

Catalogues in Thucydides and Ephorus

J. D. Smart

I

AT THUCYDIDES 2.9 are found two catalogues of the allies of the Spartans and of the Athenians respectively at the beginning of the Archidamian War. Both are full of difficulties. The Spartan catalogue starts with an awkwardly expressed geographical distinction between *Πελοποννήσιοι μὲν οἱ ἐντὸς ἰσθμοῦ πάντες πλὴν Ἀργείων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν* and *ἔξω δὲ Πελοποννήσου Μεγαρήσ κ.τ.λ.* (2.9.2). The words *πλὴν Ἀργείων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν* show that *Πελοποννήσιοι* is here meant in its geographical sense. But Steup¹ (II pp.295–96) rightly pointed out that *οἱ ἐντὸς ἰσθμοῦ* implies a contrast between ‘Peloponnesians within the isthmus’ and ‘Peloponnesians beyond the isthmus’, with *Πελοποννήσιοι* in the sense it has commonly in the *History* of the whole Peloponnesian alliance. He accordingly wanted to delete *οἱ ἐντὸς ἰσθμοῦ*.² Gomme (II p.10) was prepared to accept the received text and interpret “the Peloponnesians (I mean on this occasion the Peloponnesians in the geographical sense, those living within the Isthmus).” More difficulties follow. The Locrians are included among the extra-Peloponnesian allies without mention of the later alliance between the Ozolian Locrians and the Athenians (*cf.* 3.95.3, 97.2, 101.1),³ and there is no explanation of why the Phocians have aban-

¹ The following editions of Thucydides have been used and will be so cited: KRÜGER=*Θουκυδίδου Ἐνγγραφή*, erkl. K. W. Krüger³ (Berlin 1860); CLASSEN=*Thukydidis*, erkl. J. Classen (Berlin 1863); SHILLETTO=*Thucydides II*, ed. R. Shilleto (Cambridge 1880); STAHL=*Thucydides de Bello Peloponnesiaco*, ed. E. F. Poppo, aux. et emend. I. M. Stahl (Leipzig 1889); MARCHANT=*Thucydides Book II*, ed. E. C. Marchant (London 1891); HUDE=*Thucydides Historiae*, ed. C. Hude (Leipzig 1901); STEUP=*Thukydidis*, erkl. J. Classen, bearb. J. Steup (Berlin 1914); SMITH=*Thucydides*, ed. C. F. Smith (London 1919); JONES-POWELL=*Thucydides Historiae*, ed. H. Stuart Jones and J. Enoch Powell (Oxford 1942); GOMME=*A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, ed. A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes and K. J. Dover (Oxford 1945–1970); LUSCHNAT=*Thucydides Historiae*, ed. O. Luschnat (Leipzig 1954); DE ROMILLY=*Thucydide, La Guerre du Péloponnèse*, ed. J. de Romilly (Paris 1962); ALBERTI=*Thucydides Historiae*, ed. J. B. Alberti (Rome 1972).

² Of subsequent editors only Marchant 142 has followed Steup in deleting *οἱ ἐντὸς ἰσθμοῦ*.

³ Steup II p.24, followed by Gomme II p.11, sought to excuse this omission by maintaining that Thucydides normally used *Λοκροί* and *Λοκρίς* without further qualification to mean only the eastern, *i.e.* Opuntian and Epicnemidian, Locrians. But in fact it is the context in every case which indicates whether an unqualified *Λοκροί* or *Λοκρίς* refers to

doned their earlier alliance with the Athenians (*cf.* 1.111.1, 112.5, 3.95.1). This first, geographically ordered list is followed by a second list ordered by the sort of military assistance provided—navy, cavalry or infantry. The Anactorians appear in the geographical list in the extra-Peloponnesian division and yet not in the navy division in the second (2.9.2–3, *cf.* 1.46.1, 2.80.3), whereas the Sicyonians and Pelleneans do appear in the navy division despite the fact that their hoplite contribution (*cf.* for Sicyon 5.52.2, 58.4, 59.3, 60.3, 7.19.4, 58.3 and for Pellene 5.58.4, 59.3, 60.3) figures as prominently as their naval contribution in the actual account of the war (*cf.* for Sicyon 2.80.3, 8.3.2 and for Pellene 8.3.2, 106.3).⁴ Finally, no mention at all is made of the allies in the West (*cf.* 2.7.2, 3.86.2).

