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PREFACE

In these two volumes is comprised the major instalment of a work, which should present at least the last six Books of Herodotus, duly annotated and explained. By this issue the editor discharges the heavier portion of his covenanted labours. The task has been long a-doing, hindered and interrupted, as it has been, by sufficient causes, which here to specify further might seem to be assuming too general expectancy of the book. Enough now, if some friends, interested in the progress of this work, be not disappointed in its execution; and if the public, a somewhat critical one, to which it appeals, find it, upon the whole, serviceable and welcome.

The increase of materials and the rising standard of method will presently render it well-nigh desperate for any one man to elaborate a complete edition of Herodotus upon the scale of former editors. One must needs be not merely grammarian and historian, but archaeologist, anthropologist, philosopher and something more to boot, in order adequately to explain and illustrate 'the Father of History,' his work. The next commentary on 'The Muses,' intended for scholars at large, will haply be undertaken by a syndicate, or trust, in which each department of the Herodotean Museum may be headed by an all-competent sub-specialist. But, even then, a controlling mind will be necessary in order to bring consistency and point to the result: meanwhile there is a chance that this edition may still be in time to invest the middle section of the Herodotean Histories with Introduction, Commentary and
Appendices, not all unworthy, having regard to the present state
of knowledge and research, a place beside the accomplished
labours of a less exacting age.

The more precise relations of this edition to those others cannot
be described in a sentence. Whatever may now be the right
estimate of works even as recent as those of Larcher and of
Schweighäuser, no competent judge will expect to find a claim here
advanced to supersede the commentaries of Baehr, of Blakesley,
of Rawlinson, of Stein, each of which has merits, visible, even in
this very edition, by derivation or deposit. Of any preponderant
debt to this one or that of his predecessors the present editor
is scarcely conscious. The extent to which antecedent labours
support his own, is attested, perhaps too scrupulously, twice over,
in the Notes passim and in the Index of Authors, sub nominibus.
Though the references there accumulated betoken not seldom
dissent or criticism, they are none the less indicative of obliga-
tions incurred. A similar canon applies to the works of the
historians, Grote, Thirlwall, Curtius, Duncker, Busolt, Eduard
Meyer and others, and, in short, to all the modern authorities at
all copiously cited. If the writer were conscious of a primary
nexus to one or other of his many creditors, this would be the
place to acknowledge it. Let critics, if they please, discover his
scientific pedigree, if he have one. His first claim is to have
focussed a good number of results, many of which are virtually
common property in the Republic of Hellenic Studies, enforcing
them by methods, to the development of which schools of recent
and living investigators have contributed. He has taken some
pleasure in accentuating the English contribution to the common
stock; but no one using these volumes will accuse him of disguis-
ing his obligation to foreign sources. Throughout, properties have
been, to the best of his ability, assigned to the rightful owners,
after the example of that truly classic plagiarist, who plundered
his friends only to give them back their goods, on the principle
that men thank you more for restoring to them what is their own,
than if you had never robbed them at all. It would, however,
be an excess of altruism, on the writer's part, to announce these volumes as the mere exploitation of other men's labours. So far as he is aware, no previous commentary has applied so completely the methods of analytic and discriminative criticism to the work of Herodotus. Consequently, this edition should exhibit more fully than others the structure and composition of the Herodotean opus, should discover more systematically the problems of origin and source, and should appreciate more nicely the varying values of the different parts, paragraphs, and items, of the multifarious and complex whole. Two cases, *exempli gratia*, may here—not without some risk—be named in support of this claim. Though the geography of Herodotus has been discussed again and again, the composite and unsystematic quality of the Herodotean world has not been so distinctly presented as it is in this work. Again, though scholars and historians might seem by this time to have said the last word about the battle of Marathon, the genesis and progress of the story itself appear never to have been so fully considered as in the present work. That consideration, though in the first instance a literary exercise, is none the less an essential preliminary to a definitive solution of the real problems at issue. And so forth, in other cases.

This work makes no claim to multiply paradoxes. It was no slight satisfaction to find, in the fourth volume of the collected and posthumous *Kleine Schriften* of an illustrious savant, Alfred von Gutschmid, published only in 1894, an *Index Pontium* and an *Oekonomie* to the work of Herodotus, anticipating to some extent, and confirming, observations and methods advocated in the *Introduction* to these volumes, which was then already in type. The laureate work of a well-known French Hellenist, M. Hauvette, appeared after the second of these volumes was already in the printer's hands, or account would naturally have been taken of his labours. It is some comfort to reflect that his masterly support may be utilised in the production of the portion of this work still remaining to do. An identical remark applies to the researches of an American scholar, Professor Herbert Weir Smyth,
upon the Ionic dialect, to which here appeal can be made only
in support of observations upon the Herodotean style printed on
pp. cxvii, cxx of this volume. It is matter for congratulation
that no results, however startling, brought by Mr. Arthur Evans
from Crete, or by Professor Flinders Petrie from Egypt, are likely
to invalidate the utterances in these volumes in regard to the
problems of Hellenic origines, or of Libyan ethnology.

It remains to acknowledge gratefully assistance given from
time to time towards the production of this work. Professor
Ramsay, Professor Percy Gardner, Mr. Mackinder, Mr. Walker,
and other Oxford colleagues, have kindly replied to inquiries,
or afforded light, on points of detail. Other scholars (whom the
editor is proud to claim, in one sense or other, as 'old pupils')
have laid him under various obligations. Professor Titchener, now
of Cornell University, made an observation embodied in a note to
5. 55, 3. A large debt to Mr. Hogarth is fully set out in
Appendix XIII. § 9. Without a suggestion, volunteered by Mr.
Arnold C. Taylor of Uppingham, the last Appendix would
probably never have been written. Mr. Tracey of Brasenose
College kindly read some of the earlier proofs of the Greek
text. The first and second Indices are mainly the work of Mr.
A. S. L. Farquharson of University College. Other services,
not here specified, are had in grateful remembrance. The
revision of the proof-sheets, as a whole, was a labour too long
and exacting to be inflicted upon any friend, however willing.
In a work, the mere printing of which has occupied upwards of
twenty months, and which combines a very large number and
variety of types and symbols, some allowance will be granted for
an occasional lapsus calami that may have kept its place in type.
A few Corrigenda will be found after the Table of Contents in
each volume.

If irregularities in the Englishing of Greek words and names
cause any offence, let them be taken for experimental evidence of
a desire to attain the unattainable, to wit, a satisfactory trans-
literation of Greek forms. For the rest, there has been nothing
detected, up to date, to mislead a competent reader. This result is mainly due to the admirable work done in the printer's office; and if, in other respects, the work issues well-equipped, that shows again the high standard and the ready goodwill of a long-suffering publisher.

R. W. M.

University College, Oxford,
April 1895.
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INTRODUCTION

§ 1. To appreciate the importance of the Greek text, herewith printed and annotated, its relation to the work of Herodotus as a whole must be duly considered. To understand the whole, it is necessary to discover its general structure, and the sections into which it may most usefully be sub-divided. A successful Analysis of the full text is an essential preliminary to a just conception of the problems connected with the sources and the composition of the work, and with the character of the author, whether as historian or as hero. The full exhibition and discussion of those problems should only be attempted when the analytical criticism of the work has been accomplished: this criticism, however, in its progress incidentally tends to define canons and conclusions, which affect the appreciation of the several parts of the work. Thus, although no more than the fourth, fifth and sixth Books of Herodotus are here immediately under review, they must be considered in the light of principles which are to be gathered from all the nine Books, and cannot be fully verified except by reference to the whole work, and its every part. To enumerate or to discuss these principles in this place would be to open up the whole mass of problems and arguments, which should be reserved as Prolegomena to a complete edition of the work. It must suffice to make such assumptions or statements as may be easily verified by a general acquaintance with the whole work, in order to concentrate attention and criticism upon the three Books here printed, and to elucidate their position and import, intrinsically and in relation to the antecedent and succeeding portions of the text. The intrinsic significance of these Books it is the more especial function of the Notes and Appendices to elucidate: this Introduction aims at emphasising the relative bearings of the middle section of the
text upon the two remainders, which it separates, or connects. The distinction between intrinsic and relative importance or interest is, of course, itself arbitrary and artificial: many points might be brought equally well under either head, and a satisfactory judgment, even in particular problems, whether literary or historical, cannot be reached until the whole work and the particular passage in question have been surveyed from every profitable point of view: but with this large cævæat to control his results the practical student may courageously proceed on his way.

§ 2. The work of Herodotus (the unique and authentic character of which inter alia is here assumed) has come down to us with a ready-made division into nine Books. These divisions hardly any one now supposes to be primitive, or made by the author himself: they may be dated to the Hellenistic period, and may have been made in Alexandria. But when, where and by whomsoever made, they were made with great skill and judgment; they correspond to the grand argument of the work; they are dictated or justified by the natural divisions of the story or subject matter, nature in this case being indistinguishable from art. In short, the nine-fold division of the work of Herodotus, though not formally his doing, is so obviously just and reasonable, that it might fairly be taken to suggest, to a greater or less extent, even the secret history of the composition of the work. At any rate, there was, so far as is known, no rival division made or suggested

1 A. Wiedemann, Herodotus zweites Buch, Leipzig, 1890, p. 13, seems to argue that the existing division into nine Books is from the hand of the author. The expression ὁ πρῶτος τῶν λόγων, 5. 36, does not support the argument, see note ad l. The division is, indeed, Herodotean, inasmuch as it corresponds to the best Analysis of the work, but that is another matter.

2 This is A. Bauer’s suggestion: Entstehung des herodotischen Geschichtswerks, Vienna, 1878, p. 5. His other suggestion, that the Egyptian Logi led to the subdivision of the work, is almost superfluous, if the tripartition below given be rightly grounded. Wiedemann (l. c. supra) may be left to explain how and why, if a ‘Grammarian’ could not have been guilty of the anti-grammatical division of Hdt. 7/8, a similar division originated in the other cases mentioned by him, viz. Thucydides 3/4, Xenophon, Anabasis 5/6, Hellenica 3/4, 6/7. It seems probable that the older historical prose works were not subdivided into ‘Books’ until later writers had begun to compose in ‘Books.’ As the summaries in the Anabasis (Bks. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 ad init.) are obviously spurious, it is probable that no author previous to Ephorus had written prose works in ‘Books.’ (See Diodor. 16. 76, βιβλία γέγραπτα πράκτωρ, προοίμων ἐκάστῳ προβείς, cp. 5. 1). Herodotus and Thucydides do not quote even the Iliad and Odyssey by reference to Books; the ἰδρυθεὶς in this case was certainly Alexandrine. Op. Susemihl, Gr. Lüt. i. 330 ff.
§ 3. in antiquity, a fact which is in itself some guarantee of the correctness of the existing divisions: nor has the ambition of modern editors aspired to improve on the received division into nine Books. § 3. It may, however, fairly be doubted whether the full significance of the nine-fold division, and of the reasons underlying it, have always been duly apprehended. The practice of most editors points rather to an adverse decision, and the debate on the question whether the work of Herodotus is finished and complete, from the author's point of view, could hardly have run to such lengths, or ended so indecisively, as in the case heretofore, had due stress been laid upon the considerations now to be urged. It is not enough to observe that the work of Herodotus lends itself easily and obviously to the division into nine Books, each of these Books being more or less a literary unit in itself, with a natural beginning and end. A broader, a more fundamental, primary, and significant division presents itself, when the nine Books are regrouped into three successive and sharply-contrasted sections, or volumes. The three-fold division of the one great united and complete story is in truth more obvious, indisputable and convincing than the nine-fold division, which stands in a subordinate and derivative relation to the other and simpler. Convenience of reference, for literary and historical purposes, demands indeed the division into Books of moderate dimensions, in this as in other cases; and the particular division into nine has almost everything in its favour. But among the considerations which justify the nine-fold division, it can hardly be an accident that the nine parts may have been reached by the tripartition of three original parts, and that they constitute a division of a division, suggesting a ground-plan for the whole work of extraordinary and memorable symmetry, with a mutual correspondence and balance between divisions and sub-divisions, going far to assure any reader, who has possessed himself of this clue, that the work is finished as it stands, and incapable of addition or appendix, without the destruction of its literary form and artistic finish.  

1 The case was otherwise with the works of Thucydides and of Xenophon. Cr. Marcellinus, vita Thucydidis 58 την πραγματαν αυτων οι μεν κατεχον εις προεκ και δεκα ιστοριες, διαλοι δε άλλων. Diogenes Laertius 2. 6, συνεγραφε δε [ος ο Ευρυθες] βιβλια προτο τα τετρακοσια άλλων άλλων διαφθοραν.  

2 Even Ed. Meyer's Ist Herodots Geschichtswerk vollendet? Rh. Mus., 1887, p. 146 (now reprinted in his Forschungen, 1892, p. 189), does not take the above-given point into account.
§ 4. In order to realize the three-fold plan underlying the work of Herodotus it is convenient to compare the two extreme members of the triple unity, before considering the nature and character of the intervening elements, which serve, according to the critic's point of view, to connect or to separate them. Even the briefest and most general comparison (undertaken with adequate knowledge) would serve to show that the points of contrast between the first three Books of Herodotus and the last three Books are so great and startling as to make it difficult to comprehend the two sections as equal parts of a single literary work. True, in respect to dialect, vocabulary, style and so forth, the two sections, here hypothetically in juxtaposition, give evidence of a common authorship; but if material considerations be taken into account, the two sections might well belong to different works, even if by one and the same author. The last three Books (7, 8, 9) form by themselves an obvious unity both materially and formally. On the one hand, the seventh book is clearly marked off from the sixth: on the other hand the seventh passes into the eighth, the eighth into the ninth, without grammatical or stylistic break and without material interruption. The three Books, taken together, contain, in an almost unbroken and continuous narrative, the story of the great Invasion in the time of Xerxes. The subject is a single war, complicated indeed in virtue of its magnitude and the variety of arms and operations comprised in it, yet confined ex hypothesi to a couple of successive campaigns, and requiring for the action of the story neither a very extensive theatre, nor a long-drawn chronology. The scenes of the story are laid, in the main, within an area familiar to Greeks in the fifth century, and requiring little description. For the most part the geography is incidentally involved in the action of the story, and but little treated as a matter of interest in itself; while the time required for the events as narrated is reckoned by seasons, or years, or at most by a decade from the date of Marathon, or of Paros, to the return from Sestos. If, indeed, the continuous story of the single war, which fills the main bulk of the last three Books, be taken, as it fairly may be taken, for the real backbone of this section of the whole work, the time-condition for the connected story and subject is fully supplied by two or three years of our notation, to wit, from the mustering of the forces in the year 481 to the capture of Sestos in the early

1 7. 1.  2 6. 135.  3 9. 121.  4 7. 26-36.
springs of 478 B.C. The general character of the narrative corresponds to these simpler and more easily fulfilled conditions. The narrative, which is continuous and comparatively free from digressions, is historical, that is, truthful in character, and the history is to the author recent history. Criticism has indeed shown that the traditions of the great Invasion as preserved by Herodotus have not escaped transfiguration by the mytho-poetic faculty: fiction is largely blended with fact; interests, humours, fancies, pieties, a dozen various powers have contributed to the record, and the result is far from being the truth exacted by the historical standards of to-day. Still, for the actual history of the war with Xerxes, and much connected therewith, the last three Books of Herodotus remain to us a primary and invaluable authority, a golden treasury of evidences. But the case stands very differently with the histories contained and offered by the first three Books. From almost every material point of view the first volume of the work affords truly marvellous contrasts to the last volume. Mere general propositions are here indeed, as usually, misleading. To do proper justice to the matter many distinctions must be introduced. The historical value of the matter found in Herodotus' work varies not merely from volume to volume, or from Book to Book, but from paragraph to paragraph, from sentence to sentence, from line to line. Every separate story, every individual statement is to be tried on its own merits. Distinctions must be drawn between matters of fact of which Herodotus is the unconscious witness, and the information which he explicitly and professedly bequeaths to posterity: between matters of which he had, or might have had, the express evidence of his senses, or the testimony of good witnesses, and matters which were of remoter evidence or origin: between traditions derived from good Hellenic or foreign sources, and traditions in which interests of one kind or another are latent or patent. Tried by careful and discriminative methods a great deal, even in the first three Books of Herodotus, remains of almost infinite value for the modern historian—indipendently of the secondary value, as literature, in itself illustrative and evidential, which even the most harsh or the most careless criticism allows that part of the work. In

1 K. W. Nitzsch's paper, Rk. Mus. der Perserkriege, Munich, 1876, were N. F. xxvii. 228 ff. (1872), and N. 'epoch-making' in this respect. Wecklein's tract, Uber die Tradition
the marvellous second Book the extremes of value meet. There are matters of fact of almost every shade of meaning to be found in it. Evidences in regard to the mind and character, the adventures and life of the historian himself; evidences in regard to the state of knowledge and ignorance in the cultivated society of his time; evidences in regard to the physical facts in the writer's own present; traditions of widely varying value in regard to the past, from the comparatively accurate record of the last native dynasty in Egypt, to the grotesque and laughable substitutes for history connected with the memory of 'Rhamnitiones' and the Pharaohs of the three empires. What is true of the second Book is true, mutatis mutandis, of the first and of the third Books also. Still, when due allowance is made for the special merits of each particular case, for the fictitious elements in the last three Books and the historical elements in the first three Books, a broad general difference in regard to the respective character of these two primary sections in the work as a whole cannot be denied or much diminished. In historic character and truth, in chronological conditions, in the geographical elements implied or explicitly introduced, in the subject matter and connexion or argument underlying the details, there is a sharp and a far-reaching difference between the first and the third volumes, or major sections, of the work. The first three Books do not form so much a single continuous story, as a mass of stories concerning nations and generations of men, sometimes but very indirectly related to one another. The second Book introduces, indeed, a colossal excursus, almost like a separate and substantive work, upon Egypt and the Egyptians. This Book is sometimes regarded as unduly breaking the unity and cohesion of the whole story told by Herodotus: but from the present point of view the matter contained in it, or something equivalent, is absolutely necessary in order to preserve the balance and harmony of the work in its three-fold division, and further to point completely the contrast between the first and the third volumes. An excursus or digression would be no digression, if it did not interrupt an otherwise continuous argument; and a unity, both material and literary, does undoubtedly pervade the heterogeneous elements, out of which the first three Books are composed, especially when the second Book is temporarily withdrawn; but a first perusal leaves many students too much bewildered and overcome by the masses of details to detect the unities of interest and of action. The
subject is not a single short war for freedom, issuing in the secured liberty of Hellas, but a secular struggle, or series of struggles for empire, issuing in the triumph of Persia, and the unification of the civilised world, outside Hellas proper, in the hands of the Persian king. This story, however, is so buried under the mass of digressions and excursus, larger or smaller, of one kind and another, that the reader is sometimes at a loss to decide whether the Father of History is himself conscious of the art which conducts the stately yet multifarious pageant of the nations through his pages. The scenes for this great argument are not, for the most part, laid in Greece proper, nor in Greek territory. Such episodes as are located in Sparta, or Athens, or Samos or Corinth mark digressions from the principal narrative: the interest, the point of view are, on the whole, non-Hellenic, within a civilised but a ‘barbarian’ world. The history is the history of Lydia, of Media, of Persia, of Egypt, above all of Persia; Sardes and Ecbatana, Babylon and Memphis, and, above all, Susa are the centres of interest; the Greek history which enters, as synchronous or ancillary to the main story, is made, so to speak, a function of the non-Hellenic history. Not but what every considerable passage, almost every detail, is thoroughly hellenised in tone, colour, ethos and sentiment; but it is not the history of Hellas that is in the main narrated: it is an Hellenic version, or number of versions, of non-Hellenic history. From the nature of the case the chronological conditions are large and indefinite; an immense retrospect, a number of vast chronological parallels are driven back into the past. The authentic history is carried a century, two centuries back before the writer’s time: up to the age of Kroisos and of Peisistratos,\(^1\) of Anaxandrides and Ariston in Sparta, up to the age of Gyges in Lydia, Deiokes in Media, Psammetichos in Egypt.\(^2\) Behind these epochs looms a vast antiquity in Egypt, in Asia, not to say in Greece itself. It is small wonder if these partially-apprehended parallels, this dim and vast perspective, grow more dubious and questionable as they recede, and if the systematic order into which they are worked by the historian’s art, is rather literary than scientific. The historical here is less historic, persons are more doubtful, actions are less politic, morality and mythology have made more free with tradition. In all these

---

1 *Circa* 560 B.C., cp. 1. 6, 29, 59, 65;
2 *Circa* 650 B.C., cp. 1. 14, 16, 73, 96; 67 (5, 71), 2. 152.
and some other respects the contrast between the first three Books and the last three Books can hardly be exaggerated. There is, indeed, one material point of community in the observation that the main theme of the first volume is the rise of Persia, and the main theme of the last volume is the failure of Persia; but the themes are handled on widely different scales, from points of view almost opposed to one another, and with results correspondingly different. This is not the place to pursue the analysis of the first and last divisions of the work of Herodotus into further detail. But, in short, viewing the six Books (1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9) as two separate groups we see that, if now they stood alone, it would be difficult to understand how they came to be members of one literary whole, so different are the chronological and geographical conditions, in the two groups respectively, so sharp the contrasts between their historic qualities and materials. In the first three Books Greek history is so to speak an accident, the non-Hellenic, the barbarian history is the essential factor in the argument; in the last three, the history is the history of the Hellenes, though the barbarians are of necessity present as the opposite of Hellas. In the first three, enormous times and large spaces are demanded for the narrative; the known world is displayed, or traversed by the actors in the story; generations, centuries, even millenniums are taken as time-units: in the three last Books, the shores of the Aegean, the lake-like Mediterranean waters, the notorious passes, bays and islands of Hellas are enough for the action of the story. In the first three, the pageant of barbaric civilisations is unfolded in the splendour and magnitude of its works of peace, its deeds of war: in the last three Books, the narrative concentrates upon the course and issue of a single war, a war great and significant, but brief and recent. In the last three Books we have a fairly historic tradition, or treasury of traditions amalgamated, 'contaminated,' or left in the raw state, but always fairly manageable and responsive to criticism: in the first three Books is contained a bewildering mass of traditions, legends, myths, memories, imaginations, theories, hypotheses, in which to separate the credible from the incredible, the serviceable from the unhistoric, the fictitious from the true, is a veritable labour of psyche, only to be accomplished by the co-operation of a multitude of specialists, many of whom owe little or no allegiance to Hellenic studies.
§ 5. Such are the leading aspects of the patent contrast between the first and the last volumes of Herodotus; a contrast so extreme as to leave us doubtful whether the volumes could be essential parts of one literary whole. The connecting links between the two extreme members of the one great work, though not perhaps the complete clue to their incorporation in one and the same work, are supplied by the intervening group of three Books, numbered 4, 5, 6, and named, without any obvious or special appropriateness, Melpomene, Terpsichore, and Erato; with which, collectively and severally, this present edition is concerned. The characteristics and details of these three Books must, of course, be here pursued and noted throughout with all practicable minuteness. But for the immediate purpose of the present argument it will be sufficient to emphasise the salient characteristics of this triad, or group of three Books, in comparison and contrast with the preceding group, 1, 2, 3, and the succeeding group 7, 8, 9, in order to establish the relative importance of the middle group in the general scheme of the work.

§ 6. So little have students in general, or even apparently expert editors, been accustomed to regard the fourth, fifth and sixth Books of Herodotus, sub specie unitatis, as forming a unity in themselves,¹ that it will here not be labour wasted to revive the argument for so regarding them. The argument is a double one: it rests, first, upon the break between the third and fourth Books, and between the sixth and seventh; it rests, secondly, upon the positive continuity and absence of material break between the fourth and fifth Books, and between the fifth and sixth. The three Books are thus detached from their predecessors, and distinct from the sequel, while in themselves, despite important digressions and asides, they are bound and fused into one by a clear and continuous unity of action and of narrative. This point is universally recognised in regard to the fifth and sixth Books, the story of the Ionian revolt being obviously told partly in the end of the fifth Book and partly in the beginning of the sixth. The undoubted

¹ The Tarnhitz edition, 1853, err. F. Palm, presented the text of Herodotus in three volumes; and the third and fourth volumes of Rawlinson’s translation contain, respectively, the two last triads of Books. Prof. Sayce segregated the first triad (1883). The second Book has frequently been treated as sui generis, as by Kenrick (1841), Wiedemann (1880), and A. Lang, in his edition (1888) of the English translation of B. R. (1884). A sound instinct led Kenrick to include Bk. 3. 1-67 in his volume.
pause created by the story of the end of Aristagoras, while affording a legitimate excuse for the division between Book and Book, is obviously not so great as to dissolve the continuity of the main narrative. The break between the fifth and sixth Books is, indeed, far less abrupt, structurally or argumentatively, than breaks occurring inside the fifth and sixth Books themselves respectively; as, for example, the breaks occasioned by the digressions on Athenian and Spartan affairs,¹ which override the chronological conditions of the direct narrative in a highly disturbing fashion.² The unity or continuity of the fifth and sixth Books is, in fact, easily and universally conceded, and even exaggerated; for the point more generally overlooked is the continuity, the solidarity, so to speak, between the fourth Book and its successor.

§ 7. At first sight, indeed, the fourth Book may seem insulated in the work of Herodotus, and endowed with a physiognomy as distinctive and peculiar as that which belongs to the second Book. The fourth Book is undoubtedly, from some points of view, marked with a character of its own: but this character is but the exaggeration or apotheosis of elements present in several of the other Books, and among them the fifth. ¹ The fourth Book is the Book anthropological par excellence. The ethnography and ethnology of the uncivilised barbarians contained in the Scythian and Libyan Logi ³ would in themselves be enough to constitute Herodotus one of the fathers of anthropology, as now-a-days understood. But these passages are not the only passages of the kind in Herodotus. Not to dwell upon the ethnography furnished under the form of army-lists in Bks. 7-9,⁴ there are in the first three Books a number of passages ⁵ similar in kind though smaller in bulk as compared with the ethnography of Scythia, and of Libya, presented in Bk. 4. But the special ethnographical text is, so to speak, incomplete in Bk. 4; its natural context and complement is to be found in Bk. 5. The fact that the ethnography of Thrace and the Thracians is begun in Bk. 4 (cc. 93-96) and continued in Bk. 5 (cc. 3-8) serves to emphasise the connexion between the two Books. ² A similar

¹ 5. 39-48, 55-96; 6. 35-40, 51-98
² passim.
³ Cp. notes to 5. 89; 6. 85, 92 et al.
and Appendices VII, VIII.
⁴ Particularly cc. 46, 59-75, 102-109, 183-199.
⁵ e.g. 1. 93, 94 (Lydians). 125, 131-140 (Persians). 178-187, 192-200 (Babylon and the Babylonians). 215 (the Massagetae). 2. 35-99 et passim (Egyptians). 3. 98-116 (the ends of the earth, their products and inhabitants), et al.
remark applies to a second point on which one of the main
characteristics of the fourth Book depends. None of the other
Books, as they stand, is so elaborately geographical as the fourth
Book. Not merely are the geography of Scythia and the geo-
graphy of Libya introduced more or less under cover of the
narrative, or subjects proper to the Book: excuse is found for
a display of the author’s conception of the whole earth, inhabited
and uninhabited, with its divisions natural or artificial, albeit
to complete the outline, or picture, of the arear terrarum Herodoto
nota, recourse must be had to the account of the Ends of the
Earth in Bk. 3,\(^1\) while the details intervening can only be filled
in by observation of the whole work passim. To such observation
the fifth Book offers some notable materials direct and indirect,\(^2\)
and although it would hardly be possible to found on these
dealences a strong plea for the continuity of Bks. 4 and
5, yet it is fair to see in the passage on the parts beyond the
Istros (cc. 9, 10) a designed appendix to the geography of Scythia
and its neighbourhood given in Bk. 4, and to suggest some
relation between the pínax exhibited by Aristagoras at Sparta
as recorded in Bk. 5 with the maps of the earth, according to
the Ionians, over which Herodotus makes merry in Bk. 4.\(^3\)

§ 8. But it is not on the solidarity of the anthropology, eth-
nography, and geography in Bks. 4 and 5 that the main inner
argument for the unity of the ‘Books’ rests, but upon the obvious
or easily ascertainable continuity of the main narrative, whether
viewed chronologically or viewed as a series of related actions.
Apart from episodes and digressions, in which the author places
himself more or less arbitrarily at various dates above and below
the period proper, so to speak, to the standpoint of these three
Books, the events recorded may be said to extend from the capture
of Babylon about 518 B.C.,\(^4\) or the invasion of Europe in 512 B.C.,\(^5\)
to the battle of Marathon in 490 B.C.,\(^6\) or the failure of Miltiades
at Paros in 489 B.C.,\(^7\) and his trial, condemnation and death

---

\(^1\) cc. 98-118.
\(^2\) c.g. cc. 9, 16, 17, 117-122. More especially, however, 52, 53 (the road
from Sarde to Susa).
\(^3\) 5. 49; cp. 4. 36.
\(^4\) 3. 150-158. Sayce (note ad l.) dates the second revolt of Babylon mentioned
on the Behistun inscription 515 B.C.
\(^5\) Ed. Meyer, Geschichte d. Alterthums, i.
615, dates it 519 B.C. In any case the
Behistun inscription as nearly as possible
covers the period represented by the
Persian history in Hdt. 3.
\(^6\) For this date cp. Appendix III.
\(^7\) Cp. Appendix X.
\(^8\) Cp. 5. 182 ff.
subsequently. A lower or later date as a *terminus ad quem* cannot be brought into the direct narrative, for the seventh Book takes the battle of Marathon as its chronological point of departure.\(^1\) Thus references to later events, though intrinsically valuable, and also important as factors in determining the date of composition and other problems, are not included in the present argument. The year 490 or 489 B.C. is, therefore, the chronological finale for the middle volume, so to speak, of Herodotus, just as the year 480 or 479 B.C. is the end of the third. It may with more reason be sought to push the chronological start for the narrative behind the date of the invasion of Europe, or of the capture of Babylon. Some of the excursus, or episodes, in the Books under review carry the broken chronological perspective into a dim and distant antiquity;\(^2\) but it can hardly be contended that these passages should constitute the chronological framework of the whole, nor do they affect the argument immediately. For such passages are evenly distributed over all the three Books here grouped together, and indeed over the two other groups or triads likewise. More pertinent to the matter in hand are the passages which, though digressions from the point of view of the mere literary structure of the Book or Books in question, are essentially proper or ancillary to the general stream of the continuous narrative. Thus, although it cannot be disputed that a capture of Babylon, or an invasion of Europe by Dareios in person, be the express or structural *terminus a quo* for the period treated in these Books, yet the digressions on matters essential to the main story, and virtually contemporaneous, carry the date some years higher up. From the death of Hipparchos in 414 B.C. at least the fuller stream of narrative flows fairly continuous.\(^3\) If the conventional date for the alliance with Plataea could be maintained, the point of departure might be pushed back to 519 B.C., but that convention is no longer maintainable.\(^4\) That date involved a chronological overlapping between the third and the fourth (fifth and sixth) Books; nor is that overlap in any wise removed by the revision of the date of the Atheno-Plataean alliance; for the story of the accession of Kleomenes is related in Bk. 5, and carries back in any case to 519 B.C. or thereabouts, and Kleomenes is already king in

\(^{1}\) 7. 1.  
\(^{2}\) e.g. 4. 5-13 (origin of the Scyths): 145 ff. (the Minyae); 5. 82 ff. (origin of the Aigineto-Athenian quarrel); 6. 137 (Pelasgi in Attica).  
\(^{3}\) 5. 55.  
\(^{4}\) 6. 108. See notes at l.
Sparta at the coming of Maiandrios, as related in Bk. 3. Thus it might be fairly argued that, while the explicit chronology of the direct narrative in these Books starts with the invasion of Europe by Dareios (variously dated from 508 B.C. up to 516 B.C.), the implicit chronology of the continuous narrative is by an afterthought, or by a retrospect essentially organic in the direct narrative, carried back to 519 B.C., the three Books thus covering some thirty years. There is nothing foreign in such a device to Herodotus' methods of historiography; quite the reverse. It is strictly parallel to the method exemplified in the first Book, where the age of Kroisos and of Peisistratos is taken as the express starting-point, only to be superseded by retrospect which carry back the Lydian record to Gyges, and the Medo-Persian to Deiokes the contemporaries of Psamatik, a century before Kroisos. But a hitch, or rather a lacuna, occurs in the traditions preserved by Herodotus, between the final usurpation of Peisistratos and the murder of Hipparchos. Several decades of Athenian tradition are all but lost to Herodotus, and the years from 529 to 519 B.C., and again from 519 to 514 B.C., are sparsely represented by such fragments as those on the fortunes and misfortunes of the Philaidae (6. 34-39, 103), or the expulsion of the Alkmaionidae (5. 62). It is, indeed, the sixth Book, not the fifth or the fourth, that supplies the links between the Athenian traditions in the first Book concerning the age of Peisistratos, and the traditions in the fifth Book which concern the expulsion of the Peisistratidae. The digression in Bk. 5 on Spartan affairs seems to refer expressly back to the digression on Sparta in Bk. 1, irrespective of the notes on Spartan history that occur in the intervening text. But the case is different with the greater digressions on Athens and Athenian history, in Bk. 5; they are not expressly referred back to the digression in Bk. 1, and it is but an accident, to all appearance, that Bk. 6 supplies, to some extent, the missing links. Had due weight been always allowed to this observation, it would not have been the fashion to present the two digressions on Sparta and on Athens, in Bk. 1 and in Bk. 5, as respectively continuous, and forming exact parallels. The treatment of Sparta and the treatment of Athens in the two cases are not strictly co-ordinate. The Spartan traditions are

1 5. 39-48; cp. 3. 148.  
2 See note 5. 89.  
3 Cp. Appendix III.  
4 S. 45-47, 54-56, 148; 4. 145-149.
ostensibly taken up in Bk. 5 where they had been dropped in Bk. 1; nay, they are made to overlap and cohere the more by the retrospective account of the marriages of Anaxandridas¹ and the fortunes of his sons. The Athenian traditions are not taken up in Bk. 5 where they were dropped in Bk. 1. There is a gap, partially filled in less by the story of the Alkmionidae in Bk. 5 than by the stories of the Philaidae in Bk. 6. The imperfect observation of these peculiarities in the structure of the fifth and sixth Books may in part be accountable for the editorial practice of treating these two Books, divorced from the fourth, as something of an isolated unity in the work of Herodotus, and of dividing the whole work for practical purposes into two volumes instead of into three.

§ 9. In one respect, indeed, there is a conspicuous breach in the unity of the actions comprised in the chronological period (519-489 B.C.) determined for these Books. This breach has likewise contributed to detach the fourth Book from its immediate successors, and to disturb the natural divisions of the whole work. The Libyan Logi obliterate, to some extent and at first sight, the continuity of Bks. 4 and 5; not because they contain a large amount of digressional matter in the form of ancient history, or contemporary ethnography, but because they introduce an independent and separate series of events, a different action, to all appearance but loosely connected with the main stream of the story, by the feeble accident of a reputed or real synchronism. Thus, the whole of the Libyan Logi (which form about one-third of the fourth Book) present the appearance of a digression, and the strictly continuous action in the narrative is resumed in Bk. 5, c. 1 from Bk. 4, c. 143—the intervening text being, so to speak, ignored. Even for this structural device there is analogy in the other portions of the work. On a smaller scale the Libyan Logi afford in the second volume a parallel to the Egyptian excursus in the first, which fills the whole of the second Book; while, if it be remembered that in the last volume, and particularly in Bk. 9, Herodotus narrates in succession two series of actions, the operations of the Greek army and the operations of the Greek navy, which are synchronous ex hypothesi²; while in Bks. 7 and 8 he treats in similar fashion two series of actions, which were not merely synchronous, but strategically

interdependent: it may be admitted that there is nothing abnormal in his method of presenting synchronous series of events in Bk. 4. The question, therefore, may here be postponed, whether there was in fact any strategic or politic relation between the expedition into Europe and the expedition into Libya, and whether Herodotus is right in his notion that the bournes of the one and of the other were virtually identical, a universal Persian empire. Nor need the question here be raised whether the story of the Libyan expedition is largely and conspicuously prejudiced and pragmatic in itself. Its pragmatic purpose, in the work of Herodotus, the literary intention with which the Libyan Ῥᾳδηί are introduced in this place, is what has here been the point of the argument. They are in their nature somewhat of an episode, and a breach of continuity, whatever their historical value may be. But still, judged by the hypothesis of their introduction, and considered in the light of analogies suggested by the structure of the first volume and of the last volume, they are far from justifying the practice, or the view, which isolates the fourth Book from the fifth and sixth Books, ignores the essential continuity of the narrative throughout, and thus destroys the artistic balance and congruity of the whole work. As will appear subsequently the Libyan Ῥᾳδηί have, indeed, a remarkable and special function in the lesser unity of the fourth Book taken by itself; but although the fourth Book gains here a strong characteristic, its organic relation to the fifth Book is not thereby destroyed; and though the analogy above suggested, between the second Book or Egyptian Ῥᾳδηί and the Libyan Ῥᾳδηί in the fourth Book, is capable of further elaboration, and may be in part a result of some community in the originēs for Egypt and for Libya, the Libyan Ῥadiens are less of a breach, both in bulk and in character, in the unity and continuity of Bks. 4, 5, 6, than the second Book is in the unity of Bks. 1, 2, 3. However the matter be looked at, the perception will probably deepen and grow that the three middle Books, if not so conspicuously and transparently a whole within the whole as Bks. 7, 8, 9, are yet more of such a minor whole than the first three Books, the unity of which, from the author's point of view, can hardly be gainsaid; nor is this unity and continuity

1 The defence of Thermopylae (7. 202-205) and the naval engagements off Artemision (8. 1-21).
invaldated either by the recognition of the distinct and individual structure of each of the three Books in question here (as likewise of the six here passed over), or by the discovery of the multitude of subordinate members, or tributaries, which go to make up each of the numerous acts, or series of acts, descriptions or narratives, which have been incorporated by the author in this volume of his text.

§ 10. To display in detail the individual structure of the fourth, fifth and sixth Books, and to emphasise the remarkably diverse and heterogeneous elements, or materials, of which this volume of the text is composed, or conglomerated, is the function of a subsequent analysis. The unity of structure which underlies and pervades the extraordinarily complex material of these Books having been provisionally indicated, it will be next in order to characterise this second volume, or section, of the whole work in comparison with the other two, already described in general terms. For this purpose the four canons or tests, previously employed, the conditions, namely, of place, time, subject, and truth may be re-applied. In other words, we are to consider the geographical and chronological framework, or antecedents of the story, or stories, involved; the national or political interests and points of view implied in the narrative, and its general character or quality as history, or true story. In regard to these canons, speaking generally, the character of the fourth, fifth and sixth Books, viewed as a whole, is ambiguous, and not so clearly defined as the characters of either of the other two groups of Books. The middle Books are in fact intermediate and transitional in character. They present a dissolving view, or a series, nay, a large amphitheatre, of dissolving views. They partake of the characteristics of each of the extreme groups, and in a manner combine them. The 'barbarian' interest in the middle Books is more extreme than in the first three Books, for the second triad deals largely with the outer and utter barbarians; yet the Hellenic interest is more special and intense than in the more exclusively Hellenic Books (7-9), for the second triad deals largely with the inner history of the Greek states, and their relations to one another, irrespective of the non-Hellenic interests. Here too, still speaking generally, the fourth Book may seem to lean towards the 'barbarian' interest in Bks. 1, 2, 3. The main story is still told, as it were, from the non-
Hellenic standpoint, and nominally, to a large extent, from non-Hellenic sources; while the sixth Book, containing, as it does, the record of Marathon, may seem to lean towards the latter Books, which pile the fuller records of Thermopylae, Salamis and Plataea upon the scantier story of the first Athenian achievement. Meanwhile, the fifth Book, the centre of this group, and of the whole work, focusses the Hellenic interest twice over: first in the anti-medism of the story of the Ionian Revolt, and, secondly, in the positive and centripetal tendency of its great passages of pure Spartan and Athenian history.

§ 11. Apart from these passages the Books may be said to carry on the story of the advance of the Persian power; its approximation to the great centres of Hellenism; its absorption of Hellenic colonies; its gains at the expense of barbarous Europe; its reconquest of rebel Ionia; its spread over the Aegean; its assault on Attica.

The geographical conditions presupposed in this theme are remarkable as compared with those presented in the preceding Books. Speaking generally, the scene is transferred from non-Hellenic to Hellenic soil, and in the fifth and sixth Books the geographical assumptions are similar to those in Bks. 7, 8, 9, especially Bks. 8, 9. The actions are laid in familiar regions, the description of which the story-teller may, for the most part, take for granted. With Bk. 4 the case stands differently; here, indeed, as above recognised, we have geography in excelsis, but the fact has been sufficiently discounted, and must not be allowed to destroy the hardly-won recognition of the continuity of the fourth and fifth Books, but should rather be employed to emphasise the special character of this volume, into which, apparently, the author has thrown many a thing for which he found no lodging elsewhere. The geographical overweight is, in fact, but a further evidence of the composite character, the transitional purpose, of this part of the finished work. That character is not less conspicuous when the chronological scale of the narrative is considered. In this, his middle passage, the historian is out of the dim illimitable vistas and labyrinths of Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Lydian, Median, Persian history; but the chronological scale is not yet reduced to the narrow and exact proportions which obtain in the last three Books. The continuous and advancing narrative but carries us, as above shown, over a period of thirty years at most;
the retrospects take us, however, much farther back towards the beginnings of things. Not to treat the literary introduction, on the origin of the Scythians, over seriously, the passages on the Hellenic states present early conditions of Sparta and of Athens to view; something more than a glimpse is given into the colonial diffusion of the Hellenes into the age of the Tyrants; the ever-growing communion and union of Hellenic stocks and states are shadowed forth through the centuries. Still, even in these matters it is at most with generations, or with centuries, that the narrator deals, in contrast with the millenial conditions of the historic perspectives in the first three Books, and in distinction from the brief and all but contemporary vision of events presented in the three last Books.

1 4. 145-149; 6. 52 ff.
2 6. 187 ff.
3 On the Euxine (4. 8, 18, 76 ff., 95, 103, 108; 6. 33); Hellespont (4. 14, 85, 95, 144; 5. 1, 65, 94; 6. 34-39); the West (4. 15, 99, 152; 5. 9, 43-47, 124; 6. 17, 22-24); Libya (4. 150 ff., 179, 197; 5. 42); to say nothing of Kypros (5. 113), or of the Asinean at large.
4 In Corinth, 5. 92; Sikyon, 5. 67; Kyrene, 4. 159 ff.; Athens, 5. 55 ff.; Ionia and Hellespont, 4. 138, etc.; 5. 37, etc.; Kypros, 5. 104, 113; Italy and Sicily, 5. 44 ff.; 6. 23 ff., etc.
5 Cp. the celebrated text, 8. 144 το Ελληνικόν έκε ηκά, with the illustrations afforded by this volume, e.g. consanguinity (δεσμόων) in Sparta, 4. 145-149; 5. 72; 6. 53 ff.; in Kyrene, 4. 161. Ionia φιλίας in Sikyon and Athens, 5. 86 f., etc. Language and literature (λογισμοῦ), 6. 119 (τω γραμματείᾳ γλώσσῃ), 6. 138 (γλώσσαν της Ἀττικῆς); 4. 155; 6. 98; 8. 87 (γράμματα Ελληνικά); 5. 57 f. (γράμματα Ἰωικά), 6. 27 (γράμματα διδασκαλίας); for the literature see §§ 16, 20 infra. Religion (θεῶν θεουμάτα το κοινό καὶ θριαία), in Delos, 4. 33 ff.; 6. 97; Delphi, 4. 150 ff.; 5. 92; 6. 19, 77, etc.; Olympia, 5. 71; 6. 103; 5. 22, 70. Hellenic deities (θεῶν ὁλόκληρων), 5. 92, 93, 49. Hero-worship, 5. 47, 115; 6. 38. Common culture and customs (οἰκείων θεουμάτων), 4. 77, 78, 95, 108; 5. 42, 58, 67 f.; 6. 27, 43, 86, 137, etc. See, further, notes on the list of Agraiota's suitors, 6. 127; the use of the term Ἑλλάς, 5. 32, 49; 6. 106, 138. The very interest in barbarian states and tribes, including the uncivilised, implies the growing consciousness of a common Hellenism. Excommunications (6. 67, 72, 88; 6. 38) are less to the point in this connexion than the growth of 'great friendships,' as between Kyrene and Thera (4. 152), Chalkis and Samos, Eretria and Milotis (5. 99), Milotis and Sybaris (6. 21), etc. In estimating such passages it is important to consider how far the highly stimulated patriotism of the Persian wars may have reacted on the records of the earlier period (cp. § 17 infra); but even after all due allowance has been made, there remains a substantial contrast between the tone and effect of the last three Books and the three middle Books in the work of Herodotus; the later achievement and spirit have not by any means wholly destroyed the perspective of a developing Hellenism.
6 In 6. 98 Herodotus appears to draw a distinction between the period beginning with Dareios and the twenty generations preceding. See note ad l.
Concerning the historic quality, credibility, or truth, of the matters in these Books it is harder to frame any general proposition that can be of use. The truth (as distinct from the honesty) of the *Histories* of Herodotus cannot be adequately measured from volume to volume, nor even from Book to Book; every story, every sentence must be separately weighed. Still, with this *caveat* entered, and looking at the question in the broadest way, it may fairly be expected that the three middle Books will hardly be found to report the objective series of events in a manner so full, coherent, credible and authoritative as that of the last three Books; while, on the other hand, it may be expected that the historic truth will be found less involved in myth, legend, fiction and error than in Bks. 1, 2, 3. More than this admission cannot be extorted from a critical observer, nor will such an one ever relax his vigilance over any page of this author without disaster, for there is no page on which fact and fiction—if so crude a distinction may be admitted for the sake of argument—are not to be found lying side by side, or indissolubly interpenetrated, mutually affected, not as oil and vinegar, but as water and wine. And, when the fourth, fifth and sixth Books of Herodotus are critically studied, they are found to contain facts solid and objective as those preserved in any other Books, or passages, of the work (or in any other work), and fictions romantic, droll, purposeful and pragmatic, as comedies of Aristophanes, *fables* of Aesop, *orations* of Perikles, or *oracles* of Bakia.

§ 12. The argument as given so far is sufficient to show that in truth the main narrative in the three Books here under discussion is a continuous and united whole, if less obviously, yet hardly less essentially, than the continuous narrative in Bks. 1, 2, 3 (or rather Bks. 1 and 3) on the one hand, or Bks. 7, 8, 9 on the other. This chronological unity must be conceded in regard to the simple and obvious story, which may be said briefly to comprise the invasions of Europe, the Ionian revolt, the Marathonian campaign. Considerations above urged tend to show that, even if the narrative be complicated by the introduction of digressions and retrospects

---

1 *e.g.* 6. 125.
2 *e.g.* 4. 182 f.
3 *e.g.* 4. 118 f.; 5. 49; 6. 109.
4 4. 178; 5. 43. Notably romantic elements may be found in the story of Phronime, 4. 154; of Dorieus, 5. 42-48; of Demaratos, 6. 61, 62, 67, and others.
on Spartan and Athenian affairs, the main stream hardly recurs to a point before that marked by the opening of Bk. 4, and in so far as earlier dates are reached (in relation to the main stream of events), they are not reached at the expense of Herodotus’ ordinary methods of composition, or in such a way as to take the fifth Book, or the fifth and sixth Books, out of organic relation to the fourth. If, on the one hand, the advance of the Persian power be conceived as the main subject of the continuous narrative in these Books, it is abundantly clear that the organic connexion between the fourth and fifth Books is as close and strong as that between the fifth and sixth. If, on the other hand, the parallel or synchronous evolution of affairs in the Greek states, in particular Sparta and Athens, be conceived as only second in importance from the structural point of view, it must still be conceded that no sufficient case can be made out for detaching the fifth and sixth Books from the fourth; on the contrary, to do so is to exhibit and propagate a wholly inadequate understanding of the literary structure of the work of Herodotus, and to destroy the elaborate and classical harmony of its parts. Moreover, it is observable that the main stream and structure of the narrative in the fourth Book sets towards the coming two Books, and breaks with the preceding. The story of the expedition of Dareios into Scythia is told less as an adjunct or sequel to the history of the first years of his reign in Bk. 3, than as the first stage in the great movement which culminates thrice: first, in the Scythian expedition, again in the Ionian revolt, its suppression and sequel, and again in the Marathonian campaign.1

After this summary of the argument in favour of the unity and detachment, within the work of Herodotus, of the fourth, fifth and sixth Books, taken together, it is next in order to present the results of analysis applied to the Books individually; such a process being essential to any critical discovery of the sources, composition and credibility of the many and various materials brought together, and more or less completely fused into an artistic whole, by the genius of this prince of old Ionian researchers,2 greatest of the Logographers.3 The exercise is, of course, confined

1 Oversight of this important point may have led Blakesley, and others, to discard the reading ἄνδρος Δαρείου in 4. 1. See note ad l.
3 Or ‘Logopoioi,’ Arrian, Anab. 3. 30. 8.
to the volume here reprinted. The Analyses, which follow, aim at representing the materials collected in these Books from several points of view. The literary structure of each Book is exhibited in such a way as to bear witness at once to the skill of the author in composing his work, and to the appreciative intelligence of the scholar, who marked the three existing divisions. Passages, which contain the record of events for the period proper to the chronological scheme of these Books (519-489 B.C.), are re-grouped, within the table for each Book, in sequences which exhibit the author's contribution to the history of those three decades. Passages, which from the point of view of that chronology are digressions and out of the scheme, are brought into juxtaposition under provisional titles. Special emphasis is laid upon the detachment of passages primarily geographical, or ethnographical, as also of passages which present legendary, mythical, or otherwise unhistorical materials. It has not been considered necessary to reprint in immediate sequence, and without regard to the division of the Books, these various groups of sub-divisions and references: any one who uses these tables of contents will be able, without much trouble, to recompose their elements or items so as to obtain from them the contexts in which the main narrative is presented, and likewise those in which digressions of various kinds are to be found. To pursue the classification of the traditions, preserved by Herodotus, into still further ramifications, without regard to evidence from other sources, whether literary or monumental, would be to foster exaggerated ideas respecting the exclusive authority of the Herodotean work. The primary purpose of these Analyses is fulfilled, if they serve to elucidate the problems of the sources and composition of this portion of the text. But one class of notices or memoranda, those concerned with events and objects later than the fall of Miltiades (489 B.C.), is of such supreme importance for the determination of those very problems, that the analytical tables of contents are to be followed by a special discussion of all that class of memoranda, as found scattered through this triad of Books. The elucidation of these notices leads naturally to a consideration of the part played by afterthought in these records of the past, and the actual historic value, or values, of the various elements displayed by analysis. Somewhere in the course of the argument the personal equation of the author, and his relation to the events he records, and the objects
he describes, must be approximately stated and discussed. The chief gain from this methodical analysis is, perhaps, realised when we perceive an infinity of values in the work of Herodotus, and a critical absurdity in any single or general proposition regarding the whole, based upon the prevalent character of this or that part, or section of a part. The curve of credibility drawn by the higher criticism of these *Histories* moves from horizon to zenith; the degree appropriate to each of the author’s stories, or statements, is a distinct and individual problem.

Book 4

§ 13. The fourth Book falls clearly, like the first, second, ninth, and perhaps the seventh, into two main parts, the division being not merely involved in the difference of subject matter, but clearly and formally marked by the author himself. The first part comprises cc. 1-144, and may be denominated, for the sake of brevity, the Scythian *Logi*; the second comprises the remainder of the Book, cc. 145-205, and is apparently by Herodotus himself named the Libyan *Logi*.1 Two or three considerations may have prohibited the erection of these two parts into separate ‘Books’: (1) The second part is hardly of sufficient bulk to form a separate Book, yet from the nature of the subject matter defies incorporation with the next succeeding passages, which now form the beginning of Bk. 5. (2) The second *ex hypothesi* contains a record of events synchronous with the main course of events recorded in the first part. (3) A curiously exact parallelism, more pronounced than in any other of the Herodotean Books, may have been detected underlying the literary structure of the two parts. For, without much violence, each of the two main parts falls into three sub-divisions or elements: I. An historical, or legendary, retrospect or introduction (προδιήγησις).2 II. An excursus, or series of digressions on lands and peoples in question, in other words, a geographical and ethnographical element. III. The direct historical narratives, in the one case, of the invasion of Europe, in the other, of the invasion of Libya, *ex hypothesi* synchronous, even if independent. The following Analysis employs these observations:—

1 2. 161.  
2 Ср. νροδηγηγησις 4. 145.
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Bk. 4. A. The Scythian Logi, or the story of the expedition of Dareios, and cognate matters, cc. 1-144.

I. Introductory retrospecta.
   i. Causa belli, c. 1.
   ii. Previous history of the Scyths, cc. 2-13.
      1. The Scyths and their slaves, cc. 2-4.
      2. Origin of the Scyths: various accounts.
         a. Native legend, cc. 5-7.
         b. Local Greek legend, cc. 8-10.
         c. Combined Graeco-barbarian legend, cc. 11 f.
         d. The version of Aristeas, c. 13.
            (Notes on Aristeas, cc. 14-16.)
            (Cp. Notes on Anacharsis, cc. 76 f. Skyles, cc. 78-80. Salmoxia, cc. 95 f.)

   [iii. Story of the Amazons, and their wedding with the Scyths, or, the origin of the Sauromatae, cc. 110-117.]

II. Geographical and ethnographical excursus.
   i. Geography: (a) descriptive, (b) physical.
      2. The Pontos and adjacent seas, cc. (46), 85, 86.
      3. The rivers of Scythia, cc. 47-57.
      b. Physical geography; notes on climate, fauna and flora, et sim., cc. 28-31, 58, et passim.

   ii. Ethnography (local and anthropological).
      1. Various tribes and nations, cc. 17-27, viz.:
         b. Beyond Scythia, cc. 21-27.
      2. The Scyths, cc. (17-20), (46), 59-75 (-82).
      3. Thracians, cc. (89-92), 93-96 (cp. 5. 3-8).
      4. Tribes bordering on Scythia, cc. 103-109, (110-117).

   iii. Various notes, digressions, et sim.
      1. Legends of the Hyperboreans, cc. 32-35.
      2. Story of Anacharsis, cc. 76-77.
      4. Numbers and marvels, cc. 81, 82, et passim.

III. The story of the expedition of Dareios in person against the Scyths (cc. 1, 83-98, 102, 118-144).

   (1. Causa belli, c. 1.)
   2. The march from Susa to the Istros, cc. 83-98.
      i. In Asia, cc. 83, 84.
      ii. At the Bosporos, cc. 85-89.
      iii. In Thrace, cc. 90-98.
   3. The Kings (of Europe) in council, c. 102.
   4. The Scythish campaign, cc. 118-144.
      i. From Istros to Oaros, cc. 118-123.
      ii. From the Oaros to the Agathyrsi, cc. 124, 125.
      iii. The fighting in Scythia, cc. 126-134.
      iv. The flight of Dareios, cc. 135-142, (143).

Pause or Colophon.—Two anecdotes of Megabazes, cc. 143, 144.
B. The Libyan Logi, or the story of the great expedition into Libya, and
cognate matters, cc. 145-205.

I. Introductory retrospect.
   i. Story of the colonisation of Thera from Lakedaimon, cc. 145-149.
   ii. Story of the colonisation of Kyrene from Thera, cc. 150-158.
   iii. History of the Hellenes in Libya down to the death of
        Arkesilas III, and the application of Pheretima to Aryandes,
        cc. 159-167.

II. Geographical and ethnographical excursus.
   i. The coast, and ‘nomadic’ tribes from Egypt to lake Tritonis,
      cc. 168-180.
   ii. The Desert, Oases, and their six tribes, cc. 181-185.
   iii. Manners and customs of the ‘nomad’ Libyans, cc. 186-190.
   iv. Libya west of Tritonis, cc. 191-196.
      Notes on the zoology, ethnology, climate, etc., of Libya, cc.
      191, 197-199.

III. Story of the Persian expedition in Libya, cc. 200-205.
   i. The siege and capture of Barke, cc. 200-202.
   ii. The deliverance of Kyrene, cc. 203 f.
   iii. The divine judgment on Pheretima, c. 205.

The preceding Analysis is enough to show the extreme
artificiality patent in the composition of the fourth Book. This
artificiality could not be disguised by divorcing the two strictly
parallel structures now combined under one number. It may
be taken to support the hypothesis that these parts of the work,
and the whole volume or section into which they are incorporated,
were designed as a connecting link between the extreme members
of the larger trinity, into which the whole work of Herodotus, as
above shown, naturally divides. The indications of place, and to
some extent those of time, to be collected subsequently from this
Book (see § 16 infra), tend to show that the author was in con-
tact with western sources before this Book assumed its present
form. The Analysis itself suggests a considerable number and
diversity in the sources here laid under contribution. It is,
indeed, on the face of things unlikely that matters so disparate
as the histories and geographies here presented side by side had
previously been brought into juxtaposition or intimacy. The
story of the Scythian expedition is one thing; the geography and
ethnography of Scythia another. The description of Libya is out
of all proportion to the story of the Persian mission to recover
Barke. It may be doubted whether the stories of the early
colonial adventurers, and the early history of the Greeks in Libya,
stood in any connexion with the story of the Persian mission,
until Herodotus put those as a preface to this. It is possible that the expedition against the Scyths and the expedition into Libya may have been mentioned together in a Greek source before Herodotus; it is probable that the geography of Scythia and the geography of Libya had been described in more than one work previously. But the literary scheme and rationale of the Scythian and Libyan *Logi*, together with an infinity of details, are almost certainly due to the idiosyncrasy of Herodotus. For the further evaluation of the contents of this extraordinary Book the reader is referred to the concluding sections of this Introduction, to the notes on the text, and to the appendices, in which the problems immediately connected with it are discussed.

**Book 5**

§ 14. The main lines of literary structure in the fifth Book are less clear than those in the fourth, and are certainly not laid down on the same highly-artificial plan. From one point of view the Book is divided between a narrative of events which carries on the general course of the Herodotean argument from the point reached in the fourth Book, and a narrative, or set of narratives, recounting the history of the leading Greek states, speaking roughly, in the period covered by the Persian history in the third and fourth Books, and a part of the fifth. If these two elements in the fifth Book be separately envisaged, the matter may be distributed as follows, neglecting for the immediate purpose some other major and minor digressions:

A. The connected chronological narrative of the continued advance of the arms and power of Persia, until checked by the Ionian revolt, together with an account of the origin and early course of this reactionary movement (cc. 1-38, 49-51, 97-126).

B. A dual excursus, inserted into the main structure of the narrative, and breaking it up, as just above shown, into three stages: the first digression (cc. 39-48) dealing with Sparta, or rather with two Spartan stories (a. the story of the accession of Kleomenes, cc. 39-41; b. the story of the adventures of Dorieus, cc. 42-48); the second digression (cc. 55-96) on a much larger and more complex scale, dealing with Athens, or rather, stringing together a number of stories, the main current of which is an important contribution to the history of Sparta, during the period,
broken in turn by a number of digressions within the digression, which demand further analysis. Provisionally, however, and in the first instance the structure of the Book may be exhibited as falling into five divisions, or stages:

I. The advance of the Persians continued, and the immediate cause or occasion of the Ionian revolt, cc. 1-38.
II. Digression on Spartan affairs, cc. 39-48.
III. Aristogoras in Sparta, cc. 49-51 (-54).
IV. Digression on Athenian affairs, cc. 55-96.
V. The alliance of Athens with the Ionians, and the conduct of the revolt, down to the flight of Aristogoras, cc. 97-128.

From this tabulated statement it is obvious that the three parts or divisions of the Book numbered I, III., V. make up a record of events ex hypothesi in time successive, in causation more or less closely connected: while parts II. and IV. contain respectively two records of two series of events (neglecting digressions), more or less strictly synchronous with each other, and with the main course of the continuous narrative in the preceding Books.¹ But this five-fold sub-division of the fifth Book is so far from exhibiting adequately the extreme complexity of its structure that it may well be supplemented from a second point of view. There follows, accordingly, an Analysis in which the two main elements in the Book are treated severally, and each sub-divided into the smaller parts or sections which seem naturally to suggest themselves, without any attempt to carry the process of analysis to a point where the wood might become invisible, by reason of the trees.

A. The connected or continuous narrative.
   a. The continued advance of the Persian empire.
      i. The reduction of Thrace, cc. 1, 2, 12-15.
      ii. The surrender of Macedon: or, the story of the young men in women's apparel, cc. 17-21.
      iii. The incorporation of the Propontine states and islands in N. Aegaean, cc. 26, 27.

   β. The Ionian revolt.
      i. The immediate cause and antecedents.
      1. The affair of Naxos, cc. 28-38.
      2. Aristogoras in Sparta, cc. 49-51.

¹ With this arrangement may be three of continuous narrative (cc. 1-38, compared the structure of Bk. 3, as we have it, which consists of five parts, 61-97, 118-160), and two great excursus (39-60, 98-117), dividing the narrative.
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3. Aristogoras in Athens, c. 97.
4. The return of the Palionians, c. 98.
   ii. Outbreak and conduct of the Ionian revolt down to the flight of Aristogoras, cc. 99-123.
   iii. The defection and end of Aristogoras, cc. 124-126.


It will be observed that the three sections into which the first main division of the continuous narrative is sub-divided are not continuous in the text. They are in fact separated by a number of small digressions, or notes; and in the first of these subdivisions, dealing with Thrace, the historical narrative is further interrupted in such a way as may be most easily exhibited in the following table:

A. a. Continued advance of the Persian empire.
   i. The reduction of Thrace, cc. 1-27.
      a². The Perinthians, and others, cc. 1, 2.
      (πῶσον πόλιν καὶ πῶς ἵθος τῶν ταύτης νικημένων, c. 2.)
      b¹. Ethnographical excursus, cc. 3-10.
      1. Thrace and the Thracians, cc. 3-8.
      2. Country beyond Istros, cc. 9-10.
   a². The sea-coast (N. of Aegean), c. 10.
      (τὸ παραπλακόπτα, c. 10 ad f.)
      b². Digression on Dareios at Sardes, cc. 11-13.
      1. The tyrants’ rewards, c. 11.
      2. Story of the Pasionian bèle, cc. 12, 13.
      [3. The mission of the spies, 3. 135-138.]¹
   a². Pasion, cc. 14, 15.
      b². Digression on the Lake-dwellings, c. 16.
   ii. The surrender of Macedon, and the story of the young men in women’s apparel, cc. 17-21.
   Excursus, or notes, on
      1. The Hellenic descent of the kings of Macedon, c. 22.
      2. Dareios at Sardes, cc. 23-25 (anecdotes of Megabazos, c. 23, Otanes, c. 25).
   iii. Incorporation of the Propontine states, etc., by Otanes, son of Phar-\n      aspas, cc. 26-27.

Passing on to the second division of the continuous narrative (β. the Ionian revolt), a pause, or fresh start, is obviously marked

¹ The story of Demokedes, S. 129-138, may, as Duncker (Hist. of Antiquity, E. T. vol. vi. p. 270 n.) suggests, belong chronologically to this place, and might have come in here, or below, cc. 23-25. It might, however, pace Duncker, be placed at Dareios’ first coming to Sardes: the king gets him rather too easily from Susa to the Bosporos, 4. 85.
by the author himself at the opening of c. 28, \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \ \delta \varepsilon \ \kappa \tau \lambda \). The short aside on the previous history of Miletos (c. 29), which immediately follows, is treated in the Analyses above as a \textit{quantité négligeable}; but it might be marked as a digression, and the main narrative resumed in c. 30. The story of Naxos and the immediate results of the failure there is told continuously (cc. 30-38), and the next two stages in the continuous narrative (Aristagoras in Sparta, cc. 49-51; Aristagoras in Athens, c. 97) are separated as clearly as possible from what precedes, and from each other, by the two notable digressions on Sparta (cc. 39-48), and on Athens (cc. 55-96), to be further considered below. At first sight the division and titulature of the remainder of the Book, and of the continuous story of the Ionian revolt, from the appearance of Aristagoras in Athens down to his defection and death, might be left unbroken; but the subdivisions, above given, seem so strongly marked in the literary structure of the Book, that, quite apart from their practical convenience, they can hardly be ignored. What is here exhibited is, indeed, not more but less than may be deemed essential. A fuller analysis is desirable from two points of view. It is as necessary to a discussion of the actual course of events, as to a discovery of the sources. But these two points being considered elsewhere, the broad titles of the above Analysis may be taken as sufficiently displaying the bare literary anatomy of the direct narrative in this Book. The two considerable digressions (B. and II., IV. pp. xxxiii f. \textit{supra}) on Spartan and on Athenian history, require, however, further analysis in this place. Of the two the first, on Sparta (cc. 39-48), is much the simpler, and is in fact in itself an utterly inadequate sketch of Spartan history during the period \textit{ex hypothesi} under review. In consequence it fails to supply any sufficient reason for the policy of Sparta in the crisis here actually reached by the main narrative. In this respect the excursus compares unfavourably with the greater excursus on Spartan affairs, more than a generation earlier, in Bk. 1, 65 ff. The passage here under review substitutes for the history of the state biographical anecdotes of its kings. This substitution may be in part an homage to the personality of Kleomenes, the greatest figure in Spartan tradition since the era of Lykurgos; but it may also in part be due to the discreet silence in which the Spartans wrapt their political and military actions, at least when
those actions were little to their credit. It is fortunate, and in many ways significant, that the shortcomings of this brief sketch of Spartan affairs are, to some extent, made good by Herodotus himself in the context. Some knowledge of Spartan action and policy during the last two decades of the sixth century, previous to the application of Aristogoras in 499 B.C., may be recovered from the second and larger excursus, ostensibly on Athenian affairs, supplemented by other digressional passages in these Books, such as the story of the Argive war,\(^1\) of the Plataean alliance,\(^2\) not to speak of the earlier application of Maiandrios recorded elsewhere.\(^3\) But all these references are beside the question here immediately considered, viz. the literary anatomy of the fifth Book. From this point of view the express digression on Spartan affairs resolves itself simply into two sections:—

II. Digression on Spartan affairs, cc. 39-48.
   i. The story of the succession of Kleomenes, cc. 39-41.

The material or historical aspects of these stories are more fully discussed in the notes and appendices, and need not here be anticipated.

Separated from the anecdotal or biographical traditions, which do duty for Spartan history in this Book, first by a section of the continuous narrative (III. Aristogoras in Sparta, cc. 49-51), and secondly by a geographical appendix (on the king’s highway from Sardes to Susa, cc. 52-54), comes the larger and more considerable excursus on Athenian affairs (cc. 55-96), which is in itself compacted of various elements, direct narrative and digression, covers or illustrates a great variety of subjects, and calls for minute analysis. The direct narrative in this passage consists of a sketch of Athenian history from the year 515/14 B.C. to the year 500/499 B.C., or thereabouts; in other words, from the date of the arrival of Dareios at Sardes, for the ‘Scythian’ expedition (4. 1), to the date of the arrival of Aristogoras at Athens (5. 97). But this sketch is complicated by a number of minor digressions, or inserted notes, to an extent which almost defies clear analysis. Nevertheless, in the following tables the attempt is made to exhibit the structure of this portion of the

\(^1\) 6. 76-84. \(^2\) 6. 108. \(^3\) 3. 148.
Book, without prejudice to the problem, how such an admirable disorder may have originated.

IV. Digression on Athenian affairs, cc. 55-96.
   i. Main story, or series of stories (515-499 B.C.).
      1. The dream and death of Hipparchos (514 B.C.), cc. 55-56.
      3. History of the Athenians from the date of their liberation to the coming of Aristagoras (neglecting digressions), 510-499 B.C., cc. 66-96.

The first and second sections of this main narrative are plainly separated by the digressions on the Gephyreans, and Phoenicians in Boeotia, cc. 57-61. The second and third sections are plainly differentiated by the pause, or title, introduced by the author in the words ἄντε μὲν κτλ. c. 65 ad fin. So far the analysis is plain sailing. But the third section of the main narrative is traversed and shattered by a variety of sub-sections digressions, asides and what not, constituting an almost desperate chaos of pieces, the pattern of which is well-nigh inextricably confused. At one point, indeed (c. 92), an oracle is needed to decide whether the passage with which we have to deal is an article in the main narrative, or a digression in the form of such an article; while at other points (c. 9; cc. 89, 90; cc. 94, 95) main narrative and digression alternate with bewildering rapidity. We have a very Proteus in hand, but it is necessary to retain a firm hold of this body of dissolving episodes, if the secrets of its composition and origin, credibility and authority, are even to be adequately stated and discussed. With that prospect in view the following table may be submitted, as a fairly sufficient Analysis of the literary structure of the passage here immediately in question.

   (1) a. The constitution of Kleisthenes, c. 66.
       b. Digression on Kleisthenes of Sikyon, cc. 67, 68.
   (2) a. Attempts of Sparta and other states, including Aigina, to overthrow Athens, cc. 69-81.
       b. Digression: origin of feud between Athens and Aigina, cc. 82-88.
   (3) a. Project for restoring Hippias, and its failure. His retirement to Sigeion, cc. 89-94.
       b. Digression: how Sigeion came into the possession of Hippias, cc. 94 f.
   (4) The medium of Hippias, and the quarrel between Athens and the Persians, c. 96.
Even this Analysis of the passage, elaborate as it may appear, insufficiency exhibits the full complexity of the construction. Two sub-divisions in particular require further elucidation, those numbered (2) α and (3) α respectively. Further Analyses are therefore here subjoined.

(2) α. Attempts of Sparta, etc., to overthrow Athens, cc. 69-81.
   i. Appeal to Sparta against the democracy; expulsion of the ‘accursed’ legislator, cc. 69, 70.
   \textit{Note.}—Origin of the curse: the Kylonian ἄγος, c. 71.
   ii. The interference of Kleomenes, and his discomfiture: appeal of Athens to Persia, cc. 72, 73.
   iii. The great invasion of Attica by Kleomenes and its collapse, cc. 74-76.
   \textit{Note.}—On the Dorian invasions of Attica, c. 76.
   iv. Victory of the Athenians over Boeotians and Chalkia. The anathema and epigram, c. 77.
   \textit{Note.}—On the excellence of democracy, c. 78.
   v. Alliance of Thebes and Aigina against Athens, and hostilities, cc. 79-81.

\textit{Exкурsus.} (2) b supra, with

\textit{Notes} 1. On the adoption of Ionic dress in Attica,
   2. On certain customs in Argos and Aigina, c. 88.

(3) α. Projected restoration of Hippias, etc., cc. 89-94.
   i. Reprisals of Athens on Aigina, c. 89.
   ii. Alarm of Sparta, c. 90.
   iii. Congress of allies at Sparta, cc. 91-93.
      a. Project of restoring Hippias, c. 91.
      b. Opposition of Corinth, based upon memories of the Tyrants of Corinth, c. 92.
         a. Story of Kypselos and his salvation.
         β. Stories of Periander.
            1. The advice of Thraexbulos.
            2. The ghost of Melissa.
      c. Failure of the project, c. 93.

In regard to the somewhat confused elements which make up the whole section denominated here 3 (α) it is elsewhere argued that cc. 81-89 probably involve some anachronism,\(^1\) and it is obvious that the speech put into the mouth of Sokles (c. 92), which is a colossal \textit{ignoratio elench} and in itself also obviously inconsequent, from a more general point of view must be regarded as a valuable contribution to the conventional legend of the \textit{Tyrannis}, current in the author’s day. On the legitimate inferences to be drawn from the passage, and the context, as to the sources, and the date of composition, or collection of materials,

\(^1\) Op. \textit{note ad l.}, and Appendix VIII.
by the historian, it would here be premature to enlarge. But it is difficult for an attentive reader to apply the method of pure literary analysis to the text of Herodotus, in this important excursus, without detecting the presence of many valuable clues and suggestions for the statement of those problems respecting sources and composition, upon the solution of which the historical authority of the work, line by line, in the plain sense of the terms, must largely depend.

Book 6

§ 15. The literary structure of the sixth Book is almost indescribably complicated. At times the narrative might seem to have little more unity than a batch of anecdotes, the memorial stream of events to break into a shower of spray. The unity of Herodotus' work, as a whole, the inner unity of the second of the three greater sections, or volumes, into which it may best be divided, seem to be here in jeopardy. For something more than a moment or two the unities of action and of interest are all but lost in a maze of cross purposes, a mass of details, a confusion of memoranda. For this result the nature of the historian's subject in the stage here reached is in part responsible. The sixth Book brings him and us, as it were, in due course face to face with the Hellenic aggregate, whose turn to do and suffer at the hands of the Persians is come. In the progress of ecumenical history the moment arrives for the Persian to assault the liberties of Hellas, and this Book records the results of the first encounter. But, in attacking the Greeks, Dareios was not opposing a single and united system, political and military: he was invading a nebulous infinity of autonomous states. This fact, once a source of strength and of weakness to the Greeks, in war and in peace, must ever be a source of difficulty and confusion to historians of Greece. That the Greeks formed not a single sovran state, but a host of independent political communities, made it very difficult for Dareios to conquer them, and for us, as for Herodotus, to relate their fortunes, and misfortunes, in a coherent story. So long as the course of pre-Hellenic antiquity could be depicted as a succession of great monarchies or empires, the last of which, the Persian, gave unity to the civilised Asiatic world, and looked at one time almost capable
of comprehending the whole Mediterranean basin in one political scheme, the unity and continuity of the story could be substantially preserved. But at the point where, from the nature of the case (or from the nature of the evidences), the system of ancient civilisation resolves itself into a number of co-ordinate states, the unity of action and interest, necessary for successful literary treatment, disappears, until the empire of the Romans for a while restores it. It can of course be replaced in the meanwhile, to a greater or less extent, by various devices, more or less corresponding to the reality of things. For the actual history of the Greek states may be substituted an abstract scheme of typical forms or stages of social and political development, more or less true of each state generally: but that is not history. Or a unity may be imparted to the treatment of Greek history by elevating one or other Greek state into leading or representative prominence, and making a history of the many a function of the history of that one. There is much, doubtless, in the condition of the literary sources which has encouraged these devices; but scientific history protests against them, as inadequate and misleading in view of the objective order of events, and even in presence of the accumulating evidences, of one kind and another. Or, again, a transcendental unity is communicable to Greek history, when it becomes, for a time, the record of a struggle between a league of Greek states, relatively a Pan-hellenic union, and a single non-Hellenic power. But every such union was partial and brief: partial, for the forces of Hellenism were divided, scattered, pre-occupied, and opposed; a brief, two or three years, three or four battles exhausting the genuine unity of the action. In short, the treatment of Greek history must alternate between a bundle of monographs and a philosophic abstraction; for “only the state has a history,” and Hellas was never a state. The genius of Herodotus seized the opportunity afforded by the traditions of the great Armada for the historical treatment of an ecumenical episode, which exhibited the highest instance of Pan-hellenism

---

1 This view, however, of oriental history is dissolving in the light of fuller knowledge. Cp. Ed. Meyer, Greek d. Alcitho. I. § 516.

2 Even the defence of Hellas did not unite Hellas. See especially Hdt. 7. 145-174.

3 Thuc. 1. 25: των δὲ προτερον εγραμεν μεγατων εκραύγη το Μαθασιν, και τοιον δωμ διων παιμαχιας και πειθομαχιας ταχεια την κρατιν δελε.

4 Cp. τω μεγαρω σταθε, Thuc. 1. 18, 2.
on record, and lent itself to literary treatment in the common interest, almost as though it had been the achievement of a single state. To have complicated the story of the last invasion by any adequate review of the antecedents and acts of the Greek states severally, might have ruined all unity in the work. His art or a happy accident saved Herodotus from any such blunder. Still less could such a review have found adequate expression in the first volume of his work without destroying the unity proper to the history of the barbarian civilisations, which is certainly the predominant interest of those Books. But in the course of the intervening Books, and particularly in the course of Bk. 6, opportunities arise, nay, a necessity is laid on the historian, of sketching the antecedents and characteristics of the several Greek states opposed to the Persian and attacked by him. The multiplication of these opportunities, the growth of this necessity, till a sort of climax is reached in the sixth Book, are not hard to explain, on objective grounds, connected with the general scheme of the work, and with the natural or primary sources of the narrative. As the Persian power becomes more and more deeply implicated with Hellas, the Greeks not forming a single state or power, but a number of states and powers, many more or less independent lines of action have to be brought together and focussed, so to speak, on the Greek side, in order that the action may be coherent and memorable. Moreover, this complexity is increased by the relations of the Greek states to each other at the time, or in the immediate past; as well as by the necessity, or at least the opportunity, of introducing matter to illustrate the special character or antecedents of particular city-states. Thus, although as above indicated, a substantial and a chronological continuity underlies the three Books (4, 5, 6), the general stream of Persian history being carried onwards systematically from the invasion of Europe to the battle of Marathon, yet there is an immense increase in the amount of Hellenic matter, in the materials for Greek history, supplied by Herodotus in these three Books, and a strongly-marked change in the tone and character of his narrative and the standpoint from which the tale is told. These characteristics reach their highest intensity in the sixth Book, and render the analysis of this Book specially difficult. The main narrative does, indeed, continue after a fashion, but it
is compounded of very disparate elements; it loses almost every pretense or appearance of sustained or intrinsic authority, and becomes now a mere string of unrelated adventures, now a bald chronicle of annalistic jottings; it is buried for a time and encom-passed by masses of purely episodic matter, which have little or nothing to say to the Persian and his doings; it emerges at last into fuller view, in the story of the Marathonian campaign, only to disappear again, as if down a *katavoikha*, under a final pile of Athenian anecdotes and self-interested memories. In short, the digressional element in this Book is more conspicuous than the element of direct narrative, and stands in a variety of relations thereto. There are digressions involved in the direct narrative, or at least fairly introduced as explanatory of the relations of the Greek states to Persia.\(^1\) There are digressions, the object of which is to explain the relations of Greek states to each other.\(^2\) There are digressions in which the internal affairs of Greek states are treated on their own merits;\(^3\) and there are purely anecdotal items, or at least stories, for the introduction of which it is hard to find any excuse, except the all-sufficient one that they are far too good to be omitted.\(^4\) This classification may not be exhaustive, and its members are certainly not rigidly exclusive. The first two classes of excursus are obviously and generally more closely related to the main narrative than the two last classes, but it is not always easy to draw hard and fast lines between them, or to say into which class a particular passage should be inserted; nor is it always easy to draw the line between the main narrative and the excursus in this Book.\(^5\) The general effect is to make the literary or structural analysis extremely difficult, and a satisfactory or convincing scheme hardly attainable. It is, however, reasonable to maintain the distinction between the continuous narrative and digressional or excursional matter, as far as possible; although it may have to be admitted that even the consequent or advancing narrative

---

\(^1\) Perhaps the digression on the Athenian occupation of the Chersonese, cc. 34–39, or the passages on the medium of Aigina and the Spartan interference, cc. 48–50, 61, 73, may be regarded as specially connected with the continuous theme, the advance of Persia.

\(^2\) e.g. 6. 108 (Athens and Plataea).

\(^3\) e.g. cc. 50–60, on the privileges of the kings of Sparta.

\(^4\) e.g. c. 86, story of Glaukos; c. 125, Alkmone’s wealth.

\(^5\) e.g. the story of Paros (cc. 132–135), on which see further, pp. xlii., l. f.
is made up of very disparate elements, while the excursus are heterogeneous in the extreme.

A. The direct, or continuous narrative in Bk. 6, even if not quite so conspicuously tripartite as in Bk. 5, still falls without much straining into three sub-divisions. The first concludes the story or stories of the Ionian revolt (cc. 1-32); the last contains the story or stories of the Marathonian campaign, or expedition of Datis (cc. 94-120). The structure of each of these two passages is, however, very imperfectly displayed by the bald references just given, and it is desirable to pursue the analysis farther. The process is not, however, plain sailing. In the case of the sixth Book more than in the case of any other single Book in the work of Herodotus, the major sub-divisions, and still more the minor, may have to be drawn with some appearance of free-will, and the results will lie open to contentious alternatives. For example, the first sub-division above given (cc. 1-32, end of the Ionian revolt) is obviously exposed to more than one objection. It may be urged that it includes matter (the adventures of the exiled Dionysios in the west, c. 17; adventures of exiled Samians in the west, cc. 21-25), which hardly belong to the history of the Ionian revolt, and certainly suggest a difference in origin or source. Again, it may be urged that the break or point of sub-division is not correctly placed at the end of c. 32. Chronologically, it might be argued, c. 31 begins a new narrative, and this apparent chronological break coincides likewise with the literary structure of the work, the fate of Histiaios (cc. 26-30) serving as a finale to the story of the revolt, even as the fate of Aristagoras has properly served as a finale to Bk. 5. In regard to the last section of the connected narrative in the Book a similar objection may be taken. It must, indeed, be conceded that the story of the Marathonian campaign flows on in almost unbroken continuity from c. 94 to c. 120, inclusive, the only digression (on the origin of the Plataean alliance, c. 108) being at once short and pointed. But a difficulty arises in regard to the sequel. The story of the Parian expedition (cc. 132-136) may be regarded as carrying the connected and chronologically continuous narrative one stage farther on; if so regarded, it spoils the symmetry of the tripartition above. To deal with these objections in reverse order: the story of the Parian expedition appears in the text of Herodotus not as a section of the general story, but
rather as an excursus or a sequel to the story of Marathon. It is not so much the story of an expedition to Paros as the story of the divinely ordained fate of Miltiades. Its object is less historical than ethical. Herodotus himself shows little or no sense of its political or military significance. In short, structurally the story is not a contribution to the chronological and continually advancing narrative which runs through these Books, but one of a number of heterogeneous appendices, tacked on to the story of Marathon, forming a rather complicated finale to the sixth Book, and emphasising all the more effectively the pause or breach between the second and third volumes of the work. These observations justify us in maintaining the tripartition of the continuous narrative in the sixth Book, which is accordingly here subsequently observed in the tables.

Bk. 6. Continuation of the main narrative.

A. I. The intrigues and end of Histiaeos and the suppression of the Ionic revolt, cc. 1-32.

i. The intrigues of Histiaeos in Ionia, cc. 1-5.

ii. The battle of Lade, cc. 6-16, a note on Dionysios, c. 17.

iii. The capture of Miletos, cc. 18-21, including a note on the Sybarites and on the Μιλήσιου δαμασκην, c. 21.

iv. The fortunes of the exiled Samians, cc. 22-25.

v. The last adventures of Histiaeos, cc. 26-30, with a note on Divine Providence, c. 27.

vi. The recovery of Chios, Lesbos, Tenedos, and the punishment of the rebels, cc. 31, 32, with a note on the σαρκοφάγος, c. 31.

In regard to the first section of the Book (cc. 1-32) it must be admitted that cc. 17, 22-25, relate matters not immediately proper to the story of the Ionian revolt, whether from a chronological or from a constructive point of view. But on the other hand the matters are so short and slight in themselves, and so directly related to the story, that it is hardly worth while to mark them by distinct numbers in the table, even if so doing we might emphasise their probably foreign origin. The first question here must be as to the conception of the author himself; he plainly regards these passages as parts of the narrative in place, or at the worst as mere parenthases. So much may, indeed, be admitted, even while we refuse to shatter the continuity of the text or story in this section: that these manifest asides, or parentheses, serve to betray the composite character of the narrative of the Ionian revolt as a whole, and help to explain the chronological inconse-
quence, or incompleteness, which is elsewhere the subject of special examination in this volume.¹ The last remark has some bearing upon the chief objection to the limits assigned in the literary analysis of this Book to the first part, and the break between Parts I. and II. For where exactly does the story of the Ionic revolt end, and the next part begin? It must be admitted that chronologically the point fixed by c. 32 is unfortunate in two directions. On the one hand, as elsewhere demonstrated, a later point of time is reached in cc. 28-30 than in c. 32. On the other hand, c. 31 opens with a clearly marked principium divisionis in the indication of a date, and this principle is so well maintained in the sequel that it forces itself into our literary analysis of the Book as the constitutive principle for the composition or recognition of the second part of the direct narrative; how, then, can the break between the first and second parts be placed in c. 32 and not in c. 30? Simply because it seems impossible to overlook the structural significance of the sentence which concludes c. 32 and sums up the three conquests of Ionia. It may further be observed that a new point of departure is gained in c. 33 by the change of scene from Ionia to the Hellespont. At the same time the inconsequence or anomaly in the analysis of the Book here admitted is not without its further value. What is clear in the main narrative of the Book is the story of the Ionic revolt and the story of the Marathonian campaign. What is not so clear is the matter intervening between the two. That matter is partly, indeed, conspicuous digression; but in part it belongs to the continuous or advancing chronicle. So much of it as belongs to the continuous chronicle forms the direct connecting link between the story of the Ionic revolt and the story of Marathon. This link is, however, itself anything but simple or easily determined. Its delimitation must, however, be attempted before the further contents of the connected narrative in this Book can be profitably exhibited in a tabulated form.

The chief characteristic of the portion or portions of the sixth Book, which serve to connect the story of the Ionian revolt with the story of the Marathonian campaign, is that they are presented in strict annalistic form, and with a chronological severity,

¹ See Appendix V.
wholly remote from the method of the antecedent Books, and not fully recovered ¹ even in the story of the great invasion, as told in Bks. 7, 8, 9. We seem, in this passage, to have passed from the historical methods of Herodotus to the historical methods of Thucydides. The events are assigned strictly to their proper years. The years are apparently campaigning or war years; and even the distinctions of season are not wholly wanting.² On this wise the annals of three years which separate the suppression of the Ionian revolt from the expedition of Datis and Artaphernes are systematically given in this Book. In the case of the first two years the method is clear. The annals of the first year (493-2 B.C.) are indeed broken or interrupted by a digression (cc. 34-40, on the Athenian acquisition of the Thracian Chersonese), but the digression is so obvious as not to obscure the chronological sequence, and the acts of the year are given in cc. 31-33, 41, 42. The annals of the second year (492-1 B.C.) are continuously and concisely given in cc. 43-45. The annals of the third year (491-0 B.C.) are in various ways more problematic. Down to a certain point, indeed, they proceed with consistency (cc. 46-51). But then and there the narrative becomes involved and confused with digressional matter, and matter anachronistic, to an almost desperate extent. An attempt to re-establish the true sequence of events is made elsewhere³; here it is sufficient to remark that Herodotus places in a confused and tentative fashion previous to Marathon—as is shown clearly by the transition from c. 93 to c. 94—a good many events which must have occurred after that epoch. With these provisions and observations the following table may be taken as fairly representing the Analysis of the second part of the connected narrative in the sixth Book.

Bk. 6. Continuous narrative.
A. II. Matter connecting the history concluded in c. 32, with the history resumed in c. 94.
1. Annals of the year 493-2 B.C., cc. 31-42.
   i. Complete reduction of Ionia, cc. 31, 32.
   ii. Recovery of the Hellespont, c. 33.
   iii. Escape of Miltiades; capture of Metiochoe, c. 41.
   iv. The ordinances of Artaphernes, c. 42.

¹ This observation is made on the Books as they stand, without prejudice to the order of their composition originally.
² ἐν χρονολογία c. 31; τῷ ἐποχή c. 43.
³ See Appendix VI.
   The work of Mardonios.
   i. Democracies in Ionia, c. 43.
   ii. Naval and military operations in Europe, cc. 44, 45.
3. Annals of the year 491-0 B.C., cc. 46-51 + z (or cc. 46-93, minus
   digressions).
   i. Reduction of Thasos, cc. 46, 47.
   ii. Mission of the Heralds, cc. 48, 49.
   iii. Medism of Aigina, cc. 50-51.
      Appeal of Athens to Sparta, cc. 51, 61, 65 f.
      Intervention of Sparta, cc. 73, (85-86).
      (iv. Subsequent hostilities between Athens and Aigina, cc. 87-93.)
   ' (Annals of the year 490 B.C. Expedition of Datis and Artaphernes, c. 94 ff.)

Here may conveniently follow at once the Analysis of
A. III. The expedition of Datis; stories of Marathon; or chronicles of 490
B.C., cc. 94-120, (-124).

In this passage the narrative as a whole is continuous, and the
sub-divisions, which naturally suggest themselves, turn rather on
the objective course of events, and upon changes of scene in the
action, than upon the character or structure of the narrative
itself. From both points of view the record of the actual battle
of Marathon (cc. 110-116) stands up as the most important
and substantial block of the story or commentary: before and
after it the passages are apparently more composite, the structure
most disputable. Small digressions occur at three points: (1) a
note on the Delian earthquake, c. 98; (2) a longer note, on the
antecedents of Miltiades and his Strategia, cc. 103, 104; (3) a
very important note on the origin of the Atheno-Plataean alliance,
c. 108. If these digressions in the narrative proper were to be
taken as determining its structure, the following analysis might
serve as sufficient:

i. (cc. 94-98, Ἀλόλας). Story of the expedition down to the visit to Delos.
   Note on the unique earthquake, c. 98.
ii. (cc. 99-103, Ἑν Μιλτιάδης). Story of the expedition down to the meeting
   at Marathon.
   Note on the antecedents, etc., of Miltiades, cc. 103, 104.
iii. (cc. 105-108, παρόντος). Preparations for battle. Note on the Plataean
   alliance, c. 108.

The above table is, however, far from exhibiting the variety of
the matters included in the passage as a whole, and it may be doubted whether in this case the short digressions or notes should be taken as the fixed points even for the literary analysis. It seems well to supplement an imperfect and disputable Analysis by a fuller one, based upon sub-divisions, into which the story naturally falls, when account is taken of the course of action and events as here recorded.

Bk. 6. Direct narrative continued.
A. III. The Marathonian campaign, cc. 94-124.
   i. The commission of Datis and Artaphernes, c. 94.
   ii. From Kilikia to Samos, c. 95.
   iii. From Samos to Naxos, cc. 95, 96.
   iv. Delos; with a note on the earthquake, cc. 97, 98.
   v. From Delos to Karystos. Persian conquest of the Kyklades, c. 99.
   vi. Siege and capture of Eretria, cc. 100, 101.
   vii. The landing in Attica (Hippias), c. 102.
   viii. The Athenian defence. Note on Miltiades, cc. 103, 104.
   x. The dream of Hippias, c. 107.
   xi. The coming of the Platæans. Origin of the alliance, c. 108.
   xii. The Athenian council of war, c. 109.
   xiv. Losses, c. 117.
   xv. Wonders, c. 117.
   xvi. The dream of Datis: the Delian statue, c. 118.
   xvii. Fate of the Eretrian captives, c. 119.
   xviii. The arrival of the Spartans, c. 120.
   xix. Problem of the shield; defence of the Alkmaionidae, cc. 121-124.

The above Analysis, in some nineteen articles or numbers, exhibits at once the action and the story, as they appear in the pages of Herodotus; and probably may suggest, when traced in the text, directions in which observations must be sought for the elucidation of the problems of source and authority. Even such an Analysis cannot but be somewhat arbitrary and incomplete; and in particular the passage on the actual battle (cc. 110-116), and its immediate sequel, may seem too summarily disposed of. But in the structure of the Book, and of this sub-division of the main narrative, the description of the actual battle emerges in unmistakable contour. Moreover, the problems connected with it and the immediate context are hereafter discussed with no lack of minuteness.1

1 Appendix X.
Here, therefore, further discussion of this topic may be postponed; nor can the problem of the authenticity of the text, containing the defence of the Alkmaionids, be raised within the limits of this Introduction.¹

B. It remains to consider, in further detail, the excursus, digressions, asides, notes or similar elements, which remain in the sixth Book, after the three organic sections or stages of the main narrative have been detached. It has, however, already been observed that the elements of direct continuous narrative and of digressional interest are almost inextricably combined in this Book. This conflation is especially obvious and especially perplexing in two sections or possible sections of the Book, viz., that dealing with the annals of the triennium (say, cc. 31 (33)-93), and that dealing with the sequel to Marathon (say, cc. 121 (125)-140). In the other two sections of the Book, which would exist on this hypothesis, viz., the end of the Ionian revolt (cc. 1-32) and the Marathonian campaign (cc. 94-120), the digressions or notes are comparatively short and easily enumerated. As whatever may be the most acceptable arrangement for the exhibition of the fundamental literary structure of this labyrinthine Book, these two passages must in any case be recognised as substantial items or entities in the Analysis, it may be worth while here to recapitulate the short digressions which they contain.

I. The end of the Ionian revolt, cc. 1-32, with short digressions, notes, or parenthetical remarks upon—
   a. The adventures of Dionysios, c. 17.
   β. The capture of Zankle by the Samians, cc. 23 f.
   γ. The divine warnings to Chios, c. 27.

II. The Marathon campaign, cc. 94-120, with digressions, etc., upon—
   a. The earthquakes of Delos, c. 98.
   β. The antecedents of Miltiades, cc. 103 f.
   γ. The Athenian cult of Pan, c. 105 ad fin.
   δ. The Atheno-Plataean alliance, c. 108.
   ε. Losses, etc., c. 117.

But this table leaves two other passages (II. Annals of the Triennium, cc. 33-93; IV. Sequel to Marathon, cc. 118 (121)-140) unanalysed. The second passage, indeed, may seem to offer less difficulty, though it is not easy to decide where exactly it begins, any one of the following chapters 117, 118, 121.

¹ See notes ad l.
125 being possible points of departure. Taking c. 125 as perhaps the least unsatisfactory, the finale of the Book resolves itself into a series of appendices as follows:—

3. The Athenian occupation of Lemnos, cc. 137-140.

But the long and important section, cc. 33-93, remains and defies analysis, the continuous narrative being represented by cc. 33, 41-(46, 48)-51, 61 ad init., 73, the remainder (cc. 34-40, (47), 52-72, 74-93) being devoted to digressions, in which it is almost impossible to maintain chronological order, and not easy throughout even to distinguish between what is Spartan and what is Athenian history. In regard to the chief passage (cc. 52-93), it is, indeed, clear that it begins by being purely Spartan history, and ends by being Athenian or Aigineto-Athenian history, but where the one passes into the other it is not easy to determine. The turning point seems to lie in the record of the appeal of Aigina to Sparta, c. 85, with the visit of Leotychides to Athens, and his reputed speech to the Athenians, c. 86. Speaking roughly, the matter and stories are mainly Spartan from c. 52 to c. 86, and mainly Athenian from c. 87 to c. 93.

Bk. 6. B. Analysis of the Excursus or Digressions, esp. cc. 51-93 (cc. 34-40, on the Philaidae, break the annals of 493 B.C.)

Digressions on the affairs of Sparta and Athens.

i. Story of the origin of the dual kingship, c. 52.

ii. Excursus on the privileges (γενεα) of the Spartan kings, cc. 55-58.
   Note.—On non-Hellenic analogies to Spartan institutions, cc. 59, 60.

[A short passage of the continuous narrative, c. 61 ad init.]

iii. Story of the birth of Demaratos, cc. 61-64.

iv. Story of the deposition of Demaratos, cc. 65, 66.

(This story belongs ex hypothesi to the chronicle of the year 491-0 B.C., i.e. the direct narrative. It also contains a retrospective note on the origin of the feud between Demaratos and Leotychides.)

v. Story of the exile of Demaratos, cc. 67-70.

(This story might seem to belong, in Herodotus' conception, to the chronicle of the year before Marathon: but this may be anachronistic. The story includes a λογος which goes back ex hypothesi to events 30-50 years earlier.)
vi. The accession of Leotychides, with notes, cc. 71, 72,
1. On Archidamos,
2. On the disgrace and death of Leotychides.
[The intervention of Kleomenes and Leotychides in Aigina is a
reurrence to the main narrative of the events of 491-0 B.C.,
c. 73.]
vii. The exile, restoration and awful death of Kleomenes, with various
theories to account for his fate, cc. 74-84;
including an inset: Story of the Argive war, cc. 76-82,
with a note: On the servile régime at Argos, and its over-
throw, c. 83.
viii. The appeal of Aigina to Sparta; Leotychides at Athens. His
speech (the story of Glaucos), cc. 85, 86.
ix. Renewal of hostilities between Athens and Aigina, cc. 87-93.

The chronology, or the anachronisms, of this passage, or
series of passages, need not here be discussed; suffice it to say that
with the exception of the obvious notes in cc. 71, 72, 83 we are
not justified in concluding that Herodotus reckons any of the
events recorded in this context as having occurred subsequently
to Marathon. On the contrary, the only fair inference from his
arrangement of the facts, or traditions, is that he conceives them
all as belonging to a date before Marathon. This conception is,
however, almost demonstrably erroneous.¹ The observations upon
which this judgment is based, and indeed the point now reached
in this expository Analysis, suggest the elucidation, in the next
place, of those express notices of post-Marathonian affairs which
occur in these Books. The detection of such notices will prepare
the way for the recognition of those anachronisms and after-
thoughts, which, if they diminish or obscure the historic value of
the work in one direction, serve to heighten its interest and
evidential value in another.

§ 16. The passages, excursus, sentences or notes in the fourth,
fifth, and sixth Books, which assert or imply post-Marathonian
dates, are not all of one kind. It is convenient to distinguish the
principal classes into which such notices fall:

I. A chronological difference is given and implied by every
passage of an autobiographical kind, for obviously the author
throughout his main narrative is writing of matters which are
remote from his own day. He is not a contemporary authority
for the things which form the bulk and the raison d'être of
his work. There is a difference between the times about

¹ See Appendices VI., VII., VIII.
which he is writing, and the times in which he is writing. Explicit references to his own times, \(^1\) his own experiences, \(^2\) occur throughout the Books, independently of the many passages in which a personal observation, an autobiographical reference, is latent and problematic. \(^3\) Even passages expressing a personal opinion or view are of similar significance in this connexion. \(^4\)

To determine the exact dates involved in these particular references is one of the last and most abstruse attempts of constructive criticism. In the final resort these passages contain the most important evidences for the solution of the problems of the time and place, or times and places, of the composition of the work, as a whole, or in its several parts. The dates given or implied in such passages are not, of course, the same, except so far as the author's age or lifetime be regarded as a single period or epoch. An expression of opinion by the author carries us down to the actual moment of composition. \(^5\) A statement of an actual personal experience implies a precise day and hour in his lifetime, if only it could be ascertained. \(^6\) Other references may be less precise, and suggest some chronological margin within the limits of the author's lifetime. \(^7\) But no such passage can be pushed back so as to overcome the chronological interval everywhere implied between the author's present and the past, about which he is writing. There is not, however, in the whole of these three Books any autobiographical passage which serves to determine with any precision the extent of that interval, or even to what generation the author belongs. \(^8\) There is, in short, no exact parallel to such passages as occur in the first \(^7\) and in the last \(^8\) volume of the work; nor even any clear proof that the author

---

\(^1\) In the formulae ἐν καὶ ἐν τῷ, καὶ πῶς ἐστι, ἐν καὶ ἐν ἔμε, μέχρι ἐμέ, εἰς σύμ., and, indeed, all verbs in the present, other than the strictly 'historic' present (γράφει γράμματα, 5. 14).

\(^2\) 4. 14; 5. 59.

\(^3\) Cp. § 21 infra.

\(^4\) ἐμοὶ μὲν αὐτοῦ παρέχεται, τῷ μᾶλλον λέγεται ἀστίν προσέρχεσθαι, τάδε σίθα, διότι εἰμι, εἰς σύμ. passim. See further § 22 infra. Still more, expressions of intention: e.g. 4. 81 ὅπως δήλωσον: 89 ἰδραμένας ὅτε ἐν τῷ καὶ ἀρχαὶ εἰς λέξεων λέγον (cp. 5. 82), εἰς σύμ.

\(^5\) 4. 124 τὸν ἐν ὑμὶ ἐν τῷ ἐφικτῆς σῶς ἁπέ: 6. 42 αὐτ. φόρου κατὰ χόρον διακεφαλέως ἔχετε ἐν τούτῳ τού χόρου αὐτ. ἐν καὶ ἐν μέν ἐν τάχθησαι ἐξ Ἀριστερᾶς.

\(^6\) Even the interview with Tymnes, 4. 76, and his connexion with Ariaephtes, Skyes and Sitalkes is inconclusive. An exception might be claimed for the "240 years after the second disappearance of Aristean," 4. 15. But cp. note ad l.

\(^7\) 5. 55.

\(^8\) 9. 16.
had conversed with the Marathononomachae.\textsuperscript{1} Other classes of passages or references to post-Marathonian events make it plain that he might have done so; the absence of any clear evidence that he did is therefore all the more remarkable. The chronological hiatus suggests an important gap in the sources or tradition.\textsuperscript{2}

II. A second group of references to the author’s own days, as distinguished from the times about which he is writing, is created by the numerous notices of the sources from which he is professionally drawing. It is but seldom that a reference to a source, or authority for the writer’s statements, is made otherwise than in the present tense. Where the reference is made in the past tense, either the case will clearly fall under the class of passages above noticed (I.),\textsuperscript{3} or the author is quoting a previous written authority,\textsuperscript{4} or the passage gives rise to a further problem.\textsuperscript{5} As a rule, indeed, Herodotus cites his sources in the present tense;\textsuperscript{6} his living authorities are his own contemporaries and not the actors or contemporaries of the events which he records; or if dead, they are still speaking. This practice of citing in the present must not, indeed, be made the basis of a narrow inference: it is artificial, literary, unscientific, or inexact. At most it brings the author within his own experience into more or less direct relation with a living tradition, or with an authority \textit{ex hypothesi} verifiable at the time of writing. The phraseology of Herodotus incidentally confirms this impression, which would stand even without confirmation; for he does not draw substantial distinction between the λόγος he has heard at some time or other, and the λόγος he is writing down,\textsuperscript{7} nor between the moment of inquiry and the moment of composition or record.\textsuperscript{8} The fundamental distinction which remains intact throughout is the chronological

\begin{itemize}
\item[$\textsuperscript{1}$] 6. 117 is, if anything, against it.
\item[$\textsuperscript{2}$] See further, § 20 infra.
\item[$\textsuperscript{3}$] 4. 16, 76, 77, 81.
\item[$\textsuperscript{4}$] 4. 13 ἐφι : 16 ἐφι, Ἐλευς : 6. 137
\item[$\textsuperscript{5}$] Ἐλευς.
\item[$\textsuperscript{6}$] Ἐλευς 4. 81 ; 6. 98.
\item[$\textsuperscript{7}$] Ἐλευς 4. 5, 8, 13, 14, 15, 35, 38, 105, 150, 154, 165, 173, 184, 187, 195, 196 ; 5. 10, 22, 44, 49, 57, 85, 86, 87 ; 6. 52, 54, 134, 137 ; λέγεται 4. 4. 46, 184, 194, 195 ; 5. 87 ; 6. 54 ; ἄρα λέγεται 4. 11, 179
\item[$\textsuperscript{8}$] (λέγομενοι) ; λέγεται 4. 26, 184, 191 ; 5. 113 ; 6. 14 ; λεγόμενα 6. 53 ; et al. λέγοντες 4. 27.
\end{itemize}
interval separating the author's own date, whether of investigation or of composition, from the dates of the events, which form the principal material of his narrative. But the exact determination of that interval is not ascertainable from his notices of the sources from which this portion of the work is derived.

III. A third class of references to the author's Present, or of passages which involve dates subsequent to the battle of Marathon (or to the Parian expedition), may conveniently be made out of a large number or mass of statements referring to existing objects, whether natural or artificial, or existing institutions and customs, or even the present state of nations, tribes, and cities.

From the nature of the case this class includes a prodigious amount of matters, but all with the common quality that they were ex hypothesi observable, verifiable by the historian himself and his contemporaries. Not, indeed, all equally verifiable; and so various and separable are the matters to be included in this class, that it is expedient to sub-divide it. One sub-division may contain the geographical and ethnographical passages which form a considerable feature in the literary Analyses of these Books. These passages contain, indeed, theory as well as fact, and errors as well as accurate knowledge; but this criticism does not affect their classification in the present connexion. The historical element in them is very small, from the author's point of view. He does not conceive himself as having to record changes in geographical fact, or events in the physical history of the earth.1 In the Books here in question he treats the physical environment and conditions of history as permanent and un-changing. Land and seas, mountains, deserts, rivers and lakes are regarded as always the same, or as not altering sufficiently to make the present-day description of them inapplicable to any previous time. Climate, flora and fauna are similarly regarded.

---

1 The earthquake in Delos, 6. 98, is a portent. The great convulsion of Thera (Santorin) is unknown to Hdt. See note to 4. 147. There are no eclipses recorded in these Books. Dareios' canal, 4. 39, is hardly an exception, much less Neco's, c. 42. The ἀρχαῖα of Herodotos, 4. 82, is more like one, but not important. The origin of geographical names, 4. 45, is not a physical problem. There is nothing like the passage, 2. 11, on the physical history of the Nile Valley. Hdt. does not 'harmonise' his account of the Scythian campaign with his description of the great rivers by the supposition that the rivers have made their appearance since the time of Dareios.
In describing all these matters Herodotus speaks in the present, on the implied hypothesis that in these respects there has been no historical change.

It is, of course, immaterial for the present purpose, whether the Herodotean descriptions are scientific or not. It may, however, be observed, in passing, that we are to go to Herodotus not so much for information in regard to the actual physical history or condition of the globe as for information in regard to the opinions held on the subject by himself, and those whom he represents or reports. Respecting the flora and fauna, something more may be due to Herodotus. His statements in regard to the area covered by the silphium, and in regard to the animals of Libya, deserve attention, even though the silphium has disappeared or degenerated, and the camel, the chief beast of burden in northern Africa, does not figure in his Libya. All, however, that immediately concerns the present argument or classification is the observation that, if Herodotus makes no difference under this head between past and present, describing the facts or features as they existed, or as he believed them to exist, in his own day, it is because he assumes the facts of his present as valid, in this connexion, for the past, and not because his sources of knowledge for the past history or events, of which the places described were the scenes, contained the geographical descriptions, which form the bulk of the digressions.

It is, perhaps, more remarkable that Herodotus should describe the ethnography, institutions, manners and customs of the natives in Scythia, Thrace and Libya with hardly a hint of any historic perspective. He recognises, indeed, some changes or attempted changes arising from the influence of Greek settlements in Scythia, and in Libya, as also the influence of Egypt upon the Libyans, since the historical period has begun; and the movements or disappearance of some tribes recorded may be thought to affect the political geography or the tribal frontiers of these non-Hellenic lands. But it is obvious, for the most part, that the habitations,

---

1 4. 169. But the statement in regard to the olive, 5. 82, is pragmatic, and Hdt. himself evidently suspects it.
2 4. 191, 192.
3 4. 17, the Kallippidae; 78 f., story of Skylas; 108, Hellenism in Gelenos; 109, Iphigeneia in Tauris; (95, Salmoxis the Thracian). It is to be regretted that Hdt. did not sketch the history of the Greek settlements in Scythia, as in Libya.
4 4. 170, 171, 189.
5 4. 163, 180, 186.
6 4. 11, 12, the praec-Scythian popu-
the institutions, manners and customs of the uncivilised barbarians are described as they are, or are supposed to be, in his own time. Virtually the whole of the ethnographical and anthropological passages and notes may be segregated from the materials for past history, and classified, with the geographical excursus and notes, as material for the description of the world in the historian's own time, or in the historian's own mind. The exception here proves the rule: the record of change is the exception. The case is widely different with the notices of Greek states, societies, institutions and laws. Here the historical note is uppermost, and the contrast between the historian's own time and the times he is describing almost everywhere expressed, or obviously to be understood. The constitution of Demonax,\(^1\) the Parian settlement of Miletos,\(^2\) the tyrannies of Ionia,\(^3\) or of Peloponnesos,\(^4\) are all here described as things of the past. Though Kleisthenes counts as the founder, or establisher, of the Athenian democracy,\(^5\) it is indicated that changes have been effected even since his day in Athenian institutions,\(^6\) and what is recorded here of that period (519-489 B.C.) must not be taken as a description of existing institutions. Among Greek states Sparta furnishes an exception. Herodotus does, indeed, record a new departure in Spartan custom, or law,\(^7\) but whatever inferences may be drawn from events as recorded by him, the implied assumption in regard to Sparta is that its customs and institutions are fixed in his own time as from the beginning, and where he goes out of his way to describe them, he treats them as matters of present observation.\(^8\) Thus, embedded in a legend of the prime, is to be found the memorable note on the Spartan practice of executing the death penalty at night.\(^9\) More general notices of Hellenic customs of ancient times, still in force, are involved in the remark on the cult of Stesagoras,\(^10\) in the mention of the common gods,\(^11\) and of the fixed rate of ransom among the Peloponnesians.\(^12\) Historic

\(^{1}\) 4. 161.  \(^{2}\) 5. 29.  \(^{3}\) 4. 138; 5. 33; 6. 43, etc.  \(^{4}\) 5. 67, 92; 6. 120.  \(^{5}\) 5. 69; 6. 131.  \(^{6}\) 6. 109 (ρδ παλαιών); 111 (δ γάρ

\(^{7}\) 5. 75.  \(^{8}\) 6. 59-60.  \(^{9}\) 4. 146 κτείνους δι τούτων δι κτείνους.  \(^{10}\) 6. 38.  \(^{11}\) 5. 49, 92 ad fin.  \(^{12}\) 6. 79, cp. 5. 77.
differences are implied in the remarks on the origin of Greek writing, the changes in dress, the institution of slavery. These contrasts lie outside the limit of the direct narrative in these Books (519-489 B.C.) Speaking generally it may be said that, where no express notice of change occurs, Herodotus may be assumed to hold that Hellenic customs, religious and political, have not undergone appreciable change between the day of Marathon and his own time.

IV. Fourthly, in this class of references may be placed the list of passages in which Herodotus notices monuments, works of art, or similar objects still extant in his own day, though not, as a rule, works of his contemporaries. In some cases explicitly, in others at least implicitly, the notices of such objects contain the note of contrast between ‘now’ and ‘then.’ Among these notices it is hardly necessary to include the names of cities, except, indeed, where Herodotus asserts or implies the rebuilding of this or that city in the interval between the time of which he is writing and the time at which he is writing; as for example Gelone, or Barke, or Sardis, or the Ionian cities generally, and Miletus with its temples in particular, or again Sybaris, or Athens itself. But short of cities, or their walls and buildings as a whole, works of less magnitude are even more in evidence. Thus Herodotus notices expressly as still extant and visible, and therefore verifiable, the tomb of the Kimmerian chiefs, as well as some Kimmerian fortifications in Scythia, perhaps merely earth-works; likewise the remains of the eight forts ascribed to Dareios on the river Oaros. A very explicit passage asserts the existence of a huge bronze bowl at Exampaiaos in Scythia at the moment of writing, and the same passage records a krater set up by Pausanias at

1 5. 58.
2 5. 88, ep. 4. 180.
3 6. 137.
4 The Persian method of netting a population is described in the present (σαγγελιών) à propos of operations belonging to the year 493 B.C., ep. note ad loc.
5 4. 100 (τότε καὶ υἱῶν); 5. 62 (υἱὸν ἐκ τῶν ἔξω); 5. 67 (ἱνα καὶ ἔστιν), etc.
6 4. 108, ep. with 123. But Hdt. seems hardly conscious of this instance.
7 4. 160; 5. 102.
8 6. 32 τὰς πώλιας ἑνεπιμετράσων αὐτοῖς τῶν ἑράσι.
9 6. 18 f.
10 5. 44 f.; 6. 21.
11 5. 77.
12 4. 11 ἔτι ὄνειρον ἔστι ὁ τάφος.
13 4. 12 καὶ νῦν ἔστι μὲν ἐν τῷ Σκεκύρῳ Ἐλευθερία τεῖχεα.
14 4. 124 τῶν ἔτι ἐς ἑμὲ τὰ ἑρείπωμα, ἢ δή.
15 4. 81 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χώρῳ κέεται χαλκοῦ κτλ.
the mouth of the Pontos as an object which any one might still go and see. Other passages, without actually asserting the existence of the objects or monuments named, may be taken to imply so much. The inscribed stelae of Dareios used by the Byzantines for the altar of Artemis, and the one stone left lying by the temple of Dionysos, were surely in existence in the writer's time, though he does not happen to say so explicitly. In regard to the inscription on the Tearos we may the more admire his reserve. It will be generally conceded that it is more probable that there were artificial mounds of stone on the Arteskos, in the territory of the Odrysae, than that it was Dareios who erected them; but the description of the lake-dwellings in Lake Prasias must rank as one of the most valuable contributions made by Herodotus to the description of antiquities extant in his own time, whatever the origin of his knowledge in the matter may have been. Whether the wall across the isthmus of the Thracian Chersonese was in existence in his time Herodotus does not expressly signify. It was a structure with a long and interesting history, and Miltiades was probably not the first and certainly not the last to be busy with it. The bridge over the Bosporos had utterly disappeared long before the historian's time, but who can doubt that the picture and epigram of Mandrokles were still to be seen in the Heraion at Samos, even though Herodotus merely records the historical fact of the offering having been made. More explicit is the notice of the krater adorned with griffins' heads, and supported by three kneeling colossi, offered by Kolaios and his crew, and still to be seen in the Heraion as Herodotus wrote. In the Agora of Samos stands, the historian records, a stele, on which were inscribed the names of those eleven trierarchs who had not betrayed the common cause at Lade, though they may have been afterwards among the treacherous freebooters who seized the fair city of Zankle. At Metapontion, in the Agora, was still standing, the historian notes, a statue of Aristeas side by side with that of Apollo, amid a bower of laurels.
On the Krathis stood the shrine of Athene, dating but from the time of Dorieus, or the Sybarites, in the historian's own time, could not have been appealing to it as evidence against the grants enjoyed by the Iamidæ at Kroton. At Egesta the Heroon of Philip, a man of divine beauty, is in honour. The shrine of fair Helen may still be seen in Therapne above the shrine of Phoibos; the Adrasteion is where it was, in the Agora of Sikyon. The temple of Delphi had been consumed by fire, but it stood in the historian's time as completed by Kleisthenes the Athenian. Hard by, in the Corinthian treasury, was lying a work of art well worth seeing, the censer presented by Erevthon of Kypros. At Thebes there were still to be seen inscribed offerings, which the historian thought might throw some light upon the early history of writing, and help to connect the Greek alphabet with the Phœnician: at Athens separate shrines attested the presence of the Kadmeian strangers, not less surely than the huge heap of refuse in Thasos, the work of early Phœnician explorers.

In regard to the Athens of his own day these books of Herodotus are, indeed, remarkably important. The conflagration in 480 B.C. had made of Athens and of its Akropolis a new city. This great event and its consequences Herodotus takes for granted: the wonder for him is, perhaps, that any remnants or monuments of the older Athens survive. It is not, indeed, clear whether he conceived Marathonian, or Peisistrateid, Athens to have been a walled town, nor has he occasion to notice specifically the Themistoklean walls, unless indeed the description of the burial place of Kimon involve such a reference. The tomb of Anchimolios at Alopeke hard by the Herakleion in Kynosargos, leaves the problem undecided.

---

1 5. 45 ἀποδεικνύωσεν.
2 5. 47 τά καὶ ἐς ἔμε ἐς τέμπον τοῦ Ἀκρόπολις Ἀθηνῶν.
3 6. 61 τοῦ δ᾽ ἔστι ἐς τοῦ Ἡράκλειον καλεομένῃ ἐπίρμοι τοῦ Θηβαίον Ἰροῦ.
4 5. 67 ἡ μάνικα τοῦ ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐστι ἐς τοῦ Ἡράκλειον τοῦ Ἐλέυθερου τοῦ Ἡρακλείου.
5 5. 180 ; 5. 62 τὸν μοῖρο . . τὸν νῦν ἔστα τότε ὡς οἶκον.
6 4. 162 δὴ τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς βουμανθήσαν Ἰαποδήθεντον ἔτη τοῦ Ἡρακλείου ἰερομνῆσθαι.
7 5. 59-61, cp. notes ad l.
8 5. 61 καὶ σφυρά ἔτη ἐκεῖ πλή.
9 6. 47.
10 5. 77.
11 5. 64 ; 6. 103, and Appendix X.
12 See notes, 5. 64 ; 6. 103, and Appendix X.
13 6. 103 καταλεῖπεν δὲ Κιμίων κροὶ τοῦ Ἀθηνῶν πέρα τῆς τῆς Κόρης καλεομένης ὀδός.
14 5. 63 Ἀγγυμαλιοῦ εἰς τοιαύτῃ ἡ τῆς
attention is concentrated by the natural course of the story. The ‘Pelagic wall’ is mentioned as something that requires no explanation,\(^1\) but the grotto of Pan, in which ever since the day of Marathon the Arkadian god has been worshipped year by year, is located under the Akropolis.\(^2\) The temple and statue, mentioned in connexion with the sacrilegious attempt of the Spartan Kleomenes,\(^3\) cannot have been in existence in the historian’s own time, and the temple behind the walls, which still showed traces of the Medici fire, must have been a restoration,\(^4\) like the walls themselves. Herodotus may have seen the fetters in which the Boeotian prisoners had erst been bound,\(^5\) though the notice of them does not fix a date for his sight of them: nor does he seem to have asked himself how these and other monuments had escaped the effects of the Persian invasion: and in particular the Quadrige standing on the left hand immediately as you enter the Propylaea with the epigram (of Simonides) on the base.\(^6\) The importance of this reference can, indeed, hardly be exaggerated. The monument seen by Herodotus is probably a Periklean restoration, perhaps a replica of the older one, but not dating earlier than the Thirty Years’ truce.\(^7\) The Propylaea can hardly be any other than the Periklean Propylaea, finished in the year 433 B.C.\(^8\) Even so, this notice does not supply the latest date recorded or implied in the work of Herodotus, but it fits in with other passages to give precision to the date of the composition, or revision of his work. Finally, in the holy island of Delos are monumental objects, as Herodotus writes, which serve to keep alive or to confirm traditions which he records: the tomb of the Hyperborean maidens Hyperoche and Laodike,\(^9\) the coffin of the maidens Arge

---

\(^1\) Απεικόνισε Αλεπτερός, ὕποκεφαλώτου Πρασιελου τοῦ ἐν Κυνονάγη: cp. 6. 116, a passage which also marks the difference between old and new Athens in respect to the change of arsenals (Φαλάσας, τούτου γὰρ ἐν ἐπίθειον τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων).

\(^2\) 5. 64, but cp. 6. 137.

\(^3\) 6. 105, but cp. p. 73 infra.

\(^4\) 5. 71, 72.

\(^5\) 5. 77. See note ad l.

\(^6\) 7. See notes ad l.

\(^7\) Note ad l.; Curtius, Stadg. v. Athen, 147 ff. On the temenai of Aiasos in the Agora, cp. note to 5. 89 and Appendix VIII, § 3.

\(^8\) 4. 34 τὸ δὲ σημεῖον ἀντέχει τὸ Ἀργείλιον ἐπιλατεὶ ἀρτερὴς χεὶρᾶς, ἐπιτίφικε δὲ οἱ Θαλῆς.
and Opis, who had come to Delos from the same region still earlier; ¹ the great altar, whereon Datis had made a lordly offering,² not many weeks before Marathon.

It is impossible to review this last batch of references without suspecting that the objects recorded or described in them were pregnant with historic associations, and must be taken into account, when the sources from which Herodotus drew his knowledge come to be reckoned up. The same remark applies with even more force to a further batch of references, which might here be brought into view, but may still more conveniently be postponed. Yet, in enumerating the monuments of the past, extant in the time of Herodotus, of which he was cognisant, and made use, while they marked for him a difference between the past and the present, the schedule would be incomplete without notice of the literary documents, tangible and material evidences in their way, which had come down to him from earlier authors. The line between the inscribed stone or metal and the book is a fine one, and it might be a mere accident whether a saying of Simonides were quoted from the one or from the other.³ But economy and convenience dictate here the postponement of the passages illustrating the use made by Herodotus of books, and such written documents. They may be more conveniently considered under the head of his sources.

V. Events ⁴ subsequent to Marathon, and most of them subsequent even to the siege of Sestos in 479-8 B.C.,⁵ are mentioned incidentally in these Books, and serve to determine with some precision the date of their composition or revision. From the date of Marathon to the date of the last of the events, so noticed, is a period of about sixty years. It is not possible to fix each of them to a particular year, or even in all cases to a particular decade, and in no case does the date of the event decide in itself the date of the passage in which it occurs; but as such references are historical, not prophetic, they fix an upward limit, and they tend to fix a lower limit for the collection of materials, and for the actual composition of the work.

¹ 4. 35 ἡ δὲ θηκή αὑτῶν εἰσὶν διασαφεῖ τοῦ Λαστευμονίου, πρὸς ἡ τετραμεθύς, ἀγαθάκων τοῦ Κυλίου Λαστευμονίου. See notes ad ii.
² 6. 97, cp. 4. 35.
³ 5. 102, cp. with 5. 77.
⁴ It seems hardly worth while to specify persons apart from events, as in almost every case the events are acts or associated with persons, in some way.
⁵ 2. 114-121.
The Median war, that is to say, the invasion of 480 B.C., is itself referred to explicitly in more than one passage, and less expressly in some others. And certain passages refer to events which occurred between the dates of Marathon and the invasion of Xerxes. If the Parian expedition belong to the continuous narrative of the sixth Book, yet the notice of the payment of the fine of 50 T. by Kimon must belong to a somewhat later point, though probably in this decade. The exact age of Pericles at his death is unknown, but his mother's dream, or at least his own birth, may fall after Marathon. The establishment of Nikodromos and his fellow-exiles at Sunion appears to be dated by Herodotus after Marathon, even though the conspiracy which resulted in his exile is dated before. The Olympiad of Alexander is not easily determined, but might conceivably fall as late as 488 or 484 B.C. The rebellion of Aryandes can hardly be identified with the revolt of Egypt after Marathon; and therefore, although expressly post-dated in the text, where it occurs, probably belongs to the period within the express termini of these Books, though the mention of the Aryandic silver, still in circulation, brings the event down to the moment of composition. In regard to this group of eventful notices there is not one that can be very precisely dated. About ten or twelve references occur in these Books to occurrences between the Persian and the Peloponnesian wars. In regard to some of these, dealing primarily with Persian affairs, we must be content to date them within the limits of the reign of Xerxes, viz., the mission and end of Sataspes, perhaps the death of Skythes at the Persian court, and even the upbringing of the sons of Metiochos. Still more precisely is it possible to date the suit of Pausanias the Spartan for the hand of an Achaemenid princess, whether the lady was daughter of Xerxes, or of Megabates, while Herodotus himself defines the period for the restoration of the gilded statue to Delion. The accession of Archidamos is involved in the notice of the end of Leotychides, and the passage therefore carries

---

1 5. 77, 102. 2 o.q. 6. 98. 3 6. 136. 4 6. 131. 5 5. 22. See note ad l. 6 4. 166. 7 7. 1. 8 4. 43. Xerxes is named four times in the passage. 9 6. 24 et δ γῆρα μέγα ὀλίκος ἐν ἑδεῖναι ἐν Πέργαμῳ. 10 6. 41. 11 5. 32. About 476 B.C. Cp. note ad l. 12 6. 118 δ' ἐπεφίλησεν. About 470 B.C. 13 6. 71, 72.
us down into the ‘sixties,’ within which decade also fall the destruction of Tiryns. The sack of the Lepreatis can hardly be dated before the close of the third Messenian war, and approaches the middle of the fifth century B.C., a date which Herodotus expressly regards as falling in his own times. The establishment of the Pan-cult on the Akropolis may fall after the Medec war in the days when Kimon, son of Miltiades, was the leading man in Athens, while in the implied expulsion of the Pelasgi from Lemnos and Imbros might lurk a reference to the Athenian kleruchies established by Pericles after the Thirty Years’ truce. The most precise and interesting passages are those that may be more or less plausibly referred to the Peloponnesian war and its immediate circumstances. Of these cases there are at least three in the present Books. The expulsion of the Aiginetans from their island can scarcely be referred to any other event than that recorded by Thucydides, and dated precisely to 431 B.C., a time when ideas connected with sacrilege were in the air. If the Delian earthquake recorded by Herodotus be identified with the one recorded by Thucydides, the same epoch may be reached; and in any case the reference in the passage to the Persian kings, and to the struggles of the Hellenic Koryphaei for supremacy, even though Artaxerxes be not dead, nor the Ten Years’ war already half over when the passage was first writ, still brings us within measurable distance of its outbreak. To the same period has by some scholars been referred the passage recording the fate of Skyles, and the composition effected on the Danube by Oktamasades and Sitalkes. But Sitalkes was an interesting personage some years before the Peloponnesian war, and the historical and chronological requirements would be satisfied even if the extradition of Skyles were dated 12-15 years before the revolt of Potidaea; though, doubtless, elsewhere in Herodotus we have indubitable evidence of the importance of the Thracian king at that precise moment.

§ 17. There remains to be noticed a number of passages, in which events are recorded belonging to dates subsequent to

---

1 6. 83.
2 4. 148 ἐκ’ ἐμὲ.
3 6. 105 καταστάσεως αυτῆς εἰς ἥδη τῶν θρημάτων.
4 5. 27.
5 6. 91 ἔφθασαν ἐκπεπάθεσαν πρῶτον ἐκ τῆς νῆσου ἡ σφί οἷς γενέσθαι τὴν θέων.
6 Thuc. 2. 27.
7 Thuc. 1. 126 ff.
8 6. 98.
9 Thuc. 2. 8. But cp. § 21 infra, ad fin.
10 4. 78-80.
Marathon, though Herodotus has anachronistically ante-dated them. The oracle, which presupposes eight Battiai princes, may be taken to belong to this class,\textsuperscript{1} and with it may rank the oracles foretelling the subjugation of Aigina by Athens,\textsuperscript{2} and the prophecies of Hippias touching the days when Corinth should suffer grievously at the hands of Athens.\textsuperscript{3} The verifications of these oracles all fall well before the middle of the century, for even the last did not wait its fulfilment till the quarrel over Korkyra; but belonging, as they do, to the main texture of the narrative, and having less the air of subsequent additions, they are of especial weight in determining the date of composition; unless, indeed, they are to be regarded as genuine prophecies. A more subtle anachronism may lurk in the figure assigned to the total number of Athenian male citizens at the time of the visit of Aristagoras.\textsuperscript{4} In three other cases Herodotus has apparently dated before Marathon events in Spartan history, which should have been placed thereafter: (1) the flight of Demaratos from Sparta to Asia;\textsuperscript{5} (2) the death of Kleomenes, with its immediate antecedents;\textsuperscript{6} (3) the visit of Leotychides to Athens.\textsuperscript{7} To these must be added (4) the records of the warfare between Aigina and Athens growing immediately out of them.\textsuperscript{8} The occurrence in the latter context of a notice which must be dated to 431 B.C., does not necessarily carry the whole story down to that date; but, in any case, as all these events may be dated to the decade between Marathon (490 B.C.) and Salamis (480 B.C.), ample time is allowed for the distortion of the true sequence and perspective, before the date at which Herodotus compiled the narrative in these Books.

The greatest and the subtlest anachronism of all still remains to be discovered; it is the anachronistic spirit, or tone, which pervades the whole story, or series of stories, forming the continuous narrative of the Persian campaigns, and even the Hellenic record for the years 519-489 B.C. as given in these Books. This tone is traceable in the main to two closely related causes: (1) the tendency to review the memories, the traditions, the whole bequest of that generation in the light of later events, especially in the light of the 'Medic war,' and the final victory of the

\textsuperscript{1} 4. 163.
\textsuperscript{2} 5. 89.
\textsuperscript{3} 5. 93.
\textsuperscript{4} 5. 97.
\textsuperscript{5} 6. 67-70.
\textsuperscript{6} 6. 74, 75.
\textsuperscript{7} 6. 85, 86.
\textsuperscript{8} 6. 87-93. Cp. Appendix VIII.
Greeks; (2) the tendency to impart a moral or quasi-religious meaning to the story, or stories, of the past. Both tendencies combine to substitute afterthoughts for the simple record of facts. In some cases even more immediate interests, of a personal or political kind, may have to be reckoned with. No critical student can cite any story, or even any statement, from these Books, as historic or authoritative, without having satisfied himself whether, and to what extent, the passage betrays the influence of this subtle pragmatism. It is much more obviously present in some cases than in others, and where least apparent is, of course, most detrimental. Every one can see that the story of the Scythian expedition is largely a romance to illustrate a moral; that the sin (διόριος) of Dareios is there pilloried, even as the sin of Kyros, of Kambyses, of Xerxes elsewhere: but it is not always perceived that the story of the defeat of Xerxes is, perhaps, the older story, and even Grote accepted the account of the conduct of the Ionians at the Danube, without inquiring how far it was a fiction framed in the interests of Miltiades, and of Athens. It has not generally been considered to what extent the accounts of the Ionians and their conduct throughout these Books have been affected by later situations and later interests. The unfavourable judgment upon them, put into the mouths of the barbarous Scyth, is not seriously qualified by their subsequent struggle for liberty against Persians and despot; Dareios took their measure; and the story of the revolt, and specially its finale at Lade, exhibit their weakness and incapacity. Whether the ill-will shown to the Ionians is to any extent due to the personal animus of the Dorian writer, who leaves the treatment and behaviour of the Dorian Greeks in Asia out of account throughout this story, is not an unfair question. It is at the expense of Ionians, if at all, that Herodotus betrays a little malice. Otherwise he might have found a better reason for the reforms of Kleisthenes at Athens than the one which he assigns as his own deliberate judgment. It is at the geography of the Ionians that the Dorian laughs, and against his own greatest predecessor, an Ionian statesman and historian, that he seems to

1 4. 142.
2 5. 105. Cr. 2. 1.
3 5. 69 διέλειν μικρι καὶ ἀργος ὑπεράνων ἑνὸς κτλ. : cr. 1. 143 οἰ μὲν κιν ἄλλοι
4 4. 36.
bear a somewhat special grudge. Yet, after all, Herodotus pays Ionia the compliment of writing in Ionic, and of going to Ionic sources for a good deal of his history, which is, moreover, to some extent a not unfriendly history of Ionian states. Even here the discoloration of his narratives is arguably due more to the condition of his sources than to personal bias or ill-will. The conduct of the Ionians on the Danube comes from a tainted and interested source, and in any case the discredit, such as it is, lay primarily with the tyrants, whose political dependence on the Persian it is one of the merits of the story to exhibit. The story of the Ionian revolt looks, in part, like a justification of the Athenian hegemony and empire. The Athenians could insist upon their ‘metropolitan’ relation to the Ionians, when it suited them. Grote, in his politic way, drew a parallel and contrast between the battle of Lade and the battle of Salamis, and pointed the moral, that it justified the subsequent overlordship of Athens; he forgot, however, to ask how far this moral had already been at the making of the story. Of a truth the moral of the three enslavements of Ionia was that the Ionians were incapable of liberty, and had but a choice of masters. This judgment is historically verified; but the particular stories which illustrate it may have been affected in the telling by the foregone conclusion. Moreover, it was difficult to do justice to the almost unaided and all but successful effort of Ionia to emancipate itself from foreign and domestic lords, without seeming to censure the policy and inaction of Athens and of Sparta during the revolt.

The anachronistic spirit, the element of afterthought, are nowhere more conspicuously present than in the story of Marathon.

---

1 5. 36, 195 f.; 6. 137 f. (2. 143). The absence of any clear acknowledgment of the works of Hekataios among his own sources (notwithstanding 2. 129) is not a proper indictment against Herodotus; but the omission of the name of Hekataios in 6. 42 (cp. Diodor. 10. 25) is suspicious.
2 Ironic of one sort was his native language, cp. Hicks, Manual, No. 21. But Hdt.’s style is literary not lapidary.
3 e.g. Samos 6. 14; Miletos 5. 28; Chios 6. 27.
4 ἄλλος γὰρ καταίσχωται, 6. 14.
5 4. 137 f.
6 The story was not given its present state until after the time when the process of converting Ionian allies into subjects had been inaugurated on the principles explained by Thucydides, 1. 99.
7 5. 97 (cp. 8. 105); 6. 21 (στείρες καταλ.).
8 iii. 510, 512 f.
9 6. 32.
In spite of the consciousness that things have changed in Athens since then, even the constitutional position is misconceived, and in other respects there is hardly an element in the later Marathonian legend which is not already present in the story as told by Herodotus. One legitimate conclusion from this observation is in favour of assigning a relatively late date to the compilation of that story. This topic is, however, so fully discussed elsewhere that it is needless to pursue it farther in this place. It is not, however, merely in the three great subjects, which occupy respectively the fourth, fifth and sixth Books of Herodotus, that the influence of late reflection upon the story of the past may be detected supplying elements of moral and literary motive, as in the story of the Scythic campaign; of political bias, as in the accounts of the Ionian revolt and the Ionians generally; of patriotic exultation, as in the story of Marathon; the same influence is to be discovered, here more strongly, there more mildly, in almost every compact and complete story in these Books, whether belonging to the direct narrative, or to one or other of the numerous asides. If the story of Pheretim's revenge suggests a pious moral, the story of the escape of Kyrene from the Persian yoke is a transparent apology for the unpatriotic attitude of that state in the Medes wars. The story of Alexander and the young men in women's apparel lies under similar suspicion. The story of the Naxian expedition can hardly be taken au pied de la lettre. The story of the reception of Aristagoras at Sparta is largely a suppressio veri and a suggestio falsi. The account of the first campaign of Mardonios is plainly coloured by the desire to discredit one of the most brilliant enemies of Hellas. In his account of the Parian expedition Herodotus has almost demonstrably gone out of his way to prefer a less historical version in the interests of a moral theory.

The case is not very different with the stories which have little or nothing to do with the Persian wars. Afterthought of one kind or another has been at the making of them, and has diminished their historical authority. They are not pure traditions or memorials, they are inversions, or perversions, of the facts to an extent varying from case to case. The story of the

---

1 Cp. Appendix X. 4 5. 18-20. 7 6. 43-45.
2 4. 205. 5 5. 32-34. 8 6. 132-135.
3 4. 203. 6 5. 49-51.
Minyae at Sparta inverts the actual facts in the political interests of the existing situation. The stories of the colonisation of Thera and of Kyrene are similarly, if not to the same extent, affected by existing interests. The story of the origin of the dual royalty is manifestly an aetiological fiction. The records of Sparta, in the reign of Kleomenes, form a series of stories, in which the pragmatic or fictitious elements vary from comparative innocence and obscurity in the account of Dorius, to the astounding impositions to be detected in the stories of the Argive war, and of the death of Kleomenes. It is comparatively well with us, when instead of a rationalised history we have good anecdotes, the saving of Kypselos, the advice of Thrasybulos, the necromancy of Periandros, the wealth of Alkmaion, the wedding of Agariste, for in these cases the reader, who could fail to suspect the presence of the 'well-born falsehood,' is capable of accepting the story of the Clever Thief as sober history, and must be left to provide his own canons of historic probability.

§ 18. A very erroneous impression would remain if the detection and exposure of the large element of fiction, of afterthought, the sport of fancy or the more calculated result of local interests, were to be taken as depriving the tales told by Herodotus of substantial historical value, or denying to Herodotus the possession of a critical faculty. The true appreciation of the historical value of the work of Herodotus does not lie simply in the substitution of one point of view for another. Doubtless the damage undergone in depreciating his work regarded as history of a past that was past to him, is compensated to a greater or less extent by the gain which accrues from discovering in it traces, evidences, influences of his own times, which are past to us. But the historical value of the work of Herodotus is very far from exhausted by that consolatory substitution of a history of the author's present for the author's history of the past. It must, of course, be remembered that there is much in the work which professes deals with matter open to the writer's own observation, either actual or potential; all that must rank now as historical, in the first degree, saving so far as exception is taken

---

1 4. 145 ff.  2 6. 76-82.  3 5. 92.  4 6. 126-130.
2 4. 150 ff.  3 6. 74 f.  4 Ibid.  5 6. 135.
2 6. 52.  3 5. 92.  4 6. 125.  11 2. 121.
2 5. 39-45.
successfully, on the score of deliberate and wilful misstatement—
of which in these three Books there is little or none established: or so far as allowance has to be made for scientific error, as in
geographical measurements and so on—in which cases the matter falls into the second degree, and remains valuable as a contribution to the history of science and of literature. But over and above all matters belonging professedly to his own time, or reducible to a value of that kind, the historical value of the work of Herodotus must be sought in the results of two applications of critical method. In the first place, it is but seldom in the work of Herodotus that we are dealing with mere myths, even mere legends, against the utilization of which, for historical purposes, Grote brought a heavy, perhaps an irrefutable, indictment. In the stories told by Herodotus we are dealing, almost invariably, with historic persons and with historic conditions. It is doubtless partly due to this cause that in a large number of cases, even where other evidences, literary or monumental, direct or indirect, are not forthcoming, the attempt may still be made, not without success, to sift the fact from the fiction, and to determine, with some probability, the actual course of events. Not very much reflection is required to show that our knowledge today of the course of Greek history and affairs for the generation that closed the sixth and opened the fifth century B.C. is based mainly upon the work of Herodotus; and the period (519-489 B.C.) covered by these Books may be extended with no less assurance at least ten years later, and may be run back at least to the age of Peisistratos, if not to the age of Gyges and Psammetichos, when the whole work is taken into the account. Beyond that epoch an indefinite vista opens back into the origins of Hellenic and non-Hellenic societies, to which the contribution of Herodotus is not inconsiderable. The one simple test of the transcendent value of the work of Herodotus as a substantial basis and source for ancient history is the question: What would the world now-a-days know of the subject if the work of Herodotus had never been written? The one fatal error is to

1 The historical value of myths and legends, by the way, is distinctly on the rise again. Recent research seems to show that although myth and legend, taken by themselves, are almost worse than useless, yet taken in connexion with other evidences, archaeological and anthropological, they yield a valuable deposit.

2 τὰ τάτα πρὸ τῆς Πεισίστρατος ἡλείης ἐγένετο, 5. 71.
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treat the work, in each of its three parts, in every Book, in each natural sub-division, in each particular story, or anecdote, as equally historical or unhistorical, as equally valuable or valueless, for historical purposes. The historical value of the work varies from volume to volume, from Book to Book, from chapter to chapter, almost from sentence to sentence. But if the time is gone by when the work could be dismissed as a 'pack of lies,' the time is equally gone by when the mere citation of a Book and chapter of Herodotus can be taken as definitive. The nature of the statement in itself, the nature of the context, agreement or difference with other statements, or with alternative versions, the source, obvious or probable, the interest, if any, and the general probabilities of the case must all be reckoned with before positive authority is conceded; doubtless with the result that, in a large number of cases, the version, account or statement of facts preserved by Herodotus will be dismissed as untrue, or at best admitted as possible.

In the second place, it is worth while to observe that there is a mass of particular statements of fact in the work of Herodotus, which may pass almost unchallenged into the historical order. The work of Herodotus is an artful maze or labyrinth of particular stories, held together by a master plan: many, perhaps the majority, of these stories are artistically complete, each in itself. But such art is suspect. It is the incomplete story, the casual reference, the statement of fact, which has little or no relation to its context, which is most likely, caeteris paribus, to be historical. Where no other purpose is to be served by a statement, the purpose served is the purely historical interest. Where a statement occurs, not as part of a more or less obviously pragmatic story, but simply because it is in itself known to the author and worthy of mention, the probability is that the statement is true. For example, the very fact that the notice of the Phoenician circumnavigation of Libya occurs in the fourth Book, and not as an item in a systematic account of the maritime policy of Neco in the second Book, is an additional argument in favour of its historic reality. Again, the story of the Scythic expedition is mainly fictitious, but the casual notice that Dareios recrossed into Asia from Sestos, an action apparently inconsequent and not

---

1 4. 42.  
2 4. 143.
explained, is eminently credible on that very account. The story of the interview between Kleomenes and Aristagoras\(^1\) is open to many adverse criticisms; but who will doubt the mention of the \textit{pinae} exhibited by Aristagoras to be based upon a genuine Spartan memory?\(^2\) The story of the Plataean alliance makes Kleomenes a chief agent;\(^3\) this detail, and indeed the whole story, is all the more authoritative seeing that Herodotus has not rationalised the matter by bringing it into chronological conformity with the expeditions of Kleomenes recorded in the fifth Book. Conversely, it seems more probable that the conspiracy of Nikodromos in Aigina\(^4\) is genuine history than that it is correctly chronologised, for it occurs in a context where Herodotus seems to have lost his way in an inconsequent attempt to systematise the history of the Aigineto-Athenian feud.

\textbf{§ 19.} As hardly anything is known of Herodotus apart from what is to be learnt from his work,\(^5\) it is small profit to argue from his character or reputation apart from the work. But the analytical estimate of the historical authority of the work in its various component parts, divisions, elements and factors may seem unsatisfactory to two classes of students: those, on the one hand, who have appraised the whole work in every part at the value to be set upon its best elements; those, on the other hand, who have involved the whole and every part in a condemnation, hardly justifiable even if limited to its weakest spots. But the times are now favourable for a discriminative verdict, and the methods indicated in the preceding pages, and applied in those which follow, will probably commend themselves to scholars and historians as sound, however great the difference of opinion may be on the results in detail. Perfect agreement cannot be expected in regard to particular cases and passages. It should, however, be universally recognised that the most stringent application of historical and critical methods to the text of Herodotus leaves the work irremovably and irreplaceably at the head of European prose literature, whether in its scientific or in its artistic character. To those capable of realising intelligently the conditions under which

\(^1\) 5. 49-51.
\(^2\) See Grote iii. 497. The map made more sensation at Sparta than at Athens.
\(^3\) 6. 108.
\(^4\) 6. 88-90.
\(^5\) The external evidences are purposely excluded from the purview of this \textit{Introduction} to the three Books contained in this volume; the internal evidences, so far as they are obtainable from these Books, are considered § 21 \textit{infra}. 
Herodotus collected and composed his materials, the growing wonder must be the triumphant issue of his labour in a work which is not merely a monument of his own genius, a mirror of his own times, but an almost inexhaustible treasury of knowledge respecting times that were to him, as to us, past and gone. It must be admitted that a writer capable of offering readers or hearers such a story as the story of the Scythian expedition for a sober or serious version of actual events, does not compose history on our principles, and falls far short of the standard announced by his junior contemporary Thucydides. On the other hand, it may be easily perceived that a premature application of the methods of Thucydides to the subject, or great series of subjects, which form the theme of Herodotus, might only have led to a result of far less historical value and authority than the actual work now in our hands. Herodotus might have gained consistency and forfeited truth: exterminated the evidences and obtained a personal verdict: established his own authority by obliterating his authorities. His method of telling stories has preserved more history for us than would otherwise have survived the later and more systematic pragmatism of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. He is for us the first historian because he is the last, or at any rate the best of the Logographers. He preserves the historic material even where he does not use it historically. His merits as a writer, as an artist, as a prose-poet are generally recognised. It is something to have written the best story-book in Greek literature, perhaps in European literature. No other Greek writer has covered so large a world with so full a population of living and immortal men and women as Herodotus (no, not even his master, Homer). The work of Herodotus is a prose Iliad and Odyssey in one, rich in episodes and details, and more indisputably one and indivisible than either Epos. Had occasions or fashions served, Greek playwrights might have gone to Herodotus as to an almost inexhaustible mine of plots and subjects for tragedy and comedy. His pathos is profound: his humour infinite. Neither the superstition nor the sophistry of his age affects him so deeply as to distort irremediably the mirror which he holds up to the ages and generations of the world as he knew it. Upon the whole, he is not merely the most delightful but the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{ Thuc. 1. 21, 22, 97.}\]
most instructive of the Hellenes. The mind reflected in his pages is sane and sage. We moderns are baffled by his art and genius: the results look more like the voices of many peoples than the utterance of one man. We can hardly understand how an early adventurer accomplished so much. We can hardly tell whether the wonderful effects are due to design or to accident. The work is a problem, a store-house of problems, in art as well as in history. It is enough to engage the attention of many students and commentators from many points of view. Each generation looks at it in something of a fresh light, finding new interests in it, and new solutions for its problems. No consideration of it has been final, and none has been complete. Nor is any commentary superfluous, or unserviceable, which succeeds in asserting fresh, or forgotten, aspects of the work as a whole, and in elucidating the character and value of its component parts or elements. In regard to the portion here immediately under view, three problems, or groups of problems, remain to be discussed, albeit their fuller solution may require the exploration of the whole work. There remain for discussion problems concerning the sources from which these Books have been drawn; concerning the evidences afforded by these Books in regard to the author's researches and autopsy; concerning the materials contained in these Books for an estimate of his own conscious mind and methods. With these three groups of problems severally the remainder of this Introduction deals. Only when the two former have been, at least provisionally, described, can we be in a position to complete, provisionally, our estimate of the genius of Herodotus, by including therein his qualities, as critic and philosopher.

§ 20. In regard to the Sources from which Herodotus derived so much of these Books as cannot be matter of his own creation, mere general statements, or a mere abstract classification, cannot be of much service. Here, as with every important problem concerning the composition of the work, it is essential to distinguish between part and part, element and element, story and story, sometimes almost sentence and sentence. The old-fashioned view that the work of Herodotus, as a whole, was the product, or redaction, of oral tradition has been much discredited of late; yet it may be found, on further examination, to be the most prob-

1 Cp. especially, H. Panofsky, de Historiae Herodoteae fontibus, Berlin, 1884.
able and reasonable account to be given of the last three Books. 1 Further, if coupled with the hypothesis that the last three Books, the third volume of the Histories as we have them, formed originally a substantive work, or at least were substantially complete, before the previous volumes assumed their present form, that view would go some way towards explaining the semblance of oral tradition, which the work undoubtedly wears in every part. The predominant nature of the sources for the last part of the work, which first engaged the author, has, on this hypothesis, deeply affected the form and character of the work as a whole, and in every part. At the same time it will be generally recognised that the mere occurrence of the formulae of oral tradition is far from justifying the inference that the passage in which they occur is based wholly and solely on bare word of mouth. There is an extreme ambiguity in the employment of such formulae in Herodotus’ diction, as in the usage of our own language at the present day, and the formulae proper in the first instance to the word spoken are freely used of the word written. The word may have been written in order to be read aloud and heard; it remains legible but inaudible, or only potentially audible. A few crucial cases will prove that the formulae of the living voice occur in passages not derived by the author from oral tradition:

(1) Herodotus applies the terms of oral tradition to his own work, which is manifestly and explicitly a written work. He ‘speaks’ —one ‘says’ it naturally—of his whole work as a λόγος, 2 and of portions of it as λόγος, 3 and in referring from one part, or passage, in the written work to another, he uses the phraseology of audible speech. 4 He also naturally uses the more precise term applicable to written words, 5 and he uses terms which are ambiguous and indifferent. 6 Thus, although similar phraseology is undoubtedly used of spoken speech, 7 it is obvious that the formulae in them-

---

selves carry little weight in deciding whether material introduced under them has come to Herodotus from a strictly oral source or not.

(2) He cites in terms proper to oral statement, sources, or authorities, which were undoubtedly not living voices, but manuscripts, in prose or verse. Thus Hekataios, the only prose-writer whom he expressly names, is an ἄρης λόγοφος, and in quoting from one of the written works of Hekataios, Herodotus uses most emphatically the phraseology of oral speech. Exactly similar terms are used of the manuscript of the Arimaspea, attributed to Aristeas, side by side with references, in the same terms, to genuinely vocal statements. It is therefore obvious that Herodotus not merely applies the terminology of oral speech to his own work and writings, but cites the written works of other writers in similar formulae.

(3) The point here asserted is further established by the observation that Herodotus, in referring to documents, which he may or may not have seen, but the existence or contents of which he reports, uses in regard to them language proper to living voices. The oracles found by Kleomenes in the Athenian Akropolis and carried to Sparta are vocal. The tripod at Thebes say their say in incised hexameters, and the inscriptions of Dareios tell their own story. Two notable documents are unfortunately silent, or indifferent, in the pages of Herodotus, the despatch of Dareios to Megabazos, ordaining the transportation of the Paionians, and the 'bible' of Histiaios, which came into the hands of Artaphrenes. Similarly indifferent is the term used of the word or words tattooed on the head of the trusty messenger from Histiaios to Aristogoras; but it will hardly be contended that in any of these cases the language of audible

---

1 5. 36, 125 (cp. 2. 143).
2 6. 137 τότε γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω φράσας, πλὴρ τὰ λέγωμεν, διὶ Ἐκαταῖος μὲν ὣς Ἡγορήδης τῷ ἔργῳ ἐκ τούτων λέοντος λέγων ἀδίκως ... εἰκόνα δὲ Ἡκαταῖος ὡρίζει τῇ Ἀθήναις λέγοντα. Cp. 6. 132, where φράσας, φάς and λέγων occur within four lines, all applying to a spoken oration.
3 4. 13, 16.
4 5. 90 οἱ χρησιμοὶ λέγοντες.
5 5. 60, 61 (cp. 4. 88 ἐπεράσκητο).
6 4. 91 γράμματα ἐγράφασα λέγωντα τάδε (cp. 4. 88 ἐπεράσκητο τάδε). The most striking instance of all is in 1.123-125, where the ἄκοιτας is only to be tolerated on the supposition that Kyros had the λέγωντα γράμματα read aloud to him.
7 5. 14.
8 6. 4.
9 5. 35 τὰ δὲ στίγματα ἐσόμαι ... ἀκούσασι.
speech, if applied to the written message, would have been surprising, or anomalous, judged by the practice of Herodotus, or even by our own. If, then, in regard to his own written work, in regard to the manuscripts of his predecessors, and in regard to written documents, which he has occasion to cite or mention in the course of his narrative, Herodotus freely uses the language of oral speech, it is obvious that the use and prevalence of such formulae in respect to his sources, or authorities throughout, is very far in itself and by itself from proving that he did not employ written authorities to a considerable extent. In short, so freely are the terms λόγος, λέγειν, φασί έτ cim. used of written authorities that, except where Herodotus expressly notifies oral communications, it is difficult to be sure that he is not using a written source in regard to matters which certainly, or probably, had been committed to writing before his time. This conclusion may serve at least as a corrective to exaggerated assumptions in regard to the place of the vox viva among Herodotus’ sources.

A second corrective to exaggerated views of the extent of Herodotus’ oral sources is supplied by a canon, to be expressed as follows: the nominal citation of authorities by Herodotus cannot be taken, without further criticism, as proof that he himself had the statement, or passage, so introduced, from the authorities so named, much less from those authorities in loco. It cannot safely be assumed that, when Herodotus names any nation, tribe or corporation as authority for a story, or a statement, he has himself had the matter from the lips of men of that nation, tribe or city, still less that he has visited and conversed with them in their native place. There are several other possibilities, which are not excluded by the methods and standards of Herodotus. As the story, apparently based on oral information, may be derived by Herodotus from a written authority, so the nominal authority for the story may have been taken over by him from his written source. Or again, authorities quoted nominally to him in conversation may reappear in his text at first hand. Even in cases where he may be quoting information given to him by word of mouth, and by the men named in his text, he may

---

1 Cp. Wiedemann, Herodotis æigitus Buch (1890), p. 25 (following Diels), sogar an einzelnen Stellen, an denen die Aegypter als Gewährsmänner genannt sind, ist die Quelle Hekatios, dem diese Ursprungsangabe mit entnommen wurde.
have encountered his informants elsewhere than in their native places. Thus, for example, when Carthaginians are cited,\(^1\) we are not justified in concluding that Herodotus had been in Carthage, for he might have met Carthaginians elsewhere, in Sicily, in Egypt; nor in concluding that he had conversed with Carthaginians at all, for he might have found the Carthaginians quoted as authorities in a book, or might have heard them so quoted in conversation. Nor is this all: another and less obvious possibility must be contemplated. The nominal citation of an authority may be due to an inference, an act of judgment, on the historian’s part. Thus, for example, after narrating the end of Kleomenes, Herodotus records no less than five explanations of the king’s awful doom, four of them agreeing in one point, that the end of Kleomenes was a divine judgment for a crime, but differing as to the particular crime for which it had been divinely ordered. The Argives, the Athenians, the Hellenes generally, each had their own theory of the particular crime in question; Herodotus himself differed from all three on this point; the Spartans raised the previous question, and explained the madness and death of the king on purely natural grounds.\(^2\) For his own theory Herodotus is, of course, himself responsible. He had certainly been in Sparta;\(^3\) and the nature of the account in itself makes it probable that he reports the Spartan view at first hand. But how did he arrive at the Athenian, the Argive, the general Hellenic views? It cannot be denied that Herodotus may have questioned Athenians in Athens, Argives in Argos, and Hellenes generally, either in Hellas generally or at Delphi in particular: but neither can it be denied that the report and assignment of the views severally might be, to a greater or less extent, the result of inference on the part of Herodotus himself, or of his informants, or authorities. The actual facts as accredited must, of course, have been first published or made known by Spartans. Once the Spartan statement of fact was accepted, any Greek might infer without much hesitation the view which Athenians, or Argives, or Hellenes would take of its significance: the Athenians would see in the Spartan king’s doom the expiation of a crime on Attic soil, the Argives would transfer the motive to

1 4. 43 Καρχηδόνιοι εἰς οἱ λέγοντες: 196 λέγουσι Καρχηδόνιοι: 198 λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τὰς Καρχηδόνιοι.
2 6. 75, 84.
3 3. 55.
Argos, while Hellenes in general would turn with more pious satisfaction to the crime against the common sanctuary. Even if any statements made by the historian were due to inferences, or combinations of his own or of others, they might have some truth in them. In the present instance, however, there are two special reasons for doubting whether the nominal authorities introduced by Herodotus, for the various views reported, would have stood in every case the test of verification on the spot. In the first place, Herodotus is here, to some extent, 'improving the occasion,' having his own particular theory on the subject to ventilate; something is gained for the main issue by the widespread consensus as to the supernatural significance of the event, something is gained for the historian's own hypothesis by the conflict among three other rival hypotheses. In the second place, the story, though necessary in order to bear out the alleged theory of the Argives, is not an Argive but a Spartan story. We are in possession of the Argive version of the war with Kleomenes, and it differs materially from the story in Herodotus. The particular outrage on the grove of Argos is not, indeed, excluded by the Argive story, but the purely Spartan account of the war, given by Herodotus, seems to make it doubly improbable that Herodotus had consulted Argives, whether in Argos or elsewhere, touching this whole matter. Had he done so, he could hardly have remained ignorant of the Argive version of the affair, some points in which are almost necessary to explain inconsequences or obscurities in the Spartan story, which he follows; and ignorance is here the sufficient explanation of their omission. It is not, however, on this or any particular instance alone that the case stands for allowing room for inference, judgment, hypotheses in the nominal citation of authorities by Herodotus. Other considerations supervene. It has been generally allowed that Herodotus was not acquainted with any language but Greek. Though he cites Scythians, Libyans, Persians, Lydians, Carthaginians, and other 'barbarian' authorities, he cannot have conversed with them in their own languages. If he is not quoting

---

1 Cp. notes to 8. 76-82, and Appendix VII.
3 4. 5, 8, 79, 103 (αὐτός Ταύρων), 105, 142, etc.
5 6. 54 (ὦν δὲ ὁ [παρά] Περσῶν λέγειν λέγεται).
6 4. 45 (Ἀνδρι, φίλων κτλ.).
7 Il. cit. supra.
interpreters, or written authorities, or barbarians who spoke Greek, or Greeks who named the barbarians cited, he is giving the ultimate source inerentially. How easily such inferences are made, and with what good show of reason, may be demonstrated by our own methods in dealing with the text of Herodotus itself. Herodotus does not always nominate his authorities or sources, immediate or ultimate; but we can generally supply the omission with a greater or less assurance from self-evident or internal indications. Thus the originés of the story of the battle of Marathon are not specified; but who can hesitate long to ascribe it to Athenian traditions?¹ The speech put into the mouth of Leotychides might have been heard in Athens, or in Sparta; but is a Delphic source to be regarded as inadmissible?² The conjecture of Schweighäuser, which actually introduces nominatim the Lakedaimonians instead of the Athenians as authorities in the story of the liberation of Athens, is based upon a consideration of the subject matter and the method of the story itself.³ It is a legitimate exercise of critical discrimination to assign, upon the evidence of such internal indications, various portions, longer and shorter, in the work of Herodotus to the sources from which he derived the matters in question, immediately or mediatly; and this operation he may himself have already practised upon his raw materials. In fine, some room must be allowed, in the nomination of authorities by Herodotus, for the play of inference on his part; although the practical result is not so much to invalidate the evidence of his nominees as to restrict the supposed area of his travels, and the activity of his conversation.⁴

On the other hand, if the dependence upon oral information were to be restricted to the passages wherein it is expressly cited by the historian, or implicitly ascertained, it would be all too much diminished and denied. Herodotus but seldom expressly notices that a statement, anecdote, or story has been imparted to him by word of mouth; and the statements so introduced are not always of much historical importance.⁵ For the most

¹ Cp. Appendix X.
² 6. 86.
³ 5. 63, note ad l.
⁴ For further exercises of the historian’s own judgment (γρών) cp. § 22 infra.
⁵ 4. 16 ἀκούει τῆς ἡπτοτικαί geographical information, cp. c. 24. Similar formula in c. 192 (animals of Libya) without ἀκούει: 4. 183 ἀκούεις (swiftness afoot of the Troglydotes) not perhaps quite conclusive. The formula 4. 105 ad fin.
part the express signals of this evidence occur in connexion with relatively trivial matter and anecdotes. It is also observable that they occur chiefly in the fourth Book. The geography, ethnography, and anthropology of Herodotus are largely matters of hearsay; historical subjects which fall within his own lifetime, or shortly before, are presumably reported from oral or visual sources; doubtless also a large and indefinite amount of what goes to make up his main narrative is drawn or reinforced from oral tradition, conversation, anecdote, not infrequently heard and gathered in connexion with visible monuments and memorials of the past. But an examination of the actual phraseology of Herodotus throws us back, in the main, for the delimitation of the portions or elements based exclusively on oral testimony, of one kind or another, upon considerations other than the express guarantee of the writer himself.

A similar remark holds in regard to the matters reported on the evidence of the writer's own eyesight. From the nature of the case it could only be geographical and ethnographical facts, and so-called archaeological evidences, which Herodotus might owe to this source. It is again remarkable how little is expressly and explicitly referred thereto. In the three Books here immediately in question there are only three express appeals to the author's own eyesight. There are, besides, half-a-dozen passages at most, in the fourth Book, where the actual phraseology may be taken to imply autopsy on the writer's part. These passages are again comparatively unimportant, and their chief interest lies in the light they throw upon the problems of the writer's life and

(esp. the words ἐσμαι ἄν ὑπὸ λέγωντες) looks very like a personal reminiscence; yet it might be based on second-hand authority. Even the term περιθηκαί, which frequently denotes oral evidence (4. 16, 24; 5. 9; 6. 117), and λατρεύειν can hardly be regarded as absolutely unambiguous. 4. 76 ἱκανον (interview with Timnes); id. c. 77 ἱκανα λόγον ἐπεὶ Πελοποννησίων λεγόμενον; 4. 81 ἱκανον (ὅπερ) the number of the Scyths; 6. 117 ἱκανον...

1 How such evidence filters through is well indicated in 4. 27.

5. 59-61 (the 'Kadmeian' inscriptions in Thebes); 6. 47 (the mines in Thasos).

2 ὅτως 4. 36 is, of course, not a case in point. But 4. 58 (the appearance of the entrails in Scythian cattle) suggests autopsy; and the formula ἐκ μὴ ἐκεῖ in 4. 74 (cannabis), 81 (the krater of Pausanias) suggests a similar experience on the writer's part, as also the words ἐκ μὴ παραπτώσκε in c. 99 (Simon). On the other hand ἀπ' φάγων μοι ἐστὶ φυσι c. 81 (krater at Exampaios) and φαίνουσα c. 82 (the footprint of Herakles) are less conclusive: while the ἔτι ἐστὶ ἐπι c. 124 can only refer to hearsay.
travels. If we are prepared to extend largely, and indefinitely, the range of autopsy as of oral tradition, or intercourse, among the sources from which Herodotus drew his material, it is less on the strength of express phraseology than upon implicit or unconscious indications, and upon what may be called the general probabilities of the case. Thus, although it cannot be admitted that Herodotus visited all the places he describes, and even describes well, or reviewed all the tribes and tribal institutions on which he reports, or saw all the monuments and works of art which he mentions, yet it is quite certain that he had seen such objects in the principal centres of Hellenic life, and morally certain that he had seen a vast number, which he does not happen to mention. The importance of this observation in regard to the Histories of Herodotus, and their sources, lies less in establishing the authority of these notices for the service of archaeology than in suggesting that every such monument was a nucleus for oral tradition, and that the effect of temples, tombs, sacred and state buildings, public and private monuments, in preserving indirectly, as well as directly, the records of the past for Herodotus and his contemporaries can hardly be exaggerated. The appeal to these evidences by Herodotus is often direct, though not always critical; but, in estimating the sources from which his information is derived, it is necessary to make large allowance for a mass of tradition, which he acquired by hearsay, in view of such monuments, material objects and evidences.  

2 Blakesley in his Introduction pp. xxv. ff. laid just emphasis upon the importance of temples, and temple-meetings (παρηγόρεις), as sources of myths, traditions, chronicles. Later criticism has pointed out the probable transfer of points, acts, features from cult-practice, or ritual, to the historical record. To such a source has been traced (see A. Mommsen, Heerologie p. 211) one of the strangest exaggerations in the story of Marathon (6. 112 δρομή et polemuos ἐχθροντος); and the same story furnishes in a note the explanation of such transfers (6. 111 ἄνω ταύτης σφι τῆς μέχριν καλ.). To matters of ritual and cult may be ascribed not a little in the story of the Atheno-Aiginetan wars, even if the inferences have come to Herodotus ready-made (5. 82-88, 89); from that source may have been borrowed details in the stories of the Minyae (4. 146), and of the Macedonian reception of the Persians (5. 20). To this source has been traced some elements in the story or stories of the Argive war (6. 77, 81, and Plutarch, Mor. 245). The extent to which historical events have been commemorated by rites, and ritual in turn has affected historiography, even in this
From the inscribed monument or object to the written authority is but a step, or rather a mere change in terminology, for it is hard to say where the monumental evidence ends and the documentary or manuscript evidence begins. After the comparatively scanty evidences of autopsy and of hearsay expressly recorded, or implicitly afforded, by these Books, the large number of references to literary evidences or documents is the more striking. Even omitting the inscribed offerings or objects, we encounter throughout these Books a mass of references, or citations, explicitly or implicitly based on literary documents, or written authorities. Some of these cases may be more or less problematic: the general result, however, compels the conclusion that the text of Herodotus is to a large and indefinite extent based upon literary sources of one kind or another. It would be a mistake to recognise among these sources only poetical works: and it is important to observe that Herodotus (like Thucydides), while referring only to one prose-writer expressly by name, uses phraseology which assumes a command of all existing Greek literature, whether in verse or in prose. Herodotus will commemorate of the kings of the Dorians what no other writer has recorded. The phrase covers prose-authors as well as poets. A little before he uses terms which imply a control over the whole poetic literature of Hellas.

The incidental references to poetic writers by name bear out the general assumption. Herodotus was not writing a history of Greek literature, but his incidental citations are

portion of the work of Herodotus, is probably far from exhausted by the above instances. The following ref. may be serviceable: 4, 7, 35 ff., 95, 105, 180, 189; 5, 1, 12, 22, 47, 57, 61, 66, 67, 83, 88, 92 ff., 114; 6, 16, 35, 61, 68, 105, 137 ff.

1 Stele of Dardios at Byzantion 4. 87 (at Teos 91); picture of Mandrokles at Samos 4. 88; inscribed tripods at Thebes 5. 56-51; Athenian Quadriga 5. 77; stele in the Samian agora 6. 14. We now know that the altar of the twelve gods was inscribed 6. 108, cp. Thuc. 6. 54. But besides these, the kraters and other anamathae, tombs, etc., mentioned by Herodotus were probably inscribed (e.g. 6. 103).

2 6. 55 τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ὁδὸι καταλάβοντο τοῖσον μὴν ποιήσαντα. This phrase applies to the particular matter in hand, and cannot be generalised into a maxim for Herodotus' whole work. In the preceding passage 6. 53 τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ’ Ἑλλήνων obviously includes written genealogies.

3 6. 52 Λακεδαιμόνιοι γὰρ ὄμολογεν- τες οὐδενὶ ποιητῇ λέγοντες. The Lake- daimonian λόγος which follows is not necessarily a mere oral tradition, nor necessarily derived by Herodotus himself from a Lakedaimonian source. He may have had it from a Logogra- pher.
numerous, and imply a background of further possibilities. Even in these three Books he cites by name Homer, Hesiod, Aristeas, Solon, Alkaios, Simonides, and his reference to Olen may fairly be taken to imply an acquaintance with poems in writing, ascribed to the Lykian seer. The references to Aristeas, Solon, Alkaios, and Simonides are of especial importance here, as they are made in connexion with matters which belong essentially to the scheme and subject matter of these Books. The same remark governs the reference to the Drama of Phrynichos, the loss of which leaves us free to conjecture that there is more in the text of Herodotus due to that work than appears at first sight. The reference to one son of Euphorion would in itself carry an inference to the works of the other, even if Aischylos were not elsewhere named; and Aischylos probably had something to say to the making of the story of Marathon. Herodotus' acquaintance with the poets may on the whole have had more influence on the form, style, and mechanism of his history than on its materials and subjects: but his knowledge of the poetic literature makes it additionally improbable that he was unacquainted with the prose-writers, such as there were; and if his own style was different from theirs, and showed a recurrence to the ideas and principles of literature as a fine art, this very reaction, or advance, in itself implies a knowledge of the actual state of prose-writing, which particular references further confirm. If Herodotus mentions the geographers, the Ionian geographers, mainly to ridicule them, yet it is almost a matter of course that he used their materials and knowledge, wherever it seemed to him sound: even as he accepted the genealogies of the great houses, which were certainly in writing. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of such writings for the earlier chronology and perspective of Greek history as presented by Herodotus. The loss of the works of Hekataiios, and other contemporary writers, deprives us of the one complete and satisfactory method of determining the exact extent of the actual debt of Herodotus

1 4. 29, 32 (5. 67).  3 4. 32.  5 95.  7 4. 85. The description of Pythagoras

2 4. 13.  4 5. 113.  6 5. 102.  8 6. 81.  9 6. 114.  10 2. 156.  11 Cp. Appendix X.

(4. 95) does not necessarily involve the recognition of any writings.  12 4. 36.

13 6. 53 (cp. 7. 264; 8. 131).
to Hekataios and the Logographers: but to deny it altogether, or to reduce it to the bare minimum involved in the explicit or demonstrable references,¹ is unsound and illogical, and would involve, by analogy, the reduction of the oral traditions in the work to the passages where the formulae were conclusive, and the limitation of the area of Herodotus’ journeys and sightseeing by the express and indubitable evidence of his autopsy and travels.

The written authorities, or documents, employed by Herodotus in the composition of these Books were by no means limited to authors, whether in verse or in prose. The smaller the element recognised as derivable from actual authors the more material remains to be ascribed to other documentary sources. Perhaps the most indubitable class of documents which reappear in the text of Herodotus is to be found in the oracles, whether in verse or in prose, whether Delphic, or from some less august revelation. It is little short of incredible that the isolated oracles, given originally ex hypothesi to divers persons at divers times and occasions, and preserved by Herodotus ipsissimis verbis, were simply reported to him orally. They were certainly preserved in writing at the centres of inspiration, and probably in copies by the cities, houses, or persons immediately concerned.² The question is whether Herodotus took these oracles over from historical works, or from other documentary sources.³ That collections of oracles existed, other than Delphic oracles, in Herodotus’ time is probable, and is supported, out of these Books, by the references to the oracles of Laios⁴ and others.⁵ That Pythian utterances were less carefully treated seems improbable. In regard to their frequent occurrence in the Herodotean text, there is no necessity for one ruling and one only: in some cases Herodotus may have had recourse in person to the written source, in others he may

¹ 6. 137 ; 5. 36 (cp. 4. 87) ; 5. 125 ; 4. 8 (2. 21, 22, 38, 143). Grote did not hesitate to ascribe to Hekataios’ authority some elements in the story of the Ionian Revolt (Grote iii. 512). Of his geography Herodotus owed to Hekataios probably more than will ever be ascertained. Cp. further Dinsis, Hermes, xxii., and Ed. Meyer, Forschungen, pp. 153 ff.
² Cp. 5. 90 ; 6. 57.
³ Verse oracles 4. 155, 157, 159 ; (5. 56) ; 5. 92 (inr) ; 6. 19, 77, 86. Prose 4. 151, 161, 163, 178 ; 5. 67, 79, 89 ; 6. 34, 135 (139). Cp. Schöll, Philologus, x. 43 ff. (1855) ; Schubring, De Cygnolo (1862), pp. 54 ff.; Benedict, De oraculis ab Herodoto commemoratis (1871). F. Studniczka, Kyrene (1890), pp. 97 ff., supports Schöll’s view that the Battiaid oracles are fragments of an epic narrative in oracular form.
⁴ 5. 43.
⁵ 5. 93 (cp. 7. 6 ; Bakis, 8. 20, etc.).
have taken over the divine utterance with the human tradition, oral or written. Where the oracles are quoted in prose, where the scriptural verse has been obviously dissolved, there the intervention of a medium becomes additionally probable.

Indications in the text of Herodotus seem to suggest the hypothesis that he, or his authorities, may have had, among documentary sources, copies or abstracts of speeches delivered, or reported to have been delivered, upon certain occasions. Not, indeed, in the speeches inserted as such,¹ which have sometimes very little the appearance of authenticity; but rather in certain stories, which appear to go back to speeches, at least for their raw material. The story of the Ionians on the Danube was told, in some shape or other, at the first trial of Miltiades, as we may infer with all but certainty.² Herodotus expressly affirms that the stories of Marathon and of the taking of Lemnos were articles in the defence, on the second trial.³ It is self-evident that stories used for such purposes were not scrupulously accurate. It is not to be supposed that political or forensic argument, even in the pre-sophistic age, took the child-like form of a string of good stories,⁴ and speakers in Herodotus’ pages can reason closely upon occasion⁵; but there is no inconsequence in maintaining that Herodotus may have owed materials for his accounts of historic events, directly or indirectly, to such occasions. Important passages in the story of the Spartan war with Argos are directly traceable to the trial and defence of

¹ A large part of the Herodotean text is devoted to reporting the words of various speakers on various occasions, in direct or indirect ‘oration.’ Some of these speeches are short, pithy, laconic sayings, bon mots, apophthegms, proverbs, et sim. (ἀφηγ., ἡμώρα), of which there is a very large number. There may have been collections of such sayings already in manuscript (cp. 4. 148, 149; 5. 23, 105; 6. 1, 50, 67, 107, 139). In other cases the speeches form a dialogue, conversation, deliberation, of a private or of a public nature (cp. 4. 79, 97 f., 113 f., 118, 126 f., 134, 136, 137, 139; 5. 17, 23 f., 39 f., 49-51, 106, 108, 111; 6. 9, 11 f., 68 f., 105). It would be rash to suppose that Herodotus had scriptural or even oral authority for every such case. Another class of cases appears somewhat more public and notorious (5. 49, 79 f., 91, 109, 130). Perhaps the class of examples most open to suspicion is that containing the longest set speeches ascribed to individual speakers named, e.g. the speech of Sokles, 5. 92; the speech of Leotychides, 6. 86 (cp. the Ναυα cited 6. 43=3. 80 f.). Just for these it is most likely that Herodotus had written authority or materials.

² 4. 137 ff., cpdl. w. 4. 104.

³ 6. 136.

⁴ As with Sokles 5. 92, or Leotychides 6. 86.

⁵ 5. 49, speech of Aristagoras (cp. 5. 97); 6. 109, speech of Miltiades.
Kleomenes, as recorded by Herodotus.\(^1\) A legal process led to the deposition of Demaratos, and the pleadings have probably left their mark on the traditions.\(^2\) To the prosecution of Phrynichos might perhaps be traceable this or that item in the story of the Ionian revolt.\(^3\) The Alkmaionids had supplied occasion for more than one verdict in Athenian history; and it is just possible that the version of the Kylonian sin (ἀγος) given by Herodotus\(^4\) may have formed part of the defence on one or other of these occasions.\(^5\) It is not clear whether the Athenian ambassadors to Artaphernes, who had ‘medized’ first of all free Greeks, were actually brought to trial or not\(^6\); but in any case there were probably speeches in the Ἑκκλεσία on the subject, though it might be rash to assume that any documentary report of them has reached Herodotus. Acts of the Ἑκκλεσία at Athens, or of the corresponding bodies in other states, are recorded by Herodotus explicitly, and still more frequently implied, such as alliances, treaties, declarations of war, legislations, and so on; but whether he had written evidence in any of these cases is not obvious. Epigraphic evidence is more probable in such cases than official manuscript, and perhaps the source, so far as present in the text, is present in a diluted form, filtered through the medium of oral tradition or literary authority. The phraseology of Herodotus lends but slender support to the hypothesis of his having employed official documents to any considerable extent. We can hardly suppose him to have used the Royal Parchments,\(^7\) and the Ionian documents referred to by him may have been private documents, nor is there express mention of his using them.\(^8\) He had hardly seen the king’s despatch to Megabazos,\(^9\) or the papers of Histiaios.\(^10\) In any case the Persian wars doubtless made great havoc of such evidences in Athens and in Ionia; and in Sparta

---

\(^1\) 6. 82.  
\(^2\) 6. 65.  
\(^3\) 6. 21.  
\(^4\) 5. 71.  
\(^5\) The Alkmaionid stories (6.125-130), which furnish a set-off to the (Philaid) version of the battle of Marathon, have rather the appearance of a poetic origin, and it seems unlikely that such an event as the wedding of Agariste was uncelebrated in literature and song until Herodotus arose to commit the story to writing; certainly the completion of the temple of Apollo had been glorified in literature long before Herodotus told the story (5. 62, cp. Pindar, Pyth. 7).  
\(^6\) 5. 73 ἀπελθὼν ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς αἰείας μεγάλος εἰχων.  
\(^7\) Βασιλεία ἐμφέται, Κτεινᾶς ἀπὶ Diodor. 2. 32. Op. Hdt. 5. 58.  
\(^8\) I.e.  
\(^9\) 5. 14.  
\(^10\) Ἑπιλεία, 6. 4. The ἐυετολία of Demaratos, 6. 50, may have been a verbal message.
such documents are less likely to have been accessible or existent. It is not, therefore, to any great extent from such sources that Herodotus records state acts, though here again the direct indications in the text are probably an imperfect measure of the extent to which he had such evidences to employ.

To convert the restrictions above imposed upon the presence and importance of direct oral testimony or tradition, among the sources of these Herodotean Books, into an attack upon the authority and value of the work, would be a strange or perverted exercise of criticism. Here again methodical discrimination is, before all things, necessary. It is no doubt satisfactory to be as near as possible in time and place to the evidence of the senses, to be in direct contact with the eye-witness and the ear-witness. We joyfully detach from the work of Herodotus any and every fragment which is, or may be, derived from the direct evidence of his own senses. But these grains of gold are of necessity, as has been shown, comparatively scanty. In regard to events they are, from the very nature of the subject, almost out of the question. For his historical materials, properly so called, Herodotus was of necessity dependent upon other men. In regard to the main subject of his last volume (Bks. 7, 8, 9), he was able to draw still to a very large extent upon the living voices of contemporaries. For the history of the world previous to Dareios this was less and less possible. The history of the generation contemporary with the reign of Kleomenes (c. 519-489 B.C.) in this, as in other respects, occupied an ambiguous position. But in any case, if Herodotus had scriptural evidence for his story, so much the better; for such evidence was nearer to the events. If he was not the first prose-writer to recount the story of the Ionian revolt, but was the first to attempt the reduction of the story of Marathon to writing, the hypothesis might help to explain why the earlier story is, in some respects, the better.

In regard to all those records in these three Books, which carry back the history before the date of the continuous story, the case for literary authorities is proportionately stronger. Other things being equal, the earlier the written evidence or tradition goes back the better. The case may seem, at first sight,
to stand differently, in regard to all matters, for which Herodotus might \textit{ex hypothesi} have had the direct evidence of his own senses. These matters fall, speaking broadly, into two categories: events, and facts of geographical, anthropological, or archaeological interest. For events during his own lifetime Herodotus must rank as a first-class witness, even if his knowledge of them was due as little to immediate observation as to documentary evidence. The other category may seem, at first sight, to stand on a wholly different footing. But even here further discrimination is desirable. Precise archaeological observations may be all the better guaranteed if based upon the writer's own senses\footnote{4, 34, 35, 87; 5, 77; 6, 47, etc.}; but with the mass of geographical and ethnological materials in these Books the case stands otherwise. There is nothing derogatory to the authority of these records, as preserved by Herodotus, in the supposition that they are based but to a small extent upon his own direct observation, and to a considerable extent upon other authorities. The weight of those authorities is not diminished, but augmented, by the further supposition that Herodotus is not preserving merely travellers' tales, commercial or temple traditions about foreign parts, but popularising, not perhaps altogether without recourse to the arts necessary to make such things acceptable to a wider public, a \textit{Periegesis} of Libya, a \textit{Periplus} of the Pontos, or other works of the great geographers of Miletos.\footnote{Cp. H. Berger, \textit{Gesch. d. wissensch. Erdkunde d. Griechen}, i. (1887).} In such works the digested results of generations of travellers and of natural philosophers were probably incorporated: Herodotus' own adventures might supply brilliance or force to his descriptions, but could hardly have added much to the actual science of the best men of his day in these matters.

It is not within the scope of this \textit{Introduction} to attempt minutely to determine the space filled by one or other of the various sources above enumerated in each chapter of these Books. Further light is incidentally to be shed on such questions by the succeeding sections, which state and discuss the further problems of the composition and contents of the work; and in the \textit{Notes} and \textit{Appendices} the principles here obtained are exhibited in application to the cases of special importance. But to
attempt in a tabular form to determine the provenance of each passage or portion of the text would be to transgress all limits of probable agreement. The attempt, where made, is doomed to speedy wreckage, for want of sufficient evidence, of a decisive nature, internal to the text, and for want of external material to furnish comparisons. We are not, indeed, so completely bound to the personal authority of Herodotus as, for example, to the personal authority of Thucydides; for Herodotus does afford copious indications of the sources of his materials: but the indications are not sufficiently precise to supersede the personal authority of the writer, or to enable us to recover his materials throughout in the raw state. From the strictly scientific standpoint nothing less than such a result would be completely satisfactory; but such a result is beyond attainment. It is, however, worth while to carry the elucidation and evaluation of the sources to a point where a general agreement may still be obtainable, without going so far, in the way of speculative analysis and reconstruction, as to challenge opposition or scepticism at every further stage.

§ 21. The problem of the place or places, and date or dates, of the composition of the work is twofold. Questions touching the acquisition of the material in the first instance must be distinguished from questions touching its subsequent, or final, elaboration into the work as we have it. Probability and internal evidences are in favour of the hypothesis that the collection of materials by Herodotus was a work of many years, and conducted in many places.\(^1\) There is also something to be said for the hypothesis that the work in its present form is the result of a final and comparatively late redaction by the author himself, in which literary unity has been imposed upon or infused into traditions, testimonies, evidences, opinions, which were not all originally contemplated as forming parts of one and the same opus. If so much be admitted, nothing compels us to assume that

---

\(^1\) Dahlmann's work, *Herodot. Aus seinem Buche sein Leben* (Altona, 1824, Eng. tr. by G. V. Cox, London, 1845), was 'epoch-making' for the study of the question, and is still worth consulting. Rawlinson's first chapter (i.\(^2\) pp. 1-34, 1875), while admitting that 'the quantum of travel has indeed been generally exaggerated,' still errs in the direction of exaggeration (pp. 8 ff.). Stein, even in his last edition of the work (vol. i.\(^3\) 1882), sends Herodotus forth on *Forschungsreisen in all den Ländern mit deren Beschreibung und Geschichte das Werk sich beschäftigt.* The evidence for such journeys is purely internal; their greater extension depends upon a less critical interpretation.
the various sections, parts, Books, or component parts of Books, came into existence in the order which they now occupy in the work.\footnote{1} We are free to argue that larger or smaller parts of the work, as we have it, were in the first instance projected, and to a greater or less extent composed and elaborated, as separable stories, before the author conceived and applied the great idea of fusing all into a continuous and highly artistic unity. Six such well-articulated groups, or systems, of traditions, or histories, can be easily detected in the work, even neglecting the masses of material concerned with, and presumably drawn in the first resort from, local Greek sources: (1) the traditions of the great invasion, as given in Bks. 7, 8, 9; (2) the Egyptian Logi, as presented in Bk. 2; (3) the Libyan Logi, and (4) the Scythian Logi, together forming the fourth Book; (5) the Persian Logi, which fill considerable parts of the first and third Books, and seem to supply, and ultimately to suggest, the framework and system for the work as a whole; lastly (6), the Lydian Logi, which furnish the bulk of the first part of the first Book.\footnote{2} The final redaction or incorporation of these diverse and originally independent materials, in whatever condition of relative finish and completion, is approximately dated by the references to late and contemporary events, which are especially frequent in the second\footnote{3} and third triads of Books, and which point conclusively to the opening years of the Peloponnesian war as the time when Herodotus laid the last touches upon his work, though the idea of its complete structure and final form may have been conceived a good while sooner, and even more or less accomplished. A single passage, the con-

\footnote{1} E. Ammer’s attempt, in a tract, \textit{Herodotus Halicarnassensis quo ordine libros suas conscripsit} (1881), to vindicate the final order as the original order of composition, may be taken to show that it is for those who think different portions of the work to have been once themselves separate entities, to prove it; and such proof can hardly be forthcoming. But that L. Cwiklinski, who has thrown so much light upon the problems of the composition of the work of Thucydides, should be found on the other side, in regard to the problems of the composition of the work of Herodotus, is slightly paradoxical. See his review of Bauer (op. e. infr.) in Zeitsch. f. österr. Gym. 1879.

\footnote{2} Cp. A. Bauer, \textit{Die Entstehung des herodotischen Geschichtswerkes} (1878). The unfulfilled promises in regard to the \textit{Σωρόν Νέον}, l. 184, op. l. 106, may fairly be adduced in support of the above hypothesis. The unfulfilled promise in 7. 213 may be regarded as an oversight. Whether Herodotus ever contemplated monographic treatment of the history of any individual Greek state is very doubtful; the monographic appearances in his text can be explained by his ‘contamination’ of various sources.

\footnote{3} Cp. § 16, pp. ixii ff. supra.
cluding words of the third Book,\textsuperscript{1} carries the latest revisory and unifying process back over the first volume or triad of Books. That process has indubitably made the secret history of the genesis and creation of the work, which stands before us as an almost perfect whole, difficult, perhaps impossible, to discover. But some theories are more probable or luciferous than others. It is here assumed that the first great section of the work of Herodotus, for which materials were acquired, and to which some degree of finality was given, was the story of the great invasion in Bks. 7, 8, 9,\textsuperscript{2} even though, in the present and perfect work, these Books are specially rich in references to the events of the Peloponnesian war. The date of the visit to Egypt may be fixed with approximate certainty to the period between 449-445 B.C., or at least between 454-443 B.C.\textsuperscript{3} That would be the date at which the bulk of the matter in the second Book was obtained, and its elaboration might have succeeded before the final revision during the period of Athenian supremacy, 460-455 B.C. His visit therefore falls between 455-443 B.C. (4) But from 455-449 B.C. Amyrites maintained himself in the marshes, and fighting was going on; in 449 B.C. Pausiris was established by the Persians in succession to his father, 3. 15. Therefore the visit of Herodotus may be dated between 449-448 B.C. The conclusion thus reached would be voidable on the hypothesis that the notices combined were insertions on the final redaction of the work; but the combination numbered (3) is especially strong evidence, and the conclusion fits in remarkably well with external probabilities. The obvious parody on the opening of Herodotus in Aristoph. \textit{Acharn.} 523-529 (425 B.C.) makes it more likely that this part of Hdt.'s work had been recently published, or was just then notorious, in Athens. Bauer's notion (\textit{Herodot's Biographie}, 1878, pp. 4, 29), that the work of Herodotus was quickly antiquated, is hardly reconcilable with the reference(s) in Aristophanes, the elaborate, though veiled, polemic of Thucydides, the attack of Ktesias, the respect of Aristotle (including the '\textit{Aphi.}
\textit{πολιτεία}', and the merits of the work itself.

\textsuperscript{1} 3. 160. Cp. Rawlinson \textit{ad l.} (vol. ii.\textsuperscript{3} p. 536). In the first three Books there are only some half dozen allusions to events later than 478 B.C. This circumstance may arise in part from the nature of the subject (cp. § 4 \textit{supra}). In the three middle Books there are a dozen or so. In the three last Books about a score.

\textsuperscript{2} This view was suggested, as far back as 1854, by Blakesley (see notes 1, 477 to Bk. 7) and endorsed by Rawlinson (iv.\textsuperscript{3} p. 1). A. Schöll, \textit{Philologus} x. (1855) pp. 29 ff., also apparently originated it. A. Bauer, \textit{op. cit.}, has enforced it; and the arguments of §§ 4, 5 \textit{supra}, seem to tell in its favour.

\textsuperscript{3} Hdt. visited Egypt (1) after 460 B.C., for he mentions the battle of Parnemis 3. 12; (2) probably before 438 B.C., for in 2. 148 he mentions, as the greatest buildings of the Greeks, the temples of Ephesus and Samos; the Parthenon was finished in 438 B.C. This point is not conclusive, but accepting the tradition of his settlement at Thurii \textit{αἰγία} 443 B.C., this date may be taken as limit. (3) Hdt. visited Egypt during a period of Persian supremacy, between 460-443 B.C., and therefore not during the period of Athenian supremacy, 460-455 B.C. His visit therefore falls between 455-443 B.C. (4) But from 455-449 B.C. Amyrites maintained himself in the marshes, and fighting was going on; in 449 B.C. Pausiris was established by the Persians in succession to his father, 3. 15. Therefore the visit of Herodotus may be dated between 449-448 B.C. The conclusion thus reached would be voidable on the hypothesis that the notices combined were insertions on the final redaction of the work; but the combination numbered (3) is especially strong evidence, and the conclusion fits in remarkably well with external probabilities. The obvious parody on the opening of Herodotus in Aristoph. \textit{Acharn.} 523-529 (425 B.C.) makes it more likely that this part of Hdt.'s work had been recently published, or was just then notorious, in Athens. Bauer's notion (\textit{Herodot's Biographie}, 1878, pp. 4, 29), that the work of Herodotus was quickly antiquated, is hardly reconcilable with the reference(s) in Aristophanes, the elaborate, though veiled, polemic of Thucydides, the attack of Ktesias, the respect of Aristotle (including the '\textit{Aphi.}
\textit{πολιτεία}', and the merits of the work itself.
of the work. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the story of the
revenge of Pheretim and some parts at least of the Libyan
Logi were obtained in Egypt, but internal evidences in the second
part of the fourth Book point also strongly to western sources
and influences, as will appear below. The Scythian Logi have
been brought into connexion with the significant expedition of
Perikles in 444 B.C.\textsuperscript{1} A more plausible suggestion has never
been made to account for the visit of Herodotus to Scythia, and
his interest in the Scyths. The Persian and the Lydian Logi
remain. It may seem a violent hypothesis to see in them
materials gathered, or adapted, comparatively so late in the day.
But there are several considerations which soften the violence.
Some amount of material may have been in the hands of Her-
rodotus before he left Halikarnassos for Samos, or Samos for Athen,
or Athens for the west. The material in the Books here in
question (1-3) is not by any means indubitably drawn from
sources accessible only or mainly in Asia: (a) there is consider-
able room for literary sources which Herodotus might have had
with him. (b) The Lydian Logi are saturated with Delphic
authority; it is hardly conceivable that Herodotus wrote the first
part of the first Book before visiting Delphi. (c) Western sources
are visible in the first volume, notably in the story of Demo-
kedes;\textsuperscript{2} and Kirchhoff, even Kirchhoff, was not strictly accurate
when he wrote that in the first three Books (or 1-3. 117) there
is no trace of Herodotus’ residence and journeys in Magna Graecia
and Sicily;\textsuperscript{3} but the slight correction necessary only leaves the
conclusion of Kirchhoff the more unassailable, viz. that the redaction
of these Books was only undertaken when Herodotus’ travels were
all but concluded. Assuming, as has here been assumed, that
the last three Books were the first substantial portion of the work
projected, and worked out (subject to the modifications subse-
sequently introduced, on the final incorporation and revision of the
whole), the other six Books of Herodotus are virtually a proem

\textsuperscript{1} Duncker, \textit{Der Perikles Fahrt in den
Pontos, Abhandlungen}, pp. 143 ff., \textit{op.
Geschichte}, ix. pp. 95 ff.
\textsuperscript{2} 3. 129-138.
\textsuperscript{3} “Von seinem Aufenthalt und
seinen Reisen in Unteritalien und Sicilien
findet sich in diesen Büchern noch keine
Spur,” \textit{Entstehungszeit}, p. 7. There are
not demonstrable traces in the portion
delimited by Kirchhoff, but 1. 23 f., 94,
145, 166 f. may count for something;
while if we add the remainder of Bk. 3
the story of Demokedes, as Kirchhoff
himself, of course, fully recognises, is
almost inconceivable except as a western
story. \textit{Cp. p. xxxv. su ra}
to the story of the great invasion, composed out of several more or less independent parts, of which the second Book is the most obvious, while the fourth Book contains two other parts, only one degree less obvious; but, whether any of these parts ever actually existed independently, much more was promulgated before others, are questions which the internal evidence will never decide authoritatively: for Herodotus' object never was to write his own life, or the history of his travels, or of his work; and his final revision of the work has given it such a substantial unity that the decisive traces of its genesis are almost hopelessly obscured. Thus, for example, the reference in the second volume to criticisms on a passage in the first\(^1\) can never be made to prove that the passage in the first volume was written and published before the passage in the second, for two reasons: (1) the passage in the first volume itself replies to such criticisms, and proves that the story told by Herodotus was adversely criticised, and that he defended it, either in the first instance, or in the last revision; (2) even if the passage in Bk. 6 be taken as a reference expressly to the passage in Bk. 3 it would only prove that the second passage was written after the first, and not that the first had been published and circulated previously. To encounter incredulity, it would have been enough for Herodotus to have told the story, or to have read the story aloud, as he might have done at Thurii as well as at Athens. If, however, as is equally possible, the assertion in Bk. 3 is directed against critics, not of the story as told by him, but of the story as found by him, itself perhaps already a more or less notorious story, then the critics to whom he replies in Bk. 6 may be critics not of the story as told by him in Bk. 3 but simply of the story; and against their incredulity the passage in Bk. 3 already contains a protest.

It remains to review certain passages in these Books which point to solutions of the question regarding the time and place, or times and places, in which Herodotus amassed and arranged the materials which form the contents of this his second volume, so to speak. These Books contain, expressly and explicitly, evidence that Herodotus visited Thasos\(^2\), Kyzikos and Prokonnesos\(^3\), Thebes\(^4\).

\(^1\) 6. 43, op. 3. 80.  
\(^2\) 6. 47.  
\(^3\) 4. 14.  
\(^4\) 5. 59.
Zakynthos, Metapontion. Such fixed points involve many others intermediate. It may here be taken for granted that Herodotus had visited Samos, Delos, Sparta, Delphi, Athens; and the general character of the traditions in these Books fully bears out these assumptions, which are also supported by particular points or phrases in regard to those places. It is not so easy to carry Herodotus in person to Marathon, or to extend his travels in Peloponnesse to Sikyon and Argos. It is not easy to make out much of a case for his autopsy in Asia Minor, and only an uncritical use of his terminology can carry him into Bactria, to Ampe, or to Arderikka. If it is to be admitted that he may have been in Kypros, and at Amathus, it is not on the strength of the phrase μετὰ εἶμεν in the fifth Book.

But in regard to the stories and descriptions in these Books, the main problems, under this head, resolve themselves into the question of the extent of Herodotus’ travels in the Pontos, in Libya, and in the west.

The Pontos.—Passages already quoted, just above, guarantee visits to Thasos, the ‘Hellespont,’ as, en route, towns on the Propontis, to which may be added with confidence Byzantion. How far Herodotus’ excursions inland into Thrace extended can hardly be made out. No critical reader will cite the inscription of the Tearos, or the description of the Lake-dwellings, as evidence in this connexion; nor argue from the course of the Danube, or the geography or ethnography of the Thracians, that Herodotus had ever penetrated beyond the coast. A casual phrase on Thracian ritual carries a stronger suggestion of autopsy without determining its area. Nor will any critical reader argue from the descriptions and measurements of the Pontos, and adjacent waters, that Herodotus had in person traversed the length and breadth of

---

1 4. 105.
2 4. 15.
3 For ref. see p. lxxxii. supra.
4 Cp. Appendix X.
5 5. 67.
6 6. 76. Add Elia (1) 4. 30, 5. 22 (92 3), 6. 127, etc.
7 5. 100 and note ad l.
8 4. 204.
9 6. 20.
10 6. 119.
11 5. 116. As Herodotus had cer-

tainly been to Tyre (2. 44) he may very well have been in Kypros.
12 Cp. 4. 95.
13 4. 81, 87.
14 4. 91.
15 5. 16.
16 4. 48-50.
17 4. 89-98 ; 5. 3-10.
18 4. 33 οἷδα δέ αὐτός . . τὰς Θρημιὰς καὶ τὰς Πανοιχίδας γεναίκας κτλ. : cp. 4. 74 on cannabis.
19 4. 85 f.
of the Euxine, or ever set eyes upon the sea of Azof. The heart of the problem is reached when the point arises, whether Herodotus ever got him farther than Byzantion? There is but one passage in the fourth Book, and not any elsewhere, which is at all difficult to explain on the supposition that Herodotus stayed his voyage at Byzantion. The description of Examps, and of the krater there,\(^1\) might seem hardly consistent with candour and honesty, if Herodotus had not at least been as far as Borysthenes (Olbia). The indication of the site of Olbia, or Borysthenes, would suit autopsy, but is not inconsistent with an oral or written source.\(^2\) The supposition that he reached Olbia, however, once granted fits in so well with the character of much of the Scythian Logi, especially the parts descriptive of the land, rivers, manners and customs of the people, that it can hardly be resisted. No one, however, will carry Herodotus beyond the Tanais on the strength of the ruins he reports as extant in his own day,\(^3\) much less to the city of Gelonos even though he corrects ‘Hellenes’ for an error in regard to its inhabitants;\(^4\) albeit the misdescription of the Crimea\(^5\) is not conclusive proof that he never sighted its shores, but proves at most that he did not approach it on the land side. The attempt to construct a map of any country, or district, by simple autopsy is one of the grossest fallacies of inspection that can be perpetrated; but it is more likely to be committed by an actual visitor than by a mere literateur. Neither the description of the Emporion of the Borysthenites as the middle of the Scythian coast\(^6\) nor the references to other natural or artificial objects\(^7\) can prove much; but bearing in mind the obvious principle that Herodotus is

---

\(^1\) 4. 81. See notes ad l.

\(^2\) 4. 53 πέραν τοῦ ἱπποῦ ὑπὸ τῶν Ταύνων Βορυσθενῶν κατοίκηται.

\(^3\) 4. 124.

\(^4\) 4. 108 f.

\(^5\) 4. 99.

\(^6\) 4. 17.

\(^7\) The remarks on the blindness of the slaves (c. 2) is very far from implying a visit to Scythia. The remarks on the Emoroes (c. 67, ep. w. 1. 105) are more to the point. One might almost fancy that Herodotus had heard the Scyths howling in the vapour-bath (c. 75). Herodotus might easily have seen pictorial representations of Scyths with cups at their girdles (c. 10), or have met Scyths elsewhere than in Scythia proper. Those who think Herodotus must have gone to Scythia to see snow (c. 81, ep. 50) may infer from his account of the climate (c. 28) that he spent a whole year in the land. The native pottery (c. 61) has a flavour of autopsy about it; but pottery is portable. Tymnes (c. 76) may have met Hdt. in Olbia elsewhere. The Kimmerian remains (c. 11, 12) are no more conclusive than the forts of Dareses (c. 124). The same canon applies to other geographical and ethnographical details.
not writing a book of travels but a work on history and geography, it is reasonable to conclude in this region that the absolutely convincing evidences, if taken alone and interpreted strictly, would lead to an under-estimate of the range of his personal observations, and that a margin should be allowed over and above the bare necessities of the case: though in regard to the breadth of that margin an exact agreement is hardly to be expected.

Libya.—The difficulty of establishing a visit by Herodotus to Kyrene, or any travel in Libya, is very great. The citation of Libyans,\(^1\) of Kyrenaecans,\(^2\) of Carthaginians,\(^3\) certainly does not prove it. The clearest proof that Herodotus had in person conversed with men of Kyrene is supplied by a passage in the second Book,\(^4\) but there is nothing in the passage to suggest that the scene of the interview was Kyrene: the context would rather suggest Egypt. If another passage in the second Book,\(^5\) which has been relied upon to prove a visit to Kyrene,\(^6\) is conclusive, then the passage in the fourth Book, describing the forts on the Oaros, may also be held to prove autopsy, or a passage in the sixth Book\(^7\) to prove a visit to Arderikka and the Eretrians. The comparison between the size of Plataea and Kyrene\(^8\) may suggest that Herodotus had not seen the island, but cannot prove that he had seen the city. The hint of the elevation of the Kyreneean plateau\(^9\) is suggestive of vision: but the statement might be based on hearsay, as the passage which follows on the eight months' harvest of Kyrene most probably is, unless we are prepared to keep Herodotus nearly a year in the place. The descriptions of Aziris,\(^10\) and of Kinyps,\(^11\) are graphic, but cannot prove more than that Herodotus has lively sources to follow. The localisation of the Silphium cultivation\(^12\) no more proves autopsy than the mention of the weasels which infest it closely resembling those of Tartessos;\(^13\) such creatures Herodotus might have seen without going to Spain.

---

1. 4. 173, 191.
2. 4. 154.
3. 4. 43, 195, 196.
4. 2. 32 τάδε μὲν Ἰκουσα ἄνδρῶν Κυρηναίων φαμάδων κτλ.
5. 2. 181 ἢ δὲ Λαδίκαι ἀνέβας τὸν εἰκόνα τῇ περὶ τοῦ καλλίου ἀνέπεμψε ἐκ Κυρήνης, τὸ ἕτε καὶ ἐκ ἐκείνου οὗτος, ἦν τετραμμένος τοῦ Κυρηναίων ἄστεος.
7. 6. 119, 6. 204; 6. 20.
8. 4. 156 λέγεται δὲ λαμ εἴπαι ἡ νήσος τῷ μέν Κυρηναίων πόλι.
9. 4. 199.
10. 4. 157.
11. 4. 175, 198 (ep. 5. 42).
12. 4. 169.
13. 4. 192.
or Libya. If the general account of Kyrene and the adjoining regions is relied upon as furnishing proof that Herodotus visited Kyrene, it must be remembered, on the other hand, that the general account is what Herodotus might most easily have obtained at second hand, and that in some respects the general account is misleading, or distorted. Thus, it is generally admitted, that the description of the Zones applies less accurately to the eastern part of Libya (which would be familiar in Kyrene), than to the western part (which would be known in Carthage, or from Carthaginian sources). It is practically beyond doubt that Herodotus cannot have visited the Oases which he describes with complete confidence, for he makes them hills instead of hollows, and he blunders at the start to a matter of some 400 miles. The account of the parathalassie Libyans begins from Egypt; the tribes are not based or centred on Kyrene, as is the case with the Scythian tribes in relation to Olbia. It might from this contrast be argued that for the Libyan ethnography Herodotus is not even following a Kyrenaean source. In regard to the historical portion of the second part of the fourth Book no one will maintain that Herodotus must have gone to Kyrene to acquire any part or elements in it. In regard to the geography, however, a different impression prevails. Even assuming that, for the Libyan geography, Herodotus had no scriptural source—a large assumption—enough allowance has not been made for some other possibilities. A good deal was known of Libya in Thera, in Samos, in Delphi: but still more in Egypt, and not a little, we may conjecture, in Sicily and Magna Graecia. The presence of the Egyptian (Helleno-Egyptian) sources seem specially strong in the account of the coast, in the account of Libyan tribes, between Egypt and the Syrtes, and in the account of the Oases. The presence of the western sources may fairly be suspected in the account of the Zones and in such passages as are ascribed to Carthaginian authority. The story of Dorieus, the adventures of Philip, suggest channels along which information reached Sicily and the West. The southward connexion between the western Greeks and Africa.

1 Bunbury, i. 263.
2 Ibid. 275.
4 4. 168-169 ἀπ᾽ Ἀγρίπτου ἄρχεται.
5 Cp. p. lxviii. supra.
6 5. 42-47.
has perhaps not been sufficiently taken into account. The well-ascertained route from Tripoli inland was probably known to Sikeliota.\(^1\) It might even be suspected that the artificial African honey, or sugar,\(^2\) came across to compete with the genuine Hyblaean product in the home-market. The correspondences between the Egyptian and Libyan Logi\(^3\) suggest a large community of origin. The obvious evidences in the fourth Book, and throughout the second volume, of Herodotus’ migration to the west before the materials of the fourth Book were brought into their present form, give ample room for additions from western sources. In any case, if Herodotus ever set foot in Kyrene, it would probably have been in connexion with his voyage to and from Egypt.

