

HISTORY IN [DEMOSTHENES] 59

It is well known that Athenian orators, when they made reference to the historical past, usually eschewed prolonged narrative in favour of brief allusions to familiar episodes from Athenian history.¹ Perhaps the most striking exception to this custom is the long and detailed account of fifth-century Plataean history in the pseudo-Demosthenic speech *Against Neaera* (Dem. 59.94–103). The main interest of this passage, however, lies not in its divergence from contemporary rhetorical practice, but in its clear reliance on Thucydides for its account of the siege of Plataea during the Peloponnesian War. Indeed, it is unique in Attic oratory in the extent of its reliance on an identifiable historical work. Yet, considering its significance, this passage has received very little scholarly attention, and merits a closer re-examination.²

The background to the prosecution of Neaera is as follows. In 348 Apollodoros of Acharnae, who was a supporter of Demosthenes, moved a *probouleuma* that the surplus of the annual budget should be transferred to the military rather than to the Theoric fund. Although he secured the acceptance of this proposal, he was prosecuted by Stephanos of Eroadae under a *graphē paranomōn* and was convicted.³ The resulting hostility between his family and that of Stephanos lasted throughout the decade, and culminated in his kinsman Theomnestos prosecuting the woman with whom Stephanos lived, Neaera, under a *dikē xenias*, at some time between 343 and 340.⁴ Although it was Theomnestos who brought the prosecution and opened the speech, the bulk of it was delivered by Apollodoros, who acted as his *synegoros*, and who probably also wrote the speech.⁵

The bulk of the speech is devoted to a picaresque account of Neaera's early career as a courtesan (§§ 18–48), and to an attempt to prove that Stephanos acknowledged by his own actions that Neaera was not his legal wife (§§ 49–84). The excursus on the Plataeans is introduced in order to impress upon the jurors the seriousness of the crime of which Neaera stands accused. Apollodoros argues that her attempt to pass herself off as an Athenian is all the more disgraceful because the Athenians considered their citizenship to be a very valuable gift, only to be granted with the greatest

¹ Thus L. Pearson 'Historical Allusions in the Attic Orators', *CP* 36 (1941), 209–29: 'When an orator allows himself the luxury of a digression into the past history of Athens, he is usually more interested in broad outlines than in exact detail' (p. 210). For general discussions of the orators' use of historical examples see Pearson, *op. cit.* and M. Nouhaud, *L'Utilisation de l'histoire par les orateurs attiques* (Paris, 1982), *passim*. These works are referred to by author's name alone, as are A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford, 1945–81) and L. Gernet *Démosthène Plaidoyers civils* IV (Paris, 1960).

² The passage is not mentioned by Pearson, nor by O. Luschnat in his examination of references to Thucydides in the fourth century ('Thucydides', *RE* Supp. 12 cols. 1266–91). It is however discussed by Nouhaud, pp. 263–4.

³ The course of relations between Apollodoros and Stephanos is narrated at §§ 2–10. On the possible political basis of the trial see G. H. Macurdy 'Apollodorus and the Speech against Neaera', *AJP* 63 (1942), 257–71.

⁴ The reference to Xenocleides in terms which suggest that he was in Athens (§ 26) implies that the speech postdates his expulsion from Macedonia in 343 (Dem. 19.231). Demosthenes secured the passing of legislation to transfer money from the Theoric fund to the military fund in 339, and it is certain that Apollodoros would have mentioned this at § 5 if he had been able to do so.

⁵ That Apollodoros was the author was first suggested by A. Schäfer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* (Berlin, 1856–8), Beilagen pp. 184–93, and is now generally accepted.

reluctance to those who manifestly deserved it. As proof of this, he cites the case of the Plataeans, who had lost their city during the Peloponnesian War and who were the first people to receive Athenian citizenship *en bloc*. These men, for all their bravery and loyalty to Athens, were granted Athenian citizenship only on the most stringent terms and after detailed individual scrutiny: the difficulty which they had in obtaining the citizenship makes it all the more disgraceful that a prostitute like Neaera should simply usurp the privilege. The purpose of the excursus on Plataean history is therefore to illustrate how well the Plataeans had deserved of the Athenians. The excursus falls into three sections, dealing with the Persian Wars, with Plataea and Pausanias, and with the siege of Plataea, which I discuss separately.

Plataea in the Persian Wars §§94–6

Apollodoros' account opens with the claim that the Plataeans, alone of the Greeks, fought alongside the Athenians at Marathon. He offers as confirmation of this their depiction in the painting of the battle in the Stoa Poikilē wearing their Boeotian caps.⁶ His recounting of the background to the battle – that Datis had returned from Eretria after his subjugation of Euboea, had landed in Attica, and started to ravage the land – also accords with what we are told by Herodotus (6.102).

The section dealing with the campaign of 480–479 (§§95–6) is much less accurate, and demonstrates a clear bias in favour of the Plataeans. Apollodoros claims that half of the Plataeans fought and died at Thermopylae, whilst the other half was embarked on Athenian ships and fought at Salamis and Artemision, and that they were the only Boeotians to do so (§95). This account contains a number of details which do not accord with what we are told by Herodotus, and which appear to be wrong. First, the Plataeans, so far from being the only Boeotians to have fought at Thermopylae, took no part in the battle (Hdt. 7.202–4; 222). In fact it was the Thespians who had stayed with Leonidas until the bitter end (Hdt. 7.222). Second, much as it might stick in an Athenian throat to admit it, there was also a Theban contingent present at the battle.⁷ Third, although the Plataeans were indeed engaged at Artemision, Apollodoros is wrong to claim that they also fought at Salamis.⁸

It would be naive to think that these divergences from Herodotus indicate the use of an independent source, since the battles of the Persian Wars were extremely popular at Athens, and were progressively elaborated so as to exaggerate the achievements of the Athenians.⁹ Against this background, Apollodoros' inaccuracy and crude bias is nothing out of the ordinary. Moreover, this section was written precisely in order to glorify the Plataeans, whilst the Thespians and Thebans were

⁶ This is the first mention of the famous fresco. See E. B. Harrison, 'The South Frieze of the Nike Temple and the Marathon Painting in the Painted Stoa', *AJA* 76 (1972), 353–78 for a full discussion of the literary references to it.

