Chapter 3:

Narrative Consistency in the *Histories*

It is a perilous undertaking to attempt to reconstruct the thought processes of any ancient world author. We now cannot know, for example, if particular information, or certain sources, were viewed by the author with trust or scepticism. In the case of Herodotos, however, we have some hope for in his dialogue with us, his audience, he does provide information about his methods and his beliefs. From this dialogue it is possible to form some idea of Herodotos' methodology, the criteria he utilised in judging information and the kind of information or sources he was likely to believe or disbelieve.

In Chapter Two approximately 60 passages where Herodotos provided the audience with direct guidance about his opinions were examined. These passages show that Herodotos did apply criteria based on ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη to evaluate the reliability of oral information. Where oral information was either capable of verification through personal observation, not contrary to human experience or derived from authoritative sources, Herodotos was prepared to assert that it was accurate. Conversely, if information failed one of the criteria, yet was worth reporting, Herodotos indicated his disbelief, often with his reasons, to the audience. The passages examined in Chapter Two also show that certain sources, such as the Egyptian priests or locals generally, were believed by Herodotos in most circumstances to be reliable informants.

characterisations of individuals so that their portraits confirm to a set religious or moral theme, or that his individuals are one dimensional.[1] Nor do I believe that Herodotos' portrayal in all passages is likely to be totally consistent; where he derived oral accounts from different sources some inconsistency may be expected.[2] Rather, I believe that in particular sections of the narrative Herodotos' portrayal of certain individuals possesses an internal narrative consistency. Where some of the information recorded about the individual incorporates source-attributing words, and some does not, it is unlikely that in the whole consistent account some sections are treated with reserve by Herodotos and this is indicated by the presence of the source-attributing words.

3.1.1: Zopyros and the Capture of Babylon

A consistent narrative which includes source-attributing words occurs in the passage which describes the deeds of Zopyros, son of Megabyzos. This passage is part of Herodotos' long, detailed account (3.150-160) of Dareios' capture of Babylon after a siege of twenty months in which Zopyros is the main character and his cunning, loyalty, heroism and sacrifice the central theme.[3]

Herodotos records (3.151) that Dareios laid siege to Babylon and that the Babylonians mocked him from the walls

---

[1]   See generally, Waters, *Tyrants*.

[2]   This can be illustrated with a basic example of an individual's father. In Hdt. 9.75 Sophanes of Athens is the son of Eutychides of the town of Dekeleia and Eurybates was a victor in the Pentathlon. At 6.92.3 Sophanes is the son of Dekeles and Eurybates is a man practised in the Pentathlon who had already killed three men in single combat.

[3]   Myres, p.120, Immerwahr, p.105 & n.83.

τότε γὰρ αἱρήσετε ἡμέας, ἐπεὰν ἡμίονοι τέκωσι. (3.151.2)

After twenty months, however, a mule belonging to Zopyros did give birth to a foal. Zopyros recognised this as a sign from the gods and devised a plan to capture Babylon. First he cut his nose and ears, shaved his hair and scourged himself. Then he went to Dareios and, in an interview which Herodotos dramatically renders in direct speech, outlined his plan. Zopyros said he would pretend that he had been mutilated by Dareios, desert to the Babylonians and gain their confidence by defeating increasing numbers of Persian soldiers.[4] Zopyros believed that, as a consequence of these victories, the Babylonians would entrust him with the keys to the gates of the city and, on a given day, he would let in the Persians. The elaborate deception was put into place, worked exactly as Zopyros had planned and Dareios captured the city.

At the conclusion of this account of the fall of Babylon, Herodotos reports that it is said (λέγεται, 3.160.1) that Dareios had declared many times that he would prefer more to have Zopyros unmutilated than to possess twenty Babylons. Despite the presence of λέγεται in this statement, this sentiment is unlikely to be doubted by Herodotos because it is part of the consistent theme of Zopyros' worth to Dareios. The value of Zopyros is, in fact, outlined in this sentence which precedes the λέγεται information:

---

[4] Dareios was to sacrifice 7,000 men. At intervals, 1,000, 2,000 and then 4,000 men were to be sent to particular areas, armed only with daggers. Zopyros, having specified the numbers and place in advance, would then surprise the Persians and massacre them (3.155). Waters, *Tyrants*, p.61, remarks that this deliberate expenditure of troops would have been shocking to the Greeks with their citizen soldiers but adds that there is no hint of disapproval of the plan by Herodotos.

Ζωπύρου δὲ οὐδεὶς ἀγαθοεργίην Περσέων ὑπερεβάλετο
παρὰ Δαρείῳ κριτῇ, οὔτε τῶν ὕστερον γενομένων οὔτε
τῶν πρότερον, ὅτι μὴ Κῦρος μοῦνος. (3.160.1)

In Dareios' judgment, none of the Persians from the earliest to the present had
performed as good a service as Zopyros, except Kyros alone.

Immediately after the λέγεται information Herodotos asserts that
Dareios greatly honoured Zopyros, gave him many gifts and appointed
him governor of Babylon for life without requiring him to pay tribute.

There is no suggestion that Herodotos had any reservations
about the accuracy of the story of the capture of Babylon or of Zopyros'
role. The account, replete with the fulfilment of prophesies, self-
mutilation and dramatic speeches reported in direct speech, is recorded
by Herodotos without citing any source, contains no source-attributing
words, no statement by Herodotos that the account is not to be
believed nor any hint that he finds the dramatic elements of the story
in any way doubtful.[5] Indeed, Zopyros is twice described by Herodotos
(3.155.1 & 157.1) as a "δοκιμώτατος" and it is difficult to believe that,
of the entire story, only one small section which indicated that Dareios
often praised Zopyros is treated with reserve by Herodotos because of
the λέγεται. Rather, the entire account is a consistent portrayal of
the character of Zopyros in which the information about Dareios'

---

[5]   It is possible that Herodotos' informant was connected with the grandson of
Zopyros, who deserted the Persians and came to Athens (Hdt. 3.160.2): D.M.
Lewis, 'Persians in Herodotos' in *The Greek Historians: Papers Presented to A.E.
Raubitschek*, Stanford, 1985, pp.97-100, J.A.S. Evans, *Herodotus*, Boston, 1982,
p.151, Waters, p.77, P.T. Brannon, 'Herodotus and History: The Constitutional
Debate Preceding Darius' Accession' *Traditio* 19 (1963), p.428, n.2. The story is
almost certainly complete fiction (Lewis, pp.105-106).

praise, introduced by the source-attributing word, forms a climactic conclusion. Indeed, this information is an integral part of the account which serves to reinforce the information in the narrative.

3.1.2: Artemisia at Salamis

The source-attributing words in Herodotos' portrayal of Artemisia, tyrant of Halikarnassos, also seem to reinforce the theme of the narrative rather than imply reserve. Herodotos admired Artemisia, gave her deeds and history prominence and, if he did know of the traditions which portray her in a less favourable light as subject to female deviousness, passion or vengefulness, he declined to record them.[6] While the other native leaders of contingents in Xerxes' forces are generally left unnamed (7.96; cf. 7.98), the lineage and background of Artemisia are given in detail. Her five ships, Herodotos stated (7.99), are by repute the best of the Persian fleet except for the ships of Sidon, Artemisia followed Xerxes out of daring and courage, not through compulsion (7.99), and she was honoured as the first of all his allies (8.69.1). These favourable mentions of Artemisia reach a climax in Herodotos' account of the battle of Salamis where she is portrayed as courageous and cunning. There her flight and sinking of the ship of an ally, Damasithymos of Kalyndos, constitutes the central, most dramatic and most extensive episode in his description of the battle.[7]

---

[6] These unfavourable traditions are reported by later writers; Ptolemy Hephaestion (Photius 190, 153a) and Polyainos 8.53.4.

[7] The description of the general battle occupies less than 19 lines in the *OCT* (8.84, 86). 15 lines (8.85) mention the Persian fleet and name two Samians. In contrast, the section on Artemisia (8.87-88) occupies 35 lines in the *OCT*.

The theme emphasised throughout the passages on Artemisia, especially at Salamis, is surprise and wonder at the achievements of a woman.[8] For example, Herodotos introduces Artemisia by saying that it was greatly surprising that a woman would campaign against Greece

τῆς μάλιστα θῶμα ποιεῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα

στρατευσαμένης γυναικός (7.99.1)

and the description of her achievements at Salamis reinforces this theme, both in her actual deeds and through the praise of Xerxes emphasising the role reversal. In his description of the battle Herodotos stated

κατὰ μὲν δὴ τοὺς ἄλλους οὐκ ἔχω [μετεξετέρους] εἰπεῖν
ἀτρεκέως ὡς ἕκαστοι τῶν βαρβάρων ἢ τῶν Ἑλλήνων
ἠγωνίζοντο· κατὰ δὲ Ἀρτεμισίην τάδε ἐγένετο, ἀπ' ὧν
εὐδοκίμησε μᾶλλον ἔτι παρὰ βασιλέϊ. (8.87.1)

Now concerning the others I am not able to report accurately how the commanders of the Barbarians or the Greeks fared in the battle. But this happened to Artemisia and caused her to be even more esteemed by the King.

The narrative construction of this passage is illuminating. Herodotos states οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν ἀτρεκέως thus making it plain to his audience that he does not have *accurate* information about the deeds of others at Salamis. This is in contrast (κατὰ μὲν . . . κατὰ δὲ) with the activities of Artemisia which made her especially esteemed by Xerxes. Herodotos then describes in detail Artemisia's sinking of the ship of Damasithymos and he specifies that she obtained two benefits

---

8   Macan, *VII-IX*, p.125. In Artemisia's' speech to Xerxes (8.68α.1) she stresses the superiority of men over women: R.V. Munson, 'Artemisia in Herodotus' *ClAnt* 7 (1988), pp.91-106.

from it. First, the Greek ship pursuing her assumed she was on the Greek side and turned away. Second, she won favour with Xerxes, for it is said (λέγεται, 8.88.2) that he saw her sink the ship and asked his retainers to confirm Artemisia's role. They did and Herodotos continues

Ξέρξην δὲ εἰπεῖν λέγεται πρὸς τὰ φραζόμενα· Οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες γεγόνασί μοι γυναῖκες, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἄνδρες. ταῦτα μὲν Ξέρξην φασὶ εἰπεῖν. (8.88.3)

when he heard the things related, it is said Xerxes exclaimed "My men have become women, and my women, men." They say Xerxes said these things.

In this case, the narrative of Herodotos and Xerxes' praise (as reported by Herodotos) paint a consistent narrative picture of the deeds of the woman Artemisia. The information which incorporates the repeated λέγεται and the φασί forms the climax to Herodotos' portrayal of the character and deeds of Artemisia. As this information is consistent in theme and tone with the rest of the picture of Artemisia in the *Histories*, it seems unlikely that Herodotos would undercut his narrative by implying that he doubts the statement that Xerxes praised Artemisia.[9] Rather, I believe that the information incorporating source-attributing words is an integral part of the story of Artemisia and her achievements at Salamis. The audience's perception of Artemisia is guided by both the description of her actions in the narrative and by the notification of the esteem of the Great King. The source-attributing words, in fact, reinforce and enhance the narrative, not undercut it.

---

9   Cf. Macan, *VII-IX*, p.496.

3.1.3: The Madness of Kambyses

A even more extensive example of information with a consistent narrative theme is Herodotos' account of the deeds of Kambyses, son of Kyros.[10] The hostile picture of Kambyses' character and actions which emerges in the *Histories* is a product of a combination of narrative description, information which incorporates source-attributing words and direct authorial commentary.

Herodotos leaves the audience in no doubt whatsoever about his own attitude to Kambyses: he is categorized as mad or deranged ten times in close succession.[11] In addition, as a culmination of his description of the deeds of Kambyses, Herodotos commented

πανταχῇ ὦν μοι δῆλά ἐστι ὅτι ἐμάνη μεγάλως ὁ
Καμβύσης· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἱροῖσί τε καὶ νομαίοισι
ἐπεχείρησε καταγελᾶν (3.38.1)

it is clear to me that Kambyses was in every way greatly deranged as otherwise he would not have set himself to deride religion and custom

thus making his authorial position clear and providing the audience with the reason for his opinion. The description of Kambyses' many and varied mad acts, provided in the narrative with and without source-

---

[10] The literature on Herodotos' portrait of Kambyses is extensive. For recent works, see Waters, *Tyrants*, pp.53-56, T.S. Brown, 'Herodotus' portrait of Cambyses' *Historia* 31 (1982), pp.387-403, Balcer, pp.70-100, R.V. Munson, 'The Madness of Cambyses' *Arethusa* 24 (1991), pp.43-65.

[11] At 3.25.2 Kambyses is both ἐμμανής and οὐ φρενήρης, at 3.29.1 ὑπόμαργος ; at 3.33.1, 34.1, 37.1, 38.1 & 38.2 some form of ἐμμανής and at 3.30.1, 35.4 & 61.1 some form of φρενήρης.

attributing words, both supports Herodotos' clearly expressed authorial position and provides the evidence upon which it was based.

In the course of his account, Herodotos describes the mad deeds Kambyses inflicted upon his own family, the Persians and other peoples. In Egypt Kambyses embarked upon mad military schemes and was guilty of sacrilege and fratricide. As soon as he had conquered Egypt (for which he receives scant credit in the *Histories*),[12] Kambyses went to Sais where he exhumed, desecrated and then burnt the body of the pharaoh Amasis. This last act especially, Herodotos declared (3.16.2) in a direct authorial statement to the audience, was sacrilegious for it was contrary to the customs of both the Persians and the Egyptians.[13] Kambyses' insanity is also a dominant theme of Herodotos' description of his campaign against the Ethiopians. Herodotos notes that Kambyses set out with the army but

οἷα δὲ ἐμμανής τε ἐὼν καὶ οὐ φρενήρης (3.25.2)

he had made inadequate provision to supply his soldiers. As a consequence, they were soon reduced to eating grass and pack animals. Herodotos comments that Kambyses would have been a wise man if he had led the army back at this stage

εἰ . . . ὁ Καμβύσης ἐγνωσιμάχεε καὶ ἀπῆγε ὀπίσω τὸν στρατόν, ἐπὶ τῇ ἀρχῆθεν γενομένῃ ἁμαρτάδι ἦν ἂν ἀνὴρ σοφός (3.25.5)

---

[12]   As Munson, *op.cit.* (n.10), pp.44-45 recognised.

[13]   The passage which describes the desecration of Amasis' corpse contains no indication of a source. However, immediately after the description Herodotos twice cites the Egyptians (λέγουσι, 3.16.5 & 6) as informants for the story that it was not the corpse of Amasis which was burned by Kambyses. Herodotos specifically rejected their story as he believed that Kambyses, consistent with his character, did burn the body of Amasis.

but Kambyses, of course, was not a wise man and he pressed forward until some of the troops resorted to cannibalism. At this, Kambyses finally admitted defeat and turned back. In this short account of the campaign, therefore, the madness of Kambyses is a theme which is frequently before the audience.