The West.—It is not merely the Libyan Logi which betray the influence of western sources, and therefore support the view that the western migration of Herodotus was an important factor in the composition of his work, and in particular of this second volume of his work. His knowledge and opinions of Europe and European matters, outside Hellas, are apparently affected by his visit to the west. The dominant instance is the comparison between Attica and the Iapygian promontory: \(^4\) but it may fairly be considered that the unique reference to Massalia,\(^5\) if not the mention of the Veneti,\(^6\) is attributable to contact with western information. It may also fairly be asked whether the statements and theory of Herodotus respecting the Danube\(^7\) are not coloured by western information, startling as it may be to find the Danube, in his pages, pursuing a course which silently intersects the actual course of the Rhone. It is, however, in the narrative portions of the fifth and sixth Books that the western sources flow most freely. The story of Dorieus,\(^8\) as told by Herodotus, is almost inconceivable except as due in part to local authorities. The same remark applies with equal force to the account of the Samian adventurers at Zankle,\(^9\) and to the note on Dionysios.\(^10\) If

---

1 4. 183.  
2 4. 194.  
3 4. 159, cp. 2, 101; (4. 165, cp. 3, 91). Add 4. 181, 186, 204 f. The absence of a cross reference from 4. 172 to 2. 32 is no great difficulty. The references to Egypt in the Scythian Logi do not prove much, though it is observable that Egypt is cited as better known 4. 47 (conversely the course of the

---

Danube is better known than that of the Nile, 4. 48 f., 2. 33). 4. 42, 43 is a remarkable supplement to 2. 158. Cp. also 4. 39.

4 4. 99.  
5 5. 9.  
6 5. 9.  
7 4. 49, cp. 5. 9.  
8 5, 42-48.  
9 6. 22, 23.  
10 6. 17.
the appearance of Smindyrides of Sybaris, with the intercalated note on the acme of Sybaris, and of Damasos son of Amyris the sage of Siris, among the suitors of Agariste, need not be explained as a compliment to the émigré historian’s new surroundings, yet the citation of the Sybarites who occupied Laos and Skidros, after the destruction of their own city, has an almost unmistakable ring of local knowledge in it. The whole evidence verificatory of Herodotus’ acquaintance with western sources at first hand is, of course, not confined to the three Books here considered; and such stories as the tale of Demokedes, or the account of the battle of Himera, supply important evidences in this connexion. But it is the fourth Book, significantly enough, which contains the irrefragable evidence of an actual movement by the historian in person to the west, in the proof of his presence in Zakynthos, and in Metapontion, and in the implicit appeal to a western audience by the introduction of the Tapygian promontory as a natural feature better known than the Attic Sunion. And the distribution of the Italo-Sikelio influence and materials over all three volumes of his work, points strongly to the conclusion that Herodotus gave the work its final form and unity in the comparative retirement and detachment of his western home. Internal evidences hardly justify the attempt to trace more minutely his movements on Italiote, or on Sikeliote ground.

Whether Herodotus ever revisited Athens, after his traditional settlement at Thurii, there is no clear evidence to show. No other hypothesis, however, so well explains the presence, the presumable insertion, of the numerous references to events in the early years of the Peloponnesian war. The chief bar to the theory—apart from the absence of positive testimony—is raised by the conflict between the testimony of Thucydides and the testimony of Herodotus concerning the shaking of Delos. According to Herodotus there was a unique earthquake there just after the invasion of 490 B.C. According to Thucydides there was a unique earthquake there just before the outbreak of war in 431 B.C. The two statements

1 6. 127.  
2 6. 21.  
3 120 ff., cp. also 3. 115.  
4 165-167.  
5 4. 195. The visit to Dodona (2. 52) might belong to the same period.  
6 4. 15.  
7 4. 99. The remark on the relative positions of Attica and Lemnos, 6. 139 ad fin., would hardly have been necessary east of Adrius.  
8 6. 98.  
9 Thuc. 2. 8.
are irreconcilable. The contradiction has to be explained. It seems most improbable that, if there had been an earthquake in 431 B.C. and if Herodotus had been in Athens then, or shortly afterwards, he should not have heard of it; or hearing of it, should have left his statement uncorrected. Even bringing the date of Herodotus' last revision down to 425/4 B.C.—a date so late as to be hardly tolerable—the supposition is inadmissible that an earthquake in 431 B.C. had been thrown back sixty years, and relegated to the region of ancient history to please an interested visitor.\(^1\) The first alternative is to suppose Thucydides in the wrong. If there were two earthquakes, Herodotus has not heard of the one in 431 B.C. Thucydides has, wittingly or unwittingly, denied the other. If there was only one earthquake, Herodotus is in the right, Thucydides in the wrong. How the error in Thucydides is to be explained is another question; but it must be remembered that Thucydides was at work on his history at least twenty-eight years, and possibly thirty years or more, after the alleged earthquake of 431 B.C., and that there is nothing to show at what time he was informed of the earthquake, or inserted the information in his work. Without any insinuation of *mala fides* against Thucydides, it is just conceivable that, before he wrote the passage in question, the earthquake of 490 B.C. had been carried down to do duty in connexion with the Peloponnesian war. That hypothesis is less violent than the alternative that an earthquake in 431 B.C. had been antedated forthwith sixty years. It is to be feared that the vigilance of Thucydides somewhat relaxed when he had to deal with allegations which tended to magnify his own proper subject.\(^2\) No critic is bound to exalt the authority of Thucydides at the expense of Herodotus, least of all on a point where the later historian has an interest adverse to the credit of the earlier. One other conceivability should be faced. Both historians may be in error to this extent, that there had been no earthquake at all, either in 490 B.C. or in 431 B.C. Earthquakes unfortunately cannot be verified like eclipses. An invention at Delos is not impossible. A fiction might be more easily a movable or multiple point. Of all these possibilities

---

\(^1\) All the more inadmissible as in that very year took place the great Purification and institution of the Penteteris, *Thuc.* 1. 8, 3. 104, cp. 5. 1. It is remarkable that Thucydides does not connect the Purification with the earthquake.

\(^2\) *Thuc.* 1. 23, 1-3; 5. 26, 3, 4.
the least probable is surely the transfer to 490 B.C. of an earthquake belonging to 431 B.C. There is therefore nothing in the situation to bar effectively a visit by Herodotus to Athens after 431 B.C. The mention of the Propylaea\(^1\) favours the supposition. Later than 425 B.C. it cannot be brought, even by pressing the evidence.\(^2\) Further speculation were easy but idle.\(^3\)

§ 22. Upon the materials which reached him one way or another, at various times and various places, the mind of Herodotus seems to have exercised a two-fold action, for the one part critical and selective, for the other presentative and creative. A very large part of the text of Herodotus is occupied with the express statement and exposition of his own opinions, views, judgments, while indirectly and inferentially this element is largely reinforced by his methods of historiography. The presence of a large reflective element, as distinguished from strictly descriptive and strictly narrative elements, in the text is, indeed, more obvious than the extent to which the reflective element is to be ascribed to the proper action of the historian’s own mind. Certain opinions, judgments and afterthoughts are so closely implicated in the historic matter reported, and are so highly characteristic of popular modes of Greek thought, that they may have come to Herodotus ready-made, in tradition, or in his scriptural sources. Even his own most conscious essays in the philosophy of life and history are hardly original creations, but rather exhibit the precision and application of certain ethical and theologic ideas, constantly present in Greek literature, from Homer and Hesiod to Aischylos and Pindar. But what he found ready to his hand, Herodotus made his own by adoption; and so far as the estimate of the historian’s mind, methods, and authority is concerned, the distinction between his own judgment, reason and understanding of the matters recorded in his work, and the

---

\(^1\) 5, 77.

\(^2\) Artaxerxes is not for certain dead in 6, 98 (cp. notes ad L.), and the death of Zopyros has been plausibly dated 428 or 427 B.C. (ep. Ktesias, ed. Gilmore, p. 165), so that his desertion to Athens (3. 160) might fall some time earlier.

\(^3\) As, for example, whether Herodotus survived Perikles (cp. 6. 131); whether Herodotus came back to Athens with Gorgias in 427 B.C.—of which there is absolutely no evidence; whether Herodotus died of the plague from which Thucydides recovered, and so on. Once for all, Herodotus did not attempt to write an autobiography, and the independent evidences are scanty, late and untrustworthy (cp. Bauer, Herodot’s Biographie, 1878).
judgment of others, his contemporaries and predecessors, is mainly important where he obviously records an opinion or theory in order to express his own dissent therefrom; or emphasises the expression of his own opinion in such a way as to imply that it is more or less peculiar and original. It is, indeed, evident that Herodotus was very far from believing everything that he had heard and read. The conflict of evidence and opinion, natural to a multitude and variety of sources, forced upon him a certain degree of criticism, and even an uncontradicted report was not acceptable to him if it conflicted with his general conceptions of probability. It is easily intelligible that critical expressions of dissent, or disbelief, should be most frequent in regard to natural as distinguished from historical facts, or at least in regard to facts involving directly the appeal to natural probability. It is rarely that a purely historical statement is reported and discredited by Herodotus as false or calumnious. In general the historical doubt is exhibited by the conflict of authorities, the exhibit at least implying that Herodotus had not definitely made up his mind in favour of one or other. For the rest, where a statement is given without express comment, or with only so much criticism as is implied in the citation of an authority, it must be taken as the version of facts, or of affairs, adopted by Herodotus, and as the expression, so far, of his own understanding. It is important to observe that Herodotus, though plainly implying the distinction between the credible and the incredible, the probable and the improbable, the uncertain and the certain, does not base the said differences on differences in his sources of information, or on distinctions between observation and inference, inference and testimony. Such differences and

---

1 4. 42, the sun on the right hand (ὑμιν μεν οθ πιστα, ἄλλω δε δὴ τευ); 4. 24, existence of goat-footed men; 5. 10, a country full of bees (οθνεκάτα); 4. 25, that any human beings sleep six months on end (ταύτα δε οθ ενδεκάμα την ἀρχήν); 4. 5, that the first man in Scythia was a son of Zeus and the daughter of Borysthenes (ὑμιν μεν οθ πιστα); 5. 86, that wooden statues fell upon their knees (ὑμιν μεν οθ πιστα λέγοντες, ἄλλω δε τευ); 6. 82, a report in the Herion excites his strong suspicion; 4. 96, the existence of an underground chamber is itself an open question, the story is discredited on other grounds; 4. 36, incredulity rises to ridicule.

2 6. 121, the responsibility of the Alkmionids for the shield episode (θώμα δε μοι καὶ οθ ενδεκάμα την λόγον... θώμα δε μοι καὶ οθ προσέλευ την διαβολήν). Cp. 4. 77, 105, 155, 195; 5. 10.

3 6. 14 τὸ ἐνθέμενον οθ ἐχω ἀπεξεται συγγράφαι... ἄλληθι γάρ κατατίθεται. λέγοντες δε κτλ. Cp. 4. 8, 11 ff., 154; 5. 44 ff., 57, 85 ff.; 6. 52 ff., 154, 137.
distinctions are implied in his *formulae*, but they are not made the basis of a scale of probabilities. Herodotus has plainly some ideal of knowledge and historic certainty; but the truth, as he conceives it, may be obtained by various ways from various sources in various degrees. Knowledge is not with him different in kind from opinion, and certainty is equally attainable by testimony, by the evidence of his own eyes, by inference and combinations. He knows, by his own inferential conjecture, that Aristeas appeared in Metapontion 240 years after his final disappearance in Kyzikos.¹ He has no knowledge of any man of erudition, except Anacharsis, who has ever arisen among the Scythians.² He has an absolute certainty in regard to the Hellenism of the Macedonian royal house,³ which he offers to demonstrate, and he subsequently fulfils the promise by a transparently pragmatic legend.⁴ But he does not always accept a family’s history at its own valuation; for he corrects the Gephyraean tradition in the light of his own personal investigations.⁵ He has personal knowledge of the employment of wheat by Thracian bacchanals,⁶ but whether such knowledge is based upon the evidence of sight,⁷ or of hearsay,⁸ his *formulae* do not in themselves enable us to determine.

The canon that Herodotus does not, as a rule, draw a hard and fast distinction between hearsay and autopsy, autopsy and inference, avoids the error of arguing, from the standing formula τῶν ἕμεις ἕδει,⁹ the presence of anything more than a tradition, or an inference. In some cases, indeed, the phrase occurs in regard to matters which might have come actually under the writer’s own observation;¹⁰ but in others such a possibility is excluded by the reference to a particular event in the past.¹¹ The turn of

¹ 4. 15 τάσις ἕνεκα... ὡς ἑνώ εὐμSELL academics... εἴρηκαν.
² 4. 46 αὐτόν ἀνδρα λόγον ἀδαιρεν γενόμενον.
³ 5. 22 αὐτῷ τέ τυγχάνω ἑπιστάμενον.
⁴ 8. 137 ff. ‘subsequently,’ i.e. in the present order of the work.
⁵ 5. 57 ὃς μὲν αὐτοί λέγοιν... ὃς ἐν ἀναπροσβάλλομεν εἴρησκον.
⁶ 4. 33 μέν ἄνθρωπος ἀδιάβαστος... ταῦτα μὴν διὰ ταύτα ἀδιάβαστος.
⁷ Op. 4. 31 δύσι... ἐδεί... ἅν τὸ ἄτροπον.
⁸ Op. 4. 16 ἀδελφὸς ἀδείς ἄρκειον... αὐτοῦ γὰρ δόθη κατὰ τάσιν εἰδέναι φαμένον δύναμις πόθεναν.
⁹ This formula is originally but a modest limitation of an otherwise absolute superlative; πρῶτος, 4. 42; 6. 112; μέγιστος, 4. 46, 48, 152; μικρός, 4. 148; 5. 119; ἐπιχολωστής, 4. 58; ἑγκράτειν, 4. 187.
¹⁰ The Danube, 4. 42; the Scythian grass, 4. 58; Libyan health, 4. 187; absence of proper names, 4. 184.
¹¹ Circumnavigation of Libya, 4. 42; charge at Marathon, 6. 112.
the formula in itself tends to reduce it to a mere form, implying very little deliberate limitation. When Herodotus wishes to mark the limits of knowledge, whether personal or general, he has more explicit methods.\(^1\) The occurrence of such *formulae*, whether conventional or charged with a personal significance, goes some way towards constituting Herodotus, for us, the father of criticism, as he is the father of history. Such a title, however, cannot be construed into the statement that he was the only, or even the best, critic of his time; in this, as in some other respects, he was probably rather behind than ahead of some contemporaries. It is a happy accident that his work remains to represent much that has perished of better and of worse.

Even larger than the space filled by express statements of disbelief, doubt, or conflicting opinions in the text, is the room assigned to expressions of constructive personal opinion, directly or indirectly at variance with tradition, or with rival hypotheses. Here again, from the nature of the case, the most obvious examples concern natural facts, as distinguished from historic events or occurrences, but examples of inference or theory, in regard to the latter class of facts, are not infrequent. Herodotus has his own theory to account for the absence of floods in the Danube,\(^2\) the relation between climate and inhabitants,\(^3\) the relation between climate and growth,\(^4\) the great superiority of Europe to Asia and Libya in size,\(^5\) and of Europe and Asia to Libya in fertility.\(^6\) Herodotus passes more distinctly into the region of historic theory, or construction, when he expresses an opinion that the Hellenes learnt the art of writing from the Phoenicians,\(^7\) that Egyptian armour was used in the Libyan ritual before Greek,\(^8\) that the Allelu-cry was invented in Libya,\(^9\) that Salmoxis lived long before Pythagoras,\(^10\) that the men of Thera and Kyrene were mistaken in reporting that their founder’s name was Battos.\(^11\) Herodotus allows himself some liberty in the ascription of motives

---

\(^1\) δευτ. ἡμεῖς Πήνεως, 4. 197 (cp. 4. 20); τοῦτο δὲ ἐν ἔχω εἰκών, id.; οὐκ ἔχω ἄρκειαν ἑικών, 4. 187 (διός); οὐκ ἔχω προϊστρέφων εἰκών τούτων, 6. 124; οὐκ ἔχω συμπάθειας, 4. 45; μόνον δὲ τούτων τῶν τοιαύτων καὶ Νείλου οὐκ ἔχω φράσεις τὰς πηγὰς, διόκει δὲ, οὐδὲ οἷοι ἑλκύουσι, 4. 53; ἐκείνην τοῦτο εἶναι ἄδικον γεζησαν, 6. 139.

\(^2\) 4. 50, but cp. notes ad l.

\(^3\) 5. 10.

\(^4\) 4. 29.

\(^5\) 4. 42.

\(^6\) 4. 198.

\(^7\) 5. 58.

\(^8\) 4. 180.

\(^9\) 4. 189.

\(^10\) 4. 96.

\(^11\) 4. 155.
for historical acts, or possibilities, but the express motivation of actions or explanations of conduct is so seldom qualified by any formula, that the introduction of a formula rather seems to suggest alternative theories, or accounts of the action. In general Herodotus assigns, or reports, motives for personal conduct without apparent misgiving. Such motivation may have been taken over from his sources, or may be an inference of his own, so obvious, perhaps, as to seem almost self-evident. But the judgments implied are not always indisputable, or even adequate.

The motivation of action in such cases may, or may not, be as historically true as it is psychologically natural. In some cases, indeed, the anecdotal or biographical details present improbabilities or inconsistencies more or less considerable; and it would be too much to say that the action of individuals, when explained by Herodotus, is always explained in a satisfactory or convincing manner. There may not be an absolute contradiction between the motives and objects for the Scythian expedition as stated in the opening of the fourth Book, and the account given in the third; but there is a discrepancy sufficient to justify the hypothesis that the two passages belong to different cycles, or sources, of tradition, or that one of them is a tradition or anecdote, which Herodotus would not forego, while the other is his own more rationalised explanation. The contrast between the incorruptibility of Kleomenes, in his interview with Maiandrus, and

---

1 5. 67, 69, motives of Kleisthenes (δοκεῖν ἐμοὶ διὰ); 5. 48, the reason given by Hdt. for the hypothetical succession of Doriæus; 5. 118, the course that would have been the best.

2 6. 30, Dariæus would not have put Histiaies to death (δοκεῖν ἐμοὶ).

3 Hdt. allows himself great liberty in explaining the psychological motivation of actions, e.g. in the case of Dariæus 4. 1 ἐπεδιόρισε... διὰ κτλ.; 58 ἡθελε... ἐδωρήθησε (cp. εἰς. 91, 97); 44 βουλήμενος εἰδέναι (a purely scientific curiosity!); 5. 11, 12, 24, 105; 6. 30, 48, etc. In the case of Aristagoras, 5. 30, 35, 98, 124. In the case of Histiaies, 4. 137; 5. 11, 23, 35, 106 f.; 6. 1-5, 29. Other persons, Theras, 4. 147; Doriæus, 5. 42; Kleomenes, 5. 74; Pausanias, 5. 32, etc., etc. A volonté générale is also similarly accounted for: e.g. 5. 77, 78, 79, 81 (εἰδαμωσίας τε μεγᾶς ἑξάρθησεν κτλ.); 83 (ἀγνωρίσθην χρησάμενος); 91 (καθισμός ἤ στιν κτλ.), etc., etc. From another point of view Hdt.'s motivation may be tabulated differently. Desire for revenge (τικίστ), 4. 1, 139; 5. 74, 79, 91; 6. 84. Gain, 6. 100 (θὰ κέρδηκα προσδοκόμενοι), 132. Ambition, 4. 146; 5. 12, 30, 32, etc. Patriotism, 6. 109; Jealousy, 6. 61, etc. Scorn, 6. 67. Pity, 4. 167 (κασακωτερίας); 5. 92 (οἰκτίστ τιν). Fear, 5. 124; 6. 29. Affection, 4. 146; 5. 49; 6. 21. Gratitude, 5. 91; 6. 30. Ignorance, 5. 19 (ἀνείπως τε τῶν καὶ κακῶν ἀπαθή). Curiosity, 4. 44, and so forth.

4 4. 1, cp. 3. 134.

5 3. 148.
his facility in yielding towards Aristagoras,\(^1\) might be explained by a degeneracy in his character, or by a superiority in the arts of the Milesian adventurer over those of the Samian; but the simpler explanation is found in assigning the anecdotes to different sources, and in detecting the ‘pragmatic’ character of the second: though it is significant of Herodotus’ methods that he should seem wholly unconscious of the difficulty. Of course the madness of Kleomenes would account for almost anything related of him; but the madness itself has still to be proved.\(^2\) The motive for the exile of Theran from Sparta might have been taken from the story of Dorieus, or of Demaratos; but the verisimilitude of the psychological motivation is in this case probably a substitute for historical truth.\(^3\) The contrast between the aged and wise Amyntas and the inexperienced and youthful Alexander\(^4\) adequately accounts for the difference in the action ascribed to them, but cannot guarantee the historic reality of the story of the young men in women’s clothes. In short, it is very seldom, if ever, that individual conduct is explained by Herodotus in a way which is unnatural, or psychologically untrue; but it is not seldom that the explanation he gives is unsatisfactory, at least where he is dealing with political characters and with actions of historic importance. The materials for correcting or completing his rationale of affairs are not seldom supplied by himself, but they are apparently supplied, to a large extent, unconsciously. Thus, in accounting for the different reception accorded to Aristagoras in Sparta and in Athens, Herodotus betrays an exemplary want of political circumspection; but his own text, in its narrative of events, supplies us with full materials for the correction of the error.\(^5\) His ascription of motives to Kleisthenes the Athenian reformer seems prejudiced and superficial; it requires at least to be translated into more political language before it is rendered acceptable.\(^6\) It is difficult to understand how an author could have written the defence of the Alkmaionidae\(^7\) in oblivion of the

\(^1\) 5. 51.
\(^2\) 5. 42 ήμεν τε οδ οφρυνήμεν ἀκροφανῆ τε. The words ὃν λέγεται suggest a doubt, which disappears in 6. 75, 84. though the words ἐώνα καὶ πρῶτον ἔμφασις ἐμπηχύνον look rather like an harmonistic suggestion.
\(^3\) 4. 147 ὁ Ὀθρατι δεινόν ποιήσαμεν κτλ.: εἰρ. 5. 42, ὁ Δωρεύς δεινὸν τε ποιήσαμεν κτλ.
\(^4\) 5. 19.
\(^5\) 5. 69, εἰρ. Εἰκόνα VII.
\(^6\) 5. 69, εἰρ. § 17 εἰκονα.
\(^7\) 6. 121, 123, 124.
alliances with Peisistratos,1 which he elsewhere records, and with Kleisthenes of Sikyon, which he immediately relates.

Thus, a modern critic may fairly be tempted to charge Herodotus himself with a failure of political insight, remarkable in a contemporary of Pericles and Thucydides, to say nothing of the Comedians; and to ascribe the profounder glimpses of policy and political causation, which traverse or illuminate his pages, either to a better source, or group of sources, or to the irresistible logic of facts honestly narrated, and recoverable or replaceable in chronological order. The natural and profound identity of interest between the Mede and the local despotisms in the Greek states could not anywhere be more conspicuously and convincingly displayed than in the pages of Herodotus;2 but he makes himself doubly responsible for the story—which no apologetic attempts can effectively save—of the proposed institution of democracy in Persia in the year 521 B.C.3 It is difficult to understand how the author, who penned the praise of democracy in the fifth Book,4 should have committed himself to the amazingly superficial judgment involved in his comments on the Atheno-Ionian alliance a few pages later;5 unless we catch echoes, in the one passage, of an Athenian judgment, in the other, of a Laconian jest. The verdict upon the strength and weakness of the Thracian folk (ἐθνος) is one of the most pregnant in the pages of Herodotus, and he expressly claims it for his own;6 and the general cause of migrations is detected amid a medley of fabulous traditions.7 Two other passages, in which the selfish, yet shrewd, policy of Sparta is placed in an unusually clear light, exhibit a political penetration which goes beyond the normal standard of Herodotus' own rationale of affairs, the account of the proposed restoration of Hippias,8 and the account of the refusal of the Platean alliance.9

---

1 1. 60 f.
2 4. 137, cp. 4. 165; 5. 11, 12, 32, 37; 6. 9, 13, 25, 94, 96, 104, 107, etc.
3 6. 43.
4 5. 78.
5 5. 97.
6 5. 3 εἰ δὲ ὡς ἄρχω οἱ φρουροὶ κατὰ τῶντά, ἵππειν τὰ ἐν εἰς καὶ πολλὰς κρατιστοὺς πάντων ἠθέτω καὶ κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐνέσι. Did Hdt. intend to insinuate a parallel, a warning? See note ad l.
7 4. 11.
8 5. 91 τούτῳ Ἀθηναίοις ἀρων αὐτοπρεπεσι καὶ οὐδεμισί ἐποίησον ἑντάς πείθεσι θαλάσσιοι, νῦν λαβότοι ὃ ἐλθέτων μὴ ἐν τῷ γένοι τῷ Ἀττικῶν ἱσαρθοῦν ἔν τῷ ἑωτῶς γένεσι, κατεχόμενον δὲ ὡς τυραννίδος ἀθετῆται καὶ πειθεθεῖσθαι ἐταμομοι, εκλ.
9 6. 108 ταῦτα συνεβαλλον οἱ Δακεναιμόναι οὕτως ὕπο τῶν Παταλών ὃ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐξειν πόλοις ἑμαυτεῖς Βοιωτοῖς.
These cases suggest an Athenian Machiavelli in the background. In other instances Herodotus seems to have fallen a victim to local sources, concerned to give an explanation, other than political, for political actions. The expulsion of the Peisistratids by the Spartans was due purely to religious piety—as we may suppose Spartans themselves, or philo-Laconians at Athens, to have averred.\textsuperscript{1} The Athenian expedition to Paros—for which it is not difficult to find good reasons in policy and strategy—is ascribed by Herodotus, or his sources, to motives of mere personal revenge in the commander, and mere avarice in the citizens.\textsuperscript{2} The Eretrians went to Miletos to repay an old benefit—as Eretrians themselves were, perhaps, careful to record.\textsuperscript{3} That the friendship of Corinth for Athens was dictated, or affected, by commercial motives, it does not become Herodotus, or his sources, to suggest.\textsuperscript{4} This superficiality in the rationale of action is the more remarkable, inasmuch as Herodotus knew well enough that the real and the apparent reasons do not always coincide in political affairs.\textsuperscript{5} But this knowledge is but rarely applied by him to the explanation of human action, and upon the whole it is evident that his own conscious explanation of public actions fell far short of the policy and statecraft of the ages which he describes and represents.

The indifference shown by Herodotus, in his rationale of human conduct, whether in peoples or in individuals, for the merely utilitarian motives may be traced, at least in part, to two principles:

i. Herodotus loves a good story, and writes for lovers of good stories, for the many rather than the few: he was a logograph, not a sophist, and took Homer rather than Anaxagoras for his master. Science and philosophy are abstract, and eliminate details essential to good story-telling. There may, indeed, be more truth in well-told stories than in half the systems of philosophy, but it is a truth, so to speak, held in solution, and unrelated to other truths. Its charm lies in its indefiniteness: it is not in a teachable form. It gives delight but not instruction. It preserves the memory of men and deeds; but it carries no

\textsuperscript{1} 5. 63 τὰ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ πρεσβύτερα ἐποιήσετο οἱ τῶν ἄνδρων.
\textsuperscript{2} 6. 132, 133.
\textsuperscript{3} 5. 99.
\textsuperscript{4} 5. 75, 92; 6. 89.
\textsuperscript{5} 4. 166 αὕτην οἱ ἄλλην ἐπενέκας: 4.
167 αὕτη μὲν νῦν αὕτη πρόσχημα τοῦ στόλου ἐγένετο. Ὅπ. 5. 24; 6. 3.
advice, and formulates no maxim. It rests in the simple and immediate intuition that anything and everything which men and women do or suffer is interesting to their fellows. This naïve yet noble sense of humanity was the first instinct of representation for Herodotus, and leaves him for the most part free to take the past at its own valuation.\footnote{1}{Cp. Hdt. 1. 5, and Thuc. 1. 22. 4.}

ii. It is not inconsistent with this observation to admit that the characteristic defects of Herodotus, from the point of view of the scientific or philosophic historian, are also due, in part, to his preference for a particular theory, a certain rationale of events and affairs. Herodotus too often and too easily has recourse to the supernatural for the reason, cause, or explanation of the doings and sufferings of men. Not that the regions of the natural and of the supernatural were divided, or disintegrated, in the time and thought of Herodotus, and of those for whom in the first instance he was writing. But the very indefiniteness of the frontiers between the human and the superhuman, as conceived by Greeks five centuries before Christ, opened the door, on the smallest provocation, to the deus ex machina, to the special and direct intervention of the superhuman agent. A comparison between the stories of Herodotus and the stories of Homer, from this point of view, exhibits a difference of degree rather than a difference of kind. In two respects there is a development observable in passing from the Epos to the Logos: (1) Direct intervention of gods is not, indeed, absent from the pages of Herodotus, even when he is recording events of yesterday;\footnote{2}{Pan, 6. 105; Helena, 6. 61; Astrabakos, 6. 69. These are but second class deities. The visions of Epizeiros, 6. 117, and Miltiades, 6. 135, are scarcely in point. Aristaeas, 4. 15, is not identified by Herodotus with Apollo, and the historian appears to have some doubt as to the epiphany of the god in Metapontum. The apparition of Triton, 4. 179, is ancient history.} but in general the gods are farther withdrawn,\footnote{3}{Herodotus disbelieves the story of the marriage of Zeus and the daughter of Borysthenes, 4. 5, and even removes Zeus from the pedigree of the Herakleids (τὸν θεόν ἀπέδωκε, 6. 53), though, so to speak, 'without prejudice.' If he records a flagrant myth, or harmony of myths, in regard to the paternity of Athene (4. 180, cp. 188), it is plainly not that he believes it. His scepticism in regard to the inspiration of Aristaeas (φοβόλαμένος, 4. 18) may be due to the higher faith: a similar influence may be traced in the practice, almost invariable with him, of making the Pythia, rather than the god, technically responsible for the oracular response. Even the Euhemerism, before Euhemeros, which appears in his pages, is evidence of the tendency to remove the genuine gods farther from the immediate sphere of mortality.} nor does the historian
pretend to reveal them in their Olympian or celestial home. Corresponding to this change there is a double development. (a) On the one hand what may be called the secondary causes, agencies, or channels of divine revelation and will, play, positively and relatively, a larger part in the narrative. (b) On the other hand the unity, the continuity, and the ubiquity of the supernatural agency, are presented under more abstract, less personal and less frankly polytheistic formulae.

Though Damis and Aulus, 5. 82, are still gods in the eyes of Herodotus (τῶν θεῶν τωτῶν c. 88), he quietly accepts the process which has deposed Arge and Opis (4.39-35), Arietos (4.12), Adrastos (6.67); the identification of the Tamia Virgin with Iphigenia (4.108) finds less favour in his eyes, and he applies, with considerable misgiving, on his own account the same process to the divinity of Salmoxis (4.96).

The actual habitation of the gods is a problem upon which Herodotus can scarcely be cross-examined. Sokles turns the world upside down without reference to the question (5.92 ad init.). The symbolic act and prayer of Dareios (5.105) in no way commits Herodotus. His account of a performance of the Getae (πρὸς βραχυanism tis kai ἐπαραγωγὴ τάξισες ἴσως ἐπὶ τῶν ναόων ὀπλίσσει τῶν θεῶν, 4.94) points more clearly to an assumption, and a hint of the same assumption is involved in his report of the disaster to the palace of Skyles (ἐν ταύτην ἵ θεος ἐνέκρινε βέλος, 4.79). Even if such phrases came to Herodotus, ready made in his sources, his adoption of them would justify inference to his own opinions: but the materials are slight.

2 e.g. Oracles: for ref. see § 20 supra. Dreams: of Hipparchos, 5.56; Hippias, 6.107; Datis, 6.118; Agariste, 6.131. Omens, or Portents: the Delian earthquake, 6.98; the swarm of bees, 5.114; the flash in the Heraion, 6.82; the kneeling statues, 5.86. Natural events may have divine significance: σήματε μεγάλα, 6.27; the sign of the hospitable man, 6.35. Mero accident (τῶν θεῶν) may be divine: (4.2) 5.92 γ. Cp. 4.152.

2 Herodotus was a polytheist. It would, of course, be an ignorant elenchos to cite passages which simply illustrate the common Greek polytheism, without dissent on the historian's part, as such passages might all claim privilege; but certainly the omis probabitis lies with those who consider Herodotus to have been emancipated from the average theology of his time and folk. In speeches, the polytheistic formulae might be regarded as dramatically appropriate: e.g. ἡθος τὰ λαοί νεμόνων 6.11; θεοὶς τὰ καὶ Σεβάστης εἴδοτες χάροι, 4.136; πρὸς θεῶν τῶν Ἑλλήνων 6.49; cp. 92 ad fin., 93. (In 5.106 a monotheistic formula might have been more appropriate.) In a large number of cases a monotheistic, or 'kathenotheistic' expression occurs, but can nearly always be reduced to a particular denomination: Thus ὁ θεὸς in 4.157; 5.67; 5.79 (ἐν θεῶν), 80, plainly means Apollo; in 6.53 Zeus. In 6.63 (τῶν θεῶν προβριότερα ἐπιμένον ὁ τῶν ἱερῶν, Apollo is almost certainly meant; the reference in the following passages may not be so indisputable: 4.79 (ὁ θεὸς ἐνέκρινε βέλος), Zeus! 5.1 (χαράφατος τοῦ θεοῦ) Dionysoos! 6.98 (τερας ἥραμεν ὁ θεὸς) Apollo! In 6.27 (πάντα μέν σαρ σημαίνη ὁ θεὸς προβοδεῖ) Herodotus comes nearer to a monotheistic formula than anywhere else, perhaps, in these Books. τὸ ἀδυνατὸν τῶν θεῶν, 5.72, may be taken to imply the deity of Athene; τὸ τέμνον τῶν θεῶν, 6.75, that of Demeter and Persephone; τῶν θεῶν, 6.61, that of
If dreams, omens, oracles, and other works of divination\(^1\) play a large part in the narrative of Herodotus, belief in them played a large part in the actual life and action which he depicts. Still we are bound to remember that some of his contemporaries were looking for natural causality, where others saw more or less direct intervention of the superhuman will, or wills; and that Herodotus in his attitude on this matter represents rather the popular than the critical spirit of his age. This reaction, or survival, in his mind seems to leave him satisfied with the more edifying version of many events and acts where a more scientific one might have been forthcoming, or to lead him even to prefer a story, or a version of affairs, which introduces the miraculous or supernormal element, even if it be in the humble form of an undesigned coincidence.\(^2\) If from one point of view the result presents to us a more lively and instructive picture of the mind and morale of Hellas in the historian’s own day, still, on the

---

1 The apparition of Melissa 5. 92 \(\eta\); the madness of Kleomenes, 6. 84; the panic of the Persians, 4. 203; the fright of Miltiades, 6. 134.

2 6. 116, to this class might also be referred the curious or ironical fulfillments of prophecy: 5. 72; 6. 86, 139 \(f\).
whole, it can hardly be contended that the professed history recorded by Herodotus has not suffered by the idola fori, which intrude upon it at every turn. The result may be all equally historical to us; but the history is not exactly the history as the writer himself conceived it.

(2) The above argument is not substantially modified when we turn from the particular and secondary manifestations of the divine purpose, and causality, to the metaphysical and ethical design underlying or pervading the world of human history, as conceived by Herodotus. To Herodotus human history as a whole, and in its parts, is a fable, or book of fables, with one moral, verifiable in the fortunes of the State, revealed in the cases of the Family and the Man. Human life to Herodotus is a sphere for the realisation of Divine Judgments. The rise and fall of communities, the fates of individuals alike proclaim themselves manifestations of an overruling interference and providence. The judgments are not, indeed, mysterious, but intelligible. Explaining, rather than paraphrasing, the thought of Herodotus, one might say that the judgment is human, the power which fulfils it is divine. Doubtless this view of human affairs tends at times to trivialities. It becomes a substitute for hard thinking. It furnishes an easy exit to every moral problem. It does duty instead of an investigation into the actual circumstances of an obscure case. It encourages ethical and devout intuition as a substitute for the discovery of intrigue and policy, the lower and higher springs of human action. It eliminates accident; it tends to eliminate pity and pathos. Though it begins in poetry, it ends in the flattest commonplace. But it has one great merit—it appeals to the wide public, not to this or that school or clique; it preserves, to a wonderful extent, facts which are significant, and leaves the philosopher or critic to place his own interpretations upon the facts which have been preserved by their very apotheosis. Herodotus was not, of course, in any sense the inventor of that philosophy of life which meets us in his pages. On one side the doctrine of divine feeling and judgment and their exhibition in human history is but the application of the common Greek standards of character and conduct to the fortunes of states and nations, of great persons and families. The principles of the divine justice are but the maxims of popular ethics writ large.
and applied on a large scale. In literature this application had a long history before the time of Herodotus, beginning at least with the Homeric poems, and passing, through lyric and tragic poetry, to the creators of prose literature. If originality is to be claimed for Herodotus in this connexion, it must be sought rather in his application of the doctrine to the fortunes of nations, and in the enlargement of the sphere and operation of this poetic justice by its introduction as a principle of artistic creation into logography. It here especially concerns us to observe the variety of the formulae employed by Herodotus for its expression, and their incidence in the fourth, fifth and sixth Books. Four principal terms, with their cognates, occur for the expression of the doctrine, as verifiable in history: φθόνος, νέμεσις, τίας, δίκη. A consideration of these terms, and an examination of their employment, can leave little room for doubt that the first is the most emphatically anthropopathic, and the last the most purely moral and objective, while the second inclines to the region of human feeling, and the third to the greater austerity of the purely moral judgment. It is also clear that in the usage of

1 Cp. the reason given for the 'promiscuity' among the Agathysins: ἵππα καθωριστὶ τε ἄλλων ἔως καὶ ἄλλοις εἶναι πάντες μὲν ἐνθαν αὐτῆς ἐγχεῖται ἔτη ἄλλου, 4. 104. Add, φθόνος τι καὶ ἰμποσ τῆς γῆς, quoting Ἀκαταλόκα, 6. 137; φθόνοι καὶ δίκαιοι χρησίμων, 6. 61. In χρυσός φθόνοις, 6. 192, the compound has lost its primary force. The only passage in these Books where the term is predicated of the divine beings is 4. 205, but the doctrine underlies the prejudice against the ἔθνων of Naxos and Miletos, 5. 28, and other passages.

2 The absence of δίκη marks a savage lawless condition: ἂν ἀνθρώπων ἄνθρωποι ἔχουσι χρήμα, οὐτε δίκην νομίζοσθε οὐτε ἐνερ γίνεσθε χρείματα, 4. 106. Justice demands the avoidance of aggression by states as by individuals (ὑπηρετοὶ δίκης, 4. 1; cp. 119), the respect for contrata, 5. 84, cp. 4. 196, scrupulous honesty, 6. 86, and in general respect for the rights of persons, family, property, and so on; cp. 4. 114; 5. 92 (the injustice of tyranny, cp. 6. 127, Pheidon): and as the truly just man is blessed (Skythes, 6. 24, δικαίωτας . . . γαρ μέγα δίκης ἐκ τῶν ἐκείνην), so the unjust man is surely punished (6. 86, Glanoke). To be punished or to make atonement for wrong-doing is the law of this world (τῶν πρὸσερ θεομάτων δίκαιος ἔκκα, 6. 87), and has the highest sanction (τὴν Πολιτείας ἐκλεον Ἀθηναίων δίκαιος δίκαιος, 6. 139), and well is then that recognises this law (cp. 6. 92). The corruption of human justice (δίκαιος δίκης, 5. 25) is deservedly punished with condivg severity.

3 The term νέμεσις does not occur in these Books as it happens; though we are within measurable distance of that idea in the myth of Adrastos, 5. 97, see notes ad l., and perhaps not far off, in the ἔρωτος τῶν ἀνθρώπων of the 'oracle' put into the mouth of Leotychides, 6. 86.

4 The term τίας and its cognates might appear in some respects the most purely objective, supplying, as they do, a formula for the lex talionis as a fact,
Herodotus the first two terms are more distinctly religious, the last two more ethical. It can hardly be a mere accident that in the three Books here in question the formula of φθόνος, νέμεσις, almost disappear, giving way to the more abstract and colder formula of τίτας and δίκη, or even to the indifference of a purely fatalistic principle.\textsuperscript{1} It may be that the change is due, at least in part, to a difference in the date and mood in which Herodotus compiled this portion of his work. Without endorsing the theory that his visit to Egypt produced any sceptical development, or tendency, in his mind,\textsuperscript{2} it is still possible to argue that the various portions of the work of Herodotus were not all composed in the same vein, and that in the course of thirty years or so his mind underwent some development and readjustment in the light of his ever-growing experience. But anything like a radical change or conversion in the mind of Herodotus cannot be discovered in his work. In any case he left all the passages, in which the lower anthropopathetic and least defensible descriptions of the divine nature are to be found, standing in the last and mature revision of the whole work; and the elements for a sceptical education were much more efficient in the philosophic schools of Ionia, or of Magna Graecia, than in the temples of Egypt. Nor could it be mere chronological differences in the subject that account for the differences in the formulae, which express the judgment of Herodotus on the course of affairs; for in regard to the most recent section of events, the invasion of Xerxes, the doctrine of the divine φθόνος is formulated not less explicitly than in regard to the more remote. Something plainly depends upon the scale of action, the elements of contrast; and if Artabanos applies for the benefit of Xerxes\textsuperscript{3} the same

\textsuperscript{1} Without the intervention of the act of judgment implied by δίκη. But such an appearance is illusory. For, in the first place, τίτας, τίταια, et sii. are more nearly related to human feeling than δίκη, and, secondly, the τίτας only becomes part of the divine order when it is related to δίκη and the judgment therein contained. The following refl. will show that a real τίτας implies a real, or supposed, δίκη, δίκη, as antecedent, 4. 1, 118, 139; 5. 77, 78, 91, 105; 5. 72, 75, 84, 87, 92, 101 (cp. 5. 102). The most perfect expression of the law is found in the divine verse 5. 56, οὐκέτα δέονται διαθέσαι δικήν τίτας οὐκ αἰτούμενα. It may be added that the term δέον, or an equivalent, is not infrequently found to express, or explain, the wrong, 4. 146, 150; 5. 74; 6. 57, 127, 137, cp. 4. 99 ff.; 5. 89; 6. 95; 6. 19, etc.

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Bleer et sii.} Cp. note 3, p. cxiii. 

\textsuperscript{3} A suggestion of A. Bauer's, \textit{Die Entstehung, etc.}, p. 47 ft.
doctrine, in almost the same words, which is put into Solon’s mouth for the benefit of Kroisos; one reason may be that Kroisos and Xerxes supplied the two greatest and most thrilling examples within Greek memory to illustrate this strain of Greek thought. Something also may turn upon the state and condition of the sources available for Herodotus. The story of Xerxes, the story of Kroisos, as surely as the story of Periandros or the story of Glaukos, had been ethicised and pragmatised before Herodotus undertook to narrate them. The story of Marathon was still in the making, and more a matter of private interpretation; the supernatural ornaments were not wanting to it; but the Athenian sources followed by Herodotus, pragmatic though they were, could not wholly obliterate the historic significance or even the immediate causality of that victory. The story of the Ionian revolt is curiously free from the supernatural deposit, whether as a constituent, or as a reflective, element. The lesson of the story as told by Herodotus is an almost purely political and historical lesson. So far as his sources were not affected by later political interests, they seem to go back to authentic and contemporary testimony of one kind or another. That the historical element is not always in inverse proportion to the amount of supernaturalism in a story is proved by the case of the Scythian campaign, where the element of fiction is patent and preponderant, and the supernaturalism is conspicuous only by its absence. The story as a whole may have been calculated to exhibit a case of human pride and ambition foiled and punished by divine will; but the lesson is not explicitly enforced, and the story is largely an illustration of military, rather than of ethical,

1 1. 32.
2 It is observable that Hdt. is very far from restricting the significance of the Delian earthquake to the campaign which, according to him, it immediately preceded, 6. 98. The epiphany of Pan, 6. 105, the dream of Hippias, c. 107, the vision of Epizezos, c. 117, the dream of Datis, c. 118, the coincidence, c. 108, 116, exhaust the marvels of Marathon in the Herodotean record. But the miraculous element is still far larger than in the stories of the Scythian campaign and Ionian revolt.
3 See further on this subject, Appendix X.
4 oţi γὰρ ἔδεε κτλ. 5. 33. The burning of the temple, 5. 102, the prayer of Dareios, 5. 105, the oath of Histiaios, 5. 106, can hardly be reckoned. But 5. 114; 6. 16, 27, are more to the point.
5 4. 83; 7. 10, 18. In the last passage it ranks with the disastrous expeditions of Kyros against the Massagetae and of Kambyses against the Aithiopes.
maxims. Stories of Mardonios, of Dorieus, of Kleomenes, of Miltiades had all been ethicised and pietised, that is rationalised, in terms acceptable to the feelings of good Hellenes, before they reached Herodotus. How much his own art or piety added in such cases it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to determine. In the case of Kleomenes, the actual variant of the historian himself involves but a distinction without a difference. The story of Glaukos likewise points to the source of such implicit morals; for it cannot be supposed that Herodotus simply invented that story. Neither in these, nor in other cases, have we the means of determining the exact limits of Herodotus’ creative energy as an author. His style is his own, as much as any word, thought, language or method can ever be the proper and sole work of one individual mind. His materials are all but invariably worked up into the forms and phrases of his own style; it is very rarely that he presents his materials raw, or just as he obtained them. The speeches, as they stand in his work, can hardly be authentic, however much of traditional matter they may directly, or indirectly, preserve. It is not likely that any story or anecdote, as a rule, loses in the telling, as Herodotus tells it; but that he deliberately fabricated anecdote, legend or narrative is an hypothesis beyond proof. All but the greatest achievement of his art is the work as a whole, the wholeness of the work. But this wholeness can best

1 6. 43-45.
2 6. 42-45. It was the men of Sybaris who reasoned: εἰ δὴ μὴ παρέπεμψε μὴν εἶλα, that is, who argued that the fate of Dorieus was a divine judgment. But Herodotus only differs by exaggerating the alternative, c. 48.
3 6. 75, 84.
4 6. 135 makes the Pythia responsible for the moral.
5 ι. c. εἰσὶ δὲ δοκεῖ τινι πάντως ὁ Κλεομένης Ἀγαθίνης ἐκτίναι.
6 6. 86.
7 We have, indeed, practically almost nothing of the Logographs with which to compare it; but the verdict of antiquity comes in; cp. Dionys. Halikarn. De imitations 3 (ed. Usener, 1889, pp. 22 ff.), Ep. ad Pomp. 3 (Usener, pp. 49 ff.), Hermogenes, De gen. dicendi, 2.

12 (ed. Spengel, ii. p. 421). The conscious and deliberate contrast of style presented by Thucydides might suggest an analogous relation between Herodotus and Hekataios, who was by no means devoid of style; cp. Hermogenes, op. cit. (Spengel, ii. pp. 428 ff.). Herodotus’ ‘first style’ (cp. Schöll, Philologus, x. p. 76), or other styles, may be sufficiently accounted for by the varieties of his subjects and sources. Cp. § 20 supra, and p. lxvii.

* But cp. notes to 4. 13 ; 5. 36 ; 6. 137.

* Express quotations, of course, excepted. The poetical source sometimes shimmers through the prose; cp. 4. 163 ; 5. 92 ; 6. 126. The official document sometimes shows through the more artful texture; cp. 5. 52 ; 6. 53.
be understood when the work is regarded as a result of growth, revision, reflection and time, almost a lifetime: not a product, conceived as it stands, and worked out, at one time and one place, in accordance with that single preconception. The summit of the writer's art is to have all but completely obliterated the evidences of that process by which his work reached its relative perfection, rendering any and every hypothesis on the subject apparently beyond the conditions of absolute verification. So far as reasonable hypotheses go, they are to be reached almost solely by a simple yet searching analysis of the work into its constituent parts and elements, and a critical observation of the general and special qualities and characters of the materials, or elements, out of which the work, as a whole, has been created. In the present edition that method is exhibited in application to a good third of the work, in accordance with the initial principle of division expounded above.\textsuperscript{1} That the exhibition is complete, or exhaustive, is not here insinuated; nor is it to be denied that its results, in regard to any given portion of the work, must depend, in the final resort, on its application to the work from beginning to end.

\textsuperscript{1} §§ 1 ff.
THE TEXT

The Greek Text printed in this edition is taken, not without corrections, from Stein's smaller edition, Herodoti Historiae. Ad recensionem suam recognovit Henricus Stein. Berolinii, apud Weidmannos. A. MDCCCLXXIV. That edition presents a more conservative result than would be generally acceptable now-days, or than Stein himself, perhaps, would now endorse, as appears from the later issues of his annotated edition of Bks. 7 (1889), 8, 9 (1893). That result, however, represents an average of the codices, as good, perhaps, as any other, and therefore, apart from certain practical advantages, lends itself conveniently to the purposes of the historical commentator. In the Notes, however, some space has inevitably been devoted to various readings, emendations and conjectures, and a few contributions to the ideal text have been attempted. The textual criticism of Herodotus has, indeed, for some time past been largely and justifiably exercised in conjectural emendation. The condition and classification of the MSS. appear to have been fairly well ascertained, and the statement of the case, as given by Stein in his larger edition (1869), still, in the main, holds the field. Of some six and forty codices Stein rejected five and thirty, as critically useless; of the eleven remaining codices he took five, as the basis of his text, using the others as subsidiary or illustrative. Having regard merely to the actually extant and best MSS., it is generally agreed that they are ultimately derived from two main types: I. A text represented by the three oldest MSS., the Medicæus, Medicæus (A) succ. X., a Roman, Passioneus (B) succ. XI., and a Florentine, Florentinus, or Laurentianus (C) succulit, ut videtur, XI., now, like A, in the Laurentian Library. II. A text represented by a Roman, Vaticanus (R) succ. XIV., a Parisian, Parisinus (P) succ., ut videtur, XIII., a Viennese, Vindobonensis (V), and the Sancroft MS. in Emmanuel College, Cambridge (S, or s), this last having a special interest for English scholars, as its collation formed the characteristic of Gaisford's text. These two main types are indicated in A. Holder's edition by the symbols α (= A + B), and β (= R + V + S), which symbols have been occasionally employed in the following Notes. Speaking broadly, Stein's texts incline in favour of the first class, α, and especially of A, while the tendency of later editors has been to increase the authority of the second, β, and especially of R. (See C. G. Cobet, Mnemosyne, 1882, pp. 400 ff., M. Wehrmann, de Herodoti codicis Romani auctoritate. Halle, 1882.) The whole of the fifth Book, however, happens to be wanting in this Roman MS. It would be rash to assert that the last word has been said upon the authority of the existing codices; but, meanwhile, criticism has been busy, on the strength of the approximate agree-
ment above indicated, in restoring the original text, not merely upon the basis of the MSS. readings, but by the aid of copious conjecture. There are three directions in which this work has been carried on: first, towards the removal of glosses and interpolations, mostly short; the only long passage, in the books here immediately under consideration, open to grave suspicion being 6. 122, a chapter actually omitted in α (ABC). Secondly, in the direction of marking, and supplying lacunae, a class of corruptions which editors are tending to enlarge more and more. In the third place, an effort is being made to purify and restore the true Herodotean dialect, not alone from the literary sources, but also from epigraphic evidences. Whether this last device can result in a genuine restoration of the Archetype, from which ex hypothesi all existing MSS. are descended, much more in the sure restoration of genuinely Herodotean forms, are problems involving some previous questions, as, for example, the relation of the dialect of inscriptions in evidence to the literary forms adopted by Herodotus, which cannot here be pursued. Remarks upon the constitution of the text have been introduced in the Notes following, mainly where they seemed to be demanded by material or historical considerations. It is assumed that every student of the text, as such, will have at his command the larger edition of Stein (Herodoti Historiae. Recensuit Henricus Stein. Berlin, 1869), exhibiting the testimonia as well as the MSS. readings, together with the indispensable edition of Holder (Herodoti Historiae recensuit Alfred Holder. Leipzig, 1886, 1888), the apparatus criticus of which includes the principal emendations up to date; and it were well not to overlook the strictly castigated edition of van Herwerden (HPOΔΟΤΟΥΥ ICTΟPIAI recognovit Henricus van Herwerden, 4 vols. Utrecht, s. n.), which, though designed, perhaps like the archetype of class β above described, in usum scholarum, is a monument of critical courage, not less acceptable to the historical student than exemplary to the textual reformer. Cobet's recension of the text of the three Books here in question is to be found in Mnemosyne, 1884, pp. 77 ff., 129 ff. The Index Lationum, at the end of volume II., exhibits the critical apparatus of this edition in a continuous form.
ΜΕΛΟΠΟΜΕΝΗ

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν Βαβυλώναν αἴρεσιν ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Σκύθας αὐτῶν Ἰ Δαρείου Ἑλλάσι. ἀνθεύόμενος γὰρ τῆς Ἀσίης ἀνδρᾶς καὶ χρημάτων μεγάλων συνόντων, ἔπεθυμησε ο Ναρέιος τίσασθαι Σκύθας, ὅτι ἐκεῖνοι πρότεροι ἐξακολούθησαν ἐς τὴν Μηδικὴν καὶ κινήσας τοὺς ἀντιομένους ὑπήρξαν ἀδικίς. τῆς γὰρ ἄνω Ἀσίης 5 ἦρξαν, ὥς καὶ πρὸτερον μοι εἰρήθη, Σκύθαις ἦταν δυνῶν δέοντα τριθέοντα. Κιμερίους γὰρ ἐπιδιώκοντας ἐξέβαλον ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην, καταπαύσαντες τὴς ἄρχεσις Μήδους; οὕτω γὰρ πρὶν ᾧ Σκύθας ἀπεκέφαλι ἦρξαν τῆς Ἀσίης. τοὺς δὲ Σκύθας ἀποδιδόμενα σκέφτατο καὶ ἐκεῖσι ἦταν καὶ διὰ χρόνον τοσοῦτον ἤταν κατανόησαι ἑξεδέβατο ὡς ἐλάσσον πόνος τοῦ Μηδικοῦ; εἰρον γὰρ ἀντιομένη σφίεσε στρατηγὴν οὐκ ὁλήθην. αἴ γὰρ τῶν Σκυθέων γυναῖκες, ὡς σφι παῖς ἄνδρες ἀπῆραν χρόνον

1. 1. μετὰ πτχ. For the Chronology, see Appendix III.
2. Ἐπὶ Σκύθας αὐτῶν Δαρείου Ἑλλάσι. Of the king in person, as of Cambyses against Egypt (3. 1), and against the Althiopians (3. 25), or Xerxes against Hellas. Compare 7. 10 8; 7. 20; cp. Isocrates 4. 88 μετὰ δὲ ταύτα γενοµένη τῆς δυστού στρατείας, ἄρετος Ἐξέβησεν τῆς Σάτρας τοῦ Λαοῦ, which is the reading of the codices, is preferable to αὐτὸ τοῦ (Schweig. and Blakeley), or to αὐτὸ, suggested by Stein, or the bald τοῦ (Cobel). Cr. αὐτοῦ Δαρείου 5. 32, and c. 83 inστ. Book 1. Introduction, § 12, p. xxviii.
3. Ἑλλάσι, 7. 87. μετὰ Ἀσίης. On the motives and object of the Scythian Expedition, see Appendix III.
4. Ἀνδρᾶς. But compare 7. 210. τολμῶν μὲν ἄνδρων εἰς, ὁλγοί δὲ ἄνδρες. Here ἄνδρας denotes the fighting population of Asia: there the fighters of Hellas as compared with Asia. 5. τῆς ἄνω Ἀσίης. E. of the Halys, cp. 1. 5, 72, 95, 177. 6. ὡς καὶ πρῶτον. 1. 108-107. The phrase proves nothing concerning the original order of composition.

Though nodom hordes had swept over civilized Asia, an ἄρξις of the Scyths is hardly to be admitted (pace Guest, Origins Ciliciae i. 17). The idea illustrates a pragmatic tendency towards artificial combinations and perspective in historiography. There are other misconceptions in the passage. That the Scyths entered Asia 'in pursuit of' the kimmerians is very doubtful; that the Median overlordship preceded the invasion of the nomads is certainly not true. The number of years (28) is also suspect. On these three points see further Appendix I.
2. 1. τοῦ δὲ δοῦλου. This chapter comes in awkwardly, the matter it contains is suspicious, and the logic (τοῦ γάλατος διέκεισα) questionable; but these considerations are not sufficient to call its authenticity into question. Stein supposes it a later insertion by the author himself; and attempts have been made to diminish its harshness by emendation and rearrangement. That mare's milk was a principal item in Seythian diet is certain, and that the yield was increased by some such strange operation as is here described is probable (see Rawlinson, ad locum). It may be further argued from the passage that even the nomad Seythians possessed slaves, and Rawlinson apparently accepts the statement that the slaves were all blinded. But in c. 20 infra we are told that the Seythians between the river Gerhis and the 'Trench' consider all the other Seythians their slaves. We are evidently dealing with inexact terms and ideas. Blindness is said to be common in South Russia (vide Baehr ad l.), and blind men, whether bond or free, could make themselves useful in preparing the enemies, though they could not guide a plough, or look after droves of cattle. Slaves were of course largely exported from Seythia to Athens, but koumis was apparently not generally known to the Hellenes, or this passage would, perhaps, not have been inserted. φαινεται does not prove that Herodotus saw the process or its result, or even that it was explained to him personally by native Seythians (cp. Introduction, § 20, pp. lxxvii ff.). Neumann, Die Helenen im Seythenlande, p. 379, calls the story eine abgeschmackte Erzählung, and is shocked by Hdt.'s logic, or want of logic: Rawlinson thinks the blindness adapted to pastoral life, an opinion directly traversed by Stein, who thinks there is some etymological confusion at the base of the story: the Seythians gave slaves a name which Greeks mistranslated τυφλοί—hinc illae lacrymæ (cp. Schol. ad Aristoph. Eq. 959 Φαινόντο μαλαγών ἄμα τοῖς τυφλοῖς. Ἡροδότος δὲ ἑπτάκοροι τῶν Ἡλείων τόσον ἐκκόλοξος τῆς Σεβλίας εἶναι. On which Doebre: Phainus videetur translusissi ad Hippomolos quaé tradit Herodotus de Ari- napsis. Phainus seems also to have misunderstood the word μαλάγας, Lobeck, Aglephantinus ii. 966, but that does not here concern us). Anyway, as Hansen (Unt-Europa §§ 16-202) points out, Hdt. is guilty of an inconsequence, in not explaining the connexion between the blindness of the slaves and the preparation of the milk: and no rearrangement of the text cures this defect. "Fabula perobscuræ," van Herweder.

8. κοίλα. Tr. 'capacious,' 'roomy,' or 'deep' (Krüger).

9. πειρατεύεται. The MSS. vary; πειρατεύεται a (AB), πειρατεύεται β (RR) which 'seems to make Doebre's conjecture πύεις ετεταύεται almost certain. πειρατεύεται in c. 202 infra militates against πειρατεύεται here.

12. οὐ... νομάδες. Stein transfers so as to follow πίσωνι νομάδα. The transposition may obviate the inconsequence of the remark, but does not diminish its inconsistency with subsequent passages, cp. 17. 18 infra. The whole chapter must be limited to the 'Royal' Seythia, c. 20 infra.
3. 2. νούτης. The notion of a kindred but inferior clan, or stratum, as being the offspring of free-born women and base or servile fathers is common. Well-known instances are those of the Partheniae at Sparta, see the foundation legend of Tarantum, Strabo, 278 (ed. Teubn. 1, 352), Aristot. Pol. 8, 7, 2, 1306 b. the Argive ‘slaves’ at Tyrins (§ 83 εύθρα), the Pelasgo-Athenians in Lemnos (§ 138 εύθρα). A legend could only have incorporated such a motive after society had entered the patriarchal stage. The story here is inconsistent, as Stein points out, with the view taken in § 11 εύθρα, and § 103, as it implies that the Scythians settled in Europe for a time before pursuing the Kimmiri into Asia. Hdt. seems unconscious of the inconsistency. Further, the report of the επίσημα verba of the Scythian orator, and the formulae used by him (specially δραμαλ τε καὶ εξ δραμαλ), do not render the story more probable. It has a flavour of Greek political philosophy about it; a moral for Greek slave-states.

4. τάφρον. Cp. c. 20 εύθρα. This trench is a puzzle to the geographers. Did it run E. and W. across the isthmus of Perikop, and divide the Crimea from the mainland, or did it run N. and S. within the Crimea, cutting off the Eastern portion of the peninsula? In after times at least there was a trench in the former situation; the mention of the mountains favours the latter supposition, and the majority of commentators adopt it, the rather as in c. 20 εύθρα this τάφρον is represented as forming part of the E. frontier of the Scythian royal, and so seems to run N. and S. The misconception of the situation and lie of the Crimea, c. 99 εύθρα, renders this supposition tenable. But there was probably more than one τάφρον in Scythia, and Hdt.’s ignorance of the true site and shape of the Crimea, and the questionable character of the tradition about the τυφλοὶ and their sons, discredit any fixed identification.

5. 5. τώδε εἶναι. On the freedom which Herodotus adopts or allows him-
5 'Ou de Sikhou³ labouv, neostatov pantov éthneôn elinai to
sféteron, touto de genésathai òde. Índra genésathai prôton en
thi yé taúth éousè érhmow thò ónuma elinai Tarchitaºn' toû
de Tarchitaºn toutou touk toxékas labouvai elinai, émou méws ou piastá
5 légovotes, légovai ð' òvn, Díma te kai Voronénes tou tomatou
vugatéra. Genéous méw toisotou ð' twos genésathai tou Tarchitaºn,
toutou de genésathai piados treis, Lepoxaiw kai 'Arpoxaiw kai
neostatoû Koláxaiw. Epî toutoun arghontoun ek tou ouaránu
fërómene chríseis toumata, árpton te kai xugnou kai
10 sáragen kai filalhn, pesein ð' thn Skuthekyn' kai thon idónta
prouton tou prosbútaun ðaskon Ieina buvolómenou auta lazein,
tou de chrusou épíntos kai légei, apallakheventos de tous
prosínei ð' deuterón, kai thon autha toumata poiweis, touws méw
dh kaiómenon tou chrusou apóstasathai, tríto de ð' wostatô
15 epeláthu katanábai, kai méw ekéinous komatá ek éousou' kai
touws prosbúterous adelphous prós toumata syngrynta thn
6 basileías páson paraðoyn ð' wostatô. Apò méw dh
Lepoxaíw gégevnavi toutous thon Skuthekyn ou 'Avgatíw génos
kaléontai, apò de toutos méson 'Arpoxaíw ou Katárois te kai
Tráspies kaléontai, apò de toutou wostatóu auton thn basileías

self in the motivation of actions, see
Introduction, § 21.
3. 1. òv de Sikhou³ lécovu. See In-
introduction, § 29, p. lxxxix.
On the Scythian Legend (cc. 8-13),
see Appendix I.

neostatoû. Cr. Justin 2. 1, 5
Scytharum gens antiquissima semper
habita, quamquam inter Scythas et
Aegyptos dix centum de genera
vetustate fuerit. Herodotus
knows nothing of dispute, though he
records a philological experiment made
by Psammetichos by which the priority
of the Phrygians to the Aegyptians was
thought to have been demonstrated,
2, 2.
4. ðei... ðv. An even more tolerant
formula is found elsewhere, e.g. 42
infra; a more decisive rejection, c. 25

9. toumata. These four may be
regarded as the prime instruments of
the local culture; their inventors' names
had been forgotten. The golden models
were objects of worship (fetish). (On
the worship of gold cp. Prof. Paley, in
Contemp. Revieiw, Aug. 1851. Very
quaint, deriving the use of gold from Sun
worship.) A humorous case of Gold
worship in Tylor, Prim. Culture ii. 154.
Gold was native in Scythia, and ex-
ported; it is chiefly found in the Ural
district, and, be it observed, to the east
of the mountains. See Stanford's
Compendium of Geography: Europe p.
184; Schrader, Prehistoric Antiquities
of the Argan Peoples (transl. by F. B.
175, 179.
6. 4. tou basileías. Holder reads tou
basileías, Wesseling touw basileías.
Would it not be better to cut out
the first τ. β. altogether? The omis-
sion of the proper name Kolaxios is
observable, after the introduction of the
two other proper names, Lipoxaís and
Arpoxaís. Could it be that Hdt. felt a
miegiving about the derivation of the
name Skoloti from the king's name?
Or did the text originally run (omitting
the first τ. β. basileías) Skolótou
Skolótou basileías émpynh, as Abich and Stein
suggest? But Skoloti might come of
Kolaxios: or rather, perhaps, Kolaxios
of Skoloti. Stein favours the derivation
of Skoló from a word meaning to shoot
with the bow; Rawlinson takes fSkóth-
οἱ καλέονται Παραλάταις σύμπανι δὲ εἶναι οὖν ὁμόμοια Σκολότους, τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπονυμημένος. Σκύθαις δὲ Ἑλληνες ὑώμοσαν. γεγονόντι μὲν τὸν σφαῖρα ὦν λέγουσιν οἱ Σκύθαι, ἔτεια δὲ σφίσι ἐπετεί ἕγενόντι τὰ σύμπαντα λέγουσιν εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτον βασιλέως Ταρταρίτου ἐν τῷ Δαρείου διάβασμα τὴν ἐπὶ σφαῖρα χίλιον οὖ πλέον ἄλλα τοσάθροι. τὸν δὲ χρυσὸν τούτον τοῦ ἱρόν φυλάσσουσι οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα, καὶ θυσίας μεγάλης θαυμάζουσι μετέχονται ἀνά πάν ἔτος. δὲ γὰρ ἢν ἔχων τὸν χρυσὸν τοῦ ἱρόν ἐν τῇ ἑρτῇ θυσίας κατακομμέθη, ὅτες λέγεται ὑπὸ Σκυθῶν ὦν διεισάγουσιν ἀλλὰ πρὸ ἐς τὸ τούτο ὅσα ἄν ἵππο ἐν ἥμερῃ μὴ περελάθῃ αὐτῶς, τῆς δὲ

= Σακά = Saka, the Persian name (perhaps connected with σκύτα, schützen, shoot).

The tripartition of the Skoloti or Scyths is implied in this legendary pedigree, and perhaps also a sense that the Paralataes (Royal, Nomad) Scyths were the last comers. Compare the Hellenic pedigree of Aeolians, Dorians, Ionians, and Achaianas, in which, however, the tribes are classified rather in the order of Hellenic dignity, than in the order of chronological precedence.

In the next chapter a tripartition of the Paralatae, or of their territory, is ascribed to Kolaxais (sic), so that he, like his father Targinas, is supposed to have had three sons. These three kingdoms reappear in c. 120 as the kingdom of Skopasia (to which the Saromatae are joined), the kingdom of Idantheys, the largest, and the kingdom of Taxakis (with which the Geloni and Budini are associated). From c. 10 it might be inferred that a tripartition lay between Agathys, Scyths and Geloni: that being in a story from another source. 7, 4, χίλιον may be merely a round number for an indefinite number of years, or may be based upon royal genealogies, probably imaginary, going back thirty generations. Van Herwerden deletes Ταργιτάνοι.

χρυσὸν. This passage on the "sacred gold" and its cult is very mysterious. (1) It comes in to break the immediate connexion. (2) It is incomplete and obscure in itself. (3) No reference is made to this cult in the subsequent passages where Hitt. dilates on the religion of the Scyths, cc. 59-63. (4) The χρυσαῖς = the κριναῖς ποιήματα c. 5 supra, which include an ἀστυρω, surely a strange implement to be worshipped by the Nomads. (5) The exact nature of a σάγας is doubtful: 7, 64 seems to identify it with δάμας. The cult of the golden σάγας contrasts with the better authenticated cult of the iron δάμας c. 62 infra. (6) Private property in land among the Nomads is improbable; and the enormous scale upon which it is granted—as much as he can ride round in a whole day (sunrise to sunset)—does not make it more credible. That the Scythic kings had gold cups is certain (cp. cc. 8, 71 infra): for the rest, we seem to be in contact with a genuine gold-myth, or treasure-saga: though it might be rash to assert that in the annual feast and sacrifice, the sleep sub Jove, the day’s ride, and the death within the year, we have indications of the source and symbolism of the supposed cult. There is nothing to show that Hitt. himself had seen the sacred gold treasure, guarded so jealously by the ‘kings,’ and fraught with such dire fatality to its guardian; there is no reason to believe that he had his direct knowledge of it from other than a Greek source, though the fable has a genuine native and primitive ring in it, worthy of the Edda.

8. διὰ τοῦτο. For going to sleep or for guarding the gold and taking the risk of being overcome by supernatural sleep! If he went to sleep it was feared, perchance, that the Niflings would come and steal or recover the gold. A ‘griffin’ would have done the service on lower terms or even perhaps a one-eyed man, like Hagen—vulc c. 15 and 27 infra.
10 χώρησ εύστοις μεγάλης τριφασίας τας βασιλείας των παραγωγών των εις τοιούτο καταστήσασθαι Κολάζαιν, και τοις μιν ποιήσαι μεγάστων, ειν τη του χρυσού φυλάεσσασθαι. τα δε κατύπτερε προς βορέην λέγουσι άνεμον των ύπεροικών της χώρης ούκ οὐδά τε είναι έτι προσωτέρω ουτέ οραν ουτέ διεξείναι υπό πετρών κεκαμένων πετρών γάρ και την γην και των ήρας είναι πλέον, και ταΰτα είναι τα ἀποκλειοντα την ψυξ.

8 Σκύθαι μέν διδ τέρ σφέων τε αυτών και της χώρης της κατύπτερε λέγουσι, Ἑλλήνων δε οι τον Πόντον οἰκεύοντες οίκε. Ἡρακλεία εὐαίσθητα τάς Γραισόνων βούς ἀπωκείμεναι ες γην ταύτην εὐσάν εἴρημεν, ἦτοι κατά τόν Σκύθαν νέμονται. Γραισόα δε οἰκείων 5 ἔξο τοῦ Πόντου, κατοικισμένοι την Ἑλληνες λέγουσι Ἐρυθεινον νήσου την πρός Γανδεριον τοιούτου ἔξο Ἡρακλείου στήλεων ἐπὶ της Ὡκεανοῦ. τον δε Ὡκεανοῦ λόγον μεν λέγουσι ἀπο ἠλων ἀνατολής αριθμόν γην περι πάσαν ρέμων, ἐργον δε οὖν ἀποδεικνύσι. ἐκθέτευν τον Ἡρακλεία ἀπικείμεναι ες την τόν Σκύθην χώρην 10 καλεμένην, και καταλαβέθην γάρ αυτών χειμώνα τε και κρύμων, ἐπεσυνάμενοι την λεωτέρην κατυπουσάν, τάς δε οἱ ἔποποι τάς ἀυτῶν ἀφαιρέσθημι θεί

11. Πατοῦ. Kolaxais, himself the youngest of three brothers, after excluding his two elder brothers from the kingdom, divides them among his three sons.

15. πατρήν. Cr. c. 31 infra.

8. 2. Ἑλλήνων. A list of the principal Greek cities on the Pontos is given by Rawlinson in L., cp. Kiepert, Manual of D. Geography §§ 184, 190, or Grote, Ill. 60, Ed. 1872, Pt. II. c. xvii. The expression used by Hdt. would of course cover Greeks on all coasts of the Pontos, but it is not to be supposed that the Greeks were unanimous in preferring this Herakleid legend. Possibly the story would be especially popular in Herakleia Pontica. It is characteristically Greek. A Herakleid lineage is provided for the Scythic kings, and an Hellenic claim to the soil thereby established. Cr. the Herakleid legend in Peloponnnes (8, 55 infra), the Herakleid genealogy in Lydia (1, 7), and the story of Dorius and the projected colony in Sicily (5, 43 infra). Certain touches in the native legend and custom are preserved; the number (3) of sons, the preference to the youngest, the bow, the drinking cup.

5. Ἁρρ. τ. Π... Ἁρρ. Ῥ. σ. A rather clumsy description, due perhaps to the fact that only the first vague indication was contained in the source, the second and fuller specification being an addition. This is the only mention of Gades in Herodotus (cp. 5, 9 infra).

The Herakles whose pillars were at Gades was the Tyrian, and this legend, intended to satisfy Hellenic feeling, suggests (to us) the idea that the Phoenicians were in the Pontos before the Greeks. Cr. c. 82 infra. The version in Diodorus, 2, 43, substitutes Zeus for Herakles, perhaps an improvement from a Greek point of view (cp. 2, 21, 23, and c. 38 infra).

Hdt.'s rejection of the ocean-stream theory probably fortified him in his rejection of this legend, which took that theory apparently for granted. Hekataios had previously rejected it: Arrian, Anab. 2, 16. Herakles was perhaps supposed to return from Creticae by ocean, or its shore: otherwise it would be difficult to justify the introduction in this place of the ocean. In this advent of the Tyrian Herakles to Scythia from the land side (N. or N.W.), have we a confession or confusion of old trade-routes from the Baltic to the Euxine? (Cr. c. 33 infra.)
tóχρ. ὅς δ’ ἐγερθῇναι τῶν Ἡρακλεών, δίξησθαι, πάντα δὲ τῆς 9
χώρης ἐπεξελθόντα τέλος ἀπεκένθαμεν ἐς τὴν Ἱλαιῆν ἑλεομένην
γῆν· ἐνθαῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν ἐφερεῖν ἐν ἄντρο μιχαπάρθενων τις, ἐχθρικαν
οἰκία, τῆς τὰ μὲν ἄνω ἀπὸ τῶν ἱλιθανῶν εἶναι γυναικών, τὰ δὲ
ἐνερεῖ ὀφίως. ἐδοῦτα δὲ καὶ θομάσαντα ἐπειρήθη πάντως ἐνἐνεῖβο 5
ὁδοὺ ὑποτος ἐπανώντας· τὴν δὲ φάναι ἐσωτήριον καὶ ὅλου
ἀποδώσειν ἐκεῖνος πρὸς ἡ ὑπερβάλλωσθαι τῶν ἀπόσσιν
τῶν ὑπόπτων, βουλομένου ὡς πλεῖστον χρόνον συνεῖναι τῷ Ἡρακλεών,
καὶ τῶν κομισάμενον ἐθέλειν ἀπαλάσσεσθαι· τέλος δὲ ἀποδε
dοῦσαν αὐτὴν εἰπεῖν “ὑπονοῦσ μὲν δὴ ταύτας ἀπικουμένας ἐνθάδε
ἐσσοσιτίς, ὡς, σάκτα καὶ σύ παράσχεσιν· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ σε ἕνες
τριῶν παῖδας ἔχω. τούτους ἐπείτω γένονται τρόφισι, ὃ τε χρή 
ποιέων, ἐξηρέο σὺ, εἰπεῖ αὐτῶν κατακλίζω (χώρης ἡ ἀκόλουθε ἔχω καὶ τὸ κράτος
αὐτῆς) ἐπὶ ἀποτέμπως παρὰ σέ.” 15
τὴν μὲν δὴ τάυτα ἐπειροῦσα, τὸν τὲ λέγουσι πρὸς τάυτα εἰπεῖν “ἐπείτω ἀνδροθέντας ἴδῃ τῶν
παῖδας, τάδε ποιεῦσα ὅτι ἀν ἀμαρτάνους τὸν μὲν ἄν ὀρίσει αὐτῶν
τὸ τόξον ὅπερ διατείμνεσθαι καὶ τῷ ξωστήρῳ τόδε κατὰ τάδε
ζωομένον, τούτου μὲν τάξις τῆς χώρης ὀλεθροπόρα ποιεῖ· δ’ δὲ
ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἐντέλλωμαι λείπεται, ἐπεμπεῖ ἐκ τῆς
χώρης καὶ τάδε ποίεσα αὐτῇ τε εὐφανεῖα καὶ τὰ ἐντελεχεία
ποιήσεις.” τὸν μὲν δὴ εἰρύσατο τῶν τόξων ὅτε ἔτερον (δύο 
τὴν δ’ ἐφορεῖν τέως Ἡρακλεών) καὶ τὸν ξωστήρα προδέθαμεν, παρα
dουσιν τὸ τόξον τε καὶ τὸν ξωστήρα ἔχοντα ἐπ’ ἀκρής τῆς
συμβολῆς φιάλην χρυσῆν, δόντα δὲ ἀπαλάσσεσθαι. τὴν δ’,
ἐπεί δὲ γενομένου τὸν παῖδας ἀνδροθήμεν, τούτῳ μὲν σφί οὖν
5 ματὰ θέσατο, τῷ μὲν Ἀγάθυρσαν αὐτῶν, τῷ δ’ ἐπομένῳ Γελανός,
Σκύθην δὲ τῷ νεκτάτῳ, τότε δὲ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς μεμημένην
αὐτῆς ποιήσα τα ἐντελεχεία. καὶ ἐπὶ δύο μὲν οἱ τῶν παῖδων,
τὸν τὲ Ἀγάθυρσαν καὶ τὸν Γελανός, οὐκ οὐκός τε βεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβεβε
δεῖ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος ἔχων οὔτε, τῷ μὲλλέστα λεγομένῳ 11

11. λ. ἐκεῖ καὶ. This εἰσεῖ τοῖς Ἐλλήνων
tε καὶ ἐπιστάμενα λεγομένου λόγος certainly
commands itself to the mind of to-
day, as to Hdt., in preference to the
'Scythic' or 'Helleno-Pontic' traditions. One is tempted to make the Greeks responsible mainly for the form of the tradition, reproducing as it does the terminology and motives of Greek politicians, and to refer the matter mainly to the barbarians; and further, to understand by 'barbarians' in this passage the Kimmerian refugees, and by Greeks, those of Sinope. In accepting this tradition as in the main the historical one we are not committed to the belief that the Kimmerians voluntarily vacated their territory, and that all the fighting was confined to the heroic duel between the chieftains. It is hardly likely that the chieftains at Sinope were drawn wholly from 'the masses,' or reached their new home without chiefs, and told a story there so much to their own discredit. (Rawlinson is wrong in translating βασιλεός "Royal tribe.") Hdt. makes himself responsible for the geography of this tradition, but it involves a grave difficulty. Whether the Araxes, here taken as the boundary between Asiatic Scythia and European Kimmeria, answer to the great river usually understood by that name, or to the Wolga, or to some other, in any case it must be sought far eastwards of the Taurus (Dnieper), beside which the last resting-place of the Kimmerians is set. This consideration drives us, in rationalising the legend, upon Niebuhr's hypothesis (apparently favoured by Rawlinson), that the Kimmerians quitted Europe and made their way to Sinope, not by the Caucasus, but by the Thracian Bosporos. Or, might they not have found their way across the sea? The real point of this tradition remains that the Scythians superceded and drove out the Kimmerians in South Russia, coming themselves from Asia, and further East. Cp. Appendix I.

9. πρὸ στροφῆς is an emendation of Stein's on the MSS. which read πρὸ τοῦ πολεμοῦ (β) or πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου (α), and he compares 8. 74 πρὸ χρόνον δομαλότου μετασχηματισθεὶς. The paralleling is not extensive or exact. It justifies πρὸ = ἠπάτη, but nothing further. The territory of the Kimmerians is not in the hands of the Scythians as Attica in the hands of Xerxes, and στροφὴ for χρόνον or χρόνον αὐτοῦ or such expression, is without other example. στροφή = μετασχήμασι c. 172 ἠπάτη of course proves nothing. In c. 35 ἠπάτη the word is used in its strict meaning. Kallenberg, Holder, and others read πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου.

10. μένωτας is another difficulty. The MSS. give δέλεμον, δέλος and νευμένα. Reiske emends δέλεμον, which Holder and van Herwerden adopt. Valeskena reads νυθή δέλος μένωτας, Buttmann δέλο μένωτας, Bredovius μένωτας (omitting δέλο), and this last is adopted by Kallenberg ed. Temn. Stein in his annotated ed. 1877, reads and defends δέλεμον = δέλο : cp. Soph. O. C. 570, Plat. Men. 79 δελοῦσα for δέλο.
11-13 MELOPOIHE

 epilepsy katalembanein. ois de dòxai aphi taúta, diastántau kal
 árthron isous genoménoi máxeisbai próz Ællhous, kal tois
 mèn atopoanóttas pátas úp' éowton thyai tón dímon tón
 Kimmérion pará potamó Túrón (kai sxeoan èti dhlóis èsti ó 20
 táfoi), thánontas dé ou toù tís ephodón ek tís chôrnis poiesaibai.
 Skúbas dé epelthóntas laseí梧 tìn chôrnu èrphn. kal kai
 mèn èn tì Skúthis Kimméra teînha, èsti dé porðmìa Kimméra,
 èsti dé kai chôrny ouño Kimméra, èsti dé Bosporos Kimmério
 kalómenos' fainontai dé oì Kimméria phugúntes éz tìn 'Åsin
 touc Skúbas kai tìn chêrphnwn ktiásantes, èn tì nýn Sinoptí
 pòlies 'Ellás oikístai. fainoroi dé eîaí kai oì Skúbas diówzantes
 aútous kai esabalóntes ès gína tìn Mnêikína, ámörttous tís
 ódou oì mèn gàr Kimmério ailei tìn pará thalassan èfeuñon, oí
 dé Skúbas èn deîgh tòn Kânikasou èsantos èdíasos ès ès èsbaló
 ès gína tìn Mnêikína, ès melouríma tís ódou traphèntes. oustos dé
 allas évnon 'Ellínwn te kai barbárou leptomévous lógos égraptai.

 'Éphò dé 'Aristóteles ó Kaustróbion ánìr Ækkonísher 13
 poikón èpea, ápiktári ès 'Isokhónas phoibálmptos genoménoi,

 20. èn diùs y. o. t. For this remark
 Hdt. is personally responsible, and it
 may be based on antoepo, or information
 gained on the north side of the Pontos.
 Taken in connexion with the local
 archaeology adduced in c. 12 infra
 as external evidence in support of the
 tradition preferred by Hdt., it seems to
 make for the hypothesis that this barbaro-
 Hellenic tradition was local in Sinope.

 22. èrphn. The Scyths have no credit
 in this tradition for anything but
 numbers (epíqutol megállo épuro). The
 Kimmernian chiefs are heroic.

 12. 1. kai nýn. This chapter consists
 of four sentences, or, including the re-
capitulation at the end, of five. The
 first sentence contains some valuable
 local archaeology. The second adds
 a statement which may be accepted as
 historical. The third is probably a
 mixture of truth and error, which is
 raised in the fourth, into a complete
 misconception, by a pragmatic combi-
nation of unrelated events.

 Kimmernians to avoid the Scyths
 from Asia are represented as flying
 eastward into Asia! The Scyths who
 entered Media, or rather Assyria, were
 probably not European but Asiatic
 nomads. See Appendix 1.

 5. Sinoptí y. 'E. Sinope was perhaps
 more, or less, than 'Hellenic'; it was
 already Athenian, when Hdt. wrote (or
 revised) this passage (cp. Plutarch, Per.
 c. 20). In any case the phrase illustrates
 Hdt.'s Hellenic feeling. His sense of
 the contrast between Hellas and Bar-
 barism is always deeper than his per-
 ception of the divisions of Hellas.

 13. 1. òph 66. The version of Aristaeus
 has two points in common with the
 tradition just given: it is at variance
 with the native Scythian legend, and it
 ascribes the advent of the Scyths to
 a general pressure and migratory move-
 ment of tribes, a toto kaima. With
 Aristaeus the pressure originates in the
 N.E., not in the east, a view which
 some, with Stein, may prefer. The
 story is based on Iasemidian tradition, c.
 16 infra, and supported by the existence
 of the Skolotì east of the Thyssagetae c.
 22 infra. Hdt. rejects a legend, which,
 though committed, or supposed to be
 committed, to writing and vouched for
 by a well-known name, incorporated
 one-eyed men, griffins, Hyperboreans,
 and the ocean: four things which he
 cannot digest. But he uses it as a
 negative argument against the 'Scythic'

 2. On the Issedones cp. c. 26 infra.
3. On the Arimaspi and griffins cp. 3. 116 and c. 27 ἐνθ. 5. On the Hyperboreans cp. c. 32 ἐνθ. 9. The νότια βαλάσσα is here of course the Euxine, as compared with the (north) sea mentioned above; the relation of that ‘northern sea,’ on which dwelt the Hyperboreans, to the Okeanos river does not clearly appear. 10. ἐκλείπουσιν. Cp. co. 105, 118 ἐνθ. 6. 100. 14. 2. τὸν δὲ περὶ αὐτὸν κτλ. The two chapters 14, 15 contain a remarkable digression upon Aristaeus, under which name are combined and confused the real or supposed author of the Arimaspeia, extant in Hdt.’s day (Bergk, Gr. Litt. Gesch. ii. 99), and a mythical figure, which may be taken as at once the son and the double of the god Apollo himself. To rationalise such stories as are here and elsewhere told of Aristaeus into “the alternate appearance and disappearance of an enterprising traveller” (R.) may safely be pronounced ἄγωνος τις σοφία. To deny all historical reality to Aristaeus (with Crusius, Roscher’s Lexikon 2814), is perhaps the excess of scepticism, attributable to an exaggerated ‘solarisation’ of myths and legends. The date of the historical Aristaeus cannot, however, be fixed with any certainty. ἄγωνος here is the reading of α (=Δ + B) supported by ancient citations: B (−R + V) read ἄγωνος. The text would make the date of Aristaeus’ poem about 690-680 B.C., which may be accepted as an approximation, προς Συδών, who makes Aristaeus contemporary with Kroisos and Kyros. The poem of Aristaeus may have been among the firstfruits of Ionic adventure in the Pontos before any actual Greek colony was established on the northern coast. The settlements are dated to the beginning of the eighth century B.C. Foundation of Kyzikos, c. 726 B.C. Refoundation, c. 680 B.C. See Busolt, Gr. Geschicht. i. 321 f. But cp. Grote, iii. 61, who dates “the mystic poet Aristaeus” about 540 B.C. On Aristaeus see further Smith, Diez. Biography i. 292, the excellent article in Pauly, R.-E. i. 1581, and Roscher, Lexikon 547 ff. s. v. ARISTAIOS, HYPERBOREER. The historical reality of Aristaeus is accepted incidentally by Flach, Gesch. der Gr. Lyrik (1883-4), and expressly by Bergk, l.c. supra. The passage before us here, if it proves anything, proves that Hdt. visited Prokonnesos and Kyzikos, and at some subsequent time Metapontion. (On the first two, Kiepert, Man. § 50, on Metapontion § 285.) It is also valuable as illustrating Hellenic ideas in religion, and the action of Delphi. Artake, a little to the N.W. of Kyzikos. The passage is of the highest importance as a simple and candid revelation of the principles and method of research employed by Hdt. Cp. Introduction, § 21.
ο Ἀριστέρας, ἐς ἀμφίσβεσίας τοῖς λέγουσι ἀπικενέσθαι ἄνδρα
Κυζικοῦ ἢ κοίτα ἢ Ἀρτάκης πόλιος, φάντα συντιχεύν τέ οἱ
ἰόντες ἐπὶ Κυζικοῦ καὶ ἐς λόγους ἀπικενέσθαι. καὶ τούτων μὲν τοῖς
ἐντευταμένιοι ἀμφισβατεῖτε, τοὺς δὲ προσήκοντας τοῦ πεπραγμένον ἐπὶ
tὸ καπνὸν παρεῖναι ἐκθέσατα τὰ πρόσφορα ὡς ἀναρχησμένους
ἀνουχθέντος δὲ τοῦ οίκηματος ὡστε τεθνεότα ὡστε ἑρεθὸ
φαίνεσθαι Ἀριστέραν. μετὰ δὲ ἐξοικομοῦ ἐτεὶ φαίνεται αὐτὸν ἐό
Προκόπηνος ποιήσας τὰ ἔπειρα ταῦτα τὰ νῦν ὑπ' Ἑλλήνων
Ἀριστοτέαν καλέσται, ποιήσας τὸ ἀφαιρήσθαι τὸ δεύτερον,
tαῦτα μὲν αἱ πόλεις αὐτὰ λέγουσι, τάδε δὲ οίδα Μεταποτινώς τοῖς
τοῖς ἑν Ἰταλία ἡ συγκυρήσασθαι μετὰ τὴν ἀφαίρεσιν τὴν δεύτερην
Ἀριστέρα ἔτει πεπερακόμενα καὶ διηκολείσθαι, ὡς ἐνώ συμβαλλο-
μένων ἐν Προκόπηνος τοῖς καὶ Μεταποτίνῳ ἐδρισκοῦν. Μεταπο-
τινῶν φιλοί αὐτὸν Ἀριστέραν φανεῖται σφί ἐς τὴν χώρην κελεύσαι 5
βασιλόν Ἀπόλλωνον εὐθυνασθαί καὶ Ἀριστέρα ὁ Προκόπηνος ἐποιη-
μήν ἐχοντα ἀνδριαντα παρ' αὐτὸν ἑστάναι φάναι γάρ
σφί τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος Ἰταλίλαστου μονοστοῦ δὴ ἀπικενέσθαι ἐς τὴν
χώρην, καὶ αὐτὸς οἱ ἔπεται ὁ νῦν ὑπὸ Ἀριστέρας· τότε δὲ, ὡς
ἐπετεῖ τὸ θεῷ, εἶναι κόρας· καὶ τὸν μὲν εἰποῖνα ταῦτα τοῖο
ἀφαιρήσθαι, σφέας δὲ Μεταποτίνος λέγουσι ἐς Δελφοῦς
πέριπατα τοῦ θεοῦ ἑπερωτάτων ὁ τῷ τὸ φάσμα τοῦ ἀνδρόπου εἰν.,
tὴν δὲ Πυθοῦν σφέας κελεύεις πεθερασθαί τῷ φάσματι, πεθομένους δὲ ἡμεῖς ἐποιημένους
καὶ σφέας δεξαμενούς ταῦτα ποιῆσαι ἐπιτελέα. καὶ νῦν ἑσταγε
ἀνδριάς ἐποιημένην 15
ἐχον Ἀριστέρα παρ' αὐτῷ τὸ ἀγάματο τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, πέρες
δὲ αὐτῶν δαφνια ἐστάται· τὸ δὲ ἀγαλμα ἐν τῇ ἄγορῃ ἑδρασθαι.
Ἀριστέρα μὲν νῦν πέρι τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθαι.

Τὴν δὲ γῆς, τῆς πέρι δὲ ὁ λόγος ὅρμησι λέγεσθαι, οὔδεὶς 16
οἶνος ἀπερεκόμενος ὁ τῷ καταπέρευστον ἐπιστ. οὐδεὶς γάρ ὁ ἀνεύτερος
εἰς ἅμους φαμένου δύναμιν πυθεῖσθαι. οὐδὲ γάρ οὖν ἠ
Ἀριστέρας, τοῦ περὶ δόλου πρότερον τούτων μνήμην ἐποιεῖσθαι, οὖν ἔτος
προσωτέροι Ἰστικάδινων ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἔπειρα λέγεσθαι 5

16. 1. ὡς ὁ λόγος . . λέγεσθαι. Of
written words, and so eirhetai ad fin.—
and perhaps ἐλεγε, ἐφευρε, φᾶ βῆμα.
The λόγος as it stands is not easily de-
defined. It is certainly not identical or co-
extensive with Book 4 (Melipome). Is it
even co-extensive with the Seythian
portion of the book? Or is it not,
rather, to be reduced to the merely
geographical passage following (cc. 17-
31), defined by the eirhetai c. 16, and
the eirhetai c. 31, and succeeded by the
Delian λόγος cc. 33 ff., and the (rejected)
lόγος περὶ Ἀθηναίων c. 36? The geo-
graphical account of Seytha is a λόγος not
merely as told by but as received by
Herodotus; based mainly upon hears-
say, or script, and little, if at all, upon
his own eyesight. See Introduction,
§ 20.
17. In the passage which follows (cc. 17-21) Hdt. attempts a sketch of the geography and ethnography of Scythia and its surroundings. The relation of this sketch to the subsequent sketch of Scythia (cc. 99-101) is problematic: cp. Appendix II. The method pursued by Hdt. here is apparently to enumerate the tribes in four or five groups from W. to E. and the subordinate members of each group in order from S. to N., as follows: I I: 1 Kallicippae (Helleno-Scythie); 2 Alazones, 3 a Scythic ἄργορες, 4 Neuri (c. 17), II 3b Scythic γεωργοί, 5 Androphagi (c. 18), III 3c Scythic Νομαδείς (c. 19), 3d Scythic Βασιλίδες, 6 Melanchlaeni (c. 20), IV 7 Sauromatae, 8 Budini, 9 Thyssa-getae, 10 Iuriki, 3e Scythic ἄσωμα, 11 Argippaei (cc. 21-23). We may add as a fifth group V 12 the Issedones (cc. 25, 26), 13 the Arimaspi (c. 27). The descriptive passage is broken by reviews of the sources, or by similar criticism (cc. 24, 25, 27), and succeeded by an essay in the physical geography of the region (cc. 28-31).

It is further evident that the whole passage is composed of three successive flights of somewhat diverse matter and authority. A (cc. 17-20) gives the geography of Scythia proper, 6 tribes, groups I-III, fairly intelligible. B (cc. 21-23) geography of five tribes: Group IV, closed by a review of the sources, and an assertion of their trustworthiness. C (cc. 25, 26) the more or less fabulous tribes round the Issedones and Arimaspi. This last flight lands us fairly in the world of myths. The discussion of one-eyed men and griffins (c. 27) leads insensibly to other marvels, of climate, and to the rationalisation of the story of the feathers (cc. 28-31). And while in this vein Hdt. adds a discussion of the legend of the Hyperboreans (cc. 22-25), who, if existent, would have crowded the ethnography of the north. This discussion opens up the wider question of ecumenical geography (37 ff,) from which he ingeniously returns via the Pontos (46) to the rivers of Scythia. A (cc. 17-20) gives the geography of Scythia proper in three stages. The first group of tribes between the Hypanis (Bug) and the Borysthenes (Dniepr). The northern limit, north of the Neuri, is desert. The enumeration closes with a confession of ignorance: ἐρμηνευτώς, ὅσων ήμεις οὐκην. The second group, east of the Borysthenes, is similarly bordered on the north by a desert, and the enumeration closes with the same confession of ignorance: ἐρμηνευτώς, ὅσων ήμεις οὐκην. Similarly the third group terminates on the north by a: ἐρμηνευτώς, καθότων ήμεις οὐκην. The core of the first group is formed by the Σκιθαί ἄργορες, of the second by the Σ. γεωργοί (apparently a distinction without a difference), and of the third by the Νομαδείς, or rather the Royal horde. Each Scythic division is bordered on the north by a non-Scythic tribe, which intervenes before the desert; these three tribes are the Neuri, the Androphagi, and the Melanchlaeni.

This is all beautifully symmetrical, but its architectural symmetry does not render it more plausible. Nor is the ethnography made satisfactory by the omission of the Ancharata Katiari-Enagiges and Paralatas of c. 6 supra: or, at least, by the neglect of those appellatives. Herodotus is not greatly concerned to harmonise the varying nomenclature employed in his various sources or authorities: yet it is surely no inconsequence, in a passage professing to give an exhaustive account of the geography of the land, to omit all reference to the native ethnography (c. 6). It is also evident that in this passage he has not in view the abstract scheme of Scythian geography given below, cc. 99-101.

The ἄργορες here is to be identified with the ἄττοι c. 75 ἵππαι and the πόλις of c. 79 ἵππαι. There is no ground, as Rawlinson says, for a substantial distinction, and all three terms denote Olbia. The variation in the terms, however, and the omission of the actual name of the place here, seem to support the view that the passages are taken from various sources, and to augment

Rawlinson considers this passage conclusive against Niebuhr’s scheme of Scythian geography, on the strength of the word πάνω. If the word πάνω be thus unduly pressed it will result that in this chapter Ηdt. places Olbia at the S.E. corner of Scythia, between the Pontus and the Maeotis! In c. 101 infra Hdt. clearly places the mouth of the Borysthenes (and therefore virtually Olbia) exactly half-way between the Ister and the Maeotis, i.e. bisecting the line of the S. coast. K.’s map, moreover, contradicts his note.

If the word πάνω is rightly to be pressed, it would be better to recognise that this passage may have been written when Ηdt. was not thinking of the geographical scheme of Scythia found in cc. 99-101, so that in τὰ παραδόλια he need not have included the coast of the Μαύρα Λαμνα. Scythia as conceived or implied in this passage is different from Scythia as conceived, much more clearly, in cc. 99-101. (See Appendix II., on the geography of Scythia.)

3. Ἐλληνες Σκύθων can hardly mean Scythians that had adopted Hellenic customs (so Stein), for Ηdt. goes on to say that the Kallippidae only differ from Scythians in growing wheat and certain vegetables, op. c. 78. Still less could the words mean Hellenes turned Scythians. Baehr quotes a passage of Olbia, C.I.G. ii. p. 122, No. 2058, for μίσθοι, who might represent a mixed race.

4. Ἀλαζώνες is the reading of a (A+B). Ἀλαζώνες of β (B+B+8) is supported by Strabo, and adopted by Kallen-berg and Holden. Baehr reads Ἀλαζώνες. Rp. c. 52 infra, where some additional geographical facts are given.

5. ηγίστηρ. On the Athenian corn trade with Scythia see Rawlinson, ad l., Boeckh, Staatshaushaltung, i, 99 etc., Buchenhäusler, Bests u. Erwerb, p. 422, etc. The Neuri are more fully described in another connexion c. 106 infra.

18. 4. Ἡ Υλάη. "The Bush" (Blakesley), which however no longer deserves the name. That a colony of Greeks dwelling upon the Hypanis (Bug) should bear the name of the Borysthenes (Dniepr) is to be explained by the fact that the latter river is the more important. Kiepert, Manual, § 190, describes Olbia as situated "on the estuary of the Hypanis, which joins the larger estuary of the Borysthenes." Rawlinson, iii. p. 208, gives a still more exact description of the site. Cp. note to c. 58 infra. The colonists may have changed the name of the settlement as it rose from a mere ἐνέργεια to the dignity of a ναός, but it continued to be better known outside the neighbourhood by the old title, applied to it by Ηdt. in c. 78 infra; cp. Steph. Byzant. sub v. Βορυσθηνῆ. The coins of Olbia, ‘in all three metals,’ recognise only the new name, but there are apparently none extant of the 6th cent. The bronze coins, however, show a head of the river- god Borysthenes. Cp. B. Head, Historia Numorum, p. 223. They would be especially for local use.
The text on the page appears to be a continuation of the previous discussion on geography and the territories surrounding the Tanais, which is a river in ancient history. The text references other areas and terms like "Androphagi," "Scythia," and "Tanais." It also mentions "Gerrhos" and "Melanchlaeni," which were towns or regions of interest.

The page includes a reference to a page number, which might be part of a larger text or a book. The text is written in a classical style, typical of ancient or classical texts, and mentions various regions and tribal names.

The page is part of a larger document, possibly a historical or geographical work, that discusses the territories and their names, likely in Greek, given the terminology and structure of the text.

The text snippet is incomplete and does not provide enough context to fully understand the entire discussion. It seems to be discussing the names and boundaries of different areas, possibly in the context of Greek or Roman geography.
καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους νομίζουσε Ἀκίνδυος δοῦλους σφέτεροις εἶναι·
κατήκουσα δὲ οὗτοι τὸ μὲν πρὸς μεσαμβρίην ἐς τὴν Ταυρικὴν, τὸ
δὲ πρὸς ἕκε ἐπὶ τε τάφρον, τὴν δὴ οἱ ἐκ τῶν τυφλῶν γενόμενοι 5
ἀφείαν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς λίμνης τῆς Μαιριτίδος τὸ ἐμπύριον τὸ
καλέσαι Κρημνὸι· τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν κατήκουσα ἐπὶ ποταμῶν Τάναιν.
τὰ δὲ κατύπερθε πρὸς βορέων ἄνεμον τῶν βασιλείων Σκυθῶν
οἰκέοντο Μελάγχλαινοι, ἀλλὰ ἔθνος καὶ οὐ Σκυθικόν. Μελάγ-
χλαινοῖς δὲ τὸ κατύπερθε λίμναι καὶ ἔρημος ἐστὶ ἄνθρωπος, 10
κατόπου ἤμεις ἴδομεν.

Τάναιν δὲ ποταμῶν διαβάζετε οὐκέτα Σκυθική, ἀλλὰ ἡ μὲν 21
πρώτῃ τῶν λαξίων Σαυροματέων ἐστὶ, οί ἐκ τοῦ μοχυοῦ ἀρξάμενοι
τῆς Μαιριτίδος λιμνὸς νύμβοτα τὸ πρὸς βορέαν ἄνεμον ἁμέρεσιν
πεντεκαίδεκα ὀδὸν, πάσαν ἐφούσαν ψυλήν καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ ἠμέρων
dευδρῶν ὑπερισκόμενοι δὲ τούτων δευτέρῃ λάξιν ἐχοντες Βουδίνοι,
γῆ τερμαμενοί πάσαν δασέαν ὑπὲρ παντοτίνη τετράνοιο 5
δύναι, γῆς νεφελωμενοί πάσαν δασεὰν ὑπὲρ παντοτίνη τετράνοιο
Βουδίνοι δὲ 22
catype rate πρὸς βορέαν ἐστὶ πρῶτῃ μὲν ἄρημοι ἐπὶ ἠμέρετον ἐπὶ
ἀρχῆν, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἁρμὴν ἀποκλίνοντε μᾶλλον πρὸς ἀπηλεύσοντων
ἀνέμων νύμβοτα Θυσσαγετέα, ἔθνος πολλὸν καὶ ἔθνος ἔστι δὲ ἀπὸ
θήρης, συνεχέοις δὲ τούτοις ἐν τοῖς ἄνθροποι τόποις 5
κατοικιμέναι εἰσὶ τοὺς οὐραμά κεῖται Ἰδρέας, καὶ ἔθνοι ἀπὸ τῆς
θήρης ἔστο τρόπον τούμως. λοιχα ἐπὶ δευδρῶν ἀλεβᾶς, τὰ δὲ
ἔστι ποικίλα ἀνὰ πάσαν τὴν χώρην ἐπὶ τὸ ἐκάστοτε δεξαμενόμενο
ἐπὶ γαταέρα κεῖσθαι ταπεινώτατος εἶναι ἔτοιμος ἐστι καὶ κύκλου
ἐπείπερ δὲ ἀπίπεδη τὸ θηρίον ἀπὸ τοῦ δευδρίου, τοξεύσας ἐπιβάτας 10

21. ποταμῶν διαβάζεται. To cross the Palus is not thought of; but we learn incidentally that the territory yonder was occupied by the Sindi, c. 28 infra. The Tanais is the Don, c. 57 infra.

2. Σαυροματέων. See infra cc. 110 ff. Fifteen days’ journey is given as the measure of their territory.

5. Βουδίνοι. See infra c. 108. No measure is given for the journey through their territory.

6. ὑπὲρ παντοτίνη. Oak, white beech, and further north birch, juniper and pine are given by modern authorities as the prominent trees of the woodland.

22. ἀποκλίνοντι. The traveller who has hitherto been moving, hypothetically, northward, is here supposed to incline in a north-easterly direction. This conception may very probably correspond to the direction of an ancient trade-route in those parts.

4. Θυσσαγετέα. R. interprets “Lesser Getae,” in contrast with “Massagetae” or “Greater Getae.” Stein compares Μαργετέα, Σαργετέα. The Thysagetae are mentioned again, c. 123. Of the Juriki we hear no more. Their method of hunting, with trained horse and hound, is far from primitive: it is unfortunate that p. 114 does not specify the wild animals hunted. Though the measure of the desert journey is given no estimate is added for the territory of these tribes. In the Scythian settlement beyond the Juriki it is natural to suspect rather a remnant left behind on the migration S. or S.W., than a band of emigrants from the W. or S.W., if indeed any positive value is to be attached to so vague an authority. No account, it may be observed, of the ἀστατοίς is recorded.

10. ἐπιβάτας. Holder reads καὶ ἐπιβάτης after β.
23. Μέχρι μὲν δὴ τῆς τούτων τῶν Σκυθείων χώρης ἐστὶ ἡ κατα-
λεξθείσα πάσα πεδιάς τε γῆ καὶ βαθύναις, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτων λιθώδης τ' ἐστὶ καὶ τρηχεία. διεξελθόντες δὲ καὶ τῆς τριχής χώρης πολλῶν ὁικεύοντα ὑπόρεαν ὁρέων ὑψηλῶν ἀνθρωποι λεγό-
ται μεν εἰναι πάντες φαλακροὶ ἐκ γενετήρα γνώμονα, καὶ ἐρημεῖς καὶ βθλαεὶ ὁμοίοις, καὶ σιμοῖ καὶ γένεια ἔχοντες μεγάλα, φωνὴν δὲ ἑδέν ἔχοντες, ἐστὶ δὲ χρεώμενοι Σκυθείη, ζώντες δὲ ἀπὸ δενδρών. πορικοῖς μὲν ὁμοῖοι τῷ δενδρῷ ἀπ' ὦ ζώος, μέγασος δὲ κατὰ συκένθει μὲν μαλατῇ κηρ. καρπὸν δὲ φορεῖ καῦμω-
λος, τυρίνα δὲ ἔχει. τούτο ἐπεάν γεύνηται πέπον, σακκέουσιν ἰμαλοίσι, ἀπορρέει δὲ ἄπ' αὐτοῦ παχὺ καὶ μέλαν ὁμοῖοι δὲ τῷ ἀπορρέοντι ἐστὶ ἄχµα τούτο καὶ λέγοντες καὶ γάλακτα οὐσί-
στοισεν πίνουσι, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς παράγης αὐτοῦ τῆς τριχῆς παλάβας συντειβοί καὶ ταύτα σιτέονται. πρόβατα γάρ σφί-
15 οὐ πολλά ἐστιν οὔ γὰρ τι στουδαία αἷνομαι αὐτόθι εἰσί. ὑπὸ

23. 4. ἀνθρωτοὶ κτλ. In the hairless snub-nosed tribe, the Argippaei, described in this passage, one is tempted to see a Mongolian type of Central Asia. The food described answers to a species of cherry, still used and prepared by the Kalmyks; but the similarity of food does not justify an inference to an identity of race, and the length of their chins, or beards, and the sanctity of their morals are puzzling characteristics in the Argippaei. Perhaps a negative has dropped out, and we should read γένεια ἔχοντες οὐ μεγάλα, but in any case we seem to be approaching the neighbour-
hood of the idealised Hyperboreans; or to be in sight of a substitute for them.

The high mountains here mentioned Rawlinson identifies with those men-
tioned c. 23 in sr, and both with the Ural; and he places the Argippaei to the east and the Issedones to the west of the Ural mountains. Herodotus, however, in c. 23 clearly places the Issedones to the east of the Argippaei, and puts no mountains between them. He is, more-
over, moving from south to north when he encounters these mountains which bar further progress and knowledge; the mountains therefore he conceives as running E. and W. This would suit the Altai (with which Heeren identified the mountains mentioned in c. 25), better than the Ural. But it seems an error to attempt any such identifica-
tions in these outlying and misty regions of Hdt.'s geography. It is of course possible that some vague rumour of a great chain of mountains N. E. of Scythia carried to Hdt. should refer to the nearer chain of the Ural, but all accurate perspective and orienta-
tion have disappeared, and it is not im-
possible that these mountains in the extreme N. E. of (Herodotean) Europe are an imaginary set-off to the mountains in the extreme W. of Libya, c. 184 in sr. If the river Araxes in c. 11 were correctly identified with the Wolga (by Rawlinson) and a knowledge of that river ascribed to Hdt., it is strange that the Araxes-Wolga is not encountered upon this journey from the Tanais (Don) to the (Ural) mountains. These mountains, be it remarked, are not of an imposing elevation, rarely rising above 5000 ft., and though ranging N. and S. for a distance of 1200 miles, they sink at their southern extremity gradually to the plain, and leave a wide gap towards the Caspian.
δευτέρω δὲ ἐκαστὸς κατοίκηται, τῶν μὲν χειμώνα ἐπέαν τὸ δευτέρω περικλαύη ἐπὶ λέυκω στεγνῷ λευκῷ, τὸ δὲ θέρος ἀνεύ πτέλου. τούτους οὖδεὶς ἀδικεῖεν ἀνθρώπων· ἰρόι γὰρ λέγονται εἶναι· οὖδὲ τι ἀρχήν ὁπλον ἐκτείνεται. καὶ τούτο μὲν τοῖς περικλαύην οὖν εἰσὶ οἳ τὰς διαφορὰς διαιρέοντες, τούτα δὲ ὅσ οὐ φέγγον ποταμός ἐργαζόμενος πολλῇ περικλαύῃ 24 τῆς χώρης ἑστὶ καὶ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν ἑθνῶν· καὶ γὰρ Ἐκθέου τινὲς ἀπεκινεῖον τὸς αὐτοῦ, τῶν οὐ χαλεπῶς ἑστὶ πυθεῖσθαι καὶ Ἐλληνῶν τῶν ἐκ Βορουθένων τοὺς ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἄλλων Ποντικῶν ἐμπροσθεν· Ἐκθέου δὲ οὐ δὲν ἐλθοὺς ἐς αὐτοῦ, δὲ 5 ἐπὶ τὰ ἐρευνήσας καὶ δὲ ἐπὶ γλωσσάσας διαπρῆσασθαι. μέχρι 25 μὲν δὴ τούτων γινώσκεται, τὸ δὲ τῶν φαλακρῶν κατύπερθε οὖν οὕτω ἀκριβῶς οὐχ ἡφαίστη. ὅρα τὸς ἄγαλμα ἀπόταμεν ἀβατα καὶ οὖν οὐκ οὐκ ἀπεβαινεί. οὐ δὲ φαλακροὶ οὕτως λέγονται, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγονται, οἰκεῖν τὰ δραίον ἐξόποδας ἀνδρῶς, ἐπερσοῦντες. 10 δὲ τούτους ἀνδρόπους ἄλλους οἱ τὴν ἐξήμωντος κατεύθυνσι τὸ ἄλλα τὸ μὲν πρὸς ἄνδρὸν τῶν φαλακρῶν γινώσκεται ἀκριβῶς ὅπως Ἰσσηδῶνων οἰκέομενον, τὸ μὲντο κατύπερθε πρὸς βαρέν ἀνέμων οὗ γινωσκεῖται ὁ μὲν τῶν φαλακρῶν ὁ μὲν Ἰσσηδώνων, ἐν μὲν ὀσα αὐτῶν τούτων λέγοντων. 10 νομοὶ δὲ Ἰσσηδώνων τοισὶ δέ λέγονται χράσθαι. ἐπέαν ἄνδρι 26

24. καὶ γὰρ. We have here again a pause in which the sources of Hdt.'s information are reviewed. These author's notes (cc. 24-27) on his sources advertise the mythical character of the tribes enumerated on the authority of the Iseidones; the existence of the Iseidones is, however, guaranteed, probably on the authority of Aristeas, c. 13. Some of Hdt.'s information, whether oral or written, comes down, as appears from this passage, through Greeks of Oliba or other mercantile colonies, who owe their knowledge to Scythian travellers, who have to employ interpreters to the number of seven on their way between Oliba and the Arghippa.

3. τῶν . . . πυθείσαι. There is nothing in this passage to prove that Hdt. ever set foot in Oliba; or will it be contended that he visited ‘all the other Pontic emporia’? Nor even to prove that his statements are based simply on oral information. See Introduction, § 29.

6. ἐπιτὰ. How the number seven is arrived at is not easy to see. Rawlinson includes Scythian, for which Scythas would require no interpreter.

25. ὄρα. The same as mentioned before c. 22, on the skirts (ἐνώρεα) of which dwell the Argippa.

5. ἀγύπτοδας. There seems nothing incredible in the statement, rightly understood, that ‘goat-footed’ men dwell on the mountains: it is even curious that Hdt. himself should not have ‘rationalised’ the phrase; cp. c. 31 ἄνθρωπος.

6. ἐξήμων. In this statement, so utterly incredible to Hdt., in his ignorance of the sphericity of the earth (cp. c. 42 ἄστρα), it is natural to see a distorted tradition of the long polar winter; as in the Homeric account of Laisttrygonia (Od. 10. 82-86) a dim notion of the midnight sun may be enveloped.

10. ὑμή δέσμα. γινώσκεται subauditor.

26. 1. νόμοις. The savage custom here described as practised by the Iseidones
is not without parallels: 1. 216 of the Massagetas, 3. 38 of the Kallatias, 3. 99 of the Padosai; and on the subject of such feasts of—and on—the dead, see J. G. Frazer, The Golden Bough ii. 59, “It is now easy to understand why a savage should desire to partake of the flesh of an animal or man whom he regards as divine. By eating the body of the god he shares in the god’s attributes and powers.” The Hyperboreans (cp. c. 32 εἰφρά) were said by Hellanikos to destroy sexagenarians. 7. ἄγλαμα. Not ‘ornament’ (Schweig. and Rawlinson), but ‘object of reverence,’ almost ‘fetish.’ 8. ταῖς ψαρτί and ταύρον supra might lead to the inference that the Issedones were in the patriarchal status, which is hardly born out by the position assigned to women, the latter rather pointing to a matriarchal society, or gynaeocracy.

τὰ γενέσια. A birthday festival in honour of the dead; τὰ γενέσια in honour of the living: but the distinction is not always rigidly observed, cp. I. & S. sub voc. (rectior on the anniversary of death). 9. καὶ οὕτω. As well as the Argippaei. 27. 2. οἱ λέγοντες. Stein explains as referring back to the Arimaspeia of Aristaeus (c. 16 supra where the Issedones are expressly given as the poet’s authority). The passage however before us here seems to trace the common Greek rumour (ἡμεῖς οἱ ἄλλοι) through the Scythians to the Issedones, cp. c. 32 εἰφρά. For the formula cp. c. 43 εἰφρά. 6. ἄρμα γὰρ. Rawlinson recognises the scientific character of this philosophical excursus and admits arima and sny as two genuine Scythic words the meanings of which are certainly known. Enstatios and the Scholiast to Aischylus, Prom. 804, ἄρι μὲν γάρ τὸ εἰφράττει, μακρὰ δὲ τὸ ὀφθαλμὸν (apud Stein). Neumann, Die Hellenen im Skythenland, p. 195, explains the word by the Finnish vuozin-maa ‘Bergland,’ Highland; and supposes that Aristeas had called them figuratively Kyklopes, and that Herodotus (and of course Aischylus) took the trope for a translation, and so on. Other philologists have other etymologies. We seem to be in the region of etymological speculation, which “is apt to be misleading” (Rawlinson, iii. p. 5, n. 3). Cp. Appendix I. 55. 1. Δυσχείμερος. From such marvels as one-eyed men and griffins Hdt. glides to the portentous climate of Scythia and the European north-east. Scythia supplied the place in the ancient imagination filled by Siberia in ours. Ovid, ex Pontio 1, 3. 57 Scythico quid frigore peius? Hippocrates, de Aeris 25 (quoted by Stein as 19), describes it. The Herodotean description does not appear to be a gross exaggeration, but lacks discrimination. Rawlinson (note ad L.) supposes a change in the climate for the better in modern times; but the trade and products of the
διαστημή κατά τον λόγο των μηνών θύμος εἰρήμενον, εἴναυτα τοὺς γὰρ τοὺς ἤτοι τῶν ἁρμόνων συναφῶν τόου κρυμμάτων, ἐν τοῖς ὑδαιράκησις πυλῶν οὐ ποιήσεις, πῦρ δὲ ἀνακαίλων ποιήσεις πυλῶν λέος τὰς τάφους τὴν Κύπρον κατοικημένου περιττου καὶ τὰς ἀμαξας ἐπελαπήσουν πέρην οἰς τοῖς Σλώνοις. οὕτω μὲν δὴ τοὺς ὁκτώ μῆνας διατελείει χειμών έινα, τοὺς δὲ ἐπείγουσα τέσσερα ψύχες αὐτόθι ἐστι. κεχώρισται δὲ οὕτως ὁ χειμών τῶν πρώτων πάντα τοῖς εἴναυτα ἄλλοις χαρώσεις γινομέναις χειμώνας. εἴ τι τὴν μὲν ὀραίην οὐκ ὅλογον ἄξιον οὔδεν, τὸ δὲ τὸ θέρος οὖν οὐκ ἀνείπει βρονταὶ τε ἦμος τῇ ἄλλῃ γίνονται, τυνκαίτια μὲν οὐ γίνονται, θέρησε δὲ ἀμφιλακεῖς, ἕν δὲ χειμώνας βροντῆς γίνεται, ὅταν τέρας νεκρωμεναθαυμάζομαι. ὅς δὲ καὶ ἕν σεισμος γείνηται ἢν τε βέρεος ἢν τε χειμώνος εἰς τῇ Σκυθικῇ, τέρας νεκρωμαι. ὑποί δὲ ἀνεκχωμενοι φέρονται τὸν χειμώνα τοῦ οὐντον, ἠμοῖοι δὲ οὖδὲ οὐκ ἄνεχονται ἀρχην τῇ ἄλλῃ ὑποὶ μὲν ἐν κρυμμα ἐποτες ἀποσφάκελλοι, οὗν δὲ καὶ ἠμοῖοι ἄνεχονται: δοκεῖ δὲ μοι καὶ τὸ γένος τῶν βοῶν τὸ 29 κόλπον διά ταύτα ὑπὸ φύσεως κέρεα αὐτόθι: μαρτυρεῖ δὲ μοι τῇ γυνώμη τὸν Ὁμήρου ἐπον ὡν ὑδαιράση ἔχον ὑδαιράση, καὶ Λιβύνην, οὕτι τ’ ἄρνες ἄφαρ κεραί τελεύσουσι, ὅρθος εἰρήμενον, εἴναυτα σημαινάς ταχύ παραγίνεσθαι τὰ κέρας, 5

district mentioned by Hdt. himself seem to show that the eight months of winter and four months of cold are an overstatement. Hdt. is not speaking from personal experience. "The summer is now intensely hot." R. And it was in antiquity likewise. Cp. Aristot. Proc. 26, 6, Strabo, p. 307 (quoted by St.); see further, Stanford's Europe, p. 185. Blakesley says that the extension of the winter to eight months is "due entirely to the circumstance that the commercial season lasted only four." But why should the commercial season have lasted only four months, if six or more had been available?

4. η δὲ θάλασσα. "The sea freezes to a considerable distance from the shore." R. θάλασσα need not be confined to the Palus, but covers the salt water outside.


7. τὰς ἄμαξας. Drawn by ozen, cp. cc. 69 in/ra and 29 in/ra.

Σλώνοις. An undesigned but valuable addition to the geography of c. 21 supra, supplying us with the tribe east of the Palus and south of the Sauromatae. c. 86 in/ra their territory is named θυαρασα. 14. εἰ τ ’. Σ. τέρας cannot be taken to mean that earthquakes were not regarded as portentous in Hellas. The words εἰ τ ’. Σ. are perhaps misplaced, and might better follow the previous ἕν δὲ χειμώνας.

29. 2. κέρας. Hdt.'s speculation on the effects of the cold is not altogether happy; elk and reindeer refute it (vide Rawlinson). But these cases are unknown to him. His remark on the ass seems questionable. Cp. Burton's Pilgrimage to Mecca, iii. 398, n. It is more important to observe that we see here a recognition of physical causation, and of a relation between fauna and environment, which is one of the beginnings of science, as contrasted with mere astonishment or superstition.

3. Ὀδυσσέας. 4. 55.
30. Ἐνδιάφερε μὲν νυν διὰ τὰ ψύχεα γίνεσαι ταύτα. Θομαῖος δὲ (προσθήκης γὰρ δὴ μοι ὁ λόγος ἡ ἀρχή εἰς ἑξίσωτα) ὅτι ἐν τῇ Ἡλείᾳ πάση χόρη οὐ δυνάται γίνεσθαι ἡμιόνοι, οὔτε ψυχρὸν τοῦ χῶρου ἔντος οὔτε ἄλλου φανεροῦ αὐτίκου οὐδένος. φασὶ δὲ 5 αὐτοὶ Ἡλείαι ἐκ κατάρχης τεν ὡς γίνεσθαι σφίς ἡμιόνοι, ἀλλ' ἐπειδ' ἡρέφη ἡ ἄρχ' εὐκακεκαθαὶ τὰς ἱπποὺς, ἐξελαύνουσι εἰς τοὺς πλησιοχώρους αὐτάς, καὶ ἐπεισά ὅτι ἐν τῇ τῶν πέλας ἐπέεισε τούς ἄνοις, ἦ οὗ ἄν σχοὺς αἱ ἱπποὶ ἐν γαστρὶ. ἐπεισά δὲ ἀπελαύνουσι.

31. Περὶ δὲ τῶν περιών τῶν Σκύθων λέγοντας ἀνάπλευον εἶναι τῶν ἥρας, καὶ τούτων εἴνεκα οὐκ ολοί τε εἶναι οὔτε ἰδεῖν τὸ πρὸς τῆς ἠπείρου οὔτε διεξεῖναι, τίνδε ἕχω περὶ αὐτῶν γνώμην τὰ κατοπτέρθη ταῦτα τῆς χώρης αἰεὶ νῦσσαι, ἐλάνουσι δὲ τοῦ θέρους 5 ή τοῦ χειμῶνος, οὕτως καὶ οἶκος. Ἰδέ ὅτι δής ἄρχονθε χώνα ἀδρῆν πτυποῦσαν ἐδέ, αὖτε τὸ λέγον ἐνεκε γὰρ ἡ χώνα περιώς καὶ διὰ τῶν χειμῶν τούτων ἐντούτοις ἀνοίκητα τὰ πρὸς

30. 2. προσθήκαι. Ἐξήγησις. A passage that has been too generally taken as raising the whole problem of the times, places, and methods of composition betrayed by the work of Herodotus, as if this passage must needs have been an addition to the "first edition" or draught of the whole work (cp. 7. 171). But the λόγος here specified is not the whole work, but is the λόγος about Scythia, cp. c. 16 supra; and the ἀρχή is the ἀρχὴ referred to in c. 82 supra. To speak of this short note as an addition to the whole work would be out of all proportion.

There is, in any case, nothing here to prove that this passage was “added at Thurii” (R.). Supposing indeed that Hdt. gleaned his facts at Elis, he may have touched there going, or returning, between Athens and the West, cp. c. 195 supra; or he may have visited Elis from Sparta (3. 55); or he may have visited Elis at some other time for an Olympiad; or he may never have visited Elis at all: for the mere formula ἔπει δὲ ἀρχῇ Ἡλείας does not prove that Herodotus was ever in Elis, or even that he ever discussed the matter with men of Elis. Cp. Introduction, §§ 20, 21.

6. Ἡρώδετος κτλ. Of this fact there need be no doubt as it is touched further by Pausan. 5. 5, 2, Plutarch, Mor. 309, and is not without parallels, e.g. the case of the women of Delos (Thuc. 3. 104, 2) and an Al satian legend, quoted by Stein, connected with the story of S. Deodatus: from Zeitseh. f. d. Philol. iii. 357. That the immediate reason of the custom was a religious one need not be doubted, though the design may have been to encourage horse-breeding (consult Plutarch, l.c.). Hdt. however being in the vein for physical explanations apparently discredits the Elean account without hitting upon the sufficiently obvious economic reason.

31. 5. ἄρσεν κτλ. It appears that Hdt. has in his mind readers, or hearers, who had never seen a heavy fall of snow close by; who had never been out of doors in a snow shower. This condition may have been realised by some fine gentlemen in Hellas from Sicily to Cyprus, from Athens to Naukratis; but, as ἄρσεν is feminine as well as masculine, it may include here the fair sex, among whose ranks Hdt. even in his own day may have numbered many admirers.

7. ἀνοίκητα. The extreme north is thus in Hdt. so opinion rendered uninhabitable by the cold just as the extreme south by the heat. He would have smiled to hear that the south was as cold as the north. Cp. c. 36 infra.
8. The concluding words τὰ ὑπεραρχον... λέγεται are a crux to the translators. "And the Scythians, with their neighbors, call the snowflakes feathers because, I think, of the likeness which they bear to them," Rawlinson. "The feathers then is a name which the Scythians, in my opinion, give to the snow, indicating the similarity." Blakesley. The following version might do: "In speaking of (the) the feathers the Scyths and their neighbours are in my opinion speaking of the snow under a figure." Larcher ad loc. cites Psalm 145. 5 dat nivem sciant lanam. (Mr. Macaulay translates; "I think therefore that by the feathers the Scyths and those who dwell near them mean symbolically the snow.")

9. τεραίκους, καὶ πλησιοχώρους (c. 33 infra et al.).

32. 4. ἄλλα. Blakesley endorses Wolf's suspicion that the sentence ἀλλὰ ἠνδιδόθη —ἐνῶνες is the insertion of a late grammarian. If that were so the following sentence τοιαὶ δὲ εὐρεῖα would be an inconsequence (as if Hdt. wrote,— "The Scyths say nothing, but the Delians say most").

5. ἡνδιδοθη. Perhaps in the lost work Γῆς περιδώρ. Stein however argues that as Hdt. does not name the work there must have been a Hesiodic poem specifically on the Hyperboreans.

6. Ὀμηρος. Hdt. questions the Homeric authorship of the Epigoni as in 2. 117 of the Oiycria. Mahaffy, G.L. i. 267, sees in this scepticism the result of "the critical labours of the commission of Pelaistratus" (ep. Bergk, Gr. L. i. 505). The Epigoni, a poem belonging to the Thesan cycle, he ascribes to Antimachos of Teos (ep. Bergk, ii. p. 42). It was a poem of 7000 lines of which only one has come down to us, not concerning the Hyperboreans. To the Homeric pseudo-epigrapha containing allusion to Hyperboreans is to be added Hym. 6. 28 ἔνθα σαλάντας ἐλεγεῖσαι ἢ ἄλλον [ ἡθήνων ] ἢ ἑγάγον τοῖς ἡθήνων (ed. Gemoll. p. 80). And to the poetical authorities might have been added Pindar, Ol. 3. 15 (where the Hyperboreans seem to be located about the Danube), Pyth. 10. 30, Isth. 5. (4.) 23, Frag. 257 (156), and Aischylos, Choep. 365.

Hdt. does not here expressly refer to the Arimaspae of Aristeas, though the poetical exception in favour of the Iassodon is presumably due to the utilisation of their authority in that poem (cc. 13, 16 supra). Niebuhr (Geography of Hdt. p. 6) regarded Hdt.'s dis众人ion on the Hyperboreans as a polemic against Hekataios: but the passsage in Diodorus 2. 47 is now generally ascribed to Hekataios of Abdera. The elder Hekataios, however, had presumably mentioned the Hyperboreans, and it is a curious coincidence that the passage in Diodorus adds a tradition about Abaris (c. 36 infra). The traditions in Hesiod and 'Homer' (Epi- goni) probably reproduced the Delphic version of the Hyperborean myth, to which Herodotus evidently prefers the Delian.

33. 1. Δῆλος. The Delian myth of the Hyperboreans (cc. 33-35). Whatever else we have in this legend we seem to have an indication of a great trade-route from the north to the religious and commercial centre of the Ionians of early times (ep. Thuc. 3. 104) in the Aegaean sea. Some of the stations on this route are indicated. It goes back from Delos to Tenos, Karyatos, up through Euboan waters (the Eurius) to Malia; from Malia overland to Dodona: northward again along the
Adriatic coast. A route connects the head of the Adriatic with 'Scythia.' Thence the journey fades away to the north. It was along this line, or along these lines, probably, that the great amber trade was conducted from the Eastern (Baltic) source. But of stations north of Adria no hint has reached Herodotus, or his informants: and it may be doubted whether there is not underlying the saga an unconscious confusion between two routes, from the Baltic to the southern sea, one reaching its waters in the Adriatic, the other in the Pontos. (On the amber trade and its routes see F. Waldmann, Der Bernstein im Alterthum, Fellin. 1833.) Whether Phoenicians and 'Karians' (cp. Thuc. 1. 4, 8) preceded Ionians in the occupation of Delos or not, probably this trade between Delos and the Baltic dates from times long before Ionian and Hellenic occupation. We therefore need not see in the story (with Attinger, Delos, 1887) any memorial of the Hellenic invasion of Delos from the north.

Kallimachos, Hymn. Del. 283 ff. (ed. Meineke), is presumably indebted to Herodotus for the stations mentioned on the route. Pausan. 1. 31, 2 (77) follows a different tradition, according to which the offerings from the Hyperboreans pass to the Arimaspi, Issedones, Scyths; are conveyed by the Scyths to Sinope, and from Sinope to Attica, to the temple of Apollo at Prazia: the Athenians pass them on to Delos. This story Haselinson discredits as an invention of Athenian vanity: Crusius (Roscher's Lexicon, 2820) traces it to Phanodemos and recognises its Athenian motive. It is on the face of it less primitive than the other, but of course utilises real facts and trading stations. Schubart's emendation, Διδυμον for Σενών, may be dismissed, with Crusius, as a mistaken effort to harmonise Pausanias (Phanodemos) and Herodotus, inter alia because it establishes a connexion between the Hyperborean myth and the cult of Apollo, and deduces the former from the latter. See the admirable article by Crusius in Roscher's Lexicon, sub voc. Hyperboreer.

6. Διδυμον. Etym. M. sub ν. 9. "Ανδρον. This boycotting of Andros by its nearest neighbours, Karystos and Tenos, may have been due to commercial or to religious rivalry. Andros was connected by its colonies Akanthos, Sane, Stageiros, Argilos, with Thrace, and specially addicted to the cult of Dionysos. It pursued at times an independent policy, cp. 8. 111. 11. Λέγουσι. We here tap one of Hdt.'s sources. That he visited Delos is morally certain (6. 98 infra). Introduction, § 21. The Delians probably got their information out of their hymnbooks. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxxiv.

12. Ξυρεγός. There was a certain dualism in the cult at Delos which dated back to the pra-Hellenic days (Hirschedorff, Deutsche Rustschau, Oct. 1884), but the sex of the divinities was different as with Apollo-Artemis. The virgins here, like the still more primitive pair c. 35 infra, seem to be Hellenic personifications, or aspects of Artemis.

13. Συναφής, praestans, eminent. Αλαδία, populi jus: Baehr.
ασφαλείς είναικ τίμης τούς "Τεπερβορέως τῶν ἀστῶν ἀνθρώπων τεύτειν ποιμένας, τούτος οἱ νῖν Περιφερέας καλέοντα τιμᾶς μεγάλα 15 λαός ἐν Δῆλω ἐχοντες. ἔτει δὲ τοῦ "Τεπερβορέως τοῖς ἀποπεμβοῦνται ὑπόσποι οὐκ ἀπονοστείνει, δεινὰ ποιεμένοιν εἰς σφέας αἰεί καταλάμψεται ἀποστέλ领ται μὴ αποδέκεσθαι, οὕτω δὴ φέροντας ἐς τοὺς οὖν τὰ ἱππα ἐπεδεμένα ἐν πυρῶν καλάμη τοὺς πλασμούμονας ἐπικατήστησις κελεύσατα προσερέμεθεν σφέα 20 ἀπὸ ἑωτόν ἐς ἂλλο ἑσθόν. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω προτεμπῶμεν ἡπικενέσατα λέγονι οὔτε Δῆλων. οἰδὰ δὲ αὐτὸς τότεοι τοῖς ἱροῖσα τὸς ποιεμένον προσφερές, τὰς Ἐρυμνίκαις καὶ τὰς Παιονιῶδες γυναικὰς, ἐπέλει θυσίας τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ βασιλείᾳ, οὗ ἄνευ πυρῶν καλάμης ἐγχύσας τὰ ἵππα. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὅ ταῖς αὐτῆς 34 ποιεῖσας: τρία δὲ παρθένους τοιαύτην τρία ἐξ "Τεπερβορέων τελευτάσας ἐν Δῆλῳ κηρύνται καὶ αἱ κύριαι καὶ οἱ παῖδες οἱ Δηλίων ἀι μὲν πρὸ γάμου πλόκαμον ἀποταμώμενο καὶ περὶ ἀτρακτὸν εἰλιθίας ἐπὶ τὸ σῆμα τεθείος (τὸ δὲ σήμα ἄστι 5 ἐσοὶ ἐς τὸ Ἀρτέμιδον ἐσώμεν ἀριστερῆς χειρός, ἐπτετέφκε δὲ οἱ ἕλαι), ὅσοι δὲ παιδεῖ τῶν Δηλίων, περὶ χιλιῶν τεινα εἰλιθίας τῶν τριχών τεθείου καὶ οὕτω ἐπί τὸ σῆμα. αὐτὰς μὲν δὴ ταῦτὰ 35 τριμῶν ἐγχύσας πρὸς τῶν Δῆλου ὀικητόρων. φασί δὲ οἱ αὐτῶν οὖν καὶ τὸν "Αργήν τε καὶ τὸν "Ωπν ἐσώς παρθένους ἐξ τεπερβορέων κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις παρευμένοις ἀπικέσθαι ἐς Δῆλον ἐτε πρὸτερους "Τεπεράχης τε καὶ Λαοῦδης. 5

15. "Περιφερέας" ἑβεχθος Ἠσυχ. A cording to some etymologists this word contains the key to the mystery. Ἱπερβορέιος ἢ ἦπερβορέα, 'the 'Bringers of the offering,' ἦπερβορέα becomes ἤπερβορος. (Τεπερβορέας a spring month in Krete: Τεπερβερεάς a harvest month in Macedonia.) A Βολκσεντιολογικ connects the word with Boreas and creates a mythic land and people "beyond the north-wind." (Ahrens). This is to be preferred to G. Curtius' suggestion that ἴπερβορείος = 'Τεπερ(φ)οροι, the men beyond the mountains. (uileannmamh.)

19. ἱππαν . πνεύμα can only mean 'offerings tied up in wheaten straw.' What the offerings were is not here said clearly, but they may have consisted in or included fruits and offerings in kind. Paussanias I. 31, 2 pragmatiseis, οἷς ὑπὸ ἀγαθὸν καταλέγονται μὲν ἐν καλάμη πυρῶν γεμοῦσεται δὲ ἐπὶ σφέας. In any case they were unbloody offerings, offered to Apollo as a god of agriculture.

22. οἴδα κτλ. seems to imply that he had not seen the straw in use at Delos. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxxi.

34. 5. τὸ δὲ σῆμα κτλ. reads like the result of autopsy: as also the description of the θεία c. 55 ἐνθρ. Cp. Introduction, § 21 and l.c. μερα.

35. 3. "Ἀργήν and "Ωκείας may also be taken as epithets and duplicates of Artemis. For Argo Paussanias 5. 7, 8 (Pseudo-Platon, Apotheke 371 A) has Άργης, an unmistakable title, which it has been proposed to substitute here: but ἄργου, swift or bright, is perfectly intelligible as applied to the moon-goddess, "Ἀργής ἡ Βασιλείας, c. 33 ψιφ (=Lucina, Stein). "Οἰνία or "Οἰκία is an epithet of Artemis Lucina as Eileithymia, Kallim. Hymn. Del. 204, Pseudo-I. Λ. Cicero, de Nat. Deor. 3. 23, 55, represents Οὐπι as the father of Diana, and adds: eam Graecis saepi Upim paterno nomine appellant. In Pa.-Plat. Λ. 2."Οἰκία is perhaps masculine (i.e. not Artemis but Apollo).}
taütas μὲν νυν τῇ Ειλεθινῇ ἀποφερόντας ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄκτοκον τὸν ἑτάξαντο φόρον ἀπικέσθαι, τὴν δὲ Ἀργην τε καὶ τὴν Ὄπιν ἄμα αὐτοῖς τοις θεοῖς ἀπικέσθαι λέγονται καὶ σφι τιμάς ἄλλας δεδόθαι πρὸς σφέων· καὶ ἱάρ ἀγελέων σφι τὰς γυναικάς ἐπομομαζόντας τὰς οὐνόματα ἐν τῷ ὅμοιῳ τοῖς σφι Ὄπιν ἄμη Ἀλκής ἐποίησε, παρὰ δὲ σφέων μαθούσας νηστιώτας τε καὶ Ἰωάννας ὑμνεῖν Ὄπιν τε καὶ Ἀργην ὄνομαζοντός τε καὶ ἄγελοντας (οὕτως δὲ ὁ Ὅπιν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς παλαιοὺς ὄμοιους ἐποίησε ἢς Ἀλκής ἔλθων τοὺς ἁδεδομένους ἐν Ἁλῆρω), καὶ τῶν μηρίων καταγγελμένων ἐπὶ τῷ βομβῷ τῆς στοάς ταύτην ἐπὶ τῷ θησίῳ τῆς Ὅπιν τε καὶ Ἀργης ἀνασαμηνοῦσθαι ἐπιβαλλομένην. ἡ δὲ θησίον αὐτῶν ἐστὶ ἄипαθε τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου, πρὸς ἥν τετραμφέτη, ἀγχότατο τοῦ Κηνικοῦ ἵστυπορίου.

36 Καὶ ταύτα μὲν Ὅπιπερερεν πέρι εἰρησθόν· τὸν γὰρ περὶ Ἀβάριο τῆς λόγου τοῦ λεγόμενου εἶναι Ὀπερερεν ὡσ μένι ἔληγα, [λέγει] δὲ ποίον περίφερε κατὰ πάσαν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ στειβότα. 6. τοῦ ὄκτοκον. "It is undoubtedly their own ἀκροατα that is intended." H. What must really be intended is the ἀκροατα of Leto, in the birth of Apollo and Artemis. Aristot. Hist. Animal. 6. 35. Pausan. 1. 18. 5.

7. τοῦ ἑτάξαντο φόρον has a curiously official ring about it. One sees how easily religious precedent might be utilised for political purposes. (Cp. 3. 18 φόρον τε ἑτάξαντο καὶ δόρα ἐστίτων, and the rubric in the Athenian lists: τὸ λαὸς ἀμέτρητος, Hicks, No. 36, C.I.A. 1. 244.)

8. τοῖς θεοῖς. Apollo and Artemis naturally suggested; but as they did not come to Delos (according to the Delian legend here presupposed) but were born there, we must consider earlier divinities to be here meant, though these earlier divinities are only Apollo and Artemis in earlier forms, perhaps Phoenician as distinguished from Hellenic. (Crusius, op. cit. 2811, understands it of "Elleithyia Leto and the twins.")

10. Ὅπις. Διαμάλη ὅτε Ὅπερερεν ὡς Ἀλκής ἐστίτος· μάλλως δὲ Ἀλκής ἀπὸ Ξάνθου ὑπὸ ἀρνίου Καλλίμαχοι καὶ ὁ Πολυστύρων ἐν τοῖς περὶ Δωρίας, Συδίας. These variations were probably inferences from the internal evidences of his Hymns. Pausanias is our best authority, and explains the article in Suidas. Paus. ἐν. supra; add 5. 7. 8. 21. 3. and 9. 27. 2. A Delphic tradition represented Olen as a Hyperborean, and one of the founders of the oracle, and inventor of the hemistich, 10. 5. 7 f. See further, Mahally, Loc. cit. 14. 16, Bergk, ii. 111, and Pauly, R.-E. sub ν.

17. πρὸς ἑ ili seems to prove that this was a Carian or Phoenician tomb. Müller, Dorians, iv. 3. 3.

76. 1. Ἀβάριος. Cp. Harpekrat, Suidas sub ν. Where Hdt. heard or read the story of Abaros, which he rejects, he omits to mention; perhaps in Sparta, where the Hyperborean disputed with the Thracian Orpheus the honour of having founded a temple to Κόρος Ἐρωτίας Pausan. 3. 19. 2. (That he was worshipped in Sparta I cannot discover. Schröber in Roscher's Lexikon, sub ν.) Perhaps in Pindar's works, who made Abaris contemporary with Kroisos (p.e. Harpekrat), Cp. Bentley, Dissertations, ed. Bohn, pp. 109, 110. Lobeck, Aglaoph. 313 f. assigns as a date for the verses circulated in his name c. Ol. 42=612-3 p.l.c. (op. article in Pauly, R.-E. 13 p. 7.) Neither is it obvious why Hdt., who admits the story of the ecstatic journey of Aristaes, should reject that of Abaris, unless it be that the one is a Greek and the other a Hyperborean.

3. τοῖς ὑπάτοις. Later tradition improved on this, and made the arrow carry Abaris. Jamb., riv Pelag. 19. 28: but perhaps we should boldly read here ὑπάτοις καὶ αὐτομενον.
On principles of symmetry valid for Hdt. The intense heat of the south makes such an hypothesis inadmissible, and the argument is a reduction ad absurdum. A very powerful form of rationalization, when the facts are correctly ascertained.

5. υπερφοί. Herodotus' errantism at the expense of Hekataios and others his predecessors, though not altogether amiable, has fortunately led him to develop further his own geographical notions. Cp. 5. 49 ff. infra.

6. ηυσελφότατος. An emendation by Stein (a ήσελβότατος) upon Dobre's νόνον ήσον. The MSS. read ὅσον ἦσον ἑξώτατος ἑξώγραφον. Blakesley proposes οὖς ὥσον ἦσον νόν ἦσον, νόν ἦσον ἑξώτατος. The MSS. reading is not unintelligible, taking the words in the following order: καὶ ἑξώτατος νόνον ἑξώγραφον (not, however, "to guide them"") R., which would be ἑξώγραφον. ηυσελφότατος is rather Platonic than Herodotean Greek.

7. κελειστερεά καὶ. Would Hdt. have laughed, had he been acquainted with the idea that the earth was actually spherical? Or had this "Pythagorean" (Berger, Geogr. d. Ionier, p. 28) notion crossed him and reinforced his contempt for the science of the Ionians? 37. 1. Περσαί. Schweighäuser reads Λεοντις Περσαί κατά. Even so the transition is somewhat abrupt. τὴν μὲν Λεοντις κατά might be admitted (cp. ἐς δὲ Διονύσιος, c. 41, after τοιαύτη μὲν).

8. τὴν νοτιinois. Here of course the Persian Gulf or Indian Ocean (r. Ερυθρήν κ. cp. 1. 1.; Hdt. not making any distinction between them); while the northern sea is here the Pontos, cp. c. 18 supra.

The mention of the four nations (Persians, Medes, Susaeiros, Kolchi) Blakesley, n. 116, explains as due to a commercial route. In 1. 104 the Susaeiros are expressly said to be the only people between Media and Kolchis. In 3. 94 with the Matsieni and Alarodii they make up the eighteenth satrapy. They may be located in Eastern Armenia, but cannot be identified. (Bunbury, Anc. Geogr. i. 245.). Their arms are described in 7. 79, where they appear in company with the Alarodians.

3. Κόλχος. According to Hdt. 2. 104 of Egyptian origin, which, if anything more than a false inference from the evidence there adduced, may again be taken as indicating commercial relations (through Phoenicians!).

There is no reason to doubt that Hdt. conceives these tribes in a line due north: he could signify N.W. if he wished to do so. 38. 1. δεκαίδες. L. & S. take of the N. and S. coasts of Asia Minor. Ηδτ.'s meaning is plain. One δεκαίδες is made up of Asia Minor with thirty nations (c. 38), the other, as he conceives it, is made up of Persia, Assyria, and Arabia, containing only three nations (c. 39). δεκαίδες thus used by Hdt. seems to mean a process or elongation of the continent larger than a χειρότονος, and perhaps without a clear isthmus. But see Baeckelandt 1. 2. άντις άντις, κατά Λεοντις.
3. τὰ πρὸς β. The north side of the first δέτη extends from the Phasis to Sigeion. Can it be that Hdt. places the Phasis too far south, and on the northeast corner of the peninsula? Sigeion is situated at the S. exit of the Hallespont, which, as Stein points out, includes here the Propontis and Bosporos (cp. 1. 57, 4. 76, 96, 183, 5. 103, 6. 26, 35, 7. 187).

3. τὰ πρὸς νότον. The south coast extends from the gulf of Myriandos to the Triopian promontory, S. of Hali-karnassos.

8. τριήκοντα. It is possible to bring together 30 names from the list of satrapes 3. 90 or from the Army list 7. 72-89, 93-95, but the names will not exactly coincide. 1. 28, called in to elucidate, is of doubtful authenticity. See Rawlinson for a probable list. But the method of systematising the geography or geographical passages and remarks in the work of Herodotus, without allowing for the differences of source and interest, is unsound.

39. 2. ἢ δὲ δὴ ἐτέρη. Hdt. had plainly no conception of the existence of the Persian Gulf, no knowledge of the true lie of the Arabian peninsula, or he would not have included Ἰερισχ. in this second δέτη, nor would he have projected the δέτη as running along towards the west. The Arabian Gulf and Egypt conventionally terminate this δέτη; yet Hdt. seems to propose that Egypt and Libya should be included in it. It is obvious by the way that he has no conception of the real shape of Africa, and probably conceives it as resembling Asia Minor, cp. c. 43 infra, and Appendix XII.

5. νόμῳ. Hdt. then is following some authority and will not quite break with convention in his geography. The authority is perhaps Ionian, his dissent in part a product of his Egyptian tour. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

50. τόν κόλπον τ. Ἀ. The Red sea of to-day, the size of which Hdt. greatly under-estimates, see 2. 11.

Δαρείου. 2. 158.

10. ἢθεν τρά. Obviously Persians, Assyrians, and Arabsians. Rawlinson substitutes Phoenicians for Persians, and Blakesley agrees with him, but then B. wants to cut out the words ἧ τε Περσηκ. Ἐραμπίη εὐφρα ασπούρια.

60. 2. τὰ κατάπορφοι = τὰ πρός ᾿Εραμπίη εὐφρα ασπούρια are bounded on the south by the Erythrean sea, on the north by the Caspian sea and the river Araxes, on the east by Indi, or rather the unknown desert beyond. Ἰππον γὰρ τὸ πρὸς τὴν σύρικα γωνίαν ἑστὶ διὰ τὴν φάμον 3. 98.
ΜΕΛΟΠΟΜΕΝΗ

5. Ἡ Κασπίη. Ηδτ. must have full credit for the assertion that the Caspian is an inland sea, but it must also be admitted that he appears to think its greater length lies E. and W. Of the Sea of Aral he knows nothing. To suppose that in his day the two formed one is violent. Time was undoubtedly when the whole ‘Aralo-Caspian Depression’ was part of a greater inland sea extending from the Euxine to the Frozen Ocean (ep. Stanford’s Compendium, Europe, p. 168, Asia, pp. 400, 408-9), but one might almost as well suppose that those geographers, who made the Caspian an arm of the ocean, followed an historical tradition, as that the separation of the Caspian and the Aral occurred in historic times, and indeed since the days of Herodotus, as some commentators appear willing to do. Aral is apparently more in the nature of a great lake, being fed by the Oxus and the Sir, while the Caspian, which lies nearly 250 feet lower, is a real relic of the ocean.

6. Αράκη is here a river east of the Caspian, and flowing towards the E. away from the Caspian. In 1. 202 it is a river rising in Matiene and having one mouth emptying into the Caspian, and thirty-nine others, which lose themselves in marshes. It forms the southern frontier of the Massagetae. It is said to be both greater and smaller than the Danube. The simplest hypothesis which explains these inconsistencies is the supposition that under the same name are confounded two (or more) totally different rivers, the Kun, which rises in Matiene and flows E. into the Caspian, and one of the great rivers of central Asia E. of the Caspian, the Oxus, or Jaxartes, which however flow north-westwards into the Aral. To suppose that Hdt. meant here to write westward and wrote eastward by a slip, is to assume that Hdt. was accurately informed on the region, a thing not probable. In c. 11 supra an Araxes is the boundary between the former land of the Scyths and Kimmernia. It is of course possible that the errors or inconsistencies arose, in the first instance, from the confusion of various streams under one generic name, as might happen with our own Avons and Ouses.

41. 1. Ἡ Δισμος comes in for fuller ethnographical description by τὸς Δισμος λόγος which form the second part of this Book. Cp. Introduction, p. xxxi. ἐν τῇ ἄκτῃ. Hdt. first represents Libya as comprised in the second prolongation of Asia; a few lines lower as being an individual or third ἄκτη. If he has a geographical system, it is not completely articulated. Cp. c. 44 infra.

2. ἄπο excludes Libya from Egypt and Egypt from Libya. Cp. 2. 16.

5. Χόλα. The direct distance across the Isthmus of Suez is less than 700 (R.). Hdt.’s estimate is probably based on the journey.

6. πλατα. The breadth of Libya is apparently conceived by Hdt. north and south: its length as east and west. ‘Broad’ as it is, however, it does not extend, in Hdt.’s conception, so far south as the tropic of Capricorn. Cp. c. 42 ad fin.

42. 1. θυμάζει. Hdt. expresses astonishment that any persons should have adopted a tripartite division of the earth, seeing that one of the divisions,
Europe, is vastly greater than the other two, Asia and Libya, put together; so extensive indeed as to have been only partially explored. Europe is separated from Asia by the line of the Pontos, Phasis, Caspian, and Araxes.

Hdt. disregards alike the boundary laid down by Hekataios, viz. the Tanais (c. 45 supra) and the modern boundary of the Ural mountains and river, which, however, is neither physically nor politically defensible (cp. Stanford's Europe, pp. 2 ff.); Siberia and central Asia, so far as known to him, are reckoned to his Europe. In this again, there is a certain accidental anticipation of modern geography, which views the geographical boundary between Asia and Europe as purely conventional. Regarded from a strictly geographical view, "Europe is after all only a peninsula of Asia" (Stanford's Europe, p. 1, and pass.). If Hdt. had only made Europe instead of Libya an etc. of Asia!

6. Necho. See 2. 156-9. It is characteristic of Hdt.'s methods that this important act of Necho's reign, which was no doubt a piece of his policy of maritime aggrandisement, should come in here by a side wind: but the record, for that very reason, is the more trustworthy. Cp. Introduction, p. lxii.

7. τὴν διάρκειαν. 2. 155, and c. 39 supra.

9. πλοῖοι, 'galleys,' ἐνταλματικοί. This injunction of Necho's does not in the least prove that the form of Libya was then already known, or even the fact of its peninsula, and therefore that this was not the first circumnavigation (pace G. W. opus Rawlinson). The terms of the direction, if authentic, might have been hypothetical.

10. τὴν βορ. θάλασσαν. The Mediterranean.

12. τῆς Ε. ὤ, seems here to stand for the Arabian Gulf: the whole for the part.

13. στεφάνωσιν. This is not incredible, see Rawlinson's note ad l.

17. ἔμοι μὲν κτλ. Cp. c. 5 supra and Introduction, § 22.

18. τοῦ ἔλεος. This assertion that the circumnavigators of Libya had the sun to the north of them (for a time), has generally been taken as a conclusive argument of the reality of this voyage, the rather because Hdt. disbelieves it. Blakesley, in a highly ingenious note 189, disputes the argument, and represents the statement as an inference made by analogy from the northern hemisphere. Against the incredulity of Blakesley we may set the fact that Africa is circumnavigable, and the consideration that an actual circumnavigation even in Necho's time was a possibility. Hdt., be it observed, does
not disbelieve the circumnavigation to have taken place. His authority for the story was perhaps Aegypto - Hellenic. Herodotus, by the way, evidently conceives Libya as a sort of parallelogram, the longer sides of which run E. and W. Cp. c. 41 supra et al. The plain meaning of this passage has been frequently misread. So e.g. [G. W.] and Rawlinson thinks what Hdt. discredited was an assertion that in sailing to the north the sailor had the sunrise on his right: so, too, P. Gaffarel, Budose de Cyprique, etc. Beazley 1875, p. 49.

43. 1. Καρχηδώνος. The voyage added to may be that of Hanno; it is curious that Hdt. gives no details. Cp. c. 42 supra.

2. Σατάπης ο Τ. Αχ. Α Teaspes is named, 7. 79. 9. 76. as father of a Pharnabazus, described as a Persian (but not Achaemenid). Teaspes appears as a name in the Achaemenid pedigree 7. 11.

6. Ζωτύρου υ. Μ. This might be either one of two men: Ζ. άνθρωπος γιόγιος και πετον Σταθέως 3. 160, c. 428-5 π. c. "probably the latest event recorded by Hdt." (R.). Cp. Ktesias, Pers. § 43. (The deserter may have brought this and other stories into Greece. But see infra.) Or Ζ. the grandfather, 3. 158. Cp. Saye's note to 3. 150. If the elder Zopyros was governor of Babylon under Xerxes, he was probably the father of this unhappy lady.

8. Δ. ά. Both father and mother were of the royal family. 13. ν. ία. He was better off than the Phoenicians had been, who sailed in πλούς, c. 42 supra.

15. Σολόες. Cp. 2. 32. The only spot on the Atlantic shore of Africa named by Hdt. He makes it the most westerly point of the continent: this would lead us to identify it with Cape Verde. On the other hand the voyage of Satapes steers south from Soloeis, after passing Gibraltar: this would lead us to identify Soloeis with Cape Spartel, near Tangier (see G. W.'s note in Rawlinson, vol. ii. p. 49). But again Soloeis in Hanno, Skylax, and Ptolemy is undoubtedly Cape Cantin (see Bunbury, i. p. 329), the importance of which was exaggerated in antiquity. It seems therefore that we must return to Rennell's view that Soloeis is Cape Cantin, but add, with Bunbury, that though Hdt. was acquainted with the name he had no definite idea of its true geographical position (op. cit. p. 288).
ΠΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ

καὶ ταύτης ἀπικόμενος παρὰ βασιλέα Ἑρέξα ἔλεγε φας τὰ προσωτάτῳ ἀνθρώπως μικροὺς παραπλεῖει ἐσθήτη φοινικής διαχρεωμένους, οὓς σφαίρας καθαφόρα τῇ γῇ φεύγονσαν πρὸς τὰ δρας λειτουρτες τὰς πόλιας: αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀδικεῖσιν ὁδόν εἰσίντες, βραστὰ δὲ μοῦνα ἐξ αὐτῶν λαμβάνετε. τοῦ δὲ μὴ περιπλάνησαι Δήμην παυτέλεος αἰτήσαι τὸν ἑλεῖν, τὸ πλοῖον τὸ πρῶσον οὗ δυνατόν ἐτί εἶναι προβάλλειν ἀλλ' ἐνοχέσθαι. Ἑρέξας δὲ οὐ οἱ συγκρινόμενοι λέγειν ἀληθέα οὐκ ἐπιτελεσθήσιτα τοῖς προκείμενοι ἀθικοῖς ἀνεκδοτικές, τῆν ἀργαίην ὅλην ἐπιτμήσων. τούτου δὲ τοῦ Σατάσπεως εὔνοχον ἀπέδρη ἐς Σάμον, ἐπιτεί ἐπούθετο τὰς τῆς ἐνέσσεστο τετελευτηκότα, ἐχόνοι χρῆμα μεγάλα, τὰ Σάμιος ἀνήρ κατέχεσε, τοῦ εὐταμάμον τὸ ὁνόματι εὐπλήθησεν.

44. Tης δὲ Άσιῆς τὰ πολλὰ ὑπὸ Δαρείου ἐξευρήθη, ὅς βουλόμενος Ἰνδόν ποταμὸν, δὲ κροκοδείλους δεύτερος οὗτος ποταμὸν πάντων παρέχεται, τούτοις τὸν ποταμὸν εἰδέναι τῇ ἐς βάλλασσιν ἐκδοθὲ, πέμπει πλοῖοι ἄλλους τε τούτοις ἐπιστετε τὴν ἀληθεῦν ἐρέειν καὶ 5 ὡς καὶ Σκύλακα ἄνδρα Καρυανδέα. οἱ δὲ ὄρμηθεντες ἐκ Κασπα- τόρου τε πόλιοι καὶ τῆς Πακτυκίδης γῆς ἐπέλειον κατὰ ποταμὸν

19. φοινικῆς. Hdt. uses the word in two senses: (1) of the date palm 1. 194, 2. 88, 3. 20; (2) φοινικίας, Phoenician. Here the word must be taken in the first meaning. His word for scarlet is φοινίκια.

21. πόλις. We might have expected εὔμαχος.

24. ἄλκαζάνας. Xerxes and apparently Hdt. disbeliefed this statement; but it also furnishes an undesigned confirmation to us of the truth of the report, as we may reasonably refer this trait in the story to the "well-known southerly trade wind" (R.). Cp. σ. 42 supra.

Whether Hdt. heard this story of Satapeses in Athens, or in Egypt, or in Samos, may reasonably be questioned; probably in Samos, or from a Samian source, as the finale suggests.

29. τὸ ὁνόμα του ἑλ. Is it a case of 'de mortuis noln nisi bonum'? Cp. 1. 51, and De Joinville, St. Louis, Hutton's Tr. ed. 1868, p. 63, "I could easily name them [some cowards], but abstain from doing so, seeing that they are dead." If the anonymous Samian was Hdt.'s authority he had not stipulated for the suppression of his name (ἐκώς).

44. 2. κροκοδείλους. Two species of aligator, the harmless "sharp-nosed," and dangerous "snub-nosed," frequent most of the large rivers of India, and even the tanks. Stanford, Asia, p. 284.

δείνους οὗτος. Second of two, cp. 1. 25, c. 113 ἐνυμα. The other in this case of course is the Nile. The river mentioned 2. 32, he forgets, or considers fabulous, or identifies with the Nile.

5. Σκύλακα of Karyanda (in Caria, N. of Halikarnasso). Though Hdt. does not say that Skyllax was an author as well as a discover it seems probable even from this passage. Aristot. Pol. 4, 14, 3, 1332 quotes Skyllax on the Indians. The Periplus which has come down to us is certainly a pseudographon of much later date. (Müller, Geogr. Minerals, ed. Didot, i. pp. xxxiiii-ii, 16-96.)

Κασπατόρου. See Sacy on 3. 102, who identifies it, as do most authorities, with Kabul. Rawlinson questions this (note 6 to 3. 102) on the ground that Hdt. places the city on the Indus: as if Hdt. were incapable of a geographical error! Baehr, indeed, argues that Hdt. does not expressly locate the start on the Indus.
7. πρὸς ἧδω τε καὶ ἱλίου ἀνατολάς ἐς θάλασσαν, διά θαλάσσης δὲ πρὸς ἐστέρην πλέοντες τρικοσσ[I] μηνὶ ἀπεκλίνεται ὕπο τοῦτον τὸν χώρον θεον ὁ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεὺς τοὺς Φαῦνας τοὺς πρότερον ἐπά ἀπέστειλε περιπλῶνει Λιβύην. μετὰ δὲ τούτου ἑν περιπλῶναντας Ἰνδοὺς τε κατεστράφατο Δαρείου καὶ τῇ θάλασσῃ ταύτῃ ἕχρατο. οὕτω καὶ τῆς Ἀσίης, πλὴν τὰ πρὸς ἤλιον ἀνίσχυτα, τὰ ἄλλα ἀνεφέται ὡμοὶ παραχωμένη τῇ Λιβύη.

Ἡ δὲ Εὐρώπη πρὸς οὐδαμῶν φανερῇ ἐστὶν γυνωσκομένη, οὕτω 46 τὰ πρὸς ἤλιον ἀνατέλλοντα οὕτω τὰ πρὸς βορέων, εἰ περιπρόντος ἐστὶν μήκει δὲ γυνωσκεται παρὰ ἀμφοτέρας πάρῃκουσα. οὐδὲ ἔχω συμβάλλειν ἐπὶ ὅντι μὴ ἐσορήσῃ ἡμῖν ὁ ὄνοματα τριβάσια κέεται ἐπονυμίας ἐχοντα γυναικῶν, καὶ οὐρίσματα αὐτῆς Νεῖλος τοῦ 5 Αἰγυπτίων ποταμῶν ἐτέθη καὶ Φάσις ὁ Κόλχος (οἱ δὲ Ταύναι ποταμὼν τὸν Μαιήτην καὶ πορθμαί τὰ Κιμερία λέγουσιν), οὐδὲ τῶν διατριστῶν τὰ οὐνόματα πυθέονται, καὶ οἶδον ἐένιοτο τὰς ἐπονυμίας. ἦδη γὰρ Λιβύης μὲν ἐπὶ Λιβύης λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν Ἐλλήνων ἔχειν τὸ οὖνομα γυναικὸς αὐτόχθονος, ἢ δὲ τῷ Ἀσίῃ ἐπὶ τῆς Προμηθεοῦ γυναικὸς τὴν ἐπονυμίαν. καὶ τούτον μὲν μεταλμαβόνται τὸν οὖνοματος Λυδοῦ, φάμενοι ὑπὶ Ἀσίεω τοῦ Κόντου τοῦ Μάνεω κεκλῆσθαι τῆν Ἰσίους, ἄλλα οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς

7. τὸν Μαιήτην seems to distinguish it from some other Tanaids; but all the rivers here mentioned have local appellations added. Stein suggests that Ηδοτ. takes the expression from an author he is quoting; is that Hekataios? (Van Herwerden obelises the words and adds σπειρος καὶ λιμνη την Μαιητην.) Later writers, including those of Imperial times, recurred to the Tanais as the boundary (cp. Polybius, 3. 37, 3. Pomp. Mela, liv. 2, ad init.). We have here a reminiscence of the river frontiers, perhaps of the island-theory, of the continents. Cp. Berger, Gesch. d. wissenschaft. Erdkunde, pp. 65 f. πορφυρα τα Κιμερία. c. 12 supra. 8. δοῦνας ἐν δρ. ἄτομον, Stein.

14. γυναικεῖς. According to some Promethesians was the son of Asia. Eustathius reads μηνος in this passage; cp. Baehr ad l.

13. Κόντος. In 1. 94 Aty is the son of Mænes, and in 1. 7 Lydos not Asia the grandson (Mænes—Atys—Lydos: Mænes—Kotys—Asiais). It is likely enough that it was in Lydia (Asia tòlì Λιδών παρὰ την Ἱμιλή Στεφᾶ.)
Προμηθέας 'Ασίης ἀπ’ οὗτε καὶ τὴν ἐν Σάρδηι φυλήν κεκλήθη τις Ἀσία. ἦ δὲ ἐν Ἐλυσίῃ οὗτε εἰ περιλήπτως ἔστι γενόσκεται πρὸς οὐδεμίαν ἀνθρώπον, οὔτε ἐκεῖθεν τὸ οὐμαία ἔλαβε τούτο, οὔτε ὅστις οἶ δὲ τοὺς θέμενος φαίνεται, εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς Τυρίζης φήσομεν Ἐλυσίας λαβεῖν τὸ οὐμαία τὴν χώραν πρότερον δὲ ἐν ἀρὰ ἀνάγινοις ὅστεραι αἱ ἔτεραι. ἀλλ’ αὐτὴ γε ἐκ τῆς 'Ασίης τε ἐπὶ θείας ἐνακμένη ἐκ τὴν γῆν ταύτην ἦτις νῦν ὑπὸ Ἐλλήνων Ἐλυσίας καλεῖται, ἀλλ’ ὅσον ἐκ Φοινίκης ἐκ Κρήτης, ἐκ Κρήτης δὲ ἐκ Δυσίλει. ταῦτα μὲν γὰρ τούτου εἰρηκότως τοιάδυ γαρ νομιζόμενα αὐτῶν κρυσσόμεθα.

46 ὃ δὲ Πόντος ὁ Ἑβίκενος, ἐκ’ ᾗν ἐστρατεύετο ὁ Ἀραδεύς, χαρέων πασέων παρέχεται ἐξος τοῦ Σκυθικοῦ θέου ἀμαθείτατα. οὔτε γὰρ θεὸν τῶν ἐντῶν τοῦ Πόντου οὐδέν ἔχομεν προβαλέσθαι σοφίς πέρι οὔτε ἀνδρὰ λόγιον οὐδαμαν γενόμενον, πάρεξ τοῦ Σκυθικοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἀναχάρασιος. τῷ δὲ Σκυθικῷ γένει ἐν μὲν τὸ μεγίστον τῶν ἀνθρωπισμῶν φρομμάτων σοφότατο πάντων ἐξευρήθη τῶν ἡμῶν λόγων, τὰ μένων αὖλα οὖν ἀγαμαί. τὸ δὲ μεγίστον οὗτον σφι ἀνευρήται ὅστε ἀποφυγεῖν τοὺς μιθέων ἐπελθόντα ἐπὶ σφαέα, µὴ βουλόμενος τοὺς ἐξευρεθήναι καταλαβεῖν µή οἶνον τε εἶναι. τούτω γὰρ µήτε ἀστεα µήτε τείγεα µὴ ἐκτισμέα, ἀλλὰ φερέων οὐντες πάντες ἐσωὶ ἰπποτοξίται, ξώντες µή ἀπ’ ἁρότων

Byz.) or on the banks of the Kastor (II. 2. 461), that the Hellenes first heard the name, which was gradually extended to the whole continent.

17. Τυρίζη. 1. 2, Europa is the daughter of the King of Tyre; the King’s name Agenor may be obtained from c. 147 infra; and from 1. 173 it may be inferred that if Europa went from Kret to Lykia—then called Milies—it was in company with her son Sarpedon. This version differs from the Homeric, and is perhaps traceable to Hesiod. Cp. Stein, note to 1. 173.

23. τοις νομιζόμενοι. That is, Hdt. adopts for practical purposes the tripartition of the earth, and the current nomenclature, though regarding them as arbitrary. Cp. c. 39 supra.

46. 1. ἐν’ ἐν... χαρέων. The Pontos must be taken to include the θέη ἐντῶ τῆς. Ποντός.

ὁ Δαρεύς. For a moment the thread of the narrative is resumed, only to be dropped again immediately; the chapter perhaps belongs to the first draft, or stratum, of the Book, or rather of the Σκυθικὸν Λόγον.

2. ἔν τοι Σκ. del. Gompertz.

3. ἀπό ἐκ τούτου τοῦ Pontos. Cp. 1. 6, 174, 4. 28. But in 6. 44 it means east (of Macedonia) and here the sense demands that the shores of the Pontos itself should be understood. Cp. 6. 33 ἐν τῷ Εὔβοιαν πόλιν, τ. 36 ἀνάθεσια.

4. λόγοι, ν. τ. λόγων. Hdt. has abandoned part of the theory of the ideal savage, but not the whole. Cp. c. 32 supra and c. 32 infra. Anacharsis, c. 76 infra.

11. φερέων. Not literally, but as he explains just below ἐντεικνεῖαι. φ. is Hesiod’s word for a snail. Cp. L. & S. sub v. ἰπποτοξίται. Scythian archers are represented on foot (cp. Baumgärtner, Deutschn. Ab. 315, after Antig. du Bosp. Cymmerien, pl. 33); but we can hardly doubt that they were also mounted. There were ἰπποτοξίται in the army of Mardonios at Platæa 9, 49. Cp. Thuc. 2. 96 εἰτ οἱ οἴκτηι καὶ οἱ παύτη δυργοὶ τοῖς Σκύθοις καὶ ἄλλοις κυρίως πάντες ἰπποτοξίται.

ξώντες κτλ. Cp. Aristotle’s ἰβάρα
Hdt.‘s admiration seems to condemn the δρόμοι and γεωργία, who must be supposed to have had settled habitations.

47. 5. πεδία. For the general truth of this description cp. Stanford’s Europe, c. vi.

5. διορύχων. Cp. 2, 108. It may be inferred that the visit of Hdt. to Egypt preceded the journey to the Ποντός, cp. Introduction, § 21. After διορύχων Stein would insert εἶτε δὲ ἄκτοι αὐτὸς. Hdt. is correct in giving prominence to the river system of Scythia, or South Russia, a region which not only includes some of the greatest rivers of Europe, but also has common features, arising from the large scale and homogeneity of the country drained by those rivers. But Hdt.’s statements reveal the limitations of his knowledge. Three of the rivers cannot be identified: and though the Wolga does not belong to the Scythia of Hdt., the absence of any clear reference here, or elsewhere, to the largest Russian or European river can only be put down to blameless ignorance (cp. cc. 124, 125 infra). In regard to six of the rivers Hdt. adopts what may be called a Lake-origin theory. That he rejects the rival theory of the Rhipean mountains, to which even Aristotle refers (Mela. 1. 13, 359β ὡς αὐτὴν ὅ τι τὴν ἄρτα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐσχάτης Σκύλθας αἱ καλομεῖραι ἔτης, πέρι ἀν τοῦ μετέπεσε λίκων εἰς αὐτῷ μέσα τὸν Λεμύκεα τὴν ἐνεπέπηθεν ἄλλων ποταμῶν ἐνεπέκτεθεν ὡς φαίην) may be put down to his credit; but though Russia contains the largest lakes in Europe, they have nothing to do with the rivers of the south, most of which, however, ‘agree in having their sources in comparatively low-lying regions amid a labyrinth of waters’ (Stanford, Europe, p. 177). Some are anxious to see in these marshy labyrinths the Lakes of Hecocythas, and even suppose physical transformation scenes since his day to enhance his credit: it is more natural to recognise that his information is imperfect or incorrect.

48. 1. Ἡστρος μὲν. The Istrus and its tributaries (cc. 48-50). To complete the Hecocythas conceptions of the course of the Danube 2, 33, 34 must be read in connexion with the present passage. From that context the following items may be added: (1) the rise of the Danube, by the ‘city’ Pyrene, in the land of the Kolts, beyond the Pillars of Heracles. (2) The course of the river through the whole length of Europe (καὶ τόκει Ἐὐρώπης), bar the territory of the Kynesi west of the Kolts, dividing the continent into two (equal) parts (μὲν ὡς σχῆμα τὴν Ἐὐρώπην, a statement which, if pressed, conflicts with the ignorance of north Europe c. 45 supra, but μὲν ὡς may be fairly taken as a loose expression: cp. μὲν ὡς σχῆμα τοῦ Ἰλισοῦ c. 49, l. 8 infra). (3) The exact location of the embouchure of the river beside the Milestian colony of Istria in the ‘meridian’ of Sinope (sic), Kilkis aspera and Egypt. Whether these data are more remarkable for the knowledge than for the ignorance displayed in them is a fair question. The sources of the Danube, which rises in the Black Forest, are located much too far west: the ignorance of the Rhone, not to mention other streams, implied in Hdt.’s description of the course of the river, is surprising. It is plain that Hdt. rightly conceives the Danube as running from W. to E. and
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he apparently conceives it as bending to
the south (so as to form the W. boundary
of Scythia, cf. p. 3 infra) though it
bends again to the E. (cf. p. 99 infra).
The final bend eastwards is correct
enough. The previous bend, if Hdt.'s
conception is rightly interpreted, is
wholly misconceived: a confusion be-
tween the Danube and the Pruth per-
haps underlies the misconception. (4)
The observation of the absence of flood
on the lower Danube is correct, but the
explanation is not according to know-
ledge. The true cause is to be sought in
the action of that monster Strid, 'the
Iron Gates,' which serve as a valve
and equalise the flow of water by flooding
the plain of Hungary. Cp. c. 50 infra.
2. πρῶτος ἡδ. And so forms the
western frontier of Scythia: cp. it to
πόλις τῆς Ἑπτάλας σφαῖρας c. 49 infra ad
fin. Cp. also infra on the Pruth,
and 5. 3. For μὲν ὁ Ὑ. Schenkl suggests
μὲν οἱ σφραίτες. Stein μέγαλοι μμοίτες.
Of the five Scythian tributaries the
Πόλια is may be identified with the Pruth.
The identification of the other four is
quite uncertain.
9. τρόφος ἢ μὲλας. The Pruth flows
south, but this misdescription supports
the view that according to Hdt. the
Istrus forms the western frontier of
Scythia.

49. 2. Μάρης. If this is the Marosch
it is not a tributary of the Danube.
3. Αίμευ. Extended by Hdt. to in-
clude the whole chain of mountains N.
of Macedon, as well as the Balkan proper.
4. μηγάλος. An easy way of recon-
ciling Hdt. with the facts is to read σο
μέγαλο, but it rests on the erroneous
supposition that Hdt. must have had
accurate information even on such out-
landish points. The six rivers next men-
tioned cannot be satisfactorily identi-
fied. Hansen, Ost-Europa, §§ 99, 100, sug-
gests the rearrangement of the passage,
so that ἐβδόλλυσιν... Ζίβης should
follow 'Istros. αὐτὸν then refers to the
Maris, and instead of six there are only
three tributaries of the Danube to be
accounted for, the Maris and its tribu-
taries representing 'the system of the
Theiss.' On this theory the text must
further run: εκ ὑπὸ τοῦ Αίμου... μέλατες
di Θράκης κτλ. and the displacement,
as Hansen suggests, may have been
facilitated by the resemblance of 'Ἀλας
and 'Αμβρ. Ingenious rather than con-
vincing, this suggestion again is open to
the same objection as the former.
7. Κιόσ. The 'Ormos of Thuc. 2, 96,
now Isker. Σκίος is read here by most
editors.
8. σχίζων τὸν Αἴμον. 'This is un-
true' Rawlinson.
δὲ ρέων πρὸς βορέην ἀνέμου Ἀγγερος ποταμὸς ἐσβάλλει ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τριβαλλικόν καὶ ἐς ποταμόν Βρόγγου, ὃ δὲ Βρόγγος ἐς τὸν Ἰστρον ὁ δὲντος ἄμφιστορος ἐκφεστὰς μεγάλους ὁ Ἰστρος διέκειται. ἐκ δὲ τῆς κατώπερθε χώρας Ὀμβρικὼν Κάρπης ποταμὸς καὶ ἄλλος Ἀλντις ποταμὸς πρὸς βορέην ἀνέμου καὶ ὁ δὲντος ρέωντες ἐκδίδοισα ἐς αὐτὸν ῥέει γὰρ δὴ διὰ πάσης τῆς Εὐρώπης ὁ Ἰστρός, ἀρβανίτης ἢς Ἐλληνες, οἱ ἑσχατοὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον διὰ συμβεβηκαὶ καὶ κύνης ἐς ὡς διὰ πάσης τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐς τὰ πλαγία τῆς Σκυθῆς ἐσβάλλει. τούτων ἂν τῶν καταλεκτήτων 50 καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν συμβαλλομένων τὸ σφέτερον ὑδάρ γίνεται ὁ Ἰστρός ποταμὸν μέγατός, ἐπεὶ ὑδάρ γε ἐν πρὸς ἐν συμβάλλειν ὁ Νεῖλος πληθεῖ ἄποκρατεῖ. ἐς γὰρ δὴ τὸν ὁ δὲντος ποταμὸς ὁ δὲντος πληθείς οὕτω κρήνη οὐδεμία ἐσδιδοῦσα ἐς πλῆθος οὐκ συμβάλλεται. ἵσος 5 δὲ αἰεὶ ρέει ἐν τῷ βέρει καὶ χειμώνι ὁ Ἰστρός κατὰ τούτῳ τι, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν τοῦ μὲν χειμώνος ἰστὶν, δύος πέρι ἴστον ὁ, ὁ δὲντος μὲν τῆς ἑωτοῦ φύσιος γίνεται; ὕπειρα γὰρ ἡ γη αὐτῇ τοῦ χειμώνου πάμπαν ὅλης, υφεστὸ δὲ πάντα χράταιν τοῦ δὲ βέρεος ἡ χων ἡ

10. Τριβαλλικον. The Triballi occupied the modern Servia and perhaps extended into Hungary ( Gundu). But the two rivers are again not to be identified with certainty. The tribe was strong enough to resist the Odryssian power, and Sitalkes met his death in an expedition against them, 424 n.c. Thuc. 4. 101. 5. This event perhaps brought the name forward at Athens, and ten years later Aristophanes has his laugh at their expense (Birds, 1533 et al.

In the Carpia and Alpis which swell the Danube from the region 'north of Umbria' most persons will be content to see a strange dissolution of the Carpathians and Alps from mountains into rivers. The waters from those sources do augment the Danube; but Hdt.'s statements can hardly rank as real knowledge.

14. Διὰ πάσης τῆς Ἕλληνες. Cp. 2. 33 μέτων αἵματι τῆς Ἕλληνες. 15. ἐκ Κ. καὶ Περίχων πέλαγος 2. 33. Aristotle knew that Pyrene was the name of a mountain, Meteors. 2. 13, 389; so that Guest, Orig. Celt. i. p. 37, was hardly quite accurate in describing his knowledge as "equally limited" with that of Herodotus; but he too makes Pyrene the source of the Danube.

Κάρπης. In 2. 33 Κάρπης. If the readings are right Hdt.'s sources were perhaps different. Stein puts the Kynetians in Spain south of the Pyrenees; and the Kelts in Gaul, north of the Pyrenees.

17. τὰ πλαγία. Hdt. know that the mouths were to the east, c. 99 infra.

50. 1. τ. καταλεκτήτων. Seventeen in number; ἄλλων πολλῶν may be supposed to be a saving clause with no exact knowledge behind it. Cp. c. 58 infra.

4. ἐν μέσων τοῦ. The statement is true of the Nile upwards to Khar- toum: Hdt.'s knowledge does not reach so far.

5. ἵσος αἰτ. This statement is not correct, as the Danube and its principal tributaries are subject to great and disastrous floods. It is however approximately true of the main stream below Belgrade, for a reason given infra.

8. εἰται. This statement is true of Scythia, and the modern Moldavia, Galicia, and Bukowina (Europe, p. 186), but not of the whole 'catchment basin' of the Danube. The real cause why the lower Danube preserves its volume unaltered is, as stated c. 48 supra, the obstructions in "the bed of the stream below Belgrade, which regulate the stream at the cost of deluging the country above" (see Stanford's Europe, p. 155). These obstructions are now in process of reduction: and presumably in future the floods will be carried off by the channel instead of inundating the Hungarian lowland. Cp. Geogr. Journal, i. 248 ff. (1868).
51. 2. Τύρνα. Tyran is the Dniestr "which rises on the Galician slopes of the Carpathians." When Mrs. Guthrie performed her journey (1795-6) the Dniestr was the frontier of the Russian Empire. (See Guthrie's Tour, London, 1802, p. 14.)


4. Τυρίτα. Tyrim was a colony of Mileus (Porphyria, 62). Like the people of Borysthenes the men of Tyran perhaps had a second name for their city, Ophiussa (Steph. B. s. v. Τύρνα). Strabo 306 seems however to place Ophiussa some miles up the river. On a coin of Tyran the term Tyran (TYPANON) occurs: B. Head, Hist. Muse, p. 234.

52. 1. Υπάρες. The Bug rises within the limits of Scythia.

2. λ. μ. On the 'Lake theory,' cp. note c. 47 supra. The Bug is still navigable (Europe, p. 179).


4. ἑβα. The movement is down stream; the whole distance is but nine days' journey.

5. βραχυς. 'shallow'; cp. in τοὺς βραχούς c. 179 infra.

6. κρήνη. Rawlinson supposes that this fountain was a reality, and that Ἡδ. penetrated to it; but admits that there are no traces of it now, nor anything peculiar in the water of the Bug. The waters of all the rivers are brackish to a considerable distance from the sea: prob. (as Stein suggests) the bitter fountain is a hypothesis to explain this fact observed in the Hypanis. But if so, what becomes of Ἡδ.'s travels in Scythia? Cp. c. 81 infra. Introduction, § 21.

7. ἐν ἀλώσιοι μέγαν, 'inferior to few in size,' cp. 9. 41.

8. Εξειδειανος, c. 81 infra. It was perhaps a cross-roads, or Carfax, with or without a conduit. Some Etymologists see in the word two roots connected with Sansk. accha, Gk. ἄγα, Lat. Sac. Germ. Hexe, Engl. Hag; and patha, πάθος, παθή, path. (Rawlinson, Hist. p. 198.) But cp. Appendix I.
13. κατὰ Ἀλαξάνδρα. Not “in the country of the Alazonians” (R.), but “as far inland as the Alazonians,” for they were between Hypanis and Borysthenes c. 17 supra, north of the Scythic ἄρησες and south of the Neuri. The Hypanis is a tributary of the Borysthenes or, as Hdt. says in the next chapter, empties into the same ἤμισσα.

53. 1. Βορυσθένης. To the Dniepr Hdt. assigns the third place of honour among the rivers of the earth. His admission for it is of the strictly utilitarian order. But the passage is still a poem: perhaps from a poetical source.

2. πολυκρεστάτους, plurima praebens commoda. B. So of Italy γῆ πολυκρεστάτης, Dionys. Halic. i. 36; of Alexandria πόλις πολυκρεστάτης, Plut. Alex. 26; cp. L. & S. γνώμας. Not αὐτοφύλα, which may or may not be the basis of γνώμη. Cp. the loci classici 2. 99. Introduction, § 22.

6. εὐκομιδεστάτας, εὐκομιδῆ L. & S. render “well cared for.” Stein suggests sufragichate, i.e. most digestible. Mela 2. 6 has: αἷλτα λατεσσίμα παπλα. The reading is not above suspicion, β giving εὐκομιδεστάτας.

7. διαφρόδον. Η. 12. 103, 15. 108.

8. παρὰ δολαρίων can only refer to the other rivers, even though the statement is not accurate.

10. άλες. An important staple of commerce (Dio Chrys. p. 437) specially useful for preserving the fish.

11. ἀνάκανθα. Mela, l.c., alit magnos pisces quibus et optimus sapor et nulla ossa sunt. (Quoted not to confirm the fact, but to suggest the meaning, or legitimate inference.)

12. τάρχεις ἀντακαίων, caviar, mentioned in the Paradisi of Antiphanes (Com. Frag. ed. Bothe, p. 390), may have been another important article of commerce.

άλεα . . . άξια. A convenient saving clause (cp. c. 60 supra), under which we may insert the islands, woodlands, and cataracts, which form important features in the scenery and economy of the Dniepr. Cp. Appendix II. § 7.

13. Γερροί. Baehr, Kalimberg, Holder, van H. read Γέρροι. Stein conjectures Γερροίων. The river and the Χάρα have the same name, c. 58 infra. τασσοράκαντα, τασσορακάλλες which has been proposed here would bring Gerroes inside Scythia, cp. cc. 71, 127.

14. γινώσκεται cannot be taken to mean that Hdt. speaks from autopsy, if only by reason of the very next sentence. Nor do the words ὢς ἐμοί ἐσθαν just below imply that he had visited the sources of all other rivers

17. Δίκα, s. 18 supra έδεκα. But here perhaps he is going down stream, or following another authority.

21. Ολος. The Dniepr is one of the shallowest. "A peculiar feature of this region is the longitudinal water basins filling the outlets of all even the smallest valleys, and known as 'limans,' a term taken from the Greek language, at one time prevalent in this region. These lakes, though they have all been cut off from the sea by the deposition of alluvial matter, are yet mostly fresh, but are in some cases largely charged with salt, so that their neighbourhood is specially favourable to the growth of saline plants" (Stanford's Europe, p. 168 f.).

22. έμβολον. The beak of a ship. "Has the author's memory played him false or are we to suppose that the form of the land has changed since his time?" R. There is a third alternative. Yet the particularity of description here is remarkable. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

24. Ἁπώλειον. Of Hippolochus (cp. Pape, Wörterbuch, iii. p. 565) nothing seems known. The point is identified with Cape Stanisloas.

25. Δήμητρος. A deity proper to a population cultivating cereals. The reading of a is Μυρίδος which Baehre prefers, regarding Δήμητρος as a gloss. The worship of Kybele was widespread on the shores of Pontos. An inscription of Panticapaeum has Μυρίδ Φωτιάς U. J. G. ii. No. 2107, and Lawlinson prints a coin of Olbia which shows a mural crown, emblem of Kybele: but oddly enough the wreath of corn, emblem of Demeter, is combined with it. The mural crown is found on representations of the Aphrodite of Askalon and Kypros, vid. Perrot and Chipiez, Art of Phoenicia, ii. 43. B. Head, Hist. Num. p. 293, gives the head of Demeter as the principal type of the gold and silver coinage of Olbia. We are perhaps in presence of a 'contaminated' cult. Cp. Strabo, p. 469, and c. 76 infra.

54. 2. Παντικάπαι. The name is plainly connected with Panticapaeum (Kertch): but the river defies identification, as do the Hypakyras and Gerrasos. It is conceivable that these difficulties may be due to great changes in the physique of the country, and that Hdt. may be unimpeachable; it is also possible that "Hdt. may have been completely at fault:" considering his circumstances, the latter is the less violent hypothesis of the two—which are not, however, mutually exclusive. Hdt. has made many mistakes, and physical changes have made it doubly difficult for us to correct those mistakes. Perhaps there were three streams to be crossed by the commercial travellers between the Dniepr and the Don.
53-58 MELOIONEI

ἐκτὸς δὲ Ῥπάκυρος ποταμός, διὸ ορμᾶται μὲν ἐκ Λίμνης, διὰ 55 μέσων δὲ τῶν νομάδων Σκυθῶν ἱεῶν ἐκείστι κατὰ Καρκινίτιν τὸλμιν, ἐς δεξιὰν ἄπεργων τὴν τε Ῥαίην καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλήνου ἄμμουν καλείμενον. Ἐβδομος δὲ Γέρρος ποταμός ἀπεχθαίται δὲ 56 μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Βορυσθένεος κατὰ τούτο τῆς χώρης ἐς ὅ γεισκοῦτα ὁ Βορυσθένης· ἀπεχθαίται μὲν ων δὲ τοῦτον τοῦ χώρου, οὐκοῦκα δὲ ἐκεῖ τὸ περ ὁ χῶρος αὐτοῦ, Γέρρος, μέσω δὲ ἐς θάλασσαν οὐρίζει τὴν τοῖς νομάδων χώρην καὶ τὴν τῶν 5 βασιλείων Σκυθῶν, ἐκεῖδο δὲ ἐς τὸν Ῥπάκυρον. ὅγοδος δὲ ὃς 57 Τανάις ποταμός, δς μὲν τάνκαθεν ἐκ Λίμνης μεγαλὸς ὅρμομενος, ἐκείδο δὲ ἐς μεῖον ἐκ Λίμνης καλομένην Μαίητιν, ἢ οὐρίζει Σκύθας τε τοὺς βασιλείους καὶ Σαυρομάτας. ἐς δὲ Τανάϊν τούτου ἄκλος ποταμός ομβάλλει τῷ οὐκοῦκα ἐστὶ Ῥγίς.

57. Τοῦτο δὲ ὑμομαστοῖτε ποταμοῖς οὕτω δὴ τοι Σκύθαις 58 ἐσκευάζαται, τοὺς δὲ κτήσει ἢ πολὺ ἀναμφοτέρω ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ ἐστὶ ἐπιγολοστάτη πασέων πολεῶν τῶν ἡμεῖς ἱμερεῖ ἀναγεν

88. 1. Ῥπάκυρος. The Hypakyrhis not identified. See note on previous chapter. Λίμνης. See note on c. 47 supra.

2. Καρκινίτις, c. 99 infra.

3. Ἀχιλλήνου ἄμμους. Διώνυσος ὁ Ἀλαζάνου ἦσσα χάρις ζῶος λεγε-

θείς Ἀχιλλήνου ἄμμους Schol. Apoll. Rh. 2. 658 qu. by Neumann, i.e. ἴσηρα.

This, which was the most celebrated, is a narrow strip of land (now broken into two, or more, islands) extending about 80 miles, between the mouth of the Dnieper and the Crimea (vid. Smith, Dict. Geogr. p. 20), and connected with the Hylsea (c. 76 infra) by an isthmus. (Neumann, Die Hellesen im Skythenlande, pp. 365 ff.) It may have looked like a colossal stadium, fit for the swift-footed hero, whose cult was popular on the coast. Cf. especially Strabo, 307.

56. Τανάις. The Tanaos is the most bewildering of the Scythian rivers. It is an off-shoot of the Dniepr, which leaves that river forty days up from the sea, flows to the east and south, forms the boundary between the Nomad and Royal Scythia, and then empties itself into the unknown Hypakyrhis, instead of finding its way to the sea, or the Tanais. It has the same name as the land, and the people are Gerrhil. Stein suggests that the name may mean 'Border,' 'Borderland,' 'Borderers'; that the border may have followed, at least in parts, the course of a stream or streama

88. 2. Τανάις. The Tanaos or Don, "more than half as long again as the Rhine" (Europe, p. 179), formed with Hekataios the frontier between Europe and Asia (cp. c. 45 supra), but with Hdt. only a part of the eastern or N.E. limit of Scythia, c. 21 supra. (But cp. Appendix II.)

Λίμνης. As the Wolga flows from a lake some have wished to make the Tanaos of Hdt. into the Wolga. But cp. c. 47 supra and cc. 123, 134 infra.

88. 3. Ὄρρης. This is a statement which we might have expected c. 21 supra, where the Tanaos is given as the boundary between Scythia and the Sauromatae, as also c. 115 infra. The sub-contradictions belong to various geographical strata or sources.

88. 4. οὐρίζει. This appears as the Σόσης (perhaps the Donetz; cp. previous c.).

58. 3. ἐπίκολος. 'apt to generate bile.' That the reading is correct seems proved by the method of verification adduced just below. The fact was disputed, some authorities asserting that the animals grow fat, well-liking and free from gall
upon the Scythian grass (Theoph. Hist. pl. 9, 17, 4 qu. by Stein). Hence perhaps Hdt.'s appeal to the post mortem demonstration; which, by the way, does not prove that he had assisted at a dissection, or sacrifice. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

59. 1. τὰ... μέγιστα can hardly refer to the river system: cp. cc. 46, 47.
2. νόμαι is taken in apposition to τὰ λαῶν, as, more commonly, with Δίας, cp. c. 61 ταῦτα. This is ingenious, but in any case the sense and even the terms of the sentence carry back to c. 46, before the excursion on the rivers. τὰ μέγιστα here resumes τὸ μέγιστον there, and even εἰσόρον here may be an echo of ἐσώρος c. 46 ἐσ. ἐσώρον. The observation confirms the suspicion that cc. 48-57, more or less, are an interpolation, or at least from a distinct source. Cp. Appendix II.

3. Δάσκαλοι. More usually of cult of heroes 5. 47 ταῦτα, but the Homeric use is as here. Cp. L. & S. sub voc. and σίδηραν. 'Ἰστιν. Hestia had a certain primacy with the Greeks themselves in ritual. See Freun., Hestia-Verst., 1 ff. and Schol. to Aristoph. Ἀκ. 385. Thehom. 299. The Scythic Tabiti was probably the goddess of the tent, or tent-fire, and offered an analogy to the Greek Hestia. Cp. cc. 65, 127 ταῦτα.

νομίζοντες. That had probably been the view of the Greeks themselves at one time, ere Zeus had been distinguished from Uranos: but it was already long passed in the days of the Homer-Hesiodic theology (cp. 2. 53), in which Ge ranks with the elder deities, pre-olympian, and even at times anti-olympian.

4. 'Ἀπόλλων, 'Αφροδίτη. The sun and moon deities. The mention of Aphrodite Urania, the Tauric Artemis, again suggests the presence of the Phoenician in the Pontos prior to the advent of the Greek. For Herakles Hdt. knows no Scythic name, and he may possibly represent the Tyrian (cp. c. 8 supra). Rawlinson gives a representation of a Scythian god who carries cup, bow, club, and shield; but hesitates to identify him with Herakles.

5. 'Αρεί. Ares c. 62 ταῦτα. One MS. has ἄρει here.

8. ῥόδητα. In Hdt.'s opinion, because doubtless he connects ταῦτα with ταῦτα or ἀρτάτι (Od. 8. 57). Could it be connected with the Phrygian god Papat? Cp. Preller, Gr. Myth. 1. 536.


Τοῖς σύντομοι κτλ. The forms of these Scythian names vary considerably. Ποσειδόνος is taken from Hesychius; Celsus ap. Orig. 6. 39 has Ποσειδόνος. The MSS. vary. "Ἀργυρόπερα is the reading of one or two MSS. (PR Stein) supported by Celsus. The other MSS. vary between θαυμασάνα and ἀργυρόπερα. Hesychius has "Ἀργυρόπερα. Θαυμασάνα is an emendation by Stein, the MSS. varying between θαυμασάνα, θαυμασάνα, θαυμασάνα, and the MSS. of Origen between θαυμασάνα and θαυμασάνα.

60. Ἄρης. Sacrificial rite: differing from the Greek uses.


2. ἀτάρ, ‘by itself.’

4. τήν ἀρχὴν τ. σ. ‘the end of the rope’ (with which the victim is bound).

6. περὶ δὲ ἐμαθηκαί. A tmesis frequently used by Hdt. with the aorist indicative (2. 172 with participle) to emphasise a sudden or vivid action: very forcible, if he was reading aloud.

Cp. 1. 194 ἀπ’ ἑν τούτου, 2. 39 ἀπ’ ἑν τούτου, 2. 40 ἐξ ἑν ἱλαρ, 2. 47 ἀπ’ ἑν ἱππεῖς et al. Cp. Stein’s note to 1.4. 194. ἡμαθικά, sc. ‘into the noose.’

7. οίτα καταράκτιοι, ‘not beginning with consecration.’ Cp. 2. 45.

61. Δίκτυα. The shape of the Lesbian krater is not known. As Edt. does not say anything about putting a cover on these boilers, they were perhaps pot-bellied and narrow-necked.

12. Ἀπαράμιλλος, c. 188 ἐπιφαν. By Homer used with accusative: τρίχας II. 19.

254, Od. 14. 422, or absolutely Od. 3. 446.

13. Τὰ ἅλλα πρόβατα. Like τὰ λοικὰ νήματα c. 59 συρπα. 14. Ἱππον. Perhaps to Poseidon c. 59 συρπα as well as to Arex c. 62 ἐπιφαν. On the pre-eminence and solemnity of the sacrifice of the horse cp. Grimm’s Teutonic Mythology (tr. Stallybrass) i. 47 ff.: at Rome, to Mars: Frazer, Golden Bough, ii. 64. At Rhodes, horses cast into sea as sacrifice to the sun, Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites, p. 275. These sacrifices not quite the same as those recorded cc. 71, 72 ἐπιφαν, where see notes.

62. The cult of the Sword, Dirk, or Sabre is remarkably like customs of the Alani (Ammianus Marc. 31. 2, 23) and of the Huns, Jordanus, de teb. 9. 35 (Hansen, § 248). ‘This word (Akinákes) is erroneously translated ‘Seymir’, a weapon which, in its present shape,
dates from about the rise of El-Islam," R. F. Burton, The Book of the Sword, p. 227. In this passage (cc. 62-66) Hdt. takes for granted a political organisation of the Scyths which unfortunately he nowhere describes in detail. There are ἄρχα, perhaps to be identified with the βασιλεία, and if so, probably three in number, subdivided into νομαί (like Egypt 2, 4, 42, etc.), number not stated, each under a νομάρχης, c. 66 infra. As each νομαί has an image of the war-god it was perhaps connected with the military organisation and mobilisation. The βασιλεία reserves the distribution of the spoil and jurisdiction. Cp. c. 64 infra. All this implies considerable local settlement and organisation, to a degree inconsistent with the merely nomadic Scythia of the ensuing narrative. It would be an excess of rationalism to argue to a political development in Scythia between the dates of the invasion of Dareios and of the visit of Herodotus, a development of which the historian betrays no consciousness: it is altogether simpler to add the inconsistency to the evidence in favour of a 'contamination' of sources, and against the historic character of the narrative. Cp. Introduction, § 16, III.

10. Ιδέω. A temple, or holy place. Cp. cc. 60 ad init. and 59 ad fin.

τούδα. Canon Rawlinson's note ad l. runs: "These measures are utterly incredible. We gather from them that Herodotus had not seen any of these piles, but took the exaggerated accounts of certain mendacious Scythsians. How a country amidst ξύλοι was to furnish such enormous piles of brushwood, he forgets to ask himself." Ο σι σι σι αννία! But there is no sufficient reason for thinking that Herodotus had these accounts from Scythsians. Cp. Introduction, § 20, 9. σύδρομο. "The sword in the great tomb at Kertch was [sic] of iron, so that Herodotus is perhaps not mistaken." R. Cp. Schrader (tr. Jevons), Prehistoric Antiquities, p. 203, Antiqu. de la Russie mérid., p. 182.

10. Ἀγαλμα, 'fetish.' Cp. c. 26 supra. 11. τούδα' ἐν πλάε. Bahr follows Wesseling in taking τούδα' (or τούδα') with Stein to mean acacinbus, 'to the aforesaid sabres.' Krüger suggested tentatively un fortum mehr, i.e. with the following, or, 'as follows.' This is endorsed by Stein and Ahlert, who adds that τούδα' is a 'Dative of Difference': whatever that may be. Perhaps Herodotus means: 'they sacrifice to Ares, though not to the other gods, victims in great numbers as follows.' Wine must have been imported. Cp. c. 68 infra.
τοὺς δεξιοὺς ὀμοὺς πάντας ἀποταμόμεντες σὺν τῇ σιτίᾳ χερσὶ εἰς τὸν ἥραν ἱεῖσι, καὶ ἐπεντα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀπέρξαντες ῥήμα αὐτάλλως. Σοφοὶ ὑπερτέμπονται ὡς τῷ ἄνδρω καταβάλλεται. ἄνθρωπος οὐδὲν ὑποτέλεσιν εἰς τὴν κόσμον τὸ παράπτωμα θέλονται.

Τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ λέγοντα ἄγετα ἄφησι διακέδαιες ἐπειδ' ἔτοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐφύς τίμιον ἄθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, τοῦ ἀἵματος ἐμπίπτει, ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῇ μάρτᾳ, τούτων τῆς κακότητος ἀποφείρει τῷ βασιλεῖ. ὑπενεκάς μὲν γὰρ κακότητι τῆς λης μεταλαμβάνει τῇ ἀνάδωσι, μὴ ἑνεκάς δὲ οὕτω. ἀποθεοῦντες δὲ αὐτῶν 5 τρόπου τοιοῦτος περίτομον κύκλῳ περὶ τὰ ὄντα καὶ λαβόμενοι τῆς κακότητος ἐκσηκοῦσι, μετὰ δὲ σαρκίζοντες βασιλεῖς πλευρῆ δέθει τῇ τῇ χερσὶ, ὁργάζεται δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ σιρμόμενον ἐκτητικαί, ἐκ τῶν γαλανοῦ τοῦ ἱπποῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔλαινες, ἐκ τούτων ἐξάπτεται καὶ ἀγαλλίεται. δὲ γὰρ ἁρπάζεσθαι δέρματα σιρμόμενα ἐκχεῖ, ἀνὴρ ἁμέσως ὑπὲρτέλεσις κέρκυται: τοιλοὶ δὲ αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀποδιπλωτῶν καὶ χαλάσαι επείνουσα τοίς πολλοῖς, περίπατον κατὰ περὶ βαλταία παρακατά τοῖς δεξιοῖς γαλανοὺς νεκροῖς ἔντονον ἀποδιπλωτῶν αὐτοῦς ὑπονοεῖ καλύττορας τῶν φαρετρῶν ποιεῖται.
15 δέρμα δέ ἀνθρώπου καὶ παχὺ καὶ λαμπρὸν ἦν ἄρα, σχεδὸν δερμάτων πάντων λαμπρότατων λευκότητι. πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ οὓς ἀνδρᾶς ἐκδείραντες καὶ διατείναντες ἐπὶ ἔξων ἐπ' ἔπτων περι-65 φέροντες. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ οὐσί σφή γενομασται, αὐτὰς δὲ τὰς κεφαλάς, οὕτω πάντων ἀλλὰ τῶν ἠχθέστων, ποιεῖτο τάδε: ἀστράπας [ἐκαστὸς] πάν τὸ ἐνεργεῖ τῶν ὁμών ἐκκαθαρίες: καὶ ἤ μὲν ἢ πένης, ὁ δὲ ἔξωθεν ὄμοσθεν ἀμύνειν περιτεῖναι οὐσί 5 χράται, ἢ δὲ ἢ πλούσιος, τὴν μὲν ὄμοσθεν περιτεῖναι, ἐσωθὲν δὲ καταχρυσάως οὕτω χράται ποτηρὶο. ποιεῖτο δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ τῶν οἰκημῶν ἦν σφὴ διάφοροι γένονται καὶ ἢ ἐπικρατήσῃ αὐτοῦ παρὰ τὰ βασιλεῖς. ξεῖνον δὲ οἱ ἔδοιον τῶν αὐτὸν λόγον ποιείται, τὰς κεφαλὰς ταῦτας παραφέρει καὶ ἐπιλέγει ὅσι οἴοντες οἰκήμοι πόλεμον προσθήκαντο καὶ σφέων αὐτὸς ἐπε-66 κράτησε, ταῦταν ἀνδραγάθη εἴργοντες. ἀπὰ δὲ τοῦ ἐναντίου ἐκαστοῦ ὁ νιμάρχης ἐκαστος ἐν τῷ ἐναντίῳ νομῷ καρφίν κρῆτιμα οἶνον, ἀπ' οὗ πίνουσι τῶν Σκυθέων τούτι ἀν ἄνδρες πολέμισαν ἀραιμημένοι ἐσως· τοῖς δὲ ἐν μὴ κατεργασμένοι ἢ τοῦτο, οὐ 5 γεύονται τοῦ οἴνου τούτου, ἀλλ' ἀτερισμένοι ἀποκατέαται· διειδὸς δὲ σφή ἐστι μέγατον τοῦτο. ὅσοι δὲ ἐν αὐτὸν καὶ κάρτα πολλοὶς ἀνδρὰς ἀραιμηκτὸς ἐσωμι, οὐσί οἱ σύνδυο κύλικας ἔχοντες πίνουσι όμοι.

67 Μάντιςς δὲ Σκυθέων εἰσὶ πολλοὶ, οἱ μαυτεύονται ῥέβδοσι

15. ἦν. Hdt. does not actually say that he had seen any such quiver, with a cover of human skin, and the ἦν ἀρα need not suggest at most more than 'is as I was told.'

16. πολλοὶ. Rawlinson mistranslates 'some,' feeling perhaps that the custom cannot have been very common.

65. 3. ἐκαστός. Krüger brackets as a gloss.

66. 2. οἰνόμαχος. See c. 62 supra.

67. 1. Μάντις. This passage on the Scythian mantic and oaths might have been expected to follow immediately on the religion, from which it is now separated by the notice of τὰ ἐπάλλαξις ἔχοντα. The separation marks, though

this annual drink was connected with the sacrifice there described. It was perhaps those drinking bouts which earned the Scyths a bad reputation, especially with each hero drinking from two cups at the same time! cp. 6. 64 infra. All the more remarkable is the doctrine or criticism on Bacchos ascribed to the Scyths, c. 79 infra.
not perhaps by Hdt.'s conscious design, the difference between theologio ritual and divination. The rhapsodacy of the Scythians approaches witchcraft, and had probably nothing to say to their θυεῖα. It is not described in perfectly clear language, and it may reasonably be doubted whether Hdt. ever assisted at the performance.

