

## 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<sup>1</sup>).

1. Ἀπελαννόμενος δὲ ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης ἐκ τῆς Σπάρτης ἦιε ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας γενομένης τυράννων ὧδε ἐλευθέρας, 5, 55. Herodotos, however, now launches into a many-layered disquisition on diverse topics<sup>2</sup>). It is not until 5, 62, 1 that he once more takes up the theme of liberation<sup>3</sup>); 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<sup>4</sup>):

---

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, 423f., 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, 9b, 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 (= *Griech. Historiker*, 1956, 58f.); Immerwahr *Form and Thought* 117f.; Macan *ad loc.*; also Benardete *Herodotean Inquiries*, 1969, 143f. 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. ἐλευθέρος, ἐλευθερίη, ἐλευθεροῶ, 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

ὡς τυράννων ἐλευθερώθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι (62, 1);  
 Ἀλκμεωνίδαί ... ἅμα τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Ἀθηναίων φηγάσι ... προσ-  
 ἔπταιον μεγάλως πειρώμενοι κατιέναι τε καὶ ἐλευθεροῦν  
 τὰς Ἀθήνας (62, 2);  
 οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαί πᾶν ἐπὶ τοῖσι Πεισιστρατίδησι μηχανώμενοι  
 ... τὸν ἦθον μισθοῦνται ... ἐξοικοδομῆσαι (62, 2);  
 [οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαί] ἀνέπειθον τὴν Πυθίην ... προσφέρειν [τοῖσι  
 Λακεδαιμονίοισι] τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐλευθεροῦν (63, 1)<sup>5</sup>);  
 Λακεδαιμόνιοι δέ, ὡς σφι αἰεὶ τωὐτὸ πρόφαντον ἐγίνετο,  
 πέμπονσι Ἀγχιμόλιον (63, 2);  
 μετὰ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι μέζω στόλον στείλαντες ἀπέπεμψαν ἐπὶ  
 τὰς Ἀθήνας, στρατηγὸν ... ἀποδέξαντες βασιλέα Κλεο-  
 μένεα (64, 1);  
 οὕτω ... Ἀθηναῖοι τυράννων ἀπαλλάχθησαν (65, 5).

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 Herodotos<sup>6</sup>). 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 ἀναπεῖθειν denotes a pivotal point in Herodotos' account<sup>7</sup>).

The problem, however, is confounded by the inclusion of a variant to the version Herodotos chooses to adopt as his own: ὡς ὦν δὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι<sup>8</sup>) λέγουσι, οὗτοι οἱ ἄνδρες ἐν Δελφοῖσι κατή-

into place by themselves; the straightforward chronological arrangement almost obscures this. On a small scale 5, 55 ff. – commencing in an involuted maze of information and emerging finally into flowing narrative – parallels the design pattern of the entire work.

5) ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας is the standard phrasing of the oracle's exhortations in all sources (cf. *Hermes* 102, 1974, 182 n 11). Cf., however, Crahay *La littérature oraculaire chez Hérodote*, 1956, 284 ("cette formule ne peut avoir été la réponse authentique", being too direct, political, a "slogan").

6) Cf. Bornitz *Hdt-St* 27; 40.

7) ἀναπεῖθειν is prominent in the condensed exposé 6, 123; here it interlocks, so to speak, 5, 62–63, 1 with 5, 63, 1–65, 5.

8) Ever since the days of L.C. Valckenaer (1715–1785), the transmitted text of Herodotos in 5, 63, 1 has periodically come under attack. The 'emendation' of Valckenaer (cf. Jacoby *FGrHist* 3b Suppl. Notes 357 n 3) and his successors substitutes the Spartans for the Athenians in the λεγόμενον on bribery; it has recently been revived by Forrest *GRBS* 10, 1969, 281. A string of incongruities results from the 'emendation', since it

μενοι ἀνέπειθον τὴν Πυθίην χρημάσσι, 5, 63, 1. 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: ἀνδρες δόκιμοι now are οὔτοι οἱ ἄνδρες who “hang around” in Delphoi; the alleged outrageous aspect of their dealings forms a climactic conclusion of the variant<sup>9</sup>).

