'MARCELLINUS'' *LIFE* OF THUCYDIDES: CRITICISM AND CRITERIA IN THE BIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

The focus of this paper will be the critical material in the particular *Life* of Thucydides which is attributed to 'Marcellinus'.[1] After some preliminary remarks about the extant *Lives*, I shall identify the critical material to be discussed, and proceed to examine its composition and possible origin. I shall suggest that, like the biographical material, the critical passages are a compilation of material from different sources and show a variety of approaches. In discussing these approaches, I shall show that the critical passages contain different emphases, analytical skills and priorities, and vocabulary.

Finally, I shall attempt to allocate to this material a place and function in the biographical tradition. Examination of the text has shown that it represents more than simply a biographical interest in Thucydides himself; rather there is a reckless compiling of material that is worthy of analysis for the insight it provides into what was apparently thought to constitute biography at various times in the tradition. What emerges is a succession of interests that could be defined as *anecdotal, stylistic,* and *rhetorical*. The *anecdotal* material builds in a fanciful manner on a few details in the *History* of Thucydides himself, and seems to be driven by a desire to endow an author with a history and personality in order to be able to appreciate his work. This kind of fiction can be found in such works as the *Chrestomathia* of Proclus. The material that concentrates on *style* owes as much to the approach of Dionysius of Halicarnassus as it does to the later rhetoricians and commentators, but is largely uncritical and irrational in its approach to genre. Finally, and in my view this reflects the development of interest in *rhetoric*, there is interpolated material that is concerned only with the speeches of Thucydides. This material is interpolated so crudely that it generally renders the passage in which it occurs unintelligible. Nonetheless, the whole compilation is of interest for two reasons: when taken as a whole it shows what was thought appropriate to a biography at the time of its compilation, and its separate components provide examples of different interests and approaches in the study of the written text. In order to establish these distinctions and assess their value, it will be necessary to analyse the material in considerable detail. At the conclusion of this analysis, I shall be in a position to make some suggestions as to a possible author and date not only of some of the sources, but of the compilation itself.

INTRODUCTION

The two oldest manuscripts[2] containing accounts of the life of Thucydides are the codices Vaticanus Palatinus Graecus 252 (E: 10th or 11th century) and

[2] The manuscript tradition has been exhaustively collated and discussed by I. B. Alberti, *Thucydidis Historiae* (Rome, 1972).

Guelferbytanus Gudianus Graecus 35 (Gu.: 13th century).[3] The codices[4] contain two accounts; one is by an anonymous author, and the other, which is my concern here, contains a substantial amount of material concerning Thucydides' style. This account has been attributed to a certain 'Marcellinus',[5] who cannot be identified with certainty.

Various suggestions have been offered concerning the identity of 'Marcellinus'; there is general agreement that the subject matter, style, and composite nature of the work render the notion of any single author out of the question. As a consequence it has been ascribed at least in part to, among others, Zosimus,[6] Didymus Chalcenterus,[7] Caecilius Calactinus,[8] or Proclus.[9]

The name of Marcellinus, referred to as author of this *Life* of Thucydides, first appears in *Suidae Lexicon*, cited as a source for certain terms.[10] This indicates only that this was the name that had become attached to the work by the time the Suda was being compiled, in the tenth century A.D. Prior to this, there is no mention of him or his work; neither Ammianus Marcellinus nor Macrobius mentions 'Marcellinus', while in the *Life* of Thucydides 'Marcellinus' mentions Didymus, probably Chalcenterus, but makes no mention of Ammianus or Macrobius.[11] I will suggest below how the name of 'Marcellinus' became attached to his compilation. I will show that certain passages have a similarity of approach and style to the commentaries on Hermogenes of Syrianus, Sopater and Marcellinus the orator,[12] and may well owe a certain amount to Marcellinus the orator himself.

When the *Life* attributed to 'Marcellinus' is compared with the anonymous *Life* and the biography in *Suidae Lexicon*, it becomes apparent that with the exception of the material on Thucydides' style they are compiled from a store of anecdotal material. The difficulties of assessing this material have long been noted,[13] perhaps most emphatically by Wilamowitz and most recently by Piccirilli. Commentators are generally agreed that the anecdotes show a strong tendency to build in the first instance upon the few hints of his own life that Thucydides includes in his *History*, and thereafter upon one another.

[3] Another account of Thucydides' life is preserved in *Suidae Lexicon*.

[4] Alberti's stemma shows that all existing manuscripts derive from a single archetype, with a proliferation of copies from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. This is borne out by the way in which E and Gu., while exhibiting a few minor differences one from the other, in the main replicate inconsistencies and dubious passages, and leave the same gaps, presumably where their sources were lacking. However, for chs. 32–49 of the material attributed to 'Marcellinus', we must depend on Guelferbytanus alone. For a complete list of the codices containing one or both of the *Lives* of Thucydides, see Alberti, *praefatio* p. clxxxix.

[5] For the textual variant of this name, see note 15 below. For convenience, I shall use inverted commas when referring to this Marcellinus.

[6] G. Oomen, *De Zosimo Ascalonita atque Marcellino*, Diss. Monasterii Westphalorum, (1926).

[7] F. Ritter, *Didymi Chalcenteri Opera* (Cologne, 1845) pp. 124ff. For discussion with regard to *Life* 2, 14, and 32–4, see M. Schmidt, *Didymi Chalcenteri Grammatici Alexandri Fragmenta* (Amsterdam, 1964), pp. 324–33.

[8] Caecilius Calactinus, *Fragmenta*, E. Ofenloch (ed.), (Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 193–5.

[9] E. Bux, *RE* 1471–3.   [10] Cf. entries for ἀπήλαυσε, ἀπολαύειν, and μέτριος.

[11] Ammianus and Macrobius also mention Didymus.

[12] See C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, pp. 1–211. References to these scholia will be to this edition.

[13] U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, 'Der Thucydideslegende', *Hermes* 12 (1877), 326–67; E. Petersen, *De Vita Thucydidis Disputatio* (Dorpat, 1873); C. F. Haack, *De Thucydidis Vita* (Leipzig, 1820); L. Piccirilli, *Storie dello storico Tucidide* (Genova, 1985). Between them, the entry in *RE* (1450–87) and Piccirilli's introduction provide an ample survey of the problems and work done.

The *Life* by 'Marcellinus' is notable for its digressions. As Petersen[14] and others have noted, there are two recapitulations of material concerning Thucydides' life as well as his style; it should be noted also that within these divisions there are inconsistencies and changes of emphasis. The sub-heading to E suggests that this *Life* was compiled from those scholia to Thucydides that concern his life and style:

Μαρκελλίνου ἐκ τῶν εἰς Θουκυδίδην σχολίων περὶ τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ Θουκυδίδου καὶ τῆς τοῦ λόγου ἰδέας.

A shorter version of this, implying authorship on the part of 'Marcellinus' rather than compilation, heads Gu.:

τοῦ Μαρκηνίνου[15] περὶ τοῦ Θουκυδίδου βίου καὶ τῆς ἰδέας αὐτοῦ.

Bekker[16] accepts the sub-heading

Μαρκελλίνου περὶ τοῦ Θουκυδίδου βίου καὶ τῆς ἰδέας αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὅλης ξυγγραφῆς παρεκβολή

in the edition of Manutius Aldus (1502); Petersen (n. 13), p. 9, disagrees, suggesting that these words are conflated from two headings, one to a commentary by 'Marcellinus' on Thucydides, and the other to one concerning his life and style. Considering the format of this *Life*, the suggestion is persuasive. Bux begins the *RE* entry with a useful discussion of the problems, making two points. First, the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς ὅλης ξυγγραφῆς is self-defeating as it then becomes unclear whether simply the *History* of Thucydides is meant, in which case ἀπό loses its meaning, or whether a corpus in some other form is meant, in which case the term ξυγγραφή is inappropriate. Secondly, the addition of the words ἐκ τῶν σχολίων, as in E, makes it unclear whether the authorship of 'Marcellinus' is to be credited to the scholia or to the *Life* itself. It is certainly clear, as I have already mentioned and as Petersen points out,[17] that 'Marcellinus' was an established source for the life of Thucydides by the time *Suidae Lexicon* was compiled.

Even a cursory reading of the 'Marcellinus' *Life* shows that an assessment of compilation rather than authorship is more appropriate. Furthermore, although scholia may have provided a source of material, there are signs that other sources were used as well. Among these, the following may be noted.