⁷ Herodotus implies that all of the Boeotians, with the exception of the Thespians and the Plataeans, gave their pledges of soil and water to the Persians when they were requested to do so (7.132.1). At 7.233.1 he says that they were among the first to do so. This is borne out by his assertion at 7.222 that the Thebans were forced to remain at Thermopylae as hostages, but R. J. Buck, *A History of Boeotia* (Edmonton, 1979), p. 132 argues that this charge was false, that the Boeotian League gave their pledges solely as a form of insurance policy with Xerxes, and that they fought loyally at Thermopylae.

⁸ Herodotus relates that the Plataeans manned some of the Athenian ships at Artemision (8.1), but says that they did not fight at Salamis, having left the fleet after Artemision (8.44.1). Moreover, the fact that Thucydides has the Plataeans claim that they fought at Artemision (3.54.4) suggests that they were not also at Salamis.

⁹ See Nouhaud, pp. 135–7.

respectively insignificant and widely hated at Athens. Indeed, there is no reason to believe that he was not simply recycling popular tradition. The only detail which might suggest a written source is his account of Datis' earlier movements, but this hardly requires such an explanation. On the other hand, it would be invalid to conclude from his use of the Marathon painting as evidence that he had no literary source, since it was an effective rhetorical tactic to use evidence which was so familiar to all of the jurors. If he did use a written source, it was clearly not Herodotus, but may have been a popularising account of the Persian Wars.

Plataea and Pausanias §§96–8

In this passage Apollodoros describes how Pausanias, swollen with pride because the Spartans had been given supreme command against the Persians, had ordered the inscription of a self-serving and arrogant epigram onto the tripod which the Greeks had constructed from the barbarian spoils and erected in Apollo's honour at Delphi. The Plataeans, acting on behalf of the allies, prosecuted the Spartans before the Amphictyones for 1,000 talents, as a result of which the Spartans were compelled to erase the epigram and inscribe the names of the cities who had taken part.¹⁰

The only other author to deal with the inscription and erasure of the epigram is Thucydides, in the course of his excursus on Pausanias (1.128–35). He and Apollodoros agree that Pausanias ordered the hybistic epigram to be engraved, and provide identical wordings of it,¹¹ but thereafter their two accounts differ sharply. Thucydides depicts Pausanias as a vain and over-ambitious maverick at odds with his city,¹² whilst Apollodoros represents him as seeking to further the interests of Sparta, and as acting in an official capacity. Thus at §96 he says that Pausanias wished to insult Athens, and that he was dissatisfied with Sparta's standing among the Greeks. He is twice erroneously described as being the Spartan king (he was in fact regent), but the error more probably arose from ignorance or carelessness than from a desire to link him more closely with official Spartan policy.¹³ Thucydides says nothing about Pausanias being prosecuted, merely remarking that the Spartans erased the epigram and replaced it with a list of the cities which had erected the monument.

These two accounts are clearly incompatible. It is generally assumed that Thucydides' version is correct, and that Apollodoros provides no more than a particularly extreme instance of fourth-century rhetorical exaggeration and distortion of earlier history.¹⁴ Yet, however reliable the rest of Thucydides is, the accuracy of his excursus on Pausanias and Themistocles cannot be taken for granted.¹⁵ Moreover, there are several reasons why his version should not be automatically preferred.

¹⁰ The erection of the original monument is described at Hdt. 9.81.1. For a full discussion see R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 57–60. See too D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 216–17.

¹¹ 'Ελλήνων ἀρχηγός, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων, | Πανσανίας Φοῖβω μνήμ' ἀνέθηκε τόδε. Diod. Sic. 11.33 provides a different epigram: 'Ελλάδος εὐρυχόρου σωτήρες τόνδ' ἀνέθηκαν | δουλοσύνας στυγερὰς ῥυσάμενοι πόλιν. This version is problematic: it reads as a replacement for Pausanias' verse, but Thucydides says that the latter was replaced by a list of Greek cities (1.132.3). Yet we should be reluctant to convict Diodorus of such gross incompetence in the case of a well-known piece of verse.

¹² Thucydides says of Pausanias' voyage to the Hellespont that he was δημοσία μὲν οὐκέτι ἐξεπέμφθη, ἰδίᾳ δὲ... ἐφιέμενος τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀρχῆς (1.128.3).

¹³ The same error is found at Lyc. *Leocr.* 128, and indeed in the bracket at Thuc. 1.131.2.

¹⁴ Thus C. W. Fornara 'Two Notes on Thucydides', *Philologus* 111 (1967), 291–5.

¹⁵ A sceptical view of the accuracy of this excursus is provided by P. J. Rhodes, 'Thucydides on Pausanias and Themistocles', *Historia* 19 (1970), 387–400.

First, Apollodoros' account accords with what we know from elsewhere about Amphictyonic judicial procedure, and there is certainly nothing implausible in the matter having been brought before the Amphictyony.¹⁶ Admittedly the amount of the fine appears implausibly high, but we should remember that in 382 a fine of 500 talents was imposed on the Spartans for their seizure of the Cadmeia (Diod. Sic. 16.29.2), albeit for what seems to us a much more serious offence. Second, some support for Apollodoros' account might be found in the following statement of Plutarch (the supplement is that of Pearson):

τῶν δ' Ἑλλήνων οὐκ ἀνασχομένων ἀλλ' ἐγκαλούντων, πέμψαντες εἰς Δελφοὺς Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοῦτο μὲν ἐξεκόλαψαν (ἀπὸ τοῦ τρίποδος τὸ ἐλεγείον, πασῶν δὲ ἀντεπέγραψαν) τὰ δ' ὀνόματα τῶν πολέων, ὥσπερ ἦν δίκαιον, ἐνεχάραξαν.

