Catalogues in Thucydides and Ephorus
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I

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

---

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

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

3 Steup II p.24, followed by Gomme II p.11, sought to excise this omission by maintaining that Thucydides normally used Λοκροὶ and Λοκρὲς without further qualification to mean only the eastern, i.e. Opuntian and Epicnemidian, Locrians. But in fact it is the context in every case which indicates whether an unqualified Λοκροὶ or Λοκρὲς refers to
doned their earlier alliance with the Athenians (cf. 1.111.1, 112.5, 3.95.1). This first, geographically ordered list is followed by a second list ordered by the sort of military assistance provided—navy, cavalry or infantry. The Anactorians appear in the geographical list in the extra-Peloponnesian division and yet not in the navy division in the second (2.9.2–3, cf. 1.46.1, 2.80.3), whereas the Sicyonians and Pelleneans do appear in the navy division despite the fact that their hoplite contribution (cf. for Sicyon 5.52.2, 58.4, 59.3, 60.3, 7.19.4, 58.3 and for Pellene 5.58.4, 59.3, 60.3) figures as prominently as their naval contribution in the actual account of the war (cf. for Sicyon 2.80.3, 8.3.2 and for Pellene 8.3.2, 106.3). Finally, no mention at all is made of the allies in the West (cf. 2.7.2, 3.86.2).

The Athenian catalogue is even more unsatisfactory. It starts with what appears to be a distinction between free and autonomous allies on the one hand (2.9.4, Χιοί, Δέβιοι, Πλαταιής, Μεσσήνιοι οί ἐν Ναυτάκτῳ, Ἀκαρνάνων οί πλείους, Κερκυραίοι, Ζακύνθοι) and those who paid tribute on the other (2.9.4, καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις αἱ ὑποτελεῖς οὐδείς). Then in this second category a subordinate principle of order by ethnic division is introduced (2.9.4, ἐν ἔθνει τοιοῦτῳ), but this becomes confused with a geographical division somewhat similar to the division evident in the quota lists since 443/2. Gomme commented (II p.11): "here he [sc. Thucydides] confuses apparently two things, the geographical division of the empire into its five divisions, Karia (which included its Dorian neighbours), Ionia, Hellespont, Thrace and the Islands (of which by this time the Karian had been merged with the Ionian), and its ethnic divisions; for Ionia includes the Aioleis of Mytilene and the opposite mainland, the Kyklades were as Ionian as Ionia, and Hellespont and Thrace a mixture of Ionian and Dorian." This first already confused list is followed, as in the Spartan catalogue,
by a second list ordered by the sort of military assistance provided—in this case, navy, infantry and money. The allies who provided ships are named as the Chians, Lesbians and Corcyraeans (2.9.5), but no more names are given and no distinction is made between those who provided infantry and those who provided money. Presumably one is meant to understand those providing money to be identical with the second category in the first list (2.9.4, πόλεις αἱ ὑποτελέσθησαν οὐκαὶ) and to discover those providing infantry by subtracting those now named as providing ships from all the names in the first category in the first list to leave the Plataeans, the Messenians in Naupactus, most of the Acarnanians and the Zacynthians. As in the Spartan catalogue, no mention is made of the allies in the West (3.86.3). Even more serious is the absence of the Thessalians, despite their presence in the very first year of the war (2.22.2-3). And the concern shown to exclude Thera from the alliance (2.9.4, πᾶσαι αἱ Κυκλάδες πλὴν Μήλου καὶ Θήρας) makes all the more strange the later silence about Thera. On all of this see Gomme II p.12.

II

Ephorus’ catalogues, to judge from Diodorus 12.42.4–5, would seem to have been much more satisfactory. In his Spartan catalogue Diodorus makes a straightforward and uncomplicated geographical distinction between Peloponnesian and extra-Peloponnesian allies (12.42.4). The Achaeans and Anactorians are omitted, but account is taken of the Ozolian Locrians and of the later cooperation of the inhabitants of Amphissa with Eurylochus (12.42.4, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων Ἀμφισσεῖς, cf. Thuc. 3.101.2). The Athenian catalogue shows a similarly straightforward geographical order, passing from the Carians, Dorians and Ionians of the Asiatic coast through the Hellespontine
region, the islanders and the Thraceward area to the Messenians at Naupactus and the Corcyraeans (12.42.5).

