Aurélien Pulice

From ἐξήγησις to μίμησις: Thucydides' Readership in the ὑπομνήματα from the Roman Period

Ὑπομνήματα were self-standing linear commentaries.¹ They used to be read alongside the text that they commented on. Being often elaborated upon by cultured readers, they were meant to be used by other readers of ancient texts – scholars, schoolmasters or even advanced students trying to get more familiar with an ancient author. Investigating ancient commentaries is therefore a good way to understand by whom and for what purposes a classical author was read.

This paper will explore some aspects of Thucydides' readership as exemplified by *P.Oxy.* 853, a 2nd century papyrus displaying the remnants of an anonymous commentary.² The extant text covers ch. 1–45 of Book 2 (i.e. years 431–430 BCE). In that it is the longest commentary on ancient Greek historiography which has been preserved,³ *P.Oxy.* 853 provides a quite unique window into the ancient scholarship and readership of the classical historians. Nevertheless, its value has been quite neglected by scholars. In this paper, I hope to demonstrate that it was composed at a crucial time of Thucydides' reception, and that it is most likely to have been dedicated to readers who took a keen rhetorical interest in the historian's work. After a brief outline of the context in which our commentary has been written and/or compiled, a comparison with the Byzantine scholia will draw out that the papyrus' author has reshaped a Hellenistic source – doubtless a grammatical ὑπόμνημα influenced by Alexandrian scholarship – and transformed it into a more rhetorical commentary, which implies that his work was more specifically addressed to readers interested in Thucydides from a rhetorical perspective. Lastly, I will consider the apologetic dimension of this commentary, focusing precisely on the detailed refutation of criticisms formulated by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his treatise on Thucydides. We shall see that the author's response to Dionysius – which has no parallel in ancient

1 In this paper, I use ὑπόμνημα and “commentary” as synonyms and follow Del Fabbro's definition of the former: “tutti quei testi su papiro che, materialmente separati dall'edizione critica del testo commentato, sono stati scritti al fine di fornire un chiarimento al testo dell'autore, e che si presentano con una successione di lemmi e relative spiegazioni” (Del Fabbro 1979, 69). On the abusive use of the Greek word, see Arrighetti 1977.

2 Also known as *MP*³ 1536 or *TM* 62878. On this papyrus, see Grenfell/Hunt 1908, 107–149 (*editio princeps*); Voltz 1911; Fischer 1913, 2–19; Luschkat 1954, 25–29; Maehler 2007. See also the Trismegistos database (www.trismegistos.org/text/62878).

3 Concerning Herodotus, there are fragments of an Aristarchean ὑπόμνημα (*P. Amb.* 2.12) and pieces of another commentary mentioning Didymus (*P.Oxy.* 4455). There are two fragmentary (but substantial) commentaries on Thucydides: *P.Oxy.* 853 (Grenfell/Hunt 1908, 107–149) and *P.Vindob.* 29247 (Gerstinger 1925). I do not know of any commentary on Xenophon's historical works.

literary sources – constitutes a crucial contribution to our understanding of Thucydides' reception during the Roman Empire.⁴

1 Date and context of *P.Oxy. 853*

P.Oxy. 853 consists of eight main fragments displaying about 600 lines of text divided into 19 columns that are unequally preserved, but that cover the first 45 chapters of Thucydides' Book 2. The commentary has been copied on the back of three documentary papyri which have been put together in order to make a new roll. One of these documents is dated from 131–132 CE, meaning that our commentary was copied after this date (*terminus post quem*) and doubtless composed beforehand. A paleographical analysis of the handwriting suggests that the copyist was clearly active before the end of the 2nd century (*terminus ante quem*).

The ὑπόμνημα was probably composed between the very end of the 1st century BCE and the first decades of the 1st century CE. Indeed, one of the first notes mentions Dionysius of Halicarnassus and summarizes a section of his treatise *On Thucydides*, which was probably published around 10 BCE (*terminus post quem*). This means that our commentary was written afterwards and can hardly be later than the time of Hadrian. It is generally assumed that its author was active during the Julio-Claudian dynasty,⁵ at a time when Thucydides' rhetorical exemplarity was vividly debated.

By this time, Thucydides was already recognized as a major figure of historiography: his method but also his style – considered to be *dense* and *concise*⁶ – had already been imitated several times by Greek and Latin historians such as Polybius or Sallust. But the fall of the Republic and the rise of the Empire (1st century BCE – 1st century CE) was also characterized by an important rhetorical turn in the reception of the historian. As is attested in both Greek and Latin sources from the period, it is closely related to the development of Atticism.

According to Cicero, Thucydides was almost his only way to access the oratory of 5th-century Athens.⁷ He admired the historian, at least to a certain extent. On several occasions, he praised his *acumen* ("sharpness"),⁸ this being (as closely related to the efficiency of *inventio*) an essential prerequisite to one who wanted to become a per-

4 As ὑπομνήματα address the issue of a literate audience, some connections can also be made with the contributions of Duchêne, Shaw, Pausch and Liotsakis.

5 Cf. Grenfell / Hunt 1908, 109: "[sc. its composition] can hardly have taken place later than Hadrian's time, and it is more likely that it was written soon after the beginning of the Christian era."

6 See, for example, Cicero, who describes his style as *subtilis, acutus, brevis sententiisque magis quam verbis abundans* (*de Orat.* 2.22.93), but also Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.73) or Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Th.* 24.10).

7 Cic. *de Orat.* 2.22.93; *Brut.* 29.

8 Cic. *Brut.* 65–66; *de Orat.* 2.22.93.

suasive orator.⁹ But if Cicero was not particularly reluctant to support the *imitatio Thucydidis* in the field of historiography, he firmly advised against the intrusion of a Thucydidean style in forensic and deliberative oratory. As a matter of fact, his *Brutus* and *Orator* were written in 46 BCE, at a time when his eloquence was openly criticized by a group of young orators, labelled as *attikoi*. On many respects, these two treatises answer their criticisms. As opposed to the sophisticated Asianist oratory (as allegedly embodied by Cicero), these young *oratores* valued the ancient simplicity of the Attic orators. Some of them apparently had a predilection for Thucydides. But these *Thucydidii*, as Cicero calls them, in making the historian their favorite rhetorical paradigm – have pushed the *imitatio Thucydidis* too far (Cic. *Orat.* 8.30–31):

Ecce autem aliqui se Thucydidios esse profitentur, *nouum quoddam imperitorum et inauditum genus!* nam qui Lysiam sequuntur, causidicum quendam sequuntur non illum quidem amplum atque grandem, subtilem et elegantem tamen et qui in forensibus causis possit praeclare consistere. Thucydides autem res gestas et bella narrat et proelia, grauius sane et probe, sed nihil ab eo transferri potest ad forensem usum et publicum. ipsae illae contiones ita multas habent obscuras abditasque sententias uix ut intellegantur; quod est in oratione ciuili uitium uel maximum. [...] quis porro umquam Graecorum rhetorum a Thucydide quicquam duxit? at laudatus est ab omnibus. fateor, sed ita ut rerum explicator prudens, seuerus, grauis; non ut in iudiciis uersaret causas, sed ut in historiis bella narraret; itaque numquam est numeratus orator, nec uero, si historiam non scripsisset, nomen eius exstaret, cum praesertim fuisset honoratus et nobilis.

And here come some who take the title “Thucydideans”, – *a new and unheard-of group of ignoramuses*. Those who follow Lysias at least follow a pleader of sorts, not indeed grand and stately, but for all that refined and precise, and able to hold his own famously in the law-court. Thucydides, on the other hand, gives us history, wars and battles – fine and dignified, I grant, but nothing in him can be applied to the court or to public life. Those famous speeches contain so many dark and obscure sentences as to be scarcely intelligible, which is a prime fault in a public oration. [...] Furthermore, what Greek rhetorician ever took any examples from Thucydides? Every one praises him, I grant, but as an intelligent, serious and dignified commentator on events, – one to describe wars in history, not to handle cases in law-courts. Consequently he has never been classed as an orator, nor, to tell the truth, would his name be known unless he had written his history, although he was of noble birth and had been honoured with public office.¹⁰

The expression *novum quoddam imperitorum et inauditum genus* clearly suggests a characterisation of these writers as following a new fashion. This is why Cicero’s testimony can be seen as a fairly good starting point for Thucydides’ “début” as an oratorical *exemplum* (at least in Rome).¹¹ If Cicero disapproves of the use of Thucydides as a rhetorical paradigm, he admires him as a historian and does not blame the *imitatio Thucydidis* as long as it is restricted to historiography.

⁹ Cic. *de Orat.* 1.28.128; 1.38.172; 1.51.223; 2.35.147; *Brut.* 35; *Orat.* 5.18.

¹⁰ Trans. Hubbel.

¹¹ Cicero’s attitude towards the *Thucydidii* is moreover unchanging. See also *Brut.* 287–288; *Opt. Gen.* 15–16.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who arrived in Rome around 30 BCE and died after 8 BCE, goes one step further. No less than three of his rhetorical works are entirely or partly dedicated to Thucydides.¹² All are addressed to people who seemed quite fond of the historian. Dionysius, who does not really share their enthusiasm, is entirely aware that he goes against the tide.¹³ He argues that not only aspiring orators but also historians – and this is a major difference with Cicero – should avoid blindly imitating Thucydides' uneven style. He recommends to separate the wheat from the chaff first, and to resort to a more cautious and moderate form of imitation. Now, getting into the details of Dionysius' evaluation of the *History* would lead me too far from *P.Oxy.* 853; but within the scope of this paper, it is enough to refer to the conclusion of the treatise *On Thucydides*, which provides a good synthesis of his point of view (D.H. *Th.* 55.2–5):

Οὐκ ἂν ὀκνήσαιμι τοῖς ἀσκοῦσι τοὺς πολιτικούς λόγους ὑποτίθεσθαι τοῖς γε δὴ τὰς κρίσεις ἀδιαστρόφους ἔτι φυλάσσοισι, Δημοσθένει συμβούλῳ χρησαμένους [...]. ἴνα δὲ συνελών εἴπω, ἀμφοτέρα μὲν ἐπ' ἴσης ζηλωτὰ εἶναι, τὰ τε μὴ σαφῶς εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ συγγραφέως καὶ τὰ προσειληφότα σὺν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς τὴν σαφήνειαν, οὐκ ἔχει λόγον· ἀνάγκη δὲ ὁμολογεῖν κρεῖττονα τῶν ἀτελεστέρων εἶναι τὰ τελειότερα καὶ τῶν ἀφανεστέρων τὰ γ' ἐμφανέστερα. τί οὖν μαθόντες ἅπασαν τὴν διάλεκτον τοῦ συγγραφέως ἐπαινοῦμεν καὶ βιαζόμεθα λέγειν, ὅτι τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτὸν οὖσιν ἀνθρώποις αὐτὰ ὁ Θουκυδίδης ἔγραψε συνήθη πᾶσι καὶ γνώριμα ὄντα, ἡμῶν δὲ λόγος αὐτῷ τῶν ὕστερον ἐσομένων οὐκ ἦν, οἱ δ' ἐκβάλλομεν ἐκ τῶν δικαστηρίων καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἅπασαν τὴν Θουκυδίδου λέξιν ὡς ἄχρηστον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸ διηγηματικὸν μέρος αὐτῆς πλὴν ὀλίγων πάνυ θαυμαστῶς ἔχειν καὶ εἰς πάσας εἶναι τὰς χρεῖας εὖθετον, τὸ δὲ δημηγορικὸν οὐχ ἅπαν εἰς μίμησιν ἐπιτήδειον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ὅσον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ μέρος γνωσθῆναι μὲν ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις εὐπορον, κατασκευασθῆναι δ' οὐχ ἅπασι δυνατόν; τούτων ἡδὶ μὲν εἶχόν σοι περὶ Θουκυδίδου γράφειν, ὃ βέλτιστε Κόιντε Αἴλιε Τουβέρων, οὐ μὴν ἀληθέστερα.

I should not hesitate to suggest to students of political oratory – those, at least, who still try to keep their critical faculties unprejudiced – that they should take Demosthenes as their guide [...]. To sum up, it does not make sense for us to admire equally the passages in Thucydides which lack clarity and those which possess clarity in addition to his other virtues; for it must be admitted that perfection is better than imperfection, and clarity is better than obscurity. What reasoning, therefore, has led some of us to praise Thucydides' style as a whole, and to insist on asserting that he wrote his history for his contemporaries, and that the language in which it was written was familiar and comprehensible to all of them, but that he took no thought for us, his future readers; while others of us banish all his work from our law-courts and assemblies as being worthless, instead of agreeing that the narrative portions of it, except for very few passages, deserve to be admired and used for every sort of purpose, while the speeches, though they are not all suitable for imitation, contain a good proportion of passages which all men can easily understand, though they cannot all compose in the same style? I could have written an essay on Thucydides which would have given you more pleasure than this one does, my good Quintus Aelius Tubero, but not one which was more in accordance with the facts.¹⁴

¹² *On Thucydides*, *The Second Letter to Ammaeus*, and *The Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*. In the last one a section of Dionysius' lost treatise *On imitation* (περὶ μιμήσεως) has been reproduced.

¹³ D.H. *Th.* 2.2.

¹⁴ Transl. Usher.

However relevant they may be, Cicero's and Dionysius' respective concerns apparently failed to convince the Thucydidean Atticists. As a matter of fact, the existence of a passionate *imitatio Thucydidis* in the specific context of eloquence is still attested in the first decades of the Empire. Let us briefly consider three examples, starting with a short epigram from the *Catalepton* generally assumed to belong to the Augustan period (Verg. *Cat.* 2):¹⁵

Corinthiorum amator iste verborum,
iste, iste rhetor, †namque hactenus† totus
Thucydides, tyrannus Atticae febris,
thau Gallicum, min et sphin ut male illisit,
ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.

That lover of Corinthian words,
that...that 'rhetor', Thucydides all complete,
a tyrant with an Attic fever,
look how bad he smashed to pieces the Gallic tau and min and sphin,
and that is for his brother he mixed this way all these words!¹⁶

This epigram mocks Annius Cimber, an Atticising *rhetor* known for his obscure style and abusive use of outdated words.¹⁷ Interestingly he is here depicted as a passionate imitator of Thucydides (cf. *totus Thucydides*). From Latin texts, the first lines of Petronius' *Satyricon*, are also worth recalling (Petr. 2.6–8):

Pace uestra liceat dixisse, primi omnium eloquentiam perdidistis. leuibus enim atque inanibus sonis ludibria quaedam excitando, effecistis ut corpus orationis eneruaretur et caderet. nondum iuuenes declamationibus continebantur, cum Sophocles aut Euripides inuenerunt uerba quibus deberent loqui. nondum umbraticus doctor ingenia deleuerat, cum Pindarus nouemque lyrici Homericis uersibus canere timuerunt. et ne poetas quidem ad testimonium citem, certe neque Platona neque Demosthenen ad hoc genus exercitationis accessisse uideo. grandis et, ut ita dicam, pudica oratio non est maculosa nec turgida, sed naturali pulchritudine exsurgit. nuper uentosa istaec et enormis loquacitas Athenas ex Asia commigrauit animosque iuuenum ad magna surgentes ueluti pestilenti quodam sidere adflauit, semelque corrupta regula eloquentia stetit et obmutuit. ad summam, quis postea Thucydidis, quis Hyperidis ad famam processit? ac ne carmen quidem sani coloris enituit, sed omnia quasi eodem cibo pasta non potuerunt usque ad senectutem canescere.

With your permission I must tell you the truth, that you teachers more than anyone have been the ruin of true eloquence. Your tripping, empty tones stimulate certain absurd effects into being, with the result that the substance of your speech languishes and dies. In the age when Sophocles or Euripides found the inevitable word for their verse, young men were not yet being confined to set speeches. When Pindar and the nine lyric poets were too modest to use

¹⁵ On this, see Iodice Di Martino 2002, 345–348.