It has been pointed out that “there is a linguistic point ... ὃν δὴ is normally ‘resumptive after a digression’”<sup>10</sup>). 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<sup>11</sup>), we might say, introduced appropriately by οἷα δέ<sup>12</sup>), ‘inasmuch as’<sup>13</sup>). The particles ὃν 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 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 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 ὃν δὴ proves beyond doubt that the promulgators of the 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.* 860D (περὶ τῆς Ἡροδότου κακοηθείας 23) would have gone so far as to reproach Herodotos for *adopting as his own view* what ‘the Athenians’ malignantly allege. See also Jacoby *Atthis* 335 n 27, “a variant, with a citation of the source as οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι”, (cf. Immerwahr *F & Th* 119 n 126, “Ἀθηναῖοι means all Athenians”) “accused the Alkmeonids of having corrupted the Pythia”. The assumption of Spath *Das Motiv der doppelten Beleuchtung bei Herodot.* 1968, 159 n 272, that “dahinter verbirgt sich wohl ein *alkmeonidischer* [my italics] Gewährsmann” is surely untenable (it may have been precipitated by Jacoby l.c. and *FGrHist* 3b Suppl. Notes 357 n 3; Schachermeyr *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 ὃν II, 2 (p. 387 col. 1); δὴ A, V, 2 (p. 83 col. 2); ὡς C, IV, 3 (p. 390 col. 2; normal for “hearsay”, without or with δὴ); ὃν IV, 2 (p. 387 col. 1; ὃν δὴ may also mean “however”).

11) Bornitz *Hdt-St* 26, rather strangely, reverses the relation.

12) Forrest l.c. 278 writes οἷα δέ.

13) Powell *oios* 5, a (p. 262 col. 1).

temple<sup>14</sup>). 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 *μηχανή* ultimately succeeded in freeing Athens from tyranny<sup>15</sup>). The words *ἀπέπειθον τὴν Πυθίην* indeed constitute an integral component of Herodotos' main account, even though they are displaced – joined up with *χοήμασι* – into the *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι*-variant. Herodotos killed two birds with one stone<sup>16</sup>).

2. Ἀθῆναι, εἰσοῦσαι καὶ προὶν μεγάλαι, τότε ἀπαλλαχθεῖσαι τυράννων ἐγένοντο μέζονες. ἐν δὲ αὐτῆσι δύο ἄνδρες ἐδυνάστευον, Κλεισθένης<sup>17</sup>) τε ἀνὴρ Ἀλκμεωνίδης, ὃς περὶ δὴ λόγον ἔχει<sup>18</sup>) τὴν Πυθίην ἀναπειῖσαι, 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

14) There is in fact no homogeneous "story of temple-building" (Forrest l.c. 279).

15) Bornitz *Hdt-St* 32.

16) Bornitz *Hdt-St* 33 too recognizes that 5, 62 and 63 "sich gegenseitig ergänzen" (he means "einander 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* 3 b 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<sup>2</sup>*, 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, 334 with n 211; Strasburger l.c. 8 (= 584 M<sup>2</sup>); Podlecki *Historia* 15, 1966, 129 n 2 ("a suggestion of bribery: 63.1, 66.1"; why does he omit 6, 123, 2?); 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 *ἀναπειθεῖν* does not, *eo ipso*, suggest corruption, let alone bribery; similarly, *μηχανή* or *μηχανᾶσθαι* 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 *χοήμασι*, if *ἀναπειθεῖν* 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 *ἀναπειθεῖν*, or 5, 90, 1 (*τὰ ἐκ τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν ἐς τὴν Πυθίην μεμηχανημένα καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς Πυθίης ἐπὶ σφέας* [sc. *μεμηχανημένα*]!) for *μηχανᾶσθαι* (the Pythia surely did not bribe the Spartans).

17) This is the first instance in which Herodotos cites the name of Kleisthenes.

18) = *λέγεται*!

Athenians' on bribery): he instead records yet another *λεγόμενον*, according to which *Kleisthenes himself* persuaded the Pythia<sup>19</sup>).

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*<sup>20</sup>) *agrees with Herodotos' own picture of the events culminating in the retreat of the Peisistratidai*<sup>21</sup>) – 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”<sup>22</sup>).

4. In book six Herodotos pronounces his disbelief that the Alkmeonidai conspired with the Persians, *βουλομένους ὑπὸ βαρβαροῖσι τε εἶναι Ἀθηναίους καὶ ὑπὸ Ἰππῆι*, 6, 121, 1<sup>23</sup>). He bases his scepticism on three postulates. Two of these are *functionally* impeccable (6, 121; 124)<sup>24</sup>), whereas difficulties arise in the interpretation of the third instance (6, 123).

