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INTRODUCTION

Purpose and scope of the analysis

The present work is a study of how the identifiable units of the Histories are joined to one another at their beginnings and ends. Such an analysis may be expected to contribute to our understanding of Herodotus' general principles of organization and selection. The Histories are composed of numerous parts of various length that are partially autonomous. A conceptual unity of the whole is indeed assumed at the outset and will be incidentally confirmed in the course of the analysis. But it is the breadth and the diversity of the Histories that strike this reader as a compositional feat. It is my purpose to identify the technical means by which Herodotus has achieved it and to get closer, in consequence, to the basic criteria that determine his composition.

Since a study of all the major transitions throughout the Histories would be too lengthy for the scope of a dissertation, I will concentrate almost exclusively on the first book, in the belief that it serves as the most suitable sample of the entire work. For the complexity and diversity of its articulations, Book I as a whole may be regarded as unique, but at the same time it is also representative in that it provides a broad basis for a catalogue of transitions: Since the material contained here is more varied than that in other parts of the Histories of comparable length, there are also more types of transitions to be examined. Even though, in the first book,
"subordinate construction" predominates while "parallel narrative", as we shall see, is more frequent later in the Histories, all the most important phenomena of Herodotus' method of composition are present here. For this reason only occasionally will it be necessary to step outside the pre-fixed limits of the investigation, in order to make this study of transitional devices truly representative for the entire work. Book I may be regarded in fact as the ultimate example of Herodotus' skill in the unification of widely different parts into a cohesive entity.

History of the problem

While modern scholarship has assiduously studied the relationship of the different parts of the Histories to each other and to the whole, the transitions between contiguous units have not yet been systematically analyzed. Among the critics who have confronted the problem of the unity of the work, F. Jacoby, in the first place, has focused to some extent on the way in which its individual sections are formally connected to each other, and in particular on the way in which those parts which he terms "digressions" (Exkurse) are made to hang from the main narrative. Jacoby's approach is genetic. His observation of the self-contained character of certain parts of the Histories of a certain length has led him to attribute to them an originally independent existence largely before the plan and the basic idea of the entire work as we have it now were even conceived. Even though Jacoby admires Herodotus' artistry in the way in which he arranges his digressions, he frequently regards transitions (i.e.,
the connective sentences or group of words between different *logoi*)
as awkward fastenings, conspicuously external to the exposition itself. The simplest and most frequent type of transition to a digression is, in Jacoby's observation, the abrupt beginning of the passage without introductory formula, and with the repetition of a noun or proper name appearing in the main narrative as an element of connection. In such cases, as also when more complex methods are used to subordinate material (e.g., in the case of the Greek *logoi*), the digressions are not truly integrated into the main narrative since it is possible to remove them without damaging its logical sequence, and this, according to Jacoby, proves their separate composition. A whole series of syntactical devices (relative clauses, participles) or words and phrases (*καί ἄν τοι, πλήν* etc.) can also trigger shorter digressions attaching them more or less loosely to the main narrative. Furthermore, a short digression can be expanded (often awkwardly) by addition, into a self-contained *logos*. Through all these interruptions, the course of the main narrative is recalled by framing and repetition. For Jacoby all these transitional phenomena confirm his developmental theory and he points out the examples of transitions which appear most clearly to him as secondary additions, interpolated by the author himself for the purpose of tying the several independent *logoi* together.

Jacoby's view of the essential autonomy of the individual *logoi* is somewhat tempered by K. A. Pagel, who studied the aetiological factor in Herodotus' work. In an appendix to his analysis, in which
he considers the significance of this element for the formal structure of the Histories, Pagel distinguishes between episodic and "motivating" digressions. While the former are thinly attached to a subject touched upon in the main narrative with repetition of the word in question, the latter are immediately characterized in the transition as an explanation of the aitia of an event in the main narrative. Thus the shortest form of "motivating" digression consists of a causal subordinate clause, and this leads in some cases to another autonomous sentence. Other forms of transition are represented by a ἄνευ clause or, on a larger scale, by a transitional statement which emphasizes the causal relation through a word such as aitia. Pagel's observations have the merit of underlining the importance of explanation as a force that contributes considerably to the narrative breadth of the Histories and to the unification of different narrative units. However, in practice, his identification of "episodic" as opposed to "motivating" digressions does not always appear to stand on any clear and unquestionable basis. Moreover, Pagel also subjectively identifies false (unechte) motivierende Exkurse in which the aitiaological connection only represents a pretext for inserting an autonomous narrative. In these cases, as in those which he considers as "episodic" digressions, Pagel's limited examination of Herodotean transitions and his view of them as artificial devices, is entirely colored by the assumption, inherited from Jacoby, that it was the author's goal to put together large masses of material not because of their internal coherence but
simply because he had them at his disposal.

A completely different way of considering transitions emerges from the study of M. Pohlenz, which concords with that scholar's view of the *Histories* as a unified work of art, in which each part fulfills a function for the whole. Against Jacoby's developmental theory, Pohlenz points out that the partial autonomy of individual members within the whole characterizes also very small passages in the *Histories*, which could never have stood independently, and that consequently it cannot be taken as proof of a part's originally separate existence. 16 This feature, according to Pohlenz, rather constitutes a peculiarity of Herodotus' archaic style, which reflects a more general attitude: Herodotus regards each individual fact as having its own separate value, apart from participating in a larger context to which it is always factually connected. To separate and to connect are in fact for Herodotus equally important compositional functions. 17 Repetition constitutes precisely the most important technical means by which Herodotus marks the subdivisions of his work isolating the individual units, and at the same time holds fast to the thread of his narrative connecting its different parts to each other. 18

Pohlenz' remarks about transitions remain general in nature, but they provide a firm basis for further study. More recently H. Immerwahr has taken a somewhat closer look at Herodotean transitions. Immerwahr is professedly a follower of Pohlenz' unitarian approach, but at the same time he has also drawn on the
stylistic analysis of H. Fränkel far more than Pohlenz himself seems to have done. The purpose of Immerwahr's study as a whole is "to analyze the work as it stands and to define some of its leading ideas" through a "close investigation of its narrative structure and of the stylistic means by which this structure is wrought." Immerwahr makes a distinction between an outer and inner structure in the Histories; the one is expressed in the formal elements that hold the logoi together, while the other rests on interconnections among the logoi that are left implicit and emerge from the contents of the logoi themselves. Indeed, for the most part, Immerwahr's analysis concerns this latter aspect of Herodotus' composition and tries to discover internal thematic relationships among the logoi, rather than examining the way in which contiguous units are externally attached to each other. However, the author points out at the outset Herodotus' use of "framing sentences" as a device of external connection between logoi: these consist in "repeated introductory phrases or sentences at the beginnings of sections of the narrative" and "summary ones at the end," which "function as sign posts, marking ... the stages of the work's progress." In the chapter on "Style and Structure" some examples are given of different ways in which introductory and concluding statements may summarize a section. Also Immerwahr, like Pohlenz, emphasizes repetition as an organizing device in Herodotus' work, especially in the combination of final and introductory statements. Several other transitional phenomena such as synchronism, narrative pauses and
certain especially elaborate introductory passages (which Immerwahr calls "proems") are also taken into consideration. This part of Immerwahr's exposition touches on specific points of great interest but it is unsystematic and somewhat unclear.

Among the critics who have concerned themselves primarily with matters of style, rather than with the question of the literary and conceptual unity of the Histories, we must mention first of all H. Frankel. In his description of the \( \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \iota \varsigma \epsilon \iota \pi \omicron \mu \nu \nu \eta \) in archaic Greek literature Frankel has included a few fundamental observations on the method of Herodotean transitions, although the view of the meaning and purpose of the Histories as a whole to which those very observations have led him appears now unacceptable. Just as, within the single small units of the work, remark leads to remark and more and more information is added about people, places, and things, so in the overall composition, Frankel draws attention to the constant progress from subject to subject. This occurs in general through \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \ldots \xi \) systems, where the conclusion of what precedes always looks forward to something else which is to follow. The connection between separate units can indeed be merely mechanical, but in most cases it has a factual basis as well. Frankel does not stop to investigate the type of content, the variable force, or the frequency of these \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \ldots \xi \) systems. Rather, he proceeds to recall certain particular transitions in the Histories - Croesus' investigations into Greek affairs (I.56), Aristagoras' appeal to Sparta and Athens (V.38,55), Darius'
inspection of the Pontus from the cliffs of the Bosporus (IV.85),
Cambyses' dispatch of explorers to Aethiopia to verify the existence
of the "table of the sun" in that land (III.17), Solon's speeches
to Croesus (I.30-31) - as notable examples of Herodotus' art in
creating the connections for ever new descriptions and narratives. 26
The cases cited by Fränkel are particularly striking and regardless
of their form belong because of their substance to a special category
which we shall term "organic transition". 27

Aside from Immerwahr's chapter on "Style and Structure" 28
later studies on Herodotus' style have not carried Fränkel's
analysis of Herodotean transitions any further. Most recently D.
Müller has briefly focused on μέταφράσεις transitional systems,
which he appropriately calls "Scharniersätze". 29 Müller's
considerations, however, remain general: he does not distinguish
among different formal types of such transitional sentences, nor
does he provide any guidelines to estimate from the transition
itself the degree of the break, the importance of the subdivision,
or the substance of the connection. This is indeed understandable
since Müller's goal is not a study of transitions, but more broadly
and ambitiously an analysis of Herodotus' style and of its
development. In that context, transitions between different
narrative units constitute a secondary aspect of Herodotus' general
method in connecting and articulating his thoughts. Similarly,
the study of I. Beck on ring composition 30 analyses a series of
phenomena which sometimes play a role in transitions, as we shall
try to point out at appropriate moments of our analysis; but for the most part these phenomena are examined as pervasive features of Herodotus' prose, noticeable within internal sentences or short periods, and not especially - to judge from most of the examples used by Beck - at articulation points, between identifiable units of the Histories.

**Definition of "transition" and criteria for the subdivision of the Histories**

The word "transition", as a critical term in literature used in the broadest sense, implies a break of any type and importance and refers to the process by which that break is more or less bridged over or emphasized. For the purposes of this analysis a transition is a sentence (or a series of sentences, or a group of words) which in some way links together and separates two contiguous units of the Histories. Self-contained units of a certain length and complexity can be called "logoi" as both Pohlenz and Immerwahr do. The term has the advantage of allowing for great flexibility since "a logos is . . . basically a series of items which are themselves smaller logoi . . ." Thus, in the course of my discussion, I will refer for example to the Croesus logos (i.e., the story of Croesus 1.5.3-6, 26-92.1), which occupies most of the entire Lydian logos (i.e., of 5.3-94) and on a smaller scale to the Croesus - Atys - Adrastus logos (34-45), which in turn constitutes a shorter but complex and self-contained part of the Croesus logos. Similarly, the great ethnographies of the Histories may be termed logoi. Often, instead
of logos, I will use the term "section", especially in reference to shorter semi-autonomous units and to small subdivisions of a logos. The beginning and the end of logoi and "sections" of course correspond to more or less important points of transition. The subdivision of Herodotus' work for the purpose of examining transitions between contiguous units, seems to require, however, a somewhat more precise and informative terminology. Logos, (like "section"), is an absolute designation, which gives no clue as to the formal relationship of a unit to its surroundings, aside from indicating that it stands partially autonomous from them. The logoi of the Histories are not -- needless to say -- only juxtaposed to one another like the beads of a single-string necklace, but rather they also frequently hang down in loops or straight ends from the simple string. In order to describe the relative position of the logoi in such a structural context, Herodotean scholarship has always distinguished a "main narrative" from "digressions." The latter term has however been overused and should be avoided, mainly because it has come to designate a passage for its content, connoting a substantive, more than merely formal, subordination of the part to the whole. Jacoby's distinction between echte and unechte Exkurse, and that made more recently by Erbse between "necessary" and "unnecessary" digressions are precisely based on, and motivated by, the idea that digressions are secondary and in certain cases expendable for the main narrative. Pohlenz protested against referring the term "digressions" to certain important passages which
by virtue of their contents evidently represent an integral part of the main narrative. These are, for example, explanations concerning the background of people and places, or the Greek *logoi* of the first part of the *Histories*, the latter introducing, according to Pohlenz, the equivalent of parallel action. Immerwahr uses the term digression only sparingly, preferring to apply to all units (whether or not they may be considered as digressions) the more neutral one of *logos*. After describing the structure of the *Histories* as a chain made up of sections of unequal length with interruptions attached at definite points, Immerwahr cautions us about calling the latter "digressions" since "it is frequently impossible to say whether the digression is more or less important than the main narrative." 

The identification of digressions on the basis of their substantive, as well as their formal, relationship to their surroundings is necessarily subjective and has led to different and inconsistent uses of the term on the part of individual critics. Thus Jacoby, who generally seems to count as a digression any passage (regardless of its length) which interrupts the onward progress of the historical account, considers the flashback on Cyrus' antecedents (I.95-130) as part of the main narrative, while regarding as a digression, for example, an episode integrated in the chronological continuum such as the adviser scene at I.27. Pagel also views as digressions any isolated passage of Greek history, even the parallel narrative of the Spartan expedition against Samos.
(III.39-60), and the passage on Athenian affairs at VI.87-93, which is formally part of the main account. Here Pagel evidently disregards the way in which these units are connected to their surroundings and labels them as digressions in consideration of the fact that in this part of the Histories, Herodotus' narrative still focuses mostly on the East.

Later scholars, as the contrary point of view of Pohlenz already partially indicates, have sometimes shown the tendency to restrict the term "digression", referring it in particular to those parts which seem harder to integrate conceptually into the history proper. These are especially the ethnographical and geographical descriptions on the one hand and the so-called "novellas" on the other. Most recently, for example, J. Cobet's study about the unity of Herodotus' work, which proposes to argue the relevance of the individual semi-autonomous units in the Histories to the principal theme of the whole, only focuses on three types of digressions. Before considering the ethnographical logoi and the Novelle, Cobet examines remarks or short accounts concerning events that took place after 479 B.C. (i.e., beyond the chronological limit of the Histories). These last passages, however, formally represent, as we shall see, only a part of a broader type of unit, all characterized by a change to a later time with respect to the chronological narrative. Cobet disregards that fact because his identification of digressions, as his initial definition already implies, is based on their internal subject matter more than on
the way in which they are attached to the structure of the whole.

From the formal point of view, however, there is an objective analogy between the ethnographical descriptions scattered throughout the *Histories* and the narrative passages on Athenian and Spartan history in Books I and V, not to mention the flashback on Cyrus' antecedents (I.95-130), which may appear too evidently functional to the main historical account to be labeled a "digression".

Conversely, if in content the Greek *logoi* of I and V introduce the equivalent of "parallel" action just like the Samian *logos* of Book III (39-60), as Pohlenz maintained, the formal and structural position of these two sets of passages is entirely different.

Finally, the term "novella", which some scholars use to designate a type of Herodotean digression, more properly indicates a distinct component of Herodotus' composition which can appear within the main narrative (as is the case for example in the Croesus - Atys - Adrastus *logos*), as well as in passages which we would structurally identify as "digressions" (e.g., the Arion episode).

For the purpose of identifying the different units of Herodotus' work and consequently the points of "transition" to be examined, the only objective element of reference is provided by the historical narrative that proceeds in a chronological sequence, taking the reader from the time of Croesus to that of Xerxes throughout the nine books of the *Histories*. In Book I, which constitutes the specific focus of our present analysis, this
historical narrative proceeds from the statement that the author will begin with Croesus (5.3-6) to the account of his reign until its end with the conquest of Lydia by Cyrus (26-92.1, except for the interruptions at 56.3-5, 59-64, 65-68, 70, 72, 73.3-74 and 82); it continues then with the report of Cyrus' subsequent achievements until his death (141-214, except for the interrupting passages at 142-151.2, 163, 166-167, 171-173, 178-187, 192-200, 202-204.1, 215-216). Of course even in this chronological account, Herodotus does not invariably follow a strict chronological order: often he tends to proceed from effect to cause rather than vice versa, and at other times -- especially when the narrative is most compressed -- he lumps events together in broad categories. In general however, within these parts the main phases in the development of the action follow each other according to a chronological sequence and the narrative proceeds as if events had taken place in the order in which they are told. Because of its intrinsic continuity -- and not because it may be presumed to be more important than the rest -- the chronological account will also be termed as "main narrative." In spite of its subdivision and interruptions, this constitutes in fact the πέρας χρονο, which Herodotus keeps pursuing and to which he always returns.

Herodotus' chronological narrative appears subdivided by different and sometimes coexisting elements into "sections" of various length and autonomy. An especially pervasive subdividing device is represented by the author's own marked transitional
statements, which indicate clearly the beginning of particular stages of the action, or the end, or both. These are the introductions and the conclusions which Immerwahr calls "framing sentences" and which shall be examined in detail later on. Regardless of the author's use of marked transitions, moreover, the chronological account can become subdivided in a conspicuous manner by a change to the dramatic mode in an entire section and then back again to the style and pace of the normal historical report. Thirdly, subdivision within the chronological account also occurs when the focus of the narrative changes from one principal agent to another. Thus, for example, in Book I we can identify a "generals of Cyrus section" (157-177) distinct from the surrounding report of Cyrus' activities. The chronological account centered around a single agent keeps going forward in time and changes setting only according to the development of the action, which may move from place to place. On the other hand, when a new agent becomes the focus of attention, a chronological overlap (i.e., partial or complete synchronism), and an abrupt change of setting may also occur. This happens, for example, at the end of the "generals of Cyrus section" just mentioned above (I.177), and in the transition to the Samian logos of Book III which Jacoby and Pohlenz have called "parallel narrative" (III.39). When changes of agents are involved, at any rate, the chronological narrative proceeds forward according to a broken, rather than a continuous line:
Besides being subdivided into sections or larger logoi by the elements just mentioned (i.e., marked transitional statements, changes of mode and changes of agent), the main narrative of the Histories is also frequently interrupted by passages of various length which temporarily arrest its chronological progress. These interrupting sections or logoi, distinct from the sections and logoi of the main narrative, shall be called "insertions". This is a term purposefully less rich in connotations than "digressions". It simply indicates the structural relationship of certain parts of the Histories to the chronological account, and makes no reference to their contents, substantive function, or importance. Similarly, the term "insertion" does not imply any genetic assumption: I do not mean to suggest, for example, that the passages in question have been interpolated at some point into an initially cohesive whole. In some ways, the notion of "insertion" as passage distinct from the main narrative because it suspends its chronological continuity, corresponds rather closely to what Jacoby identifies in the Histories as a "digression." But Jacoby ranks even statements consisting in a single sentence in this category. For the purpose of an analysis of transitions, on the other hand, we shall regard as insertions only semi-autonomous units that mark a perceptible interruption in the chronological account. Brief momentary remarks of a parenthetical nature will be taken into consideration only occasionally.

In relation to the main narrative, insertions have two features.
In the first place they generally mark a change of time backward or forward with respect to the chronological sequence, and often also of setting or of subject matter or of mode (from narrative to dramatic or vice versa), or of more than one of these at once. In particular, insertions can be either narrative or descriptive. Those of the first type, which are each internally characterized by their own chronological continuity, as is the main narrative as a whole, mark with respect to the latter a change to an earlier time (flashbacks) or to a later time (flashforwards and follow-ups), often with a change of setting as well. Descriptive insertions, on the other hand, mark primarily a change of subject, often with a change of time as well, from the past of historical narrative to the present of durable circumstances. These insertions are represented by ethnographies, geographies and passages on monuments.

The second and most important feature which, combined with the changes mentioned above, is essential to an insertion in relation to that which we have called "main narrative," is represented by its formal subordination to the latter. Formal subordination occurs when a narrative or descriptive passage, regardless of its contents and substantial function, is attached to the main narrative as an appendage to some element (event, character, place, person or thing) that has just appeared in the main narrative itself. This means the insertion may be ostensibly introduced more or less explicitly as an explanation of a fact reported in the main narrative -- as is the case of the flashback on Cyrus (I.95-130). Or, in broader terms,
even if no explanatory function is indicated in the transition from the main narrative or in the transition back to it, the insertion is tacked on to the mention of some element in the main narrative as a definition or background report. The Perinthian insertion at V.1 -- to take another flashback as an example -- represents a case in point. Both flashbacks, on Cyrus and on the Perinthians, so different from one another in contents, importance, length and overall function, are in any case placed outside of the main narrative and are formally auxiliary to it. On the contrary, the story of the Spartan expedition against Samos already mentioned (aside from the insertions which it contains) does not constitute an insertion. It alters somewhat the chronological continuity of the account simply because it is initially introduced as parallel action (III.39.1), but it is on the same formal level as the surrounding actions and is part of the main narrative.

While insertions as entire units are sharply distinct from their surroundings, internally they tend to be subdivided into shorter sections, just like the main narrative. In descriptive insertions the principal subdividing element is represented by marked transitions separating and connecting different phases or items of the discussion. Narrative insertions, on the other hand, like any other chronological stretch, may be subdivided by transitional statements which isolate the account of individual actions or stages thereof, as well as by changes of mode or of agent and by insertions within the insertion. Thus in general by "section"
we mean any passage of the main narrative or of an insertion, comprised between marked transitions or between changes of time, setting, subject matter or mode. A longer section or a unit composed of several sections represents, as we have already seen, a logos. 64

Plan of the dissertation

The following analysis will examine the transitions between the different sections of Book I. In the first chapter we shall consider the individual parts of speech and the words which regularly contribute to effect the transition, either as connectives or by isolating a certain section from its surroundings. These elements of transition range from the most mechanical, such as particles and demonstrative pronouns, to the most meaningful, like the term θῶμα and other signifiers. The study of individual elements of transition will provide the basis for examining entire transitional statements, both between sections of the chronological narrative (Chapter II) and between the chronological narrative and each type of insertion (Chapter III). The substance and contents of these statements, the way in which they express the importance of an account which is to come or has just ended or of specific elements within it, as well as the terms by which they indicate the connection of two contiguous units, will help to clarify Herodotus' art and principles of composition.
1. It is at least lamentable, if not execrable, that certain trans-Atlantic scholars reduce "Herodotus" to an unpronounceable consonant cluster. We will eschew this habit.

2. For an excellent survey of the unitarian-analytical controversy, see Justus Cobet, Herodots Exkurse und die Frage der Einheit seines Werkes. Historia Einzelschriften 17 (Wiesbaden, 1971), pp. 1-44 and 188-198. A sensible position which reconciles the two extremes is held by Charles Fornara, Herodotus, An Interpretative Essay (Oxford, 1971), pp. 1-23: even though one may detect traces of Herodotus' development in the Histories, the finished work as we have it represents a unified whole and the question of its unity is unrelated to that of its genesis.

3. See below, especially pp. 182-195 and Appendix pp. 304 - 312. "Parallel narrative" occurs when the author focuses in turn on two or more agents operating independently at about the same time in different settings. Subordinate construction, on the other hand, occurs when in an account centered on one agent, the report of other actions pertaining to other agents and to different settings are appended to explain, define or specify elements of the central account. See pp. 14-15.
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5. For the use of the term "digression", see below, pp. 10 - 13.
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CHAPTER I

THE ELEMENTS OF TRANSITION

The analysis that follows, on particles and other elements of transition, is based on the consideration of all the cases in which these elements appear in transitional statements of the first book of the Histories.

Particles

The particle ~ is the simplest and most frequent element of transition. In general it indicates continuation of the report and establishes mechanical connection between the sentence where it appears and that which immediately precedes. When ~ is used in transitions between different sections, it appears in the initial sentence of a section, often in conjunction with other more expressive elements of connection. Since ~ serves to join consecutive sentences and in transition it joins specifically the first sentence of a new section with the last preceding one, the import of those sentences largely determines the connective scope of ~.

The initial sentence of a section with ~ may coincide with the beginning of the account; or it may be an introductory statement that summarizes the contents of the section that follows
identifying it more or less emphatically as a unit. In the latter case δέ becomes a stronger connective between that whole section and what precedes (e.g., 7.1).  

Similarly, the final sentence of a section may coincide with the end of the account; it would then be tied to what precedes by continuative δέ or by some other particle as it records the last stage of an action or the last item of a discussion. On the other hand, a section may also end with a concluding statement that summarizes in some way its contents. These conclusions almost invariably have anticipatory μέν (or καί ... μέν, μέν νυν, μέν οί to enhance the mechanical connection of the passage that has just ended with what follows. While the concluding statement identifies the preceding section as a separate unit and marks a break, the μέν within it looks forward to a correlative δέ.  

μέν... δέ systems and δέ... δέ systems

The μέν conclusion, δέ introduction-system by itself would achieve a concatenation of well-defined units, but that system coexists throughout Book I with the less marked δέ... δέ... δέ sequence. In a conclusive statement that marks the end of a passage of any type and length, the μέν may be correlative to a weak δέ in a sentence that simply indicates continuation of the report. This happens sometime, for example, when the chronological narrative resumes after the conclusion of a passage that has come to
interrupt it with a change of time, place, or subject, or when the narrative continues after a sentence underlining the end of a stage of the action, or when a descriptive passage continues after a sentence that has emphasized the end of a part. Conversely, strong in an introductory statement is not invariably anticipated by in a statement that concludes the preceding section. The beginning of a new stage of the action, or of an insertion in the narrative, or of a new part of a descriptive passage, may in fact be emphasized within a weak sequence. Finally, passages that cover a well-defined stage of the action, or that mark a change of place, time, subject or mode, stand out from their surroundings by the nature of their contents but may or may not be also identified in transition as special units by either introductory or concluding statements, or both.

Introductions and conclusions also vary greatly in scope since they can identify large and complex sections of Herodotus' work or smaller passages. At any rate these summarizing statements at the beginning or at the end, or both at once in a system, fulfill two partially distinct purposes. On one hand they serve to organize the report. They subdivide it clearly into sections or underline the subdivision inherent in it; at the same time the particles always link together consecutive units, and the connection of a unit to its surroundings or to other parts of the work may be otherwise expressed in the statements themselves. Secondly, introductions and conclusions, just by anticipating or repeating in
summary form the contents of a passage, or by stressing in some other way its importance, may serve the purpose of emphasis.

The combined presence in the Histories of the μέν conclusion, δέ introduction-system with the weak δέ -sequence is both deliberate and casual. As we have just remarked, and as it will become more clear throughout the analysis of Book I, marked transitions are means of emphasis and, by using them in irregular fashion, Herodotus purposefully underlines certain units of his work more than others, as well as different elements of their contents. But this factor does not fully account for the combined frequency and irregularity of introductory and concluding statements. Such feature rather seems to indicate in many cases only that the author's striving for structural clarity is coupled with a tendency to a spontaneous compositional style, not entirely inhibited by the creation of a rigid system of external organization.

Types of μέν -conclusions

Retrospective programmatic and summary conclusions

Statements with μέν at the end of a section always summarize what precedes to a greater or lesser degree and mark a pause in the report. In the overwhelming majority of cases the μέν -conclusion takes the form of a "retrospective sentence" characterized by a backward-pointing demonstrative pronoun or adjective ("this much", "of this sort") or adverb ("in this way"), which refers to the information given in the preceding account.
Examples:

1) κατὰ μὲν τὸν πρὸς μιλησίους
te καὶ θρασύδουλον πόλεμον

2) ὄντων μὲν νῦν πέρι τὴν

3) οὗτοι μὲν δὲ εφι γνώμας

4) καὶ περὶ μὲν ἀναθημάτων

tοσάτοι εἰρήνεια

5) τούτο μὲν δὴ
tοιοῦτον ἐκτε

A second form of μὲν -conclusion is a "programmatic statement" where the author intervenes in first person to announce the end of a section.²² In the most clear-cut instance of this type of conclusion in Book I, the programmatic and the retrospective forms are combined:

6) ἄλλοι δὲν οὐδὲν μὲρα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλο ἔρρον

εὐγένετο θαυμασιάσαντος ἱσών δέοντα τεσσαράκοντα ἐτῶν,
tούτοι μὲν παρῆςομεν, τοσάτα ἐπιμεθέκων(14.4)²³

In certain cases the concluding statement is neither retrospective nor programmatic and does not otherwise look backward in its form, only in its contents. This type of μὲν -sentence can be termed simply "summary conclusion". For example:
Ways in which μέν -conclusions may summarize the preceding narrative

The sentence above, which definitively closes the Croesus logos, shows how a conclusion may mark a pause at the end of a section of historical narrative by emphasizing only the final action or its results. On the other hand, concluding μέν statements, when they appear at the end of complex descriptive passages before the transition to the historical narrative, regularly refer to the last topic covered rather than to the whole unit. Thus, for example, the Persian ethnography (131-140) ends with a conclusion at 140.3 which summarizes only the immediately preceding description of a particular funeral custom.

The other examples quoted earlier, delimit sections of various types and length, identifying them in their entirety, albeit in different ways and in greater or lesser complexity. Statement 2, which includes the account of Harpagus' conquest of Phocaea is far less specific than 1, at the end of the narrative of "Alyattes' war against the Milesians and Thrasyboulos." The words Γνώμακ and ἀναθέματων in 3 and 4 respectively, define in general the topic just covered, while 5 with the demonstrative in place of a specific summarizing term is a tag that indicates the end of a section without giving any idea of its contents. Statement 4 is a dismissal with the third person imperative almost equivalent to an
intervention by the author himself at the close of a section as in
a programmatic conclusion.\textsuperscript{27}

Although most conclusions consist of a single $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ sentence
immediately correlative to a $\delta e$ -sentence at the beginning of the
following section, some sections end with a longer and more complex
concluding passage. At the end of the flashback on Cyrus (130) and
of the section on Harpagus' Ionian campaign (169), a $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ -sentence
that first closes the account is followed by a series of statements
in antithesis and counter-antithesis that provide additions and
specifications to the preceding narrative or that summarize it
repeatedly in different ways. In both cases a definitive conclusion
is provided by a final emphatic retrospective sentence with $\delta \eta$
(130.3, 169.2).\textsuperscript{28}

Resumptive conclusions

Conclusions are most frequently placed at the end of the section
which they summarize. In some cases however (2 and 7 quoted above)\textsuperscript{29}
the $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ -sentence underlines the end of a stage of the action
related before an intervening insertion. Such "resumptive conclusions" contribute to keeping hold of the historical narrative when an
interruption caused by a change of time, place, and subject occurs
at a point of subdivision in the historical narrative itself.\textsuperscript{30}
Types of δέ -sentences at the beginning of a section

Prospective, programmatic, summary introductions and initial δέ -sentences

Initial δέ sentences are of a far greater variety than concluding statements with μέν. Statements that mark the beginning of a section by summarizing in some way its contents can be grouped, according to their form, in prospective, programmatic and summary introductions. The prospective sentence, which is rather predominant among the three types is characterized by a forward looking demonstrative. (For example, κατ' αὑτὸν κροίσιν τὸ δέ ἐγίνετο , 85.1.)

In the programmatic introductions the author intervenes in the first person to announce the beginning of a new section. For example:

τὸ δὲ ὁπάντων νῦν μὲ τίς ἔστι τῶν ταύτης μετὰ τοῦ αὕτην τὴν πόλιν ἐγρομαν Ἰεράκλην (194.1).

Contrary to these two types, the summary introduction does not look forward in its form but consists in a self-standing statement that becomes specified in the report that follows. Summary statements, sometimes composed of more than one sentence, can be strong markers of transition and can summarize a passage in a full and meaningful way. In other cases they represent the least conspicuous of introductions even though they still serve to announce
the subject of a new section. This happens, for example, when Herodotus starts an account by mentioning a general category that serves as heading for a subsequent discussion of specific items. For example:

Κροίμω δ' ἔστι καὶ ἀμα ἀναθήματα ἐν τῇ Ἑμάδι πολλά λαὶ οἱ τὰ εἰγνώνα μοῦνα (92.1)

In cases of this sort it is not always possible nor crucial to distinguish between an introductory statement and the outright beginning of a section. Certain initial ἔστι sentences, like the beginning of campaign reports or of the account of a King's reign are equivalent to weak summary introductions in that they automatically signal the transition to a new stage of the action and identify at the outset the general subject matter of what follows. Prospective and programmatic introductions as well as the summary statements less intertwined with the beginning of the narrative proper are, like in general μέν -conclusions, clearer indicators of Herodotus' deliberate subdivision of his account. They may carry special emphasis, the focus and meaning of which must be determined in each case, and they may express or reveal in different ways Herodotus' principles or organization and selection.

Resumptive introductions

All introductions considered so far and termed "prospective", "programmatic" or "summary" are ἔστι -sentences that primarily
summarize in some way at the outset the contents of the following report even though, as we shall see, they may also include a summary of the preceding narrative in a subordinate clause. The continuity of a complex historical narrative, rather than its subdivision, is enhanced, on the other hand, by a different type of introductory statement that constitute independent summaries of the preceding or earlier narrative. These "resumptive introductions", as they may be termed, lead to the next section by emphasizing appropriately already known facts often with the addition of some new element. In Book I resumptive introductions bind together different sections of historical narrative. When they occur at the resumption of the narrative after an interruption caused by a change of time and place, they in fact summarize information previously related, thereby contributing to the continuity of the chronological account; at the same time they may also establish connection between the next section and the preceding insertion. 37 Resumptive introduction before an insertion, on the other hand, serves to integrate it closely into the narrative while providing the transition to a different time and place. 38

Connective elements in introductory and initial & -sentences and "Janus" transitions

Resumptive introductions are connective statements of transition. But also introductions that summarize the following report and initial & -sentences in general, often also contain some element of
formal connection with the preceding passage that makes the sequence of the narrative explicit and reinforces the mechanical link provided by $δε$ or $μέν...δε$. A backward-pointing demonstrative frequently fulfills that role. For example, in the introduction at 5.3 ($ἐν...δε...παρι$ $μέν$ $τιτων...$), the new beginning of Herodotus' narrative is not autonomous from what precedes, but it connected to it by the $δε$ as well as by the demonstrative $τιτων$, which refers to the facts just discussed.

Other connective elements often found in initial $δε$-sentences (in addition to the particle) are personal pronouns, or the implicit person of the main verb;\(^{39}\) the repetition of a proper noun appearing in the main narrative;\(^{40}\) the repetition of specific terms, or of an idea expressed just above;\(^{41}\) a term indicating a relationship of diversity or similarity with what precedes, or the adjective $\Delta \\gamma\lambda\omicron\omicron\omicron$;\(^{42}\) and, most important, a participle, a participial clause or some other subordinate clause.

Participles or subordinate clauses may appear at the beginning of a new stage of the action to express different types and degree of connection within the historical narrative. An introductory statement may thus establish a strict and meaningful relationship between two parts of the chronological narrative by referring to the preceding section while announcing the contents of the next one. A "Janus transition" of this sort, i.e. a statement that looks both backward and forward, is represented in Book I by the emphatic summary introduction to the Croesus - Atys - Adrastus logos (34.1).\(^{43}\) Here
the initial participle phrase μετὰ Κόρινα αὐχώμενον
just expresses the temporal continuity of the narrative as in many
initial sentences that will be considered later. But the clause
ὁ Εσσύτης ᾠδήποτε από χάκων ἀρκότατον places the Solon episode and the account of the Μέδειοι that
befell Croesus, here introduced, in a relationship of mutual
dependence by underlining an aspect of the preceding narrative as
essential to the report that follows.⁴⁴

Aside from Janus transitions, participial and subordinate clauses
contained in introductory statements (and in other initial sentences,
for the purpose of binding together two sections of the same
chronological account) in most cases only reinforce the sequence
already inherent in the narrative.⁴⁵ Some initial sentences within
the historical narrative have in fact no formal connective with
what precedes other than ἦ;⁴⁶ while in other cases the
elements that do express connection between two contiguous passages
are pleonastic.⁴⁷

Participles or subordinate clauses have generally a more
important role as connectives between parts of the chronological
account, when they summarize the preceding action or its outcome
at the point where the narrative resumes after an interruption
caused by a change of time, place, or subject, i.e. after an
insertion.⁴⁸ Then the participle or subordinate clause in the
initial ἦ-sentence takes the place of an independent resumptive
conclusion with μέν⁴⁹ (or of a resumptive introduction).
For example:

καὶ Βαβυλὼν μὲν οὖν οὕτω τῆς πρώτης ύπαίτης
(191.6, retrospective conclusion of the account of Cyrus' Babylonian campaign)

192-200 Babylonian ethnography

'Ω δὲ τῷ Κύρῳ λαὶ παρῷ ἐνος κατεργασάμενος ἐπεθύμησε Μασσαλέα μετὰ ἐνποίησας
(201, resumption of the historical narrative and beginning of a new stage of the action).

After an insertion the initial sentence resuming the narrative may contain elements that logically bind what follows to the insertion itself or with its final part rather than expressing, as in the example just quoted, chronological sequence with respect to the action reported previously. In these cases a backward-pointing demonstrative belonging to the main or to a subordinate clause is most frequently the connective that makes the insertion rejoin the narrative in a circular or semi-circular manner. For example:

τοιούτων δὲ τοῖς Σαρδίνοις ἐνεκτεινόντων προηγμένων ἢκε ὁ Σαρδίνος κύριος
δεῖμενος κροίς βοήθειν πολιορκεῖον Κέο μένων
(83.1)

In this initial sentence the genitive absolute, equivalent to a retrospective conclusion, ties the resuming narrative to the preceding insertion on Spartan affairs, while the clause governed by δείμενος establishes connection with the narrative immediately previous to that
Initial sentences of sections characterized by change of time, place or subject with respect to their surroundings establish to a variable extent the outward link with what precedes. Most narrative insertions open with an introductory statement that contains a partial summary of the preceding or earlier narrative or a reference to its contents. But the simplest element of connection in the introduction or in the initial sentence of an insertion (aside from, and usually in addition to, the particle ᾧ) is represented by a substantive (70.2) or more often by a proper noun carried over from the preceding narrative. When this represents the only explicit link, as happens especially in the case of most descriptive passages, in general the closer the name in the narrative appears to the initial sentence of the insertion where it is repeated or referred to by a demonstrative, the smoother is the transition to a different subject, time and place.

Passages that do not follow a continuous line of chronological narrative tend to cover a variety of topics and may be accordingly subdivided in several shorter sections which introductory and concluding statements used irregularly help to delimit. The general subject matter of each entire unit is in most cases nowhere explicitly stated: Herodotus has for instance no terms for "geography" or "history" or for the broad area of research that we call "ethnography", although he uses once in Book I the yet more general expression "Assyrian Logoi" (184.1). The main explicit unifying element in a
passage outside the chronological narrative characterized by internal changes of topic is precisely its object of report, namely a country or a people of which Herodotus considers different aspects. The initial sentences of the individual subsections within units of this sort often do not increase the continuity of the account by expressing to any greater degree the connection with what precedes. 57

**Framing systems**

Correspondence and variation

When a passage is identified both by an introduction and by a conclusion, the two statements form a framing system. There is normally no exact verbal correspondence between the two statements even in those cases when they both express in analogous form the same basic idea such as, typically, "so and so happened in this way". 58 Example:

7.1: η δὲ προσαράγησεν ὡς τω ἐπεσαράγησεν ἡ ἡ λογιστήριον ἐπεσαράγησεν ἐς τὸ γένος τῶν Κροίκων καὶ ἐπεσαράγησεν δὲ μεταλλάζει (prospective introduction)

episode of the change of dynasty in Lydia.

14.1: τὴν μὲν δὲ τιμάνιαν ἤτοι ἐχον τοῖς μεταλλάζει τούς ἡραλδικοὺς ἀπελάμβανεν (retrospective conclusion).

Here the introduction establishes the necessary logical connection with the preceding passage (ἐκ τοῦ γένος τοῦ Κροίκου) and emphasizes the change (περιήγητο), while the conclusion
rather stresses the result of the change itself (ἐκχών).\(^{59}\) The term ἁπάντια is equivalent to ἐτοιμονίν and each is in emphatic position at the beginning of the sentence, followed by οὐτω and by the main verb. The couplets Heraclids-Mermnads, Mermnads-Heraclids form a chiasmus, with the reigning dynasty mentioned first in each case. While in the introduction the power is said to have passed from the ones to the others, the same concept is expressed in the concluding statement in a less impersonal and more intense way, which reflects the substance of the episode just told.

The components of a framing system do not always differ as drastically, when they are so symmetrical in form and contents, as in the example examined above. In the case of some short passages, exact verbal correspondence seems to have been avoided purely for the sake of formal variation.\(^{60}\) At other times the difference between the framing sentences is due to the fact that the introduction is phrased in terms that establish connection with the preceding passage.\(^{61}\) But in general the introductory statement, which bears the task of making the transition to a new topic, also tends to summarize a section more specifically that the conclusion, which marks the end of the section and can simply refer to its contents with a word or two,\(^{62}\) or even with a demonstrative pronoun.\(^{63}\) In fewer cases, as to some degree in 14.1 quoted earlier, the conclusion is more specific on the basis of what has just been related.\(^{64}\) Either one of the two statements in a frame -- usually the introduction -- may contain elements of special emphasis.\(^{65}\) However, in
spite of these several possible reasons for variation between introduction and conclusion, and in spite of the fact that the two components often differ from each other in their form (e.g., a programmatic introduction may form a framing system with a retrospective conclusion), some verbal correspondence between the two frequently helps to identify the subject matter of a section.

Function of emphasis and organization

When a framing system encloses a long and complex section, perhaps interrupted by insertions, it may act as a device of unification and emphasis if the concluding statement recalls certain essential elements of the narrative initially underlined in the introduction. A shorter passage may be set off from its surroundings and emphasized by its frame.

A series of successive frames clarifies the subdivision of a descriptive passage or of a discussion by identifying its different topics. Thus, for example, the prospective sentence in 131.1 announces the general subject matter of the Persian ethnography ("Persian customs"), but more specifically introduces its first and major part about customs on which the author is fully informed. After concluding this passage, Herodotus introduces a discussion of a less verifiable funeral ritual (140.1). The inclusion here of some incidental remarks about the Magi (140.2-3) broadens the initial topic, but the dismissal in 140.3,
brings forward again what has constituted the main object of report in this section of the ethnography.

The consistent regular use of framing systems is however essentially alien to Herodotus' method. In the Babylonian ethnography, for example, three topics are successively identified by frames: 194.1-194.5, "boats" (especially emphasized in the introduction); 195, "dress"; 196.1-200, "customs". But the discussion on climate and agriculture (193) has no introductory nor concluding statement and seems to grow as an extension of the preceding section, enclosed in a frame (192.1-192.4), on Babylonian wealth.69

In order to identify two sections both individually and as part of a single unit Herodotus sometimes uses introductory and concluding statements in the following pattern:

```
Introduction to A       frame
Conclusion to A
Introduction to B
Conclusion to AB
```

The discussion of the remote causes of the East-West conflict is organized in this manner (see 1.1, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3), as well as the account on Athens and Sparta (59.1, 65.1, 65.1, 69.1), although in the latter case the final conclusion to the whole is incorporated by means of a participle clause in the resumption of the main narrative.
Final sentences

Variable force

In the Histories passages that do not within themselves follow a chronological sequence tend to develop by addition of different topics, or of different remarks, or of individual items within a same topic (as in a list of customs or in a description of several monuments or features of a land). In this type of section generally final sentences, aside from conclusions, in no way indicate the end of the report or of part of it before the transition to another topic, or, more important, to the historical narrative. When no concluding statement appears referring at least to the last part of the passage, and the passage does not rejoin the narrative in a semi-circular manner, the resumption of the latter is therefore rather sudden. On the other hand, final sentences (for the most part with ἀποκριάτικα) in the historical narrative may contribute to its subdivision by reporting succinctly, with various degrees of emphasis, the last stage of an action. In a few cases some verbal correspondence with the statement introducing the account of that action renders the final sentence almost equivalent to a framing sentence. For example:

(84.1, prospective introduction)
Formulaic endings

Some final sentences follow a formulaic pattern such as, at the end of the account of a King's reign, the notice of his death with a participial clause recording the total of his years in power:

""""

Final & sentences with force of conclusions

Formulaic endings subdivide the report according to the natural historical development without, in their simplest form exemplified above, carrying particular emphasis. They may however appear in more elaborate μέν-conclusions (such as 14.4 and 130.1) or ο&-sentences. Thus the final ο&-sentence that records the capture of Croesus (86.1) is a considerably expanded version of the essential formula. Because of the emphasis in form and contents of the three participial clauses that summarize in different ways the preceding narrative (ἀργοντα... πολιορκηθε... οὐαπεκαίνην... the first two in chiasmus), this sentence functions as a marked conclusion to the account of Croesus' reign, wholly equivalent in strength..."""
and scope to a μέν -statement such as that concluding the story of Astyages (130.1). 74

The dramatic representation of the last stage of an action at the end of a recognizable narrative unit may also carry the force of a conclusion, as happens in Book I especially in the final sentence of the Croesus - Atys - Adrastus logos:

```
Αδραστος δὲ ὁ Γορδίων τῷ Μίδεω ὤμοι ὁ δὲ
λογαριάς μὲν τῷ ἐνενεμφαλὸς ἀνακοινός τε ἀνακοινός
dὲ τῇ ναυτήρᾳ, ἐπείγε ἐκεῖνη τῶν ἀν
θρώπων ἠφελμένη περὶ τῷ σώμα, καταμνήσθωμεν
ἀνθρώπων ἢν τῶν αὐτῶν ἦδερε ἀπο-
μαρτυρώτας, ἐπίπεδα παραβάζ
τῷ ἄρρητῳ ἐννυπὲν
```

(45.3) 75

Here the accumulated subordinate elements serve primarily to build up the suspense before the main verb and give in a flash the picture of Adrastus' misery, but also they in part repeat and sum up the preceding narrative -- which is the essential element in the contents of those statements that have been termed "conclusions". 76 The combination διὸς σὺ , which picks up and escalates the δὲ , serves precisely to underline and introduce the repetition of known facts. 77

In some narrative sections, a far less deliberate type of ending than a μέν or an emphatic δὲ -sentence is represented by a short descriptive remark or by a notice on later events (flash-forward or follow-up) 78 inserted after the report of the main action. 79
Such additions, with \( \delta \), \( \mu \), \( \gamma \), are common and occur also before or within a conclusion (85.4, 130.1, and 2). In the absence of a concluding statement they merely provide a slight pause before the transition to the next section.

Other particles

\( \gamma \)

The particle \( \gamma \) is frequently used as connective at the beginning of a narrative or descriptive passage which starts as an explanatory expansion of a more general preceding statement. For example:

\[ \text{Περιέχων μέν νυν οἱ λόγοι Φοίνικας φασι γενέσθαι αἵτινες τῆς ἐθνοσφορῆς. τότε \( \gamma \) ἀπὸ τῆς ἴρυθρος καλεομένος θαλάσσας ἀπιπομένους (1.1) } \]

In general the statement from which the \( \gamma \) -clause originates anticipates the results of the discussion that follows or announces more or less fully its contents and is in most cases of the type termed earlier as "summary introduction". 80

In 16.2-17.1 the \( \gamma \) -sentence, rather than belonging to the beginning of the narrative proper, represents the last and most specific of three consecutive introductory statements:
The frequent μόνον ἄν combination in conclusions, apparently equivalent to μόνον and μόνον νυν, has been already discussed. In the two instances when simple ἄν after retrospective οὔτω appears at the end of a long concluding passage, it underlines the definitive value of the statement where the outcome of the preceding or earlier narrative is repeated and summed up for the last time.

Also in initial sentences ἄν often emphasizes the repetition of some aspect of the preceding or earlier historical account by reinforcing the connective particle with which it is combined or another element of connection. Thus, in the Janus introduction of 95.1, the combination ἄν ὅτε adds to the emphasis of the whole statement, which marks a new beginning in Herodotus' narrative and which at the same time binds the announced flashback on Cyrus with the former report of Cyrus' role in the Croesus logos. In 188.1 a resumptive statement with δὲ ἄν repeats the beginning of Cyrus' campaign against Babylon (178.1) while at the same time underlining
the connection of Cyrus with the queen Nitocris discussed just above in the intervening insertion. 87

In other initial sentences ἓν is combined with ἐν and by its position may emphasize a whole clause that repeats what has already been said before, as in the resumptive statement at 82.1 (ἐκ τοῦ ἓν ἐν πᾶς ὡς ἐπέμπτε εὐμμαχᾶς). More frequently, however, ἓν ἐν (or ἐν ἓν) 88 occurs after a demonstrative that refers to an object of the preceding discussion or to the entire contents thereof. In such cases ἓν reinforces the connection provided by the backward-looking demonstrative, while ἐν carries forward the narrative. This happens, for example, in the resumptive introduction at 75.1 ("This Astyages whom we have been discussing, then, had been dethroned by Cyrus . . .") and in some other cases when the narrative resumes after an insertion e.g., 69.1, "Having learned all these things that we have just said, then Croesus . . ."). 89 Similarly, after the account of Candaules' genealogy and antecedents (7.2-4), which constitutes a minor insertion within the episode of the change of dynasty in Lydia, 90 the narrative about Candaules and Gyges begins with ὅλεα ἓν ἐν ὅ
καὶ θαλάς (8.1). 91

Asyndeton

On the basis of the instances found in Book I (except, naturally,
for the first sentence, which represents a special case), asyndeton is used in the first or in the only introductory statement that opens a section, or in the initial sentence of a section that starts directly with no introduction, only if these begin with a demonstrative pronoun which clearly refers to something mentioned just before, as in 70.2 (ὅ̑ ἡρίτ η̑). This means that each section is connected at the point of transition with what precedes either by a particle, or at least by a demonstrative pronoun, or by both (as in 184).92

Asyndeton is, on the other hand, frequent in the sentence that immediately follows an introduction,93 at the beginning of the account proper or even (as in 6.1, 17.1, and 194.1) in the second of two consecutive introductory statements. When the first or the only introduction is prospective, i.e. characterized by a forward-looking demonstrative, asyndeton in the next sentence is an almost inevitable phenomenon.94 Other types of introductions may also be followed by asyndeton. After three emphatic programmatic statements, namely, the introductions to the Croesus logos (5.3), to the flashback on Cyrus (95.1) and to the account of the final stage of Cyrus' career (177), the phenomenon is stylistically remarkable because it helps to emphasize a new beginning of the narrative.
Demosntratives

In prospective sentences the forward-looking demonstrative is most frequently a form of ὅς or of ἦνος, but ὅτι is also found. The backward-looking demonstrative in retrospective sentences is in most cases a form of ὅτι, but also of ἔναντι, ἔναντιον and ἔς.

Aside from this particular function, backward-looking demonstratives are the most frequent and least elaborate transitional elements after the particles. They help to connect the beginning of the narrative to its programmatic or summary introduction (e.g., 1.1: Περί έργων μέν χρον ηγείον Φίλι σικας αύτίνας φαίνεται τὴν ἡμέραν, see also 15, 16, 24.1), or the introduction or initial sentence of a section to the preceding narrative. The presence of a demonstrative pronoun that refers to an element of the preceding narrative in a concluding statement (often a retrospective statement with its own retrospective demonstrative) makes the conclusion less specific. Thus, a tag like τῷ μὲν δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐξτι (95.3) does not help to identify the topic just discussed and could occur anywhere. For less inexpressive examples of conclusions with backward-looking demonstratives, see 140.3, 169.1, 171.1, 173.1, 187.1, 214.1.

