ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. V

INDEX

INDEBTEDNESS TO HECATAEUS IN
HERODOTUS II 70–73

Saara Lilja

In the course of an investigation, which I shall publish in the near future, into the style and syntax of the earliest Greek prose fragments, the question arose as to whether chapters 70, 71 and 73 in Book II of Herodotus can be regarded as real quotations from Hecataeus.

We have ancient testimony on the matter: Porphyrius cites an earlier grammarian Polio, who says that Herodotus took II 70, 71 and 73 from Hecataeus κατὰ λέξιν, which expression is, however, moderated by βραχέα παραποιήσας (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* X 3). »Dies begründet den Zweifeln Neuerer gegenüber H. Diels»,[1] whose famous article »Herodot und Hekataios» was published in 1887 (*Hermes* 22, 411—444). In 1924, this subject was discussed at some length by Hermann Fränkel in his article »Eine Stileigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur».[2] Fränkel's view that the three passages in question are »kaum veränderte, wörtliche Entlehnung» from Hecataeus (p. 88) has been endorsed by Snell and by Pohlenz.[3] Legrand, too, speaks in connection with those passages of »purs et simples emprunts» (Introd. to Book II of Herodotus, p. 23), and Lesky in his History of Greek Literature says that in them »we seem to catch very clearly the tone of Hecataeus' simple, flowing narrative» (p. 220).

Jacoby, in his *RE* article on Hecataeus published in 1912, ascribes to the style what Hermogenes says of the relationship between Hecataeus and Herodotus — ʽΕκαταῖος ὁ Μιλήσιος παρ᾽ οὗ δὴ μάλιστα ὠφέληται ὁ ʽΗρόδοτος (*Π. ἰδ.*, p. 411, 12 ff. Rabe) — but understands that Porphyrius is thinking rather of »sachliche Abhängigkeit» (*RE* VII, cols. 2675 f.). Nor are Herodotus

---

[1] The quotation is from Schmid, Gesch. d. griech. Lit. I: 2, p. 628, n. 2; one of the doubters is Stein (Introd. to his edition of Herodotus, 5th ed., p. XL, n. 3).

[2] This article (in *Nachrichten v. d. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1924, 63—127) will be meant in subsequent references to Fränkel; but see also his Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums, New York 1951, pp. 446 f.

[3] Snell, »Bericht über Herodot», *Jahresbericht ü. d. Fortschr. d. klass. Altertumswissenschaft* 220, 1929, 1—36, esp. 21 f.; Pohlenz, Herodot: der erste Geschichtschreiber des Abendlandes, Leipzig 1937, p. 51.

II 70, 71 and 73 printed as quotations proper in Jacoby's *FGrHist* I A 1 (fr. 324 b), the second edition of which was published as late as 1957. Of those that do not believe that Herodotus took anything word for word from his predecessor, we may mention Myres, who writes: »There is no reason to suppose either that he had not read Hecataeus, or that he copied from him».[1]

Fränkel makes some acute observations on the style of Herodotus II 70, 71 and 73 and comes to the conclusion that these passages are from Hecataeus. But he admits that one important point has been left out of consideration: »Eine eigene Untersuchung über das Vorkommen der einzelnen Besonderheiten bei Herodot habe ich allerdings nicht angestellt» (p. 87, n. 4). For other purposes, I have studied all nine books of Herodotus from a stylistic point of view[2] and in this I have tried to look out for those characteristics that Fränkel considers to be genuinely Hecataean. Only a few details out of many, to illustrate each characteristic, can be dealt with in this paper, for a minute discussion of the subject would call for an independent investigation — and much more space.

While the possibility of Hecataeus' influence is present throughout Book II of Herodotus as well as in large parts of Books III and IV, the later books, apart from a few mostly short geographical descriptions, supply us with more trustworthy specimens of Herodotus' own style. In Book I, where Hecataeus should perhaps be taken into consideration as a possible source in more passages than is usually done, it may be that we meet Herodotus' style in its earliest phase.[3] Further, an important point is that the »normal» style of Herodotus is by no means uniformly homogeneous, for certain stylistic features may be due to the requirements of certain contexts. To take an example, not only are we to distinguish narrative from geographical and ethnological description, but also, among the narratives, accounts of battles, let us say, from simple story-telling. Or, to take another example, in speeches and dialogue some particular device of style may serve to characterize the speaker or speakers.

