

## THUCYDIDES ON PAUSANIAS AND THEMISTOCLES— A WRITTEN SOURCE?

The excursus of Thucydides on the last years of Pausanias and Themistocles (1.128–38)<sup>1</sup> is remarkable for its simple, rapid-flowing style, its storytelling tone, its wealth of personal anecdote, its marked deviation from his normally strict criteria of relevance. These characteristics, which give the excursus a Herodotean flavour, have often been noted by modern scholars, but until recently acceptance of its general credibility has been widespread, and indeed, with one important exception,<sup>2</sup> which seems to have created very little impression, almost unchallenged.<sup>3</sup> During the last decade, however, there has been a spate of publications on the excursus, and a striking feature of them is the consensus of opinion that much of the narrative is highly suspect, even incredible.<sup>4</sup> Criticism has been directed mainly, though not wholly, at the section dealing with Pausanias, whose image is believed to have been undeservedly tarnished by hostile bias originating from his enemies. While not all the arguments used in these recent works are altogether cogent, the case for regarding both sections of the excursus with considerable scepticism seems to me to be cumulatively overwhelming. It is indeed surprising that confidence in the trustworthiness of the narrative persisted so long. This confidence is doubtless attributable to the high reputation of Thucydides for having taken care to ensure that what he wrote was fact and not fiction.<sup>5</sup>

It is not my intention to add to the debate on the extent to which the information recorded in the excursus is true or false, but to consider the origin of this information. Some years ago I included a brief discussion of this subject in a study of the excursus on the Pentecontaetia.<sup>6</sup> Influenced partly by the recent works mentioned above,<sup>7</sup> I have had some second thoughts about the views expressed there, which seem now to require modification for reasons which will

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter references are to the first book unless otherwise stated.

<sup>2</sup> K.J. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* 2.2 (Strasbourg, 1916), 155–7, sought to exonerate Pausanias from the charge of medism, arguing that the account of his intrigues recorded by Thucydides was based on calumnies invented after his death to justify the inhuman treatment of him by the ephors. Beloch, *ibid.* 147–8, also maintained that the anecdotes about the flight of Themistocles are apocryphal.

<sup>3</sup> In most general histories the narrative is accepted without question, cf. E.M. Walker *CAH* 5 (1927), 37–9, 61–5. E. Meyer, *GdA* 4<sup>4</sup> (1944), 489n., expresses the opinion that the section on Pausanias is authentic but has reservations about some details which may have been embroidered.

<sup>4</sup> A. Lippold, *Rb. Mus.* 108 (1965), 320–41; C.W. Fornara, *Historia* 15 (1966), 257–71; Mabel L. Lang, *CJ* 63 (1967–8),

79–85; G.L. Cawkwell in *Auckland Classical Essays presented to E.M. Blaiklock* (Auckland and Oxford, 1970), pp. 39–58;

P.J. Rhodes, *Historia* 19 (1970), 387–400. Somewhat earlier J. Wolski, *Eos* 47 (1954), 76–7, touched upon the same problem. A. Blamire, *GRBS* 11 (1970), 295–305, accepts the general credibility of the section on Pausanias, though he has doubts on some points (cf. 304).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the *bon mot* of R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1972), p. 465, that if the excursus had 'been written by any other Greek historian, it would not have been taken seriously'.

<sup>6</sup> *CQ* NS 5 (1955), 53–67 = *Essays on the Greek Historians and Greek History* (Manchester, 1969), pp. 39–60 (hereafter cited as *Essays*). For discussion of the excursus on Pausanias and Themistocles see *Essays*, pp. 51–5.

<sup>7</sup> See above, n.4.

be explained. I suggested that the first section of the excursus on the Pentecontaetia (89–96), where Themistocles dominates the scene and Pausanias is also prominent, together with the far more personal accounts of both leaders in the excursus on their closing years, is based upon material collected by Thucydides at an early stage of his literary career for use in studies of Pausanias and Themistocles; and that he later adapted this material for a different purpose when he wrote his *History*.<sup>8</sup> This hypothesis still seems to me to provide a reasonable explanation accounting for the extraordinary features of the two excursuses. On one important point, however, I was, I believe, mistaken, namely that Thucydides obtained his material about Pausanias and Themistocles exclusively from his own research, relying on popular tradition and on oral information from his elders.<sup>9</sup> The scholarly barrage lately directed against the credibility of the excursus on Pausanias and Themistocles has persuaded me that Thucydides, even at an early stage of his development,<sup>10</sup> can hardly have accepted, almost without question, so much near-fiction if he conducted his own research, whereas he might well at this stage have been misled by the account of some predecessor whose trustworthiness he had no reason to question. Furthermore, while there is no means of determining why the aura of Ionian *ιστορίη* is much more prominent in this excursus than in any other part of the *History*, a possible explanation, which would satisfactorily account for this remarkable feature, is to believe that the excursus is based upon a work written in the Ionian manner. Accordingly, there seems to be a *prima-facie* case for thinking that he found an account of Pausanias and Themistocles which presented them in a light corresponding to his own judgement of them;<sup>11</sup> and that his main source for his excursus was a work containing this account, which, if written before he began to devote himself to historical research, will almost certainly have conformed to the Ionian tradition.

Another development in Thucydidean studies has also contributed to my second thoughts on the origin of the excursus. I maintained that, while Thucydides might conceivably have used a written source, this possibility was remote because of his critical attitude towards the historical research of others which is forcefully revealed in a celebrated passage appended to his *Archaeology* (20–1).<sup>12</sup> It is true that the *Archaeology* is evidently the fruit of independent research involving the application of strikingly novel methods;<sup>13</sup> it owes little to works by his predecessors on early Greece,<sup>14</sup> though he certainly consulted their accounts (cf. 9.2). Support has, however, been growing for the view that, though explicitly or implicitly critical of other historians, he did not hesitate to make considerable use of their works wherever he thought that his own work would

<sup>8</sup> *Essays*, pp. 48–59.

<sup>9</sup> *Essays*, p. 56. Such could well be the origin of the reports on the activities of Themistocles in the first section of the excursus on the Pentecontaetia (90–3). Because he was still in Athenian service, information about these activities was doubtless obtainable at Athens long afterwards, though it was not necessarily altogether reliable. The same considerations do not apply to information on the period when he had left Athens and become a fugitive.

<sup>10</sup> F.E. Adcock, *Thucydides and his*

*History* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 22–3, and Rhodes (above, n.4), p. 400, believe the excursus to have been a product of his youth.

<sup>11</sup> Thucydides did not share the attitude of Herodotus towards either leader (cf. *Essays*, p. 52).

<sup>12</sup> *Essays*, p. 56. This attitude is also reflected in 97.2 and 6.54.1–2.