¹⁶ I follow Iodice Di Martino's text (Iodice Di Martino 2002, 345–348).

¹⁷ See, for example, Suet. *Aug.* 86. Quintilian quotes this epigram in order to prevent his reader from falling prey to all kinds of excessive sophistication and abusive use of archaic words (Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.27).

Homer's lines, no cloistered pedant had yet ruined young men's brains. I need not go to the poets for evidence. I certainly do not find that Plato or Demosthenes took any course of training of this kind. Great style, which, if I may say so, is also modest style, is never blotchy and bloated. It rises supreme by virtue of its natural beauty. Your flatulent and formless flow of words is a modern immigrant from Asia to Athens. Its breath fell upon the mind of ambitious youth like the influence of a baleful planet, and when the old tradition was once broken, eloquence halted and grew dumb. In a word, who after this came to equal the splendour of Thucydides or Hyperides? Even poetry did not glow with the colour of health, but the whole art, nourished on one universal diet, lacked the vigour to reach the grey hairs of old age.¹⁸

Here the narrator attacks Asianists who, according to him, have killed eloquence. He speaks himself in favor of an Atticism exemplified by Plato, Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Thucydides!

Last but not least, it is no coincidence either that “rhetorical” anecdotes start to become more widespread in the historian's biographical tradition from the reign of Augustus onwards. Caecilius of Calacte, for example, inferred from Thucydides' good opinion about Antiphon that he used to be his disciple, as if it had become a necessity, at the beginning of the Roman Empire, to transform Thucydides into an Attic orator (T32):

Καΐκίλος δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ συντάγματι Θουκυδίδου τοῦ συγγραφέως καθηγητὴν τεκμαίρεται γεγονέναι ἐξ' ὧν ἐπαινεῖται παρ' αὐτῷ ὁ Ἀντιφῶν.

Caecilius, in his treatise about him [i.e. Antiphon], *deduced* that he used to be the teacher of the historian Thucydides from the way Antiphon is praised in his work.¹⁹

Judging from both Greek and Latin documentation, the last years of the Republic and the first decades of the Empire represent an important rhetorical turn in the reception of the historian. Thucydides' exemplarity – both in the field of oratory and historiography – is highly debated. On the one hand, there is a fervent imitation of his style, and, on the other hand, there are those who try to temper this enthusiasm by showing the historian's weaknesses, especially his stylistic obscurity. If this last tendency is more frequently documented in our sources, it should not lead us to underestimate the number of historians, orators and rhetoricians ready to stand up for Thucydides' qualities against their detractors. The author of the commentary preserved in *P.Oxy.* 853 was doubtless one of them.

¹⁸ Transl. Heseltine.

¹⁹ Woerther 2015, 15. See also T34 (ibid.): [...] Καΐκίλος δὲ Θουκυδίδου τοῦ συγγραφέως καθηγητὴν γεγονέναι φησι τὸν ῥήτορα.

2 From grammar to rhetoric

We do not know much about the ancient scholarship around Thucydides. Dionysius seems to be the first to mention ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικάί, which he describes as a necessary guidance to those who seek a perfect understanding of the *History*, regardless of their familiarity with classical Greek.²⁰ If we refer to the famous definition that Dionysius Thrax, a grammarian active between the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, gave of his own discipline, one can have a reasonably good idea of what these Hellenistic ἐξηγήσεις may have been (D.T. 1):

Γραμματική ἐστὶν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεύσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. μέρη δὲ αὐτῆς ἐστὶν ἕξ· πρῶτον ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβὴς κατὰ προσωδίαν, δεύτερον ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικούς τρόπους, τρίτον γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις, τέταρτον ἐτυμολογίας εὗρεσις, πέμπτον ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός, ἕκτον κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὴ κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ.

Grammar is an experimental knowledge of the usages of language as generally current among poets and prose writers. It is divided into six parts: first, trained reading with due regard to prosody; second, explanation according to poetical figures; thirdly, elucidation of *glossai* and *historiai*, fourthly, discovery of etymology; fifthly, an accurate account of analogies; sixthly, criticism of poetical productions, which is the noblest part of grammatic art.²¹

Ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικάί would have provided the reader with information about the way that the text used to be read aloud (i.e. pronounced) originally, elucidations of γλῶσσαι (i.e. rare words) and ἱστορίαι (i.e. historical or cultural information that the reader needs to know in order to understand properly the content of the text) and etymologies. They would also have clarified not only difficult forms by replacing them with their grammatical paradigm, but also longer passages by identifying a trope or a figure of speech and then by reformulating it. In other words, ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικάί were mostly intended to help the reader in his understanding of Thucydides' difficult Attic prose. They were certainly not primarily interested in the historian as a stylistic paradigm for imitation.

When talking about ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικάί, Dionysius may have in mind some kind of grammatical ὑπόμνημα, particularly given that he probably used one to write the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*.²² A comparison of *P.Oxy.* 853 with the Byzantine scholia tends to confirm that such a ὑπόμνημα did exist in the Roman world by the time our commentary was written, being probably its main source.

²⁰ D.H. *Th.* 51.1 and 55.2.

²¹ Transl. Davidson (modified).

²² See Usener 1889 and, more recently, de Jonge 2008.

P.Oxy. 853 provides us with 104 lemmata of which 10 have lost their comments.²³ Therefore, our comparison with the scholia involves the 94 remaining lemmata for which comments have been preserved. Following Voltz's first intuitions,²⁴ I have compared these notes with the scholia of the seven oldest manuscripts of the *History* (dating back to the 10th-12th centuries), which all belong to the same textual tradition, called Θ.²⁵ The lexical parallels that I have been able to identify are listed in *Appendix* 1. It turns out that 25 comments – out of 94 – match the Θ Scholia (i.e. 23.5%). It is remarkable that most of these parallels (22) deal with the same passage of the *History*. Given that a thousand years stand between the two corpora, these connections are too striking to be a mere coincidence. It has been convincingly demonstrated by Voltz and Luschnat that the commentary preserved in *P.Oxy.* 853 was not at the origin of the Byzantine scholia but represented rather an independent redrafting of a common source.²⁶ As the 25 parallels deal with ἐξηγήσεις γραμματικάι, we can reasonably assume that our Hellenistic source was a grammatical commentary.

We must now try to characterize the specificity of the commentary displayed in *P.Oxy.* 853 with respect to this Hellenistic ὑπόμνημα by emphasizing the discrepancies that exist between the two of them. Focusing more precisely on two significant examples, I will first consider their respective approach to speeches, especially Pericles' Funeral Oration (Th. 2.35–46), and then I will examine a defense of Thucydides' οἰκονομία which is unparalleled in the Thucydidean scholarship and represents the greatest specific detail of *P.Oxy.* 853.

2.1 The notes on Pericles' Funeral Oration

I shall first specify that most of the parallels between *P.Oxy.* 853 and the Θ scholia are to be found in connection with the narrative sections of the *History* (17 cases).²⁷ This number drops when it comes to speeches (8 cases).²⁸ I believe that this reflects different attitudes towards the speeches. As a matter of fact, the few parallels to be found in connection with these speeches – namely Archidamos' speech before the first invasion in Attica (Th. 2.11) and Pericles' Funeral Oration (Th. 2.35–46) –, however

²³ Lemmata without comment: Comm. Th. 2.8.2; 13.5b; 24.1; 40.5; extremely corrupted comments: Comm. Th. 2.2.1c; 14.1; 19.2b; 35.3; 40.3; 45.2a.

²⁴ Cf. Voltz 1911, 37–42; see also Maehler 2007, 587–589.

²⁵ On this textual tradition, see Kleinlogel 1965, 143–172; Alberti 1972, XL-LIII.

²⁶ Cf. Voltz 1911, 37–42; Luschnat 1954, 25–29. Among other proofs, there are some cases (as we shall see) where Θ scholia convey more material than *P.Oxy.* 853. Note also that both scholars disagree on the nature of this common source: Voltz, who is very much influenced by Schwabe's thesis (see Schwabe 1881), favors the hypothesis of lexicographical works, whereas Luschnat supports the idea of a grammatical set of glosses on Thucydides.

²⁷ Comm. Th. 2.2.4b; 2.3.3; 2.4.3; 2.4.7; 2.5.5; 2.8.1–2; 2.13.2c; 2.13.7b; 2.15.5a; 2.16.1a; 2.18.5a; 2.20.3b; 2.21.1; 2.21.3a; 2.22.2ab; 2.22.3.

²⁸ Comm. Th. 2.11.9a; 2.35.2c; 2.37.1b; 2.37.2a; 2.37.3b; 2.8.1a; 2.39.1a; 2.39.4.

scarce they may be, can help us to understand how the Hellenistic grammatical ὑπόμνημα used to comment on the speeches, and to what extent our commentator deviated from it.

Pericles' Funeral Oration (Th. 2.35–46) is a famous eulogy of Athens but can also be read as a disguised criticism of Sparta. Both our commentary and the Θ scholia were aware of this “double entente”, which culminates in ch. 39, when Pericles explicitly alludes to the Lacedaemonians (Th. 2.39.2):

Table 1

<i>P.Oxy.</i> 853	Θ Scholia (Hude)
NO MATCH	<p>Schol. Th. 2.37.1 τοὺς τῶν πέλας νόμους: αἰνίττεται τοὺς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, οὓς Λυκοῦργος ἔγραψε, μιμησάμενος τοὺς Κρητῶν καὶ Αἰγυπτίων νόμους ABFGc2</p> <p>καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τὰ πλείω πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίου (rec);</p> <p>Schol. Th. 2.37.1 ὄνομα μὲν ...: ἐπειδὴ φαῦλον δοκεῖ ἡ δημοκρατία καὶ ἑώρα τοὺς Λάκωνας σεμνυνομένους ἐπὶ τῇ ἀριστοκρατίᾳ, ἐπάγει λέγων ὅτι τῷ μὲν ὀνόματι δημοκρατία, τῷ δὲ ἔργῳ ἀριστοκρατία ἐστὶν ἡμῶν ἡ πολιτεία ABFGc2</p> <p>Schol. Th. 2.37.1 οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους: τοῦτο λέγει διὰ τοὺς Ἑρακλείδας βασιλεῖς τῶν Λακῶνων, οἵτινες ἀπὸ μέρους ἦρχον διὰ μόνην τὴν εὐγένειαν, κἂν μὴ εἶχον ἀρετὴν ABFGc2</p> <p>Schol. Th. 2.37.2 λυπηρὰς δὲ τῇ ὄψει ἀχθηδόνας: τοῦτο λέγει, ἐπειδὴ ποτε οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, Ἀλκαμένη ἐν προαστείῳ θεασάμενοι μετεωρίζοντα, κακῶς ἐχρήσαντο. οἱ γὰρ Λακεδαιμόνιοι σκυθρωποὶ εἰσι, διὰ παντὸς ἐπιείκειαν ὑποκρινόμενοι, καὶ τοὺς ἄβροτέρους κολάζουσι τὸ γὰρ τερπνὸν τοῦ βίου κώλυμα νομίζουσι τῶν ἀναγκαίων ABFGc2</p> <p>Schol. Th. 2.37.2 ἀνεπαχθῶς δέ ...: ταῦτα πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίου αἰνίττεται ABFc2</p> <p>Schol. Th. 2.37.3 ἀνεπαχθῶς δέ ...: ταῦτα πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίου αἰνίττεται ABFc2</p> <p>Schol. Th. 2.38.1 τὸ λυπηρόν: αἰνίττεται πρὸς τοὺς ταπεινοὺς καὶ εὐτελεῖς Λακεδαιμονίου ABFGc2</p>
<p>Comm. Th. 2.39.1a τήν τε γὰρ [πό]λιν κοινὴν παρέχομεν: ἀκροβο]λίζει Λακεδαιμονίους.</p>	<p>Schol. Th. 2.39.1 τῶν ἐναντίων: τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ABFGc2</p> <p>Schol. Th. 2.39.1 ξενηλασίαις: ὥσπερ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ABFGc2</p> <p>Schol. Th. 2.39.1 καὶ ἀπάταις: πάλιν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, οἵτινες ἀπάτη τὸ πλέον καὶ γοητεία γνώμης ἐκράτουν ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ABFc2</p> <p>Schol. Th. 2.39.1 εὐθὺς νέοι ὄντες: καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ἀπὸ μικρᾶς ἡλικίας εἰς τὰ πολέμια ἡγυρεπίζοντο καὶ εὐθὺς ὡς ἐτίκτετο τὸ παιδίον, ἐν ἀσπίδι ἐτίθεσαν αὐτὸ καὶ δόρυ πλησίον, καὶ ἐβόων ἢ τὰν ἢ 'πὶ τὰν, τουτέστιν, ἢ ταῦτα σῶσον, ἢ μετ' αὐτῶν ἀναιρέθητι. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ οὕτως ἐπιπόνως ἥσκουν, ὡς μηδὲ λουτρῶν ἀνέχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀρκεῖσθαι τῷ Εὐρώτῃ ποταμῷ πρὸς τὸ λούσασθαι. ἀμέλει καὶ διαμαστιγώσεις ἐγίνοντο</p>

Table 1 (Continued)

<i>P.Oxy.</i> 853	Θ Scholia (Hude)
	κατά τινα καιρόν, ἐν αἷς οἱ πλείονας ἐνεγκόντες ἀνδρείοτεροι ἐνομίζοντο ABFGc2
Comm. Th. 2.39.4 καίτοι εἰ [ῥαθ]υμίᾳ ... φαίν[εσθαι]: καίτοι εἰ[ι] ἐν ἀνέσει μᾶλλον [καὶ ῥ]ασι- τωνῇ ζῶμεν μὴ κακ[οπα]θοῦντες τῇ ἀσκήσει μὴδ' ὑπὸ νόμων ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἔμφυτο[ν] ἀνδρείαν ὑπο[φέρον- τες] τοὺς κινδύνους, [περ]ιέστ[αι] ἡμᾶς πρὸ τῶν δεινῶν [μὴ ταλαι- πωρεῖσθαι] καὶ ἐς τοὺς κιν[δύ- νους ἀπαντήσ]αντας μὴ ἀναν- δ[ρ]οτ[έ]ρους τῶν αἰεὶ κακοπαθούντων φαίνεσθαι. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Λάκωνες αἰεὶ πονεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων ἠναγκάζοντο, οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι παρὰ τοὺς κινδύνους ἐπονοῦντο.	Schol. Th. 2.39.4 καίτοι εἰ ῥαθυμίᾳ ...: πάντα συνάγει τὰ εἰρημένα, καὶ ὥσπερ ἀνάμνησιν αὐτῶν ποιεῖται ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος. αἰνίτ- τεται δὲ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ABFGc2
NO MATCH	Schol. 2.40.2 ἔνι τε τοῖς αὐτοῖς ...: οἷον τοῖς δημιουργοῖς καὶ γεωργοῖς καὶ κυνηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἰδιώταις καὶ χειροτέχναις. τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, ἐπειδὴ ὀλίγοι ἦσαν αὐτῶν οἱ τὰ πολιτικά σκοποῦντες, οἱ δὲ τὰ πολέμια πάντες ABFGc2

The Θ scholia provide us with much more material than *P.Oxy.* 853. The 13 comments are all grammatical in nature and provide the reader with cultural information about the Spartans (what Dionysius Thrax calls ἱστορίαι), or otherwise serve the purpose of making some hints more explicit, αἰνίττεται being the ordinary way to identify the trope of αἴνιγμα. Given the two parallels with *P.Oxy.* 853, we may assume that the Θ scholia listed above derive from their common Hellenistic source and reflect (to some extent) its exegetical work on the Funeral Oration.²⁹

It appears from this comparison that our commentator – unlike his Hellenistic source – was not primarily concerned with providing grammatical ἐξηγήσεις such as ἱστορίαι to his reader, at least when he was commenting on a speech.³⁰ As I said before, grammatical comments on the Funeral Oration (but also on the speech of Archidamos) are very scarce and also very brief. In the present case, what we have

²⁹ The second parallel (about Th. 2.39.4: καίτοι εἰ [ῥαθ]υμίᾳ ...) suggests that the original comment has been summarized to the extreme in the scholia, and is better preserved in *P.Oxy.* 853.

