The Journal of Hellenic Studies (2024), **144**, 122–143
doi:10.1017/S0075426924000077

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Twice-occurring terms in Herodotus: random distribution, habit of presentation and deliberate pairings

John Dillery

University of Virginia
Email: jdd4n@virginia.edu

Abstract

Repetition is a critical issue in interpreting the work of Herodotus. Detlev Fehling, for one, has pointed to recurrence of motif and scene as evidence of the historian's 'free invention'. Words that occur twice in Herodotus are an efficient way to consider pressing issues at the centre of how and why Herodotus put together his narrative in the way he has. Pairs where the uses are close together in stories with a lot in common suggest that we may be seeing Herodotus' 'habit of presentation', especially when phrasal repetition is also found. Where pairs are found further apart, the issue of deliberate linkage between discrete episodes may be indicated through the strategic redeployment of a key term. Finally, with Xerxes' invasion, recurring terms help us to see how Herodotus could operate over large portions of text, deliberately linking one episode to another through the deployment of twice-occurring words, thereby also connecting the whole account of the campaign to the largest project of the *History*.

Keywords: Herodotus; clustering; narrative patterning; habit of presentation; deliberate pairing

I. Introduction

When we see two near-identical episodes told in the same, or almost the same, language in two separate but near-identical contexts, in the same historical text, something other than charting what really happened must be at work. The problem becomes acute when, after surveying the entire narrative of a historian, several repetitions emerge: the author does not occasionally lapse into a duplication but does so frequently.[1]

Subsidiary to the problem of what we might call narrative 'patterning' is the issue of intention on the part of the author. When we detect an unlikely repetition, do we understand the author as simply being unaware that a duplicate has been written into the account, or is the duplication something that is meant to be observed? To take a well-known example from Herodotus: out of contingents of 300 men, 299 Spartans died at the battles of Thyrea in 546 and Thermopylae in 480, with one survivor from each (1.82; 7.224, 229–30). Did these battles really produce identical results, to say nothing of the other parallels between them recorded by Herodotus? If they did not, and Herodotus is

[1] *Cf.* Fehling (1989) 202; also, Jacoby (1913) 409, with Fehling (1989) 199–202. I have followed the text of Hude throughout and all translations are mine. All unattributed references are to Herodotus, although where the texts of other authors are discussed, I have sometimes added 'Hdt.' for the sake of clarity.

responsible for the parallelism (either as inventor himself or as a reteller of accounts), did he mean for the battles to mirror each other so closely, or was he thinking along strikingly similar lines, unconsciously, when he treated both episodes?[2] The same worries arise in connection with larger portions of narrative: why, for instance, do the careers of Cambyses and Cleomenes look so much alike?[3]

Operating at another level from motif and scene repetition is word repetition. In Herodotus, or in any other Greek author, a great deal of repetition is presumably due simply to the structures and preferences of the ancient Greek language. When at 1.2.1 Herodotus wrote ἴσα πρὸς ἴσα, it is difficult to know how conscious he was of the repetition of ἴσα;[4] and, in any case, settling that question does not seem to provide us much information about Herodotus. Similarly, while we can see the features of *lexis eiromenē* (*cf.* Arist. *Pol.* 1409a) on every page of the *History*, a type of composition that is heavily dependent on repetition, determining whether Herodotus was aware of the repetitions in, say, the story of Candaules (ἠράσθη … ἐρασθεὶς δὲ ἐνόμιζε … νομίζων, 1.8.1),[5] does not really help us to understand why he structured that *logos* in the way he did, or what his purpose was in reporting it. More illustrative of how Herodotus conceived of at least the boundaries of his various stories is ring composition and its reliance on the repetition of key terms to introduce and conclude discrete *logoi* (for example, κατεχόμενον … κατέχοντα, at 1.59.1 and 65.1).[6]

Where repetition of words in Herodotus is particularly illuminating and at the same time also manageable is in connection with twice-occurring terms.[7] It is a curious fact that, as Detlev Fehling observed regarding motif repetition,[8] a number of twice-occurring terms in Herodotus are found in close proximity to each other *and nowhere else* in his text.[9] In these cases different interpretations are possible. When the terms are synonymous for words that are found elsewhere in the *History*, it is tempting to speculate that we have something akin to epic 'clustering', namely, the favouring of a word by Herodotus for a distinct period during the composition of his text, after which the term was dropped.[10] These cases would seem best understood as 'unfigured' or 'accidental' repetition.[11] In places where the repeated terms are also accompanied by identical or near-identical words and phrases ('phrasal repetition'),[12] it seems reasonable to suppose that we are

[2] *Cf.* Dillery (1996). Note Lucian *Rhetorum praeceptor* 18 and Men. Rhet. 1.365.6–7, where the battles are connected; also possibly Chariton 7.3.11, who may link Othryadas (the sole survivor of Thyrea) and Leonidas ('Othryadas' is an emendation for 'Mithridates').

[3] Griffiths (1988) 70–71; *cf.* Dillery (2005) 403–06; Bruns (1896) 75–80: madness, self-wounding and especially failure to recognize the name where predicted to die.

[4] *Cf.* Fehling (1969) 226; Dover (1997) 134.

[5] Invariably cited as evidence for Herodotus as a practitioner of *lexis eiromenē*: Norden (1913) 368; Fränkel (1924) 91 = (1968) 65; Haberle (1938) 41; Legrand (1932) 242. Note also Fehling (1969) 147; Müller (1980) 6–7; Long (1987) 12; Slings (2002) 55–59; Brock (2003) 4; for Dover (1997) 134, the repetitions at 1.8.1 are 'formal'.

[6] Wood (1972) 16 ('ring-words'); *cf.* Immerwahr (1966) 53; De Jong (2002) 260; Hornblower (2013) 148.

[7] In what follows there are some cases where terms are used more than twice by Herodotus, but the uses are confined to two distinct sections of the text. Additionally, I have omitted discussion of repeated proper nouns.

[8] Fehling (1989) 198.

[9] For example: ἐπαφρόδιτος (2.135.2, 5), κατόπτης (3.17.2, 21.2), ἐπιμαρτύρομαι (5.92.η.5, 93.2), ζωγρίη (6.28.2, 37.1), ἐξογκῶ (6.125.4, 126.3), παραμνῶμαι (7.96.1, 99.1).

[10] Hainsworth (1993) 27–28; *cf.* Hainsworth (1976), Janko (1981). Relatedly, Fehling speculates that repetition in Herodotus may be imitative of epos: Fehling (1969) 102. *Cf.* Cesca (2022).

[11] The concept of 'unconscious repetition' has been questioned and 'unfigured' or 'non-figural repetition' preferred: *cf.* Wills (1996) 473–77. On the problem of intentionality and repetition, see Pickering (2003) especially 491 and n.6; *cf.* Fehling (1969) 74–78 and Easterling (1973). Older discussions that assume a high degree of accidental repetition in Greek authors due to an alleged greater tolerance for repeated use of the same term: Cook (1902); Bannier (1914); Denniston (1954) lxii; Laughton (1950); Jackson (1955) 220–22. *Cf.* Richards (1907) 307–11; Lilja (1968) 35–38; Dover (1997) 140; Wilson (2015) 118–19.

[12] Here I am thinking of the biblical scholar Robert Alter's use of the concepts of 'word reiteration' and 'phrasal reiteration': Alter (2011) 122–26. On the utility of Alter's work for Herodotus: *cf.* Griffiths (2006) 143; Long (1987) 3–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

being provided a view of regular associations Herodotus made, that is, his habit of mind when narrating events that were similar or that he saw as similar. In other places, especially where the terms in the pair are separated by a substantial amount of text, the repetitions are less likely to be 'accidental' and more likely to be purposeful on Herodotus' part.[13] It is possible, in the context of longer-range repetitions, to examine whether some of the pairs of repetitions are interconnected, creating a network or ladder of single-recurring terms whereby different episodes are linked together in chains of associated terms.

In the following sections of this paper, I will examine several unique pairs of words in Herodotus. I begin with close-proximity pairs and how they are particularly illustrative of clustering, as well as providing evidence for habits of Herodotean presentation. In subsequent sections I look at pairs of terms that are more widely separated, twice-occurring words that raise successively with greater clarity the issue of deliberate connection between uses; in particular, how connected pairs could help Herodotus structure his account; and, finally, how some pairs in books 7–9 can be seen to connect with each other to assist Herodotus in articulating the key moments in the campaign of Xerxes. The paper concludes with a brief consideration of the importance of twice-occurring terms in understanding Herodotus' historical writing.

II. Hdt. 3.129–32, 134: the Democedes *logos* and close-proximity repetition

Darius badly injures his foot dismounting from a horse (στραφῆναι τὸν πόδα, 3.129.1). Egyptian doctors attempt to heal him but only make matters worse. On the eighth day after the injury, with Darius seriously ailing (ἔχοντί οἱ φλαύρως), he learns about the presence in Sardis of the doctor Democedes and sends for him:

> When they located him among the captives of Oroetes, somewhere or other, utterly uncared for (ἐν τοῖσι Ὀροίτεω ἀνδραπόδοισι ὄκου δὴ ἀπημελημένον), they brought him before the king (παρῆγον ἐς μέσον), dragging his fetters (πέδας τε ἕλκοντα) and clothed in rags. Having been made to stand in the middle (σταθέντα δὲ ἐς μέσον), Darius asked him if he knew the craft [of medicine] (τὴν τέχνην εἰ ἐπίσταιτο). He did not admit it, fearing that if he revealed himself (ἑωυτὸν ἐκφήνας) [as knowing medicine], at once he would be in a state of having been deprived of Greece. But it was revealed to Darius that he was practising deceit, knowing [the craft as he did] (κατεφάνη … τεχνάζειν ἐπιστάμενος),[14] and he ordered the men who had fetched Democedes to bring whips and goads into the middle (ἐς τὸ μέσον) [of everyone there]. Then indeed he reveals (ὁ δὲ ἐνθαῦτα δὴ ὧν ἐκφαίνει) [himself], having stated that he did not have exact knowledge, but that having associated with a doctor, he knew the craft to a slight degree (φλαύρως ἔχειν τὴν τέχνην).

The passage is full of repetitions, but not of the *lexis eiromenē* type. It pivots around the repetition of compound forms of φαίνω (ἐκ- and κατά-): Democedes initially is unwilling to reveal himself as a skilled doctor, but Darius knows that he knows the craft; he is threatened with torture, and even then only partially admits to having medical knowledge

[13] *Cf.* Dover (1997) 134: he refers to 'close proximity' recurrence (intervals of one to five words) and larger intervals of six to 20 words. These limits are radically different in scale from what I will be discussing in some cases. Most studies of repetition in Greek focus on what I would call highly local recurrence; a major exception is 'long-distance repetition' in Homer (*Fernverbindung*): Schadewaldt (1938) 24–28; van Groningen (1958) 91 (recurrence 'à distance'); Reichel (1994).

[14] LSJ *s.v.* καταφαίνω II.2 ('Darius *well knew* that he was evading').

