

NOT OUR THUCYDIDES? IDENTIFYING THE *STRATEGOS* AT *HISTORY* 1.117

By Robert D. Luginbill

Summary: The Thucydides mentioned at *History* 1.117 as being one of the three *strategoi* in command of the reinforcement sent to reinforce Pericles' siege of Samos in 439 was most likely the author of the history. No other known likely candidates exist, and the objections to considering the historian are based upon flawed conjectural readings of the internal evidence of the *History*.

καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ὕστερον προσεβोधήσαν τεσσαράκοντα μὲν αἱ
μετὰ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Ἄγνωνος καὶ Φορμίωνος νῆες (1.117.2)

Fresh reinforcements afterwards arrived – forty ships from Athens with Thucydides, Hagnon, and Phormio (trans. Crawley).

ἕτερός τις Θουκυδίδης, οὐχὶ ὁ συγγραφεύς (schol. *ad loc.*)

It is a different Thucydides, not the historian.

While the scholiast's judgment about the identification of the first named *strategos* in the group of three above (sent to reinforce Pericles' siege of Samos in 439) has been doubted by some few in the past,¹ it is more than fair to say that most scholars today agree that whoever this Thucydides is, he is not "our Thucydides."² Hornblower's comments capture the current consensus:

- 1 E.g. Schmidt 1879: 197-98 n. 1. The modern consensus to the effect that the scholiast was correct on this point is represented by Gomme 1945: 354; Phillips 1991: 385-95; Hornblower 1991: 191.
- 2 Alternative identifications include Thucydides the poet (*Acherdousios*): Busolt 1897: 442 n. 1; Thucydides *Gargettios*: Kirchner 1901: 473; Gomme 1945: 354; see also Fornara

Unlikely to be the historian, because he insists at V. 26. 5 that he was fully mature at the beginning of the war, perhaps with the implication ‘only just’, i.e., perhaps 30. Had he served as general ten years earlier, this defensive-sounding claim would be less intelligible.³

Hornblower’s analysis is typical of modern scholarship in wisely refusing to rely on ancient speculation that might give some clue as to the historian’s age at the time of the Samos *strategia*, in preference for the internal evidence of the *History*. For while there are dubious reports about the life of Thucydides to be found outside of the comments he himself makes therein, this external material is without exception of questionable reliability. Scholars have generally found unanimity on the point that all such later information about the historian’s life is likely to have been derived from deductions arising from the material in the *History* itself rather than stemming from any independent source.⁴

Notwithstanding the status quo of the scholarship, it seems a fair point to observe that many a casual reader of the *History* has assumed (before looking at notes or commentaries) that the Thucydides here could well be one and the same person as the historian. The main reason for this, of course, is that for those without some depth of exposure to Greek history, “our Thucydides” is likely to be the only one known; before being introduced to other individuals named Thucydides, the name seems unique enough to western ears to invite the identification of “our

1971: 50; Piccirilli 1985: xi ff. The identification of the *strategos* here with Thucydides the son of Melesias is occasionally to be found in earlier scholarship: Thirlwall 1846: v.3, 53 n.1; Croiset 1886: 288; Unger 1886: 158-61; Morris 1891: *in loc.*, but fell out of favor because of the likelihood of his being in exile at the time of the expedition: Gomme 1945: 354. The effort mounted by Krentz 1984: 499-504 to revive this interpretation was effectively refuted by Phillips 1991: 385-95; see also Meyer 1967: 141-54; Carawan 1996: 406 n. 2; thirteen ostraka mentioning Thucydides son of Melesias have been found: Vanderpool 1949: 411.

3 Hornblower 1991: 191.

4 The classic treatment is that of Wilamowitz 1877: 326-67. See also Jacoby 1902: 283; Steup 1919: i-xxv; Luschnat 1970: 1091-95; Piccirilli 1985: xv-xxxiv; Maitland 1996: 539.

Thucydides” with “this Thucydides” of 1.117, absent some instruction to the contrary, and the historian provides no such instruction in the text.

