INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.
- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.
- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.

Claxton, Cynthia Lois

THE ROLE AND PERFORMANCE OF HERODOTUS AS NARRATOR OF THE "HISTORIES"

University of Washington PH.D. 1987

The Role and Performance of Herodotus
as Narrator of the *Histories*

by

Cynthia Lois Claxton

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington
1987

Approved by Lawrence J. Bliquez
(Chairperson of Supervisory Committee)

Program Authorized
to Offer Degree Classics

Date 12/12/86

Doctoral Dissertation

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral degree at the University of Washington, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for copying or reproduction of this dissertation may be referred to University Microfilm, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom the author has granted "the right to reproduce and sell (a) copies of the manuscript in microform and/or (b) printed copies of the manuscript made from microform."

Signature Cynthia L. Clayton

Date December 12, 1986

University of Washington

Abstract

THE ROLE AND PERFORMANCE OF HERODOTUS
AS NARRATOR OF THE *HISTORIES*

by Cynthia Lois Claxton

Chairperson of the Supervisory Committee: Professor Lawrence J. Bliquez
Department of Classics

This dissertation examines the importance of Herodotus as narrator of the *Histories*. It is noted that Herodotus assumes the stance of both an overt and covert narrator. Herodotus narrates most of the *Histories* in a very overt fashion. There are sections, however, that Herodotus relates in a much more covert manner by withdrawing his own *persona* as investigator and historian. In these passages, he narrates the events in such a way that they are presented as virtual mimetic reenactments of their original occurrence. In type of presentation, Herodotus keeps his presence as narrator as minimally detectable as possible so that the reader will have the impression that he has been shown what happened rather than merely told.

Chapter One discusses overt and covert narration and Herodotus' place in the development of Greek historiography. Chapter Two discusses Herodotus' use of overt narration and the types of personal statements made by Herodotus are noted. Additional examples of these types of personal expressions are listed in four appendices. In Chapter Three, Herodotus' use of covert narration in the telling of a traditional tale is examined. The analysis of three passages reveals how a covert narrator may shape his

readers' perceptions of a character without directly intruding into the text, how important dialogue is in mimetic presentation and how direct speech may be used to present information directly from the points of view of the characters. Herodotus' use of covert narration in his account of historical events is discussed in Chapter Four. Through the analysis of three passages, it is seen that Herodotus adapts the techniques of covert narration discussed in Chapter Three to his account of certain historical events. Herodotus effaces his presence in order to give the impression that a mimetically accurate account is being presented. He recognizes that this type of narration provides a self-explanatory picture of the event. The historian/narrator allows the historical personages to tell their own story. The points of view of the individuals and the conflicting issues in the event thus avoid the appearance of having been filtered through the eyes of the historian.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professor Lawrence J. Bliquez for his guidance, encouragement and patience. I am especially grateful for his keen ability to put things in proper perspective and for his good humor throughout the long course of this research. To Professor Pierre MacKay goes my appreciation for his insightful comments on the drafts of this dissertation and for his help with many of my computer problems. I would also like to thank Professor Merle K. Langdon for his help and suggestions. To Andrea Deagon of Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand go my thanks for her encouragement and useful comments. And finally, I would like to thank Mark D. Ohman for the understanding and patience that can come only from one who has already accomplished the arduous task of writing a dissertation.

To my parents

Chapter One

Introduction

Most narratives presuppose the existence of a narrator.[1] This is no less true for a factual work than it is for a fictional one. To put it simply, if the reader feels that he is being told something, there must be someone who is doing the telling. In a fictional work, the story may be told by the author himself, by any one of his characters or by a separately conceived figure who acts as narrator but who is not a participant in the action. In a factual work, such as a biography or history, the narrative is generally related by the researcher himself. However, the historian or biographer must make many of the same choices that a writer of fiction makes in respect to the manner in which the work is to be narrated. Chief among these decisons is the choice of whether the narrator's *persona* should be overtly manifested or one more covertly active. That is to say, the author must ascertain what stance he wishes the narrator, whatever his identity, to take. He must decide whether the narrator's position should be bold and intrusive or self-effacing and unobtrusive. The overt narrator is free to

[1]Some modern writers try to effect the illusion that the story is entirely nonnarrated. Such a work gives the impression of being "untouched transcripts of characters' behavior" that record "nothing beyond the speech or verbalized thoughts of characters". See S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse, Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, 1978; Cornell Paperbacks, 1983), pp. 166-69.

make comments in his own person, to pass judgment upon the actions of the characters or to offer his own interpretations of the event. The covert narrator, however, keeps his own presence as narrator as minimally detectable as possible while telling the story. He avoids personal commentary of all sorts and tries to remain behind the scenes.[2] There are, of course, many points along the line from overt to covert narration and the designation of one narrator as covert and another one as overt is, to some degree, a relative one. In addition, the techniques employed by narrators of both types are as much dependent upon their authors' historical periods as they are upon stylistic preferences. These generalizations, however, reveal the basic ideas behind the concepts of overt and covert narration.

There are three distinct moments discernible in the composition of a historical work.[3] The historian must first read the documents or, in the case of oral history, interview his informants. Once he has familiarized himself with all of the evidence, he then evaluates and criticizes that evidence in order to reconstruct an accurate picture of the particular event or period he is investigating. The final step comes in the retelling of what he has learned and it is at this point that the historian must decide how he wants to narrate the work. Among the choices that the historian must make is the decision whether he will take an overt or covert stance as narrator of his history. In a historical work, the *personae* of the author and narrator

---

[2]For a discussion of covert and overt narrators and narration, see Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, pp. 196-262.

[3]P. Veyne, *Writing History: Essay on Epistemology*, trans. M. Moore-Rinvolucri (Middleton, Conn., 1984), p. 292, n. 10.

are, at least in general terms, identical[4] and so the author is, in essence, deciding what image of himself as researcher, historian *and* narrator he desires to project.

A historian's role as narrator of his work is an immensely important one whose significance should not be minimized. For it is the historian *as narrator* who not only decides what image of himself to project but who also sets the tone for the entire work and directs the attention of his readers in a particular pre-determined manner to each event reported or individual mentioned. In addition, the historian as narrator must decide what elements of the story or event to emphasize or omit; determine whether to compress some points for the sake of dramatizing others; and select the perspective or point of view from which the story should be told or the event recounted. Now the importance of these considerations is influenced by the degree to which a particular historical piece is valued as a work of literature by its original audience. Few modern historians would put matters of style before historical considerations, but to historians from antiquity to the nineteenth century, literary concerns were as

[4]Modern literary critics would argue that the *persona* of the actual author does not enter into any work of literature, fiction or non-fiction, at all. What is present is the *persona* of the 'implied' author, who is really a calculated projection of the real author. The narrator, even when identified with the 'implied' author, is thus even further removed from the real author. These distinctions, though perhaps true in an absolute sense, do not seem to be helpful in the study of Herodotus and indeed, introduce an unnecessary degree of complexity to this examination. The term 'implied' author will consequently be avoided. For a general discussion of the concept, cf. W. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd ed. (Chicago, 1983), p. 151; Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, pp. 147-51.

important to the compositional process as the subject matter itself. Literary fashions and preferences had nearly as much influence in the composition of history as they did in the writing of fictional works.[5] For example, a characteristic feature of both fictional and historical writings of the eighteenth century is the ironic distance set up between the narrator and the narrative and the complicity between reader and narrator that results from the establishment of this ironic distance. In the nineteenth century, however, writers of fiction and history replaced the overt *persona* of the eighteenth century narrator with one who operated in a more covert fashion in order to present an unproblematic and more harmonious work.[6] While it would be an overstatement to claim that the historians of antiquity exhibited profound self-awareness of their role as narrators, it is true that these authors paid attention to the various narrative techniques they might employ and to their own activity as narrator of their works.[7] For, the ancient historian was acutely aware that his popular success depended not only upon his abilities as a competent researcher of his subject matter but also upon his skill as a narrator who must be able to present a masterful and compelling account of the historical event. Consequently, the recognition of the importance of this aspect of the ancient historian's task results in a finer appreciation of the historical text.

---

[5]For an interesting discussion of the varying relationships and correspondences between the writing of history and fiction, see L. Gossman, "History and Literature: Reproduction or Signification" in *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding,* eds. R.H. Canary and H. Kozicki (Madison, Wis., 1978), pp. 3-39.

[6]Gossman, "History and Literature: Reproduction or Signification," pp. 22-24.

[7]See, for example, Thucydides, I.22.

This study actually began as an examination of the personal statements made by Herodotus throughout the *Histories* and gradually evolved to an investigation of the historian's presence in the work as narrator of the course of events. The evolution grew out of the recognition that the techniques used by Herodotus while narrating the work vary, depending upon the subject matter under discussion and his intent behind relaying each item of information. It was noticed that while Herodotus frequently makes comments in his own person and generally narrates the text in a very overt fashion, there are certain passages in which he refrains from personal commentary and assumes the *persona* of a covert narrator. Many commentators have noted Herodotus' willingness to inform his readers when he observed something personally, whom he questioned and whether or not he regarded the information he received as reliable evidence.[8] However, it has not been recognized that there are moments in the course of the *Histories* during which Herodotus is not as willing to put his scholarship and evaluative abilities on display through the inclusion of the types of personal commentary that are typical of overt narration. These passages are generally those that are presented in a scenic fashion, much in the manner of epic or drama. In such passages, the tempo of the passage is slowed so that each step in the event may be presented as an individualized

[8]See, for example, H. Verdin, *De historische-kritische Methode van Herodotus* (Brussels, 1971); V. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton, 1982), pp. 50-52; R. W. Macan, *Herodotus, The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books*, Vol. 1. Introduction, Text with Notes (London, 1895; reprint ed., New York, 1973), pp. cii-cvi; W.R. Connor, "Narrative Discourse in Thucydides" in *The Greek Historians. Literature and History.* (Saratoga, Calif., 1985), p. 5.

moment. Direct speech plays an important role and the actions, words, thoughts and feelings of the historical participants are presented in the fullest detail. Because this type of presentation may seem natural for those passages that fall more firmly into the category of folktale[9] than into that of pure history, it is surprising to find this method of narration used selectively in some passages that relate historical events. These passages are presented with such vividness and in such detail that Herodotus' readers are left with the impression that they have just witnessed a mimetic reenactment of the original event.

In his book, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome,* C. Fornara recognizes and discusses the mimetic nature of ancient historical narratives. He specifically credits Herodotus with adapting what is, in origin, a Homeric technique to the needs of historiography.[10] He observes that a consequence of this tendency to present events mimetically is "the

[9]E.g., Solon and Croesus (1.29-33); Atys and Adrastus (1.34-45); the birth of Cyrus (1.108-22); Polycrates and Amasis (3.39-43); Demaratus and the questions regarding his birth (6.61-70).

[10]C. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome,* (Berkeley, 1983), pp. 31-32. Cf. W.R. Connor, "Narrative Discourse in Thucydides," p. 15. Conor notes the ability of Thucydides to recreate events and moods "through the dramatic interplay between abstraction and sudden flashes of vividness" that produces "the illusion that we are ourselves present, witnessing events," but he does not recognize Herodotus' ability to achieve nearly the same effect. He sees Herodotus as one who keeps the "problematic" of history always before the eyes of his readers by sharing with them the various difficulties he had in his research (p. 5). This generalization is certainly true for most of the *Histories* but there are specific passages in the work in which Herodotus' presentation approaches Thucydides' ability to recreate events and moods.

fusion of the factual basis of the record with its imaginative reenactment by the writer"[11] and also notes,

> The need for imaginative recreation and inferential elaboration from the facts was a necessary consequence of the demands placed on all subsequent historians by Herodotus when he decided, following Homer, to present events with verisimilitude. Everything from needful circumstantial detail to the virtual reproduction of the thoughts of leading figures was injected into the historical narrative, often on the mere grounds of probability.[12]

Fornara's work has been enormously helpful during the course of this research and his influence will be evident throughout this examination. However, Fornara does not recognize the important part Herodotus himself plays as narrator of this type of mimetic presentation. It is around this point that the following discussion will focus. In a mimetic presentation, Herodotus assumes the stance of a covert narrator whose omniscience allows the reporting of all details but who keeps his own *persona* behind the scenes in order to present the event as a seamless whole that mimetically recreates the entire scene. Examples of such passages are: Cyrus and the Massagetae (1.204-14); the false Smerdis and the death of Cambyses (3.61-67); the seven conspirators and the massacre of the Magi (3.68-84); the prelude to the Ionian revolt, including the recall of Histaeus to Susa (5.23-24) and the actions of Aristagoras (5.30-34); Aristagoras and Cleomenes (5.49-51); Demaratus and Xerxes (7.101-105); the Greek embassy to Gelon (7.153-63) and the advice of Mardonius and Artemisia to Xerxes after the battle of Salamis (8.100-102). Other similar examples may also

[11]Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, p. 135.
[12]*Ibid.*, p. 134.

be found. And while these passages have been studied for their contributions to our understanding of the historical events, little attention has been paid to the manner in which they have been narrated and how this differs from the way in which Herodotus relates the greater portion of the *Histories*.

This investigation will thus examine Herodotus' role and performance as the narrator of the *Histories* and the different techniques he used. It will show that while Herodotus prefers an overt stance as narrator for most of the *Histories*, he reserves a more covert stance for certain passages for which he desires a more specialized presentation. Chapter Two will begin the discussion with the consideration of Herodotus' activity as an overt narrator. Since the primary characteristic of an overt narrator is his tendency to make comments in his own person, the various types of personal commentary that Herodotus makes will be examined. It will be seen that though Herodotus most often makes comments in his own person in those passages in which he is relating ethnographic or geographic information, he does generally feel free to make similar comments in passages that treat historical matters, provided he has not assumed the stance of a covert narrator. In these passages of overt narration, Herodotus keeps his *persona* as narrator in the forefront of his material by frequently informing his readers of the difficulties he encountered in his researches, where his investigations led him and the relative reliability of his evidence. His stance is that of a researcher who is fully in control of his evidence and who desires to share with his readers not only what he learned but the scope and progression of the entire investigative process.

Chapter Three will examine Herodotus' activity as narrator at its most covert. It will be seen that Herodotus assumes his most covert stance when relating stories in which traditional or folkloric elements[13] dominate whatever historical kernels may be present in the tale. Three of these passages will be examined in order to determine how Herodotus sets out to tell a tale. While it is true that most of the material is traditional, Herodotus certainly operates with enough freedom so that he may determine what aspects of a story to highlight and what techniques to use to create desired effects such as irony, suspense or humor. In fact, it is Herodotus' activity as covert narrator that is responsible for guiding his readers' perceptions of the story. He is there behind the scenes at every step of the story, shaping and coloring the tale so that his readers will receive it in the manner he desires. But because Herodotus keeps his own *persona* hidden, the reader is unaware of his influence and has the impression that he has been presented with an unmediated recreation of the original tale. It will come as no surprise to note that Herodotus owes far more to the epic poets and dramatists than to the logographers for the manner in which he relates a traditional story or tale.

Chapter Four will approach Herodotus' use of covert narration from a different angle. The particular focus will be the use Herodotus makes of covert narration in passages that deal with the events of the Persian Wars. It will be noted that there are certain historical events for whose narration Herodotus assumes a covert stance. Rather than remaining at the forefront

[13]For a study of the specific folktale elements in many of the stories in the *Histories*, see W. Aly, *Volksmarchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen.* 2nd ed. Gottingen, 1969.

of his material, informing his readers when one source disagreed with another or whether or not he felt that he could believe a particular story, Herodotus withdraws from the account and presents the event in a manner more akin to that which he utilizes while telling a traditional tale. The account is a finished product; all notice of the discrepancies between sources and other problems have been removed. He works behind the scenes in order to shape his readers' perceptions of the event rather than overtly revealing his presence and his own opinions. He relates the event from the points of view of the actual participants by giving full and direct expression to their words, thoughts and motives. This omniscient stance leaves his readers with the feeling that they have observed a recreation of the event that is mimetically accurate and convincing. There is thus no need for the historian to explain what has happened. The event is self-explanatory through the manner of its presentation. In addition to examining Herodotus' use of covert narration in three specific historical passages, particular attention will be paid to the narrative surrounding these sections in order to see how Herodotus integrates a covert stance as narrator with a more overt one. The difference between the two stances and how they affect the entire narrative will be able to be appreciated more fully as a consequence.

To apprehend fully the achievement of any author, it is necessary to consider his work in comparison to that of his predecessors and contemporaries. For only in this manner will one be able to detect whether or not the author has followed the conventions of his genre and if he has not, what changes or developments he has made. It is indeed unfortunate that the work of the Ionian logographers has reached us in such fragmentary

condition and that there is some debate over the dates of several of these authors. The matter is complicated further by the general unwillingness of Herodotus to mention his predecessors and contemporaries by name.[14] With the exception of Hecataeus, whom Herodotus does mention,[15] it is, as a consequence of these various factors, impossible to be absolutely certain whether or not Herodotus was acquainted with the work of specific logographers. However, it does appear likely that in addition to Hecataeus, Herodotus was also familiar with the work of Xanthus.[16]

Hecataeus of Miletus is considered to be the first prose-writer in the fields of geography and mythology and he is credited with two works, variously called the **Γενεηλογίαι, Ἡρωλογία** or **Ἱστορία** and the **Περιήγησις** or **Περίοδος Γῆς**. His period of activity seems to have been near the end of the sixth century.[17] As with all of the logographers, his work survives only in fragments; there are thirty-five fragments remaining from his mythological work and nearly four hundred from the **Περιήγησις.** Most of the fragments from the **Περιήγησις** consist only of a phrase or two. It is, as a consequence, difficult to come to any definitive conclusions regarding subject matter as well as style.

---

[14]Herodotus prefers to refer to these individuals in more general and somewhat disparaging terms. E.g., **Ἕλληνες δὲ λέγουσι ἄλλα τε μάταια πόλλα καὶ ὡς...** (2.2.5); **Εἰ ὧν βουλόμεθα γνώμῃσι τῇσι Ἰώνων χρᾶσθαι τὰ περὶ Αἴγυπτου...** (2.15.1); **Ἀλλὰ Ἑλλήνων μὲν τινες ἐπίσημοι βουλόμενοι γενέσθαι σοφίην ἔλεξαν...**(2.20.1). Cf. L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, (Oxford, 1939; reprint ed. Westport, Conn., 1975), p. 13.

[15]2.143; 5.36; 5.125-6; 6.137.

[16]The evidence for Charon of Lampsacus and Hellanicus of Lesbos is less certain. See Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, pp. 139-235.

[17]Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, pp. 25-26.

That Herodotus used Hecataeus as a source is certain not only because Herodotus himself mentions his predecessor, thus revealing his acquaintance with his work, but also because ancient authorities comment on this dependence[18] and because there are several passages in the *Histories* that resemble closely extant fragments from Hecataeus' work.[19] In addition, there are certain passages in the *Histories* for which Hecataean influence may be inferred because of similarities in subject matter or ideas.[20] However, for the purposes of this investigation, the question of whether Herodotus used Hecataueus' work as a source for his material is not as important as whether or not he was influenced by his predecessor's style of narration. And it is in this respect that the fragmentary nature of Hecataeus' work is especially regrettable. For, the extant fragments do not provide enough material for an adequate evaluation of Hecataeus' techniques of description and style of narration. One can only note what the ancients said about Hecataeus in this respect; it is not possible to test accurately the reliability of their claims. Hermogenes noted that the pure and clear style of Hecataeus is simpler and less varied than that of Herodotus[21] while Demetrius indicated that the sentences of Hecataeus were short and abrupt.[22] For the purposes of this investigation, however, the most interesting ancient testimonium is a statement made by

[18]See F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Berlin, 1923), 1 T 1, 18, 22. Hereafter cited as "*FGrHist*".
[19]See A.B. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II*, Vol. I: *Introduction* (Leiden, 1975), pp. 128-29. For a complete discussion of Herodotus' use of the work of Hecataeus, see pp. 127-39.
[20]Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II*, 1:129.
[21]*FGrHist*, 1 T 18.
[22]*FGrHist*, 1 T 19.

the author of *On the Sublime*[23] who quotes a passage of Hecataeus to illustrate how both Homer and Hecataeus abruptly introduced the direct speech of their characters. The author writes,

> Ἔτι γε μὴν ἔσθ ὅτε περὶ προσώπου διηγούμενος ὁ συγγραφεὺς ἐξαίφνης παρενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ πρόσωπον ἀντιμεθίσταται, καὶ ἔστι τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶδος ἐκβολή τις πάθους.
>
> Ἕκτωρ δὲ Τρώεσσιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν ἀΰσας,
> νηυσὶν ἐπισσεύεσθαι, ἐᾶν δ ἔναρα βροτόεντα.
> ὃν δ ἂν ἐγὼν ἀπάνευθε νεῶν ἐθέλοντα νοήσω,
> αὐτοῦ οἱ θάνατον μητίσομαι.
>
> οὐκοῦν τὴν μὲν διήγησιν ἅτε πρέπουσαν ὁ ποιητὴς προσῆψεν ἑαυτῷ, τὴν δ ἀπότομον ἀπειλὴν τῷ θυμῷ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος ἐξαπίνης οὐδὲν προδηλώσας περιέθηκεν· ἐψύχετο γάρ, εἰ παρενετίθει· 'ἔλεγε δὲ τοιά τινα καὶ τοῖα ὁ Ἕκτωρ·' νυνὶ δ ἔφθακεν ἄφνω τὸν μεταβαίνοντα ἡ τοῦ λόγου μετάβασις. 2. διὸ καὶ ἡ πρόχρησις τοῦ σχήματος τότε, ἡνίκα ὀξὺς ὁ καιρὸς ὢν διαμέλλειν τῷ γράφοντι μὴ διδῷ, ἀλλ εὐθὺς | ἐπαναγκάζῃ μεταβαίνειν ἐκ προσώτων εἰς πρόσωπα, ὡς καὶ παρὰ τῷ Ἑκαταίῳ· Κῆϋξ δὲ ταῦτα δεινὰ ποιούμενος αὐτίκα ἐκέλευε τοὺς Ἡρακλείδας ἐπιγόνους ἐκχωρεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ὑμῖν δυνατός εἰμι ἀρῆγειν. ὡς μὴ ὢν αὐτοί τε ἀπόλησθε κἀμὲ τρώσητε, ἐς ἄλλον τινὰ δῆμον ἀποίχεσθαι. [24] (27, 1–2)

(There is further the case in which a writer, when relating something about a person, suddenly breaks off and converts himself into that selfsame person. This species of figure is a kind of outburst of passion:

> Then with a far-ringing shout to the Trojans Hector cried,
> Bidding them rush on the ships, bidding leave the spoils blood-dyed-

[23]The attribution of the work to Longinus is not universal. See W.R. Roberts, *Longinus, On the Sublime* with text, introduction and translation, (Cambridge, 1935; reprint ed. New York, 1979), pp. 1-23.
[24]Cf. *FGrHist* 1 F 30.

> And whomso I mark from the galleys aloof on the farther side,
> I will surely devise his death.
>
> The poet assigns the task of narration, as is fit, to himself, but the abrupt threat he suddenly, with no note of warning, attributes to the angered chief. It would have been frigid had he inserted the words, 'Hector said so and so.' As it is, the swift transition of the narrative has outstripped the swift transitions of the narrator. 2. Accordingly this figure should be used by preference when a sharp crisis does not suffer the writer to tarry but constrains him to pass at once from one person to another. An example will be found in Hecataeus: 'Ceyx treated the matter gravely, and straightway bade the descendants of Heracles depart; for I am not able to succour you. In order, therefore, that ye may not perish yourselves and injure me, get you gone to some other country.'[25])

This passage from *On the Sublime* reveals that Hecataeus used *oratio recta* in his genealogical work. It is impossible, however, to determine to what extent he employed the technique and whether or not he also included direct speeches in his ethnographic work. Throughout the course of this examination, the importance of Herodotus' use of *oratio recta* will be noted and discussed. Because of Herodotus' undoubted acquaintance with Hecataeus' work, it is reasonable to ask whether or not Herodotus' use of *oratio recta* owed anything to Hecataeus'. Again, the fragmentary nature of the evidence makes a definitive answer to this question impossible. Since the full extent and nature of Hecataeus' use of *oratio recta* is uncertain, it cannot be determined whether Herodotus was influenced more by Hecataeus' use of direct speech than he was by Homer's.

The ground is even less certain in respect to Xanthus the Lydian and his influence upon Herodotus. Works attributed to him include a Λυκιακά in four books and possibly a Μαγικά and a work dealing with the life of

---

[25]The translation is Roberts' who notes that the verse translations in his volume were done by Mr. A.S. Way. See Roberts, *Longinus, On the Sublime*, p. 113.

Empedocles.[26] He is thought to have been a contemporary of Herodotus and his period of activity may have extended down to the time of Thucydides.[27] Whether or not Herodotus used Xanthus as a source is a matter for debate but there are several subjects that both authors treat. Both Xanthus and Herodotus include the story of the industrious woman who spins her spindle while walking to the spring to fetch water and to water her horse, though in Herodotus' version she is a Paeonian not a Mysian.[28] In addition, there are versions of the stories of Croesus on the pyre and of Gyges in both works.[29] It is, of course, impossible to prove that Herodotus was dependent upon Xanthus for these stories since both authors could have used the same source that is no longer extant.

As is the case of Hecataeus, there is a testimonium concerning Xanthus that is particularly tantalizing. According to Ephorus, Herodotus got his 'starting-point' from Xanthus. The statement, preserved in Athenaeus, claims,

> ..."Ἔφορος ὁ συγγραφεὺς μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ ὡς παλαιοτέρου ὄντος καὶ Ἡροδότωι τὰς ἀφορμὰς δεδωκότος.[30]

---

[26]Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, pp. 117-19.
[27]Dion. Hal., *De Thuc*. 5.
[28]Xanthus' version is preserved in the history of Nicolaus of Damascus whose work is generally believed to be based on that of Xanthus. See *FGrHist* 90 F 71. For Herodotus' version, see 5.12-15.
[29]For the Croesus story, see *FGrHist* 90 F 68 and *Histories*, 1. 86-88 and for the account of Gyges, see *FGrHist* 90 F 47 and *Histories*, 1.13. For a discussion of whether or not Herodotus is dependent upon Xanthus for these stories, see Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, pp. 128-34.
[30]*FGrHist* 765 T 5 (Athen. 12, 11, p. 515 DE).

What Ephorus meant by the word 'ἀφορμάς' is uncertain. Pearson suggests that "Herodotus found inspiration in the work of Xanthus; that he took his idea of historiography, his combination of historical narrative with anecdote, from the *Lydiaca* of Xanthus; that Xanthus gave Herodotus a 'starting-point', 'something to go on', even 'provided him with a model'."[31] But did this 'starting-point' or 'model' have to do with subject matter or means of description and narration? It is impossible to decide. Most of our information about Xanthus comes from Nicolaus of Damascus whose histories are thought to have been based on the work of Xanthus. It is difficult, however, to determine whether the stylistic features and techniques of narration in Nicolaus' work were also influenced by Xanthus or whether they are Nicolaus' own. Nor do the fragments of Xanthus' work itself allow for any conclusions in respect to Xanthus' influence over Herodotus in matters of style; they are simply too fragmentary to provide any really firm evidence. We are thus left with the notion that Xanthus provided some sort of starting-point to Herodotus, but what precisely that entailed remains a matter of speculation.

Another predecessor of Herodotus has already been mentioned.[32] It is, of course, Homer. The Homeric qualities of Herodotus' work have been noted since antiquity.[33] While discussing similarities between the two authors, C. Fornara notes,

---

[31]Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, p. 109.
[32]See above, p. 6-7.
[33]Cf. 'Longinus', *On the Sublime*, 13, 3: μόνος Ἡρόδοτος Ὁμηρικώτατος ἐγένετο;

> The most fundamental similarity linking the two works, however, concerns the *means* of description employed, for Herodotus accomodated Homer's instruments of poetic representation to his prose work.
>
> Nothing in the tradition of Ionian *historia* suggested to Herodotus that he turn the results of his inquiries into narrative pictures of events that he had never seen, thus cutting himself free from his sources, especially in books 7-9, to create the illusion that he *was* the observer of the deeds under description. Our habituation to books and to the quotation of speeches they contain dulls our appreciation of this remarkable artistic innovation.

He continues,

> Herodotus' *Histories* represent a fusion of prose and poetry, of the Homeric epic and now an utterly transformed Ionian historiography. History thereafter remained a mimetic genre, devoted to the description of the memorable actions of men.[34]

But upon reflection, it must be acknowledged that only portions of the *Histories* are truly mimetic. The exceptions are not just the ethnographic and geographic passages of the *Histories*; much of the work that treats historical events cannot be said to be wholly mimetic. Those sections of the *Histories* that are related in overt narration, especially those in which Herodotus makes comments in his own person, are not mimetic. The obvious presence of the narrator keeps the readers from experiencing the passage as a mimetic reenactment of the event. It is only when Herodotus narrates an event in covert fashion by keeping his own presence behind the scenes that a truly mimetic effect is achieved. For in such a presentation, the reader has the impression that he is being shown what happened rather than simply

---

[34] C. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, pp. 31-32.

told. Much of the focus of this investigation will be upon how Herodotus set about to achieve this effect.

Before beginning the discussion of Herodotus as narrator of his work, it is necessary to consider a few ancillary points which have relevance for any study of Herodotus and his *Histories*. Firstly, one must always keep in mind that because Herodotus stands at the beginning of the development of Greek historiography, one can only speak of the tendencies found in his style and technique rather than of unswerving and dogmatic practices. Rather than this being an excuse for the lack of consistency on the part of Herodotus, it is a recognition of the difficulties he faced in the composition of a work on such a large scale, particularly since no single adequate model existed on which he could pattern his work. In addition, the fact that Herodotus most certainly lived and worked during a period of transition from a society more accustomed to oral literature to one familar and comfortable with works composed with the full potential of writing in mind[35] surely is responsible for much of the fluidity of Herodotus' technique and style. The *Histories* simultaneously looks backwards to

[35]For a discussion of the work of Herodotus as a transition point in the movement from oral to written literature, see V. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides*, pp. 294-95; E. Havelock, *Prologue to Greek Literacy* (Cincinnati, 1971), p. 60; M. L. Lang, *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse* (Cambridge, Mass., 1984), p. 52.

works orally composed[36] and also provides an inkling of all the thematic complexities and stylistic sophistication made possible by the written form.

No serious student of Herodotus may undertake any sort of investigation of his work without having to face, in some fashion at least, the question of how the *Histories* achieved its final form. It is no small triumph, however, to be able to state that Herodotean studies no longer seem to be dominated by the opposing and mutually exclusive theories of composition as proposed by the two schools known as the Separatists and the Unitarians. The Separatist theory, formulated chiefly in the landmark study by F. Jacoby in 1913,[37] suggested that Herodotus underwent some sort of developmental change from a geographer/ethnographer in the Ionian tradition to a full-fledged historian of the Persian Wars as an explanation of the varied texture and apparent independence of many parts of the work. Such an approach is not now seen as an obstacle to the appreciation of the final cohesiveness the work does seem to possess. Similarly, the Unitarian

---

[36]Some indications of the debt of Herodotus' work to the techniques of oral composition are self-conscious interruptions and asides, repetitions, and phrases which indicate what the narrator is about to relate (e.g., 1.192.1: **τὴν δὲ δύναμιν τῶν Βαβυλωνίων πολλοῖσι μὲν καὶ ἄλλοισι δηλώσω ὅση τις ἐστί, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ τῷδε.**) See A. Scobie, "Storytellers, Storytelling and the Novel in Graeco-Roman Antiquity," *RhM* 122 (1979): 255, 257. For a full discussion of Herodotus' debt to oral composition, see Lang, *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse.*

[37]F. Jacoby, "Herodot" in Pauly-Wissowa, et al., eds., *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. 2 (Stuttgart, 1913), col. 205-520, especially col. 341-43, 352-60, 379-80. Others who espouse the Separatist position in some form or another are K. von Fritz, "Herodotus and the Growth of Greek Historiography," *TAPA* 67 (1936): 315-40; J. E. Powell, *The History of Herodotus* (Cambridge, 1939).

viewpoint, as expressed in its extreme form by M. Pohlenz[38] who not only emphasized the clear subordination of the *Histories'* many parts to the whole but also claimed that Herodotus conceived its entire plan and scope from the very onset of his investigation, cannot be considered the only way to recognize and understand the overall design of the *Histories*. The current trend is far from an instance of wanting to have it both ways - a situation not uncommon in classical scholarship - rather, it stems from the recognition, as noted by C. Fornara, that "the 'unity' of a work need imply nothing as to its genesis."[39] Whether Herodotus initially was inspired by the logographic tradition and then later began to compose actual history and edit his previous material to fit in with that history or whether he underwent no change at all and composed the work in the order it now stands matters very little. Indeed, it is the result of the process of composition which ought now to be the object of critical attention rather than the steps which formed that process. A likely scenario may, of course, be created for the composition of the *Histories* but such a scenario, whatever its merits and probability, needs must remain in the realm of speculation. In this particular study, attention will be focused not so much upon the compositional problems of the *Histories* or even upon the

---

[38]M. Pohlenz, *Herodot, der erste Geschichtsscreiber des Abendlandes* (Leipzig, 1937; reprint ed., Darmstadt, 1973); Other scholars professing the Unitarian viewpoint include Sir J. L. Myres, *Herodotus, Father of History* (Oxford, 1953); P.-E. Legrand, *Herodote, Introduction*, 2nd ed., (Paris, 1955); H. R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland, 1966).

[39]C. Fornara, *Herodotus, An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford, 1971), p. 6. Cf. K. H. Waters, *Herodotos, the Historian: His Problems, Methods and Originality* (London, 1985), p. 55.

meaning and wider significance of what Herodotus relates, though these latter questions of course have particular value for any study of Herodotus. It will, rather, be centered around one of the means Herodotus utilized to convey that significance, viz. his role and presence as narrator of the account.

Chapter Two

The Researcher and his Evidence

One of the results of Herodotus' use of overt narration is that his readers are able to get a firm picture of how he went about his research. Though we may confidently assume that Herodotus utilized the same methods for his investigation throughout the entire work, it is through an examination of the passages that Herodotus narrates overtly that the clearest picture of Herodotus, the researcher, emerges. In these sections, Herodotus is quite explicit about his role as both the investigator and the narrator of the account. He frequently makes comments in his own person, telling us where he travelled, to whom he spoke, what he saw, what he accepted as reliable evidence and what he did not and how he reasoned and arrived at his conclusions. These passages give the impression that Herodotus is trying to establish his credentials as a researcher by making it clear to his audience that his methodology is not only sound but also firmly rooted in his investigative procedures from the very outset. This chapter will examine some of these passages with a view to highlighting Herodotus' use of overt narration. The specific topics which will be discussed are Herodotus' indications of his reliance on personal observation and inquiry, his admissions of the limits of his knowledge, his criticisms and judgments regarding his sources and informants and other expressions of personal

opinion and his tendency to include variant versions of a particular event. Evaluations of whether or not Herodotus correctly interpreted his evidence, or whether he is accurate in the various assertions he makes, will not be a part of this investigation. Rather, attention will be given to the particular types of statements made and to the image of Herodotus as the investigator and narrator of his research these statements create.

It is in Book Two[1], the Egyptian λόγος, that Herodotus' use of personal observation (αὐτοψία) and inquiry (ἱστορίη) as his predominant methods of research is most clearly delineated[2]. Herodotus places a great deal of emphasis upon what he himself saw in the course of his travels in

[1]For the most recent commentary on Book Two, see A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus. Book II*, 2 Vols. (Leiden, 1975-1976).

[2]For a select listing of the passages from the entire ***Histories*** that are indicative of Herodotus' use of observation and inquiry, see Appendix One.

Egypt.[3] Thus he states two times that he believes the account of the priests regarding the geography of Egypt because his own observations support their statements:

> Ταύτης ὦν τῆς χώρης τῆς εἰρημένης ἡ πολλὴ, κατά περ οἱ ἱρέες ἔλεγον, ἐδόκεε καὶ αὐτῷ μοι εἶναι ἐπίκτητος Αἰγυπτίοισι. τῶν γὰρ ὀρέων τῶν εἰρημένων τῶν ὑπὲρ Μέμφιν πόλιν κειμένων τὸ μεταξὺ ἐφαίνετό μοι εἶναί κοτε κόλπος θαλάσσης, ὥσπερ τά τε περὶ Ἴλιον καὶ Τευθρανίην καὶ Ἔφεσόν τε καὶ Μαιάνδρου πεδίον, ὡς γε εἶναι σμικρὰ ταῦτα μεγάλοισι συμβαλεῖν. (2.10.1)

> τὰ περὶ Αἴγυπτον ὦν καὶ τοῖσι λέγουσι αὐτὰ πείθομαι καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτω κάρτα δοκέω εἶναι, ἰδών τε τὴν Αἴγυπτον προκειμένεν τῆς ἐχομένης γῆς κογχύλιά τε φαινόμενα ἐπὶ

[3]O.K. Armayor has recently published several polemical articles in which he actually charges that Herodotus is lying whenever he says that he has visited a specific place. See "Sesotris and Herodotus' Autopsy of Thrace, Colchis, Inland Asia Minor, and the Levant," *HSCP* 84 (1982): 51-79; "Did Herodotus Ever Go to the Black Sea?" *HSCP* 82 (1978): 45-62; "Did Herodotus Ever Go to Egypt?" *JARCE* (1978): 59-71; "Herodotus' Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the Light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition," *TAPA* 108 (1978): 1-9. In his most recent publication, *Herodotus' Autopsy of the Fayoum: Lake Moeris and the Labyrinth of Egypt*, (Amsterdam, 1985), Armayor questions Herodotus' autopsy of Lake Moeris and the Labyrinth and the very existence of these monuments. He notes, "Lake Moeris and the Dodecarchs and their Labyrinth do not belong to history at all, but rather to the story-tellers of Ionia who built on Homer" (p. 7). Because Armayor's views regarding Herodotus have not been widely accepted (cf. W.K. Pritchett, "Some Recent Critiques on the Veracity of Herdotus" in *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography, Part IV (Passes)* (Berkeley, 1982), pp. 234-85), I prefer to take the traditional view that Herodotus is telling the truth when he makes a claim of autopsy. For a discussion of autopsy as a fundamental element in the methodology of fifth century Greek historians, see G. Schepens, *L' 'autopsie' dans la méthode des historiens grecs du V siècle avant J.-C.* (Brussels, 1980).

τοῖσι ὄρεσι καὶ ἄλμην ἐπανθέουσαν, ὥστε καὶ τὰς πυραμίδας δηλέεσθαι , καὶ ψάμμον μοῦνον Αἰγύπτου ὅρος τοῦτο τὸ ὑπὲρ Μέμφιος ἔχον, πρὸς δὲ τῇ χώρῃ οὔτε τῇ Ἀραβίῃ προσούρῳ ἐούσῃ τὴν Αἴγυπτον προσεικέλην οὔτε τῇ Λιβύῃ, οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ τῇ Συρίῃ (τῆς γὰρ Ἀραβίης τὰ παρὰ θάλασσαν Σύριοι νέμονται), ἀλλὰ μελάγγαιόν τε καὶ καταρρηγνυμένην ὥστε ἐοῦσαν ἰλύν τε καὶ πρόχυσιν ἐξ Αἰθιοπίης κατενηειγμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ. (2.12.1-2)[4]

In several other passages, Herodotus makes the distinction between what he himself was able to see in contrast to what he was told by others. He admits that although his information as far as Elephantine is based on autopsy, his account of places beyond this area is based only on what others told him (2.29.1);[5] he states later on that the first half of Book Two resulted from his own observations, inquiries and opinions and that the remaining portions will include what he heard from the Egyptians, augmented by autopsy when possible (2.99.1); and he freely acknowledges that he was only able to see the upper floor of the labyrinth near Lake Moeris and that what he relates of the lower floor is founded on hearsay (ἀκοή) alone (2.148.5)[6] The recognition by Herodotus that his audience may want to know on what source his account was based contributes greatly to

[4]Cf. 2.5; 2.7 for other observations of Herodotus concerning the geography of Egypt.

[5]See Lloyd, *Herodotus*, 2: 115-17 for a refutation of the argument that Herodotus never visited Elephantine.

[6]It is clear that Herodotus distinguished between material gathered from reliable sources (e.g. the Egyptian priests) as compared to that based on hearsay evidence alone. In addition, Herodotus does often attempt to test both types of accounts by the application of his own reasoning and logic. Cf., Waters, *Herodotus, the Historian. His Problems, Methods and Originality,* pp. 25, 90.

the overall impression that Herodotus was a careful researcher who understood the variable worth of different types of evidence. To Herodotus, information derived from his own personal autopsy had the greatest authority and that gained from the inquiry of a reliable source was reasonably trustworthy, especially if substantiated by autopsy, either his own or that of some other eyewitness[7]. Evidence collected through hearsay possessed the least degree of reliability but if used judiciously, could contribute meaningfully to the topic under discussion.