The Athenian catalogue is even more unsatisfactory. It starts with what appears to be a distinction between free and autonomous allies on the one hand (2.9.4, *Χῖοι, Λέεβιοι, Πλαταιῆς, Μεσσήνιοι οἱ ἐν Ναυπάκτῳ, Ἀκαρνάνων οἱ πλείους, Κερκυραῖοι, Ζακύνθιοι*) and those who paid tribute on the other (2.9.4, *καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις αἱ ὑποτελεῖς οὐσαι*). Then in this second category a subordinate principle of order by ethnic division is introduced (2.9.4, *ἐν ἔθνει τοσοῖδε*), but this becomes confused with a geographical division somewhat similar to the division evident in the quota lists since 443/2.⁵ Gomme commented (II p.11): “here he [*sc.* Thucydides] confuses apparently two things, the geographical division of the empire into its five divisions, Karia (which included its Dorian neighbours), Ionia, Hellespont, Thrace and the Islands (of which by this time the Karian had been merged with the Ionian), and its ethnic divisions; for Ionia includes the Aioleis of Mytilene and the opposite mainland, the Kyklades were as Ionian as Ionia, and Hellespont and Thrace a mixture of Ionian and Dorian.” This first already confused list is followed, as in the Spartan catalogue,

the eastern or western Locrians; *e.g.* at 2.26.1 *Λοκρίς* is clearly eastern Locris, whereas at 3.101.2 it is western Locris. Thus in the catalogue the absence of any contextual implication makes it difficult to excuse the omission.

⁴ The principal difficulty with the division into navy/cavalry/infantry-providing allies is that it is presented as exclusive, whereas it clearly was not. All the navy-providing allies, and not merely the Sicyonians and Pelleneans, provided hoplites also, *cf.* 5.58.4 (Corinthians, Megarians), 2.80.5 (Ambraciots, Leucadians). Compare Stahl I.2 p.20 and Steup II p.24: “*ναυτικὸν παρείχοντο* und *ἰππέας* muß im Sinne von ‘stellten auch Schiffe, auch Reiter’ verstanden werden. Fußvolk stellten alle.”

⁵ *Cf.* B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery and M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists II* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1949) 18 (=List 12).

by a second list ordered by the sort of military assistance provided—in this case, navy, infantry and money. The allies who provided ships are named as the Chians, Lesbians and Corcyraeans (2.9.5), but no more names are given and no distinction is made between those who provided infantry and those who provided money. Presumably one is meant to understand those providing money to be identical with the second category in the first list (2.9.4, πόλεις αἱ ὑποτελεῖς οὐδαι) and to discover those providing infantry by subtracting those now named as providing ships from all the names in the first category in the first list to leave the Plataeans, the Messenians in Naupactus, most of the Acarnanians and the Zacynthians.⁶ As in the Spartan catalogue, no mention is made of the allies in the West (3.86.3). Even more serious is the absence of the Thessalians, despite their presence in the very first year of the war (2.22.2–3). And the concern shown to exclude Thera from the alliance (2.9.4, πᾶσαι αἱ Κυκλάδες πλὴν Μήλου καὶ Θήρας) makes all the more strange the later silence about Thera. On all of this see Gomme II p.12.

II

Ephorus' catalogues, to judge from Diodorus 12.42.4–5, would seem to have been much more satisfactory. In his Spartan catalogue Diodorus makes a straightforward and uncomplicated geographical distinction between Peloponnesian and extra-Peloponnesian allies (12.42.4). The Achaeans and Anactorians are omitted, but account is taken of the Ozolian Locrians and of the later cooperation of the inhabitants of Amphissa with Eurylochus (12.42.4, τῶν δ' ἄλλων Ἀμφισσεῖς, cf. Thuc. 3.101.2). The Athenian catalogue shows a similarly straightforward geographical order, passing from the Carians, Dorians and Ionians of the Asiatic coast through the Hellespontine

