

Appendix A:

Source-attributing Words in Context: A Commentary on Book Nine.

This appendix aims to test the conclusions advanced in this study about the function of source-attributing words in the *Histories* upon a large, generally self-contained, section of Herodotos' work. Book Nine has been selected for commentary because, although the division of the *Histories* into nine books postdates Herodotos, Book Nine is substantially a connected narrative of the battles of Plataiai and Mykale with few digressions. These battles occurred less than fifty years before Herodotos began to conduct his researches. Traditions grow and diversify over time. If the function of source-attributing words is to provide evidence of reliable sources with which to settle disputes where different accounts exist, as this study argues, we should expect fewer variant accounts and thus fewer source-attributing words in Book Nine than in the books which deal with the events of the more distant past.

The following table summarises the narrative of Book Nine and indicates the points where the Herodotean dialogue, such as authorial insertions, source-attributing words and reliability indicators, occur.

**Table D:
The Herodotean Dialogue in Book 9**

<i>Chapters</i>	<i>Details</i>
1-5	Mardonios invades Attika and offers peace to Athens.
6-12	Sparta delays but finally sends an army to the Isthmus (ἐλέγετο, 9.6).
13-15	Mardonios retreats from Attika.
16	A banquet is given by Attaginos of Thebes for the Persians (ἦκουον, 9.16.1 & 5, ἔφη, 9.16.1).
17-18	The testing of the Phokians.
19-32	First position of the armies at Plataiai, the cavalry attack and the death of Masistios. The Athenians and Tegeans both claim a position in the line of battle. The orders of battle of both armies.
33-37	The history of Teisamenos of Elis, a seer.
38-41	The history of Hegesistratos of Elis, a seer.
42-43	Stalemate; the Persians debate strategy. Oracles concerning the battle (οἶδα, 9.43.1 & 2).
44-45	Alexander of Macedon warns the Greeks.
46-49	Reorganisation of the Greek line of battle.
50-51	The Greeks retreat (λέγουσι, 9.51.2).
52	The willful disobedience of the Allies.
53-57	The conduct of Amompharetos. The Persians attack.
58-68	The Battle of Plataiai
69-70	Some of the Allies are destroyed by the Thebans. The casualty lists.
71-75	Details of those who fought best at Plataiai, Sophanes and a tradition about Dekeleia (λέγεται, 9.71.1, 9.73.1, 9.74.2; λέγουσι, 9.73.1 & 2; λεγομένους, 9.74.1).
76-82	Two actions of Pausanias. The division of the spoils of battle (λέγεται, 9.81.2). Two banquets ordered by Pausanias (λέγεται, 9.82.1 & 3).
83-84	The place of burial of Mardonios (ἦκουσα, οἶδα, 9.84.1; πυθέσθαι, 9.84.2).
85	The tombs of the Greeks at Plataiai (πυνθάνομαι, ἀκούω, 9.85.3).
86-88	Punishment of the Theban leaders.
89-92	The flight of Artabazos. The Samians urge the Greek fleet to attack Asia.
93-95	The history of Deiphonos, a seer (ἦκουσα, 9.95).
96-101	The omens before the Battle of Mykale.
102-106	The battle of Mykale.

107-113	Xerxes' passion for Artaynte and the death of Masistes.
114-122	The Greeks consolidate, the death of Artayktes (λέγεται, 9.120.1; λέγουσι, 9.120.4).

This summary highlights the fact that in Book Nine there is a concentration of source-attributing words into a few chapters, especially those describing the aftermath of the Battle of Plataiai (Chapters 71-85). In contrast, the preliminary skirmishes at Plataiai and the actual battles of Plataiai and Mykale are narrated without source-attributing words. Other source-attributing words occur in connection with information about amazing events or when controversies have arisen. For example, source-attributing words and reliability indicators occur in the sections describing the amazing information Herodotos derived from Thersandros, his account of the tombs of the Greeks and the actions of Pausanias of Sparta.

As the above table shows, the majority of Book Nine is historical narrative without authorial commentary, reliability indicators or source-attributing words. When the narrative stands unadorned by any of the aspects of Herodotos' dialogue with the audience, we cannot now establish Herodotos' view of the reliability of the information he records. Nevertheless, some suggestions can be made about the status of information recorded as narrative without authorial guidance. The absence of specific guidance could mean either that:

- 1: Herodotos accepts the information is a widely believed account and so he reports it without citation of sources or authorial

comment; it does not need additional authority for it to be accepted by the audience.

- 2: The information represents the only version of the story heard by Herodotos; if he heard no variants, and the story of itself does not fail Herodotos' criteria for belief (as outlined in the earlier chapters of this study), it can be reported without comment.
- 3: It may be information which Herodotos considers worthy of recording in line with his intention to record the things he heard but which needs no supporting evidence or elaboration.

The following summary and commentary on Book Nine¹ is intended to clarify some of the issues raised in the study. It is accepted that some of the suggestions made in the commentary below are tenuous, for we now cannot reliably establish every issue that may have been controversial when Herodotos produced his work.

* * * * *

¹ The division of Book Nine into sections for the commentary is admittedly arbitrary. Chapters have been grouped where the narrative concentrates on one theme or where they contain some aspect of Book Nine which is important to the discussion. The passages in a different font (Times), indented and boxed are not a translation of Book Nine but a summary. Points commented upon, source-attributing words, reliability indicators and particular features of the narrative are in *italics*. Direct authorial commentary by Herodotos as *histor* are given in the first person and are also in *italics*.

Book Nine: Summary and Commentary

Section 1: Chapters 1-5

1. Mardonios left Thessaly with his army for Athens. He was aided by the rulers of Thessaly, especially *Thorax of Larissa* who had previously aided Xerxes. 2. When the army arrived in Boiotia, the *Thebans counselled* Mardonios to camp there and employ bribery to fracture the alliance of the Hellenes. 3. Mardonios blindly and ardently rejected their advice and recaptured Athens, ten months after Xerxes had done the same thing. The city was abandoned as the Athenians had retreated to Salamis. 4. Mardonios sent Morychides, a man from the Hellespont, to Salamis offering the Athenians an alliance. 5. Morychides came before the Athenian Boule. Lykidas spoke in favour of the offer *either because he had been bribed by Mardonios or because he considered the offer appropriate*. The Athenians stoned Lykidas to death. Later the Athenian women went to his house and stoned to death his wife and children.

This is a narrative section about which there would be little dispute and so the information does not require further authority. For example, the route of Mardonios would have been widely known and, although the extent of the aid given to the Persians by the Medising Greeks of Thessaly and Boiotia was disputed after the defeat of the Persians, their guilt was widely accepted.² Herodotos also accepts their guilt: he previously had emphasised the Medism of the Thessalians,

² If there was a dispute later it was about who was responsible; see footnote 64 below.

especially Thorax of Larissa,³ while the assistance the Thebans willingly gave to the Persians is a theme throughout Book Nine.⁴

The single variant in this section concerns the motivation of Lykidas. The difficulties faced by an inquirer in identifying motivation from information provided by oral sources has already been mentioned.⁵ The variant is provided in the narrative with neither source-attributing words nor an expression of opinion. There certainly existed different accounts of this incident which came to be reflected in later writers.⁶ It is possible that Herodotos is speculating about the motives of Lykidas but he does not identify the speculation as his own (as, for example, in the guise of the *histor* commentating upon the narrative) and thus it is also possible that both variants recorded by Herodotos are Athenian in origin⁷ and may have resulted from an attempt by a family member to rehabilitate Lykidas' reputation.⁸ In any case, the informants were not of sufficient authority to settle the dispute about motivation and none

³ Thorax of Larissa was a son of Aleuas (Hdt. 9.58.2). Herodotos had previously reported (7.6.2) that the Aleuadai had Medised very early and repeats his belief on other occasions; 6.130.3 & 6.172.1

⁴ See, for example, 9.31.2, 38.2, 40, 67-68, 69.2.

⁵ Chapter 4.1.3.

⁶ Demosthenes (*de Cor.* 202, 204) records the name of the man as Kyrtilos and transfers the stoning to before Xerxes took Athens the previous year.

⁷ The naming of a non-prominent Athenian suggests Athenian informants for the story as it is unlikely that any other city group would know of or care about the motives of an obscure Athenian.

⁸ The variant that Lykidas considered the offer for the best is less damning than a charge of Medising for money. This may indicate an attempt by his family to revive his reputation but as nothing else is known no conclusions can be reached.

is cited by Herodotos. Instead, both variants are recorded without source citation or comment.

Summary:

This section records information about the Medisers and the Persian forces which was widely known and accepted. As such, source-attributing words are unnecessary to establish the authority of the narrative. Motivation provided a more difficult problem. Herodotos is unable to cite authoritative sources to settle the dispute about the motivation of Lykidas and so both versions of the tradition are recorded without comment.

Section 2: Chapters 6-12

6. The Athenians waited for Spartan help. When the Spartans did not come and the Persians were said (ἐλέγγεται, 9.6)⁹ to be in Boiotia, the Athenians retreated to Salamis. Athenian envoys were sent to Sparta to warn that the Athenians might withdraw from the alliance unless they received Spartan help. **7.** The Spartans were celebrating the festival of Hyakinthos when the Athenian, Megarian and Plataian envoys arrived. The envoys addressed the Ephors (*direct speech*). **8.** The Ephors delayed answering for ten days. Meanwhile the Spartans were building a wall across the Isthmos. *I am not able to report the reason why*

οὐδ' ἔχω εἰπεῖν τὸ αἴτιον (9.8.2)

when Alexander of Macedon had previously come to Athens with Mardonios' offer of an alliance, the Spartans had urged the Athenians to resist but now did not help them. *Except that now the Spartans no longer needed the Athenians as the wall across the Isthmos had been completed.* **9.** Chileos of Tegea, a ξείνιος of Sparta,¹⁰ learnt what the Athenians had said and admonished the Spartans (*direct speech*) for their treatment of the Athenians. **10.** The Ephors took his counsel to heart and before dawn the next day five thousand Spartans and thirty-five thousand helots marched out. Their leader was Pausanias, son of Kleombrotos, regent for the boy king Pleistarchos, son of Leonidas. Kleombrotos had died after leading away from the Isthmos the army which had built the wall. He retreated *because an eclipse had occurred while sacrificing for victory.* **11.** The envoys came before the Ephors and told them (*direct speech*) that the Athenians would make peace with the Persians. The Ephors disclosed that the army had already left and sent another five thousand troops. **12.** The Argives sent a messenger to Mardonios, as they had promised, to inform him that the Spartan army had marched.

⁹ This is a marginal use of a source-attributing words indicating merely that the Persians were reported to be in Boiotia. Nothing is implied about the reliability of the report.

¹⁰ This man is otherwise unknown but, following Herodotos, he is mentioned by Plutarch, *Moralia* 871F-872A (*de Mal. Herod.* 41, and *Themistokles* 6) and Polyainos 5.30.

This section is primarily narrative although it does contain a number of features typical of Herodotos' methodology. The actions of the Spartans outlined in the narrative require some explanation. The problem for the inquirer to resolve is again one of motivation and an explanation is provided by the commentary in two parts. The first authorial insertion expresses the limits of available information but does offer an answer; Herodotos comments that he cannot report why the Spartans had a change of heart but he can suggest a solution consistent with γνώμη. The second authorial comment suggests a reason why Kleombrotos retreated after building the wall.

In any explanation of Spartan motivation, the best authority would be the Spartans. In this case, however, they are unlikely to be the source for this section as Spartans would certainly not report that they had only promised Athens aid while they were completing their defensive wall. If Herodotos' source was indeed a non-Spartan they would not be likely to be considered authoritative about Spartan motives and thus, in the absence of reliable authority which could be cited through source-attributing words, Herodotos applies logical deduction to arrive at an explanation. The conclusion is, however, presented as a judgment by the *histor* and the audience is asked to judge the conclusion on the basis of their perception of the reliability of the researcher.

Another issue raised in this section is the role of speeches in Herodotos. Most ancient historians utilised reports, in direct speech, of orations made by leaders and generals. It is not intended at this

place to consider the question of speeches in Herodotos.¹¹ In terms of the question of the function of source-attributing words in the *Histories*, there is reason to accept that reported speeches represent Herodotos' interpretation of a person's character or an event. In contrast, where source-attributing words introduce direct speech (for example, the speech of Xerxes at Salamis, 8.88.2-3) the reliability of the report depends on the reliability of the informant.

Summary:

For the information in this section Herodotos was unable to cite an authoritative source. To enhance the reliability of the narrative, Herodotos as *histor* comments upon motivation and relays to the audience a rational explanation.

¹¹ It seems likely that speeches in the *Histories* are intended to convey Herodotos' own interpretation of events and to show his own judgments and opinions; K.H. Waters, 'The Purpose of Dramatisation in Herodotos' *Historia* 15 (1966), pp.157-171, especially pp.158, 167-169. See also M.L. Lang, *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse*, Cambridge, Mass., 1984, esp. pp.18-36. On the speeches at Plataiai, see L. Solmsen, 'Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Battle of Plataea' *CPh* 39 (1944), pp.241-253.

Section 3: Chapters 13-15

13. Mardonios destroyed Athens and retreated. *The reason Mardonios retreated* is that the country of Attika was unsuitable for cavalry and that if he was defeated in battle there was only one line of retreat. *His plan was to retreat to Thebes* and fight with a friendly city behind him in country suitable for cavalry. **14.** Mardonios learnt that an advance guard of one thousand Spartans had arrived at Megara and sent his cavalry against that city. This was the most westerly place in Europe the Persians reached. **15.** Mardonios learnt that the Greeks were gathering at the Isthmos and marched back to Thebes via Dekeleia, Sphendalea and Tangara to Skolos where the army encamped from Erythrai, past Hysiai to the Asopos River.

This section is a narrative of widely known events; as such, source-attributing words are not needed to attest to the reliability of the information. In this section comes the first suggestion that Herodotos relied upon sources from among the Greeks who fought at Plataiai on the side of the Persians. For example, Herodotos without comment states the reason for a number of decisions made by Mardonios and reports precise information about the Persian line of march and camping sites. Chapters 13, 14 and 15 each detail messages received by Mardonios which suggests that much of Herodotos' account of Plataiai displays a Persian centred view. See the commentary on Chapter 9.85.¹²

Summary:

This section provides information which would generally be accepted by others as accurate and thus it is recorded without comment or source-attributing words.

¹² See also my article 'Herodotos' Sources for the Plataiai Campaign' AC 61 (1992), pp.80-97.

Section 4: Chapter 16

16. At the banquet at Thebes given by Attaginos, son of Phrynon, for Mardonios a Persian expressed defeatist sentiments (*direct speech*) to Thersandros of Orchomenos. I heard (ἤκουον, 9.16.1 & 5) the story from Thersandros and report the things he said (ἔφη, 9.16.1).

This passage has already been examined in detail in Chapter 6.1. It is possible that this banquet was recorded in another tradition which presented a different account from that of Herodotos.¹³ Certainly, the information that a Persian nobleman knew the result of the battle was predestined and confided his concern to a Greek ally in terms compatible with Greek ideas on the power of necessity and the inevitability of fate is difficult to accept without question. To establish the credibility of his account, Herodotos cited as an informant a man who was at face value an impeccable source: a leading man of a Greek city who was present at the banquet, personally spoke to the Persian and relayed his information directly to Herodotos. The ἤκουον in this case does not imply that Herodotos doubts the story. First, it stresses to the audience that Herodotos performed this research in person. Second, it highlights that Herodotos derived his information from a source who is credible, reliable and likely to possess accurate information. The citation of Thersandros is intended to persuade that the story, while fantastic, is completely accurate.

¹³ Macan, VII-IX, vol.1, p.620. The banquet was well enough known for Athenaios (148E) to preserve the menu.

Summary:

In this passage the function of the repeated ἤκουον identifying the source is to show the audience that an ostensibly fantastic account was derived by Herodotos from a credible source. As such, the story should be accepted by the audience as authoritative.

Section 5: Chapters 17-18

17. The Greeks of Boiotia had all Medised although the Phokians had not done so willingly. One thousand hoplites led by *Harmokydes of Phokis*,

ἀνὴρ τῶν ἀστῶν δοκιμώτατος, (9.17.2)

arrived to join the Persian forces. They were surrounded and threatened by the Persian cavalry. Harmokydes (*direct speech*) exhorted his men to die valiantly. **18.** The cavalry retreated. *I cannot accurately report*

οὐκ ἔχω δ' ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν (9.18.2)

whether the cavalry had come at the request of the Thessalians to kill the Phokians, and had retreated when the Phokians formed a phalanx, or whether Mardonios was merely testing the courage and resolve of the Phokians.

The source of this narrative section may have been Phokian. This is suggested by the favourable report of Phokian courage and actions, the statement that they had not Medised willingly and the identification of an otherwise obscure individual, Harmokydes, as the Phokian commander.¹⁴ Whether the testing of the Phokians occurred as a result of the enmity of the Thessalians or because of Mardonios, Herodotos cannot determine. Neither is contrary to γνώμη¹⁵ and if Herodotos had obtained information from a source which might resolve the issue it is likely that this would have been cited by him. As an authoritative source seems to have been unavailable, Herodotos confesses his inability to resolve the issue to the audience and leaves the question unresolved.

¹⁴ Harmokydes is otherwise unknown (Pape/Benseler, p.140) and would be unlikely to be remembered by informants in another city.

¹⁵ The ancient enmity between the Phokians and Thessalians is documented elsewhere by Herodotos (8.27-32).

Summary:

There seems to have been no source who Herodotos can cite to resolve the different accounts about the testing of the Phokians. Neither account is contrary to ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη and thus Herodotos confesses his limitations and provides both variants without comment.

Section 6: Chapters 19-32

19. The Athenians from Salamis and forces from the Peloponnesian cities joined the Spartans at the Isthmos. The combined army then moved to the foothills of the Kithairon range. **20.** Persian cavalry led by Masistios attacked the Greek army. **21.** The Megarians were stationed in the most exposed position and requested assistance. Pausanias called for volunteers to relieve the Megarians; no-one was willing to go except three hundred Athenians led by *Olympiodoros, son of Lampon*. **22.** The Athenians killed Masistios in a skirmish. **23.** The Persian cavalry attempted to recover Masistios' body but failed. **24.** The Persians mourned Masistios. **25.** The Greeks displayed Masistios' body before their army. The Greeks *decided* (ἔδοξε, 9.25.2) to advance to the Gargaphian spring where water was more plentiful. **26.** The Tegeans (*direct speech*) claim the right to be positioned on the left flank of the army because of their "heroic age" services to the Peloponnesians. **27.** The Athenians make a counter claim (*more direct speech*) invoking both "heroic age" deeds and the Athenian victory at Marathon. The army awards the position to the Athenians. **28 - 30.** The order of battle of the Greek army and the total number of the Greek forces. **31.** The numbers and order of battle of the Persian army. Mardonios organised his army *instructed by the Thebans*

ΤΑΥΤΑ Δ' ἔποίηε φραζόντων τε καὶ διδασκόντων
θηβαίων. (9.31.2)

Not all the *Phokians* allied with the Persians; *some harried the Persian army*.

32. The total number of the Persian forces.

The section contains no authorial comments by Herodotos and no source-attributing words. Of interest is the implication of Athenian sources for some of this section and the continued detail about events occurring in the Persian army.

The battle at Plataiai was clearly won by the courage and ability of the Spartan infantry while the Athenian contribution was

secondary.¹⁶ Thus, Athenian sources for some of this section are implied by the two suggestions of Athenian prominence in the narration (the report of Athenian voluntary assistance to the Megarians and their killing of Masistios) and the details of the dispute between the Athenians and the Tegeans over which contingent would have the honour of holding the left wing of the Greek army. First, the naming of the Athenian commander and the statement that the Athenians volunteered to go to the assistance of the Megarians when no other contingent of the army was willing to go implies an Athenian source for this information.¹⁷ Second, the insertion into the narrative of direct speech recollections of Athenian achievements, culminating in the victory at Marathon balances the fact that at Plataiai the Athenian achievements were secondary to those of the Spartans.¹⁸ In these circumstances, this record of Athenian achievement 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

¹⁶ This is made clear by Herodotos: 9.71.

