HERODOTOS – INTERPRETATIONS

A number of passages in Herodotos which have all – individually or in various contexts – come under the scrutiny of modern expounders, shall be examined as a distinct group. On grounds of method all strictly historical deliberations or premature allusions to ‘parallel’ passages elsewhere will be excluded 1).

1. 'Απελανυμένος δὲ ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ἐκ τῆς Σπάρτης ἤμε ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας γενομένας τυράννων ὁδὲ ἔλευθερας, 5, 55. Herodotos, however, now launches into a many-layered disquisition on diverse topics 2). It is not until 5, 62, 1 that he once more takes up the theme of liberation 3); in 5, 62, 2 he finally gets down to the task of demonstrating how the Athenians were freed from the tyrants.

Four chapters, 5, 62–65, are devoted to this subject; the logical skeleton of these presents itself as follows 4):

1) The reader is asked to read with a copy of Herodotos before him, since I have attempted to re-read Herodotos on the basis of Herodotos (therefore the barring of other authors; cf., incidentally, the remarks of Fornara Historia 17, 1968, 423 f., on the hazards of reading Herodotos with a full knowledge of Thukydides’ view).

I hope to reassess the traditions of the tyrannicide, and Hellanikos in particular, in the near future; cf. on Schol. Pind. Πυθ. 7, 9 b, Philochoros FGrHist 328 F 115, and Ephoros, my paper in Hermes 102, 1974, 179–190.

I am grateful to Dr. E. F. Bloedow for valuable criticism, and to Dr. C. W. Fornara for reading the finished manuscript.

2) That is, the harsh rule of Hippias after the tyrannicide; Hipparchos’ dream and end; Gephyraian genealogy; Phoinikian letters. Cf. the structural analyses of Jacoby RE Suppl. 2, 307–310 (= Grieb. Historiker, 1956, 58 f.); Immerwahr Form and Thought 117 f.; Macan ad loc.; also Benar­dete Herodotean Inquiries, 1969, 143 f. The account of Aristagoras’ appearance in Athens comes in 5, 97.

3) By dealing with the tyrannicide outside the account of how the Athenians were freed, Herodotos makes it abundantly clear that in his view the tyrannicide was but a circumstantial happening. Cf. Macan ad loc. and especially Bornitz Herodot-Studien, 1968, 26; cf. 30. ἔλευθεροις, ἔλευθερη, ἔλευθερος, are in this context recurring catchwords.

4) We are faced here with a kind of inverted account, or should one say, reporting in inverse logical order (cf. Mary White Phoenix 23, 1969, 44 n 15). By reading backward from 5, 65, 5, we discern the clearly arranged framework; the interspersed pieces of enriching information fall.
The oracles which Spartan enquirers kept receiving serve as motivation for Sparta's intervention (in fact, the only motivation); they are authentic, therefore, in the opinion of Bero- dotos\(^6\). These Pythian utterances were of course indispensable in accomplishing the Spartan-aided expulsion of the Peisistratidai, since the Lakedaimonians did not intervene on their own volition. Great weight must for this reason be attached to both the oracles and (by implication) the rôle of their instigators: the verb ἀναπείθειν denotes a pivotal point in Berodotos' account\(^7\).

The problem, however, is confounded by the inclusion of a variant to the version Berodotos chooses to adopt as his own: ός ὑπ' ὅν δὴ ὁ 'Αθηναῖοι\(^8\) λέγουσι, οὖτοι οἱ ἀνδρεῖς ἐν Δελφοῖς κατή-

\(^5\) ἐλευθερώθησαν 'Αθηναίοι (62, 1);
\(^6\) Ἀλκμεονίδαι ... ἄμα τοῖς ἄλλοις 'Αθηναίων φυγάσι ... προσέπταιον μεγάλος πειρώμενοι κατέναι τε καὶ ἐλευθερών τὰς 'Αθηρᾶς (62, 2);
\(^7\) οἱ Ἀλκμεονίδαι πᾶν ἐπὶ τοῖς Πεισιστρατίδαι κυριανώμενοι ... τὸν χεῖρα μισθοῦνται ... ἐξουσιοδομήσαι (62, 2);
\(^8\) [οἱ Ἀλκμεονίδαι] ἀνάπειθον τὴν Πυθίαν ... προφέρειν [τοῖς Λακεδαίμονίσι] τὰς 'Αθηρᾶς ἐλευθερών (63, 1)\(^5\);

Lakedaimonoi δέ, οἷς σφι αἰεὶ τωῦτο πρόφαντον ἐγίνετο, ἐπέμνουν 'Ἀγχιμόλου (63, 2);