(*De malignitate Herodoti* 873c)

It would be unwise to place too much reliance on a corrupt passage in such a notoriously rancorous work, but this statement seems to imply that the Greeks took some form of concerted action against the Spartans. Third, Thucydides' silence about Pausanias being brought to trial is not a decisive reason for rejecting Apollodoros' account, since his interest in this excursus is primarily in the behaviour and character of Pausanias, whilst the wider historical and political context is largely ignored.¹⁷ Moreover, Thucydides persistently suppresses mention of the Delphic Amphictyony. Sometimes this may be explained by the scale of the narrative, but this hardly applies to his leisurely excursus on Pausanias.¹⁸ It is interesting to compare the practice of Herodotus, who makes several references to the Amphictyony, including one to the trial of the traitor Ephialtes (which indeed is comparable to the trial of Pausanias in Apollodoros' account).¹⁹

There is, however, a potentially fatal objection to Apollodoros' credibility which has been raised by C. W. Fornara.²⁰ It is a crucial element in Apollodoros' account that the distich was erased immediately, whilst Pausanias was still alive. This appears to be borne out by Thuc. 1.132.3, but Fornara argues that Thucydides' apparent agreement depends upon the acceptance of an unnecessary emendation to the text. Thucydides tells us that at the time of Pausanias' trial the Spartans, casting around for earlier instances of illegal behaviour on his part, remembered that he had once (πότε) had the epigram incised. Having quoted it, he continues:

τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐλεγείον οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐξεκόλαψαν εὐθύς τότε ἀπὸ τοῦ τρίποδος τοῦτο καὶ ἐπέγραψαν ὀνομαστὶ τὰς πόλεις ὅσαι ξυγκαθελοῦσαι τὸν βάρβαρον ἔστησαν τὸ ἀνάθημα· τοῦ μέντοι Πανσανίου ἀδίκημα καὶ τότε [τοῦτ' MSS.] ἐδόκει εἶναι, καὶ ἐπεὶ γε δὴ ἐν τούτῳ καθειστήκει, πολλῷ μᾶλλον παρόμοιον πραχθῆναι ἐφαίνετο τῇ παρουσίᾳ διανοίᾳ.

¹⁶ Thus R. J. Bonner and G. Smith, 'Administration of Justice in the Delphic Amphictyony', *CP* 38 (1943), 1–12, p. 2: 'Since the distich had been inscribed as an offering to the god, the matter involved religion. Hence, as a religious matter which was international in its scope, the Plataeans brought it before the Amphictyony.' Contra, Gernet *ad loc.* wrote that 'Le fait n'est pas attesté ailleurs. Et le rôle qu'est attribué aux Platéens dans l'humiliation de Pausanias apparaît fantaisiste.' I can see nothing inherently implausible in Apollodoros' account.

¹⁷ Thus Bonner and Smith (op. cit. n. 16), p. 2 n. 10: 'Thucydides is interested in the incident merely as an illustration of the presumption of Pausanias and naturally omits details.'

¹⁸ See S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London, 1987), pp. 81–3 for Thucydides' minimisation of the importance of Delphi in Greek affairs.

¹⁹ The conviction of Ephialtes by the Delphic Amphictyony is recorded at Hdt. 7.213. See K. H. Waters, *Herodotos the Historian: his Problems, Methods, and Originality* (London, 1985), pp. 106–8 for a discussion of 'the quite remarkable prominence of oracles in the work of Herodotos' (p. 106).

²⁰ Fornara (op. cit. n. 14).

Fornara argues that the words *μὲν οὖν* are resumptive, in other words that they do not refer to the time of the inscription, but take us forward again to the time of the trial of Pausanias at Sparta. He argues that the manuscript reading *τοῦτ'* should therefore be retained, and also claims that there is nothing in Thucydides' account to suggest that the epigram was excised before Pausanias' trial. He concludes that 'it is easy to see how the effacement of Pausanias' epigram might have been retrojected in popular belief to the time of his failure as hegemon of the Greek Confederacy: pseudo-Demosthenes provides nothing more than the fourth century Athenian oral tradition' (p. 293). If this argument is accepted, it means that Apollodoros' account is fundamentally incompatible with the evidence of Thucydides. However, there are a number of reasons for doubting the argument of Fornara. First, *εὐθὺς τότε* surely implies that the epigram was erased as soon as it was engraved. Second, if *μὲν οὖν* is resumptive, it is so only in the sense that Thucydides is returning to his story after the quotation of the epigram. Finally, some such word as *τότε* seems to be required to point the contrast with the clauses *ἐπεὶ γε δὴ ἐν τούτῳ καθειστήκει, πολλῶ μάλλον κτλ.* More generally, we should not dismiss a story out of hand merely because it represents the oral tradition: even if Fornara is correct in his interpretation of Thucydides, we are under no obligation to accept that Thucydides got it right and that Apollodoros was in error.²¹

It is not easy to reach any conclusion about the provenance of Apollodoros' account, except that it clearly does not derive from Thucydides. It is possible, as Fornara believes, that it represents no more than popular tradition, and there is certainly little that requires us to believe that Apollodoros used a literary source. The distich of Simonides, accurately quoted at §97, is the only detail which might suggest such a conclusion. On the other hand, Apollodoros' clear use of Thucydides in his account of the siege of Plataea (see below) makes it more likely that here too he may have used a literary source.

The siege of Plataea §§98–103

It is evident that Apollodoros' account of the siege of Plataea depends to some extent on that of Thucydides (2.1–6, 71–8; 3.20–4, 52–68). But, although this dependence has been frequently noted, little attention has been paid to the equally numerous differences between the two accounts, or to what these differences tell us about the way in which Apollodoros used Thucydides.

There are marked similarities between the two accounts of the initial Theban attack on Plataea (Thuc. 2.1–4; Dem. 59.99–100). They agree that the prime mover on the Theban side was Eurymachos the son of Leontiadas, and that the Plataeans who opened the gates for them were led by Naucleidas. They also agree that the attack was made at night, and that the reason that not all of the Thebans entered Plataea was that heavy rainfall had caused the river Asopos to rise, which made a nocturnal crossing more difficult than usual. Finally, they agree that the Plataeans counter-attacked and defeated the Theban vanguard. To this similarity of content should be added a number of close similarities of phrasing between the two versions:

Thuc. 2.2.3 *ἔπραξαν δὲ ταῦτα δι' Εὐρυμάχου τοῦ Λεοντιάδου, ἀνδρὸς Θηβαίων δυνα-
τωτάτου...*

Dem. 59.99 *ἔπραξε δὲ ταῦτα ἐκ Θηβῶν δι' Εὐρυμάχου τοῦ Λεοντιάδου βοιωταρχοῦντος...*

²¹ On the potential reliability of orally transmitted material see R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1989).