¹⁷ It is unlikely that the name of the Athenian commander would be remembered outside the Athenian forces or that another city state would praise the Athenians in this way: see Chapter 1.4. It is probable that Herodotos received information from relatives of Olympiodoros, son of Lampon, in Thurii after he migrated to that city. Olympiodoros is likely to have been a relative of the seer Lampon who was a co-founder of Thurii and a signatory to the Peace of Nikias (Thu. 5.19.2 & 5.24.1, Diodoros, 12.10.3, Plutarch, *Perikles* 6.2-3, Tod, No.74 and notes, p.183, Meiggs/Lewis, No.73 and p.221). As the Athenians were stationed next to the Megarians and possessed a body of archers which allowed them to be effective against the Persian cavalry, they were the logical contingent for Pausanias to have sent: Macan, *VII-IX*, vol.1, pp.631B-632B, How/Wells, vol.2, p.391, C. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*, Oxford, 1963, p.300, P. Green, *The Year of Salamis*, London, 1970, p.246.

¹⁸ Solmsen, *op.cit.*, (n.11), p.249.

propaganda issue.¹⁹ As Herodotos does not indicate any doubts about the information, it is likely that he heard only the Athenian version when he visited Athens and accepted it as reliable.

This section continues the emphasis on the decisions and deeds of the Persian army. For example, the bland statement that the Greeks decided to move, unaccompanied by details of counsels or debate, may be contrasted to statement that the Thebans instructed the Persian commander, the experienced Mardonios, how to arrange the order of battle of the Persian army. This information and the continued praise of the Phokians are further indications that the material for the section was drawn by Herodotos from sources among the Medising Greeks.

Summary:

In this section there seems to be nothing which required additional authority and the information is recorded by Herodotos without variants or comment.

¹⁹ This became important later in the fifth century with the rise of the Athenian empire: Thu.1.73-78, Meiggs/Lewis, No.19, W.C. West III, 'Saviors of Greece' *GRBS* 11 (1970), pp.271-282, J.A.S. Evans, 'Herodotus and Athens: The Evidence of the *Encomium*' *AC* 48 (1979), pp.113-114.

Section 7: Chapters 33-37

33. Teisamenos of Elis was the diviner for the Greeks. Delphi had prophesied that he would win five victories. Teisamenos thought this referred to athletic contests and trained for the Pentathlon at Olympia where he was defeated in the wrestling by Hieronymos of Andros. The Spartans understood that the oracle referred to war and tried to employ him by offering to make him hegemon of their army. He requested full Spartan citizenship for himself and his brother, Hegias. **34.** By doing this, in as far as citizenship and kingship may be compared, he imitated Melampos who cured the madness of the Argive women in return for the kingship of Argos for himself and his brother. **35.** Teisamenos' demand was granted by the Spartans. He and his brother *alone of all mankind gained Spartan citizenship*
 ΜΟΥΝΟΙ ΔΕ Δὴ Πάντων Ἀνθρώπων Ἐγένοντο οὗτοι
 Σπαρτιήτησι Πολιῆται. (9.35.1)

Under his guidance Sparta won five victories. **36.** Teisamenos sacrificed and counselled the Greeks to stay on the defensive. **37.** The diviner for Mardonios, Hegesistratos, son of Tellias of Elis, also counselled defence. Hegesistratos did *the bravest deed of all we know*

ἀνδρηότατον ἔργον πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν (9.37.2).

He was taken prisoner by the Spartans and placed in the stocks. To free himself he cut off part of his own foot, dug through a wall and travelled for three days and nights to Tegea. After his escape he had a wooden foot made and declared himself an enemy of the Spartans. But his hostility to the Spartans achieved nothing as he was later captured and killed by them in Zakynthos.

In this section, Herodotos records information about the Greek seers who sacrificed for the Greek and Persian armies. This information provides two of the few digressions which appear in Book Nine. The digressions include some startling information which is supported by Herodotos by reliability indicators and additional evidence.

The information that Delphi prophesied Teisamenos would bring five victories is not questioned by Herodotos and the five victories are named in the narrative. The accuracy of the prophecy was proven by events which were open for all to see; as such, no reliability indicators were necessary to prove the authenticity of the information. Instead, it was the granting of Spartan citizenship to non-Spartans which seemed dubious and it is this section of the account which required support.²⁰ To counter any claims that the information was incorrect the story of the granting of Spartan citizenship is provided with credibility through an assertion of fact and additional evidence. First, Herodotos asserts that the award of Spartan citizenship was unusual, confirming that this case was the sole example

μοῦνοι δὲ δὴ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐγένοντο οὗτοι
Σπαρτιήτησι πολιῆται. (9.35.1)

This assertion echoes the formula πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν which functions as a reliability indicator below (9.37.2) and, in the same way as that authorial insertion, it is intended to be an assertion by the *histor* to the audience that the narrative is credible. Second, Herodotos cites a precedent, although acknowledging that the cases are not strictly the same. In this instance, assertion, knowledge and precedent are adduced to vouch for the reliability of Herodotos' account. The

²⁰ Pausanias (6.14.13) saw a statue of Hieronymos at Olympia and commented that Hieronymos defeated Teisamenos in the pentathlon. Pausanias does mention that Teisamenos was the seer of the Greeks at Plataiai but omits mention of any grant of Spartan citizenship. He also outlines the oracle of the five contests elsewhere (3.11.6-8) without mentioning the grant of Spartan citizenship. Such a unique event, if true, would surely rate a notice by Pausanias and it seems that, for all Herodotos' assertions, the information was incorrect: How/Wells, vol.2, pp.302-303.

source of the story was not cited by Herodotos which implies that it was not one whom Herodotos could cite with confidence.

The account of Hegesistratos receives a similar constructed credibility. Hegesistratos, imprisoned in chains by the Spartans and under sentence of death, cut off part of his foot to free himself from the chains, escaped by burrowing through a wall and then travelled for three days, eluding his pursuers, until he reached Tegea and safety. Herodotos calls this deed the "bravest deed of all we know", a formula including πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν. This phrase functions as a reliability indicator, the *histor* attesting that the information recorded by the narrator is reliable and that the wondrous deeds ascribed to Hegesistratos were indeed true.

Summary:

In this section occur stories which seem wondrous and may lack credibility. To enhance the perceived reliability of the information Herodotos employed assertions, additional evidence derived from precedent and a formula based on πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν as a reliability indicator to convince the audience that the information recorded was accurate.

Section 8: Chapters 38-41

38. Hegesistratos and Hippomachos of Leukas, sacrificing for the Persian army, could not get favourable omens. *Timagenides son of Herpys of Thebes* counselled Mardonios to block the pass over Kithairon to cut off Greek reinforcements. **39.** Mardonios accepted Timagenides' advice. A cavalry detachment intercepted a Greek supply train in the pass called by the Boiotians the "Three Heads" and the Athenians the "Oaks' Heads". **40.** A stalemate occurred for two more days as neither army advanced. *The Thebans waged war zealously* with the Persian cavalry, harassing the Greek army. **41.** The inaction continued. Mardonios was troubled at the delay. A dispute occurred between Mardonios and Artabazos (*recorded in indirect speech*). Artabazos argued that the army should retreat into Thebes and use bribery to defeat the Greek alliance. In contrast, Mardonios favoured immediate attack.

In this section the prominent Theban role in the campaign, shown by the advice given to Mardonios, by their actions, and by the naming of the Theban commander, continues to suggest that Medising sources, probably Theban, were consulted by Herodotos. The section thus displays a Persian centred viewpoint. This suggestion is supported by the information about the deliberations of the Persian leaders which are recorded in detail in indirect speech.

Summary:

This section seems to have been based upon information from Greeks within the Persian forces. There is nothing in the section which requires enhanced authority to be believed by the audience and thus reliability indicators and source-attributing words are absent.

Section 9: Chapters 42-43

42. Mardonios summoned the leaders of his army and asked if any of them knew of any unfavourable prophecies. *They said nothing, some not knowing the prophecies but others knowing them and afraid to speak.* Mardonios stated (*direct speech*), *that they either had no knowledge of the prophecies or were afraid to speak*, but that there was indeed an oracle that the Persians would come to Greece, plunder the temple at Delphi and be destroyed. Knowing this they had not plundered the temple and thus they would be safe. Mardonios ordered the attack to begin the next day. 43. Mardonios was wrong for *I know* (οἶδα, 9.43.1) that this oracle was not given to the Persians but to the Enchelees promising them victory over the Illyrians. Instead, there is a prophecy concerning the Plataian battle made by Bakis predicting great slaughter upon the Medes (*which Herodotos quotes in full*). This prophecy and others like it spoken by Mousaios, *I know* (οἶδα, 9.43.2) were spoken about the Persians.

In this section are detailed the deliberations and mistakes of Mardonios. Herodotos seeks to establish the reliability of his account in a number of ways. First, the narrative records that the leaders did not respond to Mardonios either because some did not know the prophecies or because others, who did, were afraid to speak. This is repeated in the speech of Mardonios. While the words of the speech are unlikely to be exact,²¹ in this instance the speech repeats the details of the narrative. The effect is that the direct speech enhances the narrative by purporting to give the words of Mardonios. It is easy to forget that, in reality, it is the same author giving two different versions of the same information.

²¹ Herodotos does specifically state that the Medising Greek leaders were present. It is therefore possible that this is further evidence of Greek Medising sources for Herodotos' account of Plataiai.

The credibility of Herodotos' record is further established through the repeated οἶδα as a reliability indicator.²² Mardonios obviously had the oracle wrong as the events of 479 showed. Herodotos, by means of the reliability indicator, claims more accurate knowledge of the oracles. Twice Herodotos as *histor* affirms that the narrative is accurate by means of οἶδα stressing the accuracy of Herodotos' report of the oracles. His proof is worked into the narrative, its accuracy attested through repeated reliability indicators and the direct citation of the oracle concerned.

Summary:

The veracity of the account is established through the direct citation of speeches and reliability indicators. No source is cited for these passages and no evidence in terms of ὄψις, γνώμη or ἱστορίη is offered by Herodotos. Instead twice Herodotos as *histor* affirms by means of his οἶδα statements that the narrative is accurate.

²² This passage has been discussed in Chapter 5.1 and footnotes 20-21 to that chapter.

Section 10: Chapters 44-45

44. That night Alexander of Macedon rode up the Athenian lines and asked to speak to the Athenian generals. **45.** He told them (*direct speech*) that Mardonios had only a few day's supplies left and would attack at dawn. "Remember that Alexander of Macedon gave you this warning", he said, "at great risk to myself".

This section represents part of the rehabilitation of the reputation of Alexander from the charge of Medising which occurs throughout the *Histories*.²³ The information was probably derived by Herodotos from official Macedonian sources²⁴ which he accepted without question.

Summary:

It is likely that Herodotos was told this story in Macedonia. He heard no contradictory accounts to this official line and accepted the story as accurate. As such, source-attributing words were not necessary.

²³ Alexander receives favourable coverage in the *Histories*. He murdered the Persian envoys (5.20), advised the Greeks to retire from Thessaly (7.173), acted as envoy to Athens on behalf of Mardonios (8.140) and visited the Greek lines before Plataiai. The intention of many of Alexander's actions recorded in the *Histories*, especially the report of his warning to the Greeks before Plataiai, is to show that he helped the Greeks and thus lessen allegations of support for the Persians; see R. Scaife, 'Alexander 1 in the *Histories* of Herodotos' *Hermes* 117 (1989), pp. 129-137.

²⁴ It is reasonably certain that Herodotos visited Macedonia and received information about the activities of the ruling family, possibly from Alexander himself (N.G.L. Hammond and G.T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, vol.2, Oxford, 1979, pp.98-99). Herodotos specifically accepts the Macedonian assertion that they are Greeks (5.22) and the mythical background of their rule is fully detailed (8.137-139).

Section 11: Chapters 46-49

46. The Athenians took Alexander's warning to Pausanias. He, in fear of the Persians, suggested (*direct speech*) that the Spartan and Athenian troops change places so that the Athenians face the Persians and the Spartans the Greek Medisers. The Athenians (*direct speech*) agree. **47.** The Spartans and Athenians changed places. The Boiotians reported the change to Mardonios who moved the Persians to again face the Spartans. Pausanias saw this and moved the Spartans back to the other wing. The Persians again also changed. **48.** Mardonios sent a herald to challenge the Spartans to fight only the Persians (*challenge in direct speech*). **49.** The Spartans made no reply. Overjoyed by this, Mardonios sent the cavalry to harry the Greeks. Because of this the Greeks were unable to draw water from either the spring or the Asopos River.

It might be expected that the information Pausanias was afraid of the Persians and disclosed this to the Athenians citing their prowess at Marathon would be controversial and need support in some way. Certainly, this account would be challenged in Sparta as it is, as Macan²⁵ noted, "a transparent fiction implying a Spartan acknowledgement of Attic superiority" which a Spartan would never concede and, if nothing else, totally overlooks the ability shown by the Spartans at Thermopylai. The explanation may be found in Herodotos' information gathering process and his sources. The source for this account was probably Athenian and the story, like the information about the debate between the Tegeans and Athenians, was part of the later anecdotal material intended to increase the importance of the

²⁵ Macan, *VII-IX*, vol.1, pp.690B-691A.

Athenian role at Plataiai.²⁶ Herodotos shows no disbelief about the account, despite his praise elsewhere for the Spartans' ability in the battle (9.71) which supports the view that the story was later Athenian embellishment. This part of the account was heard by Herodotos later and was not discussed by him with his Spartan sources, just as the supposed existence of the Pitonate battalion was not discussed (see commentary on 9.53 following).

Summary:

This section contains information which was later embellishment derived by Herodotos from Athenian sources. There was no contrary information heard by Herodotos (perhaps he could not at that time discuss the episode with his Spartan sources) and thus no source-attributing words indicate the Athenian source.

²⁶ Similar to the insertion into the narrative of the *Histories* of recollections of Athenian achievements, culminating in the victory at Marathon, during the dispute between the Tegeans and the Athenians over who would be stationed on the left wing; see commentary on 9.19-32 and footnotes 18-19 above. There was probably some readjustment of the Greek line which gave credence to the Athenian story: G.B. Grundy, *The Great Persian War*, London, 1901, p.477, How/Wells, vol.2, p.308.

Section 12: Chapters 50-51

50. The Greeks were short of food and water and were discomfited by the constant Persian cavalry attacks. **51.** *They resolved* (ἔδοξε, 9.51.1) to retreat ten stades to the "island" between two channels of the River Oeroe who, *say the local inhabitants*

λέγουσι . . . οἱ ἐπιχώριοι (9.51.2),

was the daughter of Asopos. They further *decided* (ἔδόκεε, 9.51.3) to move that night and when they came to *where Asopos' daughter Oeroe divides* to send half of the army to Kithairon.

In this section important Greek tactical decisions are reported without details, speeches or deliberations. This is in great contrast with the detailed deliberations of the Persians and supports the view that Herodotos did not have sources for the battle within the leadership of the Greek army.

The source-attributing word in the section concerns a small disputed detail. In this instance, the information outlined following the source-attributing word λέγουσι is immediately repeated in narrative form. The effect is to affirm the identification by the locals of the Oeroe as the descendant of the Asopos and thus it is clear that the source-attributing word does not indicate disbelief by Herodotos.

It is possible to see this source-attributing word as a random citation of locals for no real effect. It is possible, however, that the source-attributing word is related to a dispute which arose when the River Asopos was made the boundary between Thebes and Plataiai after an earlier conflict.²⁷ Thus, the origin of the River would have significance in conflicts between those cities. The reference to the

²⁷ See Hdt. 6.108 for details of this conflict.

natives of the area as Herodotos' informants is a citation of sources who should have reliable information.

Summary:

If there was a boundary dispute, the local inhabitants could be expected to be reliable informants. Thus, a source-attributing word citing locals as sources for information is a means of settling the record in such a dispute.

Section 13: Chapter 52

52. That night the majority of the Greek army started the retreat *with no intention of going where they had agreed*. They fled twenty stades to the town of Plataiai and piled arms around the Temple of Hera.

This section contains the first of the direct statements made by Herodotos in the narrative about the lack of courage and commitment of the majority of the Greek army,²⁸ a theme which recurs throughout his account of Plataiai. The theme here is forcefully introduced and the narrative expressly asserts that the additional withdrawal of the majority of the army was a premeditated defiance of orders, not a mistake.²⁹ The audience is therefore guided from the first mention of the cowardice of the Greek allies to accept their treachery as factual.

Summary:

The treachery of the Greek allies was accepted by Herodotos and narrated as fact. Without a doubt, this view would be disputed, and Herodotos provides supporting evidence throughout his narration of the battle (see especially the commentary on 9.85 below).

²⁸ That is, all the contingents except those from Sparta, Tegea and Athens. Herodotos (9.28) locates the Spartans and Tegeans on the right wing of the army and the Athenians on the left. In between he names contingents from 20 different cities.

²⁹ 9.52: ἔς μὲν τὸν χῶρον ἔς τὸν συνέκειτο οὐκ ἐν νόψ ἔχοντες.
Herodotos reinforces his statement of the allies' intentions by his choice of words; Macan, VII-IX, p.705A, identifies "a depreciatory, a dyslogistic [and] a sarcastic note" contained in this phrase and in the immediately preceding ἀερθέντες οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπαλλάσσοντο with its implication that the mass of the army departed "under full sail".

Section 14: Chapters 53-57

53. Pausanias ordered the Spartans to retreat but Amompharetos son of Poliades, λοχήγης of the Pitonate battalion, refused and cast a stone to the ground as a vote not to retreat. The Spartan army remained in position while Amompharetos was urged to retreat. **54.** The Athenians did not trust the Spartans. When the rest of the army retreated, but the Spartans did not, they sent a rider to see what was happening. **55.** He arrived while Pausanias and Amompharetos were arguing. Pausanias asked the Athenians to retreat at the same time as the Spartans. **56.** The Spartans, less the Pitonate battalion, moved at dawn. The Athenians then retreated. **57.** Amompharetos believed he was abandoned and set out after the rest. The main column had gone ten stades and waited *because* (ἐίνεκα, 9.57.2) if Amompharetos did not move they would be in a position to aid him. As Amompharetos' battalion caught up, the army was attacked by the Persian cavalry who had advanced to the previous Greek positions and, when they did not encounter the Greek army, had continued in search of them.

This narrative section was probably based by Herodotos on Athenian sources. First, the narrative indicates that the Athenians sent a messenger to the Spartans who saw Amompharetos stubbornly refusing to move. There is therefore evidence of an Athenian witness. Second, the detail in the account where Amompharetos seized a stone and threw it down as a vote not to retreat betrays an Athenian source; it was Athenians, not Spartans, who voted with stones.³⁰ The naming of the Pitonate battalion by Herodotos also implies a source who did not understand the divisions of the Spartan army. Thucydides (1.20.3) is adamant that the Pitonate battalion did not exist at this time. If Thucydides is correct it confirms that the source of the story was not

³⁰ A.R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*, London, 1962, p.532, Hart, p.103. Spartans voted by acclamation: Plutarch, *Lykourgos* 26.4.

Spartan and that Herodotos did not check his facts in Sparta; any Spartan male, such as Archias of Sparta to whom Herodotos did speak in Sparta (3.55), would be aware of the divisions of the Spartan army.

Summary:

The details within the account imply Athenian sources for this section.

Section 15: Chapters 58-68

58. Mardonios learnt that the Greeks were retreating. He gloated over their retreat to Thorax of Larissa and his brothers (*direct speech*). **59.** The Spartans and Tegeans were the only Greeks visible to the Persians and so they were attacked by the entire Persian forces. **60.** Pausanias sent a message to the Athenians asking for aid, stating that *the rest of the Greek forces had fled in the night (direct speech)*. **61.** The Athenians were attacked by the Medising Greeks and could not help the Spartans and Tegeans. The Peloponnesians sacrificed and received unfavourable omens. Therefore they did not attack but held their position suffering casualties. Pausanias prayed to Hera. **62.** The Tegeans attacked. As they did the Spartans finally received favourable omens and also attacked. Both sides fought bravely but the Persians were less skilled in warfare, fought in small groups and possessed only light armour. **63.** The battle was close while Mardonios fought but when he was killed the Persians retreated. They had been undone by their light armour. **64.** In this battle the Spartans gained revenge for the killing of Leonidas. Pausanias won *the most glorious victory of all we know*

νίκην . . . καλλίστην ἀπασέων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν. (9.64.1)

Mardonios was killed by Arimnestos who long after this battle was killed at Stenykleros in Messenia. **65.** The Persians fled into their fortified camp. And *it amazes me* (θῶμα δέ μοι , 9.65.1) that although the fighting occurred by the grove of Demeter no Persian entered the precinct and *I consider* (δοκέω δέ , 9.65.2), if it is permitted to judge the ways of the gods, that the goddess had denied them entry because they had burnt her shrine at Eleusis. **66.** Artabazos and his division did not take part in the battle but retreated to Phokis. **67.** The Medisers, except the Boiotians, fought without heart. The *Thebans fought with zeal* but they too were forced to retreat. **68.** The whole Barbarian army retreated when the Persians were defeated and *their rout was shielded by the Boiotian cavalry*.³¹

³¹ For a discussion of the role of Greek cavalry at Plataiai, see I.G. Spence, *The Cavalry of Classical Greece*, Oxford, 1993, pp.159-162.