μετὰ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι μέξω στόλων στείλαντες ἄπέστησαν ἐπὶ τὰς 'Αθηρᾶς, στρατηγὸν ... ἀποδεξάντες βασιλέα Κλεο-

μένεα (64, 1):

οὔτω ... 'Αθηναίοι τυράννων ἀπαλλάχθησαν (65, 5).
Herodotos and the Athenians are at variance concerning the means employed by the Alkmeonidai: according to the Athenians, money changed hands. Herodotos, however, as if to dissociate himself from the allegation, couches it in conspicuously contrasting language:

\[ \text{οἱ άνδρεῖς δόμιμοι now are οἱ άνδρεῖς who "hang around" in Delphoi; the alleged outrageous aspect of their dealings forms a climactic conclusion of the variant}. \]

It has been pointed out that "there is a linguistic point ... \( \text{όν δὴ} \) is normally 'resumptive after a digression'". What is here the 'digression'? We cannot turn back too far without the variant appearing absurdly out of context; the preceding section, 5, 62, 3, is indeed itself sufficiently 'digressive' to qualify: a footnote), we might say, introduced appropriately by \( \text{οία δὲ} \), 'inasmuch as'. The particles \( \text{όν δὴ} \) directly resume the account of the entering of the contract for the building of the

requires us to assume that: (a) Herodotos interrupts his own account to record a Spartan \( \text{λεγόμενον} \), yet fails to mark clearly the terminal point of it (there is no resumptive particle to indicate where he resumes his own account); (b) in a passage on Athenian history, we would hear only Herodotos himself and a Spartan variant without reference to any Athenian \( \text{λεγόμενον} \); (c) Herodotos presents the events from the tyrannicide to the departure of the Peisistratidai from a Spartan point of view, since the resumptive quality of \( \text{όν δὴ} \) proves beyond doubt that the promulgators of the \( \text{λεγόμενον} \) on bribery are in broad terms in full agreement with Herodotos (see below p. 195; 197); (d) the Spartans in their own speech in 5, 91, 2–3 have forgotten everything about bribery (see also n 47).

9) Cf. 5, 62, 3; 6, 124, 1. See Immerwahr \( F \& Th \) 51 ff.

Not even Plut. mor. 860 D (τέρον τῆς \( \text{Ηροδότου καινοθελεύς} \) 23) would have gone so far as to reproach Herodotos for adopting as his own view what the Athenians' malignantly allege. See also Jacoby \( \text{Attis} 335 \) n 27, "a variant, with a citation of the source as of \( \text{'Αθηναίοι}'" (cf. Immerwahr \( F \& Th \) 119 n 126, "\( \text{'Αθηναίοι means all Athenians}'") "accused the Alcmeonids of having corrupted the Pythia". The assumption of Spah \( \text{Das Motiv der doppelten Beliebung bei Herodot, 1968, 159 n 272, that "dahinter verbirgt sich wohl ein alkelmeonidischer [my italics] Gewährsmann" is surely untenable (it may have been precipitated by Jacoby l.c. and \( \text{FGrHist} 3 b \) Suppl. Notes 357 n 3; Schachermeyer \( \text{Die frühe Klassik der Griechen 62f.}\). Should the passage be connected with 5, 72, 4 and the unfortunate Isagoras-comrade Timesitheos of Delphoi?

10) Forrest \( GRBS \) 10, 1969, 279. See Powell \( \text{όν II, 2 (p. 387 col. 1); \( \text{δὴ A, V, 2 (p. 83 col. 2); \( \text{ός C, IV, 3 (p. 390 col. 2; normal for "hearsay", without or with \( \text{δὴ}; \text{όν IV, 2 (p. 387 col. 1; \( \text{όν δὴ} \) may also mean "however"."}} \)

11) Bornitz \( \text{Hdt-St} 26, \) rather strangely, reverses the relation.

12) Forrest l.c. 278 writes \( \text{oła δὴ} \).

13) Powell oloς 5, a (p. 262 col. 1).
temple\textsuperscript{14}). To mention the contracting for the temple-building, however, would be pointless if it were not its declared function to explain how the Alkmeonidai persuaded the Pythia and by this \(\mu\varepsilon\chi\alpha\nu\nu\) ultimately succeeded in freeing Athens from tyranny\textsuperscript{18}). The words ανέπεδυον τὴν \(Πυθὴν\) indeed constitute an integral component of Herodotos' main account, even though they are displaced – joined up with \(\chiρ\iota\mu\sigma\alpha\iota\) – into the \(\iota\iota\'Αθηναίοι λέγοντες\)-variant. Herodotos killed two birds with one stone\textsuperscript{16}).

