An Interpretation of Thucydides’ Book I. 1, 20–22: A Contemporary Understanding of the Historiographical Approaches of Thucydides

Thucydides in Book I, paragraphs 1, and 20-22 raises critical issues concerning historiographical approaches and concepts. Thucydides believes that the art and science of history (historiography), the writing of events – very past or immediate events – should follow some specific methods. His statements may not be entirely accurate, nevertheless, some of the issues he raises need critical interpretation to find out how Thucydides conceives of the art, science, and the writing of past events. By interpretation and juxtaposing Book I, 1:20-22 of the Peloponnesian War, the article demonstrates, from a contemporary standpoint and concepts of historiography, that we can assume that contemporary discussions and concepts of historiography are the developments and adaption from Thucydides’ conception of historiography by contemporary historians although Thucydides did not openly declare his conception of historiography to us as we have conceived today.
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Introduction

The historical writing of the Greeks (and Romans) covers some 800 years: from Herodotus’ Histories (written in the mid to late fifth century BCE to the Res Gestae of Ammianus Marcellinus who composed his history in the late fourth century CE.1 Within these periods, a lot of people tried to create some record of their past, either of the early past or immediate past events (or of their own or earlier times), in a variety of formats.2 It is well acknowledged that of the vast historical pieces of literature, only the smallest possible portion has come down to us. Besides, whereas the extant literature represents some good eras in Greek culture and historical past, others hardly represented at all.3 Whatever the case may be, so far as historical writings of the Greeks are concerned, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon are considered by most ancient Greeks4 and contemporary alike as the three greatest historians whose works have preserved the socio-cultural and socio-political practices of the Greeks and non-Greeks.

On one hand, we get to know very much about the ancient Greek history and the historiographical approaches used by the ancient writers by relying on the works of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon since their works were not

3 Ibid.
in fragmented form. So, in researching into finding how and what methods and techniques were used by ancient Greek historians in recording and preserving their histories; the understanding of history and historiography, it is appropriate to consult the works of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon.

Fortunately, on the part of the ancient Greek historians and us, it is Thucydides who attempts to let us know his conception of history, historiography, and the appropriate methods that are needed for writing a factual account. Thucydides tries to tell us how history should be written by making some claims in Book I. 1, 20-22. In Book I. 1, Thucydides declares his aim for writing the Peloponnesian War. First, he believed that the war was going to be great than any other war fought in history because it affected most parts of the Greekland and also because it focused on contemporary issues of warfare. Second, Thucydides declares that due to the remoteness of the cause of the war, he cannot acquire a precise knowledge of the distant past or of the history preceding his own time, nonetheless, the little retrospective check he has made leads him to conclude that those preceding periods were not great in warfare or anything else. By implication, the works of his predecessors, especially Herodotus, lack empirical evidence except for hearsays, oral, or mythical.

It is well acknowledged that the historical writing of the Greeks was a gradual process, starting with the mainland Greek poet – Homer, and the Ionian Greek logographer – Hecataeus in the periods of 800 to 600 BC until the period Herodotus came into the scene (ca. mid-fifth century BC). Thucydides, who later joined the school of Greek historiographers, touched on how history should be done or written; by way of direct and indirect disapproval of the methods of his predecessors as attested from the quotations below:

---

2. J. Marincola, *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* Volume I. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007). 2. In the opinion of John Marincola, the knowledge of the numerous ancient Greek writers is supplemented in part by fragmentary evidence. Besides, the available information are of several types which include testimonies from informational remarks made by surviving writers (not only historians) about the scope, arrangement, and nature of lost historical works. There are also fragments from citations (either verbatim or otherwise) by later writers that inform us of the contents of lost works.
People are inclined to accept all stories of ancient times in an uncritical way – even when these stories concern their own native countries... (Thuc. I, 20, 1ff)...the evidence which I have put forward. It is better evidence than that of the poets, who exaggerate the importance of their themes, or of the prose chroniclers, who are less interested in telling the truth,...whose authority cannot be checked, and whose subject matter, owing to the passage of time, is mostly lost in the unreliable streams of mythology (Thuc. I, 21, 2-8)....And with regard to my factual reporting of the events of the war I have made it a principle not to write down the first story that came my way, and not even to be guided by my own general impressions; either I was present myself at the events which I have described or else I heard them from eye-witnesses whose reports I have checked with as much thoroughness as possible. ...[my history] is absence of romantic element... (Thuc. I, 22, 1ff).