⁶ Such an understanding would of course exclude the possibility that some allies provided both money and infantry and so would do violence to the facts: e.g. for the Milesians, Andrians and Carystians cf. Thuc. 4.42.1, 53.1, 54.1. Thus it might be argued that no distinction is deliberately made between infantry-providing and money-providing allies precisely in order to cover such as the Milesians. But such concern on the author's part would have been satisfied at the cost of implying a manifest untruth: that all allies who provided infantry also provided money and *vice versa*. Furthermore, for Thucydides the tribute which paid for the fleet was far more important than any infantry contribution, cf. 1.141–43, 2.13.2: he would have agreed with ps.-Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 1.2, 2.1 on the comparative unimportance of infantry. And so it is odd to find infantry placed before money at 2.9.5, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι πεζὸν καὶ χρήματα.

region, the islanders and the Thraceward area to the Messenians at Naupactus and the Corcyraeans (12.42.5).

Unfortunately at this point there is a lacuna in the text: *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Μεσσήνιοι μὲν οἱ τὴν Ναύπακτον οἰκοῦντες καὶ Κερκυραῖοι . . . αἱ δ' ἄλλαι πᾶσαι πεζοὺς στρατιώτας ἐξέπεμπον* (12.42.5). Wesseling's precise supplement from Thucydides 2.9.6 of *τούτων ναυτικὸν παρείχοντο Χῖοι, Λέσβιοι, Κερκυραῖοι*, adopted in the Loeb edition by C. H. Oldfather, cannot be right, despite the repeated *Κερκυραῖοι* which would nicely explain a copyist's error. The *μὲν* of *Μεσσήνιοι μὲν* remains unexplained, as does the feminine gender in *αἱ δ' ἄλλαι πᾶσαι*. And Ephorus cannot have believed—although admittedly Diodorus may have misrepresented him—that all the allies of the Athenians, with the exception of the Chians, Lesbians and Corcyraeans, supplied them with infantry. Even so, Wesseling might have been right about the general sense of what is missing. This would suggest that, after concluding his geographically ordered list, Ephorus had distinguished between the *πόλεις* which paid tribute, those which provided ships, and those (*αἱ δ' ἄλλαι πᾶσαι*) which provided infantry. But still one wonders. *αἱ δ' ἄλλαι πᾶσαι πεζοὺς στρατιώτας ἐξέπεμπον* seems an odd way to describe the little infantry assistance that the Athenians received from their allies (*cf.* Thuc. 4.42.1, 53.1, 54.1 with 7.57.4 and 8.69.3). The words would better fit the assistance given to the Spartans by their Peloponnesian allies. And so I would guess that Ephorus within the lacuna at Diodorus 12.42.5 had ended his two catalogues with an ethnic point already suggested earlier (Diod. 12.42.5, *οἱ τὴν παράλιον τῆς Ἀσίας οἰκοῦντες . . . Δωριεῖς; ibid. πλὴν τῶν ἐν Μήλῳ καὶ Θήρᾳ κατοικούντων; ibid. πλὴν . . . Ποτιδαιατῶν*) and would propose the following *exempli gratia* as a possible alternative supplement to that of Wesseling: *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Μεσσήνιοι μὲν οἱ τὴν Ναύπακτον οἰκοῦντες καὶ Κερκυραῖοι <τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις συνεμάχουν, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι Δωριεῖς τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις· τούτων δὲ πόλεις τινὲς οὐ πολλαὶ ναῦς παρείχοντο ὥσπερ καὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις οἱ Κερκυραῖοι.> αἱ δ' ἄλλαι πᾶσαι πεζοὺς στρατιώτας ἐξέπεμπον.*