In fact, of course, the name was, as Busolt had remarked, “um diese Zeit in Athen nicht selten.”⁵ *LGPN* lists the name Thucydides as occurring eighteen times in Attica over the course of the fifth and fourth centuries.⁶ And while most of these individuals must be excluded on chronological grounds from being considered as the *strategos* in question, this evidence does show that the name was not particularly unusual in Athens at this time.

But it is an Attic name. The only non-Attic Thucydides occurring in the remainder of the *LGPN* corpus has an explainable Attic connection: an Athenian *proxenos* in Thessaly (known also to us from Thuc. 8.92.8). Having composed his history for future generations (1.22.4), Thucydides was certainly also writing with a Panhellenic audience in mind, not merely an Attic one.⁷ For that reason alone, it seems inexplicable that he would not have seen the potential confusing of himself with this *strategos* in the reception of much of his intended readership, especially given that the name might well seem too unusual to be coincidental for non-Athenians.

This argument is, of course, not decisive proof that the *strategos* of 440/439 was our Thucydides, but it does furnish a reasonable point of departure for the question of whether the historian should be removed from consideration altogether. Would that conclusion really have seemed so obviously wrong to contemporaries outside of Attica so as to warrant no further explanation in the text? Or was there such an obvious alternative candidate by the name of Thucydides that the identification could have been considered automatic? We shall take up these questions in reverse order.

In terms of famous Athenian statesmen named Thucydides, other than the author of the *History*, only Pericles’ old enemy, Thucydides the son of Melesias, qualifies. Outside of these two, no other contemporary

5 Busolt 1897: 442 n. 1.

6 *LGPN* vol. 2 (1994): s.v. Θουκυδίδης; see also Kirchner 1901: vol. 1, 468-73; Fiehn, *RE* 6.A.1 (1936) s.v. Thukydides no. 2, cols. 625-27; Davies 1971: 230-37. See also now Traill 2000: 311-17.

7 Gomme 1945: 89; Hornblower 1991: 4.

Thucydides whose *floruit* admits him to consideration of being the *strategos* of 1.117 is mentioned in any extant historical writing; that fact alone should serve to cast doubt on the assumption of the existence of some other Thucydides famous enough to invite the automatic recognition necessary to obviate the need for any further identification of the person in our passage as a means of avoiding confusion with the historian.⁸

We do, of course, know of other contemporaries named Thucydides from inscriptions, scholia (Ar. *Vesp.* 947; cf. *Ach.* 703), and later sources (Marcellinus, *Vita* 28-30).⁹ In addition to the famous opponent of Pericles, the son of Melesias,¹⁰ Phillips' excellent collection of the evidence produces a list of six possible candidates for our *strategos*,¹¹ of which one is the historian (see below),¹² leaving us with the son of Melesias, the Acherdousian, the Gargettian, an otherwise unknown casualty of war (PA 7263),¹³ and a Pharsalian/Thessalian (for whose potential citizenship Phillips argues).¹⁴ Even if it were possible for this last individual, described by Thucydides as a *proxenos* (8.92.8), to be an Athenian citizen,

8 The other possible known Thucydides (mentioned in *IG I²* 242.112 [now *IG I³* 302.28]; 324.25, 34, 35 [now *IG I³* 369] = *SEG* 10.227) would, in Raubitschek's view (1955: 287 n. 10), have been "of an advanced age" at the time of his assumption of his treasurer-ship in 424, so as to disqualify him for consideration as our *strategos* (though that is not dispositive inasmuch as he could well have been young enough to have held that office fifteen years earlier). Ehrenberg 1945: 119 n. 21 similarly insists that this Thucydides of *Hist.* 1.117 is otherwise unknown.

9 Wilamowitz 1877: 330 n. 7, 349ff. posited that, in addition to sources such as Polemon and Androtion, much of Marcellinus' information stemmed from a later work *περὶ ὁμωνύμων*, and Schöll 1878: 435-36 thought this to be the work of Demetrius of Magnesia. Corradi 2012: 495 follows Raubitschek 1960: 91 in attributing the list to Ammonius.