This section contains a description of the course of the battle. Much of the detail of the action would not be disputed although some of the narrative is controversial and those sections are supported by Herodotos in different ways. In addition, some of the themes introduced earlier in Book Nine are repeated. First, the treachery of the Greek allies is again raised and the narrative is reinforced by the direct speech Herodotos attributes to Pausanias.³² Second, the whole-hearted Medism of the Thebans is again stressed.

The view that Plataiai was the most glorious victory known, and thus a greater victory than Marathon or Salamis, would be disputed in Athens.³³ This view is asserted by the *histor* through the phrase

νίκην . . . καλλίστην ἀπασέων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.

In this case source-attributing words would be unlikely to resolve the dispute as the assertion would not gain authority from the citing of informants; Spartans would accept the verdict without need of further authority, Athenians reject it whatever the source. This is a situation where, if a researcher does have an opinion, his view would displease somebody. Therefore, instead of a source citation to provide authority, Herodotos shows the audience that he has reached a rational conclusion based upon the information recorded in the narrative and

³² In this instance the speech supports the earlier narrative: see the commentary on 9.42 above.

³³ Especially later in the century when arguments about which city had done the most to save Greece had become an important issue; see references footnote 19 above. It is a measure of Herodotos' even-handedness and good sense that he can give his own opinion that the Spartans were paramount at Plataiai (9.71.1) but that Athens had saved Greece (7.139.5).

the *histor*, as an ostensible outside commentator, provides the audience with a statement of opinion.

The preservation of the shrine of Demeter is a miraculous story. If the battle did occur around the shrine as the narrative maintains, the non-entry of Persians is a marvellous event which seems contrary to γνώμη.³⁴ The activities of the gods however, over-ride normal γνώμη tests and the *histor* twice inserts his commentary into the narrative and also provides a tentative suggestion to explain why the shrine was preserved. By means of this repeated authorial intervention as part of the dialogue with the audience, Herodotos assures the audience that the story of the miraculous preservation of the shrine was indeed accurate.

Summary:

This section includes some information which is wondrous and seemingly contrary to γνώμη. The reliability indicators in the guise of commentary by the *histor* reassure the audience that it is Herodotos' personal conviction that the events occurred as narrated.

³⁴ θῶμα in the *Histories* does not show that Herodotos disbelieves the things he describes but indicates his awe, or wonder. See Chapter 2.1, footnote 3.

Section 16: Chapters 69-70

69. During the Persian rout a message confirming the Greek victory came to those Greeks camped around the temple of Hera *who had avoided the battle*. They hurried in disorder towards the fighting. The Megarians and Phleisians were intercepted and massacred by the Theban cavalry led by *Asopodoros son of Timandros*. **70.** Thus these men died without reputation

οὗτοι μὲν δὴ ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ ἀπώλοντο. (9.70.1.)

The Persians retreated behind their wooden wall. The Spartans had no skill in assaulting walls but the Athenians came up and breached it. The Persians inside were slaughtered. The Persians lost 257,000 men, the Spartans ninety-one, the Tegeans seventeen, the Athenians fifty-two.

The information in this section is consistent with, and reinforces, the earlier narrative as the treachery of the Greek allies and the achievements of the Thebans are emphasised. The betrayal of the Spartans, Tegeans and Athenians had already been narrated as fact and reinforced in a speech by Pausanias. The narrative here reminds the audience that the Greek allies had deliberately avoided the battle and their fate is immediately juxtaposed to present them in the worst possible light; some of them are killed in circumstances where no reputation was gained.³⁵

In contrast, the bravery and skill of the Thebans are again narrated and the fact that the commander of the Theban cavalry is

³⁵ Esteem and reputation were a part of Greek consciousness since Homer and were still praised as the highest reward by Pindar, *Isthmians* 1 l. 51, A.W.H. Adkins, *Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece*, London, 1972, p.76-77. See also the close connection between the senses of *λόγος* which means both esteem and word: Liddell/Scott pp.416-417. Thus somebody of whom no word is spoken is a person of little reputation: see Hdt 5.105.1, 8.102.3 & 9.71.3.

named in the narrative suggests a Theban source for some of this section.

Summary:

The guilt of the allies is accepted by Herodotos and evidence supporting his view is provided by him both before and after this assertion of their guilt.

Section 17: Chapters 71-75

71. *It is said* (λέγεται, 9.71.1) that those who fought best among the barbarians were the Persian infantry and the Sakai cavalry, and that the bravest man was Mardonios. Among the Greeks, the Tegeans and Athenians fought well but the most valiant were the Spartans. *I have decided this* because, while all three defeated the enemies who faced them, the Spartans defeated the main part of the Barbarian army. *In my opinion*

κατὰ γνώμας τὰς ἡμετέρας (9.71.2)

the best of the Greeks was Aristodemos, who had been reviled for surviving Thermopylai, Poseidonios, Philokyon and Amompharetos. But those Spartans present at Plataiai judged that Aristodemos wanted to be killed; Poseidonios did not and was thus a better man. *This they may have done because of envy.* All who died received honour except Aristodemos, who because he desired death, received none. **72.** Kallikrates, the fairest in the army, was wounded by an arrow before the fighting began and died in the company of Arimnestos of Plataiai. **73.** *It is said* (λέγεται, 9.73.1) that

of the Athenians, Sophanes of Dekeleia won renown. This township, *as the Athenians themselves say* (ὡς αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι, 9.73.1) did a service in ancient times. When the sons of Tyndaros came looking for Helen and destroyed towns in Attika during their search, the people of Dekeleia (and *they say* [λέγουσι, 9.73.2] Dekelos himself) guided them to Aphidnai. For this service, when the Spartans ravaged Attika in the later war between the Athenians and the Peloponnesians, they spared Dekeleia. **74.**

Sophanes of Dekeleia was the best Athenian soldier in the battle. Two *stories are told* (λεγόμενους, 9.74.1) about Sophanes. The first was that he chained himself to an iron anchor so that his opponents would not be able to move him from his place. In the second, at variance to the first, *it is said* (λέγεται, 9.74.2) he did not have a real anchor but carried an anchor device on his shield. **75.** Sophanes later killed Eurybates of Argos while the Athenians were besieging Aigina. He was killed at Datos, when he was a general with Leagros, son of Glaukon.

After any battle there are conflicting claims for prominence by cities and individuals which result in different traditions. This is not

only because participants in a battle observe only their own small fraction of the whole battlefield but also, most naturally, because they give prominence to their own, and their own cities', achievements. This is certainly true of Plataiai which was a fragmented battle; the Spartans and Tegeans fought in one section of the battlefield, the Athenians in another and some of the allies in another.³⁶ Thus, it is to be expected that conflicting traditions about the achievements of various individuals and groups would emerge after Plataiai. The existence of these different traditions would require any inquirer attempting to establish a definitive and credible record of events to provide authority in order to persuade the audience of the reliability of their version of events. In his account in the *Histories*, Herodotos attempts to provide this authority through a number of authorial insertions and source-attributing words.

The first source-attributing word in the section (λέγεται, 9.71.1) indicates that the information about the best of the Persians was based by Herodotos upon oral report. Macan³⁷ has suggested that this λέγεται may be intended by Herodotos to insinuate a doubt. Yet, given the context of the passage, the source-attributing word cannot signal Herodotos' doubts or disagreement as in the narrative of the battle the valour of the Persian infantry and Mardonios' ability and bravery is repeatedly emphasised. For example, the narrative (9.63) makes it clear that Mardonios and his bodyguard were where the battle was fiercest and that when Mardonios was killed the Persians retreated. This defeat of the Persian infantry precipitated the disintegration of the

³⁶ The sections of the Greek army had lost sight of each other; Hdt. 9.59 & 69.

³⁷ VII-IX, vol.1, p.746.

Persian army (9.68). In this instance the information introduced by λέγεται acts as a summation of the narrative and cannot be taken to show that Herodotos does not believe that narrative.

Herodotos' conclusions about the most prominent of the Greek states are likely to be far more controversial. The honouring of one valiant foe over another would not necessarily disturb a Greek audience. The assertion that, while the Tegeans and Athenians fought well, the Lakedaimonians excelled all in virtue would certainly be disputed, especially at a time when Athens was embroiled in a deadly struggle for survival with Sparta.³⁸ There is some evidence that traditions awarding pre-eminence to other cities existed at some time. The story that the Spartans and Athenians almost fought over the official award for valour which, by compromise, was finally given to the Plataians, for example, is another version of events which was recorded.³⁹ To counter either other traditions or the disbelief of sections of his Greek audience, Herodotos appealed to γνώμη and explained to the audience why the narrative asserted the supremacy of the Spartans; while each of the Tegeans, Athenians and Lakedaimonians defeated their opponents in the battle, the Lakedaimonians met and defeated the strongest part of the Persian forces. In this instance a statement of "fact" supported by evidence

³⁸ The date of publication of the *Histories* is not certain but even the widest range places it during the Peloponnesian War between 424 and 410; see J.A.S. Evans, 'The Medism of Pausanias: Two Versions' *Antichthon* 22 (1988), p.8, notes 36-37, A. French, 'Topical Influences on Herodotos' Narrative' *Mnemosyne* 25 (1972), pp.9-27 and S. Flory, 'Who Read Herodotos' Histories?' *AJPh* 101 (1980), pp.23-26.

³⁹ Plutarch, *Aristeides* 20, *Moralia* 873A (*de Mal. Herod.* 42).

based upon γνώμη has to carry the weight of convincing the audience that Herodotos' account was reliable.

The claims of merit made on behalf of different individuals might also be controversial. Accordingly, Herodotos commences his account about the merits of individual Spartans with an authorial insertion of his own opinion; in his judgment the bravest of the Spartans were Aristodemos, Poseidonios, Philokyon and Amompharetos. In this instance, however, Herodotos' authorial views are at variance with that of the Spartans present at the battle. They judged that Aristodemos, who had been dishonoured as the only Spartan who survived Thermopylai, had sought death at Plataiai. Thus, they considered Poseidonios to be the better man because he fought bravely but had no desire to die. This information is reported by Herodotos without source-attributing words although it may be the official Spartan line. Herodotos' own judgment seems to have been based upon details he heard about the battle but the source was not one which would enhance the authority of Herodotos' view. Accordingly, as Herodotos cannot cite an authoritative source, he introduces a reliability indicator in the form of an authorial statement of opinion to establish that his view is reliable. In this case, Herodotos himself becomes the source of the information and it is his reputation which the audience is intended to weigh against the opinions of the Spartans. The reliability indicator identifies Herodotos as the authority, a view which is enhanced by his churlish attack upon the credit of the opposing point of view: Herodotos comments that Aristodemos alone was not honoured and that the Spartans may have been envious of him.

Herodotos' report of who was considered the best of the Athenians includes different techniques to establish its authority. In contrast to the Spartan section, in which a number of individuals are named, only one individual is mentioned in the Athenian section. Of the Athenians, Sophanes of Dekeleia is said (λέγεται, 9.73.1) to have won renown. There would almost certainly be other claimants in Athens to have won renown in the battle but they are not mentioned. Instead, the λέγεται in this case is the first part of an elaborately constructed account, involving details of Dekeleia and the achievements of Sophanes, intended to show that the account was reliable.

In the account of Sophanes the λέγεται at the outset emphasises that the narrative is not the opinion of Herodotos alone but has the authority of an oral tradition. Again, this cannot suggest reserve on the part of Herodotos for the remainder of the narrative sets out, step by step, to establish the primacy of Sophanes' claim. There is first a digression about the history of Dekeleia to settle another controversial issue: the identity of the people who in ancient times showed the Tyndaridai where to look for Helen.

This digression contains λέγουσι in two places to indicate to the audience that the account has its source in the belief of the Athenians who are local informants and therefore should possess reliable information. The essence of the dispute is over who guided the Tyndaroi to Aphidnai and the existence of alternative traditions is shown by the tradition later recorded by Plutarch.⁴⁰ In order to

⁴⁰ *Theseus* 32. In this version it was Akademos who helped the Tyndaroi and the grounds of the Academy which were spared by the Spartans when they later invaded Attika.

establish his account as the definitive record in the mind of the audience, Herodotos through the repeated λέγουσι indicates that his authority is oral tradition. In addition, Herodotos adduces further evidence supporting the accuracy of his account based upon γνώμη and ἱστορίη. In terms of ἱστορίη he provides (9.73.3) the information that, for their assistance to the Spartans, the people of Dekeleia are still allowed exemption from all taxes at Sparta and precedence at feasts. This information was presumably capable of verification by anyone who cared to enquire. In addition, γνώμη suggests that the Spartans, by the safety they afford Dekeleia during the Peloponnesian War, confirm their claim. The function of the source-attributing words and the evidence Herodotos adduces is to show that the version he recorded was accurate. Some people may question the story, but Herodotos provides his authority and his evidence to support the credibility of his account.

Herodotos then returns to Sophanes. The narrative repeats (9.74.1) the assertion that Sophanes was the best of the Athenians in the battle which is clear proof, if there is still any doubt, that the earlier λέγεται was not an indication of reserve. Herodotos then provides support for this statement in two ways. First, he relates two stories about Sophanes' conduct at Plataiai. Second, he records other illustrious deeds performed by Sophanes. The effect of this detailed information about Sophanes is to show the audience that the information of his award at Plataiai was likely to be justified. Herodotos first relates two stories which were told (λεγόμενους) concerning Sophanes. This use of λεγομένους indicates both natural storytelling and an indication of Herodotos' oral source material.

According to the first of these stories, Sophanes attached an iron anchor to his body armour with a bronze chain. When the enemy approached, he would anchor himself to the ground so that he could not be moved from his position. Herodotos repeats his identification of an oral source for this story λέγεται (9.74.2) before relating the second account, also incorporating λέγεται (9.74.2). According to this story, Sophanes had an emblem of an anchor on his shield which he spun around constantly in the battle.

Herodotos makes no specific comment about either variation and, in fact, his statement that Sophanes won most renown in the battle might be confirmed in Herodotos' mind precisely because there were a number of stories about his achievements. Further support for the justice of Sophanes' claim is provided by other information. Herodotos reports (9.75) another deed performed by Sophanes⁴¹ during the earlier siege of Aigina before giving the circumstances of his death in battle in Thrace some years later.⁴²

Herodotos' technique to establish the supremacy of the claim of Sophanes is evident. There existed various traditions concerning who was the best fighter of the Athenians at Plataiai. Herodotos' source assigning prominence to Sophanes, however, was not one which would establish the authority of this conclusion. In these circumstances, Herodotos both indicates through source-attributing

⁴¹ Sophanes killed in single combat the Argive Eurybates. Herodotos makes another mention of this at 6.92.3 and the slight differences indicate the possibility of different sources. At 9.75 Sophanes is the son of Eutychemes of the town of Dekeleia and Eurybates was a victor in the Pentathlon. At 6.92 Sophanes is the son of Dekeles and Eurybates is a man practised in the Pentathlon who had already killed three men in single combat.

⁴² At Datos near Amphipolis: see Thu. 1.100 & 4.102.

words that the narrative has the support of an oral tradition and provides further evidence of the exploits of Sophanes in order to confirm the justice of the claim. The burden of establishing the authority of Herodotos' record is therefore shared by source-attributing words and the evidence of the deeds of Sophanes provided in the narrative.

Summary:

This section, which details the awards for bravery at Plataiai, was likely to be disputed by parts of the audience. Source-attributing words, reliability indicators and supporting evidence all are intended to establish the authority and reliability of Herodotos' version.

Section 18: Chapters 76-82

76. The daughter of Hegetorides of Kos, who had been abducted by the Persian Pharandates, son of Teaspis, fled to Pausanias. He treated her with courtesy and sent her to Aigina. **77.** The Mantineans and Eleans arrived at Plataiai after the battle. On their return home they banished their leaders.

78. Lampon, son of Pytheas, one of the leading men in Aigina

Αἰγινητέων <ἐὼν> τὰ πρῶτα (9.78.1)

urged Pausanias (*direct speech*) to behead and impale the body of Mardonios in revenge for the beheading of Leonidas after Thermopylai. **79.** Pausanias (*also direct speech*) rejected the suggestion as impious and called it an act more suitable for barbarians. **80.** Pausanias instructed the helots to collect all the spoils of the battle. They stole some and sold it to the Aiginetans who thus laid the foundation of their fortune by buying gold as if it was bronze.

81. From the spoils of the battle a tripod was made at Delphi, a bronze figure of Zeus at Olympia and a bronze Poseidon at the Isthmos. The rest was divided between the members of the army. How much was set aside for those who fought best *is not said by anyone, but I consider they received gifts*

οὐ λέγεται πρὸς οὐδαμῶν, δοκέω δ' ἔγωγε καὶ τούτοισι
δοθῆναι. (9.81.2)

Pausanias received a tenth part of everything. **82.** *It is said* (λέγεται, 9.82.1) this also occurred. Pausanias had captured Xerxes' sumptuously appointed tent and servants. Pausanias instructed them to prepare a Persian meal, then ordered his own cooks to prepare a Spartan meal. He sent for the Greek generals and pointed out (*direct speech*) the difference; the Persians had so much yet came to take away the little the Greeks possessed. In this way, *it is said* (λέγεται, 9.82.3) Pausanias spoke to the Greek generals.

This section contains source-attributing words in both negative and positive functions. The negative signals a limitation in Herodotos' information about the spoils of the battle and confirms that he did not have access to those who had fought best or their relatives for they would have been able to report if they received gifts or not.

Even the family of the Athenian Sophanes, about whom so much is revealed including the circumstances of his death, seem to have provided no information to assist Herodotos. On the positive side is the information which twice incorporates λέγεται about the banquet prepared by Pausanias. This information about the banquet and the ancillary source-attributing words should be considered in the context of both the entire account of the deeds of Pausanias as recorded by Herodotos and the role of source-attributing words in the *Histories*.

This section contains a capsule of the character of Pausanias which is seemingly at odds with his later reputation for Medism, treason and arrogance. Earlier, Herodotos had praised Pausanias as the winner of the most glorious victory known (9.63). In this present section, Pausanias is shown as a man who is honourable, just, reasonable and the antithesis of Persian despotism and excess. He is gracious to a suppliant, rejects as impious a suggestion that he should mutilate the corpse of Mardonios and serves an ironical banquet. Together with the information that Pausanias released the sons of the Theban Mediser Attaginos as guiltless even though their father had escaped (9.88), Herodotos portrays a very positive picture of the character and deeds of Pausanias. Yet this is not his reputation as preserved by history. Pausanias, saviour of Greece, died a miserable death from starvation in Sparta as a result of indictable behaviour including Medism, arrogance towards Sparta's allies and conspiring with helots. This different picture is the direct result of the account

recorded by Thucydides which was followed by later writers such as Diodoros, Plutarch and Pausanias.⁴³

The account of Thucydides (1.95, 1.128-135) is both detailed and supported by documentary evidence. In this account, Pausanias commanded the Greek fleet for the offensive war against Persia but so offended the Greek allies by his dictatorial manner that they asked the Athenians to take over hegemony of the alliance. Pausanias later adopted Persian customs, dressed in the Persian style, maintained a Persian bodyguard, gave lavish banquets in the Persian manner and corresponded with Xerxes asking for the king's daughter in marriage. When recalled to Sparta, Pausanias continued to correspond with Xerxes and also intrigued with the helots. The Ephors intercepted his correspondence with Xerxes and contrived to overhear a traitorous conversation between Pausanias and his messenger. Pausanias was not arrested but escaped to a temple where he was walled up and starved to death.

