationship’ between Demosthenes and the Periclean period. For details (ancient judgments; particular stylistic comparisons), F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* iii² 1 (Leipzig 1893) 19 f., 87 f., 142 ff., 154. Lucian, *Adv. ind.* 4 says Demosthenes copied out Th. eight times.

²³ J. Trevett, *Apollodoros the son of Pasion* (Oxford 1992).

²⁴ J. Trevett, ‘History in [Demosthenes] 59’, *CQ* xl (1990) 407-20, esp. 416-7 on Daimachus of Plataea (*FGrH* 65), on whose relation to Th. see my ‘Thucydides and Boiotia’, *Proceedings of the 2nd Int. Congress of Boiotian Studies* (1992) (forthcoming). C. Carey, *Apollodoros against Neaira, [Demosthenes] 59* (Warminster 1992) 132-40 is sceptical about Trevett’s suggestion. But Th. i 132-3 does not tell the whole story; see *HSCP* xciv (1992) 176.

knowledge (cf. above p. 50; also below n. 65 for oratorical divergences from Thucydidean terminology for the war and its parts). Nor are all oratorical differences from Thucydides worth pursuing: it may be too charitable to see the fifth-century material in Andocides (iii) *On the Peace* as an informed dialogue with Thucydides. One instance in Lysias is worth stopping over, the allusion to Themistocles' wall-building against the wishes of the Spartans (xii 63). This is surely from Thucydides (i 90-2); note that it is from a readable and Herodotean digression and that the chronological context is close to the Persian Wars (for the significance of these points see II below).

* * *

My first non-oratorical author, Aeneas Tacticus, is hard to fit in to any genre and is best dealt with separately. He will however enable us to pass on smoothly to other signs of fourth-century awareness of Thucydides' *speeches*. For that is, in the context of the present discussion, the most remarkable thing about Aeneas: he knows the speeches of Thucydides, or rather he casually recycles part of one speech. That Aeneas drew on Thucydides' narrative for some of his material is not perhaps surprising, given the military content of much of his treatise. Thus Aeneas' chapter (ii) about Plataea reproduces facts in Thucydides (ii 2-6). Aeneas edited, by simplifying, paraphrasing, reducing and amplifying, what he found in Thucydides' narrative;²⁵ but the Thucydidean derivation is clear. Even more remarkable, as I have already implied, is the echo in Aeneas Tacticus (xxxviii 2) of a Thucydidean speech, that of Brasidas before the battle of Amphipolis (Thuc. v 9.8).²⁶ The resemblance was pounced on by Aeneas' first editor, the great Casaubon, in 1609, and it has never since been disputed. After Whitehead's splendid modern commentary on Aeneas, nobody (to anticipate a possible objection) can any longer regard Aeneas' book as just a military manual and thus too specialised to have implications beyond itself; it is a great deal more than just that. Not, agreed, a rhetorical treatise, but still a wide-ranging document about how to achieve and maintain civic *homonoia* or harmony, and about the ways (including the posting of suitable announcements) to keep up morale among troops and civilians alike. Aeneas was writing about 350 BC: he mentions (xxxi 24) the 'Lokrian maidens' tribute, discontinued in about 346 but still in being when he wrote.²⁷ That such an author, at such a date, casually reuses a Thucydidean speech, is relevant to the question, could the author of the *Rhetoric to Alexander* have known Thucydides' speeches?

Aeneas is no narrow or philistine soldier, but he is no Aristotelian either. I move to an obviously 'Aristotelian' historian, in the strict sense of 'historian', Callisthenes (*FGrH* 124). Callisthenes was Aristotle's relative, and they collaborated in the compilation of a list of Pythian victors²⁸. Nobody who described the Pamphylian sea parting to do obeisance to Alexander

²⁵ D. Whitehead, *Aineias the Tactician* (Oxford 1990) 102. Simplification: L.W. Hunter and S.A. Handford, *Aeneas on siegecraft* (Oxford 1927), 107; also lxxxi and n. 1 (other Thucydidean reminiscences). The phrases there quoted look like echoes of speeches not narrative.

²⁶ Aen. Tact. xxviii 2: τὸ γὰρ ἐπὶν μάλλον οἱ πολέμιοι φοβοῦνται τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος καὶ παρόντος ἤδη. ('An enemy is more fearful of a force which *may* come to attack them [*sic*] than of one which is already there', tr. Whitehead). Cp. Thuc. v 9.8: ἐλπὶς γὰρ μάλιστα αὐτοῦς οὕτω φοβηθῆναι· τὸ γὰρ ἐπὶν ὕστερον δεινότερον τοῖς πολεμίοις τοῦ παρόντος καὶ μαχομένου ('This is the way to terrify them; for reinforcements are always more formidable to an enemy than the troops with which he is already engaged', tr. Jowett). Note again the slight simplification.

²⁷ Whitehead (n. 25) 188 f.

²⁸ Tod no. 187 with W. Spoerri, 'Epigraphie et littérature: à propos de la liste des Pythioniques de Delphes' in D. Knoepfler, *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque* (Neuchâtel 1988) 111-40.

(F31) could be described as exactly a thorough-going Thucydidean.²⁹ I shall however suggest below that Callisthenes imitated Thucydides on *stasis* but if so it was at two removes, *via* Ephorus who in turn comes *via* Diodorus. Of attested fragments of Callisthenes, one in particular (F44) has a bearing on our subject. This fragment³⁰ was plausibly regarded by Jacoby as a development of Thucydides' methodological demand (i 22), and others (Strebel, Pearson, Lendle) agree.³¹ Pearson went further: 'we may suspect that Callisthenes not only admired the work of Thucydides but that he discussed with Aristotle some of the literary and moral issues which it raised'.³² Pearson also wished to see in fragment 8 (from Callisthenes' *Hellenica*; the account of the Spartan speech at Athens in 370/69, stressing past *Athenian* services to Sparta) a reminiscence of Pericles in Thucydides (ii 40.4): the Athenians make friends by conferring rather than receiving favours. This is, perhaps, too much of a commonplace for the parallel to be cogent.³³ But it is surely reasonable to postulate engagement with Thucydidean speeches, and with Thucydidean principles of speech-writing, among Aristotelians active as both historians and rhetoricians (for Callisthenes' facility with rhetoric see *inter alia* F2, the encomium on Hermias). The Peripatetic Praxiphanes of Mytilene also handled the relation between poetry and history in dialogue form, with special attention to Thucydides. And there is other Peripatetic evidence.³⁴

²⁹ The fair comparison is, however, with the *Hellenica* rather than with the 'Deeds of Alexander'. The former seems to have been less aggressively anti-Theban than Xenophon's *Hellenica*: *CAH* vi² (1994) 10 f. Beyond that, characterization is precarious. It gave space to natural portents like earthquakes (FF 19-22), but *cf.* Th. i 23.2-3; iii 87.4; iii 116, etc. As for the 'Deeds of Alexander', (i) it lay behind the other main accounts to be found in the Alexander-historians, including Ptolemy, until it ran out with the disgrace and death of its author; (ii) Polybius' criticisms of Callisthenes as military historian (xii 17-22) recoil on Polybius, see Walbank, *HCP* ii 364. These two points overlap: P.A. Brunt in the Loeb, *Arrian* i (London 1976) 462 notes 'if we believe that Polybius demonstrates that C[allisthenes] had no understanding of war, we must on the same reasoning convict A[ristobulus] and Pt[olemy]'. On Clitarchus and the vulgate tradition see below p. 64. Generally, assessing the debt of the Alexander-historians to Th. is tricky: what is Arrian himself, what is from Ptolemy/Aristobulus and what from Callisthenes? Th. viii 46.3, κοινωνοῦς ... τῆς ἀρχῆς is surely echoed at Arr. *Anab.* vii 11.9, but is the echoer Arrian or a source? (Not Callisthenes, at this late point). Christian Habicht reminds me of the classical Greek history at *Anab.* i 9; this looks like Arrian's own (ie. not taken from an Alexander-historian), but where did he get his material? Th. and Xenophon, Bosworth concludes (see his comm). The reference to Melos and Scione at ¶ 5 (see p. 50 above) might suggest Isocrates, *cp.* Ael. Arist. i 302 ff.; but as Bosworth notes, Arrian's odd slip, in making Scione (as well as Melos) an island, recalls Th. iv 120.3.

³⁰ The fragment (*FGrHist* 124 F44) is from Athenaeus *Mechanicus*: ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἱστοριογράφος Καλλισθένης φησί· δεῖ τὸν γράφειν τι πειρώμενον μὴ ἀστοχεῖν τοῦ προσώπου, ἀλλ' οἰκειῶς αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τοὺς λόγους θεῖναι. 'For the historian Callisthenes says 'in attempting to write anything, one must not prove false to the character, but make the speeches fit both the speaker and the situation'. (Tr. L. Pearson, *Lost histories of Alexander the Great* (New York 1960) 31.

