

Stylistic characterization in Thucydides: Nicias and Alcibiades

DANIEL P. TOMPKINS

THAT characters exist in Thucydides, and that their distinctive traits influence historical action, cannot be disputed. Themistocles' wit and effectiveness are first displayed (i. 90-3, i. 135-8) and then described (i. 138. 2-3). The traits that made Pericles a great statesman are affirmed, as are the personal qualities that determined Cleon's influence (ii. 65, iii. 38. 6, v. 16. 1). We are also given an explicit statement that Alcibiades' character proved harmful to Athens by alienating public trust (vi. 15. 1), while later passages imply that Nicias' personal stubbornness hurt the expedition in Sicily (vii. 48. 3, vii. 50. 4).

The general outlines of the roles of Nicias and Alcibiades in Thucydides are clear, and, while differences of opinion exist as to the precise motives of these men, the importance of their characters is undeniable.¹ It is also undeniable that the speeches are a major source of information about these men. In Nicias' speeches, for instance, we are given strong arguments for hesitation and conservative ἀπραγμοσύνη, while Alcibiades' exhortation to the Athenians urges action and defends the speaker's competitiveness.

Despite the general admission that characters are important in Thucydides, and the agreement that their speeches provide insight into them, modern scholars insist that these speeches show no individuality of language. Thus Friedrich Blass says: 'spricht nun der Athener wie der Lakedaimonier, Perikles wie Kleon und Brasidas, was die Form der Rede und den Ausdruck anbelangt'.² Another great figure of nineteenth-century rhetorical scholarship, Richard Jebb, was equally unyielding:

1. On Nicias, see in particular A. B. West, 'Pericles' Political Heirs', *CP* 19 (1924), 124-46, 201-28; H. D. Westlake, 'Nicias in Thucydides', *CQ* 35 (1941), 58-65; and Mary Morse Fuqua, *A Study of Character Portrayal in the History of Thucydides* (Dissertation, Cornell University 1965).

2. Friedrich Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, 1 (Leipzig 1868), pp. 229-30, cf. p. 238.

Thucydides has given us distinct portraits of the chief actors in the Peloponnesian War, but these portraits are to be found in the clearly narrated actions of the men; the words ascribed to them rarely do more than mark the stronger lines of the character; they seldom reveal new traits of a subtler kind. The tendency of Thucydides was less to analyse individual character than to study human nature in its general or typical phenomena... The dramatic truth, so far as it goes, is in the matter, not in the form. He may sometimes indicate such broad characteristics as the curt bluntness of the ephor Sthenelaidas or the insolent vehemence of Alcibiades. But, as a rule, there is little discrimination of style. In all that concerns expression, the speeches are essentially the oratorical essays of the historian himself.³

The denial of characteristic language has been echoed by nearly every scholar who has seriously concerned himself with Thucydides.⁴ In it we can see the effect of several attitudes widely held by classicists. First of these is a widespread reluctance to consider character important in Greek literature, and a consequent failure to observe characteristic language.⁵ Another is the traditional view

3. R. C. Jebb, 'The Speeches of Thucydides', in *Essays and Addresses* (Cambridge 1907), pp. 404, 419-20.

4. Cf. John H. Finley, Jr, in *Three Essays on Thucydides* (Cambridge, Mass. 1967): 'Preface' (1966), p. x; 'Euripides and Thucydides' (1938), pp. 4-6, 52; 'The Origins of Thucydides' Style' (1939), p. 116; and *Thucydides* (Cambridge, Mass. 1941), p. 275; K. J. Dover, ed., *Thucydides. Book VI* (Oxford 1965), p. xi; Otto Regenbogen, *Thukydides: Politische Reden* (Leipzig 1949), pp. 16-17; C. N. Cochrane, *Thucydides and the Science of History* (Oxford 1929), p. 26; David Grene, *Man in his Pride* (Chicago 1950), pp. 220-2; Werner Jaeger, *Paideia. The Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet (New York 1945), 1, 397; A. W. Gomme, 'The Speeches of Thucydides', in *Essays on Greek History and Literature* (Oxford 1937), pp. 165-6; Wilhelm Schmid, in Schmid-Staehlin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* 1, 5 (Munich 1948), p. 171; John Edmund Ziolkowski, *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens* (Diss., University of North Carolina 1963), pp. 2-3; Karl Reinhardt, 'Herodots Persergeschichten', and 'Thukydides und Machiavelli', in *Vermächtnis der Antike*, 2nd ed., ed. Carl Becker (Göttingen 1966), pp. 173-4, 193.

5. A reluctance recently exemplified in various ways by John Jones, *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy* (London 1962), and by Hugh Lloyd-Jones: 'The "Supplices" of Aeschylus: The New Date and Old Problems', *AC* 33 (1964), 370-1; 'The Guilt of Agamemnon', *CQ* 12 (1962), 187. See too his reviews of Jones, *RES* Ser. 2, 15 (1964), 221-4, and of Kurt von Fritz, *Antike und moderne Tragödie* (Berlin 1962), *Gnomon* 34 (1962), 740-1. For other examples of this

that Thucydides was primarily a political scientist and his speeches political analyses of past and future events.⁶ A third is the classicist's hesitancy, widespread though not universal, to study stylistic elements other than those sanctioned by tradition.

This essay is aimed only indirectly at these assumptions, and more directly at the argument based on them, but discussion of the one inevitably affects our view of the other. If it can be shown that Thucydidean speakers do vary significantly in their manners of speaking, and moreover that there is a particular aptness of styles to speakers, the canonical denial of differentiated styles must be challenged; if the distinguishing traits of these styles are ones not usually studied, the limited nature of conventional classical stylistics may become evident; if the speeches reveal emotional qualities as well as political theory, we must widen our view of Thucydides' characters, and become skeptical of the claim that characterization is absent from fifth-century Greek literature.

The two studies that follow, on the language of Nicias and Alcibiades, are provisional attempts to gather evidence for stylistic characterization. The method is simple: a search for the dominant stylistic elements in a work or passage, followed by an attempt to interpret these and relate them to other stylistic traits and thus illuminate the work's tone and meaning.⁷ This basically inductive method is the opposite of more encyclopedic approaches, like that of Holger Thesleff's recent *Studies in the Styles of Plato*.⁸ While Thesleff finds traits that aid in establishing general classification of attitude, cf. Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*, *Philologische Untersuchungen* 22 (1917); A. J. A. Waldo, *Sophocles the Dramatist* (Cambridge 1951); Walter Zuercher, *Die Darstellung des Menschen im Drama des Euripides* (Basel 1947); R. D. Dawe, 'Inconsistency of Plot and Character in Aeschylus', *PCPS* 9 (1963), 21-62. More moderate views are expressed by C. Garton, 'Characterization in Greek Tragedy', *JHS* 77 (1957), 247-54, and G. H. Gellie, 'Character in Greek Tragedy', *AUMLA* 20 (1963), 241-55.

6. So Reinhardt, 'Thukydides und Machiavelli', p. 193, 'Herodots Persergeschichten', p. 173, Blass, pp. 229-30, and Jaeger, p. 388.

7. Readers will recognize the derivation of this method from that of Leo Spitzer. Spitzer's method is outlined in the first chapter of his book, *Linguistics and Literary History* (Princeton 1948), pp. 1-39. Unfortunately, many English-speaking scholars know of Spitzer only from the somewhat inaccurate discussion in the handbook, *Theory of Literature*, by René Wellek and Austin Warren (2nd ed., New York 1956), pp. 172-3. Wellek has admitted the shortcomings of these comments in his necrology, 'Leo Spitzer (1887-1960)', *Comparative Literature* 12 (1960), 310-34.

8. Helsinki 1967.

style (colloquial, rhetorical, intellectual, etc.), our aim is to recognize precisely those stylistic idiosyncrasies that reveal distinctions among passages in the same classification,⁹ thus demonstrating the subtlety and flexibility of Thucydides' prose.¹⁰

I. SENTENCE COMPLICATION IN THE SPEECHES OF NICIAS

Ἡ μὲν ἐκκλησία περὶ παρασκευῆς τῆς ἡμετέρας ἤδε ξυνελέγη, καθ' ὅτι χρή ἐς Σικελίαν ἐκπλεῖν· ἐμοὶ μέντοι δοκεῖ καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ τούτου ἔτι χρῆναι σκέψασθαι, εἰ ἄμεινόν ἐστιν ἐκπέμπειν τὰς ναῦς, καὶ μὴ οὕτω βραχείᾳ βουλῇ περὶ μεγάλων πραγμάτων ἀνδράσιν ἄλλοφύλοις πειθομένους πόλεμον οὐ προσήκοντα ἄρασθαι. [2] καίτοι ἔγωγε καὶ τιμῶμαι ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦτου καὶ ἦσσαν ἐτέρων περὶ τῷ ἑμαυτοῦ σώματι ὀρρωδῶ, νομίζων ὁμοίως ἀγαθὸν πολίτην εἶναι ὅς ἂν καὶ τοῦ σώματός τι καὶ τῆς οὐσίας προνοηταί· μάλιστα γὰρ ἂν ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ τὰ τῆς πόλεως δι' ἑαυτὸν βούλοιοτο ὀρθοῦσθαι. ὁμῶς δὲ οὐτε ἐν τῷ πρότερον χρόνῳ διὰ τὸ προτιμᾶσθαι εἶπον παρὰ γνώμην οὕτε νῦν, ἀλλὰ ἥ ἂν γιγνώσκω βέλτιστα, ἔρῳ. [3] καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς τρόπους τοὺς ὑμετέρους ἀσθενῆς ἂν μου ὁ λόγος εἴη, εἰ τὰ τε ὑπάρχοντα σφάζειν παραινοίην καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἐτοίμοις περὶ τῶν ἀφανῶν καὶ μελλόντων κινδυνεύειν· ὥς δὲ οὐτε ἐν καιρῷ σπεύδετε οὐτε ῥᾳδίᾳ ἐστί κατασχεῖν ἐφ' ᾧ ὠρμησθε, ταῦτα διδάξω. (vi. 9)

The vocabulary of this passage resembles that of other speeches by Nicias, and points to underlying concerns that seem constant in his speeches.¹¹ μὴ οὕτω βραχείᾳ βουλῇ reminds us strongly of εὐβουλίᾳ (cf. vi. 23. 3), a conservative and Dorian catchword in Thucydides and elsewhere.¹² The aversion to κινδυνεύειν (vi. 9. 3) finds echoes elsewhere in Nicias' speeches and in narrative

9. This is not at all to denigrate Thesleff's work, from which I have profited, but to show that it is different from my own.

