HERODOTOS AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES*

Real data is messy.
Tom Stoppard, *Arcadia* I iv

AMONG early Greek historians, Herodotos and Thukydides, owing to their survival, inevitably dominate our attention. But of course they were not alone. We have some substantial citations and numerous shorter fragments of many contemporaries. Difficulties of interpretation and the authority of their greatest modern interpreter, Felix Jacoby, have for many years prevented a thorough re-evaluation of early historiography and the position of Herodotos within it. The present paper is a contribution to this effort. In the first section, the list of Herodotos' contemporaries is drawn up as a necessary starting-point. We shall find that Jacoby's assessment of the evidence, and in particular his late date for some historians, is to be rejected, and that his conclusions about Herodotos' position in the development of historiography, which still dominate the field, lack at least part of their foundation. In section II an alternative method, in the absence of certain chronology, is developed for identifying the salient characteristics of the individual historian; the method owes something to narratology. It is illustrated from the fragments of the authors listed in section I, together with those of other historians down to the beginning of the fourth century. Section III then focuses on Herodotos; it will emerge that the most distinctive thing about him is his constant talk about sources and how to assess them. Other historians (and, indeed, poets) knew that sources contradict each other, but Herodotos first realised that this situation exists as a theoretical problem requiring the development of new methods. His is a second-order, or meta-cognitive awareness. Section IV goes on to deal, as seems necessary, with Detlev Fehling's theory about Herodotos' sources, since if he is right Herodotos is not really serious about them. An epilogue draws attention to a fifth-century passage in the Theognidean corpus with striking parallels to a passage in Plato's *Protagoras*; the two together throw light on Herodotos' proem, and confirm the picture drawn in this paper of his historical activity.

I. WHO WERE HERODOTOS' CONTEMPORARIES?

Discussion must begin with the well-known passage of Dionysios of Halikarnassos in which he assesses the contributions of Thukydides' predecessors:[1]

Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 5.1 (i 330.7 Usener-Radermacher, 48.17 Aujac). μέλλων δὲ ἄρχεσθαι τῆς περὶ Θουκυδίδου γραφῆς ὀλίγα βούλομαι περὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγραφέων εἰπεῖν, τῶν τε πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἀκμασάντων ἐκείνῳ χρόνους, ἐξ ὧν ἔσται καταφανὴς ἥ τε προαίρεσις τοῦ ἀνδρός, ᾗ χρησάμενος διήλλαξε τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ δύναμις. (2) ἀρχαῖοι μὲν οὖν συγγραφεῖς πολλοὶ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς τόπους ἐγένοντο πρὸ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου (a. 431)· ἐν οἷς ἐστιν Εὐγαίων τε ὁ Σάμιος (*FGrH* 535 T 1) καὶ Δηίοχος ὁ Προκοννήσιος (*FGrH* 471 T 1) καὶ Εὔδημος ὁ Πάριος (*FGrH* 497 T 1) καὶ Δημοκλῆς ὁ Φυγελεὺς (*FHG* ii p. 20) καὶ ῾Εκαταῖος ὁ Μιλήσιος (*FGrH* 1 T 17a), ὅ τε ᾿Αργεῖος ᾿Ακουσίλαος (*FGrH* 2 T 2) καὶ ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς Χάρων

[1] For treatments of the passage see L. Pearson, *Early Ionian historians* (Oxford 1939) 3 f.; W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: on Thucydides* (University of California Press 1975); T.S. Brown in *AHR* lix (1953-54) 834 ff.; Sandra Gozzoli, 'Una teoria antica sull'origine della storiografia greca', *SCO* xix-xx (1970-71) 158-211; David L. Toye, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the first Greek historians', *AJP* cxvi (1995) 279-302. For details of the textual criticism I may refer to my forthcoming edition of the early mythographers.

(*FGrH* 262 T 3a) καὶ ὁ Χαλκηδόνιος <...> ᾿Αμελησαγόρας (*FGrH* 330 T 1), ὀλίγῳ δὲ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν καὶ μέχρι τῆς Θουκυδίδου παρεκτείναντες ἡλικίας ῾Ελλάνικός τε ὁ Λέσβιος (*FGrH* 4 T 5 = 323a T 2a) καὶ Δαμάστης ὁ Σιγειεὺς (*FGrH* 5 T 2) καὶ Ξενομήδης ὁ Κεῖος (*FGrH* 442 T 1) καὶ Ξάνθος ὁ Λυδὸς (*FGrH* 765 T 4) καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοί. (3) οὗτοι προαιρέσει τε ὁμοίᾳ ἐχρήσαντο περὶ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὑποθέσεων καὶ δυνάμεις οὐ πολύ τι διαφερούσας ἔσχον ἀλλήλων, οἱ μὲν τὰς ῾Ελληνικὰς ἀναγράφοντες ἱστορίας, οἱ δὲ τὰς βαρβαρικάς, {καὶ} αὐτάς τε ταύτας οὐ συνάπτοντες ἀλλήλαις, ἀλλὰ κατ᾽ ἔθνη καὶ κατὰ πόλεις διαιροῦντες καὶ χωρὶς ἀλλήλων ἐκφέροντες, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν φυλάττοντες σκοπόν, ὅσαι διεσῴζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνῆμαι {κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις} <ἢ>[2] εἴτ᾽ ἐν ἱεροῖς εἴτ᾽ ἐν βεβήλοις ἀποκείμεναι γραφαί, ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἁπάντων γνῶσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν, οἵας παρέλαβον, μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτε ἀφαιροῦντες· ἐν αἷς καὶ μῦθοί τινες ἐνῆσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ πεπιστευμένοι χρόνου καὶ θεατρικαί τινες περιπέτειαι πολὺ τὸ ἠλίθιον ἔχειν τοῖς νῦν δοκοῦσαι· (4) λέξιν τε ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τὴν αὐτὴν ἅπαντες ἐπετήδευσαν, ὅσοι <γε>[3] τοὺς αὐτοὺς προείλοντο τῶν διαλέκτων χαρακτῆρας, τὴν σαφῆ καὶ κοινὴν καὶ καθαρὰν καὶ σύντομον καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι προσφυῆ καὶ μηδεμίαν σκευωρίαν ἐπιφαίνουσαν τεχνικήν· ἐπιτρέχει μέντοι τις ὥρα τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτῶν καὶ χάρις, τοῖς μὲν πλείων, τοῖς δ᾽ ἐλάττων, δι᾽ ἣν ἔτι μένουσιν αὐτῶν αἱ γραφαί. (5) ὁ δ᾽ ῾Αλικαρνασεὺς ῾Ηρόδοτος, γενόμενος ὀλίγῳ πρότερον τῶν Περσικῶν (480/79), παρεκτείνας δὲ μέχρι τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν, τήν τε πραγματικὴν προαίρεσιν ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον ἐξήνεγκε καὶ λαμπρότερον... καὶ τῇ λέξει προσαπέδωκε τὰς παραλειφθείσας ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων ἀρετάς.

Before beginning my account of Thukydides I wish to say a few things both about the writers who preceded him and about his contemporaries, so that the plan of his work, in which he surpassed his predecessors, as well as his overall ability will become apparent. The old writers, then, were many and came from many places; among those living before the Peloponnesian War were **Eugaion of Samos, Deiochos of Prokonnesos, Eudemos of Paros, Demokles of Phygela, Hekataios of Miletos, the Argive Akousilaos, the Lampsakene Charon, the Chalkedonian <...and the Athenian> Amelesagoras**; born a little before the Peloponnesian War and living down to the time of Thukydides were **Hellanikos of Lesbos, Damastes of Sigeion, Xenomedes of Keos, Xanthos the Lydian** and many others. These writers had a similar plan in respect of subject matter, and did not differ greatly from one another in ability. Some wrote about Greece, others about barbarians, not joining their inquiries together into a continuous whole, but separating them by nations and cities and bringing them out individually, with one and the same object in view, that of bringing to the attention of the public traditions preserved among the local people {by nations and by cities} <or> written records preserved in sacred or profane archives, just as they received them, without adding or subtracting anything. Among these sources were to be found occasional myths, believed from time immemorial, and dramatic tales of upset fortunes, which seem quite foolish to people of our day. The style which they all employed was for the most part the same (at any rate among those who used the same dialect): clear, ordinary, unaffected, concise, suited to the subject and displaying none of the apparatus of professional skill; nonetheless a certain grace and charm attends their works, some more than others, and this has ensured their preservation. But **Herodotos of Halikarnassos,** who was born a little before the Persian Wars and lived down to the time of the Peloponnesian War, both raised the choice of subject to a more ambitious and impressive level... and added to his style those virtues which had been omitted by writers before him.

Dionysios divides the early historians into two groups: first those who lived before the Peloponnesian War, then those who lived or flourished from a date not long before the war down to the time of Thukydides. Then there is Herodotos, who Dionysios says was born just before the Persian Wars and lived to see the start of the Peloponnesian War. The lower terminus we know to be correct from Herodotos' own words (ix 73.3), and the higher one is in all likelihood correct as well. Dionysios' list is partly chronological, but also schematic, in that he is attempting to sketch, no doubt after Theophrastos, the history of early prose style. It is possible that the chronological lines have been stretched in some cases in order to accommodate

---

[2] Following Usener's deletion and Aujac's supplement. Dionysios, of course, has no independent knowledge of early archives and pre-literary chronicles; he infers their existence from the text of the historians, especially Herodotos and Thukydides.

[3] For the reading ὅσοι <γε> cf. *Thuc.* 23.4 sqq., where Dionysios carefully reminds us that each dialect has its own character.

an author's perceived place in the history of style. In one instance he has been taken in by a forgery, that of Amelesagoras. His list has some remarkable omissions, but as there seems to be a lacuna in the manuscripts, the fault may not be his.

On the other hand, where we can test his information directly, he scores not badly. We must take his word for the very early date of the first four authors he mentions, Eugaion or Euagon,[4] Deiochos,[5] Eudemos[6] and Demokles,[7] but he is right about the date of Hekataios and Akousilaos.[8] Damastes of Sigeion[9] is said to be a contemporary of Herodotos by the *Suda* (δ 41 = *FGrH* 5 T 1), which, however, also says that he was a student of Hellanikos, and indeed he can occasionally be seen to follow that writer's version of events. Damastes also named as a source for details of Persian geography Diotimos son of Strombichos, who was strategos in 433/32.[10] On the other hand, the testimony that Hellanikos' book *Barbaric Customs* was pillaged from Damastes and Herodotos tends rather to support an earlier date for the Sigeian (or a later date for Hellanikos).[11] For the precise date of Xenomedes of Keos[12] we have really no other indications than those Dionysios gives us. As for Xanthos,[13] his book on Lydian history contained some spectacular information which it is hard to believe Herodotos would have omitted had he known about it, e.g., that King Kambles ate his wife (*FGrH* 765 F 18), or that the magi have sexual relations with all their female relatives (F 31). A stronger indication than this argument from silence is that Xanthos dated an event by its Olympic year (*FGrH* 765 F 30), using a technique we do not expect to find in advance of the publication of Hippias of Elis' list; but for this very reason some scholars reject the fragment as spurious.[14] Ephoros (*FGrH* 70 F 180) explicitly says that Xanthos gave Herodotos his ἀφορμαί, either 'starting-point' or 'source material',[15] and Athenaios, who preserves the fragment, took him to mean (if he did not say so himself) that the Lydian was the earlier of the two. A *terminus a quo* is provided by a reference to Artaxerxes (*FGrH* 765 F 12), who reigned from 465-425. On balance, H. Herter's assessment—'an older contemporary of Herodotos'[16]—is probably right.

[4] The truest form of the name (Euagon) is given in *IPriene* 37 = *FGrH* 535 F 3. He wrote local history of Samos (no title transmitted).

[5] Transmitted titles are Περὶ Κυζίκου and Περὶ Σαμοθράκης.

[6] Parian or Naxian; no titles transmitted.

[7] No titles transmitted.

[8] Hekataios wrote Γενεαλογίαι (also cited as Ἱστορίαι and once as Ἡρωολογία, *FGrH* 1 F 8) and the *Periodos*; Akousilaos wrote Γενεαλογίαι.

[9] Transmitted titles are Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι γενομένων, Περὶ γονέων καὶ προγόνων τῶν εἰς Ἴλιον στρατευσαμένων, Ἐθνῶν κατάλογος καὶ πόλεων, Περὶ ποιητῶν καὶ σοφιστῶν, Περίπλους.

[10] Strabo i.3.1 p. 47 = *FGrH* 5 T 7, F 8.

[11] Porph. *fr.* 409 Smith apud Eus. *Praep. Evang.* x.3.16 p. 466b = *FGrH* 5 T 5 = Hellan. *FGrH* 4 T 17.

[12] Wrote local history (no title transmitted).

[13] Λυδιακά, Μαγικά, Περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους.

[14] See Pearson (n. 1) 115. The Olympic date in this fragment, which is preserved by Clement, might be someone else's calculation on the basis of some synchronism in Xanthos; on this assumption the fragment may be accepted as genuine.

[15] See R. Drews, *The Greek accounts of eastern history* (Princeton 1973) 102, who, however, thinks that Ephoros may have drawn an incorrect inference about their chronological relationship from Xanthos' subject matter which for the most part seems to treat an earlier period than Herodotos. Against this see Peter Kingsley, 'Meetings with magi: Iranian themes among the Greeks, from Xanthus of Lydia to Plato's Academy', *JRAS* v (1995) 173-209 at 174 n. 12.

[16] *RE* ix A.2 (1967) 1354.