The theme of the madness of Kambyses is again emphasised by the description of his next acts. On his return to Memphis, Kambyses οἷα ἐὼν ὑπομαργότερος (3.29.1) stabbed the sacred Apis bull and mocked the priests. Because Kambyses killed the Apis bull the Egyptians say he immediately became mad, having formerly been of unsound mind

Καμβύσης δέ, ὡς λέγουσι Αἰγύπτιοι, αὐτίκα . . . ἐμάνη,
ἐὼν οὐδὲ πρότερον φρενήρης. (3.30.1)

At this place Herodotos makes no specific comment about the Egyptian claim.[14] However, he later implies that he does not believe them and his reservations are due to the existence of another story which maintained that Kambyses had suffered from "the sacred disease" (epilepsy) from birth:

εἴτε δὴ διὰ τὸν ᵀΑπιν εἴτε καὶ ἄλλως, οἷα πολλὰ ἔωθε
ἀνθρώπους κακὰ καταλαμβάνειν· καὶ γάρ τινα καὶ ἐκ
γενεῆς νοῦσον μεγάλην λέγεται ἔχειν ὁ Καμβύσης, τὴν
ἱρὴν ὀνομάζουσί τινες. (3.33)[15]

---

14   Munson, *op.cit.* (n.10), p.49, recognised that the ὡς λέγουσι Αἰγύπτιοι in this passage is important but cannot decide just what its importance is: "the parenthetical reference to the Egyptian authorities variously adds support or a note of caution, or both at once".

15   The Hippokratic work, *The Sacred Disease* 1-5, attacks the view that epilepsy comes from the gods and Herodotos expresses a similar reservation.

these (mad deeds) were either done because of the Apis or something else, such as one of the many ills which afflict mankind. For indeed it is said that from birth Kambyses had suffered from some great disease, which some call sacred.

In contrast to the religious explanation propounded by the Egyptians, this diseased body, diseased mind parallel, which incorporates a source-attributing word, explains the actions of Kambyses in simple terms and is considered likely by Herodotos as he specifically indicates:

οὖ νύν τοι ἀεικὲς οὐδὲν ἦν τοῦ σώματος νοῦσον
μεγάλην νοσέοντος μηδὲ τὰς φρένας ὑγιαίνειν. (3.33)

now it is not at all unlikely that when his body was greatly diseased, his mind should not enjoy good health.

Following these descriptions of Kambyses' deeds in Egypt, Herodotos records his acts against his own family and the Persians. Herodotos reports in the narrative that Kambyses ordered the murder of his brother Smerdis and twice notes (3.30.1 and 3.31.1) that this was the first of Kambyses' evil actions.[16] There are, however, variant accounts about how Smerdis died; some say (οἱ μὲν λέγουσι, 3.30.3) Smerdis was killed while hunting whereas others say he was drowned. There are also two accounts of how Kambyses killed his own sister, the first attributed twice to the Greeks

---

[16] καὶ πρῶτα μὲν τῶν κακῶν ἐξεργάσατο τὸν ἀδελφεὸν (3.30.1) and πρῶτον μὲν δὴ λέγουσι Καμβύσῃ τῶν κακῶν ἄρξαι τοῦτο (3.31.1).

Chronologically, Herodotos places the killing of Smerdis after the invasion of Egypt. Dareios, in the Behistan Inscription, states that the killing took place before Kambyses went to Egypt (DB I §10, Kent, p.119).

Ἕλληνες μὲν λέγουσι (3.32.1) and Ἕλληνες μὲν δὴ . . .
φασί (3.32.3)

and the second to the Egyptians.[17]   Herodotos then restates his

opinion of the character of Kambyses, noting

ταῦτα μὲν ἐς τοὺς οἰκηιοτάτους ὁ Καμβύσης ἐξεμάνη

(3.33)

later adding τάδε δ' ἐς τοὺς ἄλλους Πέρσας ἐξεμάνη (3.34.1).

The repeated ἐξεμάνη in this passage clearly guides the

audience's perception of Kambyses' character and prepares them for the

continued description of his mad acts against the rest of the Persians

which is introduced by λέγεται (repeated twice, 3.34.1).[18]   Under the

category of mad acts committed against the Persians, Herodotos records

the story, including sections in direct speech, of how Kambyses tried to

prove that he was not mad by killing Prexaspes' son in front of his

father and cutting open the body (3.34-35.4) and how, on a pretext,

Kambyses buried alive twelve noble Persians (3.35.5).   These examples

reinforce Herodotos' picture of a deranged Kambyses.   And, to ensure

that this picture of Kambyses continues to be brought to the attention

of the audience, Herodotos comments

ὁ μὲν δὴ τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ἐς Πέρσας τε καὶ τοὺς
συμμάχους ἐξεμαίνετο (3.37.1)

---

[17]   Αἰγύπτιοι δέ (3.32.3), picking up from the φασί of the Greeks.

[18]   The infinite verbs which follow λέγεται, for example, εἰπεῖν (3.34.1, twice,
34.2, 35.3, 35.4), λέγειν (34.3, 35.1), ἀμείβεσθαι (34.3), βαλεῖν (35.3),
ἀνασχίζειν (35.3) make it clear that Herodotos is recording what was said by
his oral source.

many such mad deeds did he commit against the Persians and their allies

before recording yet more incidents of insanity, including Kambyses' sacrilege at Memphis where he opened coffins and burnt images (3.37).

The entire account of Kambyses in the *Histories*, accordingly, is a consistent, elaborate, hostile picture of a man afflicted by madness in his dealings with his family, his associates, the Persians and other peoples; a consistent narrative picture which covers religious, secular, judicial and military activities. As a ruler, a general, a devotee and a man, Kambyses showed that he was totally insane.

It is unusual to find such consistency in reported human behaviour,[19] especially where stories are drawn ostensibly from diverse sources.[20] As noted, Herodotos cited Egyptian sources for some of the stories, Greek, Persian or anonymous oral sources for others.[21] The

---

[19] For the view that Herodotos' portrait is that of a typical tyrant, see Immerwahr, p.169, J.G. Gammie, 'Herodotus on Kings and Tyrants: Objective Historiography or Conventional Portraiture?' *JNES* 45 (1986), pp.180-181; cf. Waters, *Tyrants*, pp.41-42. Herodotos' Kambyses may have been influenced by Greek tragedy; Ph.-E. Legrand, *Hérodote Histories III*, 3rd. ed., Paris, 1958, p.12. For the view that the account is contradictory, see I. Bruns, *Das literarische Porträt der Griechen im fünften v vierten Jahrhundert vor Chr. Geb.*, 2nd ed., Hildesheim, 1961, pp.79-80.

[20] Although, as Macan (*V-VI*, vol.1, p.lxxvii) long ago noted, just because Herodotos cites a certain race or people as informants, such as "the Persians say", it cannot be assumed that he heard the information directly from Persians. Rather, the most that can be said is that what is related was a tradition of the Persians and that the actual informants may equally have been Persian or Greek or Lydian. See also H. Diels, 'Herodot und Hekataios' *Hermes* 22 (1887), p.438, Jacoby, *RE*, col.250, H.W. Parke, 'Citation and Recitation: A Convention in Early Greek Historians' *Hermathena* 67 (1946), pp.80-92, Marincola, p.127, Dewald/Marincola, pp.39-40.

[21] Egyptians: λέγουσι at 3.16.5, 28.2, 30.1 and φασί at 3.32.3; Greeks: λέγουσι at 3.32.1 and φασί at 3.32.3; Persians are suggested at 3.34.

fact that some of these stories can be shown to be untrue[22] is not relevant to this discussion; what is important is that Herodotos records in the *Histories* an account in which Kambyses is shown consistently in the narrative, in authorial commentary and in passages for which sources are cited by means of source-attributing words as being mad or deranged.

Source-attributing words occur in a number of passages with differing indications of reliability by Herodotos. For example, λέγουσι (3.30.3 & 3.32.1) and φασί (3.32.3) introduce variant explanations of Kambyses' murder of Smerdis and his sister. In both cases, Herodotos does not indicate which version he considers more reliable although both variants cannot be correct as they are mutually exclusive. It is also unlikely that all variants are doubted and that this doubt is indicated by the presence of the source-attributing words. I believe, rather, that as none of the stories were contrary to γνώμη, but all confirmed the guilt of Kambyses, all versions were brought to the attention of the audience and the respective sources cited by Herodotos through source-attributing words.[23] In one passage (3.34.1), λέγεται twice introduces information which is consistent with the narrative. In

---

[22]   The story (3.28-29) that Kambyses killed the sacred Apis calf in Memphis after which it was buried secretly is contradicted by contemporary Egyptian evidence which shows that the Apis died in May 525 shortly after Kambyses invaded Egypt. It was mourned for seventy days, embalmed and given a proper burial with full ceremony in a granite sarcophagus dedicated by Kambyses. Its successor died in the reign of Dareios after living for eight years, three months and five days: A.H. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, Oxford, 1961, p.364, A.T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, Chicago, 1948, pp.89-90, Brown, *op.cit.* (n.10), p.397, n.33, Balcer, pp.86-91.

[23]   Variant accounts are examined in Chapter Four.

another, which seeks to explain the cause of Kambyses' insanity, one piece of information incorporating a source-attributing word (λέγεται, 3.30.1, on the Apis) is doubted by Herodotos on the basis of another which also contains a source-attributing word (λέγεται, 3.33, on the sacred disease). In another passage a source-attributing word (λέγουσι, 3.16.5 & 6) does refer to information which Herodotos disbelieves but in this instance his rejection of the account of the Egyptians is expressly indicated to the audience.

The above passages provide evidence that source-attributing words are not themselves indications of reserve but are intended to enhance the reality of Herodotos' negative portrayal of Kambyses. Herodotos was convinced that Kambyses was a madman whose actions betrayed his mental state and the account in the *Histories* seems set on establishing this view in the mind of the audience.[24] In the course of this account, information is sometimes introduced by source-attributing words, sometimes not, but in all cases the information forms part of the same consistent account of the character and deeds of Kambyses. The source-attributing words show the audience that the evidence which establishes Kambyses' insanity was not derived from one group of informants. Instead, source-attributing words show that complementary information was derived by Herodotos from Persians, Egyptians, Greeks and others, and that all sources confirm the narrative view and attest to the madness of Kambyses, even where they report variant traditions. The source-attributing words, accordingly, introduce material consistent with Herodotos' beliefs and his account

---

[24] The hostile view of Kambyses was so effective that centuries later the destruction of Heliopolis and Thebes (by an earthquake) could be blamed on Kambyses; Strabo 17.1.27, 46.

of the deeds of Kambyses is both a model of consistency and a damning indictment in which material introduced by source-attributing words is an integral part. In these circumstances, it seems unlikely that Herodotos had reservations about the information with source-attributing words as this would lessen the impact of his theme and his clearly expressed authorial opinions.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

While we should not expect consistency in accounts derived from oral information from different sources, the passages in the *Histories* about the deeds of Zopyros, Artemisia and Kambyses clearly do show a consistency between narrative description, authorial commentary and information for which sources are cited by Herodotos through source-attributing words. In each case information introduced by means of source-attributing words is consistent with the characterisation of that individual in the *Histories* and, in fact, enhances the themes of the narrative. I believe that it is unlikely that Herodotos would seek to undercut the dominant narrative theme of the passages on Zopyros, Artemisia and Kambyses by doubting information which supports his own expressed authorial position. Instead, rather than indicating reserve, the source-attributing word passages form an integral part of the account of the individual in the *Histories* and, in some cases, provide the climax of Herodotos' account.

3.2: Reasonable and Logical Information

Some of the passages examined in Chapter Two show that Herodotos evaluated information in terms of γνώμη and, where he believed that the information was inconsistent with human experience, he indicated directly his rejection to the audience. There are many other passages in the *Histories* which include source-attributing words where Herodotos makes no authorial comment. Many of these passages seem so unexceptional, reasonable, logical or consistent with other information that, were it not for the theory that source-attributing words indicate reserve, it would be difficult to suggest any reason why Herodotos would have reservations about their accuracy. There is, in essence, a narrative consistency within the passages, or between these and other passages, which makes it seem unlikely that the presence of a source-attributing word signals reserve. Examples of this kind of information include passages of simple geographic comparisons, information about numbers or information which Herodotos elsewhere in the narrative or in authorial commentary indicates is accurate.

A simple example of reasonable information is geographic comparisons, such as where Herodotos reports that there are many islands in the River Araxes which they say (φασί, 1.202.1) are as big as Lesbos or where Herodotos records the founding of a colony on the island of Platea off the coast of Libya and adds

λέγεται δὲ ἴση εἶναι ἡ νῆσος τῇ νῦν Κυρηναίων πόλι.

(4.156.3)

In each of these passages, the information introduced by the source-attributing word supplies a comparison which aids the comprehension

of the audience by relating information on distant locations to locations more familiar to Herodotos' Greek audience. In these circumstances, it seems unlikely that the source-attributing words are supposed to imply that Herodotos himself doubts the information.[25] Source-attributing words in other passages also show that geographical information is provided by local sources. For example, the Lydians say (λέγουσι, 1.93.5) that Lake Gygaia near the tomb of Kroisos' father is fed by springs while the Tearos River is said by locals dwelling around the river

ὁ δὲ Τέαρος λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων (4.90.1)

to be the best for healing and to have thirty-eight springs. These informants are local sources, reporting information about local geography and, again, it is difficult to see why the citation of the locals means that Herodotos doubts the information. Two unique events are also attributed to local sources. First, the Delians said (ὡς ἔλεγον Δήλιοι, 6.98.1) that when Datis left the island to invade Eretria an earthquake occurred for the only time in their history. Second, the Thebans in Egypt themselves say (ὡς λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Θηβαῖοι 3.10.3) that the only time it rained at Thebes was in the reign of Psammenitos, and Herodotos adds his own comment

οὐ γὰρ δὴ ὕεται τὰ ἄνω τῆς Αἰγύπτου τὸ παράπαν.[26]

In these passages the information is not contrary to γνώμη and was derived by Herodotos by means of ἱστορίη from local sources.

---

[25] At most, they indicate that Herodotos has relied upon the oral information of others; How/Wells, vol.1, p.353.

[26] This statement is not correct: C. Sourdille, *La Durée et l'étendue du Voyage d' Hérodote en Egypte*, Paris, 1910, pp.163-164, Fehling, pp.91 & 242; cf Lloyd, *Intro*, p.71.

Although not free from doubt, I believe it unlikely that Herodotos shows reservations about the material through the source-attributing words. Instead, I believe the source-attributing words show the audience that Herodotos' record was based on the oral accounts of others, often sources such as local people who might be expected to possess reliable information.

There are other passages in the *Histories* where it is unlikely source-attributing words are intended by Herodotos to indicate doubt. For example, in his account of Kyros' battle against the Massagetai, a portion of the description which incorporates a source-attributing word is consistent with the remainder of the narrative. Herodotos first advanced his own opinion that this battle was the most violent conflict fought between non-Greeks and his description of the bitterly contested fighting, although introduced by λέγεται (1.214.2), reinforces his clear authorial opinion. Twice Herodotos certified to the audience his belief in the accuracy of his account of the battle, noting at the beginning πυνθάνομαι οὕτω τοῦτο γενόμενον (1.214.1) and at the end

τὰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ τὴν Κύρου τελευτὴν τοῦ βίου πολλῶν

λόγων λεγομένων ὅδε μοι ὁ πιθανώτατος εἴρηται.

