Representation & Rhetoric

National Identity in the
Anonymous Speeches of Thucydides

By Daniel Diggins

A thesis submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington in fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in Classics

Victoria University of Wellington

2013

REPRESENTATION & RHETORIC: NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE ANONYMOUS SPEECHES OF THUCYDIDES

This thesis is about patterns in the speeches of Thucydides' unnamed ambassadors which create a sense of the national identity of the speakers. While general scholarly opinion had tended to regard Thucydidean speakers as not able to be differentiated, some scholars have demonstrated characterising patterns in the speeches of named individuals, such as Nikias or Archidamos. I focus on three *poleis*, Athens, Corinth, and Sparta, and base my own investigations on those of the named speeches. I argue that patterns can be discerned in the anonymous speeches which differentiate these three *poleis*, and which suggest national characterisation.

The first part of this thesis considers stylistic features of the anonymous speeches, in the form of a case study of the Spartan anonymous speech, as the statistical evidence highlights some unexpected features of this speech. Thus, I first consider sentence organisation, arguing that while the Spartans in their speech utilise an unusual amount of subordination, the speech retains the brevity and simplicity one would expect of Spartans, relative to speakers of the other *poleis*. I then consider two features of vocabulary which we would not expect to see in the Spartan speech, arguing that these features suggest an attempt by the Spartans to ingratiate their speech to the Athenians, and that the vocabulary underscores the unusualness of the speech and, due to two programmatic statements in the speech, ultimately serves to re-emphasise Spartan national character.

The second part of this thesis considers broader rhetorical features. First, I consider how the speakers frame the persuasive purpose of their speeches, arguing that the Athenians frame their speeches as the giving of advice, as opposed to the Spartans' openness of purpose, while the Corinthians stand between the two. Then I consider the approaches to argumentation,

arguing that the Spartans couch their arguments in a conservative, Doric framework, that the Corinthians are also conservative, and that the Athenians highlight the openness to risk-taking of the *polis*, and consideration of what is profitable, or advantageous.

I conclude that differences in organisation of the speeches, length and relative complexity, and rhetorical posturing would suggest national character to a sensitive reader. That is, the Spartan speeches suggest a conservative, Doric *polis*, the Athenian speeches reflect a democratic state in which sophistic education is freely available, and open to risk-taking, and the Corinthian speeches reflect their geographical and cultural middle point between the poles of Athens and Sparta.

τῷ τε φίλῳ πατέρι, τεθνηκότι,
φίλῃ τε μητέρι, ἔτι φῶς τὸ ἡλίου ὁρώση.

Contents

Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction.....	1
Part 1. Stylistics.....	14
1 A. Sentence Structure	14
1 B. Vocabulary.....	33
Conclusion	37
Part 2. Rhetorical Features.....	40
2 A. Rhetorical Posturing.....	40
2 B. Rhetorical Framework.....	53
Conclusion	72
Conclusion	74
Bibliography	78

Acknowledgements

Special thanks go to my supervisors, Dr David Rosenbloom, Professor Art Pomeroy, and particularly Dr Simon Perris, who worked tirelessly with me in the last few weeks of this project. Their advice and criticism has been invaluable.

Thanks also go out to Dr Mark Masterson and Dr Judy Deuling, the former who, for many years, has guided my writing, and taken the time to discuss many topics with me over the course of this thesis, and the latter, as she is always prepared to act as a sounding-board for ideas and approaches. Thanks go as well to the other academics in VUW Classics Department, who have provided me with useful feedback on my ideas, presented to them during research seminars.

My fellow post-graduates have also earned my thanks for their advice, help in staying sane, and other support. Particularly noteworthy are Alex Wilson, Hanna Mason, and Chris de Lisle, your help has been especially beneficial.

Finally, I wish to thank my family for their understanding and support while I completed this project.

Cover picture is a photograph of the bust of Thucydides from the Royal Ontario Museum, sourced from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Thucydides-bust-cutout_ROM.jpg accessed on 12/04/2013.

Introduction

τοὺς δὲ λόγους μακροτέρους οὐ παρὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς μηχανοῦμεν,
ἀλλ' ἐπιχώριον ὃν ἡμῖν οὗ μὲν βραχεῖς ἀρκῶσι μὴ πολλοῖς
χρηῆσθαι, πλέοσι δὲ ἐν ᾧ ἂν καιρὸς ἦ διδάσκοντάς τι τῶν
πρoύργου λόγοις τὸ δέον πράσσειν (4.17.2).

And we will make a longer speech, not contrary to our custom, but it
is the custom of our land not to use many words when brevity suffices,
and more when the moment is critical to do the necessary thing by
teaching something that is useful in words.¹

So spoke the unnamed Spartan ambassadors when they came seeking peace from Athens in book four of Thucydides' *History*. Clearly the ambassadors had a self-awareness not only of the Spartan manner of speech, but also of how their speech habits were perceived by the rest of Greece. They suggest, however, that what follows this statement should not be considered unusual for a Spartan, which raises an interesting question of whether, given that this speech was recorded by an Athenian in Attic-Ionic Greek, likely some time after the speech was given, this speech was in fact representative of Spartan discourse at all. It is this question, whether this speech by unnamed ambassadors from Sparta, as well as those delivered by the unnamed ambassadors of Athens and Corinth, reflects either the speech habits, or some characteristic of their respective *poleis*, that this thesis seeks to answer.

Any question related to the speeches in Thucydides must consider his stated methodology regarding the speeches in the infamous can of worms that is 1.22:

Καὶ ὅσα μὲν λόγῳ εἶπον ἕκαστοι ἢ μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἢ ἐν
αὐτῷ ἤδη ὄντες, χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων
διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν ἐμοί τε ὧν αὐτὸς ἤκουσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοθεν
ποθεν ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν• ὥς δ' ἂν ἐδόκουν ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ
τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστ' εἰπεῖν, ἐχομένῳ ὅτι
ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, οὕτως
εἴρηται. (1.22.1)

¹ All translations are my own, unless otherwise stated. Greek text from Jones & Powell (1942).

And as much as each person said in a speech, either before the war or already in the midst of it, it was difficult for me to completely recall an accurate account of what was said, both of those I myself heard and those reported to me by others; but as it seemed to me each one would say the necessary things about the present circumstances, still keeping very close to the overall thesis of what was actually said, so they are told.²

In this chapter, Thucydides readily admits that the speeches given could not be recalled exactly, and goes on to describe his solution to the problem in terms that have proved most challenging to interpret. What Thucydides actually claims of his approach to the recording of speeches is much debated, though many understand it to contain a contradiction: staying accurate to what was said, while also containing what Thucydides thought was demanded by the context of a particular speech.³ Geoffrey de Ste. Croix argues similarly in regards to what he believes Thucydides is claiming, but argues against there being a contradiction in the two claims: Thucydides wrote what he thought was apposite for the given context, except for one small segment in the speech, which represented the *ξύμπεσα γνώμη*, the “main thesis”, a summary of the argument of the actual speech given. De Ste. Croix argues that these do not contradict, as they are separate components of a speech, each composed according to their own governing principle, as listed in the two halves of the problematic clause.⁴ Gomme, on the other hand, suggests that Thucydides wrote down the speeches as he thought those giving them would have spoken, while staying as close as possible to the “general purport” of the speech.⁵ Garrity takes a similar tack to Gomme, and adds to it by arguing that Thucydides made an explicit distinction using the two modal adverbs *ὥς* and *οὕτως* to differentiate between the form and the content of the speeches.⁶ John Marincola takes a slightly different tack again, arguing that Thucydides means he wrote as close to what was said as possible, and that when he did not have enough information, he wrote what he thought the speakers would

² I have deliberately translated this passage rather loosely. Disagreements with my translation should serve to underscore the difficulties this passage contains.

³ Walbank (1965), 4, or Hornblower (1991), 59-60, for example.

⁴ De Ste. Croix (1972), 7-11.

⁵ Gomme (1945), 140.

⁶ Garrity (1998), 364-7.

consider the necessary things (τὰ δέοντα) to say.⁷ One point that all these interpretations of 1.22.1 have in common is that they all imply that the speeches as we have them were written by Thucydides, whether by reconstruction, invention, or some combination of the two. One implication of such an origin for the speeches in this work is that they are susceptible to various biases of Thucydides, whether conscious or unconscious, including expectations on Thucydides' part regarding what kinds of arguments representatives of various *poleis* would make, and how they might have made them. As such, it is important for a better understanding of Thucydides to investigate his speeches to discern evidence of such biases, including whether these lead to characterisation, as implied in the Spartan speech discussed above.

The question of characterisation in Thucydides has occurred to others. In particular, Daniel Tompkins published an article in 1972 investigating the speeches of Nikias and Alkibiades. Tompkins found that Nikias' speeches made significant use of subordination, and impersonal verbs used to over-qualify many of his statements, with the result that Nikias' speeches seemed less assertive, as though he were less sure of himself. The effect of these speeches matches up with what is known about Nikias. That is, Nikias' personal characteristics are reflected in his speeches.⁸ Alkibiades, on the other hand, tended more towards parataxis, using “καί” to join clauses which ought not necessarily be joined. By this method, Alkibiades led audiences from points with which they would agree to points with which they might not, as though all the points were harmonious. The style is confident, as Alkibiades certainly seems to be elsewhere.⁹

Paula Debnar studied the speech of the Thebans in book 3, finding it filled with unintended irony on the part of the Theban speakers, contradictions, and poorly constructed

⁷ Marincola (2007), 121.

⁸ Tompkins (1972), 184-204.

⁹ Tompkins (1972), 204-14.

overall, which she found reflective of the Athenians' general lack of regard in respect to Theban intelligence.¹⁰

Tompkins returned to the topic of characterisation, analysing the speech of Archidamos in book 1. He considered various factors such as use of gnomic statements, neuter abstractions (that is, article plus infinitive, participle or adjective), and sentence complication, amongst others, and found that the frequency of these features in Archidamos' speech set him apart from other speakers. The overall effect of the use, or lack of use, of these features characterises Archidamos' speeches. As this overall effect has a "Spartan" feel, it could be said to characterise the man.¹¹

Sthenelaidas' speech also comes under investigation. June Allison and Edmund Bloedow in separate articles demonstrate some surprising rhetorical features in Sthenelaidas' brief speech, which certainly differentiate his speech from the other named Spartan speakers.¹² Bloedow concludes, ultimately, that such rhetorical artifice was a ploy by Thucydides to draw attention to the context, and the weakness of Sthenelaidas' arguments, so that Thucydides' audience would see that the decision to go to war was irrational.¹³

Robert Connor, in a note, suggests Kleon's speech to be "distinctive and individualized".¹⁴ Finally, David Francis surveyed all the Spartan speeches in Thucydides, including a brief discussion of the anonymous embassy of book 4. He found some interesting features, including some difficult syntax in the anonymous speech, yet overall the speeches are representative of the Spartans.¹⁵

The speeches, then, are an issue complicated by Thucydides' various aims, yet it would seem that Thucydides manages through language to convey some of the character of the speaker for several of the named speakers. It follows from these results to inquire whether

¹⁰ Debnar (1996), *passim*.

¹¹ Tompkins (1993), *passim*.

¹² Bloedow (1981 & 1987), Allison (1984).

¹³ Bloedow (1987), 65-6.

¹⁴ Connor (1971), 95, n. 12.

¹⁵ Francis (1991-1993), *passim*.

Thucydides' characterising efforts stopped with named speakers, or whether he attempted something similar in the speeches of unnamed ambassadors, to which I refer as the anonymous speeches. As Thucydides presumably did not know who the ambassadors were, he could not have attempted to characterise the ambassadors as individuals. Any characterisation would occur at a broader level. That is, the anonymous speakers stand in as representatives of their various *poleis*, and thus any attempt at characterisation on Thucydides' part in these speeches would be to characterise the *polis* in question, to display "national" characteristics.¹⁶

There is reason to suspect that some national characterisation is occurring in Thucydides. There are three *poleis* of which Thucydides demonstrates a good deal more knowledge than of others: Athens, Sparta, and Corinth. Of these three Corinth has the fewest speeches in direct discourse, just four.¹⁷ Of these four speeches, one is a brief attempt at rousing sailors prior to the sea battle near Corcyra (1.52.4); so there are only three major deliberative speeches attributed to Corinth, all in the first book, and all of which are anonymous. Further, as Gomme notes regarding the conference at Sparta in book 1, Thucydides was particularly concerned to demonstrate the disposition of those *poleis* represented, Athens, Corinth, and Sparta. If here, why not elsewhere?¹⁸

For the purposes of this project, and due to limitations in size, I am focusing on just the deliberative speeches of Athens and her two main opponents: Sparta and Corinth. Apart from such limitations, moreover, there are good reasons for this selection. First, the focus on deliberative speeches rules out the speeches for rousing troops, which tend not to vary, where the speeches arguing for a certain point better allow differences between *poleis*' character to come through. Second, in the cases of Athens and Sparta, there is a suitably-sized set of

¹⁶ I speak of national character, sometimes national identity, as this is the standard term in the literature, and usefully brief; however, I do not intend any implication of "nationhood" in regards to Greek *poleis*.

¹⁷ Stroud (1994), 268-70 demonstrates Thucydides' greater knowledge of these *poleis* through his knowledge of who did what for the *poleis*, including obscure people who show up only once in the entire work.

¹⁸ Gomme (1945), 233.

named speeches in which to check for certain patterns found in the anonymous speeches; Corinth, on the other hand, has three anonymous speeches in which to find patterns. Third, as noted above, Ronald Stroud's study of people named in Thucydides' work shows Thucydides had the most knowledge of these three *poleis*.

Thus, the deliberative speeches of Athens, Corinth, and Sparta give us a better set of data in which to seek patterns, though this data set is not without its problems. While Corinth provides us with three anonymous speeches, Sparta only provides one, in book four. Athens only provides two if we include the rather artificial Melian Dialogue, and for the purposes of extra data, I will be including the Melian Dialogue in my analyses. As discussed above, while Athens and Sparta have the fewest anonymous speeches, they do provide a suitable number of named speakers whose speeches can be used to verify patterns found in the anonymous speeches, yet the paucity of data does affect the strength of any conclusions we may reach.

Another concern regarding the data is dialect. Almost the entire work is written in a somewhat modified form of Ionic, including the speeches attributed to the Corinthians and Spartans, who spoke Doric.¹⁹ These facts lead us to ask whether or not, if Thucydides really were attempting to capture some aspect of national character in the anonymous speeches, he would use the appropriate dialect. The question is important given that Thucydides lists two treaties, verbatim, in book five in Doric (5.77 and 5.79). There are two responses to this question. First, Gomme *et al.* argue that the treaties were included in the draft version, to aid memory, and that Thucydides would have included only a summary in Ionic in the final version, for which their case is good: too much extraneous detail for a minor, short-lived peace.²⁰ If we accept this argument, then it would seem to be a matter of style or preference on Thucydides' part. A conclusion of style is supported by the fact that neither Herodotus' nor Xenophon's histories contain speeches, or any great length of text, in other dialects – history

¹⁹ Colvin (1999), 62.

²⁰ Gomme *et al.* (1970), 131-2.

was not written so.²¹ In fact, Stephen Colvin points out that the dialect of “scientific prose”, a tradition which included history, was Attic-Ionic, and as such, the inclusion of other dialects was constrained to the occasional gloss or brief line.²² Thus we should not expect to find any characterisation in specific dialect markers, but rather in details unaffected by dialect, such as the ideas expressed, or overall organisation.

At this point, it may be useful to define what is meant by “national characteristics”, and Thucydides’ “characterising” activities. There have been various approaches to the understanding of characterisation in Thucydides, from the very reductive, to the more encompassing. Robert Luginbill provides an example of the former. In his 1999 book, Luginbill defines national character in terms of how the *polis* as a collective acts with regards to hope and fear, and the uncertainty of the future, such that some *poleis* tend to avoid taking risks, while others more willingly engage in risky activities.²³ Christopher Gill, on the other hand, states that character can be thought of as a means of explaining an agent’s actions by way of their beliefs and desires, and also, that character is an “evaluation by reference to general social norms”.²⁴ In the case of anonymous ambassadors, the individual ambassadors’ beliefs and desires would be subsumed to the those of the *polis* as a whole. These definitions, however, do not seem to reconcile all the features of speeches identified as characterising in the discussion above. Certainly, aspects such as type of argument made would fit well into Gill’s definition, but would be likely to vary as much according to the circumstances as to national character. Jonathan Hall, however, while discussing *ethne*, provides a more useful framework for considering characterisation, by analogy. Hall talks about *indicia*, which, for *ethne*, he describes as “the operational set of distinguishing attributes which people tend to associate with particular ethnic groups once the criteria have been established.” The criteria is

²¹ Colvin (1999), 59-61, and 71-3.

²² Colvin (1999), 73.

²³ Luginbill (1999), 14-5.

²⁴ Gill (1990), 5, note 15.

the set of attributes by which membership of a group is defined.²⁵ To give an example of how this could be used for the purposes of this thesis, the criteria for being “Spartan” could be defined as being Doric, stoic, brachylogic, amongst other things. If these factors are the criteria for being Spartan, the *indicia* would then be what is generally agreed to represent Spartan-ness, so, perhaps, indifference to luxury, verbal expression of Doric ideas, terseness. This framework has the benefit of easily including the others’ discussed above: openness to risk-taking could be part of the criteria of membership of a *polis*, as seen by themselves or an outsider, and thus actual risk-taking behaviour or avoidance, or how risk-taking is discussed, would be an *indicium* of membership of a given *polis*, and similarly for Gill’s definition. Thus, when looking for characterisation in Thucydides in speeches, we are looking for non-dialect based *indicia*, such as ideology, openness to risk-taking or risk avoidance, but also how ideas are organised, and brevity or prolixity of speech.

At this point, we ought to note which speeches will be used in my analysis, and what, specifically, will sought in these speeches. The speeches I am investigating are: the three Corinthian speeches from book one (1.37-43, 1.68-71, and 1.120-4), from the Athenians, the speech at the first conference at Sparta, and the Melian Dialogue (1.73-8, 5.85-113), from the Spartans, the embassy to the Athenians in book four (4.17-20). My methodology follows, in part, Tompkins’ two articles on characterisation. That is, I will look for differences in organisation of sentences: sentence length, as well as the total number of sentences, and total word count, levels of subordination, and ratios of subordination to parataxis. By parataxis, I mean a sentence in which a series of clauses are arranged parallel to each other, joined by conjunctions, or simply separated by cola. Subordination, on the other hand, is more complex. My method of classifying subordination comes ultimately from T. Webster’s discussion, which I modify following Tompkins, and Rijksbaron.²⁶ I consider clauses which are connected to a main verb by particles such as ὥστε, ὥς or ὅτι, or relative pronouns, to be

²⁵ Hall (1997), 20-1.

²⁶ Webster (1941), 389-90, Tompkins (1972), 184-6, and Rijksbaron (2006), 50-74 and 96-131.

subordinated. Further, “obligatory” clauses are considered to be subordinated to the verbs which require these clauses, such as verbs of emotion, perception, thinking, saying, and others.²⁷ Note that these obligatory clauses may have a participle in lieu of another part of the verb. When a participle is optional, however, it is not considered a subordinated clause, as the participle in these instances is more closely connected to another argument of the governing verb, rather than that verb. For example, consider the following excerpt from the anonymous Spartan speech: “οὔτινες ἀξίωμα μέγιστον τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔχοντες ἤκομεν παρ' ὑμᾶς,” (4.18.1) – “we have come to you, who have the greatest reputation of the Hellenes.” The participial phrase from οὔτινες to ἔχοντες is unnecessary for understanding the main verb, ἤκομεν, and does not add optional information about the verb. It does, however, modify one of the arguments of the verb, the subject, “we” (itself contained in the verb). In this instance, then, the participle is not considered subordinated to the verb. Rather, it is an adjectival phrase modifying the subject.

Other than sentence organisation, I will also look for differences in vocabulary, such as uses of abstract nouns and what Tompkins refers to as “neuter abstractions”, such as articular infinitives. Additionally, I will look for differences in the rhetoric itself, that is, how the speakers frame their speeches and how they approach argumentation. Note that the specific arguments made in the speeches will not be considered, as they are too subject to variation as the circumstances vary, except when they highlight an aspect of the form of argumentation. Patterns found in the anonymous speeches listed above will be checked against deliberative speeches from named persons of the relevant *poleis* to verify, as much as possible, that the patterns found are properly considered attributes of the *polis* in question. Note, though, that it is not important for the purposes of this project whether Thucydides deliberately attempts to characterise *poleis* in these speeches or not; I am only looking for evidence of characterisation per se. Moreover, this thesis takes a decidedly literary approach to Thucydidean

²⁷ Rijksbaron (2006) uses this term; some use the terms “complementary”, or “supplementary”.

historiography: I am concerned not so much with what actually happened or what was actually said, as with how Thucydides presents events, characters, and arguments.