Chapter 1[18] promises a discussion of Thucydides' writing, a promise that is not in fact carried out until ch. 35; the impression is of an interruption rather than a digression. Whereas ch. 1 contains nothing more than a recommendation to read Thucydides, there is a more substantial hint of a following commentary in ch. 51. There are also inconsistencies of approach; some passages cite sources carefully or indicate that a statement is based on hearsay, whereas others present information as though it were undisputed fact. For instance, in ch. 14 the suggestion that Thucydides was Miltiades' grandson is tempered by a cautious 'some think'; in ch. 19 the much bolder description of Thucydides' marriage to a wealthy Thracian woman is

[14] Petersen (n. 13), pp. 5–6.
[15] The script is very faint here, but it appears that λλ is missing. η has also been written instead of ε. Bertrand Hemmerdinger, *Essai sur l'histoire du texte de Thucydide* (Paris, 1955), pp. 61–3, wishes to emend Μαρκελλίνου to Μαρκέλλου on the basis of sch. *Anab.* ii.6.29, which cites 'Marcellinus' 27 but attributes it to the commentator Marcellus, referred to by Gregory of Corinth, *De Dialecto Attica* 34.
[16] I. Bekker, *Thucydidis de Bello Peloponnesiaco* (Berlin, 1821), p. vii.
[17] Petersen (n. 13), p. 10.
[18] I follow the conventional chapter divisions; I shall have cause to dispute some of them below.

presented in an authoritative fashion. At times the writer expresses himself in the first person (33, 42, 44, 52, 57); at other times there are quaint exhortations to the reader, usually in the first person plural (16, 21, 25, etc.) but once in the second person singular (40). Actual citing of a source is largely confined to the biographical sections. Of the chapters that deal with style, only 36, 43, and 49 mention any source at all. Of these, Homer, Pindar, Prodicus and Gorgias are cited as exemplars in 36, Theopompus is rejected in 43 as author of Thuc. 8, and there is reference to the texts of Thucydides, Herodotus and Xenophon in 43 and 49. In all the critical material only one source is actually acknowledged by name: Antyllus[19] in 36.

Finally, the biographical passages are violently interpolated among the critical material. Both the critical material and the biographical passages fall into three sections of decreasing length, alternating without preamble. All this contributes to an impression of a compilation.

THE CRITICAL PASSAGES

For convenience, I shall refer to these as sections 1, 2, and 3. Section 1 consists of chs. 35–44, section 2 of chs. 48–53, and section 3 of chs. 56–8. I have prefaced section 1 with ch. 1.

In what follows I will argue for a distinction between that part of the discussion which is concerned only with the speeches in Thucydides, and that part which seems to employ a rather broad definition of rhetoric or style. For this reason, I will print 41.2ff., 42, 56.2, and 57 in italics.

Chapter 1. It is time from now on for those who have become devotees of Demosthenes' outstanding speeches and debates, and who may be sated with polemical and judicial discussion, and sufficiently well versed in it, to venture into the territory of Thucydides. He displays great artistry in the beauty of his speeches (λόγων)[20] and the accuracy of his narrative and his military advice and political speeches on public policy. But first it is necessary to speak about the family and life of this man; for intelligent people must examine these things carefully before his words.

I have already suggested that ch. 1 is no guide to what follows, but simply raises problems of its own. This chapter begins with the suggestion that a study of Thucydides would be a refreshing change from that of Demosthenes. This may be a stab at contemporary enthusiasms, or indeed a veiled attack on Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who thought well of Demosthenes and had complaints to make against Thucydides.[21] If this is so, we may at any rate have here some basis for dating these remarks. Poppo[22] suggests that this passage may have followed a similar piece on the life and work of Demosthenes. However, there is mention of Demosthenes again in ch. 56, after a more overt criticism of Dionysius; this could be an attempt on the part of a compiler to give the material some unity. It seems that 56 at last takes up the undertaking made in 1, which has every appearance of the preliminary remarks of a compiler. The fact that not one but three accounts of his life follow, alternating with ever shorter accounts of his style, leads me to suppose that chs. 1–44 were in their turn combined with additional material by subsequent compilation.

---

[19] Antyllus is a mysterious figure unknown apart from this *Life* and the scholia to Thucydides. For discussion, see Piccirilli, (n. 13) pp. 96–7.

[20] Any Greek terms to be referred to in discussion are given in brackets in the translation.

[21] As for example in his treatise on Thucydides, 2–4, 9–13, 15–16 etc. All references to Dionysius will be to the text of Usener-Radermacher (Stuttgart, 1899, repr. 1965), unless otherwise indicated.

[22] E. F. Poppo, *Thucydidis de Bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo*, (Leipzig, 1866–83), ad loc., p. vi.

Section 1 (35–44)

Chapter 35. Thucydides was influenced by Homer's arrangement (οἰκονομία) and Pindar's grand and lofty style, though he himself was deliberately too obscure in expression to be accessible to every reader. In skilfully pursuing his train of thought, he did not wish simply to appear to provide an easy source of information for every person wanting it. Instead, he is appreciated and admired by those who pride themselves on their discrimination. Praised by the best critics, and receiving admiration based on sound judgement, he has acquired a reputation that has been well attested since his time, one that is in no danger of removal by subsequent opinion.
Chapter 36. According to Antyllus, he imitated to some extent Gorgias' way of balancing his clauses and using nominal antitheses, which were fashionable at that time among the Greeks, and indeed Prodicus' precision in word usage.

Chapter 35 resumes what was promised in ch. 1; a discussion of Thucydides' writing (λόγοι). This is done without preamble, after brief reference to his appearance and his death in 34. The obscurity of Thucydides' style is defended on the grounds that he was deliberately obscure; the expression ἵνα μὴ...βατός is supposedly taken from an epigram against Thucydides (Anal. Brunck. t. III, p. 265).[23]

There is no reason to assume that 36 has always followed 35; it is quite self-contained and is unique among the critical material in citing the opinion of another, as noted above.

Chapter 37. Most of all, as I said before, he imitated Homer in his choice of words and precision of composition, in the power of his interpretation, and also in the beauty and pace of his work.

In 37 the author refers to an earlier remark, that Thucydides imitated Homer in his choice of words and precision of composition. The author has not in fact said this before. It seems unlikely that the writer would choose to gloss the term οἰκονομία in this way, or that a compiler would couch an explanation of οἰκονομία in this form. I therefore suggest that this small chapter, a fragment of a larger piece of criticism, has been included here uncritically.

Chapter 38. The writers and historians before him produced lifeless writings and used one bare narrative throughout, not attributing speeches to their characters nor portraying public debates. An exception, however, is Herodotus, who made an attempt in this direction, though not indeed with great success, as he did so only occasionally in his work, more for the sake of characterisation than to record political disputes. Our historian was the only one to investigate the political discussions and recount them meticulously with their principal points and subdivisions, so as ⟨to show that⟩[24] the debates were founded on certain bases. This indeed is the ideal of accurate reporting.
Chapter 39. While there are three kinds of literary style, the elevated, the plain, and something in between, he rejected the others and cultivated the elevated style, as it was appropriate to his own nature and fitted for the scope of a war such as this. He thought it appropriate to match the words to the deeds, where the deeds of men were great.
Chapter 40. So that you may not be ignorant of the other styles, you should know that Herodotus used the moderate style which is neither elevated nor plain, and Xenophon used the plain style.
Chapter 41. In fact, in using the lofty style, Thucydides also incorporated many poetic expressions and some metaphors.
Some have been bold enough to suggest, concerning the work as a whole, that its form (εἶδος) is not rhetorical but poetic. But it is clear, from the fact that the work is not subject to any metre, that it is not poetic. If anyone wants to dispute this, on the grounds that not all prose is rhetorical, as indeed are neither the writings of Plato nor the medical writings, I say that on the other hand this writing is divided under headings and is elevated to the form (εἶδος) of rhetoric. Chapter 42. In general the whole work tends to the form of the deliberative—though others assign it to panegyric,

---

[23] Poppo ad loc., p. xxiv.
[24] I have added the words in pointed brackets to clarify the otherwise inconsequential στάσει ὑποπίπτειν τὰς δημηγορίας.

saying that he praises those who distinguish themselves in war—but the work of Thucydides is
subject particularly to three forms (εἴδη): deliberative (τὸ συμβουλευτικόν) in all the political
disputes except that between the Plataeans and the Thebans in Book 3, panegyric in the funeral
oration, and forensic (δικανικόν) in the dispute between the Plataeans and the Thebans, which is
my favourite part. Where the judges from the Spartans are making their decision, and the Plataean
is up for judgement and cross-examination, and he defends himself against the enquiry at some
length, and the Theban makes reply to this, trying to stir the Spartan to anger, the arrangement
of the narrative, the method, and the structure show that the form is forensic.

In 38 we find the first explicit mention of the speeches in Thucydides. The author
remarks on them with approval, comparing them favourably to those in Herodotus.
This is the first sign of the interest in rhetoric which appears intermittently in the
'Marcellinus' *Life*. The expression στάσει ὑποπίπτειν τὰς δημηγορίας has some
parallels in Hermogenes and in the scholia *Ad Hermogenem* of Syrian, Sopater and
Marcellinus; these will be discussed in the section on the sources.

In the light of this interest in rhetoric, 39–41.1 should be read with care. These
chapters clearly refer to Thucydides' work as a whole, speaking in terms of literary
style. In 41, the question of rhetoric arises again, in rather curious form. The author
refers to a dispute as to whether the work be rhetorical or poetic in form (εἶδος). The
author points out that the work can hardly be poetic as it is not in metre. This seems
naive, but is in fact typical of the fussy, laborious style of Hermogenes;[25] and the
notion that a work must be either rhetorical or poetical suggests a mode of literary
criticism that insists on such a distinction.