(1.214.5)

This repeated commentary by the *histor* supports the accuracy of the narrative.[27] As such, it seems illogical to suggest that Herodotos had reservations about the λέγεται statement which introduced the narrative of the bitter fighting. Instead, the description of the battle introduced by λέγεται provides the audience with evidence which supports Herodotos' authorial position.

---

[27] For πυνθάνομαι as a source-attributing word, see Chapter 6.2.

There are further passages in the *Histories* which incorporate source-attributing words but contain information it seems unlikely Herodotos or a Greek audience would doubt. For example, the statements that Kourion in Cyprus was an Argive settlement (λέγονται, 5.113.1), that the Persians had suffered huge losses in ships and men in the storm at Athos, said (λέγεται, 6.44.3) to be three hundred ships and twenty thousand men, or that as οἱ ἐπιχώριοι λέγουσι (2.60.3) up to seven hundred thousand people gathered at Bubastis in Egypt for the great festival of Artemis, are not unreasonable statements. A Greek would consider Argive migration to Cyprus unremarkable[28] and, as the Greeks habitually overstated the magnitude of the Persian forces,[29] they would see nothing unlikely in Persian losses of the magnitude reported. Similarly, many sources attest to the huge numbers of people who attended Egyptian festivals down to Hellenic times.[30] In all of these passages, accordingly, it is difficult to suggest why the information might be doubted by Herodotos.

Each passage considered in this section alone is not conclusive evidence against the view that source-attributing words indicate reserve. However, each passage contains information which is likely to be considered feasible by a Greek audience and is not

---

[28] Strabo (14.6.3) agreed with Herodotos on this point. Macan, *IV-VI*, p.261 comments that λέγονται shows that Herodotos doubts the statement. He then goes on, however, to show that the statement has validity (see also How/Wells, vol.2, p.62, for the same conclusions). This highlights some of the problems with assuming that Herodotos does not believe material introduced by λέγεται or λέγονται, for then it becomes necessary to apologise for genuine traditions.

[29] How/Wells, vol.2, pp.366-367.

[30] Lloyd, *1-98*, pp.268, 276.

unreasonable or inherently illogical. The information of locals when it does not transgress against the test of γνώμη is likely to possess authority. Information of a simple geographic comparison, or about numbers, is also not unreasonable and it seems unlikely that it was doubted by Herodotos solely because he cites a source by means of source-attributing words. The evidence of the passages examined in Chapter Two showed that there are instances where source-attributing words clearly do not indicate reserve. Where information is reasonable and Herodotos does not express a direct opinion, I believe it is more likely that the source-attributing words are intended to show the audience that Herodotos' report was based upon oral accounts, often from people who could be expected to have accurate knowledge.

3.3: Custom, Greek Perceptions and Source-attributing Words

Herodotos' description of the customs of various peoples provides further examples of information which is consistent with Herodotos' stated purpose and themes. The customs of various races are described throughout the *Histories*.[31] In many of these passages Herodotos describes bizarre customs, including sexual peculiarities and ritual cannibalism, some of which incorporate source-attributing words

---

[31] For example, 1.29, 1.35, 1.61, 1.79, 1.82, 1.90, 1.93-94, 1.131-132, 1.137, 1.140, 1.144, 1.146,1.172,-173, 1.195-200, 1.202, 1.216, 2.35-39, 2.42, 2.45, 2.65, 2.77, 2.79, 2.92, 2.113, 2.126, 2.136, 2.147, 2.177, 3.2, 3.16, 3.20, 3.31, 3.38, 3.48, 3.82-83, 3.99, 3.100-101, 3.118, 4.26, 4.68, 4.78, 4.80, 4.96, 4.103, 4.104, 4.106, 4.107, 4.117, 4.168-172, 4.176, 4.180, 4.187, 4.190, 5.3, 5.6, 5.16, 5.75, 5.88, 6.38, 6.58, 6.86, 6.89, 6.106, 6.111, 6.130, 6.138, 7.2, 7.9, 7.41, 7.102-104, 7.136, 7.236, 9.41 & 9.111. The list is not exhaustive, but the extent of Herodotos' interest is clearly indicated.

while others do not. The purpose of reporting the customs of various peoples is not only to give entertainment to the audience.[32] Rather, for Herodotos, a rational examination of custom can establish the reason why something happened as it did; custom provides an explanation of why people act in a certain way[33] and makes otherwise unpredictable actions comprehensible. That is because νόμος, in all its senses,[34] signifies a certain order and implies that this order is, or ought to be, generally regarded as valid and binding by the members of the group in which it prevails.[35] A description of custom is where the enquiry into historical explanation and causation can stop.

Herodotos was broad-minded about the customs of others. For example, Herodotos accepts that each race has customs which they believe to be the best, however strange the custom may seem to others. Herodotos noted

οὕτω νομίζουσι πολλόν τι καλλίστους τοὺς ἑωυτῶν
νόμους ἕκαστοι εἶναι (3.38.1)

---

[32] As suggested by O.K. Armayor, 'Herodotus' Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition' *TAPhA* 108 (1978), p.9.

[33] J.A.S. Evans, 'Despotes Nomos' *Athenaeum* 43 (1965), pp.142-143, 153, S. Humphreys, 'Law, Custom and Culture in Herodotus' *Arethusa* 20 (1987), p.218, Lateiner, p.91, M.W. Bloomer, 'The Superlative *Nomoi* of Herodotus's *Histories*' *ClAnt* 12 (1993), pp.30-50. For an examination of the way regard for *nomos* ties together the diverse stories in Book 1 of the *Histories*, see D. Konstan, 'The Stories in Herodotus' *Histories*: Book 1' *Helios* 10 (1983), pp.1-22.

[34] The word νόμος ("custom" or "law") appears 121 times in the *Histories* and similar terms are also used; Evans, *ibid.*, p.142. M. Ostwald, *Nomos and the Beginnings of Athenian Democracy*, Oxford, 1969, p.54, demonstrates the range and connotations of *nomos* in the Fifth century BC.

[35] Ostwald, *ibid.*, p.54.

and concluded by quoting Pindar:

νόμον πάντων βασιλέα. (3.38.4)[36]

Essentially, this world view means that, for Herodotos, each race decides for itself what is bizarre and what is not; a value judgment based upon νόμος. Thus, even though Herodotos from a Greek viewpoint might consider some of the customs he describes strange, bizarre or unusual, he accepts that the custom exists among other races. As his description of equally unusual customs sometimes incorporates source-attributing words, sometimes not, it should not be assumed without analysis that the presence of source-attributing words indicates that Herodotos doubts the information he records.

Herodotos often seeks to make his account of the customs of others intelligible to his Greek audience by comparing foreign customs to information within the perception and knowledge of his Greek audience. The purpose of this technique is to make the bizarre custom comprehensible by fixing it within a wider cultural context.[37] This technique can take at least two rhetorical forms: inversion and analogy.[38] Inversion and analogy operate to make the differences

---

[36] This passage occurs in Herodotos' account of the experiment conducted by Dareios about Indian and Greek funeral customs; H.E. Stier, 'Nomos Basileus' *Philologus* 83 (1927-28), pp.239-240, Humphreys, *op. cit.* (n.33), pp.212-214. On this fragment of Pindar, see M. Ostwald, 'Pindar, *Nomos*, and Heracles' *HSCPh* 69 (1965), pp.109-138.

[37] See, for example, C. Dewald, 'Women and Culture in Herodotus' *Histories*' *Women's Studies* 8 (1981), p.103.

[38] For these terms, see Hartog, pp.212-230. "Inversion" points to opposites in order to explain cultural differences. Differences are "antisameness" (p.213-214). "Analogy" makes the differences comprehensible by comparison, translating the custom to a representation of something known to the audience (p.225). See

between the cultures of diverse people more comprehensible by comparison or opposition, translating the description of a custom, initially strange or incomprehensible, into a representation of something known to the audience. The simplest explanation of how this type of rhetoric operates can be shown from a physical example. When describing a hippopotamus for the benefit of his Greek audience, who were unlikely to have seen one, the animal is described by Herodotos in terms of the more familiar physical characteristics of horses and oxen.[39] The descriptions of the island of Platea (4.156.3) or the River Araxes (1.202.1) mentioned earlier in this chapter, which were both related back to information within the knowledge of his Greek audience, provide further physical examples.

An example of a passage incorporating a comparison without source-attributing words is where Herodotos states (3.37.2) the image of Hephaistos in the temple at Memphis is like the image of the Phoenician Pataikos. To further clarify his point he notes, for those who have not seen these figures, that it is a dwarf's likeness. This fixes the Egyptian images into a Greek context that Herodotos' audience would understand. In a similar way, the outer circuit wall of Ekbatana is compared in size with the circumference of the walls of Athens (1.98.5), a Persian measure is fixed through comparison with Attic measures (1.192.3), the distance of an Egyptian journey is compared to one between Athens and Olympos (2.7.1) and the land of the Tauric peninsula is described through analogy to both the Sounion peninsula

---

also generally, G.E.R. Lloyd, *Polarity and Analogy in Early Greek Thought*, Cambridge, 1966.

[39] Hdt. 2.71. The animal had cloven hoofs like oxen and was as big as the biggest oxen but had a mane and tail like a horse and a horse's neigh.

in Attika and a section of southern Italy (4.99.5). These passages rely upon analogy to enhance the audience's comprehension of the point being made by Herodotos. Other passages use inversion; the customs of the Egyptians are contrary to those of all mankind (2.35.2 & 2.91.1) while those of the Lydians are like those of the Greeks except that they prostitute their daughters (1.94.1). Other passages contain both source-attributing words and analogy. For example, the Persian system of post riders, described by Herodotos after an introductory λέγουσι (8.98.1), is compared to an Athenian relay race (8.98.2). A more complex example concerns the Issedones. The Issedones are said (λέγονται, 4.26.1) to honour their fathers after death by eating their bodies at a feast and gilding the skull as a sacred relic and sacrificing to it annually. Herodotos appends an explanation for this custom which is, to a Greek, abhorrent;[40] each son does this to honour his father

κατά περ ῞Ελληνες τὰ γενέσια. (4.26.2)

The method of paying homage, Herodotos is suggesting, may be bizarre, but it is a custom which is based upon a desire, familiar to the Greeks, to honour one's parents. The practice of the Issedones is, in fact, a

---

[40] The Greeks considered eating the dead the ultimate impurity and a reduction of man to a sub-human level: J. Redfield, 'Herodotus the Tourist' *CPh* 80 (1985), p.105, C. Segal, 'Greek Myth as a Semiotic and Structural System and the Problem of Tragedy' *Arethusa* 16 (1983), p.183. This is confirmed by the other references to cannibalism in Herodotos. The only people Herodotos knows who eat humans as a norm are the most savage of mankind who know no law or justice (4.106). Hesiod, *Works and Days* 276-280, expressed the same sentiment: fish, birds and beasts eat each other because they have no justice, but Zeus gave justice to men. Other mentions of cannibalism in Herodotos are of a ritual kind and do not carry the same stigma; i.e., the Massagetai (1.216.2) and Padaioi (3.99).

bizarre mirror of Greek burial custom and is explicable in these terms. This analogy, and the source-attributing word, indicate to the audience why the information about the custom should not be dismissed by them as bizarre fantasy. First, the custom, while bizarre, was nevertheless based upon concerns recognisable to the Greek audience. Second, the report was derived by Herodotos from oral reports and was not Herodotos' invention. In these circumstances, the source-attributing word is unlikely to denote reservations by Herodotos.

In other instances, descriptions of equally exotic customs sometimes include source-attributing words, sometimes not. For example, the dwellers in the Caucasus, it is said (λέγεται, 1.203.2), use the leaves of a tree to permanently dye wool and also copulate in the open, the Padaioi eat family members and raw fish (λέγονται, 3.99.1), while the women of the Gindanes, ὡς λέγεται (4.176), wear an anklet for each lover they have taken. Near the Caspian Sea, they say (λέγουσι, 1.202.3), dwell men who eat raw fish and dress in sealskins. These customs are no less exotic or bizarre than many others Herodotos records without source-attributing words. For example, the Massagetai have wives in common and, when they wish to have sexual intercourse, merely hang a quiver on a woman's waggon (1.216.1). The Babylonians and the Enetoi in Illyria auction the prettier girls and use the money to provide a dowry for ugly or deformed women (1.196), while the Lydians prostitute all the daughters of the common people (1.93). The Machlyes have promiscuous sexual relationships and determine that the father of a baby is the man whom the baby most resembles (4.180). The Nasamones also have wives in common and a bride, on her wedding night, has intercourse with each

of the guests and receives a gift (4.172). Some Indian tribes (3.101) copulate openly like cattle and have sperm which is not white but black like their skins. The Kallatai (3.38.4) eat their parents.

Some of these statements are, in fact, untrue and it seems that either Herodotos' informants were in error or Herodotos got his story wrong. The bride auction of the Babylonians, for example, does not accurately reflect Babylonian marriage customs[41] and the sperm of negroes is not black.[42] However, whatever the accuracy of Herodotos' report about these customs, they are not introduced by source-attributing words nor seem to be doubted by Herodotos. While consistency in narrative treatment should not be expected from Herodotos, the previous chapter provided evidence that when Herodotos wanted to indicate to the audience that he had doubts about particular information, he specifically provided his opinion. Significantly, Herodotos never once states specifically that he does not believe the details he has heard about a custom, which at first sight seems strange, given the number of times he describes customs which are unusual, peculiar or downright bizarre. This can, however, be explained by reference to Herodotos' expressed narrative concerns and themes. All customs are of interest to Herodotos and all are explicable in terms of the diversity of human nature. Thus, Herodotos neither doubts that bizarre and strange customs exist among different races

---

[41]   R.A. McNeal, 'The Brides of Babylon: Herodotus 1.196' *Historia* 37 (1988) pp.54-71. The account as described by Herodotos, with slight variations, had a long literary life: Nicolaos Damaskenos (*FGrH* 90 F103w), Strabo 16.1.20.

[42]   A notorious error by Herodotos; Aristotle twice refutes this statement: 736a 10-14 (*Generation of Animals* ii.2) and 523a 16-18 (*Historia Animalium* iii.22). See also Sayce, p.280, D.H. Kelly, 'Egyptians and Ethiopians: Color, Race and Racism' *CO* 68 (1991), p.80.

nor does he reject any information about them on the basis of γνώμη. Recording details of these customs is an integral part of the Herodotean narrative and the presence of source-attributing words in an account should not be taken to indicate that Herodotos has doubts about the information. Instead, in many instances the presence of source-attributing words seems an indication to the audience that Herodotos' record of these often strange customs was based upon oral information.

3.4: Information from Local Informants

Elsewhere in this study, passages have been examined which suggest that Herodotos believed, unless he had other evidence, that people are generally reliable when they relate information about their own history, culture, customs or geography.[43]   In Chapter Two, passages where source-attributing words were present and Herodotos also expressly indicated his authorial position on the information were considered.   In this chapter citations of local informants where Herodotos does not make an explicitly comment are examined.   It appears from these passages that Herodotos' reliance upon local informants is such a part of his methodology that it is difficult to see why the citation of local informants through source-attributing words denotes reserve by Herodotos.