Thuc. 2.3.1 οἱ δὲ Πλαταιῆς ὡς ἤσθοντο ἔνδον τε ὄντας τοὺς Θηβαίους καὶ ἑξαπιναιῶς κατελημμένην τὴν πόλιν...

Dem. 59.99 αἰσθόμενοι δ' οἱ Πλαταιῆς ἔνδον ὄντας τοὺς Θηβαίους τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἑξαπίνης [αὐτῶν] τὴν πόλιν ἐν εἰρήνῃ κατελημμένην...²²

Thuc. 2.5.2 ὁ γὰρ Ἀσσωπὸς ποταμὸς ἐρρὺν μέγας καὶ οὐ ῥαδίως διαβατὸς ἦν.

Dem. 59.99 ὁ γὰρ Ἀσσωπὸς ποταμὸς μέγας ἐρρὺν καὶ διαβήναι οὐ ῥάδιον ἦν.²³

However, there are also a number of differences between the two accounts:

(i) Apollodoros describes the Theban attack as having been engineered by the Spartan king Archidamos (59.98), but there is no suggestion in Thucydides that the Thebans were acting as Spartan surrogates.

(ii) Apollodoros states that Eurymachos was one of the Boeotarchs (59.99), whilst Thucydides refers to him merely as ἀνδρὸς Θηβαίων δυνατωτάτου (2.2.3).

(iii) Apollodoros states that the Plataean traitors were bribed (59.99), whilst Thucydides attributes to them a factional motive (2.2.2).

(iv) Apollodoros states that the Plataeans only realised how few the Thebans were when day broke (59.99), whilst Thucydides emphasises that the Plataeans launched their counter-attack when it was still night, so that the Thebans would be at a disadvantage because of their ignorance of the geography of the city (2.3.4).

They also disagree in important respects as to the aftermath of the Theban attack. Thucydides reports the following sequence of events (2.5–6): the Plataeans sent a messenger to Athens, and then entered into negotiations with the Thebans. The Thebans withdrew, whereupon those of them who had been captured were put to death. Another messenger was then sent from Plataea to Athens, and an Athenian relief force was sent to Plataea. Apollodoros omits the negotiations between the Plataeans and the Thebans, and only mentions the first messenger. Moreover, he places the despatch of the Athenian relief force immediately after the arrival of the Plataean messenger. Thus in his account it was when they saw the Athenians marching to the help of the Plataeans that the Thebans retired (§100), whilst Thucydides makes it clear that the Thebans had already retreated (2.5.7) by the time the Athenians decided to send a force to Plataea (2.6.4). The execution of the Theban prisoners therefore comes last in Apollodoros' account.

Turning to their two accounts of the Spartan reaction to their Theban allies' debacle, Apollodoros shows no sign of realising that it was not until 429 that the siege was renewed, but goes straight on from his account of the Theban attack to the statement that the Spartans were angered and marched out openly (ἀπροφασίστως) against Plataea (§101). He also produces a detailed order of battle for this Peloponnesian force: 'the Spartans summoned all of the Peloponnesians, with the exception of the Argives, at two-thirds strength, together with the rest of the Boeotians, the Locrians, the Phocians, the Malians, the Oetaeans, and the Aenians at full strength' (§101). Thucydides says nothing of these allies.

Their accounts of the initial negotiations between the Spartans and the Plataeans are broadly similar (Thuc. 2.71–4; Dem. 59.102). Apollodoros says that the terms offered to the Plataeans were that they should surrender their city to the Spartans but be allowed to keep their land and enjoy their property, and that they should break off

²² ἑξαπιναιῶς is found once in Hippocrates, 8 times in Thucydides, but nowhere else in Attic prose. ἑξαπίνης is found 6 times in Thucydides, 3 times in Aristophanes (all in *Ploutos*), but only once in the works of the Attic orators (Isaeos 1.14), for whom ἑξαίφνης was the regular word for 'suddenly'.

²³ If Apollodoros was using Thucydides directly, it is possible that he found the adjective διαβατός too poetic, and preferred a more periphrastic construction.

their alliance with the Athenians (§102). According to Thucydides, the Spartans demanded that the Plataeans rescind this alliance and become neutrals (2.72.1). This was followed by an offer to hold the city in trust for the Plataeans for the duration of the war (2.72.3). In Apollodoros' account the Plataeans are represented as replying that *ἀνευ Ἀθηναίων οὐδὲν ἂν πράξειαν* (§102). This could mean either that they refused to make a decision until they had consulted the Athenians, or that they refused to be separated from their allies. The former interpretation accords better with the version of Thucydides, according to which the Plataeans said that they wished to consult the Athenians first, but that they were prepared to accede to the Spartans' request if the Athenians were amenable, and were only led to reject Archidamos' proposal by clear Athenian promises of support (2.73.3).²⁴

Thucydides recounts the progress of the siege in full (2.75–8; 3.20–4, 52), whilst Apollodoros' account is considerably more cursory (§102). He gives no details of the Spartan conduct of the siege, or of their attempt to burn the city down, saying only that they made many varied attempts to capture it (§102). He correctly records the Spartans' construction of a double wall of circumvallation (§103, cf. Thuc. 2.78.1–2; 3.21), but appears to have been mistaken about the duration of the siege. The siege in fact lasted for two years (from summer 429 to summer 427), but Apollodoros gives the figure of ten years (§102).²⁵

Both authors agree that the Plataeans' escape from the city was motivated by hunger and desperation (Thuc. 3.20–4; Dem. 59.103), but they provide different explanations of why only half of the Plataeans took part in the attempt. Apollodoros says that the Plataeans divided themselves by lot into two groups, whilst Thucydides relates that the original intention was that everyone should take part in the attempt, but that half of them lost their nerve and would not go (3.20.2). However, they agree that the attempt was made on a stormy night, and again we find striking verbal similarity between their accounts:

Thuc. 3.22.1 οἱ δ'... τηρήσαντες νύκτα χειμέριον ὕδατι καὶ ἀνέμῳ καὶ ἄμ' ἀσέληνον ἐξῆσαν.
Dem. 59.103 οἱ δὲ τηρήσαντες νύκτα καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἄνεμον πολύν...

