

## THUCYDIDES AND DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

More than halfway through Thucydides's *Histories*, his intended 'possession for all time', we suddenly encounter the carefully cited wording of a diplomatic text. At 4.118, it is an innovation in Thucydides' method and it proved infectious. In Books 5 and 8 it is followed by yet more closely cited texts, another eight of them in all, a treaty, a peace, three agreements prior to alliances and three actual alliances themselves. At 1.21–2 Thucydides discusses his methods of research with the implication that he has already complied with them. However, he does not refer to documentary research or citation as innovations and he does not even mention documents among his sources. In the light of his later practice we are left to wonder why, and why this sort of citation begins only at 4.118, to be repeated eight more times before the end of Book 8.

Thucydides' purpose here, his methods and the status of these documents have attracted the highest levels of scholarship for more than 150 years. From Dobree to Kirchoff, Wilamowitz to Schwartz, Gomme and Andrewes to Canfora, detailed and penetrating contributions have addressed questions which these texts raise.<sup>1</sup> With hindsight we can see that 1876–7 was a cardinal year for these issues, the occasion of a brilliant, if unconvincing, essay by Wilamowitz, the first masterly paper by Kirchoff and, in 1876, a stunning discovery at Athens' Theatre of Dionysus: the inscribed text of the grandiose hundred-year alliance between the Athenians, Argives, Mantineans and Eleans whose text is also given by Thucydides at 5.47.<sup>2</sup> This remarkable find has been somewhat dulled by the passage of time, but it was the first major discovery of an inscribed text which overlapped with an equivalent text in an ancient historian since the discovery of the Lyons Tablet nearly three centuries earlier.

Discussion of Thucydides's documentary practice continues to reach a wide range of conclusions. For Westlake, in 1971, the change of technique (exemplified in Book 5) is connected with Thucydides' wish to focus attention upon the 'utter bankruptcy of Greek statesmanship at this time, especially in the Peloponnese. This

<sup>1</sup> This article began as a lecture to the AMPAH Graduate Meeting in Oxford in March, 2007, with revisions up to June 2008. I am grateful to S. Hodkinson and P.J. Rhodes for comments and ultimately to A. Andrewes for my initial interest in the question. I wrote my first draft before publication of S. Hornblower's *Thucydides Commentary* vol. 3 and as our approaches do not overlap, I have left my text unchanged in its previous form. P.P. Dobree, *Petri Pauli Dobree adversaria* 1 (London, 1883) 51; A. Kirchoff, *Thukydides und sein Urkundenmaterial* (Berlin, 1895); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, 'Die Thukydideslegende', *Hermes* 12 (1877), 326–67; E. Schwartz, *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* (Bonn, 1919); Gomme–Andrewes–Dover, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (= *HCT*), 3.596–607, 666–82, 4.62–3, 131–3, 6.143–6, 374–5, 391–2; L. Canfora, 'Trattati in Tucidide', in L. Canfora, M. Liverani, C. Zaccagnini (edd.), *I Trattati nel mondo antico. Forma, ideologia, funzione* (Roma, 1990), 193–216, repr. in L. Canfora, *La storiografia greca* (Milano, 1999) 124–59.

<sup>2</sup> Tod, *GHI* 1 no. 72, with his penetrating commentary; A. Kirchoff, 'Zur Geschichte der Überlieferung des Thukydideischen Textes', *Hermes* 12 (1877), 368–81; Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (n. 1) 326–67.

is the basic lesson he intends to convey to his readers.<sup>3</sup> Yet when Thucydides wants to convey something approaching a ‘bankruptcy’ of ‘statesmanship’, he has already proved in the case of Cleon that he ‘conveys’ it much more explicitly in a way which none of his readers could possibly miss. In 1998, Rood proposed that ‘literary approaches can suggest positive reasons for the inclusion of documents’, including that ‘grappling with the terms of treaties helps readers to construct their own narratives’.<sup>4</sup> Generations of modern exam candidates have feared that they may be made to do exactly that, but even if this intention was Thucydides’ own, a most unlikely intention in my view, the question still remains why he made his readers ‘grapple’ and ‘construct’ only from 4.118 onwards, and at particular moments only in Books 5 and 8. Introducing ‘Book iv–v.24 as a work of art’, Hornblower has listed yet more reasons which modern scholars have adduced to explain what he rightly regards as an innovation. His own additional emphasis is on ‘Thucydides’ anxiety to demonstrate, boldly and assertively, his own microscopic precision’, a quality, one feels, of all good commentators on the *Histories*.<sup>5</sup> But again the question remains: why only there, why only then and was this ‘anxiety’ really so well applied to such minutiae as the citation at 4.118 and its accompanying list of names? In 1962, in his eminently contestable lecture on Thucydides to the British Academy, Syme considered it was not. He dismissed 4.118 and the subsequent texts as manifest ‘stopgaps’, whose lists of names ‘have no meaning whatsoever’. That beguiling mirage, Thucydides’ final version, would, Syme believed, have left them out.<sup>6</sup> His view reminds us how Thucydides’ nine closely cited texts have been central for more than a hundred years to that equally intractable question, the strata of the *Histories*’ composition both before and after 404 B.C.

If we look back over Thucydides and then over Herodotus too, we can be more precise about the prevailing impression that 4.118 and its eight successors in the *Histories* were a new departure. Thucydides is aware of wording in previous documentary texts (the Megarian Decree being one instance) and before 4.118 he is aware of such details as the treaty made for a hundred years in north-west Greece in 426 B.C. or the truce at Pylos in 425 B.C. whose provisions he gives in indirect speech.<sup>7</sup> What he does not do is quote these actual clauses directly, as he does at 4.118. Elsewhere he does not even summarize, neither the Thirty Years’ Peace nor the treaty, for instance, at Gela in 424 B.C. He occasionally cites or quotes non-diplomatic inscriptions which were displayed in public, but they concern past individuals. They are particularly evident in the excursus on the Athenian tyrants from 6.54 to 59 where he was particularly keen to set the record straight.<sup>8</sup> They are not, however, in evidence at all in his opening *ἀρχαιολογία*. For facts in the more distant past, his recourse to inscriptions was intermittent.

Herodotus, famously, cites inscriptions, nineteen in all. When he cites their texts he is not always accurate, although we should not therefore conclude that he had

<sup>3</sup> H.D. Westlake, ‘Thucydides and the uneasy peace – a study in political incompetence’, *CQ* 21 (1971), 315–25, at 323.

<sup>4</sup> T. Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford, 1998), 92.

<sup>5</sup> S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1996), 113–18, at 117.

<sup>6</sup> R. Syme, ‘Thucydides’, *PBA* 48 (1962), 39–56, esp. 42 = *Roman Papers*, vol. 6 (Oxford, 1991), 72–87, esp. 78.

<sup>7</sup> Thuc. 3.114.3; 4.16.

<sup>8</sup> Especially Thuc. 6.54.7 with *HCT* 4.331–2 and Thuc. 6.55.1–2 and 59.3 with *HCT* 4.324–5.

never seen the inscription in question.<sup>9</sup> His practice is not so different here from Thucydides 6.54–9. We can also infer that sometimes he is using an extraneous written document, an inference which we cannot make with quite such confidence in the case of Thucydides before 4.118. Herodotus has some sort of list of the people and tributes in the Persian Empire and a so-called ‘army list’ of contingents (he believes) in Xerxes’ expedition to Greece.<sup>10</sup> It has been argued with some plausibility that he also drew on a diary record of the days taken by Xerxes’ progress into northern Greece.<sup>11</sup> Now that an Aramaic translation of Darius’ Bisitun inscription is known from Egypt, some might argue that its text had also been translated into Greek and we could then wonder whether Herodotus himself saw such a text.<sup>12</sup> In my view he only heard stories which overlapped with parts of it, told (as Wells brilliantly argued in 1907) by the likes of Zopyrus son of Megabyzus, accessible to Herodotus in Athens.<sup>13</sup> What we cannot do is point to a verbatim quotation of any Greek text of alliance, treaty or pre-treaty in his *Histories*. Minor documentary trivia, known to us, have also escaped Herodotus altogether, such as Magnesia-on-the Maeander’s (genuine) Greek text of Darius’ answer to his satrap Gadatas, preserved at the city’s temple of Apollo.<sup>14</sup> After his visit to Cyrene in the late 440s, Herodotus’ wording implies that he was aware that a formal ‘pact’ had been made by the city’s first settlers from Thera, but he made no effort to follow it up himself and give it word for word.<sup>15</sup> We do not know enough about Hellanicus, Thucydides’ immediate predecessor, but so far as we know, the close citation at 4.118 is indeed an innovation not just for Thucydides but in all surviving Greek historiography. First, I wish to solve the problem of this innovation’s origins and its role in Thucydides’ researches. Then I wish to return to the famous theory of Jacoby that a documentary method, or way of presenting the past, was the result of the research projects of Aristotle and his school from the 320s onward.<sup>16</sup> Did they, not Thucydides, change the method of subsequent Greek historians?