Locals are frequently cited as sources by Herodotos utilising source-attributing words. As noted previously, Herodotos cites the Lydians (1.93.5), the Thebans in Egypt (3.10.3) and the locals in Thrace around the Tearos River (4.90.1) as informants for geographical

---

[43]   Chapters 1.5.1, 2.3 & 3.2 above.

information. Herodotos also cites particular ethnic groups as sources for material about their own origins, or their own history. For example, the people of the city of Borysthenes themselves say (λέγουσι, 4.78.3) that they are Milesians, the Sigynnai say (λέγουσι, 5.9.3) that they migrated from Media, while the Macedonians say (λέγουσι, 5.22.1) that the Macedonian royal family were originally Greeks. The Athenian clan of the Gephyraioi themselves say (λέγουσι, 5.57.1) that they came from Eretria. The Phoenicians themselves say (λέγουσι, 7.89.2) that they had previously lived by the Red Sea while the names of the tribes of the Cyprians are recorded by Herodotos in accordance with what the Cyprians say (λέγουσι, 7.90). In connection with information about their own history, Herodotos cites as informants Athenians (λέγουσι, 8.41.2 [twice] & 9.73.1), Abderians (λέγουσι, 8.120), Delphians (λέγουσι, 8.39.1), Poteidaians (λέγουσι, 8.129.2), Thracians (λέγουσι and φασί, 7.75.2), Spartans (λέγουσι, 6.52.1, 2 & 8, 6.53.1), Parians (λέγουσι, 6.134.1) as well as the Egyptian priests on numerous occasions.[44] Locals are also cited in connection with information about their own religion, culture and customs. For example, the Skythians say (λέγουσι, 1.105.4) that those who plundered the temple of Aphrodite in Syria, and their descendants, have been afflicted by a disease sent by the goddess. The Enarees say (λέγουσι, 4.67.2) that Aphrodite gave them the art of divination, the Lydians (λέγουσι, 1.93.5) that various games now practiced by both the Lydians and the Greeks had been invented by the Lydians.[45] A story said by the Skythians (λέγεται , 4.7.2) is that anybody who falls

---

[44] See the list in Lloyd, *Intro*, pp.186-187 and Appendix B.

[45] Cf. K.M.T Chrimes, 'Herodotus and the Reconstruction of History' *JHS* 50 (1930), esp. p.90.

asleep during the annual festival of the sacred gold dies within that year. The Cyprians (λέγουσι, 1.105.3), the Chaldaians (λέγουσι, 1.181.5) and the Egyptians (λέγουσι, 2.42.2) also are cited by Herodotos as sources for information about their own customs.

In some of these cases Herodotos indicates that he agrees with the information; occasionally he states that he disagrees.[46] In most cases, however, he makes no explicit comment. When Herodotos cites locals for information which is not contradicted by ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη it is difficult to see why it must be assumed that Herodotos believed the information to be unreliable merely because of the source-attributing words. Instead, most of the information from locals is not unreasonable or illogical and they are the people who might be expected to have the best knowledge. When no opinion is expressed by Herodotos, I believe that the citation of locals by Herodotos through source-attributing words does not suggest doubt. Instead, it is intended to indicate to the audience that particular information was derived from local people who should possess reliable information.

3.5: Consistent Narrative Themes

In this chapter many passages are examined where source-attributing words seem unlikely to indicate that Herodotos has doubts about the reliability of a passage. I accept that each of the passages examined in this chapter is not, in isolation, conclusive evidence that source-attributing words do not imply reserve. We cannot now

---

[46] Agreement: Macedonians (5.22.1), Delphians (6.98.1), Potidaians (8.129.2); disagreement: Gephyraioi (5.57.1), Spartans (6.52).

reconstruct Herodotos' thoughts and opinions except where he specifically provides us with evidence of his position. Nevertheless, the passages where he does express an opinion provide us with a guide which enables us to evaluate other passages. Using this guide, the passages examined in this chapter provide a substantial and weighty body of circumstantial evidence that source-attributing words do not imply reserve by Herodotos.

In Herodotos' description of the deeds and character of certain individuals, his comments on geographical and numeric matters, his reports of the customs of the different races and his relaying of local information, the details in the narrative are consistent with both γνώμη and Herodotean concerns, themes, interests, narrative or attitudes. Reports that Xerxes praised Zopyros and Artemisia or that Kambyses was mad form an integral part of the account of the individual in the *Histories* and, in some cases, provide the climax of Herodotos' account. Simple geographic comparisons, information about numbers, information which Herodotos indicates is accurate elsewhere in the narrative or in authorial commentary and the reports of various customs possess a narrative consistency which makes it unlikely that Herodotos would doubt the information. Herodotos' reliance upon local informants is also such a part of his methodology that it is difficult to see why the citation of local informants through source-attributing words denotes reserve.

Where information possesses an internal narrative consistency, and can be considered in terms of γνώμη to be reliable, it is unlikely that the source-attributing words in the passages are intended by Herodotos to show he doubts the information. Rather, the

passages examined in this chapter, added to those examined in Chapter Two, suggest that there is a substantial number of instances in the *Histories* where it is unlikely that source-attributing words denote reserve. Indeed, the cumulative effect of the passages considered in Chapter Two and Three is to show that passages where source-attributing words either cannot, or are unlikely to, denote reserve are not in the minority but recur throughout the *Histories*.

Chapter 4:

Variant Accounts and Herodotos' Dialogue with the Audience

It is to be expected that different versions of the same event would be heard by Herodotos due to the fluidity and variability in remembered oral tradition and the physical limitations he faced in his inquiries, The transient nature of oral tradition meant that information was not "fixed" in the sense that written records become concrete and unchangeable. A written record has concrete existence in its own right, an oral record does not. Different oral versions of events can occur, accidentally or deliberately, because of any number of reasons including political loyalties, social change, personal prejudice, bias or propaganda, exaggeration, individual interests, special pleadings, aesthetic forms, defective memory or the ability of those retelling the tradition. Later historical methodology required that conflicting accounts be analysed and one version presented to an audience as the preferred version. Herodotos' response was different as he recorded variant accounts throughout the *Histories*,[1] sometimes also providing guidance to the audience about why he did so. The reason Herodotos records variant accounts can be found in the nature of the information available to Herodotos, his historical methodology and his technique of maintaining in his role of *histor* a dialogue with his audience. Instead of a distant, anonymous pose, Herodotos, as *histor*, intrudes his own *persona* into the *Histories* in a very public dialogue

---

[1]   Lateiner, *Method*, pp.84-90, lists 150 passages where alternative versions are recorded by Herodotos.

with his audience about how he collected and analysed his source material. The recording of variant versions, sometimes with express commentary, mostly without, is part of this dialogue with the audience about the processing of information. Indeed, this recording of variants is the feature which most gives the *Histories* its distinctness and serves to distinguish Herodotos' historical methodology from that of other ancient historians, such as Thucydides,[2] and from modern historical technique.

On a number of occasions Herodotos explains his attitude to the various stories he heard, and why he recorded them. This is Herodotos in his role as *histor*, explaining to his audience his criteria for including reports in the *Histories*. For example, in Book Four he comments

προσθήκας γὰρ δή μοι ὁ λόγος ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐδίζητο

(4.30.1)

while in Book Seven he tells his audience

ἐγὼ δὲ ὀφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πείθεσθαί γε μὲν

οὐ παντάπασιν ὀφείλω, καί μοι τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς

πάντα λόγον (7.152.3)[3]

which makes it clear to his audience that he intended throughout his work to seek after subsidiary matters and to set down what he has heard, although he himself was not obliged to believe it. Other statements in the *Histories* stress the same practice.[4] These statements

---

[2] For Thucydides' methodology and a source-attributing word, see H.D. Westlake, 'Λέγεται in Thucydides' *Mnemosyne* 30 (1977), pp.345-362.

[3] The context and content of Herodotos' statement at 7.152.3 is examined in detail below in Chapter 4.2.1.

[4] For example 2.123.1 & 4.195.2.

of purpose do not, however, refer specifically to variant versions of the same event but to the many stories which make up the material upon which the *Histories* are based.

These statements have been used to support the argument that Herodotos records variant accounts simply because they have been told to him.[5] In the most basic sense it is fanciful to suggest that Herodotos did record everything he was told. All historical writing involves some selection and sorting of information. Herodotos was no exception and the *Histories* make it clear that he does not, in fact, record everything he has heard.[6] His selection process is based on his historical purpose as expressed in the *Histories*, the limitations of oral information as a source and the evaluation of information in terms of ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη. The recording of variant accounts results from this evaluation process.

It has been said, with some justification, that alternative versions of stories were reported by Herodotos either from a "genuine inability to choose between the variants or a desire to stress the superiority [of one version] especially when he was anxious to discredit

---

5   Lloyd, *Intro*, p.83, F.J. Groten, Jr., 'Herodotus' Use of Variant Versions' *Phoenix* 17 (1963), pp.79 & 87.

6   For example, in his account of the birth and early life of Kyros, Herodotos notes that he only tells one story although he had heard three other versions (Hdt. 1.95.1). Similarly, Herodotos states (2.70) that there are many ways of hunting crocodiles but choses to relate only the one he thinks most worthy of mention. Herodotos (7.244.1) also knows the names of the three hundred Spartans who died at Thermopylai but (thankfully) does not list them. On other occasions he explicitly declines to record information he has heard about certain religious observances, a statement often made or implied in Book 2; for example, 2.3.2, 46.2, 47.2, 48.3, 51.2, 62.2, 65.2, 81.2 & 123.3. See also Lloyd, *1-98*, pp.17-18.

a popular tradition of which he disapproved".[7] However, some explanation is needed to clarify the circumstances under which Herodotos felt this "genuine inability" to select between variants. This clarification is the purpose of the present chapter in which the function of source-attributing words is an important consideration. The circumstances in which Herodotos would be anxious to stress the superiority of one version are essentially a separate issue related to Herodotos' attempt to distance his record of events from that of others; this is considered in Chapter Seven.

Many variants incorporate source-attributing words. As such, an examination of variant accounts developed from an analysis of the function and role of source-attributing words, advanced in the previous chapters of this study, can provide evidence about the circumstances in which variants are recorded by Herodotos. In Chapter One it was argued that Herodotos intended to produce in the *Histories* a rational explanation of events which would settle the historical record. Accordingly, he needed to indicate to his audience that his record of events was a reliable and accurate record, based on information from authoritative sources evaluated through a rational, objective methodology. Thus, although a storyteller in a direct line from the oral epic poets,[8] Herodotos was predominantly and pre-eminently a methodical researcher employing a historical methodology based upon ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη as the active ingredients in his evaluation of his material and his informants.

---

[7] C. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*, Oxford, 1963, p.32, after Jacoby, *RE*, cols.473-4. Also cited by Lateiner, *Method*, p.83.

[8] This relationship is discussed in Chapter Seven.

A conclusion which resulted from the analysis of Herodotos' expressed opinions and source-attributing words in Chapter Two is also applied and restated in the present chapter. In Chapter Two it was argued that the presence of source-attributing words in a passage by themselves does not imply that Herodotos had reservations about the material he recorded. This is especially relevant in the case of variant accounts as frequently all variants include source-attributing words. To argue that source-attributing words denote reserve would be to argue that all variants are doubted by Herodotos. This seems highly unlikely and confirms that source-attributing words alone do not imply reservations.

In this chapter a number of the variant traditions recorded by Herodotos are examined in order to suggest the circumstances in which Herodotos felt obliged to record variants. First, three passages where Herodotos explicitly states that he cannot decide which variant is the more reliable and leaves it to his audience to decide for themselves are examined. These passages are his accounts of the conflict between Sybaris and Kroton, the immortality of Salmoxis and the death of Polykrates. Second, more complex variant passages which incorporate source-attributing words are examined.

4.1: The Audience must decide:
4.1.1: The Conflict between Sybaris and Kroton

Herodotos' account of the conflict between Sybaris and Kroton is an example of a passage where Herodotos provides his audience with precise indications of his sources for different sections of

the account, the evidence in terms of ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη adduced by each side in support of their version of events, and a clear statement of the inability of the *histor* to judge which version was the more reliable.

The passage occurs when Herodotos (5.42) pauses in his account of the reign of King Kleomenes of Sparta to record details of the death of his brother Dorieus in Italy.[9] Herodotos commences the passage with the statement that Dorieus expected to ascend to a throne of Sparta on the death of his father Anaxandrides, but was disappointed by the selection of his elder brother Kleomenes. As a result, he left Sparta and attempted to establish a colony in Libya but this failed after three years because, according to Herodotos, Dorieus neither consulted Delphi nor did anything else which was customary.[10] Dorieus returned to Sparta and was advised by Antichares of Eleon to establish a colony at Heraklea in Sicily. Dorieus this time obtained the approval of Delphi and sailed with a number of Spartans to Sicily.

This initial section is recorded by Herodotos in narrative form, without variants, source-attributing words, or any indication of his sources.[11] However, when Herodotos records the activities within Sicily variants begin and the source for each version is delineated carefully.

---

[9]   For Dorieus in Herodotos, see A. von Stauffenberg, 'Dorieus' *Historia* 9 (1960), pp.180-215.

[10]   The blessing of the oracle was a key part of Greek colonisation; see Hdt. 4.159, Thu. 3.92, How/Wells, vol.2, p.17, W.G. Forrest, 'Colonisation and the Rise of Delphi' *Historia* 6 (1957), pp.160-175, esp. pp.173-174.

[11]   The generally uncomplimentary passages in the *Histories* about the reign of Kleomenes are usually considered to have been derived from sources in Sparta; How/Wells, vol.2, pp.348-349; cf. A. Griffiths, 'Was Kleomenes Mad?' in A. Powell (ed) *Classical Sparta: Techniques Behind Her Success*, London, 1989, pp.53-55, D.

The account in the *Histories* is as follows. At the time of
Doreius' arrival in Sicily King Telys ruled Sybaris. As the Sybarites say
(ὡς λέγουσι Συβαρῖται, 5.44.1), they were about to attack
Kroton.[12] The Krotoniates asked Dorieus for help and with his
assistance they attacked and captured Sybaris. Herodotos once again
specifically cites his source

ταῦτα μέν νυν Συβαρῖται λέγουσι ποιῆσαι Δωριέα τε

καὶ τοὺς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ (5.44.2)

before recording the version of the people of Kroton. They say (φασί,
5.44.2), in contrast, that they were only aided by the Elean seer Kallias,
who had previously divined for King Telys but had deserted to Kroton
when he was unable to obtain favourable omens for the Sybarite attack
on Kroton. Herodotos again repeats his source citation for this
version, ταῦτα δ᾽ αὖ οὗτοι λέγουσι. (5.45.1)

Herodotos then reports the proofs both sides adduce in
support of their version of the events. The Sybarites first point to a
temple complex beside the dry bed of the River Krathis which they say
(λέγουσι, 5.45.1) Dorieus founded after he had helped capture Sybaris.
They also say that the later death of Dorieus and the destruction of his

---

Boedeker, 'The Two Faces of Demaratus' *Arethusa* 20 (1987), pp.185-201. A
source in Delphi for this passage is also possible. The passage about the
colonisation attempts of Doreius stresses the role of Delphi while the individual
identified by Herodotos, Antichares of Eleon (who is otherwise unknown
[Pape/Benseler, vol.1, p.101]), was a Boiotian from near Tanagra (Pausanias
1.29.5).