10 See Davies 1971: 53-54, 230-37.

11 Phillips 1991: 393f. There is also a Thucydides who proposed an amendment to the decree in honor of Herakleides of Klazomenai ca. 423: *IG I³* 227.12 (I am indebted to an anonymous referee for this reference).

12 Phillips 1991: 393; compare Krentz 1984: 499.

13 *IG I³* 1190.4, a grave stele, possibly for those who died in the battle of Cynossema (if so, it would date to ca. 411).

14 Phillips 1991: 392; see Hornblower 1991: 277-78 for reasonable doubts about this thesis, also advanced by Walbank 1978: 385. Phillips thus dubiously conjectures two Thucydides from Gargettos; Raubitschek's conclusion (1955: 287-88) that we are

both he and the Thucydides who fell at Cynossema are documented as active in war and politics in 411, nearly three decades after the Samos campaign, and are for that reason dubious candidates at best for the *strategos* mentioned at 1.117.¹⁵

However we wish to count these individuals named Thucydides, all of them are problematic as the *strategos* of 440/39. For the son of Melesias, we would have to posit an otherwise unknown recall from exile¹⁶ (see n. 2 *supra*); for the Pharsalian, positing either a second Thucydides from Gargettos or a *proxenos* with citizenship are necessary, as well as allowing for an active role nearly thirty years after the Samos campaign, a problem shared with the individual listed as a casualty from the tribe of *Erechtheis* known to us only from the stele; as for the Acherdousian, while it is not a decisive objection, it is still fair to observe that none of the scanty details of his life give us confidence of a political career significant enough to warrant election as a *strategos*: the *tamiai* were elected by lot, not on account of perceived ability or influence,¹⁷ and while being a poet (according to Androtion: Marcellinus, *Vita* 28) is no disqualification for generalship (we think of Sophocles), it is also no particular recommendation; and finally there is the Gargettian Thucydides – of which we know nothing for certain and certainly nothing of significance.¹⁸ As noted, scholars have picked their favorite candidates for Thucydides the *strategos* of 440/39 (see n. 2 *supra*), but the common thread with all such identifications has been a necessary lack of convincing evidence on the one hand and a conclusion arrived at more by a process of elimination than by convincing argumentation on the other. Modern unanimity has

dealing with a doublet is more convincing; cf. Osborne & Byrne 1996: 311: "... whether he was naturalized as an Athenian like his father is unclear."

15 See Clairmont 1983: 51, for examples of *strategos* and other military titles occurring in Athenian polyandria of this sort.

16 Raubitschek 1960: 89 n. 12; and see n. 2 *supra*; see also Wade-Gery 1932: 240-43 for his ostracism, and 258-60 for his return from exile. Gomme 1945: 354 also dismisses the son of Melesias on these grounds. Wilamowitz 1877: 349 distinguishes between the son of Melesias and the *strategos* of 440/39, but see also n. 33. See also Schmidt 1879: 197-98 n. 1.

17 Samons 2000: 38-39.

18 For a strong critique of the dubious conjectures about him (and other potential Gargettians), see Scheidel 1994: 372-78.

been achieved on only one point: he is not “our Thucydides.” In the face of unconvincing alternative candidates, it seems not unreasonable to ask, why not? Though not absolutely uncommon, if the name Thucydides was uncommon enough to defy solution to this problem among those familiar with Attic names and sources, we might give the historian the benefit of the doubt in anticipating this potential problem for his non-Attic readership if he were not speaking of himself – and consider anew the possibility that he was.

The first objection to identifying our Thucydides with the *strategos* is, curiously enough, the lack of any patronymic provided for the *strategos* at 1.117. Despite the fact that the absence of any further identification might easily be taken by a casual reader to mean that this is the historian himself, it is sometimes argued that this is evidence that Thucydides is in fact not referring to himself.¹⁹ One thing is sure, however: if Thucydides had provided a patronymic here we would know for certain to whom he was referring. So why did he not do so?