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(τέχνη).[15] All the action takes place ἐς (τὸ) μέσον, in the 'midst' of everyone, but this means, in the context, in the presence of the king.[16] The vividness of the scene is underscored by the repetition of the action as happening 'in(to) the middle', encouraging the audience to 'see' what is going on.[17] The entrance of the doctor is particularly vivid, stressing his abject state and balancing his immobility with Darius' (Darius has injured his foot badly, and the captive Democedes is similarly unable to walk properly, 'dragging the fetters' on his feet).[18] The added detail that Democedes is 'clothed in rags' and halting in his walk has even suggested to some the figure of the tragic Telephus.[19]

Democedes' backstory is given at 3.131, and at 132 we return to the main narrative with the events following Democedes' treatment of Darius: having thoroughly healed Darius (ἐξιησάμενος), Democedes was given a large house and was made a table companion of the king, enjoying all sorts of privileges 'except return to the Greeks'; when the Egyptian doctors who had tried to heal Darius (ἰῶντο: conative imperfect) were about to be impaled for having been bested by the Greek doctor, Democedes begged for their release from the king and 'rescued' them (ἐρρύσατο). But this was not Democedes' only act of salvation: 'On the other hand (τοῦτο δέ), he rescued (ἐρρύσατο) an Elean *mantis* who attended Polycrates and who had been utterly uncared for among the captives (ἀπημελημένον ἐν τοῖσι ἀνδραπόδοισι)' (3.132.2). The two cases of Democedes' help for others are set off by τοῦτο μέν and τοῦτο δέ and are punctuated with the same word 'rescued' (ἐρρύσατο). Evidently, Democedes and the *mantis* had been fellow captives, both having earlier been in the retinue of Polycrates of Samos and then wound up under the control of Oroetes (*cf.* 3.125.1–3).[20] The verb ἀπαμελέω occurs in only these two places in all of the *History*, and in identical form. Furthermore, word repetition is accompanied by phrasal repetition: the participle ἀπημελημένον is modified by the very same words in slightly different order, describing the plight of both men (Democedes: ἐν τοῖσι … ἀνδραπόδοισι … ἀπημελημένον, 3.129.3; *mantis*: ἀπημελημένον ἐν τοῖσι ἀνδραπόδοισι, 3.132.2). Later, when Atossa identifies Democedes as the perfect man for providing Darius information about Greece, she refers to him as the man 'who thoroughly healed your foot' (ὅς σευ τὸν πόδα ἐξιήσατο, 3.134.5). This and the participle ἐξιησάμενος at 3.132.1 are likewise the only two places where the verb ἐξιάομαι is found in the *History*.

It is important to note that we are never told why Democedes sought the release of both the Egyptian doctors and the Elean *mantis*. Herodotus seems to want us to extrapolate the answer from the narrative itself. Unlike the Egyptian doctors, the seer has not been mentioned before, and once introduced, he is dropped from the account, never to reappear. Why mention him at all then? Scholars have pointed to the solidarity that Democedes evidently felt with his Egyptian colleagues.[21] The same perhaps can be said for the *mantis*. Unlike the Egyptian doctors, he is described in identical terms with Democedes. Perhaps Herodotus was emphasizing the point that Democedes' life produced commonalities, shared

[15] Thomas (2000) 41. Stein (1864–1893) 2.140 *ad* 3.130.2 notes the wordplay of τεχνάζειν ('to practice deceit') with τέχνη.

[16] *Cf.* Rhodes (2018) 268 with n.21.

[17] Vernant (2006) 206.

[18] *Cf.* Davies (2010) 23, 35–36.

[19] Davies (2010) 25, 35.

[20] Itinerant Greek doctors: for example, *Od.* 17.384, Hippoc. *Aer.* 1.3, with Jouanna (2003) 186 n.2.; Lane Fox (2020) 35–62.

[21] Griffiths (1987) 42–43: possibly a folk-tale motif. *Cf.* Davies (2010) 34 n.50. Note, however, that the failure of the Egyptian doctors and its broader consequences may have an historical basis; the reform of the 'Houses of Life' in Egypt referred to in the Testament of Udjahorresnet may be related to the inability of Egyptian doctors to heal Darius (Lopez (2020)). The Egyptian doctors' treatment of Darius' ankle is described as 'twisting and forcing' the joint back into place (στρεβλοῦντες καὶ βιώμενοι, 3.129.2); the verb στρεβλῶ is found only once more, much later, at 7.36.3, of the twisting (στρεβλοῦντες) of the cables holding together the pontoon bridge across of the Hellespont. There is no obvious connection between the passages.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

experiences, with others, and that he acted upon the empathy that these experiences aroused. One is reminded of the pity that Cyrus feels for Croesus when he recognizes (ἐννώσαντα) that he is at the point of burning alive another man who had been no less fortunate than he (αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν ἄλλον ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον ἐωυτοῦ εὐδαιμονίῃ οὐκ ἐλάσσω, 1.86.6);[22] or, less spectacularly, those at Babylon who give advice to the ill, explaining what they had done to survive a similar illness or seen another do (1.197).

If indeed empathy is a major theme of the *logos*, it is only the clearest example of a larger point that Herodotus seems to want to make through his telling of the story of Democedes' life. Democedes' own personal history produced ripple effects that profoundly affected the lives of many others: individuals, groups, cities, even empires.[23] Because of their similar plights (it seems), Democedes seeks the release of the Elean *mantis*; because of Democedes, Crontoniate doctors became renowned (ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὐκ ἥκιστα Κροτωνιῆται ἰητροὶ εὐδοκίμησαν, 3.131.2); and of course, Democedes heals Atossa, but thereby sets in motion the Persian reconnoitring of Greece that becomes preparatory to invasion.[24]

The critical issue is the effect that ἐξιάομαι and ἀπαμελέω have in the story and to determine (if possible) why the use of both verbs is restricted to this passage. To take ἐξιάομαι first, the prefix ἐκ- denotes the thoroughness of Democedes' treatment of Darius (*cf.* LSJ *s.v.* ἐκ C.2), in contrast with the Egyptian doctors (indeed, note that their activity is described with the simplex ἰῶντο, furthermore imperfect because conative: 'they *tried* to heal'). A crucial element in the story is precisely that Democedes succeeds as a healer where the Egyptians fail. Hence the compound ἐξιάομαι is entirely apt. As for ἀπαμελέομαι, it too has a pre-verb that indicates intensity: 'to be neglected *utterly*' (LSJ). It is more difficult to see why it is limited in its use to this *logos*.[25] Elsewhere Herodotus tells stories about people who are explicitly identified as 'fellow slaves' (σύνδουλοι: Mitradates and Spaco, 1.110.1; Rhodopis and Aesop, 2.134.3), though admittedly in neither case is the idea of 'neglect' important.

The double use of ἀπαμελέω, together with the phrase ἐν τοῖσι ἀνδραπόδοισι, in connection with Democedes and the Elean *mantis*, whose release from identical circumstances Democedes secures for no other reason, apparently, than altruism born from the same experience, may be deliberate on Herodotus' part, but I do not believe it is possible to tell. So, too, with the double use of ἐξιάομαι. Both ἀπαμελέω and ἐξιάομαι are highly specific, almost technical terms that Herodotus wanted for this particular *logos* and evidently did not feel the need for elsewhere. While there are other *Leitwörter* running through the *logos* (note, for instance, the prominence of the *deik*-root ('show'): 3.133.1; 134.1, 2, 3, 5; 135.2),[26] they are not unique to the account, whereas these are. It is worth

[22] Macleod (1983) 14, Pelling (1997) 16 and n.70. Note also the sympathy shown by Psammenitus to his friend when he has himself experienced massive loss, and the pity that this generates in Cambyses in turn for Psammenitus (3.14.7–11). These parallels, if valid, are still problematic inasmuch as Democedes, though possessing the needed *technē*, is a powerless captive, whereas both Cyrus and Cambyses have the ability to be compassionate from a position of power as the 'gazing king': Griffiths (2001) 79–81.

[23] *Cf.* Briant (2002) 139, 143; Baragwanath (2008) 120; Lane Fox (2020) 54.

[24] So, for example, Fornara (1971) 30; Lewis (1985) 105 = (1997) 348; Derow (1994) 76 = (2015) 110; Lane Fox (2020) 52–53. Momigliano (1977) 30 believes that only Democedes was in a position to know about the illnesses of Darius and Atossa and hence that Herodotus' information must go back directly or indirectly to him. Presumably the broader impact of his return to Greece would not have been in his original account.

[25] Compare the close proximity and unique repetition of ἐμποδίζω, 'to shackle', in the Scythian ethnographic excursus: at 4.60.1, the Scythian method for securing the sacrificial victim involves its front feet being 'shackled together' (ἐμπεποδισμένον); at 4.69.1, some four and a half pages later, the Scythians 'shackle' (ἐμποδίσαντες) inaccurate *manteis* and then bind their hands to carts that are to be set alight as a form of execution.

[26] 'Leitwort' from Alter (2011) especially 116–17. Thus, note that the concept ἀνδράποδα recurs at 3.137.3 (ἀνδραποδίζεσθαι); also, 'rescue' (ῥύομαι) at 138.1 (ῥυσάμενος), and 'matter (of importance)' (πρῆγμα) at 138.4. *Cf.* also Darius' condition and Democedes' alleged imperfect knowledge of medicine (129.3 ἔχοντί οἱ φλαύρως, 130.2 φλαύρως ἔχειν τὴν τέχνην).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pointing out here that many of the unique pairs I examine in this paper are precisely compounds, verbs, nouns and adjectives.

III. Hdt. 1.34.3 and 209.3, 1.115.1 and 3.62.2: remote pairings and the habits of Herodotean presentation

At 2.119.3 and 7.191.2, and only in these passages, Herodotus uses the same expression to refer to sacrifices for the calming of winds: ἔντομα ποιέειν.[27] Both scenarios concern the same mythological circumstance: the abduction of a minor female deity (Helen, Thetis). The very specificity of the phrase and the purpose behind the sacrifice in both cases, together with the near-identical status of the deities involved, renders the suggestion that the pairing is random extremely unlikely if not in fact impossible.[28] And yet, does Herodotus want to connect the two passages together? That, too, seems improbable: after so much narrative space, two otherwise relatively minor details connected? To what purpose? It seems, rather, that we are viewing a recurring set of associated ideas and terms. By contrast, it is worth pointing out that Herodotus uses the noun μῦθος only twice, both in book 2, and in both cases of Greek 'stories' whose truth he cannot accept: on the existence of the river Ocean surrounding the earth (2.23), and in connection with the 'silly tale' (εὐήθης … ὅδε ὁ μῦθος) the Greeks tell which has the Egyptians attempt to sacrifice Heracles (2.45.1).[29] In this case, the pair reveals a critical stance taken by Herodotus that seems to show him as capable of critiquing his own culture's traditions from the vantage point of another ancient society. While it is difficult to determine with certainty if the reader is meant to connect the passages, it seems likely both are intended to be seen as tacit criticisms of Hecataeus of Miletus (cf. *FGrH* 1 F 1 Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται).[30]

An important pair of recurrent terms and phrases is also found at 1.34.3 and 209.3, in passages that are of much greater narrative significance. In the first passage, we are told that 'a great nemesis from the divine' took hold of Croesus, presumably for his belief that he was the happiest of men. Herodotus tells us that Croesus dreamt that his son Atys would be killed, struck by an iron point; 'when he awoke (ἐπείτε ἐξηγέρθη) and considered the matter [lit. 'gave a word to himself': ἐωυτῷ λόγον ἔδωκε], in dread of the dream', he found a wife for his son and stopped sending him out on dangerous missions (combat, hunting). In the second passage, having just crossed the river Araxes in preparation to do battle with Queen Tomyris, Cyrus has an admonitory dream about the eldest son of Hystaspes, Darius, that seems to show a winged Darius in the sky casting shadows over Asia and Europe, forecasting that he was destined to rule over those places; 'when Cyrus awoke, he was

[27] *Cf.* Powell (1938) *s.v.* ἔντομα.

[28] *Cf.* Burkert (1985) 200 and n.8: ἐντέμνειν specifically a chthonic sacrifice. Compare the phrase ἀνακῶς ἔχειν τινος, 'give heed to': it, too, is found only twice in Hdt. (1.24.7, 8.109.4), of Periander 'keeping an eye on the sailors' who thought they had done away with Arion by making him jump into the sea, and of Themistocles encouraging the Athenians to stay at home and 'attend to the sowing' of crops rather than sailing to the Hellespont. While deception is a major element in both accounts, it is hard to make out any other connection between the passages. Note also the pairing ἐξυφαίνω + φᾶρος, where both terms are found in only two passages and always together, with the verb always in aor. participial form (2.122.3, 9.109.1–3). Evidently, when weaving a φᾶρος in Hdt., one only uses ἐξυφαίνω, though the simplex ὑφαίνω is also found (2.35.2 bis), as well as the compounds ἐνυφαίνω (1.203.2, 3.47.2) and συνυφαίνω (5.105.1, in the passive and metaphorical).