3. εἶτι μέν. Krüger suggests μάλιστα εἰτὶ μὲν as εἰτὶ μὲν is grammatically inexplicable, κατὰ μᾶλλον ἴσως Στέιν takes as a mere variation for εἰτὶ μὲν. The obvious sense required by the performance is that the djviners undo a bundle of rods, use the rods one by one, and then do up the rods into one bundle again. Transposing εἰτὶ and κατὰ might mend the passage.

5. ὅπωσιν seems here = παλαιον and not 'behind their backs!' (Neumann, p. 205.) Cr. τῃς. 71 εἰσιν.

6. τῆς Ἐνώρεις. Cr. 1. 105.

οἱ ἄνθρωποι looks like a gloss.

There are three chief theories in regard to the θύελαι τοὺς, that it was a vice, that it was a malady of the body, that it was a mental affliction. The three are one. The whole question is exhaustively treated in Rosenbain's Gesch. der Lustesuche im Alterthume, pp. 141-219. Bouhier, Recherches, etc. (1746), c. xx. is still worth consulting. Hansen, Ost.-Europa, § 223, suggests that Hippocrates (de Aer., §§ 107 ff.) in his polemic against the superstitious (supernatural) explanation of the Scythian impotence has Hdt. (1. 105) in memory. But it is not certain that Hdt. was the only or the earliest authority for that story, and the combination of facts implied in it.

68. 2. οἱ Σκύθεων. Curious, as there were three kings, cr. cc. 65 supra, 102, 130 εἰσιν.

5. ἱστιάς. The plural here is explained by Stein as referring to the polyamy of the king, who might have as many hearths as wives; or is it not rather due to there being several kings? Or is it, perhaps, connected with the worship of the dead kings? (R. renders it as singular: and so too Macanlay.)

8. διαλληλομένοι = ἐκπροσώπων καλλαμά
dεν. Aristoph. Eccles. 1090 has διαλληλομένοι of a person held by two others, one on either side.
έσορόωντες ἐς τὴν μαυτίκην καταδύσασι εὐπορίκησα, τοῦ δὲ 15 ἱδέας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτήμνουσι, καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ διαλαγχάνουσι οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν μαυτίων· ἦν δὲ οἱ ἐπεξεύροις μᾶντες ἀπόλυσεις, ἄλλοι πάρεις μᾶντες καὶ μάλα ἄλλοι. ἦν δὲν οἱ πλεύνες τὸν ἀνθρωπον ἀπολύσωσι, δέδοκα τούτοι πρῶτοι τῶν μαυτίων αὐτοῖς ἀπόλυσαν. ἀπολλαθεὶς δὴν αὐτοὺς τὸ στήφω
69 τούτως· ἐπεάν άμαξαί φρυγίων πλήσωσι καὶ ὑποξεύσωσι βοῦς, ἐμποδίσαντες τοὺς μάντεις καὶ χειρὰς ὑπὸς δήσαντες καὶ στομα- σάντες κατεργάσθη ἐς μέτα τὰ φρύγανα, ὑποπρίσαντες δὲ αὐτά ἀπείσαν φοβησάντες τοὺς βοῦς· πολλοὶ μὲν δὴ συγκατακαλοῦνται 5 τούτοι μάντει βοῖς, πολλοὶ δὲ περιεκαμένοι ἀποφεύγουσι, ἔπεαν αὐτῶν ὁ ῥώμος κατακαυθηθεί. κατακαυσθεὶ δὲ τρόπῳ τὸ εἰρήμενο καὶ δὲ ἄλλασ αἵτις τοὺς μάντεις, φευδομάντιας καλεόντες. τοὺς δὲν ἄν ἀποκτείνῃ βασιλεὺς, τούτων οὔδε τοὺς παίδας λείπει, ἄλλα πάντα τὰ ἔρενα κτείνει, τὰ δὲ θήλεια οὐκ 10 ἀδίκειε·
70 "Ὅρκια δὲ ποιεῖται Σκύθαι ὥσε ὑπὸ τοὺς ἄν ποιεῖται· ἐς κυλήκα μεγάλην κεραμίνην οἶνον ἐγχέαντες αὐρα, συμμίσθισαν τῶν τὸ ὄρκιν ταμπνόμενν, τύφαντε ὑπάτε ἐπιταμίμντες μαχαίρι σμικρόν τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἔπεεται ἀποβάλλετε ἐς τὴν 5 κυλήκα αἰκανίκην καὶ διστούς καὶ σάγμαρκ καὶ ἀκόννυμιν ἔπεαν δὲ 11 τοῦτο ποιήσαντ, κατεύχουσε πολλά καὶ ἐπέεται ἀποτίνουσε αὐτοῦ τε το ὄρκιν ποιεύμενα καὶ τῶν ὁμονάμοιν ἐπτίσαν τούτον ἄξιοι.
71 Ταφάι δὲ τῶν βασιλεῶν ἐν Γέρροισι εἰσὶ [ἐς ὄ ο Βορυσθένης

69. 1. βοῦς. Horses, of which there were so many (c. 28 supra), were only used for riding, ec. 122, 129 infra, and for sacrifice, c. 61 supra.
9. ἔρενα. Op. 1. 155, where no doubt Kratos (Hdt.) is thinking of the proverbial line of Stasinos: τιππας ἀπ’ πατέρα κτείνας ταῖς καταλέγει, Arist. Βι. 3. 21. This was a wisdom widely recognised in antiquity (cp. 3. 119).
70. 1. ὅρκια. The method of plighting faith by drawing, exchanging, or drinking each other’s blood, was not confined to the Scythians (cp. 1. 74, 3. 8), and is still common in Africa. Two ideas may be detected in it: the recognition of the blood as the life (Blut is ein ganz bewunder Samt! Mephistopheles to Faust), and the purpose of memorialising the act of troth by a vivid ceremony. Cp. Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites, pp. 206 ff. and esp. Trumbull, The Blood Covenant (New York, 1885), cited ibid.
2. κεραμίνη. Was it broken after the ceremony? οἶνον, c. 66 supra.
5. διστός. Perhaps to the number of five, cp. c. 64 supra.
71. 1. ἐς... προσπλοτὸς. The sentence is bracketed by Stein on the grounds (1) that ἐς προσπλοτὸς implies that there are obstacles to navigation in the Bory- 
shenes (higher up) which Hdt. nowhere [else] recognises: had he known of them he would have mentioned them, c. 53. (2) That Gerrhes is placed 40 days up the river, whereas the Dnièp is only navigable 14 to 16 days up. This argu-
ment is not quite conclusive, seeing that the second ground implies accurate knowledge, and the first implies systematic exposition, two characteristics which Hdt. does not possess. There is also the possibility of reading ταυτακειδέα for ταυτακειότα in c. 55 supra. Nevertheless the phrase comes in here very unnecessarily, the passage reads better without it, and it may very well be a grammarian's insertion.

2. ὁ βασιλεὺς. Cp. c. 68 supra. This royal ταυτακειότα is enough to transport the reader back to Egypt. 2. 86. Rudimentary embalming may not be beyond the resources of primitive culture. Cp. Helbig, Hom. Epos, I, pp. 41 ff. Were the ingredients native or imported? Cp. note c. 75 supra.

7. συν. ὁπ. Cp. 2. 86 συνάκτοιοι ἐστίν, ἢ τάνων.

9. cf. Σ. Σ. Presumably the same who are called c. 20 supra Σκ. ὁ δρεπάτω τε καὶ τιτανότα.

tου ὅπος. Not the whole of it.

10. τρίχαι. The Scyths were their hair long, sul. c. 84 supra. On such mutilations cp. Spencer, Ceremonial Institutions, c. iii.

18. cf. ἕλθον. So that on each stage they are accompanied by two ἔνθα.

Dr. M'Pherson found skeletons in graves at Kerch "enveloped in seaweed" and Rawlinson suggests that the mummies at Gergos (40 days inland!) were of this material. For plans and descriptions of Scythic tombs see Dubois de Montpéroux, Voyage autour du Caucase, vol. I., and Atlas iv. xviii. Cp. Antig. du Bosphore Cimmerien (1864), re-edited by S. Reinach, 1892, and Antig. de la Russie méridionale, now publishing (1891 ff.).

16. τῶν ἄρχοντων. Really, or only in their own consent? Cp. c. 20 supra.

18. ἤψι. The tombs found in the south have stone walls and roof.

19. τῶν παλαιότων. χρυσίας. Such practices based upon animistic beliefs are widespread, cp. Tylor, Prim. Culture, i. 488 ff., H. Spencer, Sociology, i. 834, 103, 104, etc.; cp. c. 94 supra. They may be distinguished from human and other sacrifices offered to immortal deities, the motive or theory of which is, or becomes, different. (For, according to one theory, "the oldest form of sacrifice is the worship of the dead." Schrönner-Jevons, op. cit. p. 409.) On Sacrifices see
72 Ἡροδότου ὑπὸ παντὸς ἀπαρχαί καὶ φιλάκας χρυσέας· ἀργυρῷ δὲ οὐδὲν οὐδὲ χαλκὸν χρέοναι. ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες χοῦς πάντες χῶμα μέγα, ἀμιλλόμενοι καὶ προβυποκόμμενοι ὡς μέγιστον ποιήσαι.

esp. Robertson Smith, op. cit. cc. (Lectures) vi. Η. 22. Ἀργυρῷ. When Blakesley says that “this must mean that they do not use either silver or bronze in commerce, for their arms would doubtless be of the latter” he acquires Hdt. of an error by making him guilty of an inconsequence—commerce not being here on the tapis. The obvious meaning is that silver and bronze (caps) were not included in the royal tombs.

72 Ἡροδότου. How nomads measured the year Herodotus does not directly or indirectly indicate. (Cp. c. 99 infim.) That the ghastly description which follows is not all a mere traveller’s tale is proved inter alia by S. Lee, Ibn Bututa, London, 1829, p. 220. Blakesley, note ad loc., quotes (without references) the Arabian traveller’s report of the burial of the Khan of the Tartars, and also a remarkable parallel in the description of a Patagonian funeral reported by Fitzroy, Narrative of the Beagle, ii. 155.

It is interesting to compare the quiet way in which Hdt. reports this spectacle with the rhapsody in which Neumann, op. c. pp. 234 f., repels indignantly the horrible suggestion that the Scythian custom here described has some analogy with primitive German practices.

It is not to be supposed for one moment that Hdt. himself beheld either this rite or its objects. Unfortunately we do not know exactly when the last Scyth ‘King’ died before Hdt. wrote the Scythian Logi, or how long it was since a proper opportunity had been afforded of celebrating a King’s obsequies, or getting a special report of them.

6. Ἀποκαταστάσεις. There was no bloodshed as of enemies: and the performance is apparently not propitiatory.
ΜΕΛΙΟΜΕΝΗ

Οὕτω μὲν τοὺς βασιλείας ὑπάτους· τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους Σκύθας, 73 ἐπέαν ὑποθάμωσι, περιάγουσι οἱ ἀγχοτάτῳ προσήκοντες κατὰ τοὺς φίλους ἐν ἀμάξῃν κείμενον· τῶν δὲ ἐκατός ὑποδεκόμενος εὐνοεῖ τοὺς ἐπομένους, καὶ τῷ νεκρῷ ἀπάντησαν παραπληγιῶς παρατίθησι ὡς τοῖς ἁλλοί. ἡμέρας δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὡσάχ 5 οἱ ἱδίατον περιάγονται, ἐπεῖτα ἄπτονται. βάφοντες δὲ οἱ Σκύθαι καθαροῦνται τρόφῳ τοιώδε. σφοδρόνευοι τὰς κεφαλὰς καὶ ἐκπλυνάμενοι ποιεῖσθαι περὶ τὸ σῶμα τάδε· ἐπεάν ἦσαν στῆσαι τρία ἐν ἄλληλα κεκλεμένα, περὶ ταύτα πῖλους εἰρινέους περιτελοῦσι, συμφράζοντες δὲ ὡς μάλιστα λίθους ἐκ πυρὸς τοῦ διαφανέας ἐσβάλλουσι ἐς σκάφην κειμένην ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἵππων τε καὶ τῶν πῖλων. ἐστὶ δὲ σφι κάναβας φοιμένη ἐν τῇ χόρῃ 74 πλὴν παγότητος καὶ μεγάθεος τῷ λίθῳ ἐμφερετάτη· ταύτῃ δὲ τολλῷ ὑπερφέρει ἡ κάναβις. αὐτή καὶ αὐτομάτη καὶ σχειρομένη φύεται, καὶ ἐς αὐτῆς Ὀργάκες μὲν καὶ εἰματα ποιεῖται τοῖς λινέασι ρούχατα· αὐτὸ τό ἄν, διὸς μὴ κάρτα τρίβου οὐκ αὐτῆς, 5 διαγροφή λίθου ἡ κανάβιδοι ἐστί· δὲ δὲ μὴ εἴς καὶ τὴν καναβίδα, λίθον δοκήσει εἶναι τὸ εἶμα. ταύτης ἦν οἱ Σκύθαι τῆς κανάβιδος 75 τὸ σπέρμα ἐπέαν λάβοντες, ὑποῦντοντες ὄποι τὸν πῖλον, καὶ ἐπειτα ἐσβάλλουσι τὸ σπέρμα ἐπὶ τοὺς διαφανείς λίθους τῶν πυρᾷ· τὸ δὲ θύματά ἐσβάλλουμεν καὶ ἀτμία παρέχεται τοπαύτην ὅστε Ἐλληνικὴ σύνεμα ἢ μῖν πυρή ἀποκρατήσετε. οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι 5 ἀγάμουν τῇ πυρίῃ ὀρῶντον· τούτοι σφι ἄντι λαυτροῦ ἐστιν οὔ

73. 4. καὶ τῷ νεκρῷ. A genuine touch of animism, but not of course proving that Hdt. had ever assisted at these scenes. How the forty days were measured is unfortunately not indicated: cp. c. 72 μερα.

7. καθαροῦνται. It was surely not only when a death had occurred in the family that the vapour bath was used: but it is obvious that Hdt. himself had never indulged in the Scythian form of this luxury.

74. 6. δὲ δὲ μὴ ἐδῆ καν. Upon this Canon Rawlinson remarks that Hdt. speaks like an eye-witness. But if so, what did Hdt. see? To have seen hemp, or flax, growing in Scythia would not have helped any one to distinguish a hemplen from a linen garment, worn, moreover, by a Thracian. Hdt. had apparently seen one or more of these Thracian Himata, and perhaps not being a connoisseur had mistaken it for linen, until the difference was pointed out to him. Thracians were to be found out of Thrace, and the Scythian cannabis was presumably exported: in any case the passage proves nothing in regard to Hdt. in Scythia. On the formula cp. cc. 81, 99 ἐγώ, and Introduction, § 20.

75. 6. ἀγάμουν τῇ πυρίῃ ὀρῶντα. The words are saner than the behaviour they describe. Desperate attempts to amend the text seem to proceed from an oversight of the consideration adduced in the note next but one below. We need not, however, infer that Hdt. had heard Scythians howling. Cp. c. 189 ἐγώ. πυρίῃ. On Greek bathing consult Becker’s Charikles, Some 8, Excursus 3 (vol. iii. pp. 98 ff. Calvary’s ed. 1878).

ἀντὶ λαυτροῦ. ‘Hdt. appears in this instance to have confounded to- VOL I
76 Ξεινοκοίοι δὲ νομαίοις καὶ οὔτοι φεύγουσιν αἰνῶς χράσθαι, 
μήτε τέων ἄλλων, Ἐλευθροκοῖοι δὲ καὶ ἥκιστα, ὡς διεδείχθη 
'Ανάξαραίς τε καὶ δεύτερα αὕτως Σκυλῆς, τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ 
'Ανάξαραίς ἐπείτε ἣν πολλὴν θεωρήσας καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος, καὶ 
αὐτὴν σοφὴν πολλὴν ἐκοιμήτε οὐς ἦθεα τὰ Σκυδέαν, πλέων δὲ 
'Ελευθροκοῖον προσισχεῖ ἐκ Κυζικοῦ καὶ εὐρέ ἔμπρος τῇ μητρὶ τῶν

gather two things in reality quite distinct, viz. intoxication from the fumes of hemp-seed, and indulgence in the vapour bath" Rawlinson. There is in fact nothing in this chapter from first to last that betrays the eye-witness.
3. κυπαρίσσιον. Cypress grows in the Crimea, but cedar and frankincense must have been imports. Cp. c. 71 supra. 
τὸ κατασκηνόμενον ... τὸ σῶμα. The two accusatives are irregular.
78. 1. καὶ οὗτοι seems a clear reference to 2. 91, cp. c. 63 supra.
2. μήτε τέων (τέω St.). The reading of the MSS. is μήτε or μὴ τέ or μὴ τό γε δὲ on which Stein corrects as in the text, and explains that οἰκ θέλων may be suggested by φεύγων. Locus insinuabiliis van Horwerden.
3. 'Ανάξαρας. Rauh and Holder read Αναχάρα αν και Ἐλευθροκόνοι not without MSS. authority, and certainly with literary force. Anacharsis (cp. c. 46 supra) became to the Greeks the type of an intelligent foreigner, and (like Goldsmith's Chinese citizen, et simil. mutatis mutandis) the mouth-piece of a great deal of criticism on things Hellenic. His figure has had a long life in literature from Herodotus and Plato to Lucian, Stobaeus, Suidas and—Abbé Jean Jacques Barthélemy (Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grèce, Paris 1788). He was represented as a contemporary and friend of Solon, Periandros, and the Laconian Myson (cp. Plat. Protog. 340), as one of the visitors to Kretos, as a poet, letter-writer, and inventor (see esp. Suidas, sub ε., Cicero, Tusculum 5. 32, Diog. L. 1. 105). A number of
more or less authentic sayings of his of a Laconic character were preserved, Diog. L. 1. 102, and elsewhere. Cp. Smith's Dict. Biogr. i. 157, where A. is erroneously called a Thracian.
Σκυλῆς, c. 78 infra.
6. 'Ελευθροκοῖον. In an extended sense. He was in the Propontis, on his way homewards, cp. c. 14 supra.
Anacharsis was still perhaps remembered and spoken of in Kyziko as was Aristea (c. 14 supra), but Hdt. would not have had to go to Kyzikus to hear his romantic story, and Kyzikus might have been introduced into the story as the place where Anacharsis would probably have seen the ritual of Kybele—in his time therefore unknown in Scythia (cp. c. 53 supra), even though the Phoenician Aphrodite had reached that shore, c. 59 supra. Kyzikus was one of the chief centres of the worship of the Mother, who had a temple on Mount Dindymon close by the town (Strabo, 575): not to be confounded with the greater mountain of the same name, in Galatia, or ancient Phrygia, by Pessinus, the chief seat of the Asiatic Mother (Agdistis or Dindymene, cp. 1. 80). Doubtless at Kyzikus the cultus was of a highly orgiastic kind. The Morfou at Athens was dedicated to the same goddess, and Preller, Gr. Myth. i. 2 p. 537, very plausibly suggests that the introduction of the cult at Athens may be connected with the age and policy of Pelasgiotai: any way it was not at Athens that Anacharsis was initiated. Perhaps the more orgiastic rite was not popular at Athens until after the Peloi-
θέων ἀνάγοντας τοὺς Κυκῆνοις ὅρθιν μεγαλόπρεπῶς κάρτα, εὐθατὰ τῇ μητρὶ ὁ Ἀνάχαρις, ἢ ὁς καὶ ἄγης ἀπονοσίαν ἐξ ἐώντος, θύσειν τε κατὰ ταῦτα κατὰ ὅρα τοὺς Κυκῆνοις ποιεῦν- τας καὶ παναχώδεα στήνειν. ὁς δὲ ἀπίκετο ἐς τὴν Σκιθέων, τοι κατάδου ἐς τὴν καλεμένην 'Αλάγην (ἡ δ' ἐστὶ μὲν παρὰ τῶν Ἀχιλλόην δρόμων, τυχάνει δὲ πᾶσα ὅσα δεδέων παντολον πλέξ), ἐς ταύτην δὴ καταδὺν ὁ Ἀνάχαρις τὴν ὅρθιν ἐπετελεῖ πάσαν τῇ θεῷ, τῷ πανάν, τό ἔχον καὶ ἐκδησάμενος ἀγάλματα. καὶ τοῦ τῶν Σκυθέων καταφρασθεῖς αὐτῶν ταύτα ποιεῦντα ἐσέμιναι ἑπτα, τὸ βασιλεία Σαμνίου· ὁ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπικόμιος ὦς εἰθεί τοῦ Ἀνά- χαριν ποιεῦντα ταύτα, τοξεύσας αὐτῶν ἀπέκτεινε. καὶ νῦν ἡν ἡς εἰρήνη πέρι Ἀσσαρίσιοι, οὐ μοίραι μιν Σκύθαι γενόσκειν, δια τοῦτο ὅτι ἔξοδος μὲ τὴν Ἐλληνα καὶ ξενικού ἔθεος διερχόμενο, ὁς δ' ἐγὼ ἥκουσα Σύμρει τοῦ Ἀριστείδου ἐπιτρό- που, εἰς αὐτόν Ἰδανύρσων τοῦ Σκυθέων βασιλέως πάτρων, παίδα δὲ εἰς Γνώρου τοῦ Δύκου τοῦ Σταργαπέθεου. εἰ ὦν ταύτης ἡν τῆς οἰκίας ὁ Ἀνάχαρις, ἵστο ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄδελφου

ponnesian war, when the rift between the religions of the Few and of the Many was fully developed or revived, and coarser cults again became prominent. (Cp. Aristophanes, Pac 420, Lysistr. 359 ff., Plato, Rep. ad init., Demosthen. de Cor. 322 ff.)

10. παννυχία(ς). In later days he might have assisted at such a celebration in Athens, cp. Aristoph. Frugs 371, 445, and Plato, Rep. 352; and for a similar night-watch cp. the Egyptian celebration described 2. 62 and the laukathoria 5. 95.

11. ἡ δ' ἐστί. It is curious to find this geographical excursus here, embedded in the story of Anacharsis, after cc. 55, 18 supra, if we suppose that the whole Scythian λόγος was written continuously and in one vein. This geographical aside suggests a variety of sources.

14. τόμπανον. These orgiastic drums were of two kinds, one like a tambourine, the other like a small kettledrum (cp. Smith, Dict. Antig. 2 p. 1180 and L. & S. sub s. τύμπανος, τύμπανες et cogn.). Baumeister, Denkmäler, p. 1663.

ἀγάλματα. "Imagines suspensas sibi fecerat" Baehr. Little images of the goddess or of Atthis, such as those worn by the Galli (Polyb. 22. 20 παραθύρια καὶ τύποι) or found in Attic graves (Praun, op. c. p. 539), hung round his neck. The construction is the not uncommon Greek idiom (cp. Aischines 3. 164 ἐπιστολάς ἐπηρεῖμεν, Aristoph. Eo. 494 τάγμαν ἐπηρεῖμεν) copied by Horace, Sat. 1. 6, 74 suspensi loculos tabulamque.

18. οὗ φασὶν μιν Σκύθαι. It is evident, therefore, that Hdt. did not get the story from a Scythian source, and evident further that Tymnes was no Scyth. The name occurs twice again in Hdt. as that of the father of a Histias of Termes in Karia (5. 38, 7. 95), very near Halikarnassos Hdt.'s native city. Where Hdt. met and conversed with this Tymnes, he does not say, but it need not have been in Scythia: it is not even certain that the ἐπηρεῖμα of Tymnes involved residence in Scythia, or was exercised there, although a probability to that effect may exist. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

21. τάρτων. Here again we have evidence, such as it is, that the patriarchal family was developed among the Scyths, though no doubt polygamous, cp. c. 69 supra.

23. ἔστω. The dead man is regarded as conscious and capable of being addressed. Stein compares Paus. 1. 6, 8, which seems an imitation of this passage, not an independent parallel.
to have no leisure.' The Greeks were all too busy to attend to higher (unpractical) matters, σοφία and σωφροσύνη, with the exception of the Lacedae-
omonians. (Cp. L. & S. sub ev. αχλοῦς, ἀρχιμέλης.)

5. Ἰστρημῆς δὲ γυναικὸς ὁδὸς γίνεται καὶ οὐδεμόν ἐγχώριος: τὸ

24. Ἰδάνθυρος, c. 129 ἐφην. If Anacharsis was his father's brother, and so a contemporary of Kyros, he might possibly have been a friend of Solon's. Diog. L. 1. 101 and Plut. give the name of the brother as Kaloidas. Lucian makes the father's name Δαμενης (Σcyth. 4) γένος τοῦ δοκιμαστοῦ οὗτο καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις Σκυθέων. Hdt. seems to have a doubt whether Saulios was really his brother.

77. 1. Πρώηνα. Hdt. does not actually say that he heard this anecdote in Sparta, but internal considerations point to a Spartan origin. There was some tradition at Sparta of a visit from Scythes in the days of Kleomenes (cp. 6. 84 ἐφηνα); and Greeks had a way of making foreigners the vehicles of their criticisms on one another, cp. 1. 153, 2. 160, and perhaps 62. 142 ἐφηνα. Hdt.'s visit to Sparta is certain. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxviii, lxxx f.

2. ὡς ... ἀποτελέσθαι ... γένοιτο. Mistranslated by R. (and Baehr) 'sent to make acquaintance ...'


5. ἀσχόλοις εἶναι ἐν τὰς πολλὰς σοφίας, "occupied in the pursuit of every kind of knowledge" R.; "busied about every kind of cleverness" Macaulay ("belessen much jeglichér Art von Weisheit" Baehr). These translations must all be wrong, the point of the anecdote being to extalt the wisdom (δοξαι τε καὶ δέξασθαι λόγων) as well as the virtue (σωφρόνων) of the Spartans. ἄσχολοι εἶναι means:
η μιτήρ αυτή γλώσσαν τε Ἕλλαδα καὶ γράμματα ἐδίδαξε. μετά
de χρόνο ὑστερον Ἀριστεῖθος μὲν τελευτά δώλο ὑπὸ Σπαργαπεί-
θεος τοῦ 'Αγαθόρρων βασιλέως, Σκύλης δὲ τὴν τε βασιληλὴν
παρέλαβε καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πατρὸς, τῇ οὐνομά ἦν 'Οποίη·
ἡν ἀυτή ἦ 'Ὁποίη ἀστή, εἰ ἦν ὁ Ὀρικος Ἀριστεῖθει παῖς. το
βασιλείου δὲ Σκυθέων ὁ Σκύλης διαίτης οὐδαμὸς ἡρόσκετο
Σκυθική, ἀλλὰ παλαιὸν πρὸς τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ μάλλον τετραμμένος
ἡν ἀπὸ παιδεύσις τῆς ἐπεταίδευτο, ἐποίει το τοιοῦτο; εὔτε
ἀγάγοι τὴν στρατηγὴν τὴν Σκυθέων ἐς τὸ Βορυσθενεῖτεν ἄστυ
(οὗ δὲ Βορυσθενεῖται οὗτοι λέγονσι σφέας αὐτοῦς εἶναι 15
Μιλησίων), ἐς τούτους οἰκος ἔθεοι ὁ Σκύλης, τὴν μὲν στρατηγὴν
καταλίπτεσε εἰ τῷ προαστείῳ, αὐτὸς δὲ οἰκος ἔθει εἰ τὸ τέιγος
καὶ τὰς πύλας ἐγκαλίσειε, τὴν στολὴν ἀποθέμενος τὴν
Σκυθικὴν λάβεσε ἀν Ἑλληνιδά ἐσθήτα, ἐξων δὲ ἀν ταινή ἡγόραξ ὡς
δορυφορὸν ἐπιμένον ὡς ἄλλου ὀδοντος; τὰς δὲ πύλας ἐφύλισ
λασσόν, μὴ τῆς μν. Σκυθέων ἐδο ξενοῦντα ταῦτα τὴν στολήν:
καὶ τὰ τέ αλλὰ ἄρα ἱδαίτη διαίτη Ἐλληνική καὶ θεοῦν ἢ ἐποίεις
κατὰ νόμους τοὺς Ἑλλήνων. ὑπὸ δὲ διατρίβεσε μίνη ἡ πλέον
τοῦτον, ἀπαλάνσετο εἴδος τὴν Σκυθικὴν στολήν. ταῦτα
ποιέσσεσε πολλάκις καὶ οἰκία τε ἐδείματο ἐν Βορυσθείᾳ καὶ 25
γυναῖκα ἔγγημε εἰς αὐτὰ ἐπιχώριην. ἐπείτε δὲ ἔθει οἱ κακοὶ 79
γενέσθαι, ἐγνεντο ἀπὸ προφάματος τοινύς. ἐπεθύμησε Διονύσιος
Βακχείοι τελευθής: μέλλουτε δὲ οἱ εἰς χειρὰς ἄγεσθαι τὴν
tελεύτην ἐγενέτο φάσμα μέγιστον. ἦν οἱ ἐν Βορυσθενεῖτεν τῇ
πόλιν οἰκίας μεγάλης καὶ πολυτελείας περιβολῆς, τῆς καὶ ὄλυνος 50
πρόπετρον τούτων μνήμην ἔχουν, τὴν πέριξ λευκοῦ λιθοῦ σφίγγες

6. γλώσσαν... γράμματα. But not Religion !
15. οἱ δὲ... Μιλησίων (οἱ ν. 17) εἰρήνευν comes in as a curious after-thought

18. τὴν στολήν τ. Σ. Oddly enough

50. ὄλυνος τι πρ. ἦν. = five lines, οἱ ν. 16 νυμέα.
56. σφίγγας τε καὶ γνυτέρας. The same combination occurs upon the celebrated

François-vase (original in Florence)

Baumeister, Denkmaler, Tafel Ixxiv.

vol. iii. 1790 (dated 550-500 B.C.), and a sphinx, with griffins, lay on the

helmet of the Chryselephantine Athene of Pheidias (Pausanias, i. 24, 5). (The

modern archaeologists convert these griffins into Pegasi: cf. O. Waldstein,

ἐποδα Βαυμέσιτε, οἰκίας ν. 56 Παιδίας.

For clear representation see Antig. de la

Russie mérid. p. 233, after M.D.I. 1888,

Pl. xxv.) Sphinx and griffin alike, in

relation to temples, served as guards.

Morphologically the chief difference be-

between the winged monsters is that the

Greek sphinx has a human head and
upper body (female), while the griffin has a bird's head (eagle); in each case the re-
mainder being supplied by the lion. The sphinx was originally at home in Egypt: where the colossal at Gizeh, though perhaps 'older than Memer,' still excites the astonishment of travellers. A vast number of sphinxes, dating from the time of Memphian I, formed, and forms, an avenue from the gate of Luxor to the great temple. The Egyptian sphinx has, however, not female (Egyptian Νέα = the Lord, cp. 2. 175), and not winged. In both these respects the Greek differs morphologically from the Egyptian, and the difference is presumably due to Asiatic influence at least in part. The sphinx appears upon the coinage of Chios, in especial, as symbolic of the cult of Dionysos (cp. Gardiner, Types, iv. 6, x. 19, B. Head, Historia, p. 515). The sphinx of Thebes is a more distinctly mythological creature, but her part in the story of Oedipus may possibly not be older than the Dramatists (Banmeister, p. 1658). The name sphinx is pure Greek (cp. L. & S. sub voc.): the Egyptian common proper, Φίξ (Hesiod, Thog. 326) may have been originally quite unlike the later sphinx.

Griffin, γρών, is probably like sphinx a good Greek or Indo-German word, the derivation from Hebrew הקדב being no longer admitted (A. Furtwängler, in Roscher's Lexikon, pp. 1742 ff., from whom what follows is mainly taken). Morphologically the griffin is a composite of lion and eagle (generally the head and wings of eagle on lion's body). Originally it is a distinctly Asiatic monster, not Egyptian; its elements are found in Chaldaea and Assyria, and above all in 'Hittite' art. In Greece it is seen distinctly in the works of Mykenean art, apparently used for purely decorative purposes. At a later time the figure is associated with Apollo; and it 'is to be inferred, from later Athenian coins, that the ancient temple figure of Apollo at Delos had two griffins, rampant, one on either side (op. c. 1751). In the coinage of Teos, and of its colony Abdera (founded 544 n.c. Hdt. 1. 168), the griffin appears in special connexion with Dionysos. Cp. Gardiner, Types, xvi. 9, 10, B. Head, Historia, pp. 511, 219. The griffin may signify divine power, and may be supposed to guard divine places, treasures, etc. Mythologically the monster was poorly treated, and had no such story as the sphinx. Hesiod appears to have introduced the griffins into Greek poetry, and Aristotle (cp. c. 18 340a), perhaps working upon some native Scythian legend of god-guarding monsters (Furtwängler, op. c. 1769), located the griffins in the far north (Hdt. 3. 116, 4. 18), and made their function the protection of the gold against the Arimaspi.

As when a Gryphon through the Wilderness Pursues the Arimasopian, who by stealth Had from his watchful custody purloined The guarded Gold. Par. Lost, 2. 945 ff.

This is the story rejected by Hdt. Ktesias thought to improve matters by transferring them to India, Indica 12, where he describes the animals: οὐκεία τεταράποδα, μεγάλοι δεσον λέον, σκέλη καὶ άνθρακες, οδηγόι λεόν, τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ νίσυρον, τοιαύτῃ δὲ τῷ περιβαλλόμενο. This may be in the main an alternative to the story in Hdt. 3. 102 ff. and is chiefly valuable as showing Ktesias at work. A 'variety' of the griffin also appears on the gold coins of Panticapaion: "griffin, holding spear in jaws treading on ear of corn," Gardner, Types, vii. 42; cp. B. Head, Historia, p. 239. His index describes this as a "gold-guarding" griffin. The date is c. 550 n.c.

9. ἐπεξαίρεσις. This conduct betrayed an imperfect acquaintance with Hellenic use, according to which such a contrepoo would have suspended a ceremony whether secular or religious.

10. φασι. This might have been put down as one of the Apotheosis of Anax-
better according to them to have ignored the existence of such a deity.

12. διεπρήστησαν. An ἔνας λεγ. (vox nihil, L. & 8.), but almost certainly the true reading, the MSS. giving διεπρήστησαν, ενέπρηστησαν, διεπήστησαν, and Stein’s emendation being far the happiest (Al. διεπρήστησαν, διεμπρητήσαν, διεπήστησαν, διαητήσαν < ἐπεητήσαν>). Stein explains the word as a popular expression (“aus der derben Volks-sprache”) meaning probably ‘tamt,’ ‘chaff’ (hählen, spotten).

19. διάνοια, ‘procession.’

80. 3. Τήρων. It is a little curious that Teres and Sitalkes should be named here as though they were well-known persons who required no introductions, their names speaking for themselves. When Thucydides (2. 29) has occasion to mention Teres he adds: ὁ δὲ Τήρων οὗτος ὁ τοῦ Σίταλκος πατὴρ πρῶτος Θράκης τῆς μεγάλης βασιλείας ἐπὶ πλῆρει τῆς Αλβής Θράκης ἐπώριος. Thuc. indeed has so little confidence in his readers that he thinks it necessary to guard against a possible confusion between Teres, father of Sitalkes, and Teres, husband of Prokne (Plakley, referring to 7. 137, argues that 7. 137 was written before Sitalkes became notorious; that this notoriety was acquired after Sitalkes joined the Athenian alliance, which he did in the first year of the Peloponnesian war; and that this passage was written after 7. 137. If that were so, then the passage would be one of the last additions to the work of Hdt. by the author, though, as said, Sitalkes cannot be supposed to be dead, it would have been added before 3. 180. But the notoriety of Sitalkes and Teres dated long before the Peloponnesian war; it would be strange if this passage inserted here, referring to events certainly prior to the extradition of Nikolas and Aneristos, had been obtained and inserted by Hdt. after the passage in Bk. 2, and Blakeley’s argument overlooks the possibility of the two stories being from different and independent sources, the terminology of which Hdt. has adopted. 7. ὑπὶ τῇ Ιστρῷ. Inferentially the boundary between Scythia and Thracia.

9. εἰς μὲν μὲν τῇ Αλβήνῃ ποῖς, Sitalkes, son and successor of Teres, was mother’s brother (οἰκονομιός) to Oktamasades, the Thracian mother of Oktamasades being apparently full sister to Sitalkes. In any case his connexion with Skyles was remote, the
τῆς ἄδελφεις σας, ἔχεις δὲ μεν ἄδελφειν. σὺ δὲ μοι ὑπὸδος τούτον, καὶ ἔγω σοι τῶν σοῦ Σκύλην παραδίδωμι· στρατή δὲ μήτη σὺ κινδυνεύσῃς μητ’ ἐγώ.“ ταῦτα οἱ πέμψας ὁ Σιτάλκης ἐπεκπροκυψευτὼν ἢν γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Ὀκταμασάδῃ ἄδελφειον Σιτάλκεω πεφευγόν. ὃ δὲ Ὄκταμασάδος κατανεῖται ταῦτα, ἐκδόντως δὲ τῶν ἔσωτοι μήτρα Σιτάλκη ἔδρα τῶν ἄδελφων Σκύλην, καὶ Σιτάλκης μὲν παραλαβὼν τὸν ἄδελφον ἀπῆγγετο, Σκύλεως δὲ Ὄκταμασάδος αὐτοῦ ταύτη ἀπέταμε τὴν κεφαλῆν, οὕτω μὲν περιτεθέντως τὰ σφέτερα νῦμα Σκύλης, τούτο δὲ παρατηρούμενοι ξεικικός νόμους τοιαῦτα ἐπιτιμή διδοῦν. 

Πλῆθος δὲ τὸ Σκύληων οὐκ οἷος τε ἄγεόμενος ἀρτεκέως πυθήθαι, ἀλλὰ διαφόροις λόγοις περὶ τοῦ ἁριτοῦ ἦκον καὶ γὰρ κάρτα πολλῶν εἶναι σφέας καὶ κλίγον ὡς Σκύλης εἶναι, τοσοῦτοι μέντοι ἀπάθαινοι μοι ἢ ὃπως. ἔσται μεταξῆς Βορυσθένους

latter being son of a Greek lady. (Stein oddly makes Sitalkes "mütterlicher Oheim Beider, des Skyles und des Okta-
masades."") He died in 424 B.C. Thuc. 4. 101.
10. ἄδελφειν. Possibly as Stein sug-
gests Sparadokes, Thuc. 2. 101, whose son Suthes succeeded, 4. 101.
18. στίχο. Hdt. we may suspect draws
hardly the full and correct moral of this
story. Oktaemases is a near relative to
Sitalkes. The two relatives are each
holding a throne, the one as pretender,
the other against a pretender, both any-
way against possible rivals: and each
by an exchange of prisoners has it in
his power to secure his own possession.
In the dethronment of Skyles there is
much apparently of dynastic intrigue
and personal quarrel, though prejudice
may have been raised against him as
'Hellenic.' Even this feeling may
have had as much policy as religion in
81. ἢσσαρχος, i.e. when I was making
my inquiries:—when, where, and from
whom he made inquiry, Hdt. unfortu-
nately does not say. Such omissions are
to be ascribed not to a wish on the his-
torian's part to exaggerate his own
authority, but rather to a certain laxity
in his canons of evidence: cp. Intro-
duction, § 20.
3. ὡς Σκύλης ὄναι, 'genuine Scotys,' 'Scytus properly so called.' In 2.
8 σύνεται πολλοί χρόνοι δὲ ἐναι Ἀ-
γκάστων is exactly parallel, cp. 2. 136
where ἂς is added. As to the matter
Thuc. 1. 97 commits himself to the
former view: and oddly enough Hdt.
commits himself similarly in regard to
the Thracians, 5. 3 infra. See note there:
and in regard to the Indi 3. 54.
A reconciliation of the two statements
here is not difficult, if the population
of the territory, more or less subject
to the Scyths, be distinguished from
the Scyths proper, or nomad Scotys, or
ev'n royal Scotys, who were not perhaps
' the most numerous' but the only
genuine Scytys. Cp. cc. 19, 20 supra,
and Appendix I.
4. τοσοῦτο μέντοι ἀπάθαινοι μοι ἢ ὃπως.
A good deal depends on the exact
meaning of this sentence. It has gener-
ally been taken to prove that Hdt.
visited this spot Examphaios, and had
seen the bronze krater described below.
But grammatically the words fully admit
of another interpretation. Hdt. uses the
imperfect of actions which were projected
but not performed or accomplished: so e.g.
ἐσωθεύσαντο γαρ οἱ κυβηλόντα τήν ἀδέλῳ 1.
68; πέφρασεν... τῇ Σάρδεις χρόνοι ὁμέτοι
1. 69; ἐπεθύμησεν... τὴν χλαύδος καὶ αὐτῇν
προσηλώσθων ὁμέτοι 3. 139; οἱ ἀντικείμενοι
'Ελλήνων ἐξεργῆς μοι 5. 22... ἀντεῖκεν τὸν
κτήνην συνεκαστήσατο 5. 104. Add
fares: in c. 52 supra, which certainly
does not mean "they succeeded in show-
ing me." It is obvious, then, that in this
passage Hdt. does not clearly say that
he saw the krater at Examphaios. He
only says: 'They were for showing—
'offered to show me.' The point of his
assertion is not his autopy, but their
paper, and the form of his expression is also remarkable. (He does not put it as elsewhere αὐτὸν ἐς δίδυμα ἀπεικύμενον aut sim. cp. c. 195 infra, Introduction, § 30.) His expression discredit his argument, not the existence of the krater of Exampsios: Hdt., while accepting what he heard of the existence of this vast krater, apparently does not think much of it, as an optical demonstration of the number of the Scyths, nor commit himself to the story of its origin. But he does not doubt its existence in situ at the moment of writing (σερεία) nor assert that it was there when he visited the place (ἐκτέρα). Stein explains the subject of ἀνέφαρων as τὸ ἑπίχρωμον from l. 13 infra, but supplies τὰ βασιλεία as the subject of φαίνονται, c. 82. This is inconsequent. If Τούραν be the subject of φαίνονται it may just as well be the subject of ἀνέφαρων, or ἀνέφαρων may have a different subject from ἑλεγχον and from φαίνονται. Even if τὸ ἑπίχρωμον, or ἑπίχρωμον, be supplied as subject to ἀνέφαρων it would not be necessary to conclude that Hdt. visited Exampsios, or saw the krater.

If it be argued that the natural way of understanding this passage is the way in which it has been generally understood, I admit so much. But the question is whether the view here advanced is not tenable as a grammatical and logical exposition of the passage, and materially coherent with the general evidences in regard to Hdt.’s visit to the Pontos. If the passage implies a visit to Exampsios, which yet is not directly asserted, it raises the question of Hdt.’s honesty and character as a historian: but if it is conceivable that he might have penned this passage without having been to Exampsios, and without wishing it to be supposed that he had been to Exampsios, addit queasi. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

6. τοῦ... ἢ χώρον, ἢ. In c. 52 supra: compare with this the use of the same phrase in c. 70 of a statement made five lines higher, and it is difficult to believe that the four passages were originally in the relation in which we now find them to one another: the first τοῦ καὶ ἐλεγχον κράτος referring to a statement five lines up; the second referring back over this statement to a statement upwards of 400 (404) lines before (reckoned in Stein’s ed. 1834). The story of Skyles, cc. 78-80, may have been inserted after the original composition of the passages 52, 81. But the mystery of the original order of composition is well-nigh insoluble. Cp. Introduction, § 21.

8. χαλκῆος, a bronze. Cp. c. 152 infra. 1. 68 it is used in a different sense ("a smithy"). This Scythian krater is six times the size of one at the Bosporus (which held therefore only about 100 amphorae). Assuming the ἀρμονία here to be the same measure as the Attic αρμονία (see Hultsch, Metrologia, p. 101) which was = 39-39 litres, or about 9 gallons, 600 would = 339-37 hektoletres, or upwards of 5000 gallons. It has been calculated that this krater would have weighed upwards of 40,000 (41,000) ol. French pounds, and that no modern cast could be compared to "except the great bell in the Kremlin at Moscow, eid. Baehr. On the Bosporus, in the third century n.c., this krater was still to be seen: the story then ran that it was older than the time of Pausanias, and that he had appropriated and re-dedicated it in his own name. So Nymphs of Herakleion apud Athenaeus, p. 536 (7, 9). Cp. the story of Pausanias and a similar act at Delphi, Thuc. 1. 132 (which might be regarded as a confirmation or as a source of the story in Athenaeus); or the conduct of the Lacedaemonians in the case of the golden περισσαρίων 1. 51. Such plagiarisms were common with the Pharaohs. Cp. Wiedemann, Aegypt. Gesch. 1. 57.

It is curious that Hdt. should not refer to the silver krater, dedicated by Kroisos at Delphi, 1. 51, which so many of his readers or hearers would have seen, and which was as nearly as possible the same size as the Scythian bronze.

The rivers and the plain were certainly two broad features which might well astonish a Greek accustomed to the streams of Hellas proper, or even of Ionia, and their mountain-valleys. The Ἑρακλεῖον Ἰησοῦς seems rather a bathos thereafter. Hdt. by no means says he has seen this wonder, and Stein is divided between ἔρημος and οὐδὲν ἔρημον as subject for φαίνει. As Herakles was not a Scythian divinity, and as his mark in the rock would have the same moral as the Herakleid legend above cc. 8-10, viz. to establish a claim for the Greeks, we may be pretty sure that it was Greeks, of Tyras or elsewhere, who acted as showmen in this case, though the presence of Herakles may signify a Phoenician trade-route. Cp. cc. 8, 99 supra.

5. δησικία. Same size as the shoe of Perseus in Egypt 2. 91. Exrede Herodotus: it follows that the one hero was about the same superhuman size as the other. A foot of two cubits would give a height of about twelve cubits: or upwards of 18 feet.

7. λόγον. The story of the Scythian expedition, resumed from c. 1 cc. 4, rather than the (geographical) λόγος introduced c. 16. For the phrase cp. 5. 52 infra, and Introduction, p. lxxv.

83. 1. παρασκευασμένου. Cp. c. 4.
ποινος ἀγρεύοις ἐπιτάξατας τοίς μὲν πεζον στρατόν, τοῖς δὲ νέας παρέχειν, τοῖς δὲ ἔχοντας τῶν Ὀρικέων Βόστορον, Ἀρτάβανος ὁ Ὀστάππεος, ἀδελφός ἐνών Δαρείου, ἐχρήσα 
μηδαμόν αὐτῶν στρατηγὴν ἐπὶ Σκύθων ποιεῖσθαι, καταλέγουν τῶν ἦ
Σκύθων τὴν ἀπορίαν. ἄλλος οὖ καὶ γὰρ ἐπείθει συμβουλεύοις οἴ
χρηστά, ὁ μὲν ἐπιπαντο, ὁ δὲ, ἐπείδη οἱ τὰ ἄπαντα παρε
σκευαστο, ἐξῆλαν τὸν στρατὸν ἐκ Συνόκων. ἐπανά 
περαιόν Οἰόβαζος ἐδείχνη Δαρείου τριῶν ἐνούν οἱ παιδὰ 
καὶ πάντων στρατευμένοι ἐνα αὐτῷ καταλειφθήκα 
. ὁ δὲ ἐφι οἷ 
φιλο ἐστιν καὶ μετρίων δεομένων πάντας τοὺς παιδὰ 
καταλειφθ 
. ὁ μὲν δὲ Ὁλαζεος περιγραφή ἢ, ἐπιτίκ οὐκ 
νεὰς στρατηγὴν 
καταλειφθήκ 
. ὁ δὲ ἐκέλευε τοὺς ἐν τοῖσ ἐπετεοτο 
ταπετείοι 
τοὺς Οἰ 
νο 

infra, and on the story of the Scythic expedition see Appendix III.

2. ΤΟΙΣ ΑΝ ΝΕΑΣ. Apparently Ionians or Hellenes only: but see c. 87 infra. Phoenician vessels do not appear in the Aegean until the Ionian Revolt. Cp. (§ 105) 6. 6 infra. But their absence on the present occasion is curious.

3. ΤΟΙΣ ΣΑ ΖΕΓΝΩΒΑΝ. Probably Hellenes, as appears cc. 87, 88 infra, though Phoenician engineers were afterwards employed, in conjunction with Greeks, by Xerxes on the canal at Athos 7. 23, and Phoenicians and Egyptians on the bridges over Hellespont 7. 34. The Bosphorus (wrongly Bosphorus) still bears the name Θρίαυ, to distinguish it from the Kimmerian Bosphorus (strait of Yenikale): cp. cc. 12, 23 supra, 100 infra.

4. ΑΡΤΑΒΑΝΟΣ has already an old head on comparatively young shoulders. Thirty years afterwards he reappears to damp the military ambition of Xerxes, 7. 10, where he is represented as referring to the advice he is here reported to have given to Dareios. Cp. also c. 148 infra. Such advice comes better from the uncle to the nephew, than from the younger to the elder brother.

5. ΑΥΤΟΝ, 'IN PERSON.' Cp. c. 1 supra, καταλέγων. Used here in a somewhat remarkable way, as only one single particular is specified: perhaps Hdt. had already robbed Ariabanos of his items in the passages quoted below. In ἢ καταλέγειν τὰτα χάρος c. 28 supra the account embraces many particulars, as still more obviously in cc. 50, 95, 114, 115. Cp. especially 5. 39, 6. 58.

6. ΤΗΝ ΑΠΟΡΙΑΝ. In 7. 10 Ariabanos explains this: ἄρας ἀδιάμαδε γῆς ἀπο 
νεῶνται. Cp. c. 46 supra τοῖσ γὰρ μήτε 
ἀστα μήτε τίχα ... ἄμα χαλ τε καὶ ἄρο 
κορο προομαγεί. Cp. also the remarks of Gobyras c. 134 infra. (From another point of view the Scythians were remarkable for a certain εὐφορία, c. 59 supra.)

8. ΣΟΙΣΩΝ. The capital of Elam had been adopted or retained as one of the royal residences by Dareios, if not by Kyros. Cp. note to 5. 49 supra. We hear little in the Greek authors before the age of Alexander of Persian capitals proper. It does not seem probable that the στρατός started from Susa: a rendezvous would have been appointed: cp. 6. 95, 7. 26.

84. 2. ΟΙΟΒΑΖΟΣ ἙΣΘΗΔΗ ΔΑΡΕΙΟΝ. Xerxes on a similar provocation at Dareios (see the anecdote of Pythios, 7. 38, 39) is content to execute one out of a family of five sons: but then he gives Pythios 'a bit of his mind': which is perhaps necessary, in order that proper emphasis should be laid upon the conduct of Xerxes, who was bound to leave nothing undone in the despot's rôle. Other circumstances in the anecdote of Xerxes may be taken to subserve the same unconscious purpose. But the action of Dareios is the more savage, though not on that account the more probable. It is even possible that it is a récit of the anecdote of Xerxes. (Cp. Introduction, pp. lxv. ff.)

6. ΤΟΙΣ ΕΞΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΣΕΤΕΙΩΤΟΣ. Cp. 7. 38 τοῖσ πρωταίτα ταῖτα πρῆσειν: 7. 36 τοῖσ προεθέκον αὐτὴ ἡ ἄνα τιμ.
85 ἀποσφαγέντες αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἐξεύκταις. Δαρείους δὲ ἐπείτε πορεύο-
μενος ἐκ Σοῦσαν ἀπίκετο τῆς Καλλιθονίης ἐπὶ τὸν Βόσπορον ἢ
ἐξευκτὴ ἡ γέφυρα, ἐνθεύσαν ἐσβάς ἐς νέα ἐπλυε ἐπὶ τὰς
Κυσάπες καλευμένας, τὰς πρότερον πλαγιάτας Ἑλληνίδες φασὶ
εἶναι, ἐξεύκτως δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ ἐθνείτο τὸν Πώμον ἐξηκεῖτο ἕξιοντος.
πελάγειον γὰρ ἀπάντων πέφυκε θωμασιώτατος. τοῦ τὸ μὲν
μήκος σταδίων ἐκεῖ ἐκατῶν καὶ χίλιων καὶ μύρων, τὸ δὲ εὐρος, τῇ
εὐρύτατος αὐτοῦ ἐωτοῦ, σταδίων τριμικρίων καὶ τρισχίλιων,
τούτου τοῦ πελάγεος τὸ στόμα ἐστὶ εὐρός τέσσερα σταδίων,
τὸ μήκος δὲ τοῦ στόματος, ὁ αὐχην, τὸ δὴ Βόσπορος κέκληται, κατ'
ὁ δὴ ἐξεύκτη ἡ γέφυρα, ἐπὶ σταδίων ἐκεῖσο καὶ ἐκατῶν ἑστι
τεινεὶ δὲ ἐς τὴν Προποντίδα ὁ Βόσπορος, ἢ δὲ Προποντίδα ἐνώπιος
εὐρος μὲν σταδίων πεντακοσίων, μήκος δὲ τετρακοσίων καὶ

8. αὐτοῦ τοῦτο. In Susa. 85. 2. Kallithonía. Cp. c. 144 infra. The journey from Susa to the Bosporus is
lighty regarded here; did not the king winter on the way, as Xerxes at Sardes in
481-0 n.c.? Cp. Introduction, p. xxxv. n. 3. νεά. Presumably a Greek ship;
but where? 1. Κυσάπες. παγαντή δὲ τού τάς γε
βασιλ. μάρασι καλοὺσαν Od. 12. 61, αίοσ
Σωτηρίων, Eurip. Medea 2. Hdt. appears to doubt their former mobility.
5. ἐνὶ μῆ. An emendation for ἰπον ὀρ
ὑπὶ ἱπον. No temple has been mentioned.
Some would emend ἱπον into ἱπον the
deck or poop of the ship. But ἱπον (รก) is
the only form recognised; the singular
here would be unique (cp. 5. 18 infra)
and the remark in any case feeble. The
temple of Zeus Urius must be meant,
if the reading ἱπον be retained.
6. ἀνάπτων. Hdt. evidently does not
think of the Mediterranean as one
παγαντή but as made up of several παγαντή.
Cp. the last words of the chapter.
The Pontos is made more than twice
too long in this estimate, the straight
line from the Bosporus to the Phasis
being only about 630 miles (5500 stades)
instead of 1250 miles (11,100 st.). It
may be said of course that Hdt. is following
the coast line, and bases his estimate
on the time occupied by sailing, cp. c.
86. In that case he must have vastly
overrated the way made under sail, as the
distance "even following the sinuosities
of the coast" does not exceed 7000 stades
(800 m.). These figures are taken from
Rawlinson, who asserts that Hdt. "had
probably been himself from the Bosporus
(sic) to the Phasis in a sailing ship." If
that was so, how did Hdt. come to take
the Phasis as the eastern boundary of
the north coast of Asia minor, and
apparently to think of that coast as
much straighter than it is? Cp. c. 33
supra.
7. τὸ δὲ εὐρὸς instead of being 3800
stades (380 miles) is about 2340 stades
(270 miles).
9. τὸ στόμα is now rather more than
six, but the passage may have been
widened by the current.
10. ὁ αὐχήν looks like a gloss specially
with ἐς following, and might have been
supplied from c. 118 infra. Stein suggests
that the Pontos was regarded as the
trunk and the Propontis as the head,
and so the Bosporos becomes the neck:
but the parallel of the Danube dispenses
of such exact analogy, c. 89 infra.
The 120 stades, an understatement; the length
being about 16 miles (140 st.).
12. Προποντίδα. As a rule Hdt.
does not distinguish the Propontis from
the Hellespont, vide c. 33 supra. So, for
example, he calls the inhabitants of
Perinthos Hellespontians 5. 1 infra.
This passage may have been written
with fuller knowledge of the character
of the waterway between the Ægean
and Euxine, gained by his own voyage.
13. εὐρὸς . . . μήκος. R. corrects the
breadth to 440 st. (50 m.) taking the
line from Perinthos to Plakia; and the
length to 1000 st. or 115 m.
The length of the Hellespont is "as
nearly as possible 40 miles (about 345
stades)"; its breadth is now about one
mile (83 stades).
14. καταδιδοῖ ἐς· ‘opens down into’...
15. The accusative σταδίους is curious. Krüger proposed ἐπ’ ἐστι στ., Stein the genitive.

86. 1. μεμετρήτων. Cp. ἐνεργ., μοι με-μετρήτων. The expression does not in any way carry with it the inference that Hdt. had performed the voyage; it only asserts that he has made a calculation, based on certain data which he indicates. He is probably correct in estimating the voyage from the Bosporus to the Phasis as nine days and eight nights (not allowing for obstruction or delay) and the passage from the Thermodon to Sindikē at three days and two nights: he goes astray in taking the distance performed by a sailing ship in twenty-four hours as equal to 18,000 fathoms, or 1300 stades (2. 149), nearly 150 miles. Generally 1000 stades (115 miles) seems to have been reckoned as a twenty-four hours voyage. Cp. Smith, Dict. Antiq. p. 755.

2. For μακρότατον there is good MSS. authority.

4. μακρότατον. An error; the greatest length being from bay of Burghaz (Apollonia) to the Phasis, about 700 miles (over 6000 stades).

8. Σινδικής is an obvious emendation by Wesseling for σίδη. Cp. c. 28 σίδη.

12. Van H. brackets the first σῶς and drops the second. The apparatus of the editors here leaves something to be desired, but the passages cited by van H. and quoted by Stein ed. maj. from Cramer, Anecd. Orient. i. 287, Elym. M. p. 578, 43 suggest some doubt as to the ultimate source of this chapter.

13. παρέχεται... Πόντου. Stein thinks this last sentence is a later addition: what, only the last sentence? Perhaps the whole passage from τρισχίλιον υπότροχον or from ἐκεῖνων ἐστι, in c. 85.

15. Μαυρίτης. At present the Sea of Azof is not much more than one-twelfth the size of the Black Sea. It is reasonable on such a matter to suppose that Hdt. made a mistake rather than enlarge the Palus Maecotis in the time of Hdt. to “an area four or five times as great as it has at present” (Rawlinson), an enlargement which would still leave the Palus much too small for the position. How should Hdt. have had accurate knowledge of its size? The name has been derived from the tribe of Moecetii or Maestae, whom Rawlinson would connect with the Sauro-Maests. Maestae a quibus lacus nomen accepit, Plin. 4. 26, 10. Inscriptions of the Bosporone kingdom give the form of the name as Mastra, cp. Dittenberger, Syll. No. 103, 104 (C.I.G. 2118, 2119). The folk is mentioned c. 128 ἐνεργ. μήτηρ. Strabo 214 ὁδ. 334, quotes Polybios as saying that the Timavus was
locally called πηγή καὶ μνήμα τῆς θαλάσσης (Adriatic). The 'large' lake from which the Hypanis was said to rise is called c. 52 supra μήταρ τῶν Τάπανων. In the case of the P. Maecens a popular Greek etymology (μάις) may have suggested, or enforced the metaphor, 87. 1. ὡς θεόφιλος, 'when he was done beholding . . .'.

3. στῆλας. Perhaps one (in cuneiform) on the Asiatic and the other on the European side! Or were both on the European side, as we might infer from the action of the Byzantines described just below? One might have expected bilingual inscriptions, i.e. both languages on the same stone. In any case such inscriptions would furnish information to Hdt., or to his sources (cp. 5. 36, and Introduction, p. lxiii). 4. Λίθον λευκόν. Marble, c. 79 supra. 'Ασσύρια, i.e. cuneiform, Persian. "Hdt. is no doubt inaccurate when he speaks here of Ασσύρια letters" R. How, when, and where was the numbering effected? Obviously before these inscriptions were cut. The record in c. 92 infra looks like a rude attempt at enumeration. The passage before us here is perhaps part of an addition made after Hdt. had visited the Pontos. 5. ηγεί δὲ πάντα κτλ. Like Xerxes. This generality should imply that Phoenicians, Egyptians, Cyprians were serving: how if not on the fleet? But in any case the phrase is a patent exaggeration. 7,000,000 including the cavalry is given as the number realised by the general Lysander in the Persian empire at this time. This is a mere trifle compared to the levée en masse effected by Xerxes Bk. 7. The number of ships is here 600. In the Macedonian campaign there are also 600 ships, triremes, 6. 95 infra. Cp. note ad i.e. No nation or people is named in this story as contributing ships to the fleet except the Greeks (Ionians, Aeolians, Hellenes points). The Ionian fleet at Lade some eighteen years afterwards numbered only 355. See 6. 8 infra. It is very improbable that the 600 vessels employed on the Scythian campaign can have been supplied exclusively by Greeks. Cp. c. 89 infra. Phoenician and perhaps Egyptian vessels were included, cp. 3. 19 for Phoenician fleet under Kambyses, 7. 89, 8. 90 under Xerxes, Aegean Bk. 7. 89, 8. 17. But the sources used by Hdt. ignored all but the Greek vessels, for the Scythian expedition.

8. ἥπερον. How long after? Hdt. apparently does not know, or he would, we may suppose, have been more exact (cp. 6. 118): nor is he apparently aware of the tradition that a similar act of defiance was perpetrated by the Alkedonians on the Asiatic side. Ktesias § 17 (ed. Gilmore, p. 151). Stein suggests on the strength of this passage that the date was immediately after the failure of the expedition. (But was it a failure?) Cp. however c. 143 infra: and Appendix III. 9. τῆς Ὀρθοσύνης Ἀρτ. Stein, n. ad 1., connects the worship of Artemis Orthia at Byzantium with the Dorian colonisation from the metropolis Megara, and appears to regard this deity as popular with Dorians. Schreiber, in Koserer's Lexikon 555, contents himself with describing Artemis Orthia as of purely Hellenic origin ("eine . . . ihrem Ursprungs nach rein hellenisch Gestalt"). The identification of Artemis Orthia with Iphigenia (cp. c. 103 infra) and her connexion with Orestes and Agamemnon disproves a specifically Dorian character, though no doubt the cult was found and adopted, with more or less of modification, in Sparta and Megara, and other places where the
Dorians pushed in. The primitive localization of the cult at Lemnos (old name of Lemnos, Taurike, Schreiber, op. cit. 586) may be safely taken back to a pre-Hellenic epoch. The idea that Byzantium was genuinely Dorian because Thera was its metropolis is on a par with the theory that Kyrene was Dorian because Themis was its metropolis, vide supra, p. 147 ff. If the Phoenicians penetrated into the Pontos before the Greeks, it is probable that they carried their cults of 'Artemis' and 'Heraclis' with them (cp. notes c. 82 supra). When colonists from Hellen arrived, they found cults already established, which they rightly identified with cults they had left behind, the religions in Peloponnesus, in the islands, on Hellespont and Bosporus comprising elements that were there established long prior to the advent of the Dorians, and foreign, if not anterior, to the Hellenic settlement.

Orthosis: the cult was ascetic and sensual. Schreiber, op. cit. 586, suggests a phallic origin for the title, comparing Dionysae Orthia, the ὀφθαλμος of the Ἀσσ, Pindar Pyth. 10, 32, and Aristoph. Lysistrat. 944 (cp. ὀφθαλμ. 2. 51). We may add that the ἀναφοράς Astrabakos was said to have found the lost image of Artemis Orthia, and to have gone out of his mind thereon. Pausan. 3. 16. See for Astrabakos 6. 69 supra. Yet the hypothesis looks awkward in regard to a female title, though it may be preferred to Preller's suggestion (Gr. Myth. i. 2 250) that the title was derived from the stiff columnar character of the archeaic images of the goddess, a characteristic which was not confined to the ἔκλεις in question.

Rawlinson understands 'A. 6. to be 'Diana (sic) who had established or preserved their city. (Compare the Latin 'Jupiter Stator.')' As a matter of fact Dionys. Halie. uses ὀφθαλμος Ζέες for the Latin Jupiter Stator, 2. 50. Jup. Stator however is not the founder, establisher, or preserver of cities, but a god of battle. Livy I. 198. Cp. Preller, Ion. Myth. vol. i. p. 361, and vol. ii. p. 198 (where Stator item Conservator and item depulsor are given from C.I.L.)

May we not venture to regard A. Orthia as a later and more ethical form of A. Orthia? The first place where the title occurs is in Pindar, Ol. 3. 30, ποταμ. 476. The derivation of the title from a mountain in Arcadia named Orthion (Schoi. to Pindar) is worthy of a Scholiast, and is refuted by the alternative: ἄναφορας τῆς γυναῖκας καὶ εἰς συνυγίαν ἐκ τῶν τοκέτων ἄργους, an alternative which has at least the merit of a reference to recognised functions of Artemis.


88. 1. ἅρβεκας. Dareios' progress through Thrace is a succession of delights: the Despot was in excellent humour: see further c. 91 ἁρβεκα, ἢρβεκα τῆς πτασμοφ., and c. 97 κέρας η ἤρβεκα τῆς γυναῖκας.

2. τάρα δέκα. Stein compares 9. 81, and warns against taking the words literally (as R. does).

5. γραψαμένος. Can any one doubt that Hilt saw this picture in the Heraios, or that stories connected with it have found their way into his narrative? How much of the story of the campaign may be due to Samian sources it is impossible
to determine exactly: but this picture has to be reckoned with. Samos had passed first of the islands into the Persian empire, 3. 139. On its engineers cp. 3. 69. The greatest work at Samos, the water tunnel and duct, so accurately described by Hdt. l.c. (cp. H. F. Torell, Islands of the Aegaeon, pp. 185 ff.), was the work of a Megarian, by name Eupeithes, son of Naustrophos, of whom we know nothing further. The work may have been executed under Polykrates. Rhoeos (3. 69), Telecles (3. 41), Theodotos (1. 51, 3. 41), or the two Theodori (see K. O. Müller, Ancient Art, E. Tr. p. 31, Overbeck, Schriftenquellen, §§ 273 ff.), Mandrokles were native Samians. Was the remarkable painting, here put on record, the work of a Samian? Hdt. unfortunately omits the painter's name. It was not from the hand of Mandrokles (γυμνόβιος mi.), though he may have himself composed the epigram (ἐγιγμασίας, but cp. c. 91 infra) as well as the pontoon. Whether the picture was a wall-painting or a πίναξ is not definitely stated: presumably the former. The Heraion was a treasury of votive offerings 1. 70, and c. 152 infra. In Strabo's time it was a veritable παραμυθένια, the collections indeed having overflowed the temple proper (p. 637).

89. 2. Συγγράμματα. Υποβαθμίων. This would seem to imply that the session or review of Dareios took place on the Asiatic side. The passage of the Great King on to European soil for the first time is an historic moment of the highest interest, and a modern historian would be likely to improve the occasion: but Hdt. is too good a story-teller to overdo such situations. Besides, he was reserving, if he had not already expended, his strength for the nearer and more thrilling parallel in the case of Xerxes.

4. ἐκ τῶν Ἱστρῶν. One might suppose the mouth of the river was meant. Cp. c. 97 infra.

5. ίγαν. Not by any means necessarily "furnished the chief strength" (K.), though they may have "formed the leading members" of the navy. Cp. c. 87 supra.

7. Κυναγεῖας. Two rocks to the north of the exit from the Bosporus. Cp. c. 85 supra.

10, local: cp. c. 120 infra. Hdt. knows elsewhere that there is a bay to the south of the mouth of the Danube, c. 99 infra, but hardly realises the full sweep of the coast, or he would not have measured the greatest length of the Pontos from the Bosporus, c. 80 supra. In any case the fleet apparently was to make straight for the Ister. Cp. c. 99 infra.

9. τῶν αὐχέων. Not so called because you can make a head on one side and a trunk on the other, cp. c. 85 supra, but because it was a narrow place which admitted of being 'yoked' or 'collared.' On the topography see c. 97 infra.

11. Τείρα. See note next chapter.
tás tēn χαίραν ἐστρατοπεδεύσατο ἥμερας τρεῖς. ὁ δὲ Τέαρος λέγεται 90 ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων εἶναι ποταμῶν ἄριστος τά τέ ἀλλὰ τά εἰς ἀκέσαι φέροντα καὶ δὲ καὶ ἀνδράσι καὶ ἑποίουσι ψόρνη ἀκέσασθαι. εἰσὶ δὲ αὐτῶν αἱ πηγαὶ δυὸν δέονται τεσσαράκοντα, ἐκ πέτρης τῆς αὐτῆς ἥρων καὶ αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν εἰσὶ ψυχρὰ καὶ θερμὰ ὑδάτων. ἤδος δὲ ἐπὶ αὐτᾶς ἐστι ἤδος ἐξ Ἡραιοῦ τοῦ πολὺ τῆς περάς Περίκλου καὶ ἐξ Ἠραίανης τῆς ἐν τῷ Εὐξείνῳ πόντῳ, δυὸν ἥμερας ἑκατέρας. εἶκοσι δὲ ὁ Τέαρος οὗτος ἐς τὸν Κοντάδεσσον ποταμῶν, ὁ δὲ Κοντάδεσσος ἐς τὸν Ἁγριάνην, ὁ δὲ Ἁγριάνης ἐς τὸν Ἑράρον, ὁ δὲ ἐς θάλασσαν τὴν παρ᾽ Ἀλντερίο πόλι. ἐπὶ 91 τοῦτον ὁν τῶν ποταμῶν ἀπίκουμεν ὁ Δαρείος ὃς ἐστρατοπεδεύσατο, ἤσθε τὸ τοπαμὸν στῆλην ἐστῆσε καὶ ἐνθαῦτα, γράμματα ἑγρήγαρσα λέγουτα τάξις. "Τέαρον ποταμὸν κεφαλαί ὑδν ἄριστον τε καὶ κάλλιστον παρέχεται παντῶν ποταμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτὰς ἀπίκυτο ἐλαύνει ἐπὶ Σκύθας στρατον ἀνήρ ἄριστος τε καὶ κάλλιστος πάντων ἃνθρώπων, Δαρείος ὁ "Τύπταστεος, τὸν Περίνθουσον. These words do not prove that Hdt. himself visited the source of the Teiros; a local assertion probably reached him in Herion, or Perinthos, or Apollonia, if indeed it be not derived from a literary source, or be more than an inference. Cp. Introduction, § 20. The geography of this passage has hardly received in some quarters the attention that might have been expected. The Geogr. Journal, 1854, vol. 24, pp. 36 ff., contains a paper, Notes on a Journey into the Balkans, or Mount Haemus, in 1847, by Lieut.-Gen. A. Jochmus, in which the routes of Dardos, and of Alexander, 335 n.c. (Arrian, Anabasis, 1, 1 ff.) are discussed. The route of Dardos through Thrace led him down to Perinthos, and then northward to the 'neck' of the Danube. He would have to pass the Balkan (Haemus), but of that Hdt. says nothing. Jochmus claims to have made out the 35 sources of the Teiros near the villages of Yene and Bunarchissar 'easily', in which case the Teiros is the Simzedere, which has lost its medicinal properties, though keeping the number of its springs, and apparently its name (Dere, Dears). Yene is more than two days' journey from either Ereklei (Perinthos) or Sizeboli (Apollonia), being 70 miles from the former, and rather more from the latter. Plainly Hdt. can hardly have visited the springs.

90. Περίνθουσον. A Samian settlement (Ethym. Mag.) west of Perinthos.
91. Ἁγιάνη = Ἡραιόν or Ἡράων, the modern Ergiion or Erkine. The Kontadesos is apparently not identified (Jenat Forbiger, All Geogr., III. 1075). H. M. Maritz, "the greatest of the southern rivers" (of the Balkan peninsula). Stanford's Europe, p. 312.

4. γράμματα ἑγρήγαρα. The active in such cases can only be on the principle qui facit per atinem (cp. ἑγρήγαρας cp. 88 supra). Some persons fondly believe that this inscription or a portion of this inscription was in existence a few years ago (Kawlinson ad loc., Jochmus, op. c.). That Dardos set up one or more inscriptions in Thrace is not unlikely: but that any Persian inscription contained the lines preserved by Hdt. is less likely. Cp. 1. 188 οπέανται δὲ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἦν μεγίς καὶ στίλβος εἰς ἐκείνους εἰς ὁδοὺ καὶ προβάτων καὶ δὲ καὶ ἔδωκαν ἐπὶ τοῦ Χολ- στευτοῦ ποταμοῦ ἅμα ἄγαν τοῦ παρὰ Σούσα βοῦτος τοῦ μονοῦ πῦξι βασιλεύον καὶ ἄλλον ἀπόθεν ποταμοῖ. The believers will also have it that the inscription was in cuneiform, though Hdt. does not say so (cp. c. 87 supra).
Πορέσων τε καὶ πᾶσις τῆς ήτερου βασιλεύς." ταῦτα δὲ ἐνθαῦτα ἐγράφη.

92 Δαρείος δὲ εὐθεῦτεν ὀρμηθαι ὑπίκετο ἐπὶ ἄλλου ποταμοῦ τῷ οὖνομα Ἀρτησικὸς ἐστὶ, διὰ διὰ Ὄδρυσιον μέει. ἐπὶ τούτων δὲ τούτων ἀπεκόμενος ἐποίησε τοῦτον ἀποδέχασα χωρίον τῇ στρατιᾷ ἐκέλευ τὰντα ἀνδρὰ λίθον ἧνα παρεξιῶτα τιθέναι 5 ἐς τὸ ἀποδεδεγμένον τοῦτο χωρίον. ὅς δὲ ταῦτα ἡ στρατιὰ ἐπετέλεσε, ἐνθαῦτα κολωνίας μεγάλως τῶν λίθων καταλαμπὼν
93 ἀπήλαυνε τὴν στρατιὰν. πρὶν δὲ ἀπεκέχθαι ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήν, πρῶτος αἱρέει Γέτας τῶν ἀβανατήτων. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὸν Ἁλμυρόσσων ἔχουσε Θρήμες καὶ ὑπὲρ Ἀπολλώνης τε καὶ

8. Ἡπείρος is explained to mean Asia (cp. 1. 4), the King apparently not being aware that he was in Europe!

92. Ἀρτησικὸς. If the Artaxiakos were correctly identified by d'Anville and Gattener with the Arda or Arta (see Larcher viii. p. 82), Dareios would have had to cross the Maritza (Hebros) before coming to it. This would destroy the credit of Hdt. Jochmus followed by Rawlinson identifies it with the Tekedere, which is crossed several times on the present high road to the Balkan. Of the maps some place the Artaxiakos on the W., others on the E. of the Hebros, owing to the above difference among the geographers.

3α Ὄδρυσιον, Thuc. 2. 96. Adrianople (Usadama) now stands about the centre of the great plain which formed apparently the territory of the Odrysae, probably separated from the Getae by the Balkan, until their frontier was pushed forward to the Danube by Sitalakes, c. 80 supra. But it is possible that the Odrysae at this period (512 n.c.) lay wholly west of the Hebros, in which case Dareios did not march through their territory. It is certainly curious that no notice is taken of their fate.

3. τοῦτο. This performance looks like a rude attempt at a count of the army, else why the 'one man one stone'? Cp. cc. 81 supra, 98 infra, 7. 69.

93. 1. πρὸς. It is curious that Hdt. does not mention the Balkans or specify by what pass Dareios crossed from the territory of the Odrysae to that of the Getae. If Dareios crossed as far to the E. as Jochmus supposed, with a view to getting him to Apollonia, it is strange that the fleet should have been sent ἐκεῖ to the Danube c. 80 supra, and that we hear nothing of the king's presence in the Greek cities on the Thracean coast of the Pontos. Hdt. indeed knew at some time in his life that there was a block of mountains between the Danube and Thrace called Haimos, c. 49 supra, but his geography and geographical excursus are independent of his history, and his history of his geography; the sources he follows here for Dareios' campaign made no mention of mountains or passes. Cp. Appendix II.

2. Γέτας. The Getae, here first mentioned in history, are identified with the Goths by Rawlinson who compares Massa-getae, Thyssa-getae, Tyri-getae, Visi-gothis, Ostro-gothis. The identification is very doubtful. See Mullenhoff, Deutsch. Alterthume, iii. 192. Their home lay apparently between the Balkans and the Danube, Bulgaria, after the treaty of Berlin, 1878, represented the territory of the Getae of Hdt. Cp. Fyfe, Mod. Europe, iii. 518.

3. Σαλμύρσσων. The name is perhaps connected with that of the Thracian deity Σέλας-εῖν, the termination -esos, -isos being praes-Hellenic. Porphyry, Vit. Pythag. 14, preserves a Thracian word Ζαλμός = ὅρα.

Salmydessos, Apollonia, and Mesambria are all on the W. coast of Pontos. They are mentioned in order from S. to N. Mesambria the most northerly is south of Haemus, south of which all the terraces of the Kyme and Napes must be placed. Salmydessos was a wild coast where 'wrecking' was organised, see Xen. Alexab. 7. 5. 13. Athenians did not know much about it, if it be this Salmydessos that Aischyl. Prom. 726 locates
in Asia, and the names of the tribes here given are doubtful. Apollonia, see c. 90 supra.

Mesambria is not to be confused with the town mentioned 7. 108. Oddly enough Hdt. appears in 6. 33 infra to date the colonisation of this Mesambria after the Ionic revolt, though he here seems to imply that it was in existence when Dareios went by. He ascribes it to fugitives of Byzantium and Chalkeon; in later times it was traced to Megara the metropolis of those cities, Strabo 319. Ht. was Thracian for a town: Steph. Byz. who gives Selymbria, Poltymoria as further examples. Cp. Strabo 319. It has been thought that Mesambria formed one member of a pentapolis, the others being Apollonia to the south, and Odessos, Kallatis, Tomi to the north. C.I.G. ii. p. 79, 2056 c, note.

7. Δικαίωται. These Getae had some virtues, ἀδύρα, δεκαμένην, but they lacked σοφία or they would not have been guilty of ἄγνωστον. Cp. 2. 172 σοφία... δὲ ἄγνωστον. Add 7. 9.

94. 1. Ἀδαντισσοῦν. Cp. Grimm, Teutonic Mythology (tr. Stallybrass) cc. xxviii. on Death, ad init. "To the olden time death was not a being that killed, but simply one that fetched away and escorted to the underworld." And so elsewhere (op. cit. i. 145) Grimm quotes the phrase τῶν παρὰ ἄγνωστον as parallel to the Northern phrase "faring to Odin."

3. Σάλμος. The name is variously given as ἄγνωστος, ἄγνωστος, Σάλμος, Σάλμος (Stein).

4. διὰ πεντετεύριον looks rather Hellenic. Savages seldom, if ever, have regular festivals at such long intervals, which imply a developed calendar.

τὸν. This method was democratic and just! 3. 80.

7. Διαλαβότητες. Cp. c. 68 supra.


15. τῷ Θεῷ. As the Greeks considered it. This primitive monotheism is almost unintelligible to the tolerant Greek polytheist, and is apparently not reckoned to the credit of the Getae, who showed perhaps in religion as in policy a certain ἄγνωστον. At the same time the absurdity to Hdt. is rather in a Thracian god being the only deity, than in the idea of there being but one God; as he was not altogether a stranger to the monotheistic tendency of his own age and people (op. Introduction, § 22), even though there is nothing in
his ideas that can be put beside the utterance of Xenophanes of Kolophon: οἱ θεοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθεσιν καὶ ἀνθρώπους μέταστοι οὐ τι δέμας θυγατέρας ομοίοι οὖν νόμοι.

Alex. Strom. 5, p. 601 c. (Ritter and Preller, § 183.)

65. 1. Ἑλλησπόντον. Evidently used here rather of the Propontis. Cp. c. 56 supra.

2. Ἑλλάνων. These Greeks were Euhemerists before Euhemerus, at least in regard to this particular case. The 'histrionicising' method had been introduced presumably by the first Logographers, Genealogists, Historians, perhaps partly as an adaptation of the wisdom of the Egyptians (2. 43, 143), and is illustrated by Hdt. himself (2. 44, et al.) as well as by Thucydides (1. 3, 5, 2. 15, esp. 2. 29). After much discredit it has been revived in a somewhat extreme form in our own day by Mr. Herbert Spencer (esp. in his Ecclesiastical Institutions). That within certain limits it is a genuine method in accordance with facts has been virtually demonstrated by Sir A. Lyall's Asiatic Studies.

6. ὑπαφρονεστέρων. It is likely enough that the sharp-witted Greeks often got the better of these Getae in their bargains. So "Large quantities [of gansflints] are annually exported from London to the Gold Coast for the interior of Africa, where a brisk trade is still done with the confiding aborigines" Mag. of Art. Oct. 1857. (African travellers do not all seem to find the aborigines confiding, but rather cunning and hard bargainers, see W. M. Kerr, The Far Interior, ii. 121, 233 et passim.)

7. θέα. It may be doubted whether his morals had been improved by contact with Hellenes, especially Ionians. Some commentators here find a deliberate hit at the Ionians. Stein sees intentional irony in this passage, and argues from it that Hdt. disliked the Pythagoreans; comparing 2. 123 7 ὄλοι. In regard to Pythagoras and his doctrines and rule of life, there is very little to show that Hdt. understood, or knew much about them: otherwise we might have expected more information concerning the position and influence of the Pythagoreans in Italy than he affords. In regard to the passage 2. 123: admitting that there is a reference to Pythagoras, the way it is made shows consideration and respect, rather than dislike. Cp. c. 43 supra. Hdt. has a slight anti-Ionian feeling (cp. Introduction, p. lxxvi.), but in the passage before us here I can see no intentional irony. Stein finds it in ὑπαφρόνεστερων and Ιάττημα 'Ιατρός. What then is to be said of Ἑλλησπόντων? The word σωφρωτέρων, which a few years later would perhaps have shown malice prepense, has no dyalogistic force in Hdt.; cp. 1. 29. There is indeed irony in this passage, but it is unconscious, the self-exposure of these Greeks whose mouth-piece for the moment is Hdt., though he himself does not credit the tale, and charges them with an anachronism. And there is also malice in the story, which must be put down to these Greeks of Pontos, among whom Samos and the Samians were no doubt unpopular, they themselves mostly hailing from Miletos or Megara.
19. ούτω. The absurdity lay not in their accepting his doctrines upon the strength of a miracle, but in their being taken in by a sham miracle. The way in which these Pontine Greeks rationalised away the traditions, or beliefs, of their Thracian neighbours, on the imposture hypothesis, resembles in more than one respect some of the rationalistic paradoxes of the last century.

Strabo 297 f., 303 f. tells the story of Zamolxis (αδ) without any malice or irony. According to the version followed by him this Geta, Zamolxis, had been in the service of Pythagoras, and had visited Egypt and other places. On his return to his native land he rose to great power, persuaded the king to associate him with himself in authority, became priest of the deity most honoured among the Getae, withdrew himself from the public to a cave, and was by and by recognised as a divinity. It is the same story told in a kindlier vein, and revived perhaps in the days of Strabo in the interests of that Byrebiatias who seemed likely to be troublesome to the Romans, and who had an αναγγέλας, Dekaines, in his train, who had been in Egypt and learnt its wisdom, and re-enacted the rôle ascribed to Zamolxis. The 'total abstinence' of the Getae, which in Strabo is represented as a result of local option with them under the influence of the wizard, may have been long a matter of fact; the Pontine Greeks indeed seem to insinuate that it was hardly a matter of choice (καθόλου), but though in Strabo the abstinence of the Getae is traced back to the influence of Zamolxis, in the passage before us a contrary influence is ascribed to him.

(Stein sees a possible allusion to this passage in Soph. Et, 62.)

96. 3. Σοκικ. Otherwise (perhaps Hdt. thinks) there would not have been time for the development of the rite described in c. 94, as actually practised by the Getae. The death of Pythagoras at an advanced age is variously dated 499 B.C., 472 B.C. See Clinton, Hist. H. ad ann. But cp. Ueberrcg, Hist. of Philosophy, p. 45 (E. T.), Burnet, Early Gr. Phil. p. 93.

4. έστα. The alternatives are not really exclusive of each other: the apotheosis and divinisation of men (and women) being a genuine and widespread process. See Spencer, Lyall, opp. cit. supra, note, c. 95 l. 2.

97. 2. άποντα. The numbers above given, c. 87, would thereby have been augmented, or at least maintained: but no notice of this result is taken.

3. αν' ατη. The position of the words is peculiar, as we hear of no land forces beside those with the king, unless τόν αν' τών τεσσαράν τόν Προτέρου be so understood. β (PRVS) omit the words.

κατ' τόν Ιστρόν. Where did Dareios and his forces cross the river?

The opening words of c. 89 supra might naturally be taken to mean that the fleet was ordered to sail to the
mouth of the Danube, throw a pontoon across the river there, and await the king's arrival. So Rawlinson translates. If so, the king's orders were disobeyed, for the fleet advanced two days up the river to 'the neck,' and there constructed the pontoon. This point is now reached by Dareios; and as everything goes smoothly we must suppose that the rendezvous was according to orders. We might conjecture that the king was ignorant of there being more than one channel, or mouth, if it were worth while to harmonise such discrepancies; and was easily satisfied that the Ionians had obeyed the spirit of his orders. Where is the neck to be located? Stein and Blakeney do not raise the question. Rawlinson practically gives it up as insoluble (vol. iii. pp. 79, 80). Was the passage effected at the mouth or mouths by ship? or up the river at 'the neck' on a pontoon? or elsewhere, higher up? or was it ever effected at all? Is the bridging of the Ister a reduplication of the bridging of the Bosporos? Such questions may legitimately be raised, especially in the light of the improbabilities of the story which follows. (Cp. Appendix III.) But on the whole it seems credible that Dareios crossed the Ister, perhaps in the vicinity of Galatz, possibly much higher up than two days' row, a small contingent of the fleet being sent up the stream to throw a bridge across, while the greater portion of the fleet remained at the mouth. The majority of the craft sent up the river must surely have been used for the bridge itself, and perhaps the Greek ships were specially employed on this service. Cp. cc. 85, 87, 89 supra.

5. λέγοντας. Is it to be supposed that the bridge was to be broken up and the whole fleet abandoned? Or were the ships to be sent down stream and home? Or what was to be the service of the fleet? This command to the Ionians is unintelligible, except on the supposition that Dareios was going round by the Kaukasos. Cp. Appendix III.

7. Κάμη. This name was remembered perhaps from his fate in the Ionian revolt afterwards. He was only στρατηγός at this time; the τιμή was understood to have been the reward of his services on this occasion 5. 37. Cp. c. 137 έναφα.

Μυτιλήνας. The reduction of Lesbos has not been previously specified.

8. πυθόμενος πρόξυρων. A charming touch, full of verisimilitude, and just what a Greek story-teller would introduce as characteristic of oriental court-life. Rawlinson compares the inquiry of Kreitos 1. 88, an item no doubt equally true or equally fictitious.

10. ἄρρητον. Are we to suppose that the plough was introduced among the Scythian Georgi and Arotres subsequent to the expedition of Dareios? or that Dareios was not going against the district where the Arotres and Georgi were to be found (cp. 7. 10), or that Koes was ignorant of the existence of agriculture in Scythia? or that the story is a free creation?

Mutatis mutandis, the same remarks apply to the assertion that there were no ρεκται in the land to be invaded; there were at least the Greek colonies on the Scythian coast; to say nothing of Gela or ἡ Νεάπολις c. 105) which Dareios is represented as taking (c. 123).
19. ὁ δὲ ἦλθεν. Rawlinson remarks that "after the punishment of Olibarzos (c. 84 supra) it was important to guard against this suspicion." No doubt the two anecdotes serve to set each other off admirably; this observation partly explains them: but it is paying their versimilitude too high a compliment to make the contrast a basis for such material inferences.

20. κάρτα τι ἡμῆς. Cr. c. 88 supra.

98. i. ἁμαρτα ἔξηκτον. These sixty knots, or days, play a considerable part in the sequel: cc. 138, 136 ff. But so much the worse for the whole story. That the knotted cord (Peruvian, Quipu) is an authentic method of reckoning among primitive folk cannot be doubted. Cf. Taylor, Early History of Mankind, pp. 16 ff. There are some strings of this character in the Pitt Rivers collection at Oxford, one in particular, connected with observances after a great man's death, in which the knots are reinforced by bits of tortoise-shell for the 'red-letter days': and an exact parallel to the story here recorded is to be found in the action of the naked but gentle savage, Abba Thulle, described by Keate (Pelasgians, London 1785, p. 229): "Between the hours of two and three a messenger from the northwards arriving, the king was thereupon awakened by one of his attendants, who brought in a lighted torch; he instantly arose and ordered the messenger to be introduced; after holding some conversation with him, the king delivered to him a piece of cord, on which he had tied as many knots as there would be days before our people purposed to sail." The number of days was apparently only six or seven, cp. op. c. p. 216 for a second instance. But that the Great King dealing with Ionian Greeks at the close of the sixth century, had recourse to so simple a device for assisting them in counting two moons and four days is hardly credible. As well suppose that Kleisthenes of Sikyon reckoned time by so primitive a device, when he invited the Suitors to Sikyon 6. 126 infra: or that Hdt. is satirising the Ionians. The device is probably geographically true: i.e. it may have been employed by the Greek traders in their intercourse with the natives of the steppes, or by the natives among themselves.

What inference they were to draw should he not reappear within the sixty days the king left the Ionians to guess; nor has Hdt. enlightened his readers on this point.
higher up as forming the frontier practically parallel with the (imaginary) coast of Macotis and the Tanais boundary. The correct line of the mouth was however known to him. In c. 47 supra he has described the river as having five mouths (like the Nile, 2. 10).

6. Ἀρχαῖα. If this meant ‘original’ from which the Kimmerians had been longest driven out, as Rawlinson holds, then it would appear that the Scyths entered Scythia from the west. Stein explains it as meaning merely ‘Scythia proper’: but in the four parallel passages quoted by him 1. 75, 2. 24, 7. 184, 9. 48, there is a contrast between two conditions temporarily removed from each other (of river, sun, fleet, army), and though his term urwrunglich is applicable, the term eigentlisch is questionable.

I suggest that here the word is used not from a Scythian source but from a Greek: ‘Old Scythia’ is the part of Scythia where corn was cultivated, and society comparatively settled, and with which the Greeks had longest had dealings.

7. Καρκείτως, c. 55 supra, τός Κ. = Κάρκεια or Καρκεία. See Smith, Dict. Geog. sub Κ. (l. 515 b) and Forbiger, Alt. Geogr. iii. 1118. (Κάρκεια sic σχετ. Ptol. 3. 5, 27. The word καρκεῖα has a heteroclitic pl. καρκεῖα, cp. L. & S. sub c.)

Πετωνία τῆς Ἀρχαίας. Hdt. is describing the Crimea which forms in his mind a sort of prolongation of the south and east coasts of Scythia, resembling the tip of Attica, or the heel of Italy. It is evident that he does not know the correct shape of the Crimea, nor the fact that it is attached to the mainland by a narrow isthmus. Rawlinson (iii.
80-101 MELAPOMENH

νῦν τε χώρην καὶ προκειμένην τὸ Ἐπίστολον, νέμεται τὸ Ταυρικὸν ἔθνος μέχρι χειροσήμου τῆς τρηχής καλεμένης· αὕτη δὲ ἐς τὸ θάλασσαν τὴν πρὸς ἀπελεύθητι ἀνέμων κατῆκε. ἔστι γὰρ τῆς Σκυθίκης τὰ δύο μέρεα τῶν υδάτων ένθα λάβασαν φέροντα, τὴν τε πρὸς μεσαμβρίνην καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὴν ἤδον, κατὰ περὶ τῆς 'Ἀττικῆς χώρης· καὶ παραπλήσια ταυτη καὶ οἵ Ταὐροί νέμονται τῆς Σκυθίκης, ὡς εἰ τῆς 'Ἀττικῆς ἄλλο ἔθνος καὶ μὴ 'Αθηναίοις εἰ νεμοιάτο τὸν γονίον τῶν Σουμακῶν, μᾶλλον ἐς τὸν πότντον τῇ ἄκρῃ ἀνέχοντα, τὸν ἀπὸ Θερμού μέχρι 'Αγαθίστου δῆμου λέγω δὲ ὡς εἰναι ταῦτα συμφωνεῖ συμβάλλειν· ταυτῷ δὲ τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἔστι. δὲ δὲ τῆς 'Ἀττικῆς ταύτα μὴ παραπληκώμε. εἰ γὰρ ἄλλοι δηλῶσαν· ὡς εἰ τῆς Ἰστρύνης ἄλλο ἔθνος καὶ μὴ ἄν

'Ιστρύνες ἄρξαμεν έκ Βρετουσίου λιμένοι ἀποταμωλά μέχρι Τάραντος καὶ νεμοιάτο τὴν ἄκρην. δύο δὲ λέγων ταῦτα πολλά λέγω παρόμοια, τοῖσι ἄλλοις δοκεῖ τῇ Ἀττικῇ. τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς 100 Ταυρικῆς ἦδη Σκυθεῖα τὰ κατύπερθε τῶν Ταύρων καὶ τὰ πρὸς βαλλάσης τῆς ἴσης νέμονται, τοῦ τε Βουσάρου τοῦ Κυμερίου τὰ πρὸς ἄσπερης καὶ τῆς λίμνης τῆς Μαυλίδος μέχρι Τανάιδος ποταμοῦ, δὲ εἰκόνις ἐς μυχῶν τῆς λίμνης ταύτης. ἦδη δὲ ἀπὸ 5 μὲν Περσοναῖ τὰ κατύπερθε ἐς τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέροντα ἀποκληρεῖται ἡ Σκυθίκη ὑπὸ πρῶτον Ἀγαθίστου, μετὰ δὲ Νευρῶν, ἐπιστάδε ἡ Ἀνδροφάγων, τελευταίοι δὲ Μελαγχλαίοι. ἔστιν ἀν τῆς 101 Σκυθίκης ὡς ἐσθής τετραγώνων, τῶν δύο μερῶν κατηκούντων ἐς

suggestion, as usual, that Hdt. is right for his own day, and that the Ptolemaic System has come into existence since.

That Hdt.'s illustration which applies to Attica can only have been written after a visit to Athens, and that referring to the Iapygian premonitory after a visit to Italy, is almost self-evident. What is not so generally remarked is that both illustrations may be insertions, that the second looks specially like an addition, and that in any case the passage is not calculated in the first instance for an Italian audience, or the order of the illustrations would have been reversed.

100. 2. τὸ πρὸς θαλάσσης τῆς ἴσης. Explained by the words which follow as including parts on the Kimmerian Bosporos (cp. ii. 12, 83 supra) and the Palus Maeotis. It would therefore appear that Hdt. in this place conceives the corner inhabited by the Tauri as extending below the Kimmerian Bosporos, the western shore of which is inhabited by Scythia. The length of the K. Bosporos he does not specify.

5. ἀπὸ Ἰστρύνον. That must be from the north-east corner of Scythia where the Ister first strikes the sea, then parallel with the south coast of Scythia, and extending to the Maeotis, or to a point on the Tanais 20 days (4000 st.) inland (upstream) from the (open) sea, outside the Kimmerian Bosporos. Those parts are occupied by four tribes, enumerated from W. to E.: Agathyrsi, Neuri, Androphagi, Melanchlaeni. This tribal order is one of Hdt.'s fixed ideas, ep. ii. 102, 125, though the Agathyrsi do not appear with the Neuri, Androphagi, Melanchlaeni in the geography, cp. 17-20.

Cp. Appendix II.

102. 2. ὡς ἐσοντες τετραγώνου, 'assum-
ing as he may that it is quadrangular'; the words which follow (πάντα ἔσων) and the measurements there detailed, and the total absence of any further specifications in regard to the two sides not here described, leave no doubt that Hdt. in this passage represents Scythia as practically a square of 20 days' journey, or 4000 stades (c. 460 m.), each way. Of these sides the south is formed by the sea coast from the Istros to the Palus (excluding Tauriski just described, c. 99); the east by the coast of the Palus, and, presumably, the lower part of the Tanaïs; the north side, by a row of four non-Scythian tribes (the natural frontier on that side would have been the desert or lakes elsewhere specified, cp. Appendix II.), while the west side of Scythia is formed apparently by the Istros and Thrace. That the lower course of the Tanaïs forms part of the E. frontier of Scythia is suggested by c. 122, cp. c. 21. Stein's map is therefore not correct in drawing the ideal north frontier line from the mouth of Tanaïs: except indeed that Hdt. expresses himself in terms hardly consistent with one another, see infra, next note and Appendix II.

υῆμον δὲ μέρεων, 'the south and east, being bordered by salt water,' i.e. by Pontus and Palus. Hdt.'s employment of the terms τὸ et τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέρον, τὸ ἀπὸ θάλασσαν ἐκ μεσόγαιας, τὸ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν, and τὰ κατάπερ ἐκ τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέροντα (c. 100 supra) leaves a good deal to be desired. There are here four terms employed, but only three sides of Scythia clearly indicated, the western side remaining here un-specified. The two first terms here cited plainly refer to the same side, the eastern, which might consistently with Hdt.'s conception have been also described as πάντα ἔσων since he conceives the Palus, which he also describes as θάλασσα, to form (in part) its limit, and has indeed just asserted that Scythia is bounded by salt water on two sides. τὸ παρὰ θ., is plainly the south side, τὰ κατάπερ ἐκ τ. μ. φ. as plainly the parallel northern side. The western side which would also have been rightly described as ἐκ τὴν μεσόγαιαν φέρον is not specified. It is, however, to be conceived as bounded by the Ister, cp. Appendix II.

102. Οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι ἄνω τῆς λόγου ὡς οὐκ οἶοι τὲ εἰς τὸν Δαρείου στρατόν ἴθυμαχία διώσασθαι μοῦνοι, ἐπεμπὸν ἐν τοὺς
would have been to abandon their own greatest invention, c. 46. Yet this council implies that they contemplate so doing, cp. c. 120 πάντα. Subsequently a remnant of the Scyths offer pitched battle, c. 134 ἐπί ταῖς ἱπποσεληνίας.

3. 1. Ταύρων μὲν. Ἰωάννης' information about the Tauri is not to be regarded as the result of a personal visit to the country, nor is there anything that implies that he saw the coast, rather the reverse, cp. c. 99 εἰς τὴν ἱπποσελήν. He indicates a conflict of hearsay authorities (οἱ μὲν δὲ λέγουσι, etc., cp. 64, 65), and the dubious assertion below made upon the authority of the Tauri themselves (ὁ μάχης αὐτῶν Ταύρων) is a good illustration of the fallacy of inferring from this formula that Hdt. is himself drawing directly and immediately from every fountain-head of tradition which he names. Cf. Introduction, p. lxxix.

The Tauri were wreckers and pirates who found a religious sanction for profitable but inhuman and unhellenic practices; worse in fact than the Thracians of Salmydessos described by Xen. Anab. 7. 5, 13 (c. 93 πάντα).

3. Ελλήνων. The only persons they would find on the high seas.

4. ἔπαναχθέντος, 'on the high seas.' The word has MS. authority, and is restored by Stein for the εἰς τὴν ἱπποσελήν mistranslated 'delatos illice,' or the conjecture of Schweichäuser ἐπιστέφθητα, which would be rightly so rendered, but gives a sense very much inferior to the MS. reading. For ἐπιστέφθηται see L. & S. sub n. IV, and correct V. καταρθέμενοι. Cp. c. 60 πάντα.

9. Ιῳγγύνων. This would be very small consolation to the Hellenic victims or their friends. On the probable antecedents of this Virgin, see note c. 87 πάντα. The cult was un-Hellenic and pra-Hellenic, going back to old Lemnos and the Lemnians, a trace perhaps of Phoenician influences in the Aegean and Pontos, though of course it is not improbable that the Semitic rituals found some native elements or cults with which to coalesce, just as in the case of Hellenic worship.
11. κεφαλήν. On these head-trophies, cp. c. 64 supra and H. Spencer, Ceremonial Institutions, § 250. The Tauri, be it observed, have houses, with chimneys or smoke-vents, according to Hdt.

14. υπεραωρεύασα, 6. 118 infra.

104. 1. Αγάθυρος. A remarkable contrast to the Thracians just across the Danube (cp. c. 95 supra), whom they nearly approach in all other customs except those next specified!

Stein argues that ἄρροι here seems to apply only to externals, at least if it is to be reconciled with the spirited conduct of the Agathysai described in c. 125 infra. But this ingenious argument assumes that Hdt. is conscious and careful of such latent inconsistencies. Moreover the word was used in the poets, especially Pindar, without any condemnatory sense; nor in l. 71 does Hdt. appear to use it in such a sense (οὔτε ἄρροι οὔτε ἀγαθοῦ ὀδός). Here perhaps he uses the word in a poetical way or even from a poetical source. On the gold cp. c. 5 supra. It is a suspicious circumstance that it should be so common with the Agathysai.

2. ἐπίκαιον. The extent and evidence of this promiscuity require definition before the anthropologist can make much of it; nay, it is doubtful, notwithstanding the frequency with which such conditions have been reported by outsiders, whether they ever or anywhere have existed. (Cp. Westermarck, History of Human Marriage, cc. iv. v. vi. and cc. 172, 180 infra.)

3. καράγγυροι. We have here an illustration of "the classificatory system of relationships." Cp. L. Morgan, Systems of Consanguinity, etc., Washington, 1871.

A result of certain social arrangements very different from the patriarchal system seems here ascribed to moral and sentimental intentions, though the rationale of such things is to be sought rather in economic and social causes, than in the spiritual motives which led Plato to propose a reversion to Communism, in the Ideal State. We have here in fact another example of the ordinary Greek rationalism of the day, which resembled some modern rationalisms in explaining primitive man's action by motives or ideas, good and bad, drawn from the experiences of civilized society. In this case the motive is ideal. (In the story of Salomix above, the reverse.) This explanation was from an Hellenic Rousseau. It is unhistorical. (Cp. for a modern instance of the same sort note to 6. 65 infra.)

4. φόδος is an eminently political or civil vice (cp. 7. 237 πολεμώς μὲν πολεμής τῷ πρότερον φθείρα), but the abolition of the family, or even of property, will hardly eradicate it, so long as society gives more honour, or God more ability, to one man than to another.

106. 1. Νευροί. The wizard Neuri separate the wealthy and well-intentioned Agathysai (c. 104) from the unjust and inhuman Androphagi (c. 106). This story of an evacuation of the country before a plague of serpents looks as though it had some sort of historic fact behind it (cp. c. 173 infra). Hdt. must be understood to mean that the Neuri returned after the serpents disappeared, for the Neuri, not the serpents, are in possession at the time of Dareios and in the historian's own day. The comparative exactness of the date is remarkable. It might be conjectured that the story really records the advent of the Neuri to their historic district on the confines of Scythia, which is represented (by implication) as a return, and reoccupation of territory rightly their own: though
it might be rash to say that the snakes represent the previous inhabitants (αὐτροχόων) or their 'tote.'

4. ἀνυσάν σφι ἐκ τῶν ἐρήμων. Cr. c. 17 supra Νευρών δὲ τὸ τρία βορεῖν ἄνεμον ἐρήμων ἄνθρωποι δυσώς ἔμειν. Οὐκ ἔτην. 6. Βουλιά: Stein objects that the Budini were according to Hdt. (c. 21 supra) beyond the Tanais. What of that? The Budini were in any case the next people to the east of the Neri of whom the Greeks had any real knowledge. See notes on Androphiaghi (c. 106) and Melanchlaeni (c. 107), names which are perhaps only descriptive epithets hypothesised and inserted between the Neri and the Budini, to enrich the perspective.

7. Λέγονται. The Scythians told the Hellenes living in Scythia, who told Herodotus? At least the swearing looks as though he had heard strong language. Did the Greeks swear that the Scythians told them? On the formula cp. Introduction, § 22. The belief in werewolves is wide-spread. Cr. Taylor's Prim. Culture, i. 113, 308 (Werewolves) and ii. 191 ff. (Vampires).

106. 1. 'Androphiaghi. Androphiaghi had the Neri to the W. and the Melanchlaeni to the E. of them: N. and S. of them two deserts, c. 18 supra. Here, their clothing is said to resemble the Scythian: in c. 18 supra they are described as 'θυνοι θνων καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς Σκυθοίν. We must not say in such cases that Hdt. contradicts himself: better say that Hdt. omits to reconcile the discrepancies in various accounts and narratives collected by him.

4. 'Ηλαστεύν Stein explains with φοσφόροι as a zeugma. Holder (following Reiske) inserts ἄησων, van Herwerden (following Dobree) 'αναφορεῖται after ἄησω.

Διαφορέαρνι: Holder reads, with θ ( = R + V+S ), 'ἀνθρωποφαγοί. Whatever their title, it is not likely that these cannibals restricted their appetite to the one sex. (On Cannibalism, cp. Oscar Peschel, Races of Men, E. tr. pp. 161 ff. Peschel endeavours to establish three points: (1) that cannibalism is not a necessary stage in evolution, (2) that it is not connected with the custom of human sacrifice, (3) that it is not peculiar to inferior races, but ‘is most frequently encountered exactly among those nations and groups of nations which are distinguished from their neighbours by their abilities and more mature social condition.’ Cr. c. 26 supra, 3. 99, 1. 216—all cases in which the cannibalism seems to have a religious significance. 3. 38 gives the philosophy of the question, l'esprit des lois, in the form of an anecdote.

107. 1. 'Μελάγχλαινοι. 'Αλλα θνῶν καὶ οὐ Σκυθοίν c. 20 supra. If the Scythians did not wear black (skin) coats, one or more of the tribes inland did so. Rawlinson suggests that the name may be a translation of the native name, citing parallel cases from India and America. It is certain that these Blackskinned have a long literary history from Eusebius, who calls them a Scythic tribe (F. 154,
Müller, J. 10) to Pliny (6. 5, 1) and a little later Dio Chrys. (p. 439) the latter of whom describes the black Himation and other clothing worn by the Borysthenites as borrowed from γένος Σκύθων των Μελανχαλείων ὡς ἐκδοκαῖς κατὰ τοῦτο ἀκομαθτικόν ἀντὶ τῶν Ελλήνων.

2. τὰς ἐπωνυμίας. The plural here is embarrassing: the text is not above suspicion, for the words ἀνδρωφαργώνια or ἀνδρωφαργαρία: μενένια τοιτών occur here in the MSS. after ἐγων, and were transferred to the previous chapter by Reitz (after Wesseling), whom the rest have followed.

108. Βουδίνω. In c. 21 surv the Budini are placed E. of Tanais. Nothing is here said of the Tanais, but as in c. 100 surv the Mélanchleni are τελευταίοι, farthest east, of the tribes forming the north boundary of Scythia, the map-maker may be justified in representing the Tanais as the boundary between the Mélanchleni and Budini-Geloni.


πυρρός is darker than ἔλασσός, Plato Tim. 65 c, and generally refers to the hair. If Stein is right in taking it here of the σκίν on the strength of Hippokr. de Aer. 20 (ep. Neumann, p. 155), where certainly it is so used and applied to the whole Scythic race, then Hdt. is here guilty of making a distinction where none existed, the Budini in his conception plainly offering a physical contrast to the Scythians. But there is no need to divert the word from its usual application by reference to Hippokrates a junior contemporary of Hdt. whom it is not to be supposed that Hdt. is here quoting. Larcher takes the terms to refer to παλιέντα the body red and green; citing Verg, Georg. 2. 115 and Heyne's note. To see in these red-haired blue-eyed Budini "the ancestors of the German race," as Rawlinson does in one sentence, or "a remnant of the Cimmerians," as he does in the next sentence but one (vol. iii. p. 92, n. 4): or in their city, the Askari of the Scandinavian mythology, with Lenormant (Manual, ii. p. 194), or to identify them with Buddhists, as did apparently the great geographer C. Ritter, Vorhalte, p. 381, or indeed to adopt any one of the numerous hypotheses in respect to their ethnology, is to go beyond the evidence, which is too imperfect to lead to any determination. The article in Smith, Dict. Geogr. i. 455, is worth consulting.

πολις... Γελονίς. It is not for members of a modern 'nation of shopkeepers,' with experience of the zeal of commercial (and missionary) enterprise and settlements, to question the possibility of such an Hellenic colony or outpost as here described. Still one cannot but feel that such a well-organised and permanent establishment as is implied in this description seems improbable, located, as it is, in the heart of savagery. It cannot be supposed that Hdt. speaks as an eye-witness, though he speaks with the assurance of one. Nor should the fact that the description is correct ecclesiastically, ἀγάλματα, βωσκόντα, ἑρείπια being the three essential requisites for Hellenic temple-service (Stein), and the orgiastic Dionysos festivals being biennial, in any way mislead us into believing that Hdt. ever set eyes on the wooden walls of Gelonos. If such things were evidences there would be an end to all story-telling, and one might as well argue to the truth of the Amazonian adventure, c. 110 infra, from the nautical correctness of the terminology there, ἀγάλμα, ἑρείπια, εὐρείπια.

Γελονοὶ τὸ ἄρχαιον "Ελληνες, ἐκ τῶν δὲ ἐμπόριων ἐξαγαστάταντες οἰκησαν ἐν τοῖς Βουδίοις· καὶ γλώσσῃ τὰ μεν Σκυθικὰ τὰ δὲ Ἰθ Ἐλληνικῷ χρέωνται. Βουδίοι δὲ οὐ τῇ αὐτῇ γλώσσῃ χρέωνται καὶ Γελονοὶ, οὐδὲ διάτητα ἡ αὐτή. οἱ μὲν θάρ συν Βουδίοι ένωνει 109 αὐτόχθονες νομάδες τέ εἰσι καὶ φθειροπαρέοι μοῖνοι τῶν ταυτή, Γελονοὶ δὲ γῆς τε ἐργάται καὶ σιτισφάγοι καὶ κήπους ἐκτημένοι, οὐδὲν τὴν ἰδέαν ὅμοιον οὐδὲ τὸ χρώμα. ὑπὸ μέντοι Ἐλληνῶν καλότατοι καὶ οἱ Βουδίοι Γελονοὶ, οὐκ ὀρθῶς καλεῖται 5 μένοι, ἡ δὲ χώρα σφένοι πᾶνά ἐστὶ δασεὶ ὁδοὶ παντοῦ. ἐν δὲ τῇ ἱδέ τῇ πλείστῃ ἐστὶ λήμνη μεγάλη τε καὶ πολλὴ καὶ ἔλος καὶ κάλαμος περὶ αὐτήν. ἐν δὲ ταυτή ἐνόδεις ἀλισκόνται καὶ κάστορες καὶ ἀλλα θηρία τετραγωνοπρόσωπα, τῶν τὰ δέρματα παρὰ τὰς σισίρες παραρράπτεται, καὶ οἱ δρυεῖς αὐτοῖς εἰσι το χρύσεις καὶ ὑπερέον ἀκεσίαν.


9. έξαγαστάταντες. From Olbia, Tyras, etc. Stein, who wishes to find room for the Budini west of the Tanais, upon the Borysthenes, sees in this tradition a confirmation of his localisation. But even Hdt. can hardly have forgotten his own assertion in c. 21 περία, that the Budini lived east of the Tanais, beyond Scythia; and Neumann (op. c. p. 91) long ago pointed out that they form a link or station in the great trade-route that ran from the Pontos to the Ural regions.

109. 2. φθειροπαρέοι. "Qui manger de la vernine" Larcher; "they eat lice." Rawlinson. C. Ritter (Vorhalle, etc. Berlin 1820, p. 154) was the first to suggest that φθειρος here meant 'hairs,' and he is followed by Stein, who cites Strabo and Arrian for the existence of a tribe on Caucasus named φθειροφάγοι near a town named Περνοί, and adds Phot. lex. φθείρ, ά τῆς πίτου κέρατο. The real or at least the first question must be: What did Hdt. understand by the word? The practice described c. 108 περία to the women of the Adymnachidae, cp. note ad l., in the absence of any clearer indication of his meaning, may be taken as a fair commentary on the word here. If it be said that the κέρατο πίτου was edible, it may be replied that so is the φθείρ, nor is it quite obvious why φθείρ, vegetable, is a better antithesis to οἶκος than φθείρ, animal. Finally, vermin-eating is a not uncommon practice (Oscar Peschel, Rass. p. 159).

4. τὸ χρώμα. We cannot argue from this that περία in c. 108 must refer to the colour of the skin, for the contrast is not fully drawn out—γλώσσα there and ἱδέ here being left unrelated.

ύπο... καλόμενοι. There are Greeks who make the mistake of calling the Budini Geloni—perhaps Hekataios'... 8. ἐν τῇ ταυτῇ. On this passage Stein quotes Neumann pp. 92 f. as showing that on the upper courses of the Don otters and beavers and elk (Elend), not to say wolves and bears, were found as late as 1830. If any stress were to be laid on the locality the fauna would make against his transfer of the Budini to the Borysthenes. But no doubt these animals were formerly spread over a wide area, and this passage affords in reality a poor argument for the identification of Gelonus, and its site, either way.

9. τετραγωνοπρόσωπα. Neumann and Stein think, points to a distorted description of the elk: Rawlinson hints at 'seals.' Is it anything more than a judicious et sēstera? Cp. for such a saving clause c. 191 εἴδη.

10. σισίραι. See L. & S. sib Σ. and σισίρα.

δρυεῖς. The καστόροι is probably meant, an item in the Hellenic pharmacopoeia not to be confounded with the vegetable product, caster oil, and erroneously supposed to have the utility here ascribed to it.
110. The Sauromatae were south of the Budini, east of the Palus Maeotis, or rather of the Tanais, vide cc. 21 supra, 116 infra. That the two statements are not quite consistent, is only a fresh illustration of the fact that Hdt. draws on varying sources without always harmonising them. It might appear that "a custom of the women," in which they differed widely from the Scyths, whom yet they in many respects resembled, suggested to the Greeks this entertaining fable of their origin, which Hdt. here inserts according to his wont, quite oblivious of the inconsistency in which he hereby is involved. For according to this story the Scyths are in possession of Scythia in the time of the Amazons, and of Herakles; whereas, according to the view to which Hdt. has previously committed himself, the Scyths had immigrated into Scythia in comparatively recent times, c. 11 supra (Neumann, p. 327).

111. By whom? C. Fries, Quaestiones Herodoteae, Berlin 1893, argues that Herodotus is combating a story which Hekataios had drawn from a poetical source, with a version which he himself had heard from 'Pontine Greeks.'
οὐδένι πρότρω ἐτὶ αὐτάς, ἑωτοῦ δὲ τοὺς νεωτάτους ἀποτέμψαι ἐς αὐτὰς, πλῆθος εἰκάζαντας όσαι περ ἐκείναι ἦταν, τούτων δὲ στρατοπεδεύσαν βελάνιον ἑκείνων καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ περ ἀν καὶ ἑκείναι ποιεῖσθαι. ἢν δὲ αὐτῶν διώκοντας, μάχεσθαι μὲν μὴ, ἕπο- 10 φεύγειν δὲ ἐπεάν δὲ παύσωμαι, ἐλθόντας αὐτὸς πλήσαν στρατοπεδεύσαν. ταῦτα ἐδουλεύσαντο οἱ Σκύθαι Βουλώμενοι ἐξ αὐτῶν παίδας ἐκγεννήσεσθαι. ἀποπεμφθέντες δὲ οἱ νευρικοὶ ἐποίειν τὰ ἐντεταλμένα. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐμαθὼν αὐτῶν, ἦν Ἀμαζόνες 112 ἐπ' ῥεομέριν ὁπλήσας ἀπεργώμενον, έαυτὴν χαίρειν προσεχόρογον δὲ πλησιαίτερο τὸ στρατόπεδον τῷ στρατόπεδοι ἐπ' ἡμέρῃ ἐκάστη. εἶχον δὲ οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἦν νευρικοί, οὔσιν οἱ Ἀμαζόνες, εἰ μή τὰ ὅπλα καὶ τοὺς ἐπόπους, ἀλλὰ ἔξων τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνην, 5 θηρευόντες τέκε καὶ ληξόμενοι. ἐποίειν δὲ αἱ Ἀμαζόνες ἐς τὴν 113 μεταμνήθησαν τοιοῦτον ἐγκόκτονον σποράδες κατὰ μίαν τε καὶ δύο, πρόσω δὲ ἀπ' ἄλληλων ἐς εἰμαρείν ἀποκυκλώμενα. μαθόντες δὲ καὶ οἱ Σκύθαι ἐποίειν τῶντο τούτο. καὶ τις μενοθησείων τινα αὐτῶν ἑνεχρήμητο, καὶ ἦ Ἀμαζόνων οὐκ ἀποθέτετο ἀλλὰ 5 περιείδει χρήσασθαι. καὶ φωνήσας μεν οὐκ εἴχε, οὐ γὰρ συνείδαν ἄλληλων, τῇ δὲ χειρὶ εἶναι ἐν τῇ ὑπεραιρή ἐλεύθερα ἔτοιμον πρὸς χωρίον καὶ ἑτέρων ἄγεων, σημαίνουσα δύο γενέσθαι, καὶ αὐτὴν ἑτέρων ἄξεν. οὗ δὲ νευρικός, ἐπεὶ ἀπῆλθε, ἔλεξε ταῦτα πρὸς τῶν λουτρών: τῇ δὲ δευτεράρι ἠλευθερώσθη πρὸς τῷ χωρίῳ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὁδός τοῦ καὶ ἑτέρων ἄγεων, καὶ τῇ ὑπεραίρῃ ἐνεργή δευτεράρι αὐτὴν ὑπο- μένουσαν. οἱ δὲ λουτροὶ νευρικοὶ ὡς ἐπόθηκον ταῦτα, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐκτελόσαντο τὰς λαβάς τῶν Ἀμαζώνων. μετὰ δὲ συμμι- 114 ξαντες τὰ στρατόπεδα ὅλους ἡμοῦ, γυναίκα ἔλοχεν ἐκατόσ ταῦταν

7. ἐσταντων, 'warriors.'
8. πλῆθος. Three boat-loads of prisoners, some of whom had since been slain, would not have amounted to very many; say 150! Anyway the Scyths were pretty far advanced in the art of counting. (Cp. Tylor, Prim. Cultures, c. viii., Anthropology, p. xiii.)
112. 2. προσοχόροιν. A striking instance of a construction not uncommon in Hdt., e.g. 5. 112 αὐ τ' αναλαμβάνει τὰ στρατόπεδα συμπεπόντα ἑμάχεατα.
113. 6. φανερὰς. Cp. φάνω, c. 114 ἐφάρα. One cannot expect Hdt. to be as exact as Aristotle, Pol. 1. 2. 11. 1253στ' ἕκα τὸν φαν. ἐν τῷ λαοὶ καὶ ἐπὶ ἐκάτερον σημαίνει, διὰ καὶ τὸς ἄλλος ὑπάρχει ζύδου. φαν. καὶ λόγοι are not always distinct
to Hdt. (ep. c. 114 ἐφάρα) though he elsewhere uses γλῶσσα for speech, and φωνή for donkeys' braying, c. 129 ἐφάρα. Cp. further the use of λόγος c. 127 ἐφάρα. There follows a fine illustration of gesture language. (On which in general cp. Tylor, Early History of Mankind, co. ii. iii. iv., and on this passage and 7. 233, Sittl, Die ἑβαρην της θρ. u. ἐπικ. p. 148.)
114. 2. μετξαντον. Pindar uses the form κτλεςιν παπαιμαισαι, ἔδρα αἰ ποιώνα κτλας ανένατα κατάραν λεύσων τον Fr. 233, and the adj. κτλες, ἑρίνα κτλες Ἀρυδίσας Πυθ., 2, 17, on which the Schol. οἶνι τον συντεθρϊμικόν καὶ συνὴλθε λέγεται καὶ κτλας ἐν τῇ χείρι.
τη το πρώτο το ευμετάχυτα. την δε φωνή την μέν των γυναικών
οι άνδρες ούκ εδύνεατο μαθείν, την δε των άνδρων αι γυναίκες
5 συνελαβούν. ἐπεὶ δὲ συνήκαν ἀλλήλων, ἔλεξαν πρὸς τὰς
'Αμαζόνας τάδε οἱ άνδρες. "ήμειν εἰσὶ μὲν τοικὲς, εἰσὶ δὲ
cτήσεις" νῦν δὲ μηκέτι πλεῦνα χρόνον ζωής τούτῳ ἐγχώμης,
ἀλλ' ἀπελθόντες ἐς τὸ πλῆθος διασταύρωμα, γυναίκαις δὲ ἔδωμεν
ὑμέας καὶ οὐδαμᾶς ἄλλας." οἱ δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα ἔλεξαν τάδε.
10 "ήμειν οὐκ ἄν δυναίμεθα οἰκεῖν μετὰ τῶν ύμετρέων γυναικῶν
ὅπρος τὰ αὐτὰ νόματα ἴμην τε κάκευνσι ἐστὶ. ἴμειν μὲν
τοξευόμενον τε καὶ ἀκοινοῦσαν καὶ ἀπαξομεθα, ἔργα δὲ
γυναικήα οὐκ ἐμάθομεν· αἱ δὲ ύμέτεραι γυναίκες τούτων
μὲν οὐδὲν τῶν ἴμηες κατελέξαμεν ποιεόντα, ἔργα δὲ γυναικίαν
15 ἐργάζονται μένουσαι ἐν τῷ δ' ἢ μᾶς, οὐτό ἐπὶ θηρίου ἱοῦνται
οὗτε ἄλλη οὐδαμῇ, οὐκ ἄν δυναίμεθα οἰκεῖν συμφέρεισθαι.
ἀλλ' εἰ βουλεύσῃς γυναίκας ἐχειν ἴμηας καὶ δοκεῖς εἶναι δίκαιοι,
ἔλθοντες παρὰ τους τοῖκες ἀπολαμβανεῖ τῶν κτημάτων τὸ μέρος,
115 καὶ ἐπείτη πρόκειται οἰκείομεν ἐπὶ ἴμηες αὐτῶν." ἐπείθοντο καὶ
ἐποίησαν ταῦτα οἱ νευρίκαι. ἐπείτη δὲ ἀπολαμβάνατε τῶν
cτημάτων τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἴμηον ὅποιον παρὰ τὰς 'Αμαζόνας,
ἔλεγαν αἱ γυναίκαι πρὸς αὐτούς τάδε. "ἡμέας ἠχεῖ φόβος τε
5 καὶ δόεις ἰκανή χρὴ οἰκεῖν εἰ τώδε τῷ χῶρῳ, τούτῳ μὲν ἴμας
ἀποστερησάσας πατέρων, τούτῳ δὲ γῆρ τὴν υμετέρην ἐνεχώρησαν
πολλά. ἀλλ' ἐπείτη ἀξίωντε ἴμας γυναίκας ἐχεων, τάδε
ποιεῖτε ἀμα ἴμας. φέρετε ἐξαιπατεόμενον ἐκ τῆς γῆς θηρᾶ δη καὶ
116 περίσσωνς Τάναιν ποταμίων οἰκεύσεως." ἐπείθοντο καὶ ταῦτα
οἱ νευρίκαι, διαβάντες δὲ τὸν Τάναιν ὀδυπόρεον πρὸς ἴμηον

Sauromatae: but the historic fact of a primitive pairing season inter aila may fairly be read in this legend. A charming story has been told by Addison, Spectator, No. 493, in which he more than hints at the said 'pairing season,' of which Westernmarck, History of Human Marriage, e. ii., has made a good deal: in justice to Ed. Greswell, it should be observed that he long ago collected a vast amount of evidence on the matter, see Origines Kal. Hell. vi. 571 ff.
3. φων. One might have expected γλῶσσαν, or c. 108 supra, but cp. Pindar's φωνάντα συνεργόν and φωνής cc. 112 supra, 117 infra.
4. οἱ άνδρες. With their characteristic stupidity, c. 46 supra.
116. οἱ τῶν Τάναιν. The geographical position of the Sauromatae at the date of the story is here very exactly indicated; yet it is not quite plain whether we are to conceive them as three days' or as six days' journey beyond the Tanais, which appears, in either case, as the eastern boundary of Scythia. Probably the former. In c. 21 supra the territory of the Sauromatae begins immediately beyond the Tanais, and extends fifteen days [3000 st., 875 mill. pass.] north from the Palus.
Hippokrates who agrees with Hdt. in the description of the manners and customs of these ladies limits their martial performances (cp. Plato, Rep. 452 ff.) τοις ἐν παρθένοις τοῖς, Hippokr. de Aer. 17, and the limitation might be inferred from the next chapter, though Hdt. does not clearly express it. Hansen,
ἀνίσχυντα τριῶν μὲν ἦμερῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ταμιάδου ὅδον, τριῶν δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Λίμνης τῆς Μαυριτίους πρὸς βορέων ἄνεμον. ἀπικόμενοι δὲ ἐς τούτον τὸν χώρον ἐν τῷ νῦν κατολεγομένα, οὔχ ούτως τούτων 5 καὶ διαίτη ἀπὸ τούτου χρέωνται τῇ παλαιᾷ τῶν Σαμοσατέων ἡ γυναῖκες, καὶ ἐπὶ θήρην ἐπ᾿ ἑπτάν ἐκφυούσαι ἄμα τούτα ἀνδράται καὶ χρώσει τῶν ἀνδρῶν, καὶ ἐς πόλεμον φυτάσαι καὶ στολὴν τῆς αὐτῆς τούτα ἀνδράται φησίναι. φωνῇ δὲ οἱ Σαμο- 117 μάται νομίζουσι Σκυθίης, σολωκέμουτε αὐτῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίων, ἐπεὶ οὐ χρήστος ἐξεμικροῦν αὐτὴν αἰ Σαμάζωνες. πᾶ τὰ ἐμάμον τὸ ὁδὸν σφι διακέπαται οὐ γαμέται παρθένοις οὐδεία 7 πρὶν ἀν τῶν πολεμιῶν ἀνδρὰς ἀποκείμην αἰ δὲ τίνες αὐτῶν 5 καὶ τελευτάσθησιν ηγησαίοι πρὸ ἡμᾶς, οὐ δυνάμεθαι τὸν νόμον ἐκπλήναι.

Ἐπὶ τούτων δὲ τῶν καταλεχθέντων ἐθένος τοὺς βασιλέας 118 ἁλισμένους ἀπικόμενοι τῶν Σκυθείων οἱ ἄργελοι ἐλεγον ἐκδιάκοντες ὡς ὁ Πέρσης, ἐπειδὴ οἱ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἡτερῷ τῇ ἑτέρῃ πάντα κατέστραπταν, ἑγώναν ξένας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐχένι τοῦ Βοσπόρου διαβέβηκε ἐς τρίθη τῷ ἡτερῷ, διαβάς δὲ καὶ καταστρεφάμενοι 5 Θρήκας ἑγώναι ποταμῶν Ἰστρον, βουλόμενοι καὶ τάδε πάντα ἐντούτῳ ποιήσασθαι. "ὅμεις δὴν μηδενὶ τρόπῳ ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατήμενοι περιώδη ἡμέας διαφθαρέντας, ἀλλὰ τῶν τοῦτο νοῆσαντες

Ως-Ευρώπη, § 293, suggests that Σαμοσατέως is a loan word Latin for 'Σαμάζωνες.

The same result would be achieved by taking τῶν Σ. al γυναῖκες together.


Σαμοσατές, Samo-satæ. Northern Medes = Samo-satæ = Sarmatæ = Slaves, Rawlinson n. to c. 117. If this were so, in the conquest of S. Russia, and the Danyubian region, these ‘Medes,’ centuries after, fulfilled the intentions with which Dareios, according to Hdt., set out, viz. to punish the Scyths for their invasion of Media, c. 1 supra. On the Samosatae see Smith’s Dict. Geogr. sub v., and Forbiger, in Pauly, Real-Encycl. sub v., Pape’s Wörterbuch d. gr. Eigenn. 1347, 1354, Müllerhoff, Deutsch. Altert. iii. 101 ff., and Appendix I. supra.

118. 1. ἄν. Narrative resumed from c. 102 supra. With some very trifling verbal changes the speech which follows would have done admirably in the mouth of an Athenian addressing the congress at the Isthmos, before the invasion of Xerxes. It is difficult to suppose that the parallel was not latent in the historian’s mind, or in his sources: it is not unreasonable to conjecture that the later situation has coloured the narrative of the earlier and remoter campaign. (A similar situation upon a smaller scale is sketched in the Corinthian speech, Thuc. 1. 120.) It must be admitted that the Scythian envoys very skilfully refute the view put forward by Hdt. in c. 1 supra. The harmonist may, however, say that the one passage gives the respectable, the other the real, reason: thus both are admissible! The Scythian view is rejected in favour of the Herodotean by a majority of the council, c. 119. Such likewise to a certain extent was the practical maxim of the Peloponnesians in 480 B.C. In fact why the Scythians should appear in the guise of petitioners before this congress of kings it would be hard to say, unless it be because their case is analogous to the Athenian attitude towards the Peloponnesians at a period, subsequent indeed to the date of the events here narrated, but prior to the date at which this narrative came into being. Cp. Introduction, § 17.
αντίαξομεν τὸν ἐπίοντα. οὐκον ποιήσετε ταύτα: ἡμεῖς μὲν
πιεόμενοι ἡ ἔκκεισθαι τὴν χώρην ἡ μένοντες ὁμολογή χρησό-
μεθα. τι γὰρ πάθωμεν μὴ δουλομένων ύμεν τιμορεῖς; ύμαι
dε οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἐστιν ἀλαφότερον: ἤκει γὰρ ὁ Πέρσης
οὐδὲν τὸ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ ἡμέας ἢ οὐ καὶ ἐπὶ ύμεας, οὔδὲ οἱ καταχρητεῖς
ἡμᾶς καταστρφαμένοι ὑμένων ἀπέχεσθαι, μέγα δὲ ύμων λόγων
15 τῶνοι μαρτύρων ἔρεομεν. εἰ γὰρ ἑπὶ ἡμέας μούνους ἑστρατη-
λάτες ὁ Πέρσης τίς σαβεῖ τὴν πρὸσθε δουλοσύνης βουλομένοις,
χρὴν αὐτῶν πάντων τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀπέχομεν ἱερὰν ἐπὶ τὴν
ἡμετέρην, καὶ ἕδη τοῖς πᾶσι ὡς ἐπὶ Σκύθας ἐλαύνει καὶ οὐκ
ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, νῦν δὲ ἐμπὶ τὰχάστα διεῖβε ἐς τῆρε τὴν
20 ἡπειρον, τοὺς αἰεὶ ἐμποδῶν γυναικέοις ἡμεροῦτα πάντας: τοὺς
tη ἄλλους ἔχει ὑπ’ ἐνοτο Θρήκεια καὶ δὴ καὶ τοὺς ἡμῶν

119 ἔστατα πλησιωγώρους Γέτας." ταύτα Σκυθέων ἐπαργελλομένων
ἐβουλεύοντο οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑθείων ἡκοντες, καὶ σφενον
ἐσχήσθεναι αἱ γυναικεῖοι: ὁ μὲν γὰρ Γελανός καὶ οἱ Βούδικος καὶ
ὁ Σανουράτης κατὰ τῶν δουλομένων ἔπειθεν Σκύθας τίμων
5 ῥήμαν, οἱ δὲ Ἀλκασάρος καὶ Νευρός καὶ Ἀλκράτος καὶ οἱ
τῶν Μελακχαίων καὶ Ταυρών τάδε Σκύθας ἐπικρήσαντο: "εἰ μὲν
ἡμεῖς ὑπερανατίς ἐστε οἱ πρότεροι ἁδίκοντες Πέρσας καὶ
ἀρκαντες πολέμου, τούτων δεομένων τῶν νῦν δέθεσθε λέγειν τε ἐν
10 ἐσθενες ἡμῶν ὧραν ὁρᾶν, καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑπακούσαντες τῶν δὲ οὐκ
ἐπιρίσσεσθαι, νῦν δὲ ύμες τῆς τὴν ἐκείνων ἐγαζαλώτας γῆν
ἀνεῖν ἡμῶν ἐπεκτρατεῖε Περσῶν ὅσον χρώνον ύμων ὁ θεὸς
παρεδίδουν, καὶ ἐκεῖλοι, ἐπεὶ σφενο πᾶν τὸν ἡγεῖται, τὴν ὁμολγ
ὑμῶν ἀποκαθιστῆσαι. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὕτω τὸ τότε ἠδυκασμεν τῶν ἀνδρῶν
τούτων οὐδὲν οὕτω τῶν πρότερον πιερησώμεθα ἁδίκησεν. ἦν
15 μέντοι ὑπερανατίς καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμετέρην ἐρώμενοι θεῶν ἀδεικέων, καὶ ἡμεῖς
οὐ πειραμόμεθα, μέχρι δὲ τὸτε ἠδυκάρει τὸ οὐκ ἂν ἔφειρεν
ἡμεῖς γὰρ δοκεόμενον οὐκ ἐπὶ ἡμέας Πέρσας ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοὺς αἰτίους
(nextProps τῆς ἀδίκης γενομένων.

120 Ταύτα ὁς ἀπενεχθέντα ἐπιποθότο οἱ Σκύθαι, ἐβουλεύοντο
ἴθυμαχίαν μὲν μηδὲν ποιέσθαι ὡς τοῦ ἐμφανός, ὅτε δὴ σφί
ουτοι γε συμμαχοι ου προσεγγινοτο, υπεξαντες δε και υπεξελανυνοντες τα φρεατα τα περαξιον αυτοι και τας κρηνας συγχοιν, την πολυ τη εκ της εστης εκτηιβειν, δισου σφεας διελοντες. και 5 προς μεν την μιαν των μοιρων, της εβασιλευε Σκωπασις, προσχωρεσε ταυτων τοις μεν δη υπαγειν, ην επι τουτο τραγηται ο Περσης, ιδον Ταυδεος ποναμον παρα την Μαιητεν ξυμην υποεισηναται, απελανυνοντος το του Περεσεω επιστατης διοικειν. αυτη μεν σφη μιαν ην μοιρα της βασιληης, τεταμενη ταιτη την 10 οδων η περ ειρηται τας δε δυο των βασιληων, την τε μεγαλην της δραχε Ιδανθυρους και την τριτην της εβασιλευε Ταξακης, συνελθουσας ες τουτο και Γελανων τε και Βουδινων προσγεινουν, ημερης και τοις οδοι προεχουσαν των Περσεων υπαγουσιν, επιταντας τε και ποιευτας τα βεβουευνεα, προτα μεν νυν 15 υπαγειν σφεας ιθυ των χωρων των απειπααν την σφετερην συμμαξην, οι και τοις οδοις εκπολεμουσαν ει γαρ μη εκπολεμησομεχες επιεχουσι των πολεμων των προς Περδας, άλλα οικησισ αποκελουσι μετα δε τουτο υποστρεφειν ες την σφετερην και επιχειρεσιν, διη βουλουευνεοι δοκησι.

Ταυτα οι Σκυθαι βουλουευμενοι υπηριτασιν την Δαρειου στρατηγιν, προδρομους αποστελλαντες των ιππεων τωσ άριστους. τας

4. τα φρεατα... και τας κρηνας.
Leaving all the rivers however (cc. 47-57 supra) for the benefit of the Persian. This plan of campaign is rather calculated for Greece, where there were no rivers to speak of, than for Scythia: at least it could hardly have been devised by any one acquainted with Scythia, though it is consistent with the bare map of Scythia, sketched above, cc. 90-101.

5. την πολυν.
Cc. 58 supra. But what of all the products enumerated cc. 17 supra?

6. εβασιλευε as a permanency: cc. 129 infra. There were three territorial divisions in εβασιλευε, each under its own king, the greatest under Idanthyrsos, who has a sort of superiority over the others: the next probably that under Skopasis: the third under Taxakis, cc. 8 supra. The liegemen of Skopus together with the Sauromatae, cc. 118, are apparently thought of as almost equal to the following of Idanthyrsos reinforced by the contingent of Taxakis, and the Budini-Geloni.

7. Σαυροματος ought to include men and maidens, cc. 116, 117 supra, but the story of the campaign takes no account of women combatants: this is a great opportunity lost, and a fresh evidence that the legend of the Sauromatae above is an insertion from a different source, and no part of the original narrative of the campaign.

16. ιθυ των χωρων.
Cc. 59 supra ιθυ των Ἅγαθυραν και ιθυ των Ταυδεον, i. 8 above.

tων ἀπανωμένων, ιον των ἠθνων.
This would take them either to the land of the Agathyrsas N.W. of Scythia, or to the land of the Tauri, S.E., two very different directions. The former seems intended; but in the sequel this is the last thing they attempt. In fact, as Rawlinson points out (vol. iii. p. 100) “the Sauromatae, Budini and Geloni are even the first sufferers. (Infra chs. 122, 123).” This only shows how inconsequent the narrative is. To explain such inconsequence is not easy. Dares had to be taken all over Scythia: on the other hand good Hellenic strategy might have commended the plan here indicated, for application to ‘Medizers’.
δε ἀμάξας ἐν τῇ οἱ σφι διανιάτο τὰ τέκνα καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τάσας καὶ τὰ πρόβατα πάντα, πλὴν ὅσα αἱ ἐς φορρῆν ἱκανὰ ἦν τοιαύτα 5 ὑπολιπόμενοι, τὰ ἄλλα ἀμα ἀμάξας προέμεναν, ἐνετει 129 λάμμεναι αἰεὶ τὸ πρὸς βορέα ἑλαύνειν. ταῦτα μὲν ἐν προεκομιζο- τῶν δὲ Σκυθέων οἱ πρόδρομοι ὡς ἐδών τοὺς Πέρσας ὅσον τε τρίῳ ἰμέρεις ἡδον ἀπέχουσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰστροῦ, οὐτοὶ μὲν τούτοις ἑσόρτες, ἤμερός ὡς προέχοντες, ἔστρατοπεδεύοντο τὰ ἐκ τῆς 5 γῆς φυλέμενα λειώνοντες, οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ὡς ἑδῶν ἐπιφανείαν τῶν Σκυθέων τὴν ἦπεν, ἐπημάζαν κατὰ στίβοις αἰεὶ ὑπάγοντον καὶ ἐπετα (πρὸς ἵππον τῆς μιᾶς τῶν μορφῶν ἠθείων) οἱ Πέρσαι ἐλίακοι πρὸς ἴππο τε καὶ ἱδον Ῥαχάδος: διαβάζαντων δὲ τούτων τῶν Τάναιν ποταμῶν οἱ Πέρσαι ἐπιδιώκαντες ἐλίακον, ἐν δὲ τῶν Ἑα. 10 Σαυροματάνα τῆς χώρης διεξέχωντες ἀπέκλειον ἐς τὴν τῶν

121. 3. ἀμάξας. Cp. c. 114 supra, and especially c. 48 supra.

31 nam. One might have expected the plural verb; but the more important word carries the construction. Slaves are not here specified at all. Cp. S, 40 and 41.

4. πλὴν ὅσα. This looks like a bit of rationalism: all sent away except what they wanted for food; as if they knew just how many that would be; yet afterwards they have enough and to spare. Cp. c. 130 ἵππα. But perhaps they were not sent very far! The gen. with πρὸς is noticeable. Some twenty days or less would have taken them out of Scythia, c. 101 supra. Were they not to go right away north, but to keep moving along the north line, inside their own frontier, or perhaps on the edge of the deserts? This grammatical refinement is difficult to maintain in the light of the recurrent phrase, c. 125 ἵππα αἰεὶ τὸ πρὸς βορέα ἑλαύνειν, "immer in nördlicher Richtung zu ziehen" Baecher; "to keep marching, without change of course, to the north." Rawlinson: "proceed continually towards the north wind" Macaulay. Such direction would have landed them in deserts, or in the lands τῶν ᾿Ερημαῖων τῆς συμμα- χείας, through which the Persians were to be led. Obviously there is here an inaccuracy in the story, or between the story and the geography.

132. 2. τρίων ἰμέραν. These three days would have taken the Persians on to the steppe between the Danube and the Dniestr, into Bessarabia. To this region, as Stein here points out, Strabo, 305, confines the trans-Danubian adventures of Dareios: misled, we may add, by an excessive rationalism. Nor is it easy, while admitting fully the contradictions and improbabilities of the Herodotean narrative, to describe it with Stein as a fabulous creation of Scythian vanity (Ruhmredlichkeit). Greeks had more to say to this fable than Scyths, to judge by the internal evidences, and even perhaps the general probabilities.

3. οὐτοὶ, sc. αἱ Σκιθαί.

7. μιᾶν. The one under Skopasis, which included the Sauromatae.

8. πρὸς ἵππο τε καὶ τῶν Τ. is MSS. reading. One preposition with two different cases is rather startling. Stein therefore suggests that Hdt. wrote ἱππὸ τῶν Ταραδῶν, cp. c. 129 supra. May it not be that there is a combination of an absolute direction (πρὸς ἵππον) with a relative direction (πρὸς τῶν Ταραδῶν)? Cp. c. 121 supra.

Between the Istræs and the Tanais the Scyths and the Persians would have had to cross, on the historian's own showing (cc. 61-57 supra) at least six rivers, of which this story takes no account. The distance on the most favourable computation for a single traveller may be reckoned, on the historian's own showing, at twenty days, c. 101 supra; for huge armées such as are here in motion at least twice as much time is to be allowed. The territory of the Sauromatae extended fifteen days' journey from the mouth of the Tanais (c. 21 supra) northwards. What was the extent of the territory of the Budini is not mentioned: but
ΜΕΛΙΟΜΕΝΗ

Βουδινῶν. ὃςον μὲν ὁ Χρόνων οἱ Πέρσαι ἦσαν διὰ τῆς Σκυθίας 123 καὶ τῆς Σαυρομάτιδος χώρης, οἱ δὲ εἰγον οὖν δεῖναται ἄτε τῆς χώρης ὑστηρής χέρσου ἐπείτε δὲ ἐς τὴν τῶν Βουδίνων χώρην ἐσβάλλων, ἐνδαίνα δὴ ἐντοχώντες τὸ ἔλινων τείχει, ἐκκελουτών τῶν Βουδίνων καὶ κεκειμένου τοῦ τείχεσσα πάντων, 5 ἐνέπρημαν αὐτο. τούτο δὲ ποιήσαντες ἐνσυν ἀεὶ τὸ πρῶτο κατὰ στήβον, ὃ δὲ διεξεῦθοντες ταύτην ἕς τὴν ἔρημον ἀπίκοντο. ἤ δὲ ἔρημος αὕτη ὑπὸ ὅδομαν νεμέται ἀνυόν, κεῖται δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς Βουδίνων χώρης ἑνεὰ πλῆθος ἐπὶ ἡμερείαν ὁδοῦ. ὑπὲρ δὲ τὴν ἔρημον Θυσαγάται οἰκέουν, ποιμαλοὶ δὲ τοῦτον τόσον μεγάλον ρέοντες διὰ Μαητέων ἑκάδουσι δὲ τὴν λίμνην τὴν καλεομένην Μαητίνα, τοίς οὐσίαν κεῖται ταῦτε, Λύκων. Οι Αἰαῖς Σώρεις.

Ἐπεὶ δὲν ὁ Δαρείος ἦλθε δὲ τὴν ἔρημον, παυσάμενος τοῦ 124 ὄρμου ἐδρυσε τὴν στρατινὴν ἐπὶ ποσαμῶν Ὁδρο. τούτο δὲ ποιήσαν τοῦτο τείχεα ἔτειχεικε μεγάλα, ἵσων ὑπ᾽ ἀλλότιν ἀπέχουντα.

what is to be become of Darius' return
within sixty days (c. 83 supra) !
123. 2. of Σέ, in αποδο, c. 94 supra
and position.
3. χέρσου. 'dry, barren,' L. & S.
Yet they must have passed through
the land of the Georgi and Aroteres.
Cp. co. 17, 18 supra.
4. τοῦ τείχου, c. 108 supra.
9. πλῆθος. Used similarly of space in
regard to Caucasus, the trans-Caucasian
region, 1. 203, 204 ὄρεων πλῆθος μέγατον.
τείχου πλῆθος ἀπεκλειεῖ ἐς ἑπταφόριν.
ἐπὶ. This statement agrees with the
statement on the same subject, c. 22 supra,
which proves only that state-
ments drawn from different sources do
not always contradict each other.
10. Θύσαγατα. Cc. c. 22 supra.
The geography introduced here is like an
afterthought, probably from a fresh
source. The Malatæe must be located
between the Sarmatae on the north, c. 21
supra, and the Sindi on the south, co. 23-
85 supra.
Syrigis has appeared before as the
Hyrgis, c. 57, the two passages being
obviously independent. Hansen, Orp.
Europa, § 85, suggests that the final ι in
Σαράξ is the source of an error here.
Oaros might pass for the name of the
Wolga which flows into the Caspian.
The identity of the Lykos is lost. For-
büger, All. Geogr. iii. 1115, is worth
consulting.

124. 3. τείχεα ἔτειχε. Even those pre-
pared to extend Hdt.'s travels liberally
draw the line at these forts (cp. Rawlin-
son ad L.) and notwithstanding the
remarkable formula, τῶν ἐν Ἅτομες ὑπὸ ἑπταφόριν,
deny that he can have seen the remains which he here describes.
Two further questions arise: whether
Darius built these, or any such, forts;
and whether the forts described in the
text ever existed at all. In regard to
the first question: 'It is extremely un-
likely that any forts were built in
Scythia by Darius' (Rawlinson). It is
of course still more unlikely that Darius
built any forts far beyond Scythia, be-
Yond Sauromatae, Bedini, on the edge of
the desert, on the banks of the Oaros.
It is in fact absolutely incredible. But
did these erections exist in Hdt.'s own
day? That 'ruined barrows' existed
within and beyond the confines of
Scythia is indeed highly probable; but
that there existed on the banks of the
Oaros eight such ruins at regular dis-
tances of about sixty stadii, or seven and
half 3, miles, seems less probable.
Hdt. does not mention the material of
which these remains consisted. It may
perhaps be that some confusion between
tumuli or barrows, and some stations
on a trade-route, underlies the suspicious
symmetry of these distances (cp. the
Libyan cases, c. 181 infra). Anyway
these archaeological remains, which
σταδίους ώς εξήκοντα μαλλιάθα ἴνα τῶν ἔτες ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σάρα ἤν. ἐν ὃ δὲ οὗτος πρὸς ταύτα ἐτράπη, οἱ διωκόμενοι Σκύθαι περιέλθοντες τὰ κατέπερθε ὑπέστρεφον ἐς τὴν Σκυθεῖαν. ἀφαιρεθέντων δὲ τούτων τὸ παράπαν, ὡς οὐκέτι ἐφαντάζοντο σφί, οὕτω δὲ ὁ Δαρείος τείχεα μὲν ἐκεῖνα ἡμερὰς μετήκε, αὐτὸς δὲ ὑποστρέφας ἥν πρὸς ἑσπέραν, δοκεόν τούτον τε πάντας τοὺς

125 Σκύθας εἶναι καὶ πρὸς ἑσπέρην σφιές φεύγειν. Ἐλαύνων δὲ τὴν ταχύτατην τῶν στρατῶν ὡς ἐς τὴν Σκυθεῖαν ἀπίκειτο, ἐνέκυκρος ἀμφοτέρους ἡμερὰς μολύβησε τῶν Σκύθων, ἐτυγχάνον ὡς ἐδιώκε ὑπεκφέροντας ἡμέρας ὅφει. καὶ οὐ γὰρ ἀνείπων ὁ Δαρείος, οἱ 5 Σκύθαι κατὰ τὰ βεβουλευμένα ὑπέστρεφον ἐς τῶν ἀναπαρασκεύασμα τὴν σφετέριν συμμαχίαν, πρῶτην δὲ ἐς τῶν Μελάγχλαντων τὴν γῆν. ὡς δὲ ἐσβαλόντες τοὺς ἑτάραζαν οἱ τοῦ Σκύθαι καὶ οἱ Πέρσαι, κατηγοῦσαν οἱ Σκύθαι ἐς τῶν 'Ἀρδροφάγων τοὺς χώρους ταραχθέντων δὲ καὶ τούτων ὑπήρξαν ἐπὶ τὴν Νευρίδαν ταρασσόμενοι δὲ καὶ τούτων ἤσαν ὑποβευόντες οἱ Σκύθαι ἐς τοὺς 'Αγαθύρσους. Ἀγαθύρσου δὲ ὑρεῖντες καὶ τοὺς ὁμόμοιους φεύγοντας ὑπὸ τοῦ Σκυθεῖαν καὶ τεταραγμένους, πρὶν ἡ σφί ἐμβαλεῖν τοὺς Σκύθας περιφάνας κήρυκα ἀνηγόρευσεν τοῦ Σκύθα καὶ ἐπιβαίνειν τῶν σφετέρων ὄροις, προδέχόμεντας ὡς εἰ πειρήσομαι

15 ἐσβαλόντες, σφίσι πρῶτα διαμαχήσωμαι. Ἀγαθύρσου μὲν προειπάντες ταύτα ἐβοήθεσαν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφροὺς, ἐρμίκει νῦν ἐν νόῃ ἔχοντες τοὺς ἑτίοντας. Μελάγχλαινος δὲ καὶ 'Ἀρδροφάγοι καὶ Νευρί ἐσβαλόντων τῶν Περσῶν ἄμα Σκύθας οὐκέ πρὸς ἄλλην ἐτράποντο ἐπιλαθάμενοι τε τῆς ἀπειλῆς ἐφεύγον αἱ ἔτος πρὸς

would be such admirable evidence, if only they were genuine, throw some light upon the character of Hdt.'s materials and methods, not altogether to his credit: and the personal formula here (τῶν ἔτες ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σάρα ἤν), which suggests autopsy, and yet is disallowed even by the least sceptical Herodotean critics, may justify scepticism in other less clear cases. Cp. Introductory, p. xvi.

125. 3. Ἀμφιτροπία. The two divisions of the Scyths must be supposed to have joined, though this is the first intimation of their junction.

5. τῶν ἀνεπαρασκεύων. The tribes are here given in order from E. to W. c. 102 supra. The rhetoric of the passage is remarkable, and may be exhibited in a diagram as follows:

ψέφισσαι... έκ τῶν Μελαγχλαιν... έν τούτων ἐπιλαθάμενοι τε τῆς ἀπειλῆς ἐφεύγων αἱ ἔτος πρὸς

13. κήρυκα. Thoroughly Greek: not a mere ἄγγελον, cp. ε. c. 131 ἴσης. The Agathyrsi, like the Getae, c. 92 supra, whose neighbours they were, are prepared to stand up for their liberty. Fraternity and equality are also their watchwords, cp. c. 104 supra. They were better worth attacking than their neighbours, having gold galore, but the defence of their frontiers would have been facilitated by the mountain rampart of the Carpathians, which Hdt. omits to mention.

19. αἰεὶ τὸ πρὸς βορέω ἐς τὴν ἱσημένον.
βορέω ἐς τὴν ἐρήμον τεταραγμένην. οἳ δὲ Σκύθαι ἐς μὲν τοὺς 20 Ἀγαθιδορίους οὐκέτει ἀπείπαντας ὑπικενέντο, οἳ δὲ εκ τῆς Νευρίδος χώρης ἐς τὴν σφατέρνην κατηγέοντο τοὺς Πέρσας.

Ὡς δὲ πολλῶν τούτω ἐγίνετο καὶ οὐκ ἐπαύησε, πέριπας Δαρείου 126 ἐσπέρα παρὰ τῶν Σκυθέων βασιλέας Ἑδανθυρόσον ἑλεγε τάδε. "δα-

μόνοι ἁνδρών, τί φέεγως αἰεί, ζεῖνον τοῖς τῶν ἑτέρα τοιούτων; εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἄξιοχρεός δοκεῖς εἶναι σωστὸ τοῦτο ἐμοὶ προῆκας ἀντιμοῆλθη, σὺ δὲ στὰς τε καὶ πανταῖς ὑπενθῆς μάχεσθαιSY 5 εἰ δὲ συνηγμόνοικε εἶναι ἱπποι, σὺ δὲ καὶ οὖτο παντάμενος τοῦ ὁρῶν δεσπότη τῷ σῷ ὁδώρα φέερων γῆν τε καὶ ὅσιοι ἐλθὲ ἐς λόγους," προς ταύτα δὲ Σκυθέων βασιλέας Ἑδανθυρόσον λέγεται τάδε. 127 "οὕτω τὸ ἔμοι ἔγει, ὃ Πέρσα. ἐγὼ οὔδεναι καὶ ἀνδρόπουν δεῖσας ἦγεων οὔτε πρῶτον οὔτε ψένεις σὺ φέεγω, οὔδε τὶ ὅριτον ἐμὲ ποίησαι τόν καὶ ἔνα ἐκοιμῖα σπάσω. εἰ μὲν οὖτε ἀστέα 5 οὔτε γὰρ τετευμένη ἐστὶ, τῶν πέρι δείσαμεν μὴ ἄλοι ἢ καρπή ταχύτερον αὖ ὡς συμμισμένην ἐς μάχην. εἰ δὲ δεύοι πάντως ἐς τούτο κατὰ τάχος ἀπικενέσθαι, τυχόναι ἔστως τάροι πατρίως φέρετε, τούτους ἀνευρότες συγχεῖνε τειχεῖσθε αὐτοὺς,

καὶ γνώσεσθε τὸτε εἶτε ὡς μαχησμέθα περὶ τῶν τάφων εἶτε 10 καὶ οὐ μαχησόμεθα. πρῶτον δὲ, ἕνυ ἐμέ τὸν λόγον αἰρέσθαι, οὐ συμμείομεν τοῖς. ἀμήδες ὑμῖν μάχης ταύτας εἰρήσθαι, δεσπότας δὲ ἐμοῖς ἐγὼ Δία τις νομίζω τὸν ἐμὸν πρόγονον καὶ Ἰστίρῳ τὴν Σκυθέων βασιλείαν μονάρια εἶναι. σοὶ δὲ ἀντί μὲν δώρων γῆς τε καὶ δότας δώρα πέμψω τοιαύτα ὅλα σου πρέπει ἐλθεῖν, ἀντὶ 15 δὲ τοῦ ὅτι δεσπότης ἐφίες εἶναι ἐμός, κλαίεις λέγω." [ποτὸ ἐστὶ ὁ ἄρτο Σκυθέων ῥήσει.]
'Ο μὲν δὴ ήρχοτα οἰχώκεια ἄγγελον τάκτα Δαρέων, οἱ δὲ Σκύθεων Βασιλείς ἀκούσαντες τῆς δούλοτης τὸ οὖν οὖν άρχης ἐπίθωσθεναν. τὴν μὲν δὴ μετὰ Σαυρομασίων μοῦραν γαρθείς, τῆς ήρχε Σκύπετας, περιουσι 'Ιωσίς κελεύουσας ἐς λόγους ὡς πεστέοια, τούτου οἱ τῶν Ἰστρον ἔσχενμενον έφεροντες αὐτῶν δὲ τοὺς ὑπολείποντοι εἶδον πλανᾶν μὲν μηκέτι Πέρσας, σύνε δὲ ἐκάστωτε ἀναιρεούμενοι ἐπιτίθεσθαι, νωμόντων σὰν σύν ἀναίρεομένους τοὺς Δαρείου ἐπούλευν τὰ βεβολευμένα. ἢ μὲν δὴ Ἰππον τὴν Ἰππον αἰεὶ πράττεσε ἢ τῶν Σκύθεων, οἱ δὲ τῶν 10 Περασίων ὑπόπολε τούδε πεσστέοις ἐς τὸν πεζόν, ὁ δὲ πεζὸς ἄν ἐπεκουρεῖ· οἱ δὲ Σκύθεις ἄσαράζοντες τὴν Ἰππον ὑποστρέφον τὸν πεζόν φοβερούντος, ἐποιείωσε δὲ καὶ τὰς θύκτης παραπληκτὰς 129 προσβολάς οἱ Σκύθεις, τὸ δὲ τοὺς Πέρσας τῇ ἡμίσυμον καὶ τοὺς Σκύθης ἀντίθεον ἐπιτιθεμένους τῷ Δαρείου στρατοπέδῳ, θύμα μέγιστον ἐρέω [τῶν τε ἰών ἡ φωνή καὶ τῶν ἡμίων τὸ εἶδος]. οὕτε γὰρ ὕσοι οὕτε ἡμίων γιὰ τὴν Σκύθηκα φέρει, ὡς 5 καὶ πρῶτον μοι δεδήλωται, οὐδὲ ἐστὶ ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ πόλῃ χώρᾳ τὸ παράπαν οὕτε ὅσοι οὕτε ἡμίων διὰ τὰ ψυχήα. ζώρικον καὶ ὅσοι ἐτάρασσον τὴν Ἰππον τῶν Σκύθεων, πολλάκις δὲ ἐπελαύνοντον ἐπὶ τοὺς Πέρσας μεταξὺ δῶκας ἀκούσαντι οἱ Ἰππον τῶν ἰών τῆς φωνῆς, ἐταράσσοντο τὰ ὑποστρέφομεν καὶ ἐν θύματι ἔσκον, ὄρδα ἰστότατα τὰ ὀστὰ, ἄτε οὕτε ἀκούσαντες

It was apparently derived from this passage, or from this story. Cp. Bekk. Anecd. p. 305, quoted by Stein: ἡ ἀνὰ Σκύθεων ῟εία τι ἔστα; 'Ἰάκτηρος Σκύθων βασιλεὺς Δαρείον πέμφαντο όι αὐτῶν πρόερα καὶ κελεύοντος η ἐπικόλου η ἐπερεμέναι τῷ κυβιστεῖον ἐκπραζόν οἰκοβό 128. τὰς Σκυθικούς, κτλ. The words have been bracketed by Valkenaer, Dietsch, Stein, and others. But all the MSS. exhibit them: the phrase may well have become notorious and proverbial long before Hdt.'s time, and we are not to assume that the later authors all took the anecdote from him, indeed the variations in the phraseology seem to show that they are not quite quotations.

128. 2. δουλεύζων. Strictly speaking they had only heard the correlative δουλότης, s. 128 supra.
4. τῆς ἡγίας Σκύπετας. The first μοῖρα of s. 120 supra. Ἡρακλ. he not being βασιλεύς of the Σαυρομασίων. Cp. i.e. 'Ἰωσίς, with εἰ λέγοντι ἐπειδήν, cp. s. 133 supra.
6. τούτη ὑπολείπομενοι. The two divisions of Scythians under Idanthysso and Taxakis, together with the Budini and Geloni (c. 120 supra), which last, it may be observed, had taken the destruction of their city very quietly (c. 128 supra).
11. ἰσαράζοντες τὴν Ἰππον. 'After driving the cavalry in upon the foot,' cp. 5. 116 ἰσαράζοντες σφέει ἀνὰ τὸν πέταν. 129. 4. ὁς καὶ πρῶτον μοι δεδήλωται. The reference is to c. 28 supra where the assertion is made: ἔσκον δὲ ἀνεχόμενον φέροντο τὴν ψυχήν τῶν ήμίων δὲ σύν ὅσοι ἄρχονται ἄρχρα, which may be taken for proof that οὕτε οὕτε ἡμίων γιὰ τὴν Σκυθικὰ φέρει kτλ. 6. ἐρέώντας, letting off steam, 'braying'; though not because they were 'over-fed' (as L. & S. say, p. 1594). The word is not usual of sound, but the next sentence makes the meaning here plain, and the conjecture ἔρωτοι (van H.) unacceptable.
9. ἱαρη. See c. 114 supra.
10. ὀρδά ἰστότατα τὰ ὀστά. This is very
130. 1. ταύτα . πολέμου. This short sentence has occasioned the commentators a good deal of trouble. Larcher renders: "Mais c’était un folible avantage." Rawlinson: "It was not without some little influence on the progress of the war." Baehr gives practically the same in his German translation: "Es hatte diess immerhin einen, wenn auch geringen Einfluss auf die Führung des Krieges." These renderings all take ταύτα as nominative and as the subject of ἐφέρωτο. Schweighäuser, Gaisford and Baehr, ed. n. ad loc., take ταύτα as object and ἐφέρω (understood) as subject of the verb. " Dum hoc, leve quidem, sed aliquid tamen ad bellii successum Persae apti sunt." So apparently L. & S. "this they received as a small help towards the war," p. 1663. Stein also takes this view of the grammar, but understands ἐπὶ σμακῶν τοῦ πολέμου of time: "these were the advantages which the Persians gained for quite a short time (for the horses soon grew accustomed to the noise)." Stein also would transfer the sentence πολλάκια (om. δὲ) ... ἐδον so as to take the place of the sentence bracketed in c. 129 supra. Mr. Macaulay renders: "So far then the Persians had the advantage for a small part of the war" and gives as an alternative: "with some slight effect on the course of the war."

There are two objections to taking ταύτα as the subject of ἐφέρω: (1) the neut. with the pl. verb, (2) the use of the middle voice. The second seems insuperable; otherwise we might interpret this passage in the light of 8. 62 τὸ τῶν ἑδρῶν τοῦ πόλεμον ἐφέρων αἱ νῆσι τῆς. But this passage may serve to show that σμακῶν τοῦ πολέμου is not here to be taken temporally. I suggest therefore as the sense: 'The Persians gained very little in (by) these feats towards deciding the war,' i.e. it was little that the Persians gained for the real issues by the braying of their asses and mules. This interpretation seems to add a rhetorical to the grammatical advantage.

5. τοιάδε. They must have starved themselves to feed the Persians, for they had only kept just enough for their own wants, c. 121 supra, to say nothing of the inconsequence of their action, in keeping their enemies' table supplied. Larcher defends the passage against Wesseling who wanted to amend it on some such rationalistic grounds, and Baehr supports Larcher. Such rationalism is indeed misplaced. The passage wants no amending: it is perfectly of a piece with the whole story of the campaign: it is necessary to fill up to the brim the cup of folly and confusion which is here presented to the Great King, for the edification of the Hellenes.

6. νομίμων. Presumably slaves. The indication accords imperfectly with the rationale of Sthymian slavery given c. 2 supra.

131. 1. πολλάκια. Larcher makes a great point of the partitive genitive of τῶν προβάτων, but is judiciously silent over this πολλάκια.

2. κήρυκα. Not a mere ἄγγελος, cp. c. 125 supra. Everything must be done correctly.

4. ἄνωτερος πύντε. Cp. c. 64 supra.
132. 2. Δαρείου . . . εἰκαζών. Cp. 2. 15 Ἱλάρω . . . λεγόντων . . . λεγόντων, and contrast Γεβρέου . . . εἰκαζώντων just below.

"The Steppes of South Russia swarm with rodents, to all which the Greeks applied indiscriminately the general term mice." Neumann, p. 287, quoting Hippocrates de Aer. 19.

5. ὅρων. Explained as a symbol of the Air would obviously have been both logical and sarcastic, but have ill-suited the King’s moral. The bird resembles the horse in rapidity, and the horse might be taken as the most valuable possession of the Scyth. Dareios is not yet out of his optimistic vein (cp. c. 88 supra): but he might have realised that if the Scyths had meant a horse they would have sent a horse.

7. οἰκονόμες. See L. & S. sub n. B. II. 2. p. 1494. Gobryas was something more than one of the Seven: he was the one who, if the story in 3. 78 be true, in the supreme moment had nearly given his life for Dareios. He was the son of one Mardonios (Mar- duniyahya: Bihistus Inscri. vol. 4, § 18), and the father of another, whose name was familiar to every Greek, 6. 43 and 7. 9 passim. According to 7. 2 Dareios had married a daughter of Gobryas before he came to the throne.

133. 1. το ἄρα εἰκαζόν. Rather slovenly grammar for τοῦ νόον τῶν δόρων c. 131 supra (St.) or το θέλει τά δ. λέγειν. But such slips are not uncommon in any language (e.g. "The embassy sent by the Greeks . . . as told by Hdt., is so lively and dramatic etc." Freeman’s Sicily, vol. ii. p. 515, meaning ‘the story of the embassy’). Cp. c. 134, 1. 6.

μά μοῖρα. Under Skopasia, c. 128.

4. ἶλλα, ἥμα μοῖρα: they cannot all have spoken at once, though some of them may have spoken Greek.

6. ἑξικονετήσε. Sixty days must have passed and gone long before, if the previous narrative were anything like correct. Cp. note c. 122 supra. How the Scyths had come by this information there has been nothing to show. One can hardly suppose that the horseman sent by Dareios to Ianthyres in c. 126 had betrayed the fact.
131-135 ΜΕΛΠΟΜΕΝΗ

τὴν γέφυραν, αυτοῦ µὴ παραγενοµένου ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ, ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι εἰς τὴν ύµετέρην. νῦν ὁν ύµεις τὰ δάκτυλον ἔκτος µὲν ἔσσεσθε πρὸς ἐκείνους αἰτήτως, ἐκτὸς δὲ πρὸς ἡµέων τὰς προκειµένας ἡµέρας παραµείναι τὸ ἀπὸ τούτου ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι." οὕτωι μὲν νῦν ὁπολειφθέντως Ἰώνων ποιήσεως ταῦτα ὑπάλληλον τὴν ταχύτατα ἐπελέγοντο. Πέρσης δὲ µετὰ τὰ δώρα ἐδόθη Ἰωνίταις Δαρείου ἀντετάχθησαν οἱ ὁπολειφθέντες Σκύθαι πεζοὶ καὶ ἔποιοι ὡς συµβάλλοντες, συνεµισνίσοις δέ τοῖς Σκύθησις λαγὸς ἐς τὸ µέσον δηµίζετε· τῶν δὲ ὡς ἐκαστοι ὧραι τῶν λαγῶν ἐδίκουν, ταραχθέντων δὲ τῶν Σκυθῶν καὶ βοη χρεωµένων, εἱρέτε οἱ Δαρείους τῶν ἀντιπολεµίων τῶν βόρυμων πυθόµενοι δὲ σφενές τῶν λαγῶν διόκουσιν, εἶπε ἀρα πρὸς τοὺς περ ἔσθε καὶ τὰ ἄλλα λέγειν "οὕτωι δυνάς ἡµέως παλλὼν καταφρονοῦσαν, καὶ µοί νῦν φαίνεται Γοβρής ἐπείπερ τῶν Σκυθῶν διάρων ὅρθος. ὡς δὲ νῦν ἡδον ὁδόν κυκλοφοροῦσι καὶ αὐτῶ µοι ἐχεῖν, βουλησθεὶς τὸ ἀργαθεῖ δει, ὅκασι αὐτοῖς ἔκεισθαι ἡ κοµιδὴ ἡµῖν ἐσται τὸ ὅσιον." πρὸς ταύτα Γοβρής ἐπεί "ο βασιλεύ, ἐγὼ σχεδόν µὲν καὶ λόγο µνήσεσθαι τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὴν ἀπορίαν, ἐλθὼν δὲ µάλλον ἐξεσάµενος τούτων ὁ διὸν αὐτῶ µὲν ἐνδεχόµενος εἰς νῦν δὲν δικεῖ, ἐπεὶ τὰν τάχιστα νῦις ἐπέθηκε, ἐκείνης τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν ταῦτα ἐστιν ὡς ὑσθαι ἐπὶ καὶ ἄλλοτε ποιέων, τῶν στρατιωτῶν τῶν ἀσθενετάτων ἐς τὰς ταλαντορίας ἐξαπατώσαντας καὶ τῶν διὸς πάντων καταδίκασαν ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι, πρὶν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν "Ιστρον ἄρθαι Σκύθας λύσοντας τὴν γέφυραν, ἢ καὶ τῇ ἑορτῇ ἐξεργάσασθαι." 20

Γοβρής µὲν ταύτα συνεβούλευε· µετὰ δὲ νῦις τε ἐγείρετο 135 καὶ Δαρείος ἐχράτο τῇ γνώµῃ ταύτῃ τοὺς µὲν κακατηροῦσιν τῶν

134. 1. µετὰ τὰ δώρα ἐδόθη = µετὰ τὴν ἐπίστευσεν τῶν δώρων. 2. οἱ ὁπολειφθέντες. The two divisions of Scyths under Idanthyronos and Tarakias with the Budini and Geloni, c. 129. 3. πεζοϊ. Was this force, as Stein suggests, supplied by the Budini? If so, they must have been good walkers. Is it worth while to rationalise such details in a legend? If there was to be a battle-array infantry was needed: but the Herodotean legend does not call upon the Scythian πεζοῖ to fight. But cp. c. 46 supra. 4. δηµίζετε. Through the ranks of Scyths. 5. ἐκαστοι, each group (or troop). 6. εἱρέτε. τῶν βόρυμων, sc. διη ἑνός: cp. c. 133 τὰ δῶρα ὑσθαι. 7. ἐπεί κατὰ. This incident lowers the pride of Darelos, and he comes to his senses: thus are great conversions affected upon small occasions! Darelos, like Xerxes, got him safe home after his act of δῆµος, and this was unfortunate for Hellenic theories; but at any rate he could be made ridiculous, and he was. There is the comic as well as the tragic Nemesis: Xerxes and his father alike incurred it. 8. ἀπορίην. Ους c. 33 supra. 9. τοῖς ἀδιστορήτωσι. The Persians have as little regard for their feeble folk as the Scyths for their herdmen, c. 199 supra.
136 4. καπαθήνας. Applies only to the δώος, not to the ἄνδρας.
6. βοήν. Stronger than φωνή, cp. c. 129.
8. In 1. 211 ὁ καθαρὸς στρατὸς is opposed to ὁ ἄρχων, and the sense is practically the same here.
10. ἰρύοιτο. Cp. 6, 7 τὰ τέχνη ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ Μελαρίον.
11. οἱ δὲ . . . φωνῆς . . . This seems rather overdone, as there were plenty of animals and men about; nor is solitude known to have this effect upon the ass. The genitive, however, shows that they had some voice left: it was their being tied up, not their being deserted, that made them noisy. Moreover, this extra noise might have excited suspicion.

But Hitt. is at home, day and night, in both camps, in the councils of the Great King, and in the heart of Histiaios: this ubiquity enhances the charm, but depreciates the credibility, of his narrative.

136. 3. τὰ κατάγητα τὰ καθαρῶτα as in 1. 97, 5. 49; τὰ κατάγητα τοῦ Στρατηγοῦ, 7. 104, is obviously different.
10. οἱ Σκύθαι. All three divisions of Scythia and the Saumomatae, Budini and Geloni. In c. 120 supra ἡ μία with the Saumomatae make up one army under Skopas, while αἱ δὲ μ. the great one under Idanthyressos and the third under Taxakis together with the Budini and Geloni make up a second army. Here the two armies are massed, and the second offer and appeal to the Ionians is, with utmost dramatic skill, no more repetition of the first, but an enlarged and altogether more impressive scene.
14. δίκαια. Their conduct involving a breach of faith—to the Scyths.

The Ionians by their refusal are to some extent made responsible for the subsequent invasion of Greece; though to be quite accurate Dareios apparently made no subsequent expedition in person (αὐτῶν cp. c. 1 supra). But the whole moral is obvious: had the Ionians acted on the advice of the Scyths, repeated with every circumstance calculated to make it impressive and acceptable, there never would have been a Persian invasion of Greece, cp. c. 142 infra. To be sure it was the Despots who were to blame: the cities preferred Democracies, c. 137. The story and its moral are largely coloured by Afterthought, and the philosophy of the passage is almost unimpeachable: mais, ce n’est pas l’histoire. Cp. Introduction, p. lxvi.

137. 1. Μιλιταδέω μὲν. Thirlwall (Hist. of Greece, vol. ii. App. 2) long ago pointed out the pragmatic tendency of this story, and traced it to its probable source. It was, one may almost say, doubtless, used on the occasion of the trial of Miltiades for ‘tyranny’ in the Chersonean, to which he was subject on his return to Athens in 492-2 B.C., cp. 6. 104 infra. That he should really have taken the line here ascribed to him at the Ister in 512 B.C. and remained still undisturbed for twenty years in possession of the repavis in the Chersonese, is well nigh incredible. Upon this subject see further notes to l.c. Introduction, p. lxxixvi. Appendix III. § 14.

‘Ἀθηναῖον. If the advice of the Athenians had been taken the liberty of Ionia would have been secured there and then, without all the subsequent trouble. Athenians had ever been the champions of Ionia: it was well that this should be remembered.

5. διὰ Δαρείου. It was to their interest to maintain the king’s power upon which their own depended. The dependence of the Greek tyrannis in the Asiatic towns upon the foreign supremacy, and not in the Asiatic towns alone, was a familiar truism of Greek thought at the time, and no doubt contributed to the unpopularity of the tyrannis, which this whole story was well calculated to augment and maintain. See further, c. 165 infra, 5. 37, 96, 6. 102.

8. δημοκρατεῖσθαι. Hist. will have it that they afterwards had their wish (cp. 6. 48 infra), and that from the Persians. See note ad l. c.

138. 1. διαφανέστερα τῆς ψήφου, ‘voting in the division.’ Stein suggests that Hist. wrote διαφάνεστε τῆς ψήφου πρὸς βασιλέα (on the king’s side) καὶ ἔστως λογιμοῦσαν οὑ λόγου πλείου


πρὸς βασιλέας, Ἐλλησποντίων μὲν τύραννοι Δάφνις τε Ἀβυδώνος καὶ Ἰτακόκλεας Λαμψακείνος καὶ Ἡρῴαντος Παρινᾶν καὶ Μητρόδοτος Προκούνης καὶ Ἀρισταγάρης Κυκλείνος καὶ Ἀρίστων Βυζάντιος. οὕτω δὲν ἦσαν οἱ εἰς Ἐλλησπόντον, ἀν Ἰωάννης δὲ Στράττης τε Χῖος καὶ Αἰάκης Σάμων καὶ Δαοδάμας Φοκαιέως καὶ Ἰακώβου Μιλήσιος, τοῦ ἡ γνώμη ἢ προκειμένη ἐναντίον τῆς Μιλήσεως. Ἀλαέων δὲ παρῆν λόγιμος μοίχος

139 Ἀρισταγάρης Κυκλείς. οὕτω δὲν ἦπετε τὴν Ἱστιαίον αἱρέσειν γνώμην, ἐδοξεῖ σφί πρὸς ταύτη τάδε ἔργα τε καὶ ἕπαι προσθεῖεν, τῆς μὲν γεφύρης λύειν τα κατὰ τοὺς Σκύθας ἔντα, λυεῖν δὲ ὅσον τόξευμα ἐξικνύεται, ἵνα καὶ ποιεῖν τι δοκεῖσθω ποιεῖντες μὴ δέν 5 καὶ οἱ Σκύθαι μὴ περιφάσαν βιοίμενοι [καὶ βοηθαμένοι διαβήμα τὸν Ἰστιαίον κατὰ τὴν γέφυρα], εἰπεῖν το λύσασα τῆς γεφύρης τὸ ἐν τὴν Κυκλείνην ἔχον ὃς πάντα ποιήσονται τὰ Σκύθης ὡστε ἐν ἡδοῖν. ταύτα μὲν προσέθηκαν τῇ γνώμῃ· μετὰ δὲ ἐκ πάντων ὑπερήφανο Ἰστιαίος τάδε λέγων. ἃς ἀναλείψει, χρηστά

10 ἢκατε φέροντες καὶ ἐκ καιρὸν ἐπείγεθεν καὶ τά το ἀπ' ἤμεν ήμέν χρηστῶς ὀδοῖται καὶ τά ἀπ' ἠμέν εἰς ἤμεν ἐπιτρέπεται. ὡς χρήστε, καὶ λύομεν τῶν πόρων καὶ προβλημα τῶν ἐξομοῦντες εἶναι διεθνεῖ. ἐν οὗ δὲ ἤμεν τάδε λύομεν, ἤμεν καιρὸς ἄστε διξηθαι ἑκεῖνος, εὐρύνας δὲ ὑπὲρ τε 15 ἢμένων καὶ ἤμεν αὐτῶν τί σασθαι οὕτω ὡς κείνους πρέπει." Σκύθαι μὲν τὸ δεύτερον Ἰωαὶ πιστεύσαντες λέγειν ἀληθέα

(ἐπ. λόγιμον μοίχον ἐνερ). That certainly makes a more forcible and consequent clause; but it is difficult to account for such a corruption, the MSS. showing practically no trace of it; and we must remember that Hdt. is not always as consequent or forcible in his thought, expressions, and grammar, as he might have been. Perhaps Hdt. wrote ἐνερ.

2. Ἐλλησποντίων. The term here includes all from the Chersonese to Byzantium, cp. c. 85 supra.

8. Αλαέων. No Dorians: the Dorians are blameless. (Not so thirty years later, 7. 93.)

139. 5. περίφασα. With this form cp. ἀνράσα ὄ 130.

καὶ Περίφασαν see edit. Stein. The words involve a material non sequitor.

18. Ἰλευθερία. The Scythians not being republicans did not realise the incompatibility of freedom and monarchy. The ἱεράθεια here is only freedom from

the foreign despot; to a Greek, however, it meant republicanism, cp. 7. 104. In the mouth of Histiaios it was, if not an absurdity, at least a satire.

140. Σκύθαι. The whole forces under the three kings, with their allies, are present on this occasion. As the more impressive demonstration, and in fact the climax of the narrative, the author has shown his art in enlarging at this point upon the Scythian offer: but surely debate and discussion, if there ever was any on the question, must have taken place on the first occasion, where nothing of the kind is hinted. Miltiades and everybody remaining silent, c. 133 supra ad fin. . . . (A somewhat similar situation is shown in the unreported and reported councils at Salamis: 8. 56, 59 ff.)

15. Ἰωαὶ πιστεύσαντες. The (Doric) anther seems to think the Scythian rather simple to believe Ionians, at least after one breach of faith. Cp. Introduction, p. lxv.
4. τὰ ἄλλα. Cr. c. 120 supra. The adverse criticism on the Scyths is necessarily unjust, the supposed facts of the case being impossible, but the dramatic situation and moral are charming, and have presumably helped the production of the story. Anyway the Ionians alone were not to blame for the escape of the Persians: a Greek strategist would have managed things better (cp. cc. 46, 96 supra, Introduction, pp. Ivii. fii., cxxvi.).

11. τῶν πρότερον κτλ. This is an inconsequence. According to the story the Persians left the Danube and followed the one division of Scyths eastward and across the Tanais, returned along the north side of Scythia as far as the frontier of the Agathyrsi (the Carpathians) and now retreating due south (or even from the north-west), they come back on the same track as they had made going east (or north-east). If Dacieos returned by the way by which he had gone, he did not go eastward: if he went eastward he did not return by the same way: at least if he went to the Carpathians, after all the most probable terminus ad quem. See Appendix III. § 16.

121. ὃς ἐστι πρέπει Δαρείου κτλ. Are there many finer situations in historic literature than this? The fate of the King of Kings, and of the flying remnants of the Asiatic host trembling in the balance; vengeance behind, the impassable river in front, the great cry of the Egyptian rending the night; and the wakeful Milesian, on the watch for his Lord: no need to call him twice!

2. φυλέων... καλλαί. Generic, specific. Men with loud voices were much esteemed in antiquity: Artachases the Persian, who thirty years afterwards had the loudest voice in the world, was worshipped by the Akhantas 7. 117. One misses the name of this Egyptian Stentor. He was perhaps of the class of Interpreters, 2. 154.

3. χεῖλεσι. If such metaphorical words were to be pressed, the anatomy of the Danube, Hellespont, etc. would become very puzzling. Cr. c. 86 supra.

142. 3. κρίνοντα. For this literary device of making the intelligent foreigner a mouthpiece for home truths, see cc.
τῶν ἁνδρότον, τούτο δὲ, ὡς δούλων ἐντὸν τὸν λόγον ποιεῖμενα, 5 ἁνδρότοτα φιλοδέσποτα φασί εἶναι καὶ ἄδροστα μάλιστα. ταύτα μὲν δὲ Ἐκύθρεσι ἐς Ιωάννα ἀπέρριπται.

143 Δαρείος δὲ διὰ τῆς Ὁρθοκρίτης πορευόμενος ὑπίκετο ἐς Σηστοῦ τῆς Χερονήσου. ἐπιθυμεῖ δὲ αὐτὸς μὲν διέβη τῇς νησίς ἐς τὴν 'Ασίνην, λειπεὶ δὲ στρατηγοῦ ἐν τῇ Εὐρώτῃ Μεγαβάζον ἄνδρα Πέρσαν. τῷ Δαρείῳ κοτὲ ἔδωκε γέρας, τοιαύτης εἶπας ἐς Πέρσας. τοῦ δὲ ἁρμηνεύω νοοῦ τὴν πρώτην τῶν ροϊῶν, εἴρετο αὐτὸν ὁ ἀδελφός Ἀρτάβανος ὁ τι βουλητής οὐκ ἦν τὸ τοσοῦτο πλῆθος γενέσθαι ὅσοι ἐν τῇ ροΐ κόκκοι. Δαρείος δὲ εἰπε Μεγαβάζοις ἃν οἱ τοσοῦτοι άριστόν γενέσθαι βουλευσάμην μᾶλλον ἡ τὴν 'Ελλάδα ύπήκουσιν. ἐν μὲν δὲ Πέρσας εἰς ταύτα μὲν εἶπας έτίμια, τότε δὲ αὐτὸν ὑπέλπη στρατηγοῦ ἐρώτατο 144 τῆς στρατιᾶς τῆς οὖν τοῦ ἑκτο μυριάς. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Μεγαβάζος εἶπας τώδε τὸ ἐπὶ ἐπάνω δῶν τους μνήμην πρὸς Ἑλλησποντίον.
Artificial synchronisms are part of the machinery of Hdt.'s history, cp. 7. 166, 9. 101, and Introduction, § 9.

2. ἐπὶ Διβύνων. The subsequent narrative makes this view appear a great exaggeration of the objects of this expedition: but cp. Append. XII. The exaggeration is, in any case, necessary to keep up the parallel with the Scythic expedition, and to justify the geographical and ethnographical excursus on Libya. Cp. Introduction, p. xxxi.


3. προδυναμόμενοι. The relation of this προδυνάμεις to the narrative, its sources and significance, are discussed in Appendix XII.

4. ἐκ τῆς 'Αργούς. Cp. 7. 193. In 1. 2 it is simply called a νησίον μαραθ. In Apollodorus, Biblioth. 1. 9, 16 πεντεκότας κατε. The ancients amused themselves with making lists of the Argonautae, fifty or so; a comparison of these lists gives twenty-eight constant names (K. Seeliger, in Roscher's Lexikon, p. 508). Hdt. names Jason c. 129 infra, Herakles 7. 196, the Tindaridae (here).

4. ἐπιβασκεῖαν must not be pressed here, though in 6. 12 et al. it is contrasted with παράθυρον. Hdt. would have agreed, in those days, ἀπεράτως, δὲ τι ἡμέρα καὶ μέρας πνέεται Θεοί. 1. 10.

παίδων παιδεσ. Not to be taken literally; just below they call themselves παιδεσ ἰδρών. Op. Pindar, Nem. 7. 147 παίδων δὲ παιδεσ θεῶν ἐλεόν γένοιτο πέρ ὑμῶν καὶ ἄργων διήθων. Add II. 49. 508. Hdt. 1. 2 puts the voyage one generation before the Trojan war. Here he conceives the 'sons' of the Argonauts as coming to Sparta after the Dorian conquest and Return of the Heraclidæ, just in fact at the majority of the Twins. Hekataios had dealt with the saga of the Argonauts if the Schol. on Apollon. Rhod. be trusted. Hdt. may have him in view here, cp. Hecataeis Frag. 187. (Miller, F. H. G. i. 193.)

5. τῶν ἐκ Βραυρόνων. Cp. 6. 137 ἑνδε. The words τῶν καὶ ἐξελπαθήνεσι are not unlike a gloss. Van Herwerden amends by inserting ἐν ἄρτοις τῶν. 7. ἐν τῇ Τηγύτητι, ὅπερ ἦν. It was not necessary that Hdt. should specify that Taygetos was a mountain, but it is not obvious on what point or part of Taygetos the fire is to be located. The highest summit of the mountain, anc. Taleton, mod. St. Elias (1992 ft.), is above Sparta: oddly enough the district between Taleton and Eoros (Mount Paximadhi, the highest summit next to St. Elias) was called Theras. Taleton (St. Elias, still the scene of an annual pilgrimage) was sacred to the Sun. Pausan. 3. 20, 5. Op. Smith, Dict. Geogr. sgd v. Laconia.
καὶ ὁκόθεν εἰσί· οἱ δὲ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ εἰρησώντων ἔλεγον ὡς εἴησαν
10 μὲν Μινιάς, παίδες δὲ εἰς τὸν ἔξω τῆς Ἀργοὶ πλεύνων ἤρων, προσεχόντες δὲ τούτους καὶ Δήμουν φυτεύσαν αἰσθάνεται εἰσιν. οἱ δὲ Δακεδαιμόνιοι ἀκηκοῦσί των λόγων τῆς γενεῆς τῶν Μινιάων, πέμπουσι τῷ δεύτερῳ εἰρήτων τῷ θέλοντες ἰκεῖον τε ἐς τὴν χαρίν καὶ τῷ αὐθενί. οἱ δὲ ἔφασαν ὑπὸ Πελαγιῶν ἐκβιβασιν τὰς ἁπάντας ἔχειν ἐς τοὺς πατέρας. δικαίωσαν γὰρ εἶναι όντω τοῦτο γινεῖσθαι: δὲ ἐσέχθη δὲ οἰκεῖοι ἀμα τούτους μοιράσαν τε περικόν καὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπολαγοῦσαν. Δακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἔδειχθαι τοὺς Μινιάς ἐπ’ οἷς θέλοντι αὐτοῖς, μάλιστα δὲ ἐνεγερεῖ σφαῖρα ὅστε ποιεῖν ταῦτα τῶν Τυνδαρίδεων ἡ ναυτίλια ἐν 20 τῇ Ἀργο. δεξίαζον δὲ τοὺς Μινιάς γῆς τε μετέδουσιν καὶ εἰς φυλὰς διεδάσκοντο. οἱ δὲ αὐτίκα μὲν γάμους ἔγιναν, τὰς δὲ ἐκ
146 Δήμουν ἐγγυτοί ἐξέδωσον ἄλλους. χρόνου δὲ ὡς πολλοί διεξελθόντως αὐτίκα οἱ Μινιάς ἐξυπηρέτωσαν, τῆς τε βασιλείας μετατέωντες καὶ ἄλλα ποιοῦστε ὁς ὅσαι. τοῖς δὲ Δακεδαιμόνιοι ἐξέδωσε αὐτοῖς Ἀποκτείνω, συλλαβώντες δὲ σφαίρα κατέβαλον ἐς 5 ἐρείπία. κτείνοντες δὲ τοὺς ἄν κτείνοντο Δακεδαιμόνιοι νυκτὸς.

9. ἀγγέλ. Speaking Greek of course: so that in their case the mother tongue had not prevailed! But Hdt. does not think of these things. Cp. c. 133 supra.
15. δικαίωσαν. They had a just claim on their fathers, though πατέρας is rather straining a point.

They fail to answer the part of the question referring to the fire. Blakesley regards it as “a symbol of the Hephaistos-worship brought from the volcanic island of Lemnos.” But not by immigrants after the Dorian invasion, surely: besides, one might light a fire on Taygeton without wanting to worship it. Was it, however, connected with the Sun-worship (see above)? The sense of any such connexion has obviously disappeared in the story as told by Hdt.
17. Δακεδαιμόνιοι. This passage has been gravely quoted as an exception to the rule of Spartan citizenship stated 19, 35, as though these Minyae in the Peloponnesse had really immigrated and been admitted into the Spartan (Dorian) franchise! For a similar case at Athens cp. 5, 57. It is, however, far from certain that Spartan εὐθείας was restricted to pure Dorians.
19. τῶν Τυνδαρίδων ἡ ναυτίλια. The motive here cannot be historical, but the statement none the less illustrates a kind of appeal that was popular with Hellenic audiences even long after Hdt.’s day; specially when there were sound reasons for the line of action demanded on mythological precedents or principles. Or sometimes the myth served as an excuse for inaction. For instance cp. 5, 43, 79, 94, 6, 137 ff., 7, 159, 9, 26, 27. Their relationship with the Tyndarids would not have given the Minyae a lien on Dorian land, or women, except so far as the Dorian conquerors had adopted Minyan traditions and institutions.
21. φυλᾶς. As they were given Dorian wives (according to the saga) the word might include the Dorian tribes.
tάς δὲ. Not their wives but their sisters! The passage is interesting as showing that these early refugees were not always thought of as voyaging without women (cp. 1, 146); and also as further evidence of the mixed descent of Spartan citizens. Cp. c. 149 infra.
146. 3. καὶ ἄλλα. One would at least like to know the other charges against them; specially if connected with cult and worship (cp. 5, 72, 8, 81). It was just in the kingship at Sparta that the non-Dorian element was nominally represented. See 5, 72 infra.
5. κτείνοντες. Nicholas of Damascus is the (weak) authority for the state-
μετ’ ἡμέραν δὲ οὐδένα. ἐπεὶ δὲν ἔμελλον σφαιρας καταχρήσασθαι, παρατίθησαν αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν Μινώων, ἐνυσία ἀσταὶ τε καὶ τῶν πρῶτων Σαρπινείων θυγατέρες, ἐσθελθεὶς τε ἐς τὴν ἔρκην καὶ ἐς λόγους ἐδειν ἐκάττη τῷ ἔσωθι τῷ ἀνδρί. οἱ δὲ σφαιρας παρῆκαν, οὐδένα δόλον δοκεόντες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔσέβαι. αἱ δὲ ἐπείτη ἐσθήθης, ποιεῖσθαι τοιαύτα πᾶσαν τὴν εἴρην ἐσθήτα παραδόθησαν τοῖς ἄνδράς αὐτὰ τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔπαισιν. οἱ δὲ Μινώαι ἐδύναντος τὴν γυναικεῖαν ἐσθήτα ἄτε γυναίκες ἐδύναν ἐξω, ἐκφυγόντες δὲ τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ ξυνὸν αὐτῶς ἢ τῷ Θηύητο. Τῶν δὲ αὐτῶν τοῦτον χρόνον Ὄηρας ὁ Αὐτείσιον τοῦ Τισα. 147 μενοῦ τοῦ Θερεάλδορον τοῦ Πολυμείκους ἐστέλλει ἐς ἀποκλῖν ἐκ τεκελίμων. ἤ δὲ ὁ Ὄηρας οὕτος, γένος ἐδών Καδέας, τῆς μνημονίας ἐδείπνεος τοῦτο Ἀριστοδήμου παίσι Εὔρυστῆνει καὶ Προκλῆτι. ἐνυσία δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν παῖδων τούτων νηπίων ἐφιτροπαίρην 5

ment that the possession of gold or silver was punished with death. Cq. Stobaeus, 44. 40. K. F. Hermann, Gr. Staatsalt. i.6 p. 141, § 27, n. 10. The supreme penalty was (we may assume) rarely if ever enforced against Spartan. Hdt.’s remark in its own way illustrates τὸ εἰστίν τῆς τοιείας. It furnishes also a suggestive example of the necessity of reading a general statement in the light of its context: divorced therefrom, this statement would be absurd. Whether the statement is taken over by Hdt. from his source, or inserted by him proprio motu, is a curious point, cp. Introduction, pp. lvii.

9. ἐκάττην, ἀνδρί. Strict monogamy is implied (cf. 5. 40). K. O. Müller, Orchomenos, 2 p. 307, believing that the Minyae were immigrants, discards the saga here told, by pointing out that connubium between Spartans and strangers was impossible. But the connubium is just one of the most significant traits in the saga, one of the data, so to speak, which the saga undertakes to explain; a fact which, however, may be thought to prove that the Minyae were not immigrants admitted to Doric franchise, but part of the pre-Doric population. Cq. c. 149 infra. The conduct of these Spartan (Dorian) wives is a splendid contrast to the schelchos Ergos of the Lemnian women to ergastos αἱ γυναῖκες τοῦ ἄμα Θηύητον Ὄηρας σφαιράμαν καὶ τοιαύτα, 6. 138 infra, where see note. Plutarch, de Virt. Mulier. viii. (Mor. 247), gives a tradition differing in many particulars from the Herodotean, but betraying similar motives and results.

147. 2. ἡτοιμαὶ ἐς ἀποκλῖν. Osten-

dibly an independent and fortunate coincidence; historically, perhaps, a trans-
figured reminiscence of the discontent of the pre-Dorian inhabitants with the
new situation.

3. τῆς μνημονίας ἐδείπνεος. Theras
stood in the relation of Aeunclus to the fatherless family. The importance
of the mother’s brother, which is, of course, not adequately explained by
the death of Aristodemus, points to a matriarchal society: cp. Bachofen,
Antikurrische Briefe, xi. xvi. ητο. When K. O. Müller, Orchom. 3 p. 330,
says that the relation in which Theras is put to the Heraclides kings is reine
Dichtung des Dorischen Nationalpolis
(pure imagination in the Dorian
national epic), we must qualify the
term reina (puro) by remembering that the epic will have imitated real
situations, claims, and customs; and
the term Nationalpolis, by remembering that the Dorians had none of their
own, but accepted the non-Dorian, and made the best of it, from their own point of
view.
10. τῇ νῦν Θήρῃ κ. What remains of it is now called Santorin: see H. F. Tozer, Islands of the Aegean, c. vi.; Theodore Bent, The Cyclades, c. vi.; though there is a tendency to revive the ancient name.

11. Καλλιστή. Mr. Bent (op. cit. p. 114) describes this volcanic island as “hideous” but “fascinating in its hideousness.” Mr. Tozer (op. cit. p. 108) suggests that the old name was “a euphemistic expression,” but adds that the vineyards and the harbour of the island might supply an explanation. The utilitarian seems more probable than the aesthetic reason. Cp. c. 167 infra.

16. συγγενείων. It was a similar motive which had guided the Minyae to Sparta: c. 145 supra.

Μεμβλαρόν. There is an island of this name near Thera. Prehistoric remains, buried under volcanic matter, in Thera and Therasia attest the antiquity of its occupation; in Hdt.’s time the memory of the eruption which had overwhelmed them, and which may be dated even before Kadmos, had apparently been forgotten. Cp. Fourné, Santorin et ses éruptions. Paris 1879.

18. ὁκτώ ἀνδρῶν. K. O. Müller, Orchom. p. 319, makes out nine: 1 Kadmos, 2 Polydoros, 3 Labakos, 4 Lalos (see Hdt. 5, 59), 5 Oedipus (Hdt. 5, 60), 6 Polemikes, 7 Thersandros, 8 Tissemonos, 9 Antision, 10 Theras. Stein follows him. Nine generations would be just 300 years. Rawlinson ad l. defends the discrepancy by observing that there might be ten (nine) generations at Thebes and only eight at Kalliste-Thera. This would be odd, Hdt.’s allowance being three generations to the century (2, 142): but it is possible that there is the frequent confusion of regius and generations at the bottom of the anomaly, and it may be observed that there were eight Battiadai in Kyrene, Thera’s colony, covering a period of less than two centuries, 632-469 B.C. Cp. c. 163 infra.

148. Λακεδαίμονος, ὁκτώ ἀνδρῶν. ἐπὶ τῶν φιλέων ἐστελλε, συνοικήσων τούτοις καὶ οὐδαμῶς.
8. τρικτεχνοτέρων. Three triekonters would not have held many men, even if room be made for a few passengers: Theras takes ἄλγος πτωμα. Even so, there is little space for the λεον ἀπο τῶν ψεύδων.

The Minyas in the Peloponnesse, i.e. the representatives of a culture which had been traced in Boeotia, Lemnos, Thera, and other islands, were perhaps descendants of immigrants, in regard to whom it was perceived that they did not constitute the most primitive and subordinate stratum in the population (Kaufkones, Parasevatai), while they were equally distinct from the Doriens.

13. Δέτραν κτλ. These citylets formed the Triphylian Hexapolis. Cp. Busolt, Die Lokalismen, I. pp. 149 ff. who notices that they composed a sort of Amphictyony, the centre of which was the sanctuary of ‘the Samian Poseidon,’ in charge of the Makistii. Strabo, 348. Cp. Busolt, Gr. G. i. 2 240.

14. ἐκ ηλιό. A lamentably vague date. The small local business on the W. of Peloponnesse here recorded would hardly have obtained special notice if it had been an old story at the time of Hdt.‘s visit to Sparta where he perhaps heard about it: the Spartans concealing any part they themselves had in the matter. Stein would date it 460 B.C. after the third Messenian war (assumed to have lasted not ten but only four years: Thuc. I. 108). It was surely not unconnected with the Synoekism of Ellis, and the establishment of the Eleian democracy about the year 472 B.C. (cp. Busolt, Gr. G. ii. 371 ff.) and certainly marks a moment when Spartan influence and power were depressed. Cp. Introduction, p. lixiv.

149. 5. Αλιγείδαι. There were Aligeidae in Thebes, in Kyrene, in Thera, in Akrages, as well as in Sparta, all professing to be hereditary priests of Karesian Apollo (Orchom., p. 321): yet according to Hdt. the name was derived from Aligeus son of Oiolokos son of Theras. This is the local Spartan version (Pausan. 3. 15. 8) and at variance with the tradition in Pindar. Isth. 6. (7.) 15 (not himself a member of the clan, Pyth. 5. 75 notwithstanding: vide F. Studniczka, Kyrene, pp. 73 ff.), and with Hdt.’s own record of Aligeidae in Thera. Blakesley, from overlooking this latent contradiction, wants to relegate τῶντο... γεγονός to the margin as a gloss.

Φιλή is used inexacte: φιλάρα would probably have been a better word; the addition of μεγάλη shows that Hdt. is not using φιλή in the technical sense (Orchom. p. 323 n.).
ἐν Σπάρτῃ. τούτι δέ ἐν τῇ φυλῇ ταύτῃ ἀνδράσι οὐ γὰρ ὑπέμειναν τὰ τέκνα, ἢ ἀριστοτετράπλοι 'Ερμίνων τῶν Λαοῦ τε καὶ Ὁδισπόδεων ἱρών καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ὑπέμειναν . . . τῶν τοῦτο καὶ ἐν Θήρῃ τούτα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων γεγονοῦσι.

150 Μέχρι μὲν ἦν τοῦτον τοῦ λόγου Λακεδαιμόνιοι Θηραίοι κατὰ ταύτα λέγοντες, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦτον μοῦνον Θηραίοι εἶδε γενέσθαι λέγοντες. Γρίνως ὁ Αἰσθείνων ἔφη Θήρα τούτου ἅπαντος καὶ βασιλείων Θηρὰς τῆς νήσου ἀπίκετο εἰς Δελφοὺς, ἄγων ἀπὸ 5 τῆς πόλεως ἑκατομβίην εὐποροῦν δὲ οἱ καὶ ἄλλοι τῶν πολιτείων καὶ ή αἱ καὶ Βάττος ὁ Πολυμνήστου, ἐνω γέρων Εὐθυμίδης τῶν Μανέων. χρεωμένον δὲ τῷ Γρίνῳ τῷ βασιλείῳ τῶν Θηραίων περὶ ἄλλων χρὰ τῆς Πολυμνήστου ἐν Αἰδών πόλιν. οὐ μὴν ἀμείβετο λέγων "ἐνω μὲν ἅναξ πρεσβύτερος τε ἠδ' εἰμὶ καὶ βαρύς ἀἱ διέφθαται: ὅ τε δὲ τινα τῶν νεωτέρων κελέει ταύτα ποιεῖν." ἂν δὲ ἔλεγε ταύτα καὶ ἑδέσκειν εἰς τὸν Βάττον. τότε μὲν τοσάπα, μετὰ δὲ ἀπελθόντες ἀλογήν εἶχον τὸν χρυστηρίον, οὔτε Λιβύν τοι αἰθέτος οὐκ ἦς εἰς οὔτε τοιμάστες ἢ ἄφανς χρῆμα ἀποστέλλειν

6. ἐν Σπάρτῃ. Pindar, who perhaps is following the local Kyrenean tradition, makes the Aigeiadae accompany the Herakleidae into Lakedaemon. This according to K. O. Müller (op. c. p. 325) is grounded on the reconstruction, the Aigeiadae came into Lakonia a generation before the Dorians: on the invasion of the latter they took refuge with Achaeans and Miynans in Amyklao, entered into special relations with the Herakleids, and after the conquest of Amyklao became a (Dorian) phratry in Sparta. The 'Minyan' colonisation of Thera he places before the Dorian invasion (pp. 327, 8).

8. τωντο. Stein suggests συνεβαίνει δὲ τωντὸς, Cobet συνεβαίνει δὲ which Holder puts into his text.

10. 1. μέχρι μὲν. A possible discrepancy has been indicated between Spartan and Theraean versions in note to 1. 5. previous chapter.

2. μοῦνος. The Lakademonians having no story on the subject, and the Kyreneans a different one c. 154. There is even now nothing to prove that Hdt. heard this version in Thera, or even from Theraeans at first hand: he would give it in the same way (Blakely points out) if he had heard it from a Samian, who professed to have heard it in Thera, or from Theraeans. Nay, he might give it, on grounds of internal evidence, or of external authority, as the Theraean story, no matter how he came by it. (Cp. Introduction, pp. lxvii. ff.) Cobet omits Θηρᾶς.

3. Γρίνως. The name, with one υ, is found in a (late) Theraean inscription (the will of Epikteta), C.I.G. 2448. Cauer, Delectus, No. 148.

6. Εὐθυμίδης is an emendation borrowed (by Palmer) from Pindar, Pyth. 4. 455. The MS. have Εὐθυμίδης (one Εὐθυμίδης). Blakely protests against the alteration. K. O. M. calls it: "Palmerius' unabestrebliche Emendation" (Orckron, p. 335 n.). The emendation may be incorrect in the sense that Hdt. made a slip (through oblivion or ignorance) and wrote Εὐθυμίδης. He does not appear to know Pindar's ode, cp. c. 154 infra. But that he ought to have written Εὐθυμίδης is beyond question.

