INDIRECT TRADITION IN THUCYDIDES

I

At the opening of the Peloponnesian War Perikles encouraged the Athenians with hopes of victory, recounting to them, among other assets, their financial strength, in current income and in reserves of various kinds, including an accumulation of coined money which lay on the Acropolis ready to their use at the time he made his speech. The relevant passage is in the thirteenth chapter of Book II in the accepted book-texts of the author.1 The dramatic date was spring of 431 B.C. just before the Spartan invasion of Attica. Thucydides reports the speech of Perikles in indirect discourse, making his main points in order, and, in three instances, adding explanatory footnotes of his own. The statement about income, and about money on the Acropolis, reads as follows: 2

“And he bade them be of good cheer, since there were coming in six hundred talents by and large of tribute each year from the allies for the State apart from their other revenue, and since there still existed on the Acropolis at that time six thousand talents of coined silver.”

And now the footnote (as it is generally rendered):

“The maximum had been, in fact, ten thousand talents, lacking three hundred, from which expenditures had been made for the Propylaea of the Acropolis and the other buildings and for Poteidaia.”


This present article, in a condensed form and adapted for oral presentation, was given as the presidential address before the American Philological Association at its joint meeting with the Archaeological Institute of America in New York, on December 28, 1953. As it was delivered there and as it has now been written out in publishable form, the manuscript has been studied by both H. T. Wade-Gery and Malcolm F. McGregor, who were joint authors with me of our discussion in The Athenian Tribute Lists. Without wishing to hold either of my collaborators to agreement in details I am happy to say that this publication is made with their approval. I wish particularly to express my thanks to McGregor for many helpful criticisms and to acknowledge my indebtedness to Herbert Bloch for his invaluable assistance on the question of the manuscripts. It has been a source of great pleasure, as well as of profit, that I have been able to consult D. Mervyn Jones of Oxford by correspondence about the manuscripts of Aristophanes.

2 Thuc. II, 13, 3: ἔπει τὸ πολὺ φόρον κατ’ ἐμαυτὸν ἄναν τῶν ἐξαιροτόντων ταλάντων ὁς ἐπὶ τῶν συμμάχων τῇ πόλει ἄνευ τῆς ἄλλης προσόδου, ὑπαρχόντων δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀκρισίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀρχοντικόν ἐπιστήμων ἐξαιροτόνοι ταλάντων (τὰ γὰρ πλείστα τρακοκόσια ἀπὸ δέντα μύρια ἐγένετο, ἀν’ ὅσα ὑπὲρ τὰ προπύλαια τῆς ἄκρισίας καὶ τάλα ὀικοδομήματα καὶ ὑπὲρ Ποτηδαίων ἀπανθλώθη).
This passage from Thucydides exists also, in part, in another version, different from that of the book-texts, which we know from the scholia on the Plutus of Aristophanes. The scholiast's quotation begins too late to report the current income; it commences with the verb ὑπαρχόντων, and gives the amount of the accumulated reserve: 3

"Since there always existed on the Acropolis down to that time six thousand talents of coined silver."

And now the footnote:

"The bulk of them, lacking three hundred, were in fact still there, from which expenditures had been made for the Propylaia of the Acropolis and the other buildings and for Poteidaia."

The sense of the two passages is radically different: the book-texts have a maximum of 9700 talents, from which expenditures had been made for the Propylaia and the other buildings and for Poteidaia that reduced the actual balance on hand in 431 B.C. to 6000 talents; the scholiast's text describes a fairly level bank balance down through the years of 6000 talents in the reserve, of which actually 5700 talents were on hand in the spring of 431 B.C., and from which expenditures had been made for the Propylaia and the other buildings and for Poteidaia.

The antiquity of this scholion and its legitimate place in the manuscript tradition of Aristophanes are beyond question, even though a recent note by Arnold Gomme seems to disparage the value of the quotation from Thucydides by claiming that it was not in the scholion in its original form. 4 The alleged reason for assuming a later date for the quotation ("added by a later reader") is that "it comes at different places in the scholion in different sources." It must be emphasized that the character of the quotation, rather than the date (within limits), determines its value and that in this instance the different chronological strata observable in the scholia on line 1193

3 Schol. Aristophanes, Plutus, 1193: καὶ Θουκιδίδης φησίν ἐν τῇ δεύτερᾳ οὕτως "ὑπαρχόντων δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀκρόπολει αἰεὶ ποτὲ ἀργυρίου ἐπιστήμην ἐξαισιχλίων ταλάντων· τὰ γὰρ πλείστα τριακοσίων ἀποδέοντα περιεγένετο, ἀφ’ ὧν ἐς τὰ προπόλλα τῆς ἀκρόπολεως καὶ τάλα ὀικοδομήματα καὶ ἐς Ποτίδαιαν ἐπανηλῶθη."

are of no importance for the value of the reference to Thucydides. The order of the scholia is here, also, of minimum importance.

Let us examine the relevant manuscripts. The Codex Ravennas, of the tenth century, is the oldest.\(^5\) Rutherford’s description of the scholia which belong on the same page with the quotation from Thucydides is correct, but his edited text is misleading\(^6\) in that it separates τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς from what follows: εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀνέφερον, etc. The correct arrangement may now be followed in the facsimile edition published in Leiden in 1904 by J. van Leeuwen. The scholion in which we are interested begins on p. 14v in the left margin opposite line 1193 of the Plutus: τὸν ὀπισθόδομον ἀεὶ φιλάττων τῆς θεός. Its first business is to explain that “the goddess” meant “Athena.” Actually τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς is a gloss on τῆς θεός, just as in line 1189 τὸν πλοῦτον λέγει is a gloss on ὁ Ζεὺς ὁ σωτὴρ. But using τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς as a lemma the scholion reads as follows: τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς: εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀνέφερον τὰ χρήματα κάνταβα ἐφυλάττοντο καθαῦτα καὶ Θουκυδίδης φησὶ ἐν τῇ β οὕτως ὑπαρχόντων δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀκρόπολει ἀγεῖ ποτὲ ἀργυρίῳ ἐπιστήμῳ ἐξακισχυλῶν ταλάντων τὰ γὰρ πλείστα τὰ ἀποδέοντα περιεγένετο, ἀφ’ ὧν εἰς τὰ προτύπα τῆς ἀκρόπολεως καὶ τάλλα οἰκοδομήματα καὶ εἰς Ποτίδαιαν ἐπανηλώθη —τὸν ὀπισθόδομον: ἐπειδὴ τὰ χρήματα ἐν τῷ ὀπισθόδομῳ ἀπέκεντο· μέρος ἔστι τῆς ἀκρόπολεως ἐνθα ἐστὶ τὸ ταμεῖον ὅπισθε τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ναοῦ.

The Venetus Codex (V) of the eleventh century has the scholia in the same order as the Ravennas.\(^7\) This is now available for study in facsimile in the edition published in London and Boston in 1902 by John Williams White and Thomas W. Allen. Page 21v contains the scholia on line 1193 of the Plutus: τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς δηλονότι εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀνέφερον τὰ χρήματα κάνταβα ἐφυλάττοντο καθαῦτα καὶ Θουκυδίδης φησί ἐν τῇ β οὕτως ὑπαρχόντων δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀκρόπολει ἀγεῖ ποτὲ ἀργυρίῳ ἐπιστήμῳ ἐξακισχυλῶν ταλάντων τὰ γὰρ πλείστα τὰ ἀποδέοντα περιεγένετο, ἀφ’ ὧν εἰς τὰ προτύπα τῆς ἀκρόπολεως καὶ τάλλα οἰκοδομήματα καὶ εἰς Ποτίδαιαν ἐπανηλώθη: ἄλλως ὁπίσω τοῦ νεὸς διπλοῦ τοίχος τῆς καλομείνης Πολιάδος Ἀθηνᾶς ἔχων θύραν, ὅπου ἦν θησαυροφυλάκιον. ἄλλως: ἐπεὶ τὰ χρήματα ἐν τῷ ὀπισθόδομῳ ἀπέκεντο μέρος δὲ τῆς ἀκρόπολεως ὅσι μέλλοντο προϊέναι τοῦ πλοῦτον:

While both the Ravennas and the Venetus have the reference to “the goddess” as Athena, and while both tell the story of the money on the Acropolis, neither has the complete text of the references particularly concerned with the Opisthodemos.\(^8\) Moreover, the scholia which belong with line 1193 are wrongly keyed in the Venetus to the words τὸν Πλοῦτον in line 1192 (the key number being ξθ’), as may be seen in the facsimile. But this is an editorial error on the part of the scribe and has no

---

8 The words ὃς μέλλοντος προϊέναι τοῦ Πλοῦτου have been transposed here from the scholia on line 1195 (cf. Dührner, *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*, p. 613).
bearing on the place of the quotation from Thucydides in the tradition of the ancient scholia.⁹ So far as Thucydides is concerned, both R and V are in agreement, not only in the essential wording of the quotation but also in the prominent place to which the quotation is assigned within the scholia.

An element of confusion appears in the Aldine editio princeps of 1498, for which Musurus used as his main source the Codex Estensis (E) now at Modena.¹⁰ The notes on the Opisthodomos only are credited to line 1193. The gloss-lemma which explains that “the goddess” of line 1193 was Athena and which is followed by the account of the money on the Acropolis—including the quotation from Thucydides—is postponed, even past the scholion on line 1194, so that finally it follows the lemma "Ἰνα ἔχουν προηγή τῷ θεῷ" from line 1195. The proper scholion for this line is τούτο δὲ εἶπεν ὡς μέλλοντος προϊέναι τοῦ Πλούτου, as is made clear in Dübner’s edition. The gloss τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς (with the Thucydidean passage following it) cannot explain τῷ θεῷ, for “the god” obviously was not Athena. In the Codex Laurentianus (Θ) of the fourteenth century, which has the same disposition as the Aldine text, the lemma for τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς has been abbreviated so that it reads merely ἴν’ ἔχουν προηγή, and the connection would be quite unintelligible without the rest of the manuscript tradition. The Ravennas and Venetus codices show how the correction in attribution must be made. The scholion beginning with τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς belongs to τῆς θεοῦ at the end of line 1193 rather than to τῷ θεῷ in the middle of line 1195. This was observed as early as Hemsterhuis,¹¹ and is set right in Dübner’s edition, though Dübner fails to give to the scholion its position as the first of the several scholia on line 1193. The position is guaranteed by the oldest manuscripts (VR), and the vagaries of assignment that appear in Θ and in the Aldine text are important largely as editorial curiosities. They have no value as evidence for a late date of the quotation from Thucydides in the manuscript tradition. Gomme suggests (loc. cit.) that there are manuscripts of the Plutus whose scholia still need examination. There are, in fact, no other known manuscripts so old as the Venetus and the Ravennas, whose authority in the matter of disposition must here be counted as definitive.

One may well question, however, how the scholion quoting Thucydides came to be attached to the gloss τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. It is here that Jones, with whom I have had recent correspondence on this problem, thinks one may find a “later date” for the quotation. He envisages an original commentary which had for line 1193 only the scholia on ὅπως ὅδοιμον and the gloss on τῆς θεοῦ. A scholar using this simple text may

---

⁹ The key-references were not original with the Venetus, but go back to its prototype. Cf. Konrad Zacher, “Die Handschriften und Classen der Aristophanesscholien,” Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, Suppl. XVI, 1888, pp. 518-519.


then have been reminded of the Thucydidean passage, which he copied in at a convenient point. Thus an explanation might be given for the relatively loose organic connection between ἡς Ἄθηνᾶς and the scholion that follows, and at the same time for the use of a mere gloss as the lemma for a rather elaborate (if somewhat remotely related) scholion. But this hypothesis means that the student of Aristophanes who wrote our scholion was antiquarian enough to be reminded of Thucydidès. The whole scholion comes from the age of scholarship, and both its parts (if indeed the idea of a later reader is correct) belong to the corpus of ancient learning that has come down in the pre-Byzantine scholia vetera on Aristophanes. There is no reason to impugn either its validity or its antiquity, and the assumption of a “later reader” has no pejorative connotations. One can speculate also about what cue reminded the reader of Thucydidès, though there is really little profit in so doing. He may, first of all, have remembered generally the wealth of money on the Acropolis and where it was kept (which seems to me most likely), or ἄεὶ φυλάττων may have led him to write κανταίθα ἐφυλάττοντο with its consequent reminder of Thucydidès and hence with the quotation introduced by the words καθα καὶ θεουκιδίδης φησὶ ἐν τῇ β ούτως (this seems to me quite possible), or ἄεὶ φυλάττων may have reminded him of the ἄεἰ ποτε in Thucydidès’s account of the Acropolis moneys (because it is so trivial, this seems to me least likely). The realm of high conjecture has already included, in the discussion of this text, such theses as those of Accame and Adcock that the words ἄεἰ ποτε in Thucydidès (which they believe corrupt) may be only an echo of ἄεἰ in the ἄεἰ φυλάττων of Aristophanes. But this is another matter: such speculation seems to me least profitable of all.

Which version of the text (book-text or scholion) is true to the fact? Can the fact be determined by any other available evidence? Which version is to be attributed to Thucydidès?

I wonder whether some such idea as that expressed here lies behind the cryptic statement made by Rutherford (op. cit., p. 117) that “the quotation from Thucydidès’ text appears to have been copied in by somebody.” The observation as given is quite superficial, as indeed, obviously, is Rutherford’s further remark that “The variations from the textus receptus are interesting.”

On the scholia, see especially Konrad Zacher, “Die Handschriften und Classen der Aristophanesscholien,” Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, Suppl. XVI, 1888, pp. 501-746, and the admirably lucid account by John Williams White in the introduction to his Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes (Boston and London, 1914). The Laurentian Manuscript (Θ) is said to have παρεγένετο instead of παρεγένετο (cf. Dübner, op. cit., p. 613. Dindorf’s edition of 1838, Vol. IV, Part 1, p. 354, even reads παρέγετο). This is not true, but this modern error of transmission will surprise no one who knows the frequency of confusion (and the palaeographic ease of it) between the abbreviations for παρά and πέρι (cf. Zacher, op. cit., p. 518). The Aldine and the Laurentian texts both read ἀπότε κ for ἄει ποτε.

14 Silvio Accame, Riv. di Fil., LXXX, 1952, p. 244.
15 Historia, II, 1953, p. 7, as reported by Gomme.
II

It is axiomatic that our book-texts are usually superior to quotations, and for this reason there have been generations of scholars (including our own) who have not questioned the supposed maximum of almost 10,000 talents. Bury's history of Greece, published in 1904, states categorically (p. 404): "There had been as much as 9700 talents in the treasury, but the expenses of the buildings on the Acropolis and of the war at Potidaea had reduced this to 6000." In spite of the rising doubt that there could ever have been 9700 talents on the Acropolis at any one time, the third edition of Bury's history, published in 1952, leaves this statement unchanged and makes no comment upon it. The new evidence is largely epigraphical, partly papyrological, and has convinced most historians that the figure 10,000 in the book-texts is factually wrong. Beloch's judgment is a fair illustration: he does not believe that the 10,000 talents come from textual corruption, but somewhat paradoxically he concludes "Es bleibt eben nichts übrig, als anzuerkennen, dass die Angabe falsch ist; wer Thukydides für unfehlbar hält, mag sie für interpoliert erklären." He dismisses the scholion with some impatience.10

Busolt is discreetly silent about the whole business of the 10,000 talents. Silvio Accame has twice put forward the suggestion, in 1935 and in 1952, that Thucydides was confused, and that—really—the 9700 talents do not represent the maximum of the treasure on the Acropolis, but the sum of money collected by the hellenotamiai between 448 and 431, that is, from the year when the large public works on the Acropolis were begun.11 The book-text, in his opinion, is nonsense, but he still insists that Thucydides wrote it. He too dismisses the scholiast's version, claiming that the accuracy of the Thucydidean manuscripts cannot be doubted.

On the other hand, the validity of the scholiast's version has been consistently upheld, now for almost fifty years, by Eugène Cavaignac.12 Even before it was possible to use the full evidence of the tribute lists, he realized the impossibility of any grand total of 9700 talents, and for "raisons de fond," as he said, urged that the scholiast's text be accepted as the true text of the historian. He avowed that with the book-texts one's reconstruction of the financial history of Athens before the Peloponnesian War could result only in a monstrosity. He discussed both texts, about 1908, with Maurice Croiset; and Croiset agreed with him that the scholiast's text was perfectly admissible, but he warned that no editor could prefer to the Thucydidean manuscripts a text of a scholiast that was not itself more ancient. "Si ce texte était appuyé par un papyrus, ce serait autre chose." Thus M. Croiset.13

12 Études sur l'histoire financière d'Athènes au Ve siècle, le trésor d'Athènes de 480 à 404 (1908), pp. 107-111. See also the reference in note 19.
It should be made quite clear that there is here no question of “emending” the text of Thucydides, in the sense in which that term is usually understood. Faced with two different ancient versions, we merely seek to decide which version is Thucydidean and which pseudo-Thucydidean. Beloch raised the issue of “method”: 20 “dass es überhaupt ein methodischer Fehler ist, unsere gute Überlieferung des Thukydidestextes aus den Scholi en zu Aristophanes, die von Fehlern wimmeln, zu ‘emendieren,’ — — .” This merely obscures the problem. The establishment of an ancient text is often a laborious process; generally speaking, however, we have no great cause to complain that the book-texts of Thucydides are corrupt. But this does not mean that individual passages derive a halo of sanctity from the over-all excellence of the manuscript tradition. A corrupt passage can occur in a very good manuscript. Conversely, a very good reading can occur in scholia which otherwise abound in error. The case has been succinctly stated by Alphonse Dain, in his book Les Manuscrits (Paris, 1949): “Il n’y a pas de bon manuscrit” (p. 155). Dain means that, when a reading is in question, then that problem is unique and must be considered on its merits quite apart from the excellence of the rest of the manuscript. How “good” a manuscript is may have no bearing on the value of a particular reading. This statement applies to scholia on the Plutus of Aristophanes just as aptly as to the transmitted text of Thucydides. The value of the scholiast’s reading is that it is a direct quotation from Thucydides, not a paraphrase, and that in style and in content it rings true. It has been fashionable to dismiss the quotation as a corruption, as being from a “bad” manuscript of Thucydides, as being “scholiast’s Greek,” and in general as hardly being worth serious consideration. But even its imperfections are such as to insure that the transmission of its text has been reliable: the Ravennas has ἄγει ποτὲ instead of αἰεὶ ποτὲ, revealing the copyist’s attempt to write a form as he thought he saw it, without regard to the sense, and the Venetus has τά instead of τριακοσίων, showing that the copyist had used a manuscript in which appeared the numeral τ’ (＝τριακοσίων, and easily confused with minuscule τά), and which he perpetuated without change, as he saw it, by writing τά. Yet the correct text is in no way in doubt. These scholia in their present manuscript tradition go back to the tenth century (Ravennas) and the eleventh century (Venetus), and so are (within very narrow limits) as early as any existing manuscript of Thucydides.21 In their original form, as we have already observed, they belong to the great body of scholia vetera on Aristophanes, and so give evidence that the alternative version of Thucydides, II, 13, 3, was known and available to the scholarly world in antiquity and that it has an equal claim with the “book-text” to

20 Gr. Gesch., II, 2a, p. 341.
21 F. W. Hall, Companion to Classical Texts (Oxford, 1913), pp. 205, 279-280. The date of the Venetus is here given as by D. Mervyn Jones, Cl. Quart., N.S. II, 1952, p. 168. Actually the Thucydidean text C may be some years older than the R of Aristophanes, but both are now dated in the tenth century.
a place in the Alexandrian library. Some copies of Thucydides in Alexandrian times evidently preserved one version, some the other.