<sup>13</sup> These methods are analysed by J. de Romilly, *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide* (Paris, 1956), pp. 240–73.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. de Romilly, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

benefit therefrom. This procedure was not considered to be discreditable or inconsistent as it would be in modern times.<sup>15</sup> Recent study of the excursus on the barbarian and Greek settlements in Sicily (6.2–5) has established almost beyond doubt that he derived its substance from the Sicilian history by Antiochus of Syracuse.<sup>16</sup> There are good reasons for believing that he followed this source closely and that he reproduced its chronological scheme without apparently appreciating that the calculations upon which the scheme was based were liable to produce gross inaccuracies.<sup>17</sup> The mainly chronological content of this excursus is not well suited to the purpose for which it is intended, namely to demonstrate the magnitude of the task undertaken by the Athenians in 415 when they embarked upon their expedition to Sicily (6.1). Another writer to whom Thucydides seems to have been indebted is Hecataeus, from whom he probably derived some of his geographical notes, especially those on remote localities.<sup>18</sup> Finally, he was undoubtedly familiar with the various historical works of Hellanicus, whom he explicitly disparages in his only reference to another historian (97.2) and is believed to be tacitly criticizing elsewhere.<sup>19</sup> The relationship between the two historians is a complex and obscure subject, but there is more than a possibility that Thucydides, though disagreeing with the methods of Hellanicus, made considerable use of his works, especially when dealing with events of the past, as in the excursus on the Peisistratids (6.54–9).

Since on general grounds there appears to be some reason for believing, and no cogent reason for disbelieving, that a written work may have been the main source of the excursus on Pausanias and Themistocles, the next step will be to consider whether there are any points of detail which support this conclusion. In the following sections attention will be drawn to a number of such points which, mainly because there is some degree of conflict with the normal practice of Thucydides elsewhere, seem to provide positive indications that he is using a written source. I do not claim that any one of them is altogether conclusive.<sup>20</sup>

### A. SPARTIATES

A distinctive feature of the excursus is the use of the term *Σπαρτιάτης*. This word occurs four times in the section on Pausanias (128.3; 131.1; 132.1 and 5), and except in the last instance it is used in a sense not found in any other part of

<sup>15</sup> Cf. K. Ziegler, *RE* 20.2 (1950), 1991 (art. *Plagiat*).

<sup>16</sup> K. J. Dover, *Maia* 6 (1953), 1–20 = *Wege der Forschung* 98 (Darmstadt, 1968), 344–68; R. van Compernelle, *Étude de chronologie et d'historiographie sicilotes* (Brussels and Rome, 1960), pp. 437–500 (summary of conclusions, pp. 497–500).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. my review of van Compernelle, op. cit., *CR* N.S. 12 (1962), 266–8.

<sup>18</sup> L. Pearson, *CQ* 33 (1939), 48–54, maintains only that these notes may come from a *Periegesis*, since they are written in a style found in the fragments of Hecataeus and probably created by him. N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 446–51, goes further, showing that Thucydides almost certainly derived 46.3–4 (on

Cheimerium) and 2.68.3 (on Amphiloichian Argos) from Hecataeus, also probably 24 (on the Taulantii).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. O. Lendle, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 129–43 = *Wege der Forschung* 98 (Darmstadt, 1968), 661–82.

<sup>20</sup> So far as I am aware, the only reference to the possibility of a written source occurs in a note by Rhodes (above, n.4), p. 389 n.11, who mentions that it was suggested to him by Dr. D. M. Lewis. Rhodes himself is inclined to believe that 'Thucydides is publishing the results of his own enquiries'. I am much indebted to Dr. Lewis for encouragement to pursue my investigation and for some valuable advice. It should not be assumed that he agrees with any of my arguments.

the *History*, though not uncommon in Herodotus. These passages will be considered below, but first it is necessary to point out what the term means when used by Thucydides elsewhere.<sup>21</sup> It is to him purely a definition of status, differentiating members of the highest class in the Spartan state from 'inferiors'. Although the Spartiates are seen to dominate the state and to enjoy privileges from which others are debarred, their status does not in itself confer upon them, individually or collectively, the right to exercise any political authority. The term occurs most commonly, becoming almost a formula, where Thucydides, after naming, usually for the first time, a Spartan entrusted with a military command or other responsibility, adds that he was a Spartiate.<sup>22</sup> Occasionally a group of Spartans charged with some special duty is stated to have been composed of Spartiates: the ten commissioners appointed to advise Agis (5.63.4), the three officers sent to Corinth to organize a fleet for service in Asia (8.7), the eleven commissioners appointed to advise Astyochus (8.39.2).<sup>23</sup> Thucydides does apply the term to substantial numbers of men in connection with the Spartan disaster at Pylos, but here again it is a definition of status: he attributes the importance of the episode, and its influence on the course of the war, largely to the fact that the troops trapped and eventually overwhelmed on Sphacteria included a high proportion of Spartiates. The advance force sent to Pylos at the outset consisted of 'the Spartiates themselves and the nearest of the *perioikoi*', while 'the other Lacedaemonians' moved more slowly (4.8.1);<sup>24</sup> the number of prisoners captured on Sphacteria was 292, of whom 120 were Spartiates (4.38.5); in 421 feeling at Sparta was in favour of peace in order to recover the prisoners because the Spartiates among them belonged to the most prominent families (5.15.1).

Nowhere in the *History*, except in the excursus on Pausanias, does the term *Σπαρτιάται* designate a decision-making body. Where action is contemplated, resolved, or carried out by the Spartan government or by its appointed agents, such as generals on active service, the term used is *Λακεδαιμόνιοι* with or without the article.<sup>25</sup> Scores of examples could be cited. Where Thucydides wishes to refer specifically to a meeting of the assembly at Sparta, the assembly is *ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων*, as when he reports the meeting in 432 which debated the issue of war or peace (87.1) or the meeting addressed by Alcibiades which considered the situation in Sicily (6.88.10).<sup>26</sup> In speeches delivered at these meetings

<sup>21</sup> Only the use of the term by Thucydides will be considered here; the historical problem of determining precisely what it did or did not mean is irrelevant to the present investigation.

<sup>22</sup> 2.12.1, Melesippus; 2.25.2, Brasidas; 2.66.2, Cnemus; 3.100.2, Eurylochus and two subordinates; 4.11.2, Thrasytelidas; 7.19.3, Eccritus; 8.11.2, Thermon; 8.22.1, Eualas; 8.39.1, Antisthenes; 8.61.1, Dercylidas; 8.61.2, Leon; 8.91.2, Agesandridas; 8.99.1, Hippocrates. Exceptionally Phrynias, 8.6.4, and Deinias, 8.22.1, are described as *perioikoi*.

<sup>23</sup> Other relevant passages are: 5.9.9, where Brasidas reminds his subordinate Clearidas of his duty as a Spartiate, and 6.91.4, where Alcibiades urges the Spartan assembly to send a Spartiate to take com-

mand in Sicily (cf. 7.58.3).

<sup>24</sup> Here Thucydides foreshadows the ultimate consequences of the episode by stressing the extent to which Spartiates were involved in it.