That leaves Hellanikos[17] and Charon.[18] Jacoby argued repeatedly that Herodotos knew nothing of either writer, even though Charon is placed in Dionysios' first group. At most Jacoby would concede that some of their works, like those of some of the other early historians, might have been published before Herodotos' *logoi*, but *not* before his travels, so that he could play out his part in *Entwicklungsgeschichte* unencumbered by familiarity with anybody but the old ethnographers.[19] Jacoby's view is tied up with his still influential theory of the development of Greek historiography, which held that the ethnography and geography of Hekataios was first succeeded by the panoramic *Hellenika* of Herodotos, who indeed first set out to write ethnography, but changed into an historian as a result of his experience in Athens, and of the Persian Wars.[20] Local history, Jacoby held, originated in the desire of the individual city to 'secure in Greek history a place for herself, which Great Historiography [i.e., Herodotos] did not assign to her... The local chronicles... deliberately place the history of one city in the framework of the general history of the Greek people as designed by "scientific" historiography.'[21] So local history had to wait for Herodotos. But *some* Greek sense of an historical framework had existed for a long time. We must not forget the poets. Mimnermos had written historical verse at the end of the seventh century.[22] Xenophanes wrote the foundation of Kolophon and the colonization of Elea.[23] Herodotos' own uncle (or cousin) told the story in verse of the colonization of Ionia,[24] which is to say the starting-point for many prose histories. Epic poems in which legendary local history played a leading role are the *Korinthiaka*, the *Meropis*, the *Naupaktia*, the *Phoronis*, and the *Phokais*; many lyric poems such as Alkman's or Pindar's, though not historical in purpose, display detailed knowledge of local traditions.[25] A local history in prose before Herodotos would be in no way surprising; the argument from a theory of development is no stronger than that which placed the *Supplices* of Aischylos at the

---

[17] Φορωνίς, Δευκαλιωνεία, ᾿Ατλαντίς, ᾿Ασωπίς, Τρωϊκά, Αἰολικά / Λεσβι(α)κά, ᾿Αργολικά, Περὶ ᾿Αρκαδίας, ᾿Ατθίς, Βοιωτιακά, Θεσσαλικά, Αἰγυπτιακά, Εἰς ῍Αμμωνος ἀνάβασις, Κυπριακά, Περὶ Λυδίας, Περσικά, Σκυθικά, Κτίσεις ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων, Περὶ Χίου κτίσεως, Βαρβαρικὰ νόμιμα, ᾿Ιέρειαι τῆς ῞Ηρας αἱ ἐν ῍Αργει, Καρνεονῖκαι οἱ καταλογάδην, Καρνεονῖκαι οἱ ἔμμετροι. Of course this list and the others I have given are attended by the usual problems, but there is no need here to discuss the various efforts of scholars to combine or otherwise modify the list of Hellanikos' works, which must remain impressive on any reconstruction.

[18] Αἰθιοπικά, Περσικά, ᾿Ελληνικά, Περὶ Λαμψάκου, Λιβυκά, ῟Ωροι Λαμψακηνῶν, Πρυτάνεις {ἢ ἄρχοντες} (deleted by editors as a gloss) τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων (but see below, p. 67), Κτίσεις πόλεων, Κρητικά, Περίπλους τῶν ἐκτὸς τῶν ᾿Ηρακλέους στηλῶν.

[19] F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949) 184; introduction to *FGrH* 323a pp. 8 f.

[20] 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* ix (1909) 80-123 = *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* ed. H. Bloch (Leiden 1956) 16-64; *RE* articles on Hekataios (vii.2 [1912] 2666-2769), Hellanikos (viii.1 [1912] 104-53), and Herodotos (suppl. ii [1913] 205-520), all reprinted in *Griechische Historiker* (Stuttgart 1956); *Atthis* ch. III §4 *et passim*; introduction to *FGrH* 323a. Support (with some qualifications) in K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (Berlin 1967); more recently in S. Hornblower, *Greek historiography*, ed. S. Hornblower (Oxford 1994) 15 f.; compare his *Thucydides* (London 1987) 19 n. 14.

[21] *Atthis* 201.

[22] Frr. 13-13a West.

[23] *Vorsokr.* 21 A 1.

[24] Panyasis Test. 1 Davies. *Cf.* also Kallinos *fr.* 7 West. On ktisis-poetry see now C. Dougherty, 'Archaic Greek foundation poetry: questions of genre and occasion', *JHS* cxiv (1994) 35-46; to her discussion of the occasion of elegy add R.L. Fowler, *The nature of early Greek lyric* (Toronto 1987) ch. 3. Her general scepticism about the genre's separate existence does not affect the point made here.

[25] The ἀρχαιολογία Σαμίων attributed to Semonides of Amorgos (test. 1 West), though scarcely a title originating with the author, presumably treated the island's foundation. *Cf.* F. Lasserre, 'L'historiographie grecque à l'époque archaïque', *QS* iv (1976) 113-42 at 119 ff.

head of his surviving tragedies.[26]

Jacoby further argued that Herodotos shows no sign of knowing any such local histories or chronicles.[27] If we could be sure of that, it would be a stronger argument. Jacoby's main reason for his diagnosis was that Herodotos uses very few archon-dates or similar devices. But we do not know how frequent these were in the earliest chronicles, in spite of their name,[28] nor what use Herodotos might have chosen to make of them. His aims were quite different. Scholars disagree strongly about how much of Hekataios made its way into his pages, when we do in fact have a respectable number of fragments of that author; how much more hazardous must it be to make any statement about works represented by a mere handful of citations. The gaps in the record are simply too great for dogmatism.

Hellanikos, as we know from his fragments, was still active towards the end of the Peloponnesian War;[29] tradition held that he lived a long life,[30] and indeed he must have lived to mature, if not very ripe years to compose so many works. If his name is really connected with the victory of the Greeks over the Persians,[31] we may reasonably conjecture that his happy parents chose to commemorate a recent event in such a manner; but if his name is to be read ᾿Ελλάνῑκος, with short iota,[32] one may rather think that the tradition of his longevity is owed to someone who scanned the iota long and drew the appropriate inference. At all events, while Dionysios here places his career as a whole after Herodotos, other testimonies unequivocally place him before;[33] and even Dionysios in another place says that some work(s) of Hellanikos came first.[34] The evidence really presents no serious difficulties: Hellanikos was almost exactly contemporary with Herodotos, lived a long life, and died sometime after 406 BC.

---

[26] Jacoby repeatedly questioned Dionysios' evidence because it was ultimately based only on the style of the authors concerned; consequently he simply ignored him (e.g. 'ganz unbrauchbar' *RE* viii.1 109). But style is no very bad criterion—indeed, it is a better one than Jacoby's, if you have nothing else to go on.

[27] *Atthis* 182; *RE* suppl. ii 404.

[28] Jacoby, 'Über die Entwicklung' (n. 20) 49 ff., insists that anything called ῏Ωροι must have proceeded κατ᾿ ἔτος. But we do not know if these titles were assigned by their authors (note the variance in the title of Aristophanes' work, below n. 54, and see on Charon, below n. 44), and anything that proceeded in chronological order using expressions such as 'during King X's reign', 'in the time of his son', 'a few years later', 'twenty years after the destruction of Y' (expressions we often see in the fragments of early historiography and in Herodotos) might have earned such a title from a later scholar looking for the right pigeon-hole in which to place the work.

[29] *FGrH* 4 FF 171-172 = 323a FF 25-26 (references to events of 407/6 BC).

[30] [Lucianus] *Macr.* 22 = *FGrH* 4 T 8, 323a T 6 (lived to 85 years of age).

[31] *Vit. Eurip.* (i 2.5 Schwartz) = *FGrH* 4 T 6, 323a T 4 (he and Euripides both born on the day of Salamis). Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften* iv 673 n. 1 explains the name on the analogy of Πυθιόνικος and ᾿Ολυμπιόνικος as 'victor over the Greeks' in athletic contests (he might have cited also ᾿Ανδρόνικος). *Cf.* L. Pearson, *The local historians of Attica* (Philadelphia 1942) 5 f.

[32] The name is then the ethnic with changed accent. For other occurrences of the name see P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews, *A lexicon of Greek personal names* i (Oxford 1987) s.v. (One example from the 3rd century AD is written -νεικος, for what it is worth; the name of the historian himself may also occur, so spelled, twice in *POxy* liii 3711.)

[33] Aul. Gell. 15.23 = *FGrH* 4 T 3, 323a T 5; *Suda* δ 41 = Damastes *FGrH* 5 T 1, Hellan. 4 T 9 (quoted above p. 64). Aulus' source is Pamphila, *FHG* iii 521 *fr.* 7, who places his birth in 496/5 (reckoning inclusively; she says he was 65 in 432/1); this would place his ἀκμή in 457/6, close to the year of Euripides' first production (456/5), which F. Rühl, *RhM* lxi (1906) 475, argued was the foundation of her (Apollodoros') date; Hellanikos' *Suda* article (= *FGrH* 4 T 1, 323a T 1) synchronises the two writers. See further Alden A. Mosshammer, 'The Apollodoran *Akmai* of Hellanicus and Herodotos', *GRBS* xiv (1973) 5-13. At Eus. (Hieron.) *Chron.* p. 107ᵉ Helm = *FGrH* 4 T 4a, Hellanikos is said to have been '*clarus*' in Ol. 70.1 (a. 500/499; the Armenian version gives Ol. 69.3, the *Chronicon Paschale* Ol. 67.1); on the assumption that this date represents a misreading of γέγονε as a *floruit* rather than a birthdate, we have another testimony to the standard ancient view, which should not be tossed aside without reason: whether born in 495 or 480, he was born early in the century like Herodotos.

[34] *Pomp.* 3.6 = *FGrH* 4 T 12, 323a T 2b, 687a T 1, referring to work(s) which treated the same subject as Herodotos; there are several candidates (Αἰγυπτιακά, Εἰς ῎Αμμωνος ἀνάβασις, Περὶ Λυδίας, Περσικά, Σκυθικά, Βαρβαρικὰ νόμιμα). The *Suda* entry synchronises him with Herodotos.

Within that life we know the approximate dates of only a few of his works.

For Charon, the one secure fact is a reference to the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes: Charon said that Themistokles in exile went not to Xerxes' court but to his son's.[35] Artaxerxes acceded in 465/4 and died in 425/4. This accords well enough with the date given by Dionysios, and with the admittedly confused indications in the *Suda*[36] (none of which, however, point to a later date, rather the opposite). Jacoby's arguments for dating Charon to after the end of the fifth century are weak.[37] The reference to an event near the beginning of Artaxerxes' reign he managed to change into a reference to the end: 'Der Ansatz [by chronographers] im ersten Jahr eines Königs bedeutet oft, dass man den Autor überhaupt nach seiner Regierungszeit bestimmt; und das Jahr 425/4 wäre an sich ein passender Schluss auch für ein Werk über persische Geschichte.'[38] Another argument has little more to recommend it. Thukydides i.97.2 says that apart from Hellanikos no one before him has treated the Pentakontaetia. Therefore Charon had not yet written his *Hellenika*.[39] We do not know, however, what the scope of this book was.[40] Just as importantly, one cannot know what books Thukydides might disdain to mention in so polemical a passage. A final argument is that Charon's book Πρυτάνεις Λακεδαιμονίων, described by the *Suda* as χρονικά, was presumably inspired by Hellanikos' *Priestesses of Hera in Argos* (*FGrH* 4 FF 74-84), which we infer from Thukydides iv 133 was published sometime after 423, or at any rate (since the inference is not quite secure) sometime after 429, on the basis of Thukydides ii 2.1.[41] Furthermore, Jacoby argues, interest in the officials of Sparta is much more likely after 404 with the rise of Sparta to hegemony.[42] This third argument is no stronger than the first two. Sophists were interested in systems of government long before 404; Kritias (*ob.* 404/3) in fact wrote a book entitled Πολιτεία Λακεδαιμονίων, of which several fragments are preserved.[43] Anyhow the title of Charon's book is suspicious. Sparta never had πρυτάνεις. Anton Westermann in 1838 emended to Πρυτάνεις τῶν Λαμψακηνῶν.[44] This still leaves the argument about possible influence from Hellanikos untouched, but even if this book was produced late in Charon's career (late 420s?), there were many others that preceded it. Like Dionysios, both in *Thuc.* and *Pomp.* (3.6, cited above), Plutarch is perfectly clear that Charon was the older writer.[45]

---

[35] Plut. *Them.* 27.1 = *FGrH* 262 F 11.

[36] *Suda* χ 136 = *FGrH* 262 T 1.

[37] F. Jacoby, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *SIFC* xv (1938) 207-42 = *Abhandlungen* (n. 20) 178-206. H.D. Westlake, 'Thucydides on Pausanias and Themistocles—a written source?', *CQ* xxvii (1977) 95-110 at 108 n. 74, finds Jacoby's arguments weak; detailed criticism in Gozzoli (n. 1) 169 n. 33; Drews (n. 15) 24 ff.; Mauro Maggi, 'Autori greci di *Persika*. II: Carone di Lampsaco', *ASNP* vii (1977) 1-26 at 5 n. 17; Silvio Accame, 'La leggenda di Ciro in Erodoto', *MGR* viii (1982) 1-43 at 26 ff.

[38] P. 179.

[39] P. 182.

[40] Drews (n. 15) 25. One might think a discussion of Themistokles' exile points to a treatment of the Pentekontaetia; but he could have looked briefly forward to the admiral's demise after a treatment of Salamis. (Jacoby p. 178 calls this idea 'very improbable'; the reasons given on pp. 202 ff. in support of this judgment are of a very general kind. Obviously, it is perfectly possible.)

[41] See Jacoby, intro to *FGrH* 323a p. 4; Gomme on Thuk. iv 133.2-3.

[42] P. 187. He might have added, given his penchant for arguments from silence, that Thukydides might have been expected to use the data of such a book at least once or twice, just as he used Hellanikos' book of priestesses.