³¹ Jacoby comm.; L. Pearson *l.c.* (n. 30); Strebel 21 f.; O. Lendle, *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung von Hekataios bis Zosimos* (Darmstadt 1992) 159 f.

³² Pearson, *ibid.* citing Ar. *Poet.* 1450b 5-12. Note however K.S. Sacks, 'Rhetoric and speeches in Hellenistic historiography', *Athenaeum* lxiv (1986) 383-95 at 384 with n. 10: Callisthenes may not have been thinking just of history-writing, but of the criteria for any kind of oratory. On Callisthenes F44 see also C.W. Fornara, *The nature of history in ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley 1983), 145 f.

³³ See M. Whitlock Blundell, *Helping friends and harming enemies: a study in Sophocles and Greek ethics* (Cambridge 1989) 35, and other refs. in my comm. (n. 3).

³⁴ F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar* ix²: Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes (Basel 1969) F18; Strebel 20; A. Momigliano, *The classical foundations of modern historiography* (Berkeley 1990) 45, cp.64. The Praxiphanes fragment (from Marcellinus) mentioned Th. in connection with King Archelaus of Macedon. The retention of 'Archelaus' is defended by Momigliano, *The development of Greek biography* (Cambridge 1971) 66 f. Praxiphanes was a pupil of Aristotle's pupil Theophrastus, and the latter was certainly interested in Th. Cicero, *Orator* 39. Other Peripatetic evidence: Cic. *Brutus* 46-8, of explicitly Aristotelian origin (not necessarily Aristotle himself, but perhaps a member of the school); this includes at ¶ 47 an inaccurate citation of Th. viii 68 on the oratory of Antiphon. See A.E. Douglas' commentary (Oxford 1966) *ad. loc.*, also intro. xlvi-xlvii on the Aristotelian Συναγωγή τεχνῶν (Cicero's source in the *Brutus*); Luschnat 1287.

But what of the scholar, Aristotle himself? His attitude to history in general, and to Thucydides in particular, *has* received some attention.³⁵ The most obvious Thucydidean debtor among the works of Aristotle is the *Athenaion Politeia* (I leave aside the question of Aristotle's own authorship).³⁶ Thucydides was an obvious source for the events of 411 BC, and for other items also, and that was that. But what of the *Politics*? As always we must proceed obliquely. Silent polemic, or unflagged disagreement (n. 47) is one indicator. Thus Aristotle's explanation of the Mytilenean Revolt as prompted by a quarrel about heiresses (*Pol.* 1304a 4 ff., contrast Th. iii 2.3) is informative about the attitudes both of Thucydides (the reticence about women is characteristic) and of Aristotle, who is surely here engaged in argument with Thucydides over priorities if not over facts (there is no formal contradiction). Other indications of knowledge are more straightforward. I single out one passage in particular, because it shows Aristotle to be familiar with a Thucydidean speech, the Thebans' at Plataea in Thucydides book 3; the Thebans artfully contrast family cliques, *δυναστεῖαι*, and more open and equitable forms of government (iii 62.5). W.L. Newman remarked that Aristotle (1292b7 and 1293a25 ff.) 'probably had before him' the Thucydides passage:³⁷ surely plausible. More generally, Aristotle's conception of the development of constitutions (*Politics* 1293 certainly envisages the transition of one oligarchic form to another) goes back ultimately to the simple Thucydidean progression (i 13.1): *basileiai*, hereditary aristocracies, based on stated privileges, are succeeded by tyrannies.³⁸ Herodotus' constitutional debate in book iii (80-82) also has the idea of development and decline, notably from extreme democracy to tyranny, as indeed does Solon (F9 West 3-4). But it is Thucydides who first writes like a systematizing political scientist.

Aristotle, I said, 'ultimately' goes back to Thucydides. Implied by that 'ultimately' is the intervening figure of Plato, and it may be more correct to apply to Plato what I said about Aristotelian ideas about constitutional change and their debt to Thucydides.

The relation between Thucydides and Plato continues to exercise moral philosophers, for whom it is of no particular interest whether Plato was consciously engaged in argument with Thucydides. The most important and striking parallels between Plato and Thucydides are between *Republic* viii and the Corcyran *stasis*.³⁹ Here is the answer to our question, who imitated Thucydides on *stasis*? The answer is to be found in Plato and in Aristotle's *Politics* (which also resembles Thucydides on *stasis*),⁴⁰ rather than in the historians. Among the latter,

³⁵ Luschnat 1284-8; R. Weil, *Aristote et l'histoire: essai sur la 'Politique'* (Paris 1960).

³⁶ Rhodes, *CAAP* 15-30; G.E.M. de Ste Croix, 'Aristotle on history and poetry (*Poetics* 9, 1451a36-b11)', in B. Levick (ed.), *The ancient historian and his materials: essays in honour of C.E. Stevens on his seventieth birthday* (Farnborough 1975) 45-58 = A. Rorty (ed.) *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics* (Princeton 1992) 23-32, at 56 n. 34 of the original publication.

³⁷ W.L. Newman, *The Politics of Aristotle* iv (Oxford 1902) 183; on *δυναστεῖα* see O. Murray, *JRS* lv (1965) 180. For another possible near-quotation of Th. in the *Politics* see L. Kallet-Marx, *Money, expense and naval power in Thucydides' History 1-5.24* (Berkeley 1993) 81: *Pol.* 1271 b10 on Spartan finance = Th. i.80.4 (Archidamus), a *speech* n.b.

³⁸ See my comm. on Th. iii 62.5 and i 13.1 and *Thucydides* (n. 3) 126 f.

³⁹ R.B. Rutherford, *The Art of Plato* (London, 1995) 66-8 supersedes all previous discussions, e.g. S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* 121 on Thuc. iii 82-3 and Plato *Rep.* 560-1. Gomme, 'Thucydides and fourth-century political thought', *More essays* (n. 1) 122-138, minimizes the parallels between Plato and Th. For the Platonic *Menexenus*, discussed by Gomme, see L.J. Coventry, 'Philosophy and rhetoric in the *Menexenus*', *JHS* cix (1989) 1-15, esp. 3 n. 8 on the whole tradition of the *epitaphios*, on which see N. Loraux, *The invention of Athens* (tr. A. Sheridan, Cambridge MA 1986). Fourth-century examples differ from the Thucydidean Funeral Speech as much as they resemble it.

On the relation between Plato and Th. see B. Williams, *Shame and necessity* (Berkeley 1993), 162-4: he praises Th. because, unlike Plato, his psychology is 'not at the service of his ethical beliefs', and he is 'less committed to a distinctive ethical outlook than Plato', but does not consider whether Plato's was aiming specifically at Th.

⁴⁰ A. Lintott, 'Aristotle on Democracy', *CQ* xlii (1992) 114-28 at 126 compares Th. iii 82 with Ar. *Pol.* 1296b.

Diodorus in two passages comes closest. The first (xiii 48, from Ephorus in the first instance, but ultimately from some unknown source) relates a recrudescence of *stasis* at Corcyra itself under the year 410, in obviously Thucydidean manner. The second (xv 57.3-8) is even more interesting. It, too, derives from Ephorus but here the ultimate source is within conjecture: perhaps Callisthenes.⁴¹ The passage describes the *σκυταλισμός* or ‘crucifixion’ at Argos after the battle of Leuctra (371 BC). Note especially the introductory claim (57.3) that this *stasis* was accompanied by the *greatest* slaughter ever recorded in Greece, a very Thucydidean-looking superlative. The whole excursus may have looked more leisurely and Thucydidean in the Ephoran or Callisthenean original. It faintly reflects the horror of Thucydides’ account, and I refer not only to the main account in book iii but to what is surely the most repulsive section of narrative in all Thucydides, the *final* phase (iv 47-8) of Corcyran *stasis*.

Finally, Plato and Thucydides, admirers of Sparta both, may owe a shared debt to the historical Socrates, who on the evidence of the *Crito* was the first intellectual laconizer.⁴²

* * *

I return to historians proper. I have already looked at the definite fragments of Callisthenes, because of his Aristotelian connections; and I later slipped in the notion that there was in Ephorus, and so perhaps in Callisthenes, material reminiscent of Thucydides in one of his moods.

Philistus of Syracuse was an early supporter of Dionysius I, and a genuine believer in tyranny as a form of rule (*FGrH* 556 T5d). Noting this, Lewis says ‘a historian of this character will have found much to interest him in the hard world of Thucydides, and in fact it is clear that he was the most determined imitator of Thucydides in antiquity’.⁴³ There is confident ancient testimony about his imitation of Thucydides (T 15-17, from Dionysius, Quintilian, Hermogenes, Cicero).⁴⁴ Even without such testimonia the relation is unmissable: Philistus’ plague passage (Diod. xiv 70 f., see above) is a close piece of virtuoso imitation.