G.T. Griffith’s highly influential and still widely-cited article on Thucydides’ habits in introducing characters in the *History* deals mainly with the historian’s use of biographical information, but he does treat the issue of patronymics by way of introduction.²⁰ The bottom-line of Griffith’s analysis of Thucydides’ use of patronymics is that while his use or omission of them cannot be predicted with any precision or confidence,²¹ his employment of a patronymic seems to signal something of significance.²²

19 See Hornblower 1991: 191, expressing doubts about the “first mention patronymic argument.” None of the other *strategoí* mentioned, Hagnon, Phormio, Tlepolemos and Anticles, receive a patronymic here (nor any other identifier).

20 Griffith 1961: 21-33.

21 Griffith finds 38 Athenian generals mentioned with patronymics and 16 without them, “excluding book VIII” where he assumes that Thucydides’ editing process was not completed (1961: 21 n. 4). Griffith excludes the Pentekontaetia from his considerations.

22 Griffith 1961: 24. This is the first mention of Hagnon who turns up next during the siege of Potidaea, where he does receive the patronymic “son of Nicias” (2.58; though not, understandably, in the two following mentions in the same paragraph); it is absent later in the same book (2.95); he is again called “son of Nicias” at 4.102.3; but never again (i.e., no patronymic given at 5.11, 5.19, or 6.31). This is the third mention of Phormio who does receive a patronymic, “son of Asopius” on his first appearance

At times, however, that significance is found by Griffith in Thucydides' desire to add some ballast to a description which would otherwise seem bare without the addition.²³ Was the arrival of the Athenian reinforcement something Thucydides would have felt needed to be emphasized? This hardly seems to be the case since Pericles' previous reestablishment of the blockade was merely buttressed by these additional ships. When we add to this the fact that this force is not said to have done anything whatsoever on its own initiative, nor was it the only reinforcement mentioned, it is quite understandable that merely mentioning it and noting its commanders as briefly as possible would have seemed more than sufficient to Thucydides' lights.²⁴ If that is so, then taking the absence of the patronymic to mean that Thucydides is disqualifying himself thereby seems dubious at best.

Finally, it is also highly possible that Thucydides, if he gave any thought to the matter at all, could have assumed that his contemporaries would have had no issues in his identifying himself as the *strategos* mentioned.²⁵ In that case, gratuitously including his patronymic alone among all the other generals mentioned could well have seemed a self-aggrandizing gesture, while listing all the other *strategoï* with patronymics

(1.64.2), but never again. This is the only time Thucydides mentions Tlepolemos and Anticles.

- 23 As in the example of Cleopompus, son of Clinias at 2.26 (Griffith 1961: 22). Griffith 1961: 24 also mentions a category of individuals where the inclusion of the patronymic merely makes it seem that they thus have "a little more right to be there", i.e., in the *History*.
- 24 This spare method of description is not unprecedented: while military titles are sometimes present in the remains of Athenian polyandria, patronymics never are (even though they do appear in other Attic name lists): Clairmont 1983: 52. As Hammond 1973: 387 n. 1 notes, the large number of *strategoï* participating in this campaign is also not unparalleled.
- 25 Griffith 1961: 24 theorizes that Thucydides probably removed many patronymics during the process of editing for similar literary reasons. But Thucydides often does provide patronymics for multiple commanders or officials (e.g. 1.29; 1.45; 1.51; 1.91; 2.2; 2.23; 2.33; 2.58; 2.67; 2.70; 2.71, *et passim*).

would have been ponderous, given the footnote-only nature of the discussion.²⁶ To the extent that the lack of patronymic at 1.117 indicates anything at all, therefore, it suggests that Thucydides is more likely than not speaking about himself (rather than the other way around).²⁷

Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων, ὡς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀρξάμενος εὐθύς καθισταμένου καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολιγώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων (1.1.1).

Thucydides, an Athenian, wrote the history of the war between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians, beginning at the moment that it broke out, and believing that it would be a great war and more worthy of relation than any that had preceded it (transl. Crawley).