In ch. 42, the author introduces the notion of three forms (εἴδη): deliberation (τὸ
συμβουλευτικόν), panegyric (τὸ πανηγυρικόν) and forensic (δικανικόν). This seems to
be a garbled version of Aristotle's γένη (δικανικόν, συμβουλευτικόν, ἐπιδεικτικόν),
but can be found in Hermogenes, Περὶ ἰδεῶν λόγου 6.131–192.[26]

It seems plain that in 41.2–42 the author's interest is only in the speeches that
Thucydides assigns to the characters in his *History*, rather than τὰ ἔργα. It is to be
noted, though, that this is not stated, and that the speeches are not defined as rhetoric.
These omissions, the use of ὑποπίπτειν, and the introduction of the three εἴδη suggest
that this passage has been extrapolated and condensed from another source, possibly
Hermogenes or the scholia *Ad Hermog.* Furthermore, there is a greater critical faculty
and sense of continuity in 35–41.1. This may be discerned in the attempt to give
examples and cite sources, as noted above. Ofenloch[27] prefers on these grounds to
ascribe the whole of 35–41.1 to Caecilius Calactinus; whether or not this is correct,
it certainly seems appropriate to mark a break after 41.1.[28]

Chapter 43. Some say that the eighth book is not by Thucydides; some attribute it to his
daughter, others to Xenophon. To these I say that it is obviously not by his daughter. No woman
would be capable of work of such quality and technique; besides, if there were such a woman,
she would not have been content to remain anonymous, and she would not have written only
the eighth book but would have left many other works as testimony to her talent. Not only the
nature of the work announces that it is not Xenophon's; what particularly makes it clear is the
style, somewhere between elevated and plain.[29]
Chapter 44. It is certainly not by Theopompus, as some think. To some, particularly those of
greater discrimination, it seems to be the work of Thucydides, though not polished but written
as though roughly hammered out, and full of abbreviated accounts of events, capable of being

[25] See, for example, *Prog.* ix.3–4, Περὶ ἰδ. vi.131-92.
[26] Piccirilli (n. 13), p. 31, cites the Scholia for this definition, but not Hermogenes.
[27] See above, note 8.
[28] Krüger (Berlin, 1846) seems to have noted the inconsequentiality of the passage, as he
suggests δ' οὖν for γε οὖν 41.1.
[29] πολὺ γὰρ τὸ μέσον: Ritter wants to add διαφέρει. Poppo ad loc., p. xxviii says that πολὺ
γὰρ τὸ μέσον means *amplum discrimen*. I prefer to assume a repetition of βοᾷ after πολὺ γάρ.

polished and of receiving expansion. From this I would deduce that it is expressed less powerfully and in brief, to the extent that he seems to have set out the work as he became weaker. If the body is weakened to some extent, it is likely that the intellectual powers will lack energy as well, because there is a certain interdependence between the intellect and the body.

The foregoing passages are rendered more disconcerting when the author immediately (43-4) moves to a discussion of the problems relating to the very different form and approach of Thucydides' eighth book. The passage has a speculative approach like that of the other biographical material. The discussion is logical enough, but quaint, in particular the point in 43 that excludes Thucydides' daughter from authorship on the grounds that no woman, had she managed to write such a piece, would have been content to remain anonymous. In 44 Theopompus is mentioned without preamble; one would expect him to be mentioned along with Herodotus and Thucydides' putative daughter at the beginning of 43. The comments are less naive than in 43, and altogether this chapter seems not to derive from the same source. At this point, quite abruptly, the biography resumes.

Section 1 (i.e. 35-44), then, should by no means be ascribed to a single author or any particular critical approach. In addition to the discrepancies noted so far, there is the matter of technical vocabulary which, as it is helpful in determining possible dates and provenance of the various passages, will be discussed separately.

Section 2 (48-53)

Chapter 48. He is opposed to story telling ($\mu\hat{\upsilon}\theta\omega$) because he delights in the truth. So he did not make a practice of the same method of writing as other historians, who mixed anecdotes in their own histories more for the sake of elegance than truth. Those others worked in this way; but our historian did not give priority to the pleasure of his hearers, but to writing as accurately as possible for the benefit of those who wanted to learn something. And he termed his writing an $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\omega}\nu\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$.
He avoided many of the ploys that make for pleasant reading; parentheses ($\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\nu\theta\dot{\eta}\kappa\alpha s$), which most prefer to term digressions.
Chapter 49. An example of this in Herodotus is the dolphin that loved to listen, and Arion who guided[30] it by means of his music; and the second book of his history is completely alien to the purpose of his work. This author, if something interesting comes to mind, mentions it because it is necessary, but only in so far as to gain the understanding of his hearers. For instance, he mentions Tereus [2.29] only with reference to the experience of the women, and the story of the Cyclopes is recounted for the sake of the geographical references, and when Alcmaon is required to be resourceful, and thereupon in his resourcefulness (?) creates an island,[31] Thucydides gives no superfluous detail.

Chapter 48 begins another discussion of Thucydides' style, which seems to me to embody a different approach. The vocabulary changes to a marked degree; out of 78 technical terms that I have found in the 'Marcellinus' *Life*, only seven appear both before and after ch. 45. At the very least this must suggest that section 2 is no summary of what has gone before. The discussion is also more specific; in 48-50 we find a discussion of the use of $\mu\hat{\upsilon}\theta\omega$ to enhance a narrative. By this the author seems here to mean what is often meant by *fabula*, a story told to make a point. In chapter 48 itself the writer actually makes reference to the text of Thucydides, but the passage presents some problems. This writer distinguishes $i\sigma\tau\omega\rho\dot{\iota}\alpha$ from $\mu\hat{\upsilon}\theta\omega s$, which he says is used by other writers to add $\tau\dot{\omega}$ $\tau\epsilon\rho\pi\nu\dot{\omega}\nu$ at the expense of $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\dot{\iota}\alpha$:

...οἵ μύθους ἐγκατέμιξαν ταῖς ἑαυτῶν ἱστορίαις, τοῦ τερπνοῦ πλέον τῆς ἀληθείας ἀντιποιούμενοι.

---

[30] The writer uses the middle voice here ($\gamma\upsilon\beta\epsilon\rho\nu\dot{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu\omega s$); it may be a feature of his particular usage.   [31] See note 33 below.

The basis for these remarks is Thuc. 1.21-2, but the author only seems to be concerned with extracts from this passage, which he has extrapolated without taking account of the passage as a whole:

χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν, ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες ἀτερπέστερον φανεῖται... κτῆμά τε ἐς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα... ξύγκειται.

When Thucydides mentions ἀκρίβεια he is talking about the problems of recording speeches and events where he was not present, whereas the author assumes he means the whole process of writing history. Again, when the author says that Thucydides called his work an ἀγώνισμα (καὶ γὰρ ὠνόμασεν ἀγώνισμα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ συγγραφήν), Thucydides in fact says that it is something to keep for always rather than an ἀγώνισμα for the purposes of entertainment. This mistake has not passed unnoticed and emendations have been suggested;[32] but given the superficial nature of the whole passage I am inclined to think that we have here an overcompressed paraphrase of another summary, made without reference to the text of Thucydides.

At the end of 48, immediately after this remark, we are told that Thucydides avoided parentheses, which the author tells us are generally termed digressions: τὰς παρενθήκας ἃς εἰώθασι ποιεῖν οἱ πλείονες ἀποκλίνας. The chapter division falls awkwardly here; this remark clearly belongs at the beginning of a new paragraph, as Herodotus is immediately cited by way of example. The summary of the anecdotes in Thucydides which the author finds acceptable, though it shows a knowledge of the text, is particularly cryptic (cf. *creates an island*, 49). The text presents difficulties here which evidently predate our earliest manuscripts.[33] It may be that the material was badly epitomized and subsequently not well understood.

Chapter 50. This is his approach to story telling, but he is very good at character portrayal. He is clear in the separate parts but in his arrangement he sometimes seems to be unclear as a result of extending his interpretation. His style is very serious and lofty. The style of his composition is full of roughness,[34] dense, weighty, favours transposition of words and clauses, and at times even becomes unclear. His compressions are amazing, with much thought expressed in few words.

Chapter 51. His grasp of ideas is particularly to be praised. He is very powerful in his descriptions, describing to us sea battles and sieges, diseases and political conflicts. He is versatile in his oratorical figures, for the most part imitating those of Gorgias, quick in his application of terms, subtle in his austerities, able to present character and frame a description. Indeed you will see in his work the thought of Pericles, I hardly know what to say when it comes to Cleon, the youthful energy of Alcibiades, all about Themistocles, the excellence of Nicias, his religious scruples, his good luck until Sicily, and many other things, which we shall try to examine each in their turn.

Chapter 52. Generally he uses the old Attic form, in which ξ was preferred to ς, whenever he writes ξυνέγραφε and ξυμμαχία, and he writes the diphthong αι instead of α, saying αἰεί, and altogether he is a great finder of new words. Some of them are from before his time: αὐτοβοεί, and πολεμησείοντες, and παγκάλεπον and ἁμαρτάδα and ὕλης φακέλους; others are characteristic of the poets, like ἐπιλύγξαι and ἐπηλύται and ἀνακῶς and such. His own forms, like ἀποσίμωσις and κωλύμη and ἀποτείχισις, and others like them, are not used by other authors but are found in his work.

Chapter 50 begins by closing the topic of μῦθος, but there follows an

---

[32] Casaubon wishes to insert κτῆμα ἐς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ before ἀγώνισμα.

[33] In translating, I have accepted σωφρονεῖν which is attested in the later manuscripts, and Poppo's suggestion of ἔνταυθα. E and Gu agree on the reading νήσους ποιεῖ; Alberti (Rome, 1972) reads οἰκεῖ for ποιεῖ in E, but the reading is clearly ποιεῖ. Hude's suggestion μνῆσιν ποιεῖται might seem attractive, but the mention of islands is crucial to the point.