[29] *Cf.* Thomas (2019) 75 n.1: the two uses of *muthoi* are clearly derogatory and thus close to our understanding of 'myth', in contrast to earlier Greek usage which not infrequently stressed the idea of 'authoritative statement'. Compare Pind. *Ol.* 1.29 ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι, *Nem.* 7.23 σοφία δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μῦθοις, 8.33 αἰμύλων μύθων: only three occurrences in Pindar's corpus, always in the plural, and always with a negative connotation (Köhnken (1971) 49 n.62, Gerber (1982) 64 *ad loc.*).

[30] Dillery (2018) 30–33: note especially the case of the second *muthos*, where Herodotus argues that it is unlikely that Egyptians, who avoid even killing animals in sacrifice (except in certain cases), would attempt to sacrifice a human (2.45.2).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

giving thought to his dream' (ἐπεὶ ὦν δὴ ἐξηγέρθη ὁ Κῦρος, ἐδίδου λόγον ἑωυτῷ περὶ τῆς ὄψιος).[31] Remarkably, these are the only two passages in the *History* featuring the verb ἐξεγείρομαι, in the same form, though rising from sleep is an important detail elsewhere.[32] What is more, structural parallelisms are also very much in evidence: both descriptions of waking are set off by the temporal clauses launched by ἐπείτε/ἐπεί, and both are followed by the identical expression for 'consider/think', namely, δοῦναι ἑωυτῷ λόγον, involving the interpretation of a dream. Again, we have both recurring word and phrasal repetition together.

And, of course, the similarities can be seen to run deeper than that. Both episodes concern eastern monarchs who are about to face catastrophe, signalled either literally in the case of Croesus (stated at 1.34.1), or figuratively in the case of Cyrus (the crossing of the Araxes); both dreams concern young men who ought to be or will be ultimate successors to their thrones. Moreover, each king's response to his dream is misguided: because of their limited understanding, both attempt pre-emptive measures to avoid the portended outcomes of their dreams that must fail. Croesus is persuaded to believe that a boar hunt will not involve iron-pointed weapons, and Cyrus is convinced that Darius is plotting to overthrow him, when in fact it is Darius' future accession to the throne of Persia that is being foretold in his dream. It is a notorious problem that the 'great nemesis' that seized Croesus, namely the death of his son Atys, in fact does not explain Croesus' decision to invade Persia and therefore his defeat or loss of power.[33] But the parallel dream in the case of Cyrus *does portend* his loss of power, in the form of Darius' eventual succession to the Achaemenid throne, ending the direct line descended from Cyrus. Reading 1.34.3 retrospectively through 1.209.3 demonstrates what is only intimated indirectly as regards Croesus: personal catastrophe (loss of Atys) suggests or even implies more general disaster later (the Persian conquest of Lydia).

While it is tempting to understand 1.34.3 and 209.3 as intentionally parallel, it is not possible to determine with certainty whether the use of ἐξεγείρομαι in both scenes, in similar contexts, with supporting phrasal repetition, is something Herodotus deliberately crafted and wanted us to note, thereby establishing a linkage between the two kings. But if it is not possible to be certain that the parallel is one Herodotus intended, that there is a connection through the single recurrence of term and phrase is indisputable and demonstrates an even more important point: Herodotus viewed Croesus and Cyrus similarly and evidently could not help but construct his narratives about them in ways that mirror each other in very precise ways.

As already observed, compounds easily make up the largest number of twice-recurrent terms in Herodotus. There are exceptions, however. κορέω, for instance, is found at 1.214.5 and in the Constitutional Debate at 3.80.4. Another case involves the verb βλέπω, in passages that are even further apart than I have so far examined. When the Median nobleman Artembares complains to Astyages about the rough treatment his son received from the son of the shepherd, he sends for both of them and confronts the young Cyrus with the facts (1.115.1–2):

> When they were both present, having turned his eyes on Cyrus (βλέψας πρὸς τὸν Κῦρον), Astyages said: 'You, being the son of this man, being the sort of person he is, dared to treat with such injury as this (ἀεικείῃ τοιῇδε) the son of this man who is first

[31] Cambyses' dream about Smerdis is similar (3.65.2): Smerdis sitting on a royal throne with his head touching the sky.

[32] For instance, Cleobis and Biton not rising from sleep (1.31.5 ἀνέστησαν); Heracles waking to find his horses missing in Scythia (4.9.1 ἐγερθῆναι). More specifically, awaking after an admonitory dream: Xerxes (7.15.1 ἔδραμε ἐκ τῆς κοίτης) and Artabanus (7.18.1 ἀναθρῴσκε).

[33] Fränkel (1924) 113–14 = (1968) 84; *cf.* Forrest (1979) 311; Dillery (2019) 30, 49.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> at my court?' But he answered him as follows: 'O lord, I did these things to this one with justice (ὁ δὲ ἀμείβετο ὧδε; Ὦ δέσποτα, ἐγὼ δὲ ταῦτα τοῦτον ἐποίησα σὺν δίκῃ)'.

In book 3, in the account of the usurpation of the Magi, a herald makes a proclamation to the Persian army in Egypt that Smerdis has assumed the throne of Persia and that Cambyses is not to be obeyed (3.62.2–3):

> Cambyses having heard these things from the herald, and having assumed that he was speaking the truth and that he had been betrayed by Prexaspes (that he, sent out to kill Smerdis, had not done this), having turned his eyes upon Prexaspes (βλέψας ἐς τὸν Πρηξάσπεα), said: 'Prexaspes, thus for me you carried out the task which I set before you?' But he answered: 'O lord, these things are not true (ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Ὦ δέσποτα, οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα ἀληθέα), that at some time or another your brother has revolted against you, or that there will be any trouble great or small from that man'.

It is important first to note the formal similarities between the passages: in each the only two uses of βλέπω in the *History* are found in identical form (βλέψας) governing a prepositional phrase (πρὸς τὸν Κῦρον, ἐς τὸν Πρηξάσπεα), with a main verb of speaking in a past tense (ἔφη, εἶπε). Both Astyages and Cambyses ask accusatory questions that are not really information-seeking but rhetorical: 'You, low-born as you are, dared to injure …?'; 'So this is how you performed my order …?'[34] The reply of the person interrogated by the king begins with the same words, Ὦ δέσποτα, a particularly marked form of address because it is so deferential and indicative of significant asymmetry in the status of the persons involved.[35]

There are also several substantive parallels. In both cases, the king had earlier sought to engineer a dynastic murder of a near relation: Astyages had ordered Harpagus to put to death his infant grandson Cyrus, Mandane's child about whom he had been warned in a pair of dreams (1.107–08); likewise, Cambyses, also warned in a dream (3.30.2), sent Prexaspes back from Egypt to Persia to kill his brother Smerdis. It is true that there is a significant difference at this point: whereas Harpagus failed to carry out his mission to kill the infant Cyrus, Prexaspes did murder Cambyses' brother Smerdis.[36] Nonetheless, in both episodes, the king is shown making an incorrect assumption: Astyages assumes that Cyrus is the low-born son of a shepherd and not a royal prince and his own heir; Cambyses assumes Smerdis is still alive and has taken his throne. As noted already, the initial responses of the individuals to the kings' indignant questions are obviously identical. Furthermore, both consist of assertions that, despite what the monarch might believe, are true. Since, as Cyrus notes, he was made 'king' by his age-mates in their royalty game (115.2 με … παίζοντες … ἑστήσαντο βασιλέα; *cf.* 114.1 παίζοντες εἵλοντο … βασιλέα), making Artembares' son, strictly speaking, insubordinate (114.3), the boy Cyrus did in fact act 'with justice' (σὺν δίκῃ) in punishing him.[37] And, of course, Prexaspes really did kill Cambyses' brother (3.30.3), so that Cambyses in fact had nothing to fear from that quarter.

[34] Cambyses' question to Prexaspes is also framed around a series of puns on Prexaspes' name: Πρήξασπες, οὕτω μοι διέπρηξας τό τοι πρῆγμα; *Cf.* Powell (1937) 104; Harrison (2000) 263 n.48. Note also διαπρήξει at 3.61.3 of Patizeithes, who persuades his brother that he himself will 'carry out/through' everything relating to the coup.

[35] Dickey (1996) 96–97; *cf.* Vannicelli (2017) 313 *ad* 7.9.1. Note especially Xen. *Cyr.* 7.2.9, where the vanquished Croesus acknowledges Cyrus the Great's status as conqueror and sovereign, remarking on the appropriateness of the term: χαῖρε, ὦ δέσποτα, ἔφη· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τύχη καὶ ἔχειν τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε δίδωσι σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ προσαγορεύειν.

[36] Saïd (2002) 131.

[37] Strabo, in his description of Persian education (15.3.8), makes explicit reference to elite boys dividing into companies and appointing one of the sons of the king or of a satrap as leader (ἡγεμών) of each group; Briant (2002) 328–29). *Cf.* also Xen. *Cyr.* 1.2.6, 1.3.16.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Given that tyrannical figures in Herodotus routinely fail to see the truth, and furthermore often are shown to be or attempting to be violent towards their own kin and subordinates, it is difficult to argue that Astyages and Cambyses are being deliberately linked by Herodotus through these scenes of confrontation and interrogation. But, if not deliberate, the two scenes are undeniably scripted in very similar ways. Both scenarios have the same initial circumstance: the king hears (ἀκούσας, 1.115.1, 3.62.2) of a pressing matter (the dishonouring of Artembares through the maltreatment of his son; the assumption of the throne by 'Smerdis'); he questions the one person in a position to clarify what has happened. In both cases, the 'turning of his gaze' upon that person (βλέψας) is a moment that Herodotus chooses to mark out as significant. It seems that he wants to show us the king take in the pressing information and process it, and not just in any context, but in the presence of the informant who is able to reveal the truth. The outcome is in both cases a reaction by the king that will lead to self-destructive action (for Astyages, the alienation of Harpagus through his punishment with the Thyestean feast; for Cambyses, his determination to return at once to Persia and his self-wounding). Indeed, it is tempting to speculate that in both cases the king is meant to be seen as illustrating the proverb 'seeing, they were seeing in vain/not seeing' (*cf.* [Aesch.] *PV* 447 βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην).[38]

The similarities between 1.115.1 and 3.62.2 are substantial and structural in nature. The two uses of βλέψας, followed by the interrogations and answers of Cyrus and Prexaspes and beginning with the phrasal repetition Ὦ δέσποτα, reveal how Herodotus constructed two similar episodes along similar lines, without necessarily meaning for them to be connected in any way. It is important, however, to consider another possibility. Mabel Lang has noted the similarities between the stories of Harpagus and Prexaspes, and has proposed that in the case of the latter, what she labels the 'Janus-agent pattern' was 'perverted': that originally, instead of killing the real Smerdis, Prexaspes did not obey Cambyses' order to kill his brother, and because of that, he, like Harpagus, was punished with the murder of his son for his disobedience; otherwise, the grim details of both men's careers are virtually identical.[39] If a common story type lay behind the accounts of the two courtiers, that may explain why Herodotus constructed his narratives involving them in such similar ways. However, even this possibility does not in my mind account for the presence of the verb βλέπειν in both and only these passages, together with the Ὦ δέσποτα statements.

It should be added that there are other pivotal twice-occurring words and phrases in *logoi* that are centred on dynastic matters relating to Darius. For example, the verb οἰδέω in the phrase οἰδεόντων τῶν πρηγμάτων ('with affairs being in ferment') is only found just before the coup of the seven conspirators and just after the installation of Darius as king (3.76.2, 127.1), in both places with unsettled conditions being pointed to as the reason for hindering action that Darius wishes to undertake. At 3.76.2, Otanes and his group wish to delay the coup attempt against the Magi, whereas Darius and his supporters want to push forward as planned; at 3.127.1, Darius cannot move openly with an armed force against Oroetes, so he instead sends out an assassination team.[40] Moreover, in Darius' appeal for a volunteer to do away with Oroetes, he points to Oroetes' murder, literally his 'making invisible', of Mitrobates and his son (3.127.3 ἠίστωσε); the same rare verb is used earlier in Phaedime's expression of certainty that, should she be caught feeling for the ears of the pseudo-Smerdis, the magus would 'disappear her' (3.69.4 ἀιστώσει). These are the only two occurrences of ἀιστόω in Herodotus.

