

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)

PART I

Issues of genre and historical method

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)

CHAPTER I

In the shadow of Thucydides

W. J. McCoy

The Athenian Thucydides has cast such a giant shadow over the domain of Klio that he cannot be ignored. Indeed so magisterial is his *History of the Peloponnesian War* that comparison with other historians is inevitable. It matters not whether the latter preceded him or followed in his wake; nor is their familiarity with the nature and methods of his work necessarily taken into account. In simple terms Thucydides has become a barometer by which to gauge the writing of history both past and present.¹

Born the son of Oloros of the deme Halimous in c. 454 BC,² Thucydides lived during the most significant and exciting period in the history of ancient Athens, for among other things he was able to witness first hand the consolidation of the Athenian Empire, the emergence of radical democracy, the cultural effervescence of the “Golden Age of Pericles,” and the grueling civil war between Athens and Sparta. The total effect of these developments must have been overwhelming on any contemporary, especially one of Thucydides’ intelligence and

¹ For a concise yet informative discussion of Thucydides, his work and his times, see W. R. Connor, “Thucydides,” in T. J. Luce, (ed.), *Ancient Writers*, vol. 1 (New York, 1982), pp. 267–289, and P. A. Brunt, “Introduction to Thucydides,” rev., in *Studies in Greek History and Thought* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 137–180; for an in-depth presentation, see O. Lushnat, s.v. “Thukydides,” *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. 12 (Stuttgart, 1970), cols. 1085–1354 (= *Thukydides der Historiker* [Stuttgart, 1970]).

² 4.104.4. I have used the Oxford Classical Text of Thucydides throughout: H. S. Jones (ed.), *Thucydides Historiae*, rev. J. E. Powell (2 vols., Oxford, 1942). For a brief yet informative prosopographical sketch, see J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 233–237.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)

4

W. J. MCCOY

station.³ Given his education at the hands of sophists, he was probably all the more alert to the rapidly changing world around him and became determined to be a principal player in perpetuating the issue of events. We are quite uninformed about the details of his personal life and public career save for what he himself tells us,⁴ namely that he was an aspiring author (as early as 431, if not before),⁵ that he contracted and survived the plague in 429,⁶ and that he was a member of the *strategia* in 425/4, during which time he was held responsible for the loss of Amphipolis and was exiled from Athens until 404.⁷ In retrospect, we should be thankful for his misfortune, for had he remained an active public servant on campaign, we might not possess his *History*, which is certainly to be numbered among the most important literary works of the ancient Mediterranean world.

In the pages that follow, it is my intention to focus on three things: (1) what Thucydides tells us about his methods and the composition of his *History*; (2) how Greco-Roman historians and critics evaluated his work; and (3) how modern scholars assess his worth and impact. My purpose is not to be argumentative, but rather to identify a wide range of opinion and interpretation.

WHAT THUCYDIDES HIMSELF SAYS . . .

Thucydides appends two prefaces to his *History* (1.1–23 and 5.26). In the first, he says that he began to write about the war

³ It is almost certain that Thucydides was related to the Philiadaï (see E. Cavaignac, “Miltiade et Thucydide,” *Revue de Philologie*, ser. 3, 3 [1929], 281–285; and more recently Davies) and enjoyed the fruits of family affluence. For one thing, he possessed gold mines in western Thrace (4.105.1; see also Plutarch, *Cimon* 4.1).

⁴ Some scholars (e.g. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, pp. 233–234) are more skeptical than others about the validity of biographical information about Thucydides as found in Plutarch and three ancient *Lives*, in particular that of a certain Marcellinus of the sixth century AD. Marcellinus asserts that Thucydides was a pupil of Anaxagoras and Antiphon, that he was born of a Thracian (Hegesipyle) and married a Thracian, that he fathered a daughter and perhaps a son, and that he was over fifty at the time of his death.