From one of these was derived the archetype of the book-texts, which Bartoletti and Powell attribute to the sixth or fifth century \(^2\) (the earliest extant manuscript [C] is of the tenth century); one of them was copied in part by the scholiast on the Plutus of Aristophanes. To dismiss the scholiast’s version merely as a “corruption” is to condemn the better rather than the worser text.\(^3\)

Let us for a moment consider these texts on their own merits—as texts—and how they shall be translated from Greek into English. Beloch attacked Cavaignac’s rendering of the scholion with great vigor, protesting that it is “sprachlich wie sachlich gleich unhaltbar.” It is not true, says Beloch, that there had always been 6000 talents on the Acropolis, and our grammar teaches us that after τριακοσίων ἀποδέωντα a numeral has been lost (he thinks μύρια) that the scholiast has corrupted into περί.\(^4\)

We do not need to believe that 6000 talents had “always” been on the Acropolis. Always is a long time, and of course it is “sachlich unhaltbar” that there had always been 6000 talents. The question is rather how long a time does αἰεὶ ποτὲ, meaning “always, down to now,” imply. Sophokles makes Antigone say (Antigone, lines 456-457) that the laws of the Gods are eternal: ἄει ποτὲ ζῆν ταῦτα. In the nature of the case we believe that this is true and that αἰεὶ ποτὲ here means a very long time indeed. There is no span so great in any passage of Thucydides; though the long-standing enmity of Ionians and Dorians (VI, 82, 2), of Athenians and tyrants generally (VI, 89, 4), of Athens and Oinidiadai (II, 102, 2), of Athens and Aigina (IV, 57, 4), and the long-standing friendship of Athens and Phokis (III, 95, 1) and of the Corinthian Aristeus for Poteidaia (I, 60, 2) are all characterized by αἰεὶ ποτὲ. Here in the nature of the case, when we think of Aristeus, “always, down to now” can include only part of his adult manhood. Aristeus had no predilection for Poteidaia when Aristeus was a babe in arms. Clearly, αἰεὶ ποτὲ cannot go back longer than the inception of the condition which it describes. As soon as Aristeus began to have political ideas he favored Poteidaia, and continued to do so, αἰεὶ ποτὲ, down to 432. Something similar is true of what Perikles said about the money on the Acropolis. There had come to be about 6000 talents on the Acropolis soon after the transfer of the treasure from Delos. Five thousand of them are attested for the year 450/49 in a papyrus known as

---


\(^3\) See below, pp. 230-231, for illustrative examples of a comparable double tradition in antiquity in the text of Aristotle.

the *Anonymus Argentinensis*, of which more later. Before that date Athenian treasure on the Acropolis was comparatively negligible. We have Thucydides's word for it (epigraphically confirmed by the record of borrowings during the Archidamian War) that there were about 6000 talents on the Acropolis in 431 B.C. Up and down during the intervening years the balance had fluctuated. Income generally matched expenditure, for the text tells us that with the help of this fund the great buildings of the Acropolis had been erected (we know that the Athena Parthenos had also been constructed—at a cost of 847 talents)\textsuperscript{25} and that money had been paid out for Poteidaia. It was a heavy blow when the Samian War and the revolt of Byzantium cost 1400 talents. It was a gain when in 434/3 the Other Gods put their 750 odd talents on the Acropolis. But the fund had in fact been systematically maintained since its inception—as Thucydides says, *αιεὶ ποτὲ*—down to 431, a span of at least 18 years. Lest this seem, even so, too short a time for *αιεὶ ποτὲ*, one should call to mind that in 411 B.C. Hermokrates the Syracusean went with certain Milesians to Sparta to complain about Tissaphernes for not handing over all the pay he had promised. Inasmuch as the promise was first made in 413 B.C. at Sparta (VIII, 5, 5) and had become a concern of Hermokrates only in 412 B.C. (VIII, 29), the personal differences between Hermokrates and Tissaphernes about pay can have had a duration of perhaps one year, or at most two years. Yet Thucydides (VIII, 85, 3) says of them: ἔχθρα δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἣν αὐτῷ *αιεὶ ποτὲ περὶ τοῦ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀποδόσεως* (Hermokrates had always, *αιεὶ ποτὲ*, down to 411, been at enmity with him about the handing over of the pay)\textsuperscript{26}

There are other arguments that have been put forward against the scholiast's text of Thucydides's footnote. How can it be said that the bulk of the 6000 talents still survived, when ἄφ' ἄν modifies τὰ πλείστα and the building expenses (which certainly did not survive) have to be deducted? The answer, I believe, is that τὰ πλείστα, meaning "the greater part," implies its own substantive, namely, the whole of which the greater part was defined, and it was therefore from this continuous reserve that the buildings had been paid for. The cost of the buildings did not much change the reserve because it was constantly being replenished. Perikles indicated to the Athen-

\textsuperscript{25} *A.T.L.*, III, p. 341 note 66 and p. 343 note 84.

\textsuperscript{26} Arnold Gomme (*Historia*, II, 1953, pp. 6-7) has now argued that *αιεὶ ποτὲ* is inappropriate in the scholion in the sense required. To him "it means 'from of old,' 'traditionally,' 'of long standing'"; see particularly iii 95.1, vi 82.2, 89.4. In the dozen instances of its use in Thucydides, it once refers to a short period (viii 85.3), elsewhere always to a long one, and vaguely long, not exact. Here it is required to mean 'for 17 years,' 'since the archonship of Euthynos.' I take issue with him that Perikles must have had in mind here either the name of the archon under whom the league treasure had been voted to Athena or the fact that all this had happened exactly seventeen years ago. And, though Gomme admits that the reference in VIII, 85, 3 is to a short period, he does not bring out—as we have just done—how extraordinarily short the period was, nor the consequence that this one reference makes the conclusions to which he has come in his speculation about *αιεὶ ποτὲ* quite untenable.
ians that the reserve was in an amount great enough to bring success in war. The note of Thucydides called attention to what the reserve had already done for the buildings and for Poteidaia. The grammatical construction may be illustrated by a simple English sentence, which might be illogical (to a grammarian) but which I think is not unintelligible. Let us imagine that we are speaking of soldiers who have fought a battle engagement with heavy casualties. One might say, for example: The great majority, of whom very few survived, perished utterly. Or, it would run in Greek: οἱ γὰρ πλεῖστοι, ὧν Ἐλάχιστοι διεσώθησαν, ἀπώλοντο. If one argues that there are more logical ways of saying this, that ὧν should have an antecedent other than οἱ πλεῖστοι, that the language is “tortuous,” I should agree. I should deny that it is ambiguous; but even if it were ambiguous, or illogical, I should not hold this to be a sufficient reason for rejecting it, were it to be found in a text attributed to Thucydides. Comment on the difficulties of Thucydides’s style is as old as Dionysios of Halikarnassos, and, to put the matter quite bluntly, I doubt that any scholar who has read Thucydides could long maintain that being illogical, or being too brief to be quite clear, or being “tortuous,” is a criterion that tells against his authorship.

Rather less needs to be said about Beloch’s contention that a numeral is needed for τριακοσίων ἀποδέοντα. The numeral, of course, is τὰ πλεῖστα and ἀποδέοντα is a present participle in the neuter plural which modifies it. There is nothing illogical about the grammar of this, for it is about as simple and as straightforward as anything could be. Yet it has been claimed that the sense is illogical. Gomme avers that “the scholiast’s words, τὰ πλεῖστα τριακοσίων ἀποδέοντα, ‘the greater part less 300,’ do not make sense. Logic demands a figure which is short by 300.” Is logic so necessary? If we find that 5700 talents were, in fact, the greater part of 6000, and then write that the greater part (less 300) survived, do we mean that the amount surviving was only 5400? I have no wish to quibble, but even in logic I see no reason for demanding more of the Greek than we demand of its English equivalent. There can be no reasonable doubt what is meant when one has been talking about 6000 talents and then says that the bulk of them, lacking 300, are still on hand. The exception involves a single, not a double, subtraction.

On the other hand, when we turn to the accepted book-texts we find that this passage (II, 13, 3) is not good Thucydidean Greek. The reading τὰ γὰρ πλεῖστα τριακοσίων ἀποδέοντα μῦρια ἐγένετο involves translating τὰ πλεῖστα as “the maximum,” a meaning which it never has in Thucydides. I do not—indeed, could not—deny examples of it in other authors. They exist, for example, in Herodotos, and in Isokrates.

27 Gr. Gesch., II, 2, p. 341. Gomme, in Historia, II, 1953, p. 7, feels the need of a figure. In his commentary I find it curious that he is willing to accept πάντες (if need be) in lieu of a figure, but not τὰ πλεῖστα.

But in Thucydides ἡ πλείονα, or any form of πλείονος with the article, always means “the greater part” of something. Hence the quotation by the scholiast ἡ γὰρ πλείονα τριακοσίων ἀποδέοντα περιεγένετο is good Thucydidean Greek, whereas ἡ γὰρ πλείονα τριακοσίων ἀποδέοντα μύρια ἐγένετο is not. This seems to me fundamental. It is not surprising that this meaning of ἡ πλείονα as “the maximum” passed unchallenged in antiquity after the false reading μύρια had been introduced into the text. The ancients—from Isokrates down—would not have been bothered, in principle, by ἡ γὰρ πλείονα μύρια ἐγένετο, and this obtuseness to the niceties of Thucydidean style was in time the permissive excuse for altering a sound text ἡ γὰρ πλείονα περιεγένετο, which is intelligible in Thucydides, into ἡ γὰρ πλείονα μύρια ἐγένετο, which is not.

It would be strange that modern scholars should have accepted ἡ πλείονα here as “the maximum,” were it not that the consistency of Thucydides’s style with reference to ἡ πλείονα was first documented only so recently as 1950. In The Athenian Tribute Lists, Wade-Gery, McGregor, and I tabulated every appearance of πλείονος with the article, in all genders, numbers, and cases. The striking conclusion is that ἡ πλείονα is always partitive, never superlative, except only here in the book-texts of Π, 13, 3, which on other grounds we know to be historically wrong. Only Reiske, in 1761, seems to have felt the stylistic difficulty of this passage. He felt no historical difficulty, for he had no way of knowing whether the total was ever really as high as 10,000 talents. But he proposed to emend the book-texts to read ἡ γὰρ πάντα (instead of πλείονα). What he should have done, of course, was get rid of μύρια.

Yet in spite of this documentation, and the obvious conclusions that must be drawn from it, Gomme persists in thinking that Thucydides wrote ἡ πλείονα to mean “the maximum.” I set forth below the full evidence: references alone apparently do not carry conviction, and I believe the matter of such importance that the documentation should here form part of the argument. Gomme says that Thucydides seldom needed to speak of “the maximum,” and that for this reason ἡ πλείονα or its equivalent “generally means ‘the greater part.’” The fact is that Thucydides needed to speak of “the maximum” with sufficient frequency to show his habit of speech in so doing—not seldom, but many times—and that ἡ πλείονα or its equivalent always (not just generally) means “the greater part.” When Thucydides wanted to say “maximum,” he omitted the article. This has all been put down in the discussion of this text in the third volume of The Athenian Tribute Lists, but Gomme now writes (in 1953) that “there cannot be this difference between πλείονα with and without the article.” On the contrary, there is this difference, and of course the recognition of it, or the failure to recognize it, is fundamental to the understanding of this text in Thucydides

29 A.T.L., III, pp. 128-129.
and, consequently, to the understanding of the whole history of Athenian finance in the fifth century. Gomme says that “when the article is omitted it is because πλέιόστα is predicate (iii 17.4, vii 70.4) or due to the noun it qualifies (iv 26.4).” No one denies that πλέιόστα appears without the article in predicate position, and indeed Thucydides frequently preferred the predicate to the non-predicate position in order to avoid ambiguity in meaning. Even without the article it does not always mean “maximum” in either position, for the superlative has a quite normal meaning of “very many” and should sometimes be so translated. Gomme refers to IV, 26, 4 as an instance in which a form of πλέιόστος is given without the article “due to the noun it qualifies.” The quotation refers to the loss of spirit suffered by the Athenians at Pylos: ἀθυμίαν τε πλέιόστην ὁ χρόνος παρείχε παρὰ λόγον ἐπεγγυνόμενος: “the unexpectedly long delay in time caused them the greatest discouragement.” The use of πλέιόστην does not here imply a maximum; there is no implication that this was the greatest discouragement the Athenians ever suffered; we may translate in English by saying that the delay caused them the greatest discouragement, but in fact the meaning is simply “very great.” The idea of “maximum” does not arise, because there is no comparison, beyond that which is very nebulously implied, with other unhappy circumstances of similar nature. The examples quoted below will show many instances in which πλέιόστος without the article has some meaning other than “maximum,” but they will also show that all cases of πλέιόστος with the article mean “the greater part.” There are instances in which Thucydides went to some trouble to avoid the article when he wanted to say “maximum,” and this is what we mean by saying that he has a style which would be violated by so translating τὰ πλεῖόστα in II, 13, 3. To support his erroneous thesis, Gomme cites as his clearest instance the two references in IV, 31, 2 and IV, 33, 1 to a body of Spartan troops on Sphakteria. They are described first as οἱ πλεῖόστοι αὐτῶν καὶ Ἐπιτάδας ὁ ἄρχων and second as οἱ δὲ περὶ τῶν Ἐπιτάδαν καὶ ὅπερ ἦν πλεῖόστοι τῶν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ. In commenting on the meanings of πλεῖόστος with and without the article in these two references, Gomme makes the following extraordinary statement: “whether οἱ πλεῖόστοι—πλεῖόστον means here ‘the majority of all the troops in the island’ (as is highly probable) or ‘the largest of the three bodies of troops in the island’ (possible, but less likely), there is no distinction in meaning, but only of grammatical usage, between πλεῖόστοι or πλεῖόστον with and without the article.” Such rendering of the Greek merits the strongest protest. The difference in usage between οἱ πλεῖόστοι and πλεῖόστον exists precisely because there is a difference in meaning. The first reference (with οἱ πλεῖόστοι) means “the greater number of them and Epitadas the commander”; the second reference (with πλεῖόστον) means “those under Epitadas, which were the largest body of troops on the island.” What is language for, except to express such differences as these? Thucydides has been at some pains to get rid of the article in the second reference and has recast this sentence with a relative clause, simply because he wanted to say that this was the largest force of those who were
on the island. That πλείστον falls into predicate position is incidental; but one will see from the examples below that Thucydides frequently used the predicate position when πλείστος without the article was needed.

It is essential to remember that we are dealing here with a matter of literary style. We seek to determine what is characteristic of the way in which Thucydides wrote, not what he could have done had he thought with the mind of Herodotos or of Isokrates. We seek to determine not what was possible only, but what was in keeping with his character: τὸ οἰκεῖον rather than τὸ δυνατόν. Gomme cites, for example, a sentence from Herodotos (VI, 46, 3): προσήμε... ἕτεος ἑκάστου δυνάμεων τάλαντα, ὦτε δὲ τὸ πλείστον προσήμαθε, τριακόσια, and asks how else could Thucydides have expressed himself, had he used the same sentence construction. “We cannot suppose,” says Gomme, “that he could not use this construction.” I am in agreement that Thucydides could have used any construction that may have suited his fancy. He could, indeed, have copied Herodotos had he so wished. But we are not interested in this; we are interested in the style of Thucydides as manifest in the text of his own writings, and here they teach us that he would not have said ὦτε δὲ τὸ πλείστον προσήμαθε. Gomme has asked how else he could have expressed the same idea had he used the same construction. The best evidence is that Thucydides would simply have written ὦτε δὲ πλείστα προσήμαθε. We have quoted elsewhere a sentence in which Isokrates used τοὺς πλείστους to mean “the maximum” (IX, 28): παρακαλέσας ἀνθρώπους, ὦς οἱ τοὺς πλείστους λέγοντες, περὶ πεντήκοντα. Surely here Thucydides would have said ὦς οἱ πλείστους δὴ λέγοντες, just as in II, 97, 3, he said δῆ... πλείστον δὴ ἐποίησε to mean “who established the maximum (tribute).”