[43] *Vorsokr.* 88 B 32-7.

[44] In his re-edition of Vossius' *De historicis graecis*, p. 21 n. 63. If the emendation is correct (it is certainly plausible, though Jacoby p. 187 thought it 'most improbable'), the further question arises whether this is not simply an alternative title for the Ὧροι Λαμψακηνῶν listed immediately before in the *Suda*. It is possibly relevant that a Spartan king bore the name Prytanis (Hdt. viii 131).

[45] *De Hdt. mal.* 20 p. 859b = *FGrH* 262 F 9. Similarly Tert. *De Anim.* 46 = *FGrH* 262 F 14.

In brief, Herodotos could have known the works of many of the writers mentioned by Dionysios, as well as others not mentioned by him. These include Skylax of Karyanda[46] and the other early periegetes Euthymenes of Massilia and Hanno of Carthage,[47] Dionysios of Miletos,[48] Pherekydes of Athens,[49] Antiochos of Syracuse,[50] Ion of Chios,[51] and Simonides of Keos the Genealogist.[52] These are all authors for whom a sufficiently early date is attested. In addition we must mention the names of others whom various indications assign to a date at least as early as the first half of the fourth century, and who could for all we know be earlier: Aethlios of Samos,[53] Aristophanes of Boiotia,[54] Armenidas,[55] Kreophylos of Ephesos,[56] Menekrates of Xanthos,[57] and Skythinos of Teos.[58]

Jacoby's theory of early Greek historiography, though a work of undeniable genius, thinks too much in terms of development, a self-evident concept to scholars of the day. A theory in which all the characteristics of the first stage of historiography are found in one author, Hekataios, and all the characteristics of the logical second stage in another, Herodotos, all of the logical third stage in another, Hellanikos, and all of the fourth stage, in another, Thukydides, all of whom fit together like ashlar blocks, squeezing out anyone caught between, is inherently unlikely. Jacoby based the arrangement of his edition on his theory; consequently it is very easy to forget just how many historians were active during Herodotos' lifetime, since everybody after volume I (indeed, everybody after number 3 in volume I) is conceptually post-Herodotos in Jacoby's scheme. We have compiled a lengthy list of Herodotos' contemporaries. If a god could restore all the works of these people to us, with dates helpfully attached, we would surely receive many shocks.

Was there then a Herodotos before Herodotos? In theory one must admit the possibility. Practically speaking, one would expect to have *some* inkling of the fact, if (say) Charon's *Hellenika* was a book of similar scope. We can at least say this much, that of all the early titles known to us, Charon's is the *only* one which suggests a work anything like Herodotos'; and that is encouraging.[59] Herodotos, on any reconstruction, is likely to remain the cardinal turning-

---

[46] *FGrH* 709; pseudo-Skylax in *GGM* i 154 ff. Transmitted titles are Περίπλους τῶν ἐκτὸς [ἐντὸς coni. quidam] τῶν Ἡρακλέος στηλῶν, τὰ κατὰ Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα, Γῆς περίοδος. Herodotos, of course, names Skylax himself at iv 44.

[47] *FHG* iv 408; *GGM* i 1 ff.

[48] *FGrH* 687. Only transmitted title, Περσικά. Synchronised by the *Suda* s.v. Ἑκαταῖος (= *FGrH* 1 T 1) with Dareios; the same entry says Herodotos borrowed from him.

[49] Wrote genealogical Ἱστορίαι (once cited as Θεογονία, *FGrH* 3 F 54, no doubt by confusion with the Syrian). He is probably to be dated to about 470: see G. Huxley, 'The date of Pherekydes of Athens', *GRBS* xiv (1973) 137-43; R. Thomas, *Oral tradition and written record in classical Athens* (Cambridge 1989) 161 ff.

[50] *FGrH* 555; Περὶ Ἰταλίης, Σικελικά. Died sometime after 424/3 (below, n. 109).

[51] *FGrH* 392, *Vorsokr.* 36, *TrGF* 19, *IEG* ii 79; wrote Χίου κτίσις plus poetic, philosophical, and other works. First tragedy produced Ol. 82 (452/48); dead by 421 (Ar. *Pax* 827 ff.).

[52] *FGrH* 8; son of the poet's daughter κατά τινας. Wrote Γενεαλογία, Εὑρήματα, perhaps also Σύμμικτα.

[53] *FGrH* 536; Ὧροι Σαμίων.

[54] *FGrH* 379; Θηβαῖοι Ὧροι (also cited as Θηραϊκά and Βοιωτικά).

[55] *FGrH* 378; Θηβαϊκά.

[56] *FGrH* 417; Ἐφεσίων Ὧροι.

[57] *FGrH* 769; Λυκιακά.

[58] *FGrH* 13, *IEG* ii 97; Ἱστορίη.

[59] Damastes' Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι γενομένων (a phrase, as Jacoby ad loc. remarks, presumably taken from the proem) was, it seems, a *Hellenika*, but was probably later than Herodotos. The fragments of Charon contain tantalizing references to Persian affairs; for discussion of possible connections with Herodotos see Accame (n. 37) and L. Piccirilli, 'Carone di Lampsaco e Erodoto', *ASNP* v (1975) 1239-54.

point in the history of historiography. But it has long been recognized that Herodotos drew on various kinds of material for his history, and if (as I think we have now established as a strong possibility) Herodotos knew works of local history and others mentioned here, no one can really know how many of these writers might have shaped his thinking, or schooled him in the technique of *historie*.

Of course Greek historiography developed in some sense, but one must be careful to describe developments in appropriate terms. Rather than thinking of a step-by-step development, we would be wise to think in terms of a long and mutually beneficial exchange of work and ideas between Herodotos and his many contemporaries. Therefore if we wish to prove Herodotos' uniqueness, it is best to do so by demonstrating that those qualities which seem most characteristic of him are intimately bound up with his *own* perception of his task as an historian. If that is the case, it becomes less likely that he was anticipated by a predecessor in any essential point, and would not matter anyway if he was.

II. THE HISTORIAN'S VOICE

Scholars have looked again and again at Herodotos' proem, where indeed insight into his self-perception is most likely to be found. Close examination of Herodotos' proem shall here be postponed to the end. In the meantime it will be useful to look at various aspects of what may be termed the 'historian's voice'. Any historiographical text involves the historian and the object of study. In reading the text, we are frequently aware of the intercession of the investigator between ourselves and the data. Most obviously, this obtrusion may take the form of first-person statements or self-reference of some kind. The proem is a place where such statements are apt to occur. A surprisingly large number (ten) of beginnings of fifth-century prose works by named authors is known.[60] The first-person deictic pronoun (in Hekataios, ὧδε μυθέεται and τάδε γράφω; in Herodotos, ἀπόδεξις ἥδε; in Antiochos, Ἀντίοχος... τάδε συνέγραψε, and so on) is a well-known stylistic habit of these passages, as if to say, here I am, this is my work. The pronoun is often accompanied by assertions of the importance of the subject or the accuracy of the information.[61] The historian's voice is strong and egotistical already in the first Greek historian. It need not have been so; but in a time when even the poets had arrogated to themselves the inspiration of the Muses, such pride in individual achievement is perhaps not surprising. Thukydides, as usual, differs from the others in style (no deictic pronoun), though not in the forcefulness with which he announces his subject, nor the implied

---

[60] The qualification 'by named authors' excludes the works in the Hippocratic corpus. Known beginnings are: Hekataios *FGrH* 1 F 1; Herakleitos *fr.* 1 Marcovich; Ion of Chios Τριαγμός *fr.* 20 von Blumenthal; Antiochos of Syracuse Περὶ Ἰταλίας *FGrH* 555 F 2; Alkmaion of Kroton *Vorsokr.* 24 B 1; Philolaos of Kroton 44 B 1; Diogenes of Apollonia 64 B 1; Kritias Πολιτεία Λακεδαιμονίων 88 B 32; Herodotos and Thukydides. Depending on the reading, Anaxagoras 59 B 1 may be included as an eleventh example: that is, whether '...λέγων ἀπ' ἀρχῆς· "ὁμοῦ πάντα ἦν..."' or '...λέγων· "ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁμοῦ πάντα ἦν..."' is correct.

[61] This chest-thumping habit of early writers is commented on by Aristeides (xxviii 68) in a minor testimonium that escaped Jacoby's notice: ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἀλλ' ἢ ἐνδείκνυται τῷ Ἡροδότῳ καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλανίκοις καὶ τοῖς Ἑκαταίοις καὶ πᾶσι τούτοις ὅτι ἐγὼ ὑμῶν προέχω τῇ κρίσει πρῶτον· τὰ γοῦν κράτιστα ἐξειλεχὼς, ταῦτα καὶ περὶ τούτων γράφω, τὰ δὲ πλείω παιδιά. *Cf.* Joseph. *Ap.* i 16 = Eus. *Praep. Evang.* x 7.12 p. 478c = Akous. *FGrH* 2 T 6, Hell. 4 T 18 on the frequent disagreement between Hellanikos and Akousilaos; Thuk. i 97.2 = *FGrH* 4 T 16, 323a T 16 (the celebrated attack on Hellanikos); Aristophanes *FGrH* 379 F 5 (attacking Herodotos). See also Hippias *FGrH* 6 F 4, a verbatim quotation of a passage that might well be from a proem, in which Hippias brags about his κοινὸς καὶ πολυειδὴς λόγος. L. Koenen, 'Der erste Satz bei Heraklit und Herodot', *ZPE* xcvii (1993) 95-6, argues that the deictic pronoun refers to the book itself; ultimately (once the book was deposited somewhere) it must have that effect, but the original reference is to the performance, and thus effectively to the author.

pride in his accomplishment.[62]

First-person statements are only the most obvious form in which the historian's voice might manifest itself. At the other end of the scale are the decisions implied by the basic shape of the narrative, and turns of phrase that direct the reader's attention to different objects as the narrative unfolds itself; some of these devices, as narratologists have demonstrated, can be very inconspicuous indeed. In Greek the tiniest of particles can betray the involvement of the author. Here is a small example from Herodoros of Herakleia (*fl.* ca. 400), which, though slight, is pleasing enough in that it has to be rescued by philology (*FGrH* 31 F 63 *bis*):

δράκοντες δέ που ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Καυκάσῳ <θαυμαστοὶ τὸ> μέγεθος, καὶ μέγεθος καὶ πλῆθος

Demetr. *Eloc.* 66. καὶ ἀναδίπλωσις δ' ἔπους εἰργάσατο μέγεθος ὡς ʹΗρόδωρος (Orth: –δοτος cod.)· ʹδράκοντες δέ που' φησίν ʹἦσαν—πλῆθος'. δὶς ῥηθὲν τὸ μέγεθος ὄγκον τινὰ τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ παρέσχεν.

<div align="center">1 add. Kroll apud Radermacher</div>

Radermacher and Roberts and no doubt earlier editors gave the little word που to Herodoros, but Orth,[63] who restored the name of Herodoros and identified the Argonautic context of the fragment, strangely gave the particle to Demetrios; he was followed by Jacoby. This creates a very difficult word order, in that a break exists after δέ, so that we have πού φησιν, instead of φησίν που; the enclitic has nothing to lean on. If we give the particle to Herodoros we get an attractive result. που does not here mean 'somewhere', as Orth thought (which then seemed to him difficult with ἐν τῷ Καυκάσῳ), but 'I suppose';[64] I conjecture that Herodoros is rationalizing the story of the serpent which guarded the Golden Fleece. He frequently rationalized in this manner. The tone of 'I suppose there were amazingly big snakes in the Kaukasos' is casual and self-assured, as if such rationalizations were a routine and well accepted technique of scientific study. There is something conspiratorial in the way the reader is assumed to understand the method and invited to share in the writer's sophistication. A century earlier Hekataios had to argue hard for his new method.

Many particles imply judgment, assessment, evaluation of the relative priority of different facts, and many other operations which involve the intercession of the historian. Every γάρ might be thought to imply such intercession. A character's motive for some action is usually only surmised by the historian; this is almost certainly the case when alternative motivations are given, for instance at i 86.2 where Herodotos offers three possible reasons why Kyros put Kroisos on the pyre.

Between the two extremes of explicit and inferred self-assertion there are many other ways in which the historian's voice might be heard. Here is a list of such ways, compiled by reading through Herodotos and looking out as diligently as possible for any sign of the historian at work; no doubt ingenuity might discover many more:

1. Explicit or implicit first-person statements, e.g.:
general statements of purpose (e.g. in proem); discussion of methods; statements about what comes next, went before, or will be omitted in the narrative; value judgments or editorial comments about events, characters, sources' credibility; avowals of ignorance; ridicule of or disagreement with other practitioners; use of particles.

---

[62] For Thukydides' proem see the study of A.M. Bowie, 'The beginnings of Thucydides', in *Tria lustra. Essays and notes presented to John Pinsent* (Liverpool Classical Monthly, Liverpool 1993) 141-7.

[63] *B.phil.Woch.* xlv [1925] 778 ff.

[64] A referee helpfully notes Hdt. i 114.2 and iii 72.3 as parallels for this position and meaning of δέ που (κου); at i 181.4, by contrast, κου is spatial, at iii 120.1, temporal.

2. Using scientific tools, e.g.:
rationalization; chronography; etymology; testing a report or theory by comparing it to similar phenomena or by inquiry with those likely to know; appeal to τὸ εἰκός; providing a σημεῖον, τεκμήριον, or μαρτύρια.

3. Referring to sources:
explicitly named; implied by λέγεται; giving alternative sources and weighing their merits; saying no source is available.