## II

Let us begin with a particular cluster of Thucydides’ documents, those which record diplomacy between Spartans and people other than Athenians. At 5.77 Thucydides gives us the preliminary agreement, or *ξυμβατήριος λόγος*, between Sparta and Argos in Doric Greek. At 5.79 he then gives us the text of their full alliance, once again in Doric. The citation of not one but two stages in the outcome is unusually painstaking, and yet the significance of these agreements in the total course of

<sup>9</sup> S. West, ‘Herodotus’ epigraphical interests’, *CQ* 35 (1985), 278–305.

<sup>10</sup> Hdt. 3.90–5 and 7.61–99.

<sup>11</sup> A.R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*<sup>2</sup> (London, 1984), 395–7 and 435.

<sup>12</sup> J.C. Greenfield and B. Porten, *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great: Aramaic Version* (London, 1982).

<sup>13</sup> J. Wells, ‘The Persian friends of Herodotus’, *JHS* 27 (1907), 37–47.

<sup>14</sup> Meiggs–Lewis, *GHI* no. 12 with R. Lane Fox, ‘The Letter to Gadatas’, in A.P. Matthaiou (ed.), *Chiakon Symposion Eis Mnēmēn W.G. Forrest* (Athens, 2006), 149–71.

<sup>15</sup> Hdt. 4.153, with the formal word *εἶθε* (compare 4.145.3, of the Spartans; 1.151.3, of the Ionians; 4.201.2, of the Barcans). For the dating of his visit to Cyrene, F. Chamoux, *Cyrene sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Paris, 1953), 207–9.

<sup>16</sup> F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), 208–9, on ‘disciples and helpers of Aristotle’.

the war is quite remarkably modest. This Spartan–Argive alliance collapsed very quickly and was never revived.

Why does Thucydides give such exceptional detail about such a passing event? We should look at the people who negotiated the agreements. On the Argive side they were Argive oligarchs but on the Spartans' side, the Spartans' Argive *proxenos* would obviously be involved. At 5.22, Thucydides has already named two Spartiates who went to renew alliance with Argos, one of whom was Lichas. At 5.50.4 he mentions Lichas son of Arcesilas, evidently the same Spartiate because at 5.76.3 he refers to Lichas son of Arcesilas as the *proxenos* of the Argives. Taken together, the three references show that at 5.22 the Lichas was this Lichas, involved in alliance with Argos as the Argives' *proxenos*. It is a very famous name, whose family background surely included the Lichas of the 560s B.C., the Spartiate who mistook the bones of a Peloponnesian mammoth for the bones of the hero Orestes as described in Herodotus, the name of a homonym who turned up as a magistrate on Thasos in the early 390s, of Lichas ὁ Σαμῖος attested by a vase inscription and also the *geron* Lichas who became notorious, as Thucydides describes, for cheating at the Olympic games of 420 B.C.<sup>17</sup> This Lichas the Argive *proxenos* and Lichas the *geron*, who cheated at the Olympics, are manifestly the same person.<sup>18</sup> In his life of Cimon, Plutarch quotes a poem by the Athenian Critias which praises the Spartan Lichas' hospitality.<sup>19</sup> In the *Memorabilia*, Xenophon refers to the Spartan Lichas, famous for his *δειπνα*, or dinners, and his hospitality to foreigners at the Gymnopaedia.<sup>20</sup> Manifestly he is the same son of Arcesilas. Lichas was known, and remembered, in Athenian upper-class, right-wing company as a generous host. That milieu was also Thucydides' milieu.

At 5.77 and 5.79 the Doric Greek in our text is slightly clouded by uncertainties in the manuscripts. There is a possibility of editorial adjustments at some stage in our text's history, but a Doric original was certainly what underlay it. Whose Doric was it? Kirchhoff's discussion is still fundamental here. Observing the absence of Argive accusative plurals in *-vs* and assessing the texts and their context very carefully, he amassed the case for a Laconian–Doric original: sigmas are used for thetas, even in the texts as transmitted to us, and so forth.<sup>21</sup> None the less, he hesitated to rule out an alternative Argive origin and in his discussion of the texts' initial route to Thucydides, an Argive starting point is the one which he prefers.<sup>22</sup> In his view the originals of 5.77 and 5.79 were acquired by Argive democrats, enemies of the Argive oligarchs who negotiated them. They would be keen to preserve these texts because they could be used later as evidence if the chance arose to attack their oligarchic Argive opponents. These Argive democrats had Athenian political friends and so for Kirchhoff it was as 'good as certain' that copies of these two diplomatic texts promptly reached Athens too and were

<sup>17</sup> D.M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden, 1977), 33 n. 44, citing Hdt. 1.67.5; S. Hornblower, 'Lichas Kalos Samios', *Chiron* 32 (2002), 238–46, esp. 238–41 on the Spartan connections of the name and its correct spelling.

<sup>18</sup> Thuc. 5.50.4.

<sup>19</sup> Plut. *Cim.* 10.5–6, quoting Critias.

<sup>20</sup> Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.61.

<sup>21</sup> Kirchhoff (n. 1), 105–14; S. Colvin, *Dialect in Aristophanes* (Oxford, 1999), 61–7 none the less raises the possibility of a Peloponnesian koina dialect, believing that 5.79 is a 'joint effort or an Argive composition'. I do not share that belief.

<sup>22</sup> Kirchhoff (n. 1), 115 and 125–7.

preserved there.<sup>23</sup> The most famous such friend was Alcibiades. When Kirchhoff moves on to discuss the diplomatic texts in Book 8, Alcibiades is again the link in the chain of transmission he proposes.<sup>24</sup> For 5.77 and 5.79, meanwhile, he proposed transmission via, or at, Athens to Thucydides himself, leaving Alcibiades' specific role open.

These elaborate proposals are far from convincing. If Argive democrats wanted to attack Argive oligarchs they would do so without bringing actual treaty texts into the conflict. The mere fact, publicly known, of an (oligarchic) Argive–Spartan alliance would suffice. It would suffice, too, for their Athenian friends without an exact copy of the short-lived pre-treaty agreement (5.77) to keep in their (supposed) 'archives'. Thucydides was unable to visit Athens at the time, or for at least another twelve years, so who was sending him carefully copied Doric versions of such texts kept (somehow) among pro-Argive friends in the city?

There is a simpler, obvious alternative which Kirchhoff did not pursue, partly, I think, because his mind was already on Alcibiades and his supposed role in transmitting the texts in Book 8. 5.77 is a Spartan text taken to Argos by Sparta's Argive *proxenos*, Lichas. Surely 5.79 originates from the same Lichas' copy of the treaty. Hence the Laconian Doric which Kirchhoff pointed out, among the uncertainties of our later manuscripts. Lichas, the Argives' *proxenos*, was personally involved in both the negotiations. Famously hospitable to foreigners, this Spartan gave the texts (I will suggest) to Thucydides at one of their meetings.

Moving on to 412/1 and Thucydides's Book 8 we are confronted with texts of two preliminary agreements between Spartan negotiators and Persian satraps and then the third agreement, the treaty, sworn between Spartiates and the Persian King, with other named participants.<sup>25</sup> What exactly is this drawn-out sequence of texts? The first two are not simply drafts: the first is described as *συμμαχία*, the second as *συνθήκαι*. The first one, Andrewes rightly comments, was not ratified formally: 'this first "treaty" is no more than a preliminary working arrangement between the forces on the spot'.<sup>26</sup> Like Cawkwell, I take them both to be texts agreed in Asia by Spartiate envoys and then brought back to Sparta to be ratified by the Spartan assembly.<sup>27</sup> The obvious parallel is the ill-fated attempt at a peace treaty in 392/1 B.C. involving Spartan and Athenian envoys in Asia and a Persian satrap.<sup>28</sup> On that occasion the Athenian assembly rejected the (modified) agreement which was submitted to it: in 412/1 B.C., the Spartan assembly did the same to Thuc. 8.18 and 8.37. At 8.43 we learn that a team of eleven Spartiates were then sent out to Asia to try again. Thucydides names one, and only one, of the eleven: Lichas son of Arcesilas. He is the only one of the team whose comments in Asia are recorded: at 8.52 Thucydides reports his blunt remarks to Tissaphernes about the freedom of the Greek *poleis*. Plainly, Lichas or a close associate had talked to Thucydides about these exchanges. Tissaphernes was angry, but he met again with

<sup>23</sup> Kirchhoff (n. 1), 127.