[38] *Cf.* [Dem.] 25.89 ὥστε, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, ὀρῶντας μὴ ὀρᾶν καὶ ἀκούοντας μὴ ἀκούειν. Also, Aesch. *Ag.* 1623 (with Fraenkel (1962) 3.767–68 *ad loc.*); Matt. 13:13, 14; Luke 8:10. Consult Tosi (2018) no. 413.

[39] Lang (1992) 204; *cf.* Reinhardt (1966) 153–56; Luraghi (2013) 100–01.

[40] Similarly, σόφισμα ('ruse'), is found only at 3.85.2 and 152, both of tricks used by subordinates of Darius (Oebares, Zopyrus) to help him at critical points, though the same concept shows up in the verb form (σοφίζομαι) elsewhere (1.80.4, 2.66.2, 3.111.3, 8.27.3).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

IV. Hdt. 1.108.2 and 111.1, and 1.187.5 and 212.2–3: two stronger cases for deliberate echoing

I would like now to look at two cases of close-proximity recurrence of unique pairs, but ones that seem to provide more reason to believe that they are meant by Herodotus to be connected.

In the story of Cyrus' origins, the adjective ἐπίτεξ + ἐοῦσα ('about to give birth') is used of both his biological mother Mandane and his surrogate mother Spaco/Cyno and in only these two places in the whole of the *History* (1.108.2, 111.1). Three possibilities present themselves. (i) The two uses of ἐπίτεξ are random. This is highly unlikely, given that the passages are so close together and concern two women who are so similar, namely, both maternal figures for the same individual, Cyrus. Furthermore, other women's pregnancies and deliveries of offspring are prominently featured elsewhere in the *History* and do not have the term.[41] (ii) The doublet is evidence of clustering as well as habitual thinking on Herodotus' part, but not necessarily a deliberate pairing that he wanted the reader to see. This interpretation cannot be ruled out but seems less likely when we consider other features of the story. (iii) The pairing is deliberate because the *logos* concerning Cyrus' origins, birth and near-destruction is precisely constructed around a series of parallels presented almost as diptychs: the two dreams of Astyages; the two missions to carry out the murder of the infant Cyrus, the one by Harpagus and the other by Mitradates; the exact synchronization of Mitradates' concern for his wife Spaco/Cyno with hers for him (ἦσαν δὲ ἐν φροντίδι ἀμφότεροι ἀλλήλων πέρι, 1.111.1); the sole occurrence in the account of the description of Cyrus' birth and his miraculous survival of the phrase 'the true/actual *logos*' (ὁ ἐὼν λόγος, 1.95.1, 116.5).[42] At the centre of the story, and an element that Eduard Fraenkel saw as crucial to the logic of its presentation, is the suppression until narratively important of the detail that Spaco/Cyno gave birth to a stillborn child while Mitradates was away.[43] It is difficult to see in this context where parallel presentation seems so much in the forefront of Herodotus' narrative how the two uses of ἐπίτεξ could not be deliberate, indeed carefully deployed by Herodotus.

The second set of examples has also to do with two female characters with a great deal in common. Recounting the accomplishments of the Babylonian queen Nitocris in book 1, Herodotus concludes his treatment of her reign by telling the story of her deception of Darius many years after her death and burial. Herodotus tells us that Nitocris created for herself a tomb above, or rather in, one of Babylon's gates, and had carved into the outside of the crypt the following words (1.187.2):

> If one of the kings of Babylon who comes after me is in need of money (ἢν σπανίσῃ χρημάτων), let him open my tomb and take however much money he needs; however, not being in need (μὴ σπανίσας) may he otherwise not open it, for it will not be well for him (οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον).

Herodotus makes a point of telling us that Nitocris' tomb remained undisturbed until the reign of Darius. That king considered it terrible (δεινόν) that he should not use the gate in which Nitocris was entombed (because a corpse was above a person's head while passing underneath through the gate, 187.4), and that although money had been deposited there,

[41] Labda's pregnancy and the infant Cypselus is especially close (5.92.β–γ); other scenarios of note: the wives of Anaxandrides (5.41.1), the mother of Demaratus (6.69) and Agarista pregnant with Pericles (6.131.2).

[42] *Cf.* Long (1987) 126–75, who goes through the many parallelisms in the entire *logos* though not this particular and unique one (*cf.* p. 156). On τὸ ἐόν meaning 'truth' or 'reality', see also 1.30.3 and Hippoc. *VM* 2.18 with Powell (1938) 104 *s.v.* εἰμί III ἐών, ἐοῦσα, ἐόν 4; Festugière (1948) 37; Dewald and Munson (2022) 322 *ad* 1.95.1.

[43] Fraenkel (1962) 3.805.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the inscription forbade anyone taking it (μὴ οὐ λαβεῖν).[44] Darius opened the tomb, but found no money, only another text with the following message: 'were you not insatiate for money and sordidly avaricious, you would not be opening up tombs of the dead' (εἰ μὴ ἄπληστός τε ἔας χρημάτων καὶ αἰσχροκερδής, οὐκ ἂν νεκρῶν θήκας ἀνέῳγες, 187.5).

At the end of the same book, recounting Cyrus' campaign against the Massagetae, Herodotus reports that Queen Tomyris' son was captured by Cyrus after falling into a trap that involved getting him drunk on wine. When Tomyris learned what had happened, she sent a message to Cyrus: 'O insatiate-for-blood Cyrus, don't be encouraged by this matter that has happened' (Ἄπληστε αἵματος Κῦρε, μηδὲν ἐπαρθῇς τῷ γεγονότι τῷδε πρήγματι, 1.212.2), namely the wine-assisted capture of her son. She demands that Cyrus return her son, and concludes her message with a threat: 'if you will not do these things, I swear by the sun, the ruler of the Massagetae, truly I will glut you with blood, even though you are insatiate' (ἢ μέν σε ἐγὼ καὶ ἄπληστον ἐόντα αἵματος κορέσω, 212.3). In the ensuing battle the Persians are defeated and Cyrus killed. Tomyris orders a search for Cyrus' body among the dead, and having found it, puts his severed head in a wineskin full of blood. Herodotus continues (214.4–5):

> Defiling [him] (λυμαινομένη), she was saying over his corpse: 'You destroyed me (σὺ μὲν ἐμέ) though alive and victorious in battle over you when you took/killed my child with deceit (παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν ἐλὼν δόλῳ); you I, precisely as I warned, will glut with blood (σὲ δ'ἐγώ, κατά περ ἠπείλησα, αἵματος κορέσω)'.

Although Herodotus knows many accounts of how Cyrus met his end, this is the one that is in his view most reliable, a point he also made in connection with his report of Cyrus' birth (πιθανώτατος, 214.5; *cf.* 1.95.1).[45] Reciprocity is the key, emphasized by the pairing of pronouns close together at the start of succeeding sentences linked by *men/de* as subject and object, and then with their cases reversed (σὺ μὲν ἐμέ … σὲ δ'ἐγώ), expressing the requital Tomyris has exacted from her adversary.[46]

The twice-occurring repetition to be examined is ἄπληστος. Although technically found three times in the *History*, two uses are close together and refer to the same person within the same context. Whereas some thematic continuity can be assumed for a unique pair within a single *logos* such as we have in ἀπαμελέω or ἐξιάομαι in the Democedes *logos*, the repetition of ἄπληστος raises the possibility of the same patterning or messaging by Herodotus in different sections of his *History*.

The parallel circumstances associated with the use of ἄπληστος are arresting. Nitocris and Tomyris are both eastern queens who communicate with a Persian king characterized as avaricious.[47] The communications themselves are in fact in each scenario a two-part message.[48] The first communication consists of a condition as well as a warning; the second confirms what

[44] Dillery (1992).

[45] See above. At 1.95.1, in connection with the Persian account of Cyrus' birth and infancy which Herodotus elects to follow: ὡς … λέγουσι οἱ μὴ βουλόμενοι σεμνοῦν τὰ περὶ Κῦρον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐόντα λέγειν λόγον, κατὰ ταῦτα γράψω. At 1.116.5 Mitradates is threatened with torture and reveals 'the whole truth' of the infant Cyrus' survival to Astyages (ἔφαινε τὸν ἐόντα λόγον). Likewise, σεμνοῦν is only found at 1.95.1 and one other place, where it also has to do with royal propaganda (3.16.7: Amasis' corpse is not actually the body mutilated by Cambyses).

[46] Compare Hom. *Il.* 1.173, Agamemnon to Achilles: οὐδέ σ' ἔγωγε (also a threat). Herodotus has similar pairings elsewhere: σύ/ἐμέ 3.122.4, 7.38.3; ἐγώ/σέ 1.9.2, 1.32.5, 141.1, 1.117.3 (ἐγὼ πρὸς σέ), 1.121, 1.212.3, 2.115.4, 5.24.3, 6.68.3, 6.69.5, 7.16.β.2. 7.28.3, 8.65.5, 8.106.3; ἐγώ/σοί 4.80.3, 7.29.2, 7.52.1; σύ/ἐμοί 1.32.5, 3.36.3, 3.40.3, 4.80.3, 8.101.4. In addition to 1.214, there are three other cases of repeated, successive alternating pronoun pairings in Hdt.: 1.32.5, 4.80.3, 6.69.3 and 5.

[47] *Cf.* Dewald and Munson (2022) 476 ad 1.212.2.

[48] Earlier (1.206) Tomyris sends a message to Cyrus telling him not to try to rule over others, or if he wants to persist in trying to conquer the Massagetae, to agree to a pitched battle on one side or the other of the Araxes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the narrative makes clear, namely, that the Persian king is a wrongdoer in precisely the manner warned against by the queen. ἄπληστος is more obviously relevant in the story of Tomyris, for its original meaning ('unfillable') can be more easily connected to the liquid elements which are important in that *logos*, both wine and blood.[49] ἄπληστε at 1.212.2 is worth noting in particular. Vocative forms of adjectives are strongly marked,[50] and when they occur in Herodotus are often negative adjectives found in oracles or spoken by deities themselves, both addressing parties that have acted or tried to act against the divine will.[51] This is a significant detail, not only because it lends divine weight to Tomyris' voice, making her a quasi-oracular authority, but also because it connects her first message to Cyrus back to Nitocris' first message to 'a future king of Babylon', namely, Darius: if that future king is not in need of money but opens up her tomb anyway, 'it will not be well for him' (οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον), a phrase that has also been interpreted as oracular in nature.[52] It is worth noting here that the only other occurrences of this phrase in Herodotus' *History* both come from the mouth of Darius later in book 3, are close together in the text and are both connected to his attempt to secure the throne of Persia (3.71.2, 82.5).[53] Similar is the phrase οὐ θέμιτον, found only at 3.37.3 and 5.72.3, the only two uses of the adjective and in both instances negated, with both referring to the unlawful entry into temple space by an impious king (Cambyses, Cleomenes).[54]

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the repeated use of ἄπληστος was deliberate on Herodotus' part: as with the story of Cyrus' two mothers, the term fits within a larger set of parallel details. What is more, while not proof in itself, it is easy to see how useful the repetition is to Herodotus' narrative: the story of Nitocris' posthumous rebuke of Darius, though later in time chronologically, prepares us textually for Tomyris' vaunting over Cyrus.

V. Xerxes' invasion of Greece: the interconnection of paired terms

In this section I will take up twice-occurring terms that are found in connection with Herodotus' treatment of Xerxes. The reason for this focus on Xerxes and his activities is that, in Herodotus' narrative of the monarch, sets of twice-occurring terms are particularly visible and can be seen to intersect, with one set becoming implicated in another, thus generating a larger network or 'ladder' of doublets. Additionally, Xerxes' destruction of temples and divine statues became a topos in antiquity and seems to have generated something of a recognized and conventional vocabulary, helping to make clear cases where there were divergences from normally favoured terms. Such a situation leads inevitably to the issue of intention on Herodotus' part in his use of these pairs of terms.