Having discussed the methodology, we ought to consider what our expectations regarding characterisation should be for the *poleis* in question, Athens, Corinth and Sparta. I begin with Athens. A danger in attempting to draw a picture of fifth-century Athens, which could be encoded in speech habits, is that a major source of scholarly argument regarding the *polis* is Thucydides. Yet we can develop some expectations by working from certain incontrovertible facts. First, two major developments of the Athenian *polis* in the fifth century were the consolidation of the democracy, begun at the end of the sixth century, and the acquisition of the empire. The fifth century also saw the rise of the sophistic movement, and, though Athens was not the birthplace of the sophistic movement,²⁸ the movement was popular there. Athens' empire was important for its democracy, as the wealth gained from the subject states allowed for a great deal of participation from all levels of the citizen body – David Pritchard notes that Athens could spend in the vicinity of 100 talents a year for a variety of roles in the democracy.²⁹ Further, as Arlene Saxonhouse argues, *parrhesia* (free, frank speech) was very important to the Athenian democracy.³⁰ Although, as Pritchard notes, the speakers were still members of the “upper class”,³¹ these upper-class politicians were still required to win over the non-elite majority.³² Thus, from a citizen body highly involved in the running of their *polis*, and to whom the schooling of the sophists was available, we should expect sophisticated rhetoric, with a tendency to flatter the audience, given the situation of elites convincing non-elites that the former had the latter's interests in mind. To the sophisticated rhetoric we can add a tendency to encourage risk-taking: Luginbill demonstrates, through

²⁸ Robinson (2007), 110.

²⁹ Pritchard (2010), 3.

³⁰ Saxonhouse (2006), 86.

³¹ Pritchard (2010), 2.

³² Connor (1971), 87-8 notes the dangers of tensions between the wealthy politicians and the poorer Athenians who manned the oars of the fleet, upon which Athens had become increasingly reliant.

Thucydides' narrative, a general tendency to boldness and risk-taking.³³ If Thucydides himself tends to view Athens in such a way, we should expect to find this boldness in the speeches.

Perhaps the least problematic of the three *poleis* in terms of speech habits is Sparta. Spartan brachylogy was proverbial in antiquity, as evinced by accounts such as that found in Herodotus:

Ἐπεῖτε δὲ οἱ ἐξελασθέντες Σαμίων ὑπὸ Πολυκράτεος ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὴν Σπάρτην, καταστάντες ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἔλεγον πολλὰ οἷα κάρτα δεόμενοι. Οἱ δέ σφι τῇ πρώτῃ καταστάσει ὑπεκρίναντο τὰ μὲν πρῶτα λεχθέντα ἐπιλεληθέναι, τὰ δὲ ὕστερα οὐ συνιέναι. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δεύτερα καταστάντες ἄλλο μὲν εἶπον οὐδέν, θύλακον δὲ φέροντες ἔφασαν τὸν θύλακον ἀλφίτων δέεσθαι. Οἱ δέ σφι ὑπεκρίναντο τῷ θυλάκῳ περιεργάσθαι· βοηθέειν δ' ὧν ἔδοξε αὐτοῖσι. (3.46)

And after that, the Samians, having been driven out by Polykrates, came to Sparta, coming before the magistracy they said many things which they very much needed. But the Spartans replied to them first that the first things said they had forgotten, and the later things they did not follow. After some time, coming before the magistracy a second time, they said no other thing, but carrying a sack they said "the sack needs grain". And the Spartans replied they had overdone things with the sack. But they purposed to help them.

Herodotus' description suggests that Spartans not only spoke very briefly, but had trouble following longer discourse. This latter point seems unlikely, given Sparta's relations with other *poleis*, who were not so laconic in speech, and it is likely Herodotus was here exaggerating. Exaggeration, as Crane notes, only works if the factor being exaggerated has some truth to it.³⁴ Thus, this passage supports our expectations of brevity in Spartan speeches. Other than brevity, however, the Spartans also made much of their belonging to the Dorian *ethnos*, which claim resulted in their self-portrayal as stolid, conservative, and cautious.³⁵ There is also evidence that the Spartans could be dilatory.³⁶ Thus, we should expect Spartan

³³ Luginbill (1999), 92-6.

³⁴ Crane (1992a), 9.

³⁵ Debnar (2001), 5.

³⁶ Consider Herodotus 6.106.9-11 for Spartan tardiness.

speeches, if they are representative, to be brief, to express a preference for delaying action, and their arguments to be couched in their conservative ideology.

Like the Spartans, the Corinthians also claimed membership of the Dorian *ethnos*, and were allies of Sparta.³⁷ Yet Corinth was also a maritime and mercantile *polis*, like Athens, and geographically situated between Athens and Sparta. These details mean that Corinth had a good deal more opportunity to be exposed to the sophistic movement of the fifth century, than Sparta, which could result in their seeming more Athenian. Crane notes, however, that to Thucydides the Corinthians still seemed as much the opposite of Athens as Sparta was.³⁸ The difference between Corinth and Athens, according to Crane, comes from Corinth's holding to values relating to inter-*polis* relationships, which Crane describes as "archaic".³⁹ By archaic, I understand Crane to mean inter-*polis* rules of engagement which developed during the Archaic age. Included in this term, and not discussed above, are rules governing the system of prestige, and the application of prestige to inter-*polis* affairs, and *charis* – a system of reciprocity between *poleis*.⁴⁰ Thus, we may expect to see a rhetorical style similar to that of the Athenians, if Corinth has been influenced by the sophistic movement, but a more conservative, archaic, ideology framing their arguments.

I investigate the anonymous speeches for the above factors in two parts of this thesis, each part divided in turn into two subsections. Part 1 looks at stylistic considerations in the form of a case study of the Spartan speech. Specifically, Part 1A considers sentence organisation and will show that the Spartan speech, despite certain unexpected features, is representative of Spartan discourse in terms of its relative brevity and organisation of ideas, and that the highlighting of the unexpected features of the speech by two programmatic statements in the speech itself serve to underscore the norms of Spartan discourse. Part 1B

³⁷ Parry (1981), 137.

³⁸ Crane (1998), 96.

³⁹ Crane (1998), 6-7 uses the term, which he relates to traditional values. These traditional values are spelt out in much more detail in regards to the Corcyraian affair, particularly at 97-104.

⁴⁰ Crane (1998), prestige: 100-4, *charis*: 108-12.

considers two unexpected features of the vocabulary in the Spartan speech and argues that the Spartan speeches demonstrate a pattern of gradual adoption of key features.

Part 2 considers rhetorical features, with Part 2A considering the rhetorical guise that speakers adopt through their discussion of their speech, showing the Athenians tend to present themselves as “wise advisors”, and their speech as advice, the Spartans take a position of openly noting they come to persuade, and the Corinthians either do not frame their position, or follow the Spartans. Part 2B will consider the ideological framework of the arguments in the speeches, arguing that the Athenians highlight openness to risk-taking of their *polis* and prominence of profit or advantage in their thought, the Spartans display more conservative and risk-averse ideas, and the Corinthians occupy a medial position between Athens and Sparta.

Overall, the thesis will show that the Athenians are characterised by their longer, and comparatively more cognitively demanding speeches, as well as their more sophisticated rhetorical posturing, and argumentation which reflects democratic ideology and practice. Spartans are characterised by their discourse which tends to be briefer, and less cognitively demanding. Their rhetorical posturing is more straightforward, and they espouse a conservative and risk-averse ideology. The Corinthians are characterised by a speech structure similar to Athens, reflecting a greater exposure to the sophistic movement, as well as generally more straightforward rhetorical posturing and ideas highlighting their cultural position between Athens and Sparta.

Part 1. Stylistics

In Part 1 of this thesis I shall investigate two stylistic considerations. In section A, I shall look at speech organisation, demonstrating that despite the greater use of subordination, the Spartan anonymous speech is rhetorically simpler than the other speeches. In section B, I shall consider vocabulary, focusing on two particular word types that only became popular in the later fifth century: *-sis* nouns and neuter abstractions. I shall demonstrate that while these features are unusual in the Spartan speech, they ultimately serve to highlight Spartan rhetoric.

1 A. Sentence Structure

In this part of the thesis, I will examine the structure of the sentences in the anonymous speeches, considering both quantitative features, such as sentence length, and syntactical features, such as subordination and parataxis. I will show that, while the Spartan anonymous speech has a higher proportion of subordinated sentences, it nonetheless remains a shorter and more straightforward speech than those of the Corinthians and Athenians.

Before discussing the evidence from the speeches, it is necessary to discuss precisely what I am considering and what statistical evidence I will be gathering. As noted in the introduction, in this chapter I will look at the organisation of sentences in the anonymous speeches, noting both the proportion of subordinated sentences in a speech, and the levels of subordination.⁴¹ Other statistics gathered include average sentence length, ratio of subordination to parataxis, and total number of sentences in each speech.

A quick glance at the sentence related statistics in Table 1, below, shows one somewhat surprising area of similarity: the average sentence length does not vary a great deal between the speeches, ranging from 31.7 words in the second Corinthian speech (1.68-71), to 38.0 in the first Corinthian speech (1.37-43). Also, consideration of the standard deviations shows

⁴¹ Unlike Tompkins, I count as a sentence only those clauses ending in a full stop, following the editors' judgement.

that there is a great deal of variation within each speech. Thus a difference of 5.6 in terms of average words per sentence is not statistically significant.

Table 1. Sentence Statistics for the Anonymous Speeches

Comparison of Anonymous Speeches	Corinth 1.37-43	Corinth 1.68-71	Athens 1.73-8	Corinth 1.120-4	Sparta 4.17-20	Athens 5.85-113*
Number of sentences	26	30	31	24	19	30
Shortest sentence	12	10	10	12	17	7
Longest sentence	91	91	127	111	59	73
Average Sentence Length	38.0	31.7	35.2	36.5	32.4	32.7
Standard Deviation of Sentence Length	23.5	19.3	24.2	23.1	11.5	14.7
Word Count	988	952	1091	877	616	980
Ratio Parataxis: Subordination	0.783	0.814	0.686	0.682	0.625	0.791
Ratio of >1 sub clause: all clauses	0.561	0.551	0.593	0.595	0.615	0.558
Ratio of >1 sub clause: all sub cls.	0.522	0.349	0.353	0.455	0.625	0.372

* Only includes sentences spoken by the Athenians.

Similarly, in regards to the actual number of sentences in each speech, the Spartans have the lowest count, at 19 sentences, only five fewer than the speech with the second fewest, the third speech of the Corinthians, to their allies, with 24 sentences. The difference between the speech with the fewest sentences, and that with the most, however, is a total of 12 sentences, which seems somewhat more significant than the average sentence length statistics.

While the average sentence length of the anonymous speeches does not differentiate between the *poleis*, that the Spartans' is at the low end, combined with their having the fewest sentences, is suggestive of a certain brevity on their part. Further support for this Spartan brevity can be found by comparison of maximum sentence length. The longest Spartan sentence is 48 words long, where all the longest sentences of the other speeches are over 70. The longest of the sentences in the anonymous speeches, though, is more than twice the length of the Spartans' longest sentence, at 127 words found in the Athenian speech at Sparta

(1.73-8), and the longest sentence in a Corinthian speech is 91 words long (found in two speeches), is more than two-thirds the length of the Spartan sentence again. Thus, this statistic for the Spartans falls in line with average sentence length and total number of sentences, to reveal the Spartans as brachylogic, which seems to meet what is expected of Spartan rhetoric: brevity. In fact, the Spartans draw attention to this rhetorical reputation of theirs in their speech:

τοὺς δὲ λόγους μακροτέρους οὐ παρὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς μηχανοῦμεν,
ἀλλ' ἐπιχώριον ὃν ἡμῖν οὐ μὲν βραχεῖς ἀρκῶσι μὴ πολλοῖς
χρηῖσθαι, πλέοσι δὲ ἐν ᾧ ἂν καιρὸς ἢ διδάσκοντάς τι τῶν
προϋργου λόγους τὸ δέον πρᾶσσειν. (4.17.2)

And we will make a longer speech, not contrary to our custom, but it is the custom of our land not to use many words when brevity suffices, and more when the moment is critical to do the necessary thing by teaching something that is useful in words.

That they felt it necessary to explain at the outset of this speech that it would be longer, suggests both knowledge of their brachylogic reputation, and also that a normal speech for the speakers would be very brief indeed, given that what constitutes a longer speech for these Spartans is markedly shorter than the speeches of others. Yet, as will be discussed below, these ambassadors do not even utter the longest Spartan speech, and it would seem that this rather programmatic statement serves to highlight the overall oddness of the speech.⁴²

Apart from brevity, there are two other structural differences evident in the statistics. First, the Spartans have the lowest ratio of paratactic clauses to subordinated clauses. That is, the Spartans join ideas together using conjunctions less often than either the Corinthians or the Athenians. Second, the Spartans' speech has the highest ratio of sentences with greater than one level of subordination to all sentences, and to subordinated clauses. The Spartans, then, not only organise their ideas by subordination more often, but subordinate in multiple levels more often as well.

⁴² Frances (1991-1993), 212 says that this speech is the Spartans' "one national attempt at rhetorical sophistry".

Structurally, then, there are three notable differences separating the Spartan anonymous speech from the anonymous speeches of the Corinthians and Athenians. Only one, however, clearly meets expectations of Spartan discourse: brevity. The higher use of subordination does not readily seem to fit Spartan *brachylogia*, potentially giving rise to a greater complexity of speech than their reputation would suggest. Consider, for example, the opening sentence of Archidamos' speech in Book Two, which seems to be more in line with Spartan *brachylogia*:

Ἄνδρες Πελοποννήσιοι καὶ ξύμμαχοι, καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν
πολλὰς στρατείας καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ Πελοποννήσῳ καὶ ἔξω
ἐποιήσαντο, καὶ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οὐκ ἄπειροι
πολέμων εἰσὶν· (2.11.1)

Peloponnesian men and allies, our fathers made many expeditions
both in the Peloponnese itself and out, and the older men of us
ourselves are not inexperienced in wars;

This sentence is representative of the majority of sentences in the speech: it is fairly brief and is unremarkable in its construction, having two parallel main clauses. It seems more Spartan than the anonymous speech of Book Four based on the statistics alone, and thus requires further investigation.

The Spartans' use of subordination, however, serves the purpose of facilitating the transmission of their ideas much better than other speakers, as I will endeavour to show below. It is worth noting that the majority of the analysis to follow will be a consideration of individual sentences, which at first glance may seem artificial. Speeches are collections of sentences spoken one after another, after all. Nevertheless, there are two main reasons for this approach. First, it is at the level of the sentence that relative differences in complexity are found, the cumulative effect of which results in some of the key differences between the speeches of the *poleis* under consideration. Second, as Gregory Crane notes, Thucydides was taking great advantage of the written medium, where Herodotos had not.⁴³ Thus, the speeches, like any other aspect of the history, were intended for close examination.

⁴³ Crane (1998), 37.

The opening sentence of the Spartans' attempt to broker a peace reaches the highest level of subordination found in this speech:

Ἔπεμψαν ἡμᾶς Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ὧς Ἀθηναῖοι, περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἀνδρῶν πράξοντας ὅτι ἂν ὑμῖν τε ὠφέλιμον ὦν τὸ αὐτὸ πείθωμεν καὶ ἡμῖν ἐς τὴν ξυμφορὰν ὥς ἐκ τῶν παρόντων κόσμον μάλιστα μέλλῃ οἴσιν. (4.17.1)

The Lakedaimonians sent us, Athenians, to do regarding the men on the island, whatever we persuade you is beneficial for you and us alike with regard to the disaster, so that it is likely to bring the most honour from the present circumstances.

The sentence may be broken down thus:

Ἔπεμψαν – 1) περὶ .. πράξοντας
 i) ὅτι .. πείθωμεν
 ii) ὥς .. μέλλῃ
 a) ἐκ .. οἴσιν

From the above, we can see this sentence reaches the third level of subordination.⁴⁴ Despite, or perhaps in this instance, because the sentence reaches such a high level of subordination, it remains very straightforward. It opens with its main verb, ἔπεμψαν, which takes the direct object ἡμᾶς, in turn modified by the future participle of purpose πράξοντας, subordinate to ἔπεμψαν. To this participial phrase is subordinated a general relative clause, the main verb of which is πείθωμεν, with two outcomes listed: finding a mutually beneficial way of handling the Spartans captured on Sphacteria and salvaging as much honour (κόσμος) as possible. Interestingly, these two outcomes demonstrate Thucydides' fondness for having parallel ideas, but disrupting the parallelism of the syntax. To the general relative clause is subordinated a further result clause, consisting solely of the subjunctive μέλλῃ, which has a complementary clause subordinated to it. This structure, though highly subordinated, smoothly allows the flow of ideas, requiring comparatively less cognitive effort on the part of the audience, thus making it easier to understand.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ See Tompkins (1972), 184-5 for discussion of levels of subordination.

⁴⁵ Warren (2012), 180-2. Scheppers (2011), 24-5 briefly discusses cognitive effort.

Contrast this opening sentence with that of the first anonymous Corinthian speech in

Book One:

Ἀναγκαῖον Κερκυραίων τῶνδε οὐ μόνον περὶ τοῦ δέξασθαι
σφᾶς τὸν λόγον ποιησαμένων, ἀλλ' ὥς καὶ ἡμεῖς τε ἀδικοῦμεν
καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰκότως πολεμοῦνται, μνησθέντας πρῶτον καὶ
ἡμᾶς περὶ ἀμφοτέρων οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἄλλον λόγον ἰέναι, ἵνα
τὴν ἀφ' ἡμῶν τε ἀξιώσιν ἀσφαλέστερον προειδῆτε καὶ τὴν
τῶνδε χρεῖαν μὴ ἀλογίστως ἀπόσῃσθε. (1.37.1)

After these Corcyraians have made a speech not only about accepting themselves as allies, but also that we do them harm and they themselves are attacked with no good reason, it is necessary for us too, first making mention of these matters, so to proceed to the rest of our speech, so that you may know first more surely our merited claim, and reject not irrationally their request.

The speech opens with a genitive absolute, to which are subordinated two paratactic, and nearly symmetrical, clauses “but also we do them harm”, and “they are attacked unfairly”.

The remainder of the opening sentence is governed by ἀναγκαῖον [ἐστι]. To the main verb is subordinated the clause μνησθέντας .. ἰέναι, which in turn has two subordinate result clauses: ἵνα .. προειδῆτε, and τὴν .. ἀπόσῃσθε. Though the structure is easier to describe, the sentence is longer, at 51 words versus the 34 of the Spartan speech, and where the flow of ideas was facilitated by the structure of the Spartan opening sentence, here more 'mental juggling' is involved to render the whole sentence sensible. Furthermore, a listener would be required to supply many pieces of information to understand the Corinthians. Although the context would provide at least some of the information, for example, that the Corinthians are speaking after the Corcyraians' request for Athenian alliance explains the τῶνδε (of these men here) of the last line, it still remains that the listener is required to do more work in understanding the Corinthian opening, than the Spartan opening.

The Spartans' simpler use of subordination can also be seen in their most subordinated sentence, 4.18.1, which reaches the fourth level of subordination:

γνῶτε δὲ καὶ ἐς τὰς ἡμετέρας νῦν ξυμφορὰς ἀπιδόντες, οἵτινες
ἀξίωμα μέγιστον τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔχοντες ἤκομεν παρ' ὑμᾶς,
πρότερον αὐτοὶ κυριώτεροι νομίζοντες εἶναι δοῦναι ἐφ' ᾧ νῦν
ἀφιγμένοι ὑμᾶς αἰτούμεθα. (4.18.1)

Make your decision,⁴⁶ having looked at our present circumstances; we,
who have the greatest reputation of the Greeks, have come to you,
previously considering ourselves to be in a more authoritative position
to grant that for which we have come now to ask you.

The four levels being:

γνῶτε .. ἀπιδόντες – 1) ἤκομεν παρ' ὑμᾶς
i) πρότερον .. εἶναι
a) δοῦναι
I) ἐφ' .. αἰτούμεθα

Again the organisation of ideas is rather straightforward, though perhaps less so than the opening sentence. Opening with the imperative, γνῶτε, with an adjectival participial phrase, the Spartans in neat order highlight their change of circumstances for the Athenians: despite their reputation, and despite their beliefs regarding power or authority to come to terms (κυριώτεροι), the Spartans have had to come to Athens to ask for peace. Further, following a pair of sentences discussing, in general terms, the fickle nature of fortune, this sentence provides the specific example of the Spartans, and the subordinated components all clearly serve the purpose of this example as expressed in the opening clause: make your judgement, having considered the following facts of our current circumstances. All of which they express in only 30 words, and with no unnecessary, even if relevant, information added.

An appropriate comparison for the above sentence comes from the Athenian anonymous speech of Book 1, which also reaches the fourth level of subordination:

⁴⁶ Gomme (1956), 454 translates γνῶτε thus, following Classen.