⁵ 1.1.1. ⁶ 2.48.3. ⁷ 4.104.4 and 5.26.5.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)*In the shadow of Thucydides*

5

from its very beginning, believing that it would prove a great war worthy of account.⁸ In the second, he contends that he witnessed the whole war as a mature adult and followed its course with careful attention.⁹ Would that the terminus of his narrative were coincidental with the last years of his life, or at least extended down to 404/3; as it is, the final Book 8 breaks off abruptly in the midst of events in late 411. In short, Thucydides never finished his *History*.¹⁰ It is apparent from the outset, however, that he was not content with describing just a “great war,” for by the second sentence in Book 1 he is referring to this clash of arms as “the greatest disturbance in the history of the Hellenes,”¹¹ an assessment that is re-echoed again and again.¹² Thucydides bases this judgment on his own research into the past, both near and remote. Exactly what sources he consulted is not entirely clear,¹³ although he says it was impossible to recover clear information owing to the lapse of time.¹⁴ Nevertheless, he proceeds with an abbreviated review of ancient times, emphasizing that earlier populations and communities were so hard pressed when it came to waging war, or even defending themselves, that they were incapable of bringing about peace and stability.¹⁵ He deplores their lack of revenue and underscores the debilitating impact of continuing political strife (including tyranny) and the general tendency to abstain from alliances of any sort.¹⁶ On the positive side, he recognizes a progressive trend in the making, particularly on the part of those naval states which accumulated capital and began to rule

⁸ 1.1.1. ⁹ 5.26.5.

¹⁰ Since Thucydides apparently died before finishing his work (perhaps at sea, or so says Marcellinus), scholars postulate an editor, redactor, or literary executor as responsible for the ultimate edition of the *History* and its division into books and chapters. It has also been argued that there were nine or even thirteen books instead of the conventional eight that appear in all extant manuscripts; see R. J. Bonner, “The Book Divisions of Thucydides,” *Classical Philology* 15 (1920), 73–82. Diogenes Laertius (2.57) attributes the publication to Xenophon.

¹¹ 1.1.2. ¹² 1.21.2; 1.23.1; 7.87.5.

¹³ Although Thucydides would have us believe that he consulted a wide range of evidence, he mentions only Homer and Hellanicus by name. See nn. 18–20 below.

¹⁴ 1.1.3 – τὰ ἔτι παλαιότερα σαφῶς μὲν εὔρειν διὰ χρόνου πλῆθος ἀδύνατα ἦν.

¹⁵ 1.12.

¹⁶ 1.15.2.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)

over others.¹⁷ It is here that Thucydides finds the seeds of naval hegemony, which, by way of the Athenian experience, will constitute a central ingredient in his work.

More than once during this superficial (and self-serving) history lesson, Thucydides challenges the reliability of Homer and the poets¹⁸ as well as traditional hearsay stories.¹⁹ He also decries the chroniclers (λογογράφοι) who ξυνέθεσαν ἐπὶ τὸ προσαγωγώτερον τῆ ἀκρόασει ἢ ἀληθέστερον, ὄντα ἀνεξελέγκτα καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ὑπὸ χρόνου αὐτῶν ἀπίστως ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες ἐκνευικηκότα.²⁰ Thucydides will have none of this. He is not about to pen a fable (καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον φανεῖται), or a declamation devised for a moment of listening pleasure (ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν ζύγεται).²¹ Nor will he allow the divine to adulterate his narrative.²² On the contrary, he will focus exclusively on the human element and offer a factual, season-by-season²³ account of the great Peloponnesian War designed to last for all

¹⁷ 1.15.1. Thucydides (1.18.1) applauds the power and stability of the Spartan system of government – καὶ δι' αὐτὸ δυνάμενοι καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσι καθίστασαν, even though the Spartan league was not a true empire.

¹⁸ 1.9.4: ὡς Ὅμηρος τοῦτο δεδήλωκεν εἰ τῶ ἱκανὸς, τεκμηριώσαι; 1.10.3: τῆ Ὅμηρου αὐ ποιήσει εἰ τι χρῆ κανιαυθα πιστεύειν, ἦν εἰκὸς ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον μὲν ποιητὴν ὄντα κοσμήσαι; 1.11.2: καὶ αὐτὰ γε δὴ ταῦτα, ονομαστότατα τῶν πρὶν γενόμενα, δηλοῦται τοῖς ἔργοις ὑποδεέστερα ὄντα τῆς φήμης καὶ τοῦ νῦν περὶ αὐτῶν διὰ τοὺς ποιητὰς λόγου κατεσχηκότος; and 1.21.1: καὶ οὔτε ὡς, ποιηταὶ ὑμῆκασι περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον κοσμούντες μᾶλλον πιστεύων.