12 Herodotos does not reveal why Telys was about to attack Kroton. Diodoros
(12.9.2-6) records that after a period of internal strife in which Telys was
victorious, 500 wealthy Sybarites sought exile in Kroton. The Sybarites insisted
that they be repatriated but the Krotoniates declined and prepared for war. It
seems from Herodotos that they launched a pre-emptive strike!

army at the hands of the Phoenicians and Egestans[13] supports their story because, in involving himself in the overthrow of Sybaris, Dorieus had done far more than the oracle at Delphi had approved. The Krotoniates, in complete contrast, show (ἀποδεικνῦσι, 5.45.2) as supporting evidence the fact that a large parcel of land at Kroton was given to the seer Kallias and none to Dorieus. (Herodotos supports this from his own knowledge, stating that in his own time [καὶ ἐς ἐμέ, 5.45.2] the descendants of Kallias still resided on that land.) The Krotoniates argue that had Dorieus really aided them in the war against Sybaris he would have received far greater gifts of land than those given to Kallias. Herodotos notes that these are the proofs adduced by each side and appends his own authorial comment:

ὁκοτέροισί τις πείθεται αὐτῶν, τούτοισι προσχωρέειν. (5.45.2)

by whichever one of these one is persuaded, this let one adopt.

Herodotos then continues his account, describing the later death of Dorieus and the deeds of some of the Spartan survivors, before returning to the narrative of Kleomenes and Sparta.

The dispute between the variant versions is not about the cause, nor the course, of the conflict. Both variants agree, for example, that Kroton captured Sybaris. Instead, the dispute is about Spartan assistance in the defeat of Sybaris and the local sensibilities this obviously aroused resulted in firmly believed, contradictory, local traditions in Sybaris and Kroton. Faced with these conflicting oral reports, Herodotos' solution was to define precisely through repeated

---

[13]   Reported by Herodotos at 5.46-47.

source-attributing words the identity of each source and the extent of the information he derived from each. In this way the audience is aware of the local informant status of each source and the information each provided. In addition, the proofs offered by each side are also recorded precisely before Herodotos' statement of his own uncertainty and his invitation to the audience to determine the impasse for themselves.

I believe that the reason for Herodotos' authorial expression of uncertainty may be found in his own methodology of adjudicating between of the merits of oral traditions on the basis of ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη, the status of the informants and the evidence adduced by each.

First, ἱστορίη is unable to break the impasse as each informant group had a claim to be considered by Herodotos as an authoritative, local source. Here, the geographical location of the combatants in Southern Italy is relevant, as is the date of the conflict. The destruction of Sybaris by Kroton occurred in approximately 510 B.C. The neighbouring towns of Skidros and Laos sheltered Sybarite refugees until the site of Sybaris was reoccupied in 453/2, again destroyed, and then resettled on Athenian initiative as Thurii in 444/3.[14] Herodotos migrated to Thurii around this date[15] and was

---

[14]   Hdt. 6.21.1, Diodoros 11.90.2-4, 12.10, Plutarch, *Perikles* 11.3, V. Ehrenberg, 'The Foundation of Thurii' *AJPh* 69 (1948), pp.149-150, J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, London, 1980, pp.178-180. The subjection of Sybaris by Kroton is confirmed by numismology; there are coins extant (c.500-490) which show the tripod of Kroton on the obverse and the bull of Sybaris on the reverse: C.M. Kraay, *Greek Coins*, (*GC*) London, 1966, p.310 & plate 92, no.266, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, (*ACGC*), Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1976, nos.578, 579, 580.

[15]   How/Wells, vol.1, p.3, Myres, p.13.

thus in a position to obtain the stories of both sides and to check their proofs as his reference (5.45.2) to the continued habitation of the descendants of Kallias indicates. The descendants were there to be seen and ὄψις would seem to support the account of the Krotoniates. Yet, in this case, ὄψις was not sufficient to settle the dispute in Herodotos' mind and solve his methodological impasse because both Sybarites and Krotoniates had strong claims to credibility in terms of ἰστορίη; they were local informants,[16] retelling their own recent history. As such, they both fulfil some of Herodotos' criteria to be accorded the status of reliable informants. In these circumstances, Herodotos methodology has failed to provide a guide as to the most credible version.

An additional factor behind Herodotos' uncertainty is that the evidence adduced by each side is consistent with his own historical methodology. On the one hand, the Sybarites point to proofs derived from ὄψις and γνώμη, namely, the land grants still held by the descendants of Kallias and the absence of grants to Dorieus. None of the evidence adduced by either side is contrary to γνώμη and could be discounted by Herodotos on that basis; in fact, the proofs of each side are logical and reasonable and act to support the oral traditions of the combatants. In these circumstances Herodotos is unable to reject the

---

[16] Although Sybaris was destroyed there were survivors in surrounding towns whose descendants returned with the Athenian re-occupation of the site; Diodoros 12.11.1-3. Coinage also charts the progress of the refugees. Coins from Laos (c.490), a former colony of Sybaris, show the local river god in a form similar to the Sybarite bull while later (c.450) coins show that the first resettlers of Sybaris were the descendants of the refugees of 510; Kraay, *GC*, *op.cit.* (n.14), p.303, Plate 76 no.215, *ACGC*, pp.172-173, no.585. Another coin (Kraay, *ACGC*, no.584) shows that refugees also went to Poseidonia, another Sybarite colony.

information of either of the Sybarites or Krotoniates through γνώμη as neither was illogical, unlikely, impossible or unnatural. Γνώμη had also produced an impasse.

Herodotos, in brief, did not know who to believe. In this section the information heard by Herodotos emanates from local sources, is reasonable and believable and is supported by additional proofs. Each, in terms of Herodotos' methodology of testing by ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη, have superior claims to be recognised as reliable. Thus, when Herodotos was faced with the prospect of deciding between two accounts from reliable sources which appear equally likely and in support of which plausible proofs are offered, he cannot decide which to relay to the audience as the preferred version. Instead, he records both variants, clearly outlining the information, the sources and the proofs adduced, before, in the role of *histor*, specifically addressing the audience confessing his limitations and leaving it to his audience to accept whichever version they believe is the more credible. In these circumstances there should be no suggestion that the source-attributing words are intended by Herodotos to warn his audience that both stories are unreliable.

4.1.2: The Immortality of Salmoxis

Some of the factors behind Herodotos' inability to adjudicate between the merits of rival versions through his normal methodology can also be found in the description of the immortality of Salmoxis (4.94-96). The passage in the *Histories* is as follows. When Dareios invaded Skythia, he first conquered the Getai, a Thracian tribe to the

west of the Ister River who claim to be immortal (4.94.1). They claim this immortality because they believe that after death they join the god Salmoxis (called by others Gebeleizis). The Getai practice a rite in which a messenger to the god is impaled upon spears. Three spears are held point upwards and a selected man is thrown into the air to fall onto the spear points. If the man dies, the Getai believe the god favours them; if not, they blame the messenger and another is selected in his place.

This section about the religious rite of the Getai and the god Salmoxis is recorded by Herodotos in narrative form without source-attributing words or an indication of his source and there is no evidence in the passage that Herodotos considers the information in any way doubtful. Then, at the end of the account, Herodotos records another story he learnt from the Greeks dwelling around the Hellespont and the Pontos:

ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι τῶν τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον καὶ

Πόντον οἰκεόντων Ἑλλήνων. (4.95.1)

The story of these Greeks as repeated by Herodotos is as follows. Salmoxis was a slave of Pythagoras, son of Mnesarchos, on Samos where he became wealthy and learnt Ionian ways. The Thracians are a simple minded people. When Salmoxis returned home to Thrace, he built a hall where he entertained the foremost of his countrymen, instructing them that neither themselves or their descendants would ever die. At the same time, he secretly built an underground chamber and one day vanished into it. He remained there for three years while the Thracians mourned him. Then, in the fourth year, he reappeared.

Because of this, the Thracians believed Salmoxis' teachings about immortality.

Herodotos concludes this account of the Greeks by keeping the source of the information before the audience by means of a source-attributing word, noting

ταῦτά φασί μιν ποιῆσαι. (4.95.5)

Herodotos then provides his audience with information about his own equivocal position:

ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτου καὶ τοῦ καταγαίου οἰκήματος
οὔτε ἀπιστέω οὔτε ὧν πιστεύω τι λίην, δοκέω δὲ
πολλοῖσι ἔτεσι πρότερον τὸν Σάλμοξιν τοῦτον
γενέσθαι Πυθαγόρεω. εἴτε δὲ ἐγένετό τις Σάλμοξις
ἄνθρωπος, εἴτ᾽ ἐστὶ δαίμων τις Γέτῃσι οὗτος
ἐπιχώριος, χαιρέτω. (4.96)[17]

concerning these things and the subterranean chamber, I neither disbelieve nor
believe either, but I do think that Salmoxis lived many years before
Pythagoras. And whether there was a man Salmoxis, or he is a native god of
the Getai, farewell to him.

Thus, Herodotos explicitly, through testing by a combination of γνώμη and ἱστορίη, does reject one detail of the Greek story as chronologically inaccurate although he does not advise the audience

---

[17] The version of the story of Salmoxis and his chamber of Hellanikos (*Nomima Barbarika*, FGrH 4 F73), may have been in circulation when Herodotos was writing (Drews, p.23). Despite Herodotos' statement, Strabo (7.3.5; 297-298) maintained that "Zamolxis" (sic) had been a slave of Pythagoras and was a priest of the god. Diodoros (1.94.1) merely notes that the Getai claim immortality and were given their laws by Zalmoxis.

about whether he believed Salmoxis was a man, as the Greeks maintain, or a Thracian god.[18]

In this instance testing through ὄψις and γνώμη does not establish the more likely version. One tradition details the religious rites of the Getai and their belief in the existence of their god. Although immortality is beyond normal human experience, Herodotos is mostly reluctant to deprecate the religious beliefs of others[19] or the activities of gods, and thus γνώμη provides an insufficient criterion for testing the veracity of the account. In this case ὄψις is not available, although perhaps had Herodotos been shown the underground chamber by the Greeks he may have been convinced. Thus ὄψις and γνώμη do not resolve the impasse. There remains ἱστορίη.

In terms of ἱστορίη, the conflict between the different versions is between the rational explanation of Greeks as local informants and the religious beliefs of the Getai relayed by an unspecified source. Herodotos' description of the religious beliefs of the Getai may have emanated from the Getai directly and been relayed through other informant groups as the contrast implicit in the "ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι" (4.95.1) does not exclude other Greeks as conduits of the details of Getai religion and religious rites.[20] Yet, the source for the rites is not identified by Herodotos which either suggests that the informants are not of sufficient authority to enhance the credibility of the account or that the oral tradition was not derived by Herodotos

---

[18] Cf. Marincola, 'p.129.

[19] See for example, Hdt. 2.123.1 and footnote 24 following.

[20] The formula "the Persians say", for example, does not mean that Herodotos derived the information from Persians directly, only that a Persian tradition was related; see, Chapter 3, footnote 20.

from a specific, homogeneous group which could be cited. On the other hand, the Greeks dwelling on the Hellespont and the Pontos, which was adjacent to the location given by Herodotos for the Getai (4.93), have the status of local informants[21] and their account advances a rational explanation for otherwise improbable phenomena. Thus both γνώμη and ἱστορίη support their version of the story.

This rationality is highlighted by the section of the account specifically rejected by Herodotos on chronological grounds; that is, that Salmoxis was the slave of Pythagoras on Samos. The Greeks of the Black Sea region did not have any status as local informants for information about events on Samos. Accordingly, their information about Pythagoras did not have the same credibility as their information about events in Thrace and it was rejected by Herodotos, possibly because of contrary information heard by him when he lived on Samos.[22] Given the elaboration inherent in the transmission of oral traditions,[23] it is likely that the teaching of a doctrine of immortality was enough to link Pythagoras to the tradition about Salmoxis and his

---

[21] Herodotos may have used a literary source such as Damastes of Sigeum: J.S. Morrison, 'Pythagoras of Samos' *CQ* (ns) 6 (1956), p.139 & n.3. However, it is more likely that Herodotos received the information when he travelled in the region: Myres, pp.5-6, R.P. Lister, *The Travels of Herodotus*, London & New York, 1979, pp.45-73, Pritchett, pp.235-241; cf. O. K. Armayor, 'Did Herodotos ever go to the Black Sea?' *HSCPh* 82 (1978), p.46-49.

[22] For the impact of Samos and Samian informants on the *Histories*, see Chapter 1.4 and Chapter One, footnotes 46-52. There is another possibility. Pythagoras left Samos to settle in Kroton (Diogenes Laertius, 8.3), a city in which Herodotos had informants as the section on the conflict between Kroton and Sybaris shows.

[23] Not least over the name "Salmoxis". It appears in later tradition as "Zamolxis" (Strabo, 7.3.5; 297-298) and "Zalmoxis" (Diodoros, 1.94.1).

teachings remembered in oral tradition by the Black Sea Greeks.[24] For details about events in Thrace, however, the Black Sea Greeks were local informants repeating a rational explanation for otherwise unnatural events and so their information has credibility under Herodotos' criteria. Although Herodotos does specifically disagree with a minor part of the Greek story, its essential elements, that Salmoxis lived among the Ionians of Samos and took wealth and learning back to Thrace where he taught his doctrine and then disappeared into an underground shelter, remain unchallenged by him.[25]

Despite the regard that Herodotos placed on the information of the Black Sea Greeks, he does not challenge the religious beliefs of others[26] unless he has conclusive evidence to the contrary provided by ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη. Yet, in this instance ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη do not provide Herodotos with a clear indication of which account was the more reliable. Herodotos had heard two stories, both of which contained features which to some extent fulfilled his criteria

---

[24] For example, it was widely known that Pythagoras lived on Samos and taught the doctrine of the transmigration of the soul and so it was probably a logical conclusion by persons reporting the story to suppose that he had passed on his doctrine to Salmoxis: E. Zeller, *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*, 13th ed., (Dover ed) London, 1980, Morrison, *op.cit.*, (n.21), pp.136-137. This view relies upon the assumption of the Black Sea Greeks that a simple minded barbarian must have learnt his doctrine from the Greek sophist; Hartog, pp.98-100. Herodotos elsewhere (2.123.2) speaks about the immortality of the soul as an Egyptian doctrine; in this he is mistaken: Lloyd, *99-182*, pp.59-60.

[25] Cf. D. Asheri, 'Herodotus on Thracian Society and History' in *Hérodote et les peuples non grecs* (Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique 35, Genève, 1988), p.148.

[26] See especially Herodotos' comments in Book 2: Lloyd, *1-98*, pp.17-19, W. Burkert, 'Herodot als Historiker fremder Religionen' in *Hérodote et les peuples non grecs* (*ibid.*), p.24.

of γνώμη and ἱστορίη. The first account details the religious beliefs of a barbarian people, and may have been indirectly derived from them; in religion, things otherwise physically impossible are possible. The second account emanated from local sources who tell a credible, rationalising, story. The one source-attributing word, on the face of Herodotos' express statement of disbelief with another small section of the story, cannot here have the force of implied disbelief. Instead, a small piece of information is specifically rejected on the basis of γνώμη and ἱστορίη. Instead, the source-attributing word provides information to the audience of the identity of a local source which might be expected by that Greek audience to be reliable.