³⁰ Elucidations of ἱστορίαι are frequent in connection with narrative sections.

instead consists in a title – ἐπιτάφιος³¹ – followed by 20 meticulous paraphrases of Thucydides' text (out of 27 notes).³² Here is a short sample of these reformulations:

Comm. Th. 2.35.1 [καὶ μὴ ἐν ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ πολλῶν ἀρετὰς [κινδυνεύεσθαι] εἴ τε καὶ χεῖρον εἰπόντι πιστευθῆναι: καὶ μὴ ἐν ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ . . . τ]οσοῦ[των ἀνδρῶν] ἀποθανόντων] τὰς ἀρετὰς κινδυνεύειν εἴ εἰπόντι καὶ κακῶς τοιοῦ[τοτρόπου]ς πιστεύεσθαι ὡς ἂν [οὗτος εἴ]πῃ.

²τ]οσοῦ[των ἀνδρῶν] Grenfell/Hunt | ²Wilamowitz : [εἶναι τῶν] ἀποθανόντων | ³κίνδυνος γάρ Wilamowitz κινδυνεύειν vel κινδυνεύ[ε]σθαι Grenfell/Hunt.

... and not that the valour of many [men] should be risked on one man to be believed, whether he spoke well or badly³³; and not to risk on one man ... the virtues of so many dead men, whether he spoke well or badly, and to believe all the sorts of things that this man would say.

Comm. Th. 2.37.1b μέτε[σ]τι δὲ κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους πρὸς τὰ ἴδια διάφορα πᾶσι τὸ ἴσον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίωσιν ὡς ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίμῳ οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πλεόν: διάφορα νυν τὰ διαφέροντα· μ[ε]τέχουσι δὲ πάντες κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις συμβολαῖ[οι]ς ἰσηγορίας, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίαν ὡς ἐν τινὶ ἐκ[α]στος λαμπρὸς νομίζεται ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς, οὐ κατὰ τὸ μέρος τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἴσον αὐτῷ τῆς π[ο]λιτείας πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τ[ι]μᾶται ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἀρετῶν οἱ[.] . κ[.] ε[.] [.] νταξιν [.] ἕκαστος [.] τῶν νόμων [.] ἰ ἀρετῇ [.]ς.

⁶οἱ[δ]ε κ[α]τανεμ[η]θησομένην <τὴν> τάξιν [αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ] ἕκαστος Bury.

as regards the law all men have a share equally when it comes to their private disputes, but as regards the value that each man holds in a certain respect, it is not greatly from [a particular] class ...: 'disagreements', then 'points of disagreement'. As regards the law, all men have a share in equality of speech in their private covenants, and, as regards their dignity, as each man is considered to be illustrious in something related to public affairs, he is not honoured by the community according to the equal part of civil rights he inherited, but because of [his] virtue or from the virtues ...

Comm. Th. 2.37.3a ἀνεπα[χθῶ]ς δὲ τὰ ἴδια προσομιλοῦντες τὰ δημόσια διὰ δέος μάλιστα οὐ παρανομ[οῦ]μεν: ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀπ[ο]λύστερον ἀλλ[ή]λοις συνόντες ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς [εὐ]λαβῶς καὶ νομίμως πολιτευόμε[με]θα.

But while we thus avoid giving offence in our private intercourse, in our public life it is chiefly through fear that we do not deviate from the law: while in our private life, we are quite straightforward with each other, in our public life, we behave cautiously and in keeping with law.

Comm. Th. 2.40.1a πλοῦτψ τε ἔργου μᾶλλον καιρῷ ἢ λόγου κόμπψ χρώμεθα: ὁ πλοῦτος ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἔ[ργ]ων ἐν καιρῷ φαίνεται, οὐ λόγῳ[ν ἀλα]ζονείᾳ λέγομεν πλουτεῖν.³⁴

Wealth we treat rather as an opportunity for action than as a subject for boasting: our wealth, when it comes to actions, appears at the right moment, we do not say that we are wealthy out of verbal chicanery.

³¹ Comm. Th. 2.35.

³² Comm. Th. 2.35.1; Comm. Th. 2.35.2bc; Comm. Th. 2.35.3; Comm. Th. 2.36.3; Comm. Th. 2.37.1ab; Comm. Th. 2.37.2ab; Comm. Th. 2.37.3ab; Comm. Th. 2.39.4; Comm. Th. 2.40.1ab; Comm. Th. 2.40.2ab; Comm. Th. 2.40.3; Comm. Th. 2.41.1; Comm. Th. 2.41.3a; Comm. Th. 2.45.2b. These paraphrases are very different from those which one can find in the Θ scholia. From this angle, the two corpora seem to have proceeded independently from their source.

³³ All translations are my own.

³⁴ The text of P.Oxy. 853 is based upon my own reading of the papyrus.

Why did paraphrases seem more important to him than the Lacedaemonian *realia*? Like tropes and figures, paraphrases are, to some extent, at a crossroads between grammar and rhetoric, between ἐξήγησις and μίμησις. They undoubtedly provide the reader with an alternative text that is easier to understand. Under the Early Empire, however, paraphrases were mainly school exercises that a student had to practice while learning eloquence. They were part of the assignments of a *rhetor*, and were closely related to the rhetorical notion of μίμησις (or *imitatio*). In theoretical texts, paraphrases were frequently used by rhetoricians to underline the qualities or defects of a classical author.³⁵ Interestingly, Aelius Theon (1st century) dedicated a specific chapter of his *Progymnasmata* to paraphrases – μεταθέσεις in Greek –, and recommends that student reformulate a speech by Lysias in order to make it more resemble a speech by Demosthenes. The idea is for the student to become more familiar with the Attic dialect by offering an alternative Attic text that can exist beside the original. He also argues that Demosthenes occasionally paraphrased Thucydides himself, which suggests that the speeches of the historian used to be taken as good examples of Attic oratory and were paraphrased at school at the same time that our commentary was composed!³⁶

The paraphrases displayed in *P.Oxy.* 853 perfectly illustrate the exercises documented in Theon's manual. If they undoubtedly make the speeches easier to read, they also provide the reader with an alternative Attic formulation of the same content. Being simple and clear both in terms of vocabulary and syntax, they try to reproduce the style and language of the Attic orators, and may therefore represent a set of examples that are to be used in the schools of rhetoric. The fact that *P.Oxy.* 853's paraphrases massively prevail over γραμματικαὶ ἐξηγήσεις among the notes concerned with the speeches (while being, on the other hand, utterly marginal when it comes to the narrative sections) is another argument in favor of their rhetorical nature. The prevalence of μεταθέσεις over γραμματικαὶ ἐξηγήσεις in the notes regarding the speeches commented on in *P.Oxy.* 853 exemplifies Thucydides' rhetorical reception during the Early Roman Empire, and denotes the impact of Thucydides' new readership on the development of scholarly works about the *History*. Since this readership became more and more interested in the historian from a rhetorical perspective, the Thucydidean scholarship, by paying particular attention to the speeches, more and more reflected a rhetorical approach of the *History*, accomplishing a progressive shift from ἐξήγησις to μίμησις.

35 To take only one example, Dionysius himself resorts to μεταθέσεις in three different kinds of situation: (1) most of the time, he uses them to correct what he considers to be wrong in the original text; (2) in his treatise *On Composition*, by contrast, he wants to emphasize the virtues of the original; and (3) lastly in his later works, his paraphrases consist in providing “a text that is neither preferable nor inferior to the original, but [which] offers an alternative that can exist beside the original” (see de Jonge 2008, 366–390). One might be tempted to be more specific and talk rather of an Attic alternative. This last type of μεταθέσεις corresponds to the exercise that Aelius recommends.

36 Theon *Prog.* 139.21–142.10.

2.2 A defense of Thucydides' οἰκονομία against Dionysius of Halicarnassus

The clearest example of this new rhetoricized perspective (i.e. one which looks at Thucydides as an author to imitate, not only as an author to explain) is certainly to be found in a very long note commenting on Th. 2.1:

Ἄρχεται δὲ ὁ πόλεμος ἐνθένδε ἤδη Ἀθηναίων καὶ Πελοποννησίων καὶ τῶν ἑκατέρους συμμάχων, ἐν ᾧ οὔτε ἐπεμείγνυντο ἔτι ἀκηρυκτεῖ παρ' ἀλλήλους καταστάντες τε ξυνεχῶς ἐπολέμουν· γέγραπται δὲ ἐξῆς ὡς ἕκαστα ἐγίνετο κατὰ θέρος καὶ χειμῶνα.

At this point in my narrative begins the account of the actual warfare between the Athenians and the Peloponnesians and their respective allies. When it continued, they ceased having communication with one another except through heralds, and once they were at war they waged it without intermission. The events of the war have been recorded in the order of their occurrence, summer by summer and winter by winter.³⁷

The note is attached to the lemma γέγραπται δὲ ἐξῆς ὡς ἕκαστα ἐγίνετο κατὰ θέρος καὶ χειμῶνα (the reader will find a translation of the whole text in *Appendix 2*).³⁸ It offers a detailed refutation of some criticisms formulated by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his treatise *On Thucydides*.³⁹ Summarized at the beginning of the note, these are all related to the οἰκονομία of the *History* (i.e. the way Thucydides organized his own narrative), and they all deal more precisely with its διαίρεσις (*divisio*, “division”) and τάξις (*dispositio*, “arrangement”).⁴⁰ Indeed, the discussion focuses on three main points: (1) the division by summers and winters; (2) the fragmentation of episodes covering more than a year of war; and (3) the τάξις of Book 1.

This refutation of Dionysius is isolated among the extant scholarship on Thucydides of the Roman period. It is generally assumed that it was written by the author of our commentary,⁴¹ but, on my verdict, given that he proceeds (at least partly) by compilation, one cannot rule out the possibility that we are dealing here with an excerpt from a lost rhetorical treatise. Regardless of the hypothesis one would like to favor, the note still reflects the commentator's own view on Thucydides' exemplarity.

To offer a detailed analysis of every aspect of this note would lead me far beyond the scope of this paper. I will rather then focus on some salient features of the text. Following the three points discussed, I will first examine how the commentator summarized Dionysius' statements (and whether he did so faithfully or not); then I will analyze the way he disproved of his adversary (what arguments did he use? What

³⁷ Transl. Forster Smith.

³⁸ Comm. Th. 2.1c.

³⁹ It is, as far as I know, the first mention of this treatise in ancient texts. On Lucius Annaeus Cornutus (2nd century AD), one of the first rhetoricians who quotes Dionysius of Halicarnassus as an authority, see Voltz 1911, 57.

⁴⁰ D.H. *Th.* 9–11.

⁴¹ Cf. Grenfell/Hunt 1908, 111–112; Voltz 1911, 57–58; Luschnat 1954, 28.

kind of rhetorical techniques did he resort to?). It will appear that our commentator offers a formally perfect διάλυσις (“refutation”) of Dionysius’ view, although it is based upon an uneven summary of his statements, and that he tries to re-categorize Dionysius’ own words and arguments in order to turn them against him, in the style of rhetorical antilogy. Moreover, even if the commentator’s familiarity with the treatise *On Thucydides* goes without saying, I will argue that his *refutatio* also exhibits a comprehensive knowledge of the comparison between Herodotus and Thucydides displayed in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*.⁴²

2.2.1 The division by summers and winters

Dionysius first criticized the historians’ διαίρεσις by summers and winters. He could not understand why Thucydides did not follow his predecessors, who divided their narrative either κατὰ τόπους (like Herodotus and Hellanicus) or κατὰ χρόνους, “which the local historians had preferred, dividing their records according to the accession of kings or priests, or by the periods of the Olympiads, or by the appointment of civil magistrates to annual office”. As he writes at greater length (D.H. *Th.* 9.2–4):

Ἀρξομαι δ’ ἀπὸ τῆς διαίρεσεως, προειπὼν ὅτι τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένων συγγραφέων ἢ κατὰ τόπους μερίζοντων τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἢ κατὰ χρόνους εὐπαρακολουθήτους ἐκείνους οὐδετέραν τούτων τῶν διαίρεσεων ἐδοκίμασεν. οὐτε γὰρ τοῖς τόποις, ἐν οἷς αἱ πράξεις ἐπετελέσθησαν, ἀκολουθῶν ἐμέρισε τὰς διηγήσεις, ὡς Ἡρόδοτός τε καὶ Ἑλλάνικος καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων ἐποίησαν· οὐτε τοῖς χρόνοις, ὡς οἱ τὴν τοπικὴν ἐκδόντες ἱστορίαν προείλοντο, ἤτοι ταῖς διαδοχαῖς τῶν βασιλέων μερίζοντες τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἢ ταῖς τῶν ἱερέων ἢ ταῖς περιόδοις τῶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἢ τοῖς ἀποδεικνυμένοις ἄρχουσιν ἐπὶ τὰς ἐνιαυσίους ἀρχάς. καὶνὴν δὲ τινα καὶ ἀτριβὴ τοῖς ἄλλοις πορευθῆναι βουλευθεὶς ὁδὸν θερείαις καὶ χειμερίοις ὥραις ἀκολουθῶν ἐμέρισε τὴν ἱστορίαν. ἐκ δὲ τούτου συμβέβηκεν αὐτῷ τούναντίον ἢ προσεδόκησεν. οὐ γὰρ σαφέστερα γέγονεν ἡ διαίρεσις τῶν χρόνων ἀλλὰ δυσπαρακολουθητοτέρα.

I shall begin with division and state by way of introduction that whilst the writers that preceded Thucydides adopted either topographical or chronological subdivisions that were easily followed, Thucydides did not see fit to adopt either of these divisions. In the division of his work he was guided neither by the places in which the events narrated took place, as were Herodotus and Hellanicus and some others of his predecessors, nor by the times after the manner chosen by those who published local histories, who determined their subdivisions by kingly or priestly successions, or by Olympiads, or by the appointees to annual offices. But Thucydides chose to follow a new path and one that had not been trodden by others, and divided his work by events of summers and winters. The effect of this was different from what he had expected. The chronological division has not become clearer, but it is more difficult to follow.⁴³

⁴² D.H. *Pomp.* 3.2–21.

⁴³ Transl. Pritchett.

In *P.Oxy.* 853, this passage was drastically simplified:

Διονύσιος [ὁ] Ἀλικαρνασσεὺς ἐν τῷ περὶ Θουκυδίδ[ου] συντάγματι περὶ οὐ πολλῶν μ[έ]μφεται τὸν Θουκυδίδην, τὰ δ' ἀν[ω]τάτω τρία κεφάλαια διέξεισιν, ὅ[τι] τε οὐκ ἄρχοντας καὶ Ὀλυμπιάδ[ας] ὥς οἱ λοιποὶ προτέθεικε τῶν χρόν[ω]ν ἀλλ' ἰδίως θέρη καὶ χειμῶ[ν]ας [...].

Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his treatise on Thucydides blames Thucydides on a few grounds, and discusses three chief points: first, that he has not fixed his dates by archons and Olympiads, like other historians, but according to a system of his own by summers and winters [...].⁴⁴

The Dionysian distinction between a διαίρεσις κατὰ τόπους (to be found in Herodotus and Hellanicus) and another one κατὰ χρόνους (distinctive of local histories) was eliminated, and only the divisions by archons and Olympiads (which are only two examples among others of divisions κατὰ χρόνους in Dionysius' text) are preserved. In so doing, the commentator slightly distorted Dionysius' original statement: if the rhetorician certainly disapproved of Thucydides' division by summers and winters, he never wrote that he should have preferred Olympiads or archons in particular.