But the evidence for Thucydidean style is abundant and should be presented without omissions. The following catalogue contains every instance from Thucydides in which πλείστος in any form is used with or without the article: 34

**The Usage of πλείστος in Thucydides**

1. (I, 1, 2) κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ τοὺς Ἐλλήνων ἐγένετο καὶ μέρις τῶν βαρβάρων, ὥσ ἡ εἰπέν καὶ ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀνθρώπων

As an upheaval, in fact, this was the greatest that had ever come to the Hellenes, and to some part of the barbarians, in a word, even to the farthest reaches of mankind (but cf. N. G. L. Hammond, Cl. Quart., N.S. II, 1952, pp. 129-133)

2. (I, 2, 5) τὴν γοῦν Ἀττικὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἐπὶ πλείστου διὰ τὸ λεπτόγειον ἀστασίαστον οὖσαν ἀνθρώπου ἡμέραν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἱ τε

Accordingly Attica, from the poverty of its soil enjoying from a very remote period freedom from faction, never changed its inhabitants (Crawley)

3. (I, 3, 2) κατὰ ἑκατὸν ἡ ἄλλα τε καὶ τὸ Πελασ-

33 See below, p. 201 (No. 53).
34 All references have been tabulated from von Essen’s *Index Thucydideus* (Berlin, 1887).
γικών ἐπὶ πλείστον ἄφ' ἐαυτών τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν παρέ-χεισθαν

But that according to the several races (and particularly the Pelasgic) it was called most generally by their own names

4. (I, 4) Μίνως γὰρ παλαιάτατος δὲν ἀκόη ἱσμεν ναυτικόν ἐκτύσατο καὶ τῆς νῦν Ἕλληνικῆς βαλάσσης ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐκράτησε

For Minos was the eldest of those whom we know by tradition to have acquired a navy and he established control to the greatest extent over what is now called the Hellenic sea

5. (I, 4) τῶν Κυκλάδων νῆσον Ἰρζέ τε καὶ οἰκιστήρ πρῶτος τῶν πλείστων ἐγένετο

He became ruler of the Cyclades islands and was himself the first colonizer of most of them

6. (I, 5, 1) καὶ προσπέποντες πόλεισιν ἀτειχίστοι καὶ κατὰ κώμας οἰκουμέναι ἱστραζον, καὶ τὸν πλείστον τοῦ βίου ἐντείθην ἐποιεῖντο

They would fall upon towns unprotected by walls and consisting of mere collections of villages, and plunder them, and they made this the main source of their livelihood

7. (I, 8, 1) ὅτευ γὰρ δὴ τὰς πλεῖστας τῶν νῆσων ἄκησαν

For these had colonized most of the islands

8. (I, 9, 4) φαίνεται γὰρ ναναῖ τε πλείστας αὐτῶν ἀφικόμενοι καὶ Ἀρκάτη προσπαρασχόν

For it is evident that he came with the greatest number of ships himself and also supplied the Arcadians with them

9. (I, 12, 4) καὶ Ἰωναὶ μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ νησιωτῶν τῶν πολλοῖς ὄρεσσαν, Ἰταλίας δὲ καὶ Σικελίας τὸ πλείστον Πελοποννήσου τῆς τὴν Ἑλλάδας ἐστιν ἀ χωρία Α

The Athenians colonised Ionia and most of the islands; the Peloponnesians the greater part of Italy and Sicily, and various places in Hellas (Jowett)

10. (I, 17) οἱ γὰρ ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐχύρωσαν δυνάμεως

Those in Sicily, indeed, attained the greatest height of power

11. (I, 18, 1) Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἱ τε Ἀθηναῖων τύραννοι καὶ οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπὶ πολὺ καὶ πρὶν τυραννευθέσας οἱ πλείστοι καὶ τελευταῖοι πλὴν τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ ῥήμας Δακεδαμονίων κατελύθθησαν

Since the tyrants of the Athenians and those of the rest of Hellas (which had to a large extent even earlier been under tyranny), the greater number and the latest, that is, except those in Sicily, had been put down by the Lacedaemonians

12. (I, 18, 1) ἡ γὰρ Δακεδαμίων μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν τῶν νῦν ἐνοικοῦντων αὐτῆς Δωρίων ἐπὶ πλείστον ἄν ἱσμεν χρόνον στασιάσασα ὅμοις ἐκ παλαιάτατοι καὶ ἴσημομὴν καὶ αἰεὶ ἀτυραννευτος ἦν

For Lacedaemon, though it suffered faction after its founding by the Doriwho now inhabit it, for the longest time of any we know, yet at a very early age obtained good laws and was always free of tyranny

13. (I, 23, 3) σεισμῶν τε πέρι, οἱ ἐπὶ πλείστον ἁμα μέρος γῆς καὶ ἵσχυσατοι οἱ αὐτοὶ ἐπέσαν

About earthquakes, which befell over the widest extent to the earth and were at the same time themselves most severe

14. (I, 30, 3) τοῦ τοῦ χρόνου τῶν πλείστων μετὰ τὴν ναυμαχίαν ἐπεκράτησας τῆς βαλάσσης καὶ τοῦ τῶν Κορινθίων ἐμμάχους ἐπιπλέοντες ἐφθειρόμενοι, μέχρι ὁδ' — — — —

For most of the period after the battle they remained masters of the sea, and sailed against and ravaged the allies of the Corinthians, until — — — —

15. (I, 33, 1) ναυτικὸν τε κεκτήμεθα πλὴν τοῦ παρ' ἤμων πλείστον

And, except your own, we have the biggest navy

16. (I, 50, 3) πρὸς τά ναυάγια καὶ τῶν νεκρῶν τῶν σφητέρων ἐπάντος, καὶ τῶν πλείστων ἐκράτησαν ὡσεὶ προσκομίσας πρὸς τὰ Σύβιτα

They turned their attention to the wrecks and
to their own dead, and they got possession of most of them so as to convey them to Sybota.\textsuperscript{35}

17. (I, 54, 2) Κορίνθιοι μὲν κρατήσαντες τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ μέχρι νυκτὸς, ὅστε καὶ ναυάγια πλείστα καὶ νεκρῶν προσκομίσαντες

The Corinthians had retained the advantage in the sea-fight until nightfall, and had thus secured a greater number of wrecks and dead bodies (Jowett)\textsuperscript{36}

18. (I, 60, 2) κατὰ φιλίαν τε αὐτοῦ ὅξιστα οἱ πλείστοι ἐκ Κορίνθου στρατιῶται ἐθέλοντα ἐξεύρεσθαι

It was mainly out of regard for him that most of the Corinthian soldiers volunteered on the expedition (Jowett)

19. (I, 70, 5) κρατοῦντες τε τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐπὶ πλείστων ἔξερχονται καὶ νικώμενοι ἐπὶ ἐλάχιστων ἀναπίπτουσιν

When conquerors, they pursue their victory to the utmost; when defeated, they fall back the least (Jowett)

20. (I, 71, 1) οἴσθε τὴν ἡσυχίαν οὗ τούτων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ πλείστων ἀρκείν, οἳ ἂν — — —

You imagine that peace does not longest endure for those who — — —

21. (I, 74, 1) τρία τὰ ὀρφευματάτα ἐς αὐτῷ παρασκύμεθα, ἀριθμὸν τῶν νεῶν πλείστων καὶ ἄνωρ στρατιῶν ἐξεύρεσθαι καὶ προθυμιὰν ἀκροντάτην

We made the three most useful contributions to it: the greatest number of ships, the ablest general, and the most unhesitating zeal

22. (I, 82, 4) ἢς φείδουσαν χρὴ ὡς ἐπὶ πλείστων

Which you ought to spare as long as possible

23. (I, 84, 3) πολεμικοὶ τε καὶ εἰβουλοὶ διὰ τὸ

éκοσμον γεγονομέθα, τὸ μὲν ὅτι αἰδως σωφροσύνης πλείστον μετέχει, αἰσχύνης δὲ εἰσφυσία — — —

Our habits of discipline make us both brave and wise; brave because the spirit of loyalty quickens the sense of honour, and the sense of honour inspires courage (Jowett)

24. (I, 101, 2) πλείστοι δὲ τῶν Ἑλώτων ἐγένοντο οἱ τῶν παλαιῶν Μεσσηνίων τότε δουλοθείντων ἀπόγονοί; ἢ καὶ Μεσσηνίως ἐκλήθησαν οἱ πάντες

These Helots were mostly the descendants of the Messenians who had been enslaved in ancient times, and hence all the insurgents were called Messenians (Jowett)

Most of the Helots were the descendants of the old Messenians that were enslaved in the famous war; and so all of them came to be called Messenians (Crawley)

Un très grand nombre des hilotes étaient les descendants des anciens Messéniens, asservis à l’époque: d’où le nom de Messéniens, qui fut appliqué à tous (de Romilly)

I prefer to translate: “Most numerous of the Helots were the descendants of the old Messenians who had been formerly enslaved; and so they all came to be called Messenians.” It should be brought out that οἱ ἀπόγονοι is subject of ἐγένοντο and πλείστοι τῶν Ἑλώτων the predicate. This is missed in most of the translations. In more idiomatic word order and wording we might render: “The descendants of the old Messenians who had been formerly enslaved were very numerous among the Helots; and so they all came to be called Messenians.”

25. (I, 110, 1) οἳ δὲ πλείστοι ἀπόλοντο

Most of them perished

\textsuperscript{35} This passage should be read in the light of No. 17 where the same wrecks and the same dead bodies are described and where the recovery of them is given as one reason why the Corinthians felt justified in setting up a trophy. In that passage πλείστα occurs without the article, for the Corinthians had recovered more than had the Corcyraeans. Had τὰ πλείστα been used it would merely have meant that they got back most of their own.

Though only two parties are involved, the Greek for this uses the word “most,” and there πλείστα appears without the article. In the quotation here given, there is no comparison with what anyone else has recovered. The Corinthians merely succeeded in getting the greater part of what they had lost in wrecks and in dead. In this instance πλείστων requires the article. The different ways of thinking about this salvage operation remind one of the differences in point of view about the Spartans on the island of Sphakteria which we have discussed above, p. 196, and which appear in Nos. 73 and 75 below.

\textsuperscript{36} See note 35 above on I, 50, 3. De Romilly (in the Budé translation) has a mistaken rendering here of πλείστα as “la plupart.”
26. (I, 115, 5) καὶ ἐκράτησαν τῶν πλείστων
And got most of them into their power
(Jowett)

27. (I, 122, 4) οὐ γὰρ δὴ πεθερύβας αὐτὰ ἐπὶ τὴν
πλείστους δὴ βλάψασαν καταφροίσανεν κεχωρίκατε
For surely you have not fled these imputations
and taken refuge in that contemptuous wisdom which has brought ruin to the greatest
numbers

28. (I, 137, 4) Θεμιστοκλῆς ἦκε παρὰ σέ, ὅπε κακά
μὲν πλείστα Ἑλλήνων ἐξήγαγμε τὸν ὕμετέρων οἶκον
I, Themistocles, have come to you, I who of
all Hellenes did your house the greatest injuries
(Jowett)

29. (I, 138, 3) τῶν τε παραχρῆμα δ' ἐλαχίστης
βουλής κράτιστος γνώμων καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἐπὶ
πλείστον τοῦ γενησμένον ἄριστος ἐκαστής
He was the ablest judge of the course to be
pursued in a sudden emergency, and could best
divine what was likely to happen in the remotest future
(Jowett)

30. (II, 4, 5) τὸ δὲ πλείστον καὶ ὅσον μάλιστα ᾦ
ἐκκαταραμέμενον ἐπιπότουσιν ἐν οἴκημα μέγα
But the greater number kept together
and took refuge in a large building
(Jowett)

31. (II, 11, 1) ὅμως δὲ τίσοδε οὕσω μείζωνα παρα-
σκευῆν ἔχοντες ἐξήλθομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ πόλιν δυνα-
tωτάτην νῦν ἐρχομένα καὶ αὐτοὶ πλείστου καὶ ἄριστοι
στρατεύομεν,
Yet we have never set out with a larger force
than the present; and if our numbers and effi-
ciency are remarkable, so also is the power
of the state against which we march
(Crawley)

32. (II, 11, 7) καὶ οἱ λογισμῷ ἐλάχιστα χρώμενοι
θυμοὶ πλείστα ἐς ἐργόν καθίστανται
Men who reflect the least rush most impetu-
ously into action

33. (II, 13, 3) τὰ γὰρ πλείστα τριακοσίων ἀπο-
δέοντα μύρια ἐγένετο
[The passage under discussion in this article]

34. (II, 15, 5) ἐκεῖνοι τὲ ἔγγις ὅση τὰ πλείστου
ἀξία ἐχρώντο
Since it was near (i.e. the fountain Kalli-
rhoe) the men of those days used it for the most
important offices

35. (II, 34, 8) προεβλέψαντι ἀπὸ τοῦ σήματος ἐπὶ
βῆμα ὕψηλον πεπουμένον, ὃποιοι ἀκούοιτο ὡς ἐπὶ
πλείστον τοῦ ὑμίλου, ἔλεγε τοιᾷδε
He advanced from the sepulchre to a lofty
platform which had been erected, in order that
he might be heard as far as possible by the
multitude, and spoke as follows

36. (II, 35, 3) χρῆ καὶ ἐμὲ ἐπόμενων τῷ νόμῳ
πειρᾶθαι ὑμών τῇ ἐκάστῳ βουλήςεως τε καὶ δόξης
τυχῶν ὡς ἐπὶ πλείστον
I too must obey the law and try to satisfy
your several wishes and expectations to the best
of my ability

37. (II, 38, 1) καὶ μή καὶ τῶν πόνων πλείστας
ἀναπαύλας τῇ γνώμῃ ἐπορισάμεθα
Further, we provide plenty of means for the
mind to refresh itself from business

Further, we provide plenty of means for the
mind to refresh itself from business
(Crawley)

38. (II, 41, 1) ἐνευλῶν τοῖς τε λέγω τὴν τε πάσαν πόλιν
τῆς Ἑλλάδος παιδεύσεως εἶναι καὶ καθ' ἐκαστὸν δοκεῖν
ἀν μιὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα παρ' ἤμων ἐπὶ πλείστ' ἐν εἶδῃ
καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιστ' ἐν εὐτραπέλω τὸ σῶμα
ἀνταρκεῖ παρέχεσθαι
To sum up: I say that Athens is the school
of Hellas, and that the individual Athenian in
his own person seems to have the power of
adapting himself to the most varied forms of
action with the utmost versatility and grace
(Jowett)

39. (II, 49, 6) ὥστε δ' ἀδειφεὶροντο οἱ πλείστοι
ἐκαταίοι καὶ ἐβδομαίοι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐντὸς καύματος, ἐτί
ἔχοντές τι δυνάμεως, ἦ —
So that either they died, the most of them on
the ninth and seventh days, from the internal
burning, still having some strength left, or — —

40. (II, 51, 4) καὶ τὸν πλείστον φθόρον τοῦτο
ἐνεποίει
And this caused the greater part of the mor-
tality

41. (II, 57, 2) τῇ δὲ ἐσβολῆς ταῖτη πλείστον τε
χρόνον ἐνέμειναι καὶ τὴν γῆν πᾶσαν ἔτεμον
In this invasion they remained the longest time and ravaged the whole countryside

42. (II, 61, 3) δουλεὶ γὰρ φρόνημα τὸ αἱρετικὸν καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον καὶ τὸ πλείστον παραλόγῳ ἐξεβαινὸν

For before what is sudden, unexpected, and least within calculation the spirit quails

(Crawley)

43. (II, 64, 3) γνώτε δὲ ὅσον μέγιστον αὐτῷ ἔχουσαν ἐν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις διὰ τὸ ταῖς ἐξιμφοραίς μὴ εἴκεν, πλείστα δὲ σώματα καὶ πόνους ἀνηλωκέναι πολέμῳ

Know that our city has the greatest name in all the world because she has never yielded to misfortunes, but has sacrificed more lives and endured severer hardships in war than any other (Jowett)

44. (II, 64, 3) μνήμη καταλείψεται, Ἔλληνων τε ὅτι Ἔλληνες πλείστων δὴ ἦρξαμεν καὶ πολέμους μεγίστους ἀντέχομεν

The memory will have been left that as Greeks we ruled the greatest number of Greeks, and withstood the greatest wars

45. (II, 65, 4) πλείστου ἄξιον νομίζοντες εἶναι

Considering him to be the most valuable

46. (II, 77, 3) ἐπισαράνθησαν καὶ τῆς ἄλλης πόλεως ὅσον ἐδύναντο ἀπὸ τοῦ μετεώρου πλείστου ἐπισεχέν

They piled up (faggots) also as far as they could reach from the top into the rest of the city

47. (II, 84, 4) οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι καταδιώκαντες καὶ ναῶν δῶδεκα λαβόντες τοὺς τε ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πλείστων ἀνελόμενοι ἐν Μολύκρεοι ἀπέπλεον, -- --

The Athenians pursued them, captured twelve ships, and taking on board most of their crews, sailed away to Molycrium (Jowett)

48. (II, 85, 4) κελεύων αὐτῷ ναῦς ὅτι πλείστας διὰ τάχους ἀποστεῖλαι

Bidding them send to him promptly as many ships as possible

49. (II, 89, 9) καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐργῷ κόσμον καὶ σηγήν περὶ πλείστου ἡγεῖεθε

And in action think order and silence all important (Crawley)

50. (II, 95, 3) ἐδει γὰρ καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους νανοὺς τε καὶ στρατιᾶς ὡς πλείστῃ ἐπί τοὺς Χαλκίδεας παραγίνῃσαι

For the Athenians were to join him against the Chalcidians with a fleet and as many soldiers as they could get together (Crawley)

51. (II, 96, 2) παρεκάλει δὲ καὶ τῶν ὀρεινῶν Θρᾴκων πολλῶν τῶν αὐτονόμων καὶ μαχαιροφόρων, οἱ Δῖοι καλοῦνται, τὴν Ροδόπην οἱ πλείστοι οἰκοῦντες

He also summoned to his standard many of the highland Thracians, who are independent and carry dirks; they are called Dii, and most of them inhabit Mount Rhodope (Jowett)