<sup>24</sup> Kirchhoff (n. 1), 146–50.

<sup>25</sup> Thuc. 8.18, 8.37 and 8.58.

<sup>26</sup> Andrewes in HCT 5.40 and 143.

<sup>27</sup> G.L. Cawkwell, *Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War* (London, 1997), 135 n. 15 on the first two 'treaties' as drafts.

<sup>28</sup> P.J. Rhodes, *A History of the Classical Greek World, 478–323 B.C.* (Malden and Oxford, 2006), 192–3.

the Spartan team at Caunus, evidently in early 411.<sup>29</sup> Terms were agreed and sent back to Sparta for approval and this time the Spartan assembly accepted them. So a treaty was sworn in the 'Maeander plain in the thirteenth year of Artaxerxes'. The chronology here has posed acute difficulties, carefully reviewed by Andrewes.<sup>30</sup> However, the place of the meeting did not necessarily impose a delay: it need not have been too far from the Spartan ambassadors' starting point on the coast. The 'Maeander plain' could mean a place near Miletus.<sup>31</sup> As for the 'thirteenth year of Artaxerxes' it need not have been reckoned by the Babylonian spring-to-spring system, as Andrewes simply assumed. Bickerman has acutely observed that alternative regnal datings existed in Asia, one of which reckoned a king's first year more flexibly. The 'thirteenth year', therefore, could include February to lateish March 411 B.C.: his observations, as he points out, cause Andrewes's chronological difficulties to disappear.<sup>32</sup>

After the swearing of the third agreement, who would have had copies of the three texts? Kirchhoff rightly argued that one and the same person was Thucydides' source for all three but then went on to urge that the person in question was Alcibiades.<sup>33</sup> He observed that Alcibiades was very closely involved with Chalcideus, the Spartiate who negotiated the first alliance, that Alcibiades had defected to Tissaphernes before the satrap made the second agreement and that he was an active adviser of Tissaphernes in the months before Tissaphernes made the third agreement.<sup>34</sup> Above all our text of these documents is predominantly in Attic Greek. This last point, especially, convinced Kirchhoff: Thucydides's source was an Athenian, and the one Athenian with easy, close access to a maker of all three treaties was Alcibiades.<sup>35</sup> Copies of the three agreements, he believed, were retained by Alcibiades and eventually brought back with him to Athens in 407 B.C. They survived there in the company of friends and it was through them (Kirchhoff suggested) that Thucydides finally encountered them, three much-travelled bits of papyrus, probably after his own return in or after 404 B.C.<sup>36</sup>

For Kirchhoff, Alcibiades thus emerged as the plausible conduit for the diplomatic texts in both Books 5 and 8. For the latter book he has often been followed, but the case is not well founded. It is not just that Alcibiades is not said specifically to have been with Chalcideus or Tissaphernes when each of these agreements' wording was negotiated. He may have been, but he was not a direct participant.<sup>37</sup> More importantly, texts between Tissaphernes and Spartans were not the most creditable items for him to retain, let alone to bring back to Athens when risking his return home. They did not reflect too well on his loyalties. If Alcibiades really did keep five years' worth of diplomatic texts, he would prefer those which reflected well on himself or badly on his enemies. Above all Kirchhoff's prime argument, the Attic language, has been answered by Lewis and by Dover and Andrewes. They point out the probability of Greek-speaking secretaries in Persian service who could

<sup>29</sup> Thuc. 8.57.1 and 8.58.

<sup>30</sup> Andrewes, in *HCT* 5.138–9 and 147–9.

<sup>31</sup> L. Robert, *Documents d'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1987), 44.

<sup>32</sup> E. Bickerman, 'En marge de l'écriture', *Revue Biblique* 88 (1981), 19–41, at 19–23.

<sup>33</sup> Kirchhoff (n. 1), 143–7.

<sup>34</sup> Thuc. 8.17, 45, and 56–8.

<sup>35</sup> Kirchhoff (n. 1), 147.

<sup>36</sup> Kirchhoff (n. 1), 149–50.

<sup>37</sup> Thuc. 8.17.4, 36–7, and 57–9.

very well use Ionic, a dialect which Thucydides would then easily overlay with Attic of his own. They also point to possible Ionisms surviving in the manuscript tradition of the *Histories* here.<sup>38</sup> Unlike 5.77 and 5.79, the diplomatic texts in Book 8 were not agreed between two Doric-speaking parties. At 4.118, I will argue, we have a non-Doric copy of a Spartan ambassador's text which was for use in Ionic or Attic company in northern Greece.<sup>39</sup> I see no difficulty, then, in arguing that the Attic-Ionic texts at 8.18, 8.37 and 8.58 came from a Spartan negotiator, not an Athenian one, negotiating with a non-Doric counterpart.

The economical answer is that the source for all three texts was a Spartiate negotiator of the final treaty, one who had come out from Sparta with copies of the previous two rejects. These texts had to accompany the negotiators because they had orders to do better this time round and needed to be sure of what had previously been agreed. Thucydides names one, and only one, negotiator: Lichas, son of Arcesilas. Surely Thucydides talked with him: hence the emphasis on Lichas', and only Lichas', bold words to Tissaphernes.<sup>40</sup> He knew him and so he includes the details of Lichas' subsequent words of caution to the Milesians after the third treaty was sworn and the Milesians' angry reaction to him. He even adds Lichas' death from sickness *ὑστερον* and the refusal by the unforgiving Milesians to allow his body to be buried where the Spartans on the spot had wanted. Lichas' story was known to Thucydides and he followed it through to the end.<sup>41</sup> One reason, I suggest, was that Lichas had talked with him and entertained him personally. When they met, Lichas gave Thucydides texts of the treaties in which he had been personally involved. First he gave him the Argive–Spartan pre-treaty agreement (5.77) and the actual treaty (5.79). Then he gave him the Sparto-Persian treaty at 8.58, with the two previous attempted texts which reflected so poorly on Lichas' predecessors and which he (and ten other Spartiates) had been told to improve. All these texts reflected well on the achievements of Lichas the diplomat.

In 1983, Pouilloux and Salviat, I find, raised exactly this possibility, Lichas as a source of documents for Thucydides, but they raised it only as a question in passing.<sup>42</sup> It has been ignored in subsequent scholarship because the main aim of Pouilloux and Salviat's article was quickly refuted. They wished to identify our Spartan Lichas son of Arcesilas with a Lichas son of Arcesilas whom their epigraphic researches revealed as a magistrate of the Thasians in 398/7 B.C.<sup>43</sup> The two were homonymous, but they were not the same person, as was promptly and correctly observed, especially by Cartledge.<sup>44</sup> Our Spartan Lichas, a *geron* in 420 B.C., had died at Miletus soon after the events of 411 B.C., so Pouilloux and Salviat were wrong to wonder if Thucydides had met this Lichas in the area of Thasos and as late as the 390s. By then Lichas the Spartiate was already dead. They

<sup>38</sup> Lewis (n. 17), 95 n. 57; Dover and Andrewes, *HCT* 5.144–5.

<sup>39</sup> See n. 47 below.

<sup>40</sup> Thuc. 8.42.3–4 and 52.

<sup>41</sup> Thuc. 8.84–5.

<sup>42</sup> J. Pouilloux and F. Salviat, 'Lichas, Lacédémonien, Archonte à Thasos et le Livre VIII de Thucydide', *CRAI* (1983), 376–403, esp. 403.

<sup>43</sup> *SEG* 33.702.