4. Giving unusual information that implies special knowledge or research, e.g.:
oddities of local customs, beliefs, nomenclature, climate, flora, fauna, etc.; catalogues of places, people, objects; genealogies; statistics; dates; former names of places; foreign language equivalents; 'the first / the only / the most X (where 'X' is an adjective) τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν'; 'ἔτι ἐς ἐμέ'.

These are all, it is hoped, self-explanatory, except perhaps the last two in group 4. The first of these, τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, which is always in Herodotos (and Thukydides, for that matter) accompanied by a superlative or an equivalent such as πρῶτος, implies that the historian has eliminated all contenders but one for a title such as 'first to harm the Greeks' or 'most productive land of any known to us'. The second phrase, ἔτι ἐς ἐμέ (or an equivalent), is often used by Herodotos to refer to some monument or practice that still exists in his day; it shows the historian researching and establishing the links that exist between past and present. All the other devices in the list similarly betray the working hand of the researcher.

By carefully describing the frequency and use of these devices in a given historian—or 'markers' of the historian's voice, as I shall call them—one may in theory obtain a kind of voiceprint, which must be unique in every case. Of course the voice of the fragmentary historian can never be clearly heard. Yet some of the main contours can be made out, and with due regard to the gaps in our evidence and the danger of arguments from silence, one can also suggest what is unique about Herodotos, or at any rate highly characteristic. Close study of all these particulars can hardly be attempted here; but an exploratory effort to hear the louder echoes may at least determine the main contours of the graph and suggest possibilities for further work.[65]

Rationalization of legend is one item on the list that figures in every discussion of early historiography. As everyone knows, it is a method especially associated with Hekataios (perhaps his invention); his proem, 'I write these stories, as they seem true to me; for the tales of the Greeks, as they seem to me, are many and ridiculous', is commonly and plausibly taken to refer to the supernatural element of traditional tales which Hekataios proposes to eliminate, or at any rate reduce, by his rationalizations. He made Kerberos into a big snake, and Geryones into an ordinary human king.[66] These innovations, and what part they might have played in the march from μῦθος to λόγος, have long exercised scholars. What I should particularly like to draw attention to here is the quaver in the voice: at the same time as Hekataios seeks to reduce Kerberos to realistic proportions, he is able to accept the story that Orestheus' bitch gave birth to a stump, and much else besides.[67] It is one thing to develop a revolutionary new method;

---

[65] In looking for interesting examples I have extended the list of authors to include slightly later ones, but no later than the early fourth century: Agias/Derkylos (*FGrH* 305); Anaximander of Miletos the younger (*FGrH* 9); Andron of Halikarnassos (*FGrH* 10); pseudo-Epimenides (*FGrH* 457); pseudo-Eumelos (*FGrH* 451); Herodoros of Herakleia (*FGrH* 31); Metrodoros of Chios (*FGrH* 43); Polos of Akragas (*FGrH* 7); Skamon of Mytilene (son of Hellanikos; *FGrH* 476); Hippias of Elis (*FGrH* 6); Stesimbrotos of Thasos (*FGrH* 107); Kratippos of Athens (*FGrH* 64); Akesandros (*FGrH* 469); Thibron (*FGrH* 581); Kritias (*Vorsokr.* 88 B 32-7). I cast an occasional glance sideways at Thukydides; at Xenophon not at all.

[66] *FGrH* 1 FF 27, 26

[67] *FGrH* 1 F 15.

it is another to realize all its possibilities and to think instinctively of applying it at every opportunity. In a similar way Hellanikos rejects the story of Niobe's petrifaction, saying instead that there is a spring on Mt. Sipylos whose water turns the bellies of those who drink from it to stone—a version only superficially more realistic than the myth and obviously invented.[68] Geoffrey Lloyd has said much about a similar failure to universalize among early scientists, who, indeed, could hardly be expected to discover the truth about, say, epilepsy with the means at their disposal; while espousing admirably rational principles and rejecting the nonsense of their opponents, they often substitute equally arbitrary theories of their own.[69] The point will be relevant later in our discussion of Herodotos' methods. For the moment we may note, in respect of rationalization, that the second book and much of the fourth are wholly imbued with its spirit. An example among many is his argument that the 'speaking dove' of Dodona was really only a foreign woman whose barbaric utterances sounded like the chirping of birds, since birds cannot speak with human tongue.[70] Herodoros presents a peculiar mixture of rationalism, allegory, and fantastic zoology.[71] Among major figures, only Pherekydes affords no example of rationalization; nor is there any other trace in this author of the Greek enlightenment. Akousilaos has perhaps two examples; neither is particularly striking.[72]

Etymology as a scientific method became especially favoured in the late fifth century, but of course popular etymology is as old as Homer.[73] Hekataios thinks that Mykenai got its name from μύκης, the cap of Perseus' scabbard.[74] Pherekydes tells a charming story of how Teos got its name from the conjunction τέως; 'while you were looking for a spot to build your city,' said Athamas' daughter as she built little castles out of stones, 'I have found one.'[75] Ion and Metrodoros of Chios derived Chios' name from χιών.[76] Herodotos certainly makes play with so-called 'speaking names', for instance Atys and Adrastos in the story of Kroisos, but the only example of the scientific use of etymology seems to be found at ii 52, where he derives θεοί from τίθημι, and (a novelty) a Skythian etymology of 'Arimaspians' at iv 27.[77] If the potential of etymology has not yet been fully realized in these earlier authors, it is again and again the weapon of choice for Hellanikos. He is capable of some astonishing claims in this respect—for

---

[68] *FGrH* 4 F 191; further examples at *frr.* 28, 72, 104b, 148, 168a.

[69] G.E.R. Lloyd, *Magic, reason and experience. Studies in the origin and development of Greek science* (Cambridge 1979); *id., The revolutions of wisdom. Studies in the claims and practice of ancient Greek science* (Berkeley 1987).

[70] On rationalization in Herodotos see A. Lesky, 'Aithiopika', *Hermes* lxxxvii (1959) 27-38 = *Gesammelte Schriften* (Bern/Munich 1966) 410-21; A.B. Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II* (Leiden 1975) i 135 ff., 162 ff.; Virginia Hunter, *Past and process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton 1982) 107 ff.

[71] *FGrH* 31 FF 4, 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, 28, 30, 57, 58, 63 *bis*. On the other hand Kerberos growls still at *fr.* 31.

[72] *FGrH* 2 F 29: the Cretan bull captured by Herakles was the one that bore Europa—which was not, therefore, Zeus metamorphosed; 2 F 37: the fleece was not golden, but dyed purple from the sea. See also Agias/Derkyllos 305 F 6; Xanthos 765 F 20.

[73] On etymology see E. Risch, 'Namensdeutungen und Worterklärungen bei den ältesten griechischen Dichtern', in *Eumusia, Festschrift Ernst Howald* (Erlenbach/Zurich 1947) 72-91 = *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin/New York 1981) 294-313; M. Salvadore, *Il nome, la persona. Saggio sull' etimologia antica* (Genova 1987); and other references listed by L.E. Woodbury, *Phoenix* xxxiv (1980) 114 n. 12 = *Collected writings* (Atlanta 1991) 341 n. 12.

[74] *FGrH* 1 F 22; further in Hekataios note *fr.* 15 ('Oineus' from οἶναι, what the ancients called ἄμπελοι).

[75] *FGrH* 3 F 102.

[76] *FGrH* 392 F 1; 43 F 3 *bis*.

[77] Something like an etymology at iv 189: the Greeks, it is argued, got their custom of dressing Palladia in αἰγίδες (something like a goatskin) from the Libyans, who use αἰγέαι (real goatskins) for the same purpose. See Henry R. Immerwahr, *Form and thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland 1966) index s.v. 'etymologies'. If pressed to state how 'popular' and 'scientific' etymology are to be distinguished, one might not be successful in stating universally valid criteria, but the latter usually seems more self-conscious and displays a pretence of being based on some theoretical understanding of the phenomenon; in particular, it may be used to construct or confirm an historical hypothesis.

instance, that the Idaian Daktyloi got their name because they touched Rhea's fingers, or that Hermes Philetes was so named because he was conceived in love.[78] These are as arbitrary as any in Plato's *Kratylos*, and should always be presumed to be his own invention unless proof to the contrary can be supplied. Consequently his explanation of the Apatouria—that it was originally named Apatenouria, because it commemorated a 'trick' of Melanthos in his fight with Xanthios—is most unlikely to represent genuine Athenian tradition about the origin and purpose of the festival.[79]

The typical Herodotean locution ἔτι ἐς ἐμέ does not occur in any surviving verbatim quotation of the people on our list, but it is implied in the second fragment of Charon, who, we are told, claimed to have seen, still extant in Sparta, the cup (designated καρχήσιον) that Zeus gave to Alkmene when disguised as Amphitryon. The καρχήσιον was also mentioned by Pherekydes and Herodoros, and under the name σκύπφος by Anaximander.[80] It was plainly a fixture in the myth; the moment when Zeus handed it over was depicted also on the Kypselos chest,[81] and one may suspect that it did in fact exist as a cult object. A kind of equivalent of ἔτι ἐς ἐμέ which is very common is to identify a character in myth as the eponym of an existing city; this occurs dozens of times in Hekataios, who set the pattern for everybody else.[82] Also a writer might identify by-the-bye a still existing landmark near which the story is supposed to have taken place, for instance the Seven Pyres at Thebes in a fragment of Armenidas,[83] the wild olive tree in the marketplace at Herakleia in a fragment of Herodoros,[84] or the Hypelaios fountain, the sacred Harbour, a temple and two sanctuaries at Ephesos in a fragment of Kreophylos.[85] Very frequent too is the habit of identifying former names of cities or countries, with an appended relative clause 'which is now called so-and-so'.[86]

To turn from ἔτι ἐς ἐμέ to τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν: again, although the phrase does not occur in the verbatim quotations of any of the people on our list, the πρῶτος εὑρετής was a favourite theme, which would easily occasion the use of the phrase πρῶτος τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν.[87] Hekataios, Dionysios of Miletos, Anaximander, Herodotos, and Andron of Halikarnassos all

---

[78] *FGrH* 4 FF 89, 19b; *cf.* 33 (Maloeis), 38 (Areopagos), 71 (Sinties), 108 (Agammeia), 111 (Italy), 123 (Pelias), 130 (Aphetai), 188 (Helots). Instances in other writers: Andron 10 FF 4 (Selloi), 8 (Parnassos); Aristophanes of Boiotia *apud* Phot. p. 237 Porson = *Suda* λ 867 s.v. λύσιοι τελεταί (Arist. of Byzantium *fr. dub.* 421 Slater; not in *FGrH* 379; the rites were so named διὰ τὸ λυτρώσασθαι Θηβαίους παρὰ Ναξίων ἄμπελον); Charon 262 F 12 (Hamadryads); Herodoros 31 F 45 (Miletos); Hippias 6 F 6 (τύραννος); Menekrates 769 F 2 (Lykia); Stesimbrotos 107 FF 12 (Daktyloi), 13 (Dionysos); Xanthos 765 F 15 (Mysoi); Xenomedes 442 F 4 (Telchines). The concentration of this activity in the later part of the fifth century is obvious.

[79] *FGrH* 4 F 125 = 323a F 23. Unfortunately this assumption is crucial to P. Vidal-Naquet's enormously influential theory of the Black Hunter: 'The black hunter and the origin of Athenian ephebe', *PCPS* xiv (1968) 49-64; reprinted with corrections most recently in *id., The black hunter. Forms of thought and forms of society in the Greek world* (Baltimore 1986) 106-28. See also 'The black hunter revisited', *PCPS* xxxii (1986) 126-44.

[80] *FGrH* 3 F 13; 31 F 16; 9 F 1. The words ἔτι καὶ νῦν in a paraphrased fragment of Xanthos (*FGrH* 765 F 29) may well come from him.

[81] Paus. v 18.3.

[82] The use of eponyms is so common and universal that I have not bothered to illustrate it.

[83] *FGrH* 378 F 6 (a verbatim quotation).

[84] *FGrH* 31 F 51; cf. *fr.* 31.

[85] *FGrH* 417 F 1.

[86] Further instances of the phenomena discussed in this paragraph: Hek. *FGrH* 1 FF 10, 84, 119, 127-9, 234, 239, 275, 308-9, 372; Pher. 3 FF 54, 64a, 79a, 84, 125, 145, 155; Hell. 4 FF 4, 6, 23, 25, 26a, 51, 59-60, 77, 79a, 109, 115, 117, 150, 163, 165, 197 *bis*; Aethlios 536 F 3; Agias/Derkyllos 305 FF 4, 7, 8, 8 *bis*; Andron 10 FF 6, 16a; Antiochos 555 FF 3, 11, 12; Aristophanes 379 FF 2, 4, 9; Armenidas 378 FF 3, 5; Charon 262 FF 7, 8, 12; Deilochos 471 FF 3, 5, 7a, 9; Epimenides 457 F 11; Eumelos 451 F 4; Herodoros 31 FF 34a, 48; Menekrates 769 F 2; Xanthos 765 F 17; Xenomedes 442 F 1.63.