Apollodoros states baldly that the Plataeans scaled the wall, avoided the Spartan forces, killed the guards, and escaped to Athens, which is certainly compatible with Thucydides' much more detailed narrative. The detail that the Plataeans reached Athens *δεινῶς διακέκρυμμένοι καὶ ἀπροσδοκῆτως* is not found in Thucydides, but would be a reasonable assumption on his part.

The two accounts also differ in several important respects as to the eventual fate of those Plataeans who remained in the city (Thuc. 3.52–68; Dem. 59.103). First, Apollodoros says that Plataea was taken by storm (§103), whilst Thucydides

²⁴ In such contexts *ἀνευ* often means simply 'without' (Ar. *Lys.* 143; Plato, *Symp.* 217a; Tod 127.11–13: *πῶς[λ]ε[μ]ον δὲ καὶ εἰρήνην μὴ ἐξεῖναι Κορκυραίους ποιήσασθαι [ἀ]νευ Ἀθηναίων*), but it can also mean 'without the consent of' (Aesch. *Cho.* 431; Soph. *OC* 926; Aeneas Tact. 10.4).

²⁵ *δέκα* was emended to *δύο* by Palmer, but the manuscript reading was defended by G. Grote, *A History of Greece* (London, 1884), vi. 353 n. 3: 'because the Pseudo-Demosthenes introduces a great many other errors and inaccuracies respecting Plataea, besides his mistake about the duration of the siege. The ten years' siege of Troy was constantly present to the imaginations of these literary Greeks.' F. Lortzing, *De orationibus quas Demosthenes pro Apollodoro scripsisse fertur* (Berlin, 1863), p. 49 n. 10 rejected this explanation but agreed that the text is sound. He suggested that Apollodoros was misled by the text of Thuc. 3.68: *τὴν δὲ γῆν δημοσιώσαντες ἀπεμίσθωσαν ἐπὶ δέκα ἔτη, καὶ ἐνέμοντο Θηβαῖοι*. I share his reluctance to emend the text, since Apollodoros may have been simply mistaken, or else may have wished to exaggerate the bravery of the Plataeans.

emphasises that the Spartan commander much preferred not to have to launch an assault on the city, and that the Plataeans surrendered to him (3.52.2–3). Second, Apollodoros is silent about the trial of the Plataeans, to which Thucydides devotes so much space (3.52–68). They agree, however, that the men were executed whilst the women (and children in Apollodoros' account) were enslaved. Apollodoros excludes all those who had seen the Spartans advancing and had secretly escaped to Athens, which I take to be a reference to people who had got away in 429 when the Spartans were preparing to lay siege to the city rather than to any last-minute escape.

The similarities between these two accounts, particularly those of phrasing, suggest that Apollodoros had used Thucydides as a source. Yet the differences between them show that Apollodoros did not simply follow Thucydides: either he altered Thucydides' account for some reason, or he used an additional source or sources. The scholarly consensus is that Apollodoros simply provides a condensed and in places distorted version of Thucydides' account.²⁶ Yet it is clear that Apollodoros, if his only source was Thucydides, made a large number of alterations to the historian's account. We are therefore compelled either to posit the use of a second source, or to explain how and why Apollodoros should have treated Thucydides' narrative in such a cavalier fashion. It is this latter alternative which I consider first.

First, a number of the differences may be simply attributable to the need to compress Thucydides' account to a manageable length. This seems to be the most plausible explanation of his treatment of the events which followed the repulse of the Thebans and of the negotiations between the Plataeans and the Spartans, and also explains his failure to make it clear that there was an interval between the Theban attack and the Spartan siege. And in general the need for concision clearly required that many details (for example of the siege proper) be cut out, whilst the Spartan trial of the Plataeans, to which Thucydides devotes so much space, was obviously irrelevant to his purpose. Second, some differences may be due to a desire to make the story more vivid. A possible example of this is the statement that Eurymachos, whom Thucydides described as a very powerful Boeotian, was a Boeotarch. Third, some differences, such as his statement that the siege lasted ten years, could be attributed to simple carelessness. Yet it is hard to believe that Apollodoros alternated the accurate transmission of precise details, often with close verbal correspondence, with pieces of gross carelessness. It is particularly hard to believe this of a man who elsewhere in his speeches reveals a pedantic concern for detail.²⁷ Finally, we must consider whether Apollodoros was led by his rhetorical purpose – to emphasise the bravery of the Plataeans – into deliberate distortion. It is certainly possible that the account of the Plataeans drawing lots to determine which of them should break out, when Thucydides had stated that those who stayed behind did so because their nerve had failed, is an attempt to suppress evidence of Plataean lack of spirit. Moreover, the role given to Archidamos in the planning of the Theban attack may be a device to connect the attack of 431 with the Plataean opposition to Sparta after the Persian Wars, and thus to exaggerate the importance of the Plataeans. He may also have felt that the Plataeans would appear nobler if their city was taken by storm rather than

²⁶ F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* (Leipzig, 1887–93) iii (1). 538 thought that 'Der Platäer Thaten und Leiden werden ausführlich erzählt, und zwar, soweit es Ereignisse des peloponnesischen Kriege sind, nach Thukydides, den der Verfasser zuweilen fast wörtlich ausschreibt.'

²⁷ This pedantic streak reveals itself in the repeated and detailed quotation of laws (see especially Dem. 46 *passim*) and in the extremely detailed records which he kept as trierarch (Dem. 50.30). No doubt this concern for accuracy was a product of his background in banking (Dem. 49.5).

(as Thucydides relates it) surrendering. Finally, the long list of Spartan allies might have been included in order to emphasise the insuperable odds with which the Plataeans were faced.

However, although the Peloponnesian order of battle serves a clear rhetorical purpose, its length and detail make it hard to believe that it is the product of either confusion or invention. It is possible that it derives from popular tradition. And indeed, although the Athenians tended to know far more about their own history than about that of other cities, it is quite likely that the siege of Plataea constituted a special case, since it arose from the Plataeans' refusal to break their treaty with Athens, whilst the large number of Plataean refugees at Athens no doubt preserved, and possibly embellished, the story of their gallant defiance of the Spartans.²⁸ Yet in my opinion the same features which seemed to preclude this list having been invented also tell against its being orally transmitted – it is simply too obscure to have been of popular interest, and therefore almost certainly derives from a written source, and probably from the work of a historian.