Fränkel first deals with Herodotus II 70, its opening sentence excluded, and the latter part of II 73, from πρῶτον τῆς σμύρνης ᾠὸν πλάσσειν onward.

---

[1] Myres, Herodotus: Father of History, Oxford 1953, p. 7.

[2] This was done, for purposes of comparison, in connection with my above-mentioned study of the earliest Greek prose writers, including Hecataeus, whose style, then, is familiar to me.

[3] As is well known, there are still greatly conflicting views as to the gradual development of Herodotus' work.

In these technical descriptions of crocodile-hunting and of the phoenix-bird's manner of enclosing his father in myrrh, he calls attention in the first place to the unnecessary use of pronouns and the superfluous repetition of nouns (pp. 87—89).

As for the repetition of nouns, those examples that FRÄNKEL cites from Hecataeus, οὔρεα . . . ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖσιν οὔρεσιν (fr. 291) and ἔστι νῆσος . . . ἔστι δὲ ἡ νῆσος (fr. 305),[1] are not strictly parallel. In these cases, where a preceding principal clause is followed by another principal clause introduced by δέ, instead of by a dependent relative clause, the repetition serves as an additional connective, but in Herodotus II 70 and 73 we do not find any instance of this kind of repetition. Elsewhere in Herodotus there are a great many instances of the repetition of a noun as an additional connective, most of which occur in geographical descriptions, so that the influence of Hecataeus must be taken into account.[2] It seems that in his later books Herodotus prefers the paratactic type of sentence structure without the repetition of a noun, such as ἐς τὴν νῆσον . . . ἡ δέ ἐστι (IX 51),[3] but only a thorough investigation could give more definite results on this matter.

Though most of the instances in Herodotus of the repetition of a noun as an additional connective occur in geographical descriptions, there are enough others. For instance, in I 31 Solon tells Croesus how Cleobis and Biton, the second happiest men, εἷλκον τὴν ἅμαξαν, ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάξης δέ σφι ὠχέετο ἡ μήτηρ, and in I 108 we are told of Astyages' vision, how he dreamt that there grew from his daughter a vine, φῦναι ἄμπελον, τὴν δὲ ἄμπελον ἐπισχεῖν τὴν Ἀσίην πᾶσαν. These two examples from the first book illustrate the fact that Herodotus often employs the repetition of a noun to make his subject more impressive or solemn, especially when he is narrating a vision or a miracle or the like. In another typical example from Book I, where the Pythian priestess repeats with emphasis τρία γὰρ ἔτεα . . . ὕστερον τοῖσι ἔτεσι τούτοισι (I 91), the repetition does not serve as a connective. Such is the case also in VIII 65, where we are told of the miracle that Dicaeus and Demaratus saw: ἰδεῖν δὲ κονιορτὸν . . . ἀποθωμάζειν τέ σφεας τὸν κονιορτόν and, after a few words, καὶ πρόκατε φωνῆς ἀκούειν, καὶ οἱ φαίνεσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εἶναι . . .[4] In the later books of Herodotus

---

[1] A further example from Hecataeus is οὔρεα· ἐν δὲ τοῖσιν οὔρεσι (fr. 292 a); see JACOBY, *FGrHist* I A 1.

[2] Note that the above examples from Hecataeus are geographical, too.

[3] A few lines further on, the noun is repeated (νῆσος δέ), but then follows again οὔνομα δέ οἱ.

[4] The narrative use of καί in the latter citation is another trait to be noted — whether archaic or popular, compare *infra*, p. 90.

we find considerably fewer instances of this device, one probable reason being that there are fewer similar passages in them.[1]

Let us now have a closer look at Herodotus II 70 and 73, where the repetition of a noun, as has been pointed out, never occurs as an additional connective and which certainly are not such solemn passages as have been dealt with in the previous paragraph. In the two instances that we find in II 70, ἐς μέσον τὸν ποταμόν . . . ἐπὶ τοῦ χείλεος τοῦ ποταμοῦ and ἐπακούσας δὲ τῆς φωνῆς . . . ἵεται κατὰ τὴν φωνήν, the repetition serves to make the description of the crocodile-hunting more clear and precise; in II 73 first ᾠόν and then πατήρ are repeated several times each,[2] but then the technical manoeuvre in this chapter is more complicated.