[49] *Cf.* Immerwahr (1966) 167. The main achievements of Nitocris involved massive waterworks (1.185–86) and probably should not be linked to Darius being 'unfillable'. Her achievements are paralleled by her Egyptian namesake (2.100; Griffiths (2006) 138: both are 'hydraulic engineer[s]'). Henkelman (2011) 134 suggests that ἄπληστος might be connected to leaky vessels which cannot be filled and, further, that Nitocris' tomb is to be linked to the idea of filling it with money/gold. It should be noted in this connection that σπανίζω, also a single-occurrence doublet in Herodotus (1.187.2 bis, 2.108.4), means 'to be rare', but secondarily as here 'to lack', and in its use in book 2 specifically of lacking water.

[50] *Cf.* Dickey (1996) 167–73.

[51] See for instance 1.85.2 (Oracle at Delphi to Croesus, verse): μέγα νήπιε Κροῖσε; 1.159.3 (Oracle at Branchidae to Aristodicus): ἀνοσιώτατε ἀνθρώπων; 2.114.4 (Proteus to Paris/Alexander) ὦ κάκιστε ἀνδρῶν, ξεινίων τυχὼν ἔργον ἀνοσιώτατον ἐργάσαο.

[52] Dillery (1992) 32–33; Henkelman (2011) 115; Allgaier (2022) 70 n.81.

[53] 3.71.2: Darius warning his co-conspirators to hurry their plot against the Magi; 3.82.5: in the Constitutional Debate urging that monarchy be the form of government for the Persians; *cf.* Dillery (1992) 32 n.13; Allgaier (2022) 70–71.

[54] Of course, it has been shown that Cambyses' and Cleomenes' careers have a number of other parallels: see above n.3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

i. Hdt. 7.49.4 and 8.54

At 7.49.4 Artabanus attempts to make clear to Xerxes how the logistics of invading Greece with such a large force will themselves prove to be a major obstacle to his success. Land and sea will be Xerxes' greatest enemies:[55]

> Land becomes hostile to you in the following way: if nothing wishes to be opposed to you (εἰ θέλει τοι μηδὲν ἀντίξοον καταστῆναι), to such a degree does the land become more hostile to you, namely, to the degree that you advance further, always led (lit. 'stolen') on to what lies next (τὸ πρόσω αἰεὶ κλεπτόμενος).[56] For humanity there is no satisfaction of success (εὐπρηξίης δὲ οὐκ ἔστι ἀνθρώποισι οὐδεμία πληθώρη).

The gnomic sentiment with which this passage concludes focusses on the concept of 'success' (εὐπρηξίη); Artabanus even notes a little later that he is employing a piece of proverbial wisdom (τὸ παλαιὸν ἔπος, 7.51.3).[57] His words can be connected to the widely expressed sentiment that success in the form of εὐπραξία/εὐπραγία leads to hubris and massive change in fortune, from good to bad.[58] The only other place where εὐπρηξίη is found in the *History* is in connection with a communication between the same two men.[59] After Xerxes' successful capture of Athens, marked by his burning of the Acropolis (ἐνέπρησαν πᾶσαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν. σχὼν δὲ παντελέως τὰς Ἀθήνας, 8.53.2–54), Xerxes sent a messenger back to Artabanus in Susa 'in order to announce his present success' (ἀγγελέοντα τὴν παρεοῦσάν σφι εὐπρηξίην, 8.54). It seems that Xerxes is deliberately responding to the caution of his uncle expressed at 7.49.4. He appropriates the key term of his uncle's advice and throws it back at him: 'here's the good fortune you warned me about, but now it is in my hand'. But, of course, Artabanus will be shown to be correct in the end. The qualification of εὐπρηξίην, easy to read over, is particularly important in this regard. '*Present* success' (παρεοῦσα εὐπρηξίη) limits the concept; it makes εὐπρηξίη contingent, dependent on the moment.[60] And, of course, Xerxes' success will indeed be fleeting, ruined by his defeat at Salamis which in essence forces his return to Persia, to say nothing of the Battle of Plataea later still. That there is a connection between uses of εὐπρηξίη seems inescapable, given the circumstances and that the same people are involved. I should add that while εὐπρηξίη is limited to these passages, allied concepts such as εὐδαιμονίη/εὐδαίμων are much more common and widely distributed in Herodotus.[61]

[55] *Cf.* Aesch. *Pers.* 792 αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ γῆ ξύμμαχος κείνοις πέλει (spoken by the ghost of Darius, Artabanus' brother).

[56] The meaning of the Greek is difficult; *cf.* Macan (1908) I.1.70 *ad loc.* I have followed Stein (1864–1893) 5.61, Legrand (1951) 87–88 n.2 and Vannicelli (2017) 358 *ad loc.*

[57] *Cf.* Harrison (2000) 50–51.

[58] Note especially Eur. *fr.* 437 (the first *Hipp.*) ὀρῶ δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐγὼ | τίκτουσαν ὕβριν τὴν πάροιθ' εὐπραξίαν. Also Eur. *Hec.* 57–58 ἀντισηκώσας δε σε | φθείρει θεῶν τις τῆς πάροιθ' εὐπραξίας. *Cf.* Polyb. 1.35.2, 8.21.11; Manetho *FGrH* 609 F 9 = Joseph. *Ap.* 1.99, of the pharaoh Sethos, μέγα φρονήσας ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐπραγίαις ἔτι καὶ θαρσαλεώτερον ἐπεπορεύετο, with Dillery (2015) 310–11.

[59] *Cf.* Vannicelli (2017) 358 *ad loc.*; Immerwahr (1966) 268 n.85.

[60] At Thuc. 3.39.3–4 Cleon refers to the Mytileneans' 'present good fortune' (ἡ παροῦσα εὐδαιμονία) as not having prevented them from embarking upon a dangerous course of action, and, in the next section, that 'unforeseen success' (ἀπροσδόκητος εὐπραγία), coming at short notice, has encouraged states to 'turn towards hubris'; *cf.* Dem. 1.23 (Poppo and Stahl (1875) II.1.65 *ad loc.*). Winnington-Ingram (1965) 74 detects Herodotean and tragic echoes (*cf.* Hornblower (1991) 428 *ad loc.*), though without reference to Herodotus' παρεοῦσα εὐπρηξίη specifically. 'Present success' in Herodotus and Thucydides contrasts with 'earlier' (πάροιθε) good fortune: see previous note. Contingency: Baragwanath (2008) 286.

[61] For the equivalence, again Thuc. 3.39.3–4 (previous note); add Soph. *OC* 1554–55 κάπ' εὐπραξίᾳ | μέμνησθέ μου θανόντος εὐτυχεῖς ἀεί, with Jebb (1889) 239 *ad loc.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ii. Hdt. 8.102.3 and 7.8.β.2

I do not want to lose sight of the burning of the Acropolis as a significant moment for Xerxes, one that marks the high point of his invasion of Greece.[62] Another single-recurrent pair of terms is to be connected precisely to this detail from Herodotus' narrative of Xerxes' expedition. In book 8, when Xerxes is contemplating abandoning his campaign for Persia after his defeat at Salamis, Queen Artemisia endorses the plan that he remove himself from the theatre of action, leaving Mardonius to prosecute the land war against the Greeks (8.102.3):

> No account is taken of Mardonius, if he should suffer some loss (Μαρδονίου δέ, ἤν τι πάθῃ, λόγος οὐδεὶς γίνεται); for not even if they are victorious in some action do the Greeks win, having destroyed your slave. But you, having burnt Athens, for which reason you made the expedition, will march away (τῶν εἵνεκα τὸν στόλον ἐποιήσαο, πυρώσας τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀπελᾷς).

Artemisia provides a compelling pretext for Xerxes to abandon his army in Greece by pointing out that he has fulfilled his stated goal for the expedition: the burning of Athens (πυρώσας τὰς Ἀθήνας). It goes without saying that Artemisia's comments are also a tacit admission of defeat for Xerxes, inasmuch as they endorse his personal retreat to Persia. It is, therefore, deeply significant that the only other use in the entire *History* of the key verb πυρόω is at the start of book 7, when Xerxes announces to his council of war his intention to invade Greece, and specifically to burn down Athens in retaliation for the firing of Sardis (7.8.β.2–3):

> I, on behalf of that man [Darius] and the rest of the Persians, will not cease until I capture and burn Athens (ἔλω τε καὶ πυρώσω τὰς Ἀθήνας), the very people who began doing unjust things towards me and my father (οἵ γε ἐμὲ καὶ πατέρα τὸν ἐμὸν ὑπῆρξαν ἄδικα ποιεῦντες). First (πρῶτα) having come to Sardis … they burnt (ἐνέπρησαν) its groves and temples.

There can be little doubt, I think, that this first instance of πυρόω is meant to be linked to its second and only other use later:[63] Xerxes views the destruction of Athens by fire as the chief and crowning moment of his planned invasion, payback for the attack on Sardis and the burning of its 'groves and temples', and Artemisia reminds him of this fact when she provides him cover for his ignominious retreat to Persia. In essence she is saying: 'You have achieved your *stated* goal; now you can leave'. What is more, in Xerxes' accounting of events at 7.8.β.2, in speaking of the Athenians as initiators of the wrongs against Darius and himself, he uses language that connects his planned action against the Athenians to the largest and most comprehensive narrative arc of the *History*, namely, the conflict between Greeks and barbarians as defined by Herodotus at the beginning of book 1: 'the man who I myself know first began unjust deeds against the Greeks (πρῶτον ὑπάρξαντα ἀδίκων ἔργων ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας), identifying this man, I will proceed with the rest of my account' (1.5.3; *cf.* 1.130.3). The voice of Xerxes and that of the narrator align.[64]

[62] *Cf.* Bowie (2007) 141.

[63] So, Stein (1864–1893) 4.13; Chiasson (1982) 158; Bowie (2007) 192 *ad loc.*

[64] *Cf.* Vannicelli (2017) 311 *ad loc.*; Pagel (1927) 25. Note also 6.119.1, explaining Darius' hostility towards the Eretrians (Ionian Revolt): οἷα ἀρξάντων ἀδικίης προτέρων τῶν Ἐρετριέων.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

iii. Hdt. 8.53.2 and 9.76.1

In the narrative of the Persian capture of Athens, just before his notice that it was after that episode that Xerxes sent a messenger back to Artabanus reporting his εὐπρηξίη, Herodotus describes the final, desperate scene on the Acropolis (8.53.2):

> When the Athenians saw that they [the Persians] had got to the top, some were throwing themselves down from the wall and perishing, while others were fleeing into the temple hall. Those of the Persians who had made the ascent first turned against the gates and, having opened them, were slaying the suppliants. When all had been overwhelmed by them (ἐπεὶ δε σφι πάντες κατέστρωντο), they plundered the temple and burnt the entire Acropolis (τὸ ἱρὸν συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν πᾶσαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν).