When the Theraeans in the days of Grinios and Battos (Ol. 35, K. O. Müller) are represented as knowing nothing of Libya, Hdt. must, as Blakely remarks, be following a different tradition from that which led him in 2. 50 to derive Poseidon from Libya. That indeed would be manifest without the contradiction: what this proves is how little Hdt. concerned himself to eliminate inconsequences and inconsistencies from his work as a whole. Cp. c. 159 infra.
151. 1. ἑτέοιν. On the genitive see Goodwin, Gr. Gr. § 170, Monro, Hom. Gr. § 150. Seven, a conventional number, we may suspect.

σοκίον (ἢ θεόν) τὴν Ὁθήνην ἐφηβοῦν, ἐφεσικέας, c. 50 νεαραῖον. In this visitation it might perhaps be fanciful to see a distorted reminiscence of an early, or perhaps a prehistoric, eruption. It cannot however be said with accuracy that from the colonisation of Memel and onwards we have a consecutive account of the inhabitants” (Bent, op. cit. p. 106).

2. πάντων ἐνοχὸς. Santorin is described as “favourable for the growth of nothing but the grape.” Was this one survivor a generic vine?

5. Κρήτην. An early home of navigation, Thuc. 1. 4, Aristotle. Pol. 2. 10, 4, 1271. So Odysseus in Ithaka gives himself out as a Kretan Od. 14. 190. But could the Cretans be trusted to tell them! Κρήτης ὁ πέλαγος. Op. Anthol. 7. 275. It is, by the way, remarkable that the ‘Dorians’ of Thera made no application to those Dorians of the Hexapolis, or of Aigina, who probably were already trading with Egypt (cp. 2. 175).

μετοχεία. The use of the word here raises several problems. The date of the application of the Theraeans to the Kretans is long after the Dorisation of both islands. The question arises, who are to be understood by the Metics? At Athens, or in an Athenian story, the meaning would be local, but metics does not appear as a Kretan term. Are they identical with the πτέροσα of Aristotle. Pol. l.c. whom he describes with some inaccuracy (cp. Hoechh, Kret. ii. 29 ff.), or with the σύνταξα of the great Gortynian inscription? It is evident that they are persons who may be engaged in commerce, and it will be safe to assume that the word is used here, without prejudice, to include any residents who were not ‘Kretans.’ L. & S. seem to take the word here in the more definite sense of ‘immigrants.’ If that were pressed, the ‘metics’ would include the Doriani; the ‘Kretans’ might be the aboriginals (Periokoloi etc.). The word does not occur elsewhere in Hdt. On the Laws of Gortyn, see H. J. Roby in Low Quarterly Review, ii. 135 ff., J. W. Headlam, J.H.S. xiii. 48 ff.

7. Ἰτανον. Itanos: “the most easterly town of Crete,” Hoechh, op. c. i. p. 37—the foundation ascribed to Phoenicians, Steph. Byz. sub τ. πτέροσα. Not a common word (cp. L. & S.), probably a bare-fisherman. Platea has been identified with Bomba.

12. λέπτοιν. Why should they have left Korobios, or what he was to do, all alone on a desert island, we are to ascertain by conjecture. The particularity with which names are given in this story cannot disguise the pragmatic character of the tradition. Whether Korobios was a ‘Kretan’ or a ‘Motie’ is not expressly stated, but cp. Appendix XII. It seems improbable that the Cretans and their metics should not have been well acquainted with Libya long before this time, but like other ancient monopolists they perhaps kept their knowledge as much as they might be by themselves: and possibly Korobios the metic was bribed rather than hired to give the coveted information. Hoechh (iii. 430) sees in the difficulty with which information about Libya was procured an evidence that the commerce
of Crete was at this time (c. 680 B.C.) decayed. It may, indeed, be supposed that the Ionians had damaged it; a Samian ship presently (c. 152) makes its appearance at Platea, on route for Egypt.

152. 3. ναύκληρος. Probably he was on board, 1. β, Thuc. 1. 137, 2. This was a fortunate accident for Koroblos, but it is difficult to understand how a Samian ship sailing towards Egypt (from Samos) should find itself at Bomba, the usual route being via Rhodes (Kypres), cp. 2. 182, Thuc. 8. 35, 2, unless indeed the strong E. or N.E. wind was blowing which afterwards drove the Samians all the way to Tartessos; in which case it is difficult to understand why they put to sea again if they really wished to make Egypt. Blakeney suggests that Kolais touched at Bomba not on his way to but on his way from Egypt, his line being from Egypt to Crete and then to Samos. This saves one point in the narrative at the expense of another. The whole stands or falls together as far as the credit of Hdt. and his sources for the particular story are concerned, though, of course, as usual in such cases, real relations have been incorporated in more or less fictitious records. The probability is that these trade-routes were very much older and known much longer to the Greeks of Asia than Hdt. seems here to recognise. Not to raise remoter problems, since 650 B.C. at least a regular Greek settlement had been maintained in Egypt, and people in Samos at any rate, if not in Thera, must have known where 'Libyans' were to be found; viz. to the west of Egypt.

8. Ἦρακλας στῆλας. On the original στῆλης 2. 44.

9. Ταρτησσόν. Cp. Meltzer, Ges. d. Kortnager, i. 35; Kiepert's Manual, § 247, the Tarshish of Scripture by Hdt. used apparently of a city, or perhaps a district (Basetia) 1. 163, by other writers sometimes used of the river Guadalquivir (e.g. Stesichoros apud Strab. 145) and cp. the use of Aegyptos, Borysthenes, Istros, etc. Tartessos was long in the hands of the Phoenicians, praec. Carthaginian and perhaps anti-Carthaginian, the rivalry facilitating the intrusion of third parties.

10. δέκρατον. Inaccurate, seeing that the Phoenicians had shown them the way, as Koroblos the metic had done to the Thracians. For the formula see Introduction, p. cxii.

11. θεία πομη. For no Phoenician would have shown them the way, as Koroblos the metic had done to the Thracians. For the formula see Introduction, p. cxii.
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tον Δαδάμαντος Αλμήνην· τούτο γάρ οὐκ οὖν τέ εἶνε ἔρασιν ἄλλον. οἱ δὲ Σάμιοι τὴν δεκάτην τῶν ἐπικερδῶν ἐξελόντες ἔκ
tάλαντα ἐπούσαντο χαλκῷν κρητήρων Ἀργολικοῦ τρόπον· 15 ἄριστα δὲ αὐτῶν γρυπών κεφαλῶν πρόκρουσαν εἰς· καὶ ἀνέθηκαν ἐς ἡ Ἡραίον, ὑποστήχατοι αὐτῷ τρεῖς χαλκέως κολοσσοὺς ἑπταπέσχας τοῖς γενόμενοι ἐρημεισμοῦν. Κυρηναίοις δὲ καὶ Θρακίοις ἐν Σαμίοις ἀπὸ τούτο τοῦ ἔργου πρῶτα φιλιάν μεγάλα συνεκρήθησαν. οἱ δὲ Θρακίοι ἐπείτε τοῦ Κορᾶβιος 153 ἁλύντες ἐν τῇ νῆσῳ ἄλκευον ἐς τὴν Ἡραῖον, ἀνήγγελλον ὅσιοι ἐν ἦμιν ἐπὶ Διβύδον ἔκτιςμένον. Θρακίοις δὲ ἔδαδε

superlative formula, cp. Introduction, p. civ.

14. τὴν δεκάτην. "The entire profit was therefore between £14,500 and £15,000," Rawlinson. But this of course means immensely greater value, owing to the high purchasing power of money then. On the mines in Spain cp. Ridgway, Origin of Currency, pp. 97 ff.

15. ἐπούσαντο, middle. Cp. γραφάκων c. 88 supra. ABC have the poorer ἐστίναπα here.

χαλκῷν, c. 81 supra. Hdt. unfortunately does not preserve the artist's name; no doubt they employed local talent. Was it Theodorus? I. 51, 3. 41. Cp. K. O. Müller, Ancient Art (Eng. Tr.), § 60, A. S. Murray, Greek Sculpture, i. p. 78.

'Ἀργολικόν, c. 61 supra.

16. γρυπῶν κεφαλῶν, c. 79 supra. πρόκρουσαν. Rawlinson, "standing out in high relief." L. & S. p. 1289 render: "placed at regular intervals." But battlements (κρουσά) and tassels, or a fringe (κρουσοί), are continuous, and so perhaps was the row of griffin heads around this Argolic krater; probably on the body. The way occurs again 7. 188 of ships at sea, and in Homer, Il. 14. 35, of ships on land.

17. τὸ Ἡραῖον, c. 60 and c. 88 supra, where no doubt Hdt. saw it and heard, one can hardly say how much of the preceding story. Cp. Introduction, pp. iv. xxxii.

18. Κυρηναῖοι δὲ καὶ Θρακίοις ἐν Σαμίοις. Κυρηνε, Θέρα, Σαμος: Θέρα acting as half-way house, though they would hardly pass Kretë without touching probably at Itanos (c. 161 supra).

19. ἔργον. Not the work of art but the work of money just narrated. φιλίαν μεγάλα: does not necessarily mean an 'alliance' (Rawlinson, note), Cp. 6. 21.

153. 3. ὠδὴ, placeit, cp. c. 145 supra. Three points in the colonial decrees may be distinguished: (1) Brothers were to draw lots which should go, families wherein there was only one son not being touched. (2) No women accompanied the expedition: a definite number of men were selected from the seven parishes. What the number was is not stated, at least in our text. Stein suggests that it has fallen out after ἄρετης. σ = ἀρετοί (Mahaffy and Cobet) is accepted by van Horwerden. The pentekonters have been made the basis of a calculation. Rawlinson allows 200 men as a maximum to a pentekontes, i.e. the complement of a trireme, and is not content with 100 men for a colony: 90 is nearer the mark, cp. 7. 184. This would give 160 men. But the two pentekonters dwindle to one vessel and its bare complement, "insignis paucitas," ap. Justin 13. 7. 4. The smaller the number the better the moral. K. O. Müller by a slip transfers the pentekontes to Thera and his advent to Kalliste, Orkhon, 2 p. 334. He has confounded two pentekonters with three triekonters, c. 143. Rawlinson well observes: "The numerical accuracy affected by the Theran narrative is remarkable," i.e. fictitious. Whatever the number of men, they obtained wives in Libya by one or another means, c. 186 infra. (Cp. Pindar's record of Barke (Alkeis) given as an athletic prize by Antaios, native King of Iariss, and won by Alexidamos, ancestor of the Pythian victor Telesikrates, perhaps an Ageist, Pyth. 9.) (3) One 'Bottes' appointed oekistemonarch. In Pindar his proper name is given, viz. Aristotelis, Pyth. 5. 87. In
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αδελφεόν τε ἀπ' αδελφεῷ πέμπτειν πάλιν λαγχάρνοντα καὶ ἀπὸ 5 τῶν χώρων ἀπάντων ἐπὶ τὰ ἐντούτων ἄνδρᾳς . . ., εἶναι δὲ σφενοὶ καὶ ῥημέονα καὶ βασιλέα Βάττου. οὖτω δὲ στέλλουσι δύο πεντηκοντάριους ἐς τὴν Πλατέαν.

154 Ταῦτα δὲ Ὠθραῖοι λέγουσι, τὰ δὲ ἐπίλυτα τοῦ λόγου συμφέρονται ἦσθ' Ὠθραῖοι Κυρρηναιοὶ. Κυρρηναιοὶ γὰρ τὰ περὶ Βάττου οὐδαμῶς ὠμολογοῦσιν Ὠθραῖους· λέγουσι γὰρ οὕτως, ἐστὶ τῆς Κρήτης Ὑσάβα τόλμης, ἐν τῇ ἐγένετο Ἕπειρος 5 βασιλεὺς, δε ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ ἀμήτορι τῇ οὐνομα τῇ Φροίμη, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ ἔγγυτε ἄλλην γυναῖκα. ἡ δὲ ἐπεσελθοῦσα ἐδικαλών καὶ τῷ ἐργῷ ἐλεῖνα μητρυῤῥᾳ τῇ Φροίμῃ, παρέχοντα τε κακά καὶ πᾶν ἐπὶ αὐτῇ μηγανομένην, καὶ τέλος μαλακεύνην ἐπενεικασά εἰς πείθει τοῦ ἄνδρα ταῦτα ἔγγυτε οὕτως. ὁ δὲ ἀναγνοθεῖς ὑπὸ τῆς γυναῖκος έργον οὐκ δότων ἐμφανάντο ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ. ἣν γὰρ δὴ Θεμίσων αὖρ Ὠθραῖος ἔμπορος ἐν τῇ Ὑσάβῃ τοῦτον ὁ Ἕπειραχος παραλαβὼν ἐπὶ ξείνα εξεροκημικῆ τὸ μὲν ἦν δυνακόμενον δ' ἔτι ἐν δηθῇ, ἐπεὶ δὴ εξώρωκεν, ἀγανών ῃ υπαριθίδευν τὴν έευνήν θυγατέρα καὶ ταύτην ἐκέλευσε καταστύνως ἀπαγάγοντα.

15 δὲ Ὠθριάσων περιγραμμάτως τῇ ἀπάτῃ τοῦ Ὑσάβου καὶ διαλυσάμενον τῇ έευνήν ἐπόσει τοιάδε παραλαβὼν τὴν παίδα ἀπέπλευε· ὡς δὲ ἐγύνευτο ἐν τῷ πελάγει, ἀποσημεύοντα τὴν ἐξώρωκεν τοῦ Ἕπειραχου, σχοινοὺς αὐτοῦ διαδήσασα κατῆκε εἰς τὸ πέλαγος, 155 ἀναστάσας δὲ ἀπίκευτο εἰς τὴν Ὀθρήν, εἰρεύθην δὲ τῇ Φροίμῃν.
The Thraean version recognised Polymnestos as the father of the founder, c. 159 supra.

2. Πολύμνηστος. The Thraean version describes Polymnestos as the father of the founder, c. 159 supra.

3. έπαλακεύτο. He could not make her his wife, she being a foreigner. But the result is a shadow over the birth of the founder, as so often in the foundation legends of the colonies, which was deepened by his physical defects (εγκύψονις and τραύλον). These physical defects are probably an inference from the misinterpretation of his title (Battos) and are not to be rationalised away into a charge against his Kretan mother.

5. άλλος. He is no doubt right, though it is strange that he should not know the name (Aristoteles, c. 153 supra), and inedible that the Kyrenaecs should not have known it. That his informants, or his documents, may have made the assertion is of course possible. That Aristoteles was called Battos prophetically by the Pythia can hardly be regarded as impossible, but if true, seems to imply that something was known in Delphi about Libya and the Libyans, c. 159 supra, however ignorant the Thraeans were. The ‘Kyrenaec’ version of the visit of Aristoteles Battos to Delphi differs from the Thraean previously given in the following points: (1) He goes to Delphi on his own account to ask about his voice (ομήλευς) instead of being ordered to do so by Grinos. (2) The interview with the Pythia is quite different. (3) In the former (Thraean) version it is the universal ignorance of Libya which leads to disobedience of the god’s mandate: here simply the humility or impotence of Battos.

8. Βασίλεα Βάττος. For the passage of a title into a proper name, e.g. cases of Augustus, Pendragon, Arthur, etc., (E. Wise’s Letter to Dr. Mead concerning some Antiquities of Berkshire, Oxford 1738, cites Baxter, Glossarium Antig. Brit. sub voc. VEVRAGUS, PENDRAGON = caput gentis). It is curious that the name Battos occurs in the myths of Arkadia and Messenia, cp. Orat. Metam. 2. 705, cp. Graserger, Gr. Ortsnamen, p. 18, E. Curtius, Peloponnesos, ii. 198 (note 49 to Landsc. Messenien). Thuc. 4. 43 has it as a proper name.

15. άπταν. Van H. follows Valekenser in bracketing as a gloss, and suggests that the verses were originally in Doric. Cp. c. 157 infra.
156 μετά δὲ αὐτῷ τε τούτῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἡραίοις, συνεφέρετο παληγκόταις ἄγρονετοι δὲ τὰς συμφορὰς οἱ Ἡραίοι ἐπέμετον ἐς Δέλφους περὶ τῶν παρεόντων κακῶν. ἢ δὲ Πυθή σφυ ἔχρησε συγκετίζουσι Βάττο τὸν Κυρήνην τῆς Διβήνης ἀμείων πρήξεις. 5 ἀπέστελλον μετὰ ταύτα τὸν Βάττον οἱ Ἡραίοι εὔτη κεντροντάρια, πλώσαντες δὲ εἰς τὴν Διβήνην οὔσιν, οὐ γὰρ εἶχον δὴ τι ποιέως ἄλλο, ἀπὸσω ἀπαλλάσσοντο εἰς τὴν Ἐρήνην. οἱ δὲ Ἡραίοι καταγομένους ἔβαλλον καὶ οὐκ ἔως τῇ γῇ προσίσκευας, ἀλλ' ὅπως πλοῖαν ἐκέλευον, οἱ δὲ ἀναγκαζόμενοι ὑπὸσοι ἂν ἀπέπελεον καὶ ἐκτίσαν νήσον ἐπὶ Διβήνῃ κελέμενην, τῇ οὖν ομοῖα, ὡς καὶ πρῶτον εἰρέθη, ἐστὶ Πλατέα. λέγεται δὲ ἠνὴρ εἶναι ἡ 157 νῆσος τῇ νύν Κυρήναιον πόλις. ταύτην οἰκεύεται δύο ἔτεα, οὐδὲν γὰρ σφυ Χρήστον συνεφέρετο, ἐνα αὐτῶν καταλύουσι οἱ λαοὶ πάντες ἀπέπελεον ἐς Δέλφους, ἀπικακευομένι σὺντὶ ἐπὶ τὸ

156. 1. συνεφέρετο in the Kyrenaean version represents the fuller details given in the Theraean, c. 151 supra.

5. δὲ πεντηκοντάρια c. 153 they appear in the Theraean version, but at a later, and less likely point: here they correspond prius factae to the ἐπίθερον κατάχοσται ἄδερφε τὰ πρῶτα ὁ πολὶ. c. 151; but no addition is made to the two pentekonters in this passage, on their return to Thera, and so a substantial agreement is re-established between the two versions upon this point.

8. ἔβαλλον. In this hostile passage between the Theraeans and the εἰμιγράτες Stein sees a hint of the real reason of the adventure, for according to Menecles of Barca (c. 120 B.C.) Baricos was head of a political faction, and was driven out of Thera, consulted the oracles whether he should attempt a return or found a colony, and was recommended to adopt the latter course. Schol. Pindar. Pyth. 4. 10, and Muller, Frag. H. G. vol. iv. p. 449.

11. πρότερον. That is, in c. 151 supra, in the Theraean λόγοι.

Πλάτεα. The occupation of Platea is another point common to the two versions, but in the Theraean λόγοι Platea is occupied from the first, c. 151 supra, while here Platea is first occupied on the return of the colonists.

λέγονται. It may be argued from this expression that Hdt. had not seen both Platea and Kyrene, though it does not follow that he had seen either, cp. Introduction, p. xxvii.

12. πόλ. Acropolis! 157. Somewhere in this chapter τὰ ἐπίθερον τῶν λόγων (c. 154) may be taken to begin: i.e. the Theraeans do not contradict the Kyrenaean story of what happened in Libya, though they contradict τὰ πρῶτα Βάττον, c. 154-156.

2. ἐνα αὐτῶν. Does duty for Korobios the "metis" c. 151, who is however put at a different stage of the proceedings. The harmonist might say there were three visits: (1) Korobios and his Theraean companions ὁ πολὶ. c. 151. (2) The colonists’ first visit and departure leaving another man. (3) The colonists for final occupation. But such attempts do not even reconcile the particulars, e.g. the points at which Platea is occupied in the two stories, much less account for the variation, or detect the moral or Tendence. In any case this one man was to be regarded no doubt as sufficient to assert the proprietary rights of occupation. Cp. passage in Main, Anciēnt Later, c. viii. on "The Roman principle of Occupancy as the source of the acquisition of sovereign rights in newly discovered countries" (pp. 244-250).

It might be argued from the way in which Hdt. arranges the pieces that he considers the Theraean story (150-153) the more probable. Hdt. has not, however, indicated clearly whether it begins after δὲ πεντηκοντάρια, c. 156, or at Πλάτεα, cp. closing words of c. 153, or whether it begins here at ἀπέπελεον ἐς Δέλφους or at ἀντελέων, c. etc.

3. ἀπελέων. This visit of the colonists to Delphi is a fresh fact, beside
the battle with the Therasans, and was placed by Menekles, who may have been a rationalising harmonist rather than a historian with better sources, before the settlement at Platea. Here again the stories can be reconciled by multiplying the visits to Delphi (visit to Delphi: battle off Thera; occupation of Platea; second visit to Delphi); but such attempts are misplaced ingenuity, where you are dealing with unauthoritative traditions obviously belonging to variant cycles. It is far more likely that such stories, each of which professes to be the whole story, and is in a way complete in itself, should be inconsistent with each other, and with facts, than that a complete and consistent and true narrative is to be extracted by combinations and permutations in the details of them all.

7. ΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΆΜΦΟΤΡΩΦΟΥ. The oracle contains Dorians on the strength of which R. O. Müller (Arch. 2, p. 339) argues that it must be derived from the local oral tradition and not from a Delphic source: as if Attic poets could write Doric on occasion, and the Delphians in a Dorian affair could not produce dialectal congruities! (Suda Dialecto Cycloena vel acepeperant vel etc., Valeskens.) Diodor. 8. 20 preserves a longer variant which suggests a poetic version of the Foundation-legend (cp. Introduction, p. lxxxv); but it is as likely that the poem was an expansion of the oracle, as that the oracle was distilled from the poem. Müller must, however, be right in arguing that the oracle dates after the development of the local myth of Apollo and Kyrene, so charmingly utilised by Findor, Pyth. 9: (for Therasan and Kyrenesam dialects cp. Caesar, Delect. 2, nos. 141-153).

μηλοτρόφον. The trade with Libya may have included wool, or may have been expected to do so; but sheep do not appear among the celebrated products of that favoured region (cp. Dict. Geogr. 1, 752 b), nor does Kyrene figure among the well-known staples of the wool-trade. The flecks of the Nasamones, however, are mentioned, c. 172 infra (cp. Büchschachtz, Besitz und Erwerb, 220 ff.). Plutarch, M. 405, quotes this oracle, with melosphoan σταθέν ἄριστον.

The epithet μελοτρόφος is applied to Asia by Archilochus, Fr. 26 [98] (Bergk, ii 4, p. 390) and Aischylus, Pers. 763 (cp. Fr. 479 teποσερξατίζων 5, 49 infra). Büchschachtz, op. c. p. 229, converts the Demeter Melopores of Megara (Pausan. 1. 44, 3) into a Demeter Melotrophes, a title for which there appears to be no evidence; L & S make the goddess bear them apples, perhaps rightly (cp. Pfeiler, Gr. Myth. 1, 768), though the passage in Pausanias runs: τοῦ πρώτου πρώτατα ἐν τῇ γῇ δέχατα Αίδημητα ἔφοινας Μαλεφόραν. Pausanias has, however, just before: λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐν τῇ ἔκθεσιν.

13. ΑΞΙΡΙ. The name of this district (χώρας) has a thoroughly native sound: sometimes softened into "Αξίως, then rationalised into "Αξολις, by the Greeks. A definite settlement (ἐκτισμὸς) is implied. In Ptol. 4, 5, 2, a village of the name is the first mentioned in the Μαιμαρικὴ πέμα. The name does not occur in Strabo, where it might be expected (888), nor in the extant works of Sallust, notwithstanding the passage in Steph. Byz. which may here conveniently follow: "Αξίως, πόλις Αξολίας, οἱ δὲ περὶ Σαλβάνων αἱ πόλεις Αξολίας φαίνεται καὶ ποσομῶν εἶναι, των ὅτι [π. Πιδ.] Αξίως μετὰ τοῦ Ῥ Αξολοκρίνει τὸν
158 συγκλήσων οίκος επὶ βάτερα παραρρέειν. τούτον οίκον τῶν χώρων ἐπὶ ἔτεα, ἐβδόμῳ δὲ σφαιράς ἔτει παρατησάμενοι οἱ Διόνυσος ὡς ἐς ἀμέλειαν χώρον ἄξωσιν, ἀνέγινασαν ἐκτείνουσι. ἡγοῦν δὲ σφαιράς ἔνθειτον οἱ Διόνυσος ἀναστήσαντες πρὸς ἑστρέφῳ, 5 καὶ τῶν κάλλιστον τῶν χώρων ἣν διεξίοντες οἱ "Ελληνες μὴ ἰδοιει, συμμετρησάμενοι τῷ όρθῳ τῆς ήμέρης νυκτὸς παρῆγγον, ἐστὶ δὲ τῷ χώρῳ τούτῳ οὕτως Ἰρασ. ἀγαθόντες δὲ σφαιράς ἐπὶ κρήνην λεγομένην εἶναι "Ἀπόλλωνος ἔσταιν ἄνδρες "Ελληνες, ἐνθαῦτα ὑμῶν ἐπιτίθεν οἰκέειν· ἐνθαῦτα γὰρ ὁ οὐράνιος τέτρηται."  

159 'Επὶ μὲν ἐνν Βάττω τε τοῦ οἰκιστῶ τῆς Ἰότης, ἀρχαίοις ἐπὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτεα, καὶ τοῦ παῖδος αὐτοῦ 'Αρκεστίλεω ἀρχαίον ἐκκαλεῖκεν ἐτεα, οἴκεει οἱ Κυρηναῖοι ἔστωκος τοῦτον ὑπὸ ἀρχήν ὡς τὴν αὐτοκλίνην ἐστάλησαν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τρίτου, 5 Βάττῳ τοῦ εὐδαίμονος καλεομένου, "Ελλῆνας πάντας φάρμε φρήσασα ὑπὸ Πυθή πλεῖσθε συνοικίσαντοι Κυρηναῖοι Λεβύνη ἐπεκάλεσαν γὰρ οἱ Κυρηναῖοι ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναδασμῷ ἔχρησε δὲ ὅδε ἕχοντα. 

δὲ δὲ κεῖν ἢς Λεβύνη πολυήρατον ὕστερον ἔθη 

γὰς ἀναδαιομένας, μετὰ ὁ ποκὰ φαμὲ μελῆσιν, 

συλλεξθῶντας δὲ ὁμίλου τοῦλου ὡς τὴν Κυρηνήν, περιπατοῦμενοι γῆς πολλῆν οἱ περίοικοι Διόνυσος καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν

χώρον. Χάρας δὲ "Ἄξων ἐγεί αὐτήν. It was near but not identical with the "Harbour of Menelaos," cp. e. 169 infra. There is nothing in Hdt.'s description or reference to justify the conclusion that he had visited the spot. On the beauty of Utility cp. e. 147 supra. 158. 2.  

ἐπὶ ἔτεα. On the date: Clinton, Fasti Η. αδ αὐτ. 639-637 ν.κ.  

ἐβδόμῳ looks conventional, cp. e. 151 supra. Platea, Αρκεστίλεως (Iras), Kyrene form successive stations, probably in time as well as space, of the Hellenic immigration. The natives are here represented as on friendly terms with the settlers (cp. note e. 153 infra), but the anecdote looks suspiciously like a reply to critics, who wondered that the Greeks had passed by the best spot and chosen an inferior one (cp. anecdote e. 144 supra). Irass is named by Pindar, Pyth. 9. 106, as πόλεις Ἀρκεστίλεως. The κρήνη Ἀπόλλωνος (cp. Pindar, Pyth. 4. 204) was called σημαία or κηρή Bekker, Anecd. π. 1173, and gave its name to the town. 9. ὁ οὐράνιος τέτρηται refers of course to rainfall. The expression seems to imply that the wellkin is solid. Stein compares Gen. 7. 11, Malachi 3. 10. See c. 184 infra τὸν ιερὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 159. 1. Ἰότης. Instead of βιοτοι: cp. e. 112 supra. 2. τεσσαράκοντα. The forty years may be spread over the three settlements, Platea two years (c. 157), Aziris six years (c. 158) leaving thirty-two years to Kyrene. This chronology is exact: whether it is true is another question, cp. Appendix XII. 3. τοῦτο. That the original number of Kyreneans remained for fifty-six years without increase, or diminution, is a statement so absurd on the face of it that the author must be supposed to have meant something other than he says: perhaps merely that the city remained without ἐποίημα, fresh immigrants: i.e. that the number of κληρος remained unaltered. 9. Ἡ Πυθή. The oracle was set in motion by the Kyreneans, and they, presumably, made its favourable response known, perhaps at Pythian or Olympian festival (παρατα Ἐλληνας), cp. e. 126. 12. γῆς πολλῆν. The land to be
158-160
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τοῦ οὖνομα ἦν 'Ἀδικράιν, οἷα τής τε χώρης στερεσκόμενοι καὶ περιμμεμβρύομενοι ύπὸ τῶν Κυρηναῖον, τέμνοντες ἐς Αἰγυπτικὸν ἐδοσαν σφέας αὐτοῦς Ἀπρίλῃ τῇ Αἰγυπτίου βασιλείᾳ. ὥ δὲ ἐσσυλλέξαν στρατὸν Αἰγυπτίων τοῦτον ἐπεμφε ἐπὶ τήν Κυρηνήν. οἱ δὲ Κυρηναῖοι ἐκκαταρτευόμενοι ἐς Ἱρασα χώρον καὶ ἐπὶ κρήνην Θέστην συνέβαλον τε τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους καὶ ἐνίκησαν τή συμβολή. ἀτε γὰρ οὐ πεπειρημένοι πρότερον οἱ Αἰγυπτίοι Ἑλήνων καὶ παραχρεώμενοι διεθαρῆσαν οὗτος ὡστε ὅλην 20 τινὸς αὐτῶν ἀπενόστησαν ἐς Αἰγυπτίαν. ἀντὶ τούτω Αἰγυπτίων καὶ ταῦτα ἐπιμεμβρύομενοι Ἀπρίλῃ ἀπέστησαν ὄτ' αὐτοῖς.

Τούτου δὲ τοῦ Βάττου παῖς γίνεται Ἀρκεσίλεως ὡς βασιλεύς 160 λέγεται πρώτα τούτων ἐκεντοῦ ἀδέλφου τούτου ἐπασαίας, ὅ μὲν όντος ἀπολύτων ὑπ' ἀλλον χώρον τῆς Λιβύης καὶ

divided is taken at the expense of the natives, and a breach in the relations hitherto friendly (c. 158) is thereby made.

12. Δίστος. Libyans had long had relations with Egypt: they appear among the conquests of Amenemphis II. (18th Dynasty) and Ramses II., and contributed by their invasions to the fall of the "Middle Empire." (See Wiedemann, Apog. G. 374, 480, 473 ff., and on the present episode, p. 687.) Adikran seems a genuine name.

15. Ἀπρίλῃ, 2. 161. In that passage Hdt. promises to recount at greater length (μεσέως) ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις λόγος τῶν προφανῶν, which led to the downfall of Apries. Blakeney asks whether this promise can be said to be fulfilled in the meagre account of the affair here given. The difficulty has struck many, and the answer given has often been in the negative, various inferences in regard to the sources and composition of the work following therefrom. But it must be remarked that the real question is whether Hdt. under any circumstances could have thought the promise made in 2. 161 to be redeemed in this passage. Now in 2. 161 Hdt. does not state the reason of the expedition of the Egyptians against Kyrene at all: here it appears as the application of the Libyans. Further particulars are here given, the name of the Libyan king, the name of the battlefield, and we might add the more remote cause which led to the application of the Libyans. Unless then we press perhaps unduly the word μειζόνως in 2. 161, we may suppose that in revising his work Hdt. might allow this passage to pass as a sufficient discharge of the debt incurred in 2. 161, the more so, as on other grounds it may be plausibly maintained that this passage was written before that, though it takes a later place in the final form of his work.

(Cp. Bauer, die Entstehung, pp. 66-69.)

17. Ἰρασα, c. 158 supra.

18. Θέστην. PR have Θέστην. Steph. Bux. has Ἰέστην, πόλις Ἀδάμ καὶ ἄλλη Λιβυής.

19. οἱ πετρυμένοι. This statement has presumably been taken over from his authorities, or allowed to stand by Hdt. as originally written, for he could hardly have penned it deliberately for the first time after his researches in Egypt had taught him the position and achievements of Hellenic mercenaries there. Cp. 2. 159. But though he would hardly have written this passage after those, he may have allowed it to pass, in a revision, seeing that πετρυμένοι might be taken to refer to aggressive measures, or at any rate that Ἑλλήνως might be restricted to free Greeks, Greeks acting on their own account, not mercenaries, like the Ionians and Karians. Yet that Egyptians would have 'despised' Greek soldiers at that date is incredible.

The absence of any reference to 2. 161 would be remarkable, if that passage had been composed before this.

160. 1. βασιλεύας. 'After coming to the throne,' or 'on becoming king.' The στάτης is transferred to the royal
house, but was perhaps a larger movement, of the native Libyans against the Greek colonists.

4. ἐντὸν βαλλόμενον. Cr. 5. 73.

Βάρκη. Presumably a native name, a fact which may be in Hdt.'s mind when he says τότε καὶ εἰναι. The identity with the surname of the great Hamilkar (Barak) is presumably a mere accident. The seceders evidently had a Libyan following, and the town no doubt was mixo-Libyan. The site of Barko is ascertained to the west of Kyrene: being accurately indicated in Skylax (Müller, Geogr. min. i. p. 83. Cr. Dict. Geogr. i. 378). In the Middle Age the name was applied to the whole district. Kiepert, Mannal, § 122.

10. Δέοντων. Stein suggests may be identified with the Λευκός of Ptolemy 4. 5, 38, the most westerly of the inland villages of Marmaria: Leukoe must be placed well to the east of Kyrene (as on the map, xix. Ptolemais in Geographos mánoeis). The relation between the foundation of Barka on the west and this battle with the Libyans on the east of Kyrene is obscure: but the carnage of Leukoe is presumably a genuine memory. This τρόμος may be compared with the losses of Argos (6000) 6. 83, 7. 148, of the men of Rheidon and Taras (3000+2) 7. 170. The number of Sybarites slain by the men of Kroton (6. 21, 5. 44 f.) is not given by Hdt.

16. Ἐρυχό. This chapter (160) has all the points from which a stirring and tragic drama might be composed. The
παῖς Βάττος, χωλὸς τε ἐὼν καὶ οὐκ ἄρτις. οἱ δὲ Κυρηναῖοι πρὸς τὴν καταλαβούσαν συμφορὴν ἐπέμενον ἐξ Δέλφων ἐπιησομένους ὄντινα πρὸτότο καταστησάμενοι κάλλιστα ἄν οἰκεῖον. ὡ δὲ Πυθήνη ἐκέλευε ἐκ Μαυτινῆς τῆς Ἀρκάδουν 5 καταρτιστῆρα ἀγαγέομαι. αὐτοῖ οὐ οἱ Κυρηναῖοι, καὶ οἱ Μαυτινεῖς ἔδοσαν ἀνδρα τῶν ἀστῶν δοκιμαστῶν, τῷ οὖν οὖν ἦν Δημώναι. οὗτοι δὲ ἐν πολίμενοι εἰς τὴν Κυρηνὴν καὶ καθὸν ἔκαστα τοῦτο μὲν τριφύλους ἑπισκηπτῇ σφαιρὰς, τῇ δὲ διαθέλῃ Θηραῖον μὲν καὶ τῶν περιοίκων μιᾶς μοῖραν ἐπιτήρησε, ἀλλὰ δὲ τοῦτον Πελεόνατον καὶ Κρήτην, τρίτης δὲ ἡγεμόνων πάνω.

6. καταρτιστῆρα. Σρ. 5. 28. The Kyrenaens apparently ask for a constitution, and are given a legislator.

The Κυρηναίων τοπολογία is virtually lost (cp. V. Ross, Arist. Frag. ed. Teubner, p. 328), but perhaps it is to the work and policy of Demonax (περὶ Κυρηνὴν οἱ τῶν δήμων καθεστῶν) that Aristotle refers Pol. 7. 4. 10, 1310b as similar in policy and utility to that of Kleisthenes at Athens, φιλοὶ τὴν γὰρ ἐπέταξαν τοὺς πλεονατὰς καὶ σταθμήσει, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἰδίων λεπτά συνακτῶν εἰς δύνα καὶ κατὰ, καὶ πάντα συναρτῶν ὅπως ἐν ὃτι μάλα ἄνωθεν πάντας ἄλλοις αἱ δὲ συνήθεια διασχιζόμεναι αἱ πρότεροι. 9. τριφύλων. The number is the Dorian number, but the members are colluvial, μ口服 below seems φολί, not a part of a phylum. The first tribe is not Dorian, being composed of Theraeans and their clients, whether brought from Thera (Niebuhr) or native Libyans (K. O. Müller). The Phylae are in fact geographical, though not localised.

10. περιοίκων. Did they cease to be dependent, and receive the franchise (Niebuhr) or remain vassals (Müller, Rawlinson)? It seems more natural to suppose that περιοίκων refers to local relations in Kyrene: in which case a full franchise can hardly have been accorded. On the other hand there is no sense in their being mentioned unless they had some political status. It is possible that this first tribe of Theraeans formed something of a Eupatrid class, and were in possession or were assigned possession of the soil, and that the text is only a clumsy and obscure way of saying that the first or Theraean tribe formed a landed aristocracy.

11. Πελεόνατος καὶ Κρήτην. Neither is the second tribe Dorian,
τούτο δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἄπτω τεμένεα ἐξελόν καὶ ἱροσύναι, τὰ ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ πρότερον εἶχον οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐς μέσον τῷ δῆμῳ ἔθηκε.

162 Ἡπί μὲν δὴ τούτῳ τοῦ Βάπτου οὕτω διετέλεσε ἑόντα, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τούτου παιδὸς Ἀρκεσίλεως πολλῆς ταραχῆ περὶ τῶν τιμῶν ἐγένετο. Ἀρκεσίλεως γὰρ ὁ Βάπτω τοῦ κυρίου καὶ Φερετίμης οὐκ ἔφη ἀνέξεσθαι κατὰ τὰ ὁ Μαντινεῖς Δημοδίως ναξ ἐτάξε, ἀλλὰ ἀπαίτε τὰ τῶν προγόνων γέρεα. ἐνεβάζετε στασιάζον ἐσοφθή καὶ ἔφυγε ἔς Σάμων, ἢ δὲ μήτηρ οἱ ἐς Σαλαμάντας τῆς Κύπρου ἔφυγε. τῆς δὲ Σαλαμάντας τοῦτον τῶν χρόνον ἐπεκράτησε Ἔυδῆθων, δό τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς θυμηττοίροιν ἐνν ἐξεβάθην ἀνέθηκε, τὸ ἐν τῷ Κορινθίον θησαυρὸν κέκειται.

10 ὡσικομένη δὲ παρὰ τούτῳ ἡ Φερετίμη ἔδεστο στρατηγὴν ἢ καταάξε σφῆς ἐς τὴν Κυρηνήν. ὅ δὲ Ἔυδῆθων πάν μάλλον ἢ στρατηγὴν ἐνδιδό ὃ δὲ λαμβάνοντα τὸ διδόμενα καλὸν μὲν ἐφὶ καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι, καλλίον δὲ ἐκεῖνο, τὸ δοῦναι οἱ δειμένη στρατηγὴν. τούτῳ ἐπὶ παντὶ γὰρ τὸ διδόμενα ἔλεγε, τελευταῖοι 15 οἱ ἐξεπεμφθη διαφοροῦ ὁ Ἐυδῆθων ἅπακτον χρόνου καὶ ἡλικίας, προσὴ δὲ καὶ ἐρίων ἐπεμψαίης δὲ αὐτὴς τῆς Φερετίμης τῶντο

though there might be a few Dorians among them. Still less is there anything to show that the tribe of Nesiotis was Dorian. Rawlinson boldly makes it Ionia.

12. ἐσ μένον. Cp. 3. 142. The case of Maiaudrius is an interesting and perhaps not accidental parallel: cp. c. 164 ἐνθα.

ἤμισ. Nor does this make a Dorian (Spartan) interest prominent.

152. δ. γερα. Royal honours, cp. 5. 56, 6. Σάμων. Polykrates was at the time (c. 550 B.C) tyrant of Samos. Blakesley obviously exaggerates in suggesting that this visit of Arkesilaos might have caused the whole [sic] history of Cyrene to be brought to the common [sic] knowledge of the Samians (n. 424): but there are some curious coincidences in the stories of the Samian and Kyrenean tyrants; cp. c. 161 supra, 164 ἐνθα. Evthelon need not have been stricken in years at this time even if his grandson Gorgos is on the throne thirty years afterwards, 5. 104 ἐνθα. α. In his interests, by concert. Blakesley.

9. ἐξεβάθην. Hdt. had presumably seen the said censer in the Corinthian treasury at Delphi, with the offerings of Gyges I. 14, cp. Introduction, § 16, IV. Delphi owed the treasury properly speaking to Kypselos. On the over throw of the tyrannis, the title no doubt was changed. Delphi rather than Samos appears throughout as the focus of these traditions (cp. c. 163), but the applications of Arkesilaos to Polykrates and of his mother to Evthelon suggest interesting problems of commercial and political intercourse between the states named (cp. c. 139 supra), and it is not likely that these matters were forgotten in Samos, or even in Zankle (6. 22 ff.).

12. ἐδιδ. . . τὸ διδόμενον . . τὸ διδόμενον. It is not meant that any actual gift passed except the golden spidle and distaff: this point is much plainer if we read καὶ τοὺς γὰρ ἐπὶ παντὶ τῷ διδόμενον ἔλεγε κτλ. Perhaps Pheretime's mission to Evthelon might have been more successful if her son had not been intriguing at the same time in Samos. The omission of Egypt from their counsels, and of the previous negotiations with Amasis, from Hdt's narrative are observable (vide c. 160 supra), specially in the light of c. 165 ἐνθα: had Amasis and Polykrates already broken?
163. 1. τούτον τῶν χρόνων. It may be conjectured that Arkesilas and Pericles went together as far as Samos, and there parted, he for Delphi, she to Salamis, perhaps to meet again at Samos before their return to Kyrene (c. 164).

2. πάντα ἄνδρα. Women were not wanted. The men enlisted would not necessarily be all Samians.

Rawlinson’s contention that ἄνδρασις need not mean a new re-division is supported by the use of ἄνδρασις in the oracles c. 159 supra. The land was to be taken, as in the former case, from the Libyans. This oracle is in part, assuming the authenticity of the text, a summary past event. If such an oracle had been extant in 466 B.C., Findar would hardly have written in that year: παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀδελφόν θέλλει μέρος Ἀρκεσίλαιος, Ἱθυ. 4. 115. Arkesilas I had must have been deposed about or before 460 B.C., see Appendix XII, Introduction, § 17, and Hdt. cannot have acquired this material until some time after that event. The oracle has been reduced to prose again, but the hexameter terminations are easily detected: Κυρήνης Βασιλέως—ἐσπευσίας εἰσι—Ἀρκεσίλεως—ταῦτα ὁ καλλιστών. These tags do not touch the "four Battis and four Arkesilai," or the eight generations. On the confusion of reigns and generations cp. c. 147 supra.

164. 3. ἐπικρατήσας. Cp. τὴν Σάμου ἄπειραν c. 162 supra, the difference of tense is not solely due to the difference of tense.

τοῦ μαντητή. Given in the preceding c.

5. οἱ πάν. Others going no farther than Delphi. Cp. l. 18 ἵστρα.

6. ἐς Κύπρον. Although Euthydemos had not supported him, Σάμος would offer no difficulty. The captives might have been destroyed without being sent to Kypros. Perhaps he sent them away from Kyrene without intending that they should arrive at Kypros. Anyway they were released at Knidos and despatched to Thera. Stein ascribes the action of the Kynidians to their Dorian kinship with the Kyreneans, Knidos being a colony from Lakedaimon. l. 174, like Thera, the metropolis of Kyrene; but is the kinship certain? It was remote, if not fictitious: and even the recognition of a common metropolis would not have counted for much against diverse political interests. Opposition to the dynastic intrigues between the tyrants of Samos and Kyrene might help to explain the rescue.
9. πύργων Ἀγλωμάχου ἰδιωτικόν. For private persons to have fortified houses was perhaps an aristocratic note: Aristot. Pol. 4. 11, 5, 1330b.
11. ἐκ ἐξαραμένων. 8. 94, 9, 77.
13. ἔργα. As in 7. 107 ad fin., cf. ἐργαθῆ 5. 57.
14. ἠμφόρους. Whether he was mistaken in his interpretation Hdt. does not say: the sequel would rather incline us to suppose that Barka, or the market-place in Barka, must have been intended; but Barka had even less claim than Kyrene to be regarded as ἠμφόρων. Cp. Rawlinson. In c. 156 supra Kyrene is compared to an island (in size).
15. γυναῖκα... Ἀλάζερ. The commentators make a difficulty out of Alazir's daughter being a συγγενής of her husband Arkesilas, and Rawlinson infers from the name that Barka was under a native dynasty, and that Alazir's daughter was related to Arkesilas on the mother's side. This is unnecessary. Alazir, or Aladdeir (cp. Baehr, ad l.), though a Libyan name, or title, may have designated an Hellenic, a Battiaid prince; and there were certainly Battiai in Barks, as we see from c. 202 ἐπέφερ. Reconciliation had been effected between the two branches of the Battiai, if there had ever been a quarrel.
165. 1. ἔστω μὲν. Some time was occupied by the transactions just narrated, c. 162-164. At the date of Arkesilas' exile (c. 162), Polykrates was alive, and Egypt probably still independent; at the time of Arkesilas' death, Egypt had been conquered by Rambyse, and Rambyse was perhaps already dead, having meanwhile received the submission of Arkesilas, and of Kyrene. This 'medium' must have taken place during the interval covered by the narrative in c. 164, and this consideration shows us how artificial and incomplete the narrative is, and how much Hdt. is at the mercy of his pragmatic sources. As often happens, however, Hdt.'s text contains in itself a possible solution of the difficulty. Pheretim pleads in Egypt that her son has perished διὰ τῶν μαθημάτων. Hdt. himself asserts that Arkesilas III. surrendered Kyrene to Rambyse and paid tribute. Have we here then one of the true reasons of his death, and of the death of his father-in-law Alazir in Barka, if not the true reason of his flight from Kyrene, ascribed in c. 164 to his superstition?—That Pheretim applies to Aryandes proves that Rambyse had already left Egypt; the expedition presently despatched by Aryandes, in an answer to the prayer of Pheretim, is εἰς ὑποθεσιν synchronous with the Scythian expedition of Dareios (c. 145 supra).
166. 2. ὑπὸ ὑπήρχο ἥ χρόνο. Digestion on the subsequent fate of Aryandes. The appointment of Aryandes is not mentioned in Bk. 3. The unfortunate absence of chronological exactitude prevents our fixing a date for the fall of Aryandes. Cp. Appendix XII. 7. ἐκάκφατο. The Middle in full force: cp. γεγονάκατος s. 88 supra, etc. Αἱ γυναῖκες οὐκ εἶχαν ἀνάγκην. Egypt had no native coinage: and "it was not until after the conquest of that country by Alexander the Great (330 B.C.) that money was there struck for the first time," Ridgway, Origin of Currency, p. 218 (where this reference should be added to the note on the Persian issue). 8. νῦν. Undoubtedly at the date when our author was writing this passage: but was that the date? Cp. Introduction, § 16, L. 9. αἰτίη. The offence of Aryandes was apparently a double one (1) coining, (2) disturbing the relations of the imperial coinage by the extreme purity of his silver. Rawlinson argues that there would be no need of any other charge: but as Blakesley points out the position of Dareios was long insecure, and the story of Oroetes 3. 127 f. suggests that roundabout methods were employed for suppressing formidable satraps. However the ἀλλαχία was probably the true one, as the mere coinage of silver was probably not an offence, though the coinage of gold would have been high treason. (Cp. Gardner, Types, pp. 8, 26, B. Head, Historia, 669 f.) As usual Hdt. is complete master of the king’s mind (cp. s. 1 supra), but the logic of the passage is not very close: the coinage might have been taken as a symptom of a rebellious intention. In Hdt.’s conception, perhaps, Dareios was jealous of the purity of the satrap’s silver. No Aryandes have been as yet identified by the numismatists, B. Head, i.e. 167. 1. τότε. Opposed to ὑπήρχο χρόνο previous s. ad finit. 2. κατοικτήρια. There was probably as much policy as of pity in it: nor is it likely that the mission of the Herald was confined to the bare question given below: anyway our author quickly enlarges the project of Aryandes into a wholesale conquest of Libya. In this consideration he finds an excuse for the excursions on the Libyan, their land and life, which follows (cc. 168-199). Cp. u. s. 146 supra, and Introduction, p. xxxii. στρατάν... ὡσποτά. That Egypt was left literally denuded of soldiers is not likely, but the supposed scale of the
expedition swells the triumph of the Greeks in Libya.

3. ναυτικον. The employment of the fleet, if indeed there was a fleet, is noticeable: information as to its composition would have been interesting; the other, as another fleet was ex hypothesi serving against Scythia. The ships may have been manned by native Egyptians, cp. 7. 89, or the vessels may have been Phoenician, cp. 3. 17, 19. It is not inconceivable that some Greeks may have served; in any case the command is in the hands of a Persian, cp. 7. 97. Such divided and coequal commands were not calculated to ensure success, cp. the anecdote c. 203 infra, and the case of the Naxian expedition, 5. 32, 33. Were there other Persians in the force beside the commanders? Cp. 200 infra. Both commanders are Persians, though one has an Egyptian name, which is remarkable, and even suspicious. On Maraphil and Pasargadae, cp. 1. 125. Polybaeus, 7. 29, reports a siege of Barke by a Persian Arsames, who may be the Amasias of this passage, but the circumstances are different (see Appendix XII.).

8. πάρθηκοι. Yet according to the obviously imperfect story of his conduct (cc. 162-164) the Barkalians had nothing much to complain of. Ἀρμ. sect. Stein.

168. Οὐκένοι δὲ κατὰ τὰδε Ἀργοῖν. ἀπὸ Ἀγαύτου ἀρξάμενοι

the parallel belt of Oases inland: the third (cc. 191-196) on Western Libya. The remaining passages of the excursus (cc. 197, 198, 199) contain some general remarks, and bring the historian back to Kyrene. What relation this excursus, which is apparently from a source or sources other than the preceding and succeeding history of Kyrene, bears to other parts of Hdt.’s work, and whether all portions of the excursus were composed and inserted at the same time, are questions which must be raised, even if no definite answers are forthcoming, cp. Appendix XII. Blakesley has suggested that Hdt.’s information is based on “merchants’ stories,” and further discriminates between the information gained by concert traders (cc. 168-180) and the information based on corvæarum (cc. 181 ff.). This suggestion obviously corresponds to the character of the material. It does not follow that Hdt. collected information or compiled results from these different sources at one time or in one place, nor that this ethnographic excursus was part of his original draft of the Persian dealings with Kyrene. It appears on internal evidence to have been written (or revised) not merely after his visit to Egypt (cc. 165, 150, 181, 186), but also after his settlement in Thurii (cp. c. 195 infra). If the passage (cc. 165-180) might have been composed from information collected in Egypt (cp. 2. 32, 33), the last portion of the excursus (cc. 191-196, or 199) has the appearance of being derived from western (Italiot, Siceliot) sources. The
πρῶτον Ἀδυρμαχίδαι Λιβύων κατοικεῖται, οἵ νόμοις μὲν τὰ πλέον Ἀγυπτίοισι χρέωνται, ἐσθήτα δὲ φορέοντο οἵνη περὶ οὗ ἄλλοι Λιβύες, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν σέλινων περὶ ἑκατέρρη τῶν κυριμάτων φορέονται χάλκεων· τὰς κεφαλὰς δὲ κομόσκων, τῶν 5 φθείρας ἐπεάν λάβοντα τούς ἱερὰς ἑκάστῃ ἀντίδεκας καὶ οὗτο ῥύστε. οὗτο δὲ μοῦνοι Λιβύων τοῦτο ἐργάζονται, καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ μοῦνος τὰς παρθένους μελλόντας συνοικεῖς ἔπειδεικνύονται· ἢ δὲ ἀν τῷ βασιλεί ἀρέστη γένεται, ὑπὸ τούτου διαπρᾶβευεται, παρῆκανος δὲ οὗτο οἱ Ἀδυρμαχίδαι ἀπ' Ἀγυπτίων μέχρι Λιμένον τοῦ ὀνόματι Πλωνύς ἔστε. τοῦτον δὲ ἔχονται Γιλσπάρμων, οἱ μένονοι 169

passage on the Oases (cc. 181-185), starting as it does from Egypt, may be thought to be due to an Egyptian (Græco-Ég.) source: but the great geographical blunder by which the parallel of Thebes is substituted for that of Memphis, the excessive symmetry in the oases and zones, and the zone-theory itself point to western ideas. (Cp. Appendix XII.) It must also be remembered that Hdt. was not the first author who described Libya in prose.

1. Ἀρχαῖον (cc. 17 supra ἄρα τοῦ Ἐρέφανταίων εἰς), ἀρχαῖον is here de trop. The Adyrmachidae are mentioned by Skylax, Strabo and others, and placed by them in substantially the same positions as by Hdt. As Hdt. however does not mention the Marmaridæ, the chief tribe in these parts according to Skylax, Strabo, and Ptolemy, Rawlinson would identify them with the Gilgamæas. See next c.

2. τὰ πλέον Ἀρχαῖοντες. Skylax places the Adrymarchides within the Egyptian frontier (Geogr. Ì. i. p. 81), making Libya begin from the Canopic mouth of the Nile: even so, we may suspect that the Egyptian influence is overstated, if the habits described were really still in force.


8. βασιλεῖ. 'chief.' With his reputed privilege, Bœhr and Rawlinson compare the mediaeval Droit de cuissage or de culage (ius primæ noctis). See references in Bœhr: Saint-Martin adds that the custom still obtains among Berbers south of Atlas, op. c. p. 43. Cp. also Westernarch, History of Human Marriage, pp. 72 ff., p. 539.

11. Πλωνύς. There is some doubt about the identity of this place. Skylax (op. c. p. 82, § 108), places it two days' sail west of Apis, which with him marks the western limit of Egypt and of the Adrymarchides. Rawlinson admits the identification with the Panormos of Ptolemy—Port Bardesh. (Ptol. 4, 5, 4). K. Neumann (Nordafrika nach Herodot. 1892) remarks that the great Katasthumos (Akabet el Kabira) would form a natural frontier and support Hdt. against Skylax, but is also prepared to allow that each may have been right in his own time. (Hdt. does not in general allow for any changes between his own time and the time of the story, cp. Introduc- tion, p. lv.)

169. 1. Γιλσπάρμα is a form restored from Steph. Byz. The MSS. vary between θαλγάρμα, γιγάρμα, γργάρμα (γργάρμα, as quoted in note to Steph. B. ed. Berkelin). One editor of Steph. B. gives Γιλσπάρμα. "Pour un nom dont la signification est encore inconnue, il est bon de recueillir les variantes" (Saint-Martin). The name is not found except as apparently quoted from Hdt. The locality corresponds to the Marmaridæ of Ptolemy, occupied by several small tribes. The Periplus of Skylax places the Marmaridæ next the Adrymarchides and extends them to Hesperides, Rawlinson identifies the Gilgamæas with the Marmaridæ:
Saint-Martin suggests that in the word Marmaridae we have the name of the Berbers. R. Neumann suggests that Adyphacholidae and Gigilammadas (sic) are subdivisions of Marmaridae (op. c. p. 18)—a remark favoured by the statement regarding their φωνή, ἀσφαλέσθαι.

2. ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ. Between Plynos and Aphrodias, χώραν ἔσχεν Ἣδη Ἰ. Stein.

The island Aphrodias is identified by Rawlinson with Leia, a small island due north of Kyrene, off Apollonia. To the east lie Aziris, Platea, Portus Menelaeos. According to Skylax, Menelaeos is two days' sail west of Plynos; from Menelaeos to Platea (Πλάτεα) upwards of two days. Whether Ἦδη correctly conceives the order of the places named is not apparent, owing to his mentioning first the islands, and then the places on the mainland. Menelaeos, Platea, Aziris, Aphrodias represent the order from E. to W. On Aziris op. c. 157 supra. The name Menelaeos suggests a tradition which would carry the acquaintance of the Hellenes with Libya back into heroic times. Cp. 2. 118, Ω. 4. 351 ff.

5. τὸ στέφανον. Too well-known in the historian's time to require description, hence the article; as we might say the potato, 'the tobacco-plant.' The wealth of Kyrene and the Battisades was largely due to the export of this simple, valuable as a drug and as a condiment. Cp. the proverb τὸ Βάρτου στέφανον Aristoph. Πινδος 925, and Schol. ad l. It appears on the coins of Kyrene and Barca (vid. Gardner, Tyrees, P. iii. 27, ix. 29, 30). In Plyn's time it was extinct at Cyrene though still found elsewhere (Nat. H. 22, 48). Strabo mentions its malicious destruction by the nomads 857. It is believed to exist now in the Cyamantes as azteca, in a degenerate form. See further notes ad l. in Baehr and Rawlinson, R. Neumann, op. c. pp. 146-151. The name was probably Libyan (slipah), cp. Studniczka, Kyrene, pp. 7, 12.

6. τοῦ στόματος τ. Σ. What can the mouth of the Syrtis' mean? Rawlinson (ad l.) recognises that Ἦδη knows of but one Syrtis, the Greater; the expression here used generates an idea that Ἦδη thought vaguely of the Syrtis as a river. The phrasology here and in c. 173 ἀσφαλέσθαι lends colour to the suggestion. The gender of ἄσφαλτος (ὁ) is against such a notion, but might be paralleled by ἅ Ἆνωθεν.

170. 1. Ἐρυθρά. Cp. 5. 49.
2. ὑπὲρ, 'to the south of'—marks the writer's point of view, as that of Greeks, it might be in Kyrene, or in Europe. The form Ἀσβόστατα is supported by Kallimachos (of Kyrene) Hymn to Apollo, 760 Ἀσβόστατα γαῖας, and by Steph. Byz. Saint-Martin suggests that the tribe survives in the Gezibda, a division of the Toub, in the desert east of Fezzan, to which they were presumably driven by the Arab conquerors. In the historian's time the Asystaeas appear as the tribe most affected by the Hellenic colony: they perhaps supplied the Periokoi mentioned cc. 159, 161 supra.

4. τερπωτὸβατα. Ἦδη. does not say here that they learnt the practice from the Greeks, and c. 159 ἀσφάλεσθαι he makes exactly the opposite statement: see note ad l.
171. 1. Αὐχήσαια. The sites of Barka, Euhesperides, Tauchira and Kyrene which are all ascertained, and exhibited on the proper maps, define the position of the Anechiae (Anechiae, Steph. B. L.) V. de Saint-Martin compares the OUTCATA, a berber tribe located on the Syrtis by the Arabian historian Ibn Khaldoun.

3. Βάκαλες. There is a respectable variant Kábalis (which Holder adopts): Rawlinson identifies them with the Cabyles of Algeria: Ptolemy 4. 7. 35 has a district BAKALIS in Aethiopia.

5. χέρωται. Subject is Αὐχήσαια.

172. 2. Νασαμώνες. The Nasamones were evidently one of the most important and best known of the Libyan tribes, and the ancient geographers agree generally in the position assigned to them. (See Rawlinson ad l.) The Romans, however, appear to have wished to push them inland, or at least to chastise them for their 'wrecking' practices. (Vasta Nasamon populator Syrtis, Sil. Ital. 1. 408. Cp. Lucan 9. 432 ff.) Josephus and Eusebius record Roman expeditions against them (Bull. Jud. 2. 16, Chron. p. 378, ed. Maior). Saint-Martin (to whom the above references are due) argues from Ptolemy 4. 5, 21, 30 that in Ptolemy's time the Nasamones were diminished and confined to the interior. They are mentioned (he adds) in the middle of the 6th century in the Johannes of Corippus as rising against the dominion of Constantineople with numerous other Libyan tribes under native chiefs. A little later they pass under the Arab dominion, and Saint-Martini finds them again in the,Nefedowa of the writers, especially Ibn Khaldoun (end of 14th century), a name comprising a number of berber tribes south and west of the Syrtes.

3. Αὐχύλα, one of the best ascertained spots in the Herodotean geography of Libya, the name and place remaining unchanged to the present day. Herodotus was the first European who visited the Andjelah, in 1798, apparently without describing it in detail; Pauchon visited it in 1826 and guarantees the fidelity of Hot's description; Hamilton (Wanderings in North Africa, 1856, c. xiv.) describes Anglia (sic) and thinks that the name formerly included a group of cases, the most important of which is Jalo, 28 miles or eight hours E.S.E. from Angila (op. c. p. 191). The date is still the staple of the country.

5. ἀπώριεντες, future. c. 132 infra.

5. ἀπελαθόντες, Attic ἀπέλαθας, 'a kind of locust without wings' L. & S. Cp. Pliney, Nat. H. 29. 29 locustarum minimae sine penis quos atticabes vocant. Locustae are specified as lawful food for Muhammadans. (Hughes' Notes on Muhammadanism, p. 144.) Arrian, Indica, 29, describes a preparation of dried fish similar to that here described (cit. apud Baehr). ēri seems superfluous, and inessential (ἐτέρα ἐπὶ εἰς ἐκάστατος). If it is retained with β (Holder) against α it is of course to be understood in times. The marriage customs are probably not quite accurately described by Herodotus; in fact the passage which follows is not free from confusion. Polygamy and Promiscuity are hardly reconcilable, and the ceremony, paralleled from the practice of the Massogeans (1. 216), suggests rather polyandry than polygyny. The marriage custom further specified (πρῶτον μὲν κτλ.) also resembles a polyandrous custom. Strabo 783 (apud
αὐτήν τιν όλην καταλέγει καὶ ἐπειτὶ ἡ γάλα ἐπιτάσσωντες πίνουσι. γυναίκας δὲ νομίζοντες πολλὰς ἦσσον ἐκάστος ἐπιλειον εἰς τὴν μέζην ποιεῖται τρόπῳ παραπλησίας τῇ καὶ Μασαγέτας ἔτεων σκίπωνα συντρήσωνται, μᾶζονται. πρῶτον δὲ γεγομένος Νασαμόνος ἄνδρος νόμος ἐστὶ τὴν νύφην νυκτὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διὰ πάντων διεξελθεῖν τῶν δαιμονίων μεγαλόμενην· τῶν δὲ ὡς ἐκατός οἱ μαχηθὲς, διδυμὸς δόρον τὸ ἄξον περιέμενος ἐξ ὀδοὺ ἀρχαῖος ἤτοι καὶ μαντικὴ χρέωνται τούτῳ ὁμολογοῦν μὲν τοὺς παρὰ σφιάν ἄνδρας δικαιοτάτους καὶ ἀρίστους λαγωνικούς·

173 Νασαμόνοι δὲ προσώπων εἰς Πύλλον, οὐτὸν ἑξαπολωλάς τρόπῳ τοιαύτῃ· ὁ νόμος σφί πνεύμα ἢ ἄνωμος τὰ ἐπιτα οὐδὲν ἐξήνυθε, ἢ δὲ χώρῃ σφί ἀπασα ἐντὸς ἐνώπια τῆς Σύρτισι πάντως ἢ ἄνδρος·

Bachr) mentions a similar practice among the Arabians. Cp. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, p. 133. The three particulars mentioned by ΗδΤ. reduce themselves to a misconception of a community of wifes, or of a wife, among a (small) number of kinsmen, instances of which are common. It is possible, however, to combine practices of polyandry and polygyny: "a Nair may be in one of several combinations of husbands." see further, H. Spencer, Principles of Sociology (vol. 1. pt. iii. cc. iii.-viii.) and Westermareck, op. cit. cc. iv. v. 4. and esp. p. 72.

10. ἐπιρρέονται, λέγει οὐκ οἷον καλλίτεχνος. In 1. 216 τῆς ἡμέρας. The absence of the concretion in this passage betrays perhaps the indefiniteness of Hdt.'s authority. Or are the words ἐκέντα .. μᾶζοντα a mere gloss?

18. ἐκ τῆς χαρᾶς. Shaw, History i. 393 (Bachr) records a similar custom obtaining in the marriage ceremony in Algiers.

19. oὐκεπάγωμε. The Mahometan law of ablation allows sand to be used where water cannot be procured," Rawlinson.

173. 1. προσώπων εἰς καὶ περιεργασία constitute a contradiction: that the fault lies with the latter term seems demonstrated by the frequent mention of the Peyli in subsequent authors, esp. Strabo: and that Hdt. himself does not believe in their extermination seems indicated in his quasi-reference to the source of the statement λέγω τὰ ναῦτα τὰς Λέγυσιν Αίβες. Cp. Introduction, § 22. According to Pliny (7. 2) it was the Nasamones (not the Nots) which nearly exterminated the Peyli. Rawlinson rationalises the story by combining the wind and the Nasamones. The tribe of Peyli was specially renowned for snake-charming. Pliny, loc. c. Aelian, de nat. am. 16. 27.

3. ἐν τῶν τῆς Σύρτις. Cp. ἔντος Ἀλη οἰσταμάτου 1. 6. μέρος τοῦ στόματος τῆς Σύρτις. cp. 109 πυργία and note. The gender of Σύρτις would forbid the addition of στόματος here. In any case ἔντος is equivalent to 'East of . . .' in this passage: the writer is proceeding west-
wards. The Psylli are placed east of the Nasamonos by Strabo, 383. Maps erroneously place them to the west, as though ἐνθέωσι here merely meant south, or perhaps "not extending (W.) beyond..."

4. λέγοντο. This phrase is no guarantee that Hdt. had not read the story in the Períodos of Hekataios, much less that he had conversed with 'Libyans' on the subject; or with other Greeks, who cited Libyans as their authority. But even 'Libyans' Hdt. might have met in Egypt, or in Sicily, or the west. Cp. 7. 165. The specification of the source here invalidates the testimony. Cp. c. 187 infra. Introduction, § 22.

174. Ταράμαντες. These Garamantes are a truly pacific folk, who though dwelling ἐν τῷ θηριώδει do not know how to defend themselves except by flight. Unfortunately a tribe of Garamantes appears in c. 183 infra with very different qualities: are they the same, is the reading correct? Eustathios and Steph. B. both read Garamantes here. Larcher supposes two tribes of the same name but different habits! Pliny and Mela ascribe the pacific peculiarities here predicated of the Garamantes to a tribe of Gamphasantes. R. Neumann would boldly read Gamaphantas here (op. cit. pp. 21 ff.). Blakeley conjectures that Hdt. draws from two different sources, and his authority here mistook the Troglydote Tibboes, who in c. 183 are said to be hunted by the Garamantes, for the hunters. Saint-Martin suggests that the Garamantes here referred to are to be sought in the Wady Gadama three or four days south of Tripoli. Even if we could make Gadama out of this, we should not save the credit of Hdt.'s description of the people, which appears to fit only the Troglydotes c. 183 infra. See note ad l.c. The conclusion to which we are driven is that Hdt. could make or leave contradictory or inconsequent statements in his text, almost in juxtaposition, without becoming conscious of the trouble he was providing for his friends. No one has ventured to reconcile Hdt.'s statements about the Garamantes by the supposition of a wholesale degeneration, such as the Lydians underwent (1. 79, 155 f.), or by the hypothesis that they are described in this passage from the Greek point of view and in c. 183 from the Troglydote point of view: such subtleties are less probable than the simple conclusion that Hdt. sometimes blundered, or slumbered.

175. τὸ ἐν τῇ παραθάλσαν. The Makaé come next to the Nasamonos on the littoral.

3. λόφους κείροντας. A sort of talic predication: 'so as to produce crests.'

5. στροβύθων καταγωγῶν, στροβύθος καταγωγή, στροβύθος καταγωγή, =στροβύθωνκαταγωγή, an ostrich: not now found north of the desert. R. Neumann, op. c. p. 160.

6. Κύνης. The extraordinary fertility of the Kýrýpes is celebrated c. 198 infra, cp. 5. 42. There is however some difficulty in identifying the river or the Hill of the Graces with any modern features. The Gharian range of mountains is only four or five miles from the sea: the only stream answer-
ing to the Kinepes is the Wady Mgrur-Ghirn, an insignificant brook. Has the face of nature changed, or was Hdt. ill-informed? The simplest solution is the hypothesis that Hdt. was mistaken, or misinformed, as to the length of the stream. Cp. R. Neumann, op. c. p. 25.

176. 2. Gı̇ndanes. With the practice of the Gindanes may be compared certain customs in Thibet as described by Marco Polo, Bk. 2, c. 45 (vol. ii. p. 35, and note* Yule, ed.).

3. de λέγεται. Hdt. appears to have doubts in regard to his information. Cp. c. 173 supra. Introduction, § 23. It is obvious that the wearing of leathern anklelets, or bracelets, may be a fact, though the reason given may be a fiction. Anyway metal would presumably have been worn, if the wearers could have afforded it. Cp. c. 168 supra. The Gindanes must have been a poor folk; or was it only the poor among them who wore leather rings?

177. 2. Δωτοφάγος. Lotophagi is obviously only a Greek epithet as old as Homer (Od. 9. 84) derived from the staple food of the tribe; the native name is generally supposed to be lost. Pliny, indeed, gives Atrachroas as the name of the lotos-eaters (Hist. nat. 5. 4), and this has been identified with the name of the next tribe mentioned by Hdt., the Machlyes or Machryes (V. de Saint-Martin, op. c. p. 54), who also eat the lotos. May we not infer that Hdt. or his authority here has duplicated the lotos-eating Machlyes? Rawlinson, however, seems to identify the Lotophagi with the Gindanes, about whose identity there is some doubt. In any case an epithet has been raised into a separate tribal appellative, cp. cc. 106, 107 supra. The country of the Lotophagi is to be recognised in the promontory of Zarae near the lesser Syriss (Rawlinson). Neumann's objections, op. cit. p. 26, do not touch the topographical identification, but only the supposition that the Lotos-land is to be restricted to the peninsula, of which neither Rawlinson nor even Hdt. is guilty. In 2. 96 the Kyrenanean lotos is described as resembling a thorn-tree: in 2. 92 the Egyptian lotos is described as an edible water-lily, Rawlinson's note enumerates six different plants to which the name was applied; the lotos here referred to he identifies with the Rhamnus Zizyphus, which "looks and tastes rather like a bad crab-apple." Hdt. says it is sweet as a date. Perhaps it has degenerated even as the silphium. The passage on the lotos in Rennell, Geogr. Syst. of Hist. ii. pp. 282-299, is worth consulting. Also Excursus I. to Pliny, Nat. Hist. xiii. ed. Lemaire, curante L. Desfontaines, Paris, 1829.

4. σχέινον, lentisk-tree. Pliny 15. 32 (17) describes a paste and a wine, made from the lotos, a description based perhaps in part on the authority of Polybios, direct, or through Cornelius Nepos. Cp. Atheneaues, 651 (= Polyb. xii. ii. ed. Didot, p. 562), who remarks that Polybios had seen the Lotos.
Μάχλες, το λατινό μὲν καὶ οὖντα χρέωμενοι, ἀταρ ἡσών γε τῶν πρώτων λεγόντων, κατήκουσα δὲ ἐπὶ ποταμῶν μέγαν τῷ οὐρομα Τρίτων ἐστὶ· ἐκδοῦν δὲ οὖντος ἐκ λίμνης μεγάλην Τριτώνιδα· ἐν δὲ αὐτῇ νήσος ἐν τῇ οὐρομα Φα. ταύτης δὲ τὴν νήσοι Δακεδαίων μονοίσιοι φασὶ λόγον εἶναι κτίσαι· ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ λόγος λεγόμενος, 179

3. κατήκουσα δὲ κτλ. The geographical details of this c. give rise to considerable difficulties; the first, as to the identification of “Lake Tritonis.” This difficulty is obviated by the supposition that the so-called Lake includes (a) the lesser Syrtis, unknown or unnamed by Hdt. and (b) an inland lake in the neighbourhood, which once communicated with the Syrtis. The name of this lake is given as Shibk-el-Lowdeath (Rawl.), Shibka-Leoudal (Saint-Martin), al. Chot el-Kebir. A parallel case, of an inland sea called Μαΐνα, we have in the Μαΐνα Μαυρίνα. An alternative supposition must be reckoned with, viz. that this passage in the geography of Hdt. is still in the speculative and imaginary stage, and that there is a lake in Libya because a lake is wanted for the procession in c. 180. The second difficulty is more serious, yet more easily disposed of. There is no ‘great’ stream or river in those parts to-day: there are only riuvelts losing themselves in the sands of the lake. Rawlinson endorses Rennell on the subject. (Cp. Rennell, ii. 2 pp. 335 f.) The river again may be a mythical river, or it may be wanted to divide the Machilies and Ausseus. A third difficulty is created by the oracular island. The island of Phila, if it ever existed, is now part of the sandy tract between the lagoons and the sea. K. Neumann, op. c. pp. 28-30, discusses the above problems at length, and though he considers that the data in Hdt. (and Skylax) are too precise and full (einsehend) to be mere invention, he proves that the Triton Lake and River cannot be satisfactorily identified with the actual features, that they are bequests of the strictly mythological period, and that the later and better-informed geographers move the Lake on to the Atlantic (Diodorus) or back to Kyrene (Strabo), though Ptolemy, most precise and misleading of all, gives latitude and longitude for Lake and River, very much where Hdt. seems to place them.

6. φασὶ, who? Delphic authorities? Or men of Thera, or of Kyrene, who were concerned to push their interests under Lakedaemonian auspices? Or Sikeliots, who might be dreaming of attacking Carthage on its native soil? In any case the tradition of such an oracle carries us back to the days of Lakedaemonian expansion (cp. 1. 69, 70, 3. 47), before the Spartans were open to the taunts current in Hdt.’s own day, 8. 132 ἀνθρακότα, for it is hardly explicable as satiric.

κτίσαι is mistranslated by Rawl. “were to have colonised.” The aor. inf. κτίσαι represents the direction of the oracle in the imperative (cp. Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, § 23, note 2). Try. “They say the Lacedaemonians were hidden by an oracle colonise this island,” or, “an oracle, they say, bade the Lacedaemonians colonise this island.”

179. 1. ἐςτὶ δὲ καὶ δὲς λόγος λεγόμενος. Rawlinson who begins with a mistranslation (“The following is the story as it is commonly told”) is content to show, following Grote, from the variety of the modes of bringing Jason to Lake Tritonis, “the unreal and poetic character of the entire narrative.” This however does not suggest the significance, the moral, of the poem. Blakesley, n. 463, sees that the mythical story was used to justify actual policy; but he stops short of suggesting that the myth was invented to justify the occupation of Libya. The story of Jason’s visit to Libya is told by Pindar, Pyth. 4, as of course afterwards by Apollon. Rhod. Cp. ἰνθρακὸς. In Pindar’s version of the myth there are two important variants from the version in Hdt. (1) the visit is paid on the way home, whereas in Hdt. the visit is involuntary,
paid on the outward voyage, or rather on a voyage to Delphi. (2) In Pindar Triton gives the Argonaut Emphemus (ancestor of Bates) a clog of Libyan earth, while in Hdt.'s version Triton receives from Jason a tripod, and promptly puts it to its Delphic use, divines on it, and foretells to Jason and his crew the whole story, i.e. truth (τὸν πάντα λόγον). Had the exaggerated hopes of Hellenic colonisation in Libya ever been more nearly realised doubtless the old tripod of Jason's would have been forthcoming. An unfulfilled prophecy is specially precious to the student as showing that all oracles are not to be dismissed as satio in post eventum. Where Hdt. got this story it is not easy to say: Rawlinson indeed remarks, "Hdt. is here only reporting the story as it was told by some poet"; but the bourn of Jason's voyage suggests a Delphic source. In Diod. (4. 56) Triton is enumerated into a king of the country. The symbolic clog of earth re-appears in one of the foundation legends of Thera; according to which Euphemos, after receiving the clog from Triton, threw it into the sea where it became Kalliste (Thera). Apollon. Rh. Argonaut. 4. 1549 ff., 1758 ff.

180. Αὐσεῖς. The Auseeans are also untraceable. Rawlinson suggests a possible identity with the Anseerian Synesius: Saint-Martin finds them again in the Johannes of Corippus 2. 58 Antilen patria non mollior Ausis (patria non mollior ausis, Bekker).

4. ὅρτῃ ἡ Εἰνανίη. There follows a description of the annual festival with which Athenian Tritonis is worshipped by the Ausean maidens, consisting of (1) a procession, (2) a worry between two companies. The words τὴν ἀσφαλήν, ἀεί ζωήν, τ. ἐσ. στάντε ἐπειδὴ ἡ Εἰνανίη, οἱ δὲ Αὐσεῖς τὰ ἐμπροσθε. ὅρτῃ ἡ Εἰνανίη
doubt by the evidence of the 'Corinthian helm' and 'Hellenic panoply,' with which the whole, chosen to personate the goddess (ep. story of Phya, 1. 66), was equipped. This theory Hdt. apparently sets himself to combat. If the cult was native and primitive, the question arose, what arms were employed before the advent of the Hellenes? To solve this difficulty Hdt. expressly offers a conjecture of his own: the damsel was equipped in Egyptian armour. For this belief he gives a very unfortunate reason, viz. his own theory that the Greek δσπτς and κρατς were introduced from Egypt. The evidence of the monuments is against this theory (Rawlinson and Stein ad l.), and it is inconsistent with the story of the Bronzemen which Hdt. himself tells 2. 152. It may be observed that Hdt. uses the two terms κυκλα (gales) and κρατς (cassis) as equivalent; had he used them with a consciousness of their originally distinct meanings, he might have hit upon a theory that would have squared with the theory c. 189 συντρα that the snakes of the aigis were originally leather thongs. Why Hdt. supposes that the Libyan goddess had Egyptian armour before she had Grecian is not clear: not, surely, by such a syllogism: Greek armour originally came from Egypt, this is Greek armour, ergo, it was originally Egyptian! More probably he supposes that Egyptian influences once extended as far as Lake Tritonis; for he nowhere betrays any knowledge of the Libyan regime in Egypt. (Op. Appendix XII.) Anyway, if a native war-goddess was worshipped by the Auseans she was no doubt armed with native weapons. But on the shore of the lesser Syrtis we are already within the limits of the Carthaginian influence, and it may be conjectured that in this daughter of Poseidon and Tritonis we have a Libyan-Phoenician deity not to be distinguished from Astarte. (This appears to be Baehr's view too; cp. his German translation, note ad l.1) or at least that there was a syncretism between a Punic and Libyan cult, before the Greek influence, if ever, was added. If a Corinthian helmet was used on the lesser Syrtis the probability is that it was imported via Syracuse.

12. κυκλα. How the procession could go round a lake, which, according to his own showing, is an arm of the sea and has a large river flowing into it, Hdt. omits to explain. The account of the ritual may have come from one source, and the geography from another.

19. μεξυ δε. On the supposed customs cp. note c. 172 συντρα. Aristotle may have had this passage in mind when he criticised Plato's Communitas, Pol. 2. 3, 9, 1262a.
181. 2. ἡ θηριόδης Δισβόη. The sky and peacable Garamantes have been described as dwelling in the θηριόδη Δισβόη, c. 174 supra. There are according to Hdt. (or the authorities followed by him) three or rather four belts in Libya: διαραβαλλασσα (Δισβόη), διαραβάτης, δραγή φύκης extending all across the continent, and finally ἡ ἀσσομος. The most northern or seacoast belt is divided, by the river Triton, into an eastern section inhabited by Nomads, and a western, inhabited by Husabandmen, c. 191 infra. In the present chapter Hdt. (having described the population of the Nomad section of the northern belt, cc. 169-160, and of the second belt so far as inhabited c. 174) proceeds to describe the chain of Oases in the sandy ridge, from Thebes to the Pillars of Herakles: oddly enough he does not use the term Oasis, except once as a proper name, 3. 26. Almost every feature in this geographical scheme is an exaggeration or a defect. Rawlinson, indeed, defends Hdt. from Niebuhr's criticism, and asserts that there are in fact three (sic) tracts which stretch across the continent from Egypt to the Atlantic ocean, first the coast tract, comparatively fertile; next, the hill-region (sic), "which especially in its more western (sic) parts is greatly infested with wild beasts"; thirdly, the Great Sahara. But Rawl. admits that these distinctions are to a greater extent fanciful, and the most to be said for Hdt. is that his artificial scheme had some relation to natural facts. For a description of the Libyan desert, or eastern portion, see Keith Johnston's Africa (Stanford) pp. 104-107, from which it will be seen that the apologetics of Heeren and Rawlinson go too far. As a matter of fact the zone-theory suits western Libya (esp. Algeria) better than the region from Egypt to Carthage: and might have been thence derived. Rawlinson appears also to go too far (with Heeren) in extolling the virtues of Hdt.'s description of the caravan route, and in defending Hdt. on the ground that he only says the stations are separated by "about" (μαλακα) ten days' journey each from the next. Rawlinson overlooks the fact that in the details Hdt. separates the stations by exactly ten days. Cp. infra.

3. ἀπὸ Θηβῶν τῶν Δισβότων ἐν Ἰρακλείου στήλαις. The terminus a quo and the terminus ad quem here mentioned are both puzzling. Not Thebes but Memphis should be the point of departure (cp. note above), and the Pillar of Herakles suggest a voyage rather than a desert journey. The passage looks as though it were based on the information gathered by Hanno: who touched the desert a day's voyage short of Kerne, Periplus 3 (Geogr. Mec. i. p. 6), cp. c. 105 infra. Did Hdt. conceive the line here indicated as a diagonal? Or had he no very clear conception in the matter at all, and did he use the 'Pillars' simply to suggest the far west? The phraseology in c. 185 infra seems to show that by the Pillars he means the meridian of the Pillars. But even so, the chain of Oases is too far extended, and this description takes no account of the mountains of Algeria and Morocco. This δραγή φύκης must be a combination, or indulgence, based upon several particulars, starting from the sandy desert bordering on Egypt, perhaps connected with the 'hill-region,' mentioned by Rawlinson as corresponding to Hdt.'s θηριόδη, but all exaggerated and systematised, like other features in Hdt.'s Libya. As a matter of fact the oases of Siweh and Aužila are not on a sandbank but each in a hollow. Cp. K. Johnston's Africa, p. 106.

4. μαλακα. Rawlinson emphasises this word, as though Hdt. did not intend to make the intervals exactly ten days, overlooking the fact that the historian separates the particular places named infra by exactly ten days' journey each from the next. Should not the μαλακα here then be taken with the preceding words ἐν δὲ τῇ δραγῇ ταύτῃ?
'On this sandbank roughly speaking, at intervals of ten days' journey.'

5. ἄλος. Salt is found in patches, sometimes in extended tracts, in North Africa, and springs occasionally rise in their midst, but as Rawlinson admits 'the general character of these salt-tracts is rather of plains than of hills.' We have in fact here apparently again a confusion and an exaggeration, the cases are identified with salt patches, and the salt patches are endowed with springs, and the springs are elevated on conspicuous hills at intervals of ten days' journey. R. Neumann, who remarks that Hdt. can never have set eyes on an oasis, suggests that Hdt. placed the springs on hill-tops for two reasons: (1) that situation is common in Greece, (2) the sand had to be kept out of the springs (Nordafrika, p. 86 ff).

8. πρότεροι μὲν ἀπὸ Θηβῶν διὰ δέκα ἡμέρων ὃδον 'Αμμώνιον. The Ammonium is identified with the oasis of Siweh. Siweh is at least twenty days' journey from Thebes. The ordinary caravan route is from Memphis, which is in the same latitude as Siweh, and twelve days' journey. Hdt.'s description is thus apparently in double error. Thebes was not the natural point of departure, and was at least twice as far off as he states. Saint-Martin has a far-fetched explanation of Hdt.'s error. He observes that the great oasis is seven days from Thebes, and that three days beyond the great oasis is the oasis of Dakhel. He argues that there was a sanctuary of Ammon at Dakhel. He supposes that it was against Dakhel, and not against Siweh that Cambyses directed an expedition from Thebes, 3. 26. He infers that Hdt. has confused the Ammonium of Siweh with the Ammonium of Dakhel, which is twenty days' journey distant. He thus recovers twenty days for the Itinerary of Hdt. and leaves Thebes as the starting point. But it is easier to believe that Hdt. was in error in making Thebes the point of departure. He might more naturally have done so as the god Ammon was from Thebes. R. Neumann (op. c. p. 99) explains the error in Hdt. by the hypothesis that he had enquired of the priests in Thebes (sic) the distance of the oasis of Ammon (meaning Siweh), and that they gave him the distance to the temple of Ammon at Dachel (sic).

10. οὐ καὶ πρότερον, 2. 42. τὸ σεολ. Stein, 14. τε καὶ. For the co-ordination, cf. 198 infra.

19. ἡ κρήνη κ. ἦλον. "The supposed variation in the temperature of the water is an illusion of the senses produced by the changes of the atmospheric temperature." (Saint-Martin). This, however, will hardly account for the ἐν ἀμμολάδῃ, which Wilkinson apud Rawl. explains as a mistaken inference from the numerous bubbles which rise in these sulphureous ponds. The bubbles would presumably rise at all times; it seems unlikely that the
gardenst were watered at the hottest moment of the day.
In marking the subdivisions of the day (or night) Herodotus does not avail himself for narrative purposes of the twelve subdivisions which, he tells us, 2. 109, the Greeks borrowed from the Babylonians (Ep., 8. 14, 9. 53, points of time). He employs a more poetical terminology (sometimes even thrillingly graphic, e.g. περὶ λέγουν ἄφες 7. 215) taken over from the daily life of the people. There are seven divisions of the day and night (4+3) here employed. With τὸ δόξων cf. ἄρα τὸ ἀρχον 1. 185, τὸ ἄρχον 2. 173 (ἄραν ἀνεκάθαρτα 7. 228, εἰ γὰρ 7. 167) with ἄγορας πληθυσμός. πληθυσμός (i.e. πληθυσμός) ἄγορας 2. 173, ἄγορας πληθυσμός 7. 228 (πρὸ τῆς ἡμέρας 9. 101) with ἀνακλωμένης τῆς ἡμέρας cf. ἀνακλωμένης τῆς μεσαμβρίας 3. 104 (διὸς 9. 101). ἅλεξ πλὴρως 8. 6, ἄφες 8. 9, 167; with διότι ὅ ἄρας cf. δύντος ἄφες 7. 149, μεσαμβρίας 3. 104, c. 113 supra, ἄφες 7. 217.

182. 4. Αὐγίλλα, c. 178 supra. Augila or Aquila is a comparatively important spot, marked on the modern maps, and well described by Hamilton, Wonders, c. xiv. Hamilton describes Jalal, 28 miles or eight hours E.S.E. from Augila, as by far the most important in this group of oases. The distance between Siweh and Augila is stated by K. Johnston as twelve days' journey; Hornemann accomplished it in nine days, at high pressure: ten days is given by Rawlinson, Saint-Martin and others as the usual local computation.
12. οἱ Γαραμάντες δὲ οὖν resuming from Γαραμάντες supra ad tunc, can need not be referred back to c. 174. It appears in fact from a comparison of the two passages that the Garamantes of c. 174 are the Troglydite Aethiopians of c. 183. The Garamantes of the passage before us may be identified with the population of Fezzan, the ancient capital of which was Garama (Djerma). The 'Aethiopians' here referred to are to be less certainly found in the Tibbus, still the victims of man-hunting raids, the slave-trade being the principal source of wealth in Fezzan. (K. Johnston, Africa, p. 100, Saint-Martin, op. c. 50.) The four-horsed chariots are out of fashion. 'Troglydites' or cave-dwellers here may suggest the Tibbus Roshade, 'Tibbus of the Rocks' (Tibodi Rèchadjèh, Saint-Martin), who however have been described by Nachtigal as rapacious, treacherous, and cruel, a character due perhaps to six centuries of suffering in the slave raids. The Tibbus are still described as fleet of foot, and their language compared to the whistling of birds: op. references in Rawlinson and Saint-Martin.

184. 3. 'Αδράντες is an emendation by Salmansius from Rhiánum, apud Steph. Byz., the MSS. all reading "Αλάατες. The name in any case looks suspiciously like a duplicate of the "Αλάατες τῆς Πίος (cp. Γαραμάντες, Γαραφάντες). It has even been suggested that the name Atlas (Atlantes, Δαραντες) is a softened form of Ἀδράντες, mountain, the chain of mountains still called by the Berbers Lădaréen, Aderéen, in the plural. (Saint-Martin, p. 60.) ἄνθρωποι. Other ancient authorities are quoted by Baehr, but a total absence of proper names is unparalleled and inconceivable. Rawlinson therefore concludes that Hdt. "probably misunderstood his informant." Stein quotes Od. 6. 552 οὗ μὲν γὰρ τις πάμπας ἄνωμος ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπον. May it not be that the report rests on a misconception of a savage taboo, or custom of silence, in regard to proper names (cp. 1. 1. 46 custom of the Karian women μὴ κοτέ ἄσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄνθρωποι μηδὲ ὀνομάτι βλέπει τῆς ἐποχῆς ἄνθρωπον): for instances and explanation of which, see Tyler, Early History of Mankind, pp. 141 ff.

5. ὑπερβαλλοντι. Some of the commentators hait between two opinions here, viz. between II. and III. in L. & S. 7 sub v. Stein's nínis wrenti seems best; in which case the passage should be placed in L. & S. under II. Rawlinson's "when the sun rises high in the heaven" is ambiguous: does it mean midday, or midsommer, or midsummer-midday? Strabo 822 describes an Aethiopian tribe, τῆς ἱέρας, ἱερακευμένης, as cursing the rising sun. "When one really feels the high temperature is when down with fever; or when fever, unknown to one, is coming on. Then, indeed, the heat becomes maddenning and insupportable; nor has the victim words to express his feelings towards
καταράωναι καὶ πρὸς τούτοις πάντα τὰ αἰσχρὰ λυοδέρονται, ὅτι σφέας καὶ τῶν ἐπιτρήσει, αὐτοὺς τε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν. μετὰ δὲ τὰ ἀλλὰς ἐκεῖ ἰμερεῖν ἄλος κολονίας ἄλος καὶ ὑδρ. καὶ ἀνθρώπου περὶ αὐτῶν οἰκεῖναι. ἔχεται δὲ τοῦ ἄλος τοῦτον ὄρος τὰ χώμαμα ἐστὶ 'Ατλαντ. ἔστι δὲ στεινὸν καὶ κυκλοτέρες πάντα, ὑψηλὸν δὲ οὗτο δὴ τι λέγεται ὅτι τὰς κορυφὰς αὐτὸς οὖς οἷς ταῖς ἐναι Ιέσσαιι οὐδὲκετο γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀπολεπίσει νέφες οὗτε βέρες οὗτε χειμῶνος. τοῦτο τὸν κίονα τοῦ υἱοῦμοι λέγουσι οἱ ἑπτάκοροι εἶναι. ἔτι τούτου τοῦ ὄρεος οἱ ἀνθρώποι οὕτω εἰπώμενοι ἐγένοντο: 15 καλῶνται γὰρ δὴ 'Ατλαντες. λέγονται δὲ οὕτως ἐμψυχον οὐδὲν αὐτόσθαντι οὗτε ἐνυπνία ὅραν.

185 Μέχρι μὲν δὴ τῶν Ἀτλαντῶν τούτων ἔχο τὰ υψωμάτα τῶν ἐν τῇ ὅρφῃ κατοικημένων καταλέξαν, τὸ δ’ ἀπὸ τούτων οἰκεῖται.


10. "Ἀτλαντ. Ἰδτ. οἱ λάστ ῥασις οὐκοτι θέας ἔν τοῦ Μούντ Ἀτλαντ, οὐκετι συν φορτι στειρου τῆς Καρθαγόνης, ή οὐ ντις Τυρίων. Τὸ δὲ χρώμα τοῦ Ατλαντικοῦ οὐκ εἶναι ἐνυπνοίος, παντὸς τῶν κύκλων τῆς οὐρανοῦ λέγονται οἱ ἑπτάκοροι εἶναι. έπι τούτου τοῦ ὄρους οἱ ἀνθρώποι οὗτος ἐπώνυμον ἐγένοντο: 15 καλοῦνται γὰρ δὴ 'Ἀτλαντες. λέγονται δὲ οὕτως ἐμψυχον οὐδὲν αὐτόσθαντι οὗτε ἐνυπνία ὅραν.

185. Μέχρι μὲν δὴ τῶν Ἀτλαντῶν τούτων ἔχο τὰ υψώματα τῶν ἐν τῇ ὅρφῃ κατοικημένων καταλέξαν, τὸ δ’ ἀπὸ τούτων οἰκεῖται.

*

---

10.  "Atlanes. Hdt.’s last oasis or station lands us at the foot of Mount Atlas, somewhat south of Carthage, or of Tunis. This description of Mount Atlas in no respect corresponds to the local facts. If there be any more than fancy in it the description might have arisen from some distorted account of the Peak of Tenerife, combined with a knowledge of mountainous ground in the west of the mainland. The region of the Atlas embraces the whole district between the Atlantic and the Syrtis minor, comprising roughly speaking Morocco, Algeria, and Tunis, and bounded on the south by the Sahara. The Atlas proper, or Great Atlas, is a lofty mountain range wholly within Morocco: there are however two lesser mountain ranges in Algeria, parallel to the coast, to which French geographers give the names of lesser and middle Atlas. The highest points attain an elevation of about 6000 feet. A third chain to the south is called by some French geographers the Great Atlas: the term Sahara Border range is to be preferred. (R. Johnston’s *Africa*, c. ii.) From a comparison of these facts with Hdt.’s statements it is plain that he is quite ignorant of the true orography of the country, and in particular moves Mount Atlas 15°-20° long. to the east, and converts it into a single peak.

11. ἐγένοντα. ἐγένοντα & οἱ ἑπτάκοροι...

16. ἐνυπνία ὅραν. The Atlanteans are vegetarians and never dream: cause and effect? That mountainous should eat no flesh is obviously improbable. Clouds, indeed, rest upon Atlas and the Atlanteans, and if not dreamers themselves, they still are the cause of dreams in others—of which the last specimen is Knöl’s *Atlantis und das Volk der Atlanten*, Leipzig, 1803, one of those works in which much learning and little judgment have combined to produce wondrous visions.

185. 2. τὸ δ’ ἀπὸ τούτων. The oasis (καλώσεις ἀλα καὶ διαμ) of the Atlanteans carries us no farther than the eastern frontiers of modern Algeria, if so far: it would be rash to identify Hdt.’s last
station with Ghadames, or with any of the oases of the Algerian Sahara (on these, see K. Johnston’s Africa, pp. 89-95).

3. δύναται δ’ ἄν. The ὀφθεῖν is practically a pigment, but the desert south of Algeria and Marocco is only bounded on the west by the ocean, and is crossed north and south, east and west, by caravan routes (see K. Johnston’s Africa, c. viii.), with stations at very irregular intervals. Ἐξω τοῦτον. A legitimate inference from this phrase is that Hdt. conceives of Libya as projecting beyond the meridian of the straits. The extension of the desert to the ocean was known to Hanno. Cp. c. 181 supra.

4. ἔστω ... οἰκοδομεῖται. Do these words introduce a fresh oasis-station, or simply—as Rawlinson takes it—resume the description of the whole line of stations? He translates: "throughout the whole distance, at the end of every ten days' journey, there is a salt-mine, with people dwelling round it." It is not indeed quite clear whether "the whole distance" means "the whole remaining distance," or the whole distance from Thbes to the Pillars of Heracles (c. 181 supra); apparently the latter. In this case Rawlinson identifies μέταλλον ἄλευ here with κολοβωθ ἄλευ in cc. 181, 182 supra; and to make his translation good we should require μέταλλα not μέταλλον. Oddly enough in his note, vol. iii. p. 160, he writes μέταλλα. The τῶνται πάντες and the τῶν ἀλ. χόρων (the latter recalling c. 181, supra) seem to support, or to have suggested, R.’s view. Stein, Blakesley and Baehr all understand the words here to refer to another (sixth) station beyond the Atlantes, and so grammatically the words must be taken; but the remark falls short of what we might expect. If the ὀφθεῖν extends beyond Mount Atlas, and beyond the Pillars, would Hdt. be content with one single station in all that remaining distance? It looks as though what he was for saying, when his heart failed him, was that throughout the remainder of the ὀφθεῖν the same rule held good as obtained as far as Atlas, viz. that at regular intervals of ten days' journey, as far as ever the sand-ridges went, were oases; or salt and fresh-water stations: he has only courage for one more station explicitly. The result is some obscurity and clumsiness: a falling between two stools. Cp. the still more conspicuous instance, 6. 57 ἐν αὐτῷ. In the ὀφθεῖν, to wit, in that part of it beyond Atlas.

5. τοῦτων πάσης. Obscure: does it refer to the inhabitants of the single station west of Atlas, just mentioned: in which case πάσης seems jejune and superfluous; or to all the inhabitants of all the salt-stations, which seems suggested by τῶν ἀλ. χόρων repeated from c. 181? As matter of fact the houses built of salt-blocks are genuine, and have been seen by modern travellers in the Libyan desert and in Fezzan (see Rawlinson) though not apparently in the western Sahara.

6. ὅσο. Even so far north. Cp. c. 191 ἐνεπλ. ταῦτα may be taken to apply to the whole parallel of the ὀφθεῖν. The remark looks suspiciously like an inference from the argument introduced by τῆς following. Cp. c. 189 ἐνεπλ. 7. ὅ ἄλ. ἄλες. Three different coloured salts are found, reddish, white, bluish: see authorities quoted by Rawlinson.

8. τῆς καλλ. This is an exaggerated account of the Sahara. Cp. K. Johnston, Africa, cc. vii. viii., though Tristram, The Great Sahara, Appendix I. (On the physical geography of the Sahara), using Sahara in a restricted sense for the sandy pasture land, distinguishes from it the Desert to the south “arid, salt, affording no sustenance to cattle or sheep, ... excepting in its rare oases, equally inhospitable to man.” The camel however catches a scanty subsistence, and there are the rare oases.
186. Οὕτω μὲν μέχρι τῆς Τριτωνίδος Λίμνης ἀπ’ Ἀλγύπτου νομάδες εἰσὶ κρεοφάγοι τε καὶ γαλακτοπόται Δίας, καὶ θηλέων τε βόσκουσιν, οὐδὲν γεωμένοι, διότι περ οὐδὲ Ἀλγύπτιοι, καὶ ὑπὲρ τρέφοντες. Βοσκοῦσιν μὲν ὑπὲρ θηλέων οὐδ’ αἱ Κυρραίων γυναίκες δικαιοῦσι 5 πατέεσθαι διὰ τὴν ἐν Ἀλγύπτῳ Ἰσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ νηστήσας αὐτή καὶ ὅταν ἐπιτελέσων’ αἱ δὲ τῶν Βαρκαίων γυναίκες οὐδὲ ὑπὸ πρὸς 187 τὰ τινα βουλὴ γενοῦνται. ταῦτα μὲν οὐδ’ οὕτω ἐξέστη τὸ δὲ πρὸς ἐστέρης τῆς Τριτωνίδος Λίμνης οὐκέτι νομάδες εἰσὶ Δίας οὐδὲ νῦνοι τοίοι αὐτοίσι χρεωμένοι, οὐδέ κατὰ ταῦτα ποιεῖται οἷον τι καὶ οἱ νομάδες ἐσώθαι ποιεῖν. οἱ γὰρ δὲ τῶν Δίαν

186. 1. οὕτω μὲν. There follows, rather abruptly, an account of the culture of the Nomad Libyans between Egypt and Lake Tritonis (cc. 186-190): geographically and ethnographically the scene shifts back to where we were in c. 180: or perhaps to the close of c. 183. As already observed cc. 184 f. seem to belong to a somewhat different stratum, and to carry us, though vaguely, far beyond the Lake Tritonis. Moreover κρεοφάγοι is inapplicable to the "Δαλαρτες" of c. 184, and bears out the suspicion that cc. 184 f., if not the whole passage on the Oases (cc. 181-185), are an addition, or contamination. The description following is presumably intended to apply generally to the tribes previously enumerated (omitting c. 184): but it is inapplicable to the "Lophaghi" described c. 177. Flesh and milk are the proper food of 'Nomads,' so Hippokr. de aer. et locis. § 94, αὐτὸ γὰρ οἶδαν; κρέας ἐνθημοῖ καὶ πτώσει γάλα ἤπνων (ἀπὸ Βασίλ.).

3. Πληθύνοντες. The Egyptians abstained for a theological reason, 2. 41. As milk was so important to the Libyans they may have had a good economical reason. In Kyrene and Barka, however, the cult of Isis may have been established, as well as among the Libyan tribes. The women in the Greek colonies would be native Libyans to some extent. Barka was more Libyan than Kyrene (cc. 160 supra); and the women of Barka were more puritan than those of Kyrene. On pigs, see 2. 47: and c. 63 supra. The flesh of swine was extremely popular with Hellenes: cp. Od. § (14) 15-19, et al.

187. 1. τὸ δὲ κτλ. R. Neumann (op. c. p. 10) suggests that Hdt. borrows the distinction between E. and W. Libya from Hekataios. Cp. Frg. 205. This may be so, but Hdt.'s visits to Egypt and Italy if not to Kyrene itself would at least have confirmed the borrowed idea. The first sentence of this chapter prepares us for further contrasts, to be resumed c. 191, between the ethnography of eastern and that of western Libya, i.e. the spheres of Egypto-Hellenic and of Carthaginian influence respectively.

2. οἰκεῖοι νομάδες εἰσὶ = οἰκεῖοι is virtually locative, cp. ὄνειρος previous c. It is difficult to reconcile Hdt.'s statement that west of the Lesser Syrtis there were no Nomads, with the well-grounded geography of the later and Roman authorities, which designated the western portion as Numidias per excellence; and though the Carthaginians are known to have promoted agriculture (cp. Dict. Antiq. I. 45), the nomad life of shepherds and herdsmen never died out in the west (cp. Capes, Saltust. Introduction, pp. 38, 39). The view of Hdt. points to purely paròklasis sources of information, and it was just about his time that a decided effort was made by the Carthaginians to promote husbandry, cp. Mommsen, Rom. Hist. Bk. III. c. 1. (E.T. ii. p. 9), Meitner, Gesch. der Karchager. i. 82.

3. τούτοι αὐτοῖς. Same as the Nomads.
νομάδες, εί μέν πάντες, οίκῳ ἄρκεσιν τούτῳ εἰσίν, ποιεῖται δὲ 5 αὐτῶν συνοχοὶ τιμαίδες τῶν παιδίων τῶν σφητέρων, ἐπειδ' ἰτεράταν γένεται, ὡς ἡ προβάτων καλύουσι τὰς ἐν τῇ κούρασι φλεβᾶς, μετεξετέρω τοῖς αὐτῶν τὰς ἐν τοῖς κρατάμοις, τοῦθέ εἰσιν ὡς μὴ σφαίρας ἐς τὸν πάντα χρόνον καταρρέουσι φλέγμα ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς δήληται, καὶ διὰ τούτῳ σφαίρας λέγονται εἶναι ἑγγιστάταις· εἰσὶ δ' ἡ γάρ ὡς ἄιλιθεως οἱ Δίζευς ἀνθρώπων πάντων ἑγγιστάται τῶν ἡμεῖς λόμεν, εἰ μέν διὰ τοῦτο, οίκῳ ἔχου ἄρκεσιν εἰσίν, ἑγγιστάται δ' ἦν εἰσί. ἦν δὲ καλοῦσι τὰ παιδία σπασμὸν ἐπιγενητα, ἐξερευνῇ σφε ἂκος τράγῳ γάρ οὖν ἄριστο σπείσαντες μόναι σφαίρα. Λέγω δὲ τὰ λέγοντι αὐτοὶ Δίζευς.

Οὐσία δὲ τοῖς νομάσι εἰσὶ αἰδει ἐπείδ' ἐτεκυν τοῦ ὁτὸς ἁπάρξαντας τοῦ κτήνεος, ῥυτόντων ύπ' ὑπὸ δομοῦ, τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσαντες ἀποστρέφουσι τὸν αὐχένα αὐτοῦ θύοντες δὲ ἠλώρ καὶ σεληνή 15

5. εἰ μὲν πάντα ἐν συνοχα. This appearance of statistical accuracy is somewhat disconcerting, especially as it might seem to imply that other general statements in Libyan ethnography are based upon an exhaustive analysis of evidences. But what evidence could Hdt. have to justify him in asserting that none of the tribes west of Tritonis practised the cantery here described, or anything like it (ἀλλ' τ'?

7. ὡσαν, ὡς ὡσαν, but the same word, meaning apparently grease; thus ἑρα ὡσανα Aristoph. Acharn. 1177. ὡσανηί is a tuft of greasy wool: and that seems the sense here required. Cp. L. & S. 7 in voc. and add ὡσανηί (Aristoph. Lyc. 575).

Cauterisation is a wide-spread remedy for various maladies, and was not peculiar to the Libyan nomads, nor confined to the object here specified. Aethiopians, Scythians, Ostiaks, Arabs, Celts, Moors, Negroes are stated by Baehr, on various authorities, to have employed this method. Rawlinson quotes from Denham a description of the cure as “the sovereign Arab remedy for almost every disorder.” But it might surprise Greeks, who favoured milder methods. Cp. 3. 180.

11. πάντων ἐγγιστάται τῶν ἡμεῖς θρυσ. On the formula, cp. Introduction, p. civ. The healthiness of the Libyans is a fixed maxim with Hdt., cp. 2. 77. Tristram in his preface speaking of the northern Sahara (of Algiers) says: “Here an atmosphere
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13. σπασμ. The convulsion happens to the infant not to the operator, as we infer rather from the nature of the case than from the form of the expression. Van H. suggests καῦμαν.

14. λέγον κτλ. Cp. c. 173 supra. His scepticism apparently extends only to the two points: (1) the reason alleged for Libyan health: (2) the ἂκος assessed as good for convulsions.

188. 1. θυσία. Sacrificial rites, one of Hdt.’s standing categories in ethnography. Cp. c. 60 supra.

2. τῶν δομῶν. As Nomads they are scarce entitled to houses: Reiske suggested ἄδικον. Cp. c. 190 infra.

3. ἀποστρέφαν is used of turning back the hands so as to bind them behind the back, ἀποστρέφατε τὰ χέρια σαῦρων, οὕτως Ἐσσέθα, Aristoph. Lysistr. 456. Here we may take it of turning back the neck so as to cut it. ἀχέναι ἀποστρέφαν occurs in Theognis 585 with a different intention: ἀχέναι ἀποστρέφαν ὡς ἐσφάρν ἰδίαις.

15 ἢμε καὶ σεληνή μούναις. If they offered sacrifices to sun and moon alone it would follow that sun and moon were the only divinities recognised by them. This is not likely, by analogy, and the words following qualify it for the Libyans on the shores of Lake Tritonis. Cp. 172 supra to some extent.
μούσα. τότεσι μέν νυν πάντες Λίβυνες θόουν, οταρ οί τερι
5 τήν Τριπόλια άλμην νέμοντες τήν Ἀθηναίη μάλιστα, μετά δέ τοῦ
189 Τρίτου καὶ τής Ποσειδέαν. τήν δέ άρα άσθητα καὶ τάς αἰγίδας
tῶν αγαλμάτων τής Ἀθηναίης ἐκ τῶν Δικυσσέων ἐποίησαντο οἱ
"Ελληνες" πλὴν γὰρ ἣ ὅτι σκεύη ἡ ἐσθης τῶν Δικυσσάων ἐστὶ
cαὶ οἱ θύσαιν οἱ ἐκ τῶν αἰγίδας αὐθην τύχοι σφίς εἰς ἅλλα
5 ἱμάντινα, τά γε ἅλλα τῶν κατὰ τόντο έσταλται. καὶ δή καὶ
tό οὖνα καταγραφέται ὅτι ἐκ Δίβοις ἤκε τή στολή τῶν Παλλαδίων·
suggests a qualification for the Nasa-
mones, though that passage does not con-
cern θοοίν. The Attarante of o. 184
could hardly be described as sun-
worshippers.
5. 'Αθηναίη. Athens as worshipped
in Libya was hardly, perhaps, to be
distinguished from the Moon-goddess.
Triton is the River-god, Poseidon the
Sea-god. Cp. c. 150 supra. The
qualification here added after the strong
statement (μούσας) just made looks like
a later correction, inserted perhaps from
a different (western) source.
189. 2. τῶν αγαλμάτων τῆς 'Αθηναίης.
There are two archaeological questions
raised in this chapter and answered by
Hdt. in favour of Libya. (1) Were the
snakes on the aigis of Athene originally
leather thongs? (2) Was the aigis itself
derived from Libya? That the snakes of
the aigis were originally leather
thongs, forming a sort of tasseled fringe
round the aigis, may be regarded as
no less probable than that the aigis
was itself originally a skin. (2) That
the aigis, and indeed the whole vesture
(στολή) of the statues of Athene,
were derived from Libya is by no means
as probable. In Homerio poems the aigis
is not confined to Athene, but proper
to Zeus and Apollo likewise. The use
of skins, undressed and dressed, for
clothing and defence, was not confined
to the Libyans. Hdt. asserts that the
Quadriga was introduced among the
Greeks from Libya, which is at least
disposable, and hazards an opinion
that the δαλακγ was also of Libyan
origin, which is even less probable.
The theory of the Libyan origin of the
aigis hardly deserves more favour, even
if aigis originally meant 'goat-skin,'
unless we are to suppose that there were
no goats but in Libya. Cp. Pauly,
R.-E., 1593, i. 970 ff. or (as a δεύτερος
πλεύς) Dict. Antiq. 2 sub v. ILLUSTRAT-
tions, Baumeister, Denkmäler der Klass.
Athenae, x. v. ATHENE. See further infr.
4, "after the fashion," καὶ τοιῆς, καὶ;
but no other examples of this mean-
ing are produced, nor do L. & S.
notice it. In any case the statement
of fact here made is plainly an (erone-
ous) inference from the following ob-
servation which is introduced by γάρ.
Cp. c. 185 supra.
Δικυσσάων. "Native Libyan woman"
is generally understood.
ἐποίησαντο. The natural force and
meaning would be that the Hellenes
in the first instance got the women
of Libya to make them the dress for
Athene.
3. πλὴν κτλ. The exception here
is everything. The commentators seem
to overlook the fact that the ἐσθής
is not the same as the aigis. Hdt.
goes so far as to say that the whole
ἐσθής, the whole στολή of the statues of
Athene, was of Libyan origin; this
cannot be treated as a serious archae-
ological problem now. Whatever may
be said in regard to the aigis, the rest
of Athene's attire, whether archaic or
later, has nothing in common with
Libyan leather. Cp. 5. 116 ἑσπρα.
Are we to understand that the Libyan
women wore leathern ἐσθής under all
but the aigis with the leathern fringe?
In Ethiopia (tale Wilkinson Apollo Rawl.)
The aigis has dwindled to a mere apron
of thongs: see illustrations in Rawlin-
son. The use of such fringes is largely
exemplified in Westermanck, 2 c. c.
ix., according to whose theory such
things are not defensive but decorative.
6. τό οὖνα. The argument, even
if etymologically correct, does not prove
the point: Hdt. should first have proved
that aigis is the native Libyan word.
The derivation of aigis is doubtful.
Its connexion with αἰ at may be an early Volksstümlichkeit, and the false etymology, the "disease of language," may have led to the investiture of Athene with a goat-skin breastplate. The fact that leathern armour was in common use, and the belief that the war-goddess would need her lorica as much as helmet or spear, would facilitate the artistic representation of the aegis or (Cloud) shield of Zeus, or of Athene, by a lorica, or skin doublet. Whatever may be thought of meteorological mythology in general, the association of the aegis with the weather seems incontrovertible (see Roscher, Lexicon, p. 150), and it looks as though the cloud became a breastplate in passing from poetry to sculpture.

9. ΣΟΚΕΣ ἐκτα. This sentence contains an hypothesis of Hdt.'s own invention, it may therefore be inferred that he had authority for the antecedent ascription of the Palladian costume and the Quadriga to Libya. The δαλαγγή was proper to the worship of Athene, and presumably as ancient as the cult itself. Hom. II. 6. 301. If introduced into Greece from outside, it was surely from the East. It is a cry of triumph or exultation (opposed to καῦμας Eurip. Med. 1176, cp. L. & S.): perhaps connected with the Semitic Halla(h) (which appears in Hallilu-iaha). 11. πέντερα τέκτα. This statement has been generally sacrificed by commentators even the most loyal (cp. Rawlinson, note ad l., R. Nemmann, op. cit. p. 141), but on insufficient grounds. The four-horsed chariot is now no longer to be found in the genuine Homer, for II. 8. 185 is obviously spurious, and II. 11. 690 probably a late insertion (cp. W. Leaf, Iliad, note ad l.), 15. 679 is not a case in point, and Od. 13. 81 is a late insertion. That the Quadriga was used at the games of the 26th Olympiad = 680 B.C., cp. Clinton, Festi ad ann. is rather more than Pausanias l. c. 3 expressly asserts, and in any case the statement (by Africanus apud Euseb.) must rest on inferences and combinations far from indisputable. It is even questionable whether the Olympian Typhon itself was in existence, or at least of Panhellenic significance, as early as 680 B.C. (cp. Bury, Nemean Odes, Appendix D, p. 258.) All that can be said against Hdt. on this score is that, assuming him to mean that the τέθηρας was introduced to the Greeks through Kyrene (cp. o. 170 supra), this statement conflicts—not with ascertained facts—but with the statement that the τέθηρας was used at Olympia in 680 B.C. This conflict is an argument against the chronologists rather than against Hdt., for if the quadriga was introduced at Olympia after the foundation of Kyrene, so much the worse for the chronology of the early Olympiads (cp. Mahaffy, On the authenticity of the Olympian Register, J. H. S. vol. ii., reprinted in Problems in Greek History, 1892). But Hdt. does not expressly say when the Greeks took this hint from the Libyans, or what Greeks first took it. The Libyan example was, it might be argued, borrowed either directly, or through Egypt, before the foundation of Kyrene, and even perhaps at a very early date, in the time of Libyan Pharaohs (cp. Appendix XII.). Clearly the statement in Hdt. is an inference, not a tradition: but it may be a sound inference, even though he was hardly entitled to make it. The assertion (Smith, Dict. Antiq., sub v. Currus) that the Lydians drove four-horsed chariots appears to repose on a mistranslation of Alcybios, Persae, 47.
present, not meaning 'the dying,' those in articulo mortis, but denoting a series or succession of acts, covered by θέπτωσιν. Cp. τὰς ἀποθηκαίους c. 180 supra.

2. κατὰ τὰς οἱ Ἑλληνες, without thereby implying that the practice of recumbent burial was borrowed on either side. It is only this one point which is in view, presumably.

The Nasamones practised Divination at the tombs of their ancestors, c. 172 supra, and the peculiar posture of the dead may be connected with their necromancy. Others, including the ancient Britons, have used the sitting-posture (Rawlinson ed l.).

3. ἂτηγ. sc. δέ ἀποθεμένων, 'the dying man.'

4. οἰκήματα. Cp. Verg. Georg. 3. 340 with Conington's note. Sallust, Jug. 18, ceterum adhuc aedificia Numidarum agrestium quae mapulia illi vocant oblonga incurvus lateribus tecta quasi navi marine sunt. The original form of the word was perhaps magaria. See Capes, Sallust, note in l. c. The resemblance to an inverted ship seems to have given rise to the story related in Sallust. For these tabernacles (περιβολησφορ) cp. φερόσκου c. 40 supra.

191. 1. Διόνυσ. The Ausses, separated from the Machyles by the river Triton, still belong to the Nomad Libyans, according to Hdt. Beyond the Ausses lie the Maxyes, with whom Agriculture begins. The situation of these tribes would be west and north of the Lake Tritonis, as the land here projects again in a way which Hdt. does not appear to realise. The Maxyes seem to occupy the district afterwards named Byzacianum.

They were mentioned in the Pergegis of Hekataios as Māper, Müller, Frag. Bœk. 304 (vol. i. p. 23). Saint-Martin op. c. p. 58 identifies them with the Maxitani of Justin, 18. 6, in whose territory Carthage was built. The establishment of the Tyrians there would naturally press the tribe down south. Aegyptiologists see in the Maxxes of Hdt. (or in the name) the descendants of the Maschusaei (Mafa described, E. Meyer) who from the days of the 19th dynasty onward play a rôle of growing importance in Egyptian history, until finally they became the dominant power in the land (cp. Wiedemann, Aeg. Gesch. §§ 37 ff. and Appendix XII.).

2. §§ 7η. Cp. c. 185 supra. This chapter carries us into the country west of the Lesser Syris, i.e. into the modern Tunis and Algeria. Physically and politically the region was in the days of Hdt. as it is in the present day separated and divided from the eastern parts of Libya. We pass here, so to speak, into the sphere of Carthaginian influence. Geographically the whole area between the Gulf of Cabes (Lesser Syris) on the east and the Atlantic on the west, and bounded by the Mediterranean on the north and the Desert on the south, is the Region of the Atlas, and is virtually a huge island, belonging rather to Europe than to Africa. Cp. Tristram, The Great Sahara, p. 360, "To the naturalist North Africa is but an European island," etc., and especially Grant Allen, in Contemp. Review, vol. 53 (1888), pp. 506 ff. Legend connected the population of the region with the Iberian peninsula, probably correctly (cp. Sallust, Jug. 18). The Arab conquest long obliterated the earlier relations of lands and peoples in the western Mediterranean, but the natural frontiers are now reasserting themselves.

This region is the true island of Atlantis, if the Greeks had only known it. A very remarkable fact is this, that the three zones, which are sought for in vain in eastern Libya, are found in Algeria and this region to perfection. See K. Johnston's Africa, c. ii. This scheme of parallel belts is specially conspicuous in Algeria; there
three belts may be clearly distinguished—the Tell, the region of uplands or steppes, and the Algerian Sahara,” op. c. p. 18. The Tell is the arable and cultivated land. Op. Tristram, op. c. p. 52. For those who were masters of the Tell to invade the Sahara. As the southern nomads say of themselves, "We are the subjects of our stomachs." The Tell is their only granary, whence they procure corn by barter for wool, hides, dates, ostrich-feathers etc."

Could it be that Hdt.'s conception of Libya and its zones (c. 181 supra) is an extension and generalisation of the characteristics of that part of Africa under Carthaginian supremacy or influence, a knowledge of which he may have first acquired after his migration to Sicily? Or a dim vision of which may have been passed on to Egypt by Phoenicians or Hellenes?

4. μᾶτος (ἡ) is red ochre, mineral; and so different from μάτης, c. 189 supra.

φαεί κτλ. A few years ago this statement might have been dismissed as a purely Hellenic theory, resting on some merely fanciful or pragmatic combinations. Even now it can hardly be allowed to take rank as literal truth; but the fresh evidences and new methods of the last decade or two have very much modified the attitude of scholars to such statements, and we are disposed to see a larger and sounder deposit of historic fact in them than our predecessors were able to admit. 1. The Asiatic origin of a part of the population of Libya is a tenable hypothesis. Op. Appendix XII. 2. Whether a direct racial connection existed between tribes of Libya and tribes of Asia Minor or not (op. Wiedemann's denial of the identity of the Asiatic Schakalesha and the Libyan Schakelscha, op. cit. p. 499), it will be generally recognised that the Egyptian evidences open up possibilities of intercourse and contact between Libyans and minor-Asiatics, some traditions of which may very well underlie the theories regarding Trojan colonies in the west. That Hdt. had this particular statement from natives is less likely than that he had it from Graeco-Egyptian or Siceliot sources, if indeed it was not due to Hekataios.

5. ἢ δὲ χάρη κτλ. Hdt. here commits himself to a description of the rest of Libya, i.e. the modern Tunis, Algeria, and Marocco, or Region of the Atlas. Blakesley thinks the account of the country and its torres an exaggeration due to Carthaginians, who wished to keep the region to themselves. Rawlinson regards the passage as an accurate description of the general differences between the eastern and western regions of North Africa. It is, however, obvious that although Hdt. has an idea of a strong contrast between Libya east and west of 'Lake Tritonis,' he has no clear idea of the character of the west, nor does he suspect that the description which he has given of eastern Libya, applies much better to the west. There is, moreover, a slight inconsequence in his employing ἡ θηριότης of the inner belt of his eastern Libya and here going on to describe western Libya as πολλαὶ θηριοδοτέραι.


The Tell is described now as planted with numerous forests as well as containing luxuriant pasture lands in addition to its fertile and arable settlements (Africa, p. 19). The second belt, behind the Tell and the Algerian range, is sandy, but supplies fodder, and in some favoured spots corn (ib. p. 20). This second belt as steppe land is succeeded by the Sahara.

Δέρνοι. Whether bears were ever found in Africa is disputed; see Bœch’s note ad l. Hdt. 2. 67 mentions them as rare in Egypt. The ‘Dardanian’ Akested, at Erýx, wears the skin of a Libyan she-bear, Verg. Aeni. 5. 37.

Αἰγεία, an asp, “Egyptian cobra,” L. & S. δυναί. Bœch suggests that the oryx, a species of antelope with one horn, is meant. See references in his note. But if Hdt. had been thinking of unicorns he would hardly have written of τὰ κέρα ἔχοντες.

13. Κυνοκέφαλοι are described by Diodor. 3. 35 among the wild beasts of Αἰθιοπίαν, next after the sphinx. They have ugly human bodies, and very savage tempers. One characteristic there noted might seem to suggest the Kangaroo.

Αἰγεία, κτλ. This description is too much for Hdt.’s credulity, as is shown by his adding the ultimate source (ότι δὲ κτλ) of the description, cp. ο. 187 supra.

14. οἱ ἄγριοι ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες. Few will hesitate to identify these with the large apes of Africa, some report of which might easily have reached Magna Græcia, Egypt, or the Levant, for their skins had been seen at Carthage, Hanno, Peripl. 18 (Geogr. Min. i. 13 f.). Bœch, however, disputes this identification, and is so much offended by the harshness of the text (ἄγριοι ... καὶ ἄνδρας ... γυναῖκας) that he is strongly disposed to regard the words of ἄγριοι ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες ἄγριαι καὶ as an interpolation. They are read in all the MSS. and even if ἄλλα and θηρία were not separated in the text, ἄλλα would not necessarily imply that ἄνδρεσ and γυναίκες were θηρία (cp. ἄγριον δὲ καὶ κτέρα δὲ καταγίζων εἰς τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν Lyc. 293, 32, with Alford’s note). See 5. 32, 67, 6. 121 infra. ἄγριαι scil. Stein.

15. ἄλλα πλῆθει πολλά covers a long catalogue, Hdt.’s list of authentic beasts being very short, and a marked contrast to the fuller details that follow in the next c. for eastern Libya.

Kruger follows Reiz in reading καταγέννητα. The MS. reading is defensible; Hdt. has indicated his scepticism just above. But van Herwerden’s suggestion καταγίζων καὶ κατάκεφαλοι avoids the dilemma.

192. 1. τῶν οὖν οὐδέν. The contrast between the fauna east and west of the Triton is certainly exaggerated. Foxes, jackals, and other beasts here confined to the east are, and probably were, found west of ‘Triton’; while among the ἄλλα πολλα θηρία ἀκάραφαστα of western Libya would surely be included some not unknown to the Greeks of Kyrene, Naukratis, or Thurii.

2. πυγάργος is mentioned by Aristot. Hist. Anim. 618b as a kind of eagle. Here it appears to be a kind of antelope.

3. θηρία. Bœch reads δομάθα (cp. 7. 69), not without MSS. authority (δομάτα Helder B. R. tr. “gazelles.”)

4. βουβάλις. R. renders “bussallos.” Buffaloes are found in N. Africa, but there is some doubt whether the βοοβάλις was not a variety of antelope.
4. όρνες. Also a species of antelope, cp. Bachr's note.

5. φοίνιξ is named by Athenaeus 636 (14. 38) among stringed instruments of music, in immediate conjunction with τύρις and μαγαδάς (μαγαδάς L. & S.). It is mentioned in the same connexion p. 182 (4. 90), and in 337l (14. 49) φοίνιξ & τος θρόνος ἐμφανίσε καὶ Σέκκυμον (Σέκκυμον) ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἑλήρωματον ὑπὸ Φοινίκων εὐφήθησα τὰ ἑκτένα τῆς προσογγορίας.

6. πιγγίας. The arms, or uprights, of the said Phoenician lyre. The closest piece connecting them was the βύγω (L. & S.). The construction τὰ κέρας οἱ πίγγια πειθέται is remarkable. Cr. 3. 27 ἢ δεκατὴ γένους οἱ ἀνδράτες. The voice and number in the verb are also noteworthy.

7. Βασάρσαρα, vulpeculae. Basaraphes is a title of Bacchus in the wolf-skin: see Bachr ad l.

6. οὐστριγες. Ηυστρίς cristata, porcupine.


9. δώδε. Canis aureus, jackal. In Π. 11. 474 the Τρώες are compared to δώδε.

10. πάνθηρες. According to Bachr's authorities used here incorrectly for τίγναλα. Panthers are not found in Africa: leopards are common.


12. κροκοδείλος. This animal is apparently not a small crocodile but an 'immense lizard' (Wilkinson ορωδ Rawlinson).

13. δίφις. No one apparently takes offence at these small horned-snakes.

14. καὶ τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀληθοῦς is an emendation. The general MSS. reading is ἐπιρ τῆς ἀληθοῦς. P has ἄλα τῆς ἀληθ. ἄλα τάγμα τῆς ἀληθ. would do fullest justice to the MSS. τῆς ἀληθοῦς (sc. τῆς χώρας) means 'elsewhere.' Cr. c. 182 μετα, 1. 1 et al.

11. οὖν ἐκτ. This statement must be regarded as exaggerated. The stag did not, however, occur perhaps in the Libya of Hdt. and the wild boar proper (Bos scrotus) is not found there, though cognate kinds are forthcoming. Authorities in Bachr and Rawlinson.

12. οὐσιδῆς. Perhaps from their habit of standing on their hind-legs, which are longer than the fore-legs in the jerboa.

13. ξεγέρες interpreted by the author, if the following words τὸ . . βουνοὶ are genuine, as equivalent to βουνοῖ. In c. 199 ἐγραύτω here the author is describing, not three kinds of mice, but three seasons of the year, the words occur: τῶν ὑπερθαλασσίων χώρων τὰ μέσα ἐγραύτω συνεχομέναι τα βουνοὶ κελέουσι. βουνοῖ which is here mentioned as a familiar Greek word is there introduced as a local Kyrenaic term. Blakesley has a suggestive excursus on the word, which he is inclined to regard as a primitive Greek or 'Pelasgian' term for Mother Earth, and ventures to trace it in Gaelic, Latin, Old English and other tongues. The word has more usually been regarded as having been introduced from Africa into the Greek language. Whatever its origin it was not Attic, and was foreign or archaic in Helias proper in the time of Hdt. But it was used at Kyrene (c. 199 infra), it was used in Sicily, and it is found in later Greek, LXX., Polybius (βουνοδές), Diodorus Siculus (βουνοδές), Strabo and Pausanias. It was ridiculed as a foreign word by the comic poet Philodem.

(1) Meineke, F. G. C. ed. mi. p. 880—Eustathios ad Hom. 880. 30. (2)
μὲν Λιβυττικῶν, ὑνὰται δὲ κατ’ Ἑλλάδα γνώσαν βουνοῖ, οί δὲ ἐξινεῖς. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ γαλαὶ ἐν τῷ σφάλφιρ γνώμενα τῆς Ταρταρίας. τοσαῦτα μὲν ἦν ὁμοίως ἡ τῶν νομάδων Λιβυττικῶν τῇ ἑγέρει, ὁσον ἴσως ἴστορον τούτων ἐπὶ μακρύτατον ὅτι τὸ εὐγέμενα ἠξίωσαί τινα

193 Μαξύνων δὲ Λιβυττικῶν Ζαύηκες ἠχονται, τούτοι αἱ γυναῖκες ἰμνοχείσι. 

194 τὰ ἀρματα ἐν τοῖς πόλεμοι. τούτων δὲ Γύεντατες ἠχονται, ἐν τούτοι
μέλε τολλοί μεν μέλισσαι κατεργάζονται, πολλοὶ δὲ ἐτὶ πλέον λέγεται δημορεύον ἄνδρας ποιεῖν. μιλτοῦται δὲ ὑπὸ πάντων αὐτοῦ καὶ πιθηκοφαγέως· οἴ δὲ αἱ ἄφθονοι ὅσοι ἐν τοῖσι δρέαι γίνονται. κατὰ τούτοις δὲ λέγουσι Καρχηδόνιοι κείσθαι νῆσον τῇ 195· οὐνόμα εἶναι Κύρανω, μῆκος μὲν διήκοσια σταθένο, πλάτος δὲ στενών, διαβατῶν ἐκ τῆς πτερίδος, ἐλαιῶν τε μεσθήν καὶ ἀμπελῶνος. λιμήν δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ εἶναι, ἐκ τῆς αἱ παρθένους ἐν πτερίδοις ὄρνιθων κερκυρόειν πισοῖρ ἐκ τῆς ἰδίως ψηφία ἀναφέρουσα χρυσοῦ. 5 ταῦτα εἰ μὲν εἰσὶν ἀληθεῖς οὐκ οἶδα, τὰ δὲ λέγεται γράφομεν· εἰ δὲ ἐν πάν, δοκοῦ καὶ ἐν Ζακύνθῳ ἐκ λίμνης καὶ θάλατος πῖσοις ἀναφέρο-

In this case they must have been displaced between the Roman time and the Muslim conquest. Their geographical situation (see next chapter) suits with the former identification.

2. μελ. Genuine honey was all the more important in antiquity from the scarcity and inferiority of sugar. Other instances of the manufacture: 1. 193, 7. 31. Had this artificial honey a bad or a good name in Sicily and Magna Graecia? Cf. Steph. Byz. sub v. Ζευσπάισ. 3. μιλτοῦται. Cp. c. 191 supra.

4. πιθηκοφαγεῖς. Oddly enough the apes have not been expressly mentioned among the fauna of Libya, c. 191 supra. 
οὶ δὲ, σ. οἱ πιθηκοῖ.

τοιάδε δρέαι. This phrase is astonishing, as Hdt. makes no use elsewhere (in his geography) of these mountains, which are, nevertheless, much needed on his map.

195. 1. λέγουσι Καρχηδόνιοι. The expression suggests that Hdt. had not visited the country; but it does not prove that he had conversed with Carthaginians, cp. next c. If he held any such converse, it might have been in Sicily: or the Carthaginian account might have been gathered there. See Introduction, p. lxxviii.

2. Κύρανω. Now generally identified with the island Cercina, modern Kerkenna or Kerka-na, in the gulf of Cabes, just opposite Sfax, which fixes the district under review as identical with Byzæum. Meltzer, Gesch. d. Karchager, i. 77, 231, argues that a dim knowledge of the island of Kerne in the Atlantic is combined with a better knowledge of Cercina, to produce the Herodotean Kyranus. From this point of view the description of the situation of Kerne, in the meridian of Carthage, is remarkable: cp. Hanno, Periplus 8 (Geogr. Min. i. 7). R. Neumann (Nordafrika, 64 ff.) argues that the wine and oil are taken from Djerba: and concludes that the description of Kyranis is a combination of points taken from Carkenel, Djerba, and Kerno, or one of the other West African islands (gold).

3. διαβατὸν ἐκ τ. ἤτ. is translated by Rawlinson: "soon reached from the mainland." Hdt. appears to mean that the passage between the land and the island is fordable. Cp. 1. 75 ad fin.

6. ταῦτα μὲν. Hdt.'s scepticism is here much to the point, as there appears to be no evidence of any gold in the island, though gold perhaps was found in the interior of Africa. A more or less misunderstood method of procuring the gold dust may have been transferred to the site of exchange.

εἰ δὲ ἐν πάν. Cp. 5. 9, and Introduction, § 22.

7. δοκοῦ, 'since,' 'seeing that,' cp. 1. 68, 192, 7. 100.

Σακύνθων. The tar springs of Zante are guaranteed by many authorities, ancient and modern: Ktesias, Indic. 10, Pliny, 35. 15; Chandler, Dodwell, Hawkins, among the moderns. Cp. quotation from Chandler, apud Rawlinson. Burnian, Geogr. der Griechen. ii. 359 f., locates the chief tar well close to the S.W. coast, near Cape Chieri, and mentions a second curious phenomenon, an oil spring, rising in a grotto, or cave, only approachable from the sea, north of the east coast of the island. Hdt. may very well have visited Zante, en route for Thurii and the west. This allusion is a fresh confirmation of the hypothesis that the Abydos λέγεται betray western influences and were not compiled in Egypt and Kyrene (merely). Cp. Introduction, pp. xxvii ff.

λιμήν καὶ θάλατος. There might
μένην αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ὃρων. εἰς εἰν καὶ πλεῖνες αἱ λίμνει αὐτόθι, ἢ δὲ ἄν μεγαστή αὐτέων ἐβδομήκοστα πάντες πάντες, βαθὸς δὲ τὸ διάρρημα έστιν: ἐς ταῦτην κατούν κατέστη ἐπὶ ἀκρό μυρίης προσδοκήσαντες καὶ ἐπειτε ἀναφέρονται τῇ μυρίης πᾶσαν, ἄδηλον μὲν ἔχουσαν ἀσφάλτου, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τῆς Πειρηκῆς πίσιν άμελεών. ἔσχεσις δὲ εἰς λάκκον ὄροφυγόμενον ἄγχου τῆς λίμνης· ἐπεάν δὲ ἀθροίσαι συχνήν, οὕτω ἵνα τοὺς ἀμφορέας ἐκ τοῦ λάκκου κατα-χεύοντες. ὃ τε δ' ἂν ἐστείλῃ ἐς τὴν λίμνην, ὡς ἐπὶ γῆν ἵνα ἀναφαίνεται ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· ἢ δὲ ἀπέθει νὸς τέσσερα στάδια ἀπ' ὑπὸ τῆς λίμνης· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς νήσου τῆς ἐπὶ Λιβυῆς καμένης οἴκοτα ἐστὶ ἀληθεύει.

196 Αὔγουστος δὲ καὶ τὰ Καρχηδόνιοι. εἰναι τῆς Λιβυῆς χώρον τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἔξω Ἡρακλεών στηλέων κατοικημένους. εἰς have been no water in the λιμνη, hence the word is added. λιμνη is a curious word to apply to the object which other travellers have described as a ‘well,’ or ‘spring.’ ‘The spring most distinct and apt for inspection’ is described by Chandler as four or five feet in diameter. There may have been seventy feet square of water or marsh-land round the well referred to by Hdt. The ground has apparently undergone change since his time, as the tar springs are now close to the coast (cp. Bursian, op. cit. supra). The tar is very poor, and there is no communication between the wells and the sea. Blakesley suggests that Hdt. was perhaps misled by the sight of the tar floating on the sea off the island. In 6. 119 a still more wonderful well is described, but Hdt. makes the more of the Zante springs, because he has seen them with his own eyes. Besides, he introduces this experience to confirm a Carthaginian story, feeling perhaps that Carthaginian authority did not rank high with Hellenes.

12. ἀρακά. Didymus, Geograph. 6. 5 τὴν πίσσαν ὧν ἐράχων ἄμελεν παραδείσατο καλλίτην εἶναι τὴν ἀντὶ τῆς Ιδης, μετὰ ταῦτην τὴν ἐκ Πειρηκής. The former was preferred in Asia, but the latter in Greece. Plin. Nat. Hist. 14. 20 (24).


14. οὕτω τυλ. The fact that there were tar wells in Zante, an island off Peloponnesse, hardly goes far to prove that there was a gold well in Kyrenia an island off Libya, nor if a branch of myrtle was used to catch the pitch does it follow that a bunch of feathers would draw the gold. Speaking generally, however, it is a wonderful world, and one ought to be ready to believe a good deal about it (ἐν δ' ἄν τιμ). Cp. Introduction, § 22.

196. 1. Ἀὔγουστος. Hdt. discounts the story by adding the authority. That he had it direct from men of Carthage he does not assert (as for example Melzer cp. cit. p. 235 infers); for the Umstand, that Herodot these Nachrichten nach eigener Angabe aus dem Munde von Karthagern erhalten hat u. a. w.). The reality of a ‘dumb commerce’ of the kind described in this chapter is fully borne out by modern authorities, instances being added from the Sudan, i.e. the region of Africa between the desert of Sahara and the Equator. Senegambia or the Gold Coast would answer to the geographical indications in the Carthaginian story, which inter alia goes to show that the Carthaginians had more extensive dealings with native Africa than was always suspected. The Periplo of Hanno (Müller, Geogr. Minor. i. pp. 1-14) points to the same conclusion. Modern authorities are cited in Isbeer and Rawlinson. Melzer (op. cit. p. 234) speaking of Hdt.'s knowledge of the further west observes that it is not to be supposed that Hdt. had the Periplo of Hanno in his hands; but none the less his information may be ultimately due to Hanno's expedition.
τοῖς ἐπεὶ ἀπίκειται καὶ ἐξέλλονται τὰ φορτία, θέντες αὐτὰ ἑπεξῆς παρὰ τὴν κυματωγήν, ἐσβάντες ἐς τὰ πλοῖα τόφεων καπνὸν. τούς δὲ ἐπιχορήγοις ἰδομένους τὸν καπνὸν ἴναι ἐπὶ τὴν 5 θάλασσαν καὶ ἔπευγα ἀντὶ τῶν φορτίων χρυσῶν τυδέαν καὶ ἔξαγαρχοντος πρόσω ἀπὸ τῶν φορτίων. τοὺς δὲ Καρχερονίους ἐκβάλλεις σκέπτεσθαι, καὶ ἢ μὲν φαίνεται σφι ἄξιος ὁ χρυσὸς τῶν φορτίων, ἀνελόκειναι ἀπαλλάσσοντα, ἢ μὲν ἄξιος, ἐσβάντες ὅπως ἐς τὰ πλοῖα κατέστατοι: οἱ δὲ προσελθόντες τὸ ἄλλον πρὸς ὁν θηκας χρυσῶν, ἢς οὐ δὲ πείθοντι, ἁδικεῖν δὲ οὐδὲντέρως: οὕτω γὰρ αὐτῶν τὸ χρυσὸν ἄπτεσθαι πρὶν ἂν ἄτι 10 ἀπιστοθῇ τῇ ἄξιῃ τῶν φορτίων, οὕτ᾽ ἐκείνους τῶν φορτίων ἄπτεσθαι πρῶτον ἡ ἀυτὸ τὸ χρυσὸν λάβειν.

Οὖντι μὲν εἰσὶ τοῖς ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν Λιβύων ὄνομασάς, καὶ 197 τούτων οἱ πολλοὶ βασιλεῖς τοῦ Μῆδων οὐτε τοὺς οὐτὲ τότε ἐφροντίζον οὐδέν. τοσοῦτοι δὲ ἐτί ἐγὼ εἰπεῖν περὶ τῆς χώρης ταύτης, ὅτι τέσσερα ἔθνεα νῦμετται αὐτὴν καὶ οὐ πλέον τούτων, ὅσον ἡμεῖς ἑμεῖς, καὶ τὰ μὲν δύο αὐτόχθονα τῶν ἐθνῶν τὰ δὲ δύο 5 οὖ, Λιβύες μὲν καὶ Αἰθιοπεῖς αὐτόχθονες, οἱ μὲν τὰ πρὸς βορέω οἱ δὲ τὰ πρὸς νότον τῆς Λιβύης οἰκέωντες, Φοινίκες δὲ καὶ Ἑλληνες ἑπτάλειν ὅλα μὲν. 12. αὐτότου. Bekker suggests αὐτό which would be the normal construction, as in c. 137 supra λέγωςτος οὔτε αὐτὸ κτλ. The converse case is found as Stein points out in 1. 66 ov ᾽ ἂν αὐτόν ὁδὸν ἐν (Instead of τοὺς) ἐς αὐτὸν παύσεθαι κατὰ τῆς ἁργῆς. The whole chapter before us is an interesting example of the sustained oratio obliqua, and a slight grammatical lapse towards the end would not be un-Herodeotean.

197. 1. οὖντι μὲν. The words do not refer to the passage immediately preceding, but to c. 194, or even c. 191 supra. Cρ. c. 167 supra ad fin. νῦν again was a challenge to the commentator. Can we be even quite sure that the νῦν here was of date strictly contemporaneous with the νῦν there? I.e. belonged both originally to the same draft or stratum of the Λιβυκαλ λέγει. Certainly a revision or second edition would synchronise the two, by bringing both down to a common later era. The composition of this part is highly problematic: cp. Introduction, p. xcvii.

Λιβύνων. The Libyans of Hdt. may be taken to represent the whole Berber stock of North Africa, though the name Libu originally denoted only one powerful tribe or group in the neighbourhood of Egypt. The Aethiopians represent the dark inhabitants of the Sudan. Hdt. does not think it necessary to multiply his native races in order to classify such tribes as he has mentioned 2. 32, or c. 191 supra. Egyptians he does not mention, as Egypt is not with him strictly speaking a part of Libya 2. 17, cp. c. 41 supra, albeit the statement, c. 42, that Libya is circumnavigable, involves the inclusion of Egypt in the continent. The Phoenicians are of course represented by Carthage, and the Hellenes by Kyrene, or the Pentapolis. The ethnography of this passage agrees with that of 2. 32; the Aethiopians must be supplied from 3. 17 ff. (Macrobius). 3. 97 (οἱ πρόσωνοι Ἀγάπτεροι, cp. 7. 69), and c. 183 supra (Troglydtae). (Asiatic Aethiopians are included in the army list of Xerxes 7. 70, cp. 3. 94.) On the modern Ethnology of Africa, see K. Johnston, Africas, Appendix I.

5. ὅσον ἡμέρας τῆκεν. Cp. Introduction, p. cix. The words are something more than a mere form here, Hdt. plainly holding that the continent was not fully explored. Cp. cc. 41-43 supra.
198 Δοκεῖ εἰς καθ' άρετήν εἰναι τις τή Λιβύη σπουδαίη οὕτως ἢ Ἀτή ἢ Ελλάτη παραμηθήναι, πλὴν Κίνωνος μονής: τό γάρ ἐντόνον οὐδὲν ἢ γῆ τήν ποταμοῦ ἢχειν. αὕτη δὲ ὁμοίη τῇ ἀριστηγήγειον Δήμητρος καρτών ἐκφέρειν οὐδὲ ἀοίκειν οὐδὲν τῇ Ἀλή Λιβυής.
5 μελαγχόλιον τε γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἐπινους πίδαξιν, καὶ οὗτοι αὐγοῦν φροντίζουσα οὐδὲν οὗτοι ὁμβρον πλέον πιοῦσα δεδήλωται: ἦται γὰρ δὴ ταῦτα τῆς Λιβύης. τῶν δὲ ἐκφοροί τοῦ καρποῦ ταῦτα πέρα ἡ Βασιλείου ἡ κατάστασις. ἀγάθη δὲ γῆ καὶ τῶν Εὐσφερίων νέμονται: ἄπτε κατοικία γὰρ, ἐπεὶ αὐτὴ ἐνόυτη.

199 ἀριστὰ ἐνέκηκῃ, ἐκφέρει, ἢ δὲ εἰν τῇ Κίνωντι ἐπὶ τριγκόσια. ἦχει δὲ καὶ ἡ Κυρηναιὴ χορή, εὔσαφεν ὄρφιοτάτη ταύτης τῆς Λιβύης τῆς ὦ νομοίδες νέμονται, τρεῖς ὄρας ἐν ἐνότητι ἀξίας ἂνθρωπον. πρώτα μὲν γὰρ τὰ παραβάλλασσα [τῶν καρπῶν] ὄργῳ ἀμάσθαι τε καὶ τρυγθαῦναι τούτων τε ὑπὲρ τῶν θαλασσίων χώρων τὰ μέσα ὄργῳ συγκομισθῆναι, τὰ βουνοῖς καλέναι· συγκοκύμισαι τε ὄστος ὀ μέσως καρποῦ καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ κατυπερτάτη τῆς γῆς πεπαίνεται τε καὶ ὄργῳ, ὦστε ἑκτέποτε τε

198. 1. Σοκεί δὲ μοι κτλ. The tricontinental system is here endorsed by Hdt. for practical purposes. Cp. s. 45 supra.

2. Κίνωνος. Described above c. 175 as in the territory of the Makae, flowing from the Λόφος Χαρίσων. The district is just, so to speak, between the Greater and the Lesser Syritis. Cp. note ad 1. The utterances here on the Kinys region seem an afterthought, an addition, to the remarks on the river there. This effort in comparative geography may have been suggested to Hdt. after his visit to the west, Sicily and Magna Graecia and the Pontos regions being the best corn-growing regions of Europe known to him, while the references to Babylonia seem to justify the inference that this passage was written or revised subsequently to 1. 193, the very language of this passage reproducing the language of that: Δήμητρος καρτών ἐκφέρειν. 6. φροντίζοντα οὐδέν. A careless echo from c. 197 supra.

6. φροντίζοντα οὐδέν. Ίτη, passive. Hdt. of course know nothing of the heavy rainfall of tropical Africa. Cp. Keith Johnston's Africa, Appendix II. on the Distribution of rain in Africa. "In Morocco and Algeria ... the west winds of the north Atlantic provide the winter rains; ... on the coasts of Tripoli and Egypt the scanty winter rains seem to be supplied from the vapours of the Mediterranean itself," op. c. p. 571, and cp. pp. 572-574.

9. Εὐσφερίων. Cp. 171 supra, 204 infra. It is now Benghaz (Berenice) the second town of Tripoli.

199. 2. ὄρφιοτάτη. Here again we have a postscript, which corresponds well to the facts, the Kyrenaica being a high plateau of rocks projecting in a solid mass into the Mediterranean ... This plateau gradually descends towards the Egyptian frontier." The height of the upper plateau is estimated at 1700-1800 feet. Hdt. does not, however, appear to be aware that higher points existed even within his nomad Libya in the ranges of the Black Mountains, or Jebel es Soafa, and Harush, which attain an elevation of 2800 feet (Johnston, Africa, p. 69).

3. τρεῖς ὄρας. Modern travellers confirm the general truth of this statement: Baehr cites Padico, Beechey, Russell, Barth: Rawlinson adds a quotation from Hamilton. The three seasons correspond to three steps or levels rising from the sea inland a characteristic of the country no previously noted by Hdt. (1) τὰ περὶ θαλάσσα οὐθεν θαλάσσα, (2) τὰ μέσα, τὸ βουνό, (3) τῇ κατυπερτάτῃ.

4. τῶν καρπῶν del. Gomperz.

6. βουνόν, op. c. 192 supra.

8. ἑκτέποτε. The win would have been quickly made and consumed.
καὶ καταβέβρωται ὁ πρῶτος καρπὸς καὶ ὁ τελευταῖος συμπαραγίνεται. οὕτω ἐπὶ ὁκτώ μήνας Κυρηναίους ὕπορη ἐπέχει. ταῦτα 10 μὲν νῦν ἔπι τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω.

Οἱ δὲ Φερείτιμος τιμοροί Πέρσαι ἐπείτε ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου 200 σταλέντες ὑπὸ Ἀραμίδεων ἀπέκκεντε ἐς τὴν Βάρκην, ἐπολυόρκεσα τὴν πόλιν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι ἔκδεδον τῶν αἰτίων τοῦ φῶνος τοῦ Ἀρκεσσίλεως· τῶν δὲ πάν ἦρ ἃν τὸ πλῆθος μεταίτων, οὐκ ἔδεκοντο τοὺς λόγους. ἔνθατα δὴ ἐπολυόρκεσα τὴν Βάρκην ἐπὶ μήνας 5 ἐνέφε, ὀρύσσοντες τα ὀρύγματα ὑπόγαια φρέντα ἐς τὸ τεῖχος καὶ προσβολὰς καρτερὰς ποιεύμενοι. τὰ μὲν νῦν ὀρύγματα ἀκῆρ χαλκεῖς ἀνεύρει ἐπιχάλκοι ἀστιδί, δὸς ἐπιφρασθεῖς· περιφέρας αὐτὴν ἐνῶ τοῦ τείχους προσίσχε πρὸς τὸ δάπεδο τῆς πόλεος. τὰ μὲν δὴ ἄλλα ἐσκε κοφα πρὸς τὰ προσίσχε, κατὰ δὲ τὰ ὀρύσσωμα ἡμῖσεκε ὁ χαλκὸς τῆς ἀσπίδος, ἀντορύσσοντες δὲ ἀνατήρητοι οἱ Βαρκαιοὶ ἐκτεινοῦν τῶν Περσῶν τοὺς γεωργευόμενας, τοῦτο μὲν δὴ ὡς ἐξευρέθη, τὰς δὲ προσβολὰς ἀπεκρούοντο οἱ Βαρκαιοὶ. χρόνον δὲ δὴ πολλὸν τριβομένοι καὶ πυττόνων 201 ἀμφότερον πολλὸν καὶ ὄσον τῶν Περσῶν, ἀμασὶς ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ πεζοῦ μνηματάτα τοιάδε. μαθὼν τῶν Βαρκαιῶν ὡς κατὰ μὲν τὸ ἱσχυρὸν ὁ περίητον διε, δόλῳ δὲ αἰρετοὶ, ποιεῖ τοιάδε· νυκτὸς τάφρην ὀρύξεις εὐρέαν ἐπέτεινε ἔξωλα ἄσθενεα ὑπὲρ 5 αὐτῆς, κατυπερθὲ ἐπιπολὴς τῶν ἐξωλῶν χών τῆς ἐπεφόρησε, ποιεῖ τῇ ἄλλῃ γῇ ἱσόπεδον. ἀμα ἡμέρη δὲ ἐς λόγους προε—

none of the first was left when the last vintage was ripe. Hdt. seems to exaggerate somewhat with his prepositions ἐκ, κατά.

9. κατά. With the form of construction εἰς, c. 181 συρᾶ μεταβαίνει τὸ ἐντζ καὶ τὸ ἱππα γίνεται μνημών εἰς, c. 53 συρᾶ.

200. 1. αἱ... Πέρσαι. The narrative is resumed from c. 167 συρᾶ. Hdt. has not previously specified any as Persians except the two commanders; unless στρατὸν τῶν ἐκ Αἰγύπτου ἄπαστα c. 167 συρᾶ were to include the Persian garrisons: but cp. l. 12 ἔντζα.


5. ἑπολυόρκεσα. The nine months’ siege of Barke (c. 512 n.c. f) was apparently memorable for the mining operations still at that time unfamiliar to Greeks in warfare. Mining was the Assyrian alternative to Battering as practised by Greeks and Romans (Rawlinson, who refers to Livy 4. 22, 5. 19), and is frequently represented on Assyrian sculpture. Cp. 5. 116, 6. 18 ἔντζα (Bl.), Aeneas Poliorcetis c. 37 relates the story here told as illustrating one of the ways of hindering mining, without hinting that the Amasis, whom he names, was a Persian.

8. ἑπαγγέλλει. One would suppose that a shield entirely of metal would have answered the purpose best and the word is so understood here. Hdt. 9. 80 speaks of κλών ἐπιχώνοι καὶ ἑπάγγελα which he speaks of in 9. 52 as κρίσει καὶ ἐφύρασε.

12. Περσῶν cannot be pressed so as to mean that the soldiers were genuine Persians: it is enough that they be Persian subjects.

201. 1. χρόνον δὲ δὴ, viz. the nine months specified in preceding chapter.
18. Το δε μεταφράσω. To Greek and, if we believe this story, Persian ideas of justice were not perpetrated if the letter of an oath was observed, however completely the spirit might be disregarded. 

Cp. c. 154 supra. That Spartans were sometimes given to this sort of scrupulous duplicity may be seen not merely from the well-known case of Kleomenes and the Argives (ep. 6. 76 ff., notes) but from the anecdotes of Dercyllidas and Thibron preserved in the Euhemer Polygenes 59. 2, 3 (Biblioth. Teubner, ed. Melber, p. 477). See further L. Schmidt, Die Ethik der alten Griechen, ii. 5 ff.

202. 6. πλήν δόσω. This is the first clear mention of any of the Battail family or party in Barke: but it implies that the record of the proceedings is anything but complete, cp. c. 164 supra. What there was left of the city to enthrone them after the murderers of Arkesilas had been atrociously penalised and all the rest spoiled by the Persians hardly appears: perhaps the extent to which the common folk of Barke sympathised with the anti-Battail, anti-tyrannic, anti-Medic, and presumably aristocratic or oligarchic party, has been exaggerated in the traditions (cf. 167, 200 supra).
fancy of the Kyrenaeans, or their friends, and devised long after the event, at a time when it was to the credit of Kyrene to believe and get it believed that she had not medised, but had had her own brush with the Persian, even before the days of Marathon and Salamis. According to Polyainos 8, 47, the expedition of Pherecine was directed against the 'Kyrenaeans,' but the passage is in general terms, and insufficient to override the facts implied in the Herodotean story.

7. Δυσ Λυκαιοῦ. Λυκαιῶν δὲ ὁ Πελαγοῦς τοιοῦτος ἦθεν ἢ ὁ πατήρ οἱ συφώνερα. Ἀκολουθία ταῦτα πάντα ἢσσων ἐν τῷ ὅρῳ τῷ Λυκαιῷ, καὶ Δίω ἱκώμας Λυκαιῶν, καὶ ἄγων Θεύας Λύκαια. Pausan. 8, 2, 1. The presence of the Arkadian deity or deities at Kyrene speaks volumes for the ethnic character of the population, and would lead us to expect the presence of other than Dorian names." Cp. s. 161 supra. On Zeus Lykaios, cp. W. Immerwahr, Kulte u. Mythen Arkadiens, i. 1-24. On Pan cp. n. 6, 105 infrar. 204. 1. ἐστὶ Εὐσεπερίδα. This statement, perhaps a genuine reminiscence, militates against the idea employed in the previous c. that Bark was the only goal of the expedition, and betrays the imperfection of the record.

Some Greek captives from Libya may have been an encouraging and appropriate offering to Dareios, after his own expedition into Europe. The king's treatment of these Barkains anticipated the treatment accorded to the Eretrians, some two or three and twenty years after, 6, 119 infrar. This chapter also in the words οἱ κατὰ ἐκεῖ ἤρθαν ἐπισκόπευσαν ἅπαντα Βάρκην, ἣν ἐπὶ καὶ ἐξέ 5 ἵναις ὑποκαίρως ἐν ἐγὼ τῇ Ἀθηνῆ.
Of much η Φερετίμης εκ τήν ξόην κατέπλεξε. ος γὰρ δὴ τάχιστα ἐκ τῆς Λεβύνης τισαμένη τοὺς Βαρκαλῶν ἀπενεύσας ἐς τὴν Ἀγνυτον, ἀπέθανε κακῶν. ξόσα γὰρ εὐλέον εξέσε, ὡς ἥρα ἀνθρώπους αἰ λὴν ἵσχυραλ τιμώρηται πρὸς θεών ἐπίφθεουν καὶ γίνονται. ἐκ μὲν δὴ Φερετίμης τῆς Βάττου τοιαύτη τα καὶ τοσαύτη τιμώρη ἐγένετο ἐς Βαρκαλῶν.

305. 2. ἐκ τῆς Ἀγνυτον. If Phereˇtime really returned to Egypt and died there shortly (circa 510 B.C.) her fate and story may have been told in Egypt with the appropriate Greek moral which concludes it (op. Introduction, § 22). But she left a grandson, Battus, on the throne in Kyrene, of whom these pragmatic traditions take no account (except simplicissime in the oracle c. 103 supra). She can hardly therefore have been "afraid of remaining in the Cyrenae" (Rawl.). Perhaps she looked to Egypt not merely for political but for medical aid. She died worm-eaten (σκληρωσ ντροσ), and an end so disgusting implied (to a pious Greek) a divine judgment, a previous transgression. The tale of the τιος, ὁ τιμώρης ἐς Βαρκαλῶν, supplied what was wanted. Blakeley ad l. gives a list of illustrious victims of the foathsome malady.

5. τῆς Βάττου. She was the wife of one Battus and the grandmother of another. Baur suggests that she may have been the daughter of a third. Stein supplies γιωτες and compares das homericˇ homericˇ Εραφος Ἀσδρωδυχη. I have not been able to discover the expression in Iliad or Odyssey. Wesseling's note ad l. runs: Id nollem, turpem Valla sererem, quo Φερετίμης τῆς Βάττου Phereˇtime Batli filiae, per omnes editiones sine animadversione propagari . . . Verenti Laurentio non observabatur Εραφος Ἀσδρωδυχη, etc., etc. Vergil seems to be the author of the phrase Hecatris Andromache, Aen. 3. 519. Bouhier, who was the first to take exception to Valla's filiae (Recherches et Dissertations sur Horodote, Dijon 1746, p. 146), only gives a reference to "the grammarians, among others Lambert Bos, Myster. Elique. Greec." to prove that in such cases γιυι is to be supplied. But cp. R. Kühner, Ausf. Grammatik d. gr. Sp. § 414. 2, who only gives the Vergilian instance. It looks as if Wesseling had started this hare by a lapsus memoriae. The genitive in Hecatris Andromachen (sic) is better taken as possessive, not as elliptical. Cp. Conington, note ad l. c.
ΤΕΡΨΙΧΟΡΗ

Οἱ δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἕλληνικῇ τῶν Περσῶν καταλειφθέντες ὑπὸ 1 Δαρείου, τόν ὁ Μεγάλας ὤργη, πρότον μὲν Περσίδαν Ἑλληνο-ποντίκων οὐ βουλομένοις ὑπηκούσιν εἶναι Δαρείου κατασβέσαντο, περιεβρόματι πρότερον καὶ ὑπὸ Παιῶνον τρηχέως. οἱ γὰρ ὃν ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος Παιῶνος χρήσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ 5 Περσίδαν, καὶ ὃν μὲν ἀντικαταζόμενοι ἐπικαλεσμένοι σφεία οἱ Περσίδαι ἀνομαστὶ βῶσαντες, τοὺς δὲ ἐπιχειρεῖν, ἢν δὲ μὴ ἐπιθύμησαν, μὴ ἐπιχειρεῖν, ἐποίεον οἱ Παιῶνος ταῦτα. ἀντι- καταζόμενοι δὲ τῶν Περσίδων ἐν τῷ προστεθέντω, ἔνδαιτα μονομαχίας τρίφαση ἐκ προκλήσιος σφι ἐγένετο· καὶ γὰρ ἶσχυρὰ ἀνδρὶ καὶ ὢτον ὀπτηρὶ συνέβαλον καὶ κῦκα κυκλ. νικών- των δὲ τα ἐν τῶν Περσίδων, ὃς ἐπαινόντων κυριαρχήσεις, συνε- βαλλοντο οἱ Παιῶνος τὸ χρυστήριον αὐτὸ τοῦτο εἶναι καὶ εἰπὰν καὶ παρὰ σφίσι αὐτοῖς "νῦν ἂν ἐγὼ ὁ χρησμός ἐπιτελεύμασις ἡμᾶς, νῦν ἡμέτερον ἔργον." οὕτω τούτω Περσίδαιοι παιωνίζονται 15

1. 1. οἱ δὲ κτλ. The material reference is back to Book 4, c. 144: the grammatical to the last sentence of Bk. 4 (ἐν μὲν ὂν κτλ.). The Persians in Europe are contrasted with the Persians in Libya. The continuity of Bks. 4 and 5 is thus fully established. On the division cp. 6. 1 note, and Introduction, § 2.
2. Περσίδαι, 80,000 strong, cp. 143 supra, but of course not all Persians proper, 4. 200 etc.
2. πρότον. This passage appears to imply that Perinthos and the Helle- pontians had not been previously reduced by Dareios: the priority might, however, be taken to refer to the operations of Megabazos. Byzantium was the base of operation against Thrace and the west: yet the fleet of Dareios had passed freely through the Hellespont proper, thanks no doubt in part to Miltiades. Cp. c. 2 infra. On the king’s route through Thrace, cp. 4. 89 ff. and Appendix IV. § 4.
3. Ἑλληνοποντίκαι here includes all west of Byzantium, cp. 4. 85, 89, etc.
5. τοῦ θεοῦ. Dionysos had an oracle among the Bessi of Dalphic lucidity, cp. 7. 111. The παῖς might rather suggest Apollo: but see infra.
9. ἔνδαιτα. It looks as if a friendly and athletic contest had resulted in a free fight: such things happen. If so, the incident has been exaggerated. But cp. note infra on ἐλέγχοι.
11. ἔτοπον... κῦκα. Pannonian horses and hounds were celebrated. Polinx, s. 46, Minoermos, Fr. 17 (Stein).
12. ἐπαυνόντων. The Perinthians were not mocking the Pannonians but shaming the Apolline cry of victory: the clients of Dionysos apparently did not like it.
ἐπιχειρήσων οἱ Παιόνες, καὶ πολλὰς τὰ ἐκεράτησαν καὶ ἐξαιτού σφένοι ὁλόγως. τὰ μὲν δὲ ἄπτο Παιόνων πρὸτερον γενόμενα ὁδε ἐγένετο· τότε δὲ ἀνδρῶν ἄγαθῶν περὶ τῆς ἑλευθερίας γυναικῶν τῶν Περινθίων οἱ Πέρσαι τε καὶ ὁ Μεγάβαιος ἐπεκράτησαν πληθεῖ. ὡς δὲ ἐγερθῶθα ἡ Πέρσαν, ἤλαυνε Μεγάβας τὸν 3 στρατού διὰ τῆς Θρακίας, πάσαν πόλιν καὶ τὸν ἱππικον τῶν ταύτης οἰκείων ἑμερομένων βασιλεύς. ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ ἐνετέταλκο ἐκ Δαρείου, Θρᾷς καταστρέφεσθαι.

3 Θρακίων δὲ ἔθνος μέγαντόν ἐστι μετὰ τῆς Ἰνδοὺς πάντων ἀνθρώπων· εἰ δὲ Ἰνδός ἐν ἐν θέματοι ἡ φρονείς κατὰ τὰ τούτα, ἀμαχοῖς τὰν ἐν ἐν καὶ πολλῷ κρατίστων ἐν τόνδεν κατὰ ἑνώμεν τῆς ἑπάτη, ἄλλα γὰρ τοῦτο ἀπορον σφι καὶ ἀμαχίαν ἢ καὶ 5 ἔγχυνασι, εἴς δὲ κατὰ τότεν ἀσθενεῖς, οὐδέματα ἐξοντίσαν πολλὰ κατὰ χόρσας ἐκαστοῖ, νόμοσα δὲ ὀούτοι παραπλησίαι

17. ἄλγον. Yet the Perinthians offer a stout resistance to the Persian. Rawlinson makes πρὸτερον long before, vol. iii. p. 211. If this massacre of 'Perinthians' took place before the days of the Greek colonisation it may have facilitated the Greek occupation. Unfortunately Hdt. does not precisely date the event. Perinthos may have been occupied by Samians about b.c. 599. Cp. Smith's Dict. Geogr. sup. sc., Busolt, Gr. G. 1.2 470. The Samian connexion may perhaps explain the introduction of the tradition. The distinction between the original Perinthians and the Samian ἔσωος has been obliterated. 2. 4. πλήθος, 80,000 strong, 4. 143. οὐ δὲ corresponds to πρῶτοι μὲν c. 1 supra.

5. πόλεις, Hellenic, ἔθνος, non-Hellenic. τῶν ταύτης οἰκείων. Cp. 6. 33. How Miltiades and the Chersonesians could be excepted from this general statement does not appear, save on the supposition that their loyalty was sans reproche. Cp. c. 10 ad fin. where the concluding sentence resumes the narrative. 3. 1. μέγατος. One misses the qualification τῶν ἱματίων. Cp. Introduction, p. eiv. The area of Thrace was much enlarged for Hdt. by his misconception of the course of the Danube. Cp. 4. 90. Even so, it is difficult to understand his putting the Thracians before the Scythians. Ἰνδοὺς. Cp. 3. 94, 98. 2. ἵνα ἔνοδον, monarchy.

φρονού. κ.τ., like good republicans (federation).

Monarchy in Hdt.'s opinion might be a good thing—for Thracians. Sitalakes made the attempt in Hdt.'s own day to found a united Thrace, and it was repeated by Bybistes long after. Cp. 4. 80. Was this passage written before that excursus on Sitalakes?

3. γνώμην τῆς ἑρήμου. But not in the opinion of Thucydides, who perhaps knew more about the Thracians and less about the Scythians than Hdt. It is, indeed, difficult to avoid the inference that Thucydides had the statement of Hdt. in view when he wrote: ταύτη δὲ ἐν διάφωνα διέσωσαν εἷς ὑπ' ἐν τῇ ἑξαερίᾳ ἂν ὧδ' ἐν τῇ 'Ἀσία τιθέν τοῦ ἐν προς ἐν ἂν ἐςεν ὑπ' ἐν τοις ἱππικοῖς ὑμωγειμητοῖς πᾶσιν ἀντιστάσει, 2. 97, 6. Asia covers the Indians of Hdt. Aristotle leaves no obscurity about the implicit moral when discussing the characteristics of a free and imperial race: Pol. 4. 7, 3, 1327b τὸ δὲ τῶν 'Ελλήνων γένος . . . διῳκήμον ἀρχετα πάσας, ματ γεγένηται πολιτείας. 4. ἑορτα. Cp. 4. 48 supra. 5. ὀνόματα . . . πολλά. We know the names of 50 tribes (R.). Hdt. names 19 (vide Stein ad l.).

The customs of the Thracians in general are specified c. 6 infra.

The customs of the Getae have been described 4. 93 supra, and are therefore here omitted. Those of the Thraes are given c. 4, and those of the Thracians beyond Kreston, c. 5 infra.
πάντες χρέωται κατά πάντα, πλὴν Γετέων καὶ Τραυνοῦ καὶ τῶν κατόπτερθε Κρηστοναίων οἰκεύοντων. τούτον δὲ τὰ μὲν Γέται οἱ 4 ἀδαναπτύουστες ποιεύσι, εἰρηταὶ μὲν Τραυνοὶ δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα κατὰ ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλους Ὀρηῖς ἐπιτελοῦσι, κατὰ δὲ τῶν γενόμενον σφι καὶ ἀγονόμενον ποιεύσι τουώδες τοῖς μὲν γενόμενον περιτάχον μενο προσήκουσιν ὀλοφόρωσιν, ὡσ μὲν δὲ ἑπείτε ἑγένετο ἀναπλήρθησαν κακά, ἀναγεννοῦσι τὰ ἀνθρωπόμην πάντα πάθεα τῶν δ’ ἀγονόμενον παλιῶσιν τε καὶ γονόμενον γη κρῆτον, ἐπιπλέοντες ὅσων κακῶν ἐξαιτίασε ἢυτί ἢν πάσης εὐδαμομοίρῃ, οἱ δὲ κατόπτερθε Κρηστοναῖοι ποιεύσι τουώδε. ἔχει δ’ ἴμακας ἑκάστος πολλάς· ἐπείδ’ ὅπως τῶν αὐτῶν ἀποθάνῃ, κρῖσις

On Thrace and the Thracians see Kiepert, Manual, §§ 180 ff., Smith, Dict. Geogr. ii. 1176 ff., Giseke, Thracisch-pelasische Stämme der Balkanhalbinsel, Leipzig, 1855. For Greeks, especially Athenians, of the Periklean age, the interest in Thrace and its inhabitants was doubtless augmented by the fresh settlements there (cp. 8, 75); and mythical or prehistoric links were revived or established (especially in Athenian speculations), cp. Gaertlingen, de Graecorum fabulis ad Thraces pertinentibus (Berlin, 1888).

4. εἰρηταὶ. 4. 93 εὐρήσι. 4. γενόμενον. . . γενόμενον. The change of tense should be observed.

5. ὀλοφόρωσιν. This Transian view of life as ‘not worth living’ is by no means uncommon, specially where a higher culture intrudes. Wholesale cases of voluntary extinction by barbarous nations are not unknown: O. Peschel, The Races of Man, E.T. p. 151. The pessimistic vein is, however, anything but un-Hellenic, cp. 1, 32, 7, 46. The Sophoklean chorus gives utterance to a similar sentiment O.C. 1225 ff.

An incomplete list of life’s evils follows: φθόνοι, στίξεις, ἐραί, μέμια, φέους, γῆρας. The more humane and optimistic view, which estimates life as a whole, striking a balance twixt good and ill, is embodied in such maxims and anecdotes as those reported of Solon and the Sages, cp. 1, 30, and nearly represents the cheerful common sense of the Hellenes from Achilles (Od. 11, 488) to Aristotle (Rh. Nic. i. 9, 15, 1095a 5 ὅ ἐν καὶ πολέμοις, ὅσο ἡ εὐδαμομοίρῃ).


Blakesley note 11 remarks that Euripides (in his Kresphontes) had a parallel to this custom of the Transi, and thinks the poet heard of it “as the Macedonian court.” Stein suggests that Euripides got the idea from this passage in Hdt.

9. Κρηστοναίων. By ‘Krestonaeans’ must be understood the inhabitants of Krestonae, which was a district ad-joining Ἡλεωνη to 7, 124 (cp. 8, 116) between the Axios and the Strymon. What the relation if any between the Kresto-νή αἰ γη (8, 115) and the Κρῆτων πόλις (1, 57), between Κρήστοναντικαι and Κρηστοναῖαι, are most points. To change Kreston into Kroton (= Etrurian Cortona) in 1, 57 (with Stein) cuts the knot, in a way not convincing. Perhaps Hdt.’s information is here drawn from sources that avoided ascribing city organisation to the Thracians, or Pelasgi, of Krestonice, cp. πόλις—φθόνοι c. 2 εὐρήσι. Hdt. however below c. 7 uses πολίς carelessly of Thracians.

8. 2. πολλάς. One is tempted to think from this that the Krestonaeans at least were monogamous.
This sacrifice of the favourite wife is as good a proof of belief in a future life as the practice of the Getae 4. 94, or Scythians, 4. 71. Cp. O. Peschel, Races of Man, p. 259. On the wide prevalence of satyrs, cp. Westermarck, History of Human Marriage, p. 125. The practices of polygamy and satyrs would show that these highlanders had male-descent.

6. ι. νέοιο. This and the two following chapters exhibit the use of three of the standing anthropological categories of Hdt.—νέοιο, θεόν, ταφαί.

7. 2. ένοης. Hdt.'s list of Thracian deities is incomplete (vide Rawlinson) and even misleading. R's view that Ares, Dionysos, and Artemis represent respectively War, Drinking, and the Chase is fanciful. All three deities were more probably war-gods, helenised by the Greeks in Thrace. Artemis may stand for the Thracian Kotys or Korytto or for Bendis whose cult was not unknown in Athens itself ( Xen. Hel. 2. 4, 11, Plato, Rep. 1. 1). Stein happily refers to 4. 33. Dionysos had an oracle among the Bessi, 7. 111.

In the royal Hermes Rawlinson sees "some mythic inventor of the useful arts." But as the Thracians despised these labours this conjecture appears unfortunate. Perhaps Hermes stands for a deity invoked by the chieftains in their bargains or treaties (diónos, ménos, rov'tos) with the Greeks, and represented by them (Mégos) as their ancestor. That ancestor-worship was practised is of course not disputed.

1. τολυτήνας looks like a lapus calamin, but cp. cc. 5 supra, 16 infra.
8. 1. τοιού εὐδαίμονα. The wealthy, cp. οι., 28, 31 ἑπόμα.
 3. ἐπουσ˽. κράταντες, τρ., 'they burn and bury the corpse, or simply bury it.'
 5. τὰ μέγιστα ἄδελα τίθεται κατὰ λέγον μονομαχίας. "the single combat is awarded the highest prize" (BL); "die grössten Preise für den Einzelkampf je nach seiner Bedeutung ausgesetzt werden" (St.); "die grössten Preise ausgesetzt werden, je nach Verhältnissen des Zweikampfes" (Baehrl.). The meaning seems to be simply: 'The greatest prizes (given for such things) are awarded, the competitors being matched in pairs.' There is no necessary implication that smaller prizes were awarded on a different system; or that the importance of the various 'duels' varied. The contrast implied lies not between the several items in the Thracian δῶρα, but between the Thracian δῶρα and Hellenic δώραs in which the prizes were slight (ὁ δίδυμος στέφανος 8. 26), and more than two competitors entered (c. 22 ἑπόμα). An example of this Thracian μονομαχίας is given c. 1 ἑπόμα.

9. 1. οἶδα. Op. the formulae in 4. 16, 24. Who furnished him with τὰ ἄρετα concerning Thrace itself Hdt. unfortunately does not specify. This chapter may have been derived in part from western Greek sources. It carries us into the Adriatic region. See Introduction, p. xix, and 1. 5 ἑπόμα.

2. αὐτῷ ὡς. Ἰταρόν s.v. Stein.
3. δῶρα. There is no Ocean on the north of Europe, according to Hdt. Cp. 4. 36, 45.

4. τίρημα τ. "I. The Danube with Hdt. is the N. boundary of Thrace, and as he probably places the Danube in this part much too far north, he has the more room for Thrace. Cp. c. 3 ύπομα.

5. Σιγύνας. Steph. Byz. quotes Ktesias as authority for Σῖγυνας in Egypt. Strabo 520 places Σῖγυνας in the Caspian region, and says of them τὰλλα μὲν ποριβάζουσι, ἵππαι δὲ χρωμάς μακρὰς διότι τὸν αἰτῶν. The resemblance with this passage is obvious. In the 'Zigeuner' (gipsies) Bl. sees a survival of the Sigunae. Touching their Median origin there may have been some confusion on the part of Hdt. or his sources over the Thraxian tribe Medoi (Steph. Byz. sub e.), whom he does not mention. The 'Median' dress (c. 49 ἑπόμα, cp. 6. 112) may have supported the theory. But cp. Strabo l. c. supra.

The Eneti on the Adriatic (cp. Hekataios οἰοι) Steph. Byz. sub voc. 'Αδριατικὸς are probably so described to distinguish them from the Paphlegonian Enotes of the Haid 2. 852. Blakesley suggests that the Eneti conducted a traffic between the Adriatic and the Exeine by means of some entrepôt on the Danube. Cp. 4. 33. We have here again an indication of the Amber route from the Baltic, all the more valuable if this passage be from a different source.

6. ἵππας. Bl. sees in these small horses polnische Pferde, i.e. ponies.
10 τούτον τοὺς ὁδοὺς ἀγχοῦ Ἐνετῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ Ἁδρή. ἦν δὲ Μῆδους σφέας ἀπολίκους λέγουσιν, ἄκος δὲ οὗτοι Μῆδων ἀποικίων ἦγοντο, ἔγο μὲν οὖκ έχο ἐπιφράσσεται, γένουτο δ’ ἂν πάν ἐν τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ. σιγήνας δ’ ὁν καλέωσι Λάγνες οἱ ἀνώ ὑπέρ
10 Μασσαλίλης οικεῖοις τῶν κατήλλων, Κύπροι δὲ τὰ δόρατα. ὅσ’ δὲ Θρήκες λέγουσιν, μέλισσαι κατέχουν τὰ πέρι τοῦ Ἰστροῦ, καὶ ἢπ τωσίων οὐκ ἦν διελθεῖν τὸ προσοτερόν. ἐμοὶ μὲν νυν ταύτα λέγουτε δοκεῖσθαι λέγειν οὐκ οἰκότα: τὰ γὰρ ξῦνα ταύτα 5 φαίνεται ἐναι δύσραι: ἀλλὰ μοι τὰ ὑπὸ τὴν ἄρκτον ὀλίκητα δοκεῖν ἦν διὰ τὰ φύγεα. ταύτα μὲν νυν τῆς χώρης ταύτης πέρα λέγεται τὰ παραβάλλοντα δ’ ἂν αὐτής Μεγάβαζως Περσέων κατήλλοι ἐποίει.

11 Δαρείος δὲ ὡς διαβάζει τάχυστα τῶν Ἐλληντικοῦ ἀπίκετο ἐς Σάρδης, ἐμνήσθη τῆς ἐς Ἰστιαίου τοῦ Μιλησίου ἐφεργεσίας καὶ τῆς παρανείπους τῶν Μυκηναίων Κώσων, μεταπερφήμους δὲ σφεας ἐς Σάρδης ἐδίδου αὐτοῦ ἀιρέσειν. ὦ μὲν δὴ Ἰστιαίου, ἀτε 5 τυραννεύον τῆς Μιλησίου, τυραννιδος μὲν ὀδεμείας προσεχής, αὐτέα δὲ Μύρκινον τὴν Πήλον, θουλὸμενος ἐν αὐτῇ πρόλυτα κτίσαν. ὀυτός μὲν δὴ ταύτην αἰρέται, ὡ δὲ Κώσα, οίδα ὑπὸ 12 τύραννος δημότης της ἐως, αὐτέα Μυρλήνης τυραννεύσαι. τελεω-


13. συγγένες . . δόρατα. The last sentence of this chapter is suspiciously like a gloss. Stein defends it. If genuine it is all the more remarkable as the only passage where Hdt. names the greatest of the Phokian colonies. It is inconceivable, however, that Hdt. should have been ignorant of the existence of Massalia. This passage would also bear out the view that Hdt.'s information here is derived from a western source. It is plainly not from a 'Thracian': see next chapter. Cp. Introduction, p. xcix.

10. 2. Θρήκες. He returns to eastern sources. The specification of the source here accompanies incredulity, cp. 4. 157. Hdt. might have rationalised the Thracian bees into the sting of cold, as the Scythic feathers into snowflakes 4. 31 supra, but stops short of that. Is it possible that the 'bees' were gnats or mosquitoes?

5. τὴν ἄρκτον. The Bear (cp. 4. 101). 'Αρκτον θ’ ἢ καὶ 'Αμαζόν ἐπιφράσσει καλάτοι μη 18. 487. The constellations Ursae Majoris. The translation "pole" (Macaulay) seems to imply a cosmical theory, of which Hdt. betrays no conception. Cp. 4. 36.

7. τὰ παραβάλλοντα. The Thracian Chersonese would have to be included, if the loyalty of Miltiades were not above suspicion. Cp. c. 2 supra.

11. 1. Μυρκινος. Which he could hardly have done without the support of Miltiades.

Ἐλληνιστικόν in narrower sense. Cp. 4. 35. The sentence carries back to 4. 143. The service of Histiaeus 4. 137-142, the suggestion of Koes, 4. 97. In their rewards the tyrants here appears as the out-post and prop of 'Medism,' Cp. 4. 137.

Myrkinos was not on the site afterwards occupied by Amphipolis (Nine Ways, 8. 114) vid. Rawlinson ad loc. The Eolians recovered the city c. 126 τάφρα, and it was in their hands in 424 B.C. Thuc. 4. 107 (St.).
12. 3. Δαρείον συνήγγεια... ἐπιθυμήσα. The words suggest a coincidence rather than a causal relation. Ὡς ἐπιθυμήσεως 4. 1. ἐπιθυμησαί ἐπιθυμήσαι ταύτης ἐπιθυμήσεως is an inelgant sequence. The charming story which follows, cc. 12, 13, seems hardly adequate to account for the fete of the Palionais.

The passage suggests a picture; like some other passages in Hdt.'s work: cp. 4. 88. Had the subject been pictorially treated! Nicolas of Damascus (αιμι Κωνσταντίνος, Perp. de dom. 1. 3. Hist. Gr. min. i. p. 75 ed. Teyb, Müller, Frag. Hist. iii. p. 413) tells the same story, with trilling variations, of a certain 'Thracian' (Μυσιαῖος) and his wife, Alyattes the Lydian king taking the place of Dareios. Though the citation is bald, it is quite as likely to give the earlier version. "The repetition of such tales is a common feature of ancient legendary history" (R.). For another instance cp. c. 20 ἐντρα. A local story has apparently been transferred to Dareios. Possibly the τοιοῦτος betrays a slight misgiving on the part of Hdt. or a hint that he has touched up the material. Cp. Append. IV. § 7.

14. Ἀσίας. In Asia the women were kept in confinement. This contrast may have contributed to the elaboration of the anecdote. The political motive suggested (ἐθνικής Παλιονᾶς τυραννίας) for the rise of the brothers, and the nemesis which attends them, are also observable, in the same connexion.

13. 6. τίνς... ἀδημοίτω ζήσε καὶ κατὰ γῆς οἰκήματος. Cp. the question of Kyros respecting the Lakedaimonians 1. 153, and of Dareios respecting the Athenians c. 105 ἐντρα. Even satraps put this lordly question, c. 78 ἐντρα.
160 ΗΡΩΔΟΤΟΥ

έλθοιεν ἐς Σάρδις. οἱ δὲ οἱ ἐφραζόν ὡς ἐλθοιεν μὲν ἐκείνῳ δύναντες σφέας αὐτοὺς, εἰς δὲ ἡ Παιονίη ἐπὶ τῷ Στρομόνιον ποταμῷ πεπολυμένη, ὁ δὲ Στρομόνιον ὁ πρὸς τοῦ Ἑλλησκότου, εἰσαμεν δὲ Τευκρῶν τῶν ἐκ Τροίς ἀποκοιμηθήσατε. οἱ μὲν δὲ ταῦτα ἐκαστὰ ἔλεγον, ὁ δὲ εἰρήνη εἰ καὶ πᾶσαι αὐτῶι αἱ γυναῖκες εἰσαμεν οὕτω ἑργαίτες. οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐφέσυν προβούμων οὕτω

14 ἑκεῖνι αὐτοῦ γάρ ὡν τοῦτον εἶνεκα καὶ ἐποτεύκα. ἔνθατα Δαρείος γράφει γράμματα Μεγαβάκριοι, τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν τῇ Θρηκίᾳ στρατηγοῖς, ἐπίτελονος ἐξεναστήσαι εἰς ἡδέων Παιονίων καὶ παρ' ἑνῶν ἀγαγεν καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ τέκνα τε καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας τοὺς 5 αὐτούς. αὐτίκα δὲ ἐπεγενέσθαι νῦν ἀφερή τῆς ἡμερήσιοι ἐπὶ τῶν Ἑλλησκότου, περαιαθείς δὲ διδοὺ τῷ βυζίλων τῷ Μεγαβάκριοι, ὁ δὲ ἐπιπλεξάμενος καὶ λαβὼν ἡγεμόνας εἰ καὶ τῆς Θρηκίας ἐστρατεύετο επὶ τῇ Παιονίᾳ. πυθόμενοι δὲ οἱ Παιονίως τῶν Πέρσας ἐπὶ σφέας ἑκατον, ἀμέθυστος εὔστρατεύεστο πρὸς θαλάσσης, δοκοῦντες ταῦτα ἐπιχειρήσεσθαι τῶν Πέρσας ἐμβάλλοντας. οἱ μὲν δὲ Παιονίως ἦσαν ἔτοιμοι τοῦ Μεγαβάκρου στρατοῦ ἐπίσταντα ἑρίτευκαν ὁ δὲ

15 Πέρσας πυθόμενοι συναλίθεσι τοὺς Παιονίους καὶ τὴν πρὸς θαλάσσης ἐσβολήν φυλάσσοντας, ἔχοντες ἡγεμόνας τὴν ἀνω ὁδὸν τράπωνται, λαβόντες δὲ τοὺς Παιονίους ἐσπόπτουσι ἐς τὰς

9. Παιονίως...πεπολυμένην. An exaggeration no doubt. Cp. πολυτευκιν. s. 7 supra.

11. Τευκρῶν. This would be an argument for the Persian protectorate, as the Persians claimed Assiatics in their own right. Cp. 1. 4. On Teukrian colonies cp. 4. 191. That Trojans might have found their way to Thrace, after the destruction of their city, is surely not very improbable. Rawlinson erroneously supposed that the Palomians are here conceived as an off-shoot of the Teukri, before these left their ancient abode in Europe. R.'s supposition is disproved by 7. 20 which he here quotes in support of his mistake. The Strymon was claimed centuries after as the western frontier of the Persian empire. Cp. letter of Sapor to Constantius A.D. 358. "As the lawful successor of Darius Hystaspis Sapor asserted that the river Strymon in Macedonia was the true and ancient boundary of his empire," Gibbon, c. xix. (i. 405, ed. 1848).

13. ἑργάθες: ἑργάθες ἑργῶν τε καὶ κεραίωντας, Nic. Dam. L.c. supra. ἑφασαν προβούμων. The young men overreach themselves, and instead of winning crowns involve their own people in captivity. αὐτῶν τοῦτον εἶνακα is vague, if not inconsequential. The object of the young men has been expressly stated above, to establish a tyranny in Paimia, supported by the Persians: their action was, however, better calculated to produce the result actually realised. This inconvenience is not involved in the story, as found in Nicolaus, and is another reason for condemning the Herodotean version: not but what consistency may be a product of reflection. Such inconveniences, however, are not rare in Herodotus, and betray his constructive methods. Cp. Introduction, § 19.

14. 2. γράφει γράμματα. One cannot suppose that Hdt. had documentary evidence for this special commission, which here comes in to define the more general direction ὅπνιων κατάστρεψεια c. 5 supra. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxviii.

5. ἐποτεύκα. The Persian courier service, or royal post, is more fully described 8. 98. But on the present occasion a single messenger seems to have performed the whole service.
πόλιας αὐτῶν ἐσόδας ἀνδρῶν ἐρήμωσε τετετεός κατέσχον, οἱ δὲ Παιόνες ὡς ἐπιθύμοντο ἐξομένοις τὰς πόλιας, αὐτίκα διασκεδασθέντες κατ᾽ ἐκουσίον ἐκαστοι ἐτρέποτοι. 10 καὶ παρεδίδοσαν σφέας αὐτῶν τούτοι Πέρσης. οὕτω δὴ Παίονων Σιρισπαίννες τε καὶ Παιόπλα ταῖς Πρασιάδος λήμνης εἷς θέσεως ἐξεναστάντες ἔγινον ἐν τῇ Λήμνῃ, οἱ δὲ περὶ 16 τῆς Πάγγαλος Ὀρος [καὶ Δύσηρας καὶ Ἀγρικάννας καὶ Ὀδομάντους] καὶ αὐτὴ τὴν λήμνην τῆς Πρασίαδα οὐκ ἐχαιρώθησαν ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ Μεγαβάξουν ἐπετρήθη δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ λήμνῃ κατοικημένοις ἐξαιρέσθην ὁδός. ἦκα τεπὶ σταυρῷς ἐνθεὶ πῆλοι ἐξερχόμενα ἐν μέσῃ ἐστικε τῇ λήμνῃ, ἐσοδον ἐκ τῆς ἡπείρου στενήν ἐχουτα μῆ γεφύρη. τοὺς δὲ σταυροὺς τοὺς ὑπετέωτας τοῖς ἱκρώσει τοὺς καὶ ἐρχόμενοι τὸν καὶ ἐκαστοῖς ἐνθαρρύνετο καὶ πλεῖστον μετὰ δὲ πάνω χρεώμενοι ἱστάσατο τοὐδεὶς κομίζομεν τοὺς ὀδοὺς τὴν ὁδονάμα ἐστὶ Ωρβίλλος, κατὰ γυναίκας ἔκαστην τὸ γαμεῖον τρίς σταυροῦς ἐπιτρήσσετο. ἂντεις δὲ ἐκαστος συνήκας γυναίκας. εἰσένυσαν δὲ τοὺς τρωτός, κρατέους ἐκαστος ἐπὶ τῶν ἱκρών καλύπτης τῆς ἐν τῇ διαστάσει καὶ θύρας καταπακτής διὰ τῶν ἱκρών κατὰ φεροῦσας ἐς τῇ λήμνῃ. τὰ δὲ νῆπια παιδία δέοντα τοῦ πωδός σπάραν, μὴ κατακυκλῳσθης δεμαίνοντες. τοῖς δὲ ὑποσκιοῦντας καὶ τοῖς ὑποσκιοῦσι 15 παρέχουσι χώραν ἰχθύν. τῶν δὲ πληθὺς ἐστὶ τοσοῦτο ὅστε, ὅταν τὴν θύραν τὴν καταπακτὴν ἀνακλίνῃ, καὶ καθε χίλιον σπυρίδα κενήν ἐς τῇ λήμνῃ, καὶ οὔ πολλὰ τινα χρῶν ἐπεισχὼν.

pates the strategy at Thermopylae 7. 213. This same pass was afterwards traversed by Brutus and Cassius on the way to Philippi. The normal pass followed the valley of the Strymon. Giesecke, Ἐρακίστης-πελαγική Ἰμένη, p. 5.

8. πόλιας, used loosely for κώμας, cp. πανάλομη, ch. 18. επφαρ. If they had been really empty (εὔβοι) the men need hardly have surrendered.

12. Σιρισπαίννε. Giesecke (op. cit. p. 4) sees their name in the town Siris (mod. Seres) 8. 115. A town in Italy bore the same name, cp. 8. 62 and Steph. B. sub voc.

Παιόπλα. Giesecke places east of the Siropaiantes.

μέρπ. As far (north) as ... 16. 2. Πάγγαλος Ὀρος. The district abounded with gold and silver 7. 112. The tribes on Mount 'Pangian' would be in the rear of Megabazos when he had reached the Paionian plain north of the mountains. The Deberi (to be distinguished from the tribe, Thuc. 2. 90) are placed (by Giesecke) "between Amphipolis and Philippi"; the Odomant further north on left bank of the Strymon; the Agrian still further north, by the sources of the same river. "The lake Prasia is the lake into which the Strymon flows" (Giesecke op. c.). It is difficult to believe that Paonia was conquered, or even attacked, until the tribes in the region of Pangian and Prasia had been reduced to order. Cp. next chapter. Stein brackets the words καὶ ... Οδομάντους. 5. εἰσαρέον ἥδε is very harsh. St. suggests κατοικημένοις δὲ ἥδε instead of ἥδε. Abicht simply transposes εἰσαρέειν κατοικημένον.

We have in this chapter the earliest description of 'Lake Dwellings.' On the subject in general consult Lubbock, Prehistoric Times, ch. vi., Encyc. Br. xiv. 222 ff., R. Munro, The Lake Dwellings of 

VOL. I
Europe (London, 1890), and the forthcoming Album lacustre du Musée de Lavalasse. Whether there were really Lake Dwellings in Lake Plassen, or not, has not been ascertained; and it is at least possible that Hdt. may have here have mixed up some description of such remains with a report of such a method of fishing as that described in Rawlinson, note ad f. vol. iii. p. 222.

17. 2. δόε ἰχθυοβιτα. After conquering but before carrying them into Asia. Cp. c. 23 infra, ad init. The conquest of Paionia was by no means complete or effective. The Paionians lay out of the direct line of advance, and it required a special command from the king to bring about operations against them, c. 14 supr. The direct advance of the Persians is now resumed, and brings them into contact with Macedonia, the E. frontier of which, at this date, may be placed on the Axios. The invasion of Thrace, with the reduction of the Paionians and other tribes by the Persians, was no doubt a benefit to Macedonian ambition, of which it was not slow to avail itself. Anytus, old in years and affairs sees his opportunity, and pays homage to the Persian king. The story of the patriotism and chivalry of Alexander which follows would be more credible but for the following considerations: (1) his subsequent conduct and policy were not of a piece with what is here set down. Not merely does he himself afterwards make terms with the Persian (see c. 21 infra), he also makes, so far as we learn, no effort subsequently to repudiate the Persian supremacy, though opportunity was not wanting, see 6. 44. (2) Similar stories, as Rawlinson remarks, are told of other persons: of Messenians and Laconians, by Pausanias 4. 4. 2. Of Athenians and Megarceans by Polyainos 1. 20, 2 (= Plutarch, Solon 8). Of Theban exiles and the Polemarchs by Xenophon, Hdt. 5. 4. 2-6. Add the banquet scene in Plutarch, Theseus 30, which, however, lacks the Verkleidung; and the story of the Mipyaa 4. 146 supra, which lacks the banquet. Of course such things may happen, and may happen more than once; yet the repetition of similar stories tends to discredit. Cp. c. 12 supra. If it be said that there are touches of verisimilitude in Hdt.'s story (e.g. ἄληθεν οἵ ἀνθρώπων c. 18 infra), it may be answered that such touches are not beyond the art of the good story-teller, and that there are other touches (see c. 18 infra) with a contrary moral. There are, besides, many small omissions and inconsequence in the story: were the interpreters employed? How many of the supposed ladies were there, seven or more? How was the massacre of the suite managed? Where is the scene laid? and so forth. (3) If the story were not so easily explained, the motive so obvious! The story is a part of the general glorification of Alexander and Macedon, which is conspicuous in every reference to him in Hdt. Cp. c. 22 infra.

This observation in no way impugns the bona fides of Herodotus, who in such matters was not hypercritical. Stein remarks on the partiality of Hdt. for the Macedonian royal house, and credits the tradition of his residence at the court. (Cp. c. 22 infra αὐτοὶ Αἰγυπτίων αὐτῇ τε ὑπὸ τιγυξίων εὐπιστάτους.) Apart from this possibility, it would seem that Athenian observers in the Herodotean age were interested in Macedon, with which the Athenians would fain have been on good terms, and the traditions of the Persian wars in Hdt. are largely an Athenian product. The friendship and fidelity of Alexander to Athens were such a wholesome and suggestive memory in the days of the shifting Perdickas! Cp. Thucyd. 1. 57.

Grote (vii. 83 ed. 1872) believes the story in Xenophon, although he has this anticipation before his eyes, and although Xenophon admits that there was another account of the affair, afterwards endorsed by Plutarch, which omitted the 'young men in women's attire.' The fabulous character of the Messenian legends preserved by Pausanias make against the story told by him. It resembles the story of the Athenians told by Polyainos (cp. Plutarch, Solon, l. c. supra), and this might be the most genuine of all the traditions. Even in this case the ruse,
δούνην ἀνδρας ἐπὶ Πέρσας, οἱ μὲν αὐτὸν ἐκείνον ἦσαν δοκι-
μοτατοί ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἐπέμποντο δὲ οὐνοὶ πάρα Ἀμύντη
αἰτήσοντες γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ Δαρείῳ βασιλεῖ. ἐστι δὲ ἐκ τῆς 5
Πρασίδος ἄμμης σύντομος κάρτα ἐς τὴν Μακεδονίαν· πρῶτον
μὲν γὰρ ἔχεται τῆς ἄμμης τὸ μέταλλον εξ ὦν ὑστερον ὑπὸ τῶν τὸ
καλλυντὸν ἄργυρον Ἀλεξάνδρου ἠμέρης ἐκάστης ἐφοίτη, μετὰ δὲ
tὸ μέταλλον Δύσσαρον καλεόμενον δρος ὑπερβαίνει εἰσὶν εἰς Μακε-
doνίαν. οἱ όν Πέρσαι οἱ περιβλέποντες οὐνοὶ πάρα τὸν Ἀμύντην ὄν
ἀπίκουσι, ἀπεναντίας ἐδόθην ἔς ὑπεν τὴν Ἀμύντηυ Δαρείῳ
βασιλεῖ γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ. ὁ δὲ ταύτα τε ἐδίδοντο καὶ σφαῖρας ἐπὶ
ξεινα καλέειν, παρασκευάζοντος δὲ δείπνοιν μεγαλοπρεπές ἔδεκεν τοὺς
Πέρσας φιλοφρόνουσιν. ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ δείπνου εἴγεντον, διαπέσοντες 5
ἐκπον οἱ Πέρσαι τάδε. "ξείνη Μακεδόνος, ἡμῖν νόμος ἐστὶν τοῖον

or the story of the ruse, might have been suggested by something in the ritual at Kolos. But if such a story was
at least in Athens, and connected with Solon, it is not difficult to see in it
one source of the story of Alexander and
his young men. The new element in
the Atheno-Macedonian version is the
Banquet. (Cp. Plutarch, Theseus, L. c.
supra.) Whatever the source or origin
of the story, it is hardly credible in the
light of the inconsistencies, improp-
abilities, and duplicates above pointed
3. ἐντά. The number but not the
names being given, a particularity which
should not be used as an argument for
the truth of the story. Krüger observes
that Seven is the holy number of the
Persians. Cp. the number of the con-
spirators against the Magi, 3. 70, 71, a
number indubitably authentic, or at least
official (Behistun). The large number
of envoys, and the fact that they were
called all true Persians (Πέρσας not as in
c. 1 supra) and of the highest rank, all go
to mark the dignity of the Macedonian
court. Apparently only two heralds
were sent to Sparta, 7. 194 (anno 491
B.C. cp. 6. 48 infra).
4. Ἀμύντην, fifth in descent from
Perdikkas the founder of the Macedonian
fortunes. Cp. 8. 137. A few years, or
it might be months, after this Amyntas
offered Anthemus, a district near Therm
at the head of the Thermian gulf, to
the exiled Hippias: c. 94 infra. per-
haps it was not his to give: any way
Hippias declared the offer, preferring a
direct application to Persia.
5. γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ. The symbolic
offerings of subjects or vassals. Cp.
6. 48.
7. ὑστερον. At this time the district
was not yet subject to Macedon: indeed
in making Dysoros the eastern frontier
of Macedonia Hdt. is guilty of an ana-
chronism. The frontier about 510 B.C.
may be left at the Axios, or at most on
the east of the Thermian gulf. Hdt.
indeed makes the Axios the boundary
between Myglena and Bottiaeis (7.
123), and the Lydias and Halikam-
the boundary between Bottiaeis and
Makedonis proper (7. 127) in his own
day. But these are rather political than
ethnical frontiers.
8. ἐφοίτη. Cp. 3. 115 ἄν ἐστιν τὸ
Ἀθηναῖος φασίν ἀφεός ἐστι. In the
absence of any indication of the duration
of this large output, it seems useless
to attempt an estimate of the annual
income, gross or net; it may have
cessated at the time of writing, and Alex-
ander was presumably no more. Cp.
p. 193.
12. ἀπίκοντο. Hdt. omits to state
the place at which the scene is laid.
Blakley is no doubt right in specifying
Aigai (Edessa), "high up in the moun-
tains." Fella was not the Macedonian
'Residence' until the days of Philip II.
6. νόμος. "If this portion of the
tale be true (the speakers) must have
presumed greatly upon the Greek
ignorance of Persian customs" (R.). (Cp.
1. 133 for Persian drinking boats.)
Stein quotes Plutarch, Mor. 613 τοὺς
Πέρσας ἀνάδεης φασίν µὴ ταῖς γαμήταις ἄλλα
tας παλακίας συμμεθύσκαται καὶ συνορ-
χεύσαν.
Πέρασης, ἐπεὶ δὲ πιπτόν προτιθέμεθα μέγα, τότε καὶ τὰς παλλακάς καὶ τὰς κουριότιας γυναίκας ἐσάγεσθαι παρέδρους. σὺ νῦν, ἐπεί τερ προθύμως μὲν ἐδέξαμεν μεγάλοις ἐξεσοφηγοῦν τῷ ἱμετέρῳ," εἶπε πρὸς ταύτα Ἀμύνης "δ' Ἑράσσει, νόμος μὲν ἡμῖν γε ἐστὶ οὐκ οὖσαν, ἀλλὰ κεχορισθαί ἄνδρας γυναίκας· ἐπειτε δὲ ἢμεῖς ἔστειλεν δεσπότα προσχρηστεῖ τούτων, παρέστατο ὑμῖν καὶ ταύτα." εἶπας τοσαία ἡ Ἀμύνης μετεπέμπτε τὰς γυναίκας· ἀι δ' ἐπείτε ἐστείλει καλεόμεναι Ἠθον, ἐπεξῆς ἀντίας Ἰζοντο τοὺς Πέρασας. ἐνθαῦτα οἱ Πέρασαι ἐδέσμευοι γυναίκας εὐμόρφους ἔλεγον πρὸς Ἀμύνην φάμενοι τὸ ποιηθὲν τούτο οὐδὲν ἦν σοφὸν· κρέσσον γὰρ ἐναι ἀρχήθην μη ἐλθέω τὰς γυναίκας ἢ ἐκθούσας καὶ μὴ παριζομένας ἀντίας ἵππεαν ἀληθείαν σφηνὶ ὁδηγαμένων· ἀναγκαζομένως δὲ ἡ Ἀμύνης ἐκέλευεν παρίξεων· πειθομενων δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν ἀντίκη δὲ Πέρασαι μαστῶν τε ἄπτοντο οὖν πλεόνως οἰρομένως, καὶ κοῦ τις καὶ φιλέειν ἑπεράτο. Ἀμύνης μὲν δὴ τὰτα ὁρέων ἀτρέμας ἐλίξε, καὶ πτερ διαφορέως, οὐτ' ἐπερθεμαίνου τός Πέρας· Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἡ Ἀμύνης παρεῖν τε καὶ ὁρέων ταύτα, ἄτε νέον τε ἐνῶ καὶ κακῶν ἀπαθίας, οὐδαμὸν ἢτα κατέγειν ὁδὸν τῇ ὑπ. ὅστε δὲ 5 βάρεος φέροντι εἶπε πρὸς Ἀμύνην τάδε. "ο ἐπαρτέρ, σὺ μὲν εἰκε τῇ ἡμείᾳ ἀπίων τὲν αναπαύει, μηδὲ ἄπαφες τῇ πόσιν· ἐγὼ δὲ προς ἐγείροντι αὐτὸν τῆδε πάντα τα ἐπιτίθεαι παρέξω τοια τείνοντι." πρὸς ταύτα συνείς Ἀμύνης ὅτι νεότατα πρήγματα πρόσεχες μέλλος ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος, λέγει "ο παῖ, συχθὸν γὰρ σεν ἀνακαιν. 10 μένου συνήμενος τοὺς λόγους, ὃτι ἐθέλεις ἐλὲ ἐκτίθησας ποιέων τι νεοθαρέως· ἐγὼ δὲ σεν χρήσκει μηδὲν νεοχωμάζω καὶ ἀνδράς τοῦτο, ἔμενη μὴ ἐξεργάζοντα ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ ἀπεκέφαλο τὰ τοιούτα· 20 ἀκριθεὶς δὲ ἀπόφθεγμα τῇ ἐμὴ πελεσμῷ ταῖς. ὅς δὲ ὁ Ἀμύνης χρήσσας τούτων οἰχίκειε, λέγει ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος πρὸς τοὺς Πέρας ὁ γυναικών τούτων, ὁ ἐξεστὼ, ἔστιν ὑμῖν ἐπολλ' ευπετείη, καὶ εἰ τάσπος βουλέσθη τις μέγεσθαι καὶ ἀκόψης ὡν αὐτῶν. τοῦτον μὲν πέρι 10. Δαρείῳ: see pluteus. Stein. 19. ἀλήθονας ... ὁδήγοιν. Blakeney suggests that this curious expression represents an orientalism; even if so, such touches are not beyond the storyteller’s art. Alexander the Great is made to return the compliment by using the same expression of the Persian ladies, Plutarch, Alex. 21. 19. 3. νεός. Young and inexperienced but not devoid of shrewdness (σοφία c. 21 infra). 4. κατέχειν. Cp. 6. 129 κατεχεὶς ἐκεῖνο followed by ὁκέτει κατέχειν δυνάμενον. 7. τῶν ἐπιτίθεαι. Not without a certain irony. 8. νεότητα πρήγματα πρόσεχες. A very strong expression: πρόσεχεν τι νεότατον and νεοχωμάζω below rather milder. Cp. 4. 201. 12. ἐξαγάλλω. ἐξεργάζεσθαι to finish to undo. "Not used in Attic prose," is the latter sense (Krüger). Cp. 4. 154 and note on ἐξαγάλλω c. 20 infra.
αυτοὶ ἀποσημανέτεντε· τών δὲ, σχεδὸν γὰρ ἦν τῆς κοίτης ὁρὴ 5
προσέρχεται ὡμέν καὶ καλῶς ἔχοντας ὡμένα ὅρῳ μέθης, γυμναῖς
tαύταις, εἰ ὡμέν φίλον ἐστι· ἀπετε λουσάσθαι, λουσαμένας δὲ
ἵπτωσι προσδέκεσθε.” εἶτας ταῦτα, συνέταιναι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ
Πέρσαι, γυμναῖς μὲν εξελθοῦσιν ἀπέτεμπε ἐν τῷ γυμναίρην,
αὐτοῖ δὲ ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρος ἵσους τῷ γυμναῖς ἁριμένων ἀνδρῶς το
λειωγενέος τῆς τῶν γυμνακῶν ἑσθήθη σκευασάς καὶ ἔγραφε ἄριστος
δοὺς ἔρη ἐςο, παράγων δὲ τοῦτον ἔλεγε τοῖς Πέρσης τάδε. 60
“ο Πέρσαι, ωθήσετε παραδιάγνη τελέη ιστιμήσατε· τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα
ὅσα εἴχομεν, καὶ πρὸς τά ὅλα τά ἑρευνήσατε παρέχειν, πάντα
ὡς τῷ πάροσιν, καὶ ὡς καὶ τάδε τό πάντων μεγεῖτο, τάς τό ἐσορευόν τις
μητέρας καὶ τὰς ἀδελφὰς ἐπιδαφεύσαμεν ὡμέν, ὅ ταυτελεὸς
μάθητε τιμῶντοι πρὸς ἡμένων τῶν πέρ ἐςτε ἀξίου, πρὸς δὲ καὶ
βασιλεῖ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγιασμῆς ἀνταγγέλλοντες ὡς ἢν "Εἰλήν
Μακεδόνων ὑπάρχοις εὐ ψεύδατο καὶ τραπεζῆ καὶ κοίτη. ταῦτα εἶτας
ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρος παράξει Πέρας ἄνδρι ἀνδρὰς Μακεδόνας ὡς γυμναὶκα 20
τῷ λόγῳ· οἱ δὲ, ὑπείτες σφέων οἱ Πέρσαι ψαίνει ἐπειροῦτο, διεργάζότοις αὐτούς
καὶ μοῦ μέν τινὸς τῷ μόρῳ διεθάρρησαν, 21 καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἡ θεραπεῖα αὐτῶν· ἐπέτε χάρ δὴ σφι καὶ ἀχθήματα
καὶ θεραπωντες καὶ ἡ πᾶς πολλὴ παρασκευῆ· πάντα δὴ ταῦτα
ἀμα πᾶσι ἔκεινοις ἤπαντο. μετὰ δὲ χρόνῳ ὥσ πολλὸ ὑστερόν
ζήτησες τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων μεγάλῃ ἐκ τῶν Περσῶν ἔγνωτο, καὶ 5
σφέως Ἀλεξάνδρος κατελαβεί σοφία, χρήματα τε δοὺς πολλὰ
τῷ ἐσορευόν ἀναλείψας τῇ ὑπνομῇ ἦν Γυμναῖς· δοὺς δὲ ταῦτα κατέ-

20. ή λούσασθαί, to bathe. N.B. the
force of the middle voice. In 4. 75
λούσατο with acus. but in strict middle
sense. Cr. L. 6 & 8. sub v.
9. γυμναίρην· γυμνώτερος = γυμνῶτα or
gυμνακῶν. The ground-plan of the
palace of Tiryna exhibits the relation of the
Harem to the ἄδεφα, which seems to
be implied in this story of the Macedonian
Court. Cr. 4. 96 supra and 3. 78.
10. ἱσοῦς. A. ἱσοῦς. What number
is not stated: presumably not less than
seven. Cr. c. 17 supra; but perhaps
many more, if they of the suite (c. 21
ἰσθήμα) were present at the banquet.
16. ἑπιδαφεύσαμεν, a rare word.
γέλασιν ἐπιδαφεύουσα Xεν. Οἰχος. 2. 2.
15. Stein suggests the perfect here
(ἐπιδαφεύσαμεν). Η
17. ἂξιοι. Again ironical, as like-
wise the rest of the speech.
18. "Εἰλήν is perhaps partly the key
to the story (cp. c. 22 ἱσθήμα).
22 'Ο μέν νυν τῶν Περσῶν τούτων θάνατος ούτω καταλαμβάνεις ἔσογήθη. "Ελληνας δὲ εἶναι τούτων τοὺς ἀπὸ Περσίκους γεγονότας, κατὰ περ ἀυτοὶ λέγουσι, αὐτοὶ τε οὕτω τυχαίως ἐπιταμείνοι καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ὅπως ἔργον ἀπόδεξα ὦ θεός Ἐλληνες, πρὸς δὲ καὶ οἱ τῶν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ διέσπορται ἄγνων Ἐλληνιδικὰ οὕτω ἔγραψαν εἶναι. 'Αλέξανδρον γὰρ ἀθελεῖν ἐλομένου καὶ καταβάντος ὑπ’ αὐτὸ τούτο, οἱ αἰνιθεωρομένοι Ἐλλήνων ἐξεύρηκαν μι, φάμενοι οὖ τι βαρβάροις ἄνθρωποις εἶναι τὸν ἄγνων ἀλλὰ Ἐλλήνους. 'Αλέξανδρος δὲ ἐπειδή ἀπέδεξε ὦς

marriage. Cp. c. 23 infra. As Alexander, not Άμνιτας, gives the lady in marriage, the wedding of Gygaea should be dated after Alexander's accession (486 B.C.); χρόνον οὖ τοῖς ἑτέροις just above cannot therefore be pressed.