[34] Alberti, following Krüger, brackets ὄν; there is no need if a comma is assumed after μέγαν.

inconsequential compilation of material that extends to the end of 53. With the exception of 52, this passage seems to be part of the preamble to a larger discussion of Thucydides' work. The discussion is introduced abruptly and the topic as swiftly abandoned. The undertaking to examine various topics in their turn is not fulfilled; possibly this material was culled from the introduction to a larger work, now lost.

To make matters more difficult, the passage is broken up by ch. 52, which goes into detail about Thucydides' use of language, even to spelling. As before, the material seems to be derivative; the writer generalizes about Thucydides' use of diphthongs when he should be specific about his spelling of αἰεί, and mentions neither Thucydides' use of Ionic ἐς for εἰς nor his neologistic abstract nouns ending in -μα. The arrangement of 52 presents some anomalies. It follows that of Dionysius, *Ad Amm.* 2.3 in so far as both passages give examples of archaisms first and then move on to coined words. The *Life*, however, includes some poetic terms—τὰ δὲ ποιηταῖς μέλει. As Poppo has pointed out,[35] two of the three given, ἐπηλύται and ἀνακῶς, are not poetic. Furthermore, Thucydides uses the verb ἀποσιμοῦν (4.25), not the noun ἀποσίμωσις. The only word common to both passages is κωλύμη. Since the list seems to be the product of incompetence, and the categories derivative, perhaps the 'poetic' terms at least can be explained as the result of a misunderstanding of Dionysius' term ποιητικά,[36] and the presence in *Life* 52 of the term κωλύμη the only accuracy.

Chapter 53. He is concerned with the weightiness of his words, with the ingenuity of his arguments and, as I said before, anticipating myself, with brevity of composition. Most of the events are described in narrative form. He often concentrates on sufferings and deeds rather than the characters themselves, as in 'mutual antagonism'.[37] There is the element of panegyric, where he records the funeral oration, and he introduces subtle ironies, and asks questions, and disputes in a philosophical manner. In the passages where he is using dialogue, he writes philosophy. Many people find fault with the form (ἰδέαν) of his writing and its arrangement, among them Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He criticizes Thucydides for using prose and political style when he cannot, not realizing that effectiveness in this is simply a matter of ingenuity and practice.

Chapter 53 continues the remarks begun in 51. Although there are passing references to panegyric and to political style, it is nevertheless clear that the remarks in this chapter refer to the *History* as a whole. There seems to be an attempt (καὶ ὥσπερ φθάσαντες εἴπομεν, βραχύτητος συντάξεως) to make a connection with 50, at the end of which the author noted that Thucydides expresses much thought in few words. The comment about panegyric in 42 is reiterated; there then follows an apparent interpolation suggesting that Thucydides is writing philosophically when he uses dialogue form. This comment is presumably meant as a gloss on the previous remark. It is similar in approach to the observation in 41 that Thucydides does not write in metre; if it is not another example of the overparticularizing style of Hermogenes, one suspects that it may be a purely specious judgement based on the appearance of the Melian dialogue rather than an evaluation of Thucydides' method.

The writer then takes exception to an opinion expressed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who criticizes Thucydides[38] for attempting to use prose and political style when he cannot: ὡς πεζῇ καὶ πολιτικῇ λέξει χρῆσθαι μὴ δυναμένῳ. The writer observes that this is simply a matter of ingenuity and practice, presumably in order to exonerate Thucydides, but fails to counter the criticism.

---

[35] Poppo ad loc., p. xxxiv.
[36] Dr Plant has called my attention to the Latin term *poeticus*, which does mean *poetical*.
[37] Thuc. *Hist.* 3.11.1.   [38] This may refer to *Thuc.* 34; see comment below p. 22.

Section 3 (56-7)

Chapter 56. His work is magnificent in form and style, so that even in the pitiable parts he does not lose this magnificence. He is weighty in his expression, opaque in his thought process because he loves the excessive style, explaining many events in few words, most versatile in the arrangement (σχήματα) of his prose, but quite the opposite, utterly disorganised (ἀσχημάτιστος), in his thought process.

He uses no irony, no criticism, no oblique utterances, or any other tricks to please the ear. Demosthenes is the most skilful exponent of this kind of thing. **Chapter 57.** *I think that Thucydides dispensed with these techniques on purpose, not because he was not aware of them, but because he was putting together those words that were fitting and appropriate to the underlying characters. For it was not appropriate to Pericles or Archidamus or Nicias or Brasidas, men of high intellect, noble, and of heroic repute, to bandy ironies and oratorical tricks, as if they had no freedom to refute arguments openly, to chide an opponent to his face, or to say whatever they wanted. Because of this he regularly used a simple style, not conducive to character portrayal, preserving even in this way that which was fitting and appropriate to his art. It is, after all, the mark of a craftsman to maintain the appropriate reputation for his characters as well as an orderly sequence of events.*

After some compressed autobiographical comment, which includes the famous anecdote about the young Thucydides weeping when hearing Herodotus reading his work,[39] another summary of Thucydides' style begins in 56. This chapter has the appearance of a rephrase of the second part of 50. It may be that these are two separate summaries of the same original. At first sight, the summary shows some carelessness, as contradictions seem to develop. It is clear from 51 that the term σχῆμα is used there to refer to Gorgianic figures, but there is no sense of this in the loose usage at the beginning of 56. Contrary to the remarks in 53, the author observes that Thucydides uses no irony.[40] Neither does he use criticism, remarks with a hidden meaning[41] or other tricks to please the ear. If, however, the chapter division is set aside, and this sentence is assumed to be a new start, it combines well with ch. 57 as a discussion of the speeches, not the narrative, in Thucydides. The tribute to Demosthenes bears out the rhetorical emphasis. We then have a passage in which, in contrast to the previous chapter, a different author defends the style of Thucydides' speeches, saying that it would have been inappropriate to represent men such as Pericles, Nicias and others as having recourse to cheap oratorical stunts.

This arrangement has the advantage of making the passage coherent,[42] and is supported by the recurrence of terms such as εἰρωνεία and πανουργία. There are also signs of uncritical compilation; in defending Thucydides as he does, the author either forgets or does not know that Thucydides also attributes speeches to such as Cleon, Sthenelaïdas, and Alcibiades. Instead, he offers a pious generalization about the duty of the craftsman to preserve the reputation of his characters.[43]

Certain considerations have now emerged. There are several layers of writing here; it is impossible to say how many there are, though all seem to be in some way

---

[39] Poppo ad loc., pp. xxxv-vi gives an exhaustive list of those who believe or discount this anecdote about Herodotus; Wilamowitz' remarks (p. 331 and n. 10), will suffice.

[40] Poppo ad loc., p. xxxvii notes the discrepancy and cites Thuc. *Hist.* 1.133; 3.61; 6.16, 80.

[41] So I translate ταῖς ἐκ πλαγίου ῥήσεσιν. My reasons will be discussed below. In this passage, the expression refers to one of a number of πανουργίαι designed to please the ear.

[42] Piccirilli, *introduzione* pp. xxv-vi, notes the difficulties encountered in simply rearranging the material, for example placing 56-8 after 42, and observes that this strategy could only be effective if the work were by a single author, and it were assumed that it had subsequently been tampered with.

[43] Ofenloch (n. 8), pp. 195-6 notes that Blass considers 56-7 to be derived from Caecilius. This is one way to surmount the inconsistency concerning irony, but not the change of approach.

derivative. While the material has been combined uncritically, this process has preserved two distinguishable theoretical approaches, one concerned with historical writing and one with rhetoric. That dealing with rhetoric is concerned only with the speeches in Thucydides' history, and this material is superimposed on the discussions of historical writing, with the consequence that a passage which begins by discussing the text as a whole may suddenly refer only to the speeches. In discussing possible sources, it will be necessary to take these separate interests into consideration.

THE SOURCES

The first question is that of vocabulary. In investigating the terminology used I have selected Aristotle as an appropriate source of technical vocabulary, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Caecilius Calactinus[44] on the grounds that they concern themselves with Thucydides' style. I have then turned to Proclus on the grounds that in the *Chrestomathia* at any rate he showed an interest in biography, and in his other commentaries an interest in style. Proclus also is an appropriate example of later writing, given the mention of Didymus and others in the *Life*. Finally, on the basis of similarities of which some have already been noted, I will discuss some aspects of Hermogenes and the scholia *Ad Hermog.*

The technical vocabulary in the 'Marcellinus' *Life* twice changes almost completely; however, each section takes a different approach, and almost all the terms occur freely in the work of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and in comments attributed to Caecilius Calactinus. Many of them are also found in Aristotle's rhetorical works. The 'Marcellinus' *Life* thus can be seen to represent an established stock of technical terms in a tradition of discussion concerning style and rhetoric up to the time of Dionysius and Caecilius.

There are certain terms, however, which occur in the context of discussion but are not part of this stock. Some occur in the work of Proclus, and of these some tend to be scientific; it may be that parts at least of the 'Marcellinus' *Life* utilize vocabulary and ideas that were current in Proclus' time or subsequently, and thus can be dated and located accordingly. Others are prominent in the work of Hermogenes and in the later scholia. Yet a smaller selection seems to consist of terms that the compiler has used in adding linking material or comment of his own.