Does Herodotus employ repetition for the sake of clearness in those books that are not suspected — or are suspected only slightly — of being influenced by Hecataeus? The difficulty lies in the fact that in his later books very few passages can be compared with II 70 and 73. Here are two examples from the last book: Masistius' armour is described with the words ἐντὸς θώρηκα . . . κατύπερθε δὲ τοῦ θώρηκος, and then follows τύπτοντες δὲ ἐς τὸν θώρηκα (IX 22); after the battle of Plataea one of the sights to be seen among the Persian corpses was γνάθος καὶ τὸ ἄνω τῆς γνάθου[3] (IX 83). As for the first book, FRÄNKEL points out that there is no repetition of nouns in I 9, which is a passage comparable to II 70 and 73 (pp. 88 f.). I do not find that this passage, where in direct speech Candaules gives Gyges detailed instructions which will enable him to see unobserved the beauty of the queen, is quite parallel. But if we examine the technical description in I 179 of the building of the wall of Babylon, we shall find the use of repeated »leitwords», the first being πλίνθος and the second one τεῖχος: ἐπλίνθευον . . . ἑλκύσαντες δὲ πλίνθους ἱκανὰς . . . διὰ τριήκοντα δόμων πλίνθου . . . αὐτὸ τὸ τεῖχος . . . ἐπάνω δὲ τοῦ τείχεος . . . πέριξ τοῦ τείχεος.[4]

There is another point which connects Herodotus I 179 with II 70. In the latter passage there is an instance of the unnecessary use of pronouns in ἔχων δέλφακα ζωὴν ταύτην τύπτει, and in I 179 ἑλκύσαντες δὲ πλίνθους ἱκανὰς ὤπτησαν

---

[1] One of the more conspicuous instances of repetition in Book VII happens to occur in a geographical description: τοὺς ποταμοὺς τούτους καὶ πρὸς τοῖσι ποταμοῖσι τούτοισι (129).

[2] FRÄNKEL appropriately calls a word which is repeated at short intervals a »Leitwort».

[3] This is the MSS' reading; MACAN suggests γνάθος κατὰ τὸ ἄνω [τῆς γνάθου], but the repetition is here natural for the sake of clearness; for the possible κατά see STEIN, ad.loc. (in the text he has καί).

[4] At the end of this passage there is one further instance of repetition: οἰκήματα . . . τὸ μέσον δὲ τῶν οἰκημάτων.

αὐτάς has the same superfluous addition of a pronoun as object. Such use of pronouns serves to make a technical account more accurate,[1] thus corresponding to the repetition of nouns in similar passages. Another example, from II 73, is κοιλήναντα τὸ ᾠὸν . . . ἐς αὐτὸ ἐντιθέναι. In fact, κατασπάσαντες τὰς πεντηκοντέρους ἐσθέμενοι τέκνα κτλ. (I 164) seems to represent the normal style of Herodotus; ἐξαρπάσαντα . . . δέλτον . . . γράφειν ἐς αὐτήν (VIII 135) occurs in a solemn context, where Mys is writing down the words of an oracle.

FRÄNKEL points out that in Herodotus II 70 and 73 the whole is constructed of remarkably small and independent items (p. 88). There is no great difference in this respect between these passages and the account in I 179 of the building of the wall of Babylon. But the geographical description in the latter part of I 179 gives a striking example of the »Hecataean» manner of connecting tiny units loosely together: ἔστι δὲ ἄλλη πόλις . . . Ἴς οὔνομα αὐτῇ. ἔνθα ἐστὶ ποταμὸς οὐ μέγας· Ἴς καὶ τῷ ποταμῷ τὸ οὔνομα· ἐσβάλλει δὲ οὗτος ἐς τὸν Εὐφρήτην ποταμὸν τὸ ῥέεθρον. οὗτος ὢν ὁ Ἴς ποταμὸς κτλ.[2] When dealing with the problem of Herodotean sources, PEARSON writes in connection with Hecataeus: »No fragments relating to Babylonia are preserved, so that this region must be excluded entirely from the discussion.»[3] Does Herodotus I 179 possibly bear witness to the direct influence of Hecataeus? It can be said for the present that the construction out of small units,[4] together with the superfluous use of nouns and pronouns, seems to point to that direction.