2. 'Ἀθήναι, ἑοῦσαί καὶ ποιν μεγάλα, τότε ἀπαλλαχθεῖσα τυ­ράννων ἐγένοντο μέζονες. ἐν δὲ αὐτῇς δύο ἄνδρες ἐδυνάστευον, Kleisthenes\textsuperscript{17}) τε ἀνήρ Ἀλκμεωνίδης, δὲ περὶ δὴ λόγον ἔχει\textsuperscript{18}) τὴν \(Πυθὴν\) ἀναπείθεσα, 5, 66, 1. The statement regarding persuasion as it stands implies a reference to 5, 62f. Herodotos, however, does not simply repeat (either himself or the λεγόμενον of 'the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} There is in fact no homogeneous “story of temple-building” (Forrest l.c. 279).
\item \textsuperscript{15} Bornitz Hdt-St 32.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Bornitz Hdt-St 33 too recognizes that 5, 62 and 63 “sich gegenseitig ergänzen” (he means “einerher ergänzen”). His conclusions, however, are different, partly as the result of a futile controversy against Jacoby whose English he misreads twice (33; 33n 63). Since Herodotos of course refers back to his own version, Jacoby’s remark FGrHist 3b Suppl. Notes 363 n 27 that “Herodotos could not, or would not, decide for one of them” (cf. Strasburger Historia 4, 1955, 15 = Marg [ed.] Herodot 2, 1965, 595, “ohne zu sagen, was er davon denkt”) is superfluous. Modern interpretations often blur, or even ignore, the clear distinction which Herodotos draws in all relevant instances between persuasion and bribery; cf., for example, von Fritz Griechische Geschichtsschreibung 1, 354 with n 211; Strasburger l.c. 8 (= 584 M²); Podlecki Historia 15, 1966, 129 n 2 (“a suggestion of bribery: 63,1, 66,1”); why does he omit 6, 123, 27); too superficial Kirchberg Die Funktion der Orakel im Werke Herodots, 1965, 72; completely obscure Benardete Hdt. Inqu. 143. Well balanced treatment Berve Tyran­nis 70.

The verb ἀνασείθεσα does not, eo ipso, suggest corruption, let alone bribery; similarly, \(\mu\varepsilon\chi\alpha\nu\nu\) or \(\mu\varepsilon\chi\alpha\nu\nu\sigma\thetaα\iota\) are not expressions that would occur foremost in order to denounce the crime of bribery. I do not see why Herodotos would have specifically added \(\chiρ\iota\mu\sigma\alpha\iota\), if ἀνασείθεσα unequivocally denoted bribery; nor do I see how it could be explained that he inserted a variant that is not at all a variant. The meaning of bribery is unnecessary in all instances (including 6, 66, 2), if not nonsense, as in the case of 5, 97, 2f. for ἀνασείθεσα, or 5, 90, 1 (τὰ ἐκ τῶν Ἀλκμεωνίδων ἐς τὴν \(Πυθὴν\) \(μεμχανημένα\) καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς \(Πυθής\) ἐπὶ σφέας [sc. \(μεμχανημένα\)]) for \(μεμχα­νασθα\iota\) (the Pythia surely did not bribe the Spartans).

\item \textsuperscript{17} This is the first instance in which Herodotos cites the name of Kleisthenes.
\item \textsuperscript{18} = λέγεται!}
Athenians' on bribery): he instead records yet another λεγόμενον, according to which Kleisthenes himself persuaded the Pythia 19).

3. These two different λεγόμενα both represent variants only in details to Herodotos' own account: gilded arguments in 5, 63, 1; the actual identity of the perpetrator in 5, 66, 1. This leads to the conclusion that in general terms common opinion 20) agrees with Herodotos' own picture of the events culminating in the retreat of the Peisistratidai 21) – or alternatively, that these λεγόμενα are but random snippets of irrelevant information without connexion and that "Herodot ist ein Esel: aber die 'Tradition' ist gerettet" 22).

4. In book six Herodotos pronounces his disbelief that the Alkmeonidai conspired with the Persians, βουλομένους ύπο βασιλέως Ἀθηναίων καὶ ύπο Ἰππίου, 6, 121, 1 23). He bases his scepticism on three postulates. Two of these are functionally impeccable (6, 121; 124) 24), whereas difficulties arise in the interpretation of the third instance (6, 123).

19) The fact of άπαντείθεν obviously is not the contentious point between Herodotos and the promulgators of the λεγόμενον, unless we impute to Herodotos a sudden and mysterious shift of opinion in favour of the version of 'the Athenians'.