<sup>25</sup> That this is the official term may be seen from the texts of treaties quoted verbatim by Thucydides (cf. 4.119.1; 5.18.1 and 23.1; 8.58.1) and in extant inscriptions belonging to the same period, cf. R. Meiggs and D.M. Lewis, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1969), No. 67, where all the contributions to the Spartan war-fund are given *τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις*.

<sup>26</sup> The phrase is also found in the text of a treaty between Sparta and Argos (5.77.1).

the form of address to the assembly is ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι (cf. 68.1; 76.1; 80.1; 86.5; 6.92.1 and 5).<sup>27</sup>

To return to the excursus on Pausanias, one of the four passages in which the term Spartiate occurs is entirely compatible with the practice of Thucydides elsewhere. When Pausanias is under suspicion for the second time, the Spartans initially take no action against him because of their traditional reluctance to commit themselves to an irrevocable decision *περί ἀνδρός Σπαρτιάτου* without possessing incontrovertible evidence (132.5). In the other three passages, which are akin to one another, the term has a totally different meaning. These passages are:

- (a) 128.3. Pausanias ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος is recalled for the first time from his command in the Hellespont *ὑπὸ Σπαρτιατῶν*. He is then put on trial by them and acquitted.
- (b) 131.1. When he has returned to Asia and is once more suspected, the ephors order him to return home with the herald who delivers their instructions; they warn him that, if he disobeys, 'the Spartiates' declare war on him.
- (c) 132.1. After this second recall to Sparta and an apparently brief period of imprisonment, he offers to stand trial on any charges that might be brought against him, but *φανερὸν μὲν εἶχον οὐδὲν οἱ Σπαρτιάται σημείον, οὔτε οἱ ἐχθροὶ οὔτε ἡ πᾶσα πόλις*. It is noteworthy that two groups of Spartiates are differentiated here, namely his private enemies, who might all be expected to possess the status of Spartiate, and the whole body of Spartiates identified, it seems, with the government.

In these three passages the Spartiates appear to be endowed, by virtue of being Spartiates, with supreme authority which empowers them to take drastic action even against their most eminent fellowcountryman; they constitute the governing body of the state. It might be thought to be a coincidence that Thucydides uses the term in this special sense three times in as many pages and nowhere else in the *History*, where, as has been pointed out, it occurs frequently as a definition of status. This possibility, which is remote enough in any case, can be eliminated if the excursus is examined more closely; for there is no doubt that in each of the three passages the term 'Spartiates' is used loosely as a substitute for the official term 'Lacedaemonians'. Whereas in the first passage (128.3) Pausanias is recalled *ὑπὸ Σπαρτιατῶν*, it is οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι who take this action when Thucydides again refers back to this first recall in a later passage of the excursus (131.1).<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, in three other passages of the section on Pausanias (132.3; 134.4; 135.1) and in two passages of the transition to the section on Themistocles (135.2–3)

<sup>27</sup> Xenophon and other historians of the fourth century habitually use the term Spartiate in accordance with the normal practice of Thucydides. It occurs some sixteen times in the *Hellenica*. Named individuals are designated as Spartiates (5.4.39; 7.1.25 and 4.19, cf. *Anab.* 4.8.25; 6.6.30; also *Hell. Ox.* 11.4 (Bartoletti), and Theop. *FGrHist* 115 F 323); commissions of Spartiates are sent with Agesilaus to Asia (*Hell.* 3.4.2–3; *Ages.* 1.7) and with Agesipolis to Olynthus (*Hell.* 5.3.8); attention is drawn to the heavy casualties suffered by

the Spartiates at Leuctra (*Hell.* 6.4.15; *Ages.* 2.24). When Xenophon implies, in connection with both occasions on which Sparta was threatened by Epaminondas, that the city was defended only by Spartiates (*Hell.* 6.5.28; 7.5.10), he seems to be using the term rather loosely, since they must have been supported by many 'inferiors'.

<sup>28</sup> Similarly in the excursus on the Pentecontaetia, where the same events are reported more fully, οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι recall Pausanias (95.3).

he refers to 'Lacedaemonians', not 'Spartiates'. Thus the conclusion seems to be inescapable that in this excursus, but in no other part of the *History*, these terms are interchangeable, being used indiscriminately to denote the Spartan government. It will be seen that this is also the practice of Herodotus.

The term Spartiate is common in Herodotus; it occurs almost four times as frequently as in Thucydides. Occasionally it is only a definition of status, either where named individuals are designated as Spartiates (8.42.2, Eurybiadas, cf. 5.46.1; 9.71.2) or where Spartiates are differentiated from 'inferiors' (6.58.2-3). In the army also the Spartiates are seen to have enjoyed a privileged status: at Plataea they serve in exclusively Spartiate units, each man being attended by seven helots, and the troops supplied by the *perioikoi* form a separate force (9.10.1; 11.3; 28.2; 29.1-2). In many passages, however, the Spartiates collectively are identified with the Spartan government, and sometimes Spartiates and Lacedaemonians are mentioned side by side in an account of a single episode, the terms being apparently synonymous. A few examples will suffice to show how loosely these terms are used. Spartan kings are described as βασιλεὺς Σπαρτηγέων (5.75.1; 6.50.1; 51; 85.2) but also as βασιλεὺς Λακεδαιμονίων (7.238.1). The phrase Σπαρτηγέων τὸ κοινόν occurs three times (1.67.5; 6.50.2; 58.1). In a short account of the Spartan demand for satisfaction from Xerxes for the death of Leonidas, the Delphic oracle calls upon 'the Lacedaemonians' to make this claim, 'the Spartiates' send a herald to deliver it to Xerxes, and the herald announces in his message that 'the Lacedaemonians and the Heracleidae at Sparta' are responsible for it (8.114.1-2).<sup>29</sup> The same indiscriminate use of the terms is found in some longer passages. Examples are the account of Spartan measures to expiate the impious murder of the Persian heralds sent by Darius to demand Greek submission (7.134-7) and the lengthy stories about two Elean seers, Teisamenus and Hegesistratus, who interpreted the omens before the battle of Plataea, the former serving the Greeks and the latter employed by Mardonius (9.33.1-38.1).<sup>30</sup>

Thus on a point of detail, which is of some historical importance, the excursus on Pausanias is in accord with the normal practice of Herodotus and not with that of Thucydides. This anomaly might conceivably be explained on the ground that Thucydides could here be dependent on material about Pausanias assembled by his own research at an early stage of his career,<sup>31</sup> when he may not yet have adopted the interpretation of the term Spartiate found elsewhere in his *History*. Another explanation, which is perhaps more acceptable, is that he may be using as his source the work of some predecessor who wrote in the Ionian manner and, like Herodotus, had little interest in official nomenclature.