<sup>44</sup> P. Cartledge, 'A new lease of life for Lichas son of Arkesilas', *LCM* 9 (1984), 98–102; cf. Hornblower (n. 17), 241–2. I suggest that a possible Spartan–Thasian connection, before Thuc. 1.101.2, would be Plut. *Mor.* 859D, alleging a Spartan expulsion (under Cleomenes, I wonder?) of the tyrant at archaic Thasos. Did 'Lichas' enter Thasian nomenclature through consequent *xenia* with a Spartiate?



were not, however, wrong to suspect that Thucydides and the Spartan Lichas did actually meet, but the meetings (as I will show) took place at different times and venues. For the moment, it suffices that one and the same Lichas, so hospitable to foreigners, was an active participant in the two longest clusters of diplomatic texts which Thucydides cites, five texts in all. Lichas, I suggest, gave him his copies of them. They came to him because Lichas leaked.

### III

I now turn to the fascinating question of the source and nature of the text at 4.118, the Atheno-Spartan Truce of 423 B.C. whose reception is set out for us between 4.118 and 4.123.

The text of this truce as quoted by Thucydides strikes any modern epigraphist as most unusual.<sup>45</sup> It sets out detailed proposals from ‘us’ (the Spartans) to ‘you’ (the Athenians). The first two proposals concern Delphi and are described as agreed by the Spartans and their allies, at least those who were present. They are followed by a series of detailed territorial and diplomatic conditions: ‘if the Athenians make a treaty’ (*σπονδαί*) these conditions, too, ‘seem good to the Spartans and their allies’. If anything seems more just to the Athenians, they are to come to Sparta and ‘instruct’ the Spartans. Meanwhile the ‘treaty’ (*σπονδαί*, again) will last for a year.

Self-evidently this cluster of proposals was resolved by the Spartans (‘us’) and their allies and then brought from Sparta up to the Athenians for adoption or rejection. Thucydides’ text, however, continues with an abbreviated formula of the Athenians’ acceptance at Athens. ‘It seemed good to the *demos*’ (no mention of the Council); the names of the Athenian *prytanis*, *grammateus* and *epistates* are given, followed by the proposer Laches and his brief proposal of acceptance. Although none of the Athenian names is given with a patronymic or demotic, we would not expect them necessarily in a public Attic decree of the fifth century B.C.. It was further agreed in the assembly that the truce should be for a year, beginning on ‘this day’ (the day of the assembly in Athens), Elaphebolion 14. The embassies who were present among the *demos* should pledge ‘at once’ to abide by the truce for a year.

So far, what Thucydides quotes is a cluster of Spartan proposals sent to a formal meeting of the assembly at Athens and agreed by it, as proposed by Laches. They were also resolved in the assembly to be the basis of an immediate truce, which was to be pledged by the embassies (including the Spartans’) who were attending, in the *demos*’s presence. If Thucydides was quoting directly from a text inscribed at Athens or preserved in an archive copy set out for an Attic stonemason’s benefit, the order of the decree would be tidier and more conventional: first, the Athenian formulae, then, Athenian officers at the assembly, then the proposal to accept the terms resolved by the Spartans and their allies, a list of those terms (without, surely, the sentences specifying in each case their agreement by the Spartans and their allies or with a description of the Spartans as ‘us’). Instead, we have a text which has snowballed as it passed from one party to the next.

<sup>45</sup> Thuc. 4.118; S. Hornblower (n. 5), 356–8, 368–9, 374 for much bibliography; Kirchhoff (n. 1), 3–27 is still a major contribution.



It continues to roll in 4.119 with a statement that the Spartans and their allies agreed ‘these things’ at a date specified in Spartan terms: ‘on the twelfth of the month, in Sparta, Gerastios’. The Spartans who agreed and poured libations are then listed, three in all. So, next, are two Corinthians, two Sicyonians, two Megarians and an Epidaurian. I take it that these people were the ambassadors present in Athens who promptly swore before the Athenian assembly and who (in the Spartan case) are stated to have been ordered by the Spartans to come with full powers (*τέλος*, in Spartan language). Last of all come the names of the three Athenian generals who poured libations too. Like the other ratifiers, they are named with their patronymics: even so they are not listed in their correct tribal order.<sup>46</sup>

Again, the text does not read like an Athenian archival or epigraphic copy. What is it? The simple answer, as Canfora has also seen, is that all of it is the actual working text of the treaty, jotted down for immediate use when agreed by the parties in Athens.<sup>47</sup> As a working text it had a further life, as we can see from the sequel. Two ambassadors were to take news of it northwards, Aristonymus the Athenian and a Spartiate to whom I will return. They were to ‘announce’ the truce in the Chalcidic region. Presumably they took copies of it with them to convince disbelievers that the truce had indeed been formally agreed. Our 4.118 should represent one of the copies, but here Canfora and I part company.

At 4.122 Thucydides somewhat compresses the reception of the truce.<sup>48</sup> He refers to ‘those who were carrying around news (*περιαγγέλλοντες*) of the truce’, meaning the two ambassadors, one an Athenian, the other a Spartan. Together they arrive in a trireme at Torone on the central prong of the Chalcidic peninsula and announce the truce to Brasidas who has just returned from his personal attempt to persuade an Athenian ally, Scione, to revolt. At Torone ‘all the Thraceward allies of the Spartans accepted what had been done’, that is, the truce at Athens. Aristonymus was also ‘approving’ the others (the Athenian allies, presumably, not ‘the other matters’) but as for the Scioneans, Aristonymus said that they would be excluded because they had revolted after the beginning of the truce. There seems to be some telescoping of events here. The Spartans’ Thraceward allies included Amphipolis and *poleis* on the easterly prong of the Chalcidic peninsula, like the Olophyxians.<sup>49</sup> How had they heard about this truce and been so willing to come to Torone and accept it? They had not already been with Brasidas on his recent mission to Scione. The answer is surely that one of the two envoys had gone out to announce it to them. As Spartan allies they would particularly trust the Spartan envoy: it was he, I assume, who went off to announce it on the peninsula’s eastern prong. The Athenian envoy, by contrast, needed to inform the remaining Athenian allies on the western prong, places like Mende, Scione and so forth. He went west, while the Spartan counterpart went east. They then returned to Torone, as did Brasidas, and reviewed the results. The Athenian envoy Aristonymus then calculated that Scione (on the western prong) had recently revolted, although the truce was already in force.<sup>50</sup> The Spartan envoy, meanwhile, had encouraged the

<sup>46</sup> Thuc. 4.119.2; S. Hornblower (n. 5), 374; contrast Thuc. 5.19.2 where the official order of the names is discerned by A. Andrewes and D.M. Lewis, ‘Note on the Peace of Nicias’, *JHS* 77 (1957), 177–80.

<sup>47</sup> L. Canfora, *La storiografia greca* (Milano, 1999), 152–5.

<sup>48</sup> Thuc. 4.122.1–3.

<sup>49</sup> Thuc. 4.109.3–4.

<sup>50</sup> Thuc. 4.122.3.

Spartan allies on the eastern prong to attend the Torone meeting; they saw no problem in accepting what had been agreed at Athens by the Spartans, their allies and the Athenians.

On the eastern prong of the Chalcidic peninsula there was, I suggest, a significant other. In July 424 B.C. Thucydides had been appointed general in the Thraceward area where he then presided over the crushing loss of Amphipolis. What did he do next? In his important study, Canfora suggested that even after the disaster Thucydides remained in his generalship until he was eventually replaced in summer 423 B.C., a replacement which he notes in his narrative at 4.129.2.<sup>51</sup> I cannot credit this continued tenure. As Thucydides' narrative shows, Athenian troops in the north were in some disorder meanwhile and apparently leaderless. Back in Athens an angry *demos* would surely strike at once on news of the loss of Amphipolis.