The big lost historians active in the fourth century before Alexander were Callisthenes (whom we have looked at), Theopompus, Ephorus. The last two were both supposedly pupils of Isocrates (for whom see above). Theopompus was a continuator of Thucydides, and as a Chian would, it has been suggested, have read Thucydides Book Eight closely, and noted especially the judgment on Chian prudence and prosperity (viii 24).⁴⁵ There is solid evidence for knowledge of Thucydides: Theopompus tried to improve on a formulation in the Funeral Oration.⁴⁶ This specific evidence for knowledge increases the likelihood that Theopompus

⁴¹ *CAH* vi² (1994) 10.

⁴² *Thucydides* 124-6; 162 f. on Plato, *Crito* 42e.

⁴³ Lewis, *CAH* vi² (1994) 123, cf. 144 n. 103 (plague).

⁴⁴ Luschnat 1288-91; R.Zoepffel, *Untersuchungen zum Geschichtswerk des Philistos von Syrakus* (Diss. Freiburg i.Br., 1965). On the ?Philistan papyrus *FGrH* 577 no. 2 and Th., A.B. Bosworth, ‘Athens’ first intervention in Sicily: Thucydides and the Sicilian tradition’, *CQ* xlii (1992) 46-55.

⁴⁵ Shrimpton (n.17) 38 f.

⁴⁶ *FGrH* 115 F395 (from Theon), with which cf. Th. ii 45.1. See Jacoby’s comm. and R. Lane Fox, ‘Theopompus of Chios and the Greek world 411-322 BC’, in J. Boardman and C.E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.) *Chios: a conference at the Homereion in Chios 1984* (Oxford 1986) 105-20 at 107; Shrimpton (n. 17) 114.

Luschnat 1271 suggests Theopompus’ description of Lysander (*FGrH* 115 F 20) as ‘superior to [the temptations of] all pleasures’, ἡδονῶν ἀπασῶν κρείττων, may echo Th. ii 60.5 where Pericles says he is ‘superior to [the temptations of] money’, χρημάτων κρείττων. But the phrase was common; see LSJ⁹ s.v. κρείττων III, and, for ἡδονῶν κρείττων in particular, D/K 68 Demokritos B 214.

Book Ten ‘On the Demagogues’ is part of an *argument* with Thucydides⁴⁷ (although Hellanicus no doubt also provided much for Theopompus to disagree with; see below). But the historical text on which Theopompus worked more comprehensively was Herodotus (*FGrH* 115 FF 1-4).⁴⁸ Theopompus (F 381) said he would include myths in his history; this is usually seen as a knock at Thucydides.⁴⁹

Jacoby⁵⁰ says the two most important things about Ephorus: he was a compiler; and he had enormous influence in antiquity (I return to this in II). Because of Jacoby’s exclusion principle (n. 12), a study of the Ephorus fragments collected by him (*FGrH* 70) may conceal a basic fact: Ephorus depended extensively on Thucydides for the fifth century BC. Modern scholarship, always on the alert for controls on Thucydides, has tended to interest itself in the many *divergences* from Thucydides to be found in Diodorus/Ephorus. For our purpose the general factual dependence is the crucial point: it is large-scale, and it has never been in doubt.⁵¹ It is a commonplace that Ephorus organised his material differently from Thucydides, and intruded much explicit moralising of a fundamentally non-Thucydidean sort; this is one of the things which commended him to Diodorus. (Others were his absence of Theopompan rancour—i.e. he liked Ephorus’ ‘sound’ reputation; and his vast chronological coverage. Use of Ephorus saved Diodorus many a choice). But to treat the reception of Thucydides without treating Ephorus is absurd. The success of Ephorus’ derivative but readable work no doubt had the effect, as such works often did in antiquity, of helping to push the original into a siding. But insofar as Ephorus on the classical period went on being read in antiquity, it is important to remember that so, in a way, did Thucydides too.

Another medium in which Thucydides, or some of him, survived, was *via* the Atthidographers. (We have mentioned one parochial history of Athens already, the *Athenaion Politeia*). The first of the Atthidographers proper was Hellanicus, but strictly we have to speak of his reception by Thucydides, rather than the other way round (Thuc. i 97). Further relations are speculative, but Jacoby was right⁵² that it was remarkable for Hellanicus to take Athens as his theme at a time when other East Greeks were fawning on Lysander. This aligns him with Thucydides, whatever their pedantic differences. One point about Hellanicus: wherever we are tempted to think a post-Thucydidean author ‘must be’ correcting Thucydides, e.g. on Pentekontaetia details, we should recall the possibility that some lost assertion of Hellanicus, rather than a surviving one of Thucydides, was the real target.

There is enough material in Thucydides to justify Pearson in devoting a chapter (2) of his *Local historians of Attica*⁵³ to ‘Thucydides’ place in the tradition’. This material is not the most important element in Thucydides; it tends to feature in antiquarian digressions (e.g. i 126, ii 15-16 and iii 104); but those digressions are there, and they are valuable evidence on Athenian antiquities, particularly religious.⁵⁴ They were not however all that Atthidographers used Thucydides for. An example: Androtion (*FGrH* 324 F 42) said the Athenians ostracised

⁴⁷ W.R. Connor, *Theopompus and fifth-century Athens* (Washington DC 1968) 29 for ‘willingness to disagree with Thucydides’ as one of Theopompus’ characteristics, and 106, 119-20 for Theopompus’ (surely deliberate) divergencies from Th.

⁴⁸ M.R. Christ, ‘Theopompus and Herodotus: a re-assessment’, *CQ* xliii (1993) 47-52.

⁴⁹ Shrimpton (n. 17) 64.

⁵⁰ *FGrH* 70, introduction at 30 and 32.

⁵¹ Ed. Schwartz, *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber* (Leipzig 1959) 21 f.; Jacoby (n.49) 31; G. Barber, *The historian Ephorus* (Cambridge 1935) 98.

⁵² *FGrH* 323a, introduction at 20.

⁵³ (Philadelphia 1942). Luschnat 1294 disposes of the ‘un-Thucydidean’ Atthidographers too summarily.

⁵⁴ Pearson, *Local historians* 37.

Hyperbolus for his worthlessness, φαυλότης. Thucydides (viii 73) said Hyperbolus was ostracised for his πονηρία; the nouns hardly differ in meaning and Androtion *may* have had Thucydides in mind. Much has been written on the problem of how many years Hyperbolus was ostracised for and when; very little, by contrast, has been said on the reception aspect of the argument.⁵⁵ (Cp. n. 47 for Theopompus). Theopompus' disagreement from Thucydides, and Androtion's near-quotation from him, alike testify to the persistence of Thucydides' text.

Philochorus' dependence on Thucydides is likely; Jacoby collects a long list of the relevant fragments,⁵⁶ while conceding that Philochorus' knowledge of Thucydides came *via* Androtion (see n. 55 for one example) and insisting that Philochorus 'used Thucydides extensively without sacrificing his independence from him'.⁵⁷ For Jacoby, Philochorus was the first scholar among the Atthidographers,⁵⁸ while for Pearson, 'in their bald presentation of the facts, the fragments [of Philochorus] recall the apparent impartiality of Thucydides'.⁵⁹

The Atthidographers have brought us up against Thucydides' digressions. In this respect the Atthidographers resemble Plato and Aristotle, who were interested in Thucydidean digressions of a different sort.

Another kind of digression was represented by Thucydides' *Sikelika* (vi 2-5). This was surely read carefully by Timaeus of Tauromenium, the first great historian of the West. That Timaeus concerned himself with Thucydides personally is explicitly attested by two fragments (*FGrH* 566 FF 135-6, both from Marcellinus); they concern Thucydides' place of exile and death (Italy, according to Timaeus. Not probable). And Timaeus disagreed with Thucydides' Sicilian Expedition narrative on points of detail (e.g. F 101). Nor should Hermocrates at Gela (n. 1) be forgotten. Whatever the implications of this problem for Polybian reception of Thucydides, it is possible that Timaeus' different handling of Hermocrates' speech was offered as silent polemic against Thucydides. (Hardly as explicit polemic, in which case Polybius' silence on the Thucydidean version of this speech would be even odder). One of Timaeus' contributions, it has been said, was to provide or invent the speeches on the Syracusan side which Thucydides lacked. We are told that Timaeus set out to rival Thucydides (T18, from Plutarch *Nicias* i). This sort of testimonium is, however, hard to evaluate, and the same as we shall see is true of Photius' statement that Agatharchides imitated Thucydides. The problem about words like *zelosis* 'imitation', is in part one of attribution: do these testimonia reflect something actually said by Timaeus (or Agatharchides) or are they Plutarch's (or Photius') way of making a literary point? The emphatic and widely shared view that Philistus imitated Thucydides surely rests on something solid (elastic though the ancient notion of *zelosis* is); but the testimonia about Timaeus and Agatharchides are isolated and ambiguous.⁶⁰

We come, not quite last but certainly not least, to Hieronymus of Cardia (*FGrH* 154). Explicitly 'Thucydidean' testimonia and fragments are lacking, but we have learned by now not to give up just because Hieronymus fails the 'IBYCUS test'. One point of resemblance to

⁵⁵ P. Harding, *Androtion and the Atthis* (Oxford 1993) 161 directs the reader to Jacoby's comment that on Hyperbolus, Androtion and Philochorus [*FGrH* 328 F30] 'judged like Thucydides' (*FGrH* 324 F42 comm.). The relation of F8 (Phormio) to Th. iii 7 remains elusive. F43 (number of συγγραφεῖς in 411) corrects Th. viii 67.1.