Herodotus' reliance upon inquiry is also very evident throughout the whole of Book Two. Herodotus tells us that he travelled to Tyre to get as much information as possible concerning Heracles from the priests of a temple there that was dedicated to that deity. Herodotus asked the priests how old the temple was (2.44.2: **ἐς λόγους δὲ ἐλθὼν τοῖσι ἱρεῦσι τοῦ θεοῦ εἰρόμην ὁκόσος χρόνος εἴη ἐξ οὗ σφι τὸ ἱρὸν ἵδρυται**) and left satisfied with the priests' answer (2.44.3)[8] He also asked the people of Chemmis why they alone of the Egyptians were visited by the god Perseus and why they had established games in his honor (2.91.5: **εἰρομένου δέ μευ ὅ τι σφι μούνοισι ἔωθε ὁ Περσεὺς ἐπιφαίνεσθαι καὶ ὅ τι κεχωρίδαται Αἰγυπτίων τῶν ἄλλων ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν τιθέντες**). In answer, Herodotus was told that Perseus' ancestors were Danaus and Lynceus who were Chemmites by birth. At 2. 150.2, Herodotus indicates that he asked the inhabitants around Lake Moeris what was done with the soil which had been

[7]That Herodotus sought eyewitnesses is clear from 3.115.2 and 4.16.1 where he states that he was not able to locate anyone who could give him an eyewitness account of the sea beyond the northwestern boundaries of Europe (3.115.2) or of Scythia beyond the region of the Issedones (4.16.1).
[8]Cf. 2.44.5.

removed when the lake had been excavated (ἐπείτε δὲ τοῦ ὀρύγματος τούτου οὐκ ὥρων τὸν χοῦν οὐδαμοῦ ἐόντα, ἐπιμελὲς γὰρ δή μοι ἦν, εἰρόμην τοὺς ἄγχιστα οἰκέοντας τῆς λίμνης ὅκου εἴη ὁ χοῦς ὁ ἐξορυχθείς). He then states that he had no problem believing the inhabitants' account because of similar method was used at Ninevah (2.150.2-3). It is important to note that Herodotus' inquiries, however, do not always produce results as in the instance when he asked the priests questions concerning the inundation of the Nile (2.19.1: τοῦ ποταμοῦ δὲ φύσιος πέρι οὔτε τι τῶν ἱρέων οὔτε ἄλλου οὐδενὸς παραλαβεῖν ἐδυνάσθην).[9]

Many commentators have noted that Herodotus, while conducting his inquiries, granted a considerable amount of authority to the Egyptian

[9]Cf. 2.19.3; 34.1.

priests.[10] He frequently contrasts their accounts with those of the Greeks whom Herodotus often felt were not reliably informed. After relating the priests' version of the language experiment performed by Psammetichus, Herodotus gives the Greek account, with a strong cautionary note prefacing

[10]Much of the discussion concerning Herodotus' use of the Egyptian priests as sources revolves around the question of their rank, particularly because not all of their information as reported by Herodotus is absolutely accurate. See Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II,* 1: 92-100 for a refutation of the theory that Herodotus' Egyptian informants were priests of a very low ranking. To Lloyd's mind, there is no reason to expect the Egyptian priests, whose daily lives concerned matters of ritual, to have an acute knowledge of their country's past. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides*, also discusses the trust Herodotus has in the Egyptian priests as reliable sources, though she overstates this point at times. See, especially, her second chapter, "The Discovery of "Historical Space": Herodotus and the Beginnings of Human History in Egypt," pp. 57, 60, 65, 76, 85. Though it is true that Herodotus generally preferred the accounts of the Egyptian priests to the Greek version of the story or event, Hunter is overemphasizing this tendency when she suggests that one of Herodotus' purposes in writing Book Two was to correct "tradition and history in the light of the genuine knowledge he had gained in Egypt" (p. 85). If this had been Herodotus' purpose behind the composition of Book Two, we may be well assured that he would have devoted more than four passages to this goal. For an earlier and opposing viewpoint, cf. W. A. Heidel, "Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus, Book II," *Mem. Am. Ac. Arts & Sciences* XVIII (2) (1935). Heidel believes that the bulk of Book Two derives not from the accounts of the Egyptian priests as Herodotus claims, but is merely an inadequate reworking of the work of Hecataeus. For a brief discussion of the unlikelihood of Heidel's claims, see W. Sieveling, "Herodot, 1928-1936," *JAW* 263 (1939), p. 137. Sieveking notes that the statement of Porphyry that specific chapters in the *Histories* are literal adoptions of passages in the work of Hecataeus makes it improbable that the entire book was dependent on Hecataeus. Sieveking also argues that the Egyptian trip of Herodotus would have been entirely superfluous if it did not result in any new information for Herodotus' work and that the excursus on Egypt is hardly justifiable if it does not present a wealth of previously unknown facts.

the story (2.2.5: Ἕλληνες δὲ λέγουσι ἄλλα τε μάταια πολλὰ καὶ ὡς γυναικῶν τὰς γλώσσας ὁ Ψαμμήτιχος ἐκταμὼν...). Similarly, Herodotus prefers the Egyptian version concerning the age of Heracles (2.44.5) and finds the Greek story that the Egyptians attempted to sacrifice Heracles ridiculous (2.45.1: λέγουσι δὲ πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα ἀνεπισκέπτως οἱ Ἕλληνες...).[11] For, he argues at 2.45.2, how could they have intended to sacrifice Heracles when they only sacrificed those few animals which religious custom permitted?

Perhaps the most discussed passage in which Herodotus prefers the Egyptian version of an event to a Greek one is the story of Helen (2.112-120),[12] and even in this instance Herodotus disparages the Greek account as being foolish (2.118.1: μάταιον λόγον). Herodotus says that he asked the priests what they knew about the story of Helen (2.113.1: ἔλεγον δέ μοι οἱ ἱρέες ἱστορέοντι τὰ περὶ Ἑλένην γενέσθαι ὧδε) and they told him that Paris and Helen had been shipwrecked on Egyptian shores while on their way to Troy and were sent for by the Egyptian king Proteus who had learned of their arrival from a man named Thonis. Paris was asked by Proteus who they were and where they were going and when Paris began to dissemble concerning the reason for Helen's presence with him, the entire story was revealed by his slaves. Proteus, angered at Paris' betrayal of Menelaus'

[11]Cf. 4.77 for another example of a Greek story that Herodotus finds foolish.
[12]For a discussion of this passage, see J. W. Neville, "Herodotus on the Trojan War," *G & R* 24 (1977): 3-12; F.J. Groten, Jr., "Herodotus' Use of Variant Versions," *Phoenix* 17 (1963): 79-87; H. Verdin, "Les remarques critiques d'Herodote et de Thucydide sur la poesie en tant que source historique," in *Historiographia Antiqua*, (Louvain, 1977), pp. 53-65; Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides*, pp. 52-61.

hospitality, sent Paris out of the country and said that he would keep Helen and her property in Egypt until Menelaos came for her. Herodotus believes that Homer knew this version of the story but rejected it as unsuitable for epic poetry and his artistic aims[13] (2.116.1: **αλλ' οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως ἐς τὴν ἐποποιίην εὐπρεπὴς ἦν τῷ ἑτέρῳ τῷ περ ἐχρήσατο**) but left evidence of his acquaintance with the story in *Iliad* VI.289ff. and *Odyssey* IV.227ff.; 351-2.[14] Herodotus then goes on to state why the Egyptian version of the story must be the correct one. He constructs an elaborate argument from probability to prove that the Homeric version of the Trojan War is historically unreliable by reasoning that if Helen had been at Troy, Priam would have returned her to the Greeks as it was unlikely that he would have risked the well-being of the city and that of his own family simply for the sake of Paris who was not even heir to the throne (2.120). The Trojan War then, whose historicity Herodotus does not doubt, was the result of the Greeks' refusal to believe the Trojans when they stated that Helen was not at Troy. This refusal was brought on, Herodotus believes, by the gods in order to demonstrate that evil deeds will be punished by the gods (2.120.5: **...ὡς τῶν μεγάλων ἀδικημάτων μεγάλαι εἰσὶ καὶ αἱ τιμωρίαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν**).[15]

Why is it that Herodotus granted the Egyptian priests such a great degree of reliability as sources? He certainly did not concede such

[13]Cf. Verdin, "Les remarques critiques," 59-61.
[14]These lines from the *Odyssey* are thought by most commentators to be interpolations. Cf. W.W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus,* 2 vols., corr. rpr. ed. (Oxford, 1928), 1: 224.
[15]This resort to the divine to explain the occurence of an event is not infrequent in the ***Histories.*** Cf. 7.137.1.

authority to his other informants concerning whom he is considerably more critical.[16] One of the reasons for his confidence in the priests is his recognition of the obvious care they took in preserving their traditions. In Herodotus' mind, such care guarantees the reliability of the information.[17] There is, however, another reason for Herodotus' trust in the priests that is even more important. At the end of their account concerning the events of the Trojan war, the priests state that some of the facts they related resulted from their own inquiries and that the others were clearly known because the events had occurred in their own country (2.119.3: **τούτων δὲ τὰ μὲν ἱστορίῃσι ἔφασαν ἐπίστασθαι, τὰ δὲ παρ' ἑωυτοῖσι γενόμενα ἀτρεκέως ἐπιστάμενοι λέγειν**). This statement reveals why Herodotus had so much trust in the Egyptian priests as reliable sources. Both Herodotus and the priests used the same techniques of investigation, viz. personal observation and inquiry. Herodotus has a great deal of confidence in his own methodology and the Egyptian priests have gained his trust chiefly because of their use of similar methods.

There are also passages from books other than Two which are indicative of Herodotus' reliance on autopsy. He relates that the shield and

---

[16]Cf., for example, Herodotus' attitude toward the Scythians' own account of their origin at 4.5.1.

[17]Cf. 2.77.1: **Αὐτῶν δὲ δὴ Αἰγυπτίων οἳ μὲν περὶ τὴν σπειρομένην Αἴγυπτον οἰκέουσι, μνήμην ἀνθρώπων πάντων ἐπασκέοντες μάλιστα λογιώτατοί εἰσι μακρῷ τῶν ἐγὼ ἐς διάπειραν ἀπικόμην.** Cf. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides*, p. 60, 74, who also emphasizes the antiquity of the Egyptian civilization and the care its priests took in preserving records as elements which helped to produce Herodotus' trust in the priests as reliable sources. See also, Groten, "Herodotus' Use of Variant Versions," p. 81.

spear of solid gold dedicated to the shrine of Amphiaraus by Croesus were still to be seen in Thebes in the temple of Ismenian Apollo (1.52: **τὰ ἔτι καὶ ἀμφότερα ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν κείμενα ἐν Θήβῃσι καὶ Θηβέων ἐν τῷ νηῷ τοῦ Ἰσμηνίου Ἀπόλλωνος**) and that the chains brought by the Spartans to bind the Tegeans in slavery were preserved in Tegea in the temple of Athena Alea as a memorial of the Tegean victory (1.66.4: **αἱ δὲ πέδαι αὗται ἐν τῇσι ἐδεδέατο ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν σόαι ἐν Τεγέῃ, περὶ τὸν νηὸν τῆς Ἀλέης Ἀθηναίης κρεμάμεναι**).[18] Herodotus has seen the gold mines on Thasos (6.47.1: **εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ μέταλλα ταῦτα...**) and considers the Phoenician mines on the island the most remarkable. A more extraordinary sight were the Egyptian and Persian skulls that Herodotus saw on the battlefield near the Pelusian mouth of the Nile which differed dramatically from one another in thickness (3.12.1: **θῶμα δὲ μέγα εἶδον πυθόμενος παρὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων·**) and Herodotus adds that he saw a similar phenomenon at Papremis (3.12.4: **εἶδον δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ὅμοια τούτοισι ἐν Παπρήμι τῶν ἅμα Ἀχαιμένεϊ τῷ Δαρείου διαφθαρέντων ὑπὸ Ἰνάρω τοῦ Λίβυος**).

Herodotus also indicates in books other than Two when his method of **ἱστορίη** has yielded material for his work. At the end of his discussion of the animals in the area of Libya inhabited by nomads, he states that he has reported such information as his inquiries permitted (4.192.3: **...ὅσον ἡμεις**

[18]The phrase **ἐς ἐμέ** or a similar construction does not necessitate autopsy but does imply it. Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary*, 1: 18. For other passages in which Herodotus uses this phrase, see 1.92.1, 181.2; 2.130.1, 181.5; 3.97.3; 4.124.1; 5.77.3, 88.3; 8.39.2, 121.1.

ἱστορέοντες ἐπὶ μακρότατον οἷοί τε ἐγενόμεθα ἐξικέσθαι).[19] He has learned through inquiry that the temple of Aphrodite in Ascalon is the most ancient of all the temples of this goddess (1.105.3: ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθανόμενος εὑρίσκω) and that the Gephyraioi were really Phoenicians in origin rather than Eretrians (5.57.1: ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ ἀναπυνθανόμενος εὑρίσκω). Thersander of Orchomenos told Herodotus about the famous dinner party between the Thebans and Persians (9.16.1: τάδε δὲ ἤδη τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἤκουον Θερσάνδρου ἀνδρὸς μὲν Ὀρχομένιου, λογίμου δὲ ἐς τὰ πρωτα ἐν Ὀρχομενῷ).[20] Herodotus also heard stories while conducting these inquiries which he clearly considered hearsay and not necessarily trustworthy. At 7.35.1, Herodotus relates that he heard a story which claimed that Xerxes ordered the Hellespont to be branded in addition to being whipped. He writes,

> ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα ὡς καὶ στιγέας ἅμα τούτοισι ἀπέπεμψε στίξοντας τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον. ἐνετέλλετο δὲ ὧν ῥαπίζοντας λέγειν βάρβαρά τε καὶ ἀτάσθαλα. (7.35.1)

---

[19]It is interesting to note that this is the only occurrence of the verb ἱστορέω used by Herodotus outside of Book Two to refer to himself in the process of conducting his research. In these other passages in Two, the verb occurs in the singular, usually participial, form. Cf. 2.19.3, 29.1, 34.1, 113.1. Herodotus prefers to use πυνθάνομαι or one of its compounds to refer to his process of inquiry in books other than Two. Cf. 1.22.2, 92.2, 105.3; 3.12.1; 5.9.1, 57.1. It is not impossible that the usage of ἱστορέω in Book Two and the exclusion of it in the other books might be indicative of an earlier (or even later) period of composition.

[20]Cf. 2.55.3; 3.55.2; 4.76.6 for the only other passages in which Herodotus specifies the name of his informant.

The words δὲ ὦν indicate that while Herodotus believes what is stated in the ὦν clause to be an unquestionable fact, he does not find the story regarding the branding credible. The adversative δέ "marks opposition to what preceded and implies that the foregoing statement is uncertain and liable to dispute."[21]

A notable characteristic of Herodotus' understanding of his role as a researcher is his willingness to admit the limits of his knowledge of any particular subject. Just as he thought it important to inform his readers and audience what he did learn through his inquiries, he considered it equally important to declare what he could not find out. Such remarks are found throughout the entire ***Histories.***[22] Common phrases used by Herodotus to indicate the limits of his knowledge are **οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν ἀτρεκέως, οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι, οὐκ οἷός τε ἐγενόμην ἀτρεκέως πυθέσθαι,** etc. Thus Herodotus states that he cannot speak with any degree of confidence regarding the Pelasgian language (1.57.1); that he cannot decide whether the Caunian dialect was influenced by the Carian or *vice versa* (1.172.1); and that he could not get any reliable information in Egypt concerning the god the Greeks worship as Heracles (2.43.1). Several times, Herodotus expresses his inability to get much information of value concerning the source of the Nile (2.19.1; 28.1; 34.1; cf. 4.53.5). He cannot

---

[21]H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammer*, revised by G. M. Messing (Cambridge, Mass., 1956; 7th printing, 1972), p. 664. It appears, in fact, that the phrase ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα ὡς καί and its variants are signs of Herodotus' distrust of the report. Cf. 4.77.1; 7.55.3; 9.84.1, 95 for usage of the phrase. It is clear in context that Herodotus does not believe what he has heard.

[22]For a list of select passages in which Herodotus admits the limits of his knowledge, see Appendix Two.

speak with certainty of the geography of the far west of Europe (3.115.1), of the country north of Thrace (5.9.1) or of the population of Scythia (4.81.1).

Herodotus also reveals the limits of his knowledge and information in the more historical sections of the ***Histories*** though it is important to note that these instances tend to lie outside the main lines of the narrative and usually refer to events about which there is some question or controversy.[23] He refuses to believe that the Alcmaeonidae were responsible for the shield signal to the Persians after Marathon (6.123.1) but states that he does not know who did give the signal (6.124.2: **ὃς μέντοι ἦν ὁ ἀναδέξας, οὐκ ἔχω προσωτέρω εἰπεῖν τούτων**). He expresses an inability to determine whether or not Boreas himself set the storm against the Persians at Sepias even though this what the Athenians claim (7.189.3).[24] Regarding whether or not Artemisia rammed the Calyndian ship because she had some quarrel with its king, Herodotus states that he is not able to say (8.87.3: **εἰ μὲν καί τι νεῖκος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐγεγόνεε ἔτι περὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἐόντων, οὐ μέντοι ἔχω γε εἰπεῖν**). The adversative **μέντοι** indicates that there was some controversy concerning the motivation of Artemisia for ramming the ship. Herodotus, however, does not intend to

[23]This point will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Four.
[24]One should note the skepticism expressed by Herodotus regarding this entire incident and the participation of both Boreas and Thetis. Though Herodotus often included a divine explanation for the occurence of an event, he does express some degree of doubt concerning the participation of individual deities in human affairs. Cf., 7.19.2.

make a judgment on something about which he has no firm evidence.[25] Nor can Herodotus relate who it really was who buried Mardonios, despite the number of stories he heard:

> ...Μαρδονίου δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ ὁ νεκρὸς ἠφάνιστο, ὑπ' ὅτευ μὲν ἀνθρώπων, τὸ ἀτρεκὲς οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, πολλοὺς δέ τινας ἤδη καὶ παντοδαποὺς ἤκουσα θάψαι Μαρδόνιον, καὶ δῶρα μεγάλα οἶδα λαβόντας πολλοὺς παρὰ Ἀρτόντεω τοῦ Μαρδονίου παιδὸς διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον· ὅστις μέντοι ἦν αὐτῶν ὁ ὑπελόμενός τε καὶ θάψας τὸν νεκρὸν τὸν Μαρδονίου, οὐ δύναμαι ἀτρεκέως πυθέσθαι. (9.84.1)

In addition to admitting the limits of his knowledge, Herodotus at times indicates that he does not believe an informant or that he has doubts concerning the truth of his account. He refuses to believe the Chaldaean priests at the temple of Bel in Babylon who claim that the god, in human form, enters the temple and sleeps upon the couch (1.182.1: φάσι δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι, ἐμοὶ μέν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, τὸν θεὸν αὐτὸν φοιτᾶν τε ἐς τὸν νηὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης).[26] Those who relate the alternative story about Mycerinos, his daughter and the statues with the missing hands are merely talking nonsense (2.131.3: ταῦτα δὲ λέγουσι φλυηρέοντες, ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω...) as are those who attribute the erection of

---

[25]Μέντοι here appears to be used as a balancing adversative, i.e., two alternatives are stated (or implied, as in this passage) but neither one is eliminated or invalidated. Cf. J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1954; reprinted with corrections, 1959), pp. xlix, 405.

[26]The priests' implication is, of course, that Bel has intercourse with the woman who supposedly spends the night in the temple. Herodotus refuses to believe the story in this passage though he apparently did not question the possibility of such an occurrence at the temple of Zeus in Egyptian Thebes. Cf. 1.182.1.

the pyramid actually built by Mycerinus to the courtesan Rhodopis (2.134.1). He refuses to believe the story recounted by non-Greek speaking peoples concerning the existence of a river called Eridanus (3.115.1: **οὔτε γὰρ ἔγωγε ἐνδέκομαι**...), or the one about the existence of the one-eyed men (3.116.2: **πείθομαι δὲ οὐδὲ τοῦτο, ὅκως μουνόφθαλμοι ἄνδρες φύονται**...).[27] Herodotus does not accept the Scythians' own version about their descent from Targitaus, the son of Zeus and a daughter of the river Borysthenes (4.5.1) or the story, told by both the Scythians themselves and by the Greeks in Scythia that the Neuri change into wolves for a few days each year (4.105.2). The miraculous story told by the Aeginetans concerning the statues of Damia and Auxesia (5.86.3) is rejected out of hand by Herodotus, but he allows for the possibility that someone else - less critical than he - might want to believe it (5.86.3: ...**ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, ἄλλῳ δε τέῳ**...). He also expresses skepticism that the diver Skyllias could have swum under the water the entire way from Aphetae to Artemisium (8.8.2: ...**θωμάζω δὲ εἰ τὰ λεγόμενά ἐστι ἀληθέα**).

It will be noticed that in most of the examples given above, Herodotus is rejecting stories and accounts which exceed the limits of credibility or probability.[28] While it is true that in the majority of the cases in which Herodotus refuses to believe a source, he is rejecting an account which few people would be credulous enough to accept, Herodotus does, on occasion, indicate in the more historical sections of the work that he does not believe

[27]Cf. 4.25.1 where Herodotus is equally skeptical about the existance of goat-footed men.

[28]Cf. L. Pearson, "Credulity and Skepticism in Herodotus," *TAPA* 72 (1941): 340; R. W. Macan, *Herodotus, The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books,* 1: ciii.

a certain account or that he has doubts about its veracity. As was the case with Herodotus' admission of the limits of his knowledge, these instances tend to be limited to those about which there apparently was some debate and they usually are not found within the main frame of the narrative. It is important to note that in most of these cases, Herodotus offers an argument or reason why the account cannot be true. When Herodotus rejects an account which exceeds the bounds of possibility, he usually rejects it outright and does not feel obliged to offer any proof of its impossibility or inaccuracy. Thus, Herodotus flatly rejects the story that Xerxes returned to Asia by ship and when caught in a storm, suggested to the Persian noblemen who were on the deck that they jump overboard in order to lighten the boat's load and thus save their king (8.119). Herodotus finds the whole story ludicrous and reasons that if Xerxes had actually returned to Asia on a ship and had been caught in a storm, he would have ordered the Phoenician oarsmen overboard long before he would have suggested such a recourse to the Persian noblemen.[29] Similarly, Herodotus does not believe those who claim that it was Onetes of Carystus and Corydallus of Anticyra, not Ephialtes, who revealed the mountain track to the Persians at Thermopylae (7.214.1: ἔστι δὲ ἕτερος λεγόμενος λόγος...οὐδαμῶς ἔμοιγε πιστός) and offers as proof the facts that the Amphictyons put a price upon Ephialtes and not upon the other two men and that Ephialtes fled to Thessaly because of the accusation (7.214.1-2). Herodotus also expresses serious

[29]Cf. G. L. Cooper, III, "Intrusive Oblique Infinitives in Herodotus," *TAPA* 104 (1974): 55. Cooper notes that the intrusion of the infinitives ὑπολαβεῖν, χειμαίνεσθαι, εἰρέσθαι, εἶπαι where one would expect finite forms indicates Herodotus' distrust of the story.

doubt that Megates' daughter was ever betrothed to the Spartan Pausanias (5.32.1: ...εἰ δὴ ἀληθής γέ ἐστι ὁ λόγος...). And as mentioned above,[30] Herodotus does not believe that the Alcmaeonidae gave the shield signal to the Persians (6.121.1: θῶμα δέ μοι καὶ οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι τὸν λόγον...) and goes on to illustrate that their hatred of tyranny makes them unlikely allies of the Persians (6.121-24).[31]

In several of the instances in which Herodotus expresses skepticism or disbelief concerning the veracity of an account, he also disavows any responsibility for what he is reporting. Most of these remarks are found in Books Two and Four, the sections of the *Histories* most characterized by the ethnographical and geographical point of view. In 2.123.1, at the end of the story concerning Rhampsinitus' descent into the underworld and the religious ceremony the Egyptians later practiced to commemorate this event, Herodotus baldly states:

> τοῖσι μέν νυν ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων λεγομένοισι χράσθω ὅτεῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα πιθανά ἐστι· ἐμοὶ δὲ παρὰ πάντα [τὸν] λόγον ὑπόκειται ὅτι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' ἑκάστων ἀκοῇ γράφω. (2.123.1)

Herodotus feels obligated to report what he has heard but not necessarily to believe it. Regarding the wooden statues standing in a room near the burial chamber of Mycerinos' daughter which were said by the priests to represent

---

[30]See page 36.

[31]The attempt, however, is not at all successful. Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary*, 2: 115. and Macan, *Herodotus, The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books,* 1: 376. Chapter 122 is regarded by most commentators as an interpolation.

Mycerinos' concubines, Herodotus says that he cannot vouch for the truth of this identification (2.130.2: **αἵτινες μέντοι εἰσί, οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, πλὴν ἢ τὰ λεγόμενα**).[32] In 4.173, Herodotus recounts the story of the march of the Psylli upon the South wind and their subsequent destruction by the wind. At the most fantastic point in the story (4.173: **ἐστρατεύοντο ἐπὶ τὸν νότον**), he adds parenthetically, as if in his defense for relating such an absurd story, **λέγω δὲ ταῦτα τὰ λέγουσι Λίβυες**. Similarly, after including in a list of the types of animals found in eastern Libya dog-headed men and headless men with eyes in their breasts, Herodotus again protects himself against the charge of excessive credulity by stating, **ὡς δὴ λέγονται γε ὑπὸ Λιβύων** (4.191.4).[33]

There are three passages outside of Books Two and Four in which Herodotus disavows any responsibility for the truth of what he is relating which are marginally different in tone from the examples discussed above. In these instances, Herodotus still feels obliged to relate what has been told to him but he avoids accepting responsibility for their truth not because of their fantastic nature and the desire to avoid giving the impression of excessive gullibility on his part, but because he did not have enough information to determine the truth of the report. The passages are historical in content and reveal that a certain amount of dispute must have

[32]It is interesting to note that Herodotus does not always believe what the priests tell him. Cf. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides*, Ch. II, passim. Hunter does not acknowledge this fact and generally reads too much into Herodotus' reliance upon the priests as sources. See above, note 9.

[33]Cf. 2.146.1; 4.96.1, 187.3, 195.2 for similar disclaimers of responsibility for what Herodotus is reporting.

existed concerning the events. In 6.82, Herodotus states that he does not know whether or not Cleomenes was speaking truthfully when he claimed that he thought that he was fulfilling the oracle when he took the temple of Argos rather than the city itself (6.82.1: ...οὔτε εἰ ψευδόμενος οὔτε εἰ ἀληθέα λέγων, ἔχω σαφηνέως εἶπαι). In chapter 137 of the same book, Herodotus gives two accounts, those of the Athenians and of Hecataeus, concerning the expulsion of the Pelasgians from Attica . He prefaces his remarks with the statement that he could not determine whether or not they had been expelled justly or unjustly and that he could only relate what he was told (6.137.1: ...εἴτε ὦν δὴ δικαίως εἴτε ἀδίκως· τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι, πλὴν τὰ λεγόμενα...). In 7.152.1, Herodotus states that he cannot say with certainty whether or not Xerxes sent a message to Argos or whether at a later date Argive messengers in Susa asked Artaxerxes if Argos and Persia were still friends. He confirms that he is only relating what the Argives say and not his own personal opinion. Herodotus then continues:

> ἐγὼ δὲ ὀφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πείθεσθαί γε μὲν οὐ παντάπασιν ὀφείλω, καί μοι τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς πάντα λόγον. (7.152.3)

This remark and the others discussed are significant as they reveal that Herodotus was sensitive to the possibility of appearing not only excessively

credulous but uncritical as well.[34] Herodotus may have believed accounts that a modern historian, accustomed to all the comforts and aids of today's research methods which easily allow verification, would not have believed. Herodotus may not have been as skeptical as modern sensibilities warrant, but the fact that he was at least aware of the image of himself that he might project while relating the results of his research is, given his place in the development of Greek historiography, certainly to his credit.

Perhaps the most common occurrence of personal expression are the instances in which Herodotus directly asserts his own opinion. Examples may be found throughout the entire ***Histories*** and are spread fairly equally throughout all nine books. Upon examination, it will be discovered that Herodotus has much more in common with Thucydides in this respect that has been previously acknowledged.[35] Though the tendency toward excessive

---

[34]Cf. Fornara, *Herodotus, An Interpretative Essay*, pp. 21-22, n. 34. Fornara suggests that Herodotus' disclaimers in 6.82, 137 and 7.152 are a result of "Herodotus' desire to have the audience judge cautiously what he tells them". While this is, of course, quite possible, it is necessary to note that Herodotus does not state that his audience may believe the story or version if they like, as he does in other passages. Cf. 2.123.1, 146.1. See also Macan, *Herodotus, The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books,* 1: ciii who notes that Herodotus' tendency to question the veracity of certain reports helps to establish Herodotus as the "father of criticism" as well as the "father of history". Macan does caution, however, that this does not mean that Herodotus was always the best critic.

[35]See, for example, the two articles by L. Pearson: "Credulity and Skepticism in Herodotus," *TAPA* 72 (1941): 335-55 and "Thucydides as Reporter and Critic," *TAPA* 78 (1947): 37-60. In the latter article, an otherwise excellent discussion of Thucydides' expressions of personal opinion, Pearson does not notice that many of the characteristics and tendencies displayed by Thucydides when expressing an opinion are also found in Herodotus.

credulity may, at times, be a justified criticism of Herodotus,[36] the historian is, nonetheless, quite capable of expressing his opinion in a reasoned and critical manner. Herodotus, like Thucydides, at times offers his opinion systematically and without argument. In other instances, he is more tentative and often adds the phrase ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει or a similar expression and may support his opinion by logical argument, by citing evidence (τεκμήριον, μαρτύριον) or by appealing to probability (τὸ εἰκός).[37]

Although Herodotus tends most often to qualify an expression of opinion by the words ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέει or a similar phrase, there are numerous passages in which Herodotus dogmatically declares his opinion. In 1.214.1, he asserts that Cyrus' battle against the Massagetae was the fiercest ever to occur between foreign nations (1.214.1: ταύτην τὴν μάχην, ὅσαι δὴ βαρβάρων ἀνδρῶν μάχαι ἐγένοντο, κρίνω ἰσχυροτάτην γενέσθαι...). Herodotus has decided that it is the sun that is responsible for both the evaporation of the Nile water in winter and summer (2.25.5) and also for the general dryness in Egypt as a whole (2.26.1). He is absolutely certain that Cambyses was insane (3.38.1: πανταχῇ ὢν μοι δῆλά ἐστι ὅτι ἐμάνη μεγάλως ὁ Καμβύσης); that the strength of the Athenians rested upon their democratic government (5.78); and that the Athenians and their refusal to come to terms with the Persians were the chief factors in the

[36]E.g., 2.125.6. For a favorable estimation of Herodotus' general lack of credulity, see B. Baldwin, "How Credulous was Herodotus?" *G & R* 11 (1964): 167-77.
[37]Cf. Pearson, "Thucydides as Reporter and Critic," p.37.

victory of the Greeks over the Persians. Herodotus prefaces the discussion of this opinion with the remark:

> ἐνθαῦτα ἀναγκαίῃ ἐξέργομαι γνώμην ἀποδεξάσθαι ἐπίφθονον μὲν πρὸς τῶν πλεόνων ἀνθρώπων, ὅμως δέ, τῇ γέ μοι φαίνεται εἶναι ἀληθές, οὐκ ἐπισχήσω. (7.139.1)

Herodotus is keenly aware of the unpopularity of such a stance, but he will express his beliefs nonetheless.

Herodotus often expresses his opinion authoritatively in regard to the relative value of certain barbarian customs and practices. He praises the Persian educational system and the custom which denies the Persian king the right to inflict the death penalty (1.136.2 - 137.1). Similarly, he considers the Babylonian practice of auctioning off young girls of marriageable age extremely clever (1.196.1: ὁ μὲν σοφώτατος ὅδε κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἡμετέρην...) and ranks their treatment of disease as second in ingenuity (1.197.1: δεύτερος δὲ σοφίῃ ὅδε ἄλλος σφι νόμος κατέστηκε). Their most disgraceful practice, in Herodotus' mind, is the forced prostitution of all Babylonian women in the Temple of Aphrodite (1.199.1: ὁ δὲ δὴ αἴσχιστος τῶν νόμων ἐστὶ τοῖσι Βαβυλωνίοισι ὅδε). The Egyptians, according to Herodotus, have made themselves the wisest of men through their care in record-keeping (2.77.1); the Libyans are the most healthy (4.187.3);[38] and the Aithiopian cave-dwellers are the swiftest (4.183.4). In a tone similar to that later found in Thucydides, Herodotus states that the Thracian people could be the most powerful race if they

[38]Herodotus admits that he doesn't know why the Libyans are so healthy but agrees, nevertheless, that they are the most healthy of all men (4.187.3: εἰ μὲν διὰ τοῦτο, οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν, ὑγιηρότατοι δ' ὧν εισί).

were ruled by a single individual or were like-minded (5.3.1: εἰ δὲ ὑπ' ἑνὸς ἄρχοιτο ἢ φρονέοι κατὰ τώυτό, ἄμαχον τ' ἂν εἴη καὶ πολλῷ κράτιστον πάντων ἐθνέων κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμήν).[39] In a more historical vein, Herodotus states that Aristides was the best and most just man of his time (8.79.1) and that Aristodemus proved himself the best soldier at Plataea (9.71.2). After declaring that Xerxes' invasion of Greece was the greatest of all such attempts (7.20.2), Herodotus compares this expedition to those of the past to support his statement.

Another expression used by Herodotus to indicate a dogmatic opinion on a certain matter is his use of a form of the verb **συμβάλλομαι**, especially when accompanied by **εὑρίσκω**. Thus Herodotus is of the opinion that the temple of Aphrodite, the Stranger was really the temple of Helen (2.112.2: **συμβάλλομαι δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἱρὸν εἶναι Ἑλένης τῆς Τυνδάρεω**) and he supports this contention by relating the account of the Egyptian priests that Helen spent some time in Egypt. In 7.24, Herodotus offers a bold opinion regarding why Xerxes ordered a canal to be cut across the land at Athos and backs up his belief by stating that it was really not necessary to have the canal dug. He writes:

[39]Cf. Thucydides' judgment in 2.97.6 concerning the Scythians. This statement is undoubtedly a criticism of Herodotus' judgment regarding the Thracians. It is interesting to note that chapter 96 and 97 are also very Herodotean in tone. In a manner not unlike that of Herodotus, though certainly more laconic, Thucydides here describes the various Thracian tribes with whom the Thracian king Sitalces came into contact in his march against Perdiccas. Thucydides includes geographical notes (96.4, 97.1-2), description ofweapons (96.2) and information regarding customs (97.4).

ὡς μὲν ἐμὲ συμβαλλόμενον εὑρίσκειν, μεγαλοφροσύνης
εἵνεκεν αὐτὸ Ξέρξης ὀρύσσειν ἐκέλευε, ἐθέλων τε δύναμιν
ἀποδείκνυσθαι καὶ μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι· παρεὸν γὰρ
μηδένα πόνον λαβόντας τὸν ἰσθμὸν τὰς νέας διειρύσαι...
(7.24)

In contrast to the certainty expressed in this passage, Herodotus is somewhat tentative in expressing his opinion concerning the area near the Bosporus which Darius bridged (4.87.2: **τοῦ δὲ Βοσπόρου ὁ χῶρος τὸν ἔζευξε βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν συμβαλλομένῳ, μέσον ἐστὶ Βυζαντίου τε καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ στόματι ἰροῦ**). This statement, though perhaps based on autopsy,[40] is far less certain in tone than if Herodotus had said **ὡς μὲν ἐμὲ συμβαλλόμενον εὑρίσκειν** rather than **ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν συμβαλλομένῳ**.

In 8.30.1, Herodotus combines this manner of expressing his opinion with another method occasionally used by him not only to reveal his feelings on a matter but also to indicate what would have happened if the event had transpired differently. It is in these instances that the critical powers of Herodotus may clearly be seen. In this passage, Herodotus states that in his opinion, the Phocaeans refused to medize solely on account of their hatred of the Thessalians (8.30.1: **οἱ γὰρ Φωκέες μοῦνοι τῶν ταύτῃ ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἐμήδιζον, κατ' ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν, ὡς ἐγὼ συμβαλλόμενος εὑρίσκω, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Θεσσαλῶν**). He then goes on to suggest that the Phocaeans would have medized, had the Thessalians remained loyal to the Greek cause (8.30.2: **εἰ δὲ Θεσσαλοὶ τὰ Ἑλλήνων ηὖξον, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ἐμήδιζον ἂν οἱ Φωκέες**). Herodotus' estimation of the situation

[40]Cf. Macan, *Herodotus, The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books,* 1: 63.

may or may not be correct,[41] but the fact that Herodotus has clearly thought enough about the event to make such a statement reveals some degree of historically relevant criticism.

There are several other passages in which Herodotus reveals what, in his opinion, would have occurred had the individuals involved acted differently or had the circumstances under which the event took place been other than what they were. Thus in 3.25.5, Herodotus is of the opinion that if Cambyses had recognized the dangers of proceeding in his march against the long-lived Aethiopians when his troops were so low on supplies that they were forced to eat the pack animals, he would have shown some sense, and - the implication is - avoided the disaster which followed. In his discussion of the siege of Samos, Herodotus states twice what would have happened had the circumstances been different. Corinth, in his opinion, would never have taken part in the siege against the island, if relations between Corinth and Corcyra had ever been reconciled (3.49.1: **εἰ μέν νυν Περιάνδρου τελευτήσαντος τοῖσι Κορινθίοισι φίλια ἦν πρὸς τοὺς Κερκυραίους, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἂν συνελάβοντο τοῦ στρατεύματος τοῦ ἐπὶ Σάμον ταύτης εἵνεκεν τῆς αἰτίης**). And Herodotus believes that Samos would have been taken, had all the Lacedaimonians displayed the same courage and persistance as Archias and Lycopes (3.55.1). Psammenitus, the former king of Egypt, Herodotus states, would probably have been appointed governor of Egypt by Cambyses, had he kept out of trouble (3.15.2). Similarly, Dorieus might have become king of Sparta, if only he had had the patience to endure being ruled by Cleomenes (5.48). The Spartans would not

[41] Cf. Plutarch *de Mal. Herod.* 35. This judgment on the part of Herodotus is strongly attacked by Plutarch as slanderous and maliciously inventive.

have captured the Pisistratidae, if they had not had the good fortune to get hold of their children (5.65.1)[42] At 6.30.1, Herodotus makes it clear that he is stating his own opinion with the words δοκέειν ἐμοί when he states that Histaeus would have suffered no extreme punishment for the revolt had he been taken to Darius after his capture. As it was, Artaphernes and Harpagus, anticipating Darius' clemency, executed Histiaeus. The most famous example of this form of expressing an opinion is, of course, Herodotus' estimation of what would have happened if the Athenians had abandoned their land or had come to terms with the Persians (7.139.1-6). Herodotus is aware that such an opinion is not likely to have too many followers but nevertheless feels compelled to state it (7.139.1: ἐνθαῦτα ἀναγκαίῃ ἐξέργομαι γνώμην ἀποδέξασθαι ἐπίφθονον μὲν πρὸς τῶν πλεόνων ἀνθρώπων, ὅμως δέ, τῇ γέ μοι φαίνεται εἶναι ἀληθές, οὐκ ἐπισχήσω.). Herodotus reasons that if the Persians had gained control of the seas because of an Athenian withdrawal or surrender, the conquest of Greece would have inevitably resulted since the Greeks would not have been able to hold out for long on land. What is significant about these passages is not so much whether or not Herodotus is correct in his analyses but the fact that Herodotus has revealed his tendency to look beyond the mere occurrence of the event itself to the specific elements which made it occur as it did.

Though a categorical expression of personal opinion by Herodotus is not uncommon in the *Histories*, it is far more usual for Herodotus to

[42]The protasis of this condition is not explicitly stated but is clearly implied in the passage. Cf. Macan, *Herodotus, The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books,* 1: 204.

qualify an opinion by ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει, ὡς ἐμοὶ καταφαίνεται, or a similar phrase.[43] The Greeks, according to Herodotus, appear to have always used the same language (1.58: τὸ δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν γλώσσῃ μέν, ἐπείτε ἐγένετο, αἰεί κοτε τῇ αὐτῇ διαχρᾶται, ὡς ἐμοὶ καταφαίνεται εἶναι). The Persians do not erect altars, statues or temples for their gods because, as Herodotus believes, their gods are not anthropomorphic and thus, he implies, have no need of such things (1.131.1).[44] Geometry may have developed in Egypt from the division of land into parcels (2.109.1-3) and Darius' offer of gifts to Democedes was straightforward and untreacherous (3.135.3). Pixodarus, during the Ionian revolt, offered the best plan of action - at least, in Herodotus' estimation - for dealing with the Persians (5.118.2: ἐγίνοντο βουλαὶ ἄλλαι τε πολλαὶ καὶ ἀρίστη γε δοκέουσα εἶναι ἐμοὶ Πιξωδάρου...); Cleomenes' madness and inglorious death were punishments for his treatment of Demaratus rather than the result of learning to drink wine neat as his own countrymen claimed (6.84.3: ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκέει τίσιν ταύτην ὁ Κλεομένης Δημαρήτῳ ἐκτεῖσαι); and the fact that the anger of Talthybius avenged itself upon the sons of Sperchias and Bulis is sufficient evidence for Herodotus to see the working of the divine in the whole affair (7.137.1: τοῦτό μοι ἐν τοῖσι θειότατον φαίνεται γενέσθαι[45]).

One of the most common circumstances under which Herodotus qualifies an expression of his own opinion by ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει or a similar phrase is when he gives an individual's motivation for a certain action or

[43]For a select listing of passages in which Herodotus makes it clear that he is stating his own personal opinion, see Apppendix Three.
[44]Herodotus is apparently correct in general on this point, though there were a few exceptions. Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary*, 1: 111.
[45]Cf. 7.137.2.

behavior. Democedes, once back in Crotona, arranged to be married to the daughter of the wrestler Milo in order to show Darius what a man of consequence he was in his own country (3.137.5).[46] Aryandes, according to Herodotus, helped Pheretima out of self-interest rather than out of any real sympathy for her situation (4.167.3: **αὕτη μέν νυν αἰτίη πρόσχημα τοῦ λόγου ἐγίνετο, ἐπέμπετο δὲ ἡ στρατιή, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ἐπὶ Λιβύων καταστροφῇ**). During the withdrawal from Artemisium, Themistocles left messages on the rock for the Ionians asking them either to desert to the Greek cause or if that were impossible, to remain neutral. He left these messages because he thought he probably could either persuade the Ionians to desert Xerxes or convince Xerxes himself that the Ionians were about to desert and so could not be relied upon during the battle (8.22.3). Eurybiades was persuaded by Themistocles to remain at Salamis to fight rather than withdraw to the Isthmus because of his fear of losing Athenian support (8.63: **δοκέειν δέ μοι, ἀρρωδήσας μάλιστα τοὺς Ἀθηναίους [ἀνεδιδάσκετο], μή σφεας ἀπολίπωσι, ἢν πρὸς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἀνάγῃ τὰς νέας**). Datis and Artaphernes sailed from Samos across the Icarian Sea to the mainland because they feared a repeat of the disaster off Athos (6.95.2: **...ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, δείσαντες μάλιστα τὸν περίπλοον τοῦ Ἄθου**).