Herodotos consistently neither associates Kleisthenes with anything except the phylai-reform, nor identifies any individual member of the Alkmeonid clan in the context of their efforts to expatriate the tyrants. Fornara goes so far as to suggest that "the inference that [Kleisthenes] left Athens is not inevitable" (Philol 114, 1970, 163f. n 39); this cannot be proved or disproved (on Fornara's attempt to read something similar into Thuk. 6, 59, 4, Philol 111, 1967, 294f., cf. my rejoinder in RbM 116, 1973, 91ff.). The opposite view is favoured by Stanton JHS 90, 1970, 181 (Kleisthenes himself leader at Leipsydrion), on equally shaky grounds. For a correct summary of the actual evidence see Davies Ath. Prop. Fam. 375.

20) Cf. Crahay Litt. orac. Hdt. 282f. ("tradition bien établie, par conséquent, et acceptée, au moins en substance, par les Alcmeonides eux-mêmes, dont le nom revient à chaque mention de l'imposture ainsi que le verbe ἀπαντείθεν").

21) Cf. also Bornitz Hdt-St 32f.

22) Jacoby Gnomon 1, 1925, 266 (= Abb 175).

23) Repeated 6, 123, 1. Cf. the reasoning on behalf of the Alkmeonidai of McGregor HSPh Suppl. 1, 1940, 72.

24) The reasons cited in 6, 124 may be of dubious logical value – they do nevertheless meet the formal requirements of logical argumentation; the argument in 6, 124 derives its logical viability from the firm conclusion of the argument of 6, 123, 2. Cf. Powell γάρ 4, d (p. 65 col. 1), on the meaning of γάρ in 6, 124, 1: "advancing an untenable suggestion"; one does
Konrad H. Kinzl

Herodotos alludes, without elaborating, to an Alkmeonid μηχανή (6, 123, 1), goes on to denounce the tyrannicide 25), reiterates that 'Αλκμεόνιδαι δὲ ἐμφανέως ἠλευθέρωσαν, and concludes, εἰ δὴ οὕτωι γε ἀλήθεως ἦσαν οἱ τὴν Πυθίαν ἀναπείσαντες προσημαίνειν Ἀκαδεμονίοις ἠλευθέροιν τὰς Ἀθήνας, ὡς μοι πρό­­τερον δεδήλωται 28) (6, 123, 2). He betrays acquaintance, however, with only one μηχανή of the Alkmeonidai in order to "free": persuasion at Delphoi 27). A clause of causal quality – stating evidence for the assertion that "they freed" – is plainly required. Current exposition of the passage nevertheless postulates conditional meaning of the εἰ δὴ οὕτωι γε-clause. Yet would it not be patent nonsense, if Herodotos had called into question his very thesis 28)? Herodotos, to be sure, does not twaddle 29). And indeed "quasi-causal" meaning is well attested for εἰ by Herodotos’ usage 30). Translations as, for example, "if at least it be not normally advance such a suggestion before the ground has been cleared.

For a recent negative assessment of the logical qualities of 6, 121–124: Gillis GRBS 10, 1969, 133 ff. Cf. also Bornitz Hdt-St 95 ff.

25) 6, 123, 2: εξηγήσασαν τοὺς υπολοίπους Πεισιστρατιδέων Ἰππαρχον ἀποκτείναντες, οὐδὲ τι μάλλον ἔπαναν [τοὺς λοιποὺς] τυφανενθαντας. I do not see how the deletion of τοὺς λοιποὺς could alter the meaning, let alone "reconcile Herodotus and Thucydides" (Fornara Philol 114, 1970, 161 n 34; cf. 162 with n 36). – Herodotos uses the plural τυφανενθαντας anyway; by retaining τοὺς λοιποὺς, furthermore, a linguistic oddity is kept in the text (cf. Powell λοιπος 1 [p. 211 col. 1]).

26) Powell δῆλον 6, b (p. 85 col. 2; ten instances of identical or similar phrases for a "reference backwards"). An excursus would have been in order, had Herodotos not been able to refer back; or else, 6, 123 would remain obscure.


28) See Pohlenz Herodot 167 n 1 ("die Worte VI 123 εἰ δὴ ... enthalten keinen Zweifel. Herodot verweist ja sofort ... auf V 62 ff. und will doch nicht etwa seine frühere Darstellung abschwächen"). By calling into question his own account, Herodotos would also remove the formal logical requirement (see above n 24); for it is the εἰ-clause alone in which Herodotos hints at how the Alkmeonidai distinguished themselves as liberators. He is also at pains to make it clear that in his own judgement the Alkmeonidai are deserving of praise as liberators for exactly that reason (ὁς ἐγὼ κρίνω, 6, 123, 2; cf. Fornara Philol 114, 1970, 161). Fornara, however, (l.c. 136 n 16) detected a "note of caution", "implicit" in 6, 123, 2. In a true defence of the Alkmeonidai, a conditional εἰ-clause would make even less sense: we would be at a loss in searching for someone else who might have corrupted the Pythia. The logical contortions of Bornitz Hdt-St 46 f. (cf. also 96) illustrate beyond doubt what difficulties conditional meaning of the εἰ-clause is bound to create.