οὕτως οὐδ' ἡμεῖς θαυμαστὸν οὐδὲν πεποιήκαμεν οὐδ' ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου τρόπου, εἰ ἀρχὴν τε διδομένην ἐδεξάμεθα καὶ ταύτην μὴ ἀνείμεν ὑπὸ <τριῶν> τῶν μεγίστων νικηθέντες, τιμῆς καὶ δέους καὶ ὠφελίας, οὐδ' αὖ πρῶτοι τοῦ τοιούτου ὑπάρξαντες, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ καθεστῶτος τὸν ἥσσω ὑπὸ τοῦ δυνατωτέρου κατείργεσθαι, ἄξιοί τε ἅμα νομίζοντες εἶναι καὶ ὑμῖν δοκοῦντες μέχρι οὗ τὰ ξυμφέροντα λογιζόμενοι τῷ δικαίῳ λόγῳ νῦν χρήσθε, ὃν οὐδεὶς πω παρατυχὸν ἰσχύι τι κτήσασθαι προθεὶς τοῦ μὴ πλέον ἔχειν ἀπετράπετο. (1.76.2)

Thus neither have we made anything marvellous, nor turned from the customs of men, if we accepted an empire offered, and did not surrender this, having been conquered by the three greatest [motivations], honour, fear, and interest, we were not the first to begin such things, but it has always been established that the weaker are kept down by the more powerful, and we thought ourselves to be worthy of this and seemed so to you until now when you calculate your own interests, talking about justice, which no man, when he had the power to acquire something by force, turned himself away, placing this before not having more.

The sentence is not only considerably longer, it is also more involved, having both parallel main verbs and a high level of subordination, as can be seen in the following breakdown:

οὕτως .. πεποιήκαμεν .. τρόπου
 εἰ .. ἐδεξάμεθα
 ταύτην μὴ ἀνείμεν .. ὑπάρξαντες
 [ἐστίν] – 1) τὸν ἥσσω .. κατείργεσθαι
 – 2) ἄξιοι .. δοκοῦντες
 i) οὗ τὰ .. χρήσθε
 a) ὃν οὐδεὶς .. ἀπετράπετο
 I) ἰσχύι τι κτήσασθαι
 II) τοῦ μὴ πλέον ἔχειν

Clearly, there is a good deal more discussed in this sentence than in the Spartan sentence above, and while the Spartan sentence contains both a phrase with a concessive sense (οὔτινες .. ἔχοντες), and a clause which serves to qualify (πρότερον .. εἶναι), they are both very concise. In the Athenian sentence, the concessive component comes in two paratactic clauses (εἰ ἀρχὴν .. ἐδεξάμεθα, and ταύτην .. ὑπάρξαντες), the latter of which contains a qualifying prepositional phrase, complete with a short list, and a qualifying participial phrase. This clause is longer than any found in the Spartan sentence above, and there is a considerable

amount of information offered before one could mentally take a pause, and this is but one component of a long sentence that is soon to provide a lot of subordination to follow. Further adding to the audience's cognitive burden is that the sentence has no clearly expressed point. Compare with 4.18.1, which opens with the point of the sentence: judging in light of present circumstances. Coming between a sentence considering likely Spartan behaviour in similar circumstances, and one considering Athenian moderation in ruling their empire, this sentence's purpose would seem to be to defend the existence of the Athenian empire, though it perhaps only becomes apparent when one has the leisure to study each sentence in detail, since the only time the Athenians say they will defend their having an empire is in their opening sentence: "... βουλόμενοι ... δηλώσαι ὡς οὔτε ἀπεικότως ἔχομεν ἃ κεκτήμεθα," – "... intending ... to show that we have that which we acquired not unreasonably" (1.73.1.8-9). A sentence such as 1.76.2, in the middle of a reasonably long speech, would be quite taxing on an audience, and make a greater cognitive demand on the audience, than the Spartan sentence, 4.18.1, above.⁴⁷

Another appropriate comparison to the highly subordinated Spartan sentence above can be found in the first Corinthian speech:

Καὶ φασὶ δὴ δίκη πρότερον ἐθελῆσαι κρίνεσθαι, ἣν γε οὐ τὸν προύχοντα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀσφαλοῦς προκαλούμενον λέγειν τι δοκεῖν δεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐξ ἴσον τὰ τε ἔργα ὁμοίως καὶ τοὺς λόγους πρὶν διαγωνίζεσθαι καθιστάντα. (1.39.1)

And they say that previously they were willing to submit to arbitration; we shouldn't give credence to someone proposing this from a superior position of security, but [we should give credence] to someone who sets their words and deeds alike on an equal footing [with the enemy] before clashing.

⁴⁷ Martin *et al.* (1994), 84-5 discuss limitations on working memory, necessary for comprehending language, amongst other things.

The schema of this sentence is as follows:

- φασί – 1) πρότερον ἐθελῆσαι
i) δίκη κρίνεσθαι
a) ἦν .. δεῖ
I) δοκεῖν
*) τόν .. λέγειν τι
II) ἀλλά .. καθιστάντα

In length, this sentence is more comparable to the Spartan sentence than the Athenian sentence discussed immediately above: it is only 35 words long, compared to the Spartan sentence's 30, and the Athenian sentence's 76. Further, it is much more compact than the Athenian sentence, almost as concise, perhaps, as the Spartan sentence. As can be seen, however, this sentence reaches the fifth level of subordination, one more than in the Spartan and Athenian sentences discussed above, providing more for an audience, or reader, to track.

There are other areas in which this sentence proves more complex than its Spartan comparandum. First, the opening clause, though quite straightforward, brings the sentence to the second level of subordination: it opens with main the verb, φασί, which takes the complementary infinitive, ἐθελῆσαι, modified by πρότερον, and in turn governing its own complementary infinitive, κρίνεσθαι, which is at the second level of subordination. The relative clause, which has as its antecedent δίκη, the direct object of κρίνεσθαι, is also more complicated than the comparable component of the Spartan sentence. The main verb of the relative clause is δεῖ, governing δοκεῖν, which, other than λέγειν τι, has a quite complex complement: “τὸν πρὸνχοντα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀσφαλοῦς προκαλούμενον” – “one in a superior position and proposing [arbitration] from a position of safety”. The second participle, “προκαλούμενον”, according to Cameron, has as a direct object the relative pronoun “ἦν”, though for reasons of sense, rather than grammatically.⁴⁸ Thus, the pronoun which opens the clause, and is one of the complements of the main verb, is also attached to a participle modifying the direct object of the other complement of the main verb. Such an intertwining of

⁴⁸ Cameron (2003), 59.

components is not at all present in the Spartan sentence, and is more difficult for a brain to process.

Further complicating matters is the last part of the sentence, in which a contrast to the complex complement above is expressed in another participial phrase, introduced with ἀλλά. The phrases are centred around δεῖ, yet are asymmetrical: fewer participles and two direct objects in the latter; again, a structural organisation unseen in the Spartan comparandum. Additionally, an audience is required to mentally supply “with respect to their opponents”, or something similar, to appropriately understand “καθιστάντα ἐς ἴσον” – “placing into an equal position”, akin to the need to mentally supply either the relative pronoun, or “δίκη” to completely understand “προκαλούμενον”, as noted above.

In 4.18.1, the last three quarters of the sentence follow a fairly similar pattern, but again, it is more straightforward than the Corinthian sentence above. There are two participial phrases centred around the main verb, “ἤκομεν”, though they are both modifying the subject of the main verb, rather than contrasted. Further, the phrase “οἵτινες ἀξίωμα μέγιστον τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔχοντες” – “such ones having the greatest reputation of the Greeks”, lays out its meaning in a far less convoluted manner than seen immediately above: opening with the indefinite pronoun “οἵτινες”, serving in this instance to generalise what follows to all Spartans, not just those present, followed by the participle with a direct object, and its adjective, with a partative genitive. The second participial phrase, though a little more involved, due to the clauses subordinated to it, nevertheless remains quite straightforward, especially so in comparison.

Having considered the most subordinated sentence in the Spartan anonymous speech, we ought now to consider the longest sentence:

σωφρόνων δὲ ἀνδρῶν οἵτινες τὰγαθὰ ἐς ἀμφίβολον ἀσφαλῶς
 ἔθεντο (καὶ ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς οἱ αὐτοὶ εὐξυνετώτερον ἂν
 προσφέροιντο), τὸν τε πόλεμον νομίσωσι μὴ καθ' ὅσον ἂν τις
 αὐτοῦ μέρος βούληται μεταχειρίζειν, τούτῳ ξυνεῖναι, ἀλλ' ὥς
 ἂν αἱ τύχαι αὐτῶν ἡγήσωνται· καὶ ἐλάχιστ' ἂν οἱ τοιοῦτοι
 πταίοντες διὰ τὸ μὴ τῷ ὀρθουμένῳ αὐτοῦ πιστεύοντες
 ἐπαίρεσθαι ἐν τῷ εὐτυχεῖν ἂν μάλιστα καταλύοιντο. (4.18.4)

Wise men place into safety their good things against the uncertain future (and the same ones would apply themselves more intelligently to the circumstances), and they know with respect to war, that they engage with this not to the extent one may wish to practice a part of it, but as their fortunes lead; And such ones, erring the least through not getting excited trusting their success to increase, would eagerly come to terms during their good fortune.

We can break the sentence down thus:

ἔθεντο
 προσφέροιντο
 νομίσωσι – 1) τὸν τε .. ξυνεῖναι
 i) μὴ .. βούληται
 a) αὐτοῦ .. μεταχειρίζειν
 ii) ἀλλ' .. ἡγήσωνται
 καταλύοιντο

Containing four parallel main verbs, the third of which governs several other clauses, this sentence resembles 1.76.2 from the Athenian speech, discussed above. The sentence, though, presents some difficulties in regards to understanding, rather than simply overwhelming an audience. The first difficulty is whether ἐς ἀμφίβολον or ἀσφαλῶς should be understood as more closely connected to the verb, ἔθεντο, in terms of meaning.⁴⁹ Gomme suggests what is meant is “deposit in a safe place with a view to the uncertainty of the future”, though he notes that this cannot be rendered from “ἐς ἀμφίβαλον”.⁵⁰ The *LSJ* offers “prudently count their good fortune as doubtful” for this section.⁵¹ This translation seems to match the sense both of the last clause of this sentence, and that of the preceding sentence, that the Athenians cannot trust “on account of the strength of their city and empire, their current fortune to be with

⁴⁹ Graves (1982), 81.

⁵⁰ Gomme (1956), 455.

⁵¹ *LSJ* s.v. ἀμφίβολος (III).

[them] always” (4.18.3). Hornblower, however, suggests the passage may be corrupt, though offers no emendations, and his translation, though looser, follows Gomme, as does Hammond’s translation.⁵² In light of the weight of scholarly opinion in this matter, I have followed Gomme in my translation.

Another issue in this sentence is the middle: τόν τε πόλεμον ... ἡγήσωνται. The difficulty in this section centres around τούτῳ ξυνεῖναι in that what the subject of ξυνεῖναι is, and what the referent of τούτῳ is, is unclear. The effect of this lack of clarity is to create ambiguity in the clause, though the intended meaning seems fairly clear: the Spartans are warning the Athenians they cannot win the war simply using their fleet. Just the same, this is a difficult sentence, and its difficulty may have had a negative impact on the audience’s ability to follow this sentence and the following speech.

The longest sentence found in the Athenian speeches is found in the first anonymous speech to the Spartans, at 127 words long:

τοιούτου μέντοι τούτου ξυμβάντος, καὶ σαφῶς δηλωθέντος ὅτι ἐν ταῖς ναυσὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰ πράγματα ἐγένετο, τρία τὰ ὠφελιμώτατα ἐς αὐτὸ παρεσχόμεθα, ἀριθμὸν τε νεῶν πλεῖστον καὶ ἄνδρα στρατηγὸν ξυνετώτατον καὶ προθυμίαν ἀοκνοτάτην· ναῦς μὲν γε ἐς τὰς τετρακοσίας ὀλίγῳ ἐλάσσους τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, Θεμιστοκλέα δὲ ἄρχοντα, ὃς αἰτιώτατος ἐν τῷ στενῷ ναυμαχῆσαι ἐγένετο, ὅπερ σαφέστατα ἔσωσε τὰ πράγματα, καὶ αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς ἐτιμήσατε μάλιστα δὴ ἄνδρα ξένον τῶν ὥς ὑμᾶς ἐλθόντων· προθυμίαν δὲ καὶ πολὺ τολμηροτάτην ἐδείξαμεν, οἳ γε, ἐπειδὴ ἡμῖν κατὰ γῆν οὐδεὶς ἐβοήθει, τῶν ἄλλων ἤδη μέχρι ἡμῶν δουλευόντων ἡξιώσαμεν ἐκλιπόντες τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα διαφθεύραντες μὴδ' ὥς τὸ τῶν περιλοίπων ξυμμάχων κοινὸν προλιπεῖν μὴδὲ σκεδασθέντες ἀχρεῖοι αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐσβάντες ἐς τὰς ναῦς κινδυνεῦσαι καὶ μὴ ὀργισθῆναι ὅτι ἡμῖν οὐ προυτιμωρήσατε. (1.74.1-2)

⁵² Hornblower (1996), 174; Hammond (2009), 262.

Such indeed was the outcome of this, and clearly showed that the power of Hellas was in her fleet, to this we provided three very helpful things: the greatest number of ships, the wisest man as general and the most resolute goodwill; in the four hundred ships [ours were] a little less than two-thirds, Themistokles as leader, who was most instrumental in causing the sea-battle in the straits, thus most clearly he saved our cause, and on account of this you honoured him more than any other foreign man who had come to you; and we showed altogether the hardest good spirit, who, when no one came to our aid by land, and the others as far as us enslaved already, we resolved to abandon our city having destroyed our property, thus neither abandoning the alliance of our remaining allies, nor to be useless to them having been scattered, but having taken to our ships we took the risk and were not angry that you had not aided us first.

For which the schema is:

[τοιούτου .. δηλωθέντος] – 1) ὅτι .. ἐγένετο
παρεσχόμεθα – (τρία .. ἀοκνοτάτην)
– (ναῦς .. ἄρχοντα)
1) ὅς .. ἐγένετο
i) ὅπερ .. πράγματα
ii) καὶ αὐτὸν .. ἐλθόντων
ἐδείξαμεν – 1) οἷ γε .. διαφθείραντες
i) ἐπειδὴ .. ἐβοήθει
ii) [τῶν ἄλλων .. δουλευόντων]
iii) μηδ' ὥς .. προλιπεῖν
iv) μηδὲ σκεδασθέντες .. γενέσθαι
v) ἀλλ' ἐσβάντες .. κινδυνεῦσαι
vi) καὶ μὴ ὀργισθῆναι
a) ὅτι ἡμῖν οὐ προυτιμωρήσατε

Not only is this sentence more than twice the length of 4.18.4, but clearly the arrangement of the sentence is more involved, as well. Note that the first main verb, *παρεσχόμεθα*, is governing two object phrases, the second of which governs a series of subordination. The two main verbs between them govern the list of three details the Athenians want to draw out of the victory at Salamis: that they provided the most ships, the best leader in Themistokles, and the most resolute good spirit. Having listed these items, the Athenians expand on them, which expansion is unbalanced. The second item, regarding Themistokles, extends into a relative clause, governing two further subordinated clauses, whereas the third item is expanded on at great length, and with its own main verb. The unbalanced sentence structure, combined with

the length of this sentence would create a greater cognitive load for the audience than the longest Spartan sentence, as with 1.76.2. While there is a good deal more information in this sentence, compared to the Spartan sentences, there is repetition of some of the information, particularly the Athenians choosing to abandon their city, and take to their ships. This repetition is unlike 1.76.2, and would make it more likely that the repeated information would be received by the audience, despite the length of this sentence. While there are no difficulties in the Greek of this sentence, as in 4.18.4, it is a very long sentence in a long speech. We cannot know the comparative effects of these issues on comprehension for an ancient audience, but one difficult sentence in 19 is likely to have less impact than several long, involved sentences in one long speech.

The Corinthians, however, also had longest sentences beyond that of the Spartans, and the one which comes closest in length to the Spartan sentence comes from the first Corinthian anonymous speech:

τό τε γὰρ ξυμφέρον ἐν ᾧ ἂν τις ἐλάχιστα ἀμαρτάνῃ μάλιστα
 ἔπεται, καὶ τὸ μέλλον τοῦ πολέμου ᾧ φοβοῦντες ὑμᾶς
 Κερκυραῖοι κελεύουσιν ἀδικεῖν ἐν ἀφανεῖ ἔτι κεῖται, καὶ οὐκ
 ἄξιον ἐπαρθέντας αὐτῷ φανεράν ἔχθραν ἤδη καὶ οὐ μέλλουσιν
 πρὸς Κορινθίους κτήσασθαι, τῆς δὲ ὑπαρχούσης πρότερον διὰ
 Μεγαρέας ὑποψίας σῶφρον ὑφελεῖν μᾶλλον (ἢ γὰρ τελευταία
 χάρις καιρὸν ἔχουσα, κἂν ἐλάσσων ᾧ, δύναται μείζον ἔγκλημα
 λῦσαι), μηδ' ὅτι ναυτικοῦ ξυμμαχίαν μεγάλην διδόασι, τούτῳ
 ἐφέλκεσθαι· (1.42.2.1-4.1)

For the advantage, meanwhile, follows he who errs the least, and the likelihood of war, by which the worrisome Corcyraians urge you to injustice, still remains in uncertainty, and is not worth, having been roused by this, acquiring clear enmity, not lying in the future, towards the Corinthians, but it is prudent, rather, to remove the ill-will garnered previously on account of the Megareans (for a final favour at the right time, although it is lesser, is able to remove greater complaints), and do not be drawn on by this, that they offer a great naval alliance.

We can break the sentence's structure down as follows:

- ἔπεται – 1) ἄν τις .. ἁμαρτάνῃ
κεῖται – 1) ᾧ .. ἀδικεῖν
– 2) καὶ οὐκ .. αὐτῷ
i) φανεράν .. κτήσασθαι
σῶφρον [ἐστι] – 1) τῆς δέ .. ὑφελεῖν
– 2) μηδ' .. ἐφέλκεσθαι
i) ὅτι .. διδόασι
δύναται – 1) κἄν .. ᾧ
– 2) μείζον .. λῦσαι

I have included a breakdown of the bracketed text at the end despite it being an independent sentence, because it is inserted, parenthetically, in the midst of the main sentence, and would require any audience to make sense of it as they made sense of the other sentence.

Comparison with 4.18.4 above shows some similarity of pattern: four parallel main verbs and subordination of three levels at most. In the case of this sentence, however, the four main verbs all have at least one level of subordination, accounting for the higher number of words. Like the Spartan sentence immediately above, the various components all relate to the central point that it is advantageous to repay the χάρις (here: favour, boon) of the Corinthians, though the final point, regarding the temptation of the Corcyraian fleet, seems a little jarring. Further, it is quite possible that the Corinthians could have made their point just as well without mentioning the Megareans, and discussing the ill-will towards Athens in general. Despite these similarities with 4.18.4, though, this sentence is clearly more complex, syntactically, than the Spartan comparandum: there are more verbs with subordinate clauses for an audience to follow, with the addition of a parenthetical sentence. The longest Spartan sentence, like those discussed previously, is much shorter than the longest sentences from speakers of the other *poleis*. While the 4.18.4 has its difficulties, as when compared with the Athenian speech, the cumulative effect is likely to be less than the greater complexities of the Corinthian speech.

Thus far, I have demonstrated the greater simplicity of the Spartan speech through comparison with excerpts from the Athenian and Corinthian speeches, yet it remains to be seen whether this pattern of greater simplicity is found in the named speeches. Unfortunately, aside from a brief exchange with an Athenian captain during the Corcyraian debacle (at 1.52.3, with Athenian response at 1.52.4), Thucydides records no other speech of the Corinthians in direct discourse, so the remaining discussion focuses on a comparison between Spartan and Athenian named speakers. It is worth noting, however, that the speeches of the Corinthians are reasonably consistent statistically, as table 1 shows. Consider the comparison of the anonymous Spartan speech with select known Spartan speakers in table 2, and the anonymous Athenian speeches with select named Athenians in table 3, below.

Table 2. Spartan anonymous speech compared with named speakers

	Spartans 4.17-20	Archidamos 1.80-5	Sthenelaidas 1.86	Archidamos 2.72-4.2	Brasidas 4.85-7
Number of Sentences	19	31	5	8	13
Longest Sentence	59	83	46	54	103
Word Count	616	853	153	225	603
Ratio of >1 sub clauses: all clauses	0.615	0.115	0.200	0.267	0.308

Table 3. Athenian anonymous speeches compared with named speakers.