Herodotus, on occasion, offers more than one explanation for the motivation behind a person's behavior. Such instances, like those qualified by **ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει**, reveal that Herodotus was not absolutely certain about what prompted an individual's behavior. It is also possible that Herodotus' sources indicated a variety of motives, but that Herodotus was unable to

[46]Though this story may have originated with the Crotoniates, Herodotus clearly accepted it. Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary*, 1: 298.

choose the most likely one. At 6.134.2, Herodotus indicates that Miltiades entered the precinct of Demeter Thesmophoros, either to touch some of the sacred objects or to do some other thing (6.134.2: **εἴτε κινήσοντά τι τῶν ἀκινήτων εἴτε ὅ τι δή κοτε πρήξοντα**). Alyattes sent to Delphi to inquire about his illness either because someone had advised it or he had thought of it himself (1.19.2: **εἴτε δὴ συμβουλεύσαντός τευ, εἴτε καὶ αὐτῷ ἔδοξε**) and similarly, Cyrus' successful trick to capture Babylon resulted from either his own or someone else's initiative (1.191.1). The Athenian Lykides suggested to his fellow countrymen that they accept the proposal of Murychides to support the Persians because he had been bribed to say this or because he actually held this opinion (9.5.2: **ὁ μὲν δὴ ταύτην τὴν γνώμην ἀπεφαίνετο, εἴτε δὴ δεδεγμένος χρήματα παρὰ Μαρδονίου, εἴτε καὶ ταῦτά οἱ ἐάνδανε**). Herodotus' suggestions as to what would motivate Cyrus to put Croesus on the pyre are three: either Cyrus intended to make a sacrificial offering out of Croesus or he put him on the pyre to fulfill some sort of previously made vow, or perhaps he wanted to see if some deity would save the god-fearing man (1.86.2).

It will be noticed, however, that although Herodotus may often qualify the expression of his opinion regarding the personal motivation behind an action by the phrase **ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει** or may give two or more possibilities for the motive of an individual, it is far more customary for him to ascribe motives in an authoritative fashion. Such a practice is generally what one would tend to expect from Thucydides than from Herodotus,[47] but the historian is quite capable of confidently assigning motivations to the

[47]Cf. Pearson, "Thucydides as Reporter and Critic," p. 53ff.

various individuals in the *Histories*. He relates that Aristagoras aided the Naxian exiles because he thought he could become ruler of the island (5.30.3: ὁ δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος ὡς, ἢν δι' αὐτοῦ κατέλθωσι ἐς τὴν πόλιν, ἄρξει τῆς Νάξου) and that Darius sent an expedition of men down the Indus in order to discover where the river met the sea (4.44.1: ...βουλόμενος...τοῦτον τὸν ποταμὸν εἰδέναι τῇ ἐς θάλασσαν ἐκδιδοῖ). Cleomenes gathered an army to march against Athens in order to have his revenge upon the Athenians for previous mistreatment and to set up Isagoras as tyrant (5.74.1) and revenge also provided Darius with a motive for the invasion of Scythia (4.1.1). Numerous other examples may be found throughout the entire *Histories*.[48]

There are several instances in which Herodotus supports his opinion by citing evidence (τεκμήριον and μαρτύριον) or by constructing an argument based on appeals to probability (κατὰ τὸ εἰκός). While arguing that Cambyses must have been quite mad in order to abuse so outrageously his own countrymen and the ancient laws and customs of his country, Herodotus ends the passage with the statement that a sound individual will always prefer his own laws and customs to those of another. He offers an anecdote about Darius who horrified men from the Callatiaen tribe by asking them if they would like to practice burial in the customary Greek manner as proof that this claim is true (3.38.2: πολλοίσί τε καὶ ἄλλοισι τεκμηρίοισι πάρεστι σταθμώσασθαι, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ τῷδε·). The fact that Xerxes defiled the body of Leonidas was ample proof to Herodotus that the

[48]See, for example, 1.61.1. 174.3; 5.11.1; 6.100.2; 8.76.2; 9.99.3. The fact that Herodotus frequently attributed motives in such a direct fashion does not imply, of course, that he was always correct. Cf. Macan, *Herodotus, The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books,* 1: cv-cxi.

king was greatly enraged at the Spartan since the Persians customarily honor all men who have excelled in war (7.238.2: **δῆλά μοι πολλοῖσι μὲν καὶ ἄλλοισι τεκμηρίοισι, ἐν δὲ καὶ τῷδε οὐκ ἥκιστα γέγονε, ὅτι...**). The Egyptian origin of the parents of Heracles provides sufficient evidence that the Greeks took the name of Heracles from the Egyptians and not *vice versa* (2.43.2: **πολλά μοι καὶ ἄλλα τεκμήριά ἐστι τοῦτο οὕτω ἔχειν, ἐν δὲ καὶ τόδε...**).[49] Herodotus believes the account that Leonidas dismissed the troops from Thermopylae because of an unfavorable oracle rather than the suggestion that these troops themselves deserted and cites as support the fact that in the Spartan camp, the seer Megistias had also foretold the disaster (7.221: **μαρτύριον δέ μοι καὶ τόδε οὐκ ἐλάχιστον τούτου πέρι γέγονε, ὅτι καὶ τὸν μάντιν...**). That Xerxes returned to Persian by land rather than by sea as one source claimed (8.119) is corroborated by the fact that Xerxes was known to have journeyed through Abdera on his way back home (8.120: **μέγα δὲ καὶ τόδε μαρτύριον· φαίνεται γὰρ Ξέρξης ἐν τῇ ὀπίσω κομιδῇ ἀπικόμενος ἐς Ἄβδηρα...**). In an argument **κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς** quite remarkable for this time period,[50] Herodotus offers at 2.22.2 four pieces of evidence that the flooding of the Nile cannot have resulted from the melting of snow in that area. He states,

> **ἀνδρί γε λογίζεσθαι τοιούτων πέρι οἵῳ τε ἐόντι, ὡς οὐδὲ οἰκὸς ἀπὸ χιόνος μιν ῥέειν, πρῶτον μὲν καὶ μέγιστον μαρτύριον οἱ ἄνεμοι παρέχονται πνέοντες ἀπὸ τῶν χωρέων**

[49] For other examples of the use of **τεκμήριον**, cf. 2.13.1; 2.58; 2.104.4; 9.100.2.

[50] It is not my purpose in this discussion to refute what Herodotus claims. Even given the obvious errors in his argument, the proof is till worthy of recognition for its rationalism and consistent argument. Cf. Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II,* 2: 102-3.

τουτέων θερμοί· δεύτερον δὲ ὅτι ἄνομβρος ἡ χώρη καὶ ἀκρύσταλλος διατελέει ἐοῦσα, ἐπὶ δὲ χιόνι πεσούσῃ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη ἐστὶ ὗσαι ἐν πέντε ἡμέρῃσι, ὥστε εἰ ἐχιόνιζε, ὕετο ἂν ταῦτα τὰ χωρία· τρίτα δὲ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὑπὸ τοῦ καύματος μέλανες ἐόντες· ἰκτῖνοι δὲ καὶ χελιδόνες δι' ἔτεος ἐόντες οὐκ ἀπολείπουσι, γέρανοι δὲ φεύγουσαι τὸν χειμῶνα τὸν ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ χώρῃ γινόμενον φοιτῶσι ἐς χειμασίην ἐς τοὺς τόπους τούτους. (2.22.2-4)

There are several other noteworthy passages in which Herodotus supports his opinion by an argument **κατὰ τὸ εἰκός**. While discussing the evaporation of water by the sun during its course over Libya, Herodotus reasons that the south and southwest winds will be the most rainy ones on account of the absorption of this moisture (2.25.2: ...**καὶ εἰσὶ οἰκότως οἱ ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς χώρης πνέοντες, ὅ τε νότος καὶ ὁ λίψ, ἀνέμων πολλὸν τῶν πάντων ὑετιώτατοι**). In a similar vein, Herodotus states that it is not likely that winds would originate in a warm region (2.27: ...**τήνδε ἔχω γνώμην, ὡς κάρτα ἀπὸ θερμέων χωρέων οὐκ οἰκός ἐστι οὐδὲν ἀποπνέειν**...). Probability is evoked as the reason why the priestess kidnapped from Egyptian Thebes would reinstitute her religious rites as a memory of her duties and life at home when working as a slave at Dodona (2.56.2). The likely reason why the areas near the Nile are found to be filled with small fish when the river begins to rise is, as Herodotus conjectures, because the fish, in the previous year, have laid eggs in the mud just before the last of the water retreated (2.93.6: **κόθεν δὲ οἰκὸς αὐτοὺς γίνεσθαι, ἐγώ μοι δοκέω κατανοέειν τοῦτο·**). And, in the passage already discussed above regarding Cambyses and his madness, Herodotus states that it is not probable that anyone except a madman would so outrage his own country's

laws and customs (3.38.2: **οὐκ ὢν οἰκός ἐστι ἄλλον γε ἢ μαινόμενον ἄνδρα γελῶτα τὰ τοιαῦτα τίθεσθαι**).[51]

Herodotus' tendency to report several versions of a single story or event is symptomatic of his understanding of the role and responsibilities as a researcher. As he himself states at 7.152.3,[52] he feels obliged to repeat what he has heard, though he does not feel bound necessarily to believe every report. And it is true that Herodotus rarely indicates which version he believes to be the correct one. Too much, however, has been made of this refusal to take sides, as H. Verdin notes.[53] Rather than being solely indicative of an uncritical attitude, this practice is part of the open-minded position that provoked Herodotus to let all sides state their case. In addition, it is indicative of Herodotus' understanding that a historian seeking to write about the past must first acknowledge the various accounts contained in tradition.[54] This is a necessary precursor to the process of selecting the correct account of an event from a number of versions. Variant versions play an important part in all books of the ***Histories***, though more are found in books One through Six than in the final three books.[55]

---

[51]Cf. 3.33 which also concerns Cambyses' madness: **οὐ νύν τοι ἀεικὲς οὐδὲν ἦν τοῦ σώματος νοῦσον μεγάλην νοσέοντος μηδὲ τὰς φρένας ὑγιαίνειν.**

[52]Cf. 2.123.1.

[53]H. Verdin, *De historisch-kritische Methode van Herodotus* (Brussels, 1971), p. 233 of English summary (pp. 223-34).

[54]*Ibid.*

[55]For a select listing of passages which concern variant versions, see Appendix Four.

After his introductory statement, Herodotus opens Book One with the Phoenician and Persian accounts regarding the origins of the hostilities between the East and the West (1.1 - 1.5). Herodotus does offer two explanatory remarks to clarify elements in these accounts;[56] otherwise he refrains from making a specific comment or judgment upon these accounts but does state that he knows the one who first harmed the interests of the Greeks.[57] At 1.70.2, Herodotus reports both the Spartan and Samian versions concerning the whereabouts of the bronze bowl which the Spartans had intended to be a gift to Croesus. In this passage, Herodotus does indicate, albeit subtly, that he does not trust the Spartan account. As G. Cooper pointed out in a 1975 article in *TAPA*, the optative is not generally expected in primary sequence *oratio obliqua* and the use of the optative, **ἀπολοίατο**, indicates that Herodotus doubted the veracity of their story.[58] This, coupled with Herodotus' remark that the Spartans might fabricate such a story of theft in order to hide the truth (1.70.3: **τάχα δὲ ἂν καὶ οἱ ἀποδόμενοι λέγοιεν ἀπικόμενοι ἐς Σπάρτην ὡς ἀπαιρεθείησαν ὑπὸ Σαμίων**) makes it clear where Herodotus stands on the issue.

It is interesting to note that Herodotus did not always feel obligated to relate every version of an event that he had heard. Before beginning his account of Cyrus, Herodotus states that he will relate what he believes to

---

[56] 1.1.2: **τὸ δὲ Ἄργος τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον προεῖχε ἅπασι τῶν ἐν τῇ νῦν Ἑλλάδι καλεομένῃ χώρῃ**. 1.2.1: **εἴησαν δ' ἂν οὗτοι Κρῆτες.**

[57] Cf. 1.5.3.

[58] G. L. Cooper, III, "Ironic Force of the Pure Optative," *TAPA* 105 (1975): 30-31. Note that the Samian version is reported in the indicative throughout. Cf. P.-E. Legrand, *Herodote: Histoires I* (Paris, 1964), p. 74, n. 2.

be the most trustworthy version of the life of Cyrus, though he could, if he wanted, give three other versions as well. He writes:

> ὡς ὧν Περσέων μετεξέτεροι λέγουσι οἱ μὴ βουλόμενοι σεμνοῦν τὰ περὶ Κῦρον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐόντα λέγειν λόγον, κατὰ ταῦτα γράψω, ἐπιστάμενος περὶ Κύρου καὶ τριφασίας ἄλλας λόγων ὁδοὺς φῆναι. (1.95.1)

Similarly, at the end of the account of Cyrus' death, Herodotus states that he has relayed the account which, among the many circulating at the time, seemed to him to be the most trustworthy (1.214.5: **τὰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ τὴν Κύρου τελευτὴν τοῦ βίου πολλῶν λόγων λεγομένων ὅδε μοι ὁ πιθανώτατος εἴρηται**). The chief significance of these passages is that they reveal Herodotus working more in the manner of Thucydides, selecting the most reliable account from the all the available information and reporting only that one. If Herodotus explicitly used this methodology here, we may confidently assume, I think, that he was capable of using it elsewhere even if he does not state in a forthright fashion that this is the case.

At first glance, it may be somewhat surprising that there are relatively few variant versions in Book Two, given the length and the varied subject matter of the book. There are only four passages which include alternative versions of a story that has already been recounted in one form. The first is found at the beginning of the book and concerns the Greek version of Psammetichus' language experiment and Herodotus, while dismissing the story sharply, chooses not to give a full account of the the version (2.2.5). At 2.55, Herodotus recounts the version given by the priestesses of Dodona concerning the origin of the shrines there and in

Libya. They tell Herodotus that two doves flew away from Egyptian Thebes and after their arrival in Dodona and Libya, instructed the inhabitants to establish an oracle of Zeus on these spots. Herodotus then goes on to explain how such a story could have developed from the actual kidnapping of the two priestesses from Thebes (2.56.1 - 57.3). Herodotus clearly prefers the more probable version of the Theban priests to the romanticized account of the Dodonian priestesses. Herodotus' preference for the Egyptian priests' account of Helen and the Trojan War over the Greek version of events (2.112 - 120) has already been discussed.[59] The final variant version that Herodotus includes in Book Two concerns Mycerinus' alleged rape of his daughter, her subsequent suicide and entombment within the wooden cow (2.131.1-3). Herodotus does not say who told him this version of the story but he clearly believes the Egyptian priests version over this one. The reason why there are so few instances of variant versions in Book Two surely must lie in the fact that in this book, Herodotus' chief informants are the Egyptian priests, sources in whom he has an extraordinary degree of confidence and trust. He thus has little reason to report a variant. In the few passages in which alternate accounts are found, it is important to note that Herodotus inevitably prefers the Egyptian priests' account to the alternative.

The most common format used by Herodotus for variant versions is to report what one source says (οἱ μὲν λέγουσι...) and to contrast it with what another source says (οἱ δὲ λέγουσι...). Usually the speakers of these accounts are not identified or are specified only by vague terms such as οἱ

[59]See page 30.

Αἰγύπτιοι, οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, οἱ Σκύθοι, etc. Thus, Herodotus gives both the Greek and the Egyptian accounts concerning Cambyses' murder of his sister (3.32.1-4). He reports both the most popular account of the origins of Oroetes' designs against Polycrates (3.120.1: **...ὡς μὲν οἱ πλεῦνες λέγουσι**) as well as the less accepted version (3.121.1: **οἱ δὲ ἐλάσσονες...**) and ends the account with the statement that the reader may believe whichever account he wishes (3.122.1: **πάρεστι δὲ πείθεσθαι ὁκοτέρῃ τις βούλεται αὐτέων**). Near the beginning of Book Four, Herodotus relates the Scythian account of their descent from Targitaus (4.5-7.3), then the Pontic Greek version (4.8-10.3) which he follows with a third version based far more on plausible historical events than on legendary ones like the first two accounts (4.11-13.2). Herodotus, in this instance, does have a preference and chooses the third account as the most likely one (4.11.1: **Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος ἔχων ὧδε, τῷ μάλιστα λεγομένῳ αὐτὸς πρόσκειμαι...**). In 6.137.1, Herodotus contrasts the account of Hecataeus with that of the Athenians concerning the expulsion of certain Pelasgians from Attica. Hecataeus reported in his history that the Athenians unjustifiably expelled the Pelasgians when they realized that the land they had given them had been so improved in condition that they begrudged the original gift. The Athenians, on the other hand, claimed that the Pelasgians would rape the Athenian girls when they came for water at the Nine Springs and were later caught in the act of plotting against Athens. Herodotus, in this passage, makes no comment regarding the veracity of either account. It is important to note that he is here contrasting what was clearly a written source with an oral one and apparently considered them to be on equal footing.

It is curious that Herodotus reports only a few variant versions in each of the final three books. In a lengthy passage in Book Seven (7.148-152), Herodotus reports the two versions concerning Argos' pro-Persian position in the war - the Argive story and the other more malicious version for which Herodotus does not name a specific source. He does state, however, that he cannot vouch for the truth of this second story but that he feels obliged to repeat it (7.152.1 - 3). The story of Aristodemus' cowardly behavior during the battle of Thermopylae is also told in two versions (7.230 - 231) as well as the flight of Adeimantus at the battle of Salamis (8.94.4) and the fighting prowess of Sophanes, the Dekalaean, at Plataea (9.74.1). What is important about these passages and the other variant versions that are found in the last three book of the ***Histories***[60] is the fact that none of them concern or affect the main events of Xerxes' invasion of Greece. They involve charges of treachery or cowardice,[61] or stories that probably arose *ex post facto*[62] and are narrated overtly by Herodotus, but these passages remain nonetheless outside the main narrative frame. The significance of this will be discussed in Chapter Four.

This chapter has examined Herodotus' use of overt narration through an investigation of the various types of personal statements made by Herodotus throughout the course of the *Histories*. Statements demonstrative of his reliance on autopsy and inquiry as his primary methods for conducting the investigation were noted as well as those signifying the limits of the information gained, his criticisms regarding the reliability of

---

[60]See Appendix IV.

[61]7.148-152; 214.1; 230-231; 8.94.4.

[62]8.118; 9.74.1.

his informants, his expressions of personal opinion and his inclination to include several versions of a story or event. It is through the personal statements of Herodotus noted in this chapter and others of a similar nature that Herodotus has created an image of himself as a competent researcher quite in control of his evidence and confident of his abilities to extract from his sources a reliable report of the topic under discussion. When his sources fail to produce such an account, Herodotus generally admits the fact and often attempts to construct a probable version of the event or a reasonable explanation of the phenomenon being considered. If he cannot do this, he is usually forthright about his inability and leaves it up to the reader to fill in his gaps. It must be admitted, of course, that there are times when Herodotus has believed a source which he probably should not have or has misinterpreted or misunderstood the evidence but these moments are in the minority. Rather than criticizing Herodotus for his failure to conform to modern expectations of how research should be conducted, it is far more productive to recognize Herodotus' achievements, while taking into account the wide scope of his material and his place near the beginning of the development of Greek historiography.

It now remains to consider Herodotus' use of covert narration. Before considering how he used this type of narration to relate a specific historical event, his use of the technique in the recounting of a traditional story will be discussed.

Chapter Three

The Teller and the Tale

Herodotus' predilection to incorporate what must properly be classified as folktales or stories into his history has been a source of consternation for critics since antiquity. Cicero noted the apparent discrepancy in the work of Herodotus when he replied to Quintus' observation that entirely different rules governed the composition of history as compared to those that were applicable to the writing of poetry. He remarked,

> Quippe, cum in illa [historia] omnia ad veritatem, Quinte, referantur, in hoc ad delectationem pleraque; quamquam et apud Herodotum, patrem historiae, et apud Theopompum sunt innumerabiles fabulae.[1]

Herodotus' tendency to include such stories is, no doubt, directly related to his position near the beginning of the development of Greek historiography. Because the writing of history was still under development, the boundary lines for appropriate subject matter simply had not been determined yet. And although these stories may present problems for those studying the work from a historical perspective, they are an essential part of the *Histories* because they frequently have relevance to the more

[1] *Leg.*, 1.5. Cf. *Inv. Rhet.*, 1.27: Fabula est in qua nec verae nec veri similes res continentur...Historia est gesta res, ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota.

philosophical and thematic sides of the work. They thus should not be dismissed as mere entertainment. For the purposes of this investigation, however, they are important because they provide the intermediate step in this examination of Herodotus' use of covert narration. For, it is in the relation of these stories that Herodotus' use of narration may be most clearly seen. These stories are largely unencumbered by great amounts of historical matter and often their inclusion in the work has more to do with their didactic possiblities than with their historical significance. It is in these stories that Herodotus is at his creative best as narrator. Though he could not change the main story line of a traditional tale, his own particular style as storyteller and narrator shapes and fashions the story in such a way that it becomes, essentially, his own. Once the characteristic elements of Herodotus' use of covert narration have been isolated, it will then be possible to examine how Herodotus adapts these techniques to his account of a historical event.

This chapter will discuss three of the traditional stories found in the *Histories* in order to determine how Herodotus utilized covert narration in the telling of a tale. The stories of Gyges (1.7-14), of Atys and Adrastus (1.34-45) and the tale of the birth of Cyrus (1.107-13) have been selected for consideration but other traditional stories that exhibit a similar use of covert narration may also be found.[2] These three stories have been singled out because they are especially illustrative of specific techniques that Herodotus adapted to the relation of a historical event. The story of Gyges

[2]E.g., Solon and Croesus (1.29-33); Polycrates and Amasis (3.39-43); Demaratus and the questions regarding his birth (6.61-70); the wooing of Agariste (6. 126-131.2).

reveals how a covert narrator may subtly shape his readers' opinion of his main character; the tragic tale of Atys and Adrastus shows how important dialogue is in the mimetic presentation of a story; and the account of the birth of Cyrus demonstrates how a narrator may use direct speech to present information that relates the progression of events. Other ancillary points that are indicative of Herodotus' use of covert narration will also be discussed.

Before beginning the discussion of Herodotus' use of covert narration in the telling of a traditional tale, there are several general points about narratives and narration that should be clarified since they will have some bearing on the following discussion. All narratives, whether they relate fictional, historical, or legendary and traditional events, may be categorized as being straight narratives, scenic narratives, descriptions or commentaries.[3] Straight narrative involves the simple reporting of the action. The author desires the narrative to move swiftly and evenly from event to event and thus avoids including any elements such as description, commentary or direct speech which would interrupt the flow of the account. Only essential details are included in the narrative because too much emphasis on details inhibits the even movement from event to event. Scenic narrative, however, presents the events as a progression of scenes and the tempo of the narrative is slowed down so that each scene may be appreciated in its own right. The time and place of each scene are individualized and emphasis is placed upon each facet of the action and upon the words, thoughts and feelings of the characters involved. As a

[3]For a discussion of these narrative modes, see J. Licht, *Storytelling in the Bible* (Jerusalem, 1978), pp. 29-30.

consequence, direct speech plays a very important part in a scenic narrative, though simple narration is included to ease the transitions from scene to scene and to convey information that is not easily presented in direct speech or dialogue form. In descriptive narrative, the author interrupts the account of the events to describe in detail how a person looked or sounded or how a particular place appeared. In such narratives, the creation of an atmosphere complementing the events being recounted is of extreme importance to the author. Narratives which include commentary contain long passages, made either by the author himself or by a character, which explain the situation, reveal a moral or the philosophical underpinnings of the work or allot judgment about the various actions committed by the characters.

Few authors will employ one of these modes of narrative to the exclusion of the other three. In most narratives, it is usual to find a mixture of modes though one form may be more frequently used than the others. While the greatest portion of the *Histories* is related as straight narrative, and description[4] and commentary[5] also have their places in the work, the traditional stories recounted by Herodotus are largely scenic. Each scene is able to be individually distinguished and a full accounting of

[4]Much of Book Two is properly categorized as descriptive narrative. See, for example, II. 5.2ff; 68ff.

[5]Extended passages of commentary are rare in the *Histories* as Herodotus prefers to comment only briefly upon the topic under discussion. Though he does not always make comments in his own person, it is usually clear when he is expressing his own opinion or offering his own explanation of something. A notable exception to Herodotus' preference for short comments is his commentary on the pivotal role of Athens in the success of the Greek over the Persians at 7.139.

the interaction between the various individuals is given. Individuals' thoughts, feelings, motivations and constraints are revealed and their influence upon the turn of events is implicit within the confines of the story. Herodotus quietly lurks behind each tale and only allows his presence to be known when necessiated by the story; he prefers to maintain the artifice that the story is telling itself.

Throughout the course of this investigation, it is very important to keep in mind at all times just how much influence a narrator has over his audience's perception of an event or story simply by the power of his presence. This is equally as true for scenic narratives as it is for any other type of narrative. Both overt and covert narrators control and guide how their readers perceive their narratives; the difference between the two types of narrators is found in the various means used. The range of items which points to the presence of a narrator extends from the simplest 'he said' to intrusive statements or comments made in the narrator's own person. Even the most seemingly insignificant adjective plays a part in shaping a reader's perception of an event. Consider, for example, the differences in tone created by the narrator's words in the following sentences:

"We've had 354 casualties," *the captain said to his commanding officer.*

"We've had 354 casualties," *the enraged captain shouted at his commanding officer.*

The words spoken are identical but the images created by the narrator's words are very different and it is these words even more than the actual

words spoken that are instrumental in guiding the readers' understanding of the event. Because we have been habituated to the telling and reading of stories since early childhood we tend not to notice this shaping activity on the part of the narrator. It is, after all, an intrinsic part of storytelling. However, to anticipate what will be treated more fully in the next chapter, it is a different matter when it come to the scenic narration of a historical event. What is in actuality a circumstantial detail that is included to enhance the mimetic nature of the narration should not be mistaken for fact.[6] These details are small points that usually focus on an individual's state of mind, the general ambiance that prevailed during the course of an event or upon incidental bits of activity that enable the presentation of the action step by step. In any event, these circumstantial details are necessary components of the mimetic depiction of the historical event because they add the missing touches that are essential for a fully scenic presentation. They are, however, more a product of the imagination of a historian who desires to present an event in a scenic manner than the result of historical investigation. What the historian has done is to fill in the gaps so that the event will unfold in his readers' minds just as a play would before the eyes of the audience.

It is in scenic narration that a covert narrator is most at home. Covert narration allows the narrator to develop fully the scenic potential of an event by permitting the narrator to present that event as a creative

[6]Cf. Connor, "Narrative Discourse in Thucydides," pp. 12-13. Conor notes that this is a result of Thucydides tendency to present his readers with an account of an event that is a finished product, though he does not discuss the idea in terms of scenic or mimetic narration.

reenactment of its original occurrence. One of the requirements for a successful mimetic presentation of an event is that the narrator keep his presence as minimally detectable as possible while he is relating the event or story. If the narrator interrupts the account to offer a comment in his own person, he not only disrupts the flow of the story but he destroys the illusion as mimesis as well. His personal comments make apparent his mediative activity in relation to the narration of the story. By refraining from comment, this mediation is no less active but it is less conspicious.

If a narrator has selected a covert stance for his narration of a story or event and if he has decided to present it mimetically, he must determine whether he, as narrator, will maintain an external or internal stance relative to the events being recounted.[7] That is to say, he must decide whether he, as narrator, shall recount the events as one observing the action from the outside looking in or as one placed right in the midst of the event and its participants. The former stance allows the narrator to report only those details and facts that may be perceived by any observer and any words spoken must be presented in an indirect form. An internal viewpoint, however, permits the narrator to stand among the characters and to see things as if he were one of them. Such a stance grants the narrator access to the direct words, thoughts and feelings of a character. The narrator may relate this information either by assuming the point of view of that character and thereby will present the material in the character's own words in the form of a direct speech or he may convey it as an omniscient

[7]For a detailed discussion of the external and internal viewpoints that a narrator may take, see Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*, (Sheffield, England, 1983), pp. 58-59.

narrator who has entered the character's mind to reveal what he is thinking or feeling at that particular moment. The narrator may, of course, choose to vary how he presents the information to which such an internal stance has made him privy and he may even switch from the internal to the external viewpoint and vice versa. However, the choice of an internal stance over an external one by the narrator increases the tone and depth of the narrative by creating the illusion that the narrator has intimate knowledge of the thoughts and feelings of the individuals involved in the event. Strictly speaking, of course, the narrator of a history can have no such knowledge of these individuals because thoughts and feelings are thoroughly internal and therefore not accessible to the historian.[8] The technique is, of course, artifice[9] but as such was familiar to ancient audiences since the work of Homer.[10] It is, however, a technique more suitably used by writers of fiction and is one shunned by most modern historians. Ancient historians, though, were not constrained by the same guidelines and used this technique as an aid in their presentation of a verisimilar account of the event. However, before considering Herodotus' use of covert narration and the internal stance in his accounts of historical events, it will be profitable to examine some of these techniques in passages where their use was more customary, i.e., in the traditional tale.

The Story of Gyges (1.7-14)

[8]This is true even for a historical work unless the individual whose thoughts or feelings are being reported has been directly interviewed by the historian.

[9]Cf. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, pp. 3, 160.

[10]Cf. *Iliad*, 1.188ff.

The accession of Gyges to the throne of Lydia is a historical event around which a great deal of legendary material developed, if the extant versions of the story[11] are anything by which to judge the popularity of the tale. However, reliable information about Gyges' usurpation of the Lydian throne is scanty. After his return from exile c. 698 B.C., he gained the confidence and trust of Candaules and was put in control of Tyre. In 687 he revolted and through civil war and possibly intrigue, he defeated Candaules, gained mastery of Lydia and solidified his victory by marrying Candaules' wife Tydo. He established a despotic monarchy and ruled 687-52 B.C. He spent the first years of his rule strengthening his power and he went against Miletus and Smyrna and seized the city of Colophon, as reported by Herodotus (1.15). Then c. 663, alarmed at the growing power of the Cimmerians, he offered the Assyrian king Assurbanipal tribute and together with the Assyrians, defeated the Cimmerians. He then broke the alliance with Assurbanipal and joined with Psammetichus against his former ally. Assurbanipal sent the Cimmerians against Gyges who was killed in battle c.

[11]See K. F. Smith, "The Tale of Gyges and the King of Lydia," *AJP* 23 (1902): 261-82 and 361-87 for a discussion of the extant versions of the tale. After discussing these versions, Smith attempts to reconstruct the version circulating during the time of Herodotus and Plato. Smith seems to believe that the original tale necessarily had to contain all elements found in each of the various versions. For a summary of his attempt, see pp. 381-87.

652.[12] It was, no doubt, Gyges' connections with Delphi, the fame of his elaborate gifts to the oracle, and rumors of his fantastic wealth[13] that made him a figure familar to the Greeks. Local Lydian gossip and stories concerning the king presumably made their way to the Greeks via travelers and businessmen, thus providing material for poets and other writers. The most well-known versions are those found in the *Histories* and the *Republic* (359d-60b) but there are also versions in the works of Nikolaos Damaskenos,[14] Plutarch,[15] and Justin.[16] In addition, it is clear from a papyrus fragment dating from the late second or early third century A.D. that there was a pre-Sophoclean or Hellenistic tragedy that concerned the

[12]For historical information on Gyges, see J. Boulos, *Les Peuples et les Civilisations du Proche Orient*, 5 vols. (The Hague, The Netherlands, 1962), II: 261-62; J. G. Pedley, *Sardis in the Age of Croesus* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1968), pp. 38-50; G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia*, 3 vols. (Gotha, 1895; reprint ed., Hildesheim, 1967), II: 456-63; G. Radet, *La Lydie et le monde grec au temps des Mermnades (687-546)*, (Rome, 1967), especially pp. 112-86.

[13]Cf. M.L. West, ed., *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, Vol. 1. (Oxford, 1971: reprint ed., 1978), p. 8: Archilochus 19: Οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω τοῦ πολυχρύσου μέλει.

[14]*FGrHist* 90 F 47. This account, most likely derived from the work of Xanthos, contains the most historically probable reflection of the actual event. See Smith, "The Tale of Gyges," pp. 263-66.

[15]*Aetia Graeca*, XLV, p. 301f.

[16]i.7.14. This version is probably based on the work of Pompeius Trogus. Cf. Smith, "The Tale of Gyges," pp. 362-67.

accession of Gyges.[17] Thus it is evident that the Greeks had some sort of fascination with Gyges and his accession to the throne. While it is uncertain whether Herodotus had anything to do with the popularity of the tale, the figure of Gyges in the *Histories* is one of Herodotus' most engaging creations.

In this discussion of Herodotus' account of Gyges' usurpation of the Lydian throne, Herodotus' activity as covert narrator will be the chief focus. It will be seen that Herodotus has chosen to remain behind the scenes as much as possible while he tells this tale. It will be shown that his choice of an internal stance facilitates the shaping of his readers' opinions about Gyges. Because this internal stance grants omniscience to the narrator, the thoughts and feelings of Gyges, as well as his words, are able to be reported. The reader is this left with the impression that the narrator has a special knowledge and understanding of the event and its participants. In

[17]The dating of the play is a matter of debate though most scholars believe it to be Pre-Sophoclean and as such, available to Herodotus. Whether or not Herodotus used the play as a source is also an issue which has provoked much discussion. The similarities between the fragment and the Herodotean version are indeed striking and it has been suggested by D.L. Page (p. 6., see below) that what Herodotus has included in his work is a virtual summary of the play. For those who are bothered by the notion that Herodotus may have used a dramatic work as a historical source, it should be recalled that most Greeks of the fifth century did not doubt the historicity of the substance contained in the works of epic and drama, though the miraculous elements were undoubtedly not taken at face-value. The bibliography on the subject includes: E. Lobel, "A Greek Historical Drama," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1950); 207-16; D. L. Page, *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge, 1951); H. P. Stahl, Herodots Gyges-Tragodie" *Hermes* 96 (1968): 385-400: A. Lesky, Tragodien bei Herodot?" in *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory*, ed. K.H. Kinzel (Berlin, 1977), pp. 224-30.

additon, the various means employed by Herodotus to produce the illusion of mimesis will be noted. Particular attention will be paid to how Herodotus effects a feeling of the passage of time since this is an essential element in the mimetic presentation of any story or event.

An obvious but essential requirement of covert narration is that the narrator may make no overt reference to himself. Thus Herodotus refrains from making any reference to where he heard this story and launches immediately into his introduction of the tale. One of the most common ways Herodotus structures a passage in which he is utilizing covert narration is to open the account with a narrated summary of background information and then to continue on to the scenic presentation which is usually signalled by the beginning of a speech or dialogue.[18] The introductory remarks concern those who controlled Sardis before the Mermnadae, the family of Croesus, took over. Herodotus recounts the lineage of Agron, the first of the Heraclid kings of Sardis and that of Candaules, the last of this line. He also briefly mentions the rulers from whom the Heraclids had received power, the family of Lydus (1.7.1-3). After relating the number of years that the Heraclids had mastery over Sardis, Herodotus ends his introductory remarks with a repetition of the name of Candaules (1.7.4: **ἄρξαντες [μὲν] ἐπὶ δύο τε καὶ εἴκοσι γενεὰς ἀνδρῶν, ἔτεα πέντε τε καὶ πεντακόσια, παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδεκόμενος τὴν ἀρχήν, μέχρι Κανδαυλεύω τοῦ Μύρσου**), thus providing the starting point for the story of Gyges.

---

[18]Cf. Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation in the Bible,* p. 57.

The story proper begins with a brief narrative introduction of the main characters of the tale: Candaules, the king of Lydia and Gyges, a member of his bodyguard. It is here that the narrator's shaping of his readers' perceptions of the main characters may be clearly seen. For, Herodotus includes a descriptive phrase for each man that reveals what characteristic of each will play a crucial role in the events that follow. What is most significant about Candaules is that he was greatly in love with his wife and considered her the most beautiful woman in the world (1.8.1: **οὗτος δὴ ὢν ὁ Κανδαύλης ἠράσθη τῆς ἑωυτοῦ γυναικός, ἐρασθεὶς δὲ ἐνόμιζέ οἱ εἶναι γυναῖκα πολλὸν πασέων καλλίστην**). Gyges, on the other hand, is described in very passive terms and this characteristic is one that will be repeatedly emphasized by Herodotus. Herodotus characterizes him as the member of the bodyguard most liked by Candaules and the one to whom the king would communicate his very important affairs. Chief among the matters which Candaules confided to Gyges were his excessive praises of his wife's beauty (1.8.1: **ἦν γάρ οἱ τῶν αἰχμοφόρων Γύγης ὁ Δασκύλου ἀρεσκόμενος μάλιστα, τούτῳ τῷ Γύγῃ καὶ τὰ σπουδαιέστερα τῶν πρηγμάτων ὑπερετίθετο ὁ Κανδαύλης καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς γυναικὸς ὑπερεπαινέων**). It is important to note that Herodotus has mentioned only those characteristics of Gyges and Candaules that have relevance for the story. It does not matter whether Candaules was a weak or strong king or whether Gyges had ambitions for the Lydian kingship, though such matters would certainly be relevant to whatever historical realities may be reflected in this story.

This shaping on the part of the narrator is apparent even in the way the introduction of Gyges is worded. Herodotus states,

> ὥστε δὲ ταῦτα νομίζων, ἦν γάρ οἱ τῶν αἰχμοφόρων Γύγης ὁ Δασκύλου ἀρεσκόμενος μάλιστα, τούτῳ τῷ Γύγῃ καὶ τὰ σπουδαιέστερα τῶν πρηγμάτων ὑπερετίθετο ὁ Κανδαύλης καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς γυναικὸς ὑπερεταινέων. (1.8.1)

Now, ὥστε may be placed at the beginning of a sentence to signal a strong conclusion to that sentence[19] and it is used in this fashion here. The conclusion (1.8.1: **τούτῳ τῷ Γύγῃ καὶ τὰ σπουδαιέστερα τῶν πρηγμάτων ὑπερετίθετο ὁ Κανδαύλης καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς γυναικὸς ὑπερεπαινέων**), however, is postponed by the insertion of the phrase introducing Gyges as the favorite among the king's bodyguard (1.8.1: **ἦν γάρ οἱ τῶν αἰχμοφόρων Γύγης ὁ Δασκύλου ἀρεσκόμενος μάλιστα**). Now strictly speaking, the most usual and expected construction would probably have omitted the intrusive phrase identifying Gyges as the king's favorite and may have included that information in the form of a participial phrase. Such a construction could perhaps be construed: **ὥστε δὲ ταῦτα νομίζων, τῷ Γύγῃ τῷ Δασκύλου ἀρεσκομένῳ μάλιστα οἱ τῶν αἰχμοφόρων καὶ τὰ σπουδαιέστερα τῶν πρηγμάτων ὑπερετίθετο ὁ Κανδαύλης καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς γυναικὸς ὑπερεπαινέων**. However, by introducing Gyges in a sentence in which the activity of the king is the main concern, the narrator has graphically indicated that Gyges will be more of a victim of circumstances than an instigator of action in the story that follows. Had

---

[19]H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. by H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie, (Oxford, 1953), s.v. ὥστε.

the reverse been true, Gyges would have merited a separate, more individualized introduction of his own.

After this introduction of Candaules and Gyges, Herodotus can now begin the fully scenic presentation of the events. He marks the beginning of the scene in the sentence, **χρόνου δὲ οὐ πολλοῦ διελθόντος, χρῆν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς, ἔλεγε πρὸς τὸν Γύγην τοιάδε·** (1.8.2) which points to the following dialogue scene. This sentence, however, accomplishes more than the transition to the scenic mode. Herodotus as narrator is detectable behind the anticipatory **γάρ** clause,[20] **χρῆν γὰρ Κανδάυλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς**. Though it is subtle, this type of anticipation is one of the techniques a narrator can use to prepare his readers for what will follow and to ensure that they will perceive the actions of the characters in the way he desires. The stage has now been set: Gyges, in actuality the usurper, is the passive hero of the story who is forced by the king to listen to the frequent praises of his wife and Candaules is the king doomed to a bad end because of his immoderate adulation of his wife's beauty.

The first scenic episode relates a conversation between Candaules and Gyges. The king, convinced that Gyges does not believe that his wife is the most beautiful in the world, orders him to see her naked (1.8.2: **Γύγη, οὐ γάρ σε δοκέω πείθεσθαί μοι λέγοντι περὶ τοῦ εἴδεος τῆς γυναικός...ποίει ὅκως ἐκείνην θεήσεαι γυμνήν**). Gyges, horrified at such an indecent suggestion, vehemently protests (1.8.3-4). It is important to note that the words of both Candaules and Gyges are presented in *oratio recta*. As has been previously noted, direct speech is a necessary element

[20]See J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1959). pp. 68-69.

of scenic narration. It is, in fact, the chief indicator of mimesis because it is the principal form of enactment.[21] Consider, for a moment, the difference in the reader's impression of the narrator's presence that is created by his use of *oratio recta* in preference to *oratio obliqua*:

> [Κανδαύλης] ἔλεγε πρὸς τὸν τοιάδε· Γύγη, οὐ γάρ σε δοκέω πείθεσθαι μοι λέγοντι περὶ τοῦ εἴδεος τῆς γυναικός... (1.8.2)

> Κανδαύλης ἔλεγε πρὸς τὸν Γύγην ὅτι οὐ δοκοίη Γύγην πείθεσθαι οἱ λέγοντι περὶ τοῦ εἴδεος τῆς γυναικός...

The indirect form implies more mediation on the part of the narrator because it is impossible to determine whether or not the indirect statement is a verbatim reporting of the words actually spoken, the narrator's summary of a longer speech or even his interpretation of its contents.[22] In addition, the indirect form also necessarily presupposes the existence of someone who is doing the reporting. Direct presentation, however, creates the illusion that a character is saying something in the presence of the narrrator or, if you will, in the presence of the narrator's audience. The only overt indication of the narrator in this type of presentation is his notification of the change of speaker and such indications are functionally necessary to the dialogue because ancient narrative had no other means by

[21]Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, p. 32.
[22]Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, p. 200.

which to indicate the change.[23] However, Herodotus has made the most of this necessity by frequently including in his notation of a change of speakers information regarding the state of mind of the individual who is about to speak. Thus, Herodotus is able to inform his readers of Gyges' reaction to the king's suggestion with the words, **μέγα ἀμβώσας** (1.8.2). The inclusion of this type of circumstantial detail is important because it enhances the mimetic tone of the narrative.