III

It is generally assumed that Diodorus 12.42.4–5 represents a fairly close summary of Ephorus' catalogues and that Ephorus in his turn was dependent upon Thucydides 2.9. There are obvious similarities between the two sets of catalogues: both Spartan catalogues show a

geographical division, however awkwardly expressed at Thucydides 2.9.2, between Peloponnesian and extra-Peloponnesian allies; both Athenian catalogues show a concern, at once more explicit and more confused at Thucydides 2.9.4, with ethnic divisions; and in both sets of catalogues a distinction is drawn, in more developed fashion throughout Thucydides 2.9, between different sorts of military contribution. On the accepted view that Ephorus stood between Thucydides 2.9 and Diodorus 12.42.4–5, and that Diodorus added nothing himself to his summary of Ephorus, one might come to several conclusions about the form and content of Ephorus' catalogues. The first such conclusion would be that Ephorus in his Spartan catalogue made the geographical division clearer and then went on to adopt the same principle of order in his Athenian catalogue, abandoning the division in his source between autonomous and subject allies. One might conclude secondly that in both his catalogues Ephorus made additions where he thought fit, so clarifying the bare reference to the Locrians (Diod. 12.42.4, *cf.* Thuc. 2.9.2) and excluding the Chalcidians and the Potidaeans from Athenian allies in the Thraceward area (Diod. 12.42.5, *cf.* Thuc. 2.9.4). And thirdly one might suppose that he perhaps included some material from his source that Diodorus has omitted in his summary, *e.g.* the Achaeans, with explanatory comment (Thuc. 2.9.2), the Anactorians (Thuc. 2.9.2), the Sicyonians, Pellenians and Eleans (Thuc. 2.9.3, perhaps summarised by Diodorus in his lacuna at 12.42.5 as *πόλεις τινές οὐ πολλαί*, see above), the Plataeans, most of the Acarnanians and the Zacynthians (Thuc. 2.9.4). It is, however, not necessary to conclude from Diodorus 12.42.4–5, if one supplies the lacuna as suggested above rather than as suggested by Wesseling, that Ephorus had adopted his source's thorough distinction in both catalogues between sorts of military assistance provided. It is at least possible that only at the end of his account, as part of his final comment that the Spartan alliance was essentially Dorian and the Athenian alliance essentially Ionian, Ephorus added that similarly the Spartan alliance was composed essentially of allies who contributed infantry and the Athenian alliance of allies who contributed ships.

Certainly a comparison between Thucydides 2.9 and Diodorus 12.42.4–5 enables one to reconstruct the probable form and content of Ephorus' catalogues. But the accepted view of the relationship between the two passages, with Ephorus as the intermediary, is not

the only possible view. One might instead suppose Thucydides 2.9 to be the work of an interpolator who took his material from Ephorus. In this case both Thucydides 2.9 and Diodorus 12.42.4–5 will be dependent upon Ephorus, with the interpolator departing further from the structure and categories of the original than Diodorus, who was content with a close summary. This view has in fact much to recommend it. Thucydides 2.9 is deficient, as we have seen, in both structure and content. Gomme called it (II p.12): “a meagre and beggarly description. . . . [it] in fact looks like a short note (made at the time)⁷ which was never properly worked into the main narrative.” One might add that, as it stands, it constitutes a positive disturbance to the main narrative. Thucydides seems already to have said all that he wants to say about the state of military preparation and alliance on either side in 2.7. Here the themes of *παρασκευή* and *ξυμμαχία* are carefully interwoven: 7.1, *παρασκευάζοντο δὲ καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι . . . πόλεις τε ξυμμαχίδας ποιούμενοι ὅσαι ἦσαν ἐκτὸς τῆς ἑαυτῶν δυνάμεως*; 7.3, *Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ τὴν τε ὑπάρχουσαν ξυμμαχίαν ἐξήταζον καὶ ἐς τὰ περὶ Πελοπόννησον μᾶλλον χωρία ἐπρεσβεύοντο, Κέρκυραν καὶ Κεφαλληνίαν καὶ Ἀκαρνᾶνας καὶ Ζάκυνθον, ὀρώντες εἰ σφίσι φίλια ταῦτ’ εἶη βεβαίως, περίξ τὴν Πελοπόννησον καταπολεμήσοντες*. In the following 2.8 Thucydides deals with the attitude of mind (*γνώμη*) on either side and is then ready to proceed. One expects *παρασκευῆ μὲν οὖν καὶ γνώμη τοιαύτη ὄρμητο . . . ἑκάτεροι* (2.9.1) to be immediately followed by *οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι μετὰ τὰ ἐν Πλαταιαῖς εὐθὺς περιήγγελον κατὰ τὴν Πελοπόννησον καὶ τὴν ἔξω ξυμμαχίδα κ.τ.λ.* (2.10.1). But instead one has the intrusive reprise *πόλεις δὲ . . . τάςδε ἔχοντες ξυμμάχους ἐς τὸν πόλεμον καθίσταντο . . . ξυμμαχία μὲν αὕτη ἑκατέρων καὶ παρασκευῆ ἐς τὸν πόλεμον ἦν* (2.9.1–6), as though first the themes of *παρασκευή* and *ξυμμαχία* had not been already dealt with in 2.7 and secondly the *μὲν οὖν* in *παρασκευῆ μὲν οὖν* (2.9.1) did not indicate an intention to proceed.⁸ It is true that the treatment of *παρασκευή* and *ξυμμαχία* at 2.9 shows a different approach