	Athens 1.73-8	Athens 5.85-113	Perikles 1.140-4	Nikias 6.9-14	Kleon 3.37-40	Alkibiades 6.16-18
Number of Sentences	31	30	35	23	29	30
Longest Sentence	127	73	89	135	140	106
Word Count	1091	980	1212	946	1175	962
Ratio of >1 sub clauses: all clauses	0.353	0.372	0.236	0.522	0.317	0.267

I have reduced the statistics displayed in tables 2 and 3 to those which proved significant in the discussion above.⁵³ Table 2, comparing Spartan speeches, shows that the anonymous Spartan speech is not particularly unusual in regards to the number of sentences, longest sentence, nor word count, though Archidamos' first speech is longer. The anonymous Spartan speech is, however, unusual in the amount of subordination used in its organisation. In table 3, the Athenian anonymous speeches are compared with those of named Athenians. Statistically, the anonymous speeches of the Athenians are consistent with the majority of other Athenian speeches. The only exception is Nikias, who uses more subordination than the anonymous ambassadors. Nikias' greater use of subordination is more in line with the anonymous Spartans than the Athenians. As can be seen in the discussion above, however, subordination can either complicate or facilitate the transmission of ideas. Thus, we need to investigate Nikias' use of subordination to confirm the pattern found above.

Consider the opening sentence of Nikias' first speech:

Ἡ μὲν ἐκκλησία περὶ παρασκευῆς τῆς ἡμετέρας ἦδε ξυνελέγη, καθ' ὅτι χρὴ ἐς Σικελίαν ἐκπλεῖν· ἐμοὶ μέντοι δοκεῖ καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ τούτου ἔτι χρῆναι σκέψασθαι, εἰ ἄμεινόν ἐστιν ἐκπέμπειν τὰς ναῦς, καὶ μὴ οὕτω βραχεία βουλή περὶ μεγάλων πραγμάτων ἀνδράσιν ἀλλοφύλοις πειθομένους πόλεμον οὐ προσήκοντα ἄρασθαι. (6.9.1)

This assembly was called together about our preparations by which it is necessary to sail out to Sicily; however it seems to me to be necessary still to consider regarding this matter, if it is better to send out the fleet, and not thus by a brief counsel about great matters, to take up a war not concerning us, having been persuaded by foreign men.

⁵³ See bold statistics in Table 1, page 15.

A schema for which is as follows:

- ξυνελέγη – 1) καθ’ ὅτι χρῆ
i) ἐς Σικελίαν ἐκπλεῖν
δοκεῖ – 1) ἔτι χρῆναι
i) περὶ .. σκέψασθαι
a) εἰ ἄμεινόν ἐστιν
I) ἐκπέμπειν τὰς ναῦς
II) καὶ μὴ .. ἄρασθαι

The sentence reaches the fourth level of subordination, as does the most subordinated sentence of the Spartan anonymous speech (4.18.1). Unlike 4.18.1, however, Nikias’ sentence has two main verbs, both governing subordinated clauses, the second governing four levels. Thus Nikias’ sentence is already more complicated than the most subordinated of the anonymous Spartans. Further, we can see in this sentence a complicating factor that is a feature of Nikias’ speaking: concessions and reversals. Nikias reverses the direction of his speech with the μέντοι (however) in the second line: the assembly was called to discuss preparations (παρασκευή), however, Nikias thinks it is necessary to return to the decision to send the fleet to Sicily.

More examples of Nikias making reversals and concessions can be found in the next sentence of this speech:

καίτοι ἔγωγε καὶ τιμῶμαι ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου καὶ ἦσσον ἑτέρων
περὶ τῷ ἑμαυτοῦ σώματι ὀρρωδῶ, νομίζων ὁμοίως ἀγαθὸν
πολίτην εἶναι ὃς ἂν καὶ τοῦ σώματός τι καὶ τῆς οὐσίας
προνοῇται· μάλιστα γὰρ ἂν ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ τὰ τῆς πόλεως δι’
ἑαυτὸν βούλοιτο ὀρθοῦσθαι. (6.9.2)

And yet, I am honoured among such men and fear for my body less than others, thinking just the same a man is a good citizen who takes thought for his body and property; for indeed such a man would plan through himself to increase the prosperity of his city.

[illegible]

Such concessives and reversals are absent from the 4.18.1. As discussed above, each level of subordination builds on the preceding level to complete the idea being transmitted. Nikias, however, often uses subordination to reverse the direction of his speech, or make concessive qualifications of previous statements, as can be seen in the two sentences above.

1 B. Vocabulary

33

explained by context in which the Corinthian ambassadors find themselves, arguing against Corcyraians who have made claims to just action, as well as other factors which will be considered in Part 2 B. Another factor affecting word choice may be Thucydides' use of the Attic-Ionic dialect. Rather than focusing on specific words choices, then, I will focus on certain word types. Following Tompkins again, I wish to consider first *-sis* noun usage in the anonymous speeches, then neuter abstractions. I will consider the former because, though they have been in use since Homer, as Tompkins notes, they only started becoming particularly popular in the later fifth century, which is not a pattern found in other abstract nouns. Neuter abstractions, Tompkins' collective term for articular infinitives and articular participles, also saw a similar rise in the later fifth century.⁵⁴ These types of words, then, could be used to differentiate the three *poleis* in question.

Table 4, below, provides a comparison of *-sis* noun, and neuter abstraction usage. From this table we can see that, though the absolute numbers of *-sis* nouns used in the speeches are low, Sparta has a higher proportion of *-sis* noun use. Both Athens and Corinth have consistent lower usage of this type of noun. A similar pattern can be found in neuter abstraction usage. There is more variation with neuter abstraction usage, however, but again the Spartans have the highest proportion of use, considerably higher than all the other anonymous speeches but for the first Corinthian speech.

⁵⁴ Tompkins (1993), 102.

Table 4. Comparison of *-sis* Noun & Neuter Abstract Usage in Anonymous Speeches

	Corinth 1.37-43	Corinth 1.68-71	Athens 1.73-8	Corinth 1.120-4	Sparta 4.17-20	Athens 5.85-113
Number of <i>-sis</i> nouns	6	7	7	5	6	7
Proportion of <i>-sis</i> nouns	0.231	0.233	0.266	0.208	0.316	0.233
Number in accusative	6	4	0	1	4	1
Number in other oblique cases	0	2	4	2	2	6
Proportion of Neuter Abstractions	0.615	0.333	0.194	0.250	0.789	0.400
Number of Articular Infinitives	8	6	1	1	3	3
Number of Articular Participles	8	4	5	5	12	9

Thus, the Spartan anonymous speech stands out from the other anonymous speeches in respect of these features of vocabulary, yet we need to see how the Athenian and Spartan anonymous speeches compare to other speakers of their respective *poleis*. Consider tables 5 and 6 below.

Table 5. Comparison of *-sis* Noun & Neuter Abstract Usage in Spartan Speeches

	Sparta 4.17-20	Archidamos 1.80-5	Sthenelaidas 1.86	Archidamos 2.72-4.2	Brasidas 4.85-7
Number of <i>-sis</i> nouns	6	0	0	1	6
Proportion of <i>-sis</i> nouns	0.316	0	0	0.125	0.462
Number in accusative	4	0	0	0	3
Number in other oblique cases	2	0	0	1	2
Proportion of Neuter Abstractions	0.789	0.097	0	0	0.154
Number of Articular Infinitives	3	0	0	0	0
Number of Articular Participles	12	3	0	0	2

Table 6. Comparison of –sis Noun & Neuter Abstract Usage in Athenian Speeches

	Athens 1.73-8	Athens 5.85-113	Perikles 1.140-4	Nikias 6.9-14	Kleon 3.37-40	Alkibiades 6.16-18
Number of -sis nouns	7	7	9	2	7	4
Proportion of -sis nouns	0.266	0.233	0.281	0.087	0.241	0.133
Number in accusative	0	1	4	1	0	2
Number in other oblique cases	4	6	3	0	5	1
Proportion of Neuter Abstractions	0.194	0.400	0.171	0.261	0.241	0.100
Number of Articular Infinitives	1	3	1	4	2	1
Number of Articular Participles	5	9	6	2	5	2

Table 6 above shows that the anonymous Spartan speech was somewhat unusual in comparison to the other Spartan speakers, save Brasidas with respect to –sis noun usage, and very unusual in terms of neuter abstracts. Table 7, on the other hand, shows that the anonymous Athenian speakers were in line with average Athenian usage. Thus we need to explain the unusual word-type choices in the anonymous Spartan speech, particularly given that Thucydides was fond of these word types, as Tompkins notes, and scattered them liberally throughout his text, yet Sthenelaidas uses no such words, and Archidamos, in the speeches surveyed, uses one –sis noun and three articular participles.⁵⁵

One approach to explaining these data in the Spartan speech is to note the pattern in the Spartan speeches. At the beginning of the war, we see no –sis nouns being used by Spartans, and very few neuter abstractions. As the war progresses, we see the introduction of such nouns into Spartan discourse, and it is worth noting that the first –sis nouns we see uttered by a Spartan are from Archidamos who uses ἐπιχείρησις (attacking) and ἐλευθέρωσις (liberating). These words, as Francis notes, are old enough to be found already in Herodotos.⁵⁶ Later, we

⁵⁵ Tompkins (1993), 102.

⁵⁶ Francis (1991-1993), 206.

see the ambassadors using more, and then Brasidas more again. Such a pattern may reflect the gradual adoption of the newly in vogue word-form.

The sudden leap in proportion of use from Archidamos' speech to the Plataians (2.72-4.2), to the embassy to the Athenians may partly be explained by the greater amount of lapsed time between the two speeches, but also as an attempt on the part of the Spartan ambassadors to ingratiate themselves to the Athenian audience. Given Kleon's chastisement of the Athenian *polis* for preferring new and impressive rhetoric over good advice (3.38.5), and the fact that the Spartans would have had ample opportunity to form such an impression for themselves, this assumption on the part of the Spartans would not have been unreasonable.

Further support for the possibility of an attempt at ingratiation comes from the end of the anonymous Spartan speech: “ἡμῶν γὰρ καὶ ὑμῶν ταῦτα λεγόντων ...” – “for with we and you saying the same things...” (4.20.4). While this genitive absolute is part of the Spartan closing statement regarding the benefits of presenting a united front to the rest of Greece, it is also very much a programmatic statement, as Francis notes.⁵⁷ At the beginning of their speech, the Spartan ambassadors made a very programmatic statement regarding the nature of their speech, in regards to others' expectations of their rhetoric, discussed above (4.17.2), and in the light of this opening, such a closing remark does suggest an attempt by the Spartans to ingratiate themselves to the Athenians.

It is worth noting, as well, that the unusual features of this Spartan speech, and the fact that the Spartan ambassadors draw attention to these features, serves to underscore the expectation of Spartan rhetoric.

Conclusion

By gathering statistics on the stylistic features of the anonymous speeches, we can see that the anonymous Spartan speech is shorter than speeches from representatives of other

⁵⁷ Francis (1991-1993), 206.

poleis in word order and in terms of longest sentence. The Spartan anonymous speech is unusual, however, in its greater use of subordination, and to higher levels than other anonymous speeches and other Spartan speakers. Comparison of the subordination shows that the Spartan speech remains simpler relative to the other anonymous speeches, even in regards to the more difficult sentences in the Spartan speech. The Spartan speech also contains unusual levels of particular word types, *-sis* nouns and neuter abstractions. The proportion of these word types by sentence is higher than in speeches from the representatives of other *poleis*, and other Spartans. The greater use of these word types, though, can be explained in terms of gradual adoption, as evinced by the pattern found in their use by Spartan speakers, as well as an attempt to ingratiate the Spartan ambassadors to the Athenian audience, as demonstrated by the dove-tailing of the speech in two programmatic statements related to the nature of the speech. Overall, then, the Spartan anonymous speech, while somewhat unusual, does fit the expectations of Spartan rhetoric in terms of brevity and conservativeness.

The nature of the Athenian anonymous speeches has not been explicitly discussed in this part of the thesis, yet their use as comparanda which demonstrate the Spartans' greater simplicity also demonstrates the greater complexity of the Athenians, as we would expect given their embrace of the sophistic movement. Statistically, the anonymous speeches are consistent in regards to subordination and vocabulary with the speeches of other Athenian speakers, except Nikias. Nikias, like the anonymous Spartans, used a higher proportion of subordination than the other Athenians, yet, his use proved to be more complex than that of the Spartans, which ultimately fits the Athenian model of greater rhetorical complexity.

Interestingly, the Corinthians anonymous speeches resemble the Athenian speeches to a high degree, statistically. Further, the use of Corinthian sentences as comparanda demonstrating the relative simplicity of Spartan sentences shows that, like Athenian speeches, Corinthian speeches also were more rhetorically complex. We can understand the Corinthian

pattern also in terms of the sophistic movement: their proximity to Athens led to greater exposure to it.

Part 2. Rhetorical Features

In this second part of the thesis, I am concerned with the high-level features of the anonymous speeches, that is, with aspects of the rhetoric itself. I am not considering the arguments made in each speech in and of themselves, as the arguments vary according to the circumstances of the specific contexts in which each speech is given. Instead, I consider what various arguments reveal about the underlying ideology of the speakers. In section A, I investigate the different ways in which the three *poleis* frame the task of persuading their audience in their rhetoric, that is, the rhetorical posturing of each. In section B, I consider the approaches to argumentation, that is, the ideological framework underlying the specific arguments in the speeches.

2 A. Rhetorical Posturing

One difficulty in investigating argumentation in the anonymous speeches is that each speech was given in a particular context to a particular audience, meaning that the kinds of arguments a *polis* would make should vary considerably as the context varies. Consider the Corinthians: their first speech was to Athens, for a different purpose to their second and third speeches, to Sparta, and their non-Spartan allies, respectively. Despite these differences in audience and aim, however, there are common points to be found in Corinth's anonymous speeches, as with the other *poleis*. In this section, I shall consider how the ambassadors frame the purpose of their speeches, showing that the Athenians present their speeches as the giving of advice, while the Corinthians either do not discuss the matter, or are open about their attempt to persuade, and that the Spartans are open about their attempts to persuade.

In her investigation of the speeches made at the first conference at Sparta, Mabel Lang compared Thucydides' speeches with the tetralogy found in Herodotus at 8.140-4. Lang notes various similarities between the two tetralogies, in particular the pattern of the speech types. This pattern is two pairs of speeches, the first a *πειθώ* speech, that is one of persuasion,

followed by a speech of a “wise advisor”; the second pair consists of a speech responding to the persuasion speech, followed by one that responds to the wise advisor.⁵⁸ The distinction between persuasion and “wise advice” may best be illustrated by an example: as Lang states, the Corinthians in their speech of persuasion urge Sparta to war, but the Athenians, who are the wise advisors (discussed below) warn against war.⁵⁹ The Athenians, however, could have given a speech urging Sparta to bring matters to arbitration, yet they instead warned the Spartans. It is this insight of Lang’s which serves as the framework for this section, beginning with the Athenians.

As noted above, the Athenian ambassadors’ reaction to the conference at Sparta was to advise against war. They do not take on the guise of wise advisor merely in the overall manner of their speech, however; they explicitly frame their speech in this way. Consider the opening of the first Athenian speech to the Spartans:

Ἡ μὲν πρέσβευσις ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἀντιλογίαν τοῖς ὑμετέροις
 ξυμμάχοις ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν ἡ πόλις ἔπεμψεν·
 αἰσθανόμενοι δὲ καταβοὴν οὐκ ὀλίγην οὖσαν ἡμῶν παρήλθομεν
 οὐ τοῖς ἐγκλήμασι τῶν πόλεων ἀντεροῦντες (οὐ γὰρ παρὰ
 δικασταῖς ὑμῖν οὔτε ἡμῶν οὔτε τούτων οἱ λόγοι ἄν γίνονιντο),
 ἀλλ’ ὅπως μὴ ῥαδίως περὶ μεγάλων πραγμάτων τοῖς ξυμμάχοις
 πειθόμενοι χεῖρον βουλευέσθε, καὶ ἅμα βουλόμενοι περὶ τοῦ
 παντὸς λόγου τοῦ ἐς ἡμᾶς καθεστῶτος δηλῶσαι ὥς οὔτε
 ἀπεικότες ἔχομεν ἃ κεκτήμεθα, ἢ τε πόλις ἡμῶν ἀξία λόγου
 ἐστίν. (1.73.1)

Our embassy was not for the purpose of speaking against your allies,
 but about which things our city sent us to do; but perceiving there is
 not a little outcry against us we came forward, not to gainsay the
 complaints of the cities (for the speeches of neither us nor them are
 presented to you as judges), but so that you may not easily come to a
 worse decision about great matters, being persuaded by your allies,
 and also we intend to show about the whole complaint set down
 against us that we do not hold the things which we have acquired
 unreasonably, and our city is worthy of renown.

Here the Athenians present themselves first and foremost as advisors. Their speech is given not to gainsay (ἀντεροῦντες) Sparta’s allies, but in order that the Spartans not easily make a

⁵⁸ Lang (1999), 326-7.

⁵⁹ Lang (1999), 326.

bad decision. The bad decision would be, of course, going to war, yet only at the very end do the Athenians suggest the Spartans should choose arbitration over war, rather than in that part of the speech most obviously seeking to persuade. In the above sentence, the Athenians list three purposes for the speech, advising the Spartans to aid their decision making, as noted, but also to convince the Spartans of the fairness of Athens' having an empire, and that Athens is worthy of account. These two latter purposes may be seen as attempts at persuasion. However, the Athenians still frame these, initially at least, as merely information given for the purpose of good decision making:

ῥηθήσεται δὲ οὐ παραιτήσεως μᾶλλον ἔνεκα ἢ μαρτυρίου καὶ
δηλώσεως πρὸς οἷαν ὑμῖν πόλιν μὴ εὖ βουλευομένοις ὁ ἀγὼν
καταστήσεται. (1.73.3)

But it will not be said deprecatingly, rather for the purpose of
presenting evidence and to show against what sort of city the contest
would be set if you are not well counselled.

The Athenians make this point in regards to their upcoming discussion of the Athenian contributions to the Persian wars, which forms part of their attempt to persuade the Spartans that Athens' empire is acceptable and of their recognition-worthiness, or claim to respect. This statement, however, is framed in such a way that even this attempt at persuasion is merely for the purposes of ensuring the Spartans are well advised prior to deciding whether to go to war. What follows is evidence for the Spartans regarding Athens.

One challenge to the above analysis is that the Athenian speakers, as they admit in their opening sentence, were not sent as representatives of the Athenian demos, at least not for the purposes of speaking to the Spartans and their allies. These Athenians, then, were not in a position to attempt to persuade Sparta of anything, and as such, only speak as advisors as that is what they truly were, or at least how they saw themselves. If we consider, however, the Melian Dialogue, we can see that the Athenians there, too, make use of this rhetorical guise. The purpose of the debate with the Melians was to persuade them to surrender to Athens, as can be seen in the following:

Εἰ μὲν τοίνυν ὑπονοίας τῶν μελλόντων λογιούμενοι ἢ ἄλλο τι
ξυνήκετε ἢ ἐκ τῶν παρόντων καὶ ὧν ὁρᾶτε περὶ σωτηρίας
βουλευόμενοι τῇ πόλει, παυοίμεθ' ἂν· εἰ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτο, λέγοιμεν
ἂν. (5.87.1)

If, then, you are going to argue from suspicions of the future, or you
meet for any other purpose than considering things from your present
circumstances and concerning yourselves about saving your city, we
ought to stop; but if [you are here] for this, we should speak.

The key words in this sentence are βουλευόμενοι, considering, deliberating, and ὁρᾶτε, here
give heed, concern one's self about. The meeting is for the Melians to consider their options,
and realise surrender is the only appropriate response, with the Athenians merely helping the
process. Thus, in the anonymous speeches of the Athenians, there is a deliberate and clear
claim made to their speeches being that of advice given by a (wise) advisor.

Having considered the case of Athens, let us turn to the speakers of Corinth. As
discussed above, the Corinthians at Sparta made a speech of persuasion. The same is true of
the first Corinthian speech, made to the Athenians to persuade the Athenians not to enter
alliance with Corcyra. Like the Athenians above, the Corinthians make an open claim
regarding the purpose of their speech:

Ἀναγκαῖον ... μνησθέντας πρῶτον καὶ ἡμᾶς περὶ ἀμφοτέρων
οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἄλλον λόγον ἵεναι, ἵνα τὴν ἀφ' ἡμῶν τε
ἀξιῶσιν ἀσφαλέστερον προειδῆτε καὶ τὴν τῶνδε χρεῖαν μὴ
ἀλογίστως ἀπώσῃσθε. (1.37.1.3-6)

[It is] necessary ... for us too, first speaking about both of these
matters, so to proceed to the rest of our speech so that you may know
first more surely our merited claim, and reject not irrationally their
request.

The Corcyraians' claim is their request for alliance with Athens, which Corinth seeks to
persuade Athens to reject. That Corinth does not frame their discussion as anything other than
persuasion can be seen in the second of the two result clauses: so that the Athenians will not
irrationally reject the Corcyraians' request. The Corinthians are directing the Athenians to
their preferred outcome.