If we re-examine the statements above, it becomes obvious that Thucydides raises critical issues concerning the methods of writing historical account. It is based on this that I have tasked myself to interpret the claims from a contemporary point of view.

**Methodology**

I have used content analysis from both primary sources in translation, as well as secondary sources on concepts of historiography. Key among the primary sources are Rex Warner’s translation of the *Peloponnesian War*, Benjamin Jowett’s translation of the *Peloponnesian War*, George Rawlinson’s translation of the *Histories*, T. Griffith. All Thucydidean quotations are taken from Rex Warner’s translation. The article ultimately employs interpretive, and analytical approaches all of which are some aspects of the qualitative research method.\(^1\) I have used the interpretive approach since it centres on how historians make sense of their subjective reality and attach meaning to it\(^2\), and recognize the individual historians’ interpretation and understanding of historical or past events and their own time.\(^3\)

---

By these methods, I have interpreted Thucydides’ claims in Book I.1,20-22 and his perceived\textsuperscript{14} understanding of historiography and what should undergo historical writing by juxtaposing his claims with a contemporary conception of historiography, history, philosophy of history, the link between historiography and science, factual representation in historiography, and attaining facts of the past, especially from E. H. Carr’s perspective.

\textbf{The Place of Thucydides in Contemporary Concepts of Historiography, History, and philosophy (idea) of history}

Thucydides’ Understanding of Historiography

In general terms, \textit{historiography} could mean the writing of history or written history.\textsuperscript{15} Stated differently, historiography is the history of historical writing, together with a discussion of the methodological questions raised by the construction of historical accounts.\textsuperscript{16} Thus, historiography mainly deals with the method, process, and various modes of writing a history of past human events.\textsuperscript{17} In this sense, unlike Herodotus who do not declare to his readers his historiographical methods apart from stating that he writes to preserve the wonderful actions of the Greeks and non-Greeks\textsuperscript{18}, Thucydides in Book I.22.1 informs his readers about his historiographical approach:

… with regard to my factual reporting of the events of the war I have made it a principle not to write down the first story that came my way, and not even to be guided by my own general impressions; either I was present myself at the events which I have described or else I heard them from eye-witnesses whose reports I have checked with as much thoroughness as possible. …[my history] is absence of romantic element…(Thuc. I, 22, 1ff).

It obvious from the above that Thucydides, who probably knew what historiography in our contemporary conception is about, enlightened us on his methods. He understood historiography as the embodiment of a factual

\textsuperscript{14}I have used the term “perceived” since Thucydides did not openly tell us he knew what historiography is about or any definition whatsoever. However, from contemporary point of view, we can deduce from Book I of Thucydides’s account that he generally knew about how history should be written.


\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.


representation of events in a scientific approach (devoid of fantasies and
hearsays), from an empirical or eye-witness source. 19 Although Thucydides in
his account gives us a gist of what historiography is about, some contemporary
historians have equally found some problems associated with the approach(es)
Thucydides used to conduct his research. 20 For example, M. I. Finley in his
introductory notes of Rex Warner’s translation of Thucydides’ Peloponnesian
War has pointed it out that apart from a passage on the unreliability of
eyewitness testimony, the way Thucydides went about his work is also
unknown, since he [Thucydides] says little about his methods (Thucydides, I,
22). 21 To find supporting evidence of Finley’s assertion is to consort
Herodotus’ account of history; whereas Herodotus would mention names of his
informants or sources, Thucydides would not mention the names of his
informants, especially, after his exile in 424 and thereafter (Thucydides, IV,
104-7). 22 Nonetheless, it could be said that Thucydides knew what he was
doing and had conceptualized historiographical methods from our
contemporary point of view since he outlined the approaches he had used for
his histories, and how history is supposed to be done.