This marriage is referred to 8. 186, and there can be little hesitation in identifying Bubares, the husband of Gygaea, with Bubares, son of Megabazos, one of the Epistates at Athens in 481-0 B.C. 7. 22, the father Megabazos being none other than the commander in Europe of the passage now before us. Whether the commission of Bubares at Athens had anything to say to his marriage with the Macedonian princess, whether the marriage took place much before his appointment, are open questions. The idea that the marriage was part of the consideration for hushing up the murder of the embassy may be a pragmatic fancy, and may be the ground for the chronological statement μέχρι νῆα ὑπὸ τοῦ ὅτε γένοιτο.

The vague and clumsy use of καταλαβή διὰ (σφεῖα καταλαβεῖ, καταλαβεῖ absolute), followed by καταλαμβάνει (c. 22 θάνατος καταλαμβάνει) seems to betray a bad conscience in the author, or retailer, of this story.

22. 2. "Ελληνας εἶναι. Cp. ἀνήρ "Ελλην, c. 29 supra, the chief point and motive, probably, of the whole story, which is a glowing vindication of the Hellenism of Alexander, in spite of the marriage connexion with the Persians.

3. αὐτοὶ λέγουσι. It was no doubt a family claim, and the family probably invented the story which justified the claim. Cp. 6. 187-9, where the family legend is given. For a case in which Hdt. rejects a family tradition, see c. 57 infra.

αὐτῶ. From contact with the family! Cp. c. 17 supra and Introduction, p. eiv. There are only two proofs below all this verbiage: (1) the 'Argive' legend, (2) the Olympian verdict. The former may have been the ostensible basis of the latter.

4. ἐν τούτῳ διέσηκα λέγουσι, 8. 137-139. Why the story is not told here is not obvious. The most plausible explanation is to be found in the hypothesis that the passage in Bk. 8 was written before the passage in Bk. 5. Cp. Introduction, § 21. It would be interesting to know the exact date of this decision. It may at least be placed before Alexander's accession. Duncker (vii. 100) would put it Ol. 71 = 496 B.C. two years after his accession, but his argument is far from conclusive: and on his own showing Alexander was not merely king, but "at least" 34 years old! On the Hellenodikai, cp. Pausan. 5. 9 (397) and 6. 127 infra.

7. ἀντιθεωρομένως . . ἔξευρηκαν. The pregnant use of the tenses should be observed.


The 'tyrannic' argument might have been used against Alexander, cp. 8. 142, especially if he had been king at the time. (Cp. the attempt to exclude Dio- nysius, Lylias Or. 39, Diodor. 34. 108, 3 (725).) His 'barbarism' would have been all the more strongly marked, if Macedon was at the time subject, really or nominally, to Persia. The proof of Hellenism no doubt lay in the story given 8. 137 E. But the evidence might not have been admitted if policy had
εἰν Ἀργείων, ἐκρίθη τε εἶναι Ἔλλην καὶ ἀγωνιζόμενος στάδιον το ἀνακτήσας τὸ πρῶτον.

Ταῦτα μὲν τούς οὕτω κη ἔγενετο. Μεγάβαζος δὲ ἄγων τοῦ 23 Παύλους ἀπίκειτο ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἐλλήσποττους ἐνδεδέχεται διαπεραχθεὶς ὕπικετο ἐς τὰς Σάρδεις. ἀπὸ δὲ τεῖχοστοι ἤδε Ἰστιαίοι τοῦ Μελησίου τὴν παρὰ Δαρείου αὐτῆς ἐτύχει μισθὸν [δορεῖν] φυλακῆς τῆς σχεδίας, ἐνέτος δὲ τὸν χώρον τούτου παρὰ Στραμίδαν 5 ποταμὸν τὸ οὖνόμα ἐστὶ Μύρκιον, μαθὼν δὲ Μεγάβαζος τὸ ποιεῖν-

not clinched the argument. His Argive claims would not have made him more welcome to Sparta.

11. τὸ πρῶτον can hardly mean τὸ μεγαίρετο, quite apart from the consideration that the word would not designate his competitor more properly than himself. This objection lies against Stein’s interpretation which takes συνεξέπτεστε to refer to the final decision of the judges. (Stein adds that the imperfect shows that no decision was reached: but the imperfect need not do that necessarily, and the winners’ names in the stadion are recorded, and Alexander’s is not among them. Cp. G. H. Forster, Die olympischen Sieger, Ζβίκανκ, 1891, pp. 10, 11.) It is true that Krzyżanowski and Heberdey, when discussing the function of the Judge οὐσθέμενον διὸ δρομειι διὸ συνεξέπτεσε αλλάκας naturally asked what was the judge to do in such a case of a dead heat (Plutarch. Mor. 1045 δ). The meaning in this case is as plain as the grammar: not so in the case above. The observation that τὸ πρῶτον can hardly designate either of two coordinates bars the meaning given by Rawlinson: his lot fell out with the first, i.e. it fell to his lot to run in the first heat—if ἄγων is understood: i.e. ἄγων or some such word, the harshness of the personal subject for συνεκτείνῃ is aggravated. Macaulay explains: “he was drawn to run in the first pair.” But the foot races at Olympia were not conducted κατὰ λόγον μοναρχικὰ like contests in Thrace (cp. c. 1, supra). One would like to know whether Alexander ran or not, and with what result. Could the meaning be: “He dropped out of the competition in the first round” (ἀγωνεῖ) with the others, i.e. he was beaten in the first heat (no wonder, if he was 34 years of age) though he was not the only one beaten.

The use of συνεξέπτεσε elsewhere in Hdt. (I. 296, 8. 49, 123) might be thought to support the rendering of Rawlinson, but for the objections urged: the uses of συνεκτείνῃ will be admitted to render the meaning above suggested plausible (5. 72, 6. 121 et al.).

23. 1: τοῦ Πάυλους. Ср. с. 17 supra ad loc.

2. ἀπίκετο. Without waiting apparently to learn the fate of the embassy to Aigai! The connexion, grammatical and material, of the opening of c. 17 with this passage (στὴν… Μεγάβαζος δὲ… Μεγάβαζος δὲ ἄγων… ) supports the view that cc. 17-22 are an insertion. Van Herwerden deletes the second ἀπίκετο.

4. δορεῖν. Stein brackets after Dobree. Might we not prefer τίτρει δορεῖν μισθὸν αἰ χώρω τοῦ; For the matter see c. 11 supra.

6. τὸ ποιείμενον. Not the mere fortification but the whole political design. The notion that in those days Thrace might be united, Greeks and barbarians, under an Hellenic monarch (ср. с. 5 supra) and made the seat of an empire, which should be a serious danger to the Persian, looks more like an anachronism (ср. с. 49 ιδρύς) than a true prophecy (ἐδ τρόπον τὸ μέλλον γινεῖται). If Histiaios was so clever and so ambitious as Megabazos represents, he might have kept out of the lion’s den. Blakeley, who makes Histiaios into a sort of “satrap over all the Ionian cities,” thinks that “a man so powerful” only just missed the establishment of an empire which would perhaps have forestalled Alexander. There is a want of balance about this: and the student of Hdt. must allow for the influence of later events and interests on the tradition of earlier stages. The colonisation of Thrace during the Penektonia may have affected the memory of earlier adventures in the same region. Duncker suggests that the younger Zopyros son of Megabazos grandson of the Conspirator (see 5. 158, 160) may have been Hdt.’s authority for this story. But the whole
μενον εκ του Ἰστιαλον, ὡς ἦλθε τάχιστα ἐσ τὰς Σάρδις ἄγων τούς Παιονας, ἔλεγε Δαρείον τάδε. "ὁ βασιλεὺς, καί τιν το χρήμα ἐποίησα, ἀνδρὶ Ἑλληνική δεινὸν τε καὶ σοφὸν δως ἐγκτάσαται 10 πόλιν ἐν Ὀρθήκῃ, ίνα ἴδῃ τε ναυπηγήσημος ἐστὶ ἄφθονοι καὶ πολλοὶ κοπτεῖς καὶ μέταλλα ἀργυρα, ὅμιλος το πολλὸς μὲν Ἔλλην περιουκεί πολλὸς δὲ βάρβαρος, οἱ προστάται ἐπίλαβομενοι τούτοι τὸ ἀν κείνοι ἔξηγονται καὶ ημέρης καὶ νυκτός. σὺν νῦν τούτων τῶν ἄνδρα παιον ταῦτα ποιεῖται, ἢν 15 μὴ οἰκεῖον πολέμῳ συνέχει τρόπῳ δὲ ἀπὸ μεταπεμφυμένου παῖδον, ἐπειδὰν δὲ αὐτὸν περιλάβησι, ποιεῖν δως μηκέτι κείνοι 24 ὡς Ἑλληνικήν ἀπίστευτον. ταῦτα λέγων ὁ Μεγάβαζος εὐπετέος ἐπεξεὶ Δαρείῳ ὃς εὐπροφορῶν τὸ μέλλουν γίνεσθαι. μετὰ δὲ πέρασας ἄργιλον ἐς τὴν Μύρεινον ὁ Δαρεῖος ἔλεγε τάδε. "ὁ Ιστιαίης, βασιλεὺς Δαρείος τάδε λέγει, ἐγὼ φροντίζοντος ἀπρίσκῳ 5 ἐμοὶ τε καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς πρίγματι εἰναι οὐδένα σε ἄνδρα εὐνοεῖστερον τούτο δὲ ὡς λόγωις ἀλλὰ ἐργαῖς οἴον πολλῶν, νῦν ὡς, ἐπισκόπων γὰρ πρίγματα μεγάλα κατεργάσατο, ἀπικείως μοι πάντων, ἵνα τοι αὐτὰ ἐπερεῖμαι," τούτους τοῖς ἐπείποτος ὁ Ἰστιαῖος καὶ ἅμα μέγα ποιεύμονος βασιλεὺς σύμβουλοι γεγενήθησα. 10 ἀπίκετο ες τὰς Σάρδις· ἀπικομένον δὲ οἱ ἔλεγε Δαρείος τάδε. "ὁ Ιστιαῖος, ἐγὼ σε μεταπεμφγάμη τῶν δέπεν εὐκεκαίρει, ἐπείτε τάχιστα ἐνύστρατο ἀπὸ Ἡκτέων καὶ σὺ μοι ἐγένεσιν ἐς ὁφθαλμοῖς, οὐδενὶ καὶ ἄλλῳ χρήμα οὔτω ἐν βραχέι ἐπεζήσατο ὡς σε ἴδενε τε καὶ ἐς λόγους μοι ἀπίστευσα, ἐνομίκοις ὃτι κτημάτων πάντων ἐστὶν πηγόν. 15 ταύτω ἄνηρ φίλος συνετὸς τε καὶ εὐνοος, τα τοι ἐγώ καὶ ἀμφότερα συνείδως ἔχω μαρτυρεῖν εἰς πρίγματα τὰ ἐμα. νῦν ὡς, ἐν γὰρ ἐπίσκοπος ἀποκόμενος, τάδε τοι ἐγὼ προτείνομαι. Μελήτωτα μὲν ἐκαὶ τὴν νεκτιστον ἐν Ὀρθήκῃ πόλιν, σὺ δὲ μοι ἐπάρμενον ἐς Σώσα.

career of Histiaios was richly treated, we may be sure, in Ionian, and especially in Miletan, tradition, and there are no convincing inner indications of a Persian source for this part of the story, though R. suggests that “day and night” is an orientalism.

7. Σάρδες. Daresios is still at Sardes on the return of Megabazos. This gives time for Duncker’s hypothesis that the events narrated by Hdt., 3. 129-138, should be inserted here, cp. Introduction, p. xxxv. 16. οἰκείον πολέμῳ. Thuc. 1. 118, cp. οἰκεία πατρίδα 3, 21 s. inv.

24. 1. ὁ Μεγάβαζος εὐπετέος ἐπεξεὶ Δαρείον. Tradition or afterthought had to explain the transfer of Histiaios from Ionia to Susa: the explanation is furnished in these chapters (23, 24). The contrast between the message and the speech of Daresios had they been genuine would have opened the eyes of Histiaios. The μεγάλα πρίγματα of the despatch disappear in the speech. The anecdote is artistic, e.g. the contrast between Ἑλληνική δεινὸ τε καὶ σοφὸ τοὺς Megabazos to Daresios, and ἄνηρ φίλος συνετὸς τε καὶ εὐνοος in the mouth of Daresios to Histiaios. Hdt. has no misgiving in reporting the very words of these intimate interviews, any more than in determining the innermost motives of his dramatis personae.
25. I. καταστήσας Ἀρταφρένας... ἀθήνας. Dareios’ departure from Sardes for Susa apparently takes place before the expulsion of Hippias from Athens, or at least before his application at Sardes: or his return to Susa may have been delayed by his sickness (3. 129) till the spring of 510 B.C.

Artaphernes (father of the younger Artaphernes who accompanied Datis 6. 94) was plainly satrap in Sardes: Obares son of Megabazos (6. 33) may have been appointed satrap in Daskyleion at the same time. The exact position of Otanes, and his exact relation to the satraps in Sardes and in Daskyleion, are obscure points. He is here described as στρατηγὸς τῶν παραθελσιών ἀνδρῶν, and in the next chapter as διάφορας ἴματα τῆς στρατηγίας. The latter expression probably explains the former, and the παραθελσιῶν ἄνδρες here are not as Stein takes it, the ἐπιστάδος οἱ ἐν τῇ ἄρτην of c. 30 infra or the τύχην δασκ- yλην ἅ ποιοι are the islands, R. of the Behistun inscription, col. 1, § 6, nor may we see in his position an exact anticipation of that of the younger Cyrus, Xen. Hell. 1. 4, 3. Anabasis I. 1. 6 ff. 9, 7 ff., with Groes, vol. vi. p. 359; but rather this Otanes may be regarded simply as a military official without any political duties (στρατηγὸς... ἀνδρῶν) in succession to Megabazos, cp. c. 123 infra, though his exact relation to the satraps may not have been very clearly defined. His headquarters appear to be on the Hellespont. His name was had in remembrance there, for good reasons, cp. 26, 123 infra. Blackesey warns against confusing this Otanes, son of Sissames, with Otanes, one of the fathers-in-law of Dareios, whose father’s name is given in 3. 65 as Pharnaspes, and on the Behistun inscription, col. 4, § 18, as Socris. The name was probably not uncommon, and is interpreted as = Εὐθε- μοῖος, cp. Rawlinson, vol. iii. 2 p. 548.

4. τοῦ τῶν πατέρων κτλ. This grim practical jest was worthy of a madman; but is hardly a worse jest than some kings might perpetrate (ep. 4. 84), and seems to have been approved by the Father of English Poetry. Cp. Gower, Confessio Amantis, Bk. vii. (ed. Morley, 1889, p. 375).

26. 3. Βυζαντίους κτλ. If Otanes had to reduce Byzantion, Chalkedon, Antandros and Lampionion, it is obvious that these places had revolted from the Persian after the disaster in Scythia. Rtesias, Pers. § 48 (ed. Gilmore, p. 151), apparently made Dareios burn down the houses and temples of Chalkedon. Polyainos (7. 10, 5) gives an account of a siege and capture of the town by a mine, or tunnel. If the Byzantines were reduced, it may be supposed that their loyal despot Ariston (4. 138) was restored. Lemnos and Imbroes were new acquisitions for the Persian: not so Lesbos, where Koes was presumably already Tyrant, c. 11 supra.
5. ἀρχοτέρας ἦτε τῶν. As Miltiades subsequently drove the Pelasgi out of Lemnos (6. 140) they only remained in Imbris. Perhaps as Blakesley suggests the mention of the Pelasgi may be meant as some excuse for the action of the Lesbians. Apparently Køe having won a tyrannis for himself in Lesbos assists the Persians to establish a tyrannis, under Lykareteos brother of Malandrios king of Samos, in Lemnos. The word tyrannis is however avoided (ἵππαχος ... ἄρχων) for Lykareteos as for his brother. The ‘reign’ of Malandrios had been short, cp. 3. 142. Lykareteos had entertained ambition of succeeding him at Samos, 3. 143. If Hdt.’s chronological indications are correct Aikes, son of Sylason, was by this time tyrant of Samos (cp. 4. 156, 6. 18). The government had been put into the hands of Sylason (brother of Polykrates) soon after the accession of Dareios, by that Otanes who was one of the Seven (3. 141).

27. 4. τελευτᾷ, probably before the conquest by Miltiades 6. 140.

The text of this chapter is unsatisfactory and in disorder: ‘locus versus’ Stein. The σήτη given in the closing lines plainly refers to the reductions of Byzantion etc. enumerated in c. 26. Cp. Grote, vi. 204 nots. 207 n. Schweig, suppose the words of μὲν ... τελευτᾷ to be a later addition, by the author. Blakesley would be content to bracket σήτη ... τελευτᾷ as such. Cobet supplies μεταξέμενοι ἐν τὰ τέληων after τελευτᾷ: sed plura perissae videntur, van Herwerden.

6. λειτουργὴι and σήτων inflicted on the army (cp. 8. 65, 9. 49), doubtless genuine and well-deserved charges, and in so far conflicting with the criticism of the Scythians 4. 142 supra.

28. 1. τοσοῦτος, ‘this was all he accomplished.’ Cp. c. 50 ἐνεργείᾳ, μετὰ δὲ οὗ πολλάς χρόνων ἄνεις κακῶν ἤρθε, a celebrated erew (cp. Grote, iii. 491 n.). The MSS. read ἄνεις or ἄνεος of which no sense can be made. κακῶν and ἄνεις look a little suspicious.

Whether we adopt ἄνεος with de la Barre, Stein, Holder, and the editors generally, or ἄνεις (which better explains the corruption, but would require Grote’s punctuation) the sense arrived at will be much the same, viz., that after the campaign of Otanes described cc. 26, 27 there was a brief pause or interval of peace and recuperation until fresh trouble fell upon the Greeks in Asia, growing out of the relations of Naxos and Miletos. Rawlinson observes that Grote’s proposed punctuation μετά δὲ οὗ πολλάς χρόνων, ἄνεος κακῶν ἤρθε καὶ gives no sense at all. Can it be that Grote understood ἄνεος to mean ‘a letting loose’? (L. & S. sub ε. Π.), a sense here inadmissible. (ἄνεις, κακῶς ἑχομένων.) metá here is an adverb, though if ἄνεις was read metá must be taken as a proposition.

If the exact material significance of the words οὗ πολλάς χρόνων could be determined, the chronology of the period would become a good deal clearer. Rawlinson even says: ‘the chronology of Dareios’ reign depends almost entirely on what we are to understand by this expression.” He approves of Clinton’s “two years.” But it is no use determining first of all what a purely indeterminate expression means, and then arguing back to the chronological perspective. The result in R.’s case is that he brings down the Scythic expedition to 308 B.C. subsequent to the expulsion of Hippia from Athens. This vague expression must be interpreted in the light of the general chrono-
logical perspective: so interpreted it must be taken to stand for more than two years; probably for four or five years. The ἄρχοντας in Naxos, or rather the application of the Naxian oligarchs to the Milasian despot; the date of which is circa 561 B.C. The operations of Otanes fall a year or two after the return of Dareios to Susa, circa 510 B.C. Cp. Appendix V.

2. καί. For the parataxis cp. 4. 181.

3. γάρ seems to have more than a temporal or narrative force here: the fact of synchronous prosperity is a reason for expecting the mutual origin of disaster, cp. c. 33 ἐν μεν.

4. ἐν εἰσαγωγῇ. Naxos had apparently thriven under the despoticism of Lygdamis and the patronage of Peisistratos (560-528 B.C.). The despoticism of Lygdamis had made way (with or without a helping hand from Sparta, cp. 3. 56, Plutarch, Mor. 856) for a (commercial) oligarchy, probably of the Corinthian type (circa 520 B.C.). The growth of democracy at Athens, and the establishment of the Kleisthenean constitution (circa 508 B.C., cp. c. 66 ἐν μεν) may have stimulated the democratic movement in Naxos, culminating in the exile of some of the leading 'men of substance' (circa 504-3 B.C.) Tradition represented the Naxians as able in their heyday to put 8000 hoplites in the field, to say nothing of galleys (πλοῖα μαραί πολλά), slaves (rivers, c. 31) and material (χρήματα πολλά c. 51). Naxos, however, suffered from the Persians in 490 B.C., 6. 96. Four ships were all they transferred to the national fleet at Salamis in 480 (8. 46). As tributaries of Athens they paid at most but half the assessment of Paros (cp. C.L.A. i. p. 234). Their (probable) rivals the Parians rose on the ruins of their fortunes. Cp. 6. 133. τῶν νῆσων, Paros, Andros, Delos, etc., cp. c. 31 ἐν μεν.

κατὰ τῶν αὐτῶν χρόνων. Hdt. here, following probably good authority, perhaps Hekataios, makes the prosperity of Miletos synchronous with the prosperity of Naxos, and particularly with the regime of Histiaios. Later authorities placed the θαλασσεκαρία of Miletos about 750-730 B.C., and her colonies may have been founded in the seventh and eighth centuries. Cp. Rawlinson’s note ad l. Miletos has previously figured as a flourishing place in the days of Thasibulos, Alyattes, and Periandros of Corinth, c. 92 ἐν μεν, 1. 20 ff. (c. 600-580 B.C.). In fact there was apparently a revival under Histiaios of Milesean prosperity, which again coincides with a despotic régime, under Persian auspices. How and when Histiaios became tyrant we are left to conjecture. One guess before the Scythic expedition would bring us back to the treaty with Kyros (546 B.C.), surely a prosperous moment in Milesean annals. A second generation would take us to 580 B.C. about the date of Thasibulos. The story of the Parian arbitration and constitution in Miletos is very suspicious. Stein quotes Atheneaen 524 (sc. Herakleides Pont.) to the effect that after the fall of the Neleids a struggle broke out between the rich, i.e. the Hellenic immigrants, and the demos, i.e. the subject Karians called Θερμαῖοι. It would be in accordance with analogy if the tyranny at Miletos marked an upward movement of the Θερμαῖοι. The tyranny at Miletos thus appears doubly anti-Hellenic, as Karian and as Persian, but the first tyranny was at least a bulwark against Lydia (1. 20 ff.). The two generations of στρατιῶν may be the period intervening between the tyranny of Thasibulos and the tyranny of Histiaios, but if so the mediation of the Parians can hardly be placed at its latter end, or must be regarded as singularly unsuccessful. A friendship between Paros and Miletos would not tend to the prosperity of Naxos, but might be thereby explicable.
5 ἡ Μίλιτος αὐτὴ τε ἐωτίς μάλιστα δὴ τότε ἀκμάσασα καὶ δὴ καὶ τῆς Ἰανίης ὡν πρόσχημα, κατύπερθε δὲ τούτων ἐπὶ δύο γενεὰς ἀνδρῶν νοσήσασα ἐς τὰ μάλιστα στάσις, μέχρι ὧν μὲν Πάριοι κατηρτίζαν· τούτων γὰρ καταρτισθῆσα εἶ πάνων Ἐλλήνων
29 εἶνοντο οἱ Μιλησιαίοι. κατῆλθαν δὲ σφαιρᾷ ὅπερ Πάριοι, ὡς ἀπίκουσα αὐτῶν ἀνάφερε οἱ ἀριστοὶ ἐς τὴν Μίλιτον, ὦραν γὰρ δὴ σφαιρὰ δεινῶς οἰκοβορημένους ἔφασαν αὐτῶν βούλευσιν διεξέλθει τὴν χώρην· ποὺεύτες δὲ ταῦτα καὶ διεξόμετε πᾶσας τὴν
5 Μίλισην, ὡκὼς τῶν ἰδίων ἐν ἀνεστροφῇ τῇ χώρῃ ἄγρον εὐ ἐξεργασμένον, ᾑγράφοντο τὸ οὖναμα τοῦ διεσότευ τοῦ ἄγρου, διεξέλαντες δὲ πᾶσας τὴν χώρην καὶ σπανίως εὑρόντες τούτον, ὥς τάξιστα κατέβησαν ἐς τὸ ἀστῶ τε, ἅλην τουρσάμενοι ἀπέδεξαν τούτων μὲ τὴν πόλιν νείμεν τῶν ἐφόρων τοὺς ἄγροις
10 εὐ ἐξεργασμένους· δοκεῖν γὰρ ἐφάσαν καὶ τῶν δημοσίων ὅστῳ δὴ σφαιρὰ ἐπιμελήσεθαι ὁσπερ τῶν σφετέρων· τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους Μιλησίους τοὺς πρὶν στασιάζοντα ἐκεῖ ἐπέδανεν.

6. Ἰωνία πρόσχημα. Ὑπὲρ Ἰωνία' ὑπ. c. 30 ἰδίων ἐπίλειψιν ἀπὸ κατηγορίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐλλάδα πρόσχημα = ὑπὸ διάσημον ἀρχαίον ἐπὶ τῇ πόλει ἄντεικνυότας.
7. μπουσασία καταγεγραμμένη. ὑπ. Ἀριστοφάνης. Ἡ περί τοῦ ἀπεγραμμένου τοῦ ἣν ἀρχαίον ἐπὶ τῇ πόλει ἀντείκνυότας.
8. Ἰωνία ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγροῦ. Ἡ Ἰωνία ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγροῦ περιγράφεται γενικούσας τοῦ ἀρχαίου ἀναφοράς ήπ. 1. 12.
9. ἐπιγράφοντο (mhd.). Ἡ ἴδιος ἔπιγραφα μὲ ἀριστοὺς χρήσιμος ήπ. 1. 12.
10. ἔριξα. Ἡ ἴδιος ἔριξα μὲ ἀριστοὺς χρήσιμος ήπ. 1. 12.

---

6. 'Ἰωνία πρόσχημα. Ὀν 'Ἰωνία' ὑπ. c. 30 ἰδίων ἐπίλειψιν ἀπὸ κατηγορίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐλλάδα πρόσχημα = ὑπὸ διάσημον ἀρχαίον ἐπὶ τῇ πόλει ἄντεικνυότας.
7. μπουσασία καταγεγραμμένη. Ὀν Ἀριστοφάνης. Ἡ περί τοῦ ἀπεγραμμένου τοῦ ἣν ἀρχαίον ἐπὶ τῇ πόλει ἄντεικνυότας.
8. Ἰωνία ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγροῦ. Ἡ Ἰωνία ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγροῦ περιγράφεται γενικούσας τοῦ ἀρχαίου ἀναφοράς ήπ. 1. 12.
9. ἐπιγράφοντο (mhd.). Ἡ ἴδιος ἔπιγραφα μὲ ἀριστοὺς χρήσιμος ήπ. 1. 12.
10. ἔριξα. Ἡ ἴδιος ἔριξα μὲ ἀριστοὺς χρήσιμος ήπ. 1. 12.
Πάριον μέν νυν Μιλησίουσ οὕτῳ καταρτίσαν, τότε δὲ ἐκ 30
τούτων τῶν πολιῶν ὅδε ἦρχετο κακὰ γίνεσθαι τῇ Ἰωνίᾳ. Εἰς
Νάξου ἐφιγμον ἀνδρεῖς τῶν παχέων ἐπὶ τοῦ δήμου, φυγόντες δὲ
ἀπίκουσι εἰς Μήλην. Τῆς δὲ Μήλητον ἐτύγχανε ἐπιτροπος ἕως
Ἀρισταγόρας ὁ Μολπαγόρεως, γαμβρὸς τε ἐνοι καὶ ἀνεφίς 5
Ἰστιαίοι τοῦ Λυσαγόρεως, τὸν ὁ Δαρείδος ἐν Σύντοιοι κατείχεν· ὁ
γὰρ Ἰστιαῖος τύραννος ἦν Μήλητον καὶ ἐτύγχανε τοῦτον τὸν
χρόνον ἐν ἐν Σύντοιοι, ὅτε οἱ Νάξοι ἠθένων ἔσσεω πρὶν ἔοντες

30. 1. τότε δὲ goes back to τότε ἀκμάσασα c. 25, all that follows
πρὸν ἡμᾶς being probably a digression, not found in Hdt., or in Hdt.'s
authorities for the story of the Ionian
Revolt. The sentence somewhat
cumulously resumes the narrative broken by
the digression.
2. Ἰωνία more restricted than Ἰωνή c. 93 supra, and used here probably in
a strictly geographical sense. In
this sense it is contrasted with Kypros
c. 109 infra, with Sicily 6. 22, with
Peloponnesos 6. 86, with the Helles-
pont 8. 109. Naxos is 'near' or 'off'
it c. 31 infra, 'Aiolia' is 'next' it c.
123 infra, Teos is in its midst 1. 170.
Men can sail to it c. 115 infra, march
to it 1. 162, be in it 1. 170, leave it 1.
163. It can be devastated, but not
being an island the Sagene cannot
sweep it, 6. 31. It is a district with a
most beautiful climate, 1. 142, made
up of the territories of twelve city-
states, enumerated 1. 142, two of the
number, Samos and Chios, being islands.
In two passages however 'Ionia' is used
in other than a geographical sense: Ἰωνία
πάγων παρ᾽ Ἀθηναίοις 7. 51, and
τῶν Ἰωνίων μέτα οὗτο τοῦ ὀνόματος
οὐκέτα 1. 146. Ioniwh in fact are not
confined to Ionia proper. To restrict
ourselves to Hdt., the presence of
Ioniwh is attested in 'the Islands'
l. 171, 7. 95. In Naxos, Keos, Serifos,
Siphnos, Euboea, 8. 46. In Delos,
4. 35. In Europe, 7. 9. Athens,
regarded as the 'Metropolis' of the
Ioniwh, 1. 143, 146, 7. 95, 9. 106.
The Dodekapolis however going back
to Achaia, and the Peloopenese 1. 145,
where Ioniwh were still to be found, 8.
of the colonies farther east and west
Hdt. does not happen to insist. That
he is no admirer of the Ioniwh is shown
by the following passage, 1. 145. The
Ioniwh form the weakest branch of
the Hellenic stock: the Athenians and
everyone else are ashamed of the name
except the twelve cities, who glory in
their shame, 1. 143. Kleisthenes of
Athens set them at naught 5. 69.
Kyrosh made no account of them 1. 153.
Kambyses regarded them as slaves
2. 1. The Scythians, utter barbarians,
gave them the unkindest cut of all 4.
142. Their last stands are conspicuous
at Lade 6. 11, 12, 13. Hdt. combats
the geography of their wise men 2. 16,
4. 36, makes fun of their διάσωμα 4. 95,
traces the father of Ioniwh philosophy
to the abhorred Pheenian stock 1. 74,
and seems to think little of their great
lights (4. 95, 96; cp. 2. 123) though
he has perhaps more kindness for the
Samian than for the Milesian school, 3.
5. Ἀρισταγόρας. The names of the
dynastic clique are noticeable. Histiaios
is son of Λυσαγόρας, Aristagoras, his
nephew and son-in-law, is the son of
Μολπαγόρας, and perhaps Iatriagoras
mentioned c. 37 infra was, as Stein
suggests, a relation. The names have
a popular ring; cp. 6. 11 and c. 29
supra.
Aristagoras is here mentioned for the
first time, but that Histiaios, 'Tyrant
of Miletos,' should be introduced again
as though he had not already played
an important rôle in Hdt.'s narrative,
looks a little as though we were here
on the trace of an originally independent
source, or story.
8. ξένων. So the tyrant of Athens
finds friends at Sparta, cp. 63, 90 infra;
In 431 n.c. Euxarchos tyrant of Astakos
is restored by the Corinthians, Thuc. 2.
33. However unnatural the friendship
between oligarchy and tyranny (cp.
the story of Gelon 7. 155) special
circumstances might lead to a com-
munity of interests between these
natural opposites. In this case the
friendship of the Milesian oligarchs with
το Ιστιαλώ. Ἀπικόμενοι δὲ οἱ Νάξιοι ἐς τὴν Μιλήτην ἔδειον τοῦ Ἀρισταγόρα, ἐλ καὶ αὐτοί Παράσχοι δύναμιν τινὰ καὶ κατέλθοιν ἐς τὴν ἔωστον. ὁ δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος ὡς ἢν ἢν αὐτοῦ κατέλθοιν ἐς τὴν πόλιν, ἀρξεῖ τῆς Νάξου, σχῆμα τοῦ ποιείνων τῆς ἕξω τῆς Ἰστιαλῶ, τὸν δὲ σφι λόγον προσέφερε. "ἀυτῶς μὲν Ἰόνιος ὡς φερίγγοις ἤκου ἐκεῖνον παρασχεῖν τοσαίνην δῶσε 15 κατάγειν ἄκοπτοι ὑπὸ τὰς πόλις ἐκόμισσοι Νάξιοι· πυθαλώμαι γὰρ ἀκτικαιχιλίην ἄσπιδα Νάξιοι εἶναι καὶ πλοῦτα μακρὰ πολλὰ· μιχανήσαμε δὲ πᾶσαν στούντιον ποιείσσεις. ἐπινόει δὲ τήδ. Ἀρταφρέθης ὡς τῆς Ζικαζίας ὡς φίλος· ὁ δὲ Ἀρταφρέθης ἔρωτι Ττάοπες μὲν ἐστι παῖς, Δαρείος δὲ τοῦ βασιλοῦ ἄδελ- 20 φέως, τοῦ δ' ἐπιθαβασσίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀθήναι ἀρξεῖ τρώγλων, ἔχων στρατιῶν τὰ πολλὰ καὶ πολλὰς νέας. τούτων ὡς δοκεῖ τῶν ἀνέφερθην τῶν ἐν χρήσεινεν, ταῦτα ἀκούσας τοι Νάξιοι προσέθειν τῷ Ἀρισταγόρᾳ πρήσεσθαι τῇ δύναυ τῷ ἀριστα, καὶ ἦπασχεσθαι δώρα ἐκέλευν τῷ καὶ δαιμόνισθαι τῇ στρατιῶ τὸς αὐτοῖ 25 διαλύσεις, ἐπιθεῖ ταῖς πολλὰς ἔχοντες, ὡς ἐπιθείνεις ἐς τὴν Νάξου, πάντα ποιήσας τῶν Νάξιοι τὰ ὡς αὐτοὶ κελεύσας, ὡς δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἕστοις τῶν Κυκλα-

the Parians might be an additional reason for a good understanding between the Milesian tyrant and the Naxians.

11. ἐπιλέξαμεν. Hdt. shows a remarkable assurance in dealing with the motives of Aristogoras. Κρ. c. 35 ἐνθρα.; Introduction, p. cxxi.

12. σημάδιον. Aristogoras laid stress on the obligation, in order to conceal his true motive, and then concluded his speech as follows.

15. πυθαλώμαι. There would have been no use in exaggerating the power of the Naxians to the exiles, who could have put him right immediately, but whether the whole 8000 shields stand for free men of Naxos may be doubted. 8000 is the reported number of Spartan c. 7. 234 in 480 B.C.

19. ἢν, 'you know.' Whatever the meaning of ἐπίθαλάσσει there must be an exaggeration here, in τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀθήναι πάντων. In regard to the former word, the question arises whether the position of Araphrones as here described is reconcilable with the position of Otanes described c. 25 ἐνθρα. as στρατηγίς τῶν παραθάλάσσων ἀνδρῶν, assuming the παραθάλασσοι there to be the same as the ἐπιθαλάσσαι here. Yes, on any one of these hypotheses: (1) Otanes' command might now be over. See τοποθητυ ἐ-

21. ἐπιθανάσσει τῶν ἀναμιμαστών τῇ στρατῇ c. 31 ἐνθρα. The Strategos was subordinate to the Satrap, at least in this case. (2) ἐπιθαλάσσω = on the Aegaean, παραθάλασσοι = on the Hellespont. That distinction may be materially correct, but the words can hardly have such a technical meaning. (4) Aristogoras was deliberately exaggerating or dramatically presented as deliberately exaggerating. But as above explained, note c. 26, if we understand Otanes as successor to Megabazus in command of an army on the coast (ὁ παραθ. ἄρτας) there is no need for an harmonistic attempt to reconcile this and that passage, though of course there is stress to be laid on the difference of the prepositions, and this passage remains an exaggeration of the satrap's authority, which probably extended only over the first 'nome' as described in 3. 90. 24. ἐπιθαλάσσει. A phrase curi-

27. τῶν Κυκλάδων looks like a gloss, ὡς ταῦτα Κυκλάδας καλεῖναι next Κ. The name was probably used, perhaps
invented, by Hekataios, cp. Bursian, Geogr. v. Gr. ii. 348. They were not reduced till 490 B.C., 6. 99 infra; there was still therefore a field open to the ambition of the Naxians.


6. 93. etoimē por' hōs 'already lodged with me.'

9. tás ek taũtēs ἡρτημένα. Primarily a geographical expression, but has a political suggestion in it.

12. ós de Áspron Kýrōn. Kypros is nearly thrice as large as Euboea, but the exact area of these islands, respectively, is not easy to ascertain. Strabo gives the circuit of Kypros as 3420 stadia (p. 582) (say 425 R. miles). He does not give the circuit of Euboea, but estimates its greatest length at 1200 stades and its greatest breadth at 160 (p. 444). For modern estimates and literature, cp. Lolling, cp. e. infra, pp. 190 ff. 273 ff.

17. ἡμέρα τοῦ Εὔρωπος. The visit of Aristagoras to Sardis would be just a year before his visit to Sparta, c. 38 infra. Op. Appendix V.
42. 4. αὐτὸς Δαρείος. Σρ. 4. 1. What interval must be allowed for the communication between Sanæs and Susia? (cp. c. 105 infra). At any rate the ships were to be ready ἄνα τῷ ἑαυτῷ.

τριτέρασι. The 200 triremes were presumably levied from the Greeks. The number of the Greek fleet at Lade was 350, 6, 8, and from the list there given it is obvious that Miletos, Samos, Chios and Lesbos might easily have supplied the whole number on this occasion. That the levy was more general is however shown by the anecdote which follows in c. 39.

5. ἄλλως. Other than Greek? or simply ‘allies as well.’ Cp. 4. 191.

6. στρατηγῶν τούτων. Otanes has nothing to say to the expedition. The exact authority of Megabates is in the story represented as ill-defined—Hinc illae incoerentes.

7. Παυσανίας. In this interesting reference we have another question in debate between Hdt. and Thucydidès. Σρ. θυσ. 1. 128. The chief points of difference are two: (1) The story in Hdt. represents Pausanias as a suitor for the daughter of Megabates. Thucydidès represents the lady in question as a daughter of Xerxes; in Thuc. Megabates does indeed figure, as satrap of Phrygia, while Pausanias was at Byzantium, and is by Xerxes removed and replaced by Artabazos, in order that negotiations may be the better conducted. This looks remarkably like a Thucydidescorrection of the tradition preserved to us by Hdt. (2) Hdt. expresses a doubt as to the truth of the story (εἰ δὴ ἄλλης γε ἔστιν ὁ λόγος). Thucydidès bases his version upon the apparently irrefutable evidence of Pausanias’ own correspondence. Hdt. has here perhaps simply oral tradition to rely on, and he is undoubtedly tender of the fame of Pausanias. Cp. 9. 64. But had Thucydidès really genuine documents?

9. ὑστέρον χρόνῳ τούτων. A vague and almost superfluous chronological indication if by ρατίζει be understood simply the Naxian affair. The age of Megabates makes it perhaps additionally unlikely that it was his daughter whom Pausanias sought in marriage. But such points do not strike Hdt. (Σρ. 3. 1.) ἐρωτα. Pausanias’ love was not for the lady but for the throne. There is humour in this, cp. 6. 129. Was Pausanias already married? Σρ. θυσ. 5. 16.

τῆς Ἑλλάδος τύραννος. A remarkable expression. The political unity of Hellas could only have been realised under a monarchy, and only at Sparta could a Panhellenic monarchy have been established. But it would have been established, like the Roman principate afterwards, upon the ruins of the republican oligarchy. Upon a small scale the problem of empire was more than once presented to Sparta, as on a larger to Rome. Sparta clung to her domestic institutions, and foremost a Panhellenic unity. Rome accepted the imperial destiny, and discovered too late that it involved the tyranny. (Σρ. 3 συμφ.) On ‘Hellas’ cp. c. 49 infra.

33. 2. τῆς Ἡλείας στρατηγή. Απαρατολογικά διακόμητα μὲν ἐν τῇ δημοσίᾳ περίεργῳ διαφορα τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων. Στίλ τοι Μεγαβατίς ἐπείτης καθαροῦς ἐκ τῆς Ἡλλας συμμάχων.
Kάσα, ὡς ἐνθεύτευ τῷ ἀνέμῳ ἐς τὴν Νάξον διαβαδον. καὶ ὁ γὰρ ἔδεε τοῦτο τῷ στόλῳ Ναζίους ὑπολεύται, πρήγμα τούτῳ 5 σινηνεῖχῃ γενέσθαι. περσῶντος Μεγαβάτεω τὰς ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν φύλακας, ἔπι νεῶς Μυνίδης ἔτυχε οὐδὲς φοιλόσσων. οὗ ἐφευρότητα τι ποιήσαμεν 10 ἐκεῖνος τῶν διορφούμενος ἑξευρότομα τῶν ἁρχονταί τοῦ νέος, τῷ ὅνῳ ἔμοι Ἑκκλαζε, τοῦτον δήσαται διὰ βαλλομένης διελθόντος τῆς νεῶς κατὰ τοῦτο, ἕξομεν μὲν κεφαλὴν ποιεῖντα ἢσώς ἐς τὸ σῶμα. δεθεντό δὲ τοῦ Ἐκκλαζε, ἔσαρξαί τε τῷ Ἀριστοτέρῳ ὑποστητοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν Ναζίων Μεγαβάτον δῆσαν λυμαίνοντο. οὗ ἐδῶν παρακάτω τὸν Πέρσην, τυχώνοντο δὲ οὐδὲνος τῶν ἐκείνου, αὐτὸς ἐδῶν ἔλυσεν. τυχόμενος δὲ κάρτα διευθύνετο οἱ Μεγαβάτος καὶ ἐσπέρχοτο τῷ Ἀριστοτέρῳ. οὗ ἐντὸς ἔσεσθαι τῷ στόλῳ. ἔσαρξεν τε τοῦτοι πρήγματι τί ἔστι; οὐσὶν ἀπε- στειλε Ἀρταφρήνης μεῖον πείλεθει καὶ πλέειν τῇ ἄν ἐγὼ κελέω; τί πολλὰ πρῆσετε; τούτα ἔσεσθαι οἱ Ἀριστοτέρους. ἐτειχεῖς τούτοις, ὡς νυὲ ἐγένετο, ἐπέμπει ἐς Νάξον πλοῖον ἄδρας φρά-

3. Καύκασος is placed by Kiepert's Atlas in the S.E. of Chios, looking towards the mainland: presumably on the strength of this passage.


οὐ γὰρ ἔσεσθαι. See Introduction, p. cxvi., and c. 28 σύρµα, 6. 64 ἵμαρα.

5. τοῦτο τῷ στόλῳ. The ruin of Naxos was accomplished by the next expedition, cp. 6. 96.

6. περιοντός. Megabates appears an active commander bent upon the success of his mission.

7. Μυνίδης. Mydonos, not mentioned elsewhere by Hdt., was situated near Halikarnassos, and, like the latter, a colony from Treczen (Pansan. 2. 30, 8), though not a member of the Dorian Hexapolis (1. 144) but to be included in the πρὸςκειομένων there referred to.

Skylax though merely the ἀρχων of a single Myndian trireme must have been a considerable person, if he was really on terms of ἐξωσι with Aristogoras. Skylax appears to be a local (Karian) name. Cp. 4. 44

11. τῷ σῶμα. Van Herwerden cpn. 7. 107 κάρα δὲ τῷ σώμα σαφῶς.

12. δήσας λυμαίνοντο, not a case where cessante cessam cessat et effectus, though at this stage the man was still in bonds.

13. ἔδωρ, (1) to head quarters, (2) to the ship.

VOL. I

παρακάτω. N.B. the imperfect. His suit was unsuccessful, cp. c. 22 σύρµα. 19. ἐτειχε τούτων. Cp. Ἐθεσίους 1. 26 ἡ δῶρον μη ἐπιδιώκετε ἐκ τῶν παραργομένων ἤλων. Perhaps a Pythagorean maxim, cp. Plutarch, Mor. 448 quoted by Alford, Ἀκ. Τεστ. iii. 4 p. 129. Three stages are indicated in the feeling of Megabates (i) δείκνυ τι παραμένων ... (ii) κάρτα διευθύνεται καὶ ἐσπέρχετο ... (iii) δησάς λυμαίνει. It can hardly be said that his action in the first two stages was surprising or culpable. In the third stage, however, this Persian Grandee, of the blood of the Achaeandids, commander-in-chief of the expedition, avails himself, betraying the king's interest, ruins a project which had the king's own express sanction, disappoints the satrap of Sardes, and prepares a discredit for himself, in order to gratify a passionate pique with the vice-governor of a single Greek city, who was insolent. Is this likely? Cp. Duncker, Gesch. des A. v. 5 p. 34 (1882).

If the act of treachery had been put down to Skylax, or to Aristogoras, it would have seemed more credible. Perhaps the Greek tradition preferred to assign the failure to the foreign foe. It is to be remembered that this traitor Megabates is in high favour afterwards (c. 32 supra), although this story of his treachery was presumably notorious—if true.
34 σοντας τοις Ναζιαίσι πάντα τα παρευή αριστηματα. οι γαρ ουν Ναζιοι ουδεν πάντως προσεκουκοντο ἐπὶ σφές των στόλων τουτου ὀρμήσασθαι. ἐπει μέντοι ἐπιστυντο, αὐτίκα μέν ἑσπερικαντο τα ἐκ των ἀγρων ἐς το τεύχος, παρεσκευάσαντο δε ὡς πολυρροφόρων και σύτα και σωτα, και το τεύχος ἐσάξαντο. και ουτοι μέν παρεσκεύασαντο ὡς παρεσκευάζοντο σφι πολεμον. οι δ' επείτε διέβαλον ἐκ τῆς Χιλο τας νέας ἐς τήν Ναζαιων, πρός πεφραγμένους προσεφέρουσαν και ἐκπολεύκερων μύρων τέσσερας, ὡς δε τα τε ἔχουσι ήλθουν χρήματα οι Πέρσαι, ταύτα κατεδεδεικνυτο πάντοτε σφαι, και αὐτῷ τῷ Ἀρισταγόρη προσανασκόμενω πολλα. τοῦ πλείου τε ἐξεικενθεν πολύρροιη, ἐνθαυτα τεύχα τους φυγασ τῶν Ναζιών οἰκοδομήσαντες ἀπαλλάσσοντο ἐς τήν ἤπειρον κακὸς πρήσοντο. Ἀρισταγόρης δε οὐκ εἶχε τήν ὑπόσχεσιν τῷ Ἀρταφρένι εἰκέλεσας. ἀμα δε ἐπιζε μή διατάη τῆς στρατίτης ἀπαγωγή, ἀρροδεῖ δε τοῦ στρατοῦ πρήξας κακώς και Μεγαβατὺ διαβεβηλευμένος, ἐδοκεῖ τῇ τής βασιλείᾳ τῆς Μελίτου ἀπαρεβήσεσθαι. ἀρροδεῶν δε τοιτών ἕκαστα ἐξουβενετο ὁποίας εκπάθησαν, συνέκπη τας των έστυγμών την κεφαλήν ἁπτόθαι εκ Σωτών παρὰ Ἰστιαυον, σημαίνωντες ἀπίστασθαι Ἀρισταγόρην ἀπὸ βασιλέως. ὁ γαρ Ἰστιαυων βουλομένου τῷ Ἀρισταγόρῃ σημαίνει ἀποστήμαι ἄλλος μὲν οὐδαμῶς εἶχε ἄσφαλεον σημαίνει ὁ τιστε φυλασσομένων τῶν ὁδών, ὁ δὲ τῶν δοῦλων τῶν πιστώτων

34. 2. οἰκι. Krüger adds τι which ν. Herwerden admits. The Naxians are represented as little better than simpletons, paying no heed to the intrigues of their exiled fellow-citizens abroad, suspecting nothing of the two hundred triremes at Miletes, taking no thought of the fate of Samos, Cius, Lesbos, Larnes; yet able withal on the shortest notice to make all things ready for a siege. These improbabilities are necessary to the story of Megabates’ treachery.

5. ἐφάπαξ from εὔπεπευμ. Schweig. reads ποτα το τέχος ἐφάπαξ ἢ ο. e. τ. ἐφάπαξ. Herwerden adopts ἐφάπαξ from Höger.

8. μένας τέσσερας would carry them over most of the summer; looks like a genuine memory, but does not make the improvisation of the Naxians more probable, nor consequently, the story of the treachery of Megabates.

10. προσανασκόμενο πολλά. Aristagoras being genuinely in earnest in the undertaking, the failure of which Megabates had secured beforehand! On what terms the two were with each other during the four months’ siege, it would be interesting to know.

35. 1. τῆν ὑπόσχεσιν, c. 31 supra. The only actual promise Aristagoras made to Artaphernes was to find supplies. The suggestion seemed to be that Artaphernes should himself undertake the annexation.

4. ἀνυπακόμενοι. We are left to suppose that the treachery of Megabates was not discovered till long afterwards, and even then not reported to the Persian court, otherwise he could hardly have been satrap of Daskyleimon in 476 B.C., cp. c. 32 supra.

There are almost too many (five) good reasons here! Probably the message of Histiaios would have been enough to account for the revolt. This indeed was the view taken by Artaphernes, who exonerated Aristagoras, d. i.

6. τῶν ἐστυγμῶν referred to apparently a notorious personage, like “the man in the iron mask,” etc. There seems truth in the tale.

10. οδ. ‘so he ...’
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άποδημήτας τήν κεφαλήν ἐστίκε καὶ ἀνέμεινε ἀναφύνει τας τρίχας, όν δὲ ἀνεύρσει τάγματα, ἀπέτεμπε ἐς Μιλιτοὺς ἐπεταλάμενος αὐτὸς ἅλλο μὲν οὐδὲν, ἕπειν δὲ ἀπίκης τας Μιλιτοὺς, κελεύειν Ἀρισταγόρην ἐξουσιαστάμενον μὲν τὰς τρίχας καταδέσατε ἐς τῆν κεφαλήν. τὰ δὲ στίγματα ἐνίμαιον, ὃν καὶ πρῶτον μοι ἐίρηται, ἀπόστασιν. ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ἰστιαῖος ἐποίησε συμφόρων ποιεῖσθαι μεγάλην τὴν ἐνωτού κατοχήν τὴν ἐν Σοῦσοιν ἀποστάσιος ὁ οἰκομένης πολλὰς εἰχὲ ἐπιδίκας μετέχεισθαι ἐπὶ θαλάσσαν, μὴ δὲ νεώτερον το ποιεῖσθαι τῆς Μιλιτοῦ ὀυδάμας ἐὰν αὐτὴν ἤξεν ἐτὶ ἔλογκετο.

Ἰστιαῖος μὲν νυν ταῦτα διανοεῖμυος ἀπέτεμπε τὸν ἄγγελον. 36 Ἀρισταγόρη δὲ συνέπιπτε τοῦ αὐτοῦ χρόνου πάντα ταῦτα συνελθώντα. ἐβουλευόταν δὲν μετὰ τῶν στασιωτών, ἐκφύσις τῆς τὴν ἐνωτοῦ γυνῶμη καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Ἰστιαίου ἀτελεμένα. οἱ μὲν δὴ ἄλλοι πάντες γυνώμη κατὰ τὸν τοῦτο ἐξεφερότας, κελεύοντες ἀπόστασις.

11. ἔστικε, with his own hand? probably. The letters were not branded but tattooed (τὰ μὲν ἔστικε καλεῖ. c. 6 supra). Histiaios may have learnt the art in Thrace. Aulus Gellius who tells the story (17. 9 ad fn.) with some (worthless) variations, from a different source, seems to imagine that the communication was a lengthy one. Demosthenes was credited with a different method of sending a dangerous message 7. 239 (c). 92 infra. 16. ἀπόστασιν. Perhaps this single word was all that was on the man’s skin. However Pausanius I. 24 knows better, Ἰστιαῖος Ἀρισταγόρης ἐμνεί ἀπόστασιν. 15. πολλὰς εἰχὲ ἐπιδίκας, c. 30 supra.

The Nostalgia of Greek exiles is most fully exemplified in the story of Demokedes, 3. 129 ff. The case of Histiaios was not one of simple home-sickness: better to reign in Militothan serve in Susa. 36. 2. πάντα ταῦτα. The five sufficient reasons enumerated c. 35 supra. 6. ὁ λογοτέκτος. Κρ. c. 125 infra, 6. 137, and Introduction, p. lxvi. Hekataios is one of the tyrant’s partisans. This circumstance would not recommend him to Hdt., nor yet his sacrilegious advice infra. Perhaps Hdt. (pace his own recorded experience) did not approve of historians meddling with politics. 7. καταλέγων. Was this catalogue by Hekataios not committed to writing, included in any of his works known to Hdt.; and used by him, e.g. in 3. 90 ff., 7. 61 ff. et al. ! cp. 4. 87.

Hekataios the prose-wright is at first in despair and then full of hope, his hopes being bound up with a counsel of despair, if not of impurity. However, he had reason, for the historic offerings at Branchidae apparently suffered the fate he prophesied, cp. 6. 19. Hence the rather ἐὰν just below. 18. Βραγχίστας, ai Βραγχίστας the place, Didyma, 6. 19 infra; al Βραγχίστας, cp. 1. 188, the priests and custodians, 'Sons of Branches,' first founder. Strabo, 634.

τὰ Κροῖον καλ. 1. 92. πολλὰς εἰχὲ ἐπιδίκας. Here from
Ἐπικατατήρων τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ οὕτω αὐτοὺς τι εἶχεν ταῖς 15 χρήμασι χράσαι καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους ὡς συλλήψει αὐτά, τὰ δὲ χρήματα ἣν ταύτα μεγάλα, ὡς δεδηλοῦσα μεν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν λόγων. αὐτὴ μὲν δὴ οὐκ ἔνικα ἡ γραμμὴ, ἐδοκεῖ δὲ ὅπώς ἀπεσταθαι, ἕνα ταύτων πλοῖαν ἦν Μυλάντα ἐν τῷ οἰκτόπεδου τὸ ἁπτῷ τῆς Νάξου ὑπελθὼν, ἐν ἐνθαῦτα, συλλαμβάνειν πειράσθαι 37 τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν ἐπιπλέοντας στρατηγοὺς. ὁποτεμφέβητος δὲ Ἡπειρόρρημα κατ’ αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ συκλαβότος δόλῳ Ὀλίπων 1Βακόλλος Μυλασσά καὶ Ἰστιάιος Τύμνεως Τερεμέα καὶ Κών 2Ερβάνδρων, τῷ Δαρείῳ Μυτιλήνη ἐδοράθαι, καὶ Ἀρισταγόρην 3Ἡρακλείδης Κυμαιῶν καὶ Ἀλλών ισχυρῶν, οὕτω δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανοῦς ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ἀπετιθηκε, τῶν ἑπὶ Δαρείῳ μηχανο- 4μενος. καὶ πρώτα μὲν λόγῳ μετεις τὴν τυραννίαν ἴσονομοι ἐπαύει τῇ Μιλήσῳ, ὡς ἐν ἐκάντοις αὐτῷ οἱ Μιλήσιοι συναπ- 5σταίατο, μετὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀλή Ιωνητῷ τούτῳ τούτῳ ἐποίει, τοὺς ἡπεξαύουν τῶν τυράννων, τοὺς δ’ Ἀλαί τυράννους ἀπὸ τῶν the mouth or pen of Hekataios. Cp. cc. 30, 36 supra.

16. ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν λόγων, 1. 92. A remarkable expression, the authenticity of which there is little reason to question. Had the words been a gloss, the reference would probably have been still more explicit. ὁ πρώτος τῶν λόγων can scarcely be identified with the whole of Bk. 1 (notwithstanding the use of ὁ λόγος in 1. 95), but may be taken to cover cc. 1-94, or the first of the two divisions into which Bk. 1 clearly falls. ἐν τοῖς Λυκανοι λόγων would have been an expression more in accord with Herodotean phraseology, cp. 1. 184, 2, 161. The employment of the ordinal number here is, however, specially interesting in its bearing on the question of the Composition of Hdt.'s work. See further, Introduction, §§ 2, 21.

18. ένα . . . πιέσαι. Αὐτὸ ἀρχισαίον. He would have the assistance of his ship's crew at least: but he may have had all the ships of Milctos at his disposal. Myus was not ten miles distant, across the Latmian Bay. Its territory bordered on that of Priene, cp. 1. 142, and 6. 8.

37. 2. Ἡπειρόρρημα, see c. 30 supra. What the δόλος was we are left to conjecture: nothing is more probable than that there was a banquet. —Ολίπων. An Heracleides son of Dionysus. Of Mylaea, who appears c. 121 infra. The proper name sounds 'Karian.' —Μυ- λασσά (or Mylassa, cp. Forbiger, Alt. Geogr. ii. 232), some 30 miles south of Myus. The Karian Zeus had a temple there 1. 171; cp. Head, Hist. Num. p. 528, who mentions that "Mylassa was originally the residence of the dynastic of Caria until they obtained possession of the Greek town of Haliarkhmans." Ramsay, op. c. p. 422, makes it the seat of a bishopric in Roman times (but cp. pp. 416, 417). —Hesiodos, 1. 303, 2, 182. —Terman. "A small place on the promontory between Haliarkhinos and Myndus" (Head). "Τέρμανα ήδη ἐστιν ἄνατολις. . . ." (Ramsay, p. 424). —Koes, 4. 97 and c. 11 supra is a Lesbian (Aeol- lian). —Aristagoras, the son of Heracleides of Kyme, 4. 139, likewise an Aeolian.

The short list of tyrants arrested at Myus by Istragoras, under orders from Aristagoras of Miletos, is not a little remarkable. It includes only four names. Two of these are apparently native Karian, or Helleno-Karian dynastie: two are Aeolian tyrants. No Ionian tyrant is mentioned. The anonymous ἄλλοι ἀκτικές remain anonymous to the end of the story.

7. ἴσονομοι. So Miletos follows suit to Naxos, as Naxos to Athens, c. 30 supra.

The tyrants was identified with "medism" in the Ionian cities at this time. Cp. 4. 137.
38. 3. ἀπίστως. The tyrants presumably retired to Sardes. Perhaps they met Hippias there. At any rate Sigeion remained in his hands.

τυράννων...κατάτασσα. This might have been reckoned an ἄσεις κακῶς, cp. c. 25 supra.

5. στρατγοὺς. The precedent of Athens (c. 69 infra) may have been followed. However that may be, Strategi were wanted for the coming struggle with the Persians. The old title for the chief magistrate in the Ionian cities was perhaps πρῶτος, as at Miletos (Aristot. Pol. 5. 5, 8, 1305a), where, however, the term may have been associated with the tyranny, owing to the circumstances referred to by Aristotile, Lc.

6. δεύτερα. The event is second in numerical order, but it is a distinct event, not a repetition of a former event. Cp. note on τὸ δεύτερον, c. 28 supra.

39. 1. Σπάρτης. The digression or excursus on Sparta is short (cc. 39-48), and biographical. The history of Sparta is more fully given as a 'function' of Athenian history, cc. 55-57 infra. Cp. Introduction, pp. xxxvi ff., and Appendix VII.

’Αναξανδρίδης ὁ Δέοςτος. For the complete genealogy, see 7. 204.

οὐκέτα must be taken to refer back to 1. 67 (Anaxandrides was no longer King, for he was no longer alive) though Kleomenes has been mentioned already (3. 145) as king of Sparta. There is some awkwardness in the words οὐκέτα περίον ἐβασίλευεν; they seem to imply that Anaxandrides was king till his death. For the use of the negative Stein cp. Th. 1. 12 ὅτε μὴ ἤρχασας αὐτήθηκα. τὴν βασιλείαν, ‘the kingly office,’ which, though no one would discover it from this passage, was dual or collegiate. κατ’ ἀνδραγαθίαν, not Kleomenes but Doryclés would have been king c. 42 ἔτη/φα. γείον = προσβεβεγέρα, priority of birth.

4. ἀξιόλογον ἱωτότο τυγχάνει, consequently his own niece. Cp. case of Leonidas and Gorgo, 7. 239; Archidamos and Lamptio, 6. 71.

6. ἑπικαλεσάμενοι. The five Ephors summon the leading king before them, as guardians of the Spartan Institutions. The extinction of one of the kingships might have led to the agrandissement of the other. The Ephors would no doubt have been equally solicitous for the House of Procles. Dual Royalty was a double safeguard against tyranny. Cp. Aristot. Pol. 2. 9, 30, 1271a. On the kingships cp. 6. 51 ff. Plutarch, Kleom. 10, reports that king as saying ἡταμεν παλαιοῦ τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν ἐφόρων τῷ πρῶτον ἀντίλεγεν κατὸ τὸ δεύτερον, τὸ δὲ τρίτων καλοστον ἀναστάτω βαδίζειν πρὸς αὐτῶν: a report which may preserve a genuine custom.
συ σωστον μη προοριζη, αλλα ημιν τουτο εστι ου περιοπτεον, γενος το εξωσυνθεος γενεσθαι εξιτηλον. συ νυν την μεν εχει γυναικα, επιτε του ου τικε τε, εξει, αλλαν δε γημον και ποιεσ αποκα ταιται 
Σπαρτηται άδησεσι.
ο δε αμειβετο φας τοιτων ουδετερα ποιησεως, εκεινους τε ου καλος συμβουλευειν παραινεοντας, την εχει γυναικα εσται της θυμαρητης ενοικω τα αντα αποκα, ααλη
εσαγωγεσαι ουδε σφι πειθεσαι. προς ταυτα οι οφοροι και οι γεροντες βουλευουμενοι προσεβερον εν αναξανδρια ταδε.
"ετε τοις τοις της περιγεμνεον σε ερξον της εχεις γυναικος, συ
de ταυτα ποιει και μη αντιβαλε τουτους ια μη τοις αλλοιν
περι σει 
Σπαρτηται βουλευουμενοι γυναικοι μεν της εχεις ου
προσεομεθα σει της εχειν, συ δε ταυτη τε παντα θα 
v

5 περι σει 
Σπαρτηται βουλευουμενοι γυναικοι μεν της εχεις ου
προσεομεθα σει της εχειν, συ δε ταυτη τε παντα θα 
v

11 συμβουλευειν παραινεοντας. The
dictum of the Ephors was advice not
calling the king. 

60. 1. οι ζηµων και οι γυβοντες. 

5. Σπαρτηται, in the Apella! There 
was still a trump to play. 

9. Σπαρτητικα. Such, we must 
suppose, was the general ignorance 
among the 'Greeks of Spartan usages, 
that the bigamy of Anaxandrides might 
have been mistaken for lawful custom, 
without this express caveat. E. Hrns, 
Polybian und Pelikchant nach gr. Rechte, 
pp. 60 ff., questions whether there was 
any express prohibition. But at Sparta 
the rule might hold: 6 δε μη μελετησαι, 
υπογραφησεις, Aristot. Ethik. Nic. 6. 11, 
1138a.

41. 1. οι πολλοι. It is a wonder they 
did not question the paternity of Kleo-
menes as of Demaratos, vid. 6. 65. 
The year of his birth cannot be fixed. It 
might be about the date of the fall of 
Sardas (546 b.C.), in which case Klee-
menes might have been upwards of 30 
years of age, at the date of the applica-
tion of Mainandrios 3. 148 (circas 516 n.c.). 
If, however, Kleomenes was on the 
throne in Sparta in 519 n.c. (Duncker, 
vi. 650) and if the king's minority 
extended to the age of 30, he must have 
been born about 550 n.c. or earlier. 
Cp. 6. 105 infra.

3. άπεφαυς. Stein suggests απ- 
φησιν.
χρόνου ἄτοκος ἑώσα τότε καὶ κατήν Recognize that this Demarmenos was son of the
famous Chilon, I. 59, 6. 65. Blakesley
suggests that the mother of Kleomenes was of Achaian not of Herakleid blood:
"By his father's side Kleomenes was pure Dorian," and quotes the pedigrees
7. 204. But Achaian and Herakleid are not opposed to each other. On the
contrary, if Kleomenes had claims to Achaian descent (c. 72 infra) it was in
virtue of his being an Herakleid.

5. ἔχονταν. Cobet would read κυνωναν or add ἐν γαστρὶ after λόγῳ.
With ἔλογον cp. τὴν ἄλληνθεν, τὸ μεν ἔστιν παρθένῳ λόγῳ 6. 68.
οἱ τῆς . . . οἰκίαι. Family interests and connexions counted for a good deal
in Sparta, cp. 4. 149.

6. ἐφόροι. A fresh evidence of the care for the royal family entertained
by the Ephors: not the same men of course as those alluded to cc. 39, 40.

9. ἴσως, consp.!

10. οἱ δὲ . . . λέγοντες. Hdt. would hardly have mentioned this view, if he
thought there was nothing in it. His
authorities then were good: perhaps
Spartan. Conversely, Spartan tradition
was not clear upon this point. Hdt. however seems to prefer the view put
first, perhaps as better according with the
succession of Leonidas.

12. τὸ δείτερον . . . τὸ δεύτερον. The
awkwardness of this repetition is not
greatly diminished by bracketing with
Stein the first τοῦ, though the grammar
is improved; and δευτέρον ἑκατάδους is
tautologous. Holder follows Botticher
in bracketing καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἑκατάδους.
On δεύτερον cp. δεύτερα c. 38, τὸ δεύτερον
c. 28. The difference made by the
article is well shown in this passage,
δευτέρον ἑκατάδους applying to a single
act by a different person; τὸ δεύτερον
ἐκείνη to a repeated act by the same
person. (Cobet brackets γενή also.)

13. Διημαρμένου. Stein suggests
that this Demarmenos was son of the

νράξιρον ταύτη τρων καὶ ἐκίνησε, συντυχίᾳ ταύτη χρησμαμένην.

Ἐξουσαν δὲ αυτὴν ἀλήθει λόγῳ οἱ τὴς ἐπετελούσης γνωμοσύνας οἴκημα 5
πολυμέναν ἄλοχον, φάμενοι αυτὴν κομπέειν ἄλλως βουλομένην
ὑποβαλέσθαι. δεινὰ δὲ ποιεύσαντον αὐτῶν, τὸν χρόνον συντάμνοντο, ὑπ’ ἀπόστησις οἱ ἐφόροι τίκτουσαν τὴν γνωμικα περιμένους ἐφιλαχαί.

6. ἔστεκε Δωρία πειραμάτων ἱδεῖν ἵσχει Λεωνίδην, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἱδεῶν ἱσχει Κλεόμβροτον; οἱ δὲ καὶ δεδομένων λέγοντες τὸ ὁ Κλεόμβροτον καὶ Λεωνίδην γενόσθαι, ἦ δὲ Κλεόμενη τεκόντος καὶ [τὸ] δεύτερον ἑκατάδους γενή, ἑόσην θυγάτηρ Πριμήτιδος
τοῦ Δημαρμένου, οὐκέτι ἐτικτε τὸ δεύτερον.

Ο μὲν δὲ Κλεομένης, ὁς λέγεται, ἦν τε οὐ φρενηρῆς ἀκρο- 42
μανής τε, ὃ δὲ Δωρίας ἦν τῶν ἕλκων πάντων πρῶτος, εὖ
tε ἐπίστατο καὶ ἀνδραγαθίνην αὐτῶν σχῆσις τὴν βασιλείαν.

οὕτω ὠν οὕτω φορεών, ἐπειδὴ ὃ τε 'Ἀναξανδρίδης ἀπέθανεν καὶ
5 οἱ Δακεδαιμονίωι χρεώμενοι τῷ νόμῳ ἐστίναμο ἄστικσαμεν ναυσίλια τοῦ πρεσβύτατου Κλεομένεα, ὁ Δορίεις δεινὸν τοιαντεμενοι καὶ οὐκ ἄξιον ὑπὸ Κλεομένεως βασιλεύσασθαι, αὐτήσας λεῶν Σμαρτήτας ἦν ἐς ἀπουκοιλήν, οὕτε τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖς Χρηστηρίῳ Χρησάμενος ἐς ἤτοι σαργά χιλιῶν κτίσιων ἤγε, οὕτω ποιήσας ὡδὲ τῶν νομίζομεν οἷα δὲ δὲ βαρέας φέρων, ἀπείρε ἔς τῇ Διβύνῃ τὰ πλοία· κατηκέαντο δὲ οἱ ἀνδρεὶς Θηραίωι. ἀπικόμενοι δὲ ἐς Διβύνῃ ὀκτεὶ χώρον κάλλιστον τῶν Διβύων παρὰ Κιννώς ποταμῶν. ἐξελάοικες δὲ ἐνθεοὶ τρίτῳ ἔτει ὑπὸ Μακεώς τε Διβύων καὶ Καρχηδονίων ἀπίκετο ἐς 43 Πελοπόννησον. ἑνθαῦτα δέ οἱ Ἀντιγόρας ἀνὴρ Ἕλεωνς συνε- βούλευσε ἐκ τῶν Δαλίων χρησιμῶν Ἱππαλκεὺς τῇ ἐν Σικελίᾳ κτίζειν, φασὶ τὴν Ἔρμυκος χώρην πάγαν εἶναι Ἱππαλκείδεων αὐτῶν.

5. ὁ Δακεδαιμόνιος... ἀστίκαμόν ἄστικσαμεν. Some election or ratification (as it were a lex de imperio) seems to be implied; cp. Thuc. 5. 16 ad f. Hdt. seems to use the terms Δακεδαιμονίωι and Σμαρτήτας as equivalent. Cp. G. Gilbert, Gr. Staata. 1. 2 41, where, however, the statement that in Thuc. 1. 128-134 we find an exception to the strict use of the later historians appears to me incorrect. τῷ νόμῳ. If the φάσις 7. 3 is to be trusted this νόμος was not unqualified. The description of the merit and the mind of Dorien seems to imply that the claim of primogeniture might have been set aside, at least in the case of imbecility or insanity.

7. Σμαρτήτας. Not in apposition to λεῶν but acc. after αἰτηθείς (αἰτεῖ τωι τωι common). The Ōχικατι may all have been Dorians or at least leading citizens c. 46 infra, though citizens could ill be spared from Sparta in any great number. Cp. the restrictions on ἀνα- δομία. Harpocratio: καὶ γὰρ τὸ μη- δένα τῶν μαχιῶν ἀπειρεί τῆς τῶν ἀρχιτῶν γρώμας ἀποθηκεύς, κτλ. V. Ross, Arist. Prag. 2. 549.

8. ἐν Δελφοῖ. This bad example was, we may suspect, well remembered in Delphi together with the failure of Dorius. The claim here advanced on behalf of Delphi has sometimes been exaggerated into an historical record (e.g. "almost all Greek colonies were founded with the sanction and frequently by the express command of the Pythian Apollo" Dict. Geogr. 1. 726). Cicero's question is better: quam vero Graecia coloniam misit in Apollam Ioniam Asiam Siciliam Italianiasimine Pythio aut Dodonaeo aut Harmonis oraculo de Dévis. 1. 1, 3.

9. τῶν νομιζομένων. The conduct reported of Dorius hardly bears out the praise bestowed upon him. To set religion and law at defiance is hardly good evidence of virtue and wisdom. Had Delphi, as well as Spartan νόμος, already decided against him?

10. Διβύν. He knew apparently what he was about, had a definite goal, and chose his guides wisely, cp. 4. 150 ff. That he omitted to obtain Delphic approval of a mission to Libya is the more remarkable considering the relations between Delphi and Kyrene (4, 1. c. supra). Perhaps Delphi would have urged a site too far west, cp. 4. 178.

11. χώρον κάλλιστον τῶν Διβύων παρὰ Κιννώς. 4. 175, 198. He was not working against, or apparently, with the Kyreneans.

13. τρίτῳ ἔτει, 'after two years.' (Not drei Jahre hindurch, Duncker, vi. 2 559.)

14. Μακεώς, 4. 175. The native and Semitic opposition to a fresh Greek settlement is significant.


2. Δαλίων χρησιμῶν. One of the collections of oracles that were coming into fashion. Cp. 7. 6, 8. 20 et al. and Introduction, p. 188.

Ἡρακλεία. There never was an Heracleia ou Mount Eryx; but the Herakleid legend was located there. Cp. Freeman, Sicily, 1. 299 ff., 2. 88 ff. Stein suggests that γῆ has dropped out, and would read: Ἡρακλείας τῆς γῆς.

3. φάσε. On the character of this claim and argument cp. 4. 8. A Boeotian
The passage is not fully visible or legible, but it appears to discuss historical events and geographical locations. The text is punctuated with a mix of Greek and Latin, suggesting it may be a historical or literary document. The language and context suggest it might be discussing events or figures from ancient history, possibly involving battles, expeditions, or conquests.

The text references locations such as "Laos and Skiodos 510-448 B.C.", "Thurii (the Athenians)", "Diodorus 12. 9.", and "Duncker 1961, 639 ff.", which indicates a connection to classical antiquity. The names "Herakles" and "Herakleids" are mentioned, which are references to figures from Greek mythology and history.

Overall, the document seems to be a historical or scholarly text discussing ancient events and figures, possibly with a focus on military or political strategies and their outcomes.
clear that the Sybarites, when it came to evidence, have the best of the argument? (1) They asserted that Dorius founded the temple and precinct on the Krathis at Athene Krathia, but perhaps the assertion was not true (Hdt., op. cit. 4. 187). Even if that assertion was true, it did not prove that Dorius had joined in the destruction of Sybaris. (2) Still less did the premature death of Dorius (μαρτύρων μέγας των) prove their point. (3) The same probandi lay with the Sybarites. (4) The motive for ascribing the destruction of Sybaris to Dorius rather than to the men of Kroton is obvious. (5) The argument of the Krotoniates though not absolutely final is no sophism. If a man of the Herakleid stock of Sparta had lent them his aid, he would have claimed and obtained his reward. It might be said that the temple dedicated to Athene was out of his share of the spoil. But the connexion of Dorius with Athene, or with this temple, was not established. Moreover (6) what of Philip of Kroton? (c. 47 ιναρια) who would likewise have had his reward. It is, however, obvious that Hdt. attaches considerable weight to the Sybarite argument. Probably the μέγας των μαρτυρων outweighs all others with him, as it carries a divine moral with it. A "παράγως" must be discovered to account for the failure and fate of Dorius; not that Delphi would have admitted a non-fulfilment of prophecy in the case. Dorius did indeed obtain ετειλητηριον χωρραν. Op. c. 43 supra. Hdt. himself may have wished to side with the Sybarites, his townsmen, but he cannot bring himself to force the argument.

10. ξηραςτησα... τολά. Not all confined perhaps to landed property. Op. the demands of Malandriou s. 142. τα και ει δε ει σκινοντο (imperf.). The obvious suggestion of this phrase certainly is that Hdt. had been to the spot, or district, before he wrote this; yet the inference is not binding, op. 4. 124 and Introduction, p. xcv.


2. of, clumsy, for it apparently includes Dorius but excludes Euryleon.

3. παριτι στόλων. Op. κασισι στόλων αποκέντρου 6. 39, σπαρτησις μέγας στόλων 4. 145, ιδιω στόλω c. 38 ιναρια, μείν στόλος στους c. 64 iναρια. The word carries with it, perhaps, a suggestion of official authority or sanction, and is used here, not unintentionally, of the arrival of the leaders at their proper destination.

4. Φοινικων και Εγκσταλων. The 'Phoenicians' would be men of Carthage (op. c. 42 supra), or of the Carthaginian settlements in Sicily, which might of course cover older colonies from Phoe-
nica proper. Egesta was a non-Hellenic city, a city of the Elymi people of supposed Trojan origin. (Cp. Freeman, *Sicily*, i. 200 ff., Thuc. 6. 2.)


7. Πεδαγόρας. The name must not be confounded with Pythagoras. ‘Monarch’ = tyrant. There is some point in his death at the altar of Zeus apateo, but Hdt. has no consequent σύγκορος.

8. Μένει δήλον, ‘but not for long.’ This story of Western adventure is presumably from Siceliot sources, but contains no evidence that Hdt. had ever actually set foot in Sicily.


2. άρμοσάμοις. Ψ. ἡμελέσκει τὴν πλατέα τῆς Αλέξανδρου. Καὶ ψαλώνουσι οἱ γάρ μεν Σελινούσιοι ἐπαναστάτησεν ἀπαντώντας καταφυγόντα ἐπὶ Δίδυμον άρμον ωφι σωμών. Συνέσπεστο δὲ Δορίει καὶ συνυπάθαις Φίλιππος 47 ο Βουτακίδεως Κροτονίτης ἄνηρ, δε ἀρμοσάμοις Τήλιος τοῦ Συμπαρίσστος δυνατέρα ἐφύγε ζέ Κρότωνικος, ψηφεύει δὲ τοῦ νάμον οὖχετο πλέον ἐς Κυρήνην, ἐκ ταύτης δὲ ὁμομένως συνεσπέστοις οἰκείης τε τριτει καὶ οἰκείη ἀνδρῶν διπάντη, εὐώτως τ' Ὀλυμπιανήκης 5 καὶ κάλλιστος Ἐλλήνων τῶν κατ’ ἑσύτων. διὰ δὲ τὸ ἐσώτου κάλλος ἤνεκάτω παρὰ Ἑγεσταίου τὰς ὀδοὺς ἀλλος, ὕπη γὰρ τοῦ τάφῳ αὐτοῦ ἡμῶν ἰδρυμαίους θυσίας αὐτὸν ἡλόκοτος.

Δορίεως μὲν νυν τρόπον τοιούτῳ ἐπελεύθη: εἰ δὲ ἤνεκάτω 48

8. ᾿Πάσκοντας. This Hero-worship of an Hellenic shade at Egesta (Segesta) is doubly remarkable, for (1) he has been fighting against the Segestaean, and (2) they were not Greeks. The case of Onesilos in Amathus in Cyprus c. 114 B.C. is similar. Stein remarks that it cannot have been his beauty for which Philippus was worshipped; but why not? Freeman (*Sicily*, ii. 95) compares the effect of the personal appearance of the Rhodian Dorius upon the Athenians, Xen. Hell. 1. 5, 19, but considers the Segestaean tribute to Philip higher “as paid to a dead man,” and “more distinctly a tribute to beauty as such.” The tribute of worship was properly paid to dead men; it would have been a still higher tribute to have worshipped him alive (cp. 7. 56). Prof. Freeman makes the pregnant remark that “it must have been when they came to strip the slain,” that the men of Segesta were overcome by the majestic form, noble even in death, of the victor of Olympia.” However, they might, perhaps, have seen him alive in the battle. Up. the case of Leon, 7. 186. (In regard to the proper name of the city, Segesta is the more correct, but both are found on coins, cp. B. Head, *Historia*, pp. 144 ff. The MSS. here vary between *ἔγεσταίων* and *αἴγεσταίων*.)

48. 1. Δορίεις .... ἐπελεύθησα. The *Story of Dorius* (pp. 45-50) looks like an episode, and insertion, based by no means in the main upon local Spartan
authors or sources. The ‘Sybarite’ and ‘Krotonite’ authorities are, indeed, nominated in general terms: the finale (cc. 46, 47) has a strong ‘Sicilian’ colour: the first colonial adventure (cc. 42, 45) might have been recorded at Delphi; for the Spartan situation Hdt. might have been indebted to Spartan sources, either on the spot, or emigrant. (See c. 42 supra.) But few writers were in a position to combine or to contaminate these various sources as Hdt. has done; and the result can hardly have been accomplished before his settlement at Thurii. Of the general truth of the story there need be no doubt: and true or transfigured, its significance is not small. The desultory efforts to make way against the barbarian in Libya and the west: the rivalries and mutual destruction of Hellenic states: the canker (cp. c. 28 supra) of internal stasis: the careers open to the military or political adventurer: the position and influence of Delphi: the character and spread of Hellenic art, religion, ethics: all these, and other points, are illuminated by this well-told story, which ranks with the tale of Demokedes (3. 131 ff.) in historic interest, if not in artistic finish. Cp. further, Appendix VII. § 4.

3. οὖν... τινα πολλάν χρόνον. A very remarkable observation, for Kleomenes must be taken to have been king about 30 years or so, on Hdt.’s own showing: cp. 3. 148, 6, 73. The former passage finds him on the throne about 516 B.C. (cp. Duncker, vi. 2506 a.). The latter reference keeps him on the throne till the eve of the battle of Marathon, nearly 20 years after the death of Doriæus; and the exile, restoration and death of Kleomenes have still to take place. The moral argument has proved too much for Hdt.’s chronology. Still the fact remains that Kleomenes was succeeded by his brother Leonidas. If Doriæus had remained in Sparta and survived Kleomenes, he would presumably have been king, and perhaps have wedded Gorgo. He was, however, married in Sparta, for he left there a son Euryanax (9. 10), who had apparently no right to the throne against Leonidas. Cp. c. 42 supra. On the chronology of Kleomenes’ reign, cp. Appendix VII. § 3.

4. Ἀπαθαί. The Ephors had not tried to secure him male issue, as the succession was provided for in the persons of his brothers, cp. c. 39 supra. Gorgo became the wife of her uncle Leonidas (7. 239), and was presumably the mother of Pleistarchus (9. 10).

49. ή εἶναι ἵππον. Going back to c. 38 before the digression cc. 39–48.

tέρατον. Aristogoras is incorrectly and inconsistently here described, for (1) he was only viceroy of the tyranny c. 25 supra, (2) he had laid down the tyranny c. 37. But the story of Aristogoras’ visit to Sparta comes perhaps from Spartan sources, in which he may have been so described. The λέγεσθαι in c. 37 is probably harmonistic.

2. ἐρήμη, sc. τὴν βασιλείαν (cp. 6. 106). The way his colleague is ignored is remarkable. Demaratus was still in possession of the second kingship. The date is very vague, but arguing back from the date of the capture of Miletos (6. 18) and supposing Aristogoras to have visited Sparta (and Athens) in the winter before the first campaign, his visit would fall at the earliest into the winter of 500–499 B.C. or at latest, the winter of 499–8 B.C. Cp. Appendix V.

80. Λακεδαμιώνιοι λέγουσι. The phrase seems to carry ‘Lakedaemonian’ authority for the whole account of Aristogoras’ visit to Sparta, i.e. (1) the exhibitions of the pinax, (2) the interview, or interviews, with the Eurythesten (Agid) king, (3) the speech and arguments of Aristogoras. But the historian’s art must also be reckoned with. The dialect is certainly his; but is that all? Cp. Appendix VII. § 8.

3. πάνως. This metal map of the earth was perhaps a fabrication of
περιόδος ἐνετέμετρο καὶ θάλασσα τε πάσα καὶ ποταμοὶ πάντες, ἀπικεφαλικῶς δὲ εἰς λόγους ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ἔλεγε πρὸς αὐτὸν τάδε. 5 ὁ Ἐλλάδος. Ταῦτα ἀνακύκλωσε οἱ Χρυσόκοκκος καὶ Πατής, ἂν λέγεται ἡ καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς ἐπαύλως ὃς ἔχει· ἔτεροι μὲν οἱ Πελοπόννησος καὶ Αἰγαίος, ταῦτα ὁ Ἐλλάδος. τοῖς ἐνετέμετροι καὶ ἀναλυόμεροι μὲν αὐτοῖς ἦμι, ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Ἐλλάδος. 

Anaximandros (Strabo 7, Meineke i, p. 8) and exhibited the great Ionian scheme of geography, which Hdt. so heartily despised, 4. 36. (Cp. Introduction, p. lxvi.) It does not appear certain that Hdt. had himself seen this map, or pínax, nor do we know its subsequent history. Great observers (III. 497) that it evidently made a profound impression at Sparta. Its construction marks an epoch in Greek geography (see Bunbury, History of Anc. Geography, i. 145, and more particularly Hugo Berger, Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen, Erste Abtheilung, pp. 1 ff.). If, however, Anaximandros was born 611 B.C. (Ueberweg, i, 34), and Aristogoras really brought a map of Anaximandros to Sparta, the map can hardly have been up to date. Agathemeros, i. 1 (Geogr. min. ii. p. 471), appears to say that Hekataios made some much admired improvements on the map of Anaximandros, and it has frequently been suggested that the tabula displayed by Aristogoras was the work of Hekataios. Cp. Förberger, Handb. d. alt. Geogr. i. 58. But the map of Hekataios was a γραφήμα, not a πίναξ. Strabo 7.

5. ἀπικεφαλικῶς. Aristogoras, despot of Miletos, is represented as interviewing Kleomenes, king of Sparta, as though the latter could act in and for Sparta on equal terms with him. There is a latent reason for this: see Appendix VII. § 8. 

τάδε. How the exact words, or arguments, which passed at a presumably secret interview, were divulged, it is not Hdt.'s way to state: cp. 4. 137 et al. Aristogoras, however, repeated himself at Athens, c. 97 infra, and see c. 51.

7. τὰ κατικέκκοσα, 1. 97, with πρόγνωσα 8. 19, 40, 102, passages in which τὰ κατικέκκοσα are contrasted with τὰ τοιαύτα.

9. ὑμῖν. The plural would not be inadmissible in a private appeal to the king, but both the grammar and the argument, addressed to the Spartan sense of honour, suggest a larger audience.

διά τοῦ προστάτου τῆς Ἐλλάδος. The Spartan προστάτωσις had been formally recognised, perhaps for the first time, about the middle of the sixth century B.C., by Kroisos 1. 69, on account of their power, δυνατότητος, c. 56, and prominence, προέχωσις c. 56. Since then, the claim had been again and again endorsed and acted on: by the Ionians and Aioli (1. 141, 152), by Samians (3. 46, 149), by Athenians (6. 63), by Boeotians (6. 105), to say nothing of Scythians (6. 84). The argument is strictly appropriate to the time and place, though in Hdt.'s own day it might have counted—in some places—as antiquated.

10. τὸ πρὸς τῶν Ἐλλήνων contains a fresh argument, and further illustration of the unity of Hellas, such as it was. Cp. c. 92 ἐνετέμετρα ad fin. Κεῖται Ἐλλήνων 9. 7. 

μία ὄμνοιμα. Aristogoras contains a third argument. The assertion of a relationship, a consanguinity, between Sparta and Ionia is not to be overlooked, and can hardly be explained by an admixture of Dorian ( Epidaurian) elements among the settlers in Ionia, 1. 146, or even by the large mixture of non-Dorian elements in Sparta. The national pedigree had already been invented, cp. 1. 56-58, 8. 144. The kinship is by male descent.

11. ἐνετέμετρο. A negative argument combined with a subtle compliment to Sparta (ὅμως στὰ) which would have been rather thrown away on a single Spartan. With the passage which follows should be compared i. 71.

13. ἔτερα μέχρι. The inferiority of
the armour and weapons of the Barbarians is recognised by Hdt. as one of the causes of the subsequent Greek victory, see 8. 62.


16. ἀγαθά. A utilitarian and economic argument, which ought to have been thrown away upon the votaries of the Lykurgian discipline. Compare the story told of Pausanias and the spoils of Plataea, 9. 60, also the story told of Kleomenes himself, 3. 148.


24. πολυπροβατάται. Phrygia was no doubt rich in flocks: Strabo 568, 575, Aristoph. Birds 493 (II. 3. 185 horses).

25. τῶν ἔγω οἴδα, though a standing formula with Hdt. (cp. Introduction, p. civ.), may be put here into the mouth of Aristagoras to emphasise his responsibility for the exaggerations.

...πολυκαρπότατοι. Specially the grapes: 

...καὶ αἵμη βραχεῖα: ἀναξιρίδας δὲ ἔχοντες ἔρχονται ἐς τὰς μάχας καὶ κυρβασίας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλῆς. οὗτοι εὑρετεῖς χειρώθηνει εἰςιν. ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ἀγαθὰ τούσι τὴν ἤπειρον ἀκόμαι νεμοῦνσιν ὡς ὁ ὄβε ὄντει συνάπτης ἀλλοιοι, ἀπὸ χρυσοῦ ἀρξαμένοις, ἀργυροῖς καὶ χάλκοις καὶ ἄσπης ποικίλη ἤ ἰποζυγία τε καὶ ἀνδράποδα τὰ θυμὸ βουλήμεναι αὐτοῖ ἔρχοντε. κατοικηται 20 δὲ ἄλλης ἀρχῆς ὁς ἄγω φράσο, Ἰώνων μὲν τῶν ὅδε Ἀσωτοὶ, αἰσχοῦντε τε καὶ χαρῆν ἀγαθῆ καὶ πολυπροβατύτατοι ἔρωτες. " δεικνύσι δὲ ἔλεγεν ταῦτα ἔς τῆς γῆς τὴν περιοδον, τὴν ἐφερετο ἐν τῷ πίνακι ἐντειμημένῳ. " Ἀλιῳ δὲ ἐφι λέγων ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης "οἴδε ἄραντες Φρύγεις οἱ πρὸς τὴν ἡμῖν, πολυπροβατύτατοι τε ἐρῶτες 25 πάντων τῶν ἔγω οἴδα καὶ πολυκαρπότατοι. Φρύγων δὲ ἔρχονται Καππαδόκια, τοὺς ἡμῶν Συρίων καλέμεν. τούτοις δὲ πρόσοντα κιλίκες, κατίκοις ἐπὶ βαλασσάν τιμῆ, ἐν τῇ ἤδε Κύπρος ἦσος κέται: οἱ πεντακόσια τάλαντα βασιλέα τὸν ἐπέτειον φόρον ἐπιτελείοι. Κιλίκων δὲ τῶν ἔρχονται Ἀρμένιοι οἴδα, καὶ οὕτως 30 ἔρωτες πολυπροβατυντε, Ἀρμενίων δὲ Ματινών χαρήν τιμῆ ἐχοντες. ἔχεται δὲ τούτων γῆ ἦς ἡ Κίσσις, ἐν τῇ δὴ παρὰ παταμῶν τῶν Χαστινα κείμενα ἐστὶ τὰ Σύρα ταύτα, ἐνάσα βασίλειος τε μέγας δίαταν ποιεῖται, καὶ τῶν χρημάτων οἱ θησαυροί ἐνερταίοι εἰσιν, ἔλαντες δὲ ταύτην τὴν πόλιν θαρασσόντες 35 ἧδη τῷ Δίῳ πλούσιον πέρι ἐρίζετε. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν χώρης ἀρα...
οὐ πολλῆς οὐδὲ οὕτω χρηστῆς καὶ οὕρων συμκρών χρεών ἐστὶ ύμαις μάχαις ἀναβάλλοντας πρὸς τε Μεσσηνίους ἐφέντ' ἰσοπαλίας καὶ Ἀρκάδας τε καὶ Ἀργείους, τοσοῦ ὡστε χρυσοῦ ἐχθρεύον ἐστι οὐδὲν οὕτω ἀργῷ, τῶν πέρα καὶ τινα ἑνήμερα προφθείρη μαχῆμεν ἐπάνθησενεν παρέχον δὲ τῆς 'Λασίης πάντω ἁρχὴς 40 ἐπετείων, ἀλλὰ τα ἀρίστεσθα; "Ἀρισταγάρης μὲν ταῦτα ἔλεγε, Κλεομένης δὲ ἀμαβεῖτο τοιοῦτον. "ὁ ξείνης Μιλήσιος, ἀναβάλλων ταῖς ἔστεί τρίτην ἡμέραν ὑποκρίνεσθαι. ὑπὸ τὲ μὲν ἐσοῦ-50 τον ἤλασαν εὐετεῖν δὲ η ἡμέρα ἡμέρα εὐγένετο τῆς ἤποκρίσεως καὶ ἠλθον ἐς τὸ συγκείμενον, ἐξερετερήσεις τὸν Κλεομένης τῶν Ἀρισταγάρηρ ὀκοσίων ἡμερῶν ἀπὸ χαλάσεις τῆς Ἰανάκον ὄδος εἶναι παρά βασιλέα. οὐκ ἄρα Αρισταγάρης τὰλλα ἐνοφοι καὶ διελθόλων 5 ἑκατον ἐν τόπῳ ἑσφάλλω χρεῶν γὰρ μὲν μὴ λέγει τὸ ἔνων, ἰσοτόμων ἐν Ἐλληνικίταις ἑξεγαγενεῖς ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην, λέγει δ' ὃν τριών μηνον φάνε νὰ εἶναι τῆς ἀνοδον. ὁ δὲ ἀποπράσας τῶν ἐπιλοιπῶν λόγων τὸν ὁ Ἀρισταγάρης ὀρμητο λόγειν περὶ τῆς ὀδοὺ, εἴπε "ὁ ξείνης Μιλήσιος, ἀπαλλάσσον ἐκ Ἐπάρτης πρὸ 10

frivolous, exaggerated, and 'lyricistic' tone about this speech, which helps to explain and justify the rejection of Aristagoras' suit at Sparta. Whether the speech is true and authentic is of course another question.

37. ἡμέρα ἀναβάλλωσιν ἀναβάλλων ὑποκρίνεσθαι just below: κρίσεων 6, 86 ἐνταφία: μὲ σοι μεγαλέωσθαι 5, 38; ἔφοροι μεγαλεῶσθαι καὶ μὲ ἀναβάλλοντα 3, 85: ἑπαρκόσεσθαι 9, 8 make it extremely difficult to take ἀναβάλλοντα in this passage in any sense but 'put off,' 'postpone.'

Μεσογιάνας. If this refers to the so-called first and second 'Messenian wars,' it is one of two allusions to them in the whole of Hdt.'s work, cp. 3, 47. It may, however, only be a shadow or suggestion, reflected back from the 'third' war. Cp. 9, 35; though ἀνοπλώσιος may be thought against this.

Ἀγωνιάς. Cp. 1, 82. Whereas the barbarians were εὐπόλεμοι χειρωθών supra. The argument, however, would have been a curious one to use in order to persuade the Spartans to send a strong force to Ασία: a thing they could only venture to do when they had nothing to fear from their neighbours, cp. 1, 68.


Ἀργείους. A big war with Argos was probably impending though neither Aristagoras nor Hdt. seems to realise the fact. Cp. 9, 76 ff.

39. τῶν τινών. The Miletian appeals to the basest motives, and this at Sparta: these be 'Ionian' sentiments. Not but what Hdt. shows that a Spartan would do a good deal for filthy lucre. Cp. the story of Glaukos 6, 86. Aristogoras, however, appeals also to other and more respectable motives as well: (1) Honour and ambition, (2) Religion, (3) Affection. See supra.

40. τῆς 'Ασίης πόλεως. Probably an anachronism. That any Greek in the year 500 B.C. had such a notion is unlikely, though before Hdt. wrote, or gathered his materials, the march to Susa had loomed up as a possibility, a dream, which republican Greece was not destined to realise. Cp. Appendix VII. § 8.

50. 1. ἐς τοσοῦτον, 'no further.' Cp. c, 23 supra.

5. Διελθόντων. Obviously different from the use in e, 96; but identical with the use (Hdt) c, 97.

7. ἐς τὴν 'Ασίην. What Aristogoras would have wished was that the Spartans should attack not Susa but Sardes. This the Athenians actually did. Aristogoras' speech begins with a petition for the protection and liberation of Ionia, and ends with the offer of an Asiatic empire. Λέγει δ' ὅτι, sc. τὸ ἔνων. Cp. 6, 50.

10. ἀπαλλάσσον ἐκ Σπάρτης πρὸ δύνας ἀλλοι. Years before when Kleomenes wished to employ the xenology against Mianendres of Samos, he must
fain call in the Ephors, 3. 148; here he is represented apparently as enforcing it himself. We may well doubt if a king had this competence. It is not enumerated among the γέρος 6. 56 ff.

51. 4. ἀντιπέμφαντα 'after dismissing.' The immortal anecdote of Gorgos' astounding precocity, if true, must obviously be traced to the lady herself, since neither Cleomenes nor Aristagoras can be supposed to have divulged a story, the circumstances of which were so discreditable to both. The conduct of Cleomenes upon this occasion offers an interesting contrast to his youthful virtue some fifteen years before (3. 148). Thus men with age degenerate! Fifty talents would be some £12,000. Was it a bribe, or a war-subsidy! Themistocles afterwards, according to report, received thirty from the Ereboans 8. 4; sixty was all the Athenians obtained from the Egesteans in 415 B.C. (Thucyd. 6. 8) at that time, just enough to keep sixty vessels on service for one month. But it is hardly worth while to rationalise the fifty talents, when the story as a whole is discredited. See Appendix VII. § 8.

6. Γοργά. The description is remark-

able, coming so soon after c. 48. The two passages probably are independent.

52. 1. ἁδη. This itinerary from Sardes to Susa is introduced on the somewhat lame plea that Aristagoras was prevented from enlarging further to Cleomenes περὶ τῆς ἄδου τῆς παρὰ βασιλέα. Had Anaxagoras been allowed to continue, he would hardly have spent his time on such an itinerary, even had he been qualified to expand it. The description of the road is a duller replica of the speech of Aristagoras just before; or perhaps rather the speech of A. is a lively creation based upon the itinerary. Cp. notes infra. The use of ἁδη is remarkable.

That the road was well provided with guard stations (cp. c. 35 supra) would not have been a good argument to induce the Spartans to take to it; and so of the gates, rivers, etc. But the fact that it avoided the deserts (dū oikoumén) might have been an inducement to the spoiler. So Aristagoras above indicates the countries by their inhabitants. On the stations (σταθμοί) and Khans (κατα-

λῶσε) Baehr's note should be consulted.

3. Λυδία. Λυδῶν ἔχωνται Φρύγες c. 49 supra.
5. ὁ Ἀλυ. It is curious that Hdt. does not here expressly notice the bridge, ep. 1. 75; but perhaps the mention of the gates (φύλα) on the river, and the phraseology (διεξέλασα διεκ-
πέρα), may be taken to imply a bridge, specially when contrasted with διαχω-
δμείσα οὖρα. The fact is the road must have crossed the Halyas twice: (1) between Ankyra and Pteria or Tavium, (2) between Pteria and Mazaka, or some other town on the way to Ephesusa. The bridge was presumably at the former passage. Hdt. was not accurately informed of the course of the Halyas. See Appendix XIII. § 4.

8. Κασπαδόκην. Φρυγῶν ἦσσατι Κασ-
παδόκην, c. 49 supra. It appears possible that Herodotus here refers to the cele-
brated Pylae Kilikiae, through which, Prof. Ramsay has said, "led the main road from all parts of the plateau of Asia minor to Cilicia in all periods of history" (Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor, pp. 349 f.). But the Royal Road, as described by Hdt., cannot have gone through the Pylae Kilikiae. A Kilicia, of which the Ephesus was a frontier, could never have been traversed in 153 parasangs from the Gates, διπλα, διπλα, ep. c. 40 supra, and Appendix XIII. § 4, note.

15. Ἀρμενία. Καλλονῶν ἔγγυται Ἀρ-
μενία, c. 49 supra. ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστιν, but presumably = ἐν τοῖς Ἀρμενίοις.

17. ἐκ δὴ ταῦτας τῆς Ἀρμενίας k.t.l. Stein has transposed the sentence from below, and bracketed τ. Ἀ. as an obvious gloss. The transposition redeems Hdt. from an extraordinary blunder, on which, and on the corruption of the text, ep. Appendix XIII. § 2.

18. τέσσαρες. After this word de la Barre (1729) proposed to insert the words and τρίκοντα, paraπραγγαί δὲ ἔσται καὶ τρίκοντα καὶ ἐκατόν. The emendation is certain, for (1) otherwise no Parasangs are given for Matiene; (2) the totals ισόροδα do not agree with the items; (3) the measurement suits the region here, as in the speech of Aristogoras, de-
nominated Matiene. Stein completed the purification of the text by the transfer and the brackets above noted. The passages have, however, here been dittographed, the better to exhibit the state of the case.

21. ἄντως ὁμομοιόμενοι, όχι ἄντως ἔσεσθαι. There can be little doubt that the rivers in question are the Greater and the Lesser Zab. Weissensborn proposed Σάβατον instead of the first ἄντως, van Heeringen prefers to insert Σάβατον after ὁμομοιό-
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μέρος (sic) with Bobrik. The termination

μέρος makes this the more acceptable.

24. τον Κέρος. αν. 1. 189, 190.

Hdt. firmly believed that item.

25. εκ. τέσσαρες. αν. 11, 17, 18 επι.

27. Κάστορι. εκατόν εκ τοσίων γιά
βλέπε Κάστορι, αν. 48 επι.

28. Χαδάσην . . Σουσαν. εν τῇ δὲ
παρὰ ποταμοῦ τῶν χαδάσην κεῖναι ἐστὶ
τὰ Σουσαν τάχα, αν. 49 επι.

It can hardly be doubted now that
for the Itinerary Hdt. had written
authority. That the distances are given
in parastas only shows that the road
has been remeasured by Persian
authority. The road itself, as Prof. W.
M. Ramsay (Asia Minor, pp. 27 ff.) has
demonstrated, was far older than the
Persian period. The omission by Hdt.
of all mention of the towns en route be-
tween Sardes and Susa is very unfortu-
nate, and shows pretty plainly that there
is no autopsy in the passage. That
omission, the corruption of the text,
and the introduction of the double
Gates, have made the task of reconstruct-
ing, geographically, the actual course of
the road, a difficult one. Kiepert gave
the first adequate theory on the subject
Ramsay’s more recent attempt (op. cit.
enp.), where it departs from Kiepert’s, is
not in all respects preferable. For the
fuller discussion of the question, and for
Mr. Hogarth’s argument in regard to
the passage of the Euphrates, see App. XIII.

53. 2. ὅροις. The total given in this c.
did not correspond to the items in the c.
preceding until de la Barre, followed by
Stein, emended the passage above noticed.
It is extremely unlikely that there was an
arithmetical error in the text originally.

The Parassoc (face) = 30 stadia = 3
m. 787½ yds. (2. 6). Ramsay reckons the
Parassoc at 24 m. (op. cit. p. 48), 13,506
stades, or 1500-1600 miles, is probably
not an over-estimate: this road, however,
by no means followed the short-
est available route from Sardes to the
Halys, or again from the Halys to the
Euphrates. See Appendix XIII.

7. τέσσαρα καὶ εκατόν. This
gives about 17-18 English miles to the
day’s march.
ΤΗΡΙΧΩΡΗ

τής Ἐλληνικῆς μέχρι Σουήν (τούτο γὰρ Μεμύνειον ἂστιν καλέσατα) τεσσαράκοντα καὶ τετρακισχιλίους καὶ μιρίους: οἱ γὰρ ἐξ Ἐφέσου ἐς Σάρδις εἰσὶ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ πεντακόσιον στάδιοι, καὶ οὕτω τρισὶ ἡμέρᾳς μηχανόντας τῇ τρίμηνος ὥσις.

Ἀπελαυνομένοις δὲ ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ἐκ τῆς Στὰρτῆς ἦσε ἐς τὰς 55 Ἀθήνας γενομένας τυράννων διὸ υλεύθερας. ἔπει Πιπαρχὸν τῶν Πεισοπρῶτων, Ἰππίδου ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου ἀδελφῶν, ἱδίωτα ὄψιν ἐνυπηνύον τῷ ἑωτῷ πάθει ἐναργεστάτην κτείνοντι Ἀριστογείτονα καὶ Ἀρμόδιος, γένος ἔνοικος τὰ ἀνέκαθεν Γεφυραίων, μετὰ ταῦτα 5 ἑτεροτευνων Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ ἐτεί πέντε σώματα ὅσον ἄλλα καὶ μᾶλλον ἡ πρὸ τοῦ. ἡ μὲν νῦν ὄψις τοῦ Πιπαρχοῦ ἐνυπηνύον ἦν 56

54. Ὁ Μεγάλος οὖν ᾠδην. Ατ one end of the Royal Road is the city of Meenon, Susa (cp. 7, 151), at the other end are certain monuments which Hdt. held to be Egyptian, but others ascribed to Memnon. 2, 166. The monuments, incorrectly placed by Hdt. (cp. Ramsay, op. e. pp. 30, 60), are 'Hittite' or Syro-Kappadokian; and as Memnon certainly represents an Upper Asiatic power (cp. Ed. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alt. i. § 256) there was more to be said for ascribing the monuments to Memnon than for ascribing them to Sesostris (cp. Wiedemann, note to Hdt. 2, 166). The Akropolis of Susa has been the scene of the brilliant labours of M. and Mde. Dietlafay. Cr. L'Acrople de Susa, Paris, 1893; Billerbeck, Susa, Leipzig, 1895.

10. Ἡμέρα. It was the three days', not the three months', march which Aristagoras probably proposed to the Spartans. See c. 55 supra.

55. 1. τὰς Ἀθήνας. In the regular course of his narrative Hdt. brings Aristagoras to Athens. He takes occasion therefrom to insert a digression on the Peisistratidae, and the Liberation of Athens (cc. 55-56), which leads him to an excursion on the Gephyraeans (c. 57), which involves a note on the Phoenicians in Boeotia (c. 58), which excuses a remark upon the origin of Greek culture, which merges in an appendix on certain Kadmian inscriptions at Thebes (cc. 59-61); after which the main digression is resumed (c. 62). This main digression performs admirably two requirements, of which its author appears unconscious: first, it helps to explain why the suit of Aristagoras was rejected at Sparta; secondly, it goes far to explain why it was granted at Athens. Both explanations are contained in the history of the ten or twelve years preceding the application of Aristagoras.

3. Ίππίδου τοῦ τυράννου ἀδελφῶν. If these words are genuine (and none of the previous editors appear to have suspected them), Hdt. is entirely clear of the popular error, which represented Hipparchos as the tyrant, and Hippias as his successor. Op. Thuc. 1, 20, 6, 54 ff., 'Ἀθ. πολ. c. 18. But nowhere does Hdt. expressly say that Hippias was the elder brother. Op. c. 65 infra.

4. τὰ δὲ ἱστορίαν καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ τέταρτῳ. Stein, πάθος might have been introduced from Thuc. 6, 55, 4.

5. τὰ ἀνέκαθεν. Op. c. 65 infra, 6, 55, 128.

6. ἡ ἑτεροτευνων. Op. Thuc. 6, 59, 4. τοῦ τευνων ἡ ἑτεροτευνων ἐν τῷ τευνων Ἐθένας καὶ ταυτευνων ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ. 'Ἀθ. πολ. 19 ἐτεί τέταρτον μάλιστα μετὰ τῶν Ἰππίδου τῶν οἰκετῶν. Op. the further chronological indications in the passage. The absolute date for the assassination of Hipparchos remains where Clinton placed it: Hekatomabaion 514 B.C. (cp. Fraith, ad anm. So also Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aristoteles u. Athen, i. 21, 1903). As the death of Hipparchos occurs practically at the beginning of the Attic year (Panathenaea = end of Hekatomabaion: Mommsen, Hestorologie, pp. 129 ff.) the years here may be treated as (Attic) Calendar years: and the date of the expulsion of Hippias is fixed for 511-510 B.C. Ol. 67, 2, 4 (Αρχακέλαυ). 'Ἀθ. π. c. 19. Whether it is to be dated 511 B.C. or 510 B.C. depends on the season to which it may be fixed: anyway it takes place before Ol. 67, 3, Hekatombaion 510 B.C. (cp. Marcov Portius, ed. Flach, § 14 = Ol. 67, 2).

Παναθηναίοι. For the chronological importance of this indication, see above. The institution or reorganisation of the Panathenaia was not improbably due to Peisistratos, with whose policy such a festival would admirably square. (Cp. Mommsen, Heorologist, p. 112, Curtius, Gr. G. i. 8, 338, 859.) The religion, like the political régime, of the sons is of a somewhat darker complexion; though the difference is one of degree rather than of kind.

6. ἀποστία. The authorship of this epigram is unknown; and it can hardly be supposed that it was a creation of Hipparchos' unconscious cerebration, or that he made it known. The ethical doctrine of the second line is Hellenic, even Delphic. Cp. 6. 84, and Introduction, p. cvv.

7. ἀπαύγαμος. ἀκρίσιασθα is common in Hdt. in the sense of to refute: cp. 4. 129, 6. 109, et al. Here its use seems peculiar: ἀνερρίωνε, cp. L. & S. sub ν. ἀνερρίων. The force of the middle voice in ἀπαύγαμος and of the imperfect tense in ἀπαύγας should not be missed.

8. ἐν τῇ δὲ τολμὴν, 'which he did not live to accomplish,' or simply, 'in which the end overtakes him.'

2. Παναθηναίοι. For the chronological importance of this indication, see above. The institution or reorganisation of the Panathenaia was not improbably due to Peisistratos, with whose policy such a festival would admirably square. (Cp. Mommsen, Heorologist, p. 112, Curtius, Gr. G. i. 8, 338, 859.) The religion, like the political régime, of the sons is of a somewhat darker complexion; though the difference is one of degree rather than of kind.

6. ἀποστία. The authorship of this epigram is unknown; and it can hardly be supposed that it was a creation of Hipparchos' unconscious cerebration, or that he made it known. The ethical doctrine of the second line is Hellenic, even Delphic. Cp. 6. 84, and Introduction, p. cvv.

7. ἀπαύγαμος. ἀκρίσιασθα is common in Hdt. in the sense of to refute: cp. 4. 129, 6. 109, et al. Here its use seems peculiar: ἀνερρίωνε, cp. L. & S. sub ν. ἀνερρίων. The force of the middle voice in ἀπαύγαμος and of the imperfect tense in ἀπαύγας should not be missed.

8. ἐν τῇ δὲ τολμὴν, 'which he did not live to accomplish,' or simply, 'in which the end overtakes him.'

2. Παναθηναίοι. For the chronological importance of this indication, see above. The institution or reorganisation of the Panathenaia was not improbably due to Peisistratos, with whose policy such a festival would admirably square. (Cp. Mommsen, Heorologist, p. 112, Curtius, Gr. G. i. 8, 338, 859.) The religion, like the political régime, of the sons is of a somewhat darker complexion; though the difference is one of degree rather than of kind.

6. ἀποστία. The authorship of this epigram is unknown; and it can hardly be supposed that it was a creation of Hipparchos' unconscious cerebration, or that he made it known. The ethical doctrine of the second line is Hellenic, even Delphic. Cp. 6. 84, and Introduction, p. cvv.

7. ἀπαύγαμος. ἀκρίσιασθα is common in Hdt. in the sense of to refute: cp. 4. 129, 6. 109, et al. Here its use seems peculiar: ἀνερρίωνε, cp. L. & S. sub ν. ἀνερρίων. The force of the middle voice in ἀπαύγαμος and of the imperfect tense in ἀπαύγας should not be missed.

8. ἐν τῇ δὲ τολμὴν, 'which he did not live to accomplish,' or simply, 'in which the end overtakes him.'
7. Βοιωτίαν. Thuc. 1. 12, 8 dates the Boeotian movement sixty years after the capture of Troy. This passage in Hdt. is in substantial agreement with that in Thucydides, and the two probably have a common origin (Hekataios). 8. Ἀθηναίοι κτλ. The terminology is suspiciously recent, and the statement seems to imply the synoikism of Attica, and a graded franchise. The partial taboo, or excommunication, looks like the most genuine element in the tradition: see first note supra and c. 61 infra ad fin. Madvig's insertion of ω before τοιχωρ is acceptable.

58. 1. Οἱ Φοίνικες οὖν. Presumably in part identical with the Kadmeians of c. 57, the other part being the Gephyraeans. Toepffer's article on the Gephyraeans (Attisch. Genealogie, pp. 283 ff.) exhibits the reaction against the 'Phoenician' theory. But the argument is in favour of recognising oriental and Semitic elements in the population of early Greece is not confined to local and gentile names, while the resolution of the traditions in its favour into mere products of pseudo-etymology is unacceptable. Questions respecting the primitive inhabitants of the Greek peninsula, or rather the Aegean region, must be kept open, recent archaeological evidence tending (1) to push the perspective of diffusion and settlement farther and farther back; (2) to suggest greater complexity and mixture than the followers of K. O. Müller, whether old or new, have been willing to recognise.

3. γράμματα. Hdt.'s hypothesis in regard to the origin of the Greek alphabet resolves itself into two main propositions: (1) It was of Phoenician origin. (2) It was introduced or taught to the Greeks by the Phoenicians of Boeotia. It does not follow from these two propositions that the distinctively Greek alphabet was first used in Boeotia, much less in Thebes: rather the statement (3) that it was Ionic περικεφαλαία who achieved, assimilated, and transformed the Phoenician elements of culture (ἀνάσακτα), points to a different conclusion. It must, however, be admitted that the appeal in cc. 59 ff. to Theban examples of Kadmeian, i.e. palace-Hellenic letters, goes to show that Hdt. regarded Thebes as the cradle of Hellenic letters. Concerning this theory of Hdt. it is to be observed that, whatever be the character of 'Kadmos,' the ascription of the Greek alphabet to a Phoenician original is an 'historical' theory, as distinguished from a mythological theory (e.g. that of Aischylos, who ascribes it to Protheus, P. V. 468 ff.); secondly, that the theory is probably right. (Cp. Roberts, Greek Epigraphy, §§ 1 ff., Hünrichs, in Iwan Müller's Handbuch, i. pp. 359 ff.) The same, however, cannot be said for the localisation of the primitive Greek alphabet in Boeotia, or even on the mainland of Greece. So far as evidences at present go, it appears that Greek alphabets were first employed in the islands of the Aegean, particularly Thera and Crete. It is a third point in the Herodotean hypothesis that it was the Ionians who first adapted the Phoenician alphabet to the service of the Hellenes. As Hdt. nowhere locates Ionians in Boeotia, this statement would tend to qualify the inference from his quoting only Theban inscriptions, and to suggest that he is, perhaps, thinking of Euboea, Attica, Peloponnesus or the Marathonian tetrapolis, as the Ionian centres which had dealings with the 'Kadmeians,' though he is unable to adduce any instance of archaic lettering except from Thebes. On Hdt.'s view of the Ionian mediation it is to be observed that the Ionic alphabet was not the first but the last state of Hellenic letters, the one that survived and displaced a host of rival alphabets, as at Athens after the Archonship of Eukleides (403-2 B.C.). This Ionic alphabet was that used in Asia, where it early asserted itself at the
πρὶν Ἑλλησὶ ὡς ἐμὸ δοκεῖν, πρῶτα μὲν τοῖς καὶ ἀπαντεῖς χρώμους ὘νικῆς: μετὰ δὲ χρῶν προβαίνουσα ἀμα τῇ φωνῇ μετέβαλλον καὶ τῶν ῥυθμῶν τῶν γραμμάτων. περιοίκους δὲ σφαιρα παλαιά τὰ πολλὰ (τῶν χρώνων) τούτων τῶν χρῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Ἰωνίων, οἱ παραλαμβάνετε διδαχῇ παρὰ τῶν Φωνικῶν τὰ γράμματα, μεταρρυθμίσατε ἀπὸ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν κεκληθάτως. καὶ τὰς βίβλους διδάσκεσαν Ἀστράντων τοῦ παλαιοῦ Ἰωνίας, ὅτι κατὰ εὐθεῖαν ἑς καὶ οἰκεῖας ἐτί δὲ καὶ τὸ κατ᾽ ἑμὲν 59 τοῦ τῶν βαρβάρων ἔς τοιαύτας διδάσκεσας γράμματα. εἰδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς Καμηνία γράμματα ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ

expense of any other, and was employed for example in Hdt.'s native city in his own day. (Halikarnassian inscription, Hicks, Manual, No. 21.) Whether it was locally a product and modification of the absolutely first Greek alphabet, this being neither of European nor of Nesiote, but of Asiatic-Ionian origin, may perhaps be an open question. In any case Hdt.'s statement that the authors of the distinctively Greek alphabet (or alphabets) were Ionians is probably true; at least as against a ‘Dorian’ claim. For, though Thera passed in the fifth century for ‘Dorian,’ the validity of that theory is extremely doubtful. See 4. 147. Hdt. makes two other observations on Greek writing: 2. 36 where he states that Greek writing went from right to left, without noticing the other archaic methods; 1. 139 where he seems to indicate the co-existence of different syllabic symbols in the older alphabets. Cp. Roberts, op. c. supra, p. 9. Whether the Hellenes, or inhabitants of the Peninsula, even before the coming of the Phoenicians, or of the Dorians, had alphabets, is a question which the present state of the evidence hardly raises, much less solves: and even if solved in the affirmative, the Phoenician origin of the historic alphabet would probably remain unaffected.

5. φωνῇ. Their native (Semitic) language; on the word cp. s. 114.

6. ἱερός, figure, form = σχῆμα, Aristot. Metaph. 1. 4, 98a, op. de mirab. 138, 8495.

περιοίκους. In Eubea, Attica, Peloponnesos, the islands. Probably Hdt. is right substantially: for the Ionians were the first of the distinctly Hellenic stocks to have extensive deal-
ΤΕΡΨΙΧΟΡΗ

58-61

'Ιασμήνιον ἐν Ὁθῆβαι τῆς Βασιλείας, ἐτεί πρῶτοι τισι ἐγκεκολαμμένα, τὰ πολλὰ ὕμια ἐόντα θοιεῖν ιουκικοῖσι. ο μέν δὲ εἶς τῶν τριπόδων ἐπιγραμμα ἦχει

Ἀμφιτρύων μὲ ἀνέθηκεν ἐὼν ἀπὸ Τηλεβοῦαν.

ταῦτα ἡλικίαν ἐγὼ ἀν κατά Λαίον τὸν Λαβδάκου τοῦ Πολυδώρου τοῦ Κάδμου. ἔτερος δὲ τρῖτον ἐν ξαμέτρω τόνω λέγει

Σκαῖος πυρμαχέων μὲ ἐκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνοι νικήτας ἀνέθηκε τινὲς περικαλλές ἁγάλμα.

Σκαῖος δὲ ἐγὼ ὁ Ἰπποκόωνος, εἰ δὲ οὐτὸς γε ἐστὶ ὁ ἀναβείς καὶ μὴ ἄλλος τῶντο ὁ νόμον ἐχον τῷ Ἰπποκόωνοι, ἡλικίαν κατὰ 5 Ὀδίπτων τὸν Λαίον. τρῖτος δὲ τρίτους λέγει καὶ οὐτὸς ἐν 61 ἐξαμέτρῳ

Αἰσχύραμος τρίποδος αὐτὸς ἐυσκότηρ Ἀπόλλωνοι μοναρχέων ἀνέθηκε τινὲς περικαλλές ἁγάλμα.

γράμματα. It has generally been concluded that these inscriptions were unauthentic: for Hdt. seems to assume that in the days of Laios and of Oedipus the inhabitants of Thebes not merely spake and wrote good Greek, but even composed their inscriptions in Hexameter verse. According to his own chronological scheme, if we may attempt to rationalise one for him, this would set the origin of Greek writing as far back as 1500 B.C. (cp. 4. 147). It is of course possible that the objects, on which the inscriptions were to be read, were much older than the inscriptions themselves. As Llawinson remarks: "The inscription can at best only have expressed the belief of the priests as to the person who dedicated the tripod." Hicks (Manual of Gr. Inscr. p. 2) follows Bergk in dismissing these inscriptions as hardly earlier than the seventh cent. But perhaps Hdt. did not mean that the very words he gives were inscribed or legible on the anathema: he may be giving a proposed version of archaic inscriptions. Cp. the story of the ancient Stela found at Hyme, the inscription on which was interpreted by comparison with certain anathenai in the Isemion. Aristot. de mirab. 133, 848β.

ἐν τῷ ἱππ. Of the two rivers of Thebes the Isemion was the one to the east. The temple may have been situate on the hill above the stream, and to the east of the Kadmia (cp. Dict. Geogr. ii. 1151 ff.). E. Fabricius, Theben, Freiburg im B. 1890, p. 22 and plan, identifies the Isemion with the hill of S. Luke (after Ulrici, cp. Baedeker's Greece, 1880, p. 175).

3. τῆς Βασιλείας. As distinguished from Egyptian Thebes. The mention of βασιλεία just before may have led to this particular, rather than the mention of the Kadmias.

6. Ἀμφιτρύων, the human father of Heracles. Cp. 6. 53.

ἀν is doubtful. The passage has been variously emended: ἀν ὁ (bad); ἀν ὁ Valckenaer; ἀν Βentley; ἀν Β. ἀν ἀν Βerk. Stein suggests ἀν ὁ thec. Why not ἀν ὁ thec. if L. & S. are right in marking the iota long? ἀπὸ, "e præda" (Stein). A usage not noticed by L. & S. (for 1. 6 will not cover this), but established by the instances quoted by Stein. Simonid. Fr. 137, Aischines c. Klearch. 116, Pausan. 1. 13, 3, 5, 10, 4.

60. 2. Σκαῖος. Skaios, one of the sons of Hippokoon, apparently helped his father to drive Tyndaros out of Lake-daimon, before his marriage with Leda, and was afterwards slain with his father and brothers by Herakles, who restored Tyndaros. Apollodorus. Bibliotheta, 3. 5. Hdt. may well have doubts as to the donor's identity with Skaios son of Hippokoon.

61. 2. ἐξαμέτρῳ. ἐξαμέτρῳ seems to have dropped out. Stein 4 reads it.
6. ἕνεκ' Ἀργείων. The Epigonoi, Laodamas himself being slain by Alkmæon, the leader. Aphænides. Bibliothea, 3, 7, 2, 3. According to this authority the Thebans fled and founded Heraclea.

Εὔχλεας. As Rawlinson remarks ad l. "There was a legend that Cadmus assisted them against the other Illyrians (Apollo, Π. v. 4). Hence perhaps it was thought likely that the Cadmeians would take refuge with them," i.e. we have here not tradition but rationalism.

7. Γεφυραῖοι. The Gephyreans of Tanagra appear here almost co-ordinate with the Kadmeians at Thebes. Originally united they are ultimately driven apart, north (west) and south. Thuc. 1, 12 dates the Boeotian invasion sixty years after the Trojan war. It was doubtless connected with the tribal migrations which brought the Dorians into Peloponnesus.

9. κακοφυρμία. The separate cultus no doubt points, as Hdt. rightly suggests, to a difference of origin and kinship. Later political union did not wholly obliterate such traces and survivals, even in Attica. Cp. c. 65 infra. 'Achaiaν' Demeter is Demeter of the Lamentations (Etym. M. sub ν.): the Hellenic Mater Dolorosa: but not necessarily the same as Γεφυραῖα Λῆμυραι (Demeter of the Bridge, Et. M. s. τ. Γεφυραί). This shrine of Achaian Demeter was presumably in Aplidnae, vide c. 57 supra.

62. ἕνεκ' Ἀργείων. The Epigonoi, Laodamas himself being slain by Alkmæon, the leader. Aphænides. Bibliothea, 3, 7, 2, 3. According to this authority the Thebans fled and founded Heraclea.

Εὔχλεας. As Rawlinson remarks ad l. "There was a legend that Cadmus assisted them against the other Illyrians (Apollo, Π. v. 4). Hence perhaps it was thought likely that the Cadmeians would take refuge with them," i.e. we have here not tradition but rationalism.

7. Γεφυραῖοι. The Gephyreans of Tanagra appear here almost co-ordinate with the Kadmeians at Thebes. Originally united they are ultimately driven apart, north (west) and south. Thuc. 1, 12 dates the Boeotian invasion sixty years after the Trojan war. It was doubtless connected with the tribal migrations which brought the Dorians into Peloponnesus.

9. κακοφυρμία. The separate cultus no doubt points, as Hdt. rightly suggests, to a difference of origin and kinship. Later political union did not wholly obliterate such traces and survivals, even in Attica. Cp. c. 65 infra. 'Achaiaν' Demeter is Demeter of the Lamentations (Etym. M. sub ν.): the Hellenic Mater Dolorosa: but not necessarily the same as Γεφυραῖα Λῆμυραι (Demeter of the Bridge, Et. M. s. τ. Γεφυραί). This shrine of Achaian Demeter was presumably in Aplidnae, vide c. 57 supra.

62. ἕνεκ' Ἀργείων. The Epigonoi, Laodamas himself being slain by Alkmæon, the leader. Aphænides. Bibliothea, 3, 7, 2, 3. According to this authority the Thebans fled and founded Heraclea.

Εὔχλεας. As Rawlinson remarks ad l. "There was a legend that Cadmus assisted them against the other Illyrians (Apollo, Π. v. 4). Hence perhaps it was thought likely that the Cadmeians would take refuge with them," i.e. we have here not tradition but rationalism.
such like. (3) would lead to the conclusion that the Peisistratidae were Ionian immigrants, and the Alkmoinidae the native stock. But, as Petersen points out, the tradition of the foreign origin of the Alkmoinidae can scarcely be later than Hdt., rather does our author appear to be expressly combating and denying such a view. We are thus driven back to (1). Both families were foreign, i.e. from the Peloponnesos, and perhaps related. The Peisistratidae proudly preserved this family tradition. The Alkmoinidae repudiated it, owing probably to their quarrel with Peisistratos and his sons, and put themselves at the head of an Athenian movement before the end of the sixth century, which involved the negation of all foreign claims and elements, Peloponnesian, Ionian, Pelasgian, and the assertion of the indigenous primitive earth-born character of the whole Athenian and Attic population. 

Cp. cc. 66, 69 infra. Thucydides with his more systematic rationalism tries to be just to the rival views, recognising the foreign extraction of the great families, yet asserting the autochthonous origin of the masses. Nor is this view perhaps far from the truth. Thuc. 1. 2. 
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Πεισιστρατίδαι, ἑπείτε σφὸ ἄμα τούς ἄλλους Ἀθηναῖος φυγάς πειρομένοια κατὰ τὸ ἵσχυρον οὐ προεχόρει [κάτοδος], ἀλλὰ προεπέτατιν μεγάλων πειρομένων καταίνει τε καὶ ἑλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθῆνας, Λεωφόρον τὸ ὑπὲρ Πανονίης τεχνίσαντες, ἐνθαῦτα οἱ το ' Ἀλκμοινωῦν ἓν ἐπὶ τούς Πεισιστρατίδας μηγανομένοι παρ᾽ Ἀμφικτυόνων τῶν ἱηνον μισθοῦνται τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς, τὸν νῦν ἔως τότε δὲ οὐκο, τοῦτον ἔχουσιν ἐσχατοῦσα. οἷα δὲ χρημάτων καὶ ἱηνων καὶ ἱηνων ὀποφείλεται του παραδείγματος κάλλιον τά τε ἅλλα καὶ συγκεκιμένων σφὶ πορίνου λίθῳ ποιόν τον ἱηνον, Παριον τὰ ἐμπροσθεν ἄξιον 

12. Ἀμφικτυόνων. The Amphicyonian council and the Delphic oracle were to be worked against the Peisistratidae. The temple had been burnt down in 548 B.C. on which occasion the Golden Lion of Kroisos suffered some injury. 1. 50. The estimate fixed by the council for the rebuilding was 360 T. and the money was raised by donations from various quarters, including Egypt, 2. 150. The exiled Alkmoinidae seem to have undertaken to complete (ἐξώποιος) the structure, which may have been at a stand for want of funds. As gratitude is a short-lived faculty, probably this act of the Alkmoinidae was not long previous to the expulsion of the Peisistratidae. It was still pursued with envy (φόνος) in 490 B.C. when Findar wrote the (seventh) Pythian Epinikion in honour of Megacles; and half a century later it was the chief title of his children to fame. 

13. χρημάτων. Thanks to their relations with Kroisos. But cp. 6. 125. The 'Ατ. τοῦ implies that they made a good thing of their contract with Delphi (καὶ εἰσήφοροίν χρημάτων 10. 4). 


15. Παρά. Parian marble was of
course much more splendid than porine (taula) stone. Cp. 3. 57, 6. 133.

63. 1. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. Other than the Alkmaionidæ, Schweigehäuser conjectured Ἀλκεδαμίωνες. But there were plenty of people in Athens who had no illusions about the Alkméonidæ, cp. 6. 115. Still as we have now in the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία', c. 19, what is obviously an Athenian version of the whole affair (cp. Appendix IX. § 4), the discovery supports and verifies the conjecture of Schweigehäuser.

2. τὴν Πυθίαν. The Pythia was not above suspicion, cp. 6. 66, though whether a dancer to the prophetesses alone would have had the desired effect may be fairly doubted. It may also be thought that the Delphic authorities would have needed very little inducement to preach a crusade against the Peisistratidæ, whose pieties looked in other directions, vide c. 58 μητρα, and whose poms and buildings were not calculated to further the special interests of Delphi. The Ἀθ. πολ. seems to suggest that the Alkméonidæ spent money at Sparta (πρὸς τὴν τῶν Ἀλκμώνων βοήθειαν 19. 4).

6. τῶν άτοτῶν ἄμεσα δεδοκιμοῦν. Like Eurybiades the navarch in 480 B.C. Cp. 8. 42. Anachimolos is the first Spartan commander, other than the kings, whose name we know, although the expedition to overthrow Polykrates was no doubt under similar command, 3. 54 ff. The fact that these first expeditions are by sea may perhaps explain the absence of the king.

7. ξενίων. τὰ μάλιστα. The Spartans had no objection to an alliance with 'tyranny' when it suited their own interests. But 'tyranny' at Athens (or Sardes, or Susa, or Syriae) was one thing: in Sparta, or even in Peloponnese, another. It was not, according to the Lakédaimonians, on political grounds that they expelled the Peisistratidæ, but on religious, 'putting the god before the men.' Athenian tradition saw in the Argive alliance a political motive. Αθ. πολ. 19. Policy indeed afterwards led the Spartans to project a restoration, cp. 90 ff. ἑπίστευτα. Statecraft was far more highly developed in and after "the age of the Despots" than Hdt. appears to realise.

10. Φάληρον. At that time still of course the harbour; cp. 6. 116.

12. συμμαχίας. Peisistratids and hissons were like most tyrants good politicians and paid special attention to foreign affairs. The Thessalian alliance was only one of a number designed to cooperate and secure the régime: as with Lygdamis of Naxos, 1. 64, Amyntas of Macedon, c. 94 ἑπίστευτα, Hippoklos of Lampsakos, cp. 4. 138, Thuc. 6. 59, the Argives, Ἀθ. πολ. 10. The connection between Athens and Thessaly remained a permanent idea of democratic Athens: and if the Thessalians κοινὰ γέννηθα had sent to support the Athenian tyrant (c. 511 n.c.) in Hdt.'s own time the Athenian democracy had attempted the restoration of Orestes in Thessaly (n.c. 554, Thuc. 1. 111).
χυλίνη τε ἔπτων καὶ τὸν βασιλέα τὸν σφέτερον Κινέρη ἄνδρα Κανιτιόν τοὺς ἐπέτειε ἐσχῶν συμμάχοις οἱ Πεισιστράτιδας, ὁ ἐμπιστούντο τουάδε: καίσαντες τῶν Φαληρέων το πεδίον καὶ ἐπιτάσσειν παυάσαντες τούτοι του χώρου ἐπίκαιν το στρατόπεδον τὴν ἔπτσιον ἐμπεσοῦν δὲ δίδειε αἱλαῖ τοι πολλοῖς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ δῇ καὶ τὸν Ἁγικόλιον τοὺς δὲ περιγενομένους αὐτῶν ἐς τὰς νέας κατείρξαν. ὁ μὲν δὴ πρῶτος στόλος ἐκ 20 Λακεδαιμονίων οὔτως ἀνάλαξε, καὶ Ἁγικόλιον εἰσὶ ταφαὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἀλεπεκῆς, ἄρχῳ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ Ἐφι Κυνοσάργει. 

Ἡ αἰσχρὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀθάνατον, οὐδὲ τὰς νέας κατείρξαν. ὁ μὲν δὲ πρῶτος στόλος ἐκ 20 Λακεδαιμονίων οὔτως ἀνάλαξε, καὶ Ἁγικόλιον εἰσὶ ταφαὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἀλεπεκῆς, ἄρχῳ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ Ἐφι Κυνοσάργει. 

Metá de Lakedaimonía méxw στόλον στείλαστε ἀπεπεμφάν 64 ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας, στρατηγόν τῆς στρατηγῆς ἀποδεξάσατε βασιλέα Κλεομένεα τὸν Αἰαζανδρίσεω, οὐκέτι κατὰ τίθηλον στείλαντες ἀλλὰ καὶ ἅπερνεῖν τούτο ἔσβαλον εἰς τὴν Ἁττικὴν χώρην ἡ τῶν Θεσσαλῶν ἔππος πρώτη προσέμεξε καὶ οὐ μετὰ πολλοὺς ἑράτειτο, καὶ σφενὸς ἐπιστὸ ἐπερ τοσσεράκοντα καὶ ἂν δὲ περιγενομένου ἀπαλαξάσαντο ὡς εἰχόν εἰθὸς ἐπὶ Θεσσαλῶν.

16. ἐμπιστούντα. Blakseley has pointed out, and Rawlinson has admitted, some difficulty in envisaging or rationalising the military situation and movements described in this chapter. It is not easy to understand why Anchimolos was buried at Alopekai unless he fell there: if he fell there, he must have advanced off the Phalerian plain, and past the city, for Alopekai lay between Lykabettos and the Ilissos. (Smith, Geogr. Dict. i. 9276, cp. Curtius and Kaupert, Atlas v. Athen, Blatt ii.) In that case the Thessalian horse would have been between the Lakedaimonians and the sea, and any survivors who reached their ships could only have done so by bursting through the lines of the Athenians and Thessalians. It is, however, very easy to invent hypotheses to explain this difficulty, admitting that Anchimolos fought and fell at Alopekai.

To take the most obvious: the Spartans must have left on the strand a force to guard the ships. The narrative is curt and inadequate, but there is nothing self-contradictory or inexplicable in it.

22. Ἡρακλείον. It was here that the Athenians halted after their forced march from Marathon, 6. 116. The spot no doubt commanded a view of Phaleron and the esplanade, or at least such a view can be obtained from Lykabettos. The Herakleion would hardly perhaps have been specified here as a topographical feature, but for the notoriety it had obtained in connexion with the Marathonian campaign. The passage suggests, though it does not prove, autopsia. Cp. Introduction, pp. ix f. The idiomatic plural ἀρχαῖ is observable.

64. 1. μετὰ. The Lakedaimonians had now a defeat to avenge, or at least a disgrace to obliterate, for this expedition is marked distinctly as a separate and subsequent act, and we must not suppose that the troops under Kleomenes were intended to co-operate with the forces of Anchimolos. But cp. 6. 76, for an instance of such strategy.

2. ἀποδεξάσατε. Did the king then require to be appointed to the command? Such an implication may seem to conflict with the story cp. 74 ff. ἁσθοτ, and with the alleged prerogatives 6. 56, but it is the regular course of procedure, at least in later times: cp. Xen. Hell. 4. 2, 9, 6. 4, 18, 6. 5, 10, and cp. 9. 10 ἁσθοτ. The general rule no doubt was to appoint one of the kings to command; this passage shows that this rule cannot date merely from the quarrel of Kleomenes and Demaratos, cp. 75 ἁσθοτ.

7. ἀπαλαξάσαντο. The engagement would have taken place on the Thriasian plain, and the Thessalians may have ridden by Eleutherae and Drybakenphae over Kithisron homeways, cp. 9. 19.
8. Ἀθηναῖοι. There was a party in Athens working against the Peisistratidae.

9. τοὺς τυράννους. The plural might mean simply 'Hippias and his house,' but there is, perhaps, an element of feeling in it: *ποιος αὐτής non deficit alter.*

10. τὸ Πελοποννήσιον τέχνη. The old wall round the Akropolis, 6. 137, within which probably the Peisistratidae had their dwelling, cp. Pausan. 1. 28, 3 ἐκ τῆς ἐκριθεὶς πληθυντὸς Κικάνων ἡμέρας αὐτῆς ὁ Ματιάδων, κεραυνών τὴν λάθευς ἐντέλει τῆς χώρας τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν ἠμέτρουσαν, τότε δὲ ὁ τύραννος, τάνατον αὐτῶν τὰ πρῶτα συνειστήριον, παράστησαν δὲ ἐπὶ μισθὸ τους τέκνους, ἐπὶ οὓς ἐβούλοντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡστε ἐν τοῖς ἑκούσεται ἐκχωρήσῃ ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς, μετὰ δὲ ἐξεχορήσαν

8. The Gate of Hadrian marks a point in a prae-Theomistoklean city-wall. Curtius proposes therefore a compromise. He ascribes to the tyrants an intention, partially carried out, to build a city-wall of about 20 stades in circumference. But this compromise is hardly satisfactory. Why the old ring-wall can only belong to the age of the despots (ein solcher kann nur der Tyrannenzeit angehören, ὁρ. σ. 90), is not self-evident. The despotick family or dynasty would be better able to hold a citadel than a fortified city, and as likely to destroy as to build a wall of 20 stades in circumference: though they might have left old gateways standing. In any case, if there was a wall, it might have been built before the age of Peisistratos: but it can hardly have been effective in the days of Marathon. Cp. 6. 109.

65. ἐν τῷ ἄνω. The protasis of this sentence is not grammatically expressed, but is materially contained in what follows (ἐν ὧν συντρίβῃ τὰ, ὁ ὁμοό εἰς ἱδεῖν). The narrative gains in rhetorical force by the transition out of the conditional, effected by ἐν τῷ. How Hdt. knows so well that but for an accident the Lakedaimonians would have failed, does not appear. It is presumably an inference: and might have been qualified (δικαίως εἰπό. Cp. Introduction, § 22).

6. ἔνεκτῆδες, 'in the act of being secretly conveyed out.'

8. Συνειστήριον. The tense is rhetorical. μισθὸ and τέκνον are in apposition, and ἐν has nothing to say to either. The whole chapter reads as if the exciting moment of the Regifuge were too much for Hdt.'s grammar.
ές Σίγειον τό ἐπὶ τῷ Σκαμάνδρῳ, ἀρξαντες μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἐπ’ ἔτεα ἐξ ἐς τε καὶ τριμηκτά, ἐντευτὲς δὲ καὶ οὗτοι ἀνέκαθεν Πιλοὶ τε καὶ Νηλεῖδαι, ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν ἑγεμόνες καὶ οἱ ἀμφι Κόδρον τε καὶ Μελανθοῦ, οἱ πρῶτοι ἐπίθυμες ἐπίτευτες ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίων βασιλεῖς. ἐπὶ τούτου δὲ καὶ τῶντο ὁμοῦ ἀπεμισμόνευσε οὗτοι τῷ παλινθασία τῶν Πεισίστρατος, ἐπὶ τὸν Νέστορος Πεισίστρατόν ποιεόμενος τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν. Οὗτοι μὲν Ἀθηναίοι τυράννων ἀπαλλάχθησαν: δόσα δὲ ἐλευθερόθηκες ἔρξαν ἡ ἔπαιθεν ἀδιόχρεα ἀπηγγέλασιν, πρὶν ἡ Ἀλέκουρη τῇ ἀποστέφας ἀπὸ Δαρεῖον καὶ Ἀρισταγάρᾳ τῶν Μιλησίων ἀπηκομένων ἐς Ἀθήναις χρησάων σφέων βοηθείας, τάτα τρώγα φράσα.

Ἀθήναι, ἐνασκά τε καὶ πρὶν μεγάλα, τότε ἀπαλαλθᾶται 66 τυράννων ἐγκυροῦ μέσονες· ἐν τῷ διὰ αὐτής δύο ἀνδρῶν ἐννιάτευν, Κλεοθήκης τε ἀνήρ Ἀλκμεινίδης, δὲ τῇ δὴ λόγῳ ἔχει τὴν Πυθηνὰν ἀναπείσα, καὶ Ἰσαγόρας Τισάντρου οἰκίας μὲν ἐνον

11. Σίγειον, c. 94 ἐνίσχυσ, op. Thuc. 6. 59, ἐξακρίνων (’Ιτιάιος) ἐς τῷ Σίγειον καὶ τῷ Δαιστίδων ἐς Λύμψασον καὶ τῷ Ἀλκιφίδιον καὶ τῷ Λιμναίον κατοικοῦν ταῦτα, which would seem to imply that Aristides had by this time succeeded his father Hippokles, op. c. 63 supra.

12. ἔτεα ἐς τε καὶ τριμήκτα, i.e. thirty-six years of actual power, excluding the years of exile. The 'Ἀθ. πολ. c. 19 gives the Archen's name, Harpaktides (which may therefore be placed for the year 511-510 n.c.) and the duration of the tyranny as seventeen years from the death of Peisistratos, and forty-nine in all. These figures are not based exclusively upon Hdt., for they are more precise than his data. The forty-nine years include the periods of exile; and there is no conflict between the data in Hdt. and in the 'Ἀθ. πολ. Discrepancies only come in with Aristotle, Pol. 8. 12, 5, 1915a. The passage, however, is perhaps interpolated.

καὶ ὁσία, as well as the Koridaians. The connexion helps to explain the 'Ιωσίων of Peisistratos; op. 1. 147.

13. ἐν τούτου ... τῶν Πεισίστρατων, ἐν τῷ Νέστορῳ Πεισίστρατῳ ... The grammar is not as lucid as might be wished. τούτου may be taken as neuter, and τῶν Π. as appositive and exogedical of οὔσια. With ἐν τούτου cp. ἐν τῷ δώδεκα 7. 40, 83, ἐν τῷ τέσσαρες τ. 153, ἐν τῷ δώδεκα 2. 57 (Stein). But the cases are not exact parallels to the expression here, as in them the neuter genitive is followed (or preceded) by a demonstrative sentence, here by a repetition of the preposition with a personal name.

18. δόσα κατά. This sentence marks very clearly a stage in the narrative, and perhaps a change in the sources. δόσα is a large promise, and should leave nothing to be desired. Hdt. offers what follows as a complete account of Athenian history from 510-500 n.c.

66. 1. καὶ πρὶν μεγάλα. Krosis when directed to form a μεγάλη σφαγχων (civitas 566 n.c.) had preferred Sparta to Athens, 1. 69, but since the days of Peisistratos, his wars (1. 59, c. 94 infra) and alliances (c. 63 supra), Athens might be reckoned as one of the 'great' (Hellenic) powers, though possibly unknown to the Persian, c. 155 infra. The καὶ πρὶν presumably refers to the period of the tyranny, and hardly squares with 1. 59, 65. Anyway the increase or revival of power is antedated: probably the immediate effect of the expulsion of the Peisistratids was to weaken the power of Athens.


4. Τισάνδρον. Tisandros is father
of Hippokleides, an undoubtedly Philaid, who was τά άνέκαθεν related to the Kypselids of Corinth, see 6. 128; but we cannot argue therefrom that this Isagoras belonged to the Philaidae; the notices here rather points to an opposite conclusion; even though the passage in Bk. 6 may be a late addition. The Αθ. πολ. c. 20 describes Isagoras as φίλος ἐν τῷ τυραννῶν, meaning the Peisistratids, which is unlikely. If by Καρια Ζεύς were meant the Zeus Stratis or Labrandus worshipped by the Karians (vide c. 119 infra) the statement would go to show that Isagoras was of Karian ancestry. It would, however, bew astonishment to find a pure Karian stock at home in Athens. We need not go further than Megara for the cradle of the family. The Megaraean akropolis was called Karia (Pausan. 1. 40, 6) and Zeus was there worshipped; though in Pausanias' time it was 'Olympian Zeus.'

6. τελ. δυνάμει, 'political power.' The struggle was probably over the elections to the Archonship, still the highest office, cp. Αθ. πολ. c. 13. An Isagoras was the Archon 560-7 B.C. See Clinton, F. H. ad loc. and to the year of Isagoras the Reforms of Kleisthenes are dated by the Αθ. πολ. c. 21.

7. ἵστοτιμός. Kleisthenes and his relatives must have returned immediately upon the expulsion of the Peisistratid. Their long absence might help to explain their getting the worst of the ensuing political struggle. It is surely an anachronism when the Αθ. π. ascribes the defeat of Kleisthenes to the 'clubs' (ἐτατείαι), but may have been partially suggested by the προστάτηται here. For the verb cp. 3. 70, for the substantive c. 71 infra.

τὸν δὲν, not of course his own party, with which he was already in partnership, much less the party of Isagoras, but the headless and disorganised party of the Peisistratides. Cp. 1. 59.

9. Ἰόνιος. That these divisions are 'Ionian' and not 'Attic' should now be recognised. Rawlinson calls them 'ancient hereditary tribes of Attica'; Duncker definitely regards Attica as their cradle, and speaks of them habitually as the 'Attic Phylae.' But unless we are to believe not merely that the Ionian cities in Asia, but also that the Ionians of the Peloponnes and elsewhere, really were colonies of Athens, we must conclude that this system was common to Ionians, and that the abolition of the system for political purposes at Athens was part of a general anti-Ionian movement. The weight of tradition or ancient theory is in favour of some such conclusion. The Phylae are closely attached to Ion: they are never called 'Attic' by any ancient writer; but as Ion was provided for in Attica, the Phylae are there attached to the soil. It suited Athens from time to time to reassert her solidarity with the Ionians; the 'metropolitan' idea was emphasised in the fifth century, and Athens took the place of Miletos as the πρόσχεμα τῆς ἴδιας in the larger sense; but to regard Attica as the cradle of the Ionian stock and the Ionian Phylae as originally Attic, generalised by the colonial diffusion, is to be more Ionian than the Ionians or Athenians themselves ever were. However, even if it were admitted that Attica was the first home of the Ionians, and that the four Phylae came into existence there first, this would not make them 'Attic' as distinct from 'Ionian.' Attica is not a genetic but a local designation, and cannot be the sumnum genus of genetic divisions. Such an expression as Hdt. uses 1. 59 τὰ Ἀττικὰ ἱδρυσι is obviously unscientific, and belongs to a time when the political unification of Attica had given a sort of 'ethnic' unity to all Athenians. Its application to the Athenians of the age of Kroisos is something of an anachronism.

10. τὰς ἐπονυμιὰς. The origin and meaning of the names is obscure. The current Greek view given by Hdt., that...
they were the proper names of veritable persons, sons of Ion, ancestors and eponyms of the four Phyleis, can hardly be now advocated. There being no positive evidence in favour of the existence of the persons, it is probable that the names are products of the same historic imagination as that which created an Amphiheatron to be founder of the Amphiheatrya, and rationalised the supposed ethnic affinities of the Hellenic stocks into the national pedigree, marking the cadetship in Hellenism of Ionians and Achaians by making Ion and Achaia one step farther removed than Doros and Aiolos from Hellen. That the names were once significant can hardly be doubted; but their significance is not clear. Ἕλενωτες has been connected with ἩΕΑ denoting brightness. That Ἕλενωτες not Τέλενωτες is the correct form of the word is proved by inscriptions from Teos, Kyzykos, and Attica (C.I.G. 3078, 3694, 3665, and Ross, Attic Inscriptions, S. vii. Stein), a fact of which L. & S. take no notice, sub v. Τέλενωτες. Αἰγικοῖς is taken to mean goat-herders (vide L. & S. sub v.), but who will venture to guarantee that etymology in view of the aigis and its possibilities, cp. 4. 189 aigia, and Αἰγιαλέται c. 68 aigrea. Ἄργον (Ἀργόν = Ἀργόν, so Stein, but this seems violent. Αἰγαῖος is found in Plutarch, Solon 23, probably from a conjecture of the copyist to give the sense of Ηusbandmen, L. & S.) might as well be connected with ἈΡΓΩ shinning, as Ἕλενωτες with ΗΕΑ. The Οὐρανός cannot be the heavy armed (= Ὑπάτος L. & S.) or ‘warriors,’ otherwise they would not hold the fourth place, least of all if the names stood in rank. That the first name should stand for ‘Priests’ is well-nigh impossible: there were priests in every ‘tribe;’ and a separate caste of ‘priests’ as such could hardly have disappeared. The names are apparently co-ordinate: they may have something to say to employments, or to totems; but the origin and meaning of the names were evidently lost to the Ionians, or at least the Athenians, in Hdt.’s time. On the subject cp. K. F. Hermann’s Lehrbuch, i. 8 § 54, pp. 294 ff.

10. ιτέρων. Not Ionian, but quite different; local, indigenous heroes, of the true Attic stock, the Ionian element had in Attica been foreign. The Αἰαῖ took its name from Αἴας of Salamis, which since its conquest by Peisistratus had been an Athenian kleruchy, and probably the first of its kind; cp. c. 77 ιππα. It is remarkable that there is no hint in Hdt. of the method by which the eponyms for the new Phyleis were selected. He represents it as the immediate work of Kleisthenes (ἐξωτερικά... προσέθεν, though the latter, it may be observed, is middle voice). The Αἴας, cp. c. 21 supplies the omission with much verisimilitude: τοι δὲ φωλάς ἐποίησε ἔσωθων, καὶ τῶν προκαθήκων ἐκάκων ἄρχοντες, οὐ ἄνεσιν ἡ Ποιοὶ δέκα. Cp. further c. 69 πολικ. and Appendix IX. § 9.

67. 1. θονεύον ἲμοι. Hdt. makes himself responsible for the curious view of Kleisthenes’ policy. The mimetic aspect is decided far fetched: the contrast between the two policies is more obvious than the resemblance. Hdt.’s reflections on politics are sometimes defective; cp. Introduction, § 22.

2. μητροπατάτων. The exact connexion is not cleared up till 6. 126 ff. in the story of the wedding of Agariste. That the Athenian ‘Liberator’ should be grandson and namesake of a Despot throws some light on the alleged ‘misogyne’ or ‘misotyrannism’ of the Alkmaionidae. Cp. 6. 121 ff.

Σικύων, one of the great Dorian states of the Peloponnesos 8. 43 (cp. Pausanias, 2. 6. 7, 7. 1), was not a member of the Achaian Dodekapolis i. 145, though the time came (251 b.c.) when it ‘stooped to ask for admission to the franchise of the remnant of the conquered Achaians’ (Freeman, History of Federal Government, 2nd ed. p. 283). The ραπαρίς in Sikyon no doubt marks, as everywhere in the Peloponnesos, at least in the vii.-vi. centuries b.c., a reaction and revival of the native or pre-Dorian population and interests against the Dorian conquerors (cp. c. 82 ιππα). In the case of Sikyon this movement is complicated by a rivalry
It shows how completely the Homeric poems had been appropriated by the Dorian conquerors that the Achaean representative of the anti- and pre-Dorian interests in opposition to Dorian Argos surrenders the works, which celebrated the Achaean heroes, to the men who had usurped their places and exploited their traditions. But as Blakeney points out, the objection of Kleisthenes would hardly apply to the Iliad and Odyssey, and so we must understand Ophelia by the Thelasia and Epigoni (with Stein) or the Thelasis-Epignoi (cp. Bethe, Thesae. Helleni. p. 38), a view which is borne out by the reference to Adrastos below, who is barely mentioned in the two former, while he must have been the chief hero of the latter poem, or poems. Yet Hdt., who had doubts as to the 'Homeric' authorship of the Kypria (2. 117), would hardly have ascribed the Thelasis or Epignoi to Homer.

3. Ἀργοὺς πολεμάς. The date of this war cannot be fixed: it is curious to find the tyrant of Sikyon doing the work of Sparta: Sparta may have been still eclipsed by 'Dorian' Argos. The rise of Sparta to Hegemony is later, 1. 65. πάντως...ἀγνώστως. The more usual construction would be ἄγνωστοι, which, however, might give rise to the false idea that the Rhapsodists were stopped in the very act (St.).

6. ἴστι does not prove that Hdt. had been to Sikyon: it only anticipates the defeat of Kleisthenes in his attempt to exterminate Adrastos. Cp. Introduction, § 16, v, and p. lxxxii.

4. Ἀδρήστου. Adrastos son of Talos the Argive, to be distinguished from Adrastos son of Gordias, the Phrygian, 1. 35 ff., Bethe in Pauly R. - E. But cp. Posnansky, Nemesis und Adrasteia, p. 87. ὅτε Ἀδρήστος ἐπήγαγε...Ἀργόν τινα. Παλάνθον ἡδὲ εἰς Σικύων καὶ ἔστερον ἀποσάνευτον Πελάθον τὴν ἐν Σικύων ἄρχην ἔχετο, Pausan. 2. 6, 6. He is subsequently restored to Argos.

7. τούτου...ἐκβάλειν. Coupled with the Hero-worship is the animistic belief, that to retain or expel the corpse is to retain or expel the man. Cp. the story of the bones of Orestes, 1. 68, the bringing of the bones of Theseus to Athens, Plat., Theae, 36 etc. But A-drastos would be the last person in the world to run away! (Cp. 4. 142.) How Adrastos came to be buried at Sikyon is not made clear: he was reported to have died at Megara, on the way back from Thebes (Pausan. 1. 43, 1). Some held that the tomb in Sikyon was a cenotaph (Schol. to Pindar, Nem. 9. 30). As Hero he was specially connected with Adrasteia-Nemesis, and was the Avenger (“der unentrinnbare Rächer” d-δώρεας); see Scholl, apud Pauly, 1. pp. 187 ff., Roscher (totidem verbis), 78 ff., Posnansky, op. cit. pp. 82 ff. A tyrant might well object to Adrastos!

8. Ἀδρήστες. If this τευχή took place during or after the First 'Sacred War,' in which Kleisthenes had espoused the cause of Delphi (Pausan. 2. 9, 6, 10. 37, 6), the reply to a benefactor is the more astonishing. It is probably unhistorical.

10. Σικυώνων βασιλέα. Cp. Il. 2. 572 καὶ Σικύων' ἐόθ' ἀρ' Ἀδρήστος πρὸς ἐμβασιλέαν. Delphi had no real hostility to 'tyrants' as such: witness the relations with Kypselos of Corinth 1. 14, Miltiades, son of Kypselos of Athens, 6. 34 ff., the Battaeidae 4. 155, 162, 163, 165, 163, Gelon of Syracuse 7. 163, not to speak of foreign potentates, Cyges, Amasis, etc. Kleisthenes was a special benefactor, cp. Burv, l.c. 5. 127 infra. Λεωντήρα. See L. & S. sub γ. There was a jingle on βασιλεύς and λεωντήρ in the Response, which perhaps ran ἔν' ὅ μεν Ἀδρήστος βασιλέως λεωντήρ ἐν τῷ γ' ἄσαι.
ο θεός. Prima facie, Apollo: but it might stand for Zeus; cp. P. 27 infra.
14. ἔσωσον, Melanippus, son of Astakos, according to Aischylos (Septem, 408) κάρης ἐγχώρος. According to Pausanias 9. 18, 1 his tomb was outside the Protid Gate of Thebes on the road to Chalkis. Cp. Fabricius, Thebes, p. 22, Bethe, Thesam. Holdem. p. 61. The Thebans in fact support Sikyon against Argos as on a later occasion Aigina against Athens, c. 54 ff. infra. It is reasonable to suspect in this innocent narrative the record of political aims and combinations worthy of the ally of Solon, the father-in-law of Megakles, the founder of the Pythian Games. (Cp. Bury, Nemaea Odes, Appendix D.)
15. εν αὐτῷ τῷ πρωτανθρῷ. While Adrastos was out in the Agera (ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἄγιῳ, l. 16 supra).
17. καὶ γὰρ τούτῳ δὲ ἀπηγγέλσαται. Every body could not be expected to know these historical minutiae. Hith, doubtless got them from his poetical authorities.
18. ὁ σαλ. Melanippus, of Adrastos. The killing was no murder, being done in fair fight in front of Thebes: still, it left a blood feud apparently with the inevitable One.
23. ἐπες. Without male issue. Cp. c. 48 supra, for Polyboas also gave him his daughter, according to one tradition, and in any case was μητροπάτης to him.

14. ἔσωσον, Melanippus, son of Astakos, according to Aischylos (Septem, 408) κάρης ἐγχώρος. According to Pausanias 9. 18, 1 his tomb was outside the Protid Gate of Thebes on the road to Chalkis. Cp. Fabricius, Thebes, p. 22, Bethe, Thesam. Holdem. p. 61. The Thebans in fact support Sikyon against Argos as on a later occasion Aigina against Athens, c. 54 ff. infra. It is reasonable to suspect in this innocent narrative the record of political aims and combinations worthy of the ally of Solon, the father-in-law of Megakles, the founder of the Pythian Games. (Cp. Bury, Nemaea Odes, Appendix D.)

15. εν αὐτῷ τῷ πρωτανθρῷ. While Adrastos was out in the Agera (ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἄγιῳ, l. 16 supra).
17. καὶ γὰρ τούτῳ δὲ ἀπηγγέλσαται. Every body could not be expected to know these historical minutiae. Hith, doubtless got them from his poetical authorities.
18. ὁ σαλ. Melanippus, of Adrastos. The killing was no murder, being done in fair fight in front of Thebes: still, it left a blood feud apparently with the inevitable One.
23. ἐπες. Without male issue. Cp. c. 48 supra, for Polyboas also gave him his daughter, according to one tradition, and in any case was μητροπάτης to him.
27. ἀπέβασε. Something turns upon the meaning of this word, or perhaps the meaning of the word must be determined by historical arguments. Does it mean 'restored,' 'gave back,' or does it mean simply: 'duly assigned,' 'rightly gave up'? From the instances (op. L & S. p. 179), it is obvious that it may here mean either. Does Hdt. imply that the choruses had been taken from Dionysos? If so, by whom? Bergk (op. c. 254) is prepared with the answer, arguing that political motives had led to the transfer of the honours to Adrastos, and that Kleisthenes 'restored the tragic choruses to their original object.' The first robbery is put down conjecturally to the Sikyonic poet Epigenes (op. Bergk, l.c.). This view is endorsed by Mahaffy, Gr. Lit. 13, c. xiv. ad init. But the conjecture seems elaborate and superfluous, if Adrastos was originally a 'Cthonian' divinity. Even if Hdt., or his sources, had intended by ἀπέβασε a 'restoration,' the fact would not be indisputable, for it would have been natural enough to represent such an innovation as a restoration; but the text of Hdt. does not support the view, his statement being that the men of Sikyon used to honour not Dionysos, but Adrastos, until Kleisthenes, so to speak, divided the divine from the heroic elements in the cult of Adrastos, assigning the divine to Dionysos and the heroic to Melanippos, the one a Thesian hero, and the other a god, of special association with Thebes indeed, but as a god not tied and bound to a sepulchre.

ΔΆΛΝ. Op. 4. 191, c. 32 supra.

68. 3. οὐνόματα. A mere change of name would not have broken down the Dorian phyle system in Sikyon, nor could the members of the Dorian Phylae have been persuaded to adopt and maintain sixty years after the death of Kleisthenes—down to the date of the expulsion of the Peisistratidae from Athens—mere nicknames or terms of contempt. Is it even certain that the 'Pig' and the 'Ass' were contemptible animals in the eyes of Adrastians or of Dionysiacs? In the form of a wild Boar, μέγα χρυμα βός, the Pig might play a providential role in an Adrastos-Myth (op. 1. 34 ff.), and though not perhaps in 'purely Hellenic' religion, yet in the religion of Hellenes, the Pig was an holy animal (op. Ramsay, Asia Minor, pp. 31 f.). The Ass, indeed, was in little reverence among the Greeks (op. Paroxysmographi, ed. Gaisford, or Leutsch and Schneideuw, Index, sub c.), yet his name appears honourably associated with the landscape of Hellas in δοῦν γαβάο, δου ρήξα, τὸ Ὄντος (a hill near Corinth) (op. Grasberger, Studien, p. 99), albeit this nomenclature may have been a bequest from a people, other than Hellenes, that had the Ass in more honour. If the Archelai became the localised Aigeoii, who certainly represent a pre-Dorian population, the 'nicknames' might possibly represent localities, and localisations of the Dorian phyla. Op. Τάμαλες, Σένσες, Τάμενα, Σέγαρος, Σέβας, οί Χαράδος et al. (Grasberger, op. c. p. 101). 'Pigs,' 'Asses,' 'Swine' are possible totems, for which however parallels can hardly be found. Perhaps names and nicknames existed side by side, and were not used by the same classes or persons at Sikyon. The 60 years may mark the duration of the anti-Dorian régime at Sikyon, and the supposed recovery of the old tribal names may signify in reality the restoration of the Dorian and aristocratic régime. (Stein quotes Pintarch, Μορ. 569 = de Herodoti motio, c. 22, where the expulsion of a tyrant Aischines from Sikyon by the Spartans is mentioned, but not dated.)
11. *μετέβαλαν.* We might have expected τὰ ώρα or some word to indicate that the change was a restoration, if a restoration it really was. Hyleis, Pamphylia, Dymanes were the three `tribes' of Dorian: though the first, as descendants of 'Herakles,' and the second, on plain etymological grounds, look little like pure Dorian kinships. Steph. Byz. sib. τ. Δομινισκουσ is much to the point: φᾶλον Δυμίνιαν, ἓπαι δὲ τρεῖς 'Τλάλα καὶ Πάμφιλον καὶ Δυμάνθης ἐξ Ἡρακλείων, καὶ προστέθη ἢ 'Ὑπακούα ἐστὶ 'Εφορος α'. Δύναμις γὰρ ἦν τῶν περὶ τῆς Οὔτης Δομίνικους βασιλείαν. ἔχον δὲ δύο παιδεῖς, Πάμφιλον καὶ Πάμφιλα, καὶ τὸν τοῦ 'Πρακτοῦς 'Τλαλοῦς κατέφθασε πρῶτον, χάριν ἀποδόθη ἔτη' ἕως ὡς Ἡρακλῆς ἑπταεκατότητα κατηγόει. Οἱ οἰκιστές Δυμάνικαι (sic) καὶ Δυμάνικες τὸ υφίσταν καὶ Δυμάνα. Cr. F. F. Hermann, Helodich, L 8 § 16, for literature and ref.

12. ἔτι τοῦ, op. 65 supra, 69 ἑνάτια.

14. Δυμάνικας was undoubtedly a name for the non-Dorian population "along shore," Cr. 7. 94. On the hypothetical eponymous ancestor cp. c. 65 supra. The non-Dorian, pre-Dorian character of Adrastos comes out plainly: whether he was an 'Ionian,' Achai, Pelasgian, Asiatic, or what not, is hard to say. According to one tradition Sikyon was originally called Aigialeia and the name Sikyon marked the Attic ('Ionian') advent; Pausan. I. 6. 2.

69. 3. δοκεῖν ἐμοί. C. c. 67 supra. Hdt. makes himself explicitly responsible for this theory or reflection; was it not one he borrowed or found ready made in Athens? But the motive here

ascribed to Kleisthenes is superficial, and misses the full and the true significance of the change described. The imitative element (ἀμφισβητώ) in the change is not conspicuous: an anti-Ionic reform, as such, is not an imitation of an anti-Dorian reform: and the Athenians did not secede from the Ionian organisation, or cease to celebrate the great Ionian festival (1. 147), much less invent nicknames for the old tribes. Nay more, it is probable that many Ionians in Athens were enfranchised by Kleisthenes, among his metic citizens, Arist. Pol. 3. 2, 3 (127b). In so far, however, as the reform of Kleisthenes was a democratic move, and broke with the ancient régime, based on blood and genetic associations, it offered some analogy to the policy of his grandfather at Sikyon. An anti-Ionic character might, indeed, to some extent seem to belong to it, inasmuch as the breach with the foreign policy and relations of the Peisistratidae, and the preoccupation with domestic questions, might bring about a temporary chill or estrangement with Delos, Naxos, Miletos, Euboia. Yet within ten years, if Hdt. may be trusted, an Ionian alliance was formed at Athens, expressly on the ground of the consanguinity and metropolitan connexion, c. 97 ἑνάτια.

6. ἑπταεκατότητα where it stands makes no sense. To insert μετέβαλον, as Stein suggests, is to charge Hdt. with a great exaggeration; to read ἐπισκοποῦντος πάνων, τότε πρὸς κτλ. involves a possible exaggeration. The best sense would be made by reading τότε πάντα... Kleis-
thens gained the whole demos over, and joined it to his ranks—cp. c. 68 supra.
7. ἡς φυλᾶς μετονόμασε. Mised by his false parallel Hdt. mistakes the nature of the reform. The four Phylae must have remained, or at least the φαραγγίας which were their sub-divisions, and which appear in post-Kleisthenic Athens, in use even for civil purposes. Cp. Ἀθηναίοι, πολ. 21, 6 τὰ δὲ γένη καὶ τὰς φαραγγίας καὶ τὰς λεστίφας εἰκὸνες ἐσχῆν ἑκάστου καθ’ τὰ πέντε, with Sándya's note. But cp. Appendix IX. § 10.
8. δέκα τε ἐν ἴδια κτῆλ. The notion that in the Kleisthenic phylae there were at any time one hundred Demes neither more nor less must now be regarded as utterly untenable in view of the evidence of the Αθηναίων συλλογῆς, which (1) lends no support to it, (2) presents an alternative, c. 21. The question remains whether Hdt. in this passage justifies that notion, and shared that error. In commenting on this passage, before the discovery of the Αθ. p. and at a time when the arguments of Schömann and others in favour of the 100 Demes, ten to each Phyle, appeared to have been raised almost to demonstration by the reading of the Berlin Fragment (H. Diehl, Über die Berliner Fragmente, etc. Berlin, 1885, p. 24) I ventured to suggest that either the text was corrupt, or Hdt.'s own view on the matter was confused, for no one wishing to say that Kleisthenes distributed the (100) demes, ten to each of the Phylae, would have expressed himself as in the text: nor could the text as it stood be translated naturally, except to mean that there were ten Demes distributed into the Phylae, which of course was nonsense, as δέκα φυλαχοῖς implied that the number of the Phylae was ten. Madvig had solved the difficulty by deleting δέκα δέ, a proceeding at once drastic and insufficient. Can the text thus produced: δέκα τε ἐν ἴδια φυλάξις αὐτή τεσσάρων ἐποίησε καὶ τοὺς δήμους κατέτειμε ἐς τὰς φυλᾶς be regarded as satisfactory? It leaves the number of the Phylae a matter of inference, and it puts the cart before the horse, the 'Phylarches' before the 'Phylae': while it leaves the corruption as great a difficulty as ever. Hdt. perhaps wrote as follows: τὰς φυλᾶς μετονόμασε καὶ ἐποίησε πλείονας εἰς ἐλασσόνων· δέκα δὲ καὶ τοὺς δήμους κατέτειμε ἐς τὰς φυλᾶς· ἣν τε τὸν δήμον προσθέμενος πολλῶς κατούρα. We might have expected στρατηγοὺς, whose existence, number, and title are implied in the narrative of the Marathonian campaign (6. 109) and whose institution has in general been inferentially assigned to Kleisthenes. Nor can the Ἀθηναίοι, πολ. c. 22 be taken to assert that the ten strategi were only instituted in 501 n.c., nor, if it could, would the case of the 'Phylarch' in Hdt. be any clearer. After τεσσάρων must be supplied grammatically φυλάξις, but technically φυλαχοῖς (cp. Αθ. p. 8, 41, 87), and if φυλαχόντων can thus stand generically for φυλαχσαλίσσων why not for στρατηγούς? But the chief material difficulty arises from the fact that at the time when Hdt. was writing there were not merely ten strategi, but there were also ten Phylarches, properly so called, the commanders of the cavalry, as were the taxarchs of the Hoplites, cp. Αθ. π. c. 61. The same treatise c. 30 carries the Phylarches back beyond the last decade of the fifth century (411 n.c.) and they may be safely carried farther back to the period of the creation, or development and reorganisation of the cavalry, which amounted at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war probably to 1000 (100 from each Phyle), Aristoph. Ζω. 225, Xenoph. Ἡθ. Ἀρκ. 9, 3, or 1200 τῶν ἵππους, Thuc. 2. 13. In the time of Kleisthenes they may not have amounted to above 100; they have no record in the battle of Marathon (cp. 6. 112). At the battle of Platæa there may have been 300 (cp. 9. 21, 22). Andokides, indeed, appears to give a date for these 300, de Pace § 5—but it is almost impossible to base any inference on the passage (see Jebb, Attic Orators, i. 1 p. 130) even if it be genuine. In any case Hdt. writing at a date when the Phylarches are prominent officers in Athens, leaves this passage uncorrected: the inference is inevitable that he was not sufficiently careful or well informed in regard to Athenian institutions.
70. 1. _isostoi'menos_. If the Kleisthenian constitution was really completed before the second advent of Cleomenes, the defeat of Isagoras may have reflected itself in the elections to the executive. Unfortunately the list of Archons gives no names between Isagoras in 508 B.C. and an unknown Ake storides in 504 B.C., Clinton, P. H. ii. 5 p. 20. (The 'Aθ. π. does not supply the void, but dates the legislation of Kleisthenes to the Archonate of Isagoras, c. 21.)

2. _Kleisthenes_ ἐξεσόμενος. Cp. c. 63 supra, on the _exousia_ with the Peisistratidae, a comparison which may suggest in part the origin of the statement that Isagoras was a friend of the Peisistratidae: added to the fact that he was undoubtedly an enemy to Kleisthenes.

4. ἐξεσόμενος. Likely enough Alkmaionid scandal. If Gorgo was eight or nine years old at the time of Aristogoras' visit to Sparta c. 51 supra, her birth would fall about the time of her father's expeditions into Attica. Contr. form of expression 'ἐξεσόμενος ἀνήγιμω τιν' ἐν δια'.

5. ἐπιβάλλει. N.B. imperfect: he did not succeed. Cp. c. 22 supra. Whether Cleomenes could have undertaken this action ἄνευ τοῦ καπνίου (cp. 6. 50), may be doubted. See Appendix VII. § 8.

8. οἱ μὲν κτλ. A clumsy sentence, τοῦ φόνου τοῦ σεόντος being unintelligible before c. 71. This obscurity of language betrays the historian's embarrassment.

9. _autòs_. Referring apparently to Isagoras.

71. 1. _δέ_. The story of the origin of the ἀγος is told by Thucydides I. 126 at greater length and varying in some important particulars from the version of Hdt., and Plutarch, Solon 12, takes sides with Thucydides. The Thucydidean version is more complete, intelligible, and authoritative than the story as here told, and is certainly a designed correction if not of the text of Hdt. at least of the (Alkmaionid) tradition upon which the text of Hdt. is based. This will appear from the comments following. It may now be added that the _'Αθηναίων πολείται_ lends no support to the Herodotean version. True, the new text just misses recording the story of Kylon, but (1) Plutarch (c. 6) may be taken as evidence for the version in the _'Αθ. π. (2) The 'Αθ. π. knows nothing of Pryta- neis of the Naukrarai or Naukrariae at any stage. (3) The 'Αθ. π. in putting the Naukrarii in line with the Demarchs of later date (c. 21, a passage already known from Harpokration, s. v. _naukrariskei_), condemns the Herodotean version: for if the Naukrarii corresponded to the Demarchs they could never have been on a level with the 'Archons' (though their 'principals,' superior officers, might have been). It is important in this connexion to remember the respective _interests_ of the Sources. Herodotus and Thucydides tell the story of Kylon _apropos of the_ ἐναγαία, the Alkmaionids: Plutarch's interest in the story arises from Solon's connexion with it, as the trial and expiation took place thanks to Solon: the author of the _'Αθ. π. was specially concerned with its bearing on the constitutional history: no one tells the story merely on its own merits, or in the interests of Kylon.

_Κύλων_. Thuc. adds that he was of ancient lineage and political importance, and had to wife a daughter of Theagenes tyrant of Megara.
τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀνήρ Ὀλυμπιονίκης. οὗτος ἐπὶ τυραννίδι ἐκάμης, προσπευσάμενος δὲ ἔταιρήν των ἡλικιωτῶν καταλαβεῖν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἐπειρήση, οὐ δυνάμενος δὲ ἐπικρατήσαι ἰκέτην ἤξετο πρὸς 5 τὸ ἀγάλμα, τούτους ἀναστάσις μὲν οἱ πρωτάνες τῶν ναυκράτων, οἱ πέρ ἐνεμὸν τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας, ὑπεγγύνουσι πλὴν βανάτου' φονεύσαι

2. Ὀλυμπιονίκης. The full bearing of this fact on the story is not brought out in the Herodotean version. Vide infra.

3. ἐκάμης. ἐπὶ τῷ κομματί Αριστοφ. Βιζαντ. 1517 (ἐπὶ τῷ κομματί Αριστοφ. Βιζαντ. 1517). Thuc. states that Kylon consulted the Delphic oracle and was directed to seize the acropolis & τῇ τοῦ Δωρίων μεγαίτης ἐφορή. Instead of inquiring further whether this phrase referred to the Peloponnesian Olympic, or to the Athenian Diasia, as an Olympic victor he assumed the former interpretation and timed his coup accordingly.

4. προσπευσάμενος. Thuc. says that beside gaining over his Phila he received assistance from Thucydides. For the verb cp. ε. 66 infra, for ἐπαρχή cp. ε. 66 supra.

5. ἐκέτης. According to Thuc. Kylon κατέλαβε τὴν ἀκρόπολιν.

6. δυνάμενος κτλ. According to Thuc. the Athenians as mosse (πανουμεν) besieged Kylon and his friends and supporters in the Akropolis. The siege lasted some time, till the majority went home, after leaving a force on guard, and empowering the Archons to act in the matter with full authority. This vote of the ἐκελεύει is a trifle suspicious and in the later manner.

7. πρωτάνες τῶν ναυκράτων. οἱ πέρ ἐνεμὸν τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας. Thuc. says: τοῦτο δὲ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν οἱ ἐνεκα ἀρχότες ἐπραξαν. Thuc. is here certainly right prima facie against Hdt. Even if the Naukriases and Naukrai were pro-Solonian institutions the 'Prytanies of the Naukrai' cannot have been superior officers to the Archontes. The 'Prytanies of the Naukrai' may have been, as Rawlinson suggests, 'the chief military officers' subordinate of course to the Archontes (or rather, to the Polemarch!), a suggestion to be preferred to his alternative that they were a council or court which assisted the chief (sic) Archons in the decision of criminal causes. Another hypothesis is open. By πρωτάνες τῶν ναυκρατῶν may have been meant the Archons. Harppokration, indeed, points to such a solution (πανομενον). Ναυκράτων τοῦ τῶν ἀρχότερι ἀρχότερος ἐπραξαν ἐπὶ τῇ τεύχει ἐπιβρασότα τοιοῦ. But to this article there are three objections: (1) it looks like an inference to harmonise Hdt. and Thucydides; (2) the Ἀθ. τοῦλ. identifies the ναυκράτων with the διμερχεία; (3) if Hdt. proves anything it is not that the ναυκράτων, but that the πρωτάνες τ. ν. ἐπαρχής.

Reading ναυκρατων, indeed, οἱ πρωτάνες τῶν ναυκράτων might be (= oi ναυκρατοι). It would, however, hardly be safe to argue that the Athenian Archons had ever been known officially as ναυκράτων or πρωτάνες τῶν ν. Rather in the light of the articulated account of the origin of the archontic offices and titles given by the Ἀθ. τουλ. we may conclude that this passage in Hdt. is erroneous and misleading. The motive and tendency are not far to seek. The rôle assigned to the Prytanies of the Naukrai in the narrative looks very like an attempt to absolve the (Alkmissonen) Archontes, who Thuc. distinctly says were responsible for what took place (1) in virtue of the magisterial authority of the Archons at that date, (2) in virtue of a special commission αὐτὸ. Hoc. In this matter Thucydides had any bias, it would presumably be due to his connexion with the Philaia.
7. αἰτητ. We must suppose that the Head of the House and perhaps other members were in office at the time. This view although not expressly stated by Hdt. or Thuc. is found in Plutarch, Solon 12 Μεγαλή καὶ οἱ συνάρχοντες. 

πρὸ τῆς Πεισοτράτου ἡλικίας. A very vague chronological datum. For Hdt. indeed the continuous history of Athens practically begins with Peisistratos. The Solonian reforms are barely referred to; the Drakonian legislation is not mentioned; much less the coup d'état of Damasippus (Arist. Ἀθ. πολ. Berlin Frug. ed. Diels, p. 10 "Ἀθηναίων π. c. 15"). It is possible that he thought of Kylon's attempt as shortly preceding the more successful stroke of Peisistratos. The date in the Ἀθ. π. is indefinite, simply placing Kylon before Solon, or perhaps Drakon, though the passage on Drakon (c. 4) is in the highest degree suspicious. Thuc. gives two chronological points in the story: the synchronism with Theagenes in Megara, and the Olympic. But these are insufficient by themselves. The list of Archontes also fails us. Clinton, F. H. vol. i. dates the attempt of Kylon 620 B.C. one year after the Legislation of Drakon, twenty years after the Olympic victory of Kylon himself, and twenty-four years before the purification of Epimenides and the first expulsion of the δύνα. It is possible that the coup d'état and the Legislation of Drakon stood in some causal relation to each other; but if so, it is perhaps more likely that the attempt of Kylon preceded the Legislation of Drakon. So Busolt, Gr. Geschichte, i. 540 ff. The discovery of the text of the Ἀθ. πολ. has of course confirmed Busolt's suggestion, which has also been endorsed by J. H. Wright, The Date of Cylon, Boston, 1892. This digression on the δύνα (cp. 6, 91) may possibly have been inserted after the pourparlers, recorded by Thuc. (1. 126), had revived the discussion. This hypothesis might explain the stylistic inequalities.

72. 1. δίκαιος c. 70 supra. 2. αὐτός. This voluntary exile of Kleisthenes was afterwards perhaps improved by tradition into an Ostracism, the engineer being thus "hoist with his own petard." Aelian, 18, 34, cp. Did., op. c. p. 30. The Ἀθηναίων π. says nothing of the acts or fate of Kleisthenes after his Legislation, dates the first use of the Law πέρι τῶν ὀστρακισμῶν to the year 488 B.C. though the Law itself is ascribed to Kleisthenes (op. c. 22), and places the retirement of Kleisthenes before his Legislation, which is effected after his return (c. 20). This arrangement gives a better 'perspective' than the text of Hdt.

4. ἐπακόλουθα. The number is large; the expulsion is effected ὀ ὑπὸ μεγάλην κυρίαν. ἐπιστέα=ἐπιστά, i. 176, 6, 86.

5. διέφθαρα. Cp. ce. 38 supra, 111 ἐπιστέα. Stein (note c. 70) connects with τὰ μὲν πρῶτα there, i.e. first of all Kleomenes proceeded to get rid of Kleisthenes, and indeed came to Athens to complete the work; secondly he endeavoured to overthrow the institutions of which Kleisthenes was the author. But is not this reference a little far-fetched? διέφθαρα hardly balances grammatically τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ πρῶτα, and materially the order of events is (1) a message from Kleomenes to expel Kleisthenes and his partisans, (2) the retirement of Kleisthenes, (3) the advent of Kleomenes (ὁδὸν ἔχοντα παρίσταται), (4) the expulsion of the 700 families, (5) ταύτα ἐπὶ παρίσταται Kleomenes next (διέφθαρα) attacked the Buli. Historically, the order of events is to say the least questionable, as it is not borne out by the Ἀθ. π. μεγαλή. The Kleisthenesian Buli of 500 members, here first mentioned (cp. Ἀθ. π. 21). That after the actual expulsion of 700 (Kleisthenesian) anti-
oligarchic households, men, women, and children, the Bulé of 500 should have successfully resisted an attempt at its own dissolution would speak volumes for the success of the Kleisthenean institutions, and suggest the reflection that they had been in working order some time before the intervention of Kleomenes, if only the order of events and the figures could be trusted. But if the 'Αθ. π. cc. 20 f. is right, the Constitution of Kleisthenes was subsequent to these acts of Kleomenes. The conduct of the unpaid Bulé on this occasion is an ideal and undesigned contrast to the conduct of the paid Bulé in 411 a.c. (Thuc. 8. 69, 70).

καταλέγεις ἐπιστήμην. καταλαβὼν ἐπιστήμην, c. 71.

6. τὰς άρχας, σ. τάς βουλευτικά. The places of the 500 were to be taken by a council of 300. The Solonian Council had been 400, 100 from each of the four Ionian Phyleae, 'Αθ. π. 21. According to the new text, it would be the Solonian Council which was still existing at this crisis.

10. τὰ αὐτὰ φρονήσαντες may cover a meeting of the Ekklesia: though, if the 'Αθ. π. 21 be right in its date for the expulsion of Kleisthenes, it was the Ekklesia of Solon, not that of Kleisthenes. That the names of the popular leaders on this occasion have dropped out of the tradition is much to be regretted. Xanthippus, Aristides probably took part in these transactions: Callimachos, Stesagoras, Kynegeiros and others of the Ἑλληνικαὶ may have been of service. Miltiades was presumably in the Chersonese. Hipparchos, the Peisistratus, who probably have been opposed to Isagoras and his doings, by an irony of fate may have worked for the restoration of the Alkimaidion. But it is dangerous to speculate where tradition is so meagre. Political jealousy (φθόνος) has too often im-

mortalised the names of traitors who ruined the state, and consigned to oblivion the names of the loyal leaders, who restored or preserved it.

7. τῇ δὲ τρίτῃ. So also 'Αθ. π. c. 20, probably on the authority of this passage.

12. ἡ φήμη. A divine or portentous intimation, cp. 3. 133 (coupled with τέρας) and 9. 100 (with τέραμον), here with ἐλεφάντως. Cp. 9. 101.

13. τὸ ἄντων τῆς θεότητος. As though there had been but one shrine of Athena on the Akropolis at this time. There were at least two: (1) The (old) Erechtheion, occupying the site of the later temple, the remains of which are still standing; (2) A temple known as the Hekatompedon: for the site of which, see further below. The oldest cult of Athena was certainly that in the Erechtheion, and in that shrine was preserved the archaic wooden image of the goddess. It seems probable that the shrine entered by Kleomenes was the Erechtheion. It is not, however, proven that Hdt. had that temple clearly in mind in this passage. The inchoate condition of the restored Erechtheion in his day might contribute to the ambiguity of the reference in this passage. Had Hdt. defined exactly the temple here in question he might have specified some other great shrine of Athen on the Akropolis. Ten years ago that other shrine would have been identified as a matter of course with an older temple upon the site now covered by the Parthenon of Perikles, and that older temple with the Hekatompedon. But in 1885 Dr. Dörpfeld discovered the foundations of an ancient temple close to the Erechtheion (see his article Der alte Athena-Tempel auf der Akropolis in the Mittheilungen, xi. (1886), pp. 337 ff. Op. Harrison, Myth. and Mon. pp. 496 ff.). If this "central" temple, between the Erechtheion and the Parthenon, was standing down to the Persian wars, it would have to be reckoned with in this
Τής θεού ὡς προσερέων· ἢ δὲ ἱρείς ἐξαναστάσα ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου, πρὶν ἡ τὰς θύρας αὐτῶν ἀμέσως, ἐπεὶ "ὁ ἐφέαν Δακεβαμώνε, 15 πάλιν χόρης μηδὲ ἐσθιθ έγεῖ τοὺς θρόνοις οὗ γὰρ θεμῶν Δαρεβοῦν 
παρενήγη ἐγείρανα," ὥ δὲ εἶπε ὁ τῆς ἕρων, ἀλλ' ὁ δωρεῶν εἰμὶ 
ἀλλ' Ἀχαῖος., ὅ μεν δὴ τῇ κληρονομίᾳ οὐδὲν χρεωμένους ἐπεχειρήσε 
te καὶ τῶν πάλιν ἐξεπετε υποτέ τῶν Δακεβαμώνων τοὺς δὲ 
ἀλλοὺς Ἀθηναίων κατέδικαν τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ, εν δὲ αὐτοίς καὶ 20 
τιμήθειτον τῶν Δελφῶν, τοῦ ἐργα χειρῶν τοῦ καὶ λήματος ἔχουμεν".

passage. Mr. Penrose has argued that this 
temple had been destroyed long 
before the Persian wars. (For the 
troversy between Dr. Dörpfeld, see J. H. §., 
xiii. 1201-92, Mittheilungen, xvi. 
(1892).) For a discussion of Dr. Dörpf 
feld's further theory that the "central" 
temple was rebuilt after the Persian war 
(and consequently standing in Hdt.'s 
day), see Mr. J. G. Frazer's admirable 
article, J. H. §. xiii. pp. 154 ff. The 
old Hekatompedon is identified by Dr. 
Dörpfeld with the central temple (and 
in this respect he is followed by Mr. 
Frazer). But in any case the temple 
here in question was most probably the 
Erechtheum, rightly in my opinion 
identified by Mr. Frazer with the temple 
of Athens Pallas, at any rate for the 
period here concerned. Cf., further, 
Curtius, Stadtgeschichte, pp. 71 ff. Lolling 
in Iwan Müller's Handbuch, iii. 351 f. 
(Smaller sanctuaries of Athens need not 
be considered.)
14. Ἡ ἱρα. Probably a lady chosen 
from the family of the Eetobatadse, who 
supplied the priest of Erechtheus and 
the priestess of Athens Pallas for the 
time being (Petersen, op. cit. 140); 
ἕξαναστάσα ἐκ', 'rose up and left her 
seat.'
15. τὰς θύρας, folding-doors.
16. τάλαν, 'back' = διώνη 
οἱ δωρεῶν Δακεβαμών. Was there 
a special excommunication or taboo 
for Dorians, or was it more general, 
covering all non-Ionian tribes? Cf. s. 81 infra.
18. That Kleomenes was Αχαῖος be 
because his mother was an Achaian, as 
Blakesley suggests, is an explanation 
both inadequate and unnecessary. 
Inadequate, for the Spartan kings traced 
their descent through their male ancestors 
(see 7, 204, 8, 131); unnecessary, because 
those male ancestors were ex hypothesis 
of non-Dorian, of Achaian, origin, exiled
had a statue (by Ageladas) at Olympia: he had won two victories at Olympia and three at Pytho as paunkratist, and was also a daring and fortunate man of war, until this last adventure in which he met his death.

22. ἔπειτα τοὺς ἀντικρούσας. Presumably after some judicial procedure. The 'Αθήναιος πί. c. 20 represents all the men with Kleomenes as allowed to depart with him: perhaps a pragmatic Athenian version.

73. 1. 'Αθηναίος marks presumably an act of the Ekklesia. According to άθες. π. c. 21 it is not until the fourth year after the 'regifuge' and ἐν 'Ἰσαγώρων ἄγχος' that Kleisthenes carried his legislation. If that statement be correct, and if the Archon was the Isagoras who had driven Kleisthenes out, we should have to suppose that the rival leaders and factions had come to terms again, and that the constitution of Kleisthenes was the result of a compromise. It would of course have to be dated after the events recorded co. 74, 75 infra.

2. μεταβατόμενοι. Where they had taken refuge is not recorded: perhaps no farther off than Leip- sydrion, cp. c. 62 supra, or Delphi. It might be too rash to suggest that they had found their way to Sardes, and prepared the way for the democratic ambassadors. But cp. 8. 125.

3. συμβαίνοντως. It is noticeable that the Athenians make the first advances to the Persian, and those of a friendly kind, and against Sparta. This tradition is not at all likely to be false, though it is fragmentary. What conclusion they could offer the Persian is not here indicated. At a later time there was an oracle in circulation in Sparta at least which shows what was possible. Cp. 8. 141, and c. 90 infra.

πρὸς del. Schweig.

6. Ἀρταφρένης ὁ 'Υσαπούς Σαρ- δῶν ἐπάρχων. The full description has a fine effect, but would perhaps hardly have occurred here (after cc. 26, 30, 31, 32, 38), if this passage were from the same source as those passages. Chronologically the situation in this chapter is prior to all the others, except that in c. 25.

7. τινῶς. If the inquiry is historical, and if Artaphernes really asked for the sake of information, it would follow that this embassy preceded the arrival of Hippias at Sardes, c. 90 infra. But in any case it is not likely that Artaphernes was quite ignorant of Athenian affairs, and the formula is suspicious, cp. cc. 18 supra, 105 infra.

9. ἀντικρούσα, 'put the point to them in a nutshell, as follows.'

10. ἢ ἡ πόλις, 'the city,' cp. c. 84 supra. 'el ἢ answering to el μὲν. The grammar of the passage, combining as it does the structures of the recta and obliqua, is interesting.

συνεπικέφαλος = συνεπικεφαλής Ἕλλην, Krüger, cp. c. 84 infra.

11. εἰς σφόν αὐτῶν βαλόμενοι. 4. 160.

13. αἰτίας μεγάλας ἡ ἀκον. Whether
matters went so far as a γραφὴ παρατηρητική, or any judicial proceedings, it is not possible to say. The experience would at least suggest the necessity of providing such for future occasions. On στίχος εἰσα λ.c. 70 εὑρέω.

74. Ι. περιμβολῶν. The account in Aristophanes, L.c. c. 72 εὑρέω, is obviously exaggerated. On the previous showing of Hdt. it is hard to see that the Athenians were to blame. A Spartan king might wish, indeed, to wipe out the discredit of a failure, but the purely personal motive and personal action here ascribed to Kleomenes is not strict or adequate history. The establishment of Democracy at Athens—even in a form which in after days seemed moderate—the return of Kleisthenes, and the possibility of Athenian aggression supported by Persia were reasons sufficient to set the Spartan Simoomoh in motion. That the Peloponnesian allies were not informed of the destination of the expedition is possible, though the Boeotians were in arms, διὰ συνθημάτος. Anyway, no superhuman clairvoyance surely was necessary to assign a probable object and goal. That the one king of his own initiative could have set the confederate force in motion, and carried the other king with him, is not to be admitted. To quote this story, or the story of the interview of Kleomenes and Aristagoras, as showing the power of the Spartan king(s) at the close of the sixth century, and the story of the interview of Philippides with the Ephors in 490 (6. 106) or at least the clearer case in 479 B.C. (9. 7 ι. ένθρα), as marking the exact date at which even the military mobilisation (φρονημένῳ φάλεις) passed to the Ephory, is to betray a most naive unconsciousness of the problematic conditions under which these stories came into existence, and found their way into the work of Hdt. as well as a poor conception of the working of Spartan Institution. See further on the subject, Appendix VII.

4. τίτανον. This is the first hint that Isagoras too was aiming at the tyranny, and it seems an afterthought. Isagoras hitherto represents the oligarchic interest. His views may have developed in exile, or the afterthought may be proper to the tradition. In either case the Spartan king is credited with an intention to restore tyranny, at Athens, first in the person of Isagoras, and then in the person of Hippias (cc. 90 f. infra). The Αθηναίοι, πολ. makes no mention of this expedition, which broke up at Eleusis: there is no special reason why it should have mentioned an event which left the constitution intact. But it places the final legislation of Kleisthenes at this point i.e. after his return (=Hdt. c. 73) and dates it to the archonship of Isagoras (508-7 B.C.). If that representation were correct, Isagoras could not have left Athens, or must have returned, and the events recorded in this chapter would fall later still. It is, however, hardly possible to harmonise the narratives in Hdt. and in the 'Αθηναίοι, πολ. If the latter is the better authority for the purely constitutional points, the former may be the better for the external policy and course of events. Cp. Appendix IX.

συνθήματος. The omission of this circumstance in c. 72 is remarkable: it comes in here as an inference.

6. οἱ Βοιωτοὶ ἀπὸ συνθήματος. If this be true, the Boeotians obviously must have been informed of the object of the Peloponnesian movement, and are not likely to have acted simply on the king’s direction. Chalkis too and perhaps Aigina were astir: cp. infra.

7. δήμων. There were two Demi of the name of Oinoe: 1 (Hippothoontid. cp. Milchhoefer, cp. cit. p. 81), on the road from Eleusis to Platea, by Eleutherai. The mention of Hysiae suggests this one.
the interest of Corinth to favour the rising power of Athens. Cf. p. 89, and c. 92 infra.

meteballontos. L. & S. sub v. B. II. 2 understand "to change one's purpose." That would rather be metaballon. "Wheeled round, i.e. 3, and ref., is here preferable. (Cp. c. 59 supra.)

5. συμβεβαγγείον. On the simple initiative of Kleomenes and without knowing the object of the expedition! The presence of Demaratus is not consistent with the rôle assigned to Kleomenes. Cf. Appendix VII. § 8. Ariston was the predecessor of Demaratus, cp. 1. 67, and for his story 6. 61 ff. infra.

6. εν τῷ πρῶτῳ χρόνῳ. This may have been the first open breach between Kleomenes and Demaratos (cp. 6. 64), but there is some ground for doubting the date given here by Hdt. for the enactment of the law; cp. 6. 82 infra, and Appendix VII. § 5.

7. ἔτη νόμος. On the Spartan legislative procedure we are imperfectly informed. The νόμος may have been passed or sanctioned by the Areopag, on the proposal of the Ephors, or of the Ephors and Gerusia. Cp. cc. 39 f. supra. That the kings should have been thus amenable to the legislature and yet, one or both, have been able to levy war on whom they would, must surely seem improbable. On the date of this νόμος cp. previous note. This νόμος passed into general recognition, but could not be implicitly relied on (cp. Xen. Hell. 5. 8, 10 ἡ δὲ τῶν Φιλευτίδων τοὺς νομίζων τις ἐξε ἴσιον. There is also, however, the "Athenian law of the Ephors of 350 B.C.,">

2 (Aisantid. Milchhoefer, p. 34), between Marathon and Aphiath. The cooperation of the Chalkidians suggests that this one is meant. The inference that Hyneas was an Attic Deme is doubtful, may highly improbable (cp. Hermann's Ezkubuc, t. i. 1477); this passage cannot be taken to justify it. The Demi were older than Kleisthenes (cp. 1. 80), so this passage cannot prove that his new organisation, dated in 'Ath. η. c. 13 to 508 B.C., was already in existence; even if Hdt. were incapable of an anachronism.

ἐγγάτου. From Athens. Bl. remarks that the order in which Oinoc and Hyneas are mentioned looks as though the story came from an Athenian source. But the order would be the same to a Peleponnesian. Anyway, it is not from a Boeotian, or Eubeean: but the argument is hardly necessary to establish Athenian provenance. The action of the Chalkidians might seem to have been preconceived; but the σφήνα was probably passed on to them. What meanwhile were the Alcineutans about? A situation is a suspiciously exact anticipation of the situation about 446 B.C., and the tactics of the Athenians are prophetic. At the later date Aigina was quiescent, having been thoroughly subdued some ten years before (Thuc. 1. 108). Is that the reason why the Aiginetans are missing here? Cp. c. 82 infra.

75. 2. Κορίνθιος. Oddly enough this service of the Corinthians is not appealed by the Corinthian orator in Thuc. 1. 41. σφήνα αὐτοῖς δόντες λόγον. Cp. c. 68 supra.