To take the last first: in 35 there occurs the term βατός; it seems to denote the notion of *accessible*, but is not normally used in contexts relating to style.[45] Our compiler, however, in offering his highly condensed remarks about Thucydides' admiration of Homer and Pindar, seems to have incorporated terminology of his own; in this instance he may have been glossing Dionysius' δυσπαρακολούθητος in *De Imit.*, quoted *Ad Pomp.* 3.13:

καὶ γίγνεται Θουκυδίδης μὲν ἀσαφὴς καὶ δυσπαρακολούθητος...

Life 35:

...ἀσαφῶς δὲ λέγων ἀνὴρ ἐπίτηδης, ἵνα μὴ πᾶσιν εἴη βατός...

In 39 we find the expression χαρακτὴρ φραστικός; the application of the term χαρακτήρ, referring to a particular or distinguishing quality, is familiar, but φραστικός does not seem to be part of the established stock of rhetorical terms. It is

---

[44] In considering the vocabulary of Caecilius, a distinction must be made between terminology expressly attributed to him in the sources and that contained in late paraphrases.

[45] Stephanus offers the meaning *pervius*.

a late usage, referring in Eustathius to the ability to speak or be spoken, and Stephanus in defining the term refers to 'Marcellinus'. Certainly, the whole expression, χαρακτὴρ φραστικός, seems to be contrived by the compiler in order to refer to the high, middle and low styles of composition. ἄτονος (44) is a medical term, although it is not inappropriate in the context, if it is assumed that the writer is speaking metaphorically. It is, however, used by Hermogenes in a rhetorical context (Περὶ ἰδ. 2.11.98). In a work attributed to Hermogenes there occurs the term ἀτονία (Περὶ εὑρέσεως 4.3.59).

A compound form, ὑπερβατικός, appears in 50; this also seems to be peculiar to this compilation, but it may be derived from a similar form, ὑπερβατός, which is found in Dionysius,[46] ascribed to Caecilius Calactinus,[47] and occurs frequently in Hermogenes. Also in 50 occurs the term ὑπέρσεμνος; this also appears to be a late usage, appearing for example in Eustathius, but without rhetorical connotations. As I have noted above, the beginning of 50 introduces a shift in vocabulary and approach from the material immediately preceding. For this reason, and as the brusque, summarizing style is similar to that in 39, I ascribe 39 and 50 to a late compiler, who occasionally showed his hand in gathering and epitomizing material from a number of sources.

A larger group of terms occurs infrequently in rhetorical discussion but freely in the work of Proclus. Of these, some are to be found in the technical vocabulary of Hermogenes. An example is πλάγιος (56), a term more likely to occur in the scientific than the rhetorical works of Aristotle and not greatly used by Dionysius in rhetorical or stylistic discussion. Proclus makes use of the term in both literary and scientific contexts.[48] A definition is offered in Περὶ εὑρέσεως 4.13.11 (πλάγιον δέ ἐστιν, ὅταν μετὰ τοῦ κατασκευάζειν τὸ ἐναντίον καὶ ἄλλο τι περαίνῃ ὁ λόγος...) and may reflect Hermogenes' views. In *R*. 8.2, Proclus seems to owe something to Hermogenes or the author of Περὶ εὑρέσεως when he defines this term as follows: τὸ δέ τι σχῆμά ἐστι πλαγίως ἕτερα μὲν λέγον, ἕτερα δὲ ἐργαζόμενον ἐν λόγοις. These fit well with the usage in the *Life*. Hermogenes also makes frequent use of ἀφηγήσις (*Life* 51) and ἄπλαστος (57), but not πολυειδής (51); all of these are scarcely used by Aristotle, Dionysius or Caecilius but seem well entrenched in the vocabulary of Proclus.

Still other terms occur infrequently throughout the sample. Such are ἀκριβολογία (36) and προσωποποΐα (38), a term discussed by Hermogenes, *Prog*. 9.3–8. The interpolation 43–4 features ἐκτύπος and καλλωπίζω, normally sculptural terms. ἐκτύπος can be found in Syrian and Sopater, *Ad Hermog*. 4.259.14, while καλλωπίζω is very frequently found in Hermogenes' rhetorical criticism. The negative form, however, while found in the *Life* and in Proclus, does not occur in Hermogenes or in the scholia *Ad Hermog*. Two terms occur in 48, ἀποκλίνῃ and παρενθήκῃ; ἀποκλίνῃ is a scientific term favoured by Proclus and the term παρενθήκη (48) which otherwise appears once in Proclus, *In Ti*. 3.203.2, is puzzling. Stephanus offers *interjectio*, *expositio* as possible meanings, referring to the 'Marcellinus' passage. These may well be what Thucydides calls ἐκβολὰς τῶν λόγων 1.97.[49]

τραχύτης (50) is not found in Aristotle, is scarce in Dionysius and occurs only once in material attributed to Caecilius.[50] It is, however, an important concept to

[46] *Thuc*. 31, p. 378.1; 52, p. 412.10.

[47] Quintilian 9.1.3, 3.91, 23; Tiberius 3 p. 80, 13 Sp.; Longinus, *De Sublimitate* 22.1, may have taken a sub-heading straight from Caecilius.

[48] See, for example, Proclus on Plato's *Republic*, 8.2.10; 8.11.40; 8.16.11, 21; *Timaeus* 2.260.12, 27; 3.74.21.   [49] See Poppo's note ad loc., p. xxxi.

[50] Schol. Demosth. 17. p. 254, 5 (Dindorf).

Hermogenes; he describes it in detail in Περὶ ἰδ. 1.7.1–26, 82–7. In 51 αὐστερότης is a rare term not occurring in the sample, though it may reflect the term αὐστερός which appears for example in Dionysius, *Comp.* 22, p. 96, 10. γνωμολογικός appears in Photius' epitome of Proclus, and σημασία appears rarely in Dionysius and Proclus.

I have listed these terms in detail because their use and occurrence possibly show the hands of late compilers. It should be noted that they tend to occur in groups. The first such group consists of the two sculptural and one medical term found in 44 which also occur in Hermogenes; this reinforces the impression, discussed above, that 43 and 44 are compiled from different sources. Two rare terms occur in 48, both of them in the section that must belong to the beginning of 49, as a preamble to what follows. I will have more to say about this passage subsequently. No less than seven occur in 50–1, two of them being terms important to the theorizing of Hermogenes; this confirms the impression of a passage culled from a late introduction to a discussion of Thucydides. All these terms save those at the end of 48 occur in contexts that summarize or link one passage to another.

The next question is that of context and approach. In taking these into account, it is necessary to distinguish between author and compiler, and identify their interests. To this end, I have made a closer examination of the authors mentioned above.

DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS

Certain sections of the 'Marcellinus' *Life* are strongly reminiscent of Dionysius' work on Thucydides while in no sense providing a summary of his conclusions. This applies to parts of *De Compositione Verborum* and *Ad Pompeium*, but most of all to *De Thucydide*. At times the technique seems to be that of careless summarizing, at others imperfect recollection. Certain passages seem to follow Dionysius in his choice of topic while presenting the author's own examples or conclusions.

In *Comp.* 22, p. 96, 10, Dionysius in discussing ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς αὐστερᾶς ἁρμονίας chooses to examine a passage of Pindar, then of Thucydides. He also makes frequent reference to Homer throughout this work. His interest, however, is centred upon the euphonious arrangement of words, indicated by his use of the term ἁρμονία (22–4 etc.). He does not say that Thucydides was an admirer or imitator of Pindar, as is suggested in *Life* 35. Here the writer briefly remarks that Thucydides admired Homer's arrangement—οἰκονομία, and Pindar's style—τὸ μεγαλοφυὲς καὶ ὑψηλὸν τοῦ χαρακτῆρος—before moving on to the question of Thucydides' obscurity. If this passage is based on *Comp.* 22, the author does not seem to understand what Dionysius means by ἁρμονία.

In *Thucydides* Dionysius says that his purpose is ἐκλογισμὸς δέ τις τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τῶν λόγων (3, p. 328, 9). In the course of this he includes a passage which seems to have been in part a source for the author of the *Life*. Dionysius discusses Thucydides' use of myth (6–7). He begins by saying that Thucydides

… κατὰ τὸ μηδὲν αὐτῇ μυθῶδες προάψαι, μηδ᾽ εἰς ἀπάτην καὶ γοητείαν τῶν πολλῶν ἐκτρέψαι τὴν γραφήν…

and goes on to cite the kind of myth that detracts from ἡ γραφή. After some remarks about the sources of myths, Dionysius adds the following:

Θουκυδίδῃ δὲ τῷ προελομένῳ μίαν ὑπόθεσιν, ᾗ παρεγίνετο αὐτός, οὐχ ἥρμοττεν ἐγκαταμίσγειν τῇ διηγήσει τὰς θεατρικὰς γοητείας…

and proceeds to quote Thucydides 1.22 in support of his remarks. He then adds ... τῆς
ἀληθείας...πλείστην ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν... (8, p. 334, 15-16). *Life* 48 begins
without preamble as follows:

ἔστι δὲ τοῖς μύθοις ἐναντίος διὰ τὸ χαίρειν ταῖς ἀληθείαις. οὐ γὰρ ἐπετήδευσε τοῖς ἄλλοις
ταυτὸν συγγραφεῦσιν οὐδὲ ἱστορικοῖς, οἳ μύθους ἐγκατέμιξαν ταῖς ἑαυτῶν ἱστορίαις...