There are many difficulties with this account of Thucydides, as has frequently been recognised,⁴⁴ and scholars have sought to

⁴³ Although the circumstances of his death are not given, Pausanias' reputation for treachery is accepted by Diodoros (11.46.1-4, 54.3). Plutarch gives two versions (*Kimón* 6 and *Aristeides* 23) while Pausanias (8.52.1) notes that the crimes of Pausanias of Sparta preclude him from being considered a benefactor of Greece.

⁴⁴ The story of Pausanias in Thucydides is presented in a different way from the rest of his history [Evans, *op.cit.*, (n.38), p.1, n.2, P.J. Rhodes, 'Thucydides on Pausanias and Themistocles' *Historia* 19 (1970), p.387, M. Lang, 'Scapegoat Pausanias' *CJ* 63 (1967), p.81] and there are problems of chronology [C.W. Fornara, 'Some Aspects of the Career of Pausanias of Sparta' *Historia* 15 (1966) pp.263-265; Rhodes, p.389; A. Blamire, 'Pausanias and Persia' *GRBS* 11 (1970) p.297], inconsistency, special pleading and incongruity which bring the account

explain or reconcile some or all of the inconsistencies.⁴⁵ Rather than attempt to explain away the inconsistencies in Thucydides, however, it is possible that Thucydides was misled and that Pausanias, initially at least, was the victim of a propaganda campaign initiated by Athens⁴⁶ which was later used by the Spartan state.⁴⁷ If this is so, it is possible

into serious question. Lang, for example, (p.80) lists 14 points which need explanation.

- ⁴⁵ Some scholars doubt that Pausanias Medised immediately after Plataiai but accept that success could have gone to his head and that the charges of arrogance are more likely (Rhodes, *ibid*, p.389). Other scholars have argued that a charge of Medism based upon Pausanias' first period in Byzantium is as incomprehensible as it was conceivable on the second occasion and so the charge has been added retrospectively (Fornara, *ibid*, pp.266-267). Still other scholars believe that Pausanias did return to Byzantium with Spartan backing, either to secure Persian support for Sparta (Lang, *ibid*, p.83) or to work against Athens (M. White, 'Some Agiad Dates: Pausanias and his Sons' *JHS* 84 [1964], p.152). Yet another explanation suggests that the charges of Medism were true from the beginning, as Thucydides states, and that the chronology of Thucydides is accurate, but that Pausanias' approaches to Persia were part of his plan for social revolution at home (Blamire, *ibid*, p.303).
- ⁴⁶ Thucydides (1.95.2) notes that Athens moved to put a check on Pausanias while Herodotos, Aristotle, Diodoros and Plutarch all preserve traditions indicating that the transition from Spartan to Athenian leadership of the Hellenes was not smoothly achieved and that the defection of the Ionians was orchestrated by Athens: Hdt 8.3.2, Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 23.2 & 4, Diodoros 11.50, Plutarch, *Aristeides* 23; cf. Thucydides (1.95.1 & 1.75, 1.96 and 1.130). If the transition from Spartan to Athenian leadership was indeed orchestrated by Athens, organising the removal of the victor of Plataiai would be an important step.
- ⁴⁷ In the compendium of charges against Pausanias is almost everything a Spartan might be accused of for political and propaganda purposes: Medism, interest in luxury, arrogance and, that perpetual fear of the Spartans, conspiracy with the helots. There may be evidence of an internal power struggle between Pausanias and the Ephors (Aristotle, *Politics* 1301 b.20) which helps to explain the hostile traditions preserved within Sparta. Indeed, the charges made against Pausanias

that Pausanias' reputation and character has been incorrectly preserved by history. Herodotos, at least, seems to provide evidence of a tradition about Pausanias at odds with the version later recorded by Thucydides.

Indeed, it seems possible that Herodotos' account in Book Nine of the *Histories* was a deliberate attempt to provide a contrast to the emerging picture of Pausanias' Medism and arrogance. Where Xerxes cut in half the innocent son of Pythios the Lydian and marched the army between the halves because Pythios asked for his son to be released from the campaign (7.38-39),⁴⁸ Pausanias condemned and executed the Theban leaders responsible for aiding the Persians but, despite the escape of Attaginos, released his sons as blameless. In contrast to the desecration of the corpse of Leonidas by Xerxes after Thermopylai (7.238), Pausanias rebuked the man who suggested similar treatment for the corpse of Mardonios. In contrast to his lust for and accidental murder of a noble Byzantine woman,⁴⁹ Pausanias was courteous and correct with the woman from Kos. Another contrast, introduced and closed with λέγεται, is the account of the twin banquets, one Persian and one Spartan, ordered by Pausanias and his comment on Persian excess to the assembled Greek generals. While the informants for this banquet are clearly not authoritative (otherwise

parallel the earlier action by the Spartan state to discredit and minimise the reign of Kleomenes and the later campaign against Lysander (Plutarch, *Lysander* 25-26). Kleomenes was also accused of conspiring with the helots; Rhodes, *op.cit.*, (n.44), p.392, n. 30. For Kleomenes, see Chapter 7, footnotes 38-42.

⁴⁸ In another example, Dareios killed all three sons of Oiobazos because he asked that one of his sons be excused from joining Dareios' Skythian expedition: Hdt. 4.84.

⁴⁹ Plutarch, *Kimon* 6. This story is not found in Thucydides but Plutarch comments that it was told by many authors.

they would almost certainly have been cited by Herodotos) the repeated λέγεται is a part of Herodotos' dialogue with his audience, intended to show that audience that the information was not speculation by Herodotos but emanated from oral accounts.

From his first introduction of Pausanias, Herodotos indicated that he knew the story that Pausanias was a traitor. In the midst of an account about a Persian expedition against Naxos, Herodotos states that Dareios appointed to command the fleet Megabates, who

Παυσανίης ὁ Κλεομβρότου Λακεδαιμόνιος, εἰ δὴ
ἀληθὴς γέ ἐστι ὁ λόγος, ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ τούτων
ἤρμόσατο θυγατέρα, ἔρωτα σχὼν τῆς Ἑλλάδος
τύραννος γενέσθαι (5.32).

In this instance εἰ δὴ ἀληθὴς γέ ἐστι ὁ λόγος makes Herodotos' doubts plain. This qualification of Herodotos' refers to both Pausanias' betrothal to the daughter of Megabates and to the fact that Pausanias sought to become tyrant of Greece⁵⁰ and his account, if nothing else, shows that the Pausanias story went through different stages.⁵¹ Herodotos' failure to record the details of Pausanias' disgrace and death was not because it fell outside the scope of the *Histories* as has been

⁵⁰ Fornara, *op.cit.*, (n.44), p.263 and n.30; cf. A.W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol.1, p.423.

⁵¹ This is shown by Thucydides' reference to the marriage alliance with Megabates, not Xerxes. This must have been an earlier version; Megabates was replaced as satrap by Artabazos before Pausanias returned to Byzantion so the account that Pausanias was to be betrothed to his daughter (as opposed to the daughter of Xerxes) had its beginnings before Megabates faded from history. Even if the final "Thucydidean" form had not been fixed some version of it was current when Herodotos was gaining his information.

suggested;⁵² on at least four other occasions in Book Nine alone Herodotos gives the subsequent history of individuals⁵³ and he does refer to the later exile of Themistokles (8.109.5). The different treatment by Herodotos was because he believes the information about the crimes and character of Themistokles and has no hesitation in recording them in the narrative. In contrast, he displays clear hesitation about the Medism of Pausanias and portrays a very different picture from the man who in the next year supposedly adopted Persian dress, manners, customs and sought a Persian marriage alliance. Yet, by Herodotos' time Pausanias' reputation was probably being attacked by official Athenian and Spartan sources which explains why Herodotos did not state that the information is wrong. It is clear that his informants, whoever they were, would not be of sufficient status to confer authority on Herodotos' version against the combined Athenian and Spartan version. Therefore, Herodotos provides most of his account in narrative and the λέγεται statements show the audience that a contrary oral tradition did exist.

Summary:

In this section source-attributing words lend support to the views expressed in the narrative.

⁵² Evans, *op.cit.*, (n.38), p.11.

⁵³ Hegesistratos (9.38), Aeimnestos (9.64), Sophanes (9. 75) and Hermolykos (9. 105).

Section 19: Chapters 83-84

83. In later days the Plataians found other chests of precious metals and things such as the skeleton of a man five cubits long. **84.** The body of Mardonios was carried away the day after the battle. *I am unable to report accurately*

ἀτρεκέες οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν (9.84.1)

by whom but *I heard* (ἤκουσα, 9.84.1) of many different people who claim to have buried Mardonios. *I know* (οἶδα, 9.84.1) many people who received gifts for this deed from Artontes, the son of Mardonios but *I am unable to learn accurately*

οὐ δύναμαι ἀτρεκέως πυθέσθαι (9.84.2)

who did bury the body although Dionysophanes of Ephesos was named.

This section illustrates Herodotos' methods of dealing with disputed traditions through reliability indicators and a source-attributing word. First, the *histor* indicates the limitations of the available information. Once the audience has been cautioned, however, the researcher reveals the information he does possess but appends another disclaimer.

Herodotos knew of a number of different accounts about the removal of Mardonios' body after the battle and its burial. However, none of the informants were of sufficient authority to be cited by Herodotos to settle the controversy. Instead, Herodotos twice acknowledged the limitations in his information while affirming by means of reliability indicators and a source-attributing word the facts about which he is confident. The naming of one of the claimants, Dionysophanes of Ephesos, is part of this process. Although Herodotos is not as certain of the accuracy of the claim of Dionysophanes as he is, for example, about the identity of the man who betrayed the Greeks

at Thermopylai,⁵⁴ his naming of one person is his method of suggesting a solution to the controversy. The matter, however, is not clear, for based on the evidence of the payments made by Artontes, more than one of the claimants has a claim to accuracy.

Summary:

Different claims were heard by Herodotos about the identity of the person who buried the body of Mardonios. Herodotos indicates to his audience through a source-attributing word, a reliability indicator and authorial insertions of opinion that although he cannot resolve the dispute he can advance a tentative solution.

⁵⁴ See 7.213-214 for the dispute and Herodotos' reasoning and stated opinion.

Section 20: Chapter 85

85. After the battle the Greeks buried their dead in separate tombs. The Spartans constructed three tombs, the Tegeans one and the Athenians one. One was also made for the Megarians and Phliasians who had been killed by the Theban cavalry. These tombs contained bodies; all the other tombs visible at Plataiai are empty barrows, *as I discovered*

ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι (9.85.3),

and had been built because the cities were ashamed to have been absent from the battle. The tomb called the tomb of the Aiginetans, *I heard* (ἄκούω, 9.85.3), was built ten years later at the Aiginetans' request by their πρόξεινος Kleades, son of Autodikos, of Plataiai.

It is clear that Herodotos firmly believed that the allies had betrayed the Greek cause at Plataiai as the information that the allied contingents had deliberately disobeyed orders and avoided the battle is repeated throughout Herodotos' narration of the campaign. This hostile view is repeated by statements in the narrative, by the *histor* as commentator and by the speech placed in the mouth of Pausanias.⁵⁵ There is little question, however, that this conclusion would be challenged by other Greeks. Indeed, there is evidence that traditions existed in which the allies had performed with credit at Plataiai. For example, an epigram in honour of the Megarian dead in the war specifically mentions those killed by the cavalry on the Boiotian plain.⁵⁶ Other evidence may be found in the later defence of the allies, and the corresponding attack upon the credit of Herodotos, by

⁵⁵ Refer to the commentary on Hdt. 9.49.2-50, 9.60.1-2, 9.69 & 9.70.1.

⁵⁶ Tod, No.20, W. Peek, *Greek Verse Inscriptions*, Chicago, 1988, No.9 & p.4. For comment on this epigram, see H.T. Wade-Gery, 'Classical Epigrams and Epitaphs' *JHS* 53 (1933), pp.95-97 and F. Jacoby, 'Athenian Epigrams from the Persian Wars' *Hesperia* 14 (1945), p.172, n.57.

Plutarch⁵⁷ who, for example, challenged Herodotos' denigration of the allies and cited a poem by Simonides, in which the role of the Corinthians at Plataiai is praised, as evidence that Herodotos was wrong.⁵⁸ If this is a genuine poem of Simonides⁵⁹ it shows that, contrary to Herodotos' account, cities other than Athens, Sparta and Tegea were considered by some to have performed with credit at Plataiai. Indeed, it seems clear that the charge of cowardice and dereliction of duty had not been levelled at the allies in the period immediately following the campaign for, as Plutarch argues, the fact that the allies were included on the inscription set up to commemorate the Greek victory shows that Pausanias and Aristeides did not think that the allies had deliberately avoided the battle.⁶⁰ The building of cenotaphs in memory of those who fought and died in the cause of their state

⁵⁷ *Moralia* 871E-873E (*de Mal. Herod.* 41-42). It does not matter whether the author of this work was Plutarch or not if the contemporary evidence is accurately quoted. However, the defence of the allies in Plutarch, *Aristeides* 19.5-6, is consistent with that in *de Mal. Herod.*

⁵⁸ *Moralia* 872D-E (*de Mal. Herod.* 41), Plutarch, *Aristeides* 19.6.

⁵⁹ The epigram is found in the Palatine Anthology (6.50) where it is attributed to Simonides: D. Sansone (ed), *Plutarch, The Lives of Aristeides and Cato*, Warminster, 1989, p.195.

⁶⁰ *Moralia* 872F-873E (*de Mal. Herod.* 42). The inscription has been preserved: Tod, No.19, Meiggs/Lewis, No.27. As Tod, p.23 and Meiggs/Lewis, p.59, note, this inscription cannot refer exclusively to Plataiai as it includes some island states which did not fight there. Yet there is validity to the claim that, had the Spartans and Athenians believed that the allies had avoided the battle, some of the states who did not fight elsewhere would have been excluded. Scholarship, in this instance at least, supports Plutarch's criticism of Herodotos and concurs that the allies did not deliberately seek to avoid the battle (Macan, *VII-IX*, p.706A, Grundy, *op.cit.*, (n.26), pp.490-492, Burn, *op.cit.*, (n.30), p.531, Hignett, *op.cit.*, (n.17), pp.327-328, Green, *op.cit.*, (n.17), p.262).

implies that the soldiers thus memorialised had fought with honour.⁶¹ These tombs are evidence in terms of ὄψις of the reliability of the alternative traditions. The physical evidence of the tombs could not be ignored for their very existence contradicted the conclusions reached by Herodotos and narrated in the *Histories*. To establish the accuracy of his account of Plataiai, it was necessary for Herodotos to debunk and overturn this most visible evidence of a contrary tradition.

In this section, therefore, Herodotos provides evidence of the duplicity of the allies at Plataiai which is intended to prove that his account of their treachery is true. In order to challenge the physical evidence of the tombs Herodotos asserts through a reliability indicator and a source-attributing word that they are frauds, erected because of shame. Herodotos' personal assertion that his claims are true is the evidence presented to the audience. Through this dialogue with the audience Herodotos invites them to view himself as a reliable researcher and to accept his assertion as surety for the view expressed in the narrative. To add verisimilitude Herodotos names Kleades as the man who ten years later was responsible for the Aiginetan's tomb. The purpose of the specific name is the same as Herodotos' authorial assertion of knowledge; to establish in the audience's mind the view

⁶¹ S.C. Humphreys, 'Death and Time' in S.C. Humphreys & H. King (eds), *Mortality and Immortality: The Anthropology and Archaeology of Death*, London, 1981, p.262, notes that a permanent monument, tomb-mound or statue was an important element in the Greek ideal of a "good death". When men died in battle on behalf of the state, the state took upon itself the duty of honouring them with cenotaphs and performing the funeral rites that otherwise were the duty of the family: F. Jacoby, '*Patrios Nomos*: State Burial in Athens and the Public Cemetery in the Kerameikos' *JHS* 64 (1944), pp.38-40.

that his account is true despite the visible evidence of the tombs at Plataiai.

To establish the reliability of his account in this contentious issue, it might be expected that Herodotos would cite his informants if they were of sufficient authority to confirm Herodotos' version of events in the mind of a Greek audience. I believe he does not do so because of the nature of the informants and the information imparted. There is evidence that much of the information for the Plataiai campaign was derived by Herodotos from Medisers.⁶² For example, as has been noted in the commentary on the earlier sections of Book Nine, Herodotos concentrates upon the deeds of the Medising Greeks, especially the Thebans, names specific individuals from among the Medisers more frequently than from among the Greeks, and shows knowledge of the counsels of the Persians, but not the Hellenes. The Medising Thebans are not castigated. Instead, their achievements in the battle are praised while the role of the Hellenic allies is maligned. The leaders of the Thebans, Phokians, Macedonians and Thessalians are named, while those of the Hellenes, even the Tegeans who receive praise, are not. All these factors contribute to a Persian centred view of the campaign.

The nature of the information is also relevant. The tradition believed and supported by Herodotos was that, in the battle which conclusively expelled the Persian invaders from mainland Greece and ensured the freedom of the Greeks,⁶³ the Greek allies (who nevertheless

⁶² The arguments for this are given in detail in my 'Herodotos' Sources for the Plataiai Campaign' AC 61 (1992), pp.80-97.

⁶³ An essential motif in the *Histories* is the contrast between Greek freedom and Asian slavery: Immerwahr, pp.108, 175, 181-184. Pausanias (9.2.5) notes that in his time there were still games at Plataiai called "Freedom games".

picked the "right" side) had been guilty of cowardice and dereliction of duty. Many of the Greeks were either unaware of this charge or, if aware, vehemently disagreed. Herodotos was convinced that the allies had deliberately avoided the battle until it had been won by the Greeks, but would surely be reluctant to cite Medisers as the source of material which denigrated loyal Greeks.⁶⁴

Summary:

The information of Medisers on a question which concerned the treachery of loyal Greeks would be unlikely to be accepted as good authority when Herodotos was writing the *Histories*. In attempting to establish the accuracy of his account, Herodotos could not cite Medisers as authority and so he relied upon repeated assertions of the guilt of the allies in his narration of Plataiai and supported it by reliability indicators asserting his claim to possess reliable information. In this passage it is his own authority as a researcher which is intended to establish the reliability of the account in the mind of the audience and to contradict the evidence of the tombs of the allies.

⁶⁴ The term "Medism" had a specially derogatory and odious connotation in the Greek world (D.F. Graf, 'Medism: The Origin and Significance of the Term' *JHS* 104 (1984), p.15) and clearly, the taint of having medised in 480-79 remained a stigma among the Greeks well into the fifth century and beyond. Alexander of Macedon was anxious to promulgate the tradition of his services to the Greeks (Scaife, *op.cit.*, (n.23), pp.129-137) while the Thebans sought to excuse their Medism by blaming the ambitions of their oligarchic leaders (Thucydides 3.62.4, Plutarch, *Aristeides* 18.6 and Pausanias 9.6.2). Even neutrality carried odium; the Argives put out a story that they remained neutral only because of an oracular response from Delphi and Spartan intransigence (Hdt. 7.148-152).

Section 21: Chapters 86-88

86. The Greeks *resolved* (ἔδοκέε, 9.86.1) to march against Thebes and demand the surrender of the Theban medisers, especially Timagenidas and Attaginos. When they had thus *resolved* (ἔδοξε, 9.86.2) they marched to Thebes. The Greeks lay siege to the city. **87.** After nineteen days Timagenidas offered (*direct speech*) to surrender himself and the other Medisers. **88.** They then surrendered. Attaginos himself escaped but his sons were captured. Pausanias judged that they were not responsible for the crimes of their father and released them. Pausanias felt that the others might secure their release by bribery so they were sent to Korinth and executed. These things occurred in Plataiai and Thebes

ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἐν Πλαταιῆσι καὶ Θήβησι γενόμενα. (9.88)

The statement ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἐν Πλαταιῆσι καὶ Θήβησι γενόμενα formally closes Herodotos' account of the campaign of Plataiai. In this final section some of the earlier narrative concerns and themes are repeated. First, the counsels of the Greeks are again merely indicated by "it was resolved" without direct speech or detail while information from the Theban side is reported in direct speech. Second, the treatment of the children of Attaginos completes the consistent picture in Herodotos of a just Pausanias.

Summary:

There is no information in this section which is at variance with the rest of Herodotos' account and it is narrated without comment.