⁵⁶ *FGrH* 328 Introduction 230 f. and (giving the references) n. 80. Jacoby refers to his commentary on FF 8-10, 34, 38, 39, 94, 117, 118, 121, 128 ff.

⁵⁷ Jacoby *ibid.* 230.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 227. See also below p. 61.

⁵⁹ Pearson, *Local historians* 135.

⁶⁰ For Timaeus as supplying speeches not given by Th. see Jacoby on *FGrH* 566 FF 99-102. On the width and freedom of the ancient concept of *zelosis*, imitation, P.J. Parsons in A.W. Bulloch et al. (eds.) *Images and ideologies: self-definition in the Hellenistic world* (Berkeley 1993) 162.

Thucydides has already been mentioned (p. 51), the likely division of the narrative by campaigning seasons. There are others: the absence of gods as causal factors (chance, *tyche*, plays a role but it is circumscribed); the search for deeper causes for e.g. the Lamian War; the obsessive interest in the unity (τὰ ὅλα) of Alexander's empire (cp. Thucydides on ἀρχή); the preference for the lowest and most believable of competing statistics; last and most subjective, the unmistakably high quality of the narrative as it has come down through the relevant books (xviii-xx) of Diodotus.⁶¹ Hieronymus, not Xenophon, was Thucydides' real successor.

I postpone Phylarchus (*FGrH* 81); see above p. 48 and below p. 62.

Polybius' awareness of Thucydides is problematic. I discuss it, and Polybius' possible knowledge of Hieronymus, elsewhere (n. 10). I conclude that on the one hand Polybius' three-tier analysis of causation (iii 6) looks like an attempt to refine Thucydides' two-tier version (i 23); and there are other Polybian echoes of Thucydides on methodology. On the other hand—and this was the oddity which prompted Gomme's remark with which this article began—there is the apparent implication (n. 1) that Polybius was ignorant of Hermocrates' speech at Gela, reported by Thucydides (some scholars have detected an echo of, precisely, Hermocrates at Gela in Agelaus' warning at Naupactus, *Pol.* v 103. Not necessary, see Walbank's comm.). Polybius may have had better recall of the methodological chapters of Thucydides, especially those early in Book One, than of routine Thucydidean narrative and particular speeches. In this he is perhaps unlike Callisthenes and other Aristotelians, who *were* interested in Thucydides' speeches and in his principles in composing them. In any case it did not for whatever reason occur to Polybius that Thucydides was a stick with which to beat Timaeus. A final and obvious warning: Polybius is not fragmentary like Hieronymus or Agatharchides, but nor is he complete either, in the sense that Herodotus or Thucydides were complete. A papyrus find tomorrow might disclose Polybius in explicit dialogue with the dead Thucydides, and we should all look appropriately foolish.

Then there is Agatharchides of Cnidus, another second-century BC historian of stature, but one who survives in fragmentary form (*FGrH* 86). He is a bridge between the figures just mentioned (the historian Polybius on the one hand and the Peripatetics on the other) because he too was a 'Peripatetic'.⁶² And he was supposedly an imitator of Thucydides (T2, from Photius). But for the difficulties of such evidence see above on Timaeus.

Finally, Polybius' continuator Posidonius (above pp. 49-50). Specific Thucydidean influence has been detected in Posidonius' introduction to the Sicilian slave war (*FGrH* 87 F108); and his more general interest in detailed 'recording as well as explaining' might, if we had more of him, recall Thucydides.⁶³

This nearly completes my review of the evidence. But there is one Thucydidean digression which has not yet featured much, the *Archaeology*. (See however above on Aristotle's possible awareness of Th. i 13). The *Archaeology* did continue to be read—among the antiquarians. Thus a scholion of Aristarchus on Homer's *Odyssey* (iii 71) rebukes Thucydides for saying (i 5.2) that

⁶¹ J. Hornblower (n. 2), concluding (235) that the dominant influence on Hieronymus ultimately must have been Th.: 'in his account of *aitiai* and his analysis of the struggle for total power Hieronymus shows his desire to be a political historian'.

⁶² P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* ii (Oxford 1972) 773 n. 163; 786 n. 217.

⁶³ Slave war reminiscent of Thucydides: K. Reinhardt, 'Poseidonios von Apameia', *RE* xxii 1 (1953) 528-826 at 633 (but note the rather different picture in G.P. Verbrughe, 'Narrative pattern in Posidonius' history', *Historia* xxiv (1975) 189-204, speaking of 'episodic adventure stories'). Detailed recording as well as explaining: I. Kidd, 'Posidonius as Philosopher-historian' in M. Griffin and J. Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia togata: essays on philosophy and Roman society* (Oxford 1989) 38-50 at 50.

piracy was not reprehensible in Homeric times.⁶⁴

I repeat, I do not think that Thucydides was, in the period I have covered, as influential or popular as was Herodotus. But I believe I have adduced enough evidence for knowledge of Thucydides, on the part of writers engaged with rhetoric, history, or both, to make it plausible to suppose that the authors of fourth-century rhetorical handbooks could have read him. Aeneas Tacticus is relevant as showing casual knowledge by a writer aiming at a fairly catholic readership; Callisthenes as showing Peripatetic interest.

II

Bigger questions loom behind these testimonia and fragments. What did fourth-century and hellenistic Greeks think about Thucydides and the period he described, above all the Peloponnesian War itself and its various phases?⁶⁵ Why did he, and it, and they, not feature more prominently in what survives (n.b. the qualification) of the historiography of the next few centuries? Why does he appeal to the authors who do use him?

⁶⁴ Strebel 24. The Aristarchus scholion is in Dindorf's ed. See S. West, in A. Heubeck, S. West, J.B. Hainsworth, *Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* i (Oxford 1988) 164 f. Strebel 24 gives other instances, adding that Callimachus in his *Pinakes* will have known Th. Cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of classical scholarship from the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic age* (Oxford 1968) 225: 'it could not be very surprising if Aristarchus had also written the first commentary on Thucydides'; cp. Luschnat 1312 f.

⁶⁵ For what past Greek history and earlier Greek historians meant to Polybius, F.G.B. Millar, 'Polybius between Greece and Rome', in J.T.A. Koumoulides (ed.), *Greek connections: essays on culture and diplomacy* (South Bend 1987) 1-18.

The terminology used, after Th.'s own time, for the phases of the Peloponnesian War, and the war itself, is relevant; on this topic there is still something to be said, for the purposes of the present paper, despite de Ste Croix, *OPW* 294 f., a useful collection of texts from Th. and later writers. Th. does not seem to have affected nomenclature until after the fourth century, i.e. after the fading of family memories about what, after all, were real and traumatic events as well as a mere subject for a historian. 'Archidamian War' is first attested in a lost speech of Lysias, Harpocration s.v. 'Ἀρχιδάμειος πόλεμος but Thucydides had called it the 'First' or 'Ten Years' War: v 20.3; 25.1; 26.3. See Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* iii 854 n.1. The expedition to Sicily is called just that by Isaeus (vi 14), hardly a technical expression or echo of Thuc. ii 65.11. As for the final phase, for Thucydides (v 26.3, with his mind very much on the whole 27 years) it was just 'the war that followed [flowed out of [the uneasy peace]], cp. also (with de Ste Croix 295) iv 81.2; though there is Thucydidean authority of a sort (viii 11.3) for the modern 'Ionian War'. But in the fourth century it was the 'Decelean War', see e.g. Isoc. xiv 31 and viii 37. Schepens (n. 16) 194 and n. 75 argues that Isoc. got the expression from *HO/Cratippus*, partly on the grounds that (he claims) no fourth-century literary source other than Isocrates uses it. Not true; see Dem. lvii 18. The expression may have been in common circulation in Athens, and reflect the real-life impact of the Decelean occupation (which of course Th. described at e.g. vii 28, note vii 27.2 for 'the war from Decelea').