The commentator probably chose to focus on these two divisions because of their significance to several inconsistencies that he perceived in Dionysius' criticism of Thucydides' οἰκονομία (see below). First of all, these διαίρεσεις by archons and Olympiads were apparently not in use by the time Thucydides wrote his *History* (1), nor did a common system of calculation exist (2):

Εἰκότως δ' ἂν τις πρὸς αὐτὸν προπετῶς οὕτως [μεμφόμενον ἀντεγκαλέ]σε[ι]εν [ὅ]τι.
 .. τοσο ε . . . τ τῶν πραγμάτων σ ν λογισμὸν ὃς καὶ α
 νος παρέδωκεν ε αν. ἢ γὰρ κατὰ ἄρχ[ον]τας διαίρεσις] καὶ κατ' Ὀλυμπιάδ[ας]
 οὐπω ἐγγόνει] ἐν πλάτει καὶ οὐ κ[οι]νὸς λογισμὸς ἦ]ν.

In opposition to this rash criticism one might reasonably retort that [...]. Indeed, the division by archons and Olympiads had not yet come into common use, and there was not a common system of calculation.

Dionysius says that ancient historians (both prior and contemporary to Thucydides) used the division by Olympiads or archons in their local histories. The commentator argues the opposite. Given all that is lost from Classical Greek historiography, this dispute seems to be unverifiable. One can only observe that neither Herodotus, Thucydides nor Xenophon utilized them. In later historiography, however, Polybius resorts to an openly declared division by Olympiads.⁴⁵ Book 3 of his *History*, for example – which is the true beginning of his narrative –, exactly covers the four years of the 140th Olympiad (i.e. 220–216 BCE). As for the division by archons, one might think of Diodorus, who used it in his books dedicated to Classical Greece, but it is

⁴⁴ Grenfell/Hunt's translation. See *Appendix 2*.

⁴⁵ Plb. 3.1.11.

very likely that he was not the first to resort to this form of chronological narrative division.

As regards a common system of calculation, Thucydides' own narrative clearly suggests that there was no κοινὸς λογισμὸς in his own time. In Book 2, the historian uses no less than five different strategies of dating to locate the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (431 BCE) (2.2.1):

Τέσσαρα μὲν γὰρ καὶ δέκα ἔτη ἐνέμειναν αἱ τριακοντούτεις σπονδαὶ αἱ ἐγένοντο μετ' Εὐβοίας ἄλωσιν· τῷ δὲ πέμπτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει, ἐπὶ Χρυσίδος ἐν Ἀργεὶ τότε πενήκοντα δυοῖν δέοντα ἔτη ἱερωμένης καὶ Αἰνησίῳ ἐφόρου ἐν Σπάρτῃ καὶ Πυθοδώρου ἔτι τέσσαρας μῆνας ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοις, μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ποτειδαίᾳ μάχην μηνὶ ἕκτῳ καὶ ἅμα ἦρι ἀρχομένῳ Θηβαίων ἄνδρες ὀλίγῳ πλείους τριακοσίων (ἡγοῦντο δὲ αὐτῶν βοιωταρχοῦντες Πυθάγγελός τε ὁ Φυλείδου καὶ Διέμπορος ὁ Ὀνητορίδου) ἐσῆλθον περὶ πρῶτον ὕπνον ξὺν ὅπλοις ἐς Πλάταιαν τῆς Βοιωτίας οὖσαν Ἀθηναίων ξυμμαχίδα.

For fourteen years the thirty years' truce which had been concluded after the capture of Euboea remained unbroken; but in the fifteenth year, when Chrysis was in the forty-eighth year of her priesthood at Argos, and Aenesias was ephor at Sparta, and Pythodorus had still four months to serve as archon at Athens, in the sixteenth month after the battle of Potidaea, at the opening of spring, some Thebans, a little more than three hundreds in number, under the command of the Boeotarchs Pythangelus son of Phyleidas and Deimporus son of Onetoridas, about the first watch of the night entered under arms into Plataea, a town of Boeotia which was in alliance with Athens.⁴⁶

While the truce of Euboea and the battle of Potidaea are internal chronological markers (Thucydides mentions them in Book 1), the allusions to Chrysis, priestess of Argos, Aenesias, ephor at Sparta, and Pythodorus, archon at Athens, refer to local calendars that are very similar to those Dionysius talks about. Interestingly, Thucydides did not use Olympiads. Maybe this omission confirms what the commentator says: Olympiads were not particularly in use back to Thucydides' time, at least in historiographical texts.⁴⁷

2.2.2 The fragmentation of episodes covering more than a year of war

Dionysius' second criticism is made as a direct consequence of the division based upon seasons. As an example that signifies Thucydides' fragmentation of the narrative, Dionysius describes how the historian intertwined the crisis of Mytilene with the siege of Plataea and the Corcyrean στάσις.⁴⁸ The commentator more faithfully summarized this part of the treatise:

⁴⁶ Transl. Forster Smith.

⁴⁷ The use of chronological markers in ch. 2.2.1 is aimed at emphasizing the gravity of the moment (the beginning of the war). On that matter, see Liotsakis 2015, 285–286.

⁴⁸ D.H. *Th.* 9.6–9.

Table 2

D.H. <i>Th.</i> 9.6 and 8–9	Comm. <i>Th.</i> 2.2.1c (<i>P.Oxy.</i> 853)
<p>Ἐν γοῦν ἡ τρίτῃ βύβλῳ (ταύτῃ γὰρ ἀρκεσθήσομαι μόνῃ), τὰ περὶ Μυτιληναίους ἀρξάμενος γράφειν, πρὶν ὅλῃν ἐκπληρῶσαι τὴν διήγησιν, ἐπὶ τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων ἅπεισιν ἔργα· καὶ οὐδὲ ταῦτα συγγορυφώσας, τῆς Πλαταιέων μέμνηται πολιορκίας· ἀφείδ' δὲ καὶ ταύτην ἄτελῃ, τοῦ Μυτιληναϊκοῦ μέμνηται πολέμου·</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Καὶ τί δεῖ πλείω λέγειν; ὅλη γὰρ ἡ βύβλος οὕτω συγκέκοπται καὶ τὸ διηνεκὲς τῆς ἀπαγγελίας ἀπολώλεκε. πλανώμεθα δὴ, καθάπερ εἰκός, καὶ δυσκόλως τοῖς δηλοῦμένοις παρακολουθοῦμεν, ταραττομένης ἐν τῷ διασπᾶσθαι τὰ πράγματα τῆς διανοίας καὶ τὰς ἡμιτελεῖς τῶν ἀκουσθέντων μνήμας οὐ ῥαδίως οὐδ' ἀκριβῶς ἀναφερούσης. χρὴ δὲ τὴν ἱστορικὴν πραγματείαν εἰρομένην εἶναι καὶ ἀπερίσπαστον, ἄλλως τε ἐπειδὴν περὶ πολλῶν γίνηται πραγμάτων καὶ δυσκαταμαθήτων.⁴⁹</p>	<p>[...] καὶ ὅτι διέσπακε καὶ διή- [ρηκε] τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ συγκό- [πτει] τὰ πράγματα οὐκ ἀπα[ρ]τί- ζω[ν τ]ῆ[ς] περὶ ἐκάστων διηγ[ή]σεις ἀ[λλ]ὰ ἀπ' ἄλλων ἐπ' ἄλλα τρεπόμενος πρ[ὶ]ν τελειώ- σαι [...]⁵⁰</p>

Here we see that he chose to keep διασπάω and συγκόπτω, two key verbs in Dionysius' text. What is more, the participial clause seems to borrow some of its vocabulary from the rhetorician's description of Book 3.⁵¹

The refutation of this second point is much longer but also more damaged than the previous one:

οὐδ' ὥς Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ βύβλῳ αὐτοῦ συνεχῶς τ κατὰ τόπους ποικίλον
. μον γράφω[ν] οἷον τῇ τοῦ [πολέμου ἀρχῇ] ἐξάσας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὰ
μὲν] Πλα[τ]αϊκὰ ἀπὸ [τῶν πρώτων] μέχρι τῶν ὑστάτων [εἴρειν πάν]τα, εἶτα πάλιν πάσας τὰς [ἐσ]-
βολὰς τῶν Πελοποννησίων [ἐ]παλλήλους γράφειν, [τὰ] <δὲ> Κ[ορ]κυραϊκὰ ἐφεξῆς διαφέροντ[α]
τοῖς χρόνοις. πάντα γὰρ ἂν συν[έ]χεν ἢ πάλιν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χ[ρό]νους ἀνέτρεχεν ἀπρεπῶς
κα[ὶ] ἀλόγως. οὐ γὰρ μία ὑπόθεσις ἦν οὐδὲ ἐν ἐνὶ χρόνῳ ἡ τόπῳ, ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ πολλαχοῦ
καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιροὺς. καὶ μὴν εἰ καὶ κατὰ ἄρχοντα<ς> ἔγραφεν, ἀνάγκη πάλιν ἦν διαφεῖν
τὰ πράγματα· ἐπ' ἄλλων γὰρ καὶ ἄλλων ταῦτα ἀρχόντων συνέβαινε· ὅταν δέ τις ἐν κεφάλαιον

49 D.H. *Th.* 9.6 and 8–9, transl. Pritchett: “In the third book (for I shall limit myself to this, needing no other) the author starts to write about the Mytileneans, but before completing the narrative passes on to Lacedaemonian affairs. Yet, without bringing these to a head, he mentions the siege of Plataea. Leaving this also unfinished, he speaks of the Mytilenean war. [...] But what need is there of saying more? The whole book has thus been chopped up into small bits and has lost the continuity of the narrative. We lose our way, as is natural, and it is hard for us to follow the narrative, our mind being confused by the tearing asunder of the events, and being unable easily and exactly to remember the half-finished reports it has heard. The events narrated in an historical treatise must follow without interruption, especially when the events are many in number and hard to follow.”

50 “that he has disturbed and divided the narrative and breaks up the events, not completing his accounts of the several incidents, but turning from one subject to another before he has finished with it”.

51 See also D.H. *Pomp.* 3.14, where Dionysius says that Herodotus, contrary to Thucydides, οὐ διέσπασε τὴν διήγησιν.

γράφῃ, μόνον συνεχῶς εἴρει. ἐαυτῷ οὖν ἐ<ν>αντία λέγει ὁ Διονύσιος· καὶ γὰρ εἰ κατ' ἄρχοντας ἔδει γράφειν ὥς φησιν, ὁμοίως ἐχρήν διαιρεῖν τὰ π[ρ]άγματα ἀκολουθ[ί]ως τοῖς ἀρχ[ο]ουσιν. [ἐ]άν γέ τοι συνείρῃ [τὰ πράγματ]α καὶ [μ]ὴ κωλύωσιν οἱ χρόνοι ἐφεξ[ῆ]ς [ὁ Θου]κυδίδης[ς] διηγέ[ι]ται, οἶον . ι τῇ ζ' συνεχῶς τὰ Σικελικά διηγέ[ι]ται. οὐδ' εἰ τ ροι κατο ι ικα κα[τ]οικί [εἰς] πολλ[ὰ]ς κεφα[λ]ὰς μεμερισμένα ἐξ]-ετάζειν. ὁ δὲ Δ[ιονύσιος]] ἔξωθεν παραβα μεταβάσεις μεταξ[ὺ] τῶν [πρασ-σομέν]ων οὐκ ἐπιτιμᾷ [Ἡροδότῳ]]ν προκειμένην ι' ν τὰ Αἰγ[ύ]πτια καὶ Λυδ[ια]κά, π δὲ ο α αση . λ ἀκριβῶς αχ α.

Not even Herodotus ... in his book ... continuously ... by geographical areas ... diversified ... writing ... just like [it was impossible],⁵² leaving the Athenians at the beginning of the war, to relate the Plataean affairs from first to last, and then go back to describe all the invasions of the Peloponnesians one after the other, and Corcyrean affairs continuously, differing as they did in date; for he would have thrown everything into confusion, or turned back again to periods which he had treated, in a fashion both unsuitable and unreasonable. For he was not dealing with a single subject or events at one time or one place, but with many subjects in many places and at many periods. Moreover, even if he had dated by archons, he would still have been obliged to divide the events, for these occurred some under one archon, some under another; it is when a person is only writing about a single subject that his narrative is continuous throughout. Hence Dionysius contradicts himself; for even if Thucydides ought to have dated by archons, as he asserts, he would have been equally obliged to divide events according to the archons. If however, the events are connected and the chronology offers no obstacle, Thucydides' narrative is continuous, as for instance ... in the seventh book where the Sicilian events are related continuously. Not even if ... explain ... divided into many points ... Dionysius ... doesn't blame Herodotus for his digressions in the middle of the events ... the events of Egypt and Lydia ... accurately ...

As we shall see, the commentator based his refutation on argumentative techniques which are typical of rhetorical ἀντιλογίαί, using Dionysius' own words against him. In so doing, he also demonstrates his intimate knowledge of other Dionysian treatises on Thucydides, namely the (now lost) Περὶ μιμήσεως and/or the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*.

First of all, one should notice that the whole passage is organized according to a ring-composition pattern,⁵³ which encapsulates in its centre the author's main point. There is thus a debilitating contradiction in Dionysius' claim:

A: First Σύγκρισις

a) Herodotus

b) Thucydides

B: Even a division by archons implies to break up the events

(καὶ μὴν εἰ καὶ κατὰ ἄρχοντας ἔγραφεν, ἀνάγκη πάλιν ἦν διαιρεῖν τὰ πράγματα)

C: Hence, Dionysius contradicts himself

(ἐαυτῷ οὖν ἐ<ν>αντία λέγει ὁ Διονύσιος)

⁵² On the textual problems here, see Grenfell / Hunt 1908, 138.

⁵³ For a concise introduction to ring composition, see Douglas 2007.

B: Even a division by archons implies to break up the events
(καὶ γὰρ εἰ κατ' ἀρχοντας ἔδει γράφειν ... ὁμοίως ἐχρῆν διαίρειν τὰ πράγματα)

- A: Second Σύγκρισις
b) Thucydides
a) Herodotus

Two symmetrical comparisons between Herodotus and Thucydides frame this part of the *refutatio*. In the treatise *On Thucydides*, Dionysius barely mentions Herodotus twice.⁵⁴ In the *Περὶ μιμήσεως*, however, he formulated his conception of historiography through a comprehensive comparison (σύγκρισις) of the two historians, which is now to be found in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*. Our commentator's two συγκρίσεις doubtlessly echo Dionysius' evaluation of the two historians in these treatises. As these comparisons aim at emphasizing Thucydides' exemplarity against Herodotus (to whom Dionysius is characteristically more inclined), they are openly anti-Dionysian. The commentator used the same argumentative technique as an answer to his adversary.