¹⁹ 1.20.1: Τὰ μὲν οὖν παλαιὰ τοιαῦτα, ἡῦρον, χαλεπὰ ὄντα παντὶ ἐξῆς τεκμηρίῳ πρτεῦσαι, οἱ γὰρ ἀνθρωποὶ τὰς ἀκοὰς τῶν προγεγενημένων, καὶ ἦν ἐπιχώρια σφίσι νῆ, ὁμοίως ἀβασαθίστως παρ' ἀλλήλων δέχονται. Perhaps Thucydides is chiding Herodotus, among others, for perpetuating such misinformation. C. W. Fornara and L. J. Samons, II (*Athens from Cleisthenes to Pericles* [Berkeley, 1991], p. 6) call this the vanity of Thucydides, who “willingly seized the opportunity to illustrate how uninformed the Athenians were about their own history.” Others argue that Thucydides owed an enormous debt to both Homer and Herodotus: e.g. J. L. Moles, “Truth and Untruth in Herodotus and Thucydides,” in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Austin, TX, 1993), pp. 88–121.

²⁰ 1.21.1. Later in 1.97.2 Thucydides seems almost exasperated at having to include an excursus on the Pentekontaetia.

²¹ 1.22.4.

²² In 5.26.4, Thucydides admits to the reliability of a lone oracle which prophesied that the war would last twenty-seven years. Still N. Marinatos (*Thucydides and Religion* [Königstein/TS, 1981]) contends that Thucydides genuinely accepted the traditional beliefs of Greek religion; see also B. Jordan, “Religion in Thucydides,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 116 (1986), 119–147.

²³ 5.26.1.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)*In the shadow of Thucydides*

7

time (κτημα τε ες αιει).²⁴ With this in mind, he takes special pains to elucidate the nature of his data base: τα δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος ἤξιωσα γράφειν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει, ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβεῖα περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξεληθῶν.²⁵ And yet in the end his censorship became so discriminating that he gave his readers no opportunity to judge controversial evidence for themselves. Instead he judged it for them.²⁶

Thucydides also makes bold to embellish his narrative with speeches, but once again he countermands his apparent passion for objectivity. Indeed by his own admission, he took liberties in presenting what a speaker reputedly said and even how he said it,²⁷ claiming that, χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκριβειαν αὐτῆν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν ἐμοὶ τε ὦν αὐτὸς ἤκουσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοθεν ποθεν ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν.²⁸ This is perhaps the most provocative statement in the entire *History*, for in effect Thucydides is testing the willingness of his readers to accept on his authority the content of these crucial passages.

All in all, the various acknowledgments of purpose and methodology are remarkable revelations, especially for a historian from antiquity. They also set a precedent, whether Thucydides willed it or not, for the future writing of history. It remains to examine how readers and critics past and present hold him accountable.

IN THE OPINION OF THE ANCIENTS . . .

Whereas Thucydides was quick to carp at the deficiencies of his predecessors, his successors as late as the second century AD treated him with much greater respect and at times with

²⁴ 1.22.4. ²⁵ 1.22.2.

²⁶ Thucydides tells of his troubles in dealing with eyewitnesses, 1.22.3: ἐπιπόνως δὲ ἠύρισκτο διότι οἱ παρόντες τοῖς ἔργοις ἐκάστοις οὐ ταῦτά περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔλεγον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκαστέρων τις εὐνοίας ἢ μνήμης ἔχοι – yet he never tires of emphasizing the accuracy of his account: e.g. 1.21.1: ἐκ δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων τεκμηρίων ὁμοῦς τοιαῦτα ἂν τις νομίζων μάλιστα ἀδιήλθον οὐχ ἀμαρτάνοι . . . ἠύρησθαι δὲ ἡγρησάμενος ἐκ τῶν επιφανεστάτων σημείων ὡς παλαιὰ εἶναι ἀποχρώντως; 1.22.4: ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφές σκοπεῖν; and 5.26.5: ἐπεβίων δὲ διὰ παντὸς αὐτοῦ αἰσθανόμενος τε τῇ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ προσέχων τὴν γνώμην ὅπως ἀκριβὲς τι εἴσομαι.