10. I am indebted to Professors Adam M. Parry and C. M. Dawson for considerable help in writing this paper.

11. This and other quotations are from Jones' Oxford text.

12. Cf. Ar. *Birds* 1539, *Ach.* 1008, Pindar, *Ol.* 13. 6, cited in Robert Alexander Neil's edition of Aristophanes, *Knights* (Cambridge 1901), 'Appendix II: Political Use of Moral Terms'.

descriptions of him,¹³ and seems more appropriate to a Spartan than an Athenian.¹⁴ σφάζειν, although lodged in a conditional clause, nevertheless recalls the fact that Nicias uses or is referred to by words like σφάζειν and σωτηρία eleven times in Thucydides. All these words put Nicias in a conservative light.

The syntax, too, appears to be characteristic. The potential optative construction (vi. 9. 2, 9. 3) is typical of Nicias.¹⁵ Another syntactic feature of the paragraph is perhaps best indicated by an outline of the transitions and shifts of directions it contains:

We are here to discuss provisions... *But* it seems imperative to consider whether we really should sail... *yet* I am honored and fearless, *although* I think a man could be fearful and still remain an ἀγαθὸς πολίτης.... *Still*, I have never spoken against my γνώμη, nor will I now; I will say what I must, weak though it might be if I should call for a secure policy... *But* I'll show that your policy is difficult and wrong-headed.

As the italicized words show, this paragraph is packed with concessions and reversals. These cause a constant subordination of one thought to another. Thus in vi. 9. 1a, the main verb is ξυνελέγη. Subordinate to the main clause is a clause containing χρή, which is in turn completed by the infinitive ἐκπλεῖν, a further step in subordination.¹⁶ Slightly adapting the terminology of T. B. L. Webster, we can say that this sentence contains two levels, or degrees, of subordination, or complexity.¹⁷ The next sentence is yet more complex, and can be diagrammed as follows according to its stages of subordination:

13. Cf. vi. 10. 5, vi. 12. 1, vi. 12. 2, vi. 13. 1, vi. 47, vii. 77. 2.

14. Cf. i. 73. 2, 74. 2, 74. 3, ii. 39. 1, 40. 3, 42. 4, 43. 4, 61. 1 for the Athenian willingness to take risks, and ii. 11. 3, iv. 18. 5, 87. 2, 126. 5, v. 9. 2, viii. 24. 5, and viii. 64. 4 for the opposed sentiments of Spartans and conservatives.

15. He uses it more than any other speaker in Thucydides except Hermocrates.

16. Although subordinate clauses can be governed by nouns, they all contain verbs, and for convenience of notation I will refer to them by the verbs they contain.

17. I use with slight modification the system of classifying sentences proposed by T. B. L. Webster in 'The Architecture of Sentences', in *Studies in French Language and Medieval Literature Presented to Professor Mildred Pope* (Manchester 1939), pp. 381-2, and 'A Study of Greek Sentence Construction', *AJPh* 62 (1941), 385-415.

δοκεῖ	(main verb)
χρῆναι	(first level of subordination)
σκέψασθαι	(second level)
ἔστιν	(third level)
ἐκπέμπειν	(second level)
ἄρασθαι	(second level)
πειθομένους	(third level)
προσέκοντα	(third level) ¹⁸

In vi. 9. 2a, προνοῖται depends on εἶναι, which leads to νομίζων, which in turn qualifies ὁρῶδῶ, thus producing a sentence that is complex to the third level. The next two sentences reach only the first degree of subordination, while the two that follow again reach the third degree.

Analysis of the seven sentences in vi. 9 could thus be summarized in chart form:

level of complexity	number of sentences reaching each level
1	2
2	1
3	4

On investigation, the chart turns out to be typical not only of this paragraph but of all the speeches of Nicias. The distinguishing characteristic of these speeches is their consistently high level of complexity. Four of the seven sentences in the paragraph are complex to at least the third degree, which means that they contain at least three clauses subordinate to one another. In the speech as a whole, seventeen of the thirty-six sentences reach this level, and the level is maintained in Nicias' other speeches and harangues.¹⁹

Comparison with the speeches of other characters shows that

18. This scheme follows the commentaries of Steup and Dover (in *Thucydides. Book VI.* Ed. K. J. Dover (Oxford 1965)). If we were to view ἐκπέμπειν and ἄρασθαι as dependent on ἔστιν, the sentence would be yet more complex. The difficulty in determining the order of subordination is indicated by de Romilly's translation, which seems to allow either choice.

19. I follow the punctuation of the Oxford Classical Text. De Romilly and Classen-Steup seem rather consistently to mark fewer sentences than Jones, while Bekker (1821) marks more. For further comments on punctuation and sentence-length, see below, n. 20.

Nicias' level of complexity is extraordinarily high. That the level is maintained over the course of two books, in six speeches short and long, is yet more remarkable.

Proportion of sentences with three or more levels of complexity in Thucydidean speeches (in descending order)

Speaker and passage	Proportion of sentences complicated to third level
Spartans, iv. 17-20	0.615
Corinthians, i. 37-43	0.555
Nicias, vi. 20-3	0.533
Nicias, vi. 68	0.500
Nicias, vii. 61-4	0.500
Syracusans, vi. 66-8	0.500
Nicias, vi. 9-14	0.472
Nicias, vii. 11-15	0.464
Brasidas, v. 9	0.455
Hermocrates, vi. 76-80	0.438
Brasidas, iv. 85-7	0.409
Nicias, vii. 77	0.357
Euphemus, vi. 82-7	0.351
Athenians, i. 73-8	0.333
Pericles, ii. 60-4	0.333
Hermocrates, iv. 59-64	0.325
Cleon, iii. 37-40	0.318
Athenagoras, vi. 36-40	0.313
Pagondas, iv. 92	0.308
Corcyraeans, i. 32-6	0.303
Alcibiades, vi. 16-18	0.297
Hermocrates, vi. 33-4	0.296
Thebans, iii. 61-7	0.291
Corinthians, i. 120-4	0.289
Plataeans, iii. 53-9	0.288
Corinthians, i. 68-71	0.283
Diodotus, iii. 42-7	0.268
Archidamus, ii. 11	0.267
Alcibiades, vi. 89-92	0.262
Pericles, i. 140-4	0.236

Pericles, II. 35-46	0.228
Mytileneans, III. 9-14	0.166
Brasidas, IV. 126	0.154
Sthenelaidas, I. 86	0.125
Archidamus, I. 80-4	0.111
Phormio, II. 89	0.095
Spartans, II. 87	0.067

Nicias uses subordination more consistently than any other speaker. About half of all his sentences are complex to the third degree, as compared with one-fourth of Pericles' and one-third of Cleon's.²⁰

Several stylistic tendencies cause subordination and thus contribute to Nicias' high level of complexity. I will discuss in particular the use of abstract nouns and adjectives, and impersonal constructions, that take a dependent infinitive, and then consider the motives behind sentence-complication, of which at least two can be singled out with some certainty: Nicias' constant concern with himself, and his habit of making concessions and admissions of inadequacy.

20. This insistence on subordination, as might be expected, can affect sentence-length. Thus two of Nicias' speeches have far and away more 'long' sentences (over thirty words) than other speeches in Thucydides: in VII. 61-4, 0.563 of the sentences are 'long' by this standard, and in VI. 20-3, 0.533 are long. No other speech by any character goes beyond 0.440. But other speeches by Nicias are not abnormal in this regard: in VI. 9-14, 0.278 of the sentences are long; in VI. 68, 0.250; in VII. 11-15, 0.258; and in VII. 77, 0.286. There is, therefore, no necessary correlation between sentence-length and degree of subordination. (With most recent students of Greek sentence-length, I count as sentences clauses ending in half stops. Cf. William C. Wake, 'Sentence-Length Distributions of Greek Authors', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, A, 120 (1957), 334; A. Q. Morton and John McLernan, *Paul, The Man and the Myth* (N.Y. 1966), p. 54; and Tore Janson, 'The Problems of Measuring Sentence-Length in Classical Texts', *Studia Linguistica* 18 (1964), 28-30. Wake has a useful discussion of ancient ideas on punctuation. Texts of Thucydides vary considerably in marking sentences, but the distinction between full and half stop seems, on the basis of checks of over two hundred sentences in four editions, to be unimportant.)

A. SOME SYNTACTIC SOURCES OF SENTENCE-
COMPLICATION: IMPERSONAL VERBS AND
ABSTRACT NOUNS

Impersonal verbs are frequent in Nicias' speeches. So are a number of abstract terms, both nouns and neuter adjectives, which, with the verb 'to be' expressed or understood, take the infinitive. Both these classes have roughly the same force, as we shall see below. Nicias uses these words consistently, and in a manner that reveals a good deal about the way he thinks. The following table, based on five major speakers in Thucydides, helps to document this argument.