If Apollodoros did use another written source, we must consider whether he used Thucydides and this other source side by side, or whether he used a single source which had in turn made partial use of Thucydides. On this latter view, the verbal similarities between the two accounts would have to be attributed to Apollodoros having copied his source, who had in turn copied Thucydides, word for word, which seems to me to be highly unlikely. Moreover, as I suggest below, there are a number of other passages in *Against Neaera* which suggest that Apollodoros had the text of Thucydides in his mind when he was writing them. If this is correct, it becomes almost certain that Apollodoros had used Thucydides directly. It is no objection to this hypothesis that most orators were too careless of historical accuracy to consult even one written source. The fact that Apollodoros had already diverged from normal practice by choosing to include a long and detailed excursus in his speech indicates that he was not bound by convention. My solution is speculative, but seems to be required by the difficulties of the text.

IMPLICATIONS

If my analysis so far is correct, it has implications in a number of different areas. First, it suggests that there existed at least one previously unknown historian of the siege of Plataea, writing either as a contemporary observer or at some point in the first half of the fourth century. Since we cannot tell how many of the divergent elements in Apollodoros' account derive from this source, rather than from his own distortion and compression, it would be wrong to attribute every difference between the two accounts to this source. The one irreconcilable difference between the accounts of Apollodoros and Thucydides is the appearance of the catalogue of Spartan allies at §101. Of the allies whom Apollodoros lists, we know from Thuc. 2.9 that the Boeotians, Locrians and Phocians were allies of Sparta. The statement that all of the Peloponnesians were summoned except for the Argives is slightly more problematic, since although Thucydides confirms that the Argives were not allied to Sparta, he says the same of the Achaeans (2.9), whom Apollodoros does not exclude. The Oetaeans, Malians, and Aenianians were Thessalian tribes from the Spercheios valley, and form

²⁸ On Plataean refugees at Athens see Lys. 23.2–6. Note too the Plataean graveyard at Athens: J. J. E. Hondius, *Novae inscriptiones Atticae* (Leiden, 1925), pp. 126–30. Gomme (endnote *ad* 3.20–4) believed that these men provided Thucydides with his information on the siege.

a coherent geographical unit.²⁹ However, far from there being any evidence that they were allied to Sparta at the time, we know that in 426 the Spartans founded Heracleia in Trachis at the request of the Trachinians, who were under pressure from the Oetaeans (Thuc. 3.92). Moreover, we are told that in 419 there was a battle between the people of Heracleia, on the one hand, and the Aenianians, Dolopians, Malians, and some of the Thessalians on the other (Thuc. 5.51). Such passages make it hard to believe that any of these Thessalian tribes could have been allies of Sparta in 429. Finally, the authenticity of the detail that the Peloponnesians mustered at two-thirds strength is supported by Thuc. 2.10. To sum up, we cannot exclude the possibility that the list is genuine, and that the Spartans formed a short-lived alliance with the Thessalian tribes, but I am inclined to doubt it. On the other hand, it is hard to see how or why such a list should have been fabricated. Interestingly, we know that in 395 these tribes formed part of the force which Lysander collected before the battle of Haliartus, and were therefore allies of Sparta (Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.6), and one might speculate that the list of allies has been erroneously retrojected to this earlier period.

Second, it is possible that the detail that Eurymachos was a Boeotarch, rather than just an important figure as Thucydides relates, derives from the same source and is accurate. Finally, Apollodoros and Thucydides disagree about the arrangements which the Plataeans made when they were planning their escape through the Spartan lines. Gomme had trouble accepting Thucydides' account, arguing *ad loc.* that the diversionary sally

seems to have been a brave action by men whose nerve had failed them when they first thought of escaping from the town (20.2); perhaps there is more truth in the statement of Demosthenes [sc. Dem. 59.103] that the besieged drew lots, the plan being that half should escape, so that the food might last longer.

This suggestion would have added force if Apollodoros was using a reputable source, but again I have already suggested that this divergence might be due to Apollodoros' desire to suppress any evidence of Plataean lack of spirit.

As to the identity of Apollodoros' putative source, no obvious candidates suggest themselves. However, one name worth serious consideration is that of Daimachos of Plataea (*FrGrHist* 65).³⁰ Tantalisingly little is known about this man, whom Jacoby championed as a possible author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*.³¹ There is no evidence that he ever wrote a history of Plataea, but the fact that he was a source for Ephoros suggests that he wrote a *Hellenika*.³² We do not know which period his work dealt with, but it is possible that it contained an account of the siege of Plataea. Alternatively, we know that he wrote a work about sieges (*Poliorketika Hypomnemata* F 3–4), although the extant fragments suggest that this was a technical manual rather than an account of particular sieges (F 4 deals with the qualities of different types of iron). Much stronger support for the theory that Daimachos wrote an account of the siege of Plataea is provided by the fact that one of the generals who led the Plataean break-out was Eupompides the son of Daimachos (Thuc. 3.20.1). It is tempting to speculate

²⁹ See H. D. Westlake, *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.* (London, 1935), pp. 16–17 on the valley of the Spercheios: 'in historical times it enjoyed no political unity and little independence, being divided between the Aenianes, the Malians, and the Oetaeans, whose feuds other powers turned to their own advantage'.

³⁰ I owe this suggestion to Dr S. Hornblower.

³¹ F. Jacoby, 'Der Verfasser der Hellenika von Oxyrhynchos', *Gött. Nachr.* (1924), 13–18.

³² This seems to be the clear implication of T1 (Porphyry *apud* Eusebius, *PE* 10.3, p. 464b: καὶ τί γὰρ Ἐφόρου ἴδιον, ἐκ τῶν Δαιμάχου καὶ Καλλισθένους καὶ Ἀναξιμένης αὐταῖς λέξεσιν ἔστιν ὅτε τρισχιλίουσ' ὁλοῦς μετατιθέντος στίχους;

that Daimachos the historian was a descendant of this man (possibly his son), and that he therefore had an excellent source of information about the course of the siege, as well as a strong reason to write about it.