In these conditions, Herodotos' methodology has resulted in another impasse and Herodotos does not know who to believe. The absence of specific direction to the audience by Herodotos plus the ambiguity in his language while narrating his account of the rites of the Getai[27] makes it clear that Herodotos leaves the reliability of both variants open as possible explanations. This is because neither story could conclusively be judged by Herodotos as superior to the other in terms of ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη. Having gathered the information, Herodotos presents it to his audience together with the source information for one version and leaves it open for them to decide which version to believe. The decision remains with the audience and because, in part, of the evidence provided by Herodotos through source-attributing words, this can be an informed decision.

---

[27] Detailed by Hartog, pp.86-87.

4.1.3: Oroites and Polykrates of Samos

The passage describing why Oroites, the Persian governor of Sardis, brought about the death of Polykrates of Samos is another instance in which Herodotos discloses that an impasse has occurred. The passage commences with the statement that Oroites desired to kill Polykrates even though Polykrates had not wronged him in any way. Two versions of Oroites' motivation are recorded by Herodotos. Herodotos first notes that the majority say it was for this reason:

ὡς μὲν οἱ πλεῦνες λέγουσι, διὰ τοιήνδε τινὰ αἰτίην.[28]

(3.120.1)

The majority say that Oroites was taunted by another Persian governor, Mitrobates of Daskyleion, because he had not conquered the nearby island of Samos. Stung by this taunt, Oroites determined to destroy Polykrates. In contrast, the minority say (οἱ δὲ ἐλάσσονες λέγουσι, 3.121.1) that Oroites sent a herald to Samos with some request (although it was not said what this request was: οὐ γὰρ ὦν δὴ τοῦτό γε λέγεται, 3.121.1). Polykrates, in conversation with Anakreon of Teos, by accident or design rudely ignored Oroites' herald. Herodotos concludes the passage with an authorial comment

αἰτίαι μὲν δὴ αὗται διφάσιαι λέγονται τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Πολυκράτεος γενέσθαι, πάρεστι δὲ πείθεσθαι ὁκοτέρῃ τις βούλεται αὐτέων (3.122.1)

These then are the conflicting reasons told for the death of Polykrates, believe whichever of them you wish

---

28 For αἰτίη (cause), contrasted with πρόφασις (an alleged reason or pretext), see Chapter 2, footnote 45.

thus declining to guide the audience about which version he believes provides the best explanation of the motivation of Oroites.

The motivation behind a decision or action is often difficult for an inquirer to identify. A motive, unlike an event or action, is not concrete or capable of discernment by informed observation. Dissemination, justification or even idle speculation by interested but uninformed parties tend to obscure rather than reveal the real motive for action. In addition, unless the person concerned is the immediate informant (and they tell the truth), the discrete nature of motivation means that speculation, rather than more reliable information, is the base material against which $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta$ or $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau o\rho\acute{\iota}\eta$ are applied. For these reasons, a credible investigation of motivation requires either sources with excellent reliability credentials, a rational account, or both, in order to identify the most reliable version.

In this instance, Herodotos is unable to decide which version is more reliable through his usual methodology. Neither version fulfils the tests to be definitive in terms of $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau o\rho\acute{\iota}\eta$; no source is identified and so neither account can claim to be derived from superior sources, such as local informants. One version does gain authority by being identified by Herodotos as the majority view.[29] In contrast, the minority view gains verisimilitude through naming a specific individual, Anakreon of Teos.[30] As such, neither version is superior in terms of

---

[29] Which majority is not specified: cf. the majority of the Greeks as at 1.75.4, 6.75.3.

[30] An account in which specific people are named as participants seems to be, at face value, more authentic than one which only refers to shadowy, unnamed, people. See, for example, Hdt. 1.2, where he notes that the Persians are unable to identify the names of the Greeks who landed in Tyre to abduct the king's daughter. In this instance, the naming of Anakreon of Teos does not suggest a

ἰστορίη. Second, γνώμη does not resolve the impasse. Either story is plausible through γνώμη in terms of the themes expressed in the *Histories*. For example, expansionism is a Persian custom[31] and a substantial part of the *Histories* records the expansion of the Persian empire under successive kings. Thus, a taunt by a Persian governor to another suggesting that easy pickings have not been added to the King's domains is logically consistent with one of the narrative themes of the *Histories* and is likely to have been accepted by Herodotos as a reasonable catalyst for the action of Oroites. In contrast, Polykrates was a tyrant (whose achievements on Samos are underemphasised by the informants of Herodotos),[32] and tyrants in the *Histories* act contrary to law and custom.[33] To illtreat a herald, even by ignoring him, is contrary to accepted custom and is both an act consistent with

---

source from Teos as Anakreon was a poet well known in antiquity; see the entry in *OCD*, 2nd ed., p.57.

[31] Xerxes (Hdt.7.8.1α) gives the Persian custom of expansion as a reason for invading Greece. For Persian expansionism as a theme of the *Histories*, see J.A.S. Evans, 'The Dream of Xerxes and the *Nomoi* of the Persians' *CJ* 57 (1961), pp.109-111, 'Despotes *Nomos*' *Athenaeum* 43 (1965), pp.149-150, Immerwahr, p.24; cf. Pohlenz, pp.1-2, Myres, pp.60-61.

[32] Herodotos praises Samian achievements and twice (3.60.1 & 4) states that they are the reason for his lengthy account of Samos but he does not link them to Polykrates; cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 1313B. There is no inconsistency in accepting that Herodotos was influenced by Samian sources who, while they could not dissociate Polykrates from his military successes and wealth, stressed that the building programmes were the achievements of the Samians as a whole: Mitchell, *op.cit.* (n.21), pp.82-84, G. Shipley, *A History of Samos 800-188 BC*, Oxford, 1987, pp.75-79; cf. M. White, 'The Duration of the Samian Tyranny' *JHS* 74 (1954), pp. 40-41, J.P. Barron, 'The Sixth-Century Tyranny at Samos' *CQ* 14 (1964), p.214.

[33] Both included as *nomos*. See generally Chapter 3.3 and, in connection with Kambyses and his ignoring of *nomos*, Chapter 3.1.3.

tyranny and one which would lead to retribution from the gods.[34] This version of the story, when evaluated by γνώμη, is consistent with Herodotos' views on causation and is thus not improbable. Accordingly, both explanations have some claim to be reliable under γνώμη and neither can be excluded as impossible, unnatural or unlikely.

While Herodotos' indecision in the case of the conflict between Sybaris and Kroton was a result of two excellent sources, telling logical stories supported by evidence, this passage is almost the opposite. The sources are equally unimpressive and there is no supporting evidence. Yet, the motives expressed are plausible and the audience would be interested in information about as prominent a figure as Polykrates. As such, the stories have value and the source-attributing words citing the basis of the accounts in oral tradition show the audience that the stories recorded in the *Histories* are not speculation by Herodotos. The evaluation of motivation by the *histor* has proved, however, to be inconclusive because of the lack of status of the informants and the extent of their information. In terms of ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη, Herodotos has failed to establish the more reliable account and so he again indicates to the audience his inability

---

34   Both stories maintain that Polykrates died because of the enmity of a jealous satrap, thus fulfilling the Greek formula where disaster follows excessive good fortune which excites the jealousy of the gods: Hdt. 3.40-43 (especially 3.40), 3.124-128. The perils of illtreating heralds are shown by Hdt. 7.133-137. In reality, however, Polykrates was an ally of Mitrobates who was also killed by Oroites (Hdt. 3.126.2). It seems likely that Oroites was attempting to establish a western empire in the period when Dareios had his hands full: Mitchell, *op.cit.* (note 21), p.85. Significantly, when Dareios was secure he had Oroites executed (Hdt. 3.127-128).

to settle the historical record and to decide between conflicting accounts. The *histor* has again provided the audience with the evidence he collected and an identification, such as it is, of the sources and allows the audience to form their own judgment.

4.1.4: When Can Herodotos not Decide?

It has been argued that logic demands the conclusion that when Herodotos records more than one story he must think that one of them at least is false.[35] This may be true in some instances although the evidence of the above passages suggests that this need not be the case. Instead, I believe that variants are recorded when Herodotos' critical methodology of reliance on ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη produces an impasse because different accounts have relatively balanced claims to be believed. In these circumstances, Herodotos cannot make up his mind and because of this genuine inability to decide he records the variant versions and, in the passages examined above, specifically advises the audience that he, as *histor*, can take the historical record no further. The *histor*, however, does provide the audience with as much detail about informants, the information they provide and supporting evidence as he has himself. He also provides the identity of the source when it is a relevant consideration. The audience is then given the responsibility to resolve the impasse to their own satisfaction and in line with their own biases and judgment.

The precise reason for the impasse varies in each of the passages considered above. In the passage about the conflict between

---

[35] Lateiner, *Method*, p.22.

Sybaris and Kroton, both sides have strong claims under ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη to be considered reliable. Both were local informants telling a logical and reasonable story of their own recent history and both adduced supporting evidence. In the passage about the immortality of Salmoxis, in contrast, γνώμη and ἱστορίη were in conflict: the account of the religious beliefs of the Getai was contradicted by a story told by local informants relaying a rational explanation for otherwise improbable phenomena. In the passage about Oroites' motivation, both versions are oral traditions of some value, whatever the lack of status of the informants in terms of ἱστορίη, and are logical under γνώμη because they are both consistent with the themes of the *Histories*.

Thus, although the reason for Herodotos' uncertainty varies in each of the passages, the consistent factor is that, in terms of Herodotos' methodological criteria of ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη, each variant fulfils some of the criteria for belief. Herodotos' critical methodology has produced an impasse and it is this which creates a "genuine inability" to decide. When the decision about who to believe is especially difficult because the claims of each variant to be reliable are particularly balanced, Herodotos provides the audience with information about his sources, any evidence they provide and invites the audience to make up their own minds from that information. The *histor* has made the inquiries but is unable to guide the audience further.

4.2: Complex Variant Accounts

In most passages where variants occur, however, Herodotos neither rejects or commends one version nor instructs the audience to decide for themselves. When Herodotos makes no direct authorial comment, what indications can be found to show why these variants are recorded by Herodotos? Many of the variants, which consist of a single phrase or sentence, provide no evidence to assist the inquiry. However, examination of some of the longer, more complex variant passages can provide some conclusions. Three complex passages are analysed below: the record of embassies from the Hellenes to the Argives (7.148-152) and to Gelon (7.153-162) prior to Xerxes' invasion of Greece and the report of the conflict between Athens and Argos (5.80-89). The analysis of these passages suggests that, although Herodotos did not specifically make a comment to the audience about why he reported the variants, they were in fact recorded because of an impasse generated by Herodotos' methodology of reliance on ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη.

4.2.1: The Hellenic Embassy to Argos

The different stories in the variant passages which seek to explain why the Argives did not join the alliance of the Hellenes against Xerxes' invasion of 480 warrant examination because, first, they provide another example of the difficulty in determining motivation and, second, because Herodotos incorporates into the section on the

embassy a statement explaining to the audience why he records different information.

Herodotos first records (7.148.1) that the Hellenes sent messengers to Argos asking for assistance against Xerxes. The *Histories* then record three variant accounts; the first the story of the Argives themselves (hereafter called the first variant), the second a story reported widely throughout Greece (the second variant), the third an oral account from an unspecified source (the third variant).

From the beginning, Herodotos through source-attributing words ensures that his audience is frequently reminded that the first variant he records is the story of the Argives. The Argives say (Ἀργεῖοι δὲ λέγουσι, 7.148.2) that they had known for some time that the Persians intended to invade Greece. As Argos had recently been defeated by Kleomenes and the Spartans, losing six thousand men,[36] they asked Delphi whether they should join the alliance against Persia. The Pythia advised the Argives

κεφαλὴν πεφύλαξο· κάρη δὲ τὸ σῶμα σαώσει (7.148.3)[37]

---

[36] If this figure is in any way accurate it represents a major loss of Argive man-power. The Argive army at Mantinea in 418 BC was about 5,000 men which represented most of their active troops. The Argive losses in that battle, a defeat, were under 700 men but it was enough to overthrow the democracy in Argos and establish an oligarchy; Thu. 5.68, 74.3, 75, A.W. Gomme, A. Andrewes & K.J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol.4, Oxford, 1970, pp.110-117.

[37] This phrase has been variously explained; A.D. Godley, *Herodotus, Books V-VII*, Cambridge Mass. & London, 1922, p.456, How/Wells, vol.2, p.188, Macan, *VII-IX*, vol.1, part 1, p.202. There is a similar phrase in another oracular statement recorded by Herodotos just prior to the Argive oracle which was supposedly given as a response to the Athenians (οὔτε γὰρ ἡ κεφαλὴ μένει ἔμπεδον οὔτε τὸ σῶμα , 7.140.2). This response is inconsistent with the Athenian political

which they interpreted as a warning not to join the alliance. Despite this warning and their fear of disregarding the oracle, the Argives advised the Hellenes that they would join the alliance against Persia on two conditions. First, Sparta must agree to a thirty year truce with Argos and, second, Argos must be granted command of one-half of the Greek forces. The Argives say that this was the answer of their Council

ταῦτα μὲν λέγουσι τὴν βουλὴν ὑποκρίνασθαι (7.149.1)

and that their reason for requesting the truce was to allow their children to become men. For they believed that, if they suffered further losses at the hands of the Persians, Argos would fall easy prey to the Spartans. The Spartans among the messengers replied that the matter of the thirty year treaty must be referred to their own assembly but that Sparta would not relinquish any part of the command of the Greek forces.[38] At that, say the Argives (οἱ ’Αργεῖοί φασι , 7.149.3), they refused to join the alliance as they considered it better to be ruled by foreigners than give way to the Spartans. The first variant concludes with a further identification by Herodotos of the source of the account

αὐτοὶ μὲν ’Αργεῖοι τοσαῦτα τούτων πέρι λέγουσι

(7.150.1)

which makes it clear to the audience that the information recorded was the account of the Argives themselves explaining their reasons for not entering the conflict on the Greek side.

---

system (Macan, *VII-IX*, vol.1, p.187) which makes it inadvisable to argue about a precise meaning in the context of the Argive political system.

[38] The Spartans replied that they could not compel either of the Spartan kings to give up their command. Since the law had been passed already that only one of the Spartan kings could accompany the army (Hdt. 5.75.2), the Spartan reply to the Argives was evasion.

The second variant Herodotos indicates was widely reported "throughout Greece"

ἔστι δὲ ἄλλος λόγος λεγόμενος ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

(7.150.1)

This variant was as follows. Before Xerxes invaded Greece, he sent a messenger to Argos who, it is said (λέγεται, 7.150.2), told the Argives that the Persians were descendants of the Argive Perseus. Because of this shared kinship, he urged Argos not to campaign against Persia. The messenger also assured the Argives that if Argos stayed aloof from the war Xerxes would hold them in the highest regard. The Argives gave no answer at that time but when the Hellenes requested aid they sought part of the command, knowing that the Spartans would not agree. In this way they had a pretext (πρόφασις)[39] for remaining out of the conflict. Some of the Greeks say (λέγουσί τινες Ἑλλήνων, 7.151) that the story of the Persian messenger is confirmed by an event which occurred many years afterwards. When Kallias and the other Athenian envoys were in Susa,[40] Argive envoys were also present and asked Artaxerxes if the friendship they had previously with Xerxes still held. Artaxerxes replied in the affirmative.