The whole 27-year war was, for Th., 'the war of the Peloponnesians and Athenians' (i 1.1), or 'the war against the Peloponnesians/Athenians' depending on viewpoint (de Ste Croix 294); he does not refer to the 'Peloponnesian War' though at e.g. v 28.2 we have ὁ Ἀττικὸς πόλεμος. The fourth-century orators naturally had a more fragmented view, cp. e.g. Isaeus v 42 for a reference to somebody who had fought in 429 at Spartolos (for which see Th. ii 79) and de Ste Croix 295 for oratorical refs. in e.g. Andocides to the phases of the war as if they were separate wars. The war had to recede some considerable way into the past, before the long Thucydidean perspective could be recovered. The first demonstrable use of Πελοποννησιακὸς πόλεμος 'Peloponnesian War'—an expression not in Thucydides, but equally one which I would say betrays his influence—is in Diodorus' source, see Diod. xii 37.2, 74.6 and 75.1; xiii 107.5. But what is the source? The first and last of the four passages are from the (hellenistic) chronographic source, on which see n. 73; the second and third (xii 74.5 and 75.1) look at first blush like Ephorus recycling Th., and it would be interesting if Ephorus already thought in terms of the 'Peloponnesian War'. But note (a) that these two passages actually and sloppily refer to what was really the Ten Years or Archidamian War and (b) Diodorus' language here may be contaminated by the chronographic material in the vicinity, i.e. we cannot securely push 'Peloponnesian War' back to Ephorus and the mid fourth century rather than to the third or whenever the chronographer was working.

By the time of Strabo, Th. does I think lie behind the subdivision of the war, which was now a matter of purely academic study (cp. Thucydides' own use, in the *Archaeology*, of 'The Catalogue of Ships' or 'The Handing Down of the Sceptre' for parts of the *Iliad*). Thus Strabo not only speaks of the 'Decelean War', 9.396, but subdivides the Archidamian War, see 13.600 for 'the Pachetian part of the Peloponnesian war', τῷ Παχητῶ, i.e. Th. iii 1-50, the Mytilene revolt. This looks like a donnish allusion to Th. (though others than Th. wrote about the Peloponnesian War—and about Paches, Plut. *Nik.* vi and *Arist.* xxvi 5).

But first I wish to pick out the kind of Thucydidean item which did and did not have fourth-century and hellenistic mileage.

The fate of Plataea, treated by Thucydides in narrative and speeches recurs with noticeable frequency (Aeneas Tacticus, Apollodorus, Aristotle—obliquely—in the *Politics*, and we can add Isocrates xiv). Why? A prosaic and not ridiculous answer might be to point to the number of Plataean refugees at Athens: if you wanted to find a Plataean in early fourth-century Athens you went to the fresh cheese market on the last day of the month (Lys. xxiii 6). There were simply a lot of Plataeans in Athens making a lot of noise about their monstrous treatment. But this will not quite do (for one thing Aeneas is not an Athenian). There is surely a deeper reason for the interest in Plataea, namely its quite exceptional prominence in the Persian Wars tradition, a prominence which seems actually to have increased as the classical period melted into the hellenistic.⁶⁶ More generally, the elucidation of the mid fourth-century absorption with the Persian Wars, and of the faking of documents to ‘verify’ the importance of those wars, is one of the outstanding achievements of modern scholarly work on ancient Greece or rather Athens; the discovery of the ‘Troezen Decree’ in 1959 gave the stimulus.⁶⁷ And here is one clue to the problem of Thucydides’ relative unpopularity which we shall shortly address: Thucydides (and his speakers) ostentatiously kept the Persian War theme, so crucial an element in the ‘invention of Athens’, out of sight.⁶⁸ This cannot have done anything for Thucydides’ appeal in an age which was growing progressively more not less interested in myth-making about the Persian Wars. Insofar as Thucydides’ handling of Plataea was an exception to his austere reluctance to expand conventionally, ἀρχαιολογεῖν on this particular topic (note esp. iii 58.4-5), it was natural that Thucydides on Plataea should have continued to attract interest.

I turn now to the digressions. The *Archaeology* was perhaps drawn on by Plato and Aristotle for its brief account of constitutional progression; otherwise it was quarried by antiquarians such as Homeric scholiasts. Other digressions like that on Cylon or the Attic synoecism (i 126; ii 15-16) had their uses for the Atthidographers. The novelistic story of Pausanias the Regent (Apollodorus, Lycurgus) and the wall-building of Themistocles (Lysias) are the exceptions which prove the rule that Herodotus was more popular than Thucydides: these are from very Herodotean sections of Thucydides. (Note that Clitarchus discussed Themistocles’ death, *FGrH* 137 FF 33-4, as did Theopompus *FGrH* FF 85, 87—both in conscious contradiction of Thucydides? Or of Hellanicus?) The *Pentekontaetia* does not seem to have had much of an after-life: too skeletal to appeal to rhetorical minds? But the Atthidographers worked on this period too, see *FGrH* 328 Philochorus F34 on the Sacred War, cp. Thuc. i 112. So also did Theopompus, FF88, 153. However, as we have repeatedly seen, fragments of this sort may reflect disagreement with Hellanicus as well as or rather than with Thucydides. Finally in this antiquarian category, Thucydides’ *Sikelika* will, we conjectured, have been read by Timaeus.

⁶⁶ *CAH* vi² (1994) 879. For hellenistic Plataea as a place where reminders of the Persian Wars were taken to the point of tedium see Heraclides Creticus (Ps.-Dicaearchus) i.11 ed. F. Pfister, *Die Reisebilder des Herakleides* (Vienna 1951) tr. M.M. Austin, *The Hellenistic world from Alexander to the Roman conquest* (Cambridge 1981) no. 83; cp. the inscribed decree of the Greeks at Plataea honouring Glaucou son of Eteocles (mid third century BC), *BCH* xcix (1975) 51-75 = Austin no. 51, mentioning joint cult of Zeus Eleutherios (liberator) and Concord and the ‘contest which the Greeks celebrate on the tomb of the good men who fought against the barbarians for the liberty of the Greeks’. But the Plataean cult of Zeus Eleutherios is already in Th. (ii 71.2). The role of Plataea is not, then, ‘invented’ but ‘exaggerated’ tradition. See also E. Badian, *From Plataea to Potidaea: studies in the history and historiography of the Pentekontaetia* (Baltimore 1993) 109-23.

⁶⁷ C. Habicht, ‘Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege’, *Hermes* lxxxix (1961) 1-35; ML no.23; J. Davies, ‘The tradition about the First Sacred War’, in *Greek historiography* (n. 10) 193-212.

⁶⁸ N. Loraux (n. 39).

Then there is the Plague Account. In the hellenistic period, nasty plagues did occur,⁶⁹ but as we saw historians between Philistus and Procopius (*de bell. Pers.* ii 22-3) do not seem to have wanted to 'do a Thucydides' on them, except perhaps for a nod towards Thucydides by Cassius Dio (lxxiii 14.3, note the Thucydidean νόσος μέγιστη ἣν ἐγὼ οἶδα, 'the greatest plague I know of'). Otherwise the clearest imitations are in the Roman poets, above all Lucretius' famous description of, precisely, the great Plague at Athens (vi 1138 ff.);⁷⁰ there are also passages in Virgil (*G.* iii 478 ff.) and Ovid (*Met.* vii 523 ff.). Thucydides' own plague description does however merge into a general treatment of moral decline (ii 53), much in the manner of the Corcyrean *stasis* section in book iii. So to that limited but important extent the post-Thucydidean fortunes of the plague digression follow those of that main *stasis* section, to which we may now turn.

Stasis itself recurred after Thucydides' day; but we have seen that although the Argive σκυταλισμός is a possible Ephoran or Callisthenean imitation of Thucydides, it was in the main the philosophers who picked up Thucydides' initiative in this area. Even in the hellenistic world there was *stasis*: Phylarchus, who for Polybius was the archetype of the tragic historian, had the unusual privilege of recording *stasis* in the one city, Sparta, which Thucydides (i 18.1) had reported as wholly free from *stasis*. Phylarchus shows no obvious trace of Thucydidean influence; but it is hard to believe that this historian of Sparta's hellenistic time of troubles did not read Thucydides. (By contrast, the author of First Maccabees, who made kin out of the Spartans and Jews (i Macc. 12.21), hardly got this 'fact' from Thucydides, though when reading modern assessments of this sober and excellent work it is impossible not to be reminded of Thucydides).

As for methodology, the passages on causation were I believe known to Polybius, who elaborated Thucydides on this issue. The programmatic statement on speeches was known to Callisthenes and (I argued) other Peripatetic writers such as Theophrastus and Praxiphanes. Thucydides' remarks on chronology could well have featured explicitly in the arguments of people like Timaeus, Eratosthenes and Apollodorus of Athens (not to be confused with the orator already mentioned); but the point cannot be demonstrated. There are however particular fragments of such writers which may well have formed part of a dialogue with Thucydides' particular data as opposed to his methodological statements. Thus Eratosthenes worked out a date for the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (*FGrH* 241 F1); Apollodorus mentioned Hykkaron in Sicily (*FGrH* 244 F8, cp. Thuc. vi 62.3 etc.); incidentally he also dated Thucydides' own death (F7), though hardly as part of an 'argument' with him. More speculatively, Jacoby thought Apollodorus rejected Thucydides on the date of Themistocles' death.⁷¹ By contrast it is for our purposes striking that the hellenistic chronologist behind the Marmor Parium or Parian Marble (*FGrH* 239) is interested in battles between Greeks and Persians, and in cultural achievements, but is not concerned to report battles between Greeks; exceptions are the fourth-century (n.b.) battle of Leuctra and the Phocian seizure of Delphi.⁷²

Of particular Thucydidean speeches, the Funeral Oration continued to have an impact

⁶⁹ R.Sallares, *The ecology of the ancient Greek world* (London 1991) 266 and n. 375.