Section 22: Chapters 89-92

89. Artabazos in his retreat was entertained by the Thessalians. *He felt that if they knew the truth his army would not escape so he led them to think (direct speech) that the army of Mardonios was following.* He hurried to Byzantion and crossed into Asia by boat. **90.** On the same day as the defeat at Plataiai the Persians were also defeated at Mykale in Ionia. The Greek fleet were at Delos under the command of Leutychides of Sparta. Three Samians, *Lampon son of Thrasykles, Athenagoras son of Archestratides and Hegesistratos son of Aristagoras* arrived secretly from Samos. *Hegesistratos (direct speech) urged the fleet to sail to Ionia and free the Greeks there.* **91.** *Leutychides (direct speech) agreed.* **92.** The Samians joined the alliance against Persia.

This section illustrates the transition made by Herodotos between the accounts of Plataiai and Mykale. Although his account of Plataiai has been finalised, chapter 9.89 is connected to the earlier section. Thus, continuing the Persian orientation of his account of Plataiai, Herodotos records details of the thoughts and the direct speech of Artabazos. The immediately following chapters on Mykale, in contrast, display a Greek orientation as is shown by the naming of three Samians⁶⁵ and, for the first time in Book Nine, the recording in direct speech of details of the deliberations of the Greek leaders. This implies that the informants for Mykale are not part the Persian forces but among the Greeks, possibly Samians.

⁶⁵ In the Plataiai section few individuals are named in the Greek force. In contrast, in this section *three* Samians are identified which suggests Samian sources were consulted by Herodotos. For Herodotos and Samos, see Chapter 1.4 and footnotes 46-52.

Summary:

This narrative section contains no disputed information but it does illustrate the difference in Herodotos' sources between Plataiai and Mykale.

Section 23: Chapters 93-95

93. The next day the Greeks obtained favourable omens from Deiphonos, son of Evenios of Apollonia. This had happened to Evenios. In Apollonia there was a sacred flock which the most notable of the townsmen were required to guard, each serving for one year. Evenios, during his turn, fell asleep and sixty of the animals were killed by wolves. He tried to hide his crime by buying replacements but was discovered. He was blinded by the citizens as punishment but from that moment the land of Apollonia became bare and the flocks barren. The Apollonians enquired about the cause at Delphi and Dodona and were told that the gods themselves had sent the wolves and that the people had been unjust in blinding Evenios. Their ills would continue until they had given Evenios whatever restitution he himself chose. **94.** The citizens did not tell Evenios this but instead asked him what he would accept in recompense for his lost sight. He knew nothing of the oracle and asked for certain land which was provided. When he discovered the oracle Evenios was understandably annoyed but from that time he immediately gained a gift of divination

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔμφυτον αὐτίκα μαντικὴν εἶχε. (9.94.3)

95. His son Deiphonos had accompanied the Corinthians and was diviner for the Greek army. But *I had already heard* (ἤκουσα, 9.95) that Deiphonos was not the son of Evenios but made fraudulent use of the name.

This section contains another digression which records background information about a seer. This account, like the section about the Greek seers who sacrificed for the Greek and Persian armies (9.33-38), also might seem to contain "fantastic" elements. Yet, there is every reason to accept that Herodotos, and his Greek audience, would believe the story was genuine. First, it involves the activities of the gods and so normal tests are suspended. Second, the narrative implies that the oracular responses obtained from Delphi and Dodona were the same. Two Greek oracles in agreement clearly would provide

the account with a high level of reliability and so further comment would be unnecessary.

The only source-attributing word in this section concerns whether Deiphonos was Evenios' son. In this instance ἤκουσα as a source-attributing word occurs in connection with information which seems to be doubted by Herodotos. On three occasions the narrative (9.92.2 [twice] and 9.95) states that Deiphonos *was* the son of Evenios before Herodotos indicates that there was a tradition he had heard which contradicted this information. There is no indication in the account of either the source of the information accusing Deiphonos of deceit or the source of the account reported by Herodotos in the narrative without comment. The use of the source-attributing word in this case indicates that the story emanated from oral tradition and thus had some authority.

Summary:

In this section, a source-attributing word ἤκουσα indicates to the audience that Herodotos heard a tradition which had some authority and so it is recorded although it is contrary to the rest of the narrative.

Section 24: Chapters 96-101

96. The Greeks sailed for Samos and anchored near the temple of Hera. The Persians had retreated to the mainland as they had *decided* (ἐδόκεε, 9.96.2) they would not be able to win at sea. Their plan was to beach the ships near the army of Tigranes on the mainland. **97.** They beached their ships near the temple of Eleusinian Demeter and constructed a fence around them. **98.** The Greeks discovered where the Persians had gone. *They resolved* (ἔδοξε, 9.98.1) to sail to the mainland. When the Persian fleet remained on the beach, Leutychides sailed past and urged (*direct speech*) the Ionians camped with the Persians to desert. He did this for the same reason as Themistokles at Artemision; either the Persians would not understand Greek and the Ionians could desert or the Persians would understand the message and distrust their Greek allies. **99.** The Greeks beached their ships. The Persians disarmed the Samians who were with them and posted the Milesians to the rear. **100.** The Greeks advanced. A rumour ran through their army that the Greeks had defeated Mardonios in Boiotia and a herald's mace was seen lying at the water's edge. *There are many clear proofs of divine ordering of events*

δηλα δὴ πολλοῖσι τεκμηρίοισι ἔστι τὰ θεῖα τῶν
πρηγμάτων. (9.100.2)

Here the disaster of the Persians at Plataiai heartened the Greeks at Mykale.

101. There was another coincidence; both battles took place near temples of Eleusinian Demeter. The Greek victory at Plataiai occurred early in the day, Mykale in the afternoon. *The fact that they happened on the same day was proved when the Greeks examined the issue shortly afterwards.* Before the rumour they had been afraid, after they were eager for battle.

In this section Herodotos narrates the preliminaries to the battle at Mykale. Most of the account is unremarkable and requires no authority to be accepted as accurate. However, the statement that the Greeks defeated the Persians twice on the same day is astounding information which may be questioned by the audience. To establish the reliability of his account, Herodotos as *histor* asserts that the

information is accurate and provides the proof upon which the assertion is based.

The account is constructed as follows. The information that the battles of Plataiai and Mykale took place on the same day is first reported in the narrative without proof or comment (9.90). This prepares the audience for the assertion in this later section about the miraculous nature of the victory. The speed of the knowledge of Plataiai, the herald's mace and the location of both the battles near temples of one goddess, reported in the narrative without source citation, are all miraculous facts. As a rational explanation is not possible, the *histor* comments that these facts point to divine intervention. In addition, the narrator indicates that the date of the battles were confirmed shortly afterwards by examination, thus adducing evidence in support of the seemingly miraculous events.

Herodotos does not seem to possess a source which would establish the accuracy of his account. Instead, the weight of proving to the audience that the events did happen as they were described by Herodotos is carried by authorial insertions as reliability indicators, supporting evidence and Herodotos' assertion that the dates had been checked soon after the battle. The account is thus constructed to reassure the audience that the miraculous events did take place and to show that there was independent verification available in the form of the subsequent examination.

Summary:

In this section the absence of a source citation where a story seems to need additional support suggests that Herodotos did not have sources whom he could cite as authoritative. Instead, the account is constructed around a number of proofs and an assertion by the *histor* in commentary that the information provided is accurate.

Section 25: Chapters 102-106

102. The Athenians attacked first, passing the word that they and not the Spartans should have the victory. The Athenians, Korinthians, Sikyonians and Troizenians broke into the fence and all the barbarian army except the Persians fled. Of the Persians, the leaders of the fleet, Artayntes and Ithamitres, escaped while Mardontes and the army leader Tigranes were killed. **103.** The Spartans came up and finished off the Persians. While the result of the battle was still in the balance, the Samians in the Persian army did all they could to assist the Greeks. The other Ionians followed their example. **104.** The Milesians left to guard the passes misled the retreating barbarians and killed some of them. In this way the Ionians revolted a second time from the Persians. **105.** In the battle the Athenians fought best; the best of the Athenians was Hermolykos son of Euthoinos. Later he was killed in the battle at Kyrnos in Karystos in the war between Athens and Karystos. After the Athenians the next best were the Korinthians, Sikyonians and Troizenians. **106.** The Greeks collected the booty, burnt the Persian ships and sailed to Samos. They felt they could not protect the Ionians from the expected Persian response to the revolt. The Spartans argued that the Ionians should be moved to mainland Greece and settled on the land of Medisers. The Athenians disagreed and the Spartans did not press the point. The Greeks admitted the Samians, Chians, Lesbians and other islanders to their alliance and sailed away to the Hellespont to break the Persian bridges.

This is a narrative section with no comments by Herodotos or evidence that the information is disputed. This is puzzling, given that the awarding of reputation for valour may be a source of conflicting traditions. The contrast with the earlier section on Plataiai (9.71-74), where there were disputed claims, is striking. In this section about Mykale, there is no indication of controversy; the award to the Athenians is supported by the narrative and this fact, together with the naming of one Athenian and information about his subsequent fate,

suggests an Athenian source. It is possible that Herodotos heard only one version of the awards from Athenian sources and did not make enquiries in the other cities present at the battle.⁶⁶ In these circumstances, he possessed no contrary information and so the narrative and the awards show complete consistency.

Summary:

There seems to have been no dispute among Herodotos' sources probably because Herodotos' enquiries about the battle had been limited to a few cities (Samos and Athens). The section is thus narrated without comment.

⁶⁶ For example, the absence of information about Korinth and named Korinthians in the *Histories* suggests that Herodotos had not made enquiries in that city; see Chapter 1, footnote 49.

Section 26: Chapters 107-113

107. During the Persian retreat, Masistes son of Dareios insulted Artayntes. Masistes was saved from injury at the hands of Artayntes by Xenagoras, son of Praxilaus, of Halikarnassos. For this Xenagoras was made ruler of Cilicia by Xerxes. **108.** Xerxes had been in Sardis since his flight after Salamis. He desired the wife of his brother Masistes but she would not submit. To get near her Xerxes arranged a marriage between his son Dareios and Masistes' daughter Artaynte. But he then changed his mind and seduced Artaynte. **109.** This became known in this way. Xerxes' wife, Amestris, had woven Xerxes a multicoloured cloak. Xerxes gave it to Artaynte when she asked for it as he could refuse her nothing. **110.** Amestris believed that Masistes' wife was to blame. At the Persian banquet named "tukta" the king makes gifts to his subjects. Amestris asked Xerxes to give her Masistes' wife; he knew why and was reluctant to grant her request. **111.** Amestris' insisted and Persian law required Xerxes to grant her request. Xerxes sent for his brother and instructed him (*direct speech*) to give up his wife and marry Xerxes' daughter. Masistes (*direct speech*) declined. **112.** The wife of Masistes was handed over to Amestris; her breasts, nose, ears and lips were cut off before she was sent home. **113.** Masistes and his family set off to Baktria to revolt. He would have done this, *as it seems to me* (ὡς ἔμοι δοκέειν, 9.113.2) had he managed to escape to the Baktrians and the Sakai. But he was caught and killed by Xerxes' army.

This section contains the elements of an oriental fantasy from the Persian court which a Greek audience would have no hesitation in believing. It is a story recorded by Herodotos without source-attributing words and no source is cited because no extra credibility was required. Nor would Herodotos disbelieve the information; this account of lust, injustice, torture and murder is consistent with Herodotos' view of the lawlessness of one man rule.⁶⁷ The only

⁶⁷ See Waters, *Tyrants*, esp. pp.82-85.

authorial insertion by the *histor* to the audience is a reliability indicator supporting a minor part of the narrative.

Summary:

This section describes information about the Persian court which would be accepted as accurate by a Greek audience.

Section 27: Chapters 114-122

114. At the Hellespont the Greeks found the Persian bridges had been destroyed. The Spartans with Leutychides sailed back to Greece but the Athenians under Xanthippos decided to attack the Chersonesos. They besieged Sestos. **115.** Sestos was the strongest place in that region and the Persians had gathered there. **116.** Artayktes, governor of Sestos was a man *δεινὸς δὲ καὶ ἀτάσθαλος*. (9.116.1) Artayktes had tricked Xerxes into allowing him to loot the shrine of Protesileos at Elaios and he had also desecrated the precinct. He was now besieged in Sestos. **117.** The siege dragged on. **118.** Supplies ran out. The Persians escaped and the townspeople surrendered. **119.** Artayktes and his son were captured and returned to Sestos. **120.** It is said by the people of the Chersonese (*λέγεται ὑπὸ Χερσονησιτέων*, 9.120.1) that a marvellous thing happened to the man who guarded Artayktes. He was cooking dried fish which began to leap about as if newly caught. Artayktes saw this and advised the Athenian guards that the omen was Protesileos' response. He offered to ransom himself and his son but Xanthippos refused. Artayktes was taken to the headland where Xerxes had constructed the bridge of boats over the Hellespont and crucified and his son stoned to death. But others say (*οἱ δὲ λέγουσι*, 9.120.4) that he was taken to the hill above Madytos city. **121.** They then sailed away to Greece. **122.** Artayktes was the grandson of that Artembares who suggested to Kyros that the Persians should move down from the hills and settle on the fertile plains. Kyros rejected the advice.

The final source-attributing words in the *Histories* occur in respect of information reported about the Persian governor of Sestos, Artayktes. The information incorporating source-attributing words is in two parts. The first details a strange story about the fish, the second identifies two variant traditions about the location of Artayktes' crucifixion.

The account of the frying fish leaping from the pan is a strange story by any criteria and is contrary to γνώμη. As the story is connected to the shrine of the hero Protesileos⁶⁸ normal tests of credibility may be suspended. Although strange, the story is related to an omen about the death of Artayktes and the desecration of a shrine. In any event, the credibility of the account is enhanced by the identification through λέγεται of the source as locals, relayed by a man who was a witness to the events. In these circumstances, the citation is intended to attest to the credibility of the account.

The second source-attributing word concerns the location of Artayktes' crucifixion. Herodotos notes, without identifying a source, that Artayktes was taken to the headland where Xerxes had constructed the bridge of boats over the Hellespont and crucified. Alternatively, others say (οἱ δὲ λέγουσι, 9.120.4) that Artayktes was crucified on the hill above Madytos city. Artayktes was a man who plundered and desecrated the tomb of Protesileos at Elaios, so offending the Greeks that the unusual step was taken to crucify him alive.⁶⁹ Given this enormity of hostile local feeling it is not surprising that there would be rival claims for his place of death. As the difference in location was not great⁷⁰ both sources had some claim to credibility and thus Herodotos reported both versions without comment.

⁶⁸ The first of the Greeks killed in the war against Troy: *Iliad* 2.701. See also D. Boedeker, 'Protesileos and the end of Herodotus' *Histories' CLAnt* 7 (1988), pp.30-48.

⁶⁹ How/Wells, vol.2, p.336.

⁷⁰ Herodotos (7.33) states the headland where Xerxes constructed his bridge ran between Madytos and Sestos.

Summary:

In this section the function of one source-attributing word is to indicate that the story Herodotos records, although contrary to γνώμη, has the authority of a local source. Another source-attributing word indicates that alternate claims have a origin in local tradition and are worthy of some credibility. Neither can be discounted as improbable and so both are given with source citations.

* * * * *

This commentary on Chapter Nine of the *Histories* aims to support the analysis advanced in the preceding chapters of this study. Reliability indicators in the narrative are part of Herodotos' dialogue with the audience and propel Herodotos' personal certification of the accuracy of particular information to their attention. Herodotos, as *histor*, asserts that certain information in the narrative is reliable, thus ostensibly placing an additional viewpoint before his audience. For example, this occurs in connection with Herodotos' account of the oracles about the Battle of Plataiai (οἶδα, 9.43.1 & 2). Source-attributing words are another part of the dialogue and also occur in order to enhance the credibility of the narrative. An example of source-attributing words and reliability indicators combining to assert the reliability of a narrative viewpoint occurs during Herodotos' account of the tombs of the Greeks at Plataiai. Some of the occurrences of source-attributing words in Book Nine also confirm that source-attributing words simply cannot indicate disbelief on Herodotos' part. The instance of the River Oeroe, said by the locals to be the daughter of the Asopos, is a case in point as the information sourced by means of

λέγουσι (9.51.2) is immediately repeated by Herodotos in the narrative.

In no case in Book Nine do source-attributing words occur in connection with information which can be shown conclusively to be disbelieved by Herodotos. Some instances are at worst neutral, for example, the information about Deiphonos (ἤκουσα, 9.95) or the traditions about who fought best at Plataiai (λέγεται, 9.71.1, 9.73.1, 9.74.2, λέγουσι, 9.73.1 & 2, λεγομένους, 9.74.1), but in these cases the function of the source-attributing words is to emphasise to the audience that the record preserved by Herodotos has a source in oral accounts. Likewise, the source-attributing words in the stories about Artayktes (λέγεται, 9.120.1, λέγουσι, 9.120.4) or the information obtained from Thersandros (ἤκουον, 9.16.1 & 5, ἔφη, 9.16.1) help to assert that Herodotos' record of events is reliable. Where controversy is expected, Herodotos indicates by means of source-attributing words that there is factual information behind his account. For example, information about Pausanias, known by Herodotos to be contradicted by other traditions, is strengthened by the inclusion of source-attributing words (λέγεται, 9.81.1 & 2) indicating that the information has its origin in oral tradition.

In summary, the above analysis of Herodotos' dialogue with his audience in Book Nine suggests that the assertions of belief in the narrative by the *histor* through reliability indicators, his authorial commentary and the recording of details of his sources through source-attributing words were equally part of Herodotos' dialogue with his audience, intended to attest to the superiority of the account in the *Histories*.

Appendix B:

Index of Source-attributing Words in the *Histories* by Book

The following is an index of source-attributing words in the *Histories*. As noted in the Introduction, the list is as complete as constant rereading of Herodotos and reference to Powell can make it. Almost inevitably, however, I will have missed some occurrence of a source-attributing word. In addition, there are some passages in which it is unclear whether a particular word acts as a source-attributing word or not. I am confident, however, that any omissions or errors do not effect materially the conclusions advanced in the study.

The tables following may be read as follows:

The first column lists the reference to the word as it occurs in the *Oxford Classical Text* of Herodotos edited by Hude.

The second column gives the exact form used in the *OCT*. Variations are only noted where the difference would effect either the sense or the context of the passage in the *Histories*. Where this occurs the difference is discussed in notes to the text.

The third column lists the identity of Herodotos' source when they are cited at the point where the source-attributing word is used or where the passage as a whole makes the identity of the source certain. Where sources can be inferred, their identity is followed by "?".

The fourth column may contain a comment.