29) The objection that the whole digression might after all have a false bottom does not therefore affect our argument.

30) Powell εἰ A, V (p. 99 col. 2): "w(ith) v(er)bs of wonder, pleasure,
true”, miss the point, to say the least; I therefore suggest as a translation “when it was surely they indeed” (or something similarly ‘quasi-causal’).

The train of thought strung out in 6, 123 comes to a full stop with Herodotos’ reference backwards. This circumstance lends weight to the ως-clause which also stands out at the most exposed position\(^{31}\), indeed becomes the central point upon which the meaning of 6, 123 hinges. By obeying Herodotos’ signal and consulting his full treatment of events in book five, striking parallelism becomes evident:

\[(5, 62, 2) \; \text{Ἀλκμεωνίδαι} \ldots \; (6, 123, 1) \; \text{Ἀλκμεωνίδαι} \]
\[\text{φευγόντες} \quad \text{ἐφευγόν τε τὸν πάντα} \]
\[\Pi εἰσιοστρατίδας \ldots \quad \chi ρώνον τοῦς τυράννους, \]
\[πὰν ἐπὶ τοῖς Πεισιοστρατὶδησι μηχανώμενοι \ldots \quad \\ \\
\]
\[\text{προφέρειν} \quad \text{ἐκ μηχανῆς τε τίς τούτων} \]
\[\text{την τυραννίδα. [ Cf. 5, 65.]} \]

\[(62, 2–3) \; \text{[temple-building.]} \]

\[(63, 1) \; \text{ἄνεπειδὸν τὴν} \quad (123, 2) \; \text{[denunciation of ty-} \]
\[\Pi υθίνη \ldots \text{ρροφέρειν} \quad \text{rannaicide; cf. 5, 55; 62, 1.]} \]
\[\text{[Ἀσκεδαιμονίοισι]} \quad (123, 2) \; \text{τὴν Πυθίνην} \]
\[\tauὰς \; \text{Ἀθήνας ἔλευθε-} \quad \text{ἀναπείσαντες προση} \]
\[\text{ροὸν} \quad \text{μαίνειν} \]
\[\text{ἐλευθεροῦ τὰς Ἀθῆνας,} \]
\[\text{ως μοι πρότερον δεδή-} \quad \text{Ἀσκεδαιμονίοισι} \]
\[\text{λωται\(^{32}\).} \]

\[\text{etc. ... hence, without such v(er)b, quasi-causally [my italics].}\]

\[\text{Stein at 5, 78: “bei Berufung auf einen einzelnen Fall als Beweis für eine allgemeine Behauptung”}.\]

\[\text{31) Cf. Immerwahr \textit{F} \& \textit{Th} 51f. It would seem incongruous if it were a mere gracenote.}\]

\[\text{32) Such encompassing parallelism is not accidental. Our contention that the ως-clause holds the key to the interpretation of 6, 123 has been borne out, for unless we obey Herodotos’ signal and refer to his extensive account in book five, all ambiguity in 6, 123 cannot be obviated. The later passage of course represents a condensed version which is confined to the principal issues, since Herodotos is able to refer back to book five. Corroboration can also be derived from the observation that in 5, 62, 3, the Alkmeonidai are introduced as χρημάτων ἐδ ἐργοτες without explanations about the provenance of their wealth – these are to be found in book six (6, 125); cf. Bornitz \textit{Hdt-St} 45 n 83. Bornitz l.c. 36f. deduces from 6, 123, 1, τὸν πάντα χρόνον, that this has to be read also into 5, 62, 2, φευγόντες Πεισιοστρατίδας. The opposite, however, appears to be true in view of the demonstrative character of 6, 123; I do not believe that the words τὸν πάντα χρόνον in 6, 123 possess any weight other than rhetorical; cf. also my forthcoming ‘Miszelle’ in \textit{RbM}.}\]
5. In 6. 109, 3, Herodotos imputes to both Kallimachos and Miltiades the notion that it is indeed possible to exceed the fame of the tyrannicides. He in effect puts his own views and arguments into the mouth of Miltiades: Harmodios and Aristogeiton are not liberators par excellence; defeat by the Persians is tantamount to being delivered up to the scourge of Hippias; only if Athens is not ruled by tyranny is it to achieve greatness. Is it not symptomatic that Herodotos did not judge it inappropriate to submit such reasoning to his audience through the mouth of Miltiades? Herodotos’ view of the events surrounding the eviction of the tyrants does not indeed appear out of line with that of ‘the Athenians’. It emerges, on the contrary, that the passage 6, 109, 3, far from being contradictory, is fully consistent and in accord with Herodotos’ statements elsewhere. (There is admittedly still an alternative ‘explanation’: “more likely it is a mere rhetorical commonplace.”)