A demonstrative adjective may accompany the transitional noun or proper name at the beginning of an insertion (e.g., 70.2 ὅτι, κοινή, see also 70.2, 142.1, 171.2) or as we have already
partially seen it may connect the resumption of the narrative to the immediately preceding insertion (8.1, 30.1, 59.1, 69.1, 75.1, 96.1, 103.1, 175, 204.1).

As a result, narrative frequently shifts from the past tense of historical narrative to the present. Verbs such as ἔγγισα, ἔρχομαι, ἐρμαίνομαι, ἔστιν, and the first person present indicative of verbs of knowing, saying, writing, containing, etc., in the first person indicative future.

The change from the present tense indicates a shift in the historical narrative to another description, or which are introduced by expressions such as "there are", "such are", "there are", "they have", etc., as ἔγγισα, ἔρχομαι, ἐρμαίνομαι, ἔστι, ἔστιν, ἔστιν, ἔστιν, ἔστιν, ἔστιν, ἔστιν, ἔστιν, ἔστι

In the historical narrative, transitions between the different sections coincide with the end of an action and the beginning of another, and are variously expressed by the form and meaning of verbs.
Verbs

Form and meaning

Past and present

Herodotus' report frequently shifts from the past tenses of historical narrative to the present. Forms such as γέγονε, φας, γέγονε and the first person present indicative of verbs of knowing or learning, frequent throughout the account, may introduce or conclude a section. Programmatic transitions on the other hand are characterized in most cases by a verb of saying, writing, mentioning, etc., in the first person indicative future.95

A change from a past to the present tense occurs with the insertion of descriptive passages about monuments, customs and other permanent phenomena which proceed directly from the historical narrative or from another description, or which are introduced by expressions like "there are", "such are", "these are", "they have", etc., with εἰμί, καὶ ὁμαλ, ἑκ, παρέχομαι, κατίστημι, φορέω,96 and concluded in a similar manner.97 The concluding statement may take the form of a dismissal with the third person imperative (εἴρηκο, ἔχε ὑμῖν),98

In the historical narrative, transitions between two different sections coincide with the end of an action and the beginning of a new one, and are variously expressed by the form and meaning of verbs.
Verbs in conclusions

A statement may conclude a section simply by summarizing its contents (e.g., 76.4, καὶ τὰ μὲν στρατεύσα ἀμφότερα ἤγγικ ἡμείνας or by the definitive expression ἤγγικ ἐσχέ attached to the indication of the subject matter or stage of the action just covered (e.g., 92.1, κατὰ μὲν δὴ τὴν ἱστορία τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ ἰονία τὴν πρώτην καταστολὴν ἐσχέ ἤγιο

In other cases the conclusion of a section may already suggest the beginning of a new stage of the action and prepare the transition to the next narrative unit. Thus the change that an event just described has brought about may be emphasized by an ingressive aorist, as in 130.3: ἤγιον τὸν Αἰαῖν ἥρκο ("started to rule"). Similarly, in some conclusions of campaign reports, the resulting state of enslavement and conquest, rather than simply the end of the preceding action, is emphasized by means of a pluperfect. For example: ἠρίστοι μὲν δὴ ὑπὸ Πόρσεις ἐσθαλων ("were enslaved from then on"). This tends to happen in definitive statements, which mark an important pause in the narrative, like the last conclusion of the Croesus and Lydian logos just quoted, the conclusion of the narrative of the second conquest of Ionia (169.2 ἐσθαλοῦλων) and the conclusion of the Babylonian campaign logos (191.6, ἀρκέεντο).

The end of a narrative stage is sometimes marked by a verb that records the last action of death or departure in the historical present, as in 33 after the Solon episode (ἀπὸ τῆς πέτας),
in 45.3 after the Croesus - Atys - Adrastus logos (ἐπικαταφάζει) and in several cases after the account of a King's reign (τεχνητά at 25.1, 106.3, and 214.3). 103

Verbs in introductory and initial sentences

The transition between Kings usually includes for clarity a notice of the fact of the succession at the start of the next King's reign: ἐδείκτησα (16.1, 26.1, 103), παρεδείκτησα (102.1), ἐδείκτησα (107.1). The historical present in initial sentences, as in the last case just cited, seems to carry somewhat greater emphasis than the aorist, heralding the beginning of an important and detailed narrative (see ἀπίκνεοντα at 29 and ἀπίκνεσα at 35.1 cited just below). Campaign narratives are often not preceded by an introduction. Their beginning may be indicated by a verb of "attacking" in the incohesive imperfect (75.1 ἐπηκαταστάθησα, 171.1 ἐποίησα καταστάθησα, 178.1 ἐπηκαταστάθησα, 188.1 ἐπηκαταστάθησα), 104 while preparations sections before a campaign report proper tend to start with verbs of planning in the aorist or imperfect (e.g., 46.1, ἐπελέγχεται ἄνα ἐπεισοδία). 105

Expressions such as "So and so was" or "There was a man" indicate the point where the narrative starts anew with the introduction of its protagonist (e.g., 6.1 Κροίος τόν Λυδίκα μὲν γένος). 106 Less emphatically, at the beginning of dramatic sections, a verb of going or arriving often
indicates the entrance of a character upon a definite setting (27.2 ἀπελοίμενον; 29-30.1 ἀπεικόνισεν... ἀπελοίμενος... τεῦχον 35.1 ἀπελευθέρωσεν; 86.1 ἡ λαυροῖ)

A narrative section may be introduced by a statement that summarizes the following actions by a formula such as ὅποιον αὐτῷ ὅποιον τὸ ἔργον τὰ ἔτη τοῦ... (85.1), or in more specific terms (e.g., ἔπος ὅποιον ἡμών ὑπεράναι... , 84.1)107 In these introductions the verb may be an especially meaningful element as in the case of ἐπανδιάλεγον (16.2) which combines with a celebratory expression to signal the beginning of an important account. 108

Verbs of becoming and changing are often markers of explanation of an event and in Book I indicate the transition to an earlier time with respect to that of the surrounding narrative:

7.1 ἐν καιρῷ ἐγενότατον... 65.2 μετέβαλεν... 96.1... ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπηρεάσα ἐπειρήσουν 73.2... ἐνώπιον γαμήλων καί χάριν ἐκείνη... 73.2... ἐνώπιον γαμήλων καί χάριν ἐκείνη... 80.1... ἐνώπιον γαμήλων καί χάριν ἐκείνη... 80.1... ἐνώπιον γαμήλων καί χάριν ἐκείνη...

Participles, especially in the aorist, and subordinate clauses, as we have already mentioned before, fulfill an important connective function in transition, especially when in introductions or initial ἐν-sentences they summarize the preceding narrative or the narrative before an immediately preceding insertion. 109 Participles and subordinate clauses with this function often refer to a previous conquest (95.1, 141, 171.1) since the ends of campaigns are regularly
important breaking points in the narrative of Book I. On the other hand, in conclusions where the main clause summarizes the outcome of the action that has just ended, or in final sentences that record the final stage of the action, or in resumptive introductions where the main clause repeats one element of the preceding actions, participles and subordinate clauses may recall different aspects of that action and in many cases serve the purpose of special emphasis.
Herodotus' intrusions throughout the account of the Histories with the first person singular, or plural for singular, of verbs and pronouns, are mainly of two different types. Programmatic introductions and conclusions are by definition transitional statements in which the author personally intervenes to announce or to dismiss a subject. Evaluations of truth, on the other hand, may express at any point of the report, in transition or along the narrative itself, Herodotus' own opinion, positive knowledge or uncertainty about specific facts, or his belief of disbelief in the veracity of certain reports. Since evidently the use of λέγει, φαίνεται, λέγωτα, etc., a frequent ingredient of transitions but pervasive throughout, may either bring about or just imply this second type of personal intrusion, it will be discussed in connection with it.

In the two most important transitions of Book I other than the proem (5.3 and 95.1), the programmatic statement and the evaluation of truth are combined. After a retrospective sentence which concludes the discussion on the mythological causes of the East-West conflicts Τῶν Μέν ὑπὸ Πέρσας θεοῦ καὶ Φοινίκης λέγει Herodotus announces his own program for the beginning of the narrative and his criterion in the long range for the Histories as a whole:
In this entire statement heralding the overall organization of Herodotus' work from its particular initial motif (γάρ... ὑπάρξαντα ἄδικον ξύλον ἐς πολλὰς Ἑλληνικὰς Ἐπιμνήματα Ἑπτακόντα) to its general contents (Περὶ Τίνων... ὁμοίως εὐμελῶς καὶ μερικὰ ἄστεα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεζηών... Ἑπιμνήματα... ὁμοίως), the summarizing elements rephrase and specify in reverse order those of the proem (τὰ γενόμενα ἐς ἀνθρώπων... ἕκατο μέρα ἐκ λαοῦ Ὀμαράτα... τῷ τε ὅτι ἔδη τὰν αὐτίν...)

The substance of the last passage (5.4) even confirms the idea implied earlier (μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐς ἀνθρώπων τῷ κρόνῳ ἐξίσυν ρέγναται μήτε ἐρρά μερόλα ἐκ Ὀμαράτα... ἀκραία γέννατα) that the direct manifestations of greatness do not last, except that the emphasis is here no longer on the oblivion of facts due to the changes that take place with the passing of time but on the
process of change itself as an historical necessity. The reference
to cities great and small translates in historical terms the
philosophical idea that human destiny is based on reversal of fortune,
a unifying theme of the Histories henceforth emphasized implicitly
through the narrative of specific events and stated in general only
in dramatic speeches.116 In a unique occurrence due to the preliminary
character of the statement at 5.4, Herodotus formulates directly in
his own voice a general interpretation of history claiming personal
knowledge and experience as a guarantee of its validity
(ἐπιμελομένος), for the purpose of emphasizing and
explaining an aspect of his general program of inclusiveness
(ἐνίμνησομαι).

The first part of the introduction quoted above (5.3) combines
elements that more closely reflect the two different types of first
person intervention predominant in the rest of Book I: evaluation of
truth with regard to information on specific facts and the announcement
of a specific report. In this transition the first decision deter-
mines the second: Herodotus' dismissal of the preceding discussion
(οὐκ ἐχομεν ἔφεσον) already implies as a reason his
aporia with regard to those mythological traditions, while the new
starting point of the narrative is chosen precisely because it reaches
as far back as possible (πρῶτον), but within the range of known
facts (δὴ διὰ). Thus Herodotus' desire for historical
accuracy, in the moment in which it emerges in the Histories for the
first time, emerges as a factor of the selective process. As for the
mythological version that Herodotus has nevertheless included before rejecting it as part of his own account, it will be considered later. 117

In the next fundamental introduction of Book I, at the beginning of the Cyrus logos, a programmatic statement first announces and justifies the subject matter of the narrative and then an autonomous evaluation of truth seems to express especially, as in 5.3, a criterion of Herodotus' selectivity:

\[ \text{This passage, like the earlier one that has just been examined, shows how Herodotus intervenes in first person to formulate, and take full responsibility for, answers to problems of composition and exposition. In this case the first question concerns the inclusion of an account of Cyrus' background and beginnings ("who he was") into the structure of the Histories. "My λόγος requires such an account and it requires it at this point", 118 says Herodotus (as he had said "not yet but later on" in 75.1), between the narrative of the conquest of Lydia and the report of what happened in Asia after } \]
that. This is a major structural decision, like that of beginning the Histories with Croesus, and Herodotus emphasizes it and also explains it by establishing the appropriate relationships among the different events thus arranged.119

If inclusion and organization are the concerns expressed in the first sentence of 95.1, the problem of truthfulness emerges from the second statement as affecting to some extent the contents of the narrative that follows. In the first place here truthful reporting is implied as Herodotus' permanent aim. In saying that, although he knows different versions of the story, he will write according to those few sources "who do not want to magnify the facts regarding Cyrus but to tell the truth," the historian sets appropriate limits to his goal to preserve and celebrate — announced in the proem and evident throughout the Histories120 — just as in 5.3 he had let the requirement of historical accuracy limit the scope of his investigation of first causes. A later passage at 122.3 gives in fact an idea of the type of material that Herodotus was determined to omit.

In 95.1 however Herodotus cannot contrast his own ὅσα with the sources' λέγουσι because with regard to the great part of the required subject matter — the early story of Cyrus — a remote (Περσέων) and complex tradition (ἅλλας λόγος ὁδοὺς) is the only basis of investigation, much like for the question dismissed earlier of the original causes of the East-West conflict. The author defends in advance his report and interpretation of Cyrus, which could indeed appear extraordinary121 by
guaranteeing the objectivity of his sources rather than their knowledge of facts or his own. The whole statement stresses the unverifiable character of the material as well as Herodotus' deliberate acceptance of tradition, provided it be untendentious, as the source for a section of narrative which, as the author himself has just stated, his narrative requires.

Other evaluations of truth and use of ἡγοῦσθοι

The same problem of historical accuracy in the report of certain facts of Cyrus' life and the same attitude of critical receptivity of tradition are reflected in the retrospective sentence at the end of the entire narrative about Cyrus:

τὰ μὲν οὖν ὅτι λατα τὴν Κύρη περευτὰν τὼ ζῶον πολλῶν λόρων λεγομένων ὥσμοι 
πιθανώτατος ἐρμήσαι

Here πολλῶν λόρων λεγομένων corresponds to ἡγοῦσθοι in 95.1 and ὅ πιθανώτατος... ὡς Περσέων μετεξέτεροι λέγοισιν... ἐκλόμενοι ἐν ἐόσια λέγον λόρον. The conclusion refers only to the brief account of Tomyris' revenge after the notice of Cyrus' death (214.4-5), just as the statement at 95.1 refers to the narrative of the circumstances that led to Cyrus' enthronement, namely his birth, survival and upbringing. In including these events Herodotus emphasizes his total dependence on tradition, albeit the one which he himself has
judged to be the most trustworthy among many different versions. While in 5.3 the impossibility of verifying tradition has made the inquirer disregard a time for which no other type of information was available, in the account of Cyrus the data of tradition which in themselves may or may not be absolutely true, combine with known historical facts -- campaigns, conquests, policies and diplomacy -- and complement their report.

Other cases in Book I indicate, even more clearly than the passages examined so far, that while Herodotus considers it part of his task as a researcher to intervene in the narrative and distinguish true and false or probable and unlikely information, his assessments do not express mainly or at all a principle of selection. In these cases, in fact, Herodotus does not omit or even shortly dismiss the unreliable stories, but on the contrary he shows that he has chosen to record \( \tau \alpha \ \varepsilon \rho \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu \) independently from the question of their historical veracity - a choice which, as Herodotus himself will state at II 123.1, corresponds to a deliberate plan with regard to the whole work. Evaluations of truth, therefore, when they accompany the report of a condemned version, actually serve the purpose of inclusiveness: they allow the serious historian, committed to being accurate on what really happened or is, to broaden his subject matter by relating legends and conjectures side by side with the facts which he is able to deem certain. The reasons behind this particular aspect of Herodotus' inclusive tendency usually emerge clearly from the examination of the particular instances.
Thus in the introductory and concluding statements of the first section of the Persian ethnography (131-140) Herodotus claims personal knowledge (οἶδα, ἄφηλενέως ἔξω... σιδώκ σιπῆν) of the customs listed there; another less verifiable practice is discussed separately (140) but included in the report nevertheless, no doubt because it represents a striking deviation from Greek customs in an area as sensitive as that regarding the treatment of the dead. 123

More important, in the introduction of the narrative of Croesus' invasion of Cappadocia, Herodotus states that he does not believe the popular Greek story of how the Lydian army managed to cross the Halys, but then he proceeds to tell it anyway:

In this statement Herodotus expresses the antithesis between the sources' version of facts and his own opinion as forcefully as in 5.3 he had opposed against each other the account based on legend and his own based on knowledge. Here however the author reverses the order of the elements with respect to that earlier passage and gives emphasis to
the tradition rather than to what he believes to be \( \delta \varepsilon \iota \nu \nu \lambda \omicron \omicron \). At the end of the episode he even adds a variant which he equally rejects in explicit terms.\(^{124}\) After making clear the distinction between truth and legend, Herodotus accepts the latter for what it can contribute to the narrative, namely for the interpretation it provides -- the general Greek interpretation, \( \delta \nu \iota \lambda \omicron \omicron \ \lambda \omicron \omicron \omicron \nu \) of the bare historical event of Croesus crossing the Halys. Herodotus considers this interpretation valid, if not the literal substance of the tradition. The story of how the Lydian King bent and divided, or totally dried up, the course of the river because there were as yet no bridges (i.e., the two empires were separate) makes the idea of violation of natural boundaries immediately conspicuous for the first time in the Histories. As a secondary element, the role of Thales in the episode recalls the Greeks' allegiance to Croesus\(^{125}\) and Croesus' own adoption of Greek methods and resources\(^{126}\) as well as the broader theme of the intellectual superiority of Greeks over barbarians.\(^{127}\) Herodotus uses tradition in the same way as the poets use myth even while he writes history. By emphasizing his disbelief, he safeguards his integrity as a researcher and at the same time also indicates the symbolic value of the story not only for this specific occasion but as a point of reference for later ones.\(^{128}\)

Herodotus' acceptance of false or irrelevant traditions in these terms also partially explains the rather lengthy passage on the remote
causes of the East-West conflict (1-5) introduced, concluded, and punctuated by \( \phi \alpha \kappa \iota \) and \( \mu \varepsilon \gamma \upsilon \chi \iota \) \(^{129}\) and then, as we have already seen, curtly dismissed by the author himself. That passage in the first place represents a deliberate false beginning of the historical narrative which serves to illustrate the limits set to Herodotus' inclusiveness by his chosen method of inquiry. But if the rehash of mythological material appears to constitute for the researcher an unproductive approach to the question of the origin and first causes of historical events, \(^{130}\) the tradition that bases itself on that approach is shown to contribute a general interpretation which will perhaps be confirmed by a proper analysis of known facts.

Herodotus declines to deal with the specific data which the Persian \( \mu \omicron \omicron \iota \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \omega \) provide -- a series of rapes of women which eventually led to the Trojan War. But the idea inherent to the report that a first (minor) offense generated a chain of retaliations which led at a certain point to a disproportionate reaction, the initiative of the actual conflict, identifies a plausible type of historical development. Herodotus therefore sets it forth at the beginning of his work as a preliminary hypothesis which he will attempt to verify in his inquiry into historical events and integrate into a more complex and intelligible causality of the Persian Wars. \(^{131}\)

The discussion at 1-5.3 introduces the theme of revenge in the Histories. Through this account and through the legendary episode of how Croesus crossed the Halys, tradition has a similar role and purpose in the narrative of the Histories: it provides its object of
report with a general meaning which is transferable to the historical reconstruction of events because, paradoxically, that meaning emerges more clearly from an account which may be false in its specific contents than from the true version achieved by inquiry. In each case the role of tradition may be expressed schematically as follows:

1) 75.3-6. Fact: Crossing of the Halys. Problem: How Croesus crossed the Halys.
   Tradition: He divided the course of the river (false)
   Herodotus: He crossed over the bridges violation ➔ violation

2) 1-5.2. Fact: East-West conflict. Problem: How did it start.
   Tradition: rapes of women led to the Trojan war (irrelevant, maybe false)
   Herodotus: from Croesus onward series of retaliations revenge motif
           from a first violation

By attributing to his sources particular information along the narrative, or entire reports in introductory or concluding statements, Herodotus puts some distance between the fact mentioned and the reader, and shares with the latter the process of his inquiry in a similar way as when he expresses independently on the basis of the evidence his own opinion, aporia and conjecture.132 Expressions with ἐπίθετοι, φασί,
\( \text{\textit{έρεταλ}} \) etc. may serve to identify specifically the source of a given information\(^{133} \) or to indicate the lack of direct knowledge on a certain matter.\(^{134} \) The report thus presented may be consequential as a claim\(^ {135} \) or characterize the sources themselves,\(^ {136} \) confirm Herodotus' own observation\(^ {137} \) or be part of a discussion.\(^ {138} \) In certain cases \( \text{\textit{λέγουσι}} \) enters the narrative unobtrusively, like \( \text{πως ὁ Ὀλυμπίος} \), and merely reflects the practice of \( \text{προσφέρεται} \).\(^ {139} \)

However sometimes the reference to the sources, even if it is not combined in antithesis with Herodotus' statement of disbelief or uncertainty, appears nevertheless to be cautionary and indicates that the author declines to take full responsibility for the veracity of the report. Thus, both the introduction and the conclusion of the Arion episode (23, 24.8), similar to the reference in 75.3 to \( \text{διὸ ποῦ λογος τῶν Ἑλλήνων} \), emphatically identify the story as the object of a unanimous local tradition, so well established that it has even produced a tangible memorial. The insistent use of \( \text{λέγουσι} \) in these summarising statements and in the narrative itself (especially in the moment of its prodigious climax, 24.8) implies a measure of agnosticism on the author's part with regard to the veracity of the report, and contributes with other elements to set the Arion story on a different level with respect to the rest of the narrative: \(^{140} \) Herodotus signals here, as on other occasions examined earlier (1-5, 95.1, 75.3), the inclusion in his history of information which may be false but which is of great interest and importance nevertheless. Explicit evaluations of truth or passages
that imply a critical attitude with regard to his material indicate that the author keeps clear the distinction between history and myth, between what is true and what might be true, but also show that he claims both as suitable subject matter of his exposition.

Other programmatic statements

Selective μεν...δε-type

Programmatic statements for the most part confront directly the dual problem of inclusiveness and selectivity as they clarify in explicit terms the immediate organization of the narrative. Of the two passages already considered, 5.3 delimits the scope of the inquiry by providing a precise setting and time as a starting point from which Herodotus' narrative will proceed forward. The criteria which determine this starting point are specific: Herodotus re-establishes as the initial focus of his report the question formulated in the proem of the origin of the East-West conflict but he dismisses once and for all any discussion in the area of prehistorical mythology. In the subsequent programmatic interventions of Book I that include a dismissal and an introduction according to the pattern of 5.3, inclusiveness and selectivity are justified in far broader and less immediately intelligible terms on the basis of the assumption that the Histories are a report of great and wondrous achievements and that the observation of greatness in any connection bears a permanent relevance to Herodotus' report. Thus in the
statement at 14.4-15.1 Herodotus dismisses a topic and announces a new one in the following manner:

"Ἀλλὰ οὐδὲν ἔρρησεν μᾶλλον ἀμύντινον ἢ γὰρ γὰρ ἔρρησεν ἡ ἀρχήν τῆς παραφήγουσας ἡμῶν διάταξις εἰς τὴν ἑωτίαν μὴν παρέχομεν ὡς ἑτοιμασινεύσαντες. Ἀρδυνος δὲ γὰρ Κύρος μὲν ἅπαν χαῖρεν εὐδοκιμάτω τοίς κοιμηθέντες.

By marking here the transition from the passage on Gyges' reign that had followed on the change of dynasty episode (14.1) to the mention of the next king, this statement establishes the organization of the narrative according to a chronological sequence that will account for each stage of development. Herodotus expresses a criterion of selectivity within this sequence but does not indicate specifically the direction and the limits of his report. The account of Cyrus' campaigns in upper Asia is emphasized at the outset by a similar antithetical statement that defines the contents of the narrative on the broad basis of what is "most worthy of mention":

Τὰ μόνα μὲν λόγω τῆς Ἀσίας Ἀχααιῶν ἀναστὸν ἐποίησε τὰ δὲ ἄλλα αὐτῶν κύρος... τὰ μόνα μὲν αὐτῶν πλέον παρέχομεν, τὰ δὲ οἱ παρέχοντες τὰ πόλειν ἀπείρον λαὶ ἦλθαν τὴν ἑωτίαν ἁπάντως ἐκλήσθε τῷ ἔρρησεν εὐδοκιμάτω τοῖς κοιμηθέντες.
Inclusive δέ-type

The other programmatic statements found in Book I contain no dismissal and focus entirely on the announcement of a new topic stressing its deliberate inclusion in the narrative. The statement at 95.1, as we have already seen, justifies the introduction of a new topic by identifying it as directly pertinent to the historical account. The same is true for the introduction at 192.1 to a descriptive insertion where Herodotus declares that he will illustrate the power of Babylon. The observation of greatness provides in this case the specific connection with the preceding narrative.

On the other hand, inclusiveness on the basis of what is in general relevant to the Histories or, to use Herodotus' terminology, "worth mentioning" is implied in 179.1 where the author expresses the need to extend with additional information the description of Babylon's walls (δὲ δὲ μὲ ἱστοὶ Πύργοι ἑτὶ φάτας ...). The latter case shows how, although programmatic interventions carry a certain emphasis and therefore tend to occur in major transitional statements jointly with other emphatic elements, Herodotus displays the same process of deliberation with regard to the inclusion of material at any point of transition.

To a far greater extent than other types of introductions and conclusions, programmatic statements express the author's deliberate choice and show him exercising control over the contents of his work. This is particularly evident when his intervention to announce what
he is going to talk about next is underlined by a value judgment that justifies the inclusion in subjective form:

\[ \text{'de apóvnon ūmò μήριαν μοί ἐστιν} \\
\text{τῶν αὐτῶν μεδό το αὐτίων ην} \\
\text{πόριν ἐγχώαθα φάσσω (194.1).} \]

Also here, as in the μέν... δὲ statements quoted above, Herodotus does explicitly assume the category of the remarkable as the permanent object of his report, but the intrusion is twofold and further emphasizes that the focus of the account at any given moment is entirely dependent upon the author's personal choice of what is worth mentioning. Later on in the course of the Babylonian ethnography customs are classified according to Herodotus' own opinion (196.1 \[ \text{μαθαὶ} \\
\text{γνώμην τὴν ή μοι ἔχειν} \]). Similarly in the list of Persian customs the transition between two different areas is in one case determined by the author's praise.\(^{143}\)

Back references

The last programmatic statement to be considered is unique among introductions of all types because it does not identify a subsequent report as a unit by mentioning its subject matter but only defines its place in the structure of the account:

\[ \text{καὶ ἀμβῇ μὲν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἔχειν... ἔγιναι δὲ ἐπὶ} \\
\text{φών πεότικαν ἁρόν (140.3).} \]

Although the whole transition formally reproduces the pattern
dismissal-announcement common in programmatic statements, it is entirely mechanical since its two parts are not logically related and complementary as they were in the cases examined before. The sentence rather connects the beginning of the next section of chronological narrative with its antecedent before the interrupting insertion, and has therefore a function which in other transitions of this type is normally fulfilled by a resumptive conclusion, or only by a subordinate clause summarizing the previous account within the initial sentence of the new section. The connection provided by such a subordinate clause in 141.1 (ὡς οἱ Λυσίωνία ἔνατος ἠκατοντάραξα οὗτος ἦπεν Περσέως) is rendered more explicit and deliberate by the preliminary reference to the πρὸτερος μόρος which announces the continuation of the narrative suspended after the conclusion at 94.7 (Λυσίωνία μὲν δὴ ὑπὸ Περσης ξεδεδύσων, already resumptive, after the Lydian appendix). At the end of the flashback on Cyrus (130.3) Herodotus had already reverted to that same point with a reminder of Cyrus' conquest of Croesus underlined by ὡς εἴρηναι μοι πρὸτερος.

The passage at 140.3 represents the last stage of the lengthy and complex transition between Croesus and Cyrus, which starts already at 86.1 and is exceptionally underlined by a whole series of insertions (92-94, 95-130, 131-140). By intruding personally in the account to draw attention to its structure, Herodotus is here trying to achieve maximum clarity in the connection of the several pieces of historical narrative. In general, however, for joining together
distant parts of his subdivided and interrupted historical account, Herodotus relies on patches of repetition rather than, as in this case, on the visible seams of explicit back references. Also auxiliary expressions like "as I have said before" found in 130.3 are remarkably rare in transitional statements that summarize earlier narrative.

Forward references

Subordinate or parenthetical clauses that carry an explicit forward reference along the narrative or in transitions are also used sparingly. These represent however a more important phenomenon than backward references because they are not mainly a device of clarity but serve to justify a temporary selection by expressing a specific choice of the author with respect to the organization of the material.

The statement in 73.2 that Croesus wanted to avenge Astyages who 1) was his brother-in-law and 2) had been conquered by Cyrus, leads to an insertion explaining "how Astyages became Croesus' brother-in-law" (73.3-74), and requires for Herodotus an account of the circumstances of Astyages' dethronement as well, or at least provides an opportunity for such a report. But after explaining the first item Herodotus mentions again the second only to say that he is going to talk about that later: "Well, then, Cyrus had conquered this Astyages, his own grandfather.
The temporary selection is consistent with Herodotus' preconceived plan to focus first on Croesus and then on Cyrus, keeping the two accounts as far as possible separate. The reasons for that plan, and the reasons why the story of Astyages' fall and of Cyrus' accession to the throne do not belong in an insertion within the Croesus *logos* on the same plane as that on the origin of Croesus' bond with Astyages, will become perfectly clear only with the introduction at 95.1 and with the subsequent narrative. But at this point Herodotus' bare statement of his choice with respect to the organization of the historical account acknowledges the waived opportunity and the gap which contrary to his method the author has left in the present report.

The other two forward references in Book I reflect Herodotus' problem of how to distribute along the narrative of the Medo-Persian expansion all the information that he wanted to include about the Assyrians. In the compressed survey of Median kings, the wars of Phraortes and Cyaxares against Nineveh (102.2-103.2) are described as briefly as the other Median campaigns of conquest, but in mentioning the capture of that Assyrian city Herodotus promises a more detailed report at another time (καὶ τὴν Νινον ἐμοὶ, ωὲ δὲ ἐμοὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ μόροις εἰμινεῖν, 106.2). The later far more important account of Cyrus' Assyrian campaign comprises an insertion on Babylon of considerable length (178-187). The subject of the city's architecture leads Herodotus to turn his attention to its builders, the kings who contributed to that achievement:
This summary introduction makes a transition from the general to the particular, from all the rulers who adorned Babylon to the two queens that are here singled out as the topic of discussion. From this new point of view the next report continues the description of Babylon and bears even stronger factual and thematic connections with the narrative of Cyrus' campaign and to the Cyrus logos in general than the preceding part. The account of Nitocris' works is first of all necessary to the reader's understanding of Cyrus' operations. On the thematic level, the works of both Semiramis and Nitocris have to do with mastery over the river, a dangerous privilege which Oriental monarchs of Herodotean narrative are wont to arrogate for themselves, most particularly starting with Cyrus. The mention of both Babylonian queens also emphasizes the motif of the female opponent which Herodotus has already introduced earlier with the character of Candaules' wife (8-13) and which he will bring back recurrently throughout the Histories to explore the idea of wisdom and manly fortitude. Here Nitocris, represented as the true adversary of the Persian aggressor (see in 187 the story of her άνδρασ at the expense, as it happened, of Darius), in role and personality
anticipates in a special way Tomyris of Cyrus' last campaign, and
more indirectly the other queens who will enter the narrative later
on -- the Egyptian Nitocris, Atossa, and Artemisia.

The contents of the report at 184-187 reveals why Herodotus
considered the two queens of Babylon particularly worthy of attention
at this point in his history of the Persian empire in relation to
Cyrus' last successful campaign. As for the many other rulers
mentioned collectively in the introduction, they also contributed
to the magnificence of the city and Herodotus here implies that a
report of their achievements especially in this area would have been
entirely pertinent to a general description of "temples and walls",
which is what the inserted passage starts out to be. The statement
at 184.1 seems to indicate that Herodotus had a great deal of
particular information on who built what in Babylon, but he chooses
not to use it, at least at this point. The forward reference intends
to justify the selection by announcing that the author had planned
to reserve for the History of Assyria a special chapter later on,
where the survey of Babylonian Kings and their achievements more
appropriately belonged in a broader connection than that on which
it would be dependent at this point. As the author had declined
earlier to include the history of Cyrus in the Croesus logos and the
narrative of the capture of Niniveh in the schematic report of the
growth of Media, intending it, one may assume, for the same Assyrian
logoi which he mentions in 184.1, so at this later point he uses only
a special part of the material which he deems suitable to give
historical dimension to the description of Babylon and claims for the rest a greater relevance to a different part of the *Histories*. If most programmatic statements considered earlier reveal the broad range and the freedom which Herodotus claims with regard to the contents of his narrative, forward references demonstrate a process by which the author regulates the arrangement of his material and assigns to it the prominence it deserves.
Nouns and adjectives

λόγος

As a transitional term, λόγος may refer to what people say -- the legend, the tradition, or a version of facts. With this meaning it appears in Book I in statements where Herodotus also intervenes to evaluate critically his sources (75.3, 95.1, 214.5). Herodotus occasionally mentions his own λόγος or χόροι in first person cross-references to designate a specific section of his work (143.3, πείθερος λόγος; 75.1, 106.2, 184.1, χόροι). The plural form represents an indication of the term's flexibility, since a part of the work that constitutes a narrative or descriptive unit is likely to be composed in turn of smaller units or λόγοι. In the two most important programmatic statements of Book I (5.3, 95.1), λόγος refers to the entire work. In both these passages λόγος is, in the most general and abstract sense, Herodotus' "story", which generates itself as it goes forward in time starting with Croesus (ἐκ πρό-

Throughout the Histories, Herodotus' references to his logos imply, or clearly express, rather than a single goal and subject matter for his entire narrative, a consistent attitude of inclusiveness already reflected in the preliminary statement at 1.5.3 about "cities great and small". Thus, if at 1.95.1 ἐνδήσας...
emphasizes the transition to the important flashback on Cyrus, a similar phrase, which in an entirely different context later on (IV.30.1) justifies the insertion of a minor \( \nu \delta \pi \alpha \) further illustrates Herodotus' broad conception of history.\(^{154}\) As Pohlenz saw, in the first case Herodotus refers to the requirement of his \( \lambda \varphi \) for an explanation necessary to the understanding of a historical development which has direct bearing upon his ultimate focus of the East-West conflict. In the second case, Herodotus' logos is said to require "additions" (\( \pi \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \nu \sigma \eta \uomicron \alpha \) ) insofar as it represents the exposition of a writer and researcher who guarantees for himself the freedom of bringing in, according to his subjective choice, also specific topics that do not appear immediately related to the historical development which he is following.\(^{155}\)

In concluding the account of Gyges' reign Herodotus says that that king accomplished "no other great deed", aside from those mentioned (14.4). On the other hand the section on Alyattes' war against Miletus is introduced by \( \alpha \mu \alpha \ \sigma \varepsilon \ \gamma \nu \alpha \ \alpha \phi \varepsilon - \delta \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \iota \ \alpha \zeta \iota \pi \iota \iota \iota \iota \alpha \tau \alpha \iota \sigma \omicron \) (17.1). This prospective sentence follows a brief list of some of Alyattes' military achievements and introduces what is really the most detailed and important part of the account of Alyattes. At the end of the
historical narrative concerning Croesus, a summary introduction with
announces an additional account of Croesus' offerings in Greece which completes the earlier more prominent description (50-
52) of that King's offerings to Delphi and Amphiaras:

In the two introductions just quoted ἄλλος has inclusive
and connective value. It is part of a summary expression (ἄλλα
ἔφρα, ἄλλα ἀναθήματα) which serves to announce the
subject matter of a new section where a certain series of facts will
be discussed in addition to those of the same kind covered just above
or earlier. This use of ἄλλος to introduce an addition is
also relatively frequent within sections and particularly in
descriptive passages where Herodotus' account proceeds from item
to item. In all these cases ἄλλος is applied to the
object that Herodotus is going to talk about next and establishes its
relationship with others of the same kind previously mentioned.

Selective ἄλλος

In a different type of introductory statement, ἄλλος, ἄλλοι
or πολλοὶ ἄλλοι (with τε λαῖ, δὲ λαῖ, μὲν λαὶ,
μὲν ὦς ἦ) is part of an expression which signifies not "other,
aside from those already discussed", but rather "others . . . and
especially one", i.e., approximately "several, which I am not going
to talk about, at least now, except for one". This use of άλλος, frequent in Herodotus throughout and not confined to transitional statements, has been termed "anticipatory" because it anticipates the idea that a particular object is one among many in a given category, rather than naming the object in question first, and then assigning it to its proper context. In transitions, expressions like ἄλλοι το οὐκ οὐδέποτε lai etc. fulfill both a connective and an emphatic function. On the one hand Herodotus' subject matter in the section that follows is identified as part of a more general area of interest evidently related to the preceding narrative. On the other hand, the combination of particles (τε lai, lai διὰ και, έλ.τ.) serves to bring into relief at the outset the upcoming topic, signaled prominently among others as essential to the present account.

Expressions with anticipatory άλλος give a selective force to introductory statements. The selection conveyed in this manner is in certain cases explicitly temporary, and depends on the author's arrangement of his material. For example in the introductory statement of 184.1 the two queens of Babylon (ἐν δὲ οὐκ λαί πονγιλες δίο ) are singled out as the subject of the immediately following section, while Herodotus promises to mention later the many other rulers (ποσιοι μὲν ίδοι 2,880 lai, lai ).

A somewhat less clear case of temporary selection with occurs in the programmatic and prospective introduction to the Babylonian ethnography:
Here the pronoun ὅς that indicates the element singled out among many refers to the topic of the immediately following section, concluded by a more specific retrospective statement (192.4) and containing the most direct proof of Babylon's power and wealth. The "other arguments" are perhaps represented indirectly, in Herodotus' intention, by part of the remaining ethnographical section (193 on agriculture and 194 on commerce) or possibly they should also have appeared later on in the planned Assyrian logoi.

Differently from the two examples cited so far, the expression with ὅς most often seems to indicate definitive selection: the "other" elements are left out of the narrative that immediately follows, and Herodotus expresses no intention to discuss them at any point later on. Thus within a narrative passage, Herodotus says that the Phoenicians during their long and habitual voyages ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλλῃ [χώρῃ] ἐστιν ὡς ὁ ἁλικαία λεῖα δὲ λαὶ ἐς Ἀγρος (1.1) and that there came to the shore for the purpose of buying the Phoenicians' ware Πόρθεμος ἡ οἰκεῖα τῷ ποταμῷ λαὶ δὲ λαὶ τοῦ οἰκεῖος Νυμφάδα (1.3). The "other" places where the Phoenicians landed and the "other" Argive women who came in contact with them only provide an indistinct background to the storyteller's specific focus. Their mention at the most reflects Herodotus' option, like that of an epic poet, to expand his
story with a wealth of preliminaries and details or to make it as here, shorter and more to the point.

In a somewhat analogous manner Herodotus says that Croesus ἐκ 76-

δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐπερεύετε σύμμαχον, λαοὶ ὑπὶ λαῷ ἐκ Ἀλισσάμων (82.1). This resumptive statement repeats the information given just above (81) of Croesus' second appeal to his allies and prepares the transition to the next section. The singled out element, Ἀλισσάμων, marks a change of setting in the report that follows on the situation of the Spartans at the time of Croesus' appeal and on how they responded to his embassy. On the other hand, nothing is ever said about the response of Croesus' other allies referred to in the passages above (81, 82.1) and identified earlier (77.2).

The selective expression with ἄλλος in this context implies that Croesus' relationship with all of his allies and the facts of his appeals to them indeed belong to the story of the Lydian-Persian war. But for the purposes of his present exposition (purposes as usual undeclared but clear enough in this case), Herodotus wishes to emphasize Sparta and treats the other allies as secondary to such extent that their roles become in fact obliterated. The expression with ἄλλος has selective force, but it also expresses the potential extent of Herodotus' subject at a particular moment of his narrative.

After saying that Cyrus started an expedition against the Assyrians, Herodotus introduces the description of Babylon with the
The progression of thought is here — from the general to the particular — Assyria, great Assyrian cities, Babylon. The last is the best of the great and moreover, as capital of the empire, it is to be Cyrus' specific target (this is implicit but clear), so that Herodotus singles it out for description. The other cities will not be named individually, much less described at this point. However Herodotus mentions their existence as part of Assyria and because they are great, thereby recognizing them by implication as potentially worthy objects of his focused interest, not now but perhaps elsewhere in his work. Of course, in the passage just quoted the emphasis is all on Babylon, Herodotus' next topic, while in 184.1 the emphasis is more evenly distributed between the two queens that Herodotus is going to discuss immediately, and the other Assyrian rulers that he thought would find a place later on in the Histories (but in fact did not). Like the "many other Kings", so the "many other cities" have been de facto permanently excluded from Herodotus' report after the first cumulative mention of their existence. But the introduction at 178.1 does not in itself imply Herodotus' a priori determination to do so, only his
immediate intention with regard to the specific object of the following description.

In conclusion, expressions with διάλογος of the type just considered tend to indicate provisional rather than definitive selection. Introductory statements phrased in this manner reflect a tension between the extent of material suitable in general to the subject matter of the Histories and the need that the author felt to narrow his focus at particular moments of his report.

**Celebratory terms:** superlatives, μέγα εφον, ἀργιαπεριπτός, ἰδίμα, ἀ.λ.ε.

This class of transitional elements includes mostly adjectives and nouns, or combinations of nouns and adjectives by which Herodotus expresses praise of his subject. As some of the statements quoted above show, celebratory terms may cooperate with διάλογος in either its inclusive or selective function to introduce (and in one case conclude) a section. In those instances, while διάλογος establishes relationship, the celebratory term expresses a certain autonomy of the part from the surrounding narrative since it identifies an action or an object as somehow remarkable and worth mentioning in a broader connection. Thus Babylon is singled out for discussion as "the most famous and strongest" among the many great cities of the Assyrians that Cyrus undertook to conquer (184.1). Although the superlative ἐκείνος anticipate the account of Cyrus' difficult siege (190.2), the celebratory introduction brings into
focus the greatness of Babylon as worth describing beyond its specific relevance to the narrative.

In the survey of Croesus’ predecessors (14-22 and 25), the contents indicate that Herodotus’ selection is mostly ruled by the motif of Lydo-Greek relations, so that the narrative at this point follows closely on the beginning of the Histories from Croesus as "the first to make some Greeks his tributaries and other Greeks his allies" (5.3). However, when Herodotus says that Gyges did not accomplish any other great deed (μέγα ἐξακολουθεῖ) and therefore he will go on to the next King (14.4), or when he introduces the account of the Lydo-Milesian war not as a milestone in East-West relations -- which Herodotus thought it was -- but as Alyattes' other ἐξακολουθεῖ worthy of mention (17.1), he is treating the survey of Croesus' predecessors more broadly, as if it were a chronicle of the most remarkable accomplishments of each Lydian King. Herodotus is here keeping his options open, as it were, and pursues the history of Greek-Barbarian relations without locking himself into that approach.

Celebratory words and expressions justify inclusion beyond the immediate connection of a part to the surrounding narrative, and in general seem to reflect a different and pervasive criterion of composition based on the observation of greatness. But when Herodotus points to an object of discussion and qualifies it at the outset as worthy of mention, it becomes an underlined point of reference in the Histories as a whole, even though the praise itself does not
clarify its significance.

The narrative of the Lydo-Milesian war reveals implicitly a number of reasons why Herodotus would stress this series of events as being διὰ τῆς Μιλήσιας, aside from the historical importance of their outcome.165 The same superlative stresses the transition to the account of Cyrus' last important campaigns (177). Here Herodotus' declaration that among the people conquered by Cyrus he will only mention those who gave him the most trouble (Πόνον Προσέχοντα) is specific and expresses the principle of selection already apparent in the preceding narrative of Harpagus' campaigns.166 But the term διὰ τῆς Μιλήσιας lends itself to a broader interpretation and justifies in advance the inconclusiveness of Herodotus' approach as he considers not only the quality of the peoples' resistance but also their character, their civilization, their land and their resources. The elements that make the peoples covered in Herodotus' narrative "worthy of mention" may be strictly relevant to the campaign history or may appear rather autonomous from it,167 but in any case Herodotus deliberately claims them as part of his subject matter and draws attention to them as significant to the Histories as a whole.

The term οὖν μαχα is used to introduce the episode of Arion and the dolphin (23-24) between the account of the Lydo-Milesian war and the notice of Alyattes' death. This story has nothing to do with Alyattes or the Milesians and its only factual link
with the preceding narrative is provided by the mention of Periander in a secondary role as the adviser of Thrasyboulos of Miletus against Alyattes (20). In order to make the transition to the episode of Arion after the conclusion of the war narrative, Herodotus first goes back to Periander restating who he was and recalling the Periander-Thrasyboulos connection:

This is only the first step of the transition to a story which however is not about Periander although it relates to him. The second step is represented by a summary introduction announcing the contents of the story and presenting the character of its protagonist:

The whole transition is particularly laborious because the jump from the Lydo-Milesian war under Alyattes to Arion's adventure is considerable. The episode is relevant to the Histories and has been inserted at this point -- between Alyattes and Croesus -- for a complex
series of thematic reasons. It should be noticed, however, that Herodotus does not, here as elsewhere, explicitly use themes (i.e., the general ideas which the particulars of the narrative symbolize and which reveal the author's interpretation of history) as connective elements between different parts of his work. In the transition to the Arion story the expression \( \mathfrak{ομα μὴται} \) coupled with the praise of Arion himself (\( \text{ὁδένος ἁνάερν, πρώτος} \)) serves by itself to justify the striking change of subject. This is a remarkable story about a remarkable individual and it deserves to be told. The celebratory introduction emphasizes the passage that has come to interrupt the account of events without in any way clarifying its import to the rest of the narrative.

In the case of the Arion episode \( \mathfrak{ομα} \) indicates a surprising and miraculous event. In two ethnographical passages of Book I (on the Lydians and on the Babylonians) \( \mathfrak{ομα} \) is used almost as a technical term, applicable to a broad category of exotic facts that seems to represent a special part of Herodotus' subject matter.

At the end of the Croesus logos, after the description on Croesus' "other offerings" to Greek sanctuaries (92), Herodotus turns his attention towards the country and the people of Lydia. Here the subject matter of two consecutive sections is identified in their particular summary introductions respectively as \( \mathfrak{ομα τά} \) and customs.
Each of the two initial sentences is a denial that Lydia is a land of things unusual, with one exception, and each is followed by a sentence in antithesis introducing, as another exception, an interesting aspect of the Lydian civilization. The two chapters on the Lydians constitute the first ethnography of theHistories. Herodotus' preconceived scheme to include discussions of this sort for the most important peoples that enter the historical narrative emerges from the statements just quoted that so deliberately introduce the ethnographical viewpoint. The author's intention to record what is in some way remarkable about the people in question is also evident here.

In the first introductory statement the term ὑάμα is applied to an uncommon natural phenomenon, which Herodotus does not stop to describe (the golden dust from the Tmolus), as well as to a monument. The latter is also called ἀπὸν μέρισμα, with an
expression used elsewhere in the sense of "great deed", while here it clearly means "big building". Herodotus does not specifically apply the word ναός to customs, but the statement in 94.1 indicates that also in this area Herodotus is on the lookout for something that is unusual, i.e. different from what one meets among the Greeks. In the case of the Lydians Herodotus finds remarkable their ἐξευγήματα rather than their current customs. The inventions of a people are customs that were originally peculiar to them, but that were eventually adopted by others, including the Greeks. Since these contributions to civilization are in themselves a mark of cleverness, they are remarkable, so that when Herodotus introduces an individual character or a community as the first to do something, πρῶτος functions in some cases as a celebratory term and serves to justify inclusion.

The celebratory intent is the main recurrent explicit (and implicit) criterion of organization and inclusiveness in ethnographical and other descriptive passages. Customs are listed as remarkable in the sense that they are peculiar or just different from Greek practices, or because they are both different and especially wise, or even especially shameful. Cities, monuments and other material objects are said to be worthy of mention or worthy to be seen, or singled out as especially so among many, for their strength, size or magnificence. Even though the report of what is remarkable and great in these cases may indirectly support the historical narrative in many different ways, it is presented for the most part as an end
in itself.

Contrary to Lydia, Assyria, to which Herodotus doubtlessly refers in 93.1 (οἶκος ἦν Ασσυρία), is a land of wonders. The abundance of Herodotus' material on this topic can be detected from the frequency of selective statements in various forms introducing and subdividing the two descriptive passages that hang on the account of Cyrus' campaign against Babylon. In the second passage, after discussing the greatness of Babylon's resources and the extraordinary fertility of the land, Herodotus introduces the topic of the round collapsible boats that the Assyrians use to take their merchandise down the Euphrates (194.1). The fact that such primitive vessels are singled out at the outset as the greatest wonder of Assyria after Babylon itself (the greatest of the many great Assyrian cities, built to perfection like no other, according to 178. 1-2), shows how broad and unconventional Herodotus' conception of is. The Assyrian boats are for Herodotus almost as meaningful a demonstration of Assyrian resourcefulness as the whole complex of Babylon's architecture. By this system of commerce the people exploit the river in a legitimate and productive way, without defying or violating it, but rather accepting its nature -- an attitude which is in direct antithesis to that displayed in so many cases in the Histories. Of course Herodotus does not explain the significance of the Assyrian boats in these or in any other terms. The expression Θώμα μετίκος, with the added indication of Herodotus' subjective outlook (μοι), simply
draws attention to the specific phenomenon as an important item in the wide category of the remarkable, which forms the basis for Herodotus' ethnographical reports.

Celebratory terms as transitional elements both in the historical narrative and in descriptive parts of Book I are primarily means of inclusiveness. Insofar as they qualify an object or an event as worth mentioning for its own intrinsic interest, at one level they isolate it, or confirm its already apparent autonomy, from the surrounding narrative. At the same time celebratory terms are means of emphasis that keep re-establishing observation of greatness as a basic criterion of Herodotus' composition and underline the importance of certain parts of his report. The reader is thereby sensitized to the implicit and undeclared meaning of those facts that Herodotus praises, for the surrounding narrative and for the whole.

ΠΡΩΤΟΣ

Differently from its celebratory use mentioned earlier, ΠΡΩΤΟΣ in several cases serves to identify the beginning of a historical development in view of the later events that constitute its subsequent stages and that will be covered later in the narrative. Thus the question in the process of the cause of the East-West conflicts leads to a discussion of who first started the injustice (see 1.2, 4.1). Herodotus begins the narrative anew with Croesus, introduced as ἰὸν... πρώτον ὑπάρξαντα ἀδικων ἔρρων ἐκ τῆς Ἐλιμνᾶς, and as "the first to make some Greeks his tributaries and others his
allies" (6.1). In the conclusion of the Croesus *logos* Herodotus recalls that King's subjection of Ionia as ἱωνίνης ἡν περὶ ἱωνικῆς (92.1). The second and third conquests of Ionia are mentioned in statements concluding later narrative passages (169.1, VI 32). Similarly, the account of Cyrus' Assyrian campaign ends with the retrospective statement "Babylon was thus captured for the second time" (191.6) which refers forward to the second conquest of that city under Darius (III 159.1).

In the flashback on Croesus' predecessors which includes the first beginnings of Lydian history (7.2-4) Herodotus specifies that Gyges was the first barbarian, aside from Midas, to send offerings to Delphi (14.2), while Alyattes was the second of his family to do so (25.2). Thus Croesus' own policy in this area of Lydo-Greek relations is explained by Herodotus as part of the Mermnads' tradition.