⁷⁰ There are however some non-Thucydidean (Hippocratic?) insertions. E. Rawson, *Intellectual life in the late Roman Republic* (London 1985) 177 suggested Lucretius supplemented Thucydides with a lexicon of Hippocratic terms. B.W. Sinclair, 'Thucydides, the *Prognostika*, and Lucretius: a note on *De Rerum Natura* 6.1195', in G.S. Shrimpton and D.J. McCargar (eds.), *Classical contributions: studies in honour of M.E. McGregor* (Locust Valley, NY 1981) 110 f. thinks Lucretius could have consulted both Thucydides and the Hippocratic treatises for himself. M.F. Smith, *Hermathena* xcvi (1964) 45-52, speculates that Luc. v 1440-7 echoes the early chapters of Th.

⁷¹ F.Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik: Eine Sammlung der Fragmente* (Berlin 1902) 241 f.

⁷² See Tod's comm. on Marmor Parium (his no.205) 312. It was as a cultural achievement that Th.'s History rated mention by Diodorus' chronographic source: xii 37.2; xiii 42.5, cp. xiv 84.7. But Ephorus, Theopompus and Diyllus also got in on this ticket. (See however n. 65: the chronographer mentioned the 'Peloponnesian War'.)

(Theopompus, Callisthenes, and we can add the Platonic *Menexenus*, n. 39), but there was, as we noted, some post-classical distortion here: from Isocrates' *Panegyric* on, there was a tendency to retroject anachronistically onto Pericles a pride in Athenian culture as opposed to power (for this hellenistic view of Athens see e.g. *Syll*³ 704E, and above on the Marmor Parium). Pericles' no less magnificent Last Speech (ii 60-4) was neglected in antiquity just as it has been neglected in more recent times: one reason (I suggest) is that it was concerned with external Athenian successes, whereas the Funeral Speech dealt with the Athenian way of life (that is what *πολιτεία* means), and this is what later Greeks chose to remember.

This article is not concerned with Roman historians as such, but Sallust's debate between Cato and Caesar in the *Bellum Catilinae* is modelled on the Mytilene Debate of Thucydides. And Sallust's definition of *optimatus/popularis* ideology translates a sentence from Thucydides on *stasis* (Sall. *BC* xxxviii 3 = Thuc.iii 82.8 *init*; Sallust's definition should thus be used with caution by Roman historians trying to define a *popularis* or an *optimatus*). Finally, Livy's account of the Roman acceptance of Capua's formal surrender or *deditio* (vii 29-31) draws on the Corcyra debate in Thucydides Book One (i 32-43).⁷³

The Thucydidean Hermocrates at Gela was notoriously not cited by Polybius (n. 1). But equally we allowed (p. 58) for the possibility that Timaeus' account of the speech was silent polemic against Thucydides.

In all this, however, the gaps in our knowledge must never be forgotten. If it were not for the survival of Aeneas Tacticus, nobody would have offered Brasidas before Amphipolis in Thucydides v as a likely candidate for the reception of Thucydides' speeches.

But it is the routine narrative of Thucydides which forms the greater part of his text. Apart from Plataean allusions, this tends not to be referred to or criticized much. (Nobody at any date wrote a treatise *On the Malice of Thucydides*, like Plutarch's on Herodotus; Diodorus' inaccurate complaint at i 37.4, that Thucydides and Xenophon omitted to discuss Egypt, is very mild and anyway combined with a general tribute to their acknowledged truthfulness). I now turn to address the more general question, why did Thucydides' main theme and period not attract later historians?

* * *

The *relative* neglect of Thucydides, compared to Herodotus, is a fact. Some reasons, banal but still true, have already been hinted at. There is, for example the purely stylistic answer: the difficulty and tiresome characteristics of Thucydides (and Philistus) caused them to be driven off the market by such as Theopompus. So Theophrastus (n. 34); so Cicero, and so, in effect, Strebel.⁷⁴ Certainly an Alexander-historian like Clitarchus had more success than the less

⁷³ M. Frederiksen (ed. N. Purcell), *Campania* (London 1984) 183, 199 n. 28 on Livy's knowledge of Th. But large stretches of Livy are indebted to Polybius; and Thucydidean echoes in such stretches might have a bearing on Polybius' own knowledge of Th. E. Rawson (*CAH* viii² 453) notes that Plutarch says (*Cato* ii) that the elder Cato took a small amount from Th., but doubts whether he 'was able to come to real grips with either the language or the thought of the great historian'; she contrasts Xenophon with his 'easy Greek'. Going back further, not much can be got from Plut. *Fab.* i 8: some compare Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus' oratory to Th.

⁷⁴ Th. driven off the market: the papyri are relevant, though here too hellenistic neglect of Th. should not be exaggerated as sometimes. Useful list dressed by O. Bouquiaux-Simon and P. Mertens, 'Les papyrus de Thucydide', *Chronique d'Égypte* lxi (1991) 198-210. In a stimulating article, Malitz claims no Th.-papyrus survives from the last three centuries BC: J. Malitz, 'Das Interesse an der Geschichte: die griechischen Historiker und ihr Publikum', in H. Verdin, G. Schepens, E. de Keyser (eds.) *Purposes of history: studies in Greek historiography from the 4th to the 2nd centuries BC* (Louvain 1990 = *Studia Hellenistica* 30) 323-349 at 344. This ignores the third-century BC. P. Hamburg 2.163 = E.G. Turner, *JHS* lxxvi (1956) 96-98, which allows W.H. Willis, 'A census of the literary papyri from Egypt', *GRBS* ix (1968) 205-241 at 217 to include Th. (who certainly belonged to the historical 'canon', see Radermacher, *RE* x 2 (1919) cols.1873-8) in his short list of eleven authors papyrologically represented at all periods of antiquity, Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine. But this statistic should itself be used with caution because P. Hamburg is the *only* hellenistic papyrus of Th. Malitz (*ibid.*) suggests Egyptian readers were more interested in the

colourful and supposedly ‘Thucydidean’ accounts used by Arrian, namely Ptolemy and Aristobulus (Arrian’s so-called ‘main sources’). One must be careful here: recent work has tended to depreciate Arrian, and at the same time there has been a reaction against over-confident characterizations of the ‘rhetorical’ Clitarchus. More generally, the notion of ‘tragic history’, as exemplified by Clitarchus and as opposed to a more responsible and Thucydidean model, has been put in question.⁷⁵ For one thing, it has often been noted that nothing could be more tragic than some of Thucydides.⁷⁶ More recently, Thucydides has been placed under the lens of narratology, and can be seen to use rhetorical devices of an essentially Homeric type.⁷⁷ Returning to Thucydides’ relative unpopularity in hellenistic times, it may be that the most we should say is that fashions changed, not that Thucydides was a stranger to rhetoric. As for the difficulty of Thucydides, this should not be over-done: in some ways Herodotus, with his infinitely more complex structure, is a far harder author than the more linear and serial Thucydides.

There is a second and related answer: derivative but easier accounts like that of the popular Ephorus made it unnecessary to go back to Thucydides. There is thus a certain justice in the fate of Ephorus himself, eventually ‘pickled in Diodorus’ *Bibliothēke*.⁷⁸

Third, there is the religious perspective. Thucydides kept the gods out, and the hellenistic world was not happy with this exclusion. Even Polybius startlingly brings on Philip V of Macedon pursued by the Furies (xxiii 10.2).

We might be tempted to suppose that a fourth reason for Thucydides’ loss of ground was his virtual exclusion of women. But though there are women in e.g. Hieronymus and Phylarchus, the world of these two remains patriarchal. If hellenistic readers missed women in Thucydides it was not because they disapproved of his patriarchal attitudes but because they wanted more sensationalism.

But can we go further and ask why Thucydides’ *period* seemed not to offer the attractions of some others? After all, if the success of Ephorus was partly responsible for a decline in Thucydides’ fortunes, we still need to ask why, *given that Ephorus handled the fifth century as well as the fourth*, a historian like Polybius seems naturally to look to the fourth century for his exempla. Millar⁷⁹ has rightly drawn attention to the remarkable language in which Polybius (ii 62) refers to the Athenian financial and naval mobilization in 378 BC. ‘Who [Polybius asks] has not read that when the Athenians, in conjunction with the Thebans, entered upon the war with the Lacedaemonians, and despatched an army of twenty thousand men, and manned a hundred triremes, they resolved to supply the expenses of the war by a property tax? And that accordingly they had a valuation taken, not only of the whole land of Attica and the houses in it, but of all other property; but yet the value fell short of six thousand talents by two hundred

history of their own day (and their own country) than in old Greece; very relevant to the theme of the present paper. Malitz 342 f. says the early books of Th. were more often cited than the later, but see O. Bouquiaux-Simon and P. Mertens 198: recent Oxyrhynchus publications have skewed things (see *POxy* lvii) and future publications could rectify the imbalance tomorrow, indeed Peter Parsons tells me that another fourteen or fifteen pieces of Th., mainly of books v-viii, will be published in *POxy* lxi. In general the Oxyrhynchus material is too late for my purposes; it is mostly AD.