A single pro-Plataean source

The fact that Apollodoros' account of the siege of Plataea clearly depends on the close use of at least one written source makes it more likely that the same is true of the earlier sections of the Plataean excursus. And if so, it is possible that the sections dealing with the Persian Wars and with Pausanias derive from a common source. In support of this hypothesis, it has been alleged that an anti-Spartan bias runs through the narrative of §§94–8. Thus Nouhaud, referring to the claim at §95 that the Plataeans fought at Thermopylae, suggests that 'il diminue, au détriment de l'histoire, la valeur des Lacédémoniens en leur adjoignant un renfort dont ils ne bénéficièrent pas' (p. 186). I find this interpretation hard to accept since, although it is true enough that the Plataeans have been included where they do not belong, the presence of the Thespians and Thebans at Thermopylae has been suppressed. It can therefore hardly be argued that the Spartans have been robbed of their due credit for being the only Greeks to have resisted the Persians. Rather than diminishing the role of the Spartans, this passage displays pro-Plataean (and also anti-Theban) bias, which is no more than one would expect in an account whose purpose is to eulogise the Plataeans. As for the role attributed to the Spartans in instigating the Theban attack on Plataea, Gernet noted that 'le rôle de Sparte et de la famille de Pausanias...est surajouté: indice, peut-être, d'une tendance antilaconienne dans la tradition' (p. 101 n. 2). This may possibly be true, but Nouhaud offers a plausible alternative: 'Ne serait-ce plus simplement un moyen très rudimentaire trouvé par l'orateur pour donner un fil conducteur à sa longue digression sur Athènes et Platées au Ve siècle?' (p. 263). Finally, one might detect a degree of anti-Spartan bias in his account of the humiliation of Pausanias. On the other hand, I have already suggested that Apollodoros may provide the true account of what happened. In short, I believe that we should talk not so much of bias against the Spartans as of bias in favour of the Plataeans, and that the whole of §§94–8 may derive from a single pro-Plataean source. And if this were the case, we might wonder whether the differences between Apollodoros' and Thucydides' versions of the siege of Plataea might derive from the same source. In other words, Apollodoros may have used a history of Plataea, or at any rate a history with a particular interest in Plataea, for the whole of the excursus, supplementing it with Thucydides' account for the sections dealing with the siege of Plataea. However, this hypothesis raises a further problem, for if Apollodoros used Thucydides for the siege of Plataea, why did he not use him for Pausanias? The answer may be that he did not believe that Thucydides had told the whole truth about Pausanias, or he may have decided that a more colourful version, particularly one which showed the Plataeans in such a good light, better suited his purposes.

Apollodoros and history

The use of history in this excursus prompts us to examine whether Apollodoros shows a similar interest in the past elsewhere in the speech. The only passage in which such an interest is revealed is §§74–6, where he expatiates on the traditional religious role of the Archon Basileus. The purpose of this passage is to prove that in marrying Neaera's daughter to Theogenes, who was Archon Basileus, Stephanos and Neaera had offended the deepest and most traditional Athenian religious beliefs. Apollodoros

starts with a programmatic statement: βούλομαι δ' ὑμῖν ἀκριβέστερον περὶ αὐτῶν ἄνωθεν διηγήσασθαι καθ' ἕκαστον (§74). This concern for precision is more what one would expect of a conscientious historian than of an orator.³³ He then relates that:

τὸ γὰρ ἀρχαῖον...δυναστεία ἐν τῇ πόλει ἦν, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν ἀεὶ ὑπερεχόντων διὰ τὸ αὐτόχθονας εἶναι, τὰς δὲ θυσίας ἀπάσας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔθνε, καὶ τὰς σεμνοτάτας καὶ ἀρρήτους ἢ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἐποίει, εἰκότως, βασιλῖνα οὔσα. ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θησεὺς συνώκισεν αὐτοὺς καὶ δημοκρατίαν ἐποίησεν καὶ ἡ πόλις πολυάνθρωπος ἐγένετο, τὸν μὲν βασιλέα οὐδὲν ἦττον ὁ δῆμος ἤρειτο ἐκ προκρίτων κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν χειροτονῶν, τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ νόμον ἔθεντο ἀσπὴν εἶναι καὶ μὴ ἐπιμεμειγμένην ἑτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ ἀλλὰ παρθένον γαμεῖν...

Much of this passage merely reflects Athenian popular belief about their early past. Thus it was generally accepted (at least by the fourth century) that the Athenians were autochthonous, and that they had originally been ruled by kings.³⁴ Moreover, the ascription of the prime religious role to the Basileus accords with the prominent religious role of the Archon Basileus in classical times.³⁵ Less straightforward is his explanation of the basis of the early kings' rule. First, it is not clear what the phrase διὰ τὸ αὐτόχθονας εἶναι means here. Interestingly, a very similar phrase (διὰ τὸ αὐτόχθονες εἶναι) occurs at Thuc. 6.2.2, in the course of a discussion of the claim of the Sicani that they were the first inhabitants of Sicily. Second, it is difficult to understand the force of οὐδὲν ἦττον – it suggests that the people had previously also selected the Basileus, but this hardly accords with his earlier statement that he came from τῶν ἀεὶ ὑπερεχόντων. Apollodoros' belief that the synoecism of Attica was the work of Theseus was widely shared in classical Athens, but there was disagreement as to whether this unification was only political, or whether it also involved an influx of people into Athens. Thucydides' account at 2.15 suggests that the former was the case, whilst Isocrates (10.35–6) agrees with Apollodoros that settlement patterns changed. The idea that Theseus was in some sense the founder of Athenian democracy was also widely held in classical Athens.³⁶ As for what Apollodoros says about the selection of the Archon Basileus in historical times, we know that originally the archons were elected, but that either Solon or Cleisthenes instituted the procedure of *klerosis ek prokriton*.³⁷ No other ancient source explicitly states that the original procedure was one of double election, but M. H. Hansen argues that Isoc. 7.22–3 and 12.145 taken together suggest such a procedure.³⁸ It may therefore be that Apollodoros is correct, but I do not think that the conclusion reached by Hansen rests on sufficiently secure foundations to enable us to assert this with any confidence, and it remains possible that Apollodoros has here conflated the two procedures of popular election and *klerosis ek prokriton*.

³³ Compare Thuc. 1.22.1–2 with its stress on accuracy and on the need to include every detail: ὅσον δυνατόν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξελθὼν (1.22.2).