It will be convenient to mention here another passage in the excursus where an expression is used in a sense which has no parallel throughout the *History*. When Pausanias after his acquittal at Sparta returned to the Hellespont in a private capacity, he sailed thither τῷ μὲν λόγῳ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν πόλεμον, τῷ δὲ ἔργῳ τὰ πρὸς βασιλεία πράγματα πράσσειν . . . ἐφιέμενος τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀρχῆς (128.3). The context requires that the meaning of τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν πόλεμον must be 'the war

<sup>29</sup> Macan, n. ad loc., is surely right in maintaining that these terms are 'hardly used in deliberate contrast', but 'merely as a literary variation'.

<sup>30</sup> In 9.33.5 and 35.1, where Herodotus refers to the enrolment of Teisamenus and

his brother as Spartiates, the term is undoubtedly a definition of status; from the context it is clear that only this highest status would have been acceptable.

<sup>31</sup> See above, p. 96.

fought by the Greeks against Persia' and that the professed intention of Pausanias, which is contrasted with his real intention, was to resume his command of the allied forces which had been interrupted by his recall and trial. This pretext was a plausible one, which doubtless deceived many Spartans: Dorcis, who was sent from Sparta to succeed him, had been rejected by the allies, and the Spartans had renounced their leadership of the war against Persia (95.7), but Pausanias might reasonably hope that his own personal prestige would cause him to be accepted again as supreme commander. On the other hand, it is undeniable that a far more natural translation of τὸν 'Ελληνικὸν πόλεμον would be 'the war against the Greeks',<sup>32</sup> especially as Thucydides uses ὁ Μηδικὸς πόλεμος several times as an alternative to the common τὰ Μηδικὰ to denote 'the war against Persia' (90.1; 95.7; 3.10.2).<sup>33</sup> It is barely credible that Pausanias can have hoped to convince anyone by professing that he intended to fight a war against the Greeks in Asia in order to re-establish Spartan authority there.<sup>34</sup> The prospects of success would have been seen to be negligible: he had only a single trireme, and indeed the Athenians later expelled him from Byzantium, apparently without difficulty (131.1). There is one other passage in which Thucydides uses the phrase 'Ελληνικὸς πόλεμος, in this case without the definite article (112.2, 'Ελληνικοῦ μὲν πολέμου ἔσχον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι); it denotes the war in Greece between the Athenians and Peloponnesians during the Pentecontaetia. Although the precise meaning of 'Ελληνικός here is debatable,<sup>35</sup> it certainly cannot mean 'fought by Greeks against non-Greeks', so that this passage is not compatible with the passage about Pausanias.

The conclusion is inescapable that Thucydides, when reporting the professed intentions of Pausanias, designated a war by employing a phrase which has no parallel elsewhere in the *History*. The next surviving instances of 'Ελληνικός πόλεμος meaning 'war fought by Greeks' occur in references to the Lamian war; its Athenian instigators evidently adopted this term because they claimed to be the leaders of a crusade for the liberation of Greece from Macedonian domination.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>32</sup> The emendation Μηδικόν for 'Ελληνικόν, which some editors have adopted, is a desperate and unacceptable expedient.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. τοῦ Ἀττικοῦ πολέμου (5.28.2; 31.3 and 5), which is synonymous with τοῦ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους πολέμου (5.29.1). Elsewhere phrases with πόλεμος define an area of hostilities (5.26.2, Μαντινικός καὶ Ἐπιδαύριος πόλεμος; 8.11.3, Ἰωνικός πόλεμος), but this sense is clearly inapplicable to the passage under discussion, since the war was being fought in Asia.

<sup>34</sup> Cawkwell (above, n.4), p. 53, suggests this interpretation, cf. G.E.M. de Ste Croix, *Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London, 1972), pp. 171–2, who, however, concludes by regarding it as unlikely because of 'the casual way in which Thucydides uses the expression "for the Hellenic war", and the employment of the definite article, without any elucidation'.

<sup>35</sup> Three interpretations seem to be possible: (a) 'war in Greece', contrasted with the expedition to Cyprus (ἐς δὲ Κύπρον) reported in the same sentence.

The translations of Jowett, de Romilly, and Landmann adopt this interpretation. Cf. above, n.33, for instances of this local sense. (b) 'war between Greeks', namely the Athenians and the Peloponnesians. This seems to be the meaning in a passage of Lysias (2.48), who uses the phrase when referring to the same war (perhaps following Thucydides), cf. Isocr. 12.1 and Dem. 9.22 (both plural and with the definite article). See Meiggs (above, n.5), p. 72, n.1. (c) 'war against Greeks' (the Athenians, who are the subject of the sentence, against other Greeks, namely the Peloponnesians), cf. ὁ Μηδικὸς πόλεμος in the passages cited above. Steup, n. ad loc., favours this interpretation.

<sup>36</sup> IG ii<sup>2</sup>.448.44 (ἐπὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ὃν ἐνεστήσατο ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων); 505.17; 506.9; Plut. *Phoc.* 23.1. The part played by the Athenians in launching the crusade for Greek freedom is stressed by all the sources, cf. Hypereid. 6 (*Epitaphios*) 16, 24, 34, 40; Diod. 18.9.1 and 5, 10.2–3; Dexippus, *FGrHist* 100 F 33 f.

More than a century earlier authors whose works are not extant may well have applied the same term to the crusade for the liberation of the Asiatic Greeks from Persia. The reason why Thucydides uses it in the passage quoted above (128.3) could be that it occurred in the work of some predecessor from which he derived information about Pausanias.<sup>37</sup>

## B. THE LETTERS

The excursus includes the texts of three personal letters: Pausanias to Xerxes (128.7), Xerxes to Pausanias (129.3), and Themistocles to Artaxerxes (137.4). Although there is still support for the belief that these letters are genuine documents,<sup>38</sup> the case against their authenticity,<sup>39</sup> which was, in my opinion, always convincing, has been further strengthened by the recent publications challenging the general credibility of the excursus mentioned at the beginning of this paper.<sup>40</sup> Scholars rejecting the authenticity of the letters have concluded, explicitly or implicitly, that Thucydides composed them himself. When briefly discussing the question in my paper on the Pentecontaetia, I supported this conclusion.<sup>41</sup> It does, however, involve an assumption which I now consider to be at least disputable. The letters are in *oratio recta* and apparently complete and unabridged, except that part of the third one (137.4) is omitted and its substance summarized in a parenthesis.<sup>42</sup> Their presentation conveys an implicit claim that the text is that of the originals. Thucydides uses *τάδε* to introduce the first two, as he does when introducing official documents reproduced verbatim (cf. 5.17.2). On the other hand, the much longer letter of Nicias to the Athenians from Sicily (7.11–15), which conforms to the principles of Thucydidean speeches, including the provision of *τὰ δέοντα*, is introduced, like almost all the speeches, by *τοιάδε* (7.10).<sup>43</sup> Undeniably Thucydides was capable of composing, if he so wished, letters which created a specious impression of authenticity, including the oriental

<sup>37</sup> A similar phenomenon, though in the reverse direction, may be seen in the phrase *ἐπιέμενος τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀρχῆς* at the end of the same sentence. The context requires that the meaning must be 'rule over the Greeks', which has no parallel elsewhere in the *History*. A more natural translation would be 'rule by the Greeks', as in 8.43.3, *Μηδικὴν ἀρχήν* (cf. Hdt. 1.72.2); see also 8.96.4, ἡ Ἀθηναίων ἀρχή and similar expressions in 2.97.1; 6.82.3; 6.90.2). The earliest parallel for the sense required by the context seems to be Arist. *Pol.* 2.1271b33.