3. δίκαια. Justice and expediency not seldom go hand in hand. Aigina not Athens was still the leading commercial rival of Corinth, and it was to
ΤΕΡΨΙΧΩΡΗ

τούς βασιλέας ἔξωούσίς στρατηγὸς, τέως γὰρ ἀμφότεροι ἐπούτον· παραλυμένου δὲ τοὺν τοῦ ἔτερον καταλείπεισαν καὶ τῶν Τυνδαρίδον τῶν ἔτερων πρὸ τοῦ μᾶς δὴ καὶ οὗτοι ἀμφότεροι το ἐπικλήτως ἀφι ἔννοις ἐπούτο. τότε δὴ ἐν τῇ Ἐλευσίναι ὀρώντες 76 οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν συμμάχων τοὺς τε βασιλέας τῶν Δακεμποῖσιν ὕφε ὦμολογόηται καὶ Κορυνθίους ἐκλεπτόντας τὴν τάξιν, ὀργητό καὶ αὐτὸ ἀπαλλασσόμενοι, τέταρτον δὴ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀπικόμενοι Δωριές, διὰ τε ἐπὶ πολέμῳ ἐσβαλόντες καὶ δὶς ἐπὶ 5 ἀγαθὸ τοῦ πλήθεος τοῦ Ἀθηναίων, πρῶτον μὲν ὅτε καὶ Μέγαρα καταλείπαν: οὗτος ὁ στόλος ἔπλυ τὸν Ἐβραίοντος Ἀθηναίων ὀρθῶς ἄν καλέντος δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τρίτον ὅτε ἐπὶ Πεισιστρατιδῶν ἐξέλασιν ὀρμηθέντες εἰς Σπάρτης ἀπόκοντο, τέταρτον δὲ τὸν ὅτε ἐπὶ Ἐλευσίναι Κλεομένης ἀγῶν Πελωπονησίων ἐσβάλει. οὗτος τέταρτον τότε Δωριές ἐσβάλον ἐς Ἀθηναίας.

in 479 n. c. Pleistarchos, however, the infant king was at home (9. 10). The two kings are despatched on a mission together 6. 73 infra, though not perhaps ἔξωος στρατηγός. In cases where one king was in exile the other king would practically have been confined to Sparta, if such a 'law' had been rigidly enforced. The law would favour the employment of citizens in high military commands, especially as the occasions for such employment multiplied. But one is tempted to doubt whether there was any express enactment at this time (or later) upon this subject: whether, in fact, it had not always been the rule for one king to command at a time, and the exception for both to be absent together.

9. τῶν Τυνδαρίδων. The ξώα of Kastor and Polydeukes. The notice preserves an interesting example of fetishism or idolatry. For further examples cp. c. 86 infra, 82 ff. infra, 6. 80. Stein, indeed, argues that the law cannot have referred to the status, or twin-status, as its form would not admit of the one figure being separated from the other. In this case we should have here an instance of simple animism, or the invocation of ghosts. But were the figures cut out of a solid block? Is it certain they could not be separated? Or could the spirits have been detached from the idols?

10. 5. Κορυνθίους ἐκλεπτότας τὴν τάξιν.
5. ἐπί ἄγαθο τοῦ πλήθεος τοῦ Ἀθηναίων. The occasion upon which they had come to overthrow the popular constitution (c. 72 supra) and departed in disgrace is omitted.
6. ἐπὶ Μέγαρα καταλείπαν... οὗτος ὁ στόλος ἔπλυ τὸν Ἐβραίοντος Ἀθηναίων ὀρθῶς ἄν καλέντος δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τρίτον ὅτε ἐπὶ Πεισιστρατιδῶν ἐξέλασιν ὀρμηθέντες εἰς Σπάρτης ἀπόκοντο, τέταρτον δὲ τὸν ὅτε ἐπὶ Ἐλευσίναι Κλεομένης ἀγῶν Πελωπονησίων ἐσβάλει. οὗτος τέταρτον τότε Δωριές ἐσβάλον ἐς Ἀθηναίας.

11. Ἀθηναίας loosely for Ἀττικήν.
Grote, iii. 386, emphasises this occasion as the first recorded instance of the action of the Peloponnesian symmachi under Sparta. It was not a success. The omission in this passage of all reference to subsequent invasions of Attica, such as that under Pleistomax in 446 n. c. (Thuc. 1. 114) and that under Archidamos in 431 n. c. (Thuc. 2. 10 ff.), is all the more remarkable in that Ed. does elsewhere (9. 73) refer to one, and has a few references to events of the Peloponnesian war. Yet it is tempting to suppose that this list of invasions was compiled not without.
Διαλυθήτος δὲ τοῦ στόλου τούτου ἀκλέως, ἐνθαῦτα Ἀθηναῖοι τίνος ἤμεν οὕραμον πρώτα στρατηγὴν τούτῳ ἐπάνω Ἐλληνιδέας. Βουλατὴς δὲ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ Ἐλληνιδέας βοηθήσωτε ἐπὶ τῶν Εὐριποῦ. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἔδωκαν τοὺς Βουλατησ οὐδὲ πρότερον τοῦτο Βουλατῆσι ζήτησαν Ἡ τούτου Χαλκίδης ἐπιχείρησαν καὶ τοῦτοι Αθηναίοι καὶ πολλοὶ ἔκρατησαν, καίρια τοῦτον φονεύσαντες ἐπικούρευσαν αὐτῶν ἐξόφησαν, τῇ δὲ αὐτῆς ταύτης ἡμέρας οἱ Ἀθηναίοι διαβάτες ἐν τῇ Ἐλληνιδέα ἐσωμβάλλουσι καὶ τοῦτοι Χαλκίδεις, νικάντες δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἐπικρατεύσαντες 10 καὶ παγίοις ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιπολοτῶν τῇ χώρᾳ λείσθησαν. οἱ δὲ ἐπιπολοτοί ἐκάλεσαν οἱ παγίοι τῶν Χαλκίδων. δόσαν δὲ καὶ τοῦτον ἐξόφησαν, ἀμα τοῦτοι Βουλατησ ἐξομηνίσαντες ἐγνώσαντας ἐπὶ τῆς φυλακῆς [ἐς πέδας] δοθήσαντες: χρόνον δὲ ἐλυσάν τοὺς δίκαιους ἀποτιμήσαντες.

reference to the events of 431 B.C., or at least to those of 446 B.C.

77. 1. Ἀθηναῖοι. Again we miss any indication as of the constitutional preliminaries so of the intellectual authorship of this active foreign policy. Cp. c. 72 supra.

2. στρατηγὴν τοῦτον. A peophtism of the Ekklesia was presumably passed for this vindictive expedition; but the name of the Athenian strategos (or polemarch!) who conducted these operations is unrecorded: not so the analogous campaign of 446 B.C. associated with the name of Perikles. Thuc. 1. 114.

Χαλκίδαι. The men of Chalkis were Ionians. Their hostility to the rising power of Athens might well have had the same commercial grounds as the hostility of Aignina. They had a closer rival in Eretria, a city-state on good terms apparently with Athens. Cp. c. 57 supra, l. 61, 6. 100. These rivalries and friendships were of long standing (cp. c. 99 infra). The expansion of Athens under the Peisistratidae was perhaps not welcome in Chalkis, with its interests in Thrace and in the west—interests to which Athens succeeded in virtue of this conquest. Cp. 8. 62, 6. 21 infra.

5. τοῦτο Βουλατῆσι. The alliance with Plataia had probably been consumed just before this time (see 3. 108 and notes there), although Hdt. has not made mention of it, and this alliance sufficiently explains the hostility of the Boeotians. The battle took place presumably close to the Euripos. Its result, here recalled, must have been consoling to the Athenians after Koroneia. (Thuc. 1. 113.)

9. τετρακρατεύσας. 4000 kleruchoi can scarcely have been left there and then in possession. The establishment of a kleruchy required certain preliminaries, a doma of the Ekklesia, the appointment of a commission, and so forth. The number too is suspiciously large. Aelian, V. H. 6. 1, who tells the story from a different source, has Δυνύμες (unfortunately with a ν. τετράκρατος) and apparently quotes an inscription set up in the Agora to prove that part of the ground was left (τῶν δὲ λευχμίνων ἐμπιστευόμενοι). It is not clear whether the events should be all dated to the same period or divided between 506 B.C. and 445 B.C. Grote, III. 387, regarded this kleruchy as the first: but the discovery of the now celebrated Salaminian peophtism (Mitt. des k. a. L. il. 1894, pp. 115 sq.) has established the priority of the settlement in the nearer island. Cp. Busolt, Gr. G. i. 547, Hermann, Lehrbuch, I. 6. 435.

11. ἐκάλεσαν. 'Hippoboteus was the name for the men of substance in Chalkis.' οἱ παγίοις, c. 99 supra.

ἐδώσαν. That the number of Boeotian prisoners should be given, and not that of the Chalkidians, is curious.

μενοι. τάς δὲ πέδας αὐτῶν, ἐν τῇ οὖν ἐδεδέχετο, ἀνεκρέμασαν ἐς τὴν ἄκροπολίν: αἱ περ ἐνι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν περευοῦνται, κρεμάμεναι 15 ἐκ τευχέων περιπελευσμένους πυλὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μήδου, αὐτῶν δὲ τοῦ μεγάρου τοῦ πρὸς ἐσπέρην τετραμένου, καὶ τῶν λύτρων τὴν δεκατίνην ἀνέθηκαν πουπάμενο τέθρυππον χάλκεον: τὸ δὲ ἀριστερῆς χειρὸς ἄστηκε πρῶτον ἐσιώτην ἐς τὰ πρὸτρόπλαυα τὰ ἐν τῇ ἄκροπολί, ἐπηγέρασται δὲ οἱ τάδε.

ἐθναὶ Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδίων δαμάσαντες παῦς 'Αθηναίων ἔργασιν ἐν πολέμῳ.

15. καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ. Naturally here taken to refer to Hdt.’s autotomy, though the phrase in itself is inconclusive (cp. 4. 124, Introduction, p. lxii.). It would be interesting to determine the date of his visit (or visits) to Athens, for which unfortunately he gives no express indication. (Cp. notes supra.) The walls, that still bore the marks of the Persian conflagration to the eyes of Hdt., if indeed he saw them, can scarcely have been any other walls than the fortification. By the μέγαρον turned towards the west Stein understands the Cells of the Polias temple, or Erechtheion (cp. note c. 73 supra), and identifies the site of the chains with the northern wall, which the burning of the former Erechtheion may have scorched, 8. 58.

It is a wonder the Boeotians did not carry off these trophies in 480-79 B.C.

18. δεκατίνην. If a tithe of the ransom was sufficient to make a full-sized quadriga of bronze, the number of Chalkidians ransomed must have been considerable, for the Boeotian tithe would only have amounted to 2 T. 20 M. But Pausanias 1. 28. 2 represents the tithe as taken from the Boeotian as well as from the Chalkidic spoil, which is probably correct.

19. ἄστηκε, present sense.

τὰ πρὸτρόπλαυα. As the great Propylaia were only completed in 438-2 B.C. this passage is generally taken to have been written after that date, and to indicate that Hdt. himself was in Athens after the completion of the building. On the other hand the Akropolis undoubtedly had Propylaia of one kind or another from time immemorial, and the mere expression is not in itself conclusive proof that the work of Mnesicles is here intended, much less that the work was complete when this passage was written. But there is a difficulty in referring the word here to earlier Propylaia, seeing that Hdt. certainly lived long enough to have visited or heard tell of the great building of Mnesicles. It is possible that as originally written the passage referred to an earlier Entrance, but was left untouched, as equally applicable to the later. It may also be observed that Hdt. in describing the siege of the Akropolis in 489 B.C. speaks three times of the πύλαι (8. 61-63), but nowhere of Athenian πρὸτρόπλαυα save in this passage. The Ἀθηναῖ. πολ. c. 15 has τὸ πρὸτρόπλαυ τῆς ἄκροπολίνος of the time of Peisistratos. On the Propylaia see Harrison and Verrall, Mythology and Monuments, pp. 353 ff., Curtius, Studia, pp. 147 ff.

21. ἔθνα. By good fortune a fragment of this inscription is extant, C.I.A. 1. 334, Hicks, Manual, No. 27. The character of the letters shows that the inscription is not older than about 445 B.C. It was a reproduction of an older inscription. Cp. C. I. A. iv. 2, 334 a. The whole trophy may have been a reproduction: that a bronze quadriga escaped the spoiler and the fire in 480 B.C., and the ‘restorer’ later, seems improbable. The situation in 446-5 B.C. (Thuc. 1. 113) would account for a good deal of the interest taken in the older story, for its revival, and commemoration. That the inscription was cut in his own day is not suggested by Hdt., still less that he had ever seen the Akropolis without the Quadriga, or the Quadriga without the inscription. But then the Propylaia are mentioned in an equally casual fashion. Hdt. conceived himself to be writing history not compiling a guide-book.

Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδῶν. The way
δεσμοῦ ἐν ἀχλυνώσει σιδηρῶν ἐσβεσαν ὑβρίν
tῶν Ἰπποὺς ἐκάτατην Παλλάν τάσ[σε] ἔθεσαν.

78 Ἀθηναίοι μὲν νυν ἡτξύντο. δὴνοὶ δὲ οὐ κατ’ ἐν μούνον ἀλλὰ
πανταχὺ ἢ ἱσγγροὴ ὡς ἔστι χρῆμα σπουδαῖον, εἰ καὶ Ἀθηναίοι
tυραννεύμενοι μὲν οὐδαμῶν τῶν σφέας περιοικοῦτον ἦσαν τὰ
πολλίμα ἀμέλους, ἀπαλαξθέντες δὲ τυράννων μακρὸ πρῶτοι
5 ἐγένοντο. δὴνοὶ δὲν ταῦτα ὅτι κατεχόμενοι μὲν ἐθελοκάσεον ὡς
δεσποτῆς ἐργαζόμενοι, ἐλευθεροθέντων δὲ αὐτῶς ἐκαστὸς ἐνωτὸ
προεθυμέτο κατεργάζεσθαι.

in which the 'Chalkideis' are co-
ordinated with the Boeotians is a good
testimony to the importance of the
city. It was a great metropolis. Bergk reads
ἐν πολέμῳ, bello confecto and ἄγνωστον
(after Hecker) "non carcer quidem
tenebrosum sed poterat, non forsan
vincula." Codices AB have ἄγνωστον
and C has ἄγνωστη. ἄγνωστος ἄγνως.
The quatrains is the composition of
Simonides; see Bergk, Pros. Lyr. iii.4
477.
24. τῶν, without the ἄτα. Cp. c. 59
supra.

78. ἡτξυνό. The tense is remark-
able. The ἄγνωστα had taken place before
they could erect such monuments. Cp. c.
68 supra Ἀθηναίαι, ἑὼναι καὶ τὸν μεγάλα,
tότε ἀπαλαξθέντα τυράννων ἐγένοντο
μέφερον. This c. 78 might be expected
to close the digression, introduced c. 65
ad fin. ῥήμα δὲ κτλ.

2. ἱσγγροή, political equality:
liberty. The symptom for the essence.
Compare the account of the rise of
Sparta 1. 66.

ἐν κτλ. Hdt.'s logic is a little at
fault. His argument goes to prove that
tyranny has everywhere, even at Athens,
a bad effect, but not directly that
ἰσγγροὴ has everywhere a good effect.
For we cannot suppose him to mean
that the Athenians were the last men
in the world of whom superiority was
to be expected (cp. 1. 60). The argu-
ment is interesting as (1) positing a
close relation between the domestic
institutions and the foreign policy and
fortunes of a state, (2) ascribing military
success to the democratic spirit and
constitution. The first position, which
is here rather implied in the particular
instance than expressly formulated,
became a commonplace of Greek
political philosophy, and is well
illustrated in Polybius' remarks on
the Spartan and Roman constitutions:
Bk. 6. 3 ff. The second is more dis-
putable: and with the judgment of
Hdt. may be connected the judgment
put by Thucydides into the mouth of
Kleon, Bk. 3. 37, though the παράνοε
here ascribed to the Athenians is not of
course quite the same as the capacity
for ἀρχή there denied of them, as a
democracy. Great military success, or
at least conquest, has generally been
associated with monarchic government,
for obvious reasons, cp. c. 3 supra:
and the success of Rome (not exactly a
democracy by the way) is no real ex-
ception to the rule, regard being had to
the special circumstances of the case.
But success in the petty warfare of the
Greek states might well go to the most
high-spirited body of citizen-soldiers:
whether ἱσγγροὴ could acquire or main-
tain an empire was another question.

3. ἱσγγράκειν κτλ. This passage
reads rather like an economical than
like a political formula. It is to be
remembered that, although here are
so clearly stated the effects of servitude
and freedom respectively on labour,
the ancient world never rose to the
application of this principle to domestic
and predial slavery. Ancient writers
tended to isolate the political from
the economical problem, as some
moderns have isolated the economic
from the political. With the judgment
of Hdt. on the effects of liberty Stein
cpe. Hippokrates de aer. 23.

7. κατεργάζεσθαι, 'to achieve suc-
cess,' cp. c. 24 supra.

8. ἵστρατον, imperfect; the action
being subsequent to that implied in
ἡτξυνό supra ad init.
79. Οὔτος μὲν νυν ταῦτα ἔπρησαν. Ὁθβαιῶν δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐς 79
θέου ἔτεμπων, Βουλόμενων τίσασθαι Ἀθηναίοις. ἢ δὲ Πυθῆν ἀπὸ
σφέων μὲν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔφη αὐτοῖς ἵναι τίσιν, ἐς πολὺφθηνον δὲ
ἐξενεκταντι ἐκεῖνοι τῶν ἀγχιστὰ δέσσαται. ἀπελθύνον τῶν τε
θεσπρώπων, ἐξέφερον τὸ χρηστήριον ἄληθεν πυρσάμενοι· ὡς ἐπιν-5
θανόντο δὲ λεγόμενοι αὐτῶν τῶν ἀγχιστά δέσσαται, εἰπάν οἱ Θβαιοὶ
αὐκούσαντες τούτων "οὐκ ἄγχιστα ἡμέων οἰκέουσιν Τανγραγοί
tε καὶ Κορωναῖοι καὶ Θεσπηλέες; καὶ οὔτοι γε ἂμ ἡμῶν αἰεὶ μα-
χάμενοι προβάσμιοι συνδιαφέρουσι τοῦ πόλεμου· τὰ δὲ τούτων γε
δέσσαται; ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον μὴ οὐ τούτῳ ἢ τὸ χρηστήριον." τοιαύτα 80
ἐπιλεγομένων εἰπε δὴ κατε μαθῶν τις "ἔγιν ἡ μοι δοκεῖ συνείπα
τὸ θέλει λέγειν ἡμῖν τὸ μαντηῖον. Ἀσωποῦ λέγονται γενισθαί
θυγατέρες Ἡβης τε καὶ Ἀλκινά· τουτέστιν ἀδελφῶν ἐνεὐσέρων δοκεῖ

80. 2. εἰπε δὴ, στ. 6. 37 μήγισ κοτέ
μαθῶν τοῖς παρατηρήτοις εἰτε.
3. θέλει, στ. 6. 37 τὸ θέλει τὸ ἐστί
eιτε.
4. Ἀσωποῦ in the mouth of a Boc-
tonian might be supposed to refer to
the well-known Boeotian stream; but
at least two other historic streams bore
the same name, and were probably con-
founded in legend with the Boeotian;
the Asopos of Trachis 7. 199 et al.,
and the still better known Asopos of
Achaia: in honour of which last
no doubt was named Asopodoros the
Philiasian hipparch at Plataea in 479
n.c., 9. 69. The Asopides fathered
upon these streams were numerous.
Apolodoros, Bibliothec 3. 12, 6, ascribes
two sons and twenty daughters to
Asopos. Beside the two here named
the most important would be Korikya.
This at least was the Philiasian view:
s ρ. Παυσανίας 2. 5, 2, the Philians
claiming all three nymphs for their
own Asopos.
Λέγονται. The anecdote and inter-
pretation are important as illus-
trating the utilisation of mythical be-
liefs for political purposes. Сτ. с. 67 supra.
4. Ἡβη καὶ Ἀλκινά: so Pindar,
Isth. 7 (8), 55 ff.—
χρῆ δὲ ἐν ἐκπαιδείᾳ Ἰθάιας πραγμάτων
Ἀλκινᾶς χαρίτων ἄτων προνομίων,
πατρὸς δὲ σύνετο ἡμῖν γένεσιν θυγατέρας·
Ἀσωπών
ὑπόλογοι
ἐπιλαταὶ Ἡβη τοῦ ἄδων βασιλέως.
Here, moreover, Thbe and Aigina are
twins and the latest-born daughters of
5 ἦμων Αἰγινητῶν δέσθαι τῶν θεῶν χρῆσαι τιμωρητήριον γενέσθαι. καὶ οὐ γὰρ τις ταύτης ἀμείναν τρωμή εὔδοκε φαίνεται, αἰτία πέμψαντες ἐδῶντο Αἰγινητῶν ἐπικαλείμενοι κατὰ τὸ χρηστήριον σφι βοηθέει τις ἐντὸν ἄρχοντα. οἱ δὲ σφι αἰτεοῦσιν ἐπικουρίαν τοὺς Αἰακίδας συμπέμπτεις ἐθασάντας, πειρασμένοι δὲ τῶν Ἡθαίων κατὰ τὴν συμμαχίαν τῶν Αἰακίδων καὶ τρηγέως περιεβαθέντων ἤπε τῶν Ἀθηναίων, αὐτοί οἱ Ἡθαιοί πέμψαντες τοὺς μὲν Αἰακίδος σφι ἀπεδίσαν, τῶν δὲ ἀνδρῶν ἐδῶντο. Αἰγινῆται δὲ εὐδαιμονίη τε μεγάλη ἐπαρθέντες καὶ ἱσθρής παλαίσι ἀναμιμθέντες ἐχοῦσις ἐς Ἀθηναίους, τῶν Ηθαιοί δεσθέντων τόλμων ἄκρυκον Ἀθη-

Aigina was carried away by Zeus to the island previously named Oenone (8. 46), where she becomes mother of Aiakos, Apollodor. 3. 12. 6. The Rape of Aigina was a subject of frequent occurrence in art: at Olympia, Pausan. 5. 22. 4. A bronze Zena and Aigina at Delphi, id. 10. 13. 3: both offerings of the Phliasians.

9. τοὺς Αἰακίδας. (Images of) the sons of Aiakos. Aias and Telamon were located in Salamis (8. 64). (Salamis indeed was a daughter of Asopos: Schol. Pind. Ol. 6. 144.) Aiakos and the other Aiakides in Aigina (8. 64, 88, 84). On the benefit of images, cp. c. 75 supra.

31. 2. τῶν Αἰακίδων after συμμαχίαν. Aiakos and the Aiakides were at home in Athens too, and could scarcely be expected to give efficient aid to the enemies of Athens. One of the new Phylæae already bore the name of Aias, cp. c. 88 supra, and its Demi were specially thick towards Boeotia; cp. Milh. hefier, op. cit. p. 34. Miltiades son of Kypselos and rival of Peisistratos traced his descent from Aiakos 6. 35, and there was a τὸμας dedicated to Aiakos during, or before, the war with Aigina, c. 89 supra. Is it possible that the localisation of the Aiantis was determined with a view to the struggle with Boeotia and Aigina? 4. τῶν σικεία, σικεία, βασιλεία being constructed with a double genitive, cp. 3. 157.

ἀνδρῶν. As distinguished from the ξένον. Cp. c. 63 supra.

εὐδαιμονίη μεγάλη ἐπαρθένεις. A reason in Herodotean ethics for expecting a catastrophe. Cp. c. 28 supra. An Athenian scandal afterwards traced the origin of Aigineta prosperity to their receiving stolen goods from the Helots at Platae, and cheating the thieves, 9. 80. But the commercial prosperity of Aigina was of long standing. The Aiginetans had a separate ‘close’ (dedicated to Zeus) in Naukratis (2. 178). The wealth of Sostratos of Aigina was proverbial 4. 152. The ‘Aiginetan’ coinage, weights and measures, attested the early wealth and commercial importance of the island, even if at the time in political dependence on Argos, cp. 6. 127. The decline of Argos was accompanied and perhaps in part caused by the emancipation of Aigina, which may probably be connected with the fall of the tyrann. The Thalassokratia of Aigina is dated by O. O. Müller (Aeginetiorum Liber, p. 88), following and amending Caster, for the twenty years antecedent to the psephism of Themistocles (7. 144), but the date is artificial. The odes of Pindar composed for private Aiginetan patrons—there are eleven extant, falling between 491-450 B.C. (cp. Metager’s Pindars Siegeslieder, pp. 324-419)—attest the wealth of the island before its subjugation by Athens. See further, Appendix VIII.

5. ἀμαρνηθέντας. That they had actually forgotten it, is not likely. However ancient its origin, the feud would not have been out of remembrance in the days when Peisistratos was settling Salamis, purifying Delos, promoting Naxos, befriending Eretria.

ἐχοῦσις ἐς. A nautical metaphor, specially suitable in this context; cp. 6. 92 Ἀγινήται νέες . . . ἄγκοι . . . ἐς τὴν Ἀγολίδα χώρας, cp. c. 53 supra. Other passages (1. 191, 2. 53, 6. 2) show that ἄγκοι ἐς can be used without the metaphorical suggestion—as is natural with a verb so abstract as ἔχων.

6. τὸλμων ἄκρυκον, 'a war without heralds' may be (1) a war without
formal notice, (2) an implaceable war (ἀπόστασις καὶ ἀπέρωτος), (3) an irregular guerrilla war. The theory, partly based upon this passage, that all wars in Greek history were formally 'declared' is exaggerated: a similar theory obtained in regard to modern times, until disproved by Colonel J. F. Maurice’s official pamphlet, Hostilities without Declaration of War, London, 1853.

8. μακρυᾶς νησίων, war-galleys or long-boats (ships): cp. 1. 163 (στρόγγυλαι).


9. παραλή is technical. Cp. ‘Ἀθ. πολ. c. 21. The Demi here mentioned are of the Kleisthenic organisation: and Phaleron belonged to the Alantis.

10. ἤσυνεκτό is more forcible than the vulgate ἤσυνεκτότα. Cp. 3. 108 ὡ ἄγων ἄνυχα ἑσύραν τοὺς παλλὶν πάντων ἀξίστατοι αμόστοι τὰς μῆτρας: αἰσθησὶς τε ὑπὸ πολλὸν μᾶλλον ἐσυκεῖται καταγράφον (v. 1. καταγράφον).

82. 2. τουῦδαν. There follows the story of the origin of the feud between the Aigionetas and Athenians (cc. 82-88). The feud begins according to Hult. in a feeling of hostility from the Aigionetas to the Athenians, ἐς Ἀθηναίους ἐκ τῶν Ἀγιοντῶς (c. 52), and ends by an ἔρμον of the Athenians to the Aigionetas, τῷ πρὸς Ἀγιοντᾶς Ἀθηναίους (c. 89). The ἔρμον τῆς ἔρμος is obviously conceived as long prior to the πολέμου ἀκομάτως of 606 B.C. or later. It would be interesting to determine its date, if possible. If we were dealing with a tradition free from anachronisms, and of historical contents, we should be taken back to an age when statues were made of wood; when no olives were to be found save in Attica; when Aigion was still subject to Epidauros; when Athenian women still wore the woollen Dorian tunic αὐτίκος, not having yet adopted the χειμώνιος θησαύρος or ἀμυντή. There are genuine archaic notes in the story (the wooden θῆσαυρα, the primitive divinities, and a dim memory of relations between Athens and Epidauros): there are equally obvious anachronisms (the trireme, the system of jurisdiction, the constitutional terminology, perhaps the votive offerings). But the archaic notes are so as to speak material, while the anachronisms concern merely points of expression or form. The supernatural touches, the motive of which is apparent, enhance the value of the story, or rather of the versions. Possibly the rivalry of Athens and Aigion went back to pre-Dorian days, when both were members of the Kalaurian Amphiktyony; and the break up of that Confederation, the Dorisation of Aigion, of Epidauros, of Argos, and the secession and survival of Ionia. Athens may underlie or colour the tradition. Cp. Appendix VIII.

4. ἐκλαῖεν. Whether this behest is an Ἀπolline response, or carries us back to the days when the Pythia was the prophet of the Ἀργοστῆρα Βάσις (Aisch. Ἐumen. 2) is an open question.

Δαμή is not the equivalent of Δαμία, as Blakesley makes out. Δαμία and Δαμή are food for speculation. Blakesley takes as equivalent to Δαμία = Δαμής. Rawlinson agrees. Stein connects Damia with δαμία, δαμία, Δαμία, Δαμία with δαμία, and describes the two as agricultural deities (of labour and increase), personifications of the two sides in Demeter: which of course is much the same as Rawlinson’s identification of the two with ‘Ceres and Proserpina.’ Bach’s explanation of Δαμή as the people’s goddess seems absurd, though no doubt Demeter, like Dionysos, and other rural deities, is eminently popular, and democratic (cp. 8. 65); etymologically, however, there may be a connexion between Δηίμος and Δαμία (cp. L & S, sub v. δηίμος).
more fantastic etymology explains δωμα (Kretan έδωμα) as the destructive, αδήσια as the productive Demeter. Damia was known to the Romans, and identified with the Bona Dea, and the cult of the latter was probably affected by the identification. Paulus, p. 68, damium sacrificium, quod sicut in operto in honorem Bonae Deae . . . des quoque ipsa Damia et sacerdos ejus damiatrix appellabatur, quoted in Roscher, Lexicon, 943. There was a festival at Tarantum called Δωμα, Hesych. sub v. The etymology of αδήσια is pretty plain. In any case we have a pair of Chthonian divinities, worshipped with orgiastic rites, and particularly connected with Epidaurus, Trozen, Attica, Old Delphi, Krete, Aigina, Taras, and the west. C.p. further, Roscher, Lexicon, sub vv.

9. λέγεται. Perhaps by the Athenians (cp. s. 65 syncr) who, not content with having the holiest, wanted to have the only olive trees. The formula suggests a doubt, cp. s. 42 supr., 4. 184.

12. τυ "Αθηναϊ, το Ἐρετρα. In the Erechtheum on the Akropolis was the olive tree which according to the Athenians had been set there as a witness or protest by Athens against Poseidon, 8, 55. Erechtheus (father of Erechtheia and so father-in-law to Boreas, 7, 189) once king, and specially king of the 'Athenians' (8, 44), of the earth earthy (8, 55), associated with Athené Polias on the Akropolis under the form of a snake (cp. 8, 41), though real history was, doubtless, condensed round his name, may well have been originally of the Chthonian and arval order, or at least have had a symbolical significance of that kind. Athens too upon some sides is undoubtedly a rural goddess, or at least important relations to climate and seasons, and especially the olive crop. Cp. Curtius, Steady., p. 35. These relations are displayed in the Calendar of Festivals: Skirophoria, Pleytheria, Panathenaea, etc. (Cf. A. Mommsen, Herculaneum, and Roscher, Lex. 883.) But these could hardly be the primary or prominent aspects of Athené Polias; and offerings to the Polias and the King suggest more than a merely physico-religious homage. On Erechtheus, cp. Harrison and Verrall, op. cit. xlvii. f. Cp. also notes s. 79 supra.

14. τυπασμένος, s. 77 supra.

83. 1. Αλγινήται Ἐπιδαιφρον ήκουν. The supremacy of Argos over Aigina would be easier to understand. Did Epidaurians succeed to some of the Argive power (on the fall of the Teneida) Or is the Epidaurian overlordship a false inference from the fact that to get to Argos the men of Aigina would go to Epidaurus? In the days of Periandros there was a tyranny in Epidaurus (3, 50-53) which succumbed to the Corinthian, and this event might have promoted the growth of Aiginetan power.

3. τοις ἀλλήλοις, i.e. suits between two citizens of Aigina were settled before the Epidaurian court. The conditions anticipate and to some extent justify injunctions laid by Athens upon her allies, subjects, colonies, in Hdt.'s own
űtő, but seem somewhat ‘advanced’ for the date here vaguely presupposed.

4. ἀγνωσμός seems the opposite of συνέβη; cp. 4. 93, 6, 10.

5. ὀλισθοκράτες. The ‘thalas-

sokratía’ here asserted might be local and relative to Epidauros.

7. ὑπαρχόντα. In getting the

statues they would get the ditties with the blessings they conferred, and deprive their enemies of the same. On this

rational of idolatry cp. o. 75, 81 supra.

11. ὀλάσκοντα. It is plain that the

Deities were worshipped in Aigion. Cp. c. 88 infra. Halitarmasses was colonised from Trozen 7, 99. Hdt. does not speak here as if these rites were observed in his native place. The number of χοροὺς cannot be inferred with certainty from the number of χοροὺς. The ἀδρο-

prunga might possibly be ceremonies to which men were not admitted. There is no reference in Hdt. to Asklepios and his cult.

84. 3. οὐκ ἔποιεσαν, ‘were failing to

fulfil’ might appear to be the meaning of the words; but Palm’s suggestion σκέιτι is less harsh with the imperfect, and is adopted by van Herwerden.

4. δυν.. ἐκλέπτων. With the

construction, cp. c. n. 73, ll. 9-11 supra.

7. Αἰγυπτίας looks like a gloss; the

sentence would be stronger without it.

85. 1. Λέγουσι. We have here the clear indication of various and conflicting sources from which the story has been
derived: Athenian, Aiginetan, Argive (Epidauran); but not of the means by which Hdt. arrived at them, or whether he was the first to reduce them to writing. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxvii. ff.

2. τριήρει. The first Greek trireme was built according to Thuc. 1, 13 at Corinth, and if Ameinokles was the first builder, the date of the invention might be εἰρά

720 B.C. or during the last quarter of the eighth century. But cp. Cecil Torr, Ancient Ships, p. 4 (1894).

3. ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ. The terminology

is that of the democratic age, but is no
tauta óws sfoférwv xúlwv éonta épeirówn to tōn básbrwv 5 exanasthán, Ína sfeá anákomósontai. Ónyn dynamévous de touto tō tótpo autòv kratíssai, periballontas sychia évkei tā ágál- mata, kai sphi éleuswv brōnti tē kai ēmā tē brōnti sychos wμegevásthē. Tōv de tērīntas tōv éleuswv úpto toutōv allorwvoun, pabhntas de touto kteínei allhlyous apé teolemos, ἐς ὁ ἐκ pánton w̱n laefínta anákomosúthēn auto ét Fálhron.

86 Ἀθηναίοι μέν οὐκ γενέσθαι λέγουσι, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ὁ μὲν ἐμὲ ἀπεκείναι Ἀθηναίοις: μίαν μὲν γάρ καὶ ὅλον πλείνα μής, καὶ εἴ σφαι μὴ ἔτυχον εἶδοσί νέας, ἀπαμώνεσθαι ἄν εὐπέτεως; ἀλλὰ τύλησεν ἑπιστείνον σφόδρα ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν, αὐτὸς δὲ σφι εἶχα 5 καὶ οὐ δυναμήσαι. οὐκ ἔχουσι δὲ τούτῳ διαστημήρα ἀγρείκεος, οὔτε ἦσονες συγγενιζομένου εἰναι τῇ ναμαχῇ κατὰ τοῦτο ἔζηαν, οὔτε ἐβουλόμενον ποιήσαι οἷον τι καὶ ἑποίησαν. Ἀθηναίους μέν νυν, ἔπειτε σφι οὐδεὶς ἐξ μάχην καταστάτο, ἀπόβασθαν ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν τράπεσθαι πρὸς τὰ ἁγίαματα, οὖν δυναμένους δὲ ἀναπαυ- ταί ἐκ τῶν βάθρων αὐτὰ οὔτω δει περισαλομένους σχοινί ἔκειν, ἐς οὖν ἐλκόμενα τὰ ἁγίαματα ἀμφότερα τοῦτο ποίησαι, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν πιστὰ λέγοντες, ἂλλῳ δὲ τεῷ ἐξ οὖνα τῷ σφι αὐτὰ πισεῖν, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τοὐτοῦ χρώμνι διατελέον ἐοτῶ ἔχομεν. Ἀθηναίους μέν δὴ ταύτα ποιεῖν σφέας δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης λέγουσι πυθμένους 15 τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὡς μέλλοιεν ἐπὶ σφέας στρατεύεσθαι, ἐτοίμους Ἀργείους ποιεῖσθαι. τῶν τε δὲ Ἀθηναίους ἀποβεβαῖναι ἐς τὴν

real indication of the epoch or state of the government (note to c. 82 supra). Cp. 6. 60. On the story which follows Rawlinson remarks that similar stories are frequent in Pausanias: see 1. 18, 2 (madness of Agraules and Hesí in consequence of an act of disobedience—not a close parallel); 3. 16, 6 (κ. 9), madness produced by the ἱεράνα of Artemis Orthias at Sparta; 7. 19, 3 μεμερία ἐξ ἀρέπεθεν for a sacrilege. He compares also the tale in Athenaeus p. 672 b, the attempted rape of the statue (βρέτας) of Hera from Samos, and the marvel by which it was prevented—a good parallel, though the Samian story might be merely a fiction to explain the ritualistic washing of the image (cp. Athenian Plyntheria). R. adds the story of the preservation of Delphi, 8. 37, which offers many points of comparison. Such coincidences explain the genesis and discredit the truth of all the narratives alike; nor can any higher probability be claimed for the eldest of the series, when it involves physical absurdities. (Cp. the story cc. 17 ff. supra in which case no physical ineptitudes are involved.)

86. 5. οὐκ ἔχωσι. As if Hdt. had cross-questioned some Aigentians on the subject! He may, however, be repeating Athenian criticism. He seems to prefer the Athenian version, as he points out carefully two weak spots in the Aiginete, and fails to suggest that the other had been dictated by Athenian pride, which preferred to ascribe a defect to the δαμανθως rather than to the men of Argos or Aigina. The case well illustrates one canon of Greek history, as made by the Greeks themselves.


12. γοβητα. The ἱεράνα presumably were kneeling figures, and their attitude lent itself to this interpretation. The βρέτας of Hera (Athenaeus, i.e. supra) not being a kneeling figure became miraculously heavy, and so defeated the intention of the robbers. Cp. c. 88 infra.
18. Ἡ Ἑπίδαφου. The Dorian states Argos, Epidaurus, Aligina appear in league against Athens; for, if Epidaurus had been at the time friendly to Athens, the Athenians would probably have had news of the Argive movement, if it had not altogether frustrated.

87. 4. Ἀργείων. The appearance of the Argives as the authority for the story at this point may be due to the fact that the destruction of the Attic force on land was especially the work of the Argives. It might be conjectured that the Aliginetans were engaged at sea, and that their Peloponnesian allies undertook operations on shore. One survivor in a battle might more or less easily make his way from place to place on dry land (ep. 1. 82 case of Othryades; and the no less immortal case of Dr. Brydon the one survivor who reached Jellalahad from Cabul in 1842); but it would be interesting to know how the one Athenian made his way across the water from Aligina to Attica, unless he was actually sent by the enemy to bear the news (κομαιεὶν ἄρα καὶ τὰς Ἀθηναίας).

11. Ἰματίων. The himation properly so called was an upper garment; for outdoor wear, and it is doubtful whether it was ever fastened with pins or brooches (ep. Blümner in Baumeister's Denkmäler, s. v.); and, by the way, the reference in L. & S. 696 περάσι to Sophokles O. T. 1269 is not to the point, seeing that the garment or garments (ἰματα) there mentioned need not have included an himation. In any case ἰματίων here can scarcely stand for ἰματαίως, unless Ἰδ. is to be charged with superfluous laxity. It is more probable that he slipped in regard to the historical evolution of feminine apparel than as to the correct use of ordinary terms for various articles as worn in his own time. But ep. next note but one, c. 92 ἐνθεία and 1. 9. By ἰματίων he here in any case probably means out-door garments, which he supposed were formerly secured by brooches; and just below he argues, rather loosely, that the long linen chiton was substituted for the short woolen chiton in the dress of Athenian women, in order that pins and brooches might be discarded altogether.

88. 2. τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἔργον. An act worthy of Lemnians (see 6. 138). But for the horror of the Athenians, and the consequent change of fashion, it might have been suspected that this act of the women was historical, and even the execution of a judicial sentence. In any case the fate of this nameless Athenian forms a remarkable parallel, by anticipation, to the lynching of Lykidas in 479 B.C. as narrated 9. 5. For the latter only the men were responsible; and no horror seems to have been felt.
4. ἔφορος. The history of woman's dress here indicated is simple. Originally all Hellenic women wore vestments of the same stuff and pattern, viz. of woollen stuff and fastened with pins, clasps, or brooches; subsequently the long Karian linen chiton was introduced by the Ionians (presumably from Asia) and adopted by the Athenians; the two types were then contrasted as Ionian and Dorian.

As a native of an Ionised Doric colony in Karia Hdt. ranks as a good authority on this subject; but it must be questioned whether his historical sketch is either complete or accurate. Only by an undue restriction of the term Hellenic could the primitive dress of Hellenic women be identified with the Dorian chiton; the Hemic Poplos, the representation of the under garment on early vases, resembles rather the long (Ionian) chiton. Nor is it quite clear whether Hdt. is speaking of the upper or under garment, or of both; though in c. 87 the σεβόμενα are taken from the ἰδία. (Blümer, in Baumeister’s Denkmäler, p. 786, seems to identify Hdt.’s Ionian kramin with a costume made up of two garments, while evidently sceptical as to the correctness of Hdt.’s statement.) Nor does it appear that the long (linen) chiton always dispensed with σεβόμενα, and in any case the statement that the Athenians adopted the long chiton in order to get rid of the τοίχων τῶν ισωρίων is somewhat inconsequent. It is to be observed that Thucydides, a better authority for Athenian fashions, has a complementary note on the history of men’s dress at Athens, 1. 6. The men had recently given up wearing the old-fashioned linen chiton and adopted the Dorian. Thucydides seems to imply that the so-called ‘Ionian’ chiton was properly ‘Attic’; on this point Hdt. is probably nearer the truth. This passage has of course extraordinary interest as the oldest extant deliberate essay on the history of Greek dress, a subject into the earlier chapters of which historic light has but lately fallen. The evidence now available is mainly the archaic pottery (Mykenean and early Attic), and goes to show, inter alia, that Hdt.’s account of the matter is much too simple. Nor can it well be supposed that it was on a carefull examination of such evidence that his account was based. For the recent growth of knowledge in this department cp. Blümmer, in Hermann’s Lehrbuch, iv. §§ 21, 22 (1882), Helbig, Das Homerische Epos, 1884 (2nd Ed. 1887), Boehlau, Quaestiones de re vestiarum Oracorum, 1884, Studniczka, Beiträge z. Geschichte der altg. Tracht, 1886, Evans (Lady), Chapters on Greek Dress (1894).

11. νόρμα. There are three customs here stated to have been instituted in consequence of this feud with Athens: (1) the enlargement of the pins, (2) the practice of offering these large pins to Damia and Auresia, (3) the exclusion of Attic wares from the cult. The last may possibly be an undue statement and pseudo-explanation of a commercial measure or custom for the protection of native wares from Attic competition. The pins or brooches were no doubt common offerings to the goddesses perhaps before marriage (Stein op. 4. 34) or childbirth. (Hence the kneeling posture of the figures. Welcker as quoted by Stein refers to the kneeling Elleithyia at Tegae, Pausan. 8. 48, 7, and the description of Leto, Hymn. ad Apoll. 117.) The ritualistic facts are probably correct: the reasons given therefor highly suspicious.

12. ἐνδότεσσα. middle. Cp. c. 82 supra.
μήτε τε ἄλλα προσφέρειν πρὸς τὸ ἱρὸν μήτε κέραμον, ἀλλ’ ἐκ χυτρίδων ἐπιχωρίων νόμον τὸ λαοῦν αὐτόθι εἶναι πῖνειν.

15 'Ἀργείων μὲν νῦν καὶ Ἀιγαντέων αἱ γνώσεις ἐκ τούτου κατ’ ἐκ τήν Ἀθηναίων περίποις ἐτί καὶ ἐς ἑμὲ εἴρησεν μέζους ἢ πρὸ τοῦ, τῆς δὲ ἐχθρῆς τῆς πρὸς Ἀιγυμνὰς ἐς Ἀθηναίων γενομένης ἀρχῆς κατὰ τὰ ἔρημα ἐγγένετο. τότε δὲ Ἑθαλεῶν ἐπικαλεομένων, προφανέστερον τούτῳ τὰ ἀγάλματα γενομένων ἀναμμυθηκόμενοι οἱ 5 Ἀιγυμνάται ἐβοήθησαν τούτῳ Βοιωτοῖς. Ἀιγυμνάται τε δὴ ἐδόησιν τῆς Ἀττικῆς τὰ παραβαλλόμενα, καὶ Ἀθηναίοις ὀρμημένοις ἐτεῖον Ἀιγυμνάται στρατεύεσθαι ἦλθε μαυτήραν ἐς Δελφῶν, ἐπισχύταις ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀιγυμνάτεων ἀδικου ὑπηκοούσα ἐπωκεῖα, τὸ ἐνὶ καὶ τρικεκτοῦ Ἀιακὸ τέμενος ἀποδέχοντο ἀρχηγοῖ τοῦ πρὸς Ἀιγυμνάτας πολέμου, καὶ σφυρήσαν τὰ βουλεύται. ἦν δὲ αὐτίκα ἐπιστρατεύονται, πολλὰ μὲν σφετερά ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τοῦ χρόνου πείσασθαι πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ποιήσαν, τῶν μὲν καταστρέφονται. ταῦτα ὡς ἄπειρα ἤκουσαν οἱ Ἀθηναίοι, τοῦ μὲν Ἀιακὸ τέμενος ἀπῄδεψεν τοὺτο τὸ νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἱδρυταῖς, τριήμεροῦ δὲ ἐτεῖον ὡς ἀνέρχοντα ἄκουσαν ἄρεσθαι ἐνὶ ἐπιστρεφεῖν πεπονθότας ἡν Ἀιγυμνάτεων ἀναρίσα. ἐς τιμορίην δὲ παρασκευασμένοις αὐτοῖς πρὸ τοῦ Ἀιακομηνίων πρήγμα ἐγείρομεν ἐμπόδιον ἐγένετο. πιθα-
been created by the relations at Sardes, cp. c. 96 infra, and Appendix VIII. § 3.

3. Ἀλεκάδαμονοι. Kings, Ephors, Gerasia, Apella. Kleomenes was presumably in favour of the policy, but Hdt. unfortunately throws no light upon the constitutional procedure. From the analogous case in 432 B.C. it might be conjectured that the matter was settled in the Spartan Apella, before the allies were summoned to vote. Cp. Thuc. 1. 67, 79, 87, 119.

τα ἐκ τ. 'Α., cc. 62, 63, 66 supra.

4. τα ἐκ τ. Π. τ., c. 63 supra.

7. χάρις. The 'ingratitude' of the Athenians consisted in their not conducting their affairs in subordination to Spartan interests, c. 91 infra. States have been guilty of similar 'ingratitude' within living memory!

8. χρησμός. These oracles, if authentic, would seem to imply that, under the Peisistratid, Athens was already entering into competition with Sparta, or at least looking forward thereto. Or were these oracles—'left in the temple by the Peisistratid's'—intended to alarm the Spartans and promote just such a reaction as is here described? That they were not of Delphic origin is obvious. On Peisistratid piety cp. c. 50 supra, and as a later example of a prophecy of similar content cp. 8. 141, later, that is, unless the oracle there cited belong to the date of Athenian overtures to the Medes (c. 73 supra).

91. τα ἐκ τ. 'Αττικόν. This sentence, ascribing a truly Machiavellian policy and morality to the Lakedaemonians, is more in the mode of Thucydides. It can hardly be an uninspired observation on the part of Hdt., still less one suggested by a Spartan source. It is, perhaps, an Athenian view, and contrasts with the taunt of ἄβαθος πρὸς τὰ ἔξω πάργαμα brought against the Spartans by the Corinthian orator in Thuc. 1. 68. A small oligarchy, indeed, Sparta preferred to the tyranny, as she showed abundantly in the Peloponnesian war and thereafter; but her essential objection to the tyranny was strictly local, for Laconia, or at most Peloponnessos, and did not extend to Attica, Sicily, or Macedonia, much less to merely 'barbarous' nations.

τό γίνοι τό 'Αττικόν. This phrase may be taken to mark the repudiation of Ionism. Cp. 1. 57, 59 (το 'Αττικόν ἔθνος) and c. 69 supra.


7. Σῖγιον. Cp. oc. 65 supra, 94 infra. The topographical indication here is less precise than there. There seems to have been no other Sigeion. ἐς δ' κτλ. del. Wesseling.
καταφέρουν οἱ Πεισιστράτιδαι]. ἔπειτ' ἐς τὴν Ἰππίην καλεόμενον ἔλεγον τὸν Ἰππίην καλεόμενον ἢκε, μεταπεμφάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων ἄγρευτος ἐλεγόν σφι Σπαρτηκήτας τάδε. "ἀνδρεῖς σύμμαχοι, συγγενισκόμενοι τὸ αὐτοῖς ἢμῖν ous ποιήσατε ὁρθῶς· ἐπαρθήντες γὰρ κυβερνοῦντες μαντηλοῦσι ἄνδρας ξένους ἐχόντες ἢμῖν τὰ μάλιστα καὶ ἀνάδεκμενον ὑποχειρίας παρέβειν τὸς Ἀθηναίων, τούτους ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος ἐξηλάσαμεν, καὶ ἐπείτα ποιήσαστε ταῦτα ὑμῖν ἀχαρίστ το τρέφομεν τὴν πόλιν· ἐν ἐπείτε ἐν ἡμέρας έλευθεροθεῖς ἀνέκυψε, 13 ἡμέρας μὲν καὶ τὸν βασιλέα ἡμέος περιπρήσας ἐξῆλθε, δόξαν δὲ φύσαν αὐξάνεται, ὡστε ἐκείμην ἡμᾶς μάλιστα μὲν οἱ περιοικοὶ αὐτῶν Βοιωτοὶ καὶ Χαλκίδες, τάχα δὲ τις καὶ ἄλλος ἐκμαθήσαται ἀμαρτώματι. ἐπείτε δὲ ἐκείνα ποιήσαστε ἡμάρτομεν, νῦν περισσόμενα σφέας ἀμα ὑμῖν ἀπεκόμενον τίσαδαν αὐτῶν ἡμῖν τοῦτον ἐκ τὴν Ἰππίην μετεπεμφάμεθα καὶ ἡμέος ἀπὸ τῶν πολιων, ἵνα κοινὸ τε λόγον καὶ κοινὸ στόλο ἔσαγαμοντες αὐτῶν ἐς τὸς Ἀθηναίων ἀποδόμενα τὰ καὶ ἀπευλόμεθα." Οἱ μὲν ταῦτα ἔλεγον, τῶν δὲ συμμάχων τὸ πλῆθος οὐκ ἐνδεδεύτηκεν τὸῦ λόγους. οἱ μὲ οὖν ἄλλοι ἥσυχην ἦσαν, Κορίνθιος δὲ Σωκλῆς ἐπέδεικτε τάδε. "ἡ δ' ἡ τοῦ ὀφραντοῦ ἐνεβρίσεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ γῆ μετέφεραι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀφραντοῦ, καὶ ἄνθρωποι νομὸν ἐν θαλάσσῃ ἔχουσι καὶ ἱθύνες τοῦ πρώτου ἄνθρωπος, ὅτε γε ἡμεῖς ἧμεν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐν τῷ στάθμῳ πολεμοῦντος, διὰ τοῦτον ἐνθάματον ἔτη ὁμολογοῦμεν τούτοις πολλοῖς τῷ ἐκ τῆς Ἰππίης ἀκμάζων μὲν ἡμέρας ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ ἐν τῷ ιστορίῳ τῇ ἔνδοξῇ τῇ ἐπίσκεψι πολεμοῦντος, καὶ καταστρόφωσαν τρίτῳ ἔτει τῇ Αθηναίων ἐπικράτειαν μὲν ἡμέος ἀποδόμασθαν τὰ καὶ ἀπευλόμεθα." 9. τῶν ἄλλων συμμαχῶν : 'the allies as well.' Σφημ. τ. 32 supra, 4. 191. 10. Σπάρτηκας. The speech shows that the king himself was not the spokesman: not of course that the speech is authentic: it has a clear Attic sound (επ. τάξια δὲ τα κλπ.) 13. ὑποχειρίας παρέβειν τὸς Ἀθηναίων. Such a condition in Athens never suited the interest of Corinth, better served by a balance of power within and without the Peloponnesus. Hence the line taken by Corinth on this occasion, and many others. Σφημ. τ. 75 supra, 93 ὕψιστα. 14. δήμῳ ἄχριτων. Σφημ. τ. 90 supra. 17. ἄλλωστε. Σφημ. τ. 75 supra, 78 ὕψιστα. The establishment of the democracy and the growth of the power of Athens fully justified the apprehensions here dramatically expressed, which make it wonderful, not that Sparta moved reluctantly to the help of Athens against the Persian, but that she moved at all. But both her inaction and her action are thoroughly intelligible. See Appendix VII. § 11. 20. Van H. reads σφημα δια ὑμῶν διεδεχόμενον partially justified by διεδεχόμενον for διεδεχόμενον in VI, but against ap (Holder). 92. 1. οὐκ ἐνδεδεύτηκεν τούτοις λόγοις, 'was for rejecting the proposals.' Σφημ. τ. 96, 98 ὕψιστα, τῶν λόγων 108 ὕψιστα, διάκεισθαι 6. 13. 3. τάδε. The contrast between Hdt. and Thuc., and the types of almost contemporary culture which they respectively represent, is nowhere more conspicuous than in the speeches introduced in their several narratives. Even in his speeches Hdt. does not always cease to be a story-teller (cp. 6. 86), nor his style decline from the ἐφοβηκη λέξει, least of all in this, his longest oration. A certain air of authenticity is lent by the introduction of the speaker's name: but that this device is no final guarantee is proved by the parallel case of the speeches 3. 50 E. (Deliberation of the seven Persians on the best form of government). That Socrates is an historical person need not be doubted, still less that the Corinthians on this occasion led the opposition to Sparta. § a l. 5. οὐρανός. The οὐρανός is here apparently conceived as a solid and im-
ο Ἀλκεδαμόνος ἤγεραις καταλύνοντες τυραννίδας ἐσ τὰς πόλεις κατάγειν παρασκευάζει, τοῦ οὖτε ἀδικότερον ἐστὶ οὐδὲν κατ' ἀνθρώπους οὔτε μαμφονότερον, εἰ γὰρ δὴ τούτο γε δοκεῖ ὡμόν εἶναι χρηστὸν ἥττῃς τυραννίσθαι τὰς πόλεις, αὐτῷ πρῶτοι τούτων καταστάσεων παρὰ σφῖς αὐτοῖς ὦτω καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις διήθησθαι κατιστάναι· γάρ δὲ αὐτῶι τυραννῶν ἀπεργοί ἐστε, καὶ φυλάσσοντες τοῦτο δεινότατα ἐν τῇ Ἑσπαρτῇ μὴ γενέσθαι, παραχράσθη ἐς τοὺς συμμάχους, εἰ δὲ αὐτῶς ἐμπεριοὶ ἔστε κατὰ περὶ ἑμεῖς, εἴχετε ἄν περὶ αὐτῶν γνώμας ἀμείνονος συμβαλεῖ·

β') οὐδὲν ἐντούς. Κορυφίωσε γάρ ἢν πόλιος κατάστασις τούτη· ἢν ὀλεγαρχία, καὶ οὕτως Βακχικάδαι καλείμενοι ἐνέμον τῷ πόλιν,

movable hemisphere: the γῆ (here including θάλασσα) presumably as a flat surface. This may be taken to indicate the conception of Hdt. himself. Op. 4. 36.

6. Ἰσοκρατία. Free constitutions, *República.* The term would probably have included both oligarchy (aristocracy) and democracy. A Corinthian can hardly be supposed to be pleading the cause of democracy as such. Op. ἰσοτροφία as used c. 78 ἐπίσχησις, ἰσοτροφία 3. 142. The conduct of the Corinthians themselves did not always correspond to the liberal sentiments here ascribed to them. Op. their restoration of Evarchos at Astakos in 431 B.C., Thuc. 2. 33. (The Athenians were not in a position to complain: op. Thuc. 1. 111, εἰς αὐτό ἐπέλευσε.)

7. τοῦ, sc. χρόνου, i.e. τυραννίδας out of the plural preceding, not, of course, what the grammar rather demands, τοῦ κατάγειν κλ. The speaker’s excitement is beyond grammar. Op. c. 55 ἐπίσχησις.

11. τυραννῶν ἀπεργοί. The Spartans in their own case had almost as little (and as late) experience of the Tyrannia as the Corinthians of Democracy. Not until the days of the usurping adventurers, Lykurgos, Machanidas and Nabis (to waive the cases of Agis IV. and Kleomenes III.), did the Tyrannia technically occupy Sparta. Op. Plass, *Die Tyrannis* (1859), ii. pp. 171 ff. C. Peter, Gr. Zeitsschr., ad ann. 195-192 n.c. But the Spartans, of course, knew perfectly well the reputed and the real effects of Tyranny, and for that very reason were anxious to avoid it at home, and to re-establish it in Athens; c. 91 ἐπίσχησις.

12. φυλάσσοντες κτλ. This was undoubtedly one of the guiding principles of Spartan policy, for the danger was there. Hence the treatment of Kleomenes, Proxanias, perhaps Leotychides and others. Hence, indeed, the very maintenance of the dual kingdom. The remark of the speaker implies that the Spartans had knowledge of the nature of the Tyranny, even if they had no empirical knowledge, and thus renders his subsequent narrative superfluous. But the whole argument is beside the point: the Corinthian had to show that it was against Sparta’s interests to establish a Tyrant in Athens; this he fails, he does not even attempt, to do—except in so far as his attitude shows the hostility of Corinth to the Spartan proposal. The fact probably is that Hdt. takes occasion to put on record a good story, or rather three good stories (1) the preservation of Kyperos, (2) the advice of Thrasyllos, (3) the ghost of Melissas.

§ 5 & 15. ἢν, and was again in the speaker’s own day: but the Bakchidæa were no longer in possession, and the hateful name of oligarchy was perhaps avoided. The Bakchidæa régime supplies a good example of the ἰσοτροφία of Thuc. 3. 62.

τόλοις κατάτασει = πολειτεία, so in technical writers (e.g. Ἀθ. πολ. c. 41 et passim).

16. Βακχικάδαι. The rationalised synthesis of traditions on the subject was to this effect. Under Aletes, the Heraclid, the Dorians had made good their position in Corinth. (Op. Thuc. 4. 42, Pausan. 2. 4.) The fourth king in descent from Aletes was named Bakchis. His power was so great that the clan took his name. After a succession of four more kings royalty gave way to
εἰδίσσαν δὲ καὶ ἣγοντο ἐξ ἀλλήλων. Ἀμφίων δὲ ἦσσε τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν γίνεται θυγάτηρ χωλῆ· οὔσα μὲν ἦσσε αἱ Ἀδάμμοι, ταῦτα μὲν ἐφικάδε τὸν Σερέκλατον, δίμου μὲν εὖν ἐκ Πέτρου, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνέκδοτων Δαπίθης 20 τε καὶ Καυνίης. ἐκ δὲ ταῦτας τις γυναικὸς ὑπὲρ ἐξ ἀλλήλων παιδέος ἐγένετο. ἔστη δὲ ἦν ἃς Δελφοὺς περὶ γῆνος. ἔστητα δὲ αὐτῶν ἦν ἡ Παυκὴ προσαγόρευτη τούτων τοῖς ἐπεσεῖς.

'Ἡτίων, οὕτως σε τίποτε πολλύτιτον ἐστα. 

Δάμδα κυίς, τέξεις ἃς δυσλογία χοιρονευομεν ἐν δὲ πεσοῖται ἀνδράται μοινάρχοισι, δεκαείσι τε καὶ Κόρινθοι.

ολίγαρχας ἐκ Βακχιάδων ἐνυατ- 

tὸν ἠγοντες Παυμρα. Ἡ. Diodorus 7. 19 


on reckons only one annual Pytianis. 

Nicolas Damasc. 66, ed. Dindorf, v. 1, 

p. 48 might be interpreted as implying a 

Polemarch as well) (c. 747 n.c.). The 

Bakshali oligarchy lasted until it was 

overthrown by Kypselos, ninety years 

after. The two hundred years 390 to 

of Strabo, 378, perhaps = ninety years + 

four generations), or may have come in 

from the Bakhchadas. See also Diodoros 

i.e. See, further, 

Smith's Dict. Biography, i. 450, 

Geography, i. 675, G. Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 

ii. 87 ff., Busolt, Gr. G. i. 442 ff., I. 631 ff. 

17. ἔσεθαν κτλ. A compressed expression for ἔσεθαν ἄλλας καὶ 

ἠγοντο ἐκ Διόλων. 

Ἀμφίων. This Amphiion apparently 

is not mentioned elsewhere. 

18. Δέδησα. Hardly the name her 

parent's may have been given her, if as the 

Elym. Mag. p. 159 (quoted by Stein) It 

was due to her deformity resembling the 

letter Α. The lameness is perhaps only 

political afterthought or symbolism. 

Cp. 4. 161. 

19. ἦγος, has to wife. Otherwise o. 

Cp. 1. 94 ἔγορα. 

20. Ἑκχοράτεσ. Of this Echekrates 

nothing is known, but the name is 

significant. 

Πέτρης. Petra is a 'deme'": an 

expression not confined to Attica, as its 

primary and frequent use in the Homeric 

poems testifies. The place is hypotheti-

ically located in the mountainous district 

near Tenea, on the N. slopes of the 

Argive mountains south of Corinth, by 

Curtius, Peloponnec. ii. 597, note 94, 

τα ἀνάκαθεν, s. 65 supra. Pausanias 

5. 18. 7 Ἐκχοράς καὶ τῶν ἄχρατων 

ἐκ Ταύρωσις ἦν γόνος ἐκ ἐχυρίου τῆς οὐρή 

Σικυώνος, καὶ πρόγονοι σφαίρας ἦν Μέλαι 

perature. 

Ἀμφίων is descended from 

the 'Atrados' Μέλαις ἐκ τῶν εἰς 

στρατων κατὰ τὰ προερεύματα μοι καὶ ἐν 

tῇ Κόρινθῳ συγγραφῇ (2. 4, 4) ὑπὲρ 

θεματος συνκόπων διέμενα, γεγονός 

οἱ μάντευμα ἐκ Δελφῶν ωφοφωνέως, ἐκ δὲ 

θεραπεία τῇ πάσῃ χρόνῳ Μέλαια καὶ 

ὅπως ἀναλαβότρητον σὺν ἄκηρεν ἐπιμαυσία 

ἀνεθάθεσα καὶ δυνή Λατής. 

Δαπίθης τε καὶ Καυνίης. The first 

a generic, the second a specific de-

signation (Stein). Cr. Πυλοὶ τε καὶ Νη-

τολίδα s. 65 supra. Action was evidently 

of the pre-Dorian population in Corinth, 

as were Kleisthenes and his ancestors in 

Sikyon, cp. s. 68 supra. This relation is 

characteristic of the Peloponnesian 

'tyrants,' the tyrants in Peloponnesos 

marking an anti-Dorian reaction of the 

conquered and subject populations. The 

pre-Dorian population and dynasty in 

Corinth passed as Argolians (cp. Thuc. 

4. 42). The Lapithae are one of the 

proto-Hellenic or pre-Hellenic stocks, 

located in Thessaly, with special relations 

to the Kentaurs on one side and the 

Dorians on the other, defeating the 

former (cp. Apollod. Bibl. 2. 4) and 

subcumbent to the latter (ib. 2. 7). Kailunès 

is known to Homer, as one of the incom-

parable heroes of Nestor's youth, Η. 1. 

262-272. 

22. Κύρσοπο, i.e. ὡστε ἐκ ταύτης ὡστ' ἐξ 

ἄλλως. 

23. Ἐν ο. As a rule the utterances 

of the Pythia were versified after her 

ecstasy, note to l. 67. Cr. l. 47, and 

the case of Lykourgos l. 65 saluted ὡς 

ἔλεγχος ἐς τὸ μέγαρον, and contra 6. 19. 

24. τις πολύτιτον contain a play 

upon the word 'Ητίων (Stein). Cr. s. 

67 supra and aierón infra. 

25. δυσλογία = δυσλογία 

supra, ἔγκυκτοι δὲ τιράννων δυναστεία 

δυνάμεις ἀνδρῶν contrasted with δυναστεία

δυσλογία.
ταύτα χρησιμένα τῷ 'Ησίων ἔξαγγέλλεται κως τοις Βακχιά-δραίς, τοιοῦ τὸ μὲν πρότερον γενόμενον χρησιμεύον ἐς Κόρινθον ἢ ἄσημου, φέρει τὸ ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ 'Ησίων καὶ λέγει δὲ·

αἰτεῖ ἐν πέτρην κύιε, τέβει δὲ λέοντα
καρτέρον ὁματιστῆς πολλῶν δὲ ὑπὸ γονιμάτα λύσεις.
ταύτα τῶν εὐ βραγεσθε, Κόρινθοι, εἰ περὶ καλῶν
Πειρήμα γοκέτε καὶ ὀφρυώνετα Κόρινθοι.

7) τούτο μὲν δ' τοιοῦ Βακχιάδραίς πρότερον γενόμενον ἦν ἀτέκμαρ-τον, τότε δὲ τῷ 'Ησίων γεγομένου ὡς ἐπίθυμουτ, αὖτα καὶ τὸ πρότερον συνήκα τὼν συνήκα τῷ 'Ησίων. συνετέλεσε δὲ καὶ τούτῳ εἰγὼν ἐν ἡμείᾳ, ἐθέλοντες τοῖς μελλόντος Ἕσιών γίνεσθαι γίνον μαθήματα. ὅπερ δὲ ἔτεκε ἡ γυνὴ τάχιστα, πέμπουσι σφέον αὐτῶν δέκα τῶν δήμων ἐν τῷ κατοίκητο ὁ 'Ησίων ἀποτελέσειν.

40 τοῦ παιδίου. ἀποκόμιοι δὲ οὕτως ἐς τὴν Πέτρην καὶ παρελθόντες ἐς τὴν αὐλήν τὴν Ἢσιών αὐτῶν τοῦ παιδίου, ὁ δὲ Δάβδα ἐδυναίτε τοὺς ἐνεκένα ἐκκένοι ἀποκόλαστο, καὶ δικεύσα τοῖς φιλοφροσύνης τοῦ πατροῦ ἐνεκένα αὐτῶν ἑκάστη, φέρεσε ἐνεχείρησεν αὐτῶν ἐκάστη, τοῖς δὲ ἄρα ἐξεβούλευτο κατ' ὅδον τῶν πρῶτων

45 αὐτῶν λαβόντα τὸ παιδίον προσούσθησαν. ἔτει δὴ ἔδωκεν φέρουσαν ἢ Δάβδα, τὸν λαβόντα τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἢ κυρία τοποθετήσας τὸ παιδίον, καὶ τὸν φρασθέντα τούτοι οἰκώτω τοὺς ἰσχεῖς ἀποκτείναν, κατοικητέρας δὲ παραδιδοῦ τῷ δυνατῷ, δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ, οὕτω δὴ διεξῆλθε διὰ πάντων τῶν δέκα παραδοδομένον, οὐδενός

50 βουλλομένου διεργάσεσθαι. ἀπόδοσε δὲν ὅποιος τῇ τεκούσῃ τῷ παιδίῳ καὶ ἔξαλλόντες ἔξω, ἐστεότερος ἐπὶ τῶν θυρεῶν ἀλλήλων ἄπτοτο κατακτημένοι, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν πρῶτων λαβόντων, ὡς όντες ἐποίησαν κἀτὰ τὰ δεδομένα, ἐς δὴ χειρὸς ἑγαμομένον δὲ ἔδωξε αὐτοῖς παραλβάνεις πάντα τοῦ φόνου μετασχει. ἔδει δὲ ἐκ

ισώνοισι by the Theban speaker, Thuc. 3. 62.

Δικασώσθη τὸν δήμον. Petra: see above. The story of [Claudius] 4 b.c. supra represents Kyrosos as especially mild in his administration of justice. See Polemarch.

39. ικετεῖον. 'The much-celebrated well-head of Corinth: reputed to rise upon the Akrokorinthos (where there is a well to this day); cp. Dict. Geogr. i. 680.

Δικασώσθην. 'Embrowed' by the Akrokorinthos and itself situate on 'a broad level rock nearly 200 feet in height above the plain' cp. c. p. 679. Cp. Strabo, 338.

§ 3. 40. τοῖς δήμοις, Petra: see above.

§ 3. 41. τῇ τέχνῃ. Cp. θ. περιθέρ. 4. 152.

45. Στῦλιον. Might be τῆς μη ἀποκτήτων cp. 1. 159, but the omission of the negative is more abrupt and forcible: cp. τῆς κυρίας, Theognis, 816. See Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, §§ 807 ff. ed. maj.

§ 3. 54. Δικασώσθην. Cp. c. 33 supra (καὶ ὁ γὰρ ἔδωκε τῶν τῷ στόλῳ Ναξίων ἀποκτήτων —where, by the way, the position of the γάρ may be contrasted with its position here ἢ Λ. γάρ) and Introduction, p. exit.
τοῦ Ἡτίανος γένος Κορίνθων κακὰ ἀναβλαστεῖν. ἦ Ἰάβδα γὰρ 55 πάντα ταύτα ἦκου ἐστιόσα πρὸς αὐτήν τῆς θύρῃς. δείπνασα δὲ μὴ σφι μεταφέρει καὶ τὸ δεύτερον λαβώντες τὸ παιδίον ἀποκτείνοις, φέρουσα κατακρύπτει ὑπὸ τὸ ἁφραστότατον οἱ ἑφαίνετο εἶναι, ὡς κυψέλην, ἐπισταμένη ὡς ἐπὶ ὑποστήριτες ὑπὸ ἔτη τούτο τῶν ἐφαίνεται καθαρά ἐφαίνεται. ὅτα δὲ καὶ ἐγένετο. ἕλθον δὲ καὶ διδῷ ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ὡς ὑμᾶς ἑφαίνετο, ἐδόκει αὐταῖς τακτικός ὡς πάντα τινὰ ποιήσαντες τὸ ἐκεῖνον ἐνετίλαντο. οἱ μὲν δὴ ἀπελθόντες ἐλέγον εἰ ταύτα. Ὁ Ἡτίανὸς δὲ μετὰ ταύτα ὁ παις ἑφαίνετο, καὶ διαφυγόντες τὸν κώνον ἀπὸ τῆς κυψέλης ἐπονυμίαν Κύψελος ὅδε οὖν ἔφη, ἀνοιχτάθηναι δὲ καὶ μαντευόμενοι Κυψέλην ἐγένετο ἀμφιδίδειν χρυστίριον ἐν Δελφοῖς, τῷ πίσοις γενομένοις ἐπεχείρησε τι καὶ ἔσχεν Κόρινθον. ὃ δὲ χρησμὸς ὑπὲρ ἦν·

δύσιος γάρ δὲ ἔμου δόμοι ἐσκαταβαίνει, Κύψελος Ἡτίανὸς, βασιλεὺς κληεῖτο Κορίνθου αὐτός καὶ παιδεῖς, παιδεῖς γε μὲν αὐτότες παιδεῖς.

τὸ μὲν δὴ χρυστίριον τούτο ἦν, τυμαμνεύσας δὲ οὐ Κύψελος τούτοις δὴ τις ἠγένετο· παλλοῦς μὲν Κορίνθιοι ἐδοξοῦσιν.
pǒllou δὲ χρημάτων ἀπεστέρησε, τολλῷ δὲ τὶ πλείστους τῆς ฿ ψυχῆς. ἀρξαντος δὲ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τρίηκοντα ἔτεα καὶ διαπλέξαντος τὸν βίον εὖ, διαδοχός οὐ τῆς τυραννίδος ὃ πάλις Περιάνδρος γίνεται, ὁ τοῦν Περιάνδρος κατ᾿ ἀρχὰς μὲν ἢ ὑποτέρως τοῦ πατρός, ἐπείτε δὲ ὡμιλησε δι᾿ ἀγγέλου Θρασύβολου τῷ Μιλήτου τυράννῳ, τολλῷ ἐπὶ ἑγένετο Κυψέλου μαχιφόρωτερος. περίψης

80 γὰρ παρὰ Θρασύβολου κήρυκα ἐπινεήθηντο οὕτως ἐν τῶν ἀσφαλέστατον καταστημάτων τῶν προμάτων κάλλιστα τῶν τῶν ἐπιτροπέων. Θρασύβουλος δὲ τὸν ἐλθόντα παρὰ τοῦ Περιάνδρου ἐξῆγε ἐξω τοῦ ἄστεος, ἐνθάδε δὲ ἐς ἄρουρα ἐστάρμενη ἀμα τε διεξῆς τὸ λήμαν ἐπειρασον τε καὶ ἀναπόβους τῶν

85 κήρυκα κατὰ τὴν ἀπὸ Κορίνθου ἀπίξι, καὶ ἐκδόθων αἰεὶ ὄν ὑμᾶ ἰδοί τῶν ἀσταχών ὑπερέχοντα, καλούν δὲ ἐρρίπτε, ἡ τοῦ λείου τὸ κάλλιστά τε καὶ βαθύτατον διείθερερο πρῶτον τοιοῦτον διεξεῖλον δὲ τὸ χορὸν καὶ ὑποβέμμενος ἐπος οὐδὲν ὑποτέρησε τῶν κήρυκα. νοστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ κήρυκος ὡς τὴν 90 Κορίνθου ὡς πρῶτως πυρθάνεσθαι τὴν ὑποθήκην ὁ Περιάνδρος· ὃ δὲ οἴδειν οἱ ἔτη Θρασύβουλον ὑπερβέβαι, θυμάθεον τε αὐτὸν παρ’ οἴνον μὲν ἄνδρα ἀποτέμψεις, ὡς παραπληγία τα καὶ τῶν ἑοφυτοί συμάχωρα, ἀπηγκέομενος τὰ περὶ πρὸς Θρασύβουλον ἄνθρωπος τὸ ποιήσθαι καὶ νῦν ἤσθων ὡς 95 οἱ ὑπετιθέτο Θρασύβουλος τοὺς ὑπερήφανους τῶν ἀστῶν φανερεῖν, ἐνθαῦτα δὴ πᾶσαν κακοτήθη ἐξέφαινε ἐς τοὺς πολίτας. ὅτα γὰρ

Damasco. 56. What Hdt. here reports as a long persecution may be the original 'extermination' of the Bakchidians. Polyainos 6. 31 explains how that was managed: but the ruse there mentioned could only have applied to a few.

§ 3 l. 75. ἔτα. Thirty years. The same chronological statement is found in Aristot. Pol. 8. 12, 3, 1315b (after Ephoros!). During his long reign the tradition preserved by Ephoros (esp. Nic. Damasco.) represents him as a wise and popular ruler, specially concerned in colonisation (Leukas, Ἀνακτορία, Ἀμβρακία), Op. Oberhummer, Abharmen, pp. 71 ff., Busolt, Gr. G. 1. 4 641 ff. The conventional date is 655-625 n.c. calculated back from Periander. See Clinton, Past. Hell. 1. 208. Busolt, op. c. p. 638, regards 657 n.c. as newly established for the accession of Kypselos; 586-5 n.c. for the death of Periander.

78. Θρασύβουλος. Thrasybulus, despot of Miletos, seems to have asserted the independence of that city in a long struggle against the encroachments of the Lydian power. His action in this matter was supported by Periander, who was on good terms with Delphi, and perhaps instrumental in obtaining the intervention of Delphi on behalf of the Asiatic Greeks in their struggle with Lydia: 1. 19, 20.

79. πείλαμος. The anecdote which here follows incorporates the popular and perfectly true observation that the tyranny and the oligarchy were essentially hostile forms and principles. It is not the Many but the Few who object to a 'one-man' power. As Periander was a Sage (Dig. L 1. 1, 24, op. Pol. 8. 11, 4, 5, 1313ab and the maxims Hdt. puts into the daughter's mouth 3. 53) Aristot. reverses the parts of the two despots, Pol. 8. 10, 13, 1311. The story reappears in the romance of Roman history, Livy 1. 54. § 9. l. 98. τοὺς πολίτας. It would only have been against τοὺς ὑπερήφανους. Either the oligarchic speaker, addressing the Spartans, takes no account of the
Κύψελος ἀπέλυσε κτείνων τε και διώκων, Περιανδρὸς σφετέρα δέητεσα, μὴ δὲ ἡμέρα ἀπέστειλε πᾶσας τῶν Κορυθαίων γυναίκας διὰ τὴν ἐνοῦτον γυναίκα Μέλισσαν. πέμφαντι γὰρ οἱ ὑπὲρ Θεοπρωτοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀχέρωντα ποταμοῦ ἄγγελους ἐπὶ τὸ νεκρομαντίαν παρα-καταβῆκεν πέρα ἑκείνης κατα-μενεῖν ὡς ἡ Μέλισσα ἐπι-φάνειαν οὔτε κατερέειν ἐν τῷ κέσται χώρῳ ἢ παρακατατάθηκεν· μεγάλῳ πρὸς τὸ γάρ καὶ ἔστεν γυμνῆς· τῶν γὰρ οἱ συγκατέθαψεν ἰματίαις ὄδεμα εἰναὶ οὐδὲν ὡς κατακαυθείτων· καθορίων δὲ εἰναι ἄνθηθα ταύτα λέγει, ὅτι ἐπὶ γυμνῶν τῶν ἱππῶν Περιανδρὸς τούς ἀρτους ἐπέβαλε. ταύτα δὲ ὡς ὁπίσω ἀπηγγέλθη τῷ Περιανδρῷ, πιστῶν γὰρ οἱ ὁ ἡ συμβόλαιον ἢς νεκρῶ ἐνοῦσα Μέλισσην ἐμνή, ἰδέως δὴ μετὰ τὴν σφυγήν κρίνην ἐπούσατο ἐν τῷ Ἥραοις ἐξένει πᾶσας τῶν Κορυθαίων γυναίκας. αὐτὸν δὲ ὡς εἰς ὅρθον ἦσαν κόμφο τῷ καλλίστῳ χρώμενοι, ὁ δ΄ ἱπποτήσας τοὺς 110 δορυφόρους ἀπέστειλε σφαίρας πᾶσας ὀμολόγως, τὰς τε ἑλευθέρας καὶ

Many, with whom the anti-Dorian tyrants were probably popular enough: or, as is more probable, Herodotus has not fully rationalised the situation. Historically, perhaps, Periandro had to contend with a Dorian reaction, which had gathered force under the mild reign of his father, and was encouraged from Sparta.


98. ἀπέστειλε. 'stripped.' On Corinthian attire cp. s. 88 supra, and next note.

99. Μέλισσα. Daughter of Procles, tyrant of Epidaurus. According to the story in 3. 50 Periandro himself killed her—possibly by accident. Her real name was Lyside: Melissa was her husband's name for her, Diog. L. i.e. Athenaeus, 589, quotes Phainetemos of Aegina as follows: Περιανδρὸς τῷ Ἱππῶν τῷ Ἐνοῦσα Ἰδούανα Πελοπω-

The performance here narrated, if historical, is presumably an act of atonement for the crime (ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ θεσθῇ ἦν οὕτως: which however is good Anismus. See below. The performance here narrated, if historical, is presumably an act of atonement for the crime (ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ θεσθῇ ἦν οὕτως: which however is good Anismus. See below.

100. παρακαταθήκης. This motif, essential in the story of Glaukos 6. 66, is rather threadbare here. If Periandro really had murdered Melissa one may imagine he would have something else to say to her ghost than to 'inquire about a deposit.'

105. ἰματίων. Out-of-door garments, cp. s. 87 supra.

107. ἰματίων. This filth came perhaps from Egypt (cp. 2. 89) and was good enough to fling on the dead tyrant.

108. τῷ Ἥραοις. Presumably the shrine of Here Bunaic, Pausan. 2. 4, 7, situate apparently on the way up the Akrokortnous.
ἩΡΩΔΟΤΟΥ

113. κατέκασε. That the garments had to be burnt in order to be of use to the ghost is an idea entirely consonant with animistic beliefs. See Taylor, Primitive Culture, i. 491. The suggestion that Periandros wanted to get the gold off the ladies' clothing (Blakesley and Rawlinson) misses this point, and sacrifices the unity of the story. It is of course possible that various acts of Periandros have been 'contaminated' and confused by Herodotus, or his source. The tyrant may have burnt some clothes to supply his wife's ghost with a ghostly wardrobe. He may have consecrated ornaments and clothing to enrich his own treasury. According to Diog. Laert. Periandros burnt his παλαίατες, to appease his wife, and plundered the ladies of Corinth, τετειφορο, to get gold for an οἶος, in honour of an Olympian victory. Diog. L. 1. p. 25. The notion of extracting gold from a funeral pyre recurs in the unworthy insinuation levelled at Cato's memory by Julius Caesar. See Plutarch, Cat. min. 11 ad fin. καθαρίζειν τὴν τέφραν τοῦ νεκροῦ μετέβαλε καὶ διέφθεγκε χρυσὸν ήταν κατακεκαμένον.

119. θεοῦ τοῦ Ἐλληνίου. Cp. c. 49 supra. Chronologically this appeal to the 'Unity of Hellas' (cp. 8. 144 θεοῦ ἡρωίτακ τα κοινά καὶ θεοῦ) is ex hypothetis the earlier.

120. οὐκ εἰς κτλ. The asyndeton is rhetorical; cp. 4. 118 supra.

That Sокies, or Sociales, of Corinth addressed to the Spartans and Peloponnesian allies the speech here put into his mouth is simply incredible. It contains little to the point, and it omits nearly everything that might have been said upon such an occasion. The Corinthians, and others, are opposed to the restoration of the Peloponnesiadae in Athens. Their main motive, which probably was a desire to have a counter-weight to Sparta, or at least to Aigina, a reluctance to see Athens pledged to Spartan policy and supremacy, could not or course be stated openly: but what has the story of the childhood of Kyppselos to say to the argument? That story is calculated to excite sympathy for the hero, and is a non sequitur in the mouth of Sokies. Was all that follows news to Sparta? Was it to the point? It consists of two anecdotes which, though not wholly devoid of bearing on the speaker's argument, are not expressly related to it, or to each other. The inconsistency of Sparta's hostility to the tyranny at home, and friendship to the tyrant of Athens, was a good rhetorical point, which the Spartans had already ex hypothesi fully discounted in their own minds, c. 91 supra. It might have been put much more strongly, if Sparta's own action in the suppression of the tyranny at Corinth and elsewhere had been mentioned. (Plutarch, Mor. 859 = de malig. Hdt. 21.) The argument that oligarchies would serve Sparta better than tyrannies would have required a clearer statement. Viewed as a dramatic argument this speech is a failure, and an improbability; viewed as a triad of anecdotes, each good in itself, it is a miracle of logosography.

93. ἐν ἄνδρῳ Κόρινθου. The services of Corinth to Athens are accumulating. The Platanean award 6. 108, the desertion
ΤΕΡΣΙΧΟΡΗ

δὲ αὐτὸν ἀμείβετο τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπικαλέσας θεοὺς ἔκεινον, ἢ μὲν 
Κορυνθίου ἱεράς, ἢ μὲν Ἱλίου ἱερᾶς, ἢ μὲν Ἡλείας, ἢ μὲ 
ὡς Θεόν, ἢ μὲν Ἡλείας ἡ ἱερὰ, ἢ μὲν Ἡλείας ἡ ἱερὰ, ἢ μὲ 
ὡς Θεόν, ἢ μὲν Ἡλείας ἡ ἱερὰ, ἢ μὲ
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Οὕτω μὲν τούτῳ ἐπαύση. Ἡ πτήγη δὲ ἐνθεοῦτα ἀπελαυνομένῳ ἑκὼν 
ἐδίδον μὲν Ἁμόντης ὁ Μακεδών ἐπαύση. Ἁμάμοντα, ἑδίδοσαν

at Eleusis c. 75 supra, the opposition on 
this occasion, the support against Aegina 
6. 93, are all dictated by one and the 
same self-interest and policy. It was 
the action not the principles of Corinth, 
which underwent a sudden conversion 
in the light of the Themistoklean develop-
ment, and remained hostile to Athens, 
from before the battle of Salamis (cp. 8. 
59, 61, etc.) until the close of the Pele-
ponnesian war (Xen. Hell. 2. 2. 19); 
after which the great commercial olig-
archy, alarmed by the expansive ambi-
tions of Sparta, took side again with 
Athens, and promoted the Athenian 
revival (Diodoros 14. 82, Grote, Pt. II. 
c. ixiv.), not without fresh danger to it-
self.

2. τοὺς αὐτοὺς θεοὺς, sc. τοὺς Ἑλλη-

νίον οὐς c. 92 supra. The Peisistratids 
were specially entitled to appeal to the 
Twelve Gods, Thuc. 6. 64.

4. ἡμέραι αἱ κύριαι, 'the days 
divinely appointed,' not as in c. 50 
supra. That the future conflict of 
interests between Corinth and Athens 
might have been foreseen by Hippias, 
even without supernatural aid, who 
will deny? At the same time, con-

sidering the general character of Hdt.'s 
sources, one is tempted to suspect 
here too a scito quies commemoration, 
born probably not of the troubles which 
immediately preceded the Peloponnesian 
war, but of the quarrel which, begun 
in the days of Themistokes, and de-
veloping in the struggle before the 
Thirty Years' truce, culminated in the 
outbreak of political and commercial 
hostilities in 481 B.C. For similar oracles 
cp. c. 90 supra.

6. ἕπετερόνεος. For the super-

naturalism of Hippias cp. 6. 107. 

Grote iii. 391 seems to put the reply of 
Hippias after the demonstration of the 
Symmachis.

8. αὑρέστ. It is not very clear 
whether there was a formal vote, or 
any other speech besides the Corinthian. 
(Cp. contr. Thuc. 1. 67, 4.) "The shout 
of approbation and sympathy" (Grote) 
may have been accepted as a sufficient 
indication of the opinion of the 
Symmachis, by the Spartans, who them-

selves voted βοή καὶ αὸ ἔφεστο, Thuc. 1. 
87. But the appeal (ἐπιμαχαίρετο) if 
not the shout (φωνή, cp. 4. 129) might 
seem to imply something articulate. 
The political and quasi-constitutional 
significance of the conclave of the 
allies on this occasion is well described 
by Grote, iii. 390.

9. ἐπιμαχάρετο. So MSS. and 
Editors; the sense is the same as if we 
read ἐπιμαχαίρετο. Cp. ἐπιμαχαίρετα 
c. 92 l. 118 supra.

10. Ἑλλάδα, adj., cp. 6. 98 infra.

94. 1. τούτῳ. The intrigue at Sparta 
for the restoration of Hippias, the 
πρίγμα καταφύλακτον ἐκ Ἀκαδαιμιοίκων ἔπη-

ρομέος of c. 90 supra. As the move-

ment proved abortive it is not obvious why 
Athens should have completely 
arrested hostilities against Aegina, unless 
Sparta made the cessation of hostilities 
a condition of her quiescence. But cp. 
Appendices VII. §§ 8, 9, VIII. § 3.

2. ἐδέδωκα, imperf., so too ἐδέδωκα just 
below. Ἁμόντης. See c. 17 supra.

Ἀνδριομή. Thuc. 2. 99 mentions the 
place in connexion with Grestonia (sie), 
Basilia and (old) Macedonia: it was 
presumably on the coast. (Op. Fortiger, 
All. Geogr. iii. 1069.)
δὲ Θησσαλοί Ἰωλκόν. ὁ δὲ τούτων μὲν οὐδέτερα αἰρέτο, ἀνεγερεὶ
dὲ ὁπίσω ἐς Σίγην, τὸ ἐλπίς Πεισιστρατος αἰχμῆ παρὰ Μυτιλή-
ναίων, κρατήσας δὲ αὐτοῦ κατέστησε τὸ πάνω εἶναι παῖδα [τοῦ]
ἐνοτοῦ νόθου Ἡθριστρατον, γεγονότα ἐξ Ἀργείης γυναῖκας, δὲ
οὐκ ἁμαρτήστη εἰς ταῖς παρὰ Πεισιστράτου. ἐπολέμουσι
γὰρ ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀχιλλείου πόλιος ὀρμώμενοι καὶ Σίγην ἑπὶ χρόνον
συχνῶν Μυτιληναίοι τε καὶ Ἀθηναίοι, οὗ μὲν ὑπαίτευτες τὴν
χώραν, Αθηναίοι δὲ οὐδὲ συγκυριακῶς ὑποτεκνύντες τὴν
λόγον οὐδὲν μᾶλλον Ἀθελοντι ὑπεκαὶ ὑπὸ τὴν Ἰλαΐας χώρας ἢ
οὐ καὶ σφῖν
cal toûs ἄλλοις, ὡσι Ἐλληνος συνεπρέξαντο Μενέλαυ τὰς

3. Θησαλοῦ. Cr. c. 63 supra.

Τ伊利κόν. The reputed starting-point of the Argonauts on the Pagasenean gulf:
ἐς τῇ Ἰωλκῷ .... κατέστησε τὸν Πίναρον, Pyth. 4. 185.
οὐδέτερα. The singular is used 1. 51
(τῶν περιστρεφῶν οὐδέτερα).
4. ὄψινω, Cr. c. 91 supra.
5. τῶν ἐκ Σειν.
6. Ἀργεία. Timonassas, d. of Gorgias. The connexion had political
signification; cr. Αθ. σ. c. 17. οἴθων
in Athenian law. Cr. Ῥέθη, Corp. jur. Att. 1341 ff. But the conditions were
not always rigidly enforced. Cr. 6. 180
οἰστοῖς. There is no need to suppose that
Pelestratos was polygamous, 1. 56.
8. Ἀχιλλείου, a fort in the
bournehood of Rheuteum, Strabo, 600, Pliny
5. 36. On this tomb of Achilles a wreath
was laid by Alexander, Arrian, Ἄριαν. 1.
72, cr. Porphyrius, Ἀρ. ἑπερ. ii. 138 a.
10. ἀποδεικνύτην. This appeal to
legend as giving a title is common, cr.
9. 27, and the award of Salamis to
Athens, Phutarch, Solon, 10. The
Homeric claim is specially significant
coming from Pelestratos; cr. c. 67
supra. It is the Heroic conquest not
the subsequent occupation which is sup-
poused to give the title.

The conquest and occupation of a
stronghold in the Troad by Pelestratos
was something more than a foreign in-
vestment against a rainy day: it looks
like a part of a great policy which aimed
at converting the Aegan into an
Athenian lake, or at least an Ionian
lake under Athenian lead, and runs on
all fours with the klerarchy in Salamis
(cr. note c. 77 supra), the friendship in
Eetria (1. 64), the purification of Delos
(1. 64), the client-monarchy in Nanos
(1. 64), the founder’s kinship in Mileto-
(cf. 65 supra), the connexions with
Thrace (1. 64); a policy carried on by
his sons in the colonisation of the
Chersonese (6. 30), the alliance with
Lampsakos (Thuc. 6. 59), although the
latter is rather traced by Thucydides to
the new necessities created by the
murder of Hipparchos, and the rise of
the Persian power, as further shown in
the next chapter ininfra. How the alliances
with Argos, with Sparta, with Thessaly,
were related, in time and causality, to
the colonial and maritime ambitions of
Pelestratid Athens, need not here be
discussed. Cr. c. 62 supra.
12. συνεπρέξαντο: cr. συνεπρέξαντο
7. 169, which van der Werden reads
here too.

95. 2. Ἀλκαῖος. In this chapter Hdt.
is guilty apparently of a considerable
anachronism, in making Alkaios and
Periandros contemporaries of Pelestratos.
He has transferred an event, his authority
for which may have been the poem of
Alkaios, from the first war between
Athens and Lebos in the days of
Periandros and Solon, about 600 B.C.,
to the second or renewed war, in the
days of Pelestratos, at least half a
century later; and he has concluded the
second war, in the days of Pelestratos,
or rather of his sons, by the award of
Periandros, which probably closed the
first. The first war in fact has dis-
ppeared altogether from Hdt.’s view,
and its traditions have been utilised for
the story of the second war, which is thus
made to appear the only war. The case
is instructive as showing the way in
which the chronological perspective
may be destroyed by Hdt. and in the traditions collected by him, and how unconscious he is of its disappearance. Conversely, we see in this instance that much real matter of fact may be incorporated in traditions, which in their actual but accidental form are open to suspicion and discredit. Cp. Introduction, § 18.

7. Μυτιλήναοι. Mytilene must have been a considerable place in the sixth and seventh centuries B.C. It was a member of the Hellenion at Naukratis (2. 178), but its power was presumably weakened by the civic strife, only terminated by the στεγμάτα of Pittakos (Arist. Pol. 3. 14, 8 ff. 1285a), c. 590-570 B.C. (Cp. Flach, Gesch. der Gr. Lyrik, pp. 465 ff.) It is more astonishing to find the Athenians attempting to colonise the Troad, before they were secure of Salamis. Flach I.e. regards the colony as undertaken by the Attic nobility to indemnify the People for the severity of the new (Drakontic) code. It is rather to be connected with the economic and social condition of pre-Solonian Attica, described in ‘Ath. pol. c. 2. The award of Periandros is dated 500 B.C. (Flach). For the fragment of Alkmaion see Bergk, Poes. Lyr. iv. p. 159, and for the ruse of Pittakos, by which he overcame Phrynios, the Athenian, Polyainos, 1. 26, Suidas s.v. Πηρακείν. ‘The famous Sigean inscription’ illustrates relations with Athens on the one side and the Proponits (Prokonnosoi) on the other. It has been very variously dated. See Hicks, Manual (1882), No. 7. Robert, Greek Epigraphy (1887), No. 42, and pp. 334 ff., follows Kirchoff (Stud. Gr. Athen.) in assigning it to the first quarter or first decade of the sixth century B.C. U. Koehler had put it back into the seventh century B.C. (Mitthellungen, ix. (1884), pp. 121 ff.). In any case the inscription may safely be associated with the first Athenian occupation of Sigeon. But cp. note, 6. 121 infra.

8. Ὁ Κυψέλου. Hdt. would hardly have given the patronymic spontaneously here, after c. 92. He found it in his sources, or the passages did not originally run as at present. That Athenians and Lesbians should refer their differences to Periandros would ill square with the moral of that speech.

διαυτηρήσαν. On arbitration in such cases cp. c. 28 supra. The award of Periandros was in favour of Athens: this would not be viewed with any disfavour at Mileos (cp. c. 92 supra).

96. 2. θαμαν. The date might be about 504 B.C., i.e. about the time of the democratic rising in Naxos, c. 30 supra.

6. Σάρδης. The Athenians had long known the way to Sardes, Solon had been there I. 29; Alkmaion (1) had been there 6. 125 (see note ad loc.). There had just been a previous appeal to Artaphernes for assistance against Sparta, c. 73 supra, for we need not identify the embassies in this and that chapter. The application of Hippias at Sardes associated his restoration with a foreign and oriental overlordship. The ‘tyrannis’ was now to be in Athens, and in Greece proper, identified not so much with the rise of the conquered Hellenic or pre-Hellenic masses, as with the loss of autonomy, with sub-
jction to the Mede, the Barbarian. Against such a prospect not merely the old aristocratic society but the new democratic citizens rallied. The Peisistratidae, like the Ionian tyrants, had put themselves hopelessly in the wrong by 'medizing.' Cr. 4. 137 supra.

97. ἐδέδοκτο. For the tense cp. ψήσετο c. 73 supra.

97. 1. νομίσσω. The construction appears to be somewhat loosely carried on from ἔφα just before. The narrative is resumed from c. 55, or rather from c. 51 supra.

διαβιβαλένουσι, cp. διαβιβάλλεν c. 96 supra.

ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καρφῷ, 'at this crisis.'

3. ἔξελασθείς seems a stronger word than the occasion warrants (cp. ἀπελανώμονον c. 55, ἀπαλάθενσον c. 51 supra), and to imply the enforcement of the xenodochia; cp. c. 50 supra. This treatment of the Milesian by the Lacedaemonians had an obvious moral.

4. αὐτῇ γὰρ, cp. 1. 56.

ἐπιλάθων, technical term (cp. L. & S. sub c. 1. 1. e).

5. τῶν δήμων, i.e. the Ekklesia. He had no doubt been previously heard in the βουλή, ὥστε γαλλ. εἰς ουν δέρε, for an Athenian.

ταύτα. Limited to the two points not specified. It was not remembered or suggested that Aristagoras at Athens had proposed the march to Susa and the conquest of all Asia, cp. c. 49 supra.

6. τολμῆσι, 'warfare.' Cr. θεί μέχρι αὐτῶν ἐστιν τοῦθεν κτλ. c. 49 supra.

7. νομίσσω. Like διαβιβάλλω infra is a little clumsy after the opening of the chapter. Yan Herewod would bracket ὑγ., πρωτόχας, as spurious, and read ταύτα.

8. ὁ Μιλήσιος τῶν Ἀθηναίων εἰς ἄποκρισιν. Assuming the authenticity of the tradition that this statement formed one of Aristagoras' arguments at Athens, we have here the earliest definite recognition of the supposed metropolitan character of Athens. The conception, however, goes back to the time and policy of Peisistratos, and the use made of traditions for his purposes. Cp. c. 65 supra. That the idea was, to say the least, an exaggeration, a systematisation of more or less authentic tradition seems probable, cp. 1. 148. The Ionian city which under Peisistratos had been raised to primacy was made the mother of all the rest. Cp. the affiliation of Thera, Kyrene, Tarentum upon Dorian Sparta (4. 147 supra). (Solon had represented Ἀττικα as προστάται γαλλ. Ἰονίων, Ath. Const. 5.)

10. οὖν ὁ δ. τῶν οὐκ, including money of course, and surely not less than the fifty talents, which he had offered Kleomenes c. 51 supra. Cp. c. 103 infra. He could not exactly braise the Ekklesia wholesale, but he might offer to guarantee the expenses of the expedition.

11. πολλαῖς γὰρ κτλ. This remark
is a glaring instance of the political naivete of Hdt. He evidently regards the help given by Athens to the Ionian revolt as a colossal blunder, and the refusal of Sparta as a piece of sound policy. He does not, indeed, expressly say that the Athenians contemplated a march to Susa, and the terms of the pepysma (εἰκοσι νέας ἄναπτυξιν ἐπιφάνείαν) rather imply the contrary. But all the same he represents the Athenians as puppets in the hands of the adroit and plausible Mileisan. Yet Hdt. has himself already recorded two diplomatic passages between Sardes and Athens which plainly pretended a war: cp. 73, 96 supra. The Mileisan recognition of the metropolitam claim of Athens here explicitly made was also something not to be despised. A great opportunity was indeed offered to Athens. Her action anticipated and probably facilitated the formation of the Delian confederacy in 478 B.C. (cp. 9. 104). It was, moreover, an act of self-defence against Hippias and against the Mede. A Themistokles would certainly have approved it. If the Athenians made a mistake it was not in supporting the Ionian movement but in afterwards deserting it. On Hdt.’s own showing the conquest of Greece was already projected (3. 124), and his whole history goes to prove that such an attempt was inevitable. Blakely suggests that the passage is “a note from a somewhat later hand.” If we are to obelise every sentence in Hdt. to which material objection may be taken, how much will be left? The remark is certainly not Athenian. It is a venture of Hdt.’s own, or perhaps a suggestion of his Spartan sources: easier to impose on thirty thousand Athenians than on one Lakonidemonian! For an ill-omened Athenian estimate of the value of ‘one Lakonian cloak’ cp. Plutarch, Nicias, c. 19 (quoted by Freeman, Sicily, iii, 243).

13. διαβάλλειν, cp. c. 50 supra.

τρεῖς μυρίας Ἀθηναίων. ‘Thirty thousand’ is the conventional maximum for the Athenian census in Hdt.’s own day. It has generally been regarded as an exaggeration, the census for 444 B.C. being fixed—on the strength of the Scholast to Aristoph. Wasp 716, quoting Philochorus—at 19,000, or rather at 14,240 (Plut. Per. 57). In regard, however, to this lower estimate the consideration has been overlooked, that the figure is not the total number of citizens, but the total number who applied for a corn dole, and is exclusive therefore of the first two Solonian ῥυμήματα at least. The one positively certain number is the 21,000 of the year 317 B.C., though even this figure looks suspiciously round. Probabilities are all in favour of a higher figure for Periklean, and indeed for Kleisthenian Athens, even though Kleisthenes did not admit “all (sic) the foreign inhabitants (ἐνόιο μέτοχοι) and enfranchised slaves of the same rank (δῶρα, μέτοχαι) into the number of citizens” (R.). That the number 30,000 is quite conventional is shown by such passages as Aristoph. Ekkles. 1132 (where it might include the women); Plato, Symposium 3, of the audience in the theatre; Hdt. 5. 65, of the Elissenian procession, which was not confined to Athenian citizens. Stein traces the figure to a confusion between the number of Athenian citizens (circa 20,000) and the number of Athenian soldiers (citizens + 10,000 metics) on the strength of Thuc. 2, 13. But Thuc. is there giving the real number of hoplites in 481 B.C. and an allowance must be made for those adult citizens who were not hoplites. The whole question has been most satisfactorily treated by Beloch, Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt, Leipzig 1886, Capitel iii. Beloch regards 30,000 as roundly correct for the beginning of the century, and would augment it by 5000 to obtain the figure for 481 B.C. English readers will find the references in Clinton, Fast. Hell. ii. p. 476, cp. also Boeckh, Hausaltung 1, pp. 44 ff. In any case that 30,000 citizens ever supported one pepysma, or even attended one meeting, is not likely. Even for a νικήσαντες 6000 stood conventionally for νικήσας Ἀθηναίοι. (Cp. M. Frankel, Die attischen Geschworenen-Gerichte, 1877, pp. 14 ff.)
15 βοηθοὺς ἵωνι, στρατηγῶν ἀποδέξατες αὐτῶν εἶναι Μελάνθιον ἀνδρὰ τῶν ἀστῶν ἔντα τὰ πάντα δόκειμον· αὐτῶι δὲ αἱ νέες ἁρχὴ κακῶν ἔγενον Ἑλλατις τε καὶ βαρβάρωι,

98 Ἀρισταγόρης δὲ προπλοῦσας καὶ ἀποκείμενος ἐς τὴν Μιλήτου, ἐξευρόν θουλεία ἀπ' ὅν ἵωνι μὲν οὐδεμία ἐμελλε ὁφελῆ ἐστεθαι, οὐδ' ὅν οὐδ' τοῦτο εἶναι ἐπολεὶ ἀλλ' ὅκες βασιλεία Δαρείου λυπήσειε, ἐπεμφε ἐς τὴν Φρυγῆν ἀνδρὰ ἐπὶ τοὺς Παιωνίους τοὺς 5 ἀπὸ Στρυμνᾶς ποταμοῦ αἰχμαλῶτους γενομένους ἐπὶ Μεγαβάζου, οἴκευντας δὲ τῆς Φρυγῆς χώρον τε καὶ κάμην ἐπὶ ένωτον· δὲ ἐπετῆ ἀπίκετο ἐς τοὺς Παιωνίους, ἔνεγε τάδε. “ἀνδρὲς Παιωνίους, ἐπεμφε με Ἀρισταγόρης ὁ Μιλήτου τύραννος σωτηρία ὑποθησάμενον ἕως, ἥν περ βουληθεὶ τείθεσθαι. νῦν ἥπα Ἰωνίῳ πάσᾳ ἀπετάθη αὕτοι βασιλεύσει καὶ ἕως παρεχεί σωζεθαι ἐπὶ τὴν ῥετέρῃν αὐτῶν· μέχρι μὲν βαλάντης αὐτοῖς ἔως, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοὐτοῦ ἕως ἕως μελήσει.” ταῦτα δὲ ἀκοῦσαντες οἱ Παιωνεῖς κάρτα τε ἀσταστὸν ἐποιήσαντο καὶ ἀναλαμβάνοντες παίδες καὶ γυναῖκας ἀπεδίδησαν ἐπὶ βάλασαν, οἱ δὲ τινὲς αὐτῶν καὶ κατέρρευσαν 15 ἀρραβόσαντες αὐτῶν. ἐπιτεί δὲ οἱ Παιωνεῖς ἀπίκευτο ἐπὶ βάλασας, ἐνθεύσει καὶ Χλων διέβησαν. ἐπόντως δὲ ἢδη ἐν Χίῳ, κατὰ πόδας ἔλθοντες Περσῶν ὕπτος πυλή διώκουσα τοὺς Παιωνίους, ὡς δὲ
18. ἔσως δὲ, ἦν οὐ διαδεχόμεθα τὸν ἄκηρον ᾧ ἦν τοῖς 8. 22 Οὔτε ἦς ἡ προσωπική αἰτία τούτων, οὐδὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἐνδεικτικόν ἐν πεζῇ κοιμισμὸν ἀπόκειτο ἐν Ἄρισταγάρος δὲ ἔτειδή ὁ τε Ἀθηναίων ἀπεκδοκεῖ ἐκατον ἔπειτα, 99 ἢμα ἐγκύμαι Ἐρετρείαν πέντε προκάταρα, οὗ ὄν τὴν Ἀθηναίων χάριν ἐστηθευτόν, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτῶν Μιλησίων ὁφειλόμενα στὰ ἀποκέλλουν· οἷς ἀρά ἡ Μιλησίων πρῶτον τούτο Ἐρετρείαν τὸν πρὸς Χαλκίδεως πόλεμον συνδύειται, ἧττε περ καὶ Χαλκίδεως. 5
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οὐ κατέλαβεν, ἐπηγγέλλωντος εἰς τὴν Χίον τοὺς Παλαιοὺς ἔκως ἄν ὁπλίον ἀπέλευθην, ὦν ἐκ Παλαιοῦ τοὺς λόγους οὗ ἐδείκτηκα, ἀλλ' ἐκ Χίου μὲν Χίοις σφαίρας εἰς Λέσβους ἱππαῖον, Λέσβιοι δὲ εἰς σοι Δορίσκων ἐκόμματον, ἐνεύθυνεν δὲ πεζῇ κοιμισμον ἀπόκατον ἐν Παιονίᾳ.

Ἀρισταγάρος δὲ ἔτειδή ὁ τε Ἀθηναίων ἀπεκδοκεῖ ἐκατον ἔπειτα, 99 ἢμα ἐγκύμαι Ἐρετρείαν πέντε προκάταρα, οὗ ὄν τὴν Ἀθηναίων χάριν ἐστηθευτοῦ ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτῶν Μιλησίων ὁφειλόμενα στὰ ἀποκέλλουν· οἷς ἀρά ἡ Μιλησίων πρῶτον τούτο Ἐρετρείαν τὸν πρὸς Χαλκίδεως πόλεμον συνδύειται, ἧττε περ καὶ Χαλκίδεως. 5

18. ἔσως δὲ, 'they had an order conveyed to them, to get them to return.' The grammatical distinction between ἐνεύθυνεν ἔσως ἀπόκατον and ἔσως ἔδωκε βασιλεῖς ἀναφέρεται ('he was acting with a view to injure the king') supra, is observable, ἔσως δὲ implying a condition ('occasionem data'), ἔσως by itself indicating the intention, pure and simple. Cp. R. Hellenist. De sanctit. pedest. in Herodoteo etc., Pars prior, p. 39 (1885).

21. Δορίσκων. Blakesley points out that Doriskos was at this time held by a Persian garrison. Cp. 7. 59. If the fugitives were landed at Doriskos they must have been in force. Even so, it is surprising to hear nothing of any action. Is this story of the escape of the Palionians correctly dated? If they landed at Doriskos, it was probably after the revolt of the Hellespont (c. 103 BC). Is it genuine history? A former story of the Palionians (c. 12, 13) is open to suspicion, and the wholesale transportation (c. 15) perhaps exaggerated. There were evidently 'Palionians' in Phrygia in Hdt.'s own day (οἱ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν καταλύουσιν), but the greater part in Europe. Hdt. here implies that the Asiatic Palionians were a colony, so to speak, from Europe. Elsewhere he preserves the tradition, or theory, that Thrace had been invaded from Asia (7. 20): a theory for which much may be said. (Cp. Grote, Thrac. &c.) Yet it would be rather too much to suppose that the whole story here told is simply an effort to explain the appearance of Palionians on both sides of the Aegean. Whence does Hdt. derive it? There seems no internal indication to determine between an Asiatic and a European, between oral and written sources. The story here supplies a neat literary link, and perhaps answers or anticipates a possible objection to the story of the transportation told above. Aristogoras himself afterwards ran away to Thrace, to Myrkinos on the Strymon, and met his end while besieging a Thracian town, c. 126 BC. His route is not there given, but Doriskos cannot have been his point of landing; and for these Palionians, who wished to gain the Strymon, to land at the Hesperos seems a curious proceeding. (On the geography of Thrace, between these two rivers, cp. 7. 108-113.)

99. 1. ἐνεύθυνεν. Presumably in the spring (498 BC), cp. Appendix V. Twenty ships was no inconsiderable force for the Athenians of that day, being nearly a moiety of the fleet (50 sail), and the same number as was borrowed from Corinth for the Aeginean war, 6. 89. On the possible connexion cp. Appendix VIII. § 3.

2. ἐγκύμαι. The Athenian Strategos had perhaps a superior authority over the Eretrian contingent, notwithstanding the assertion of independent action (ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων χάρι, ἐρετριά). Eretria supplied only seven triremes to the national fleet at Artemision and at Salamis in 480 BC. Cp. 8. 1, 46. But the town had been severely handled by the Persians in 490 BC, 6. 101.

οὗ τὴν Ἀθηναίων χάριν looks almost like an express contradiction of an Athenian claim, or at least of a claim that would naturally occur to the mind at the date when Hdt. was writing. The Eretrian Strategos on this occasion was one Eutelkidas, c. 102 BC.
Εἰρηνού, καὶ Μιλησίων Σάμιην ἔρριθεν· οὕτω δὲν ἐπέειτε σφι ἀπίκουντοι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι σύµµαχοι παρῆσαν, ἐποιεῖτο στρατηγία ὁ Ἀρισταγάμης ὦ Σάρδης. αὐτὸς μὲν δὲν ὅλον ἐπιστεύετο ἄλλη ἔμεινε οὖν Μιλήτῳ, στρατηγοῦ δὲ ἄλλους ἀπεδέξατε Μιλησίων εἶναι, τὸν ἐναυῶν τε ἀδελφῶν Ἀραιτῖνον καὶ τῶν ἄστων ἄλλου Ἤρμων 100-100 ἡμετέρου. ἀπίκουντοι δὲ τῷ στόλῳ τούτῳ Ἰωνες ὡς Ἐφεσον πλοία μὲν κατέλαμψαν ἐν Κορησίᾳ τῆς Ἐφεσίας, αὐτῷ δὲ ἀνέβαμον χειρὶ πολλῆς, ποιεύμενοι Ἐφεσίους ἠγέμονας τῆς ὁδοῦ. πορευόμενοι δὲ παρὰ ποταμὸν Καύστρου, ἐνθεύετο ἐπίτευχεν ὑπερβάντες τὸν Τιμόλον 5 ἀπίκουντοι, αἱρέουσαν Σάρδης δούλευσιν σφι ἀντιπιθέντος, αἱρέουσιν δὲ

Εκτρια, with their respective allies, which according to Thucydides (I. 13) rose to Panhellenic proportions, and alone of wars deserved mention between the Trojan and the Persian. Like the Peloponnesian war it was a war of divided Hellas, nay, of divided Ionia. Ecretia, Athens, Milesia and their confederates (cp. 6, 21) seem to have had the worst of it. The interests at stake were probably commercial, but the dual between the two principals was fought out with cavalry on the Lelantian plain, and the Thessalians secured victory for Chalkis (Plutarch, Mor. 760, after 'Aristotle'; cp. Aristot. Frag. 98 ed. Teub. p. 96.) The geographical position of Chalkis, commanding the Euphris, may have contributed to the issue. The victor reaped as reward the great colonial i.e. commercial expansion which sowed Thrace with Chalkidic colonies, and opened Sicily and the west (Carnae) to Chalkidic enterprise. Cp. Busolt, Gr. Gesch. i. 458, E. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alterthums, ii. § 302, Freeman, Sicily, i. c. iv., A. Holm, Hist. of Greece, i. 271 f. (E. T. 1884).

7. ἔρωτος, middle. He probably could not have gone in person. See infra. If the text can be trusted Aristogoras still acted as επίκουντι. Cp. cc. 57, 38, 49, 98. Perhaps Charoplinos and Hermophatos had been in office during the absence of Aristogoras at Sparta and Athens, cp. c. 38 supra. They were presumably in command of the Milean forces, while Aristogoras remained in the city to defend it.

100. 1. Ἰωνες. Are the Athenians lumped with the Ionians? Or were they protecting Milesia? See e. 105 infra.

2. χαῖρε πολλῆς, a curious and vague phrase, πολλῆς = μεγάλης. In 1. 174 =
χορή τῆς ἀκρόπολιος τάλλα πάντα τήν δὲ ἀκρόπολιν ἐφρύετο αὐτὸς Ἀρταφρένης ἔχον άνδρον δύωμιν ὅν εἶναι ἦλθεν. τὸ δὲ μὴ λεπτατθῆσαι ἑλώντος σφέας τῆν πόλιν ἐσχε τοῦτο. ἦσαν ἐν τῆς Σάρδας οἰκίας αἱ μὲν πλεύνες καλάμων, δόσαι δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ πλείυθιναι ἦσαν, καλάμων εἶχον τὰς ὀρφᾶς· τοιοῦτον δὲ μίην τῶν τις στρατιωτῶν ὡς ἐνέπτησε, αὐτίκα ἄπτ' οἰκίας ἐπ' οἰκίαις ὅλα τὸ 5 πῦρ ἐπενέμετο τὸ ἄστρον πάν. καιομένον δὲ τοῦ ἄστεος οἱ Λυδοὶ καὶ ἄστος Περσῶν ἐνῆσαν ἐν τῇ πόλις, ἀπολαμβάνετε πάντοθεν ὡς τὰ περιέχατα νεμομένου τοῦ πυρός, καὶ οὐκ ἐγγούς ἔβλεποι εἰς ἣν ἄστεος, συνέφρεον ὡς τῇ ἁγορῇ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Πακτολῶν ἕτοιμον, ὅσα σφήματα χρυσοῦ καταφρέον ἐκ τοῦ Τμῶλου διὰ τοῦ μέρους οὗ τὴν ἁγορῆς ἤτακε καὶ ἐπείκε της Ἔρριου ποταμοῦ ἐκδιδοῖ, ὁ δὲ ἐς βάλλασαν ἐπὶ τῷ πυρὶ τὸν Πακτολό καὶ ὡς τῆς ἁγορῆς ἀπροιζόμενοι οἱ τῇ Λυδοὶ καὶ οἱ Πέρσαι ἱμαγκάζοντο ἀμώνεσθαι. οἱ δὲ Περσοὶ ἁρέστευτος τοὺς μὲν ἀμωβοῦντος τῶν πολεμιῶν τοῦ δὲ σὺν πληθεὶς πολλῷ προσφερόμενοι, ἐκείνῳ ὑπάκουες διὰ τῆς ἁγορᾶς ὑπακούειν τοῦτο τοῦ Τμῶλου καλομένου, ἐθεοῦτεν δὲ ὑπὸ νύκτα ἀπαλάττοντο επὶ τῶν νῦσας.

Καὶ Σάρδις μὲν ἐνεπρήσθησαν, ἐν δὲ αὐτῆς καὶ ἤρων 102

his stories furnished a complete and critical record. If a portion of the Persian forces were before Miletos we can understand Artaphernes retiring on the citadel. We can understand why the Ionians went to Koresos in boats (σκάφος). We can understand the burning and evacuation of Sardes, and one or two other points in the next chapter otherwise obscure.

7. δύσμαν εἰς ἀλήθη. Another vague phrase, which if true would make the conduct of Artaphernes the more inexplicable. 101. 2. τόδε. The Ionians were prevented seeking Sardes by the configuration of the lower city, which 'compelled' (φανάκειον ἐν' ὅδε) the Persian garrison in the Akropolis, and the Lydians in the lower city, who were surrounded and could not escape into the country, to rally in the Agora, to turn upon the Ionian forces, and drive them away! It is pretty obvious that the facts have been 'doctoried.'

8. ἄστεος...πόλις. The distinction between the ἄστεος and the πόλις is clearly marked: only the former was consumed. Yet just above πόλις is used in contrast to ἀκρόπολις. There was nothing to bring the garrison down out of the Akropolis. If the fire seized first the outer ring of the city, and if the Lydians were hemmed in, that looks all the less like accident.

11. τούτων μὲν...τοὺς δὲ. This passage looks like a distorted reminiscence of the probable course of events. The Persians are besieging Miletos: the Ionian fleet with the assistance of the Athenians defeat the Persian fleet off the Pamphylia coast. To raise if possible the siege of Miletos Aristocrates projects a brilliant dash on Sardes. It is successfully carried out. The Persian garrison, indeed, holds the citadel, but the town falls into the hands of the Ionians, and is fired. Meanwhile Persian forces from before Miletos advance to the rescue (ἐν' ὑπακούει τολμᾶ), and the Ionians are threatened in front and rear, but make good their retreat under cover of night, not perhaps altogether empty-handed. They are, however, overaken and routed "in Ephesus" (c. 102).
102. Κυβήβης, identified with μνήμη Διονύσου 1. 80, here treated by Hdt. (and by the Greeks who burnt her temple) as a non-Hellenic divinity. The head-quarters of the great Asianic mother were rather in Phrygia, at Pessinus, than in Lydia, at Sardes. The identification of Kybele, or Kybebe, with Rhea may be later than Hdt., or unknown to him. The classical tract upon the ritual is Lucian's περὶ τῆς Σαρδῆς θεοῦ, nor is it likely that the ritual was any purer or more wholesome in earlier times, though the destruction of Kybele's shrine at Sardes is scarcely to be ascribed to Greek puritanism. The Atys-myth, which was involved with the cult of the Great Mother, is virtually localised or connected with Sardes in the story told 1. 34-45.

τά. The Persians hardly required an excuse for destroying Hellenic shrines, nor did they destroy them apparently for set purpose, or wholesale. The sanctity of Delos they respected, 6. 97 ἵνα, and Delphi was not plundered, much less consumed. But the destruction of the temple at Sardes was, probably, an offence to Greek consciences, and Greek ideas of right were appeased by the colourless γενόμενον pro quo.

4. Αὐτῶς Ἀλκης, i.e. west of the Halys, cp. 1. 6. The νομοὶ would be the first three enumerated 3. 90. But the Persians here referred to were στρατηγοὶ not στάρας, cp. 1. 116 ἵνα.

προτυπισμένοι, grates upon the narrative, and implies that it has been incomplete. The Persians had not been sitting idle all the winter and spring. This indication goes to support the suggestions made above, cc. 100 f. notes.

8. πολλὸν ἱστόρημα. If the Ionians (Athenians) and Ecfevrians suffered a great defeat on the return march from Sardes, it is a wonder that Charon of lampsakos did not say so. His account ran: Ἀθηναίοι δὲ ἔπαυσαν τραχύνων ἔθνες ἐπαυσάμενοι τούς Ἰωνας καὶ τὰ Σαρδέα διερχόμενον, καὶ ἐπούλω τὰ περὶ Σαρδέα ἀπαντᾷ χρόνος τοῖς τεύχοις τοῦ βασιλέως ταύτα ἐπιφανεῖς ἑπαρχοντος ἢ Μαρτίου, De Mulier. 24; Müller, F.H.G. I. p. 33, Frag. 2. The burning of Sardes gave an impulse to the revolt (see next chapter) which could hardly have been the case if it had been immediately followed by a crushing defeat. Rawlinson, who suggests that the sea-fight off the Pamphylian coast, omitted by Hdt., "is probably a mere misrepresentation of the battle c. 112 ἵνα, does not suggest that the great defeat at Ephesus here recorded may be an anticipation of the battle c. 116 ἵνα. The death of Eualkides, which looks like hard fact, tends to fix the battle "in Ephesus" to the first campaign; but as Busolt (Gr. G. ii. 33) points out, the Ecfevrians probably did not desert the Ionian cause with the Athenians.

10. στεφανιφόροι here = στεφάναται. Cp. 8. 26, Herrn. Lehrbuch ii. § 90. 4. His crowns and poetical lands did not save him nor celebrate him on this occasion: the verses in question were Επιστίκα not Επιστάφια. On Simonides of Reos (c.c. 566-469) see Mahaffy, Gr. Lit. 2. Poets § 148, Bergk, Poest. Lyric. Gr. iii. 4, pp. 392-395 (where this passage appears as No. 9), Flach, Gr. Lyric. pp. 611-646. Hdt. elsewhere, 7. 228, quotes Simonides, and gives his patronymic
Τότε μὲν δὴ οὖσι ἡγομένων. μετὰ δὲ Ἄθρανοις μὲν τὸ 103
παράπτων ἀπολύτητος τοῦ Ἰωά, ἐπικαλεομένου σφέας πολλ' δὲν ἀγγέλων 'Αριστογόρω, οὐκ ἔβασαν τιμωρήσεως σφές. Ἰωάς δὲ τῆς Ἀθηναίων συμμαχίας στερηθέντες, οὖσι γὰρ σφεν υπήρεχεν πεποιημένα ἐς Δαρείου, οὐδὲν δὲν ἦσον τοῦ προς βασιλέα πύλες 5
μον ἐκείνῳ. πλάσαντες δὲ ἐς τὸν 'Ελλησπόντου Βυζάντιον

('son of Leoprepes'), not as here, his birthplace. Ceros was the nearest of the Kyklades to Attica.

102. 1. τὸ παράδειγμα ἀπολύτητος τοῦ Ἰωά. Grot (P. II. c. xxxv. vol. iii. p. 501) gratuitously conjectures 'some glaring desertion on the part of their Asiatic allies' to account for this apparently feeble and inconsequent act on the part of the Athenians. The only glaring desertion recorded is this very act of the Athenians themselves. Of course there was a sufficient reason, positive or negative, though Hdt. has recorded none. It may be conjectured that the question for the Athenians was not one of staying in Ionia or going home, but of staying at home, or returning, next year, to Ionia. The Athenians hardly sent out their ships with a permanent or unlimited commission. The ships would return to Athens at the end of the season. Something had been accomplished; the Persian fleet defeated, the siege of Mileta raised, Sardes destroyed; the revolt in Asia was in full swing; the Athenians might feel themselves safe for the present from the machinations of Hippias and Arthephyne, and turned a deaf ear to the solicitations of Arista- gorus, during the winter and ensuing spring (ἐπικαλεομένου σφέας πολλ' δὲν ἀγγέλων). Perhaps the promises of Arista- gorus, including the 50 talents or so (cp. c. 97 supra), had not been fulfilled. This change of policy was perhaps shortsighted, and selfish; but the twenty ships had not been commis- sioned in the first instance from motives of heroic altruism or ambition. It should be considered further that there may have been very good excuses in the foreign relations of Athens west of the Aegean, and in the state of parties in the city itself, for keeping the twenty vessels and their crews at home. Twenty ships could not be engaged permanently on distant service, with Aigina on one side and Chalkis on the other, each looking out for Athenian troubles; and there was probably now, as later, a party in the city itself prepared to suck advantage from any disaccord abroad, or straining of the state's resources. It is not to be supposed that Aristaqors, who went into the business a bankrupt c. 35 supra, de- frayed the expenses. The ships had accomplished their mission. That the Athenians would have been well advised, to have supported the revolt again at a later stage is not to be denied. They themselves, when too late, seem to have taken this view of the matter. See 6. 21 infra. There was current a similar criticism upon the policy of the Spartans, cp. c. 50 supra, Thuc. 1. 69, 9. See further, Appendices VII. VIII.

6. πλάσαντες. This word may mark the beginning of the second year of the war, and it would be difficult to rationalise the Ionian movement except upon the supposition that there was no immediate danger of an advance of the king's fleet, owing to the great victory in the previous summer, off the Pamphylian coast. Cp. c. 102 supra, and Appendix Y.

'Ελλησπόντων. Here used in-clusively of the whole water-way, Hellespont, Propontis and Bosporos. It might be suspected that the towns on the Hellespont proper had joined the revolt earlier, but that Byzantion, Chalkedon, and the towns about them, only joined on the appearance of the Ionian fleet in the second year of the war; cp. c. 117 infra.

A regular and necessary preliminary to the liberation of the Hellespont was an Hellenic victory in the Southern Levant; otherwise Ionia was at the mercy of the king's ships. So the prize of Mykale is the Hellespont 9. 101 ad fin. So Pansias heads for Kypros before blocading Byzantium in 478- 7 B.C., Thuc. 1. 94, and the same strategy is pursued by Kimon and the Athenians, again and again. Kypros was now, indeed, in revolt, but that revolt itself is best explained by the
τε καὶ τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις πάσας τὰς ταύτη ὑπ’ ἐνωτού ἐποιήσαντο, ἐκπλάκασαν τῇ ἐξῳ τοῦ Ἐλλησποντοῦ Καρπῆς τὴν πολλὴν προσεκτήσαντο σφίς σύμμαχον εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ τὴν Καυνὸν τρότηρον ὑπὸ βουλομένην συμμαχεῖν, ὃς ἐκσπάζοντες ἔσσει τᾶς Σάρδης, τότε σφί καὶ αὐτὴ προσεγένετο. Κύπριοι δὲ ἔθελον πρὸς τὰς πλῆθος Ἀμαυρωσίας ἀπετήρασιν γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι ὤδε ἀπὸ Μηδῶν. ἢ ὁ Ὀνήσιλος Τύρον μὲν τοῦ Σαλαμίνιος βασιλέως ἄδεξε θέτορος, Χέρσον ἐκ τοῦ Σιρόμοι τοῦ Ἐνδρ. 5 θυσιός πάλι. οὗτος ὁμοίς πολλάκις μὲν καὶ πρότερον τοῦ Γόργον παρηγορεῖτο ἀπετάσσας ἀπὸ βασιλέως, τότε δὲ, ὡς καὶ τῶν Ἰωνίων ἐπιθετῶς ἀπετάσσατο πάχυν ἐπίκειμον ἐνήγει γὰρ ὡς οὐκ ἐπείθει τῶν Γόργων, ἐνθάδε μὲν ἐνυλᾶς ἐξελίθνα τὸ ἄστυ τὸ Σαλαμίνιον ὁ Ὀνήσιλος ἀμα τοῦ ἑνυλῶς ἑπακελέμα τῶν πολέων. Γόργος μὲν δὴ στερθεὶς τῆς πόλεως ἐφευγε ἐς Μηδῶν, Ὀνήσιλος δὲ ἅρχη Σαλαμίνοι καὶ ἀνέπτει πάντας Κυπρίους συναπτάσανθα τῶν μὲν δὴ ἄλλους ἄντειες, Ἀμα-
'Ονήσίδεως μὲν νῦν ἐπολιόρρηκε Ἀμαθόντα. βασιλεύς δὲ 105 Ἀρδαίων ὅλ' ἐξαγγέλθη Σάρδεις ἀλώνας ἐμπέτρησαν ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀθηναίων καὶ Ἰονίων, τὸν δὲ ὅγιονα ἰενεῖσται τῷ συλλογῇ ὡστε τοῦτο συνυφανθήναι τὸν Μιλεσίουν Ἀρισταγόρην, πρώτα μὲν λέγεται αὐτῷ, ὡς ἐπὶ ταῦτα, Ἰονίων οὐδένα λόγον ποιήσαντες, εἰρήνατε ὦτε τοιούτους εἰς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, μετὰ δὲ πυθομένους αἰτηθησαί τὸ τόξον, λαβώντα δὲ καὶ ἐπιθέντα δὲ ὅστοις ἄνω πρὸς τοὺς ὀφραντοὺς ἀπείνας, καὶ μὲν ἐς τὸν μέρα βάλλοντα εἰπεῖν "οδὸς Ἕλεω, ἐγκενέεσθαι μοι Ἀθηναίους τίσασθαι," εἰπότα δὲ ταῦτα προστάξας 10 ἐνι τῶν θεραπόντων δειπνοῦ προκειμένου αὐτῷ ἐς τρὶς ἐκάστου τοῦτο συλλογῆς...
106 εἰσέν τοὺς "δέσποτα, μέμνειν τοὺς 'Αθηναίοις." προστάξεις δὲ ταῦτα εἰπε, καλεύσας ἐς ὅψιν Ἰστιαίοι στὸν Μιλήσιον, [τὸν ὁ Δαρείος κατείχε χρόνον ἡδύ πολλῶν.] "πυθόμασι Ἰστιαίες ἐπίτροποι τὸν σύ, τῷ σῷ Μιλήτῳ ἐπέτρεψας, υποτελάς ἐς ἐμὲ πεποιηκέναι 5 πρόμαχος." ἄνδρας γὰρ μοι ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρης ἤπειροι ἐπαγαγόν, καὶ Ἰονίας σὺν αὐτοῖς τοὺς δώσοντας ἐμὸν δίκην τῶν ἐποίησαν, τούτων αναγνώρισας ἀμα ἐκεῖνοι ἐπεβιβάσατο Σαρδίων με ἀπεστά- ῥήσει. νῦν δὲ κόσμος τοῖς ταῦτα φαίνεται ἔχειν κάλος; κώς δὲ ἀνευ τῶν σῶν βουλευμάτων τούτοις τῇ ἐπιρρήθη; ὅρα μὴ ἐξ ὑστέρης 10 σεσωμόν ἐν αἰτίᾳ σχῆς." εἰπε πρὸς ταῦτα Ἰστιαίος "βασιλεῦ, καὶ οἰκίσας ἐποιεῖς, ἐμὲ βουλεύσαι πρόμαχοι ἐκ τοῦ σοῦ τῇ μέγα ἡ σιμφωνία ἐμΦης λυπηροῦ ἀνασκέψεως; τί δὲ ἐν ὑποδέχ- μενος ποιούμεν ταῦτα, τεῦ δὲ ἐνδεχε ἐνός τῷ πάρα μὲν πάντα ἄσα περ σοι, πάντων δὲ πρὸς σὲν βουλευμάτων ἐπακοεῖν 15 αἰτίας. ἀλλ' ἐπερ τὴν τοιοῦτον ἄναν σὺ εἰρήνης πρήσεις ὁ ἔμοι ἐπίτροπος, ἄχρι αὐτῶν ἐπὶ οὖν τοῦ βασιλέου πεποιηκέναι. ἀρχὴν δὲ ἔγονεν οὐδὲ ἐνδέχομαι τὸν λόγον, ὅσοι τῷ Μιλήσιον καὶ 20 ὁ ἔμοι ἐπίτροπος νεώτερον πρήσουμεν περὶ πρόμαχα τὰ σά. εἰ δέ άρα τὴν τοιοῦτο ποιεῖσθαι καὶ σύ τῷ ἐν ἀκήκας ὁ βασιλεύ. μάθε ὁν εἰνα πρόμαχος ἐργάσασαι ἐμὲ ἀπὸ βαθαίνῃς αὐτάσσατον ποιήσας. Ἰονίων γὰρ οἰκίσας ἐμεθὲς ἐς ὀρθάμων σφι γεγομένῃ ποιήσαι τῶν πᾶλαι ὑπέρ εὐχαριστεῖ ἐμφός δὲ ἀν ἑόντος ἔν Ιωνία ὑστῆμι πόλεις ὑπεκίνησε. νῦν δὲ ὁς τάχος ἀπεκρύβηκα αὐτοῖς ἔν Ιωνία, ἴνα τούτοις καταρτιζόμεν σύ τῷ τῶν καὶ τῶν 25 Μιλήτων ἐπίτροπον τούτοις τοῦ ταῦτα μηχανήσαμεν οἰγχείρητον παραδό. ταῦτα δὲ κατὰ νόμον τῶν σῶν ποιήσας, θεοὺς ἐννομιμά τὸν βασιλέων μὲν πρῶτον ἐκδύσαται τῶν ἑνῶς καθώς καταβᾶσαμεν εἰς Ιωνίαν, πρὶν ἂν τοῦ Σαρδῶν νήσου τὴν μεγίστην

106. 2. τόν . . . σολλόν σεκεσίλι Σειν. 7. Σαρδῶν με ἀπεστάσαση. Δαρείος had spent some time at Sardes 4. 85, 143, 5. 11, and would feel its loss the more acutely. A fine literary touch. 16. ἐν ὑποτο βασιλέων, c. 73 συμπ. 19. τὸ ἔναν, 'the thing that is,' cp. c. 59 συμπ. τὸ ἐντέρ χρησάμενος 1. 30, τὰς δικὰς ἐργάζεσθαι κατὰ τὸ ἔρως 1. 97. 28. Σαρδῶν. Histoias presumes too far upon the king's geographical ignorance, in vowing the conquest of Sardinia before Naxos, the Kyklinkes, Euboea and Athens. The passage no doubt was intended to be Sardically comic (Σαρδῶν . . . Σαρδῶν), but the satire is crude. After the real subtlety and dramatic propriety of the speech of Histiaeas the mere word-play is an artistic blot.

Σαρδῶν νήσον τὴν μεγίστην. The conquest, or the colonisation of Sardinia, is an old idea with the Ionians (cp. 1. 170, c. 124 infra, 6. 2). As to its size: Freeman (Sicily, i. pp. 2, 241) accepts the Herodotean view, which is certainly erroneous. Kiepert has: "wrongly supposed by the ancients to be the largest island in the Mediterranean," Manual of Geography, § 243. Stanford's Compendium, Europe (1886) p. 297, makes Sicily "the largest island in the Mediterranean." In the excellent Epitome of Geography for the use of National Schools of Ireland (Dublin,
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δασμόφόρων ποιήσαν. Ἡ Ἰστιαίος μὲν λέγων ταύτα διέβαλλε, 107
Δαρείου δὲ ἐπέθετο καὶ μὴν ἄπτε, ἔντειλεν, ἐπεάν τὰ ἱπποχεῖα οἱ ἐπιτελεῖ ποιήσα, παραγίνεσθαι οἱ ὁπίσω ἐς τὰ Σαῦαν.

Ἐν δὲ ἡ ἀγγελίᾳ τε περὶ τῶν Ἀρχάνων παρὰ βασιλέα 108
ἀνῆ καὶ Δαρείου τὰ περὶ τὸ τύχων ποιήσας Ἰστιαίος ἐς λέγων ἦλθε καὶ Ἰστιαίος μεμετέμενος ὡς Δαρείου ἐκμετάλει ἐπὶ τὰ
λασταμένα, ἐν τούτῳ παντὶ τὸ χρόνῳ εἰρεῖντο τάδε. πολυμορφιστῷ
τῷ Σαλαμινίῳ ὁ Ἑρωδότος Ἀμαθέους ἐξεγερᾶται νῆσις στρα-
τίου πολλήν ἄγαντα Περσικήν Ἀρτέμιον ἄνδρα Πέρσης προς-
δόκιμοι περὶ τὴν Κυπριόν ἐνια: πυθόμενος δὲ ταύτα ὁ Ὀνήσιλος
κύρικας διέπτεμε ὡς τὴν Ἰονίαν ἐπικαλεύμενος σφαῖρα, Ἰωνες
δε ὡς μακρὴν βουλευσάμενοι ἱκὼν πολλῷ στόλῳ. Ἰωνες τε

1857) Sardinia is described as "considerably larger than Corsica, being about 160 miles long from north to south, and 90 miles broad" p. 195, while Sicily is given as 180 miles long from east to west, with an eastern side of about 150, p. 181. Mackay's Elements of Geography, 1807, p. 119, gives the area of Sicily, "the largest island in the Mediterranean," as 10,556 sq. miles, and the area of Sardinia, "the second largest island in the Mediterranean," as 9,157 sq. miles. So too Nissen, Italice Landskunde, i. 345-353, gives the "official" sizes (1883) Sicily 22,240 sq. km., Sardinia 24,250 sq. km. Baedeker, Southern Italy (1893), p. 225, mentions that some recent estimates enlarge the area to 25,806 sq. km. Cp. c. 31 supra.

107. ἠδιέβαλλε, as in c. 50 supra.

108. μεμετέμενος. An extraordinary formation from μεθύομαι (μετέμενος), cp. 61. ἔκμεταλε is a strict imperfect.

1. ἐν τούτῳ παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ. This chronological indication is more precise than acceptable. Nor is it really precise. The news about Sardis must surely have reached the king before the opening of the second year of the war (cp. c. 105 supra); the episode of the bow, the interview with Histiasos, were affairs of minutes merely: the journey of Histiasos down to the sea (Ionia, or Phoenicia) was a longer business. At best, this passage cannot be taken to prove more than that before Histiasos reached Sardis (6, 1) the war in Kypros had been concluded (c. 116 infra). It might further be argued that the siege of Amathus was in progress during the winter (498-7 B.C.). But if the king's fleet had been heavily defeated in 498 B.C. (vide c. 99 supra) the next year (497 B.C.) is full soon to see the Phoenicians at work again off Kypros.

Cp. Appendix V.

τάξιν. What follows: down to c. 115, or even to the end of the Book.

5. νησὶς. Probably Phoenician, though the forces are Persian under a Persian general. But cp. 6. 6 infra.

6. Ἀρτέμιος. This name is omitted in the list of proper names given in Rawlinson, vol. iii. p. 539 f.

8. Ἰωνες οὕτως παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ. This is the first hint in the actual narrative of the Ionian revolt of the confederate council and authority. The brevity of the deliberation on this occasion cannot be adduced as a proof of the folly or cowardice of the Ionians. They seem to have understood the advantage of supporting the revolt in Kypros as well as the Athenians understood the advantage of supporting the revolt in Ionia. The brevity of the deliberation indicates, however, that the confederate council was in full working order, and had probably been directing affairs hitherto, although Hdt. has said nothing about it; and also that the revolt of Kypros had been part of the general and concerted programme. Cp. c. 104 supra.

9. πολλῷ στόλῳ. Hdt.'s estimates in this narrative are nearly all vague, cp. c. 106, or exaggerated, cc. 108, 118, 120. With the parataxis following, cp. 4. 199.
10 δὴ παρῆσαν ἐς τὴν Κύπρον καὶ οἱ Πέρσαι πήγαν διαβάντες ἐκ τῆς Κιλικίας ἤμαν ἐπὶ τὴν Σαλαμίνα πεζῷ. τῇ δὲ πήγα τοῖς Φοίνικες περιέπλεον τὴν ἅγραν αὐτοὶ καλεῦνται Κλαδῆς τῆς Κύπρου.

109 τούτον δὲ τοιούτον γνωμένου ἔδεξαν οἱ τύραννοι τῆς Κύπρου, συγκαλέσαντες τῶν Ἰωνίων τοὺς στρατηγούς, "ἄνδρες Ἰωνεῖς, αἴρεσιν ὡμοῖοι δίδομεν ἡμεῖς οἱ Κύπριοι οὐκ οὕτως βούλεσθε προσφέρεσθαι, ἦ Πέρσῃς ἢ Φοίνιξ; εἰ μὲν γὰρ πεζῇ βούλεσθε 5 ταχθῆνετε Περσῶν διαπερᾶσθαι, ἢ Ἰωνεῖς ἄρη ἢ οἱ ὑπὲρ τοῦ νέον τάσσεσθαι πεζῇ, ἡμέας δὲ ἢ τὰς νέας εἴσαινε τὰς ἐμὲτέρας Φοίνιξ ἀνταγωνισμένους; εἰ δὲ Φοίνικος μᾶλλον βούλεσθε διαπερᾶσθαι, ποιεῖτε χρόνον ἐστὶν ἡμέας, ὡκύτηρα ἀν δὴ τούτων ἐλημέθη, ὡκός τὸ κατ ἡμᾶς ἔσται ἢ τε Ἰωνεῖς καὶ 10 Κύπρος ελευθέραι." εἶπαν "Ἰωνεῖς πρὸς ταῦτα "ἡμέας δὲ ἀπίστευμε τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰωνίων φυλάξοντας τὴν θάλασσαν,

11. τῆς δὲ νησί. Did the Phoenician vessels ship the Persian troops across from Kilkika (perhaps the Aegean plain, cp. 6. 95 supra) to Cyprus, and then proceed round 'the Keys,' or were not two separate fleets employed, transports and men-of-war? 12. Κλαδῆς. If the text is complete Hdt. is wrong in giving the name to the ἅγραν, εἰτε δὲ αἱ μὲν Κλαδῆς ηησαίοι δύο προσελκυμένα τῇ Κύπρῳ κατὰ τὰ ἐορτάκην μέρας τῆς γῆς, Strabo 682. The plural form of the name makes for the islands not for the promontory. There are half a dozen rocks to which the name applies; cp. Hogarth, Devis Cypriae, pp. 81, 82.

108. 1. οἱ τύραννοι. . . τοὺς στρατηγοὺς (c. 38). The 'tyrants' of Cyprus here appear as the champions of freedom, at least from the foreign yoke, and as allies of the republican Ionians. The hostility and competition of Hellene and Phoenician in Cyprus sufficiently explain the anomaly. A parallel case is supplied by Sicily, where the Hellenic tyrant is the champion of Hellenism against the Carthaginian. Cp. 7. 165 ff. and contr. c. 37 supra, 4. 157.

3. άπεταν. This ambivalent idea, that the same soldiers could fight equally well on sea and on land, would imply a comparatively rudimentary condition of the arts of war at the time, if the recorded offer was ever made. The offer no doubt is confined to the fighting men: the oarsmen presumably were to stay where they were. Yet perhaps the anecdote is scarcely historical. The patronising airs of superiority assumed by Ionians towards Kyprotes would amuse an Athenian or a Dorian audience.

5. Περσῶν διαπερᾶσθαι, 'to put Persians to the proof.' Φοίνικος δ. just below, 'to make proof of Phoenicians.' Cp. 8. 9 ἄποιησαν αὐτῶν τοὺς τινὰς ἄλλοις βούλεψαν τῆς τε μέχρι καὶ τοῦ διεκθέλειν ἀποφεύγεται, is presumably less than δαίμον, cp. 1. 47, 2. 28 and 77 (τῶν ἐγὼ ἐν διάφοροις ἀμαρτήσαν). 9. δικαίως . . . ἐσται. Cp. Goodwin, Gk. Meeds and Tenen, § 324 ed. maj. 11. τοῦ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰωνίων, cp. c. 168 supra. Says Grüber, Pt. ii. c. xxyv. (vol. III, p. 502), "we hear now, for the first and the last time, of a tolerably efficient Pan-Ionic authority." But 1. 141 shows the Pan-Ionic council at work fifty years before, though Miletos then was excommunicate. The expression here may signify that Aristagoras the 'tyrant' had not sent the fleet, either because he had not authority, or because he was already off to Thrace. Cp. c. 126 infra. The historian's record here is anyway not devoid of a certain humour. The Ionians look down on 'Kyprotes' much as Athenians upon Ionians, c. 69 supra. To avoid facing the Persian infantry (cp. 6. 112) on the plea of a strict adherence to discipline (cp. 6. 12) and to remind the men of Kypros of their servitude to the 'Mede' and exhort them to courage (cp. 4. 142), are malicious touches in Ionian portraiture, as painted by Hdt. Not but what
Ionians had proved themselves ‘good men’ (I. 169); but that was long syne, in the days of Kyros! The Ionian revolt was a mistake in Hdt.’s eyes. Cp. s. 98 supra.

110. Ημέραν. That the Persians should have been allowed to land at all seems rather a blunder: the landing may have been effected before the advent of the Ionians, c. 108.


2. οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν Κυπρίων = οἱ τάγματα τῆς Κύπρου συστα. Against Persians they might be kings: compared with Greek strategi they were tyrants. But Hdt. scarcely uses the terms with such full intent.

4. Σαλαμινίων καὶ Σαλίων. Salamin on the east coast, on the left bank of the river Pedainus: Soli upon the north (or west) coast in nearly the same parallel at the western end of the great central plain (cp. previous note), both at this time perhaps special centres of Hellenic sympathy (cp. cc. 104 supra, 108 infra) and more or less Hellenised. Salamin from its name and position no doubt was originally Phoenician, the notion of a colony from Attic Salamis being pragmatic (cp. Busolt, Gr. G. i. 3 p. 321): nor is it likely that Soli was named from Solon (according to the etymologising anecdote in Plutarch, Solon, 26); there was another Soli on the coast of Kilikia, and Hdt. apparently takes Solon to Soli in Kyros, c. 113 infra. The Greek spoken at Soli was proverbially incorrect, even in the time of Hdt., cp. 4. 117. But the town was undoubtedly Hellenic, though whether founded from Athens or not can hardly be regarded as fully ascertained. The temple of Athene might be an evidence, or merely an explanation of the legend. Busolt, Gr. G. i. 3 321, inclines to regard the Athenian settlement as historic.

111. Ημέραν, ‘rode.’ See next εἰς τό τοῦ ἐπτάμον κατάμεσον. One might have expected the ‘King of Salamis’ to have been in a chariot (πολεμητήριον ἀριμα, c. 113), but he appears to be fighting afoot.


5. κατεργάζεται. Cp. εἰκονογράφεται s. 19, διεργάζεται s. 20 supra.
8. ὤνων. The form ὤνων is certainly poetical, and to change it here into ὤνων (with Förstmann, de vocobula quasi videntur apud Herodotum poetice, 1892) would lower the tons of the anecdote.

11. προφέρετερον is Stein’s emendation of προφέρετος. προφέρετερον means ‘like.’ Whynot προφέρετερον, the προφέρετερον having been introduced by προφέρεται just below? Stein, however, thinks that Hdt. wrote προφέρετος. Cp. his note ad l. (1892).

14. δεύτερα, v.l. δεύτερα, cp. c. 38 ενυμένα.

15. ἐνδίδοχρος καὶ ἐποδανεῖν ἡμίνα συμφωνία. This knightly maxim, and indeed the whole anecdote, go to show how superficial is the view which makes ‘romantic’ sentiment a peculiarity of northern nations, or of ‘medieval’ times. Hellenic antiquity and literature are saturated with romance; and among the romantic writers of Hellas Hdt. holds a very high place. Cp. Introduction, p. xxvii.

112. 1. πεπόνεσθαι καὶ νησίον. Like the battles of the Eurymedon, Thuc. 1. 100 (c. 485 B.C.), and of Salamis again, Thuc. 1. 119, 4 (c. 449 B.C.), this was a double engagement, by sea and land. Hdt. could hardly have written the story of the Kyprian campaign of 497 B.C. without a thought of the later campaigns, in which the Athenians were engaged; and there may be a dim reference to those later days in the words νησίον μὲν τῶν Ἰωνίων ἄκροι γενόμενοι ταύτην τὰ ἡμέρα. They might however only point the contrast with Lade. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxv ff.

3. Ἑλλάδας ήρωτευον. The Aristotelian of the Samians suggest one possible source of the narrative, though the Karian’s achievement might well have been remembered in Karia, at Halikarnassos or elsewhere.


10. τῶν τόδε. Only the five ones.
113. 3. Ἐπισλέπτωρ. Steeson, the traitor, is a ‘tyrant’: Onesilos and Aristokypres, ‘kings.’ But the point cannot be pressed, cp. σ. 109 supra. The name Stesioscocus appears at Curium, about 420 B.C. (Head, Hist. Num. p. 622).

Κούρων. On the Lykos, some 16 R. miles to the W. of Amathus, one of the nine city-states of Kypros. See κ. 104 supra. Steph. B. τόλμη Κύπρου, ἀπὸ τοῦ Κάριου τοῦ Καρίου τραχύτος. Kinyras is a well-known figure in Kypros, but his sons according to Apollodoros (3. 14, 3) were Oxyporos and Adonis: Kureus is not known. Is the name connected with the Kofyres and the cult of Zeus?

5. Λέγοντα. Hdt. doubts the statement (κ. 4. 184). The connexion, real or supposed, between ‘Argos’ and Kypros is suggestive, whichever of the two was the terminus a quo: the remark of Mr. Hemill’s (Hist. Num. p. 620) that the weight standard of all the Kypriote silver money is at first the Aiginetic somewhat reduced, may point to later commercial relations, but might lead to a date too recent for the original settlements. But (1) archaeological evidence, especially ‘Kykennean’ pottery, (2) the resemblance of the Kypriote and Arkadian dialects, and perhaps (3) the separate Kypriote syllabary (cp. Deede, in Baumeister’s Denkmäler, p. 51, Hnrichs, in I. Miller, Handbuch, i. 365), go to show that Peloponnesian settlers were in Kypros before the close of the Mykenean period. Cp. further, Busolt, Gr. G. i. 2. 318 ff.

12. Σόλων ὁ Ἀθηναίος, κ. c. 110 supra. The visit of Solon to Kypros cannot have been later than 560-559 B.C. and might have been 20-30 years earlier. Upwards of sixty, it may be upwards of ninety, years thereafter the son of Philokypres, Solon’s contemporary and friend, is killed in battle. The succession in this case appears as much too slow as in the former case of Onesilos (κ. 104) too rapid.

ἐν ἔτοιν. Plutarch, Solon 26, says ἐν ταῖσ ἔργοιαν, and quotes them (cp. Bergk, Poet. Lyr. iii. p. 47), from which it does not follow that Hdt. knew not an Epel from an Elegy, when he saw them, but only that the terms are used loosely. ἔτοι = poetry, as distinguished from prose λέγοντα.

ἀληθείς τυράννων μάλαστα. It is not quite clear whether, in the eyes of Hdt., the act was a credit to Philokypres or a discredit to Solon. Anyway Solon may have seen that what suited Athens might not suit Soli, and have praised Philokypres though he blamed Peisistratos. The visits of Solon to Kypros, Egypt (cp. 2. 177) and Lydia (3. 29) may have had a politico-commercial object, at least in part.

114. 2. ἐπισλέπτης, κ. c. 104, 105 supra. The victory of the Persians on land, and the retreat of the Ionian fleet, presumably relieved Amathus: even if the siege had not been already raised (cp. κ. 110 supra).
5 κηρίων μὲν ἐνέπλησε. τούτον δὲ γενομένου τοιούτου, ἐχρεώντο γὰρ περὶ αὐτῆς οἱ Ἀμαθοῦσιοι, ἐμανεθῦσθα σφι τὴν μὲν κεφαλὴν κατελώνας τίγασι, Ὅμηρος δὲ ὅθεν ὡς ἦρωι ἀνὰ πάν ἔσον, καὶ σφι ποιεῦσι ταῦτα ἄμεινον συνολοσεβαί. Ἀμαθοῦσιοι μὲν νῦν ἐποίειν ταῦτα καὶ τὸ μέχρι ἐμείνω Ἰωνεῖς δὲ οἱ ἐν Κύπρῳ ναυμαχηθησάντες ἐπείτε ἔμαθον τὰ πρῶτα ματα τὰ Ὀμηρίου δια-φθαρμένα καὶ τὰς πόλεις τῶν Κυπρίων πολιορκευμένας τὰς ἄλλας πλὴν Σαλαμίνους, ταῦτην δὲ Γόργην τὸ προτέρῳ βασιλεῖς τῶν Σαλαμίνιων παραδόντας, αὐτίκα μαθοῦστε οἱ Ἰωνεῖς ταῦτα ὁπε-πλεον ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίαν. τῶν δὲ ἐν Κύπρῳ πολιῶν ἀνέτειχε χρόνος ἐπὶ πλείστου πολιορκευμένη Σόλοι, τὴν πέρικε ὑπορύθμισε τὸ τείχος πέμπτον μηνὶ εἶλοι οἱ Πέρσαι.

116 Κύπριοι μὲν δὴ ἐναυστὸν δεύετερον γενόμενον αὐτῖς ἐκ νέως κατεδούλωσαν. Δαυρίος δὲ ἠχον Σαρδείον θυγατέρα καὶ Ἰμαῖρας τε καὶ Ὀταῖνος ἄλλοι Πέρσαι στρατηγοὶ, ἠχοῦντες καὶ οὕτῳ Δαρείου θυγατέρας, ἐπιδιώκοντες τοὺς ἐς Σάρδεις στρατευ-

5. ἐχρεώντο γὰρ. Where? of what God? The Kyprotes had a peculiar divination by swine, at least in the time of Pausanias (4. 2, 2), but the response seems to imply that the act went beyond a mere divination by splanchnic-scopy, or such-like means. Perhaps one of the Apolline shrines in Asia Minor was consulted; or possibly an Egyptian oracle. Cp. 2. 83.

7. θεός ὃς ἦρως sounds like the direction of an Hellenic oracle, cp. c. 47 supra.

8. ἄμεινον συνολοσεβάς, c. 82 supra.

115. 2. ἐποίειν ταῦτα καὶ τὸ μέχρι ἐμείνω looks certainly like a visit of Hdt. to Amathus, or at least Kyprion; perhaps on the way to or from Tyre (2. 44) or Egypt. The mere formula, however, is not in itself conclusive; cp. 4. 124 and Introduction, p. liii, and § 20.

4. τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἄλλας πλὴν Σαλα-μίνος must be understood to refer only to the towns which had succed from the Persians. Cp. c. 104 supra. All the cities of Kypros were apparently walled.

5. Γόργης. Gorgos still king at the date of the expedition of Xerxes, 7. 98.

8. ὑπορύθμισεν. Cp. the Persian operations at Barke, 4. 200, where they dug ἄρειμα ὑπορύθμισαν φιλοστε ἐν τῷ τάγμα τινος, in that case unsuccessfully.

9. πιστῶν μην, 'after four months.' Probably late in the autumn of 496 n.c. or in the winter following. If strict calendar months underlie this date, the time might be reduced to something just over three natural months.
closely connected together in their command. The patronymics unfortunately are not given. Hymans is not commemorated elsewhere, except c. 122 supra. Oranes is the son of Sissannes, c. 25 supra στρατηγὸς τῶν παραβαλακτιων ἀνδρῶν, ὁ τρίτος στρατηγὸς c. 123 infra.

5. Ιάνων. The Athenians and Eretrians have disappeared: but cp. cc. 102, 103 supra.

Τῇ μάχῃ seems naturally to refer to the Persian victory related c. 102 supra and placed by Hdt. immediately after the burning of Sardes, on the way back. After the battle, as appears from this passage, the Ionians are driven into their ships, and the victorious Persians proceed to capture and devastate the cities. In the previous narrative, however, the battle is followed by the revolt of Karin and Kamos from the Persians—a curious consequence of a crushing defeat of the revolters!—and by the liberation of the Hellespont and Kypros (for a year). The narrative of Hdt. is evidently incomplete, and probably inaccurate. If a defeat was inflicted upon the Ionians, Athenians and Eretrians on the way back from Sardes (c. 102), it cannot have been a crushing one. If the Ionians were heavily defeated in a great battle by the three generals here named for the first time it was in a subsequent campaign, either next year, when the Ionian fleet was off Kypros, or more probably two years later, after the return of the fleet, and the reduction of Kypros, as is here perhaps indicated. The revolt of Karia (c. 103 supra) is mentioned again in the next chapter (117), in connection with the operations of Daurises against the Hellespontine towns.

117. 1. τὰς ἐν Ἐλλησπόντῳ πόλεις. The Hellespontine cities had joined the Ionians, under pressure, apparently after the departure of the Athenians, c. 103 supra. The operations of Daurises described in this chapter might fall into 497 B.C. Hdt. seems to conceive them as preceding the revolt of the Karians, cp. c. 103 supra. Byzantium and all the other cities are mentioned there; including, presumably, those specified c. 26 supra. But the cities enumerated here lie to the S.W. on the Asian side of the Hellespont, properly so called (cp. 4. 85), and are enumerated in strictly geographical order from S.W. to N.E. (cp. 7. 43). They may have joined the Ionians from the first, or at any rate months before the revolt of Byzantium. By the chronological indications here given the recapture of these Hellespontine cities should fall after their revolt and before the revolt of Karia (cp. c. 108 supra), or at least before the news of the revolt of the Karians reached Daurises at Paises. This would presumably be the season after the burning of Sardes (cp. c. 103).

118. 1. Μαρσύα. The Karians, like the Kyrians, c. 108 supra, are well informed of the movements of the Persians. Hdt.'s silence in respect to the Dorian cities in Karia is remarkable.

3. Ἐλακτος Ἐλακτος has not been identified. Strabo, 555, mentions a quarry of specially good marble above Mylassa. The Idrian country is the country about Stratoniae. See Rawlinson ad l. Marsyas, 'a river Marsyas'—not the celebrated Marsyas ("the mystic storied Marsyas"), which, though it flowed into the Maeander, did not rise in Idrias but near Kelenea=Δαιμαία in Phrygia. Cp. 7. 26. (On the latter
HRODOTOU
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ρέον εκ τῆς Τόριαδος χώρης ἐς τὸν Μαλανδρὸν ἐκδότοι. συνάλληξεν 5 θέντων δὲ τῶν Καρδίων ἐνβαύτα ἐγίνοντο βουλαὶ ἅλλαι τε πολλαὶ καὶ ἀριστὴ γε διόκεσαν εἶναι ἐμὸι Πέξωδος τοῦ Μανωλοῦ ἀνδρὸς Κιννέων, δε τοῦ Κέλληκον βασιλέως Σωσινίκτου εἶχε θυγατέρα· τοῦτον τῷ ἀνδρὸς ἡ γυνῶμ ἐφερε διαβάντας τὸν Μαλανδρὸν τοὺς Κάρας καὶ κατὰ νότον ἐκχώνον τὸ ποταμὸν 10 οὕτω συμβάλλοντες, ἴνα μὴ ἐχοντες ὡτί σω σφεγγει οἱ Κάρας αὐτοῖς τε μέειν αναγκαζόμενοι γεμίσαι ἐπὶ ἄμεινον τῆς φυσίς. αὐτὴ μὲν των οὐκ εἴκα ἡ γυνῶμ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς Πέρσαις κατὰ νότον γίνοσθαι τὸν Μαλανδρὸν μάλλον ἡ σφίς, δηλαδὴ ἡν φυγὴ τῶν Περσῶν γένεται καὶ ἐσωθένει τῇ συμβολῇ, ὥς οὐκ ἀπο- νοστίσσωσιν ἐς τὸν ποταμὸν ἐσπύρταντες. μετὰ δὲ παρεγόντων καὶ διαβάντων τὸν Μαλανδρὸν τῶν Περσῶν, ἐνβαύτα ἐπὶ τῷ Μαρσύι ποταμῷ συνέβαλλον τε τοῖς Πέρσαις οἱ Κάρας καὶ μάχην ἐμαχαίρωτα ἵσχυρην καὶ ἐπὶ χρώμιν πολλοῖν, τέλος δὲ 119 ἔσωθήσαν διὰ πλῆθος. Περσῶν μὲν δὴ ἐπέστων ἀνδρῶν ἐς διασχίζουσιν, Καροῖ δὲ ἐς μυρίους. ἐνθευτὲν δὲ οἱ διαφυγόντες

see D. G. Hogarth, in J. H. S. vol. ix. (1888), pp. 343 ff.)

5. βουλαὶ. The Karians are assumed to be acting independently of the Ionians: but the latter come to their support, c. 120. Are these operations to be conceived as contemporaneous with the campaign in Kypreos?

6. Πίξωδος son of Mauzos; from his connexion with Semeus (cp. I. 74, 7. 98) and from the recurrence of the names, Mauzos as a Karian Dymast, and in Halikarnassos, 877-333 B.C., a century after the time of Hdt. (cp. Diodor. 15. 90, 3), Piskodaro 341-335 B.C. (B. Head, Hist. Num. p. 533), as well as from the way Hdt. here speaks of Piskodaro, it may be conjectured that he was connected with Artemisia of Halikarnassos (7. 96, 8. passim), and though described as a man of Kindya, an insignificant place, had a dynastic position. Busolt, Gr. G. ii. 33, remarks that Karian dynasts (from their hereditary position) were more independent of the Persian power than Greek tyrants.

7. εἶχεν, c. 116 supra.

11. τῆς φύσεως. Which was good to start with. Cp. c. 111 supra. The question of the advantage and disadvantage of crossing a river under such circumstances had been discussed before: I. 205-207. It was a problem bound to arise in warfare again and again. (cp. 9. 36, 37). The argument of Piskodaro (δηλαδὴ κτλ.) is less far-fetched than that put into the mouth of Kroisos 1. 207.

14. ὡς, 'that they will be driven into the river and stay there.' Such was the opinion, humorously recorded or inferred (δηλαδὴ) by Herodotus. The negative ὥς shows that this is not a final sentence. Cp. R. Heiligenstäd, de enulalismorum finalium usus Herodotico etc., 1853, p. 54.

119. 2. διαβάντων. From coming to the north the Persians would cross the Maeander. The battle of the Iasor Marayas, in Karla, is only the first of three great battles, which succeed each other rapidly in the narrative of Hdt. (cc. 119, 120, 121). In the first of these 10,000 (sic) Karians are slain: the second is a still more crushing defeat; the third is a brilliant victory. The intervals which elapsed between these three engagements are not indicated: days, or months, or years? Cp. Appendix V.

6. διασχισοῦσιν... μυρίους. These are the first numerical estimates which occur in Hdt.'s account of the Ionian revolt, and even these are evidently round numbers, and probably exaggerated. Five times as many Karians as Persians fell in the engagement. Cp. c. 100.
7. Ἀβρα怎么说。Labranda described by Strabo, 659, as a village (εσφρά) on the mountain pass between Alabanda and Mylassa, some 60 stadia distant from the latter, of which it was a dependency. The MSS. vary in the spelling of the name: λαβραονδας ΑΒ, λαβραονδας Α (adopted by van H.), λαβραονδας Πτ. Meineke reads λαβραονδας προς Strabonem.

Δως στρατιά. Strabo 1, σ. clearly distinguishes Ζεδος στρατιω worshipped by the locality, and especially by the people of Mylassa, from the Κάρασιος Ζεδος (common to Karians, Lydians, and Myssians, διά δελφους, εφ. 66 supra). There was also a shrine of Zeus in Mylassa itself, under the extraordinary title Οσογος (Οσογόδα ίνδεκλ.) or Ossogos, identified with Poseidon. Cp. Pfeiler, Gr. Myth. i* 476. On the formula τῶν ἴδιων, συνεπεπέρασην τιν εἰς δελφον, cp. Introduction, p. civ.

10. συντριβής. Safety often involves flight, cp. ε. 98 supra. The complete evacuation of Asia was a frequently discussed theme or threat. Cp. I. 170, 9, 106 (εφ. 124 ἴσσας, 6, 3).

120. 2. Μῆλησιον τι καὶ τις τοῦτοι σύμμαχοι. Represents presumably the Ionians acting under the orders of τῶν κοινῶν τῶν Ἰουνών, for it can hardly be supposed that the fleet acted under orders of the Confederate Council, while the land-forces were left to act independently. Or, are the σύμμαχοι of Miletos merely some smaller towns immediately dependent on, or attached to, her? Hdt. unfortunately does not locate this battle, in which the most crushing defeat was inflicted upon the rebels: yet the terms of the narrative, if pressed, would serve to locate it in Labranda (βαλτονοῦται . . . παραγωγω- 

712. 1, μέτα δὲ. Unfortunately Hdt. does not specify how long after.

ἀνθραδό ντι καὶ ἀναμιχυσαντα. Notwithstanding two tremendous defeats, cc. 119, 120, in the lighter of which they had lost well-nigh 10,000 men, and had thereupon contemplated surrender or exile as the only alternatives! For the construction cp. 8, 100, Themistocles loquitur, ἔδει οὖσαν ἀναμιχυσαντα καλοῦσιν αμαλαίνως τις καὶ ἀναλαμβάνειν τιν πολεμήσημα καλοῦσιν.

3. ἐν Πηγάσῳ is an emendation by H. Steph. On the place, cp. 1, 175.

6. Μύρρης, son of Gyges, was presumably a Mermnad, cp. 3, 122 and I, 7.

Was Herakleides, son of Ibanollis of Mylassa, perhaps a brother of Oliatos, son of Ibanollis, of Mylassa, mentioned c. 37 supra?

7. Mylassa is about half-way by
land between Halikarnassos and Miletos; and was, according to Strabo, 658, one of the three principal towns of the Karian μεσαία, Stratoniaces and Alabanda being the other two. There is local colour and memory in this record, apparently.

122. 2. τῶν ἱερομαζόντων, c. 116 supra. The operations of Hymanas on the Propontis obviously synchronise with those of Daurises on the Hellespont, c. 117 supra.
3. Κίος, a city in Mysia, "like most other towns upon this coast was a colony of the Milesians." (R.). The name is also found upon the European side, attached to a river descending Mt. Haimos, 4. 49 supra.
5. ἦν Καρίτης, c. 117 supra.
6. Ἠλληνιστὸς is here obviously used in the strict sense, exclusive of the Propontis and Bosporos. Cp. c. 117 supra.
7. Γέρμαδα. Cp. 7. 43.
8. τῶν ἄρχαλων Τευκρῶν, c. 13 supra. αἰρέων, imperfect, 'before completing the reduction.'
9. Πώλεως has a slight suggestion of barbarism, cp. c. 2 supra.
123. 2. οὕτω. While Daurises had met, or was to meet, his fate in battle c. 121 supra. Otanes is the only general left of the three sons-in-law of the king commissioned to quell the revolt, c. 116 supra.
3. ἡταχθήσαν. The phrase would hardly be correct if Artaphernes were the guiding spirit and highest authority in these strategic plans. The campaign against Ionia was presumably carried out synchronously with the campaigns for the recovery of the Hellespont, Aiolis and Karia: and the operations of Daurises in the Hellespont, and afterwards in Karia, of Hymanas on the Propontis and afterwards on the Hellespont, and of Otanes in Ionia are to be thought of as approximately synchronous. Why Daurises, rather than Otanes, moved down into Karia is not very evident. The whole plan of operations may have been concerted in Susa by the king and his counsellors, including the renegade Helleses, not without reference to the operations against Kypros, the basis of which was Kilikia. See further on the Ionian navy list at Lade, 6. 8 ἱππα.
124. 1. Ἀλακομνέων, imperfect. On the chronology cp. c. 126 ἱππα. Arista- goras apparently had never quitted Miletes after his return (c. 98 supra) in the winter 499-5 n.o. ἦν γάρ. Cp. ἦν γάρ, ὡς διδέξη, ἐργάζοντας 1. 78, of Kyaxares.
3. ἐγκερασάμενος with ταρδέας is rather suggestive of a potion or drug, but the metaphor may be vague. Cp. c. 106 supra. Hdt. adheres to his views that (1) Aristagoras was the author of the Ionian revolt, (2) the revolt was fore-
doomed to failure. Cp. c. 98 supra, 6, 1 ἔνθα.

*ὅρησαν ἔβολεαν.* Like Xerxes after Salamis 8. 94, 100; cp. 8. 4, 18, 75.

ταῦτα. The progress of the Persians who were closing in upon Miletos on the land side.

4. βασιλέα Δαρείου. A testimony to the ultimate and presiding spirit of the empire, behind the satraps and strategi, who were not invincible. Cp. 6. 12 ἔνθα.

5. συστασίωτας. C. 70 supra. The στάσει here is a double one: (1) against the king, (2) against the other Ionians, or even Milesians. Surrender is not contemplated, as by the Karians, c. 119 supra.


7. Σαρδά, c. 106 supra, 6, 2 ἔνθα.

*ἐτέχεις.* imperfect. Cp. c. 23 supra. Histiaeas had not completed his work. The text in this passage (νέων ... λαβοῦν) seems hardly satisfactory. The words τὴν Ἰστιαίασ ἐτείχες παρὰ Δαρείου δωρεῖν λαβῶν look like a gloss, the rather as ἐτέχεις is hardly accurate, and the remark in any case could not have occurred in the speech of Aristogoras. The words ἐκ τοῦ τότου τούτου are clumsy. Even the report of Aristogoras’ argument is open to doubt (νέων ... Μίλησιον), for a κρησφύγετον he certainly had, in Myrkinos, and the point which emerges is whether he should lead his colony to Myrkinos or to Sardinia. Finally, there is in the text as it stands, an apparent aponoephes (which would be obviated by bracketing νέων ... Μίλησιον). But perhaps the objections are to be obviated by the supposition that Hdt. is here compressing a story which Hekataios had recorded more fully.

125. 1. Ἐκαταίοι. Hekataios’ suggestions, as reported by Hdt., are never acted on (cp. c. 36 supra); nor his views expressly approved (cp. 2. 143, 6. 137). If Hekataios really merely proposed ἄγεις ἐν Δέρω, to shelter in Leros, a small island off Miletos, till the war was over, his proposal was indeed absurd. The advice of Hekataios seems to have a better application to a political στάσι in Miletos, than to the given situation in a war with the Persians by sea and land; and it is possible that Hdt. has confused two occasions. Hekataios may have recommended the occupation of Leros: Hekataios may have opposed the flight of Aristogoras: but the assertion that Hekataios advocated the occupation of Leros as an alternative to the settlement in Sardinia, or in Thrace, may be a combination on Hdt.’s own part, intended to make Hekataios ridiculous (cp. 4. 36).

126. 3. Πειαγόρη, possibly a near relative, cp. c. 37 supra. 5. ἐσχέ τιν' χώρην ἡ' ἐτσιλή. A
not stated, but the interval need not be supposed a long one. If Aristagoras left Miletus any time during the year 497 b.c., it might be in consequence of the successful operations against the cities cc. 116-117, or even after the great defeats on the Marayas and at Labraunda (118-119). It might even be argued that he fled before the fleet went to Kypres (cp. c. 109 supra). He was gone presumably before the arrival of Histiaios at Sarde 6. 1. It is remarkable that Hdt. does not here name the πόλεις attacked by Aristagoras, much less the subsequent attempts by the Athenians circa 486 b.c. and 486 b.c. to colonise it (cp. 9. 76, 6. 92 supra). Nor does he localise the city, nor name the Thracian tribe. This passage was presumably written after the first and probably after the second attempt, but it is possible that Hdt. did not identify the spot (cp. 7. 114). Hence too, perhaps, the precision of Thucydides.
ΕΡΑΤΟ

'Αρισταγόρης μέν νυν Ἰωνίην ἀποστήσας οὕτω τελευτᾷ. 1 'Ισταῖος δὲ ὁ Μιλήσιος τύραννος μεμετείχομοι ὕπο Δαρείου παρίν ἐς Σάρδην ἀπιγμένον δὲ αὐτόν ἐκ τῶν Σοῦσαν εἴρητο Ἀρτα-

φρένης ὁ Σαρδῖων ὑπαρχός κατὰ κοίνα τι δικεῖοι Ἰωνίας ἀπε-

στάσαι. ὁ δὲ οὕτω εἰδεναι ἐφ' ἑθῆ ἑθώμαζε τὸ τῆς γεγονός, ὡς οὐδὲν ἐξ ὕδηθν τῶν παρέοντων προγμάτων ἐπιστάμενος. ὁ δὲ Ἀρτα-

φρένης ὁ ἐρείος αὐτὸν τεχνάζοντα ἐτευ, εἰδὼς τὴν ἀπεκεῖνη τῆς ἀποστάσεως, "οὕτω τοι Ἰσταῖε ἔχει κατὰ ταύτα τὰ πρόγματα τούτο τὸ ὑπόθεμα ἔρραφας μὲν σὺ, ὑπεθύματο δὲ Ἀρισταγόρης." Ἀρταφρένης μὲν ταύτα ἐς τὴν ἀπόστασιν ἔχοντα ἐτευ. 'Ισταῖος δὲ ὑπεθύμα ὡς συνηέντα Ἀρταφρένεα ὕπο τὴν πρώτην ἐπέλθοισαν νῦκτα ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, βασιλέα Δαρείον ἔξηγατρικός. 2 δὲ

1. Ἀρισταγόρης μέν. This sentence might be the last of the fifth or the first of the sixth Book; cp. the passages from the seventh to the eighth, and from the eighth to the ninth. The division between the fifth and sixth Books is purely arbitrary: the narrative is absolutely continuous. However, it is characteristic of Herodotus to conclude a narrative, or gain a pause, by a biographical or anecdotal passage or appendix (cp. 4. 143 ff., 205, 6. 137 ff., 9. 123); and from this point of view the divisions between Books 4 and 5, Books 5 and 6 are well devised. Cp. Introduction, § 2.

2. Ἰσταῖος 54. It might appear from the sequence of the sentences as if the death of Aristagoras preceded the return of Histiaios, but the tenses may partially correct that assumption (τελευτᾷ . . . ταῦτα, but some MSS. read οὕτω τελευτᾷ); though the material considerations point to the conclusion that Aristagoras had evacuated Miletos before the reappearance of Histiaios: for (1) this conclusion suits the probable chronology, cp. 5. 124 and Appendix V., (2) if Aristagoras had still been in Miletos, Histiaios would have gone to Miletos, rather than to Chios, cp. 5. 5 ἑσθήνη. For the disregard of strict chronological sequence by Hdt., cp. the story of the death of Kleomenes 74 ἑσθήνη.

ὁ Μ. τύραννος. Aristagoras is ὁ Μιλήσιος 5. 124, or ἔτευσεν 5. 106. μεμετείχομεν. Cp. 5. 108.

7. ὑπέθυμα αὐτὸν τεχνάζοντα. Cp. 3. 130 κατεφάνη τῷ Δαρείῳ τεχνάζειν ἐπιστά-

μενος.

9. τῷ ὑπόθεμα. Cp. the metaphors 5. 124. Hdt. calls this epigram the real truth about the revolt (τὴν ἀπεκεῖνην τῆς ἀποστάσεως): a different point of view is exhibited in the narrative 5. 28, 85, 98 where Aristagoras is protagonist, and the message of Histiaios a mere coincidence.
Σαρδέα μήσων την μεγάτην ὑποδεξάμενος κατεργάσασθαι ὑπέθυνε
τῶν Ἰονῶν τὴν ἤγεμονίνη τοῦ πρὸς Δαρείου πολέμου. Διαβάζει
δὲ ἐς Χίων ἐδέθη ὑπὸ Χίων, καταγραφθεὶς πρὸς αὐτῶν νεώτερα
πρίσσειν πρίγματα ἐς αὐτοῖς ἐκ Δαρείου. μαθόντες μέντοι οἱ
Χίων τῶν πάντα λόγον, ὡς πολέμοι εἰς βασιλεῖς, ἔλεγαν αὐτῶν.
3 ἐνθαῦτα δὴ εἰρητοῖμεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰονῶν ὁ Ἰστιαιός κατ᾽ ὃ
tί προβούμων ὑπὸ τῷ Ἀρισταγόρρῃ ἀπίσταοσθαί ἀπὸ
βασιλεῖς καὶ κακὸν τοσοῦτον εἰς Ἰωνιᾶς ἐξεργασμὸν, τὴν μὲν
gενομένην αὐτοῖς αὐτὴν οὐ μᾶλλα ἔχειναι, δὲ ἐλεγέν σφι ὡς
βασιλεὺς Δαρείου ἐβουλεύσατο Φοινίκας μὲν Ἐξαναστήσας ἐν τῇ

2. 4. Σαρδέα μήσων τήν μεγάτην. Σε
5. 106 supra. Ηδὲ here speaks propriā
persona.

ὑπέθυν, imperfect. He did not suc-
cceed in obtaining the direction of Ionia,
though he had succeeded in deceiving
(ἐπιστασθοῦσα) Dareios.

8. τῶν πάντα λόγον. Including
probably the story of the man with the
branded patē, cp. 5. 35. Cobet brackets
ὁ... βασιλῆς. Whether Histiaios was
playing a double game or not, or whether
he changed his plans opportunistically, may
fairly be doubted. That he was released
from Susa on the strength of his vow to
add Sardinia to the empire is not prob-
able (cp. 5. 106). That he came to
recover the tyranny of Miletos rather
than to head the rebellion against
Dareios is at least possible. If Arista-
goras (5. 124), if Hekataios (5. 36), if
Dareios (5. 105), all counted on the
collapse of the rebellion, is it reasonable
to ascribe to Histiaios a less intelligent
forecast? Distrusted and hampered by
Artaphernes, shut out of Miletos, sus-
pected by the man of Chios, the great
adventurer was equal to the occasion.
If he knew the strength, he also perhaps
knew the weakness of the empire better
than most men; he may have been al-
ready counting on the king’s death, and a
palace revolution. The aspect of affairs
in Ionia may have encouraged him. He
claimed to be the real author of the
national movement. He managed to
reassure the Chians, or at least made
good his escape from Chios, but he failed
to secure the hegemonia. With his
failure the last chance of sufficiently
capable and authoritative leadership dis-
appeared, and the separatist tendencies
in Ionia gained upon the confederation.

3. 1. ὅπο τ. Ἰ. Perhaps the Federal
council surely not merely the Chians,
or the Milesians: or is it a periphrasis
for ‘Hekataios,’ who had taken a gloomy
view of the prospects of revolt from the
first, 5. 36 supra?

3. κακὸν τοσοῦτον. The report of
this inquiry is barely credible. Even
Ionians would scarcely have described
the struggle for freedom in such terms.
The letter and spirit of the question are
incompatible with the action of the
Ionians throughout the struggle. They
are rid of domestic tyrants, they are
fighting gallantly, and so far not
unsuccessfully for their freedom from
the foreign yoke, and they reproach the
man whom they acknowledge as the
author of the movement, and who, εἰς
ὑποθετεῖ, is now prepared to head it,
with injuring them! The obvious
answer of Histiaios would have been:
Nor I nor Aristagoras could have made
you revolt from the king against your
own will and judgment. The anecdote
is evidently coloured by afterthought
and knowledge of the event. Hdt. fully
endorsed the shallow view that the Ionian
revolt was a huge mistake, 5. 97, 98, 124.

τὴν μ. π. αὐτός αὐτῆς. Ηδὲ has re-
vealed it 5. 35, αὐτός with ἔχειναι.
It is hardly likely that Histiaios betrayed
it to any one.

5. Δαρείος. Suspectum nomen, van
Herwerden, who leaves hardly a super-
fuous proper name in the text of Ηδὲ.
But cp. ε. 13 ἐνέργια.

Ἐπολεκτέον οὖν. This supposed
intention illustrates well the secular
rivalry and hostility between Ionian
and Phoenician. For an analogous
intention reported from another quarter,
cp. 9. 106. The Ionians were felt to
be a moveable folk, cp. 1. 179. The
anecdote may represent a genuine and
constant source; one which had per-
haps contributed, and been used, to en-
'Ιονίας κατοκίσασα, 'Ιωνας δὲ ἐν τῇ Φωική, καὶ τοὺτον εἰνεκα ἑπιστελείει. οὐδὲν τι πάντως τάται βασιλεός βουλευσαμένον ἐξειμάτω τού 'Ιωνας.

Μετὰ δὲ ὁ Ἰστιαῖος δὲ ἀγγέλου ποιεόμενος Ἐρμιππον ἀνδρὸς Ἀταρνίτεω τοίσι ἐν Σάρδισι ἐσώρες Περσέων ἐπεμπέβαιναι. οὐσι προκελατρικευμένων αὐτῶ ἀποσταίσις πέρα. ὁ δὲ "Ερμιππος πρὸς τοὺς μὲν ἀπεπέμφθη ὦ δεδομένοις. πέτρον δὲ ἐνεχείρησε τὰ βουλιόν Ἀρταφρένει. ὁ δὲ μαθὼν πάντω ἡ γνώμην ἑκέλευεν τῶν Ἐρμιππον πὰ τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῦ Ἰστιαίου δόναν. φέροντα τούτων ἐπεφερεν, τὰ δὲ ἀμώβαια τὰ πάρα τῶν Περσέων ἀντιπεμπτόμενα Ἰστιαῖος ἑωτίῳ δόναν. τοῦτον δὲ γενομένων φανερῶν ἀπέκτησεν ἐναὐτὰ πολλῶς Περσέων ἡ Ἀρταφρένει.

Περί Σάρδις μὲν ὁ ἐγώντα ταραχή. Ἰστιαῖος δὲ ταύτης ἤ ἀποσφαλέστα τῆς ἐπίπεδος Χίος κατήγορος εἰς Μήλητον, αὐτοῦ Ἰστιαίου δεηθέντος. οἱ δὲ Μήλητοι, ἁμενοὶ ἀπαλλαχθέντες καὶ Ἀριστανέμω, οὐδαμῶς πρόθυμοι ἡσυχία ἄλλοι τύραννοι δέκασθαι ἐς τὴν χώρην, οὐχ ἐλευθερίας γενομένου. καὶ δὴ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐνώσεις βίᾳ ἐπειράτο κατίον ὁ Ἰστιαῖος εἰς τὴν Μήλητον, ηταρώσχεται τῶν μηρῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Μηλητῶν. ὁ μὲν ἐνό

courage the revolt in the first instance, and is here post-dated: or it might have been suggested not by Histiaios, or not by Histiaios alone, but by other distinguished exiles; cp. c. 9 infra. 7. ὑπὸν κτλ. Krüger pronounces the assumenda intolerable (unenträchtlich), puts a comma before ὑπὸν and reads Ἰστιαῖος. Van Herwerden brackets ἐκδικάζω τ. Ἐρμίππου. (after Docse.) 4. 1. μετὰ δὲ κτλ. The chronological indication is slight, but the anecdote which follows, though obscure, has the very marks of historical fact about it, and indicates that there was an intrigue on foot in Sardis against Artaphernes among some of the Persians with whom Histiaio was acting. The story may be of Chian origin: Atenaeus belonging to Chios (1. 160), cp. c. 28 infra, but it can hardly be supposed that the correspondence (τὰ βουλιά ... τὰ ἀμώβαια) in question was preserved, or ever passed under Hdt.'s eyes. Cp. Introduction, p. Ixxxvi. 5. ἐρμηνευμένων. Cp. Ἀγαθ. 2. 32, 9. 71, Ἀλκεσ. 1. 158, ἐρμηνευμένων 2. 135 all referring to talk, conversation (but not mere dialogue); cp. ἐρμηνευσε. The change to the genitive, after ἐσώρε, is eased by the ὁ. Some MSS. (β) have the dative singular here. 6. 1. ταύτης. Hekataios was a man of many hopes (5. 85). But ἐπίστευε is here used concretely of the thing hoped for (ἀνεύτας c. 4). 2. κατῆγος, imperfect: they did not succeed. Cp. ἐσώρευς c. 2 supra, ἐπικατῆγος just below. 3. Ἰστιαῖος, deleted by van Herwerden. If this story be true, as it stands, it would imply that the Ionian confederacy was breaking down, old rivalries and jealousies asserting themselves within the league, Chian oligarchs ready to hand over Miletus to a tyrant, Aeolians of Lesbos ready to blackmail Ionians at the Bosporos. Such things may not be incredible, but it is also possible that the facts are misleading, or misrepresented, in these somewhat inconsistent traditions. The Chians and Lesbians are in force at Lade, c. 8 infra. The Chians and Milesians were old friends, 1. 18, and both must have been represented at the next meeting at the Panonion c. 7 infra, yet no complaint is heard there, or at least, none is recorded. 5. ἐλευθερίας γενομένων. The genitive is usual with ἐπιστευεῖον. Cp. Kühner, Ausf. Gram. 2 § 417, 3 (p. 305). 7. τῶν τινῶν. Krüger suggests τῶν τεν.
10. δέστη αὐτῶν, bracketed by van Herwerden.

11. Βυζάντιον had joined the revolt (497 B.C. spring), perhaps under pressure (5. 108), and may not have been very ardent in the cause (but cp. c. 33 in/ra): or Histiaios may have given himself out as on the Ionian side, or at any rate, against the king.

6. 1. ἐσολευν, imperfect. The story of Histiaios is resumed c. 26 in/ra.

5. γράφεται τ. Π. Of the three generals who had been originally entrusted with the task of quelling the revolt (5. 116) only Otanes was left. Perhaps Harpagos (c. 23 in/ra) and Artaphernes the younger, or his father (5. 123), are now in the field. The disappearance of the names of the Persian generals and admirals at this point is noticeable.

6. προδομοῦτατοι. The Phoenicians had not merely two defeats to avenge (5. 99, 112), but the prospect of recovering their quondam position in the Aegean, c. 3 in/ra.

7. Κύπριοι. It is possible that even Greek vessels fought on the Persian side at Lade, e.g. the men of Kurion, 5. 113. Cp. 7. 70. Phoenicians, Egyptians, Kyprians, Kilikians furnish the bulk of the navy of Xerxes afterwards, 7. 89 ff. The mobilisation of such a fleet is testimony to the magnitude and importance of the Ionian revolt.

11. In the year 496 B.C. probably. The date now reached is presumably just before the campaign of 494 B.C. which culminated at Lade. The great meeting at the Panionion may be dated in the winter 495-4 B.C. The earliest possible date for the reduction of the Kyprians would be in the winter of 497-6 B.C. The νεωτί here might almost persuade us to bring down the year of Kypriote freedom (5. 416) into the year 496-5 B.C. Cp. Appendix V.

12. 1. ἐστρατεύοντο, imperfect. 2. κυναγόμενοι. Cp. 5. 116. προσβάλλοντο. 7. 172. Stein takes σφέοιναίτέως, as Εκλάδος there, objectively.

3. Πανόλεον, to δέ Πανολώνοι ἔστιν τῇ Μυκήνῃ χώρᾳ Ἰσόθι πρὸς ἄρτων τηρομένων κατ' ἑαυτόν ἐστίν Ἰάννη πολεμίων Ἡλίκων. ἂ δὲ Μυκήνη ἐστί τῷ ἡττου ἕρη πρὸς ἕσφορον ἔρημου κατάκων ἡ ἐκλάδου κατακτών, ἢς ἐς συλλέγειται ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν Ἰωνίων ἄλλοις ἆργος ἢ ἄργος τῇ χιλίῃ στρατοῦ Πανολών, 1, 148. The old religious focus was used for political and military purposes. This meeting of the Ionian representatives to devise a plan of operation was clearly not the first during the war: see 5.
109. Probably from the beginning (5. 37, 38) τὸ Κορών τῶν Ιωάνων had been revived to deliberate periodically and direct the movement. This meeting, however, in the winter or spring of 495/4 B.C. was perhaps specially remembered, as the last, and that one at which the desperate resolution was taken, to abandon the struggle by land, and stake all upon another, a third, great naval engagement.

8. Νήσος. Lade was still an island in the time of Strabo, 635. The alluvial deposit has now converted it into a peninsula (cp. 2. 10). Lolling in I. Müller's Handbuch, ii. 256.

8. 2. Σωτὶ τὴν Δέσφοιν. This is Stein's text, combined out of δόσι τῷ αὐτοῦ γέρων ΑΒΓΔ (= Holder Α) and of Δέσφοιν Πμμ. (= Holder β). (The Aeolians of the Troad were already reduced 5. 122, 123.) But it would have been queer if the Lesbians had just previously sent eight ships to blackmail the Ionians at Byzantium c. 5 supra, and now sent seventy to the support of the Ionians at Lade. The Dorians are conspicuous by their absence; not a Rhodian vessel, not a vessel from Knidos, Halikarnassos or any Karian city! Of the members of the Ionian Dodekapolis eight are here present; what of the absentees? Ephesos seems to have taken little if any part in the revolt. Ephesians had acted as guides to Sardes 5. 100. Against that service may be set the massacre of the Chians c. 16 infra. Ephesos did not suffer by the revolt; she had had her share in the days of Kyros, when Miletos had got off scot-free, 1. 141. Klaizomenae was apparently already in the hands of the Persians 5. 123. Lebedos and Kolophon may have shared the fate of Klaizomenae, though Hdt. does not say so. In regard to the eight remaining: the exact specification of their contingents, and of the total, is remarkable. One would like to believe that Hdt. had some authentic evidence upon the subject, and was not merely basing an inference upon the maxima ascertained for the period of Athenian supremacy, in his own day. Samos had been swept and devastated less than twenty years before (3. 149), yet is now among the most flourishing. It is the former statement probably that is exaggerated. Chios sends 100 ships; Miletos, notwithstanding the necessity of defending the town (τὰ τεῖχα βρέθηκα αὐτῶν Μιλησίων c. 7), 80 ships; Lesbians (Aeolians) 70, but they were not present in full force, if eight ships were at Byzantium with Histiasios (c. 5); the Samians send 60. In their case there was the Record in the Agora, which Hdt. probably saw c. 14 infra, but it only vouched for 11 ships, and it can hardly have been inscribed and erected before Mycale, 479/8 B.C., when the oligarchy was restored. At the date of Lade, Athens ex hypothesi can only launch 59 triremes and yet holds her own with Aigina (cp. c. 89 infra). There is a great drop from Samos with its 60 to Teos with its 17 triremes, Priene with 12, and Erythrae with eight. Myus and Phokaia close the list with three apiece. The total is correctly stated as 355. The 600 given as the number of the 'barbarians' looks suspiciously like a round number. It is exactly the number of the fleet of Datis and Artaphernes, c. 95 infra, and it is not distributed among the nations mentioned as supplying the fleet in c. 8. Even the contingents of Chios, Miletos, Lesbos, Samos, are suspiciously round and large, as compared with the navy lists for Artemision (8. 1) and Salamis (8. 43 ff., 82). The positions of the Hellenic allies are enumerated in a line running east and west. They have their front to the south, whence the Phoenicians are approaching.
εἶχον κέρας αὐτοὶ Μηλίσιοι, νέας παρεχόμενοι ὅψωκόκταν·
5 εἶχοντο δὲ τούτων Πηρινέωι δυνάμεκα νυσὶ καὶ Μηλίσιοι τρισὶ νυσὶ, Μηλίσιοι δὲ Τήμοι ἐλύσωτα ἐπτακαίδεκα νυσὶ. Τήμοι δὲ εἶχοντο Χίοι ἐκατόν νυσί: πρὸς δὲ τούτους Ερυθραῖοι τε ἐτάσσοντο καὶ Φωκαῖας, Ερυθραῖοι μὲν ὀκτὼ νέα παρεχόμενοι, Φωκαῖαι δὲ τρεῖς. Φωκαῖαι δὲ εἶχοντο Δέσβιοι νυσί ἐβεβομή·
10 κοίτα· τελευταῖοι δὲ ἐτάσσοντο ἔχοντες τὸ πρὸς ἐσπέρην κέρας Ὀλυμποῖοι ἐξήκοντα ἐν νυσὶ. πάντων δὲ τούτων ὁ σύμπας ἀριθμὸς
9 ἐγένετο τρεῖς καὶ πεντήκοντα καὶ τρισκοίαντα τριήμερα, αὐταὶ μὲν Ἰόνων ἦσαν, τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων τὸ πλῆθος τῶν νεών ἦσαν ἐξακοσίας. ὡς δὲ καὶ αὐταὶ ἀπίκατο πρὸς τὴν Μηλίσιν καὶ ὁ τεχνὸς σφα ἄπας παρῆν, ἐνθαῦτα οἱ Περσαῖοι στρατηγοὶ πυθόμενοι
5 τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰαδων νεῶν καταρράγοντο μὴ οὔ δυνατοὶ γένωνται ἑπεξελάσθαι, καὶ οὕτω οὔτε τὴν Μηλίτην ολοί τε ἔχον ἐξελίσσαμεν μὴ οὔτε ναυκράτορες, πρὸς τε Αρδείον κυκυθεύουσαν κακῶν τι λαβεῖν. τάπητα ἐπιλεγόμενοι, συλλέξαντες τῶν Ἰονῶν τοὺς τυράννους, οὐ οὖν Ἀρισταγόρευ μὲν τοῦ Μηληνοῦ κατα-
15 λυθέντες τῶν ἄρχεων ἐφευγον ἐς Μῆδας, ἐτύγχανοι δὲ τότε συντραπεύομεν ἐπὶ τὴν Μηλίτην, τούτων τῶν ἄνδρων τῶν
παρεώντος συγκαλέσαντες ἔλεγον σφα τάδε. “ἀνδρές Ἰονεῖς,
νῦν τις νεῶν εὐ ποίησας φανῆτω τοῖς βασιλεῖς οἰκον τοὺς γάρ ἐσωτήρ ἐκατός ἴχνης πολιτῆς πείραθοι ἀποσχίζον ἀπὸ τοῦ
16 λοιποῦ συμμαχικοῦ. προϊσχομένοι δὲ ἐπαγγελλάθην τάδε, ὡς πείσονται τε ἀχαρὶ οὐδὲν διὰ τὴν ἀπόστασαν, οὔδὲ σφα οὔτε τὰ ἱδία ἐμπεφρήσαται, οὔδὲ βιασύνεργον ἔξουσι οὐδὲν ἢ
πρότερον ἐλεύω. εἰ δὲ ταῦτα μὲν οὐ ποίησοντο, οὐδὲ τάπητοι διὰ

9. 3. καὶ αὖθαν (αὐτὰ) (ἐπί τέτοιο), σε, barbarorum, 
ἀπίκατο, 3rd pers. pl. for ἀπίκατο (ἀπίγειον pl. p. ἄπας, ἄπικα, ἄπιγειον), 
ἀπίκατο, c. 10 ἑσθά, imperfect.
Μηλίσιν, σε. γῆς.
ὁ πελώς. οὐκ. εἰς ἑσθά, 11 ἑστά ἑσθά.
4. οὐ Π. στρατηγοῦ. The fleet was under Persian officers. Cp. 5, 32, 7. 97. 
Their apprehension was justified by their previous experiences off Kypres, 
and Pamphylia: and the remark goes to justify the revolt, as having had a 
5. μὴ οὖ δυσκόλος γένωνται, cp. 4. 97, a construction not to be confused with 
μῆ αὐτοκλήτους ψιχράτορες just below. Cp. Goodwin, CE. Moods and 
Tenses, p. 200, ad. maj. § 818, Madvig, 
§§ 211, 296, Kühner, Ausf. Gr. § 516.


10. 1. ἔλεγον τάδε. Hdt.'s statement is as precise as if he himself had heard the speech addressed by the anonymous Persian generals to the unspecified Greek tyrants at an interview obviously private. The story may come ultimately from Samian sources. Cp. c. 13 *infra.*

3. ἀναμοσμοῦν. The word is used with a 'dyslogistic' implication; it was a mental quality opposed to *σοφία* (2. 172) and akin to *εὐφανεία* (r. 9), and rarely, if ever, productive of advantage to its possessor; cp. 4. 93, 9. 3, where it is the antecedent of defeat. Only in the case of the Alginetan defection from Euphrates did success attend it 8. 83, if success it could be called, to be successful thieves. Cp. Introduction, p. cvii.

4. *ἐκάστῳ ἰδίκον.* It may fairly be doubted whether this remark comes from any other than a single source; whether those first messages 'to all the states whose tyrants had been deposed by Aristagoras,' dictated in the *ἐπιστολὴ* *σεβάς* of the Persian strategi, are much more than an afterthought, to soften the conduct of the Samians recorded below, c. 13.

11. 1. *ἐς τὴν Μῆλην.* The fleet ἀνίκασον τῆς τῆς Μῆλην (c. 9 *συν.*) not quite so close to the city.

From the opening sentence of this c. it might be thought that the offers were made by the Persian commanders before the muster of the Ionians at Lade. ταῦτα ἔδει λέγειν... μετὰ τέκνην. The meaning (ομοείδες) is evident from the context: the word is used differently, 7. 23. Cp. cc. 14, 58 *infra.* This popular way of conducting a campaign, by discussion, would be an object lesson and contrast to Athenian methods at the time when Hdt. is writing, and its results their justification. But what of the other strategi, of whom no account is made in this story? Cp. points in the story of Salamis, 8. 56, 59, 61, 64, 74, 78, on which this story may have been modelled. Cp. Introduction, p. lxvii.

4. ὁ Φωκαῖος στρατηγὸς. Blakley supposes that Dionysios was really an ἀγών ἄρχη in command of the exiles of Phokaia, and so obnoxious to the taunt levelled at Themistocles before Salamis, 8. 61. This point, if it could be admitted, would be a gain to the striking parallel which Grote has drawn between Lade and Salamis (*Pt.* ii. c. xxxv. vol. iii. pp. 510 ff. Cp. c. 12 *infra*). But the supposed abandonment of Phokaia happened half a century before Lade, and Dionysios and his three ships would have been rather past service by this time. The exiles of Phokaia have been already provided for in the west, 1. 163 ff. If Dionysios and his men were exiles, where were the Phokaianos of the city? The reproach against him is not that he is homeless but that he commands the smallest contingent. A remnant of Phokaianos had returned to the city, 1. 165. It
was an insignificant place at the time when Hilt was writing, and its name counted, perhaps, for more in the west (cp. c. 17 infra) than in the east. Is Phokaia credited with only three ships, because that is the number which escaped to the west, c. 17 infra, or is there, perhaps, a connexion between the three Phokian ships at Lade and the three Talents, at which Phokaia was assessed 454-446 b.c.? Cp. C.I.A. I. p. 227.

5. ἐπὶ ἐρωτόμαν ἀμφότερος. This proverbial expression is as old as Homer, II. 10. 173. For ἔρωτα, 'balanced,' ἵστασθαι seems more usual (cp. I. & S. sub n. ἐρωτ), and van Herwerden would read ἰσταται here.

ἄνδρας, emphatic. Cp. 4. 1. Thuc. 4. 92. 1, 123, 1.
6. ἐπικρατέστερον. Cp. 4. 142 supra. 7. ὑπερβαλόμενοι, cp. 9 supra, 13 infra.
10. οἰδήματα. µὴ οὐ δόσαι. Cp. Goodwin, § 95, 2 note 1 (b) (p. 200), ed. maj. 815, and the ref. given c. 9, 13 supra. ιμέλεων, objective gen.; 'you give me no hope.'
12. θεών τὰ ίσα νεώτατα. The expression is put again into the mouth of Miltiades, c. 109 infra. 13. 2 f. ἐπὶ κέρας, διέκπλου πτ. These expressions show a high state of naval tactics among the Ionians, from whom the Athenians apparently learned this manoeuvre. Cp. Thuc. 1. 89, 3, 2, 88, 5 et al. Unless, indeed, the statement is an anachronism. The construction of the sentence δοκεῖ έρρέτειν χρυσαυτό κτλ. is remarkable. Krüger approves of Schweighäuser's second thought ut remiges exercisset (cp. 5. 96 τολμάτω ἐπατά δοκεῖς γενόμενο, 5. 98 ἐπάται δοκεῖ β. Δ. λατάσεισ). But the context and the material sense suggest the view that δοκεῖ χρυσαυτό καὶ ἐπάτασε is practically co-ordinate with ἔρρέτειν παρείχε τε, the one sentence describing what took place the first part of the day, the other what took place to λογοῦ τε ἵµαρτες. Schweighäuser's first thought podignium remiges exercisset is not happily expressed, but comes nearer the sense. Day by day he put out to sea, in column, keeping the oarsmen at work, as he made them perform the Dickplus, and keeping the Marines all the while under arms; and when the manoeuvres were over, making the ships cast anchor and giving the Ionians no rest all day. τόσοι γεγονεί δαν αλλήλων could very well be spared: it makes the sense top-heavy.
6. δι' ἡμέρας. At night they were allowed to go ashore.
kai ἦδρος, ἔλεεσαν πρὸς ἐωτοὺς τάδε. "τίνα δαιμόνον παραβάντες τάδε ἀναπήπτομεν; οὕτως παραφρονήσαντες καὶ ἐκπλώσαντες ἐκ τοῦ νόου ἄνδρι Φωκαίοι ἀλλαξάντες, παρεχομένοι νέας τρεῖς, ἐπιτρέσαντες ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐχομεν;" ο δὲ παραλαβὼν ἡμᾶς λυμαίνεται λύμης ἀνηρεύοντι, καὶ δὴ πᾶλλοι μὲν ἡμῶν ἐς νοσοὺς πεπτώκασι, πᾶλλοι δὲ ἐπιδοξοῦ τώοτο πάσατο πεθανόντων εἰς, πρὸ τέ τούτων τῶν κακῶν ἡμῶν γε κρέσον καὶ ἐτῶν 15 ἀλλα παρεῖν ἐστι καὶ τὴν μέλλοναν δουληρίαν ἐπομείναν ἡμῖς ἐστιν, μᾶλλον ἡ τὴν παρενόησαν συγκέντρωσί. φέρετε, τοῦ λοιποῦ μὴ πειθομένα αὐτοῦ." ταύτα ἔλεεσαν, καὶ μετα ταύτα αὐτίκα πεθανόντων ἡμῖς ἐαυτοῖς ἠθέλει, ἀλλ’ ὅλα στρατινικές και τὴν ἡμῶν κατοικίαν ἡμῶν ἐπομείναν εἰς τὴν μέλλοναν δουληρίαν καὶ ἐστίν εν τῷ εὐθέλεισθαι ἔς τὰς 20 νέας τις ἀναπεράσαται.

Μαθόντες δὲ ταύτα τὰ γνώμενα ἐκ τῶν Ἰάων οἱ στρατηγοὶ 13

9. παραβάντες with accusative of person is unusual. The Ionians are too much excited to be quite grammatical. Cp. c. 13 ἐναρά.
10. παραφρονήσαντες. The word is used c. 76 ἐναρά, of the madness of Kleomenes, 3. 84 of Kambyses.
11. ἀκλόνταν. A striking and suitable metaphor in the mouths of Ionians; less so, perhaps, in the mouth of Darcios 3. 155. In its literal sense, it is constructed with an acc. 5. 103.
12. ἀλαιών. Proper wanderer, vagabond, landlouper (L. & S.). If Dionysios was not ἀλαιών (vide note supra) he was the next thing to it.

The Ionians were old sailors; their colonies studied the shores of the Mediterranean, Aegean, Pontos; they had memory of endless adventures, from Nile to Phasis, from Kypros to Tartessos. They had already in this war proved victorious once, and perhaps again, over the king's vessels. A few days after taking to their tents they engaged the Persians, and owed a defeat largely to treachery. They fought well at Salamis for the king, and at Mykale, on the Hallespont, in Egypt and Kypros afterwards against him. No doubt their discipline was in Hdt.'s days far inferior to that of the Athenians (cp. Thuc. 1. 99); that inferiority was vividly present to the minds of the—Athenians, who had left their kinmen to fight their battle at Lade, and who afterwards justified their own usurpation on the ground of their superiority (cp. Thuc. 1. 75). The contrast which Grote (l. c.) elaborates, apropos of Lade, is consciously patent in the Herodotean tradition. The moral is already here, and Grote, in taking the tradition au pied de la lettre, has, so to speak, fallen into the trap which a philo-Athenian writer, or his sources, has laid for us. Insubordination (ἀταξία) and mollesse (μαλακία) (c. 11 supra), disease (πάθος) and treachery (c. 13) may all have been present, and cooperated towards the result; but we should have more respect for the verisimilitude of the tradition in the former particulars, if the Samians, who in the next chapter are distinguished from 'the Ionians,' had not been the traitors. The Herodotean account of the conduct and collapse of the Ionians at Lade is at once a satire on the Ionians, and a justification of the Athenian supremacy, as necessary to keep them together, and to save them from Persia. Afterthought, and apparently even after-events, have been used in the building of the story. More than half a century after Lade the Samian secession shook the Athenian supremacy almost to its foundations. (Cp. Thuc. 1. 115-117, 8. 76, 4, Plutarch, Pericles, c. 28 ad fn.) The story of Lade is certainly in part from Samian sources (cp. c. 14 supra). Leabos, Chios, and Milatos were arrayed upon the side of Athens, in 439 B.C. Byzantium joined Samos in the revolt.