FRÄNKEL says that in Herodotus I 9, which represents the author's normal style, there is »kein einziger Fall von einem ohne Not gesetzten anaphorischen Pronomen» (p. 88) and, on the other hand, that one of the characteristics of Herodotus is »die ausgiebige Verwendung der vor- und rückweisenden Pronomina» (p. 91). In my opinion there is here a certain inconsistency. I fully understand that when he compares Hecataeus' style with contemporary Attic vases (p. 89, n. 6), FRÄNKEL has in mind the minute description of details, and that the abundant occurrence in Herodotus of forward and backward pointing pronouns serves »den Zusammenhang unbedingt sinnfällig zu machen» (p. 91), but actually the latter use of pronouns seems to me as unnecessary as that

---

[1] Compare πλήσαντες πᾶν τὸ πλοῖον τοῦτο ἀπιεῖσι, in I 194, where τοῦτο is the MSS' reading; an especially illustrative example is ἀμαξίδας . . . καταδέοντες in III 113.

[2] In the excluded part of this last sentence the repetition of θρόμβους ἀσφάλτου . . . ἄσφαλτος is in particular to be noted.

[3] PEARSON, Early Ionian Historians, Oxford 1939, p. 76.

[4] Among other passages in which the whole is composed of small items we may mention the description of the Pontic tree (IV 23) and that of bringing up asphalt, salt and oil (VI 119).

found in those pieces which are suspected of Hecataeus' influence. I should think that both these kinds of the superfluous use of pronouns originated in a common stylistic prototype, whether it be defined as belonging to popular speech[1] or as being an archaic feature.[2] Another thing, then, is that this archaic or popular characteristic may have been consciously developed by Herodotus for artistic purposes.

In Herodotus II 70 there is one further instance of pronouns unnecessarily added: τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσας . . . μὴ ποιήσας δὲ τοῦτο. The repetition of pronoun is here accompanied by the repetition of the participle in the negative; these are, moreover, arranged chiastically. We find a similar instance in I 126, in Cyrus' speech to the Persians, where both a participle and its object, this time an infinitive, are repeated: βουλομένοισι μὲν ἐμέο πείθεσθαι . . . μὴ βουλομένοισι δὲ ἐμέο πείθεσθαι. Repetition serves a rhetorical purpose here, and likewise in VIII 60, where Themistocles' passionate appeal to Eurybiades culminates in the words οἰκότα μέν νυν βουλευομένοισι ἀνθρώποισι . . . μὴ δὲ οἰκότα βουλευομένοισι.[3]

Next, FRÄNKEL makes a very interesting observation: in Herodotus II 70 the dragging ashore of the crocodile is described by using two different aspects of this action, i.e. first the durative οἱ δὲ ἕλκουσι and immediately thereafter, in a frequentative ἐπεάν clause, the effective ἐπεὰν δὲ ἐξελκυσθῇ ἐς γῆν, instead of the simple οἱ δὲ ἐξέλκουσι ἐς γῆν, and in II 73 we find the same variation of the aspect of an action in πειρᾶσθαι αὐτὸ (sc. the egg of myrrh) φορέοντα, ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀποπειρηθῇ. FRÄNKEL says that this is a construction »wie Herodot sie wohl nicht kennt» (p. 89). I have found only one exact parallel in Herodotus: καιομένων δὲ τῶν ἱρῶν τύπτονται πάντες, ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀποτύψωνται (II 40). But there is a more or less similar instance of this phenomenon also in IV 71, which describes the Scythians' manner of burying their kings: οἱ δέ σφι ἕπονται ἐς τοὺς πρότερον ἦλθον. ἐπεὰν δὲ πάντας περιέλθωσι.[4] This latter example resembles those ἐπεάν clauses that express

---

[1] So it is at least from the point of view of modern languages, but »volkstümlich» is, as FRÄNKEL remarks, »ein sehr vieldeutiges Wort» (p. 92, n. 1); for the narrative use of καί see *supra*, p. 87, n. 4.