At this point, the dialogue between the two men is interrupted by the inclusion of a brief summary statement in simple narration which relates that Gyges did all he could to dissuade the king (1.9: **ὁ μὲν δὴ λέγων τοιαῦτα ἀπεμάχετο...**). Because Herodotus has presented Gyges' first response to Candaules in *oratio recta*, there is really no need to relate the entire conversation. Thus, Herodotus can use this opportunity to add another element that furthers the mimetic illusion of the presentation. A summary statement of this type is frequently employed by Herodotus to give the impression of the passing of time. The imperfect middle form, **ἀπεμάχετο**, furthers the illusion that Gyges protested for some time. The communication of the passing of time is an essential part of a mimetic presentation. By employing various means to indicate this passage, the narrator can make his account mimic the tempo of the actual event.

---

[23]Modern writers are not as constrained in this respect as their ancient counterparts were. Both direct and indirect speech may be presented in tagged or free forms by the modern writer, depending upon the stylistic preferences of the author. In the tagged form, the author indicates that a character has said something by including the phrase 'he said' or some other similar phrase. In the free form, the tags are omitted and as a consequence, the words or thoughts of a character have greater inddepence from the activity as a narrator. Cf. Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, p. 201.

In addition to providing a means to convey the passage of time, this summary statement also performs another important function. It reveals Gyges' reasons for objecting to the king's suggestion. Gyges was afraid that there might be negative consequences for him should he give in to the king (1.9: ἀρρωδέων μή τί οἱ ἐξ αὐτῶν γένηται κακόν. Herodotus has several methods he uses to attribute motivation. He may give the reasons behind an individual's actions as his own personal opinion or he may dogmatically state what impelled the individual to act as he did.[24] These types of attributions may lie outside the main treatment of the event under consideration and may be added as an epilogue or commentary upon the action or individual. In the case of Gyges, however, the attribution of motivation arises from within the story and it is made possible by the narrator's omniscient stance. The remark is yet another example of how the narrator may shape his readers' picture of a character. It is very important to Herodotus' presentation of this story that his readers perceive Gyges as one who tried to avoid agreeing to the king's wishes.

The dialogue between the two men continues with Candaules' assurance that Gyges has no need to fear a trap (1.9.1). The king reveals to Gyges how he will set it up so that he will not be detected by the queen. He will place Gyges behind an open door from which it will be possible for him to watch the queen as she prepares for bed (1.9.2-3). The end of the conversation is signalled by the statement, ὁ μὲν δὴ ὡς οὐκ ἐδύνατο διαφυγεῖν, ἦν ἕτοιμος (1.10.1).

[24]See above pages 50-53.

The actual action is presented by Herodotus in simple narration. It is important to note that Herodotus has picked up the tempo of the narrative. The sentences are brief and simply constructed, thereby mimicking the speed with which the events occured. The events follow in quick succession: Candaules places Gyges behind the door and takes his place in the bedroom; the queen enters and undresses while Gyges looks on; Gyges slips out of the room as the queen walks toward the bed; the queen notices Gyges and realizes what her husband has done; the queen resolves to take vengeance upon Candaules (1.10.1-2). Herodotus then exploits the omniscience that his internal stance as narrator has granted him. He thus reveals the queen's decision to take vengeance upon Candaules in terms of what was going on inside her mind (1.10.2: ...**οὔτε ἀνέβωσε αἰσχυνθεῖσα οὔτε ἔδοξε μαθεῖν, ἐν νόῳ ἔχουσα τείσασθαι τὸν Κανδαύλεα**). Herodotus reinforces his readers' sense of his omniscience by explaining why the queen felt compelled to take vengeance upon her husband. He states: **παρὰ γὰρ τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι βαρβάροισι, καὶ ἄνδρα ὀφθῆναι γυμνὸν ἐς αἰσχύνην μεγάλην φέρει** (1.10.3). Herodotus has for a moment abandoned the discreet, behind-the-scenes stance to offer this information. This explanation is a necessary one as it prepares the way for the extreme form of vengeance which will be sought by the queen.

Herodotus continues this omniscient reporting in the account of the next stage of the story. The queen gathers her most trustworthy servants and readies them for her plans. She then calls Gyges who quickly arrives, still thinking that the queen knew nothing of the previous night's events (1.11.1: **ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν δοκέων αὐτὴν τῶν πρηχθέντων ἐπίστασθαι ἦλθε**

καλεόμενος). Herodotus' internal stance as narrator is made quite clear here. He is in the middle of the action, as if observing the events as they occur. In addition, he has chosen to reveal his omniscience by reporting what Gyges was thinking when he answered the queen's summons. It should be recognized that when a narrator reports the feelings or thoughts of a character from that character's perspective, he has changed points of view from his own to that of the character whose thoughts he is reporting.[25] This change in point of view enables the reader to know Gyges more intimately. The knowledge that Gyges was totally ignorant that he had been detected by the queen reinforces the reader's impression of Gyges as one caught up in circumstances beyond his control. The subsequent events will illustrate this further: he will now be forced to become the unwilling agent of the queen as well as the king.

The reporting of Gyges' thoughts has, of course, been filtered through Herodotus' eyes as narrator. For it is he who has "peered" into Gyges' mind

[25]The concepts of point of view and narrative voice are often confused with one another though they are not equivalent ideas. Narrative voice refers to the means by which a story is communicated to the audience. Generally, this is accomplished by a narrator though the narrator may be minimally present in the work or a full-fledged participant. Point of view, however, signifies the stance or perspective from which a story is told and in theory, each character as well as the narrator has a point of view, whether or not it is revealed in the story. Often, an author will vary the point of view in the work by allowing the narrator at one moment to express his own point of view and then that of a character through the reporting of that person's thoughts, words or feelings. The result is a work of greater depth and insight than if a single point of view had prevailed throughout the whole story as the reader is then permitted to view the action from a variety of perspectives. Cf. A. Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation in the Bible*, pp. 46-64; S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, pp. 151-58.

to tell his readers what Gyges was thinking at that particular moment and he has reported only those thoughts which were relevant to the point at hand. This account of Gyges' thoughts is yet another technique used by Herodotus to shape his audience's perception of the story and its actors. That it is Herodotus who is the mediator of Gyges' thoughts is made even more clear by the words, ἐώθεε γὰρ καὶ πρόσθε, ὅκως ἡ βασίλεια καλέοι, φοιτᾶν (1.11.1). Herodotus, in his capacity as omniscient narrator, has directly offered an explanation for Gyges' lack of suspicion regarding the queen's summons. The γάρ clearly sets this statement off as a remark made by the narrator. The remark, however, arises naturally from within the story and is not as intrusive as if Herodotus had offered the explanation on the authority of an informant or as his own personal opinion. The explanation is necessary from the standpoint of characterization as it furthers the picture of Gyges as a naive and trusting servant of the royal family.[26]

The actual confrontation of Gyges by the queen is presented in direct speech and the structuring of this episode by the narrator achieves the desired effect of mimesis. The queen wastes no time in getting to the reason for her summons and informs Gyges that he must either kill the king, the instigator of the evil deed, or be killed himself for following his indecent command (1.11.2-3). Herodotus then includes a short passage of simple narration:

[26]Cf. K.F. Smith, "The Tale of Gyges", p. 282. Smith suggests that behind this phrase may lie an indication of an affair between Gyges and the queen.

ὁ δὲ Γύγης τέως μὲν ἀπεθώμαζε τὰ λεγόμενα, μετὰ δὲ ἱκέτευε μή μιν ἀναγκαίῃ διακρῖναι τοιαύτην αἵρεσιν. οὐκ ὧν δὴ ἔπειθε, ἀλλ' ὥρα ἀναγκαίην ἀληθέως προκειμένην ἢ τὸν δεσπότεα ἀπολλύναι ἢ αὐτὸν ὑπ' ἄλλων ἀπολλύσθαι· αἱρέεται αὐτὸς περιεῖναι. (1.11.3-4)

This passage performs the same function as the straight narrative statement at 1.9[27] (ὁ μὲν δὴ λέγων τοιαῦτα ἀπεμάχετο, ἀρρωδέων μὴ τί οἱ ἐξ αὐτῶν γένηται κακόν). It provides a summary of events and conveys the passage of time, a necessary component of a mimetic presentation. Gyges for a time (τέως μὲν...) stood amazed at the queen's words; he then began to beseech (ἱκέτευε) her not to force him to make such a choice. Finally, after he realized that he had no alternative, he chose to live. It may be suprising to note that here Gyges' words to the queen are reported in *oratio obliqua* since *oratio recta* has been used by Herodotus up to this point. This is, however, a necessary consequence of the function of the passage. A speech or even just a few spoken words cannot be reported in *oratio recta* if the author desires the passage to act as a summary of events or to convey the passage of time. For, when a speech is reported directly, the discourse-time is equal to the story-time, i.e. the time it

[27]Cf. page 79.

takes to read the speech[28] is essentially equivalent to the time it took for the speech to be given. When a summary is needed or the passage of time must be conveyed, these two periods cannot be equal. The discourse-time must be shorter than the story-time. One of the most effective ways to accomplish this is to use *oratio obliqua* as well as iterative or inchoative imperfects and temporal adverbs. It is, of course, possible to report the exact words spoken by an individual in *oratio obliqua*, but Herodotus tends not to use *oratio obliqua* to give an account of a lengthy speech. He prefers, rather, to use *oratio obliqua* to report a summarized version of what was said and/or to convey the passage of time.[29]

---

[28]This is what is known as discourse-time. Story-time refers to the time the events of the story actually took to occur. See S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, pp. 67-79 for a discussion of the various relationships discourse-time may have to story-time. When discourse-time is equal to story-time, a scenic presentation of events results. If discourse-time is shorter than the story-time or if there is no discourse-time at all, a summary or an ellipsis is produced. A "stretch" is the result when discourse-time is longer than story-time and is usually accomplished through the use of paraphrases and repetitions. When a pause is present, the story-time has been stopped through the discourse-time continues, generally for the purpose of description or commentary.

[29]I can think of no example in the Histories of a lengthy speech presented in *oratio obliqua*. It would be interesting to examine in a systematic fashion Herodotus' use of *oratio obliqua* as compared to his use of *oratio recta*. This is beyond the scope of this present discussion. However, a brief survey of the eleven single speeches quoted indirectly that are found in Book One does indicate that Herodotus uses *oratio obliqua* to convey the passage of time or to give a summary of the speech when the *ipsissima verba* are not necessary to the narrative. Cf. 1.13.2; 44.2; 59.2; 78.3; 80.3; 87.1; 97.1; 127.2; 141.1-2; 152.1; 172.2. For a listing of the single speech in *oratio obliqua* found in the Histories, see Lang, *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse*, pp. 91-92.

For the actual laying of plans for the king's murder, the account switches back to direct speech. Gyges, reluctantly resigned to the deed, asks his mistress how they will make their attack (1.11.4: **Ἐπεί με ἀναγκάζεις δεσπότεα τὸν ἐμὸν κτείνειν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα, φέρε ἀκούσω, τέῳ καὶ τρόπῳ ἐπιχειρήσομεν αὐτῷ**). The queen informs him that Gyges will kill the king in the bedroom, the very spot where the initial deed took place (1.11.5: **Ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μὲν χωρίου ἡ ὁρμὴ ἔσται ὅθεν περ καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ ἐπεδέξατο γυμνήν, ὑπνωμένῳ δὲ ἡ ἐπιχείρησις ἔσται**).

Again, the action of the story is presented in simple narration. The details of the murder of Candaules are sparse and to the point, again recreating the speed with which the event took place: Gyges follows the queen into the bedroom once evening has come; she hides him behind the door and gives him a sword; Gyges kills the king after he has fallen asleep and gains control of his kingdom and takes his queen as wife (1.12.1-2). There is one sentence in this passage, however, where the shaping hand of the narrator is subtly evident. At 1.12.1, Herodotus interrupts the sentence beginning the account of the murder (**ὡς δὲ ἤρτυσαν τὴν ἐπιβουλήν, νυκτὸς γενομένης...**) with the parenthetical statement, **οὐ γὰρ ἐμετίετο ὁ Γύγης, οὐδέ οἱ ἦν ἀπαλλαγὴ οὐδεμία, ἀλλ' ἔδεε ἢ αὐτὸν ἀπολωλέναι ἢ Κανδαύλεα**. The narrator once again reminds his readers that Gyges could find no way to avoid the choice required of him by the queen. He must either kill the king or be killed himself, which is hardly a reasonable alternative. Herodotus must ensure that his readers continue to perceive Gyges sympathetically as a victim of circumstances beyond his control and he accordingly includes this parenthetical remark as just such a reminder.

The end of the story is signalled by the concluding tag, ...Γύγης, τοῦ καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος ὁ Πάριος, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον γενόμενος, ἐν ἰάμβῳ τριμέτρῳ ἐπεμνήσθη (1.12.2).[30] This statement reveals one method a narrator may use to close his story. By bringing his audience back to Greek culture and experience through the mention of Archilochus, Herodotus has marked the end of the tale. The story's hold on the attention of the audience has been broken; Herodotus may now return to his account of the succession of the Lydian kings. This he does, but first Herodotus relates the rest of the information he has about Gyges and his rule. It is interesting to contrast Herodotus' narrative style in Chapters 13 and 14 with the preceding account of Gyges' usurpation of the throne. Chapter 13 concerns the consolidation of his power and no doubt, includes some historical truths. The oracle confirming Gyges' control over Lydia may actually be historical as How and Wells have suggested,[31] since this would account for Gyges' feeling of debt to Delphi and the enormous number of gifts he sent as offerings. In addition, behind the mention of the supporters of Gyges (1.13.1: στασιῶται) may be a vague indication that Gyges' takeover had more to do with his own personal ambitions for power than the preceding story may indicate. In Chapter 14, Herodotus discusses the various gifts that Gyges sent to Delphi and concludes with the statement that Gyges seized Miletus, Smyrna and

[30]Some editors bracket these lines because of the apparent break in thought and the use of the technical term ἰάμβῳ τριμέτρῳ. If, however, they are understood as an indication that the scenic presentation of events has ended, they are not interruptive. In addition, the use of a technical literary term by one as familiar with the literature of his day as Herodotus is, need not necessarily be suspect. Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary*, 1:59.

[31]How and Wells, *Commentary*, 1:59.

Colophon but accomplished no other noteworthy work during his rule of thirty-eight years (1.14.4: ἀλλ' οὐδὲν γὰρ μέγα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλο ἔργον ἐγένετο βασιλεύσαντος δυῶν δέοντα τεσσεράκοντα ἔτεα, τοῦτο μὲν παρήσομεν τοσαῦτα ἐπιμνησθέντες). It is important to note that Herodotus has here used the mode of narration most commonly found in the *Histories*. In both of these chapters, Herodotus' concern and interest lie with the relation of the facts, not with the artful narration of a good tale. He thus selects the straight narrative mode to relate the information and his style is succinct, and lacking in adornment and elaboration. With his account of Gyges now complete, Herodotus continues his account of the Mermnad kings.

The Story of Atys and Adrastus (1.34-45)

The tale of Atys and Adrastus, though actually part of the larger narrative concerning Croesus, is a complete story in its own right and thus may be discussed as a separate unit. The dramatic structuring of the tale has long been recognized,[32] though there is no evidence, such as that which exists for the story of Gyges, that a tragedy on the subject was ever composed. Herodotus does not mention his sources for this story or for the story of the encounter between Solon and Croesus (1.29-33) which immediately precedes this tale. There are those who suggest that the original version of this story is to be found in the cult-myth of the Phrygio-

[32]See Immerwahr, *Form and Thought*, pp. 69-70 and R. Rieks, "Eine Tragische Erzahling bei Herodot (Hist. 1,34-45)," *Poetica* 7 (1975): 23-44.

Lydian deity Attis[33] who was killed by a boar in one version of the legend,[34] and by self-mutilation in another.[35] It is unfortunately impossible to determine whether Herodotus or his sources incorporated this tale into the story of Croesus and the sole historical fact lying beneath the story may be that Croesus had a son named Atys.[36] However, as is true for the entire story of Croesus, the historical foundations for the tale are far less important than its philosophical import.

As in the story of Gyges, Herodotus presents the tale of Atys and Adrastus in the fully scenic mode of narration. Herodotus again uses simple narration to ease transitions from scene to scene and to present information that cannot be easily take scenic form. It will be seen, however, that in this story Herodotus exploits more completely the potential for mimesis that is made possible be directly presented speech and dialogue. This discussion will show that once Herodotus has presented the necessary background information and has set the scene, dialogue prevails and Herodotus' presence as narrator is only minimally detectable in the central portion of the story. The core of the story will be seen to consist of four dialogue scenes, viz. the conversations between Croesus and Adrastus, Croesus and Mysian messenagers, Croesus and his son Atys and finally, Croesus and Adrastus. The result of this priority of dialogue over simple narration will be shown to be the enhancement of the illusion of mimesis. For, the issues and conflicts, as well as their resolution, will

[33]How and Wells, *Commentary*, 1: 70-71.
[34]Pausanias, 7.17.5.
[35]Pausanias, 7.17.5; Ovid, *Fasti* 4, 215-44.
[36]How and Wells, *Commentary*, 1: 70-71.

appear to have been presented by the specific individuals involved in the action rather than from the point of view of the narrator. In addition, the brief phrases and passages of simple narration that are found in this central section will be seen to be entirely dialogue-bound. It will be noted that they introduce each conversation in such a way that the connnection between the present conversation and the previous one is emphasized. The simple narrative introductions to the first two conversations will be seen to present information that prefigures what will be said in the dialogue rather than being the sole conveyers of new information.[37] The only passages of simple narration that function in their own right and are not dialogue-bound will be seen to be those found at the beginning and end of the story.

Herodotus sets the scene for the story in a passage of simple narration. He informs his readers of the salient facts: nemesis was to strike Croesus for thinking himself the happiest man in the work (1.34.1); he had a dream that foretold the death of his son by a blow from a spear (1.34.1-3); and that he took all possible steps to keep the dream from coming to pass by arranging for his son to be married, by preventing him from going out on military expeditions and by removing all weapons from his quarters (1.34.2). Also include in this passage is important information about Atys. Herodotus reveals that Croeus actually has two sons but one is crippled (1.34.2). Atys, however, surpassed his age-mates in every aspect (1.34.2) and was accustomed to leading his fellow Lydians on military

[37]Cf. R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York, 1981), p. 65 for a discussion of the significance that the primacy of dialogue over narration has in the Biblical text.

forays (1.34.3: ...ἐωθότα δὲ στρατηγέειν μιν τῶν Λυδῶν...). All that remains is for Herodotus to tell how the dream will be fulfilled, despite Croesus' attempts to subvert it. Convention requires that Croesus' measures fail and that Atys be killed; thus, the audience's interest in the story will not necessarily be maintained by the plot alone. Their continued attention will be secured by only one thing, the expert narration of the conventionally structured tale. And Herodotus will accomplish this not by obviously filtering the story through his own eyes as a third-party narrator but by effecting the illusion that his presentation mimetically reflects the original occurrence of the event. He does this by maintaining his stance as a covert but omniscient narrator and through the direct representation of the four dialogue scenes.

It is important to recognize that even in the work of an author as early in the development of Greek prose-writing as Herodotus was, the particular way a passage is structured and the order in which facts or details are related provide ample evidence that Herodotus understood how he, as narrator, could control the way his readers perceived his story. Notice how Herodotus reports the arrival of Adrastus in the court of Croesus:

> ἔχοντος δέ οἱ ἐν χερσὶ τοῦ παιδὸς τὸν γάμον ἀπικνέεται ἐς τὰς Σάρδις ἀνὴρ συμφορῇ ἐχόμενος καὶ οὐ καθαρὸς χεῖρας, ἐὼν φρύξ μὲν γενεῇ, γένεος δὲ τοῦ βασιληίου. (1.35.1)

These details have been narrated in the order of their relevance to the story, thus providing the audience with clues to their potential significance. First in importance is the arrival of the stranger at the very time Atys was about

to be wed, then follow the facts that he has met with misfortune and is stained by blood-guilt and finally, his race and royal lineage are mentioned. It is clear that Herodotus realized that an introduction of this sort would provide his audience with the clue that the stranger's arrival will have some bearing upon the fulfillment of Croesus' dream.

After Croesus performs the customary ritual of purification, he asks the man who he is, what part of Phrygia is his home and what person he has killed (1.35.3: **Ὦνθρωπε, τίς τε ἐὼν καὶ κόθεν τῆς Φρυγίης ἥκων ἐπίστιός μοι ἐγένεο; τίνα τε ἀνδρῶν ἢ γυναικῶν ἐφόνευσας;**). It is at this point in the story that dialogue, presented in *oratio recta*, begins to take precedence in Herodotus' narration and it will maintain its predominance until the final scene. Whenever possible, Herodotus will now present the story in the form of a conversation between the various individuals. Brief statements in simple narration will be included to facilitate the transition from one speaker to the next or from one dialogue to the following dialogue. This preference for dialogue over narration in the central section of the tale has a very important result. The reader is left with the impression that he has not been *told* a story as much as *shown* a story. That is to say, the reader feels that he has witnessed a mimetic reenactment of the events of the story rather than merely having read a second-hand account of that event.

It is important to look closely at the brief phrases of simple narration that are found in the account of the conversation between Croesus and Adrastus. The dialogue is introduced by the sentence, **ἐπείτε δὲ τὰ νομιζόμενα ἐποίησε ὁ Κροῖσος, ἐπυνθάνετο ὁκόθεν τε καὶ τίς εἴη,**

λέγων τάδε· (1.35.2). These words prefigure in a summarized form two of the three questions that Croesus will put to Adrastus in the actual dialogue. However, the most important question, viz. the one concerning the reason why Adrastus was seeking ritual purification from Croesus, is not expressed in this introductory statement. It is reserved for presentation in the dialogue itself because there, it will produce the most dramatic effect. The withholding of this question from the simple narrative introduction of Croesus' words increases the impact when it is actually stated: τίνα τε ἀνδρῶν ἢ γυναικῶν ἐφόνευσας; (1.35.3). The other simple narrative phrases in this passage are ὁ δὲ ἀμείβετο (1.35.3) and Κροῖσος δὲ μιν ἀμείβετο τοισίδε (1.35.4) which preface the remarks of Adrastus and Croesus, respectively. Thus, the conversation itself is presented in such a way that the narrator is only minimally detectable. Herodotus as author and narrator is, of course, behind these simple narrative statements as well as the conversation itself. However, his presence as narrator is overtly manifested only in the simple narrative statements. These statements mark the change of speakers and this is a necessary function performed by the narrator. Thus, the questions and the answers are presented from the points of view of the actual individuals involved. The result of this type of presentation is the verisimilar reenactment of the meeting between Croesus and Adrastus.

The next scene is presented in a manner similar to the previous scene. Herodotus again opens with a statement that reveals a synchronism of events.[38] He states in simple narration that while Adrastus was living in

[38]Cf. 1.35.1.

Croesus' palace, a huge boar was in the Mysian countryside near Mt. Olympus (1.36.1: ὁ μὲν δὴ δίαιταν εἶχε ἐν Κροίσου, ἐν δὲ τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἐν τῷ Μυσίῳ Ὀλύμπῳ ὑὸς χρῆμα γίνεται μέγα). The words ἐν δὲ τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ strongly emphasize this synchronism, especially through the solemn repetition of the 'ῳ' sound.[39] Herodotus continues to set the stage for the next scene with the words,

> ὁρμώμενος δὲ οὗτος ἐκ τοῦ ὄρεος τούτου τὰ τῶν Μυσῶν ἔργα διαφθείρεσκε, πολλάκις δὲ οἱ Μυσοὶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐξελθόντες ποιέεσκον μὲν κακὸν οὐδέν, ἔπασχον δὲ πρὸς αὐτοῦ. (1.36.1)

The iterative imperfects διαφθείρεσκε, ποιέεσκον and ἔπασχον emphasize the length of time the Mysians have been terrorized by the boar. The situation reaches such a point of crisis, that the Mysians send to Croesus for help. The messengers arrive at the palace of Croesus (1.36.2) and their words to the king are presented in *oratio recta*. They state,

> Ὦ βασιλεῦ, ὑὸς χρῆμα μέγιστον ἀνεφάνη ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ χώρῃ, ὃς τὰ ἔργα διαφθείρει. τοῦτον προθυμεόμενοι ἑλεῖν οὐ δυνάμεθα. νῦν ὦν προσδεόμεθά σευ τὸν παῖδα καὶ λογάδας νεηνίας καὶ κύνας συμπέμψαι ἡμῖν, ὡς ἄν μιν ἐξέλωμεν ἐκ τῆς χώρης. (1.36.2)

It is important to note that Herodotus' simple narrative introduction to this part of the story has again prefigured two of the three essential elements of the actual conversation. The presentation of the most important point,

[39]The technical term for the figure is 'parechesis'. Alliteration generally refers to the repetition of initial sounds. See Smyth, *Greek Grammer*, p. 680.

however, is once again reserved for the dialogue. The messengers first inform the king that the boar is devastating their land and that they been unable to kill it. Both of these details were mentioned in the introductory statement. The messengers then get to the point of their mission. They ask the king to send his son along with other young men and dogs to aid them in their hunt of the boar. As in the conversation between Adrastus and Croesus, the expression of the key element is kept for presentation in *oratio recta* so that the full dramatic impact of the request may be achieved.

Croesus replies to the messenger's request in a brief speech that is prefaced by the simple narrative introduction, **οἱ μὲν δὴ τούτων ἐδέοντο, Κροῖσος δὲ μνημονεύων τοῦ ὀνείρου τὰ ἔπεα ἔλεγέ σφι τάδε** (1.36.3). These words do more than note the change of speaker. They are the product of the omniscient narrator who is able to peer into the mind of Croesus to tell his readers what he was thinking at the very momemnt when he replied to the Mysians. They also offer an explanation for the tone and content of Croesus' reply. He begins on a rather abrupt note by telling the messengers not to mention his son (1.36.3: **Παιδὸς μὲν περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ μὴ μνησθῆτε ἔτι**). The reader, however, is already prepared for such a reply because of the narrator's words, **μνημονεύων τοῦ ὀνείρου** (1.36.3) and is not suprised when Croesus goes on to state that he will not send his son (1.36.3: **οὐ γὰρ ἂν ὑμῖν συμπέμψαιμι**). Croesus does offer his own explanation for his unwillingness to send his son to help the Mysians. He tells them that his son has been recently married and is too occupied with his marriage (1.36.3: **νεόγαμός τε γάρ ἐστι καὶ ταῦτά οἱ νῦν μέλει**). The reader, however, is

aware of the real reason behind Croesus' refusal because of the narrator's introductory words. Thus, in this discreet manner, the covert and omniscient narrator may advise his readers of the actual motive for an individual's words without being forced to relay such information in an intrusive editorial comment made in his own person. Croesus then ends his reply to the Mysians with a promise to send hunting dogs and selected men to aid them in their pursuit of the boar (1.36.3).

The most significant conversation in the story begins when Atys enters the room in which Croesus and the Mysian messengers were conferring after he overhears his father's refusal to send him on the hunt (1.37.1). It is important to note how scarcely detectable Herodotus is as narrator of the scene. His introductory statement concerning Atys' entrance into the room in which Croesus and the Mysians were meeting merely facilitates the transition to the next scene. It does not prefigure what will be said in the ensuing conversation between Croesus and Atys nor does it convey any new and essential information. In addition, once the conversation between the two has begun, Herodotus retreats almost entirely and only allows his presence as narrator to be evident in the words he uses to denote the change of speakers. Croesus' response to his son's complaint of his treatment by his father is marked by the words, ἀμείβετο Κροῖσος τοισίδε (1.38.1); Atys' reply to his father's explanation is prefaced by, ἀμείβεται ὁ νεηνίης τοισίδε (1.39.1) and Croesus' surrender to his son's plea is introduced by, ἀμείβεται Κροῖσος (1.40). Thus, what the reader experiences is a realistic depiction of the interaction between father and son with the narrator only minimally evident. Croesus and Atys speak for

themselves, and the emotions felt by both men are echoed in their words. Atys' frustration at his father's behavior toward him is reflected in the rapid succession of his questions: **κοῖος μέν τις τοῖσι πολιήτῃσι δόξω εἶναι, κοῖος δέ τις τῇ νεογάμῳ γυναικί; κοίῳ δὲ ἐκείνη δόξει ἀνδρὶ συνοικέειν;** (1.37.3). Croesus' frantic paternal concern for the life of his son is evident in the hyperbaton found in his words, **εἴ κως δυναίμην ἐπὶ τῆς ἐμῆς σε ζόης διακλέψαι** (1.38.2).[40] The reader is left with the impression that the scene has been presented as it might have occurred rather than having been excessively moderated by a narrator who supplies explanations for his characters' behavior from his own point of view or summarizes their words in *oratio obliqua*.

The story now moves to its fourth exchange of dialogue. After Croesus tells his son that he may participate in the hunt, he summons Adrastus (1.41.1: **εἶπας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Κροῖσος μεταπέμπεται τὸν Φρύγα Ἄδρηστον**). Like all of the other previous dialogues, this conversation is presented in *oratio recta*. Croesus asks Adrastus to accompany his son on the hunt after reminding him that he is under obligation to him for all that Croesus has done for him (1.41.1-2). Adrastus is hesitatnt because of his misfortune but agrees to do as the king asks (1.42.1-2). It is important to note that this dialogue has been structured by Herodotus in an manner similar to the preceding conversations. The introduction in simple narration of the conversation connects the dialogue with the preceding scene by beginning the introduction with a phrase that refers back to the previous scene (1.41.1: **εἶπας δὲ ταῦτα**). After this introduction, Herodotus

[40]The more usual construction would be: **εἴ κως δυναίμην ἐπὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ζόης σε διακλέψαι.**

withdraws from the narrative and only surfaces to mark the change of speakers (1.42.1: ἀμείβεται ὁ Ἄδρηστος), thus creating the artifice that the individuals involved in the event are very nearly telling their own story.

The story now returns to presentation in simple narration. The hunters make their preparations and begin the hunt. They reach Olympus and quickly find the boar and surround it (1.43.1). These details are related in quick succession and without elaboration. Herodotus then slows the pace of narration by stating,

> ἔνθα δὴ ὁ ξεῖνος, οὗτος δὴ ὁ καθαρθεὶς τὸν φόνον, καλεόμενος δὲ Ἄδρηστος, ἀκοντίζων τὸν ὃν τοῦ μὲν ἁμαρτάνει, τυγχάνει δὲ τοῦ Κροίσου παιδός. (1.43.2)

The descriptive phrases, οὗτος δὴ ὁ καθαρθεὶς τὸν φόνον and καλεόμενος δὲ Ἄδρηστος do not provide any new information. They are included here by Herodotus purely to increase the intensity of the scene by slowing down the tempo and by emphasizing the identity and unfortunate past of Adrastus. Herodotus then returns to his quickly-paced narration. He summarily states that Croesus' dream was fulfilled (1.43.3: ὁ μὲν δὴ βληθεὶς τῇ αἰχμῇ ἐξέπλησε τοῦ ὀνείρου τὴν φήμην) and that a messenger ran to tell Croesus the news (1.43.3). When Croesus learned of the death of his son, he cried out to Zeus as the god of purification (1.44.2: Δία καθάρσιον), as the protector of the hearth (1.44.2: ἑπίστιον) and as god of friendship (1.44.2: ἑταιρηίον). It is important to note that Herodotus here does not report the actual words of Croesus but rather relates under what aspects Croesus summoned Zeus and his reasons for invoking each one. This is not even a presentation of his words in *oratio obliqua* but a simple narrative report

of the fact that Croesus summoned Zeus. Though Herodotus could have presented this scene in a much more dramatic fashion, he has chosen to reserve the final dramatic presentation for the last scene.

The Lydians reach the palace of Croesus bearing the body of Atys and Adrastus follows behind the procession (1.45.1). Adrastus surrenders himself to Croesus and orders him to slay his body over the corpse. He mentions his previous misfortune, that he has destroyed the one who had cleansed him and that his life is no longer worth living (1.45.1: ...ἐπικατασφάξαι μιν κελεύων τῷ νεκρῷ, λέγων τήν τε προτέρην ἑωυτοῦ συμφορήν, καὶ ὡς ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ τὸν καθήραντα ἀπολωλεκὼς εἴη, οὐδέ οἱ εἴη βιώσιμον). His words are not a direct presentation but are presented in *oratio obliqua*. Croesus is moved to pity and addresses the man,

> Ἔχω, ὦ ξεῖνε, παρὰ σεῦ πᾶσαν τὴν δίκην, ἐπειδὴ σεωυτοῦ καταδικάζεις θάνατον. εἷς δὲ οὐ σύ μοι τοῦδε τοῦ κακοῦ αἴτιος, εἰ μὴ ὅσον ἀέκων ἐξεργάσαο, ἀλλὰ θεῶν κού τις, ὅς μοι καὶ πάλαι προεσήμαινε τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι. (1.45.2)

It is made clear by the structure of this passage that Herodotus recognized not only that *oratio recta* is the most effective means to produce an illusion of mimesis but also that he could affect the tone of the passage through a strategic use of *oratio recta*. Croesus' words are the final ones spoken in the story and it is fitting that the king's ackowledgement that he was unable to keep the dream from coming to pass despite all his efforts be presented in the most dramatic way possible. A verbatim presentation accomplishes this and in fact, the impact of Croesus' words is heightened because the words of Adrastus are presented in *oratio obliqua*. If the

words of both speakers had been presented in *oratio recta*, they would have received equal treatment and emphasis. But, with the expression of Croesus' words in *oratio recta* and those of Adrastus in *oratio obliqua*, Croesus' pardon of Adrastus and his acknowledgement of the working of the divine in his son's death receives the fullest dramatic emphasis possible through its contrast with the indirect reporting of the words of Adrastus.

The story closes with a brief passage in simple narration that concludes the action. Croesus buries his son (1.45.3) and Adrastus kills himself over the tomb of Atys. Herodotus has added the final dramatic touch in his report of Adrastus' suicide. Rather than just informing his readers that Adrastus stabbed himself over the grave of the boy, Herodotus again adds descriptive phrases that heighten the effect of the suicide upon the reader. He writes,

> Ἄδρηστος δὲ ὁ Γορδίεω τοῦ Μίδεω, οὗτος δὴ ὁ φονεὺς μὲν τοῦ ἑωυτοῦ ἀδελφεοῦ γενόμενος, φονεὺς δὲ τοῦ καθήραντος, ἐπείτε ἡσυχίη τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐγένετο περὶ τὸ σῆμα, συγγινωσκόμενος ἀνθρώπων εἶναι τῶν αὐτὸς ἥδεε βαρυσυμφορώτατος, ἐπικατασφάζει τῷ τύμβῳ ἑωυτόν. (1.45.3)

Each phrase reminds the reader what has happened and builds in a crescendo to the final note, the suicide of Adrastus.[41]

The Birth of Cyrus (1.107 - 113)

[41]Cf. J.D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style*, (Oxford, 1960), p. 8. Denniston notes that the suspension of the main idea until the end of the sentence and the heavy polysyllabic words heighten the effect of this passage.

Though Cyrus has been a full-fledged participant in the narrative concerning Croesus' attack upon Cyrus and the Persian empire, Herodotus postpones the discussion of his rise of power until after he has recounted the defeat of Croesus and the subjugation of Lydia by the Persians. After concluding a brief digression on the customs of the Lydians, Herodotus states that he will now discuss Cyrus and the origins of his power (1.95.1: **Ἐπιδίζηται δὲ δὴ τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος τόν τε Κῦρον ὅστις ἐὼν τὴν Κροίσου ἀρχὴν κατεῖλε, καὶ τοὺς Πέρσας ὅτεῳ τρόπῳ ἠγήσαντο τῆς Ἀσίης**). He then continues,

> **ὡς ὧν Περσέων μετεξέτεροι λέγουσι οἱ μὴ βουλόμενοι σεμνοῦν τὰ περὶ Κῦρον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐόντα λέγειν λόγον, κατὰ ταῦτα γράψω, ἐπιστάμενος περὶ Κύρου καὶ τριφασίας ἄλλας λόγων ὁδοὺς φῆναι.** (1.95.1)

Herodotus' reason for making this statement is twofold. Firstly, it is important to him as a researcher of facts that he makes it clear that the Persians are the sources for his information about Cyrus and that he has heard several versions of the story. In addition, he must indicate to his readers that he has selected the true account (**τὸν ἐόντα λόγον**) from those available. These remarks are important not only in respect to Herodotus' image as researcher but also as narrator. Herodotus is aware the much of what he has to relate about Cyrus is somewhat fabulous and he anticipates his audience's skepticism by assuring them, before they have cause to doubt, that the version of Cyrus' rise to power that he will relate is the correct one. The sentiment is not unlike that of an oral storyteller

who insists upon the truth of his tale despite its questionable veracity.[42] In fact, this statement may actually be a a remnant of those compositional techniques formerly utilized by oral poets[43] but whose influence extended to those who were among the first to compose their works in writing.

After making this statement, Herodotus does not immediately begin his account of Cyrus' rise to power. He first backs up and relates the establishment of Deioces' power over the Medes (1.96-101); the succession of his son Phraortes and his subjugation of Persia (1.102); the military accomplishments of Phraortes' son and successor Cyaxares and his eventual defeat by the Scythians (1.103-104); a digression concerning the exploits of the Scythians at the temple of Aphrodite Ascalon (1.105); and the overthrow of the Scythians by Cyaxares and the Medes (1.106) and finally, the death of Cyaxares (1.106). Herodotus uses straight narrative mode for the account of these chapters. He moves quickly through the military accomplishments of these kings and refrains from commentary or description. At 1.107.1, however, it is clear that Herodotus is planning to slow the tempo of the

---

[42]Cf. B. J. Ancelet, "And this in No Damn Lie: Oral History in Story Form," *International Journal of Oral History* 4 (1983): 100.

[43]Other remarks that are indicative of an oral narrator are those that reveal what the narrator is about to relate. Such statements are frequently made by Herodotus. See e.g., τοῦτον δὴ ὧν τὸν Ἀστυάγεα Κῦρος ἐόντα ἑωυτοῦ μητροπάτορα καταστρεψάμενος ἔσχε δι' αἰτίην τὴν ἐγὼ ἐν τοῖσι ὀπίσω λόγοισι σημανέω (1.75.1); δεῖ δή με πρὸς τούτοισι ἔτι φράσαι ἵνα τε ἐκ τῆς τάφρου ἡ γῆ ἀναισιμώθη καὶ τὸ τεῖχος ὅντινα τρόπον ἔργαστο (1.179.1); ἡ δὲ δὴ δεύτερον γενομένη ταύτης βασίλεια, τῇ οὔνομα ἦν Νίτωκρις, αὕτη δὲ συνετωτέρη γενομένη τῆς πρότερον ἀρξάσης τοῦτο μὲν μνημόσυνα ἐλίπετο τὰ ἐγὼ ἀπηγήσομαι (1.185.1). See Scobie, "Storytellers, Storytelling and the Novel in Graeco-Roman Antiquity," p. 255.

account. He first states that Cyaxares was succeeded by his son Astyages (1.107.1: ἐκδέκεται δὲ Ἀστυάγης ὁ Κυαξάρεω παῖς τὴν βασιληίην). Herodotus then tells his audience that Astyages had a daughter named Mandane (1.107.1: καί οἱ ἐγένετο θυγάτηρ τῇ οὔνομα ἔθετο Μανδάνην), thus breaking his previous pattern of relating the establishment of power by a king or his simple succession from his father and then his military achievements. This is a signal to his audience that what follows will be of a different nature than the preceding chapters. Herodotus can now begin his acccount of the rise of Cyrus to power.

Herodotus clearly recognized the importance of Cyrus to the development of the Persian state and this accounts for the detailed treatment of Cyrus and his rule by the historian. Herodotus decides to begin his discussion at the very beginning, i.e. with the actual birth of the great king. It is frequently true that in the stories of the founders of empires that a significant amount of legendary material and folktale has crept into the accounts, greatly diluting their historical value. The story of the birth of Cyrus is no exception to this tendency and consequently the tale falls into the category of a traditional story rather than a straight historical account.[44]

A quick examination of this tale shows that Herodotus has strucutured it in a manner similar to the stories of Gyges and of Atys and Adrastus. Before moving into the fully scenic mode of narration, Herodotus relays all the necessary prefatory information in a simple narrative

[44]For a discussion of the folktale elements found in the story of Cyrus, see W. Aly, *Volksmarchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen*, pp. 47-51.

introduction. He relates that Astyages had two disturbing dreams about his daughter Mandane, the first of which prompted him to betroth her to a Persian man well beneath her status rather than to a Mede of a more suitable rank (1.107.1-2). The second dream occurred during the first year of his daughter's marriage. Astyages then decided that the first child of his daughter must be killed because his interpreters told him that the dream portended that the child would usurp his throne (1.108.1-2). The scenic presentation begins with the summoning of Harpagus, the trusted servant whom Astyages will order to carry out the deed (1.108.3). As in other passages of scenic narration, Herodotus withdraws his *persona* as investigator and historian. He also tries to keep his presence as narrator as inconspicuous as possible by performing only those tasks, such as marking the change of speakers,[45] easing the transition from scene to scene,[46] and relating information that is necessary for a finely-tuned understanding of the story.[47] As in the story of Atys and Adrastus, the story is really told

[45]E.g., 1.108.4: ὁ δὲ ἀμείβετο; 1.109.2: ἡ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγει; 1.110.3: ἔλεγε ὁ Ἅρπαγος τάδε; 1.111.2: ὁ δὲ εἶπε.

[46]E.g., 1.108.3: ταῦτα δὴ ὧν φυλασσόμενος ὁ Ἀστυάγης, ὡς ἐγένετο ὁ Κῦρος, καλέσας Ἅρπαγον, ἄνδρα οἰκήιον καὶ πιστότατον τε Μήδων καὶ πάντων ἐπίτροπον τῶν ἑωυτοῦ...; 1.109.1: τούτοισι ἀμειψάμενος ὁ Ἅρπαγος, ὡς οἱ παρεδόθη τὸ παιδίον κεκοσμημένον τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ, ἦιε κλαίων ἐς τὰ οἰκία·; 1.111.1: ταῦτα ἀκούσας ὁ βουκόλος καὶ ἀναλαβὼν τὸ παιδίον ἦιε τὴν αὐτὴν ὀπίσω ὁδὸν καὶ ἀπικνέεται ἐς τὴν ἔπαυλιν.