αἰεὶ γὰρ ἔγωγε μέμνημαι, καὶ ἀρχομένου τοῦ πολέμου καὶ μέχρι οὗ ἐτελεύτησε, προφερόμενον ὑπὸ πολλῶν ὅτι τρις ἑννέα ἔτη δέοι γενέσθαι αὐτόν. ἐπεβίων δὲ διὰ παντὸς αὐτοῦ αἰσθανόμενός τε τῇ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ προσέχων τὴν γνώμην, ὅπως ἀκριβές τι εἴσομαι (5.26.4-5).

I certainly all along remember from the beginning to the end of the war its being commonly declared that it would last thrice nine years. I lived through the whole of it, being of an age to comprehend events, and giving my attention to them in order to know the exact truth about them (transl. Crawley).

More than the former one, the later passage (in conjunction with the comments by and about Alcibiades regarding his age potentially making

26 Thucydides does include his own patronymic at 4.104, but of course on the one hand this is the beginning of a lengthy and important account, and on the other it amounts to him taking responsibility for the disaster that ensues (rather than being any sort of self-glorification).

27 As Schmidt 1879: 198 n. 1, commented: “weil andernfalls eine unterscheidende Bezeichnung unerlässlich gewesen wäre.”

him unfit to command: 6.12.2; 6.17.1; 6.18.6) is generally adduced as proof that the historian's youthful age at the time of the siege of Samos excludes him from consideration as 'Thucydides the *strategos*' mentioned at 117.2.²⁸ There are really two aspects to this objection: (1) Was our Thucydides too young by any objective measure to have been a *strategos* in 440/439? (2) Do his statements at 1.1.1. and 5.26.5 prove as much?

The first thing to note is that, apart from the internal evidence of the *History*, we do not possess any reliable external information about Thucydides' date of birth. What does exist consists of educated guesses of the sort still being engaged in with at least equal validity by scholars today. Suggested dates for Thucydides' birth center mostly around the early to mid-450s,²⁹ but the basis for the conjectures has to do with fitting together three pieces of information, namely, the two passages quoted above and the fact of his documented *strategia* which took place in 424/3. As Canfora notes, the unlikelihood of Thucydides having been elected *strategos* before the age of 30 makes any birth date later than ca. 455 untenable.³⁰ Davies similarly disputes any possible date after 454.³¹

With this consensus Marcellinus may perhaps agree: "[He is said] to have died with his life brought toward its fiftieth year."³² What cannot be lost sight of, however, is that all such guesses were based on nothing more than an Apollodorus-like estimation of Thucydides' *floruit*.³³ Pamphilia's report that Thucydides was 40 at the commencement of the Peloponnesian War seems a direct enough confirmation of this procedure, since in this case his assumed *floruit* has been deliberately pegged to the

28 Compare the quote from Hornblower with which we began, and cf. Gomme 1945: 354.

29 Luschnat 1970: 1093: "... he was near thirty when the fighting broke out (431)"; Hanson 1996: x.

30 Canfora 2006: 3.

31 He suggests also receding from this date because "Thucydides' language at v.43.2 and vi.12.2 would have been impossible had he himself been elected general at Alkibiades' age (30) or younger" (Davies 1971: 234).

32 Burns 2010: 19. However, if Dodwell's conjecture (1702) in assuming that π was incorrectly read as *pentekonta* at Vita 34.4 is accepted then Marcellinus may also present an older Thucydides; see Piccirilli 1985: 26. For bibliography and assessment of these biographical materials generally see Maitland 1996: 539 n. 13.

33 Diels 1876: 1-54; Morris 1891: 4; Jacoby 1902: 283; Davies 1971: 234; and see especially Mosshammer 1973: 5-13.

beginning of the war rather than to his 424 *strategia*. If this is accepted it would make Thucydides too young for the earlier Samos campaign (twenty-something); but for those assuming an older Thucydides, would age have disqualified him in 424 as being past his prime? If Thucydides were born in the late 470s, he would have been at least forty-something when Amphipolis was lost, and late forties at that.