Considering the words he used, some echoes ought to be mentioned. Most of them are located in the first half of the text. Table 3 lists at least some of them:

Table 3

Comm. Th. 2.2.1c (<i>P.Oxy.</i> 853)	
οὐδ' ὥς Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ βύβλῳ αὐτοῦ συνεχῶς τ κατὰ τόπους ποικίλον μον γράφω[ν] οἷον τῇ τοῦ [πολέμου ἀρχῇ] ἐ[άσ]ας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὰ μὲν Πλα[τ]αϊκὰ ἀπὸ [τῶν πρώτων] μέχρι τῶν ὑστάτων [εἶρειν πάν]τα, εἶτα πάλιν πάσας τὰς [ἐσ]βολὰς τῶν Πελοποννη[σίων] ἐ[παλλήλους] γράφειν, [τὰ] <δὲ> Κ[ορ]κυραϊκὰ ἐφεξῆς διαφέροντ[α] τοῖς χρόνοις. πάντα γὰρ ἂν συν[έ]χεν ἢ πάλιν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χ[ρό]νους ἀνέτρεχεν ἀπρεπῶς κα[ὶ] ἀλόγως. οὐ γὰρ μία ὑπόθεσις ἦν οὐδὲ ἐν ἐνὶ χρόνῳ ἢ τόπῳ, ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ πολλαχοῦ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιροὺς.	Not even Herodotus ... in his book ... continuously ... by geographical areas ... diversified ... writing ... just like [it was impossible], leaving the Athe- nians at the beginning of the war, to relate the Plataean affairs from first to last, and then go back to describe all the invasions of the Pelo- ponnesians one after the other, and Corcyrean affairs continuously, differing as they did in date; for he would have thrown everything into confu- sion, or turned back again to periods which he had treated, in a fashion both unsuitable and unreasonable. For he was not dealing with a single subject or events at one time or one place, but with many subjects in many places and at many periods.
Dionysius of Halicarnassus	
— κατὰ τόπους: Th. 9.2–3: ἄρξομαι δ' ἀπὸ τῆς διαιρέσεως, προειπὼν ὅτι τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένων συγγραφέων ἢ κατὰ τόπους μεριζόντων τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἢ κατὰ χρόνους εὐταρακολουθήτους	

⁵⁴ D.H. Th. 5.5 and 23.7.

⁵⁵ “I shall begin with division and state by way of introduction that whilst the writers that preceded Thucydides adopted either topographical or chronological subdivisions that were easily followed,

Table 3 (Continued)

Comm. Th. 2.2.1c (P.Oxy. 853)	
	ἐκεῖνος οὐδετέραν τούτων τῶν διαιρέσεων ἐδοκίμασεν. οὐτε γὰρ τοῖς τόποις, ἐν οἷς αἱ πράξεις ἐπετελέσθησαν, ἀκολουθῶν ἐμέρισε τὰς διηγήσεις, ὥς Ἡρόδοτος τε καὶ Ἑλλάνικος καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων ἐποίησαν. ⁵⁵
– ποικίλον: Pomp. 3.11 – 12:	Συνειδὼς γὰρ Ἡρόδοτος, ὅτι πᾶσα μῆκος ἔχουσα πολὺ διήγησις ἂν μὲν ἀναπαύσεις τινὰς λαμβάνη, τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἀκρωμένων ἡδέως διατίθῃσιν, ἐὰν δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν μένῃ πραγμάτων, κὰν τὰ μάλιστα ἐπιτυχάνηται, λυπεῖ τὴν ἀκοὴν τῷ κόρῳ, ποικίλην ἐβουλήθη ποιῆσαι τὴν γραφὴν Ὀμήρου ζηλωτὴς γενόμενος. ⁵⁶
– ἀπρεπὼς κα[ί] ἀλόγως: Th. 10.1:	Αἰτιῶνται δὲ καὶ τὴν τάξιν αὐτοῦ τινες, ὥς οὐτε ἀρχὴν τῆς ἱστορίας εἰληφότος ἦν ἐχρῆν οὐτε τέλος ἐφηρμοκότος αὐτῇ τὸ πρέπον... ⁵⁷ ; Pomp. 3.20: Πασῶν ἐν λόγοις ἀρετῶν ἡ κυριωτάτη τὸ πρέπον· ταύτην ὁ Ἡρόδοτος ἀκριβοῖ μάλλον ἢ Θουκυδίδης. ⁵⁸
– μία ὑπόθεσις: Th. 7.3:	Θουκυδίδῃ δὲ τῷ προελομένῳ μίαν ὑπόθεσιν, ἥ παρεγίνετο αὐτός, οὐχ ἥρμωπτεν ἐγκαταμίγειν τῇ διηγέσει τὰς θεατρικὰς γοητείας οὐδὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀπάτην ἀρμόττεσθαι τῶν ἀναγνωσομένων [...] ⁵⁹
– ἀλλὰ πολλὰ καὶ πολλαχού καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιροὺς: Th. 9.5:	ἐφ' ᾧ θαυμάζειν ἄξιον, πῶς αὐτὸν ἔλαθεν, ὅτι πολλῶν ἅμα πραγμάτων κατὰ πολλοὺς τόπους γινομένων εἰς μικρὰς κατακερματιζομένην τομὰς ἡ διήγησις οὐκ ἀπολήψεται τὸ “τηλαυγὲς φῶς” ἐκεῖνο “καὶ καθαρὸν”, ὥς ἐξ αὐτῶν γίνεται τῶν πραγμάτων φανερόν. ⁶⁰

As for the first (and much damaged) comparison with Herodotus, κατὰ τόπους probably alludes to Dionysius' own classification of ancient historians according to their respective διαίρεσεις.⁶¹ In the same passage, ποικίλον may well be a hint at the Herodotean device of ποικιλία, which Dionysius often praises, usually from a stylistic perspective, but also when he is dealing with οἰκονομία, as is shown by the excerpt

Thucydides did not see fit to adopt either of these divisions. In the division of his work he was guided neither by the places in which the events narrated took place, as were Herodotus and Hellanicus and some others of his predecessors.” (transl. Pritchett).

⁵⁶ “Herodotus realised that any narrative that proceeds to a great length has a pleasant effect on the minds of its hearers provided that it contains a number of pauses, but that if it is confined to the same series of events, however successful it might otherwise be, it vexes the ears with a feeling of satiety; so he wished to give variety to his writing, thereby showing himself to be an eager admirer of Homer.” (transl. Usher).

⁵⁷ “Some critics also find fault with his order (*taxis*), claiming that he has neither made a proper beginning nor brought it to a suitable close.” (transl. Pritchett).

⁵⁸ “The most important of all literary qualities is propriety. Herodotus is more scrupulous about this than Thucydides.” (transl. Usher).

⁵⁹ “On the other hand, it was not suitable for Thucydides, who chose just one subject in which he participated, to mix theatrical enticements with the narrative, or to practice the deceit against readers which those compilations customarily exhibited [...]” (transl. Pritchett).

⁶⁰ “What is a source of astonishment, is the fact that he failed to observe that ‘far-shining light’ and ‘pure’ would not light up his narrative if divided, like so much small change, into small sections, <but there would be a state of confusion> resulting from the fact that many events were occurring in many different places at the same time. This is clear from the events themselves.” (transl. Pritchett).

⁶¹ D.H. Th. 9.3.

from the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* mentioned in Table 3. One might also think of another passage from the same letter, where the rhetorician claims that Thucydides himself tacitly recognised the usefulness of a ποικίλον narrative (D.H. *Pomp.* 3.12):

ἤδη δ' ὃ λέγω κάκεῖνος ἐνεθυμήθη, ὡς ἡδὺ χρῆμα ἐν ἱστορίας γραφῇ μεταβολὴ καὶ ποικίλον, καὶ τοῦτο ἐν δύο ἢ τρισὶ τόποις ἐποίησεν, ἐπὶ τε τῆς Ὀδρυσῶν ἀρχῆς, δι' ἧς αἰτίας ἐγένετο μεγάλη, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ πόλεων.

Even Thucydides in his day realised the truth of my contention, that change is a pleasant quality in an historical work, and gives it variety: he has had recourse to it in two or three passages, as when he is discussing the causes of the growth of the Odrysian kingdom to greatness, and again when he is describing the cities of Sicily.⁶²

As Dionysius contrasts the Herodotean ποικιλία with Thucydides' monolithic and monotonous narrative in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*, and he never discusses variety from this perspective (i.e. the perspective of οἰκονομία) in the treatise *On Thucydides* (where it is involved in sections dedicated to style),⁶³ one might reasonably assume that our commentator used this term with the treatise *On Imitation* (or the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*) in mind, where Herodotus' οἰκονομία is better characterized than it is in other Dionysian treatises.

The three examples taken from Thucydides' *History* – the Plataean and Corcyraean affairs, and the Lacedaemonian invasions of Attica – all echo those to be found in the above mentioned description of Book 3.⁶⁴

The use of the two adverbs ἀπρεπῶς κα[ὶ] ἀλόγως are a means of re-evaluating Thucydides' διαίρεσις against Dionysius, who considered it to be ἀπρεπές although he did not use the word when discussing the *History's* division.⁶⁵ He employed it, however, in the section on τάξις.⁶⁶ According to Dionysius, Herodotus succeeded in effecting τὸ πρέπον more than Thucydides did.⁶⁷ Here again, the commentator takes a polemical stand against his adversary in rhetoric.

Interestingly, μία ὑπόθεσις appears only once in the treatise *On Thucydides*, at the beginning of the section dedicated to οἰκονομία, in a passage where Dionysius praises the way that the historian refused to focus on τὸ μυθῶδες (D.H. *Th.* 7.3):

Θουκυδίδῃ δὲ τῷ προελομένῳ μίαν ὑπόθεσιν, ἣ παρεγίνετο αὐτός, οὐχ ἥρμωτον ἐγκαταμίγειν τῇ διηγήσει τὰς θεατρικὰς γοητείας οὐδὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀπάτην ἀρμόττεσθαι τῶν ἀναγνωσομένων, ἦν ἐκεῖναι πεφύκασι φέρειν αἱ συντάξεις, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ὠφέλειαν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ τῆς ἱστορίας δεδήλωκε [...].

⁶² Transl. Usher. On the Herodotean style of the Odrysian digression (2.95–101), see, most recently, Liotsakis 2016 (for further bibliography, see *ibid.*, 76–77 with nn. 13–16).

⁶³ See, for example, D.H. *Th.* 23.7.

⁶⁴ D.H. *Th.* 9.6–7.

⁶⁵ See, for example, D.H. *Th.* 9.9–10.

⁶⁶ D.H. *Th.* 10.1 (see above, Table 3).

⁶⁷ D.H. *Pomp.* 3.20 (see above, Table 3).

On the other hand, it was not suitable for Thucydides, who chose just one subject in which he participated, to mix theatrical enticements with the narrative, or to practice the deceit against readers which those compilations customarily exhibited, but to be useful, as he himself explained in the introduction to his history.⁶⁸

Saying that there is no such thing as a single subject in Thucydides' *History* (cf. οὐ γὰρ μία ὑπόθεσις ἦν οὐδὲ ἐν ἐνὶ χρόνῳ ἢ τόπῳ) might therefore be interpreted as another rhetorical tool used to contradict Dionysius by echoing his own words. And lastly, the words οὐδὲ ἐν ἐνὶ χρόνῳ ἢ τόπῳ, ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ πολλαχοῦ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιροὺς may be deliberate paraphrasings of some expressions used by Dionysius when he discussed Thucydides' διαίρεσις.

If we now try to sum up the commentator's point here, not only was it impossible, given the complexity of the subject matter – a long war with events happening in many different places at many different times –, to avoid chopping off the narrative, but also entirely irrelevant and pointless to prefer another διαίρεσις. What is more, the division by archons apparently suggested by Dionysius was ultimately doomed to exhibit the same defects as a division by summers and winters (cf. ὁμοίως ἐχρῆν διαιεῖν). As a consequence, Dionysius' judgment is irrelevant.

As I have tried to demonstrate, our commentator's defense of the Thucydidean οἰκονομία subtly echoes Dionysian words and phrases which are directly borrowed from different passages of his treatises dealing with historiography (and not only the treatise on Thucydides, but also the comparison of Herodotus and Thucydides he found both in the treatise *On Imitation* and in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*). Those echoes have a rhetorical purpose: they are meant to turn Dionysius' arguments against him, as if the rhetorician was falling into his own trap, into the trap of his own words. This rhetorical use of echoes characterized ancient antilogies and, in general, the art of *refutatio*, as is shown by Thucydides' own speeches.⁶⁹

The second comparison between Thucydides and Herodotus being very damaged, let us move to Dionysius' criticism of the τάξις of Book 1.

2.2.3 The organisation of Book 1

Dionysius sees in the observance of chronology one of the most important rules of historiography. As chronology reproduces the actual succession of events, it is closer to the exposure of historical truth than any other τάξις.⁷⁰ This is why he blamed Thucydides for not starting his narrative from the *Pentekontaetia*, which he claims to be the truest (and chronologically the first) cause of the war. Indeed, the historian first

⁶⁸ Transl. Pritchett.

⁶⁹ On paired speeches in Thucydides' *History*, see Romilly 1956, 180 – 239; Stadter 1973 (with further bibliography); Cogan 1981; Iglesias Zoido 1995.

⁷⁰ D.H. *Th.* 11.1.

relates the causes “generally alleged” (Th. 1.23.6) – the Corcyrean and Potidean affairs –, which are posterior to the growth of the Athenian Empire.

Table 4

D.H. Th. 10.3	Comm. Th. 2.1c (P.Oxy. 853)
<p>Προειπὼν γάρ, ὥς μέγιστος ἐγένετο τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πολέμων ὁ Πελοποννησιακὸς χρόνου τε μήκει καὶ παθημάτων πολλῶν συντυχίαις, τελευτῶν τοῦ προοιμίου τὰς αἰτίας βούλεται πρῶτον εἰπεῖν, ἀφ’ ὧν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε. διττὰς δὲ ταύτας ὑποθέμενος, τὴν τε ἀληθῆ μέν, οὐκ εἰς ἅπαντας δὲ λεγομένην, τὴν αὖξῃσιν τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως, καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἀληθῆ μέν, ὑπὸ δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων πλαττομένην, τὴν Ἀθήνηθεν ἀποσταλεῖσαν Κερκυραίοις κατὰ Κορινθίων συμμαχίαν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς καὶ αὐτῷ δοκούσης τὴν ἀρχὴν πεποιήται τῆς διηγήσεως, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐτέρας [...]⁷¹</p>	<p>καὶ ὅτι τὴν ἀληθῆ τοῦ πολέμου αἰτί[ι]αν ἐκί>πξι>ων ὥς σφόδρα αὐτὸς ἐξητακῶς, ὅτι δι’ εὐλάβειαν τῆς ἰσχύος τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπολέμησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, οὐ μὰ Δία διὰ τὰ Κορκυραϊκὰ ἢ Ποτειδαιατικὰ καὶ τὰς παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς λεγομένας αἰτίας, ὅμως οὐκ ἀπὸ τούτων ὧν ἔκρινεν αὐτὸς διηγεῖται ἐκ[ε]ῖθεν ἀρξάμενος ἀφ’ οἷων πραγμάτων μετὰ τὰ Περσικὰ ἠυξήθησαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰς κοινὰς αἰτίας τρέπεται.⁷²</p>

Once again, the commentator has provided a faithful summary of Dionysius’ judgement. He followed the original text and even borrowed some phrases: εἰπὼν ὥς echoes προειπὼν ὥς; οὐκ ἀπό... ἀλλά... is borrowed from Dionysius, as is the phrase ἡ ἀληθῆς αἰτία. His refutation, which is partly incomplete, seems to be based upon three counter-arguments that reveal an utterly different conception of τάξις:

Πρῶτον μὲν ῥητέον ὥς οὐκ ἔμελλε τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν προθ[έ]μενος συγγράφειν πόλεμον πλείους πολέμους ἀπὸ τῶν Περσικῶν αὐτῶν σχεδὸν ἀφ’ ὧν πρῶτων ἠυξήθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπεισάγειν ἐν προσθήκης μέρει· ἔξω γὰρ τέλεον τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐγίνετο. ἔπειτ’ ἐνθυμητέον ὅτι πᾶς συγγραφεὺς ὀφείλει τὰς φανεράς καὶ θρυλ[ο]υμένας αἰτίας τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν πρώτοις ἀκριβῶς ἀφηγεῖσθαι, εἰ δὲ τινων ἀφανεστέρων ὑπονοεῖ τοῦτο ἐπὶ σθαι ὁ δὲ [τοὶ κατ καὶ πε ἀνὰ μέσ[ον] Ὀμηρικ[ῶς] χων α [ἐ]πιεικῇ συκοφ[αντ] . . .