⁷ But 2.9.2, *Πελληνῆς δὲ Ἀχαιῶν μόνοι ξυνεπολέμουν τὸ πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δὲ ὕστερον καὶ ἄπαντες*, would suggest (unless this alone be regarded as an interpolation) that some time had elapsed since 431 before its composition. Classen II p.14 commented: “ohne Zweifel nachdem 417 *Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰ ἐν Ἀχαιαῖς οὐκ ἐπιτηδείως πρότερον ἔχοντα καθίσταντο* (5.82.1).” Gomme II p.10 would seem to want a date no later than 429 in view of Thuc. 2.83–92, cf. Stahl I.2 p.20.

⁸ On the resumptive use of *μὲν οὖν* see J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 470–73.

from that of 2.7. The introduction into both the Spartan and the Athenian catalogues of secondary lists ordered by the sort of military assistance provided shows that *παρασκευή* in 2.9 has the sense of 'resources' rather than the more straightforward 'preparation' of 2.7. And 2.7 is concerned more with the efforts of both sides to extend their alliances than, as at 2.9, with a description of the existing alliances. But this is as much an argument in favour of interpolation as against it. What may well have happened is that the interpolator took his material on the *ξύμμαχία* from Ephorus' catalogues and imposed upon it, somewhat unsuccessfully, his own distinction throughout between sorts of military assistance provided. This enabled him both to fit his extra material from Ephorus on the *ξύμμαχία* into the context of *παρασκευή* (2.9.1, *παρασκευῆ μὲν οὖν καὶ γνώμη τοιαύτη ὤρμητο . . . ἐκάτεροι*) and at the same time to make good what he saw as Thucydides' deficient account of *παρασκευή* in 2.7.

There remain jarring repetitions (2.9.4, *Ἀκαρνάνων οἱ πλείους, Κερκυραῖοι, Ζακύνθιοι*, cf. 2.7.3, *Κέρκυραν καὶ Κεφαλληνίαν καὶ Ἀχαρνᾶνας καὶ Ζάκυνθον*), omissions (cf. 2.7.2 with Gomme II p.12) and anomalous inclusions (2.9.4, *Κερκυραῖοι bis*, cf. 1.44.1). It might be argued that the omission of Cephallenia from 2.9.4 (cf. 2.7.3) presupposes awareness of 2.30.2 and so points to Thucydides' responsibility for the whole chapter. But Ephorus could have been just as careful about taking into account later passages in Thucydides (cf. Diod. 12.42.4, *τῶν δ' ἄλλων Ἀμφικεῖς* with Thuc. 3.101.2). He clearly had the care of a pedant. More significant is the inclusion of the Corcyraeans in the Athenian *ξύμμαχία* (2.9.4, *bis*). Thucydides had earlier been most concerned to point out that the Athenians had made only an *ἐπιμαχία* and not a *ξύμμαχία* with the Corcyraeans in 433 (1.41.1). This constituted an important part of his defence of the Athenians in the *Schuldfrage* of the War.⁹ Accordingly, in his account of the beginnings of *stasis* at Corcyra in 427 he implies, if somewhat ambiguously, that the same *ἐπιμαχία* was in force (3.70.2, *ἐψηφίσαντο Κερκυραῖοι Ἀθηναίους μὲν ξύμμαχοι εἶναι κατὰ τὰ ξυγκείμενα, Πελοποννησίους δὲ φίλοι ὥσπερ καὶ πρότερον*; cf. 3.70.6, *ἐπυνθάνοντο* [*sc.* the oligarchs] *τὸν Πειθίαν, ἕως ἔτι βουλής ἐστί, μέλλειν τὸ πλῆθος ἀναπείσειν τοὺς αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναίους φίλους τε καὶ ἐχθροὺς νομίζειν*). As he himself