The safest estimate of the likely earliest age to hold the generalship would seem to be late thirties to early forties, but there may have been exceptions.³⁴ The criticisms of Alcibiades' relative youth (6.12.2; 6.17.1; 6.18.6) were no doubt prompted in no small part by his character and behavior (whereas a less controversial individual might well avoided similar scrutiny).³⁵ The first thing to ask in Thucydides' case then is why he might possibly have been chosen for this position if the "older Thucydides" hypothesis is correct. A possible answer may perhaps be found in the special competency Thucydides possessed in regard to Thrace and Thracian affairs on account of his family history and connections (4.104; 4.105.1),³⁶ a not unprecedented consideration in elections of Athenian *strategoí*.³⁷

I certainly all along remember from the beginning to the end of the war its being commonly declared that it would last thrice nine years. I lived through the whole of it, being of an age (*helikia*) to comprehend

34 For evidence for minimum ages for Athenian officials, see Kennel 2013: 14. What the official minimum age was for election to *strategos* was, is not known (Hornblower 2008: 50); Rhodes 1993: 510 suggests thirty.

35 Romilly 1963: 202 quotes a fragment of Eupolis indicating a general disenchantment with the younger leaders who followed Pericles. There is also a difference between appointing a youngish general to top command of a celebrated expedition on which so much depended in the case of Alcibiades and the (no doubt felt to be at the time of appointment) relatively less critical command in Thrace.

36 Canfora 2006: 11-12.

37 See Fornara 1971: 79-80; Hamel 1998: 15. Hornblower argues that the appointment of Thucydides and Eucles for this command points to the practice already being in place. See also Badian 1992: 242 n. 18.

events, and giving my attention to them in order to know the exact truth about them (5.26.4-5; transl. Crawley).³⁸

Wilamowitz's assessment of this statement in regard to the claim about his age is doubtless correct, namely, that by these words Thucydides claims a "sufficient age to comprehend" from its very beginning, being "am Anfang nicht zu jung, am Ende nicht zu alt."³⁹ So while some have found this remark to be defensive on Thucydides' part for fear that he might have been thought by some too young,⁴⁰ the defensiveness could cut both ways:

"I have not lived so long, Lacedaemonians, without having had the experience of many wars, and I see those among you of the same age (*helikia*) as myself, who will not fall into the common misfortune of longing for war from inexperience or from a belief in its advantage and its safety" (1.80.1; transl. Crawley).

Since Archidamus had been ruling some four decades by the time he made this statement, we can be sure that in Thucydidean usage *helikia* can refer to old age as well as youth, and that therefore its appearance at 5.26.5 does not rule out a late forty-something or early fifty-something Thucydides at the time of his 424 *strategia*.⁴¹ Moreover, in the previous paragraph, 5.26.4, Thucydides stresses that at time of writing (when seventy-something, positing an older Thucydides), he still "remembered" what had happened. Any defensiveness in these comments should thus be seen as directed towards potential objections about him being too old at the end at least just as much as too young at the beginning. Thucydides' combining of *aisthanomai* with *helikia* strengthens that impression:

38 For Canfora's claim that this was written not by Thucydides but by Xenophon *in persona Thucydidis*, see Bearzot 2017: 147; Lattimore 1984: 267 n.

39 Wilamowitz 1877: 327.

40 Finley 1947: viii; Andrewes 1970: 12-13; in his third volume (Hornblower 2008: 50) he is more circumspect than he had been in the first (Hornblower 1991: 191).