Thucydidean Historiography and Science

In the opinion of Špilâčková (2012), historiography is historical research
which means the investigation of elements from history. 23 In this sense, since
historiography involves investigation into past events, the term investigation
makes any historical research scientific and sometimes as a basic qualitative
research method. 24 As a result, historiography which is also seen as historical
research, as reiterated by Špilâčková, is a critical investigation of events (be it
past or contemporary), development and experiences of the past, which
involves careful consideration of past testimonies from the perspective of
information sources, validity and subsequent interpretation of the concerned
testimonies investigation of events. 25 Per the definition given, where can we
place Thucydides’ historiographical methods so far as scientific methods are
concerned? We need to repeat an excerpt of Book I and then take a closer look:

20 L. Kallet, “Thucydides’ Workshop of History and Utility Outside the Text,” In Brill’s
Companion to Thucydides, edits. A. Rengakos and A. A. Tsakmakis (Leiden and Boston:
Brill, 2006), 335ff.
21 Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, trans. Rex Warner trans (Great Britain: Richard Clay,
Windus Ltd., 1959).
24 Ibid.; on qualitative research methos, see Tracy (2013) 1ff.
…with regard to my factual reporting of the events of the war I have made it a principle not to write down the first story that came my way, and not even to be guided by my own general impressions; either I was present myself at the events which I have described or else I heard them from eye-witnesses whose reports I have checked with as much thoroughness as possible. …[my history] is absence of romantic element…(Thuc. I, 22, 1ff).

From the excerpt, it could be realized that Thucydides did not want to write anything that he could not prove. That is why he claimed that he had made it a principle not to write whatever he hears unless he has been a witness to it or from a vicarious eye-witness which he has cross-checked with much thoroughness as possible. This is one main objective of scientific research – evidence is all that matters, not hearsays that cannot be proved. The scientific approach of inquiry includes facts presentation and careful analysis which conforms with Thucydides’ method of historiography as he states in the extract.

Nonetheless, although Thucydides’ approach of the term historiography involves itself with a scientific approach, his approach only differs from other purely scientific activities by the subject matter of history (past or contemporary events) which is difficult to reverse or wholly capture, and sometimes its accompanied difficult task of interpretation which is liable to relativity and subjectivity and especially by the influence of the nature of the unique subject matter (past or historical events and themes). However, history, whether being considered as pseudo-scientific (in terms of methods) or otherwise, the subject matter of history [which is ἴστορια – inquiry] makes history “scientific research” in its context. In line with this, Thucydides’ approach is scientific and corresponds to our conception of the scientific method of historiography.

---


Thucydidean Conception [Philosophy] of History in Perspective

The term “history” in itself is a Greek word ἱστορία, which denotes an inquiry or an investigation. History could also either mean a set of written records of the past human actions, or as an academic discipline (a course or subject) that uses a narrative to represent the past human actions and events, and studies the chronological records of events affecting people or nation(s). Ultimately, unlike historiography that mainly deals with the method, process, and various modes of writing history, “history” deals with past human events which are not limited to politics, governance, culture, religion, and social practices.

In a more contemporary perspective and conception of “history”, Edward Hallett Carr (1961), in his What is History? gives a trendy definition of history as both the inquiry conducted by the historian and the facts of the past into which he inquires (thus, it is a social process, in which individuals are engaged as social beings) … “The reciprocal process of interaction between the historian and his facts, a dialogue between the society of today and the society of yesterday”, but not a dialogue between abstract (or Divine) isolated individuals.

Thucydides’ claim and understanding of history can be interpreted from a contemporary perspective – from the contemporary conception of history given by scholars examined in this article. Thucydides may have perceived that history cannot be written anyhow or be accepted anyhow. This can be deduced from the statement:

People are inclined to accept all stories of ancient times in an uncritical way – even when these stories concern their own native countries…(Thuc. I, 20, 1ff.)…the evidence which I have put forward. It is better evidence than that of the poets, who exaggerate the importance of their themes, or of the prose chroniclers, who are less interested in telling the truth,…whose authority cannot be checked, and whose subject matter, owing to the passage of time, is mostly lost in the unreliable streams of mythology (Thuc. I, 21, 2-8).

Thus, from the quote, we can project that Thucydides understands that history is not any history unless it follows investigation as its name suggests in the Greek term, ἱστορία. It should be about humans, not gods, or anything from the mythical past. In this sense, Thucydides would be E. H. Carr’s favourite for his use of non-human abstractions as causal agents of events in human history and outcome of events in his Peloponnesian War.

Nonetheless, in another viewpoint, history is all about what the
historiographer finds worthy, or that which has a direct effect on the present
age. In this case, Thucydides’ criticisms on accounts drawn from mythical
past or far distant past cannot be fully supported since history is what the writer
finds worthy. Thus, whereas Thucydides endorses history about humans, other
writers may fancy oral history, far distant history, or past events about
humans and their gods so far as the account influences the present situation.
Either way, with the same shared belief of Burckhardt, Carr states that history
is “the record of what one age finds worthy of note in another”.