²⁷ 1.22.1. ²⁸ Ibid.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)

8

W. J. MCGOY

considerable awe. Contemporary *Hellenica*-minded historians, such as P (or the Oxyrhynchus historian), Xenophon of Athens (c. 428/7–c. 354 BC) and Theopompus of Chios (c. 378–after 323 BC), deliberately began their narratives where Thucydides left off as if to concede that any rehash of the Peloponnesian War through the fall of 411 was both frivolous and foolhardy;²⁹ P, for one, even took Thucydides as his model and inspiration.³⁰ Ephorus of Cyme (c. 405–330 BC), who wrote a universal history of the Greeks, relied on and borrowed from Thucydides' work,³¹ as did the author (Aristotle?) of the *Athenaion Politeia*³² and the corps of Attidographers from

²⁹ The identity of P is yet unknown. His *Hellenica* deals with the years 411–386; Xenophon's, 411–362; and Theopompus', 411–394.

³⁰ I. A. F. Bruce, *An Historical Commentary on the "Hellenica Oxyrhynchica"* (Cambridge, 1967), especially pp. 3–27, comments: "The nature of P's history . . . gives the impression that his choice of source material has much in common with that expressed by Thucydides (1.22.2–3)."

Re Xenophon's *Hellenica*, cf. V. Gray, *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica* (Baltimore, 1989). Re Theopompus' *Hellenica*, G. S. Shrimpton (*Theopompus the Historian* [London and Buffalo, 1991], pp. 37–39) concludes that there is no way of determining how and if Theopompus followed the "Thucydidean model," but suggests that he "devoted the first book to tying up 'loose ends' from Thucydides" by recapitulating the events of 412–411; W. R. Connor (*Theopompus and Fifth Century Athens* [Washington, DC, 1968], p. 106) is more forceful: "Theopompus' familiarity with Thucydides' history is not likely to be disputed. His own *Hellenica* is a continuation of Thucydides' work, and many parts of the *Philippica* indicate an acquaintance with his predecessor's history. But, Theopompus did not always choose to accept Thucydides' views . . . Indeed, Theopompus' account of fifth-century Athens seems not so much a rejection of Thucydides' as a caricature of him. Thucydides' impartiality becomes Theopompus' anti-Athenian bias; Thucydides' skepticism becomes Theopompus' cynicism. Thucydides' avoidance of the pretentious, the pious, the sentimental becomes Theopompus' insistence on the vanity of human efforts and the depravity of human motives. The lofty reserve and balance of Thucydides often seems missing in Theopompus. Instead one finds the enthusiasm, the virulence, the intense contemporaneity of the political tract."

³¹ The history of Ephorus is best mirrored in the pages of the *Historical Library* of Diodorus of Sicily (fl. to at least 21 BC), who used Ephorus as his principal authority for books 11–16 (which recount the history of the Greeks from 480 to 336/5 BC). G. L. Barber (*The Historian Ephorus* [Cambridge, 1935], p. 113) says that "the close connection between the narratives of Diodorus and Thucydides for the period 433–411 has been accepted as evidence of Ephorus' use of the latter," yet T. S. Brown (*The Greek Historians* [Lexington, MA, 1973], p. 114) is careful to point out that Ephorus (via Diodorus) preserves evidence about the Peloponnesian War that "we should otherwise lack and which Thucydides does not give."