[47]E.g., 1.110.1: συνοίκεε δὲ ἑωυτοῦ συνδούλῃ, οὔνομα δὲ τῇ γυναικὶ ἦν τῇ συνοίκεε Κυνὼ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων γλῶσσαν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Μηδικὴν Σπακώ· τὴν γὰρ κύνα καλέουσι σπάκα Μῆδοι. The explanation of Spaco/Cyno's name is a clue to the later importance that the woman's name will play in the development of the legend surrounding Cyrus' early childhood. Cf. 1.122.3.

through dialogue scenes. There are conversations between Astyages and Harpagus (1.108.4-5), Harpagus and his wife (1.109.1-4); Harpagus and the shepherd Mitradates (1.110.3) and finally, between Mitradates and his wife, Cyno (1.111.2-112.3). The tale then closes with a passage of simple narration that relates the final action of the story, just as the account of Gyges and of Atys and Adrastus did. The passage is brief and to the point and relates in quick succession the steps taken in the substitution of the shepherd's stillborn child for Mandane's child and the burial of the former as if it were the latter (1.113.1-3). The readers are thus again left with the impression that they have been shown a story, not told one.

Because this story is structured so similarly to the tales of Gyges and of Atys and Adrastus, it is not necessary to discuss it is the same detail. There is one passage, however, for which a closer examination would be profitable. This passage is the conversation between Mitradates and his wife Cyno. This is the most lengthy conversation in the story and is the climax of this part of the account of the childhood of Cyrus. It will be noted in this discussion that Herodotus has here exploited another feature of direct speech, viz., that *oratio recta* allows for the direct reporting of action from the point of view of a character. This type of presentation of action will be seen to be yet another way a narrator may heighten the mimetic nature of his narrative.

A short passage of simple narration eases the transition of scene from Harpagus' house to that of Mitradates. The shepherd begins his journey back home and reaches the fold (1.111.1). Before Herodotus relates what happened next, he informs his readers that Cyno, who was pregnant, had by

chance, given birth while her husband was away (1.111.1: **τῷ δ' ἄρα καὶ αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ ἐπίτεξ ἐοῦσα πᾶσαν ἡμέρην, τότε κως κατὰ δαίμονα τίκτει οἰχομένου τοῦ βουκόλου ἐς πόλιν**). Herodotus does not, however, reveal the outcome of Cyno's labor so that he may introduce a feeling of suspense into the story and thereby maintain his readers' interest. He then increases the atmosphere of uncertainty by using the omniscience granted him by his internal stance to tell his readers what the two were thinking about each other. Mitradates was apprehensive because of the advanced state of his wife's pregnancy and Cyno was anxious because her husband was not customarily summoned by Harpagus (1.111.1: **ἦσαν δὲ ἐν φροντίδι ἀμφότεροι ἀλλήλων πέρι, ὁ μὲν τοῦ τόκου τῆς γυναικὸς ἀρρωδέων, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ὅ τι οὐκ ἐωθὼς ὁ Ἅρπαγος μεταπέμψαιτο αὐτῆς τὸν ἄνδρα**). Through this revelation of their thoughts and concerns about each other, Herodotus has added circumstantial details of the sort that serve to enhance a mimetically presented scene.

The moment Cyno and Mitradates meet upon the shepherd's return, Cyno asks her husband why Harpagus had sent for him (1.111.2: **ἐπείτε δὲ ἀπονοστήσας ἐπέστη, οἷα ἐξ ἀέλπου ἰδοῦσα ἡ γυνὴ εἴρετο προτέρη ὅ τι μιν οὕτω προθύμως Ἅρπαγος μετεπέμψατο**). In a lengthy speech, Mitradates reveals the whole story to his wife. It is important to note the detailed nature of this speech. He carefully describes the complete scene that he witnessed at Harpagus' house. He relates that the entire house of Harpagus was in mourning and that when he entered, he saw an infant dressed in elaborate clothing, crying and convulsing. He says that when Harpagus saw him, he ordered him to take the child and expose him in a

section of the mountains inhabited by many wild animals, claiming that Astyages had commanded the exposure of the child and threatening him if he did not carry out the orders (1.111.2-3). Mitradates then somewhat ingenuously states that he thought the child was an offspring of one of the servants, though he did wonder at the rich clothing and the open mourning in the house (1.111.4) Mitradates continues that the whole situation was finally revealed to him by a servant who gave him the child and sent him on his way home. The child was the offspring of Mandane, the daughter of Astyages, and her husband, Cambyses. The orders to expose the infant had come directly from Astyages himself (1.111.5)

There are several features of this speech that are noteworthy. Foremost in importance is the fact that Herodotus elected to present this information in a speech rather than in simple narration. Herodotus generally reserves the use of speeches for the revelation of the interactions between the individuals involved in the event, the illumination of conflicts and the presentation of the various issues behind the action. In this instance, however, Herodotus has used a speech to present the action itself. When action is presented in simple narration, it is related from the narrator's perspective. However, if the account of an action is given by a character in a direct speech, it reveals that character's point of view and his perception of the action. This results in a more intimate view of the event because it offers the viewpoint of an actual participant rather than that of the narrator who, despite his assumption of an internal stance, is always perceived by the audience as a narrator and observer and not as an actual

participant.[48] The presentation of this material in a direct speech by Mitradates makes possible another interesting feature of this passage. This is the ironic overtone that is present in Mitradates' statement that he thought the child was the offspring of one of Harpagus' servants, though he was suprised at its elegant clothing. He says,

> καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναλαβὼν ἔφερον, δοκέων τῶν τινος οἰκετέων εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἄν κοτε κατέδοξα ἔνθεν γε ἦν. ἐθάμβεον δὲ ὁρέων χρυσῷ τε καὶ εἵμασι κεκοσμημένον, πρὸς δὲ καὶ κλαυθμὸν κατεστεῶτα ἐμφανέα ἐν Ἁρπάγου. (1.111.4)

The narrator and his audience, and of course, Harpagus all know who the child actually is. It is only the ignorant shepherd who does not know and who cannot figure it out on his own, despite all the obvious indications that the child is not who he thinks it is.

After his speech to his wife, Mitradates shows the child to her (1.112.1) and she, without yet revealing that she had given birth that day, bursts into tears and begs her husband not to expose the child (1.112.1: ἡ δὲ ὡς εἶδε τὸ παιδίον μέγα τε καὶ εὐειδὲς ἐόν, δακρύσασα καὶ λαβομένη τῶν γουνάτων τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐχρήιζε μηδεμιῇ τέχνῃ ἐκθεῖναί μιν). He replies that he has to carry out the orders because Harpagus would discover that he had disobeyed the command and would punish him with death (1.112.1: ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἔφη οἷός τε εἶναι ἄλλως αὐτὰ ποιέειν· ἐπιφοιτήσειν γὰρ κατασκόπους ἐξ Ἁρπάγου ἐποψομένους, ἀπολέεσθαί τε κάκιστα ἢν μή σφεα ποιήσῃ). It is important to note that this exchange between

[48]This is true unless the narrator is both the narrator of the story and a character participating in the story, as, for example, Lucius in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

Mitradates and Cyno is presented by Herodotus in *oratio obliqua* rather than in *oratio recta* which has been exclusively used up to this point. Herodotus' choice of *oratio obliqua* is again motivated by the desire to convey the passage of time. The imperfect ἐχρηίζε makes it clear that Cyno's pleas to her husband continued for some time but Herodotus does not feel that a verbatim reporting is necessary at this juncture in the narrative. The summarized version of the Cyno's words and her husband's reply adequately convey the necessary information while still giving the impression that time has passed. In addition, the alternation of scene and summary, whether that summary is expressed in simple narration or in *oratio obliqua*, is an important means by which the author/narrator may vary the texture of his work.

Cyno again appeals to her husband, though her words are now reported directly. She prefaces her words with the statement, ἐπεὶ τοίνυν οὐ δύναμαί σε πείθειν μὴ ἐκθεῖναι (1.112.2) and then reveals her plan. She tells her husband that she has given birth that very day, but the child was stillborn (1.112.2: τέτοκα γὰρ καὶ ἐγώ, τέτοκα δὲ τεθνεός). She then suggests that Mitradates expose their dead child in the mountains, thus satisfying the need for a body, and that they raise Mandane's child as their own. Their own child will then have a royal burial, the life of Mandane's child may be spared and Mitradates will not be caught and punished for disobeying the command (1.112.3). These words are expressed in *oratio recta* because they are the culmination of the entire story and thus should be presented in the most dramatic way possible. Indeed, it is clear that Herodotus recognized this necessity because of the fact that the

immediately preceding words of the two were presented in *oratio obliqua*. The impact of these words in *oratio recta* is made all the stronger by their implicit contrast in their modes of presentation. Now that Cyno has stated her plan, the conversation ends and the scheme is successfully carried out (1.113.1-3).

This chapter has examined the stories of the accession of Gyges, of the death of Atys at the hands of Adrastus and of the birth of Cyrus for the purpose of studying the various methods utilized by Herodotus to narrate a traditional story. It has been noted that Herodotus prefers scenic narration over the straight narrative mode in each of these stories. He slows the pace of the narrative down so that every step of the story may be presented as an individual scene with each facet of the action receiving the narrator's attention and with the full weight of the characters' words, thoughts and feelings expressed. Herodotus assumes an internal stance in relation to the action, thus making possible the presentation of the story by a privileged narrator who has direct access to those words, thoughts and feelings rather than by one who is compelled to tell the story from a perspective external to the action and characters. As a consequence, direct speech is a frequent component in these stories. Herodotus facilitates the transition between scenes by simple narrative statements that serve as an introduction to the following scene. In addition, Herodotus uses simple narration to convey information that cannot easily be presented by a character in the form of a direct speech. At some points in the narrative, Herodotus utilizes *oratio obliqua* to offer a summary of the words spoken by a particular individual when a direct presentation of the speech is avoided by narrator in order to

give the impression of the passing of time or in order to highlight a more important part of the conversation or speech which is soon to follow. The creation of the illusion of the passing of time is necessary for the mimetic presentation of an event or story. In addition, this alternation of scene with simple narration is desirable from a stylistic point of view because it varies the texture and pace of the story.

In addition to these methods of narration common to all of these stories, each tale exhibits techniques applied individually by Herodotus to that particular story. In the story of Gyges, the importance of the narrator in guiding the readers' perception of the main character was noted. Continued references to Gyges' inability to extricate himself from the situation creates the impression of Gyges as one innocently caught up in circumstances beyond his control rather than as the actual usurper of the throne. The supreme importance of dialogue as a means to impart information was focussed upon in the story of Atys and Adrastus. It was found that only the brief passages of simple narration at the beginning and end of the story functioned as conveyers of information significant to the story. The other passages of simple narration were found to be entirely dialogue-bound and thus relegated to the role of introducing and emphasizing what was said in the actual conversations. The story of the birth of Cyrus provided an example of how a narrator might use *oratio recta* to present an account of an action rather than relying on the more usual method of relating it in simple narration. This results in the presentation of the action from the point of view of an actual participant rather than from the narrator's perspective. This not only gives the

impression of a more intimate view of the action but it increases the mimetic nature of the presentation by reducing the need for simple narrative accounts of action given by the narrator. The narrator is thus able to retreat even further into the background in order to maintain the illusion that his readers are being shown a story by its participants rather than told one by a narrator.

The telling of a good tale is clearly very important to Herodotus. He desires to present to his readers a realistic rendition of the story that is, in essence, a verisimilar enactment of the events. To achieve this end, he effaces his presence as narrator so that it will be only minimally detectable by his readers. He allows his presence to be evident only when absolutely required by the story. In addition, he wants his readers to be able to appreciate not only the action of the story but the character's involvement in that action and this necessitated relating their words, thoughts and feelings. These techniques, of course, are those utilized by all good storytellers. What is unique about Herodotus' use of them is that he also employs them at certain points in the *Histories* when giving the account of what may be more properly called a historical event. It is upon this point that the next chapter will focus.

Chapter Four

The Historian at Work

Notwithstanding the faults and deficiencies that may be charged against Herodotus' abilities as a historian, few of his readers would deny that he has written one of the most absorbing histories in Greek literature. The attraction of the work results from more than the facts that the *Histories* is our earliest extant example of Greek prose preserved in its entirety and that it stands at the beginning of the Greek historiographical tradition. These characteristics, in fact, are by nature those that scholars and serious students find most interesting about the *Histories* but they are not necessarily what has kept the general reader involved in the work.

What is it, then, about the *Histories*, and particularly those portions of the work that deal with the Persian Wars, that continues to draw readers? The success of the work of the work lies, at least partially, in the manner in which it has been narrated. Herodotus has presented the events of the Persian Wars in such a way that he not only informs his readers of the major events of the wars but he also offers them what is, in essence, a mimetic reenactment of the actual events. That is to say, Herodotus not only tells his readers *what* happened; he also shows them *how* it

happened.[1] Such a presentation involves more than the collection and reporting of data gathered from one's sources. Herodotus often presents his readers with clearly defined scenes in which the complex of the interactions between historical personages is depicted in such scenic detail that one is reminded more of the composition of epic or drama than what we, as students exposed to the notions that history should be 'scientific', 'objective', or that all historical events must be explained by some sort of 'covering-law', tend to think is appropriate for the writing of history. This is not to suggest that Herodotus has included scenes in his *Histories* for which he had absolutely no evidence. What he has done, however, is to select specific moments of the historical event for a fully scenic narration in order to provide his audience with a self-explanatory picture of how what did happen could have happened. Because of the unlikelihood that these passages of scenic narration were found *as is* in Herodotus' sources,[2] it is reasonable to conclude that Herodotus has elaborated certain aspects of the scene so that a complete picture of the event may be presented to his readers. This elaboration involves the inclusion of circumstantial details that are not historically relevant but which enhance the mimetic nature of

[1]Cf. C. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, pp. 29-32.

[2]The improbability that Herodotus could have interviewed eyewitnesses of such scenes, given the time-lapse between the original occurence and the time of his research and the fact that many of these scenic narratives concern events that occurred in the Persian camp, speaks against their appearance, in scenic form, at least, in Herodotus' sources. It is far more likely that Herodotus' sources indicated that a meeting or council or whatever is scenicly depicted occurred with such and such result and from these bare outlines, Herodotus used both his imagination and historical reasoning to create a full-blown scene.

the scenic presentation; the revelation of the thoughts and feelings of various individuals; the ascription of the motives and intentions behind characters' actions; shifts of point of view; and the presentation of an

individual's words as a verbatim reporting.[3] All of these elements are necessary components for the depiction of the event as a mimetic

[3]A speech may, of course, be a verbatim transcript of what was actually said on the occasion under consideration. However, in the case of Herodotus, it is far more reasonable to assume that his speeches are, in large part, his own composition. Herodotus does not profess a general theory regarding the inclusion of speeches in this work as Thucydides does (cf. Thucydides, 1.22) and in only a single instance does he state outright that the speech was actually given (cf. 3.80.1). Many modern scholars consider the composition of the speeches to be the work of Herodotus though these scholars differ in opinion as to their function in the work. Cf. Waters, *Herodotus, the Historian*, p. 63ff.; K.H. Waters, "The Purpose of Dramatisation in Herodotus," *Historia* 15 (1966): 157-71; L. Solmsen, "Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Battle of Plataea," *CP* 39 (1944): 241-53 and "Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Ionic Revolt," *AJP* 64 (1943): 194-207; Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides*, p. 183: P. Hohti, *The Interrelation of Speech and Action in the Histories of Herodotus*. Commentationes Humanarum Literarum 57 (Helsinki, 1976). Lang, however, believes that "the combination of speech and narrative was already present in his raw material." See Lang, *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse*, p. 19. Cf. C. Fornara, *The Nature of History of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, pp. 162ff. Fornara holds the opinion that the speeches of the *Histories* dating from the Persian Wars derive from Herodotus' sources but allows for the possibility that Herodotus may have, on occasion, composed some of the speeches from this period. He lists the Artabanos/Xerxes conversation of 7.44-52 as an example of such a composition. However, Fornara does acknowledge that the speeches in the earlier books, e.g. those of Candaules and Gyges, Croesus and Solon, Harpagus and Astyages, et al. must be the composition of Herodotus' creative imagination (p. 166). I, for my part, believe that the substance of the speeches are the result of Herodotus' hand even if his sources included information that a particular speech was given at a specific moment in the course of an event. The speeches are far too Herodotean in tone and style and are bound too intimately with their accompanying narrative to be anything other than the historian's own composition. This is not to deny that in some instances a speech may reflect, in part, what was actually said but Herodotus has nonetheless appropriated and altered the speech for his own use.

reenactment of its original occurrence. In addition, in order to continue the illusion of mimesis, it was necessary that Herodotus refrain as much as possible from personal commentary upon the event and allow the event and its actors to tell their own story. Herodotus' role as narrator is no less active in these passages than it is in any other section of the work; he simply takes a less overt stance in relation to the material he is relating.

These techniques should be familiar from the discussion in the previous chapter of Herodotus' narration of traditional tales. Herodotus has adapted many of the strategies and techniques that he used in the telling of a traditional tale to his account of a historical event. However, to the modern mind, at least, these are essentially techniques to be utilized by writers of fiction and not by historians. But as has been frequently stressed in this investigation, in order to appreciate fully the achievement of Herodotus, one must be willing to acknowledge and accept that Herodotus did not compose his work according to the precepts laid down by modern theories of historiography. This in no way detracts from the historical value of the *Histories*; its worth as a reliable reporting of the events of the Persian Wars and those leading up to the conflict cannot be depreciated. What this acknowledgement does indicate is a willingness to approach Herodotus on his own terms.

This chapter will examine three selections from the *Histories* in order to determine the use Herodotus makes of scenic narration in passages that are directly concerned with the events of the Persian Wars. It will be seen that these are episodes for which Herodotus has greatly slowed the narrative tempo so that he may present the event and the characters

involved in that event in the fullest detail. The first selection that will be discussed is Book 7.1-99 which concerns the beginning of Xerxes' march against Greece. The excerpt is a lengthy one but it is important to examine it because it is in these chapters that Herodotus most fully depicts the character of Xerxes. In this selection, Herodotus presents mini-episodes that involve Xerxes in fully scenic narration so that his readers will have the impression that they are being shown what the Persian king is like rather than merely told. Through these mimetically depicted scenes, the illusion that it is the king and not the narrator who is revealing his own personality to the readers is thus created. In addition, the selection is representative of the manner in which Herodotus narrates passages in which historical concerns have predominance over ethnographic and geographic information. Though geographic and ethnographic material is present in these chapters, it is clearly subordinated to the account of the historical event. It is included by Herodotus to explain or augment certain aspects of the historical event; it is never allowed to function in its own right as an independent piece of research in the logographic tradition.[4] This integration of material will permit us to determine whether or not Herodotus modifies his method of narration when relating ethnographic or geographic material in contrast to the manner in which he relates his historical information. The second passage that will be discussed in this chapter involves the Greek petition of Gelon, the ruler of Syracuse, for aid against Xerxes (7.153-63). This passage has been selected because it is a

[4]This cannot be said of Book Two, for example, or parts of Book Four, in which the relation of geographical or ethnographical information is pursued by Herodotus as an end in itself.

typical illustration of how Herodotus uses scenic narration to depict an important historical event. He wants his readers to be able to feel as if they were witnessing the event as they would a drama performed on the stage. Herodotus recognizes that in this way his readers will be able to grasp more about the event than they would by the simple notice of its occurrence and result. His readers will find in this scenic presentation not only the dramatic portrayal of the action but also the mimetic depiction of the varying points of view of the individuals involved in the event. The final passage selected for discussion in this chapter is the account of Themistocles' attempt to persuade Eurybiades and the other Greek generals to make their defense at Salamis rather than at the Isthmus (8.56-63). This passage was chosen because it is characteristic of how scenic portrayal can highlight the issues lying beneath a particular course of action. Such a presentation not only makes these issues more vivid but it also presents them as organically and naturally arising from the event itself rather than as the results of a historian's intellectual analysis of the situation.

Certain aspects of Herodotus' narrative technique will be the main focus of the discussion of these selections. Firstly, special attention will be given to the specific means Herodotus employs to present these passages as mimetic reenactments of the actual events. It will be seen that at various points in the narrative, Herodotus has used his imagination in order to create certain scenic details that enhance the mimetic nature of his presentation. These details will be seen to have no relevance insofar as the historical facts are concerned and thus do not constitute the willful fabrication of such facts. They function purely on the storytelling level and

serve as an aid to presentation. In addition, notice will be given as to how Herodotus personally conducts himself as narrator of these mimetic passages. That is to say, the *persona* of Herodotus *qua* narrator will be examined. It will be seen that he generally tends to efface his presence as narrator of these passages, preferring to stay behind the scenes. He does assume an omniscient stance in relation to the characters involved in the event and thereby gains access to these individuals' words, thoughts and feelings. This omniscience, however, is exploited by Herodotus only to enable a better mimetic depiction of the scene; it does not affect his reporting of the facts of the action itself. If he is uncertain about specific factual details about the event, he generally will make that clear. These remarks and other comments that are made by Herodotus in his own person, however, will be seen to lie outside the scenic and mimetic presentation. In this way, Herodotus may avoid destroying the illusion of mimesis that he has so carefully created.

Book 7.1-99

In Book Seven, Herodotus resumes his presentation of the hostilities between the Greeks and the Persians that he had abandoned at 6.125 in favor of digressions that concerned Alcmaeon (6.125), the wooing of Cleisthenes' daughter Agariste (6.126-30), the ultimate fate of Miltiades (6.132-36) and the so-called Lemnian deeds (6.137-40). The book opens with Darius' reaction to the news of the Persian defeat at Marathon. Herodotus sets the scene in this first chapter in a passage of simple narration that includes

several examples of his tendency to include circumstantial details that enhance the mimetic presentation of the events. Herodotus reminds his readers that Darius was already extremely angry at the Athenians for their attack on Sardis (7.1.1: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ ἀγγελίη ἀπίκετο περὶ τῆς μάχης τῆς ἐν Μαραθῶνι γενομένης παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρεῖον τὸν Ὑστάσπεος καὶ πρὶν μεγάλως κεχαραγμένον τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι διὰ τὴν ἐς Σάρδις ἐσβολήν) and this statement calls to mind Darius' dramatic reaction to the news of the burning of Sardis (cf. 5.105.1-2). The defeat at Marathon angered the king still more and he was more than ever determined to attack Greece (7.1.1: καὶ δὴ καὶ τότε πολλῷ τε δεινότερα ἐποίεε καὶ μᾶλλον ὥρμητο στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα). It is important to note that these statements focus upon Darius' state of mind and do not, as such, provide any truly relevant historical information. They are the work of an omniscient narrator who has "peered" into the mind of his main actor in order to report his feelings upon receiving the news of the Persian defeat. These statements have little pertinance to the historical aspects of the account. They function, rather, on the storytelling level and as such are critical components of Herodotus' mimetic depiction of the events. This focus upon Herodotus' mention of the state of mind of Darius may seem to be a trivial point and if taken in isolation, it is. However, it is the sum of all of these seemingly small techniques that help to produce the mimetic touches in his presentation.

Herodotus continues to set the scene. He writes,

> καὶ αὐτίκα μὲν ἐπηγγέλλετο πέμπων ἀγγέλους κατὰ πόλις ἑτοιμάζειν στρατιήν, πολλῷ πλέω ἐπιτάσσων ἑκάστοισι ἢ πρότερον παρεῖχον, καὶ νέας τε καὶ ἵππους καὶ σῖτον καὶ

πλοῖα. τούτων δὲ περιαγγελλομένων ἡ Ἀσίη ἐδονέετο ἐπὶ τρία ἔτεα, καταλεγομένων τε τῶν ἀρίστων ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα στρατευσομένων καὶ παρασκευαζομένων. (7.1.2)

Had these statements been reported by a historian concerned only with the relation of facts, the mere notice that Darius ordered his subjects to make preparations for the attack and that these preparations lasted for three years would have been sufficient to convey the necessary information. Herodotus, however, is interested in the creation of atmosphere and thus he emphasizes the speed with which Darius ordered the preparations begun (αὐτίκα), and the facts that the messengers went from city to city (κατὰ πόλις) relaying the king's orders and that the cities were required to contribute even more to the preparations than they had for the previous incursion (πολλῷ πλέω ἐπιτάσσων ἑκάστοισι ἢ πρότερον παρεῖχον). The commotion these preparations caused in Asia is emphasized by Herodotus' verb choice (ἐδονέετο) and the conscription of the best of Asia's young men is focused upon with the words, καταλεγομένων τε τῶν ἀρίστων ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα στρατευσομένων. All of these elements are important to the setting of the scene and the creation of atmosphere. They are circumstantial details that have relatively little import on a historical level. However, they allow the reader to picture in his mind the actual preparations by the Persians for their assault upon the Greeks. It is important to note that Herodotus has not yet mentioned his sources or made his presence as narrator obvious through a comment in his own person. The less detectable as narrator Herodotus is able to remain, the more he will be able to present the events mimetically. Through this abstention from personal commentary and the avoidance of the documentation of his sources,

Herodotus is able to keep his presence as narrator barely noticeable and thus is able to give his readers the impression that they are being *shown* a story rather than *told* a story.

Herodotus continues this manner of narration for the next several paragraphs. He informs his readers that after the preparations for the excursion against Greece had been completed, the Egyptians, who had been enslaved by Cambyses, revolted. As a consequence, Darius resolved to march against both countries (7.1.3). A short digression follows that concerns the quarrel that broke out between two of Darius' sons concerning successsion to the throne. Herodotus briefly supplies the background for the story: it was required by law that a Persian king designate his successor before engaging in a military campaign (7.2.1: ...**ὡς δεῖ μιν ἀποδέξαντα βασιλέα κατὰ τὸν Περσέων νόμον οὕτω στρατεύσθαι**).[5] The disagreement between the two concerned which one of them should rightfully inherit the kingship. Artabazanes based his claim on the fact that he was the eldest of all of Darius' sons and Xerxes claimed that the right was his because he was the oldest son of Atossa, the daughter of Cyrus (7.2.2-3). It so happened that Demaratus, the exiled king of Sparta, was in Susa at this time and when he heard about the conflict, he went to Xerxes to offer his advice (7.3.1-2). He told Xerxes that it was fitting that only he succeed Darius, because he had been born after Darius had become king (7.3.2-3). Xerxes used Demaratus'

[5]There is no other evidence for such a law and Herodotus has perhaps confused the appointment of Darius' successor with the designation of a viceroy who would rule while the king was away on a military campaign. Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary* 2: 125 and R. Macan, *Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books,* Vol. 1. Introduction, Text with Notes (London, 1908; reprint ed., New York, 1973), pp. 2-3.

argument in his petition to Darius and thus convinced the king to designate him as the legitimate successor (7.3.4). There are several characteristics of this anecdote that are worth noting. Firstly, it is somewhat surprising perhaps that this story is not narrated in a more fully scenic manner, given Herodotus' fondness for the exiled Spartan king. In most of the passages featuring Demaratus, Herodotus presents the event in the scenic mode and direct speech, as well as the full expression of the thoughts and feelings of the participants, play an important part in the presentation. However, this passage, though necessary to the narrative in order to explain Xerxes' succession, digresses from the main topic under discussion, viz. the preparations of the Persians for their war against Greece. Consequently, Herodotus decided not to highlight the story through scenic narration and prefers a briefer exposition and the use of *oratio obliqua* over *oratio recta*. There are two other elements that mark the different manner in which Herodotus is treating this passage. Firstly, he indicates that he has heard the story somewhere with the words ὡς ἡ φάτις μιν ἔχει (7.3.2),[6] thus making his presence as narrator apparent. In addition, he maintains this high profile by expressing his own opinion at the end of the story. He states,

> δοκέειν δέ μοι, καὶ ἄνευ ταύτης τῆς ὑποθήκης ἐβασίλευσε ἂν Ξέρξης· ἡ γὰρ Ἄτοσσα εἶχε τὸ πᾶν κράτος. (7.3.4)

It is clear that a mimetic presentation is not desired by Herodotus for this passage. Consequently, his treatment of the tale is brief and without elaboration and he feels free to indicate the oral nature of his source and

[6]Cf. Macan, *Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books,* 1: 4.

his own thoughts upon the matter. The fact that the story lies outside the main topic makes possible Herodotus' more overt stance as narrator. Here he is solely concerned with imparting information. Previously, he desired to present his material in such a way that not only was the historical information conveyed to his readers but the complete picture of the scene recreated in their minds.

Herodotus again takes up his consideration of the main topic: Darius' decision to go against Egypt and Greece (7.4: **ἀποδέξας δὲ βασιλέα Πέρσῃσι Ξέρξεα Δαρεῖος ὁρμᾶτο στρατεύεσθαι**). He returns to his practice of keeping his presence as narrator in low profile and does not mention his source for the following material. He relates that Darius died during the year following the Egyptian rebellion before he was able to punish the Athenians and Egyptians (7.4). In retrospect, it becomes clear why Herodotus included the digression concerning Darius' designation of his successor. Relieved of the task of explaining why Xerxes and not his older stepbrother Artabanzanes succeeded to the throne, he can continue to present the main course of action without interruption. Thus, Herodotus simply states that Xerxes became king after Darius' death (7.4: **ἀποθανόντος δὲ Δαρείου ἡ βασιληίη ἀνεχώρησε ἐς τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἐκείνου Ξέρξην**) and then proceeds directly to his account of the beginning of Xerxes' reign.

Herodotus reports that at first Xerxes did not desire to proceed with his father's plans to march against Greece, preferring to devote his energies to Egypt (7.5.1: **ὁ τοίνυν Ξέρξης ἐπὶ μὲν τὴν Ἑλλάδα οὐδαμῶς πρόθυμος ἦν κατ ἀρχὰς στρατεύεσθαι, ἐπὶ δὲ Αἴγυπτον ἐποιέετο στρατιῆς**

ἄγερσιν). Rather than continuing to report Xerxes' preparations against Egypt, Herodotus moves on to recount the actions of Mardonius, Xerxes' cousin. Mardonius had a great deal of influence with the king (7.5.1: παρεὼν δὲ καὶ δυνάμενος παρ αὐτῷ μέγιστον Περσέων Μαρδόνιος ὁ Γωβρύεω...) and he would frequently urge the king to march against Greece. It is interesting to note that Herodotus has here reported the majority of Mardonius' words in *oratio recta*, despite the fact that Mardonius approached the king more than once with this advice (7.5.1: ...τοιούτου λόγου εἶχετο, λέγων...) as the iterative imperfect makes clear. In the discussion in the previous chapter, it was noted that Herodotus often prefers to use *oratio obliqua* when an individual makes a repeated appeal or objection.[7] However, Herodotus has here decided to present the speech directly for several reasons. The most obvious reason is, of course, that the presentation of Mardonius' words is far more interesting and dramatic when given in *oratio recta*. In addition, as was noted in the previous chapter,[8] there is a contrast in emphasis between the argument that is presented in *oratio recta* and the supporting points that are given in *oratio obliqua*. Mardonius' main argument that it was necessary to punish the Athenians for their previous aggressions against Persian is presented directly (7.5.2: οὐκ οἰκός ἐστι Ἀθηναίους ἐργασαμένους πολλὰ δὴ κακὰ Πέρσας μὴ οὐ δοῦναι δίκας τῶν ἐποίησαν) while his secondary arguments are given in *oratio obliqua* (7.5.3: ...τούτου δὲ τοῦ λόγου παρενθήκην ποιεέσκετο τήνδε, ὡς ἡ Εὐρώπη περικαλλὴς [εἴη] χώρη καὶ δένδρεα παντοῖα φέρει τὰ ἥμερα ἀρετήν τε ἄκρη, βασιλέϊ τε μούνῳ θηντῶν ἀξίη ἐκτῆσθαι).

[7]See page 108.
[8]See pages 98-99, 108-109..

Through the use of *oratio recta,* Herodotus is able to indicate the more important and the more persuasive argument. And finally, direct speech is an essential component of Herodotus' choice of the scenic mode of narration that makes possible the presentation of events in a mimetic manner. Because words in *oratio recta* are less obviously mediated by a narrator, they are more successful in creating the impression that the presentation of the scene accurately reflects its original occurrence.

Herodotus then offers his own opinion regarding Mardonius' motivation for making such an appeal to Xerxes. He states that Mardonius urged Xerxes to press on with the invasion because he was a political opportunist who hoped to be appointed governor of Greece (7.6.1: **ταῦτα δὲ ἔλεγε οἷα νεωτέρων ἔργων ἐπιθυμητὴς ἐὼν καὶ θέλων αὐτὸς τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὕπαρχος εἶναι**). It is interesting to compare the manner in which Herodotus expresses his opinion here with his statement regarding the inevitability that Xerxes would succeed Darius because of Atossa's power and influence (7.3.4). In the latter instance, Herodotus made the comment in his own person (7.3.4: **δοκέειν δέ μοι, καὶ ἄνευ ταύτης τῆς ὑποθήκης ἐβασίλευε ἂν Ξέρξης· ἡ γὰρ Ἄτοσσα εἶχε τὸ πᾶν κράτος**), thereby revealing himself as both the narrator and the one responsible for the analysis of the historical information. In this passage, however, Herodotus expresses his opinion in his capacity as the omniscient narrator of the event who has taken an internal stance and thus has full knowledge of the reasons behind an individual's actions. Consequently, there is no need for him to qualify the statement with a phrase that identifies it as his opinion. However, both statements are the results of his analysis of the situation

and are, in that sense, opinions. The difference is in the means of expression, but it is because of that difference that the one is more authoritative than the other.

Herodotus proceeds to relate that other factors helped to persuade Xerxes to continue on against Greece (7.6.1: **συνέλαβε γὰρ καὶ ἄλλα οἱ σύμμαχα γενόμενα ἐς τὸ πείσθεσθαι Ξέρξην**). He reports the information in simple narration and without any reference to his sources for this material. Herodotus relates that the Aleuadae, the rulers of Thessaly, and the Pisistratidae, who happened to be in Susa, promised their assistance in the attack (7.6.2). In addition, he notes that the Pisistratidae were able to increase their influence upon the king through their use of Onomacritus, a collector of oracles, who would report all favorable prophesies concerning the expedition (7.6.3-5). It is important to note that Herodotus has presented what he believes to be the most influential factor upon Xerxes' decision to invade Greece, viz., the activity of Mardonius, in a more dramatic manner that he has used in his report of these other contributing elements. Direct speech is reserved for Mardonius' words to Xerxes; the words of the Aleuadae and the Pisistratidae and even those of Onomacritus are merely summarized in simple narration or in *oratio obliqua*. Herodotus realizes that the manner of presentation can indicate even more strongly than the expression of a personal opinion the relative importance of the various parties that exerted their influence upon the king.

Though Xerxes is persuaded by this combination of forces to continue his father's plans to attack Greece, he first puts down the Egyptian rebellion. Herodotus does not relate this event in any detail at all. He

simply notes its occurrence, Xerxes' success and his appointment of his brother Achaemenes as governor (7.7). The only detail mentioned is Herodotus' remark that Achaemenes was later murdered by Inaros, a son of Psammetichus (7.7: Ἀχαιμένεα μέν νυν ἐπιτροπεύοντα Αἰγύπτου χρόνῳ μετέπειτα ἐφόνευσε Ἰνάρως ὁ Ψαμμητίχου ἀνὴρ Λίβυς). From a stylistic point of view, it is not desirable for Herodotus to relate every event in detail, even if his sources included all the necessary information.[9] If every aspect of every event is presented in equal detail, it becomes difficult for the reader to determine either what the author considers to be the most important aspect of a particular event or the most important event in a series of events. In addition, one of the facets of a mimetic presentation is the need to communicate the passage of time. As was pointed out in the previous chapter, this may be accomplished by presenting a summarized version of a speech in indirect form or by summarizing an event in simple narration, as has been done here.

Herodotus now moves on to a fully scenic presentation. The meeting between Xerxes and the influential Persians is one of those moments for which Herodotus has slowed the pace of his presentation in order to present to his readers a detailed picture of the event. He introduces the scene with the following words in simple narration,

> Ξέρξης δὲ μετὰ Αἰγύπτου ἄλωσιν ὡς ἔμελλε ἐς χεῖρας ἄξεσθαι τὸ στράτευμα τὸ ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας, σύλλογον ἐπίκλητον Περσέων τῶν ἀρίστων ἐποιέετο, ἵνα γνώμας τε πύθηταί σφεων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν πᾶσι εἴπῃ τὰ θέλει. (7.8.α1)

[9]Given Herodotus' interest in Egypt, it is hard to believe that he does not know more about Xerxes' suppression of the Egyptian rebellion.

It is again important to note that Herodotus does not reveal his source for this information. This apparent independence from his sources enables Herodotus to continue to present the events as a mimetic reenactment of the original occurrence.[10] Reference to one's sources interrupts this type of presentation and makes very clear the mediative activity of the narrator. This is not to suggest, however, that Herodotus' readers were unaware of his role as narrator of this passage. There are certain duties that the narrator performs, e.g. marking the change of speakers, as was noted in Chapter Three.[11] But it is the fact that Herodotus tries to keep his mediative activity behind the scenes that is significant. By maintaining this stance as much as he possibly can during his account of a specific historical event, Herodotus succeeds in creating the impression that his report mimetically reproduces the action in every detail much in the manner of a drama presented on stage. The lack of personal commentary on the part of the narrator and the fact that Herodotus keeps his mediative activity as narrator to a minimum allows the action and its participants to speak for themselves.

The speeches of Xerxes, Mardonius and Artabanus that were delivered at this conference are presented in *oratio recta*. The scene is constructed in a manner similar to the dialogue scenes that were discussed in the previous chapter. Herodotus' activity as narrator is limited to marking the change of speakers. Xerxes is the first to speak and Herodotus prefaces his words with the simple introduction, **ὡς δὲ συνελέχθησαν, ἔλεγε Ξέρξης**

[10]Cf. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, pp. 31-32.
[11]See pages 77-78.

τάδε· (7.8.1). In his speech, Xerxes states that ever since his accession, he has been thinking about how he should continue his predecessors' activity of increasing Persian power and influence (7.8.α1-2). He reports that he has finally decided how best to pursue these ends. He states,

> φροντίζων δὲ εὑρίσκω ἅμα μὲν κῦδος ἡμῖν προσγινόμενον χώρην τε τῆς νῦν ἐκτήμεθα οὐκ ἐλάσσονα οὐδὲ φλαυροτέρην παμφορωτέρην δέ, ἅμα δὲ τιμωρίην τε καὶ τίσιν γινομένην. διὸ ὑμέας νῦν ἐγὼ συνέλεξα, ἵνα τὸ νοέω πρήσσειν ὑπερθέωμαι ὑμῖν. μέλλω ζεύξας τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἐλᾶν στρατὸν διὰ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἵνα Ἀθηναίους τιμωρήσωμαι ὅσα δὴ πεποιήκασι Πέρσας τε καὶ πατέρα τὸν ἐμόν. (7.8.α2 – β1)

The importance of having Xerxes state these words himself extends beyond the fact that direct speech is a necessary component of scenic narration. By reporting Xerxes' words in direct speech, Herodotus is, in fact, presenting Xerxes' point of view.[12] Now it would be useless to argue that these words reflect what Xerxes actually said at this conference because there is no outside evidence which can support this claim. That question is one that is relevant to those considering whatever historical kernels may lie behind the conference.[13] What is significant for our purposes is what this adoption of Xerxes' point of view accomplishes on the storytelling level. For, not only is direct speech the most effective way for an author to present a character's

[12]Cf. Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*, p. 64. It is, of course, more correct to say that Herodotus is presenting the words as if they *were* from Xerxes' point of view.

[13]Few would deny that the speech is more a product of Herodotus' imagination than a reflection of Xerxes' actual words. Cf. Macan, *The Herodotus, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books*, 1: 8-9.

point of view, but it is also indicative of an internal stance that has been adopted by the narrator. The narrator is not relating the event as an outside observer; he is situated in the midst of the action itself as it unfolds before him.[14] He is a privileged insider who has full access to the words, thoughts and feelings of the various participants in the events. It is this internal stance that makes possible the mimetic presentation, for the narrator must be able to report this information in order to depict the event in such a fashion. It is, of course, illusion on the part of the narrator and his mediation of the material is no less here than it is in any passage of simple or straight narration. However, it is an illusion that is absolutely essential for the successful mimetic portrayal of the scene and it is one that we will see created again and again at critical points in Herodotus' narrative.

Xerxes concludes his speech with the promise that he will reward whoever brings the best-equipped troops (7.8.δ1). He then opens the topic to debate so that he won't appear to be relying solely on his own judgment (7.8.δ2: ἵνα δὲ μὴ ἰδιοβουλέειν ὑμῖν δοκέω, τίθημι τὸ πρῆγμα ἐς μέσον, γνώμην κελεύων ὑμέων τὸν βουλόμενον ἀποφαίνεσθαι). Herodotus marks the change of speakers with the minimal notation, ταῦτα εἶπας ἐπαύετο. μετ αὐτὸν Μαρδόνιος ἔλεγε· (7.9.α1). Mardonius' speech, presented in *oratio recta*, follows. The contents of the speech are not suprising; they conform to the picture of Mardonius as a proponent of an aggressive policy toward the Greeks that Herodotus has presented up to this point in the narrative. Mardonius again urges Xerxes to march against Greece but he uses arguments different from those that he had previously utilized when trying

[14]Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*, p. 64.

to persuade Xerxes to attack[15]. He belittles the Greeks' tendency to go to war with each other without much thought when they could solve their differences through arbitration (7.9.β1-2). He also notes the Greeks' tendency to overlook strategic considerations when fighting a battle (7.9.β1). Mardonius ends his speech with the words that, though it is unlikely that the Greek will resist the Persian attack, they had best make their preparations carefully since no victory is ever automatic (7.9.γ).