By implication, Carr believes that the historiographer and his historical
facts become intelligible to the living only in the light of the present. This is
because the living can fully understand the present only in the light of the past.
If that is what the predecessors (especially Herodotus) of Thucydides
conceived, then history cannot follow one particular method of inquiry. The
investigation can be done from the past, mythical, heroic, or contemporary.
Carr believes that “to enable man to understand the society of the past and to
increase his mastery over the society of the present, is the dual function of
history.” Thus, historiography (the writing of history) does not only involve
gathering data from the past or using method X or Y to unfolding the past but
collecting historical data by a historiographer or a historian is only an aspect of
historiography. In this sense, Thucydides’ understanding of history is valid as
well as his predecessors. The only difference will be how the accounts are
interpreted and supported with evidence.

What then does Thucydides consider as the ideal history? Is it
contemporary issues, or what any historian considers worthy of writing? We
need to expand the discourse further to answer this question. Long before the
idea of “history”, almost every society that had existed had some sort of
historical antecedents to narrate to the current generation. These past
antecedents or events were retold orally. Thus, up until the art of writing or
literacy, the oral account became the major source by which past events were
made known to the existing generation. When man gained the knowledge of
arts and letters, people began to write down their past events which became
known as historical recordings or writing. At this stage, most writers in
antiquity did not concern themselves with the accuracy and reliability of
sources. All that was required of the writer was to just write down what he
believed had taken place or what the traditions recount. This may be a result of
the fact that the early writers of past events did not know or have much insight
about historical facts account, past accounts, or the idea of history.

However, as time went by, writers like Thucydides began to rationalize the
past events with accuracy, reliability, possibilities, and trying to differentiate

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
\[\text{A. J. Toynbee, } \text{A Study of History} \text{ (Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1934).}\]
\[\text{E. H. Carr, } \text{What is History?} \text{ (United Kingdom: University of Cambridge Press, 1961), 32-40.}\]
between historical fact accounts and mythology by way of indirect and direct
disapprovals of his predecessors as we testify in his comment:

People are inclined to accept all stories of ancient times in an uncritical way…”37.
… of the poets, who exaggerate the importance of their themes, or of the prose
chroniclers, who are less interested in telling the truth,…whose authority cannot
be checked, and whose subject matter, owing to the passage of time, is mostly
lost in the unreliable streams of mythology”38.

By implication, ancient writers who preceded Thucydides did not fully
understand the idea of history and how historical accounts should be written.59
However, during the period of Thucydides, the idea of history became more
evolving and interesting; man became more involved in understanding the
society that he lives in and tried to find meaning and understand the present
from the past, and tried to draw a link between the old world and the new
world. The attempts made in trying to understand the present from the past, and
man’s role in his society, how events began and progressed (or ended)
culminated into what is termed as the idea or philosophy of history. From the
above quote, we get the gist of what Thucydides considered as a philosophy of
history: rationalizing the present human activities from the past; the interplay
of human activities in warfare, and its outcome. Ultimately, from his speeches,
Thucydides’ idea or philosophy of history is “contemporary events”.40

After the era of Thucydides, as history and the way it is done (historicism)
became more interesting, theorists, philosophers, and scholars began to bring
out their perception of the “philosophy of history”. There came different ideas
such as the cyclic theory of history; progressionist’s theory of history (of St.
Augustine, Kant, etc.); and Hegel’s idealistic concept. As I shall demonstrate
in due course, out of these ideas, we see a clear understanding of Thucydides’
philosophy of history, especially, from Hegel’s point of view.

According to the cyclic theory of history, the “philosophy of history” is
cyclical.41 The progressionist theory of history holds a different view from
that of the cyclic theorist. According to the progressionist theory, history
finds its root in the early dominance of religious thinking as the foundation of

37Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, trans. Rex Warner trans (Great Britain: Richard Clay,
38Ibid. I.21. 2-8; BRIA. “Herodotus and Thucydides: Inventing History,” Bill of Rights in
Action 24, no. 3 (winter, 2009); Clay, H. “Herodotus and Thucydides: Inventing History.”
Constitutional Rights Foundation Bill of Rights in Action 24, no.3. (2009), Available at
http://www.crf-usa.org/teachers/teacher-s-lounge.html
40Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, trans. Rex Warner trans (Great Britain: Richard Clay,
The Chaucer Press Ltd., 1954), Book I.1; M. C. Lemon, Philosophy of History: A Guide for
41C. Maduka, and L. Otoide, “Interplay Between Philosophy and History: Additional
Justification for Course Enrollments Across Disciplines,” African Journal History and Culture
(AJHC) 1, no. 2, 3 (2010): 35.
the doctrine of history and progress.\textsuperscript{42} This theory or idea of history is well attested in the work of St. Augustine of Hippo (1972) and its unrestricted influence in the middle ages and beyond.\textsuperscript{43} For St. Augustine, history is never cyclical as he reiterates: \textit{While they, the impious pagans, might go in circle, as the Psalmist had written, the sound doctrine of the Christian lay in a straight line.}\textsuperscript{44} Kant later in his discourse also believed history to progress. However, he summarises history as being the “idiotic course of all things human”\textsuperscript{45}.

In his \textit{Phenomenology of Spirit}, Hegel (1977) treats the development of consciousness as the key to historical change.\textsuperscript{46} Ultimately, Hegel’s claim was that from the logical presupposition of any thought whatsoever (pure being); he could generate a logical progression that culminated in a concept (the Absolute Idea)\textsuperscript{47} which was a synthesis of the entire cycle of development. Thus, for Hegel, the general definition that can be given is that the “\textit{philosophy of history} means nothing but the thoughtful consideration of it.” ‘Reasoning’ is, indeed, essential to humanity. It is this that distinguishes us from the brute”.\textsuperscript{48} We are told that Karl Marx, in later times, builds his materialistic theory of history on Hegel’s dialectics.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{43}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{44}Ibid, 36; for criticisms on Augustines idea of hisory, see L. Rubinoff, “Reviewed Work: Christian Faith and the Interpretation of History: A Study of St. Augustine’s Philosophy of History by G. L. Keyes,” \textit{Phoenix} 22, no. 2 (Summer, 1968): 173-176. According to Rubinoff, G. L. Keyes has viewed the most fundamental presupposition of St. Augustine’s philosophy of history as his conception of reality as consisting essentially of God’s eternal purpose. As a result, therefore, it is needless to have essential difference between history and nature, and no essential difference between the science of \textit{res naturae} and the historical sciences of \textit{res gestae}; and that everything, according to St. Augustine, \textit{is an expression of God’s single plan}. For this reason, Keyes argues that, it is quite different from the programme of scientific history which seeks primarily to test and hypotheses by appealing to the facts of experience. (See full discourse from Keyes, G. L. (1966). \textit{Christian Faith and the Interpretation of History: A Study of St. Augustine’s Philosophy of History}. Pp. 206, xi. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press).
\textsuperscript{47}Ibid.
Just like Hegel, Thucydides believed that the idea of history is rationalism – pure reasoning of events. Thus it is through rationalism, reasoning, or thought that one can understand past events. This may be the reason why he stated that his predecessors believed everything in an uncritical manner (Thuc. I, 20, 1ff); and since he had a fair idea of history, Thucydides made it a principle to factually report on events of the war through reasoning and a thorough check on causation which became part of Thucydides’ treatment of sources. In effect, the history that is guided by one’s impression is no history since emotions may downplay the facts of the account (Thuc. I, 22, 1ff).

**Factual Representation in Historiography: Thucydides in Contemporary Discourse**

Kumar and Karunakaran (2014) state that, the methods or approaches of writing history are largely characterized by several modifications with the evolution of human civilization and culture at various phases of human history. Consequently, the act and art of writing history (historiography) of a specific era are, most often than not, noticeable with some key or important features that are brought to it by several causes such as human values, morality, and ethics. In line with this, the historiography of a particular historical period becomes, apparently, different from other epochs of human history, although there may be similar themes of these different periods in human history. By this, we do not expect the historiography of Thucydides and his predecessors to be the same. Whereas they wrote on past events, Thucydides wrote on a contemporary event as he claimed in Book I that “I saw, too.” It can be understood that Thucydides was not writing on any event except those he could testify and prove. The question that comes in mind is: How does Thucydides, per his methods and techniques, want historians to write and present historical accounts?

To reiterate, history (ιστορια), in the Greek world (and in Herodotean rendition) means the narration of stories (λογοι). Whereas some [His...] stories may be recorded as a true event, others are classified as fictional or quasi-history. These classifications emanate from the methods by which [his...] stories are recorded as human events and the sources of the account. Meaning: it is not every historical event/account that can be presented as factual especially those that dwell heavily on oral and mythical past.

---


31Ibid.