Impersonal verbs and abstract terms causing subordination
in five speakers in Thucydides

	Nicias	Alcibiades	Pericles	Cleon	Hermocrates
1. Abstract terms					
ἔργον	0	0	0	0	1
δῆλον	0	0	0	1	0
ῥάδιον	1	0	0	0	0
αἰσχρόν	1	0	3	0	0
δίκαιον	1	0	2	0	1
καλόν	0	0	1	0	1
οἶον	1	0	1	0	1
ἀδύνατον	0	0	0	0	1
ἀνέλπιστον	0	0	0	0	1
πρέπον	0	0	1	0	0
ἀναγκαῖον	1	1	1	0	0
ἀνάγκη	1	3	1	0	0
δεινόν	1	0	1	1	2
άνόητον	1	0	0	0	0
χαλεπόν	1	0	1	0	1
εὖλογον	0	0	0	0	1

	Nicias	Alcibiades	Pericles	Cleon	Hermocrates
εἰκός	3	2	3	1	4
καιρός	1	0	0	0	0
ξυγγνώμη	0	0	0	0	1
ἄπορον	1	0	0	0	0
δυνατόν	1	0	0	0	0
Total	15	6	15	3	15

2. Impersonal Verbs²¹

ἔστι	1	0	0	0	1
δοκεῖ	4	0	4	1	2
χρή	12	4	9	2	4
δεῖ	6	0	1	3	0
πρέπει	1	0	0	0	0
ξυμβαίνει	1	0	2	0	2
λέγεται	1	0	1	0	0
ἐνδέχεται	0	0	2	0	0
προσθίκει	1	1	0	0	0
ξυμφέρει	0	0	1	0	0
μέλει	0	0	1	0	0
ὑπάρχει	1	0	0	0	0
ἄρκεῖ	0	0	1	0	0
μέτεστι	0	0	1	0	0
περιγίγνεται	0	0	1	0	0
Total impersonals	28	5	24	6	9
Total abstracts	15	6	15	3	15
Total of both classes	43	11	39	9	24

21. More properly 'quasi-impersonals' with 'proleptic *it*'. Cf. Schwyzler-Debrunner, 621-2.

	Nicias	Alcibiades	Pericles	Cleon	Hermocrates
Number of sentences in speeches	120	82	176	45	101
Average number of abstracts and impersonals per sentence ²²	0.358	0.134	0.222	0.200	0.238

The nine sentences in VI. 21-3 contain nine examples of the infinitive with abstract terms and impersonal verbs, as well as six infinitives in indirect discourse and still more in other dependent constructions:

[VI. 21. 1] Πρὸς οὖν τοιαύτην δύναμιν οὐ ναυτικῆς καὶ φαύλου στρατιᾶς μόνον δεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πεζὸν πολὺν ξυμπλεῖν, εἴπερ βουλόμεθα ἄξιον τῆς διανοίας δρᾶν καὶ μὴ ὑπὸ ἱππέων πολλῶν εἶργεσθαι τῆς γῆς, ἄλλως τε καὶ εἰ ξυστώσιν αἱ πόλεις φοβηθεῖσαι καὶ μὴ ἀντιπαράσχωσιν ἡμῖν φίλοι τινὲς γενόμενοι ἄλλοι ἢ Ἐγεσταῖοι ᾧ ἀμυνόμεθα ἱππικόν [2] (αἰσχρὸν δὲ βιασθέντας ἀπελθεῖν ἢ ὕστερον ἐπιμεταπέμπεσθαι, τὸ πρῶτον ἀσκέπτως βουλευσαμένους). αὐτόθεν δὲ παρασκευῇ ἀξιόχρεω ἐπιέναι, γνόντας ὅτι πολὺ τε ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας αὐτῶν μέλλομεν πλεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὁμοίῳ στρατευσόμενοι καὶ ὅτε ἐν τοῖς τῇδε ὑπηκόοις ξύμμαχοι ἦλθετε ἐπὶ τινι, ὅθεν ῥάδιαι αἱ κομιδαὶ ἐκ τῆς φιλίας ὧν προσέδει, ἀλλ' ἐς ἄλλοτρίαν πᾶσαν ἀπαρτήσονται, ἐξ ἧς μηνῶν οὐδὲ τεσσάρων τῶν χειμερινῶν ἄγγελον ῥάδιον ἐλθεῖν. [22.1] ὀπλίτας τε οὖν πολλοὺς μοι δοκεῖ χρῆναι ἡμᾶς ἄγειν καὶ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων, τῶν τε ὑπηκόων καὶ ἦν τινι ἐκ Πελοποννήσου δυνάμεθα ἢ πείσαι ἢ μισθῷ προσαγαγέσθαι, καὶ τοξότας πολλοὺς καὶ σφενδονήτας, ὅπως πρὸς τὸ ἐκείνων ἱππικὸν ἀντέχωσι, ναυσὶ τε καὶ πολὺ περιεῖναι, ἵνα καὶ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ῥῶον ἐσκομιζώμεθα, τὸν δὲ καὶ αὐτόθεν σῖτον ἐν ὀλκάσι,

22. Nicias also uses these words more often than others in comparison with the total number of words he uses, if we care to count in that way. But since we are looking at the function of the words counted in sentence-building, this method of calculating appears to be best.

πυρούς καὶ πεφρυγμένους κριθάς, ἄγειν, καὶ σιτοποιοὺς ἐκ τῶν μυλωνῶν πρὸς μέρος ἡναγκασμένους ἐμπίσθους, ἵνα, ἣν πού ὑπὸ ἀπλοίας ἀπολαμβάνωμεθα, ἔχη ἡ στρατιὰ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια (πολλὴ γὰρ οὕσα οὐ πάσης ἔσται πόλεως ὑποδέξασθαι), τὰ τε ἄλλα ὅσον δυνατόν ἐτοιμάσασθαι, καὶ μὴ ἐπὶ ἑτέροις γίγνεσθαι, μάλιστα δὲ χρήματα αὐτόθεν ὡς πλεῖστα ἔχειν. τὰ δὲ παρ' Ἑγεσταίων, ἃ λέγεται ἐκεῖ ἐτοῖμα, νομίσατε καὶ λόγῳ ἂν μάλιστα ἐτοῖμα εἶναι. [23.1] ἦν γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἔλθωμεν ἐνθὲνδε μὴ ἀντίπαλον μόνον παρασκευασάμενοι, πλήν γε πρὸς τὸ μάχιμον αὐτῶν, τὸ ὀπλιτικόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπερβάλλοντες τοῖς πᾶσι, μολὶς οὕτως οἰοί τε ἐσόμεθα τῶν μὲν κρατεῖν, τὰ δὲ καὶ διασώσαι. [2] πόλιν τε νομίσαι χρή ἐν ἀλλοφύλοις καὶ πολεμίοις οἰκιοῦντας ἵεναι, οὓς πρέπει τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἢ ἂν κατὰσχωσιν εὐθύς κρατεῖν τῆς γῆς, ἢ εἰδέναι ὅτι, ἦν σφάλωνται, πάντα πολέμια ἐξουσιν. [3] ὅπερ ἐγὼ φοβούμενος, καὶ εἰδὼς πολλὰ μὲν ἡμᾶς δεόν εὖ βουλευσασθαι, ἐτι δὲ πλεῖω εὐτυχεῖν (χαλεπὸν δὲ ἀνθρώπους ὄντας), ὅτι ἐλάχιστα τῇ τύχῃ παραδοὺς ἑμαυτὸν βούλομαι ἐκπλεῖν, παρασκευῇ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰκότων ἀσφαλῆς ἐκπλεῦσαι. ταῦτα γὰρ τῇ τε ξυμπάσῃ πόλει βεβαιότατα ἡγοῦμαι καὶ ἡμῖν τοῖς στρατευομένοις σωτήρια. εἰ δὲ τῷ ἄλλως δοκεῖ, παρήμι αὐτῷ τὴν ἀρχήν.

First we have a statement of necessity: 'It is necessary (δεῖ) for a large infantry force to sail' (as well as a fleet). At the end of this sentence comes a qualifying parenthesis introduced by αἰσχροῦν with ἔστι understood, 'It is shameful to be forced to return or call for reinforcements, because we planned without care'. vi. 21 ends with an impersonal expression with ῥάδιον. A little later we find a double impersonal assertion, 'It seems to be necessary (δοκεῖ χρῆναι) for us to bring many hoplites', and a little below this, 'bring as much as is possible' (δυνατόν). Then, 'It is necessary (χρή) to consider that we are going to found a city among foreign and hostile men, and it is fitting (πρέπει) for us, on the first day that we are there, to conquer, or to know that, if we are tripped up, everyone will oppose us'. In following sentences we find δεόν, χαλεπόν, and δοκεῖ. Thus the nine sentences of this section contain nine instances of abstract terms or impersonal verbs with the infinitive (and two without it).²³

23. Similar passages exist in Nicias' other speeches: cf. vi. 11. 1-6, vi. 68. 1-3, vii. 14. 2-vii. 15, vii. 62. 3-vii. 63. 2, and vii. 77.

These words contribute to circumlocution and to complexity. Each verb engenders a dependent expression, thus deepening the level of subordination. The contributions made to a sentence are affective rather than factual, and it is possible to classify them under four headings, as follows:

subjective reasoning	moral judgement	eventuality, likelihood, possibility	necessity
ἀνόητον	αἰσχρόν, δεινόν	ἀδύνατον, ἀνέλπιστον	χρή
δῆλον	δίκαιον, καλόν	ἄπορον, εἰκός	δεῖ
δοκεῖ	πρέπει, πρέπον	ἔξεστι, ἔστι	ἀναγκαῖον
εὐλογον	προσέχει, συγγνώμη	δυνατόν, ἐνδέχεται	ἀνάγκη
		οἶον, ῥάδιον	ἔργον
		ὑπάρχει, χαλεπόν	

The headings give an idea of how these terms are employed. They all betray adherence to *a priori* concepts. To say 'it seems good', δοκεῖ, requires a prior belief in what is good; the ability to invoke statements like 'it is possible', 'it is fitting', 'it is necessary', or to say a thing is pardonable, hard, or easy, rests on similar antecedent commitments.

Students are commonly told of Thucydides' penchant for abstraction.²⁴ It has not, however, generally been noticed that within the text of Thucydides abstract expressions of the type discussed here vary considerably from speaker to speaker, and that Nicias' dependence on these words reveals two characteristic thought-patterns: a tendency to view life in abstractions, and a reliance on vague moral concepts like fitness, necessity, and justice. These patterns, exceptional among Thucydidean characters, contrast especially with the attitude of Thucydides himself, who more than any other fifth-century writer noted and regretted the emptiness of both the concepts and the terms.²⁵

24. Cf. as an example Finley, *Thucydides*, p. 261.

25. Thus the *Archeology*, the demonstration of what forces are operative in history, contains over fifty words for 'power' and very few for morality. This is not to say, with Paul Shorey ('Implicit Ethics and Psychology of Thucydides', *TAPA* 24 (1893), 66-88), that Thucydides was amoral or even dispassionate: I. 23, II. 48-53, III. 82, VII. 29, and VII. 86, among other passages, refute that view.

B. THE MOTIVATION FOR SENTENCE COMPLICATION

The grammatical sources of complexity so far discussed are related to two habits of Nicias: his insistence on talking about himself, and his tendency to admit concessions that weaken his argument. Each of these merits separate discussion.

1. *Personal considerations in the speeches of Nicias*

In four passages in his speeches Nicias refers to himself, usually in an attempt to justify his policies. This is not in itself unusual: *ad hominem* attacks and defenses are frequent in Thucydidean oratory. Pericles had defended himself and his policies in II. 61, and Alcibiades in VI. 16. 1-2, to take two notable examples. Yet these defenses differ in important ways from those of Nicias.