<sup>38</sup> J. Vogt, *Satura Otto Weinreich dargebracht* (Baden-Baden, 1952), pp. 169–72, and *Historia* 18 (1969), 300–1; K. Rohrer, *Wien. Stud.* 72 (1959), 52; Blamire (above n.4), 301–2.

<sup>39</sup> Beloch (above, n.2), p. 155; J. Sykutris, *RE Suppl.* 5.209–10; H. Münch, *Studien zu den Exkursen des Thukydides* (Heidelberg, 1935), pp. 23–4. A point made by Sykutris and Münch, that the original letters would not have been written in Attic, does not strengthen the case for rejecting the authenticity of the Thucydidean texts.

Greeks did not insist that documents must always be reproduced in the dialect in which they were originally written. The three treaties between Sparta and Persia in 412/11, which somehow became known to Thucydides (8.18, 37, and 58), cannot have been originally written in Attic.

<sup>40</sup> Above, n.4; on the letters see Lippold, *passim*, but especially 334; Fornara, p. 265; Lang, p. 80; Cawkwell, pp. 49–50.

<sup>41</sup> *Essays*, pp. 43–4.

<sup>42</sup> This parenthesis contains a striking idiom, *τὴν τῶν γεφυρῶν . . . οὐ διάλυσιν*, which is thoroughly Thucydidean, cf. 3.95.2; 5.35.2 and 50.4; 7.34.6. Thus, unless Thucydides composed the letter himself, it is very probable that he had before him a complete text, whether genuine or not, and that he was himself responsible for abbreviating it by summarizing part of it. In the version of the letter given by Nepos, *Them.* 9, the gap is filled, but there is no reason to believe that Nepos or his authority used a text older than that of Thucydides.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. my *Individuals in Thucydides* (Cambridge, 1968), p. 190.



tone and phrasing of the letter from Xerxes to Pausanias. It is, however, questionable whether, even at an early stage of his development as a historian, he would have adopted a procedure so alien to the principles to which he is seen to have adhered elsewhere in the *History*. If he wrote the letters himself, they are unique in that he is to some extent misleading the reader by suggesting that he is reproducing the original texts whereas he knows that he is not.<sup>44</sup> In other cases where he includes the text of a document, he has evidently been at pains to satisfy himself that it is authentic and accurate.

The treatment of letters in a historical work is a subject on which the practice of Herodotus is instructive. He includes two letters, both considerably longer than those in Thucydides: from Harpagus to Cyrus (1.124) and from Amasis to Polycrates (3.40).<sup>45</sup> Although Herodotus introduces each letter by *τάδε* and conveys the impression that he is reproducing the authentic text, these letters are evidently analogous to his numerous passages of dialogue, which are as fictitious as those of a modern historical novel. He certainly composed the text of both letters himself, adopting a literary device designed to make his work more attractive to his public and drawing upon his personal knowledge of Persians and Egyptians in order to produce a certain verisimilitude. There is no means of proving that other predecessors of Thucydides adopted the same practice as Herodotus in their treatment of letters, but it would be surprising if they did not.<sup>46</sup> Their subjects included myth and early history, which involved the narration of stories containing dialogue between the characters, and there is evidence that Hecataeus sometimes introduces direct speech (*FGH Hist* 1 T 20 and F 30), in which the wording is clearly his own. Where, as must have occasionally occurred, traditional stories included the sending of letters, authors are likely to have treated these letters in the same way as the dialogue.

It thus seems very probable, though conclusive evidence is lacking, that Thucydides did not himself compose the texts of the letters in his excursus but derived them from the work of some predecessor. He may be thought to have been uncharacteristically credulous in accepting their authenticity. If, however, he accepted the general credibility of his source, as he apparently did, there can hardly have been any valid reason for adopting a more sceptical attitude towards the letters than towards other information reproduced in his excursus, including items recently challenged by so many scholars.<sup>47</sup>

### C. λέγεται PASSAGES

In three passages of the excursus, two of them reporting incidents of some complexity, Thucydides inserts the parenthesis *ὡς λέγεται* or uses *λέγεται* with dependent infinitives. The first passage is the story of the Argilian messenger who opened the last letter sent by Pausanias to Xerxes (132.5); the second relates how Pausanias, realizing that he was about to be arrested in the street by the ephors, ran for sanctuary to the precinct of the Brazen House (134.1); the third mentions that

<sup>44</sup> Vogt, *Historia*, loc. cit., bases his belief in the authenticity of the letters partly on the argument that Thucydides would not have stooped to falsification of this kind.

<sup>45</sup> Münch, loc. cit., followed by Lippold, (above, n.4), p. 334 n.59, is mistaken in referring to 3.40 as the only letter of which

Herodotus gives what purports to be the text. 1.124 certainly ranks as a letter, even though the method of transmission (in the belly of a hare) is unorthodox.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. the general criticisms of their methods by Thucydides (21.1).

<sup>47</sup> See above p. 96 with n.4.

Artaxerxes, on receiving the letter from Themistocles, admired his intentions and urged him to put them into operation (138.1). Thucydides normally uses *λέγεται* to indicate that he has misgivings about the trustworthiness of his evidence. It occurs most frequently where, in writing about contemporary events, he includes a statement, usually brief, derived, it appears, from some oral source in which he is disinclined for unspecified reasons to feel complete confidence.<sup>48</sup> In the passages relating to Pausanias and Themistocles *λέγεται* might be merely an intimation of uncertainty and is indeed interpreted as such by modern scholars.<sup>49</sup> The story about the Argilian has an almost fairytale atmosphere; the thoughts attributed to Pausanias when he saw the ephors approaching and the tacit warning by one of them may arouse suspicion because he was thereafter closely guarded, apparently incommunicado, until he died of starvation; the reaction of Artaxerxes to a secret letter from Themistocles cannot have been widely known, at any rate among Greeks. Thucydides was doubtless conscious of the need for caution in dealing with information of this kind. On the other hand, in passages where he is recording events of the distant past *λέγεται* may have implications which go beyond a mere desire to express uncertainty and are largely consistent with the practice of Herodotus, who introduces *λέγεται* far more frequently than Thucydides. Because Herodotus feels to some extent under an obligation *λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα* (7.152.3), he tends to use *λέγεται* to indicate that he has at least some authority, whether oral or written, for a statement which he considers to be worthy of mention, though he cannot vouch for its authenticity. Thucydides, though his interpretation of his duty as a historian is rather to record only *τῶν γενομένων τὸ σαφές* (22.4), sometimes uses *λέγεται* in much the same way as Herodotus when referring to events of the past.<sup>50</sup> One instance of this usage, which relates to the migration of the Sicels from Italy (6.2.4),<sup>51</sup> has a special relevance to the present discussion because it occurs in the excursus on barbarian and Greek settlements in Sicily, which, as has already been noted,<sup>52</sup> is almost certainly based on a written source. The three passages in the excursus on Pausanias and Themistocles in which Thucydides uses *λέγεται* surely belong to this category. He very probably intends to suggest that, while he believes the information contained in these passages to be somewhat suspect, it nevertheless has the authority of a source which he considers to be for the most part trustworthy.<sup>53</sup>