71 “Having first stated that the Peloponnesian surpassed all previous wars in length and in the occurrence of many disasters, he desires at the close of his proem first to state the causes (*aitiai*) that led to the beginning (*arche*) of the war. These he claims to be two in number – first the true cause, which was not however stated to everybody, to wit, the growth of the Athenian state; the second cause, which was not the real one but was invented by the Lacedaemonians, was the dispatch by the Athenians of an auxiliary force to help the Corcyreans against the Corinthians. He does not, however, start his narrative what he himself believed to be the true cause of the war, but he begins with the other [...]” (transl. Pritchett).

72 “and that although he declares, as the result of his own elaborate examination, the true cause of the war to be this, that it was precaution against the power of the Athenians which induced the Lacedaemonians to make war on them, not really the Corcyrean or Potidaean affairs or the causes generally alleged, nevertheless he does not begin at the point which he has chosen and start with the events which led to the growth of Athens after the Persian war, but reverts to the commonly accepted causes”.

In the first place it must be remarked that it was not his intention, after setting out to write the history of the Peloponnesian War, to introduce by way of a supplement several other wars since the Persian War itself, which may almost be regarded as the origin of the growth of Athens; for that would have laid altogether outside his subject. Secondly it must be remembered that it is the duty of every historian to describe accurately first of all the obvious and commonly alleged causes of events, and if he suspects the existence of any more obscure reason [to add these afterwards ...] [...] in the middle ... with a Homeric fashion ... [...]

The *Pentekontaetia*, although it relates the truest cause of the war, is “altogether outside [Thucydides’] subject” (ἔξω τῆς ὑποθέσεως), meaning that it lies beyond the chronological limits of the historian’s narrative, which is not a history of the Athenian Empire, but which rather focuses on a single war, the one waged by this empire against the Spartan league. It is therefore a complementary narrative to the main one, and an addition (προσθήκη). As a consequence, Thucydides was perfectly right (cf. οὐκ ἔμελλε) to skip over the period without providing a detailed account of the glorious era of mid-century Athens. There may be here a tacit justification of Thucydides’ conciseness, an aspect of the *Pentekontaetia* that Dionysius criticized in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*.⁷³

The second counter-argument focuses on the duty of any historian (cf. πᾶς συγγραφεὺς ὀφείλει) to describe τὰς φανεράς αἰτίας first and move to more obscure reason(s) only afterwards. The authoritative tone of this sentence recalls Dionysius’ no less authoritative statement on the necessity of following a τάξις commended by nature:

Table 5

D.H. <i>Th.</i> 10.11	Comm. <i>Th.</i> 2.1c (<i>P.Oxy.</i> 853)
Ἐχρῆν δὲ αὐτὸν ἀρξάμενον τὰς αἰτίας τοῦ πολέμου ζητεῖν πρῶτον ἀποδοῦναι τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ ἑαυτῷ δοκοῦσαν. ἢ τε γὰρ φύσις ἀπῆτει τὰ πρότερα τῶν ὑστέρων ἄρχειν καὶ ἀληθῆ πρό τῶν ψευδῶν λέγεσθαι, ἢ τε τῆς διηγήσεως εἰσβολὴ κρείττων ἂν ἐγίνετο μακρῶ, τοιαύτης οἰκονομίας τυχοῦσα.	ἔπειτ’ ἐνθυμητόν ὅτι πᾶς συγγραφεὺς ὀφείλει τὰς φανεράς καὶ θρυλ[ο]υμένας αἰτίας τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν πρώτοις ἀκριβῶς ἀφηγεῖσθαι, εἰ δέ τινων ἀφανεστέρων ὑπονοεῖ τοῦτο ἐπι . . . σθαι.
He ought to have stated at the beginning of his enquiry into the true causes of the war the cause which he considered to be the true one: for not only was it a natural requirement that prior events should have precedence over later ones, and true causes be stated before false one ⁷⁴ .	Secondly it must be remembered that it is the duty of every historian to describe accurately first of all the obvious and commonly alleged causes of events, and if he suspects the existence of any more obscure reason [to add these afterwards ...]

⁷³ Cf. D.H. *Pomp.* 3.9.

⁷⁴ Transl. Usher.

Both texts reflect two antinomic visions of historiography. They could be synthesized as follows:

Table 6

	D.H. <i>Th.</i> 10.11	Comm. <i>Th.</i> 2.1c (<i>P.Oxy.</i> 853)
Paradigm	ἡ φύσις	τὸ ὄφειλον (cf. ὀφείλει)
Τάξις	Πρότερον / ὕστερον ἀληθής / ψευδής	Φανερός / ἀφανής Θρυλούμενος / ὅ
Implications	Chronological τάξις Re-transcription of the past The historian narrates facts	Hermeneutical τάξις Elucidation of the past The historian analyses facts

Against a Dionysian *ordo naturalis*, our commentator promotes an *ordo artificialis* where the obvious is placed before the obscure. This τάξις, which is more hermeneutical than chronological, is based upon a retrospective ranking of causes rather than one upon continuity and linearity. The distinction between *ordo naturalis* and *ordo artificialis* is well attested in rhetorical texts.⁷⁵ Our commentator may rely on a tradition which ultimately goes back to Thucydides, that a “rule” initially inferred from Thucydides’ own work is here referred to in order to legitimate *a posteriori* the τάξις of Book 1. It seems obvious, in any case, that our commentator was somehow related to the rhetoricians, who are mentioned by at the beginning of the treatise on Thucydides, and who took the historian as a κανόνα τῆς ἱστορικῆς πραγματείας.⁷⁶

One should also notice that there may be some irony in the commentator’s statement, given that Dionysius explicitly praised Theopompus, in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*, for his ability to show both the obvious and the obscure motives of every action.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ On this, see de Jonge 2008, 253.

⁷⁶ D.H. *Th.* 2.2.

⁷⁷ D.H. *Pomp.* 6.7: τελευταῖον ἐστὶ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ καὶ χαρακτηρισκώτατον, ὃ παρ’ οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγραφέων οὕτως ἀκριβῶς ἐξείργασται καὶ δυνατῶς οὔτε τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οὔτε τῶν νεωτέρων· τί δὲ τοῦτό ἐστι; τὸ καθ’ ἑκάστην πράξιν μὴ μόνον τὰ φανερά τοῖς πολλοῖς ὁρᾶν καὶ λέγειν, ἀλλ’ ἐξετάζειν καὶ τὰς ἀφανεῖς αἰτίας τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν πραξάντων αὐτὰς καὶ τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς, ἃ μὴ ῥάδια τοῖς πολλοῖς εἰδέναι, καὶ πάντα ἐκκαλύπτειν τὰ μυστήρια τῆς τε δοκούσης ἀρετῆς καὶ τῆς ἀγνωσμένης κακίας. (“His final and most characteristic accomplishment is something which no other historian, either before or since, has achieved with comparable exactness or effect. And what is this quality? It is the ability, in the case of every action, not only to see and to state what is obvious to most people, but to examine even the hidden reasons for actions and the motives of their agents, and the feelings in their hearts (which most people do not find it easy to discern), and to reveal all the mysteries of apparent virtue and undetected vice.”, transl. Usher).

I will be brief on the last part of the note, as it is very incomplete. Ἀνὰ μέσον and Ὀμηρικῶς are certainly sound restitutions. These words made Sandys assume that a reference to a rhetorical τάξις called *dispositio Homerica* by Quintilian is being made (*Inst.* 5.12.14):

Quaesitum etiam, potentissima argumenta primo ne ponenda sint loco, ut occupent animos, an summo, ut inde dimittant, an partita primo summo que, ut Homerica dispositione in medio sint infirma et a uicinis crescant. quae, prout ratio causae cuiusque postulabit, ordinabuntur, uno, ut ego censeo, excepto, ne a potentissimis ad leuissima decrescat oratio.

The further question has been raised as to whether the strongest arguments should be placed first, to take possession of the judge's mind, or last, to leave an impression upon it; or whether they should be divided between the commencement and close of the proof, adopting the Homeric disposition of placing the weakest in the centre of the column, so that they may derive strength from their neighbours. But in the disposition of our arguments we must be guided by the interests of the individual case: there is only one exception to this general rule in my opinion, namely, that we should avoid descending from the strongest proofs to the weakest.⁷⁸

Quintilian is here referring to a passage from the *Iliad*, where the poet describes how Agamemnon arranged (τάσσειν) his troops before battle.⁷⁹ However appealing this hypothesis may seem, I would rather like to suggest another possibility. Even if the commentator considers the *Pentekontaetia* as an “addition” (προσθήκη), he also recognizes its crucial importance as being the “truest” cause of the war. Therefore, I am not entirely sure that he would call the growth of the Athenian Empire Thucydides’ “weakest” argument, which an allusion to Quintilian’s *dispositio Homerica* implies. I rather suggest that our commentator is referring to the ἀναστροφή τῆς τάξεως (inversion of the natural order), that is interestingly exemplified by Homer and Thucydides (!) in Theon’s *Progymnasmata* (Theon *Prog.* 86.7–20):

τὴν δὲ ἀναστροφήν τῆς τάξεως πενταχῶς ποιησόμεθα· καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν μέσων ἐστὶν ἀρξάμενον ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀναδραμεῖν, εἴτα ἐπὶ τὰ τελευταῖα καταντῆσαι, ὅπερ ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐα Ὅμηρος πεποίηκεν· ἤρξατο μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων, καθ’ οὓς Ὀδυσσεὺς ἦν παρὰ Καλυπσοῖ, εἴτα ἀνέδραμεν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν μετὰ τινος οἰκονομίας γλαφυρᾶς· ἐποίησε γὰρ τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα τοῖς Φαίασι τὰ καθ’ ἑαυτὸν διηγούμενον· εἴτα συνάψας τὴν λοιπὴν διήγησιν ἔληξεν εἰς τὰ τελευταῖα, μέχρι τοὺς μνηστῆρας ἀπέκτεινεν Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς γονέας αὐτῶν φιλίαν ἐποίησατο. καὶ Θουκυδίδης δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ Ἐπίδαμον ἀρξάμενος ἀνέδραμεν ἐπὶ τὴν Πεντηκονταετίαν, ἔπειτα κατήλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον.

We shall do the inversion of the natural order in five ways. It is possible to begin in the middle and run back to the beginning, then to jump to the end, which Homer did in *Odyssey*. He began with the period when Odysseus was with Calypso, then went back to the beginning in an elegant arrangement; for he had Odysseus narrate each of his own adventures to the Phaeacians; then, after taking up the rest of the narration, he continued to the end at the point where Odysseus killed the suitors and made friends with their relatives. Also, Thucydides, after starting with

⁷⁸ Transl. Butler.

⁷⁹ Hom. *Il.* 4.297–300.

the events about Epidamnus, went back to the fifty years before the war and then took up the Peloponnesian war.⁸⁰

Grossi recently connected Theon's passage to rhetorical traditions praising Thucydides' οἰκονομία (cf. μετά τινος οἰκονομίας γλαφυράς).⁸¹ As it does not imply an attempt to undermine the importance of the *Pentekontaetia* in the historian's narrative, it seems to me more likely that our commentator justified the τάξις of Book 1 by referring to the rhetorical technique of ἀναστροφή τῆς τάξεως, but given the incompleteness of our text here, this point is doomed to remain unverifiable.

3 Conclusion

I hope to have demonstrated that *P.Oxy.* 853 was composed at a crucial time of Thucydides' reception and was dedicated to readers who had a rhetorical interest in the historian's work. This papyrus was based upon an Hellenistic ὑπόμνημα mostly interested in providing γραμματικαὶ ἐξηγήσεις. These grammatical explanations were first meant to help readers to understand Thucydides' (difficult) Attic prose. The rhetorical shift of which our anonymous commentator is an excellent example implies a different point of view. It suggests that he read Thucydides as a rhetorical *exemplum* to imitate. The fact that paraphrases clearly prevail among the notes related to the speeches suggests that *P.Oxy.* 853 was intended to be circulated in the hands of schoolmasters and/or advanced students willing to improve their rhetorical skills. As a matter of fact, according to Marcellinus' *Life of Thucydides*, the study of the historian would start after the study of Demosthenes.⁸² *P.Oxy.* 853 also exhibits an unparalleled rhetorical defense of Thucydides' οἰκονομία against the criticisms of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. As we have seen, the commentator's refutation of his adversary resorts to the rhetorical techniques of ἀντιλογία and reveals an intimate knowledge of Dionysius' treatises on Thucydides but also of the now lost *Περὶ μιμήσεως* (or at least what is left of it in the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius*). Its highly polemical tone makes it a unique testimony of the historian's popularity and exemplarity during the Early Roman Empire. We should then conclude that the commentary preserved in *P.Oxy.* 853, by displaying a shift from grammatical ἐξήγησις to rhetorical μίμησις, acknowledges and exemplifies the "rhetoricisation" of Thucydides' readership during the Roman period.

⁸⁰ Transl. Grossi 2016, 108–109.

⁸¹ Grossi 2016, especially 108–109.

⁸² Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 1.

Appendix 1: List of correspondences between *P.Oxy.* 853 and the Byzantine scholia⁸³

<i>P.Oxy.</i> 853	Byzantine scholia (Hude)
Comm. Th. 2.2.4b γνῶμην δ' ἐπο[ιο]ῦντο κηρύγ- μασίν τε χρῆσθαι ἐπιτηδε[ί]οις; ἔγνωσαν δὲ φιλι- κοῖς κηρύγμασιν χρῆσθαι καὶ εἰς φιλίαν ὑπαγα- γέσθαι·λέγουσι γὰρ ἐπιτηδεῖους τοὺς φί[λ]ους.	Schol. Th. 2.2.4 ἐπιτηδεῖοις; πρὸς φιλίαν (rec).
Comm. Th. 2.4.3 στύρακι ἀκοντίου: τῷ σαυρωτῆρι καλουμένῳ. ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἔσχατον τοῦ δόρατος.	Schol. Th. 2.4.3 στύρακι: στυράκιον ἐστὶν ὁ καλούμενος σαυρωτὴρ τῶν δοράτων ABFc ₂
Comm. Th. 2.4.7 ξυνέβησαν τοῖς Πλαταιεῦσι: συνέθεντο, εἰς συμβάσεις ἦλθον, μεταφορικῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰς ταῦτο βαίν[ει]ν τοὺς ἐν παρατάξει διεστῶτας ἀλλήλων.	Schol. Th. 2.4.7 ξυνέβησαν τοῖς Πλαταιεῦσι: ἀπὸ συνθήματος δηλονότι ABFc ₂ ἀπὸ συνθήκης δηλονότι (rec)
Comm. Th. 2.8.1–2 ἀρχόμενοι γ[ὰρ] πάντες ὁξ- ύτερον ἀντιλαμβάνονται: δῆλον ὡς [οὐ κατα]πεπληγμένοι οὐδὲ κεκακ[ω]μένοι] ὡς μετα- νοῆσαι. ἐπιφέρει γοῦν [ὅτι ἡ] νεότης οὐκ ἀκου- σίως ὑπ[ὸ] ἀπειρίας] ἤπτετο τοῦ πολέμου. “Γλυ- κὺς δὲ πό[λε]μος ἀπείροισιν” ὡς φη[σ]ι Πίνδαρος].	Schol. Th. 2.8.1–2 ἀρχόμενοι γὰρ πάντες κτλ.: ὥστε διὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ὁξύτερον συνέβαινε αὐ- τοὺς ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι ABFGc ₂ Schol. Th. 2.8.1–2 ἀντιλαμβάνονται: περιέχον- ται. παροιμία “γλυκὺς ἀπείρω πόλεμος” ABFGc ₂ ⁸⁴
Comm. Th. 2.11.9a [κ]αὶ μεγίστην δόξαν οἰσόμε- νοι [το]ῖς τε προγόνοις καὶ ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς [ἐ]π’ ἀμφοτέρα ἐκ τῶν ἀποβαινόν[τ]ων: εἰ μὴ προ- σέκειτο τὸ ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρα, ἦν [ἀκοῦ]σ[αι] τὸ μεγί- στην δόξαν ἐπ[ὶ] τῆς εὐδοξίας· νῦν δὲ δε[κ]τέον [ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπ]όληψιν, ὡς τοι[αύτην ὑ]π[ό]ληψιν ἔξοντες καὶ [ὑμεῖς] καὶ οἱ πρόγονοι ἢ χρηστήν [ἢ ἐν]αντίαν ἐκ τῶν ἀποβαινόν[τ]ων ὅποιοι <ἄ>ν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων [ἐ]φ’ ἐκότερον ὀφθῇτε.	Schol. Th. 2.11.9 δόξαν: ὑπόληψιν G Δόξα ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρων, καὶ εὐκλείας καὶ δυσκλείας ABFc ₂
Comm. Th. 2.13.2c [διὰ] χειρὸς ἔχειν: ἐν χερσὶν [ἔχειν, μεταχειρίζεσθαι διὰ τῆς αἰε] δεο]ύσης ἐπιμελείας.	Schol. Th. 2.13.2 διὰ χειρὸς ἔχειν: δι’ ἐπιμελείας, ἵνα μὴ ἀποστῶσι ABFGc ₂

⁸³ The text of *P.Oxy.* 853 is based upon my own reading of the papyrus. For the scholia, I have reproduced Hude’s edition.