Pericles' defense has a vivid and energetic tone. Two sentences open strongly with καί (II. 61. 1a, II. 61. 2a), and both are stylistically simple.²⁶ Each of these short sentences is followed by a longer one of greater involvement, but the involvement springs from Pericles' strongly antithetical and gnomic manner of expression. Thus II. 61. 1a has an antithetical statement of the consequences of irresolute behavior, and ends with a gnomic utterance: ὁ φυγῶν τὸν κίνδυνον τοῦ ὑποστάντος μεμπτότερος. The next long sentence is complicated to the fifth degree, but again less through personal considerations than by another gnomic antithesis on the effects of misfortune: τὸ μὲν λυποῦν ἔχει ἤδη τὴν αἴσθησιν ἐκάστῳ, τῆς δὲ ὀφελίας ἀπεστίν ἔτι ἡ δῆλωσις ἀπασί (II. 61. 2b). The next sentence, simple and gnomic again in its structure, moves the subject away from Pericles' personal character to the nature of war in general: δουλοὶ γὰρ φρόνημα τὸ αἰφνίδιον καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον καὶ τὸ πλείστῳ παραλόγῳ ξυμβαίνειν (II. 61. 3a). Pericles thus justifies himself by turning the discussion toward general points and by sharply contrasting alternate courses to his own, without long discussion of his own motives and abilities.

Alcibiades' self-defense is vigorous: the speech begins with καί; only one of the first six sentences is complex (VI. 16. 1a). Most sentences in which Alcibiades speaks of himself remain at the first level or lower. The effort to link his own acts to the city's benefit

26. By this I mean that they remain at or below the second level of subordination; by 'complex', that they attain at least the third level.

is constant: we get not only τιμή, he says, but an impression too of δύναμις (VI. 16. 2b); there is envy for me, but foreigners think us strong (VI. 16. 3a); my 'folly' is useful to the *polis* (VI. 16. 3b). The next two sentences are complicated by gnomic antitheses. After a long and complex statement again emphasizing his aid to the city (VI. 16. 5) comes a less complex imperative sentence, two still less subordinated assertions of civic usefulness and action against Sparta (VI. 16. 6), and then two simple transitional sentences leading to a defense of the invasion (VI. 17. 1-2).²⁷

It is precisely Nicias' references to himself, unlike those of Pericles and Alcibiades, that seem to cause complication. In the first speech, for instance, Nicias' opening statements concern himself. He turns the discussion in this direction abruptly with μέντοι (VI. 9. 1), shifts course again for the same reason (καίτοι, VI. 9. 2), and yet again to explain his motives (with concessive νομίζων: 'although I consider...'). The next reference to himself is introduced by ὁμῶς δέ, another reversal of the line of thought, and VI. 9. 3 finally expands the subject of the speech but only with an antithetical reference to himself, ὑμετέρους: μου. VI. 9. 1a is carried to the fifth level of complexity, partly by ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, an emphatic reference to the speaker's person. In VI. 9. 2, the sentence is perfectly straightforward and uncomplicated up to ὁρρωδῶ whereupon a parenthetical explanation with νομίζων, 'although I think...', brings on a string of subordinate clauses.

Nicias' discussion of his motives in the second speech is briefer but again interesting. At VI. 23. 3 he says, essentially, that 'We should sail protected as well as possible from τύχη':

ὅπερ ἐγὼ φοβούμενος, καὶ εἰδὼς πολλὰ μὲν ἡμᾶς δεῖν εὖ βουλευσασθαι, ἔτι δὲ πλείω εὐτυχῆσαι (χαλεπὸν δὲ ἀνθρώπου ὄντας), ὅτι ἐλάχιστα τῇ τύχῃ παραδοὺς ἑμαυτὸν βούλομαι ἐκπλεῖν, παρασκευῇ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰκότων ἀσφαλῆς ἐκπλεῖσαι.

It is not until near the end of this sentence that we reach the main verb, βούλομαι ἐκπλεῖν; the whole opening of the sentence is occupied by the long parenthetical expression ὅπερ ἐγὼ φοβούμενος, καὶ εἰδὼς... which in turn produces three levels of subordi-

27. Alcibiades is again concerned with defending himself in his last speech, VI. 89-92, but again the style is uncomplicated and the passages of self-justification (VI. 89, VI. 92) show a similar capacity to generalize rather than to dwell on oneself.

nate clauses. The only other place at which the sentence reaches the second level of subordination is with the participle παραδούς, which again refers to Nicias and is followed emphatically by ἐμαυτόν. If we were to diagram the increasing subordination of verbs in this sentence, we would get a pattern like this:

βούλομαι (first degree)
 ἐκπλεῖν (second degree)
 παραδούς (third degree)
 ἐκπλεῦσαι (second degree)
 φοβούμενος (second degree)
 εἰδώς (second degree)
 δέον (third degree)
 βουλεύσασθαι (fourth degree)
 εὐτυχῆσαι (fourth degree)
 ὄντας (fifth degree)

Thus we have one subordinate clause at the fourth degree of complication and two at the third, all used to describe Nicias' fears and feelings, and filled with his contradictory thoughts (we must have good τύχη, yet not commit ourselves to τύχη). Nicias seems compelled to speak in the first person singular, to stress the personal nature of his concerns. At the very start of the expedition we thus see a tendency in Nicias to use himself as his constant point of reference, and to neglect other points of view. Later in the same paragraph we see the tendency once again, although not, this time, resulting in subordination: εἰ δέ τῳ ἄλλως δοκεῖ, παρήμι αὐτῷ τὴν ἀρχήν (vi. 23. 3c). The same self-centered attitude that we see here had led Nicias to offer Cleon the command at Pylos (iv. 28. 1) and to refuse to leave Sicily even at the cost of disaster (vii. 48. 4).

When Nicias sends his letter home, in the start of the seventh book, his self-concern has grown with the hopelessness of the expedition. Toward the end of the letter, he complains: τούτων δὲ πάντων ἀπορώτατον τό τε μὴ οἶόν τε εἶναι ταῦτα ἐμοὶ κωλύσαι τῷ στρατηγῷ (χαλεπαὶ γὰρ αἱ ὑμέτεραι φύσεις ἄρξαι) (vii. 14. 2).

'The most difficult thing is that I am unable to prevent any of these difficulties even though I am general (emphatic: ἐμοὶ...τῷ στρατηγῷ).' Immediately on turning to himself, Nicias adds a

parenthetical explanation that has little to do with the situation: 'For your natures are difficult to control.' As Dover says: 'this appears to have no bearing on the difficulties of the situation as Nikias has described them... It is, however, a theme prominent in Nikias' mind... and it was perhaps his habit to suggest that he could have dealt with all difficulties if only he could have relied more on his troops.'²⁸ The parenthesis also contributes to the high degree of subordination. Although the sentence takes on even greater complexity later, the parenthetical justification of Nicias' ineffectiveness plays a role in heightening the complication.²⁹

The line of thought in Nicias' last speech (vii. 77) is complex, partly as a result of personal reflections. This is especially true of the first four sentences:

[1] Καὶ ἐκ τῶν παρόντων, ὧς Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ ξύμμαχοι, ἐλπίδα χρή ἔχειν (ἥδη τινὲς καὶ ἐκ δεινότερων ἢ τοιῶνδε ἐσώθησαν), μηδὲ καταμέμφεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἄγαν αὐτοὺς μήτε ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς μήτε ταῖς παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν νῦν κακοπαθίαις. [2] κἀγὼ τοι οὐδενὸς ὑμῶν οὔτε βῶμη προφέρων (ἀλλ' ὁρᾶτε δὴ ὡς διάκειμαι ὑπὸ τῆς νόσου) οὐτ' εὐτυχίᾳ δοκῶν πού ὕστερός του εἶναι κατὰ τε τὸν ἴδιον βίον καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα, νῦν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κινδύνῳ τοῖς φαυλοτάτοις αἰωροῦμαι· καίτοι πολλὰ μὲν ἐς θεοὺς νόμιμα δεδιήτημαι, πολλὰ δὲ ἐς ἀνθρώπους δίκαια καὶ ἀνεπίφθονα. [3] ἀνθ' ὧν ἡ μὲν ἐλπίς ὅμως θρασεῖα τοῦ μέλλοντος, αἱ δὲ ξυμφοραὶ οὐ κατ' ἀξίαν δὴ φοβοῦσιν.

Nicias seems to be trying to say something like this:

1. 'We must have hope and not blame ourselves for our misfortunes.'
2. 'Look at me: I have been good on both human and divine terms.'
3. 'Therefore I have hope.'³⁰

This would fit Nicias' ideas on divine rewards and punishments. But it is not in fact what he says, for it omits the crucial first sentence of vii. 77. 2 entirely, and passes over other indications that the tone and structure of the speech are at odds with its explicit claims.

28. In A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, iv (Oxford 1970). Dover's 1965 notes make the same point.

29. In vii. 15. 1 Nicias' complaint about his illness is simple and natural, but does complicate the sentence by two degrees.

30. Classen's interpretation runs along these lines (see his note on vi. 77. 3b), as does that of Otto Luschkat, *Die Feldherrnreden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, *Philologus* Supp. 34. 2 (1942), 102-3.

Perhaps it is the particles that best show the importance of the omitted sentence. Three particles in that sentence, first of all, are strongly pathetic: *τοί*, *δή*, and *πou*. (The last is rare, occurring only three times in Thucydides.) '*τοί* is an appeal for human sympathy, as *πou* is a resigned submission to the merciless *rerum natura*', says B. L. Gildersleeve in a noteworthy comment on Thucydidean language.³¹ The emotional and personal tone of *τοί* is natural in Nicias' discussion of himself (note as well the emphatic *ἐγώ*); *πou* with the negative, as here, indicates simultaneous resignation and protest.³² The third particle, *δή*, adds pathos to the verb *ὀρᾶτε*. Denniston remarks of one use of *δή* with verbs:

In the austerer style of Thucydides and the orators this usage is hardly to be found. The emphasis conveyed by *δή* is for the most part pathetic in tone, and it is particularly at home in the great crises of drama, above all at moments when death or ruin is present or imminent...an emotional factor of great importance.³³

Although Denniston in fact goes on to claim that the usage under discussion really has 'less emotional force...a purely intellectual emphasis', basing this claim on the connection with *ὀρᾶν* (p. 216), I cannot accept this classification. *δή* occurs with verbs in Thucydides only eight times.³⁴ It comes here at a moment of crisis and pathos, and can hardly be said to have 'purely intellectual emphasis'. Denniston's convictions about Thucydidean austerity have perhaps led him to ignore the vital role of emotional factors in Thucydides' style.