[2] FRÄNKEL calls attention to the archaic mode of omitting the subject in the ἐπεάν clause which opens the description of crocodile-hunting in II 70 (p. 89, n. 2); a parallel is ἐπεὰν θύσῃ in II 47.

[3] Neither of these examples is accentuated by chiasmus, but compare ἡσυχίην μὴ ἄγειν, ὡς ἄγοντι μέν οἱ ἡσυχίην in VIII 108, where Eurybiades' opinion is presented in indirect speech.

[4] In IV 61, on the other hand, καὶ οὕτω βοῦς τε ἑωυτὸν ἐξέψει forms a parenthesis, the narrative proper being taken up with ἐπεὰν δὲ ἑψηθῇ τὰ κρέα.

a result reached after several successive phases of the activity, such as in II 87, after a detailed description of the second-best method of embalming, ἐπεὰν δὲ ταῦτα ποιήσωσι, and in II 96, which deals with boat-building, ναυπηγευμενοι τρόπον τοιόνδε . . . ἐπεὰν δὲ τῷ τρόπῳ τούτῳ ναυπηγήσωνται.

Since one of the above citations is from an ethnological passage in Book IV and all the others from technical descriptions in Book II, it is tempting to assume that the change of the aspect of an action in frequentative ἐπεάν clauses comes from Hecataeus, and FRÄNKEL takes this for granted. However, neither such variation of aspect nor a single ἐπεάν clause is found in those fragments of Hecataeus that are preserved, nor is there any instance of the ἐπεάν connection we are dealing with in the other early prose fragments. Only once do we find ἐπήν in the Athenian Pherecydes, but this clause is not frequentative: Ἥλιος . . . δίδωσιν αὐτῶι (sc. Heracles) τὸ δέπας τὸ χρύσεον, ὃ αὐτὸν ἐφόρει . . . ἐπὴν δύνηι κτλ. *(FGrHist* 3 fr. 18).[1] The difficulty lies in the fact that the fragments of the earliest prose writers are too scanty to allow any convincing conclusions.

It is interesting to note that by far the greatest number of instances of ἐπεάν in frequentative clauses (48 in 104 pages) are found in Book II of Herodotus,[2] Book IV coming next (36 instances in 95 pages), and the third, a long way behind, being Book III (11 instances in 90 pages); at the other end stand the last two books, which never use the frequentative ἐπεάν.[3] Books II and IV of Herodotus, then, form a special group as regards their exceptionally frequent use of ἐπεάν in frequentative clauses in general, and, in particular, in those ἐπεάν clauses that indicate the shift from one aspect of an action to another. It is, of course, possible that this hints at the influence of Hecataeus, though in the extant fragments there is no parallel of either phenomenon. Or should we rather formulate, as in the case of the superfluous use of pronouns, that we may have to do with a characteristic of popular speech or with an archaic feature? A thorough investigation into the history, in prose and poetry, of ἐπεάν (= ἐπήν, etc.) might help us to solve this problem.[4]

---

[1] The Athenian Pherecydes has also ἐπεί three times, but it occurs relatively more often in the Syrian Pherecydes, who has ἐπεί twice and ἐπειδή once; Acusilaus and Heraclitus never use this conjunction in any form.

[2] The numbers of pages are those of the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana* edition; the occurrences of ἐπεάν are from POWELL, A Lexicon to Herodotus, Cambridge 1938.

[3] In the sense 'as soon as', on the other hand, ἐπεάν does occur in Books VIII (4 times) and IX (twice), but never in Book II.

[4] An important point is, of course, that the ἐπεάν connection in question naturally belongs to such descriptions of local customs and processes as abound in the very books II and IV.

In this connection I want to touch upon a peculiarity in Herodotus II 70 which FRÄNKEL does not mention: when the crocodile is drawn ashore, we are told that the hunter κατ᾽ ὦν ἔπλασε αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. KÜHNER and GERTH point out that a tmesis of this type, where ὦν (= οὖν) separates prefix and stem of compound verbs which are in the aorist of habitual action, is most often preceded by an ἐπεάν clause (II: 1, p. 537); such is the case in our passage, where ἐπεὰν δὲ ἐξελκυσθῇ ἐς γῆν precedes it. By far the greatest number of instances (thirteen) of this tmesis, which is peculiar to Herodotus, occur in Book II,[1] next, but this time a long way behind, comes Book IV with its two instances, whereas in Books I, III and VII there is only one instance in each.