Source-attributing Word Index

	BOOK	ONE	
Reference	Form Used	Informants	Comments
1.1.1	φασί	learned Persians	
1.1.3	λέγουσι	Persians/Greeks	
1.2.1	λέγουσι	Persians	
1.2.1	φασί	Persians?	
1.3.1	λέγουσι	?	
1.5.1	λέγουσι	Persians	Hdt does not decide
1.5.2	λέγουσι	Phoenicians	
1.5.3	λέγουσι	Persians/Phoenicians	
1.20.	ἀκούσας	Delphians	Hdt states this is true
1.21.1	λέγουσι	Milesians	
1.22.2	πυνηθάνομαι	not attributed	
1.23.	λέγουσι	Korinthians	the Lesbians agree.
1.24.1	λέγουσι	Korinthians	(and Lesbians) {as 1.23}
1.24.6	λέγουσι	as above	as above
1.24.8	λέγουσι	Korinthians/Lesbians	
1.27.2	λέγουσι	not attributed	
1.49.	λέγεται	not attributed	in the negative
1.51.3	φασί	Delphians	Hdt agrees
1.51.3	φαμένων	Spartans	
1.51.3	λέγοντες	Spartans	
1.51.5	λέγουσι	Delphians	
1.60.3	λεγομένοις	not attributed	
1.65.4	λέγουσι	some people	
1.65.4	λέγουσι	Spartans	
1.70.2	λέγουσι	Spartans	
1.70.3	λέγουσι	Samians	
1.75.4	λέγεται	the majority of the Greeks	
1.75.6	λέγουσι	others	as opposed to Gks (1.75.4) Hdt disagrees
1.82.8	λέγουσι	Spartans?	
1.87.1	λέγεται	Lydians	
1.91.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.92.2	πυνηθάνομαι	not attributed	
1.93.5	λέγουσι	Lydians	
1.94.2	φασί	Lydians	
1.94.2	λέγουσι	Lydians	
1.94.2	λέγοντες	Lydians	

Source-attributing Word Index (Book 1)

1.95.1	λέγουσι	Persians	
1.103.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.105.3	πυνθανόμενος	not attributed	
1.105.3	λέγουσι	Cyprians	
1.105.4	λέγουσι	Skythians	
1.132.3	λέγουσι	Persians?	
1.133.2	φασί	Persians	
1.137.2	λέγουσι	Persians?	
1.137.2	φασί	Persians?	
1.138.1	φασί	not attributed	
1.138.1	φασί	not attributed	
1.153.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.159.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.170.1	πυνθάνομαι	not attributed	
1.171.5	λέγουσι	Cretans	
1.171.6	λέγουσι	Carians	
1.172.1	φασί	Kaunians	Hdt disagrees
1.176.3	φασί	Xanthians	
1.181.5	λέγουσι	Chaldaians	
1.182.1	φασί	Chaldaians	} Hdt disbelieves their } information
1.182.1	λέγοντες	Chaldaians	
1.182.2	λέγουσι	Egyptians	
1.182.2	λέγονται	not attributed	
1.183.1	ἔλεγον	Chaldaians	
1.183.3	λέγεται	Chaldaians	
1.187.5	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.196.1	πυνθάνομαι	not attributed	Hdt agrees
1.201.	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.201.	λέγουσι	not attributed	
1.202.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.202.1	φασί	not attributed	
1.202.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.202.3	λέγουσι	not attributed	
1.203.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.214.1	πυνθάνομαι	not attributed	Hdt agrees
1.214.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
1.214.5	εἴρηται	not attributed	
1.216.1	φασί	Greeks	Hdt disagrees

Source-attributing Word Index

	BOOK	TWO	
Reference	Form Used	Informants	Comments
2.2.5	ἤκουον	Egyptians	Hdt agrees
2.2.5	λέγουσι	Greeks	Hdt disagrees
2.3.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptians at Memphis	
2.3.1	ἤκουσα	Egyptians	priests of Hephaistos
2.3.1	λέγονται	not attributed	
2.3.2	ἤκουον	Egyptians-Memphis	
2.4.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptians	} priests at Memphis,
2.4.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptians	} Thebes & Heliopolis
2.4.2	ἔλεγον	Egyptians	}
2.4.2	ἔλεγον	Egyptians	}
2.5.1	λέγειν	Egyptians	
2.5.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptians	
2.8.1	ἐπυθανόμην	not attributed	
2.10.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	Hdt agrees
2.12.1	λέγουσι	Egyptian priests?	Hdt agrees
2.13.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	
2.13.1	ἤκουον	Egyptian priests	
2.13.2	ἔφασαν	Egyptians	
2.14.1	εἴρηται	Egyptians	Hdt agrees
2.15.1	φασί	Ionians	} Hdt rejects Ionian version
2.15.1	λέγοντες	Ionians	} and accepts that of
2.15.1	λέγόντων	Ionians	} the Egyptians
2.15.1	λέγόντων	Ionians	}
2.15.2	λέγουσι	Egyptians	Hdt agrees
2.16.1	φασί	Ionians and Greeks	
2.18.1	ἐπυθόμην	not attributed	Hdt agrees
2.20.1	ἔλεξαν	Some of the Greeks	} All of these are rejected
2.20.1	λέγει	Some of the Greeks	} by Hdt
2.21.	λέγει	Some of the Greeks	} "
2.22.1	λέγει	Some of the Greeks	} "
2.23.	λέξας	Some of the Greeks	} "
2.28.2	ἔλεγε	} scribe at Treasury	
2.28.4	ἔφη	} of Athena at Sais	
2.28.5	ἔλεγε	}	
2.29.1	ἐπυθόμην	not attributed	
2.29.6	λέγεται	not attributed	
2.30.4	λέγεται	not attributed	

Source-attributing Word Index (Book 2)

2.32.1	ἤκουσα	Kyreneans	
2.33.1	ἔλεγον	Kyreneans	
2.36.4	φασί	Egyptians	
2.42.2	λέγουσι	Egyptians	
2.42.3	λέγουσι	Egyptians- Thebans	
2.43.1	ἤκουσα	Egyptians?	
2.43.2	φασί	Egyptians	in the negative
2.43.4	λέγουσι	Egyptians	
2.44.1	πυθθανόμενος	not attributed	Hdt agrees
2.44.3	ἔφασαν	priests at Tyre	in Phoenicia
2.45.1	λέγουσι	Greeks	} Hdt disagrees
2.45.1	λέγουσι	Greeks	} Hdt disagrees
2.45.3	φασί	not attributed	
2.46.1	φασί	Egyptians	
2.47.2	λεγόμενος	Egyptians	
2.50.1	πυθθανόμενος	not attributed	Hdt agrees
2.50.2	λέγουσι	Egyptians	
2.50.2	φασί	Egyptians	
2.52.1	ἀκούσας	in Dodona	
2.53.2	λέγομενοι	not attributed	
2.53.2	λέγουσι	Priestesses- Dodona	
2.54.1	λέγουσι	} Egyptians- the	} contrasted to the version
2.54.1	ἔφασαν	} priests of Zeus at	} of the priestesses at
2.54.2	λέγουσι	} Thebes	} Dodona (2.55)
2.54.2	ἔφασαν	} "	
2.54.2	ἔλεγον	} "	
2.55.1	ἤκουον	as above	
2.55.1	φασί	} Prophetesses at	Hdt supports the Egyptians
2.55.3	λέγουσι	} Dodona	
2.55.3	ἔλεγον	} "	
2.57.2	λέγουσι	} "	
2.60.3	λέγουσι	locals at Bubastis	
2.62.2	λεγόμενος	not attributed	
2.63.3	ἔφασαν	Egyptians	Hdt disagrees
2.63.4	φασί	} locals at Papremis	
2.63.4	φασί	} "	
2.72.	φασί	not attributed	
2.73.1	λέγουσι	} Egyptians- at	
2.73.2	φασί	} Heliopolis	
2.73.3	λέγουσι	} "	Hdt disbelieves one section
2.73.4	λέγουσι	} "	

Source-attributing Word Index (Book 2)

2.74.	φασί	not attributed	
2.75.1	πυνθανόμενος	not attributed	
2.75.4	λέγουσι	Arabians	
2.79.3	ἔφασαν	Egyptians	
2.81.2	λέγόμενος	not attributed	
2.86.2	φασί	not attributed	
2.89.2	φασί	not attributed	
2.91.3	λέγουσι	} Egyptians- at	
2.91.4	λέγουσι	} Chemmis	
2.91.5	ἔφασαν	} "	
2.91.6	λέγουσι	} "	} the Greeks agree with
2.91.6	ἔφασαν	} "	} this section (2.91.6)
2.99.2	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	
2.101.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	
2.102.2	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	
2.104.1	ἄκουσας	not attributed	
2.104.2	ἔφασαν	Egyptians	
2.104.3	φασί	Syrians & Makrones	
2.107.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	
2.109.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	
2.110.3	λέγουσι	not attributed	
2.111.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	
2.111.2	λέγουσι	Egyptian priests?	
2.112.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	
2.112.2	ἄκηκώς	not attributed	
2.113.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	
2.116.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	Hdt criticises Homer
2.118.1	λέγουσι	Greeks	
2.118.1	ἔφασαν	Egyptian priests	
2.118.1	φάμενοι	Egyptian priests	
2.119.3	ἔφασαν	Egyptian priests	
2.120.1	ἔλεγον	} Egyptian priests	} Hdt agrees
2.120.5	εἴρηται	} "	}
2.121.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	
2.122.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	
2.122.2	ἔφασαν	Egyptian priests?	
2.122.3	λέγουσι	Egyptian priests?	Hdt cautious- see 2.123.1
2.123.1	λέγεται	Egyptians?	
2.124.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	
2.125.4	λέγεται	not attributed	

Source-attributing Word Index (Book 2)

2.126.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	in the negative
2.126.2	ἔφασαν	Egyptian priests?	
2.127.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptians	
2.127.2	λέγουσι	Egyptians?	
2.127.3	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	
2.129.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	
2.130.2	ἔλεγον	Priests at Sais	
2.131.1	λέγουσι	} not attributed	} Hdt rejects part of the
2.131.2	λέγουσι	} "	} account as a foolish
2.131.3	λέγουσι	} "	} tale
2.132.3	φασί	not attributed	
2.134.1	φασί	Greeks	Hdt disagrees
2.135.5	λέγεται	not attributed	
2.136.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	
2.136.2	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	
2.139.1	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests?	
2.142.3	ἔλεγον	Egyptian priests	
2.145.1	λεγομένων	Egyptians?	
2.145.1	λεγομένων	Egyptians?	
2.145.2	φασί	Egyptians?	
2.145.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
2.145.3	φασί	Egyptians	
2.145.4	λέγεται	Greeks	
2.147.1	λέγουσι	Egyptians	
2.147.1	λέγουσι	Egyptians and the rest	
		of mankind	
2.150.1	ἔλεγον	} locals at Lake	
2.150.2	ἔφρασαν	} Moiris	
2.150.4	ἤκουσα	locals?	
2.150.4	λέγεται	locals?	
2.156.2	λέγεται	Egyptians	Hdt doubts the account
2.156.4	φασί	Egyptians	
2.156.5	λέγουσι	Egyptians	
2.156.6	λέγουσι	Egyptians	
2.169.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
2.174.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
2.175.5	φασί	not attributed	
2.175.5	λέγουσι	not attributed	
2.177.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
2.181.2	λέγουσι	some people	
2.182.2	λέγεται	not attributed	

Source-attributing Word Index

	BOOK	THREE	
Reference	Form Used	Informants	Comments
3.1.5	λέγουσι	Persians	
3.2.2	λέγοντες	} Egyptians	} Hdt disagrees
3.2.2	λέγουσι	} "	}
3.3.1	λέγεται	not attributed	Hdt disagrees
3.8.3	φασί	Arabians?	
3.9.2	εἴρηται	not attributed	
3.9.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
3.10.3	λέγουσι	Egyptians- Thebes	
3.12.1	πυθόμενος	locals-Nile Delta	
3.12.2	ἔλεγον	as above	
3.14.11	λέγεται	Egyptians	
3.16.5	λέγουσι	Egyptians	} Hdt disagrees
3.16.6	λέγουσι	Egyptians	}
3.18	λέγεται	not attributed	
3.18	φάναι	locals-Ethiopia	as reported by the unattributed source (3.18)
3.18	λέγεται	not attributed	
3.20.1	λέγονται	not attributed	
3.20.2	φασί	not attributed	
3.23.3	ἔλεγον	} Fisheaters	} from Elephant City in
3.23.3	λέγεται	}	} Egypt
3.24.1	λέγονται	not attributed	
3.26.1	λεγόμενοι	not attributed	
3.26.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
3.26.3	λέγεται	Ammonians	
3.26.3	λέγουσι	Ammonians	
3.28.2	λέγουσι	Egyptians	
3.30.1	λέγουσι	Egyptians	
3.30.3	λέγουσι	not attributed	
3.31.1	λέγουσι	not attributed	
3.32.1	λέγεται	various	
3.32.1	λέγουσι	Greeks	
3.32.3	φασί	Greeks	
3.32.3	understood	Egyptians	
3.33.	λέγεται	not attributed	

Source-attributing Word Index (Book 3)

3.34.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
3.34.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
3.37.3	λέγουσι	not attributed	
3.45.1	λέγουσι	some people	} variant accounts. At
3.45.1	λέγουσι	other people	} 3.45.3 Hdt indicates his
3.45.3	λέγουσι	not attributed	} disbelief
3.45.3	λέγοντες	not attributed	
3.47.1	λέγουσι	Samians	
3.47.1	λέγουσι	Spartans	
3.55.2	ἔφη	Archias of Sparta	
3.55.2	ἔφη	Archias of Sparta	
3.56.2	λέγεται	not attributed	λέγεσθαι?
3.87.	φασί	some people	
3.87.	λέγεται	Persians	
3.98.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
3.99.1	λέγονται	not attributed	
3.105.1	λέγεται	Persians	Hdt doubts this
3.105.2	φασί	Persians	
3.111.1	φασί	not attributed	
3.111.2	λέγουσι	not attributed	
3.116.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
3.117.6	ἀκούσας	not attributed	
3.120.1	λέγουσι	the majority	οἱ πλεῖνες
3.120.4	φασί	some people	
3.121.1	λέγουσι	the minority	οἱ ἐλάσσονες
3.121.1	λέγεται	not attributed	in the negative
3.122.1	λέγονται	not attributed	
3.160.1	λέγεται	not attributed	

Source-attributing Word Index

	BOOK	FOUR	
Reference	Form Used	Informants	Comments
4.5.1	λέγουσι	Skythians	} Hdt disagrees
4.5.1	λέγουσι	Skythians	}
4.5.1	λέγουσι	Skythians	}
4.6.2	λέγουσι	Skythians	
4.7.1	λέγουσι	Skythians	
4.7.2	λέγεται	Skythians	
4.7.3	λέγουσι	Skythians	sometimes deleted
4.8.1	λέγουσι	Skythians	
4.8.2	λέγουσι	Greeks -Pontos	
4.10.3	λέγουσι	Greeks -Pontos	
4.13.1	ἔφη	Aristeas	
4.14.1	ἤκουον	} People of Kyzikos &	
4.14.1	λέγουσι	} Prokonnesos	
4.15.1	λέγουσι	} "	
4.15.2	φασί	} People of Metapontion	
4.15.3	λέγουσι	} in Italy	
4.23.2	λεγόμενοι	not attributed	
4.23.5	λέγονται	not attributed	
4.25.1	λέγουσι	} Bald Men	Hdt disagrees
4.25.1	λέγοντες	} "	
4.26.1	λέγονται	not attributed	
4.26.2	λέγονται	not attributed	
4.27.	λέγονται	Issodones	Indirectly relayed via the Skythians (4.27)
4.27.	λέγουσι	Skythians	
4.30.1	φασί	Eleans	
4.31.1	λέγουσι	Skythians	Hdt disagrees
4.31.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
4.32	λέγουσι	Skythians & others	in the negative
4.32.	λέγουσι	Issedones	indirectly cited
4.32.	ἔλεγον	Skythians	in the negative
4.32.	λέγουσι	Skythians	
4.32.	εἰρημένα	Hesiod & Homer?	
4.33.1	λέγουσι	Delians	
4.33.1	φάμενοι	Delians	
4.33.3	λέγουσι	Delians?	} Hdt agrees with part of
4.33.5	λέγουσι	Delians?	} their account

Source-attributing Word Index (Book 4)

4.35.1	φασί	Delians	
4.35.2	λέγουσι	Delians	
4.42.4	ἔλεγον	Phoenicians	Hdt disbelieves this
4.43.1	λέγοντες	Carchedonians	
4.45.2	λέγουσι	not attributed	
4.45.3	λέγεται	Greeks	The majority of the Greeks
4.45.3	φάμενοι	Lydians	
4.65.2	λέγοντες	not attributed	
4.67.2	λέγουσι	Enarees	
4.76.5	φασί	Skythians	in the negative
4.76.6	ἤκουσα	Tymnes	
4.77.1	ἤκουσα	Spartans	} Hdt disagrees
4.77.1	λεγόμενον	Spartans	}
4.78.3	λέγουσι	Greeks- Borysthenes	
4.81.1	ἤκουον	not attributed	
4.81.4	ἔλεγον	locals	οἱ ἐπιχώριοι
4.81.6	ἤκουον	not attributed	
4.85.1	φασί	Greeks	
4.90.1	λέγεται	dwellers around	οἱ περίοικοι
		the Tearos River	
4.95.1	πυνθάνομαι	Greeks- Hellespont	} Hdt states he neither
4.95.5	φασί	as above	} believes nor disbelieves
			} this account
4.103.2	λέγουσι	some people	
4.103.2	λέγουσι	other people	
4.103.2	λέγουσι	Tauri	
4.103.3	φασί	not attributed	
4.105.2	λέγονται	} Skythians & Greeks	}
4.105.2	λέγοντες	} dwelling in	}
4.105.2	λέγουσι	} Skythia	} Hdt disbelieves
4.105.2	λέγοντες	}	}
4.150.1	λέγουσι	Spartans & Theraeans	
4.150.1	λέγουσι	Theraeans	
4.154.1	λέγουσι	Theraeans	
4.154.1	λέγουσι	Kyrenaeans	
4.155.1	λέγουσι	} Theraeans &	
		} Kyrenaeans	
4.156.3	λέγεται	not attributed	

Source-attributing Word Index (Book 4)

4.173.	λέγουσι	Libyans	
4.176.	λέγεται	not attributed	
4.178.	φασί	not attributed	
4.179.1	λέγόμενος	not attributed	
4.180.2	λέγουσαι	not attributed	
4.180.5	φασί	not attributed	
4.180.5	λέγουσι	not attributed	
4.184.4	λέγονται	not attributed	
4.187.3	λέγουσι	Libyans?	
4.187.3	λέγουσι	Libyans	
4.191.2	φασί	not attributed	
4.191.4	λέγονται	Libyans	
4.195.1	λέγουσι	Carthaginians	
4.195.2	λέγεται	Carthaginians	guarded support by Hdt
4.196.1	λέγουσι	Carthaginians	

Source-attributing Word Index

	BOOK	FIVE	
Reference	Form Used	Informants	Comments
5.9.3	λέγουσι	Sigynnai?	
5.10.	λέγουσι	} Thracians	Hdt doubts this
5.10.	λέγοντες	} "	
5.10.	λέγεται	Thracians?	
5.22.1	λέγουσι	Macedonians	Hdt agrees
5.41.3	λέγουσι	not attributed	
5.42.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
5.44.1	λέγουσι	Sybarites	
5.44.2	λέγουσι	Sybarites	
5.44.2	φασί	Krotoniates	
5.45.1	λέγουσι	Krotoniates	
5.45.1	λέγουσι	Sybarites	
5.49.1	λέγουσι	Spartans	
5.57.1	λέγουσι	Athenians-Gephyraioi	Hdt disagrees
5.63.1	λέγουσι	Athenians	
5.82.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
5.85.1	λέγουσι	Athenians	
5.86.1	λέγουσι	Athenians	
5.86.3	λέγοντες	Aiginetans	Hdt disagrees
5.86.4	λέγουσι	Aiginetans	
5.87.1	λέγεται	Athenians & Aiginetans	
5.87.2	λέγουσι	Argives	
5.105.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
5.113.1	λέγονται	not attributed	

Source-attributing Word Index

	BOOK	SIX	
Reference	Form Used	Informants	Comments
6.14.2	λέγονται	not attributed	
6.44.3	λέγεται	not attributed	
6.52.1	λέγουσι	Spartans	} Hdt notes no poet agrees } with the Spartan account
6.52.2	λέγουσι	Spartans	
6.52.8	λέγουσι	Spartans	
6.53.1	λέγουσι	Spartans	
6.53.1	λεγόμενα	Greeks	as opposed to Spartans
6.54.	λέγουσι	Greeks	
6.54.	λέγεται	Persians	
6.54.	λέγουσι	Greeks	
6.61.4	λέγεται	not attributed	
6.74.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
6.75.3	λέγουσι	most of the Greeks	
6.75.3	λέγουσι	Athenians	
6.75.3	understood	Argives	
6.76.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
6.84.1	φασί	Argives	
6.84.1	φασί	Spartans	
6.84.3	λέγουσι	Spartans	
6.84.3	λέγουσι	Spartans	
6.84.3	λέγουσι	Spartans	
6.98.1	ἔλεγον	Delians	
6.105.1	ἔλεγον	Philidippides	
6.117.3	ἤκουσα	not attributed	
6.117.3	ἐπιθόμην	not attributed	
6.118.1	λέγεται	not attributed	in the negative
6.134.1	λέγουσι	all the Greeks	
6.134.1	λέγουσι	Parians	
6.134.2	λέγουσι	not attributed	
6.137.1	ἔφησε	Hekataios	
6.137.3	λέγουσι	Athenians	
6.137.3	ἔλεξε	Hekataios	
6.137.3	λέγουσι	Athenians	

Source-attributing Word Index

	BOOK	SEVEN	
Reference	Form Used	Informants	Comments
7.12.1	λέγεται	Persians	
7.35.1	ἤκουσα	not attributed	
7.55.3	ἤκουσα	not attributed	
7.56.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.60.1	λέγεται	not attributed	in the negative
7.75.2	λέγουσι	Bithynians	} Thracians
7.75.2	φασί	Bithynians	} "
7.89.2	λέγουσι	Phoenicians	
7.90.	λέγουσι	Cyprians	
7.94.	λέγουσι	Greeks	
7.114.2	πυρθάνομαι	not attributed	
7.129.3	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.129.4	φασί	} Thessalians	Hdt agrees
7.129.4	λέγοντες	} "	
7.130.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.137.1	λέγουσι	Spartans	
7.148.2	λέγουσι	Argives	
7.149.1	λέγουσι	Argives	
7.149.3	φασί	Argives	
7.150.1	λέγουσι	Argives	
7.150.1	λεγόμενος	not attributed	
7.150.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.151.	λέγουσι	some Greeks	
7.152.1	λέγοντα	not attributed	
7.152.1	λέγουσι	Argives	
7.152.3	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.153.1	εἴρηται	various	all cited 7.148-152
7.153.4	λέγεται	Sicilians	
7.165.	λέγεται	Sicilians	
7.166.	λέγουσι	Sicilians	
7.166.	πυρθάνομαι	not attributed	
7.167.1	λεγόμενος	Carthaginians	
7.167.1	λέγεται	Carthaginians	
7.167.2	λέγουσι	Phoenicians	
7.170.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.171.1	λέγουσι	Praisians	

Source-attributing Word Index (Book 7)

7.189.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.189.3	λέγουσι	Athenians	
7.193.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.212.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.214.1	λεγόμενος	not attributed	Hdt disagrees
7.220.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.226.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.226.2	φασί	not attributed	
7.227.	λέγονται	not attributed	
7.229.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.230.	λέγουσι	Some people	
7.230.	understood	Other people	
7.232.	λέγεται	not attributed	
7.239.4	πυνθάνομαι	Spartans?	
7.239.4	λέγεται	Spartans?	