Herodotus closes Mardonius' speech with the words, **Μαρδόνιος μὲν τοσαῦτα ἐπιλεήνας τὴν Ξέρξεω γνώμην ἐπέπαυτο** (7.10.α1). He then adds a simple narrative statement that accomplishes more than the notation of the change of speaker. These words reveal the affect of Mardonius' speech upon the group and as such, are important for the recreation of the scene. They are circumstantial details that Herodotus includes so that the illusion of mimesis may be enhanced. He states,

> **σιωπώντων δὲ τῶν ἄλλων Περσέων καὶ οὐ τολμώντων γνώμην ἀποδείκνυσθαι ἀντίην τῇ προκειμένῃ, Ἀρτάβανος ὁ Ὑστάσπεος, πάτρως ἐὼν Ξέρξῃ, τῷ δὴ καὶ πίσυνος ἐὼν ἔλεγε τάδε·** (7.10.α1)

These are the words of an omniscient narrator who has situated himself right in the midst of the action as it occurs, not the words of a historian analyzing his source-material. In his speech, Artabanus urges the king not to follow Mardonius' advice. He notes the past difficulties that the Persians had against the Scythians (7.10.α2) and the Athenians (7.10.β1) and how easily one might be betrayed by one's subjects (7.10.γ1-2). He also includes the conventional sentiment that god strikes down the great while allowing

[15] 7.5.1-2.

the humble to survive (7.10.ε: ὁρᾷς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα ζῷα ὡς κεραυνοῖ ὁ θεὸς οὐδὲ ἐᾷ φαντάζεσθαι, τὰ δὲ σμικρὰ οὐδέν μιν κνίζει). This concept is, of course, a Greek one and has been put into Artabanus' mouth by Herodotus.[16] Artabanus closes his speech by chastising Mardonius for inaccurately depicting the Greeks as ineffective in warfare (7.10.η1–2) and by challenging Mardonius to stake his children's lives on the outcome of the expedition (7.10.θ1-2). Xerxes answers Artabanus' words with a brief speech introduced by Herodotus in words that indicate the affect Artabanus' words had upon the king, Ἀρτάβανος μὲν ταῦτα ἔλεξε, Ξέρξης δὲ θυμωθεὶς ἀμείβεται τοισίδε (7.11.1). Xerxes sharply upbraids Artabanus for his cowardice and states his intentions to continue with the attack (7.11. 1-4).

After the conference and later in the evening, Xerxes begins to have second thoughts regarding the invasion. He decides not to continue with his plans and then retires for the night (7.12.1). The well-known dream of Xerxes has received a fully scenic treatment by Herodotus.[17] He presents the words of the phantom-figure in *oratio recta* as well as those of Xerxes and Artabanus. Short passages of simple narration facilitate the transition from scene to scene. These passages of simple narration introduce the speech that will follow and focus upon the state of mind of

[16]Artabanus' speech falls into the category of the wise-advisor motif often used by Herodotus. Cf. R. Lattimore, "The Wise Advisor in Herodotus," *CP* 34 (1939): 24-35.

[17]For a discussion of the meaning of the dream, see J.A.S. Evans, "The Dream of Xerxes and the "Nomoi" of the Persians," *CJ* 57 (1961): 109-11.

the speaker.[18] This mediative activity on the part of Herodotus is important because such circumstantial details as the awareness of the character's state of mind at any given point in the action are essential components in the perception of the event as a mimetic portrayal. Herodotus thus exploits his position as omniscient narrator in order to communicate this information to his readers.

The most important characteristic of this passage is, however, the self-effacement of Herodotus as narrator of the scene. At the beginning of the account, Herodotus cites the Persians as his source for the dream (7.12.1: **δεδογμένων δέ οἱ αὖτις τούτων κατύπνωσε, καὶ δή κου ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ εἶδε ὄψιν τοιήνδε ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ Περσέων**), thus making his presence as narrator evident. He feels it necessary to reveal his source at this point because of the marvelous nature of the story and the revelation of the provenance of the account has the result of removing any personal responsibility in respect to its veracity. After the statement, however, Herodotus assumes a more convert stance as narrator. He does not allow his own *persona* as narrator or researcher to enter into the narration and he escapes behind the facade of the narrator's omniscience. The reader is left with the impression that he has witnessed a recreation of the original

[18]Cf. e.g., **ὁ Ξέρξης...ὀνείρου μὲν τούτου λόγον οὐδένα ἐποιέετο...ἔλεγέ...** (7.13.1); **Ξέρξης μὲν περιδεὴς γενόμενος τῇ ὄψι ἀνά τε ἔδραμε ἐκ τῆς κοίτης καὶ πέμπει ἄγγελον [ἐπὶ] Ἀρτάβανον καλέοντα. ἀπικομένῳ δέ οἱ ἔλεγε Ξέρξης τάδε** (7.15.1); **Ἀρτάβανος δὲ οὐ τῷ πρώτῳ οἱ κελεύσματι πειθόμενος, οἷα οὐκ ἀξιεύμενος ἐς τὸν βασιλήιον θρόνον ἵζεσθαι, τέλος ὡς ἠναγκάζετο εἶπας τάδε...**(7.16.1); **καὶ ὃς ἀμβώσας μέγα ἀναθρῴσκει καὶ παριζόμενος Ξέρξῃ, ὡς τὴν ὄψιν οἱ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου διεξῆλθε ἀπηγεόμενος, δεύτερά οἱ λέγει τάδε** (7.18.1).

scene, in every aspect and detail down to the very words and thoughts of the individuals. Herodotus is thus able to have it both ways. He has disclaimed responsibility for the truth of the story on the one hand, while still being able to exploit the story's contribution to the picture of Xerxes that he has been presenting.

It is instructive to contrast the manner in which Herodotus narrates the next several chapters. After closing the dream-scene with a passage of simple narration that briefly relates a third dream of Xerxes and the return of the the Persian nobles to their provinces in order to begin preparations (7.19.1-2), Herodotus notes that the preparations took four years to complete and in the fifth year, the march began (7.20.1). But he postpones the report of the beginning of the march to compare the size of Xerxes' army to the several great expeditions of the past: Darius' campaign into Scythia, the Greek force at Troy and the expedition of the Mysians and Teucrians into Thrace (7.20.2). Herodotus has not used a covert stance to narrate this information as he did in the previous passages. He is here the researcher evaluating evidence for the edification of his readers and he makes this activity quite clear. He is preeminently concerned with imparting information, not with the creation of atmosphere or the detailing of a scene.

Herodotus continues this overt stance in his digression concerning the digging of the Mount Athos canal. In the straight narrative style Herodotus generally reserves for geographic and ethnographic material, he describes the geography of the area and the techniques used in cutting the canal.[19]

[19]The passage is not without its difficulties in respect to the accuracy of the information. See Macan, *Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books*, 1: 34-36.

Herodotus then expresses what he believes to be Xerxes' motivation for having the canal cut. He states,

> ὡς μὲν ἐμὲ συμβαλλόμενον εὑρίσκειν, μεγαλοφροσύνης εἵνεκεν αὐτὸ Ξέρξης ὀρύσσειν ἐκέλευε, ἐθέλων τε δύναμιν ἀποδείκνυσθαι καὶ μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι. (7.24)

As has been pointed out before, Herodotus usually does not express an opinion in his own *persona* in scenic passages. Rather, he prefers to offer his own thoughts on a matter in a passage where such an overt stance will not be disruptive to the recreation of the scene. His opinion may then be accepted and understood by his audience precisely as it was intended, viz. as an opinion and not as a statement of fact. His narrative, especially those passages treated in scenic fashion, may support the opinion and this, in fact, is frequently the case. For in such a way, Herodotus is able to force his audience to become involved in the narrative through the application of their own evaluative abilities. His readers must decide whether what they have been told about Xerxes, for example, confirms and supports this personal opinion of Herodotus. And the answer is, of course, affirmative. Because Herodotus gently shapes and guides his readers' perception of Xerxes in scenic passages in which his mediative activity as narrator is, on the surface, less apparent, his readers feel that it is they who have evaluated Xerxes' behavior and actions while they were reading the account. Thus, when confronted with what is clearly marked as Herodotus' own personal opinion, they will be able to agree with that opinion, if it corresponds to the results of their own evaluation.

In the final chapter of this section of straight narration, Herodotus makes another comment in his own person. He states that he does not know

which Persian governor received Xerxes' prize for the best-equipped contingent or even if the prize was ever awarded (7.26.2: ὃς μέν νυν τῶν ὑπάρχων στρατὸν κάλλιστα ἐσταλμένον ἀγαγὼν τὰ προκείμενα παρὰ βασιλέος ἔλαβε δῶρα, οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι). This refers back to Xerxes' promise to the conference to reward the best-prepared force (7.8.δ1: ὃς ἂν δὲ ἔχων ἥκῃ παρεσκευασμένον στρατὸν κάλλιστα, δώσω οἱ δῶρα τὰ τιμιώτατα νομίζεται εἶναι ἐν ἡμετέρου). The admission at 7.26.2 of this lack of knowledge supports the suggestion that Herodotus refrains from personal commentary as much as possible in a scenic narration in order to avoid disrupting the flow of the account. Consequently, Herodotus includes the remark here in a passage of straight narration in which he has already made statements in his own person. And since Herodotus includes his admission of this lack knowledge immediately after stating that the army had assembled at Critalla and begun the march toward Sardis (7.26.1), the remark is not out of place.[20]

Herodotus returns to scenic presentation with the introduction of the Lydian Pythius, the son of Atys.[21] Again, Herodotus does not mention where

[20]Macan believes that Herodotus' statement at 7.26.2 "tends to discredit the record above of the king's promise and speech" and further claims that the awarding of the prize would have been difficult, given the "motley" nature of Xerxes' troops. See Macan, *Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books*, 1: 39-40. I am of the opinion, however, that this remark confirms that there is some historicity behind the conference. Though Herodotus' hand is clearly apparent in the composition of the speeches, it is not unlikely that his sources indicated that Xerxes made such a promise to the nobles. Otherwise, why would Herodotus have made the remark at 7.26.2? It is very doubtful that his readers would have noticed that he never mentioned who received Xerxes' promised reward.

[21]This Pythius is possibly the son of Atys, the son of Croesus. See How and Wells, *Commentary*, 2: 138.

he heard this story and he takes a more covert stance as narrator. This passage illustrates how a narrator might combine the use of *oratio obliqua* with that of *oratio recta* in order to highlight the words that are presented directly. After identifying Pythius as one who had lavishly hosted the king and his troops and who had offered Xerxes a large sum of money for the expedition (7.27.1), Herodotus reports that Xerxes asked some of the Persians who this man Pythius was (7.27.2: **ἐπαγγελλομένου δὲ χρήματα Πυθίου εἴρετο Ξέρξης Περσέων τοὺς παρεόντας τίς τε ἐὼν ἀνδρῶν Πύθιος καὶ κόσα χρήματα ἐκτημένος ἐπαγγέλλοιτο ταῦτα**). It is interesting to note that Herodotus reserves the use of *oratio recta* for the Persians' reply, though Xerxes' questions are presented in *oratio obliqua*. Similarly, Xerxes' words to Pythius himself are reported in *oratio obliqua* (7.28.1: **θωμάσας δὲ τῶν ἐπέων τὸ τελευταῖον Ξέρξης αὐτὸς δεύτερα εἴρετο Πύθιον ὁκόσα οἱ εἴη χρήματα**) while Pythius' reply is presented directly. Through this strategic use of *oratio recta* and *oratio obliqua*, Herodotus is able to emphasize the content of the words presented in *oratio recta*. What is most important are the answers and so they are presented in a direct form. As previously mentioned, when the words of both parties are reported in *oratio recta*, they receive equal emphasis. If, however, some of these words are presented indirectly, they serve to highlight the words in *oratio recta* through a contrast between their differing presentations.

There is another point worth noting about Herodotus' activity as narrator of this passage. When marking the change of speaker, Herodotus has taken care to reveal the affect of the speakers' words upon Xerxes. The

king is amazed at the Persians' report of Pythius' wealth (7.28.1: θωμάσας) and he is pleased by the generous offer of the Lydian (7.28.3: ἡσθείς). Much in the manner of a storyteller, Herodotus has again "peered" into his characters' consciousness in order to reveal their state of mind. The information is obviously historically irrelevant but it goes far in its contribution to the mimetic nature of the presentation. Without these small touches of verisimilitude, the scenic depiction of the meeting is incomplete.

Chapters 30 and 31 reveal how Herodotus can integrate and subordinate ethnographic and geographic information to historical material. The historical topic is the continued progression of Xerxes' troops toward Sardis. Herodotus mentions four cities that Xerxes passed on his way to Sardis: Anaua, Colassae, Cydrara and Callatebus. He includes an identifying characteristic about each city. There is a salt lake near Anau (7.30.1); the river Lycus disappears underground near the city of Colossae (7.30.1); at Cydrara, Croesus had set up an inscribed stele marking the Phrygian-Lydian border (7.30.2); and a type of honey of tamarisk-syrup and wheat flour is made in Callatebus (7.31). Herodotus also notes the mountains passed by the army (7.30.2) and the river crossed (7.31). Though these details are very much in the logographic tradition, Herodotus does not allow the information to take predominance in the narrative. At no time, does he mention where he heard this information, that he had actually visited the cities himself or had talked to someone who had, or indicate that he has knowledge of similar phenomena existing elsewhere, as he generally does in passages in which such logographic material is his main focus. He prefers to keep his low-

profile as narrator in order to maintain the impression that the story is telling itself and thus avoids making comments in his own person.

After sending the heralds from Sardis to the Greek city-states to demand submission (7.32), Xerxes began the march to Abydos where he planned to cross the Hellespont (7.33). Herodotus then digresses from his account of the march in order to relate the manner in which the bridge was constructed. He can here assume a more overt stance as narrator because his concern is to impart information rather than to recreate a scene. His account of the construction is very thorough (7.36.1-5) and the sheer accomplishment of such a huge task was, no doubt, the impetus for the detailed treatment. Herodotus also mentions in this passage a brief summary of Xerxes' reactions to the destruction by a storm of the first bridge (7.34-35.1-3). It is curious that Herodotus does not treat this episode in fuller detail for it certainly could lend itself to scenic presentation and it is illustrative of Xerxes' character, as are many of the scenic passages in this selection. Herodotus, however, had a very good reason not to present it in a scenic fashion. He was, I believe, fully aware that much of his information about Xerxes had been tainted by gossip and the tendencies toward exaggeration that frequently accompany the oral traditions about a great leader. Now Herodotus uses many of these to his advantage, e.g., the conclusion to the Pythius-episode, for they make important contributions to the picture of Xerxes that he is creating. However, it appears that Herodotus knows the limits to which he can stretch his readers' acceptance of such stories. Thus he clearly relates the episode as an account that he has heard from someone else, thereby

distancing himself from the story. Indeed, he indicates his own skepticism about part of the story with the words, ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα ὡς καὶ στιγέας ἅμα τούτοισι ἀπέπεμψε στίξοντας τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον (7.35.1).[22] The story is thus relegated to the realm of gossip whose validity cannot be documented but which can function as innuendo. Because the picture of Xerxes in this story confirms the Herodotean presentation of the king as a hybristic and quick-tempered man, Herodotus' readers will accept the story, yet still not find fault with the historian for presenting such gossip as fact.

The final chapter of the Pythius episode is related by Herodotus in Chapters 38 and 39. In his narration of the story, Herodotus uses techniques similar to those utilized in the passages in which Pythius was introduced. Herodotus narrates the encounter in scenic fashion and gives full emphasis to the words and thoughts of Xerxes and Pythius. It is again interesting to note the contrast in emphasis that is produced by the choice of *oratio obiqua* over *oratio recta*. The entire exchange is presented in *oratio recta*, except Xerxes' first words to Pythius that he would grant the request and so to speak out (7.38.2: ...ἔφη τε ὑποργήσειν καὶ δὴ ἀγορεύειν ἐκέλευε ὅτευ δέοιτο). Xerxes' angry response to Pythius' request to exempt his eldest son from his military obligation thus receives additional emphasis (7.39.1-2). There is also the characteristic mention of the state of mind of both Xerxes and Pythius. Pythius fearing the omen of the eclipse (7.37.2), was encouraged by the gifts of Xerxes to make his request (7.38.1: Πύθιος ὁ Ἀυδὸς καταρρωδήσας τὸ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ φάσμα ἐπαρθείς τε τοῖσι δωρήμασι ἐλθὼν παρὰ Ξέρξην ἔλεγε τάδε). Similarly, Pythius took

[22]Macan, *Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books*, 1: 49.

additional courage from Xerxes' words that he would grant the request (7.38.2: θαρσήσας) while Xerxes himself was subsequently vehemently angered by the request (7.39.1: κάρτα τε ἐθυμώθη). In addition, Herodotus has even revealed what Xerxes was initially thinking when Pythius approached him and announced that he had a request to make (7.38.2: Ξέρξης δὲ πᾶν μᾶλλον δοκέων μιν χρηίσειν ἢ τὸ ἐδεήθη). These seemingly small touches reveal the mediative activity of the covert narrator that goes far to help create and maintain the mimetic nature of the presentation. The reader feels almost as if he himself has witnessed the actual conversation. He has been given all the necessary information concerning the actual event as well as circumstantial details that complete the scene in such a way that the event seems to unfold before his eyes.[23]

Herodotus maintains his self-effacing style of narration as he relates the continuing progression of the army. No sources are mentioned for the material and Herodotus refrains from making comments in his own person. Once at Abydos, Xerxes decided to hold a review of his army (7.44). Herodotus once again exploits the scenic potential of the action. In his account of the review, he sets the scene for the exchange between Xerxes and Artabanus. Herodotus keeps his stance as omniscient narrator that allows him to reveal the progression of Xerxes' state of mind. Xerxes was delighted at the Sidonians' victory in the rowing match (7.44.1: ...ἥσθη τῇ τε ἀμίλλῃ καὶ τῇ στρατιῇ) and when the king saw the Hellespont hidden by

[23]Macan notes that the precise details and touches of verisimilitude make one hesitant to dismiss this story as pure fiction, despite its obvious literary purpose of revealing the caprice of the king. Cf. Macan, *The Herodotus, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books*, 1: 59.

the huge number of his ships, he first counted himself lucky and then began to cry (7.45: ...ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Ξέρξης ἑωυτὸν ἐμακάρισε, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἐδάκρυσε). This outburst of emotion provokes Artabanus to ask Xerxes what brought on this sudden change in emotion (7.46.1). It is interesting to note the somewhat lengthy introduction to Artabanus' address of Xerxes. Herodotus writes,

> μαθὼν δέ μιν Ἀρτάβανος ὁ πάτρως, ὃς τὸ πρῶτον γνώμην ἀπεδέξατο ἐλευθέρως οὐ συμβουλεύων Ξέρξῃ στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, οὗτος ὢνὴρ φρασθεὶς Ξέρξην δακρύσαντα εἴρετο τάδε· (7.46.1)

These words are, of course, repetitious because they inform the reader of what he already knows. Herodotus' intent, however, is not to be redundant. This is the narrator's way of reminding his readers of the previous exchange between the two men.[24] With this previous episode in mind, the reader may then contrast this most recent conversation. Herodotus' statement that Artabanus was the one who originally advised the king not to march against Greece provides the reader with a clue to the part Artabanus will play in this conversation. Artabanus will continue in his role of adviser. Thus, the chief interest in this scene lies not so much in what Artabanus will say but in Xerxes' reaction to his uncle's words. The reader wonders whether or not the king will react angrily as he did to Artabanus' initial advice.[25] Xerxes, however, is not enraged by Arbanus' admission that he still has fears about the success of the undertaking (7.47.2), by his suggestion that both land and sea may prove to be his worst enemies (7.49.1-5) or by the more practical

---

[24]Cf. 7.10.1-11.4.
[25]Cf. 7.11.1.

advice to Xerxes not to use Ionian troops against their own countrymen (7.51.1-3). Xerxes allows Artabanus to speak his mind and acknowledges the dangers inherent in the land and sea but counters with the sentiment that one must be willing to take risks in order to succeed (7.50.1-4). He also disagrees with his uncle about the dangers of using the Ionian forces (7.52.1-2) but does so in a very reasoned manner, citing their previous loyalty to Darius when the Scythians were urging them to break up the bridge over the Danube.[26]

After his introduction of Artabanus at 7.46.1, Herodotus keeps his mediative activity as narrator to the absolute minimum. He merely marks the change of speaker and does not give any emphasis to either any emotions or feelings of the two speakers or to any circumstantial details.[27] The mimetic nature of such a presentation is in no way lost upon the reader. In a sense, what is happening is this: when reading the simple narrative account of an event, the reader has the impression that he is hearing the words of the narrator. However, when reading a scenic presentation in which direct speech plays such a dominant role and the mediative activity of the narrator is kept to a minimum, the reader feels that he has *overheard* the actual conversation.[28] Now, of course, the reader is fully

[26]It is not unlikely that Herodotus composed these last words with a touch of ironic intent behind them. The reader is, of course, aware that the Ionians came very close to breaking up the bridge. Cf. 4.137-38.

[27]E.g., ὁ δὲ εἶπε· and ὁ δὲ ἀμείβετο λέγων (7.46.2); Ξέρξης δὲ ἀμείβετο λέγων (7.47.1); ὁ δὲ ἀμείβετο λέγων (7.47.2); Ξέρξης δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα ἀμείβετο τοισίδε (7.48.1); ὁ δ ἀμείβετο λέγων (7.49.1); ἀμείβεται Ξέρξης τοισίδε (7.50.1); λέγει Ἀρτάβανος μετὰ ταῦτα (7.51.1); ἀμείβεται πρὸς ταῦτα Ξέρξης (7.52.1).

[28]Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, p. 206.

aware that Herodotus has composed the entire conversation, regardless of whatever kernel of historical actuality may lie beneath this encounter between Artabanus and Xerxes.[29] But such speeches were familiar to Herodotus' readers through epic and it is unlikely, for this reason, that their presence in the *Histories* was ever a source of discomfort for the original readers of the work. It is too often forgotten that the Homeric epics, particularly the *Iliad*, were accepted by the ancient audience as accounts of actual events. Consequently, the fact that many of the conventions of epic were adapted by Herodotus for use in a prose work that dealt primarily with a historical event would have hardly seemed out of place to the ancient reader. A literary convention works precisely because of its familiarity and because it is accepted on its own terms and not questioned by the audience. Once this fact is recognized, the modern reader may then ask what effect is achieved by the inclusion of the speech or conversation. To be sure, speeches and dialogues are frequently the vehicles for Herodotus' own philosophy or his interpretation of events. This is commonly noted by commentators and is no less true here than elsewhere. What is important for this examination, however, is what such passages accomplish on the level of expression. That is to say, what significance do they have in respect to the manner in which they communicate the desired information? It is in this regard that the notion of mimesis enters in. In these passages, Herodotus at one moment may speak in his own capacity as narrator to note, for example, the change of speakers, while at another, he may speak as if he

[29]Cf. Macan, *Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books*, 1: 67.

were one of the characters involved in the action.[30] When Herodotus speaks as if he were one of the characters, he is presenting the speech, whether it be concerned with issues, philosophy or facts, from that character's point of view. The information is thus conveyed to his readers in such a way that it is perceived not as the result of the intellectual analysis of the historian but as an essential part of the mimetic depiction of the original event. This latter activity may combine with the omniscient narrator's capability of revealing the state of mind of the characters and with his tendency to include circumstantial details that create the scene to produce an account that is, in essence, an imitative rendition of the original event.

The second half of the selection (7.54-99) largely concerns the crossing of the Hellespont and the descriptions of the infantry, cavalry and naval forces of the Persians. In these chapters, Herodotus resumes the overt stance as narrator that he generally uses when relating ethnographic or geographic information. He frequently makes remarks in his own person similar to those discussed in Chapter Two of this investigation. He acknowledges that he does not know Xerxes' intent behind throwing a cup, golden bowl and a Persian short sword into the Hellespont, though he offers his own suggestions. He states,

> ταῦτα οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως διακρῖναι οὔτε εἰ τῷ ἡλίῳ
> ἀνατιθεὶς κατῆκε ἐς τὸ πέλαγος οὔτε εἰ μεταμέλησέ οἱ τὸν

[30]It is instructive at this point to take note of Plato's discussion in the *Republic* (3.392C-94C) of Homer's techniques of imitation. For, as C. Fornara has noted, Herodotus employs precisely the same techniques of mimesis in respect to his speeches as those mentioned by Plato in this discussion. Cf. C. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, pp. 31-32.

Ἑλλήσποντον μαστιγώσαντι καὶ ἀντὶ τούτων τὴν θάλασσαν ἐδωρέετο. (7.54.3)

He also says that he does not know the exact number of troops each nation contributed to Xerxes' forces (7.60.1: **ὅσον μέν νυν ἕκαστοι παρεῖχον πλῆθος ἐς ἀριθμὸν, οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀτρεκές (οὐ γὰρ λέγεται πρὸς οὐδαμῶν ἀνθρώπων)**. He informs his reader when his sources have produced differing accounts of a single event. After briefly describing the crossing of the Hellespont (7.55.1-3), Herodotus adds he has also heard that the king crossed last (7.55.3: **ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα καὶ ὕστατον διαβῆναι βασιλέα πάντων)**. Herodotus also attributes much of his information to his oral informants. He relates the Median account of their name change from Arians to Medes (7.62.1: **αὐτοὶ περὶ σφέων ὧδε λέγουσι Μῆδοι)**; the Macedonian account of the name change of the Briges to the Phrygians (7.73.1: **οἱ δὲ Φρύγες, ὡς Μακεδόνες λέγουσι...)**; and the Greek claim that "Pelasgians of the Coast" was the original name of the Ionians (7.94: **...ὡς Ἕλληνες λέγουσι, ἐκαλέοντο Πελασγοὶ Αἰγιαλέες, ἐπὶ δὲ Ἴωνος τοῦ Ξούθου Ἴωνες)**. Herodotus notes when he has already informed his readers of a particular piece of information. He states that he has already mentioned the names of the chief commanders of the native troops (7.81: **τούτου ὦν τοῦ στρατοῦ ἦρχον μὲν οὗτοι οἵ περ εἰρέαται...)**, as well as the original name of the Carians (7.93: **οὗτοι δὲ οἵτινες πρότερον ἐκαλέοντο, ἐν τοῖσι πρώτοισι τῶν λόγων εἴρηται)** and the names of the Persian generals who had the actual command over the native contingents (7.96.2: **...ὅσοι αὐτῶν ἦσαν Πέρσαι, εἰρέαταί μοι)**. And finally, Herodotus admits when he is not going to include the name of the native officers of the naval contingents (7.96.1: **...ἐπίχωριοι ἡγεμόνες τῶν ἐγώ, οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκαίη ἐξέργομαι ἐς**

ἱστορίης λόγον, οὐ παραμέμνημαι) or the names of all the subordinate officers of the fleet (7.99.1: τῶν μέν νυν ἄλλων οὐ παραμέμνημαι ταξιάρχων ὡς οὐκ ἀναγκαζόμενος...). Thus, throughout this entire section, Herodotus has maintained a very high-profile as narrator of this information. This , of course, has something to do with the nature of the material. For our purposes, however, it is important to recognize that Herodotus could have narrated the entire section that has been discussed in this chapter in this overt manner. But he chose not to do so, preferring rather to take a more covert stance when narrating the beginning of the march and the various episodes that more directly concerned Xerxes himself. The choice was quite a conscious one, for only in this way, was Herodotus able to present an account that reflected in a mimetic fashion, the events themselves and the personalities involved in those events.

Gelon of Syracuse (7.153-67)

The account of the Greek embassy's petition of Gelon of Syracuse for aid against Xerxes provides another example of the manner in which Herodotus integrates an open attitude as narrator with a more covert stance. He begins the account with what appears to be scene-setting statements designed to introduce the report. He states,

> ἐς δὴ τὴν Σικελίην ἄλλοι τε ἀπίκατο ἄγγελοι ἀπὸ τῶν συμμάχων συμμείξαντες Γέλωνι καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων Σύαγρος. (7.153.1)

However, before continuing on with the report of the embassy, Herodotus inserts two digressions that concern Gelon's ancestor, Telines, who was

among the original colonists of Sicily (7.153.1-4) and the establishment of Gelon's power over Syracuse (7.154-56.3). In these chapters, Herodotus takes an overt stance as narrator and is more concerned with the relation of facts than with the scenic recreation of the events under discussion. After relating that Telines was able to reinstate the exiles from Gela through the power of some sacred objects rather than by force (7.153.3: **τούτους ὧν ὁ Τηλίνης κατήγαγε ἐς Γέλην, ἔχων οὐδεμίαν ἀνδρῶν δύναμιν ἀλλὰ ἱρὰ τούτων τῶν θεῶν**), Herodotus offers his own thoughts on the event. He states,

> **ὅθεν δὲ αὐτὰ ἔλαβε ἢ αὐτὸς ἐκτήσατο, τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν. τούτοισι δ ὧν πίσυνος ἐὼν κατήγαγε, ἐπ ᾧ τε οἱ ἀπόγονοι αὐτοῦ ἱροφάνται τῶν θεῶν ἔσονται. θῶμά μοι ὧν καὶ τοῦτο γέγονε πρὸς τὰ πυνθάνομαι, κατεργάσθαι Τηλίνην ἔργον τοσοῦτον· τὰ τοιαῦτα γὰρ ἔργα οὐ πρὸς [τοῦ] ἄπαντος ἀνδρὸς νενόμικα γίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ψυχῆς τε ἀγαθῆς καὶ ῥώμης ἀνδρηίης· ὁ δὲ λέγεται πρὸς τῆς Σικελίης τῶν οἰκητόρων τὰ ὑπεναντία τούτων πεφυκέναι θηλυδρίης τε καὶ μαλακώτερος ἀνήρ.** (7.153.3-4)

These are the remarks of a researcher who feels free to admit the limits of his knowledge and to express openly his suprise at his informants' account of the event. This is not the attitude of a narrator who desires to present a reenactment of the event and who, in so doing, keeps his activity as narrator as behind-the-scenes as possible in order to keep the illusion of mimesis intact.

Herodotus continues to put the relation of information before the creation of scene in his account of how Gelon gained control of Syracuse. He informs his readers that Gelon rose to be general of the cavalary under Hippocrates, the ruler of Gela (7.154.2) but he does not include any of the

details that brought about this promotion. He also enumerates the sieges in which Gelon participated and the fact that his services were most distinguished (7.154.2). He only briefly specifies the outcome of these sieges and he does so in a statement that overtly manifests his presence as narrator through the use of the first person verb form (7.154.2: **τῶν δὲ εἶπον πολίων πασέων πλὴν Συρηκουσέων οὐδεμία ἀπέφυγε δουλοσύνην πρὸς Ἱπποκράτεος**). His concise outline of how Syracuse managed to escape enslavement (7.154.3) is included only because of the importance Syracuse has in the establishment of Gelon's power.

Herodotus then goes on to relate how Gelon seized control of Gela and Syracuse. He gives a brief summary of the events. After Hippocrates died, Gelon pretended to support his sons, Eucleides and Cleander, against the people of Gela who were attempting to establish a democratic government. Gelon suppressed the revolt and then seized power for himself (7.155.1). He then gained control of Syracuse by supporting the exiled landowners against the populace. The town surrendered to Gelon without a fight (7.155.2). Gelon then gave control of Gela to his brother Hieron (7.156.1) and proceeded to strengthen Syracuse by importing supporters to whom he granted citizen rights. He also sold into slavery the common people of Sicilian Megara and Euboea (7.156.1-3). Herodotus gives the reason why Gelon sold these people into slavery (7.156.3: **ἐποίεε δὲ ταῦτα ἀμφοτέρους νομίσας δῆμον εἶναι συνοίκημα ἀχαριτώτατον**) and then closes his account of this chapter of Gelon's career (7.156.3: **τοιούτῳ μέν τρόπῳ τύραννος ἐγεγόνεε μέγας ὁ Γέλων**). Herodotus has included all the major events in Gelon's rise to power and has established motives for his action but he has presented all of

this information in a very abbreviated form. It will be recalled from the discussion in the previous chapter that Herodotus often employs summary in order to indicate the passage of time. However, in those instances, the summary is made either of certain aspects of the event under discussion or of a different event that occurred contemporaneously and in this manner, the illusion of the passage of time is created. In this passage, the summary is made of past events and there is no other purpose behind its inclusion than the imparting of information.

The meeting between Gelon and Greek envoys is narrated by Herodotus in a manner markedly different from the way he presented the previous chapters that dealt with Gelon. He has here taken a more convert stance so that he may report the exchange between the parties as if it were a verisimilar reenactment of the original meeting. His activity as narrator is limited to introducing and concluding the scene and to facilitating the transitions between speakers. In the passages and sentences that reveal his mediative activity as narrator, Herodotus subtly guides his readers' impressions of the scene but he does not enter directly into the text in order to offer his own opinion, reveal a source or to acknowledge the deficiency of his information. He presents the encounter as a seamless whole in which the words, actions and reactions of the participants are allowed to speak for themselves.

Herodotus resumes his account of the embassy to Gelon with a brief introduction to the actual encounter (7.157.1: **τότε δ ὡς οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπίκατο ἐς τὰς Συρηκούσας, ἐλθόντες αὐτῷ ἐς λόγους ἔλεγον τάδε**). The conversation itself consists of the envoys' request for aid

(7.157.1-3); Gelon's reply that although the Greeks did not previously grant his own request for aid against the Carthaginians, he would send them assistance, provided that he was given supreme command (7.158.1-5); Syagrus' answer that the Spartans would not surrender their command (7.159); Gelon's concession that the Spartans could control the land forces if he could control the navy (7.160.1-2); the Athenians' refusal to be deprived of their naval command (7.161.1-3); and Gelon's final words to the embassy that they had made a foolish choice (7.162.1). Herodotus marks the change of speakers with phrases that focus upon the affect the previous speaker's words had upon the respondent. Gelon was angered by the envoys' request (7.158.1: **οἱ μέν ταῦτα ἔλεγον, Γέλων δὲ πολλὸς ἐνέκειτο λέγων τοιάδε**); Syagrus could not contain himself after hearing Gelon's request for the command (7.159.1: **ταῦτα ἀκούσας οὔτε ἠνέσχετο ὁ Σύαγρος εἶπέ τε τάδε**); Gelon recognized that the Spartan refusal was final and so attempted to strike a compromise with them (7.160.1: **πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ Γέλων, ἐπειδὴ ὥρα ἀπεστραμμένους τοὺς λόγους τοῦ Συάγρου, τὸν τελευταῖόν σφι τόνδε ἐξέφαινε λόγον**); and when Gelon requested the naval command as an alternative, the Athenians preempted the Spartan reply with their own refusal to surrender their command (7.161.1: **φθάσας δὲ ὁ Ἀθηναίων ἄγγελος τὸν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀμείβετό μιν τοισίδε**). The shaping affect that these words have upon the readers' perception of the story is subtle but important. Consider the difference in tone that would have resulted had Herodotus simply marked the change of speaker with **ὁ δ ἀμείβετο** or a similarly neutral expression. The inclusion of this information is not only necessary for a verisimilar presentation of the event but it also provides

the readers with important clues for interpretation. For, the awareness of the emotions produced and the state of mind of the participants is important for the accurate understanding of the reasons why the participants behaved as they did.

Herodotus concludes his report of the embassy as simply as he introduced it (7.163.1: **οἱ μὲν δὴ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἄγγελοι τοιαῦτα τῷ Γέλωνι χρηματισάμενοι ἀπέπλεον**). He continues his account of Gelon by relating that Gelon sent three ships over to Delphi with the orders to watch the progression of the war and to submit to Xerxes, if the Greeks lost (7.163.1-2). Herodotus then concludes the passage with a variant version that offers a different explanation for why Gelon refused to send aid to the Greeks. He reports that Gelon was involved at the same time in a conflict with Terillus of Himera and Hamilcar of Carthage and so was prevented from sending assistance to the Greeks (7.165). It is important to note the entirely different tone Herodotus uses while narrating this section. His open manner of reporting the variant does not minimize his presence as narrator and he uses phrases that are indicative of his reliance on **ἀκοή**. He states that this variant is told by those living in Sicily (7.165: **λέγεται δὲ καὶ τάδε ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Σικελίῃ οἰκημένων**...) and adds that they also claim that the victory of Gelon over Hamilcar coincided with the victory of the Greeks over the Persians at Salamis (7.166: **πρὸς δὲ καὶ τάδε λέγουσι**...). Herodotus then goes on to report information he has acquired about Hamilcar. He states that he has learned that Hamilcar disappeared during the course of the battle when he realized that the Carthaginians were being defeated (7.166: ...**ὡς ἡ συμβολή τε ἐγίνετο καὶ ὡς ἐσσοῦτο τῇ μάχῃ**,

ἀφανισθῆναι πυνθάνομαι). He repeats the story that he heard from the Carthaginians that Hamilcar threw himself on the fire at which he was making sacrifices when he learned that his forces were losing and Herodotus judges the story not improbable (7.167.1: ἔστι δὲ ὑπ αὐτῶν Καρχηδονίων ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος, οἰκότι χρεωμένων, ὡς...). He concludes the story with what he believed to be the facts: Hamilcar disappeared for one reason or another and his disappearance was commemorated in Carthage with a heroic cult.[31] He states,

> ἀφανισθέντι δὲ Ἀμίλκᾳ τρόπῳ εἴτε τοιούτῳ ὡς Φοίνικες λέγουσι, εἴτε ἑτέρῳ [ὡς Καρχηδόνιου καὶ Συγηκόσιοι], τοῦτο μέν οἱ θύουσι, τοῦτο δὲ μνήματα ἐποίησαν ἐν πάσῃσι τῇσι πόλισι τῶν ἀποικίδων, ἐν αὐτῇ τε μέγιστον Καρχηδόνι. (7.167.2)

These statements are of the sort that were discussed in Chapter Two. Herodotus is very clear about his methodology, about his sources and about what he felt could be believed about this account. His attitude as narrator in the passage is very different from that which he exhibited in the embassy scene. He is the researcher intent upon reporting to his readers every piece of information he has gathered though he does not allow the information to dominate the entire passage that concerns Gelon. It is included to provide background material that is ancillary to the main consideration, viz., the embassy scene. In the former section, however, Herodotus desired to present the event as a continuous whole that realistically depicted the

[31]Macan notes that Herodotus has confused this supposed heroic cult, a phenomenon that is not likely in Carthaginian religion, with a cult of one of their gods. Cf. Macan, *Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books*, 1: 238.

meeting in a mimetic fashion. Self-effacement of his role as narrator and researcher was necessary in order to achieve this effect. Herodotus presents the embassy entirely from the point of view of the individuals involved by his direct reporting of their words to one another rather than as a straight narrative account of the event that has obviously been filtered through the eyes of a historian who is temporally distant from the original event.

Themistocles and the Naval Commanders (8.56-63)

Herodotus' account of Themistocles' plan for the Greek defense at Salamis is presented in a fully scenic narration. As is generally the case in scenic narration, Herodotus assumes an omniscient stance as narrator and maintains a strong reticence to speak in his own person. He opens the scene with a passage in simple narration that relates the affect that the news of the burning of the Athenian Acropolis had upon the Greek naval commanders (8.56). Many of the commanders began to prepare for flight before the issue of defense was resolved, but it was decided by the others that they should take their stand at the Isthmus (8.56: **τοῖσι τε ὑπολειπομένοισι αὐτῶν ἐκυρώθη πρὸ τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ ναυμαχέειν**). The scene is thus set for someone or something to convince the naval commanders of the necessity of taking a defensive stand at Salamis.

That someone is, of course, Themistocles, but his own actions are put into motion by the Athenian Mnesiphilus who makes his way to Themistocles' ship in order to find out what plan of defense the Greek have

decided to follow (8.57.1). After learning of the Greeks' decision to withdraw to the Isthmus (8.57.1: **πυθόμενος δὲ πρὸς αὐτοῦ ὡς εἴη δεδογμένον ἀνάγειν τὰς νέας πρὸς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν καὶ πρὸ τῆς Πελοποννήσου ναυμαχέειν**), Mnesiphilus breaks into a direct speech in which he points out to Themistocles the consequences of such a plan for Greece as a whole. He ends his speech by urging Themistocles to try to persuade Eurybiades to remain at Salamis (8.57.2). It is important to note that Herodotus uses *oratio recta* for Mnesiphilus' words while he reports what Themistocles said to Mnesiphilus concerning the Greek plans in a summarized form. It also should be noted that Herodotus relates the summary of Themistocles' words from Mnesiphilus' point of view (8.57.1: **πυθόμενος δὲ πρὸς αὐτοῦ...**). Herodotus has again strategically employed the use of *oratio recta* so that the words he most desires to stress receive that emphasis naturally through their means of expression rather than by some outside indicator of their importance.

Themistocles takes Mnesiphilus' words to heart and rushes over to Eurybiades' ship (8.58.1). The careful attention that Herodotus has paid to circumstantial details makes it clear that he wants his readers to be able to reconstruct the scene in their own minds. Themistocles leaves Mnesiphilus without saying a word in his hurry to see Eurybiades (8.58.1: **...οὐδὲν πρὸς ταῦτα ἀμειψάμενος ἦιε ἐπὶ τὴν νέα τὴν Εὐρυβιάδεω**). Each step leading up to the meeting is depicted by Herodotus: Themistocles arrives at the ship and announces that he has a public matter to discuss with him (8.58.1: **ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἔφη ἐθέλειν οἱ κοινόν τι πρῆγμα συμμεῖξαι**); Eurybiades orders him to embark and speak his mind (8.58.1: **ὁ**

δ αὐτὸν ἐς τὴν νέα ἐκέλευε ἐσβάντα λέγειν, εἴ τι θέλοι); Themistocles sits down beside him and begins to speak (8.58.2: ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης παριζόμενός οἱ καταλέγει...). There is no need, however, for Herodotus to relate exactly what Themistocles said to Eurybiades since Themistocles utilizes the same reasoning that Mnesiphilus used. Thus, Herodotus can compress this aspect of the meeting between the two men. He states,

> ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Θεμιστοκλέης παριζόμενός οἱ καταλέγει ἐκεῖνά τε πάντα τὰ ἤκουσε Μνησιφίλου, ἑωυτοῦ ποιεύμενος, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ προστιθείς, ἐς ὃ ἀνέγνωσε χρηίζων ἔκ τε τῆς νεὸς ἐκβῆναι συλλέξαι τε τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἐς τὸ συνέδριον. (8.58.2)

However, because Herodotus did present Mnesiphilus' speech to Themistocles in full, his readers can imaginatively, but accurately, recreate Themistocles' words to his superior.