³⁴ For Athenian autochthony see: Hdt. 1.56.2; Thuc. 1.2.5; Ar. *Wasps* 1076; Isoc. 4.24; 12.124. But note V. J. Rosivach, 'Autochthony and the Athenians', *CQ* 37 (1987), 294–306, for the suggestion that Athenian claims of autochthony may date no earlier than 470. See too R. Parker, 'Myths of Early Athens', J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London, 1987), 187–214, p. 195. On the Athenian monarchy see Thuc. 2.15.1.

³⁵ On the religious duties of the Basileus Archon see [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 57.1–2.

³⁶ See Eur. *Suppl.* 349–53, 403–8, 429–37 and Plut. *Theseus* 24.

³⁷ [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 8 relates that originally the Areopagus elected the archons, but that after the time of Solon they were selected by κλήρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων, whereby each tribe elected two candidates, from whom the archons were chosen by sortition. This account is accepted by P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 146–8, but the reform is attributed to Cleisthenes by C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford, 1952), pp. 321–5.

³⁸ M. H. Hansen, 'ΚΛΗΡΩΣΙΣ ΕΚ ΠΡΟΚΡΙΤΩΝ in Fourth-century Athens', *CP* 81 (1986), 222–9, pp. 224–5.

There is little in this passage to suggest that Apollodoros had used a written source. His account is probably no more than a reflection of popular tradition, which in truth was all that was available for this quasi-historical period. Certainly a pro-democratic strain emerges, but that is no less than we would anyway expect. Such idiosyncracies as his account contains seem much more likely to derive from confusion than from the possession of a written source.

Apollodoros next describes the actual inscription of this law:

καὶ τοῦτον τὸν νόμον γράψαντες ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν ἐν Λίμναις (καὶ αὕτη ἡ στήλη ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἔστηκεν, ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασιν Ἀττικοῖς δηλοῦσα τὰ γεγραμμένα)... καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἀρχαιοτάτῳ <ἱερῷ> τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ἀγιωτάτῳ ἐν Λίμναις ἔστησαν, ἵνα μὴ πολλοὶ εἰδῶσι τὰ γεγραμμένα· ἅπαξ γὰρ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκάστου ἀνοίγεται, τῇ δωδεκάτῃ τοῦ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος μηνός.

Here too it looks as though he might have had Thucydides in mind. First, he uses exactly the same phrase to describe the legibility of the inscription as Thucydides used in his description of the altar of Apollo in the Pythion: τοῦ δ' ἐν Πυθίου ἔτι καὶ νῦν δηλὸν ἔστιν ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασι λέγον τάδε (6.54.7). Second, Thucydides also gives a description of the temple of Dionysos in the Marshes: καὶ τὸ <τοῦ> ἐν Λίμναις, ᾧ τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια [τῇ δωδεκάτῃ] ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνι (2.15.4).³⁹

Although the similarities are suggestive, there is no compelling reason to believe that Apollodoros was using Thucydides. Having taken the trouble to go and look at the pillar, he would naturally have informed himself about the site and its history. Moreover, he includes a number of details which do not appear in Thucydides' much shorter description. On the other hand, the number of other passages in which Apollodoros either certainly or possibly used Thucydides suggests that here too he may at least have been influenced by Thucydides' phrasing.

CONCLUSION

It remains to try to draw out some of the implications of this discussion. First what does this passage tell us about the author of the speech? To have used Thucydides as a source, Apollodoros must certainly have attained some level of educational sophistication, but this excursus inclines me to believe that he had not had much formal rhetorical training. This might appear a paradoxical conclusion, but of the Attic orators it is Aeschines, who is generally thought to have been self-taught⁴⁰ and who is most prone to cite historical examples at length and without much regard for their relevance,⁴¹ whilst professional politicians such as Demosthenes avoided long digressions. Nor is there any reason to think that history ever formed a part of rhetorical education,⁴² although of course this does not mean that Athenian orators were in fact historically ignorant: the crude simplification and bias of many of their historical examples were no doubt calculated to appeal to the prejudices of the uneducated mass of the Athenian people. Most orators had a knowledge of history,

³⁹ That the date of the month is a gloss has been disputed by P. J. Rhodes, *Thucydides History II* (Warminster, 1988), who notes that the date is also given in the text as quoted in the papyrus commentary.

⁴⁰ [Plut.] *Life of Aeschines* reports contradictory traditions: that Aeschines was a pupil of (variously) Isocrates, Plato or Leodamas (840b), and that he received no formal rhetorical training (840f). For a full discussion see E. M. Harris, *The Political Career of Aeschines* (Diss. Harvard, 1983), pp. 52–3, who argues that he is unlikely to have had the money or the leisure to have received a rhetorical education.

⁴¹ See in particular Aesch. 2.115, 172–6.

⁴² Thus rightly Nouhaud, p. 109.

but the more skilled chose to deploy it sparingly. I am therefore in full agreement with Nouhaud that 'C'est sûrement le signe que cet orateur n'a pas l'habitude des emprunts que d'autres font à l'histoire de façon quasi machinale. Il a consulté consciencieusement les travaux qui devaient, pensait-il, lui permettre de produire un effet certain' (p. 264). Second, how does this passage affect our view of the *Nachleben* of Thucydides? Some Attic orators seem to have known his work,⁴³ but it is notoriously difficult to detect his influence in fourth-century writing.⁴⁴ Indeed, the only mention of his name before Theophrastos is in the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*.⁴⁵ Apollodoros does not name Thucydides, but his use of him seems to indicate that this silence is largely fortuitous, and that his work, if not widely read, was certainly readily accessible.⁴⁶

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

JEREMY TREVETT

⁴³ For a discussion of the extent of orators' knowledge of Thucydides see Nouhaud, pp. 113–18.

⁴⁴ Thus A. W. Gomme, 'Thucydides and Fourth-century Political Thought', *More Essays in Greek History and Literature* (Oxford, 1962), 122–38. The one exception is Philistos (*FrGrHist* 556), on whom see Gomme, p. 128.

⁴⁵ Thucydides' name is almost certainly to be restored at *Hell. Oxy.* Florence fr. B 32. That Theophrastus mentioned him emerges from Cicero, *Orator* 39.

⁴⁶ I should like to thank Prof. D. M. Lewis, Dr D. C. Innes, and Dr S. Hornblower for reading this article and suggesting several improvements to it. I owe a particular debt to Dr Hornblower for making available to me material from his forthcoming commentary on Thucydides I–III.