The fact that in Books III and VII tmesis of the type κατ᾽ ὦν ἔπλασε occurs in a speech, possibly as a device for a special rhetorical effect,[2] seems to corroborate BECHTEL's view that this phenomenon originates in the usage of lyric poets (Die griech. Dialekte III, p. 265). But most of the other instances occur in prosaic technical descriptions and so rather support STEIN, who speaks of »Nachahmung eines populären Gebrauches» (ad I 194 of Herodotus); this is indicated also by the occurrence of this tmesis in Epicharmus,[3] which further shows that it is not purely Ionic. On the other hand, κατ᾽ οὖν ἔβαλεν in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes (1047) is no proof of popular speech, as is generally asserted, for it is Aeschylus who is here speaking mock-solemnly. As for the very frequent use of a tmesis of this type in Book II of Herodotus, ALY says cautiously: »Fast ist man geneigt, an den Mann zu denken, der materiell der Führer gerade durch das II. Buch war, an Hekataios.»[4] Only it must be stressed, as above in the case of the special kind of ἐπεάν clauses, that there is no parallel in the fragments of Hecataeus, nor do we find any in the other fragments of the earliest Greek prose.

FRÄNKEL compares the connection πειρᾶσθαι . . . ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀποπειρηθῇ in Herodotus II 73 with ἐπιφοιτᾷ σφι . . . φοιτᾶν found in the first part of that chapter (p. 89, n. 3) — he considers this first part to be genuinely Herodotean (p. 90). »Ähnlich, aber nicht gleichartig», says FRÄNKEL; I should specify that ἐπιφοιτᾷ σφι has an effective force, whereas φοιτᾶν δὲ κτλ., which is added

---

[1] The occurrences are from POWELL's Herodotus lexicon.

[2] Is there any significance in the fact that both speeches are delivered by Persians (Darius in III 82 and Artabanus in VII 10)?

[3] BECHTEL, too, points out that tmesis with the habitual aorist occurs in the Hippocratic corpus (*op.cit.*, pp. 266 f.), which for the most part represents the common everyday language.

[4] ALY, Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen, Göttingen 1921, p. 268.

parenthetically, indicates the action as a whole. In the same way, the firm resolution τοῖσι ὦν Λακεδαιμονίοισι ἔδοξε αὐτοὺς ἀποκτεῖναι, in IV 146, is followed by the parenthetical comment κτείνουσι δὲ τοὺς ἂν κτείνωσι Λακεδαι-μόνιοι νυκτός. In VIII 38 we find the change from the effective ἀπέκτειναν to the durative κτείνοντας (a few lines further on), whereas κτείνει . . . ἀποκτείνας δέ in III 126 shows how difficult — and sometimes impossible — it can be to make a definite distinction between a simple verb and the corresponding prefixed one, as they are so frequently linked together by Herodotus.[1] I think that the author's conscious aiming at variation contributes to this interchange of verb and prefixed form.

The last-mentioned κτείνει . . . ἀποκτείνας δέ is an example of the repetition, frequent in Herodotus, in which a predicate verb is repeated by using the corresponding participle: ἠράσθη . . . ἐρασθεὶς δὲ ἐνόμιζε . . . ταῦτα νομίζων (I 8). This type of repetition is regarded as a device for connecting two sentences more firmly together, but it may arise partly from a desire to accentuate different aspects of a verbal action, also in cases where the participle is not prefixed. I shall take two examples out of many. In I 60 we are told that Pisistratus' enemies drove him out, ἐξελαύνουσί μιν, the historic present direct-ing attention to the initial stage of the action; after a parenthesis the narrative is taken up with οἱ δὲ ἐξελάσαντες Πεισίστρατον, where the aorist participle indicates that the final point was reached. The other example is from IX 92: πίστιν τε καὶ ὅρκια ἐποιεῦντο . . . ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες.[2]