These three 'pathetic' and largely poetic particles lend a sense of deep personal urgency to the sentence that contains them. Other words are also important. The sentence begins with *καί*, as does the opening sentence of the speech. Such an opening in itself tends

31. 'Brief Mention', *AJPh* 33 (1912), 239-40.

32. Gildersleeve well compares Zeus' tender utterance on human woe at *Iliad* xvii. 446-7: οὐ μὲν γὰρ τί πού ἐστιν δίζυρότερον ἀνδρὸς πάντων ὅσσα τε γαῖαν ἐπι πνέει τε καὶ ἔρπει.

33. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1959), p. 214.

34. I. 39. 1, II. 64. 5, IV. 59. 5, VI. 61. 2, VII. 77. 2, VIII. 9. 1, VIII. 48. 5, VIII. 87. 1.

to be vigorous in tone, as I will argue below. But after the forceful opening of this sentence comes a parenthesis, introduced by *ἄλλὰ*, 'But see! See how ravaged I am by disease' – given the *δή* we must interpret the clause this strongly. Then comes the adversative *καίτοι* opening the second sentence of vii. 77. 2: 'Yet I have been pious toward the gods in many ways and my human associations have been just and above reproach.'³⁵ Upon this sentence depends the conclusion, 'Therefore I am hopeful and unafraid'. Adversative *καίτοι* indicates that Nicias is strongly opposing the first half of vii. 77. 2 to the second, and that in that first sentence, with its three pathetic particles, he has so well described the pathos of his situation that he must reaffirm his faith forcefully. As with many of the examples from drama and elsewhere cited by Denniston (p. 557), Nicias is noticing that his emotions are too much in control, and adopting a new resolution. A Euripidean character might have said here, 'We are perishing undeservingly: the gods, were they really gods and really good, would not do this'. Nicias puts equal stress on his suffering, but then, rather than protesting, reaffirms his merit and restates his confidence that this will save him. It is as if he had gone on too long in the first sentence, and then had sharply to point out that 'all the same' (*ὁμως* as in LSJ III), according to his religious beliefs, salvation is sure. But the emotion of vii. 77. 2a may by this point have undermined our confidence in his religious beliefs.

From the same emotional source comes the constant urge to explain and subordinate: the antithesis, 'to our taste excessive',³⁶ between his health and his fortune, and the further elaboration on his sickness, so that the sentence is structured as follows:

αἰωροῦμαι
προφέρων
ὀρᾶτε
διάκειμαι
δοκῶν
εἶναι

35. Cf. *καίτοι* in vi. 9. 2 and Denniston, p. 557. *καίτοι* might be understood as conforming rather to Denniston's 'sylogistic' class (p. 561), the two sentences in vii. 77. 2 being viewed as a pair of premises. But the premises remain so opposed, the tone so desperate, and the salvation so remote and provisional, as to pull the 'syllogism' into an open statement of contradiction.

36. So Marchant *ad loc.*

We recognize the familiar pattern of subordination introduced by personal considerations. While the personal references of Pericles and Alcibiades, as we saw, tended to be forthright and uncomplicated, exactly the opposite occurs here, and the sentence moves out of the logical framework projected for it.

2. Concessive elements as a complicating factor

An important complicating factor in Nicias' sentences is his tendency to confuse lines of thought by interjecting concessions and reversals. Identification of such passages is often open to dispute, as the semantic and syntactic indicators are varied and complex, and indeed the very term 'concessive' is vague: any sort of conditional statement might logically be termed 'concessive'. In this section I will use the term of clauses and phrases that seem to require 'even if', 'even though', and 'although' in translation, and to exclude limitative and adversative passages.

There are, by my count, fifteen true concessions in the speeches of Nicias, compared with eight in those of Pericles, seven for Alcibiades, five for Hermocrates, and four for Cleon.³⁷ This is a provisional set of figures, but it does reveal Nicias' predilection for this form. Nicias' concessive clauses are mostly highly concentrated in his first speech in Book Six and his last two speeches in Book Seven. vi. 20-3 has none, vi. 68 one, and vii. 11-15 three. This should not be surprising. Nicias' second speech against Alcibiades is an attempt to speak forcefully, and for this reason it also has fewer potential optatives than the first speech.³⁸ vi. 68 is a harangue before a battle and follows a traditionally more straightforward form; vii. 11-15, despite its rhetorical elements, still represents a letter (it appears to have no gnomic expressions, uniquely among the speeches in Thucydides). The three speeches with high concentrations are those where Nicias is at his most emotional. A survey of the more interesting examples shows that Nicias' habit of conceding points is especially apparent in these speeches:

καίτοι ἔγωγε καὶ τιμῶμαι ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου καὶ ἥσσον ἑτέρων περὶ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ σώματι ὀρρωδῶ, νομίζων ὁμοίως ἀγαθὸν πολίτην εἶναι ἰδὲς ἂν καὶ τοῦ σώματός τι καὶ τῆς οὐσίας προνοῇται (vi. 9. 2).

37. Nicias of course has the highest proportion as well as the highest absolute number.

38. There are ten in the first and two in the second.

'Yet³⁹ I am honored by this post and I fear for my own well-being less than others, although I consider him similarly a good citizen, who is prudent both about his body and his possessions.' νομίζων is concessive (cf. Dover *ad loc.*), and fosters the impression that Nicias feels he must backtrack and try to explain more precisely what he means.

καὶ οἷσθε ἴσως τὰς γενομένας ὑμῖν σπονδὰς ἔχειν τι βέβαιον, αἱ ἡσυχάζοντων μὲν ὑμῶν ὀνόματι σπονδαὶ ἔσονται (οὕτω γὰρ ἐνθὲνδε τε ἄνδρες ἔπραξαν αὐτὰ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων) (vi. 10. 2).

'And perhaps you think that the present peace is somehow secure, which will be a peace in name only even if you remain peaceful (for thus men from here and from the enemy have arranged these things).'

ἡσυχάζοντων has been variously interpreted: 'even though you remain peaceful', or 'as long as you remain peaceful'. But Dover, observing that the parenthesis replies to the implication, 'in name only', in ὀνόματι, has given a strong reason for adopting the concessive interpretation.

καὶ γὰρ τοξόται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀκοντισταὶ ἐπιβήσονται καὶ ὄχλος, ὃ ναυμαχίαν μὲν ποιοῦμενοι ἐν πελάγει οὐκ ἂν ἐχρῶμεθα διὰ τὸ βλάπτειν ἂν τὸ τῆς ἐπιστήμης τῇ βαρύτητι τῶν νεῶν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐνθάδε ἡναγκασμένη ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν πεζομαχίᾳ πρόσφορα ἔσται (vii. 62. 2).

Nicias now admits that the circumstances are serious. The Athenians are forced, he says, to fight a land battle in the harbor (ἡναγκασμένη... πεζομαχίᾳ). He says that his preparations are πρόσφορα, but his simultaneous admission that the situation is one of passivity (ἀνάγκη), along with our recollection of the low quality of earlier πεζομαχίαι ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν, does not augur well.⁴⁰ Neither does the concessive, contrary-to-fact statement: 'Although we would not otherwise have used footsoldiers, for fear of reducing the role skill plays...' Nicias has no hope, it appears, that skill will play a role now.

39. Cf. καίτοι in vii. 77. 2.

40. For other examples of this sort of battle in Thucydides cf. i. 49. 3 and ii. 89. 8.

καὶ Σικελιωτῶν, ὧν οὐδ' ἀντιστῆναι οὐδεὶς ἕως ἡκμαζε τὸ ναυτικὸν ἡμῖν ἡξίωσεν, ἀμύνασθε αὐτοὺς, καὶ δείξατε ὅτι καὶ μετ' ἀσθενείας καὶ ξυμφορῶν ἡ ἡμετέρα ἐπιστήμη κρείσσων ἐστὶν ἐτέρας εὐτυχούσης ῥώμης (vii. 63. 4).

'None of the Sicilians dared to oppose us while our fleet was at its peak. Show them that even while weak and stricken by disaster your skill is stronger than the strength of another, even though he is fortunate.'

Nicias has admitted that Athenian ἐπιστήμη would be injured by having an ὄχλος on board under normal conditions (vii. 62. 1), and he has not produced a new ἐπιστήμη to buttress his forces now. As in vii. 62. 2, we recall the last πεζομαχία ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν. Then, a Spartan had claimed that military ἐπιστήμη was transferable from land to sea (ii. 87. 4) and the result was disaster. The double concession that closes this sentence could hardly bolster the fleet's confidence, pointing first to their own weakness and then to a lack of τύχη, which Nicias had in other passages deemed essential.⁴¹

καὶ ἐκ τῶν παρόντων, ὧς Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ ξύμμαχοι, ἐλπίδα χρεὶν ἔχειν (ἤδη τινὲς καὶ ἐκ δεινότερων ἢ τοιῶνδε ἐσώθησαν), μηδὲ καταμέμψεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἄγαν αὐτοὺς (vii. 77. 1).

'Even in such circumstances, Athenians and allies, you must have hope (already some have been saved from plights yet worse), and not blame yourselves too much.'

In his last speech as in vii. 61-4 Nicias tries to strengthen his men's courage, but can do so only to a limited degree. Once again, few signs remain that success is possible. Nicias uses the same ominous phrase as in 62. 1: ἐκ τῶν παρόντων. If 'circumstances' were dismal in the last speech they are far worse now, and to hear the same old line is not encouraging, especially with the parenthesis that follows: 'some people have survived worse plights.' Some, perhaps: but not all.

κάγω τοι οὐδενὸς ὑμῶν οὔτε ῥώμῃ προφέρων (ἀλλ' ὁρᾶτε δὴ ὡς διάκειμαι ὑπὸ τῆς νόσου) οὔτ' εὐτυχίᾳ δοκῶν που ὑστερός του εἶναι κατὰ τε τὸν ἴδιον βίον καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα, νῦν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κινδύνῳ τοῖς φαυλοτάτοις αἰωροῦμαι (vii. 77. 2).

41. Cf. v. 16. 1, vi. 23. 3, vii. 61. 3, vii. 77. 2, vii. 77. 3.

'And I, though superior to none of you in strength (see how I am laid low), and although I think I am no one's inferior in good fortune both in my private life and in other regards, am now caught up in the same danger with the weakest of you.' As I have said above, it is hard to make this sentence harmonize completely with vii. 77. 1 and vii. 77. 3.⁴² Rather, it is more reasonable to view it as a personal digression, showing Nicias thinking about what matters most to him (his own fate) in a characteristic manner (with two concessive participles).