⁸⁴ This case is a little peculiar, as the two quotations are different. In the scholia, it is considered to be a proverb and Pindar’s name has disappeared. Given this, we can risk two hypotheses: either (1) the scholion does not rely on the same source as *P.Oxy.* 853 and the parallel is a mere coincidence (see Voltz, 1911, 41); or (2) *P.Oxy.* 853 and the scholia rely on the same ancient source which is better preserved in the former text. As there is about a millennium of time between the papyrus and the scholia, the note may well have gone through so many sequential redraftings that it was already unrecognizable when it reached the Byzantine corpus. I tend to incline in favor of this second hypothesis.

Continued

P.Oxy. 853

Byzantine scholia (Hude)

Comm. Th. 2.13.7b Τοῦ τε γὰρ Φαληρικοῦ τείχους στάδιοι ἦσαν [πέντε] καὶ τριῶντα πρὸς [τὸν κύκλον] τ[οῦ] ἄστεως· ἀντὶ [τ]οῦ [ἔ]ως τοῦ κύ[κ]λου· ἦν [β'] τε[ί]χη τὸ μ[έ]ν Φαλήρου τ[ὸ] δὲ το[ῦ] Π[ε]ιραιαιέως· ἀπαριθμ[ε]ῖται δὲ [το]σοῦ[το]ν τὸ διάστημα [ἀ]πὸ τοῦ Φαλήρου [κ]οινοῦ ἄχρι τοῦ κύκλου τοῦ ἄστεως, [κ]ύκλον δὲ λέγει τὸν περὶ βόλον τοῦ ἄστ[ε]ως, [κ]αὶ πάλιν ὅποσον ἦν ἐκ Π[ε]ιραιαιέως ἄχρι τοῦ κύκλου.

Schol. Th. 2.13.7 πρὸς τὸν κύκλον: ἔως τοῦ κύκλου ABFGMc₂

Comm. Th. 2.15.5a [τὰ πλεῖστου ἄξια] ἐχρῶντο[ο]: εἰς τὰ [πλεῖστ]ο[υ] ἄξια.

Schol. Th. 2.15.5 τὰ πλεῖστου ἄξια ἐχρῶντο: λείπει ἢ εἰς, ἢ, εἰς τὰ πλεῖστου ἄξια ABFGMc₂

Comm. Th. 2.16.1a [τῇ τε οὖν ἐπὶ πολὺ κατὰ τὴν χώραν] αὐτόνομον οἰκῆσαι: μετὰ τοῦ μετεῖχον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, διὰ τὴν κατὰ [τὴν χώραν αὐτόνομον οἰκῆσιν ἀντὶ <τοῦ> τῆς κατὰ τὴν χώραν αὐτόνομον οἰκῆσεως. Εἴρηται δὲ ὑπερβαῖν, τὸ γὰρ ἐξῆς ἐπὶ πολὺ μετεῖχον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.

Schol. Th. 2.16.1 τῇ τε οὖν ... οἰκῆσαι: ἐπανάληψις ABFGMc₂
πτῶσις ἀντὶ πτώσεως, ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆς τε οὖν κατὰ τὴν χώραν αὐτόνομον οἰκῆσεως Ma₂
ἀναλαμβάνει δὲ τὸν λόγον G ἀντίπτωσις G ἐπανάληψις, ἀντίπτωσις ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆς τε οὖν (rec)

Comm. Th. 2.18.5a Τὸν Ἀρχίδαμον ἐν τῇ καθέδρᾳ εἶχεν: α [μέ]λειν καὶ [..... κ]αθῆσθαι ἀργῶς [.....]

Schol. Th. 2.18.5 ἐν τῇ καθέδρᾳ: τῇ ἀργίᾳ τῆς πολιορκίας δηλονότι (rec)

Comm. Th. 2.20.3b εἰ ἐπεξίσαιεν: ἀντὶ [τ]οῦ εἰ ἐπεξ[ε]λεύσονται, τὸν ἐνεστώτα ἀντὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐν[ίσ]τοι· οἱ Ἀττικοὶ τιθέασιν ...

Schol. Th. 2.20.3 εἰ ἐπεξίσαιεν: εἰ ἐπεξελεύσονται οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς πόλεμον (rec)

Comm. Th. 2.21.3a κατὰ ξυστάσει[ς] τε γιγνόμενοι: συνιστάμενοι, συστρεφόμενοι κατὰ μέρη.

Schol. Th. 2.21.3 κατὰ ξυστάσεις τε γιγνόμενοι: οἷον κατὰ συστήματα καὶ πλήθη ABFGMc₂

Comm. Th. 2.22.2a ἐν Φρυγίαις: τόπος δήμου Ἀθμονέω[ν].

Schol. Th. 2.22.2a ἐν Φρυγίαις: τόπος τῆς Ἀττικῆς ABFGMc₂

Comm. Th. 2.22.2b τέλει ἐνὶ τῶν ἵππεων: τάγματι, ν[ῦν] μὲν δόρπον ἔλασθε κατὰ στρατ[ὸν] ἐν τελέεσσι.

Schol. Th. 2.22.2 τέλει ἐνὶ: τάγματι ἐνὶ ABFM

Comm. Th. 2.22.3 Φαρσάλιοι Πειράσιοι: ἀπ[ὸ] Πηρείας, τὰς ἐν Πηρείᾳ θρέψ' ἀργυρότοξος. ἀμαρτάνουσι δὲ οἱ γράφοντες Παράσιοι· ἔστιν γὰρ τῆς Ἀρκ[α]δίας.

Schol. Th. 2.22.3 Παράσιοι: Παρράσιοι Ἀρκάδες, Παράσιοι Θεσσαλοὶ ABFGMc₂

Comm. Th. 2.35.2c [ὃ] τε ἀπειρός ἐστιν ἃ καὶ πλεονάζεσθαι διὰ φθόνον εἴ τι ὑπέρ] τὴν αὐ[τοῦ] φύσιν ἀκούοι: οἱ ἀγν[ο]οῦντες [.....]
..... νομίσαιαν ἂν ἔνια πλεονάζεσθαι] εἴ

Schol. Th. 2.35.2 ἔστιν ἃ καὶ πλεονάζεσθαι: ἀπὸ κοινοῦ τὸ νομίσαιεν ABFGc₂

Continued

P.Oxy. 853

Byzantine scholia (Hude)

τινα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀκούοιεν· μόνο]ν γὰρ τὸ [. . . .
 καὶ ὁ ἔ]καστος [αὐτὸς
 ἱκανὸς εἶναι δρᾶσαι] ἡγεῖται.

Comm. Th. 2.37.1b μέτε[σ]τι δὲ κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους πρὸς τὰ ἴδια διάφορα πᾶσι τὸ ἴσον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίωσιν ὡς ἕκαστος ἔν τῳ εὐδοκίμει οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πλέο[ν]: διάφορα νυν τὰ διαφέροντα· μ[ε]τέχουσι δὲ πάντες κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους ἐν τοῖς ἰδίῳις συμβολαί[οι]ς ἰσηγορίας, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίαν ὡς ἐν τινι ἕκ[α]στος λαμπρὸς νομίζεται ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς, οὐ κατὰ τὸ μέρος τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἴσον αὐτῷ τῆς π[ο]λιτείας πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τ[ι]μᾶται ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀρετῇ[ν] ἢ ἐκ τῶν [ἀ]ρετῶν οἱ[.] . κ[.]]ε . [.]νταξιν [.] ἕκαστος [.] τῶν νόμων [.]ι ἀρετῇ [.]ς.

Comm. Th. 2.37.2a [ἐλευθέρως δὲ τὰ τε πρὸς] τὸ κοινὸν [πολιτεύομεν καὶ ἐς τὴν] πρὸς [ἀλλήλους τῶν] καθ' [ἡμέ]ραν ἐπιτη[δεύμάτων ὑπο]ψίαν [οὐ δ]ι' ὀργῆς [τὸν πέλας εἰ καθ' ἡ]δονή[ν] δρᾷ τι ἔχον[τες: ἐλευθέρως]ς φησὶν πολ[ι]τευόμεθα [ἐν τε τοῖς κοι]νοῖς καὶ π[ρὸς] ἀλλή[λους] ἐν τοῖς κ]αθ' ἡμέραν ἐπιτη[δεύμασιν οὐ]χ ὑποπτεύ[σ]οντες τὸ[ν πέλ]ας οὐδ' ὀργ[ιζόμενοι εἰ πρὸς ἡδ]ονήν τι δρᾷ.

Comm. Th. 2.37.3b τῶν τε α[ἰ]εὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντων ἀκροάσαι: τῷ κατ[α]κούειν κα[ἰ] πείθεσθαι τοῖς ἀρχου[σι]ν.

Comm. Th. 2.38.1a καὶ θυσίαις [διε]τησίαις: οἶον δι' ὅλου τοῦ ἔτους.

Comm. Th. 2.39.1a τήν τε γὰρ [πό]λιν κοινήν παρέχονεν: ἀκ[ροβο]λίζει Λακεδαιμονίους.

Schol. Th. 2.37.1 τὰ ἴδια διάφορα: τὰ διαφέροντα τοῖς ἰδιώταις ABFGc₂

Schol. Th. 2.37.1 ἔν τῳ: ἐν τινι ABFGec₂

[Schol. Th. 2.37.1 οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους: τοῦτο λέγει διὰ τοὺς Ἡρακλείδας βασιλεῖς τῶν Λακωνῶν, οἵτινες ἀπὸ μέρους ἤρχον διὰ μόνην τὴν εὐγένειαν, κἂν μὴ εἶχον ἀρετὴν ABFGc₂]

Schol. Th. 2.37.2 ἐλευθέρως δὲ ...: ὡσανεὶ ἔλεγεν, οὐκ ἐσμέν ἀλλήλοις ὑποπτοι ABFG οὐκ ἐσμέν ἀλλήλοις ὑποπτοι (rec)

Schol. Th. 2.37.3 τῶν τε αἰεὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντων ἀκροάσαι: τῶν ἀρχόντων ABFGc₂

Schol. Th. 2.38.1 καὶ διετησίαις: δι' ὅλου τοῦ ἔτους θύουσιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καθ' ἐκάστην πλὴν μιᾶς ἡμέρας ABFGc₂

Schol. Th. 2.39.1 τῶν ἐναντίων: τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ABFGc₂

Schol. Th. 2.39.1 ξενηλασίαις: ὥσπερ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ABFGc₂

Schol. Th. 2.39.1 καὶ ἀπάταις: πάλιν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, οἵτινες ἀπάτη τὸ πλεόν καὶ γοητεία γνώμης ἐκράτουν ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ABFGc₂

Schol. Th. 2.39.1 εὐθύς νέοι ὄντες: καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους. ἐκείνοι γὰρ ἀπὸ μικρᾶς ἡλικίας εἰς τὰ πολέμια ἡγυρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύς ὡς ἐτίκτετο τὸ παιδίον, ἐν ἀσπίδι ἐτίθεσαν αὐτὸ

Continued

P.Oxy. 853**Byzantine scholia (Hude)**

καὶ δόρυ πλησίον, καὶ ἐβόων ἢ τὰν ἢ π'ὶ τὰν, τουτέστιν, ἢ ταῦτα σώσον, ἢ μετ' αὐτῶν ἀναιρέθητι. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ οὕτως ἐπιπόνως ἤσκουν, ὡς μηδὲ λουτρῶν ἀνέχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἄρκεισθαι τῷ Εὐρώτῃ ποταμῷ πρὸς τὸ λούσασθαι. ἀμέλει καὶ διαμαστιγώσεις ἐγίνοντο κατὰ τινα καιρόν, ἐν αἷς οἱ πλείονας ἐνεγκόντες ἀνδρείότεροι ἐνομίζοντο ABFGc₂

Comm. Th. 2.39.4 καίτοι εἰ ῥᾶθυμιά μᾶλλον ἢ πόνων μελέτη [καὶ] μὴ μετὰ νόμων τὸ πλεόν ἢ τρόπων ἀνδρείας ἐθέλομεν κινδυνεύειν περιγίνεται ἡμῖν τοῖς τε μ[έλλο]υσιν ἀλγεινοῖς μὴ προκάμν[ειν] καὶ ἐς αὐτὰ ἐλθοῦσιν μὴ ἀτολμ[οτέρ]ους τῶν αἰεὶ μοχθούτων φαίν[εσθαι]: καίτοι εἰ ἐν ἀνέσει μᾶλλον [καὶ ῥ]αστώνῃ ζῶμεν μὴ κακ[οπα]θοῦντες τῇ ἀσκήσει μὴ δ' ὑπὸ νόμων ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἔμφυτο[ν] ἀνδρείαν ὑπο[φέρ]οντες τοὺς κινδύνους, [περ]ίεστ[ιν] ἡμᾶς πρὸ τῶν δεινῶν [μὴ] ταλαιπωρεῖσθαι καὶ ἐς τοὺς κινδύνους ἀπαντήσαντας μὴ ἀνανδ[ρ]οτ[έ]ρους τῶν αἰεὶ κακοπαθούτων φαίνεσθαι. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἀάκωνες αἰεὶ πονεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων ἠναγκάζοντο, οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι παρὰ τοὺς κινδύνους ἐπονοῦντο.

Schol. Th. 2.39.4 καίτοι εἰ ῥᾶθυμιά ...: πάντα συνάγει τὰ εἰρημένα, καὶ ὥσπερ ἀνάμνησιν αὐτῶν ποιεῖται ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος. αἰνίττεται δὲ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ABFGc₂

A few parallels with the Θ-scholia of Book I are also to be mentioned:

P.Oxy. 853**Byzantine Scholia (Hude)**

Comm. Th. 2.3.3 ἐδόκει οὖν ἐπιχειρητέα εἶναι: τῷ συνήθει σχήματι κέχρηται ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπιχειρητέον.