Here we have echoes of Dionysius, followed by the faulty summary of the Thucydides
passage that I have discussed above. At this point the *Life* shows signs of originality
(48-9). The author here speaks not of μύθοι but παρένθηκαι and gives examples from
Herodotus and Thucydides. At the end of 50 the whole section 48-9 is concluded with
the words περὶ μὲν οὖν τοὺς μύθους τοιοῦτος. However, as I have suggested, there are
reasons for separating this material into two sections; these support the conclusion
that the passage on παρένθηκαι is of separate authorship, and was included here as
having something to contribute to the discussion of μῦθοι.

In *Thuc.* 21, p. 357, 23ff. Dionysius starts to discuss Thucydides' style, which he
refers to as τὸ λεκτικόν. He describes style as consisting of two things, ἐκλογὴ
ὀνομάτων and σύνθεσις...μορίων (22, p. 358, 9-11).[51] Curiously, in *Life* 37 these are
reflected in the attributes that Thucydides is said to have admired in Homer: καὶ τῆς
περὶ τὰ ὀνόματα ἐκλογῆς καὶ τῆς περὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν ἀκριβείας.... In 23 Dionysius
discusses the historians who wrote before Thucydides, commenting on their plain and
unembellished style. He makes an exception of Herodotus, though he ends with some
comments on Herodotus' inability to reproduce the forensic style. This is very briefly
summarized in the first portion of *Life* 38, ending at ... ἥπερ δημηγορίας. It is one of
the few examples of a coherent summary in the *Life* as the excerpts tend to be more
fragmentary and random, as in 36 and 56:

    Thuc. 24, pp. 362, 22-363, 3.

...τῶν θεατρικῶν σχημάτων...τὰς παρισώσεις λέγω καὶ παρομοιώσεις καὶ παρανομασίας καὶ
ἀντιθέσεις, ἐν αἷς ἐπλεόνασε Γοργίας καὶ οἱ περὶ Πῶλον καὶ Λικύμνιον...

    Ad Amm. 2.17, p. 437, 4-7.

οἱ δὲ μειρακιώδεις σχηματισμοὶ τῶν ἀντιθέτων τε καὶ παρισώσεων, ἐν οἷς οἱ περὶ τὸν
Γοργίαν μάλιστα ἐπλεόνασαν, ἥκιστα τῷ χαρακτῆρι τούτῳ προσήκοντες...

    Life 36

ἐζήλωσε δὲ ἐπ' ὀλίγον, ὥς φησιν Ἄντυλλος, καὶ τὰς Γοργίου τοῦ Λεοντίνου παρισώσεις καὶ
τὰς ἀντιθέσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων...

    Thuc. 24

ἐκδηλότατα δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ χαρακτηρικώτατά ἐστι τό τε πειρᾶσθαι δι' ἐλαχίστων ὀνομάτων
πλεῖστα σημαίνειν πράγματα...

    Life 56

...ὀλίγοις ὀνόμασι πολλὰ πράγματα δηλῶν...

In *Thuc.* 34 Dionysius embarks on a discussion of the speeches in Thucydides. He
objects to a number of them on the grounds of style and arrangement; this may be
the passage referred to in *Life* 53: μέμφεται γὰρ αὐτῷ ὡς πεζῇ καὶ πολιτικῇ λέξει
χρῆσθαι μὴ δυναμένῳ. In *Thuc.* 36 Dionysius discusses the Plataean episode. He
makes no secret of his admiration for this debate. It must be noted that it is a
dialogue, not narrative; Dionysius sets out explicitly in 34 to discuss the speeches in

---

[51] Dionysius follows Theophrastus here to some extent—see *Isoc.* 3. It appears that he adapts
his definitions to suit his subject matter.

Thucydides, and remarks in 35, p. 383, 5–7 that Thucydides' οἰκονομία is poor, except in some of his speeches. This term is translated *arrangement* by Usher,[52] and indeed this is entirely justified in the light of Dionysius' remarks in 9, p. 335, 14–18 and by Dionysius' use of, for instance, οἰκονομία and τάξις as synonyms in 10, p. 338, 4–9. However, in 36 Dionysius sets out the terms of his approval, which have nothing to do with arrangement, but rather with the assignment of appropriate words and sentiments to characters. These, furthermore, are the terms in which he finds fault with the Melian dialogue in 41. Clearly, Dionysius is adding, rather than defining, criticisms here, but if this passage were to be misunderstood by a hasty epitomator, the result might well be the puzzling application of the term οἰκονομία to Homer's work in the *Life* 35. The term οἰκονομία is an odd one on which to base a comparison between Homer and Thucydides; Poppo[53] calls this remark a 'mirum iudicium'. A hasty epitomator could, however, have based his judgement on the meaning that appears in this passage of Dionysius. This epitomator could also have failed to notice that at this point Dionysius is discussing the speeches, not the entire work, of Thucydides.

The epitomator has, however, noticed that Dionysius has a high opinion of Thucydides' account of the debate over Plataea:

Thuc. 42

...ὑπὲρ ἁπάσας δὲ τὰς ἐν ταῖς ἑπτὰ βύβλοις φερομένας τὴν Πλαταιέων ἀπολογίαν τεθαύμακα...

Life 42

...τῆς δημηγορίας Πλαταιέων καὶ Θηβαίων, ἃς ἀνωτέρω τῶν ἄλλων ὑπεξειλόμεθα.

The material here, though derivative in emphasis, does at least show some initiative; the author here gives some details of his own, which like the passage concerning παρένθηκαι show some knowledge of the text of Thucydides.

In *Ad Pomp.* 3 Dionysius is comparing Herodotus and Thucydides. Thucydides is better at representing πάθη, while Herodotus is better with ἤθη (3.18). *Life* 53 picks up part of this notion; τέθεικε δὲ πολλάκις καὶ πάθη καὶ πράγματα ἀντ᾽ ἀνδρῶν...

There is in addition an attempt to generalize which owes nothing to any particular passage of Dionysius. This is the use of the terms ὑψηλός, μέσος, and ἰσχνός, particularly in 39–41 and 43. In each of these contexts literary style, not oratory, is the subject of discussion. Dionysius, however, speaks of τόν τε ἰσχνὸν καὶ τὸν ὑψηλὸν καὶ τὸν μεταξὺ τούτων in *Dem.* 33, p. 203, 10; this is typical of the usage, which is scarce and seems to have been developed strictly for a particular oratorical context.[54] These terms are less specific than such expressions as ἡ αὐστερὰ ἁρμονία (*Comp.* 22.1) and ἡ γλαφυρὰ σύνθεσις (23.1), and may well have slipped into the general stock for this reason. At all events, our author is not interested in confining their use to an oratorical context.

The foregoing are a selection only[55] of the way in which the critical sections of the 'Marcellinus' *Life* show that the writer (or those whose work he is using) was familiar with the work of Dionysius on Thucydides. In general, the terms of discussion seem to be borrowed from Dionysius, although they may be misapplied. Certain passages

[52] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thucydides*, Loeb Classical Library (London, 1974).
[53] Poppo ad loc., p. xxiii.
[54] See also *Dem.* 5, p. 136, 12–13, 34, p. 204, 6ff.; *Ad Pomp.* 2.2.
[55] Piccirilli has provided meticulous cross-referencing in his edition, referring also to Suidas, Hesychius, Zosimus and others. He has omitted reference to Hermogenes and the *Scholia ad Hermogenem* with regard to *Life* 38, 44, 53, 56–7.

simply extrapolate from his work, one or two summarize certain sections, and others add comment of their own while keeping within the range of topics covered by Dionysius. While it is quite likely that most writers on Thucydides would make routine references to style and to the work of other historians and even to Homer, it is less likely that every discussion would contain the same references to Pindar, Gorgias, and the Plataean debate.

CAECILIUS CALACTINUS

This author, ὁ φίλτατος Καικίλιος of *Ad Pomp.* 3.20,[56] is known to us only by fragments and allusion. He was a contemporary of Dionysius, and fragments taking issue with Dionysius tend to be attributed to him.[57] Unfortunately, neither their supposed relations nor their assumed disagreements, which cannot be taken as proof one of the other, can help to identify the hand of Caecilius. When a passage contains explicit disagreement with Dionysius, all that can be said is that it is not by Dionysius.

The article in *Suidae Lexicon* credits him with a considerable output, which is confirmed in the number of fragments attributed to his authorship or influence. In the absence of any material which can be certainly identified as the writing of Caecilius, there is no opportunity to draw comparisons from context, as in the case of Dionysius. In the case of vocabulary, any that seems specific to Caecilius tends to be found in what are at best late paraphrases, notably by Photius and Longinus.[58] It is clear from the remarks of Quintilian that Caecilius was a prolific writer (3.1.15; 9.3.89 etc.), and it seems that he used Thucydides, as well as Homer, Demosthenes and occasionally Herodotus as a source of examples when discussing style and structure (Tiberius 3, p. 80, 4, 13, 18 Sp. *inter alia*). The contexts in which he is quoted show that he and Dionysius at least, and probably other critics as well, took the same approach and used the same authors as sources of critical theory. It is impossible to tell from the fragments and references whether Caecilius took a more strictly rhetorical interest than Dionysius, but it seems unlikely.[59]

PROCLUS

In discussing the vocabulary that appears in the *Life*, I have identified a number of terms that are found in the work of Proclus in the fifth century A.D. Most appear in a philosophical context, but occasionally Proclus will concern himself with the way that the material he is discussing is written. For example, in *In Alc.* 10:[60]

...τῷ δὲ εἴδει λοιπὸν ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως καὶ τῶν σχημάτων καὶ τῶν ἰδεῶν ἡ πλόκη καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τῆς λεκτικῆς ἐστι δυνάμεως...