τό τε ξύμπαν γινώτε, ὧς ἄνδρες στρατιῶται, ἀναγκαῖόν τε ὅν ὑμῖν ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς γίγνεσθαι ὡς μὴ ὄντος χωρίου ἐγγύς ὅποι ἂν μαλακισθέντες σωθείητε καί, ἦν νῦν διαφύγητε τοὺς πολεμίους, οἱ τε ἄλλοι τευξόμενοι ὧν ἐπιθυμεῖτε που ἐπιδεῖν καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν μεγάλην δύναμιν τῆς πόλεως καίπερ πεπτωκυῖαν ἐπανορθώσαντες (vii. 77. 7).

Even at the close of his speech Nicias invokes a concessive clause: 'Save the great power of your city, even though it has collapsed.' As I have suggested, Nicias' emotions in this speech often get the better of his intentions. The result in the present passage is a contradiction that implies that ruin (πεπτωκυῖαν)⁴³ and recovery are somehow not exclusive. The very hint of the fallen city strikes deeper than Nicias might wish. He had himself argued, at the start of the expedition, that the force resembled a city being founded (vi. 23. 2), and the image has returned to haunt him: 'They resembled nothing other than a city forced to surrender', Thucydides had said at vii. 75. 5. Nicias tries to use the image: αὐτοὶ τε πόλις εὐθύς ἐστε ὅποι ἂν καθέξησθε (vii. 77. 4); ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλις, καὶ οὐ τείχη οὐδὲ νῆες ἀνδρῶν κεναί (vii. 77. 7). He is right: the men are a city, but the resemblance fatally undercuts the gnomic sentence just cited, for by Nicias' own admission the 'city' built on these men is now a shambles.⁴⁴

42. Dover attempts to do so in his 1965 notes. His 1970 *Commentary* attributes more complexity to the passage.

43. Cf. LSJ on πίπτω, B. II. 2, esp. E. *Hec.* 5, also of a ruined city.

44. Nicias' language contradicts his proposals also in vii. 77. 4: intending to say that human error is remediable, Nicias uses too strong an expression, ἄλλοι τινὲς... ἀνθρώπεια δράσαντες ἀνεκτὰ ἔπαθον, echoing the Aeschylean δράσαντι παθεῖν and undercutting the hope for survival: for in Aeschylus the criminal 'suffers' by dying.

Nicias' character is largely responsible for his situation. Had he been more forceful or less self-concerned, he might have averted the disaster. The most important point to be made here is that his speeches, by mirroring the personal traits that proved to be historically important, become a form of historical and psychological description that affirm the role of personal and even irrational qualities in determining historical action.

II. THE PARATACTIC STYLE OF ALCIBIADES

Καὶ ταῦτα ἡ ἐμὴ νεότης καὶ ἄνοια παρὰ φύσιν δοκοῦσα εἶναι ἐς τὴν Πελοποννησίων δύναμιν λόγοις τε πρέπουσιν ὠμίλησε καὶ ὀργῇ πίστιν παρασχομένη ἐπεισεν. καὶ νῦν μὴ πεφόβησθε αὐτήν, ἀλλ' ἕως ἐγὼ τε ἔτι ἀκμάζω μετ' αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ Νικίας εὐτυχῆς δοκεῖ εἶναι, ἀποχρήσασθε τῇ ἑκατέρου ἡμῶν ὠφελίᾳ. καὶ τὸν ἐς τὴν Σικελίαν πλοῦν μὴ μεταγινώσκετε ὥς ἐπὶ μεγάλῃν δύναμιν ἐσόμενον (vi. 17. 1-2).

Each of these sentences begins with καί. Such clustering of initial καί occurs in only one other speech in Thucydides, and that too is by Alcibiades (vi. 89-92). In Greek prose generally it is unusual to find initial καί in three successive sentences.⁴⁵ In both of Alcibiades' speeches this initial καί plays an important role.

Consider the argument in vi. 17. Alcibiades began his speech by contending that personal extravagance benefited the city (vi. 16. 1). Then he defended his actual abilities as a statesman (vi. 16. 6), a defense that is still in process in vi. 17. 1, where he is ironically replying to Nicias' attack on him. Then the subject changes and by vi. 17. 2 we realize that the refutation of Nicias' attack is over and the commendation of Alcibiades' own plan under way. The transition is clever, even when compared to those in other speeches in Thucydides. H. Kleist perceptively pointed this out in 1876, but did not comment on the verbal particulars of the transition.⁴⁶

Alcibiades gradually passes from discussion of his own capacities

45. In the long passages from other authors mentioned later in this section, and in other passages I have surveyed, I find only three examples: Andocides, *Myst.* 15, Antiphon, *Herod.* 23, and Pl. *Charm.* 153b-c (dialogue).

46. H. Kleist, *Über den Bau der thukydideischen Reden* 1 (Dramburg 1876), p. 8.

to consideration of the expedition. By keeping the focus on himself, however, and letting the expedition appear as his own idea and responsibility, he conceals the shift from self-vindication to proposals, from *refutatio* to *confirmatio*. The fulcrum of the transition is αὐτήν in the second sentence. Its antecedent is not immediately apparent, for it is in fact two words, νεότης and ἄνοια, which share a single article. Singular and plural are confused by the pronoun, and this confusion blurs our picture of what the antecedent has been. The next pronoun is just as indecisive as the last: it is αὐτῇ. The second sentence then closes with the word ὠφελίᾳ, indicating a shift from the negative quality νεότης καὶ ἄνοια (already qualified by δοκοῦσα) to the positive one, ὠφελία. All these words have the same gender and number. The large gap between antecedent and pronoun, and the emphasis given ὠφελίᾳ by its final position in the sentence and separation from the article, show that in Alcibiades' eyes the ἄνοια imputed to him is better described as ὠφελία, and is, therefore, good for Athens. Indeed, the same transition from supposed ἄνοια to real ὠφελία is found in vi. 16. 3.

Superficially, these sentences do not appear transitional. All three begin with καί, giving the impression that they are regular emphatic assertions aligned in clear parataxis, and so typical of Alcibiades' style. The difficulties in the sentence arise from the postponement of ὠφελίᾳ, not from extreme subordination or convolution of syntax. The formal parataxis seen here, with all its naïve and folkloric associations, is put to subtle use in Alcibiades' rhetoric.⁴⁷ As a first step in understanding Alcibiades' usage, we must note the rarity with which initial καί is used in classical Greek prose (see overleaf).

47. On the 'primitive' use of parataxis, see Alarik Rynell, *Parataxis and Hypotaxis as a Criterion of Syntax and Style, Especially in Old English Poetry* (Lund 1952), pp. 24-7, and Sophie Trenkner, *Le style καὶ dans le récit attique oral* (Assen 1960), pp. 74-8 (examples from a number of languages). Archibald Hill makes sensible qualifications of Rynell's thesis in *Language* 28 (1952), 534. On the varieties of Greek parataxis, which must be carefully distinguished, see Friedrich Zucker, 'Formen gesteigert affektischer Rede in Sprechversen der griechischen Tragödie', *IF* 42 (1955), 62-77; Jean Carrière, *Stylistique grecque* (Paris 1967), pp. 118, 132; Jean Humbert, *Syntaxe grecque* (Paris 1960), pp. 86-8, and Trenkner, *passim*.

Frequency of καί in initial position in
Greek prose passages

Author	Passage	No. of sentences in sample	No. of initial καί's	Proportion of initial καί's
Inscription	Tod 66	37	1	0.027
Herodotus	vii. 1-11	133	4	0.030
Herodotus	viii. 49 = 64	83	2	0.024
Antiphon	<i>Herod.</i> 21-4 ⁴⁸	18	5	0.278
Andocides	<i>Myst.</i> 11-18 ⁴⁹	34	10	0.294
Xenophon	<i>Hellenica</i> :			
	i. 1. 14-26	31	3	0.096
	i. 4. 1-5. 21	72	4	0.056
	i. 6. 29-38	32	0	0.000
	ii. 3. 24-34	27	4	0.148
	ii. 35-49	38	0	0.000
Lysias	Oration 12	234	25	0.107
Plato	<i>Charmides</i> 153-6	97	17	0.124
Plato	<i>Republic</i> 1	841	52	0.062
Demosthenes	<i>De Corona</i> 126-38, 160-80, 252-75	167	17	0.102

Compared to Thucydides, other authors use initial καί infrequently. But even within the text of Thucydides both speeches of Alcibiades stand out.

Narrative

ii. 1-8	57	7	0.123
ii. 95-103	72	9	0.125
vii. 35-46	79	18	0.228

Speeches (in descending order)

Alcibiades	vi. 16-18	38	14	0.368
Alcibiades	vi. 89-92	44	14	0.318
Hermocrates	vi. 76-80	34	10	0.294
Corinthians	i. 68-71	46	12	0.261

48. Cited by Trenkner, p. 10, n. 2, as an example of the 'καί-style'. Note the small size of the sample.

49. Cited by Trenkner, p. 7, n. 1.

Frequency of καί in initial position in
Greek prose passages (*cont.*)

	Passage	No. of sentences in sample	No. of initial καί's	Proportion of initial καί's
	<i>Speeches</i> (in descending order)			
Nicias	vii. 61-4	16	4	0.250
Hermocrates	iv. 59-64	40	9	0.225
Corinthians	i. 37-41	36	8	0.222
Thebans	iii. 61-7	55	12	0.218
Euphemus	vi. 82-7	37	8	0.216
Nicias	vii. 77	14	3	0.214
Archidamus	i. 80-4	45	9	0.200
Athenagoras	vi. 36-40	32	6	0.188
Corcyra	i. 32-6	33	6	0.182
Brasidas	v. 9	11	2	0.182
Athenians	i. 73-8	45	8	0.178
Plataeans	iii. 53-9	52	9	0.173
Nicias	vi. 9-14	35	6	0.171
Nicias	vii. 11-15	31	5	0.161
Brasidas	iv. 126	13	2	0.154
Diodotus	iii. 42-8	56	8	0.143
Pericles	ii. 35-46	79	11	0.139
Pericles	i. 140-4	53	7	0.132
Sthenelaidas	i. 86	8	1	0.125
Nicias	vi. 68	8	1	0.125
Pericles	ii. 60-4	42	5	0.119
Spartans	iv. 17-20	26	3	0.115
Mytileneans	iii. 9-14	48	5	0.104
Brasidas	iv. 85-7	22	2	0.091
Corinthians	i. 120-4	39	3	0.077
Cleon	iii. 37-40	45	3	0.067
Spartans	ii. 87	15	1	0.067
Archidamus	ii. 11	15	1	0.067
Nicias	vii. 11-15	18	1	0.056
Hermocrates	vi. 33-4	25	0	0.000
Phormio	ii. 87	21	0	0.000
Pagondas	iv. 92	13	0	0.000
Nicias	vi. 20-3	15	0	0.000

The infrequency and consequent strong effect of initial *καί* have, as far as I know, never been pointed out.⁵⁰ Yet partly as a result of its frequency, initial *καί* can endow the comparatively few sentences in which it is employed with special vividness. The first example in Book VII of Herodotus has such a usage:

καὶ αὐτίκα μὲν ἐπηγγέλλετο πέμπτων ἀγγέλους κατὰ πόλιν ἐτοιμάζειν στρατιήν, πολλῶν πλέω ἐπιτάσσων ἑκάστοισι ἢ πρότερον παρήχον, καὶ νέας τε καὶ ἵππους καὶ σῖτον καὶ πλοῖα (VII. 1. 2).