19) The *fact* of *ἀναπεῖθεω* 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 *RhM* 116, 1973, 91 ff.). The opposite view is favoured by Stanton *JHS* 90, 1970, 181 (Kleisthenes himself leader at Leipsydriion), 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 *ἀναπεῖθεω*”).

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 *HSPb* 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

Herodotos alludes, without elaborating, to an Alkmeonid *μηχανή* (6, 123, 1), goes on to denounce the tyrannicide<sup>25</sup>), reiterates that Ἄλκμεωνίδαι δὲ ἐμφανέως ἠλευθέρωσαν, and concludes, εἰ δὴ οὗτοί γε ἀληθέως ἦσαν οἱ τὴν Πυθίην ἀναπέισαντες προσημαίνειν Λακεδαιμονίοισι ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας, ὡς μοι πρότερον δεδήλωται<sup>26</sup>) (6, 123, 2). He betrays acquaintance, however, with only one *μηχανή* of the Alkmeonidai in order to “free”: persuasion at Delphi<sup>27</sup>). 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 οὗτοί γε-clause. Yet would it not be patent nonsense, if Herodotos had called into question his very thesis<sup>28</sup>)? Herodotos, to be sure, does not twaddle<sup>29</sup>). And indeed “*quasi-causal*” meaning is well attested for εἰ by Herodotos’ usage<sup>30</sup>). 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: ἐξηγείωσαν τοὺς ὑπολοίπους Πεισιστρατιδῶν Ἰππαρχον ἀποκτείναντες, οὐδέ τι μᾶλλον ἔπανσαν [τοὺς λοιποὺς] τυρρανέοντας. 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 τυρρανέοντας anyway; by retaining τοὺς λοιποὺς, furthermore, a linguistic oddity is kept in the text (cf. Powell *λοιπός* I [p. 211 col. 1]).

26) Powell *δηλώ* 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.

27) Cf. Crahay *Litt. orac. Hdt.* 282 f. (see above n 20).

28) See Pohlenz *Herodot* 167 n 1 (“die Worte VI 123 εἰ δὴ ... enthalten keinen Zweifel. Herodot verweist ja sofort ... auf V 62ff. 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 (ὡς ἐγὼ κρίνω, 6, 123, 2; cf. Fornara *Philol* 114, 1970, 161). Fornara, however, (l.c. 156 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* 46f. (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 *ὡς*-clause which also stands out at the most exposed position<sup>31</sup>), 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) Ἀλκμεωνίδαι ... φεύγοντες Πεισιστρατίδας... πάν ἐπὶ τοῖσι Πεισιστρα- τίδησι μηχανώμενοι ...	(6, 123, 1) [Ἀλκμεωνίδαι] ἔφευγόν τε τὸν πάντα χρόνον τοὺς τυράννους, ἐκ μηχανῆς τε τῆς τούτων ἐξέλιπον Πεισιστρατίδας τὴν τυραννίδα. [Cf. 5, 65.]
(62, 2–3) [temple-building.]	(123, 2) [denunciation of ty- rannicide; cf. 5, 55; 62, 1.]
(63, 1) ... ἀνέπειθον τὴν Πυθίην ... προφέρειν [Λακεδαιμονίοισι] τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐλευθε- ροῦν	(123, 2) ... τὴν Πυθίην ἀναπείσαντες προση- μαίνειν Λακεδαιμονίοισι ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας,  ὡς μοι πρότερον δεδή- λωται <sup>32</sup> ).

etc. ... hence, without such v(er)b, *quasi-causally* [my italics]”. Cf. also Stein at 5, 78: “bei Berufung auf einen einzelnen Fall als Beweis für eine allgemeine Behauptung”.

31) Cf. Immerwahr *F & Th* 51f. It would seem incongruous if it were a mere *gracenote*.

32) Such encompassing parallelism is not accidental. Our contention that the *ὡς*-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 *χημάτων ἐδ’ ἦγοντες* without explanations about the provenance of their wealth – these are to be found in book six (6, 125); cf. Bornitz *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, φεύγοντες Πεισιστρατίδας. 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 *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*<sup>33</sup>); defeat by the Persians is tantamount to being delivered up to the scourge of Hippias<sup>34</sup>); only if Athens is not ruled by tyranny is it to achieve greatness<sup>35</sup>). 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<sup>36</sup>), 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..."<sup>37</sup>).

6. There is also a 'test case'. In 5, 97, 1<sup>38</sup>) 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<sup>39</sup>) in an undisguised act of warfare against Persia<sup>40</sup>) had a history, shaped by fears and ambitions, of the

33) Cf. 5, 55; 5, 62, 1f.; 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, 354f.