The distinction between different aspects of an action in Herodotus II 73 comes out clearly also in the variation of φέρω and φορέω, to which FRÄNKEL refers (p. 89, n. 4): the phoenix moulds an egg of myrrh ὅσον τε δυνατός ἐστι φέρειν, the effective aspect implying that the bird must be able to carry the egg to its destination (Egypt), whereas φορέω in the phrase πειρᾶσθαι αὐτὸ φορέοντα indicates the initial phase of carrying, i.e., lifting. Another instance of such variation is found in the story of the Indian ants[3] (III 102): the durative ἀναφορέουσι τὴν ψάμμον is distinguished from the effective ἡ δὲ ψάμμος ἡ ἀναφερομένη.[4] In this passage the possibility of Hecataeus' influence

---

[1] Here are some such combinations: ἐσαπικνέεσθαι — ἀπικομένους (I 1), ἐξηρίθμεον — ἀριθμέοντες (II 143; cf. VII 60), ἀπεπυνθάνετο — πυνθόμενος (III 154), ἀπιόντας — ἰόντες (VI 34), προσήισαν — ἰοῦσι (IX 100).

[2] I presuppose that both the historic present and the narrative imperfect here have an ingressive force; for some interesting observations on this so-far unsolved question, see KOLLER, »Praesens historicum und erzählendes Imperfekt», *Museum Helveticum* 8, 1951, 63—99.

[3] Or marmots, or whatever animals are here meant by μύρμηκες.

[4] All MSS have ἀναφερομένη, but they vary between ἀναφορέουσι and ἀναφέρουσι.

must be taken into account, but such is not the case in VI 61, a Lacedaemonian story of how Ariston married a third wife. Here we are told, in the popular fairy-tale style, how the nurse carried the child every day — ἐφόρεε — to the shrine of Helen, and how one day a woman appeared to her and asked her what she was bearing — φέρει — in her arms, the answer being ὡς παιδίον φορέει.[1]

Let us once more return to the passage πειρᾶσθαι . . . ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀποπειρηθῇ (II 73), where attention is first directed to the test which is going on and then to the final point of activity. FRÄNKEL cites ταριχεύουσι ἡμέρας ἑβδομήκοντα . . . ἐπεὰν δὲ παρέλθωσι αἱ ἑβδομήκοντα from II 86 as a parallel and continues: »dagegen I 46,1, wo Hekataios nicht in Betracht kommt, ἐπὶ δύο ἔτεα — μετὰ δέ (ohne die umständliche Wiederholung).»[2] I have not found any other example in Herodotus of the repetition of a time definition in an ἐπεάν clause,[3] though those ἐπεάν clauses in II 87 and 96 that have been dealt with (see *supra*, p. 91) are comparable. On the other hand, the detailed repetition of the type ἐπ᾽ ἔτεα πέντε — ἕκτῳ δὲ ἔτεϊ (III 59) is common enough,[4] another type being δύο ἐτέων διεξελθόντων τρίτῳ ἔτεϊ (IV 42). And in VI 126, after ἐς ἑξηκοστὴν ἡμέρην, the time definition ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ is made more precise by means of the repetition ἀπὸ τῆς ἑξηκοστῆς . . . ἡμέρης.

One further point in Herodotus II 73 is picked out by FRÄNKEL: πρῶτον, μετὰ δέ, οὕτω δή describe the bird's gradual method of proceeding (p. 89). A striking parallel is found in the account of the most perfect manner of embalming (II 86): πρῶτα μέν, μετὰ δέ, ἔπειτα, ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες, and — after ἐπεὰν δὲ παρέλθωσι αἱ ἑβδομήκοντα, which was mentioned in the previous paragraph — ἐνθεῦτεν.[5] Another illustrative example is from a geographical description in IV 100: ἀποκληίεται ἡ Σκυθικὴ ὑπὸ πρώτων Ἀγαθύρσων, μετὰ δέ — ἔπειτα δέ — τελευταίων δὲ Μελαγχλαίνων. In these passages the possibility of Hecataeus' influence is present, but the list in Book IX of the five great victories that Tisamenus helped the Spartans to