In the part of the flashback on Cyrus' antecedents where an account of Median Kings traces the development of that people's monarchical rule, Deioces is said to have been the first to codify the court ceremonial (99.1), while Cyaxares was the first to carry out a complete reorganization of the army (103.1). These two features of the Persian imperial power, and especially the first, which is connected with the monarch's claim to a divine nature, are then traced back not to Croesus, of whom Cyrus was also the heir, but to Cyrus' Median predecessors.

While celebratory ἡΡΩΟC justifies inclusiveness, in
that it brings in a remarkable achievement beyond its immediate connection to the surrounding account, this second use of πρωτομ which could be termed explanatory reflects Herodotus' inclusiveness in going back to the earliest possible beginning of the historical development, and it explicitly contributes to establishing a relationship among events. The two senses are not of course always absolutely distinct. Celebratory διηγομ may in some cases also mark the transition to an earlier time and to a report which explores the antecedents of a phenomenon or of an event described in the preceding or following narrative (see 163.1).
The elements of transition in the Proem, and the meaning and function of the Proem.

The analysis of individual elements of transition provides the basis for examining entire statements and evaluating their substance, i.e., their function and meaning. The first and most important transition of the Histories is represented by the Proem:

The Proem of the Histories may be described as a programmatic prospective introduction which identifies the work as a whole and provides the transition to its initial section. Several important elements that have already been discussed as recurrent in transitions appear here for the first time, namely the author's intervention, celebratory expressions, selection with ἀλλος, and a term that brings the narrative to the origin of an event chosen as a point of reference.

The passage is composed of three interrelated parts. The initial main clause that announces the authorship and defines the nature of the work by terming it an "exposition of research", directly governs the relative clause at the end (with prolepsis), which identifies as an object of the research itself "the reason why Greeks and Barbarians
came to war with one another." These two concise announcements are at once separated and connected by the generic double final clause in the middle, which superimposes a special definition of the aims and contents of Herodotus' work.

The main clause, with the author's name prominent in first position, represents a forceful statement of his double function as researcher and organizer. "Ἡρόδοτος ἦσσαν γραέεως ιστορίαν ὁ πόδα τε ὡς σφήνασίν" signifies that the Histories will reflect Herodotus' own inquiry as well as his chosen display of the material. The numerous later passages already considered in which Herodotus intervenes either to disclose the fact-finding process and to evaluate critically his information, or to express a deliberate choice of inclusiveness, selection, and arrangement are therefore fully consistent with this initial statement where Herodotus assumes at the outset responsibility for both aspects of his work. The last clause of the proem στ' ἦν α' ξιν ὑποκέμμαν ἀνίκειται makes clear that the object of Herodotus' inquiry is a historical development and implies that the war between Greeks and Barbarians will constitute the focus of the report. The term ἀγαθόν serves as a marker of the explanation of an event, as εἰσαγωγή and verbs of changing and becoming sometimes do, and it signals Herodotus' intention to start from the very beginning of the historical development. Αἴτια provides the transition to the first section of the Histories (1-5): there the repeated use of ἀιτία (1.1, 2.1, 4.1) and expressions like ἐστιν ὅμοιον.
Thus the investigation of remote causes (as remote as Herodotus' method allows, 5.3), and the explanation of events through the report of other related events and facts, is established here as a principle of inclusiveness. The history of the war will be covered from its first beginning so as to become thoroughly intelligible. This method is in fact regularly confirmed in the course of Book I where it emerges as an essential feature of Herodotus' coverage of events. 188

However, the history of the East-West conflict, as extensive as it promises to be, is in Herodotus' introduction inserted in a yet broader context. The expression with ἀλλα which here effects the transition to a particular object of investigation indicates, as in other cases already examined, immediate and temporary selection: 189 "... having inquired about other things which may concern us later on, but especially at this moment, the reason why they came to war with one another -- which is where my narrative starts". ἦτα... ἀλα expresses the potential inclusiveness of Herodotus' exposition. It refers implicitly of course to the other aspects and
to the subsequent stages of the history of the East-West conflict that the narrative will come to examine in its progress from the first \( \text{αἰτία} \), but the logical antecedents of \( \text{ἡ ἔρα} \) are represented by "the events of men" and "the achievements great and wonderful of Greeks and Barbarians" mentioned above, autonomously from the promised account of the war.

These expressions define the essential subject matter of the Histories as a whole. In the first place, at the most abstract level \( \text{ἡ τοιχοῦμαι ἐξ ἀνθρώπων} \) identifies mankind as the ultimate focus of Herodotus' interest. The subsequent mention of "Greeks on one hand and Barbarians on the other hand" which anticipates the reference to their conflict, adds spatial dimension to \( \text{ἀνθρώπων} \), and introduces the basic antithesis of the Histories between two different and separate worlds to which Herodotus will impartially direct his attention. In this part of the Proem, as Herodotus comprehends the totality of space, and does not restrict in time his outlook on the past, so he heralds as his subject matter a potentially limitless range of human endeavors. The term \( \text{ἔρα} \) is general as \( \text{ἡ τοιχοῦμαι} \) and may refer to any deed, enterprise or achievement described as a past occurrence or as a permanent result (e.g., a concrete monument). For Herodotus greatness (\( \text{ἔρα μεγαλά} \)) is relative and changeable (see 5.4) and the wonderful (\( \text{ὀμναζόν} \)) also includes what is just beautiful, clever, peculiar, mysterious or unusual from a given point of view, in short anything that is in
must have recalled to each Greek reader II. IX. 189 and Od. VIII. 73. For Homer primarily, but also for Aeschylus and Pindar, to praise individual achievements and preserve their memory implies the recognition that those achievements bear transcendent value and importance as meaningful manifestation of human activity. To celebrate means therefore to represent and -- with a sense of wonder -- to reflect upon the human condition.

Herodotus' claim to that poetic goal justifies his freedom of composition and expands the scope of his inquiry, while in turn the exhaustive analysis of a historical development multiplies the data that serve to describe and exemplify man's destiny. Celebration and explanation, the mutually operative purposes of Herodotus' ἡ istories, represent the two criteria of inclusiveness of the Histories.
any way remarkable -- a category, as we have seen entirely subject
to the author's personal judgment and control.\textsuperscript{194} Drexler's con-
clusion, after noting the general definition of contents in the Proem
and the multiplicity of themes throughout the work, that Herodotus
is no true historian "in our sense" is unclear and unjustified.\textsuperscript{195}
Certainly, however, the relationship which is suggested in the final
clause of the Proem among the individual elements of the report
stands on a different level from the system of factual connections
of cause and effect that Herodotus then promises to pursue for
explaining a specific historical event. The celebratory theme
guarantees and justifies Herodotus' freedom of composition beyond
the history of the East-West conflict, which is in turn a part --
a focal point, but subordinate nevertheless -- of Herodotus' broader
intent.

Erbse has noticed that the celebratory tone and terminology in
the central part of the proem is already anticipated in the main
clause by the expression \textit{ἀπὸ δὲ ἔγερε ἰεροφίνη} which is
patterned after \textit{ἀπὸ δὲ ἔγερε ἔργῳ}.\textsuperscript{196} But the initial
proud definition of the Histories as the result of the author's
scientific and critical effort -- sharply distinct therefore from
the activity of the poet inspired by the Muse, i.e. by tradition\textsuperscript{197} --
stands rather in contrast with Herodotus' emphatic formulation and
assumption in the final clause of what is precisely the task of
poetry when it deals with heroic themes. Herodotus introduces himself
both as a researcher and as a follower of the Epos, and the word
NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. ἕ may also express antithesis (e.g., 5.2, 5.3, 20) or a mixture of continuation and antithesis (177). See J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles (Oxford, 1959), p. 162. I have consulted Denniston throughout this study of particles.

2. See p. 34-39.

3. E.g., 26.1: beginning of the account of Croesus' reign. See p. 186.


6. The two concluding statements without μέν in Book I (130.3 and 169.2) appear at the end of elaborate conclusions each starting with a μέν sentence (see p.31). In the other conclusions there seem to be no difference in meaning and emphasis between simple μέν or οὐκ ἢ μέν and the combinations μέν νυν or μέν ὡς. For example, μέν ὡς is used in statements that mark major breaks in the narrative (92.1, 214.5), but also in several less important transitions (93.5, 156.1, 176.1, 195.1). As Fränkel observes ("Stileigenheit", p.83 n.2) the ὡς in this context signifies 'now it is time to pass on to something else.' A difference in emphasis between μέν and μέν νυν is perhaps perceptible if we compare 5.1 and 5.3. The first statement concludes the first and longer section of the preceding discussion while the second concludes the entire unit.

7. See Fränkel, "Stileigenheit", p. 83 and Müller, Satzbau etc., p.77.

8. I.e., after an insertion. E.g., 24.8-25.1, 164.1, 171.1.

9. E.g., 66.1, 77.1, 78.3-79.1, 120.1, 161.1, 167.3 (with antithesis), 214.1. All these cases constitute minor transitions within the historical narrative for which see pp.123-128.

10. E.g., 173.1, 192.4-193.1, 200. In the last case ἕ indicates an addition to the section on customs after its conclusion (see p. 257).

11. 16.2, 34.1.
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12. 70.2, 178.1.


14. E.g., cp. the episode of the change of dynasty in Lydia (7-14.1), identified at both ends and that of the founding of the Median monarchy (96-100) identified only at the beginning.

15. E.g., 95.1 introduces the long flashback on Cyrus' antecedents while 96.1 announces the short report of a particular event. For concluding statements widely different in scope cp. e.g. 92.1 and 71.1.


17. Pp. 121-165.

18. See e.g. the insertion of Carians, Cauians and Lycians, where only the transition between Cauians and Lycians is marked by a concluding statement (173.1).

19. Of forty μέν conclusions considered in Book I, thirty-five are retrospective sentences.

20. For the demonstratives, see p. 50.


22. See below pp. 57 and 69.

23. Cp. also 5.3, ἀφανεία νόμον εἴχε ἔργα μεν καὶ τοῦτον εἴχε ἔργα, ἔτει ἐν ἀλα (discussed on pp. 57-58), where the end of the preceding discussion is emphasized already within the ἔτε introduction of the next section. On the other hand in 177 the sentence τὰ μὲν ἄνων πλέω παράκολον does not constitute the conclusion of a preceding section but is rather part of a selective statement which introduces and emphasizes the subject matter of the following account. See p. 69.

24. See pp. 149, 255.

25. See also 215.5.

26. Cp. also 163.4, 187.5.

27. For another summary dismissal in Book I, see 140.3 immediately correlative to a programmatic introduction.
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28. 177 represents a less elaborate instance. Here the conclusion to the preceding narrative with μέν νυν is followed by an antithesis with βε. The strictly connected introduction to the next section is a programmatic statement also with antithesis, μέν νυν... βε.

29. See later p. 148 and 191.

30. Also the στογονικά sentence in 130.3 is a resumptive conclusion (see p. 156). Such statements, as well as "resumptive introductions" (defined on pp. 33-34) are means of that compositional technique which W. A. A. Van Otterlo first termed "anaphoric ring composition", in which summarizing statements "take up the broken thread of a narrative interrupted by a digression on matters unrelated to it" (Immerwahr, Form and Thought, p. 57). See also Beck, Ringkomposition, pp. 27-28.

31. Of thirty-six introductory statements considered in Book I, sixteen are prospective, eight are programmatic, ten are summary and two are mixed types, summary-prospective and programmatic-prospective.

32. See pp. 69 - 78 for programmatic statements.

33. 6.1 is an elaborate summary introduction in asyndeton that follows immediately upon a more general programmatic introduction in 5.3. For other emphatic summary introductions see 23, 34.1, 65.1, 184.1.

34. See also 14.1, 94.1 (p. 91), 215.1 (pp. 249-250). In 93.1 the use of Θεοίμα and ἐργον μέντικον as the summarizing terms gives the statement a special importance (p. 90). For other summary introductions see 75.3 (pp. 52 - 66), 163, 56.2 (pp. 194 - 195). 1.1 starts with a summary introduction with μέν that anticipates the antithesis in 5.2. In 17.1 a summary introduction in asyndeton occurs between two prospective sentences. In 194.1 a summary introduction also in asyndeton follows a programmatic statement.

35. E.g., 163.1, 171.1, 201.


37. See 71.1, after the insertion on the Spartan crater, and 75.1 after the flashback on the origins of the Lydo-Median alliance (pp. 140-142, 146-147).

38. See 82.1 and 73.1 (pp. 232, 142-145). The latter resumptive statement is actually placed between two insertions. It leads to the second, narrative, insertion on the origins of the Lydo-Median alliance connecting it to the earlier account of the preparations for the Cappadocian campaign. It only expresses connection with the
preceding insertion (the description of Cappadocia) by repeating the proper name of the country that has been the object of report. In two of the four resumptive introductions of Book I, namely 73.1 and 75.1, the combination ἐν δὲ in place of ἔδει acknowledges the repetition contained in the statement as preliminary to what follows. For resumptive introductions as elements of the so-called anaphoric ring-composition, see above n.30.

39. E.g., 196.1, αὑτοῖα 200, αὑτῶν 96.1, περί ἧδον

65.2 μετέβαλον

40. E.g., 7.1 (7 Κεφίσου ) and cp. also especially Chapter III, pp. 235-259.

41. E.g., in the introduction (in asyndeton) at 6.1 ἐφαρμόσων πρώτα ἡμένες ἠμεν τούς μὲν κατετεμπήκατ ἐξελεύνεν τε χώρας ἀπαρατηρήματα τά διδώματα σύλλημα χρόνος τούς ἔμενας in 5.3. In 1.1 αὐτοῦ...τὸ διηθόμας repeats and modifies the idea in the proem ἐν τῷ αὐτίνα επολέμησαν αἰματείοι (see p. 98).

42. 5.2 ὁμορρόφοις, 20 προστίθεται . 168 παρθενίωα . For ἀρρόθι indicating addition, see pp. 80 -82.

43. See p. 175. Fränkel ("Stileigenheit", p.85) talks of the Janus head of any archaic conclusion which always turns one of its faces to a new beginning. Here I use the expression "Janus transition" in a more limited sense to indicate a certain type of introductory statement.

44. At 95.1 a Janus transition binds an insertion to the preceding narrative (p.132).

45. 14.1 τυραννεύων (temporal-causal), 46.1, τοῦ παῖσε ἐστερημένοι (causal). In the latter case the participle clause recalls the death of Atys related in the preceding narrative which in its final part rather emphasizes the death of Adrastus.

46. See e.g. 84.1 (where the transition to the account of the capture of Sardis has been prepared by the contents of the preceding narrative), 85.1.

47. E.g., ὁ φρονήτης αὐτὸς τὸν ἐπιθρημ, ἔργα τῷ λαῷ ἔκει ἔτει καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς αὐτοῦ πολιθὼς. φρονήτης ὁς ἐπεισυνήσωσε ἀναλαυκοὶ καταβάλον... different, for example, from the opening sentence of Astyages' reign at 107.1 See also 102.1...
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48. This represents a form of anaphoric ring-composition according to Beck (Ringkomposition, p. 28). Cp. note 30 above.

49. For resumptive conclusions, see p. 31.

50. Cp. 25.1 (participial clause, after the Arion insertion; 141.1 (ως clause, after the Persian ethnography); 171.1 (participial clause, after the pause of the double advice scene in 170), II.1 (genitive absolute, after the Massagetan ethnography). See also 26.1 (genitive absolute, after the brief description of Alyattes' offering to Delphi).

51. When a backward-pointing demonstrative fulfills this role, the connective particles are usually δια διά (or διε διε) rather than διε. See 8.1, 59.1, 69.1, 75.1, 204.1, and p. 26. See also 188.1. In 151.1 the names of the preceding narrative are repeated, rather than referred to by a demonstrative.

52. For the strict integration of this and of the other Greek Logoi in Book I, see pp. 227-235.

53. 95.1, 56, 59.1, 65.1 (repeated reference to Croesus' investigation); 73.1, 82.1.

54. 7.1 (70) Κροίκος δέ connects the insertion to the immediately preceding statement, while και οδο τά θρησκευα μονα refers back to an earlier account within the Croesus logos.

55. Discontinuity occurs when at the beginning of a passage involving a change of subject, δέ is the only element of connection with what immediately precedes (72.1, 131.1, 215.1). See pp. 239-240, 249-252.

56. Among descriptive passages in Book I only the introduction of the Persian ethnography (131.1) which is all on customs, that of the Massagetan ethnography (215.1), on dress and customs, and that of the
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description of Babylon (178.1) announce the subject matter of the whole section.

57. See especially 93.1 and 94.1 (p. 162; 193.1, 195.1, 196.1, 216.1. In 194.1 the announcement that the author is going to report on the greatest Ωώμα implies a connection with the preceding passages as accounts of less outstanding Ωώμογα. In the subdivision of 184-188, each introduction on the other hand reflects the greater logical continuity from topic to topic: in 184.1 the relative clause of οὶ τὰ τέχνες ἐπεκόσμηκαν καὶ τὰ ἱγμ. relates the upcoming section with the topic of the preceding passage; 187.1 indicates that the next episode represents an expansion of the preceding account of Nitocris.

58. For framing systems cp. Immerwahr, Form and Thought, pp.12, 54-56; Müller, Satzbau etc., pp. 79-80; Beck, Komposition, esp. pp. 11-17.

59. See also 65.2 and 66.1: μετέβαλον ἢ ὡς ἢ εὐνομίν (prospective); ὡς μὲν μεταβαλόντες εὐνομίθεον (retrospective). See below, p. 54, for the verb of change.

60. See the statements in 195, framing the brief description of babylonian dress. Cp. however 196.1 and 200 (which frame the longer passage on Babylonian customs) where there is verbal correspondence. See also the close frame in 101, where the variation is in the word order.

61. E.g. 20.

62. Cp. e.g. the components of the following framing systems: 61, 92.1; 70.2, 71.1; 92.1, 93.4; 59.1, 65.1; 194.1, 195.5. In the frame in 187.1 and 188.5 the introduction specifically summarizes the passage that follows while the conclusion is more general and refers to that passage as well as to the preceding part of the account of Nitocris.

63. 93.1, 93.5 (cited earlier, pp. 28 and 29), 131.1, 140.1. In framed passages introduced by ἑγοῦσθε, the introduction tends to summarize the report while the conclusion only repeats ταῦτα μὲν ἑγοῦσθε: cp. 1.1 and 5.1, 23 and 24.8.

64. Cp. 17.1 and 22.4. 192.1 and 192.4 identify the framed passage differently: the programmatic statement introduces it as a proof of Babylon's power while the conclusion summarizes more clearly the contents of the section.
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65. See especially 23, 95.1, 192.1 and 194.1.

66. 6.1, Πρώτος κατεστράφησαν 92.1 πρώτην κατα-
στροφήν. 17.1 ἐπολεμήσαμε ἐμείς ἑλεινοὶ. -- 22.4
πρὸς ἑλεινοὺς πολέμον. 65.2, 66.1 (see p. 40,
note 59); 70.2 Κρησύρα. -- 71.1 Κρησύρα; 92.1
ἀναθήματα. -- 92.4 ἀναθημάτων; 194.1
τὰ πτωτα. -- 195.1 τὰ μὲν ὁπ' ἀποθανόντων
67. 6.1 (summary introduction to the Croesus logos) -- 92.1 (retro-
spective conclusion), see pp. 130, 133; 95.1 (programmatic introduction
to the flashback on Cyrus) -- 130.3 (retrospective conclusion), see
pp. 149, 155. The last great section of Book 1 on Cyrus' career
after the conquest of Lydia is not similarly unified by a framing
system.


69. For the irregular use of framing systems, see also the three
consecutive passages of the Lydian appendix (92-94), of which the
first two are clearly delimited at the beginning and at the end
(92.1-92.4, 93.1-93.5) while the last (94.1-7) ends without
concluding statement.

70. A concluding statement at the end of a descriptive passage does
not in any case normally refer to the whole unit (see above, p. 30
and note 26).

71. E.g., 94.7.

72. See also 65.1 (introduction: . . . ἐότε ἡ ἡγ γάν πολέμω
καταπετράσων Τερεκτέων) and 68.6 (καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦν τοῦ κρόνου . . .
pολέμω καταπετράσων τῷ πολέμῳ ἐπινοοῦ οἱ λακεδαιμονίοι,
final sentence). Final sentences that report the last stages of an
action not infrequently contain adverbial expressions that indicate
finality. See 25.1, 82.7, 22.4, 106.3.

73. This is an initial sentence, in that it resumes the chronological
narrative after an insertion (p. 37, note 50) but it is a final
sentence in so far as it ends the account of Alyattes' reign. For
similar formulaic endings, see 102.2, 106.3, 214.3. The same type
of statement can appear in a subordinate clause at the beginning
of the account of the next King (16.1, 102.1).


75. This sentence represents a famous example of periodic style
which Herodotus tends to use at some high points of his report. See
Denniston, Greek Prose Style, p. 8 and Müller, Satzbau etc, pp.7-8.
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For other dramatic final ἄρα sentences, see the end of Harpagus' story with its glacial brevity (119.7) and the report of Spargapises' death (213) more similar to 45.3 quoted above. These ἄρα sentences do not, like that on Adrastus, properly mark the end of a section but rather a turning point within it, before the beginning of the vendetta of Harpagus and Tomyris respectively.

76. Cp. also the less conspicuous final sentence in 33 that summarizes the substance of what precedes from Croesus' point of view (see p. 176, note 140). The sentences at 91.6 and 129.4 (both before a μέν conclusion) are similar instances of marked dramatic endings.

77. For the particle ἄρα, see below, pp. 47-48.

78. These terms will be defined in Chapter III, p. 225.

79. See 25.2, 71.4, 74.6, 82.7-8.

80. See however 214.1-2, where a ὅσοι clause follows upon a summary-prospective statement. Of the summary introductions cited on p. 32 and in notes 33-34, nine are followed by a ὅσοι clause, i.e., 1.1, quoted above, 5.2, 17.1, 59.1, 65.1, 75.3, 92.1, 168, 194.1, and 56.1 (the last of these statements announces less fully than the others the contents of what follows, although it leads to it and serves as its introduction).

81. See also 73.2.


83. 130 and 169.2.

84. See Müller, Satzbau etc., p. 76.

85. I.e., it has anaphoric function. See Beck, Ringkomposition, p. 31.

86. See pp. 148-149.

87. ἄρα ἄρα also appears in an internal transition, in 199.1 (ο ἄρα ἄρα γίοχιστος τῶν νόμων ἐστὶν τοῖς Βαβυλωνίοις ὅσοι) where ἄρα serves as a reminder that the Babylonian customs are being classified according to their wisdom and refers the reader all the way back to 196.1 (ο μέν σοφώτατος) and to 197 (σεύτερον ἰέ σοφίν). See also 184-185.1.

88. ἄρα ἄρα and ἄρα ἄρα are equivalent in meaning and function. See Denniston, Greek Particles, p. 469. In transition ἄρα ἄρα only appears in Book I in 204.1.
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89. See also 59.1 and 204.1.

90. See p. 215.

91. While at 45.3 ὅτι ὁδός, referred to Adrastus, was followed by a summary of his past already described in the preceding narrative, here at 8.1 ὁδός just refers implicitly to what has been said above. See also 30.1. At 24.1, after the introduction of Periander, the announcement of the Arion episode is a sentence with a simple ὁδός (τῷ ὁδός ...). On the other hand, the narrative about Arion after the introduction starts in asyndeton. See also 96.2 and 6.2. For asyndeton, see just below, pp. 48-49. Asyndeton is common when a backward-looking demonstrative refers to something specific or to someone just mentioned in the immediately preceding sentence, and the reference is so clear that it does not need to be underlined.

92. 70.2 and 177 (with ἄν μέν ... ἦν ἔτη ...) are in Book I the only introductions first opening a section that have asyndeton. For asyndeton occurring generally in sentences with a backward-looking demonstrative, see preceding note.

93. This is one of the cases which Denniston lists of "formal" as opposed to "stylistic" asyndeton (Greek Particles, p. xliii).

94. The only exception in Book I is represented by the mixed summary-prospective statement in 214.1. Prospective introductions may be followed by μέν ... ἔτη (17.1 at the beginning of the narrative, 70.2, 131.1, 196.1, 216.2), especially when different traditions and different items are discussed in a section, but most frequently the sentence that follows has no particle at all (7.1, 17.1, 73.2, 84.1, 85.1, 96.1, 149.1, 178.2, 187.1, 192.1, 195.1).

95. All these cases will be considered below, pp. 57-78.

96. 92.1, 178.1, 184.1, 93.1, 94.1, 101, 131.1, 195.1 (κρέων ταῖς ...), 195.1 (κατέθεσεν ...), 215.1, 216.1, 149.1.

97. 94.5, 173.1, 195.1, 195.2, 200.

98. 92.4, 140.3: see p. 30.

99. See also 78.3, 120.1, 163.4, 171.1.

100. See also 22.4, 71.1, 167.4.

102. For the importance of these points of subdivision, see below.

103. See on the other hand 102.2, 51εφΘαρη.

104. See also ἐποιέησθο αὐτοῦ ἡμιστιχία (71.1) and ἐτοιμάζοντο (73.1) in transitional statements within a "preparations section" that precedes the campaign report.

105. See also 27.1 (ἐπέναε), 201 (ἐπεθύμοντε), 204.1 (ἐὰν ἐποθιμίνα).

106. 7.1 (δὲν καὶ οὐκ ἡμείσας . . .); 23 (Περίανθος ἐν . . .); 96.1 ( . . . ὑπ' ἐν ποιήσει ἠνδοίοι έγένετο ἔκρος . . .). Also ὅτις ἐωρ in 95.1 follows this pattern.

107. See also 34.1, 17.1, 187.1.

108. ἀποδεχέναι (Proem), οὐδὲν . . . ἀποδεχάμενοι (174.1). The latter implies selection. For celebratory expressions, see pp. 86-90.

109. See pp. 35-38.

110. 130.1-3, see p. 155; 169.1, see p. 135.

111. See especially 86.1 (pp. 44 and 136-137).

112. 71.1, see pp. 140-142.

113. See pp. 7, 10.

114. In Book I evaluations of truth appear in the following passages (asterisks indicate transitional statements).

1) Certain knowledge of facts: 5.3 (ὁδοι*)*, discussed pp. 58-59; 131.1 (ὁδοι*)*, p. 64; 140.1 (ἀπρεκέοντε ἐχω*)*, p. 64; 140.2 (ἀπρεκέοντε ὁδοι*)*; 139 (personal observation: ἕνεκεν Περ- σας δυτούες λέξις, ἦμεν μεντοί οὗ); 5.4 (ἐπιστάμενος)*, p. 58.

When, in mentioning some tangible monument, Herodotus adds that "it was still there in my time" this is equivalent to his saying that he personally saw it or that he heard about it from eye-witnesses and therefore he knows (52, 66.4, 92.1, 93.3, 181.2; cp. on the other hand 183.3). Cobet (Exkurse, p. 59) observes that these references serve to make the past concretely alive, since the visible present is connected with the described past event and the present itself becomes understandable in the light of a specific event in the past.

2) Uncertainty about the facts due to lack of information: 49 (οὐκ ἐχω ἀπέναν*); 57.1 (οὐκ ἐχω ἀπρεκέοντε ἐπιτέν*); 172.1
(οὐκ ἔχω ἄπειρεξέν πως πινακί). 3) Opinion, based on the available information: 58 (ὡς ἐμοὶ κταβάθησέντι ἔμεν; ἐμοί γε δόκει); 172.1 (ὡς ἔρω δοκόεμ;); 97.2 (ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέω); 131.1 (ὡς ἐρω δοκέω); 186.1 (ὡς ἔρω δοκέω); 143.3 (φαίνονταί μοι); 214.1 (κρίνω); 119.1 is a special case and has dramatic effect; Herodotus sets himself up as spectator of the drama and enhances the tragic moment by empathy and restraint. The "as far as we know" clause is employed automatically to qualify and reinforce superlatives and πρῶτος (see 45.3), but it also implies the author's awareness that the human impossibility to apprehend the totality of space and time creates limits to the historian's scope: 6.2*, 14.2, 23*, 94.1, 192.2, 178.1. See also 171.2. According to B. Shimron, "Πρῶτος τῶν ήμεν ἣμεν"; Eranos 71 (1973), pp. 45-51, the "as far as we know" clause invariably refers to information which is either supported by some visible or other contemporaneous physical evidence or which derives from sources who had received it -- or claimed to have -- from first-hand witnesses. 4) Disbelief of sources: 95.1,* pp. 60; 214.5,* p. 62; 75.3-4,* pp. 64-; 75.6; 182.1. Acceptance of the sources' report: 95.1,* 214.5,* 75.3-4,* 51.3. The verb ηυπάνωσι implies agreement with the sources: 22.2, 92.2, 105.3, 170.1, 196.1, 214.1.

115. For the analysis of the proem, see pp. 97-102.

116. The idea of reversal of fortune permeates every account of the rise and downfall of individuals, dynasties and communities in the Histories. In Book I it is explicitly stated in terms of the individual by Solon (32) and by Croesus (207.2). In commenting on I.5.3, Kurt von Fritz (Die Griechische Geschichtsschreibung Bd. I, Von den Anfängen bis Thukydides, Berlin 1967, p.211) rightly observes that it is especially a characteristic of the Croesus logos the attempt to convey a general human meaning and a metaphysical significance of historical events.


118. For λόγος, see p. 79.

119. See p. 149.

120. See pp. 86-94, 97-102.

121. See pp. 149-164. For the fictional element in Herodotus' story of Cyrus, see Alexandru Cizek, "From the historical truth to the literary convention: The life of Cyrus the Great viewed by Herodotus, Ctesias and Xenophon", AC 44 (1975), pp. 531-552, esp. 538-544.
122. Ἐμοὶ δὲ παρὰ πόντο [τὸν] λόγον ὑπόκειμαι ὅτι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' ἐκάστων ἥκοι γράφω.

123. Herodotus knows for sure that at least the Magi follow that practice (140.2 ὑπεκέιμεν οἶδα), but the entire ethnography emphasizes the differences between the Persians in general and the Greeks; and for Herodotus funeral customs are most engrained in each community (III.38).

124. οἱ δὲ καὶ τὸ παράπτων λέγουσι καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐπεθύνον ὑπο- ζηρανθηκαί, ἀλλὰ οὔτο μὲν οὔτε προείμενε (48.6)

125. 76.3.

126. I.e., his consultation of Greek oracles and his Spartan alliance (46-70).

127. See 21-22, 30-33, 74.2.


129. 1.1, 1.3, 3.1, 2.1, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3.

130. The discussion of the mythological causes of the East-West conflict has the tone of a parody. Herodotus is perhaps polemicizing with his literary predecessors, especially the authors of the Persica (Hellanicus, Charon and perhaps Dionysus of Miletus). See Robert Drews, The Greek Accounts of Eastern History (Cambridge, Ma., 1973), pp. 88-89.

131. It is beyond the scope of this analysis to examine to what extent Herodotus' own account of causes confirms the general idea expressed by the tradition and what other elements intervene to correct it and implement it. However, the series of "minor" offenses of Barbarians vs. Greeks and vice-versa starts with Croesus conquering the Ionians and culminates in the nominal expedition of Athens to Asia after the Ionian revolt (ὅλη εἰκὼν VI.97.3). The Persian attack against mainland Greece represents the disproportionate reaction and corresponds with the expedition to Troy in the mythological version. Herodotus evidently reverses the interpretation of Persians and Phoenicians and pins the responsibility of the conflict (both for the initial minor offense and for the decisive one) on the East. See Henry Immerwahr, "Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus," TAPA 87 (1956), pp. 241-280, esp. 249.

132. See p. 57 , note 114.
133. 20, 23-24, 87.1, 94.2, 105.4, 171.5.

134. In the Massagetan geography the insistent use of λέγουσι emphasizes precisely the unfamiliar remoteness of the territory (202.1, 2, 3, 203.2). See Chapter III, pp. 245-246.

135. In 70.2-3 the Spartan version of what happened to the crater destined for Croesus in not merely a report, but an accusation, part of the ἄγεται for the Spartan attack against Samos which Herodotus will cover later on (III.47). In stating how things may have happened according to himself, Herodotus shows that he disbelieves the Spartan claim. G. L. Cooper ("The ironic force of the pure optative in constructions of the primary sequence," TAPA 105 (1975), pp. 29-34, esp. 30-31) has pointed out that Herodotus indicates his disbelief also by the use of the optative (70.2 ἄγεται ἐπιστάμεθα) in the oratio obliqua of the Spartan version.

136. 182.1 is equivalent to an ethnographical notation on Babylonian religion.

137. 51.3, 105.4.


139. 103.1, 187.5. For Πυρδάναμαλ, see p. 57, note 114.

140. See pp. 88-90, 166, 260-262. Herodotus' agnosticism with regard to the Arion story is also indicated by the infinitive in subordinate clause at 24.7 (ὡς... παρέλει). This fact was remarked on by G. L. Cooper, "Intrusive oblique infinitives in Herodotus," TAPA 104 (1974), pp. 23-76, esp. 39.

141. In 86.3 the story of Croesus on the pyre shifts to indirect discourse (See 87.1 λέγεται ὑπὸ Λυδῖων, 91.1 λέγεται...). See also the intrusive infinitive at 86.3, (πρότειναι), cp. preceding note 140. In 201, the remark εἰς ἐν ἐφίππω καὶ ἐκ μυθικῶν λέγουσιν πολλον τὸ ἔδωκε ἐκαίνα, implies uncertainty, but the information is important symbolically (See p. 258). See also 27.1.

142. For the celebratory expressions in 14.4 and 177, see pp. 86-88.

143. 132, religious rituals and sacrifices; 133.1-2, convivial customs; 133.3-134.1, social etiquette; 134.2-135, attitude towards foreign peoples; 135, love and marriage; 136, family; ἄνω καὶ ἄνω (137.1); 137, crime; 138, forbidden practices.
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144. See below p. 127.

145. In 169.2 ως καὶ πρὸτερον μοι εἶσηναι underlines the important exception of the Milesians repeated in the conclusion of the account of the Ionian conquest. In 92.1 οὐ τὰ προτερημένα μοι ἴνα connects the description that follows with the earlier one in 50-52. Two back-references occur out of transition (18.2, 85.1). On Herodotus' avoidance of explicit back-references as a general peculiarity of his style, see Pohlenz, Herodot, pp. 64-65, 67.

146. See below, pp. 148-152.

147. See pp. 81-86 for the selective expression with δάλλος.


149. See below, pp. 244-245.

150. See pp. 143-145, 158-163. For the river motif in other parts of the Histories see especially VII.20, 35, 49, 54-57, IX.59.1.

151. For a complete history of the problem of the missing Assyrian logoi see Drews, Greek Accounts, pp. 93-94 and "Herodotus' Other Logoi", AJP 91 (1970), pp. 181-191. Drews argues that I.106 and I.84 were interpolated by Herodotus himself and that they refer to a History of Assyria which Herodotus intended to write after the Histories. It seems however improbable that Herodotus should have conceived of such a work as entirely autonomous from the Histories or as a separate supplement to it. Already Jacoby (RF Suppl. 2. 373) had argued that, according to Herodotus' practice, the Assyrian logoi should have been part of the Histories, perhaps to be inserted after a narrative of the Babylonian rebellion of 479/478, which Herodotus may have intended to write but did not have the time. Gaetano de Sanctis ("la composizione della storia di Erodoto", RFIC 54, 1926 pp. 289-309, esp. 300-303) maintains that Herodotus meant to reserve the Assyrian logoi for the end of Book III, where he narrates the second capture of Babylon, by Darius (150-160). De Sanctis explains genetically the fact that the Assyrian logoi were never in fact included: when Herodotus' history became what it is now, i.e. a history of the Persian Wars, the author decided that such a lengthy digression was inappropriate and limited himself to include a small part of it (i.e., I.192-200) after the narrative of the capture of Babylon by Cyrus. Cp. also J. E. Powell, The History of Herodotus, (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 22-23.

152. Pohlenz, Herodot, p.55.
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153. See above, pp. 58 and 60.

154. Θωμάς δὲ (προσδίκας γάρ δι' μοι ὁ λόγος εὖ ἐξελε γνωστό) ... See also II.3.2, 123.1, VII.152.3. For the use of λόγος throughout the Histories, see Jacoby, RE Suppl. 2, pp. 281–82 and 327.


156. E.g., καὶ ἄλλος κάτω νησί (183.1); ... καὶ ἄλλος ἄριστος μέγας (183.2); τὸ δὲ ἄλλον ἐγγον (186.1); ἐστεροῦσὶ δὲ κοσμίκῳ δὲ ἄλλος (197.1).


158. Discussed on pp. 75 – 78.

159. See also 29.1.


161. See p. 131.

162. See 141.4, 143.1, 169.1 and 2.

163. Herodotus praises the offerings of Gyges (14) and of Alyattes (25) drawing attention to the objects themselves rather than to their political significance.

164. In fact the Gyges-Candaules episode (8–13) has already superimposed another theme in the Histories -- that of the "fall of the ruler", see Immerwahr, Form and Thought, pp. 76–78 -- which is not for the moment connected with the motif of the East-West conflict.

165. In this long and difficult war of Barbarians against Greeks, particular occurrences anticipate much later circumstances and events: the general lack of support to the Milesians from the Ionians (18.3) already reflects the disunity of the Greeks of Asia (cp. 142–151, 169 and here below, pp. 134–136, 245; an accidental fire (19) becomes a major element of causation (cp. V.101), and the burning of a temple provokes the divine anger against the enemy (cp. VII.53, 109); with Thrasybulus' ruse (21–22) cunning prevails over military strength (cp. VIII.75). For indirect anticipation as a unifying device in Herodotus, see Ludwig Huber, "Herodots Homerverständnis", in Synusia, Festgabe für W. Schadewaldt, H. Flashar and K. Gaiser edd. (Pfullingen, 1965), pp. 29–52, esp. 43–44.
166. In the account of Harpagus' Ionian campaign the facts concerning Phocaea and Teos are singled out because "they alone among the Ionians, intolerant of slavery, left their fatherland", but the brave resistance of the other Ionians is praised (169.1). The narrative of Harpagus' conquest of the Carians is cut short with the remark that this people did not perform any glorious deed (174.1). Other than the Cnidians, whose digging of the canal (174.1) anticipates Mt. Athos (VII.22), Herodotus mentions the Pedasi as the only inhabitants of that region who made things hard for Harpagus (175.2) and refers to the brave death of the Lydians (176). The theme of valorous resistance rules this part of the narrative.

167. See below, on the function of descriptive insertions for the historical narrative, pp. 243 - 248, 257 - 259.

168. See below, pp. 260 - 262.

169. Here Πρώτος has celebratory value. See below, pp. 91-92.

170. Hannelore Barth, "Zur Bewertung und Auswahl des Stoffes durch Herodot (Die Begriffe θωμα, θωμάσω, θωμάτιος und θωμαστήσω)", Klio 50 (1968), pp. 93-110, esp. 95-104. Barth surveys the use of θωμα and compounds throughout the Histories, both in the ethnographical and in the historical parts.

171. Jacoby, RE Suppl. 2.331, has observed that θωμά constitutes one of the standard topics (with geography, customs and political history) of Herodotus' logoi about foreign peoples, in conformity with the literary methods of the geographical-ethnographical periegesis. According to Jacoby, Herodotus' dependence upon this fixed form shows itself most clearly when the author declares that on one of the topics there is nothing to say, as in I.93.1 (see also IV.46.2).


173. 23 (see p. 90), 171.4, 163.1. In 25 μονος has the same force as Πρώτος in the cases just cited. For a different use of Πρώτος in transitions, see pp. 94 - 96.

174. In the Persian ethnography Herodotus states what the Persians do not do (132.1-2) and he twice makes an explicit comparison with Greek practices (131.1, 132.2). See also 173.4.

175. See 137.1, 196.1, 197.1, 198.1.
176. See note 158 and 70.1, 178-186. In 14, 50-52 and 92 Herodotus also particularly emphasizes the quantity of the monuments.

177. 178.1, 184.1, 192.1, 194.1, 196.1.

178. Quoted earlier, p. 71.

179. For a list of Herodotus' diverse objects of admiration throughout the Histories (even when his admiration is not expressed with a celebratory term), see Hans Drexler, Herodot Studien (Hildesheim and New York, 1972), pp. 14-57.

180. See above, pp. 64 - 65, 76 and note 150.

181. See H. Erbse, "Der erste Satz im Werke Herodots", Festschrift B. Snell (1956) pp. 209-222, esp. 217-219. Erbse argues that the last colon of the proem should not be taken as an addition to the immediately preceding final clause, but rather as an object of ἵστορίαν and that the sentence as it stands is, with a combination of anacoluthon and brachylogy, equivalent to ἵστορίας ἑπεξελέγατο τίδε... ἵστορίας ηδονα διὰ καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν ἁλίν... Contrary, v. H. Drexler, Herodot Studien, pp. 6-9.

182. For the meaning of the word ἵστορίαν, see Drews, Greek Accounts, pp. 14 and 77-78 and note 47.

183. See above, pp. 57 - 61 and 69-78.

184. Cp. 75.1 θιστήρ ηϊ ἡν ἄριστην εἰς... καταστρεψάμενος ἐκεί ἁλίν τὴν ἐμφάνισιν ὑπὸ τοᾶς ὀπίσω ἡροικε τημανέων. Here Herodotus implies that he will report on how things went between Astyages and Cyrus from beginning to end.

185. See pp. 54, 94-95; in Book I the term δίνιν reappears in transition only in 75.1, quoted in the note above.


187. Pagel, Aitiol.-Moment, p.8; Immerwahr, "Causation", p.245; Drexler, Herodot Studien, p.7. On the other hand, J. E. Powell (A Lexicon to Herodotus, Hildesheim 1977, s.v.) keeps the two meanings distinct.


189. See above pp. 81 - 86.
190. As Pohlenz remarks (Herodot, p.3) this must have been self-evident to Herodotus' readers.

191. I.e., they represent a statement of contents. See Drexler, Herodot Studien, pp. 4-5.

192. Erbse ("Erste Satz", p. 213) rightly observes that the expression has selective value since it distances the subject matter of the work from mythology, genealogy and pure geography. See 93.1, where Herodotus does not stop to describe the golden dust of the Tmolus. See also Pohlenz, Herodot, pp. 51-52, who remarks that seldom does Herodotus display a really autonomous interest in natural science.

193. See earlier, pp. 86 - 87, 92 and note 172. In 17.1 the facts of Alyattes' war against Miletus are introduced as his 'εργα δι' ουκομηνοταδα even though from his point of view that war was unsuccessful. Thus even a failure is an 'εργον'. Some earlier scholars have restricted the meaning of the expression 'εργα μεγάλα τε και θωμαντα'. See Jacoby, RE Suppl. 20.334; A. E. Raubitscheck, "Εργα μεγάλα τε και θωμαντα", REA 41 (1939) pp. 217-22.


196. "Erste Satz", pp. 208-211. Erbse quotes all the cases of ἀποδείκτης 'εργον and of ἀποδείκτης άριστον. For ἀποδείκτης άριστον in Book I in transition, see 16.2.

197. See Huber, Homerverständnis, p.46.

198. Pohlenz, Herodot, p.3. According to Krischer, (Herodot Prooimion, pp. 165-166), Herodotus reinterprets the task of epic from the researcher's point of view.

199. Down to the classical period, a sense of wonder seems to be basic to the Greek's observation of human realities. Drews cites the evidence of the admiration with which the Greeks regarded their Eastern neighbors and their rulers (Greek Accounts, pp. 5-6) and he considers that the astonishment at the outcome of the Persian Wars provided the stimulus to the historiography (Ibid., p. 32).
CHAPTER II

Marked transitions as dividers in the historical narrative

The main subdivision of the narrative

The main subdivision of the historical account in Book I is based on the natural break provided by the end of major campaigns which always determine special historical changes: conquest, enslavement or in some cases the end of an individual ruler or dynasty and the rise of a new one. At these points of transition a μεν -statement that normally summarizes the result of the action always concludes the preceding account, while the next section opens either with an introduction, or with an initial δέ -sentence that directly starts the report. A descriptive passage may be inserted between the two narrative units (i.e., between the μεν and the δέ sentences) and enhance the pause in the development of the action.

The most important transition of Book I, appropriately emphasized in the introduction at 95.1, is that from the Croesus logos to the Cyrus logos, where the Lydian narrative ends and the Persian narrative of the rest of the Histories begins. The break in the historical account is here rendered especially conspicuous by the fact that in the transition its chronological continuity becomes interrupted, since the Cyrus logos starts at an earlier time with respect to the historical moment reached at the end of the former report. From this new beginning the narrative proceeds in chronologi-
The text is structured in a manner that delineates sections and subsections, indicating a formal division into several parts. Here is the representation of the document in plain text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td>(descriptive insertion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>resumptive conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>Early history of Cyrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td>(descriptive insertion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.1</td>
<td>initial sentence</td>
<td>Ionian Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td>Persian campaigns in lower Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>(dramatic section)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td>(descriptive insertion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.1</td>
<td>initial sentence</td>
<td>Cyrus' campaigns in upper Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.6</td>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td>(descriptive insertion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>initial sentence</td>
<td>Massagetan Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.5</td>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td>(descriptive insertion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The internal subdivision of the narrative

The individual units identified in the outline above contain insertions that interrupt the narrative with a change of time, place or subject and that may by their position emphasize a secondary pause in the course of events. Within uninterrupted stretches, the chronological account is frequently subdivided by introductions and conclusions of the same form as those marking the major transitions, which serve to identify smaller units or to separate different stages of the action.

Statements of this sort are pervasive, but they do not represent a regular and consistent feature in all parts of the Histories. In the short narrative of the Babylonian campaign (188-191) but also in the more extensive and complex passage at 152-162 on the preliminaries of the Persian campaign in Ionia, the report runs in a continuum with no marked transitions between different events, in spite of the important change of agent which the latter section contains. In the first uninterrupted stretch of the account of Croesus' reign of considerable length (25-56.1), and in the flashback on Cyrus (95.2-129), the internal subdivision of the narrative is marked by changes of mode and style, rather than by introductory and concluding statements. The occasional retrospective statements that occur within these two passages bear little emphasis and merely serve to add clarity to the report by summarizing before the continuation of the narrative the general contents of a preceding list or of a closely focused scene. The same is true for the retrospective sentences at 208.1 and 214.1
within the account of the Massagetan campaign, where a far more
significant transition is on the other hand, provided by the
introduction at 214.1, which emphasizes at the outset the descrip-
tion, albeit brief, of the decisive battle.

However, in many chronological passages that belong either to
the main historical account or to a narrative insertion, introductory
and concluding statements of various emphases and scope used
irregularly subdivide the narrative and create a framework that brings
its components into different relief. The first chronological stretch
in the Histories, part of the flashback on Croesus' antecedents
between the introduction of Croesus (6) and the Arion insertion (23-
24), breaks up as follows, according to Herodotus' transitions:

Prospective sentence (7.1)
1) 7-13 Change of dynasty episode
Retrospective sentence (14.1)

2) 14: Gyges' reign
Programmatic μέρος transition (14.4-15)

3) 15-16: Ardys, Sadyattes, Alyattes' first achieve-
ments

Multiple introduction (16.2-17.1)
4) 17-22: Alyattes' war against Miletus
Retrospective sentence (22.4)

The change of dynasty episode, a fundamental preliminary to the
Croesus logos, is set off from the rest by its frame. In what
follows, Herodotus superimposes his own pauses on the natural subdi-
vision of the narrative which proceeds in the style of chronicles
from King to King. Thus the end of the reign of Gyges, the founder
of the dynasty, is clearly marked but the reigns of the next two
Kings and part of Alyattes’ are lumped together. The formulaic transitions between them, and the whole passage, carry little emphasis. On the other hand, the account of the Lydo-Milesian war, a microcosm of motifs that will be later developed in the inquiry on the East-West conflict, is emphasized by the statements at the beginning and at the end. Thus, within the flashback on Croesus’ predecessors, the first and the last episodes stand out as autonomous units but at the same time because of their prominence, they become points of reference for the later report of the Histories.

In the account of Croesus’ reign, after a long continuous passage mentioned earlier and a change of setting to Sparta and Athens, the narrative at 69-75.1 is fragmented by a series of insertions, and the transitional passages serve to re-establish its cohesiveness, as we shall see later, rather than emphasizing its subdivision. The following section of Croesus’ war against Cyrus, which opens with an elaborate resumptive introduction at 75.1-2 and ends just as emphatically at 86.1, consists of two parts (separated by the Spartan logos in 82) in which introductory and concluding statements punctuate the report of the action.

In the first part (75.3-81) the episode of Croesus crossing the Halys assumes special relief by virtue of its summary introduction with `ἐποιεῖται’ and first person, and of a corresponding notice in chiasmus at the end:
What follows is the less prominent account of Croesus' campaign in Pteria (76). A retrospective sentence that summarizes the description of the ensuing battle marks a light pause at the end of the offensive stage of Cyrus' campaign:

καὶ τὰ μὲν σφαίρας ἀμφότερα
οὔτως ἦσαν οἱ γεωργίαι... (77.1)

The next subsection, about Croesus in Sardis, is similarly concluded by a retrospective sentence summarizing the last part of the report:

Τεχνησέεις μὲν νῦν ταῦτα ὑπερήφανοι
Κασίος ἦν ἀλωνίσας ἀδέν λυο
εὐτέρες τὰν περὶ Σάρδης τοῖς λαὶ αὐτῷ Κασίον... (78.3)

This statement emphasizes with a flashforward the anticipation of Croesus' fate in the immediately preceding prophecy (78.2) and connects this stage of Croesus' war against Cyrus with the later report "about Sardis and Croesus himself" (84-85). At the same time it marks here a light pause after which the initiative of the action and partially the focus of the narrative shifts from Croesus to Cyrus in the subsection on the preliminaries, course, and results of the battle of Sardis (79-81). The subsequent insertion suspends the chronological account at this point, while Croesus is besieged in
Sardis awaiting help from his allies.

The narrative of the final part of the war and its aftermath is subdivided as follows:

83. Account of Spartan response to Croesus' appeal.

84. Narrative of the capture of Sardis.

85. Narrative of the capture of Croesus.

86.2-91 Section on Croesus, Cyrus and Delphi.

In 83 the flashforward with anticipation serves as an introduction to the separate and parallel reports of the last stages of the action. The concluding sentence at 86.1 mentions them both and marks the end of the entire history of Croesus' downfall.

The final smaller unit of the Croesus logos (86.2-91), delimited at each end by two conclusions to the earlier account, represents a reflection on the motif of Croesus' downfall at the moment of transition between Croesus and Cyrus. The development of events stops momentarily after the fall of Sardis, the end of Croesus' rule and the simultaneous subjection of Lydia. The dramatic epilogue that interprets this outcome proceeds directly from the narrative, but since it already suspends the action, it contributes with the series of insertions that follow in 92-140 to arrest the chronological
progress of the report and to emphasize with a structural pause the actual break in the historical continuity caused by the change of leadership in Asia.
Transitions that establish relation among different parts of the historical narrative

We have just considered how introductions and conclusions within the historical narrative in most cases serve to mark a deliberate subdivision between different stages of the action. The formal connective elements used in transition in order to balance this subdivision by enhancing the inherent continuity of the report, as well as the means by which an outwardly logical sequence is expressed between contiguous passages that differ in time, setting and subject, have been examined earlier. But beside the role of marked transitions as dividers, and apart from those elements that in any case link the beginning of a passage to the end of a preceding or earlier one, both introductions and conclusions may establish connection among several parts of the historical account (more or less far removed from each other in narrative or time-sequence), by the way in which they announce or sum up their contents. Particularly statements that encompass or delimit major accounts are likely to contribute in this manner to lend unity and direction to the report as a whole.