[87] As for instance Hdt. i 94.1: '[The Lydians] are the first people we know of to mint coins of gold and silver.' On the theme generally see A. Kleingünther, Πρῶτος εὑρετής, *Philol.* suppl. xxvi.1 (1933). In addition to the examples listed in the text, note Hellanikos *FGrH* 4 FF 71b, 86, 175, 189; Damastes 5 F 6; Xanthos 765 F 4; Hippias 6 F 8; Andron 10 F 13.

discussed the inventor of the Greek alphabet.[88] Andron discussed the origin of cremation.[89] Hellanikos knew who invented letter-writing, not to mention trousers, eunuchs, and tiaras,[90] and his son Skamon wrote a whole book on inventions, as did Simonides the Genealogist. In a similar vein Charon tells us that Phobos son of Kodros of Phokaia was the first to hurl himself from the White Rocks, and also that white doves first appeared in Greece after Mardonios' disaster at Mount Athos.[91]

We have so far discussed devices that are more or less universally employed by the early historians, with exceptions as noted. The fragmentary nature of our sources means that we cannot always be sure if lack of attestation of this or that device is significant. Thus the word μαρτύριον does not occur in any author but Herodotos and Thukydides; the word τεκμήριον only once outside these authors, in a fragment of Hippias;[92] and σημεῖον only once, in a fragment of Herodoros.[93] Some of our voice-markers (for instance, in group one, discussing how a narrative will be organized) are apt to be found only in lengthy texts; others are apt to be found only in certain kinds of texts: foreign language equivalents are a feature of ethnography, so it is not surprising that they are absent from Akousilaos and Pherekydes.[94] Oddities of local customs, climate, etc., are also at home in ethnography, as are statistics about distances or catalogues of peoples, but similar material can crop up in local histories, and even occasionally in genealogy.[95]

Chronography is a more difficult question.[96] Eduard Meyer, in a famous article,[97] inferred from the way Herodotos uses chronography that it was not original with him; indeed, with marvellous nineteenth-century confidence in the powers of analysis, he inferred that Herodotos' chronography was *two* steps away from its inventor. This must have been Hekataios, to whom a system of 40-year generations was attributed, even though its use is not attested in the

---

[88] Hekataios *FGrH* 1 F 20; Dionysios 687 F 1; Anaximander 9 F 3; Hdt. v 58; Andron 10 F 9.

[89] *FGrH* 10 F 10.

[90] *FGrH* 4 F 178.

[91] *FGrH* 262 FF 7, 3.

[92] Diog. Laert. i 24 = *FGrH* 6 F 5 (τεκμαιρόμενον); but the word may be Diogenes' (and is in fact attributed, via Hippias and Aristotle, to Thales!). However, the word appears also in Pindar and the tragedians, so nothing much should be made of this.

[93] *FGrH* 31 F 22a. This word is not so common in the two surviving historians, either: in Herodotos, only at ix 71 (ἀποσημαίνομαι); in Thukydides, at i 6.2, 10.1, 21.1, ii 42.2.

[94] In Hekataios note *fr.* 21, τῇ Δαναᾷ μίσγεται Ζεύς: Herodian, who reports the fragment (Π. μον. λέξ. ii 912.23 Lentz), says that Hekataios himself reports that this is the Phoenician equivalent of Δανάη ('ὡς αὐτός φησι'). Further examples are Hek. *FGrH* 1 FF 322, 370; Charon 262 F 5; Hell. 4 FF 54, 60, 111; Xanthos 765 FF 16, 20d, 23; Menekrates 769 F 1. Similar is Hek. *fr.* 15: Hekataios says that οἴνη is the older word for ἄμπελος, and draws therefrom an historical inference.

[95] Local curiosities etc.: many fragments of Hekataios and Skylax; Aethlios *FGrH* 536 FF 1, 3; Agias/Derkyllos 305 F 7; Antiochos 555 F 1; Armenidas 378 F 4a; Charon 262 FF 1, 5; Damastes 5 F 5 = Hellanikos 4 F 195 (a marvel: some Epeians live 200, even 300 years); Demokles *fr.* 1 Müller; Hell. 4 FF 53, 54, 66, 67, 71a, 137, 174, 184, 190; Herod. 31 F 31; Kritias *Vorsokr.* 88 B 32 sqq.; Metrodoros 43 F 3; Pher. 3 F 47; Xanthos 765 FF 13, 31; Xenomedes 442 F 1. For statistics see Damastes 5 FF 2 (distance between the pillars of Herakles), 10 (size of Kypros); Pher. 3 F 30 (size of Ares' field); Hek. 1 FF 197 (size of the Aegean, though the stade figure is not his), 332 (three days to cross the Ψυλλικὸς κόλπος). Catalogues of Niobids and the like as a feature of mythography need hardly be illustrated. The geographer's list of cities along a coastline makes a telling reappearance in Herodoros 31 F 2 (a verbatim quotation), where the Iberian coast is charted, Hekataios-like, in an account of Herakles' westward progress. It is all part of Herodoros' rationalistic programme.

[96] References to earlier literature may be found in E. Vandiver, *Heroes in Herodotus. The interaction of myth and history* (Frankfurt a.M. 1990) 133 n. 1 and Alden A. Mosshammer, *The chronicle of Eusebius and Greek chronographic tradition* (Lewisburg and London 1979) 105-11; see also the important work of Pietro Vannicelli, *Erodoto e la storia dell'alto e medio arcaismo (Sparta - Tessaglia - Cirene)* (Rome 1993) 9 ff.

[97] E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* i (Halle 1892) 153-209.

fragments. The weaknesses in Meyer's argument have long been exposed. Inconsistencies in Herodotos' application of the technique prove nothing. For instance, he has not noticed that the date implied for Herakles (*ca.* 1180) by his three-generations-to-the-century formula (ii 142), when calculated from the twenty-one generations in the Spartan king-lists (vii 204, viii 131), contradicts his date of 900 years before his own time (say, *ca.* 1330) given at ii 145. The Spartan king-lists were, however, a given, and it need not have occurred to Herodotos to apply his new technique in every circumstance.[98] If it could be established that his date for Herakles was derivative, of course that would mean someone else had first invented chronography; but the date could be Herodotos' own calculation, if we assume that the 505 years for the 22 Heraklid kings at i 7 (which notoriously produces a very short generation, and does not look like the result of chronographical calculation) was given to him by some other source; after the Heraklids we have five Mermnads who reigned for 170 years (i 14, 16, 25, 86), which is 167 years on the three-to-a-century rule plus the three extra years accorded Kroisos for his piety (i 91); from Agron, the first Heraklid king (i 7), back to his great-great-grandfather Herakles was five generations = one and one third centuries reckoned inclusively; all these added to the date of Kroisos' downfall (which cannot be exactly determined from Herodotos' indications, but is certainly somewhere in the mid-sixth century) bring us back almost precisely to 1330, a date thus produced by Herodotos on the basis of information available to him and his (own?) formula of three generations to a century.[99] It is quite impossible to judge from Herodotos' tone or the manner with which he introduces his chronological data whether some or all aspects of his method were original with him or someone else.[100] Certainly Meyer's statement[101] that Herodotos wasn't really interested in chronography—he simply took over what was given to him by others, applied the data inconsistently and made mistakes in his calculations, showing that this wasn't his invention at all—is not justified by Herodotos' text; surely he *was* keenly interested in chronography, and conscientiously gives his audience many indications of time passed. Indeed, this looks like a new-found tool whose usefulness for historical inquiry has quite impressed Herodotos.

Of course Hekataios has genealogies, but there is no indication in the fragments that he ever assigned a standard length to the generation or did chronological calculations on such a basis; nor is there any certain instance in Hekataios of synchronistic fiddling—that is, padding a genealogy with invented names in order to make contemporaries in different branches of the tree line up. Nor do Akousilaos or Pherekydes use such a technique; it is, however, typical of Hellanikos, who also produced several works of a purely chronographical nature. Whether he was the first to do so is hardly known (perhaps Charon's *Prytaneis of the (?) Lampsakenes* came first),[102] but chronography was certainly where Hellanikos made his reputation. On general grounds the sort of methodological awareness implied by such devices is not to be

[98] See above p. 72 on the failure to universalize.

[99] *Cf.* D.W. Prakken, *Studies in Greek genealogical chronology* (Lancaster, PA 1943) 22 f. If this conjecture is correct, it removes the basis for Meyer's inference of a 40-year generation, which was this figure of 900 divided by the number of Spartan kings. The only real hint of a 40-year generation left in early sources, therefore, is Thuk. i 12.3 (Dorian invasion 80 years after Troy). Multiples of 40 in Herodotos at i 163.2 and iii 23.1 are suggestive, but hardly probative. See now W. Burkert, 'Lydia between East and West, or how to date the Trojan war: a study in Herodotus', in J.B. Carter, S.P. Morris, edd., *The ages of Homer. A tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule* (University of Texas 1995) 139-48, who argues with much probability that the 505 years are ultimately derived from Assyrian records.

[100] Von Fritz (n. 20) ii 177 n.3 argues that the last sentence of Hdt. ii 146.2 implies that others before him had produced chronological calculations based on genealogies.

[101] P. 169, 184 f. *Cf.* Mosshammer (n. 96) 326 n. 6; Lloyd (n. 70) i 193 concludes after a lengthy discussion: 'That he was interested in chronological questions admits of no doubt.'

[102] See above, p. 66. I do not share Toye's (n. 1) view of the *Priestesses of Argos*.

expected in the naive early days of historiography. Of course, one can never be too careful when treading on general grounds, and Hekataios may indeed be the inventor of a rudimentary system. But on the evidence available it seems more prudent to date the advent of these methods to the lifetime of Herodotos. Perhaps he and Hellanikos had a few discussions.[103]

Rationalization, etymology, study of foreign languages, and other devices thus far mentioned, with the possible exception of chronography, are not first found in Herodotos, and cannot in themselves identify the distinctive elements in his voiceprint. We need now to inquire what those elements might be.

III. THE VOICE OF HERODOTOS

The first candidate is one of those obvious things too easily forgotten. As far as our record goes one of the distinguishing features of Herodotos' work is precisely the frequency with which he makes his voice heard. His is an extraordinarily self-conscious performance. Voice-markers occur so often that in reading through him one begins to notice their *absence* more than their presence. Thukydides, by comparison, has few markers, and thus gives the superficial impression of being the more 'objective' historian. Interestingly the places where Herodotos steps aside and allows the eye of the reader to behold the events directly are those places where his imagination as a story-teller is given the freest rein: in telling anecdotes and in composing speeches. The absence of markers is no guarantee of objectivity; by the same token, a plethora of markers does not imply an historian who is allowing his own personality to get in the way of his job.

After a lengthy stretch of straight narrative the historian's voice may reappear with particularly telling effect. A superb example is the end of the story of Harpagos and his son, i 119. 'Thus answering he gathered up what was left of the flesh and went home, intending, I suppose, to collect it all and bury it.' There has been no marker of any kind for a very long time (since chapter 110), and the quiet intrusion of Herodotos' voice, 'I suppose', breaks the spell. We realize that we have been lost in a gripping narrative; its horror and pathos become even more apparent to us.[104]

There are two noteworthy occasions in Thukydides when markers do become frequent: the *archaiologiai* of Books i and vi.[105] His language and technique in these sections are thoroughly Herodotean, suggesting that his methods were acknowledged as the appropriate way to determine the truth about the remoter past.[106] Since imitation is the sincerest form of

---

[103] For further indications of chronographical activity see Agias/Derkyllos *FGrH* 305 F 2; Andron 10 F 13; Damastes 5 F 7; Hell. 4 FF 74 sqq. (the *Priestesses of Argos*), 85-6 (the *Karneonikai*), 152, 168, 169, 201 *bis*; Herod. 31 F 33; Ion 392 F 1; Xanthos 765 F 32.

[104] τούτοισι δὲ ἀμειψάμενος καὶ ἀναλαβὼν τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν κρεῶν ἤιε ἐς τὰ οἰκία. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ἔμελλε, ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω, ἁλίσας θάψειν τὰ πάντα. *Cf.* J.D. Denniston, *Greek prose style* (Oxford 1952) 6 (reminder from H. Lloyd-Jones).

[105] *Cf.* S. Hornblower, 'Narratology and narrative technique in Thucydides', in S. Hornblower, ed., *Greek historiography* (Oxford 1994) 131-66 at 151; L. Canfora and A. Corcella, 'La letteratura politica e la storiografia', in *Lo spazio letterario della grecia antica* edd. G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, D. Lanza (Rome 1993) i 1.433-71 at 454 ff.; and especially Hunter (n. 70) chs. 1 and 3.

[106] In i 1-21, ii 15-16, and vi 1-5, I count the following markers: τεκμήριον or the like (including δῆλον and congeners, which demonstrably have the same force), 18 examples; use of an expression such as ἔτι καὶ νῦν, or 'which is now called', 26 examples; use of an expression like ὧν ἀκοῇ ἴσμεν, or reference to the first inventor, 10 examples; chronological markers, whether in terms of a span of years to his own day, or more vaguely 'a few years later', 'shortly before the Persian War', 'some generations later' and the like, 28 examples; appeal to εἰκός, 7 examples; references to sources or possibilities of discovery, 8 examples, including two instances of λέγονται, one οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, and one instance of alternative versions; one foreign language equivalent; and, revealingly, five instances of δοκεῖ μοι or the like: Thukydides cannot here command the truth in his usual sovereign manner. This is an astonishing list and is a very powerful argument against Fehling's thesis (see the last section of the article). *Cf.* also vi 54-9.

flattery, one may wonder whether Thukydides' celebrated gibe at the end of the archaeology in Book i against those more interested in τὸ μυθῶδες than the truth, was really directed at Herodotos, as we are so often told. If we are to think of charlatans, an obvious choice would be a Sophist like Hippias, who in the *Hippias Major* of Plato says that his audiences' favourite subject by far is 'the genealogies of heroes and men, how the cities were founded in ancient days, in a word, the whole of ἀρχαιολογία'.[107] This is not in the least a description of Herodotos' book, and the greater part of Thukydides' archaeology (though admittedly not all) treats subjects lying wholly outside Herodotos' purview.