Persuasion also forms the over-arching pattern of the second Corinthian speech, as previously noted:

μέχρι μὲν οὖν τοῦδε ὠρίσθω ὑμῶν ἢ βραδυτῆς· νῦν δὲ τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ Ποτειδεάταις, ὥσπερ ὑπεδέξασθε, βοηθήσατε κατὰ τάχος ἐσβαλόντες ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, ἵνα μὴ ἄνδρας τε φίλους καὶ συγγενεῖς τοῖς ἐχθίστοις προῆσθε καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἄλλους ἀθυμία πρὸς ἑτέραν τινὰ συμμαχίαν τρέψητε. (1.71.4)

So, let your sluggishness come this far and no further; and come to the aide of the Potidaians, just as you promised, by a swift invasion of Attika, so that you do not betray men who are allies and kin to the most hostile to them, and turn the rest of us to some other alliance by despondency.

After complaining about the dilatory nature of the Spartans, and extended comparison of Sparta with Athens, the Corinthians here come to the crux of their speech: urging Sparta to go to war and invade Athens. It is this action, invasion, that the Corinthians in their second speech seek to persuade Sparta to undertake. While the Corinthians mention instruction earlier in the speech (διδασκαλίας, 1.68.3), it is in the context of a hypothetical statement: if the Athenians were harming Greece in secret, then there would be need of instruction. The possibility of such a need for instruction is immediately dismissed, however. The Corinthians are not present to advise the Spartans of Athens' obvious wrong-doing, but to persuade the Spartans to war, for which the extended comparison between Athens and Sparta forms a substantial component of the argument.

Having won over Sparta, the Corinthians direct their third speech at their non-Spartan allies, for the same purpose as their second, that is, to persuade the allies to vote to go to war with Athens:

ἀλλὰ νομίσαντες ἐς ἀνάγκην ἀφῆχθαι, ὧ ἄνδρες ξύμμαχοι, καὶ ἅμα τάδε ἄριστα λέγεσθαι, ψηφίσασθε τὸν πόλεμον μὴ φοβηθέντες τὸ αὐτίκα δεινόν, τῆς δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ διὰ πλείονος εἰρήνης ἐπιθυμήσαντες· (1.124.2.1-4)

But considering that matters have come to an extremity, allied men, and also that this is the best advice, vote for war not fearing the immediate terrors, but desiring the longer peace to come from it.

As in the key sentence of the second Corinthian speech discussed above, the Corinthian ambassadors state clearly what they want from their allies, though again at the end of the speech. Their intentions, however, are strongly hinted at in their opening sentence, where they state that the Spartans can no longer be censured for not voting to go to war (1.120.1). It is interesting that when talking to their allies the Corinthians do not state clearly what they want, nor are they as open regarding their task of persuasion as when in Athens. Such an approach to the framing of their speech is different to that of both the Spartans and the Athenians in their anonymous speech (discussed above). The Corinthians, then, at the broadest level, do not disguise their attempts at persuasion, and at least once make it an open fact of their speech.

The Spartans, like the Corinthians in their anonymous speech to the Athenians, also speak in a persuasive guise, as the opening sentence makes clear:

Ἔπεμψαν ἡμᾶς Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ὧ Ἀθηναῖοι, περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ
νήσῳ ἀνδρῶν πράξοντας ὅτι ἂν ὑμῖν τε ὠφέλιμον ὦν τὸ αὐτὸ
πείθωμεν καὶ ἡμῖν ἐς τὴν ξυμφορὰν ὥς ἐκ τῶν παρόντων
κόσμον μάλιστα μέλλῃ οἴσιν. (4.17.1)

The Lakedaimonians sent us, Athenians, to do regarding the men on the island, whatever we persuade you is beneficial for you and us alike with regard to the disaster, so that it is likely to bring the most honour from the present circumstances.

The participle *πράξοντας* in the context suggests negotiating, and when paired with a subordinate clause, of which the main verb is *πείθωμεν* it is abundantly clear the Spartans are approaching the Athenians, much as the Corinthians did, in an openly persuasive fashion.

Of course, all the speeches can be seen as attempts to persuade others to one's preferred course of action, and thus the above should come as no surprise. What is being demonstrated above, however, is not simply that Corinth and Sparta attempted to persuade others, but that their attempts at persuasion were direct – they made no attempt to portray their speeches as anything other than attempts at persuasion. This portrayal contrasts with the Athenian anonymous speeches.

It follows that there is a need to inquire whether the two separate guises for presentation found in the anonymous speeches constitute a pattern found in the broader context of rhetoric in Thucydides, and what can be made of such differences. Unfortunately, as noted in section 1 B, there are no other appropriate Corinthian speeches to consider in our discussion. Thus, again, our discussion is restricted to named Athenians and Spartans. Let us begin with the Athenians. Perikles is the first named Athenian to speak, and gives two deliberative speeches, the first at 1.140-4. Consider the opening of this speech:

Τῆς μὲν γνώμης, ὧ Ἀθηναῖοι, αἰεὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἔχομαι, μὴ εἵκειν Πελοποννησίοις, καίπερ εἰδῶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οὐ τῇ αὐτῇ ὀργῇ ἀναπειθομένους τε πολεμεῖν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ πράσσοντας, πρὸς δὲ τὰς ξυμφορὰς καὶ τὰς γνώμας τρεπομένους. ὁρῶ δὲ καὶ νῦν ὁμοῖα καὶ παραπλήσια συμβουλευτέα μοι ὄντα, καὶ τοὺς ἀναπειθομένους ὑμῶν δικαίῳ τοῖς κοινῇ δόξασιν, ἣν ἄρα τι καὶ σφαλλώμεθα, βοηθεῖν, ἢ μηδὲ κατορθοῦντας τῆς ξυνέσεως μεταποιεῖσθαι. ἐνδέχεται γὰρ τὰς ξυμφορὰς τῶν πραγμάτων οὐχ ἥσσον ἀμαθῶς χωρῆσαι ἢ καὶ τὰς διανοίας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· δι' ὅπερ καὶ τὴν τύχην, ὅσα ἂν παρὰ λόγον συμβῇ, εἰώθαμεν αἰτιᾶσθαι. (1.140.1)

I hold always to the same opinion, Athenians, not to yield to the Peloponnesians, although I know that people are not persuaded by the same impulse to go to war and carrying it out in deed, but adjust their opinions in regards to the changing circumstances. But I see the same and similar advice has to be given by me now, and I expect those of you being persuadable to help the common opinion, even if we should err in any way, or not to lay claim to intelligence when things go well. For it happens that actual events advance no less irrationally than the thinking of man; and because of this we tend to blame fortune whenever things occur contrary to the plan.

Perikles opens his speech with mention of his opinion or judgement (γνώμης), which he goes on to state, yet he does not explicitly say the Athenians must follow his judgement. Though Perikles talks of the Athenians being persuadable (ἀναπειθομένους), he also talks of giving advice (συμβουλευτέα), and states that it is up to those who agree with him to convince others. Despite strongly implying that he expects the Athenians to vote for his proposition, Perikles still frames what he is doing in speaking as the giving of advice.

We find something similar in Perikles' next deliberative speech at 2.60-4, in response to the Athenians' waning resolve:

Καὶ προσδεχομένῳ μοι τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς ὑμῶν ἕς με γεγένηται
(αἰσθάνομαι γὰρ τὰς αἰτίας) καὶ ἐκκλησίαν τούτου ἕνεκα
ξυνήγαγον, ὅπως ὑπομνήσω καὶ μέμψωμαι εἴ τι μὴ ὀρθῶς ἢ
ἐμοὶ χαλεπαίνετε ἢ ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς εἴκετε. (2.60.1)

And the response of your anger towards me has happened according to my expectations (for I understand the reasons) and I called this assembly on account of this, so that I may remind and censure you if, not rightly, you are angry with me or you yield to the circumstances.

Here the purpose of the speech is explicitly framed not as persuasion, but, in this instance, as censure and reminding of what was decided previously, with the implied goal of bolstering the Athenians' enthusiasm for the war.

Thus it would seem that Perikles, as in the case of unnamed Athenian ambassadors, frames his attempts at persuasion as only the giving of advice, with the onus of making a good decision on the audience. Yet this is not the case for every Athenian speaker. Consider the one speech of Kleon recorded in direct discourse (3.37-40). Kleon opens with what may strike the modern reader as a rather startling statement to the Athenian assembly:

Πολλάκις μὲν ἤδη ἔγωγε καὶ ἄλλοτε ἔγνων δημοκρατίαν ὅτι
ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν ἐτέρων ἄρχειν, μάλιστα δ' ἐν τῇ νῦν ὑμετέρα
περὶ Μυτιληναίων μεταμελεία. (3.37.1)

I personally have already observed often, at one time or another, and particularly in your present change of heart regarding the Mytilenaians, that a democracy is unable to rule others.

Far from expressing a purpose for his speech, giving advice or persuading, Kleon opens his speech by besmirching the ability of democratic Athens to rule an empire, a point which he spends some time trying to support before giving us a hint regarding the purpose of his speech:

Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ὁ αὐτός εἰμι τῇ γνώμῃ καὶ θαυμάζω μὲν τῶν
προθέντων αὐθις περὶ Μυτιληναίων λέγειν καὶ χρόνου
διατριβὴν ἐμποιοσάντων, ὃ ἐστὶ πρὸς τῶν ἡδικηκότων
μᾶλλον ... (3.38.1)

So I am the same, regarding my opinion, and I marvel at the proposal to speak about the Mytilenaian matter again and creating a waste of time, which is to the benefit of the wrong-doers rather [than us] ...

That Kleon is amazed by the proposal to revisit the Mytilenaian matter, and considers doing so a waste of time, clearly implies his stance on the matter, which he informs the Athenians he has not changed, reminiscent both of the opening of Perikles' first speech (1.140.1) in idea, and of part of Perikles' second speech (2.61.2) in words.⁶⁰ This sentence, like Perikles' opening at 1.140.1, also prefaces the main point of the speech, and both strongly imply what the speaker expects from the Athenian demos. Yet Kleon's statement here does not serve to frame his speech, either as advice or open persuasion. The whole effect may seem condescending, heightened by the repetition of θαυμάζω – "I marvel at" – later in this sentence, a tone which can be seen in the opening sentence, particularly in the use of ἔγωγε, yet Kleon here is making use of the didactic stance – knowing better, and thus teaching his audience.⁶¹ Thus, unlike Perikles, or the anonymous Athenian ambassadors, Kleon approaches the task of speaking as a teacher instructing the *polis*, where previously we have seen Athenians speak as advisors.

The second speech regarding the Mytilenaians is given by Diodotus, who spends the first part of his speech rebutting Kleon's comments on good speaking, and good speakers. When he does turn to the main point of his speech, at 3.44, we see a return to the Athenian pattern:

⁶⁰ Hornblower (1991), 425.

⁶¹ Dover (1974), 29.

Ἐγὼ δὲ παρήλθον οὔτε ἀντερῶν περὶ Μυτιληναίων οὔτε κατηγορήσων. οὐ γὰρ περὶ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀδικίας ἡμῖν ὁ ἀγὼν, εἰ σωφρονοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐβουλίας. ἦν τε γὰρ ἀποφῆνω πάνυ ἀδικοῦντας αὐτούς, οὐ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι κελεύσω, εἰ μὴ ξυμφέρον, ἦν τε καὶ ἔχοντάς τι ξυγγνώμης † εἶεν †, εἰ τῇ πόλει μὴ ἀγαθὸν φαίνοιτο. νομίζω δὲ περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἡμᾶς μᾶλλον βουλευέσθαι ἢ τοῦ παρόντος. καὶ τοῦτο ὃ μάλιστα Κλέων ἰσχυρίζεται, ἐς τὸ λοιπὸν ξυμφέρον ἔσεσθαι πρὸς τὸ ἥσσον ἀφίστασθαι θάνατον ζημίαν προθεῖσι, καὶ αὐτὸς περὶ τοῦ ἐς τὸ μέλλον καλῶς ἔχοντος ἀντισχυριζόμενος τάναντία γινώσκω.⁶²
(3.44.1-3)

But I came forward neither to gainsay nor to bring charges regarding the Mytilenaians. For our assembly is not about the injustice of these, if we are prudent, but about the soundness of our judgement. For even if I proved perfectly that they were wrong-doers, I would not urge, on account of this, to kill them, unless it were expedient, and even if they may have some claim to forgiveness, if it does not seem good for the city [I would not urge it]. But I think our deliberating is about the future rather than the present. And this point, which Kleon firmly holds, that imposing a penalty of death will be useful in the future, regarding the weaker parties revolting, I, being concerned about the future, know the opposite is true.

Diodotus shows a return to the Athenian pattern when he states that he has not come to gainsay Kleon, and reinforces this pattern toward the end of the excerpt when he refers to the assembly as “deliberating” (βουλευέσθαι). As in the Melian Dialogue, that Diodotus refers to the present assembly in terms of deliberation suggests his purpose is giving advice so that the Athenians can consider their options and themselves decide, which is further supported by Diodotus’ statement, near the beginning of this excerpt, that the assembly is really “about our best judgement” (περὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐβουλίας). That is to say, Diodotus is implying that the Athenians as a whole are to make the decision, when they have all the facts, as we saw in the first anonymous Athenian speech.

⁶² The middle of this passage is corrupt. Lindau emends ἔχοντας to ἔχοντες, which helps only so much, but is reflected in my translation. Van der Ben (1987) also tries to repair the sentence, somewhat convincingly. He does note that the meaning of this sentence is quite clear (18), and as such my translation stays closer to the apparent meaning of the sentence than the problematic Greek.

A final Athenian speaker to consider in terms of the Athenian approach to framing the purpose of their speeches is Nikias. Nikias' first speech in the history, recorded in direct discourse, is found at 6.9-14, and he opens with the following sentence:

Ἡ μὲν ἐκκλησία περὶ παρασκευῆς τῆς ἡμετέρας ἦδε ξυνελέγη, καθ' ὅτι χρὴ 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 ἀλλοφύλοις πειθομένους πόλεμον οὐ προσήκοντα ἄρασθαι. (6.9.1)

This assembly was called together about our preparations by which it is necessary to sail out to Sicily; however it seems to me to be necessary still about this matter to consider if it is better to send out the fleet, and thus not by a brief counsel about great matters, to take up a war not concerning us, having been persuaded by foreign men.

Nikias states that the purpose of the present assembly is the preparations for the Sicilian expedition, but goes on to claim that the assembly should also consider again the actual decision to send forth the expedition. The keyword in this sentence is consider (here, σκέψασθαι): as with previous Athenian speakers, there is an invitation to hear advice and think over an important matter, rather than a signal to the audience that an attempt at persuasion is to be made. This opening would seem to fit the Athenian pattern, yet shortly after this statement, Nikias goes on to say:

καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς τρόπους τοὺς ὑμετέρους ἀσθενὴς ἂν μου ὁ λόγος εἴη, εἰ τὰ τε ὑπάρχοντα σῶζειν παραινοίην καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἐτοίμοις περὶ τῶν ἀφανῶν καὶ μελλόντων κινδυνεύειν• ὥς δὲ οὔτε ἐν καιρῷ σπεύδετε οὔτε ῥαδίᾳ ἐστι κατασχεῖν ἐφ' ἃ ὥρμησθε, ταῦτα διδάξω. (6.9.3)

And my speech would be feeble against your customs, if I were to advise preserving the present circumstances, and not to risk that which is at hand for uncertain and future things; so I will teach these things, that you do not hasten at the right time, nor is it easy to accomplish that which you have desired.

Though initially discussing advising, Nikias goes on to state that his speech will be instruction, heretofore unseen in direct discourse, though not a posture unseen in Athenian rhetoric in the

fifth century.⁶³ Thus, Nikias, in this speech, begins with the familiar Athenian pattern, then very quickly reframes his speech in terms of instruction.

In his second deliberative speech, Nikias provides only the briefest of frames:

Ἐπειδὴ πάντως ὁρῶ ὑμᾶς, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὠρμημένους
στρατεύειν, ξυνενέγκοι μὲν ταῦτα ὡς βουλόμεθα, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ
παρόντι ἃ γινώσκω σημανῶ. (6.20.1)

Since I see you, Athenians, entirely eager to campaign, may these things turn out as we wish, but I will declare what I know regarding the present circumstances.

Nikias restricts the purpose of his speech here to simply stating what he knows. He makes no claim to be attempting persuasion, though this is of course the goal, and this passing on of knowledge equals advice. Thus, while not in the exact same terms, Nikias' second speech is framed in terms of providing advice, rather than attempting persuasion.

From the above, then, we can see that the Athenian speakers generally, though not always, frame their speeches in terms of the giving of advice, where the Spartans note they are making an attempt to persuade, as do the Corinthians, when they trouble to frame the purpose of their speeches. The slight variation in Athenian deliberative discourse need not trouble us. First, only two of the speeches do not follow the general pattern: Kleon's, and Nikias' first speech. Second, as Wasserman notes, Athenian democracy tends to provide space for more individuality in speech-making than do other *poleis*.⁶⁴

Consider first the speech of Archidamos to the Spartans following the Corinthians and Athenians at 1.80-5. Archidamos' presentation initially is one of advisor:

Καὶ αὐτὸς πολλῶν ἤδη πολέμων ἔμπειρός εἰμι, ὦ
Λακεδαιμόνιοι, καὶ ὑμῶν τοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡλικίᾳ ὁρῶ, ὥστε
μήτε ἀπειρία ἐπιθυμῆσαί τινα τοῦ ἔργου, ὅπερ ἂν οἱ πολλοὶ
πάθοιεν, μήτε ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἀσφαλὲς νομίσαντα. (1.80.1)

And I myself have experience of many wars, Lakedaimonians, and I see some of you are in the age-group, so that no one out of inexperience is eager for actual war, a thing which many have experienced, nor considers it a good and safe thing.

⁶³ Kallet-Marx (1994), 233-5.

⁶⁴ Wasserman (1964), 289.

By noting that he has experienced war, Archidamos takes on the role of the “voice of experience”, which seems more an advisor role than that of persuader. That he goes on to state that his experience, and that of others of his age-group, causes him to consider war neither safe nor good strongly hints how Archidamos thinks the Spartans should vote, yet is not enough to alter the guise of his speech. Perikles is more forthright about his opinions, yet remains in the guise of advisor, as will be discussed below.

Archidamos, however, goes on for a couple of chapters to compare Athenian and Spartan resources, and ask awkward questions, which seems to change the guise of his speech. The questions in particular would seem to be asked for the purposes of persuasion, rather than as points to consider from an advisor: after pointing out that not only is Athens wealthy, and possessing many resources, but also has allies besides who pay tribute, Archidamos goes on to ask “πῶς χρή πρὸς τούτους ῥαδίως πόλεμον ἄρασθαι καὶ τίνι πιστεύσαντας ἀπαρασκεύους ἐπείχθῃναι;” – “how is one easily to wage war against these and trusting in what should we rush into this unprepared?” Such questions in the context noted would seem to serve a persuasive role, as they strongly suggest that waging war at this time is a bad idea, thus tacitly encourage voting against war. The remainder of Archidamos’ speech outlines what the king believes the Spartans should do, with arguments to pre-empt possible counter-arguments.

The debate at Sparta is closed by the speech of the Spartan Ephor, Sthenelaidas. In short order, Sthenelaidas points out that the Athenians did not deny they have wronged Greek communities, recapitulating the Corinthian point that Athens has wronged allies of the Peloponnesians and threatens the Peloponnese, before dismissing words as a solution to the problem and urging a vote for war. Absent is anything which would serve to frame the speech as an advisory one, as in the Athenian speeches – it is a brief persuasive speech.

A final comparison can be made with Brasidas. At 4.85-7, Brasidas, after marching to Acanthus, is permitted to speak to the citizens in their city, and attempts to persuade them to join the Spartan cause. In his speech, Brasidas uses a somewhat different guise to the other Spartans: he presents the arrival of himself and his army as being for the benefit of the Acanthians and others, but does not frame his speech as that of a friendly advisor. Initially, Brasidas, after describing the difficulties facing the Spartan cause should the Acanthians continue being unwelcoming, goes on to make pre-emptive arguments in favour of the Acanthians joining the Spartan cause, before finishing up with the threat of laying waste their land. Brasidas' speech does not exactly follow the pattern we have seen in rhetorical posturing amongst the other Spartans, yet cannot be said to follow that of the Athenians, either.

It is evident, then, that the Spartans tend to be quite straight-forward in how they present their deliberative oratory. The anonymous Athenian speakers, as noted, tend to frame the actual purpose of their speech, persuasion, as wise advice, though there is some variation.

2 B. Rhetorical Framework

Having discussed how the various representatives of the *poleis* in question have framed their attempts at persuasion, we need to consider the ideological framework of the speeches. That is, we ought to consider whether there are patterns behind the actual arguments made by the various ambassadors which represent their *poleis*.

As discussed in the introduction to this thesis, Luginbill argues that national characterisation in Thucydides centres around risk-taking and avoidance, with the Athenians generally being risk-takers, and the Spartans generally as avoiders of risk.⁶⁵ While there are other features which serve to differentiate the *poleis*, as this thesis has sought to demonstrate, Luginbill's framework can also be found in the speeches. That is, through their speeches the

⁶⁵ Luginbill (1999), 15-17 and 87-96.