Herodotus continues to depict the scene fully and with the inclusion of circumstantial details. He relates that when the generals reassembled, Themistocles began speaking quite vehemently before Eurybiades had even informed his officers of the reason for their meeting (8.59: ὡς δὲ ἄρα συνελέχθησαν, πρὶν ἢ τὸν Εὐρυβιάδην προθεῖναι τὸν λόγον τῶν εἵνεκα συνήγαγε τοὺς στρατηγούς, πολλὸς ἦν Θεμιστοκλέης ἐν τοῖσι λόγοισι οἷα κάρτα δεόμενος). Even the brief confrontation between Adeimantus and Themisticles, reported in *oratio recta*, adds to the verisimilar depiction of the scene (8.59).

Herodotus prefaces Themistocles' words to Eurybiades and the other generals with the remark that Themistocles used none of the arguments he had previously mentioned privately to Eurybiades. Herodotus adds an

explanation for this in his capacity as omniscient narrator: **παρεόντων γὰρ τῶν συμμάχων οὐκ ἔφερέ οἱ κόσμον οὐδένα κατηγορέειν** (8.60α1). The speech itself is delivered in *oratio recta* and it neatly sums up the advantages of fighting the sea-battle at Salamis rather than at the Isthmus (8.60.α–γ). After Themistocles finished his speech, Adeimantus again began to criticize him. It is important to note that this exchange is reported in *oratio obliqua*. The previous exchange between the two men had been directly presented because of its contribution to the picture of an overly eager Themistocles that Herodotus is depicting in this passage. Here, however, Herodotus has no such purpose in mind and in fact, the presentation of this exchange in *oratio recta* would greatly detract from the passionate speech of Themistocles. Thus, Herodotus presents the words of both men indirectly and adds a single explanatory note to clarify the meaning of Adeimantus' words (8.61.1: **ταῦτα δέ οἱ προέφερε, ὅτι ἠλώκεσάν τε καὶ κατείχοντο αἱ Ἀθῆναι**). Themistocles closes his speech to Eurybiades with the final passionate plea to follow his advice. His final words threaten that the Athenian navy will withdraw to Siris in Italy if Salamis is abandoned (8.62.1-2). Herodotus returns his presentation of Themistocles' words to *oratio recta* because of the importance of presenting the threat of Athenian withdrawal in the most dramatic form possible and from the point of view of Themistocles rather than that of the narrator who, though he has assumed the stance of a privileged insider, is not an actual participant in the event..

Throughout this entire passage, Herodotus has maintained his position as the omniscient narrator who has full knowledge of all the occurred during

the event but who keeps his own *persona* out of his narration. After the close of Themistocles' speech, Herodotus ends his account of the meeting with the remark that Themistocles convinced Eurybiades to remain at Salamis (8.63: **ταῦτα δὲ Θεμιστοκλέος λέγοντος ἀνεδιδάσκετο Εὐρυβιάδης**). After this conclusion, Herodotus can now break his stance as covert narrator and offer his own opinion regarding Eurybiades' change of mind. He states,

> δοκέειν δὲ μοι, ἀρρωδήσας μάλιστα τοὺς Ἀθηναίους [ἀνεδιδάσκετο], μή σφεας ἀπολίπωσι, ἦν πρὸς τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἀνάγῃ τὰς νέας· ἀπολιπόντων γὰρ Ἀθηναίων οὐκέτι ἐγίνοντο ἀξιόμαχοι οἱ λοιποί. (8.63)

It is important to note that this expression of opinion lies outside the scenic narration of the event. Thus Herodotus does not destroy the illusion of mimesis that he has created through covert narration of the conference by his personal commentary upon the event.

The importance of this scene lies chiefly in its presentation of the issues that lie beneath the Greeks' decision to take their stand first at the Isthmus and after being persuaded by Themistocles, at Salamis. Because Herodotus has presented the arguments for remaining at Salamis, both those of Mnesiphilus and Themistocles, in *oratio recta*, he has reported them not from his own point of view as narrator or historian but from that of two individuals involved in the event. The impact upon the original Greek audience of this dramatic depiction of such a critical moment in the war should in no way be overlooked.

This chapter has investigated how Herodotus adapts the techniques of scenic narration that he often uses in the telling of a traditional story to his account of historical events. It has been seen that there are certain events that Herodotus reserves for scenic presentation. In such instances, Herodotus slows the pace of narration so that he may fully depict the interactions between the individuals participating in the event and their varying points of view, as represented by the presentation of their words in *oratio recta*. He also includes such circumstantial details as the emotions and thoughts of the characters as well as other details that focus upon the setting of the event. Throughout this type of presentation, Herodotus keeps his presence as narrator as minimally detectable as possible in order to give the impression that a mimetically accurate reenactment of the event is being presented to his readers. Such personal comments as are made in these passages lie outside the mimetic presentation so as to avoid interrupting the imitative scene.

It is now fair to consider what may have impelled Herodotus to use scenic and mimetic narration for his presentation of certain historical events. For, he does not use such narration for all events. Most of the *Histories* is, after all, presented in straight narration. That Herodotus took his models from epic and drama is abundantly clear, but what made him apply such techniques to a historical work? The answer lies, I believe, in Herodotus' recognition that this type of narration provides a self-

explanatory picture of the event.[32] The historian/narrator may thus allow the historical personages to tell their own story through their actions, words, thoughts and feelings. The points of view of the individuals and the issues that lie beneath the event thus avoid the appearance of having been filtered through the eyes of the narrator. Now, as has been frequently pointed out during the course of this chapter, the mediative activity of the narrator is no less active in these passages than in any selection of straight narration. It is artifice on the part of the narrator, but it is essential for the mimetic presentation of events. Thus, Herodotus does not have to *tell* his readers what Xerxes was like; he has *shown* them what he is like through his mimetic presentation. The differing points of view and the self-interest that so strongly played a part in the interactions between Gelon and the Greek embassy do not need to be analyzed by the historian; they have been presented in such a self-explanatory fashion through scenic narration that any historical analysis is superfluous. In similar fashion, the issues lying beneath the Greek decision to make a stand at Salamis rather than at the Isthmus do not need to be ennumerated by the historian; they have been more convincingly presented by the actual individuals involved in the decision-making process.

This type of self-explanatory, mimetic presentation is not one that Herodotus used or should have used for every event in the *Histories*. Its strength as a vivid means of narration and its value in offering self-

[32]Cf. C. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, p. 30. Fornara also notes the self-explanatory character of Herodotus' narrative but he does not fully treat the issue or recognize that because Herodotus employs different types of narration, some passages are more self-explanatory than others.

explanatory accounts of events would thereby be diluted. It is, rather, a technique to be reserved for those critical moments in the *Histories* which may benefit most from this type of presentation.[33] Herodotus recognized this fact and so restricted his use of this type of narration. It is not surprising, however, that it is in these scenic passages that the skills of Herodotus as a narrator have made their greatest impression upon his readers.

[33]For a brief listing of some of the historical passages that are presented in scenic narration, see page 7.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

Herodotus' stance as a covert and overt narrator has been the focus of this investigation. It has been noted that though Herodotus narrates most of the *Histories* overtly, there are passages for which he selects a covert stance as narrator in order to present the story or event as a mimetic reenactment of its original occurrence. Self-effacement by the narrator was seen to be an essential element of this type of scenic presentation for only in covert narration will the readers have the impression that they are being shown a story by its participants rather than being told one by a narrator. This is, of course, an artifice carefully constructed by the narrator but it is an effective means by which to produce the illusion of mimesis.

It has been frequently pointed out during the course of this examination that Herodotus owes many of the techniques he uses to present a mimetic account of an event to Homer. The Homeric epics are also narrated by a covert narrator who is generally reluctant to intrude directly into the story[1] and who uses scenic narration to present a self-explanatory and mimetic account of the events. The question that may now be asked is whether or not Herodotus is doing something different from Homer. The

[1]For a discussion of the exceptions to this tendency, see E. Block, "The Narrator Speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil," *TAPA* 112 (1982): 7-22.

answer must be an affirmative because Herodotus only selectively applies covert narration to present certain events of the *Histories* in a mimetic fashion while the Homeric epics are related almost entirely in covert and scenic narration. The reason is twofold. Firstly, the selective use of scenic and covert narration was due to Herodotus' recognition that the strength of fully scenic narration as an explanatory tool would be lessened by its overuse, as was pointed out in the previous chapter.[2] The second reason is, no doubt, to be found in the conflicting demands placed upon Herodotus by his position near the beginning of the development of Greek historiography. Herodotus still has one foot firmly placed in the Ionian tradition of ἱστορίη no matter how much we, who want to look upon Herodotus as the father of history as *we* define it, might wish this were not true. But it is a consequence of this fact that Herodotus is so desirous to keep the *process* of ἱστορίη before the eyes of his readers. He wants them to be able to appreciate not only the results of his researches but also the very act of inquiry in its own right. A result of this are his frequent intrusions into the account to reveal to whom he spoke during the course of his investigation, where he travelled, the various difficulties he encountered along the way, or whether or not a particular informant could be considered reliable. His successors, though they undoubtedly used similar methods of research,[3] did not feel the same need to provide such a complete documentation of the investigative process. They were thus able to permit their narratives to provide the proof of the thoroughness of their research. Because of this, their personal statements were generally limited to expressions of opinions

[2]See pages 161-62.

[3]They probably, however, had greater access to written documents.

and judgments on the historical facts contained in their narratives.[4] The result was a smoother narrative that did not as frequently jump from remarks made in the historian's present by the historian himself to his treatment of the historical past.

As far as the extant evidence indicates, it was Herodotus who recognized that the techniques used by the narrator of the Homeric epics to produce a scenic narrative in a mimetic style could be adapted to the needs of the writing of history. Herodotus saw that presenting the words of an individual in *oratio recta* permitted the expression of that information from the point of view of that particular character. He noted that he could use the omniscience granted him by an internal stance to peer into the minds of the characters to reveal what they were thinking or feeling at that particular moment and he recognized that the mimetic nature of the narration would thereby be enhanced. He understood that the inclusion of small, seemingly insignificant circumstantial details such as those that revealed the state of mind of an individual, that focussed upon certain aspects of the setting or that allowed for the step-by-step reporting of the action would also complement the mimetic effect of the narrative. And most importantly, Herodotus recognized that self-effacement of his role as narrator was necessary in order to keep the illusion of mimesis intact. He did realize, however, that he could allow his *persona* as historian and investigator to enter the narrative upon the completion of the mimetic

[4]For a discussion of the way Thucydides expresses his opinions and judgments, see L. Pearson, "Thucydides as Reporter and Critic", *TAPA* 78 (1947): 37-60.

passage. In this way, he could offer his own opinions on a matter without destroying the mimetic tone of its narration.

Herodotus even went on to develop further the potential for a mimetic depiction that was offered by the presentation of a character's words in *oratio recta*. He realized that he could enhance the illusion of mimesis by strategically presenting some of these words in *oratio obliqua*, thereby creating the illusion of the passing of time. He understood that his usage of this technique would greatly increase the mimetic tone of the the account. In addition, Herodotus recognized that he could indicate the importance of a certain character's words by presenting the less significant elements of that individual's speech in *oratio obliqua* rather than in *oratio recta* or by relating the words of the other participant in the dialogue in an indirect form. He could thereby ensure that this readers would understand the relative importance of the various words spoken through a contrast in their means of expression and he would not be forced to intrude into the story to make these issues clear.

Herodotus used covert narration because he realized that a mimetic presentation could offer what would appear to be a self-explanatory account of an event. That is to say, by creating the illusion that the narration mimetically reflected the events and its participants and by keeping his own activity as narrator as minimally detectable as possible, Herodotus could in fact present his own understanding of the event, the action and its participants without openly and obviously appearing to have allowed his own point of view to influence his account. All histories, regardless of their narrative form or period of composition, are subjective accounts if only

because they are written by individuals who have the power to determine which facts are relevant to the topic and which are not. There are, in fact, as many accounts of a single historical event as there are historians who desire to treat the topic.[5] But all historians want their readers to believe that their work is the most accurate and truthful account and one of the ways to accomplish this is to give the impression that the history mimetically depicts the events and its participants.

Herodotus restricted the use of covert and scenic narration in his relation of historical events to those critical moments in the *Histories* that would benefit most from a vivid presentation that seemed to be free of the historian's own point of view. Three of these passages have already been discussed: the depiction of Xerxes (7.1-99), the Greek embassy to Gelon (7.153-63), and the case made by Themistocles to remain at Salamis (8.56-63) and other have been noted.[6] To Herodotus, scenic and covert narration were techniques to be used to enable his readers to understand in the most graphic way possible how and why the events of the Persians Wars occurred as they did.

---

[5]Cf. A.R. Louch, "History as Narrative," *History and Theory* 8 (1969): 57 and L.O. Mink, "Narrative Form as a Cognitive Instrument," in *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding,* eds. R.H. Canary and H. Kozicki (Madison, 1978), p. 144.
[6]See page 7.

Bibliography

Aly, W. *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen.* 2nd ed. Gottingen, 1969.

Alter, R. *The Art of Biblical Narrative.* New York, 1981.

Ancelet, B. J. "And This is No Damn Lie: Oral History in Story Form." *International Journal of Oral History* 4 (1983): 99-111.

Armayor, O.K. *Herodotus' Autopsy of the Fayuom: Lake Moeris and the Labyrinth of Egypt.* Amsterdam, 1985.

_____. "Sesotris and Herdotus' Autopsy of Thrace, Colchis, Inland Asia Minor, and the Levant." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 84 (1982): 51-79.

_____. "Did Herodotus Ever Go to the Black Sea?" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 82 (1978): 45-62.

_____. "Did Herodotus Ever Go to Egypt?" *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 15 (1978): 59-71.

_____. "Herodotus' Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the Light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 108 (1978): 1-9.

Avery, H. C. "Herodotus' Picture of Cyrus." *American Journal of Philology* 93 (1972): 529-546.

Ayo, N. Prolog and Epilog: Mythical History in Herodotus." *Ramus* 13 (1984): 31-47.

Baldwin, B. "How Credulous was Herodotus?" *Greece and Rome* 11 (1964): 167-77.

Berlin, A. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative.* Sheffield, England, 1983.

Bernardete, S. *Herodotean Inquiries.* The Hague, 1969.

Block, E. "The Narrator Speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 112 (1982): 7-22.

Boulos, J. *Les peuples et les civilisations du Proche Orient.* Vol. 2: de 1600 a 64 avant J.-C. The Hague, 1962.

Brannan, P. T. "Herodotus and History: The Constitutional Debate Preceding Darius' Accession." *Traditio* 19 (1963): 427-38.

Brown, T.S. "Herodotus Speculates About Egypt." *American Journal of Philology* 86 (1965): 60-76.

_____. "Herodotus' Portrait of Cambyses." *Historia* 31 (1982): 387-403.

Booth, W. C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction.* 2nd ed. Chicago, 1983.

Bury, J. B. *The Ancient Greek Historians.* London, 1909.

Busolt, G. *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia* 3 vols. Gotha, 1895; reprint ed., Hildescheim, 1967.

Canfora, L. "Analogie et histoire." *History and Theory* 22 (1983): 22-42.

Chatman, S. *Story and Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film.* Ithaca, 1978; Cornell Paperbacks, 1983.

Chiasson, C. C. "Tragic Diction in Herodotus: Some Possibilities." *Phoenix* 37 (1982): 156-161.

Connor, W. R. "Narrative Discourse in Thucydides." In *The Greek Historians. Literature and History,* pp. 1-17. Papers presented to A.E. Raubitschek. Saratoga, Calif., 1985.

Cook, A. "Herodotus: The Act of Inquiry as a Liberation from Myth." *Helios* 3 (1976): 23-66.

Cook, J. M. *The Persian Empire.* London, 1983.

Cooper, G. L. III. "Intrusive Oblique Infinitives in Herodotus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 104 (1974): 23-76.

_____. "The Ironic Force of the Pure Optative in ὅτι (ὡς) Constructions of the Primary Sequence." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 105 (1975): 29-34.

J.D. Denniston. *Greek Prose Style.* Oxford, 1960.

_____. *The Greek Particles.* 2nd ed. Oxford, 1954; reprint ed., 1959.

Dewald, C. "Practical Knowledge and the Historian's Role in Herodotus and Thucydides." In *The Greek Historians. Literature and History,* pp. 47-63. Papers presented to A.E. Raubitschek. Saratoga, Calif., 1985.

Drews, R. *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History.* Cambridge, Mass., 1973.

Egan, K. "Thucydides, Tragedian." In *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding.* Edited by R.H. Canary and H. Kozicki. Madison, Wis., 1978.

Evans, J.A.S. "What happened to Croesus?" *Classical Journal* 74 (1978): 34-40.

_____."Father of History or Father of Lies. The Reputation of Herodotus." *Classical Journal* 64 (1968): 11-17.

_____. "The Dream of Xerxes and the 'Nomoi' of the Persians." *Classical Journal* 57 (1961): 109-111.

_____."Herodotus and the Gyges Drama." *Athenaeum* 33 (1955): 333-36.

Finley, M.I. "Myth, Memory and History." In *The Use and Abuse of History,* pp. 11-33. London, 1975.

Flory, S. "Who read Herodotus' Histories?" *American Journal of Philology* 101 (1980): 12-28.

_____. "Arion's Leap: Brave Gestures in Herodotus." *American Journal of Philology* 99 (1978): 411-421.

_____. "Laughter, Tears and Wisdom in Herodotus." *American Journal of Philology* 99 (1978): 145-153.

Fornara, C. W. *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Berkeley, 1983.

_____. *Herodotus. An Interpretive Essay.* Oxford, 1971.

_____. "Evidence for the date of Herodotus' Publication." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 91 (1971): 25-34.

French, A. "Topical Influences on Herodotus' Narrative." *Mnemosyne* 25 (1972): 9-27.

von Fritz, K. "Herodotus and the Growth of Greek Historiography." *Transactions and Proceeding of the American Philological Association* 67 (1936): 315-40.

Frye, R. IV. *The History of Ancient Iran. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* III.7. Munchen, 1984.

Glover, T. R. *Herodotus.* Berkeley, 1924.

Gomme, A. W. *The Greek Attitude to Poetry and History.* Berkeley, 1954.

Gossman, L. "History and Literature: Reproduction or Signification." In *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding,* pp. 3-39. Edited by R.H. Canary and H. Kozicki. Madison, Wis., 1978.

Grant, J. R. "'Εκ τοῦ παρατύχοντος πυνθανόμενος." *Phoenix* 23 (1969): 264-68.

Grene, D. "Herodotus, the Historian as Dramatist." *Journal of Philology* 58 (1961): 477-88.

van Groningen, B.A. *In the Grip of the Past. Essay on an Aspect of Greek Thought.* Leiden, 1953.

Groten, F. J. "Herodotus' Use of Variant Versions." *Phoenix* 17 (1963): 79-87.

Hart, J. *Herodotus and Greek History.* London, 1982.

Havelock, E. A. *Prologue to Greek Literacy.* Cincinnati, 1971.

Heidel, W. A. "Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus, Book II." *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences,* 18.2. Boston, 1935.

Hohti, P. "The Interrelation of Speech and Action in the Histories of Herodotus." *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 57. Helsinki, 1976.

_____ "Freedom of Speech in Speech Sections in the Histories of Herodotus." *Arctos* 8 (1974): 19-28.

How, W.W. and Wells, J. *A Commentary on Herodotus.* 2 vols. Oxford, 1928; reprint ed. Oxford, 1980.

Hunter, V. *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides.* Princeton, 1982.

Immerwahr, I. *Form and Thought in Herodotus.* Cleveland, 1966.

_____ "Ergon: History as a Monument in Herodotus and Thucydides." *American Journal of Philology* 81 (1960): 261-90.

_____ "Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 87 (1956): 241-80.

_____ "Historical Action in Herodotus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 85 (1954): 16-45.

Jacoby, F. "Herodot." In *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft,* Suppl. 2, pp. 205-520. Edited by Pauly-Wissowa, et al. Stuttgart, 1913.

Karp, A J. "Homeric Origin of Ancient Rhetoric." *Arethusa* 10 (1977): 237-58.

Kazazis, J. N. "Herodotus' Stories and History: A Proppian Analysis of his Narrative Technique." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1978.

Konstan, D. "The Stories in Herodotus' Histories: Book I." *Helios* 10 (1983): 1-22.

Lang, M. L. *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse.* Cambridge, 1984.

_____ "Herodotus: Oral History with a Difference." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 128 (1984): 93-103.

Lateiner, D. "Limit, Propriety and Transgression in the Histories of Herodotus." In *The Greek Historians History and Literature,* pp. 87-100. Papers presented to A.E. Raubitschek. Saratoga, 1985.

_____ "A Note on the Perils of Prosperity in Herodotus." *Rheinisches Museum* 125 (1982): 97-101.

_____ "No Laughing Matter: A Literary Tactic in Herodotus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 107 (1977): 173-82.

Lattimore, R. "The Composition of the History of Herodotus." *Classical Philology* 53 (1958): 9-21.

_____ "The wise advisor in Herodotus." *Classical Philology* 34 (1939): 24-35.

Legrand, Ph.-E. *Hérodote: Histoires.* Volume 1. Paris, 1964.

_____ *Hérodote: Introduction.* 2nd ed. Paris, 1955.

Lesky, A. "Tragödien bei Herodot?" In *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory,* pp. 224-30. Edited by K.H. Kinzel. Berlin, 1977.

von Leyden, W. "Spatium Historicum." *Durham University Journal* 11 (1949-50): 89-104.

Licht, J. *Storytelling in the Bible.* Jerusalem, 1978.

Lloyd, A.B. *Herodotus. Book II.* Two Volumes. Leiden, 1975-76.

Lloyd, G.E.R. *Polarity and Analogy.* Cambridge, 1966.

Lobel, E. "A Greek Historical Drama." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1950): 207-16.

Louch, A.R. "History as Narrative." *History and Theory* 8 (1969): 54-70.

Macan, R. W. *Herodotus. The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books.* Volumes I and II. London, 1895; reprint ed., New York, 1973.

_____ *Herodotus. The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books.* Volume I, Parts 1 & 2. London, 1908; reprint ed., New York, 1973.

Miller, M. "The Herodotean Croesus." *Klio* 41 (1963): 58-94.

Mink, L. O. "Narrative Form as a Cognitive Instrument." In *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding.* Edited by R.H. Canary and H. Kozicki. Madison, 1978.

Momigliano, A. "Greek Historiography." *History and Theory* 1 (1978): 1-28.

_____ "Historiography on Written Tradition and Historiography on Oral Tradition." In *Studies in Historiography.* New York, 1966.

_____ "The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography." In *Studies in Historiography.* New York, 1966.

Myres, J. *Herodotus, Father of History.* Oxford, 1953; reprint ed., Chicago, 1971.

Neville, J. W. "Herodotus on the Trojan War." *Greece and Rome* 24 (1977): 3-12.

Page, D. L. *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy.* Cambridge, 1951.

Palmer, L.R. *The Greek Language.* London, 1980.

Parke, H.W. "Citation and Recitation, a Convention in Early Greek Historians." *Hermathena* 67 (1946): 80-92.

Parry, A. "Thucydides' Historical Perspective." *Yale Classical Studies* 22 (1972): 47-61.

Pauw, D.A. "Impersonal Expressions and Unidentified Spokesmen in Greek and Roman Historiography and Biography." *Acta Classica* 23 (1980): 83-95.

Pearson, L. "Real and Conventional Personalities in Greek History." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 15 (1954): 136-45.

_____. "Thucydides as Reporter and Critic." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947): 37-60.

_____. "Credulity and Skepticism in Herodotus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 72 (1941): 335-55.

_____. *Early Ionian Historians.* Oxford, 1939; reprint ed., Westport, Conn., 1975.

Pedley, J. G. *Sardis in the Age of Croesus.* Norman, Okla., 1968.

Podlecki, A. J. "Herodotus in Athens." In *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory.* pp. 246-65. Edited by K.H. Kinzl. Berlin, 1977.

Pohlenz, M. *Herodot, der erste Geschichtsschreiber des Abendlandes.* Leipzig, 1937; reprint ed., Darmstadt, 1973.

Powell, J.E. *A Lexicon to Herodotus.* 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1938; reprint ed., Darmstadt, 1966.

_____. *The History of Herodotus*. Cambridge, 1939.

Pritchett, W.K. "Some Recent Critiques of the Veracity of Herodotos." In *Studies is Ancient Greek Topography, Part IV (Passes),* pp. 234-85. Berkeley, 1982.

Radet, G. *La Lydie et le Monde grec au Temps des Mermnades (687-546 B.C.)*. Rome, 1967.

Redfield, J. M. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*. Chicago, 1975.

Rieks, R. "Eine tragische Erzählung bei Herodot (Hist. 1, 34-45)." *Poetica* 7 (1975): 23-44.

Roberts, W.R. *Longinus, On the Sublime*. Cambridge, 1935; reprint ed., New York, 1979.

Rosenmeyer, T. G. "History or Poetry? The Example of Herodotus." *Clio* 11 (1982): 239-259.

de Ste. Croix, G.E.M. "Herodotus." *Greece and Rome* 24 (1977): 130-147.

_____. "Aristotle on History and Poetry." In *The Ancient Historian and his Materials*, pp. 45-58. Edited by B. Levick. Farnborough, 1975.

Schepens, G. *L' 'autopsie' dans la méthode des historiens grecs du V siècle avant J.-C.* Brussels, 1980.

Schmeling, G. "The Authority of the Author: From Muse to Aesthetics." *Materiali e contributi per la storia de la narrativa graeco-latina* 111 (1981): 369-77.

Scholes, R. and Kellogg, R. *The Nature of Narrative*. Oxford, 1966.

Scobie, A. "Storytellers, Storytelling and the Novel in Graeco-Roman Antiquity." *Rheinisches Museum* 122 (1979): 229-59.

Sieveking, W. "Herodot. 1928-1936." *Jahrsbericht uber die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertemswissenschaft* 263 (1939): 137-38.

Smith, K.F. "The Tale of Gyges and the King of Lydia." *American Journal of Philology* 23 (1902): 261-82. and 361-87.

Smyth, H.W. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by G.M. Messing. Cambridge, Mass., 1956; 7th printing, 1972.

Solmsen, F. "Two Crucial Decisions in Herodotus." *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse* 37 (1974): 139-70.

Solmsen, L. "Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Battle of Plataea." *Classical Philology* 39 (1944): 241-53.

_____ "Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Ionian Revolt." *American Journal of Philology* 64 (1943): 194-207.

Stahl, H.-P. "Learning Through Suffering?" *Yale Classical Studies* 24 (1975): 1-36.

Starr, C. G. *The Awakening of the Greek Historical Spirit.* New York, 1968.

_____ "Pindar and the Greek Historical Spirit." *Hermes* 95 (1967): 393-403.

_____ "Historical and Philosophical Time." *History and Theory* 5 (1966): 24-35.

Strasburger, H. *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung.* Heidelberg, 1972.

Thomson, J.A.K. *The Art of the Logos.* London, 1935.

Ullman, B.L. History and Tragedy. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 73 (1942): 25-53.

Verdin, H. "Les remarques critiques d'Hérodote et de Thucydide sur la poesie en tant que source historique." In *Historigraphia Antiqua,* pp. 53-76. Louvain, 1977.

_____ "Hérodote historien? Quelques interpretations recentes." *L'Antiquite Classique* 44 (1975): 668-85.

_____ *De historisch-kritische Methode van Herodotus.* Brussels, 1971.

Veyne, P. *Writing History: Essay on Epistemology.* Translated by M. Moore-Rinvolucri. Middleton, Conn., 1984.

Wardman, A.E. "Herodotus on the Cause of the Greco-Persian Wars." *American Journal of Philology* 82 (1961):133-50.

Waters, K.H. *Herodotos the Historian. His Problems, Methods and Originality.* London, 1985.

_____ "The Structure of Herodotus' Narrative." *Antichthon* 8 (1974): 1-10.

_____ *Herodotos on Tyrants and Despots. A Study in Objectivity.* Historia Einzelschriften Heft 15. Wiesbaden, 1971.

_____ "The Purposes of Dramatisation in Herodotus." *Historia* 15 (1966): 157-71.

Wells, J. *Studies in Herodotus.* Oxford, 1923.

West, M.L., ed. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci.* Vol. 1. Oxford, 1971; reprint ed., 1978.

White, H. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." In *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding,* pp. 41-62. Edited by R. H. Canary and H. Kozicki. Madison, Wis., 1978.

_____ "The Fictions of Factual Representation." In *The Literature of Fact,* pp. 21-44. Edited by A. Fletcher. New York, 1976.

_____ "The Structure of Historical Narrative." *Clio* 1 (1972): 5-20.

White, M.E. "Herodotus' Starting Point." *Phoenix* 23 (1969): 39-48.

Wood, H. *The Histories of Herodotus. An Analysis of the Formal Structure.* The Hague, 1972.

Appendix One

Autopsy and Inquiry

This appendix is a select listing of passages in which Herodotus indicates his use of observation and inquiry. Only those passages that are clearly indicative that Herodotus personally employed these methods are included. Those in which the methods are implied are omitted. The key words are listed; the reader should refer to the text for the full context.

Book One

1.20.1	Δελφῶν οἶδα ἐγὼ οὕτω ἀκούσας γενέσθαι· (illness of Alyattes)
1.22.2	...ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι... (Thrasybulus and Alyattes)
1.92.2	...ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι... (offerings of Croesus)
1.105.3	...ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθανόμενος εὑρίσκω... (temple of Aphrodite at Ascalon)
1.170.1	...πυνθάνομαι γνώμην Βίαντα... (Bias)
1.171.2	...ὅσον καὶ ἐγὼ δυνατός εἰμι...μακρότατον ἐξικέσθαι ἀκοῇ... (the Carians)
1.214.1	...καὶ δὴ καὶ πυνθάνομαι οὕτω τοῦτο γενόμενον. (Cyrus' battle against the Massagetae)

Book Two

2.2.5	ὧδε μὲν γενέσθαι τῶν ἱρέων τοῦ Ἡφαίστου τοῦ ἐν Μέμφι ἤκουον. (Psammetichus' experiment)
2.8.1	...ὡς ἐγὼ ἐπυνθανόμην... (geography of Egypt)
2.12.1	Τὰ περὶ Αἴγυπτον...ἰδών... (geography of Egypt)
2.13.1	ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ τόδε μοι...οἱ ἱρέες...ὅτε τῶν ἱρέων ταῦτα ἐγὼ ἤκουον. (geography of Egypt)
2.19.3	...ἱστορέων αὐτοὺς ἥντινα δύναμιν ἔχει ὁ Νεῖλος... (the Nile)
2.19.3	...βουλόμενος εἰδέναι ἱστόρεον καὶ ὅ τι... (the Nile)

2.29.1 ...μέχρι μὲν Ελεφαντίνης πόλιος αὐτόπτης ἐλθών, τὸ δ ἀπὸ τούτου ἀκοῇ ἤδη ἱστορέων. (geography of Egypt)

2.32.1 ἀλλὰ τάδε μὲν ἤκουσα ἀνδρῶν Κυρηναίων... (sources of the Nile)

2.34.1 ...ἐπὶ ὅσον μακρότατον ἱστορεῦντα ἦν ἐξικέσθαι, εἴρηται· (the Nile)

2.43.1 Ηρακλέος δὲ πέρι τόνδε...λόγον ἤκουσα... (Heracles)

2.44.1-5 καὶ θέλων δὲ τούτων πέρι σαφές τι εἰδέναι ἐξ ὧν οἷόν τε ἦν, ἔπλευσα καὶ ἐς Τύρον...εἶδον...εἰρόμην...εἶδον δὲ ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ...ἀπικόμην δὲ καὶ Θάσον, ἐν τῇ εὗρον...τὰ μέν νυν ἱστορημένα δηλοῖ σαφέως παλαιὸν θεὸν Ηρακλέα εἶναι. (Heracles)

2.52.1 ...ὡς ἐγὼ ἐν Δωδώνῃ οἶδα ἀκούσας... (Pelasgians)

2.54.2 εἰρομένου δέ μευ ὀκόθεν... (establishment of oracles at Dodona and Ammon)

2.55.1 ταῦτα μέν νυν τῶν ἐν Θήβῃσι ἱρέων ἤκουον, τάδε δὲ Δωδωναίων φασὶ... (establishment of oracles at Dodona and Ammon)

2.73.1 ἐγὼ μέν μιν οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ ὅσον γραφῇ· (phoenix)

2.75.1 ...καὶ ἐς τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον ἦλθον πυνθανόμενος ...ἀπικόμενος δὲ εἶδον ὀστέα... (winged snakes)

2.91.5 εἰρομένου δέ μευ ὅ τι...ἔφασαν... (Perseus and the Chemmites)

2.99.1 Μέχρι μὲν τούτου ὄψις τε ἐμὴ καὶ γνώμη καὶ ἱστορίη ταῦτα λέγουσά ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦδε Αἰγυπτίους ἔρχομαι λόγους ἐρέων κατὰ τὰ ἤκουον· προσέσται δέ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος. (general statement on methodology of Book Two)

2.106.1 ...ἐν δὲ τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Συρίῃ αὐτὸς ὥρων... (stelae of Sesostris)

2.113.1 ἔλεγον δὲ μοι οἱ ἱρέες ἱστορέοντι τὰ περὶ Ελένην... (Egyptian story of Helen)

2.118.1 Εἰρομένου δὲ μευ τοὺς ἱρέας εἰ... (story of Helen)

2.123.1 ...ἐμοὶ δὲ παρὰ πάντα ...ὑπόκειται ὅτι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ ἑκάστων ἀκοῇ γράφω. (general statement of methodology)

2.147.1 Ταῦτα μέν νυν αὐτοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγουσι...προσέσται δέ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος. (methodology)

2.148.5 τὰ μέν νυν μετέωρα τῶν οἰκημάτων αὐτοί τε ὡρῶμεν διεξιόντες καὶ αὐτοὶ θεησάμενοι λέγομεν, τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν ὑπόγαια λόγοισι ἐπυνθανόμεθα. (the labyrinth)

2.148.6 οὕτω τῶν μὲν κάτω πέρι οἰκημάτων ἀκοῇ παραλαβόντες λέγομεν, τὰ δὲ ἄνω μέζονα...αὐτοὶ ὡρῶμεν· (the labyrinth)

Book Three

3.12.1	θῶμα δὲ μέγα εἶδον πυθόμενος παρὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων... (thickness of Egyptian and Persian skulls)
3.12.4	...εἶδον δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ὅμοια τούτοισι ἐν Παπρήμι... (thickness of Egyptian and Persian skulls)
3.115.2	...τοῦτο δὲ οὐδενὸς αὐτόπτεω γενομένου δύναμαι ἀκοῦσαι... (geography of the far west of Europe)
3.117.6	...ὡς δ ἐγὼ οἶδα ἀκούσας... (the river Aces)

Book Four

4.16.1-2	...οὐδενὸς γὰρ δὴ αὐτόπτεω εἰδέναι φαμένου δύναμαι πυθέσθαι...ἀλλ ὅσον μὲν ἡμεῖς ἀτρεκέως ἐπὶ μακρότατον οἷοί τε ἐγενόμεθα ἀκοῇ ἐξικέσθαι, πᾶν εἰρήσεται. (Scythia)
4.76.6	ὡς δ ἐγὼ ἤκουσα Τύμνεω... (Anacharsis)
4.77.1	καίτοι τινὰ ἤδη ἤκουσα λόγον ἄλλον...λεγόμενον... (Anacharsis)
4.81.1	...ἀλλὰ διαφόρους λόγους περὶ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ἤκουον ...τοσόνδε μέντοι ἀπέφαινόν μοι ἐς ὄψιν· (population of Scythia)
4.81.6	ταῦτα δὴ περὶ τοῦ πλήθεος τοῦ Σκυθέων ἤκουον. (population of Scythia)
4.95.1	ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι τῶν ... (Salmoxis)
4.192.3	τοσαῦτα μέν νυν θηρία...ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἱστορέοντες ἐπὶ μακρότατον οἷοί τε ἐγενόμεθα ἐξικέσθαι. (Libyan animals)

Book Five

5.9.1	μούνους δὲ δύναμαι πυθέσθαι οἰκέοντας... (the Sigynnae)
5.57.2	...ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ ἀναπυνθανόμενος εὑρίσκω, ἦσαν Φοίνικες... (the Gephyraei)
5.59.1	εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς Καδμήια γράμματα... (Phoenician alphabet)

Book Six

6.47.1	εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ μέταλλα ταῦτα... (Thasian mines)

6.117.3 λέγειν δὲ αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ πάθεος ἤκουσα τοιόνδε τινὰ λόγον...ταῦτα μὲν δὴ Επίζηλον ἐπυθόμην λέγειν. (Epizelos)

Book Seven

7.35.1 ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα ὡς καὶ στιγέας... (branding of the Hellespont)
7.55.3 ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα καὶ ὕστατον διαβῆναι βασιλέα πάντων. (crossing of the Hellespont)
7.114.2 ...ἐπεὶ καὶ Αμηστριν..,πυνθάνομαι... (Persian burial customs)
7.152.3 ἐγὼ δὲ ὀφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πείθεσθαί γε μὲν οὐ παντάπασιν ὀφείλω, καί μοι τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς πάντα λόγον. (general statement regarding methodology)
7.166 ...ὡς ἐσσοῦτο τῇ μάχῃ, ἀφανισθῆναι πυνθάνομαι... (Hamilcar)
7.224.1 ...τῶν ἐγὼ ὡς ἀνδρῶν ἀξίων γενόμενων ἐπυθόμην... (Thermopylae)
7.239.4 ...ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι... (Demaratus' message regarding invasion)

Book Eight

8.35.2 ...ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι... (Xerxes' knowledge regarding Delphi)
8.38 ...ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι... (marvels at Delphi)

Book Nine

9.16.1 τὰδε δὲ ἤδη τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἤκουον Θερσάνδρου... (banquet at Thebes)
9.16.5 ταῦτα μὲν τοῦ Ορχομενίου Θερσάνδρου ἤκουον, καὶ τάδε πρὸς τούτουσι, ὡς... (banquet at Thebes)
9.84.1 ...πολλοὺς δὲ τινας ἤδη καὶ πανταδαποὺς ἤκουσα θάψαι Μαρδόνιον... (burial of Mardonius)
9.85.3 ...τάφοι, τούτους δέ, ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι...τάφος, τὸν ἐγὼ ἀκούω καὶ... (burial at Plataea)
9.95 ἤδη δὲ καὶ τόδε ἤκουσα ὡς ὁ Δηίφονος...οὐκ ἐὼν Εὐηνίου παῖς. (Deiphonos)

Appendix Two

Limits of Knowledge

This appendix is a select listing of passages in which Herodotus admits the limits of his knowledge or information. The selections are limited to those that are clearly personal statements. Key words are indicated; the reader should refer to the text for the full context.