³² J. J. Keany (*The Composition of Aristotle's "Athenaion Politeia"* [Oxford, 1992], p. 4) says, "On one level, he used Herodotus and Thucydides directly. He also used Attidographers who themselves will have drawn their accounts from Herodotus and Thucydides." See also P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian "Athenaion Politeia"* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 15–30.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)*In the shadow of Thucydides*

9

Cleidemus (fl. c. 350 BC) to Philochorus (before 340–after 261/0 BC).³³ Theophrastus of Eresos (c. 370–288/5 BC) praised Thucydides for his rich and ornate diction,³⁴ and the Alexandrians listed him first in their canon of historians.³⁵ Polybius of Megalopolis (c. 200–after 118 BC) seems to have ignored Thucydides in his own *Histories*, but, in the words of one scholar, he “stands for a return to his [Thucydides’] aims and methods.”³⁶ Cicero (106–43 BC) praised him with some ebullience;³⁷ Plutarch of Chaeronea (before AD 50–after 120) deemed his account of the Sicilian expedition (Books 6 and 7) ἀμμήτως,³⁸ and Lucan of Samosata (c. AD 120–after 180) promoted him above all others as the paradigm of what a historian should be.³⁹

³³ L. Pearson (*The Local Historians of Attica* [Philadelphia, 1942], especially pp. 27–48) argues that Thucydides, despite his innovations, was a vital link in the continuum of *Attides* from Hellanicus on; F. Jacoby (*Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* [Oxford, 1949], pp. 95, 103, 138–140, and 165) notes his probable influence on Philochorus, to whom he refers as the “last and greatest Atthidographer.”

³⁴ Cicero, *Orator* 39: “primisque ad his [Herodotus and Thucydides], ut ait Theophrastus, historia commota est, ut aunderet uberius quam superiores et ornatus dicere.” Theophrastus was Aristotle’s successor at the Lyceum and the author of many works, among them a *Περί ἱστορίας* (Diogenes Laertius 5.47).

³⁵ J. E. Sandys (*A History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 1, 3rd ed. [London, 1921], p. 131) provides the following list: Thucydides, Herodotus, Xenophon, Philistus, Theopompus, Ephorus, Anaximenes, Callisthenes, Hellanicus, and Polybius. Cicero (*De Oratore* 2.57) says of Philistus of Syracuse: “otium suum consumpsit in historia scribenda, maximeque Thucydidem est, sicut mihi videtur, imitatus.”

³⁶ F. W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley, 1972), p. 40. Walbank goes on (pp. 41–43) to enumerate the many similarities between the two historians and concludes “that though he [Polybius] did not agree in all things with Thucydides, he regarded him as an ally on the main issue of what history should be about. He had no immediate occasion to refer to him with praise (and in any case did not find praising a very congenial activity); but significantly he nowhere speaks against him, but devotes his polemic to those who regarded historical composition as a rhetorical exercise or as an occasion for emotional indulgence.”

³⁷ Cicero, *De Oratore* 2.56: “Et post illum Thucydides omnes dicendi artificio, mea sententia, facile vicit: qui ita creber est rerum frequentia, ut verborum prope numerum sententiarum numero consequatur, ita porro verbis est aptus et pressus, ut necias, utrum res oratione, an verba sententiis illustrentur.” In *Brutus* 83. 287, however, he stops short of fully endorsing Thucydides’ speeches: “Orationes autem quas interposuit – multae enim sunt – eas ego laudare soleo; imitari neque possim si velim, nec velim fortasse si possum.”

³⁸ Plutarch, *Nicias* 1.1. P. A. Stadter (*A Commentary on Plutarch’s “Pericles”* [Chapel Hill, NC, 1989], p. lx) comments: “Plutarch knew Thucydides’ history well . . . He cites specific passages of Thucydides 23 times in the *Lives* and 30 times in the *Moralia*, not including general references.”

³⁹ Lucian, Πῶς δεῖ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν, especially 41–42.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)

The lone yet signal voice of censure throughout this entire period belongs to the rhetorician Dionysius of Halicarnassus (fl. 30–8 BC), who, in his *Περὶ Θουκυδίδου*, dared to find fault with Thucydides' choice and arrangement of subject material as well as the content and appropriateness of his speeches.⁴⁰ He also took exception to Thucydides' individual style (*ἰδιὸν τινα χαρακτῆρα*), especially in passages that were overworked and superfluous,⁴¹ or marked by a poor choice of words.⁴² If this verdict strikes a dissonant chord in an otherwise harmonious chorus of approval on the part of the ancients,⁴³ the courage of Dionysius to criticize Thucydides would eventually inspire many a modern scholar to follow in his footsteps and be less daunted by the lofty reputation of the man and his work.