[56] For a discussion of the relations between the two, see Ofenloch, *prooemium* p. XIII. I cannot see that differences of professional opinion necessarily imply that Dionysius and Caecilius were on bad terms. Certainly Dionysius is glad to report an agreement here.

[57] Frr. 137, 142 (Ofenloch). See Ofenloch's note ad loc., p. 121.

[58] Longinus, *De Sublimitate* 2.1 p. 3, 12 V; 3.1. p. 5, 9 V; 31.1. p. 53, 19 V; Photius specifically mentions Caecilius in *Bibl.* cod. 259, p. 485b 14, and according to Ofenloch (n. 8) p. 98 is paraphrasing him in *Bibl.* cod. 159, p. 102a 42 and 262, p. 488b 25.

[59] There seems to be a comparison of Thucydides and Herodotus in terms of stylistic method in Tiberius, 3, p. 81, 23 Sp.

[60] The texts of Proclus cited are as follows:
In Platonis Alcibiadem, L. G. Westerink (ed.), (Amsterdam, 1954)
In Platonis Parmenidem, V. Cousin (ed.), (Paris, 1864, repr. Hildesheim, 1961)
In Platonis rem publicam commentarii, W. Kroll (ed.), (Leipzig, 1899, 1901, repr. Hildesheim, 1965)

or *In Prm.* 645.4:

Ἔτι δεῖ οὖν τὸν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ διαλόγου πρεπωδέστατον εἶναι τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις πράγμασι καὶ τῇ μεθόδῳ τῶν λόγων.

or in *R.* 8.16:

Ἔχεις οὖν συμπλοκὴν πίστεων, ἥ περ μεγίστη σχημάτων μέθοδος· ἅ περ ἂν εἶπες εἰς ἁπλῆν ὑπόθεσιν, τὰ αὐτὰ λέγοντα ἐπὶ τῶν πλαγίων λόγων τὸ σχῆμα περαίνειν· συγκατασκευάζοντα τὸν οἰκεῖον ἀγῶνα τῷ κοινῷ ὡς ἔμαθες παρὰ Δημοσθένους, παρὰ Θουκυδίδου, παρὰ Πλάτωνος ...

The approach in these passages is similar to that found in the *Life*, particularly in sections 2 and 3. The concern is not so much to offer strict definitions as to provide a summary which is subordinate to the main argument. Proclus is providing a commentary on philosophical works including those of Plato; our compiler is putting together a summary of Thucydides' life and work.

The third passage contains the term πλαγίος, which as noted above is a late usage, occurs frequently in Proclus, and when not used literally is grammatical rather than rhetorical in application. In ascribing this kind of writing to Thucydides, Proclus is more in sympathy with *Life* 53 than 56, though the summarizing style is the same in both cases.

Though Proclus no more than Caecilius can be designated as a direct source for any material in the *Life*, comparison is still useful as a means of identifying a period and an approach. Another work of his that is useful in this way is *Chrestomathia*, a collection of Homerica[61] of which there remain to us some of the *Iliad*, a *Life* of Homer, and some résumés of the Epic Cycle. The *Life* has certain features in common to what we may call the 'Marcellinus' method; an interest in Homer's birthplace, ancestry, blindness, and death, all inconclusive. The whole is prefaced by an account of the opinions of Homer's critics. However, whereas the critical sections of the 'Marcellinus' *Life* make no attempt, apart from the mysterious reference to Antyllus in 36, to give sources of opinions or to distinguish opinion from fact, Proclus carefully attributes various opinions to their source, and goes so far as to state definitively that he does not believe that Homer was blind. If it cannot be established that Proclus contributed directly or indirectly to the 'Marcellinus' *Life*, it can at least be said that these two documents were written with similar interests in mind. It seems that a body of speculation and hearsay had established itself around the literary figures of the past, and Proclus at least, as a responsible critic, was interested in sorting it out. In the case of the 'Marcellinus' document, either the compiler found himself unable to attempt such a task, or he was more interested in a quick compilation, perhaps to serve as part of a handbook.

HERMOGENES OF TARSUS AND THE SCHOLIA OF SYRIAN, SOPATER AND MARCELLINUS

Although Hermogenes himself (second century A.D.) belongs to a time considerably earlier than Proclus, the *Progymnasmata*, Περὶ εὑρέσεως, and Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος are not considered authentic but must represent his influence. The Byzantine scholia are much later, probably the seventh century. It is thus more convenient to discuss this material at this point. These works[62] contain terminology

---

[61] A. Severyns, *Recherche sur la Chrestomathie de Proclos*, tome 1 (Liège, 1938), p. XI, finds that the *Chrestomathia* is 'ni une anthologie, ni un recueil...C'était...un Manuel abrégé de litterature'.

[62] References to Hermogenes are to the edition of Rabe (Leipzig, 1913, repr. Stuttgart, 1969).

and interests in common with certain passages in the *Life*. The similarities are numerous and suggest at the least a common source. I have selected a few by way of example, noting in particular terms prominent in the work of Hermogenes himself.

To begin with *Life* 1; the three εἴδη defined by Hermogenes and discussed above appear in this chapter. While its main function is to introduce the discussion and explain the introduction of biographical material, it does at least seem to owe something to Hermogenes.

Life 38 contains a number of terms and expressions found in Hermogenes. The terms ἄψυχος and ψιλός are part of his technical vocabulary, and the phrase προσώποις δὲ οὐ περιθέντων λόγους τινὰς is similar to προσωποποιία δέ, ὅταν πράγματι περιτιθῶμεν πρόσωπον in *Prog.* 9.3–4. *Life* 38 also contains the phrase ...ὥστε καὶ στάσει ὑποπίπτειν τὰς δημηγορίας. Attempts to give meaning to this rather cryptic expression depend heavily upon Quintilian;[63] I have considered this usage in Hermogenes and the scholia. Hermogenes, Περὶ τῶν στάσεων 7.9–10, uses ὑποπίπτειν in exactly the same way:

Τὸ τοίνυν νόμιμον ... μιᾷ τῶν νομικῶν ὑποπίπτει στάσεων ...

By στάσις Hermogenes seems to mean a particular, formal, approach to a topic under discussion, as he subsequently reinforces the point:

Τὸ δίκαιον μιᾷ τῶν δικαιολογικῶν ὑποπίπτει ...

These expressions are reproduced by Sopater, *Ad Hermog.* 724.23–5, 779.23–4. I have thus referred to Hermogenes in order to arrive at a translation of the expression in *Life* 38.

The verb ὑποπίπτειν is also used in *Life* 42. This passage contains the curious use of εἶδος that I have noted above, and the following remark:

ἐξαιρέτως δὲ ἡ Θουκυδίδου[64] τοῖς τρισὶν εἴδεσιν ὑποπίπτει, τῷ μὲν συμβουλευτικῷ ... τῷ δὲ πανηγυρικῷ ... τῷ δὲ δικανικῷ ...

These are the only usages of ὑποπίπτειν in the *Life*. Taking into consideration Hermogenes' preference for the term εἶδος in these contexts, and the way in which he specifies these three εἴδη in his discussion of Thucydides (Περὶ ἰδ. 6.131–92), leads me to conclude that *Life* 38 and 41.2–42 are derived from Hermogenes. It is in fact Marcellinus himself, *Ad Hermog.* 192.29–193.8, who comments on these εἴδη.

Life 44 is one of the passages that I have identified as summarizing or linking material. It is coherent, contains a personal opinion, and contains language that has elements of Hermogenes, while adding terms of its own, ἀκαλλώπιστος and ἐκτύπος.

In discussing *Life* 49 I have referred to the similarity in approach but difference in detail from Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In his work Hermogenes takes the expected interest in Herodotus and Thucydides, and when discussing the difference between διήγημα and διήγησις (*Progym.* 2.4–10) cites the anecdotes concerning Arion and Alcmaeon that appear in *Life* 49, and when discussing Thucydides' style in Περὶ ἰδ. mentions the Tereus story (175). To Hermogenes, μῦθος is a sub-division of διήγημα; it is thus possible that the summary in 49 could owe more to Hermogenes than to Dionysius.

The passage 50–1 is similar to 44; τραχύτης is a well documented interest of Hermogenes, but while ὑπερβατικόν is part of his vocabulary one must seek ἐμβριθής

---

[63] Poppo, ad loc., p. xxv, renders this *ut ad certum causae statum revocari possint*, and refers to the explanation of στάσις/*status* in Quintilian, 3.6.1–22. Piccirilli ad loc., p. 39: 'sicché anche i suoi discorsi rientrano in un genere'.