None the less, scholars continue to wonder when, and how, Thucydides returned to Athens to stand trial. At 5.26.5 what he actually says is more evasive and reticent: *ξυνέβη μοι φεύγειν*. Cleon, watchdog of the people, was waiting in Athens like a rottweiler; in 426 B.C., as Thucydides remarks at 3.98, the hapless Demosthenes had already 'feared the Athenians' after his failure and 'was left behind in the Naupactus area' rather than risking a return. In 415 Alcibiades certainly did not return to stand trial. So, too, Conon later in the war melted away without a court case. In 330 B.C. Aeschines tells a story of how Demosthenes' grandfather suffered a military reversal in the Pontus and became a *φυγάς ἀπ' εἰσαγγελίας*, a self-imposed exile who avoided the fait accompli of a trial. There are at least seven other named examples of such 'bolters' in fourth-century Athens before 323 B.C.<sup>52</sup> *φεύγειν*, Thucydides' word, can mean 'voluntary exile' as well as exile by sentence or decree. In 424/3, Thucydides never stood trial. He was deposed from his generalship in absence and prudently withdrew. We know that the 'Thraceward traitors' of this year were considered later to be artful dodgers. In 422 B.C., Aristophanes at *Wasps* 259 plays on the belief that the 'fat cats' from these events were still awaiting trial. He was perhaps unaware that Thucydides was one of the fattest still at large.<sup>53</sup>

Where did he go? His family's Thraceward properties and mining interests were an obvious haven, but Thucydides was already a historian and throughout Greek historiography, exile intensified historical activity. At 4.109 he gives a masterly ethnic and linguistic analysis of the various peoples and their settlement types on the easterly prong, no less, of the Chalcidic peninsula. It was impossible for him to know so much about them without going personally to the area. He was there, I suggest, in spring 423 B.C. when he heard on the Chalcidic bush telegraph of the arrival of a truce between Athens, Sparta and their allies. The Spartan envoy appeared on the eastern prong of the peninsula to announce it to the Spartan allies: what exactly, Thucydides wondered, were the terms of the truce?

There was a further irresistible attraction, the Spartan envoy himself. Thucydides names him, Athenaeus, the one truly 'Athenian' Spartiate, therefore, and the one *Ἀθηναῖος* in 423 B.C. who would not vote at once for Thucydides' punishment.

<sup>51</sup> Canfora (n. 47), 156–7.

<sup>52</sup> Aeschin., *In Ctes.* 171; W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, Pt 2 (Berkeley, 1974), 4–18 for named examples, with Hyp. *Eux.* 4.2, on five unnamed others, among 'many'.

<sup>53</sup> Direct reference to Thucydides is doubted by D.M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford, 1971), 173.

From the list of Spartan ambassadors who swore the treaty at Athens, we can discover Athenaeus' patronymic: he was the son of Pericleidas, a Periclean homonym.<sup>54</sup> How poignant to the Athenian Thucydides, smarting under his recent failure. How evocative too, not any old Athenaeus, but a blast from the great Periclean past. Pericleidas is a unique Spartiate name. This one, our Athenaeus' father, is surely the very Pericleidas who is immortalized for us in the *Lysistrata* in verses which recall how he came to beg help from the Athenians against the helots in 462 B.C. 'Pale in his scarlet cloak', Aristophanes alleges, Pericleidas had been seen beside the altar in the agora.<sup>55</sup> At the time, I suggest, he was a particularly relevant young man to send to Athenian spectators, as his name implies. How had its Athenian resonance entered Spartan nomenclature? I believe it was on that great day in 479 B.C. when the Spartan king Leotychidas and the Athenian general Xanthippus had routed the Persian fleet at Mycale.<sup>56</sup> Claspings right hands, I assume, they swore that in the wake of victory one of Leotychidas' kinsmen (one whose wife was due to give birth) would name his child, if a boy, after Pericles, Xanthippus' son. In 462 B.C. the result, Pericleidas, arrived in Athens as a pale young Spartiate with a suitably evocative name. He was the most emotive envoy available for Sparta, and a handsome one too, about sixteen years old, *τοῦ περ χαριεστάτη ἡβῆ*, which would not be lost on his male Athenian spectators.<sup>57</sup>

Spartan generals abroad were not readily accessible to inquisitive Athenians: Spartan envoys (we begin to realize) were another matter. Perhaps Thucydides knew Athenaeus from the past: certainly he would be glad to meet him now. There was (I suggest) a dinner and Thucydides inquired about the exact terms, the *ἀκρίβεια*, of the text of the new truce. Mission accomplished, Athenaeus lent (or gave) him his copy. It survives as our Thucydides 4.118, by origin a working text for envoys. It reflected the stage-by-stage growth of the treaty beginning from the proposals accepted by the Spartans ('us') and ending with their ratification by named individuals in Athens in the assembly. The Spartans (perhaps significantly) are named first and the Athenians are tacked on in no particular order at the end. The odds are that this text was a Spartan's copy. Why, though, was it not in Doric Greek, whereas the Spartan texts which Thucydides cited at 5.77 and 5.79 still essentially were? The answer is probably that the text was to be shown to Attic- and Ionic-speaking Greek allies up in the north. The Athenian envoy, Aristonymus, had a text of his own, perhaps one differently arranged with a different Athenocentric use of 'us' and 'you'. Thucydides' text, however, has kept the Spartan use of these pronouns intact.

On returning to Torone, Athenaeus found that Brasidas was heatedly arguing the toss and the relation between the timing of the truce and the moment of Scione's defection. The exact date and terms of the text became a major crux. They were compounded, we must remember, by the problems of local calendars. Chalcidic cities used a calendar with Chalcidic months, as Knoepfler has ably reconstructed them.<sup>58</sup> What were the months and dates current in Scione ('Achaean' by origin, so Thucydides believed) or in Mende, an Eretrian 'colony'? Up in the

<sup>54</sup> Thuc. 4.119.2, after which the patronymic is omitted at 4.122.2.

<sup>55</sup> Ar. *Lys.* 1138–42.

<sup>56</sup> Hdt. 8.131 and 9.92–9 and 114.

<sup>57</sup> Hom. *Il.* 24.348 with E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 249.

<sup>58</sup> D. Knoepfler, 'Le calendrier des Chalcidiens de Thrace: essai de mise au point sur le liste et l'ordre des mois eubéens', *JSavants* (1989), 23–59.

Chalcidic peninsula, who knew for sure how such dates related to the Athenians' '14 Elaphebolion' in the truce's Athenian reckoning, let alone to '12 Gerastios' in the Spartan equivalent?<sup>59</sup> Brasidas could use the uncertainty to suit his own case. So Aristonymus sent to Athens for confirmation. The row over timing made the truce's exact wording unusually pertinent for a historian. Thucydides, fortunately, had a text of it himself. He had it from an obliging Spartan diplomat. It was the first written trophy of historical relevance during his years of exile and, proudly, he copied it all into his *Histories*.

#### IV

Six of the nine texts which Thucydides eventually copied have now been explained by his personal contacts with individual Spartiates. We can account for the remaining three by following Thucydides' 'documentary trail' in the early years of his exile for the first time since the late fifth century B.C.

In his self-imposed exile Thucydides would not risk returning to Athens where he would promptly be put on trial. We can see, however, that he came south after the Peace of Nicias in summer 420 B.C. for the first Olympic games since the loss of Amphipolis over which he presided as a general. They proved to be a turbulent set of games. A Spartiate entered his four-horse chariot in the races, although Spartiates were banned from competing, and was ordered to be whipped after unwisely greeting his team in the winners' enclosure. That Spartiate was none other than Lichas son of Arcesilas.<sup>60</sup> Thucydides' detail about the event at this Olympics is evidently the detail of an eyewitness. Given Lichas' celebrated hospitality to foreigners, Thucydides may well have met Lichas in person, perhaps for pre-race drinks.

Accepting Thucydides' presence at these Olympics, Simon Hornblower has recently devoted an entire chapter to the Olympic episode with Lichas where, in his view, 'the worlds of Thucydides and Pindar most obviously intersect'.<sup>61</sup> I would propose a more evident intersection, not with Pindar but with an inscription recently on the site. The 'Hundred-Year Alliance' of Athenians, Argives and others had just been concluded, the alliance whose text is known to us on the stone found in Athens in 1876. As the text states, there was also to be a copy inscribed at Olympia. As Tod's careful commentary and a detailed article by Michael Clark well remind us, 'between the [inscribed] text thus restored and the MSS of Thucydides there are a number of discrepancies'. Various reasons may account for them, ably set out by Tod, but one (as Tod remarks) may be that Thucydides' text does not depend 'upon the record exhibited at Athens'.<sup>62</sup> I propose that it depends on the text inscribed at Olympia in summer 420 B.C. (as Clark well argues): importantly

<sup>59</sup> Thuc. 4.118.12 and 119.1.

<sup>60</sup> Thuc. 5.49–50.4; Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.21–3.