Summarization necessarily implies repetition, which is a natural means of emphasis. Individual statements that introduce or conclude a unit of considerable length are not balanced extracts of what precedes or follows but summarize it partially andselectively, thereby emphasizing in each case only certain aspects of the narrative. When the same aspects, among many that emerge from the contents of the account itself, are thus underlined in various ways at different
points of transition, they form a framework of relationships that holds together the report of the several stages of the action.

The Ionian motif
(I.6,1-2, 92.1, 169)

Herodotus' history opens with a summary introduction of the whole Croesus logos (6). Here Croesus is named for the first time and identified by his birth, nationality, position, as well as by the extent of his dominion at the peak of his power ("ruler of the people this side of the Halys . . .", 6.1); he is then immediately qualified as the first barbarian who carried through the conquest of some Greeks (78 θεον υπεργεφαστ ἐκ φόροι αἰτητογίν, 6.2), i.e. the Ionians and the Aeolians, and who made other Greeks, namely the Spartans, his allies (6.2).

The stress on Croesus' relations with the Greeks at this point, among many other aspects of his reign, reflects Herodotus' focused interest, expressed in the proem, in the cause of the East-West conflict, and further specifies the author's subsequent program (5.3) that he will begin from the first perpetrator of wrongs against the Greeks.

The same motif of Eastern-Greek relations also rules, albeit not explicitly, the contents of part of the flashback on Croesus' antecedents that follows the first summary of his achievements, i.e. the survey of Memnonad Kings (7-22 and 25). This section, which reports almost exclusively on Delphic offerings and on attacks against
individual cities of Ionia, traces back to Gyges the historical origin of Croesus' double policy of aggression and friendly overtures towards different Hellenic groups. At the same time, the account of Mermnad Kings also indirectly reinforces the explicit argument in 6.2 that no one before Croesus really conquered the Greeks of Asia. In the account of Croesus' reign after the insertion, Herodotus covers the events that have already been anticipated in the initial summary of that King's achievements: in the first place the author reports how he subjected Ionians and Aeolians (25), as well as most of the people this side of the Halys (28); later on he comes to narrate how the Spartans became Croesus' allies (69-70).

However, the statement introducing the Croesus logos provides only a very partial and restricted summarization of this large unit, since it does not anticipate in any way (aside from the out-of-context reference to the Spartan alliance) the importance that the account of the war against Cyrus will assume later in the narrative. In Herodotus' report on Croesus himself, which follows the survey of his predecessors (26-92.1), the subject of East-Greek relations soon becomes entangled with, and overwhelmed by, the analysis of the ruler's downfall. In this connection, Croesus' friendly contacts with the Greek world are explored more fully than his policy of aggression, since the account of Croesus' offerings to Delphi and of his consultations of the oracle (46-55) and that of the alliance with Sparta (56-70, including the insertions at 56.3-64, 65-68 and 70), are important parts of the section of preparations and preliminaries of the war.
which will bring the Lydian power to an end. On the other hand, among what Herodotus has chosen to report on the Greeks who were victims of Croesus' offensive, the account of the conquest itself (26) aside from its position of relative emphasis at the very beginning of the narrative on Croesus, is summarily treated along with the other facts of the ascending phase of that King’s reign (28). 22

In the rest of the Croesus logos, the Ionians are only mentioned once and in a single sentence (76.3): the occasion here can hardly be deemed inconsequential for the Greek side, but Herodotus has chosen not to stress it in his narrative and not to stop and examine the Ionians' point of view. The conquered Ionians are treated as marginal throughout, and especially in the predominant account of Croesus' errors and of the war for the leadership in Asia, because they have at this point no bearing on any of the events. The major aspect of the motif that has provided Herodotus with his starting point from Croesus has fallen into perspective as a minor element (for the time being) within a wide and balanced representation of the political forces at play in the history of a period, and as a mere component of the background in the drama of Croesus' own destiny. 23

The Croesus logos is concluded by three separate statements, one of which refers to the whole account of his reign and brings back the Ionian motif.

1) Ο Τιμεώτης τής Σωφρονίδος ἔχειν λοις ἄνω
Κερίων ἐσελθον, ἀπὸ δόσεως ἐπειπάτεω θεσπεσίαις δελτα
The first sentence (86.1) ends the account of Croesus' war against Cyrus. The last (94.7), resuming the historical narrative after an insertion, definitely closes the entire Lydian narrative by summarizing only the results of the preceding action. The conclusion that identifies more fully the Croesus logos proper, rather than referring mainly to the history of Croesus' defeat, is represented by the middle statement (92.1) at the end of the narrative about Croesus and before the descriptive insertion. For its contents this retrospective sentence looks way back to the account of Croesus' conquests (26) as well as to the early introduction of Croesus as the first to conquer to Greeks of Asia (6.2), and it constitutes a reminder of the Ionian motif in the Histories as part of the initial question of the origin of the East-West conflict.

By emphasizing the Ionian element mostly in statements outside the narrative, at each end of the Croesus logos, although not yet in the narrative itself, Herodotus declares his intention to keep track of it from a distance, as it were, while pursuing more comprehensively the development of events, until the historical moment when the Ionians
will gain their own predominance in the economy of the whole political context. In other words, the author who has announced at the beginning of his work the ultimate direction of his inquiry, confirms it later in the transition of 92.1, still much in advance with respect to the point in the Histories when that direction will start to emerge clearly from the contents of the narrative. 26

As far as the more immediate development of Herodotus' history is concerned, the mention of the "first conquest of Ionia" in 92.1 in connection with the end of Croesus' rule, implicitly looks forward to the event of the second conquest: the Ionians who seem to have fallen out of the story of Croesus will not be mentioned again for some time during the series of insertions that follow (the Lydian appendix 92-94, the flashback on Cyrus 95-130, the Persian ethnography 131-140), but they will re-enter the Histories at the resumption of the main narrative (141.1) to face the consequences of Croesus' defeat by Cyrus.

The account of Cyrus' victories after that of Lydia is as a whole far more extensive and prominent than that of Croesus' conquests. In it, the initial report on Cyrus' and Harpagus' dealings with the Ionians and Aeolians, intertwined with the related episode of the rebellion of Lydia and of Pactyas' pursuit (154-162), is in itself a section of considerable length that includes dramatic scenes (141, 152, 153.1, 170) and a background insertion (142-151). In spite of the understanding that the Greeks of Asia are still secondary historical factors, their general character as well as their present circum-
stances and reactions are here represented in greater detail and with
greater emphasis than in any previous passage of the Histories. The
Ionian motif will again be left aside after this isolated account, but
the ideas developed at this point will provide the basis for the motif
when it is resumed later on. Herodotus explains in fact how the
retaliation against the Ionians, from the new leader of Asia who
despised Greeks in general, had become inevitable; how, to
confront it, the Ionians were only supported individually by their
intolerance for slavery, given the historical disunity of their
race; enslavement itself was therefore inevitable except for those
experienced and resourceful enough to leave.

The concluding passage of the account of the Ionian campaign (169)
before its dramatic epilogue at once sums up and completes the
narrative. Intolerance of slavery is again emphasized. In the reference to the
resistance of the other Ionians, aside from the Milesians (whose
exceptional case is recalled twice) and from those already singled
out, the East-West motif also meets for the first time the theme of
valor displayed on behalf of freedom ( ). Valorous resistance will become later on a major factor in the
ultimate Greek victory over the Barbarian aggressor, but disunity
is the reason why it proved ineffecual on this occasion. The definitive conclusion is a
retrospective sentence that looks forward to the much later narrative
about the Ionians, and presupposes the second conclusion of the Croesus logos (92.1) while employing the terminology of the third (94.7), where the Lydians are said to have become slaves of the Persians:

Croesus' downfall
(I.46.1, 71.1, 73.1, 75.1, 86.1)

Of the three conclusions to the Croesus logos quoted earlier, the first, (86.1), marks the end of Croesus' reign and closes the story of his downfall before the dramatic epilogue (86.2-91). The main clause of this sentence ends the two immediately preceding actions (described in 84 and 85) by stating in chiasmus with respect to the order of the narrative, the capture of Croesus and the definitive occupation of Sardis. The recorded number of Croesus' years in power in the first participial clause follows the formula ending all accounts of Kings, but is rendered here more emphatic by the mention in chiasmus of the equal number of days during which Croesus was besieged. The coincidence suggests the predetermined nature of Croesus' end, already referred to in veiled terms before the history of Croesus himself at the end of the Gyges-Candaules episode (13.2). The conclusion therefore, indirectly recalls that early passage, as well as anticipating the later assertion of the oracle that predestination was indeed a cause of Croesus' downfall (91.1-2).

In the third and last participial clause of the conclusion, the
terms μετάλλου δικαίων in emphatic position at the end of the sentence recall the splendor of Croesus' rule at its peak and jointly with λαναναύλοιδα bring back the theme of the reversal of fortune already announced at the beginning of the *Histories* (5.3-4) and further explored theoretically in the preliminary Solon episode. 40

Here again the final sentence unifies the narrative and subtly acts as a hyphen between different parts of the preceding account and the dramatic epilogue that follows (see 86.5). More conspicuously, the reference to the response given to Croesus on the subject of his Persian campaign (53.3) and the correct interpretation of that prophecy ("... according to the oracle having destroyed his own great empire") reinforce the idea of predestination implied in the first part of the sentence, and at the same time verify in advance another argument of the Delphic oracle which mentions Croesus' misunderstanding of the oracles as part of the causality of his downfall (91.4). The repetition of the response in fact also brings back in the moment of Croesus' defeat precisely that element of the misinterpretation of the oracles which in the section on Preparations and Preliminaries of the Persian campaign (46-75.1) had been most insistently emphasized to symbolize Croesus' blindness and error.

Only the first part of this earlier section (46-68, including the insertions that hang on the main report) describes Croesus' active preparations for the campaign, namely his dealings with the oracles, his inquiry into Greek affairs and the conclusion of his alliance with Sparta. The second part (71-75.1), which may be called the "Prelimin-
“aryes” account, suspends the beginning of the campaign report with explanations and reflections of various sorts. The entire complex narrative concerning Croesus’ war against Cyrus before the account of the war itself, interrupted by insertions at different points, is unified by four “initial sentences” stating in each case that Croesus was going to attack the Persians. The contents of these passages provide an outstanding example of how Herodotus repeats, summarizes and at the same time carries forward his thought in transitions:

1) Κράτος δὲ ἐπὶ δύο ἔτεα ἐν πέντει μετοχὰς κατέθευ τῇ παραμένοντι μετὰ δὲ ἢ Ἀσσυρίας τῷ Κύρῳ ἐν μονῇ καταλήφθη ἐφ’ ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἐν τῷ Περσικῷ πρώτῳ ὑπὲρματα αὐξανόμενα πένθος μὲν Κράτος ἐπέτατεν, ἐνέβης δὲ ἐκ φροντίδας ἐξ λυχνίαις πρὸς τὸν μετοχὸν τοῦ ἔνθεα της Πέρσας καταλαβεῖν αἰτίων ἀλήθειας

THΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ. (46.1)

Test of the oracles, offerings, consultations and responses (46.2-55)

Greek insertion (56-68)

Croesus’ alliance with Sparta (69)

Insertion on the crater (70)

2) ...Κράτος δὲ ἐκ οἰκετῶν τῷ Χρησίῳ ἐποιεῖτο στρατιάν ἐκ Καππαδοκίαν ἐτίμας ἑλαιοκύρν
Κυνήγες θα λατρεύεις δύναμιν. (71.1)

Advice of Sandanis (71)

Insertion on the geography of Cappadocia (72)

3) ἐκτρατεύετο δὲ ὁ Κέπμοι ἐπὶ τὴν Καππαδοκίαν

τῶν δὲ θεωρεῖν, λατρεῖ τινς Περσαίους κυρίους, ὁμοίως δὲ τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστιν ἔχει, ἔτη τέσσαραν ἡμῶν ὑπὸ τὸν Αστυρίου Κυρέα. (73.1)

[Ἀστυρίων] ἐν Κυαράκι, οὖν Κρόισς μὲν ῥαμβέον, Ενθείοι δὲ Σάκχεια, Κύρεα ὁ Καρπάσιως ἱστοπορίας ὑπό εὐαγγελίου ῥαμβέουν Κρόισσι ἓσσα.] (73.2)

Insertion on the origin of the Lydo-Median Alliance (73.3-74)

4) Τούτων δὴ ὄντων ἐν Αστυρίῳ Κύρεα οὖν ἔστω ὁ πατρός τῆς Ηλεοτροπίας ἡγεῖται, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡ μαζών ὁ χρήσις τοῦ περί τῆς Χριστιανικῆς ἐπισκόπησις ἐν Τερσαέ. Καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς Χριστιανικῆς ἕπειτα ἐπὶ Περσαίς, ὁ Κύρος ἔστω ἐν Χριστιανίᾳ ἑνάρισθη ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν Περσαίοις ἑνάρισθη ἑκατερομενον ἐν τῆν ἐκτρατεύετο εἰς τὴν Περσόνῃ μοιραίαν. (75.1)
Of the four statements quoted in the outline above, the passage at 46.1 makes the transition from the preceding dramatic logos 42 to the history of Croesus' war against Cyrus, which begins here with the first announcement of Croesus' plan. The precise nature and goal of that plan are not entirely clear at this point. Fear of the neighbor's expansion seems to be implied as a motive in the insistent reference to the continuing growth of the Persian power (πριν ημας αὔξανο-μένα, πριν μακάριονεώσας, αὔξανομένην μίν δύναμιν). 43 the preservation of his own empire this side of the Halys through an expedition that would at least restrain that power is therefore probably the essential step in Croesus' intention. A desire to add to his dominion by conquering the enemy's territory, if it would turn out to be possible, can only be assumed as an incentive rather than derived from the contents of this statement: Croesus' other campaigns and plans up to this point -- and in fact most other previous campaigns mentioned in the Histories -- have after all been of conquest per se, with no need for Herodotus to specify that fact. 44 A third aspect of Croesus' initial plan that Herodotus will cover later on (73.1), namely that of his campaign as a punitive expedition against Cyrus, is not yet mentioned here.

Thus at the beginning of the history of the war Herodotus gives only a nebulous idea of Croesus' goals and motives, although he sets forth the political circumstances (i.e., Cyrus' usurpation and growing Persian power) that made Croesus conceive his plan. The author then begins right away the long account of consultations,
offerings and responses that occupies most of the narrative of the preparations. Thus the oracle-motif, which connects well with the preceding Atys - Adrastus logos, becomes immediately conspicuous in the history of Croesus' war. After the Preparations section, it continues to be emphasized in the last three transitional statements quoted above (all of them resumptive introductions) even while other topics are covered, preliminary to the campaign report.

The first of these statements, in 71.1, serves first of all to indicate the imminence of Croesus' attack after his preparations and to mention Cappadocia as its specific target. The reference to the oracle in the participial clause recalls the first part of the preparations account. It emphasizes Croesus' faith in the responses, which had made him certain of success, as a subsequent motive after those that may have been initially determinant (i.e., fear and imperialism), directly related to his goals (restraint of Persian power and conquest). The announcement that Croesus was going to war against Cyrus and the Persians, is here modified with respect to that in 46.1, also reflecting Croesus' newly established confidence in a positive outcome as well as perhaps the increased ambition of his plan. The preservation of his empire, earlier implied as a goal, now clearly entails the destruction of the neighbor's power.

But the summarizing participial clause also states here explicitly for the first time that Croesus' confidence was unfounded. This phrase contributes to connecting meaningfully with the main narrative the preceding flashback
on the Spartan crater, since it confirms the casual anticipation that the insertion contains of Croesus' ultimate defeat. 51 Croesus' belief in the oracle, therefore, insofar as it is a mistaken belief, is suspensefully identified at this point, not only as a motive for action, but also as a cause of his downfall, the most conspicuous sign and symbol of the general blindness which is the primary feature of Croesus in the Histories before the event of the defeat. 52

The next two statements (73.1 and 75.1) mainly serve to summarize, specify and complete the range of Croesus' motives just before the beginning of the campaign account, while the last of them by itself also re-establishes almost entirely as we shall presently see their chronological sequence, which the order of the narrative up to that point has altered.

The passage in 73.1, which resumes the main narrative after the description of Cappadocia 53 and leads to another insertion, has the form of an autonomous aitie section, 54 but like other resumptive introductions it also reechoes previous statements and adds new elements. Of the three motives listed here, imperialism is first referred to in full and explicit terms, differently from before (i.e., in 46.1 and 71.1). Croesus' faith in the oracles, the ever-present factor since the Preparations account, is again emphasized (µαρτυρία). An entirely new point then comes up with the mention of Croesus' wish to avenge Astyages against Cyrus, so that the statement results in the transition to the insertion that provides the background of that last motive. 55
Although the passage at 73.1 does not clearly express the mutual relationship of the different elements of causation which it mentions, the manner and the order in which those elements are formulated here at the end of the Preparations and Preliminaries section, reflects the hierarchy of emphasis which Herodotus wants to establish in the history of the war against Cyrus and in the general assessment of Croesus' rule in Asia. In the case of the expedition to Cappadocia, imperialism entails a violation of boundaries. The emphatic mention of this element in 73.1, in proximity of the campaign narrative and of the episode of the crossing of the Halys,\(^{56}\) therefore identifies it, like blindness is identified in 71.1, as part of the causality of Croesus' downfall, other than as a motive for action. Imperialism across the boundaries, Croesus' μὴ ἐνέπλασε, like any other desire or passion that induces a man to commit a violation, is in fact in itself related to blindness in that it prevents the offender from understanding the compelling nature of a rule, the disregard of which is cause of ruin.\(^{57}\)

Imperialism is of course an important factor in the account of Croesus, who is in the Histories the first who added conquered foreign peoples to his own -- the Greeks of Asia as well as the Barbarians this side of the Halys.\(^{58}\) However, the expansion of the East only begins with Croesus, and will be carried much further by his Persian successors. The explicit identification in 73.1 of Croesus' desire to conquer as a motive of aggression (before the first of so many episodes of violations of boundaries in the Histories)\(^{59}\) recalls
the report of Croesus' first imperialistic campaigns within his area of influence connecting it with the history of the Lydo-Milesian war, and moreover it states the premises for the subsequent narrative of other Eastern imperialistic attacks both within and across natural boundaries. 60

As far as Croesus himself is concerned, although the fact of his being the first to subject the Greeks has been emphasized (6.1) and his expansionistic motive for attacking them is clearly implied (26), his role as conqueror does not on the whole acquire great relief in the logos. The report of Croesus' conquests this side of the Halys is extremely succinct. Aside from that, the account of the rising phase of Croesus' reign includes a more conspicuous dramatic passage (27) which shows a reasonable attitude with regard to expansion: although Croesus would have liked to try and conquer the Greeks of the islands he though better of it, because success seemed unlikely and he recognized the sea as boundary of his empire.

Having dismissed quickly the subject of Croesus' expansionism, in the following part of the logos (29-45) Herodotus devotes far greater attention to representing the attitude of Croesus at the peak of his power and prosperity. This consists of an unquestioning contentment with his fortunate state, joined with the unawareness that such a state may not last -- the blindness of the happy and thoroughly satisfied man. 61 In this context a drive on Croesus' part to add to his share and to increase his wealth and his empire is not a factor. Things will be different in the case of Cyrus later on: for the latter,
even though desire of conquest is no longer explicitly stated, trust
in himself (i.e., in his own destiny) and aggression are combined,
except with respect to the conquest of Lydia, from beginning to
end. 62

Croesus' blindness manifests itself in the way in which he
misunderstands any prophecy of misfortune, and is clearly for Herodotus
the most important cause for his undertaking a war across the
boundaries of his empire. Herodotus interprets Croesus' historical
role from the objective observation of how much and under which
circumstances he conquered or attempted to conquer others, in compar­
ison to the subsequent leaders of the East. In the war against Cyrus,
the goal of conquest, according to Herodotus, may have become predom­
inant among Croesus' other motives only after the apparent promise
of the oracle, as the statement at 70.1 perhaps indicates. 63 But in
any case Herodotus emphasizes Croesus' imperialism as the desire to
increase his dominion later in the history of the war and less
insistently than the fact of his misinterpretation of the oracle as
motive for action and as cause of his downfall. 64

As far as the element of revenge is concerned, which first appears
in 73.1, this was certainly part of the original set of motives at the
beginning of the history of the war, in the moment when Cyrus'
usurpation had first triggered Croesus' plan. 65 But in Herodotus'
narrative, revenge represents the "left over" motive, mentioned so
late in the account of the war and not stressed, although explored, in
the related insertion as the least determinant and meaningful among
all the causes. Fear, perhaps already combined with the desire to conquer, sufficiently explains Croesus' initial plan to attack. The additional motive of revenge does not legitimize Croesus' aggression across the boundaries, and at the same time it bears no connection with the causality of Croesus' downfall. In this it is different from the other two causes, i.e. imperialism and trust in the oracles. Other than for the sake of completeness and historical accuracy (of course, it would have been unlikely that the historian would have completely and deliberately ignored information of this sort), Herodotus includes at last revenge as a motive for Croesus' campaign in agreement with the interest that he displays throughout his work for such a recurrent factor of history. The author consistently mentions revenge and evaluates it in order to make clear in each case whether it was the single fundamental issue in the development of events, or when combined with other meaningful elements, to what extent it seems to have played an essential or rather, as in the Croesus logos, an accessory role.

The last statement (75.1), which makes the transition from the preceding flashback to the resumption of the main narrative, provides an emphatic preliminary introduction to the campaign report, which starts at this point (85.2). The emphasis is mainly due to the length of the passage, which recapitulates once and for all the facts that led to the war with almost no new additions. The main clause announcing that Croesus is about to begin the campaign is in prominent position at the end of the sentence and in chiasmus with the
analogous clause in the previous statement. In fact, all the elements in 75.1-2 re-echo in reverse order the contents of 73.1-2 with some verbal correspondence. Differently from before, their order here follows the chronological sequence of the development of events.

The beginning of the passage ties the insertion circularly to the resuming narrative and mentions the fact preliminary to Croesus' plan, namely Cyrus' dethronement of Astyages. The story of how that happened does not belong here, and Herodotus postpones it to later on, aside from the specification of how Astyages and Cyrus were related, parallel in form to that on the kinship of Astyages with Croesus in 73.2.

The next sentence, which opens with the participial clause indicating revenge as Croesus' immediate goal, otherwise only summarizes, more specifically than before, the earlier narrative about the oracle. Three separate clauses refer respectively to the consultation (Ἐπεμεθέ), to the deceptive character of the response (Ἐνεκέμοι ὑπὸ ἄδικον) and to Croesus' consequent trust in success (ἐπίκειτο).

Thus, immediately before the last announcement of Croesus' campaign and the beginning of the campaign report, the oracle motif is again emphasized with anticipation of the final outcome, as in 71.1. The element of imperialism is not separately mentioned, but in the final main clause the more emphatic ἔκ τοῦ Περσέως μοίρας, in place of ἔπι Κάρμαδινειν in 73.1, recalls the terminology used in the previous statement to define Croesus' desire
of conquest ($
\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\varsigma$ $\nu\in\pi\omicron$ $\mu\omicron\rho\iota\rho\omicron\nu$). The phrase indirectly refers to Croesus' transgression of boundaries as a direct consequence of his misinterpretation of the oracle.

In the following narrative of Croesus' campaign and of his entire war with Cyrus the oracle-motif and all other issues of motivation and causality are set aside. But in the final sentence that marks the end of Croesus' reign (86.1), the metaphysical cause of predestination and the assessment of Croesus' measure of responsibility for his downfall come together with the verification of the prophecy which Croesus had blindly interpreted as encouraging his self-confidence.  

Cyrus' rise and fall  
(I.95.1, 130, 177, 204.2)

The resumptive conclusion at the end of the Croesus and Lydian logos (94.7) states the ultimate consequences of Croesus' defeat in the earlier narrative, namely, the fall of Lydia under Persian domination. By bringing forward the Lydian people, this statement indirectly acknowledges that a change of focus from the individual to the community has occurred in the preceding insertion (92-94), but the mention here of both the defeated nation and the conquerors also prepares for the transition to the Persian account.

The second major unit of the Histories opens with a programmatic statement (95.1) as emphatic as that which precedes the Croesus logos. Here Herodotus interrupts the chronological sequence of the
main narrative at the moment of the conquest of Lydia in order to introduce a report pertaining to an earlier time, which the author states is essential to the narrative itself, to its preceding part as well as to its continuation. Thus, in spite of the fact that the Croesus logos has ended and that by its contents the flashback provides a new autonomous beginning to the Persian narrative, at the point of transition a relationship between the two parts is first claimed by Herodotus' emphasis on the requirement of his logos, and then confirmed by the way in which he announces the contents of the next report: Φῶν τοῦ Κύρου ἐκεῖν ἐν τῇ Κροίσου ἀρχήν ἦσαν καὶ τῶν Περσῶν ἄρει θρόνων ἠπέκαθεν τῇ Ἄργε. 

Of the conclusions to the Croesus logos examined before, two pertained to Croesus himself, while the last underlined the fate of the Lydians. The introduction quoted above on the contrary, focuses entirely on the prevailing side, first the individual and then the community, in the change of leadership that has been narrated as in that which will be reported later. Herodotus' announcement that he will now relate "who was Cyrus" is subordinately combined with the summary of the earlier account "Cyrus defeated Croesus". The relationship established here between the two facts seems to be implicitly causal: "because Cyrus was who he was (which is the subject of what follows), he defeated Croesus (as we have already seen)". The Janus clause therefore announces that the flashback on Cyrus will clarify the causality of victory in the conflict between Cyrus and Croesus.
In the earlier account of Croesus' downfall, as Herodotus explores the causality of the defeat, he avoids becoming involved with the actions and character of Cyrus, except insofar as they directly affect Croesus or determine his behavior. All that the Croesus logos does reveal about Cyrus indeed anticipates the later narrative. The history of the Lydo-Persian war already refers briefly to the circumstances of Cyrus' birth, background and accession to the throne. For the last event and for that of the conquest of Lydia, Cyrus' own predestination is implied, although a more immediately important and apparently separate cause for his victory over Croesus emerges in the description of his personal talent and energy. Finally, the dramatic epilogue to the narrative of Croesus' downfall represents the point of view of Cyrus more closely than before and brings into focus in advance an other aspect -- less directly related to the history of the Lydo-Persian war -- of the character analysis pursued later on in the Cyrus logos.

However, the elements concerning Cyrus in a context where Croesus is essentially predominant are fragments of a different picture that must be autonomously analyzed. The causes of Croesus' downfall are entirely separate from, albeit concomitant with, those of Cyrus' victory. A broader representation of the latter than that which can be derived from the narrative up to this point will contribute to explain in a bilateral way the event of the conquest of Lydia and will integrate that event in the history of Cyrus' own career. As the phrase \( \tau\nu... \) suggests, the event is significant and will be integrated into the broader narrative of Cyrus' career.
implies, the causality of victory will be explored outside the narrative of the Lydo-Persian war in the representation of who was Cyrus -- just as the major causes of Croesus' defeat (his predestination and blindness) have emerged to a great extent throughout the Croesus logos and not solely in the narrative of that war. But Cyrus' birth and background have involved his becoming King with a change not only of individual leader but also of community leadership in Asia. The account of who was Cyrus announced in 95.1 coincides therefore with the report of \( \text{Πέρακε ὄθεως Ἐκέννας ὑπίσταν \ η \ Κάις} \).

In spite of its autonomy, the flashback on Cyrus explains the earlier narrative because in the history of Cyrus' dethronement of Astyages and in that of his conquest of Lydia -- aside from incidental factors peculiar to each case -- the causality of victory is identical. It resides for both events, as one may glimpse already from the narrative of the Lydo-Persian war, in Cyrus' predestination and in his character. But the account of Cyrus' survival, upbringing and accession to the throne makes clear for the first time that these two elements are strictly related. Cyrus, born to rule over all of Asia and therefore saved almost miraculously even against all odds (107-111), reveals himself as a born leader from the first emergence of his personality as a child (114) and as a young adult (123-126). Cyrus' predestination is reflected in, and matched by, his character and the two elements combined represent in fact his destiny.

What the behavior of Cyrus in the Lydo-Persian war has almost incidentally told of his timeliness and ability as a general becomes
with the flashback integrated in its proper context. Herodotus shows that fitness and eagerness to rule, the latter soon reinforced by a subjective awareness of his own predestination (126.6), are the general traits predominant in Cyrus' personality. The later narrative of Cyrus' actions after the flashback (141, 153-156, 177-214) will further represent the different aspects of his both inborn and deliberately assumed imperial role: these include the political

cοφίνη (shown already in 125.1 ff and in 88-89), by which Cyrus controls his own people and all his subjects; the strategic talent that enables him to win external wars and expand his rule; and -- ultimately the most important feature -- the unlimited drive to conquer revealed by his relentless policy of aggression.

The cause of Cyrus' victories in the first two conflicts of his career has been found in the destiny of Cyrus himself, in agreement with the premises initially set at 95.1. But the entire account of how Cyrus acquired the Kingship, starting before the event of his birth (107-129), also simultaneously focuses on the actions and the fate of the opposite side in that conflict, the individual Astyages as well as the Median people, and explores the causality of their defeat. Thus, although the introductory statement of the flashback has initially emphasized the history of the conquerors -- Cyrus and the Persians -- as subject of what would follow, its multiple conclusion reflects the broadening of the analysis and sums up separately its various aspects.
This series of statements exemplifies again Herodotus' technique of summarization and repetition with addition and different emphasis for the purpose of holding the substance of his complex narrative together. In the retrospective statement of 130.1 the first sentence, with μὲν, marks the end of Astyages' reign with the usual formulaic elements of final sentences that record a King's death at the end of his account; here the main verb κατέπαινεν indicates...
a violent change of ruler, just as ἱππότιασσα does in 86.1. The second sentence, with correlative δέ, marks the end of Median autonomy and domination; its participial clause, parallel to that which records the number of years of Astyages' reign, sums up the duration of the Median hegemony and recalls the account of Kings which starts at the beginning of the flashback with the founder of unified Media (95.2-96.1 ff). The emphasis in 130.1 and in the entire concluding chapter is, however, on the last act (107-129) of the preceding narrative and on its outcome. The phrase διά τὴν ἱππότιασσα within the mention of the Median subjection, provides the logical link between the two parallel sentences and underlines in a more direct and deliberate way than earlier in the case of Croesus, the responsibility of the individual for the fate of the community.

In this respect the concluding statement of the narrative about Astyages expresses the same idea as its dramatic epilogue immediately above (129.3-4), except that it turns Astyages' indictment of Harpagus against Astyages himself. Herodotus in his own words contradicts the words that he puts in the mouth of Astyages in order to emphasize that the latter's violation and not the revenge that has sprung from it is the cause of the King's fall and of the Median enslavement to the Persians. Cruelty, represented by the crime of the δένυσαι, is in the preceding narrative represented as the major feature of the character of Astyages and (like blindness for Croesus) it is identified in the conclusion as the primary element
in the causality of defeat. No mention is made at this point of the elements of predestination and blindness which are secondary, although they do play a part in the story of Astyages' actions and fate. The conclusion to the account of Astyages' downfall, like the final sentence of the report of Croesus' own defeat (86.1) confirms and underlines by special emphasis the essential direction of the preceding narrative.

The second and third statements of the concluding chapter partially quoted above shift the focus from the conquered back to the conquerors and identify the flashback in the same terms as the introduction. 95.1 and 130.2-3 thus include the narrative in a frame with the summarizing elements in chiasmus and the mention of Cyrus as subject of the intervening account in emphatic position at either end. In 103.2 the sentence...οἱ Πέρσαι οὐκ ὅλος καὶ Κρόνος... ἔρχον ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσία τῆς θυσίας corresponds to οὐκ Πέρσαι... ὅτε ἔρχεται ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς θυσίας in 95.1. In 130.3 the individual Cyrus is the sole focus and the relationship between his background and his defeat of Croesus is established similarly as in the initial announcement ἐν Κυρσον ὡς ἐν τῷ Κροίσῳ ἐξηκὼν οὐδὲν ζήσει.

The double participial clause τοῦμονονος οὐαὶ ἀπὸ in 130.3 may have both concessive and causal force. It recalls the disadvantage of external circumstances which Cyrus had to overcome, but also it especially refers to who, according to the preceding narrative, Cyrus was by birth and to how he developed and grew into his role so as to become King (ἔλαχθος) and conquer Croesus.
The statement that Cyrus defeated Croesus strictly intertwined with the conclusion of Cyrus' early history represents in itself yet another (resumptive) conclusion to the account of the Lydian-Persian war, phrased no longer from the point of view of Croesus and the Lydians -- like 86.1 and 94.7 -- but from that of Cyrus himself. Here the reminder that Croesus and not Cyrus had been the attacker recalls the first definition of Croesus with regard to the Greeks (5.3) and brings back from the Croesus logos the motif of aggression -- aggression for the purpose of conquest, as it had been emphasized in 73.1 -- which will become predominant later in the account of Cyrus.

At 130.3 Herodotus marks the end of the defensive stage of Cyrus' career by specifying that in the war which resulted in Cyrus' first conquest and brought him to rule across the Halys (the natural boundary of his empire), Croesus preceded Cyrus in the aggression. From this point onward the initiative will belong to Cyrus. The growth of the Persian power under Cyrus, which had already alarmed Croesus right after the change of leadership (46.1) will depend entirely on the drive of Cyrus himself until his last "across the boundaries" campaign of expansion. The notice in the final sentence of 130 that Cyrus "having defeated Astyages started to rule over all of Asia" recalls the terms used to describe the dreams prophetic of
Cyrus' destiny (107.1, 108.1) and at the same time marks the transition to the next narrative unit (141-214) and to the account of Cyrus' imperialism.91

In the first part of the account of Cyrus' reign, the Ionian motif of the beginning of the Histories re-emerges:92 also the final report (171-176) on the expedition against Carians, Caunians and Lycians relates to it93 and to the exploration, begun in the narrative of the Ionian campaign of the theme of resistance against an overbearing opponent.94 The entire section (141-176, counting all the insertions) represents the point of view of those attacked and conquered more closely than that of the attacker, who at any rate is not directly Cyrus but for the most part Harpagus.95

Cyrus' attitude and personality -- his aggressiveness as a ruler and as a conqueror and his political sophia -- do come into focus intermittently and are portrayed in a manner consistent with the earlier narrative.96 Moreover, the report of the operations in lower Asia shows how Cyrus' conquest of the empire this side of the Halys was rapidly consolidated so as to become effective, and it contributes to represent and emphasize the rising stage of Cyrus' career characterized by an accumulation of victories. But the following narrative of Cyrus' own campaigns after that of Harpagus' conquests bears a more direct relation to the motifs explored in the flashback than the whole preceding account. The transition to this third and final part of the Cyrus logos directly connects with the substance of ἱπποτασσέως ἔλεινα and of ἀνέστηκεν τε Ἀχιλλεύς.
The programmatic statement in this passage, which carries over the motif of resistance from the preceding narrative (πόνον), lends considerable emphasis to the transition and perhaps provides a humorous commentary to the sentence just above, if the pun παριζε - παρίζεμυ is intentional. The notice of Cyrus' conquest in upper Asia after the conclusion of the section on Harpagus' activities is even more succinct than the narrative of Croesus' conquests this side of the Halys (26 and 28), and yet more sweeping and forceful by virtue of its utter generality. Here Herodotus does not even attempt to chart systematically the items and the sequence in Cyrus' conquest of upper Asia: πάν ἐπιον υπάερξαμενοι λαὶ οὐδὲν παρίζει, 99 "trying to subject each people, overlooking none" describes one continuous expedition directed against anyone and everyone that happens to be in the way of its progress. This single sentence is in itself sufficient to indicate a series of aggressions with no causes,
either real or alleged, other than the expansion of Cyrus' empire. While throughout the account of Croesus, "King of the peoples this side of the Halys" (6.1), boundaries are clearly defined, Cyrus' dominion and his own eagerness for leadership are represented as almost limitless, starting with the statement in 130.3

The programmatic statement in 177 expresses the selective criteria for the transition from the general to the particular in the section of the logos that starts immediately below, where Herodotus focuses on two expeditions which he considers as the worthiest of mention among those undertaken by Cyrus in upper Asia. The first of these, against the Assyrians of Babylon, is, as far as the Histories are concerned, the prototype of the successful expansionistic campaign: difficult and yet conclusive, waged against a people outstanding in every way, and ultimately resulting in the acquisition of a permanent source of wealth and greatness for the winning side. Within the entire account of Cyrus' rise, the report of the Babylonian campaign with the attached insertions explains in concrete terms why with this victory Cyrus reached the peak of his power. As far as the representation of Cyrus himself is concerned, the episode of the punishment of the Gyndes (189) goes beyond the motif of the violation of boundaries (initiated in 75 with Croesus crossing the Halys) to symbolize Cyrus' claim to the ownership of the boundaries and to a limitless rule over all of Asia, as Herodotus has indicated in 130.3 and 177 and also as he confirms
again in the report of this campaign through the perception of the Babylonians (190.2).\textsuperscript{106}

The account of the second campaign which Herodotus has singled out for description coincides with the narrative of Cyrus' downfall. The section opens with the first announcement of Cyrus' plan with regard to the Massagetae (\ldots\, ὒπείρω Ἔμμοστα 
Μασσαγηται, ὑπ' έστης Ἱάνατα, 201) which immediately identifies desire for conquest as the primary motive for his aggression. The Massagetae are then qualified as a people "great and strong inhabiting a region toward the east on the other side of the Araxes river, opposite the Issedones." The statement of imperialism is therefore combined, as earlier for Croesus in 73.1-76, with the idea of "crossing of the boundaries." The boundaries surrounding the Massagetae constitute in fact the subject matter of the geography inserted at this point (202-204.1).\textsuperscript{107}

After the insertion which at the end rejoins, as it were, the initial starting point of Cyrus' intentions (\ldots, \textit{\ldots}) ὥσις ἓπείρω ἔτι ἔκλεισεν μὴν ἄρα τὶς 
ὁ Μασσαγητας, ἑπ' ὦς ὁ Κύρος ἤκελ 
περιτυμίαν σφαλαξεὶς, 204.1), an aitie statement follows, preliminary to the narrative regarding the campaign:

\begin{verbatim}
Πολλ' οὖ ράγα μὴν μερίζα τα 
него' 

\end{verbatim}
Here the meaning and the redundancy of ἐπαφέροντα λαϊ

(with alliteration and assonance) confirm the emotional force of ἐπεθύμοντε and παρθυμήν έκχεν in 201 and 204.1. The initial phrase πολλά τε ῥά τιν μὴ τάλα stresses in advance the importance of this passage that sets forth the reasons (in addition to the primary motive of conquest) why Cyrus would attack the Massagetae. The whole statement is analogous in function to a resumptive introduction since it summarizes what has already been related while leading immediately to what follows. At this important point of transition, Herodotus establishes the continuity of the Cyrus logos, rather than a subdivision within it, and binds together also conceptually the account of Cyrus' rise with that of his downfall.

What "exalted Cyrus and spurred him on" to attack the Massagetae is in fact based on the events of his past which Herodotus had previously described. The second motive specified here (δεύτερον δὲ ἡ ἡγεμονία), the explanation of which closely resembles the statement at 177, refers back to the account of all of Cyrus' past victories but especially to those achieved in wars of aggression after the conquest of Lydia: οὖν πάρ ἴδιεγό

implies Cyrus' initiative and also his drive to conquer everywhere,
disregarding boundaries.

The "good fortune in the wars" confirms Cyrus' trust in his 

\( \text{\textit{γενέα}} \)

which is mentioned as his first motive for action. The term refers to all the facts related to the event of Cyrus' birth, which have been described much earlier in the flashback: the prophetic dreams, Astyages' attempt to kill Cyrus, the latter's survival and growth. All these elements together symbolize Cyrus' predestination to rule, and the use of the term \( \text{\textit{γενέα}} \) in 204.2 recalls \( \text{\textit{φονόμενος λοι επαθέ}} \) in 130.3 which indicated how Cyrus' predestination and predisposition brought him to conquer Astyages and then Croesus -- an assumption that implicitly provides the basis also for the narrative of Cyrus' subsequent victories.

The narrative at 95-130 shows how Herodotus' interpretation of Cyrus' \( \text{\textit{γενέα}} \) as a sign of the latter's predestined role is indeed not radically different from Cyrus' own, as it emerges from 204.2, except that the former is combined with the notion of the limit and with the related notion of reversal of fortune. Cyrus, because of his very character of born ruler and therefore born conqueror, has no idea of limits. Excess is inherent in Cyrus' destiny, as it is symbolized by the motif of the violation and disregard of boundaries in the earlier narrative and as it becomes clear with the statement in 204.2 that Cyrus' belief in his \textit{genesis} was equivalent to a "belief that he was something more than human." This expression does not contradict Cyrus' own early claim to be a special protegé of the
gods, but restates it in stronger terms. It emphasizes the element of error in Cyrus' full identification with his role, and thus serves to anticipate the event of his downfall. Thus \( \text{f} \ \text{v} \ \text{w} \ \text{c} \), which has been formerly identified as symbolizing the cause of Cyrus' victories, becomes the cause of his ultimate failure -- which again justifies Herodotus' introduction of the early history of Cyrus as required by the logos.

Cyrus' understanding of his destiny (both his \( \text{f} \ \text{v} \ \text{w} \ \text{c} \) and his subsequent \( \text{v} \ \text{v} \ \text{x} \ \text{i} \ \text{n} \ ), rendered false by his unawareness of limits, produces a false certainty of success which causes him to act and fail. The process of the downfall is here analogous to that of Croesus' misinterpretation of the oracles, false confidence, attack and failure. Blindness is an element in the narrative of Cyrus' last campaign as well: the term \( \text{v} \ \text{v} \ \text{x} \ \text{i} \ \text{n} \ ) used in 204.2 to describe the basis of his confidence recalls Solon's warning to Croesus (32) and anticipates Croesus' warning to Cyrus before the Massageta campaign (207.2); the motif of the misunderstanding of prophecies even returns, somewhat unexpectedly, just before the campaign narrative (209-210.1). But blindness is not Cyrus' essential characteristic as it was Croesus'. Cyrus' adherence to his predestined role has led him so far from victory to victory. The downfall is part of his destiny because the series of conquests must come to an end. Cyrus' destiny, therefore, what he was and what he achieved, is emphasized as the cause of his defeat in the transitional passage that serves as an introduction to the narrative of Cyrus' downfall and as a
conclusion to the entire Cyrus logos. The components of Cyrus' predestined role and character that emerge in different forms throughout the narrative of his defeat -- insatiable imperialism and aggression, violation of boundaries, a tendency to trespass the limits of human condition -- are here summarized in advance and reduced to their essential terms in a way that unifies the account of Cyrus' whole career.

The preceding analysis has examined three sets of transitions in Book I that establish a relation among different parts of the narrative. The first introduces and recalls the Ionian motif at different points of the historical account. The transitional passages of the second set punctuate the report of Croesus' war against Cyrus and by underlining progressively in the first place Croesus' blindness through the oracle motif, and in the second place his imperialism, they connect this part of the Croesus logos with the preceding sections, they unify in particular the story of Croesus' downfall and they look forward to the narrative of later Persian conquests. The third set serves especially to integrate the narrative about Cyrus into the two initial topics of the Histories (namely the Ionian conquest and the story of Croesus) and at the same time to unify internally the Cyrus logos.

Introductions and conclusions of this sort serve to interpret as well as hold together internally the larger sections of the historical
account. Herodotus' narrative is complex because at each stage it explores different aspects of the historical development, accumulating a variety of motifs that recur throughout the work. But the transitional passages that refer to a particular historical phase described with interruptions of various sorts in a large narrative section usually bring out and emphasize the elements that are for Herodotus essential to that phase, leaving aside the accessory aspects which the narrative has nevertheless included and which anticipate or recall the report of other events. The interplay between the narrative and the transitional passages allows Herodotus to describe the recurrence of events and causes in history, and at the same time to differentiate, but in a subtle and muted way, historical periods, underlining the characters most peculiar to each of them.
Dramatic sections within the historical narrative

Single dramatic elements, dramatic "moments" and scenes

The chronological narrative of Book I is subdivided by marked transitions between individual stages of the action, and also occasionally by the presence of dramatic sections.

Dramatization in Herodotus is a term normally applied at least to all use of direct speech and dialogue in the Histories; but in a broader sense it includes a whole range of dramatic elements of which the use of direct speech is the most conspicuous and frequent stylistic feature. For example the Arion episode (24) where, incidentally, there is no direct speech -- contains a number of dramatic components in its substance and form: the miraculous aspect of the story, the scene between Arion and the pirates in indirect discourse, the vivid representation of the singer's climactic leap κὼν ῥῆις κλεῦναι καὶ θάνατοι, and the final anagnorisis. Herodotus is writing here "tragic history", albeit in a rather compressed narrative passage.

Herodotus frequently uses devices characteristic of Attic tragedy as momentary ingredients of his narrative. Thus in a section particularly rich in this respect -- the account of Cyrus' Massagetan campaign -- the reports of Spargapises' end (213) and of Tomyris' final gesture and words (214.4-5) mark moments of intense pathos. In other cases the dramatic mimesis of the action does not
aim at a strong emotional effect but enhances the vividness of the narrative and consequently the reader's involvement with the action as well as his anticipation and understanding of events. Among innumerable examples, the representation of the first return of Pisistratus (60.4-5), the scene of Lichas in the blacksmith's shop (68.2-3), Cyrus' response to the Spartan envoys (153.1), and even a small detail such as Pythermus' appearance among the Spartans dressed in a purple cloak (152.1) contribute to this result. These instances also show how the introduction of dramatic techniques slows down the narrative since through them the action is, even only for a moment, imitated closely and visualized as if it were represented on the stage.

In certain cases dramatization is the principal feature in the report of individual events or episodes of Book I. If the passage so characterized is extensive enough, the action is slowed down considerably or temporarily suspended, and moreover the dramatic section stands out from the surrounding narrative by virtue of its different mode. For example the episode of Croesus' advice to Cyrus about the Lydian revolt (155) and that of Aristodicus' consultation of the oracle (159) provide two pauses within the busy narrative of the commotion in Asia at the beginning of Cyrus' reign. Dramatic sections in Herodotus vary in length and complexity. The simplest among them can be composed of a single utterance or, like the examples just mentioned, of a single scene of dialogue with or without additional dramatic elements.

This category is especially represented in Book I by several
individual adviser scenes (like 155 mentioned just above) which suspend the action at particular moments to provide a dramatized explanation of why the main character -- i.e., the recipient of the advice -- is about to follow the right or wrong policy. Generally the only dramatic element in these scenes is the use of direct speech (as in 155), unless the figure of the adviser needs to be briefly introduced into the setting (e.g., 27.2) or qualified at the outset as "wise" (71.2).

The substance of the speech itself tends to be very close to the given historical context, but these passages also lend themselves to the introduction of motifs recurrent elsewhere in the narrative (e.g., that of the "primitive opponent" in Sandanis' advice in 71, and to the expression of general truths (207.2) that are fundamental themes of the Histories. This last possibility inherent in the adviser scene is exploited to the full in the Solon episode. Adviser scenes represent an instance in which the dramatic form allows Herodotus to suspend the action in order to interpret it, without at the same time assuming full responsibility for that interpretation which is often partial and is presented as subjective. This purpose of dramatization is also a feature of the larger passages discussed below.

Dramatic logoi

The most complex dramatic sections are represented in Book I by four "dramatic logoi": the Gyges - Candaules episode (8-13);
the Solon - Croesus - Atys - Adrastus complex (34-46); the epilogue to the Croesus logos (86.2-91); the early story of Cyrus (107-129). In these sections the mixed dramatic mode is applied in its fullest form. The narrative proceeds from scene to scene with the predominance of direct speech over reported action, variable attention to stage setting, the occasional presence of secondary stage figures; emphasis on theatrical gestures; irony; and pathos; and certain dramatic elements of plot such as prophetic dreams and anagnorisis.

But the most important feature of the dramatic logoi is characterization in the tragic manner, which consists in the intimate representation of an individual's motives for action and of the reasons within the characters themselves for their success or failure. Mainly because of tragic characterization the dramatic logoi mark a change of focus (other than of style and mode) with respect to the straight, reported narrative. The events represented in these sections may or may not be in themselves of historical importance, but in any case it is the personal (or biographical) point of view that predominates. It is especially from this seemingly more restricted standpoint through the close-up representation of certain moments in the life of individuals that Herodotus, like the tragic poet, indirectly formulates general truths -- the laws of human destiny. These are expressed autonomously in the dramatic logoi but ultimately also serve to explain other events of a historical nature reported elsewhere in the narrative. Thus, to a far greater degree than the
individual scenes considered earlier, the large dramatic units stand out from the surrounding narrative and, at the same time, serve as general points of reference for Herodotus' interpretation of history, thereby establishing connection among different and distant parts of the work.

The Gyges - Candaules episode (I.7-13)

The Gyges - Candaules episode (7-13) is the first example of this phenomenon. The change of dynasty in Lydia and the rise to the throne of Croesus' ancestor is in itself an important historical landmark, as Herodotus emphasizes in the frame (7.1, 14.1). But after a brief account of Candaules' genealogy (7.2-4) and antecedents, Herodotus makes the transition to the dramatic mode by focusing on Candaules' personal character:

From this point on the progress of the action depends on private and individual motives, while all the elements of drama conspire to detach and isolate that action from the historical level of the surrounding narrative. In spite of its narrow and personal point of view, the meaning is universal and philosophical. The general truths that emerge here come up at different points in the Histories and constitute fundamental themes that connect and explain major events in the subsequent historical development. For the moment a specific link between the historical account of Croesus' reign (introduced in 6) and the representation of Gyges' crime is provided by the mention of
the Delphic prophecy on the punishment which would befall Gyges' fifth descendant (13.2). This refers to Croesus himself and represents a veiled anticipation of his downfall (see 91.1) by which the Gyges drama is anchored to its wide historical context.

A subordinate clause recording the poet Archilochus' mention of Gyges signals the end of the dramatic section right after the climax (12.2); and shows how easily and unself-consciously Herodotus can shift from one mode to another. The next passage (13) describes the aftermath of Gyges' accession to the throne (what would have been the anticlimax of a tragedy) and completes the episode of the change of dynasty (concluded in 14.1). But here, and especially in the following account of his reign (14), Gyges is no longer the dramatic character portrayed earlier. Herodotus has lost interest, as it were, in his conflicts and motives and concentrates more objectively on his achievements. The change of focus is evident even though it is not expressed and in spite of no change of subject, place or time.