13. 1. οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Σαμίων (cp. c. 14 ἐγκατέσταται) are thus distinguished from 'the Ionians,' as though 'the Samians'
were not to be reproached with ἀπάτη and μαλακία. ‘The Ionians’ in fact are made responsible in the first instance for the treachery of ‘the Samians.’ The Samians like Aristogoras 5. 124 take the view that ἄδικα τὰ βασιλεῖα πρήγματα (= βασιλεία Δαρείων τ. έτ. οὐκ ἐσχατεύσατο. Cp. 5. 36. It is observable that in this process of whitewashing ‘the Samians’ Hdt.’s grammar becomes decidedly involved, giving rise to corruptions of the text. Holder and van Herwerden follow Cobet in transferring ἱκέτην τῶν λόγων so as to precede κεῖτον and in expunging λόγων after ἱκέτην. Even so, the sentence remains incoherent. Cp. c. 25 3ημία. 3. πρότερον, c. 10 3υπρα. 7. οὐ διέλειμα. 9. πολιτάρχηα, ο. έκ 3000. Even the navy of Xerxes numbers only 1207, 7. 89. τὸν Δαρείων δὲν, Wesseling. 9. προφάραγος. Not always a mere ‘excuse.’ Cp. 4. 135 3υπρα. 10. χρυσόν. Cp. 5. 109. For ὁ βασιλεὺς of Herodotus and Holder adopt ἀνερμοῦς, the reading of RSV (= β). 11. τὰ ίδα. Their treachery had a pious motive: and its reward, c. 25. Hence Hdt. could enumerate the Herodium among the glories of Samos in his own day, 3. 60. 11. Αἴασις. Aikes son of Sylos (4. 138) younger brother of Polykrates (3. 39) had been invested with the tyranny by grace of Dareios (3. 139-147). It was in connexion with his first establishment, presumably, that the proverb arose ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀποκάλλωσιν ἀπτεταῖρτοι. Cp. Rose, Arist. Fig. 574 (ed. 1886). 13. ὑπὸ τοῦ Μιλήσιον ἑτα στετόρ. Cp. 9. 37, c. 9 3υπρα. The constant specification of Aristogoras as ‘the Miletian’ would hardly have occurred in a Miletian source. 13. 2. εἰς κέρας, εἰς ἡπειρομεσίαν, intending to perform the ἀπέλευσαν. The exercises under Dionysius (c. 12) were not without result. The first sentence of this c. is somewhat of a non sequitur. If we mean little more than ‘well then’ (letat zur Erzählung zurück St.) the fact remains that the Ionians put to sea meaning business. 3. οὐ δὲ ἄτρικες συγγράφα. Oddly enough, Hdt. had a similar difficulty about the battle of Salamis, cp. 8. 87. This confession and the reason for the inability (ἀλλάξαν τὰ καταστήματα) are highly significant of the untrustworthy character of the Greek traditions, which differed widely in regard to the same events, according to the interests or partialities of the states, factions, and persons involved. It must not be concluded from the formulae here that Hdt. had only oral tradition to deal with. Grote (ii. 512) argues from ‘the
oùtes τῶν Ἰόνων ἐγκυντο ἀνδρὲς κακοί ἢ ἀγαθοὶ ἐν τῇ ναυ-
μαχίῃ ταύτῃ. Ἀλλήλους γὰρ καταιώνωνται. Λέγονται δὲ Ἡμάιος ἐνβαίνοι κατὰ τὰ συγκείμενα πρὸς τὸν Λάκκαν ἀνείρμοις τὰ ἱστια ἀποτιθέσαι ἐκ τῆς τάξεως ἐς τὴν Σάμου, πλὴν ἔνδεσα νεών-
τουτών δὲ οἱ πρώταρχοι παρέμενον καὶ ἐναυσάγοις ἀνήκουστη-
σαντες τοιοὶ στρατηγοί. καὶ σφί τὸ κοινῷ τῶν Ἡμάιων ἐδοκε 
διὰ τούτῳ τὸ πρόγμα ἐν στήλῃ ἀναγραφὴν πατρόθεν ὡς ἐν 
ἀνδράσι ἀγαθοίς γενομένως, καὶ ἐστὶ αὐτή ἡ στήλη ἐν τῇ 
ἀγορῇ. Ἰδόμενοι δὲ καὶ δασιμοὶ τοὺς προσέχεις φεύγοντα 
τῶν ἐποίεν τοις Ἡμάιοις· διὸ δὲ καὶ οἱ πλεύνες τῶν Ἰόνων 
ἐποίεν τὰ αὐτὰ ταύτα. τῶν δὲ παραμεμάντως ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ 
15 περιέβρασαν τὴν πτωτα Ἡρώι ὡς ἀποδεικτικοὶ τοῖς ἔργον λαμπρὰ 
καὶ οὐκ ἔθελοκέεντες. παρείχοντο μὲν γὰρ, ὅσπερ καὶ πρό-

dramatic liveliness” of the scene described cc. 11, 12 supra, that Hdt. is indebted for the description to Hekataios, “who was probably present” (Τ). Grote’s argument is unsound; Hdt. is the prince of story-tellers. But it is not impossible that the recriminations of the Ionians may have found their way into manuscript before Hdt. dealt with them. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxxiv. f.

5. Λέγονται. The majority, Chians, Milesians, Lesbians, probably agreed in saddling the Samians with the supreme act of treachery, and there was the further evidence of the στῆλη (infra) and of the intact ένω τοῦ ἰστιά. Hdt. will not himself condemn the Samians.

6. τὰ ἱστια. They should have been using their ears, for the δικασίαις (cp. δικασίαις c. 16 infra).

7. πρώταρχοι. Doubtless eleven in all, one to each ship, commanders inferior to the στρατηγοὶ, whose number is unfortunately not stated, cp. c. 13 supra.

9. τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Σάμιων. This grace, and the erection of the stele, must surely date from days subsequent to the battle of Mycale, and the liberation of Samos, cp. 9, 90, 103, 106. The evidences for Λαδὲ were post-Salamisian. Hdt. presumably had seen this very stele, and it is to be regretted that he did not copy or report the inscription, which probably contained more than bare proper names and patronyms. The στῆλη may or may not have been set forth in the title (cp. 8. 82). The phrase τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Σάμιων and ὥσ ἀνάρατο ἀγάθων γενόμενοι may be from the inscription.

11. ἵστι αὐτὴ ἢ σ. ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ. The words convey no clear indication of the date of composition, but they suggest one of Hdt.’s sources of knowledge, cp. Introduction, pp. lix, lxxii.

12. Δασιμοὶ were not Ionians (cp. c. 8 supra), and if they had been the first to betray the cause, the story might have been more consistent, cp. c. 5, 13 supra, 31 infra.

15. 1. τῶν δὲ παραμεμάντων κτλ. This chapter seems to qualify the statement, just above, that the historian cannot record who behaved well in the action. The 100 Chian ships greatly distinguished themselves, and suffered proportionately. Forty-nine Samian and 70 Lesbian ships had quitted the battle. It is remarkable that nothing is said of the conduct of the 80 Mileisan ships: presumably they fought, and the same may be assumed of the (three) ships of Phokaia. There remain only the contingents of Teos, Priene, Erythrae, and Myus, making 40 ships together. The ships of Priene were next those of Miletos: those of Teos and Erythrae east and west of the Chians. In short, it is certain that the 180 ships, or rather 119 originally (cp. c. 8 supra) forming the west or right wing towards the high sea, and subsequently perhaps the head of the column (ἔτοι ἐφαρ c. 14 supra), sailed away, and this act was sufficient to explain the sequel without supposing that their shameful example was followed by a majority of the Ionians.

2. περιέβρασαν, cp. 5, 1.

3. πρώταρχοι, cp. c. 8 supra. These apologies for repetition within a short
space might occur in passages intended to be heard at one reading: where similar phrases, referring backward or forward over several Books, occur, they imply that the author conceived his work on a large scale, and addressed it to a reading public. Cp. 5. 36.

5. ἐπιβατέωντος. Amounting to 4000 picked hoplites in all.

8. ἔνετολοντα. Notwithstanding the desolation of the Samians and Lesbians, who were heading the column, the remainder, headed by the Phokaiaeans under Dionysios (cp. c. 8 supra), who were posted next, proceeded to put the manoeuvres into operation. The story here omits the Phokaiaeans, to concentrate attention on the Chians, who came behind the ships of Phokaia and Erythrae, and is perhaps from a Chian source. Some one (Ion I) may even have written of the deeds and sufferings of the Chians (ὅσα ἠδραν ἢ ἑταῖρον ἐξέδραξε στρατιάσασθαι) before Hdt. collected his anecdotes.

9. τῶς πλείων. At least 51. But the vagueness indicates a weakness in the source.

16. 4. Μυκῆλης, τῆς Ἀθηναίων ἅρμα πρὸς τῶν ἔθεμον ἄνεμον κατάκοψα τάξις κατακόρου. 1. 148, cp. 9. 97.

7. ἀπόκατο, pluperf., cp. c. 9 supra.

καὶ ἕνων. Cp. 5. 126 ad fin. for the construction.

The Themosphoria were an autumn Festival at Athens (A. Mommsen, Heerologie, p. 291), and presumably elsewhere. Accepting the mysterious story in the text as a chronological indication, we are supplied with an approximate season for the battle of Lade. Like Marathon, Salamis, Plataea-Mykale, it was a September fight. On the origin of the Themosphoria cp. 2. 171. It was a 'Pelagic' function. The Ephesians were remarkable for not celebrating the Ionian Apaturia, 1. 147. Hdt. supplies evidence of the celebration of the Themosphoria in Alginia c. 91 supra, and in Attica, cp. 8. 96. Men were excluded, Aristoph. Them. 653. The celebration evidently took place at night, outside the city, and probably under the full moon.

3. τῶν Ἑφέσων, the men of Ephesos.' Their ignorance of what was going on at Lade and Miletos is curious, not to say incredible; but it may have served as an excuse afterwards, when this exploit was remembered against them.

9. στρατοῦ. It might amount to some 2000 hoplites, to say nothing of seamen. It is not likely that the men of Ephesos annihilated them. A parley or self-defence or flight was possible. Nor does ἐκτείνων imply that the butchery was wholesale,
17. 2. έμαθε... τα πρήγματα διεφθαρμένα. Cpr. c. 23 1. 9 ἐναρχά, Kühner, Ausf. Gr. § 492 (ii. p. 613), Goodwin, Gk. M. and T., § 384, ad. maj.
3. τρεῖς. One apiece for the three ships he commanded; more could not be expected. Cpr. c. 12 supra.
Φάκαες. He was not, strictly speaking, an ἄγων ἄρης. Cpr. c. 11 supra.
5. ΟΝ γάλλας, see Cecil Torr, Ancient Ships, p. 113. On the accent, Chandler, Gk. Accentuation, § 274.
6. Συκελίνης. Hd. may have owed his knowledge of the subsequent course of the bold buccaneer to western sources. Cpr. c. 22 ἐναρχα, Introduction, πρ. xev. f.
ὁρμώμενος, 5. 125, 128. Cpr. c. 5 ἐναρχα ἐνατικά τοῦ ἑωμένως.
7. Ἀριστεία was a comparatively respectable occupation still (cpr. Thuc. 1. 5): practised simply upon Carthaginians and Etruscans, it hardly amounted to more or less than a legitimate form of warfare, or privateering.
18. 1. ἐπίκων. Lade was the only naval engagement in which the 'Persians' ever defeated Hellenes, for the defeat in Egypt in 454 n.c. (Thuc. 1. 109 f.) was hardly a naval engagement, and the victory of Konon and the Phoenicians at Knidos in 394 n.c. (Xen. Hell. 4. 3), and the successful operations of Memnon in 335 n.c. (Arrian, Anab. 2. 1), obviously need not be reckoned. The defeat at Lade was due to treachery, and the treachery to the political and commercial rivalries which divided Greeks, Aesolian from Ionian, Samian from Chian, Milesian from Ephesian, and indeed Samian from Samian, and so forth. The moral of this battle was not lost upon the Athenians (c. 21 ἐναρχά) nor upon their great men, Mitidias, or Themistokles (cpr. 6. 106, 8. 62 et al.), and seems to have reacted upon the memory and records of events, cpr. cc. 12, 14 supra.
2. καλὰ θαλάσσης. Hitherto the siege operations had been conducted solely by land.
ὑπορέσσοντες. Cpr. 4. 206, 5. 115. Miletos was a walled town, which was more, perhaps, than could be said for Athens. Cpr. 5. 64, c. 105 ἐναρχά.
3. παντοῖος μηχανῶς implies a certain development of siege artillery; but the description is too general to be of much service to the history of warfare. Cpr. 8. 52.
κατ’ ἀκρης, Homer. ἄλοτο πᾶσα κατ’ ἀκρης Ἑλῶς, II. 13. 772.
4. ἐντον ἐτέλ. Probably a trustworthy and most valuable datum for chronology. The exact point of the rebellion of Aristagoras seems fixed (5. 37) to the seizure of the Ionian tyrants on the fleet at Myns, just after the return from Naxos. But a good deal turns on the interpretation of 'the sixth year.' The whole question is discussed, and a chronological re- construction suggested, in Appendix V.
5. στυμπτὶς, coincide, agree with, 'fulfil.'
19. 3. ἐπίκωνοι ξυστήματων. Unfortu-
nately Hdt. does not date this oracle. Rawlinson's translation darkens obscurity by inserting "once on a time." The Argive portion of the Response was afterwards interpreted as referring to the war with Kleomenes (cp. c. 77 in/fra), and Stein apparently argues from the inquiry of the Argives περὶ συνθήκης (cp. p. 119) that the war with Kleomenes was in prospect; but the Argives had occasion for such inquiries both before and after the days of Kleomenes, and the divine warning was vague enough to be sure of fulfillment sometime. The excursus, or insertion on Miletos, is somewhat more definite, and might serve to fix a date for the Argive Theoria. Blakesley argues from κακῶν ἐπιθύμησε ἔργον that the oracle belongs to the time of Croisos and Kyros, when Miletos made a separate treaty with Kyros of which Delphi would disapprove. This hypothesis credits Delphi with extraordinary foresight and considerable patriotism, or at least loyalty to Lydia. From another point of view it may be argued that the recognized fulfillment of the prophecy in the case of Miletos leads us to date the oracle shortly before or after the events of 494 B.C. The Delphic oracle already, perhaps, as afterwards certainly (cp. 7. 140), took the view attributed to Aristagoras (5. 124) and the Samians (c. 13 supra), that 'the king' was invincible. In any case the Delphians might regard Rebellion, if not Democracy, the assault on Naxos, the attempt to involve Sparta, or Alkmaneid Athens, in the struggle with Persia, the burning of the Metron in Sardes (5. 102) as possessi ἐκτύμητε (cp. 5. 97, 98). Or was the κακῶν ἐπιθύμησε ἔργον levelled at the Milesian Hekataios, a philosopher, who proposed to confiscate the treasures of Branchidiae? 5. 36. Even if the κακό referred to the acts or inaction of Miletos in 546 B.C., or included it, the oracle need not be carried back so far as to refer the Argive Theoria to the days of Anaxandrides 1. 82 (when by the way the question was not about the safety of the city but about possession of Theras). It certainly must not be assumed that every utterance, which fairly figures the event, was a work of afterthought; nor does the oracle here given commit Delphi so deeply as to be beyond the resources of interpretation, whatever the event. But anyway the association of the destruction of Miletos in 494 B.C. with the war of Kleomenes against Argos, whether due to interpretation or to inspiration, or simply to later contamination, equally points to the conclusion that those two events were approximately synchronous, whatever the date or dates of the Argive Theoria and of Argivo-Milesian Response. Cp. Appendix VII.

5. τοῦ λόγου. ὁ λόγος here cannot mean 'the (sixth, or present) Book,' though the reference is to c. 77 in/fra: nor again, is it merely 'the particular story of Argos' (κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον). The word λόγος seems here used more vaguely of the whole story, or work. Cp. line 16 in/fra and Introduction, p. lxxv.

6. ὁ παρευθείς ἤρων. A remarkable display of animus. (Cp. ψαλτής ἐπιθύμησε καὶ παρακαλοῦμαι καὶ ἐκλέγεις Thuc. 1. 118, 3.)

7. ἡμιδιαί. The text of the oracle is not above suspicion. Nauck suggested ἡμιδιαί for ἡμιδιαῖος. Van Herwerden reads ἡμιδιαίος for ἡμιδιάοιοι, a clear improvement.

8. θυλαδὶ ὑδόρα. I. 1. 213.

11. Διδύμοι. Branchidiae 5. 36. Strabo, 334, relates that the temple was burnt by Xerxes and that the Branchidiae delivered up the treasury to the king, two statements which look rather like alternatives. The Milesians afterwards proceeded to build an immense temple, which was never completed. Rawlinson
5. της ει Μιλήσιων χώρας. That the Greeks were wholly exterminated from Miletos seems an exaggeration. At the battle of Mykale the Persians employ "the Milesians," who are presumably Hellenes and not merely "Karians of Pedasa," to guard the passes, 9. 99, and these Milesians did their best for the cause of Hellas on that day (9. 104). But the greatness of Miletos was past. Samos is the leading spirit of the revolt from Xerxes (cp. 9. 90. But cp. 8. 132). The primacy of Ionia passes from the mainland to the island (cp. 5. 29). Under Athenian hegemony there was probably a revival in Miletos, but it was a tributary (paying, with Leros and Techiussa, but 5 Τ. at the time of its quarrel with Samos, cp. Thuc. I. 116, 2, C. I. A. I. p. 227) while the name of Samos never appears in the tribute lists. (Kleruchs were not established in the island before 385 b.c. apparently. See Hicks, Manual Gk. Ins. No. 90.)

αὐτῶν ὑπὸ. The Persians probably garrisoned the Akropolis, and may have appropriated the Plain, but that they cultivated it themselves is not likely. The Hyperakria would be the sheep-runs, on which some at least of the celebrated "Mileia vellera" were grown.

6. Καρπός Πηδασατός. What the Karians of Pedasa had done to deserve such a reward does not appear. We last heard of them as cutting a Persian army to pieces, 5. 121, unless indeed it was other Karians who did this, while the men of Pedasa were on the Persian side.
Παθόσες δὲ ταῦτα Μιλήσιοι πρὸς Περσέων οὔκ ἀπέδοσαν τὴν ὁμολογίαν Συβαρίται, οἱ Δαὸν τε καὶ Σκιδρῶν οἶκες τὸν πόλιον ἀντετρομένοι. Συμβάφιοι γὰρ ἀλοίποις ὑπὸ Κροτωνιτῶν Μιλήσιοι πάντες ἤβηθον ἀπεκείρατο τὰς κεφαλὰς καὶ τένειας μόνοι 5 προσεθῆκαν· πόλεις γὰρ αὕτη μᾶλλον δὴ τῶν ἡμεῖς ἱδέων ἀλλάζειν ἐξεισώθησαν· οὐδὲν ὁμολογεῖ Λατρὶοι. Αὐθαρίσιοι μὲν γὰρ δῆλον ἐποίησαν ὑπεραχθεῖσθαι τῇ Μιλήτου ἀλώσιν τῇ

21. 2. τὴν ὁμολογίαν. Συβαρίται, οἱ κτλ. Ο. 5. 44.

The date of the destruction of Sybaris by Kroton is 510 B.C., as Duncker, viii. 646, deduces from Diodorus, 11. 90 and 12: 10.

Δαὸν τε καὶ Σκιδρῶν. Originally dependent colonies of Sybaris, which may have received the exiles (cp. Busolt, Gr. G. i. 2 400), Sybaris was on the gulf of Taranto north of Kroton; Laod and Skidros across the mountains to the west, and on the Tyrrhenian sea.

Their losses and the migration might have ruptured the commercial relations between the Sybarites and Miletos, and after 15 or 16 years it is, perhaps, not surprising that the old friendship had waned. What is remarkable is that Hdt. should point so sharply a contrast between the conduct of the Sybarites, and that of the Athenians. The passage may be an addition, due in part to western sources, a possibility rendered more probable by the asyndeton.

6. ἕξανάθησαν. (On the formula τῶν ἡμεῖς ἰδέων cp. Introduction, p. c.)

The great friendship between Sybaris and Miletos previous to 510 B.C. was doubtless largely based upon commercial interests and exchanges. How long the friendship had lasted, and whether it was embodied in legal form (σύμβαςοι) are open questions: it was probably not unconnected with the Chalkid-Etruscan war (cp. 5. 99) in which Kroton and Sybaris followed Samos and Miletos respectively (Busolt, Gr. G. i. 2 450). Sybaris was in a position to mediate the traffic between Asia and Etruria, and to compete with the passage by the Straits, which was commanded by Chalkis and its "friends." As an entrepôt its advantages may be compared to those of Corinth. The wares of Asia were dispatched at Sybaris and re-embarked at Laod. By this traffic Miletos, the greatest of the Ionian cities of the sixth and seventh centuries B.C. with something like a monopoly of the Black Sea traffic on the one side, and a large share of the trade with Egypt on the other, found an almost unlimited market for her exports. The Milesians might well put on mourning for the destruction of Sybaris. (See Lenormant, La Grande-Grèce, i. 217 ff. Busolt, Gr. G. i. 2 401, points out that Grote first noticed the importance of the overland route, cp. Grote, Pt. ii. c. xxi. vol. iii. p. 308; a remarkable passage.) The revival of Sybaris under Athenian auspices, and probably from the plan of the Milesian architect Hippodamos (Grote iv. 507), is the more comprehensible from the connexion between Athens and Miletos. Imperial Athens claimed the heritage and exploited the traditions of the old Ionian centres of commerce, Miletos, Chalkis, Delos, and attempted to merge old rivalries in a higher union. The revival of Sybaris in particular was an idea that went back to Themistocles (cp. 8. 62, Plutarch, Themist. 32), though it was only realised by Pericles: not very successfully (cp. Diodor. 12. 10). Herodotus is here on his own ground. Cp. Introduction, p. c.}

οὐδὲν ὁμολογεῖ κτλ. The following passage Blakely is ready to be bracketed as spurious upon two grounds: (1) Strabo, quoting the anecdote, 632, gives Kallithenes, not Hdt., as his authority. But the anecdote was a celebrated one, probably told as often before as after Strabo (see references in Rawlinson, ad l.), and Strabo is not careful to quote the very earliest authority. (2) The asyndeton — an asyndeton is not sufficient to justify isolating a passage in Hdt. Stein compares 1. 20; cp. c. 3 synpa.

The passage may be a later insertion or part of an insertion from the author's own hand, but it is thoroughly Herodotean.

Μιλήτου ἀλώσιν. "Haud injuria dubitatum est Milhtou alwsi utrum titulus fuerit dramatis an argumentum
Περάσων quem titulus Suidas v. Φρυνίχος commemorat. * (Nauck, Trag. Gr. Frag. p. 558). The prohibition recorded by Hdt. is perhaps to blame for the fact that neither fragment nor argument of the drama has survived. The drama of Phrynichos was remarkable as taking its plot from contemporary history, a new departure in dramatic composition. It was not, however, as a violation of artistic canons, or precedents, that it gave offence to the Athenians. But was it simply as a moment of their own sorrows? Were the spectators who went the same as the dikasts who punished? Was there nothing more in the affair than Hdt.' records? The suggestions that the drama may have contained, or have been interpreted as, a reproach for the desertion of Miletos, and the Ionian cause, and that the οἰσέμα κακά (cp. 7. 152 τὰ οἰσέμα κακά... αἰσχύμα πετοῦτα) were not so much the woe and sufferings of Miletos as the error and shortcomings of Athens, are too plausible to be summarily dismissed (cp. Duncker, Gesch. d. Alt. vii. 8 83). There may have been politicians in Athens who regarded the retirement from Ionia as a blunder. Even if Themistokles was not Archon in 493 B.C., he was old enough to perceive the advantage of supporting the Ionians. On a later occasion he was chagrin of Phrynichos, when the latter celebrated not the woe but the victory of Athens in the Phoemissen (cp. Clinton, Fasti ad ann. 476 n.c., Pintarch, Themat. 5). The trial and condemnation of Phrynichos, for his drama of 493 n.c., may have been a political move, or act of revenge, by the persons who were mainly responsible for the withdrawal of the Athenians, or the repeated refusals (5, 163) to continue the support of the movement against the Persians; though the withdrawal may have been at the time inevitable. Cp. notes ad l. c.

9. δαδαξαντι. Technical term (cp. 1. 23) for teaching the actors and chorus, which was done, or superintended, by the author or composer (ταξθραντι). Van Herwerden, however, remarks: ταξθραντι et non agnoscit scriptor τηλθ δήθεν c. 24.

10. οἰσέμα. On the relationship between Athens and Miletos, cp. 5. 97 supra.

22. 1. Μιλήσιον, see note on c. 20 line 5 supra. ήρημωτο, pl. p.

τοίον ηεξοντι. It was the Samian 'Have-nots' who approved of what had been done by the (democratic) Strategoi; it was the oligarchs who had most to apprehend from a medizing tyrant. See c. 14 supra. Van Herwerden reads φάτοι and brackets Αλάκεα.

5. Μήθοιες τι καὶ Αλάκει δουλειαί. A double, but closely-related servitude: cp. c. 5 supra. The 'Persians' in this story are become 'Medes,' a variant which suggests a change in the sources.

8. Καλὴν αἰκήν. A Sikel foundation, Freeman, Sicily, i. 149. On this passage cp. Freeman, ii. 109 f., and on the importance of the place under Duketios, i.e. about 446 n.c., ib. p. 378. It is remarkable that Hdt. makes no mention of Duketios and his achievements. Freeman (after Holm) suggests that Dionysios (c. 17 supra) was at the bottom of this invitation. The Samians had long been friends with the Chalkidic Ionians, 5. 99. Zambke was a joint
settlement from Chalkis in Euboea, and Cuma in Campania, Thuc. 6. 4, 5. Thuc. 6. 5 says that Zankle was occupied όπως Σάμιον καὶ ἄλλων Ἰόνων. These 'other Ionians' are represented by Μιλησίων οἱ ἐκπεφυρότες. 9. ἔστι μὲν Σικελίων. This remark holds good of the date at which Hdt. is writing, but might have been inserted into the story of the Samians by Hdt. himself; not, indeed, that the geographical indication is so precise as to justify us in supposing it if anything of autoscopy, but that the gloss-like and clumsy remark is just such an one as the author might intercalate, supposing him to have been westwards.

12. ἐν στήλῃ (if any antecedent be required).

23. 1. Δακροίτης τ. Ἐ. Not elsewhere mentioned by Hdt. The epithet distinguishes the Italiote city from the Ὁρών (8. 29) and the ὘τώντες (7. 203).

3. Σκῖθρης. Why is Skythes called βασιλεὺς and μισθαρχος, while Anaxilas and Hippocrates are τύραννοι, if not because Hdt. had this story from a source favourable to Skythes? See next chapter: and cp. 5. 109, 110. For the co-ordinate construction, cp. 4. 181.

4. ἤγγισα. Rhesion, commanding the straits on the Italian side as Zankle on the Sicilian (cp. Thuc. 4. 24, 4), was reckoned a Chalkidic foundation. (The story in Strabo, 257.)

6. Ἀναξιλᾶς. In 7. 165, a passage avowedly drawn from a Sikelote source, Anaxilas is given with his father's name (Kretines).

8. ἄνδρον. The women and children were of course therein; cp. 4. 1.

10. Ἰπποκράτης τ. Τῆλης τ. Hippocrates son of Pantareus succeeded his brother Kleonos, 7. 154.

7. Ἕλη, Cp. Thuc. 6. 4, 3.

11. σύρμαχος. In 7. 154 Hippocrates appears as σύρμαχος of Zankle, and he certainly treats Skythes as a dependent ally not as an equal. But perhaps the 'war' referred to in 7. 154 is the one described here.

14. Phyllogenes is only memorable for this misfortune.

'Ἰνυκα. At the other side and end of Sicily, within the sphere of Akragantine and Gelaen influence (cp. Freeman, Sicily, 1. 118, App. v.). The form 'Ινος is implied in 'Ινυκες c. 24 infus, and guaranteed by Steph. Byz. sub v. for Hdt. The usual form is 'Ἰνυκα, which all the MSS. have here.
Σαμίους καὶ ὄρκος δοὺς καὶ δεξάμενος προέδοκε. μεθὸς δὲ οἱ ἐνεργόντες δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Σαμίων, πάντων τῶν ἐπιτηδίων καὶ ἀνδραπόδων τὰ ἡμέρας μεταλαβεῖν τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλι, τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄγρων πάντα Ἰπποκράτεια λαγχάνειν. τῶν μὲν δὴ πλέον τῶν Σαμηκαλίων αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνδραπόδων λόγῳ εἰχε ὁμός, τοὺς δὲ κορυφαίους αὐτῶν τρικοσιῶν ἔδωκε τοῖς Σαμίους κατασφάρει· οὐ μὲντοι οἳ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἡμῶν ἐποίησαν ταῦτα. Σκύθης δὲ ὁ τῶν 24 Σαμηκαλίων μούναρχος ἐκ τῆς Ἰσηκοῦ ἐκδόρησε ἐκ Ὑμηρῶν, ἐκ δὲ ταύτῃ παρὰ ἐκ τῆς Ἀθηναίας καὶ ἀνέβη παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρείου καὶ μὲν ἐνόχος Δαρείου πάντων ἄνδρων δικαίωσεν εἶναι, ὅσοι ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρ᾽ ἐνώπιον ἀνέβησαν. καὶ ἵππος παρατησάντων ἐπὶ τὰς παρὰ βασιλέα ἐκ τῆς Ἔλλας ἀπ᾽ ἐκ ταυτός ἐς τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρὰ ἐκ ταυτός ἐς τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρὰ βασιλέα ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρὰ βασιλέα. Ἐπεξεργαστὶς τὴν Ἀθηναίαν τοῦτος μὲν ἐνόχος Δαρείου πάντων ἄνδρων δικαίωσεν εἶναι, ὅσοι ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρ᾽ ἐνώπιον ἀνέβησαν. καὶ ἵππος παρατησάντων ἐπὶ τὰς παρὰ βασιλέα ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρὰ βασιλέα ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρὰ βασιλέα.

18. μεθὸς... εἰρημένος. Cp. Hesiod, Op. 368, L. k E. καὶ καὶ ἔβαλε. 20. ἐν ἀνδραπόδων λόγῳ, cp. s. 19 supra, Abicht takes εἰς with these words. 21. ἰδίου... κατασφάρει. Cp. Ἰσηκ. 54 a 20 supra, ἐκ τοῦ ἐν θύρᾳ, καὶ ἤρατον ἐν τοῖς Ἐπικουρίους Πρβλ. 574, Goodwin, Mnoi and Times. § 97, ed. maj. 770 ff. Hippocrates takes the Zaklean majority to sell as slaves, and hands the aristocracy, 390 in number, over to the tender mercies of the Samians—who were themselves aristocrats, cp. s. 22 supra. 24. 2. Ἰμηρῶν. Himera a colony of Chalkidians from Zankle (Thuc. 6. 6. 5. 1). Van Herwerden brackets τὴν Ἰ. 2. 3. 4. 5. 1. 3. Ἀθηναίας. Skythes may have found his way to Asia, and to Susa, in Carthaginian or Phoenician vessels. His conduct offered a marked contrast to that of Democedes, 3. 133 ff. This obvious contrast is pointed by Aelian, P. H. 8. 17, who calls Skythes Ἰνηυόμενον, perhaps from a misunderstanding of this passage, an error which bred others (cp. Perizonius ad l. c.). But did Skythes perhaps receive the tyranny in Kos from Dareios? 7. 164. If we are right in identifying (after K. O. Muller, Dovier, l. c. 171) this Skythes with that, we see that ἴσωσθαι was hereditary in the family, Kadmos the son of Skythes giving several notable proofs of it, two of which are recorded by Hdt. l. c. Freeman's attempt to separate the persons (Stellic, ii. 10). 22 n.) is hardly satisfactory. 5. πέλαν... γάλιν περιβάλλειν. For the pl. cp. 5. 78. Van Herwerden brackets the proper name here. According to the story told 7. 164, Kadmos, son of Skythes, resigned the tyranny in Kos and went to Sicily, and there received a city from the Samians, to wit Zankle, the name of which was changed to Messene. (That Hdt. forgets in one place (here) what he had said in another (there) is not so very strange. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxiii.) Thuc. 6. 4. 5 mentions the seizure of Zankle by the Samians described by Hdt., but adds that the Samians were shortly afterwards expelled by Anaxilas tyrant of Rhegium, who refounded the city with a mixed population and renamed it Messene in honour of his own original country. As may be conjectured, it was upon this occasion that Kadmos the son of Skythes took Zankle from the men of Samos: though Freeman (Stellic, ii. p. 112) unfortunately reads μετὰ Σαμωνῶν instead of παρὰ Σαμωνῶν in 7. 164, and makes Kadmos help the Samians to take Zankle from Skythes! Thucydides, who had good authority for his Sicilian Archaeology, by design or accident, corrects and supplements the hints in Hdt. who appears ignorant of the subsequent fate of the Samians, or else εἴδον ἐκοίμησα τὰς σημεία, though he mentions incidentally the change of name. Pausanias 4. 23, 3 f. gives the fullest account of these proceedings, but unfortunately spoils it by dating them to the 29th Olympiad in connexion with the second Messenian

26. Taixta men de auth epineto. Iostaiw de to Miletioi einonti peri Vyzantion kai suilambainonti tin Ialwn oukados ekplewusais ek tou Poutou efanggeletai ta peri tin Miltiou geoumenea. Tas men de peri 'Ellhnonstoi exoanta prigma ta 5 epitrapsaei Viasalti 'Apollonion paisi 'Athenws, autws de 'exou Lebsious exi Xion epile, kai Xion frouph ois protismenoi

war. It is unemphatic to say (with Rawlinson) that the narrative of Pausanias is "a mere misrepresentation of the events here narrated," for Hdt. neither here nor elsewhere narrates the expulsion of the Samians from Zankle by Anaxilas, which is attested by Thucydides, as also the change of name to Messene, which by Hdt. is associated not with Anaxilas, but with Kadmos. If Anaxilas had anything to say to the change of name, it must have taken place before his death in 476 B.C., but Freeman (Note on "Anaxilas and the naming of Messana": Sicily, vol. ii. pp. 484 ff.) suggests that Thucydides may be in error, and that the change of name may have been due to a body of Messenian exiles settled at Zankle after their expulsion from the Peloponnesos about 457 B.C. This hypothesis is quite consistent with Hdt.'s statements, but will require to be supplemented by the assumption that the Messenians were led by Kadmos, who must have laid down the tyranny at Kos at least a quarter of a century before.

3. megala. His success had inter alia reopened the Aegaean and Hellespont to the Phoenicians, c. 28 infra. The evidence and strong tradition tend to saddle the Samians, and especially the Samian democracy, with the treachery at allade, cp. c. 22 infra. Even so, it is difficult to avoid the suspicion of exaggeration in what follows (moisoumen k.t.l.). The sole salvation of Samos might seem to justify their conduct. The word eklefis is noticeable: it is active.

7. exoun. Cp. c. 33 supra tin de Xerxhs exoun.

7. tais pin... upokifasa, tais 5i... proswagynstoi is not strictly grammatical; the general form of the sentence (Kariwn exoun) seems to require tais men tin pollon theologia kteimenois tais de anagke proswagynstoi. The introduction of the adverb efelen transfers the action for the moment to the side of the Karians and leads to the substitution of upokifasa for kteimenois (or some such word), but the subject of the main clause reasserting itself (ras de), the participial description of the action of the subject is raised, by a sort of logical compensation, to the dignity of a final verb (proswagynstoi). At the same time this grammatical incoherence seems to betray a psychological confusion; cp. c. 13 supra. Van Herwerden brackets proswagynstoi.

6. Lebsious. The Aeolian Lesbians had deserted the Chians and Miletiens at Lade, c. 14 supra. Under the Miletian adventurer they now reap their reward, in the temporary conquest (katastrphs ethi 27 infra) of Chios.
10. Polýkhēs. The town of that name in the Troad (Steph. B. sub v. Demetrius of Sikepsis apud Strab. 603, describes the place: ταχύτεροι χώροι, in the vale of the Aisepos, on the left of the stream, below Palaiosikepsis) seems rather far off, to serve as a basis for operations against Chios, but it would doubtless have made an excellent bandits' nest, and the words τής Χιόν do not prove that the Polichne here spoken of was in Chios (τής Χιόν χώρος) but merely that it belonged to the Chians. From its position the Idaean citadel seems to command the short land-route from the Gulf of Adimantetion to the Propontis. If the Chians had a stronghold on that route the Lesbians might have been specially anxious to eradicate them. Now the Chians had been in occupation of Aetarsus for upwards of fifty years, 1. 160. There may, of course, have been a Polichne in Chios; if so, this passage contains the only notice of it: its situation (as that of Kaukasus 5. 33, and that of 'the hollows') remains undetermined. C. P. Diet. Geog. 1. p. 610.

27. 1. filēs di kòs pòrōsmata. The chapter is significant as an illustration of the popular theology of the age which Hdt. represents; cp. c. 98 infra. Under ordinary circumstances such signs as are here recorded might rank as themselves disasters: but has Hdt. forgotten the great iniquity of the Chians (1. 160) that he here omits to point a moral? Cp. c. 91 infra. filēs, 7. 10, 9. 122 et al. pòrōsmata, cp. 1. 45. The omission of the subject before the verb is remarkable.

4. ÆΔάφως. The connexion between Ionian Chios and Delphi is observable. A choros of 100 was a double choros, or perhaps two chori, 50 being the normal number for a dithyrambic (Dionysiac) choros (cp. Diet. Antiq. s. v. chörus): it was probably such a choros that wine-loving Dionysos-worshipping Chios sent to Delphi, and the sober god was not well pleased. Cp. 4. 79.

7. γράμματα. Cp. 5. 58. At the beginning of the fifth century there were public schools for boys, in which reading and writing were taught—perhaps for commercial purposes. But the Homeric poems would not have been neglected at Chios. The island is volcanic, and subject to earthquakes, and the disaster here recorded may have been due to a natural cause, or simply to bad building.

9. Æ θεός. What god? The λαομή might have come from Apollo (J. 1. 44 ff. etc.): the earthquake from Poseidon (7. 129): Athena was a warden of Chios (1. 160). But most probably the god here intended is Zeus, if any name is to be given. A monotheistic, or monistic, tendency is visible in the work of Herodotus (cp. especially 3. 108, 8. 13 and c. 98 infra). Influences from two different sources may have contributed to augment it: (1) The Persian religion, so far as understood by the Greeks (cp. 1. 131, 7. 37) and even the Persian Monarchy (7. 56, 203). (2) The development of Greek science, and the search for one physical principle, as substance or cause of all things, which is characteristic of early Greek philosophy. (Cp. Zeller, Die Entwicklung des Monotheismus bei den Griechen in Fortflüge u. Abhand- lungen, 1875, and Burnett, Early Greek Philosophy (1892), pp. 119 ff.) This second influence would harmonise well enough with (3) the older notions of a
singular and fatal power behind the many gods (cp. 1. 91), which perhaps underlies the Herodotean (or popular) expressions χρίς, ἀῖαν, δεῖ τοῖς and so on. Cp. Introduction, pp. cxi. ff.

10. εἰς γόνα. A metaphor from wrestling, suggested, perhaps, by ἐπολαβόντα, which need not be identical in sense with ἐπολαβῶν just above.

28. 1. Θάσος. Rawlinson points out that the gold mines may have been the attraction, c. 46 infra, 2. 44. On the chronology, see Appendix VI. § 4.

28. 2. Ἰονίων καὶ Αἰολῶν συμμονᾶς. Ionians he had got from some of the vessels passing through the Bosporos (c. 6 supra). The Lesbians were, of course, Aeolians (c. 8 supra). Other Ionian and Aeolian adventurers may have swelled his forces. Hdt. implies pretty plainly that Doryclus had none.

6. Αἰταρίων. χῶρος τῆς Μυσίης Λέσβου ἄριστος, 1. 160. The topography of the region is more fully implied 7. 42. For the richness of the Kaikos valley, in which the Attalid residence Pergamos was afterwards situated, cp. Strabo, 624 ad fin.

7. τῶν σίτων. The early harvest of 493 B.C.

9. Ἀρταγόσ. The sudden appearance of Harpagos, a Persian, in command of a large force in Aeolis is remarkable: not less remarkable, seeing that Harpagos the Mede had made himself a name in the same district half a century before, cp. 1. 162, 169. The operations and

their issue may have been connected with the events described in c. 6 supra. Histiaeos was playing, or was credited with playing, a double game. A favourite with the king, he was not a favourite with the king's right-hand men, a Megabazos (5. 23), an Artaphernes (6. 1 et al.). Histiaeos was prepared to serve in Susa if he might reign in Ionia. He preferred to do the king's work with "plenty of Aeolians and Ionians," rather than see it done by the Phoenicians and by the Viceroy at Sardes. Satraps and Persian generals were not always subservient to the wishes of the king. Histiaeos might plot and perpetrate acts of hostility against the local authorities, and yet trust to making all good in the eyes of the central government. He may very well have brought many of the maritime states round to his views by using the Phoenician scare (c. 3 supra). The Median and Persian grandees preferred the Phoenician interest, and were jealous of the great Greek tyrants.

29. 2. Μαλανής. The reading is doubtful, and the spot unknown, though Kiepert's map places it conjecturally on the Irenos, west of the Kaikos. Wesseling conjectured Καρφή or Κάρφη from 7. 42: but Rawlinson's note may be thought to dispose of that. There was a place, at least in later times, on the coast, on the borders of Pergamos, called Perperine (cp. Ramsay, Asia Minor, pp. 13, 117). One MS. reads Μεγαλάνης,
τῆς Ἀταρνείτιδος χρυσῆς, οἱ μὲν συνεστασαν χρόνων ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἡ δὲ ὑπὸς ὀστερον ὄρμηθεια ἐπιτίθεται τοια Ἔλληνω. τὸ τε δὴ ἐργω τῆς Ἰππον τοῦτο ἐγένετο, καὶ τετραμμένων τῶν Ἐλλήνων 5 ὁ Ἰστιαίος ἐπιτίθεν υἱκ ἀπολεύθη, ὑπὸ βασιλέως διὰ τὸν παρεσύαν ἀμαρτάδα φιλοπυρήνη τοιαυτῆ τινα ἀναρείται· ὃς φεύγων τε κατελμάβετο ὑπὸ ἀνδρός Πέρσακα θωράκιος καὶ ὡς καταφεύγεται ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἠμέλλε συγκεντρώθησασθαι. Περσίδα γιλοκαὶ μετείχε καταμνηνεὶ ἐνοῦτον ὡς εἴη Ἰστιαίος ὁ Μιλιτής. εἰ μὲν 30 μν., ὡς ἐξογγίση, ἀμητε ἀγώνεο παρὰ βασιλέας Δαρείου, ὁ δὲ ὑπ’ ἐν ἀνθίτην κακῶν οὐδὲν δοκεῖν ἐμοι, ἀπῆλθε τ’ ἀν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀντίθεν νῦν δὲ μὲν αὐτὸν τοῦτον εἶναι καὶ ἐν μὴ διαφωνοῖν αὐτίς μέγας παρὰ βασιλέας γένεται, Ἀρταφρένης τε ὁ Σαρδιών ὑπάρχος καὶ ὁ λαβεῖον Ἀρταγός, ὡς ἀπίκετο ἀγώνεος ἐν Σάρδιας, τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ταύτη ἀνέσταυρος, τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἀντεχόμεναι ἀνήκεικα παρὰ βασιλέας Δαρείου ἐς Σύμπα. Δαρείος δὲ πυθμένων ταύτα ἐπαινισμάτων τοὺς ταύτα ποίησαντας ὅτι μὲν οὐ ζώντα ἀνήγαγόν ἐς θώμων τὴν ἐνοτοῦ, τὴν το κεφαλὴν τὴν Ἰστιαίον λογοκειταί τε καὶ περιτελείται καὶ ἐνεπεικοτὸς δύσας ὡς ἀνδρὸς μεγάλων ἐνοτοῦ τε καὶ Πέρσακας ἑυεργέτευμεν.

Τὰ μὲν περὶ Ἰστιαίον ὑπὸ ἔσχεν. ὁ δὲ ναυτικὸς στρατὸς 31 ὁ Περσέως χειμερίσια περὶ Μιλιτήν, τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐστὶ ὡς ἄνε—

two Μελέτς. Might Περσεφόνη be the true reading? (Strabo, 607, has Περσεφόνη. Pliny 5. 32, nunc est Perpancre civitas. The name may have been there long before the civitas.)

1. χρόνον εἰς πόλλην. This is more or less a formula, cp. 5. 119, c. 115 ἐνθα. 
2. ἐργον. εἰς ἡμέραν ἐργον, 5. 1 προφα. 
3. φιλοπυρήνην ... ἀναρείται, "accepts as one's own," "entertain" (L. & S. sub v. B. II. 2. with refl.), "takes to himself." Contr. Ὀλυμπα, εἰς ἀναρείται, cc. 36, 70, 103 ἐνθα. 
4. ² ὁ δὲ. δὲ ἐν αἰσχοῦσιν. Just below (ὁπίσω) the change of subject is obvious, rather than grammatical. Ὁδ. is apparently excited by having a theory of his own (ὅμως ἐμοί) to propound. Cp. notes cc. 13, 25 πρόφα. 
5. ὁ λαβεῖον. 'his captor.' 
6. ἀνασταύρωσαν. Having first apparently beheaded him, or at least put him to death somehow. The rapidity and suddenness with which Histiaios is bisected in the narrative is grimly humo

rrous. There is an anaeolothun μν’ τ’ ἐν ἐμείς αὐτῶν.

8. παιχνίδιαται. See 2. 87. 
The activities (ἀνεσταύρωσαν κτλ.) do not prove that Harpagos and Artaphernes were themselves the immediate agents. The care with which 'Benefactors' (op. c. 9 supra, 5. 11) were treated by the Persian king, is best illustrated in the story of Sandokas and Dareios, 7. 194. 
12. δάβας. The command comes suspiciously from the devout worshipper of Ormued. Though Ὁδ. asserts that it was a Persian practice to bury persons alive (7. 114), he is apparently not aware of the Persian objection to the burial of the dead (cp. 1. 149, 7. 100). But Dareios was tolerant of the religions of his various subjects, and may have directed that the remains of a Greek should be disposed of in accordance with the Greek rite: or the stricter canon of Madaism may have been still in embryo. Cp. Perrot and Chipiez, Art in Persia, pp. 190 ff. (E. T. 1692).
31. 2. χειμερίσια. Winter 494-3 B.C.
πλῶσε, αἱρέει εὐπετέως τὰς νήσους τὰς προς τὴν ἡσπερίδα κείμενας,
Χίον καὶ Λέσβον καὶ Τήνην. ὅκως δὲ λάβοι τῶν νήσων,
5 ὃς ἐκάστην αἱρέωντες οἱ βάρβαροι ἐσαφήνευσαν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους,
σαφήνευσαν δὲ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον ἀνὴρ ἀνδρὸς ἄφαμενος τῆς
χειρός ἐκ βαλάσης τῆς βορείης ἐπὶ τὴν νυκτίν διέκοιμησε, καὶ
ἔστησε διὰ πᾶσης τῆς νῆσου διερχόμενοι εἰκῆρενεύσανος τοὺς ἀνθρώ-
πους. αἱρέων δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ ἡσπερίδα πόλιας τὰς Ἰάδας κατὰ
10 ταῦτα, πλὴρον γὰρ ἐσαφήνευσαν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους; οὐ γὰρ οία τὲ
32 οὖν, εὐθαῦτα Περσῶν οἱ στρατηγοὶ οὐκ ἐγενέσαντο τὰς ἀπελάσ
tὰς ἐσπερίδας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζοντας τοὺς ἱσταρίζο
32. 1. οἱ στρατηγοὶ. Unfortunately anonymous. Possibly Harpagoes (c. 30), Arthaphernes and Olanes (5. 132) may be included.
5. τὰς καλλιτευόμενας. Chios has always been celebrated for the beauty of its women. Its fate on this occasion anticipated its sufferings in 1822 (Finlay, History of Greece (ed. Tozer), vi. 250-6).
8. ὑπὸ Δυνάων, cp. i. 26. The Islanders, however, had not been conquered by Kroisos, i. 27. Nor is it certain that they were included in the first conquest of Ionia by the Persians, Kyros having no fleet, i. 143. The
general statement, 1. 169 ad fin., is plainly questionable. The acquisition of Phoenicia by Cambyses (cp. 3. 19) and the conquest of Egypt had put ships at the disposal of the Great King. Samos was the first island that surrendered to the Persians, 3. 44, though the story in 3. 120 ff. seems to imply that the Persian annexation was later, cp. 3. 139. The conquest, or more probably the surrender of Chios and of Lesbos, is not expressly recorded, but seems implied as an antecedent of the story of the Scythian expedition, cp. 4. 97, 138. They are not of sufficient importance to be separately mentioned in the Behistun inscription, but they may perhaps be included in ‘Ionia’ or in ‘those which are of the sea’ (Kypros) 1 col. i. § 6.

33. 1. ἀπαλλασσόμενος. The date of these operations in the Hellespont falls in any case in 493 B.C., even if it should be thought that Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos would have been reduced immediately after Lade, or at least after the fall of Milletos.

2. τὰ ἔτη δεξία. No details have been given since the capture of Kymeae (5. 123), for the battle at Malene (c. 29 supra) was subsequent to the advance of the Phoenicians (c. 28 supra). The revolt, started at Milletos, had spread to the ‘Hellespont’ as well as Aeolis, and as afterwards appears (cp. 43-45 infra), had given the Thracians and Macedonians an opportunity of recovering their independence.

3. ἀποταύγει τ. Π. Not the Phoenicians. The places on the left are of course European (ad τὰ Ἕλληνικὰ supra). Whether Hdt. could have ‘orientated’ them correctly is doubtful; cp. 7. 36.

4. τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου. This passage shows clearly that under the term Hellespont Hdt. includes all the waters between the Aegean and the Pontos. On occasion, however, he uses the term in a stricter sense. Cp. 5. 122, 4. 85.

5. Πέρμιδος 5. 1.

6. τὰ ἔτη Ὄρθην, a common expression in Thucydides, is an ἀξές θερώμων in Hdt. with a somewhat different sense. The following passage from the Periplus of Skylax, c. 67 (quoted by Bahr ad loc.) is apposite: μετὰ δὲ τὴν Χερσοσσίαν ἑστὶ Θρᾴκη ταύχα ταύχα περίων Λιθανία ἀκτή, Ταμανθία, Πράγαλα, Γέννα, Γαλανία, Νεώ τοίχοι, Πεννίδας πύλας καὶ λιμήν, Δαμάνη πεῖχα, Ἀθηναία πόλις καὶ λαίμη (Müller, Geogr. Min. i. 56). The description added to Perinthos and Selymbria explains the special mention of them by Hdt. The Phoenicians on this occasion perhaps believed that they were recovering and securing the water-way from which they had been excluded for generations. Yet their reluctance to pursue the Byzantine and Kaledonian fugitives into the Pontos is observable. They simply make a clean sweep of the Hellespont, Propontis and Bosporus, working round from the European to the Asiatic side.

Βυζάντιον had joined the revolt, 5. 163, and the expression there would cover the case of Kaledon, and others.

10. οἰκήσατα, ‘took up their abode in.’

On Mesembria cp. 4. 93 supra. Van H. reads οἰκήσαν (sic). Ab have ὅποιας, and ABC ὅπους. 11. Προκούνησθαι καὶ Ἀρτάκην, 4. 14 supra.
15. Κύμων, like Samoa, Lesbos, and probably other towns (Sigeion, e.g.) had made terms for itself, profiting perhaps by the jealousies of rival satraps. Cp. 3. 120, 126. The Daskylean satrapy presumably corresponds to the τάγμα πολισμοῦ, 3. 90. Cp. Thuc. 1. 129, and Arnold's note to Thuc. 8. 5.


34. 1. Καρδής. Why was Kardia spared? Rawlinson says: "Cardia probably escaped at this time from its position deep in the gulf of Xeros." The meaning of this enigmatical sentence appears to be that Kardia owed its immunity to its geographical position. This explanation seems hardly adequate. Blakeley supposes that Kardia was faithful to Persia and therefore escaped. The mention of Kardia in 7. 58 illustrates its position, and that in 9. 115 the subsequent hold of the Persians upon it.

3. Μιλτιάδης. Miltiades, son of Kimon, son of Sestagoras, evacuated the Chersonese on the advance of the Phoenician navy; this is the clear statement of Hdt.; cp. e. 41 ἐνέργησα. Miltiades, son of Kypselos, is here mentioned for the first time; his patronymic suggests a tie with the Corinthian dynasty, 8. 92 ε, c. 128 ἐνέργησα.

5. Διόλυξης. Little more than a name. Steph. Byz. has it that they had their name from Dolonkos, a brother of Bithynos, i.e. they were one of the great group of cognate stems found on both sides of the Hellespont; cp. Giseke, Thräkisch-Pelagische Stamme, p. 11.

6. Ἀμφιβολοί. Also Thracian barbarians, cp. 9. 119, practising human sacrifice. Ainos, the town at the mouth of the Hebros (4. 90) described as a σφλή Αἰλία (7. 58), also bare the name of Apoikithes, and probably was on their territory, which lay north of the gulf of Melas, even as the Chersonese lay south. The form of the story which reverses the parts of the Dolonki and Apisinthi (see Blakeley note ad l.) deserves no credit.

Διόλυξης. If the Thracian Dolonki really consulted Delphi after the year 560 B.C. it may have been for the purpose of obtaining, or encouraging, a Greek settlement to make head against the Apisinthi. The Athenians were already nursing ideas of expansion in the north-east. According to Diog. L. 1. 2 the idea was started by Solon. Peisistratos and his sons entertained similar views (cp. 5. 94, 95). One is tempted to refer the matter, which Corn. Nepos narrates of Miltiades son of Kimon (vita 1), to Miltiades son of Kypselos, and to suppose that the application to Delphi emanated from the Athenians. Its transfer to the Dolonki would be an even better compliment to Miltiades and his house. According to another tradition it was Miltiades who directed the Dolonki to Delphi to obtain a sanction for the commission to him. Schol. Aristid. pag. 209 (Fr.).

τοὺς βασιλέας. That the Dolonki were under 'kings' would the better excuse the monarchy of Miltiades.

8. Ἴδεῖλαι. The verses unfortunately are not preserved: but ὡς ἡ σπείρα ἡ τοίου ἑρωτήστηκαν may have been one of the endings.
It was probably not in Delphi that Hdt. heard this story.

10. τὸν ἄρχην Σἀλώτ cannot be the road ἐν τῷ Ἀθήναι ἐν τῷ Πειλότιον πέρασον. Strabo, 422, if the Dolonki went out of their way (ἐκπράτωρα) to come by Athens. But van Herwerden regards the ἐκ as "dittographia nata." That the Dolonki, if they went to Delphi at all, went via Athens is possible, though Pausanias was not on the best terms with the oracle. The Sacred Way may be the road to Eleusis, on which, in the Demi Lakidiad, was the family house of the Philaidai (Plutarch, Kióna, 10, C. L. A. 1, 179), although the Deme of their own name was near Brauron, and with it they presumably had at some time a local connexion. Thracians might very well be on the road to or from Brauron (as their port): the reference to the Sacred Way may be due to the position of the family house in Hdt.'s time. There was nothing unusual in an Athenian's having land and houses in more than one Deme (cp. Hanssouiller, Ple municipale en Attique, p. 67).


3. Σωλιστάδες. Lykurgos, son of Aristolaides, is represented, 1, 59, as leader of the Pediaci. Probably Miltiades, son of Kypselos, was only second to him. At a later time Isageros, son of Tsimardos, that is probably a man of the Philaid lineages, was leader of the faction. See 5, 66, and c. 128 infra.

Miltiades. This Miltiades was not the first of the same (and lineage) if Pausanias was right in making a Miltiades Archon in 664 B.C., and again in 659 B.C., Pausan. 4. 23, 5, and 5. 39, 2, C. Clinton, P. H. ad ain. Kypselos. This Kypselos was probably a namesake and relative of the great Corinthian. Cp. c. 128 infra, and the analogous instance of the Athenian Kleisthenes, 5. 69.

tēρπντοτρόφος, "id quod dicere non potuisset nisi agros latos in campo plano gena possidetabat," Petersen, Quæsitiones de Historia Gentium Atticarum, p. 22. On the introduction of the tēρπντοτρόφος cp. 4. 189.

4. τα ἄνεκάδαν, 5. 65.

5. Αλακοῦ, 5. 59.

5. Λακόνος. Another tradition (Pausan. 1. 35, 2) placed Philoës a step further from Aias, making him son of Eurytakos, the only son of Aias recognised by Sophokles (Petersen, Quæsitiones etc., p. 15).

3. αἰχμὸς. The carrying arms, and spears not least of all, would have been out of fashion by that time (Thuc. 1. 6), not to say contrary to the Peisistratid police regulations! (Thuc. 6. 56, 2). (The ἴχναρχος recorded 'Αθ. σ. 15 is, however, dated to the (supposed) 'third' usurpation. This of course is quite different from the act of Hippias, recorded by Thuc. 6. 58. Cp. Appendix IX.)

11. αἰττοῦ...μυ. ἐκδόντο requires a genitive (c. 13 supra, 5. 51), and μυ is accumulative before the infinitive in ex. obilig. Just below τα should be τας but for attraction.
36. 2. Ολύμπια ἀναμεικρημένα. Cp. c. 108 ινιάφα. Such an event would probably have been inscribed. Cp. Introduction, p. ix.

3. πρότερον τούτων, 560 B.C., the date of the first usurpation of Peisistratos was Ch. 55. If this was the date of the victory, the disgruntled of Miletus with the success of his rival at home would have been all the keener.

5. τύραννον καταστήσαντο (sic). He is thus not to blame. He went as okist; they made him tyrant during his life, and worshipped him after his death, c. 36 ινιάφα. καταστήσαν (β) seems right.

6. ἀπετέλεσε. This wall was subsequently restored by Perikles, Plutarch, Perikles, 19, and by Derykildas, Xen. Hell. 3. 2. 10.

7. Καρδίσα. Karde being north, on the gulf of Melas, Pakyta south, on the Propontis, E. of the closing to the Hellespont. Thither Alkibiades retired on his deposition after Notion, Xen. Hell. 1. 5. 17, epd. with Corn. Nepos Alc. c. 7. One of Alcibiades' erections was Neamechta.

8. στάδιον. No one finds fault with these measurements. Had the land been measured for the Periklean Klenuchy in 447 B.C. (On the date see Buxolt, Gr. G. H. p. 530.)

37. 2. τοιοῦτος. The Asinthii had no boats apparently, or no hope of circumventing the wall. The oracle given to the Knidians would seem to condemn the work of Miltiades (1. 174 πυργοῦτος). τὸν λοιπὸν might be taken to imply that Miltiades had a number of enemies, if not a coalition, to contend with; the Attic occupation of the Chersoneese may well have excited the hostility of tribes and towns, on both sides the Hellespont.

3. Δαμφάκηνοι. On Lampaskos see 3. 117. At this time Lampaskos was perhaps already under the tyranny (cp. 4. 138). But if so, the tyrants were not so loyal to Lydia as afterwards to Persia. The enmity of Lampaskos to the Phaid dynastic in the Chersonese might not be unacceptable to Peisistratos and his successors. Cp. Thuc. 6. 59, 3.

4. Κροίσε. How is the friendship of Croisos for Miltiades son of Kypselos, for the contemporary head of the Alkmnonid family (cp. c. 125 μηδά) to say nothing of Solon (1. 29), to be reconciled with the Lydian king's apparent ignorance of the condition of Athens, and that indeed shortly before his overthrow (1. 56, 59) Miltiades, Croisos, and the Alkmnonidae were all well thought of at Delphi. Not so, perhaps, Peisistratos: the inauspiciousness in Hist. may be explained by a difference in the sources, but it remains an inauspicious.
Adoption there may have been in any case. But it is difficult to suppose that the Philaid Miltiades had no agnates; it was perhaps, however, remembered as remarkable that his nearest agnate was also his brother uterine though not paternal. In short, Stesagoras, father of Kimon, and Kypselos, father of Miltiades, may have been full brothers, and the second marriage of S or M the mother of Miltiades Kypseli and of Kimon Stegesorai may have been a case of the Levirate, Kypselos and Stegasorai being themselves full brothers, though this fact is glossed over in the tradition of a later time under the influence of later law. In any case the stress laid upon the uterine tie is noticeable. Ideas and customs connected with the matriarchate died very hard at Athens; cp. c. 181 infr, and M‘Lennan’s Kinship in Ancient Greece, which makes no use of this case (Studies in Anc. Hist. 1886, pp. 195 ff.).

The present tense might merely be in continuation of εκφέρεσε τελευτα, yet it is probable that worship was still paid to the great okist of the Chersonese at the date of Hdt.’s writing. It was presumably the Attic element which mainly supported the cult, revived, if not established, in the days of the Kimonian victories. Cp. Introduction, p. lxiv.

Of νόμος οἰκουργίας. An instance of that hero-worship which was the quint-essence of Hellenic religion. Cp. 5. 47, 114, and for the okist, Thuc. 5. 11.
5 ἐπιτικον τε καὶ γυμνικὸν ἐπιστάσις, εν τῷ Δαμφακενῳ οὐδενὶ ἐγκατεστάται. πολεμίου δὲ ένοτος πρὸς Δαμφακενοῦς καὶ Στηνασόρεα κατέλαβε ἀποθανεῖν ἀπαίδα, πληγείτα τὴν κεφαλὴν πελέκει ἐν τῷ προταινήρῳ πρὸς ἀνδρός αυτομοῦλον μὲν 39 τῷ λόγῳ πολεμίου δὲ καὶ ὑποθερμότου τῷ ἐργῷ. τελευταίαν δὲ καὶ Στηνασόρας τρότη τοιοῦτο, ἐνθαῦτα Μιλτιάδεα τόν Κήμωνος, Στηνασόρεως δὲ τὸν τελευταίατος ἀδελφοῦ, καταλαμψόμενοι τὰ πρήγματα ἐπὶ Χερσονήσου ἀποστέλλουσι τριπήρει 5 οἱ Πειστράττιδαί, οἱ μὲν καὶ εἰ τῇ Ἀθήνῃ ἐποίειν εἰς ὥς ὁ οὐ συνειδότες δῆθεν τῷ πατρὸς [Κήμωνος] αὐτοῦ τὸν ἔμαθατ, τὸν ἐγὼ ἐν ἄλλῳ λόγῳ σημαίνει ὡς ἔγενετο. Μιλτιάδης δὲ ἀπικόμενοι εὐς τὴν Χερσονῆσαν εἰκόνα τις αὐτοῦ, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Στηνασόρας δηλαδὴ ἐπιτικοῦ, οἱ δὲ Χερσονήσους πυθαίνοντες πάντωθεν, κοινῷ δὲ στόλῳ ἀπικόμενοι ὡς συλλυπητικῶς ἰδίεσθαι ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ. Μιλτιάδης δὲ δὴ ἕγερε τὴν Χερσονήσου, πεντακοσίων βάσκων ἐπικούρου, καὶ γαμεῖε Β' Ολόρου τοῦ Θρήκους βασιλέα τὴν θυγατέραν Ηγησίπυλην.

5. ἰπποκόρος. Specially suitable in this case, cc. 35, 36 supra. οὐδὲν. These excommunications robbed the local festivals of all pan-Hellenic significance: cp. 1. 142, 144 (also 5. 88, 72, and c. 81 infra); and contrast the rules of the Olympic Agon as stated 2. 160, 8. 22.

6. πολεμίου. Kreisso is no longer on the throne to stand by the Philaid. The death of Stesagoras is dated by Clinton, C. H. c. 518 v.c.

9. τῷ λόγῳ. τῷ ἐργῷ. Not a usual formula with Hdt. Cp. 7. 155. (Thuc. would perhaps have written λόγῳ μὲν αὐτομοῦλον ἐργῷ δὲ πολεμίου κτλ.)

39. 4. τὰ πρήγματα, sc. τὴν ἀρχήν τε καὶ τὰ χρήσματα, c. 35 l. 2 supra.

5. οἱ Πειστράττιδαί may be taken to indicate that Hipparchos was still alive. His death falls in 414 B.C. Cp. 5. 55. The rapprochement between the Peisistratids and the Philaid, if correctly reported, looks like a new departure, and perhaps helps to explain the alienation between the Philaid and the Alkmionidæ. Kimon the father (nicknamed Κοσλεμός) had initiated this change during his exile. He was still alive in 524 B.C. if Clinton (with whom Duncker agrees) is right in dating his three Olympic victories, 592, 593, 524 B.C. Cp. 3. 103 infra. It was not long after the arrival of Miltiades in the Chersonese that Hippias established a connexion with Hippoklos of Lampakos, cp. 4. 138. The subsequent Philaid tradition was not unfavourable to the memory of the Peisistratids, as is obvious from the excursus in Thuc. 6. 54-59; cp. note to γαμεῖε infra.

6. Κήμωνος scc. Stein.

7. τὸν . . ἐγένετο might be a later insertion, even if from the author's hand.

7. ἐν ἄλλῳ λόγῳ. This promise is fulfilled in c. 105 infra, an indication by the way that the division into Books was not made by the author, much less that by λόγοι wc can ever understand the existing divisions, cp. c. 19 supra. Introduction, § 2.

10. ταυτῶν τ. τ. Beside Karthia c. 34, Pakkya c. 36 supra, Hdt. mentions elsewhere Sextos 4. 143, Madytos 7. 83 and Elamia c. 140 infra, as cities in the Chersonese; but this list is far from complete. Xen. Hyl. 3. 2, 10 gives the number as eleven or twelve (in 398 a.c.). For a complete list, see Forbiger, Atti. Geogr. iii. 1079-1081.

12. ἰπποκόρος. as in 3. 39 ἵππες πάνω τινα Σαμών : 'holds.'

13. ἰπποκόρος. The 500 mercenaries were presumably Thracians. Nothing is said of his ships here; five are mentioned c. 41 ἰπποκόρος, and he may have
served in the fleet of Dareios with that number, 4. 157.

γυναῖκα. This was at least a second marriage, as his eldest son Miotios was 4. ἀλλος c. 41 ὥραια.

Olóros might have been a chief among the Dolonki: there were many tribes of Thracians, and even the Dolonki had several 'kings,' c. 54 supra. This Hegesippyla, who has a Greek or Graecised name, was the mother of Kimon the victor at the Eurymedon (cp. Plutarch, etl. Kim. 4), and perhaps, by a second marriage, the mother of Oloros the Athenian, father of Thucydides the historian; Kimon who was Strategos in 477 B.C. may have been born about 508-7 B.C. The marriage of Miltiades and Hegesippyla might have taken place about the time of the expulsion of Hipias from Athens. Miltiades died about 488-7 B.C. Hegesippyla, then perhaps 35-40 years old, may have contracted a fresh marriage in the same family. Thucydides the historian might have been the grandson of this lady, and her second husband, and quite old enough in 431 B.C. to form the design of recording the war which began in the spring of that year. He could not then however have been (pace Pamphilus supra Aut. Gell. 15. 29) forty years old (though he must have been at least thirty in 424 B.C.), nor could he be identified with Thucydides the colleague of Pericles in the Samian war (Thuc. 1. 117). That the historian was connected with the house of Kimon and with Thrace may be regarded as certain. Plutarch, l.c., Marcellinus, Suidas, et al.

40. 1. οὗτος κτλ. This chapter is a mass of cruxes. The material difficulties are aggravated by ambiguities of expression, and as in other like cases (cp. c. 57 έπαθα) it seems not unreasonable to suppose that Hdt. is reproducing traditions which did not present a lucid argument or perspective to his own mind. We are in fact in the presence of an obscure self-contradiction or a clumsy tautology. The central sentence of the chapter is clear enough. It states as a matter of fact that the nomad Scyths, having received provocation from Dareios, advanced as far as the Chersonese, and that Miltiades fled before them. The Scyths afterwards retired, and Miltiades was restored by the Dolonki. Whether these statements are accurate is a further question: they are not obscure. Besides this clear statement of possible matters of fact, we have three sentences, two before and one after, of the utmost obscurity, in which vague and abstract terms are used (ἄλλα χαλε-πότερα τῶν καταλαβόντων προγμάτων). Difficult questions arise as to the significance of these terms, and as to their relations one to another.

Any one reading the first sentence of the chapter would suppose that the words νεωτὶ μὲν ἑλιθεὶς referred to the first advent of Miltiades in the Chersonese. So in fact Rawlinson in his translation understands the words. The question remains, to what events, or matters of fact, do the two phrases τῶν καταλαβόντων (cp. l. κατεχόντων FR, adopted by van Herwerden and Holder) προγμάτων and ἄλλα χαλεπότερα refer? Rawlinson takes τῶν κατεχόντων προγμάτων to refer to the advance of the Phoenician fleet (in 493 B.C.) and ἄλλα χαλεπότερα to the advance of the Scyths; Hdt. wishing to say that, bad as might be what Miltiades experienced from the Pho- nicians, it was not so bad as what he had experienced from the Scyths, "three (sic) years earlier." According to this interpretation τῶν κατεχόντων προγμάτων and τὸῦ τότε μὲν κατεχόντων refer to one and the same event or series of events (flight from the Phoenicians), while ἄλλα χαλεπότερα and ταύτα refer to another series of events, that namely specified in the sentence Σκύθαι γὰρ . . . ὀπίσω. The principal objections to this interpretation are three: (1) νεωτὶ is nonsensical, or, as Rawlinson says, shows "a curious laxity of expression, or a curious forgetfulness of dates." (2) The argument is inverted and well-nigh absurd, 'Miltiades had not been long in the Chersonese when something occurred worse than what (afterwards) happened to him, for, less than three years before being driven clean out by the Phoenicians, he had been obliged by the Scyths to retire for a time, but was
5 basileus Darieus sunestraφhsan kai ἐλλασαν μέχρι τῆς Χερσο
νῆου ταῦτας τούτων ἐπίνειας οὐκ ὑπομενετις οἱ Μιλητίδης
ἔφευγε Χερσόνησον, ἐς δ’ ὁ τε Σκήθρα ἀπελάθθησαν καὶ ἐκείνων
Δόλογκοι κατήγγαλον ὑπίσω. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ τρίτω ἔτει πρῶτερον
41 ἔγγονε τῶν τότε μιν κατεχόντων. τότε δὲ πυρνανομένως εἶναι

afterwards restored.’ (3) Grammatically, can τῶν κατεχόντων προηγμάτων refer to a period subsequent to the date of κατελαβάμεν εἰ μὲν ἐλθων ἄλλα εἰ ἃ! If the text here were τῶν τότε μιν κατε-
χόντων, referring to μέχρι τότε εἰς σ. 34 νῦν, such a sense might be got into it, though even then we might expect κατελαβάμενε for κατελαβάμενε, i.e. κατε-
λαβάμενε δὲ μὲν ἐλθὼν ἄλλα τῶν τότε μιν κατεχόντων προηγμάτων χαλεπώτερα.

As the text stands the first sentence of the chapter says that or ever Miltiades had been long in the Chersonese he was over-
taken by greater hardships than he ex-
perienced before (deaths of his father, and
brother, and the difficulties of succession).
The text then went on to say, until Stein inserted ἕσο, that less than three years after his arrival he was expelled by the Scyths, and remained in exile (ἑκρισει), how long it is not stated, until he was brought back by the Dolonki, only to be again driven out, less than three years afterwards, by the Phoe-
ncians. The objections to this interpreta-
tion are two: (1) the difficulty and indeed impossibility of making any rational chronology; (2) the obvious intention of the author to supply in the last sentence ταῦτα μὲν δὴ κτλ. an elucidation of the text preceding, and the consequent necessity to take the repeated τρίτω ἔτει as an identical date with the former τρίτω έτει. If we might omit the whole sentence τρίτω μὲν γάρ ἔτει τῶν Ἐλθας ἐκρισει, the difficulties would be solved, save that (1) εὐστί would remain a stumbling-block, and (2) the Scythian invasion would still be problematic. The sense would then run: ‘Before Miltiades had been long in the Chersonese he had a worse ex-
perience than any (in Athens, Thrace, or Scythia) that befell him so far. For the Scyths invaded the Hellespont, and he had to retire and remained (many years, 510-495 B.C.) in exile, until the Dolonki restored him, two years before the advance of the Phoenicians.’

Feeling the grave objections to these interpretations we may follow Stein in understanding ἔλθονες and ἐλθώντα, in

the light of κατήγγαλον ὑπίσω below, as equivalent to κατελαβάμενε κατελαβάμενε, and in inserting ἕσο, or at least inter-
preting τρίτω ἔτει τῶν ἕτει τρίτων ἕτει πρῶτα. We thus obtain a perfectly consistent and intelligible sense. τρίτω μὲν refers to his flight and restoration (τῶν καταλαβάμενος προηγμάτων and ταῦτα) about 499-498 B.C. some two years or so before the advance of the Phoenicians (ἄλλα χαλεπώτερα καὶ τῶν τότε μιν κατεχόντων). The sense or argument then runs: Miltiades who was tyrant of the Chersonese (c. 34 νῦν) at this time had not been long there, having been restored to his tyranny after an exile (due to the Scythian incursion) only some two years before; and he had now to evacuate the territory before the advancing Phoenicians, this time never to return. In spite of Cobet’s frutum este novum et novissimum κατελαβάμενε—τῶν κατα-
λαβάμενος (Μνησαρχίμ, N.S. xii. p. 155), we therefore adhere to the reading of ABO (a) on sensible grounds.

A further and material question remains, whether the Scyths really made their appearance on the Hellespont about the year 496 B.C. a year or two before the suppression of the Ionian revolt? If so, Miltiades, Sparta (c. 84 νῦν) the Greek reebs, all lost a grand opportunity. But this visit of the Scyths in their wrath is singularly tardy and ineffective; and Miltiades was the last man the Scyths should have penalised, if only they had known his account of the affair at the bridge, 4. 137. Hence Blakeney’s suggestion deserves favour that the Scyths have been subtinted for Thracians by the tradition, though we need not follow him in supposing that the Thracians who drave Miltiades out about 496 B.C. were the same who had just put an end to Aristogoras (497 B.C., cp. 8. 126). In any case the fortunes and acts of Miltiades between the Scythic expedition in 512 B.C. and his return to Athens in 493 B.C. are almost a blank. Cp.

41. 1. τότε, 493 B.C. Cp. 53, 34 νῦν seem to imply that Byzantion, Chal-
40-42 ΚΡΑΤΩ

τοῦ Φοινίκες ἐν Τενέδω, πληρώσας τρίηρες πέντε χρημάτων τῶν παρεόντων ἀπέπλεε ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας. καὶ ὠστερ ὅρμηθη ἐκ Καρδίας τόμοις ἐπλεε διὰ τοῦ Μέλανος κάλπου παραμεβεῖτο τε τὴν Χερσόνησον καὶ οἱ Φοινίκες οἱ περιπλασσαντες τῆς νισσί. 5 αὖτος μὲν δὴ Μιλτιάδες σὺν τῇς τάσσεσι τῶν νεὼν καταφένευε ἐς Ἰμβρον, τὴν δὲ ὑπεταγεῖ τῶν νεὼν κατείλευ διοκούντες οἱ Φοινίκες, τῆς δὲ νεὼς ταύτης ἔτυχε τῶν Μιλτιάδεω παίδων ὁ πρεσβύτατος ἄρχων Μυτίκος, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς Ὀλύμπου τοῦ Ῥώμηκος ἐων πνευματός ἀλλὰ ἐξ ἅλλης· καὶ τούτων ἦμα τῇ νησί εἶδον οἱ Φοινίκες, καὶ τὸ μν παθέμενοι ὡς εἰς Μιλτιάδεω παῖς ἄνηγαγον παρὰ βασιλέα, δοκέοντες κάρτα μεγάλη καταβαίνειν, ὡς δὴ Μιλτιάδης γνώμην ἀπεδέδοτο ἐν τοῖς ἰσος πειθεῖσθαι κελεύον τοῖς Σκήπτορι, οτε ὁ Σκῆπτος προσεδόντο λύσαντα τὴν σχεδίαν ἀποπλέειν ἐς τὴν ἑώτων. Δαρείος δὲ, ὡς οἱ Φοινίκες Μυτίκος 15 τῶν Μιλτιάδεω ἄνηγαγον, ἐποίησε κακὸν μὲν οὐκ Μυτίκος, ἀγαθὰ δὲ συνήχεια· καὶ ἡρ ὀίκου καὶ κτῆσιν ἔδωκε καὶ Περσίδα γυναικεία, ἐκ τῆς οίκν εἴγανε τὸ ἐς Πέρσας κεκοσμεῖτο. Μιλτιάδῆς δὲ ἐξ Ἰμβρον ἀπικνήτα ἐκ τὰς Ἀθήνας.

Καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἐτος τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν Περσῶν οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τλεόν 42 ἐγένετο τούτων ἐς νεόκοι φέρον Ἰσος, ἀλλὰ τάδε μὲν χρήσιμα

kedon, Prokonnesos, Atrake were visited by the Phoenicians before they completed the devastation of the Chersonese. Miltiades' flight might here be supposed to have been postponed till after the return of the Phoenicians to the Hellespont from the Bosporos. The mention of Tenedos, however, carries us back to c. 31, and makes it appear that the flight of Miltiades was upon the first approach of the Phoenicians from the south. His starting from Kardia (rather than Sestos, or one of the Hellespontine towns) supports that conclusion. Cp. the movement of Histiaeos from Thasos, c. 28 supra.

4. With the paradeia cp. 5, 108 supra.

7. Ἰμβρον, the nearest island.

12. δόθε κτλ. Cp. 4, 137. The reason alleged may of course be a mere inference. The treatment of Metiochus by Daresios does not make the story of Miltiades' supposed advice at the Danube any more probable. The captured fugitive is treated rather as a benefactor, or benefactor's son, cp. c. 30 supra. Thereafter presumably Metiochus 'medizied.' He may have been at Marathon in 490 B.C. or at Athens in 480 B.C.—who knows? Anyway, his total disappearance from the Hellenic tradition is remarkable. The name is found afterwards in Athens in a modified form (Metiochoi), borne by one of the Periklean (?) architects, after whom one of the Dikasteria was named (cp. Pollux, Onomast. 8, 121): according to the comedians, a pluralist. Cp. Plutarch, Mor. 811, where Mytiikes is read, but Metiokes would suit better.

18. ἐγένετο . . . κοσμεῖται. The conjunction of the singular and plural is remarkable.

19. ἀπικνήτα. Presumably before the end of the year 498 B.C.

42. 1. τὸ ἐτος τοῦτο. Apparently, like the year of Thucydides, this is a campaigning year from spring to spring: cp. cc. 31, 43; τὸ ἐτος τοῦτο here being the δεύτερον ἔτος of c. 31, or 'year after' the capture of Miletos, or, according to our reckoning, from spring of 493 B.C. to spring of 492 B.C. Cp. Appendix VI.

2. τοῦτων vaguely for the events narrated cc. 31, 32, 33, 41.

ἐς νεόκοι φέρον. Cp. τὰ ἐς ἄκειν φέροντα 4, 90.

τάδε. On the omission of the name of Hekataios in this connexion, see
Appendix VI, Introduction, p. lvii.

Two useful and pacific measures affecting the Ionians are ascribed to Artaphernes satrap of Sardes and dated to the year 493 B.C. (1) the institution of (commercial) treaties establishing διαί (ἀντονομάσεως) throughout Ionia, and suppressing all private or local warfare and piracy. (For samples of such treaties elsewhere, later, see Hicks, *Manual of Inscriptions*, No. 31.) (2) A new census and assessment of tribute, which Hdt. appears to say was still in existence and of force in his own day, and indeed at the time of writing (Σαρτέτοιον). In regard to the first of these measures it is probable that such arrangements were already in force between at least some of the Ionian cities, and perhaps between the states represented at Naukratis (cp. 2. 178, c. 21 supra). But the arrangement may have been revived and extended by Artaphernes at this time. In any case the precedent would be welcomed at Athens. In regard to the second measure, it is likely enough that a new assessment was made, after the reduction of Ionia, and the other revolted tributaries, Hdt. himself stating that they had been tributary previously for about the same amount (cp. 3. 90). The further statement that this census was still in force gives rise to questions which can only be hypothetically solved. Blakesley took the statement as "decisively proving" the subjection of the Asiatic Hellenes to the king of Persia, at a time when the restoration of their liberty by Athenian arms was a favourite topic with Athenian orators. But did the unhappy Ionians then pay tribute twice over, to Persia and to Athens, at the same time? Grote maintains that no Greek city on the coast paid tribute to Persia between 476 and 412 B.C., cp. Thuc. 8. 5, 5, and explains this passage as meaning that the tribute was assessed, but not paid! Rawlinson's polemic against Grote is here conclusive: Hdt. could not have been ignorant whether tribute was paid or not, and would not have expressed himself as he has done, had he meant that the claim was made but not recognised after 476 B.C. Moreover Thuc. 1. 138, though not referring strictly to Ionian cities, may be quoted against Grote. When Rawlinson goes on to date the emancipation of the Greek cities on the mainland as late as 449 B.C. and to connect it with a (fabulous) "treaty of Cyprus" this view requires correction. The argument from the Athenian Tribute lists points to the conclusion that the Greek cities in Ionia and Caria remained subject and tributary to Persia till the battle of the Eurymedon in 465 B.C. The effect of that battle was the enlargement of the Ionian tribute, by the inclusion of many cities on the main, and the addition of the Carian region. Some ten years later, however, the crushing disaster on the island of Paeopetis led (as Duncker has made probable) to the transfer of the treasure from Delos to Athens for safety, and to the loss of a large number of the tributary cities on the Asiatic main, which passed back probably to the Persians. Under Pericles the Confederacy suffered diminution in area, but many cities on the mainland continued to pay tribute to Athens down to the Peace of Nikias, and later (G. I. A. i. pp. 226 ff.). Whether this passage in Hdt. refers to the condition of the Ionian states before 465 B.C. or after 454 B.C. or both is not quite clear, but it is on the whole more probable that it was written after the later date, and there would then never have been any need to revise it. In no case is the passage satisfactory, for it is not sufficiently explicit. Hdt. refers only to "the Ionians"; of Dorians, Aeolians, Carians he says nothing. The conduct and fortunes of the Dorians here as throughout the period are unnoticed. Even in regard to "the Ionians," he does not make it plain whether the islanders or any of them are included. He is only concerned to put on record the fact that payments were still being made on the assessment of Artaphernes. (For the facts in regard to the Athenian tribute, Köhler, *Abhand. der Berlin. Akademie*, 1869;
τε ἕνωγκασε ποιείν, καὶ τὰς χώρας μετρήσας σφέων κατὰ παρασάργας, τοὺς καλέσων οἱ Πέρσαι τά τρήκοντα στάδια, κατὰ δὴ τούτους μετρήσας φόρους ἐπάξ ἐκάστους, οἱ κατὰ χώρην διατελέσαντες ἐχοντες ἐκ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου αἰεὶ ἐπὶ ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ὡς ἐτάχθησαν ἐς Ἁρταφρένους ἐτάχθησαν δὲ σχεδὸν κατὰ ταύτα καὶ πρότερον εἰχον. καὶ σφι ταύτα μὲν ἐιρήναι ἦν.

"Αμα δὲ τῷ ἔαρι, τῶν ἄλλων καταλελειμένων στρατηγῶν ἐκ 43 βασιλέως, Μαρδώνιος ὁ Γοβρύνεω κατέβαινε ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, στρατὸν τολλῶν μὲν κάρτα πεζῶν ἀμα ἄγωμενος τολλῶν δὲ ναυτικῶν, ἥλικιν τε νέος ἐων καὶ νεωτινὶ γεγεμνηκὼς βασιλέως Δαρείου θυγατέρα Αρτοφρένου ἁγών δὲ τὸν στρατὸν τούτον 6 5 Μαρδώνιος ἐπείτε ἐγένετο εἰς τῇ Κιλικῇ, αὐτὸς μὲν ἐπίβας ἐπὶ νεῶν ἐκομίζετο ἀμα τῇ σὴ ἀλλαρι ννυσὶ, στρατηγὸν δὲ τῇ πεζῆν ἄλλων ἡγεμόνις ἤγον ἐπὶ τῶν Ἐλλησθοντων. ὡς δὲ παραπλῶν τὴν Ἀσίην ἀπίκετο ὁ Μαρδώνιος ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίαν, ἐνθαῦτα μέγιστον θόμα ἐρέω τούτι μὴ ἀποδεκμένοις Ἐλληνων Περσῶν τοῦτο ἐπὶ ἢτανα γνώμην ἀποδεξάται ὡς χρεὸν εἰς δημοκρατίαν Πέρσας. τοὺς γὰρ τρῶν ἑων Ἰωνίαν καταπάντας πάντας ὁ Μαρδώνιος δημοκρατίας κατίστα ἐς τὰς πόλις, ταύτα δὲ


7. σφέων... μετρήσα (PR) seems preferable. The words τοὺς... στάδια, though fully anticipated by 5. 53 supra, are not therefore to be deleted.

43. 1. τῷ ἔαρι. The spring of 492 B.C., the midsummer of which = Ol. 72. τῶν ἄλλων, e.g. Harpagos, c. 30 supra. Otanes 5. 123. Cp. c. 9 supra and the anonymous strategi of cc. 6, 9 etc.

ἐκ βασιλέως. Not by the satrap, Dareios directing the war, or at least appointing the commanders himself. But the Persian commanders in Asia Minor can hardly have been actually cashiered; possibly Mardonios was appointed commander-in-chief. The conjecture that he superseded Artaphrenes as satrap in Sardis (P. Krumholz, De Asiae min. satrap. p. 26) is not satisfactory. He is here named for the first time. His father, Gobryas, was one of the celebrated Seven, 3. 70, and Dareios apparently named one of his own sons after him, 7. 73.

4. ἥλικιν νέος. Thucydides calls Alkibiades νέος at the age of thirty, 5.

43, 2. Mardonios had only thirteen years and a few months to live (cp. 9. 63, 64) when he received this command.


6. ἐν τῇ Κιλικῇ. Cp. c. 95 infra.

10. τοὺς μὴ ἀποδεκμένοις. This passage has been taken to prove that Hdt. is here answering criticisms passed upon the story of the Debate as told by him 6. 50 ff., and that consequently that portion of his work was written and published before this passage (cp. A. Kirchhoff, Entstehungszeit, p. 11). The proof is not conclusive, for in 3. 89 Hdt. remarks expressly that the speeches of Otanes and the others were regarded by some persons as incredible and unauthentic; he is answering the critics already there, and their critique need not have been directed against his own work in the first instance. The remark there is, indeed, farther-reaching than the remark here: there he defends all the speeches, here he refers only to the bare thesis of Otanes. As far then as this point is concerned this passage might have been written before the passage in Bk. 3. Cp. Introduction, p. xcvii.

13. δημοκρατίας. The connexion
here posited between the political reform of Mardonios for Ionia in 492 B.C., and the supposed programme of Otanes for Persia in 521 B.C., so far from lending colour to the latter, reinforces the suspicion that Herodotus—who was not a Hallam or a Stubbs—has misunderstood the real or supposed action of Mardonios on this occasion. It is possible that the supposed ‘democracies’ of Mardonios are little more than the ‘liberties of jurisdiction’ of Artaphernes c. 42. It is, however, more probable that a further reform, perhaps dictated by the king and enforced by Mardonios, was made in the local government of Ionia. The monarchical city-governors may have been set aside in favour of elective magistrates, councils, and so forth. Oligarchy and the oligarchs were at this time anti-medic in Ionia (see c. 14 supra). The democratic tyranny had not shown itself perfectly trustworthy, at least in the case of Miletus, and the Persian satraps and generals may have been jealous of the city despots. It is, however, to be observed that the tyranny is still found afterwards in the Greek cities subject to Persia (c. 25 supra, 7. 98 f., 8. 132) and πάντας is plainly an exaggeration. Hitherto obviously misconceives the act ascribed to Mardonios as well as its motive and results. From his own point of view his argument would have been stronger if Gobryas, not Otanes, had been the reputed advocate of democracy; but Gobryas and his house were probably too closely connected with the king to make that possible.

15. χρήμα πολλόν. Ср. χρήμα τ. αρδίων 4. 81, χ. π. νεών και πετος στρατ. πολλόν, ор. πολλόν μέν κάρα πετον ἀμα ἁγέμνον πολλόν δὲ κατεικύν πυρίνα, vague estimates which indicate the poverty of the genuine tradition, the lack of official records.

17. Ἐρέτριαν καὶ Ἀθήνας. It may fairly be doubted whether Athens and Eretria were as yet the ostensible or even the secret ‘objective’ of the Persian movements. Hippias was not with Mardonios. (Thrace and Macedon, which had evidently used the opportunity of the Ionian revolt to throw off the Persian yoke, were likely to cost a campaign or two.) Ср. 7. 157.

44. 2. πρόσχημα (ср. 4. 167, in a different sense 5. 28). The account of the πρόσχημα and the real intentions of the Persians recalls 7. 157, and emphasises the anachronism. The king might very well meditate the reduction of Thasos without issuing a carte-blanche for the conquest of Hellas or of Europe. In any case, Thasos was an obvious stepping-stone, if not the very next step, westwards. Its reduction had been already attempted if not accomplished by Histiaeus, and he had raised the blockade at the approach of the Phoenicians, c. 28 supra.

5. Μακεδόνων. This summary account of the reduction of Macedon is surprising in the light of the story above (5. 17-21) concerning the previous incorporation of Macedon, in the days of Amyntas. Nothing has been said of any revolt or secession of Macedon in the interval: nothing is said of any heroism of Alexander on this occasion though he is now on the throne. It might be that with years Alexander had learnt wisdom, or changed his policy: but it may be that the story above is fictitious, or at least grossly exaggerated. See notes ad l.

6. ἐντὸς Μακεδόνων, i.e. east or Macedon. Htid. writes here from the Asiatic or Persian point of view, geographically: but this cannot be taken
to prove that he is drawing from an Asiatic source. The frontier of Macedon is not here exactly marked, but it looks as though it was advanced to the Strymon. Cp. c. 45 εἰσφα. 11. τρηχός περίπετη, sc. αἰτώτης. Cp. 5. 1 οὐσία.

12. λέγεται: by whom? Anyway Hdt. discredits the figures (cp. 4. 184). These exact estimates are not worth much more than the vaguer above; but might be taken to imply that the forces of Mardonios amounted to the regulation 600 vessels, and to some 260,000 men. Cp. c. 96 εἰσφα, 7. 113.


45. 2. ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ. The E. frontier of Macedonia was formed by Dysoron, cp. 5. 17. The Βρύγοι are Phrygians, cp. 7. 73. The topographical indications here do not admit of exact determination. [Cp. Giese, Ἱστορία Ἡλεοσ. 41.]

4. αὐτῶν προκατερχόμενοι. This wound, if historic, might account for Mardonios’s retirement at the end of the campaign, which in the text seems to be ascribed to his ‘disgraceful’ defeat. Cp. Appendix VI. 3. 10. αἰσχροὶ ἀγωνισμοὶ. That the fleet suffered severely in the storm off Athos may be regarded as certain. With that exception, which was hardly a disgrace, the expedition of 492 b.c. was a brilliant success. It had cost four or five campaigns to quell the Ionians and recover Miletus. One summer was sufficient for the conquest or recapture of Thrace and Macedon, and the addition of the wealthy Thasos to the empire. Hdt. with more justice elsewhere (7. 9 a) allows Mardonios to claim credit for the operations of this year, which, as Hdt. himself acknowledges (7. 108), were substantially successful. Such inconsequences in the record viewed as a whole illustrate the vitiated and ‘pragmatic’ character of the author’s discrepant sources, and show that he himself was not careful to introduce a complete harmony, which could only have been attained by still more unscrupulous pragmatism. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxiii.
Δευτέρον δὲ ἔτει τούτων ὁ Δαρείος πρῶτα μὲν Θασίος, διαβαλλόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀστυνεῖον ώς ἀπόστασιν μηχανῷ, πέμψας ἀγγέλου ἐκείνου σφαῖρα τὸ τεῖχος περιμείνει καὶ τὰς νέας ἐς Ἀθηνᾶς κομίζειν. οἱ γὰρ ὁ δῆς Ἐλείας, οὐ τὸ Ἰστιαίου
5 τοῦ Μιλείου πολιορκηθέντες καὶ προσόδον ἐναέριοι μεγαλεόν, ἐγέροντο τούτοις χρήματι νέας ταναγρηγομένου μακρὰς καὶ τεῖχος ἵσχυροτέρου περιβαλλόμενον. ἢ δὲ πρόσοδοι σφι ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς Ἰστιαίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μετάλλων ἐκ μεν τε φαύλων ἑπιπτάν ὑγοκοντα τάλαντα τρισήμε, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐν αὐτῆς Ἐλλάδος ἑλάχιον μὲν τούτων, συνχαὶ δὲ αὐτῷ ὅτε τὸ ἐπίπταν Ἐλαίου ἐνωσί καρπῶν ἐνελέσυ προσήμε ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰστιαίου καὶ τῶν μεταλλῶν ἑτερ ἔκαστον ὧν ὁδικοῦσα
41 τάλαντα, ὅτε δὲ τὸ πλείαστον προσβόλε, τρικάκοια. εἰδόν δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν τὰ μέταλλα ταύτῃ, καὶ μακρὸ ἤν αὐτῶν θρομασιώτατα.

46. 1. Δευτέρῳ ἔτει, next year, i.e. 491-0 B.C., cp. c. 42 supra. 

Θασίος. This need for fresh demands on Thasos after its surrender in the previous year is remarkable. Mardonios, or rather the fleet, incorporates Thasos in the empire without striking a blow, and yet in the very next year the dismantling of the fortifications, the surrender of the fleet, are demanded of the Thasians, as securities against their rebellion. Such a course of affairs is not, of course, impossible: but in view of the obvious fact that the story of Mardonios’s expedition in 492 B.C. (cc. 43-45) is apparently drawn from a single source, while the passage (cc. 46, 47) shows the marks of a wholly distinct origin, especially in the autobiographical and local details, it is fair to suspect that in the two passages on the treatment of Thasos we have two different accounts of one set of events to be dated 492 B.C., and that the annals of 491 B.C. only begin with c. 48. Cp. Appendix VI. § 4. 

2. ἀστυνεῖον, perhaps Abdara, which was evidently loyal to the king. Cp. 7. 120, 8. 120. 

4. Ἀθῆνα. The name is probably Phoenician. (Cp. Graseberger, Stadion, p. 232.) There was a Carthaginian or Phoenician colony of the same name in Baetica. The Abdara in Thrace was, according to tradition, Hellenised from Kyzikos and recolonised by the Teuans about 541 B.C., 1. 168. But the coins are of the Phoenician standard, which points to the early existence of a Phoenician empire in situ. (Cp. Head, Hist. Num., p. 216.) The proximity of the Phoenicians in Thrace, and elsewhere, confirms the Phoenician character of the first settlement.

47. 1. εἰδόν δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν. Thasos (which is at present a dependency of Egypt) has been little visited by modern travellers, but Mr. Bent conducted some excavations there (see J. H. S. vol. viii. 1887), and Mr. Tozer more recently visited the island; see Islands of the Aegean, cc. xiv. xv. None of the inscriptions found are as early as the time of Hdt.’s visit (cp. 2. 44 and see Jacob’s Thasiana, 1893, p. 24). 

2. τὰ μέταλλα ταύτα applies ap-
tα οἱ Φοινικεῖς ἀνεύρον οἱ μετὰ Θάσου κτίσαντες τὴν νήσου ταύτην, ἦταν νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θάσου τοῦτον τοῦ Φοινικὸς τὸ οὖνομα ἐσχῆ. τὰ δὲ μέταλλα τὰ Φοινικικὰ ταύτα ἐστὶ τῆς Θάσου 5 μεταξὶ Ἀινύρων τοῦ χώρου καλεομένου καὶ Κοινυρῶν, ἀντίλιν δὲ Σαμοθρηκίας, δρος μέγα ἀνεστραμμένον ἐν τῇ ζητήσῃ. τούτῳ μὲν ἦν ἐστὶ τοιούτῳ. οἱ δὲ Θάσιοι τὸ βασιλεῖ κελεύσαντε καὶ τὸ τέσσερον κατείλου καὶ τὰς νέας τὰς πάσας ἐκόμισαν ἐς Ἀθήναν.

Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἀπεστράφα ὁ Δαρεῖος τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁ τε ἐν 48 νῷο ἔχον, κόπερα πολεμεῖν ἕως ὅ τοῖς παραδειδόναι σφέας αὐτοῦ, διέσπεμεν δὲς κήρυκας ἀλλος ἀλλὴ τάξας ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, κελεύσαν αἰτίεις βασιλεῖ τῆν τε καὶ ὁδόρ. τούτους μὲν δὴ ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔπεμπε, ἀλλοὺς δὲ κήρυκας διέσπεμεν ἐς τὰς ἐνεοῦτος 5

parenthetically to the mines in the island of Thasos only. The passage proves of course a visit to Thasos, but unfortunately does not enable us to date it: Hdt. can hardly have seen the island before the Athenian conquest in 465 B.C., but might have been there any time during the next twenty years, perhaps on the voyage to the Pontos. Cp. Introduction, pp. 253, 259. The Phoenicians are here again exalted at the expense of the Ionians. Cp. 7, 23.

3. Θάσος. The Phoenician occupants of Thasos were from Tyre (2, 44), and Hdt. dates the occupation five generations before the birth of Hellenic Herakles, a date based upon the genealogies, cp. 4, 147, 5, 59 f. The subsequent Hellenic colonists were Parian (Thuc. 4, 104, 4). Their oikist was Telesicles, father of Archilochos the Iambist, Euseb. Paeon. 5, 33, 6, 7 (ed. Teubn. vol. i. pp. 261, 293), and the Parian occupation may be dated to the last quarter of the 8th century B.C. Cp. Clinton, Past. Hell. i. ad augv. 729, and 708; and cp. 1, 12. The old name of Thasos was said to be Aëria (cp. Καλλιστή) as the old name of Thera 4, 147 supra, which Thasos is the most beautiful island in the Aegean (Tozer) would better have deserved. There was a town in Africa named Ἀσία (Ptol. 4, 3, 3), and a district in Spain named Thasia (Plin. 6, 10, 5), and Hdt. says that in Tyre was a temple of 'Thasian' Herakles, 2, 44. The name appears to be cognate to Taurus (Θηρασία, Joseph. A. J. i. 6), Tarshish, Tartessos, et sim., and has presumably a Phoenician origin. The personification of 'Thasos' is, however, doubtless a Greek conceit.

6. Ἀινύρων . . . Κοινυρῶν. The latter name (Kinira) still clings to the district, the former has disappeared (Tozer, cp. s. p. 306). Mr. Tozer was unable to find Hdt.'s mountain, or the mines. But presumably further exploration would yield better results.


δρος κτλ. Hdt.'s astonishment is too much for his grammar. Cp. s. 30 supra.

46. 1. μετὰ δὲ. Still in the same year 491 B.C. Cp. 35 inf. supra.


3. Ἑλλάδα. Hellas includes islands, see supra, and cp. 1, 27.

5. κήρυκας. It is characteristic of Hdt.'s methods that we learn nothing here of the wonderful story of the treatment of those Heralds at Sparta and Athens, which now follows, 7, 133 ff. It is hardly conceivable that the story should have been omitted here unless the author had (1) already committed it to writing, or (2) not yet acquired it. Part at least of the story of the μῦς Ταθθείων is obviously later.
δαμοφόρους πόλεις τὰς παραθαλασσίους, κελεύων νέας τε μα-
κάς καὶ ἱππαγωγά πλοία ποίεσθαι. οὕτω τε δὴ παρασκευ-
ἀζοντο ταύτα, καὶ τοὺς ἤκουσι ἡ τὴν Ἐλλάδα κήρυξι πολλοὶ
μὲν ἡπειρωτῶν ἔδοσαν τὰ προσχέτο αἰτίων ὁ Πέρσης, πάντες
δὲ νοσίωτα εἰ τοὺς ἀποκάλατο αἰτήσονται. οὐ τε δὴ ἄλλοι
5 νησιώται διδοῦνε γῆν τε καὶ ὕδαρ Δαρείῳ καὶ ἰδαὶ καὶ Ἀγινήται.
ποιήσας δὲ σφί ταῦτα ἱδέων Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπεκέκατο, δικαιοῦντες
τε ἐπὶ σφίατα ἐπέχοντας τοὺς Ἀγινήτας διδοκέειν ὡς ἁμα τῷ
Πέρσῃ ἐπὶ σφίς στρατεύονται, καὶ ἄμενοι προφάσιοι ἐπε-
λάβοντο, φοιτεύσας τε ἐς τὴν Ἐμπάρτην κατηγόρεος τῶν Ἀγι-
νητέων τὰ πεποιηκότεν προδότες τὴν Ἐλλάδα. πρὸς ταῦτα
δὲ τὴν κατηγορίαν Κλεομένης ὁ Ἀναλυκόθε αριστεὺς ἐώς Ἐσ-
παντητέων διέβη ἐς Ἀγινᾶν, βουλόμενος συλλαβεῖν Ἀγινη-
τέων τοὺς αἰτίωτοὺς. ὡς δὲ ἐπειράτο συλλαμβάνων, ἄλλοι
5 τε δὴ ἐγένοντο αὐτῷ ἀντίπός τούτων Ἀγινητῶν, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ
Κρίος ὁ Πολυκερίτου μάλιστα, δε σικεφ ἀυτόν οὐδὲν ἄξεν
χαίροντα Ἀγινητῶν· ἄμεν γὰρ μν Ἐσπαντητέων τοῦ κοινοῦ
ποιεῖν ταύτα, ἵν' Ἀθηναῖοι ἀναγνωρίζοντας ἤρχομαι· ἁμα γὰρ
ἀν μὴν τῷ ἕτερῳ βασιλεῖ ἐκθέντα συλλαμβάνειαι. ἐλευθὲ
tε ταῦτα ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς τῆς Ἀθηνησίν. Κλεομένης δὲ ἀπελευνό-
μενος ἐκ τῆς Ἀγινῆς εἰρέτο τῶν Κρίων ὅ τι οἱ ἕθε τὸ οὐνομα-

than 430 B.C. (cp. 7. 137; Thuc. 2. 67).
Cp. Appendix VII. § 11.
6. τοῦδα τὰς παραθαλασσίων taken
literally must include Greek cities, and
there were Ionians and Aeolians (what,
no Dorians?) in the command of Datis,
c. 98 in/ra. Cp. 7. 89-95.
49. 2. πολλοὶ μὲν ἡπειρωτῶν. There
is perhaps some exaggeration here. The
Heralds may have been received in
Thessaly, Boeotia (at Delphi?), at
Argos, but there is a suspicious gene-
rality about the assertion.
4. νησιώται. Samos (c. 25 supra),
Chios, Lesbos, Tenedos (c. 31 supra),
Thasos (c. 47 supra) have been ac-
counted for. Probably we shall be safe in
concluding that Lemnos, Imbros (Samo-
thrace), Paros, imitated or anticipated
the prudence of Thasos and Aigina.
The inhabitants of Naxos (c. 96 in/ra)
and Delos (c. 97 in/ra) hardly act like
subjects secure of protection; but the
account of Delos in particular is not
free from suspicion.
4. Ἀθηναίοι. This appeal by Athens
to Sparta in the summer of 491 B.C.
against Aigina is a notable recog-
nition by the Athenian Democracy of
the Spartan Prostasia. If it was made
on the suggestion of Themistokles,
perhaps one of the Strategi elected
in 490 B.C., it would have been of
a piece with his action and policy
ten years later. The story of Themistokles
and Krios and the Medium of the
Aiginetans, 8. 92, supports this hypo-
thesis. But perhaps on this occasion
Miltiades was the leading spirit.
50. 2. Κλεομένης ὤ Λ. Β. 4. Σ. The
elaborate description of Kleomenes
here would appear to be due to one, or
more, of three causes: (1) Hdt. preserves
the superfluous detail from his source;
and (2) does not expect his narrative to
be ređ, or listened to, continuously;
or (3) wishes to add emphasis, and to
heighten the effects of the king's re-
introduction.
50. ἀπελευνόμενος. Cp. 5. 94. The
fact that Kleomenes retires from Aigina
to return with the other king and
claim the hostages (c. 73 in/ra) implies
that he admitted the technical validity
of the objection of Krios. The story
not only ignores the law established
according to Hdt. 5. 75 about fifteen years, but is suspicious in itself, since there would be other ways of convincing the Aiginetans that the king was not acting ultra vires or without a commission, and it is not likely that Kleomenes made his appearance in Aigina absolutely alone. The story is hardly from an Athenian source. The stress laid upon the Athenian recognition of the Spartan προστασία, the witticism of Kleomenes, are not points on which Athenian tradition would insist. Nor is it likely from the turn of expression (προσδότες τὴν Ἑλλάδα) that the Aiginetans preserved the story of their own disgrace. Demaratus does not come well out of the story, or it might have been traced to that 'Per-gamene' source, from which probably several of Hdt.'s anecdotes about Demaratus were derived. (Cp. c. 70 ἐν γραμμ. Xenophon, Hell. 3. 1. 6, Pausanias 3. 7, 7.) The most obvious hypothesis remaining is that the story is from Spartan sources, in the first or second degree: albeit a Delphic tradition seems also a possible authority. (Cp. cc. 66, 75, 5. 89.) See Appendix VIII. §§ 4, 5, 11. 1. τοῦτον τοῦ χρόνου, i.e. during the absence of Kleomenes in Aigina, summer of 491 B.C. The narrative is, however, at once interrupted by an excursus upon the origin of dual royalty at Sparta, and is not resumed until c. 81 ἐν γραμμ. Δημ. δὲ Ἀριστότου. Already mentioned 5. 75.

2. Εἰσβάλλει, 5. 96, etc.

3. ἱπποδεσπότης. The inferior dignity, if not power, of the Prokleid house is here clearly asserted. That the two houses were descended from the twin sons of Aristodemus and Argeia may be regarded as an astrological fiction to account for the duality of the kingship at Sparta. According to universally received tradition the Spartans were Dorians, while their kings of both houses were Achaians. This tradition, like many others, looks like a legend to give the Dorian conquerors a better title to the soil. (Cp. 1. 67, 68, 7. 158.) But in no degree does it account for the dual kingship. Feeling a difficulty in believing that the Dorian invaders had no leaders or chieftains of their own stock, some modern critics have supposed that the royal houses were both Dorian and represented the fusion of two independent Dorian communities (so Duncker, G. des Alt. v. 254). Against this view may be urged the objections that it involves the existence of a second Dorian settlement in Laconia, that it ignores the 'Achaian' claim of the kings, and the undoubtedly Achaian, or at least pre-Dorian and anti-Dorian, elements in Spartan institutions and society. The most reasonable hypothesis seems to be that one of the royal houses was non-Dorian, and that in the dual kingship was preserved a monument of the compromise upon which the historic Spartan state was founded. No other theory so well explains the popularity of royalty at Sparta, its duality, its Achaian claim, and the constant feud of the houses. It was popular, for in it was represented the traditions and interests of a majority of the population. It was dual, because the Dorian house was not dethroned, though the Achaian house was recognised as 'the elder.' Dorian oligarchs would not be anxious to aggrandize a monarch even of their own stock. The Achaian claim was half or more than half justified, though the kings of the 'elder' house may have been most conscious of it (cp. 5. 72 ἐν γραμμ. The Dorian house was absorbed into the Herakleid pedigree: the 'twin' theory, put forward to explain the duality of the kingship, effaced the alien origin of the 'younger'
house. If this theory is to be rejected, there will be something to be said for regarding the Achaians (i.e. non-Dorian) descent of both houses as historical. There is nothing strange in the belief that the Dorians were under non-Dorian leaders and kings: how many reigning houses at the present day are of the same stock as their subjects? If it be said, the present state of Europe is the result of a long and complicated history, it may be answered that the Peloponnesos was highly civilised, and had a long history behind it, when the barbarous Dorian spearmen swept into the land, and overthrew government and culture. The term Achaians is used above without prejudice: cp. 5. 72, 4. 147 ff. For modern literature on the subject, see Busolt, Gr. G. i. 546, K. F. Hermann's Lektbuch, p. 185 ff.

52. 2. Λέγωνε. One might suppose that Hdt. heard this story in Lakedaimon itself (cp. 3. 55), but the formula is an open one (cp. Introduction, § 20), and its application here does not favour the assumption. That Hdt. was the first prose author to commit the Lakdaimonian story to writing. The 'Lakedaimonian' tradition is the prose tradition which Hdt. may have read in a prose authority. We can hardly admit (vide Bähr, ad l.) that Hdt. collected the various local traditions about Lakonia, much less that all such traditions agreed in contradicting the 'poeta.' Bähr remarks that the poetic version is followed by Pausan. 3. 1, 6.


6. Ἀργεῖα. Argeia is no Dorian either, but of 'Kadmeian' lineage, Polynikes being son of Oidipus, and so on back to Kadmos. Cp. 4. 147, 5. 69, 60 supra. Her brother is Theras, eponym of Thera, 4. 147.

8. ἑπισύνα, 'lived to see.' Cp. L. & S. sub v. εἰπεῖν, qu. Xen. Vsect. 6, where, however, ἐφ' ἡμῖν occurs. ἑπισύνα here seems to carry an acknowledgment of the twain as his sons.

9. τῶν τότε: ἐν τελεί ἐποικασία (Stein): but the authorities could not act without the commons: cp. c. 56 supra. According to 4. 147, Theras ἐπισύναιες ἔζηε.

10. κατά νόμον. This νόμος held good between brothers of the same house, cp. 5. 42, although, if Domaratoes be made to speak truly to Xerxes 7. 3, it was subject to a curious qualification, which might often cut out the eldest-born.

12. ὡμοιοῖ καὶ ἦμοι. The first term refers rather to appearance or quality, the second to quantity or strength. But they have an odd effect used of infants, and a savour of the political jargon of Agora or Lesche. Van Herwerden would reverse the order of the words. ἤ καὶ πρὸ τοῦτο. A transparent bit of rationalism, which should be illuminative of other less obvious instances. Van Herwerden brackets it; but Hdt. sometimes rationalises.

13. αὐτή. The case carries on the
obliquity of the main sentence, otherwise we should have ἦ δὲ πολύ αὐτῆς ἐτησιμότερος.
14. εἰδοὺ…τὸ κάρτα, ‘knowing perfectly well.’ (1. 191 τὸ κάρτα ἐτέσιμον; ’’they knew only too well.’’) Cobet inserts ὁ before βασιλέως.
17. καλέαν. The duality of the kingship is here referred to Delphic direction, as are the reforms of Lycurgus in 1. 65. Not βασίλεας but ἀρχαγγέλας was probably the Spartan term. Op. the Ἐλείνα, Plato, Lec. 6, but the technical word would not fit the verse.
18. τιμάω. Stein, following K. O. Müller, suggests that the word in the oracle was γεραίεσθαι. (The sense might have ended: μᾶλλον δὲ γεραίεσθαι διότι γεραίεσθαι.) The word is found 5. 57 in the same sentence as τιμᾶω: τὰ τε ήδη ἄλλα οἱ Σεισμίνοι έτιμαν τὸν Ἀργυριοῦ καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὰ πάθη αὐτοῦ γεραίεσθαι εὔφραστοι . . . The honours of the Spartan kings also included χοροὶ and δοσιασμοὶ from the Ἑλληστία. Op. Thus, 5. 16 of the restoration of Pleistoonas: τοῖς ἡμοῖοι χοροῖς καὶ δοσιασιαῖς . . . οὕστε τὸ πρῶτον Λακεδαίμων κτίστοτε τοῖς βασίλεαις αὐτῶν. Delphi establishes the principle of the dual kingship, but leaves the question of primogeniture undecided. This was settled by a device and observation which, had it been sooner thought of, would equally have settled the major question of the sole succession! Thus the story well-nigh refutes itself.
22. Πανίτην. Of Panites the Messenian there seems to be no other mention. The Spartans have often to go outside their own ranks for good advice, cp. 9. 9. Whether this ‘Messenian’ is to be considered a ‘Dorian’ is not clear.
25. τοῦ β. δὲ ἐπὶ αἰγοδίνου.
33. τρίφθαι ἐν τῷ. This τριφθῇ goes beyond the τρίφω enjoined; and seems to involve separation from the mother. Was the Eurythestid always thus brought up at Sparta, or whence the tradition? The total omission of the rôle of Theras, Argeia’s brother, uncle and guardian of the twins, from this Spartan legend, is significant. Op. 4. 147 συνιστασα.
35 διαφόρους είναι τῶν πάντων χρόνων τῆς ἡλικίας, καὶ τοὺς ἄπο τούτων γενομένως ὅσαύτως διατελέσαν.

53 Ταῦτα μὲν Δακεδαμίνων λέγουσι μοῦνοι 'Ελλήνων' τάδε δὲ κατὰ τὰ λαλόμενα ὑπ' 'Ελλήνων ἐγώ γράφω, τούτους τοὺς Δαρίων βασιλέας μέχρι μὲν δὴ Περσέως τοῦ Δανίης, τοῦ θεοῦ ὀπέτυχος, καταλεγμένους ὅρθως ὑπ' 'Ελλήνων καὶ ἀποδεκ-5 νυμένοις ὡς εἰσ 'Ελληνες· ήδη γὰρ τηρικάτα ὡς 'Ελληνας οὕτω εἴτελεν. ἤλεξα δὲ μέχρι Περσέως τούτω εἴπεκα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνέκαθεν ἔτι ἐπάθον, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπέτει ἐποιμηθείη Περσέως οὐ- δεμία πατρὸς θυτοῦ, ὡσπερ 'Ηρακλῆς Ἀμφιτριῶν. ήδη δὲν


53. 1. ταῦτα the preceding, τάδε the following. Cp. τάδε, τάδε, 5. 92 ad init. Not that Hdt. is always so strict, cp. 5. 98 supra.

2. τὰ λαλόμενα τῶν 'Ελλήνων ἐγὼ γράφω. Hdt. must not be understood to say that he is writing this account of the Egyptian origin of the Herakleids from oral tradition (cp. Introduction, pp. liv., lxxvi f.). It originated, perhaps, among Hellenes in Egypt, of whom some were Dorians, or quasi-Dorian. Cp. 2. 178. Yet reminiscences of old connexions with Egypt might have lived on through the Dorian invasion and conquest, and have at least reinforced or prepared the way for the speculations of the Greeks in Egypt under the 28th Dynasty.

Between γράφω and τούτων Blakesley suspects a lacuna, to be filled in with a complete genealogy, or catalogue of the kings, which would not be identical with the genealogies 7. 204, 8. 131. He also suspects that Hdt. followed Ηκαταίος in this passage. (The genealogiae, cp. Müller, Frag. Hist. Gr. i. p. 25.)

3. Περσέως. Rawlinson remarks: "It is strange that Hdt. should speak of Perseus as a king of the Dorians." But Hdt. only speaks of Perseus as one of the ancestors of the kings of the Dorians. Hdt. is, however, verbally incorrect in saying that the Persesidae in their day were reckoned Hellenes, as the Hellenic name apparently first entered the Peloponnesos with the Dorians. Substantially he may be right: the Persesidae were not 'barbarians.' Thucydides, however, has in this matter stated the case more accurately, 1. 8.

8. θυτοῦ. Zeus was the father of Perseus. The genealogy of his mother Danaë, daughter of Akriasion, whose forebears were Egyptians (cp. next c.) carried the Perseids back to Egypt. Hdt. only supplies certain links in this chain: Lynkeus and Danaos (2. 91) who establish a dynasty in Argos are ancestors of Perseus. Hdt. treats the Danaid legend, which connected Argos with Egypt, as notorious (cp. 2. 91, 171, 182) and well he might, as there was not only an Epic Danaïs, but the dramatists popularised the legend, though the Supplices of Aischylos is our only trophy from their labours on this theme. On the other side, neither does Hdt. exhibit the connexion between Perseus and Herakles father of Hylos. Amphitrion and Alkmene are both Perseids from Argos, one generation removed from Perseus. The Hesiodic Shield of Herakles told the story. Herakles had to serve the Perseid Eurytheus, to whom succeeded the Pelopid Atreus, the two being related on the female side (cp. Thuc. 1. 9). Thus the Pelopids, too, were connected with the Perseids and Egypt. (Menesos in Egypt, 2. 118.) The overthrow of the Pelopid dynasties by the Herakleids (with the help of their Dorian followers) is a return and a recovery, not merely because the Herakleids represent the elder branch of the Perseids, but because Herakles and Hylos had claimed their rights and been worsted by the younger Perseid Eurytheus. (Consult particularly Große: Part 1. c. 4, and Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. i., especially the table on p. 101.) The kings in Sparta were not
merely of Persoid and Egyptian origin, but also through Argeia, mother of Eurysthenes and Procles, have a further connexion with Thebes, and with the (Phoenician) Kadmeans. In fact, if it were not for the intervention of the (Hellenic) Zeus as father first of Perses, and then of Herakles, there would not be much to say for the Hellenic origin of the kings of the Dorian.

9. ὁρθὸν λόγον. A phrase which many others is popular and historical before it becomes scientific. Cp. c. 68 infra.

54. 2. ὁ παρήσεως λόγος λέγεται. We cannot be sure that these words mean more than that the Persian account was reported to Hdt. or found by him in his authorities. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxix.

3. Περσείς ἠδ' Ἀσσυρίος. The 'Persian' view is that Perseus and his ancestors were 'Assyrians,' and that he was the first of the family to 'become a Hellen.' According to the 'Persian' legend given in 7. 160, Perseus, the eponym of the Persians, was a son of Perseus, son of Danae, and Andromeda, daughter of Kepheus. Kepheus is the son of Belos (7. 61). According to the genealogy in 1. 7, Belos is father of Ninos, and son of Alkaios son of Herakles. This Herakles would be the Asiatic or Tyrian Herakles not the Greek, 2. 44. The Syrian and Assyrian connexion is through Andromeda not Perseus, and the argument in 7. 150 implies the Argive origin of Perseus. That is also the implication of the passage 7. 61. According to the story here Perseus has nothing to say to Danae or to Akrisios. That the kings or chieftains of the Dorian were really of 'Assyrian' or Egyptian descent is more improbable than that they were of non-Dorian origin. The 'Egyptian' hypothesis was the common Greek view; but the license of conjecture practised by the 'Persians' is an indication of the way in which these stories or genealogies originated or developed. The Egyptian origin of the Herakleids is, perhaps, largely a product of the attempt to connect the Greeks and their civilisation with the oldest and wisest folk of antiquity, of which we have other examples in the Dodona legend, and the Egyptian origin of the Hellenic nomenclature of the Deities, 2. 50, 54 ff. At the same time it should be recognised that not merely tradition but archaeology points to a real intercourse between Egypt and Greece, particularly Argos, long before the days of Psamatik I. (Op. P. Gardner, New Chapters in Greek History, esp. cp. v., vii.) The Phoenicians may have been the carriers and go-betweens in a later 'middle age,' but the probabilities now point more and more to a belief in early movements and intercourse between Europe and Egypt (op. F. Petrie, J. H. S. xii. 199 ff. 1991), though it is not at present credible that any Egyptian dynasty was established in Greece. So freely, in fact, were these obscure but real connexions handled by the contemporaries of Herodotus that Argos itself was made the ancestral home of the Dansids, whose advent there is consequently a return to their native land (Aischylos, Supp. 15 ff.), Cp. Hdt. 1. 1, where Io is at home in Argos. Io is the mother of Epaphos (op. 3. 27) from whom Aigyptos and Danaos are descended.
2. ἡς Δωρεὰν βασιλέασ. In Sparta, Argos, Messenia, and perhaps Corinth and Sikyon.

3. Ἀλλοιοι. Whether Hdt. here refers to poets, or to prose authors, or to both, in any case this passage might seem to indicate that one of the canons for his own work was to avoid repetition of stories which had already received literary treatment. Such a canon could not, however, be rigidly observed (cp. c. 127 infra) and such an inference would be misleading, cp. Introduction, pp. lxxiii ff. The chief story here omitted is the legend of the expulsion and return of the Herakleids, cp. 9. 26. See Grote, Pt. i. c. xvii. § 1 (vol. i. 440-452, ed. 1872). Busolt, i. 2 205 note 2 for ref. That story had perhaps been treated in the Epic poem Aigionis; but cp. Bergk, Lit. Desch. i. 1006 f. and Boeth. in Pauly, R. E. i. 963.

56. 1. γέφυρα. The notable passage which follows on the γέφυρα of the Spartan kings (cc. 56, 57, 58) can hardly be considered as complete or accurate, and might, perhaps, have been better arranged. It was, however, as the author has just asserted, the first essay upon the subject. The scheme in Hdt.'s mind apparently divided itself under the heads of privileges: (A) before death, (B) after death. (A) is subdivided into privileges, (1) in war, (2) in peace (van Herwerden would bracket τὰ ἐγκαίνια c. 57 infra as a gloss). (B) is not sub-classified. The most direct parallel to this passage is supplied by Xenophon, Rep. Laccd. cc. xiii., xv.

2. Σπαρτιτηγαί δεδόκασι. seems to imply that these γέφυρει were of positive institution (contrast δικαίωμα c. 58 infra), the rather, that seeing these 'Egyptians' διασω λαξ Δωρεὰν βασιλέασ. Hdt. does not say that the rights and duties enumerated are a residuum surviving from a time when the king was much more powerful; still less does he mean that these privileges have been but are not now given. The duplication of the kingship may have been accompanied, or followed, by not merely a de facto limitation and diminution of the royal power, but by an express contract, or Rhetra, on the subject. That the dual royalty was believed to have been of distinct institution seems implied in the passage quoted c. 52 supra, from Thucydides, 5-16, and, indeed, in the story given by Hdt. of its origin just above. The contractual basis of the Spartan kingships was attested by the menstrual oath, Xenoph. op. c. xv. 6 6 ἐκ δός εἴτε τὰς μὲν βασιλεῖς κατὰ τοὺς τὰς πόλεις κειμένων νόμων βασιλειῶν, τὰ δὲ τάλια ἐφ' ἀνερῷοι τῶν ἀντιπληρωτῶν τὴν βασιλείαν παρέχειν. Ἰρωνίτης διό. Do these specially concern τὰ ἐγκαίνια, or concern them at all? Perhaps the ἐγκάινια which is in-curred by any one thwarting the kings on the war-trail may be connected with their hieratic functions. Xen. op. c. xiii. 2 represents the king as sacrificing to Zeus ἄγνωρ and to Athene, when going forth to war.

How these two priesthoods were held, whether jointly or separately, and so forth, is unfortunately not stated. There was a special point no doubt in kings (βασιλεῖς ἔγκαινα) being invested with priesthood of Zeus, who remained a βασιλεία even in democratic times and places. (Cp. Aristot. Pol. i. 2, 7, 1252b.) The Spartan kings in particular were, as Herakleids, his descendants, and Zeus was their ancestor. The Herakleids of Macedon had a similar relation to the Bottinean Zeus, and the Aeakid dynasty in Epireos to the Dodonaean (Peller, Grisch. Mythologie, i. 119). The relation of the Athenians to the Lapithyan Zeus (7. 197), of the ancestors of Isagoras to the Karian Zeus (5. 66), and the remark of the Hellespontine to Xerxes (7. 56) may be compared. Add the satire on the 'Olympian' Perikles Aristoph. Acharna. 530 (which might partly insinuate a charge regni appetendi).

Zeus Lakadaimon Peller (i.e.) fancifully explains as the god-king from whom the Lakadaimonian and Spartan Basileia was deduced; Zeus Uranios as the king-god of the polity in the heavens. With the surname Lakadai-
δαίμονος καὶ Δίός οὐδαμῶς, καὶ πόλεμον ἐκφέρειν ἐπ᾽ ἦν ἄν
βουλονται χώραν, τούτου δὲ μηδένα εἶναι Σπαρτιητῶν διακοι-
λυτῆν, εἰ δὲ μὴ αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἄγει ἐνέχεσθαι. στρατευόμενον δὲ εἰ

wos Stein compares Zeus 'Ἀγαλμάτων, Ζ.'Ἀρμοφώς, Ζ.'Ἀλατιτής, Ζ.'Ἡρωλτής, Ζ.'Τροφίμως. There is a degree of
localisation in the Ἀκεδαίμον which makes it, perhaps, unique. Whether
the combination is a kenosis of Zeus or an apotheosis of Ἀκεδαίμον may be
doubted. Is it possible that Zeus Ἀκε-
δαίμον was something more than an
enchorial, that he was even a chthonian
deity? The cult of Zeus Ὀδύσσως is at
testified by the Ῥητὰ Ὀδύσσ withholding of which
celebration there is epigraphic evidence.
See Plessner, Ι. 2 p. 119 a., Wide, Lokau-
nische Kulte (1893), p. 2. Wide (op.
cit. p. 23) remarks that (1) the cult of
Zeus in Sparta is important, in the rest of
Lakonia unimportant, primitive
and even 'chthonic'; (2) Zeus is πα-
τοτος of the Herakleids: and therefore
Zeus was a chief god of the Dorians:
ανα πολυτηριον, ὁμ. Η. 16. 233
et passim.
Neither of these deities looks partic-
ularly Doric; if either, then Zeus Ὀδύσσως.
Was that the priesthood of the
inferior house?
asserts that the kings could make
war when and where they pleased, and
that it was sacrelege for any Spartan
(Ephors, Gerusia, Ἀπειλα) to stay it.
It is not quite plain whether we are to
understand that both kings acting
together had this power, or that each
acting separately possessed it. In
either case the statement is hardly
credible. It is true that in 5. 49 ff.
Hdt. tells a story implying that about
500 n.c. Kleomenes might of his own
accord have made war on the great
King in the heart of Ἁθίς; and in 5.
74 seems to imply that about 507 n.c.
Kleomenes put in motion the whole
Peloponnesian confederacy. But those
stories cannot be taken as accurate
representations, see notes ad l. On
the other hand in 6. 63 Kleomenes is
appointed to command in the Ἀττικ
war. It is not to the king that
Philippides applies in 490 n.c., c. 106
τὴν (but consult note ad l.). The
second Persian war is plainly not
conducted on the royal initiative, still
less the Peloponnesian wars after-
wards. The appointment of com-
manders-in-chief other than the kings
implies the diminution of the royal
authority and initiative. In 431 n.c.
the king has not even a veto on the
decision of war (Thuc. 1. 87). Yet
there is probably some ground for the
misstatement of Hdt. The fiction that
the king or kings had full responsibility
in all matters of warfare was probably a
convenient survival, and coloured the
stories though it may not have affected
the action of the Spartans. The really
soveran power of the king in the field
(though even this had been invaded
before Hdt.'s day, cp. 9. 78), which on
a long campaign might really aggran-
dise the royal power considerably (cp.
Thuc. 6. 5), coloured the representa-
tion of the king's power over the
inception of the campaign. The
modus operandi and similar points may
have been in the main within the
competence of the king on service,
though considerable degrees of in-
subordination were on record (cp. 9.
53). In short, a fiction which may
possibly have corresponded to the facts
in the days when Sparta was waging
almost annual wars with its next-door
neighbours was perpetuated, for various
reasons, into a time when the condi-
tions and problems of Spartan warfare
had become much larger and more
complex, while the power of the kings
could not have diminished, directly and
indirectly. It is hardly credible that
the alliance with Kreisios was made by
the king or kings of the day; or even
that the interference of the Spartans
against the Peloponnesian tyrants (cp.
5. 92) was undertaken on the royal
5. αὐτῶν. Brezler suspected a
lacuna after αὐτῶν, Stein supplies τι καὶ
τὸ γένος ἐκεῖνον or similar words, exer-
citions being generally thus extended.
Yán Herwerden prefers τι καὶ γένος τοῦ
ἐκεῖνου or better still τι εὐγένεϊ ἐκεῖνον τοῦ
gένους τοῦ κεῖνου. Probably exile would
be one of the results of the curse.

στρατευόμενον. If the previous
sentence is an over-statement of the royal
prerogatives, this sentence seems to
do scant justice to the power of the
πρώτοις ιέναι τούς βασιλέας, υστάτους δὲ ἀπέναιε· ἐκατὸν δὲ ἄνδρας λογάδας ἐπὶ στρατικής φυλάσσειν αὐτοὺς· προβάτωσι δὲ χρᾶσαι εὖ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἐκόσιαν ἄν ἐθέλωσι, τῶν δὲ θυμάμενόν πάντων τὰ δέρματα τε καὶ τὰ νωτὰ λαμβάνειν σφέας. 57 ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἐμπολέμια, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τὰ εἰρήνια κατὰ τάδε σφι δεδοταί. ἢν υποίη τις δημοτελῆς ποιεῖται, πρώτος ἐπὶ τὸ δεύτερον ήξει τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων πρῶτον ἀρχεῖσθαι δυνατία νέμοντας ἐκάτερο τὰ πάντα ἢ τοίς ἄλλοις δαίμονεσθαι, καὶ σπουδαρχίας εἶναι τούτων καὶ τῶν τυθέντων τὰ δέρματα. νεονησίας δὲ πάσας καὶ ἐξομάς ἰσταμένου τοῦ μηνός διδοσθαὶ ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου ἱρέων τέλεον ἐκάτερο ἐς Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ μέσιμον ἀλφίων καὶ οἷον τεταρτήν Δαλκωνίην, καὶ εἰ τοίς ἀγῶσι πάσι προεξεῖπεν ἐξαίρετος. καὶ προβέβουσιν ἀποδείκνυσι τούτους προσκείοντας τοῦ ἐθέλωσι τῶν ἀστῶν, καὶ Πυθίους αἱρεῖσθαι δύο ἑκάτερον. οἱ δὲ Πυθίοι εἰσὶ θεσπροτέοι ἐς Δελφοὺς,
suggests (in the light of some late analogies) that the Proxenos nominated by the kings was extraordinary, to meet the cases of states who had no ordinary Proxenos in Sparta. Hdt. who visited Sparta (3. 55) ought to be a good authority on this point.

**Thespóry.** The king, however, sometimes went to Delphi in person if the story c. 76 ἐν ἑαυτῷ be true. Van Herwerden brackets εἰ Δῆλοις "εἰ οὐδείς" ob structure durium.

12. συμφέρει μ. τ. β. τὰ δ. Perhaps only applied to warfare. Cp. Xenoph. op. c. xiv. 4, 5. μὴ ἱλατοῦσι δὲ. If this passage, μὴ ἱλατοῦσι ἢ ἱλασθῆναι (or, rather, down to τιμᾶσθαι), refers to the δένουσιν after a ἰδίης ἰδιοτερήτης, it should be replaced above after the words τὰ δέρματα. Standing where it now does it must be taken to refer to the στήριξις of the kings, shared by the Pythii, which should apparently have been restricted to warfare. But the Pythii may have messed with the king at the ἔθνα. Forty-eight χιούμεναι went to the μέτωπος, 114 κοτόλαι, or 12 χίλια, to the μετρήσις. These are here Aiginetan or Laconian measures, presumably. In 425 B.C. at Sphakteria the blockaded Spartans were each allowed daily 2 χοῖραι of barley-meal and 2 κοτόλαι of wine, with half the quantities for their servants (Thuc. 4. 16). But these were Attic measures, and larger than Laconian. Cp. Ἀχιλλ. τ. 39, 10 with Saneys' note, Ridgeway, Origin of Currency, etc. p. 214.

14. διπλήσια, κ. ἄ. τὰ δέρματα εἰδουσθήσεται πάντα πάντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ including flesh.

16. τὰς δὲ μαντήσις. The hieratic characters of the kings reappears (cp. 5. 90).

17. μούνοι . . . μοῦν. In conjunction with the Gerusia the kings would share jurisdiction in other cases (cp. Aristot. Pol. 2. 9, 25, 1270 b). This special jurisdiction apparently is connected with the Family (marriage of heireses and adoptions). These questions might concern the kings, as heads of the highest families; as 'war-lords' they were interested in the 'cura viarum.' Stein (followed by Gilbert, i. 50) understands the phrase merely of settling boundary disputes. At Athens the archon presided in family suits, 'Ἀθ. τ. 56, which may have been detached from the jurisdiction of the Basileus. Van Herwerden for πατριβούν αὐτὴν πατριβόνα, after Roehl, on the strength of the Gortynian inscription, which can hardly prove that Hdt. used the word. (Perhaps Hdt. wrote πατριβοῦς = πατριβόνα.) On the restriction ἦν μὴ περ ἀνθρ. ἐκλ. cp. Aristot. Pol. 2. 9, 15, 1270 b, and c. 130 ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

20. παρφαί. Certainly does not mean 'to preside.' The kings might be absent from the session. Whether they ever acted as chairmen, or might summon the Gerusia, does not appear.

24. δύο. Thucydides in a celebrated passage (1. 29, 3) gives as an instance of popular errors the belief that each of the Kings of the Leoksaimonians had two votes, not one only. It has been
58 Ταῦτα μὲν ξόως τοῖς βασιλεῦσι δέδοται ἕκ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἐπαρτιτέων, ἀποθανοῦσι δὲ τάδε. ἵππες περιαγγέλουσι τὸ γεγονός κατὰ πάσαν τὴν Δακωνικὴν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν πόλιν γυναῖκες περιούσαι λέβηται κροτέουσι. ἔπεκεν δὲ τούτῳ γίνεται 5 τοιοῦτο, ἀνάγκη ἐξ οἰκίσης ἐκάστης ἐλευθέρους δύο καταμαίνεικας, ἀνδρὰ τε καὶ γυναῖκα· μὴ ποιήσας δὲ τοῦτο ξημαία μεγάλαι ἐπικεότατα. νόμος δὲ τοίς Ἀκαδαιμονίσι κατὰ τῶν βασιλέων τοὺς θανάτους ἐστὶ ἀνύτως καὶ τοῖς βαρβάροις τοῖς ἐν τῇ 'Δαιρ. τῶν γὰρ ὅλω βαρβάροι οἱ πλεῦνες τῷ αὐτῷ νόμῳ χρέωνται 10 κατὰ τῶν θανάτων τῶν βασιλέων. ἔπεκεν γὰρ ἀποθανόντης βασιλεὺς Ἀκαδαιμονίους, ἑκ πάσης διὲ Ἀκαδαιμονίων, χωρὶς Ἐπαρτιτέων, ἀριθμὸ τῶν περιοίκων ἂναγκαστοῦ ἢς τὸ κίδος λέναι. τούτων

debated whether Thuc. is consciously referring to this passage, and urged on behalf of Hdt. that he does not say that each king had two votes. This is true; he does not: neither does he say, as Thucydides, that each king had only one vote. In short, Hdt. expresses himself obscurely, probably because his ideas were obscure upon the subject. His language here is capable of being harmonised with either the erroneous view, which Thucydides says was common, or the correct view, which Thucydides substitutes. Whether Thucydides had this particular passage of Hdt.'s work in view, or only the popular and widespread error, from which Hdt. had not emancipated himself, and to which, by his ambiguous utterance here, he may have given further circulation, depends on the previous question whether Thucydides was acquainted with the work of Herodotus or not. If he was acquainted with the work of Hdt. he was probably referring to it, for it is significant that in the same passage (1. 20, 3) he corrects another supposed error which is certainly found in Hdt. 9, 53. (The 'previous question' must here be reserved, but the weight of argument and evidence is in favour of believing that Thucydides was acquainted with Hdt.'s work.)

τρίτην δὲ τὴν ἐσφαλίν. The question is whether Hdt. that the Gerontes in question gave six votes in all, or four votes in all. 'Two for each king and then each his own': or 'two for the two kings and then thirdly (and fourthly) each his own.' The obscurity is perhaps due, at least in part, to Hdt.'s not contemplating separately the cases where one king was absent and where both kings were absent. Nor does he state whether the royal proxies gave the votes by direction of the kings, as the kings would have voted, if present, or whether they were free to vote according to their own judgment. Nor does he state clearly whether each king was represented in absentia by one or more than one relative.

2. ἤπειρα. Note that all Lakonia was ἤπειρα (cf.). These ἤπειρα are presumably genuine mounted couriers, not the so-called Hippites, or 300 chosen Hoplites (Gilbert, St. At. l. 77—81).
4. λέβηται κροτέουσι . . . καταμαίνεικας. Such extravagant signs of mourning were not in accordance with Hellenic sentiment and practice, or at least with the higher Athenian culture (cp. Pericles' Fun. Or. Thuc. 2. 45). It was an archaic or a 'barbarous' excess. Solon was credited with having restricted it by statute at Athens (Plutarch, Sol. 12), and in Plutarch's own time and family a supreme self-control was to be observed in such matters, cp. Plut. Consol. ad Uxor. (Mor. 608 ff.). According to Plutarch even Lycurgus had limited these demonstrations at Sparta: Instit. Lac. 18 (Mor. 238), Vit. Lyc. 27. Cp. further: L. Schmidt, Die Ethik der Att. Griechen, ii. p. 114 f. and especially Bekker, Charicles, Excursus to the ninth scene.
17. **πολέμῳ.** The death of a Spartan king in warfare was a rarity, and the failure to recover his body probably unique in the case of Leonidas. *Plutarch, Agis 21,* gives us to understand that the divinity which hedged a Spartan king was his security from the hands of the foeman: δὴ καὶ τὸλλὸν γεγονότων Λακεδαιμονίων ἂνγέλων πρὸς Ἑλληνας εἰς μύσιν ἀνατέθη πρὸ τῶν Φιλιστινῶν ἄρατι πληγίας περὶ Λακεδαιμονίων. *Xen. Hell. 6. 4, 13* and Buchschütz’s note. Agesipolis died on foreign service in Macedonia. His body was preserved ‘in honey,’ brought back to Sparta and ἤτοι τῆς βασιλείας ταφῆς, Xen. Hell. 5. 3, 19. So previously ἄρα ἴτοι συμπτίμες ὡς κατὰ ἀθάνατον ταφῆς, ib. 3, 3, 1. Xenoph. Rep. Lac. αὐτὸν, gives the reason for these honours: ὅσοι ἄν ἄθλος ἄλλως ἡμῶν τούτους . . . βασιλεῖς προτείνασιν.

19. οὐκ ἔσται κτῆς. The phraseology here is unsatisfactory. Stein explains ἄγραφοι as including everything that took place in the market-place, and ἀρχαιοστία as one particular case, viz. ‘electoral meeting’ (abstract for concrete). Krüger pointed out that ἄν κατίστασι would be preferable, op. Thuc. 1. 31, 4; 3. 36, 6. Van Herwerden follows Krüger and in addition alters ἀρχαιοστία into ἄρχαι αὐθεντικαί. Verily, ἀρχαιοστία σινεῖ is rather strong: moreover the Arella at Sparta probably did not sit.

59. **Σπαρτητέων.** This liberation of debtors does not apply to the Perioikoi apparently, much less to Helots, or it would be a better parallel to the remission of arrears of tribute by the Great King. The pseudo-Smerdis improved on this rule, 3. 67. At Sparta the effect would apparently be to restore the ὄμοιοι, for the time at least, to the class of ὄμοι, and so recruit the Spartiate caste at the expense of the Perioikoi. Whether the king released those in debt to the public by paying their debts, or by simple proclamation, does not appear: presumably the latter. How private citizens could be in debt to the king is not clear. Plato, Ἀλκιμ. i. 123, mentions a βασιλικὸς φόρος, ὁτὲ πληροῦσι οἱ Λακεδαιμονίων τῆς βασιλείας. This would presumably be a state-payment. Perhaps the private debts would be rent from the royal domains—in which case, however, we should expect it to be due, not from Spartiates, but from Perioikoi. It is conceivable that the Spartan kings were, unlike most other kings, money-lenders; but the κλάρα (τὰ παρὰ τῶν χρεωτῶν γραμματέα) mentioned by Plutarch (Agis 13) do not appear to have belonged to the king, and in any case would prove little for the time of Hdt.
be more important personages than ordinary domestics. Perhaps they accompanied the armies in the field, cp. 9. 82. Whether they were free or servile does not clearly appear from these passages: Helotry too was hereditary. The passage may read to us almost like a jest or a parody (as if one said: 'Kingship and cookery are hereditary arts'), but it is probably authentic and serious. In every society to a certain extent, in non-progressive societies and in societies obviously based on conquest and slave labour to a greater extent, crafts are and remain hereditary. The difference between Athens and Sparta, Sparta and Egypt, Egypt and India in these respects was one of degree not of kind. Some have asserted that there were 'castes' in early Greece (see Rawlinson, Herodotus, iii.265, n. to 5. 66), others have denied that there were castes in Egypt (Wiedemann, Herodots Zweites Buch, p. 573). There has probably nowhere been a system of Castes to compare with the Indian, so fully sanctioned by religion, and so firmly established by secular custom; but ancient civilisations, based on war, slavery, blood, and religion, tended to stereotype classes, to give fixity to status, to limit contract, to eliminate individualism and competition. Of such societies in Greece Sparta was chief.

5. κατὰ λαμπροφονήν only applies to the κῦρος, and as a result in part of this inequivalence Ἱδτ. involves himself in a grammatical obscurity, by an alternation of subjects. Cp. c. 57 supra. The obscurity is not abolished by bracketing the words as a gloss with van H.

61. 1. τότε, c. 50 supra = (summer)
491 n.c.
3. δεμαλι. δεμαλα, c. 51 supra.
φόνος. φόνος is primarily human, Hellenic, and civil, 7. 237.
4. ἀγγ is an emendation of Valkenau, and justified by P. ἄγγαι and ἀγγ of bad feeling seems to be used especially of divinities (cp. τ. & s. sub ευ.).
6. τοιχίμονοι, middle. Leotychides was his tool, c. 65 infra.

'Αριστων. Ariston, a contemporary of Anaxandrides and Kroisos, and presumably distinguished in the war with Trogas, 1. 67. Cp. c. 63 infra ad fin.

7. δίο. Only, however, one at a time (c. 63 infra), and in this respect his conduct differed from the conduct of his colleague Anaxandrides, 5. 40, and was less offensive to Spartan feeling.

8. άστ. The story which follows reads like a variation on the true and authentic history of Beauty and the Beast (Eros and Psyche). The facts are redistributed to some extent, but the situations and motives are similar: (1) the transfiguration is accomplished in the person of Beauty herself. (2) The μοχαρία by which Beauty is won is practised upon the husband not upon the father, c. 62. (3) Ariston (Astrabakos) visits Beauty in disguise, c. 69 infra. (4) The hostile elements are represented by the Ephors (cc. 63, 65), Leotychides and Kleomenes: but by a finely dramatic touch Ariston's own words occasion the discomfiture of Beauty (c. 63). (5) Aphrodite is not the enemy but the friend of 'Beauty.' On the group of myths cp. Cox.
Mythology of the Aryan Nations, ed. 1882, pp. 209 ff. Cp. Roscher, Lexicon, a. v. Astrapas. The above remarks and references are not intended to insinuate that the story of Ariston and his beautiful wife, the mother of Demaratos, is simply a myth or fable; the matter-of-fact element is probably the fundamental one in the story, but it has been fused and transfigured in a mythical atmosphere and is not sober history. That the transfiguration was the work of Hdt. is not likely; he gives the story as he heard it, though we need not suppose it to have lost in his telling. Possibly this story, or at least the latter part of it, the account of the birth of Demaratos, was put in evidence at the trial, cc. 65 f. infra. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxxi f. Apol. His name is given below as Agetos son of Alkeides.


17. 'Eleven. Helen, then, was worshipped in Sparta, and as the goddess of Beauty. Cp. 2. 112, and the preceding just below. Hdt. identifies her with Aphrodite Urania, l. c. This is probably a late theory; due perhaps to Homeric associations. The genuine Laconic Helen was, perhaps, more nearly akin to Artemis. Cp. Wide, Lachnische Kulte, pp. 340 ff. In a still older pre-Dorian (Arcadian) stage Helena was, perhaps, even a tree-spirit (Wide, op. cit. 343). Cp. Frazer, Golden Bough, i. 70 ff.

Therapne. As Therapne was up a hill some two miles distant from Sparta on the left bank of the Eurotes, this daily pilgrimage showed considerable devotion. No doubt the hill was one of the strongholds of the pre-Dorian population. Therapne de ipsum memini, a man of the hyperepaphos, Menelaius de ipso in acta nos, extremin e tois tois Demetrios kai 'Eleven enantoni tefrein lagenon (Pausan. 3. 19. 9). The hill was named the Menelaios, and Curtius (Pelopon. ii. 239) compares its position in regard to Sparta with the position of Janiculum in regard to Rome. The Pholbellus was on the right (west) bank of the river.


21. Lagentia. Where would this λόγος or story of the Epiphanie of the Madonna of Therapne more probably have been preserved than in the temple at Therapne itself? There Hdt. may possibly have heard it (3. 55). He does not quite believe it. Cp. 4. 184 supra and Introduction, p. cli.

22. Oi phainai, to refuse.
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may be doubted whether the King and Ephors alone constituted a meeting.)
The Ephors hear the king's unfortunate remark, but although it is one of their
special duties to maintain and guard the stock of Herakles in Sparta (cp. 5.
39), and although all Sparta has been praying that Ariston may have a son
to succeed him (see just below), they take no notice of the remark at the
time. Credat Judaeus!

6. ἐπὶ δακτύλων. Ariston, who appears, like a savage, to have had his
arithmetic "at his fingers' ends," may perhaps have become confused, as per-
sons are apt to be who have a difficulty in counting ten. This fingering is a
touch of a kind much emphasised in some quarters as evidence of the truth
and authenticity of a narrative. Cp. 4.
98 supra. It is undoubtedly both
humorous and artistic, but is it history? Anyway, it is not calculated to raise
our opinion of the king's education. The count was complicated by his hav-
ing to allow for the difference between calendar and lunar months: or perhaps
his doubt arose from his not (at first) making the allowance.

11. τοῦτο. The desire of the Spartans,
that Ariston should have a son, did not
arise from there being otherwise no
legitimate successor, as the sequel
proves that there was another branch
of the lesser house in Sparta, which
was thus more fortunatelycircumstanced
than the older house (5. 39 supra). An
act of the Areopag seems involved (συνα-
δήμῳ Σπαρτῖται). Αρίστων μὲν ἀπέθανε,
Δημάρητος δὲ ἔσχε τὴν βασιλείαν. Αὐξα-
nάσασάς γενομένων αὐτὰ καταπίεσας Δημάρητος τῆς βασιλείας
διὰ τὰ, καὶ Κλεομένεις διεξέχθησαν μεγάλοι πρότερος τοῦ Ἀριστό-
5 ντος ἀπαγόμενος τῆς στρατιᾶς ἐκ Ελευσίων, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸτε ἐν
Ἀγίνιτέων τῶν μεθίδαντος διαβαίντως Κλεομένεος.
'Οµηρεις ὃν ἀποτίνευσαί οὐ Κλεομένις συνιτισθεὶς Λευτυχίδη 65
τῷ Μενάρεος τῷ Ἀγίοις, ἐνυπνίστη ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς Δημαρῆτος, ἐπ'
ο τε, ἦν αὐτῶν καταστήσει βασιλεά ἀντί Δημαρήτου, ἐφεταί οἱ ἐπ' Ἀλκινήτας. ὁ δὲ Λευτυχίδης ἦν ἐξήρος τῷ Δημαρήτῳ
μάλιστα γεγονός διὰ πρήγμα τοιῶν τε ἀρμοσμένου Λευτυ-
χίδου Πέρκαλον τὴν Ἡλλων τοῦ Δημαρήτου δυνατέρα, ὁ
Δημάρητος ἐπισυμολέυσα ἀποστερεῖ Λευτυχίδεα τοῦ γὰρ,
φθάσας αὐτὸς τὴν Πέρκαλον ἀρπάζας καὶ σχοῦ γυναικῆς, κατὰ
τούτο μὲν τὸ Λευτυχίδη ἢ ἐξήρη ἢ ἦς τοῦ Δημάρητου ἐγγενῆς,
τὸ τάτο δὲ ἐκ τῆς Κλεομένεως προθυμίας ὁ Λευτυχίδης κατόρθωσε
Δημαρήτῳ, φᾶς αὐτὸν οὐκ ἰκνευμένοι βασιλεῦν Σπαρτιτεῖς
οὐκ ἔσταντα παῖδα Ἀρίστωνός· μετά δὲ τὴν κατομοσίνην ἔδωκε,
ἀνασπάζον ἐστίν τὸ ἔτος τὸ ἔστε Ἀρίστων τότε ὅτε οἱ ἐξήγγειλεν
ὁ οἰκείης παῖδα γεγονόν, ὁ δὲ συμβαβλόμενος τοὺς μίνας ἀπό-
15 μοσε φᾶς οὐκ ἔστων μῦν εἶναι. τούτῳ δὴ ἐπιβατοῦν τού ὅ-
ματος ὁ Λευτυχίδης ἀπέφαγεν τῶν Δημάρητου ὅτε ζε Αρίστωνος
γεγονότα οὐτε ἰκνευμένοι βασιλεῦντα Σπάρτης, τοὺς ἐφόρους
μάρτυρας παρεγέμενοι κείνον νῦν τότε ἐπίγνοντες πέρα 
66 ἐστε καὶ ἀκούοντες τάτα Ἀρίστωνος. τέλος δὲ ἔστων περὶ

seems to have made a slip somewhere, as in § 131, where the complete genealogy of Leotychides is given, not an Agis but an Agisalas appears as the father of Menares. It is characteristic of our author to leave such inconsistencies standing (cp. Introduction, p. lxxiii.). Leotychides had to go back to Theopompos to find a sceptred ancestor, seven names separating the two. Only six names intervene between Theopompos and Demaratos. The reigns were longer than the generations. The same phenomenon occurs in the succession of Archidamos to Leotychides, a generation (Zeuxidamos) dropping out between. Cp. c. 71 ἔτη.
5. ἀρμοσμένον, middle. Cp. 5. 32 supra.
6. Πέρκαλον, i.e. Persemon.
7. Θέλων. Chilon probably grandson of the sage (1. 59) and brother of Prienates, father of Kleomenes' mother (5. 41) (Stein). So the wife of Demaratos was aunt of Kleomenes.
8. ἀρπάζω. The forms of marriage by capture survived at Sparta, and had a disciplinary purpose for the young warriors. Cp. Plutarch, Lycurg. vil. 15. Both the anthropological and the Spartan rationale of the institution are missed by K. O. Müller, Dorians, ii. 278, and those who follow him. Leotychides seems to have converted the form into a reality on this occasion, perdventure not without the lady's goodwill. On the form of marriage, see McLennan, Studies in Ancient History, cc. ii.-iv.
9. ἡ γάμφη ἢ ἐς τ. Δ. It is, as a rule, the injurer rather than the injured that never forgives.
10. κατόρθωσε. The κατωμοσία apparently marks the first stage in the judicial proceedings (δίκαια) then follows the ἀποφάσις (ἀποφασις), with the μαρτύρα. How the court was constituted is not stated. Possibly by the Ephors, Gerusia, and the other king (Kleomenes in this case). Cp. Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. i. 2 p. 62, note 2. The decision to refer the question to Delphi may have proceeded from the Areia (ὅσον Σπαρτήσσει c. 66).
13. τότε. The proceedings against Demaratos fall into the year 491 B.C. (summer). He might be at least fifty years old at this time, as he was king in 511 B.C. Were the five ex-Ephors, who had been in office half-a-century before, produced as evidence of a remark of which they had made nothing at the time? And what would now be the ages of these Ephors? The youngest would have been at least eighty. No wonder Leotychides did not succeed in convincing the court (ἀποφάσις imperfect).
αὐτῶν νεκρῶν, ἔδεξε Ἐπίσκοπον ἐπειρήσατο τὸ χρηστήριον τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς εἰ Ἀριστοτέλει τὸν τῆς Κλεομήνης τῇ Ἐπιφάνειᾳ τῇ Πυθίᾳ, ἔθνατα προστατεύεται Κλεομήνης Κόσμαν τὸν Ἀριστοφάντου, ἀνδρὰ ἐν δὲ Δελφοῖς ἐς Δημάρχον μέγιστον, ὁ δὲ Κόσμας Περίαλλα τὴν πρόμαντα ἀνατείθη τῇ Κλεομήνης ἐξουσία λέγεσθαι λέγειν. οὕτω δὴ ἡ Πυθίᾳ ἐπειρήσαντον τῶν ἀναπόστολον ἐκείνον μὴ Ἀριστοτέλας εἶναι Δημάρχου ταῦτα. ὡστέρα μέντοι χρόνοι ἀνάπτυσε εὔγενετο ταῦτα, καὶ Κόσμας τοὺς ἔφυγε ἐκ Δελφῶν καὶ Περίαλλα ἡ ἐν πρόμαντος ἐπαύση ὑπὸ τὴν τιμῆς.

Κατὰ μὲν δὴ Δημάρχου τὴν κατάπαυσιν τῆς Βασίλειας 67 οὕτω εὐγένετο, ἐφυγε δὲ Δημάρχους ἐκ Σπάρτης ἐς Μήδειας ἐκ τοιούτῳ ὑμείς, μετὰ τῆς Βασίλειας τὴν κατάπαυσιν ὁ Δη-

66. 4. προφορά. It was on the suggestion of Kleomenes that the question of fact was referred to Delphi. Cp. 

5. προσπαθεῖα. The intrigue of Kleomenes, Kobon, and Perianna throws suggestive light upon the sources of oracular inspiration in some cases. It can hardly be assumed that every such case was discovered and exposed. The implication of the Prophetess implies that her utterance was articulated. Cp. 

5. 92 supra.


9. ὡστέρας χρόνος. It is to be regretted that the date is not more specific. It may be inferred that the exposure did not ensue till after the flight of Demaratus from Sparta, otherwise it would be difficult to explain why he was not reimagined: albeit the discovery that the Pythia was corrupt would not ipso facto have proved that Demaratus was legitimate. The exile of Kobon, the deposition of Perianna, presumably synchronised with the 'retirement' of Kleomenes, c. 74 infra. If that preceded Marathon, then a fortiori must the flight of Demaratus have taken place before that event. But cp. Appendix VII, § 5.

67. ἡμέρα. How long after is not stated. If, as is probable, the Spartan civil year began in the autumn (cf. Thuc. 5. 36 for the year 421 B.C.), and if magistrates entered office at the beginning of the year, the insult to Demaratus could not be dated before the midsummer (July) 480 B.C. His deposition may have taken place in the summer of 491 B.C. and his election to an office, not specified, may have taken place before the beginning of the new year. Was he Ephor? and managing the Festival? (cf. Pintarch, Agesilaus, 29), or one of the five Biitiaeis, whose function it was τοις ἐπὶ τῶν Πλαταντῶν καλομένων καὶ ἅλλοις τῶν ἐφόβοις ἔγερας τὰ τότε, Pausan. Σ. 11, 2 (231). On the forms ἐρώτοι, ἐρώτοι see Gilbert, Handbuch, i. 28.) The γυμνοσταία were celebrated just after midsummer, cp. Thuc. 5. 82; Xen. Hell. 6. 4. 16. Leuktra was fought during the Festival (371 B.C.), Pintarch gives the day of the battle as the fifth of Hekatomiaion (Agesilaus, 28), and the news was brought to Sparta during the Festival (ib. c. 29, Xen. t. c.).

Ἡρώδιος has: Γυμνοσταίας οὓς μὲν ἐρωτῆς φασὶν παρατείνειν ἐσὶ τοῖς ἐφόβοις ἐς τὰ περπατήματα τῶν ἐν Ἀκμαίοις βασιλέων, τύπτοσι πάλιν ἄλλων τὰ ἐφόβοι, ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ φευγήν ἐν ἀγορᾷ γὰρ ἐν ἔρωτας ἐς τὸν κόσμον, πληθυνεῖ διὸ καὶ γένοισαι, ἄλλα πρόσωμα χωρίς γυμνοσταίας. Σωτιδας has: Γυμνοσταίας, χωρὶς ἐκ παθῶν ἐν Ἐπάργυρῃ τὴν Λακωνίαν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἔχοντες, εἰς τιμῆν τῶν ἐν Ἰωάννησι ἀποθανόντων Ἐπάργυρος. The connexion with the μονομαιαῖα in Thuryssos (cp. 1. 82) is probably fictitious. Xenophon and Pintarch, Ζ. ἐ. ἐ., place the scene in the theatre, as Herodotus ἐν. Pausanias 3. 11, 7 has: χωρὶς δὲ αὐτῶν ὁ ἄγος (ὁ Ἀγορὰς) καλεῖται ταῖς όπι ἐν ταῖς γυμνοσταίαις, ἐφόβη δ' ἐπὶ τῆς ἀλλη καὶ τῆς γυμνοσταίας διὰ στενῷ Ἀλεξανδροῦτος εἰς, τούτῳ τούτω δὲ ἐν ἐγραμμα
θορυβος ιπταται τω 'Αστάλλων. There were evidently gymnastic and musical exercises, and the transactions were not confined to one spot. Xen. Hell. 6. 4, 10 (γυμνοσαλαίως τε οὐσία τῆς τελευταίας και τοῦ ἀκόροντος) does not, however, prove absolutely that the Theatre was used only on the last day. Cp. Appendix VII. § 5.

5. ἔρηδε does not leave much interval between the deposition of Demaratos and the occasion described.


11. κακότητος. Cp. 8. 109. With the formula, cp. ἀρχί κακῶν Ἐλληνικὸς τε καὶ διακόρασι 5. 97 supra. It can hardly be said that the prophetic alternative of Demaratos was fulfilled.

12. δείπνοιν. This building may have been on the same site as the marble theatre, located by Pausan. 3. 14 to the east of the Agora.

13. τῷ Διώ, sc. τῷ ἑρέτῳ, god of the family and household. Demaratos had lost the priesthood of Zeos Δακεδαλίου or of Ζεως Οφραίου (cp. c. 56 supra) but he could still sacrifice in person to Zeos ἑρετεῖον in his own ἀλήθεια. (Cp. Preller, Gr. Mythologie, i. 3 ii. 117.)

10. οὕτω γὰρ, εἶπεν πεποίηκας τι τῶν λεγομένων, μούιν δὲ πεποίηκας, μετὰ πολλῶν δὲ ο τῶν λύγων πολλῶς ἐν Σπάρτῃ ὁς 'Αρί-
στούν σπέρμα παιδοποίον οὐκ ἔνην· τεκεῖν γὰρ ἂν οἱ καὶ τὰς προτέρας γυναῖκας· ὁ μὲν δὴ τοιαύτα ἔλεγε, ἢ δὲ ἀμείβετο 69 τοιοῦτο. "Ὣ παῖ, ἐπέειτε με λατρεύεις ἑπεῖπεν τὴν ἀληθείαν, πᾶν ἐσε καταφέρσεται τολμήσει. ὧς με λατρεύετο Αρίστων ἐσ ἐωστοῦ, νυκτὶ τρίτη ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἦθε λοῖς φάσμα εἰδόμενον Αρίστωνι, συνενθηνεν δὲ τοὺς στεφάνους τοὺς ἐξέ 5 ἐμοί περιείθεθα. καὶ τὸ μὲν ὦχίωκε, ἦκε δὲ μετὰ ταύτα Αρίστωνι, ὡς δὲ με εἰδὲ ἔχουσαν στεφάνους, εἰρήτα τῆς εἰς μοι οὐ δοὺς. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφάμην ἐκείνου, δὲ οὖκ ἐπεδεῖκτο. ἐγὼ δὲ καταμνώμενεν φαμένευν αὐτὸν οὐ ποιεῖν καλὸς ἀπαρνεόμενον· ὄλγην γὰρ τὸ προτέραν ἑλθόντα καὶ συνενθηνέντα δούμαε μοι τοὺς στεφάνους, τοὺς ὑπεραυλάζον δὲ με καταμνώμενον ὁ Αρίστων έμαθε ὡς θείοι εἰς τὸ πρήγμα. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν οἱ στεφάνους ἐφάμησαν ἐντες ἐκ του ἢρωοι τοῦ παρὰ τῆς θύρας τῆς αὐλής ιδρυμένον, τὸ καλέσοι Ἀστρόβακοι, τοῦτο δὲ οἱ μάντεις τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον ἢρωα ἁναίρεσιν εἶναι. οὔτω δὲ παῖ ἔχεις πάνω, ὅσον τι καὶ βουλεύα 15 πυθέσατε· ἡ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ ἢρωου τοῦτον ἔγεινα, καὶ τοι πατὴρ ἔστι Ἀστρόβακος ὁ ἢρως, ὁ Αρίστων· ἐν γὰρ σὲ τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ἁναίρεσιν. τῇ δὲ σε μάλιστα κατάπττονται οἱ ἐχθροὶ, λέγοντες ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀρίστων, ὅτε αὐτὸ σὺ ἡγελθής γεγενημένος, πολλῶν ἀκούστων οὖ φήσησι σε έωστο τούτω εἶναι (τῶν χρόνον ἡρ, τοὺς δέκα 20 μήνας, οὐδέκα εξήκεν), ἀδρεία τῶν τοιούτων κείνω τούτω ἀπέφυγε τὸ ἐπος. τίκτουσι γὰρ γυναῖκες καὶ ἐνεάρμηκα καὶ ἐπτάμηκα, καὶ οὐ πᾶσαι δέκα μήνας ἐκτελέσασαν· έγὼ δὲ σὲ ὁ

69. 4. φάσμα, 8. 84. ὄσ. ἐπιφάνεια 5. 92 π. συρρα, φαίνεται εἰς 106, 125 σύρρα. 11. ὑπεραυλάζον δὲ κτλ. Note the validity of the asseveration on oath. ὄσ. εἰς 86 σύρρα.
13. παρὰ τῆς. Demaratos and his mother were standing by the altar of Zeus Herkeios, just inside the gates of the courtyard. The stables and storehouses were probably hard by, with the chapel of Astrabakos, the patron of the Muleteers. Pausanias 3. 16, 6 (249) tells us all we know on the subject. It is evident that at some time the Agidae found room for Astrabakos (or Astrabakos) among their ancestors, for the story goes that Astrabakos and Alopekos, brothers in the fourth generation from Agis, found the θάνατον of Artemis Orthia, which was worshiped at Lakadaimon by human sacrifices till Lykurgos substituted flogging for death. This was evidenced to Pausanias that the θάνατον in Limnatis was the true θάνατον brought by Orestes and Iphigenia from Taurike. ὄσ. εἰς 103 π. σύρρα. Astrapakos and Alopekos went out of their minds (παραφθάναν) over the discovery. (icensing. ὄσ. εἰς 85 π. σύρρα.) The mythologists associate Alopekos with the fox, and Astrabakos with the surner-mule (ἀστράβα), associations which might suggest that these heroes were probably not models of purity. Wide (Lakonische Kulte, p. 279) follows Benzoller in explaining the name as= "One riding on a mule-saddle," and emphasizes the resemblance between Astrabakos and Dionysos.
22. τίκτουσι. Hippokrates, de Septimaeir, 1. p. 447, ed. Küh. quoted by Rawlinson, iii. p. 453 is even wilder: τίκτουσι καὶ ἐνεάρμηκα καὶ ἐνεάρμηκα καὶ ἐπτάμηκα καὶ ἐνεάρμηκα καὶ ἐπτάμηκα, καὶ τοῦτο τὰ ἐκτελέσασαν ὁ περιβενθα."

4. ὄρθισμον. Plutarch mentions a πάνω στάδιον invoked against Agis IV, which εἰς τὴν Ἡλεοκάλυμνον ἔχον γεωμετρικόν ἀλλοκάπτην τενόπιον, τῶν δὲ ἐκείθεν ἡ τῆς Σιθυρίας εἰς μετακινήσιν πρὸς ἔτη τῶν ἀποθεόθηκων κλητιά. (Αγίας c. 11). It cannot have been rigidly enforced, as the case of Doricus proves. But, if Demaratos was not son of Ariston, he was no Heraclid. Cp. however c. 76 supra.

5. Ζάκυνθον, 4. 195 supra.

7. μετὰ δὲ. The flight of Demaratos from Sparta seems to fall in the summer of 490 B.C. (or possibly in the year previous). The date of his arrival in Asia, of his reception by Dareios, is unfortunately obscure. From 7. 3 it might be argued that Demaratos presented himself in Susa after Marathon, and after the revolt of Egypt, but before the death of Dareios, say about 486 B.C. Rhesias seems to place his advent very shortly before the passage of the Hellespont (Gilmore, p. 155): if this indication were trustworthy it might be taken to refer simply to the moment (in 489 B.C.) when Demaratos may have come from Pergamos to join Xerxes at Abydos. But see next note.

10. γῆν τη καὶ πόλιας: Πέργαμου μὲν ἐκόσιον προσέλαβε (ὁ Ἐθμωρ) καὶ Τευτρασίας καὶ Άλεπρας, ἐν Εὐρυτάτῳ τε καὶ Πρεσλῆς ἑρῴων ὁ ἄνω Δημαράτου τοῦ Ἀδελαδέμονος τέκνον δ' ἀντί ἢ χώρας ἄωρον ἐκ βασιλείας ἐδόθη ἀπ' τὴν ἐκ τῆς Ἐλλάδος συντακτείας. (Χει. Πελ. 3. 1, 8). If Xenophon is right, the gift was not from Dareios, but from Xerxes, which, indeed, seems probable. Cp. the rewards to Histias and others 3. 11 supra and the beneficia to Themi-stokles from Artaxerxes, Thuc. 1. 138. The Troad was an alternative to Laconia, for if Xerxes had been victorious, presumably Demaratos would have returned to Sparta as 'Tyrant' of Lakedaimon, perhaps as Satrap of Pelo-ponnese or of Hellas. Cp. the dream of Pausanias, 5. 32 supra. The Procles above-mentioned took part in the expedition of Kyros the younger and is described by Xenophon, Anab. 2. 1, 3 Πρεσλῆς ὁ Τευτρασίας ἑρῴως, γεγονός ἀπὸ Δημαράτου τοῦ Δάκωνος: and in 7. 8, 17 as Πρεσλῆς ὁ Ἀλσάρων ὁ Τευτρασίας ὁ ἄνω Δημαράτου. Pythias, the daughter of Aristocles, was married to a Procles in this same family (the second of her three husbands) and had two sons by him, Procles and Demaratos, who became pupils of Theophrastos (Sext. Emp. ιρ. μαθηματικόν 258, Bekker, ed. 1842, p. 657). It is an obvious hypothesis that Hdt.'s anecdotes of Demaratos may in part be drawn from the family traditions at Pergamos.
12. ἀπολαμπρώθης. Hitherto he has appeared in Hdt.'s narrative in an unfavourable light, cp. cc. 51, 61 supra. But in exile he appears to serve his country better. Cp. 7. 239 et al.

Hdt. becomes obscure over the exploits of Demaratos. Does he mean to say that Demaratos was the only king of Sparta who ever won a chariot race at Olympia? Or does he mean to say that he was the only king who having won such a victory had it proclaimed in the name of the Lakadimonians, not in his own? (Cp. c. 103 infra, and Thuc. 5. 50.) There seems no possibility of dating exactly the victory of Demaratos ("zwischen 510 n. 491.") H. Förster, Die Olympischen Sieger, p. 11, or rather 508-492 n. c. =91. 68-72). The event may have been commemorated on an inscription. Cp. Introduction, pp. 167, 168, and 171. The grammar of the passage is not strict, ἀλα τε ἀπολαμπρώθης καὶ προσέβαλε is inconsequent, and the duplication of τε καὶ (ἔργασε τε καὶ γνώμης) is clumsy. ἀλα τε ἄστρα, καὶ τοῦτο, παιδάρια, Ὀλυμπιάδα . . . προσέβαλε would be more correct. The grammatical inconsequent is, however, Herodotean, cp. c. 74 ἱερά προσώγγων καὶ ἀρ. So 1. 85 ἐτυφραζόμενος καὶ ἐτετύφριμος, 3. 74 αὐτοὶ μὲν φάμονε καὶ τέσσερα τοῖς ἵλικον.

71. Κυνικαὶ The daughter of Archidamos was named Kyniska; she was the first woman that reared horses, and won a prize at Olympia (Pausan. 3. 15. 1).

5. Ἀρχιδάμιος. Archidamos succeeded his grandfather and father-in-law, though his own father never held the sceptre: what of the supposed law, put into the mouth of Demaratos, 7. 3? That law, if it existed at all, would only apply to cases where there was a number of sons of a reigning king.

6. Μενίας. Nothing is recorded of Menias and Diaktorides, brother and father of Eurydamus, though they are mentioned here apparently as well-known persons. Hdt. presumably is drawing on his Spartan sources. The aunt was younger, as appears, than the nephew. On close marriages at Sparta, cp. 7. 239.

From the passage it may be inferred that Archidamos was still alive when Hdt. wrote it. Leotychides died in 469 n. c., see next c. Archidamos died in 428 n. c. (Thuc. 3. 1, 89). It is quite obvious that Xenidamos must have been born before Leotychides became king in 491/0 n. c., for Archidamos who succeeded in 469 n. c. (Duncker, viii. 184) was probably born about 499 n. c. Leotychides who may have been born about 560 n. c., and was perhaps sixty years of age when he succeeded. Demaratos in 490 n. c., had a long life, and might well survive his son.

8. δόντος. It was not a runaway match as Demaratos' marriage had been c. 65 supra, but as it is hardly possible to suppose that the wedding of Archidamos and Lampido took place before 469 n. c., much less before 475 n. c., the act here referred to must have been a Betrothal, not an Espousal: the formula rather suggests the latter, cp. c. 130 infra.

72. ἅν μὲν ὑπό τινα λόγια. "Leotychides reached old age, but not in Sparta."
2. ὑστόν. Cp. c. 84 ἐνέργα, ad fin. ἑστρατήγησε κτλ. Rawlinson, iii. 3 p. 455, dates this expedition 478 B.C. (i.e. in the same year as the expedition of Pausanias to Kypros, Thuc. 1. 94). Duncker, viii. 62, dates it two years later 476 B.C., the year (= 477/6 B.C.) that witnessed the separate organization of the maritime Allies, and the victory of Eion (7. 107, Thuc. 1. 98), and connects it with the efforts made by Sparta to retain or recover her prestige and position by working in the area of the Amphiktyonic League against the 'Medizers' (cp. 7. 213). The return of Leotychides, his trial and exile, Duncker dates spring 475 B.C. Busolt, Πτ. η. ii. 353, agrees with Duncker's date. (In 'Ἀκ. νομ. c. 23 the formation of the League is dated to the year of Timosthenes, 478/7 B.C., perhaps a slight prochronism.)

8. ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίον ὑποκάθισε. Cp. Introduction, p. lxxvi. Doubtless Hdt. had heard in Sparta the more or less official account of the judicial condemnation of Leotychides; but was the story the truth, or the whole truth? It may fairly be doubted, both in the light of the story itself, and in the light of other similar stories, perhaps not less but more improbable. So much of Spartan history, especially of Sparta's internal history, is made up of the dis-honour of her kings! Duncker has pointed out more fully and clearly than any one else the suspicions attaching to the stories of the end of Kleomenes, Leotychides, Pausanias, the great and ambitious kings of the fifth century, who aimed perhaps at ruling instead of merely reigning. A powerful king was more dangerous to the Dorian oligarchy than a weak king, and success in foreign warfare was best calculated to enhance a king's power. If Leotychides had really 'conquered TheSSaly' he might have been more formidable to Sparta than as a victor of Mykale, especially with the other king a minor, and his guardian abroad. Leotychides was already (in 476 B.C.) a greybeard: but ambition and masterfulness no more than avarice decrease with years. The charge of corruption may have been justified, but Leotychides may still have been sacrificed as a dangerous politician. Hdt. does not go behind what he has been told: still less does he suspect any foul play in the death of Leotychides. It probably coincided with the federation of Arkadia against Sparta, cp. 9. 35, and it was surely no accident that Tegea was the refuge of the Spartan exile (cp. c. 74 ἐνέργα). The Persian war strained the constitution of Sparta almost to bursting and collapse. Success and failure were alike fatal. Foreign commands were dangerous, not so much to the integrity of the individual Spartan, as to the conditions of the oligarchic régime at home. Leotychides and Pausanias, the victor of Mykale, the victor of Plataea, were too great for an oligarchic state: they went the way of Kleomenes. Spartan traditions never betrayed the Spartan government; a king is always at hand as a scape-goat (cp. 5. 49-51). If Leotychides really succumbed to a bribe, Themistokles and Athenian interests may have had something to say thereto. Duncker assigns the proposal of Themistokles to destroy the Peloponnesian fleet at Pagasae to the winter 478/7 B.C. vol. viii. pp. 65 ff. Busolt, ii. 354 n., virtually endorses his combination. (One might be tempted to put it in 479 B.C., as the Peloponnesians came back from the Hellespont, cp. Thuc. 1. 89-93.)

73. 1. τὸν σκαρ. 54 carries back to the accession of Leotychides in 491 B.C., c. 5. supra. ἀνίκωσε places the seizure of the Αγίνην οὐκαταστάσεις and their in-
Δευτερίας ἦν ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπταῖς, δεινὸν τινὰ σφί ἔγκοτον διὰ τὸν προπλακισμὸν ἔχων. οὕτω δὴ ὡς σφί οἱ Αἰγυπταῖ ται, ἀμφότεροι τῶν βασιλέων ἥκοντον ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς, ἔδωκαν ἐν τινὶ ἀνυμίαν, 5 ἐκεῖνοι τε ἐπιλεξαμένοι ἀνήρ τις Δαυίδι, ἐδέξατο τῶν πλείστων ἄξιον καὶ πλούτον καὶ γένει ἦγον καὶ ἄλλους καὶ δὴ καὶ Κριῶν τε τῶν Πολυκρήτου καὶ Κάσσαμβου τοῦ 'Αριστοκράτους, οἱ περ ἐχθροῦ μέγατον κράτος' ἀμφότερος ὑπὲρ σφίτις εἰς ἄχον τὴν Ἀττικὴν παραβήκην παραπίθενται ἐν τοῖς ἐγκλήσιοι Αἰγυπτεῖς εἰς 'Αθηναίοις.

Μετὰ δὲ ταύτα Κλεομένα ἐπάσων ἐνεργοῦν κακοτεχνίτης 74 σαντα ἐν Δαμόρττον δείμα Ἠχαπε ναρατήτων, καὶ ὑπεξέχει γε Ἑσσαλίνην. ἐνεχέον ἐς ἀπίκομενος ἐς τὴν 'Ἀρκαδίνην νεώτερα ἐπήρησε πρήγματα, συνιστάς τοὺς Ἰ' Ἀρκαδός ἐπὶ τῇ Σπαρτῇ, ἄλλους ὑπὲρ ὑπό ταύν ἐκλογάων σφί ἡ ἔκενεν ἕνατα σφίς αὐτῷ τῇ 5

termination at Athens before the winter of 491/0 B.C.

4. ἀμφότερων. Notwithstanding the νῆσος 6, 75 supra. Cp. c. 89 infra. It would be an evasion to say that the kings were not come εἰς Ὀλύμπος ἐπιστρέφοντα. The Aiginetans at least regarded it as a hostile demonstration (ἐντὰς αὐτός) and yielded to a force majeure. That the kings of Sparta should be sent by the government to hand over ten of the principal men of the Dorian oligarchy to Athens, a democracy, seems to show that the Spartans were by this time fully alive to the danger of a Persian invasion, the restoration of 'tyrannies' under Persian auspices, perhaps the establishment of the tyranny in Sparta itself, the revival of Argos, the reappearance of the Phoenician in Thera and Kythera. Had not Sparta, if the story in 7. 133 be true, already thrown the Persian heralds into the Kaiadas? The action of Korinth at this juncture is not recorded at Sparta, nor at Athens: but it is safe to conjecture that Korinth at this crisis was with them, cp. c. 89 infra.

5. Κριῶν, c. 50 supra.

6. Κάσσαμβου. Nothing is ascertainable about this man, remarkable as is his name.

10. παραβήκην. The word is not used elsewhere, but smooths the way for the wondrous argument put into the mouth of Leotychides, c. 86 infra. How long these hostages remained in Athens, how they were treated, who had them in charge, what finally became of them; on these vital questions Hdt. apparently felt no curiosity. Cp. c. 81 infra and Appendix VIII. § 5.

74. 1. μετὰ. How long after? Before or after the battle of Marathon? If the exile of Demaratos fell into the year 490 B.C. July (cp. c. 69 supra) and occasioned the exposure of Kleomenes, his flight to Thessaly may have taken place before Marathon, and these domestic troubles may help to account for the inaction and inconsequence of the Spartans in September 490 B.C., cp. c. 106 infra. The intrigue of Kleomenes in Arkadia, his restoration, insanity, and supposed suicide would follow, but surely not before the battle of Marathon. The way to Persia was barred to the conqueror of Argos by the start Demaratos had gained on him, and perchance by his part in the reception of the heralds of Dareios. What Demaratos (as Pausanias afterwards) hoped to effect from Susa, Kleomenes may have hoped to effect from Nonakris. The visit to Thessaly might have been connected with an idea of reviving the Amphiktyony against Sparta: but Kleomenes was discredited at Delphi. The old Arkadian League offered him the weapon, and Leotychides afterwards attempted to employ it again, c. 72 supra.

5. Σρακος. On the force of oaths, cp. c. 62 supra. And on Styx as an Σρακος, Homer, Od. 5. 185.

προσάγων . . καὶ . . ἦν. Cp. c. 70 supra.
δὲν ἔζηγένται, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐς Νώνακρων πόλιν πρόθυμος ἦν τῶν Ἀρκάδων τοὺς προεστεώτατοι ἀγνεῶν ἐξορκοῦν τὸ Στυγάσος ὑδαρ. εἰ δὲ ταῖτη τῇ πόλις λέγεται ἐναι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀρκάδων τὸ Στυγάσος ὑδαρ, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐστὶ τοιοῦτθε τῷ ὑδαρ ἄλωνοι φαινόμενοι εἰκέ
75 πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Ἀρκαδίης πρὸς Φενεό. μαθόντες δὲ Κλεομένε
Δακεδαμωνίων ταῦτα πρόσγοντα, κατήγγον αὐτὸν δεῖσαντες ἐπὶ τοῦτο αὐτοῦ ἔς Σπάρτην τοῦτο καὶ πρότερον ἤγετε. κατεδώντα δὲ αὐτὸν αὐτίκα ὑπέλαβε μαῖνι νοῦς, ἐστὶ καὶ πρότερον
5 ὑπομαργύρωτεν· διὸς γὰρ τετυγχοὶ Σπαρτιστέων, ἐνέχραις ἐς τὸ πρόσωπον τὸ σχήμπτρον. ποιεῖται δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα καὶ παρα-
φοράνσαντα ἔθους αἱ προσήκοντες ἐν ξύλῳ· ὁ δὲ διεβίω τῶν φύλακων μονωθέντα ὕδων τῶν ἄλων αὐτίκοι μάχαιραι· οὐ
βουλομένου δὲ τὰ πρῶτα τοῦ φύλακον διδομένα ἄπειλε νὰ μὲν
10 αὐτῶς ποιεῖται, ἐς δὲ δεισαι τάς ἀπειλὰς ὁ φύλακος (ὃν γὰρ τῶν τῆς ἐλλωτῶν) διδοὶ οἱ μάχαιραι. Κλεομένης δὲ παραλαβὼν τῶν σιδηρῶν ἀρχετὸ ἐκ τῶν κυνηγῶν ἐσωτοῦ λωβόμενον· ἐπιτάμουν γὰρ κατὰ μῆχος τὰς σάρκας προέβαινε ἐκ τῶν κυνηγῶν ἐκ τῶν μυρῶν, ἐς δὲ τῶν μυρῶν ἐς τὰ νεῖσχα καὶ τὰς λαπάρας, ἐς δὲ ἐς τῆς γαστέρας ἀπέκειτο, καὶ ταῖτην καταχορδεῖν ἄπεικεν τρόπο
τοιοῦτο, ὡς μὲν οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσι Ἑλλήνων, ὅτι τὴν Πυθέην.

6. Νώνακρων. Far to the north of Arkadia in the district of Azania (cp. c. 127 infra), the home of Arkadian independence. There at the tomb of Aipyts, first king of the land, was perhaps the focus for a confederation (cp. Iliad 2. 603-614), which Kleomenes now sought to revive in an anti-Dorian and anti-Spartan interest. Cp. E. Curtius, Peloponnesos, i. p. 163, and History of Greece, E. T. II. p. 205. 9. καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐστὶ τοιοῦτα τὰ. Ἡδ. writes almost as if he had been in Nonakres, though the critical λέγαν τι (cp. 4. 184) may infect the whole sentence, and he by no means describes the waterfall of the Styx in adequate terms. Cp. the autopsy of Pausanias, 8. 17, 5. 18. 2, and for modern references, Rawlinson, note ad l. Add Wordsworth’s Greece, ed. Tozer, p. 384; Curtius, Peloponnesos, i. 196; Bursian, Geogr. v. Griechenland, ii. 262. Van Herwerden reforms the text by omitting τῶν and τὸ Στυγάσος ὑδαρ first time, and inserting τε after λέγαν 

75. 2. ἐν τοῖς νυχτ. The words support the view that the royal institution at Sparta was based on a contract. Cp. c. 52 supra. 4. αὐτίκα. He did not long survive his return. 5. ὑπομαργύρωτον. In 5. 42 supra he has been described as ὁ φερήσῃς ἀντιμανὶ τε ενεχράζει before his accession. 6. τὸ σχήμπτρον. His badge of office. Cp. Iliad 2. 109-108. 7. προσήκοντες. Cp. c. 57 supra (τοῦ μισλωτάς σφ. . . προσήκοντας). But is it credible that relatives could attach the king’s person, without intervention of Ephors or Gerousia? 15. τῶν φύλακων. This single helot, left to guard the mud king in the stocks, must have reported the conversation, but not till all was over with Kleomenes. With some of the details, cp. the story of Hegesistratos 9. 37. (On the form φύλακας cp. L. & S.) 15. ἀπέκειτο τρόπο τοιοῦτο. There was apparently no doubt anywhere entertained that Kleomenes died by his
own hand under the most horrible circumstances. Every one accepted the Spartan account of the facts, which was necessarily an official account, and the only one available. But it was generally felt that some signal explanation was necessary of the king’s fate. There are on record five rival hypotheses in explanation of the king’s end: the pan-Hellenic (Delphian), the Athenian, the Argive, the Spartan, the author’s own. Some of the conjectures betrayed local prejudices (as the Athenian, the Argive), though the majority of the Hellenes agreed that the unpardonable sin of Kleomenes was his corruption of the pan-Hellenic centre of inspiration. Hdt., however, prefers a more exact and personal illustration of the lex talionis. Cp. c. 84 infra. Oddly enough, the Spartans took a purely natural view of cause and effect in this instance, c. 84 infra. Hdt. has left it to Pausanias 3. 4. 6 to point out that the five hypotheses are all recombilable; though the modern will be tempted to add that this harmony is far from proving the truth of any.

17. τὰ περὶ Δ. It is not actually asserted what was said was false; even the truth may be told corruptly. It is obvious, however, that the posterny of Demaratus considered themselves genuine Herakleids. Cp. c. 70 supra.

γνώμα τοις. Gomperz.

18. ἐς Ελευσίνα, c. 5. 74 supra. The circumstance of the sacrilege is not mentioned in that place. The Athenians had another ἀδείαμα to report of Kleomenes (c. 72 supra).

τῶν θεῶν. Demeter and the Kora.

19. ὡς τὰ Ἀργεῖοι. The Argives may have assigned this cause for the doom of Kleomenes, but the story of the outrage which follows is not derived from Argive sources, and it is fair to remark that the assignment of these reasons to the Argives, the Athenians and “the majority of Hellenes,” might be a fair result of inference on Hdt.’s part to the probabilities, or prophecies, of the case. Cp. Introduction, pp. lxxviii ff.

76. 2. ηπότα. The war between Sparta and Argos here narrated is unfortunately not dated by Hdt., who treats it merely as an episode in the biography of Kleomenes. Pausanias 3. 4. 1 places it immediately after the accession of Kleomenes (and Manto, Sparta, i. i. 308, ii. 329, actually dated it to 519 b.c. So too even Curtius, Gr. G. iii. p. 889 and reff.). It has been placed by others later, but still before the close of the sixth century; about 610 b.c. (Smith, Dict. Biogr. s. v. Kleomenes) or 506 b.c. i.e. between the retreat from Eleusis and the application of Aristogoras in Sparta.

The formal and material arguments against the earlier and in favour of a later date, are numerous and strong:

(1) The oracle associates the Argive war with the Ionian revolt and the capture of Miletus. This is a prima facie proof that the events were nearly synchronous, quite independent of the question whether the double-barrelled Pythonian shot was a genuine prophecy. It is enough that before Hdt.’s time the capture of Miletus in 494 b.c. and the Argive war of Kleomenes were associated together at Delphi. Cp. c. 19 supra. (2) G. 500 b.c. Aristogoras urges the Spartan king μάχεσ ἀναβαλλεμένη πράγμα τε Μεσσηνίων ἐστίς έπαλέας καὶ Ἀργείους τε καὶ Ἀργείους 5. 49 supra, which would have been rather beside the mark if the king had just put Argos hora de combat by a crushing defeat. (3) An impending war with Argos explains much better than a recent victory the refusal of the Spartans in 499 b.c. to assist the Ionians. Cp. the exactly parallel case half-a-century earlier, i. 81 ff. 152. (4) The hypothesis that the defeat of Argos fell out about the same date as the capture of Miletus, 494 b.c., rather than ten or twenty years earlier, fits in
much better with what is recorded in the words and deeds of the Argives in 481 B.C. (7, 149, 149), where they excuse their neutrality on the ground of their recent loss in the war with Kleomenes. (5) Sikyon and Aigina appear as allies of Sparta. Aigina joined 516 B.C., Sikyon in 506 B.C. (Duncker, 1. c. infras against Pausanias). Cp. Grote, iv. p. 10 n.; Duncker, vii. 5 p. 72; Busolt, ii. 48. Cp. Clinton, ii. 537 note x, who does not date the war “about 510 B.C.” as erroneously said (Smith, Dict. Biogr. i. 783), but the floruit of Telesilla, (cp. Clinton, ad ann.).

Σπαρτασανα. The Spartan tradition completely ignores assistance or allies; but c. 92 infras shows that Aigina and Sikyon at least took part in it, even if the συμμάχων στρατιά in Pausan. 3. 4. 1 is an error (Busolt, ii. 49 n.). Anyway, it is hardly to be supposed that this war was undertaken on the sole initiative of the king, or kings (c. 56 infras). The Delphic direction would weigh more with the Spartans generally (cp. 5. 63) than with Kleomenes, who knew how to procure such things. The strategy may have been of Kleomenes, the policy was Sparta’s.

3. λέγεται, cp. c. 74 infras. Hdt. does not write as though he had been in Argos: his doubt, however, might be on the connexion of the river with the lake. The Stymphalos Limne is in N.E. Arkadia, under Mt. Kyllene, and emptied through a katavothra or subterranean channel: the drainage there is to the Gulf of Corinth. The river Erasinos issues from Mt. Chaon and flows into the Gulf of Argos, S.W. of the city. The distance between the two points may be some 25 or 30 miles E. as the crow flies, but not as the water flows. Diodorus 15. 49 gives it as 290 stades (= c. 39 miles), and Rawlinson note on 7. says this is 20 miles short. It seems difficult to believe that the waters of the Erasinos really flow out of the lake of Stymphalos, and it is noticeable that Hdt. by no means commits himself to that theory, generally prevalent in ancient and modern times. The Arkadian water with almost this single exception finds its way westwards. Cp. Bursian, Geogr. v. Gr. ii. 186.

7. ἀθηρός, the river god. His daughters, Ἀθηρίας, lib. 40 (“sonst unbekannt,” Schultz apud Roscher, Lexikon, sub v.), would be water-nymphs, like the Danaids. The sacrifice was, perhaps, something less than a bull. Cp. c. 56 infras.

ἐκκαλλιέρεις. The διαστάσεως were unfavourable—as when Pausanias did not choose to cross Asopus, 9. 36. That there were other reasons for the strategic action in each case is more than probable. If when Kleomenes reached the Erasinos there were from six to eight thousand Argive hoplites on the opposite bank, the ‘citizens’ who were ‘saved by the Erasinos’ were not all Argives. But cp. note infras.


It may be permissible to add that I well remember the late Rector of Lincoln College (Mark Pattison), in a conversation on “Greek wit,” citing this jest as one of the best mops in the literature.

11. τῇ δελόστῳ, presumably Poseidon.
Prophecy less obscure. It does not, however, follow that "it is hopeless to attempt a rational explanation of this oracle:" on the contrary, rational explanations are not far to seek.

A. Favourable to Argos. She of Argos shall defeat and drive out him of Lakessalmon, but it will cost the Argive women dear: 'twill be a Kadmean victory: posterity will account that day the ruin of Argive power. The only doubt that could arise would be: who was the female of Argos: but the goddess (Hera) supplies the answer.

B. Unfavourable to Argos. Sparta (female) shall conquer Argos (male)," (but see infra). The women of Argos shall make lamentation. Posterity will date the ruin of Argos from that day. The only obscurity left in this case lies in the word Ἐξόρησις. In neither case is it easy to see how the oracle should arouse a suspicion of a ruse or trick, though a trick was certainly perpetuated on the Argives.

Taking either of these interpretations the oracle would be a remarkable prediction, and substantially consonant with the event. The first interpretation, however, promises victory of a kind to Argos for which there is no room or justification in the narrative of Hdt., unless indeed the first lines be applied to the expulsion of Kleomenes by Hera (c. 82 infra), and form a sort of ὁπρος προπρος. The second interpretation leaves nothing to be desired but an explanation of Ἐξόρησις, and even this might be found by referring Ἐξόρησις to Hera, and quoting c. 82 infra, as above. The authenticity and genuinely prophetic character of the response will then stand and fall with the credibility of the events narrated in c. 82 infra. They are incredible, see notes ad loc. c.

C. There is a third possible explanation of the oracle, which leaves no
πολλάς Ἀργείων ἀμφίδρυφας τότε θήσει.

Διὸ ποτὲ τις ἱστεῖ καὶ ἐπεσομένως ἀνδρῶν

"δεινὸς ὄφης ἄδληκτος ἀπώλετο δουρὶ δαιμονίας."

tainta di πάντα συνελθοῦντα τοῖς Ἀργείωις φόβων παραίγει.

καὶ δὴ σφὶ πρὸς ταῦτα ἐδέξε τῷ κήρυκι τῶν πολέμων χρᾶσθαι,

δόξαν δὲ σφὶ ἐποίεισ τοιῶνδε· διὸς ὁ ᾿Σπαρτινῆς κήρυξ προ-

σημαίνω τι Δακεδαιμονίωι, ἐποίειν καὶ οἱ Ἀργείωι τῶντο τοῦτο.

obscureity whatever. This explanation, however, involves the conclusion that for the truth, the whole truth, we must look elsewhere than to the story of the Argive war as told by Hdt. In this explanation the female of Argos becomes Teleilla the poetess, who, according to another tradition, with the women of Argos succeeded in driving Cleomenes out of the town, after he had defeated the men of Argos in a pitched battle. This story is indeed "incompatible with the statements of Herodotus," but it does not follow that Grote is right in concluding that "the story probably grew up out of the oracle itself." It is possible that the oracle grew up out of the story, and that the story was substantially true. So Clinton, Fast. Hell. ii.3 p. 21, 510 n. c., after quoting the authorities for the exploit of Teleilla (Plutarch, Vitr. Mul. p. 245 d e, Pausanias 2, 20, 8), adds: "Herodotus confirms the fact by recording the oracle to which it gave occasion." The oracle is plainly a catilinum post censum in Clinton's opinion. That the traditions in Pausanias and Plutarch are from an Argive source (Sokrates of Argos), while the story in Hdt. is in the main Spartan, is a further suggestion of Duncker's, which helps to explain the discrepancies. The fact that Sokrates was a late author does not make it improbable that traditions preserved through him are primitive or early: every one now sees that we are largely indebted to the latest authors (Strabo, Pausanias, Plutarch et al.) for our knowledge of primitive and early traditions, legends, myths, customs, and historic facts.

D. Two other interpretations suggest themselves as explaining the origin of the response—either of which gives a much clearer sense and application: (a) Assuming that ἡ θήλεια means Hera, and so Argos, the verses might refer to war between Argos and Epidauros, with which place the serpent was early associated. Asklepios, if not himself actually a serpent, might be represented by a serpent. Cp. Head, Hist. Num. 360, Mahly, Die Schlange im Mythus etc., p. 8. (b) Finally, it may be asked whether this oracle had originally anything to say to Argos and Hera, much less to Cleomenes or Teleilla, at all! The ὄφη was notoriously associated with Athene (4. 189 supra, cp. 8. 41, 55), and the victory of the female over the male was her victory (Erchtheus, Erichthonios = Poseidon on the one side, and the ὄφη or ὄρχησις on the other). The transfer of this old enigma to Argos may have been facilitated by the Homeric use of the word Ἀργεία. It is not unlikely that the Delphic versifiers had a stock of such ready-made riddles on hand.

13. δεινὸς, though found in Hdt. coupled with σοφὸς, in epic or oracular language must be taken in its older meaning 'dread.' ὄφη. Stein interprets as the crest or symbol of Argos, the enchorial hero ('Ἀργείφυστης = ὄφωτος). Cp. Soph. Ant. 125, Eurip. Phoen. 1137. As Busolt remarks (Gr. G. 1.3 214 n.) the proper crest of the city of Argos was the wolf, or wolf's-head (cp. Head, Hist. Num. p. 366); but that would hardly be a reason against interpreting the ὄφη here to stand for Argos. And it may be added that Sepelia, or Hespeia, is another point of suggestion between the oracle and the event (εὖς = ὄφη).

ἄδληκτος (á intensive), the better reading, may be taken as equivalent to the vulgate τρεληκτος.


16. προσημαίνω. The signal may have been given by a horn or trumpet. Cp. L. & S.3 19 ν. σημαίνω, Π. 2.
μαθὼν δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ποιεύτας τοὺς Ἀργείους ὁκούς τῷ 78 σφέτερος κύριος σύμμετρα, παραγγέλλει σφί, ὅταν σημάρη ὁ κύριος παιδεύσας ἄριστον, τοῦτο ἀναλαμβάνεται τὰ ὀπλὰ χορέει ἐν τούς Ἀργείους, ταῦτα καὶ ἐγγένετο ἐπίτηδε ἐκ τῶν Δακεδαμονίων ἄριστον γὰρ ποιεύμενοι τοὺς Ἀργείους ἐκ τοῦ κηρυγμάτος 5 ἐπεκέατο, καὶ πολλοὶ μὲν ἐφόνευσαν αὐτῶν, πολλοὶ δὲ τί πλείνας ἐστὶ ἄλογον τοῦ Ἀργού καταφυγόμενοι περιμόνευοι ἐφύλασσαν, ἐνζητοῦν δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ἐποίησε τοιοῦτον. ἂχων αὐτομόλους ἄδρας 79 καὶ πυνθανόμενοι τούτων, ἐξεκάλει πέμπτον κηρύκα ὁμομαστή λέγων τῶν Ἀργείων τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀπεργίμενοι, ἐξεκάλει δὲ φᾶς αὐτῶν ἡξει τὰ ἄτονα. ἄτονα δὲ ἐστὶν Πελοποννησίους δύο μνέα τεταγμένα καὶ ἄδρα αἰχμάλωτον ἐκτίνευσεν. κατὰ πεντῆ- 5 κοινὰ δὴ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀργείων ὡς ἐκάστους ἐκκαλεύμενον ὁ Κλεομένης ἐκτείνει. ταῦτα δὲ κως γινόμενα ἐκλεῖθη τοῖς λαϊκοῖς τούς ἐν τῷ τεμένει ἄτε γὰρ πυκνού ἔνοτος τοῦ ἄλοσος, οὐκ ἄροιν οἱ ἐντὸς τοῦ ἑκτοῦ δὲ ἐπηρήσαν, πρὶν γε δὴ αὐτῶν τις ἀναβάς ἐπὶ δεύτερον κατεύχει τὸ ποιεύμενον. οὔκοιν δὴ ἐκι σημα- τικοῦ μενεὶ ἐξίσου, ἐναυῶτα δὴ ὁ Κλεομένης ἐκέλευε πάντα 80 τινὰ τῶν ἐλπίζων περινείων ἢ ἄλοσοι, τῶν δὲ πεπθαμένων ἐνεπηρήσα τὸ ἄλοσος. καλομένου δὲ ἢδη ἐπείρετο τῶν των αὐτομολούν τίνος εἰς θεὸν τὸ ἄλοσος· δὲ ἐφη Ἀργοῦ εἶναι. δὲ ὡς ἥκουσε, ἀναστενάξας μέγα ἐπη ὁ Ἀπόλλων χρυστήριον, 5

78. 2. παραγγέλλει. How the παράγγελσι in a Spartan army would be carried out is explained by Thucydidus, 5. 66. Cp. Xenoph. Ev. Lac. xii. 6. 4. ταύτα. According to another account, which well illustrates the casuistry of swearing, Kleomenes fooled the Argives by a device more discrétiable to him than to them. Having agreed to a truce for seven days he attacked them on the third night (Plutarch, Apophth. Lac. Kleom. = Mor. 223). Being reproached for a breach of faith he replied that the nights had not been included in the oath: ἄλογον τε καὶ ὅ τι ἐν κακῶς τοις πολεμοῦντο τούτο καὶ παρὰ θεῶν καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις διέστη ῥήτερον κοιτισθεῖ— a sophistication which cuts at the root of all truces. See further, 4. 201 supra. The two stories are not strictly incompatible, but either is enough to explain the event; and the Herodotean looks rather like a Spartan version devised to disguise the king's breach of faith.

79. 1. αὐτομόλους ἄδρας suggests that treachery too was at work. They could hardly have furnished him with the names of all the six thousand, or even the majority (πολλὸς δὲ τί πλεύσας), but they might have given fifty names. The herald, a sacred personage, was not necessarily privy to the deceit; unless he was sent in to call each one separately.

4. ἄτονα. The tariff was not confined to the Peloponnesos, cp. 5. 77 supra.

7. ἑλέβας. The passage is a curious anticipation of the story in Thucydidus, 3. 81. 4. 47 f.

80. 5. ἀναστενάξας μέγα ἐπη. The sudden conversion of this impious madman, who knew that oracles could be purchased, and afterwards bought one (c. 66 supra), had just forewarned himself, had lied through the sacred lips of the herald, had committed sacrilege at Athens (c. 72 supra), at Eleusis (c. 75 supra), and presently recommits it in the Heraion (c. 82 infra), who was indeed consciously committing one at this moment in firing a sacred grove, to a conviction of the fulfilment of prophecy, and of a shaping of his conduct thereto, would be more credible
if (1) there did not exist, outside Herodotus, a tradition of the Spartan king's conduct on this occasion, more consonant with probability, and (2) if there were not forthcoming an obvious explanation of the silence of Hdt. and of the origin of the Herodotean story, The story here is “the official Spartan” (Duncker, vii. 75, Busolt, ii. 49 notes), or at any rate it is a pragmatic version, in which the facts have been manipulated in a way to suit Spartan interests and honour. Cf. notes on c. 82 infra.

81. 2. ἀπόθεσις ἀνθρώπων. Cf. c. 62 supra ad fin. Why Kleomenes should have been in such a hurry to dismiss the army, before making an attempt on the city, keeping a picked thousand (άρχικα, poetical), more than enough for protection, and less than enough for a storm or a siege, is not adequately explained even by the story which follows in c. 82, for the truth of which Hdt. declines to be responsible.

3. τῷ Ἡραίῳ. The temple of Argive Hera was not in the city, but situate some 45 stadia from Argo (op. 1. 31) across the plain, eastwards, on the spur of the mountains. Cf. Strabo, 366; Pausan. 2. 17; Bursian, Geogr. Gr. ii. 47; Baeckler, Greece p. 255; and especially Waldstein, Excavations at the Heraion of Argo, No. i. (1892). The Heraion entered by Kleomenes was burnt down in the summer of 423 B.C. (Thuc. 4. 183). The new temple was a little lower down the hill, but not enough to affect the measurements of distance.

4. ἄτυχότητα. The incident recalls the similar adventure on the Athenian Acropolis. Kleomenes had treated the Athenian lady with more courtesy than the Argive priest, 5. 72. But where was the priestess of Hera (1. 31) on this occasion?

82. 2. εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας. Kleomenes had enemies in Sparta: who were they? Were not Demaratos and his partisans among them? Cf. Appendix VII. §§ 5, 9.