'And straightway he ordered a mobilization', with *καί* underlining αὐτίκα. There are no more initial *καί*'s until VII. 9. 2, where Mardonius stresses a paradox:

καὶ γὰρ δεινὸν ἂν εἴη πρῆγμα, εἰ Σάκας μὲν καὶ Ἰνδοὺς καὶ Αἰθιοπὰς τε καὶ Ἀσσυρίους ἄλλα τε ἔθνεα πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἀδικήσαντα Πέρσας οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ δύναμιν προσκτᾶσθαι βουλόμενοι, καταστρεφάμενοι δούλους ἔχομεν, Ἑλληνας δὲ ὑπάρξαντας ἀδικίῃς οὐ τιμωρησόμεθα.

'It would *indeed* (καὶ γάρ: cf. Denniston, p. 108) be grave', if we should leave the Greeks, who have harmed us, after enslaving others, who have not.

The third initial *καί* emphasizes a point in Artabanus' speech (VII. 10. γ2), as does the fourth, a bit later (VII. 10. θ2). These are the only passages with initial *καί* in the first thirty-eight chapters of this book.

In Xenophon's *Hellenica*, the *καί* that opens sentences can be unemphatic, as in some narrative sections (cf. I. 4. 21, I. 5. 7, I. 5. 10, I. 5. 19), but in other narrative passages it serves to accentuate points (I. 1. 17, I. 1. 21, I. 1. 25) and in speeches it can be used emphatically, as in Critias' attack on Theramenes:

καὶ ἂν τινα αἰσθανώμεθα ἐναντίον τῇ ὀλιγαρχίᾳ, ὅσον δυνάμεθα ἐκποδῶν ποιοῦμεθα (II. 3. 26).

50. There are good but brief comments on the 'steigernde Kraft' of *καί* in Kuehner-Gerth (II. 246-8), though the particle's emphatic initial position is only noticed in interrogative sentences. Liddell and Scott remark that *καί* can open questions and demands (A. II), and at times has the force of *καίτοι* (A. II. 2). Denniston's long section on *καί* only tells us that when used copulatively it can come first in a sentence or clause (p. 325), with no comment on its force in this position. Denniston's discussion of emphatic *καί* contains a few examples of its use at the beginning of a sentence, but without comment. Trenkner does not discuss the subject, although many of her examples of the *καί*-style have the word in initial position.

καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόθορνος ἀρμόττειν μὲν τοῖς ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροις δοκεῖ, ἀποβλέπει δὲ ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων (II. 3. 31)

καὶ εἰσὶ μὲν δήπου πᾶσαι μεταβολαὶ πολιτειῶν θανατηφόροι, σὺ δὲ διὰ τὸ εὐμετάβολος εἶναι πλείστοις μὲν μεταίτιος εἰ ἐξ ὀλιγαρχίας ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἀπολωλέναι, πλείστοις δ' ἐκ δημοκρατίας ὑπὸ τῶν βελτιόνων (II. 3. 32).

In the last two instances *καί* effects a rapid transition from one point to the next. Finally, the last sentence of Critias' speech is introduced by *καί* in a manner similar to that of the climactic usages of Alcibiades in epilogues (Thuc. VI. 18. 6, VI. 92. 5): καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἂν σωφρονῇτε, οὐ τούτου ἄλλ' ὑμῶν αὐτῶν φείσεσθε (II. 3. 34).

Turning to Alcibiades, we find that in only two of the total number of twenty-eight sentences is this initial *καί* part of a *καί...καί*, 'both...and' construction. In the other twenty-six cases, initial *καί* is itself responsive, taking up the sequence of thought of the preceding sentence with nuances variously translatable as 'also', 'even', or 'actually'. In each case the sentence beginning with *καί* is closely bound to the preceding one, and its content appears to follow as a logical development of that sentence, with no need to explain the sequence by a subordinating conjunction, or to alter the train of thought by a limitative or adversative particle (ἀλλά, οὖν, δέ, γέ). The ultimate effect of this practice is to give an impression of clarity and simplicity. Moreover, *καί* often functions so as to prevent antithesis. A sentence with two halves coordinated by *καί...καί* rather than *μὲν...δέ*, *οὐ μόνον...ἀλλά* *καί*, etc., or a sentence opening with *καί* rather than *δέ*, *δή* or *ἀλλά*, for instance, has removed one opportunity for antithetical expression.⁵¹

The three sentences in VI. 17. 1-2 reach only the second level of subordination, the opportunity for complexity being reduced by the use of *καί*.⁵² The concomitant lessening of antithesis (note that even Alcibiades and his opponent are linked by *τε...καί* in VI. 17. 1, rather than *μὲν...δέ*) gives an impression more of harmony than contentiousness. The reader is led in a linear progression from one

51. Trenkner, pp. 32-4, does see an adversative potential in *καί...καί*.

52. The initial *καί* is one of many reasons for retaining VI. 17. 5 against Classen-Steup.

thought to the next, undisturbed by insistent rhetorical devices, antitheses, or subordinations. The unusual occurrence of initial *καί* in three consecutive sentences increases an effect of vividness and directness. Alcibiades sweeps the reader along as though there were no call for discussion of nuances and no need for subordination of thought. One idea follows directly on the last, while shifts of direction and emphasis occur below the surface structure. Initial *καί* is used elsewhere in Thucydides in moving from one section of a speech to the next, but in no other speech in Thucydides does a series of sentences produce so vigorous and direct a stylistic progression simultaneously with a conceptual and rhetorical transition.

καί produces an effect of swiftness and an emphatic tone elsewhere in this speech. vi. 16. 1 is one of four cases in Thucydides where the conjunction opens a speech, and all are emphatic.⁵³ Alcibiades uses it at vi. 16. 3 in defending his expenditures and proving he is useful (with the same progression from supposed *ἄνοια* to real *ὠφέλεια* as in vi. 17. 2). Later in the speech, sentences beginning with *καί* lead up to conclusions (vi. 17. 3-4, vi. 18. 3 (twice), vi. 18. 4), or introduce new proofs (vi. 17. 5, vi. 17. 8) in the same vigorous manner.

The penultimate sentence of Alcibiades' first speech is one of the best examples of his clever use of *καί*. The sentence (vi. 18. 6) is the keystone of the whole speech, and the preparation for it has been thorough. After defending himself and showing the weakness of τὰ ἐκεῖ Alcibiades had in vi. 17. 7 turned to affairs at home, τὰ ἐνθάδε. The key argument in that passage was that οἱ πατέρες, although they had the same foreign enemies as in Alcibiades' day, were able to establish τὴν ἀρχήν. οἱ πατέρες, more than simply introducing a stock τόπος,⁵⁴ picks up Nicias' exhortation to the πρεσβύτεροι not to be intimidated by the young followers of Alcibiades (vi. 13. 1). Alcibiades, as the deuteragonist, aims to refute the arguments of Nicias, and οἱ πατέρες are mentioned in

53. The others are: the last orations of Nicias and Pericles (vii. 77. 1, ii. 60. 1), and Archidamus' speech at Sparta (i. 80. 1). Krueger compares this last passage to Hdt. viii. 109, where *καί* opens a speech by Themistocles, one of the most vigorous and sophistic speakers in Herodotus. (Compare his techniques and language in viii. 83. 1 and viii. 111. 2-3.)

54. Cf. Karl Jost, *Das Beispiel und Vorbild der Vorfahren bei attischen Rednern bis Demosthenes* (Paderborn 1936), p. 55.

vi. 17. 7 partly for this reason.⁵⁵ Mention of the ancestors begins an extended comparison between the period following the Persian Wars and the present. ἀρχή is the key word in this comparison: not only is it what οἱ πατέρες got possession of in vi. 17. 7, but, from that passage on, it is repeated insistently:⁵⁶

τὴν τε ἀρχὴν οὕτως ἐκτησάμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ὅσοι δὴ ἄλλοι ἤρξαν (vi. 18. 2).

καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ταμιεύεσθαι ἐς ὅσον βουλόμεθα ἀρχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη, ἐπειδήπερ ἐν τῷδε καθεσταμεν, τοῖς μὲν ἐπιβουλεύειν, τοὺς δὲ μὴ ἀνιέναι, διὰ τὸ ἀρχθῆναι ἂν ὑφ' ἐτέρων αὐτοῖς κίνδυνον εἶναι, εἰ μὴ αὐτοὶ ἄλλων ἀρχοίμεν (vi. 18. 3).

καὶ ἅμα ἢ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τῶν ἐκεῖ προσγενομένων πάσης τῷ εἰκότι ἄρξομεν, ἢ κακώσομεν γε Συρακοσίους, ἐν ᾧ καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ ζύμμαχοι ὠφελήσόμεθα. (vi. 18. 4).