Cicero: note *Brutus* 66 about Philistus and Th.: they lacked admirers (‘amatores desunt’) because their successor Theopompus’ lofty and elevated style got in the way of appreciation of their brief and abrupt apothegms. Strebel: above p. 48.

⁷⁵ *Greek historiography* (n.10) 44.

⁷⁶ P.A. Brunt, ‘Cicero and historiography’, in *Studies in ancient Greek history and thought* (Oxford 1993) 181-209.

⁷⁷ *Greek historiography* (n.10) 131-66.

⁷⁸ J. Hornblower (n.2) 236. In his 1952 Princeton dissertation, *Towards a Historian’s Text of Thucydides*, D.M. Lewis showed that Alexandrian scholars went to Ephorus, not Th., for their ancient history—but they did so in order to ‘correct’ the text of Th. himself!

⁷⁹ F. Millar (n.65) 12.

and fifty'. This is an amazing amount of detail. The assumption of knowledge here is in part a rhetorical device, but Polybius would not have written so unless the assumption was plausible. At this point and often, Polybius' own horizon⁸⁰ is firmly fourth-century, as is that of the imaginary apostrophized reader. We must not exaggerate the significance of this. Polybius' home city was Megalopolis, an entirely new city which sprang to life only after Leuctra. It was natural that Polybius should have a special interest in this period, when Arcadia had an independent history for the first time. (Cf. Thucydides' own digressions about e.g. Teres and Sitalkes, surely a function of his northern connexions: ii 29-30 and iv 105.1). But the elision of the fifth century, and indeed the fourth, is detectable even in Lycophron's *Alexandra*: the poet jumps (line 1435) from the Persian Wars to Alexander, with the merest summary mention of 'many intervening struggles and slaughters'. (He seems to be thinking of fighting between Greeks and Barbarians). And we have noted the curious distribution of attention in the *Marmor Parium*.

A way forward may be to draw out the thematic implications of the contrast with Herodotus. To simplify greatly, two features (charm apart) seem to have ensured that Herodotus would have a hellenistic and Roman future. First, he showed a way to accommodate new or apparently new places and races (the 'other') to a Greek perspective.⁸¹ Second, his greatest single theme was the Persian Wars, the struggle against the Barbarian 'other'. This was a perpetual struggle, and new enemies could be redefined in Herodotean terms. Spawforth has shown⁸² how the Persian War theme established itself, or rather was deliberately established, as a theme in Roman civic discourse, as the Romans 'took over' the Persians and pleased their Greek subjects by identifying their own enemies, such as Parthians, as new editions of Persians. Some of the Herodotean resonances were luck: it was perhaps predictable that there would always be non-Greeks to threaten Greeks and so that there would be Greek historians (like Nymphis, *FGrH* 432, and others) who would need the Herodotean modalities. It was *not* predictable that the third-century BC Gauls would so obligingly repeat the Persian desecrations at Delphi, facilitating Herodotean descriptions of the god looking after his own⁸³ (but for this theme compare already Xen. *Hell.* vi 4.30).

Contrast with this Thucydides and his subject-matter. Quite simply, there was never again a destructive 27-year war between two powerful Greek cities and their dependencies; this general lack of a contemporary referent surely contributed to the lowering of detailed interest in Thucydides' narrative. But there is another reason. One outstanding exception to post-classical falling-off of interest in Thucydides' narrative is constituted by Plataea, an interest we have explained above in terms of Plataea's Persian War role. One answer, then, to the question why Thucydides lost ground was precisely his unfashionable attitude to the Persian Wars. He was not of course a historian of the Persian Wars, but even given his chosen time-span he could have said a lot more than he did about them. After all, the Persian Wars were what fuelled Greek and especially Athenian self-esteem in the post-480 fifth century; witness the celebratory building-programme on which Thucydides is so notoriously silent.

Let us however return to the simple point about the irrelevance of a 27-year war between

⁸⁰ I owe 'horizon' in this intellectual sense to Fraser (n.62) ch. 11, 'The horizon of Callimachus'. Polybius' horizon here may be fourth-century, but T. Wiedemann observes that his argument from probability about resources is constructed in Thucydidean fashion, and recalls the argumentation of the *Archaeology*; see 'Rhetoric in Polybius', *Purposes of history* (n.74) 289-300, arguing against the view of C. Wooten, *AIP* xcvi (1974) 235-51 that the main influence on Polybian rhetoric was Demosthenes not Th.

⁸¹ Murray (n.2); S.M. Sherwin-White and A.Kuhr, *From Samarkhand to Sardis* (London, 1993). A referee comments that in the expanded world of the 'Greek' East Herodotus could have appealed to a non-Greek readership because he was 'pro-barbarian' (Plut. *Mor.* 857a) whereas Th. had nothing to offer here. With this cp. Malitz (n.74).

⁸² A. Spawforth, 'Symbol of unity? The Persian-Wars tradition in the Roman Empire', *Greek historiography* (n.10) 233-47.

⁸³ S. Mitchell, *Anatolia* i (Oxford 1993) 13-26.

city-states. It is part of the truth, but only part, to say that Greek historiography showed diminished interest in Thucydides because hellenistic history was history for kings.⁸⁴ Obviously, Hieronymus' most glamorous agents were royal men and women, but there were other components too, see below. Polybius has plenty of kings, but he also has cities as agents—and leagues (*ethnē, poleis, dynastai* in the usual formulation). And Thucydides could, one suspects, have read Aratus of Sicyon's memoirs (*FGrH* 231) without feeling too much intellectual dislocation. Nor was parochial involvement with Athenian history a proof of mere antiquarianism: on the contrary, Philochorus proves that local history could be dangerously topical even in an age of kings, because he was put to death by Antigonus Gonatas for being too partial to Ptolemy Philadelphus (*FGrH* 328 T1). In any case kings were not unknown to Thucydides (see ii 99-100; v 80).⁸⁵

These are however minor qualifications, some of them merely ways of saying that the hellenistic world had features which could have led it to refer its own history and politics to Thucydides and the Thucydidean period. The fact is, it referred to them only to a limited degree, and part of the reason must indeed, I conclude, lie in Thucydides' subject-matter, defined simply as a long and destructive, but actually non-recurrent inter-Greek war. The appeal of this was just too narrow—it was perhaps even perceived as rather shameful compared to the glorious Persian Wars—and its importance for later Greek history was too slight.⁸⁶

Narrow and slight, but not non-existent. I should like finally to suggest a way of refining our definition of Thucydides' theme, so as to explain those historians who do seem definitely to have imitated him. (Philistus is easiest: he simply handled Thucydides' own subject-matter, though without apparently providing a genuinely Syracusan perspective on the Sicilian expedition,⁸⁷ and then he moved on to the Dionysii). What, in particular, of Hieronymus? That Thucydides' sober method appealed to him can be taken for granted; but what of Thucydides' subject-matter?

One key theme of Thucydides' history is the idea of liberation betrayed, specifically liberation from Athens, to be achieved by Sparta. Liberation is proclaimed early in book Two (ii 8, recalled as late as 412/11: viii 46.3), and its betrayal is insistently reported thereafter. Disappointment and betrayal are already well to the front in book Three: some Samians from Anaea tell Alcidas he is liberating Greece disgracefully (ὄυ κολῶς, iii 32.2). Then there was Heraclea, which had an anti-Ionian aspect and was surely intended as a refuge from Athens, in fact as a concrete act of liberation. The Spartans (Alcidas again!) ruined the Heraclea colony,

⁸⁴ O. Murray, in J. Boardman *et al.* (eds) *Oxford history of the classical world* (Oxford 1986) 199 on 'History for Kings'.

⁸⁵ On the political partialities of Philochorus and other Atthidographers, P.J. Rhodes, 'The Atthidographers', in *Purposes of history* (n.74) 73-81.

⁸⁶ As Fergus Millar put this second point when commenting on a draft, 'the material covered by Thucydides did not have a very high profile later because, compared to the Persian War, the rise of Macedon or Alexander's conquests, it simply was not very important in the overall development of the Greek world'. See however below for a way of divorcing Th.'s 'theme' (or one major theme: liberation) from his 'material' in the sense of the particular late fifth-century events described. In any case see n. 92: Cicero thought there were lessons to be drawn from the Thucydidean period, and others before him may have thought similarly. And as a referee remarks, 'Thucydides' theme, especially his publicity for *Athens* (good or bad is all the same) was very important for later Greek history under Rome'. On the other hand I concede that (to stray outside my time-limit) Pausanias in the 2nd cent. AD resembles Polybius in saying more about the fourth century BC than about the Pentekontaetia or the Peloponnesian War: C. Habicht, *Pausanias' guide to ancient Greece* (Berkeley 1985) 102 f.