Book One

1.49.1 κατὰ δὲ τὴν Αμφιάρεω τοῦ μαντηίου ὑπόκρισιν οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν ὅ τι... (Croesus and the testing of the oracles)

1.57.1 ...οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν... (Pelasgian language)

1.160.2 οὐ γὰρ ἔχω τοῦτό γε εἰπεῖν ἀτρεκέως... (Pactyes)

1.171.2 ...ὅσον καὶ ἐγὼ δυνατός εἰμι...μακρότατον ἐξικέσθαι ἀκοῇ... (the Carians)

1.172.1 τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως διακρῖναι... (the Caunians and the Carians)

Book Two

2.19.1 τοῦ ποταμοῦ δὲ φύσιος πέρι οὔτε τι τῶν ἱρέων οὔτε ἄλλου οὐδενὸς παραλαβεῖν ἐδυνάσθην. (the Nile)

2.19.3 ...τοῦτων ὦν πέρι οὐδενὸς οὐδὲν οἷός τε ἐγενόμην παραλαβεῖν... (the Nile)

2.28.1 ...οὔτε Λιβύων οὔτε Ελλήνων τῶν ἐμοὶ ἀπικομένων ἐς λόγους οὐδεὶς ὑπέσχετο εἰδέναι... (sources of the Nile)

2.29.1 ἄλλου δὲ οὐδενὸς οὐδὲν ἐδυνάμην πυθέσθαι... (sources of the Nile)

2.34.1 ...ἐπ ὅσον μακρότατον ἱστορεῦντα ἦν ἐξικέσθαι, εἴρηται· (the Nile)

2.43.1 τοῦ ἑτέρου δὲ πέρι Ηρακλέος, τὸν...οὐδαμῇ Αἰγύπτου ἐδυνάσθην ἀκοῦσαι. (Heracles)

2.103.2 ...οὐκ ἔχω τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν εἴτε... (Sesotris and the origins of the Colchians)

2.104.4 αὐτῶν δὲ Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Αἰθιόπων οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν ὁκότεροι... (circumcision)

2.122.2 οὐ μέντοι εἴ γε διὰ ταῦτα ὀρτάζουσι ἔχω λέγειν... (Rhampsinitus)

2.130.2 αἵτινες μέντοι εἰσί, οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν πλὴν... (tomb of Mycerinos' daughter and the identity of the statues)

2.167.1 εἰ μέν νυν καὶ τοῦτο παρ Αἰγυπτίων...οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως κρῖναι... (origins of Greek commercial practices)

Book Three

3.115.1 ...περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ τῶν...ἔχω μὲν οὐκ ἀτρεκέως λέγειν· (geography of the far west of Europe)

3.116.1 ὅκως μὲν γινόμενος, οὐκ ἔχω οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀτρεκέως εἶπαι... (gold in the far west of Europe)

Book Four

4.45.2 οὐδ ἔχω συμβαλέσθαι ἐπ ὅτευ...οὐδὲ τῶν διουρισάντων τὰ οὐνόματα πυθέσθαι... (geography of Europe)

4.53.5 μούνου δὲ τούτου τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ Νείλου οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι τὰς πηγάς... (the Borysthenes and the Nile)

4.81.1 Πλῆθος δὲ τὸ Σκυθέων οὐκ οἷός τε ἐγενόμην ἀτρεκέως πυθέσθαι... (population of Scythia)

4.180.4 ὀτέοισι δὲ τὸ πάλαι ἐκόσμεον...οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν... (the Auses)

4.185.1 μέχρι μὲν δὴ τῶν Ατλάντων τοὔτων ἔχω τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν ἐν τῇ ὀφρύῃ κατοικημένων καταλέξαι, τὸ δ ἀπὸ τούτων οὐκέτι. (tribes of the sand-belt)

4.187.2 οἱ γὰρ δὴ τῶν Λιβύων...οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως τοῦτο εἰπεῖν... (Libyan nomads)

4.187.3 εἰ μὲν διὰ τοῦτο, οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν, ὑγιηρότατοι... (health of the Libyans)

4.192.3 τοσαῦτα μέν νυν θηρία...ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἱστορέοντες ἐπὶ μακρότατον οἷοί τε ἐγενόμεθα ἐξικέσθαι. (Libyan animals)

4.195.2 ταῦτα εἰ μὲν ἔστι ἀληθέως οὐκ οἶδα... (island of Cyrauis)

Book Five

5.9.3 ...ὅκως δὲ οὗτοι Μήδων ἄποικοι γεγόνασι, ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἔχω ἐπιφράσασθαι... (the Sigynnae)

5.66.1 ...καὶ Ισαγόρης...ἀτὰρ τὰ ἀνέκαθεν οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι... (Isagoras)

Book Six

6.14.1 ...οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως συγγράψαι οἵ τινες... (Lade)

6.82.1 ...οὔτε εἰ ψευδόμενος οὔτε εἰ ἀληθέα λέγων, ἔχω σαφηνέως εἶπαι... (Cleomenes)

6.124.2 ...ὃς μέντοι ἦν ἀναδέξας, οὐκ ἔχω προσωτέρω εἰπεῖν τούτων. (the shield signal to the Persians after Marathon)

6.137.1 Πελασγοὶ ἐπείτε ἐκ τῆς Αττικῆς...τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι, πλὴν τὰ λεγόμενα... (the Pelasgians)

Book Seven

7.26.2 ...οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι... (Xerxes' reward to the best-equipped contingent)

7.54.3 ταῦτα οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως διακρῖναι οὔτε εἰ...οὔτε εἰ... (Xerxes' sacrifice to the Hellespont)

7.60.1 ...οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀτρεκές... (size of Xerxes' troops)

7.133.2 ...οὐκ ἔχω εἶπαι, πλὴν ὅτι... (the treatment of Xerxes' messengers in Athens)

7.153.3 ὅθεν δὲ αὐτὰ ἔλαβε ἢ αὐτὸς ἐκτήσατο, τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν. (Telines)

7.189.3 εἰ μέν νυν...οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν... (Boreas and the storm)

Book Eight

8.8.2 ὅτεῳ μὲν δὴ τρόπῳ...οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν ἀτρεκέως... (Skyllias)

8.87.1 ...οὐκ ἔχω...εἰπεῖν ἀτρεκέως ὡς ἑκάστοι... (Salamis)

8.87.3 εἰ μὲν καί τι νεῖκος...οὐ μέντοι ἔχω γε εἰπεῖν... (Artemisia)

8.112.2 εἰ δὲ δή τινες καὶ ἄλλοι...οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν· (Themistocles and the tribute exacted from the islanders)

8.128.1 ...ὄντινα μὲν τρόπον ἀρχήν, ἔγωγε οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν... (betrayal of Potidaea)

8.133.1 ὅ τι μὲν βουλόμενος ἐκμαθεῖν...οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι... (Mys)

Book Nine

9.18.2 οὐκ ἔχω δ ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν οὔτε εἰ...οὔτ εἰ... (the Phocians and Mardonius)

9.84.1 ὑπ ὅτευ μὲν ἀνθρώπων, τὸ ἀτρεκὲς οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν... (burial of Mardonius' body)

9.84.2 ὅστις μεντοι ἦν...οὐ δύναμαι ἀτρεκέως πυθέσθαι. (burial of Mardonius' body)

Appendix Three

Personal Opinion

This appendix is a select listing of passages in which Herodotus expresses his own opinion or judgment about a particular matter. The passages are limited to those that are clearly expressions of personal opinion. Key words are listed; the reader should refer to the text for the entire context.

Book One

1.58	τὸ δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν γλώσσῃ μέν...ὡς ἐμοὶ καταφαίνεται εἶναι· (the Greek language)
1.58	πρὸς δὴ ὧν ἔμοιγε δοκέει οὐδὲ τὸ Πελασγικὸν ἔθνος... (the Pelasgians)
1.97.2	...ὡς δ ἐγὼ δοκέω, μάλιστα... (Deioces)
1.119.7	ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἔμελλε, ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω, ἀλίσας θάψειν τὰ πάντα. (burial of Harpagus' son)
1.131.1	...ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρωποφυέας... (Egyptian gods)
1.137.1	αἰνέω μέν νυν τόνδε τὸν νόμον, αἰνέω δὲ καὶ τόνδε... (Persian customs)
1.143.3	...ἀλλὰ καὶ νυν φαίνονταί μοι οἱ πολλοὶ... (the Ionians)
1.145.1	δυώδεκα δέ μοι δοκέουσι πόλιας ποιήσασθαι οἱ Ἰωνες... (the Ionians)
1.152.2	...ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέει, κατασκόπους τῶν τε Κύρου πρηγμάτων... (Spartan rejection of Ionian appeal for aid)
1.172.1	οἱ δὲ Καύνιοι αὐτόχθονες δοκέειν ἐμοί εἰσι... (the Caunians)
1.182.1	φασὶ δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες... (temple of Bel in Babylon)
1.186.1	...καὶ ἦν, ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω, ὀχληρὸν τοῦτο. (Nitocris)
1.214.1	ταύτην τὴν μάχην...κρίνω ἰσχυροτάτην γενέσθαι... (Cyrus' battle against the Massagetae)
1.214.5	...ὅδε μοι ὁ πιθανώτατος εἴρηται. (death of Cyrus)

Book Two

2.4.1	ἄγουσι δὲ τοσῷδε σοφώτερον Ελλήνων, ἐμοὶ δοκέειν... (Egyptian year)
2.5.1	καὶ εὖ μοι ἐδόκεον λέγειν περὶ τῆς χώρης. δῆλα γὰρ... (Egyptian priests as sources for information on the geography of Egypt)
2.10.1	...ἐδόκεε καὶ αὐτῷ μοι εἶναι ἐπίκτητος Αἰγυπτίοισι ...ἐφαίνετό μοι εἶναί... (geography of Egypt)
2.11.3	ἕτερον τοιοῦτον κόλπον καὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον δοκέω γενέσθαι κου... (Egypt and the gulf)
2.15-16	... ἤδη γάρ σφι τό γε Δέλτα, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσι Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ ἐμοὶ δοκέει, ἐστὶ καταῤῥυτόν...ἀλλ οὔτε Αἰγυπτίους δοκέω ἅμα τῷ Δέλτα...εἰ ὧν ἡμεῖς ὀρθῶς περὶ αὐτῶν γινώσκομεν, Ιωνες οὐκ εὖ φρονέουσι περὶ Αἰγύπτου·...τε καὶ αὐτοὺς Ιωνας ἀποδείκνυμι οὐκ ἐπισταμένους λογίζεσθαι... (Ionian opinion regarding the delta)
2.17-18	Καὶ τὴν μὲν Ιώνων γνώμην ἀπίεμεν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ὧδέ κῃ περὶ τούτων λέγομεν, Αἴγυπτον μὲν πᾶσαν... (Herodotus' opinion about the delta)
2.25.5	οὕτω τὸν ἥλιον νενόμικα τούτων αἴτιον εἶναι. (Nile and the sun)
2.26.1	αἴτιος δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμὴν... (Nile and the sun)
2.27.1	τῆς αὖρης δὲ πέρι...τήνδε ἔχω γνώμην, ὡς... (Nile and the sun)
2.28.2	οὗτος δ ἔμοιγε παίζειν ἐδόκεε... (sources of the Nile)
2.28.5	οὗτος μὲν δὴ ὁ γραμματιστής...ὡς ἐμὲ κατανοέειν... (sources of the Nile)
2.34.2	οὕτω τὸν Νεῖλον δοκέω διὰ πάσης τῆς... (the Nile)
2.42.5	δοκέειν δὲ μοι, καὶ τὸ οὔνομα Αμμώνιοι ἀπὸ τοῦδε... (Egyptian religious practices)
2.44.5	καὶ δοκέουσι δέ μοι οὗτοι ὀρθότατα Ελλήνων ποιέειν, οἳ... (Heracles)
2.45.2	ἐμοὶ μέν νυν δοκέουσι ταῦτα λέγοντες...οἱ Ελληνες... (Greek stories regarding Heracles)
2.49.1-3	ἤδη ὧν δοκέει μοι Μελάμπους...ἐγὼ μέν νύν φημι Μελάμποδα...οὐ γὰρ δὴ συμπεσεῖν γε φήσω...οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ φήσω ὅκως... (Melampus and the cult of Dionysus)
2.50.1	δοκέω δ ὧν μάλιστα ἀπ Αἰγύπτου ἀπῖχθαι. (names of the gods)
2.50.2	...οὗτοι δέ μοι δοκέουσι ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν ὀνομασθῆναι, πλὴν Ποσειδέωνος· (names of the gods)

2.53.2-3 ... Ησίοδον γὰρ καὶ Ομηρον ἡλικίην τετρακοσίοισι ἔτεσι δοκέω μευ πρεσβυτέρους...οἱ δὲ πρότερον ποιηταὶ λεγόμενοι...ἔμοιγε δοκέειν, ἐγένοντο. (dating of Homer and Hesiod)

2.56.1 ἐγὼ δ ἔχω περὶ αὐτῶν γνώμην τήνδε. (establishment of the oracle at Dodona)

2.57.1 πελειάδες δέ μοι δοκέουσι κληθῆναι πρὸς Δωδωναίων ἐπὶ τοῦδε αἱ γυναῖκες, διότι... (establishment of the oracle at Dodona)

2.63.3 ...ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω, πολλοὶ καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσι ἐκ τῶν τρωμάτων· (festival of Ares)

2.64.2 οὗτοι μέν νυν τοιαῦτα ἐπιλέγοντες ποιεῦσι ἔμοιγε οὐκ ἀρεστὰ· (sexual intercourse in religious precincts)

2.70.1 ἢ δ ὧν ἔμοιγε δοκέει ἀξιωτάτη ἀπηγήσιος εἶναι... (crocodile)

2.73.3 τοῦτον δὲ λέγουσι μηχανᾶσθαι τάδε, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες... (phoenix)

2.77.1 ...λογιώτατοί εἰσι μακρῷ τῶν ἐγὼ ἐς διάπειραν ἀπικόμην. (judgment on the intelligence of the Egyptians)

2.77.3 ...εἰσὶ μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλως Αἰγύπτιοι μετὰ Λίβυας ὑγιηρέστατοι...ἐμοὶ δοκέειν... (health of the Egyptians)

2.98.2 ἡ δὲ ἑτέρη πόλις δοκέει μοι τὸ οὔνομα... (city of Anthylla)

2.103.1 ἐς τούτους δέ μοι δοκέει καὶ προσώτατα ἀπικέσθαι ὁ Αἰγύπτιος στρατός. (march of Sesotris)

2.106.5 τὰ δὴ καὶ μετεξέτεροι τῶν θεησαμένων...πολλὸν τῆς ἀληθείης ἀπολελειμμένοι. (statue of Sesotris)

2.109.3 δοκέει δὲ μοι ἐνθεῦτεν γεωμετρίη... (origins of geometry)

2.120.1 Ταῦτα μὲν Αἰγυπτίων οἱ ἱρέες ἔλεγον, ἐγὼ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τῷ περὶ Ελένης λεχθέντι καὶ αὐτὸς προστίθεμαι, τάδε ἐπιλεγόμενος... (Herodotus' opinion about the story of Helen)

2.120.5 ...ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ γνώμην ἀποφαίνομαι, τοῦ δαιμονίου... (story of Helen)

2.121.ε1 ...ποιῆσαί μιν τάδε, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστά· (Rhampsinitus)

2.124.3 ...ἔργον ἐὸν οὐ πολλῷ τεῳ ἔλασσον τῆς πυραμίδος, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν... (road of Cheops)

2.125.7 ...ἄλλον δέ, ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω, ἐν τῷ τοὺς λίθους ἔταμνον ...οὐκ ὀλίγον χρόνον. (pyramid of Cheops)

2.131.3 ταῦτα δὲ λέγουσι φλυηρέοντες, ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω... (tomb of Mycerinus' daughter and the statues)

2.134.1 ...τὴν δὴ μετεξέτεροί φασι...οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγοντες... (Rhodipis)

2.137.5 ὑψηλέων δὲ καὶ ἑτέρων γενομένων...ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει, μάλιστα ἡ ἐν Βουβάστι πόλις... (city and temply of Boubastis)

2.146.2 δῆλα ὧν μοι γέγονε ὅτι ὕστερον ἐπύθοντο οἱ Ἕλληνες τούτων τὰ οὐνόματα ἢ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν. (names of the gods)

2.155.3 τὸ δέ μοι τῶν φανερῶν ἦν θῶμα μέγιστον παρεχόμενον φράσω. (oracle at Bouto)

2.156.1 οὕτω μέν νυν ὁ νηὸς τῶν φανερῶν μοι τῶν περὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἱρόν ἐστι θωμαστότατον, τῶν δὲ δευτέρων νῆσος ἡ Χέμμις καλευμένη. (oracle at Bouto and the island of Chemmis)

Book Three

3.2.1 Αἰγύπτιοι...λέγοντες δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγουσι. (Cambyses' invasion of Egypt)

3.3.1 λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὅδε λόγος, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιθανός, ὡς... (Cambyses' invasion of Egypt)

3.5.2 ἀπὸ δὲ Καδύτιος πόλιος ἐούσης, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει... (entrance into Egypt)

3.9.2 οὗτος μὲν ὁ πιθανώτερος τῶν λόγων εἴρηται, δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἧσσον πιθανόν... (Arabian king's method of conveying water into the desert)

3.13.4 ...τὰ δὲ παρὰ Κυρηναίων ἀπικόμενα μεμφείς, ὡς ἐμοί δοκέει, ὅτι... (Cambyses and the offering from Cyrene)

3.16.7 αἱ μέν νυν ἐκ τοῦ Ἀμάσιος ἐντολαὶ αὗται αἱ...οὔ μοι δοκέουσι ἀρχὴν γενέσθαι... (corpse of Amasis)

3.38.1 πανταχῇ ὧν μοι δῆλά ἐστι ὅτι ἐμάνη μεγάλως ὁ Καμβύσης· (the madness of Cambyses)

3.38.4 ...καὶ ὀρθῶς μοι δοκέει Πίνδαρος ποιῆσαι νόμον πάντων βασιλέα φήσας εἶναι. (Darius' conversation about burial customs)

3.45.3 ...εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ λέγουσι τοὺς ἀπ Αἰγύπτου νικῆσαι Πολυκράτεα, λέγοντες ἐμοὶ δοκέειν οὐκ ὀρθῶς. (Polycrates)

3.115.1 ...οὔτε γὰρ ἔγωγε ἐνδέκομαι Ηριδανόν... (geography of the far west of Europe)

3.135.3 Δαρεῖος μὲν δή, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἀπ οὐδενὸς... (Darius and Democedes)

3.137.5 κατὰ δὲ τοῦτό μοι δοκέει σπεῦσαι... (Democedes)

3.143.2 οὐ γὰρ δή, ὡς οἴκασι, ἐβούλοντο εἶναι ἐλεύθεροι. (Samos)

3.146.1 Μαιάνδριος δὲ ὑπέλαβε τὸν λόγον, ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ δοκέω, οὐκ... (Samos)

Book Four

4.5.1	...τοῦ δὲ Ταργιτάου τούτου τοὺς τοκέας λέγουσι εἶναι, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες... (origins of the Scythians)
4.11.1	Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος ἔχων ὧδε, τῷ μάλιστα λεγομένῳ αὐτὸς πρόσκειμαι... (origins of the Scythians)
4.25.1	οἱ δὲ φαλακροὶ οὗτοι λέγουσι, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, οἰκέειν τὰ ὄρεα αἰγίποδας ἄνδρας... (Scythian tribes)
4.29.1	δοκέει δέ μοι καὶ τὸ γένος τῶν βοῶν τὸ κόλον διὰ ταῦτα οὐ φύειν κέρεα... (cattle in Scythia)
4.31.1	περὶ δὲ τῶν πτερῶν τῶν Σκύθαι λέγουσι...τήνδε ἔχω περὶ αὐτῶν γνώμην· (snow mistaken for feathers in Scythia)
4.32	ὡς δ ἐγὼ δοκέω, οὐδ οὗτοι λέγουσι οὐδέν... (Issedonian information about the Hyperboreans)
4.42.1	...εὔρεος δὲ πέρι οὐδὲ συμβάλλειν ἀξίη φαίνεται μοι εἶναι... (mapping of the continents)
4.42.4	καὶ ἔλεγον ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστά, ἄλλῳ... (sailing around Libya)
4.46.2	τῷ δὲ Σκυθικῷ γένεῖ ἓν μὲν τὸ μέγιστον τῶν ἀνθρωπηίων πρηγμάτων σοφώτατα πάντων ἐξεύρηται τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, τὰ μέντοι ἄλλα οὐκ ἄγαμαι. (the Scythians)
4.50.2	ἴσος δὲ αἰεὶ ῥέει ἔν τε θέρεῖ καὶ χειμῶνι ὁ Ἴστρος κατὰ τοιόνδε τι, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει· (the Danube)
4.53.1	...ὅς ἐστι μέγιστός τε μετὰ Ἴστρον...κατὰ γνώμας τὰς ἡμετέρας... (the river Borysthenes)
4.59.2	...Ζεὺς δὲ ὀρθότατα κατὰ γνώμην γε τὴν ἐμὴν καλεόμενος Παπαῖος... (Scythian gods)
4.87.2	τοῦ δὲ Βοσπόρου ὁ χώρος τὸν ἔζευξε βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν συμβαλλομένῳ... (Darius and the bridge at the Bosporus)
4.96.1	ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτου...οὔτε ἀπιστέω οὔτε ὧν πιστεύω τι λίην, δοκέω δὲ... (Salmoxis)
4.105.2	...ἐμὲ μέν νυν ταῦτα λέγοντες οὐ πείθουσι... (the Neuri)
4.109.1	ὑπὸ μέντοι Ἑλλήνων καλέονται καὶ οἱ Βουδῖνοι Γελωνοί, οὐκ ὀρθῶς καλεόμενοι. (the Budini)
4.155.1	ὡς Θηροῖοί τε καὶ Κυρηναῖοι λέγουσι, ὡς μέντοι ἐγὼ δοκέω, ἄλλο τι... (Battus)
4.155.2	Λίβυες γὰρ βασιλέα βάττον καλέουσι, καὶ τούτου εἵνεκα δοκέω... (Battus)

4.167.3 αὕτη μέν νυν αἰτίη πρόσχημα...ἐπέμπετο δὲ ἡ στρατιή, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ἐπὶ Λιβύων καταστροφῇ. (Pheretima and Aryandes)

4.180.4 ὀτέοισι δὲ τὸ πάλαι...οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, δοκέω δ ὦν... (the Auses)

4.189.3 δοκέει δ ἔμοιγε καὶ...ὁλολυγὴ ἐπὶ ἱροῖσι ἐνθαῦτα πρῶτον γενέσθαι. (Libyan/Greek exchanges)

4.198.1 δοκέει δέ μοι οὐδ ἀρετὴν εἶναί τις ἡ Λιβύη... (fertility of Libyan soil)

Book Five

5.3.1 Θρηίκων δὲ ἔθνος...εἰ δὲ ὑπ ἐνὸς ἄρχοιτο...κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμήν. (the Thracians)

5.10 ὡς δὲ Θρήικες λέγουσι...ἐμοὶ μέν νυν ταῦτα λέγοντες δοκέουσι λέγειν οὐκ οἰκότα...ἀλλά μοι τὰ ὑπὸ τὴν ἄρκτον ἀοίκητα δοκέει εἶναι διὰ τὰ ψύχεα. (country beyond the Danube)

5.58.1 ...καὶ δὴ καὶ γράμματα, οὐκ ἐόντα πρὶν Ἕλλησι ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν... (Phoenician alphabet)

5.67.1 ταῦτα δέ, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἐμιμέετο ὁ Κλεισθένης... (reforms of Cleisthenes)

5.69.1 ...δοκέειν ἐμοὶ καὶ οὗτος ὑπεριδὼν Ἴωνας... (reforms of Cleisthenes)

5.86.3 ...ἐς οὗ ἑλκόμενα τὰ ἀγάλματα ἀμφότερα τώυτὸ ποιῆσαι, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, ἄλλῳ δέ τεῳ· (origins of the animosity between Athens and Aegina)

5.97.2 πολλοὺς γὰρ οἷκε εἶναι εὐπετέστερον διαβάλλειν ἢ ἕνα, εἰ Κλεομένεα...τρεῖς δὲ μυριάδας Ἀθηναίων... (Aristagoras at Athens)

5.118.2 ...βουλαὶ ἄλλαι τε πολλαὶ καὶ ἀρίστη γε δοκέουσα εἶναι ἐμοὶ Πιξωδάρου... (revolt in Caria)

Book Six

6.30.1 εἰ μέν νυν,...ὁ δὲ οὔτ ἂν ἔπαθε κακὸν οὐδὲν δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἀπῆκέ... (Histaeus)

6.84.3 ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκέει τίσιν ταύτην ὁ Κλεομένης Δημαρήτῳ ἐκτεῖσαι. (Cleomenes)

6.95.2 ...ὁρμώμενοι παρά τε Ἴκαρον καὶ διὰ...ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέειν... (Datis and Artaphrenes' passage to Greece)

6.121.1 θῶμα δέ μοι καὶ οὐκ ἐνδέκομαι τὸν λόγον... (accusation against the Alcmaeonidae after Marathon)

Book Seven

7.3.4 δοκέειν δέ μοι, καὶ ἄνευ ταύτης τῆς ὑποθήκης ἐβασίλευσε ἂν Ξέρξης· ἡ γὰρ Ατοσσα εἶχε τὸ πᾶν κράτος. (succcessor of Darius)

7.20.2 στόλων γὰρ τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν πολλῷ δὴ μέγιστος οὗτος ἐγένετο... (size of Xerxes' expedition)

7.24.1 ὡς μὲν ἐμὲ συμβαλλόμενον εὑρίσκειν, μεγαλοφροσύνης εἵνεκεν αὐτὸ Ξέρξης ὀρύσσειν ἐκέλευε... (diggin of the canal)

7.99.1 ... Αρτεμισίης δέ, τῆς μάλιστα θῶμα ποιεῦμαι... (Artemisia)

7.129.4 ἔστι γὰρ σεισμοῦ ἔργον, ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐφαίνετο εἶναι, ἡ διάστασις τῶν ὀρέων. (Thessalian geography)

7.133.2 ...ἀλλὰ τοῦτο οὐ διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίην δοκέω γενέσθαι. (Athenian treatment of the Persian messengers and the destruction of Athens as punishment; Herodotus rejects connection)

7.137.1 τοῦτό μοι ἐν τοῖσι θειότατον φαίνεται γενέσθαι. (Sperthias and Bulis)

7.137.2 ...δῆλον ὧν μοι ὅτι θεῖον ἐγένετο τὸ πρῆγμα... (Sperthias and Bulis)

7.139.1 ἐνθαῦτα ἀναγκαίῃ ἐξέργομαι γνώμην ἀποδέξασθαι ἐπίφθονον μὲν πρὸς τῶν πλεόνων ἀνθρώπων, ὅμως δέ, τῇ γέ μοι φαίνεται εἶναι ἀληθές, οὐκ ἐπισχήσω. (role of Athens)

7.168.4 ...τὰ περ ἂν καὶ ἐγένετο, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει... (Corcyraean action regarding Greek request for aid)

7.173.4 δοκέειν δέ μοι, ἀρρωδίη ἦν τὸ πεῖθον... (pass at Tempe)

7.220.2 ταύτῃ καὶ μᾶλλον τὴν γνώμην πλεῖστός εἰμι, Λεωνίδην... (Thermopylae)

7.229.2 ...δοκέειν ἐμοί οὐκ ἄν σφι Σπαρτιήτας μῆνιν οὐδεμίαν προσθέσθαι... (Aristodemus and Eurytus)

7.238.2 δῆλά μοι πολλοῖσι μὲν καὶ ἄλλοισι τεκμηρίοισι... (defilement of Leonidas' body)

7.239.2 ...ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ δοκέω, καὶ τὸ οἶκος ἐμοὶ συμμάχεται... (Demaratus' message regarding the invasion)

Book Eight

8.8.2 ...θωμάζω δὲ εἰ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐστι ἀληθέα... (Skyllias)

8.8.3 ...περὶ μέντοι τούτου γνώμη μοι ἀποδεδέχθω πλοίῳ μιν ἀπικέσθαι... (Skyllias)

8.22.3 Θεμιστοκλέης δὲ ταῦτα ἔγραψε, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἐπ ἀμφότερα... (Themistocles' attempt to get the Ionian and Carian contingents to desert Xerxes)

8.25.2 οὐ μὲν οὐδ ἐλάνθανε...Ξέρξης...περὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἑωυτοῦ· καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ γελοῖον ἦν· (viewing dead at Thermopylae)

8.30.2 εἰ δὲ Θεσσαλοὶ τὰ Ελλήνων ἡῦξον, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ἐμήδιζον ἂν οἱ Φωκέες. (Thessalians and Phocaeans)

8.63 ταῦτα δὲ Θεμιστοκλέος λέγοντος ἀνεδιδάσκετο Εὐρυβιάδης· δοκέειν δέ μοι, ἀρρωδήσας... (Themistocles attempt to persuade Eurybiades to remain at Salamis)

8.66.1 ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, οὐκ ἐλάσσονες ἐόντες... (number of Xerxes' troops)

8.73.3 εἰ δὲ ἐλευθέρως ἔξεστι εἰπεῖν, ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατήμενοι ἐμήδιζον. (the behavior of certain Peloponnsian peoples during the war)

8.77.1 Χρησμοῖσι δὲ οὐκ ἔχω ἀντιλέγειν ὡς ουκ εἰσὶ ἀληθέες... (oracles)

8.79.1 ...τὸν ἐγὼ νενόμικα, πυνθανόμενος αὐτοῦ τὸν τρόπον, ἄριστον ἄνδρα γενέσθαι εν Αθήνῃσι καὶ δικαιότατον. (Aristides)

8.103.1 οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ πάντες καὶ πᾶσαι συνεβούλευον αὐτῷ μένειν, ἔμενε ἂν δοκέειν ἐμοί· οὕτω καταρρωδήκεε. (Xerxes' flight)

8.112.2 ...δοκέω δέ τινας καὶ ἄλλους δοῦναι καὶ οὐ τούτους μούνους. (tribute exacted from the islanders by Themistocles)

8.119 οὗτος δὲ ἄλλος λέγεται λόγος περὶ τοῦ Ξέρξεω νόστου, οὐδαμῶς ἔμοιγε πιστός... (Xerxes' retreat)

8.120.1 καὶ ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσι Αβδηρῖται, λέγοντες ἔμοιγε οὐδαμῶς πιστά... (Xerxes' retreat)

8.129.3 αἴτιον δὲ τοῦτο λέγοντες εὖ λέγειν ἔμοιγε δοκέουσι. (siege of Potidaea)

8.133 δοκέω δ ἔγωγε περὶ τῶν παρεόντων πρηγμάτων καὶ οὐκ ἄλλων πέρι πέμψαι. (Mys and the consulting of the oracles)

Book Nine

9.32.2 ...ὡς δὲ ἐπεικάσαι, ἐς πέντε μυριάδας συλλεγῆναι εἰκάζω... (forces at Plataea)

9.65.2 θῶμα δὲ μοι...δοκέω δέ, εἴ τι περὶ τῶν θείων πρηγμάτων δοκέειν δεῖ, ἡ θεὸς... (Plataea)

9.68	δηλοῖ τέ μοι ὅτι πάντα τὰ πρήγματα τῶν βαρβάρων ἤρτητο ἐκ Περσέων... (Plataea)
9.71.2	καὶ ἄριστος ἐγενέτο μακρῷ Ἀριστόδημος κατὰ γνώμας τὰς ἡμετέρας, ὃς... (Aristodemus and the battle of Plataea)
9.81.2	...δοκέω δ ἔγωγε καὶ τούτοισι δοθῆναι· (division of booty after Plataea)
9.113.2	τά περ ἂν καὶ ἐγένετο, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, εἰ περ... (Masistes)

Appendix Four

Variant Versions

This appendix is a select listing of passages in which Herodotus indicates that he knows a variant version of a particular event. The key words are indicated; the reader should refer to the text for the entire context.

Book One

1.1-5.2	Περσέων μέν νυν οἱ λόγιοι Φοίνικας αἰτίους φασὶ...περὶ δὲ τῆς Ἰοῦς οὐκ ὁμολογέουσι Πέρσῃσι οὕτω Φοίνικες...ταῦτα μέν νυν Πέρσαι τε καὶ Φοίνικες λέγουσι. (Phoenician and Persian stories of "girl-snatchings")
1.65.4	οἱ μὲν δή τινες πρὸς τούτοισι λέγουσι καὶ φράσαι αὐτῷ τὴν Πυθίην τὸν νῦν κατεστεῶτα κόσμον Σπαρτιήτῃσι, ὡς δ αὐτοὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι, Λυκοῦργον ἐπιτροπεύσαντα Λεωβώτεω, ἀδελφιδέου μὲν ἑωυτοῦ, βασιλεύοντος δὲ Σπαρτιητέων, ἐκ Κρήτης ἀγαγέσθαι ταῦτα. (origins of the reforms of Lycurgus)
1.70.1-3	...οὗτος ὁ κρητὴρ οὐκ ἀπίκετο ἐς Σάρδις δι αἰτίας διφασίας λεγομένας τάσδε· οἱ μὲν Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι...αὐτοὶ δὲ Σάμιοι λέγουσι... (bronze bowl given by the Spartans to Croesus)
1.75.3-6	ὡς δὲ ἀπίκετο ἐπὶ τὸν Ἅλυν ποταμὸν ὁ Κροῖσος, τὸ ἐνθεῦτεν, ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ λέγω, κατὰ τὰς ἐούσας γεφύρας διαβίβασε τὸν στρατόν, ὡς δὲ ὁ πολλὸς λόγος Ἑλλήνων, Θαλῆς οἱ ὁ Μιλήσιος διεβίβασε...οἱ δὲ καὶ τὸ παράπαν λέγουσι... (crossing of the river Halys by Croesus)
1.95.1	...ἐπιστάμενος περὶ Κύρου καὶ τριφασίας ἄλλας λόγων ὁδοὺς φῆναι. (admission by Herodotus that there are many conflicting stories about Cyrus)
1.214.5	τὰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ τὴν Κύρου τελευτὴν τοῦ βίου πολλῶν λόγων λεγομένων ὅδε μοι ὁ πιθανώτατος εἴρηται. (death of Cyrus)

Book Two

2.2.5 ...ὧδε μὲν γενέσθαι τῶν ἱρέων...ἤκουον. Ἕλληνες δὲ λέγουσι ἄλλα τε μάταια πολλὰ καὶ ὡς γυναικῶν τὰς γλώσσας ὁ Ψαμμήτιχος ἐκταμὼν... (Psammetichus' experiment)

2.54-57 χρηστηρίων δὲ πέρι τοῦ τε ἐν Ἕλλησι καὶ τοῦ ἐν Λιβύῃ τόνδε Αἰγύπτιοι λόγον λέγουσι...ταῦτα μέν νυν τῶν ἐν Θήβῃσι ἱρέων ἤκουον, τάδε δὲ Δωδωναίων φασὶ αἱ προμάντιες·...ἐγὼ δ ἔχω περὶ αὐτῶν γνώμην τήνδε... (stories concerning the establishment of oracles at Dodona and Ammon)

2.112-20 Egyptian story of Helen offered as a more likely account than the traditional Greek version

2.131.1 οἱ δέ τινες λέγουσι περὶ τῆς βοὸς ταύτης καὶ τῶν κολοσσῶν τόνδε...λόγον, ὡς Μυκερῖνος... (alternate story about the death and burial of Mycerinus' daughter)

Book Three

3.1-3 ...οὕτω μέν νυν λέγουσι Πέρσαι. Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ οἰκηιεῦνται Καμβύσεα...λέγοντες δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγουσι...λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὅδε λόγος, ἐμοὶ μὲν ουκ πιθανός... (reasons for Cambyses' invasion of Egypt)

3.9.2 οὗτος μὲν ὁ πιθανώτερος τῶν λόγων εἴρηται, δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἧσσον πιθανόν, ἐπεί γε δὴ λέγεται, ῥηθῆναι. (Arabian king's method of conveying water to the desert)

3.16.5-7 ὡς μέντοι Αἰγύπτιοι λέγουσι, οὐκ Αμασις ἦν ὁ ταῦτα παθών, ἀλλὰ ἄλλος τις τῶν Αἰγυπτίων...λέγουσι γὰρ ὡς...αἱ μέν νυν...ἄλλως δ αὐτὰ Αἰγύπτιοι σεμνοῦν. (Egyptian version about Amasis)

3.30.3 ὁ δὲ ἀναβὰς ἐς Σοῦσα ἀπέκτεινε Σμέρδιν, οἱ μὲν λέγουσι ἐπ ἄγρην ἐξαγαγόντα, οἱ δὲ ἐς τὴν Ερυθρὴν θάλασσαν προαγαγόντα καταποντῶσαι. (murder of Cambyses' brother Smerdis)

3.32.1-3 ἀμφὶ δὲ τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτῆς διξὸς ὥσπερ περὶ Σμέρδιος λέγεται λόγος. Ελληνες μὲν λέγουσι...Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ ὡς... (Cambyses' murder of his sister)

3.45.1-3 οἱ μὲν δὴ λέγουσι τοὺς ἀποπεμφθέντας Σαμίων...οἱ δὲ λέγουσι...εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ λέγουσι... (the fate of the Samians who were sent by Polycrates to Egypt)

3.47.1 καὶ ἔπειτα παρασκευασάμενοι ἐστρατεύοντο Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐπὶ Σάμον, ὡς μὲν Σάμιοι λέγουσι...ὡς δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι... (Spartan and Samian versions regarding Spartan aid in the expedition against Samos)

3.87 Οἱ μὲν δή φασι τὸν Οἰβάρεα τοῦτα μηχανήσασθαι, οἱ δὲ τοιάδε...ὡς... (Darius' accession and his groom's tricks)

3.120-22 ...ὡς μὲν οἱ πλεῦνες λέγουσι...οἱ δὲ ἐλάσσονες λέγουσι... αἰτίαι μὲν δὴ αὗται διφάσιαι λέγονται τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Πολυκράτεος... (death of Polycrates)

Book Four

4.5-11 Ως δὲ Σκύθαι λέγουσι, νεώτατον...Σκύθαι μὲν ὧδε ὑπὲρ σφέων τε αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς χώρης τῆς κατύπερθε λέγουσι, ... οἱ τὸν Πόντον οἰκέοντες ὧδε... Εστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος ἔχων ὧδε, τῷ μάλιστα λεγομένῳ αὐτὸς πρόσκειμαι·... (origins of the Scythians)

4.76.6-77 ὡς δ ἐγὼ ἤκουσα Τύμνεω τοῦ ...καίτοι τινὰ ἤδη ἤκουσα λόγον ἄλλον ὑπὸ Πελοπωννησίων λεγόμενον... (Anacharsis)

4.94-96 ἀθανατίζουσι δὲ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον...ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι τῶν τὸν Ελλήσποντον καὶ Πόντον οἰκεόντων Ελλήνων, τὸν Σάλμοξιν...ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτου...δοκέω δὲ πολλοῖσι... (Salmoxis)

4.103.2 οἱ μὲν δὴ λέγουσι ὡς τὸ σῶμα...οἱ δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὴν κεφαλὴν ὁμολογέουσι, τὸ μέντοι σῶμα οὐκ ὠθέεσθαι... (Taurian sacrifice)

4.150.1 Μέχρι μέν νυν τούτου τοῦ λόγου Λακεδαιμόνιοι Θηραίοισι κατὰ ταὐτὰ λέγουσι, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου μοῦνοι Θηραῖοι ὧδε γενέσθαι λέγουσι... (the Therans and the colony in Libya)

4.154.1 Ταῦτα δὲ Θηραῖοι λέγουσι, τὰ δ ἐπίλοιπα τοῦ λόγου συμφέρονται ἤδη Θηροῖοι Κυρηναίοισι. Κυρηναῖοι γὰρ τὰ περὶ Βάττον οὐδαμῶς ὁμολογέουσι Θηραίοισι. λέγουσι γὰρ οὕτω... (the Therans and the colony in Libya)

Book Five

5.41.3 οἱ δὲ καὶ διδύμους λέγουσι Κλεόμβροτόν τε καὶ Λεωνίδην γενέσθαι... (Anaxandrides and his two wives)

5.44-45.2 τὸν χρόνον δὲ τοῦτον, ὡς λέγουσι Συβαρῖται, σφέας ...ταῦτα μέν νυν Συβαρῖται λέγουσι ποιῆσαι Δωριέα τε καὶ τοὺς μετ αὐτοῦ, Κροτωνιῆται δὲ οὐδένα σφίσι φασὶ ξεῖνον...καὶ πάρεστι, ὁκοτέροισί τις πείθεται αὐτῶν, τούτοισι προσχωρέειν. (Doreius and the war between the Sybarites and the Crotoniates)

5.85-87 Αθηναῖοι μέν νυν λέγουσι μετὰ τὴν ἀπαίτησιν...Αθηναῖοι μέν νυν οὕτω λέγουσι γενέσθαι, Αἰγινῆται δὲ οὐ μιῇ νηὶ...σφέας δὲ Αἰγινῆται λέγουσι, πυθομένους τοὺς Αθηναίους ὡς μέλλοιεν...λέγεται μέν νυν ὑπ Αργείων... (Athenian and Aeginetan accounts of the origins of their animosity toward one another)

Book Six

6.53-54 ταῦτα μὲν Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι μοῦνοι Ελλήνων, τάδε δὲ κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ Ελλήνων ἐγὼ γράφω...ταῦτα μέν νυν κατὰ τὰ Ελληνες λέγουσι γεγενεηλόγηται, ὡς δὲ ὁ παρὰ Περσέων λόγος λέγεται, αὐτὸς ὁ Περσεύς... (history of kingship at Sparta)

6.75.3 ...ὡς μὲν οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσι Ελλήνων, ὅτι...ὡς δὲ Αθηναῖοι...λέγουσι...ὡς δὲ Αργεῖοι... (death of Cleomenes)

6.84.1 Αργεῖοι μέν νυν διὰ ταῦτα Κλεομένεά φασι...αὐτοὶ δὲ Σπαρτιῆταί φασι... (Cleomenes)

6.137.1-4 ...τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι, πλὴν...ὅτι Εκαταῖος μὲν...ἔφησε...ὡς δὲ αὐτοὶ Αθηναῖοι λέγουσι...ἐκεῖνα μὲν δὴ Εκαταῖος ἔλεξε, ταῦτα δὲ Αθηναῖοι λέγουσι. (expulsion of the Pelasgians)

Book Seven

7.55.3 ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα ὡς καὶ ὕστατον διαβῆναι βασιλέα πάντων. (crossing of the Hellespont)

7.148-52.3 Αργεῖοι δὲ λέγουσι τὰ κατ ἑωυτοὺς γενέσθαι ὧδε·...αὐτοὶ μὲν Αργεῖοι τοσαῦτα τούτων πέρι λέγουσι· ἔστι δὲ ἄλλος λόγος λεγόμενος ἀνὰ τὴν Ελλάδα, ὡς Ξέρξης ἔπεμψε...ἐπεὶ καὶ ταῦτα λέγεται, ὡς ἄρα Αργεῖοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐπικαλεσάμενοι... (Argive behavior during the war)

7.214.1 ἔστι δὲ ἕτερος λεγόμενος λόγος, ὡς Ονήτης... (claim that it was Onetes not Ephialtes who showed the Persians the hidden path at Thermopylae)

7.229-32 Δύο δὲ τούτων τῶν τριηκοσίων λέγεται Εὔρυτόν τε καὶ Αριστόδημον...οἱ μέν νυν οὕτω σωθῆναι λέγουσι Αριστόδημον...οἱ δὲ ἄγγελον...λέγεται δὲ καί ἄλλον ἀποπεμφθέντα ἄγγελον... (survivors of Thermopylae)

Book Eight

8.84.2 Αθηναῖοι μὲν οὕτω λέγουσι τῆς ναυμαχίης γενέσθαι τὴν ἀρχήν, Αἰγινῆται δὲ τὴν κατὰ τοὺς Αἰακίδας ἀποδημήσασαν ἐς Αἴγινάν, ταύτην εἶναι τὴν ἄρξασαν. λέγεται δὲ καὶ τάδε, ὡς φάσμα... (Salamis)

8.94.4 τούτους μὲν τοιαύτη φάτις ἔχει ὑπὸ Αθηναίων, οὐ μέντοι αὐτοί γε Κορίνθιοι ὁμολογέουσι, ἀλλ ἐν πρώτοισι σφέας... (flight of Adeimantus)

8.118.1 ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος ὅδε λόγος λεγόμενος, ὡς ἐπειδὴ Ξέρξης ἀπελαύνων... (retreat of Xerxes)

Book Nine

9.74.1-2 ...ὁ Σωφάνης καὶ ἀριστεύσας τότε Αθηναίων διεξοὺς λόγους λεγομένους ἔχει, τὸν μὲν ὡς...ὁ δ ἕτερος τῶν λόγων... (Sophanes)

9.95 ἤδη δὲ καὶ τόδε ἤκουσα ὡς ὁ Δηίφονος...οὐκ ἐὼν Εὐηνίου παῖς. (Deiphonos)

Vita

Cynthia Lois Claxton was born on September 28, 1955 in Long Beach, California of parents, Glen and Nancy Claxton. She graduated in June, 1977 from Pomona College in Claremont, California with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Classics. She began her graduate studies in Classics at the University of Washington in 1977. She received her Master of Arts degree in 1979 and Doctor of Philosophy in 1987.