35) Cf. 5, 66, 1; 5, 69, 2; 5, 78; 5, 91, 1; 5, 97, 1; also 1, 59, 1! Cf. Schmid *GGrLit* 1, 2, 578 with n 8; Bornitz *Hdt-St* 93f. It is tempting to point to the antithesis *ποκύνωσι*, 6, 109, 3 – *ἀνέκλυψε*, 5, 91, 2.

36) Podlecki *Historia* 15, 1966, 140 ("clearly the two contexts are out of line"); cf. Fornara *Philol* 114, 1970, 155; Koepf *NJbb* 9, 1902, 624 with n 2; M. Valetton *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 διαβεβλημένοισι ἐς τοὺς Πέρσας ἐν τούτοις δὴ τῷ καιρῷ ὁ Μιλήσιος Ἀρισταγόρης ὑπὸ Κλεομένηος τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου ἐξελασθεὶς ἐκ τῆς Σπάρτης ἀπέκετο ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας. αὕτη γὰρ ἡ πόλις τῶν λοιπέων ἐδυνάστευε μέγιστον.*

39) 5, 97, 3: *αὗται δὲ αἱ νέες ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἕλλησι τε καὶ βαρβάρουσι*; "beginning of the evil" (Immerwahr *F&Th* 113).

40) When the Spartan bid to restore Hippias failed (5, 92f.), he repaired to Asia (5, 94f.); there he left no stone unturned to reduce Athens to his and Darios' subjects (5, 96, 1). 5, 96, 2: *Ἰππίης τε δὴ ταῦτα ἐποίησε καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πυνθόμενοι ταῦτα πέμπουσιν ἐς Σάρδις ἀγγέλους, οὐκ ἔωντες τοὺς Πέρσας πείθεσθαι Ἀθηναίων τοῖσι φηγάσι. ὁ δὲ Ἀρταφρόνης ἐκέλενέ σφεας, εἰ βουλοῖατο σοὶ εἶναι, καταδέκεσθαι ὀπίσω Ἰππίην. οὐκ ὦν δὴ ἐνεδέκοντο*

surging Athenian *demos*, of Lakedaimonians and Persians, of a Hippias, Kleomenes, and others. It must surely be the intent of 5, 90ff. to provide the psychological<sup>41)</sup> 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’<sup>42)</sup>.

Knowledge of the contents of 5, 90ff. on the part of ‘the Athenians’ is clearly implied in 5, 97, 1<sup>43)</sup>; the introductory phrase in 5, 90, 1 insinuates Athenian acquaintance with the motives of Spartan policy<sup>44)</sup>. 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 Lakedaimonians, 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<sup>45)</sup>. We do not, however, detect anything here that would go beyond, let alone contradict, Herodotos’ statements elsewhere<sup>46)</sup>.

(5, 62, 1) δεῖ ... ἀναλαβεῖν ...      (5, 90, 1) πυνθόμενοι γὰρ  
 λόγον, ὡς τυράννων ἔλευ-      Λακεδαιμόνιοι  
 θεράσθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ...

τοὺς λόγους ἀποφερομένους οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι· οὐκ ἐνδεκομένοισι δέ σφι ἐδέδοκτο ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι πολεμίους 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 *GrGesch* 1, 362 (cf. 357).

43) νομίζουσι δὲ ταῦτα (5, 97, 1) implicates not just 5, 96 (where one is tempted to think of some sort of official document, or decree – σφι ἐδέδοκτο, 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: ἐς τιμωρίην (against Aigina; this establishes the connexion with the preceding chapters) δὲ παρασκευαζόμενοι αὐτοῖσι ἐκ Λακεδαιμόνιων πρῆγμα ἐγειρόμενον ἐμπόδιον 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 περιωβρίσθαι ἔπεσι καὶ ἔργοις ὑπ’ Ἀθηναίων, and 5, 91, 2, ἡμέας μὲν καὶ τὸν βασιλέα ἡμέων περιωβρίσας, as an additional illustration for the contention that the speech of the Spartans does not introduce new evidence.

46) On the meaning of ἀναπειθεῖν 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 (ὁμως καὶ ξείνους σφι ἐόντας τὰ μάλιστα) rests wholly on 5, 90f.