Peloponnesian War 'shameful': I am here indebted to a comment by Christan Habicht, who continues 'if one had to read about it, Ephorus may have been selected as reading easier to be digested than Th. Cicero, of course, had no reason to feel that way—and he was certainly more able than many others to appreciate the literary genius of Th.'

⁸⁷ T.S. Brown, *Timaeus of Tauromenium* (Berkeley 1958) 67: 'we could do with an account criticizing Thucydides and rooted in Sicilian tradition. But both Philistus and Ephorus chose to follow Thucydides here, and Diodorus seems not to have made any use of Timaeus at this point'.

so initially attractive to other Greeks, by behaving οὐ καλῶς iii 93.2, cp. μὴ καλῶς at v 12.1 (the Spartans themselves tried to put things right in 422). But in 419 the Spartan governor of Heraclea was thrown out by the Boeotians for governing οὐ καλῶς (v 52. 1). We are not meant to miss the cumulative force of these recurrent instances of οὐ καλῶς (Cp. v 57.1 where οὐ καλῶς is used about Peloponnesian disaffection from Sparta; and see iii 68.4, iv 108.5 for Spartan cynicism generally).

'Liberation gone sour' is a theme which surely had its attractions in an age, like the early Successor period, which had seen a string of competitive proclamations of the 'Freedom of the Greeks',⁸⁸ starting with the *diagramma* of Polyperchon in 319 (Diod. xviii 55). Alexander was a kind of self-proclaimed liberator of Asia, but his historian Callisthenes could hardly be expected to expose the hollowness of that claim. Hieronymus, by contrast, saw through some of the propaganda of the period he described, though he had to be careful how he put it; he could hardly say openly that the Antigonid liberation was executed οὐ καλῶς. So for instance he 'comments cynically on the insincerity of Ptolemy's rival professions' (Diod. xix 62.1),⁸⁹ and adds that Antigonus had by contrast decided to liberate the Greeks 'in very truth' (xix 78.2). Hieronymus, to repeat, could not say 'οὐ καλῶς' openly to an Antigonid patron; but it has been plausibly suggested that he *could* read him an oblique sermon on freedom, by describing that enjoyed by Nabataean Arabs. Hieronymus, that is, must have had an opinion on the Lamian and Chremonidean Wars, attempted wars of liberation both, and found indirect means to express his attitude.⁹⁰ One reason for the appeal of Thucydides to such a man should now be clear. Kings had at the most obvious level replaced Athenians and Spartans; but the issue of liberation and its betrayal was still a live one.

Hieronymus' attention to Thucydides' text was however (if the above is on the right lines) unusually sophisticated. More usually, the 'liberation' motif' was the cue to bring out those two standard post-Peloponnesian War *topoi*, the liberation of Athens by Thrasybulus with Theban help, and its mirror-image, the liberation of the Theban Cadmea by Pelopidas with Athenian help. These tended to be mentioned on those occasions when an orator like Dinarchus in the 320's (Din. i 25; 38-9) wished, unusually, to be polite about Thebes. (The more familiar forensic move was to recall Thebes' shameful medism of 480 BC, cp. Isoc. xiv 30, 59 etc.). Thus when Plutarch in the *Aratus* refers to the liberation from tyrants effected by Aratus (xvi 4), it is to Thrasybulus and Pelopidas that he or his source refers.

Did Thucydides' theme of Spartan liberation then disappear altogether after Hieronymus of Cardia? Perhaps; but I have a final speculation to offer. It concerns Titus Quinctius Flamininus, who is the last hellenistic link in the long Freedom-of-the-Greeks chain which runs from Sparta's announcement in 431 BC, through Flamininus' proclamation at the Isthmian Games of 196 BC, and ends with Nero's at the Isthmian Games in AD 67. I have sometimes wondered where Flamininus got this idea from, and in particular whether it is significant that he spent formative time at the South Italian town of Taras/Tarentum, which is precisely Sparta's only historical colony (for Flamininus' Tarentine period see Plut. *Flam.* i). What we call the Sicilian Expedition of 415 BC was in fact directed at South Italy too, a point well made by some Syracusan ambassadors to South Italy after the Athenian invasion has begun (Thuc. vi 88.7).

⁸⁸ Spartan liberation propaganda and its failure: K. Raaflaub, *Die Entdeckung der Freiheit* (Munich 1985) 248 ff.; later Greek and Macedonian use and abuse of liberation: A. Heuss, 'Antigonos Monophthalmos und die griechische Städte', *Hermes* lxxiii (1938) 133-94; R. Seager and C. Tuplin, 'The freedom of the Greeks of Asia...', *JHS* c (1980) 141-54; R. Seager, 'The freedom of the Greeks of Asia: from Alexander to Antiochus', *CQ* xxxi (1981) 106-12; E. S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome* (Berkeley 1984) ch. 4.

⁸⁹ J. Hornblower (n.2) 175 f.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 177 ff.; 172 ff.

Memories of that period of crisis in South Italian history were surely kept green at Taras, and we would hardly expect the Tarantines to offer Flamininus a cynical version of the liberation theme. Not everything about 'soft Tarentum', *molle Tarentum*, was modelled on the tough metropolis, but the place which summoned Archidamus of Sparta in the 330's to fight for it against Messapians surely never forgot that it was also Tarentum, *Lacedaemonium Tarentum*: after all, at not-distant Thurii, Gylippus' father Cleandridas had a heroon of which traces survived to Roman times. Memories of the Athenians, who in the fifth century had played the 'barbarian card' by allying themselves with the Messapian king Artas, will have been correspondingly bitter.⁹¹ But that is no more than speculation.

III

My aims in this paper have been: (i) to show, without I hope exaggeration, that Thucydides did not at all disappear from view in the post-classical world; (ii) to suggest reasons for his *relative* (n.b.) neglect and to make some distinctions between the reception of the different elements in Thucydides' work; (iii) to suggest what the appeal of his subject-matter might nevertheless have been to those who thought his stylistic difficulties were justified by the thematic rewards.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to ask why Thucydides' fortunes apparently (I stress apparently) improved with writers like Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. We may be dealing with inscrutable matters of intellectual taste: Rawson actually speaks of a 'fashion' for Thucydides and his style in the fifties BC.⁹² In any case, if I am right the question to some extent collapses: there was no dramatic change in the perception or reception of Thucydides, because he had not disappeared from sight in the fourth, third and second centuries BC. An obvious difference is that we have so much more of Cicero and of Dionysius, not to mention Plutarch and some other writers of the 'Second Sophistic', than of many of the fragmentary authors mentioned in this paper; and yet we happen to know that (for instance) Philodemus, tatters of whose prose writings survive by a miracle, explicitly discussed Thucydides in perhaps the 70's BC and in a way which implies that he was a familiar stylistic model.⁹³ The fragmentary character of hellenistic literature is a good note on which to end, because it enables me to stress again and finally the tentative character of this inquiry, as of any inquiry concerning the lost historians of Greece.

SIMON HORNBLLOWER

Oriel College, Oxford, and Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

⁹¹ For the neglected heroon of Cleandridas (no mention in *HCT*) see the inscribed Roman tile at P. Zancani Montuori, *Atti e Mem. della Soc. Magna Grecia* (1961) n.s. iv (1962) 36-40; G. Zuntz, *Persephone* (Oxford 1971) 287 and n. 2, where for Th. vi 63 read 93. Artas: Th. vii 33.4 with M. Walbank, *Athenian proxenies of the fifth-century BC* (Toronto 1978) no. 70.

⁹² Rawson (n.70) 222. More than style is at issue here: note her remarks on the perceived value of Th.'s subject-matter, citing Cicero *Orator* 120: the orator should know the history of earlier imperial nations, *imperiosorum populorum* (she takes this to include Athens and Sparta), as well as of famous kings. A referee notes that the revived interest in Th. 'doesn't show a change in the perception/reception of the *History* so much as of *Athens* and of the classical period (which Hdt., however glorious and perennial his story, missed out on)'.
⁹³ Th. exercised Philodemus in his fragmentary rhetorical writings, *Rhetoric* i p.151 Sudhaus, col. vii lines 20-2: ο[τ] δὲ τῆν Θ[ι]ουκυδίδ[ου] λέξιν ζῆλ[ο]ῦσιν, a clear statement that Th. already had his imitators (whatever that means, see n. 61 above) even in or before Philodemus' time. Cf. Rawson (n. 70) 144. To that extent Philodemus looks forward to Dionysius of Halicarnassus. If we had more rhetorical treatises of this and earlier dates, our ideas about Th.'s influence might have to be revised further still. Philodemus does not feature in Luschnat's *index locorum*.

Note also that Marcellinus' biography of Th., which prefaces modern editions, 'though in its present form not earlier than the fifth century AD, preserves the learned discussion which was going on at the time of Didymus (first century BC) about the mysterious family connections and about the equally mysterious death of the Athenian historian': Momigliano, *Development of Greek biography* (n. 34) 87.