Athenians show a general tendency to boldness, and the Spartans to avoiding risk, slowness and caution. Consider first the Athenians.

The first argument made by the Athenian ambassadors in the first speech, to the Spartans, concerns the Persian wars, and their role in it. They begin this argument with the following:

φραμέν γάρ Μαραθῶνί τε μόνοι προκινδυνεύσαι τῷ βαρβάρῳ
καὶ ὅτε τὸ ὕστερον ἦλθεν, οὐχ ἱκανοὶ ὄντες κατὰ γῆν
ἀμύνεσθαι, ἐσβάντες ἐς τὰς ναῦς πανδημεὶ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι
ξυνναυμαχῆσαι, ὅπερ ἔσχε μὴ κατὰ πόλεις αὐτὸν ἐπιπλέοντα
τὴν Πελοπόννησον πορθεῖν, ἀδυνάτων ἂν ὄντων πρὸς ναῦς
πολλὰς ἀλλήλοις ἐπιβοηθεῖν. (1.73.4)

For we say at Marathon alone we braved the first danger against the barbarian and then when he came later, it did not suffice to defend by land, having boarded the ships with the whole populace we fought in ships at Salamis, thus he was prevented from sailing against the Peloponnese and ravaging it city by city, you being unable to aid each other due to their many ships.

The Athenians begin their discussion of their service during the Persian wars by stating that they were brave enough to attempt to defend themselves against the Persians at Marathon alone. Although we know they were assisted by a contingent from Plataia (Hdt. 6.108), the joint forces, of which the Athenians constituted the much greater part, were still outnumbered. The defence was a bold move. The Athenian ambassadors quickly follow up the Marathon account with their unprecedented move of abandoning their land in the face of the subsequent invasion of Greece.

The Athenians sum up this line of argument with the following:

εἰ δὲ προσεχωρήσαμεν πρότερον τῷ Μήδῳ δείσαντες, ὥσπερ
καὶ ἄλλοι, περὶ τῇ χώρᾳ, ἢ μὴ ἐτολμήσαμεν ὕστερον ἐσβῆναι ἐς
τὰς ναῦς ὡς διεφθαρμένοι, οὐδὲν ἂν ἔδει ἔτι ὑμᾶς μὴ ἔχοντας
ναῦς ἱκανὰς ναυμαχεῖν, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἡσυχίαν ἂν αὐτῷ
προυχώρησε τὰ πράγματα ἢ ἐβούλετο.

But if, having been afraid for our land, we had joined ourselves before to the Mede, just as others did, or had we not been brave later to take to our ships, by being destroyed [already], then there would be no need still for you to fight at sea not having sufficient ships, but matters would have turned out for him, at his leisure, as he intended.

The key word is ἐτολμήσαμεν - we were bold. The Athenians make clear that they were bold, they took risks, and these actions, they conclude, made possible the rest of the defence of Greece. The significance of opening with this argument is not just to recall the past boldness of the Athenians, but also to imply that, if the Spartans were to go to war, they can expect to face such bold and innovative responses from the Athenians, as the ambassadors make clear at 1.73.3.

Further, many scholars, as Hornblower notes, have found this speech to the Spartans very provocative, and in fact Hornblower goes on to describe it as a “tour de force”.⁶⁶ Thus, the very act of making such a speech to the Spartans, particularly as the ambassadors had not been sent by the Athenian *demos* for the purposes of speaking, is itself a bold act.

Another common approach to argumentation that can be seen in most Athenian speeches can be found in this first speech. Consider:

τὰ δὲ Μηδικὰ καὶ ὅσα αὐτοὶ ξύνιστε, εἰ καὶ δι' ὄχλου μᾶλλον
ἔσται αἰεὶ προβαλλομένοις, ἀνάγκη λέγειν· καὶ γὰρ ὅτε
ἐδρῶμεν, ἐπ' ὠφελία ἐκινδυνεύετο, ἥς τοῦ μὲν ἔργου μέρος
μετέσχετε, τοῦ δὲ λόγου μὴ παντός, εἴ τι ὠφελεῖ, στερισκώμεθα.
(1.73.2.2-6)

And the Persian affairs so much you yourselves well know, even though it will be disagreeable to us, by constantly being mentioned, is necessary to say; for at that time we acted, imperilled ourselves for some advantage, of which you partook of part of the deed, but we should not be deprived of all the renown, if there is some advantage in it.

Here, the Athenians, while noting they need to discuss their actions during the Persian wars, state that they acted so for some advantage, or profit (ὠφελία), and do not wish to be deprived of such. The Athenians, it would seem, tend to think about matters concerning their *polis* in terms of what is advantageous. In this first speech, they mention advantage, or profit, two more times (1.75.3, and 1.76.2). It may seem obvious that one ought to consider matters

⁶⁶ Hornblower (1991), 117.

regarding the *polis*, yet, as will be demonstrated below, the Corinthians and Spartans do not tend to argue in terms of profit or advantage.

Both of these argument types can be found in the Melian dialogue as well. Regarding boldness, consider, when the Melians suggest it is expedient to be lenient, as lenience will be the paradigm for dealing with Athens, should they lose the war, the Athenian respond:

Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρχῆς, ἣν καὶ παυθῇ, οὐκ ἀθυμοῦμεν
τὴν τελευτήν· οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἄλλων, ὥσπερ καὶ
Λακεδαιμόνιοι, οὗτοι δεινοὶ τοῖς νικηθεῖσιν (ἔστι δὲ οὐ πρὸς
Λακεδαιμονίους ἡμῖν ὁ ἀγών), ἀλλ' ἣν οἱ ὑπήκοοί που τῶν
ἀρξάντων αὐτοὶ ἐπιθέμενοι κρατήσωσιν. καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτου
ἡμῖν ἀφείσθω κινδυνεύεσθαι· (5.91.1.1-2.1)

We are not worried about the end of our empire, if it should end; for the empires of others, such as the Lakedaimonians, are not terrible to the conquered (though this debate is not for us regarding the Lakedaimonians), but if the subjects themselves attacking should overcome their rulers. And regarding this, leave it to us to take the risk.

Where the Athenians at Sparta implied to the Spartans that they were willing to take risks should war eventuate, discussed above, the Athenians at Melos state explicitly that they are content to take risks. Such an attitude is again reflected by the Athenians going to Melos with the explicit purpose of adding the Melians to their empire during the Peace of Nikias.

As we can see risk-taking as an Athenian characteristic in both the Athenian anonymous speech to the Spartans, and in the Melian Dialogue, so we can see the consideration of advantage being another major motivator to action in both. Consider that, after being told the Athenians had both parties' interests in mind (5.91.2.5-6), the Melians ask how their enslavement can be in their own interest, to which the Athenians reply with the following:

Ὅτι ὑμῖν μὲν πρὸ τοῦ τὰ δεινότατα παθεῖν ὑπακοῦσαι ἂν
γένοιτο, ἡμεῖς δὲ μὴ διαφθείραντες ὑμᾶς κερδαίνομεν ἂν.
(5.93.1)

Because you could submit before suffering the worst, and we would gain not having destroyed you.

The Athenian ambassadors state baldly they would gain (κερδαίνοιμεν) with the Melians alive and under Athenian sway, while the Melians would get to stay alive. The terms are bleak, but again, what is advantageous plays a part in Athenian thinking in regards to themselves and others.

The first speech of the Corinthians has puzzled various scholars over the years, partly because the Corinthians seem to spend a lot of time talking about irrelevant details, and partly because when the arguments they make in their attempt to persuade Athens not enter alliance with Corcyra are seemingly specious.⁶⁷ Yet the arguments of the Corinthians can be understood in terms of traditional relations between *poleis*. Consider the following:

καίτοι εἰ ἦσαν ἄνδρες, ὥσπερ φασίν, ἀγαθοί, ὅσω ἀληπτότεροι
ἦσαν τοῖς πέλας, τόσω δὲ φανερωτέραν ἐξήν αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀρετὴν
διδούσι καὶ δεχομένοις τὰ δίκαια δεικνύναι. (1.37.5)

However, if they were good men, as they say, by so much as they were separate from their neighbours, by so much it was possible for them to show more clearly their by giving and receiving justice.

There are three important points to be taken from this passage: first, a *polis* should not be trusted until it has proven it can be trusted; second, exchanges between *poleis* are used to prove or disprove the trustworthiness of each party; and third, such exchanges must be seen by the rest of the Greek world.⁶⁸

The inter-*polis* relationship espoused by the Corinthians above is, as noted, a traditional, or archaic view. The Corinthian ambassadors also, however, make another claim on the Athenians formed from this archaic ideology:

⁶⁷ Crane (1998), 93-5.

⁶⁸ Crane (1998), 115.

Δικαιώματα μὲν οὖν τάδε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχομεν ἱκανὰ κατὰ τοὺς
 Ἑλλήνων νόμους, παραίνεσιν δὲ καὶ ἀξίωσιν χάριτος τοιάνδε,
 ἣν οὐκ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες ὥστε βλάπτειν οὐδ' αὖ φίλοι ὥστ'
 ἐπιχρησθαι, ἀντιδοθῆναι ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ παρόντι φαιμέν χρῆναι.
 νεῶν γὰρ μακρῶν σπανίσαντές ποτε πρὸς τὸν Αἰγινήτων ὑπὲρ
 τὰ Μηδικὰ πόλεμον παρὰ Κορινθίων εἴκοσι ναῦς ἐλάβετε· καὶ
 ἡ εὐεργεσία αὕτη τε καὶ ἡ ἐς Σαμίους, τὸ δι' ἡμᾶς
 Πελοποννησίους αὐτοῖς μὴ βοηθῆσαι, παρέσχεν ὑμῖν
 Αἰγινήτων μὲν ἐπικράτησιν, Σαμίων δὲ κόλασιν, καὶ ἐν καιροῖς
 τοιούτοις ἐγένετο οἷς μάλιστα ἄνθρωποι ἐπ' ἐχθροὺς τοὺς
 σφετέρους ἰόντες τῶν ἀπάντων ἀπερίοπτοί εἰσι παρὰ τὸ νικᾶν·
 (1.41.1-2)

So we provide to you these justifications, sufficient according to the
 customs of the Hellenes, and we have advice and a claim on your
 gratitude such as this, which, not being enemies to harm [you], nor,
 moreover, being close friends, we say, in the present circumstances,
 you ought to repay us. For, when you were lacking long ships for
 Aigina, before the Persian war, you took twenty ships from the
 Corinthians; and our good deed regarding the Samians (through us,
 the Peloponnesians did not aid them) granted you mastery of the
 Aiginetans, and the chastisement of the Samians, and this happened in
 such a time when men, going against their enemies, are very much
 unregarding of everything for the sake of victory;

The key component of this statement of the Corinthians is that it is a claim based on *charis*.

The Corinthians state two events in history when they have aided the Athenians, first the loan
 of ships to fight Aigina, and second, they prevented the Peloponnesians voting to aid the
 Samians in their revolt, and point they have already made at 1.40.5. The Corinthians claim
 that, as they have helped Athens in the past, so now Athens is required to repay Corinth, in
 this instance by not allying themselves with Corcyra. These two points, *charis* and traditional
 inter-*polis* relations, form the framework for the Corinthian speech. The Corinthians spend
 much of the first half of their speech attempting to show the Corcyraians are not trust-worthy,
 before moving on to claiming *charis* from the Athenians. Thus the first Corinthian speech can
 be seen to be a speech grounded in traditional values. These traditional values, it should be
 noted, partially explain the high proportion of δικ- words the Corinthians use, noted in Part

1B.⁶⁹ As the Corcyraians are acting counter to traditional values, they are wrong-doers, and the Corinthians wish to encourage acting justly.

The general argument of the second Corinthian speech differs from the first Corinthian speech, due to the change of context: the Corinthians are speaking to a different audience, to persuade the audience to undertake a different course of action, and with different facts to be considered. The result of these differences is that the Corinthians open their speech with something of a chastisement, only to become sterner:

Τὸ πιστὸν ὑμᾶς, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, τῆς καθ' ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς
πολιτείας καὶ ὁμιλίας ἀπιστοτέρους ἐς τοὺς ἄλλους ἢν τι
λέγωμεν καθίστησιν· καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ σωφροσύνην μὲν ἔχετε,
ἀμαθία δὲ πλέονι πρὸς τὰ ἔξω πράγματα χρησθε. (1.68.1)

Lakedaimonians, the faith you have in your own constitution and way of life makes you more distrustful to others whenever we have something to say; from this you have prudence, but also you are more ignorant in regard to foreign affairs.

Initially, the Corinthians attempt to minimise the negativity of their criticism of the Spartans' approach to the embassies of others: it is prudent, even while it results in greater ignorance.

The Corinthians, however, shortly thereafter go on to state:

καὶ τῶνδε ὑμεῖς αἴτιοι, τό τε πρῶτον ἐάσαντες αὐτοὺς τὴν
πόλιν μετὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ κρατῦναι καὶ ὕστερον τὰ μακρὰ στήσαι
τείχη, ἐς τόδε τε αἰεὶ ἀποστεροῦντες οὐ μόνον τοὺς ὑπ' ἐκείνων
δεδουλωμένους ἐλευθερίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὑμετέρους ἤδη
ξυμμάχους· (1.69.1.1-6)

And you are culpable for these things, having first allowed them to strengthen their city after the Persian wars and later to raise the long walls, and to that extent, you are always robbing of freedom not only those enslaved by these ones, but also those already your allies;

After stating their issues with the Athenians, the Corinthians go on to lay the blame for their troubles at the feet of the Spartans.

The Corinthians, however, go on to say even more remarkable things, which form the majority of the speech, in fact, where they compare Sparta with Athens:

⁶⁹ See page 33.

οἱ μὲν γε νεωτεροποιοὶ καὶ ἐπινοῆσαι ὀξεῖς καὶ ἐπιτελέσαι
 ἔργῳ ἃ ἂν γνῶσιν· ὑμεῖς δὲ τὰ ὑπάρχοντά τε σώζειν καὶ
 ἐπιγνῶναι μηδὲν καὶ ἔργῳ οὐδὲ τὰναγκαῖα ἐξικέσθαι. αὐθις δὲ
 οἱ μὲν καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταὶ καὶ παρὰ γνώμην
 κινδυνευταὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς εὐέλπιδες· τὸ δὲ ὑμέτερον τῆς
 τε δυνάμεως ἐνδεᾶ πράξαι τῆς τε γνώμης μηδὲ τοῖς βεβαίοις
 πιστεῦσαι τῶν τε δεινῶν μηδέποτε οἶεσθαι ἀπολυθήσεσθαι. καὶ
 μὴν καὶ ἄοκνοι πρὸς ὑμᾶς μελλητὰς καὶ ἀποδημηταὶ πρὸς
 ἐνδημοτάτους· οἶοντα γὰρ οἱ μὲν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ ἂν τι κτᾶσθαι,
 ὑμεῖς δὲ τῷ ἐπελθεῖν καὶ τὰ ἐτοῖμα ἂν βλάψαι. (1.70.2-4)

They are revolutionary and they are quick to form plans and to
 accomplish in deed whatever they've decided; but you are wont to
 save your own things and to devise nothing [new] and in deed do not
 accomplish the necessary things. Again, they are brave beyond their
 strength and venturesome beyond their wisdom and hopeful in danger;
 but you act short of your real power, nor do you trust in your own
 steadfastness and being in danger you never believe you will be set
 free. And they are unhesitating where you are dilatory and they go
 abroad where you are the greatest stay-at-homes; for they think they
 shall add [to theirs] by being abroad, but you think you will harm what
 is to hand by going forth.

In this excerpt, the Corinthians paint a picture of Sparta as a slow-moving and conservative *polis*, fearful of losing what it already has, and generally expecting the worst of the future, as opposed to swift-acting Athens with her optimism and ability to create novel approaches to problems. Where the argumentation of the first speech of the Corinthians seemed “old fashioned” with respect to Athens, archaic as Crane describes it, the argumentation of this speech would seem to situate the Corinthians more between the two extremes: old-fashioned Sparta, and novel Athens. The Corinthians are in a position to understand and comment on both approaches.

In fact, the Corinthians seem to claim this middle ground fairly explicitly:

Καὶ ἅμα, εἴπερ τινὲς καὶ ἄλλοι, ἄξιοι νομίζομεν εἶναι τοῖς
 πέλας ψόγον ἐπενεγκεῖν, ἄλλως τε καὶ μεγάλων τῶν
 διαφερόντων καθεστώτων, περὶ ὧν οὐκ αἰσθάνεσθαι ἡμῖν γε
 δοκεῖτε, οὐδ' ἐκλογίσασθαι πώποτε πρὸς οἷους ὑμῖν Ἀθηναίους
 ὄντας καὶ ὅσον ὑμῶν καὶ ὡς πᾶν διαφέροντας ὁ ἀγὼν ἔσται.
 (1.70.1)

And also, even if there were some others, we consider ourselves to be worthy of laying blame upon our neighbours, especially when setting out the great differences [between you two], about which you seem to have no perception, nor ever yet have you calculated what sort of people the Athenians are, how much, in fact in everything, how different your opponent is to you.

Not only do the Corinthians here claim the right, that is, that they are worthy of censuring the Spartans, but they suggest they deserve this particularly in the context of comparing Athens and Sparta. Further, they use the word ἄξιος, worthy, equal, to express this idea: the Corinthians are equal to this task. This claim would seem to suggest a mindfulness on the Corinthians' part regarding their being situated between Athens and Sparta, and in light of the comparison they give, culturally as well as geographically.

In the third Corinthian speech, we see a summary of the dangers facing the Peloponnesians and their allies, before going on to discuss their options in the proposed war. In their discussion of their forces and options, the Corinthians espouse a mixture of traditional values and novel values:

μιᾷ τε νίκη ναυμαχίας κατὰ τὸ εἶκος ἀλίσκονται· εἰ δ' ἀντίσχοιεν, μελετήσομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν πλέονι χρόνῳ τὰ ναυτικά, καὶ ὅταν τὴν ἐπιστήμην ἕς τὸ ἴσον καταστήσωμεν, τῇ γε εὐψυχίᾳ δῆπου περιεσόμεθα. ὃ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν φύσει ἀγαθόν, ἐκεῖνοις οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο διδαχῇ· ὃ δ' ἐκεῖνοι ἐπιστήμῃ προύχουσι, καθαιρετὸν ἡμῖν ἐστὶ μελέτη. χρήματα δὲ ὥστε ἔχειν ἕς αὐτά, οἴσομεν· ἢ δεινὸν ἂν εἴη εἰ οἱ μὲν ἐκείνων ξύμμαχοι ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ τῇ αὐτῶν φέροντες οὐκ ἀπεροῦσιν, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπὶ τῷ τιμωρούμενοι τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅμα σφύζεσθαι οὐκ ἄρα δαπανήσομεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ ὑπ' ἐκείνων αὐτὰ ἀφαιρεθέντες αὐτοῖς τούτοις κακῶς πάσχειν. ὑπάρχουσι δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι ὁδοὶ τοῦ πολέμου ἡμῖν, ξυμμάχων τε ἀπόστασις, μάλιστα παραίρεσις οὓσα τῶν προσόδων αἷς ἰσχύουσι, καὶ ἐπιτειχισμὸς τῇ χώρᾳ, ἄλλα τε ὅσα οὐκ ἂν τις νῦν προΐδοι. ἥκιστα γὰρ πόλεμος ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς χωρεῖ, αὐτὸς δὲ ἀφ' αὐτοῦ τὰ πολλὰ τεχνᾷται πρὸς τὸ παρατυγχάνον· ἐν ᾧ ὁ μὲν εὐοργήτως αὐτῷ προσομιλήσας βεβαιότερος, ὃ δ' ὀργισθεὶς περὶ αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐλάσσω πταίει. (1.121.4-122.1)

Chances are, they will be overcome in a single naval engagement; but if they should hold against us, we shall practice naval warfare in more time until we bring our experience to an equal level [with theirs], and perhaps be superior by our good courage. For what good we have by nature, they cannot have by learning; but what they hold over us by experience, it is able to be achieved by us by practice. We shall bring the money that is necessary for these things; it would be terrible if their allies did not cease bearing [the cost] for their own slavery, but we, being vengeful towards the enemy would not spend to save ourselves and by this, the money would not be diminished by them, so that we suffer badly by them with it. There are other ways of undertaking the war for us, causing the revolt of allies, which would very much strip them of the income by which they are strong, and we could build a fort on their land, and other such things that one cannot currently foresee. For war progresses by stated conditions the least, but it contrives many things from itself to meet the circumstances; in that he is more secure who engages in it [war] good-temperedly, but he falls who grows not the least angry about it.