(62, 2) οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι πᾶν τὰ ἐκ τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδέων  
ἐπὶ τοῖσι Πεισιστρατίδησι  
μηχανώμενοι ...  
(63, 1) ἀνέπειθον τὴν Πυθίην ... ἐς τὴν Πυθίην μεμηχανημένα  
καὶ  
προφέρειν σφι τὰς Ἀθήνας τὰ ἐκ τῆς Πυθίης ἐπὶ σφέας  
ἐλευθεροῦν. τε  
(63, 2) Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ... καὶ τοὺς Πεισιστρατίδας  
πέμπουσι Ἀγχιμόλιον ...  
ἐξελῶντα Πεισιστρατίδας συμφορὴν ἐποιοῦντο διπλῆν,  
ἐξ Ἀθηνέων, ὅτι τε ἄνδρας ξείνους  
ὅμως καὶ ξείνους σφίσι ἕοντας  
σφι ἕοντας τὰ μάλιστα.\* ἐξεληλάκεσαν  
ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνων.  
\* (5, 91, 2) ἐπαρθέντες γὰρ κιβδηλοῖσι<sup>47</sup>) μαντηίοισι ἄνδρας  
ξείνους ἕοντας ἡμῖν τὰ μάλιστα ... τούτους ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος ἐξηλά-  
σάμεν ...

7. Liberation from tyranny and the aggrandizement of the Athenian *demos* are inseparably linked<sup>48</sup>); the expulsion of the Peisistratidai cannot be divorced from the intervention of Sparta and, therefore, from Alkmeonid lobbying at Delphoi. Athen's history of that era is also the history of the *demos*; their ups and downs were shared equally by the Alkmeonidai<sup>49</sup>).

47) Immerwahr *F & Th* 159 n 26: "κίβδηλος 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 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 κίβδηλος, 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 οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι 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. Socr.*<sup>2</sup> 410 n 20), 6, 66. Cf., however, Nilsson *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics*, 1951, 128 f. Verdin *De historisch-kritische Methode van Herodotus*, 1971, 66 f.

48) Cf. above n 35.

49) This community even extends into Herodotos' choice of words, for example, 5, 66, 1, *δυναστεύειν* (of Kleisthenes), 5, 97, 1 (Athens); 5, 63, 6 (also 5, 66, 1 and 6, 123, 2) *ἀναπειθεῖν* (applied by Alkmeonidai), 5, 97, 2 f. (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<sup>50</sup>): identified as his own opinion, designated as common knowledge of ‘the Athenians’, transmitted in speeches<sup>51</sup>) 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’<sup>52</sup>). The dilemma in method is characterized by the invention even of a principle of ‘doppelte Beleuchtung’, in order to cope with modern pseudo-traditions<sup>53</sup>).

The factual knowledge which Herodotos displays will scarcely have surpassed that of many an ‘Athenian’, or even non-Athenian<sup>54</sup>); 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 Delphoi – 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<sup>55</sup>).

Herodotos obviously cannot here be commended for having performed a worth while ἀπόδεξις of his gathering of factual

curious: *δυναστεύειν* is associated with naked power (Immerwahr *F & Th* 206–208, and ind. s. ‘power’), *ἀνξάνεσθαι*, 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.

50) Cf. Fehling *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot.*, 1971, 85.

51) Cf. L. Solmsen *AJP* 64, 1943, 207 (= 644 M<sup>2</sup>); Fehling *Quellen.* 133 with n 8.

52) One especially strong modern ‘tradition’ is that strongly promoted by Jacoby concerning the tyrannicide and the Alkmeonidai, *Atthis* 161f.; 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, 104f.).

material<sup>56</sup>). 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 *demotai*; *δυναστεύειν, ἀυξάνεσθαι*<sup>57</sup>), threat and fear of tyranny, growing hostility of Sparta and Persia<sup>58</sup>).

It is true, “irony, pathos, paradox, and tragedy develop from his tacit dialogue with his audience”<sup>59</sup>); 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<sup>60</sup>). 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 ‘allgemeinmenschlich’, 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

Konrad H. Kinzl

---

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).

57) See above n 49.

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: *ἐπιστάμενος γὰρ ὁ δῆμος ἀκοῆι τὴν Πεισιστράτου καὶ τῶν παίδων τυραννίδα χαλεπὴν τελευτῶσαν γενομένην καὶ προσέτι οὐδ’ ὑφ’ ἑαυτῶν καὶ Ἀγομόδιου καταλθεῖσαν, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐφοβεῖτο αἰεὶ καὶ πάντα ὑπόπτως ἐλάμβανεν*, Thuk. 6, 53, 3.

59) Cf. Fornara *Herodotus*, 1971, 62.

60) Cf. Fehling *Quellen.* 140.