41 Pericles' use of the word at 2.36.3 and 2.44.3-4 likewise refers to maturity rather than youth.

not only did he have sufficient maturity of judgment at the war's commencement; he was also sufficiently in his prime throughout, not having lost his mental abilities because of age.⁴² Rather than ruling out the possibility of an earlier *strategia* because of being too young, therefore, the internal evidence can be read at least equally the other way.⁴³

Based on the discussion above, it seems reasonable to conclude that the case for the general mentioned at 1.117 being our Thucydides is at least as good as any brief for the other two known possibilities (the *Acherdousios* and the *Gargettios*) or some otherwise unknown Thucydides. In the funeral oration, Pericles famously censures the human tendency to be skeptical about the heroic deeds of others which are felt to be beyond one's own abilities (2.35.2). Similar skepticism about Thucydides may perhaps be partially to blame for the reluctance to credit him with the 439 *strategia* as well (two generalships and the composition of the *History* seeming a bit too much to accept). What we do not have, however, is sufficient evidence, internal or external, to deny him the earlier *strategia* in spite of skepticism, however intense. That being the case, it is more likely than not that Thucydides was referring to himself, precisely since he gives no indication that he was not doing so – exactly as first-time readers have been likely to assume, both then and now.⁴⁴

42 Compare Pericles' use of the word to express his own mental prowess in forecasting the Athenian indignation at 2.60.1; Gylippus's use of the word at 7.66.1 regarding lack of this critical ability; and Pericles' equating of insufficiency of this quality with a "failure of *gnome*" at 1.33.3. Huart's treatment (1968: 171-73) demonstrates sufficiently the word's association with mature intelligence in the *History*.

43 As Morris 1891: 3 rightly concluded, Thucydides was insisting on his maturity in these passages, not his youth.

44 If he were indeed Phormio's colleague in 439, it might also help to explain Thucydides being so well informed about Phormio's actions in the war. Also, the unusually detailed description of the Samian Revolt (by the standards of the Pentekontaetia) may perhaps be a trace of Thucydides' personal involvement in that event (I owe this observation to one of the anonymous referees and would like to express my gratitude for the many helpful suggestions and additional references provided).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Badian, E. 1992. *From Plataea to Potidaea*. Baltimore.
- Bearzot, C. 2017. 'Mantineia, Decelea, and the Interwar Years (421-413 BCE)' in R.K. Ballot et al. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*. Oxford, 145-60.
- Burns, T. 2010. 'Marcellinus' Life of Thucydides, Translated, with an Introductory Essay' *Interpretation* 38, 3-26.
- Busolt, G. 1897. *Griechische Geschichte. III. Die Pentakontaetia*. Gotha.
- Canfora, L. 2006. 'Biographical Obscurities and Problems of Composition' in A. Rengakos & A. Tsakmakis (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden, 3-31.
- Carawan, E. 1996. 'The Trials of Thucydides 'the Demagogue' in the Anonymous *Life of Thucydides the Historian*' *Historia* 45, 405-22.
- Clairmont, C.W. 1983. *Patrios Nomos: Public Burial in Athens during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* Oxford.
- Corradi, M. 2012. 'Thucydides Adoxos and Praxiphanes' in A. Martano et al. (eds.) *Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea: Text, Translation, and Discussion*. New Brunswick, 495-523.
- Croiset, A. 1886. *Thucydide*. Paris.
- Davies, J.K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families: 600-300 B.C.* Oxford.
- Diels, H. 1876. 'Chronologische Untersuchungen über Apollodors Chronika' *RhM* 31, 1-54.
- Dodwell, H. 1702. *Annales Thucydidei et Xenophontei*. Oxford.
- Ehrenberg, V. 1945. 'Pericles and His Colleagues between 441 and 429 B.C.' *AJPh* 66, 113-34.
- Finley, J. 1947. *Thucydides*. Cambridge.
- Fornara, C.W. 1971. *The Athenian Board of Generals*. Wiesbaden.
- Gomme, A.W. 1945. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. I. Oxford.
- Gomme, A.W., A. Andrewes & K.J. Dover 1970. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. IV. Oxford.
- Griffith, G.T. 1961. 'Some Habits of Thucydides when Introducing Persons' *PCPhS* 7, 21-33.
- Hamel, D. 1998. *Athenian Generals*. Leiden.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1973. *Studies in Greek History*. Oxford.