MODERN VOICES SPEAK OUT . . .

Modern readers and critics have been less reverent and more controversial in assessing Thucydides' methods and the worth of his narrative. Indeed, scrutiny and debate have identified a variety of “problems” and “questions” ranging from the composition of the *History* and the authenticity of the speeches to such matters as style, the meaning of key words and phrases, the intrusion of set themes, the author's biases and credibility, and the like. Since space does not allow for an in-depth examination of any one of these topics, I will limit myself to a broad summary of recent discussion and debate.

The composition of the “History”

If it was once reasonable to hold that Thucydides conceived of his *History* as a unity or wrote it as a consecutive whole, either

⁴⁰ See, in general, W. K. Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: “On Thucydides”* (Berkeley, 1975).

⁴¹ See *Περὶ Θουκυδίδου* 28. ⁴² See *Περὶ Θουκυδίδου* 24.

⁴³ Although Dionysius was ready to admit that Thucydides was the greatest of historians (2) and possessed admirable narrative powers (55), he chided others for being too gullible in their veneration (e.g. 34). At the same time he admits that his is a lonely and unpopular tack (2).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-49520-2 - History Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts

Edited by Ben Witherington, III

Excerpt

[More information](#)*In the shadow of Thucydides*

11

as a continuing project over many years or a single undertaking at or near the war's end, the overwhelming consensus of modern scholarship has virtually determined that the composition was both piecemeal and subject to random revising and re-editing. Current thought would have us believe that Thucydides not only produced his narrative in distinct sections, but took the liberty of altering the content of the early books in light of his changing thoughts about the war.⁴⁴ Scholars speculate, for example, that the extant manuscript contains too many rough edges: that Books 1–5.24 (the Archidamian or Ten Years War, 431–421) and Books 6 and 7 (the Sicilian Campaign) were composed as separate and self-contained items; that Books 5.25–end and 8 stand, deliberately or otherwise, unpolished and incomplete (particularly Book 8, which breaks off abruptly in the midst of the events of late 411); that digressions such as the abbreviated account of the Pentekontaetia (1.89–117) and the speech-making and policy role of Pericles (Books 1 and 2, *passim*) were inserted after the fact; and that passages such as 2.65 and 5.26 (the so-called second preface) betray obvious signs of forecasting and late adjustment. And yet, despite the many autopsies and revelations, there is no unanimity amid this barrage of second-guessing. Whereas the voices of unitarians in whatever guise have been somewhat muted,⁴⁵ the corps of “separatists,” “analyzers,” and “revisionists” are far from resolving what has long been

⁴⁴ See, e.g., V. Hunter, “The Composition of Thucydides’ History, A New Answer to the Problem,” *Historia* 26 (1977), 269–94; and E. Badian, *From Plataea to Potidaea, Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentekontaetia* (Baltimore and London, 1993), especially “Thucydides and the Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War: A Historian’s Brief,” pp. 125–62 with notes. D. Proctor (*The Experience of Thucydides* [Warminster, 1980], pp. 11–12) cautions against overconfidence in discerning the changing pattern of Thucydides’ thinking: “There are some daunting complexities . . . in attempting to trace the path of Thucydides’ thoughts through these dubieties of early and late, especially as the difficulties are at their most acute in those parts of the History, such as the speeches and one or two passages of sustained reflexion by the historian, which are richest in thought-content.”

⁴⁵ For the extreme view see J. H. Finley, Jr. “The Unity of Thucydides’ History,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* (1940), Suppl. 1, 255–297. Cf. D. Kagan (*The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War* [Ithaca, NY, 1969], pp. viii–ix), and G. E. M. de Ste. Croix (*The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* [London, 1972], pp. 51–52), who accept the work “essentially” as a unity.