After recording this variant, Herodotos expresses an authorial view. He cannot accurately say (οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν, 7.152.1)

---

[39]   See footnote 28 above.

[40]   Around 448 BC. Whether a formal "Peace of Kallias" was signed between Persia and Athens is unclear but it is agreed that Kallias, son of Hipponikos, one of the wealthiest and most prominent Athenians of his time led an Athenian embassy to Susa; R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford, 1972, pp.145-147 and Appendix 8 'The Debate on the Peace of Callias', pp.487-495.

whether Xerxes did send a messenger to Argos or if the Argives went to Susa for an audience with Artaxerxes,

> οὐδέ τινα γνώμην περὶ αὐτῶν ἀποφαίνομαι ἄλλην γε ἢ
> τήν περ αὐτοὶ Ἀργεῖοι λέγουσι. (7.152.1)

neither do I declare my opinion about those stories other than that which the Argives themselves say.

Herodotos then declares that others had done far worse things than the Argives[41] and comments

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

I have an obligation to say the things said, but no obligation to believe everything, and let that statement apply to my entire record.

Following these varied authorial statements, Herodotos reveals that there was another story told (λέγεται, 7.152.3) that the Argives invited the Persians into Greece because of their hostility to Sparta. Herodotos gives no further details of the third variant; instead, he marks the end of the section about the Hellenic embassy to Argos with a repeated notification of oral sources:

> τὰ μὲν περὶ Ἀργείων εἴρηται. (7.153.1)

Herodotos therefore recorded three stories which seek to explain the motivation of Argos for remaining outside the conflict between Xerxes and the Hellenes. The section contains a number of direct authorial comments by Herodotos and all variant versions

---

41   οὕτω [δὴ] οὐδ᾽ Ἀργείοισι αἴσχιστα πεποίηται (7.152.3).

incorporate source-attributing words. The implication is that all variants emanate from oral tradition which, when tested through ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη, have some claim to be considered reliable.

The third variant gains little support from the narrative;[42] it is briefly mentioned, reported without any supporting evidence or detail such as named individuals, has no source identified and follows Herodotos' authorial comment on the previous variants. However, the third variant does possess some authority through γνώμη and ἱστορίη; the depth of Argive hostility to Sparta was widely known and the story was current in oral tradition. Thus, while the third variant lacks any of the firm indicators of veracity inherent in versions one and two, it was not impossible and so is recorded by Herodotos, however briefly. In contrast, the first two variants have strong claims to reliability under Herodotos' usual criteria.

The second variant scores strongly under ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη for a numbers of reasons. In terms of ἱστορίη, the story was apparently widely known throughout Greece and the source citation indicates this fact. The account is also not unreasonable under γνώμη as claims to common kinship are elsewhere reported by Herodotos.[43] The veracity of the second variant is also strengthened by the existence of additional proof in the form of information from the later embassy to Persia and the naming of the Athenian envoy. This means that the second variant is a widely believed, credible story, supported by additional evidence. Usually, this should be enough to resolve any

---

[42] The story that the Argives invited the Persians to Greece runs contrary to all the other facts reported in the narrative which tie the invasion to Persian expansion and the desire for revenge against Athens (Hdt. 7.5-8).

[43] Hdt. 7.157.

doubt in Herodotos' mind about which account was the more likely. That he does not state his preference for this variant is a measure of the credibility of the first variant measured in terms of γνώμη and ἱστορίη.

In fact, it could be said that it is Herodotos' critical methodology which has created the impasse and leads to his recording of all three variants. Herodotos was not an uncritical reporter of accounts and certainly the Argive version of their own motivation was self-seeking. Yet, the Argive version, in terms of γνώμη and ἱστορίη, had claims to be considered reliable. First, their account gains prominence by being recorded first, in considerable detail including direct speech.[44] Second, the existence of an oracle from Delphi, cited by Herodotos, supports the Argive claim. Despite later criticism doubting the authenticity of this oracle,[45] there is little doubt that Herodotos both viewed it as authentic and as evidence supporting the Argive story. Third, Argives retelling Argive deliberations have the status of "local informants" which imparts an authority to their account. Given the criteria of belief previously considered, we could expect that Herodotos would be reluctant to criticise the Argive account, and this in fact is the case. It is certainly true to say that Herodotos considered the Argives were guilty of remaining aloof from

---

[44] The variant recorded first is often the one which Herodotos later states he accepts is accurate. Examples include the extent of Egypt (2.10-18), Kambyses' invasion of Egypt (3.1-3) and the reason for Kleomenes' madness (6.75.3-84). However, this is not always the case; for example, the reason for the Nile floods (2.19-26) or the origins of the Skythians (4.5-13).

[45] Fontenrose, pp.128, 315-316, R. Crahay, *La Littérature Oraculaire chez Hérodote*, Bibliothéque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 138 (1956), pp.321-324.

the conflict with Persia, and thus aided the enemy.[46] Yet, while this conclusion is elsewhere expressed specifically by Herodotos, it is not stated in the current passage. Instead, Herodotos ambiguously suggests that others had done far worse than the Argives.

This ambiguity is a direct result of the credibility of the Argives as locals and the logic of their claim. Herodotos may have doubts about their story but despite the strong variant tradition Herodotos does not specifically reject the Argive claim. Instead, he records the account of the Argives, at the same time through source-attributing words (λέγουσι three times and φασί) continuously placing the source of the account before the audience. The audience was then aware of the identity of Herodotos' source and could evaluate the information for themselves. In these circumstances of balance in terms of Herodotos' criteria for belief, Herodotos was not able to establish conclusively which version was the more reliable. Thus, he recorded all versions, provided an ambivalent authorial comment and implicitly left it to the audience to decide which version they preferred.

The reason for this ambivalent comment by Herodotos is not because he feared offending a section of his audience. Herodotos' audience was not limited to Athenians, Ionians or those who fought the Persians and there is evidence that the narration of some sections of

---

[46] At 8.73.3 Herodotos states that those who remained neutral in the war were, in reality, Medisers. Yet, even here, he is aware that there would be contrary opinions and he hedges his statement with εἰ δὲ ἐλευθέρως ἔξεστι εἰπεῖν. Elsewhere in the narrative Herodotos records Argive assistance to Persia; Hdt. 9.12, How/Wells, vol.2, pp.290-291. The nearest Herodotos comes to criticism of the Argives in the section under discussion is when he notes (7.145.1) that those who were of the better way of thinking formed the Hellenic Alliance.

Herodotos' record is less than critical of certain of the Medising Greeks.[47] In addition, where Herodotos was convinced of the accuracy of accounts through ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη he was not reluctant to state his favourable opinion, at the same time specifically rejecting other versions. Where ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη conclusively established the credibility of accounts Herodotos was more than prepared to state his opinion although he might offend sections of his audience. Instead, his ambivalence in this instance is a result of a methodological impasse. Where his critical methodology produced an impasse, Herodotos' solution was to record the accounts, detailing clearly the source for each account, the information they provide, and any supporting evidence so that the audience has the same information as Herodotos and is able to decide from the facts presented which of the variants they consider the most credible.

In summary, Herodotos heard three contradictory stories about why the Argives failed to join the alliance against Xerxes.[48] Variant one fulfilled some of Herodotos' criteria for belief because it emanated from local informants, variant two because it was widely accepted and was supported by additional evidence. Variant three, although not as strongly supported as the other two versions, seems to have gained some adherents among those hostile to Argos and was a logical explanation of events. Accordingly, all three had some claim to

---

[47] See my article, 'Herodotos' Sources for the Plataiai Campaign' *AC* 61 (1992), esp. pp.95-97.

[48] The stories agree in some details, it is the emphasis which is different. In the account hostile to the Argives they asked for partial command, knowing it would be refused, in order to create the pretext enabling them to avoid conflict with Persia.

invasion of Sicily which he only defeated at Himera on the same day as the battle of Salamis.[51] Thus, Gelon had helped Greece as best he could, sending money to Delphi because, due to the invasion, he was not able to send troops.

The first part of this section contains a detailed, dramatic record of the embassy to Gelon without source-attributing words, qualification or authorial insertion and the Spartan envoy is named.[52] The contrast with the section on the Argive embassy, with its narrative form and repeated source-attributing words detailing the informants for each section, is evident. In the Gelon passage, Herodotos gives no indication of his sources which suggests that the source or sources for this information would not be considered by the Greek audience to lend credibility to the account. Part of the information about the embassy may have been derived by Herodotos from sources in Sicily; his record of the deeds of the ancestors of Gelon does cite the Sicilians as a source for some of the details

ὁ δὲ λέγεται πρὸς τῆς Σικελίης τῶν οἰκητόρων (7.153.4)

and contains words of Sicilian origin.[53] In contrast, the naming of an otherwise unknown Spartan may imply a Spartan source[54] while the

---

[51] Hdt. 7.166, Aristotle, *Poetics* 23 (1459A); cf. Diodoros 11.24.1.

[52] It has been argued that Herodotos' entire account of the embassy to Gelon is fabrication: P. Treves, 'Herodotus, Gelon, and Pericles' *CPh* 36 (1941), pp.321-345; cf. P.A. Brunt, 'The Hellenic League Against Persia' (Addendum A) *Historia* 2 (1953/4), pp.158-162.

[53] For example, γαμόρους and Κυλλυρίων (7.155.2); How/Wells, vol.2, p.194. The tone of the account is generally hostile to Gelon, thus where Sicilian informants are implied they would possibly have little cause to laud the memory of the founder of the Deinomenid dynasty.

[54] Syagros of Sparta is otherwise unknown. The name is unusual enough for Athenaios (9.401) to cite Herodotos' use of it when making a point about its

speech to Gelon in which the primacy of Athenian heritage is stressed (7.161) suggests an Athenian source for this part of the account.[55] Thus, the report of Herodotos about the embassy to Gelon is most likely to be a combination of various pieces of information from different sources, presented as an entire account without indication of variants, qualifications or sources. There is no evidence in the *Histories* that Herodotos has doubts about the reliability of any part of this account of the embassy and it is likely that this is Herodotos' preferred version. However, because of the composite nature of the information it was probably not possible for Herodotos to cite his sources in order to establish conclusively the reliability of the first account.

Motives, as noted, are difficult for an inquirer to establish and in this instance testing through ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη did not result in the rejection of the Sicilian version. This was because Herodotos was faced with an account of the motivation of Gelon, told by the Sicilians which, although it may be self-seeking, is still the account of locals recalling their own history. Under ἱστορίη it had a claim to be considered reliable. In addition, the account of the

---

meaning. As such, this may be an exceptional case where other city's informants remembered non-locals and it is probable that the Sicilian tradition may have recalled his unusual name. The absence of a patronymic supports this view.

[55]   L. Solmsen, 'Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Battle of Plataea' *CPh* 39 (1944), p.249 has acutely noted in another context that the insertion into the narrative of the *Histories* of recollections of Athenian achievements is unlikely to be contemporary but is rather a result of later embellishment when the question of which city had done the most to save Greece had become a propaganda issue: see also J.A.S. Evans, 'Herodotus and Athens: The Evidence of the *Encomium*' *AC* 48 (1979), pp.113-114. In similar fashion, this laudatory speech, which omits any information about the name of the Athenian envoy, is likely to be later embellishment.

Sicilians was supported by other evidence based on γνώμη. First, the Carthaginian invasion of Sicily was both real enough and strong enough to have threatened seriously Gelon's hold on Sicily. Second, although the story of Gelon's money has been doubted as later propaganda,[56] there was other evidence at Delphi, of which Herodotos may have been aware, which supports the Sicilian claim.[57] Despite suspicions of self-seeking implicit in both the dedication at Delphi and in the tradition heard in Sicily by Herodotos, it is supported by ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη. On other occasions, as outlined in Chapter Two, Herodotos was ready to make his own opinion clear and reject accounts which were contrary to ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη. In this passage, however, he was faced with the information of the Sicilians, telling of their own history. The first version cannot compete with the Sicilian version in terms of ἱστορίη as the Sicilians are the local informants. Under these conditions Herodotos records the variant without explicit comment and shows the audience using source-attributing words that the variant is the account of the Sicilians. His

---

[56]   G.B. Grundy, *The Great Persian War*, London, 1901, pp.247-256, How/Wells, vol.2, p.199. Pollux (9.88) reports that Gelon was so short of money at this time that he collected women's jewellery to finance the war against Carthage. This has some support; Kraay, *op.cit.*, *ACGC*, (n14) p.210, notes the very small scale minting of coins by Gelon in the 480s in contrast to the massive increase after his victory at Himera.

[57]   An epigram engraved on a tripod dedication from Gelon at Delphi states:

πολλὴν δὲ παρασχεῖν σύμμαχον Ἕλλησιν χεῖρ' ἐς ἐλευθερίην

Schol. Pindar, *Pythian* 1.76 = Simonides fr. 170 (J.M. Edmonds, *Lyra Graeca*, Vol.2, London, 1924, T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, 4th ed., 1882, No. 141, p.485). Meiggs/Lewis, No.28, pp.60-61, record another dedication by Gelon at Delphi commemorating his victory at Himera.

assumption is that, with the evidence before them, the audience will decide for themselves whom to believe.

4.2.3: The Conflict between Athens and Aigina

The last complex variant to be considered in this chapter is Herodotos' report of the hostilities between Athens and Aigina. The first passage about the conflict (5.80-89) outlines the reason for their enmity and narrates the early hostilities while the second (6.87-94, with a further reference at 7.144.1) details their hostilities in the years between the Persian invasions of 490 and 480 BC.[58] These passages include many of the features of the variants previously considered; specifically indicated sources, authorial comment including Herodotos' expressed disbelief of some information, and direct narrative. As such, the section can be used to exemplify and clarify the conclusions suggested from the analysis of the passages earlier in this chapter.

The first passage about the conflict follows Herodotos' description of Kleomenes' invasion of Attika to reinstate Isagoras. The narrative is as follows. While the Spartans attacked across the Isthmus, the Boiotians and Chalkidians attacked Attika from different directions (5.74.2). The Spartans, however, retreated without a fight and the Athenians defeated the Boiotians and Chalkidians in separate

---

[58] On the chronology of the conflict see, N.G.L. Hammond, 'Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.' *Historia* 4 (1955), pp.371-411, L.H. Jeffery, 'The Campaign Between Athens and Aegina in the Years Before Salamis (Herodotus, VI, 87-93)' *AJPh* 83 (1962), pp.44-54, H.B. Mattingly, 'Athens and Aigina' *Historia* 16 (1967), pp.1-5, A.J. Podlecki, 'Athens and Aegina' *Historia* 25 (1976), pp.396-413, Figueira, pp.49-74 & ''The Chronology of the Conflict between Athens and Aegina in Herodotus Bk.6' *QUCC* 20 (1988), pp.49-87.

battles (5.77.1-2). The Thebans consulted Delphi after their defeat and, in response to the oracle, asked Aigina to aid them against Athens (5.79-81). The Aiginetans, remembering their ancient enmity to the Athenians

ἔχθρης παλαιῆς ἀναμνησθέντες ἐχούσης ἐς Ἀθηναίους

(5.81.2)

attacked the coastline of Attika without first sending a herald to Athens to declare war. To explain this enmity between Athens and Aigina, Herodotos records earlier events involving yet another city, Epidauros:

ἡ δὲ ἔχθρη ἡ προοφειλομένη ἐς Ἀθηναίους ἐκ τῶν Αἰγινητέων ἐγένετο ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοιῆσδε. (5.82.1)

the long-standing, unappeased enmity felt towards the Athenians from the Aiginetans began in this way.