- Hanson, V.D. 1996. 'Introduction' in R.B. Strassler, *The Landmark Thucydides*. New York, ix-xxiii.
- Harris, E.M. 1999. 'IG I³ 227 and the So-Called Peace of Epilykos' *ZPE* 126, 123-28.
- Herman, G. 1990. 'Patterns of Name Diffusion within the Greek World and Beyond' *CQ* 40, 349-63.
- Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. I. Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. 1996. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. II. Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. 2000. 'Personal Names and the Study of the Ancient Greek Historians' in S. Hornblower & E. Matthews (eds.) *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*. London, 129-43.
- Hornblower, S. 2008. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. III. Oxford.
- Huart, P. 1968. *Le vocabulaire de l'analyse psychologique dans l'oeuvre de Thucydide*. Paris.
- Jacoby, F. 1902. *Apollodors Chronik: Eine Sammlung der Fragmente*. Berlin.
- Kennel, N. 2013. 'Age-class Societies in Ancient Greece?' *AncSoc* 43, 1-73.
- Kirchner, J.E. 1901. *Prosopographia Attica*. Berlin.
- Krentz, P.M. 1984. 'The Ostracism of Thoukydides, Son of Melesias' *Historia* 33, 499-504.
- Lattimore, S. 1998. *Thucydides*. Indianapolis.
- Luschnat, O. 1970. 'Thucydides' *RE Suppl.* XII, 1085-1354.
- Maitland, J. 1996. 'Marcellinus' *Life of Thucydides: Criticism and Criteria in the Biographical Tradition* *CQ* 46.2, 538-58.
- Meyer, H.D. 1967. 'Thukydidēs Melesiou und die oligarchische Opposition gegen Perikles' *Historia* 16, 141-54.
- Mosshammer, A.A. 1973. 'The Apollodoran *Akmai* of Hellanicus and Herodotus' *GRBS* 14, 5-13.
- Morris, C.D. 1891. *Commentary on Thucydides Book 1*. Boston.
- Osborne, M.J. & S.G. Byrne 1994. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Vol. II: *Attica*. Oxford.
- Osborne, M.J. 1996. *The Foreign Residents of Athens*. Leuven.
- Phillips, J.P. 1991. 'Men Named Thoukydides and the General of 440/39 B.C.' *Historia* 40, 385-95.
- Piccirilli, L. 1985. *Storie dello storico Tucidide*. Genoa.
- Raubitschek, A.E. 1955. 'Menon, Son of Menekleides' *Hesperia* 24, 286-89.

- Raubitschek, A.E. 1960. 'Theopompos on Thucydides the Son of Melesias' *Phoenix* 14, 81-95.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1993. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
- Romilly, J. de 1963. *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism*, transl. P. Thody. Oxford.
- Samons, L.J. II. 2000. *Empire of the Owl: Athenian Imperial Finance*. Stuttgart.
- Scheidel, W. 1994. 'Thukydidēs Pantainou Gargettios: Gegner des Perikles. Geschichte eines Phantoms' *Historia* 43, 327-78.
- Schmidt, W.A. 1879. *Das perikleische Zeitalter: II. Darstellungen und Forschungen*. Jena.
- Schöll, R. 1878. 'Zur Thukydidēs-Biographie' *Hermes* 13, 433-51.
- Thirlwall, C. 1846. *A History of Greece*, Vol. 3. London.
- Traill, J.S. 2000. *Persons of Ancient Athens*, Vol. 9. Toronto.
- Unger, G.F. 1886. 'Die Nachrichten über Thukydidēs' *Jahrb.f.class.Ph.* 133, 97-111, 145-73.
- Vanderpool, E. 1949. 'Some Ostraka from the Athenian Agora' *Hesperia* Suppl. 8, 394-412, 493-96.
- Wade-Gery, H.T. 1932. 'Thucydides the Son of Melesias' *JHS* 52, 205-27.
- Walbank, M. 1978. *Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century B.C.* Toronto.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von 1877. 'Der Thukydidēslegende' *Hermes* 12, 326-67.