52. (II, 97, 2) ταύτη γὰρ διὰ πλείστου ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἀνω ἐγίγνετο

For here it reached its maximum inland from the sea

53. (II, 97, 3) φόρος τε ἐκ πάσης τῆς βαρβάρου καὶ τῶν Ἐλληνικῶν πόλεως, ὅσων ἦρξαν [ὅσων προσήξαν codd.] ἐπὶ Σείνθου, δὲ ἀστερον Στάλκου βασιλεύσας πλείστου δὴ ἐποίησε, τετρακοσίων ταξίν ἄργυρου πάλαιστρα δύναμις, ἀ χρυσὸς καὶ ἄργυρος ἦα

Tribute from all the barbarian territory and from the Greek cities, as many as they ruled in the time of Seuthes (who became king after Sitalkes and levied the maximum), amounted to about 400 talents of silver, which came in in silver and in gold 37

37 Crawley translates διὰ πλείστου δὴ ἐποίησε “who raised it to its greatest height,” while Jowett renders “under whom the amount was greatest.” I have preferred a translation that brings out clearly the construction of the Greek, in which πλείστου (φόρον) is direct object of ἐποίησε, which here means “levied” or “established.” The syntax of the passage is διὰ πλείστου δὴ (φόρον) ἐποίησε, rather than διὰ πλείστου δὴ ἐποίησε (τοῖς φόρον εἶναι), throwing πλείστου into a predicate position, as is implied in Crawley’s rendering. The structure of this sentence is illustrated by the text of Thuc. VII, 28, 4, in which the author describes the establishment of the 5 per cent tax: καὶ τὴν εἰκοστὴν ὑπὸ τοῦτον τῶν χρόνων τῶν κατὰ θάλασσαν ἀντὶ τοῦ φόρου τοῖς υπηκοοῖς ἐποίησαν. The idiom was εἰκοστὴν (οὗ φόρον) τοιῆσαι.
54. (II, 98, 4) τού δ’ ἵππου τὸ πλείστον αὐτοί

The Odrysians themselves furnished the greater part of the cavalry

55. (III, 1, 2) καὶ τὸν πλείστον ὄμλων τῶν ψιλῶν

And they prevented most of the mass of light-armed troops from advancing beyond their lines and harming the districts near the city

56. (III, 17, 1) καὶ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τούτον ὅν αἱ νῆς ἐπέχουν ἐν τοῖς πλείστα ἀνά τοῖς ἔνεργοι ἀνάλληλον

At the time when the fleet was at sea, the Athenians had the largest number of ships which they ever had all together, effective and in good trim (Jowett)

57. (III, 17, 4) τὰ μὲν οὖν χρήματα οὕτως ὑπανηλώθη τὸ πρῶτον, καὶ νῆς τοσαύτα δὴ πλείστα εἰπροϊσθαν

This, then, is the way the money at first was wastefully spent and these were the numbers of ships that were manned, at their maximum

58. (III, 30, 4) πλείστ’ ἀν ὀρθοῖτο

He would have most success

59. (III, 31, 2) ἀλλὰ τὸ πλείστον τῆς γνώμης εἶχαν, ἐπιείδη τῆς Μυτιλήνης ὑπερήφανε, ὅτι τάχιστα τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ πάλιν προσμεζία

But the most of his thought was, since he had been late at Mytilene, to get back to the Peloponnesos as soon as possible

60. (III, 42, 4) καὶ πλείστ’ ἀν ὀρθοῖτο ἀδυνάτους λέγειν ἐχουσα τοῖς τοσιοῦτοι τῶν πολιτῶν

She would fare best if such citizens were unable to speak

61. (III, 42, 5) χρή δὲ — — — τὴν δὲ σώφρονα πάλιν τῷ τε πλείστα εὐ βουλεύοντι μὴ προστεθέναι τιμήν —

The wise city should not give too much honor to him who counsels her best —

62. (III, 45, 5) η τε ὡπίς καὶ ὁ ἔρως ἐπὶ παντί, ὁ μὲν ἡγούμενος, ἡ δὲ ἐφεσομένη, καὶ ὁ μὲν τὴν ἐπι-βουλὴν ἐκφροντίζων, ἡ δὲ τὴν εὐπορίαν τῆς τύχης ὑποτεθεία, πλείστα βλάπτουσι

Hope also and cupidity, the one leading and the other following, the one conceiving the attempt, the other suggesting the facility of succeeding, cause the widest ruin (Crawley)

63. (III, 83, 1) καὶ τὸ ἐὕπθε, οὗ τὸ γενναῖον πλείστον μετέχει, καταγελασθήν ἡφαίστηθι

The simplicity which is so large an element in a noble nature was laughed to scorn and disappeared (Jowett)

64. (III, 84, 1) ἀπαθεοῦσι δργῆς πλείστον ἐκφερόμενοι ὦμι καὶ ἀπαραιτῆτως

Carried away to extremes of pitiless cruelty by the wantonness of their passion

65. (III, 104, 6) τὰ δὲ περὶ τοὺς ἄγώνας καὶ τὰ πλείστα κατελύθη ὑπὸ ἐνιαυτοῦ

The contests and most of the ceremonies had been abandoned because of hard times

66. (IV, 3, 3) καὶ ὁμοφώνους τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίως πλείστα ἀν βλάπτεσαν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὀρμωμένους

And speaking the same dialect as the Lacedaemonians they would do them very great harm using it as a base

67. (IV, 12, 3) ἐπὶ πολὺ γὰρ ἔποιες τῆς δόξης ἐν τῷ τότε τοὺς μὲν ἡπειρώσας μάλιστα εἶναι καὶ τὰ πεζὰ κρατάσαι τοὺς δὲ θαλασσίους τε καὶ ταῖς ναυσὶ πλεί-στοιν προύχειν

For in those days it was the great glory of the Lacedaemonians to be a land power distinguished for their military prowess, and of the Athenians to be a nation of sailors and the first sea power in Hellas (Jowett)

68. (IV, 14, 3) βουλομένως τῇ παρούσῃ τίχῃ ὡς ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐπέελθεν ἀπὸ νέων ἐπεξομάχων

Wishing to exploit their present fortune as much as possible they fought on from their ships as if on land

69. (IV, 17, 5) οἷς δὲ πλείστα μεταβολῶν ἐν ἀμφότερα ἐξημιβεβήκασι, δίκαιοι εἰσὶ καὶ ἀπιστῶτας εἶναι ταῖς εὐπραγίαις

While those who have known most vicissi-
tudes of good and bad have also justly least faith in their prosperity (Crawley)

70. (IV, 25, 9) καὶ γὰρ οἱ βαρβαροὶ ἐν ταῖς ὀδοῖς ἐπιπεσόντες τοὺς πλείστους διέφθειραν
For the barbarians fell upon them in the streets and destroyed the greater number of them

71. (IV, 26, 2) διαμόμενοι τῶν κάρχηγα οἱ πλείστοι ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ ἐπινοῦν οἶνον εἰκὸς ὕδωρ
Scraping aside the shingle by the sea most of them drank such water as could reasonably be found there

72. (IV, 26, 4) ἀνθυμιάς τε πλείστην ὁ χρόνος παρέχει παρὰ λόγων ἐπιγνώμονας
The unexpectedly long delay in time caused them the greatest discouragement

73. (IV, 31, 2) μέσον δὲ καὶ ὁμαλότατον τε καὶ περὶ τὸ ὕδωρ οἱ πλείστοι αὐτῶν καὶ Ἕπιτάδας ὁ ἄρχων εἶχε
The greater number of them and Epitadas the commander held the central and most nearly level area where the water was

74. (IV, 32, 3) ὅπως ὅτι πλείστη ἀπορία ἃ τοῖς πολεμίοις πανταχόθεν κεκυκλωμένοι
So that the enemy might be baffled as much as possible, surrounded on all sides

75. (IV, 33, 1) οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἕπιτάδαν καὶ ὅπερ ἡν πλείστον τῶν ἐν τῇ νῆσῳ — — — ἐνεπτέξαντο
Those under Epitadas, the largest body of troops on the island — — — serried their ranks

76. (IV, 34, 1) καὶ αὐτοὶ τῇ τε ὄψιν τοῦ θαρσείν τὸ πλείστον εἰληφότες πολλαπλάσιοι φαινόμενοι
And taking now most of their courage from the sight of their own numbers, since they were obviously many times as many

77. (IV, 35, 4) καὶ χρόνον μὲν πολὺ καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας τὸ πλείστον τολματωροῦμενοι ἀμφότεροι ὑπὸ τε τῆς μάχης καὶ διῆς καὶ ἥλιου ἀντίχων
For a long time, indeed for most of the day, both sides held out against all the torments of the battle, thirst, and sun (Crawley)

78. (IV, 38, 1) οἱ δὲ ἀκοῦσαντες παρῆκαν τὰς ἀσπίδας οἱ πλείστοι καὶ τοὺς χεῖρας ἀνέσεων
When they heard this most of them laid aside their shields and waved their hands in the air

79. (IV, 41, 2) ἐλέξοντο τε τὴν Δακωνικὴν καὶ πλείστα ἔβλαστον ὑμόφωνοι οὕτε
They ravaged Lakonia and, being of the same dialect, did it very grievous harm

80. (IV, 44, 2) ἐν δὲ τῇ τροπῇ ταύτῃ κατὰ τὸ δεξίων κέρας οἱ πλείστοι τε αὐτῶν ἀπέθανον καὶ Λυκόφρων ὁ στρατηγὸς
In this rout on the right wing most of them perished, including Lykophron the general

81. (IV, 54, 4) ἐπελευσαν ἐς τε Ἀσίνην καὶ Ἄλοσ καὶ τὰ πλείστα τῶν περὶ θάλασσαν
They sailed against Asine, and Helos, and most of the maritime settlements

82. (IV, 59, 4) δὲ καὶ ἢμιν ἐν τῷ παρόντι πεθομένους πλείστον ἀν ἄξιον γένοιτο
Which, if we are but persuaded in our present circumstances, could be for us too of utmost value

83. (IV, 62, 4) τὸ δὲ ἀστάθμητον τοῦ μέλλοντος ὡς ἐπὶ πλείστον κρατεῖ
But the incalculable element in the future exercises the widest influence (Crawley)

84. (IV, 63, 1) χρόνον ός πλείστον σπειράμενοι τὰς ἰδίας διαφορὰς ἐς αὐθίν ἀναβαλῷμεθα
Let us... make a treaty for as long a term as possible, and put off our private differences to another day (Crawley)

85. (IV, 74, 4) καὶ πλείστον δὴ χρόνον αὕτη ἐν' ἐλαχίστοις γενομένη ἐκ στάσεως μετάτασις ἐξενέμενεν
And this change of government, though it grew out of a revolt by very few, lasted for a very long time

86. (IV, 81, 1) πλείστον ἄξιον Ἀκαδαιμονίοις γενόμενον
Who was of utmost use to the Lacedaemonians

87. (IV, 90, 4) ἔπειτα, ὡς τὰ πλείστα ἀπετετέλεστο, τὸ μὲν στρατόπεδον προσπέχωρην ἀπὸ τοῦ Δηλίου
Afterwards, when the greater part had been finished, the army made an initial withdrawal from Delion

88. (IV, 90, 4) καὶ οἱ μὲν ψυλοὶ οἱ πλείστου εὐθὺς ἐξώρισαν, οἱ δὲ ὀπλιτά δέμενοι τὰ ὁπλα ἴσόχαζον

The greater part of the light-armed troops proceeded on their march, but the hoplites piled their arms and rested (Jowett)

89. (IV, 109, 4) αἱ οἰκουνταί εὐμείκτοις ἔθνεσι βαρβάρων διελόσαν, καὶ τι καὶ Χαλκιδικὸν ἐν βραχή, τὸ δὲ πλείστον Πελασγίκον, τὸν καὶ Λήμνων ποτε καὶ Ἀθῆνας Τυρσηνῶν οἰκησάντων, καὶ Βασαλ-

Which are inhabited by mixed races of bilingual barbarians, and there is present also a small Chalkidic element; but the greater part are Pelasgians (of those Tyrrenians who settled once in Lemnos and in Athens), and Bisalians and Krestonians and Edonians

90. (IV, 115, 3) οἱ δὲ ἀποθηκευμέναι καὶ οἱ μᾶλλον διά πλείστου, νομίζοντες ταύτῃ ἑαυτοκέναι ἣδη τὸ χορίον, φυγῇ ἐστὶ τὴν ἀλλασσαν καὶ τᾶς ναὸς ὄρμησαν

But those not so near, and still more those furthest off, thought that the place was already taken at that point, and fled in haste to the sea and the ships (Crawley)

91. (IV, 131, 3) καὶ διαφυγόντες οἱ πλείστοι τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ Σκιώνῃ στρατόπεδον ἐσῆλθον ἐς αὐτὴν

Most of them eluded the army before Skione and entered into the city

92. (V, 6, 2) ἀξοντας μισθὸν Θράκας ὡς πλείστουν

Who were to bring as many Thracian mercenaries as they could

93. (V, 9, 4) πλείστοι ἄν ὑπάρχοντα

They would have most success

94. (V, 16, 1) Νικίας ὁ Νικηράτου, πλείστα τῶν τῶν τότε εἰ φθερόμενοι ἐν στρατηγίας

Nikias the son of Nikeratos, the most blessed by fortune in his generalships of the men of that day

95. (V, 46, 1) σφίσα μὲν γὰρ εἴ ἐστώτων τῶν πραγμάτων ὃς ἐπὶ πλείστον ἄριστον ἐναι διασώσασθαι τὴν εὐπραγίαν

For with their affairs now going well it was best for them to preserve their prosperity as long as possible

96. (V, 74, 1) Καὶ ἤ μὲν μάχη τοιοῦτη καὶ ὅτι ἑγγύστα τούτων ἐγένετο, πλείστου δὴ χρόνου μεγίστη δὴ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν καὶ ὑπὸ ἀξιολογοῦτάτων πόλεων ἐξελθοῦσα

Such, or very nearly such, was the battle, the greatest in a very long time amongst the Hellenes and joined by the most considerable cities

97. (V, 99) οὕτω γὰρ πλείστα ἀν τῷ ἀλογίστῳ ἐπιτρέφοντες σφάς τε αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐς προώπτων κίνδυνον καταστήσειαν

For these are the most reckless and most apt to bring themselves and us into obvious danger

98. (V, 105, 4) Λακεδαίμονιοι γὰρ πρὸς σφᾶς μὲν αὐτοῦς καὶ τὰ ἐπιχώρια νόμιμα πλείστα ἅρτη χρίνναι

For the Lacedaemonians, with respect to themselves and their national customs, are ex-

ceedingly virtuous

99. (V, 111, 3) οὗ γὰρ δὴ ἐπὶ γε τὴν ἐν τοῖς αἰ-

ωροῖς καὶ προώπτους κυνήγους πλείστα διαφθείρουσαν ἀνθρώπους αἰσχύνην τρέψεισθε

For surely you will not take refuge in that sense of honor which causes men most harm in times of shameful and obvious crisis

100. (V, 111, 4) πλείστα ἄν ὑπάρχοντα

They would have most success

101. (V, 113) καὶ Λακεδαιμονίως καὶ τύχῃ καὶ ἐπίστι πλείστον δὴ παραβεβλημένου καὶ πιστεύσαντες πλείστον καὶ σφαλήσεισθε

And as you have staked most on, and trusted most in, the Lacedaemonians, your fortune, and your hopes, so will you be most completely deceived (Crawley)

102. (V, 115, 4) ἐπενεκάκμενοι οὖν τε καὶ ὡς πλείστα εἰδύναι χρήσιμα ἀναχωρήσαντες ὡς ὅμιλα

They brought in grain and as many necessities as they could; then they retired and took no further action
103. (VI, 5, 1) καὶ Χαλκιδῆς μὲν οἱ πλείστοι ἦλθον ἐς τὴν ἀποκαίναν
   And Chalkidians for the most part came to the colony

104. (VI, 11, 4) τὰ γὰρ διὰ πλείστου πάντες ἵσομεν θαυμαζόμενα
   We all know that men have the greatest respect for that which is farthest off (Jowett)

105. (VI, 11, 6) ὅσοι καὶ περὶ πλείστου καὶ διὰ πλείστου δόξαν ἄρετής εἰπένσαι
   The rather because they have laboured so earnestly and so long to win a name for valour (Jowett)

106. (VI, 13, 1) γνώντας ὅτι ἐπιθυμία μὲν ἐλάχιστα κατορθοῦνται, προσοίδε δὲ πλείστα
   Realizing that they have success least because of mere desire and most because of forethought

107. (VI, 14) τὸ καλός ἄρξαι τοὺτ' εἶναι, ὡς ἃν τὴν πατρίδα ὁφελήσῃ ὅσο πλείστα ἢ ἕκων εἶναι μὴ βλάψῃ
   The first duty of a good magistrate is to do the very best which he can for his country, or, at least, to do her no harm which he can avoid (Jowett)

108. (VI, 15, 1) Ὁ μὲν Νικίας τουαῦτα εἶπε, τῶν δὲ Ἀθηναίων παριόντες οἱ μὲν πλείστοι στρατεύοντες παρήρησιν καὶ τὰ ἐφυρμαμένα μὴ λύσων, οἱ δὲ τινες καὶ ἀντέλεγον
   Nikias spoke thus; most of the Athenians who came forward urged that they make the expedition and not repeal the votes that had been taken, though a few argued on the other side

109. (VI, 22) μάλιστα δὲ χρῆματα αὐτῶθεν ὡς πλείστα ἔχειν
   And particularly to have as much money as possible from home

110. (VI, 27, 1) μακρυκτι οἱ πλείστοι περιεκάπησαν τὰ πρόσωπα
   In one night the faces of most of them were mutilated