The Croesus - Solon - Atys - Adrastus unit (I.29-45)

The Croesus - Solon - Atys - Adrastus complex (29-45) appears within a continuous historical narrative (rather than at the beginning or at the end, like the other dramatic logoi of Book 1), thereby subdividing it into two sections. The first uninterrupted stretch of the account of Croesus' reign is articulated as follows:
I  Rise of Croesus (26-28): conquest of the Greeks of Asia (26)
   advice of Bias or Pittacus (27)
   conquest of the other people this side of the Halys (28)

Dramatic logos

   Solon episode (29-33)
   Croesus - Atys - Adrastus story (34-45)

II Croesus' preparations for the Cappadocian campaign (i.e.,
   consultation of the oracles (46-56)

Part I is the account of the ascending phase of Croesus' reign,
   punctuated in the middle by a simple dramatic section which underlines
   the notice of his Greek conquests and explains his policy towards the
   Greeks in general (i.e., he recognized the sea as boundary of his
   empire). Part II represents the beginning of the narrative of Croesus' fall. The whole passage follows a chronological continuum which runs
   like this: Croesus made sweeping conquests this side of the Halys
   and became rich and powerful; at that point he received a visit from
   Solon who, when Croesus flaunted his prosperity, gave him a lecture
   he did not understand on the changeability of human fortunes; shortly
   after, Croesus was punished for his self-conceit and lost his son in
   a tragic accident; after two years of mourning his son, Croesus
   started preparations for a campaign against the Persians, and began
   by consulting the oracles, etc. There is no marked transition between
   the individual stages of this narrative (except within the dramatic
   logos itself, at 34.1), and yet the three subsections remain sharply
   distinct by virtue of their mode. The account of Croesus' rise is
   characterized by its utmost brevity and lack of detail. Its second
   part (28) is represented by a subordinate clause, enlarged by a long
parenthesis, which already belongs to the transition to the next dramatic episode. The shift to the dramatic mode is made gradually, first by giving an idea of the general setting:

\[
\text{In justifying Solon's presence at the court of Croesus, Herodotus takes the opportunity to give the reader a historically valuable glimpse of Athenian politics (the post-Solian phase which will be explored later in 59-64).}^{138} \text{ However, the outline of Solon's past is also relevant to his role in the dialogue since his achievements as a legislator, his fame, his cunning in dealing with the Athenians and especially the knowledge of the world which he has acquired by} \]

This sentence begins to slow down the narrative by describing the situation resulting from the previous action of conquest.\(^{137}\) The mention of the wealth of Sardis side by side with that of the wisdom of Greece suggests suggestively anticipates the basic antithesis of the upcoming dialogue. From the general to the particular Herodotus then introduces the figure of Solon:

\[
\text{In justifying Solon's presence at the court of Croesus, Herodotus takes the opportunity to give the reader a historically valuable glimpse of Athenian politics (the post-Solian phase which will be explored later in 59-64).}^{138} \text{ However, the outline of Solon's past is also relevant to his role in the dialogue since his achievements as a legislator, his fame, his cunning in dealing with the Athenians and especially the knowledge of the world which he has acquired by} \]
traveling (see 30.2), make him the wisest of the wise and give him a special place among Herodotus' advisers.\(^\text{139}\)

The next sentence creates the setting and completes the elaborate but gradual transition from a compressed historical narrative to the dramatic mode:

Like all adviser scenes, the Croesus - Solon dialogue stops the action. In this case the pause is more pronounced because of the exceptional length of the passage and because its contents are removed from practical considerations of policy and entirely philosophical: Solon speaks 'for all men and especially for those who deem themselves happy.' (86.5). The shift from the historical narrative to the dramatic mode coincides here with the shift from the objective account of Croesus' achievements to the representation of how, and how misguided, Croesus regarded himself. A ruptured final sentence recording Solon's departure (33) marks the end of the Solon episode.\(^\text{140}\)

The action then resumes again after the dialogue, but we are still in
the realm of dramatic action. Herodotus introduces it with a summary Janus statement which underlines very particularly the connection with the preceding scene:

\[\text{μετὰ δὲ Κόρωνος οἰκέμενον ἔδει τὸ ἔθιμον νῦν μετὰν Κροίου, ὥς ἐνίκοι, ὁ ἐνόμισε ἐνωτὸν ἐναὶ ἀνὴρ ἔσεσθαι \τόπουν ὧν ἔλθαρον. (34.1)}\]

In an uncommon instance, Herodotus here expresses in his own voice a transcendent interpretation of the events. The substance of Solon's warning was that god will not allow man to be completely and lastingly fortunate (32.1-9). Herodotus' statement quoted above slightly modifies this notion, in that it identifies Croesus' feelings about himself (rather than his objective good fortune) as a "sin" directly punishable by god. Croesus' self-conceit, represented earlier in his uncomprehending reaction to Solon and emphasized here, plays no part in the Atys - Adrastus drama, where two main motifs emerge. The first is that of the ineluctable fate. On the one hand Adrastus, although purified by Croesus, cannot escape his destiny and kills again, on the other hand Croesus himself is warned by the dream and yet he cannot, in spite of his efforts, prevent the prophecy from coming true. The second motif is that of blindness, since Croesus does not understand all the possible ways in which the prophecy can come true. In the historical narrative of Croesus' downfall (46-85), the element of the ineluctable fate is prominent. Moreover the element of self-conceit, underlined in the Solon episode, is implicitly assumed
and merges with that of blindness because Croesus' misinterpretation of the oracles can be understood as a result of his overconfidence which in turn contributes to increase it. \(^{144}\)

Thus in the dramatic logos Herodotus begins to build up the complex causality of Croesus' defeat. The Solon episode sets the general standards for the drama that follows as well as for the later narrative. \(^{145}\) The Croesus - Atys - Adrastus story anticipates in Croesus' personal sphere his tragedy as King. At the same time the whole logos forms a unit for its style and contents, and (like the Gyges - Candaules drama) is complete and intelligible in itself.

As in the case of the Gyges - Candaules episode, the dramatic section ends with the climax, i.e. the intense report of Adrastus' death (45.3). The anticlimatic mention of Croesus' two years of mourning (46.1) bridges the break in the transition back to the historical narrative \(^{146}\) as Herodotus returns to the report of Croesus' political and military activity suspended since 28. It should however be noticed that in spite of the change of focus and style, the account of Croesus' consultations of the oracles (46-56.1) is closer to the dramatic mode of the previous section than the earlier utterly impersonal narrative of Croesus' rise (26; 28). In this section of historical narrative which proceeds at a slower pace through the various stages of the action, the episode of the testing of the oracles (47-48) and the two statements that Croesus "was exceedingly pleased" with the responses (54.1, 56.1), carry over to some extent the tragic characterization of Croesus from the preceding dramatic logos. \(^{147}\)
The epilogue to the Croesus logos (1.86-91)

The next dramatic section (86-91) is set off from the rest of the narrative, other than by its character, also by its very position between two statements (86.1, 92.1) which emphatically conclude the Croesus logos. The transition to the dramatic mode, already anticipated by the dramatic ending of the preceding account (85.4), coincides with the creation of the appropriate setting and slows down the narrative in a similar way as the preliminaries of the Solon scene, where Solon arrives at the court of Sardis and the servants show him around the treasure room. Here Croesus is taken to the presence of Cyrus and ascends the pyre in chains, according to Cyrus' orders (86.2). Of the four sequences of dialogue between Croesus and Cyrus that follow, briefly punctuated by dramatic action, two recall general truths expressed in the preceding dramatic logos and relate them explicitly to the fact of Croesus' downfall: Solon's notion of the changeability of human fortunes reappears in the scene of Croesus on the pyre (86.3-4), and the idea of the ineluctable fate is formulated by Croesus after descending from the pyre to Cyrus (87.3-4) as he had earlier expressed it to Adrastus (45.2).

The next exchange between Cyrus and Croesus, now freed from his chains (88-89), represents almost a separate adviser scene within the logos. Here the focus momentarily changes from the downfallen King to the new conqueror, as Herodotus introduces the idea of the autocratic ruler's need to establish political control over his subjects -- a motif which will recur later on and which is part of the complex
portrait of the Oriental monarch outlined throughout the *Histories*. The main subject of the *logos* -- Croesus' downfall and its causes -- is picked up again in the last sequence of dialogue (90.1-3) the function of which is to integrate into the dramatic whole the episode of the final Delphic response to Croesus. The latter (92) outlines the two basic levels of causality in Croesus' downfall, namely the concept of the ineluctable fate here explained as a consequence of Gyges' guilt (a back reference to the Gyges *logos* and especially to 13.2), and the factor of blindness (misinterpretation of the oracles emphasized in the earlier narrative) which represents the measure of Croesus' own responsibility and error. His acknowledgement that "it had been his own fault and not the god's" (in contrast with 87.3-4) closes the dramatic *logos* with Herodotus' final emphasis on the human level of causality even though both the human and the divine causes have been represented as coexisting.

The epilogue of the Croesus *logos* interprets the preceding narrative and summarizes the reasons for Croesus' fall. However its function is also to prepare the transition to the Cyrus *logos* by initiating a change of focus from the figure of Croesus to that of Cyrus who, in spite of his previous important role as an historical agent, is here closely represented as a character for the first time.

The early history of Cyrus (I.107-130)

Herodotus' investigation of the individual Cyrus is however more thoroughly pursued in the account of his birth and beginnings, a
dramatic *logos* which, as the Solon scene contributes to explain at the outset the fall of Croesus, is basic to the interpretation of Cyrus' subsequent career. This section, the contents of which are, as for the Gyges episode, formally announced in an introductory statement (95.1), stands out from the chronological continuum where it is integrated solely by virtue of its different mode. The whole flashback on Cyrus' antecedents is actually composed of two overlapping parts:

1) Median predecessors of Cyrus: Deioces 96-101  
Phraortes 102  
Cyaxares 103-106  
Astyages 107.30.1

2) Early history of Cyrus:  
Prophecies 107-108.3  
Birth and survival 108.4-113  
Anagnorisis 114-116  
Punishment of Harpagus 117-119  
Return of Cyrus to Persia 120-122  
Cyrus' conspiracy and defeat of Astyages 123-128  
Harpagus & Astyages 129  
Conclusions 130

The survey of the first three Median Kings is mostly an objective account of their achievements and of the evolution of the Median monarchy with only a few dramatic elements scattered along the narrative in accordance with Herodotus' frequent style of reporting. The transition from Cyaxares to Astyages (106.3-107.1), which is as unemphatic and formulaic as the earlier transitions from Deioces to Phraortes (102.1) and from Phraortes to Cyaxares (102.3-103.1), does not bear any indication that the account of Astyages will be in
any way different in form and approach from those of the preceding Kings, nor that we have reached here the beginning of the story of Cyrus promised earlier in 95.1.

The transition to the dramatic mode starts however with the narrative of Astyages, as Herodotus states "... and he had a daughter about whom Astyages dreamt ..." thereby focusing on the King's personal experience. Astyages' two dreams (107-108.3) serve as the preliminaries of the logos in the same way as Croesus' dream in the Atys - Adrastus tragedy (34.1). The appearance on the stage of Harpagus, introduced in the dramatic manner, leads to the first of the series of scenes (108.4-5) through which the drama develops.

The account of Astyages represents the continuation of the survey of Cyrus' Median predecessors, but the change of focus is evident. The actions of the last Median King are defined from the beginning only in terms of Cyrus, and his only historical described here is his fall at the hands of Cyrus, against all apparent odds. This event, like the end of Candaules and of Croesus' rule -- requires for Herodotus an analysis of causes (75.1 δινήν) at once more personal and more philosophical than the other steps in the historical development of Eastern power. Herodotus here represents the beginning of the Persian empire as a fated event, fulfilled through Cyrus' predisposition and Astyages' guilt and error. Between Astyages and Cyrus stands prominently Harpagus, a secondary character in the history but here a protagonist from the beginning to the end of the drama, with his own personal tragedy as the reluctant
minister-slave (108.5-109, somewhat like Gyges), a victim of tyranny (119), and a traitor to his people for a private revenge (129).

The dramatic logoi just considered constitute an extension of Herodotus' general style of reporting which includes the intermittent use of dramatic elements. These passages represent complete actions within the chronological sequence of the narrative, and may therefore be emphasized as special units, independently from their dramatic character, by summarizing transitional statements, as in the cases of the early history of Cyrus (95.1 and 130) and of the episode of the change of dynasty in Lydia (7.1 and 14.1). The shift to the dramatic mode is an added unpredictable transitional phenomenon which occurs internally with the appearance and accumulation of dramatic elements and the consequent slow-down, more or less gradual, of the narrative. The transition itself may bear a striking effect of contrast, and the dramatization sustained through the action gives these passages an autonomous unity of style and substance, in spite of their being fully integrated in the structure and progress of the historical account.

The change of focus determined by the dramatic logoi from the report of historical events to the portrayal of characters in action is, like the changes of time, place, and subject in insertions that interrupt the chronological narrative, a manifestation of Herodotus' inclusiveness. The whole range of the individual's experience is seen as part of the development of history and is therefore relevant to the investigation of causes and to the commemoration of:

\[ \varepsilon \rho \rho \xi \alpha \]
Changes of Agent

As a major subdividing element of the chronological account, the change of agent occurs far more frequently later on in the Histories than in the first book. Since this dissertation concerns primarily Book I, the discussion that follows may seem excessively theoretical. However, the reader should keep in mind that the generalizations contained in this section are based especially on Herodotus V-VI.32, analysed in detail in the Appendix. Examples for specific phenomena related to the change of agent not found in Book I are cited here in the notes, which also give the reference of the page in the Appendix where those transitional passages are quoted and discussed.

Changes of agent are infrequent in Book I because in this part of the Histories the main narrative is predominantly centered around the figure of the King, first Croesus and then Cyrus, with an organic shift of focus from one main agent to the other in the important transition that marks the moment of succession (i.e. in the statements at 86.1, 92.1 and 94.7-95.1 combined). The chronological account progresses otherwise for the most part in a straight line and the setting of the action changes according to the movements of the agent. Almost all the passages that are characterized by other changes of setting, time, or both at once, represent insertions and are formally subordinate. Similarly, within narrative insertions, the chronological account appears centralized. Visible subdividing transitions, more or less marked, from one agent to another, often coincide with the
notices of the end of a King's reign and of the advent of his successor to the throne. This happens of course in the flashback on Croesus' predecessors (7-22, 25) and in that of the Median Kings (96-107). In other cases, for example within the insertions on Athenians and Spartans respectively (59-64, 65-68), the focus may shift off and on between the community and some prominent individual character (Pisistratus, Lichas), but with no clear cut changes of agent determining a subdivision of the account into well identifiable sections.

An important break in the centralized linearity of the chronological narrative of Book I, is caused, however, by the account of the Persian campaigns in Asia Minor after the conquest of Lydia (157-177). In this section Cyrus, who had been the principal agent of the main narrative since Croesus' fall (95.1, 130.3-156), and who will later reappear again in the same role until the moment of his death (177-214), is temporarily absent from the action. The account of his activity is suspended, as the narrative passes from him to his generals, first Mazares (156.2-157.2) and then his successor Harpagus (161-162).

It should however be observed that neither of these new agents remains the central focus of the account as firmly as Cyrus himself in the rest of the Cyrus logos, or as Croesus in the Croesus logos. In this section the report proceeds with changes in the point of view from the Persian generals to their opponents (especially the Cumaeans and the Ionians). At other times in the Histories, when a
character ceases to be the focus of the account, no single new agent is identified in the transition itself or emerges from the narrative, while in yet other cases the "principal agent" of a section may be represented not by an individual but by a group, such as a whole people or an army. What we essentially mean by "change of agent" is the shift in the narrative from one sphere of activity to another, between logoi or within a single logos.

Organic and strictly formal changes of agent

At the beginning and at the end respectively of the section pertaining to Cyrus' generals, the narrative transitions that move us away from Cyrus' own sphere of operations and then back to it, are of two different types corresponding to the basic methods by which changes of agent are generally effected in Herodotus, i.e. the organic and the formal. A narrative change of agent may be termed "organic" when it corresponds somehow with the movements and the interactions of the characters of the history themselves. Aside from the cases of successions already mentioned, we shall see later, for example, how in Book I in a group of transitions from the main narrative to insertions, the account, historical or presented as historical, of Croesus' missions to Greece (first inquiries and then an appeal), moves the narrative away from Croesus' sphere of activity into those of the Athenians or of the Spartans. Within the main narrative, organic changes of agent often take very similar forms.
Typically agent A arrives at the setting of agent B or entrusts a task to B, or sends B an embassy: circumstances like these (an arrival, a mission, or a combination thereof), inherent in the action itself, may coincide with the narrative transition from the sphere of operation of A to that of B. Thus in the change of agent from Cyrus to his generals at I.157.1 agent A (Cyrus) departs from the scene of the action leaving behind agent B (first Mazares and then, from 162 on, Harpagus). The latter is entrusted with a task which becomes temporarily the focus of the narrative. In this particular transition, unlike most other cases of missions and arrivals, the change of agent is of course not concomitant with a change of setting.

The transition to a new agent, when it occurs, in general causes a subdivision in the narrative, as we have already observed, but the break can be minimized or stressed to a varying degree. In themselves, organic changes of agent maintain the spatial continuity of the report. Therefore, unless the author chooses to underline in some special way the separation between two actions narrated contiguously and pertaining to different agents, an organic change of agent can be almost as unobtrusive as the movement of a single protagonist from place to place in a linear and centralized account. Thus in Book I, at the moment of Cyrus' departure from Ecbatana, the break between the account of his own previous activities and that of the following operations in Asia Minor is not emphasized at any particular point. The transition is gradual since it actually starts at 153.3-4 (after the Spartan embassy), with a first notice of Cyrus' departure which seems to
announce an immediate change of the setting of the action in correspondence with the movement of Cyrus from Lower to Upper Asia. The notice is indeed followed instead by the brief report of what happened in Lydia as soon as Cyrus had left (154), but in the next sequence the narrative still revolves around Cyrus, who learns of the outbreak of the Lydian rebellion while en route and takes the appropriate measures after hearing and accepting the advice of Croesus (155-156).

It is here that the definitive transition occurs from the sphere of activity of Cyrus to that of his underlings: Cyrus gives orders to Mazares on what to do about the Lydians and about the leader of the rebellion, Pactyas, and then leaves for Persia, while Mazares starts executing his mission (156.2-157.2). Also at this point the change of agent remains muted. No marked transition underlines the break in the action and the entrance of the new agent is not emphasized in any way. The narrative of the events in Asia Minor in the time of Mazares' command (157-161) remains therefore closely joined to the preceding account of Cyrus' dealings with the peoples of Croesus' former empire (141-156, counting the Ionian insertion). Both passages together form a section of Preliminaries to the narrative of the Persian campaign in Ionia, which starts with the change of agent due to the succession of Harpagus to Mazares (162.1).

At the end of the account of Harpagus' campaigns, the conclusion of the preceding section is followed by the resumption of the
narrative centered around Cyrus (177). The change of agent is here inorganic and strictly formal because, while it involves a change of setting of the account, it does not correspond to the movements and interactions of the agents themselves. Transitions of this type are simply effected by means of a με... ἔσει system, as in the case under consideration, or less frequently with a simple ἔσει sentence. The procedure is the same as in transitions between two stages of an action centered around a single protagonist, except that the ἔσει -sentence changes the setting and brings the new agent to the fore.

Strictly formal transitions to a different agent are by nature more deliberate and marked than their organic counterparts because they involve a narrative jump which breaks the spatial continuity of the report. Aside from that essential feature, the subdividing force of formal changes of agent varies from case to case depending on the substance and length of the transitional statements. The με... sentence, if it appears, emphasizes at any rate the end of the preceding action or the suspension (as far as the narrative is concerned) of an unfinished activity. The ἔσει -sentence, on the other hand, can be represented either by a summarizing introduction or, less emphatically, by a sentence which immediately begins the new section. The passage at I.177 includes both a με... statement and an elaborate introduction. Thus, while at the beginning of the section on Cyrus' generals the organic transition is, as we have seen, particularly
smooth and integrated into the report, the formal change of agent back to Cyrus at the end of that same unit is on the other hand very emphatic, even for its type. Herodotus has here clearly underlined the narrative break between the entire phase of consolidation of the Persian power in Asia Minor on one hand (141-177) and that of the new conquests in the interior on the other. The marked transition to the account of the "most remarkable" campaigns waged by Cyrus himself corresponds with the beginning of the final great section of the Cyrus logos.

Basket weave composition

When a change of agent of any type occurs from A to B, the account of A's activity may have come to a definitive end with that transition, or A may reappear again in the narrative later on. Thus, the report of Cyrus' activity suspended at the point of his departure for Ecbatana at 1.157.1, is then resumed at 177, while on the other hand the whereabouts of Harpagus will no longer be pursued at all after the conclusion of the account of his campaigns of Lower Asia. This case, with the alternation of only two agents or two sets of agents as the focus of the narrative, exemplifies the simplest "basket weave pattern" employed in the Histories. The combination of organic and strictly formal changes of agent constitutes also a rather typical organizing device. Often, as in 1.157 and 177, to an organic transition from A to B corresponds a subsequent formal transition back to A:
In other passages of the *Histories* (all of them outside of Book I), the basket weave composition is far more complex than in the case just examined. In the interval between the temporary disappearance of a protagonist and his subsequent reemergence in the narrative, several other agents or sets of agents may be focused upon in turn, some of whom may reappear more than once either as principal agents or in subsidiary roles:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
A^1 & B^1 & C^1 & D^1 & F^1 & C^2 & B & E & A^2 \\
\end{array}
\]

The above graphic, which is based on part of the account of the Ionian revolt in Book V,\(^\text{167}\) gives an idea of how reports concerning many different spheres of activity may become irregularly intertwined in the historical narrative. The coherence and clarity of a basket weave account of this sort depends largely upon the form and the substance of the transitions, which express the chronological and logical relationship between contiguous sections pertaining to different agents, as well as connecting to each other the several sections pertaining to a same agent (i.e., \(A^1\) and \(A^2\), etc.).

Connection between two sections of the split account of an agent in a basket weave narrative

In the transition back to Cyrus at I.177, the general notice of
his conquests in upper Asia gives an idea of his activity since his departure for Persia, which represented the moment at which Cyrus had temporarily disappeared from the narrative (157.1). Because of its selective character, the statement introducing the new Cyrus section makes the connection with the previous one in a way which is only approximate, but adequate nevertheless for the coherence of the report. Other times the connection between two non-contiguous accounts pertaining to the same agent is very exact, so that the two pieces really form a continuous, albeit interrupted, narrative thread. This happens, for example, when the report of the activity of a character ends with his departure for a given destination and is then later resumed with the notice of his arrival there.\textsuperscript{168} Or, similarly, the agent starts performing an action over a period of time (such as a campaign or a siege) just at the moment of transition to a different agent and setting, and when his narrative thread reemerges later on, he is still engaged in the same task.\textsuperscript{169}

Cases of this sort, which exploit particularly journeys and other continuous actions as fictitious time intervals in which other agents may be represented as operating elsewhere, contribute to a particularly tight-knit basket weave, especially when the latter is of the most complex type. At the other end of the spectrum, there are instances in which the connection of two separate sections pertaining to the same principal agent seems to break down and the narrative loses sight, as it were, of that agent's whereabouts in between his appearances in the focus.\textsuperscript{170}
Logical and chronological relationships between the actions of different agents reported in contiguous sections.

"Synchronic transitions"

Two separate activities (a and b), reported contiguously and pertaining to two different agents (A and B), may be related in different ways according to their logical and chronological sequence. In the first place a and b are either logically autonomous or, if to any extent a leads to b, they are linked by a rapport of causality which naturally enhances the continuity of the narrative in spite of the change from one sphere of operations to another:

\[ a \rightarrow b \quad (a \text{ leads to } b) \]

\[ a \quad // \quad b \quad (a \text{ and } b \text{ are autonomous}) \]

A causal link between the two activities may be provided merely at the moment of transition: in those instances (e.g., I.153.1) when a ends with agent A entrusting a task to B, and b is represented by the latter's execution of the task, the organic transition by itself establishes causality (propter quod), even though all the other stages of a preceding the mission may be logically autonomous from b. At other times on the other hand, a and b are related more intimately as cause and effect.\(^{171}\)

As far as the time sequence is concerned, in a great number of cases a change of agent and setting also alters to some extent the chronological progress of the narrative.\(^ {172}\) As in I.157.1, two activities that pertain to different agents narrated contiguously and causally related often happen in succession, so that the transition
with change of agent from one to the other involves no change of time
(propter quod and post quod). Occasionally, however, a still in
process causes b, with a chronological overlap between the two actions:
then the account of b may start at a point in time earlier than that
reached at the end of the complete report of a.\textsuperscript{173}
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When a and b are not causally related, on one hand b may be
subsequent to a (post quod),\textsuperscript{174} or it may be treated as such with no
time change indicated in the transition, even though it appears
evident from the contents of the passages or from other elements that
a extends chronologically beyond the moment at which b begins.\textsuperscript{175} On
the other hand, frequently the transition from a to b establishes a
relationship of approximate synchronism or partial synchronism (i.e.,
overlap) between the two activities, indicating somehow that b took
place or began while a was in process. Then, if a is reported as
finished, the narrative of b is represented as starting from a point
in time earlier than that reached at the end of the preceding
account.\textsuperscript{176}
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By "synchronic transition" I mean precisely a change of agent which indicates some degree of synchronism between the activities of the two agents reported contiguously. The only notable synchronic transition of Book I is that at 177 from Harpagus to Cyrus. Here the imperfect tense indicates that the conquests of Cyrus were contemporary with those of Harpagus, and therefore that the series of events since Cyrus' departure in 157,1 ("a") overlaps chronologically to an undetermined extent with Cyrus' separate activity from his reappearance in the narrative until his death ("b"):  

τα μόνα νυν λάηω της Ἰάνες Ἀρηίρος ἀνέκατα ἐποίες 

τα δὲ ήνω δύνις Κύρος, πῶν ἐθνός κατάστροφόμενος 

καὶ οὐδὲν Παρέκεις.

In many cases, as in the passage just quoted, the function of expressing synchronism rests solely on the verbs involved in the transition, depending on their form (tense and mood, especially the imperfect indicative and the present participle) and on their meaning (i.e., the action which they describe). Adverbial expressions such as ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἀρομῳ, or temporal clauses indicating simultaneous action (ἐν...), are occasionally used to render the time sequence more explicit. Finally, the mention of an earlier event as time reference in the initial sentence of the new section is, in certain cases, an element
which brings the narrative back in time with respect to the moment at which the action described in the preceding report ended. 179

As we have seen, changes of agent, or of agent and setting combined, represent a subdividing factor in the historical account. The chronological continuity of the latter is somewhat altered when synchronism or overlap occur, but the different sections are structurally on the same level and part of what we have termed the "main narrative". On the other hand, differently than in the case of synchronic transitions, a change of time may coincide with the insertion of a formally subordinate passage, as we shall see later. This happens sometimes in conjunction with a change of agent, or of agent and setting. Such change may in fact involve, or lead to the transition to an earlier time with respect to that reached by the preceding account, for the sake of explaining the origin of current events and circumstances pertaining to the new agent and setting or of illustrating their background. This subordinate role is indicated or implied by the transition itself regardless of the contents and actual function of the new passage. 180 In Book I, the Greek logoi, the account of Cyrus' antecedents and the Phocaean flashback are attached to the narrative in this manner. 181

Sometimes, when two activities a and b pertaining to different agents overlap chronologically, there may be an especially conspicuous, though gradual, change to a later time with respect to the surrounding account if a appears to extend much beyond the beginning of b, or beyond b altogether. The passage in question, characterized by the
change in time, constitutes a "follow-up" which may cause a consider­able suspension of the chronological narrative, but does not always appear formally subordinated to it in a clear-cut manner. Brief follow-ups are likely to be completely integrated in the main narrative.

The phenomenon of the change of agent has been described at greater length than the cases in Book I seem to justify because it represents an important compositional feature of the Histories in general, especially in the later books. A narrative characterized by a series of frequent changes of agent, or of agent and setting combined, is markedly different from a predominantly centralized account, where changes of agent, time and setting occur for the most part with the insertion of subordinate passages. Each of these two types of narrative reflects, first of all, a special choice on the part of the author, either to distribute his focus, as it were, among different agents, or to keep it fast on one principal character. From the purely compositional point of view, moreover, a basket weave account, especially if it is of the most complex type, requires a considerable organizing technique and a whole set of special devices. For the reader it is likely to present nevertheless some problems of clarity and cohesiveness. The analysis in the Appendix of a markedly different sample of the Histories will contribute to illustrate the prominence of changes of agent in Herodotus, as well as the forms which they can assume and their cumulative effect upon the substance of the narrative.
NOTES TO CHAPTER II


2. Not all the insertions act as dividers between two different stages of an action. Many insertions originate from the introduction or the initial sentence of a narrative which they delay. See especially 7-25, 95.2-106 (an insertion within an insertion), 171-173, 178-187, 202-204.1.

3. I.e., Ionian embassy to Sparta (152.1-2), Spartan embassy to Cyrus (153.1-2), departure of Cyrus (153.3-4), rebellion of Pactyas (154), advice of Croesus to Cyrus and Cyrus' consequent policy (155-156), command of Mazares and escape, pursuit and capture of Pactyas (157-161), succession of Harpagus (162).

4. See below, pp. 182-188.

5. See below, pp. 168-181, on dramatic sections.

6. 52.1, 101, 120.1.

7. Ταύταν τὴν μάχην, ἄμηι ἡς ἄρα ἑρμοῦρν ἄνθρωπος μάκαρ ἔργον ἐποίηκα, κρίνω ἱκανῆς ἁγίας ἱεράς, καὶ ἔπι οὖν ἡμέρα τοῦτο τὸ ἡμέρας.


9. P. 70.


11. P. 44.

12. See p. 88 and note 165. This section also includes a tightly framed addition (20) that gives prominence to the introduction of Periander into the narrative in view of the upcoming Arion episode (23-24).

13. See below, pp. 139-148.

14. See above, pp. 64-65.

15. A series of prospective and retrospective sentences in 80.2 and 80.4 fragments and slows down the account of Cyrus' operations for the
battle, thereby suggesting the thoughtfulness of his strategy in contrast with his earlier rapidity of action (79.1-2).

16. See pp. 43-44.

17. Only "resumptive introductions" (see pp. 33-34) do not properly have this function.


19. See p. 87.

20. Cp. Ἕκτων and ἐκέφεξα in 14.4 and 16.2 with ἡματερής (5.3) and ἐκείνος (92.1). Herodotus is evidently drawing a distinction between capture and permanent conquest. There is still a slight discrepancy in the transition at 5.3-6.1 between "the first perpetrator of unjust acts" and "the first who conquered" because strictly speaking attacks, raids and captures are also "unjust acts". Lattimore ("The Composition of the History", pp. 10-11) I think rightly attributes the discrepancy to Herodotus' progressive style. Cp. on the other hand Jacoby, RE Suppl. 2.338 and De Sanctis "La composizione della storia di Erodoto", pp. 291-298 and "Il 'logos' di Croeso e il proemio della storia erodotea," RIFC 64 (1936), pp. 1-14, esp. 2-4. According to De Sanctis in particular the contradiction is blatant and contributes to demonstrate that the Croesus logos had been composed independently from the proem and from Herodotus' intent to narrate the origins of the war between Greeks and Barbarians. For a recent attempt to reconcile the aporia between I.5.3-6.2 and I.14.4, see Shimron, "Πρωτος τὰν ἡμῖν ἔγραψεν.."

21. As we have already mentioned (p. 130-131), the Delphic motif is already an important element of the survey of predecessors and it contributes to connect this part of the Lydian logos with the later narrative of Croesus' downfall. See Hans Schwab, "Herodot als Historiker und Erzähler", Gymnasium 76 (1969), pp. 253-272, esp. 258-261.

22. The adviser scene in 27, in spite of its connection with the account of Croesus' Greek conquests, is rather more relevant to the later narrative. See p. 144.

23. For Jacoby (RE Suppl. 2.337-40), the fact that the story of Croesus is mainly told without relation to the Greeks indicates that what is now the first part of the work was originally an autonomous work about Croesus. The "fundamental idea" of the Histories, i.e. that of the conflict between Greeks and Barbarians, is for Jacoby secondary in the composition of the work and the passages in the Croesus logos that refer to it (like 5.3-6 already examined and 92.1,
which will be discussed below) are attributed by Jacoby to a later final redaction. Cp. also De Sanctis, "La composizione della storia di Erodoto" and "Il 'logos' di Creso."

24. It will be discussed on pp. 136-137.


26. I.e., in the report of the events leading to the third conquest of Ionia (V.28-VI.32).

27. See 153.3, The Ionian's involvement with Pactyas probably determined Cyrus' decision to move against them with some alacrity, but he still left the task to another general, as he had originally planned.


29. 141.

30. 164.2.

31. 142-151.1 (discussed on pp. 148, 152, 154); 158-160 (inconsistent treatment of Pactyas on the part of different cities); 152 (lack of solidarity between the mainland Greeks and the Greeks of Asia: The Spartans, who had agreed to the alliance with a foreign King because they thought that he would win, refuse to support the Ionians).

32. 164-168. See pp. 223-225.

33. See pp. 167-168 on wise-adviser scenes.

34. For the first occurrence of that theme in the Histories see 95.2, discussed on p. 220.

35. Herodotus does not describe the Ionians' state of subjection to Cyrus as compared to Croesus' rule. But the term "enslavement" is frequently used to refer to Cyrus' conquests (129.1, 4, 89.1, 94.7, 164, 169.1, 3, 170.2, 174.1) and only once for Croesus, in reference to a conquest which was never even attempted (71.4). The discrepancy contributes to indicate a difference in the opponent in the perception of Herodotus and the Greeks. See note 28 above.


37. As we have already determined (Chapter I, p. 44) this statement
functions as a conclusion although it is technically a final σέ-
sentence.

38. ἐναπελήθης here describes a later phase of the action with
respect to ἵπτομαι and ἐπορθεῖν. In 84.1: "they had in
their power".

39. Immerwahr ("Causation", p. 259) calls it the "metaphysical" cause.

40. See esp. 28-29 and 33.9.

41. For this group of statements as an example of Ritornellkomposition
and anaphoric ring composition, see Beck, Ringkomposition, pp. 18-19.

42. 34-45, see pp. 175-176.

43. This is a truly historical cause as von Fritz saw, the same as
that which Thucydides indicates as the ἡ ὀμολογία τῆς πρόβασις
of the Peloponnesian war. Here to a great extent it may be said to
herald the transition to a more rigorous historical account from the
preceding "märchenhafte Geschichten" (which Thucydides certainly
regarded as told ἡ τῆς προφετείας τῆς ἀληθείας ἡμῶν ἦ τῆς
ἀληθείας τῆς προφετείας), although the narrative of the consultation
of the oracle which immediately follows is still a reelaborated
"Märchenmotif". See K. von Fritz, Griechische Geschichtsschreibung
I, p. 225.


45. There it is a matter of prophetic dream (34.1).

46. See Chapter I, pp. 33-34.

47. ἐπιλέγετο σχεδιάζον in 71.1 is inceptive and different
from ὑπ' ἑνῆς ἐπιλέγουσα (in 46.1, before the prepara-
tions) which indicates the first conception of the plan. See p. 54
on verbs as markers of transition.

48. It seems in fact as if the statement should lead directly to the
Cappadocian insertion (72). On this aspect, see Chapter III, pp.
239-240.

49. Compare κατάκεισθαι in 71.1. See also 54.1, 56.1) with
τὸ κατά τὸ σύναν in 46.1.

50. Compare κατά τὸ ἰσθαι ἀπὸν καταγιγομένῳ τῆν σύναμνι
in the initial announcement (46.1) with κατακτήθην πόλιν καὶ
τὴν Περσίαν σύναμνι in 71.1. κατ' ἰσθαινόν
("take down") is more drastic than κατάλακα ("restrain") and is almost equivalent to κατάλυσεν in the oracle's prediction (53.3). See Powell, Lexicon, s.v.

51. ... ἔπιν οὐδεὶς ἀπὸ Σερών τοῦ καὶ Κασίων ἡλιοβασία
(70.3).

52. Herodotus does not use ἀθέτησις or any other single abstract term to indicate what we call Croesus' blindness, but in numerous instances before the account of Croesus' preparations for the war against Cyrus, he refers to Croesus' false opinions, as he represents dramatically his basic lack of understanding. See especially the following passages (asterisks indicate those in direct speech):

30.3, ἔπινων ἕνα ἁραίροντων ὀλίγοτάρος
31.1, ἄλεσαν πέντε δευτερά τών ὅρισθήκα
33, οὔτε λέγον μὴν παλαισμένος οὔδενός... κάρτα δέος ὀμήθη δὴνι
34.1, ... ἐνομισμένα εὐνοῦν δὲν ἀνθρώπιν ἁπάντων ἐξουσίαν ὁ λόγος τάτον
38.2*, τὸν γὰρ ἐπεροῦ... οἷν εἶναι μοι λόγοισι (with irony)
40*, νενικημένος ὑπὸ οἷον ἡ εἰρήνηιων.

For Croesus' hopeful nature cp. Sheffield, Herodotus' Portrayal of Croesus, pp. 50-51. In the Solon episode Croesus is blind to the nature of happiness (he values material prosperity above all), and to the laws of human destiny (he does not understand reversal of fortune). In the Atys - Adrastus logos Croesus is blind to predestination: he entrusts his son to impure Adrastus and does not understand the possible forms under which a prophecy can come true.

53. See the repetition of the proper name in 73.1 (Ἐνί 7ήν
Καππαδοσ Σολίν) which serves as a weak connective with what precedes.

54. Cp. 204.2.

55. According to K. von Fritz, the inconsistency between this list of motives and that expressed earlier at 46.1 is increased by the out-of-context introduction of the Sandanis episode (71). He observes, in fact, how the argument of Sandanis only counters the imperialistic motive stated in 73.1, while it has no value in the light of Croesus' fear of the growing Persian power which, according to 46.1, is what induced Croesus to the campaign against Cyrus. Von Fritz takes this discrepancy as an illustration of how Herodotus has not perfectly integrated the different stories which he knew about Croesus into a unitarian whole. (Griechische Geschichtsschreibung I, pp. 227-228). However, here the consideration of each successive transitional statement in relation to the sections of narrative which they join together allows us to follow the evolution of Croesus' plan as well as Herodotus' own classification of the causes of the war. As 71.1
already implies, after the consultation of the oracles, imperialism starts becoming predominant as Croesus' motive.

56. Croesus' crossing of the Halys is told in such a way as to emphasize precisely the notion of violation. See pp. 64-65.

57. Cp. 8.1: οὗτος δὲ ἥγετος Κανδαυλῆς ἐπάνω τῆς ἐπιφύλαξε, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἔνοικε... ὅπερ τε ἡγήσατο ὁμίλον... Candaules' τρόπος is the cause of a blindness which brings him to ruin. ἔρως is in fact the basis for the statement at 8.2: τὸν πᾶτον Ἰάραντον ἐνεχθάνων ἔμψυχο. For the term ἐμέρος used to indicate the excessive desire of tyrants, see Sheffield, Herodotus' Portrayal of Croesus, p. 52, n.27.

58. 29.1.

59. See above, Chapter I, note 150.

60. Imperialism (or expansionism) is, as Immerwahr has defined it, a "permanently operative cause" of aggression in Herodotus' history of the development of the East ("Causation", p. 264).

61. See above, note 52.

62. See pp. 152 and 156-164.

63. See above p. 141.

64. Thus in 91, where the causality of Croesus' downfall is summarized, the oracle reproaches Croesus for no other crime than his lack of ἐνθυμοσύνη in not inquiring further into the meaning of the responses (91.4).

65. Revenge is here an "immediate cause" (Immerwahr, "Causation", p. 264).

66. Immerwahr ("Causation", p. 257) summarizes the different levels of causation in Herodotus' history of Croesus' downfall (46-91) as follows: "Croesus was doomed to be the last of the Mermnades ( . . . ) but the exact form of his destruction was due to a variety of factors among which the basic motive was Croesus' irrational desire for expansion ( . . . ). Two additional factors appeared immediately before the campaign: fear of Persia's power ( . . . ) and desire for vengeance on Cyrus ( . . . ). Finally in the course of his
preparations Croesus misunderstood the oracles ( . . . ); thus "led him to destruction." However enlightening, this interpretation does not sufficiently take into consideration the hierarchy of the causes which Herodotus establishes through the sequence of the narrative and the special emphasis of transitions.

67. For ζίγκες as a recurrent motive for war in the Histories, see Pagel, Aitiol Moment, 17.

68. For example, in the Gyges - Candaules episode (8-12), violation and revenge determine events and, differently than in the case of Cyrus and Croesus, the avenger had been victim of the violation. In the Persian - Phoenician version of the origins of the East-West conflict (1-5.2), the violation - revenge element is the only repeated factor of causality, and Herodotus makes the chain of rapes and retaliations ending in a war appear as a simplistic and rather ridiculous interpretation of a historical development. In Herodotus' own version of the history of the war between Greeks and Barbarians, revenge will play a role in combination with other elements. See Chapter I, p. 66, note 131. For revenge as an element of causality in the Cyrus - Astyages conflict, see below pp. 154-155, note 89. For Herodotus' evaluation of Croesus' wish for revenge against Cyrus in the flashback on the origin of the Lydo-Median alliance, see p. 214. Contra Jacoby, RE Suppl. 2.387 and 487. Jacoby maintains that the mention of the motive of revenge only at this point of the story of Croesus, far from being intentional, reveals Herodotus' imperfect mastery over the material of his complex narrative.

69. See pp. 74 and 150.

70. For Herodotus' anticipation of this fact, see p. 214.

71. Cp. above, pp. 136-137.

72. Quoted with the other two conclusions of the Croesus logos on p. 133.

73. See below, pp. 253 -255.

74. See Chapter I, especially pp. 60-62.

75. For the transition to an earlier time see Chapter III, pp. 218 -222.

76. See p. 79.

77. For Janus transitions, see pp. 35-36.
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78. See the postponement in 75.1 (discussed above, pp. 74-75).

79. 55.2, 91.5-6, 75.1. Cp. 107.

80. 46.1, 73.2, 75.1. Cp. 107-129.


82. See Cyrus' behavior in the war, 79-80.

83. See below, pp. 152, 157 and note 94, and later on dramatic sections, pp. 177-178.

84. See Chapter I, p. 44, note 73.

85. Cp. "..." in 95.1 and 14.1 both marking a change of dynasty from the opposite viewpoint.

86. Cp. the reference to the Scythian domination with the account of it in 103.3-106.1.

87. In 86.1 the mention of the misinterpreted oracle is a more indirect reference to Croesus' fault (i.e., blindness), strictly combined with the allusion to the metaphysical cause of predestination (see pp. 136-137). Moreover, the statement of Croesus' own responsibility for his downfall is not, like here, closely combined with the mention of the enslavement of his own people (94.7). The causal connection between the fall of the individual and the fate of the community is the same in both cases, but for Croesus it is not emphasized. The discrepancy reflects the difference, at the ethical level, between Astyages' guilt and Croesus' error (ἡμαρτάνειν, 91.7).

88. 129.3 (...ARIOΣ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΝ ΜΗΣΥΚ ΜΗΣΕΣ ΜΗΣΕΣ ΜΗΣΕΣ) and 124.4 (ΤΑΤΙΝ ΕΝ ΜΗΣΕΣ ΜΗΣΕΣ ΟΝΤΑΣ ΜΗΣΕΣ ΟΝΤΑΣ ΟΝΤΑΣ ΝΗΣΕΝΕΙΣ, ΠΕΡΕΙ ΔΗ ΟΙΟΥΟΙ ΟΙΟΥΟΙ ΟΙΟΥΟΙ ΠΡΙΝ ΜΗΣΕΣ ΤΟΝ ΜΗΣΕΣ ΤΟΝ ΜΗΣΕΣ). This epilogue, where Harpagus is blamed for his role in the subjection of the Medes to the Persians, is an example of how Herodotus sometimes uses the dramatic mode to express "partial truths" that enrich the interpretation of events by introducing a point of view slightly off the mainstream of Herodotus' thought in a given account. See below, pp. 167-168.

89. Other than in the striking account of Astyages' punishment of Harpagus (118-119), the King's cruelty emerges from the narrative of his treatment of Cyrus. In his desire for revenge, Harpagus seeks in fact Cyrus as an ally τάς ΠΑΘΑΣ τάς ΚΥΡΟΥ ΤΗΣΙ ΕΝΟΥΝ ὙΜΟΙΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ (123.1; see also 124.1).
90. In 127.2 Astyages is said to have been ἀληθής when he chose Harpagus as his general. Astyages' flagrant violation of a natural law in 119 and his misinterpretation of the prophetic dreams in 120 already imply blindness.

91. Cp. ἀληθής ἀληθεία in 130.3 with ηῆς ἀληθεία in the analogous statements (95.1 and 130.2) that refer to the hegemony acquired by the Persians with their victory over the Medes. The conquest of Lydia results in the elimination of the boundary between Upper and Lower Asia. Immerwahr, "Causation," pp. 258-259.

92. See above pp. 130-136.


94. See above, note 34 and p. 130.

95. Immerwahr, (Form and Thought, p. 24) observes that the logos of the second conquest of Ionia (beginning at I.141) is one of the three major logoi in the Histories which start with Greek instead of Persian action. The other two are respectively the Spartan campaign against Polycrates of Samos (III.39-60) and the Ionian revolt (V.28-VI.32). For the phenomenon of the "change of agent" in the narrative of the second conquest of Ionia, see below pp. 182-195.

96. See above, pp. 150 and 152. In this part of the Cyrus logos, Cyrus is especially represented in three brief dramatic scenes, two of which connected with the Ionian and Greek motif: 141.1-2, 153.1-2 and 155. The first (141.1-2) recalls Cyrus' style in 126 but reveals an attitude that had first emerged in 114 (see also 155.1, where the issue is also punishment). The scene where Cyrus ends up following Croesus' advice (155) shows his political side vis à vis his subjects and is particularly close in form and substance to 88-89, within the epilogue of the Croesus logos. In 153.1-2 Cyrus' threat to the Spartans indicates his boundless expectations as far as imperialism is concerned.

97. For the change of agent in this transition, see below pp. 186-188.

98. Professor Donald Lateiner suggested this possibility to me.

99. ἐπικρατεῖσθαι seems to be conative rather than indicating the result of conquest (which is however generally implied), because of the two campaigns described in the narrative that follows, that against the Massagetans was unsuccessful. On the conative present see Smyth, Greek Grammar, p. 421.
100. Cp. 263 (in the account of Croesus' conquest): Περί Περσῶν εἰναὶ ἄλλα τά κατά τὸν Ἰσμάηλίας τῆς Κριῶν, μετὰ δὲ ἐν μέρει ἑλάστοις 'Αβραάμ καί Αβραάμ, ἂλλας διὰ τὰς ἑπιφάνειας εἰς κατατάξεις ἑλάστοις ἑπιφάνειας ἑπιφάνειας.

101. See 27, 28, 73, 75.

102. See pp. 70 and 88.

103. 190-191.

104. 178-187, see p. 243.

105. 192-194, pp. 255 - 257.

106. Ἰουσπικτήμενοι... τῶν Ἐστράτιων ὁ ἄστρομόντα ὠλλα ὄφειντες ὕσταν πάντες ἑβνεί ὁμοίως ἐπιχειρεύοντα. The idea of "ownership" of the boundaries is also reinforced by the brief description at 188.1-2. Cp. the Persian claim at 4.4 (οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐν τῷ).

107. See pp. 243 - 244. Herodotus' emphasis on boundaries is in this case especially symbolic. The boundaries of Cyrus' dominion are indistinct and Cyrus had crossed and violated rivers with good results before (189). Herodotus here represents the remoteness of the Massagetae in order to convey the idea that Cyrus, in his march of conquest, eventually went too far.

108. In IX.122 an idea of limit is indeed implicitly joined with that of dominion, but that passage must be considered in its context, as "epilogue" of the Histories and of the narrative of the Persian Wars.

109. See 126.6: ... ὄμως ἔρχεται οὐκ ἐν μέρει τῆς πόλεως ἀλλὰ τὸ κατά τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρόνον τὸν Χρό


111. See e.g. K. H. Waters, "The purpose of dramatization in Herodotus," Historia 15 (1966), 157-171.

112. The insistent reference to Arion's professional accoutrements dramatically symbolizes the sacred position of the poet:
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113. For the overlap of tragedy and history among the ancients see F. W. Walbank, "History and Tragedy", Historia IX (1960), pp. 217-234, esp. 229-230.

114. This is true of later historians as well. For an analysis of certain substantial dramatic elements in Thucydides' narrative, see D. Lateiner, "Heralds and corpses in Thucydides", CW 71 (1977), pp. 101-106.

115. See Hans Fohl, Tragische Kunst bei Herodot (Leipzig, 1913), 50-62. For pathos, see also the "Do not Kill Croesus" scene in 85.4.


117. Other adviser scenes in Book I (29-32, 88-99, 123) are incorporated into the great dramatic logos discussed below, p. 168-181. For non-dramatized adviser episodes, see 59.2, 80.2, 170.

118. The scene of Croesus' advice in 207 is however part of a more complex dramatic passage, which includes the preliminary of Tomyris' message (2-6.1-3), the assembly setting and the suggestion of a debate (206.3, 208.1).

119. Cobet, Exkurse pp. 105-117. The notion of the "primitive opponent" is not central in the account of Croesus' campaign against the Persians but it will become important in the narrative of later acts of aggression, starting with Cyrus' campaign against the Massagetae (see I.207.6, 211). The introduction of the motif with the scene of Sandanis' advice represents a case of indirect anticipation. See above, Chapter I, note 165.

120. See pp. 172-175.


122. The term is used by Immerwahr, Form and Thought, p. 69.

123. See D. L. Page, A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy
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124. For the dramatic unity of this section, see R. Riecks, "Eine Tragische Erzählung bei Herodot (Hist. 1.34-45)", Poetica V (1975), pp. 23-44, esp. 33.

125. The tragic substance of the Herodotean story of Cyrus is described by Cizek "From historical truth to literary convention", pp. 531-552, esp. 531-544.

126. In the Gyges - Candaules episode two scenes of dialogue (8.2-9 and 11) alternate with two scenes of dramatic action (10 and 12). The Croesus - Atys - Adrastus drama corresponds exactly to the prose version of a tragedy in five episodes (Riecks, "Tragische Erzählung", pp. 34-37), where the narrative passage would have been rendered in a real tragedy by monologues (34, 44) or messenger speeches (36.1, 43, 45.3). In the story of Cyrus there is no unity of time (see 114.1, 123.1) and the narrative moves from place to place. Here the style is mixed with a considerable number of dialogue scenes mostly in direct speech (10) supplemented by narrative passage. For the composition of the Croesus epilogue, alternating speech and dramatic action, see below, pp. 177-178.