The Corinthians espouse values in the favour of their alliance, which are also mentioned by Sthenelaidas: the good nature of the men of Peloponnesian alliance. They also note, though, that where Athens has wealth from her subject states, the Peloponnesian alliance can access resources from Delphi and Olympia. Such thinking appears again in Perikles' speech, seemingly in response to this point by the Corinthians, yet according to Parker, Perikles' word choice contains an implication that such actions are impious.⁷⁰ It is also interesting that it is the Corinthians who suggest sourcing money as necessary to successfully prosecute the war, whereas this idea does not occur to the Spartans – Archidamos at 1.80.3 notes only that Athens is wealthy, not that Sparta and her allies would need wealth. Sthenelaidas contrasts others' resources with Sparta's good allies, clearly implying the latter is equal to the former (1.86.2). Brunt suggests this idea occurs to the Corinthians due to their greater exposure to the sophistic enlightenment, due to their maritime trade.⁷¹ So, as the Corinthians argued from a position between the two extremes of Sparta and Athens in their second speech, in this, their third speech, the Corinthians argue from a position between the two extremes in regards to the coming war: espousing traditional values, like those seen in the speeches of Archidamos and

⁷⁰ Parker (1983), 173-4.

⁷¹ Brunt (1965), 261.

Sthenelaidas, and offering novel suggestions for war, more similar to Athenian ideas. Note, though, that in neither this speech, nor the other two speeches, do the Corinthians argue in terms of what is to their advantage, unlike the Athenians. In regards to the war, they make no claim regarding advantage, but rather in terms of the danger presented by the Athenians.

Having discussed the Corinthians, let us turn now to the Spartans. In their second speech, discussed above, the Corinthians described a view of Sparta as very conservative. That is, given to caution and keeping to tradition. This view of the Corinthians (and Luginbill, discussed above) can be found in the arguments of the Spartan ambassadors, as it happens. Although their arguments may be considered apposite in the wider context of the outcome of the war, they are also conservative arguments. Consider first the following statement by the Spartans:

Ὑμῖν γὰρ εὐτυχίαν τὴν παροῦσαν ἔξεστι καλῶς θέσθαι, ἔχουσι μὲν ὧν κρατεῖτε, προσλαβοῦσι δὲ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, καὶ μὴ παθεῖν ὅπερ οἱ ἀήθως τι ἀγαθὸν λαμβάνοντες τῶν ἀνθρώπων· αἰεὶ γὰρ τοῦ πλέονος ἐλπίδι ὀρέγονται διὰ τὸ καὶ τὰ παρόντα ἀδοκῆτως εὐτυχεῖν. (4.17.4)

For it is possible for you to make good use of your present good fortune, by keeping that which you rule, and by receiving honour and reputation, and not to suffer as those who receive some unexpected good fortune; for always they reach out, through the present unexpected good fortune, in the hope of more.

Here the Spartans state what they think is the best way to capitalise on the Athenians' current position, in essence to stop adding to their empire. This argument is somewhat reminiscent of Perikles' advice in his first speech at 1.144.1. However the differences between the speakers, Perikles and the Spartan ambassadors, serve to highlight the conservativeness of the Spartan argument. Compare the above with Perikles' argument:

Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἔχω ἐς ἐλπίδα τοῦ περιέσεσθαι, ἣν ἐθέλητε ἀρχὴν τε μὴ ἐπικτᾶσθαι ἅμα πολεμοῦντες καὶ κινδύνους αὐθαιρέτους μὴ προστίθεσθαι· (1.144.1)

And I have many other reasons to hope we will survive [the war], if you are willing not to add to the empire while we are fighting and not to add self-incurred risks;

The first key difference between the two statements is that the Spartans do not put any limits on the cessation of empire building, and in fact suggest it only in a round-about way, speaking of “keeping what you have”, and then moving into a gnomic statement to convey the idea of no further growth by stating the Athenians would avoid the harm that affects people who “always reach out (ὀρέγονται) in hope of more”. Perikles, on the other hand, talks of not adding (ἐπικτᾶσθαι) to the empire “ἄμα πολεμοῦντες” – while we are fighting. Perikles suggests a pause while dealing with the war. Second, the choice of vocabulary is telling. The word “ἐπικτᾶσθαι” for adding to the empire implies the view that any attempt to acquire new subject states will be successful.⁷² The Spartans, however, speak only of reaching out, ὀρέγεσθαι, in a context where this action, they claim, leads to disaster. Such a contrast fits the pattern described by the Corinthians in their second speech, particularly at 1.70.4, discussed above.

The Spartans, then, provide a rather conservative argument early in their speech, and this conservatism proves to be the over-arching framework for their speech. This approach to argumentation, as noted, was described by the Corinthians, who also point to a pessimistic view of the future on the Spartans’ part. We can see this mixture of conservatism and pessimism in the following as well:

σωφρόνων δὲ ἀνδρῶν οἵτινες τὰγαθὰ ἐς ἀμφίβολον ἀσφαλῶς
 ἔθεντο (καὶ ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς οἱ αὐτοὶ εὐξυνετώτερον ἂν
 προσφέροιντο), τόν τε πόλεμον νομίσωσι μὴ καθ' ὅσον ἂν τις
 αὐτοῦ μέρος βούληται μεταχειρίζειν, τούτῳ ξυνεῖναι, ἀλλ' ὥς
 ἂν αἱ τύχαι αὐτῶν ἡγήσωνται· καὶ ἐλάχιστ' ἂν οἱ τοιοῦτοι
 πταίοντες διὰ τὸ μὴ τῷ ὀρθομένῳ αὐτοῦ πιστεύοντες
 ἐπαίρεσθαι ἐν τῷ εὐτυχεῖν ἂν μάλιστα καταλύοιντο. (4.18.4)

⁷² That Perikles uses the present infinitive for this verb may lend it a conative sense, weakening the implication somewhat. Yet the difference in verb choice is still telling.

Wise men place into safety their good things against the uncertain future (and the same ones would apply themselves more intelligently to the circumstances), and they know with respect to war, that they engage with this not to the extent one may wish to practice a part of it, but as their fortunes lead; and such ones, erring the least through not being excited trusting their success to increase, eagerly come to terms during their good fortune.

Speaking again in a general sense, the Spartans begin by stating that the wise protect their good things against uncertainty, which Gomme and Hornblower argue refers to the future.⁷³

From this opening, they go on to state that such men also realise the fortunes of war are capricious, and do not follow the preferences of those engaged in it. From these points the Spartans conclude that wise men, therefore, come to terms when matters are going well for them. Such a line of argument, particularly if we accept Hornblower's point, fits the "Spartan pattern" neatly: the Spartans argue from the point of view of concern for their current position, and pessimism regarding the future.

The Spartans' pessimism can also be seen at 4.17.5, 4.18.3, and is summed up again in their closing statements, particularly at 4.20.1:

Ἡμῖν δὲ καλῶς, εἴπερ ποτέ, ἔχει ἀμφοτέροις ἡ ξυναλλαγή,
πρίν τι ἀνήκεστον διὰ μέσου γενόμενον ἡμᾶς καταλαβεῖν, ἐν ᾧ
ἀνάγκη αἰδίων ὑμῖν ἔχθραν πρὸς τῇ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίαν ἔχειν, ὑμᾶς
δὲ στερηθῆναι ὧν νῦν προκαλούμεθα.

This is the best time of all, if ever, for us both to make peace, before some irreparable intervening event befall us, in which [we are] compelled to have eternal hatred for you, both in public business and personally, and you be robbed of that which we now propose.

The Spartans urge the Athenians to come to terms before some event happens forcing the Spartans to hate the Athenians forever. Although the statement is designed to motivate the Athenians, it is still couched in a pessimistic ideology, particularly when closing a speech with many other instances of such a negative expression.

⁷³ Gomme (1956), 455; Hornblower (1996), 174.

As in previous sections, the patterns demonstrated above need to be verified in the named speeches, of which only Athens and Sparta provide examples. Let us begin again with the Athenians.

As we saw above, the first Athenian anonymous speech and the Melian dialogue shared two points in common: they highlighted the risk-taking tendency of the Athenians, as well as their tendency to consider matters in terms of profit. We can see this pattern through most of the Athenian speakers, as well. Consider Perikles' first speech in light of its ideology. Perikles' speech, in response to the Spartan ultimatum, is concerned with encouraging the Athenian *polis* to risk war. While he does spend a considerable portion of his speech contrasting the resources and governance of Athens and Sparta, arguing that the risk is not so great, his opening does contain the following:

ἐνδέχεται γὰρ τὰς ξυμφορὰς τῶν πραγμάτων οὐχ ἥσσον
ἀμαθῶς χωρῆσαι ἢ καὶ τὰς διανοίας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· δι' ὅπερ
καὶ τὴν τύχην, ὅσα ἂν παρὰ λόγον ξυμβῇ, εἰώθαμεν αἰτιᾶσθαι.
(1.140.1.10-11)

For it happens that the circumstances of affairs advance no less stupidly than the thinking of man; on account of which we are accustomed to blaming fortune, whatever happens contrary to our calculation.

Perikles shortly follows this warning up with the charge to make their minds, and on this matter, he states they should decide for war (1.141.1). Perikles, then, was certainly open to risk-taking, and as the Athenians voted his advice best (1.145.1), as a *polis* they seem to also.

Further, in arguing why the Athenians go to war, Perikles makes the following claim:

οἷς εἰ ξυγχωρήσετε, καὶ ἄλλο τι μείζον εὐθὺς ἐπιταχθήσεσθε ὥς
φόβῳ καὶ τοῦτο ὑπακούσαντες· (1.140.5.3-4)

If you concede this [repealing the Megarian decree], suspecting that this was for fear, you will immediately be to do another greater thing;

Perikles argues the Spartans will assume the Athenians gave in on the Megarian matter for fear, and thus will continue making greater demands of the Athenians. Essentially, Perikles is arguing that there is no advantage to the Athenians conceding on Megara. As in the other

Athenian speeches discussed, we can see considerations of profit or advantage in Athenian reasoning.

Perikles, in his second deliberative speech, responding to the anger of the Athenian *polis*, voices similar ideas again:

Καὶ γὰρ οἷς μὲν αἵρεσις γεγένηται τᾶλλα εὐτυχοῦσι, πολλὴ ἄνοια πολεμῆσαι· εἰ δ' ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ἢ εἴξαντας εὐθὺς τοῖς πέλας ὑπακοῦσαι ἢ κινδυνεύσαντας περιγενέσθαι, ὁ φυγὼν τὸν κίνδυνον τοῦ ὑποστάντος μεμπτότερος. (2.61.1)

For [if] there is a choice for which [peace or war] and they are successful in other matters, it is a great folly to go to war; but if [the choice] is necessarily either likely immediate subjection to one's neighbours or to overcome, incurring dangers, he fleeing the danger is more contemptible than he who stands up to it.

Perikles again enjoins the Athenians to the war, saying it is more contemptible to flee the danger than to fight. Further, he goes on to state that those citizens who would act timidly in giving up the empire have no place in the Athenian state (2.63.3). Clearly, Perikles is open to risk-taking.

Also, Perikles argues based on what is of advantage:

ἐγὼ γὰρ ἡγοῦμαι πόλιν πλείω ξύμπασαν ὀρθουμένην ὠφελεῖν τοὺς ἰδιώτας ἢ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν πολιτῶν εὐπραγοῦσαν, ἄθρόαν δὲ σφαλλομένην. (2.60.2)

For I think a city altogether succeeding helps the private citizen more than each of the citizens faring well, but as a whole failing.

Perikles offers his opinion regarding a prosperous city versus prosperous private citizens, which opinion centres on the idea of what is more beneficial to the citizens. In the broader context of the speech, Perikles means what is of greater benefit to all is sticking to his plan, and thus continue risking the outcome of the war, tying the two points together.

In the debate over the Mytilenaians, however, we see a different stance towards risk from both speakers, Kleon and Diodotus. Both make arguments regarding whether or not to slay the Mytilenaians based around an avoidance of risk. Consider Kleon's case:

τῶν τε ξυμμάχων σκέψασθε εἰ τοῖς τε ἀναγκασθεῖσιν ὑπὸ τῶν
πολεμίων καὶ τοῖς ἐκοῦσιν ἀποστᾶσι τὰς αὐτὰς ζημίας
προσθήσετε, τίνα οἴεσθε ὄντινα οὐ βραχεία προφάσει
ἀποστήσονται, ὅταν ἢ κατορθώσαντι ἐλευθέρωσις ἢ ἢ σφαλέντι
μηδὲν παθεῖν ἀνήκεστον; ἡμῖν δὲ πρὸς ἐκάστην πόλιν
ἀποκεκινδυνεύσεται τὰ τε χρήματα καὶ αἱ ψυχαί, καὶ τυχόντες
μὲν πόλιν ἐφθαρμένην παραλαβόντες τῆς ἔπειτα προσόδου, δι'
ἣν ἰσχύομεν, τὸ λοιπὸν στερήσεσθε, σφαλέντες δὲ πολεμίους
πρὸς τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ἔξομεν, καὶ ὃν χρόνον τοῖς νῦν
καθεστηκόσι δεῖ ἐχθροῖς ἀνθίστασθαι, τοῖς οἰκείοις ξυμμάχοις
πολεμήσομεν. (3.39.7-8)

And consider the allies, if you apply the same penalty to [secessions]
compelled by the enemy and to deliberate revolts, do you think
anyone would not revolt with little pretext, since there is either
freedom for those who succeed, or for those who fail, they will suffer
nothing incurable? There will great risk of resources and lives for us
against each city, and succeeding, we would capture a ruined city, but
henceforward, we would lose the future revenue through which we are
strong, and failing, we will have more enemies in addition to those
with which we began, and the whole time it is necessary to fight our
established enemies, we would have to fight our own allies.

Here, Kleon argues that it is unfair not to differentiate punishments between groups, though
the two groups are those who are forced to secede from the empire by Athens' enemies, and
those who deliberately revolt. Kleon goes on to argue that if the Athenians do not punish all
citizens of a revolting city, Athens runs the risk of having to subdue every other subject state,
wasting both lives and financial resources. Thus, Kleon argues that Athens should not risk
such an outcome, by not slaughtering the Mytilenaians.

Diodotus makes use of a similar line of argument to Kleon, though to support the
contrary position. Consider the following:

νῦν μὲν γὰρ ὑμῖν ὁ δῆμος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν εὖνους ἐστί,
καὶ ἢ οὐ ξυναφίσταται τοῖς ὀλίγοις ἢ, ἐὰν βιασθῇ, ὑπάρχει
τοῖς ἀποστήσασιν πολέμιος εὐθύς, καὶ τῆς ἀντικαθισταμένης
πόλεως τὸ πλῆθος ξύμμαχον ἔχοντες ἐς πόλεμον ἐπέρχεσθε. εἰ
δὲ διαφθερεῖτε τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μυτιληναίων, ὃς οὔτε μετέσχε
τῆς ἀποστάσεως, ἐπειδὴ τε ὅπλων ἐκράτησεν, ἐκὼν παρέδωκε
τὴν πόλιν, πρῶτον μὲν ἀδικήσετε τοὺς εὐεργέτας κτείνοντες,
ἔπειτα καταστήσετε τοῖς δυνατοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὃ βούλονται
μάλιστα• ἀφιστάντες γὰρ τὰς πόλεις τὸν δῆμον εὐθύς
ξύμμαχον ἔξουσιν, προδειξάντων ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ζημίαν τοῖς
τε ἀδικοῦσιν ὁμοίως κείσθαι καὶ τοῖς μή. (3.47.2-3)

For currently the demos in all the cities is well disposed to you, and either do not join in revolt with the oligarchs or, even if they are forced, opposition to the revolutionaries begins immediately, and [when] you move against a rebellious city in war, you have the majority as allies. But if you destroy the people of Mytilene, who did not take part in the revolt, and who, when they had power of arms, willingly handed over the city, first you will be unjust killing your benefactors, then you will place the rulers of the people in the position which they very much want; since you have demonstrated that the same penalty is laid down for the guilty and innocent alike.

Diodotus suggests, unlike Kleon (3.37.2), that the common people of the empire view Athens favourably, and goes on to suggest they would be allies of Athens, as in the case of Mytilene, should the oligarchs revolt. From this start, Diodotus' argument follows the same pattern as Kleon's: that it is unfair to apply the same penalty to two different groups, and would result in greater risk to Athens. Where Diodotus differs, though, is in the constituents of the two groups. Where Kleon differentiated between those forced out of the empire and those who deliberately revolted, Diodotus differentiates between the oligarchs who revolt, and the common people who do not wish to revolt. Diodotus argues that the indiscriminate slaughter of the Mytilenaians will not just mean future revolts will be harder fought, because the latter group will necessarily join the former because their lives depend on winning, but also, the oligarchs' position is made easier, once they have begun the revolt, because they know they will be joined by the rest of their *polis*. Diodotus suggests vigilance rather than slaughter (3.46.6). One last point to note regarding both Kleon and Diodotus is that they both frame their arguments for avoiding risk over Mytilene in terms of advantage, Kleon at 3.38, and Diodotus at 3.44.

As with Kleon and Diodotus, above, Nikias also counsels the Athenians to avoid risk. that is the Sicilian expedition:

‘Φημὶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς πολεμίους πολλοὺς ἐνθάδε ὑπολιπόντας καὶ
ἐτέρους ἐπιθυμεῖν ἐκεῖσε πλεύσαντας δεῦρο ἐπαγαγέσθαι. καὶ
οἴεσθε ἴσως τὰς γενομένας ὑμῖν σπονδὰς ἔχειν τι βέβαιον, αἱ
ἡσυχάζοντων μὲν ὑμῶν ὀνόματι σπονδαὶ ἔσονται (οὕτω γὰρ
ἐνθένδε τε ἄνδρες ἔπραξαν αὐτὰ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων),
σφαλέντων δέ που ἀξιόχρεω δυνάμει ταχεῖαν τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν
ἡμῖν οἱ ἐχθροὶ ποιήσονται, οἷς πρῶτον μὲν διὰ ξυμφορῶν ἢ
ξύμβασις καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἰσχύινοσ ἢ ἡμῖν κατ’ ἀνάγκην ἐγένετο,
ἔπειτα ἐν αὐτῇ ταύτῃ πολλὰ τὰ ἀμφισβητούμενα ἔχομεν.
(6.10-11)

For I say, leaving behind, here, many enemies, you want to bring more
here, sailing there [to Sicily]. Perhaps you think the existing treaty
provides some security for you, [even] with you at rest, it is a treaty in
name only (for thus both men here and from our opponents treat it),
but should we stumble, our enemy will swiftly make an invasion with
a substantial force, the agreement was made by necessity through
misfortunes, and more shameful for them than for us, and then we
have many disagreements in this [treaty still].

By suggesting that the Athenians think the treaty provides them with safety, or security,
Nikias neatly implies that the Athenians’ proposed course of action is unsafe. This lack of
safety is built upon by the discussion of leaving behind current enemies to add new, and the
fact that people on both sides are acting as though there were no treaty. Further, Nikias points
out that any failure in Sicily will be swiftly capitalised on by Athens’ current opponents. All
in all, Nikias argues the Sicilian expedition is a risky venture, which, given the framing noted
above, and Nikias’ opening to the speech, suggests the Athenians should vote against the
venture. Nikias closes this speech by pointing out the president of the council could have the
Sicilian expedition brought to a second vote, and that this would be the honourable move, as it
benefits the fatherland (6.14). Thus, as with Kleon and Diodotus, Nikias ties what is
advantageous into avoidance of risk.

To finish with the Athenians, I wish to touch briefly on Alkibiades. Alkibiades is the
other speaker whose speech is recorded in regards to the Sicilian expedition. While he down-
plays the risks involved in the expedition (6.17), he nevertheless goes on to suggest there is no
plausible reason for not undertaking the risk (6.18.1). Alkibiades wins the debate, and thus,

not only does he argue for risk-taking, but the whole situation underscores the Athenian risk-taking tendency.

While the Athenians are generally more open to risk-taking, as we have seen, the Spartans, on the other hand, are generally disinclined. We saw their conservative stance regarding the future in the anonymous speech, discussed above. Consider Archidamos' first speech. After explaining he has much experience of war, he moves into discussing what the war would be like:

τάχ' ἂν τις θαρσοίη ὅτι τοῖς ὅπλοις αὐτῶν καὶ τῷ πλήθει
ὑπερφέρομεν, ὥστε τὴν γῆν δηρὸν ἐπιφοιτῶντες. τοῖς δὲ ἄλλη
γῇ ἐστὶ πολλή ἥς ἄρχουσι, καὶ ἐκ θαλάσσης ὧν δέονται
ἐπάξονται. εἰ δ' αὖ τοὺς ξυμμάχους ἀφιστάναι πειρασόμεθα,
δεήσει καὶ τούτοις ναυσὶ βοηθεῖν τὸ πλεόν οὔσι νησιώταις. τίς
οὖν ἔσται ἡμῶν ὁ πόλεμος; εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἢ ναυσὶ κρατήσομεν ἢ τὰς
προσόδους ἀφαιρήσομεν ἀφ' ὧν τὸ ναυτικὸν τρέφουσι,
βλαψόμεθα τὰ πλείω. κἂν τούτῳ οὐδὲ καταλύεσθαι ἔτι καλόν,
ἄλλως τε καὶ εἰ δόξομεν ἄρξαι μᾶλλον τῆς διαφορᾶς. (1.81.1-5)

Perhaps someone may be encouraged that we have a great deal more hoplites than them. But there is much other land over which they rule, and they bring in from the sea which things they need. But if we encouraged the allies to revolt, there will be need of ships to help them, as the majority of them are islanders. So what will this war of ours be? For if we cannot defeat them with ships, or reduce their revenue, from which they furnish the fleet, we shall be harmed even more. Nor could we stop this well, especially if we are seen to have begun the dispute.