111. (VI, 30, 1) τῶν μὲν οὖν ἐνυμμάχων τῶν πλείστων καὶ τῶν σταταγγοῦσι δικάσσι καὶ τῶν πλείστων καὶ ὅση ἀλλή παρασκευῆς ἐνυμματο πρότερον ἐρήμη ἐς Κέρκυραν ἠυλλέγεσθαι
   Orders had been previously given to most of the allies, to the corn-ships, the smaller craft, and generally to the vessels in attendance on the armament, that they should muster at Corcyra (Jowett)

112. (VI, 34, 2) χρυσὸν γὰρ καὶ ἀργυρόν πλείστων κέκτηται, οὐκ ὁ τε πόλεμος καὶ τάλαν εὐπορεῖ
   For they possess gold and silver in abundance, by which war and everything else flourishes

113. (VI, 34, 4) Σικελιώται γὰρ εἰ ἠθέλουμεν ἐγμα-παντες, εἰ δὲ μή, ὅτι πλείστου μεθ' ἡμῶν, καθελκύ-σαντες ἑπάν τὸ ὑπάρχον ναυτικόν -- -- --
   For if we Sicilians should all be willing—or, if not all, as many as possible with us—to launch our entire available navy -- -- --

114. (VI, 49, 2) πλείστου γὰρ ἂν νῦν φανήσαι
   For they would seem now to be the greatest number

115. (VI, 54, 5) καὶ ἐπετήθεισαν ἐπὶ πλείστου δὴ τύραννοι οὗτοι ἄρετην καὶ ἐξενεισι
   And these tyrants cultivated virtue and wisdom to the utmost

116. (VI, 64, 1) ἄ γιγνόσκοντες οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ βουλόμενοι αὐτῶν ὁγείαν πανδημείᾳ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὁτι πλείστον
   The generals of the Athenians, aware of this and wishing to lead them in a body out of the city as far as possible

117. (VI, 72, 4) οὐς τε ὡπλα μὴ ἐστὶν ἐκπορίζοντες, ὅπως ὁσ πλείστοι ἐσύναι
   Providing arms to those who had none, so that they might be as numerous as possible

118. (VI, 83, 1) ἀνθ' ὃν ἐξετ' τε ὄντες ἀμα ἀρχομεν, ὅτι τε ναυτικόν πλείστον τε καὶ προθυμίαν ἀπροφάσιστον παρεσχόμεθα ἐς τοὺς Ἐλλήνας, καὶ -- -- --
   Wherefore not only do we rule because we are worthy, having furnished to the Hellenes
the greatest navy and the most unhesitating zeal, but also — — —
119. (VI, 88, 3) τὰ πρὸς τοὺς Σικελιοὺς ἐπραισσόν ὅπως αὐτοῦ ὡς πλείστοι προσχωρήσονται
They negotiated with the Sikels so that as many as possible might come over to them
120. (VI, 88, 6) ἐκέλευον ἔπουσσαν σφίσσον ὡς πλείστους πέμπειν
They bade them send to them as many horses as possible
121. (VII, 3, 4) τῇ δ’ ὑστεραίρ ἄγων τὴν μὲν πλείστην τῆς στρατιάς παρέταξε πρὸς τὰ τείχη τῶν Ἀθηναίων
On the following day he took the greater part of his army and deployed it facing the walls of the Athenians
122. (VII, 4, 5) ἐξετέχεισα τρία φρούρια· καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς τὰ τε σκείν τὰ πλείστα ἐκεῖνο καὶ τὰ πλοῖα ἤδη ἐκεῖ τὸ μεγάλα ὄρμει καὶ αἱ ταχεῖαι νῆσες
He built three forts, and in them the greater part of the stores were deposited and the large boats as well as the ships of war were now anchored there
123. (VII, 20, 2) καὶ νησιωτῶν ὅσοι ἐκασταχθέν ὦν τ’ ἦν πλείστους χρήσαται
And as many others as could possibly be obtained from the different islanders (Jowett)
124. (VII, 21, 1) ὁ Γύλιππος ἦκεν ἐς τὰς Συρακούσας, ἄγων ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων ὄν ἐπεισε στρατιάν ὅτιν ἐκασταχθέν πλείστην ἐδύνατο
Gylippos came to Syracuse bringing as many troops as he could from each of the cities he had persuaded
125. (VII, 21, 2) καὶ ξυγκαλέσας τοὺς Συρακούσιον ἐφὶ χρήσαι πληροῖν ναὶς ὡς δύναται πλείστας
And he called together the Syracusans and said they must man as many ships as they could
126. (VII, 30, 2) καὶ ἀποκτείνουσιν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ἑρμάσα τοὺς πλείστους
And they killed the greater number of them in the attempt to embark
127. (VII, 36, 5) πλείστον γὰρ ἐν αὑτῷ σχῆμαν
For they would have the greatest advantage in it
128. (VII, 56, 4) ἐθνὸ γὰρ πλείστα δὴ ἐπὶ μιᾶν πόλιν ταύτην ξυνῆθε
Indeed, there were never so many peoples assembled before a single city (Crawley)
129. (VII, 57, 4) καὶ τὸ πλείστον Ἱωνὲς ὀντες ὀστο πάντες καὶ ἀπ’ Ἀθηναίων πλὴν Καρνειόνων
And for the most part all these being Ionians and descendants of the Athenians except the Karystians
130. (VII, 68, 3) καὶ κυνόνων ὀστοι σπανίωτατοι ο’ ἂν εὐξύστατα ἐκ τούτο σφάληνα βλάπτοντες πλείστα διὰ τὸ εὐπρίσχει ωφελέσων
And these are the rarest of hazards which bring the greatest profit when they succeed while causing a minimum of harm if they fail
131. (VII, 69, 3) ἠγε τὸν πεζὸν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ παρέταξεν ὅσ’ ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐδύνατο
He led the foot-soldiers toward the sea and extended their line as far as he could
132. (VII, 70, 4) πλείσται γὰρ δὴ αὐτὰ ἐν εὐαχόλου ἐναμάχησαν βραχὺ γὰρ ἀπέλιπον ἐναμ- φότερα διακόσιαι γενέσθαι
And never did so many fight in so small a space, for the two fleets together amounted to nearly two hundred (Jowett)
133. (VII, 71, 6) ἀλλὰ δὲ καὶ οἱ πλείστοι ἤδη περὶ σφάς αὐτῶν καὶ ὅπ’ οὐδέποτε διεσκόπησον
But others, and the greater number, now began to look to themselves and how they should be saved
134. (VII, 75, 5) ἀπηρυμολήκεσαν γὰρ πάλαι τε καὶ οἱ πλείστοι παραχρήμα
For they had long since deserted, and the most of them had done so at once
135. (VII, 76) βουλόμενοι ὡς ἐπὶ πλείστον γε- γονίσκον ῥελείων τι
Desiring to effect some benefit with his voice carrying as far as possible
Amorges unto themselves and received them into their ranks without doing them any harm, for the greater number of them were from the Peloponnesos

144. (VIII, 40, 2) οί γὰρ οἰκέται τοὺς Χίους πολλοὶ ὄντες καὶ μᾶλλον πλὴν Δακεδαμονίων πλείστοι γενόμενοι

For the Chians had many slaves, in fact the most for any one city except the Lacedaemonians

145. (VIII, 40, 2) εἰθὶς αὐτομολία τε ἐξώρισαν οἱ πολλοὶ πρὸς αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰ πλείστα κακὰ ἐπιστάμενοι τὴν χώραν οὕτω έδρασαν

Most of them immediately deserted to them and, knowing the country, these were the ones who did most of the damage.38

146. (VIII, 65, 2) καὶ καταλαμβάνοντι τὰ πλείστα τοῖς ἑταῖροι προειρηγαμένα

And they found most of the work already done by their associates

147. (VIII, 66, 5) καὶ τὸ ἀπιστὸν οὕτως μέγιστον πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐποίησαν καὶ πλείστα ἔστων τῶν ὀλίγων ἀσφάλειαν ὅφελόντας

And these created the greatest mistrust among the multitude and helped most toward the security of the few

148. (VIII, 68, 1) ὁ μέντοι ἀπαν τὸ πράγμα ἐνυδείς ὧτε τρόπῳ κατέστη ἐς τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ πλείστου ἐπιμελήθη ὁ Ἀντιφόν ὁ ἄνηρ — — —

But the real author and maturer of the whole scheme, who had been longest interested in it, was Antiphon, a man — — — (Jowett)

149. (VIII, 68, 1) τοὺς μέντοι ἀγωνισμένους καὶ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ καὶ ἐν δήμῳ πλείστα εἰς ἀνήρ, ὡστε ἐμποιεῖσθαι τι δυνάμενον ὑψεῖν

But there was no man who could do more for any who consulted him, whether their business lay in the courts of justice or in the assembly (Jowett)

150. (VIII, 90, 1) ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος, ἄνηρ ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα καὶ ἐκ πλείστου ἐναντίος τῷ δήμῳ

38 Crawley’s “did the greatest mischief” and Jowett’s “did the greatest damage” miss this completely. See No. 18 above for this type of usage: plural number, with noun in agreement and also in the plural.
Aristarchos the bitter and inveterate enemy of the commons (Crawley)

151. (VIII, 92, 10) oí de ὑπλίται ὁμόσε τε ἐκώρουν
οἱ πλείστοι τῷ ἐργῷ καὶ οὐ μετεμέλοντο
Most of the heavy infantry went on with the work and did not falter

Had Thucydides wished to say in II, 13, 3 that the maximum was 10,000 talents, he had only to follow his own habit to determine the idiom. The clearest Thucydidean turn of phrase would have been: πλείστα γὰρ δὴ μύρια ἐγένετο, with the use of the particle δὴ also characteristically Thucydidean,39 and with no article.

III

The papyri, on the whole, confirm the texts of Thucydides that we know from the books; it would be extraordinary if anything else were true. It would be of interest, surely, if our present text could be documented one way or the other from the papyri, but I could not myself feel that much would be proved thereby. One papyrus in Geneva comes very close to having the passage in question. It comes from Thucydides, II, 13, and has parts of lines which overlap the text in question. The published edition reads as follows (The Geneva Papyrus, ca. A. D. 200): 40

[χ]ρη[μάτων τῆς προσόδου],
τὰ δὲ [πολλὰ τοῦ πολέμου]
γνώμη[ν καὶ χρημάτων]
περὶ[ουσία κρατεῖσθαι].

5 θάρσ[εν τε ἐκέλευεν προσ]-
-ώντ[ων μὲν ἐξάκοσιν] -
-ων τ[αλάντων ὡς ἐπὶ]
τὸ πο[λὺ φόρου καὶ ἐναιν]
-τὸν ἀ[πὸ τῶν ἐμμάχων]

10 τ[ήν πόλει ἀνευ τῆς ἄλ]-
-λ[ῆς προσόδου, . . . . ]

Aux lignes 13 et 14, traces d’initiales.

Cavaignac has made a text which utilizes the traces of letters in lines 13 and 14, as well as in line 12, and has suggested the following version: 41

40 Jules Nicole, Textes grecs inédits de la collection papyrologique de Genève (Geneva, 1909), p. 17 and plate II.
The readings, Cavaignac confessed, were subject to doubt. Indeed, it must be held that they are in part incorrect. These lines in the facsimile have been examined by Colin Roberts, who assures me that the initial letter in line 13 is surely lambda (not alpha), and that the initial letter of line 14 was probably epsilon. I have not myself seen the papyrus, but Colin Roberts examined it again in Geneva in 1953 and confirmed the readings which he had made from the published facsimile. We may read, therefore, in the text in question either the book-version or the scholiast’s version of Thucydides, and our decision must be that the evidence here for establishing a text is entirely negative. The possible texts are printed here as alternatives A and B:

A

\[\lambda [\varsigma \rho \rho \sigma \sigma \delta \theta \upsilon \rho \alpha \chi \omicron \omicron] \]

12 \[\tau [\omega \nu \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \tau \mu \acute{a} \kappa \rho \rho \omicron \omicron] \]

\[\lambda [\epsilon \iota \epsilon i \tau \tau \tau \tau \epsilon \rho \gamma \gamma \rho \rho \omicron \omicron] \]

\[\epsilon [\pi \iota \varsigma \mu \mu \omicron \omicron \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \kappa \iota \sigma \chi \lambda \lambda \lambda \] \]

\[[\omega \nu \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \tau \tau \tau \tau \tau \tau \] \]

B

\[\lambda [\varsigma \rho \rho \sigma \sigma \delta \theta \upsilon \rho \alpha \chi \omicron \omicron] \]

12 \[\tau [\omega \nu \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \tau \mu \acute{a} \kappa \rho \rho \omicron \omicron] \]

\[\lambda [\epsilon i \acute{a} \epsilon i \tau \tau \tau \tau \epsilon \rho \gamma \gamma \rho \rho \omicron \omicron] \]

\[\epsilon [\pi \iota \varsigma \mu \mu \omicron \omicron \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \kappa \iota \sigma \chi \lambda \lambda \lambda \] \]

\[[\omega \nu \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \tau \tau \tau \tau \tau \tau \] \]

It would have been easy to exaggerate the importance of a reading in this papyrus, as Croiset and Cavaignac were in danger of doing, even if it could have been demonstrated that \(\acute{a}\epsilon i \pi \o t e\) or \(\acute{e}t\i \tau \tau\)te stood in the text. My belief is that both versions have a long history, either one of which might have appeared in this chance papyrus.

The financial history of Athens in the fifth century has been worked over in some detail by Wade-Gery, McGregor, and me in the third volume of our Athenian Tribute Lists. I do not intend to call to mind now more than the fundamentals. Primarily it is the evidence of the tribute lists that has put the seal of impossibility on a total accumulation of 10,000 talents. We can reckon an annual surplus of about 200 talents in tribute-income from the allies. In the years from 476 to 449 (just over 25
years) this accumulation amounted to about 5000 talents, which is, in fact, the sum of which the famed Anonymus Argentinensis speaks as being in the public treasury, when Euthydemos was archon in 450/49, collected according to the assessment of Aristeides. The true name of the archon in 450/49 was Euthynos, epigraphically attested. But Diodoros (XII, 3, 1), and doubtless later copies of the Atthidographers, knew him as Euthydemos, and as such he appears in the papyrus.42 Some scholars have argued that, since a known Euthydemos was archon in 431/0, the citation should apply to that year. This would rob the citation of its relevance, for the reference is to the beginning of the great public works on the Acropolis, and to the use made by Perikles of the money of the Delian League in building them. One must read the text of the Anonymus Argentinensis in the light of Demosthenes’s speech against Andronion, on which it is a commentary. Demosthenes was speaking of the great men of earlier days, and his text runs as follows: 43

"The men who built the Propylaia and the Parthenon, and decked our other temples with the spoils of Asia, trophies in which we take a natural pride,—you know of course from tradition that, after they abandoned the city and shut themselves up in Salamis, it was because they had the war-galleys that they won the sea-fight and saved the city and all their belongings, and made themselves the authors for the rest of the Greeks of many great benefits, of which not even time can ever obliterate the memory."

The scholiast felt obliged to comment on this, and to correct an obvious historical error. So taking as his cue the words “they built the Propylaia and the Parthenon” he wrote as follows (The Anonymus Argentinensis, before 100 A. D.): 45

42 The fact that the papyrus and Diodoros both mistakenly have the name as Euthydemos shows that they were following the Atthidographic tradition of their day. Gomme’s suggestion that this does not inspire confidence in our interpretation of the papyrus is odd (op. cit., p. 10); on the contrary, we know the source for Diodoros, and it is quite normal to discover that the source for the papyrus was the same.

43 Demosthenes, XXII, 13: οἱ τὰ προστάλαια καὶ τὸν παρθενων' οἰκοδομήσαντες ἔκεινοι καὶ τάλλα' ἀπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἵππα κοσμήσαντες, ἐφ' ὁς φιλοτιμομέθη πάντες εἰκότωσι, ἰστε δὴ τούτων ἄκοσι, ὅτι τὴν πόλιν ἐκλείπθαι καὶ κατακλεισθῆναι εἰς Σαλαμίνα, ἐκ τοῦ τρόμου ἦχεν πάντα μὲν τὰ σφέτερ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν πόλιν τῇ ναιμαχίᾳ νικήσαντες ἔσωσαν, πολλῶν δὲ καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλλησ κατέστησαν αὐτοί, ὃν οὖν ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν μνήμην ἀφελέσθαι δύναται.

44 Translation by J. H. Vince in the Loeb Classical Library.

45 Translation given here on the basis of the publication in A.T.L., II, p. 61 (D13). Since the
"They began to build their sanctuaries, and they made the statue, thirty-three years after the Persian Wars, Perikles having proposed a decree in the archonship of Euthydemos that the Athenians use the 5000 talents lying in the public treasury and collected from the tribute according to the assessment of Aristeides."

Demosthenes had said that the men of Marathon built the Propylaia and the Parthenon. This was not true. The honor belonged to the generation of their children, to the age of Perikles rather than to the age of Miltiades and Themistokles. The proof lay in the record. It was in 450/49 that Perikles legalized the use of Confederate funds for the beautifying of Athens, and the Parthenon and Propylaia as we know them were not even commenced till long after the Persian Wars. The interpretation of the papyrus does not, I think, depend on our restoration of it, for the essential elements are all preserved. Years later—they began to build—in the archonship of Euthydemos—Perikles a decree—the talents lying in the public treasury—five thousand according to the (blank) of Aristeides.

The Parthenon building accounts begin in 447/6 (I.G., I\(^2\), 339); the accounts of the Propylaia span the five years from 437/6 to 433/2 (I.G., I\(^2\), 363-367); the statue of Athena Parthenos was dedicated in 438 (Philochoros, Frag. 121 Jacoby). The money given to the overseers of these works came largely from the treasury of Athena. This is obvious to anyone who will read the epigraphical record. For the great buildings the only direct contribution from the hellenotamiai, the treasurers of the Delian Confederacy, was the amount of the quota due to Athena each year—a matter of six or seven talents. The funds of the Delian League had been incorporated into the treasury of Athena earlier than 448/7. The evidence of the papyrus gives the precise year of Perikles’s motion as 450/49 and the precise amount as 5000 talents. This disposition of the League funds was one of the basic differences between Perikles and Thourydides son of Melesias, which led to the latter’s ostracism in 443 b. c., and the use which Perikles is here shown to have made of the money of the League is supported to the limit by our literary tradition, including the very full account in Plutarch’s *Life of Pericles* (XII-XIV).