#### D. OTHER FACTORS

Two passages of the excursus, both at the end of the section on Themistocles, exhibit features associated rather with the historical method of Herodotus than with that of Thucydides. In the first passage Thucydides, after stating categorically

<sup>48</sup> Examples are: 1.118.3; 2.98.3; 3.79.3.

<sup>49</sup> A.W. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford, 1945), 435 and 441; Wolski (above n.4), p. 77; de Ste Croix (above, n.34), p. 8 n.9.

<sup>50</sup> Scholars have tended to assume that passages in which Thucydides uses *λέγεται* are uniform and merely suggest uncertainty. I hope to show elsewhere that they are diverse and may have other implications.

<sup>51</sup> *Essays*, pp. 157–8.

<sup>52</sup> See above, p. 97 with n.16.

<sup>53</sup> It might be argued that in each of the three passages *λέγεται* is merely copied from his source, since he seems to have followed this source closely enough to have reproduced some of its vocabulary which is not found elsewhere in his *History* (see below, pp. 105–6. This explanation, is however, not very cogent, because, when writing about the past, he himself occasionally uses *λέγεται* in the sense commonly found in Herodotus, as has been shown above.

that the death of Themistocles was caused by illness, refers to a more sensational story (λέγουσι δέ τινας), which he clearly finds less convincing, that Themistocles took poison (138.4).<sup>54</sup> Elsewhere he very rarely chooses to include alternative versions (cf. 2.5.6), evidently feeling an obligation, where there is a conflict of evidence, to decide the issue by the exercise of his own judgement.<sup>55</sup> It is noteworthy that one of the very few passages in which he gives alternatives occurs in his excursus on settlements in Sicily where he mentions two rival traditions about the origin of the Sicans and positively rejects one of them (6.2.2). Herodotus, on the other hand, gives alternatives in dozens of instances, occasionally including versions which he finds 'less credible' (cf. 3.9.2–3) or explicitly refuses to believe (cf. 1.75.3–6; 8.118–19). The second passage in which Thucydides at the end of his excursus writes in a manner characteristic of Herodotus designates the relatives of Themistocles as the authority for a report that his bones were secretly buried in Attica (138.6). Herodotus frequently discloses his source, Thucydides very seldom.<sup>56</sup>

In contrast to these two passages the celebrated eulogy of Themistocles which immediately precedes them (138.3) is strikingly Thucydidean. It attributes to Themistocles the qualities, mainly intellectual, which Thucydides considers to be the hallmarks of a great statesman and which he seeks but hardly ever finds in the political leaders of his own day.<sup>57</sup> There can be little doubt that this assessment of Themistocles is wholly the creation of Thucydides himself; it could scarcely have been conceived or written by anyone else. Its highly intellectual, almost sophistic, viewpoint and vocabulary strike an incongruous note in the simple, easy-flowing narrative of the excursus, which it interrupts rather awkwardly before the final biographical details have been recorded.<sup>58</sup> It evidently relates to the entire career of Themistocles and not merely to the period covered by the excursus when he was already an exile. Thucydides may have inserted it here because he had reached a point at which his source referred to the intelligence shown by Themistocles at the Persian court (138.2, ξυνετός).<sup>59</sup>

Finally, a few observations may be added on the over-all vocabulary of the excursus. About sixty words occur which are not used elsewhere by Thucydides, and the ratio of such words to the length of the excursus seems to be more than twice the average for the whole *History*. It must, however, be borne in mind that the subject-matter of the excursus is abnormally personal and biographical so that its vocabulary may be expected to differ somewhat from that of narrative and speeches concerned with military and political events of the Peloponnesian war. More significant is the fact that of the approximately sixty words not found elsewhere in the *History* at least one-third are used by Herodotus, in most cases several times. Examples are: ἀνευρίσκειν (128.6); ἐνδύεσθαι (130.1); εἰρκτή (131.2);

<sup>54</sup> This story must have been well known at Athens before Thucydides became an exile: Aristophanes, *Knights* 83–4, expects his audience to be familiar with it.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. A. Momigliano, *Studies in Hellenistic Biography* (London, 1966), p. 214: 'he assumes the responsibility for what he says, and feels no need to leave a choice to the reader'.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. 3.88.3; 6.2.2 (which, as noted above, belongs to the excursus on Sicily).

<sup>57</sup> Cf. 2.65.5–13, on Pericles; 6.72.2, on Hermocrates; 8.68.1–2, on Antiphon.

<sup>58</sup> The scholiast on 138.4, displaying an acuteness unusual in Thucydidean scholia, asks how it was that, if Themistocles possessed the ability to foresee the future attributed to him in 138.3, he can have made promises to Artaxerxes which he could not fulfil.

<sup>59</sup> P. Huart, *Le Vocabulaire de l'analyse psychologique dans l'oeuvre de Thucydide* (Paris, 1968), pp. 282–90 and 311, points out that ξύνεσις and ξυνετός are key words in the vocabulary of Thucydides.

ἀκροθίνιον (132.2); ξυγκατεργάζεσθαι (132.4); διάκονος (133.1); κατορύσσειν (134.4).<sup>60</sup> Some of these words are also found in the meagre remains of other prose works, predominantly Ionic, which were certainly or probably written before that of Thucydides.<sup>61</sup> In addition, it is relevant that some words not used by him outside the excursus occur in works belonging to the Hippocratic Corpus.<sup>62</sup> Although the dates of these works are notoriously uncertain, their dialect is Ionic. If Thucydides derived the substance of the excursus from some predecessor, this source will almost certainly have been written in Ionic, and his choice of words could well have been influenced thereby, even though he does not normally include Ionicisms<sup>63</sup> and indeed may have been the first to challenge the convention that Ionic was the dialect used by historians whether or not they were natives of Ionia.

Because so many uncertainties are involved, it cannot be claimed that arguments based on the over-all vocabulary of the excursus substantially strengthen the case for believing that Thucydides used a written source. Accordingly, this evidence has not been analysed in detail. It is, however, by no means negligible.