One of the things Herodotos likes to talk about more than anything else is his sources. He frequently gives alternative versions of events derived from different informants, and sometimes comments on their relative merits. He is careful to tell us what he has seen for himself and what he knows only from hearsay. He sometimes merely says λέγεται, leaving the source unnamed; at other times, he tells us explicitly that a certain piece of information is not reported. He uses an extensive vocabulary to discuss his relationship with his sources: words like ἀκούω, ὄψις, πυνθάνομαι, εὑρίσκω, συμβάλλομαι, ἱστορέω, οἶδα, δοκέω, λογίζομαι, γνώμη, σταθμόομαι, οὐ πιστά, ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν, and so on. So far as we can tell this is original with him, and it certainly strikes every reader as a large part of his literary persona. One might expect to find a certain amount of talk about sources in Antiochos of Syracuse, in view of the proem to the Περὶ Ἰταλίης (*FGrH* 555 F 2): Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίης ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα. Antiochos' surviving fragments unfortunately do not confirm or belie this expectation; but one may note that in the archaeology of Sicily at the beginning of Book vi, where as we have noted Thukydides suddenly becomes quite Herodotean in his diction, critics are agreed he is following Antiochos.[108] However, most of Antiochos' working career probably came after Herodotos', since the fragments of the Περὶ Σικελίης provide a *terminus post quem* of 424/3;[109] it is most unlikely, then, that he is the innovator.

In writers before Herodotos there is no sign of this talk of alternative sources. Certainly *sources* are occasionally mentioned. For instance, in *fr.* 21 (quoted in n. 94) Hekataios tells us that the Phoenicians do not say Danae but 'Dana'. In *fr.* 79a it appears that Pherekydes reports what the 'locals' called a certain landmark; in other fragments he appears to show knowledge of local cults at Thorikos, Thebes, and Delphi, which bespeaks a certain amount of ἱστορίη, getting out and seeing things for yourself; but he may have obtained his knowledge from literary tradition.[110]

Pherekydes once appears to say that a certain name in a genealogy is *not* reported; if we could be sure of that, it would be important, for you would normally expect an early mythographer, like a poet, to make up the name, whereas declining to do so on the grounds that tradition is silent implies that one is not part of that tradition, and that it might present problems to the researcher—in other words, it implies a different kind of awareness and self-conception altogether from that of the poet. The fragment (Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.373-76a = Pher. *FGrH* 3 F

---

[107] *Hipp. Maior* 285d = *FGrH* 6 T 3. *Cf.* Toye (n. 1) 289, 297.

[108] After K.J. Dover, 'La colonizzazione della Sicilia in Tucidide', *Maia* vi (1953) 1-20 = 'Die Kolonisierung Siziliens bei Thukydides', in H. Herter, ed., *Thukydides* (Darmstadt 1968) 344-68; see also *HCT* iv 198 ff.

[109] *FGrH* 555 T 3 explicitly gives this as the last year covered by the work.

[110] Thebes: *FGrH* 3 F 84, an aetiological myth concerning Alkmene; Delphi: 3 F 64, an aetiological myth concerning Neoptolemos; Thorikos: 3 F 34, conjectured to be aetiological by R.L. Fowler, 'The myth of Kephalos as an aition of rain magic (Pherekydes *FGrH* 3 F 34)', *ZPE* xcvii (1993) 29-42. For the citation of local sources *cf.* Hell. 4 FF 23, 71a, 137, Herod. 31 F 31, Metrod. 769 F 2 (λέγουσι in a verbatim quotation), and Arist. 379 F 6, who quotes from local archives (ὑπομνήματα).

15b) runs: Δοίας καὶ ῎Ακμων ἀδελφοί· τίνος δὲ πατρός, οὐ φέρεται, ὥς φησι Φερεκύδης.
Unfortunately one can never be sure in these scholiastic paraphrases what the original wording
might have been. In scholiasts' Greek the locution 'Pherekydes does not say X but Y', where
X is a proposition such as 'the father of Doias and Akmon is so-and-so', does not normally
mean that in Pherekydes there was an explicit denial that X was the case; it means that
Pherekydes is silent about X, and says rather Y. The expression was noted in many fragments
of Pherekydes long ago by Karl Luetke,[111] and much more recently A.B. Bosworth has drawn
important inferences about the Peace of Kallias based on the same turn of phrase in
Plutarch.[112] It is possible that behind this fragment of Pherekydes lies a misunderstanding of
the expression 'Pherekydes does not say that', and that Pherekydes was simply silent on the
subject.

Herodotos normally records the absence of information by saying οὐ λέγεται; much more
often, he records the existence of tradition by saying λέγεται. This impersonal use of the verb
in itself implies a certain distance in one's stance vis-à-vis the tradition, as if it is there to be
tested. In the verbatim quotations of Hekataios, Akousilaos and Pherekydes, no example is
recorded. There are enough such quotations that the absence seems significant. After Herodotos,
λέγεται is routinely employed in historiography and mythography.[113]

In Akousilaos discussion of alternative or non-existent sources can be excluded completely,
if the report is true that he composed his book out of ancient tales written on bronze tablets
discovered by his father while digging in his house.[114] I suspect that these tablets were in fact
mentioned by Akousilaos in his proem, and that he claimed to be merely the promulgator of
ancient lore; he would thus be a mythographical counterpart to an oracle-monger like
Onomakritos. If this conjecture is correct, it explains the report in the Suda[115] that the work
was a forgery, and therefore not a candidate for the title of oldest prose work (as some people,
therefore, did believe); it also explains how some more gullible authorities placed Akousilaos
on the list of the Seven Wise Men.[116] In the light of all this it is not to be expected that
Akousilaos adopted the pose of a disinterested inquirer, honestly appraising the merits of
different sources.

In Hekataios there is one prominent disagreement with a source, in fr. 19 where he says
'Aigyptos himself did not come to Argos, but his sons, who were fifty in number, as Hesiod
said, but as I say, no more than twenty'. His grounds are presumably that fifty is an
unrealistically high number, so he rationalistically lowers it. But he does not tell us his grounds,
unless he went on to do so after the fragment breaks off; but that would be quite out of keeping
with everything we know of the style of these early writers. We can often catch them changing
the details of a myth to avoid unpleasant implications, and to that extent we can see that they
are wrestling with a problem in their sources. We can sometimes infer the reason why they have
changed the details—for instance, local patriotism. With such inferences we must be satisfied,
for we are seldom told the reason. In this procedure the early mythographers do not differ from

[111] Carolus Luetke (a pupil of Wilamowitz), Pherecydea (Diss. Göttingen 1893) 26. See Pher. FGrH 3 FF 26,
54, 60, 72, 82, 133; Hell. 4 FF 104a, 117; Andron 10 F 13; Deilochos 471 F 5.

[112] A.B. Bosworth, 'Plutarch, Callisthenes, and the peace of Callias', JHS cx (1990) 1-13.

[113] Cf. H.D. Westlake, 'λέγεται in Thucydides', Mnem. xxx (1977) 345-62, who finds interesting similarities
to and differences from Herodotos' usage.

[114] Suda α 942 = FGrH 2 T 1.

[115] ε 360 = FGrH 2 T 7 = Hec. FGrH 1 T 1a.

[116] Diog. Laert. i 41 = FGrH 2 T 11a; Clem. Al. Strom. i 59.5 = 2 T 11b.

poets, who after all routinely reject, sometimes explicitly, myths they do not like.[117] But awareness of the disagreement or absence of sources as a general problem requiring theoretical attention and the development of critical tools is not found in either poets or early mythographers. It *is* found in Herodotos.

His thoughts on the reliability of knowledge are expressed frequently and with a subtle and consistent vocabulary. One of the most important passages in this regard comes in the second book (ii 23), in the course of discussing various theories of the flooding of the Nile:

ὁ δὲ περὶ τοῦ ᾿Ωκεανοῦ λέξας ἐς ἀφανὲς τὸν μῦθον ἀνενείκας οὐκ ἔχει ἔλεγχον· οὐ γάρ τινα ἔγωγε οἶδα ποταμὸν ᾿Ωκεανὸν ἐόντα, ῞Ομηρον δὲ ἢ τινα τῶν πρότερον γενομένων ποιητέων δοκέω τοὔνομα εὑρόντα ἐς ποίησιν ἐσενείκασθαι.

The man who spoke of Ocean, thus removing his tale into the realm of the invisible, cannot be refuted; for I do not know that any river Ocean exists, but rather think that Homer or one of the earlier poets invented the name and introduced it into his poetry.

Herodotos here has pronounced the important principle of falsifiability: a true proposition must not only be capable of being verified, it must also have the potential of being falsified. A proposition of a kind that offers no handle to anyone who might wish to test it is refused admission to the discussion on principle. Such propositions may have value in the world of imagination or poetry, but they lie outside the realm of positivistic truth or falsehood. Herodotos is not interested in such propositions.

In the world of the city-state, especially in the developed democracies, citizens had long been used to hearing alternative points of view expressed, and to adjudicating between them when they cast their votes in the law-courts and assemblies. In the middle of the fifth century, the science of rhetoric was furnishing a theoretical framework and a practical set of tools for use in such arenas. The orators argued from analogy, from contrast, from probability, from experience—just like Herodotos. Poets had long been instinctive philosophers, just as they had been instinctive rhetoricians, but it was sophists who first realized that knowledge can be expressed in the form of propositions, which can be tested, and whose properties *qua* propositions can be examined.[118] About the time that Herodotos was writing his histories, if we accept the conventional chronology, Sokrates was confronted with a mysterious proposition by the god of Delphi: that he was the wisest of men; he set out to refute this statement, ἐλέγχειν; and, again if we follow the conventional outline of Sokrates' career, it was from this experience that his own distinctive contribution to philosophy developed, the ἔλεγχος.[119] The contribution of autopsy to the acquisition of knowledge relative to other forms of sensory perception and to ratiocination, so familiar from Herodotos, was a commonplace in the philosophy of his youth.[120]

---

[117] See T.C.W. Stinton, '"Si credere dignum est": some expressions of disbelief in Euripides and others', *PCPS* xxii (1976) 60-89 = *Collected papers on Greek tragedy* (Oxford 1990) 236-64.

[118] On Herodotos and the Sophists, see Albrecht Dihle, 'Herodot und die Sophistik', *Philologus* cvi (1962) 207-20 (p. 218 on arguments from probability); on contemporary methods of reasoning, see G.E.R. Lloyd, *Polarity and analogy* (Cambridge 1966) index s.v. Herodotus; on early rhetoric, see the references given by R.L. Fowler, *HSCP* xciii (1987) 15 n. 24. A.B. Lloyd (n. 70) i 149 f., 156 ff. provides a detailed discussion of the connections between Herodotos and the intellectual climate of his day; *cf.* also Hunter (n. 70) 93 n. 1.

[119] Pl. *Apol.* 21; for the chronology, W.K.C. Guthrie, *History of Greek philosophy* (Cambridge 1969) 405 ff.; for a carefully reasoned explanation of the connection between the oracle and the ἔλεγχος see T.C. Brickhouse and N.D. Smith, *Socrates on trial* (Oxford 1989) 87-100.

[120] E.g. Herakleitos *frr.* 5-6 Marcovich; Xenophanes *Vorsokr.* 21 B 34-6; Alkmaion 24 B 1; Anaxagoras 59 B 21a; see further E. Hussey, 'The beginnings of epistemology: from Homer to Philolaus', in *Epistemology*, ed. S Everson (Cambridge 1990) 11-38. *Cf.* Donald Lateiner, *The historical method of Herodotus* (Toronto 1989) 66; G. Schepens, *L' 'autopsie' dans la méthode des historiens grecs du Ve siècle avant J.-C.* (Brussels 1980).

The language of Herodotos shows him to be a man of his day. He was not a Sophist, but he was a thinker, and he profited from discussions with other thinkers. He brought the old science of ἱστορίη, critical inquiry, up to date by employing new critical tools, and applied ἱστορίη itself to new subjects. The strength and insistence of the historian's voice is perhaps no different from Hekataios; but the combination of this extraordinary self-projection with a sophisticated awareness of the problem of sources—their nature and reliability, and the historian's relation to them: this is the unique voiceprint of Herodotos. The imitation of Thukydides and Antiochos acknowledges that his tools were the appropriate ones for finding out the truth about the past. One first obtains whatever λόγοι are available, and then tests them by various means: by gauging their inherent probability; by detecting their bias, if any;[121] by comparing them to similar stories; by appealing to everyday experience; by comparing the evidence of surviving monuments or practices; by applying elementary logic, for example by finding contradictions. Herodotos occasionally represents characters in his own story engaging in this kind of activity, which is helpful in clarifying for us what he means by ἱστορίη;[122] but even without that, we can judge for ourselves what he is up to. Herodotos' explicit awareness of the problems of sources and his development of methods of dealing with them are his distinctive contribution to historiography.

IV. HERODOTOS' SOURCES AND THE PROEM

Readers familiar with current controversies may be thinking that the picture being drawn of Herodotos will not be so brightly burnished if the sources he so persistently refers to do not really exist. One could try to evade the issue by saying everything so far established as new and different remains new and different in Herodotos' *text*, whatever the relationship of that text to external reality. But that would hardly be satisfactory. If 'inquiry' was not meant by Herodotos as seriously as it was meant by contemporary mathematicians, doctors, astronomers, scientists, philosophers, and others (or, indeed, by characters in Herodotos' own text), then his contribution to 'history' is accidental at best. Therefore it is necessary to confront any theory that would have us believe otherwise.

In a forcefully argued book, Detlev Fehling has shown that many of Herodotos' source citations are questionable.[123] They follow fixed patterns; they are always the most appropriate source possible for whatever fact is being reported or theory propounded, no matter how fantastic or unreal; credibility is carefully preserved—for instance, in the case of information from the edges of the known world, by stressing that it has come through several intermediaries, and implicitly allowing for distortion; bias is always preserved (e.g., so that Egyptians always praise Egyptians); supplementary accounts and confirmations are forthcoming from the most widespread locations, yet always dovetail perfectly with each other, even in support of what is wildly wrong. The list of indictments could be continued. Fehling concludes that almost all of Herodotos' source citations are fictive. To report Fehling fairly, it should be stressed that he is

---

[121] See e.g. i 95 on Kyros: 'In my account I will follow those Persians who do not want to glorify Kyros, but rather to tell the truth—though I know there are several other versions of Kyros' tale.' *Cf.* iii 16.