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

III

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

Certainly a comparison between Thucydides 2.9 and Diodorus 12.42.4-5 enables one to reconstruct the probable form and content of Ephorus' catalogues. But the accepted view of the relationship between the two passages, with Ephorus as the intermediary, is not
the only possible view. One might instead suppose Thucydides 2.9 to be the work of an interpolator who took his material from Ephorus. In this case both Thucydides 2.9 and Diodorus 12.42.4-5 will be dependent upon Ephorus, with the interpolator departing further from the structure and categories of the original than Diodorus, who was content with a close summary. This view has in fact much to recommend it. Thucydides 2.9 is deficient, as we have seen, in both structure and content. Gomme called it (II p.12): “a meagre and beggarly description...” [it] in fact looks like a short note (made at the time)\(^7\) which was never properly worked into the main narrative.” One might add that, as it stands, it constitutes a positive disturbance to the main narrative. Thucydides seems already to have said all that he wants to say about the state of military preparation and alliance on either side in 2.7. Here the themes of \(\text{παρασκευή} \) and \(\text{ξυμμαχία} \) are carefully interwoven: 7.1, \(\text{παρασκευάζουν} \) \(\text{δὲ} \) \(\text{καὶ} \) \(\text{Λακεδαίμονι} \) \(\text{καὶ} \) \(\text{οἱ} \) \(\text{ξύμμαχοι} \)...\(\text{πόλεις} \) \(\text{τὲ} \) \(\text{ξυμμαχίδας} \) \(\text{ποιούμενοι} \) \(\text{όσοι} \) \(\text{έκτο} \) \(\text{τῆς} \) \(\text{ἐστών} \) \(\text{δυνάμεως} \); 7.3, \(\text{Ἀθηναῖοι} \) \(\text{δὲ} \) \(\text{τὴν} \) \(\text{τὲ} \) \(\text{ὑπάρχουσαν} \) \(\text{ξυμμαχίαν} \) \(\text{ἐξήταζον} \) \(\text{καὶ} \) \(\text{ἐς} \) \(\text{τὰ} \) \(\text{περὶ} \) \(\text{Πελοπόννησον} \) \(\text{μᾶλλον} \) \(\text{χωρία} \) \(\text{ἐπρεπεβείνειν} \), \(\text{Κέρκυραν} \) \(\text{kαὶ} \) \(\text{Κεφαλλονίαν} \) \(\text{kαὶ} \) \(\text{Ἀκαρνάνας} \) \(\text{kαὶ} \) \(\text{Ζάκυνθον} \), \(\text{όρωντες} \) \(\text{εἰ} \) \(\text{σφίζε} \) \(\text{φίλία} \) \(\text{ταῦτα} \) \(\text{εἰ} \) \(\text{βεβαιῶς} \), \(\text{πέρι} \) \(\text{τὴν} \) \(\text{Πελοπόννησον} \) \(\text{κατα­}

\(\text{πολεμήσοντες} \). In the following 2.8 Thucydides deals with the attitude of mind (\(\text{γνώμη} \)) on either side and is then ready to proceed. One expects \(\text{παρασκευὴ} \) \(\text{μὲν} \) \(\text{οὖν} \) \(\text{καὶ} \) \(\text{γνώμη} \) \(\text{τοιαύτη} \) \(\text{ἀδριμνῶ} \)...\(\text{ἐκάτεροι} \) (2.9.1) to be immediately followed by \(\text{o} \) \(\text{ὁ} \) \(\text{δὲ} \) \(\text{Λακεδαίμονι} \) \(\text{μετὰ} \) \(\text{τὰ} \) \(\text{ἐν} \) \(\text{Πλαταιαίς} \) \(\text{εὐθὺς} \) \(\text{περιηγεῖσθαι} \) \(\κατὰ \) \(\τὴν \) \(\text{Πελοπόννησον} \) \(\καὶ \) \(\τὴν \) \(\text{ἐξω} \) \(\text{ξυμμαχίδα} \) \(\text{κ.τ.λ.} \) (2.10.1). But instead one has the intrusive reprise \(\text{πόλεις} \) \(\text{δὲ} \)...\(\text{τάδε} \) \(\text{ἐχοντες} \) \(\text{ξυμμάχους} \) \(\text{ἐς} \) \(\tauὸν \) \(\text{πόλεμον} \) \(\text{kαθίσταντο} \)...\(\text{ξυμμαχία} \) \(\text{μὲν} \) \(\text{αὕτη} \) \(\text{ἐκατέρων} \) \(\text{καὶ} \) \(\text{παρασκευὴ} \) \(\text{ἐς} \) \(\tauὸν \) \(\text{πόλεμον} \) \(\text{ἡ} \) (2.9.1-6), as though first the themes of \(\text{παρασκευὴ} \) and \(\text{ξυμμαχία} \) had not been already dealt with in 2.7 and secondly the \(\text{μὲν} \) \(\text{οὖν} \) \(\text{in} \) \(\text{παρασκευὴ} \) \(\text{μὲν} \) \(\text{oὐ\nu} \) (2.9.1) did not indicate an intention to proceed.\(^8\) It is true that the treatment of \(\text{παρασκευὴ} \) and \(\text{ξυμμαχία} \) at 2.9 shows a different approach.