6. There is also a ‘test case’. In 5, 97, 1 Herodotos in one masterful stroke spans the arch back to Aristagoras’ arrival in Athens, illuminates the significance of 5, 90–96, and exposes the historical forces. The twenty ships which the Athenians decreed to dispatch to Ionia in an undisguised act of warfare against Persia had a history, shaped by fears and ambitions, of the

33) Cf. 5, 55; 5, 62, 1 f.; 6, 123, 2.
34) Cf. 5, 96, 1; 6, 121, 1. Hippias is removed from Athens in two paragraphs (5, 65, 2–3); how much space, on the other hand, is devoted to his attempts to regain Athens; cf. also von Stern Hermes 52, 1917, 354 f.
35) Cf. 5, 66, 1; 5, 69, 2; 5, 78; 5, 91, 1; 5, 97, 1; also 1, 59, 1! Cf. Schmid GGrLit I, 2, 578 with n 8; Bornitz Hdt-St 93 f. It is tempting to point to the antithesis ὑποκρίσιον, 6, 109, 3 – ἀνέκδοτο, 5, 91, 2.
36) Podlecki Historia 15, 1966, 140 (“clearly the two contexts are out of line”); cf. Fornara Philol 114, 1970, 155; Koepp NJbb 9, 1902, 624 with n 2; M. Valeton Mnemosyne NS 45, 1917, 25 n 1; Schmid l.c.
37) Podlecki l.c. See above n 22.
38) 5, 97, 1: νομίζουσι δὲ ταῦτα καὶ διαβεβλημένωσι εἰς τοὺς Πέρσας ἐν τούτωι δὴ τῶι καιρῶι ὁ Μιλήσιος Ἀρισταγόρης ὑπὸ Κλεομένου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου εξελάθεις ἐκ τῆς Σάραττις ἀπέκτει αὔτῇ ἡ πόλις τῶν λοιπῶν ἐδυνάστενε μέγιστον.
39) 5, 97, 3: αὕτα δὲ αἱ νέαι ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένετο ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ καὶ βαρβαρία; “beginning of the evil” (Immerwahr F&Th 113).
40) When the Spartan bid to restore Hippias failed (5, 92 f.), he repaired to Asia (5, 94 f.); there he left no stone unturned to reduce Athens to his and Dareios’ subjects (5, 96, 1). 5, 96, 2: Ἰππίδης τε δὲ ταῦτα ἐπορεύθη καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πονηδόμοι ταύτα πέμποντο εἰς Σάρδης ἀγγέλους, οὐκ ἐδύνατος τῆς Πέρσας πείθεσαι Ἀθηναῖοι τοιαύτα φυγᾶσαι, ὅ δὲ Ἀσταφένης ἀλεξεύει σφεας, εἰ βούλοιτο σοὶ εἰναι, καταδέκεσαι ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰππίδην. οὐκ ὅν δὴ ἐνεδέκτοντο
surging Athenian demo, of Lakedaemonians and Persians, of a Hippias, Kleomenes, and others. It must surely be the intent of 5, 90ff. to provide the psychological background for the Athenian response to the representations of Aristagoras; it is all laid down in all but singularly condensed form in 5, 97, 1. The episode 5, 90ff. does not therefore represent a readily detachable ‘digression’.

Knowledge of the contents of 5, 90ff. on the part of ‘the Athenians’ is clearly implied in 5, 97, 1; the introductory phrase in 5, 90, 1 insinuates Athenian acquaintance with the motives of Spartan policy. Herodotos, furthermore, compels the reader to recapitulate the circumstances of the exiling of the Peisistratidai in 5, 62ff. (5, 90, 1). He goes on to impute a kind of reasoning to the Lakedaemonians, which effectively parallels his own argumentation in 5, 78 (5, 91, 1). The Spartan address, lastly, to their assembled allies (5, 91, 2–3) scarcely represents more than a repetition of the arguments developed in 5, 90, 1–91, 1, in direct speech. We do not, however, detect anything here that would go beyond, let alone contradict, Herodotos’ statements elsewhere.