⁹ Cf. in general G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca 1972), esp. pp.66–79.

narrates (2.25.1), however, the Corcyraeans had assisted the Athenians in force in their raids against the Peloponnese in 431. They had acted thus as *ξύμμαχοι* beyond the requirements of an *ἐπιμαχία*. The scholiast on Thucydides 2.7.3 says that the *ἐπιμαχία* had then (*i.e.* early 431) in the course of the preparations for war been made a full alliance.¹⁰ This would seem to be confirmed by the action described at 2.25.1. Gomme, however, (II p.82, *cf.* pp.221, 360) believed that this action was exceptional and that the *ἐπιμαχία* continued unchanged, as Thucydides implies, until 427. It is certainly true that, except on this one occasion in 431, the Corcyraeans sent no assistance to the Athenians until after the *stasis* of 427 (in fact in 426, *cf.* Thuc. 3.94.1, 95.2). It is particularly noteworthy that Phormio expected no assistance from Corcyra in 429 (*cf.* Gomme II p.221). It is still not at all improbable, however, that at some time after the battle of Sybota the *ἐπιμαχία* was in fact made into a full *ξύμμαχία* and that the Corcyraean assistance in 431 followed accordingly. The Corcyraean prisoners held at Corinth since the battle of Sybota may well have been returned in the winter of 431/0 (Thuc. 3.70.1), so that their pro-Corinthian activity secured Corcyraean neutrality (Thuc. 3.70.2) from 430 until matters came to a head in 427. It is just as likely that Thucydides at 3.70.1–3 covers a period extending from winter 431/0 to early 427¹¹ as that the prisoners stayed five years in Corinth before being returned to Corcyra. In fact, then, the Corcyraeans probably were full members of the Athenian *ξύμμαχία* in 431 and deserved their double mention at Thucydides 2.9.4. Thucydides, however, as we have seen, despite his obligation to the facts at 2.25.1, was concerned to keep obscure any full *ξύμμαχία* between the Athenians and the Corcyraeans until after 427 (1.44.1, 3.70.2,6). And so he is most unlikely in any catalogue of the Athenian *ξύμμαχοι* in 431 to have made prominent mention of the Corcyraeans. Such subtlety was beyond Ephorus. Just as his knowledge of Thucydides 2.30.2 led him in the composition of his Athenian catalogue to exclude Cephalenia from 2.7.3, so his knowledge of 2.25.1 led him to include the Corcyraeans.

There is much, then, in the content and position of Thucydides 2.9 that disturbs. It is awkward, too, in its wording. Το Πελοποννήσιοι

¹⁰ οἱ γὰρ Κερκυραῖοι ἐπιμαχίαν μόνον εἶχον· νῦν δὲ καὶ ξύμμαχίαν ποιεῖ (ap. Bekker 230).

¹¹ For a similar instance at 6.6.2 see my arguments in *JHS* 92 (1972) 136.