\(\text{But 2.9.2, Πελοπῆς δὲ 'Αχαίων μόνοι εχεπολέμουν τὸ πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δὲ ὄστερον καὶ ἄποντες, would suggest (unless this alone be regarded as an interpolation) that some time had elapsed since 431 before its composition. Classen II p.14 commented: "ohne Zweifel nachdem 417 Λακεδαίμονι τὰ ἐν 'Αχαιᾳ οὐκ ἐπιτρέποντο πρῶτον ἔχοντα καθίσταντο (5.82.1)." Gomme II p.10 would seem to want a date no later than 429 in view of Thuc. 2.83-92, cf. Stahl I.2 p.20.}

\(\text{On the resumptive use of μὲν oὐν see J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles (Oxford 1954) 470–73.}\)
from that of 2.7. The introduction into both the Spartan and the Athenian catalogues of secondary lists ordered by the sort of military assistance provided shows that παρασκευή in 2.9 has the sense of ‘resources’ rather than the more straightforward ‘preparation’ of 2.7. And 2.7 is concerned more with the efforts of both sides to extend their alliances than, as at 2.9, with a description of the existing alliances. But this is as much an argument in favour of interpolation as against it. What may well have happened is that the interpolator took his material on the ἐμμαχία from Ephorus’ catalogues and imposed upon it, somewhat unsuccessfully, his own distinction throughout between sorts of military assistance provided. This enabled him both to fit his extra material from Ephorus on the ἐμμαχία into the context of παρασκευή (2.9.1, παρασκευὴ μὲν οὖν καὶ γνώμη τουστη ἀρμηντο ... ἐκάτεροι) and at the same time to make good what he saw as Thucydides’ deficient account of παρασκευή in 2.7.

There remain jarring repetitions (2.9.4, Ἀκαρνάνων οἱ πλείους, Κέρκυραιοι, Ζακύνθιοι, cf. 2.7.3, Κέρκυραν καὶ Κεφαλληνίαν καὶ Ἀχαρνάνας καὶ Ζάκυνθον), omissions (cf. 2.7.2 with Gomme II p.12) and anomalous inclusions (2.9.4, Κέρκυραιοι bis, cf. 1.44.1). It might be argued that the omission of Cephallenia from 2.9.4 (cf. 2.7.3) presupposes awareness of 2.30.2 and so points to Thucydides’ responsibility for the whole chapter. But Ephorus could have been just as careful about taking into account later passages in Thucydides (cf. Diod. 12.42.4, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων Ἀμφισείων with Thuc. 3.101.2). He clearly had the care of a pedant. More significant is the inclusion of the Corcyraeans in the Athenian ἐμμαχία (2.9.4, bis). Thucydides had earlier been most concerned to point out that the Athenians had made only an ἐπιμαχία and not a ἐμμαχία with the Corcyraeans in 433 (1.41.1). This constituted an important part of his defence of the Athenians in the Schuldfrage of the War. Accordingly, in his account of the beginnings of stasis at Corcyra in 427 he implies, if somewhat ambiguously, that the same ἐπιμαχία was in force (3.70.2, ἐπιπείγοντο Κέρκυραιοι Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν ἐξ ἐνας οὖν κατὰ τὰ ἔνστομα, Πελοποννησίοις δὲ φίλους ὡσπερ καὶ πρότερον; cf. 3.70.6, ἐπιπείγοντο [sc. the oligarchs] τῶν Πειθίαν, ἔως ἐτι βουλής ἔστι, μέλειν τὸ πλῆθος ἀναπείσειν τούς αὐτούς Ἀθηναίοις φίλους τε καὶ ἔθροὺς φυλίζειν). As he himself