---

[1] Book I gives two further examples: διαφορέει — φέρουσι (88), παραφορέεται — παραφέροιτο (133).
[2] The quotation is from FRÄNKEL, p. 89, n. 5, which ends with »eine genaue Untersuchung habe ich nicht angestellt.»
[3] True, we have noticed that Herodotus uses this conjunction infrequently in most of his books (see *supra*, p. 91).
[4] Also in Book VII: ἐπὶ τρία ἔτεα — τετάρτῳ δὲ ἔτεϊ (1).
[5] After ἐνθεῦτεν note further ποιεῦνται . . . ποιησάμενοι δέ (for which see *supra*, p. 93); ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες in this list corresponds to ἐπεὰν δὲ ταῦτα ποιήσωσι in II 87 (for which see *supra*, p. 91).

win shows that precision of this kind was not strange to Herodotus: εἷς μὲν καὶ πρῶτος (sc. ἀγών) — ἐπὶ δέ — μετὰ δέ — ἐπὶ δέ — ὕστατος (IX 35).

Lastly, FRÄNKEL makes some good observations on the description of the hippopotamus in Herodotus II 71 (p. 90). This piece does in fact deviate more conspicuously than II 70 and 73 from the normal Herodotean style. Only it must be added that a reliable comparison cannot be made, since all those passages in Herodotus where an animal is equally minutely described are suspected of being influenced by Hecataeus.[1] A striking parallel is the description of the ibis in II 76: μέλαινα δεινῶς πᾶσα, σκέλεα δὲ φορέει γεράνου, πρόσωπον δὲ ἐς τὰ μάλιστα ἐπίγρυπον, μέγαθος ὅσον κρέξ. This list of characteristics is made up of tiny items equivalent to those found in II 71; φορέει belongs, though not necessarily, to πρόσωπον, but no longer to μέγαθος. In II 71, on the other hand, I would rather connect both οὐρὴν ἵππου καὶ φωνήν and μέγαθος with ἔχον and consider χαυλιόδοντας φαῖνον to be parenthetical.[2]

It is time to draw conclusions and answer the question of whether Herodotus II 70, 71 and 73 can be regarded as direct quotations from Hecataeus. We have seen that most of the peculiarities that characterize these technical descriptions occur elsewhere in Herodotus but less frequently, and sometimes, as in the case of repetition, in especially solemn passages which have to do with visions, miracles and the like. Book II as a whole differs from the author's »normal» style, among other things in the frequent use of ἐπεάν clauses, some of which express a shift from one aspect of a verbal action to another, and in the frequent occurrence of tmesis of the type κατ'ὦν ἔπλασε. Unfortunately, these two characteristics never occur in those fragments by Hecataeus or by any other early prose writer that are preserved.

One or two exceptional features would not prove anything; the essential point is that in Herodotus II 70, 71 and 73 there are so many peculiarities within a small space. Another important thing is that we have ancient testimony on the matter. Of course, all ancient information is not reliable — in our case some doubts may arise from the fact that Eusebius cites Porphyrius, who cites Polio, of whom we know nothing — but since this testimony is supported by a number of stylistic peculiarities, we are more ready to believe it. What,

---

[1] POHLENZ points out that Herodotus himself is chiefly interested in animals only »weil sie für die Lebenshaltung des Menschen Bedeutung haben» (*op.cit.*, p. 51).

[2] Also ὁπλαὶ βοός is parenthetical; ἔχον . . . μέγαθος can be compared with μύρμηκες μεγάθεα ἔχοντες (III 102).

then, does βραχέα παραποιήσας mean? If it means that Herodotus skilfully moulded the joins in his own fashion,[1] we have the right to consider the technical descriptions themselves as quotations (κατὰ λέξιν) from Hecataeus. But βραχέα παραποιήσας may mean that Herodotus has also made some changes in Hecataeus' descriptions. Accordingly, it is safest not to regard them as word for word quotations, especially if one is dealing with an investigation of minute details of style, such as the order of words.

I am, however, optimistic enough to think that a very thorough stylistic analysis of the work of Herodotus, chiefly intended to illustrate the many different elements of the complete whole and their possible sources, might also throw more light upon this special question.

---

[1] His way of moulding the joins is very well characterized by FRÄNKEL (pp. 90—92).