Source-attributing Word Index

Reference	Form Used	Informants	Comments
8.8.2	λέγεται	not attributed	} Hdt disagrees
8.8.3	λέγεται	not attributed	} "
8.35.2	πυθάνομαι	not attributed	
8.38.	ἔλεγον	Barbarians	Persians?
8.38.	πυθάνομαι	not attributed	
8.39.1	λέγουσι	Delphians	
8.41.2	λέγουσι	Athenians	
8.41.2	λέγουσι	Athenians	
8.55.	ἔφρασαν	Athenians	
8.65.1	ἔφη	Dikaios	
8.65.6	ἔλεγε	Dikaios	
8.79.1	πυθανόμενος	not attributed	
8.84.2	λέγουσι	Athenians	
	understood	Aiginetans	
8.84.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
8.88.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
8.88.3	λέγεται	not attributed	
8.88.3	φασί	not attributed	
8.94.1	λέγουσι	Athenians	
8.98.1	λέγουσι	not attributed	
8.118.1	λεγόμενος	not attributed	}
8.118.3	λέγεται	not attributed	} Hdt rejects this
8.119	λέγεται	not attributed	}
8.120.	λέγουσι	Abderians	Hdt disagrees
8.120.	φασί	not attributed	
8.12	λέγοντες	not attributed	
8.128.1	λέγεται	not attributed	in the negative
8.129.2	λέγουσι	locals at Poteidaia	
8.129.3	λέγουσι	} Poteidaians	Hdt agrees
8.129.3	λέγοντες	} "	
8.133.	λέγεται	not attributed	in the negative
8.135.1	λέγεται	Thebans	
8.138.3	λέγεται	Macedonians	

Source-attributing Word Index

	BOOK	NINE	
Reference	Form Used	Informants	Comments
9.6.	ἐλέγετο	not attributed	
9.16.1	ἤκουον	Thersandros	
9.16.1	ἔφη	Thersandros	
9.16.5	ἤκουον	Thersandros	
9.51.2	λέγουσι	locals	
9.71.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
9.73.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
9.73.1	λέγουσι	Athenians	
9.73.2	λέγουσι	Athenians	
9.74.1	λεγομένους	not attributed	
9.74.2	λέγεται	not attributed	
9.81.2	λέγεται	not attributed	in the negative
9.82.1	λέγεται	not attributed	
9.82.3	λέγεται	not attributed	
9.84.1	ἤκουσα	not attributed	
9.85.3	πυνθάνομαι	not attributed	
9.85.3	ἀκούω	not attributed	
9.95.	ἤκουσα	not attributed	
9.120.1	λέγεται	Chersonesians	
9.120.4	λέγουσι	not attributed	

Bibliography

Books and Monographs

- Adkins, A.W.H. *Moral Values and Political behaviour in Ancient Greece*, Chatto & Windus, London, 1972.
- Aly, W. *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen*, Göttingen, 1921, reprinted 1969.
- Armayer, O.K. *Herodotus' Autopsy of the Fayoum: Lake Moeris and the Labyrinth of Egypt*, Gieben, Amsterdam, 1985.
- Balcer, J.M. *Herodotus and Bisitun* (Historia Einzelschriften 49), Wiesbaden, 1987.
- Boardman, J. *The Greeks Overseas*, Thames & Hudson, London, 1980.
- Bolton, J.D.P. *Aristeas of Proconnesus*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1962.
- Budge, E.A.W. *The Book of the Dead*, Random, New York, 1960.
- Burn, A.R. *Persia and the Greeks*, Edward Arnold, London, 1962.
- Carr, E.H. *What is History?*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1964.
- Cobet, J. *Herodots Exkurse und die Frage der Einheit seines Werkes* (Historia Einzelschriften 17), Wiesbaden, 1971.
- Collingwood, R.G. *The Idea of History*, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1961.
- Cook, J.M. *The Persian Empire*, Dent, London, 1983.
- Crahay, R. *La Littérature Oraculaire chez Hérodote*, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Paris, 1956.
- Drews, R. *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*, Harvard Uni. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1973.
- Drexler, H. *Herodot Studien*, Georg Olms, Hildesheim & New York, 1972.

- Dunbabin, T.J. *The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours*, Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, No.8, London, 1957.
- Evans, J.A.S. *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past*, Princeton Uni. Press, Princeton, 1991.
- Fehling, D. *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots*, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1971.
- Herodotus and His 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art*, Francis Cairns, Leeds, 1989.
- Finley, M.I. *The Use and Abuse of History*, Chatto & Windus, London, 1975.
- Ancient History Evidence and Models*, Chatto & Windus, London, 1985.
- Flory, S. *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus*, Wayne State Uni. Press, Detroit, 1987.
- Fontenrose, J. *The Delphic Oracle*, Uni. of California Press, Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1978.
- Fornara, C.W. *Herodotus, An Interpretive Essay*, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1971.
- Fritz, von, K. *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung*, vol.1, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1967.
- Gillis, D. *Collaboration with the Persians*, (Historia Einzelschriften 34), Wiesbaden, 1979.
- Gould, J. *Herodotus*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1989.
- Green, P. *The Year of Salamis 480-479 BC*, Weidenfeld, London, 1970.
- Grundy, G.B. *The Great Persian War*, John Murray, London, 1901.
- Hammond, N.G.L. & Griffith, G.T.A. *A History of Macedonia*, vols.1-2, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1972 & 1979.
- Hart, J. *Herodotus and Greek History*, Croom Helm, London & Canberra, 1982.
- Hartog, F. *The Mirror of Herodotus*, (trans. J. Lloyd), Uni. of Calif. Press, Berkeley, 1988.

- Havelock, E.A. *The Muse Learns to Write*, Yale Uni. Press, New Haven, 1986.
- Henige, D. *The Chronology of Oral Tradition. Quest for a Chimera*, Oxford Studies in African Affairs, Oxford, 1974.
- Hignett, C. *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1963.
- Hohti, P. *The Interrelation of Speech and Action in the Histories of Herodotus*, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 57, Helsinki, 1976.
- Howe, W.W & Wells, J. *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 2 vols., Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1928.
- Hunter, V. *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides*, Princeton Uni. Press, Princeton, 1982.
- Jacoby, F. "Herodotos", *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl.II, cols. 205-520, J.B. Metzler, Stuttgart, 1913.
- Atthis*, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1949.
- Immerwahr, H.R *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, 1986.
- Kent, R.G. *Old Persian*, American Oriental Society, New Haven, 1953.
- Kirk, G.S. *Myth, Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures*, Cambridge Uni. Press, Cambridge, 1970.
- Knight, D.W. *Some Studies in Athenian Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.*, (Historia Einzelschriften 13), Wiesbaden, 1970.
- Kraay, C.M *Greek Coins*, Thames & Hudson, London, 1966.
- Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, Uni. of California Press, Los Angeles, 1976.
- Lacey, W.K. *The Family in Classical Greece*, Uni. of Auckland, Auckland, 1980.
- Lang, M.L. *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse*, Harvard Uni. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1984.

- Lateiner, D. *The Historical Method of Herodotus*, Uni. of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1989 (Phoenix Supplementary volume 23).
- Lewis, D.M. *Sparta and Persia*, Brill, Leiden, 1977.
- Lister, R.P. *The Travels of Herodotus*, Gordon & Cremonesi, London & New York, 1979.
- Lloyd, A.B. *Herodotus, Book II, Introduction*, Brill, Leiden, 1975.
Herodotus, Book II, Commentary 1-98, Brill, Leiden, 1976.
Herodotus, Book II, Commentary 99-182, Brill, Leiden, 1989.
- Macan, R.W. *Herodotus, The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books*, 2 vols., Macmillan, London, 1895.
Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books, 2 vols., Macmillan, London, 1908.
- Marg, W.(ed) *Herodot: eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung*, Darmstadt Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Munich, 1965.
- Meiggs, R. *The Athenian Empire*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1972.
- Meiggs, R & Lewis, D.M. *Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century*, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1969.
- Myres, J.L. *Herodotus, Father of History*, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1953.
- Momigliano, A. *Studies in Historiography*, Harper & Row, New York, 1966.
- Ober, J. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*, Princeton Uni. Press, Princeton, 1989.
- Olmstead, A.T. *History of the Persian Empire*, Uni. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1948.
- Park, H.W. & Wormell, D.E.W. *The Delphic Oracle*, vol. 2, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1956.

- Parry, M. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, (ed. A. Parry), Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1971.
- Pearson, L. *Early Ionian Historians*, Greenwood, Westport, 1975.
- Pohlenz, M. *Herodot, der erste Geschichtsscheiber des Abendlandes*, Neue Wege zur Antike 7/8, Leipzig, 1933, (2nd ed. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1961).
- Powell, A. (ed) *Classical Sparta: Techniques Behind Her Success*, Routledge, London, 1989.
- Powell, J.E. *The History of Herodotus*, Cambridge Uni. Press, Cambridge, 1939.
- A Lexicon to Herodotos*, 2nd ed., Georg Olms, Hildesheim, 1977.
- Rawlinson, G. *History of Herodotus*, vol.1, John Murray, London, 1880.
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H & Kuhrt, A. (eds)
Achaemenid History II: The Greek Sources, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, Leiden, 1987.
- Achaemenid History III: Method and Theory*, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, Leiden, 1988.
- Sayce, A.H. *The Ancient Empires of the East: Herodotos I-III*, Macmillan, London, 1883.
- Sear, D.R. *Greek Coins*, vol.1-2, Seaby, London, 1978 & 1979.
- Shipley, G. *A History of Samos 800-188 BC*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987.
- Shimron, B. *Politics and Belief in Herodotus*, (Historia Einzelschriften 58), Wiesbaden, 1989.
- Solmsen, F. *Two Crucial Decisions in Herodotus*, Mededelingen der Koninklyke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Amsterdam, 1974.
- Spence, I.G. *The Cavalry of Classical Greece*, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1993.
- Strasburger, H. *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung*, Akademie der Wissenschaften, Heidelberg, 1972.

- Tigerstedt, E.N. *The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity*, 2 vols., Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, 1965 & 1974.
- Thomas, R. *Oral Tradition & Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge Uni. Press, Cambridge, 1989.
- Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge Uni. Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- Thompson, P. *The Voice of the Past Oral History*, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford, 1978.
- Tod, M.N. *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Ares, Chicago, 1985.
- Toülle-Kastenbein, R. *Herodot und Samos*, Duris-Verlag, Bochum, 1976.
- Usher, S. *The Historians of Greece and Rome*, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1969.
- Vansina, J. *Oral Tradition* (trans. H.M. Wright), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1965.
- Oral Tradition as History*, James Currey, London, 1985.
- Vernant, J-P. *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, (trans, J. Lloyd), Methuen, London, 1982.
- Verdin, H. *De historische-kritische methode van Herodotus*, Paleis der Academie, Brussels, 1971.
- Veyne, P. *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?*, (trans. P. Wissing), Uni. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1988.
- Waters, K.H. *Herodotos on Tyrants and Despots*, (Historia Einzelschriften 16), Wiesbaden, 1971.
- Herodotos the Historian*, Croom Helm, London and Sydney, 1985.
- Webster, T.B.L. *Greek Art and Literature 700-530 BC*, Uni. of Otago Press, Dunedin, 1959.
- Zeller, E. *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*, 13th ed (trans. L.R. Palmer), Dover, New York, 1980.

Articles

- Africa, T.W. 'Herodotus and Diodorus on Egypt' *JNES* 22 (1963), 254-258.
- Armayer, O.K. 'Did Herodotus Ever go to the Black Sea' *HSCPh* 82 (1978), 45-62.
- 'Herodotus' Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition' *TAPhA* 108 (1978), 1-9.
- 'Did Herodotus Ever go to Egypt' *JARCE* 15 (1978), 59-73.
- 'Sesostris and Herodotus' Autopsy of Thrace, Colchis, Inland Asia Minor, and the Levant' *HSCPh* 84 (1980), 51-74.
- Asheri, D. 'Herodotus on Thracian Society and History' in *Hérodote et les Peuples non Grecs* [Fondation Hardt 35 (1988)], 131-163.
- Avery, H.C. 'Herodotus 6.112.2' *TAPhA* 103 (1972), 13-22.
- Ayo, N. 'Prolog and Epilog: Mythical History in Herodotus' *Ramus* 13 (1984), 34-47.
- Balcer, J.M. 'The Date of *Herodotus* IV.I: Darius' Scythian Expedition' *HSCPh* 76 (1972), 99-132.
- 'The Greeks and the Persians: The Process of Acculturation' *Historia* 32 (1983), 257-267.
- Baldwin, B. 'How Credulous was Herodotus?' *G&R* 11 (1964), 167-177.
- Barron, J.P. 'The Sixth-Century Tyranny at Samos' *CQ* 14 (1964), 210-229.
- Beekes, R.S.P. 'You can get new children . . .' *Mnemosyne* 39 (1986), 225-239.
- Bickerman, E.J. 'Origines Gentium' *CPh* 47 (1952), 65-81.
- Bickerman, E.J. & Tadmor, H. 'Darius I, Pseudo-Smerdis, and the Magi' *Athenaeum* 56 (1978), 239-261.

- Blamire, A. 'Pausanias and Persia' *GRBS* 11 (1970), 295-305.
- Bloomer, M.W. 'The Superlative *Nomoi* of Herodotus's *Histories*' *ClAnt* 12 (1993), 30-50.
- Boedeker, D. 'The Two Faces of Demaratus' *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 185-201
- 'Protesilaos and the end of Herodotus' *Histories*' *ClAnt* 7 (1988), 30-48.
- Bondì, S.F. 'I Fenici in Erodoto' in *Hérodote et les Peuples non Grecs* [Fondation Hardt 35 (1988)], 255-286.
- Bowra, C.M. 'Arion and the Dolphin' *Mus.Helv.* 20 (1963), 121-134.
- Brannon, P.T. 'Herodotus and History: the Constitutional Debate Preceding Darius' Accession' *Traditio* 19 (1963), 427-438.
- Briant, P. 'Hérodote et la Société Perse' in *Hérodote et les Peuples non Grecs* [Fondation Hardt 35 (1988)], 69-104.
- Brown, T.S. 'Herodotus and his Profession' *AHR* 59 (1954), 829-843.
- 'Herodotus Speculates about Egypt' *AJPh* 86 (1965), 60-76.
- 'Herodotus' Portrait of Cambyses' *Historia* 31 (1982), 387-403.
- 'Herodotus in Egypt' *AncW* 18 (1988), 77-87, 89-98.
- Brunt, P.A. 'The Hellenic League Against Persia' *Historia* 2 (1953/4), 158-162.
- Burkert, W. 'Herodot als Historiker fremder Religionen' in *Hérodote et les Peuples non Grecs* [Fondation Hardt 35 (1988)], 1-32.
- Calmeyer, P. 'Greek Historiography and Achaemenid Reliefs' *AchHis II* (1987), 11-26.
- Carpenter, R. 'A Trans-Saharan Caravan Route in Herodotus' *AJA* 60 (1956), 231-242.
- Cawkwell, G.L. 'Cleomenes' *Mnemosyne* 46 (1993), 506-527.

- Chiasson, C.C. 'Tragic Diction in Herodotus: Some Possibilities' *Phoenix* 36 (1982), 156-161.
- Chrimes, K.M.T. 'Herodotus and the Reconstruction of History' *JHS* 50 (1930), 89-98.
- Cizek, A. 'From the Historical Truth to the Literary Convention: The Life of Cyrus the Great Viewed by Herodotus, Ctesias and Xenophon' *AC* 44 (1975), 531-552.
- Cook, A. 'Herodotus: the Act of Inquiry as a Liberation from Myth' *Helios* 3 (1976), 23-66.
- Cooper, G.L. III. 'Intrusive Oblique Infinitives in Herodotus' *TAPhA* 104 (1974), 23-76.
- Darbo-Peschanski, C. 'Les *Logoi* des autres dans les *Histoires* d'Hérodote' *QS* 22 (1985), 105-128.
- Davies, J.K. 'The Reliability of Oral Tradition' in L. Foxhall & J.K. Davies (eds), *The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context*, Bristol, 1984, 87-110.
- Davison, J.A. 'Literature and Literacy in Ancient Greece' *Phoenix* 16 (1962), 141-156, 219-233.
- Demand, N. 'Herodotus' Encomium of Athens: Science or Rhetoric' *AJPh* 108 (1987), 746-758.
- Dewald, C. 'Women and Culture in Herodotus' *Histories' Women's Studies* 8 (1981), 93-127.
- 'Practical Knowledge and the Historian's Role in Herodotus and Thucydides' in *The Greek Historians; Papers Presented to A.E. Raubitschek*, Stanford Uni. Press, 1985, 47-63
- 'Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories' Arethusa* 20 (1987), 147-174.
- Dewald, C & Marincola, J. 'A Selective Introduction to Herodotean Studies' *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 9-40.
- Dihle, A. 'Arabien and Indien' in *Hérodote et les Peuples non Grecs* [Fondation Hardt 35 (1988)], 41-61.
- Diels, H. 'Herodot und Hekataios' *Hermes* 22 (1887), 411-444.

- Dillery, J. 'Darius and the Tomb of Nitocris (Hdt. 1.187)' *CPh* 87 (1992), 30-38.
- Drews, R. 'Herodotus' Other *logoi*' *AJPh* 91 (1970), 181-191.
 'Sargon, Cyrus and Mesopotamian Folk History' *JNES* 33 (1974), 387-393.
- Edwards, M.J. 'Herodotus and Mithras: *Histories* I.131' *AJPh* 111 (1990), 1-4.
- Ehrenberg, V. 'The Foundation of Thurii' *AJPh* 69 (1948), 149-170.
 'Origins of Democracy' *Historia* 1 (1950), 515-548.
- Evans, J.A.S. 'The Dream of Xerxes and the *Nomoi* of the Persians' *CJ* 57 (1961), 109-111.
 'Herodotus and the Problem of the "lake of Moeris"' *CW* 59 (1963), 275-277.
 'Despotes Nomos' *Athenaeum* 43 (1965), 142-153.
 'Father of History or Father of Lies; the Reputation of Herodotus' *CJ* 64 (1968), 11-17.
 'Herodotus and the Ionian Revolt' *Historia* 25 (1976), 31-37.
 'Herodotus and Athens: The Evidence of the Encomium' *AC* 48 (1978), 112-118.
 'Herodotus' Publication Date' *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 145-149.
 'Oral Tradition in Herodotus' *Canadian Oral History Journal* 4 (1980), 8-16.
 'Herodotus 9.73.3 and the Publication of the *Histories*' *CPh* 82 (1987), 226-228.
 'The Medism of Pausanias: Two Versions' *Antichthon* 22 (1988), 1-11.
 'The Faiyum and the Lake of Moeris' *AHB* 5 (1991), 66-74.
- Fairweather, J.A. 'Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers' *AncSoc* 5 (1974), 231-275.