---

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

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

10 οἱ γὰρ Κερκυραῖοι ἐπιμαχίαν μόνον ἔχον νῦν δὲ καὶ ξύμμαχίαν ποιεῖ (ap. Bekker 230).
11 For a similar instance at 6.6.2 see my arguments in JHS 92 (1972) 136.
μὲν οἱ ἐντὸς ἱσθαυὸς (2.9.2, see above) one might add the absence of μὲν at 2.9.3, αὐτὴ Λακεδαιμονίων ἔσμμαχία. Here μὲν is omitted by all the MSS except C (Laurentianus) which gives αὐτὴ μὲν Λακεδαιμονίων ἔσμμαχία (see Alberti I p.163). Steup (II p.25) showed that Thucydidean usage requires the μὲν, and most recent editors12 have adopted αὐτὴ μὲν Λακεδαιμονίων ἔσμμαχία as their reading. But the argument from Thucydidean usage cannot be used to explain how μὲν came to be dropped from the majority of the MSS. It explains rather why μὲν was added in the Laurentianus. And its final implication is that Thucydides did not write 2.9. There is a similar difficulty with 2.9.4: νῆσοι ὅσαι ἐντὸς Πελοποννήσου καὶ Κρήτης πρὸς Ἡλιον ἀνίσχοντα πᾶσαι αἱ ἄλλαι, ABEF) Κυκλάδες πλην Μήλου καὶ Θήρας. Editors most frequently read here either ... ἀνίσχοντα, πᾶσαι αἱ Κυκλάδες,13 omitting ἄλλαι with the Laurentianus (C), or πᾶσαι αἱ ἄλλαι [Κυκλάδες].14 In fact neither reading makes sense. The first requires a different referent for “all the islands between Peloponnesse and Crete towards the rising sun” and “all the Cyclades,” whereas clearly both descriptions refer to the same islands;15 the second, and its more radical variant [πᾶσαι αἱ ἄλλαι Κυκλάδες],16 requires Thucydides to have used the awkward description νῆσοι ὅσαι ἐντὸς Πελοποννήσου καὶ Κρήτης πρὸς Ἡλιον ἀνίσχοντα,17 when he could so easily have used the simple phrase αἱ Κυκλάδες νῆσοι, cf. 1.4. One would prefer such clumsy verbosity to belong to an interpolator rather than to Thucydides. Elsewhere in 2.9 such clumsiness is evident at 2.9.4, ἐν έθνει τοσοίτε Καρία κ.τ.λ., where, as Shilleto (194–95) saw, the string of nominatives following the dative represents a remarkably loose construction, and Stahl (I.2 p.21) was right to comment on the variation παρεῖχοντο ... παρεῖχον at 2.9.3: “Licet in talibus promiscue activo et medio verbi παρέχειν Th. utatur ... , tamen molestissima est in tanta vicinia eiusdem verbi variatio et repetitio.”

13 Shilleto 195, Jones-Powell ad loc. This reading is rightly the rarest in modern editions.
14 This deletion, which goes back to Poppo, represents by far the commonest reading in modern editions, cf. Classen II p.15, Marchant 11, Steup II p.25, Luschnat I p.127, de Romilly II p.8, Alberti I p.164.
15 I fail to see how ἐντὸς Πελοποννήσου καὶ Κρήτης πρὸς Ἡλιον ἀνίσχοντα can be understood to include Euboea, as Gomme II p.11 supposes, or Carpathos, Casos etc., as the scholiast maintains.
17 The phrase πρὸς Ἡλιον ἀνίσχοντα does not occur elsewhere in Thucydides.
IV

I would conclude that the catalogues at Thucydides 2.9 were not written by Thucydides himself but by a later interpolator who took his material from Ephorus. In itself this is not very important. But it may be that there are several other such intrusions into the text of Thucydides. Some, e.g. 3.17, have already been recognised, but others, e.g. 2.13.3–9, have so far been only dimly and partially suspected. If 2.13.3–9 can in fact be shown in its entirety to be an interpolation dependent upon artificial calculations done by Ephorus, then this will be of considerable significance for the reconstruction of the social and economic history of fifth-century Athens. My treatment here of 2.9 should thus be seen as a preliminary contribution to the larger problem of 2.13.3–9.
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18 Steup III pp.30–33, 244–49. Various editors, including Gomme II pp.272–77, have persevered against all reason in believing 3.17 to have been written by Thucydides. More recently E. C. Kopff, GRBS 17 (1976) 23–30, has rightly suspected interpolation at Thuc. 7.42.3.

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