### E. A POSSIBLE SOURCE?

The dramatic reversals of fortune experienced by Pausanias and Themistocles, twin victors of the struggle against Persia, stirred the imagination of their contemporaries and of succeeding generations. Even Thucydides, 'the least biographical of historians',<sup>64</sup> was not unaffected, as has been seen above. Stories about their last years were frequently retold, both orally and in literary works. These stories evidently lost nothing in the telling and tended to be embellished with largely fictional details. Themistocles in particular, whose personality was more striking than that of Pausanias and whose contacts with the Persian court were closer and more lasting, became an almost mythical character. The popularity of stories about him and the development of a more or less legendary tradition are attested by the *Themistocles* of Plutarch. Its closing chapters (23–32) cite an exceptionally large number of authors, most of them belonging to the fourth century, who must have at least shown an interest in his adventures in exile, though not necessarily reporting them in detail. Plutarch himself provides a full and colourful account, especially of scenes at the Persian court, which seems to be mainly fictional. It differs on some points from the somewhat earlier and shorter but equally suspect version of Diodorus (11.55–8), which was certainly derived from Ephorus. It is, however, clear that legends concerning the last years of Themistocles—trustworthy information cannot have been easily obtained—had begun to develop not very long after his death and were not largely the product of the fourth century. The reference in the *Knights* (83–4) to the story that he died after drinking bull's blood, which is demonstrably false, shows that it was already well known in 424. If Thucydides wrote

<sup>60</sup> Cf. also phrases such as τράπεζαν παρατίθεσθαι (130.1), which is found in Democritus (D.-K. 68 B 210) as well as in Herodotus (6.139.3; both use the active), and τελευτᾶν τὸν βίον (138.4; elsewhere Thucydides uses the verb absolutely).

<sup>61</sup> For κατορύσσειν see Hecataeus, *FGrHist* 1 F 15; Pherecydes, *FGrHist* 3 F 64a; Antiphon 3.2.10 and 3.3.12.

<sup>62</sup> e.g. ἐνδύεσθαι (130.1; Hippocr. *Aer.*

22 and *Insomn.* 91); ἐνθύμησις (132.5; Hippocr. *Praec.* 4); ἀποψύχειν (134.3; Hippocr. *Morb.* 1.19).

<sup>63</sup> For probable exceptions in the Sicilian excursus (6.3.1–2) see Dover (above, n.16), *Wege der Forschung*, pp. 351–2.

<sup>64</sup> A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Harvard, 1971), p. 64.

about Pausanias and Themistocles at approximately that date or some years before it, he could well have been following a source written still earlier in which he found already recorded all, or almost all, the less credible details of his excursus recently challenged by so many scholars.<sup>65</sup>

There appears to be no evidence that any author whose name has survived and who was, or may have been, a predecessor of Thucydides wrote an account of the events leading to the eclipse and death of Pausanias.<sup>66</sup> On the other hand, among the writers cited by Plutarch on the flight of Themistocles and his experiences in Asia are two from whom, since they belong to the fifth century, Thucydides might conceivably have derived the bulk of his information. They are Stesimbrotus of Thasos (*FGrHist* 107) and Charon of Lampsacus (*FGrHist* 262).

Stesimbrotus wrote a work on Themistocles, Thucydides, son of Melesias, and Pericles, of which a number of fragments have been preserved (F 1–11), three of them relating to Themistocles (F 1–3). It is, however, virtually impossible that Thucydides the historian can have used this work as his main source. In the first place, there are chronological objections. A recent study of the work maintains that it was not published before about 420,<sup>67</sup> so that, if Thucydides wrote about Themistocles at an early stage of his literary career, it was probably not accessible to him when he was collecting material. A more decisive factor is that its form and content cannot, unless the surviving evidence is wholly misleading, have been such as would have furnished him with what he required. The work of Stesimbrotus was a pamphlet and not a series of biographical sketches; it can hardly have contained much continuous narrative. The fragments suggest that it consisted largely of personal anecdotes intended to throw light on the characters of the Athenian leaders and concerned mostly with their education and family lives.<sup>68</sup> Another objection emerges from a passage of Plutarch where he cites Stesimbrotus as his authority for two stories about the flight of Themistocles, which he considers to be inconsistent with one another (F 3): that the wife and children of Themistocles were smuggled out of Athens and sent to join him in Molossia, and that he visited Hieron whose daughter he sought in marriage. The first of these stories could have been known to Thucydides but considered to be of insufficient significance to warrant a reference to it,<sup>69</sup> but the second story is totally irreconcilable with his detailed narrative on the flight of Themistocles.<sup>70</sup>

Charon of Lampsacus is one of those early prose-writers about whom so little is known that almost any speculative reconstruction of their works or views cannot easily be disproved. He is, however—unlike several others mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in a much disputed survey of early historians (*de Thuc.* 5)<sup>71</sup>—

<sup>65</sup> See above p. 96 with n.4. The tradition about Pausanias could well have been distorted by the Spartan authorities soon after his death when their treatment of him was criticized by the Delphic oracle (134.4).

<sup>66</sup> Herodotus, 5.32, may be referring to oral tradition rather than a written source when he mentions with some scepticism (*εἰ δὲ ἀληθὴς γέ ἐστι ὁ λόγος*) a report that Pausanias intrigued with the Persians.

<sup>67</sup> F. Schachermeyr, *Sitzb. Oest. Akad.* 247.5 (1965), 9–11. The whole paper (1–23) is valuable.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Schachermeyr, *op. cit.*, who persuasively disputes the widely accepted view—still favoured by Meiggs (above, n.5),

pp. 15–16—that the pamphlet was a tirade against Athenian imperialism by an embittered ally.

<sup>69</sup> Thucydides notes only that money which he had deposited at Athens and Argos was sent to him (137.3).

<sup>70</sup> Meiggs (above, n.5), p. 81. Thucydides can scarcely have obtained his material about Pausanias from the pamphlet by Stesimbrotus, though the section on Themistocles could have included some account of his relations with Pausanias.

<sup>71</sup> For a commentary on this important chapter see W.K. Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, On Thucydides* (Berkeley, 1975), pp. 50–7.

rather more than a mere name. A considerable number of works are attributed to him, rightly or wrongly, by the *Suda* (FGrHist 262 T 1), and more than a dozen certainly genuine fragments have been preserved (F 1–14). Dionysius includes him, with Hecataeus, Acusilaus, and some very shadowy figures, in a group of 'archaic' historians who wrote before the Peloponnesian war. These historians are differentiated chronologically from those of a later group, which includes Hellanicus;<sup>72</sup> members of this group were contemporaries of Thucydides, but apparently older contemporaries. A statement by Dionysius in another work (*ad Pomp.* 3.7) that Charon was older than Herodotus is echoed by Plutarch (*de Mal. Herod.* 20) and Tertullian (*de Anima* 46), but it may well be false, since it names Hellanicus also as a predecessor of Herodotus.<sup>73</sup> There is, however, no reason to doubt that Charon was older than Thucydides, and, though it is impossible to assign even approximate dates of publication to his various works, chronological considerations do not exclude the possibility that Thucydides might have used one, or more than one, of them as a source.<sup>74</sup>