[122] See i 24.7-8, 117, 122, 209 (a passage which clearly illustrates Herodotos' own awareness of the problem of knowledge), ii 2, 119. *Cf.* W.R. Connor, 'The *histor* in history', in *Nomodeiktes. Greek studies in honor of Martin Ostwald*, edd. Ralph M. Rosen, Joseph Farrell (University of Michigan 1993) 3-15, who stresses the old sense of 'arbitration' in the root (ἵστωρ already in *Il.* xviii 501, xxiii 486). Connor's rather speculative explanation of why the word is less common in the last books seems to overlook one pertinent factor, which is that they treat a period much closer to Herodotos' own time and place, thus needing less ἱστορίη.

[123] Detlev Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'sources'. Citation, invention, and narrative art,* tr. J.G. Howie (Leeds 1989; German original 1971).

not trying to call Herodotos a simple liar or a fraud, even if many of his remarks seem to have no other implication. He thinks Herodotos has invented a new art form, which is not history, but a kind of narrative based loosely on historical facts. The alternative to Herodotos the historian is not Herodotos the fraud, but Herodotos the poet.[124] He takes whatever information he has and spins a tale from it, using his imagination to fill in the gaps.

Numerous objections have been made to these startling ideas.[125] The considerations advanced so far in this paper raise a further difficulty: the only assessment Fehling can make of Herodotos' constant discussion of the basis of his knowledge is to say that he is an exceptionally clever liar.[126] This does not give an adequate account of Herodotos' place in the intellectual milieu of his time and particularly his relationship with other historians. Fehling seems at one point uncomfortable with his position; on p. 121 he allows that Herodotos' use of the devices of 'lying literature' has a 'more serious end in view than the mere enhancement of the credibility of his account... Many of the passages involved must also have been intended as object lessons on the conditions and limitations within which historical knowledge is acquired and on likely sources of error.' This qualification seems to give the game away; it is very hard to see why an expression of scepticism about a source's statement which, on Fehling's view, exists only in Herodotos' mind, should be read as an 'object lesson' on historical method, if the author is not interested himself in doing real history. Why would Herodotos bother? And how could the ancient audience have understood his real meaning from the text? How could they know he was really only 'playing' at research?[127] Fehling does not discuss the passage on the ἔλεγχος; but Thukydides, whom Fehling regards as the one true historian[128] (begging the question, where Thukydides got the inspiration for such a revolutionary new idea),[129] acknowledges the methodological insight of Herodotos in the most famous of his own methodological passages, by rejecting all stories that are ἀνεξέλεγκτα (i 21). Thukydides, as we saw above, knew that Herodotos was serious about doing history; he knew that his were the best available methods of discovering truth about the past. So far from faking his sources,

---

[124] Fehling 154 f.; cf. 11, 214 f.

[125] E. Will, review of Fehling, Rev. de phil. xlviii (1974) 119-21; Hartmut Erbse, 'Über Herodots Kroisoslogos', Ausgewählte Schriften zur klassischen Philologie (Berlin and New York 1979) 180-202 at 181 f.; id., 'Fiktion und Wahrheit im Werke Herodots', GGN 1991, 131-50 (in my judgment the best reply yet); Oswyn Murray, 'Herodotus and Oral History', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt, edd., Achaemenid history II: the Greek sources (Leiden 1987) 93-115 at 101 n. 12; Simon Hornblower, Thucydides (London 1987) 19 ff.; id., introduction to Greek historiography, ed. S. Hornblower (Oxford 1994) 18 f. with further references; J.A.S. Evans, review of Fehling in EMC/CV xi (1992) 57-60; id., 'The Faiyum and the Lake of Moeris', AHB v.3 (1991) 66-74; W. Kendrick Pritchett, The Liar school of Herodotus (Amsterdam 1993); Canfora and Corcella (n. 105) 448 ff.; P.J. Rhodes, 'In defence of the Greek historians', G&R xli (1994) 156-71 at 160 f. Qualified support and sensible remarks from H.R. Immerwahr in P.E. Easterling, B.M.W. Knox, edd., The Cambridge history of classical literature i (Cambridge 1985) 439 f. Evans well notes that Herodotos compares very favourably in point of accuracy with other early travelers, for instance reporting from the Americas (a point made again in his Herodotus, explorer of the past [Princeton 1991] 135, 141). I might add that Fehling makes little allowance for the distortions of memory, for instance when he writes (243): 'Could anyone who had ever seen the Pyramids get it all so wrong?' I recently re-visited Kenilworth after seventeen years and was amazed to discover that someone had put up two 400-year-old buildings in my absence.

[126] See 120 ff. on the features Herodotos shares with 'lying literature' (e.g. wealth of detail, occasional expression of scepticism, avowal of inability to discover the truth on some points); cf. 8, 33. Fehling grants that some history is found in Herodotos, but only the merest amount (213 f.); although Herodotos worked into his account all the genuine information he had (83), his primary purpose was not the discovery of such information, but the construction of an entertaining narrative.

[127] Fehling 252. On his hypothesis, even if the audience was duped, many other historians who decided to play at the same game were not; did Herodotos then take them into his confidence backstage after the performance?

[128] Fehling 154 f. To put everybody but Thukydides out of the historian's court is absurd. Fehling has not considered the differences that result from Thukydides' decision to concentrate on contemporary history; see below, p. 83.

[129] An objection to Fehling first raised by Dover and reported by S. Hornblower, Thucydides (London 1987) 22.

Herodotos found new ways to deal with them.

Yet it cannot be denied that Fehling has put his finger on some real peculiarities in Herodotos' procedures. There does appear to have been considerable manipulation of the facts between their discovery and their presentation. The many responses to Fehling's thesis have so far failed to identify the middle way that must be found between his extreme position and the pleasant but equally indefensible picture of Herodotos as a researcher faithful to the 'facts' as we understand them.

One must consider Herodotos' mentality, the conditions under which he worked, and the prevailing intellectual atmosphere. I referred earlier to Geoffrey Lloyd's admirable work on contemporary scientists; Stephanie West, in her careful study of Herodotos' use of inscriptions, has seen how his findings may be applied to Herodotos.[130] It is to be expected that Herodotos' critical tools will be imperfectly and inconsistently applied. It is to be expected that he will fill in gaps in the record with conjectures that make sense to him; he could hardly proceed in any other way. Given the state of contemporary knowledge, many of his conjectures, which seemed as true to him as any propositions have ever seemed true to anybody, will seem ridiculous to us. Reality is passed through conceptual filters en route to representation. Herodotos' filters required him to think that a true account of any event must have no loose ends. Corroborative accounts must dovetail perfectly. Maps must be symmetrical.[131] History has no irregularities. Instead it has patterns, for instance that nemesis follows hybris. To us, a true historical account acknowledges the endless complexity of the record; indeed, Fehling thinks Herodotos must have known this, and therefore knew that his source-citations were fictive.[132] Herodotos would say that *our* accounts are unhistorical, because they leave all the bumps in; as any number of contemporary philosophers would tell you, τὸ ἐόν—one of Herodotos' words for truth—is not like that.

If he massages his data to produce typical patterns, it is because, to him, that is the structure of truth and reality. Future historians of historiography will identify ways of thinking that have affected our explanations of historical events, and with a similar lack of generosity accuse us of lying, or at any rate, of writing nothing better than historical fiction. We have no way of knowing what these might be, and if they could be pointed out to us, we would in all likelihood simply not understand the force of the objection. Nor would Herodotos understand Fehling.[133] Thus, for instance, it may readily be admitted that Herodotos fills out his account of the Persian forces to include nations from one end of the world to the other, a cosmopolitan muster very reminiscent of the *Iliad*. This is not lying nor even fiction; it is, to Herodotos, reasonable

---

[130] S. West, 'Herodotos' epigraphical interests', *CQ* xxxv (1985) 278-305 at 303: 'The confident assurance of his historical reconstructions is bluff... The inadequacies of his argumentation may well be a matter of period rather than personality. Certainly we find rather similar procedures in the early Hippocratic writings...'; she goes on to cite Lloyd's work, and draws a telling parallel with the 'confident rationalism of a Victorian scientist confuting a literal interpretation of the opening chapters of *Genesis*'.

[131] Even though Herodotos criticises others for imposing symmetry on their maps (iv 36), he notoriously does the same himself (ii 33-4).

[132] Fehling 84, 188. The presence of any literary motif and the imposition of any pattern on the data (Fehling catalogues many of them) must, in his theory, fall under the same verdict; pressed to its logical limits it would probably condemn not only ancient but modern historians, including Gibbon, Mommsen, and maybe Fehling himself. As will become clear, I too find much in common between Herodotos' methods and those of the poet; but I differ *toto caelo* from Fehling in my assessment of Herodotos' intentions.

[133] Contrast Fehling 97: 'A remarkable thing about all these passages is that they reveal that Herodotus' standards of credibility and incredibility are little different from those of the twentieth century.'

conjecture. And there is genuine research behind it, as David Lewis as shown.[134] Modern historians, at bottom, are no different; consider what mental processes are going on every time one of them uses an expression like 'must have' or 'surely'. The difficulty for Herodotos is that the point at which he must resort to surmise comes a great deal sooner than it does for the modern historian, who has far superior tools for research. The same applies to ancient and modern scientists and other researchers. Fehling's assessment of Herodotos could apply equally well to ancients doctors, physicists, etc.; but to speak of pseudo-medicine and pseudo-science is not particularly helpful. Nor is it helpful to speak of pseudo-history.[135]

This weakness in Fehling's assessment of Herodotos' procedures is particularly visible in his treatment of the proem, to which we may now turn. After relating the Persian account of who was responsible for the aggression, which is based on the interpretation of certain legends, Herodotos goes on to say that he will not discuss whether or not the Persian account is true, but will rather say who first *in his knowledge* (τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτός) committed acts of injustice against the Greeks. I follow those who say that Herodotos is not here rejecting all legends *qua* legends, since such a proposition is not consistent with his behaviour elsewhere in the book; rather, he is rejecting *these* stories because they cannot be verified or falsified.[136] They have no ἔλεγχος. Just as in the passage on the Nile discussed earlier, Herodotos appeals to reliable knowledge as the basis for further discussion. Similarly at iii 122, Polykrates is the first thalassocrat 'of those we know'; that is (Herodotos adds by way of explanation) the first 'of the so-called human generation'. The two qualifiers are equivalent, and exclude legendary thalassocrats like Minos. If information were forthcoming that would allow the legends to be tested, then Herodotos would admit them to the discussion. Elsewhere he is quite willing to accept legends that seem plausible to him for one reason or another. These reasons might not always seem adequate to us, and might even, on investigation, seem to contradict the principles Herodotos espouses in the proem (another example of the failure to universalize). No matter; this is what he says here, and he means it. He cannot know the truth of these stories; and therefore (to make explicit the implicit logic of the ring-composition, as the λέξις εἰρομένη often requires us to do),[137] they are insufficient to answer the question posed in the opening words, why the Greeks and Persians fought one another. So Herodotos restricts the scope of his inquiry, his ἱστορίη, to a more recent period where results are more likely to be obtained. Unlike Hekataios, whose personal genealogy began sixteen generations ago with a god, and unlike Hellanikos and others, whose local histories began with the foundation by a hero, Herodotos does not pretend that a continuous record from the remotest period of time to the present day is possible.[138] He starts about two centuries before his own day; Thukydides, with

---

[134] D.M. Lewis, 'Persians in Herodotus', in *The Greek historians. Literature and history, Festschrift A.E. Raubitschek* (Saratoga 1985) 101-17. Contrast Fehling 213 ff.: a very small amount of real historical information, he says, would account for Herodotos' narrative; he knew no more about the past than the rhapsodes knew about the Trojan War. At 243 ff. Fehling develops the view that Herodotos may have composed the whole work sitting in Athens, without ever having travelled anywhere.

[135] Fehling 179 ff. For him, it seems, Herodotos must be a perfect positivist historian (a thing that never existed anyway) or no historian at all. Historians are still a cross between scientists and artists. *Cf.* E. Will (n. 125) 121.

[136] See J.A.S. Evans, *Herodotus, explorer of the past* (Princeton 1991) 105 f., who also connects the passage on Ocean with the prologue; Erbse (n. 125) 183; *cf.* Donald Lateiner, *The historical method of Herodotus* (Toronto 1989) 41; K. Nickau, 'Mythos und Logos bei Herodot', in *Memoria rerum veterum, Festschrift C.J. Classen* (Stuttgart 1990) 83-100; Hunter (n. 70) 104 ff.

[137] For a study of the thought-processes of λέξις εἰρομένη see R.L. Fowler, *The nature of early Greek lyric* (Toronto 1987) ch. 2.

[138] Hdt. ii 143.1 = Hekataios *FGrH* 1 T 4.

even severer standards, starts as it were the day before yesterday.[139] There is much in Thukydides that Herodotos never dreamed of; but there is much too that is only Herodotos taken one step further.