<sup>61</sup> S. Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar* (Oxford, 2004), 273–86; S. Hornblower, 'Thucydides, Xenophon and Lichas: Were the Spartans excluded from the Olympic Games from 420–400 B.C.?', *Phoenix* 56 (2000), 212–25.

<sup>62</sup> Tod, *GHI* P<sup>2</sup> no. 72, 177; M. Clark, 'Thucydides in Olympia', in R. Mellor and L. Tritle (edd.), *Text and Tradition: Studies in Greek History and Historiography in Honor of Mortimer Chambers* (Claremont, 1999), 115–34, esp. 124–6 on Thucydides' presence at the Games of 420 B.C.

we know Thucydides to have been present. Decidedly un-Pindaric in his interests (unlike Pindar he and his narrative never dwell at length on results in the games for their own sake), he may have taken time to copy down the text from the stele on the site. Since the encounter with Athenaeus and the arguments of 423, he had been made aware how important the exact wording of a treaty might be. Alternatively, Thucydides did not copy from the stone but received from the stonemason, or a responsible person, the papyrus copy from which the cutter had had to work (I assume it was in Attic Greek already). Like Athenaeus in 423 B.C., the cutter no longer had a use for it. The result is our Thucydides 5.47, the full text of the Hundred-Year Alliance. The alliance proved not to be so long-lasting and in the totality of the war, it was decidedly insignificant. It lasted for only 31 chapters of Book 5, but the text went in in full because Thucydides, personally, had acquired a copy.

From Olympia Thucydides returned north, possibly stopping at Corinth where, as Stroud has emphasized, his personal contacts and sources of information were good.<sup>63</sup> I doubt, however, if he applied his increasing interest in documentary texts to copying a supposed ‘treaty’ between the Corinthians and Aetolians, a copying which Stroud postulated so as to explain the Aetolian names which Thucydides gives us at 3.100.1.<sup>64</sup> They need not derive from a diplomatic text at all. Presumably he went north again but in 418 B.C. he was back in the Peloponnese, surveying (evidently) the important battlefield at Mantinea, though he was to distress Andrewes’s commentary by his description of it which ignores the trees of an intervening wood.<sup>65</sup> What, then, about 417 B.C.? At Olympia, I have suggested, the deceitful old Spartan victor, Lichas, had entertained him and in the heat of the moment, I believe, Lichas invited this likeable Athenian exile down to Sparta one day for the Gymnopaedia, an occasion at which Lichas’ hospitality became famous. In summer 417 B.C. Thucydides took up the invitation.

In the light of it we can look on his relevant narrative with sharper eyes. Exactly during this Gymnopaedia, at 5.82.2–3, he is excellently informed about Spartan plans, and their troops’ marching out and marching back again. Exactly during this Gymnopaedia the issue of the recent Spartan–Argive alliance erupted. As in 423 B.C., during another such treaty dispute in the north, the historian wanted to know what were the terms of the text in question. Like other Athenian visitors from the political right wing, he was enjoying Lichas’ hospitality in Sparta. Their friendship, I find, was hinted at, but without a specific date or context, by G.T. Griffith in 1961: ‘one of the Spartans [Lichas] who does get a patronymic was a particularly entertaining character and I suspect may have been some sort of personal friend or acquaintance of Thucydides’.<sup>66</sup> Indeed he was, an ‘entertaining’ character in a practical sense, specifically in summer 417 B.C. As Sparta’s Argive *proxenos* Lichas had just helped to negotiate the pre-treaty agreement with Argos, the *ξυμβατήριος λόγος*, and the resulting treaty itself. We have evidence that a prominent Spartan might keep texts of treaties in which he had been involved. In his *Life of Lysander*, chapter 30, citing Ephorus, Plutarch tells how a ‘dispute about alliance’, an *ἀντιλογία συμμαχική*, broke out in Sparta after Lysander’s

<sup>63</sup> R. Stroud, ‘Thucydides and Corinth’, *Chiron* 24 (1994), 267–302.

<sup>64</sup> R. Stroud (n. 63), 283–4.

<sup>65</sup> Thuc. 5.65–74, esp. 66.1 with *HCT* 4.94–102.

<sup>66</sup> G.T. Griffith, ‘Some habits of Thucydides when introducing persons’, *PCPhS* 187 (1961), 21–33, esp. 25 and n. 5.

death and as a result it was necessary to have a ‘thorough look’ (διασκέψασθαι) at the γράμματα which Lysander kept by him. These γράμματα were evidently texts of agreements and alliances, just like those between Sparta and Argos in 417. To find them Agesilaus went to the deceased Lysander’s house where he found (so he claimed) something much more disturbing, the book scroll with a text about the Spartan *politeia*. Like Lysander, Lichas the careful diplomat kept texts, I suggest, of treaties on which he had worked personally, intending – why not? – to frame them one day for the Spartan equivalent of his downstairs ἄνδρων along with a drawing of his four victorious racehorses at the Olympics of 420 B.C. and a signed, or at least marked, list of his fellow Spartiates in the *agoge* class of (say) 455 B.C.

His *xenos* Thucydides, he learned, was still beavering away at his *Histories*. How better for Lichas to ensure immortality and keep the disputed record straight than by giving this earnest author copies of the two Argive texts for his ongoing κτήμα ἐς αἰεί, especially now that the treaty was breaking down and its wording was the object of συμμαχική ἀντιλογία?

We have now accounted for seven of the nine ‘documentary’ texts which Thucydides cites so closely. The remaining two are the Peace of Nicias in 421 B.C. and the consequent Spartan–Athenian alliance. In the course of the war these texts were genuinely important and we might even think that Thucydides used a friendly Athenian contact, a kinsman maybe at Athens, who supplied him with texts from the city which he could not visit. There is, however, a simpler alternative. Stelae of the Peace of Nicias were to be put up at Panhellenic sites, at Athens and at the temple of Apollo at Amyclae.<sup>67</sup> The Spartan–Athenian alliance (cited in detail at 5.23–4) was to be inscribed both by the ‘temple of Apollo at Amyclae’ and by the ‘temple of Athena’ at Athens. Outside Athens, therefore, the one site with a text of both treaties was Apollo’s temple at Amyclae. It lay about six hours’ walk from Sparta. During a visit to Sparta, perhaps the visit of 417 B.C., Thucydides may have been alerted to those texts’ existence (or to copies kept at Sparta itself) and taken the chance to copy them for himself.

In 416 B.C. he was back, perhaps, for the Olympics, possibly risking a drink with the victorious Alcibiades but (unlike Euripides and the epinician genre) punctilious in recording Alcibiades’ exact racing results.<sup>68</sup> The Sicilian expedition followed, but in 412 B.C. Thucydides followed the war eastwards, lodging (to judge from his cluster of narrative detail) at Miletus, perhaps with a politically sympathetic friend, the sort of man who would have enjoyed the musings on the Athenian constitution, composed by Thucydides’s younger contemporary the ‘Old Oligarch’ in (evidently) 425/4 B.C.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Thuc. 5.18.10.

<sup>68</sup> Thuc. 6.16.2; Plut., *Alc.* 11.2–3; C.M. Bowra, ‘Euripides’ Epinician for Alcibiades’, *Historia* 9 (1960), 68–79.

<sup>69</sup> W.G. Forrest, ‘The date of the Pseudo-Xenophontic Athenion Politeia’, *Klio* 52 (1970), 107–16 is fundamental. S. Hornblower, ‘The *Old Oligarch* ... and Thucydides. A fourth-century date for the *Old Oligarch*?’ in P. Flensted-Jensen, T.H. Nielsen and L. Rubenstein (edd.), *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Copenhagen, 2000), 363–84 suggests the author wrote after, and was well aware of, Thucydides, but if so (I cannot see it), his failure to mention the Plague while purporting to write in the 420s is even more problematic (Diod. Sic. 14.70–1, using Philistus, shows the impact of Thuc.’s Plague chapters on his true followers).

Important dealings and discussions were taking place now in the company of satraps which Thucydides would have to struggle to get right. Early in 411 B.C., however, who should come out from Sparta to negotiate a decent Sparto-Persian treaty? Why, Lichas son of Arcesilas with ten Spartiates in his team and the two previous texts which had been so disastrously negotiated by his incompetent Spartiate predecessors. In c. March 411 B.C., after oaths had successfully been exchanged in the Maeander Plain, Thucydides (I suggest) activated his *xenia* and dined again with his Spartan host of six years previously. Ever alert to a record 'for all time', Lichas gave Thucydides once again a cluster of diplomatic texts, as if in the Spartan equivalent of a brown A4 envelope. It contained what survives for us as Thucydides 8.17, 8.37 and 8.58 (which Thucydides located rather loosely in his narrative).