I must digress for a moment to answer recent criticism of our treatment of this papyrus which has come from Silvio Accame\(^{46}\) and from Arnold Gomme.\(^{47}\) Accame writes as follows about the account given in *The Athenian Tribute Lists*:

"Gli autori pongono inoltre nella prima estate del 449 dopo la pace di Callia un decreto di Pericle che autorizzava secondo loro l’impiego di 5.000 tal., raccolti nel tesoro degli alleati con pagamenti dei tributi, per le ricostruzioni di Atene, riferito

---


\(^{47}\) *Historia*, II, 1953, pp. 10-12, 21.
dall’Anonimo Argentinense, e poggiano questa teoria su nuovi supplementi apportati al testo dell’Anonimo. Ma che tale decreto spetti a dopo la pace di Callia è da escludere perché esso per gli autori sarebbe datato dall’arconte del 450-49, mentre la pace di Callia cade giusta Diodoro, si è visto, sotto l’arconte Pedeo (449-8) e non può risalire all’arcontato precedente (450-49) — — .”

I have two comments to make here: first, we have tried, I think, with good conscience to draw our conclusions from the preserved portions of the Anonymus Argentinensis and not to base them upon supplements either old or new; and, second, I am surprised that Accame thinks the date given by Diodoro for the Peace of Kallias a matter of importance. His dates in the fifth century have very little independent value, are frequently demonstrably wrong, and he has attached dates to events—as Arnold Gomme once remarked—“on so childish a principle and applied even this principle so carelessly, that he is more of a hindrance to truth than a help.”

Accame then presents his own interpretation of the Anonymus Argentinensis. He allows the commentator to give the precise date for the beginning of construction on the public buildings, and then—I am now quoting Accame—“seguendo il suo filo cronologico, può darsi che egli abbia richiamato le deliberazioni di Pericle sotto l’arconte Euthydemos (431-0) quasi per indicare il termine di quelle costruzioni.”

This is hard to follow. The deliberations of Pericles in 431/0 had nothing to do with the end of construction, and, anyway, there were at that time no 5000 talents in the treasury of the hellenotamiai. The amount on the Acropolis was 6000 talents (almost), and, if one wants to reduce this to 5000 talents by setting aside 1000 as the “untouchable reserve,” one still has the problem of explaining how Aristeides can have been responsible for collecting the money of Athena and of the Other Gods, which was a large proportion even of these 5000 talents. Accame does not face this problem, and, in fact, has no explanation. Instead, he wishes to leave the Anonymus Argentinensis out of his calculations altogether. I shall quote from him only a little further: “A me preme l’avere messo in risalto che fino a quando non interverranno altre scoperte, l’Anonimo Argentinense, frammentario com’è, non può fornire alcuna base sicura allo studio della finanza ateniese nel V secolo, e conviene per ora prescindere da esso.”

Yet we cannot simply think this text away. Even its fragmentary lines are very real. One thinks of Hamlet’s dissatisfaction with life; in more telling words he ex-

48 See A.T.L., III, p. 169 with note 39; also p. 178 with note 63 and p. 299. Accame’s acceptance of the date 449/8 for the Peace of Kallias seems to depend on Beloch, Gr. Gesch., II, 22, p. 212. If he believes that this date comes from a chronological source which gives it greater validity than other dates in Diodorus, such a thesis remains to be demonstrated.

49 Commentary on Thucydides, I, p. 52.
pressed much the same wishful sentiment that he might also hold aloof from too present reality:

O that this too too solid flesh would melt,
Thaw and resolve itself into a dew.

We ought not to wish this, even of the *Anonymus Argentinensis*, which was written, presumably, earlier than a. d. 100, and which seems to be derived from an Atthis that knew and used Athenian decrees, or some collection of Athenian decrees, as a source. The collection of Krateros comes to mind, while the name of the archon as Euthydemos shows that the later tradition of the Attidographers, and not the decree itself (which must have had Euthynos), was the immediate source.

Gomme's treatment of the papyrus is no less unsatisfactory than that of Accame. He doubts not only the restorations which have been proposed in *The Athenian Tribute Lists* but also the authority of it as a commentary on Demosthenes (*op. cit.*, p. 21). Yet he accepts the conclusions of *A.T.L.*, III to the extent of positing that Perikles authorized in 450/49 the use of the reserve fund of 5000 talents which had been accumulated down to that time from the surplus of the tribute that was collected according to the assessment of Aristeides (*op. cit.*, p. 12). On the other hand, he does not accept this interpretation either, for it finds no place in his report on the state of the Athenian treasury between 454/3 and 432/1 (p. 20). We are left with a sort of argumentative morass,⁵⁰ not made any the less treacherous by other suggestions which Gomme has put forward for restoring the text of the papyrus—suggestions in which he himself says that he has little confidence.

His lack of confidence is supremely justified. It is a very grave objection to the whole concept which Gomme advances for these proposed lines (*op. cit.*, p. 11) that they would have nothing to do with the beginning of work on the Parthenon and Propylaia, which is the theme that the commentary sets out to discuss. The text which he proposes gives commentary which allegedly states that on motion of Perikles in 431/0 not to use the money in the public treasury the Athenians voted to move the 5000 talents collected according to the assessment of Aristeides to the Acropolis. This argues that when Perikles proposed one resolution (not to use the money in the treasury) the Athenians voted to do something different (to place the 5000 talents of tribute money on the Acropolis). Nor is it reasonable to attribute to Perikles in 431/0 a motion which had already been taken care of by Kallias in 434/3 (*D2*, lines 12-17, as published in *A.T.L.*, II, p. 47). A further absurdity is the assumption that 5000

⁵⁰ Gomme's last sentence on p. 15 (*op. cit.*) has it that the *Anonymus Argentinensis* says only (if we accept the *A.T.L.* restoration) that the 5000 tal. from the tribute was to be used for the building, not that this was the total of all reserves in 450. His first sentence on p. 16 (*op. cit.*) says that at the time of the Samian War all the League's reserve was already with Athena. It is the second position which he maintains later; perhaps we may take it as a sufficient refutation of the view in his own preceding sentence.
talents, collected according to the assessment of Aristeides, were taken up to the Acropolis in 431/0. Gomme thinks that the Greek he has restored does not mean this, but how can \[\text{μετακομιζε} \text{εισ την πόλιν}\] be read in any other way? It is Gomme's idea that the reference may pass as touching on the 5000 talents that were available in 431/0 (II, 24, 1) after the iron reserve had been established, but he concedes "It would not be a very accurate reference; nor very relevant to the text of Demosthenes; but we do not know how far we can rely on this small fragment, and it is not more irrelevant than the information about triremes below."

The relevance of the triremes is a matter of opinion, to which I shall return later. The relevance of Gomme's text to the building of the Parthenon and Propylaia is nil. Nor can the 5000 talents left on the Acropolis in 431/0 after the establishment of the iron reserve be defined as money collected according to the assessment of Aristeides. They include all the coined money of Athena, as well as a sum belonging to the Other Gods well in excess of 750 talents, and with none of this can Aristeides have had any connection whatsoever.

When we bear in mind, as Gomme asks us to do, that what we have in the papyrus is only the epitome of a commentary, we do not have to doubt its adequacy so far as it goes; nor do we have to believe that the epitomator failed to give us the essential facts of his original.\(^5\) As I said above, with reference to Accame, the skeleton of the story is in the preserved part of the papyrus and may be read fairly well with no restoration by anybody.

Gomme says that he does not believe in the second lemma given in the text as published in \textit{A.T.L.}, I, p. 572 (T9): \[\text{οι τριήρεις ἐδει ἔχει} \text{εισ την πόλιν}.\] In this he may be right,—as to wording, that is. There can be no doubt, I think, that it is, in fact, a new lemma. Not only does the sequel (\(\text{μετ} \text{εκεῖνο γινο}---\)) carry on, in asyndeton, like the opening clause of a new comment,\(^6\) but there is no way in which the triremes can be related to the beginning of the Parthenon, and no way in which \(\text{μετ} \text{εκεῖνο γινο}---\) can itself be the lemma. The triremes are mentioned in the text of Demosthenes on which this passage is a commentary. Because the Athenians had them they returned safely to their home after the flight to Salamis. They "saved the city and all their belongings." I owe to Wade-Gery the suggestion that the lemma may have read \[\text{οι ἐδώκατο κατελθε} \text{ειν εισ την πόλιν}.\] The reason for the return was of course the possession of the triremes, and commentary about ships was eminently in order. But this means a second lemma, and I can see nothing but confusion in Gomme's argument that there was none.

\(^5\) Suggestions about the pedigree of the \textit{Anonymus Argentinensis} are given on p. 213, above.

\(^6\) Cf. the commencement of the preceding comment about the Parthenon and Propylaia with the words \(\text{μετ} \text{ετη} \).
IV

The text of the *Anonymus Argentinensis* is not only intelligible in itself, and consistent with what we know of Periklean policy and of revenue from the tribute lists, but it helps, with its 5000 talents, to make intelligible those references in Isokrates and Diodoros which assert that Perikles placed 8000 talents on the Acropolis. The texts are as follows: 53

"He carried up onto the Acropolis 8000 talents besides the sacred moneys" (Isokrates, VIII, 126).

"The Athenians, holding to their leadership by sea, transferred to Athens the moneys collected in common at Delos, about 8000 talents, and handed them over to Perikles to protect" (Diodoros, XII, 38, 2).

These two statements have the same historical basis. That in Isokrates, in my opinion, is literally and factually correct. We have from the *Anonymus Argentinensis* the evidence that Perikles turned over to the treasurers of Athena on the Acropolis in 450/49 a total in profane money of 5000 talents. During the time of his leadership the decrees of Kallias of 434 B.C. prove that additional sums amounting to 3000 had been voted, taken up to the Acropolis, and given to Athena. The text in question from the decrees of Kallias reads as follows: 54

(Resolved)

"To pay back to the Gods the moneys owed, since the 3000 talents which had been voted, in our own coinage, have been taken up onto the Acropolis for Athena. And to make repayment out of the moneys which have been voted for repayment to the Gods, namely, what is now in the chest of the hellenotamiai and the other assets which belong to their account, including the proceeds of the dekeate when it is farmed out." 55

There was, of course, sacred money per se on the Acropolis, but Isokrates was quite correct in naming 8000 talents in addition to it. The component parts were 5000

53 Isokrates, VIII, 126: εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀνήγεγκεν ὀκτακισχίλια τάλαντα χαρίς τῶν ἱερῶν.
Diodoros, XII, 38, 2: Ἀθηναίοι τῆς κατὰ θάλασσαν ἡγεμονίας ἀντεχόμενοι τὰ ἐν Δήλῳ κοινῇ συννομέναι χρήματα, τάλαντα σχεδὸν ὀκτακισχίλια, μετήγεγκαν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ παρέδωκαν φυλάττειν Περικλεὶ.
54 I.G., I², 91, lines 2-7:

Kallassa eiphe apodóynai ton theois
[τ]a chrématata ta' ophelómena, épeidē tēi' Athēnaiai ti' triaschiilia tálaan
[a] ἀνένεγκαται 'ές πόλιν, ἡ ἐφόσφορο, νομίσματος ἑμεθατο. ἀποδι
5 [δ] εἶναι δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν χρεμάτων, ἃ ἐς ἀποδοσιν ἑστὶν τοὺς θεοὺς ἐφόσφομ.
[ε]iα, τὰ τε παρὰ τοῖς ἐλλενοταμίαις ὀντα νῦν καὶ τάλλα ἃ ἐστὶ τούτον
[τ]o ν χρεμάτων, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς δεκάτης ἐπειδὰν πραβεί.

The text is also given in *A.T.L.*, II, p. 46 (D1).
55 See *A.T.L.*, III, pp. 326-328.
and 3000. Isokrates also has the figure 10,000 which is already implicit in the quotation just cited from him: 8000 talents besides the sacred moneys. There can be no quarrel with this, nor indeed with his more precise over-all estimate in another oration:

"Finally Perikles, being a good leader of the people and an excellent orator, adorned the city with shrines and dedications and all other embellishments so that even now visitors to her believe her worthy of ruling not only the Hellenes but the rest of mankind as well, and in addition to this he brought up onto the Acropolis no less than 10,000 talents."

To round out the evidence of Isokrates, there is one other reference, less explicit in its pertinence, which names the 10,000 talents:

"How could we with our present helplessness win (an Empire) which with 10,000 talents we could not preserve?"

Gomme (Historia, II, 1953, p. 12) says that "there is an undoubted inconsistency (which need neither surprise nor trouble us) between Isokrates’ words in viii 126 and in xv 234 (Perikles ἀνήνεγκεν εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν 8,000 tal. in the one passage, 10,000 in the other)." There is no inconsistency: Gomme merely has not told the whole story. The 8000 talents plus the sacred money are the equivalent of the 10,000 as a total sum. Gomme misleads the reader also when he says (ibid.) that "both Diodoros, xii 38.2, and Isokrates, viii 126, have 8000 tal. as the sum which the Athenians transferred from Delos to Athens and 'entrusted to Perikles'." This is not true. Isokrates nowhere has any reference to a transfer of money from Delos. The matter is of some importance, for Isokrates is a reliable source and Diodoros, as will appear, is not. In any event, the evidence which they give for the financial history of Athens must be presented with care and precision.

When we turn to the account of the 8000 talents in Diodoros, XII, 38, 2, we must recognize first of all that he is quoting Ephoros. He depends on Ephoros generally for the fifth and early fourth centuries, but we are doubly sure here, because he states explicitly that his account of the beginnings of the Peloponnesian War depends in fact on Ephoros. We therefore speak of this quotation from Diodoros as what Ephoros said. Here we see the thin wedge of falsehood,—and of careless

56 Isokrates, XV, 234: τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον Περικλῆς καὶ δημαγωγὸς ὁν ἀγαθὸς καὶ ῥήτωρ ἀριστος οὕτως ἐκόψησε τὴν πάλην καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀναθήματι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἄποισιν ὡστ' ἐτι καὶ νὸν τοὺς εἰσαφθενουμένους εἰς αὐτὴν νομίζειν μὴ μόνον ἄρχειν ἀξίαν εἶναι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἄλλα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἄπαντων, καὶ πρὸς τούτους εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν οὐκ ἔλαττο τούτων τοιῶν τάλαντων ἀνήνεγκεν.

writing. The 8000 talents are there, but Ephoros has them all collected on Delos and transferred in a lump sum to Athens. Since the transfer of the treasury from Delos to Athens took place in 454 B.C., this careless writing on the part of Ephoros leaves him with nothing to say about the 3000 talents that were brought up to the Acropolis to Athena over a period of time preceding 434 B.C., and it dates back to 454 a sum total—a maximum single balance, that is—as coming from Delos greater by almost 4000 talents than did in fact exist on Delos at that time.

The testimony of Isokrates agrees with the papyrus and with the inscriptions. That he knew how to deal with figures of finance and public expenditure is shown by the use elsewhere in his speeches of information from the documents of Athens: he knew the cost of the Samian War of 441/39, of Poteidaia, and of the subjugation of Melos. We do not know how much of Athena's own reserve Isokrates thought that Perikles put onto the Acropolis, but it has been reckoned that her balance in 449 was about 750 talents, and that her income from 449 to 431 was about 900 talents. Add these figures to the 750 odd talents which we know—epigraphically—to have been collected on the Acropolis in 434/3 for the Other Gods, and all these sacred moneys, which Isokrates excluded from his 8000 talents, are the reasonable complement which makes up his inclusive figure of "not less than 10,000 talents." This was the achievement of Perikles, but there is no suggestion in Isokrates that the money all came from Delos, or that it was all on the Acropolis at any one time. It was left to Ephoros to make these egregious blunders.

V

Whether Isokrates influenced Ephoros, or Ephoros Isokrates (which I doubt), is a question that has been much discussed. I too have taken some part in the debate. But it seems to me that here the priority makes very little difference. Ephoros and Isokrates both had the same historical background. The decrees were there on the Acropolis for both to see. The facts must have been common knowledge. The difference between them is that Isokrates reported correctly, Ephoros did not; that Isokrates understood, that Ephoros did not. This becomes abundantly clear in that passage from Ephoros in which he names the 10,000 talents:

---

59 XV, 111 and 113.
60 A.T.L., III, p. 337.
61 A.T.L., III, p. 343 with note 90.
62 Diodoros, XII, 40 1-2: περὶ δὲ τοῦ πολέμου πεφροντισμένως ἀπολογισάμενος ἔξηρθημένοι μὲν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν συμμάχων τῇ πάλαι καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τῆς ναυτικῆς δυνάμεως, πρὸς δὲ τούτῳ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μετακεκομισμένων ἐκ Δήλου χρημάτων ἓς τὰς 'Αθήνας, ἡ συνεβαινεν ἐκ τῶν φόρων ταῖς πάλαις κοινῇ συνηθροίσθαι· κοινῶν δ' ὄντων τῶν μυρίων ταλάντων ἀπανήλωτο πρὸς τὴν κατασκευὴν τῶν προπολαίων καὶ τὴν Ποτίδαιας πολιορκίαν τετρακειχίλα τάλαντα· καὶ καθ' ἐκαστὸν ἔγιναντο ἐκ τοῦ φόρου τῶν συμμάχων ἀνεφέρετο τάλαντα τετρακύστα ἔξηκοντα.
"Having made a careful survey about the war, he recounted the vast number of allies for the city and the superiority of her naval power, and in addition to this the abundance of the moneys transferred from Delos to Athens, which had come to be collected in common for the cities from their tributes. From the 10,000 talents which were common property there had been spent for the building of the Propylaia and for the siege of Poteidaia 4000 talents. And every year from the tribute of the allies there were being brought up 460 talents."