μὲν οἱ ἐντὸς ἰσθμοῦ (2.9.2, see above) one might add the absence of μὲν at 2.9.3, αὕτη Λακεδαιμονίων ξυμμαχία. Here μὲν is omitted by all the mss except C (*Laurentianus*) which gives αὕτη μὲν Λακεδαιμονίων ξυμμαχία (see Alberti I p.163). Steup (II p.25) showed that Thucydidean usage requires the μὲν, and most recent editors¹² have adopted αὕτη μὲν Λακεδαιμονίων ξυμμαχία as their reading. But the argument from Thucydidean usage cannot be used to explain how μὲν came to be dropped from the majority of the mss. It explains rather why μὲν was added in the *Laurentianus*. And its final implication is that Thucydides did not write 2.9. There is a similar difficulty with 2.9.4: νῆσοι ὅσαι ἐντὸς Πελοποννήσου καὶ Κρήτης πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα πᾶσαι αἰ <ἄλλαι, ABEF> Κυκλάδες πλὴν Μήλου καὶ Θήρας. Editors most frequently read here either . . . ἀνίσχοντα, πᾶσαι αἰ Κυκλάδες,¹³ omitting ἄλλαι with the *Laurentianus* (C), or πᾶσαι αἰ ἄλλαι [Κυκλάδες].¹⁴ In fact neither reading makes sense. The first requires a different referent for “all the islands between Peloponnese and Crete towards the rising sun” and “all the Cyclades,” whereas clearly both descriptions refer to the same islands;¹⁵ the second, and its more radical variant [πᾶσαι αἰ ἄλλαι Κυκλάδες],¹⁶ requires Thucydides to have used the awkward description νῆσοι ὅσαι ἐντὸς Πελοποννήσου καὶ Κρήτης πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα,¹⁷ when he could so easily have used the simple phrase αἰ Κυκλάδες νῆσοι, cf. 1.4. One would prefer such clumsy verbosity to belong to an interpolator rather than to Thucydides. Elsewhere in 2.9 such clumsiness is evident at 2.9.4, ἐν ἔθνεσι τοσοῦδε Καρία κ.τ.λ., where, as Shilleto (194–95) saw, the string of nominatives following the dative represents a remarkably loose construction, and Stahl (I.2 p.21) was right to comment on the variation παρείχοντο . . . παρείχων at 2.9.3: “Licet in talibus promiscue activo et medio verbi παρέχειν Th. utatur . . . , tamen molestissima est in tanta vicinia eiusdem verbi variatio et repetitio.”

¹² Exceptions are Classen II p.14, Shilleto 194, Stahl I.2 p.21, Marchant 142. Krüger I.1 p.171 omitted μὲν in his text, but remarked: “μὲν ist wohl ausgefallen. Ich erinnere mich an keiner Stelle an der es in einer solchen Verbindung fehlte.”

¹³ Shilleto 195, Jones-Powell *ad loc.* This reading is rightly the rarest in modern editions.

¹⁴ This deletion, which goes back to Poppo, represents by far the commonest reading in modern editions, cf. Classen II p.15, Marchant 11, Steup II p.25, Luschnat I p.127, de Romilly II p.8, Alberti I p.164.

¹⁵ I fail to see how ἐντὸς Πελοποννήσου καὶ Κρήτης πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα can be understood to include Euboea, as Gomme II p.11 supposes, or Carpathos, Casos etc., as the scholiast maintains.

¹⁶ Krüger I.1 p.171, Stahl I.2 p.21, Hude I p.141, Smith I p.274.

¹⁷ The phrase πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα does not occur elsewhere in Thucydides.

IV

I would conclude that the catalogues at Thucydides 2.9 were not written by Thucydides himself but by a later interpolator who took his material from Ephorus. In itself this is not very important. But it may be that there are several other such intrusions into the text of Thucydides. Some, e.g. 3.17, have already been recognised,¹⁸ but others, e.g. 2.13.3–9, have so far been only dimly and partially suspected.¹⁹ If 2.13.3–9 can in fact be shown in its entirety to be an interpolation dependent upon artificial calculations done by Ephorus, then this will be of considerable significance for the reconstruction of the social and economic history of fifth-century Athens. My treatment here of 2.9 should thus be seen as a preliminary contribution to the larger problem of 2.13.3–9.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

December, 1976

¹⁸ Steup III pp.30–33, 244–49. Various editors, including Gomme II pp.272–77, have persevered against all reason in believing 3.17 to have been written by Thucydides. More recently E. C. Kopff, *GRBS* 17 (1976) 23–30, has rightly suspected interpolation at Thuc. 7.42.3.

¹⁹ K. J. Beloch, *Klio* 5 (1905) 356–75, suggested considerable interpolation within 2.13.3–9, but even his strong scepticism hesitated before total rejection.