The account is as follows. Once the land of Epidauros had been infertile. The Epidaurians asked Delphi[59] for advice and were instructed to set up images of Damia and Auxesia made from olive wood. The Epidaurians believed that Athenian olives were the most sacred (Herodotos adds a variant; it is said [λέγεται, 5.82.2] that at that time olives grew only in Athens)[60] and asked the Athenians for wood to make the statues. The Athenians agreed on the condition that the Epidaurians gave offerings annually to Athena and Erechtheus.

---

[59] The central role of Delphi in this story should be noted; it was at the bidding of Delphi (Hdt. 5.79) that the Thebans asked for the aid of the Aiginetans.

[60] Λέγεται here is cited by Figueira, p.54 (on the basis of Macan *IV-VI*, vol.1, p.228) as evidence that Herodotos reserves or suspends judgment at this point. This incidence of λέγεται is examined in Chapter 7.3.

The Epidaurians accepted this condition, received the olive wood and set up the images. Miraculously, their land became fertile and they sent the offerings as agreed. This mutually satisfying arrangement was upset by the Aiginetans. Herodotos notes (5.83) that Aigina had been subject to Epidauros until the Aiginetans revolted and attacked Epidauros. The Aiginetans stole the two statues and set them up in Aigina at Oia and established rites in their honour. As a consequence, the Epidaurians ceased to send their offerings to Athens. When the Athenians complained, the Epidaurians replied that, as they no longer possessed the statues, the Athenians should obtain the offerings from the Aiginetans. The Athenians demanded that the Aiginetans return the images to Epidauros but they refused.

In this section no source is identified, there are no source-attributing words except in a digression and no explicit authorial comment by Herodotos. This suggests that no variant traditions about these events were heard by Herodotos in the course of his enquiries and thus the basic facts of the story were not in dispute, even the information about the miraculous fertility of Epidauros after they obeyed the instructions of the Pythia. This may seem to be contrary to γνώμη, however, as Delphi was the likely source for this account, and the fertility was clearly the result of the actions of the gods, γνώμη and ἱστορίη were not contradicted and the account could stand as a credible tradition.[61]

---

[61] The Delphian intervention in the conflict is confirmed at another place by Herodotos. He stated (5.89.2) that when the Athenians were about to send out an expedition against Aigina in revenge for their attack in support of the Thebans, an oracle from Delphi warned them to wait for thirty years or else be afflicted by many sufferings.

From this point in the narrative, however, Herodotos records variant accounts, carefully specifying the source for each version. The Athenians say ('Αθηναῖοι μέν νυν λέγουσι 5.85.1) they sent a single trireme to Aigina to retrieve the images. Once at Oia, the Athenians attempted to remove the statues from their bases but failed. They then attached ropes to the images and started to drag them back to their ship. Suddenly, an earthquake and a thunderstorm struck which so maddened the Athenians that they attacked and killed each other until only one man was left to make his way home.

Herodotos reminds his audience that this story is the report of the Athenians before recording the variant version told by the Aiginetans

'Αθηναῖοι μέν νυν οὕτω λέγουσι γενέσθαι, Αἰγινῆται
δὲ . . . . (5.86.1)

The Aiginetans say that they could have defended themselves against a few ships but the Athenians did not come in one ship, but many, and were so numerous that the Aiginetans did not contest their landing. Herodotos adds a comment as *histor* guiding the audience in this complex issue: the Aiginetans

οὐκ ἔχουσι δὲ τοῦτο διασημῆναι ἀτρεκέως, οὔτε εἰ
ἥσσονες συγγινωσκόμενοι εἶναι τῇ ναυμαχίῃ κατὰ
τοῦτο εἶξαν, οὔτε εἰ βουλόμενοι ποιῆσαι οἷόν τι καὶ
εποίησαν. (5.86.2)

are not able to show accurately whether they did this because they confessed themselves weaker in a naval battle or because they planned to do that which they did.

Herodotos then returns to the story as reported by the Aiginetans. They say that the Athenians could not remove the images from their bases and so they dragged them along with ropes. However, as the two statues were dragged along, they fell simultaneously to their knees and have remained in that pose from that day. This, however, is expressly rejected by Herodotos

ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, ἄλλῳ δέ τεῳ. (5.86.3)

for myself, I do not believe what is said, although others may.

After this second authorial comment, Herodotos resumes the account of the Aiginetans as shown by the repeated source citation. The Aiginetans say (Αἰγινῆται λέγουσι 5.86.4) that they had learnt the Athenians were about to attack and had asked Argos for help. After the Athenians had landed and moved inland, the Argives crossed over from Epidauros and cut them off from their ships. The Athenians were attacked from two sides and at that moment an earthquake and thunderstorm struck. Herodotos concludes this variation with yet another source-attributing word indicating his information was derived from two sources

λέγεται μέν νυν ὑπ᾽ Ἀργείων τε καὶ Αἰγινητέων τάδε
(5.87.1)

before noting that both they and the Athenians agree (ὁμολογέεται, 5.87.1) that only one of the Athenians returned alive to Athens. The area of disagreement is one of *polis* pride as Herodotos makes clear to the audience. He notes, as if in summary, that while the Argives say that they destroyed the Athenians, the Athenians say they were destroyed by divine power

πλὴν 'Αργεῖοι μὲν λέγουσι αὐτῶν τὸ 'Αττικὸν
στρατόπεδον διαφθειράντων τὸν ἕνα τοῦτον
περιγενέσθαι, 'Αθηναῖοι δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου. (5.87.2)

Herodotos (5.87.2-3, 88) concludes his record of the hostilities by adding that the sole Athenian survivor made his way back to Athens but was killed there by the wives of his comrades with their dress-pins (περόναι). From that time on, Herodotos states, the Athenian women were forced to discard their Dorian style of dress and adopt the Ionian style which lacked dress-pins. On the other hand, the Argives and Aiginetans adopted a custom of using dress-pins half as long again as previously and of dedicating these pins in the shrine of Damia and Auxesia, from which Attic products were barred. Herodotos vouches for the accuracy of the details of the longer pins; they were still worn in Aigina in his time (ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ, 5.88.3) as a result of the feud with Athens.

This section on the conflict contains many overt and covert guides by Herodotos to his audience. First, he specifically advises the audience which information he himself does not believe, which he cannot determine and the evidence available in support of either version of events. Second, Herodotos ensures, through repeated use of source-attributing words, that the informant for each section and the precise information they provide is indicated clearly to his audience. Third, the areas of agreement between the different versions are specified.[62] Fourth, the precise area of dispute is summarised by

---

[62] For example, that there was a period of conflict between Athens and Aigina, that the Athenians were not able to remove the images from their bases, that an earthquake and thunderstorm occurred and that only one of the Athenians returned alive to Athens.

Herodotos for the audience. Thus, ἰστορίη from diverse sources, all having claims to be telling about their own history, has elucidated agreed facts and disputed facts. In these circumstances ἰστορίη does not establish the more reliable account and so recourse to the other methodological tests, ὄψις and γνώμη, is needed to resolve the impasse.

Ὄψις and γνώμη can apply to this account in a number of ways. First, on the whole, neither account is contrary to γνώμη except the information that statues fell to their knees which is directly and specifically rejected by the *histor*. The idea that inanimate images could fall to their knees is contrary to γνώμη and thus Herodotos unequivocally expressed his disbelief at this part of the story. However, Herodotos makes no explicit comment about the supernatural elements of earthquake and thunderstorm which are common to both accounts (that is, both are attested to through ἰστορίη). Because this intervention came from the gods, the report is not excluded through γνώμη.[63] The fate of the lone survivor in Athens was also accepted by both sides and the information had the support of other evidence; customs resulted in both areas, one of which is confirmed by Herodotos through ὄψις.[64]

Both accounts and both informants (all three if the Argives are added for the detail they support) fulfil many of Herodotos' criteria for belief. The variant versions of the conflict between Athens and

---

[63] See, for example, 7.129.4 & 8.129.3 and Chapter 2.2.1.

[64] Indeed, an inscription of the later Athenian cleruchy established on Aigina records the dedication of 356 iron dress-pins in the sanctuary there (*IG IV* 1588. 10-14, 35-37, 40-44). Herodotos' belief probably resulted from his visit to the island: Jacoby, *RE*, cols.268-269, Figueira, p.51.

Aigina each had claims under ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη to be considered reliable. Each account was derived from local informants, telling a believable story about events in their own past which is often in agreement on essential details and had supporting evidence. Where facts are contrary to γνώμη Herodotos' disbelief is stated clearly to the audience. In these circumstances, Herodotos again cannot decide which version is more reliable and so he cannot provide the audience with a conclusive report. Instead, he records each variant complete with clear signals to his audience of the identity of his sources, the extent of the information provided by each source, and the facts he personally disbelieves.

In the face of Herodotos' specific statements, identifying facts he does not believe, although he does record them, as well as facts about motivation he cannot establish conclusively, the source-attributing words within each variant cannot mean that Herodotos has reservations about the totality of both versions of events and believes each to be unreliable. Rather, the function of the source-attributing words in this section is again to show the audience the identity of the various informants and to delineate precisely the information provided by each. The audience is then expected by Herodotos to decide for themselves which version they prefer to accept, guided by the information provided and by the commentary on the narrative by the *histor*.

4.3: Why are Variant Accounts Recorded?

The statements made by Herodotos that he records stories because he heard them (cited at the beginning of this chapter) do not imply that Herodotos suspended his historical judgment and methodology. If Herodotos' prime purpose was to settle the historical record, as his preface suggests, his credibility was of prime importance. A story or variant told merely for the sake of entertainment would undermine Herodotos' credibility which, I believe, is just what Herodotos was trying to avoid by distancing himself from the methodology of the epic tradition.[65] By bringing his methodology to the attention of his audience, by providing that audience with his own views through authorial insertions of opinion, by reliability indicators and source-attributing words Herodotos attempted to convince the audience that he was a reliable and diligent researcher, that his methodology was sound and that his sources were credible.

The evidence of the passages considered in this and the earlier chapters of this study suggests that all information recorded by Herodotos, including variants, was reported by him precisely because it had some claim to credibility through ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη. When Herodotos has heard an account which has some claim to reliability, yet is repudiated through other ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη, that account is recorded by Herodotos, and specifically rejected by him. Examples of this were examined in Chapter Two. This rejection of stories is part of Herodotos' historical processes and shows that Herodotos can fulfil his stated purpose of recording information which

---

[65]   See Chapter Seven.

he himself does not believe. But the recording of variant accounts by Herodotos does not imply that he considers one, or more, of the versions untrustworthy yet records it anyway. Rather, the conclusion to be reached from a study of variants is that variant accounts are recorded by Herodotos when he cannot assess, in terms of his usual criteria for reliability, which account is the more credible.

This conclusion is supported by the one statement made by Herodotos specifically about variant accounts:

οὗτος μὲν ὁ πιθανώτερος τῶν λόγων εἴρηται, δεῖ δὲ
καὶ τὸν ἧσσον πιθανόν, ἐπεί γε δὴ λέγεται, ῥηθῆναι.
(3.9.2)

this is the most credible of the stories reported, but it is necessary that the less credible be recorded, since indeed it was said.

This statement occurs in a passage (3.4-9) which explains how Kambyses was able to invade Egypt across the waterless desert. The context of the statement is important. The report in the *Histories* is as follows. Kambyses was advised by Phanes of Halikarnassos to contact the Arabians to obtain safe passage across their lands. As part of the agreement to allow passage the Arabians organised water laden camels to meet Kambyses' army at pre-designated points. This is the account Herodotos believes and the naming of an obscure individual from Halikarnassos betrays his probable source and the reason he believed this version was reliable. The account Herodotos considered less credible is that the Arabians sewed together a viaduct like pipeline of ox skins and pumped the water to wells in the desert. This account is not attributed by Herodotos to a specific source although it does incorporate the source-attributing word λέγεται (3.9.2). In this

instance the source-attributing word is not present to show that Herodotos rejects the story; his view is plainly stated. Rather, the source-attributing word indicates why Herodotos recorded the variant; it discloses that the account emanated from firm oral tradition, worthy of record and so the account is recorded precisely ἐπεί γε δὴ λέγεται.

There are far more variant accounts in the *Histories* than those considered in this chapter. The variants examined above were chosen for analysis because they provide some evidence of Herodotos' methodology. Many variants, which range from a simple, one line sentence within a longer story[66] through a few lines,[67] provide little or no evidence within the passage about why they are recorded by Herodotos. Nevertheless, based on the evidence of the more complex variants and the various statements made by Herodotos, some suggestions can be advanced about why these simple variant accounts were recorded. For example, it is likely that he reported both versions when some element in each account or the source was such that Herodotos, in terms of ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη, was unable to evaluate which variant was more reliable. The variant of whether Bias of Priene or Pittakos of Mytilene came to Sardis to speak to Kroisos

---

[66] Such as whether it was Bias of Priene or Pittakos of Mytilene who came to Sardis to speak to Kroisos (1.27.2), whether Lykourgos received Sparta's laws from Delphi or Crete (1.65.4), whether Smerdis was murdered while hunting or drowned (3.30.3), whether Leonidas and Kleombrotos were twins (5.41.3), how Aristodemos survived the battle of Thermopylai (7.230), who began the battle of Salamis (8.84) or the place where Artayktes was killed (9.120).

[67] For example, the two stories explaining why a shrine was outside the entrance of the temple of Amasis at Sais (2.175.5), two accounts of the sacrifices of the Tauroi (4.103.2) or two accounts of the flight of the Korinthian admiral Adeimantos before the battle of Salamis (8.94).

(λέγουσι, 1.27.2) serves as an example. Both Bias and Pittakos were well known in Athens as wise men;[68] thus, the wise anecdote reported about the conversation with Kroisos would fit either character. As such, neither tradition would be considered by Herodotos to be unlikely in terms of γνώμη and both variants are recorded without comment. Thus, while it cannot be shown conclusively why all variants are recorded by Herodotos due to the lack of evidence in short variant passages, it is probable that ὄψις, γνώμη and ἱστορίη do provide a realistic basis to explain why these variants exist.

Source-attributing words are an integral part of Herodotos' authorial dialogue with the audience. Wherever possible Herodotos provided his audience with information about his methodology, his views and the nature of his sources. In this way the audience was invited to enter the historical process by determining to their own satisfaction which of the accounts recorded by Herodotos was likely to be the more reliable. Source-attributing words are a part of this process. They are not indicators of reserve; otherwise, we must conclude that all the variants incorporating source-attributing words were considered by Herodotos to be inaccurate. This is not realistic. Rather, source-attributing words act as indicators for the audience to show that the source of the information, and thus the information itself, had a claim to be considered reliable.

---

[68] Later expressed by Plato, *Protagoras* 343A, where Thales of Miletos, Pittakos, Bias, Solon, Kleobulos of Lindos, Myson of Chenai and Chilon of Sparta are counted as wise men. Their status as wise men continued into later periods; see, for example, Plutarch, *De sera numinis vindicta* 2 (*Moralia* 548E), *Quaestiones convivales* 8.6.3 (*Moralia* 726B).