127. 9.2-10.2, the setting of the royal bedchamber; see also 30.1, 86.1-2 (see below, pp. 173-174 and 177-178).

128. i.e., messengers, servants, etc. See 30.1, 36.2, 109.1 (here Harpagus' wife is only introduced to justify his speech: Herodotus does not report monologues in direct discourse), 110ff. (Mitrادات and Cynos), 114.5 (Artembares).

129. 87.2, 12.2.


131. 119.7, 44-45.

132. 34, 107.


135. For example, Candaules anticipates Croesus in his blind self-
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satisfaction (cp. 8.1, ἔνομίζε οἱ ἔνωσιν πολλὰν πασίν καλλίστην and 34.1, ἔνομίζε ἔσωσιν ἄραι ἄνων ὀλίγωτάταν), but also Cambyses for his insane violation of customs (cp. e.g. I.8.3-4 and III.34). For the theme of revenge, see p. 146, note 68. For the theme of female fortitude, see Chapter I, p. 76-77.

136. See above, p. 136.

137. Sheffield (Herodotus' Portrayal of Croesus, p. 44) points out how the historical present ἀπεκκύλονται contributes to mark the importance of the episode. Besides here, at the moment of Solon's arrival, the historical present is also used to mark Solon's initial answer to Croesus' question (30.3, λέει) and Solon's departure (33, ἀ πο τέλευτα τοῦ). For the historical present in transitions, cp. Chapter I, p. 53-54.

138. As Pohlenz acutely observes, however, (Herodot, p.37) Solon is not represented in Herodotus as a key figure in the historical development of Athens comparable to Lycurgos for Sparta (see I.65.2-66.1). It is rather Cleisthenes who, for Herodotus, marked the turning point from bad to good government in Athens with the consequent beginning of the city's rise in power (see V.66-78). Solon in fact became known as the founder of democracy rather than just a legislator only in the fourth century with the reaction against moderate democracy.

139. As Sheffield remarks (Herodotus' Portrayal of Croesus, pp. 47-48, 80-81), Herodotus consciously or unconsciously draws parallels between Solon and himself.

140. Τάτη ταῖντο τῷ Κροίτῳ ὥς καὶ καὶ ὥς ἐγρίζετο ὅτε λέγων μὴ ποιεσθε ὡδενες ἀποκατέτα, κύρια δόσας ἀκαθασία δειν, ὥσ τῷ πωρεύτα τρυβά μετῆς τῆς Τεχεύτης πινητῶν χρήματος δεκαν ἔκελευεν.

For the difficult syntax of this sentence, see Sheffield, Herodotus' Portrayal of Croesus, pp. 54-56. According to Sheffield, "... Herodotus here deliberately uses a contorted, abrupt style to emphasize further the difference between these men", and "the end of this concluding sentence emphatically summarizes Solon's warning -- look to the Τεχεύτη of all things -- and forms an ominous prelude to Croesus' subsequent downfall."

141. See pp. 35-36.

142. See also, for example, VI.84.3.
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143. Contra, von Fritz, Griechische Geschichtsschreibung I, 223, who interprets νέμων not as "punishment" but as "distribution".

144. See above, pp. 139-148.

145. Riecks, "Tragische Erzählung", p. 36.

146. See Fränkel, "Stileigenheit", 84. As Fränkel remarks, we would have preferred not to hear of how Croesus' grief died away. But Herodotus' method (and the archaic style in general) does not know the stylization of a definitive conclusion as when the curtain falls after a catastrophe. Here the narrative goes on, and with an effort to bind strictly together its different parts.

147. See above, p. 140, note 43.

148. The theme of autocracy -- control of subjects, reward and punishment -- starts being developed in the Cyrus logos (98-99, 155) rather than in the Croesus logos, in agreement with Herodotus' portrait of Croesus mainly as a rich and happy king rather than a high-handed ruler and conqueror (cp. above, note 35, p. 144, and the related notion of Croesus' philhellenism mentioned below on p. 233). That theme however makes its first appearance in the Croesus logos, in a secondary connection, with the episode of Croesus' punishment of his rival for the throne in 92.2-4 (indirect anticipation again, see Chapter I, note 165). For the theme of the despotic monarch, see Marcello Gigante, Νόμος Βασιλέων (Napoli, 1956). p. 116. Von Fritz, Griechische Geschichtsschreibung I, p. 238, draws attention to the unrelated character of the scene at 88-89 (cp. above, p. 142, note 55, for his view of the Sandanis episode), but it is characteristic of Herodotus to anticipate somewhat out of context, as in this case, motifs that will become predominant only later on. It represents Herodotus' special way of using sometimes the traditional material about certain figures to convey general points rather than to add to the characterization of the particular figure.

149. As described above, pp. 166-167. In this passage dramatic elements appear in the account of Deioces: introduction of Deioces (ἐν δὲ ἔνθην ἔφη τοῖς Μέδαις ἐπί τινας Ἐρράπος ἔγραψεν τοῖς Μέδαις Πυραύλοις, cp. 8.1), Deioces' speech to the Medes in indirect discourse (97.1), assembly of the Medes with the argument of Deioces' supporters in direct speech (97.2-98.1).

150. See Chapter I, p. 44 and note 73.

151. See e.g. Soph. O.T. 1117-18. Here Harpagus is introduced autonomously from his earlier appearance in the narrative (80.2).
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152. See above, pp. 151-156.


154. For transitions from king to king, see above, pp. 44, 124, 178-180.

155. See above, pp. 156-157.

156. Cp. e.g. the transition from Megabazus to the Libyan logos at IV.145.1 (Appendix, pp. 294 - 295).

157. See e.g. the Ionians as agents in the account of the Ionian revolt (cp. p. 307).

158. P. 182.

159. I.56.1-2, 59.1, 65.1, 82.1. See below, pp. 227 -234.

160. See Appendix, esp. pp. 293 - 303 for numerous cases and variations.

161. Other than by marked transitional statements that separate and connect the two actions, an organic transition can be rendered conspicuous by the presence of qualifying remarks underlining the appearance of the new agent (e.g. IV.143-144, pp. 294 - 295; V.25, p. 300) or by a prolonged description of the movement or interaction which occasions the change of agent (e.g. V.14, p. 297; V.99, p. 307).

162. Μετὰ ταύτα... ἀπῆλθαν αὐτοὶ ἐκ Ἀγεάταν, καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἔστιν οὕτως ἐν οὐκετὶ λέγω τοις καθελθόντες τὴν πρώτην ἐνα. Ἐγείρε τὰ Βαρθυράν οἱ ἐν πρώτῳ καὶ τὸ βάλτριον ἔθνος καὶ Σικαλι δὲ καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι, ἐπὶ δὲ ἐπιείχε τε στρατηγεῖν αὐτός, ἐπὶ δὲ ἐναντίον πέμπτην στρατηγόν.

163. This transition is quoted on p. 158, as well as below, p. 192.

164. E.g. V.11.1, 108.1 (see pp. 296-297 and 315).

165. See e.g. V.1.1 (p. 295) for a weak "σε" sentence in a transition to a different agent.

166. See especially the European campaign logos at V.1-27, discussed on pp. 293-303.

167. I.E. V.30-VI.7. The first transition from A to B is that at
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V.99 from Aristagoras to the Ionians. The other agents are the Cyprians (C), Darius (D), Persian generals (E), and Histiaeus (F). Cp. Appendix, pp. 307-322.

168. E.g., Darius in IV.143 and V.10 (see pp. 294 and 295); Megabazus in V.17.1 and 23.1 (pp. 298-299); Histiaeus in V.107 and VI.1.1 (pp. 316-322).

169. E.g., Onesilos in V.104.3-105.1 and 108.1 (pp. 315-316); Histiaeus in VI.5.3 and 26.1 (pp. 322 and 326-327).

170. See especially V.103.2 and 108.2, 115 and 120.1, discussed respectively on pp. 312-314 and 319-320.

171. E.g., in the two contiguous passages at V.11-14 and 14-15 (centered around Darius and Megabazus respectively), the episode of the Paeonian brothers (12-13) explains the aitie for Megabazus' conquest of the Paeonians. The organic change of agent at 14 further underlines the rapport of causality between the activity of Megabazus and that of Darius. See below, pp. 297-298. For a propter quod formal transition, see e.g. V.124.1 (pp. 321-322).

172. See especially below, p. 311, note 34.

173. This is expressed by the transition at V.124.1, already cited above (note 171).

174. The narrative goes forward chronologically, for example, in the transition at V.28 from Otanes to the Ionian revolt (see p. 304).

175. See e.g. the transitions at IV.205-V.1.1 (from Lybia to Megabazus, p. 295) and at V.22.2-23.1 (from Macedonia to Megabazus, pp. 298-299).

176. E.g., V.10-11.1, from Megabazus to Darius (see pp. 296-297). Sometimes (e.g., in the transition at V.105.1 from the Cyprians to Darius, see p. 314) a transition to a different agent indicates synchronism with the last stage of the preceding action recorded as still in process (usually an unfinished campaign, siege or journey), in which case no change of time occurs at the beginning of the new report. Whenever two activities pertaining to two different agents and settings are reported contiguously, and any measure of synchronism can be deduced in any way, either from the transitions or from the contents of the passages themselves, the term "parallel narrative" is generally used. See especially Jacoby, RE Suppl. 2.489. Cp. also Immerwahr, Form and Thought, 59-61.
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177. See e.g. the transition at V.124.1 between Otanes and Aristagoras, quoted p. 321 (ἀκομῆς, ἐβούλευτο).

178. E.g., IV.145.1, from Megabazus to Libya (p. 295); V.108.1, from Darius to the Cyprians (p. 315).

179. See e.g. in V.116, between the Cyprians and the Persian generals, the reference to the previous expedition against Sardis (pp. 318-319). See also VI.22.1 and VI.26.6 (p. 326).

180. E.g., at I.V.145.1 the transition from the account of the Hellespontine operations to that of the expedition against Libya first indicates synchronism with an unfinished action (see just above and note 178) and then leads directly to the transition to an earlier time for an explanation of causes. In other words, the Libyan logos begins with a flashback, i.e., a section subordinate to the account of the expedition. For the notion of formal subordination see Introduction, pp.16-18. The formal difference between a synchronic transition and a transition with change of time to an insertion is perhaps best illustrated by the way in which in Book V the beginning of the account of the revolt in Cyprus is attached to the preceding section as an explanation of the origin of the current situation (104.1, see pp. 312-313). The passage at V.104 is therefore technically a flashback, even though by contents it could well constitute "parallel narrative".

181. See below, pp. 220-222, 227-234.

182. For follow-ups see below, p. 224. See also VI.22-24, discussed on pp. 326-327.

183. E.g. V.21 (p. 300).
CHAPTER III

THE SUBSTANCE OF TRANSITIONS: INSERTIONS

We have examined so far different types of transitions within the main historical account and within any stretch of chronological narrative. Now we shall consider mainly the way in which those subordinate passages which we have termed "insertions" connect with their surroundings.

Narrative insertions:

change of time or of time and place

The transition to an earlier time in the three major flashbacks of Book I

In Book I the most important insertions characterized by a change of time with respect to the chronological narrative are the two flashbacks respectively on Croesus' antecedents at the beginning of the Croesus logos, and on the early history of Cyrus at the beginning of the Cyrus logos. A third and shorter flashback relates the origins of the Lydo-Median alliance within the history of Croesus' war against Cyrus. This passage exemplifies the simplest pattern of flashback and will therefore be examined first.

Before the account of Croesus' Cappadocian campaign a resumptive statement which summarizes Croesus' motives for the aggression mentions for the first time that Croesus wished to punish Cyrus for dethroning Astyages since the latter was in fact Croesus' own brother-in-law.
The transition to an earlier time is made by the prospective participial clause \( \rho\nu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron \nu \rho\omicron\mu\beta\alpha\epsilon\nu \ K\epsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omega\delta \) attached to the resumptive introduction. The passage that follows, like other brief momentary flashbacks included in the Histories for the purpose of explaining certain facts and actions in the main narrative, relates an episode in the past, so that the change of time at the beginning is reversed at the end: here a statement repeating that Astyages had then been dethroned by Cyrus and that Croesus wished to avenge him (75.1) starts to bring the narrative back to the point at which it had been interrupted.

The story told in the flashback belongs chronologically to the accounts of Alyattes and of Cyaxares, where Herodotus mentions it with implicit cross-references (16.2 and 103.2). Inserted at this point, in the series of explanations and definitions which from 70.1 delay the narrative of Croesus' campaign, it serves to put into perspective the nature of Croesus' ties with Astyages, providing the elements for assessing Croesus' motive of revenge.

According to the narrative, the alliance between Lydians and Medes originated almost by chance from a long and bloody war (74.1-3). The marriage of Astyages with Alyattes' daughter was arranged by the intermediaries as part of the agreement because "without the compulsion of kinship treaties do not last" (74.4). The irony of this comment is evident, especially since it is stated immediately below that "Cyrus had conquered Astyages who was his own grandfather." Astyages' kinship with Croesus as the basis for the latter's
punitive campaign against Cyrus is here subtly devaluated and the motive of revenge itself is made to appear secondary in the causation of the war. 6

The story of how the Median and the Lydian reigning families became related, the function of which for the main narrative has just been considered, is identified by the introductory clause in 73.2 as the essential component of the flashback. However Herodotus' narrative reaches farther back beyond the explanation required by the present context and beyond the introductory definition, since it also accounts for the reasons why the Lydians and the Medes went to war with one another. This aitie section, of considerable length in proportion to the entire flashback, is entirely relevant to the Histories as a whole, 7 but in particular, since it focuses on Cyaxares, it is more pertinent to the history of Media than to the immediately surrounding narrative about Croesus' expedition against Cyrus. The story of the Lydo-Median war has been included here rather than later on in the account of Cyaxares in view of the need to explain the nature of Croesus' ties with Astyages, but Herodotus does not let it be curtailed by that narrow connection and, treating it as a complete whole, he begins with an account of the origin of that event before relating its outcome. 8

The flashback on Croesus' antecedents (7-25 including the Arion insertion) is structurally more complex and ambiguous than the passage just considered because, although it starts in a similar manner with the report of a single event in the past (the change of dynasty
episode), it then extends in a chronological continuum and eventually becomes identified with the main narrative with no reverse change of time. The combination of this characteristic with the fact that the setting remains the same (i.e., Lydia) makes the pattern of the flashback on Croesus' antecedents uniquely suited to the beginning of the work.

The introduction of Croesus as the starting point of the narrative (5.3-6) is immediately followed by the announcement of the explanation of how the family of Croesus began to rule Lydia, succeeding the former Heraclid dynasty (7.1). This statement marks the transition to an earlier time, from Croesus to Candaules, the last Heraclid King (Ἡν Κανδαυλος Ἡλεος, 7.2). But before the change of dynasty episode, the introduction of Candaules comes to include a partial genealogy that reaches back to the first Heraclid (7.2), as well as a notice on the earlier dynasty of Lydia and on the Lydian people before that (7.3). The succession of that reaches farther and farther back in time (Προτερον, Προτερον) attests to Herodotus' reluctance to leave gaps in his history and to his effort to find the first possible beginning of a historical development even beyond the stage which he particularly wants to emphasize. By the end of the Croesus logos practically the entire history of Lydia will have been covered, but the flashback technique and the variable emphasis of the transitions contribute together with the different
extent and depth of the narrative itself to the production of a hierarchical order in the exposition of the material.11

Thus the initial change of dynasty episode clearly appears as the nucleus of the flashback, standing out by virtue of its dramatic mode and of its frame. This is consistent with the fact that, autonomously from the survey of Lydian Kings that follows, the passage by its contents fulfills a special function for the Croesus logos, since the early crime of Gyges directly contributes to explain the outcome of the logos itself. After the conclusion of the change of dynasty episode, the insertion proceeds by addition (with weak \( \delta \) , 14.2) and trails on in a continuous narrative irregularly punctuated by introductions and conclusions that draw attention to its individual stages. No summarizing statement, however, signals the end of the flashback and the beginning of the actual story of Croesus that had been left suspended. Although the Arion episode (23-24) and the brief notice on Alyattes' offering to Delphi (25.2) interrupt the narrative at the end of the account of Alyattes' reign, the break between Alyattes and Croesus is rather minimized in the weak formulaic transition (25-26.1).12

The first part of the narrative about Croesus is treated as belonging to the survey of the Lydian Kings' attacks against the Greeks of Asia where, incidentally, the report of Alyattes' war against Miletus had received far greater attention and emphasis. The report of Croesus' Greek conquests represents in fact the most striking example of unadvertised selectivity in Book I, and it is evident that
Herodotus is here still bridging the chronological gap between the change of dynasty episode and the time identified by the preliminary statement at 6.1, where Croesus is already introduced as being at the peak of his power. The author is evidently not interested in the details of Croesus' achievements (including his original violation against the Greeks) until he starts leading up to the narrative of his downfall. After the dramatic adviser scene in 27, which introduces the idea of natural boundary, and the list of the peoples conquered this side of the Halys (28), the gradual transition to the "main" narrative is complete with the beginning of the Solon episode in coincidence with the transition to the great dramatic logos that serves as the preliminary for the interpretation of the subsequent account of Croesus' defeat.

Structurally, the flashback on Cyrus follows yet a different pattern from that of the two other passages just discussed, although it shares to a great extent the characteristics of both. The conquest of Lydia is the point where the chronological account becomes interrupted (94.7). From the beginning of the insertion which marks a change to an earlier time with respect to that point, and to a different setting as well, the narrative proceeds in a continuum like the flashback on Croesus' antecedents until it almost rejoins the point of departure, except for the reverse change of time from the event of Cyrus' dethronement of Astyages to that of his conquest of Lydia, made at the end of the concluding passage (130.3, ... ηαι ἑδοικετε λαί Κρέισον διότακτον τούτων... ηατεστρέψῳ).
From this point onwards, the chronological account (resuming after the descriptive insertions at 141.1) directly continues the story of Cyrus with no reverse change of setting. By its contents the entire report on Cyrus' birth and rise to power could indeed have appeared at the beginning of the Histories as part of the main narrative, if Herodotus had chosen to start with Cyrus, the first to rule over all of Asia rather than with Croesus, the first to conquer the Greeks. But the East-West conflict has determined the organization of the material in this case so that the account of Croesus, at the beginning of the work, is isolated from the Persian narrative and stands by itself to represent the special character of that stage in the relations of the East with the Greeks which comprised the first conquest of Ionia. 16

The story of Cyrus thus starts at the end of the Croesus logos and is, formally, an insertion into the chronological account. The introduction at 95.1 establishes the connection of that insertion with the preceding story of Croesus' downfall as well as emphasizing it as the beginning of the Persian narrative. 17 However, after the introduction which identifies the ultimate focus of the report that follows, Herodotus starts from farther back:
Herodotus' former announcement in 95.1 that he is going to relate who was Cyrus and how the Persians started to rule Asia already moves the narrative implicitly to Media in the reign of Astyages. But Media is a setting hitherto undefined, as far as the Histories are concerned, and Astyages is its last King. The narrative has started anew from a moment in history which also represents the final stage of previous development, as in the case of Croesus the last King of Lydia and of Candaules the last Heraclid. Herodotus' method is here consistent.

The plan to relate the end of Media as an independent power poses the question of its origin.\(^{18}\) Herodotus' process of thought is not as immediately evident here as in the former cases, because the introduction at 95.1 stresses Cyrus and the beginning of the Persian power in Asia with no mention of Astyages and Media. However, the transition in 95.1-95.2 is in its substance analogous to that from the introduction of Croesus (6) to the announcement of the change of dynasty episode (7.1), and (on a smaller scale) to that from the introduction of Candaules to the mention of his antecedents (7.2-3).

The passage quoted above also indicates the beginning of a new thematic stage in Herodotus' account. Here, as soon as the narrative
moves further to the east with respect to the previous account of
Croesus, the idea of subjection as slavery is suddenly emphasized for
the first time,\(^\text{19}\) and the motif of valor on behalf of freedom which
will become rather prominent later on in part of the narrative of
Cyrus' campaigns\(^\text{20}\) makes its appearance. The two contiguous sentences
which introduce the founding of the monarchy episode also subtly
suggest a relationship between \(\alpha\iota\iota\nu\iota\mu\iota\eta\) and \(\delta\eta\mu\nu\sigma\rho\iota\iota\nu\iota\eta\)
\(\delta\gamma\omicron\omicron\nu\iota\nu\eta\) and \(\nu\rho\nu\delta\nu\nu\nu\iota\), an idea confirmed by
the contents of the episode itself which describes how the autocratic
ruler establishes control over his subjects.\(^\text{21}\) This part is not set
off from the rest of the narrative in the same way as the change of
dynasty episode in 7-14.1, but it is emphasized as its beginning, and
serves in fact to explain the Median monarchical heritage of Cyrus
and his successors.

From Deioces the founder the narrative continues in a survey of
subsequent Kings (102-106), which fills the chronological gap between
the more prominent accounts of Deioces and Astyages. Here the histori-
cal antecedents of Astyages and of Cyrus, as well as the territorial
identity of Media, the new center of action, become better and better
defined. The beginning of the account of Astyages (107.1) coincides
with the beginning of the story of Cyrus and of the Persian rise to
power in Asia announced in the general introduction at 95.1, signaled
here by the shift to the dramatic mode\(^\text{22}\) and finally emphasized in the
conclusion of the entire flashback (130).\(^\text{23}\) Thus Herodotus covers here
the entire history of Media, as he had covered the entire history of
Lydia in the Croesus logos, and through the flashback technique, the irregular emphasis of the transitions and by varying the distance of the focus in the narrative, he clearly establishes the relative importance of the different parts: first the story of Cyrus and Astyages, then the account of the origin of the Median monarchy and finally the survey of the intervening Kings. Each of these parts, like the parts of the insertion on Croesus' antecedents, contributes to explain more or less directly subsequent events, namely they clarify their causes.

The expansion of Herodotus' narrative from within with the concentric insertion of flashbacks reflects precisely the fact that the constant effort to go back to the first discernible origin and then follow the development through, an important aspect of Herodotus' inclusiveness, is equivalent to a research into causes. In the instances just considered the flashback technique allows Herodotus to cover systematically the history of the East from the beginning by tracing the development of both empires on either side of the Halys. In a more limited role, the inclusion of information pertaining to a different time with respect to the chronological narrative occasionally clarifies and completes specific reports, as in the case of the momentary flashbacks already mentioned. At the same time transitions to a different time also allow Herodotus an almost unlimited freedom to include information which, independently from its pertinence to the surrounding narrative, confirms and reelaborates particular themes recurring in different parts of the Histories.
Changes of time and setting in the Phocaean narrative and transitions to a later time.

Herodotus' flexibility in expanding his narrative in time appears evident in the account of the Persian conquest of Phocaea, which is almost overwhelmed by two insertions at each end. The first of these constitutes a flashback which, unlike those examined so far, is not explicitly introduced as an explanation of some fact in the main narrative, but is rather simply attached to the mention of Phocaea as Harpagus' target (163.1). The type of transition and partially the contents of the passage, which includes ethnographical and descriptive information, are characteristic of incidental insertions, a category that shall be defined and examined later on, but insofar as this is a report of antecedents of events in the ongoing historical account it is just as appropriate to consider it here.

The notice that Harpagus moved against Phocaea leads to an organic change of setting of the action, and the next sentence that "these Phocaeans were the first of the Greeks to undertake long voyages" shifts the focus to a different agent (i.e., from Harpagus to the Phocaeans) and to an earlier time. Herodotus then lists the faraway places that the Phocaeans discovered in their travels. He reports how they established such strong ties with the king of distant Tartessus that he even encouraged them to resettle in his land and then, since he could not persuade them to leave Ionia, he tried to provide for their safety there by financing the building of strong city walls
(163.3-4). The term πρώτη at the beginning of the report carries celebratory connotations. Of the walls of the Phocaeans Herodotus records the greatness and the skillful architecture (163.4). The retrospective conclusion which emphasizes this ἔργον (163.4, τὸ μὲν δὲ τῶν ῥηχῶν ποιαὶ φυλακέων τέσσαρα τοιούτα ἐξεταλθή) confirms the impression that Herodotus has taken advantage of the connection provided at this point by the historical narrative to insert a semi-autonomous report of remarkable achievements. At the same time, however, the flashback also constitutes a section of Phocaean preparations since resettlement was considered and the walls were built, in anticipation of a Persian attack.

The narrative that follows the insertion -- on Harpagus' offensive -- still focuses on the Phocaeans' point of view rather than on the enemy's operations. The Phocaeans, who in better times had declined Argantonius' invitation to resettle, are now determined to leave Ionia forever (164-165). After reporting briefly on the definitive return of the homesick Phocaeans (165.3), Herodotus' narrative proceeds in a chronological continuum and moves to a different setting without marked transition, following the Phocaean exiles to Cyrinus and Rhegium and finally to the city which they settled permanently and then named Hyela (166-167). At this point Herodotus returns to the main narrative of the Persian conquest of Ionia with a resumptive conclusion which signals the reverse change of setting and, implicitly, of time:
The report on the Phocaeans in Italy, which causes a considerable suspension of the chronological account, reflects Herodotus' usual propensity towards completeness in his narrative, as well as his autonomous interest for events such as resettlements, colonizations and exiles. At the same time, as far as the present context is concerned, the passage just considered, the Phocaean flashback and the intervening narrative of the Persian conquest, constitute all together a short history of the Phocaeans in which the account of each stage clarifies the central event of their departure. The entire unit (163-167) describes the hardy resourcefulness that enabled those Greeks to elude enslavement in circumstances in which brave resistance would have been ineffectual. The preliminary account of the Phocaeans' tradition as enterprising travelers explains their readiness to leave their city forever, at least when its fall into the hands of the Persians was foreseen as inevitable. The passage on the wandering and losses of the Phocaeans until their final settlement broadens the analysis of the event. It shows the consequences of Persian domination in Asia Minor on those Ionians who were not subjected, the price of their freedom, as it were, and it emphasizes the love of independence characteristic of all Greeks by describing an aspect of heroism different from valor in battle but commensurable with it. The ideas conveyed here serve as background also to the analogous case of the Teans (168) which Herodotus does not specifically
As we have seen, while the report of earlier times provides the antecedents of events in the main narrative and often contributes to the explanation of causes, the account of what happened later completes particular stories and may clarify their meaning. Herodotus includes facts pertaining to a later time in the narrative of the Histories either by making a jump ahead (flashforwards) or -- far more frequently -- with a gradual transition, by pursuing a very particular lead of the chronological account (followups). The story of the Phocaean exiles considered just above, which represents the most notable example of the second method in Book I, shows how this type of passage can appear as a strictly integral part of the main narrative. This is also the case of a follow-up concerning the Scythians (105) which, combined with the account of their conquest of Media, contributes to illustrate the nature of that people and of that invasion, and is moreover thematically related to other passages. A third follow-up in Book I, on the Spartan crater sent as a gift to Croesus (70.2-71.1), is on the other hand deliberately set off by its frame as a separate unit. This insertion marks therefore a pause at the end of the section on the preparations for the Cappadocian campaign as it illustrates symbolically the history of Croesus' alliance with the Spartans and provides the first explicit anticipation of Croesus' defeat. Other times (outside of Book I) the subordinate character of a follow-up is more clearly underlined than in the examples just mentioned at the moment of transition back
to the main narrative, by a concluding statement which acknowledges
the temporary alteration of the normal chronological sequence of
events (e.g., VI.73.1, ταύτα μὲν δὲ ἑγούμενα χρόνῳ ὑπερευθον).

The organic change of setting in the
transition to the Greek logos

At the beginning of the flashback on Cyrus and of that on the
Phocaeans, already examined, the jump back to an earlier time follows
closely upon a shift of focus from one sphere of activity to another
(i.e., from Croesus to Cyrus, from Harpagus to the Phocaeans), at a
moment of mutual contact. In the case of the Phocaean passage
particularly, the transition coincides with the movement of Harpagus
towards Phocaea for the purposes of the Ionian campaign. More
elaborate instances of this type of organic change of agent and setting
connect to the main narrative of Book I three flashbacks which report
events in mainland Greece. In these Greek logos the transition to
a different setting with respect to the surrounding historical
account is the more conspicuous phenomenon and is made in a particular-
ly artful way. The change of time represents a natural consequence,
since Herodotus does not merely describe the current situation in the
new setting, but rather traces the history of it, accounting for its
origin and antecedents.

The first and longest part of the account of Croesus' preparations
for the Cappadocian campaign (46.2-56.1) concerns his consultation of
the oracles, while the second (69) relates how Croesus made a treaty
with the Spartans according to the oracular prescription "that he should secure the friendship of those that he would find to be the most powerful of the Greeks (ὥς ἀρ γνῷν ἰσχατον ἄρ αν...ἔγερντα ϕίλον προσθέσθαι ,53.3). The phrasing of the response (ἐγερόντα) already implies the necessity of Croesus' inquiry on Greek affairs as a preliminary to his diplomatic overtures, thereby preparing the transition to the Greek logos, which is inserted between the two parts of the Preparations section and articulated as follows:

μενά δὲ παίται ἑφρόντιζε ἱστορέων ηazole ἐπ᾽ ἑμῖν ὁμωντάρης ἄρ τον τις προσ- 
ληψας ϕίλον 

56.1

56.2

1) Τῶσι γὰρ ᾧν ἡ προσελευμένα...

Athenian and Spartan Archaeology

56.2-58:

Τύτων δὲ ἀν πᾶν ἔθνων ἡ μὲν Ἀθηνῶν ἀντικόμινον ἀν ὥσπερ Ἐπίκτας ἧπαρχήν ἔπεισάνειτο δὲ κροὸς ὑπὸ Πειραιῶν τοῦ ἑπειράτου τῶν ἐν χεῖνον πυρήνεσιον Ἀθηναίων (59.1)
After the first sentence (56.1) that recalls through verbal correspondence the earlier oracular response and brings the narrative to the moment of Croesus' inquiry into Greek affairs, the Greek account develops in three distinct units focusing first on Sparta and Athens together (56-58), then on Athens (59-64) and on Sparta (65-68) separately in chiasmus with respect to the order in which they are first mentioned. The statement which identifies the ethnographical stock of Spartans and Athenians (56.2) is an unemphatic summary introduction from which the Archaeology proceeds as an explanatory addition with ἄρα. This first part of the insertion, by its subject matter and position and by the way in which it hangs from the historical narrative as a definition of the people that enter it at a given moment, belongs to the category of "incidental descriptions" examined later on. The two following sections on Athens and Sparta also start as ἄρα -additions, but they are more clearly identified and emphasized by their respective summary introductions, which at the
same time also carry forward the action of Croesus' investigations reporting its progress and its results. At each point of transition (i.e., in the introductory statements at 56.2 and 59.1, in the \( \mu \gamma \nu \) system at 65.1 and at the resumption of the main narrative in 69.1) the outward link between the Greek account and the Croesus logos is in fact reestablished in an almost dramatic manner, as if the whole insertion were a report of what Croesus learned.

This strictly organic connection between the insertion and the main narrative is partially contradicted by the internal character of the different units. Especially in the Archaeology of Spartans and Athenians that serves to define the new Greek setting for the first time, Herodotus displays his own interest in origins and beginnings and, more overtly than in the other two sections, he suspends the fiction of reporting the facts of Greece as Croesus learned them.\(^{38}\) In the next lengthy accounts on Athens and on Sparta, Herodotus more subtly exploits Croesus' point of view as he goes back in time to trace the history of those cities' current state. Much of the information contained here may indeed have reached Croesus, providing the basis for his judgment that Sparta, and not Athens, was then the ally worth seeking. The narrative of party struggles in Athens (see especially 64.3) explains why, as is implied in 59.1, the Athenians were weakened by Pisistratus' rule. The Spartan logos clarifies how the victory over Tegea (mentioned in 65.1) had removed the main obstacle to the hegemony of Sparta in the Peloponnese (see 68.6). Also in the sections on Athens and Sparta, however, Herodotus
superimposes his own point of view on that of Croesus and expands the narrative of the inserted passages beyond the immediate explanatory function which they indeed fulfill within the Croesus logos. First of all, independently from Croesus' perception of Greek affairs, the detailed reporting in these insertions is devised to underline implicitly certain thematic links with different parts of the main narrative, according to the basic unifying method of the Histories. Secondly, the transition to the Greek setting provides Herodotus with the opportunity to "keep up with the Greeks" within a narrative that has so far principally followed the Eastern line of development, and to build up, through the insertion technique, a history of the Greeks which will serve to explain their actions in 490 and 480.

Herodotus' method of carving up his Greek narrative in the course of the main Eastern account in exemplified by another section on Spartan affairs inserted later on in Book I. The story of the Spartan war against Argos over the possession of Thyreae (82.2-8) continues the earlier account of Sparta's rise in the Peloponnese (65-68). It also provides an ethical portrait of that city which reinforces the present historical narrative as well as more broadly contributing to the background of Sparta in view of its later role in the Persian wars.

The insertion, occasioned again by Croesus' diplomatic activity, because of its position between the beginning of the siege of Sardis (80.6-81) and the account of that city's fall (84) creates a pause which enhances the suspense of the narrative. Herodotus first
reports that Croesus, blockaded in Sardis, appealed to his allies for help. The resumptive statement that "he sent embassies to all his allies and especially to Sparta" narrows the focus and prepares the change of setting and agent made immediately below:

The verb *σύν επέστρωσε* seems to imply that the war between Sparta and Argos had started in the past and was still going on when Croesus sent the embassy (να oυ 'αμναν ρεν χρόνον). Before proceeding to report how the Spartans nevertheless responded to Croesus, Herodotus inserts at this point the story of the Spartan-Argive war from beginning to end, possibly with a slight follow-up with respect to the time in which the Lydian herald arrived in Sparta. 44

This Spartan logos is integrated in the main narrative much in the same way as the passages considered earlier. The statement at 82.1 quoted above functions as an unemphatic summary introduction of the following passage which grows out of it with a *πάντα* clause (82.2 πάντα θυρίας τεμπέρζε). The retrospective clause at the resumption of the main narrative brings us back to the point of departure and reestablishes the link between the...
This statement does not specify at what stage of the Argive war Croesus' appeal reached Sparta. The entire insertion is thus presented as describing the situation that the Lydian envoy found upon his arrival, and is organically tied to the surrounding narrative in the same dramatic manner as the other Greek logoi. Thus the Greek logoi of Book I grow out of the account of Croesus' dealings with the Greeks in the most organic possible way.

Although they expand within themselves and become Herodotus’ own autonomous report of certain periods of Greek history, the insertion of these passages in the Croesus logos and their repeatedly stressed connection with it answers to the internal logic of the narrative. With the change of leadership in Asia under Cyrus, the gap between the Eastern setting and mainland Greece will grow considerably, but Croesus was still in a position to be interested in, and competent about, the affairs of the Greeks. Croesus was the first barbarian to befriend Greeks (6.1), and also the last to do so in the time-span covered by the Histories; he was at home in Delphi (54) where he sent offerings in agreement with his family's tradition (14, 25), and his monuments adorned other places in Greece (92). He had close and frequent contacts with the Greek culture (29.1, 27.1) and ruled over
a people whom Herodotus describes as similar to the Greeks in most respects (94, 35.2). The organic insertion of the Greek accounts in the Croesus logos is made possible by the fact of Croesus' relationship with the Greeks, but in turn also contributes to enhance the sense of the relative proximity between East and West at this point in history.
Descriptions in Herodotus mostly concern three different subjects, often mixed together, i.e. ethnography, geography and monuments. The passages that cover these topics may be termed as "descriptions" because in most cases they mark a change of tense with respect to the surrounding narrative, from the aorist of the historical report to the present or imperfect of the account of durable conditions in the present or in the past. This feature is however not consistent due to the diversity of Herodotus' subject matter and approach.

A passage that starts as a description may come to include the account of a past event. Sections on works of art and architecture may take the narrative approach like the accounts of other types of past deeds, as well as describing objectively in the present or in the imperfect tense the permanent characteristics of the works in question. More important, the area of ethnography in Herodotus includes the description of a people's customs, institutions, cities, tribes, political associations and language, but also possibly the discussion on the origins and development of all these things which evidently is based on the narrative of past events.

Ethnography, geography, and accounts of monuments are included in Book I in different ways, and they either perceptibly break the flow of the historical report, or they do not.
There are numerous descriptive remarks scattered along as brief explanations or additions to the narrative, too subordinate and momentary to cause an interruption. For example, in introducing Croesus as King of the people this side of the Halys, Herodotus describes in a relative clause the course of that river, thereby defining more clearly the boundary of Croesus' empire:

\[ \text{Kρηθων ἦν... τύραννος τῶν ἑβοϊκῶν τῶν ἱστοὺς Ἀχαιαὶς πολλὰ, ὡς ἔπειπεν ἂν ἡμῖν.} \]

Short remarks such as this one tend to be immediately functional to the narrative but some are not, as for example the brief discussion on the antiquity of the temple of Aphrodite Ourania in Ascalon (105.3, \( \varepsilon\gamma\iota\iota\sigma\iota\pi\iota\, \delta\varepsilon\, \epsilon\iota\varepsilon\iota\nu\eta\iota\xi\iota\nu \varepsilon\iota\nu... \)).

Occasionally also descriptive passages of considerable length do not interrupt the historical account in that they are strictly intertwined with the ongoing narrative and identify with it. For example, the description of Croesus' offerings to the sanctuaries of Delphi and Amphiaras (50-52) does not constitute a semi-autonomous insertion but forms an integral part of the narrative of Croesus' preparations, even though the descriptive character of this passage is reflected both by its subject and by the frequent shifts within it from aorist to present. Similarly, the account of how Deioces founded the Median
monarchy leads to the description of Ecbatana, largely in the present tense (98.3-5), and of the Median court ceremonial (99). Both these contiguous passages are ethnographical in subject because they describe a social system, but they carry forward the historical narrative rather than suspending its progress.

Incidental descriptions (I.142-151.2, 171-173, 202-204.1, 178-187)

Position and way in which they are attached to the narrative

Accounts of geography, ethnography and monuments which cause a marked suspension are of two sorts, incidental and transitional, depending not on their contents but on their position in the narrative. The passages of the first category may be termed "incidental" because they are inserted to define an object at the moment in which it enters the narrative, as in the cases of the "Phocaean flashback" and of the "Archaeology of Spartans and Athenians" already discussed. From the point of view of their position incidental insertions are analogous to the brief descriptive remarks mentioned earlier, except that they are far more extensive.

The transition to the incidental passages of Book I is triggered in each case by the proper noun of a people or of a country appearing in the historical narrative. The proper noun is repeated at the beginning of the insertion -- or referred to by a backward-looking demonstrative -- and represents the subject, at least initially, of
the following section. 51 Instances:

1) 141.1-3 Story of how Ionians and Aeolians failed to reconcile Cyrus. ...

2) Δύσεις δὲ οἱ Καῖνοι ἐπὶ εὐθείᾳ στρατηγήσαν εἰς Καστοριάν, καὶ Καῖνοι ἐπὶ Λυκέαν... (171.1); ἢ οἱ Καῖνοι... (172.1); ὥσπερ οἱ Καῖνοι μὲν ἔθετεν τὰ ἐπίσημα χρώματα, οἱ γὰρ Λυκεῖοι... (173.1)

171-173: insertion on Carians, Caunians, and Lycians.

3) Λέσβης... (202.1)

202-204.1: description of the country surrounding the Massagetae.

4) Τὰς ἁρμάτας Ἰδράς... (178.1)

In all the cases just quoted, except the last, the insertion proceeds directly with a δὲ-clause from the narrative as an appendage to it, with no introductory statements to mark a separation between the two sections. But for the description of Babylon Herodotus wants to emphasize at the outset the intrinsic greatness of the subject matter, thereby increasing the autonomy of the insertion which is about to begin. 52

The formal continuity between the narrative and the descriptive passage, in spite of the change of time, place and subject, is at any rate generally due to the proximity of the insertion to the proper name in the historical narrative that provides the outward connection and serves as the marker of transition. In one case in Book I, however, another section of narrative occurs so that the descriptive passage appears strikingly misplaced. At the end of the Preparations section for Croesus' Cappadocian campaign (46-70), Herodotus seems at first to be making the transition to the actual campaign narrative when he says:

"κατὰ μὲν τὸν ἐν Λυδίᾳ έστε ἔσχε, Καβετος δὲ ἔμαρκεν τὸ Χαέμα εἴτε έστε ἐρυθίναι ἐκ Κάππαδοκίν, ἔντεια καλαρηκάν
Κέον τε λα ην τὴν Περσίαν Σύναρμ (71.1)"

A passage describing Cappadocia and the boundary area between the Lydian and the Persian empires inserted at this point would have been connected to the historical account by the proper name according to the usual pattern of incidental insertions noticed above. Here, however, Herodotus' narrative takes a different direction with
the scene of Sandanis' warning to Croesus on the risks of an attack against the Persians (71.2-4). The transition to the passage on Cappadocia, postponed until after the advice scene and starting directly with a δέ sentence (οἱ δὲ Καππαδοκίαν ὑπὲρ Ἐμνήνωρ

Cύριοι ὀρμᾶσαν ὁμοίως ... 72), is thus very abrupt. Since, moreover, after the description, the resumptive statement repeating that "Croesus was then making an expedition against Cappadocia" leads Herodotus to suspend again the campaign narrative with another insertion (73.2-74), the Cappadocian passage appears formally disconnected at both ends from the campaign report to which it belongs. A more logical place for it would have been, if not right after the first mention of Cappadocia in 71.1, then immediately before the campaign narrative, when Croesus is actually going to cross the Halys (i.e., after 75.1).

The peculiar position of the descriptive passage in this case is due to the different concomitant topics that Herodotus wishes to cover before starting to report on Croesus' campaign. The Sandanis episode is anticipatory and also serves to characterize the opponent; the aitie section with the flashback on the Medo-Lyodian war stops to examine Croesus' motive of revenge. The description of Cappadocia remains squeezed between these two other preliminary units revealing how, within the consistent general plan of defining the territory or the people at the beginning of campaign reports, Herodotus' narrative can still proceed by addition and free juxtaposition without seeking absolute formal continuity among the individual parts.
At the end of incidental insertions, the transition back to the historical narrative may occur in one of two ways. The passage on Cappadocia, and that on Carians, Caunians, and Lycians (like the "Phocaean flashback" and the "Archaeology of Spartans and Athenians") hang vertically from the narrative which at a certain point continues from where it had been interrupted, as if the insertion had never occurred. E.g.: "After subjecting Ionia, Harpagus made an expedition against Carians, Caunians, and Lycians, taking along Ionians and Aeolians (171.1) ... (insertion). The Carians without performing any splendid deed were enslaved by Harpagus ..." (174.1 ff).

The other incidental passages of Book I on the other hand rejoin the historical narrative in a circular manner: The last topic of the insertion is picked up at the resumption of the narrative, often with a backward-looking demonstrative and 
\[ \text{ηάν} \] as connective elements. Thus the description of Babylon is reconnected to the campaign narrative after the conclusion of the account of Nitocris:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{άιτη μέν ὑπὶ βασίλευς πραίμεν τῇ} \\
\text{μέτα τὸν θρόνον.} \\
\text{ὁ δὲ Νεῖκος ἐὰν τῶν τινὲς τῆς Ρωμαίος} \\
\text{ἐν Παρηκμα χειραφέα}.
\end{align*} \]

(187.5) (188.1)

The geographical description in 202-204.1 moves away from its original subject but leads back at the end to the Massagetae and to Cyrus' plans against them:
Similarly, at the end of the passage on Ionians and Aeolians the reference to the Aeolian cities of Lesbos and Tenedos (151.2) is attached to the historical narrative with the statement that "the inhabitants of Lesbos and Tenedos (\( \mu \delta \nu \)), like the Ionians of the islands had nothing to fear, \( ^56 \) while the other cities (\( \delta \varepsilon \)) decided to follow the Ionians wherever they might lead them" (151.3). The account of the Ionian and Aeolian embassy to Sparta, suspended from 141.4, resumes at this point (152).

Contents and function

Incidental descriptions (like the other type of descriptive passages that will be examined later) are often characterized internally by diversity of topic and by formal discontinuity. The tripartite passage on Carians, Caunians and Lycians includes a discussion on the origins and early history, as well as the mention of some peculiar customs for each of the three peoples.

The insertion on Ionians and Aeolians starts with specific remarks about the climate (142.1-2) and goes on to discuss the languages of the Ionians, with the enumeration of their cities (142.3-4), the
origin and character of the Panonion League (142.2-3, 145), the
claims of the Ionians of the Panionion to purity of race (146-147),
the geography of the Panionion, the Apaturian festival (148) and,
after a μέν... ἀλλ' transition, the cities of the Aeolians
(149-151.2). The whole report shifts back and forth between the
present tense and the narrative of past events, and contains a
noticeable interruption where Herodotus includes, for the sake of
analogy, an insertion within the insertion with information on the
Doric Triopian League (144). Except for the transition in 149.1 and
151.1, the introductory and concluding statements that irregularly
punctuate the account (142.3, 4, 145, 150.1) define its focus at a
specific moment, but do not contribute to organizing the material.

The Cappadocian and the Massagetan passages are internally more
organic because of their homogeneous geographical character. In the
latter Herodotus' report follows a continuous line as it proceeds from
place to place -- the Araxes, the Caspian Sea, the Caucasus -- to
describe the area surrounding the Massagetan territory.

The Babylonian insertion on the other hand breaks up sharply into
two parts. The first is a physical description of the city and of
some outstanding monuments within it, mostly in the present tense
(178.2-183). In the second part, emphatically identified by a state-
ment (184.1) that brings into focus the kings and queens of Babylon,
the subject matter (i.e. the architecture of Babylon) initially remains
the same but the approach becomes historical emphasizing the doers as
well as the works themselves. 57 This narrative approach leads to the
introduction (187.1) of the ἱπότην episode which closes the insertion and marks a considerable departure from the original subject matter. The main conceptual link here is cleverness because the ἱπότην episode recounts another of Nitocris' deeds, of a different sort (although her tomb too is a monument which she built), but just as clever as her architectural works. The progress of Herodotus' thought emerges clearly: the architecture of Babylon is for him the concrete sign of Assyrian ὄφιν and splendor, and the embodiment of these virtues, in which the Assyrians far surpassed the Persians (as the case of Darius baffled by Nitocris suggests), is represented by Babylon's two queens.

The function of incidental insertions with respect to the surrounding narrative, to which they appear by position subordinate, represents a complex question. The inserted passage sometimes provides practical information on which the account that follows is partially based: for example, Cyrus' strategy for capturing Babylon (191) would not be intelligible without the earlier description of the city's plant and fortifications and of Nitocris' artificial lake (180, 185.4-7).

In other cases the insertion conveys a leading idea or several ideas, mostly implicit, that help interpret the outcome of the narrative. In the passage on Ionians and Aeolians Herodotus says that "if at that time the whole Hellenic race was weak, the Ionians were by far the weakest and most unimportant of all peoples" (143.2). In the rest of the insertion many of the different bits of information on
the political background of Ionians and Aeolians illustrate implicitly
the disunity (and consequent weakness) of all the Greeks, especially
the Greeks of Asia and including the Ionians of the Panionion, in
spite of the latter's illusory ethnic pride. This idea, which
is not systematically developed or explicitly presented throughout as
the logical connective element between the whole insertion and the
historical narrative, still emerges from the contents of the passage
and contributes to explain the imminent fall of Ionia to Cyrus as
well as its earlier conquest by the Lydians.

Also the Massagetan insertion bears a special relevance to the
historical narrative in a similarly indirect manner. Even though
here Herodotus does not discuss the Massagetae themselves (the object
that triggers the insertion in the first place), but reaches out
beyond them in what can be termed literally a geographical excursus,
he provides nevertheless a series of reference points for defining
from the outside, as it were, the precise location of the Massagetae.
At the same time, and this is the leading idea produced by the outside
approach, the whole description conveys the impression that, although
it can be determined on the map where the Massagetae are, in practice
this people is so remote that even the forbidding areas that surround
their country are known only through hearsay and speculation. The
remoteness of the Massagetae, indirectly emphasized at this point
before the actual campaign narrative implies at the outset that Cyrus'
plan -- as the emotional terms ζήμευμαι in 201 and
προόμνηνς 204.1, with which Herodotus refers to
that plan, also suggest -- was utterly unreasonable and unmotivated, and therefore destined to fail. 62

However, incidental insertions do not always reveal by their contents a specific connection or a necessary function as supporters of the narrative, as in the cases just discussed. 63 Aside from data and ideas that may actually clarify the narrative at different levels, these passages generally appear to fulfill a broader defining role. They give an identity to proper names -- an aspect to a country and a fact to a people that become part of the history -- and they at least always contribute to the historical account by minimizing along the way the sphere of the unfamiliar. 64

For Herodotus to define and inform as he follows the development of events is a fairly consistent narrative method, as the frequency of incidental descriptions and of short incidental remarks indicates. In 177, the specific mention of the different peoples whom Cyrus conquered in Upper Asia would have required a series of definitions to render it meaningful. 65 As it is, Herodotus chose to omit both from his work. Conversely, the Carians, Caunians and Lycians find a place in Herodotus' history in spite of their generally unremarkable resistance and character. 66 This may be due in part to the fact that Carians, Caunians and Lycians are all close to Herodotus' homeland. The inserted ethnography neither clarifies the campaign narrative nor explains its outcome, but it identifies through a series of specific data three groups perhaps not well known by Herodotus' Greek audience but geographically and ethnically far closer to them than the peoples
of Upper Asia that Herodotus has chosen not to name. The fall of the Carians, Caunians and Lycians under Harpagus completes the Persian conquest of Asia Minor, and the account of their background completes Herodotus' description of this sensitive borderline area between Greeks and Barbarians.

Even when, as in the case just mentioned, incidental descriptions do not contribute to clarify specific points in the narrative, they illustrate nevertheless the setting of historical events. In this sense, therefore, ethnography and geography in Herodotus are at the service of the history, as Erbse maintained. However, because of the breadth of the inserted passages, where Herodotus' observations are in so many cases so far removed from the specific historical context, the reverse also appears to be true. Herodotus' historical subject, extending in space so as to comprehend great parts of the inhabited world, brings in the specific focus of the description as it goes along and fulfills for it an organizing role analogous to that of the traveler's itinerary in a traditional περιπλανώμενος.

The partial subordination of the historical narrative clearly emerges, for example, in the case of the Babylonian passage. Here the leading idea of greatness and μακάριος which permeates and unifies the whole of the insertion serves the historical narrative because, by magnifying Babylon, Herodotus also magnifies the importance of Cyrus' conquest. But at the same time the idea of greatness also justifies the description of Babylon for its own sake regardless of the
historical narrative which provides the opportunity for its insertion in the Histories.