This proem makes no sense if it is not taken seriously. Fehling's theory cannot take it seriously. The significant expression τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτός, whose strategic position gives it obvious rhetorical force, and which is followed immediately by the first announcement of one of the history's great leitmotifs, that of the mutability of fortune, Fehling is obliged to call a mere transitional formula.[140] He is obliged to condemn the words ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις as misleading, since this 'inquiry' must be bound up with the source-citations; the words must be interpreted 'from a literary point of view', and are 'of no value as a guide in any investigation of Herodotos' real practice'.[141] We ask again, how on earth was the audience to know this? What reason would they have to think that the proem, unlike the proem of every other work of Greek literature (to speak from a purely literary point of view), was *not* a guide to the author's practice? What clue would they have that the words did not bear their ordinary Greek meaning? They had none; Fehling must therefore say that they were completely taken in, and thought Herodotos was *not* just telling stories, but giving them facts; and since, according to Fehling, every other 'inquirer' from Hekataios on (except Thukydides) was doing the same thing, we must believe that the confusion in Greek minds about reality and the possibility of historical inquiry was of truly stupendous proportions. Again one wonders where Thukydides got his idea from.

Now the proem, as everyone knows, attributes a fairly extensive knowledge of Greek myths to Persians and Phoenicians; more than that, it attributes knowledge of rationalized Greek myths to them. This has always seemed difficult to defenders of Herodotos' integrity, and it seems tailor-made for Fehling's theory. Yet looked at in the right way, this passage teaches us much about Herodotos' procedures. In the first place, there is no difficulty at all in thinking that Persians could honestly be represented as knowing these stories. Whether they really did know them is another question; David Lewis demonstrated that contacts between Greeks and Persians were a great deal more extensive than we might be inclined to believe *a priori*, but let us not pursue that here.[142] More to the point is that Hekataios had already represented Phoenicians as knowing Greek myth, when (in the fragment cited earlier)[143] he tells us the Phoenician form of the name Danae. Again, it does not matter if he made this up, though I doubt he did; it is part of his representation, and was accepted by his audience, if we may judge from the behaviour of subsequent writers. That the ancestor of the Persians was Perses, son of Perseus, is a belief reported by both Herodotos and Hellanikos, probably independently;[144] his father-in-law Kepheus, eponym of the Kephenes, one of the peoples of the Persian empire, also figures prominently in early tradition.[145] This arrogation of Persian genealogy to Greek was routine,

---

[139] *Cf.* Evans' review of Fehling (n. 125) 60; D. Asheri, *Erodoto: Le storie* i² (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 1989) xxxviii; and P. Vannicelli's book (n. 96), which develops the thesis that Herodotos' focus throughout his work is on the three generations preceding the Persian Wars.

[140] Fehling 58.

[141] Fehling 247.

[142] See above p. 83; *id.* in A.R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*² (London 1984) 597 ff.; *id.*, *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden 1977) 12 ff.; *cf.* J. Diggle, *Euripidea* (Oxford 1994) 447. With respect to Phoenicians, apart from the well known connection at Al Mina, note that Phoenicians and Greeks resided together at Pithekoussai from the mid-eighth century; see D. Ridgway, *The First Western Greeks* (Cambridge 1992) 111-18.

[143] Above, n. 94.

[144] Hdt. vii 61, Hellanikos *FGrH* 4 F 60.

[145] Kepheus father of Andromeda already in Hes. *fr.* 135 Merkelbach-West; Hdt. vii 61, Hellanikos *FGrH* 4 F 59.

and it was natural for Greeks to believe that the Persians accepted it. It is, to be sure, possible that Greeks persisted in this belief in spite of Persian denials. Fortunately we have an important passage of Herodotos to help us. At vii 149 ff., Herodotos is explaining why the Argives remained neutral in the war. He gives first the Argive story, then another, which is 'told up and down Greece', λεγόμενος ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα. This story is that Xerxes sent ambassadors to Argos reminding them of their common ancestor Perseus, and urging them for this reason not to fight. Citations attributed to all the Greeks Fehling excludes from his general theory, and regards as reflections of generally accepted lore;[146] thus we may affirm that, in a widely held Greek view, the Persians accepted these stories.[147]

That Herodotos could not have got the information in his prologue from a source as he pretends to do, is disproved by the passage in Book viii and the fragment of Hekataios. That he invented it all thus becomes an unnecessary hypothesis, unless a special reason is forthcoming for thinking so. The rationalized Greek myths he imputes to the Persians may be thought to provide such a reason. But this is not in fact such a serious obstacle; whether the version Herodotos thought the Persians believed was a rationalized version or some other kind matters not, so long as Herodotos thought it was the true version of the myth. We have already posited a real source for these stories; it is natural to suppose that the rationalized version is that source's version. If we remove from the myth as presented by Herodotos those elements that are bound up with his immediate purposes, viz. the causes of the war, we are left with straightforwardly comprehensible stories: Io was not really a cow, but an ordinary human princess, who wound up in Egypt because foreign sailors carried her off. Europe was similar. These look like good Hekataian rationalizations. But even if the source here was Greek, like the source of much of the Egyptian logos, so long as Herodotos regarded it as a trustworthy guide to Persian belief, he will not say 'X says the Persians say', but simply 'the Persians say'. This is perfectly honest in Herodotos' way of thinking; indeed, such scrupulous care in verifying references is rare to this day. Thus at ii 156, he says Chembis island 'is said by the Egyptians to be floating', although the original is in all probability Hekataios FGrH 1 F 305. Again, at ii 73 where the information about the phoenix is reported from an Egyptian source ('the Heliopolitans say'), the source is Hekataios 1 F 324a.[148] A similar situation exists with regard to Aristeas and Herodotos' statements about the Skythians.

That the source of the individual rationalized stories is Greek thus presents no problem. But who first worked them all together into a tally of offences committed by one race against the other, and advanced these events as causes of the great war? The section as it stands is a carefully constructed unity; the old guess that it came from Dionysios of Miletos' Persika is not so foolish. But let us suppose that Herodotos is the culprit. Suppose he never actually heard any Persian claim these events were the cause of the war. Can we still save his integrity? Admittedly, it becomes more difficult; but we may do so, if Herodotos sincerely believed that this is what the Persians would say and therefore did say.[149] The speeches in Thukydides, after all, work that way. Even if Herodotos' account is spun out of a single chance remark from some Persian to the effect that the campaign was undertaken to avenge wrongs committed long ago,

---

[146] Fehling 118 f.

[147] Cf. Erbse (n. 125) 187 f. At vii 62 Herodotos says the Medes were named after Medeia—as the Medes themselves say.

[148] Cf. Hek. FGrH 1 F 322 and Hdt. ii 77.4.

[149] Thus I can agree partly with Fehling 152: Herodotos' work is 'a carefully thought-out picture of what any enquiries would have had to yield', though 'any enquiries' suggests (consistently with Fehling's theory) that the whole process of inquiry is just pretence. But I think he inquired, thought a bit, inquired some more, then thought some more; he did not intend to deceive, and thought he was telling the truth.

with nothing further than that specified, his procedure remains defensible. His account is not 'fictive' in any helpful sense, but an intelligent putting together of all the information available to him. That information would include the prevailing Greek world-view, with its universal tendency to evoke mythological exempla. The Persians therefore do the same. The response of the Phoenicians could also be conjectural; but it is not necessary to think so. Any Phoenician would quite naturally take umbrage at the suggestion of rapine, and reply that Io came of her own accord, naughty girl that she was.[150] However that may be, out of all of this—Greek tradition, conversations with foreigners, Herodotos' own theorizing, and even connections or shadings suggested to him at the last minute by the exigencies of a good performance—out of all this comes an amalgam which Herodotos can present with perfect honesty as the account of the Persian λόγιοι. That account is then dismissed. To think that the whole thing is a straw man of Herodotos' invention, is to mistake entirely his relationship with his sources; to think that the great words τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτός are simply a way of leaving behind this pleasant fiction, is to miss utterly his contribution to historiography.[151]

Herodotos' constant discussion of sources is the unique element in his voiceprint, so far as our evidence goes; we see now that it is an integral part of his self-perception as an historian. In accordance with the principle laid down earlier,[152] we may impute these methodological innovations to him with little fear of contradiction. He has applied to historical problems the latest methods of other branches of inquiry, making at the same time his own contribution to their development. He did not invent his sources; he discovered the *problem* of sources.

* * *

To close I should like to suggest that two passages may be relevant to the understanding of the famous expression ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις, and further confirm the general picture drawn in this paper. The first is from the Theognidean corpus, vv. 769-772:

χρὴ Μουσῶν θεράποντα καὶ ἄγγελον, εἴ τι περισσόν
εἰδείη, σοφίης μὴ φθονερὸν τελέθειν,
ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μῶσθαι, τὰ δὲ δεικνύεν, ἄλλα δὲ ποιεῖν·
τί σφιν χρήσηται μοῦνος ἐπιστάμενος;

In the *Collected Writings* of the late Leonard Woodbury, a study of the Theognidean poem has been published.[153] It is the only posthumous piece in the book, and may not be well known. The poem says that the servant and messenger of the Muses ought not to begrudge others his σοφίη, for then it is of no use to anyone; instead, he ought to seek out knowledge, present or perform it, and ποιεῖν, compose the results of his inquiry into a coherent piece of

---

[150] No doubt this reply was improvised on the spot (though Fehling 54 f. finds the idea ridiculous), and strictly speaking it implies nothing about the extent of Phoenician knowledge of Greek myth. On such improvisations *cf.* J.A.S. Evans in his review of Fehling (n. 125). Fehling is contemptuous of the 'suggestive questioning' theory, but his characterization of a complex process, at all events tendentious, comes close to parody (e.g. at pp. 5, 54). At all stages of an inquiry conducted over a period of decades Herodotos will have laid before his interlocutors knowledge already obtained elsewhere; in the course of conversation he will have obtained new information from them, engendering modifications in the views of both sides. On the complexity of the decades-long process by which the final text was produced see also Canfora and Corcella (n. 105).

[151] Erbse, 'Fiktion und Wahrheit' (n. 125) 137 ff. is particularly cogent on this point, showing that the line reveals genuine historical thought, and is of a piece with many other examples of such thought in Herodotos. He also advances some reasons for thinking that the Persians really pushed this line about vengeance for the Trojan War as a kind of official propaganda.

[152] See above, p. 69.

[153] Leonard E. Woodbury, 'Poetry and publication: Theognis 769-772', *Collected writings,* edd. C.G. Brown, R.L. Fowler, E. Robbins, P. Wallace Matheson (Atlanta 1991) 483-90.

work. Woodbury points out that to us it seems that the three aspects of the operation are presented in the wrong order—it ought to be seek, compose, present—but that this betrays our allegiance to a literate culture; in an oral culture, the act of composition, in whole or part, occurs simultaneously with the act of performance. In a footnote Woodbury also suggested that the poem displays a rationalistic reduction of τέχνη into three parts, and should therefore be suspected of Sophistic influence and a fifth-century date.[154] Had he lived to put the *ultima manus* to this article, he would surely have quoted the parallel that in my view clinches his case; this is the second passage:

ἐγὼ οὖν, ὦ Πρωταγόρα, εἰς ταῦτα ἀποβλέπων οὐχ ἡγοῦμαι διδακτὸν εἶναι ἀρετήν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ σου ἀκούω ταῦτα λέγοντος, κάμπτομαι καὶ οἶμαί τί σε λέγειν διὰ τὸ ἡγεῖσθαί σε <u>πολλῶν μὲν ἔμπειρον γεγονέναι, πολλὰ δὲ μεμαθηκέναι, τὰ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξηυρηκέναι</u>· εἰ οὖν ἔχεις <u>ἐναργέστερον</u> ἡμῖν ἐπιδεῖξαι ὡς διδακτόν ἐστιν ἡ ἀρετή, <u>μὴ φθονήσῃς, ἀλλὰ ἐπίδειξον</u>.

Plato, *Prot.*, 320b.

The context could hardly be more significant. The dialogue is Plato's portrayal of the master Sophist. Protagoras is about to deliver a showcase speech expounding his great theory of cultural development. At this juncture Sokrates says, 'I think you probably have something to say, because I think you have had great experience, have learned much, and have made your own discoveries as well. So if you have a clearer way to demonstrate how virtue may be taught, please do not begrudge it to us, but give us your demonstration.' As will readily be seen, the thought and the words are very close to those of the Theognidean passage. The σοφός has sought information and experience; this is μῶσθαι. On this basis he has made personal discoveries, αὐτὸν ἐξηυρηκέναι. Since ἐξηυρηκέναι is here distinguished from learning and experience, it presumably refers (as often in Herodotos) to drawing inferences on the basis of that learning and experience. That too is μῶσθαι, but it is also ποιεῖν. The σοφός then presents, ἐπιδεῖξαι, the results of his inquiry. Only unnatural anti-social sentiment, φθόνος, would induce a person to withhold beneficial knowledge; if he possesses it (εἴ τι περισσόν / εἰδείη ~ εἰ οὖν ἔχεις ἐναργέστερον), it should be shared.

The two passages are clearly related to one another; I suggest they are also pertinent to Herodotos. What is described in both of them is precisely ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις. Like his opening, they are both proems: the Theognidean piece is self-evidently introductory to something else; in Plato, Sokrates is in a way providing Protagoras' proem for him, and it seems most likely that Plato has borrowed the language here from Protagoras' own works. The connection once again allows us to see Herodotos in the context of his own times. The opening up of vast new areas to human inquiry is one of the great characteristics of the age, in which Herodotos played his full part. He sought knowledge and, good Greek that he was, shared it publicly; we may be grateful that, if Herodotos' gods were φθονεροί, he was not. If his ἱστορίη occasionally involved more ποιεῖν—creation or individual discovery, filling in the gaps, last-minute adjustments in performance—than it did experience or learning, it is not to be wondered. For that matter, what did Protagoras really know about evolution? Not much; but it would be a most superficial use of words to say he made it all up. So too Herodotos. We should not require him to meet the standards of modern historiography. Instead, we should allow him to be what any admiring Greek would have called him: σοφός.

ROBERT L. FOWLER

University of Bristol

[154] 488 n. 16.