- Ferrill, A. 'Herodotus and the Strategy and Tactics of the Invasion of Xerxes' *AHR* 72 (1966-67), 102-115.
- Figueira, T. 'Herodotus on the Early Hostilities Between Aegina and Athens' *AJPh* 106 (1985), 49-74.
- 'The Chronology of the Conflict between Athens and Aegina in Herodotus Bk.6' *QUCC* 20 (1988), 49-87.
- Finley, M.I. 'Myth, Memory, and History' *H&T* 4 (1965), 281-302.
- Finkelberg, M. 'A Creative Oral Poet and the Muse' *AJPh* 111 (1990), 293-303.
- Finnegan, R. 'A Note on Oral Tradition and Historical Evidence' *H&T* 9 (1970), 195-201.
- Flory, S. 'Laughter, Tears and Wisdom in Herodotus' *AJPh* 99 (1978), 145-153.
- 'Arion's Leap: Brave Gestures in Herodotus' *AJPh* 99 (1978), 411-421.
- 'Who Read Herodotus' *Histories' AJPh* 101 (1980), 12-28.
- Fornara, C.W. 'Some Aspects of the Career of Pausanias of Sparta' *Historia* 15 (1966), 257-271.
- 'Evidence for the date of Herodotus' Publication' *JHS* 91 (1971), 25-34.
- 'Herodotus' Knowledge of the Archidamian War' *Hermes* 109 (1981), 149-156.
- Forrest, W.G. 'Colonisation and the Rise of Delphi' *Historia* 6 (1957), 160-175.
- 'Motivation in Herodotos: The Case of the Ionian Revolt' *International History Review* 1 (1979), 311-322.
- 'Herodotos and Athens' *Phoenix* 38 (1984), 1-11.
- Fredricksmeier, E.A. 'Alexander, Midas, and the Oracle at Gordium' *CPh* 56 (1961), 160-168.
- French, A. 'Topical Influences on Herodotos' Narrative' *Mnemosyne* 25 (1972), 9-27.

- von Fritz, K. 'Herodotus and the Growth of Greek Historiography' *TAPhA* 67 (1936), 315-340.
- Frost, F.J. 'Scyllias: Diving in Antiquity' *G&R* 15 (1968), 180-185.
- Gabba, E. 'True History and False History in Classical Antiquity' *JRS* 71 (1981), 50-62.
- Gammie, J.G. 'Herodotus on Kings and Tyrants: Objective Historiography or Conventional Portraiture?' *JNES* 45 (1986), 171-195.
- Gardiner, A.H & Bell, H.I.
'The name of Lake Moeris' *JEA* 29 (1943), 37-50.
- Gardiner-Garden, J.R.
'Dareios' Scythian Expedition and Its Aftermath' *Klio* 69 (1987), 326-350.
- Georges, P.B. 'Saving Herodotus' Phenomena: The Oracles and the Events of 480 B.C.' *CIAnt* 4 (1986), 14-59.
- Gomme, A.W. 'Herodotos and Marathon' *Phoenix* 6 (1952), 77-83.
- Graf, D.F. 'Medism: the origin and significance of the Term' *JHS* 104 (1984), 15-30.
- Grant, J.R. 'Leonidas' Last Stand' *Phoenix* 15 (1961), 14-27.

'Ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος'
Phoenix 23 (1969), 264-268.
- Greene, W.C. 'The Spoken and the Written Word' *HSCP* 60 (1951), 23-58.
- Greene, D. 'Herodotus: the Historian as Dramatist' *JPh* 58 (1961), 477-488.
- Griffith, A. 'Was Kleomenes Mad?' in A. Powell (ed), *Classical Sparta: Techniques Behind Her Success*, London, 1989, 51-78.
- Groten, F.J. Jr 'Herodotus' Use of Variant Versions' *Phoenix* 17 (1963), 79-87.
- Grube, G.M.A. 'Greek Historians and Greek Critics' *Phoenix* 28 (1974), 73-80.
- Gruner, R. 'Ranke's Historical Theory' *Durham University Journal* 59 (1967), 139-144.

- Hadas, M. 'Utopian Sources in Herodotus' *CPh* 30 (1935), 113-121.
- Hallock, R.T. 'The "One Year" of Darius I' *JNES* 19 (1960), 36-39.
- Hammond, N.G.L.
'Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.' *Historia* 4 (1955), 371-411.
- Hardwick, L. 'Ancient Amazons- Heroes, Outsiders or Woman?' *G&R* 37 (1990), 14-36.
- Harmatta, J. 'Herodotus, Historian of the Cimmerians and the Scythians' in *Hérodote et les Peuples non Grecs* [Fondation Hardt 35 (1988)], 115-130.
- Hegyí, D. 'Historical Authenticity of Herodotus in the Persian *Logoi*' *AAnthHung* 21 (1973), 73-87.
- Herington, J. 'The Closure of Herodotus' *Histories*' *ICS* 16 (1991), 149-160.
- Holladay, A.J. 'The Forethought of Themistocles' *JHS* 107 (1987), 182-187.
- Hooker, J.T. 'Arion and the Dolphin' *G&R* 36 (1989), 141-146.

'Spartan Propaganda' in A. Powell (ed), *Classical Sparta: Techniques Behind Her Success*, London, 1989, 122-141.
- Huber, L. 'Herodots Homerverständnis' in H. Flashar & K. Gaiser (eds), *Synusia: Festgabe für W. Schadewaldt*, Pfullingen, 1965, 29-52.
- Humphreys, S. 'Law, Custom and Culture in Herodotus' *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 211-220.
- Hunter, V. 'Gossip and Politics in Classical Athens' *Phoenix* 44 (1990), 299-325.
- Hutchinson, R.W.
'The Flying Snakes of Arabia' *CQ* 8 (1958), 100-101.
- Huxley, G.L. 'The Titles of Midas' *GRBS* 2 (1959), 85-99.

'Aristeas and Cyzicene' *GRBS* 27 (1986), 151-155.
- Iggers, G.I. 'The Image of Ranke in American and German Historical Thought' *H&T* 2 (1962), 17-40.

- Immerwahr, H.R. 'Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus' *TAPhA* 87 (1956), 241-280.
- 'The Samian Stories of Herodotus' *CJ* 52 (1957), 312-322.
- '*Ergon*: History as a Monument in Herodotus and Thucydides' *AJPh* 81 (1960), 261-290.
- Jacob, C. 'The Greek Traveler's Areas of Knowledge: Myths and Other Discourses in Pausanias' *Description of Greece' Yale French Studies* 59 (1980), 65-85.
- Jeffery, L.H. 'The Campaign Between Athens and Aegina in the Years Before Salamis (Herodotus, VI, 87-93) *AJPh* 83 (1962), 44-54.
- Kelly, D.H. 'Egyptians and Ethiopians: Color, Race, and Racism' *CO* 68 (1991), 77-82.
- Kinzl, K.H. 'Herodotos- Interpretations' *RhM* 118 (1975), 193-204.
- Kirk, G.S. 'Aetiology, Ritual, Charter: Three Equivocal terms in the study of Myths' *YCS* 22 (1972), 83-102.
- 'On Defining Myths' in E.N. Lee & ors (eds) *Exegesis and Argument: Studies in Greek Philosophy Presented to Gregory Vlastos= Phronesis*, Suppl. 1 (1973), 61-69.
- Konstan, D. 'The Stories in Herodotus' *Histories: Book 1' Helios* 10 (1983), pp.1-22.
- 'Comparative Methods in Mythology' *Arethusa* 19 (1986), 87-99.
- Kothe, H. 'Der Skythenbegriff bei Herodot' *Klio* 51 (1969), 15-88.
- Krischer, T. 'Herodots Prooimion' *Hermes* 93 (1965), 159-167.
- Kukofka, D. 'Das Μαρτύριον Μέγιστον der Sybariten (Herodot, 5,43-46)' *Hermes* 119 (1991), 374-380.
- Kunstler, B. 'The Werewolf Figure and its Adoption into the Greek Political Vocabulary' *CW* 84 (1991), 189-205.
- Lang, M.L. 'Scapegoat Pausanias' *CJ* 63 (1967), 79-85.
- 'Herodotus: Oral History with a Difference' *PAPhS* 128 (1984), 93-103.

- Lang, M.L. 'Prexaspes and Usurper Smerdis' *JNES* 51 (1992), 201-207.
- Lasserre, F. 'L'historiographie Grecque à l'époque Archaïque' *QS* 4 (1976), 113-142.
- Lateiner, D. 'No Laughing Matter: A Literary Tactic in Herodotus' *TAPhA* 107 (1977), 173-182.
- 'The Empirical Element in the Methods of Early Greek Medical Writers and Herodotus; A Shared Epistemological Response' *Antichthon* 20 (1986), 1-20.
- 'Nonverbal Communication in the *Histories* of Herodotus' *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 83-119.
- 'Deceptions and Delusions in Herodotus' *ClAnt* 9 (1990), 230-246.
- Lattimore, R. 'Herodotus and the Names of the Egyptian Gods' *CPh* 34 (1939), 357-365.
- 'The Composition of the *History* of Herodotus' *CPh* 53 (1958), 9-21.
- Lazenby, J.F. 'Pausanias, Son of Kleombrotos' *Hermes* 103 (1975), 235-251.
- 'Aischylos and Salamis' *Hermes* 116 (1988), 168-185.
- Leyden, van. V. "Spatium Historicum: The Historical Past as Viewed by Hecataeus, Herodotus, and Thucydides' *Durham University Journal* 11 (1949/50), 89-104.
- Lewis, D.M. 'Persians in Herodotus' in *The Greek Historians: Papers Presented to A.E. Raubitschek*, Stanford Uni. Press, 1985, 101-117.
- Lieshout van, R.G.A. 'A Dream on a καιρόσ of History' *Mnemosyne* 23 (1970), 225-249.
- Lloyd, A.B. 'Necho and the Red Sea: Some Considerations' *JEA* 63 (1977), 142-155.
- 'Herodotus' Account of Pharaonic History' *Historia* 37 (1988), 22-53.
- 'Herodotus on Egyptians and Libyans' in *Hérodote et les Peuples non Grecs* [Fondation Hardt 35 (1988)], 215-244.

- Lloyd, A.B. 'Herodotus on Cambyses: Some Thoughts on Recent Work' *AchHist III*(1988),55-66.
- Lombardo, M. 'Erodoto storico dei Lidî' in *Hérodote et les Peuples non Grecs* [Fondation Hardt 35 (1988)], 171-203.
- MacFarquhar, C.F. 'Early Greek Travellers in Egypt' *G&R* 13 (1966), 108-115.
- MacKendrick, P. 'Herodotus 1954-1963' *CW* 56 (1963), 269-275.
'Herodotus 1963-1969' *CW* 63 (1969), 37-44.
- Marincola, J. 'Herodotean Narrative and the Narrator's Presence' *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 121-137.
- Mattingly, H.B. 'Athens and Aigina' *Historia* 16 (1967), 1-5.
- McNeal, R.A. 'The Brides of Babylon: Herodotus 1.196' *Historia* 37 (1988), 54-71.
- Meier, C. 'Historical Answers to Historical Questions: The Origins of History in Ancient Greece' *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 41-57.
- Miller, M. 'The Earlier Persian Dates in Herodotus' *Klio* 37 (1959), 29-52.
'The Herodotean Croesus' *Klio* 41 (1963), 58-94.
- Mitchell, B.M. 'Herodotus and Samos' *JHS* 95 (1975), 75-91.
- Momigliano, A. 'The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography' *History* 43 (1958), 1-13. (Also Chapter 8 of Momigliano, *Studies in Historiography*, cited above).
'Historiography on Written Tradition and Historiography on Oral Tradition' *AAT* 96 (1961-62), 1-12. (Also Chapter 11 of Momigliano, *Studies in Historiography*, cited above).
'Time in Ancient Historiography' *H&T* 6 (1966), 1-23.
'Tradition and the Classical Historian' *H&T* 11 (1972), 279-292.
'Greek Historiography' *H&T* 17 (1978), 1-28.
- Munson, R.V. 'The Celebratory Purpose of Herodotus: The Story of Arion in *Histories* 1.23-24' *Ramus* 15 (1986), 93-104.

- Munson, R.V. 'Artemisia in Herodotus' *ClAnt* 7 (1988), 91-106.
- 'The Madness of Cambyses' *Arethusa* 24 (1991), 43-63.
- 'Herodotus' Use of Prospective Sentences and the Story of Rhampsinitus and the Thief in the *Histories*' *AJPh* 114 (1993), 27-44.
- Munz, P. 'History and Myth' *PhilosQ* 6 (1956), 1-16.
- Murray, O. 'Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture' *CQ* 22 (1972), 200-213.
- 'Herodotus and Oral History' *AchHist II* (1987), 93-115.
- Murray, P. 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece' *JHS* 101 (1981), 87-100.
- Nagy, G. 'Herodotus the *Logios*' *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 175-184.
- Nenci, G. 'Il Motivo dell'autopsia nella Storiografia Greca' *SCO* 3 (1953), 14-46.
- 'L'Occidente "barbarico" in *Hérodote et les Peuples non Grecs* [Fondation Hardt 35 (1988)], 301-318.
- Neville, J.W. 'Herodotus on the Trojan War' *G&R* 24 (1977), 3-12
- Notopoulos, J.A. 'Mnemosyne in Oral Literature' *TAPhA* 69 (1938), 465-493.
- Nyland, R.J. 'Herodotos' Sources for the Plataiai Campaign' *AC* 61 (1992), 80-97.
- Ostwald, M. 'Pindar, *Nomos*, and Heracles' *HSCP* 69 (1965), 109-138.
- 'Herodotos and Athens' *ICS* 16 (1991), 137-148.
- Packman, Z.M. 'The Incredible and the Incredulous: The Vocabulary of Disbelief in Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon' *Hermes* 119 (1991), 399-414.
- Parke, H.W. 'Citation and Recitation: A Convention in Early Greek Historians' *Hermathena* 67 (1946), 80-92.
- Pearson, L. 'Herodotus on the Source of the Danube' *CPh* 29 (1934), 1-10.

- Pearson, L. 'Credulity and Scepticism in Herodotus' *TAPhA* 72 (1941), 335-355.
- 'Prophasis and Aitia' *TAPhA* 83 (1952), 91-109.
- Phillips, E.D. 'The Legend of Aristeas: Fact and Fancy in Early Greek Notions of East Russia, Siberia, and Inner Asia' *AA* 18 (1955), 161-177.
- 'A Further Note on Aristeas' *AA* 20 (1957), 159-162.
- Phillips, F.C. 'Greek Myths and the Uses of Myths' *CJ* 74 (1978-79), 155-166.
- Pocock, J.G.A. 'The Origins of Study of the Past: A Comparative Approach' *CSSH* 4 (1961-62), 209-246.
- Podlecki, A.J. 'Herodotus in Athens?' in Kinzl, K (ed), *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean: Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermeyr*, Berlin, 1977, 246-265.
- 'Athens and Aegina' *Historia* 25 (1976), 396-413.
- Pritchett, W.K. 'Some Recent Critiques of the Veracity of Herodotos' in *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography* 4 (Uni. of California Pub. in Classical Studies 28 [1982], 234-285.
- Redford, J. 'Herodotus the Tourist' *CPh* 80 (1985), 971-118.
- Richter, G.M.A. 'Greeks in Persia' *AJA* 50 (1946), 15-30.
- Rhodes, P.J. 'Thucydides on Pausanias and Themistocles' *Historia* 19 (1970), 387-400.
- Rubinson, K.S. 'Herodotus and the Scythians' *Expedition* 17 (1975), 16-20.
- Scaife, R. 'Alexander I in the *Histories* of Herodotos' *Hermes* 117 (1989), 129-137.
- Schadewaldt, W. 'Die Anfänge der geschichtschreibung bei den Griechen' *Die Antike* 10 (1934), 144-168.
- Schepens, G. 'Some Aspects of Source Theory in Greek Historiography' *AncSoc* 6 (1975), 257-274.
- Schreiner, J.H. 'The Battles of 490 BC' *PCPhS* 196 (ns 16) (1970), 97-112.

- Sealey, R. "Thucydides, Herodotos, and the Causes of War' *CQ* 7 (1957), 1-12.
- Segal, C. 'Greek Myth as a Semiotic and Structural System and the Problem of Tragedy' *Arethusa* 16 (1983), 173-198.
- Seltman, C.T. 'The Offerings of the Hyperboreans' *CQ* 22 (1928), 155-159.
- Shrimron, B. 'Πρῶτος τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν' *Eranos* 71 (1973), 45-51.
- Snowden, F.M. Jr 'Bernal's "Blacks", Herodotus, and other Classical Evidence' *Arethusa* (Special Issue, 1989), 83-95.
- Solmsen, L. 'Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Ionic Revolt' *AJPh* 64 (1943), 194-207.
- 'Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Battle of Plataea' *CPh* 39 (1944), 241-253.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. "'Myth" and History: On Herodotus III.48 and 50-53' *OAth* 17 (1988), 167-182.
- Stahl, H. 'Learning Through Suffering? Croesus' Conversations in the history of Herodotus' *YCS* 24 (1975), 1-36.
- Stauffenberg, von. A, 'Dorieus' *Historia* 9 (1960), 189-215.
- Stern, J. 'Demythologization in Herodotus: 5.92.η' *Eranos* 87 (1989), 13-20.
- 'Scapegoat Narratives in Herodotus' *Hermes* 119 (1991), 304-311.
- Sulek, A. 'The Experiment of Psammetichus: Fact, Fiction, and a Model to Follow' *JHI* 50 (1989), 645-651.
- Thomas, C.G. 'Between Literacy and Orality: Herodotus' Historiography' *Mediterranean Historical Review* 3 (1988), 54-70.
- Treves, P. 'Herodotus, Gelon and Pericles' *CPh* 36 (1941), 321-345.
- Verdin, H. 'Notes sur l'attitude des Historiens Grecs à l'égard de la tradition Locale' *AncSoc* 1 (1970), 183-200.

- Wainwright, G.A. 'The Attempted Sacrifice of Sesostris' *JEA* 27 (1941), 138-143.
- 'Herodotus 2.28 on the Sources of the Nile' *JHS* 73 (1953), 104-107.
- Walbank, F.W. 'History and Tragedy' *Historia* 9 (1960), 216-234.
- Wallace, W.P. 'Kleomenes, Marathon, the Helots and Arkadia' *JHS* 74 (1954), 32-35.
- Wallinga, H.T. 'The Structure of Herodotus, 2,99-142' *Mnemosyne* 12 (1959), 204-223.
- Wardman, A.E. 'Myth in Greek Historiography' *Historia* 9 (1960), 403-413.
- 'Herodotus on the Cause of the Greco-Persian Wars' *AJPh* 82 (1961), 133-150.
- Waters, K.H. 'The Purpose of Dramatisation in Herodotos' *Historia* 15 (1966), 157-171.
- 'The Structure of Herodotos' Narrative' *Antichthon* 8 (1974), 1-10.
- Wells, J. 'The Persian Friends of Herodotus' in *Studies in Herodotus*, Books for Libraries Press, Freeport, 1923 (Repr. 1970).
- West, S. 'Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests' *CQ* 35 (1985), 278-305.
- 'And it came to pass that Pharaoh Dreamed: notes on Herodotus 2.139, 141' *CQ* 37 (1987), 262-271.
- 'Herodotus' Portrait of Hecataeus' *JHS* 111 (1991), 144-160.
- 'Sesostris' Stelae (Herodotus 2.102-106)' *Historia* 41 (1992), 117-120.
- West, W.C III 'Saviors of Greece' *GRBS* 11 (1970), 271-282.
- Westlake, H.D. 'Ἀέγεται in Thucydides' *Mnemosyne* 30 (1977), 345-362.
- White, M. 'The Duration of the Samian Tyranny' *JHS* 74 (1954), 36-43.
- White, M.E. 'Herodotus' Starting-Point' *Phoenix* 23 (1969), 39-48.

- White, M.E. 'Some Agiad dates: Pausanias and his Sons' *JHS* 84 (1964), 140-152.
- Youtie, H.C. 'Ἐραδέως γράφων: Between Literacy and Illiteracy' *GRBS* 12 (1971), 239-261.