The pairing of συλήσαντες with ἐνέπρησαν is particularly worth noting, for Herodotus deploys it elsewhere (6.19.3, 101.3), even using exactly the same wording as 8.53.2 in one other passage (8.33 τὸ ἱρὸν συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν). Aeschylus, too, at *Pers*. 809–10, can write οἳ γῆν μολόντες Ἑλλάδ' οὐ θεῶν βρέτη | ᾐδοῦντο συλᾶν οὐδὲ πιμπράναι νεώς.[65] Herodotus concludes his account of the Battle of Plataea with a similar capping scene of narrative description, creating a bridge to the episode involving the woman of Cos and Pausanias: 'when the barbarians had been overwhelmed by the Greeks (ὡς δὲ τοῖσι Ἕλλησι ἐν Πλαταιῇσι κατέστρωντο οἱ βάρβαροι), then, of her own accord a woman approached them' (9.76.1).[66]

The repetition that deserves our attention here is κατέστρωντο.[67] It is important first to note that the verb καταστορέννυμι is extremely rare. Although as old as Homer, it is found only three times in the two epics, and then very infrequently in subsequent literature.[68] Secondly, it seems it was first used in a battle description by Herodotus.[69] And as it turns out, the particular deployment of κατέστρωντο at 8.53.2 was memorable enough to draw the attention later of Pollux, who grouped it together with other figurative synonyms for 'killed'.[70] It continued to be extremely rare in this sense after Herodotus (*cf*. Paus. 7.15.9). The verb καταστορέννυμι occurs in fact three times in the *History*, the third case also being connected to Plataea, though in the active voice: Theban cavalry caught sight of the Megarian and Phliasian contingents pursuing the enemy in disorder and 'overwhelmed' (κατεστόρεσαν) 600 of them,[71] leading Herodotus to comment, 'these men perished doing nothing worth mentioning' (οὗτοι μὲν δὴ ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ ἀπώλοντο, 9.70.1). While similar in effect (the verb caps the scene and permits the narrator to take a bigger view of the significance of the moment), the Theban destruction of the Megarian and Phliasian troops is but a single episode in a much larger narrative panel, whereas the

[65] Garvie (2009) 311–12 *ad loc*. *Cf*. Asheri and Corcella (2003) 256 ad 8.53.2; Wiesehöfer (2017) 214–15. Unlike Aeschylus, Herodotus never uses the simplex πίμπρημι.

[66] In her statement to Pausanias, the woman refers to the Persians as 'men with no respect for either deities or gods' (9.76.2 τοὺς οὔτε δαιμόνων οὔτε θεῶν ὅπιν ἔχοντας), using an expression identical to one spoken by the Athenians of Xerxes' destruction of the temples and statues of gods and heroes (8.143.2 τῶν [*sc*. θεῶν καὶ ἡρώων] ἐκεῖνος οὐδεμίαν ὅπιν ἔχων). The noun ὅπις is found only in the phrase ὅπιν ἔχων and only in these two places in Herodotus. In both contexts Spartans are informed by others of atrocities suffered at the hands of the Persians through their disregard of the gods. A related expression with the same noun is found in epic poetry of the gods' vengeance: see LSJ *s.v*. ὅπις I.1 and II.1.

[67] *Cf*. Macan (1908) I.2.755 *ad loc*., noting also κατεστόρεσαν at 9.69.2.

[68] Hom. *Il*. 24.798; *Od*. 13.73 (*tmēsis*), 17.32. *Cf*. Richardson (1993) 360–61.

[69] Flower and Marincola (2002) 227 *ad* 9.69.2.

[70] Poll. 9.153 Ἡρόδοτος δὲ ἔφη 'ἐπεὶ δέ σφι πάντες κατέστρωντο' ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀνῄρηντο. In the edition of Bethe, the passage is misidentified as Hdt. 9.53.

[71] *Cf*. Xen. *Cyr*. 3.3.64 κατεστρώννυσαν.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

two uses of the passive κατέστρωντο are found at the conclusion of the accounts of both the capture of the Acropolis and the Battle of Plataea.

Indeed, it is important to observe the rhetorical effect of κατέστρωντο at 8.53.2 and 9.76.1. Both occurrences are found at the end of substantial narratives about key events from the story of Xerxes' invasion (capture of Athens, the Battle of Plataea) and serve to bring each episode to a close: they 'cap' them.[72] This capping is brought about largely through focussing the reader's attention on the finality of the moment in question, the awful and irreversible fate that meets each collection of people. Herodotus frequently brings stories about ill-fated communities and individuals to a conclusion in such a fashion, that is, with a significant repetition: for cities/groups, compare 1.84.1 (the capture of Sardis), 4.11.4 (the self-destruction and burial of the royal tribe of the Cimmerians), 6.18 (the fall of Miletus);[73] for individuals, 1.45.3, 1.82.8 and 7.107.2 (the suicides of Adrastus, Othryadas and Boges), and 3.125 and 128.5 (the linked deaths of Polycrates and Oroetes). All of these passages are clearly closural in function and achieve their effect through the repetition of significant words ('Adrastus, son of Gordias, son of Midas' at 1.35.3 and 45.3;[74] Sardis 'captured' at 1.84.1 and 5), or with a strong deictic term signalling the end (for example, οὕτω 'thus' at 3.128.5, 4.11.4 and 7.107.2), and sometimes both (1.84.5 οὕτω δὴ Σάρδιές τε ἠλώκεσαν).[75]

It is important to note that the terms used of the two combatant groups at Plataea reported in 9.76.1 are *Hellēnes* and *barbaroi*. While it is true that Herodotus can use the words *barbaros* and *Persēs*/*Mēdos* interchangeably, very clearly he can also deploy *barbaros* in a more meaningful way, in particular when it is contrasted with *Hellēn*, as we see most notably in the Proem (ἔργα … τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα). In the narrative of Marathon, for instance, *barbaros* is used with distinct frequency, and is explicitly contrasted with *Hellēn* at 6.112.3, in an observation made by the narrator that is clearly meant to highlight a moment of great significance.[76] The scenes featuring Pausanias that immediately follow the Battle of Plataea in book 9 stress the moral superiority of the Spartan commander and the Greeks as a whole over the Persians: Pausanias sees to the rescue and restoration to her home of the woman of Cos, and he refuses to allow the body of Mardonius to be mutilated (as the body of Leonidas had been), even commenting that such actions 'are more fitting for *barbarians* to do than verily for Greeks' (τὰ πρέπει μᾶλλον βαρβάροισι ποιέειν ἤ περ Ἕλλησι, 9.79.1).[77] Given that the *barbaros*/*Hellēn* distinction seems most definitely to be in play at 9.76.1, it can be seen to connect with the largest and most important narrative arc of the *History*: the conflict of Greeks and barbarians announced at the start of the work. The seizure of the Acropolis and the Battle of Plataea are joined in Herodotus' mind; the capture of the Acropolis is also explicitly linked to the Ionian Revolt; and so on. A ladder or chain of events becomes discernible. Herodotus' narrative is in fact constructed precisely out of such 'chains' of interlocking events, often battles, that can be traced back to the very beginning of the *History*.[78] Remember that Xerxes' intention to invade Greece and punish the Athenians for

[72] *Cf.* the schemata of Jacoby (1913) 322–23 and Immerwahr (1966) 291.

[73] Compare the ends of Scione and Melos in Thucydides (5.32.1 and 116.4).

[74] Dillery (2019) 38–39.

[75] *Cf.* Müller (1980) 57–58.

[76] Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 236 *ad* 6.107.1. *Cf.* Cagnazzi (1975) 418; Powell (1938) *s.v.* βάρβαρος: 'esp. of the Persian invaders of Greece'.

[77] *Cf.* Pelling (2019) 210; Flower and Marincola (2002) 38 and especially 247 *ad* 9.79.1. On ἤ περ here: Denniston (1954) 487.

[78] *Cf.* Gould (1989) 65 ('the chain of obligation and revenge'); Immerwahr (1966) 53 ('[repetition] is particularly important in the form of *anticipation* at the beginning of a chain'), and 254–57, 287–89 on battles in particular creating chains of interlocking events. De Romilly (1971) 317 identifies 'la vengeance comme enchaînement causal'. Also Alter (2011) 115.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'having begun doing unjust deeds' (ὑπῆρξαν ἄδικα ποιεῦντες, 7.8.β.2) is phrased in language that can be connected to Croesus and to Herodotus' declaration of the main topic of the *History* at 1.5.3.

These recurring pairs of words concern not a subsidiary storyline but the main narrative of the second half of the *History*. They are deployed against a backdrop that more generally depicts the Persians and Greeks as understanding the conflict between them as chiefly about the burning of temples and sacred images (5.102–05). Retribution is therefore due in precisely these terms in Darius' and Xerxes' understanding (note especially 6.101.3 τὰ ἱρὰ συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν, ἀποτινύμενοι τῶν ἐν Σάρδισι κατακαυθέντων ἱρῶν), both presented as obsessed by the need for revenge against the Athenians for burning temple space (5.105.2, 6.94.1, 7.4, 7.8.β.3).[79] Changing sides in the conflict is an impossibility for the Athenians 'in the first place and most importantly' (πρῶτα … καὶ μέγιστα) because of the enemy destruction by fire and demolition of 'the statues and habitations of the gods' (8.144.2 τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰ οἰκήματα ἐμπεπρησμένα τε καὶ συγκεχωσμένα *cf.* 143.2 ἐνέπρησε), crimes of Xerxes that Themistocles had earlier highlighted in a speech to the Athenians (8.109.3 ἐμπιπράς τε καὶ καταβάλλων τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα)[80] and that Xerxes also referred to in a message conveyed by Mardonius to Alexander which was then reported to the Athenians (8.140.α.2 ἱρά … ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐνέπρησα).[81] It is true that Herodotus can attribute to Darius and Xerxes a range of motives for their aggression against the Greeks of Asia and Europe and even refers to the burning of the temple of Cybebe (Cybele) at Sardis during the Ionian Revolt as a pretext 'alleged' by the Persians for the later 'counter-burnings' of Greek temples (τὸ σκηπτόμενοι οἱ Πέρσαι ὕστερον ἀντενεμπίμπρασαν τὰ ἐν Ἕλλησι ἱρά, 5.102.1).[82] Some detect in such passages Herodotus signalling a difference between a 'pretext' on the one hand and 'real causes' on the other, revealing that the Persians in particular used the burning of the temple at Sardis as justification for large-scale aggressive action against the Greeks, that is, that revenge was a cloak for imperial invasion.[83] Granting that Herodotus viewed some causes as more decisive than others, it is important to note, as Simon Hornblower does, that the use of

[79] *Cf.* Funke (2007); Tuplin (2020) 569 and n.95; Janik (2018) 82–83; Rung (2016) 167–69.

[80] Themistocles' speech is deceptive, as Herodotus points out immediately after it is reported (8.110.1). Nonetheless, that does not detract from the accuracy of his characterization of Xerxes as an 'impious and wicked' man (109.3) who performed such acts as the burning and destruction of statues of the gods. Themistocles attributes the successful repulse of the Persian host by the Athenians to luck, crediting instead the 'gods and heroes' as responsible for the victory on the grounds that 'they became jealous' of Xerxes' ambition (109.2–3). *Cf.* Asheri and Corcella (2003) 307 *ad loc*. The key term is 'having repelled' (ἀνωσάμενοι), of the Athenians, repeated it seems from Herodotus' own remarks at 7.139.5, where he makes the point that 'after the gods' it was the Athenians who were responsible for having 'repelled' (ἀνωσάμενοι) the invader. These are the only two places where the verb ἀνωθέω is found in Herodotus. Relatedly, at 7.139.1, in preparing to make his claim that the Athenians were most responsible among human actors for the salvation of Greece, Herodotus famously observes that he knows he is about to express a view that is 'odious in the eyes of the majority of mankind' (γνώμην … ἐπίφθονον … πρὸς τῶν πλεόνων ἀνθρώπων); ἐπίφθονος is found only here and one other place, namely 4.205, where he surmises that 'in the eyes of gods excessive punishments among humans' are also 'odious' (αἱ λίην ἰσχυραὶ τιμωρίαι πρὸς θεῶν ἐπίφθονοι).

[81] Mikalson (2003) *passim*, but especially 24, 39, 88–89, 134–35; De Jong (2002) 261. *Cf.* Cambyses' burning of the statues of the Kabeiroi at Memphis (τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ ἐνέπρησε, 3.37.3); also, the Persian burning of the *anaktoron* at Eleusis (ἐμπρήσαντας τὸ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι ἀνάκτορον, 9.65.2).