Some of this, and much of what follows, is a paraphrase of Thucydides. Since the book-texts of Thucydides have the flat statement that there had once been 10,000 talents (less 300 to be sure, but this is of small moment), it has been thought that Ephoros learned his 10,000 talents from Thucydides, whom he obviously used, and this being so it has been held as axiomatic that the figure 10,000 must have been in the text of Thucydides at the time when Ephoros wrote.

This argument seems very persuasive, but there is in reality nothing but its speciousness in its favor. And there is a better solution.

It was suggested in The Athenian Tribute Lists⁶³ that Ephoros somehow derived his figure of 10,000 from the other figures in Thucydides; that perhaps he knew the cost of the Propylaia as 2000 talents from the same source that Heliodoros used in the second century B. C. for his description of the Acropolis⁶⁴ and the cost of Poteidaia as 2000 talents from a later passage in Thucydides (II, 70, 2); that he added these expenses together with the 6000 of Thucydides and so obtained a total of 10,000 talents. I believe that this interpretation is improbable, partly because it is complex, and partly because I doubt the capacity of Ephoros to do the necessary research to find (and understand) the elements of his equation that 2000 plus 2000 plus 6000 equals 10,000. We earlier suggested that μόρια was a marginal gloss, perhaps, in the text of Thucydides—taken from Ephoros—and that it got into the text as a correction to περιεγένετο. Thus περιεγένετο became in the book-texts as we know them μόρια ἐγένετο. After this the change from αἰεὶ ποτὲ to ἔτι τότε was deliberate and consequential. I feel happier about the text when we dispense with this twilight zone of marginal glosses, as I now propose to do, and posit that the change from περιεγένετο to μόρια ἐγένετο was also deliberate. I believe that the change was made by some scholar, perhaps between 200 B. C. and A. D. 100, who knew Greek history from Ephoros rather than from Thucydides. If trained in rhetoric he may also have known of the 10,000 talents of Isokrates and his followers, which he also failed to understand.

⁶³ A.T.L., III, p. 125, especially note 18. It is there claimed that "The 10,000 must originate, one way or other, with Thucydides, II, 13, 3 and therefore is not a rhetorical rounding-out of the 8000." Still holding that the 10,000 is not a mere rhetorical rounding-out of the 8000, I claim that it is derived (as appears more clearly in Isokrates) by including the sacred moneys with the profane. Hence it does not originate, in any way, with Thucydides.

His erudition led to the “correction” which came down into the archetype of our extant manuscripts. A change of this kind is hard to detect, and without the evidence of the papyri and the inscriptions, which has come to our help principally during the last fifty years, it would be very hard to correct. When the scholiast on the *Plutus* writes τά instead of τριακοσίων, he shows that he has been copying, conscientiously, something which he did not understand. But such a case is covered by the normal rules of palaeography, and the correction is easy. There are no rules that cover the mind of a scholar, certainly not of one who may have chosen to correct a text of Thucydides by what he found in Ephoros and the Orators. Clearly Thucydides did not write both versions of our text. I suggest that there is a logical way of explaining how the scholiast’s text (the original) may have been changed into the book-text—a change induced by the Ephorean version. It would be very difficult to advance a logical reason for the change from an original book-text to the scholiast’s version. Advocates of the book-text indeed have no explanation,—only corruption. Corruption in texts may take many forms, but corruption does not produce the accuracy of historical record and the almost arcane perfection of Thucydidean style that one finds in the scholion on the *Plutus*. Deterioration in musical composition does not produce a symphony.

If Ephoros had before him the scholiast’s text of Thucydides, as I believe he had, he could have written the same nonsense that he is supposed to have derived from the book-texts. Indeed the only thing that Ephoros could have taken from the one which he cannot have got straight from the other is the figure 10,000. He has no real conception of the facts, which Thucydides has set forth. The 6000 talents on the Acropolis included all the minted money that Athens possessed, sacred and profane. Probably little more than half of it came from the allies. Yet Ephoros says that the whole original 10,000 had been the common property of the treasury of the Delian League. If we are to believe Ephoros in his description of the funds with which Athens entered the war, Athens had no money of her own and no sacred treasure. This can be proved false, though proof is hardly necessary. What, for example, about the money of the Other Gods? Shall we accept the figure 10,000 which even champions of the traditional text have to explain away, when we know that all that Ephoros said about it is wrong? 65

The rest of the literary tradition which names the 10,000 talents—represented by Demosthenes, Timaios, and others—depends on Isokrates (misunderstood) or on Ephoros, and does not, I think, concern the present argument.

My objections to the book-text of Thucydides, therefore, are two: it makes hist-

---

65 The 10,000 talents which Ephoros has added to his paraphrase of Thucydides are symptomatic, rather, of a tendency on which Busolt has already commented, as follows (Gr. Gesch., III, 1, pp. 20-21): Für diesen Geschichtsschreiber ist ferner die Vorliebe für bestimmte Zahlenangaben charakteristisch, mit denen der aus Thukydides entlehnte Stoff vielfach bereichert ist.
torical nonsense, and it violates his style. It is, so to speak, both physically and spiritually unacceptable. We do not have to emend this text. We have at our disposal an indirect tradition, of equal antiquity with our book-texts, a direct quotation by an ancient scholar from Thucydides which agrees with the known historical facts and is itself in conformity with his style. By these two powerful criteria it has the better claim to his authorship.

VI

Something must be said about Gomme's attempt to show that there may at some one time have been 9,700 talents collected on the Acropolis. He suggests that the date for this maximum was ca. 446 B.C. (op. cit., p. 15) and so shows the amount in his synoptic table of Athenian resources (op. cit., p. 20). He arrives at this high figure with the assumption that Athens had in her public treasury (the δημόσιον as distinct from the sacred treasury or the treasury of the hellenotamiai) a balance of 3000 talents or more from at least as early as 454/3 down to 434/3, when the 3000 talents of the Kallias decree (D1) were taken up to the Acropolis. He believes that these 3000 talents came not from the hellenotamiai, but from the reserves in the δημόσιον. The δημόσιον itself, in his opinion, was built up from the collection of the direct tax (or εἰσφορά), from the surplus revenue from Laureion, from war booty, from certain other taxes, and possibly even from contributions (yearly, or in peaceful years) from the surplus of the tribute. Certainly, says Gomme, there may have been a sum of over 3000 talents in 434, from which 3000 was transferred to Athena, and the rest used to repay loans from the Other Gods (op. cit., pp. 17-18). His suggestion is that the εἰσφορά was collected for seven years—from 454/3 to 447/6—then perhaps suspended from 445 to 428, to be reimposed again in 428 (op. cit., pp. 17, 20).

All this may look specious enough, but by and large the whole financial picture thus conjured up is without foundation in the ancient evidence, and where there is ancient evidence it is sometimes ignored, and frequently misconstrued.

I begin by calling to mind the text of D1, which has been cited above to show how Isokrates arrived at his figure of 8000 talents, combining the 5000 of the *Anonymus Argentinensis* with the 3000 of the Kallias decrees, to give credit to Perikles for the profane money he brought up to the Acropolis. The implications of these decrees (D1 and D2) are that these 3000 talents had come from the funds of the hellenotamiai, at the rate of 200 talents a year (their normal surplus) from 448 to 434 B.C. The purpose of the Kallias decree known as D1 was to pay back moneys owed to the Other Gods. It starts with the injunction, ἀποδόναι τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ χρήματα τὰ ὀφελόμενα, ἐπεὶ τῆ Ἀθηναίᾳ τὰ τρισχίλια τάλαντα [καὶ ἀνενεγκταί ἐς τόλμων ἡ ἐφοσεφιστῶ, νομίσματος ἱερωδαπᾶ]. The fact that the grand obligation to Athena was now satisfied left no obstacle in the way of paying back the Other Gods. The language of Athenian fifth-century decrees is dry, precise, and to the point. It does not indulge in fine phrases that
have no relevance to the business in hand. If the settlement of Athena’s obligation cleared the way for a repayment to the Other Gods, then the source that had been preoccupied earlier in Athena’s favor was now released and available for the Other Gods. Since the text states explicitly that the source used for the repayment to the Other Gods was the money that belonged to the hellenotamiai, it follows that Athena too had received her 3000 talents from the funds of the hellenotamiai and not, as Gomme would have us believe, from a separate δημόσιον. I know that Gomme has claimed that the simplest and most natural explanation of the above sentence in the Kallias decree is to suppose that a fund hitherto ἐν τῷ δημόσιῳ had been transferred to Athena’s treasury. I disagree with him, and claim that this is not at all simple and direct. The simple interpretation of this sentence is that Athena had been paid by the hellenotamiai and that the way was now clear for the Other Gods. It is otiose, wordy, and irrelevant to assume that repayment to the Other Gods was conditioned on a transaction that involved a different source of supply and different paymasters.

Gomme evades this issue by claiming that the hellenotamiai were not the source of the money that repayed the Other Gods, and that most of the money to be used in the repayment did not belong to them. They acted, says Gomme, only as transfer agents for it. Both these theses depend on mistranslation of the Greek text of the Kallias decrees:

(a) The repayment in D1 is authorized in these words (lines 4-7): ἀποδύ[δ]όναι δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν χρεμάτων, ἄ ἐς ἀπόδοσιν ἑστὶν τοῖς θεοῖς ἐφοσφορ[ή]μ[ή], τὰ τε παρὰ τοῖς ἐλλενοταμίασ ὄντα νῦν καὶ τὰλλα ἄ ἐστιν τούτον [τὸ]ν χρεμάτων, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς δεκάτης ἐπειδὰν πραθεῖ. Gomme does not believe that the money from the δεκάτη was within the control of the hellenotamiai, nor even that the second item belonged to them, and he makes the extraordinary claim that τούτον τὸν χρεμάτων refers back to τὸν χρεμάτων ἄ ἐς ἀπόδοσιν, κ.τ.λ.

The Greek text cannot be construed in this way. To achieve Gomme’s meaning, one needs something like τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ἐλλενοταμίασ. In the text as cut on the stone the contrast is between what the hellenotamiai have on hand now and what else there is that belongs to them. With a τὲ-καὶ doublet of connectives these two categories of the funds of the hellenotamiai are closely linked together. One has the same kind of close contrast between what is now on hand and what is not in two other passages of these very texts:

(1) D1 (lines 25-26) : καὶ λόγον διδόντων τὸν τε ὅντων χρεμάτων καὶ τὸν προσιόντων τοῖς θεοῖς


In D1, line 6, the hellenotamiai are represented as having some funds on hand. They have other funds that are not on hand. These can, in part, be identified as the moneys given to generals in the field from which some unexpended balance may be expected.\(^{67}\) This explains why τὰλλα ἀ ἔστι τούτον [τὸ]ν χρεμάτον is in the indicative, rather than the subjunctive, mood. The "other moneys which belong to their fund" are not future income (or at least not exclusively so), but income already realized which will after a time become again available, given back by the generals to the hellenotamiai and by the hellenotamiai to be put at the disposal of the Other Gods.

This leaves the δεκάτη. I have translated the phrase καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς δεκάτης ἐπειδὰν πραθεῖ (above, p. 215) "including the proceeds of the dekate when it is farmed out." \(^{68}\) This is entirely legitimate, and it is hard to see why Gomme "cannot agree"; the more so, since in fact the payments made for the benefit of the Other Gods were all, without exception, to come from the hellenotamiai. If the proceeds of the δεκάτη were stewarded by a different body, there is no indication of it in the decrees of Kallias. The charge upon the hellenotamiai to provide the moneys for the Other Gods is in D2, lines 19-21: [θεοὶς δὲ πᾶσαν καταπιθέναι κ[ἀτὰ τὸ]ν ἐναυτὸν τὰ ἱεκά[στοι ὀφελόμενα παρὰ τ]α[ῖς] ταμίασι τῶν [τῆς Ἀθ]εναίας τῶς ἐκλενο[ταμιάς]: "The hellenotamiai shall deposit for all the gods during the course of the year the amounts owed to each one with the treasurers of the moneys of Athena." This stop-gap provision was necessary because the first board of treasurers of the Other Gods would not be elected until spring of 433. The treasurers of Athena were to hold the moneys repaid safe in their side of the Opisthodomos until deposits could be turned over to the treasurers of the Other Gods who would eventually move into the other side of the Opisthodomos. The actual handing over of the money was finally the duty of the prytenais and the Council (D1, lines 9-10).

(b) Gomme has misread the text of D2 when he says that in it (line 21) the hellenotamiai are to be the officers who will deposit the money with each of the Other Gods. The hellenotamiai are to deposit the money rather with the treasurers of Athena, and it would begin to look like the childhood game of "Thimble, thimble, who has the thimble?" if we are to assume that the hellenotamiai in turn acted only as receiving agents and themselves had the money given to them by some other board—unspecified, and for which there is no evidence.

Nor has there ever been any evidence for a large accumulation of treasure in the δημόσιων. The δημόσιων was supported, of course, from confiscations, taxes, and miscellaneous revenues: it was stewarded by the kolakretai. We know that the

\(^{67}\) See *A.T.L.*, III, pp. 331-332. See also below, p. 227.

\(^{68}\) This meaning of καὶ is well known, and was adopted in *A.T.L.*, III, p. 326. See also the phrase οἱ πλείοντα ἄντων καὶ Ἑπιτάδας ὁ ἄρχων in the quotation (No. 73) from Thuc. IV, 31, 2, on p. 203 above, and the phrase οἱ πλείοντες ἀντῶν ἀπέθανον καὶ Δικόφρων ὁ στρατηγὸς in the quotation (No. 80) from Thuc. IV, 44, 2, on p. 203 above.
Athena Promachos was built with its resources. But by and large the spoils of war and the Persian booty went into dedications and non-monetary objects of intrinsic value. Thucydides (II, 13, 4) lists these assets of unminted gold and silver all together with the words χωρίς δὲ χρυσίων ἀσήμων καὶ ἀργυρίων ἐν τε ἀναθήμασιν ιδίως καὶ δημοσίως καὶ ὡσα ἱερὰ σκεῦη περί τε τὰς πομπὰς καὶ τοὺς ἀγώνας καὶ σκύλα Μηδικὰ καὶ εἴ τι τοιουτότροπον, οὐκ ἔλασσον [ἡ] ἡ πεντακοσίων ταλάντων. They did not figure in the totals of coined silver and they are not part of any negotiable chest of treasure, either of Athena or the Other Gods, or of the δημόσιον, or of the hellenotamiai. Gomme's idea that surplus from the tribute was added, "yearly, or in peaceful years," to the δημόσιον is outright fiction. It caused trouble enough when the league funds were given to Athena—and for this there is evidence.

There remains the εἰσφορά. I find it incredible that the Athenians should be assumed to endure this direct tax (as Gomme posits) when they had already a surplus in the public treasury of 3000 talents (op. cit., p. 20). The εἰσφορά was a resort for times of direst need. The Athenians in 428/7 imposed the εἰσφορά for the first time during the Archidamian War because they were faced with the siege of Lesbos and because they needed extra money. What they had available in the sacred treasury, in the annual revenue from the allies, or wherever, was not enough—or at least the Athenians in 428 B.C. thought it was not enough—to meet the new crisis. Thucydides says (III, 19, 1): προσδεόμενοι δὲ οἱ Αθηναίοι χρημάτων ἐς τὴν πολυρκίαν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσενεγκόντες τότε πρῶτον ἐσφοράν διακόσια τάλαντα, ἐξέπεμψαν καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐξιμμάχους ἀργυρολόγους ναὸς δώδεκα καὶ Δαυιδέα πέμπτον αὐτὸν στρατηγόν. They could either tax themselves or they could get the money from their allies. In 428 B.C. they did both. In 425 B.C. there was a drastic revision of the whole assessment of tribute on the Empire, amounting to a total of more than 1460 talents. Wade-Gery, McGregor, and I have suggested that the high figure of this assessment was planned (in part) so as to avoid the necessity of further εἰσφορά. Gomme says that we do this without evidence; yet he is equally without evidence that εἰσφορά continued to be imposed after 425/4. We need not here concern ourselves with what Athens did near the end of the century, when Euboia had revolted and when disaster was finally only a matter of time. Doubtless there were other εἰσφοραῖ, but it is equally certain that when there were then the money in the public treasury had been exhausted. Before the final collapse, the dole at Athens was being paid in measures of grain and not in cash. The levying of the εἰσφορά meant that at the time of its levy the Athenians had need of more money than their resources could afford. It is our judgment, as against Gomme, that the high assessment of 425 B.C. removed the need of εἰσφορά, and it seems not unreasonable to suppose that those who made the high assessment knew that this would be true and approved. Gomme finds it hard to believe that the Athenians would

---

thus wish to put an undue share of the burden of carrying on the war upon the allies. “As though Kleon,” he writes, “who is given the main responsibility for the tribute increase, was especially anxious to spare the well-to-do of Athens from whose pockets the εἰσφορά chiefly came.” 70 Kleon, no doubt, had no special anxiety for the rich, but he was enough of a demagogue to know that the direct tax was unpopular, no matter whom it touched. It could be voted only with special consent even to the making of the motion—a provision which proves that the demos as a whole, whose favor Kleon curried, was opposed to it. On the other hand, Kleon had no soft feelings about dealing with the allies. In haranguing the Athenian assembly on the fate of the Mytileneans he made, in the course of his oration (according to Thucydides), this remark (III, 39, 8: Crawley’s translation) to show what the results of too lenient dealing would be in their control of other revolts: “We meanwhile shall have to risk our money and our lives against one state after another; and if successful, shall receive a ruined town from which we can no longer draw the revenue upon which our strength depends.” Even Kleon disliked the prospect of Athens risking her own money in running the Empire, and he knew that her strength lay in the money she received from the tribute. This reliance on the allies was well known throughout Greece, and Archidamos, at Sparta, warned the Lacedaemonians that they had no chance of a victory over the Athenians unless they could deprive Athens of the revenue that maintained her fleet (Thuc. I, 81, 4): 

70 Historia, II, 1953, p. 17. Gomme says that the authors of A.T.L., III, “deny that any of the ‘other revenue’ mentioned in Thuc. ii 13.3 can have been used for the war.” He has interpreted us perhaps too literally (cf. A.T.L., III, p. 333 and Historia, II, 1953, pp. 4, 17). When pressed to desperation, Athens of course used every resource she possessed, public and private, but it is our belief that in 431 B.C. in spite of an impending war the normal life of the city (financed from the ἀλλης πρόσωδος) was expected to go on. This is indicated clearly in the Funeral Oration (esp. Thuc. II, 38). At the commencement of the war Athens planned (and hoped) to have funds to carry it on from her reserves and from her annual income from the allies. Gomme’s suggestion (op. cit., p. 3) that there may have been an assessment in 432 that raised the total annual tribute from its figure of approximately 390 talents in 433/2 closer to the 600 talents named by Thucydides in 432/1 is unnecessary and without evidence. The quota-list of 432/1 proves that no new assessment governed the collection of tribute at the Dionysia of 431. Gomme is aware of this; so he makes the presumed assessment of 432 effective only in 430 (without explaining the delay) and attributes to Perikles in 431 a figure for the annual income which, by the premises of his hypothesis, is in fact false. This is too muddled to be credible, and unless some good argument can be put forward the idea of an assessment in 432 had best be abandoned.
The direct tax, or εἰσφορά, was not unknown in Athens even before the Archidamian War, and before what Thucydides has described as the initial imposition of it then in 428 B.C. In 434 B.C. the Athenians laid severe restrictions on the expenditure of funds from Athena's treasure. Having made provision for continuing work on the marble sculpture of the Parthenon, on the Golden Nikai, and on the Propylaia, Kallias then wrote into one of his decrees a provision for a limit of 10 talents a year for any other necessary work on the Acropolis.  