Schol. Th. 1.118.2 ἐπιχειρητέα: τοῦ συγγραφῶς ἢ λέξις· ἐχρῆν γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἐπιχειρητέον ABFGMc₂

Comm. Th. 2.5.5 [ὑ]ποτ[οπή]σαντες: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑποπτεύσαντες καὶ κ[] τινὲς λέγουσι.

Schol. Th. 1.51.1 ὑποτοπήσαντες: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑποπτεύσαντες· οὕτω γὰρ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀναλύουσι τὴν λέξιν ABFGMc₂

Schol. Th. 1.20.2 ὑποτοπήσαντες: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπονοήσαντες ABFGc₂ ὑπολαβόντες (rec)

Comm. Th. 2.21.1 Θριῶζε: τοπικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς τὸ Θριάσιον πεδῖον, συνήθ[ως]· ἡκολούθει γὰρ ὡς Ὀλυμπιάζε καὶ οἴκαδε Θριῶζε.

Schol. Th. 1.114.2 Θριῶζε (codd.): εἰς τὸ Θριάσιον πεδῖον, ὡς Ἀθήναζε ABFGMc₂

Appendix 2: Comm. Th. 2.1c

Comm. Th. 2.1c [γέγραπ]ται δ' [ἐξῆ]ς ὡς ἔ]καστα ἐγίγνε[το] κατ[ὰ] θέρος καὶ χει[ι]μῶνα:

Διονύσιος [ὁ] Ἀλικαρνασσεὺς ἐν τῷ περὶ Θουκυδίδ[ου] συντάγματι περὶ οὐ πολλῶν μ[έ]μεται
τὸν Θουκυδίδην, τὰ δ' ἀν[ω]τάτω τρία κεφάλαια διέξεισιν, ὅ[τι] τε οὐκ ἄρχοντας καὶ Ὀλυμ-
πιάδας ὥς οἱ λοιποὶ προτέθεικε τῶν χ[ρό]νων ἄλλ' ἰδίως θέρη καὶ χειμῶνας, καὶ ὅτι διέσπακε
καὶ διή[ρη]κε τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ συγκό[πτει] τὰ πράγματα οὐκ ἀπα[ρ]τίζ[ων] τ[ι]ὰς περὶ ἐκάστων
διηγ[ή]σεις ἀ[λλὰ] ἀπ' ἄλλων ἐπ' ἄλλα τρεπόμενος πρ[ι]ν τελειῶσαι, καὶ ὅτι τὴν ἀληθῆ τοῦ πο-
λέμου αἰτ[ί]αν ἐ<π[ι]ών ὥς σφόδρα αὐτὸς ἐξητακώς, ὅτι δι' εὐλάβειαν τῆς ἰσχύος τῶν Ἀθη-
ναίων ἐπολέμησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, οὐ μὰ Δία διὰ τὰ Κορκυραῖκα ἢ Ποτειδαιστικά καὶ
τὰς παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς λεγομένας αἰτίας, ὅμως οὐκ ἀπὸ τούτων ὧν ἔκρινεν αὐτὸς διηγέται
ἐκ[ε]ῖθεν ἀρξάμενος ἀφ' οἷων πραγμάτων μετὰ τὰ Περσικά ηὐξήθησαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀλλὰ
πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰς κοινὰς αἰτίας τρέπεται. τοιαῦτα μὲν ὁ Διονύσιος εἰκότως δ' ἂν τις πρὸς αὐτὸν προ-
πετῶς οὕτως [μεμφόμενον ἀντεγκαλέ]σε[ι]εν [ὅ]τι τοσο ε
. . . τῶν πραγμάτων σ ν λογισμὸν δς καὶ α νος παρέδωκεν ε
. αν. ἡ γὰρ κατὰ ἄρχοντας διαίρεσις] καὶ κατ' Ὀλυμπιάδας οὕτω ἐγεγόνει] ἐν πλάτει καὶ οὐ
κ[οι]νὸς λογισμὸς ἦ]ν οὐδ' ὥς Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ βύβλῳ α]ὐτοῦ συνεχῶς τ κατὰ τό-
που]ς ποικίλον μον γράφω]ν] οἷον τῇ τοῦ [πολέμου ἀρχῇ]
ἐ[ά]σας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὰ μὲν] Πλατ[ι]αῖκα ἀπὸ [τῶν πρώτων] μέχρι τῶν ὑστάτων [εἴρειν
πάν]τα, εἶτα πάλιν πάσας τὰς [ἐ]σβολὰς τῶν Πελοποννησίων [ἐ]παλλήλους γράφειν, [τὰ] <δε>
Κ[ορ]κυραῖκα ἐφεξῆς διαφέροντ[α] τοῖς χρόνοις. πάντα γὰρ ἂν συν[έ]χεεν ἢ πάλιν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐ-
τοὺς χ[ρό]νους ἀνέτρεχεν ἀπρεπῶς κα[ὶ] ἀλόγως. οὐ γὰρ μία ὑπόθεσις ἦν οὐδὲ ἐν ἐνὶ χρόνῳ ἢ
τόπῳ, ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ πολλαχοῦ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς καιροὺς. καὶ μὴν εἰ καὶ κατὰ ἄρχοντα<ς>
ἔγραφεν, ἀνάγκη πάλιν ἦν διαρεῖν τὰ πράγματα· ἐπ' ἄλλων γὰρ καὶ ἄλλων ταῦτα ἀρχόντων
συνέβαινε· ὅταν δέ τις ἐν κεφαλῷ αὐτὸν γράφῃ, μόνον συνεχῶς εἴρει. ἐαυτῷ οὖν ἐ<ν>αντία
λέγει ὁ Διονύσιος καὶ γὰρ εἰ κατ' ἀρχοντας ἔδει γράφειν ὡς εἴρειν, ὁμοίως ἐχρῆν ἐ<ν>αντία τὰ
πρ[ά]γματα ἀκολουθ[ῶ]ς τοῖς ἀρχουσιν. [ἐ]άν γέ τοι συνεῖρη [τὰ πράγματ]α καὶ [μ]ὴ καλυῶσιν
οἱ χ[ρό]νοι ἐφεξ[ῆ]ς [ὁ Θου]κυδίδης] διηγέ[ι]ται, οἷον τῇ ζ' συν[έ]χως τὰ Σικελικά
διηγέ[ι]ται. οὐδ' εἰ τ ροι κατο ικα κα[τ]οικι
. [εἰς] πολλ[ὰ]ς κεφα[λὰς] μεμερισμένα ἐξ[ε]τάζειν. ὁ δὲ Δ[ι]ονύσιος] ἔξωθεν παραβα
. μεταβάσεις μεταξὺ τῶν [πρασσομέν]ων οὐκ ἐπιτιμᾷ [Ἡροδότ]ω]ν προκειμένην
ί' ν τὰ Αἰγ[υ]πτια καὶ Λυδι[α]κά, π δὲ ο α αση . λ ἀκριβῶς
αχ α . πρὸς δὲ τὸ [τὴν ἀρχή]ν τῆς ἱστορίας μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἀθ[η]ναίων αὐξήσεως
πεποισθαι τὸν [Θ]ουκυδίδην, ἥνπερ φησὶν ἀληθεστέραν αἰτίαν εἶναι τοῦ πολέμου, πρῶτον μὲν
ῥητέον ὥς οὐκ ἔμελλε τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν προθ[έ]μενος συγγράφειν πόλεμον πλείους πολέ-
μους ἀπὸ τῶν Περσικῶν αὐτῶν σχεδὸν ἀφ' ὧν πρώτων ηὐξήθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπεισάγειν ἐν προσ-
θήκης μέρει· ἔξω γὰρ τέλεον τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐγίνετο. ἔπειτ' ἐνθυμητέον ὅτι πᾶς συγγραφεὺς
ὀφείλει τὰς φανεράς καὶ θρυλ[ο]ιμένας αἰτίας τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν πρώτοις ἀκριβῶς ἀρρηγεῖσθαι,
εἰ δὲ τινας ἀφανεστέρων ὑπονοεῖ τοῦτο ἐπὶ σθαι ὁ δ[ὲ]]τοι κατ
. καὶ πε ἀνὰ μέσ[ον] Ὀμηρικ[ῶς]
χων α [ἐ]πιεικῇ συκοφ[αν]τ

ἔπειαν Π⁸ εἰπὼν Wilamowitz | | ¹⁵διάθεσις *vel* διαίρεσις | ¹⁵οὐπὼν ἐγεγόνει Bury | ¹⁵οὐ κ[ι]νοῖς λογι-
σμός ἦ]ν Bury | ¹⁶ἐν τῇ βύβλῳ αὐτοῦ Bury | ¹⁶κατὰ τόπου]ς Bury | ^{17a}[οὐ γὰρ ἦν] ... [διεξελ-
θόν]τα Wilamowitz οἷον τῇ τοῦ [πολέμου ἀρχῇ] ἑ[ά]σας τοὺς Ἀ[θη]ναίους τὰ μὲν] Πλα[τ]αῖκα ...
[εἴ]ρειν π[άν]τα Bury | ²²χρόνους *cum* και *supra* χρo *et* ρ *supra* ν Π⁸ | ²³ταῦτά *manult* Bury |
²⁷ἔφεξ]ῃς Wilamowitz & Bury | ²⁸συν[ε]χῶς Wilamowitz / Bury | ²⁸[τὰ Σικελικά διηγέ]ται Bury
| ²⁹[εἰς] πολλὰς κεφα[λ]ὰς μεμερισμένα ἐξ]ε[τά]ζειν Bury | ³⁰μεταξ[ύ] τῶν [πρ]ασσομέν]ων οὐκ ἐπιτιμᾷ
[Ἡ]ροδότ]ω Bury | ³¹ι' Π⁸ ἰ Hude | ³⁷τας *cum* π *supra* τ Π⁸ | ³⁹ο δ[ὲ] Pulice ο Δ[ιονύσιος]
Grenff / Hunt.

Translation (Grenfell/Hunt, with some modifications)

Comm. Th. 2.1c “all the events have been reported by summers and winters”:

Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his treatise on Thucydides blames Thucydides on a few grounds, and discusses three chief points: that he has not fixed his dates by archons and Olympias, like other historians, but according to a system of his own by summers and winters; that he has disturbed and divided the narrative and breaks up the events, not completing his accounts of the several incidents, but turning from one subject to another before he has finished with it; and that although he declares, as the result of his own elaborate examination, the true cause of the war to be this, that it was precaution against the power of the Athenians which induced the Lacedaemonians to make war on them, not really the Corcyrean or Potidaean affairs or the causes generally alleged, nevertheless he does not begin at the point which he has chosen and start with the events which led to the growth of Athens after the Persian war, but reverts to the commonly accepted causes. Such is Dionysius' view.

In opposition to this rash criticism one might reasonably retort that [...] Indeed, the division by archons and Olympiads had not yet come into common use, and there was not a common system of calculation. Not even Herodotus ... in his book ... continuously ... by geographical areas ... diversified ... writing ... just like [it was impossible]⁸⁵, leaving the Athenians at the beginning of the war, to relate the Plataean affairs from first to last, and then go back to describe all the invasions of the Peloponnesians one after the other, and Corcyrean affairs continuously, differing as they did in date; for he would have thrown everything into confusion, or turned back again to periods which he had treated, in a fashion both unsuitable and unreasonable. For he was not dealing with a single subject or events at one time or one place, but with many subjects in many places and at many periods. Moreover, even if he had dated by archons, he would still have been obliged to divide the events, for these occurred some under one archon, some under another; it is when a person is only writing about a single subject that his narrative is continuous throughout. Hence Dionysius contradicts himself; for even if Thucydides ought to have dated by archons, as he asserts, he would have been equally obliged to divide events according to the archons. If, however, the events are connected and the chronology offers no obstacle, Thucydides' narrative is continuous, as for instance ... in the seventh book where the Sicilian events are related continuously. Not even if ... explain ... divided into many points ... Dionysius ... doesn't blame Herodotus for his digressions in the middle of the events ... the events of Egypt and Lydia ... accurately ...

As for the charge that Thucydides has not made the beginning of his history start with the growth of the Athenians, which he asserts was the truer cause of the war, in the first place it must be remarked that it was not his intention, after setting out to

85 On the textual problems here, see Grenfell/Hunt 1908, 138.

write the history of the Peloponnesian war, to introduce by way of a supplement several other wars since the Persian war itself, which may almost be regarded as the origin of the growth of Athens; for that would have lain altogether outside his subject. Secondly it must be remembered that it is the duty of every historian to describe accurately first of all the obvious and commonly alleged causes of events, and if he suspects the existence of any more obscure reason [to add these afterwards ...] [...] in the middle ... with an Homeric fashion ... [...]

Bibliography

- Alberti, G.B. (ed.) (1972), *Thucydidis Historiae*, Rome.
- Arrighetti, G. (1977), "Hypomnemata e scholia: alcuni problemi", in: *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 2, 49-67.
- Cogan, M. (1981), *The Human Thing: The Speeches and Principles of Thucydides' History*, Chicago.
- Del Fabbro, M. (1979), "Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea", in: *Studia Papyrologica* 18.2, 69-132.
- Douglas, M. (2007), *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition*, New Haven / London.
- Fischer, F. (1913), *Thucydidis reliquiae in papyris et membranis aegyptiacis servatae. Collegit Fridericus Fischer*, Leipzig.
- Gerstinger, H. (1925), "Bruchstücke eines antiken Kommentars zur Archäologie des Thukydides im Papyr. gr. Vindob. 29247", in: *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Denkschriften* 67.2, Vienna / Leipzig.
- Grenfell, B.P. / Hunt, A.S. (eds.) (1908), *The Oxyrhynchus papyri*, London.
- Grossi, V. (2016), "Thucydides and Poetry. Ancient Remarks on the Vocabulary and Structure of Thucydides' History", in: V. Liotsakis / S. Farrington (eds.), *The Art of History. Literary Perspective in Greek and Roman Historiography*, Berlin / Boston, 99–118.
- Iglesias Zoido, J.C. (1995), *La argumentación en los discursos deliberativos de Tucídides y su relación con la normativa retórica del siglo IV a. C.*, Anejos del Anuario de Estudios Filológicos de la Universidad de Extremadura, Cáceres.
- Iodice Di Martino, M.G. (ed.) (2002), *Appendix Vergiliana*, *Classici greci e latini* 137, Milan.
- de Jonge, C. (2008), *Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature*, Leiden.
- Kleinlogel, A. (1965), *Geschichte des Thukydides-textes im Mittelalter*, Berlin.
- Liotsakis, V. (2015), "Texts of Religious Content in Thucydides and the Implied Ancient Reader", in: *RFIC* 143, 278–317.
- Liotsakis, V. (2016), "Narrative Defects in Thucydides and the Development of Ancient Greek Historiography", in V. Liotsakis / S. Farrington (eds.), *The Art of History. Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography*, Berlin / Boston, 73–98.
- Luschnat, O. (1954), "Die Thukydides-scholien. Zu ihrer handschriftlichen Grundlage, Herkunft und Geschichte", in: *Philologus* 98, 14-58.
- Maehler, H. (2007), "Das Thukydides-Hypomnema P.Oxy. 853 und die Scholien", in: J. Frösén / T. Puroila / E. Salmenkivi (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th international congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1–7 August, 2004*, Helsinki, II, 587-593.
- Romilly, J. (1956), *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide*, Paris.
- Schwabe, E. (1881), "Quaestiones de scholiorum Thucydideorum fontibus", in: *Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie* 4, 65-150.

- Stadter, P.A. (1973), *The Speeches in Thucydides: A Collection of Original Studies with a Bibliography*, Chapel Hill.
- Voltz, E. (1911), *Die Thukydidespapyri. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde einer Hohen Philosophischen Fakultät der Kaiser-Wilhelms-Universität zu Strassburg i. E.*, Strasbourg.
- Woerther, F. (2015), *Caecilius de Calè-Actè. Fragments et témoignages*, Paris.