Thucydides draws our attention to this in his statement: “… of the poets, who exaggerate the importance of their themes, or of the prose chroniclers, who are less interested in telling the truth,…whose authority cannot be checked, and whose subject matter, owing to the passage of time, is mostly lost in the unreliable streams of mythology” (Thuc. I.21.2-8).

Neville Morley in the Writing Ancient History (1999), states that ancient [Greek] historians pursued the craft (historiography) from the evidence of existing literary texts, works of art, remains of buildings, pottery shards, and coins. All these sources of reconstructing the historical past were available to the Greek historians such as Herodotus, and Thucydides. But the major concern, so far as Greek historiography is concerned, is how they went about reconstructing and representing the facts of past events. So, in what way(s) should a historian gather and treat his facts in the space of historiography?

Carr (1961) states that History involves a body of facts. But not every single fact(s) are historical facts or are treated by a historian as a fact. For example, the Persian Wars and the Peloponnesian wars between Sparta and Athens (431 – 404 BC) is a fact but not everything that happened in the past becomes a historical fact. Thus, the basic principle in History involves a body of accurate pieces of evidence. The Historian could get his facts from documents, inscriptions, and the like. This makes one become a good historiographer. That is what Thucydides seems to do as we understand from his comment:

...with regard to my factual reporting of the events of the war I have made it a principle not to write down the first story that came my way, and not even to be guided by my own general impressions; either I was present myself at the events which I have described or else I heard them from eye-witnesses whose reports I have checked with as much thoroughness as possible. ...[my history] is absence of romantic element... (Thuc. I, 22, 1ff).

Thus, from a contemporary point of view, we can say Thucydides had the conviction that a good historian is the one who gets his fact(s) accurate and gets praised for providing factual evidence in his recordings or narrations. Just as Carr (1961) reiterates, the facts (or basic facts) are set of raw data or materials of the historiographer rather than of history itself; and that, the most important thing for the historiographer and his source(s) of information (raw materials/facts) is not about how to get access to the facts but how a priori decision of the historian is set based on the information at hand. Thus, the duty and aim of the historiographer and what historiography seeks to do, from Thucydides and contemporary points of view, are not just about the writing of past events but how, the historian, with the basic facts or materials at hand,

suggests the probable effects of a known cause or using the general principle to suggest likely effects.\textsuperscript{57}

Some contemporary historians such as Carr (1961) have in mind that, ignorance should be the first requisite of a historiographer, and that ignorance must make things easier and make clear, decide on that which is necessary and omits that which is not.\textsuperscript{58} By extension, it is suggestive that the modern historian should enjoy and cultivate the advantages of in-built ignorance necessary for himself to come nearer to the accuracy of the facts and his times.\textsuperscript{59} By inference, that is exactly what Thucydides did. He allowed his ignorance about what was happening in the Athenian and Spartan camps to motivate his incessant check of facts thoroughly as possible so that he can write an account well supported with evidence.\textsuperscript{60} Thus, the inherent ignorance should help the historian to discover the few significant facts and turn them into facts of history, and to discard the many insignificant facts as unhistorical.\textsuperscript{61}

It is believed that no material or document can talk for itself or be presented as a historical fact until the historiographer works on the material(s) and decode it. This means that no matter where the historian gets his facts, they still need to be processed by the historian before he can make the necessary use of the facts, and how he makes use of them. This is what Edward H. Carr calls, “the processing process”\textsuperscript{62} which is evidenced in Thucydides Book I.22 as he (Thucydides) says he has thoroughly checked his sources and rationalized it appropriately, and finally processed by way of recording for future generations.

\textbf{Conclusion}

To summarise, the article has demonstrated that Thucydides was not just any ordinary writer of Greek history but also a historian who knew how historiography is supposed to be done by drawing our attention to some issues he raises in Book I of his histories. By interpreting his comments and juxtaposing them to contemporary understanding and concepts of historiography, especially from E. H. Carr’s point of view, we can undeniably say and understand with Thucydides that in matters of historiographical approach, his predecessors came less close to Thucydides conception of historiography. Thucydides tried to demonstrate to his contemporaries in Book I.1, 20-22 that he knew about what undergoes historiography just as we conceive of historiographical elements today. In line with this, we can assume

\textsuperscript{58}Ibid., 6.
\textsuperscript{61}Ibid.
that contemporary discussions and concepts of historiography are the
developments and adaption from Thucydides’ conception of historiography by
contemporary historians and historiographers.
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