Unlike the Corinthians, who express far more optimism for the outcome, should Sparta vote for war now, Archidamos expresses more pessimism for undertaking war at this stage. Further, Archidamos goes on to express very traditional virtues in chapter 84: he argues for taking matters slowly, and making much preparation, next he goes on to point out such delay comes from Spartan discipline, and distrust of cleverness and rhetoric, while also noting Spartan bravery (1.84).

While Archidamos makes a long speech for a Spartan, he nevertheless espouses traditional Spartan ideology. Sthenelaidas gives a very laconic speech that may seem non-Spartan because of his arguing for war. Yet his opening also implies a distrust of rhetoric

which Archidamos explicitly states: Sthenelaidas complains he does not understand the many words of the Athenians, yet goes on to say that all the Athenians did was praise themselves, and not defend the charges, showing he understood enough (1.86.1). His complaint, in the light of his understanding, suggests distrust, or dislike of rhetoric. Further, while he argues for war, he does not actually make any optimistic claims, with the possible exception that he may claim Sparta's allies are an equivalent boon to Athens' wealth, ships and horses (1.86.3), though this could be read rather as a traditional *topos*.

The last Spartan to consider here is Brasidas. Thucydides notes, parenthetically, before reporting the speech of Brasidas to the Acanthians, that he was not a bad speaker for a Spartan (4.84.2). We may be tempted to read Thucydides' statement as meaning that Brasidas sounds more Athenian. Hornblower notes that Brasidas' speech seems to have the effect of individualising him, as we have seen with Athenian speakers, discussed in the introduction.⁷⁴ Brasidas' speeches, however, tend to fit the Spartan structural pattern, discussed in Part 1. Brasidas does in this speech discuss risk-taking: he notes in passing to the Acanthians the risk that has been taken in marching his army to them (4.85.4). Beyond this mention of risk, however, much of the remainder of Brasidas' speech is concerned with convincing the Acanthians he came to give them autonomy, and persuading them to allow him to do so (4.86-7). The claim to return autonomy is a typical sentiment espoused by the Spartans (it was the basis of their final ultimatum to the Athenians [1.139.3]), thus Brasidas' speech is more representative of Spartan discourse.

Conclusion

From the above, we can see that in most instances, the Athenians present themselves as advisors, and their speeches as advice to be considered by their audience who then may make a well-informed decision. Where this does not happen, an Athenian speaker takes on another

⁷⁴ Hornblower (1996), 276-7.

rhetorical posture, such as that of the teacher teaching the *polis* a lesson. Such rhetorical posturing we can understand as an artefact of the Athenian democracy. The speakers recognise in their speeches that the Athenian *demos* will be making the decision, and this pattern is transferred to their embassies. The Corinthians, on the other hand either clearly state their speech is intended to persuade their audience to a course of action, as do the Spartan speakers, or they do not mention a speech's purpose, and simply attempt to persuade. This pattern may reflect a distrust of rhetoric, on the part of the Spartans, or differences in governance in both cases.

In terms of patterns of argumentation, the Athenian speakers have a general trend of arguing in terms of openness to risk-taking, and advantage. Although three Athenian speakers argue against risk-taking, we can reconcile their speeches with the others in terms of appropriate risk-taking. In Perikles' first speech he argues Athens should risk going to war, while also noting that to give in to Spartan demands has no advantage: having conceded on one point, they will only come back with another, greater demand. Thus, going to war is the appropriate risk. Kleon and Diodotus' debate over Mytilene can be considered a debate over what is the most advantageous, and thus appropriate, risk to take. Nikias' speech is harder to reconcile with this pattern. Perhaps, however, given the Athenians are still involved in the one risky enterprise, the war they began under Perikles, risking the expedition to Sicily is not appropriate, though Alkibiades, and ultimately the Athenian *demos* disagreed. Even if we exclude Nikias' speech, however, the general pattern stands.

Spartan speakers, on the other hand, tend to express a disinclination to risk while also espousing traditional Doric values, such as discipline, distrust of rhetoric and other things. Corinthians tend to argue in ways which highlight their position between Athens and Sparta, as we saw in Part 1.

Conclusion

This thesis began with the anonymous Spartan ambassadors' highly programmatic statement regarding the unusual character of their speech to the Athenians. Indeed, we saw in their speech high frequency of subordination, and to higher levels, as well as an unexpected use of word types that were only becoming popular towards the end of the fifth century. As we also saw, however, the use of subordination, when compared to examples from speakers of the other *poleis*, resulted in more straightforward sentences, while also being shorter than utterances from Athenians and Corinthians. All of which fits our expectations of Spartan discourse: shorter and generally simpler utterances. Yet the Spartans saw fit to note that their speech was unusual, calling to mind Spartan discourse norms; even as they claim to break them, however, they still meet such expectations, relative to the other speakers. The vocabulary, on the other hand, remains somewhat unusual in the speech, due to the higher proportionate usage of *-sis* nouns and neuter abstractions. Yet, when considered in comparison with the other Spartan speeches, a pattern of gradual adoption of such terms over several years is revealed, which may be expected from a conservative *polis*. Further, in finding this pattern in the Spartan anonymous speech, we can see, through comparison, a freeness with words in the speeches of both Athenian and Corinthian ambassadors. This freeness is expressed in the lengthier speeches, comprised of sentences which tend to be structurally simpler than those of the anonymous Spartans, but make a greater demand on audiences in terms of comprehension.

This finding of overall "Spartan-ness" in the anonymous Spartan speech supports David Francis' impression of the Spartan speech. In his investigation of all the Spartan speeches in Thucydides, he considered the anonymous Spartan speech briefly, noting the high level of subordination, but argued that overall it was representative of Spartan discourse. Part 1 of this thesis supports that stance with a fuller argument. Further, the nature of the Spartans' use of subordination is distinctly different to that of Nikias, the Athenian speaker who also uses a

high proportion of subordination. Nikias' subordination consists of many concessive clauses and reversals, which serve to complicate the transmission of his ideas. As Daniel Tompkins points out, the overall effect of Nikias' speech is to create a sense of hesitancy which reflects Nikias' character as seen through Thucydides narrative. The anonymous Spartans, however, use subordination to make brief points in logical order without the excessive qualifying found in Nikias' speeches. Thus, the fact that the anonymous Spartan speech uses a high proportion of subordination does not weaken Tompkins' case regarding Nikias speeches, but serves to reinforce it.

The Athenians' freeness with words is also reflected in the more sophisticated way in which they frame their speeches. The speeches are meant to persuade the Athenian *demos* (or other *poleis*) to undertake a certain course of action. Yet despite this intent, Athenian speakers generally present themselves as wise advisors, claiming to wish only that their audience be well advised before making their decision. Neither Corinthians nor Spartans adopt such a rhetorical posture for their speeches, and we may understand this guise of the Athenians in light of their democracy, as a tendency of the wealthy elites who did most of the speaking in the democracy attempting flattery of the poorer Athenians. As it is likely that those individuals felt to speak well by the Athenian *demos* were sent as ambassadors, this rhetorical habit found its way into diplomatic speeches, or at least into Thucydides' presentation thereof.

Moreover, the Athenians in their speeches highlight their willingness to engage in risky activities, where the Spartans generally show themselves to be risk averse. The Corinthians, however, do not generally demonstrate discuss whether their *polis* is open to risk or not, though their urging of Sparta and her allies to war in their second and third speeches may be construed as incitement to risk-taking. The Athenians and Spartans' stances on risk-taking, though, does match the stances Luginbill found in Thucydides' narrative, based predominantly on the actions of the two *poleis*, demonstrating a match between words and deeds in regards to risk.

Another point regarding Athenian argumentation is that they tend to discuss matters in terms of what is to their advantage. We may be tempted to say the same of the other *poleis*, yet it is only the Athenians who openly express such a framework for decision-making. The Corinthians, as we saw in their first speech, discussed the possibility of Athenian alliance with Corcyra in terms of traditional inter-*polis* relations. Their second speech, while highlighting Corinth's cultural and geographical position between the poles of Athens and Sparta, was designed to motivate the Spartans to war. This speech, though, did not consider the advantages of war, but presented matters in light of the threat of Athens. The Corinthians framed their third speech in terms of traditional values we would expect, and do find, to be expressed by the Spartans, yet also offered novel approaches to the problems of fighting Athens. Again, this argumentative manner served to highlight their medial position. Like their second speech, the Corinthians discuss the war, not in terms of advantage to any state, but, again, in terms of a threat.

The anonymous Spartans, like the Corinthians, do not frame their arguments in terms of advantage, and again, like the Corinthians, express rather traditional, or conservative, values, as well as a general sense of pessimism, noted above in their tendency to be risk-averse. Thus, it seems to be a feature of the Athenians to frame their arguments openly in terms of advantage. As with the rhetorical posture of wise advisor, discussed above, this feature may be an artefact of the Athenian democracy.

So, we have found that structurally, Athenians tend to make low use of subordination, but also to make longer speeches, which tend to make a comparatively greater cognitive demand on their audience. This result fits in with a city which valued rhetorical display as much as Athens did. Further, the Athenians make use of a more sophisticated rhetorical posture, in line with the popularity of the sophistic movement in Athens in the fifth century, as well as reflecting the democracy of Athens, as does their tendency to argue in regards to

their advantage. Finally, the Athenians were open to taking risks, and this fact is reflected in their speeches.

The Corinthians' speeches are structured similarly to the Athenians, which supports a greater exposure to the sophistic movement on the part of the Corinthians. Their speeches also serve to highlight their proximity to Athens, yet they also express some traditional ideas, which we could associate with their Dorian heritage.

The Spartans, even when making use of more complex sentence structuring, still give briefer speeches, which do not make as great a demand on their audiences, in terms of comprehension. They also express a conservative, and risk-averse ideology, which we would expect from them as Dorians.

Of course, the above was demonstrated through a limited set of speeches, but it is likely nonetheless that there is characterisation in Thucydides' anonymous speeches. This finding supports, and extends, the findings of characterisation in the named speeches, and offers another interpretive tool when working with Thucydides. It also suggests avenues for further research. More work could be done, for example, to establish whether the characterisation in the anonymous speeches is deliberate, or unconscious. The overlap of ideas in Perikles' first speech with earlier speeches in book 1 suggests some intent on Thucydides' part, and it would be both interesting and profitable to extend this line of investigation.

At any rate, this thesis has established that Thucydides' anonymous speeches are highly nuanced and worthy of consideration. Regardless of one's interpretation of 1.22.1, it is clear that these speeches reflect the nationality of the speaker in various ways, and that this national character in turn develops certain tropes pertaining to the three main *poleis*, Athens, Sparta, and Corinth. All in all, further light has been shed on the corpus of Thucydidean speeches, revealing once more the singular nature of Thucydides' achievement.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Hammond, M. (Trans.) (2009). *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, H. S., and Powell, J. E. (1942). *Thucydidis historiae*. Volume 1, rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jones, H. S., and Powell, J. E. (1942). *Thucydidis historiae*. Volume 2, 2nd ed., rev. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Secondary Sources

Adcock, F. E. (1951). 'Thucydides in Book I'. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 71, 2 – 12.

Allan, R. J. (2007). 'Sense and sentence complexity: sentence structure, sentence connection, and tense-aspect as indicators of narrative mode in Thucydides' "Histories"', in R. J. Allan and M. Buijs (eds), *The language of literature: linguistic approaches to classical texts*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 93 – 121.

Allison, J. W. (1984). 'Sthenelaidas' Speech: Thucydides 1.86'. *Hermes*, 112, 9 – 16.

Allison, J. W. (1997). *Word and Concept in Thucydides*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Alty, J. (1982). 'Dorians and Ionians'. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 102, 1 – 14.

Andrewes, J. A. (2000). 'Cleon's Hidden Appeals (Thucydides 3.37-40)'. *The Classical Quarterly*, 50 (1), 45 – 62.

Arnold, P. E. (1992). 'The Persuasive Style of Debates in Direct Speech in Thucydides'. *Hermes*, 120 (1), 44 – 57.

Bloedow, E. F. (1981). 'The Speeches of Archidamus and Sthenelaidas at Sparta'. *Historia*, 30 (2), 129 – 143.

Bloedow, E. F. (1987). 'Sthenelaidas the Persuasive Spartan'. *Hermes*, 115 (1), 60 – 66.

Brunt, P. A. (1965). 'Spartan Policy and Strategy in the Archidamian War'. *Phoenix*, 19 (4), 255 – 280.

Connor, W. R. (1971). *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cameron, H. D. (2003). *Thucydides Book I: A Students' Grammatical Commentary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Cartledge, P. and Debnar, P. (2006). 'Sparta and the Spartans in Thucydides', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (eds), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 559 – 587.

Cogan, M. (1981). *The Human Thing: the Speeches and Principles of Thucydides' History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Colvin, S. (1999). *Dialect in Aristophanes: And the politics of language in ancient Greek literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Connor, W. R. (1984). *Thucydides*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Crane, G. (1992a). 'Power, Prestige and the Corcyraean Affair in Thucydides 1'. *Classical Antiquity*, 11, 1 – 27.

Crane, G. (1992b). 'The Fear and Pursuit of Risk: Corinth on Athens, Sparta and the Peloponnesians (Thucydides 1.68-71, 120-121)'. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 122, 227 – 56.

Crane, G. (1998). *Thucydides and the Ancient Simplicity: The Limits of Political Realism*. Berkely and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Debnar, P. (1996). 'The Unpersuasive Thebans (Thucydides 3.61-67)'. *Phoenix*, 50 (2), 95 – 110.

Debnar, P. (2001). *Speaking the Same Language: Speech and Audience in Thucydides' Spartan Debates*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

De Brauw, M. (2007). 'The Parts of the Speech', in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Malden, Oxford and Carlton: Blackwell, 187 – 202.

- Denniston, J. D. (1934). *The Greek Particles* 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Denniston, J. D. (1952). *Greek Prose Style*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. (1972). *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London: Duckworth.
- De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. (2002). 'Sparta's "Foreign Policy"', in M. Whitby ed, *Sparta*.
Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 218 – 222.
- Devlin, R. (1990). 'Thucydides on Speeches'. *The Ancient History Bulletin*, 4 (3), 58 – 60.
- Dewald, C. J. (2005). *Thucydides' War Narrative*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dover, K. J. (1974). *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*. Berkeley:
University of California Press.
- Finley, J. H. (1938). 'Euripides and Thucydides'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 49,
23 – 68.
- Francis, E. D. (1991 – 1993). 'Brachylogia Laconica: Spartan Speeches in Thucydides'.
Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, 38, 198 – 212.
- Garrity, T. F. (1998). 'Thucydides 1.22.1: Content and Form in the Speeches'. *The American Journal of Philology*, 3, 361 – 384.

Gill, C. (1990). 'The Character-Personality Distinction', in C. B. R. Pelling, (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1 – 31.

Gomme, A. W. (1945). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. Volume 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gomme, A. W. (1956). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. Volume 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gomme, A. W. (1956). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. Volume 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gomme, A. W., Andrewes, A., and Dover, K. J. (1970). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. Volume 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gomme, A. W., Andrewes, A., and Dover, K. J. (1981). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. Volume 5. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Graves, C. E. (1982). *Thucydides, Book IV*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

Hainsworth, J. B. (1967). 'Greek Views on Greek Dialectology'. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 66 (1), 62 – 76.

Hall, J. M. (1997). *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hornblower, S. (1987). *Thucydides*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hornblower, S. (1991). *A Commentary on Thucydides*. Volume I: Books I – II. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hornblower, S. (1996). *A Commentary on Thucydides*. Volume II: Books IV – V.24. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hornblower, S. (1996). 'Thucydides and Boiotia'. *Επετηρίς της Εταιρείας Βοιωτικών Μελετών*, 2, 667 – 678.

Hornblower, S. (2006). 'Thucydides and the Argives', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis eds, *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 615 – 628.

Hornblower, S. (2008). *A Commentary on Thucydides*. Volume III: Books 5.25 – 8.109. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hunter, V. J. (1973). *Thucydides: the Artful Reporter*. Toronto: Hakkert.

Kallet-Marx, L. (1994). 'Money Talks: Rhetor, Demos, and the Resources of the Athenian Empire', in R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 227 – 251.

Lang, M. L. (1995). 'Participial Motivation in Thucydides'. *Mnemosyne*, 48, 48 – 65.

- Lang, M. L. (1999). 'The Thucydidean Tetralogy (1.67-88)'. *The Classical Quarterly*, 49, 326 – 329.
- Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. (1940). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th edn, revised by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Luginbill, R. D. (1999). *Thucydides on War and National Character*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Marincola, J. (2007). 'Speeches in Classical Historiography', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Volume 1. Malden, Oxford and Carlton: Blackwell, 118 – 132.
- Martin, R. C., Shelton, J. R., and Yaffee, L. S. (1994). 'Language Processing and Working Memory: Neuropsychological Evidence for Separate Phonological and Semantic Capacities'. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33, 83 – 111.
- Morrison, J. V. (1999). 'Preface to Thucydides: Rereading the Corcyraean Conflict (1.24-55)'. *Classical Antiquity*, 18, 94 – 131.
- Morrison, J. V. (2006). 'Interaction of Speech and Narrative in Thucydides', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (eds), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 251 – 277.
- Parry, A. (1981). *Logos and Ergon in Thucydides*. New York: Arno Press.

- Parker, R. (1983). *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pelling, C. (2009). 'Thucydides' Speeches', in J. S. Rusten (ed.), *Thucydides*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pritchard, D. M. (2010). 'The symbiosis between democracy and war: the case of ancient Athens', in D. M. Pritchard, (ed.), *War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rengakos, A. and Tsakmakis, A. (eds) (2006). *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Rijksbaron, A. (2002). *The Syntax and the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*. 3rd edn. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Rhodes, P. J. (1988). *Thucydides, History II*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Rhodes, P. J. (2006). 'Thucydides and Athenian History', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (eds), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 523 – 546.
- Ridley, R. T. (1981). 'Exegesis and Audience in Thucydides'. *Hermes*, 109 (1), 26 – 46.

- Robinson, E. W. (2007). 'The Sophists and Democracy Beyond Athens'. *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 25 (1), 109 – 122.
- Rusten, J. S. (1985). 'Two Lives or Three? Pericles on the Athenian Character (Thucydides 2.40.1-2)'. *The Classical Quarterly*, 35 (1), 14 – 19.
- Salmon, J. B. (1984). *Wealthy Corinth: a history of the city to 338 BC*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Saxonhouse, A. W. (2006). *Free Speech and Democracy in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheppers, F. (2011). *The Colon Hypothesis: word order, discourse segmentation and discourse coherence in Ancient Greek*. Brussels: VUB Press.
- Stadter, P. A. (ed.) (1973). *The Speeches in Thucydides*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Stadter, P. A. (1983). 'The Motives for Athens' Alliance with Corcyra (Thuc. 1.44)'. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 24 (2), 131 – 136.
- Stroud, R. S. (1994). 'Thucydides and Corinth'. *Chiron*, 24, 267 – 304.
- Tompkins, D. P. (1972). 'Stylistic Characterization in Thucydides: Nicias and Alcibiades'. *Yale Classical Studies*, 22, 181 – 214.

- Tompkins, D. P. (1993). 'Archidamus and the Question of Characterization in Thucydides', in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell (eds), *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 99 – 111.
- Usher, S. (2007). 'Symbouleutic Oratory', in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Malden, Oxford and Carlton: Blackwell, 220 – 235.
- Van der Ben, N. (1987). 'The Textual Problem in Diodotus' Speech, Thucydides 3.44.2'. *Mnemosyne*, 40, 18 – 26.
- Van Wees, H. (2004). *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*. London: Duckworth.
- Walbank, F. W. (1965). *Speeches in Greek Historians*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wallace, W. P. (1964). 'Thucydides'. *Phoenix*, 18, 251 – 261.
- Warner, R. (trans.) (1972). *Thucydides: History of the Peloponnesian War*. London: Penguin.
- Warren, P. (2012). *Introducing Psycholinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wasserman, F. M. (1964). 'The Voice of Sparta in Thucydides'. *The Classical Journal*, 59 (7), 289 – 297.
- Webster, T. B. L. (1941). 'A Study of Greek Sentence Construction'. *The American Journal of Philology*, 62 (4), 385 – 415.

Weslake, H. D. (1968). *Individuals in Thucydides*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Westlake, H. D. (1989). *Studies in Thucydides and Greek History*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

Woodman, A. J. (1988). *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. London: Croom Helm.