[82] LSJ *s.v.* σκήπτω, 2 (Med.): 'allege on one's own behalf', citing this passage. Note that ἀντενεμπίμπρασαν is a *hapax legomenon*, not just for Herodotus, but for all Greek literature and likely a coinage by him (Hornblower (2013) 285 *ad* 5.102.1). *Cf.* Diod. Sic. 10.25.1, where it is claimed that the Persians learned about the burning of temples from the Greeks: τὸ κατακαίειν τὰ ἱερὰ παρὰ Ἑλλήνων ἔμαθον Πέρσαι, τὴν αὐτὴν τοῖς προαδικήσασιν ἀποδιδόντες ὕβριν (from Ephorus? *cf.* Schwartz (1903) 679; Parmeggiani (2011) 311); note the priority of Greek wrongdoing, as well as the idea of reciprocity, also conveyed by Herodotus' ἀντενεμπίμπρασαν. For Persian pretext, *cf.* 6.44.1 πρόσχημα, 94.1 πρόφασις; also Pl. *Menex.* 240a5.

[83] Note for instance Evans (1991) 17.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

terms such as σκήπτομαι and πρόφασις 'does not automatically imply the *falseness* of the excuse or proffered reason'.[84]

In this context it is good to remember that the Persian destruction by fire of Greek sanctuaries and statues, at Athens in particular, became a hallowed and living memory, a topos with a quasi-standard vocabulary featuring the verbs συλάω and especially ἐμπίπρημαι.[85] Hence, a deviation from those words such as πυρόω would presumably have been all the more noticeable.[86] Moreover, the burning of Sardis and the counter-burning of Athens were viewed as epochal moments by later ages: Philip II pointed to Persian wrongdoing as a reason for war against Persia (Polyb. 3.6.13 παρανομίαν) and Alexander the Great maintained that the burning of Persepolis was punishment for the sacking of Athens and the burning of the temples (Arr. *Anab*. 3.18.12 τάς τε Ἀθήνας κατέσκαψαν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐνέπρησαν; *cf*. Strabo 15.3.6; Diod. Sic. 17.72.2; Curt. 5.7.4; Plut. *Alex*. 38.3–4).[87] Given the centrality of the destruction of temples by fire in the narrative arc of Herodotus' *History*, that is, as a triggering event of hostilities between Greeks and Persians from the Ionian Revolt and as the most important strategic and symbolic moment of Xerxes' invasion in particular, it is important to observe the role that single-recurring terms play in this articulation of the conflict, especially in the second, Xerxes phase.

Indeed, taking stock of the recurrent pairs associated with Xerxes' invasion of Greece, we can perhaps make out a larger point. While repeated, twice-occurring terms are to be found throughout the *History*, several seem to mark out the major plot developments in the story of Xerxes' invasion and help to connect it to the largest narrative of the work: the conflict of the Greeks and barbarians. What is more, these unique pairs seem to be of the type where deliberate choice on Herodotus' part must clearly be understood: they do not occur randomly throughout the *History*, and the words themselves represent common concepts that are found elsewhere but are expressed with different terms. If this is an accurate assessment, it is important to note further that these deliberate repetitions of significant terms create connections over very large portions of text. As such, they could also be seen as examples of Herodotus' use of analepsis and prolepsis, in Irene de Jong's analysis, 'carefully insert[ed] … at places where they are most effective'.[88]

[84] Hornblower (2013) 285 *ad* 5.102.1 (original emphasis); note also Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 213 on 6.94.1: 'Dareios' desire for vengeance is real *as well as* his broader and deeper desire to reduce Greece to subjection' (original emphasis); *cf*. Derow (1994) 76 = (2015) 110. In general, Baragwanath (2008) 156 and Pelling (2019) 8–10. Note also Wiesehöfer (2017), who accepts that Herodotus framed the conflict as one driven by 'retaliation', but that he may not have properly understood Persian motives for what they did (especially the removal of cult statues).

[85] The passages from Herodotus and Aeschylus are noted above. In all the literary versions of the Oath of Plataea, the oath-takers swear not to rebuild the temples burnt by the Persians: Isoc. 4.156 (τῶν ἐμπρησθέντων ἱερῶν); Lycurg. *Leoc*. 81; Diod. Sic. 11.29.3 (τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν ἐμπρησθέντων καὶ καταβληθέντων). *Cf*. Siewert (1972) 2–3, 102–06. Additionally, passages such as Soph. *OC* 696 φύτευμ' ἀχείρωτον αὐτοποιόν, as interpreted by Jebb (1889) 118–19 *ad loc*., imply widespread awareness of the legend of the self-regenerating olive stump on the Acropolis that survived the fire of the Persian sack (*cf*. Hdt. 8.55 τῆς ἐμπρήσιος … βλαστὸν ἑκ τοῦ στελέχεος). Note also Ar. *Vesp*. 1078–79 ἠνίκ' ἦλθ' ὁ βάρβαρος | τῷ καπνῷ τύφων ἅπασαν τὴν πόλιν καὶ πυρπολῶν (*cf*. Hdt. 8.50.1 ἥκειν τὸν βάρβαρον ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτὴν πυρπολέεσθαι (this the only use of πυρπολέεσθαι in Herodotus). Memory of the two Persian destructions of the Acropolis: Scheer (2000) 207–11; Kousser (2009); Miles (2014).

[86] *Cf*. Soph. *Ant*. 285–86: ὅστις ἀμφικίονας | ναοὺς πυρώσων ἦλθε κἀναθήματα (Creon speaking of the dead Polyneices); also, Aesch. *fr*. 281.4 στέγην πυρώσω (Boreas threatening to burn down the 'house' of Erechtheus, a structure on the Acropolis that is also a temple: *Od*. 7.81; cf. *Il*. 2.549). Herodotus is not bound to use either ἐμπίπρημαι or πυρόω in connection with the burning of temples: note for example 1.19.1, where the burning of Milesian crops by Alyattes' invading army (where ἐμπίπρημαι is used: ληίου ἐμπιπραμένου) inadvertently leads to the 'burning down' of the temple of Athena at Assesus (ὁ νηὸς κατεκαύθη); also, Apollo's temple at Delphi (1.50.3: κατεκαίετο ὁ ἐν Δελφοῖσι νηός). *Cf*. the burning of temples of Athena at Xen. *Hell*. 1.3.1 and 6.1 (ἐνεπρήσθη) and of Poseidon at 4.5.4 (καόμενος … ἐνεπρήσθη).

[87] Lincoln (2012) 286 n.54; Hornblower (2013) 285; Kremmydas (2013); Rung (2016).

[88] De Jong (2018) 127, and especially the 'echoing' of the 'leitmotiv' δίκη τοῦ φόνου at 8.114.1 and 9.64.1 (p. 126).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

VI. Conclusions: unique pairs and the challenge of Fehling

There will always be disagreement about whether one set of twice-occurring terms represents a deliberate doublet and another simply a function of Herodotus' habit of presentation. It is likely that I have mischaracterized some of the unique pairs of terms examined in this paper. But it seems to me incontrovertible that there can only be three possibilities for these pairs: random occurrence, unconscious habit of presentation and deliberate pairing. Paying attention to the distribution of the terms in the text, whether the once-iterated words are accompanied by other parallels, and viewing each passage as a whole ought to make one interpretation more likely than another. Generally speaking, close-proximity pairs suggest clustering on Herodotus' part and are often evidence of non-deliberate repetition. So, too, when phrasal repetition accompanies single-word reiteration. Both seem to be strong indicators that Herodotus had certain habits of presentation that he followed but of which he may not have been entirely or at all aware. On the other hand, when the twice-occurring terms, especially from different *logoi*, can be set beside other details that are parallel, then I think the balance must tilt in favour of deliberate repetition.

However these questions are decided, though, I believe it has been shown that in most cases the claim that the two uses are random and therefore meaningless is not sustainable. Unique pairs have a distinct heuristic value in studying Herodotus' text. With great clarity and economy they bring to the fore central questions relating to how Herodotus constructed his narrative, whether deliberately or as a result of patterns of presentation to which he adhered, consciously or not. Fehling mounted an attack on the credibility of Herodotus that, for all its shortcomings, must be answered, or else his text's many repetitions and regularities cannot but provoke our suspicion.[89] One of the central elements of Fehling's critique is that Herodotus invented his material and as such produced numerous duplications throughout his account, as 'liars' tend to do. Twice-occurring terms help us to bring nuance to the study of repetition in Herodotus and thereby to salvage his reputation as an historian. Some of the cases examined in this paper show that his historical imagination did settle into patterns of language and so indirectly support Fehling's position. But this predictability in choice of expression is so widespread and various that it could just as easily be explained as Herodotean habit of presentation, regardless of whether he was making up his account or recounting material he had obtained from informants, documents and autopsy. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, Fehling's views do not allow for Herodotus deliberately to connect events that he saw as linked or parallel through the strategic deployment of rare terms, as he seems to have done in many cases.

Acknowledgements. The first version of this paper was delivered in the summer of 2020 to the Herodotus Helpline. I thank Tom Harrison and Jan Haywood for running this weekly Zoom seminar, which was a great resource for students of Herodotus during COVID, and in particular Pietro Vannicelli for his encouraging comments at my seminar. I also thank the editor and referees of *JHS* for extensive help in revising and sharpening the essay. All errors are also mine.

Bibliography

Allgaier, B. (2022) *Embedded Inscriptions in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Philippika 157) (Wiesbaden)
Alter, R. (2011) *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (rev. edition) (New York)
Asheri, D. and Corcella, A. (eds) (2003) *Erodoto. Le* Storie*, Libro VIII. La vittoria di Temistocle* (tr. A. Fraschetti) (Milan)
Bannier, W. (1914) 'Wiederholungen bei alteren griechischen und lateinischen Autoren', *RhM* 69, 491–514
Baragwanath, E. (2008) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford)
Bowie, A.M. (ed.) (2007) *Herodotus:* Histories*, Book VIII* (Cambridge)