In Thucydides's projected Books 9 to (say) 14, who knows what other insignificant documentary trophies awaited us? Pre-treaties, *ξυμβατήριοι λόγοι* between the Athenians and the Thraceward cities, this time given to Thucydides by the ego-centric Alcibiades in 410–407 B.C.<sup>70</sup> Dealings between Spartiates and Tissaphernes, mediated by other hospitable Spartiates abroad? Thucydides would certainly applaud the channel of contact whereby a decree of the actual Spartan assembly entered a historian's work in its authentic Doric Greek to survive for us as Plutarch, *Life of Lysander* 14.8.

The core of Thucydides' 'documentary trail' is solid, although there remain options and alternatives for the exact type of text before him in certain cases. From it several crucial points follow.

First, Thucydides' main documentary source for texts he quotes in detail were Spartiates. Cartledge and Debnar have recently remarked how 'Thucydides' Spartans exchange a surprising number of letters'.<sup>71</sup> They do not consider that Athenaeus and Lichas passed on documentary diplomatic texts, five in all, to an Athenian inquirer. They are a significant contribution to scholars' recent 'revisiting' of Spartan literacy.<sup>72</sup>

Secondly, in the history of his own times Thucydides is most 'documentary' when his researches are still most interpersonal. The documents he includes arrived only by the personal type of research which he discussed at 1.21. That is why they did not attract separate emphasis there as a special technique.

Thirdly, none of these documentary texts depended on access to, and work in, archives at Athens. Unlike Ranke, inspired by the archives in Venice in the 1870s, Thucydides never went near a documentary store or deposit.

Fourthly, as a result, sections which quote such documents, whether 4.118 or 5.17–50, did not rely on work in Athenian 'archives', work which was only possible after 404/3 B.C. and Thucydides' chance to return from exile.<sup>73</sup> Scholarly skirmishing about supposedly 'late' strata in 5.17–50 or an 'unfinished' strand in 8.17–58 on

<sup>70</sup> See R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1988), nos. 87–8, for a sample which ended up on Athenian stones.

<sup>71</sup> P. Cartledge and P. Debnar, 'Sparta and the Spartans in Thucydides', in A. Rengaros and A. Tsakmakis (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden–Boston, 2006), 559–88, at 579.

<sup>72</sup> E.G. Millender, 'Spartan literacy revisited', *CLAnt* 20 (2001), 124–64.

<sup>73</sup> J.K. Davies, 'Greek archives: from record to monument', in M. Brosius (ed.), *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions* (Oxford, 2003), 323–43 for a survey of 'archives', with further bibliography.



the evidence of these documents' presence or even the activity of a later 'editor' is simply wrong.<sup>74</sup>

Fifthly, in that Purgatory reserved for sceptical or atheist ancient historians, if Syme has told Thucydides that these quoted documents were simply 'stopgaps', Thucydides will have replied with appropriate pre-Tacitean irony. They were the crown jewels of his personal researches, acquired from Spartan participants in five instances and lovingly inserted while hot, or smouldering, from the events in question.

Sixthly, so much, rightly, has been written about the impact of the Supreme Leader Pericles on the young Thucydides' historical outlook. Nothing, until now, has been said about the impact of the son of a Periclean homonym, Athenaeus the Spartiate who first impelled Thucydides to a documentary innovation by giving him a text whose exact dates and contents had become a matter of important diplomatic dispute. Thucydides was able to include it, the first of the nine in his *Histories* which were also surrounded by what Plutarch later names *συμμαχική ἀντιλογία*.

## V

What I discern in these parts of Thucydides' histories is consonant with what can be discerned in other Greek histories too. The major ancient Greek historians used oral interviews and personal testimony wherever they could. As I have shown for Thucydides, it is thus possible, from the emphasis or distribution of their material, to make convincing inferences about some of the personal sources whom they too contacted. Wells's arguments for Zopyrus son of Megabyzus as a major 'Persian friend' of Herodotus still stand firm, although there were surely other sources besides him.<sup>75</sup> Herodotus' Spartan testimonies no doubt included the children in exile of Damaratus on their estates in Asia minor, as Jacoby first proposed.<sup>76</sup> They are plausible oral sources for Herodotus' remarkable detailed knowledge about the privileges of Spartan kings, twenty-eight in all: Carlier preferred to postulate an underlying 'texte juridique lacédémonien' but if the Demaratids were personally accessible there is no need here to infer his use of a separate textual source.<sup>77</sup> Perhaps, too, Herodotus really did talk with Gorgo, Cleomenes' daughter, attested as in Athens on a visit after her husband Leonidas' death.<sup>78</sup> Such Spartan oral sources add a special interest and value to Herodotus' sections on Sparta, a value which scholars do not always recognize. At Athens, by contrast, Xenophon's *Hellenica* Book 1 gives conspicuous space to Euryptolemus and his interventions. Presumably the reason is that Xenophon used him as a source. As Alcibiades' kinsman, Euryptolemus is the obvious candidate to account for the pro-Alcibiades angle of vision in Xenophon's account of the battles of Cyzicus and Notion, an

<sup>74</sup> See *HCT* 5.374–5 for such suggestions, with further bibliography.

<sup>75</sup> Wells (n. 13), 37–47.

<sup>76</sup> F. Jacoby in *RE*, Suppl. 2 (1913), 412, 442–3 and *Hdt.* 2.10.1 with D.M. Lewis (n. 17), 54 and n. 30.

<sup>77</sup> *Hdt.* 6.56–8; P. Carlier, *La Royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (Strasbourg, 1984), 251 which S. Hodkinson drew to my attention.

<sup>78</sup> Admittedly only in *Plut. Mor.* 240E, but note *Hdt.* 7.239, *ὡς ἔγω πυνθάνομαι*: from Gorgo, whether or not in Attica?

angle which Andrewes noted, but did not trace to a source, in 1982.<sup>79</sup> Even in that late Hellenistic work of *historia*, the *Acts of the Apostles*, the same sort of inference is fruitful. The author, our Third Gospeller, claims personal experience of Philip the Apostle and his household in Caesarea (marked by the significant use of 'we'). If Philip and his household were the author's oral sources, they help us to fathom why his earlier narrative moves so strikingly between Caesarea and Jerusalem, between the early doings of Philip and the separately attested deeds of Peter and Paul. Philip told our author about his doings in person, so his text included them, rays of personal light in a dark Messianic era.<sup>80</sup>

Deriving from two Spartiates, five of Thucydides' closely cited documents belong in this long-lived tradition. They do not mark a new-found passion for 'documentary research' from 4.118 onwards. Jacoby's tracing of such research to the example of Aristotle and his school may, then, seem to be strengthened. It is not so important that before Aristotle Xenophon cited clauses of the King's Peaces in his *Hellenica*: Xenophon's own prejudices were not offended and the Peaces were of such general application to the events that even Xenophon had no further reason to leave them out.<sup>81</sup> As Jacoby emphasized, it is interesting that before Aristotle Androtion used a few documents for the Atthis which he composed after his necessary departure from Athens in 343/2 B.C.<sup>82</sup> This new genre encouraged use of such documents, but the most striking examples are surely derived merely from his own father Andron, through personal family contact. A family 'folder' preserved the documents still accessible to us as *Ath. Pol.* 30–1, much as Lichas' personal texts helped Thucydides.<sup>83</sup> Androtion's documentary stirrings preceded Aristotle, whose research project then profited from them, but 'actual research among documents, by means of which the wording of them is brought into literature, was carried on in the Peripatos by the disciples and helpers of Aristotle'.<sup>84</sup>

At first sight, what we know of the Alexander historians also supports Jacoby's sequence. The few documents in Arrian mostly derived either from copies carefully made available by Alexander himself (the 'justificatory dossier' at Arrian, *Anab.* 2.14) or haphazardly, like the Persian battle order captured at Gaugamela.<sup>85</sup> However, there is a long, remarkable counter-example, the list of the Persian king's dinner which is preserved for us by Polyaeus and presented as copied word for word from a pillar in one of the Persian palaces. Its credit has risen markedly in recent scholarship and we should take seriously Briant's suggestion that the source of the Polyaeus text is Chares, Alexander's 'Master of Ceremonies': it implies contact with an underlying non-Greek list.<sup>86</sup> Citation of this long list of foreign

<sup>79</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.12 and 16–34; compare 1.3.12–13 and 1.4.18, with A. Andrewes, 'Notion and Kyzikos: the sources compared', *JHS* 102 (1982), 15–25, esp. 23.