Traditional descriptions

Position and way in which they are attached to the narrative

The complex and ambiguous relationship between historical narrative and insertions which we have just attempted to examine is also characteristic of the second type of descriptions that equally interrupt the account of events, although they occupy a position within it different from that of "incidental" passages considered so far. Since incidental passages are inserted as definitions of a proper name that enters the history, they tend to fall at the beginning of a narrative section. Although they postpone the historical report and are preliminary to the action that they suspend, they do not emphasize a natural break in the action itself. On the other hand there are four descriptions in Book I that by virtue of their position act as dividers between two sections of the historical narrative, and contribute to stress an important pause already inherent in the development and report of the action. These passages, which shall be called "transitional" for want of a better term, are the Lydian appendix (91-94) and the ethnographies of the Persians (131-140), the Assyrians (192-200) and the Massagetae (215-216). The different way in which incidental and transitional passages are inserted in Book I can perhaps be described graphically as follows, with the historical narrative
represented by a continuous horizontal line:

Incidental insertions (vertical or circular):

Transitional insertions:

Transitional insertions, although the graphic scheme cannot show it, tend to be logically related to the preceding narrative stretch. They lean against it, as it were, because they discuss people and places that have already entered the history and that have just played a major role in the action. However, since these passages, which involve at least a change of subject (monuments and customs instead of events) occur in each case after an emphatic conclusion of a stage in the action, formally they appear disconnected, although to a varying degree, from the immediately preceding, as well as from the following, narrative.

The Massagetan ethnography (I.215-216)

For example, while the first mention of the Massagetae (201) leads, as we have seen, to the geographical passage which identified in advance the setting of Cyrus' campaign, Herodotus inserts the Massagetan ethnography at the end of that campaign's report, when the role of the Massagetae in the history is over and done with. Occurring after the episode of Cyrus' death, the insertion acts as an interlude between the Cyrus logos and the narrative about Cambyses:
The concluding statement in 214.5 and the beginning of the next narrative in II.1.1 could follow each other uninterruptedly. The section that comes between them starts with an unemphatic introduction which announces the contents of the whole (ἐκθέσεις and σίγαταν are the summarizing terms). It appears formally autonomous since, aside from μόν... σέ... σέ, no other connective element attaches it to the narrative at either end.

Because of its position in the narrative, the Massagetae ethnography marks a sudden change of focus -- from the individual to the community that comes under discussion -- which together with the change of subject and time (present tense) helps to isolate the insertion from the preceding campaign report. There, with the episode of Cyrus' death (214.3-4) and its conclusion (214.5), Herodotus has already shifted his attention away from the Massagetae and back to Cyrus whose...
story, begun long ago (95.1), ends at this point. The insertion
reintroduces the Massagetan people as the object of report in the
"slot" between Cyrus and Cambyses.

The Persian ethnography (I.131-140)

In the case just examined, as in that considered earlier of the
Cappadocian insertion, Herodotus disregards formal continuity in
the transition between sections. For the Massagetan ethnography in
particular, the author ends and fully concludes the preceding unit of
historical narrative before inserting the descriptive passage. A
similar example of this method occurs with the list of Persian customs
(131-140), between the flashback on Cyrus (95-130) and the rest of the
Cyrus logos (141-214).

In the course of the elaborate conclusion of the Cyrus flashback,
Herodotus first states that the Medes then became subject to the
Persians (130.1) and then repeats: "At that time, in the reign of
Astyages, the Persians and Cyrus, having revolted against the Medes,
ruled Asia from then on" (130.2). This statement partially summarizes
the preceding section, focusing on the Persian people and pointing to
the beginning of their history as an autonomous power. But before
making the transition to the ethnography that will identify the new
rulers of the East, Herodotus adds a final emphatic conclusion (130.3).
This again summarizes the preceding narrative but from a different
point of view, the story of the individual Cyrus, and moreover rejoins
chronologically the point of Cyrus' victory against Croesus. The Persian ethnography inserted at this point, with a prospective introduction, does not therefore originate from the statement that immediately precedes it in the historical account with the proper name of the people acting as an element of connection -- in the manner of incidental insertions. It is rather formally autonomous from the preceding account as it is from the narrative that follows on Cyrus' subsequent career:

After the dismissal which concludes the Persian ethnography, Herodotus' announcement that he will now return to: the

acknowledges the break at this point and the
discontinuous progress of the report in the series of insertions that have occurred since the end of the Croesus logos. In the resumption of the narrative of Cyrus' career (141.1) the mention of Ionians and Aeolians connects all the way back to the conclusion in 92.1, while only the subordinate clause recalling that the Lydians have been subjected by the Persians (instead of Croesus by Cyrus in 130.3) subtly acknowledges the shift from individual to community marked by the insertion that has just ended.

The Lydian Appendix (I.92-94)

The change of focus from an individual to a community is a factor in the transition to ethnographical passages because the historical narrative of Book I primarily reports the actions of individual Kings. If an ethnography is not inserted to define a King's opponents or his own people at the moment in which they enter the narrative (as in the case of Carians, Caunians and Lycians) the transition is bound to be more conspicuous. As the Cyrus logos mainly revolves around Cyrus, so the Croesus logos is indeed the story of Croesus' heritage, rise and fall, and does not become a Lydian logos until the Lydian appendix. In this case, however, the transition from individual to community does not occur immediately, so that the beginning of the insertion joins more closely with the preceding history. The name of Croesus in the conclusion of the Croesus logos provides in fact the connective element between the historical narrative and the first section of the appendix,
characterized as usual by a shift from the aorist to the present:

\[ \text{(92.1)} \]

Herodotus has chosen to add the discussion of "Croesus' other offerings existing in Greece" at this point, after the end of the narrative about Croesus, probably because those lasting memorials provide a summation of Croesus' historical importance, of his ties with the Greek world and of his greatness before his fall (\( \gamma\nu\rho\alpha \mu\sigma\tau\alpha \lambda \delta \) \( \tau\varepsilon \) \( \nu\alpha\iota \) \( \theta\omega\mu\omicron\delta\omicron \)). The transition from the individual to the community begins in the second section of the appendix (93) since the funeral monument of Alyattes here described testifies to the power of the Lydian monarchy and at the same time reflects the social system of the Lydians who built it. In the last section of the insertion (94) Herodotus focuses solely on the customs, character and historical background of the Lydian people.

The Lydian appendix in its whole is not identified as a unit and the three sections of which it composed are treated as autonomous from each other. The passage on Croesus' offerings in Greece, opened by the summary introduction in 92.1 is concluded by a dismissal (\( \nu\alpha\iota \) \( \omicron\varphi\iota \) \( \mu\omicron\nu \) \( \alpha\nu\alpha\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\nu\upsilon \) \( \omicron\kappa\alpha\iota\lambda\alpha \) \( \acute{\varepsilon} \) \( \rho\omicron\iota\acute{\omicron} \) \( \omicron \), 92.4) which signals a change of subject in the following section. The next introductory
statement (93.1) indicates that Herodotus is directing his attention towards the remarkable phenomena of Lydia. The description of the funeral monument of Alyattes, the only covered, ends with a concluding tag (93.5) before Herodotus starts reporting on the customs of the Lydians (94.1-7). Here the account of Lydian inventions leads to the episode of the early Lydian migration to Tyrrhenia. The section and the entire Lydian appendix ends at this point with no conclusion of any sort while Herodotus returns to the main narrative:

\[\lambda\delta\delta\iota\mu\nu\varsigma\eta\upsilon\varphi\Pi\rho\sigma\eta\iota\upsilon\epsilon'\delta\varepsilon\delta\chi\omega\nu\tau\phi\] (94.7).

This resumptive statement summarizes again the outcome of the Croesus logos and marks another stop in the chronological narrative before the flashback on Cyrus. The transition back to the Lydians of Lydia from the Lydians of Tyrrhenia discussed immediately above is abrupt, but at the same time this statement is tied to the last section of the insertion in that, like the \[\omicron\nu\varsigma\] clause at the resumption of the narrative in 141.1, it keeps the focus on the community rather than returning again to the fate of the individual stressed in the earlier conclusion of the narrative (92.1).

The Babylonian ethnography (192-200)

The Babylonian ethnography is inserted between the report of Cyrus' Babylonian campaign and that of his campaign against the Massagetae. This logos appears more strictly connected at the
beginning with the preceding narrative than the other transitional insertions of Book I, because it starts implicitly as an explanation of the significance of the conquest just related. The first section of the ethnography, in fact, assesses the importance of Babylon specifically as a territory of the Persian empire, in which it was incorporated with Cyrus' victory:

καὶ Βαβυλώνι μὲν ἡτῶν σῆς πρώτην ἱστορήσων. (191.6)

τὴν δὲ σύναφιν τῶν Βαβυλωνίων ἡμοίωσι μὲν λαὶ ἄλλοι τῇ σημείωσι οὐκ οἷς ἐστὶ ἐν δὲ δὴ λαὶ πῶς. (192.1)

τιμὰν μὲν ὡς ἄρχοντι γυνὸς Βαβυλῶνος ὑπηρέτης ἐν τῷ. (192.4)

After the first argument on the satrapy of Babylon (192), Herodotus goes on to describe the climate and the agriculture of that country and the clever system of commerce in use there (194). The wonder of the river boats described in this section provides the transition to the report of other peculiarities of the Babylonians which are no longer connected with the initial demonstration of their δύναμις for the purpose of underlining the importance of Babylon to the Persian empire. After the description of their dress (195, identified by a prospective-retrospective frame) Herodotus turns his attention to their customs (196.1), singling out three of them as the wisest (196), the second best (197) and the worst (197). Thus the Babylonian insertion expands far beyond its original connection with
the historical narrative. 78

Herodotus concludes the section on customs with a retrospective sentence (νόμοι μὲν δὴ οἱ Βαβυλωνίας ήσσω λατερεῖα, 200) and then he adds some information about three particular fish-eating tribes, before making the transition back to the interrupted narrative of Cyrus' career:

```

(201)

The words 70070 70 ἔθνος in the backward-looking clause are thus separated from their logical antecedent, i.e., "the Babylonians" in the conclusion of the general section on customs, by the particular subject παραρμάλα γρεχα discussed just above. The addition on the fish-eating tribes, therefore, causes formal discontinuity at the resumption of the historical narrative, just like after the Lydian appendix. 79

Contents and function

Although, by virtue of their position, transitional insertions generally appear more autonomous from the surrounding narrative than incidental passages, the two types of description do not substantially differ in the nature of their contents and in their relationship to the whole. 80 Geographical information pertaining to the setting of the action tends to be included at the beginning of a campaign report,
while ethnographies most often occur at the end. However, the contents of the insertion on Carians, Caunians and Lycians and the broad scope of both incidental and transitional passages show how such a distinction between the two cannot be pressed too far. Transitional insertions do not contribute to explain specific matters of strategy in the historical narrative, but it has already been argued how that does not represent the primary function of incidental insertions either.

On the other hand, transitional passages, like incidental descriptions, may convey ideas that help to interpret the account of events. On the whole, the Massagetaean ethnography is not designed to support the preceding narrative or to clarify the facts. But the insistence on the close affinity of the Massagetae with the Scythians, (215.1, 216.1), joined with the description of their warring skills (215) and of their almost nomadic way of life (216.4) reechoes the earlier remark that the Massagetae may be of Scythian stock (201) and establishes a connection between the failure of Cyrus and that of Darius later on. The underlying idea behind the Lydian appendix is that in spite of some aspects of their oriental monarchy, the Lydians who were the first Eastern antagonists of the Greeks and who have been just dethroned as the leaders of Asia, were culturally closer to the Greeks than any other barbarian people. In the Babylonian ethnography it is again the idea of greatness that prevails, in spite of the mention of the most shameful custom. Greatness, however, as in the case of the incidental passage on Babylon, both connects the
description to the account of Cyrus' conquest (see the demonstration of Babylonian $δύναμις$ in 192) and makes it autonomous.

Transitional insertions, however, tend to be discontinuous accumulations of data, frequently in the form of lists (as the lists of customs in 131-140 and in 215-216), sometimes subdivided in several sections each covering a different topic (as the Lydian appendix and the Babylonian ethnography). Not all the information contained in one insertion contributes to the general idea that may emerge from the whole and often no general idea emerges at all from the particular data. Transitional insertions, like the other descriptions in Herodotus, cannot consistently be interpreted as supporting the account of events except that they define the world where the history takes place and establish the individuality of the people involved in the narrative as the narrative develops. The incidental and the transitional types of insertion correspond to alternative organizing devices by which Herodotus is able to include and more or less integrate in the history another area of investigation which the history requires although it is essentially separate from it.
In the course of this chapter we have seen the different ways in which insertions are attached to the main narrative. The connecting statement at the beginning or even at the end may indicate more or less clearly that the insertion means to fulfill a specific explanatory function for the historical context; or, somewhat differently, the insertion may be just appended to the narrative as a definition of a character, a place, an object or a people. In either case, the inserted passage by its contents often helps to explain factually the surrounding narrative and yet, at the same time, it invariably transcends its explanatory function. Changes of time, place and subject matter are for Herodotus not only means by which he clarifies factually the immediate context, but also means for including into his account material which relates thematically by analogy to other far and near parts of the Histories. From this point of view -- i.e., from the point of view of thematic relations -- insertions do not differ from the sections of the main narrative since these too, beyond their formal arrangement and logical sequence, are also variously related to each other even at a great distance by thematic elements. Insertions simply allow Herodotus to broaden the reader's perspective in time, space and subject and to multiply the data from the interplay of which general truth must emerge.

If its thematic importance, rather than its explanatory function, appears in certain cases to be the very **raison d'être** of an insertion,
the reader deduces that exclusively from the contents of the passage itself. Occasionally, a fact is presented as a paradigm, rather than for its own sake, through the speech of a character in the history. Thus, in Book I the stories of Tellus (30.3-5) and of Cleobis and Biton (31) exemplify the essence and limits of human happiness, but are so closely integrated into the Solon - Croesus dialogue that we have not even considered them as self-standing narrative insertions. Later in the Histories, the longer story of Glaucus (V.86.2-8), which illustrates true justice and divine retribution, represents another example of a parable narrated by a speaker. For the account of the tyranny in Corinth (V.92.4), the peculiar phenomenon occurs of a narrative introduced as a demonstration of a general idea (i.e., "tyranny is evil"), which in fact conveys important historical information as well. But all these passages that we have just mentioned, where a story is explicitly introduced to illustrate a general truth, are exceptional cases and especially they do not represent direct communications of the author to the reader, but those of one character to another. When Herodotus speaks in his own narrative voice, if he justifies inclusiveness beyond the normal sequence in the development of events, he does so only in two ways: explanation or the mention of an "interesting" fact (i.e., celebration). On the element of general meaning and thematic relevance for a part of the Histories or for the whole, transitions are mute. The story of Arion exemplifies this phenomenon.
The contents and function
of the story of Arion

The Arion episode represents a unique case in Book I because it is included as a narrative insertion that has no direct explanatory function whatsoever for the historical account and is even factually unrelated to it, aside from the initial formal link provided by the mention of Periander. The appearance of the latter in the history of the Lydo-Milesian war (20) is doubtlessly made more conspicuous by the fact that an insertion hangs from his name. However, the function of the Arion story goes far beyond that effect, resting primarily on its specific substance and meaning. Here, in a short and self-contained narrative passage, Herodotus has encapsulated in fact several of the most important themes of the Histories. Isolated as it is from the rest of the historical account by virtue of its different cultural context, the story of Arion helps to universalize ideas that keep re-emerging autonomously in other parts of the work.

The ideas conveyed through the Arion episode justify its inclusion both in the Histories in general and at this precise point of the narrative. In the first place, the story shows how no one can escape his due retribution. This represents a fundamental idea indirectly emphasized throughout the Histories in all the reports of changes of fortune down to the last failure of the Persians against the Greeks. Punishment is a necessary consequence of crime according to a justice which is in the divine order of things, whether it be meted out through human revenge (i.e., Candaules) or only by the hidden
agency of god (i.e., Leotychides and Cleomenes). Here the miracle of the dolphin, which leads to the indictment of the bad sailors, points to a divine intervention, so that the Arion episode bears a special analogy with the story of Croesus and is appropriately inserted just before Croesus (as the fifth descendant of Gyges) assumes power. Just as the Corinthian sailors unexpectedly did not get away with their crime, so Croesus (aside from his personal guilt, which will contribute to cause his ruin) will be destined to pay for the way in which Gyges obtained the throne.

The demise of the sailors caused by virtue of divine intervention in the Arion passage anticipates the downfall of Croesus but also refers back to the change of fortune of Alyattes in the immediately preceding narrative (17-22). The miracle of the dolphin is somewhat analogous to the series of unpredictable circumstances which led to the outcome of the Lydo-Milesian war, i.e. the accidental burning of the temple followed by Alyattes' sickness. Herodotus' narrative, however, focuses on the prevailing side as well: the god who causes the failure of unjust expectations, at the same time also comes to the aid of the victims and rescues them from aggression. Just as divine may or may not strike through human agency, i.e. through an avenger of the specific crime which calls for retribution, so men are represented as more or less directly responsible for their own salvation, but at any rate the latter generally appears as a reward of merit. The cunning of Thrasybulus saved the Milesians because his ruse was the decisive element which led to the peace
treaty (22). In a similarly direct manner, the shrewd policy of Themistocles, for example, saved the Greeks at Salamis (see especially VII.143-144, VIII.75), and the Greeks saved themselves on a number of occasions by fighting with skill and valor. At the same time, however, god saved Greece because it deserved to be saved for the valor, the talent, the piety, the wisdom and all the virtues of its civilization, even though these may not have led directly to a victory (see, e.g., Thermopylae). Thus, the intervention of Apollo saves Croesus from the pyre as a reward of his loyalty to the Delphic god (I.87), and Arion owes his miraculous rescue to his sacred position and excellence as a poet.94

The rescue motif in the Arion episode is actually more strongly emphasized than that of τίτις, since the punishment of the sailors is merely implied in the final notice of their confusion under indictment (24.8 λεί τίς εχάραγων ἐκ ἔκαν ἐν ἔκρω-μένην ἄρνεισα). It is Arion in fact, and not the sailors, who is at the center of Herodotus' narrative. He represents something small and civilized which is threatened by an overwhelming barbaric attack and almost hopelessly lost, but which is unexpectedly saved because of its intrinsic worth. Thus the rescue of Arion, narrated at this point of the historical account, throws a special light on the success of the Milesians against the systematic and persistent aggression of Alyattes, in anticipation of the final success of the other Greeks against the great Persian power at the end of the Histories. By representing Arion's intellectual superiority as an
indirect cause of his survival and triumph, Herodotus increases the significance of Thrasyboulus' ruse and draws attention to all the future instances in which the intelligence and creativity of the Greeks will be a factor in the narrative. The theme of ethical superiority, which hardly plays a role in the story of Alyattes and the Milesians, also emerges in the Arion episode, preparing Herodotus' many representations of Greek respect for law and valor in an unequal fight. The noble gesture of Arion who dons his robes, sings and then leaps into the sea, signifies in fact a special kind of heroism based on the respect of νόμος and acceptance of death. Later in the Histories, the same heroic attitude will be emphasized, for example, in the report that Xerxes' scout at Thermopylae observed with amazement that in the imminence of battle some of the Spartans were doing exercises, while others were combing their hair (VII.208). The Lydo-Milesian war is the first confrontation between Greeks and non-Greeks that Herodotus reports in detail. By its position and contents the Arion insertion, which may be considered as the first Greek logos of the Histories, underlines that episode in the historical development and establishes a relationship between it and the later narrative of Greek resistance and ultimate triumph. But, if at one level of interpretation Arion represents Greece and the sailors represent the Persian aggressor, the substance of the story contributes to remove the antithesis of civilization versus barbarism from a rigid and simplistic ethnical prejudice, since both Arion and the bad sailors are Greek. Thus, also later in the Histories Herodotus will temper
with great objectivity the representation of the differences between the Greeks and their Eastern opponents. 98

Another, and secondary, aspect of the Arion story, should perhaps be mentioned. Arion of Methymna personifies all the Greeks faced with the overwhelming barbarian aggression but -- from another point of view -- he also more narrowly represents the Greeks of Asia. The complex historical question of the solidarity towards them on the part of the mainland Greeks is here formulated ambiguously through the characterization of the Corinthian sailors on one hand and of the Corinthian tyrant on the other. Periander's role in the story of Arion is equivalent to that which he plays in the preceding historical narrative as supporter of the Greeks in Asia against the barbarian aggressor. Later in the Histories, the Spartans will become the allies of Croesus, who was the first to conquer systematically the Ionians and the Aeolians, but to Cyrus, after he has become Croesus' successor, the Spartans will send an envoy to pledge their support on behalf of the Greek cities of Asia (I.152.3). During the Ionian revolt, the Spartans decline to intervene (V.49-51), while the Athenians send a force to help the Ionians (V.97). Finally, the mainland Greeks, victorious against the Persians, will free the Greeks of Asia from their state of enslavement, although at the time of Herodotus -- and outside of the chronological range of the Histories -- the Ionians had become subjected again, this time by virtue of the aggressive imperialistic policy of Athens. The situation described in the small compass of the Arion episode anticipates the alternate support and
hostility of the mainland Greeks towards the Greeks of Asia in the long historical development which began with the first Lydian attacks against the latter.

The transitions

As I have tried to show in brief, the Arion insertion represents a microcosm of general ideas and more specific motifs recurrent in the Histories, and on that basis it relates to the historical narrative in a manifold and complex way. Because of its substance and meaning, the Arion episode is most appropriately inserted in its present position, right after the first full report of a barbarian attack against Greeks and just before the beginning of the Croesus logos, establishing thematic relations between those immediate surroundings and other distant parts of the work. The way in which the Arion episode is attached to the chronological narrative indeed contributes to draw attention to its special function and importance for the whole.

The passage is appended to a proper name that occurs in the historical narrative in the manner of incidental insertions, but with some peculiarities with respect to the usual procedure, which contribute to make it more isolated and conspicuous. In the first place the name of Periander, on which the insertion hangs, is mentioned during the preceding historical account in a deliberate short addition framed by prospective and retrospective statements with ΛΕΒΟΥΣ (20). It appears uncertain therefore whether the role
of Periander in the Lydo-Milesian war has led by association to the
inclusion of the Arion episode, or if it has been mentioned purpose­
fully so as to provide some factual connection with the Arion story at
this point of the narrative. Secondly, the insertion does not follow
immediately upon the mention of Periander, but is postponed until the
report of the Lydo-Milesian war has been ended and sealed by a con­
cluding statement (22.4). As a consequence of this position, the Arion
episode is markedly set off from its surroundings and placed outside of
the historical narrative, contributing to emphasize (like transitional
insertions100) a pause in the development of the action, just before
the transition from Alyattes to Croesus. Finally, in the third place,
the Arion insertion is introduced emphatically by an elaborate summary
statement:


(23)
The first sentence of the introduction just quoted, with the mention of Periander, serves to establish the factual connection with what precedes and signals a change of focus, even though Periander himself will not be the new object of report. The second sentence starts changing the setting. The third sentence constitutes the heart of the transition. Here the narrative moves to an indeterminate time and the new setting broadens to comprise several points of the Greeks' world: Methymna, Taenarum, Corinth, and shortly below (24.1), Italy and Sicily. At the same time the use of distinguishes at the outset the story that follows from an account of true historical facts, identifying it conspicuously with the mention of the sources (Corinthians and Lesbians) as a Greek legend. This tradition reflects in fact basic ethical values shared by all the Greeks, and its inclusion here towards the beginning of the Histories establishes that viewpoint for a long-range interpretation of the historical development described in Herodotus' work.

The fact about to be reported, which is indirectly related to Periander because it happened "in his life", is introduced as a . This expression draws attention to its importance and qualifies it in advance as relevant in general to Herodotus' work rather than immediately pertinent to the narrow connection that the narrative has provided. In apposition to a participial clause summarizes the major point of the story, i.e. the fact of Arion's rescue by the dolphin, while Arion, the new agent of
the narrative, is in turn immediately qualified with some emphasis in the celebratory participial clause at the end of the introduction.\textsuperscript{103} Thus, in the first place, the transition from Periander θυράνεω with Arion ὑθερωδέω separates the narrative that follows from the previous account of policies and wars and, with the mention of the Θώμα μόριον, places it on a different level: This is also confirmed by the stylistic transition to the dramatic mode which starts after the beginning of the episode proper (24.1) with the gradual accumulation of dramatic elements culminating in the central representation of Arion's last song.\textsuperscript{104} Secondly, the notice of Arion's excellence as a poet in the introduction establishes at the outset a basic premise of the story which underlines and supports the immediately preceding announcement of Arion's miraculous rescue on the dolphin.

After the initial link provided by Periander, the Arion episode is no longer factually connected to the surrounding historical narrative, from which it hangs down vertically in the manner of other narrative or descriptive insertions.\textsuperscript{105} The conclusion of the Arion passage and the resumption of the historical narrative constitute in fact a μέν... Σέ system with reverse change of agent, setting and time, in which the Σέ member only refers back to 22.4:
With this transition, the Arion episode appears further set off from its surroundings. The concluding statement forms a frame with the introduction at 23, to which it corresponds by virtue of two elements: the reference to the tradition of Greeks both of Asia and of the mainland, and the static image of Arion riding the dolphin. The latter is here recalled through the mention of a statue which Herodotus doubtlessly saw, not large, as he says, but a perennial memorial nevertheless to the merit of Arion and to his just triumph. The rescue motif is thus identified again as the essential element of the story.

Also Herodotus' own commemoration of that "wonderful deed" is a short passage included incidentally in the historical narrative --, but it represents nevertheless a meaningful indication at the beginning of the Histories of the author's program and artistic intent. Because of the thin factual connection that links it to its surroundings, some scholars have judged the Arion episode "impulsive and misplaced". I have tried to show on the contrary, how it reflects a fitting and deliberate compositional choice. Besides the analogies which relate the Arion story to different parts of the Histories, the figure of Arion who sings, leaps into the sea and survives by divine will, may be regarded as representing more subjectively, in relation to Herodotus himself, the poetic freedom of
the creative artist from external constrictions and narrowing limits. By inserting within the chronological progress of his λόγος the autonomous and otherwise unjustified report of what he calls a "great wonder", Herodotus indeed fully displays for the first time in the Histories his utter freedom to branch out at will and pursue whatever connection, with no predetermined limits to his subject matter. It is precisely that attitude of potentially unrestricted inclusiveness which allows Herodotus to show, in the analogy among widely different and unrelated events, the permanent and universal laws of history. Because the Arion episode is only related to the rest of the historical narrative at the level of ideas, it indirectly but more insistently draws out the philosophical meaning of mere contingent historical facts.
NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. The statement is quoted on p. 139 and discussed on pp. 142-146.

2. See Chapter I, p. 55 for the verb of change.

3. 84.5, how Meles, the early king of Sardis (ὁ πρῶτος Ῥωμείος βασιλεὺς) made the city impregnable except on one side; 85.1-2, prophesy to Croesus "in the past time of his prosperity" about his mute son; 168, first colonization of Abdera before they were conquered. Descriptive insertions frequently contain transitions to an earlier time in passages that explain the origin of present conditions (92.2, 94.2, 184.1).

4. I.e., thanks to a timely natural phenomenon, the solar eclipse which came as a surprise to both the Median and the Lydian army but which Thales had predicted exactly to the Ionians (74.2). The theme of the intellectual superiority of the Greeks over the Barbarians emerges here. See p. 65 and note 127.

5. What Herodotus thought of this type of compulsion may perhaps be deduced from the narrative about Pisistratus and Megacles (61.1-2).


7. The theme of revenge (73.5-74.1) ties this first part of the flashback to the mention of Croesus' own wish for revenge but it is more generally significant in relation to all the instances where revenge appears in the Histories as an element of causation (for Book I, see Chapter II, note 68). Another important theme of this passage is that of barbarism (75.5), which reappears in analogous form in the narrative about Astyages (119, the horrible banquet) and contributes to Herodotus' exploration in the Histories of the difference between Greeks on one hand and the various groups of Barbarians on the other (see also the Thales episode in the second part of this flashback mentioned in the note 4 above). The story of the Scythian suppliant-hunters who end up killing one of their guests and wards is in fact a barbaric parody of the utterly elevated Croesus - Atys - Adrastus story (the Lydians are for Herodotus closer to the Greeks than any other barbarian people); thirdly, the motif of the Scythians' fierce nature and hunting skills reappears in 214.5 and 216.3 on the Scythian-related Massagetae (see p. 258). Herodotus displays particular interest in the Scythians and in their trespassing into Asia because that was a transgression of boundaries which led to ultimate failure, and in anticipation of Book IV where the roles become reversed. For the Scythian invasion, see also I.103.3-106.2.
8. What happens here in the organization of the material is apparently the reverse of the case examined above (pp. 75-78) of the account of the two queens of Babylon, where Herodotus keeps the narrative proportionately short and pertinent to the surrounding campaign report and postpones the rest of the material on Babylon to a later more autonomous Assyrian logos.

9. For πεπιθέ as a marker of transition, see above, Chapter I, p. 55.

10. See pp. 53-54.

11. A. W. Gomme (The Greek Attitude to Poetry and History, Sather Classical Lectures, 27, Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1954, p. 90) observes that by the flashback technique Herodotus follows a logical rather than a chronological order.

12. See p. 44.

13. The first three chapters on the reign of Croesus may still be considered as part of the flashback. Cp. Wood, (The Histories of Herodotus, p. 24), who notices that 6.1 and 28.1 form a ring composition.


16. See Jacoby, RE Suppl. 2.347.

17. See pp. 60-61, 121, 148-149.

18. Of the Assyrians who, according to the statement just quoted, held the power in Asia before the Medes, we know that Herodotus had in mind to relate the history elsewhere (184.1, see pp. 75-78 and notes).

19. See above, Chapter II, note 35.

20. See 169 (p. 135 and note 166).

21. K. von Fritz (Griechische Geschichtsschreibung I, 287-288) remarks that the problem of ενοθεν, introduced at this point, binds the story of the Median monarchy to the last three books of the Histories. The problem here is how, after a despotic rule had been pulled down and individual people have earned their freedom, a new despotic rule could develop. Von Fritz notices particular relations
with the episode of Demaratus in Book VII (101-104): as Demaratus says, the Spartans have no despot, but they recognize νόμος as their ruler. In antithesis, among the Medes, after they freed themselves from Assyrian rule, injustice and anarchy predominated until they came under a new autocratic ruler.


25. For this flexibility, see Fränkel, "Stileigenheit", p. 85.


28. On celebratory πρῶτον , see Chapter I. pp. 91-92, note 173 and pp. 94-96.

29. For Herodotus' praise of buildings and monuments, see above pp. 91-92.

30. See 169.1 (p.135) and cp. 170.1-2.

31. In Book I flashforwards are only represented by the brief notice of a future Median rebellion at 130.2 (which underlines the fact of the definitive enslavement of the Medes, since that rebellion failed), by the reference to Darius and Xerxes at 183.3, and perhaps by the brief report on the outcome of Nitocris' ruse at 187.3-5.

32. Here, moreover, the notice on the divine punishment which befell the Scythians for the desecration of the temple (105.3) bears analogy with the report of the Agyllean curse in the Phocaean follow-up (167.1-2), and both these passages recall the story of Alyattes' sickness (19).

33. ὥσπερ ο καθηκὸς οὖν ἦν ἠδήστη ἐς Σάρδης ἡ αἰσχρὰς ἁ μαίνεται μετ' Ἱλομένας τὰς τάς. (70.2) καὶ μὲν νῦν τὸν καθήκον ὄφει ἔχει... (71.1)

34. See Chapter II, note 51.

35. See note 27 above.
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38. The author personally intervenes in the discussion (56.1 and 58).

39. See the author's interventions in 60.3 and 66.4.

40. The oracle motif which symbolizes predestination and man's limited understanding of it, and which is central in the narrative of Croesus' downfall (see pp. 136-148), appears both in the Athenian and in the Spartan logos: 59.1-2; 62.4; 65.2-4; 66.1-3 ἐγκύω, ἄριστος ἢ μέσος (cp. 75.1); 67-68.5. Pisistratus' μην ξανάι (59.4, 60.3-5, 63.2) are instances of the tyrant's manipulation of the people (cp. 89.3, 99, 155.4; for the theme of the autocratic ruler see p. 178, note 148). The connection drawn in both the Athenian and in the Spartan logos between a state's government and its condition of strength and weakness will be fundamental in the analysis of the Greek victory over the Persians (see e.g. VII.102-104).


42. Gomme, The Greek Attitude, pp. 88 and 93 and cp. Wood, The Histories of Herodotus, p. 31. A notice on Athenian history, as we have seen (p. 173), is integrated already earlier into the narrative with the introduction of Solon (23). For the purpose of Greek logoi throughout the first part of the Histories see also Pohlenz, Herodot, pp. 33-42. In the history of Croesus' preparations for the war against Cyrus, Jacoby (RE Suppl 2.382-383) considered the second part of the oracle at 1.53.3 and the whole story of Croesus' inquiry into Greek affairs and even of his alliance with Sparta as later additions to the Croesus logos precisely for the purpose of inserting at this point reports of Greek history in view of the later narrative of the Persian wars.

43. Herodotus specifies that Thyreae belonged to Argos and that Sparta was the aggressor (82.2 and 3). However, the account of the battle rather emphasizes Othryades' praiseworthy conduct (82.5) which illustrates the same unswerving sense of duty displayed by the Spartans in their response to Croesus' appeal (83).

44. 82.2-7 covers the war and is followed by a notice (82.7-8) about its long-range consequences on the customs of the two peoples.

45. See 92.3-4 and 187.
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47. See 56.2-58, 94.3-7, 143, 145-147.1, 150. For the "historical element" in Herodotus' geographical descriptions, see Cobet, Exkurse, 123-130.

48. What follows is a list of the other brief remarks on ethnography, geography, and monuments inserted in Book I: 24, Arion's monument (καὶ έκτι ...); 25, Alyattes' crater (άν Αθέκε δέ ...); 35.2, purification ritual among the Lydians (τού δέ ... έβοντο ...); 66.1, cult of Lycurgos (τού δέ ...); 66.4, Spartan fetters in Tegea (άδι δέ Πέδων) αὐταί ...); 67.5, explanation of agathoergoi (οί δέ ... ήκ); 70.1, Spartan crater; 71.4, rudeness of Persian life-style (Περενελίτευς λύδοις κατατρέψεις άθρω); 74.6, oath ceremony among Lydians and Medes (ορκίων δέ ...); 76.1 character and location of Pteria (νύ δε Πτερία ...); 79.3, Lydian valor (κατά τούτον τούτον ξέρον ...); cp. 71.4 above; 82.7-8, Spartan and Argive customs after the war (Πρόσων μέν νυν ἀπί τούτον τούτον ξέρον ...); 101.4, Median tribes (prospective-retrospective frame); 105.4, Scythian enareai (οντε ...); 125.3-4, Persian tribes (εκτί δε Πέρενελίτευς ...); 152.2, Greek use of markets (βτί ...); 157.3, oracle of the Branchidae (καί γάρ άντικήβι ...); 160.5, ban in Chios of grains from Atarneos (νύ δε ξέρονσ οδίτοις ...); 163.4, Phocaean walls (καί γάρ ...); 168, cult of Timesios in Abdera (τον ... νυν ...); 188.1-2, practice of the great King when he goes on expeditions (παράλληλον δε [δια] ...). Short ethnographical remarks also frequently appear in speeches. See 71.2-4, 89.2, 153.1, 155.4, 207.6. Some of Herodotus' short remarks are neither narrative nor properly descriptive, like in Book I the literary reference at 12.2.


51. See Jacoby RE Suppl. 2.381 and 388-89.

52. See pp. 86-94.

53. See p. 168, note 119.

55. This type of resumption can be considered as a type of anaphoric ring composition (see Pohlenz, Herodot, 63-64), except that the final member has a new element which connects it to the middle member, i.e. the insertion. See Beck, Ringkomposition, 31.


57. See pp. 75-78.

58. For another instance of Persian greed, see earlier in the description of Babylon, 183.3.

59. For a history of the problem of the relationship between geographical-ethnographical sections and the rest of Herodotus' work, and for a recent analysis, see Cobet, Exkurse, 4-43 and 85-140.

60. 142.3-4 (different languages), 143-145 (exclusive attitude of Greek leagues), 146 (unjustified claims to a greater nobility, inner disunity within the family), 147.1 (different leadership), 150 (political strife). See Immerwahr, Form and Thought, pp. 230-231. For Herodotus disunity is equivalent to weakness. Cp. 59.1.

61. The idea of disunity is recurrent in Herodotus' Ionian narrative. See 18.3, 26.3 (ἐν μέσαι ἐκ τωσί), 169.1, see p. 84 and 170.3.

62. See pp. 159-164.

63. As Cobet repeatedly maintains on the basis of his analysis of the major geographical and ethnographical passages of the Histories (Exkurse, pp. 94, 98, 99, 100, 103, 116), these sections do not essentially and on the whole fulfill a specific function for the historical context from which they originate.


65. Bare lists of names do have a place in Herodotus' narrative for the sake of information and effect. In Book I see 101 (Median tribes) and 28. In the second passage the enumeration of the people this side of the Halys conquered by Croesus contributes to render the idea of the greatness of that King's empire, within the finite limits of its natural boundaries. More frequently, however, Herodotus tends to define and diversify. See e.g. 125.3-4. The descriptive catalogue of Xerxes' forces in Book VII (65-99) represents a special instance of this tendency.
66. Aside from the Lycians (176.1) and the Pedasi (175), these peoples surrendered easily to Cyrus (174.1, 176.3). The insertion mentions peculiar customs and the Carian's inventions (171.4-5, see p. 62, note 173), but on the whole "greatness" is not emphasized.

67. See note 64 above. Erbse points out many specific connections between individual ethnographies and the narrative, but he carries his argument too far.

68. The autonomy of ethnographical and geographical descriptions is emphasized by Cobet (cp. note 63 above), for whom the essence of the individual "digressions" consists in the observation of human phenomena. Through the geography Herodotus inquires how far and to what extent the earth is inhabited, while ethnography is for him the representation of how men adapt differently to their environment and to the universal limitations of the human condition. See Cobet, Exkurse, pp.120 and 140).

69. Already Jacoby, RE Suppl. 2.342 had observed that the whole first part of the Histories (I - V.27) can be regarded as a description of the ᾠκομένη except the west.

70. See also below, with regard to the Babylonian ethnography in 192-200, on p. 255.

71. The Lydians, the Babylonians and the Massagetae are no longer part of the action after the conclusion of the narrative which precedes their respective insertions (although the Babylonians will re-enter the Histories in III.150-160). The Persian ethnography, on the other hand, is inserted after the Persians have just become the protagonists of the history -- which they will remain throughout.

72. See Chapter I, pp. 32-33 and note 3. The Massagetal ethnography is in fact subdivided into two parts, respectively on dress and custom, with the internal transition marked by a prospective sentence in 116.1.

73. See pp. 239-240. For the discontinuity in the transition, the Cappadocian insertion represents a unique case among the incidental descriptions of Book I.


75. See Chapter I, p. 72-73.

76. Cp., on a smaller scale, the addition in 25.2, after the mention of Alyattes' death. The material of the passage on "Croesus' other offerings" with the story of dynastic struggle in 92.2-4 pertains to the early phase of Croesus' reign.
77. See Chapter I, pp. 92-94.

78. In particular the motif of sophia and greatness which is an essential recurring element in Herodotean ethnographies here gradually acquires its autonomy from the particular narrative of the Persian conquest while maintaining its significance for the general context of the Histories. See Cobet, Exkurse p.103 and here above p. 247.

79. Powell (The History of Herodotus, pp. 19-20) took this slight irregularity as evidence that the whole Babylonian ethnography represents a later Herodotean insertion. It rather appears to be a case of abrupt transition not alien to Herodotus' method in the insertion of descriptive passages.

80. Thus, according to Jacoby, RE Suppl. 2.345, the descriptions concerning, respectively, the Babylonians and the Massagetae originally constituted autonomous unitarian logoi. Each of them, in Jacoby's view, was then divided into two parts and integrated into the narrative of Persian campaigns according to the pattern $a^1 b^1 a^2 b^2$, where $a$ represents the historical narrative or a connective passage and $b$ the ethnography. In both cases $b^2$ is formally more autonomous from the surrounding history than $b^1$. According to Jacoby, the passages on Libyans and Scythians in Book IV of the Histories reflect a somewhat similar development and technique.

81. See Cobet, Exkurse, 104-117.

82. I.e. Croesus' magnificence, and see the punishment episode in 92.2-4. On the portrait of the oriental monarch see above, Chapter II, note 148.

83. The statement that the Lydians have customs similar to the Greeks (94.1) is followed by a list of "inventions" all of which are practices that have been adopted by the Greeks. The invention of games is a sign of intellectual resourcefulness which typically represents a Greek feature (see p. 65, note 127 and above note 4). The episode of the Lydian migration to Tyrrenia shows another type of resourcefulness typical of the Greeks and recalls in fact the later stories of Phocaea and Teos (164-168, see pp. 223-224).

84. See above pp. 213-259.


86. See above, pp. 86-92, 213-230.
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episode as the Musterbeispiel of what he terms an "episodic digression," i.e., a digression connected to a subject shortly touched upon in the main narrative and leading in a different direction. Cp. Introduction, pp. 4-5, notes 12-13.

88. Erbse ("Tradition und Form", p. 250) goes so far as to say that the Arion episode serves as an orientation point for the historical context in that it identifies Periander. According to John L. Myres, Herodotus, Father of History (Cambridge, 1952), p. 83, Herodotus tells the episode of Arion and the dolphin to illustrate who was Periander and the latter, rather than Arion, is the hero of the story, "so great a sea king that he will see justice done to a Lesbian even if the villains are Corinthians." I disagree with both critics, especially Myres. In the Arion insertion, the figure of Periander represents a secondary element. See below, pp. 265-267.

89. For the origin of the story of Arion and the dolphin, see C. M. Bowra, "Arion and the dolphin," Musaeum Helveticum 20 (1963), pp. 121-134.


91. For Leotychides and Cleomenes respectively, see VI.72 and 75, 84.3: the end of both kings is explicitly attributed by Herodotus to divine θεότης.

92. Cp. Schwabl, "Herodot als Historiker und Erzähler," pp. 259-261. According to Schwabl the Delphic motif, which is prominent in the narrative of Croesus' downfall, is implicit in the Arion story as well, since both the singer and the dolphin point to Delphi. Thus the miracle of Arion is an Apollonian miracle and testifies to the power of the same god who ratified, but with precise reservations, the power of the Mermnads, the family of Croesus (1.13) and also, as we learn later in the Histories (V.92.22) of the Cypselids, the family of Periander.

93. Cobet, Exkurse, p. 149.

94. For the Arion episode as anticipatory of the rescue of Croesus from the pyre, see Wood, Herodotus pp. 23-34.


96. Ibid., p. 415.

97. Immerwahr, Form and Thought, p. 35.
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98. For example, although in the Persian wars the antithesis of Greeks vs. Barbarians corresponds to an antithesis of democracy and freedom vs. tyranny, Herodotus has tried to make clear in the course of his account that this is the result of an historical development rather than of ethnical differences. See especially the reports concerning tyrannies in Greek cities. See also III.80 and VI.43.3 where Herodotus shows how, contrary to the common prejudice of the Greeks, the idea of democracy was not hopelessly and absolutely alien to the Persians.

99. See above, p. 237.

100. See above, p. 248.


102. See Chapter I on celebratory terms, pp. 86-94 and especially 88-91.

103. For the emphatic introduction of a new agent, cp. Chapter II, note 161. See also the entrance of Solon as a character in the Croesus logos at 29.

104. See above Chapter II p. 166.


106. These words are used by Flory, "Arion's leap," p. 420.
CONCLUSION

The transitions which connect the Arion episode to the historical narrative present a unique concentration of different features recurrent in other transitions of the Histories. For this reason the way in which the Arion episode is attached to its surroundings, although it appears on the whole striking and peculiar, provides at the same time an appropriate preliminary for summing up the results of our entire analysis and for recalling in general the main characteristics of Herodotean transitions, as well as the compositional principles which they convey.

We have seen in the first chapter how elements of transition have essentially either a connective or an emphatic function. The most frequent connectives in Book I are represented by the particles μέν, δέ, ἐρα and even δὴ (in so far as it underlines another connective word or group of words); by backward-looking demonstratives or by a repeated noun; by participles, participial clauses, and subordinate clauses; and by certain adjectives such as ἄλλος (both additional and anticipatory), πρῶτος (ἀεύθερος etc.) and σίνι. On the other hand, other individual elements of transition fulfill the purpose of emphasis by drawing attention to some action or phenomenon which will be, or has been, the object of report. These
emphatic elements are most commonly, in Book I, combinations of particles like καὶ δὲ καὶ, ἐν δὲ καὶ etc.; prospective and retrospective pronouns, adjective and adverbs; verbs and clauses that clearly indicate a new beginning of the narrative (e.g., "there was a man . . ."); first person interventions, especially of the programmatic kind, but also sometimes evaluations of truth as well as the use of φασὶ and ἐρέωμαι. Finally, celebratory verbs and expressions constitute the most frequent and important elements of emphasis in transitions.

Connection and emphasis also represent the two basic functions of entire transitional clauses or sentences. Every transition contains some connective element and establishes at least a minimal link between contiguous sections. Emphatic elements on the other hand appear frequently but not regularly. Emphasis is also achieved by summarizing statements of transitions, i.e. introductions and conclusions which are employed not in a regular manner but pervasively, between the report of different stages of the action in a chronological account, between items of discussion in a descriptive passage, and at the points of juncture of an insertion in the chronological narrative. Summarizing statements make transitions conspicuous and this represents precisely a characteristic feature of Herodotus' style. Introductions and conclusions contribute to a clear organization of the account in the first place because they make visible the breaks within it and identify the sections to which they pertain as individual units, partially separate from the whole. On the other hand,
this type of emphatic transitional statement may also draw special
attention to the connection between two contiguous units (as in the
case of I.95), or fulfill a long-range connective function by estab­
ishing through repetition a relation with different and distant
parts of the account.

As Pohlenz already stated, connection and separation are equally
important aspects of Herodotus' composition. 1 Marked transitional
statements act as dividers of a continuous chronological account, so
that different moments of a historical development become individually
emphasized. At the same time, Herodotus regularly uses repetition
and summarization (and sometimes explicit back references) to
re-establish the cohesiveness of an interrupted historical report.
The autonomy of an insertion, necessitated by a change of time, setting
or subject with respect to the ongoing narrative, may be deliberately
enhanced by an introductory or a concluding statement or both, but a
factual connection of the insertion to its surroundings is always
sought. The transition to the Arion episode represents only an
extreme example of how the connective and the emphatic function may
coexist.

Herodotean transitions are indicative of the author's most
important principles with regard to inclusiveness, selectivity and
arrangement of the material. The overall examination of Book I as a
sample of the Histories first of all immediately reveals the great
variety of changes which punctuate the course of Herodotus' logos.
The report frequently jumps back in time or extends forward to explore origins and causes, as well as the ultimate outcome and consequences of particular events. The subject matter changes from the history of past deeds to the description of permanent circumstances and phenomena. The focus shifts from agent to agent, from individual to community, from the dramatic portrayal of an individual's personal experience to the more distanced historical report of his public achievements. All these different changes, as well as the frequency with which they occur, point to inclusiveness as the first and foremost concern and compositional method of Herodotus. The substance of the transitions confirms and specifies this view.

Herodotus' general program of inclusiveness is already expressed in the proem -- where ἄν ἐνόμων ἔδωκεν ἄνθρωποι essentially identifies the subject matter of the work -- and in the preliminary statement about "cities great and small" (I.5.3). In the course of the historical narrative, to be sure, we also see a selective process at work. However, selectivity appears to be in most cases a choice made for particular moments of the exposition resulting from a careful arrangement and organization of the material and not from the author's permanent judgment that some of the information he had at his disposal was not pertinent in general to his work. This emerges especially from those statements where Herodotus postpones to a later point a discussion which could be included in the present connection. But we have seen how also apparently more definitive selective statements (in particular those with anticipatory
may further reveal the potential breadth of Herodotus' subject matter rather than indicating its limits. The goal of historical accuracy functions indeed as a principle of selection to a certain extent. At the same time, however, the author's frequent evaluations of truth and cautionary references to his sources (with the use of ἄνευ and καὶ ὑπὲρ), which reflect such a permanent goal, also allow Herodotus to bring into the exposition the report of what is uncertain or false, but worth including nevertheless to support indirectly the interpretation of known historical facts.

The logos of Herodotus begins with the first origin of the East-West conflict (as the proem announces) and proceeds forward chronologically to the narrative of the conflict itself, i.e. the Persian Wars. Along the way, this logos swells and expands to a potentially unlimited extent, according to the two basic principles of explanation and celebration. As far as explanation is concerned, Herodotus likes to leave no gap in his narrative, and he aims at a complete report. As we detect already in the first sentence of the Histories, words such as αἰτήθη, πρωτοε and verbs of becoming frequently indicate the author's effort to begin from, or go back to, the first identifiable beginning of a historical development. We have seen how, when an insertion is attached to the chronological narrative as a direct explanation of a fact just mentioned, it often expands beyond the initial connection because the explanation generates the need for further explanation. Thus, the transition to an earlier time is likely to lead to another transition to a time still more remote, or in other
cases, the flashback is extended forward so as to bridge the chronological gap between the initial episode of the insertion and the events covered at the resumption of the main narrative. Follow-ups, and to a lesser extent flashforwards, similarly reflect the author's inclination towards completeness, and his practice not to leave the reader wondering about the outcome of particular developments which started in the mainstream of the narrative.

Herodotus' constant need to explain is most often explicitly indicated in the transitions to flashbacks, which at least in Book I constitute the most important group of narrative insertions. Thus Herodotus interrupts the chronological progress of his account to explain how the family of Croesus first rose to power in Lydia, how Croesus became Astyages' brother-in-law, and who was Cyrus so that he was able to conquer Croesus. On the other hand, when an insertion, be it narrative or descriptive, is simply appended to a noun in the main narrative without explicit indication of its function, explanation still emerges as the initial impulse which generates the insertion itself. The ethnographies of peoples which play a role in the history are in general inserted so as to answer implicitly the question "who were the Carians," "who were the Massagetans," etc., not too dissimilarly from the "who was Cyrus" passage. Even the Arion episode, which as we have seen is far from being factually explanatory for the historical context, originates as an explanation of "who was Periander," a fact that has deceived some critics as to the real function of the story.
Explanation induces Herodotus to broaden the scope of his chronological account by tying to it other accounts in a subordinate way, or provides him with the opportunity of doing so. Celebration, on the other hand, constitutes the second basic principle of composition which allows Herodotus to focus on an object independently from the context in which it appears. Like explanation, so also the celebratory goal is expressed in the first sentence of the Histories -- that important transition which reflects Herodotus' idea of his work as a whole. In the Proem the recording of "great and wonderful deeds" is announced as the author's task as he prepares to trace a historical development from its origins. Correspondingly, in the course of the logos, explanation and celebration intermingle to justify inclusiveness. Insertions which originate to explain and define, broaden to focus on "remarkable" facts and phenomena. In first-person interventions the author may forcefully declare that his logos requires that he clarify historical antecedents (e.g., I.95.1), or that he mention information which he deems interesting in itself even though it does not appear to be directly related to the historical account (see I.179.2). If explanation provides the initial specific connection, celebration isolates a report, rather emphasizing it as pertinent to the work as a whole. The most striking example of this transitional phenomenon is represented, as we have seen, by the Arion episode, initially attached to the preceding narrative as a definition of Periander, but then rendered immediately autonomous by its introduction as a Ὁμιλία μέρητος. An analogous method forms the
basis for the intercalation of ethnographical passages in the historical account. In those cases the goal of defining a people which has played a role in the main narrative coexists with, and is transcended by, the author's aim to record anything which is great, ingenious, interesting or peculiar. Herodotus' freedom of inclusiveness in the name of celebration is indeed further enhanced by the fact that the "remarkable" and "worth mentioning" represent a broad category, determined only by the subjective judgment of the author himself.

Herodotus' tendency towards broadening his account at will without the limitation of pursuing one single theme is matched by the deliberate variety and freedom with which he organizes his diverse material. The author's control in arranging the different parts of his work emerges clearly from certain programmatic statements which establish the appropriate place for certain reports (e.g., I.75.1, 95.1, 106.2, 184.1). The linear account mainly followed in Book I, centered around a single agent, as well as the type of narrative predominant in some later parts of the Histories where several agents are focused upon in turn (see Appendix on V.1-V.52), illustrate different methods of narration which Herodotus can master and use according to his choice. Organic transitions, such as those leading to the Greek insertions of Book I, give a measure of Herodotus' art in exploiting the internal logic of the historical narrative to join together reports pertaining to different times and settings. At the same time, however, as the insertion of many "transitional" ethnogra-
phical passages especially indicates, Herodotus in the course of his account does not avoid apparent discontinuity and abrupt transitions.

The joining together of potentially autonomous reports into a complex whole represents for Herodotus a predetermined choice and at the same time an utterly natural process, in need of little explicit justification or excuse. A careful examination of earlier works of Greek literature would perhaps help to evaluate to what extent Herodotus' methods in this respect have their roots in the archaic mentality of composition: one need only mention here as examples the way in which the story of Bellerophon is inserted in the Iliad, or the two sharply distinct sections of Alcman's Partheneion. Our modern need to explain each part of the Histories in terms of its function for a main general theme of the work is based on an anachronistic esthetic prejudice, and such an attempt is doomed to failure. On the other hand, Herodotus' transitions should not be regarded as artificial devices employed to connect externally large masses of unrelated material. On the contrary, the unity of Herodotus' work is mainly guaranteed on the level of ideas, by the system of internal analogies perceptible between the several parts of his work. The broadening of the historical narrative in many directions through explanation and celebration and the consequent accumulation of separate data, allow Herodotus to interpret the human condition and the world as a whole, as he gives the account of the specific historical development that led to the Greek victory in the Persian Wars.
NOTES TO THE CONCLUSION


4. Cp. especially IV.30: "νενεμώθη δὲ (προσθήκης χρή δὲ μου ἰδιών ἐς ὑπεροχήν ἐς ὁμοιομορφίας)..."

5. For the structure of the latter see Van Groningen, Composition, pp. 40-41.

6. As Immerwahr stated (Form and Thought, p. 5), Herodotus "... first discovered history as a method of understanding the world as a whole and made it the equal of poetry and philosophy." Cp. also Cobet, Exkurse, especially pp. 177-183.
APPENDIX

CHANGES OF AGENT IN V.-VI.32

In the main narrative at V.-VI.32, changes of agent, or of agent and setting combined, represent the most frequent and important subdividing element. This part of the Histories includes two major units, i.e. the so-called European campaign logos (V.1-27) and the account of the Ionian revolt (V.28-VI.32). But while the latter is framed by its own introduction and conclusion (V.28.1 and VI.32), the first is not similarly identified as a semi-autonomous section: it is rather delimited, in coincidence with formal changes of agent and setting, by external units, i.e., the account of the Libyan campaign (concluded at IV.205) at one end, and by that of the Ionian revolt itself at the other. Both the European campaign logos and the account of the Ionian revolt are each internally subdivided by changes of agent, and irregularly punctuated by summarizing statements with limited scope other than by insertions of various length which in some cases underline pauses in the action.

The first unit

On the basis of the subdividing elements just mentioned, the European campaign logos breaks up as follows:

293
1) V.1-10  
i) Megabazus subjects the Perinthians
insertion*

ii) Megabazus subjects the Thracians
insertion
change of agent (formal)

2) V.11-14  
i) Darius rewards Histiaeus and Coes

ii) introduction, Darius' experiences with the
Paeonians
change of agent (organic)

3) V.15-17  
Megabazus subjects the Paeonians
insertion
change of agent (organic)

4) V.18-22  
Embassy to Macedonia
insertion
change of agent (formal, organic)

5) V.23-24  
Megabazus, Darius and Histiaeus
change of agent (organic)

6) V.25-27  
insertion
Conquests of Otanes

The narrative proceeds at the beginning from the end of the
Scythian logos in Book IV, and is separated from it by the account of
the Libyan campaign in a way that already illustrates transitional
changes of setting, synchronism and basket weave narrative:

1) "Αμέδρος δέ διὰ τῆς Ῥωμιακος Ῥωμομενος ἐπὶκεν ἦσε Σκύτην

τῆς Παχυγένους ἐνθέωρεν δὲ αὐτὸ μὲν διέβα τὴν νῆσον ἦσε τὴν

λείνα, λέγοντες ἐνερμανθέν ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ Μεγαβαζον

εἶναις ἄλλας Περίην, τῆς Αμέδρος... (IV.143.1)

insertions on Megabazus (IV.143.2-144.2)

* The subdividing elements, whether they be insertions, summarizing
statements or transitions to a different agent, are underlined.
The narrative of the Scythian campaign is not formally concluded by a summarizing statement, but the first passage quoted above (IV. 143.1), indicates the end of that stage of the action. There, the notice that Darius departed leaving Megabazus behind, splits the narrative into two separate provinces or spheres of operations and provides an organic transition from one to the other--from a to b--, with no change of setting of the action with respect to the preceding report.

The entrance of Megabazus as a new agent is underlined by flashback insertions that illustrate his character, at the end of which a διὰ τῶν resumptive statement with repetition and addition (144.3) establishes Megabazus in his province exercising his activity over a period of time (αὐτοκράτηρ).

At this point the setting of the narrative changes with a marked strictly formal transition (IV. 145.1). Here the synchronism of the
expedition against Libya with the ongoing campaigns of Megabazus provides a connection between those two mutually autonomous activities and is expressed by the imperfect tenses in both the ἄν and the ἦ sentences and by the adverbial τῶν αὐτῶν... τούτων ἔχων in the latter.8

The thread of the narrative concerning Megabazus reemerges again with the next change of agent and setting (IV.205-V.111), which is formally of the post quod type, since the synchronism between the two separate activities is no longer indicated in any way.9 The ἦ sentence of this formal μόν... ἦ transition begins directly the report of the European campaign, connecting it to its previous announcement by means of subordinate clauses that summarize the substance of IV.143.1 and 144.3.

After the first two stages of Megabazus' activity, briefly recorded and each underlined by an insertion,10 a formal transition at V.10-11.1 brings the focus back on Darius:

The transition leaves Megabazus in the process of conquest (similarly as in IV.144.3) and indicates partial synchronism between the activity
of Megabazus and that of Darius. The initial \textit{δέ} sentence, which starts with the notice of Darius' arrival in Sardis, connects precisely with IV.143.1 above. In this part of the narrative Herodotus appears to exercise deliberate control over the different settings of the action, as he charts out with care the movements of the different agents. Even though he may give a compressed report of their operations (as in the case of Megabazus' conquests), their arrivals and departures are recorded to signal the beginning and the end of the stages of the action in each province. The crossing of the Hellespont will be thus mentioned four times at points of transition (IV.143.1, V.11.1, 14, 23.1), and those mentions keep qualifying the European campaign as a campaign across the border.

The next transition with change of agent and setting (between the second and third section of the scheme above) is of the \textit{propter quod post quod} type.\footnote{As a result of his encounter with the Paonian brothers, Darius sends orders to Megabazus:}

\begin{quote}
οὐδ’ἀλλα Δαρέως γράψε γράμματα Μεγαβαζῷ, ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῇ Θρησκείᾳ, ἀνεµοίρισον ἐξαναστήσας ἐγὼ ἱβέων Παονίν ἐπὶ παρ’ ἐνυαν ἀγάλην ἤ αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑπὲρ πανθραύσας αὐτῶν. αὐτὸν δὲ ἑαυτὸν ἔθει φέρων τὴν ἀγάλην ἐπὶ τὸν Ἐλμίστρον, περικατόρθωσι δὲ τὸ σώζον τὸ βουλήσιον τῷ Μεγαβαζῷ, ὅ δὲ ἐπιστολὴν καὶ μασίαν ἔσπειρεν ἐκ τῆς Θρησκείας ἐκφευρεῖς ἐπὶ τὴν Παονίν
\end{quote}

\textit{(V.14)}
This passage deserves to be quoted in full because it represents a very developed instance of how the sending of messengers, ambassadors and the like, insofar as it constitutes a factual contact between two different provinces of activity, can become a suitable means of organic narrative transition to a different agent and setting. To a greater extent than in most cases of this sort, the transition is here gradual and dramatic, with each stage noted separately in a fast sequence (the orders are first written, borne across, handed over and then read by their recipient, who immediately starts to execute them), and visually represented (see the image of the royal horseman racing across the border). The fact of the mission appears therefore emphasized and, implicitly, the dependence of Megabazus' activity on Darius' initiative.  

After Megabazus' conquest of the Paeonians, the account branches out again temporarily with an organic transition at V.17.1 which combines the procedure of V.14 just considered (agent sends off messenger) with that of IV.143 (agent departs leaving behind another agent):