The only fragment of Charon relating to the experiences of Themistocles in exile (F 11) is preserved by Plutarch (*Them.* 27.1). According to Plutarch, Charon was in agreement with Thucydides (137.3) in stating that the Great King with whom Themistocles established contact when he reached Asia was Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, whereas Ephorus and other fourth-century writers

<sup>72</sup> Hellanicus can almost certainly be eliminated as a source possibly used by Thucydides for his excursus. The experiences of Pausanias and Themistocles in their last years were presumably mentioned by Hellanicus in his *Atthis*, which contained an account of the Pentecontaetia, but Thucydides comments adversely upon the brevity of this account (97.2, *βραχέως*), so that it could hardly have provided him with sufficient detail to meet his needs. It is also improbable that the *Atthis* was published when he wrote about Pausanias and Themistocles; his reference to it is almost certainly a late insertion—see K. Ziegler, *Rb.Mus.* 78 (1929), 66 n.2), whose conclusion has been widely accepted, cf. O. Luschnat, *RE Suppl.* 12 (1971), 1145.

<sup>73</sup> Dionysius does not necessarily mean that all the works of Charon were published before the single work of Herodotus. He does not specify which work or works of Charon he has in mind. R. Drews, *Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Harvard, 1973), pp. 25–6, assumes that it was the *Persica*, but it could have been the totally unknown *Hellenica* or some other work.

<sup>74</sup> F. Jacoby, *Abhandl. zur gr. Geschichtsschreibung* (Leyden, 1956), pp. 178–206 (originally published in *Stud. ital.* 15, 1938), cf. *FGrHist* 3a Kom. (1943), 1–2, has challenged the generally accepted dating of Charon, maintaining that he belongs to the end of the fifth century. The principal conclusion of that paper is, in my opinion,

unacceptable and some of its arguments uncharacteristically weak. Two of them may be noted. According to Jacoby, *Abhandl.*, pp. 182–3, the statement of Thucydides (97.2) that only Hellanicus had written about the Pentecontaetia shows that Charon had not yet published an account of this period. There is, however, no evidence that Charon ever wrote any work covering the whole of the Pentecontaetia or even a substantial part of it, cf. K. von Fritz, *Gr. Geschichtsschreibung* 1a (Berlin, 1967), 520, and Drews, *op. cit.*, p. 25. Another point made by Jacoby, *ibid.*, pp. 187–8, is equally unconvincing, namely that the work of Charon on Spartan magistrates, together with his *Cretica*, should be assigned to the period after 405, when Lampsacus was under Spartan control, rather than to an earlier era. There seems to be no reason whatever why he could not have visited Sparta (see below) before the Peloponnesian war began and have then collected material for his work on Spartan magistrates. He was doubtless younger than most of the other historians named by Dionysius in the group of those who wrote before the war, but there is no justification for believing Dionysius to be mistaken in including him in this earlier group. In *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), pp. 164 and 335 n.26, Jacoby is confident that Thucydides obtained information about the tyrants of Lampsacus, reported in 6.59.3–4, from the *Chronicles* of Charon.

maintained that it was Xerxes himself. The agreement between Charon and Thucydides on this point is of little significance, since their version is undoubtedly correct and Thucydides could well have obtained his information from some source other than Charon. The version favoured by Ephorus and others appears to be a fabrication designed to produce a dramatic confrontation between Themistocles and the Persian king whom he had so conspicuously outmanoeuvred in the campaign of 480. Unfortunately Plutarch does not name the work in which Charon referred to the interview between Themistocles and Artaxerxes. Of the works attributed to Charon in the *Suda* (T 1) the most likely is perhaps the *Persica*,<sup>75</sup> but there are other possibilities, among them the *Chronicles of Lampsacus*, since the Persians imposed upon that city the obligation to supply Themistocles with wine (138.5).<sup>76</sup> There is no means of determining on what scale Charon dealt with the fortunes of Themistocles in exile: it is tempting to assume that he gave a detailed account of them, but the possibility cannot be excluded that he made only a passing reference to the audience with Artaxerxes.

No evidence exists that Charon even mentioned anywhere the events leading to the death of Pausanias. He might well have treated the subject in the *Persica* or in the chronographical work, attributed to him in the *Suda*, on Spartan magistrates, which can hardly have been a mere list of names but doubtless included some historical material as well. A fragment from his *Chronicles of Lampsacus* (F 2) attests that he visited Sparta: if he made inquiries about Pausanias there, he would almost certainly have received information designed to exculpate the Spartan authorities from the stigma of having treated their regent inhumanely.<sup>77</sup> Official sensitiveness of this kind seems to have influenced the account of Thucydides. He may have visited Sparta (10.2), but perhaps not before he became an exile (cf. 5.26.5). It may also be suggested that Charon, being a Lampsacene, may have felt an interest in the fall of Pausanias because it paved the way for the establishment of the Athenian empire. Further speculation about the possible influence of Charon upon the development of the tradition concerning Pausanias and Themistocles would not be profitable. It is, however, noteworthy that several fragments of his works, especially a long verbatim quotation from his *Chronicles of Lampsacus* (F 1),<sup>78</sup> reflect the distinctive style and narrative-technique of Ionian *ιστορίη*; and, as has been pointed out above, nowhere in the *History* of Thucydides is the influence of this Ionian manner so plainly traceable as in his excursus on Pausanias and Themistocles.

It is undeniable that Thucydides might have derived from Charon most of the source-material for his excursus, but there is no positive reason for believing that he did. The case remains a very flimsy one. If Dionysius of Halicarnassus is to be trusted, the number of historians who were predecessors or older contemporaries of Thucydides is considerable, though some of the former wrote too early to have dealt with Pausanias and Themistocles; and he is careful to note that in each of his two groups the historians whom he names are only a selection (*de Thuc.* 5). Most of his named historians were Asiatic Greeks, and almost all, both named and unnamed, doubtless wrote in the Ionian manner. If Thucydides

<sup>75</sup> Drews, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

<sup>76</sup> The links between Themistocles and Lampsacus, which are rather obscure, are discussed by Meiggs (above, n.5), p. 53.

<sup>77</sup> See above, n.65.

<sup>78</sup> H. Fränkel, *Gött. Nachr.* 1924, pp. 92–3, infers from an examination of this fragment that the style of Charon was much inferior to that of Herodotus.

based his excursus on a written source, its author could well have been one of his many predecessors or older contemporaries who are even more nebulous than Charon.<sup>79</sup>

*St. John's College, Cambridge*

H. D. WESTLAKE

<sup>79</sup> I am deeply indebted to Professor A. Andrewes, who has read a draft of this paper and made some most valuable comments. He has independently noticed the abnormal use of the term Spartiate in the excursus on

Pausanias and Themistocles discussed above, pp. 97-102. He has kindly shown to me an extract from the final volume of *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (note on 8.22.1) which mentions this point.