The repetition of ἀρχή points up the necessary connection between supremacy and survival for Athens, and the tension between these two concepts continues into vi. 18. 6:

καὶ μὴ ὑμᾶς ἡ Νικίου τῶν λόγων ἀπραγμοσύνη καὶ διάστασις τοῖς νέοις ἐς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἀποτρέψη, τῷ δὲ εἰωθότι κόσμῳ, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἅμα νέοι γεραιτέροις βουλευόντες ἐς τὰδε ἦσαν αὐτά, καὶ νῦν τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ πειράσθε προαγαγεῖν τὴν πόλιν, καὶ νομίσατε νεότητα μὲν καὶ γῆρας ἄνευ ἀλλήλων μηδὲν δύνασθαι, ὁμοῦ δὲ τὸ τε φαῦλον καὶ τὸ μέσον καὶ τὸ πάννυ ἀκριβὲς ἂν συγκραθῇ μάλιστ' ἂν ἰσχύειν, καὶ τὴν πόλιν, ἐὰν μὲν ἡσυχάζῃ, τρίψεσθαι τε αὐτὴν περὶ αὐτὴν ὥσπερ καὶ ἄλλο τι, καὶ πάντων τὴν ἐπιστήμην ἐγγράσσεσθαι, ἀγωνιζομένην δὲ αἰεὶ προσλήψεσθαι τε τὴν ἐμπειρίαν καὶ τὸ ἀμύνεσθαι οὐ λόγῳ ἀλλ' ἔργῳ μᾶλλον ζύνηθες ἔξειν.

Without the eleven uses of *καί* and three of *τε*, this sentence, the second longest in a Thucydidean speech,⁵⁷ would easily have gone

55. The advantages of the deuteragonist were commonly acknowledged. Cf. Pl. *Ep.* vii 343D, Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1402a, and F. M. Cornford, *The Origin of Attic Comedy* (London 1914), p. 72.

56. Even the strange play of ἀρχεῖν, 'to command', against ἀρξασθαι, 'to begin', in vi. 16. 1 had the rhetorical function of planting the word and the concept behind it in our minds.

57. Five other sentences in Thucydidean speeches have a hundred words or more: ii. 43. 1 (100), iv. 87. 2-3 (102), iii. 59. 3-4 (102), and vi. 22a (109).

beyond the fourth level of complexity. καί not only opens the sentence but is the chief connective within it, so that the sentence appears to move clearly from point to point, just as in vi. 17. 1-2. Alcibiades counters Nicias' arguments by incorporating them into his own statement and showing that a variety of components cause Athens' greatness. οἱ πατέρες, Alcibiades had said in vi. 17. 7, founded the empire. Here that term is repeated, as though it had been held poised over the last page. But this is no simple rhetorical *Vorbild*, for Alcibiades has added the paradox that these forefathers were once young men themselves just as Alcibiades is now; then the further paradox, that as youths they got the empire by ἀμα νέοι γεραιτέροις βουλευόντες, proving νεότητα μὲν καὶ γῆρας ἀνευ ἀλλήλων μηδὲν δύνασθαι. A shift from age to class differences then follows immediately, and is made to seem natural by the continuing parataxis: ὁμοῦ δὲ τό τε φαῦλον καὶ τὸ μέσον καὶ τὸ πάνυ ἀκριβὲς ἂν συγκραθὲν μάλιστ' ἂν ἰσχύειν.

The next clause is again introduced by καί, and might seem a corollary to what preceded, but in fact its content is new: ἡσυχία will cause the city to deteriorate and its skill to 'become decrepit' (ἐπιστήμην ἐγγηράσσειν). The metaphorical twist subtly disparages Nicias' view by hinting that decay and decline are typical of the elderly and that only co-operation with other age groups can prevent them.

The sentence in vi. 18. 6 is in Alcibiades' normal style, and this style, with its appearance of harmony, accords well with the picture he presents of decision-making at Athens. The use of καί permits Alcibiades to revise and elaborate on Nicias' simple antithesis of youth against age, and to show that the two groups must be mutually dependent.

The only other speech in Thucydides containing three consecutive sentences with initial καί is Alcibiades' appeal to the Spartans:

καὶ διατελοῦντός μου προθύμου ὑμεῖς πρὸς Ἀθηναίους καταλασσόμενοι τοῖς μὲν ἡμοῖς ἐχθροῖς δύναμιν δι' ἐκείνων πράξαντες, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀτιμίαν περιέθετε. καὶ διὰ ταῦτα δικαίως ὑπ' ἡμῶν πρὸς τε τὰ Μαντινέων καὶ Ἀργείων τραπομένου καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἐνηντιούμην ὑμῖν ἐβλάπτεσθε· καὶ νῦν, εἴ τις καὶ τότε ἐν τῷ πάσχειν οὐκ εἰκότως ὠργίζετό μοι, μετὰ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς σκοπῶν ἀναπειθέσθω (vi. 89. 2-3).

Alcibiades first succinctly relates his unrewarded benevolence to Sparta and his revenge when he was betrayed, and concludes by absolving himself of blame. Again the use of initial καί permits terse and emphatic argumentation as Alcibiades moves energetically from one point to the next. The other occurrences of initial καί in this speech resemble those in vi. 16-18: they introduce sentences that contain emphatic points (vi. 89. 6, vi. 90. 1, vi. 91. 3 (twice), vi. 91. 7) or move to new points in the argument (vi. 91. 1, vi. 91. 5, vi. 92. 2, vi. 92. 4, vi. 92. 5). καί opens sentences in the sophistic analysis of patriotism at vi. 92. 2-3, where Alcibiades defends his behavior. The first of these sentences is complex to the fourth degree, but the second, a direct statement on the nature of patriotism, reaches only one level of complexity. The tone established by καί is one of simple parataxis, of moving from point to point with no hint that these points are not logically connected:

καὶ χείρων οὐδενὶ ἀξιώ δοκεῖν ὑμῶν εἶναι, εἰ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ μετὰ τῶν πολεμιοτάτων φιλόπολις ποτε δοκῶν εἶναι νῦν ἐγκρατῶς ἐπέρχομαι, οὐδὲ ὑποπτεύσθαι μου ἐς τὴν φυγαδικὴν προθυμίαν τὸν λόγον (vi. 92. 2).

καὶ πολεμιώτεροι οὐχ οἱ τοὺς πολεμίους που βλάψαντες ὑμεῖς ἢ οἱ τοὺς φίλους ἀναγκάσαντες πολεμίους γενέσθαι (vi. 92. 3).

These sentences are followed by a long peroration of 63 words (vi. 92. 5b), the second longest sentence in the speech and the third longest in either speech of Alcibiades, and one that without the use of καί (seven times) and τε (four times) would be subordinated far beyond the fourth degree:

καὶ αὐτοὺς νῦν νομίσαντας περὶ μεγίστων δὴ τῶν διαφερόντων βουλευέσθαι μὴ ἀποκνεῖν τὴν ἐς τὴν Σικελίαν τε καὶ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν στρατείαν, ἵνα τὰ τε ἐκεῖ βραχεῖ μορίῳ συμπαργεγόμενοι μεγάλα σώσῃτε καὶ Ἀθηναίων τὴν τε οὖσαν καὶ τὴν μέλλουσαν δύναμιν καθέλητε, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτοὶ τε ἀσφαλῶς οἰκῇτε καὶ τῆς ἀπάσης Ἑλλάδος ἐκούσης καὶ οὐ βίᾳ, κατ' εὐνοίαν δὲ ἡγήσθε (vi. 92. 5b).

The points, Alcibiades implies, are simple: attack now, in order to save Sicily and destroy Athens' army, and to live securely and rule Greece. Long though the sentence is, its low level of subordination makes it easy to interpret.

The above discussion is limited to two aspects of Alcibiades' language: his use of $\kappa\alpha\iota$, especially to open sentences, and the consequent avoidance of complex subordination. There are other distinctive features in Alcibiades' speeches,⁵⁸ but these two suffice to show how clearly Thucydides characterizes the man by his style of speaking as well as by commentary and narrative.

III. CONCLUSION

These studies indicate that Thucydidean speakers are more individualized by their styles than has been thought. If this is true, several of the assumptions mentioned in the introduction must be revised. Thucydides now appears to be more dramatic than Jebb and Blass allowed. The designation of Lysias as the inventor of stylistic characterization must be qualified (and the meaning of ἡθοποιία reconsidered), as we learn more about fifth-century achievements in this regard. Finally, the frequent claims that Attic literature gives us only the ideal and general, and that no notion of 'personality' existed in this period, may under examination turn out to be rather the legacy of Neo-Classicism than a reasoned deduction from ancient evidence.

58. One thinks of the frequent ironic uses of the potential optative.

Scientific apparatus onstage in 423 B.C.

ROBERT S. BRUMBAUGH

THIS PAPER offers supporting evidence for the true, but un-stylish, thesis that Western science entered Athens in the mid-fifth century B.C. like a tinker's cart, hung about with jangling and gleaming hardware. That thesis, in turn, is a vital link in an inductive proof that Western science has never actually developed apart from close interaction with measures, models, and machines.

The traditional view, common to histories of science and philosophy and to more general interpretations of classical culture, made the use of models, observation, and apparatus the crucial difference between 'science' in its classical and in its modern form.¹ This did not quite match the actual documents and achievements of classical work from Archimedes through Ptolemy, and more detailed study led to a new and different consensus.²

1. In what follows, I am not arguing against the existence of a theory-building, speculative *emphasis* in classical science; for better or worse, that is there. But the myth of a total, perhaps deliberate, rejection of all mechanical models or empirical investigation (a myth already well under way by Plutarch's time; witness his 'Life of Marcellus') needs demolition. Standard histories of science – the most important of which was George Sarton's – make Plato the baneful spokesman for an anti-empiricism. (On this point, and the weaknesses of its presentation, see James Haden, 'The Challenge of the History of Science, Part 1', *Review of Metaphysics* VII (1953), 74–88.) But a similar view, without the negative evaluation, occurs in the work of A. N. Whitehead, himself both scientist and Platonist (e.g. in *Science and the Modern World* (New York 1925), chapter 1). And a similar overall appraisal opens S. Sambursky's excellent study, *The Physical World of the Greeks* (trans. M. Dagut, London 1956), pp. 2, 3.

2. Some works, particularly Heron of Alexandria's, suggest a radical change of interest and competence by the second century A.D., just as Sextus Empiricus represents a new theoretical stance favoring strict 'empiricism'. The conclusive piece of evidence that upsets the application of a 'no technology or apparatus' label to the Hellenistic period, however, is the 'Antikythera machine' (Derek J. Price, 'An Ancient Computer', *Scientific American* (June 1959), cover, pp. 60–7).

YALE CLASSICAL STUDIES

EDITED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

by

ADAM PARRY



VOLUME XXII
STUDIES IN FIFTH-CENTURY
THOUGHT AND LITERATURE

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1972