(5, 62, 1) δεὶ ... ἀναλαβείν ... (5, 90, 1) ποθόμενοι γὰρ Λακεδαίμονι

τοὺς λόγους ἀποφερομένους οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι· οὐκ ἐνδεχόμενοι δὲ σφὶ ἔδεδοκτο ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ τοῦτος Πέρσης πολέμου εἶναι. Cf. below n 43.

41) Pohlenz Hdt 16 (“psychologisch”); cf. 38; 201. Bornitz Hdt-St 82 is moving in the right direction.

42) It manifestly is not true that “überall zeigt sich hier das innerlich Unfertige”, von Fritz GrGeschschr 1, 362 (cf. 357).

43) νομίζοντι δὲ ταῦτα (5, 97, 1) implicates not just 5, 96 (where one is tempted to think of some sort of official document, or decree – σφὶ ἔδεδοκτο, 5, 96, 2, see above n 40), since 5, 96 makes sense only if the events leading up to this situation are considered.

44) 5, 90, 1: ἦς τιμωβίην (against Aligina; this establishes the connexion with the preceding chapters) δὲ παρασκευαζόμενοι αὐτοῖς ἐκ Λακεδαίμονιν πρότερα ἐγιορόμενον ἐμπόδοιν ἐγένετο. Cf. Macan ad loc., who wonders at the degree of Athenian detailed familiarity asserted by Herodotos.

45) Cf., incidentally, 5, 74, 1, Κλεομένης δὲ ἐπιστάμενος περιψοίδα τις ἀληθαίον, and 5, 91, 2, ἡμέας μὲν καὶ τῶν βασιλέως ἡμέων περιψοίδας, as an additional illustration for the contention that the speech of the Spartans does not introduce new evidence.

46) On the meaning of ἀναπειθέναι see above n 16. If Herodotos expects his readers to refer back, it must be to his own version! It may also be noted that the significance of the remark in 5, 63, 2 (ὅμως καὶ ἔινον σφὶ ἔόντας τὰ μάλιστα) rests wholly on 5, 90f.
7. Liberation from tyranny and the aggrandizement of the Athenian demos are inseparably linked\(^{48}\); the expulsion of the Peisistratidai cannot be divorced from the intervention of Sparta and, therefore, from Alkmeonid lobbying at Delphi. Athen's history of that era is also the history of the demos; their ups and downs were shared equally by the Alkmeonidai\(^{49}\).

\(^{47}\) Immerwahr \(F \& Th\) 159 n 26: "\(\text{κιβδήλος}\) means literally 'alloyed'. It is used of misleading oracles only [at 1, 75, 2 and 1, 66, 3]"; 5, 91, 2 "is not comparable, since there the reference is to forged oracles"; cf. Klees \(Die\ \text{Eigenart\ des\ griechischen\ Glaubens\ an\ Orakel\ und\ Seher}\ 85\) f.; Powell s. v. The Spartans, however, might have been loath to admit that they had been fooled by forged oracles; to have been deceived by misleading oracles surely is less embarrassing and the attempt to rectify the mistake is much more plausible. The meaning of \(\text{κιβδήλος}\), therefore, is the same in 5, 91, 2 as in 1, 66, 3 and 1, 75, 2, and in full agreement with the common tradition as shown above. Only as a result of the erroneous generalization of the \(\text{ο}\ \text{Αθηναίοι\ λέγουσι-variant}\) has the "not comparable" meaning been postulated.

The same persistent generalization has caused astonishment that we do not hear of any punitive reaction in the case of the Alkmeonidai, such as is reported in "another similar case" (Ehrenberg \(Sol.\ \text{Socr.}\) 410 n 20), 6, 66. Cf., however, Nilsson \(Cults,\ \text{Myths,\ Oracles\ and\ Politics, 1951, 128f.}\)

\(^{48}\) Cf. above n 35.

\(^{49}\) This community even extends into Herodotos' choice of words, for example, 5, 66, 1, \(\text{δυναστεῖα} \) (of Kleisthenes), 5, 97, 1 (Athens); 5, 63, 1 (also 5, 66, 1 and 6, 123, 2) \(\text{αναστάσεως}\) (applied by Alkmeonidai), 5, 97, 2f. (experienced by the Athenians). The choice may, incidentally, also seem
The information which Herodotos chooses to incorporate appears segmented in a variety of places and contexts: identified as his own opinion, designated as common knowledge of ‘the Athenians’, transmitted in speeches of a Miltiades or even the Spartans. These observations oblige us to undertake to break the circulus vitiosus of asking questions to which the work of Herodotos is not suited to provide answers, and of battling to refute answers that are offered to these questions which accordingly themselves tend to assume the rôle of a ‘tradition’. The dilemma in method is characterized by the invention even of a principle of ‘doppelte Beleuchtung’, in order to cope with modern pseudo-traditions.