[89] *Cf.* Marincola (1987) 32; Fowler (1996) 80–82 = (2013) 73–75; Harrison (2000) 23–25; Luraghi (2001) 139–40.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Briant, P. (2002) *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (Winona Lake)
Brock, R. (2003) 'Authorial voice and narrative management in Herodotus', in P. Derow and R. Parker (eds), *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 3–16
Bruns, I. (1896) *Das literarische Porträt der Griechen im fünften und vierten Jahrhundert vor Christi Geburt* (Berlin)
Burkert, W. (1985) '*Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA).
Cagnazzi, S. (1975) 'Tavola dei 28 logoi di Erodoto', *Hermes* 103, 385–423
Cesca, O. (2022) *Ripetizione e riformulazione nell"Iliade': la tecnica discorsiva dell'ἄγγελος nella rappresentazione omerica della communicazione verbale a distanza* (Berlin and Boston)
Chiasson, C. (1982) 'Tragic diction in Herodotus: some possibilities', *Phoenix* 36, 156–61
Cook, A.B. (1902) 'Unconscious iterations (with special reference to classical literature)', *CR* 16, 146–58 and 256–67
Davies, M. (2010) 'From rags to riches: Democedes of Croton and the credibility of Herodotus', *BICS* 53, 19–44
De Jong, I.J.F. (2002) 'Narrative unity and units', in E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. De Jong and H. van Wees (eds) (2002) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden) 245–66
— (2018) 'Herodotus' handling of (narratological) time in the Thermopylae passage', in L.W. van Gils, I.J.F. De Jong and C.H.M Kroon (eds), *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative: Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond* (Leiden) 113–30
De Romilly, J. (1971) 'La vengeance comme explication historique dans l'œuvre d' Hérodote', *REG* 84, 314–37
Denniston, J.D. (1954) *Greek Particles* (2nd edition) (Oxford)
Derow, P. (1994) 'Historical explanation: Polybius and his predecessors', in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford) 73–90 (repr. in P. Derow (2015) *Rome, Polybius, and the East* (ed. A. Erskine and J.C. Quinn) (Oxford) 105–24)
Dewald, C. and Munson, R.V. (eds) (2022) *Herodotus:* Histories*, Book I* (Cambridge)
Dickey, E. (1996) *Greek Forms of Address* (Oxford)
Dillery, J. (1992) 'Darius and the tomb of Nitocris (Hdt. 1.187)', *CPh* 87, 30–38
— (1996) 'Reconfiguring the past: Thyrea, Thermopylae and narrative patterns in Herodotus', *AJPh* 117, 217–54
— (2005) 'Cambyses and the Egyptian Chaosbeschreibung tradition', *CQ* 55, 387–406
— (2015) *Clio's Other Sons: Berossus and Manetho* (Ann Arbor)
— (2018) 'Making *logoi*: Herodotus' book 2 and Hecataeus of Miletus', in T. Harrison and E. Irwin (eds), *Interpreting Herodotus* (Oxford) 17–52
— (2019) 'Croesus' great nemesis', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 65, 29–62
Dover, K. (1997) *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford)
Easterling, P.E. (1973) 'Repetition in Sophocles', *Hermes* 101, 14–34
Evans, J.A.S. (1991) *Herodotus: Explorer of the Past* (Princeton)
Fehling, D. (1969) *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias* (Berlin)
— (1989) *Herodotus and His 'Sources': Citation, Inventions and Narrative Art* (tr. J.G. Howie) (ARCA 21). (Leeds)
Festugière, A.-J. (1948) *Hippocrate: l'ancienne médecine* (Paris)
Flower, M.A. and Marincola, J. (eds) (2002) *Herodotus:* Histories*, Book IX* (Cambridge)
Fornara, C.W. (1971) *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford)
Forrest, W.G. (1979) 'Motivation in Herodotos: the case of the Ionian Revolt', *International History Review* 1, 311–22
Fowler, R.L. (1996) 'Herodotos and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116, 62–87 (repr. with author's revisions in R.V. Munson (ed.) (2013) *Herodotus: Volume 1, Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past* (Oxford) 46–83)
Fraenkel, E. (ed.) (1962) *Aeschylus:* Agamemnon (3 vols) (Oxford)
Fränkel, H. (1924) 'Eine Stileigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur', *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 1–2, 63–103 and 105–27 (repr. in H. Fränkel (1968) *Wege und Formen frügriechischen Denkens* (Munich) 40–96)
Funke, P. (2007) 'Die Perser und die griechischen Heiligtümer in der Perserkriegszeit', in B. Bleckmann (ed.), *Herodot und die Epoche der Perserkriege: Realitäten und Fiktionen. Kolloquium zum 80. Geburtstag von Dietmar Kienast* (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna) 21–34
Garvie, A.F. (ed.) (2009) *Aeschylus:* Persae (Oxford)
Gerber, D.E. (1982) *Pindar's* Olympian *One: A Commentary* (Toronto)
Gould, J. (1989) *Herodotus* (New York)
Griffiths, A. (1987) 'Democedes of Croton: a Greek doctor at the court of Darius', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds), *Achaemenid History II: The Greek Sources* (Leiden) 37–51
— (1988) 'Was Kleomenes mad?', in A. Powell (ed.), *Classical Sparta: Techniques behind Her Success* (Norman and London) 51–78
— (2001) 'Behind the lines: the genesis of stories in Herodotus', in F. Budelmann and P. Michelakis (eds), *Homer, Tragedy and Beyond: Essays in Honour of P.E. Easterling* (London) 75–89
— (2006) 'Stories and storytelling in the *Histories*', in C. Dewald and J. Marincola (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge) 130–44

Groningen, B.A. van (1958) *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque: procédés et réalisations* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen 65.2) (Amsterdam)
Haberle, J. (1938) *Untersuchungen über ionischen Prosastil* (Munich)
Hainsworth, B. (1976) 'Phrase-clusters in Homer', in A. Morpurgo Davies and W. Meid (eds), *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to Leonard R. Palmer* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 16) (Innsbruck) 83–86
— (1993) *The* Iliad: *A Commentary, III Books 9–12* (Cambridge)
Harrison, T. (2000) *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford)
Henkelman, W.F.M. (2011) 'Der Grabhügel', in J. Wiesehöfer, R. Rollinger and G.B. Lanfranchi (eds), *Ktesias' Welt/Ctesias' World* (Wiesbaden) 111–39
Hornblower, S. (ed.) (1991) *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. 1: Books I–III* (Oxford)
— (ed.) (2013) *Herodotus:* Histories*, Book V* (Cambridge)
Hornblower, S. and Pelling, C. (eds) (2017) *Herodotus:* Histories*, Book VI* (Cambridge)
Immerwahr, H.R. (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland) (repr. (*Atlanta*) 1986)
Jackson, J. (1955) *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford)
Jacoby, F. (1913) 'Herodotos', *RE* Supplementband II, cols 205–520
Janik, J. (2018) 'To avenge the burnt statues and temples of the gods: the religious background of the Greek wars with the "barbarians"', *The European Legacy* 23, 77–94
Janko, R. (1981) 'Equivalent formulae in the Greek epos', *Mnemosyne* 34, 251–64
Jebb, R.C. (ed.) (1889) *Sophocles: Plays*, Oedipus Coloneus (Cambridge)
Jouanna, J. (ed. and tr.) (2003) *Hippocrate. Tome II, 2e parti:* Airs, eau, lieux (Paris)
Köhnken, A. (1971) *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar: Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten* (Berlin)
Kousser, R. (2009) 'Destruction and memory on the Athenian Acropolis', *The Art Bulletin* 91, 263–82
Kremmydas, C. (2013) 'Alexander the Great, Athens, and the rhetoric of the Persian Wars', *BICS* Supplement 124, 199–211
Lane Fox, R. (2020) *The Invention of Medicine: From Homer to Hippocrates* (New York)
Lang, M.L. (1992) 'Prexaspes and usurper Smerdis', *JNES* 51, 201–07
Laughton, E. (1950) 'Subconscious repetition and textual criticism', *CPh* 45, 73–83
Legrand, P.-E. (1932) *Hérodote. Introduction* (Paris)
— (1951) *Hérodote.* Histoires *VII* (Paris)
Lewis, D.M. (1985) 'Persians in Herodotus', in M.H. Jameson (ed.) *The Greek Historians: Literature and History. Papers Presented to A.E. Raubitschek* (Saratoga CA) 101–17 (repr. in D.M. Lewis (1997) *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History* (ed. P.J. Rhodes) (Cambridge) 345–61)
Lilja, S. (1968) *On the Style of Earliest Greek Prose* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum Societas Scientiarum Fenica 41.3) (Helsinki and Helsingfors)
Lincoln, B. (2012) '*Happiness for Mankind*'. *Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project* (Leuven, Paris, Walpole MA).
Long, T. (1987) *Repetition and Variation in the Short Stories of Herodotus* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 179) (Frankfurt am Main)
Lopez, F. (2020) 'Udjahorresnet, Democedes, and Darius I: the reform of the House of Life as consequence of the Egyptian physicians' failure to heal the Achaemenid ruler', *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 26, 100–13
Luraghi, N. (2001) 'Local knowledge in Herodotus' *Histories*', in Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford) 138-60
— (2013) 'The stories before the *Histories*: folktale and traditional narrative in Herodotus', in R.V. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus, Volume 1: Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past* (Oxford) 87-112 (tr. and updated by the author from Italian original, published in M. Giangiulio (ed.) (2005) *Erodoto e il 'modello erodotea': formazione e trasmissione delle tradizioni storiche in Grecia* (Trento), 61–90)
Macan, R.W. (1908) *Herodotus, the Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books* (I.1 and 2) (Cambridge)
Macleod, C. (1983) 'Homer on poetry and the poetry of Homer', in C. Macleod, *Collected Essays* (Oxford) 1–15 (repr. in Cairns (ed.) (2001) 294–310)
Marincola, J. (1987) 'A selective introduction to Herodotean studies: the sources', *Arethusa* 20, 26–40
Mikalson, J.D. (2003) *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars* (Chapel Hill and London)
Miles, M.M. (2014) 'Burnt temples in the landscape of the past', in C. Pieper and J. Ker (eds), *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman Past* (Leiden) 111–45
Momigliano, A. (1977) 'Eastern elements in post-exilic Jewish, and Greek, historiography', in A. Momigliano, *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford) 25–35
Müller, D. (1980) *Satzbau, Satzgliederung und Satzverbindung in der Prosa Herodots* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 116) (Meisenheim am Glan)
Norden, E. (1913) *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig and Berlin) (repr. (Stuttgart) 1956)

Pagel, K.-A. (1927) *Die Bedeutung des aitiologischen Momentes für Herodots Geschichtsschreibung* (Ph.D. Diss. Berlin)
Parmeggiani, G. (2011) *Eforo di Cuma: studi di storiografia greca* (Bologna)
Pelling, C. (1997) 'Aeschylus' *Persae* and history', in C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford) 1–19
— (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin)
Pickering, P.E. (2003) 'Did the Greek ear detect "careless" verbal repetitions?', *CQ* 53, 490–99
Poppo, E.F. (1875) *Thucydidis de Bello Peloponnesiaco Libri Octo* (ed. J.M. Stahl) (Leipzig)
Powell, J.E. (1937) 'Puns in Herodotus', *CR* 51, 103–05
— (1938) *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge) (repr. (Hildesheim) 1960)
Reichel, M. (1994) *Fernbeziehungen in der* Ilias (Tübingen)
Reinhardt, K. (1966) *Vermächtnis der Antike* (Göttingen)
Rhodes, P.J. (2018) 'Herodotus and democracy', in T. Harrison and E. Irwin (eds), *Interpreting Herodotus* (Oxford) 265–77
Richards, H. (1907) *Notes on Xenophon and Others* (London)
Richardson, N. (ed.) (1993) *The* Iliad: *A Commentary, Volume VI: Books 21–24* (Cambridge)
Rung, E. (2016) 'The burning of Greek temples by the Persians and Greek war-propaganda', in K. Ulanowski (ed.), *The Religious Aspects of War in the Ancient Near East, Greece, and Rome* (Leiden and Boston) 166–79
Saïd, S. (2002) 'Herodotus and tragedy', in E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. De Jong and H. van Wees (eds), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden) 117–47
Schadewaldt, W. (1938) *Iliasstudien* (Abhandlungen der Klasse Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig 6) (Leipzig)
Scheer, T.S. (2000) *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild: Untersuchungen zur Funktion griechischer Kultbilder in Religion und Politik* (Zetemata 105) (Munich)
Schwartz, E. (1903) 'Diodoros (38)', *RE* 9, cols 663–704
Siewert, P. (1972) *Der Eid von Plataiai* (Munich)
Slings, S. (2002) 'Oral strategies in the language of Herodotus', in E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. De Jong and H. van Wees (eds), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden) 53–77
Stein, H. (1864–1893) *Herodotos* (5 vols) (Berlin)
Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context* (Cambridge)
— (2019) *Polis Histories, Collective Memories and the Greek World* (Cambridge)
Tosi, R. (2018) *Dizionario delle sentenze latine e greche* (3rd edition) (Milan)
Tuplin, C. (2020) 'The fall and rise of the Elephantine temple', in C. Tuplin and J. Ma (eds), *Aršāma and His World: The Bodleian Letters in Context* 3 (Oxford) 344–72
Vannicelli, P. (ed.) (2017) *Erodoto. Le* Storie*, Libro VII: Serse e Leonida* (Milan)
Vernant, J.-P. (2006) *Myth and Thought among the Greeks* (tr. J. Lloyd and J. Fort) (New York)
Wiesehöfer, J. 2017. 'Herodotus and Xerxes' *hierosylia*', in Rollinger (ed.), *Die Sicht auf die Welt zwischen Ost und West (750 v. Chr.–550 n. Chr.)* (Wiesbaden) 211–20
Wills, J. (1996) *Repetition in Latin Poetry* (Oxford)
Wilson, N.G. (2015) *Herodotea: Studies on the Text of Herodotus* (Oxford)
Winnington-Ingram, R.P. (1965) 'ΤΑ ΔΕΟΝΤΑ ΕΙΠΕΙΝ: Cleon and Diodotus', *BICS* 12, 70–82
Wood, H. (1972) *The* Histories *of Herodotus: An Analysis of the Formal Structure* (The Hague and Paris)

Cite this article: Dillery J (2024). Twice-occurring terms in Herodotus: random distribution, habit of presentation and deliberate pairings. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* **144**, 122–143. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000077