Φόρουσα. The king, even in the days of Kleomenes, is admittedly responsible (ισχυοῦσα) for the military conduct of affairs in the field; yet we are asked to believe that the Spartan king could still at this time decide questions of peace and war (c. 56 supra), i.e. of policy. It is, however, very doubtful whether the Ephors alone constituted the court, which was more probably composed of the Gerousia, Ephors, and perhaps the other king. Cf. Pausanias 3. 5, 2 (ἀπὸ τοῦ προφέρου, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑορωνομοῦν δικαστήριον τοὺς ἑορωνομούν γράφεται ἐκεῖ καὶ ἔχειν δύτας ἀρχηγούς, καὶ τὸν ἑορωνομοῦν ἄρχῃ, εἰς δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν φόρουσαν βασιλεία τῆς ἑτέρας. Cf. Gilbert, Staatsalt. i. 2 p. 60 and c. 85 infra.

Ὑποδοθέωμα. Ἑρωδοτός was the convenient hypothesis to explain all miscarriages of arms or of justice (cp. c. 72 supra); but judging by Kleomenes' other acts he was capable of taking the gifts and Argos too.

3. εἰς τοὺς. From a military point of view the criticism seems just. At least there was nothing earthly to excuse Kleomenes for omitting to make
an attempt on the city, in the events as reported to Herodotus.

13. ὁ θεὸς. ὁ θεὸς might have been expected, but op. c. 27 supra. The ἄγαλμα which Kleomenes saw was perhaps the ἄγαλμα ᾿Ηραίων ὠρα ῥήμα τοῦ ἄγαλμαν ὁ θεὸς ἔβαλεν ἐπὶ κατ᾽ ἀκρης τὴν πόλιν, ἐκ τῶν στηθέων δὲ λάμψαντος πάν ὁ πε- ποίησας ὅσον ο ἄγαλμα βούλετο γενέσθαι. ταῦτα λέγειν πιστὰ τε καὶ οἰκτῶ λέγεται Σπαρτισυπήγον λέγειν, καὶ διέθυκεν πολλὰς τῶν διώκοντας.

14. διήγημα. From the emphasis which Hdt. lays on the statement it may be inferred that Kleomenes on his return from the Argive campaign was really brought to trial by Demaratos, or others, for failing to capture the city, and that the story of the portent in the Hesion was one of the pleas set up in defence, and helped to procure, or to excuse, his acquittal. It may also be conjectured that the oracles above given (cc. 76, 77) did duty upon this occasion, and may even have been procured by Kleomenes for the very purpose, perhaps through his friends, the αὐτοῖς ἄρος, perhaps direct from Delphi. Hera had driven Kleomenes out by the flames of fire from her breast, but still he had won a great victory, the fame of which would be on the lips of posterity, for valour, not for guile.

In the story of the Argive campaign we have, therefore, a more or less official account of the affair, and an explanation, satisfactory to the Spartan government and folk (πιστὰ ἠκὼ καὶ οἰκτῶ), of the failure to capture Argos after a victory in the field. Those who cannot share the Spartan view of the verisimilitude of the defence of Kleomenes, should be driven to the hypothesis of δωροθεία, if there were no other alternative forthcoming. The Argive tradition supplies one, according to which Kleomenes, as was to be expected, after his victory advanced against the city, but was repulsed by the valour of the Argive women headed by Telesilla. That this account in its turn contains exaggerations, is very likely; the question however is whether it does not contain some matter of fact, ignored conveniently in the story told at Sparta. Women have taken part in military operations, especially defensive and siege operations, or street-fighting (cp. Thuc. 3. 74), and it was on a similar occasion in Argos that Pyrrhos received a fatal blow at a woman's hand, Plutarch, Pyrrh. 84. That Demaratos played a part in the Argive war, entered the town, and was obliged to retire, is also a point in the tradition which cannot be dismissed as improbable (Plutarch, Virt. Mul. 4). It would have been a fresh ground of enmity between the kings, especially if Demaratos had reason to suspect that Kleomenes had deliberately left him in the lurch. The presence of Demaratos would be difficult to reconcile with the law recorded 5. 70 supra, and there dated c. 508 n.c. if the Argive war is correctly dated to 495/4 n.c. or to any year after the fiscus of Kleusis. But it is more than reasonable to suppose that the law is incorrectly dated, and that it was really passed, if ever formally passed, on this later occasion, which should be inserted in the recital, c. 64 supra, ad fin. Op. Appendix VII. § 10. That the Argive tradition is simply a product of Argive vanity in later times, as Manno suggests (Sparta, i. ii. pp. 292 ff.), moved thereto by the silence of Herodotus, is a conclusion based on an imperfect appreciation of the sources and methods of our author. Manno, indeed, argued that Telesilla and the women had the will to defend the city, but were not called upon to act, because a bribe did their business. That the action of the women was exaggerated, that it was put afterwards into an artificial relation to the ancient
festival of the Hybstiks (Plutarch, Mor. 245), that there were still men left to defend the town—all that is likely enough. What is more improbable is that the Spartans after a great victory, and after an expectation of the total destruction of Argos, should have turned back without attempting the town. The matter is fully discussed by Duncker, viii. 72 ff., and his suggestions virtually accepted by Busolt, ii. 48 ff. It should be remembered that Clinton, Fasti, ad an. 610 n. c., and Thirlwall, Hist. ii. 291 ff., accept the (Argive) traditions as substantially true. On the actual losses of the Argives see next chapter.

83. 1. άνδρων (cp. 4. 1 supra). Elsewhere incidentally Hdt. gives the exact number as 6000 (7. 148), Pausanias (3. 4, 1) as under 6000. The later Argive tradition gave 7777, a number the absurdity but not the origin of which was perceived by Plutarch (Virt. Mul. 4 = Mor. 245). The last number may have been derived from sacral sources, in connection with the 'Hybstiks, which was brought into artificial relation to the exploit of the Argive women against the Spartans, and to the same ultimate source (in Semitic ritual) may be due the number seven in the truce of Kleomenes and the Argives, and in the day of the month ("the seventh," Aristot. Pol. 8. 3, 7, 1303\*), Plutarch, l. c.), on which the battle was fought, according to tradition. So Duncker. The most modest estimate is probably the truest, though Argos might probably have survived a loss of even 6000 hoplites. Accurate estimates of the Argive citizens are for a later period. Cp. Beloch, Die Bevölkerung der Gr. Röm. Welt, pp. 116 ff., Clinton, Fasti, ii. 2, p. 517.

οί δειλοί. This remarkable but brief notice of the Servile Interregnum at Argos can hardly be other than an exaggeration and misconception of the relations between (Dorian) Argos and the Perioiki (Orneatae, 8. 73) brought about by the great disaster on the seventh, and the consequent changes in the political constitution of the state (cp. Plutarch, Mor. 245). Tiryns (and Mykenae) may, perhaps, be regarded, by this time, as strongholds of the non-Dorian elements in Argolis. (Busolt, Gr. G. i. 213 f., 214 f. appears to regard them as "originally" under Dorian dynasties. Tiryns however soon becoming dependent on Argos, Mykenae not so.) The victory of Kleomenes had benefited these places directly or indirectly: they recovered independence. Though Argos was neutral in the Persian war, Mykenae and Tiryns sent hoplites to Platea, 9. 28, and their names were inscribed on the τραχνορας δρόμος, 9. 81. Cp. Hicks, Manual, No. 12, Dittenberger, Syllog., No. 1. But Argos was nursing her strength during her long neutrality: in the war which ensued, though Argos may have had hard work (μάχης), yet Mykenae and Tiryns were practically annihilated (c. 465 n. c. Duncker, viii. 123 n., 125). Busolt, ii. 371, 376 n., 377, 440, asserts, with probability, the reduction of Tiryns from the reduction of Mykenae, dating the latter c. 465 b. c.) The defeat in 494 b. c. may also have left its mark upon the inner constitution of Argos, and the 'servile régime' may betoken not merely the emancipation of the Perioiki (Aristot. 8. 3, 7, 1303 \*), but the enfranchisement of a goodly number in Argos itself, with the inevitable result of a development of democracy, which remained practically a permanent characteristic of Argos, whatever its relations to other centres in Argolis. Thus the victory of Sparta 494 b. c. was in the long run fatal to Spartan, to Dorian, to oligarchic interests in Argos, and Argos becomes thereafter a focus for the democratic propaganda and a centre for anti-Spartan intrigues in the Peloponnesus, the clearest, but by no means the only, glimpse of which we obtain, for a much later period, in Thuc. 5. 27 ff. (c. 460). Busolt, Forschungen (1880), pp. 75 ff. For τάρα τά τρίγυμα cp. Thuc. 2. 65, 4.
ἄλλης εἰς, ἐπείτα δὲ ἐς τοὺς δούλους ἦλθε ἀνήρ μάντης Κλέανδρος, ἡμόν εἰς ἦν. Φυγαλεῖς ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίας. οὗτος τοὺς δούλους ἀνέγραψε ἐπιθετοῦς τοῖς δεσπότησι. ἐκ τούτου δὲ πόλεμος σφί ἦν ἐπὶ χρόνου συνήχεια, ἐς δὲ μόρισι οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἐπεκράτησαν.

Ἀργείοι μὲν εἴνα διὰ ταῦτα Κλεομένεα φασὶ μανήν ἀπολεῖ- 84 σαί κακῶς. αὐτὸ δὲ Σπαρτιτῆς φασι ἐς δαμούν μὲν ὑπάνθος μανήν Κλεομένεα, Σκύθης δὲ ὀμφλύσατά μὲν ἀκρηντότητι γενέσθαι καὶ ἐκ τούτου μανήν. Σκύθης γὰρ τοὺς νομάδας, ἐπείτε σφὶ Δαρείον ἐμβαλεῖν ἐς τὴν χώρην, μετὰ ταῦτα μεμονεῖ 5 μὲν τίσασθαι, πέρμαντας δὲ ἐς Σπαρτὴν συμμαχίαν τε ποιεσθαί καὶ συνίστασθαι ὧν χρεόν εἴη αὐτῶς μὲν τοῖς Σκύθαις παρὰ Φάσιν ποταμῷ πειρᾶν ἐς τὴν Μηδικήν ἐσβάλλειν, σφῆς δὲ τοῖς Σπαρτιτῶν κελεύειν ἐς Ἐφέσου ὀρωμένους ἀναβάλλειν καὶ ἐπείτε ἐς τῶν ἄπανταν. Κλεομένεα δὲ λέγουσι ηκῶτοι τῶν Σκύθων ἔπι ταῦτα ὁμιλεῖν σφὶ μεζόνους, ὀμιλέοντα δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν ἱερομένου μαθέιν τὴν ἀκρηντοποιήσην παρ' αὐτῶν, ἐκ τούτου δὲ μανήν μιν νομίζοντι Σπαρτιτῆς. ἐκ τε τόσον, ὡς αὐτοὶ

7. Φυγαλεῖς. Of Phigaleia, on the S.W. of Arkadia, close to the borders of Messenia; a town renowned for the cult of the horse-headed Demeter, which drew Pausanias to visit the place (8. 42, 5), whither modern travellers are likely to be attracted by the beautiful ruins of the temple of Apollo Epikuries (at Bassae), the frieze of which may be seen in the British Museum. This Arkadian diviner is one of a class of adventururers, other specimens of which are seen in Tissamenos of Ellis 9. 33, Hegesistatos 9. 37; Antichares of Elsin 5. 46; Kallias 5. 44. Whether his mission in Argolis had a political purpose, and was sanctioned by Sparta, there is hardly evidence to show.

54. 1. Ἀργεῖοι . . φασι. All that the Argives need be supposed to have said is that the doom of Kleomenes was a punishment for the sacrilege against the hero Argos and his sanctuary, c. 75 supra. The story of the war (cc. 76-82) is not from Argive tradition. Whether Hdt. had even the Argive "moral" from an Argive source may be doubted: the Argive view of the case might be easily inferred. Cp. c. 75 supra, and Introduction, pp. lxxviii f.

2. αὐτόι δὲ Σπαρτιτῆς φασι. The Spartans themselves saw nothing supernatural in the mania of Kleomenes; the miracle would have been, had he not gone out of his mind. It was a case of delirium tremens. On divine mania, cp. 4. 79, 5. 85 supra.

4. Σκύθης. This magnificent programme of a joint attack by civilised and uncivilised Europe upon the Asiatic despot surpassed even the combinations of an Aristagoras, cp. 5. 49 supra. The Scythian embassy appears to be dated soon after the retreat of Dercas. How little the Scyths could have known of Sparta, or of the state of Hellenic affairs, to appear in Sparta with such proposals! But that any such embassy took place, or that any such proposal was made, is an hypothesis hardly requiring discussion, albeit the idea of a raid on upper Asia is more appropriately fixed on Scythian nomads than upon the astute Milesian. Scyths may have been seen from time to time in Sparta (cp. 4. 77 supra), yet the practice of hard drinking, and the synonym therefore, might have found their way to Sparta without a Scythian embassy. If Kleomenes had been an inurable drunkard for twenty years or so before his end, his great plans and achievements, his fame and personality, become astonishing. It is at least possible that the Spartan assertion was a liebel.

15. ἐκ τῆς τόσου. The Σκύθης πότες was not invented in Sparta, and the verb has been brought into a pragmatic
λέγουσι, ἐπεὶνεν ὧρατέρον βουλουμένα πιεῖν, "ἐπισκύθισον" λέγουσι. οὕτῳ δὲ Ὑπὸ Σπαρτήτα τὰ περὶ Κλεομένεα λέγουσι. ἔμοι δὲ δοκεῖ τίνα ταύτην ὁ Κλεομένης Δημαρκήτην ἐκτάσατα.

85 Ἡλευλήτσαντος δὲ Κλεομένεος ὃς ἐπόθλουτο Αἰγινηταῖς, ἐπεμπόν ἐν Σπάρτην ἀγγέλους καταβουσμένοις Δευτυχείδεοι περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐθνίσσα ὁμολογούμενοι εὐχαμένοις. Διαδιάδοχον δὲ δικαστήριον δυναμόντες ἐγνωσαν περιβρύσσαται Αἰγινηταῖς ὑπὸ Δευτυχείδεοι, 5 καὶ μιν κατέκριναν ἐκάκαν ἄγεσθαι ἐν Αἰγίναις ἂν ἔκακον τῶν ἐν Ἐθνίσσα ἐχώμανοι ἀνδρῶν. μελλόστων δὲ ἄγει τῶν Αἰγινητῶν τῶν Δευτυχείδας, ἐπεὶ σφυ Θεσάβης ὁ Ἀειοτρέπης, ἐν Ἐπάρτῃ δάκμων ἄνήρ, "τῇ βολτεύσαθη ποιέως, ἀνδρὲς Αἰγινηταῖς; τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Σπαρτήτων ἐκάκαν γενόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμετέρων ἄγει; εἰ γὰρ ὁ θρήνος χρεώμενοι εὐγνώσαν οὕτῳ Σπαρτήτα, ήκας ἔξ

relation to the supposed Scythian embassy, cp. Appendix VII. § 7. But his exile may, perhaps, have taken place before Marathon. If the Aiginetans seized the earliest possible opportunity of remonstrating at Sparta, the trial of Leotychides, and his mission to Athens, might be dated still to the summer of 490 B.C. But the express date of Ηλίθ. for these events, 'after the death of Kleomenes,' and even more the general perspective, and the difficulty of finding room for these affairs while the Persian fleet was already in the Aegean, make it more reasonable to suppose that Hilt. here unconsciously anticipates events. Cp. c. 94 infra, and Appendices II. c. 3. δικαστήριον. The composition of this δικαστήριον which sat in judgment on the king, it would be interesting to determine. The Ephors alone apparently had sat in judgment on Kleomenes (c. 82 supra, but cp. note ad l.), and in the present case the phrase δ. συναγογήνεστε points to something more composite. Was the court made up of the Ephors and Gerontes? (cp. § 40 supra, with the addition of Leonidas?). Or was the question, as the matter was an 'international' one, referred to a religious tribunal? Or was it a popular court, of the whole Apella maybe? (ἐκάκον γεγένημος ἐν τῷ πολιτείᾳ). In any case the decision looks grossly unjust, for Leotychides had only performed a duty to Hellas, and probably under authority from the government, cp. c. 49, 50 supra. Had he too his enemies in Sparta, who were prepared to find or make an excuse for dethroning him? At best the decision looks like a political not a judicial one. That the Spartans should take hostages of the Aiginetans and hand them over to the Athenians as pledges for Aiginetan good behaviour, and then shortly after completely reverse their attitude and recover or attempt to recover the hostages from Athens, unless something important had happened meanwhile, is not likely. Supposing the seizure of the hostages to have taken place in 491/490 B.C., and the application for their restoration three or four years later, a great deal had happened, enough indeed fully to account for a complete reversal of policy at Sparta. Athens had defeated the Persian at Marathon, had assailed Paros and the Kyklades, and was showing signs of self-aggrandizement. Sparta on the other hand had taken nothing by the repulse of the Barbarian, and had narrowly escaped a domestic revolution. Egypt perhaps was in revolt; Dareios was nearing his end; there was no immediate danger of a return of the Persian. To set the Aiginetans free, to revive Dorian interests in the island, might seem, under altered circumstances, no bad stroke of policy.
according with this use of ἀκούω, and van Herwerden follows him. Cp. Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, § 45, note 7; § 46, note 4, Madvig, Greek Syntax, § 124 b.

13. ὑποθετεῖν. Whether this agreement was with Leuctrychides, or with the Spartan government, does not clearly appear. But it does not seem likely that the king was acting ἵνα τοῦ κοινοῦ, cp. c. 50 supra.

86. 2. παραθήκην. Cp. c. 73 supra. The diplomatic attitude and reply of the Athenians has a Themistoklean ingenuity about it. Whether, if the other king, Leonidas, had appeared to support Leuctrychides, the Athenians would have demanded a necromantic authority of Kleomenes, we are left to conjecture: but their statesmen would doubtless at this time have been equal to the occasion.

6. ἡλέξ. τάδε. One hardly knows which more to admire in the speech of Leuctrychides at Athens, the perfection of the narrative or the inconsequence of the logic. The Athenians doubtless were charmed by the one, but easily evaded the other. It was not so easy for one Spartan to cajole 30,000 Athenians! (cp. 5. 27 supra). The story has a Delphian ring about it: and this moral tale is put into the mouth of a man who had helped to corrupt the Pythia, or profited by her corruption, c. 65 supra, and who was afterwards caught tripping, as already narrated in c. 72.

§ 4 l. 9. Van Herwerden reads παραθηκήν here, and in acc. l. 28 infra, following Rav and B²; cp. l. 56 infra.

11. τρίτη. The third generation before Leuctrychides’ would be in the days of his grandfather Agesilao (8. 181) ἀδίκος Ἁγία (c. 65 supra), who might be contemporary with the kings Leon and Agesicles, 1. 65, i.e. about three quarters of a century before the date of the supposed delivery of this speech, or, in other words, about the date of the end of the reign of Alyattes, when things were going rather like the Ionians and Miletos, 1. 17.

13. δικαιοσύνη. cp. case of Kadmos 7. 164, and his father Skythes, c. 24 supra. With ἔκνομον cp. ἐρωμένον c. 84 supra, and the adverb (βίος) c. 65 supra.

18. Ἐπάτωρ. A Milesian comes to Sparta rather than to Athens: the reign of Alyattes, especially the period of the war with Miletos (623-613 B.C. ep. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alt. § 457), was not a time of security for Athens, coinciding, as it does, very nearly with the days of Kylon and Drakon, cp. 5. 71
τούδε. τι μὲν Μιλήσιος, ἢκω δὲ τῆς σῆς Γλαύκη βουλόμενος δικαιοσύνης ἀπολαύσαι. ὅσο γὰρ δὴ ἀνά πάσαν μὲν τὴν Ἐλλάδα, ἢ Ιωάννη τῆς σῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢν λόγον 20 πολλοῖς, ἐμευστῷ λόγους εἴδον καὶ διὶ ἐπικενδυόνεστι αἰεὶ κοτὴ ἢ Ιωάννη, ἢ δὲ Πελοπόννησος ἀσφαλέως ἱδρυμένη, καὶ διὸ εὐρέως οὐδαμὰ τοὺς αὐτούς ἔστι ὀραν ἔχουσα, ταῦτα τε ἢν ἐπιλεγομένῳ καὶ βουλευμένῳ ἐδοξῇ μοι τὰ θησαύρα τῆς σωτηρίας ἐκαταράσαντα θέαθαι πάρα σε, εἰ ἐξεπτυσσόμενο δὲ μοι 25 κείμενα ἐσται παρά σοι σοι. οὐ δὴ μοι καὶ τὰ χρῆματα δέχαται καὶ τάδε τὰ σύμβολα σώζῃ λαβών, δὲ δὲν ἔχων ταῦτα β) ἀπαίτητο, τούτῳ ἀποδούναι. ο μὲν δὴ ἀπὸ Μιλήτου ἠκώνεις τοιαύτα ἔλεξε, Γλαύκης δὲ ἐδέξατο τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἐπὶ τῷ εἰρημένῳ λόγῳ. χρόνον δὲ πολλοὶ διεκλάντως ἠλθὼν ἢς Σπάρτην 30 τούτῳ τοῦ παραθεμένου τὰ χρῆματα οἱ παιδεῖς, ἔλθοντες δὲ ἐν λόγον τῷ Γλαύκῳ καὶ ἀποδεικνύοντες τὰ σύμβολα ἀπαίτεον τὰ χρῆματα. ὁ δὲ διωθέτο ἀντυποκρίνομενος τούδε. ὃ ὀφεῖδει μημερία τὸ πρήξαμαι οὔτε μὲ περιφέρει οὐδὲν εἴδεναι τούτων τῶν ὑμεῖς λέγετε, βουλόμαι τε ἀναμηνεύεις ποιεῖς πάν τὸ δίκαιον· καὶ 35 γὰρ εἰ ἔλαβον, ὅρθως ἀποδοῦναι, καὶ εἰ γε ἁρπήν μὴ ἔλαβον, νόμισε τοῖς Ἐλλήνων χρήσομαι ὡς ύμαις. ταῦτα δὲν ὑμῖν γ) ἀναβάλλωμαι κυρώσειν ἐν τῆς τάρταρον μήνα ἀπὸ τοῦδε. οἱ μὲν δὴ 36 Μιλήσιοι συμφόρη ποιοσμενοὶ ἀπαλλάσσοντο ὡς ἀπεστηριμένου τῶν χρημάτων, Γλαύκης δὲ ἐπορεύετο ἢς Δελφῶν χρησάμενος τῷ 40 χρηστηρίῳ. ἐπειροτότων δὲ αὐτὸν τὸ χρηστήριον εἰ ὅρκῳ τὰ χρῆματα λησάται, ἢ Πυθίη μετέρχεται τοιοῦτο ἐπειδὴ ἐπεσει.
Γλαῦκ’ Ἑπικουδείδη, τὸ μὲν αὐτικὰ κέρδιον οὕτω ὄρκῳ νυκήσας καὶ χρήματα λύσασθαι. ἔμμεν, ἐπεὶ θάνατός γε καὶ εὐφροκός μένει ἄνδρα.

ἀλλ’ ὄρκου πάλις ἐστίν, ἀνώνυμος, οὐδ’ ἐπὶ χεῖρες οὐδὲ πόδες: κραυπὸν δὲ μετέρχεται, εἰς δ’ κε πάσαν συμμάρφας ὅλῃ γενεῆς καὶ οἰκῶν ἀπαντα. ἄνδρος δ’ εὐφροκός γενεῖ μετόπωσθεν ἀμείνων.

ταῦτα ἀκούσας ὁ Γλαῦκος συγγρώμων τὸν θεὸν παρατέτο ἀυτὸ ἱκερὶ τῶν ῥήθειτων. ἢ δὲ Πυθίη ἐφῄ τὸ πειρήματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ποιήσας ἠγον δύνασθαι. Γλαῦκος μὲν δ’ ἡ μεταπεμψάμενος δ) τοὺς Μιλήσιους ξείνους ἀποδιδόει σφι τὰ χρήματα. τοῦ δὲ εἰνεκα ὁ λόγος ὅδε ὁ Ἀθηναίοι ὀρμήθη λέγεσθαι ἐς ἱμάς, εἰρη- στεί: Γλαῦκον ὑνό υὕτε το ἀπόγονον ἔστι οὐδὲν οὐν’ ἵστη οὐδεμία νομιζομενὴ εἰναί Γλαῦκος, ἐκτετριτταὶ τε πρὸ ἕκτος ἐκ 55 Ὀρίτης. οὕτως ἄγαθον μηδὲ διανοεῖσαν περὶ παρακατάθηκης ἄλλο γε ἡ ἀπαίταντως ἀποδίδαιν.’’

Λευτυχίδης μὲν εἴπας ταῦτα, ὥς οἱ οὖν οὕτω ἐσήκουν οἱ 87 Ἀθηναίοι, ἀπαλλάσσετο· οἱ δὲ Ἀγίνηται, πρὶν τῶν πρῶτων ἀδικημάτων δοῦναι δικάς τὸν ἐς Ἀθηναίους ὑβρισαν Ἡθοικεσί.

vidualistic society, gave little trouble at Delphi in old days. The sanction of morality still rested firmly upon the idea of the family, and the need of gentle continuity. In this sanction the belief in another life is involved, for the maintenance of the family is relative to the maintenance of the ancestor-worship, and its corollaries. Still, the complete absence of any appeal to a future Heaven and Hell, or to the personal punishment of the unjust man in the other world, is significant of a pre-Pythagorean stage of thought, and had perhaps a special charm for Hdt, who was no great admirer of the Samian plagiarist. See 4. 95 supra.

51. ἵστες δύνασθαι. Could the ‘inter-nality’ of righteousness, and the necessity of the ‘good will,’ be more strongly affirmed than in this ‘lively oracle’? The sequel is tremendous: Glaukos makes restitution, but is not forgiven: his posterity blotted out, and his name become a by-word. The king proves too much! The Athenians had already ‘made occasions for delay,’ which betrayed their mind; if the will, not the act, was to be punished, they were already doomed;—supposing, indeed, that their case ran on all fours with the case of Glaukos, and that Lycophides was justified in assuming the rôle of the Milesian depositor: a parallel, the exactitude of which they were intelligent enough to disown. It is obvious from what follows that Hdt. approves of the action of the Athenians, but was not going to throw away so delightful a story on mere critical grounds.


87. 2. οἱ δὲ Ἀγίνηται πρὶν κτλ. The position and method of narrating the events next recorded seem to show that Hdt., so far as he clearly conceived the dates at all, placed all the events narrated cc. 87-92 (with certain obvious exceptions in cc. 90, 91) previous to the battle of Marathon. But this conception is almost certainly a tissue of anarchism. It has been indicated above that the death of Kleomenes is the point of departure, and that Kleomenes died after Marathon (cp. c. 86 supra). Considerable displacements have occurred apparently in the chronology of the wars between Athens and Aigina, on which see Appendix VIII.

3. Ἡθοικεσί χαριζόμενοι, 5. 81
χαρίζομενοι, ἐποίησαν τοιοῦτα. μεμύθωμεν τοιαὶ Ἀθηναίους καὶ
5 ἀξιόωντες ἀδίκεσθαι, ὡς τίμωρησόμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους παρ-
εσκευάζοντο· καὶ ἤγαρ δὲ τοιαὶ Ἀθηναίοι πεντετερίς ἐπὶ
Σούνιον, λαοχίσαντες [ἂν] τὴν θεορίαν νέα ἔλλον πλῆρες ἄνδρῶν
88 τῶν πρώτων Ἀθηναίων, λαβώντες δὲ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἶψοναν. Ἀθη-
ναίοι δὲ παθῶντες ταῦτα πρὸς Αιγινητῶν οὐκέτα ἀνέβαλλον μὲν
οὐ τὸ πάν ἀναχνίσασθαι ἐπ’ Αἰγινητήσι. καὶ ἦν γὰρ Νικόδρομος
Κροίθου καλεόμενος ἐν τῇ Αἰγινῆ ἀνὴρ δόκιμος, οὗτος μεμύθωμεν
5 μὲν τοῖς Αἰγινητῶν προτέρῳ ἐσοπτοῦ ἤζευγαν ἐκ τῆς νῆσου, μαθὼν δὲ τῶν τούτων Ἀθηναίους ἀναρτημένους ἔριδων Αἰγινητῶς
κακῶς, συντίθεται Ἀθηναῖοι προδοσίαν Αἰγινῆς, φράσας ἐν τῇ
τε ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιχειρήσει καὶ ἐκείνων ἐσ’ τῇ ἡκεῖν δεῖξει βοήθεως. -
89 μετὰ ταῦτα καταλαμβάνει μὲν κατὰ τὸ συνενθάτο Ἀθηναῖοι
ὁ Νικόδρομος τὴν παλαιὰν καλεόμενην πόλιν, Ἀθηναίοι δὲ οὐ
παραγίνονται ἐς δέον· οὐ γὰρ ἔτυχον οὔσαι νέας σφι ἄξιόμαι

supra, s. 506 B.C. The terms here employed seem to put the Aiginetans wholly in the wrong. The story is probably of Attic origin.

5. ἄδικεσθαι. The implicit assumption here is certainly that the ἄδικεσθαι, of which the Aiginetans complain, is the refusal of the Athenians to restore the hostages. It would be a wonder that, if these hostages were in Athens, the Athenians did not exchange them for their own leading citizens captured in the Theoroi. They probably did. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 5.

6. περιτερίς. The MSS. have περι-

τερης. Schümann's emendation is con-

firmed by B. Van Herwerden corrects to περιτερίς. There was a temple of Athens on Sunion (Pausan. 1. 1 ad init.) and there may have been a quadrennial festival held there (πεντετερίς ἡτὶ τε ἡμέρᾳ μὲν ἀναχλώμενος ἐπί Σούνιον. Lysias, 21. 5). That the Athenians had a quin-

quenerem at this date is incredible. The first quinquereme was not built at Athens until after the date of the Ἀθηναίων ναύσεως. Cp. op. cit. ed. Sandys, c. 46, p. 169 n. Ἄν σεκτ. Stein. 88. 2. οὐκέτα ἀνέβαλλον. 5. 49. The wording here looks like an unconscious reference to the oracle there, and serves to bring the oracle down. Cp. Appen-

dix VIII. § 3.

7. εἰς τῇ τε...καλ...ἐς τῇ. Stein regards these words as referring to two different days. It is more likely that Hdt.'s grammar is clumsy than that the conspiracy was so much disjointed. You may name the day for a coup d'état, but how can you say how long you will hold out afterwards? The Athenians were surely to be on the spot the very day of the democratic ἐνεύμ. Such miscarriages are not uncommon. Cp. Thucyd. 4. 89 for a celebrated instance.

89. 3. οὐ γὰρ ἔτυχον νέας. This is an astounding statement, unless it is to be supposed that Athenian vessels were absent on foreign service just at the time when they were needed to assist Nikodromos. The only foreign services which could come into the reckoning, on any hypothesis, would be (1) the expedition to Ionia in 499 B.C. See 5. 97, 99. (2) The expedition to Paros, c. 489 B.C., cc. 152 ff. infra. The latter
case may be ruled out at once, for (1) Miltiades took seventy ships to Paros, (2) it is scarcely credible that the Corinthian gift to Athens was after Marathon. In regard to the earlier case, the argument is not so clear. The Aiginetans may very well have taken advantage of the absence of twenty Athenian ships in Ionia, and the Corinthians may have replaced the absent ships by an equivalent; but if so, the occasion was not the coup d'état of Nikodromos, unless we are prepared to take that event completely out of its connexion and sequence here. It is possible of course that the anacronisms in the text reach that extent, and that the support given to Nikodromos had nothing to say to the seizure of the Athenian prūmoi. In this case the conspiracy of Nikodromos would fall between 498-491 B.C. The seizure of the Theorís, and the exchange of hostages, would fall after Marathon. That hypothesis conflicts with the date indicated for the settlement of the Aiginetan exiles at Sunión, c. 90 infra. In fine, the Corinthian ships were probably lent to Athens before Marathon (éfre. 488 n.c.) and are here erroneously put into connexion with the democratic coup d'état at Aigina. Cp. Appendix VIII. § 6.

6. τοῦτον τόν χρόνον. In 489 n.c. the Athenians and Corinthians are at loggerheads (8. 61). The good-will of the Corinthians did not long survive the self-aggrandizement of Athens under Miltiades and Themistokles. As Miltiades took seventy ships to Paros (c. 132 infra) the Corinthian gift must be dated before Marathon, at a time when the interest of Corinth lay in supporting Athens against Aigina (cp. 5. 75, 92 supra). The emphasis on the words here shows that there is a contrast in the attitude of Corinth to Athens at the time of writing. The Corinthian orator in Thucyd. 1. 41 (438 n.c.) is represented as taking credit for this gift; it was therefore an accepted fact at Athens, but Thucydides does not date it (€ndep tā Mndhak is (1) vague, (2) a gloss).

7. penteðrókhymai, a merely nominal price (5 francs oríce, cp. διμετω. 5. 77, and c. 79 supra). The law is a curious one, designed to protect Corinthian commerce, or, perhaps, to keep some secrets of Corinthian ship-building dark. So the Romans, before the second Punic war, had no notion how to construct a quinquereme: but a stranded Carthaginian vessel served them as a model (Polyb. 1. 20. 10-16, but cp. 1. 59. 8). The Corinthian law can hardly be supposed to have been quite so simple as Hdt. implies: but evidently there was some prohibition, which was evaded by a technical conformity, or legal fiction.

90. 2. ἰδιόδρομοι, presumably making his way to Ætica. One boat (πλοῖον) would not hold very many: possibly more than one boat-load was brought off.

3. τοίον κτλ. Cp. Thuc. 2. 27 ἐκπεπετάθη δέ τοῖς Αἰγινηταῖς τοιοῦτον. Ἡλικίαν ὑμών ὀλίγην καὶ τῆν γάρ νήσους. 5. ἐφερόν τε καὶ ἤργον, c. 42 supra.

6. υπερτερον, 'after'—how long! The
δήμου σφι ἀμα Νικοδρόμῳ ἐπεκράτησαν, καὶ ἔπειτα σφέας χειροσασμέναι ἔξηγον ἄπολέωντες. ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ καὶ ἄγων σφι ἐγένετο, τὸ ἐκθύσασθαι οὐκ οἷοι τε ἐγένοντο ἐπιμηχανόμενοι, ἀλλ’ ἐφθασαν ἐπεσόντες πρότερον εκ τῆς νύσι οὐ τῆς Πειν εὐεργεταῖο 

τὴν θεοῦ. ἐπακολούθησαν γὰρ δὴ τοῦ δήμου ζωγραφισάντες ἔξηγον ὡς ἄπολέωντες, εἷς δὲ τις τούτων ἐκφυγὼν τὰ δεσμὰ καταφεύγει τρόπο πρόθυρα Δήμητρος θεομφόρῳ, ἐπιλαμβάνομεν δὲ τῶν ἐπισταστῶν ἐγένοτ’ οἱ δὲ ἔπειτε μιν ἀποσπάσαι οὐκ οἷοὶ τε ἀπέλκαντες ἐγένοτο, ἀποκόψαντες αὐτοῦ τὰς χεῖρας ἔξων οὕτω, αἱ γέιες δὲ ἔκειναι ἐμπεφικυαί ἰσαν τούς ἐπισταστούς.

92 Ἡ ταῦτα μὲν νῦν σφέας αὐτοῦς οἱ Ἀιγιναῖοι ἐγέρασαν, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἡκουσαν ἐναναχάσαντες ὑμω ἐδειδομένι, ἐσωθεντες δὲ τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ ἐπεκάλεσαν τοὺς αὐτοῦς καὶ πρότερον, Ἀργεῖους. καὶ δὴ σφι οὕτωι μὲν οὐκέτι βοιωθοῦσι, μεμφόμενοι ἐν τούτῳ νῦν ἀνάγκη λαμβάνει ὑπὸ Κλεομένεος, ἔχοντες τὲ τὴν Ἀργολίδα χώρην καὶ συναπέθησαν Δακεδαιμόνιοι, συναπέθησαν δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ Σικυωνιῶν νεῶν ἄνδρες τῇ αὐτῇ ταύτῃ

remark would hardly have been made if some considerable time had not been thought of between the escape of Nikodromos and the settlement at Sunion. The one occurred before, the other perhaps after, the battle of Marathon, in the conception of Herodotus. But he perhaps misconceives the chronological sequence of events, see Appendix VIII. § 6.

91. 1. παχές, men of substance. 5. 30, 77, some of them, perhaps, returned hostages. ἐπαναστάτως. The remark proves the presence of a democratic movement in Aigina under Athenian auspices. Herodotus appears to date the movement before Marathon, but it is difficult to reconcile such a conception with probability: see Appendix VIII. § 5.

5. ἐϕθασαν ἐπεσόντες. This certainly appears to be a reference to the expulsion of the Aiginetans from their island by the Athenians in the first summer of the 'Peloponnesian' war, b.c. 431, Thuc. 2. 27. As such it is among the latest allusions in the work of Hdt. How long after it occurred Hdt. wrote this passage does not appear, but it is obvious that Hdt. was not acquainted with the subsequent fate of the exiles in 424 b.c., Thuc. 4. 57. The whole chapter might be an insertion (παρενθέσεις 7. 171, or προο-
91-94  ΕΡΑΤΩ

'Αργείων ἐπεξελεύθη ζημιὰ χίλια τάλαντα ἐκτίσια, πεντακόσια ἐκατέρους. Σικυωνιοὶ μὲν ὕπωνυμοί αὐτίκης ὁμολογήσαν ἐκατὸν τάλαντα ἐκτίσιαντες ἀξίωμα εἶναι, τῷ Ἀλκιμῆτι δὲ ὑπὲρ συνεννοίωσαν ἦσαν τοὺς αὐθαδέστεροι. διὰ δὴ ὅπεν σφίν ταῦτα δοκέμενοι ἤτοι μὲν τοῦ δημοσίου ὦντας 'Αργείων ἐπὶ ἔβοθεν, ἐδείκτωτα δὲ ἵππους. ἔγε δὲ αὐτῶν στρατηγὸς [ἀνήρ ὁ οὖνομα] Εὐρυμάτης, <ἀνήρ> πεντάεθεν ἐπασκήσας, τούτων οἱ πλείονες οὐκ ἀπεννοσήσαν ὅπως, ἀλλ' ἐτελεύτησαν ὑπὲρ 15 'Αθηναίων ἐν Αἰγίνῃ' αὐτῶς δὲ ὁ στρατηγὸς Εὐρυμάτης μονομαχίην ἐπασκέσθη τρεῖς μὲν ἄνδρας τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ κτάνει, ὡπὸ δὲ τοῦ τετάρτου Σωφάνου τοῦ Δεκελέως ἀποτίθεικε. Ἀλκιμῆτι 93 δὲ ἐνδυσὶ ἀπάκτωσας τοιοῦ 'Αθηναίοις συμβαλόντες τῆς ἡμέρας ἐνκίρκησαν, καὶ σφέων νέως τέσσερας αὐτῶν τοὺς ἀναγάρας ἔδωκαν.

'Ἀθηναίοις μὲν δὴ τὸλμος συνήπτω πρὸς Ἀλκιμῆτι, ὃ δὲ 94 Πέρσης τὸ ἐνοτὸν ἐποίεις, ὅτε ἀναμυθήκοντος τε αἰὲ τοῦ

94. 1. σουσίμωτο. For the tense cp. 5. 78. That war was in progress between Athens and Aegina in 491-0 B.C. is, as already shown, the reverse of probable. The narrative in this chapter joins on to the narrative in c. 78 supra, not indeed in the intention of the author, but by the necessities of the case. The earlier stages of the great θρητο (7. 145) had indeed been accomplished (5. 82 supra), and there was warfare between 498-491 B.C., but the extradition of the hostages reduced Aegina to quiescence, probably till after Marathon and Paros. Cp. c. 87 supra, and Appendix VI. § 5.

2. ἀναμυθήκοντος . . . μυθόθεν. The expression is clumsy; van Herwerden brackets μυθόθεν μὲν τὸν Ἀθηναίου. This memorialising has been going on for eight years, see 5. 105 supra. Yet according to 7. 133, Dareios had just sent (c. 48 supra) heralds to Athens to demand earth and water, and his messengers have been cast into the Barathrom : an outrage which here contributes nothing to his resentment: presumably either because Hdt. when writing this passage knew nothing of the said outrage, or had already related it, or blindly followed a source in which it was not recorded. The alternative would be to suppose that he deliberately suppressed it. On any supposition a error remains. The Athenians are here even contrasted with the Hellenes who had refused earth and water.
3. Πεισιστρατίδεως. This is the first mention of the Peisistratids actually at Susa: the date of their appearance there is not given. Ten years before Hippia had been working in the same way (διαβάλλω) at Sardes, 5. 96 supra.

7. φλαῖροις πρόξαντα, re male gesta, an exaggeration, and even misconception, cp. c. 45 supra. Whatever the reasons for relieving Mardondos of the command, his failure was not one of them. Perhaps he had been quite successful enough for the king's pleasure. An absolute Monarchy cannot afford, any more than an Oligarchy, 'an only General.'

9. Μάθην. That the commander-in-chief in this expedition was a Mede, as were Mazara and Harpagos, who had effected the conquest of Ionia for Kyros, 1. 157 ff., may help to account for the common Greek practice of speaking of the great struggle as the 'Median' affair, and their adversary as 'the Mede.' The Ionians associated their first reduction, the Athenians their first invasion, with a Mede.

10. - 84 Stein suggests, van Heerden approves.

350 ΠΡΟΣΟΤΟΥ vi

θεράτωντο μεμνησθαι μν των Ἀθηναίων, καὶ Πεισιστρατίδεως προσκατημένου καὶ διαβαλλόντων Ἀθηναίους, ἀμα δὲ βουλόμενος
5 ὁ Δαρείος ταύτης ἐχόμενος τῆς προφάσεως καταστρέψει σβαθῆς τῆς Ἑλλάδος τοὺς μὴ δόντας αὐτῷ γην τε καὶ υδαρ. Μαρδόνων μὲν
ὅτι φιλάντροπα πρῆξαντα τῷ στόλῳ παραλύει τῆς στρατηγίας, ἄλλων δὲ στρατηγοῦς ἀποδέξαντα ἀπέστειλε ἐπὶ τὲ Ἐφέστριαν καὶ Ἀθήνας, Δατίν τε ἔοντα Μῆδουν γένος καὶ Ἀρταφράνεα τὸν Ἀρτα-
θιο φέρενος παῖδα, ἀδελφιδέον ἡ ἐσωτερικῷ· ἐπταλάμους δὲ ἀπέτεμπε ἐξανδράποδαν Ἀθήνας καὶ Ἐφέστριαν ἀνάγεσιν ἐσωτῇ ἐς ὕπων
95 τὰ ἀνδράποδα. ὡς δὲ οἱ στρατηγοὶ ὁσοὶ οἱ ἀποδεχθέντες πορευόμενοι παρὰ βασιλέως ἀπίκουσα τῆς Κυκλικῆς ἐς τὸ Ἀλήνων
πεδίον, ἀμα ἅγομενοι πεζῶν στρατον πολλόν τε καὶ εἰ ἐσκενα-
σμένου, ἑσταῖντα στρατοπεδεύομενοι ἐπηθήδε μὲν ὁ ναυτικὸς πᾶς
5 στρατός ὁ ἐστι ἁρπακτικός ἐκάστοις, παρεγένοντο δὲ καὶ οἱ ἱππισσοῦ ροὶ νέος, τὸ τὸ προτέρῳ ἄτει προείπε τοῖς ἐσωτοῦ διαμφορὸς
Δαρείος ετοιμᾶτει. ἑσβαλόμενοι δὲ τοὺς ἰπποὺς ἐς ταύτας καὶ οἱ τε 
πεζῶν στρατὸν ἐσβιβάσαντες ἐς τὰς νέας, ἐπεξέλεγον ἐξακοσιοῦ
πρῆραι ἐς τὴν Ἰωνικήν, ἐνθεύτεν δὲ οὐ παρὰ τὴν ἱππερίου εἴχον
τὰς νέας ἠθο τοῦ τε Ἐλλησπόντου καὶ τῆς ᾿Ορίσκης, ἀλλ’ ἐκ
the same fate as Eretria! How would that have suited Hippias, whose object was to rule Athens as a Persian de-
pendency? (5. 96 supra).

98. 2 τὸ Ἀλήνων ναὸν. Homer (if the passage be genuine—II. 6. 200 ff.) in a punning humour sets Bellerophon roaming over the Aleian (Roman) plain. Strabo, 555, notices that the poet does not localise it, and elsewhere (676) himself describes its position, though its historical associations do not carry him back beyond Alexander and Philotas. "Inland from Mallos is the famous Aleian plain" (Ramsay, Asia Minor, 385), watered by the Pyramos, which, however, has considerably changed its course since of old.

3. πολλών . . . ἰνώς. The only figure given by Hdt. is 600 for the fleet. This number has already done duty for the barbarian fleet at Lade, c. 9 supra. Just doubled it gives the number of the fleet of Xerxes, 7. 89, minus seven. (The origin of that number may, however, be different, cp. Aischyl. Persae, 341 ff.)

6. τὸ πρωτόφρον ἔτει, c. 48 supra. The spring of 491 B.C. is referred to.

10. ἄθο τοῦ τε ᾿Ε. κ. τῆς Θ. The route of Mardondos two years before,
Σάμου ὄρμαμενοι παρὰ τε Ἰκάριον καὶ διὰ νῆσον τοῦ πλόου ἐποιεύτο, ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, διείσαντες μᾶλλον τῶν περίπλου τοῦ Ἀθώ, ὅτι τὸ προτέρον ἐτει ποιεῖτεν ταύτη τὴν κομιδήν μεγάλως προσέπτησαν, πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἡ Νάξος σφέας ἧδη ἑγίκαξε πρὸτερον ὁυκ ἄλοις. ἐτεῖ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰκαρίου πελάγος προσφέρμενοι 96 προσέμεξαν τῇ Νάξῳ, ἐπὶ ταύτην γὰρ δὴ πρῶτην ἐπείχουσα στρατεύοντες οἱ Πέρσαι μεμιμηντεί τῶν προτέρων . . . οἱ Νάξαιοι πρὸς τὰ ὅρεα ὀὕροντο δεῖχνοντες οὐδὲ ὑπέμειναν. οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ἀναπαυδαίρεσθαι τῶν κατέλαβον αὐτῶν, ἐνεπήρησαν καὶ τὰ ἱά 5 καὶ τὴν πόλιν. ταύτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ἐτέ τὰς ἄλλας νῆσους ἀνήγγετο.

Ἐν οὗ δὲ ὅσιοι ταύτα ἐποίησεν, οἱ Δήλοιο εκλιπότες καὶ ἀυτοὶ 97 τῶν Δήλου ὀὕροντο φεύγοντες ἐς Τήνῳ. τῇ δὲ στρατιᾶς καταπλεύσεις ὁ Δᾶτις προπλώσας ὁυκ ἐὰν τὰς νέας πρὸς τὴν Δήλου προσορμιζοθαί, ἄλλα ρήμαν ἐν τῇ 'Ῥημαι' αὐτός ἐκ τυθομένος ἵνα ἤταν όι Δήλοι, πέμπων κήρυκα ηγόρειν σφι τάδε. "Αὖτες 5

C. 43 supra, and of the fleet of Xerxes in 480 B.C. (acting perhaps under inspiration of Mardonios). The 'short sea' route of Datis and Artaphernes made it convenient to embark the fighting men in Kilkia, whereas in 493 B.C. the army had marched to the Hellespont. It may be doubted whether the Persians in 490 B.C. had any large number of fighting ships with them, as distinguished from transports.

τὸ Δάμου, under Aikaces, c. 25 supra, and devoted to the Persian interest. Hippias may have been cheated by the prognostic to be drawn from the ease of the Samian tyrant.

11. 'Ικάριον, ἡκ. πέλαγος as in c. 96 supra.

νῆσος, τοῦ τοῦ Κυκλαδῶν as in b. 30, 31.

The short sea-route was commanded not merely by these considerations, but by the need for rapidity, the easier comissariat, the presence of Hippias, and the 'objective' of the force.

13. τὸ προτέρον καταπλεύσας, as a ἱππος σαλαμί, as the storm off Athos took place in the summer of 492 B.C., c. 44 supra. Doherty suggested τὸ τραγῳ προτερον, but the supposition of a slip on Hdt.'s part is not unreasonable. The codices show no corruption, but the words occur eight lines above.

96. 3. τόν πρότερον. Stein marks a lacuna, and suggests ἐστάθοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνθίζητα to fill it; van Herwerden preserves the text as it stands, and puts a comma after Πέρσας, taking the participle to agree with δὲ Νάξος. The Persian motive for making for Naxos has already been stated. The two amendments are not mutually exclusive. Van Herwerden has altered δὲ Ἰλήρας, but it is a question whether it should not go out. The reference is of course to the expedition of Aristagoras and Megabates, some ten years before, 5. 30 ff. In visiting Naxos before Delos the Mede steered S.S.W. Rheneia and Delos are due north of Paros, which is due west of Naxos.

6. τὰς ἄλλας νῆσους. C. 49 supra Hdt. has stated that all the islanders from whom earth and water were demanded surrendered to the king, summer of 491 B.C., including Aigina. Naxos may have been omitted, but hardly Paros, and some of the more important Kyklades. But Datis (guided by Hippias) may have visited the other islands to levy supplies, hostages, and contingents. Cep. c. 99 infra.

97. 1. ἐν ᾧ. The men of Delos might have sighted the armada on its way south to Naxos. They retreated north to Tenos.

5. τάδε. Was the pious respect of Datis for Delos quite independent of the influence of Hippias? The resurrection of Delos had been one of
the ideas of Peisistratos (Thuc. 3. 104, op. 5. 63, 69 supra), and Hippias, expelled from Athens by Delphi (5. 63 supra), and abandoned by Sparta (5. 93 supra), was not likely to overlook the use to be made of Delos, after his restoration. If there is any force in ēghwēn here, it should mean that the speech was addressed to the men of Delos assembled.

7. ἐκ βασιλέως δὲ ἐπιστάται. The policy of the Persian Empire was tolerant towards the deities of the conquered, and there is no sign of iconoclasm, or of a religious propaganda under the Achaeomnida. The opposite idea arose mainly from a misinterpretation of the story of the pseudo-Smerdis in the light of the Behistun inscription (e.g. Rawlinson, Hdt. Appendix, Bk. iii. Essay ii. vol. ii. a pp. 548 ff.). Evidences more recently discovered (the Kyreian inscriptions from Babylon, inscriptions of Kambyses and Dareios himself in Egypt) have led to a more correct estimate. (Cp. Ed. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alterth. i. p. 608.) The treatment of Delos (and Delphi) is more significant than the destruction of Athens, in this connexion. Even in regard to Athens the anecdotes show that there was no crusade against the gods of Greece. Cp. 7. 43, 8. 54, etc.

Over and above this general policy of toleration the Asiatics would be at no loss to identify Apollo and Artemis with their own Sun and Moon deities. The offering of Datia on the Delian altar would please all pious Ionians, and even a genuine act of devotion may have been not wholly devoid of a political purpose.

12. ἑγεμόνας ταλαντ, 300 T. weight of frankincense would be incredible, though that is what Hdt. seems to say, without specifying whether the talents are Attic or other: 300 T. worth hardly less incredible. Hultsch, Metrologie*, p. 120 rationalises the statement to the effect that in the sense of the Persian [Mede] who made the offering, the 300 'weights' of frankincense, each of which amounted to (betrug) a shekel [i.e. light Babylonian shekel], might be regarded as equivalent in worth to so many shekels of gold, i.e. darics. "On this hypothesis the value of the offering amounted to exactly one Talent of silver." Cp. Ridgway, Origin of Currency, p. 6. This may explain the origin of Hdt.'s blunder, but it does not cancel it.

98. 3. προσα. Why the advance was made first on Eretria, why Euboia rather than the medizing Aigina was to be made the basis of operations against Attica, it is not easy to determine. Perhaps the prejudices, or even the superstitions of Hippias, were consulted, he leading the Persians not merely to Marathon (c. 102 ἠθρόα) but to Euboia, whence he had already 'returned' once in triumph with his father, 1. 91. Perhaps the medising party in Eretria (c. 100, 101 ηθρόα) were already in communication with the Barbarians. Perhaps the advance on Euboia and the east coast was calculated to lull the alarms of the Peloponnesians and to retard their assistance; if so, the calculation was realised. The attack on Attica was made from the same side as if the Mede had advanced from Thrace and Macedon. Possibly the Aiginetans were expected to do something for the Persian, on the other side.

καὶ Ἰωάννας καὶ Αἰολίας. The Dorians, as usual, conspicuous by their absence. Cp. c. 32 supra.
4. ὡς ἔλεγον Δῆλοι. The assertion is a double one: (1) that presently after the departure of Datis from Delos for Eretria, in the summer of 490 B.C. there was an earthquake; (2) that the said earthquake was the first and last earthquake ever felt in Delos 'down to me (my visit). How much of this double assertion is given on the authority of the Delians is not quite clear. Did the Delians simply report the earthquake, or did they assert, further, that it was a unique experience? In either case it is natural to interpret the passage as implying a visit by Hdt. to Delos, some time before he actually wrote this passage (ἲλεγον...μέχρι ομοί). It is natural further to conclude that at the time of writing Hdt. had not heard of any other seisms before or since his visit, or he would probably have mentioned it. This statement, however, is not inconsistent with the occurrence of an earthquake subsequently to his visit, nor even perhaps quite strictly with his having heard tell of such an occurrence; and he might even be contradicting such an assertion. Thucydides (2.8) also reports an earthquake at Delos as occurring a little before the outbreak of war in 431 B.C., and perfectly unique in Hellenic history, and regarded, not without reason, as portentous: Δῆλος ἔκωσθε θυλών πρὸ τοῦτων, προτέρου οὖν σεισμὸν διάφορον ἢ τοὺς μέλλοντα γεννήσας συμφώνα. It is obviously impossible to reconcile the statement of the Athenian with the statement of the 'Thuranian' historian. Thucydides asserts of his own knowledge that a unique earthquake took place just before the Peloponnesian war. If so, the earthquake reported by Hdt. as having taken place in the summer of 490 B.C. never took place. Thucydides is obviously contradicting Hdt. It by no means follows that Thucydides is right. There may have been only one shaking of Delos. It may have occurred in 490 B.C. as reported by Hdt. Thucydides, writing or retouching the history of the Archidamian war some thirty years after its outbreak, and doing all he could to magnify its importance and depreciate the glories of the wars against the barbarian, may with greater or less excuse have shifted the earthquake some sixty years down. There may have been two earthquakes, one in 490 B.C. and really unique at the date of Hdt. 's visit to the island, or interview with the 'Delians,' and still unique, so far as he knew, when he composed and when he revised his own work; the other in 431 B.C. but not unique, as Thucydides deliberately asserts. There may have been two or more earthquakes at Delos in the course of ages, though the island had a good repute for stability—but perhaps every earthquake in the holy isle ought to have been unique, and was therefore unique, according to the local authorities. That Hdt. is actually contradicting the report of an earthquake in 431 B.C. afterwards taken up by Thucydides is the least plausible hypothesis; still, as Hdt. reports events of that date, and later, his text here makes against the supposition that the report was true. Other possibilities are also not to be wholly excluded. There may have been an earthquake at some date unascertainable, previous to Hdt.'s visit to Delos, or to the composition of this passage, which Hdt. claims for the Median and Thucydides for the Peloponnesian war. There may have been no earthquake at Delos at all. But on the whole it seems most probable that the earthquake occurred at the date given by Hdt., or at least before the Medio war, and that later pragmatism annexed it to the Peloponnesian.
war in Greece 431-425 B.C. But the argument is inconclusive. If it were said: 'During the reigns of George, William, and Victoria, England has made greater progress than during the twenty reigns previous'; such a remark would not imply that the present Queen's reign was over (σε μή γένος). Artaxerxes I. reigned for upwards of a generation, coming to the throne probably about 464 B.C. (Duncker, viii. 293). Hdt. might have written as he does here many years before the king was gathered to his fathers. The identification of reigns and generations should not be pressed in favour of the latest possible date, for it proves too much. Three generations with Hdt. make a hundred years (2. 142), but the three reigns here referred to, even if regarded as complete, fall short of the century (521-425). The identification of reigns and generations only shows how loose the chronological reference is. There is thus no necessity to conclude that this passage was written after 431 B.C.

9. άκοντα δ' ἄλλας γενέων. Twenty generations — 6661 years. If these be added to the date of the accession of Dareios (521 B.C.) they bring us to 1188 B.C.; if to the date of the birth of Dareios (561 B.C.) they bring us to 1218 B.C., in either case within measurable distance of the Trojan war, the aera of which according to Hdt. is about 1250 B.C. (2. 145). Hdt. may be taken to say that since the days of Agamemnon Hellas had never had such causes of woe as 'the last hundred years or so.' It is strange to find Kyros omitted, to say nothing of the wars with the Mermnadæ. The generation as distinguished from the reign of Dareios would take us back nearly to the accession of Kroisos (Herodotus' aera in Bk. 1)., but the passage before us here is not scientific but rhetorical chronology, and it is labour lost to attempt to harmonise it with Hdt.'s other data.

11. αὐτῶν τῶν κοινωνιῶν πρὸς τὴν ἀρχήν πολεμιῶν. These words would apply to the circumstances of Hellas in 481 B.C. and following years, but they would have been justified by the events which followed the first rupture with Sparta (c. 461-451 B.C.), and at any rate must be taken to refer to them.

12. οὐδὲν ἐν ἀετῶς. On ideal principles it would perhaps have been still more proper for this portent to have occurred two years or so earlier, before the Ionian revolt, before the affair of Naxos, if not, indeed, on the first appearance of Kyros in Western Asia in 546 B.C.

2. σημαίνει. These words are omitted in some of the best MSS. ABC (=a).

15. δύναται. These etymological efforts are all unsuccessful, except perhaps that arca is an intensive particle. The modern etymologists, however, only agree in differing from Herodotus: see the valuable List of Proper Names in Rawlinson, Herodotus, vol. iii. 2. pp. 539 ff. Van Herwerden follows Wel- seling in regarding the passage as spurious, and removes it from the text.

99. 1. of S. B. answers τοῦτο μὲν, c. 98 supra.

πρὸς τὰς γέφυρας comes in here
καὶ ηὐσίοις, εὐθείως δὲ στρατηγὴν τε παρελήμβανοι καὶ ὁμίρους τῶν ναυσιτεῶν παῖς ἐλάμβανον. οὐ δὲ περιπλέαντες τὰς νήσους προσέχον καὶ ἐς Κάρυστον, οὗ γὰρ δὴ σφὶ οἱ Καρύστιοι οὐτὲ ὁμίρους ἔδιδον οὔτε ἐφασαν ἐπὶ πῦλας ἀστυνεῖονας 5 στρατευθῆναι, λέγοντες Ἕρεστριών τε καὶ Ἀθηνῶν, εὐθαίτα τούτους ἐπολύρκεον τε καὶ τὰν ἢμν σφεῶν ἐκείρον, εἰς δὲ καὶ οἱ Καρύστιοι παρέστησαν ἐς τῶν Περεόν τὴν γυνῷ. Ἕρεστριῶν δὲ πνευμῶν τὴν στρατηγὴν τὴν Περευκὴν ἐπὶ σφεῶν ἐπιτελέσατο Ἀθηναίοις ἐδείχθησαν σφίζον βοῆθον γενέσθαι. Ἀθηναίοι δὲ οὐκ ἀπείπαντα τὴν ἐπικουρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῶν τετρακατσιχλούς τῶν κληρονομιῶν τῶν ἱπποβοστῶν Χαλκιδῶν τὴν χάρην, τούτους 5 σφὶ διδόναι τιμωροῦσι. τόν δὲ Ἕρεστριῶν ἱν ἀρα οὖδὲν ἴμως

again (cp. ο. 96 supra) a little clumsily after εἰς τὴν Ἕρεστριν πρώτα in c. 98 supra. The repetition παρελήμβανοι καὶ ἐλάμβανον is also somewhat awkward. But Hdt. must sometimes be allowed to nod.

3. περιπλάνητες. A certain amount of time seems to have been consumed in this Periplus of the Kyklades. The first real resistance is experienced at Karystos in Euboia. The old Peisistratid connexion with the Kyklades may have counted for something in these delays. The conduct of the Karystians is in strong contrast to that of the Ionians and Aeolians, who served with the Persian fleet: but they too are reduced and 'medize.' (cp. 8. 90, 112. Their subjection to Athens (9. 105) would be at least partially justified thereby (cp. Thuc. 1. 98, and for the principle, Thuc. 6. 82, 83).

5. δυναστευτόνα. The Karystians were accounted Drupes, not Ionians (Thuc. 7. 57, 4), hence perhaps the choice of the term.

100. 3. Ἀθηναίων. The application of the Eretrians was presumably brought before the Ekklesia. According to the story given in this chapter the Eretrians had only themselves to thank for their subsequent fate. Eretria was divided against itself. The Athenians, indeed, evacuated Euboia, and left it to its fate, but only at the express entreaty of a leading and loyal citizen of Eretria. Strangely enough, neither he nor his partisans, though foreseeing the inevitable, accompanied the Athenians in their retreat. The apologetic tendency of this story is patent. To have detached or left these 4000 hoplites, who

doubtless fought in their own Pylae at Marathon, for the support or defence of Eretria, would have been, at the time, an heroic counsel. Afterwards, it may have seemed as though more of a stand might have been made at Eretria. But this story supplies the raison suffisante for the withdrawal. Divided counsels, positive treachery, express and pressing authority fully justified the action. The complete omission of all notice of the advantage to Athens of these 4000 soldiers in Attica makes the story the more to be suspected (cp. Wecklein, Tradition der Perserkriege, p. 39). Perhaps the Athenians were justified politically and strategically in confirming their own action to Athens, and the message to Sparta, c. 106 infra, betrays no bad conscience, but rather a hint that Sparta, if any one, was to blame for the loss of Eretria. From the Euboean point of view, would there have been much to choose between Sparta's treatment of Athens, and the Athenian treatment of Eretria?

4. τοῦ τετρακατσιχλούς: cp. 5. 77.

6. οὖν ἴμως βοήθεσα. βοήθεσα del. Cohet. Eretria was of old favourable to the Peisistratids (1. 62 and c. 98 supra). But the part taken in the Ionian revolt, 5. 99, and the obstinate defence of the city on this occasion, seem to show that Eretria by this time was for freedom. The story here rather implies that there was but one true man in a rotten state. A passage in Xenophon, Hell. 3. 1. 6, suggests that the medizing party was at this time non-existent. The king had counted a single partisan, one Gongylus, in Eretria, but he was in exile, and
had met his reward. This Gongylus may have met Eretria what Hippias was to Athens. But if Xenophon l. c. is accurate, the Gongylus there mentioned as alive in 399 B.C. cannot have medized in 490 B.C., much less previously. If Blakesley's suggestion is correct, that the Gongylus of Xenophon is grandson of the Gongylus who first medized, then Xenophon has expressed himself very inaccurately. That indeed is not unlikely. Thucydides, l. c. 126, mentions a Gongylus of Eretria as an interdictius between Pausanias and the great king in 477-6 B.C. This might be the original traitor, whom Xenophon has confounded with his son or grandson. As he is not here named by Hdt., we may suppose that he had already fled to the Medes, and was perhaps now in the suite of Datis or of Hippias.

7. διαφωσίας ιδέας. It is providential that these Eretrians are finally to be quartered in the neighbourhood of a well τά παρέχει τρφωσίας ιδέας, c. 119 ιστορία. The criticism in this chapter is unsound. There are two parties in Eretria, the party for taking to the mountains, the party for surrender and mediym. (There is, indeed, a third ιδέα—the one righteous man, Aischines.) The medizing party has its way, and yet the city instead of surrendering stands a siege, and that no make-believe, six days. Duncker, vii. 118 n., thinks that Hdt.'s source of information was the exiled Eretrians on the Tigris. But cp. note c. 119 ιστορία.


101. 1. Πρωτόν: ασέχει δέ μελέτω στ' Ερετρίας τής τῶν Ερετρίων πόλεως διαλέγεσθαι μέτρον εξερευνοντα, Thuc. 8. 95, 3. That was the new Eretria (Strabo, 448). Oropos, the Attic port for Euboea, cp. Thuc. 7. 29, 1, beyond the natural frontier of Attica, had been annexed, perhaps, at the time of the war with the Boeotians, 5. 77 supra, for it was not one of the domi (cp. 5. 74 supra). Cp. c. 108 ιστορία.

3. Τέμενος, so the MSS. but Valkenier's conjecture Ταμάνος is to be preferred. Cp. Strabo, 448 έκ δέ τ' Ερετρίας τόλμη δι Τέμενος πληροι τον περινόο. The other places probably dependent villages, cp. Baehr's note.

4. τούτους, the penultimate reference to the Persian cavalry, cp. c. 102 ιστορία. If εί τάγμα (FR) is not correct then κατέσχεσα κατασχέσεις are used in different senses.

7. ενίκα μη ἐκλειπεν τὴν πόλεων. This decision might in itself explain the retreat of the Athenians: or the retreat of the Athenians might have necessitated this decision, without recourse to the hypothesis of treachery. In the case of Athens, indeed, the danger of treachery is used as an argument for risking an engagement, c. 109 ιστορία. But then Athens was probably not in a position to stand a siege.
For six days resistance was maintained successfully in Eretria; then treachery handed over the city to the foe. Gongylus, who we may suppose was in the ranks of the Persians, may have acted on this occasion as go-between. The total destruction of Eretria and the captivity of the inhabitants (cp. c. 119 infra) might be thought to show that it was no part of the Persian policy, chiefly swayed perhaps by Hippias, to establish a local despot in Eretria; Gongylus had already received his reward, or was secure of it (Xenophon, I. c. supra).

That the destruction of Eretria was a πίστα is probably a pragmatic exaggeration. (Cp. Introduction, p. cxxv.) Eretria was restored on the old site (pace Strabo, I. c. supra), but never recovered this blow; she sent seven galleys to Salamis, 8, 46, and less than 600 hoplites to Plataia, 9, 23. For subsequent history cp. Dict. of Geogr. sub voc., and on the coinage, B. Head, Hist. Num. pp. 305 ff. The site has been explored by the American School at Athens, and Strabo’s mistake refuted. Cf. American Journal of Archaeology, vii. (1891) 3, 4, and especially p. 241.

12. ἀποτυγχάνον. Cp. 5. 102 supra. 14. ἐντολάς, c. 94 supra. The ‘commands’ are probably inferred from the results. Burnias’s inference, Geogr. ii. 420, that the Persians fired only the temples and not the private houses is illegitimate. The private houses are to be understood, a majorì.

102. 1. ὑπηργότερος. The motive for this delay we are left to conjecture; need for recuperation after the losses at Eretria, desire to intrigue in Athens, the feebleness of Hippias, some further operations (cp. c. 118 infra), or what not?

2. ἐς γήν τ. Ἁ. (Old) Eretria was much to the north or north-west of the Tetrapolis, Oropus was the nearest Attic post (cp. c. 101 supra). The promontory Kynosura would have to be rounded in order to reach the bay of Marathon. Old Eretria is placed on Kiepert’s map east of (new) Eretria, cp. Dict. of Geogr. sub voc. Burrian, Geogr. v. Oricenthil. ii. 420, questions there having been any change of site.

κατέργασε is a difficulty; κατεργασε is transitive, cp. 4. 49, 5. 63 supra.

Stein has suggested taking it inversely, in the sense hindistance, that is, ‘in hot haste’; but they do not seem to have been in any hurry. He has also suggested an emendation: κατεργάσετε το τοῦ πλοίου, κατεργάσετε with Diels, or κατεργάσετε with Madvig would be preferable. (But cp. L. & S.) Van Hesbergen reads, by conjecture, καταστολυγόντες.

3. ποιήσα τινὰ τι is strictly Hesiodotean. Cp. 1. 115, 3. 76, also ποιήσα τινὰ 4. 166 supra.

4. καὶ ἔν γάρ, κτλ. Oropus was nearer Eretria, and also Rhamnos, not to mention other places. ‘The plain’ (cp. 1. 59), if not the Thriasian plain, was much better adapted to cavalry than the confined and marshy ground at Marathon, crossed by stream-beds and commanded by hills and highland. Hdt.’s statement makes it the more inconsequent that he should say nothing subsequently of the cavalry, and raises a doubt whether he had been over the ground. On some probable reasons for attacking Athens on this side, cp. c. 99 supra.

Hippias had good reason to select the Tetrapolis, cp. 1. 62. Cp. further Appendix X. § 7.
5 ἐνυππενδάει καὶ ἄγχοστατό τῆς Ἕρετρίας, ἐς τούτο σφι κατηγέτο
103 Ἰππής ὁ Πεισιστράτου. Ἀθηναίοι δὲ ὡς ἐπιθυμοῦντα ταῦτα, ἐβοήθουν καὶ αὐτὸι ἐς τὸν Μαραθῶνα. ἦγον δὲ σφέας στρατηγοῦν ἄλοκα, τῶν ὁ δέκατος ἢν Μιλησίδης τοῦ τῶν πατέρα Κέλμαν τῶν Ἀγασίαρίων κατέλαβε φυγεῖν ἐξ Ἀθηναίων Πεισιστρατων τῶν
5 Ἰπποκράτους, καὶ αὐτῷ φεύγοντι Ὀλυμπιάδα ἀνέλθασι τε-θρίπησθαι, καὶ ταύτῃ μὲν τὴν τῆς ἔνεικα τοῖς ὁμομετρίῳ ἀδελφοὶ Μιλησίδη μετὰ δὲ τῇ

103. 2. ἐβοήθον καὶ αὐτὸί. Would a pepysm of the Ekklesia has been necessary to decide on this movement? Cf. c. 100 νεπρ. Not perhaps in the days when Hdt. was writing, at least if αὐτοκρατία has been previously voted to the Strategi; but in 490 B.C. the case was probably different. It may, however, be said that Hdt. does not negative the possibility of a pepysm on this occasion. It becomes, however, at once obvious that Hdt.'s account leaves details to be understood.

ηγοῦ .. στρατηγοῦν ἄλοκα. As the Polemarch too went to Marathon (c. 109 ϊάφεα), or rather to Probabilitos (cp. Appendix X. § 31), it appears that the city was left without any of its regular military officers. Hdt. indeed does not here use the words of ἄλοκα στρατηγοῦν, cp. c. 105 ἴναφεα, but his main conception of the constitutional situation is anarchistic. The Polemarch was probably leading (ἡχυ.). See c. 109 ἴναφεα.

3. 5 δέκατοι savours of the Thucydidean phrase δέκατοι αὐτῶ, παράτειν ἀνέλομαι καὶ σέλα., and carries with it the suggestion of a technical superiority in the Strategos named over his colleagues. Cf. Hermann, Lcgbhucb. 1. ii. § 115, p. 648. That Miltiades possessed such a superiority de facto is the clear moral of the story of Marathon. Cp. Appen-
dix X. § 5. It is plain, however, that the story is coloured by the later con-
stitutional practices of the Athenian state, as well as by other interests.

Stein interprets this passage to mean that Miltiades was the last, the order of the Strategi following the annual order of the Phylae (cp. c. 111 ἴναφεα), which they commanded and to which they belonged. (Cp. 'Αθην. ηχωλ. c. 32.) In this case Miltiades, accord-
ing to Stein, commanded the Oineis, to which his Deme, Lakiaidæ, belonged, and this Phyle stood on the extreme

left in the order of battle. But cp. c. 104 ἴναφεα, and Appendix X. § 23. Among the colleagues of Miltiades were Stesilæos (c. 114 ἴναφεα), Aristides (Phlarch, d.ii. 5) and possibly even Themistokles.

5. Ὀλυμπιάδα. The dates of the three victories are probably Ol. 61, 62, 63, or Ol. 63, 65, 64. Clinton prefers the latter (F. H. ii. 6 p. 320), Dünckel the former, Gesch. d. Alterth. vi. 1 p. 469.

6. τῶν ἐξενεικασθεὶς, "gained the very same honour which had before been carried off by Miltiades" (R.). If this is what Hdt. meant to say he took an uncommonly roundabout way of saying it; and was it worth saying? Besides, there is nothing in the text to justify the "before." Some have understood ἐξενεικασθαί in the sense "transferred"; the victory which he won he transferred to his brother, gave the honour to his brother, cp. παράδειγμα Πεισιστράτου ἀνάρχηθημεν just below. This gives a very good sense, but only by violence done to the verb. In any case the grammar of the passage is exceptional, but to preserve the correct sense of ἐξεκεικασθαί one might take ταύτη μὲν τὴν τίχνην ἀνέλομον μας as an accusativus pendens and repeat συνεργεῖ before τῷ κυρ. The sense of the passage would then run: καὶ αὐτῷ φεύγοντι Ὀλυμπιάδα ἀνέλθασι τεθρίπησθαι συνεργεῖ τῷ ὅμομετρῳ ἀδελφῷ τῶν ἐξενεκεικασθαί. Kimon won the victory, but Miltiades had the credit of it. (With τῷ κυρ. cp. τούτα, c. 105. 1. 3 ἴναφεα.) The "national" law of the Olympic meeting so far recognised the 'municipal' laws of the Greek states severally as to exclude from the honours of the ἄνω citizens under ἄνω. This at least was the case in the fourth century. Cp. Smith, Dict. of Antiquities, 862 a. Hence Kimon φεύγων and ἄνω could not have himself proclaimed victor.
12. οὐκέτα περιοντός αὐτοῦ Π. Pseisistratos died in 428 B.C., Ol. 62 began at midsummer of that year. On the date and event, cp. Appendix IX, § 1.

13. τὸ πρωτανήμιον. This term might have designated at one time or another three different buildings, on three different sides of the Akropolis: (1) The original town-hall, in Kydathenaiion. (2) The Tholos, in the inner Kerameikos. (3) The new town-hall, on the north side of the Akropolis. Cp. Curtius, Stadtp. pp. lxxxix. 51, 93, 244, 302. If Curtius is right in ascribing (3) to Demetrios of Phaleron (cp. c. p. 244), it may be ruled out. It is doubtful whether the Tholos was called the Prytaneion by any early or correct authority. It would therefore appear that we must here understand (1). But the site of this Thesean Prytaneion (Thuc. 2. 15, 3) is theoretical, and it is observable that Thucydides i.e. though fixing the position of the older temples leaves the position of the (older) town-hall undefined.

14. πρὸ τοῦ ἀστοῦ κτλ. reads like autopy. The cemetery of the Phaidai was close to Athens: πρὸ γὰρ τῷ Φαίδαι εὐκαίρια καλοπάμεια ἐστίν ἐν Κύλη τὰ καλούμενα Κύωνα μεμάκα (Marcellin. vit. Thuc. 17). It is pretty obvious that there was an inscription on the tomb of this team of mares. Were they all killed at once, in order to be buried together?

15. Εὐαγόρως. Evagoras, like Miltiades, had a memorial-chariot at Olympia, Pausan. 6. 16. 8, which Hdt. may have seen.

16. Στεγανάρης, named after his paternal grandfather in accord with custom, was plainly the elder son. Miltiades gets his name from the oikist of the Chersonese, cp. c. 34 supra.

17. Πάτρως, the διωμέρα τούτου Kimon is πάτρως to Kimon’s sons. πατριδελφος would be a more correct term for the relationship. But cp. notes to cc. 34 ff. supra. If Kypselos f. of Miltiades had been full brother to Stesagoras f. of Kimon, Stesagoras the elder would have been πατρινός (as well as stepfather) of Miltiades the oikist: this Miltiades would have had an agnatic kinship with Kimon his διωμέρα τούτου, and might therefore easily have been described as πάτρως to Stesagoras the younger.

18. ήκον (c. 41 supra) ἀστρατηγὸς Ἀθηναίων again suggests, or at least would probably have suggested to readers in Hdt. own day, that Miltiades was commander-in-chief: though not, of course, that he was the only Strategos.
λαβεῖς τε καὶ ἀναγαγέων παρὰ βασιλέα· ἀμα δὲ ἐκφυγόντα τε τοιτούς καὶ ἀπίκεμένων ἐς τὴν ἔως τοῦ δεκαετά τε εἶναι ἐν σωτηρίᾳ ἤδη, τὸ ἐνθεύτεν μοι ὑπεδεξαμένων ὑπὸ δικαστήριον αὐτῶν ἀγαγότες ἔδωξαν τυραννίδος τῆς ἐν Χερσονήσῳ. ἀντιφεύγον δὲ καὶ τοιτούς στρατηγὸς οὗτος Ἀθηναίων ἀπεδέχθη, 

10 αἰρέθεις ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου.

105 Καὶ πρῶτα μὲν ἔστες ἐπὶ ἐν τῷ ἄστει οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀποτείμητοι ἐς Ἐπάρτην κήρυκα Ἐφεσσίδην Ἀθηναίων μὲν ἀδέρ, ἄλλοι δὲ ἡμεροδρόμων τε καὶ τοιτού μελετῶντα· τῷ δὲ, ὡς αὐτὸς τε ἔξεγε Ἐφεσσίδης καὶ Ἀθηναίοις ἀπήγγελλε, περὶ τὸ 5 Παρθενῶν ὄρος τὸ ὑπὲρ Τεγής ὁ Πάν περιπετείτω· βάσαντα δὲ τὸ οὖν μνα Ἐφεσσίδης τῶν Πάνα Ἀθηναίους κελεύσας ἀρχαγγέλα, δὲ δ´ τι ἐόροις οὐδεμίαν ἐπιμελείαν ποιεύσαντα ἔστωτε ἐνυόου Ἀθηναίους καὶ πολλαχῇ γενομένοι σφὶ ἢδη κρησόμου, τὰ δ´ ἐτι καὶ ἐσομένου. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Ἀθηναίοι, καταστάντων σφὶ 

7. οἱ ἔχροι. The Peisistratid party can scarcely by itself at that time have been strong enough for such action. If we may suppose that the enemies who prosecuted him on this occasion were the same as those who prosecuted him, more successfully, on a later occasion, then this prosecution was the work of a circle or clique to which Xanthippos belonged, i.e., presumably the Alkmaionid party. 

10. ἀρέθης ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου, i.e. by the Ekklesia, not merely by one of the Phylaec. But this description is almost certainly an anachronism, though it may suit with the subsequent presentation of Miletiades as the general among the Strategi at Marathon ('Αθ. πολ. c. 22. Cr. Appendix IX. § 13). The date of this election might be the spring of 490 b.c., or he may have been Strategos more than one year in succession.

108. 1. ἔστες ἐπὶ ἐν τῷ δήμῳ. The mission of Philipides precedes the march to Marathon, which has already been specified, c. 103 supra, and neither grammatically nor materially is there any subsequent clause answering to the sentence introduced by πρῶτα μὲν.

110. οἱ στρατηγοὶ, ten, or more! including the Polemarch! On these points Hdt. leaves us in the dark.

2. θεοπροτέρας, φιλεπίθεος R et scriptorum testimonia (Stein). θεοπροτέρας must be right. The form is preserved by R, in Nepos, vit. Mill. 4, and in Pausan. 1. 28, 4, Pliny 7. 20, Solinus l.c. infra c. 106. Aristophanes would never have made 'Pheidippides' the son of Strepsiades, if the name had been consecrated in the Athenian traditions of Marathon: moreover, the corruption from Philipides to Pheidippides, for the ἡμεροδρόμως, is easier to understand than the reverse. 

Cr. further, Appendix X. § 3. The form θεοπροτέρας is guaranteed by a RV against 8 (Holder), and by a variation
in Nepos, Milt. 4. L. & S.7 do not recognise it.

11. Πανός Ἰρών, a cave on the north side of the Akropolis. Cp. Panionias l.c. (Descriptio Arctis Add. ad.) Jahn, p. 37, and the passages there quoted. That Pan was unworshipped at Athens until after his epiphany to Philipides on Mt. Pantherion and the panic of the Persians at Marathon seems improbable. Cp. παλαιάς <μεν> (Naber) γεμόμενον σφι θεόν χρυσίων. The cult was perhaps revived after the god's service at Marathon. On the connexion with Arkadia cp. 4. 203. Blakesley (notes 240-242) has some interesting conjectures, but he is wrong in taking λαμπαδίας as an 'illumination.' In the grotto was a statue of Pan dedicated by Miltiades, with the following inscription by Simonides:

τὸν τραγάνου ἐμὲ Πάνα τὸν Ἀρκάδα τὸν κατὰ Μήδον τὸν μετ' Αθηναίων στήριχτο Μαλάθηι.

(But cp. Appendix X. § 15, and Introduction, p. ixiv.)

M. Breton (Athènes, 2 Ed. p. 189) has the remark: "Cur. Wordsworth (Athens and Attica, c. xii.) prétend que cette statue orne aujourd'hui le vestibule de la bibliothèque de Cambridge," But all that Wordsworth affirmed (op. cit.4 p. 69) is that the statue in the grotto was "perhaps that which was dedicated by Miltiades, and for which Simonides wrote the inscription, and that now stands in the vestibule of the Public Library at Cambridge." The statue in question is doubtless that in the Fitzwilliam Museum. Clarke, xii, τρισαμφόρος, "discovered in a garden below the grotto of Pan at the foot of the Akropolis of Athens." See Michaelis, Ancient Marbles in Great Britain, p. 246 (ed. Fennell, 1882).

106. 1. τότε δὲ in contrast to ταῦτα μὲν καταστάτων εἰ τ. πρ. just above, and antecedent to ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα just below.

3. δευτερόσε is the next day, i.e. within twenty-four hours. Solinus (ed. Mommsen, pp. 26, 27) giving 'records' for swiftness of foot, this one included, estimates the distance at 1240 stadia. The passage is taken from Pliny, 7. 20 (84), where the received text has MCXL stadia: one C has probably dropped out (cp. Plinius Nat. Hist. l.c. ed. Lemaire).

4. τοὺς ἄρχοντας, not the king, or kings alone, anyway, cp. c. 67 supra (but cp. 5. 49 supra, 9. 7).

6. ἀρχαιοτάτην. The regular Athenian view, and doubtless just, cp. Thucyd. 1. 5, 5. Athens was of immemorial antiquity, the absence of a (Dorian) conquest facilitating the assumption of 'autochthonism.'

8. ἡ Ἑλλάς, a remarkable instance of the ethical significance of this term 'Hellenism' (making it nearly equivalent to τὰ Ἑλληνικά 8. 144). Cp. 5. 49 supra, 7. 197.

9. τοῖς δὲ ἔπαι. It would be fallacious to argue from this passage that it was possible (constitutional) at this date φυλακὰς φαίνει without an antecedent vote of the Areopagus, authorising the policy. The exact moment for mobilisation or action may have been left to the authorities, now, as in much later days. Xen. Hell. 6. 5, 10 may be taken as an example of the normal procedure: τὸν Δακενδρέας ἐθέλει βοηθῆναι ἐλατὶ (=τοῖς δὲ ἔπαι βοηθήσει) . . φορνὰρ μὲν ὁ ἔφορος φαίνεσθαι 'Αγγελαίαν
107. Oidtoi mev yw twn panteslhn emewn. tois de baubhrois kattergeito Ippias o Peiospatratoj ou ton Marathwma, thj parok-

xomhj yvth hgy nwn toymi. edhke o Ippias ti mptihj ti

diawsw Eunoj swvswthma. swvswbaleto ou ek o oulwn katexdwn

5 es tis 'Athnas kal anaskwamwos twn arkhj telswswj eu ej

diawsw hjhj, ek mev hi hgy swvswbaleto taia, toto de

kattergeomwos toio mev ta anbropoda ta ej Epitroj anbephe

eis th nposen thj Suvewma, kalomwma de Aiglynav, touto de

kattromwes es ton Marathwma tis vías brumj ods, ekβýgat

to ej hýn twn baubhron diætasthe. kai oi taia diætopo ej-

hkei stpaioj te kal βýhj mevnous h ej edwthei ola de oi pro-

xwteri ejonti ton odojw oj plwuv ejeljonti routen ouv ev

ton odojwv ekβaljve wp o βýhj βýhj. ekspovw ods ej ej hýn

fýmwn autov epoij oswj polw oswj eksewv. ej de ouk

3' ekleus he wdi ygeitha. Cp 5. 64

supra, Appendix VII. § 8.

11. ej xar kta. We must take this

passage to mean that the Spartans could

not start on the ninth, or any other
day, till full moon (15th), and not that the

full moon might have fallen on the

ninth. Did this rule hold for all

months, or only for this particular

month? The ancients understood the

rule as valid generally. cp. Pausan. 1.

28, 4, Schol. Aristoph. Acharn. 84,

Plutarch, Mor. 861. Stein confines the

rule to the month Karneios, in which the

festival lasted from 7th to 15th.

It seems well-nigh incredible that the

Spartans should have put up with such a

hindrance to military operations every

month. The limitation of the obstruc-
tion to a single month makes it more

possible to maintain with Grote, and

against Rawlinson, the bona fides of

the Spartans on this occasion. The

great haste which they used when they

started on the 15th points to the

same conclusion. This argument of

course assumes the truth of the tradi-
tion, and that the action, or inaction,
of the Spartans has not been rationalised,
or religiousised, by afterthought. Cp.

Appendix VII. § 11 ad finem.

12. de o, cp. c. 88 supra.

107. toio ej baubhrono kta. 'the

night before Hippias, son of Peisistratos,

conducted the barbarians to Marathon

he had sight of a vision as follows.'

Cp. c. 102 supra, where Hippias has

already led the barbarians to Marathon.

8. edhke o 'Ippias kta. Whether

Hippias had any such dream as that

here ascribed to him; whether he
coughed a tooth out on the sand of

Marathon; whether he conjectured that

the latter misfortune was a fulfilment

of the former visitation, and made

known this depressing conjecture to

those about him; these are questions

which can be decided only on general

grounds. The story is not inapprop-

ciate to the reputation of Hippias for

piety of a certain kind. Cp. 5. 99

supra. His brother Hipparchos was a dreamer

too, 5. 56 supra, but the story reads

rather like a bitter jest at the exiled


7. tóto mev... tóto 84. The re-

cord here seems to represent Hippias not

merely as a guide, but as Field-Marsh-

al of the Persian forces (tá anbropoda

... anbephe... tás réas brumj ods... tóx

baubhron diætase). It is important to

observe that the ships were left riding

at anchor, not drawn up on shore.

8. Aiglynav, v. 1. Aiglynav PR, may

be identified with the island lying

almost directly between Styra, in

Euboea, and Kynosena, by Marathon:

although there is no ancient authority

for the identification.

14. édrouvo, 'he caused diligent
search to be made for his tooth." Van Herwerden improves the text by removing τῶν ὀδόντων, βήχας and αὐτοῖ. The sand (ψημοί) is observable: cp. Appendix X. §§ 9, 95.

108 2. τοιχῶν Ἡρακλεῖος. This is the Herakleion at Marathon presumably, and not the Herakleion in Kynosargos, cc. 118 infra, 103 supra. The cult of Herakles at Marathon was accounted the oldest in Greece (Pausan. i. 32, 4) and was perhaps a Phoenician importation. Strictly speaking, this close was not at 'Marathon,' but near the modern Vrana, as Lolling appears to have proved (Mitt. des D. arch. Instituts, i. 59 ff.). This determination of the site must govern our conception of the operations. See Appendix X. § 31.

4. τόνων, e.g. the war with Thebes 5, 77 supra, where, however, their services are ignored.

5. 50a. That the account of the origin of the alliance between Athens and Plataia should be introduced here, out of its natural and chronological relations, is remarkable, the more so as Hdt. has already narrated no less than three expeditions of Kleomènes into central Greece (5. 64, 72, 74 supra), to one of which this episode must be supposed to belong. This incoherence might be explained by the supposition that Hdt. had composed the story of Marathon, this excursus included; before composing the narrative in the fifth Book where it would have come in more appropriately: in that case, however, we might have expected a forward reference to this passage in the fifth Book. (There is a parallel case to such an omission in the story of the μῦς Ταλέβονος 7. 133 ff., cpd. with 6. 48, 94.) Or the story of the Platæan alliance may have formed an integral portion of the (Attic) tradition about the battle of Marathon, and Hdt. may be keeping close to his sources. Or the explanation might be sought in the supposition that before Hdt. composed the story of Marathon special attention had been attracted to the case of Plataia and its relations to Athens, as in 431 b.c. (Thuc. 2, ad loc.); That this passage was written or revised after the destruction of Plataia in 427 b.c. (Thuc. 3. 68) seems improbable. It might be a late insertion (by Hdt.'s own hand), though why in this case he did not insert it in its natural place in Bk. 5, is not very evident.

7. Κλεομένε. Thuc. 3. 68, 2 dates the alliance ninety-two years before the destruction in 427 b.c. That date brings us to 519 b.c. Grose, in an unwavering note (vol. iii. p. 588, pt. ii. c. xxxi.), has proved that this date is highly improbable. It is not, however, necessary to suppose that Thucydides in this case committed a blunder. Let it be granted that a copyist added one Δ too many (ΠΔΔΔΔΙΠΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙII

Ed. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alterth. ii. p. 780, § 478 n. (1893), reverts to the earlier date, but he does not explain what Kleomenes <and the
HRODOTOY

109 Τούτο δὲ Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοίς ἐγίνοντο δίχα αἱ γυναι,

Perhaps the Panathenaic, during which the procession halted at this altar, Xen. Hipp. 3. 2, 3. Mommsen, Hest. p. 594. 21. καταλαβάνων. On the practice of arbitration, cp. 6. 29. The παρατ/χώτες κατὰ here is probably a mere phrase to cover ignorance, cp. παρατυχούσι supra. On the policy of Corinth cp. c. 59 supra, 5. 92, 93. It may be observed that the Corinthian orator in Thucydides. 1. 41 does not include this arbitration in the list of services to Athens.

23. ἡ Β. τελευ. Cp. c. 53. 1. 6 supra.

25. τῇ καθή. This cannot possibly be the victory recorded in 5. 77 supra, for (1) the circumstances are different, (2) it precedes the annexation of Hysiae, cp. 5. 74 supra. It therefore precedes the expedition of the Peloponnesians there recorded.

109. 1. δίχα αἱ γυναι. This council of war is localised at Marathon. The question before the Strategi (for the Polemarch is εὐ δύναι not present)
Whether to risk a battle or to act on the defensive. The previous question, whether to go out or to remain in the city, must have been raised before the march to Marathon, c. 108 super; but of this point Hdt. takes virtually no account. Op. case of Eretria, c. 101 super, and see Appendix X. § 26.

3. τὸν δὲ καὶ. Perhaps Aristides and the gallant Sestilas son of Thrasy- laos (op. c. 105 super), possibly even Themistokles, were among the four who supported the better judgment of Miltiades. συμβάλλων del. Stein.

5. ὁ τοῦ κυνήγου λαγὸν πολέμαρχον. This incidental phrase cannot prove that the lot had been introduced by Kleisthenes for the Archontate; at most it proves that the Polemarch was appointed by sortition, perhaps out of the college of nine Archons, after their election χειροτονία. But the general assumption that Hdt. thought of the Archons as appointed in 490 B.C. as they were certainly appointed in 490 B.C. ἰδίως or κοίλων need not be gainsaid. He may have more likely, however, that Hdt. should have been guilty of an anachronism in the constitutional history of Athens, than that the lot was introduced so early as is here implied. Is Hdt. such a high authority on political and constitutional perspectives? Are anachronisms so rare in his pages? Moreover, this matter of the lot is not what he is here mainly concerned about: at the time he is writing the Polemarch and the other Archons obtain office by sortition, but the Polemarch has ceased to be ὑμηθέτης τούτων στρατηγοίς: it is this fact, that in the days of Marathon the Polemarch was still a member of the college of commanders, not the circumstance that he was already an officer κυνηγοῦς, which affects the story. What the exact position of the Polemarch was in 490 B.C. Hdt. does not clearly indicate, but he does not say that the Polemarch had merely a casting vote in case of an equivocation among ten Strategi. The Polemarch was ὁμοψήφος τ. στ. He voted therefore on all occasions. He must have been consulted before the army left Athens (c. 108), before the mission of Philipides (c. 105); and not merely at the eleventh hour. The Polemarch also fights on the right wing—now commands it (c. 111 infra). There is indeed only one supposition which fairly makes sense of the story of Marathon. In 490 B.C. the Polemarch was still commander-in-chief, and the Strategi formed his council of war. As commander-in-chief he led the right wing, the post of honour and danger in a Greek army. Miltiades probably was the intellectual author of the Athenian tactics at Marathon, but he was not στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτους, which is virtually the position assigned to him in the traditions of the Periclean age. It was Kallimaches not Miltiades who commanded at Marathon. This theory, if correct, makes it more absurd than ever to suppose that the Polemarch was κυνηγείον. On the occasion of the introduction of the lot see further: On the significance of the lot and the date of its introduction at Athens in the Transactions of the Oxford Philological Society 1880/1. [Also J. W. Headlam, Election by Lot at Athens, Camb. 1891.]

This note so far has been left intact, as written years before the discovery of the treatise on the Athenian Polity, ascribed to Aristotle, which has the express statement for the date of Marathon: τὸν στρατηγὸν ἱερόντω κατὰ φυλῆ, εἰς ἑκάστην φυλήν ἑνα, τῆς δὲ ἀνάκρισι στρατεύματα ἰεινὸν ὅ ὁ πολέμαρχον c. 22. This statement was probably intended to clear up the obscurity in regard to the part played by the Polemarch in Hdt.'s account of the Marathonian affair, which may have perplexed Athenian students in the fourth century B.C. as it has perplexed all modern students who have given any attention to it. It does not, however,
follow that the statement in the 'Αθ. πολ. is based on historical testimony or tradition, as distinct from inference. The inference made in the nineteenth cent. P.C. may have been anticipated in the fourth cent. a.c. Cp. Appendices IX. § 13, X. § 6.

8. Λάδος seems to carry out the assumption that the Polemarch had not been present at the previous council or debate: and so do the terms of the speech which follows.

9. Τάδα. This speech appears to be coloured by later ideas; at least it may be doubted whether Miltiades would have shared the (later) popular view of the services of Harmodios and Aristogeiton to the cause of liberty (cp. Thuc. 6. 54, and the Λόμοι, Marcell. § 2, Anonym. § 1). The future augured for Athens may be thought unlikely before the event. There is, however, special point in the allusion. These Gephyreans (5. 57 supra) were from Aphidna, like Kallimachos himself (Plutarch, Moral. 628), and in later times at least the Polemarch conducted the festival in their honour, 'Αθ. πολ. c. 58.

The argument of Miltiades seems rather belated, if first urged at Vrans. (Cp. the case of Eretria, oc. 100, 101 supra.) It does not belong to Hdt.'s method to inform his hearers (or readers) from what source he derived knowledge of this intimate conference. He is, however, rarely at a loss on these occasions, cp. 4. 137, 5. 49 supra, 3. 80, etc., etc.

10. soł reappears in the appeal of Themistokles to Eurybiades, 6. 60. Cp. ές τα, έκ ετοι καὶ, and with ές τα, 'Αθ. cp. τόλων αρχαίωτης, c. 106 supra.

11. λάδους see Stein. 14. πρότης. Is this prophecy or history?

17. ήν ξεγρομα φρασών. This information might be useful for Hdt.'s public, but could hardly have been necessary from Miltiades to Kallimachos.

19. στάτων. The justice of this expectation (or reflection) is shown by the story of the shield, oc. 115, 121-124, and would in any case have been obvious in the light of Eretria, c. 101, Aigina, c. 49, and the state of parties in Athens itself.

22. έτοι τα τη σημείων, c. 11 supra.

25. πόλεις πρότης των έν τη 'Ελλάδα: cp. πρότης των 'Ελληνων πολίων supra. The unhistorical character of this speech is discovered by these phrases, which not only betray the influence of later days, but are out of keeping even with the hypothetical situation. On the eve of
110. Ο Μιλτιάδης προσκύναε τὸν Καλλιμάχον· προσεγευμένης δὲ τοῦ πολεμάρχου τῆς γρομῆς ἑκατέρωτο συμβάλλειν. μετὰ δὲ οἱ στρατηγοὶ τῶν ἡ γνώμη ἐφέρε συμβάλλειν, ὃς ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν ἔγραψε προτανήγη τῆς ἡμέρης, Μιλτιάδης παρ-

Marathon Kallimachos and Miltiades may have been discussing the questions whether to expect or to deliver an attack, and at what moment: but hardly the prospects of an Athenian primacy.

110. 5. οἱ στρατηγοὶ τὸν Καλλιμάχον (cf. supra). There were four of them, and apparently the προτανήγη came to each one of them, before it reached Miltiades. Each yielded the honour to Miltiades, yet he postpones the engagement until his own day comes round: an inexplicable inconsequence on the showing of Hdt. Perhaps the real question with Miltiades, or rather with Kallimachos, was that the Athenians should deliver the attack, and not act merely on the defensive, rather than the question of delivering the attack on any particular day. To attack without waiting for the Spartans unless some special circumstance arose to make an immediate attack advisable—might well have seemed an act of folly. Van Horssen cuts the knot by inserting εἰκόν, before δημιουργείτω.

4. προτανήγη. The word has been generally supposed in this passage to mean ‘the command-in-chief,’ cf. L & S. s.v. where no parallel is adduced. Plutarch seems to have taken this view of the passage, see Aristeid. c. 5. If, however, the supreme command was really vested in the Polemarch, and the Strategi commanded each only a Phyle, some other meaning must be sought for προτανήγη, or the word is here used incorrectly. Whether Hdt. understood its correct use is another question.

In what sense, or senses, could there be a daily change in the προτανήγη of the Strategi, the ἡγεμονία of the Polemarch remaining intact? In one sense προτανήγη was the period during which the ἀριθμοὶ of each Phyle were, so to speak, in office, i.e. one-tenth of the year. That order was determined by lot. Did the order of the Phyle for battle follow the order of the phylotic prytanies for the year? Did the προτανήγη φυλῆ for the time being hold the post of honour, with its ἡγεμονία, or did it merely follow the order of the Phyle, which was determined by lot?
in question. The attempt (Lugebii, Z. Geschichte d. Staatenverf. u. Athen, ii. § 17) to show that, in the time of the ten Phyleae, Lakiai may have belonged to the Aiantis, is disproved by C.I.A. ii. 685, p. 540, where that deme belongs to the Oineis in Ol. 105. 1 = 560-59 B.C. from another inscription. C.I.A. i. 179, it appears that Lake- daimonios (grandson of Miltiades) belonged to Lakiai, 483-2 B.C. But, is it absolutely certain that Miltiades in 490 B.C. must have been ‘settled’ in Lakiai, or, even if so settled, could under no circumstances have commanded any other Phyle? The Aiantis is recorded to have occupied the right wing, at the battle of Marathon, upon the authority of Aischylos apud Plu- tarch, Quast. Conv. i. 10 = Moral. 628, op. Appendix X. § 27. The Philaid Miltiades would have had special claims upon the Aiantis, named after his heroic ancestor; is it certain that he was not in command of that Phyle? (The deme, Philaidai, by the way, belonged to the Aigeis.) Anyway, whatever Phyle Miltiades commanded, whatever Phyle stood on the right-wing, beside the Polemarch at Marathon, the word ἰπταμένως may have been used correctly here, even if Herodotus erroneously took it to mean ‘supreme command.’

Whether, after the reform of the Polemarchia, the supremacy in the college of Strategi, in the absence of a special psephism or enactment, rotated daily, is a moot question, op. Plutarch, l.c. ἐγειρα, Diodoros 13. 97 (Arginussae), 13. 106 (Aigio-potami). See further, Appendix IX. § 14.

111. 3. ἰπταμένω. ἰπταμένω cannot mean merely that the Polemarch stood as extreme man upon the right wing. Perhaps he stood there, but in a position of supreme authority. Lugebii, op. cit. §§ 12 ff., has shown that such was the general rule in Greek armies, but his further argument to show that Hdt. clearly understood the Polemarch at Marathon to have been commander-in-chief is unacceptable; cp. previous note, and Appendix X. § 5.

5. ἰπταμένων οἱ ἐπίθεματοι αἱ φυλαὶ. Plutarch, Mor. 628, asserts that Kallimachos belonged to the Aiantis, and assuming that the Polemarch’s Phyle stood beside the Polemarch, Stein* (1874) proposed to read αἱ ὀλίκες φυλαὶ, following Valla’s ceterae tribus. This merges the Phyle in the Polemarch, and implies that the Aiantis stood on the right, and stood there irrespective of the ἰπταμένως. Hdt. says αἱ φυλαὶ, i.e. the Phyleae, without exception, stood from right to left ἐπίθεματοι: i.e. as generally understood ‘according to the allotted order for the succession of ptytanies for the year,’ an order which changed every year. The Aiantis stood right as the ἰπταμένως φυλαὶ (so Rawlinson). Stein assuming that Miltiades was in command of the Oineis, and that δικήρως means last (instead of first) puts Oineis next the Plateains. In that case Miltiades might have commanded or led the whole left wing, and we might find the ἰπταμένως on the left, and the ἰπταμένως on the right. But this combination is not trustworthy, cp. 103 supra.

Stein* (1889) now argues that, as Hdt. did not write αἱ ὀλίκες φυλαὶ, he must have been ignorant of the tradition that the Aiantis was on the right wing. He regards the tradition as itself untrustworthy: but it has the authority of Aischylos, op. note supra. As above pointed out it was a coincidence, or an omen, perhaps contrived, that the Aiantis (to which the neighbouring Demai and the Polemarch belonged, and which Miltiades, perhaps, commanded) was on the right.

Our conception of the actual order in which the Phyleae, or tribes, stood on the day of battle, turns largely on the meaning of the words ὀλίκες φυλαῖ. Lugebii, op. cit. § 18, has argued that the words refer to the fixed and official order of the Phyleae: the imperfect is
The reference is probably to the Panathenais. Cp. s. 108 supra. This was not the only honour done, in course of time, to the Plataniars: on the walls of the Polikleitos Stoa they were recognisable, in the Marathonian fresco, by their Boeotian helmets, [Dem.] s. 94. Cp. Appendix X. § 20. It seems well-nigh inconceivable that this passage should have been written by Herodotus after the destruction of Plataia in 427 B.C. Cp. s. 108 supra. Whether Hdt. had himself heard the prayer at one of the festivals is not clear. Cp. s. 112 infra.

11. Εγκύκλιο τοιούτα τι. This arrangement was hardly an accident. Though it explains and in a way justifies the retreat of the centre, we need not suppose that it was a fiction coined for the purpose, nor is it likely that the numbers of each Phyle varied very much. It is most natural to see in it a result deliberately courted by the Athenian commanders in order to strengthen the wings, and dictated by the nature of the ground (Leake) or by other considerations. Cp. Appendix X. § 37.

12. Ήλυς, the usual depth was έτει οξτά. The centre on this occasion may have been thinned down to three or four. The extra number thus set free were not, we may suppose, massed on the wings, but brought up to the front in the centre, so as to lengthen the line of battle, the order of the Phylae remaining unbroken. Thus while the wings—perhaps three Phylae on the right and two Phylae with the Plataniars on the left—were eight or more ranks deep, the five Phylae in the centre were, perhaps, only half as deep. But no account is made of light-armed men.

112. 1. Σχεδίαστηκε, the completion of
the movement is marked by the preposition as well as by the tense. The neuter construction is noticeable. Cf. πάντες ἑτέρασαν 9. 33.
2. τὸ σφάγιον ἐγένετο καλά, not as at Plataia, 9. 36. There is no delay implied in éphéforon et alii in Plataia, 9. 36.
4. τὸ μεταξόμων, c. 77 supra. Eight stades would be millia passuum.
5. Πάγχυ Stein joins with ἑκείρων on the strength of 8. 10 Πάγχυ πάντα ἑκείρων, and understands it in the sense ὅπως ἔστω. Cp. πάγχυ.
6. Ἐσχήν 4. 135 supra. (L. & S. take it with ἐλειβήνη, and the position of the words favours this.)
7. ἔλεγχον is a relative term; the army numbered 10,000 at least, as we must suppose. Cf. Appendix X. §§ 25, 26.
8. ἄρρητος. What was the case was it is of course impossible to determine. That thousands of hoplites in full armour advanced the best part of a mile at a rapid run without breaking rank (ἄρρητος προσκύνησις) seems incredible (cp. H. Delbrück, Die Perserkriege, pp. 55 ff.), whatever single athletes after special training and practice might have accomplished. Yet this statement is apparently made thrice (ll. 3, 7, 10) in this chapter. A. Mommsen, Heerologie 211, suggests an explanation. Hdt. witnessed the festival on Boedromion 6, and was persuaded, or inferred, that Boedromion πέμπτον was a commemoration of this charge. The history is an inference from the rite. On the other hand, that a rapid advance was one of the characteristic memories of Marathon need not be doubted (cp. Appendix X. § 27), and ἄρρητος might, perhaps, as a military term, be simply opposed to βάθος, cp. 9. 67, and Arrian, Anab. 5.

16. 1 (Arrian's usual antitheton to βάθος is στενώδης, 3. 8, 1, 4. 23, 2, 5. 14, 1).
10. 1 (If this means that the Athenians had absolutely no cavalry, it can hardly be reconciled with the existence of the Solonian ἰρῶν, or ἰρῶν ἀνεξάρτητον, with the alleged supply of two horsemen from each Nauckia (cp. 5. 71 supra), and with general probabilities. In the time of Herodotus the ἰρῶν were the joy and boast of Athens, immortalised on the Parthenon frieze, glorified on the stage. Cp. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Αἰσ Κυδάθεν, p. 24, and on the number of the cavalry, Rawlinson n. ad l., Αἰσ. πολ. c. 24, Sandys' note. But even at the best of times the Athenian cavalry was not a very important arm of the service. In 511 b.c., 5. 63 supra, and again later (Thuc. 2. 22, 431 b.c.) Athens relied on Thessalian horsemen. But under the tyranny the native cavalry had probably been discouraged, for political reasons. The conjectures ascribed to the barbarian might fairly be taken to imply that they on their part had cavalry present, but no mention is made of it in the action by Hdt. See Appendix X. § 7. 10. 6 ἀργύρων. This want Athens supplied apparently before the battle of Plataia, see 9. 60.
ēs πολεμίως ἐγκρησαντο, πρῶτοι δὲ ἀνέσχυστον ἐνδήτα τῆς Μηδικῆς ἀρέστες καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ταύτης ἤσθημενοι: τέως δὲ ἦν τούτο Ἑλληνική καὶ τὸ ὁνόμα τοῦ Μηδικοῦ φόβος ἀκούσας. μεμομένων 113 δὲ ἐν τῷ Μαραθωνίῳ χρόνον ἔγινεν πολλοί, καὶ τὸ μέν μέσον τοῦ πολεμίως ἐνεκὼν οἱ βάρβαροι, τῇ Πέρσαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ Σάκαι ἐπετάχυσατο κατὰ τούτῳ μὲν δὴ ἐνικοὶ οἱ βάρβαροι καὶ ῥήξαντες ἐθέλουν ἐν τῇ μεσώναιαν, τὸ δὲ κέρας ἐκέτερον ἐνεκὼν 5 Ἀθηναίοι τοις καὶ Πλαταίαις: νικώντες δὲ τὸ μὲν τετραμένων τῶν βαρβάρων φεύγειν ἔως, τοῖς δὲ τὸ μέσον ῥήξαντες αὐτῶν συναγωνίζοντες τὰ κέρα θρίμοτα ἐμάχοντο καὶ ἐνικοὶ Ἀθηναίοι. φεύγουσι δὲ τοὺς Πέρσας εὐποντο κόπτοντες, ἐς δὲ τὴν θάλασσαν ἀπέκμενοι πῦρ τις αὗτος καὶ ἐπελαμβάνοντο τῶν 10 νεώτ. καὶ τούτῳ μὲν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πόλεμῳ ὁ πολέμαρχος δια-114 φθείρεται, ἀνήρ γενόμενος ἀγάθος, ἀπὸ δὲ ἐθάνα τῶν στρατηγῶν Ἑθνολόγων ο Ἐθνολόγων τοῦτο ἐν Κυνέγεροι ἐν Ἑθνολόγωι

described by Rawlinson (i, 2 p. 78) as "an indefensible statement," and admitted as evidence of an undue partiality towards the Athenians on the side of Hdt. Without denying the partiality, it may be suggested that this remark, or something like it, occurred in his Athenian sources, and is not to be put down to the historian in the first instance (cp. a converse case 5, 97). Rawlinson l.c. gives a list of the inst. contradictiones. Cp. Appendix X. § 4.

113. 2. χρόνος πολλῶς. The phrase must be taken as decisive, though vague. The Athenians had no notion of representing the battle of Marathon as a πρᾶξινον ἔχασα (Plutarch, Mor. 882). See Appendix X. § 35.

3. Πέρσας καὶ Σάκαι, the flower of the Asiatic army, posted, as was apparently usual with the Persians, in the centre (see Rawlinson, note ad l.), though a different arrangement was adopted by Mardonius at Plataia, 9. 31. The disposition of the forces was not impromptu or irregular. The battle is here represented as a pitched battle (ἐγκρήσαντο).

By 'Sakæ' would have to be understood 'Seyths,' not European but Asiatic. See Appendix I. § 8. Cp. 7. 64, where Asiatic Sakæ are reckoned among the foot-soldiers. At Thermopylae the picked troops are Medes, Kissians, and Persians, 7. 210, 211.

5. μεσόγειοι, 'inland,' cp. 4. 100

supra. Not of course the μεσόγειοι technically so-called, which was separated from τὰ πέλαγα by Hymettos, and to reach which by the nearest way the flying Athenians would have had to pass between Pentelikes and the sea. The expression seems to imply that the Athenian front was to the sea. Cp. l. 9 infra and Appendix X. §§ 34, 35.

6. τὸ μὲν τετραμένων κτλ. This manoeuvre seems too intelligent and successful not to have been the result of design and preparation; the commanders, or at least Kallimachos, Miltiades, and perhaps others, were fully prepared for the event. Cp. Appendix X. § 37.

8. τὰ κέρας, (β) omits ἐμφύσης, which is superfluous. For αὐτῶν ἐνθάδε van Herwerden suggests ἐγκρήσαντο.

114. 1. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πόλεμῳ. It has been asserted that the main incidents of the battle as described by Herodotus are just those which were depicted in the Poilke Stoa (Stein, note ad l.). The assertion is tempting, but hardly accurate; see Appendix X. § 28. All the passages in which this picture is mentioned in the ancient authorities are brought together by Overbeck, Antiken Schriftquellen, pp. 300 f., 210 (Leipzig 1868).

3. Στράτευμα. It is unfortunate that nothing more is known of him. Κυνέγεροι, brother of Aischylus. Pliny, N. H. 35, 57, speaks of him as one of the daedos, but from the silence of
Ενθαῦτα ἐπιλαμβανόμενος τῶν ἀδιάλεκτων νεῶν, τὴν χείρα ἀπὸ 5 κοτῖνος πέλακε πίπτει, τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλα Ἀθηναίων πολλοὶ τε καί ἄνομοι. ἔποτα μὲν δὴ τῶν νεῶν ἐπεκράτησαν τρόπῳ τούτῳ Ἀθηναῖοι τίμησι τιλικμαυκομένους, καὶ ἀναλαβόντες ἐκ τῆς νήσου ἐν τῇ ἐπιστ. ἔπος Ἀρετῆς ἀνέρριτο, περιέπλεον Σόινουν, βουύλομένων φθείρας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους 5 ἀπυκόμενοι ἐς τὸ ἄστυ. αἰτίην δὲ ἐσχέ χὲ Ἀθηναίοισι ἐς Ἀλκμενίδων μηχανής αὐτοὺς ταῦτα ἐπινοοηθήναι τούτοις γὰρ συνεχόμενοι τούτοις Πέρσης ἀναδέχθη αὐτίκα σιδηρὴν ἡδὴ ἐν τῷ νει. 116 οὖν τοῖς μὲν δὲ περιέπλεον Σόινουν Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἄσ τοι πολλοὶ

Hdt., and the other authorities we may conclude that he was not one of the Strategoi. His name might have suggested the dog in the Stoas: but cp. c. 116 infra.

4. ἀδιάλεκτων. The plural is observable: cp. II. 15. 7. ἀδιάλεκτον μετὰ χείρας ἤγον. A derivation is given by Eustathius, παρὰ τὸ μὴ ράμιον φλάσθος (Stephanus, ed. Didot, 2679).

5. πελάκη, presumably a battle-axe, or bill: if so, probably wielded by a Scyth (Saka): cp. 7. 65. 4. 5, though properly speaking the πέλακε seems not to have been a weapon of war, cp. 7. 136.

116. 1. οὖν. The ships had not been beached, c. 107. The number is probably historical: that only seven ships were taken is an argument for the hypothesis that a good part of the Persian forces were already on board. It would take some time to re-embark many thousands, nay tens of thousands, of men, to say nothing of horses, etc., supposing the whole diminished forces of the barbarians had been on land, when the battle began. See Appendix X. §§ 34, 38. Cp. H. Droysen, Die Perserkriege, p. 65.

3. νησοῦ, Aiglea, c. 107 supra. They would have to round Kynosura and go a little northwards to reach it.

4. περιέπλεον, imperfect. Even if they went all night they would have taken them at least till the following day to reach Phaleron.

βουύλομένων. The statement is presumably an inference from the movement itself.

5. Ἐ Ἀλκμενίδων μηχανής. Cp. c. 121 infra.

7. δοῦνα ἔγνῃ τῆς νήσου. If these words are true, and the course of operations hitherto has been correctly rendered by Hdt., it follows that the Persians did not begin to re-embark until after their defeat at Marathon, and that the shield-signal was not displayed until after their re-embarkment was accomplished. What object it could then have served is it difficult to imagine. But, if the re-embarkment of the host had already been begun, if, say, the cavalry had been re-shipped, and perhaps more; if the signal had been shown when a number of the Persians was aboard; we can more easily understand the circumstances which determined the Athenian attack, the need for the hasty return to Athens, the comparatively slight losses, and other points which are otherwise obscure. See further, Appendix X. §8.

116. 1. περιέπλεον, as just above.

Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ. Some would, however, have been left on the battle-field to guard the bodies and the spoil. Plutarch, Arist., 5, tells us that Aristeides [who could be trusted], with his Phyle, Akamantis, was detached for this service. (Perhaps some of the Ptolemaic too remained.) The other nine tribes marched back to Athens, but not surely the same day. From Marathon to Athens would be a quick march of six to eight hours (26 miles). Plutarch, Mor. 360, has this: Μιλιτίδαι μὲν γὰρ ἄρης Βαρμαθών τῇ ἑσπεροῖς τὴν μάχην συνήθως ἔλεγεν ἄστυ μετὰ τῆς στρατιᾶς πεντήκων, i.e. the battle was fought the day after Miltiades left Athens; and he returned, it might seem, on the same day as the battle. Rawlinson misunderstands this passage, taking it to mean that Miltiades returned to Athens the day after the battle. Even so, they would have arrived, we may be sure, long before the Persian fleet rounded Sunion. The Athenian forces could not have quitted Marathon until the Strategoi were sure
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eίγον τάξιστα ἐβομήσεις ἐς τὸ ἀστί, καὶ ἑφησάν τε ἀπεκόμενοι πρὶν ἡ τούς βαρβάρους ἤκειν, καὶ ἄστρατοπεδεύοντο ἀπιγμένοι ἐξ Ἡρακλείων τοῦ ἐν Μαραθῶν ἐν ἄλλο Ἡρακλείῳ τῷ ἐν Κυνοσ- 
ἀργεῖ. οἱ δὲ βαρβάροι τῇς χθελή ὑπεραυρανθῆνες Φαλήρου, 5 
τούτῳ γὰρ ἦν ἐπίνειον τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ὑπὲρ τούτῳ ἄνο- 
κόξεσάντες τὰς νέας ἀντιπλεον ὑπότις ἐς τὴν Ἀσίνην. 

Ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἐν Μαραθῶν μάχῃ ἀπέθανον τῶν βαρβάρων 117 
kάτα ἐξακιχλίους καὶ τετρακοσίους ἄνδρας, Ἀθηναίων δὲ ἐκατὸ 
καὶ ἐνενίκησαν καὶ δύο. ἔπεσον μὲν ἀμφοτέρως τοσοῦτοι, 
συν- 

ήσσον ὡς αὐτὸθι θύμα γενέσαθι τοιοῦτο, Ἀθηναίοιν ἄνδρα Ἐπιζή 

τοῦ Κουφαρχοίρου ἐν τῇ συντάσσα μαχομένον τε καὶ ἄνδρα γινόμενον 5 
ἀγαθὸν τῶν ὀμίατος στερήθηκαί οὔτε πληγήντα οὐδὲν τοῦ σώμα- 
τος οὔτε βληθέντα, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ζώης διατελεῖν ἄπω τοῦτον 
τοῦ χρόνου ἐντὰ τυφλόν. λέγειν δὲ αὐτόν περὶ τοῦ πάθεος 
ἐκοῦσα τοιοῦτο καὶ λόγον, ἄνδρα οἱ δοκεῖν ὑπέλειται ἀντιστάθηναι 

that the Persians had abandoned the hope of forcing the way to Athens from that side. Hence when the troops did march homewards there may have been need for expedition (Duncker, Abhandlungen, p. 40). Cp. Appendix X. § 35. 

2. τάξιστα del. Valekensea. 

4. ἐν Μαραθῶν, c. 108 supra. 

ἐν Κυνοσάργει, 5. 63 supra. Pausanias, i. 19. 3, mentions the Herakleion 

between the Olympiaeion, or rather the shrine and statue of Aphrodite ἐν 

Κύνωροι, and the Lykeion. E. Curtius places Kynosarges outside the Diomedean 

gate (Stadgesch. von Athen, p. 21) on the skirts of Lykabetto. The exact 

position is uncertain: see Harrison, Mythology and Monuments, p. 216, 

where are also some suggestive remarks on the dog. (Was it not a totem?) 

To Herodotus the coincidence here 

noted is supernatural, cp. 9. 101. Was 

it from Kynosarges that the dog came 

into the picture in the Stoa? Cp. 

Appendix X. § 26, and c. 115 supra. 

5. ὑπεραυρανθῆνες Φαλήρου, cp. 

ὑπεραυρανθησαν 4. 103. Here the word 

is metaphorical: 'on the high sea off 

Phaleron.' 

6. τὸτε. At the time Hdt. is writ- 

ing Pelaissus had long taken the place 

of Phaleron, cp. 8. 66, and 55. 

ἀνακωσίεναι with van Herwerden. 

ἀνακωσίεναι (not to be confused with 

διακωσίεν) 'to stay.' Cp. 7. 36, 9. 13, 

and L. & S. sub τ. 

117. 1. ἐν Μαραθῶν del. Valekensea. 

ἀπίθανον. These figures are mir- 

acles of moderation compared with 

later exaggerations (see Rawlinson, note 

ad l.), and have an authentic air, 

though the number of the barbarian 

dead is admittedly a round number 

(sand). Among the dead Cleo names 

Hippias, ad ltt. 9. 10, 3; neasius 

Hippias, Piasstratis flius, qui in Mar- 

athonia pugna cecidit, arma contra 

patriam ferens. This might be an 

inference from the disappearance of 

Hippias from the scene, as nothing 

more is recorded of him: or an exag- 

geration of his slip on the sand (c. 107). 

Some tradition siew Datis: see next 


4. θύμα. There is nothing wildly 

improbable in the story of Epize 

los. Authentic cases are on record of total 

or partial blindness, consequent on 


is for the biographer to record such 

cases, and for the psychologist to 

explain them. Aelian, X. H. 7. 38, says 

that Epizeolos was depicted in the 

Poikile. The apparition which struck 

down his next comrade, according to 

the statement of Epizeolos as reported 

to Hdt. (but not in the Poikile: cp. c. 114 

supra) and here recorded by him, was 

of course a foe, and cannot have been 
taken for Marathon, Rechetos, Herakles, 

or Theseus, all of whom, with Athene, 

were represented in the Poikile as aid- 

ing the Athenians. Pausan. 1. 15. 

9. ἐκοῦσα. It is a pity that Hdt.
Δάτις δὲ περιεύμενος ἀμα τῷ στρατῷ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίνῃ, ἐπείτε ἐγένετο ἐν Μυκάνῃ, εἰδε δήμων ἐν τῷ ὅπρῳ. καὶ ἢτις μὲν ἢ δήμος, οὐ λέγεται· ὁ δὲ, ὅς ἡμέρη τάχιστα ἐπέσημη, ἦτησιν ἐποίετο τῶν νεῶν, εὑρὼν δὲ ἐν νηὸ Φοινίκης ἄγαμα Ἀστάλλων. 

5 κεχρυσαμένου ἐπιθύμαντον ὁκόθεν σεσυλημένον εἰπ', τιμῶμεν δὲ ἦν οὐ ἢρεῖ, ἐπέλεε τῇ ἐνωτοῦ νηί ἐν Δηλίου· καὶ ἄπικαιτο γὰρ τηρησαία οἱ Δῆλιοι όπίσω ἐς τὴν κηρίαν, καταιτεῖτα τε ἐς τὸ ἱδρυμα τὸ ἀγαλμα καὶ ἐπέτελε τοὺς Δηλίαοι ἀπαγορεύει τὸ αγαλμα ἐς Δηλίου τὸ Ἐθήβαιων· τὸ δ' ἐστι ἐπὶ θαλάσσης οἰκείον καταντιον. 

10 Δάτις μὲν δὴ ταύτα ἐντελόμενος ἀπέπελε, τὸν δὲ ἀνδριάντα τοῦτον Δῆλιοι οὐκ ἀπήγγειλεν, ἀλλὰ μὲν δὲ ἐτέρω διεισὶ Ἐθήβαιοι αὐτοῖ ἐκ θεοτροφίαν ἐκομίσαντο ἐπὶ Δηλίου.

Διὸς δὲ τῶν Ἐρημείων ἀνδραποδισμένων Δάτις τέ καὶ Ἀρταφρένης, ὡς προσέσχον πρὸς τὴν Ἀσίνην πλέοντες, ἀνήγγειλεν ἐς Ἀθηναῖον δεισίδαιρας τῆς Δελοίας συντρίβωσαν. Ἡ ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ πολέμου ἀνήγγελεν ἐς Ἀθηναίον. Ηδὲ τὸ Ἢδη ἐν τῇ Μυκήνῃ καὶ τῷ Μυκηναϊκῷ ἐπὶ τῆς Μυκηναϊκῆς ἐπιφάνειας πολέμου.

has not specified his informant (op. 4. 76 σουρα, 9. 16), and likewise the time and place of hearing. The specification, such as it is, seems introduced not to guarantee but to excuse or even to discredit the story. Cp. Introduction, § 22. The doubt, however, need only extend to the cause of the blindness. Cp. Appendix X. § 3.

118. 1. Δάνα. It is now the turn of Datis to dream. Keretiades indeed reports that Datis was slain at Marathon (Fragmenta, ed. Gilmore, §49, ed. Baehr, 18). Cp. Appendix X. § 30. Araphrones certainly was not, 7. 74, and c. 119 σουρα.

2. Μυκήνη, a little N.E. of Delos.

3. σο λίγης, an honesty or poverty in the tradition which is remarkable. οὐ λίγης ἐστιν, καὶ ἔσται στούν, διὸ καλλής ἑξετάζω, c. 107 σουρα.

4. Ἀγάλμα. Ἀστάλλων κεχρυσαμένου. The substance was presumably wood, or bronze.

5. Ἀνακάτω, p.l. Cp. 6. 9 σουρα.


7. ἐπίσω from Tenos, c. 97 σουρα.

8. Δῆλιον τὸ Ἐθήβαιον. Delian in Boeotia is not opposite Chalkis, rather is it opposite Eretria: strictly speaking it is not opposite either, but opposite the coast between them, Thucyd. 4. 76, 4. Δῆλιον ... το ἐν τῇ Ταταραγάρῃ πρὸς Ἐθήβαιον ἐπικραμασμένον Ἀστάλλων ἀρχον. Hdt. can scarcely have written this passage after the Athenian disaster at Delion in 424 B.C. Cp. Thuc. 4. 89-101.

11. εἰςοιν. Therefore about 471/0 B.C. at a time when the power and prestige of Thebes were eclipsed (cp. B. V. Head, Coinage of Boeotia, p. 20). The story of this statue suggests that the Persians were not quite idle during the two unexplained delays recorded above, cc. 102, 110.

Where Hdt. heard this story it is not easy to discover. Blakesley says "obviously from Delos." But would the Delians have confessed their wrongful detention of the statue? Is it certain that Datis bade them restore it? As certain, perhaps, as that his action was determined by a dream. The θεοτροφία was perhaps Delphic. Justice and piety may perhaps have been the whole motive of this transaction, but one would like to know more about it. In 470 B.C. Delphi, or the friends of Delphi, may have been thinking that it was time something was done to revive the power and prestige of Thebes, as a make-weight to the growing power of Athens, and the Delian symmachy.

119. 2. Ἀσίνη. From Mykonos they would have retraced their course across the Icarian to Samos, cp. c. 95 σουρα. Whether they landed at Ephesos, or sailed with the fleet to Kypros and Phoenicia cannot be determined.
Σάντα. Βασιλείς δὲ Δαρείου, πρῶτος μὲν αιχμαλώτως γενέσθαι τοὺς Ἑρετρίας, ἐνεῖχέ σφι δεῖνον χόλου, ὥσα ἀρξάντων ἄδικής προτέρων τῶν Ἑρετρίων· ἐπείτε δὲ εἰδὲ σφέας ἀπαχθεῖται παρ 5 ἑωτὸν καὶ ἑωτῷ ὑποχείριοι ἦντας, ἐποίησε κακὸν ἄλλο ποιήσεως, ἀλλὰ σφέας τῆς Κισίνης χώρης κατοίκισεν εἰς σταθμὸ ἑωτὸν τῷ σύναμεν ἐστὶ Αρδείους, ἀπὸ μὲν Σούσαν ἔδρα καὶ διηκοσίων σταθμῶν ἀπέγοντο, τεσσεράκοντα δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ φράτους τὸ παρέγινε τριακατά λήθας· καὶ γὰρ ἄσφαλτον καὶ ἄλας καὶ ἄλαιον αρώσθουσιν 10 ἐξ αὐτοῦ τρόπῳ τῶρθεν· ἀντλεῖται μὲν κηλουνία, ἀντὶ δὲ γαμβοῦ ἡμιον ἀκοῦνοι οἱ προσδέδεσσαν· ὑποτήρους δὲ τοῦτο ἀντλεῖ καὶ ἐπείτα ἐγχεῖες ἐς ἐξαμελονίαν· ἐς δὲ ταύτας ἐς ἄλλο διαχείμευς τράπεται τριακατά λήθας. καὶ ἡ μὲν ἄσφαλτος καὶ ἦλες προγίνεται παραπτικά· τὸ δὲ ἄλαιον οἱ Πέρσαι καλοῦσαν τοῦτο 15 Ῥαδικάνθην, ἐστὶ δὲ μέλαν καὶ ἄδικην παρεγόμενον βαρέως· ἐνδιατάτω τῶν Ἑρετρίας κατοίκισεν βασιλείς Δαρείου, οἳ καὶ μέχρι ἕμεο εὐχον τὴν χώρην ταύτην, φυλάγοντες τὴν ἀρχαίν ἠλώσαν. τὰ μὲν ὅπερ Ἐρετρίας ἔγχει οὔτω.

Δακταδαμωνίων δὲ ἦκον ἐς τὰς Ἀθηναῖς διαχίλιοι μετὰ τὴν 120

8. ‘Αρδείους. Αρδείκκα in Kissa, 210 studies from Susa and 40 from an asphalt + salt + oil spring, should admit of identification. (Cp. Appendix XIII. § 6.) The most successful attempt to localise it is that of Sir H. Rawlinson, quoted in Rawlinson, Hdt. iii. p. 496 n. Strabo, 747, places the Erétrians on the upper Tigris, which would contradict Hdt. Hdt. perhaps directs himself: at least he places an Ardeerika on the Euphrates, in upper Babylonis, 1. 185. There may of course have been two places of the same name. Rawlinson believes that Apollonius of Tyana conversed in the first century of our era with the descendants of these very Erétrians, and so forth (Philos. F. Apoll., 1. 24 f.), and Grote (iv. p. 50 n.), Rawlinson and others (apparently even Düncker, viii. 5 p. 118) believe that Hdt. visited the Erétrians at Ardeerika and saw the well here described. The expression of καὶ μέχρι ἐμοὶ κτάλ. does not justify any such inference (cp. 4. 124. and Introduction, pp. lili., xov.), and Hdt. might have smiled petroleum and learnt its Persian name without going to Ardeerika. If the description of this well, the method of drawing, and so on, had been beyond Hdt.’s resources, short of autopay, how much of his work would never have been written! For a description of a wonderful well which he really did see, cp. 4. 195 supra.

11. γαμβοῦ. Cp. c. 17. 1. 5 supra.

15. τὸ ἄλαιον. Van Herwerden marks a lacuna which he would fill συνήγονον ἐς ἀργεῖαν, τὸ στ. παρ. καλοῦς, καὶ ἄλαιον παρεγόμενον βαρέως. ἐνδιατάτω τῶν Ἑρετρίας κατοίκισεν βασιλείς Δαρείου, οἳ καὶ μέχρι ἕμεο εὐχον τὴν χώρην ταύτην, φυλάγοντες τὴν ἀρχαίν ἠλώσαν. τὰ μὲν ὅπερ Ἐρετρίας ἔγχει οὔτω.

18. Χλῶσταν, i.e. Greek, but you might detect an Eretrian by his ῥοδακίσιον (Plato, Cratyl. 434 o.). Cp. G. Meyer, Gr. Gram. 2 § 228.

120. 1. ἦκον, before the arrival of the Persians, or the Athenians themselves, c. 116 supra, so that the latter found the Spartans there already. So Plato, Menex. 246, says that the Spartans arrived the day after the battle. They consequently left Sparta the day before the battle. If they left on the day after the full moon, i.e. on the 15th, the battle was fought on the 16th. Plutarch, de Hdt. malig. 26 (Mor. 561), gives 6th of Boedromion as the day of the battle. Boeckh (Mondyeklen der Hellenen, § 15) has shown that the day of the annual Commemoration is substituted in this passage for the actual day of the battle. If the battle was fought on what was, or should have been, the 16th of Meta-
CHAPTER VI

The Spartans were prepared to leave Athens only feigning an excuse (c. 106), and then sent an army at a forced march, is unlikely. The true Persians by the way would not have thanked the Athenians for burial; a point upon which Hdt. was not quite accurately informed (1. 140), cp. c. 30 supra.

The Medes (Persians) were said to have been buried, but Pausanias (1. 32, 5) could not find any tomb or monument. The true Persians by the way would not have thanked the Athenians for burial; a point upon which Hdt. was not quite accurately informed (1. 140), cp. c. 30 supra.

The Medes were not likely to forget this alter, and the tribute to an achievement, all their own (tò érgon autò).
The implicit denial of any Attic war with Lesbos before Peisistratos. In any case the Keryikes may have repossessed the land again after the expulsion of Hippias (5. 65 supra).

7. ηποσονιην, κα δοχον, or perhaps κηρυκος, for there were κηρυκες and Κηρυκες.

Δυναστεια. The family were among the wealthiest in Athens. The παραγραφι further attests it, c. 122. The fortune of Kallias Λακκοπλουτος was estimated at 300 talents. Hippionikos had 600 slaves in the silver mines (Xen. de vit. 4. 15). His wealth was proverbial (see cit. apud Petersen, p. 43). His son Kallias tertius had the reputation of running through the family fortunes (see further, Petersen, op. cit. p. 44). Two of the weddings in this family were specially celebrated: the marriage of Kallias Lakkoploutos with Elpinike daughter of Miltiades (Plutarch, Kim. 4, op. Petersen, op. a. p. 41), and the marriage of Hipparete (granddaughter of that Kallias and daughter of the Strategos above mentioned) with Alkibides (Plutarch, Alk. 5).

122. 1. Καλλιες...ἄνδρι. Schweighäuser and Baehr defended this chapter. There is certainly nothing in the matter to discredit its authenticity, and the phraseology, though harsh, can be paralleled out of Herodotus, with one, or perhaps two, exceptions. But (1) the passage fails in some of the best MSS. (the Medicene, Florentine, and three others), in fact in one family of MSS. (εναι). (2) Plutarch (or the author of the de Malig. Hdt.) does not...
appear to have read it in his text (Stein). Cf. op. cit. c. 27. (3) The sense and grammar are complete without it: καὶ οἱ Ἀλκ. c. 123 ad init. answering to the last sentence of c. 121 Καλλή σε γὰρ κτλ. (4) Though Herodotean in phraseology, the style is abrupt and harsh, from the very multiplication of Herodotean tūrus: τούτῳ μὲν ... τούτῳ δὲ ... ἄξιον μένων ἔχει ... ἄξιος ... ἄνελεμος ... et al. and also from usages which are not Herodotean, e.g. τὰ προελευθέρως ... διαταγή ... ἔφεσεν. (5) Ἐλευθέρως is an exaggeration, or not properly justified in the context. σφι ... ἔκεισαι τε is incorrect. In the face of these arguments it can hardly be maintained that the passage is of Herodotean authorship. Nor is the forgery a clever one. Lucian would have written the passage better. It does not therefore follow that the matters of fact mentioned are untrue. The Olympic victories are likely enough even without the authority of the Scholiast on Aristophanes. The wedding of the daughters would have had more verisimilitude if the names of the chosen bridegrooms had been added. 123. 2. ὀρνεῖς κτλ., i.e. ὀρνεῖς τοῦτον ἢ ὀρνεῖς ἄλλον τούτων, 'just as much as, or even more than, this man.' Van Herwerden suggests οἱ <Ἀλκ.> Ἀλκ., a reading which might seem to involve Hdt. in the error of making Kallias an Alkmionid. 3. σι τρισθημα, cp. σι τρισθημα, c. 121. The λόγος has become a διαβολή in the light of the 'misotyrannic' tradition of the Alkmionids. 4. ἐφευρέω τ. π. χ. Their first exile was due to the ἄγοι 5, 71, and dated before the tyranny. The family had subsequently been on good terms with Peisistratos for a time, 1, 60. It might be argued that (a) a distinction is drawn between Peisistratos and the tyrants, (b) the tyrants are regarded not as a series but as a clique or small dynasty (πολυτελεῖα λύγων ἄνδρων Thuc. 3, 62) of members of one family. 7. γέγραπται. Thucydides agrees in this judgment on its negative side, against the claims of Harmodios and Aristogeiton 6, 54, but makes little account of the services of the Alkmionids. Cp. Appendix IX. §§ 3, 4. 9. τὸν Λαυρίων del. Wesseling. 12. οἱ μοι cp. διηθλωτα, 5, 63 supra. Such references imply a reading public. 124. 1. ἔριτρωτος. The family had been held high in honour, but had also been in disgrace and banishment. Its members were not among those celebrated in connexion with Marathon, nor did that victory apparently do much for their renown. They or their partisans had probably attacked Miltiades unsuccessfully before (c. 104 supra), and almost certainly attacked him, but that successfully, shortly after (c. 136 infra). There was that in the past history and relations, in the present attitude of the clan, which might well have seemed to justify suspicions that, sooner than see a rival house of the Peisaii founding
δεν ήθελε έκ την ανάκαθεν λαμπρόντα και τον άνω όμοιο λόγον. ἀνεδέδηκε 5 μεν γάρ ἄστις, καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔσται ἄλλος ἐπεὶ τοῦ ἐγένετο γάρ ὑπ' ὅστις μὲν οἱ ἀνάδεξας, οὐκ ἔχει προσωπικὸ εἴπει τοὺς τούτους.

Οἱ δὲ Ἀλκμαώνιδαι ἦσαν μὲν καὶ τὰ ἀνέκαθεν λαμπροῦν ἐν 125 τῇ 125 Ἁθήναις, ἀπὸ δὲ ῾Αλκμέωνος καὶ αὐτῶν Μεγακλέος ἐγένετο καὶ κάρτα λαμπροῦν. τούτο μὲν γὰρ ῾Αλκμέων ὁ Μεγακλέως τοῖς Ἡρῴδης Ἀδελφοὶ παρὰ Κροΐσου ἀπεκκενωμένοι ἔτη τὸ χρυστήριον τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς συμπτήκτωρ τοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ συνελάμβανεν 5 βαῖνε προθυμίας, καὶ μὲν Κροΐσος πυθόμενος τῶν Ἀλκμέων τῶν ἂν, ἀπεκκενωμένου δὲ διώρεται χρυσοῦ τῶν ἄν δύναται τῷ όντων σώματι ἐξενεκκάθαι ἐσώπας. ὁ δὲ ῾Αλκμέων πρὸς τὴν ἀνάδεξαν τοιαύτην τοιάδε ἐπιτεθείσας προσέφερε ἐνδυρὸν 10

a ‘dynasty’ at Athens, they would make a composition with less formidable rivals, or even with the foreign foe. Hdt.’s express judgment is largely discredited by the facts which he has himself preserved in regard to the relations of the Alcmaeonidae to Kroisos, to Kleisthenes, to Peisistratos, to Delphi and to Sparta. If this passage is, indeed, his, it may confirm our distrust of his political judgment. Cp. Introduction, § 22.

λόγος αἱρέω, cp. 4. 127 supra. ἐπὶ τοιοῦτον λόγον comes in somewhat awkwardly; Hdt.’s logic being at fault here may have corrupted his rhetoric.

6. ἐγένετο γάρ. H. Delbrück (Die Perseerriegle, pp. 59 f.) has proposed to cancel the whole shield episode: but it appears as one of the most positively attested incidents of the Marathonian campaign. It must fairly be utilised in any attempted reconstruction or rationalisation of the whole story. See Appendix X. §§ 8, 34.

7. ὁ ἀνάδεξας. To have ascribed the act of treachery to one of the relations or partisans of the Peisistratidēs still in Athens would surely have been very obvious, if the case against the Alcmaeonidae had not been very strong.

125. 1. Ἀλκμαώνιδαι. There follows here an encyclical on the Alcmaeonidae, the occasion of which may perhaps be found in the relationship of Perikles (c. 131 infra) to the house. The proper representatives of the family in the time of Hdt. hardly sustained its old reputation, and perhaps owed their continued importance chiefly to their marriage connexions (through Agariste mother of Perikles, Dinomache wife of Kleistias, mother of Alkibiades, cp. 8. 17, Isodike, wife of Kimon). The sons of Alkmaion are less prominent in later story: the Eurypylomen son of Peisanax, who figures towards the close of the Peloponnesian war (Xen. Hell. 1. 4, 19 etc.), was a member of the family. Cp. Petersen, Questiones pp. 76 ff. The gold of Kroisos was not the beginning of the fortune of the family. Its members were already influential at Delphi (here, and cp. Plutarch, Solon 11, Ἄθ. ἱσ. c. 19), and already responsible for the Kylonian ψυχ. 5. 71 supra. Relations between the Alcmaeonidae and the Mermnadai need be doubted as little as relations with Delphi, though their obvious significance is not realised by the storyteller, and the favours of Kroisos are made a comedy. The chronological data, however, are confused. On the render origins of the house, see Toepffer, Attisch. Gesch. 225 ff.

3. Ἀλκμαῖον ὁ Μεγακλέας. If Alkmaion assisted Lydian envoys at Delphi they were sent by Alyattes (cp. 1. 25) rather than by Kroisos, for the marriage of Megakles and Agariste took place before Kroisos ascended the throne, circa 560 B.C. Kleisthenes of Sikyon died circa 570 B.C. If any member of the house supported Kroisos it was Megakles. The Marmor Parium dates the mission of Kroisos to Delphi 556 B.C. But Kroisos may have sent more than once to Delphi surely.

7. φαντάσματον = ‘frequentium,’ c. 137 infra. But cp. φαντάσμα μυστήριος c. 139 infra.
380 ἩΡΩΔΟΤΟΥ

κιβώνα μέγαν καὶ κόλπων βαθύν καταλιπόμενον τοῦ κεδώνος, κοθόρυφοι τε τοὺς εὑρισκόντας ἐνότας ὑποθησάμενος, ὡς ἐς τοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐς τὸν οἰον κατηγέατο. ἔστεσθος δὲ ἐς σκορφόν ψῆγματος πρώτα μὲν παρέσαξε παρὰ τὰς κινήσας τοῦ χρυσοῦ 15 δόσον ἐχόρεων οἱ κοθόρυφοι, μετὰ δὲ τὸν κόλπον πάντα πληγάμενον [τοῦ χρυσοῦ] καὶ ἐς τὰς τρίχας τῆς κεφαλῆς διασάς τοῦ ψῆγματος καὶ ἀλλο λαβών ἐς τὸ στόμα, ἔχει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ ξίλων μὲν μόνοι τοὺς κοθόρυφος, παντὶ δὲ τερίος μᾶλλον ἡ ἀνθρώπος τὸ τὸ τε στόμα ἐβέβευτο καὶ πάντα ἐβέβευκα. 20 ἦναν δὲ τὸν Κροίον γέλους ἐσύλθε, καὶ οἱ πάντα τε ἐκεῖνα διδοὺ καὶ πρὸς ἑπέρα δωρέβεται οὖς ἐλάσσον ἐκεῖνων. οὗτοι μὲν ἐπιλύσασα ἡ οἰκία αὐτὴ μεγάλως, καὶ ὁ Ἀλεξέως ὁύτος οὗτος 196 τεθρυπτοποθήσας Ὀλυμπιακὰ αναρέτεται. μετὰ δὲ γενεῦ δευτέρη ὑστερον Κλεισθένης αὐτὴν ὁ Σικυώνοις τύραννος ἔξηνε, ὅταν πολλῷ ὄνομαστότερην γεγένατι ἐν τοῖς Ἐλληνις ἡ πρότερον ἦν. Κλεισθένης γάρ τὸ Ἀριστονύμου τοῦ Μύρωνος τοῦ 5 Ἀνδρέω γίνεται θυγάτηρ τῇ θυρώμα ἤν Ἀγαρίστη. ταῦτην θῆλησε, Ἐλληνω ἀπάντων ἐξερυθτὸν τὸν Άριστον, τοῦτο γεναῖκα προσεβεία. Ὀλυμπιάδοις δὲν ἐνόται καὶ νικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς

16. διασάς from διασάς. τοῦ χρυσοῦ scil. Stein.
19. ἀνθρώπος. The word is carefully chosen (not ἄγρις).
21. ἑρέσα... ἐκένων. Stein reads on the authority of the better codices; but the better reading is supplied by β: ἑρέσα με δωρέβεται οὖς ἐλάσσον. But op. Schweighäuser, Lexicon, sub ɜ. ἑρέσαμα.
23. τεθρυπτοποθήσας. As Blakesley ingeniously shows (note 281 ad l.) this Olympian victory was only with a pair. Op. Pindar, Pth. 7. 13. Isocrates, de Bel. 351, and op. Rawlinson, iii. p. 500, n. 8.

126. 1. γενεῦ δευτέρῃ ὑστερον involves a blunder somewhere. The wedding of Agariste must have taken place before the accession of Krosos. See preceding chapter. The explanation of the blunder may be that the friendship of Alyattes and Alcmene (πρῶτη γενεῦ) was succeeded by the wedding of Megakles and Agariste (δεύτερη γενεῦ), but the substitution of the name of Krosos for Alyattes above has involved the anachronism here: the former and the latter story being from different sources.

2. Κλεισθένης ὁ Σικυώνοις (5. 67 supra) died before the accession of Krosos. τύραννος del. Kallenberg.

4. γὰρ. Grote regards this story as (mainly) a fiction invented on Epic lines, suggested by the wooing of Helena, et sim. (vol. ii. 415 n.). Whether Hdt. or his source ('some ingenious Athenian') is accountable Grote does not clearly say. Stein suggests that the story comes from a Pindaric poem. Op. Kirchhoff, Entstehungszeit, p. 43. If the poem was an Epinikion (op. Pth. 7), to judge by the existing samples the μυθός must have been very freely articulated and transformed by Herodotus. Points in the story indicate an Italiote source, or at least an Italiote interest (op. Zhilke, De Agaristes nuptias, pp. 30 ff.) which would be sufficiently accounted for, if the story was first coined or circulated about the date of the founding of Thrui.

5. θυγάτηρ. Busolt (i. 494, i. 8 668) thinks Kleisthenes had no son.

7. 'Ολυμπιάδ. The date of this Olympiad cannot be exactly determined.
τοῦ γάμου ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἕξισσοτῆς ἀρχαίουν ἡμέρας. ἐναυτὴ Ἑλλήνων δοσί σφίν τε αὐτοῖς ἦσαν καὶ πάρη ἕξισσοκόμων, ἐφεύγον, μηνιστάς τοῖς Κλεισθένες καὶ δρόμου καὶ παλαίστρην ποιησάμενος ἐπ’ αὐτῷ τούτω εἰχε. ἀπὸ μὲν δὴ Ιταλίας ἦλθε Σμυρνίδης ὁ Ἱπποκράτεως Συβαρίτης, δι’ ἐπί πλείστον δὴ χρίζεται εἰς ἀνήρ ἀπίκετο (ἡ δὲ Σύβαρες ἑκατέρες τούτων τῶν χρώμων μάλιστα), καὶ Σαλήτης Δάμασος Ἀμφικτύος τοῦ σοφοῦ λεγομένου παῖς, ὁτιοῦ μὲν ἀπὸ Ἱταλίας ἠλθον, ἐκ δὲ 5 τοῦ κόμπου τοῦ Ἱονίου Ἀμφίλητον Ὠπιστράφως Ἐπικατηγούσας ὁτιοῦ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Ἱονίου κόμπου. Αἰτωλὸς δὲ ἦλθε Τιτόρομο τοῦ ὑπερφύστου τοῦ Ἑλλήνας ἱσχύς καὶ φυγόντως ἀνθρώπως ἐς τὰς ἐσχάτας τῆς Ἀιτωλίδος καρχις, τούτων τοῦ Τιτόρομου ἀδελφοὺς Μάλησ. ἀπὸ δὲ Πελοποννησίου Φειδών τοῦ Ἀριγελοῦ τυράννου ἑκατέρες. The scene of Sybaris might coincide with the revival of the Achaean and Ionian elements in the Peloponnesian; and there would be a special suitability in the Achaean towns of Italy sending representatives to Sikyon. Kroton, however, is not represented: perhaps naturally enough. Cp. c. 21 supra. Athenaeus xii. 641 preserves a (fictitious) embellishment to the effect that Smindyrides took a thousand fowlers and a thousand cooks with him on this occasion. Anecdotes illustrative of the luxury of Sybaris were afterwards attached to his name. (See Rawlinson, note ad l., Zühlke, op. c. p. 17.)

4. Ἀμύρος τ. σ., Ἀμύρις the sage. An Amyris is mentioned by Athenaeus xii. 520 (if the reading be correct) as a legate of the Sybarites to Delphi. Suidas (Ἀμύρις μακρέας) says that Amyris alone understood the oracle foretelling the fall of Sybaris, sold all his property, and went to Peloponnesus. The Sybarites thought him mad. Afterwards (on the destruction of the city!) he was much admired. This would bring Amyris down to the close of the century. On Siris ep. 8. 62.

7. Τύττρόμος. Later legend (Aelian, V. H. xii. 22) makes Tithymalos contemporary with Milon of Kroton; it cannot be said that Hdt. commits this anachronism, if it be an anachronism.
11. Δεσκήθης. Müller, Dorier, i. 104, identifies with Lakadas a proverbially effeminate Temenid of Argos (Plutarch, Mor. 69) and penultimate king: cp. Pausan. 2. 18. 2. 

papēs Φειδιναβ. The appearance of a son of Pheidon among the suitors has been objected to on three grounds: (1) as an anachronism. Pheidon's date has been put approximately from one to two centuries before Kleisthenes, the Olympiad referred to below being taken for the 8th = 748 B.C., or the 28th=668 B.C. Though some of the suitors were older than others (c. 128), none can have been so old as this! (2) The anti-Argive policy of Kleisthenes makes a suitor from Argos out of place (cp. 5. 67 supra). (3) A Dorian suitor spoils the otherwise non-Dorian complexion of the list. Even if the anachronism were avoidable the argument remains against believing that a son of the Dorian despotic of Argos was among the suitors of Agariste; but neither anachronism nor improbability proves the unauthenticity of the passage. Van Heerden wrongly translates ταῦτα θεοτ. (2. 325 (= θ) = θ). 

Φειδιναβ. The τα μέτρα ποιήσαντος Πελοποννησίων. Pheidon, 'who introduced a system of measures in the Peloponnesus,' was despotic of Argos and extended his power to Olympia, can be none other than the greatest of the Temenid kings. It is to be observed that Hdt. ascribes to Pheidon only the 'measures'; Ephoros was the first to make him author of the 'Aiginetan' coinage. Cp. Busolt, Gr. G. i. 143. Rawlinson admits a blunder on Hdt.'s part, but accepts the theory of there having been two Pheidons, a theory invented to avoid the anachronism (by Müller, Aiginetiorum Liber, p. 60). But at that rate we shall want three or four Pheidons; see following note. 

Beloch, Gr. Gesch. i. 216 n. (1890), suggests that the introduction of measures may have been ascribed to Pheidon, because there was in Argos a measure called a pheidon. Pollux, 10. 179 (ed. Bekker, p. 448). Is it not much more probable that the measure was named after the man?

The plan of dropping the passage Φειδιναβ. δι κτλ. to save Hdt. from anachronism is a product of criticism in extremis; better at once rewrite the passage, ἀνάθεῃ Π. τοῦ Ἀργείου τ. παῖς Α. Φειδιναβ. δείχνοντο τω Ελληνικών πάντων, δὲ εξαναστήσας τους Ἱλείων ἀγανοθέτας αὐτὸς τὸν ἐν ᾠλυμπίᾳ.
which are transparent (cp. Busolt, Gr. G. i. 145), may be set the great improbability of the synchronism of Pheidon = Kleisthenes (= Periandros), to say nothing of having to date the institution of the Pythian by Pheidon intolerably late (op. (iii) infra).

(ii) In contrast to the clear statement by Hdt. and the inferences to be based thereon, there is a still clearer statement by Pausanias 6. 22. 2, according to which the Olympiad of Pheidon is the 8th = 748 B.C. This date has been very generally accepted, even by critical historians, e.g. Clinton (F. H. ad ann.), Grote (ii. 257), Duncer (Gesch. de Alterth. v. 3 547), Busolt (Die Laederindien, i. 28 tentatively, Gr. Gesch. i. 145 decidedly), Holm (Gesch. Gr. i. 244 = Engl. Tr. i. 281), and others. But unfortunately Pausanias has marred his own authority by making Pheidon co-operate with the Pisatai, or Pisatai, instead of allowing him (as does Hdt.) to be his own Agonothetes (Hellenodikes). There is no great good, in putting in the Pisatae for the Eleianas! Pausanias' statement of the plain by roots on combinations, and apparently again on Ephoros (who in this matter is already discredited), for Ephoros made Pheidon ἐκαστος ἄρα Τυχαῖος. (Busolt, Gr. G. i. 2 619, regards the 8th Ol. as a date exsectated subsequently to Ephoros, in connexion with the Argivo-Macedonian genealogies and legends. See further,

(iii) By an emendation of Pausanias (usually attributed to Weissenborn, but now by Busolt, i. 2 611 n. 2, restored to our own Falconer) the 8th was converted into the 28th Olympiad = 685 B.C. This date is adopted by Curtius, Gr. G. i. 2 215, as “the most probable hypothesis” (cp. p. 239 and the note on p. 660. Cyp. Engl. Tr. i. 235). It is a curious coincidence, any way, that Ol. 28 was, according to tradition, celebrated by the Pisatai, not by the Eleians (cp.Clinton, Fasti, i. 190 ad ann.). It would be easy to understand the substitution of the Pisatae for Pheidon in tradition, all the more seeing that the Olympiad of Pheidon was an Anollympiad (Pausan. i. c.). It may be, indeed, that the exact figure of the Olympiad of Pheidon is, unattainable (cp. Bury, Nemean Odes of Pindar, Appendix D, p. 256), but the Olympiad of Pheidon was certainly the 28th or thereabouts, reckoning the Olympiads according to the conventional Anagraphe. For Mr. Bury (op. cit.) has made it probable that not only did Pheidon celebrate an Olympiad, but that he was the historic founder of the Agon: his Olympiad was virtually the first (pan-Hellenic) celebration. This conclusion has an important bearing upon the approximate date; it is an argument against lowering the date, so as to make Pheidon contemporary with Kleisthenes of Sikyon. The ascertained date for the first Pythian (pan-Hellenic) celebration is 585 B.C. But the Olympiad had been of a surety in full swing a long time before that. The historical perspective, the political situation in Peloponnesus so far as ascertainable, favours the fixture of the Olympiad of Pheidon about the middle of the seventh century. (This is likewise the mature judgment of Busolt, Gr. G. i. 2 623.) For conventional purposes Ol. 28 is the most suitable as the Olympiad of Pheidon.

(iv) Some traditions tended to throw Pheidon back even before Ol. 8 and to make him contemporary with Lykurgos = Ilithes, or even earlier. These need not here be further discussed. Busolt in his masterly analysis of what may be called the stratification of traditions on this subject (Gr. G. i. 2 612 ff.) has shown that these particular developments belong to the Macedonian period, and are connected with the Hellenic-Arkadean legend of the Macedonian house (cp. 5. 22 supra). The ancient authorities may be found conveniently in Clinton, Fasti, i. Appendix I. See further, Grote, Part ii. c. iv. vol. ii. p. 237, Ridgway, Origin of Currency and Weight Standards, pp. 211-215, Bury, Nemean Odes of Pindar, Appendix D. For further German literature, see Busolt, i. 2 611 n. 2. 15. Ἀἰ γόνα, of Azania, a district in N.-W. of Arkadia, cp. Curtius, Pelop. i. 385: not a proper name as Lenormant (La Grande Grèce, i. p. 282) takes it. The greater towns of Arkadia, Tegea,
ρίωνος τοῦ δεξαμένου τε, ὡς λόγος ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ λέγεται, τοὺς Διοσκούρους οἴκιοι καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου βεινοδεκέοντο πάντας ἄνθρωπους, καὶ Ἡλείος Ὠνόματος Ἀγαλαύος. οὕτως μὲν δὴ ἐξ αὐτῆς Πελοποννήσου ἠλθοῦσα, ἐκ δὲ Ἀθηναίων ἀπίκουτο Μεγακλῆς ὥστε ὁ Ἀλκμέωνος τοῦτον τὸν παρὰ Κροίσου ἀπικομένου, καὶ ἄλλος Ἰπποκλείδης Τισάνδρου, πλούσιον καὶ εἰδεῖ προφέρων Ἀθηναίων. ἀπὸ δὲ Ἐφεσίας ἀνεθεύσεις τούτου τοῦ χρόνου Λυσάννης· οὕτως δὲ ἀπ' Ἑβδομής μοῦνος. ἐκ δὲ Θεσαλῆς ἡλθε τῶν Σκοπαδέων Διακορίδης Κραννώνιος, ἐκ δὲ Μολοσσῶν

128 "Αλκαίος. τοσοῦτοι μὲν ἐγένοντο οἱ μυστήρες. ἀπικομένως δὲ τοῖς μὲν ἡ τροφημημένην ἡμέρην, ὁ Κλεισθένης πρώτα μὲν τὰς πάτρας τε αὐτῶν ἀνεπύθητο καὶ γένος ἐκάστου, μετὰ δὲ κατέχον ἐνανιατὸ διειπράτο αὐτῶν τῆς τούτης τῆς ἀνδραγαθίας καὶ τῆς δραμής καὶ παρακείμενος τε καὶ τρόπον, καὶ ἐνι ἐκάστος ὅν εὐσυνείην καὶ συνάπασι, καὶ ἐς γυμνάσια τε ἐξαγωγεῖον δοῦ ἴσαν αὐτῶν νεώτεροι, καὶ τὸ γε μέγιστον, ἐν τῇ συνεστί διειπράτο ὅσον γὰρ κατείχε χρόνων αὐτῶν, τοῦτον πάντα ἐπίειε καὶ ἅμα ἐξαίνει μεγαλοπρεπεῖς. καὶ δὴ καὶ γάμισα τῶν μυστηρίων ἑρέσκοντο

10 οἱ αὖ 'Ἀθηναίοι απυγμένοι, καὶ τοῖς μᾶλλον Ἰπποκλείδης ὁ Τισάνδρου καὶ κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν ἐκρίνετο καὶ ὅτι τὸ ἀνέκαθεν τούτοις ἐν Κορίνθῳ Κυφελίδης ἐν προσήκοις. ὁ δὲ ἐν κυρίᾳ ἐγένετο τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς τακαλίσιος τοῦ γάμου καὶ ἐκφάσιος

---

Mantinea, Orchomenos, are not represented.

16. ὁς λόγος ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ λέγεται. Hdt. does not believe this story, ep. 4, 173 supra. Four stadia from the city of Kleitor was a temple of the Dioskures (Pausan. 8. 21, 4), and their figures appear on fifth-century coins (J. H. S. viii. 102, Immerwahr, Kulte u. Mythen Arch. 229).

19. Ἀθηναίοι. Megakles himself was the contemporary of Kroisos, c. 125 supra.

21. Hippokleides son of Tisandros was probably a Philaid. Cp. next chapter.

128. 3. ἄνεσθησα. If an Epic poem was Hdt.'s main source for the story, probably Kleisthenes was represented as extracting from his visitors the information given just above in the text, c. 127. The subjects in which the suitors were tested (ἀναγαθία, ἄργη, παλιβεία, τρίσοι) are characteristic.

7. συνεστί. A curious word, specially used in the sense of 'boon-companionship.' Stein suggests ἐν τῇ συνεστί ἐξεῡρήτο . . . Van Herwerden approves of συνεστὶ (''R op-time''); which Holder also adopts.

8. πάντα. St. suggests πάντα τὰ τούτα; van H. reads πάντα πάνω ἑκάστου Madvig.

9. ἑρέσκοντο. Whom they pleased is not stated; it would be pleasant to believe that Agariste herself was consulted! Van Herwerden after Bekker inserts cl.

10. Ἰπποκλείδης. Hippokleides son of Tisandros is related to the Kypselidai of Corinth. At Athens his father is plainly contemporary with Kypselos father of Miltiades the Philaid, c. 35 supra. The inference is certainly tempting that Tisandros was a Philaid, and that the Philaidai had connexion with the Kypselids. The Kypselids traced themselves back to Kaineus the Lapith, 5. 22 supra. Lydike the mother of Philaios was counted a descendant of Kaineus. Cp. Petersen, Hst. Gent. Attic. iv.

129. 2. κατακλίσιος. Van Herwerden suggests κλίσιος.
αὐτὸῦ Κλεισθένεος τῶν κρίσιν ἐκ πάντων, θύσασ βοὸς ἐκατόν ὁ Κλεισθένης εὑρότερε αὐτοῦ τε τοὺς μνηστήρας καὶ Σιμονίωνος πάντας. ὥς δὲ ἀπὸ δεξιῶν ἐγινοῦτο, οἱ μνηστήρες ἔριν ἐχοῦν 5 ἀμφί τε μονοσκηνι καὶ τῷ λεγομένῳ ἐς τὸ μέσον. προειρήσεις δὲ τῆς πόσιος κατέχουν πολλοί τοὺς ἄλλους ὁ Ἰπποκλείδης ἔκλεισεν οἱ τῶν αὐληθῶν αὐλήσα τε ἐμμελείαν, τεθεμένου δὲ τῶν αὐληθῶν ὀρχήσατο. καὶ κοι ἑωτὸν μὲν ἀρεστοῦ ὀρχήσατο, ὁ Κλεισθένης δὲ ὀρέων ἀλων τῷ πρήγμα ὑπόπτευε. μετὰ δὲ ἐπισκόπων ὁ Ἰππο- 10 κλείδης χρόνον ἔκλεισεν τῶν τραπέζων ἐσσενείκει, ἐσθλοῦσιν δὲ τῆς τραπέζης πρώται μὲν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ὀρχήσατο Δακωνικὰ σχηματία, μετὰ δὲ ἄλλα Ἀττικά, τὸ τρίτον δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἑρείσας ἐπὶ τὴν τραπέζην τοῖς σκέλεσι ἐσχερούσης. Κλεισθένης δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα καὶ τὰ δεύτερα ὀρχευμένοι, ἀποστυγγοῦν γαμβρῶν ἀν ὁ 15 ἢ γενεῖσθαι Ἰπποκλείδεα διὰ τὴν τε ὀρχησίν καὶ τὴν ἀνωμέλην, κατείχε ἑωτοῖς, οὐ δοῦλομενος ἐκραγήνει ἐς αὐτῶν· ὥς δὲ εἰδο 10 τοῖς σκέλεσι χειρομουσίαν, αὐκάτε κατέχεις ὀνάμενος εἴπε “ὁ παῖ Τιεᾶνδρο, ἀπορριχθῶς γε μὲν τὸν γάμου.” ὁ δὲ Ἰππο- κλείδης ὑπολαβών εἴπε “οὐ φρονεῖς Ἰπποκλείδη.” ἀπὸ τοῦτον 130 μὲν τοῦτο ὀνομάζεται, Κλεισθένης δὲ συνῆν ποιησάμον ἐξέλεξε δέ μέσον τάδε. “ἀνδρεὶς παιδός τῆς ἐμῆς μνηστήρας, ἐγὼ καὶ πάντας ὑμέας ἐπαινῶ καὶ τάσι ὑμῖν, εἰ αὔν τε ηὐ, χαριζόμεν ἑν, μήτ’ ἐνα ὑμέας ἐξαιρέτου ἀποκριών μίτη τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀποδοκ. 5 μᾶχον. ἀλλ’ οὐ γὰρ οὐδ’ ἐς ἐστὶ μαῖψ πέρι παρθένου βουλεύόντα πᾶσι κατὰ νόν ποιεῖν, τοῖς μὲν ὑμῶν ἀπελευνομένοις τοῖς τοῦ γάμου τάλαντον ἀργυρίῳ ἐκάστῳ δωρεῖν δίδομεν τῆς ἀξίωσις εἴνεκα τῆς ἐς ἐμὲ γήμαι καὶ τῆς ἐς οἴκου ἀποδημήσις, το νος
10. 'Ἀλλιμένος Μεγακλές ἐγγύος παῖδα τὴν ἐμὴν Ἀγαρίστην νόμους τούτων Ἀθηναίων." φαμένου δὲ ἐγγυάσθαι Μεγακλέος ἐκείνῳ οἷς γάμος Kleištēnēs.

131. Ἀμφι μὲν κρίσις τῶν μορφῶν τοσαύτα ἐγένετο καὶ οὕτω 'Ἀλλιμένοις ἐβιοθήκησαν ἀνα τὴν Ἑλλάδα. τούτων δὲ συνοπτικῶν δίνει τὴν Kleištēnēs τε ὅ τις φιλᾶς καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν

How many talents the successful suitor received from the tyrant is unfortunately not stated.

10. νόμου τούτων Ἀθηναίων. It is not quite clear what were the marriage laws of the Athenians in the year 570 B.C. or thereabouts. The Solonian legislation may have been just enacted: but our knowledge of the domestic institutions of Athens is mainly for the fourth century, when much was ascribed to Solon which was of later institution, dating even after the Archonship of Eukleides. It is possible that at the date of the wedding of Agariste kinship through the mother was still strongly recognised at Athens (cp. σ. 103 supra). M'Leannan even argues acutely that at Athens the system of female kinship regulated to some extent marriage after it had lost importance in regard to succession (Studies in Ancient History, New Ed. p. 223). It is remarkable that the name of Kleisthenes is transferred from the μορφής to the ἑγγύας (5. 67. supra, cp. next chapter). By the strict letter of the later law Kleisthenes himself would have been σῶτος. (Cp. Ἀθην. pol. cc. 26, 42, Aristot. Pol. 3. 5, 8, 1278a.) On the other hand it can hardly be doubted that the Solonian legislation tended in the direction of the patria potestas, and probably to some extent annulled the position of women at Athens. In that case, perhaps, Kleisthenes was making some concession, on his daughter's behalf, in conforming to the Attic marriage law of the day. He performs the ἑγγύας, and he no doubt gave, with his daughter's hand, the indispensable dowry (φιλία). As, however, this speech is scarcely historic, but may be taken to represent Alkmionid tradition about the middle of the fifth century B.C., the formula would necessarily suggest conformity to the growing strictness of the domestic institutions, though it practically proves that the strict law above cited cannot have been in force at the time of the wedding. Cp. Duncker, Ein angebliches Gesetz des Perikles, in his Abhandlungen, 1887. On Attic marriage and family law generally: Texte—Petitius, Leges Atticae, Laber sextus (Parissia 1635), Meurinus, Themis Atticae (ap. Gronov. Thessaur. v. ed. 1699), Telfy, Corpus Juris Attic, Lib. ii. (1883). For further literature cp. Hermann's Lehrbuch, 11. i. pp. 1, 2. See also Smith, Dict. Antiq., articles Matrimonium in second and in third edd. (an interesting contrast).

11. ἐκείνῳ οἷς γάμος. N.B. the tense. Cp. 5. 78 supra. E. Hruba, Die Ehescheidung nach attischem Recht (1892), proves that the terms ἑγγύας, ἑγγύας ἐκείνη refer to acts constituting a legitimate marriage-contract (§ 3), and argues, from their occurrence in this story, that they date back to Solon (§ 44. Cp. further, op. cit. § 6. The ἑγγύας is a contract between the father (or other ἀνήρ) and the bridegroom: for the γάμος the presence of the bride is necessary. The formulas used by Kleisthenes and Megacles are observable.

131. 2. ἔβιοθήκησαν, the name of Alkmio's sons was noised abroad wherever Hellesines inhabited.

133. c. 106 supra. 3. Ἐξελθείς, 5. 69 supra. Did Kleisthenes die without issue? Cp. next note. Whether he was the elder of the two sons it is not easy to determine. The pedigree of the Alkmionids as given by Rawlinson, note ad l., is so far misleading as it exhibits Perikles, Alkiades, et al. as members of the clan. The proper genealogy of Perikles would of course be reckoned υπαρχόντες. Cp. 14 supra. He and his ancestors belonged to the family of the Burgydi, a priestly house, connected with Kleusia. See Petersen, Historia gent. Attic. pp. 131 ff., Toepffer, Attisch. Gesamml. pp. 136 f. On Xanthippos see further c. 136 infra. That he was among the friends of Kleisthenes and the Alkmionid party seems obvious. The birth
of Pericles may be placed conjecturally about 439/2 B.C. (Duncker, viii. 245, i. 3). This suits well enough with the date of his political début (Αθ. πολ. c. 27). That he was not the eldest son of Xanthippos may be inferred from the fact that he had a brother named Arirphon, after the grandfather. The forty years of Pericles' primacy (quadragesimae annos praefuit Athenis, Cic. de Orat. 3. 138; cp. Plutarch, Perik. 16. 2 petaφορικωτα μεν ήτη πρωτευον), which would put his first appearance back to at least 469 B.C. and his birth perhaps to 499 B.C., is artificial, exaggerated, and scarcely consistent with the indications in Plut. Perik. 7. If the first στρατηγία of Pericles is rightly dated to 462 B.C. (Duncker, viii. 247) it would support the later figure (480) as the date of his birth.

6. Μεγακλής. This Megacles was certainly ostracised, cp. 'Αθ. πολ. c. 22 ed. Sandys; but it seems unlikely that there was also a Megacles, son of Kleisthenes, who met the same fate.

8. ἄφον. The curious view in regard to the lioness and cub reported by Hdt. 3. 108 might help to explain the dream and its interpretation.

9. λόγον. Stein quotes the oracular paroly in Aristophanes, Knights, 1037 (124 n.o.). In this allusion to 'the Lion of the House of Xanthippos' who can fail to find a key to the prominence of the family stories of the Alkmaionids in the whole context before us, Pericles is nowhere else named by Hdt., and it is natural to suppose that special circumstances at the time when Hdt. was writing had emphasised the connexion of Pericles with the 'accursed' house (cp. 5. 70 f. supra); but it is difficult to imagine that Pericles was dead (429 B.C.) when this story was written. The whole passage, cc. 121-131, or 125-131, might very well be a παραπληθία made after 432 B.C. and before 425 B.C.

132. 1. μετά. How long after, Hdt. does not specify. The expedition to Paros can scarcely have taken place before the spring of 489 B.C. See Appendix XI. § 2. Miltiades was still Strategos, or perhaps re-elected in 489 B.C. But this expedition is plainly a special commission. Cp. 5. 97 supra and note 3 infra.

τρογία. We should rather have expected νίχτη, cp. 4. 160 supra.

3. ἢδομρήκοντα. The whole fleet of Athens at this time. Cp. c. 89 supra.

4. 'Αθηναίων. No doubt the Exekias, meditatively or immediately. It is difficult to believe that Hdt. here gives us a full or correct account of the secret commission of Miltiades. What he represents as a freebooting adventure admits of being interpreted as a legitimate and well-designed act of policy. See Appendix XI. § 4. On his own showing the present would have been an appropriate place for a remark on the folly of the Athenians (cp. 1. 60, 5. 97), but something kept him from it: unless the words τούτων ἐκείρετης convey a censure; such exaltation usually preceding a fall, cp. 4. 130, 5. 91 supra.
133 παρέδωσαν. παραλαβοῦν δὲ ὁ Μιλτιάδης τὴν στρατιὰν ἐπει ἔπλευ Πάρον, πρόφασιν ἔχουν ὡς οἱ Πάροι ὑπήρχαν πρότεροι στρατεύομενοι τριήρεις ἐς Μαραθώνα ἀμα τῷ Πέρσῃ. τοῦτο μὲν δὴ πρόσχημα λόγων ἦν, ἀτὰρ τινα καὶ ἔγκοτον ἔγχε τούτοι 5 Παροίσι διὰ Λυσαγόρα τοῦ Τισιέω, ἐνίκτα γένος Πάροιν, δια- βαλόντα μὲν πρὸς 'Τδάρνεα τῷ Πέρσῃν. ἀπικαμένοι δὲ ἀπ’ ἐν ἐπεκέντρωσαν τὴν στρατιὰν πρὸς ἐκδήλωσιν τοῦ σφαίρας. οἱ δὲ Πάροι δῖκοι μὲν τὸ δώσωσιν Μιλτιάδη λόγων ἀργύρων οὐδὲ διενεύσατο, οἱ δὲ δῖκος διαφυλάξαν Πάροι κατεληκμένοις ἐντὸς τείχεως, καὶ ἐσπέρμως κήρυκα αἰτεὶ ἐκατόν τάλαντα, φὰς, ἦν μὲν οὐ δῶς, οὐκ ἀπαναστήσασιν τὴν στρατιὰν πρὸς ἐκδήλωσιν τοῦ σφαίρας. οἱ δὲ Πάροι δῖκοι μὲν τὸ δώσωσιν Μιλτιάδη λόγων ἀργύρων οὐδὲ διενεύσατο, οἱ δὲ δῖκος διαφυλάξαν Πάροι κατεληκμένοις ἐντὸς τείχεως, καὶ ἐσπέρμως κήρυκα αἰτεὶ ἐκατόν τάλαντα, φὰς, ἦν μὲν οὐ δῶς, οὐκ ἀπαναστήσασιν τὴν στρατιὰν πρὸς ἐκδήλωσιν τοῦ σφαίρας. οἱ δὲ Πάροι δῖκοι μὲν τὸ δώσωσιν Μιλτιάδη λόγων ἀργύρων οὐδὲ διενεύσατο, οἱ δὲ δῖκος διαφυλάξαν Πάροι κατεληκμένοις ἐντὸς τείχεως, καὶ ἐσπέρμως κήρυκα αἰτεὶ ἐκατόν τάλαντα, φὰς, ἦν μὲν οὐ δῶς, οὐκ ἀπαναστήσασιν τὴν στρατιὰν πρὸς ἐκδήλωσιν τοῦ σφαίρας.

8. For παρέδωσαν Cobet suggests ἔδωσαν. 133. 2. Πάρον (cp. Smith, Dict. Geogr. s.v. and Bent, Cyclades, c. xv.). Paros, once only second to Naxos among the Cyclades ("traces of a vast population in former ages"), doing a brisk trade in its choice marble (3. 57, 5. 62), on good terms with Miletos before the great revolt (5. 27, 28), regarded as the metropolis of Thasos (Thuc. 4. 104, 4), was never more flourishing than in the days of Miltiades, and still in the days of Hdt. was paying 16 T. tribute to Athens (cp. C. I. A. i. 234), "twice as much as Naxos, Andros, and other larger islands" (Bent, p. 372). Paros presumably had profited by the fall of Naxos, and had made good terms with the Persians. It is likely enough that the Parions had taken part in the Marathonian campaign. Athenian tradition afterwards represented them as unpatriotic time-servers (8. 67, 112). That Miltiades should have been angry with a Parian for reporting evil of him to Hydarnes, and should seek to avenge the insult on the whole community, is not very probable. Was the victor of Marathon, the hero of the Danube, so anxious to stand well with the Persians? Good political and military reasons can be found for the expedition to Paros. See Appendix XI. § 4.

πρόσωπον. Stein suggests the addition διάς, cp. 4. 1 supra.

6. Πέρσῃν. How Lysagoras the Parian came into relations with Hydarnes is not stated. In regard to Hydarnes, it would perhaps be safe to infer that he was the commander of the Immortals, cp. 7. 83 and passim, but especially c. 135.

8. ἐκατόν. One hundred T. would have defrayed the expenses of the expedition, perhaps twice over. (Cp. Appendix XI. § 6.) Miltiades may have demanded gold, c. 132 supra, though Hdt. here thinks only of silver (even if with Krüger ἀργυρός is removed). It was just the amount which Sicyon had (according to Hdt.'s authorities) paid, not long before, to Argos for an offence, similar in kind, but surely less in degree, c. 92 supra.

134. 1. οἱ πάντες Ἐλληνες. It can hardly be supposed that more is meant by this expression than that Hdt. has not met with any variant or contrary tradition on the course of events so far. With what follows the case is different: he gives, for some reason or other, a local Parian tradition, and that tradition was at variance presumably with the 'pan-Hellenic' version. But it had local colour, it had a Delphic reference, it had a good moral in its favour. See further, Appendix XI. § 3. The local Parian tradition only includes cc. 134,
εὐθὺς μὲν Παρίην γένος, οὐνομα δὲ οἱ εἰναι Τιμοῦν, εἰναι δὲ ὑποτάκτων τῶν χθονίων θεῶν· ταύτην ἀλθεῶσαν ἐς δύσιν Μίλης· τινάξεω συμβουλεύεσα, εἰ περὶ πολυον ποιετάτα Πάρον ἔδει, τὰ ἀν αὐτὴ ὑποθήται, ταύτα ποιείσθαι. μετὰ δὲ τὴν μὲν ὑποθέται, τὸν δὲ διερχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν κολονῶν τὸν πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ἔναν ἔρκος θεσμοφόρου Δήμητρος ὑπερθερεῖ, οὐ δυνάμενον τὰς θύρας ἀνοίξας, ὑπερθερῆλα δὲ ἐναι ἐπὶ τὸ μέγαρον ὅ τι δὴ ποιῆσωντα τὸ ἑνός, εἶτε κυισάντα τι τῶν ἡμιιητῶν εἴτε ὅ τι κατ' ἐς τρῆς ἐξηγησάτω τε γενέσθαι καὶ προκάτε φρίκης αὐτῶν ὑπελθόντος ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν ἑνός ἔσβησα, καταβρώσκοντα δὲ τὴν αἱματήσει τὴν μηρόν σταθήσθαι· οὐ δὲ αὐτῶ τὸ γὰρ προσπαθείαν λέγουσα. Μιλτιάδης μὲν τινὶς φλαῖρος ἔχειν ἀπεξελεύσθη ὑπὸ, 135 οὕτω χρήματα Ἀθηναίοις ἄγων οὕτε Πάρων προεκτήρισμένως, ἀλλὰ πολιορκήσας τε ἐξ καὶ ἱκανοὶ ἡμέρας καὶ δημόσια τὴν νήσον. Πάροι δὲ πυθόμενοι ὅς ὑποτάκτων τῶν θεῶν Τιμός Μιλτιάδης καταγγέλλατο, βουλόμενοι μὲν ἀυτὶ τούτων τιμωρήσεως· σασθαι, θεσπρώτους πέμποντο ἐς Δελφοὺς, ὥς σφαγή ἰσχυρὶ τῆς πολιορκίας ἐσχε· ἔπεμπον δὲ ἐπειρασμένοις ἐκαταρρίψῃσθαι τὸν ὑποτάκτου τῶν θεῶν τὴν ἐξώγησαμενήν τοὺς ἔχοις τῆς πατρίδος ἀλλοσίν καὶ τὰ ἐς ἔρεσσα ἑνόν τίνης ἀφήνει 135 ἐκφηβήσασιν.
10 Μιλτιάδης. ἢ δὲ Πυθήν οὐκ ἦν, φάσαν οὐ τιμῶν ἐνὶ τῇ αὐτῇ τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ δέως γὰρ Μιλτιάδης τελευτῶν μὴ εἴ, φανῆται οἱ 136 τῶν κακῶν κατηγομένων. Παραπλανοῦντο μὲν δὲ τὰτά η Πυθήν ἔχρησε: 'Αθηναῖοι δὲ ἐκ Πάρου Μιλτιάδης ἀπονυστήσαντα ἔσχον εἰς στόμασι οἱ τε ἄλλοι καὶ μάλιστα Ξάνθιππος ὁ 'Αριάφρωνος, δὲ θανάτου ὑπαγόγων ἐπὶ τὸν δῆμον Μιλτιάδηδο εἰδικῶς τῆς 'Αθη- συν ἅπασς ἅπαντος εἶνεκεν. Μιλτιάδης δὲ αὐτὸς μὲν παρεῖδον οἷον ἀπελογέστα ἡ γὰρ αὕτατος ὡςτε σημεῖον τοῦ μηροῦ προ- κείμενον δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν κλίνῃ ἰππεταλεόντυοι οἱ φίλοι, τῆς μάχης τε τῆς ἐν Μαραθῶνι γενομένης πολλὰ ἐπιμεμημένοι καὶ τῆς Δημοκράτης ἀνέσεως, ὡς δὲν δῆμων τε καὶ τιμᾶμενος τοὺς Πέλα- γοις παρέδωκε 'Αθηναῖοι. προσγενομένων δὲ τοῦ δήμου αὐτῶ

11. δὲν γὰρ. Τρ. σ. 79 supra. And further, 7, 17 for a parallel or comment to the present case: οὗτος ἐκ τοῦ μετέχεσαν οὖσα ἐν τῇ παρασκ. νῦν κατα- προβοκεὶ ἄνωτέρων τὸ χρεόν γενέσθαι. To have punished the human agent after the event might be regarded as equivalent to attempting to prevent or avert its occurrence. On the formula, which here is adopted by, or from, Delphi, cp. Introduction, § 22, pp. exii ff.

φανῆθαι. Rawlinson renders "she was sent"; Macaulay, "she had appeared." Stein points out the true meaning, viz. that a φάσμα, apparition, in the shape of Tumos, had misled Milti- ades. Τρ. 4. 16 (where Delphi endorses the credentials of a φάσμα) and 69, 117 supra for other φάσματα. The subject is κατηγομένος, cp. κατηγή- σατο supra. ἄνωτέρων is the proper feminine of ἄνω, but is not used of persons, while ἄνωτερος is a divine title. (Cp. L. & S. in loc.)

136. Ἐνδήσω. Hdt. recurs here obviously to Athenian tradition: the Parians would be no authorities on the story of the trial.

3. Ξάνθιππος. We may infer from this passage that (1) Xanthippos was the accuser; (2) the impeachment was ἀπαρθείς αὐτῷ δήμῳ: cp. Meier and Schömann, Der Attische Process, p. 344. (It was a variety of the γραφή προδοσίας. At least such would have been its later title.) (3) The procedure was by an εἰσαγωγεῖα (ὑπὸ τῶν δήμων), cp. 3. 104 supra; and the reference to Plato τῆς.

6. σημεῖον, cp. σφακέλωσαν τοῦ μηροῦ καὶ σηκύνοντο τῆς. How his limb should have mortified from a sprain (εὐασθέα c. 134) it is not easy to understand, though the same diffi- culty does not attend the case of Kam- byses (3. 66 ἐσφακελωμεῖς τὸ δοτέν καὶ ὁ μηρὸς ἐστᾶτε), who was wounded. Hence the significance of the Scholion (quoted by Baehr, note to c. 134) to Aristid. p. 218, to the effect that Milti- ades was wounded in the thigh by a dart, launched by an unseen hand, which struck him as he was besieging Paros. Cp. C. Nepos, c. 7 (= Ephorus) aeger erat vulneribus, quae in oppug- nando oppido acceperat. Cp. Appendix XI. § 3.

7. εὶ φῶς. It would be interesting to know their names. Cornelius Nepos has: verba pro eo fecit frater eius Tissagoras, c. 7. His brother Bessagoras predeceased him, c. 38 supra. The omission of his service at the later is noticeable (cp. 4. 137 supra). That, however, was not a direct service to Athens, and had besides already done duty on a similar occasion perhaps, cp. c. 104 supra. His acquisition of Lem- nos might have been expected to have served also at the previous trial. It is just possible that the reference to it here is unhistorical, and introduced by Hdt. as a peg on which to hang the story of the Athenian acquisition of Lemnos. Ed. Meyer, Forschungen, p. 16, even suggests that it was, perhaps, Miltiades Cyclopē who first acquired Lemnos (for Peisistratos), in which case the achievement can hardly have done duty at either trial of Miltiades Cimon: but the suggestion is unverifiable.
κατά τὴν ἀπόλυσιν τοῦ θανάτου, ἥμισυσαντός δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀδικήν πεντῆκοντα ταλάντωσι, Μιλτιάδης μὲν μετὰ ταύτα σφακελάσαντος την μηροῦ καὶ σπέντου τελεύτα, τὰ δὲ πεντῆκοντα τάλαντα ἔξτισε ὁ πάις αὐτοῦ Κίμων.

Δὲν δὲ Μιλτιάδης ὁ Κίμωνος δὲν ἔσχε. Πελασγοὶ ἐπέτειτ 137 ἐκ τῆς 'Αττικῆς ὑπὸ 'Αθηναίων ἐξεβλήθησαν, εἶτε ὅν δὴ δικαίως εἶτε ἀδίκους· τούτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι, πλὴν τὰ λεγόμενα, ὅτι 'Εκατος μὲν ὁ 'Πηγανίδρου ἐφήσε ἐν τοῖς λόγοις λέγων ἀδίκους" ἐπέτει γὰρ ἴδεισι τοὺς 'Αθηναίους τὴν χώρην, τὴν σφίξα αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ 5 τῶν 'Αγριππᾶν εὐδοκαν ἔδωξαν Πελασγοίς οἰκήσας μετοχὸ τοῦ τείχους τοῦ περὶ τὴν αὐτόπτων κοτὲν ἐνιαλμένου, ταύτην ὡς ἴδει τούς 'Αθηναίους ἐξεργασμένην εὐ, τὴν πρότερον εἶναι κακῆν τα καὶ τοῦ μηδενὸς ἀξίας, λαβεῖσι φθόνον τε καὶ ἵμερον τῆς χῆς, καὶ οὕτω ἐξελαίανεν αὐτῶν οὐδεμίαν ἅλλον πρόφασιν προσιχομένους τοὺς τοῖς 'Αθηναῖοι. ὡς δὲ αὐτοὶ 'Αθηναίοι λέγουσι, δικαίως ἐξελάσαι.

11. κατὰ... κατὰ. In slightly different senses: the first suggesting a result, the second a cause. Or, the two might be covered by the accusative of respect. Cp. Kühner, Ausführ., Gramm. d. Gr. Srp. § 433, where this instance is not quoted.

12. ταλάντωσι. Grote, in a well-known passage (pr. pp. 62 ff., Pt. ii. c. xxxvi.), has argued that the γραφῆς must have been τουςοῦν and that the people, after the verdict of guilty, had no choice but to accept one of the alternatives. Meier and Schömann, l. c. ε., represent the γραφῆς προσελλας as δράμας, regarding the death penalty as fixed, on the ground that προσολαγμία does not admit of degrees; but considering the way the Athenians classified homicide we may be sure they would have been able to discriminate high treason from treason felony! Plato, Πράξαμα, 516, seems to suggest that Miltiades only escaped by the casting vote of the Κρητίς, if, indeed, that reference be historic, or referable to this occasion. Hdt. does not say that Miltiades could not have paid the fine had he lived. On the payment, cp. Plutarch's Κίμων 4, which explains where Kimon got the money. On the end of Miltiades, see further Appendix XI. § 6.


3. οὐκ ἔχω. A contrast to Hekataios, who determined the question against Athens. This notice would not have been a good advertisement for the Ionian's works at Athens, unless, indeed, there were some good men anxious to rake up old sins and do penance therefor: a form of patriotism which the Greeks do not seem to have cultivated much.

tὰ λεγόμενα includes written authority (Hekataios ἐφησεν ἐν τοῖς λέγων ἀδίκους) and oral tradition (ὅς δὲ αὐτοί 'Αθηναίοι, if, indeed, the latter version was not also in writing. Cp. Introduction, § 30.

5. ἐπέτει γὰρ ... 'Αθηναίοι. Practically a quotation from Hekataios, and, as Blakeney remarks, σφίξα αὐτοῖς seems to show that Hekataios had the story from 'Pelagian' (Lemnian) sources.

7. κατα. The word can hardly be used with reference to the writer's own day. It might almost seem as if the wall had been built long before the grant of land was made. Anyway the κατα here marks a different epoch to the words τοὺς τῶν χρήσμων εὐθύνοντα. According to Strabo, 401 (Hekataios), these Pelasgians came into Attica from Boeotia, driven forth by the invading Boeotians. The wall is named τὸ Πελασγικὸν τεῖχος 5. 64 supra, but the better form was undoubtedly τὸ Πελαγικὸν. Cp. Appendix IX. § 4.

11. ὡς δὲ ... 'Αθηναίοι λέγουσι. Ed. Meyer, Forschungen, p. 8, argues that there was no genuine Attic tradition in regard to the Pelasgi in Attica, and that we have in Hdt. merely an Attic reply to the charge of Hekataios. If Pelasgi
were never in Attica, they could not have built the wall round the Akropolis: who, then, did build it? Certainly it was built in primitive pre-Hellenic, or proto-Hellenic, i.e. ‘Pelasgic,’ times. The story of its building may be fabulous, and the comings and goings of the ‘Pelasgic’ are more or less pragmatic, but has Meyer shown that the Pelaigi should be reduced to the rank of a merely regulative idea? The last word on the Pelasgic question is not yet spoken: cp. Mr. Arthur Evans’ forthcoming paper in J. H. S. 1896.

14. Ἐννεάκρυνοι. There is an anachronism in calling the source by this name. The older name (to which the present has reverted) was Kallirrhoë. It was only in the days of Peisistratos that the spot was walled in and renamed, Thucyd. 2. 15, 5. In regard to its exact topographic position there has long raged a notorious controversy. Herodotus in this passage plainly implies that Kallirrhoë, or rather Enneakrunos, was outside the city (of old), and in the region of Phaleron. As a general indication this site squares with the passage of Thucydides, where he is describing buildings and objects outside the old φῶσιν, which term is explained to mean ἡ ἀκρόπολις καὶ τὰ ἐν ἀκρῷ φῶι καὶ τῶν μάλιτα τερμαμένα. The archaic Kallirrhoë, the sources of Enneakrunos, must therefore be sought outside the ancient city, to the south of the Akropolis, in proximity to the Olympiaeion (ὑγείας ὑπὸ Θεν. l. c.). These indications place Kallirrhoë implicitly on or near the Ilissos, and so Plato, Ἀπολ. 364 expressly εἶλον μας ἐς Κυνάρσειας καὶ γεγομένη μοι κατὰ τὸν Ἡλισσον. Κλειστοὶ ὠς τὸν Ἀργοὺς ἡγοῦσα ἐκ Καλλιρρῆς. But Pausanias 1. 14, 1 mentions Enneakrunos in the neighbourhood of an Odeon (cp. 8. 6), apparently in his tour of the Agora, though in a passage riddled with literary digressions, and full of small topographical uncertainties. Hence an apparent conflict of authority between Pausanias on the one part and Thucydidest et al. on the other: was Enneakrunos in the Agora, where Pausanias places it, or on the Ilissos, where Herodotus, Thucydidest et al. place it? The following points are clear: there was a Kallirrhoë on the Ilissos, which Hdt. and Thuc. identify with Enneakrunos. There was a fountain (σφηημ) in the Agora, which Pausanias identifies with Enneakrunos. If there is any error here, it must be with Pausanias, not with Thucydides. The only possible reconciliation lies in the theory that there was a connexion between the springs on the Ilissos and the fountain in the Agora, a connexion established by Pelisistrateos, and that Thucydides is speaking of one end of the aqueduct, Pausanias of the other. Dr. Dührfeld claims to have discovered the conduit in situ. See Harrison and Verrall, Mythology and Monuments, pp. 87-91, Curtius, Stadtgeschichte, pp. v, 87, etc., E. Gardner, in J. H. S. xiii. pp. 139 ff. (1893), xiv. pp. 224 ff. (1894). ταῦτα δὲ ἠρέστη τοῦ Σχαφερ. 

ὅτι ἔρως . . . οἶκας. In the Homeric poems σχώμα is an established institution. Does τὸν ἄρρητον τὸν χρόνον refer to an age anterior to the Trojan war? Strabo (ι. c. μέγα) dates it to the Boeotian invasion, ἢ. e. after (60 years after, Thuc. 1. 12) the Trojan war. Hdt. 4. 145 supports the view that the expulsion of the Pelaigi took place after the Trojan war. There is then an anachronism in this Athenian tradition, which seems to imply that there were no slaves in Greece, nearly a century after the Trojan war. On the other hand the recognition of a period when slavery was not, and the association of that period with the ‘Pelasgic’ type, are significant points in Attic tradition. It is to be noticed that the antithesis between Athenian and Pelasgian is pronounced in both versions. Cp. 8. 44, 1. 67.

198. 1. τήν. Cp. 5. 23. The story which follows looks like a reminiscence of the customs of exogamy and marriage by capture misunderstood and transfigured in tradition. On its anthropological bearings, cp. McLennan's Studies in Ancient History, 'Primitive Marriage,' c. iv., Westermarck, History of Human Marriage, c. xvii. The suggestion that the motis is obviously (offenbar) taken from the saga of Boreas and Oreithyia (Meyer, Forschungen, p. 9) seems hardly adequate.


παντοκουτάροι, open galleys. On the form of the word cp. L. & S. sub v.

4. Ἀθηναίων. The statement implies (1) the synoikismos, and so probably an anachronism; (2) the antiquity of the (Athenian) cult of Artemis in Brauron. It is thus inconsistent with the Athenian legend, as found in Euripides, Iphig. in Tauris, 1433 ff., which identifies the image at Brauron with the Tauric Artemis, and represents it as brought there by Orestes. (The Brauronian rite was Arctic if not Tauric!) It was, indeed, a pre-Hellenic cult, and likely enough 'Pelasgian' property; the ritual involving a dance in bear-skins. It was a rural festival, presumably instituted by a pastoral people: and if there were lions in Paonia in the days of Herodotus (7. 125) there may have been bears on Hymettos in 'Pelasgian' times. In Hdt.'s time, perhaps since the time of Peisistratos, the Brauronian goddess had a sanctuary on the Akropolis, the remains of which are still visible; and it was in the Akropolis that the Athenian girls were initiated; probably yearly on the 16th of Munychion. This may have been the date of the rural festival in Brauron, which at any rate would be a Spring festival and in the sea-faring season, and, perhaps annual: but in later times at least it was only a παντοκουτάρος. (Perhaps already so in Hdt.'s day: hence εὐς ἐξεστϊάσεως τὰς Ἀθηναίων ὄρμας with special significance.) Cp. A. Mommsen, Heortologie, pp. 408 ff.; Harrison, Mythology and Monuments, pp. 395 ff.; Lang, Myth and Ritual, ii. 312 ff. (With the ritual described, Eurip. Iph. in Tauris, 1458 ff., cp. the rite of the 'Shrove-Tide Bear,' Fraser, Golden Bough, i. 254.)

6. παλλακάς. The legend seems to suggest one frequent origin, at once of domestic slavery and of polygamy. For the rest, the fate of the Attic mothers and their sons of course justified the Athenian conquest of Lemnos; and the case is an instance of the political utility of myths and legends.

7. γλώσσαν τ. 'Α. On the language of the Pelagii 1. 57. But that the women carried to Lemnos spoke 'Attic,' looks anachronistic. The primitive Lemnian language may be represented in the celebrated prehistoric inscription most conveniently accessible in Dr. Carl Pauli's Vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos, Leipzig, 1886.
to his 'Aθηναίων εδίδασκον τοὺς παιδίας. οἱ δὲ οὕτε συμμάχουσαν τοῖς καὶ τοῖς Πελασγίδων γυναικῶν παιαὶ ἤθελον, εἰ τε τύπποτοι τις αὐτῶν ὄπι- ἐκεῖνοι τοῖς Πελασγίων γυναικῶν, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἄρχειν τοῖς παιδίων τοὺς εἰδικεῖαι καὶ πολλὸι ἐπεκράτει. μαθότες δὲ ταῦτα οἱ Πελασγοὶ οὐνοοί λόγους ἔδιδασαν· καὶ σφι κατείπον τοὺς παιδίας τοὺς ἐκ τῶν 'Αττικῶν γυναικῶν. οὐεύθυτα δὲ ταῦτα, προσαπολλοῦσι δὲ σφεν καὶ τὰς μυθέρας. ἀπὸ τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ ἔργου καὶ τοῦ προτέρου τούτων, τὸ ἐργάσιμοι αἱ γυναῖκες τούς ἀμα Ἰμαντι Ἀνδρας σφιτέρους ἀποκτείνασαι, νενύμνηται ἀκτὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὰ σφέτερα ἥρα πάντα Δήμων καλέσθαι. ἀποκτείνασι τοῦτο Πελασγοί τοὺς σφιτέρους παιδίας τοῖς γυναικῶν οὕτε γῆς τοῦ ἐφερε οὕτε γυναῖκες τοῖς καὶ ποιοῦν ὁμοίως ἔτεκεν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ. πιέζομενοι δὲ λαμψ καὶ ἁπαίδης ἐς Δελοῦν ἔπεμπεν 5 υἱόν τινα αὐτοῦμεν τοὺς παρεντοῖς κακῶν. ἦ δὲ Πυθή σφαῖρας ἐκέλευεν 'Αθηναίοι δίκαι διδόνα ταῦτα τὰς ἀν αὐτῶν 'Αθηναίοι δικάσσοι. ξῆδον τε δὴ ἐς ταύτα 'Αθήνας οἱ Πελασγοί καὶ δίκαι ἐπαγγέλλαντα Βουλόμενοι διδόναι παντὸς τοῦ ἀδικήματος. 'Αθηναίοι δὲ ἐν τῷ πρωτάρειον κλώτη στρώσαντες ύστερος κάλλιστα καὶ τράπεται ἐπεπλένη ἁγάθων πάντων παραδέχεται, ἐκέλευον τοὺς Πελασγοίς τὴν χόρην σφιε παραδιδόναι οὕτω ἔχουσαν. οἱ δὲ Πελασγοὶ ὑπολαβόντες εἶπαν "επεῖ θαν ἑρήμῳ ἀνέμων ἐξαισθήσεις νησὺ εἰς τῆς ἠμετέρης ἐς τὴν ἦμετρην, τότε παραδόσομεν,"

20. Ἀμα seems to imply that Thoas shared the common fate. Rawlinson, indeed, translates: "in the days of Thoas," perhaps to reconcile Ἰδέ with the ordinary tradition, according to which Thoas was saved by his daughter Hysipyle. Cp. Apoll. 1. 9, 17. Thoas did not finally escape (Apoll. 3. 6, 4).

21. Δήμων. Blakesley ad l. suggests another origin of the phrase: Δήμων was a name of the megaly dea, to whom virgins were sacrificed, so Steph. Byz. s.v. "apparently following Hephaestus." Is Ἰδέ here then consciously correcting the derivation given by Hephaestus? On Ἑλλάδα, cp. c. 106. i. 5 supra.

139. 4. Ἁμφ. Drought and famine were common signs of divine displeasure. Cp. 4. 151, 5. 82 supra.

Fragments. A theory from 'Pelasgic' Lemnos to Delphi, and a Delphic response so much to the advantage of Athens, are suggestive traditions. The whole story is presumably from Athenian sources. The oracle had not been fulfilled—perhaps not even recorded—when Hekataios wrote the passage quoted c. 137 supra. The divine behest: 'Αθηναίου δίκαι διδόναι τοῖς τοῦ διότι 'Αθηναίοι δικάσσοι: providentially anticipates the practice of imperial Athens towards her Symmachy. The phraseology and even the argument in this story smack of Attic jurisprudence: cp. ἑξιπουλεῖσθαι . . ὑπὸ ἀθηναίων c. 137 supra, and its legal consequence. Political claims are also insinuated, e.g. ἄρχειν (δε) c. 138 supra.
14. πρὸς νότον πολλάκις, about 140
miles. Rawlinson thinks a trireme
might have achieved the voyage ἀκριβῶς,
but not ἑκατέρα ἄκρυμ. Mr. Tozer
(Islands of the Aegean, p. 236) reports
the interesting observation that with a
north wind the current of the Helles-
pon-tongu set with great force towards
Lemnos, but towards Imbros when the
wind is S. Still, one or other of the
terms would have been superfluous
in the original situation, when ἔμπροσθεν
stood for Αττικα: and ἑκατέρα ἄκρυμ has
the more primitive look.
140. 1. ἐνετὸς ἐκ καλάτα πολλάκις. About
500 according to the ordinary computa-
tion. The chronological and other rela-
tions between the Persian acquisition of
Lemnos (5. 26 supra) and the Αθηναῖοι,
are not stated, nor is the problem present
to the Hdt., the two stories
being told in different connexions, and
from different sources: but, if the
voyage of Miltiades was subsequent to
the visitation of Otanies, then it may
have been from the Persians that Milti-
ades wrested the island. But see νῆσα. The case is a fresh illustration of
the use made for political purposes of
the mythical and legendary traditions.
Cp. c. 138. 1. 6 supra.
3. ἐνέτος Ἀθηναίων. Athenian
vanity (Blakseley) represents the occu-
pation of the Chersonese by the Phi-
laiots as done for Athens. But cp.
cc. 36, 39 supra, and Appendix IV. § 9.
Whatever the motive, the result was
practically as vanity might have desired.
Perhaps this acquisition of Lemnos 'for
the Athenians' had already done duty
at the first trial of Miltiades. But cp.
cc. 104, 136 supra. It is impossible to
follow Blakseley (note ad l.) in re-
ferring the passage which he quotes
from Charax (apud Steph. Byz. sub c. Ηφαιστία) to a surrender of the city of
Hephaistia by Miltiades to the Atheni-
ans. Hdt. seems to imply that He-
phaistia surrendered and that Myrina
drawing on Charax records that Myrina
was besieged and captured and that
Hephaistia then surrendered. By an
emendation of Valkenser's, Harmon is
made tyrant of Hephaistia and sur-
renders it. The date of the annexation
is to be placed during the Ionian revolt
(pace Ed. Meyer, Forschungen, p. 16).
Cp. 5. 26 supra. But the island of
course passed again out of the control
of Athens, or of Miltiades, cp. c. 31
supra, and Lemni was served in the
fleet of Xerxes, though the Athenian
connexion was not without effect, cp.
8. 11. Later, the connexion with Lem-
nos and Imbros became specially close.
(Cp. Tozer, op. cit. pp. 237 f.)
4. Ἑλλαδίστατος. On the extreme
south-west point of the Chersonese.
Strabo, 331, ἡ 52 (ed. Teubn. ii. p.
470): only about 40 stadia distant from
Sigeion in the Troad.
6. τὸ χρυσότηριον. It was rather
the ὀικογένεια of their ancestors which
should have been kept in mind. On
ἀναμμένην τυχεῖ τι, cp. L. & S. sub v.
7. Ἡφαιστίας... Myrūnaios. He-
phaistia and Myrina were the two
towns on the island, N. and W., the
former named after the god to whom
the volcanic Lemnos was sacred (cp.
Π. Ι. 594). Myrina, however (the modern Kastro), 'occupies a striking
position which marks it out as the
natural capital of the island' (Tozer,
op. c. p. 240). The only remains of the
town now, 'a splendid piece of cyclopean
masonry' (ib. p. 246). The position of
Hephaistia, Tozer observes p. 268, was
convenient for commerce, but not defen-
sively strong. It appears in the Athen-
ian Tribute-lists to have paid nearly
twice as much as Myrina (not to be
confused with Myrina by Kyme). On
the traditional volcanic claims of Lem-
nos, consult Tozer, op. c.
The story of the acquisition of Lemnos by the Athenians is introduced by Hdt. with extraordinary skill, for an artistic purpose. (1) After the miserable end of the (reputed) victor of Marathon these more heroic incidents restore tone and cheer to the narrative. (2) The story gives Hdt. an opportunity for a Parthian shot at Hekataios, to whom he has been a good deal more indebted in these Books than appears on the surface. (3) The story forms an absolute pause in the general course of the main history, and an emphatic break between the sixth and seventh Books as we have them. As the whole work closes with a biographical anecdote (9. 122) which serves at once to sum up the moral of the great war (Bks. 7, 8, 9) and to link the end with the beginning in the person of Kyros, so does Hdt. close this part of his work, the second of his three volumes, with a passage which emphasises the superiority of truly Hellenic (Attic) culture over the cruelty and roughness of uncivilisation, to the description of which so much of this volume has been devoted. If such things are accidental, they are accidents of genius. Op. Introduction, § 3.