<sup>80</sup> Acts 21:8–15, with 8:4–40, perhaps 10:1–48 and 11:28–9 with 21:10–12 (Agabus).

<sup>81</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.30–1.

<sup>82</sup> F. Jacoby (n. 16), 170, 196–8, 204–9, esp. 209.

<sup>83</sup> A. Andrewes, 'Androtion and the Four Hundred', *PCPhS* 202 (1976), 14–25, esp. 21–2, favouring a source for *Ath. Pol.* 30–1 in 'someone's family archive ... but the family need not have been that of Androtion'. I disagree, still supporting Andron as the ultimate source: the documents do distance him, creditably, from the 'force and fraud' of the real 411 B.C. and would, then, answer Andrewes's objection at the foot of his p. 21.

<sup>84</sup> Jacoby (n. 16).

<sup>85</sup> Arr. *Anab.* 3.11.3 (Aristobulus).

<sup>86</sup> Polyaeus. 4.3.32, with D.M. Lewis, 'The King's dinner (Polyaeus, 4.3.32)' in his *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History* (Cambridge, 1997), 332–41, esp. 338–41 on the relation to items in Elamite texts and 335 n. 9 for Briant's suggestion about Chares.

detail in his history would fit well with the impression of foreign style which his work left, we now know, on the recently found anonymous critic of it in the tantalizing new Oxyrhynchus papyrus.<sup>87</sup>

In Persia, in Macedon and elsewhere, kings (this instance reminds us) kept archives and documentary lists. Patronage of a historian by a king in the Hellenistic world might, then, be an important impetus to documentary research: the texts were at hand and kings issued important documentary edicts, affecting history widely. Research and use of them was relevant even if the Aristotelians had never set the example. The important exponent here is Hieronymus of Cardia whom nothing connects with Peripatetic studies. His *Histories* made serious use of documents, including direct quotation of them, as is visible even in the truncated skeleton of his work which underlies our Diodorus Books 18 to 20.<sup>88</sup> By modern scholars his junior follower Timaeus tends to be credited as the historian 'since whom it has become a fashion in Greek historiography to quote documents verbatim'.<sup>89</sup> Timaeus' own epigraphic studies were remarked on and while based in Athens he was indeed the reader and user of Peripatetic sources.<sup>90</sup> But Hieronymus, no Peripatetic, had preceded him, as had the remarkable Macedonian Craterus. Craterus was probably the child of Antipater's daughter Phila and the great Craterus, Alexander's officer. He was conceived, then, in 322/1 B.C. during their brief marriage and went on to historical work, including at least eight books which collected past decrees, among them at least two citations from fifth-century Athenian tribute lists.<sup>91</sup> His maternal grandfather, Antipater, had also had historical interests and had been friendly with Aristotle, but our present knowledge does not allow us to classify Craterus as manifestly in the Peripatetic orbit. His work, however, is remarkably far from Thucydides' methods of research.

There is also the problem of Polybius. He was disdainful of the text-based Timaeus for being buried in libraries and wasting time on footling research among inscriptions. Yet he himself quotes several such texts, the famous Rome–Carthage treaties, the lists of Hannibal's troops in Spain and after crossing the Alps, the preliminary terms for Carthage after defeat at Zama, the terms of the final treaty with Antiochus and the settlement of Asia through the Peace of Apamea and even the despatch sent by a Rhodian admiral about the battle of Lade which 'was still surviving in the *prytaneion*' at Rhodes.<sup>92</sup> Polybius emphasizes his own study of the Hannibalic army lists in a bronze copy in south Italy which he himself had seen. Unlike Timaeus' researches, he would probably say, this bit of epigraphic research was exceptionally important.

The others, however, need not derive from 'documentary research' by Polybius himself. The preliminary terms after Zama need only have reached him from the

<sup>87</sup> *P Oxy.* LXXI.4808 col. i.5 on his style. S. Amigues, 'Pour la table du Grand Roi', *JSavants* (2003), 3–59, on the realities of the Dinner List.

<sup>88</sup> J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford, 1981), 131–7.

<sup>89</sup> E.J. Bickerman, 'Notes on the Greek Book of Esther', in his *Studies in Jewish and Christian History, Part One* (Leiden, 1976), 246–75, at 261.

<sup>90</sup> A. Momigliano, 'Athens in the third century B.C. and the discovery of Rome in the *Histories* of Timaeus of Tauromenium', in his *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford, 1977), 51–66 is classic, esp. 49–51.

<sup>91</sup> *FGrH* 342 F 1–2, from tribute lists; F. Jacoby (n. 16), 170 calls him 'a disciple of Aristotle', as he also presumes, citing J. Keil, in his fine study in *RE* 11 (1922), 1617–21.

<sup>92</sup> Polyb. 3.21.9–26.7 (Carthage), 3.33.5–18, 3.56.2–4 (Hannibal's troops), 15.18 (Zama), 21.42 and 45 (Apamea), 16.15.8 (Rhodes).

Scipios' family folders. Cicero in the *Pro Sulla* reminds us that prominent Roman senators kept copies of texts involving themselves.<sup>93</sup> Like Lysander in Sparta, they too kept them in their own houses. Polybius need not even have copied the Rome–Carthage treaties himself, as Walbank well reminds us. Even the Rhodian admiral's despatch need not mean that Polybius himself had found it among the documents kept at Rhodes: he probably knew it second-hand.<sup>94</sup> As for the settlement of Asia after the Peace of Apamea, Bickerman has mounted a powerful case for Polybius' derivation of it from a Pergamene oral source.<sup>95</sup>

None of this (lack of) method need surprise us. Polybius 'accepted all the fundamentals of Thucydides' method', as Momigliano well put it.<sup>96</sup> His documentary citations are no exception. The Hannibalic army list is personally researched, like Thucydides' Peace of Nicias and its consequent alliance. Elsewhere, however, the Scipios were Polybius' Lichas. At 12.27, Polybius expatiates on differing types of research, by the 'eyes' or the 'ears', 'seeing' and 'hearing'. David Levene has correctly interpreted this rather loose distinction. 'History-writing can be divided into that requiring effort (including both autopsy and interrogating witnesses) and that which does not (using books).' The former is 'the most important part of history'. Timaeus, by contrast, used books, 'inferior effortless research ... all done by "hearing"' (our reading).<sup>97</sup> Systematic documentary study would be classed by Polybius as 'inferior hearing' too. Autopsy and the interrogation of witnesses were superior: they did not extend to the systematic autopsy of inscribed or documentary archival texts.

Polybius, here too, is singularly true to the Thucydides whom this article has presented. Even after the Aristotelians, 'documentary history' did not prevail. The thrust of much recent scholarship on ancient historiography is to move away from any neat 'linear development'.<sup>98</sup> Ancient historians' use of documents is another example in support of this useful caution.

*New College, Oxford*

ROBIN LANE FOX  
robin.lanefox@new.ox.ac.uk

<sup>93</sup> Cic. *Sull.* 42.

<sup>94</sup> F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford, 1957–79), 1.358 and 2.520; I differ from P. Pédech, *La Méthode Historique de Polybe* (Paris, 1964), 382 when he thinks Polybius consulted treaties in Rome's *tablinum*.

<sup>95</sup> E. Bickerman, 'Notes sur Polybe I', *REG* 50 (1937), 217–39, at 230; Walbank (n. 94), 3.156, on 21.42.

<sup>96</sup> A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, 1990), 47.

<sup>97</sup> D.S. Levene, 'Polybius on "seeing" and "hearing": 12.27', *CQ* 55 (2005), 627–9.

<sup>98</sup> As often in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, vols 1 and 2 (Oxford, 2007), with Marincola, *ibid.* 1.4–8. P.J. Rhodes, 'Documents and the Greek historians', *ibid.* 1.56–66 gives even more examples of the sort of uses in my nn. 81–3 and 90, without going into my details of Thuc.'s documentary sources.