The factual knowledge which Herodotos displays will scarcely have surpassed that of many an ‘Athenian’, or even non-Athenian; it does not require historical genius to detect a flaw in the exploit of Harmodios and Aristogeiton; special methods of enquiry need not be employed to learn that the expeditions of Anchimolios and Kleomenes were spurred on by Delphic oracles, and that Alkmeonidai ‘hung around’ in Delphi – nor does Herodotos in fact make any such claim; the speeches of Miltiades and the Lakedaimonians, though not at all improbable in their reasoning, fail to reveal detail which Herodotos could have gathered only in Sparta or only in ‘Philaid circles’. Inferences, therefore, concerning the identity of any ‘sources’ are inadmissible.

Herodotos obviously cannot here be commended for having performed a worth while of his gathering of factual curious: δυναστευτικά is associated with naked power (Immerwahr F & Th 206–208, and ind. s. ‘power’), αὐξανεσθαυε, representing “a general imperialist phenomenon” (Immerwahr F & Th 208 n 47), occurs in 5, 78 (Herodotos himself speaks) and in 5, 91, 2 (Spartan speech), cf. 5, 91, 1.


51 Cf. L. Solmsen AJP 64, 1943, 207 (= 644 M8); Fehling Quellen, 133 with n 8.

52 One especially strong modern ‘tradition’ is that strongly promoted by Jacoby concerning the tyrannicide and the Alkmeonidai, Althis 161 f.; Fornara Historia 17, 1968, 405 (“certainly recorded Alcmeonid claims”); id. Philol 114, 1970, 156.

53 Spath Motiv der doppelten Beleuchtung, 1968.

54 Gottlieb Das Verhältnis der außerherodoteischen Überlieferung zu Herodot, 1963, 132, for Herodotos’ knowledge of ‘extra-Herodotean’ traditions.

55 To cure one evil by a worse evil, “objectivity” has been discovered; cf. Waters Historia Einzelschr. 15, 1971 (cf. my review Gymnasium 81, 1974, 104 f.).
material\textsuperscript{56). The aim of his enquiry is clearly to penetrate the surface of bare events; to expose the inescapable forces governing Athenian history of the post-tyrannical period; the emotional, or as one might say irrational dynamics driving the demos; δυναστεύειν, αυξάνεσθαι\textsuperscript{57)}, threat and fear of tyranny, growing hostility of Sparta and Persia\textsuperscript{58).}

It is true, “irony, pathos, paradox, and tragedy develop from his tacit dialogue with his audience”\textsuperscript{59); just as a tragedian, however, Herodotos must also be able to rely on his audience’s general familiarity with his themes: it is this historical knowledge which alone permits the ‘tacit dialogue’ to develop. Now the modern reader of Herodotos not only lacks this basic knowledge, he is also bewildered by the involuted mode of progression, by frequent cross references back and forth, implicitly or explicitly, by stories told in reverse order, or broken up into small sections which reveal their significance only when read together\textsuperscript{60). Herodotos’ work surely does not excel for its ‘scientific’ quality; it reveals comparatively little about ‘history’ as a scientific discipline, yet a great deal about humanity. The simple observation that every student of Herodotos views his work in a different light confirms that its character is truly ‘allgemein-menschlich’, but also, as one might say, ‘meditative’. Thus neither the superficial reader accustomed to the pace of modern entertainment, nor the methodical and prosaic scholar will gain great enlightenment from Herodotos.

Trent University
Peterborough, Ontario, Canada

\textsuperscript{56} Cf. Verdin Histor.-krit. Methode 172 (“dat Herodotus een ‘verzamelaar van historisch materiaal’ zou geweest zijn, is een opvatting die slechts een gedeeltelijke waarheid inhoud”). Cf. also Cobet Historia Einzel­schr. 17, 1971 (especially 186).
\textsuperscript{57} See above n 49.
\textsuperscript{58} All these emotional pressures were still a reality later in the fifth century, as is demonstrated most competently by no lesser an authority than Thukydides, who has recourse to the very same theme to illuminate an irrationally charged situation; his words almost epitomize Herodotos: έπιστάμενος γιά το δήμος άκοντι την Πεισιστράτου και των παιδών των αδαμνίδα καταλυμαίεσαν γενομένη και προσέπτι ουδ’ ύπ’ έταντων και Λεμοδίων καταλυθείσαν, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαίμων, ἐροθεῖτο αἰεὶ καὶ πάντα υπόπτως ἐλάμβανεν, Thuk. 6, 53, 3.
\textsuperscript{59} Cf. Fornara Herodotus. 1971, 62.
\textsuperscript{60} Cf. Fehling Quellen. 140.