```
Παύσων μὲν δὲ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἐπὶ ἐκ τῶν Αἰλίνων
Μεγαβάζος δὲ οἱ ἐξαγόμενοι τὰς Παύσωνας, Πέρσας ἀπελθόντες
ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ ἀνάστησαν ἐπὶ Πέρσας, οἱ μὲν αὐτῷ ἐνδεχόμενοι
Ὁμήρος Ἰλιάκωται ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τῇ ἐκδήλωσι
```

(V.17.1)

Ambassadors go to Macedonia: their venture and fate (17-22, including insertion at the end)
In the first statement quoted, the μέν sentence is a resumptive conclusion (after the insertion on the Paeonians) of the previous report, and it summarizes the results of the action already stated at 15.3. The organic transition away from Megabazus' province starts in the correlative ἐν sentence, where the mention of the new "agent" (i.e., the Persian ambassadors) is accompanied by a qualifying relative clause which corresponds to the far more extensive presentation of Megabazus in IV.143.2-4. The change of setting is prolonged by an objective geographical description of the ambassadors' route (17.2), which emphasizes the proximity of the area already conquered by Megabazus to Macedonia, and implicitly therefore, the advance of Persian imperialism towards mainland Greece.

The facts concerning the Persian embassy to Macedonia are attached to the surrounding narrative as if they had happened between the departure of Megabazus and his arrival in Sardis. No overlap with the events reported later is indicated in the reverse transition back to Megabazus (22.2-23.1), even though it is evident that the end of the preceding action extends chronologically well beyond the next. After the Macedonian episode, as soon as the narrative thread of
of Megabazus is picked up again in basket weave fashion, it merges immediately with that of Darius by means of an organic transition: the former agent joins the sphere of activity of the latter (23, adviser scene) and then disappears from the history. Darius, for his part, deals with Histiaeus (24) and subsequently leaves Sardis:

This passage prepares the setting for the account of other activities later on, as it establishes Artaphrenes in Sardis and Histiaeus with Darius in Susa. At the same time, it leads directly to the report of Otanes' campaign with an organic change of agent closely analogous to that in IV.143.1, where Darius departs leaving Megabazus in Europe. Like Megabazus there (and to a lesser degree, like the Persian ambassadors at V.17.1), so now Otanes, upon entering the narrative as a new agent, is qualified in a relative clause. The episode on Otanes' father inserted here (25.1-2) corresponds to the flashbacks concerning Megabazus in IV.143.2-144.2. The activity of Otanes in the Hellespont constitutes the tail-end of the so-called European campaign.
The organization of an account that must include events occurring in different settings in the same time-span depends largely on the author's choice of a predominantly linear or of a distributive composition. In Book I, which is in general linear and centralized, the necessary split of the narrative between Cyrus' sphere of activity and the events and operations in Lower Asia, is handled with economy. After his departure in I.157.1, Cyrus remains absent from the history until the report, of considerable length, concerning the consolidation of the Persian power in Lower Asia is entirely finished at I.177, at which point the reverse change of agent is definitive. The utter absence of Cyrus from this whole section, in contrast with the way in which he always is at the center of the action in the surrounding narrative, is consistent with the idea that he considered the Ionians of no account (153.1). Moreover it confirms the image of Cyrus as perpetually driven onward to different and farther conquests, a thought expressed in I.177.

Contrary to the case just mentioned, in the European campaign logos, Herodotus favors the distributive method, organizing his account according to a tight and well constructed basket weave. The account of the military operations of the European campaign is broken up into short pieces alternated with other reports. In the first place, the focus of the narrative keeps reverting to Darius (stationed in Sardis), who emerges as the remote controlling agent of his generals' achievements. Secondly, the various sections which fragment the military history of the European campaign, by their position or
contents, contribute to diminish its importance as an autonomous step forward of the Persian expansion, and rather enhance its value as an intermediate stage between Darius' earlier attacks against Barbarian peoples and his later campaigns against Greeks. 23

The report of the factually unrelated Libyan campaign, first of all, comes to interrupt that of Megabazus' activity at its inception, rather than finding a place just before it. As a result, this passage does not really separate the Scythian and the European campaigns: the continuity of the action from one to the other is well established in the organic transition at IV.143.1. Secondly, in the sphere of Darius' activity, the continuing story of Histiaeus (V.11, 23-25.1) is important for the European campaign itself (Histiaeus' presence in Thrace was felt as a threat to the Persian supremacy in that area, (23.2), and at the same time connects it with the report of the Scythian expedition (IV.137-139, 141) and with that of the Ionian revolt (V.35.2-4, 106, VI.1-5, 26-30). The Paeonian episode, for its part (V.12-13), underlines the fact of that people's deportation, which in turn anticipates the enslavement and deportation of the Milesians (VI.20); it also recalls Darius' propensity, represented earlier (III.130-132, 134.5-6), for acquiring slaves and for exploiting foreign expertise. Finally, the Macedonian episode (V.17-21) is clearly anticipatory, since the setting of Persian activity (and failure) is here for the first time mainland Greece. By means of changes of agent and setting in the narrative, Herodotus represents the military achievements of the European
campaign as only one aspect of the Persian activity at that time, occurring among other different events which contribute to link the past with the future historical development.
The Second Unit

The conclusion of the report of Otanes' campaign is part of the transition to the account of the Ionian revolt:

This formal change of setting of the post quod type marks a major subdivision in the historical narrative. The sentence constitutes an emphatic summary introduction with μετά as the summarizing term. This statement expresses a break with respect to the preceding section by mentioning a historical pause in the action after Otanes' campaign, and by announcing the beginning of a new series of events, which originated autonomously from a different initiative.

The first section

After a notice on the prosperity of Naxos and Miletus in a sentence and connected flashback (28-29), both of which help define the new center of the action, the facts concerning the Ionian revolt are told in a complex account subdivided primarily by changes of setting and agent. Thus, a first section on preliminaries, causes, preparations and beginning of the revolt (V.30-99) is distinct from what follows and remarkably unified, in spite of the lengthy
interruption, thanks to the figure of Aristagoras. The latter is introduced briefly as the new agent at 30.2 and remains the center of the action throughout. The narrative, which aside from a passage about Histiaeus (35.3-4), runs in chronological sequence, follows linearly the movements of Aristagoras to Sardis (31), Naxos (33), Sparta (39), Athens (55), and back to Miletus; it focuses on the development of his policy, on the origin of his plan and on his revolutionary activity.

Even the report of Histiaeus' initiative with regard to the revolt is subordinate to that of Aristagoras' motives, since it is triggered by the notice that Histiaeus' messenger from Susa arrived in Miletus. This transition from Aristagoras to Histiaeus can be regarded as the reverse of an organic change of agent from A to B made at the moment when A arrives at the setting of B: 27

stratagem and motives of Histiaeus for inciting Aristagoras to the rebellion (35.3-4)
The aitie section quoted above (35.1-2), as is often the case for passages of this sort, constitutes a resumptive transition which partially summarizes the preceding or earlier narrative from the subjective viewpoint of the protagonist (35.1) and adds other information (35.2). Here Herodotus announces for the first time Aristagoras' plan to revolt as well as the decisive motive for that plan (CUVEΠΠΟΣ ΓΑΡ ...). From the latter hangs the explanation of how and why Histiaeus had sent his orders from Susa (ἘνΔΛΟΥ ΓΑΡ ...), in a passage that holds a somewhat similar position as the flashback that explains Croesus' desire of revenge at the end of the list of motives at I.13.1-2. The report on Histiaeus proceeds from an earlier point in the main narrative (24-25.1) and concerns activity contemporary to that of Aristagoras in Miletus. In the formal transition back to Aristagoras (36.1) the sentence (a resumptive introduction) underlines the coming together of circumstances which arose independently in different settings at about the same time to cause the beginning of the Ionian revolt. But for the way in which it is attached initially to the aitie section, the account of Histiaeus' initiative appears subordinate, and the narrative remains linear and centralized, revolving around Aristagoras.
Changes of agent in the rest of the account of the Ionian revolt

The disappearance of Aristagoras from the account in which he has played so prominent a role marks the beginning of the military phase of the Ionian revolt. Aristagoras' dispatch of the expedition against Sardis, while he himself remains behind in Miletus, provides a rather conspicuous organic transition to a different agent and setting:

The long passage partially quoted above underlines the idea of mission and the dependence of the Ionians on Aristagoras' initiative (ἔποιεῖτο στρατηγίνα), as well as the non-participation of Aristagoras himself to the enterprise (αὐτῷ ... οὐκ ἐσπερατεύεται). Even though the generals whom Aristagoras sent at the head of the expedition are identified at this point, they will not be mentioned again in the narrative. The new agents in the next
section and in others later on will be collectively "the Ionians", and no other individual will emerge as inheriting Aristagoras' role of leadership.

From this point forward, the narrative is subdivided by frequent changes of agent and setting into small sections, for the most part chronologically overlapping. On that basis, the entire account of the Ionian revolt breaks up as follows:

Introduction (V.28-30.1)

1) Activity of Aristagoras (V.30-99): Preliminaries and beginning (role of Histiaeus)
   A. sends off the expedition vs. Sardis.
   e.o.a. (change of agent, organic)

2) Activity of the Ionians (V.100-103): Expedition and fire of Sardis ending with battle of Ephesos.
   Campaign in Hellespont.
   Campaign in Caria.
   c.o.a. (partially organic)

3) Activity of the Cyprians (V.104): Beginning of revolt in Cyprus.
   c.o.a. (formal)

4) Activity of Darius (V.105-107): Reaction to the facts of Sardis, i.e. a row episode.
   Confrontation with Histiaeus.
   Darius sends Histiaeus off.
   c.o.a. (formal)

5) Activity of Cyprians and Ionians (V.108-116): Ionians called by Cyprians go to Cyprus; land and sea battles
6) Activity of Persian generals (V.116-123):

Daurises, first in Hellespont, then in Caria (defeat of Carians, defeat of Ionians, D.'s forces destroyed by Carians).

Hymaies first in Propontis, then in Hellespont.

Otanes, with Artaphrenes, in Ionia.

7) Activity of Aristagoras (V.124-125):

Flight from Miletus and death.

8) Activity of Histiaeus (VI.1-7):

Arrival from Susa to Sardis, whereabouts in Ionia, activity in Hellespont.

9) Activity of Ionians (VI.7-21):

Battle of Lade. Fate of Miletus.

Reactions in the West.

10) Activity of the Samians (VI.22-25):

Exiles.

Situation in Samos.

12) Activity of the Persian fleet (VI.31-32): Last conquests

Conclusion (VI.32)

The outline above, which reflects the subdivision of the account as it is immediately apparent, shows the different threads of the narrative and will provide the basis for examining changes of agent. In the report of the military phase of the revolt (i.e., from V.100 on), the expedition of the Ionians against Sardis (in section 2) and their defeat at Lade (section 9) are the crucial events, which constitute important points of reference. However, on the whole, the narrative of the revolt does not center on the Ionians. It rather comprises several principal agents who play separate roles either in the same places where the confederate Ionians carry on their activities, but at a different moment (Cyprus, Caria, Hellespont, Ionia), or in settings altogether beyond their common sphere of operations (Susa, Samos). There are four aspects inherent in the historical development itself which tend to complicate the organization of the narrative: the course of the various local uprisings as part of the general revolt (especially Cyprus, Caria and Samos); the separation between the Ionians and their original leaders (Aristagoras and Histiaeus, by now autonomous from each other as well); the separation of the Persian
King in Susa from his army and generals in Asia Minor; and finally, at certain stages of the action, the subdivision of the Persian forces into several units operating independently.

Unlike his procedure in the initial section on Preparations and Beginnings, Herodotus here enhances the multiplication of the settings of the action and handles his material in a distributive manner. Rather than keeping special hold of one sphere of activity and narrating other events mostly from that viewpoint or in subordinate reports, the author keeps shifting from agent to agent focusing on each in turn. Thus after the Battle of Ephesus, the Ionians' next major confrontation with the Persians is reported within the semi-autonomous history of the Cyprian revolt (Sections 3 and 5 in the scheme): the Cyprians here are clearly the main focus of the narrative. In an analogous way, the Ionian defeat in Caria (V.120) constitutes a minor episode in the account of Daurises' operations in that region (section 6).

The result of the distributive method in this part of the history is, formally, an intricate basket weave composition, and a narrative where changes of agent are for the most part inorganic (contrary to what happens in the European Campaign logos, and synchronic transitions predominate. Moreover, since the scattered passages pertaining to the Ionians on the one hand and to the Persians on the other are not always explicitly connected to each other, it is hard to reconstruct the continuous sequence of the two parties' respective operations throughout the revolt. The next transition to be
considered, to the history of the Cyprian revolt, will provide the first example of this phenomenon.

Account of the Cyprian revolt

In Section 2 of the scheme above, the Ionians are the principal agents. After the Battle of Ephesos, they decide to continue the war even though the Athenians have left; they sail to the Hellespont where they subject Byzantium and other cities, and then directly to Caria, most of which joins their cause:

...ἐπιτρέποντες τε ἐξελέγοντος Κυρίας τὴν πολιτικὴν παρακαταλήψειν σφία συμμαχέων διὰ· λαί αἱ τὰ ἰδιαὶ καὶ Καὺνον πεσάντων οὐ βιασμένων συμμαχέων, ἢς ἐνεπηρεάεν τὰς Κύπρια ἀπὸς σφί, λαί αἵστα ταπεινόντων. (V.103.2)

Κυπρίοι δὲ ἐκθεοίνας σφί πάντις προεξέρχοντας

πλὴν Ἀραχοίαν·

τῇ πανδελτικῇ μὲν ἔτραχοι λαί ὧπι

ἐστὶ ἄρα ἄμα λήζων. (104.1)

In the passage just quoted, after the brief report on the situation in Caria, the sentence with ἢ (both continuative and antithetical) provides further information on the spreading of the revolt in a different setting and serves as a summary introduction to the Cyprian account. The next sentence, with explanatory ὑπὲρ, is a second introduction of the prospective sort, which more precisely
preannounces the author's intention to cover the Cyprian revolt as an
episode separate at least initially from the Ionian revolt ("how also
these rebelled against the Persians"), rather than merely as a stage
of the latter. The story begins in fact with Gorgos' plan conceived
"even before" (ναὶ πρῶτερον) and actuated as soon as
the news came that the Ionians had rebelled. Since this section is
characterized by the transition to an earlier time with respect to
the preceding narrative for the purpose of explaining antecedents in
a new setting of the action, formally it constitutes a short flashback,
even though it reports events contemporary to and connected with the
Ionian revolt.36

The transition quoted above between the Ionian and the Cyprian
sphere of activity could be regarded as partially organic. The report
of the Ionians' movement southward and of their success in Caria leads
naturally to the mention of Cyprus which, one may presume at this
point, is implicitly already their intended target, or which is, at
any rate, the next recorded setting of their operations. But later on,
when the narrative of the Cyprian revolt resumes, it is said that while
Onesilos was besieging Amathus, having received news that a Persian
force was moving against Cyprus, he sent heralds to Ιονία asking for
help. (108.2). Since the last time we had heard of the Ionians they
were in Caria (103.2), Onesilos' message must have been dispatched
either before the Ionians' Hellespontine campaign -- perhaps right
after the Battle of Ephesos -- or after the operations in Caria, if
the Ionians did not proceed directly from Caria to Cyprus, as seems implied in 103.1-104.2, but returned to Ionia first. In either case there is a breakdown of continuity in the narrative thread of Ionian activities, which contrasts with the exactitude of the connections found, for example, in the European campaign logos.

Discrepancies of this sort, when they occur, may partially reflect the lack of information on Herodotus' part with regard to all the successive stages of each activity and their relative chronology. In part, however, Herodotus' neglect to connect precisely the different sections of an agent's operations is also due in this case to the complexity of the report itself, not only because of the number of actual participants in the development of events in different settings, but also because of the number of agents on whom in turn Herodotus chooses to focus. Thus, the account about the Ionians is interrupted by the semi-autonomous history of the Cyprian revolt, told from the Cyprian point of view even when the Ionians come to join the action. Moreover, the notice of the Ionian campaigns in the Hellespont and Caria (V.103) is separated from the Ionians' next reappearance in the narrative (V.108.1) not only by the flashback on Cyprus but also by a section (3 in the scheme) which interrupts the history of the Cyprian revolt by representing Darius in Susa.

Position and function of the Darius section

The Darius section is attached to the preceding narrative at the
moment of pause provided by a continuing action, the siege of Amathus:

"... The narrative thread of Darius' activity re-emerges at this point from the European campaign logos (V.23-25.1) with a formal change of agent and of setting from Cyprus to Susa. The synchronism of the two actions occurring in different places is indicated by the imperfect tense of the verb in the μν sentence (ἐπολιόρλεε), and is later more explicitly reconfirmed in the reverse formal transition back to the Cyprian account:

"... Here again, as at V.105.1, the change of agent and setting occurs after the beginning of an unfinished action (i.e., in this case, the..."
journey of Histiaeus). All the preceding stages of the activity in Susa are moreover summarized, not merely in order to express a more precise chronological relationship with the autonomous events in Cyprus which are about to be reported, but also in order to underline the contents of the section that has just ended. 40 The long temporal clause within the prospective introduction at V.108.1 thus serves the purpose of emphasis, fulfilling the function of an autonomous ἀνάλογον conclusion.

The section on Darius with the arrow episode and the King's colloquium with Histiaeus represents indeed a cornerstone of the historical account for the multiple connections it establishes among different parts of the work. In the first place it links the military stage of the Ionian revolt (which started with the expedition against Sardis), with the preparations stage dominated by Aristagoras and Histiaeus. More important, on the one hand it expressed direct anticipation of the Ionians' ultimate failure (... ὅτι ἀν ἐπὶ τὸν ἱπποτικὸν ἔδωκαν ἄντι τῆς ἀνθρώπου τῆς Τροίας τῆς μακροχρόνης..., 105.1), while on the other hand it looks forward to the long-range consequence of the Ionian revolt -- the great King's aggression against mainland Greece --, thus introducing the element of revenge in the immediate causation of the Persian Wars. 41 In the imminence of the third conquest of Ionia this passage even recalls the second conquest by representing Darius' attitude both toward the Ionians and the Greeks of the mainland as strikingly similar to Cyrus' own at the eve of that early event. 42

The initial δέ -sentence of the Darius section at V.105.1,
which contains a partial summary of the previous narrative of the Ionian revolt, underlines the fire of Sardis, since it singles out this specific event, apart from the initiative of the revolt in general, as that which triggers the wrath of the King. The narrative of Darius' reaction would have therefore found its natural place at some point closer to the fire episode, where the dispatch of the news to Susa mentioned in 105.1 would have provided the organic transition to that setting. Similarly, at the other end of the report about Darius (107), the King's dismissal of Histiaeus, who then departs for the coast, could have led directly to the account of the latter's activity (section 8 in the scheme), had the two passages been kept contiguous. But Herodotus here waives the opportunities inherent in his story for organic changes of setting. Rather than seeking continuity in the narrative, he deliberately interjects the Darius section at a point where it remains unrelated to its immediate surroundings except, somewhat formally, by synchronism of the facts of Susa with a stage of the Cyprian revolt.

By virtue of its isolated position, the only intervention of Darius in the entire account of the Ionian revolt acquires a special relief appropriate to its far-reaching connective value, and comes moreover to underline an otherwise unmarked turning point in the narrative. The preceding account (100-104), in fact, mainly focuses on the initiatives of the Ionians and on the spreading of the revolt -- to the Hellespont, to Caria and previously to Cyprus. The
sections that follow the passage on Darius record, on the other hand, different moments of decline and failure of the Ionian cause, starting with the end of the Cyprian independence and ending with the final blow of the battle of Lade.

The section on the Persian generals

The account of the Cyprian revolt is concluded by an emphatic μὲν -statement in the formal transition to a different setting; the new section is in turn subdivided by changes of agent into three separate units:

Campaigns of Daurises (117-121)

(V.116). Darius μὲν...
The δικε -sentence at 116 is a rather conspicuous summary introduction of the report of Persian operations which on the whole, with the exception of Daurises’ Carian campaign (118-121), seem to have neutralized the advantage gained by the Ionians in Asia Minor. The statement brings forward and briefly qualifies Daurises, Hymaies and Otanes as the new agents of the narrative. We learn only now that these were the Persian generals (previously unidentified in the section that focused on the activity of the Ionians) who came to counteract the Ionian expedition against Sardis (102). The clause ἵν μάχη ὤσ ἐπηλεύθησαν seems to refer to the Battle of Ephesus, so that the narrative goes back to the time immediately after that event, to follow the separate campaigns (ἐπὶ ἄμμον ... ἐπὶ ἄμμον) of the Persian generals.

The transitions at 122.1 and 123 between the spheres of activity of each general are formal, and the beginning of Hymaies’ section, at least, appears to bring the narrative back again to Daurises’ starting point. Thus the generals seem to operate in different settings at about the same time and their campaigns must be in turn roughly contemporary with those of the Ionians after Ephesus (103.2).

The logical and chronological relationship of events in this
section, where each agent is focused upon separately, is however hard to reconstruct. We learn first of all that Daurises went to the Hellespont and later, "as soon as he received the news that the Carians had joined the Ionian cause and had rebelled against the Persians" (117), he moved to Caria; Hymaies, independently, went first to Propontis and then to the Hellespont, "when he learned that Daurises had left the Hellespont and was campaigning in Caria (122.2); thirdly, perhaps at the same time (although there is no time indication here), or after the death of Daurises and Hymaies, Otanes was with Artaphrenes in Ionia and Aeolia.

The campaigns of Daurises in the Hellespont and then in Caria seem to have followed one step behind those of the Ionians in the same places. The Carians are at first represented as facing alone both the prospect and the reality of the Persian attack (118-119), which means presumably that the Ionians were no longer in the area. After their defeat by Daurises, the Carians, like the similarly isolated Phocaeans during the second conquest of Ionia (I.164) consider leaving Asia forever(119.2). Only at this point "the Milesians and their allies," i.e. presumably "the Ionians", arrive to aid them but are defeated. It seems reasonable to assume that this battle took place after the battle of Cyprus, although no time relationship is drawn between the two events. If so, it is not clear whether the Ionians stopped in Caria while on their way back from Cyprus or whether they came to the aid of the Carians from Ionia.
whither they had already returned. The last report of the Ionians' whereabouts mentioned that they left Cyprus for Ionia after the battles, as soon as they learned that Cyprus was lost (115). After this passage the narrative thread of the Ionians becomes interrupted as Herodotus focuses on other agents (just like after V.103), and when the Ionians suddenly appear to support the Carians, no effort is made to connect the different stages of their operations.

Aristagoras and Histiaeus

The Ionians do not reenter the narrative as a confederate force until the prominent report of the battle of Lade (section 9 in the scheme). In the imminence of this decisive defeat Herodotus interjects two semi-autonomous sections which represent the declining fortune of the revolt by focusing on the current activities of its original authors (sections 7 and 8).

At the end of the account of the Persian campaigns comes a formal change of agent and setting to Aristagoras in Miletus:

The transition is of the propter quod type with overlap, since the planning of Aristagoras' escape was caused by the victories of Artaphrenes and Otanes ( ), and went on as
the operations were still in process (δύναμις μένων
γων πολεμών). The reappearance in the narrative of
Aristagoras -- absent from the action since his dispatch of the
expedition against Sardis -- is rather emphasized in the summary
introduction just quoted, with hysteront-proteron and anacoluthon
(V.124.1). His role as the author of the revolt is recalled both in
this statement and in the retrospective conclusion at the end of the
section. The latter is part of the formal change of agent to
Histiaeus:

Ἡροδότος ουχ οὖν ἢμερας ἀποτελέσας οὗτως ἔγενεν.
καθαρὸς δὲ ὁ Μινιάτωρ ἐπάνων μεταβασάνος.
υοῦ Αριστάρχος παρῆν ὑπὸ Σαρδίκη.

(VI.1)

The transition to Histiaeus at this point indicates that
Herodotus is starting to tie up the several loose threads of his
plot. The narrative of how Histiaeus tried to assume a leadership
role in the revolt and failed, which starts here, proceeds exactly
from V.107, where Histiaeus was released by Darius and began his
journey to the coast. The account of Aristagoras' death constitutes
a brief follow-up which is wholly integrated into the narrative, since
the μόν... system at VI.1 only indicates an
undetermined overlap between the end of the preceding action and the
beginning of the next.
The battle of Lade

Before the report of the Battle of Lade the distributive organization of the account -- and specifically Herodotus' choice not to keep the focus on the Ionians -- contributes with the substance of the narrative since both convey the idea that the Ionians were never truly in control of events. The very initiative of the revolt was due to Aristagoras rather than to the Ionians' common deliberation to free themselves from the Persians. After the fire of Sardis, which constituted an accident, after the defeat of Ephesus and the departure of the Athenians, the Ionians continued the war because their position was already compromised vis-à-vis the King (ἢ δὲ ἔρχονται ἡπτάπεντε εἰς Ἀρτέμιον). Their campaigns were in great part counteracted by Daurises, Hymaies and Otanes. The victory of the Ionians in the waters of Cyprus did not help the fortune of that local rebellion, since Cyprus was lost in the land battle. Similarly, the Ionians' defeat in Caria was not decisive, as the Carians recovered and destroyed the Persian force. The narratives of Aristagoras' flight and death and of Histiaeus' contradictory operations show other separate participants in the course of the revolt and moreover put into relief the lack of any appropriate and acceptable leadership on the Ionian front.

In the account of the Battle of Lade, Herodotus focuses on the Ionians' point of view more closely than ever before and stresses in particular the possibility for the Ionians to gain control of events.
at that decisive moment. In the formal transition from Histiaeus (occupied capturing Ionian cargo ships in the Hellespont) to the setting of the imminent engagement, a rather solemn introduction draws attention to the moment of crisis after the report of secondary activities:

\[ (V.6.1) \]

The adjective \( \pi\rho\sigma\sigma\_\rho\_{\xi}\_\rho\_{\mu}o\_s \) already makes clear what will constitute the point of view of the narrative. The introductory statement above is reinforced by a sentence explaining that the reunited Persian forces had singled Miletus out for attack, and by a subsequent report of how the Ionians decided by common accord to arm a fleet of all the ships they could muster and to defend Miletus by sea (V.7). This is to be therefore an all-out struggle for both sides, but especially for the Ionians. The description of the order of battle (8) reinforces the expectation of the encounter.

The idea of the moment's importance and of the stakes involved (9.2-3, 11, 12.3) is conveyed simultaneously with that of choice, and the successive deliberations of the Ionians punctuate the narrative. First, as we have just seen in common they decided to gather their fleet at Lade; then, individually, they chose to reject the Persian overtures (10). Subsequently they held assemblies to deliberate on a plan for battle (11.1).
They were persuaded to follow the directions of Dionysius (12.1), only to reverse their decision later on (12.3-4).

This last choice of the Ionians helps to determine the outcome of the battle. The Samians' decision to betray is, in Herodotus' account, presented as consequent to it (13). The case of Dionysius of Phocaea confirms the notion that the absence of Aristagoras since the beginning of the military action of the revolt had left the Ionians deprived of a leader of recognized authority and that such a void was crucial for the outcome of the war. On the other hand, the attempt and failure of Dionysius to engage the Ionians, so prominently represented in the narrative, also goes to show that according to Herodotus' interpretation, in the moment in which the Ionians found themselves at last in a position to exercise control on the outcome of the revolt, they deliberately relinquished that chance and decided that even freedom was not worth the effort. The idea seems ludicrous in view of the tragic consequences of the defeat, and is intentionally expressed with irony, through the speech of the anonymous soldier (12.3). The representation of the Ionians' lack of motivation on this occasion nevertheless agrees with the fact that, according to Herodotus, the Ionian rebellion was externally provoked, as it were, by an individual led by personal motives, rather than originating as a common fight on behalf of freedom.

The last sections

The account of the battle of Lade is followed without interruption
or marked transition by the report of the fate of Miletus. The latter is subdivided into two stages, the destruction of the city "in the sixth year since Aristagoras rebelled" (18), and the enslavement and deportation of its inhabitants (19.3-20). These two parts are bridged by a flashback to the Delphic oracle to the Argives (19.1-2) and underlined at the end by a passage describing the reactions in Sybaris and especially Athens (21). Each of the remaining sections of the account of the Ionian revolt (10-12 in the scheme) hang causally from the account of the battle of Lade and of the destruction of Miletus, since they all describe the separate consequences and aftermaths of those events in different spheres of activity:

Situation of the Samians (VI.22-25)

Last activity of Histiaeus (VI.26-30)

Final Persian Campaign in Ionia (VI.31)
In the first passage (VI.22.1), the definitive conclusion of the report of the fate of Miletus is part of a formal transition by which the narrative moves to Samos. The ensuing report describes the result of the Ionian defeat both on those Samians who chose to avoid enslavement by permanently leaving their homeland and on those who stayed, subjected to the Persians and to Aeaces. The first of these two subsections, on the Samian exiles (22-24), moves forward in a follow-up thoroughly integrated in the surrounding narrative. In the transition to the second section, on the Samians at home (25), the change of time is simply expressed once more with the mention of the battle of Miletus as point of reference (μετὰ δὲ τὴν ναυμαχίαν ἤπειρος Μύλης ἔτοιμη...). The next formal change of setting (26.1) brings the focus upon Histiaeus, who reemerges in basket weave fashion as he is engaged in the same activity he was carrying on at the end of the last report about him (VI.5.3). At the beginning of this section, Histiaeus' capture of Chios (26) stands out in some relief, underlined as it is by the flashback insertion on the Chians' previous omens of misfortune (26), which also recalls the massacre of their forces at Lade and Ephesus (cp. 15-16).

Thus, in the last part of the account of the Ionian revolt starting with the battle of Lade, Herodotus draws attention separately in different ways on three participants: Miletus, the center of the revolt and the setting of its decisive battle (VI.18-21), Samos, the traitor to the cause (22-25), and Chios, its most faithful adherent. After the account of Histiaeus' capture and death (29-30) and the
formal transition (31.1, quoted above) to the report of the last operations which completed the Persian subjection of Ionia, Herodotus focuses on the common fate of the Ionians in general. A definitive retrospective statement with ἰδίως, then concludes emphatically the entire account of the Ionian revolt, marking a strong break in the narrative:

\[ \text{\textit{δὲ ἥπερ ὅσα ἴδιως ἤκουσαν ἡμῖν, ἵνα μὴ ἀπειδήθη ἡ ἄρρητη ἡγεσία, ἵνα μὴ ἐπονομάσηται} \] (VI.32).

The statement above relates the series of events just reported to the previous historical development, indicating that the outcome of the Ionian revolt was consistent with it. The substance of the narrative has clarified the reasons, according to Herodotus' interpretation, for the failure of the Ionians at this time. While on the occasion of the preceding Persian conquest, the enslavement of the Ionians had been due mainly to their utter disunity, in this case an effort an effort had been made to oppose a confederate force to the Persians. But the rebellion, which was to prove so immediately consequential for the Greeks in general, failed nevertheless, because it had been externally motivated, because the Ionians found themselves without a leader in the military phase, and because they proved incapable to counteract the several operations of their opponents, as well as control the individualistic initiatives of some of the participants in the revolt itself. Without attempting to criticize or motivate this view, or to
reconstruct historical reality,67 our analysis of the account of the
Ionian revolt as it stands has shown how the distributive structure
of the narrative -- by which Herodotus shifts from agent to agent
focusing on each in turn -- supports its substance and helps convey
the author's particular interpretation of the events.


7. For briefly formal transitions to a different agent and setting.

8. See above, pp. 133-134.

9. See above, p. 132.

10. See above, pp. 151-152.

11. See above, pp. 151-152.


13. For supportive conclusions, see Chapter 4, p. 31.


15. Their short inscriptions help to make the organic transition to the
phociotean episode more competent. See note 13 above.

16. See above, pp. 132 and 135.
NOTES TO THE APPENDIX

1. For the phenomenon of the change of agent, see above, pp. 182-195.

2. I shall nevertheless use, for V.1-27, the term "European campaign logos", borrowing it from Immerwahr, Form and Thought, p. 110. See however below, pp. 301-303 for the way in which this report is tied to the earlier and later narrative.

3. The letters a, b, c, etc. mean to indicate the different spheres of activity.


5. Of the type of I.75.1, the form of which is discussed on p. 125.

6. Cp. V.10, κατάνκοιτας ἐποίεε (below, p. 290) and VI.5.3 

7. For strictly formal transitions to a different agent and setting, see above, p. 187.


10. See scheme of pp. 293-294.

11. Here the partial contradiction with 2.2 (...νόμιμα τὸν εὐρυγόν ὁ Μερίβας ἀπ᾿ τῆς Θηρίκης, παντὸς πάντως ἐν τῇ πόλι ἡμῖν ἡμεῖς βουλεύοντες) is due to the fact that the inserted description at 3-10 has covered the customs of tribes beyond the sphere of the narrative so that now Herodotus must clarify the limit of Megabazus' sweeping conquest.


14. For resumptive conclusions, see Chapter I, p. 31.

15. See above, pp. 294-295.

16. This short insertion helps to make the organic transition to the Macedonian episode more conspicuous. See note 13 above.

17. See above, pp. 192 and 195.
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18. See the later reference to Megabazus' deportation of the Paeonians at V.98.1.

19. See V.31 and 35.

20. See above, pp. 294-295.

21. Immerwahr, Form and Thought, p. 111.

22. See above, pp. 182-183.

23. Cp. above, p. 293 and note 2, as well as Immerwahr's observation (Form and Thought, p. 110-111) that the European campaign logos is really a link between the Scythian campaign and the Ionian revolt. The introduction of the account of the latter expresses the connection to the immediately preceding narrative: "afterwards there was respite from trouble" and "troubles began once more for the Ionians" can be interpreted as references to the campaign of Otanes narrated just above (Immerwahr, Form and Thought, p. 114, note 110). At the same time, however, there is still a break between the European campaign logos and the narrative of the Ionian revolt, since the transition at V.28 also clearly emphasizes the beginning of a new and different action. See below, p. 304.

24. For summary introductions, see Chapter I, pp. 32-33.

25. See above, Chapter II, p. 157 and note 95.

26. I.e. the insertions on Sparta and Athens respectively at V.39-48 and 55-96. These flashbacks are attached to the main line of the Aristagoras narrative by means of an organic change of setting and agent (Aristagoras' arrival), which leads to the transition to an earlier time for the explanation of current circumstances. Cp. above, pp. 193-194.

27. See note 26 and V.23, p. 299.

28. Resumptive introductions in general summarize all that has been said before, as the starting point for what follows. See above pp. 33-34. For resumptive introductions that also represent aitie sections, see in particular I.73.1 (quoted and discussed on pp. 132, 142-146) and I.204.2 (pp. 160-161).

29. See note 28 above.

31. The Ionian campaigns to the Hellespont and Caria, Darius' reactions and the operations of the Persian generals all proceed separately from different moments of the expedition against Sardis. The account of Darius' reactions in turn carries forward the story of Histiaeus, while the operations of the Persian generals lead to Aristagoras' escape.

somewhat similarly, the defeat of Lade and resulting destruction of Miletus constitute a point of reference for the rest of the narrative of the revolt.
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32. Cp. the report of the decisive land battle of Cyprians against Persians (V.110-111, 112.2-113) with that of the Ionian victory against the Phoenician fleet, which is dispatched in one sentence (112.1).


34. Of fifteen transitions to a different agent and setting considered in V.99-VI.32, eight express overlap between finished activities narrated contiguously, while two express synchronism with an unfinished action and one is analogous to a transition to a flashback.

35. In the μέν sentence, the μέν must anticipate the antithesis inherent in the report: "Also the Cyprians rebelled yes, but their King fled to the Persians, and Amathus, which opposed the revolt, was placed under siege." As it is, the peculiar position of μέν in the prospective sentence followed by the beginning ήρ όνήσθησε (cp. above, p. 53) creates an anacoluthon.

36. Cp. above p. 194. The events reported here belong to the time of Aristagoras' preparations and have been squeezed out, as it were, from that first centralized section.

37. On the difficulty of reconstructing a continuum of events in this part of the narrative, see Pierluigi Tozzi, La rivolta Ionica, Biblioteca di Studi Antichi 15 (Pisa, 1978), pp. 105-113.


39. See above, p. 311, note 32.

40. Cp. Immerwahr, Form and Thought, p. 60.

41. For revenge as an element of causation in the Histories and especially in Book I, see above, Chapter I, p. 66, note 131 and Chapter II, p. 146, note 68.

42. Cp. Cyrus in I.153.3... "Τούτως ἤσυχοι ἔν σοι δειν ὑπέρ ποιησάμενοι..." (V.105.1).

43. and in I.153.1... "Αὔτοι κυρόν ἐπερεότατος τούς παρόντας οἱ Εὐλύμων τίνες ἔντιμος ὑπερβησαν τοις λαβαθαμώνοι... ταύτα ἔσχεν ἀρχὴν προστεθοῦσιν."

Just below, still in I.153.1, Cyrus threatens the Spartans as Darius the Athenians in V.105.2.
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43. I.e., it recalls in reverse order the responsibility of Aristagoras, the Athenian alliance and the facts of Sardis.

44. See also below V.106.1: ...ἀρδέαν μὲ ἀπεστέρηκε. Cp. the emphatic conclusion of the narrative of the fire of Sardis at V.102.1.

45. I.e., after the conclusion at 102.1, of after the conclusion to the battle of Ephesus, or after the notice of the Athenian departure (103.1).

46. V.116 seems to correspond with V.102.2: καὶ κως ἐν μέν ἰλιπλέοντας τοὺς ἰωνίας εὐοίκουσι [οἱ Πέρσαι] ἐπομένοι δὲ κατὰ στιβον αἰρέουσιν ἀπολοῦσι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. καὶ ἀντετάχθησαν μὲν οἱ ἰωνίς, εὐμελήτατε δὲ πολλον ἐκείσθησαν.

47. The transition between Hymaies and Otanes (123) is formally of the post quod type. See above, p. 192.

48. A. R. Burn (Persia and the Greeks, New York, 1962, p. 206) assumes that they came "from southern Ionia." According to Burn, in Herodotus' narrative time has been greatly compressed.

49. See above, pp. 313-314.

50. See above, pp. 308-310.

51. See above, p. 192.

52. With the exception of a brief reference in passing to Aristagoras' appeal to the Athenians (V.103.1).

53. See above, p. 315.

54. See p. 195.

55. The Ionians had reasons for feeling oppressed by the Persian domination but, as Burn observes (Persia and the Greeks, p. 193), "the question which Herodotus frequently, as here, fails to ask is not why the leaders acted as they did, but why people were ready to follow them."

56. At the end of the account of that event (V.101.3) Herodotus describes the Ionians' timorous reaction.
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57. See above, pp. 319-320.

58. For an analysis of Herodotus' account of the battle of Lade, see Donald Lateiner, "The Failure of the Ionian Revolt," Historia 31 (1982), pp. 129-160: esp. 151-156. According to Lateiner's argument, 1) the Samian version, which constitutes the basis of Herodotus' report at this point of the account, is tendentious because the betrayal of the Samians at Lade was the result of a premeditated decision, independent of the failure of discipline of the Ionians; most important, 2) Herodotus' report of the "Samian excuses" (13 and 14.3) bears evidence that the author was aware of 1) and that he intended to expose implicitly the Samian lie. This is also confirmed by Herodotus' caveat about the conflicting versions among the Ionians with regard to the behavior of the participants during the battle itself (14.1). The fact remains, however, that Herodotus has told the story of the Samian betrayal without openly expressing skepticism (see however 13.2, πρόθεσις) and without identifying it as a Samian version (for the use of λέγουσιν as a means by which Herodotus declines responsibility for the veracity of a report, see above, pp. 33-43). In Herodotus' account, therefore, the fact of the betrayal of the Samians in particular remains entangled with the vivid representation of the μαλακία of the Ionians in general in the face of the requirements of a common effort. For Herodotus the two factors were evidently complementary in the causation of the defeat in spite of episodes of individual valor (see especially VI.15).


60. See the speech of Dionysius at VI.11.2 (... νῦν ὑμεῖς ἄρα μὲν βούλησθεν ταλαιπωρίαν ἐκδεικνύω ...).

61. Cp. the Scythian remark about the Ionians at IV.142.


63. Cp. above, p. 195. Like the parallel follow-up on the Phocaean exiles in Book I (166-168.1, see above pp. 136-137), the follow-up on the Samian exiles helps to illustrate the meaning of the surrounding historical narrative, but it conveys almost an opposite idea with respect to that earlier passage. The Phocaean follow-up underlined in fact the desperate situation of the Ionians vis-à-vis the Persian aggressor and the great cost at which some of them managed to preserve their freedom. The Samian follow-up on the contrary describes an easy resolution achieved by betrayal and abuse (VI.23.3-6). "The Samians who escaped from the Persians, Herodotus remarks at the end of the section (VI.24-2), acquired without effort the beautiful city of
Zancle." This story appropriately underlines the outcome of the Ionian revolt for the Samians at home, who also suffered no losses nor destruction (VI.25.2) precisely because of their betrayal at Lade. Thus, the entire Samian narrative conveys the idea that on the occasion of the Ionian revolt the Samians on the whole, not admirably but perhaps wisely, managed to get away scot-free at the expense of others. Their situation is contrasted with the tragic fate of the Milesians (VI.18-20) and of the Chians (15-16, 26-27) as well as, separately in the follow-up, with that of the original inhabitants of Zancle.

64. See above, pp. 323-324 and 189-190.

65. See Chapter I, p. 47.


67. Many modern historians have found that Herodotus devalues the Ionian revolt and the Ionians unfairly. See Tozzi, La rivolta ionica, pp. 29-52.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.3</td>
<td>41-42, 72, 252</td>
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<td>324</td>
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