[64] Given Hermogenes' usage, Poppo's deletion of ἐν is appropriate.

in the work of Dionysius. Chapter 53 is curious in that while there are echoes of Hermogenes the passage is dealing with Thucydides' *History* as a whole. The striking term ὄγκος appears, a term particularly favoured by Hermogenes, but otherwise 53 seems to be a self-contained summary, recapitulating material in 41.2-2 and offering comment after the manner of Hermogenes. Finally, there is the passage 56 οὔτε γὰρ εἰρωνείαις... -57, which not only contains the term πλαγίος mentioned above but seems to paraphrase Marcellinus *Ad Hermog.* 102.22-3:

καὶ δεῖ τὸν ῥήτορα κατὰ τὸ ὑποκείμενον πρόσωπον τὸ ἦθος μιμεῖσθαι...

Life 57:

τεχνίτου γὰρ ἀνδρὸς φυλάξαι τοῖς προσώποις τὴν ἐπιβάλλουσαν δόξαν...

The foregoing examples suggest that an author well versed in the views of Hermogenes was responsible wholly or in part for *Life* 1, 38, 41.2-2, 44, end 48-9, 50-1, 53, and end 56-7. The summarizing nature of most of these passages indicates that this author was a compiler rather than a contributor. The question then arises as to whether material by Hermogenes formed part of the compilation, or whether the compiler was simply a follower of Hermogenes. To answer this, one need merely consider the approach to Thucydides found in the *Life*.

CICERO

When we consider the attitude to the speeches in Thucydides that seems to appear in the *Life*, a comparison can be drawn with Cicero.[65] In *Brutus* 27 he is discussing written records of oratory. He mentions Pericles, *cuius scripta quaedam feruntur*, and Thucydides. It is not clear what is meant by *scripta quaedam*, but in 29 Cicero says that we can best learn the vigour of the style of oratory at that time from the writing of Thucydides. The implication is that Cicero used Thucydides as a source for the style of Pericles; in 38 and 59 Cicero also refers to Eupolis as a source, and these remarks are borne out by the words *Pericles...de cuius dicendi copia sic accepimus...* in *De Oratore* 3.138.

In 287 Cicero says that Thucydides is a better exemplar as historian than forensic speaker, and then goes on to say (288-9) that though he has no wish to imitate them, he thinks highly of the many speeches that Thucydides includes in his work. In *Orator* 30-2 he takes this a little further: *ipsae illae contiones ita multas habent obscuras abditasque sententias vix ut intellegantur*. Cicero notes Thucydides' reputation as a *rerum explicator*, but judges the speeches on the same basis as those of any orator. In these passages they are taken seriously as examples of Thucydides' oratorical style rather than mere reports. This can be seen most clearly in *De Oratore* 2.92-3, where Cicero speaks of Pericles, Alcibiades, and Thucydides in the same terms, as though the words of the first two were not to be derived from an account given by the last for the purposes of his history: *Antiquissimi fere sunt, quorum quidem scripta constent, Pericles atque Alcibiades et eadem aetate Thucydides*.

This is the attitude that prevails in what I have identified as the rhetorical sections of the 'Marcellinus' *Life*. It is not so firmly entrenched in Dionysius, who at least shows some awareness that Thucydides is portraying the words and deeds of others,

---

[65] The texts of Cicero cited are as follows:

Orator, A. Yon (ed.), (Paris, 1964);
Brutus, A. E. Douglas (ed.), (Oxford, 1966);
De Oratore, H. Merklin (ed.), (Stuttgart, 1976).

and in *Περὶ ἰδ.* 183–8 Hermogenes notes that Thucydides uses *mimesis* in his speeches and dialogues: ἔτι ὡς ἱστορικὸς ὁ Θουκυδίδης κέχρηται μὲν καί μιμήσει κατά τε τὰς δημηγορίας καὶ ἔν τισι διαλόγοις. Cicero's attitude reappears, however, in the scholia. At times Hermogenes' distinction is preserved: ὥσπερ ὁ Θουκυδίδης τὸ Περικλέους πρόσωπον καὶ ἦθος ἐμφαίνει καὶ μεμίσηται... καὶ δεῖ τὸν ῥήτορα κατὰ τὸ ὑποκείμενον πρόσωπον τὸ ἦθος μιμεῖσθαι (Marc. *Ad Hermog.* 102.19–20, 22–3). Marcellinus does not seem to be sure here of Hermogenes' meaning, but later on he expresses himself more plainly: ὥσπερ ὁ Περικλῆς πεποίηται τῷ Θουκυδίδῃ λέγων (Marc. *Ad Hermog.* 193.5–6). At times the distinction seems blurred: δεῖ γὰρ μὴ μόνον τὰς τῶν προσώπων ἐξετάζειν ποιότητας ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἰδέας κατ' ἀλλήλους τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἐπιτιθέναι προσώποις· ἔστι τις καὶ ἑτέρα παρὰ Θουκυδίδῃ καὶ Δεμοσθένει μέθοδος βιαιοτέρα (Syr. *Ad Hermog.* 114.14–18), and at others it is not made at all: εἰ δέ τις εἴποι, ὅτι καὶ ἐν πανηγυρικῷ εὑρίσκεται συμβουλευτικὸν, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ Θουκυδίδου· καὶ ἐν τῷ Εὐαγόρᾳ Ἰσοκράτους (Marc. *Ad Hermog.* 58.18–20); μιᾷ τῶν τριῶν μεθόδων χρησόμενος τῶν τεχνικῶν, αἷς ὁ τε Θουκυδίδης κέχρηται καὶ Δημοσθένης παρ' αὐτοῦ μαθών (Marc. and Sop. *Ad Hermog* 205.14–16). It is likely that these variations of opinion reflect the extent to which the commentator was reproducing the opinion of Hermogenes at any point. As a consequence, it seems likely that the approach in the *Life* is closer to that of the later scholia than that of Hermogenes himself.

CONCLUSION

It is not sufficient simply to divide the 'Marcellinus' *Life* into three sections each of biography and criticism, and assign an author to each. Nor should it be assumed that any one section belongs to a particular time or is coherent within itself. The material derived from Dionysius forms the largest proportion of the critical passages, but material showing later influences occurs here and there, particularly in summarizing or linking passages. These layers of material show shifts of emphasis and developments in theoretical approach. By the time of Proclus interest seems to have developed in the authors themselves; the style and structure of his *Vita Homeri* in the *Chrestomathia* are not dissimilar to that of the biographical material in the two *Vitae* and the entry in *Suidae Lexicon*. It was obviously important to know about the author as well as his works, and this is the stated object of the *Life*. It should be stressed, however, that the critical and biographical sections of the *Life* are in no way presented as having a bearing one upon the other. Material from a variety of sources, representing different interests, has been combined, apparently more for the sake of its preservation than anything else. In the case of the critical material, the compiler, if indeed there was only one, was unable or unwilling to distinguish between literary and rhetorical criticism.

How then does such a document come to be called a *Life*? Has it retained this title or acquired it? Examination of the text has made it plain that, whatever the form of the original anecdotal material, it was nonetheless still deemed appropriate to define the expanded version as an account of Thucydides' life. This is particularly clear in ch. 1, which suggests that an account of his life is essential to an appreciation of his writing. Momigliano[66] has made a useful survey of the variety of the nature and indeed the function of biographical writing in the Greek world, particularly when it comes to the balance of interest between the individual and his achievements. It is

---

[66] A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, MA, 1971).

certainly plain that in this *Life* the objective is not to retrieve facts about the individual concerned but to provide a narrative that justifies or provides an appropriate context for these achievements.[67] Comparison with the *Chrestomathia* of Proclus places the *Life* in the tradition of biographical encomium, indispensable to the appreciation of the historian's work.[68]

When was the *Life* compiled? It was a source for *Suidae Lexicon*, and has material in common with Hesychius and the *Excerpta* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.[69] We can thus assume that it became a respectable authority somewhere between the sixth[70] and tenth centuries A.D. The scholia *Ad Hermogenem* were compiled in the seventh century. Since so much of the editorial material seems to owe a great deal to Hermogenes, and since his views show signs of modification and a quantity of late usages and vocabulary has crept into the text, perhaps it is not unreasonable to take the manuscript sub-titles at least in part seriously and attribute some of the compilation to Marcellinus, the scholiast to Hermogenes.

The University of Western Australia   JUDITH MAITLAND

The University of Western Australia   JUDITH MAITLAND

[67] Momigliano (n. 66), p. 67: '...biography acquired a new meaning when the Socratics moved to that zone between truth and fiction which is so bewildering to the professional historian'.

[68] Momigliano, p. 87: 'though in its present form not earlier than the fifth century... [the *Life*] ...preserves learned discussion which was going on at the time of Didymus... about the various family connections and about the equally mysterious death of the Athenian historian. These are examples of "Suetonian" biographies, the substance of which must go back to Alexandrian erudition'. Certainly Thucydides is mentioned by Philodemus in terms of both style and origin (S. Sudhaus, [ed.], *Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica* [Amsterdam, 1971], 151.21, 188.16).

[69] See A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon*, ad loc.

[70] K. Latte (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* (Copenhagen, 1953), *prolegomena* pp. vi–viii, suggests the sixth rather than the fifth century. Latte comments (p. xi): 'Fieri quidem potuisse, ut Aeschinis scholiasta, doctus homo eiusdem scholae, quae et Marcellini vitam Thucydidis procreavit saeculo nisi fallor sexto p. Chr., ipsum Hesychium adhiberet, non negaverim.'