Next came the restriction on other uses of Athena's money:

[... tois δ] e ἀλλοις χρέμα[σν τοι]s tēs Ἀθέναιας to[ίς τε νῦν ὅσι]


The conclusions to be drawn from this decree of 434 B.C. are (1) that εἰσφορά was a form of tax already experienced by the Athenian people, and (2) that the Athenians resorted to it only in times of emergency. This passage confirms the conclusion already valid from Thuc. III, 19, 1, that the εἰσφορά was used only when there was no other money available. Gomme's thesis that the Athenians contributed εἰσφορά to a separate public fund (the δημόσιον) during the years before the Archidamian War, specifically from 454/3 to 446/5, when (according to Gomme) the surplus in this separate δημόσιον already exceeded 3000 talents, is preposterous. Yet at some time before the Archidamian War the text of D2 shows that recourse had been had to the εἰσφορά. The logical conclusion is, of course, that the δημόσιον at that time (whenever it was) had no surplus. The date must be earlier than 454 B.C., and the most appropriate time for this early εἰσφορά is that of the Spartan invasion in the north in 458 B.C., which culminated in the two great battles of Tanagra and Oinophyta and in the subsequent Athenian subjugation of Central Greece.

There are other minor objections to Gomme's thesis of a large and early separate δημόσιον, one of them being that, in defending the total μύρια in the book-texts of Thucydides, he must at the same time accuse Thucydides of giving the mistaken im-

71 The text of this Kallias decree is given as D2 in A.T.L., II, p. 47.
72 For the history of the δημόσιον see A.T.L., III, pp. 337, 359-366.
73 See A.T.L., III, p. 177, for the chronology. I agree with Gomme (Historia, II, 1953, p. 16) that the Athenians from their own funds probably financed most of the operations of the "First Peloponnesian War." This is when their need for εἰσφορά showed that they had no surplus.
pression that the maximum had been on the Acropolis. Having made of the 3000 talents of the Kallias decree (D1, lines 3-4) an accumulated hypothetical surplus in the separate δημόσιον, Gomme finds that the words ἀνενέγκται ἔσ τόλμη in D1 mean, in 434 b. c., that the 3000 talents had not until that time been on the Acropolis. So the supposed Thucydidean maximum of 9700 talents on the Acropolis was—in reality—in 446/5 (the alleged year of the maximum) made up of 6200 talents on the Acropolis and of 3500 talents which were somewhere else.  

The figures are so given by Gomme in his table (op. cit., p. 20). Moreover, if Isokrates and Ephoros had their totals of 10,000 talents from Thucydides (which I do not believe, and which is not necessary with the scholiast’s version of II, 13, 3), they too (on Gomme’s theory) were misled by the Thucydidean implications. Nor does it seem reasonable to me, at least, that Perikles should have so much credit for amassing 10,000 talents if 3500 of them, or even 3000 of them, had been in the Athenian δημόσιον anyway from surpluses of pre-Periklean days. All this is part of the wilderness into which, in my opinion, Gomme’s speculations have led him, and which follow partly from his attempt to justify an unjustifiable μύρια in the book-texts of Thucydides.

VII

The reading of Thucydides as given in the scholon on the Plutus has ἐπανηλώθη instead of ἀπανηλώθη for the money that had been spent on the Propylaia, the other buildings, and on Poteidaia. Beginning with ἀφ’ ὄν, the text is ἀφ’ ὄν ἔσ τε τὰ προπύλαια τῆς ἀκροπόλεως καὶ τάλλα οἰκοδομήματα καὶ ἐς Ποτείδαιαν ἑπανηλώθη.  

The translation, as given in A.T.L., III, p. 131, runs as follows: “There had been extra disbursements from it for the Propylaia and other buildings and for Poteidaia.” The point of the passage, of course, is to explain what use had been made of the fund of 6000 talents during the time since its establishment in 450/49. I doubt very much if the mention of the “extra disbursements” was in any way an attempt to explain why in 431 b. c. the fund stood only at 5700 talents rather than at its canonical 6000. The “extra” expenses for the Propylaia and the other buildings and for Poteidaia were far more than the temporary deficit of a mere 300 talents. Surely in this Gomme is

74 Historia, II, 1953, p. 15: “The wording of the sentence in the Kallias decree suggests that the state treasury, τὸ δημόσιον, was not kept on the Akropolis, though I would not be positive about this;” Why not? — “in that case the only semblance of inaccuracy in Thucydides’ statement would be the implication that all the 9,700 tal. had been stored there.”

75 The Ravennas omits τὲ and uses εἰς instead of ἔ. The Venetus also uses εἰς for ἔ and abbreviates Ποτείδαιαν (which is the spelling in both mediaeval manuscripts). Both abbreviate ἀκροπόλεως and employ the characteristic symbol for καὶ. But the text is clearly that of the manuscript tradition of Thucydides except for the final word ἐπανηλώθη. Readings from the other MSS. are interesting only as curiosities: the Codex Laurentianus (Θ), for example, omits the first εἰς, reading ἀφ’ ὄν τὲ; the Aldine editio princeps also omits this first εἰς, but has καὶ ἔς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα οἰκοδομήματα.
right (op. cit., p. 6), but it does not follow that he is also right in claiming that “καὶ τὰλλα οἰκοδομήματα shows that all the relevant building costs of 17 years are included; and for that we need ἀπανηλώθη.”

Whether we need ἀπανηλώθη is, in fact, very doubtful. The modern scholar has become so much accustomed to thinking of this clause as an attempt by Thucydides to explain how a maximum of 9700 talents had been reduced to a residue of 6000, that he is inclined to look upon the 3700 talents of difference as money “spent off” from the total. This point of view must be corrected; one must realize that there never was any total of 9700 talents; the verb desired is not one to show how funds had been drained off from a hypothetical Elysian maximum, but one to show to what good use a fairly constant sum of about 6000 talents had been put between 449 and 431. The suggestion has already been made above that this note by Thucydides is the author’s attempt to show how useful the 6000 talents had already been, at a time when Perikles was laying emphasis on how useful they were sure to be in the prosecution of the war. So the question is rather one of what valuable contributions the fund had already made, rather than of what damaging deficits it had suffered. For this the verb is ἐπανηλώθη, not ἀπανηλώθη. The whole tone of the passage, indeed of this whole chapter in Thucydides, is one of pride and optimism, not of regret and discouragement. I should like to translate “from which contributory expenses had been made for the Propylaia of the Acropolis and the other buildings and for Poteidaia.” I prefer “contributory” to “extra” because, in my judgment, it gives more range to the possible magnitude of the expenses: the word “extra” somehow seems to indicate that the expenses were small, and for the Propylaia and Parthenon at least we know that this was not true.

Perhaps “contributory” is better also for other reasons. The great buildings were financed from many sources. Besides the money of Athena (from the fund after 449 B.C.) there were contributions toward the Parthenon from the xenodikai, from the mines at Laureion, from private individuals, from the baths, from the hieropoioi, from the teichopoioi. The Propylaia received funds from rentals of property, from private individuals, from the mines at Laureion, and from the surplus moneys of generals in the field when their routine missions were over. Yet there were some public buildings, like the springhouse of the mid ’thirties, that had no grants from the fund. This building was paid for directly from the tribute of the allies, and not from the reserve of 6000 talents. Not only does the decree concerning the springhouse confirm the annual grants of money from the hellenotamiai to the treasurers of Athena; it shows also that ἐπανηλώθη is the better verb to be associated with καὶ τὰλλα οἰκοδομήματα. The fund had contributed to the building program; but

80 See A.T.L., III, p. 328.
it had supplied no money for some of the buildings, and it had not supplied all the money for any of the buildings, so far as our evidence shows, except for the statue of Athena Parthenos (S.E.G., X, 257-263) if one counts that as part of the building program. For the accomplishments of the fund, therefore, the verb ἔπανηλώθη is fitting and proper, and preferable to ἀπανηλώθη.

The same applies to the expenses of Poteideaia. Wade-Gery, McGregor, and I reckoned the amount borrowed from the reserve fund for use against Makedonia and Poteideaia as 400 talents down to the time of Perikles's speech in spring of 431. Gomme would put the initial expenses higher. He confuses initial expense with initial borrowing. Undoubtedly much of the current income from the tribute was also used against Makedonia and Poteideaia. If Gomme's figures for early expense of 800 or 1000 talents are even approximately correct, they mean that contributions from the reserve fund amounted to half (or less) of the expense involved. For Poteideaia, therefore, the legitimate verb is again ἔπανηλώθη. Since the verb is closely associated with ἐσ Ποτειδαίαν by its position in the sentence, this apt usage in connection with Poteideaia could easily account for ἔπανηλώθη for the Propylaia and the other buildings also, even if it had not been in its own right (as we have seen that it was) equally appropriate with them. Wade-Gery, McGregor, and I suggested at first that perhaps in this passage ἔπανηλώθη might enjoy the distinction (as against ἀπανηλώθη) of being the lectio difficilior. In view of the rarity of the verb, this judgment may still be true, but in any case, once the shadow of the hypothetical 9700 talents is removed, ἔπανηλώθη can be more easily understood, and it agrees better with the facts and with the spirit of the context in which it is used.

VIII

The student of Periklean Athens cannot hope to understand the history of Athenian finance unless he realizes how shockingly bad is the account that has been left to us by Ephoros. The statements in Diodoros (XII, 38, 2 and XII, 40, 1-2) that (1) the Athenians had brought 8000 talents from Delos to Athens and (2) that the

83 The record of borrowings from the reserve fund in 432/1 is preserved in I.G., I², 296, the text of which is published in Meritt, Athenian Financial Documents (1932), pp. 80-83. The moneys used in the north were used against Makedonia as well as against Poteideaia: indeed Makedonia was the first objective (Thuc. I, 59, 2), but Makedonia is not mentioned in the text of Thucydides, II, 13, 3. Presumably for this is that Poteideaia was prominent in the mind of Thucydides when the passage was written, while Makedonia seemed to him at that time less significant. So too are explained the absence of Korkyra (cf. Gomme, op. cit., p. 5) and Samos. Whether Samos had repayed her damages before 431 has no bearing on the value of the service rendered by the reserve fund in combatting her revolt, had Thucydides chosen to mention it.
84 A.T.L., III, p. 130.
common funds from the tribute had been brought from Delos to Athens and that from the common 10,000 talents 4000 talents had been spent on the Propylaia and on Poteidaia are absurd. In the face of misstatements so gross it is of little moment that even in error Ephoros was unable to be consistent. We have shown above that these same figures of 8000 and of 10,000 talents were handled correctly by Isokrates, and that what he says about them is true. The crowning guilt of Ephoros is that he foisted his travesty of financial history upon a framework of narrative taken from Thucydides. The passage in Diodoros which runs from XII, 40, 1 to XII, 40, 4 is a paraphrase (with omissions and additions) of Thucydides, II, 13, 3-8. Where it has figures, some of them are the same, but most are not. Diodoros has 460 talents a year from the tribute; Thucydides gives 600. Diodoros has 50 talents of gold on the statue; Thucydides gives 40. Diodoros has 12,000 first-line hoplites and 17,000 second-line hoplites; Thucydides gives 13,000 and 16,000. Diodoros agrees with Thucydides in estimating the value of the spoils as 500 talents, and in numbering the triremes at 300. For the money from the other temples the πλήθος of Diodoros is equivalent to the οὐκ ὀλίγα of Thucydides. But the text of Diodoros (i. e., Ephoros) has no mention of the 6000 talents which Thucydides names as the reserve fund on the Acropolis, and Diodoros (i. e., Ephoros) "corrects" Thucydides’s figure for annual income from 600 to 460, apparently relying on some superficial antiquarian research of his own that yielded the Aristeidean total of the first assessment (cf. Thuc. I, 96, 2). In spite of all these evidences of tampering with the original and of changing it to suit his own pleasure, modern scholars have seen in Ephoros the "proof" that 10,000 as a maximum must have stood in Thucydides, II, 13, 3. Until we knew better, it was an understandable conceit. We have shown above how Isokrates, at least, arrived at his figure of 10,000 talents quite independently of Thucydides, and how his references to it entail a meaning and an implication quite different from that which a reading τὰ γὰρ πλείστα μῦρια ἔγενετο would have had to have in Thucydides. It is clear now that Isokrates gives no support whatsoever to the book-text of Thucydides in this context. Since Ephoros has to all appearances only a muddled version of what has been more accurately said by Isokrates, his text too is no support for the traditional τὰ γὰρ πλείστα μῦρια ἔγενετο of Thucydides. The "literary tradition," which has been held by many to give unanimous support to the numeral μῦρια in Thucydides, has, in fact, no dependence on Thucydides and cannot be used to justify the appearance of μῦρια in II, 13, 3. The figure 6000 which Ephoros might have reported from Thucydides he does not mention. But apparently he had it in mind, and my belief is (as I have indicated above) that he subtracted it from his own 10,000 to

85 E. g., by A. E. Raubitschek in Cl. Weekly, XLV, 1951-2, pp. 230-231. It is not true that Isokrates and Demosthenes mention 10,000 talents "as the sum once on the Akropolis," as Gomme claims (op. cit., p. 8). Demosthenes depends on Isokrates and neither affirms that all the money was there at any one time.
reach the sum (which he does give) of 4000 talents for the expense of the Propylaia and of Poteidaia. This is an embellishment of the simple Thucydidean account, and historically the supposed knowledge that we gain about the expense of the Propylaia and of Poteidaia is just as worthless as the sum of 10,000 talents from which it seems to have been derived.

The acceptance of the scholion on the *Plutus* as the true text of Thucydides allows the scholar to fit together all the various bits of evidence as parts of one consistent whole. I know of no evidence, historical, literary, epigraphical, or papyrological, that is not consistent with it. Gomme has used the simile of a gigantic jig-saw puzzle. When he holds to the reading μύρα in Thucydides, it is of course impossible for him (or for anyone else) to reconstruct an intelligible picture of Athenian finance. Fate has placed this joker in the miscellany of fragments that have to be pieced together, but we now have the evidence that it is foreign to the problem and ought to be discarded. Gomme is diffident about what success we can achieve with the other pieces. I would suggest that we have, at long last, a fairly tight frame for our picture and that when pieces obviously fit, like the 8000 talents of Isokrates and the 5000 talents of the *Anonymous Argentinensis* and the 3000 talents of the Kallias decrees, we ought to put them together.

Fate has also been kind, in that we have the text of Thucydides, II, 13, 3 preserved in a scholion on Aristophanes. This too fits into the picture, and fills a place which the book-text could never fill. It is not surprising that there should have been in antiquity more than one current version of Thucydides. There were in antiquity many variant texts of well known authors. The Homeric variants and the spoken lines in dramatic poetry are hardly good examples to quote as illustrations for our present dual tradition in Thucydides, but some of the doublets cited by Alexander of Aphrodisias (second century after Christ) for the text of Aristotle are pertinent. The following examples are taken as a selection from Alexander’s commentary on the first four books of the *Metaphysics*:  

(1) *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria*, p. 36, 12-13 (Hayduck) on *Metaphysics* 985 B 12-13 (... τῶν πατημάτων, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ οὕτω...) — θέρεται δὲ ἐν τοιῷ γραφῆ τοιαύτη “καὶ ὡσπερ τῶν μαθηματικῶν τῶν αὐτῶν τρόπων καὶ οὕτως.”


---

This last example is especially significant because it shows a deliberate change from the original text introduced by a scholar who wanted the text to say something different. Eudoros wanted to make Aristotle say that for "the initiates" (τοῖς εἴδοσί) Plato had only one ἄρχη, namely τὸ ἐν, which was αἴτιον also for matter.87

We believe that the text of Thucydides, II, 13, 3 was also changed deliberately from περιεγένετο to μύρια ἐγένετο by some scholar who wished to make it say something different—something he thought he knew from Ephoros, and perhaps from the orators, to be superior to what his original manuscript had given him. If our explanation of the corruption is correct, it offers some satisfaction to feel that the history of the text is perhaps easier to understand. But the validity of the scholiast’s text does not depend on our explanation of how the false text came into being from it. We believe that the corruption was intentional, and that it was induced by the historical nonsense that Ephoros had written in his paraphrase of the original. But even if our explanation is wrong, it still remains true that what Ephoros wrote is nonsense and that the scholiast’s version is the better text of Thucydides.
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