

Aleksandr Sinitsyn
<https://doi.org/10.26485/AAL/2019/65/6>

**ΤΑ Ὅπλα τῶν Γεφυρέων OF THE PERSIAN WAR:
HERODOTUS ON THE BANISHMENT OF THE BARBARIANS OUT OF EUROPE
AND THE ISSUE OF THE COMPLETENESS OF THE FIRST *THE HISTORIES*¹**

ABSTRACT The article discusses the principal “Herodotean question” of the completeness of the work done by the historian. How well did Herodotus manage to accomplish his design? Should we regard his work in the form it has reached us as complete and integral? Or does it end abruptly at the events of 479/8 BC, despite “the Father of History” having planned to continue his account of the Greek-Persian wars? Over the last century and a half, pluralism in the views the researchers on the issue of the completeness of Herodotus’ work has emerged. The author ventures some observations on the finale of the *The Histories* and draws our attention to the passage Hdt. 9.121 in which Herodotus emphasizes the fact that the barbarians transgressing the geographical boundaries of Europe had been punished: the cables of the bridges which the Persians had used to tie Asia and Europe were taken to Hellas by the victors. According to the author, the historian’s testimony τὰ ὅπλα τῶν γεφυρέων ὡς ἀναθήσοντες ἐς τὰ ἱρά symbolizes the end of the war against the Barbarian, hence, the accomplishment of Herodotus’ design – the completion of the account of “great and marvellous deeds done by Greeks and foreigners and especially the reason why they warred against each other”.

Key words: Herodotus, Athens, boundaries, bridges, Aeschylus, *hybris*/arrogance, the Persian Wars, temples, “Herodotean questions”, the last chapter of *The Histories* (Hdt. 9.121 and 122)

АБСТРАКТ В статье обсуждается принципиальный «Геродотовский вопрос» о завершенности труда «отца истории». В какой степени Геродоту удалось исполнить свой замысел? Считать ли его труд в том виде, в каком он до нас дошел, завершенным и целостным? Или же он обрывается на событиях 479/8 BC, поскольку «отец истории» планировал продолжить свой рассказ о греко-персидских войнах? За последние полтора столетия определился «плюрализм мнений» исследователей на проблему исполненности труда Геродота. Автор статьи высказывает замечания о финале «Истории» и обращает внимание на пассаж Herod. IX.121, в котором Геродот акцентирует внимание на том, что нарушение варварами географических границ Европы было наказано эллинами: канаты от мостов, которыми персы прежде связали Азию с Европой, победители увезли в Афины. По мнению автора, свидетельство историка о τὰ ὅπλα τῶν γεφυρέων ὡς ἀναθήσοντες ἐς τὰ ἱρά символизирует окончание войны с Варваром, а, следовательно, и исполненность замысла Геродота – завершение повествования о «великих и удивления достойных деяниях как эллинов, так и варваров».

Ключевые слова: Геродот, Афины, канаты, мосты, Эсхил, *hybris*/надменность, Персидские войны, храмы, «Геродотовский вопрос», заключительные главы «Истории» (Hdt. 9.121 и 122)

ABSTRAKT W artykule poddano dyskusji problem zawartości dzieła Herodota. Zadano pytanie, w jakim stopniu „Ojcu historii” udało się wypełnić zamierzenia. Pojawił się problem, czy dzieło Herodota dotarło do naszych czasów w całości? Analizując problem ostatniej partii dzieła, autor pracy zwraca uwagę na fragment Herodota IX.121, w którym odniesiono się do kwestii przekroczenia granic Europy przez Barbarzyńców.

Słowa kluczowe: Herodot, Ateny, granice, mosty Ajschylos, wojny perskie, świątynie, ‘pytania Hero-dota’, ostatni rozdział Dziejów (Hdt. 9.121 i 122)

¹ This research was carried out thanks to funding provided by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project No. 19-09-00022a “‘Forefathers of history’: The oldest representatives of ancient historical science”) / Исследование выполнено за счет гранта Российского фонда фундаментальных исследований (проект № 19-09-00022а «‘Праотцы истории’: древнейшие представители античной исторической науки»).

Prooemium

The birth of Clio is associated with the name of Herodotus of Halicarnassus, an Ancient Greek traveller, geographer, ethnographer, and “the first historian” who created a monumental historical epic about the confrontation between the East and the West. He is commonly believed to have been born in 484 BC, so, according to the ancient tradition, “the Father of History” must have been born 2500 years ago.

In spite of the centuries-long history of studying Herodotus, there are still lots of questions about the life of the *archegetes* of historians and his immortal work – such is the fate of classical authors and their works. This essay prepared for the jubilee of “the high-priests of Clio” ventures to examine one of the issues.

I. Introductory remarks:

“The Herodotean question(s)”

The Hellenes came out victorious of the mortal battle with the barbarian conquerors who had invaded Hellas from the East. The new Great War needed its own Homer to glorify the deeds of the heroes of the past and establish for centuries to come what “people had been in our time”. The ancient writers, when choosing topics and developing their plots and genres, modeled themselves on the legendary creator of the *Iliad*; poets or historiographers seemed to engage in *agon* with the Poet of poets, seeking to imitate him.²

² On the Homer origins of the Greek historiography and Herodotus as an epic historical writer à la Homer, see, for example, Huber 1965: 29-52; Strasburger 1972; Miller 1984: 6-79; Giraudeau 1984: 4-13; Erbse 1992: 122-132; Flower 1998: 373-376; Pallantza 2005: 124-174; Pelling 2006: 75-104; Marincola 2007a: 1-79 = Marincola 2013: 109-132; and a recent collection Baragwanath, Bakker 2012 (articles S. Saïd, M. de Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong, A. M. Bowie, E. Baragwanath, et al.). See more about Herodotus and Ancient Greek poets and poetry (from recent works, selectively): Rengakos 2001: 253-270; Boedeker 2001: 120-34; Boedeker 2002: 97-116; Rengakos 2004: 73-99; Grethlein 2006a; Grethlein 2006b: 485-509; Marincola 2006: 13-28; Rengakos 2006a: 279-300; Rengakos 2006b: 183-209; Scardino 2007: 36-59; Zali 2009: 24-25, 30, 39-40, 116-117; Kim 2010; Konstan, Raaflaub 2010; Rutherford 2012: 13-38; Foster 2012: 185-214; Grethlein 2012; Gainsford 2013: 117-137; Priestley 2014: 187-219; Irwin 2014: 26-27, 32, 42-70; Grethlein 2014: 236-244; Wieżel 2015: 43-52; Berruecos Frank 2015: 115-171; de Jong 2015; Raaflaub

A writer and traveller from Asia Minor, who in the middle of his life had been closely connected with Athens and glorified the City as a main hero-victor in the war with the Barbarian. Herodotus defined the major task of his work on war and peace of the peoples involved in the Persian wars in the following way:

Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέος ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἦδε, ὡς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεᾶ γένηται, τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ δι’ ἣν αἰτίην ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι.³

“What Herodotus the Halicarnassian has learnt by inquiry is here set forth: in order that so the memory of the past may not be blotted out from among men by time, and that great and marvellous deeds done by Greeks and foreigners and especially the reason why they warred against each other may not lack renown”.⁴

To what extent did the historian from Halicarnassus succeed in achieving his aim? Should we consider his work as we have it now complete and integral? Or does it somehow “break” at the events of 479/8 BC, for “the Father of History” had planned to continue his account of the Greek-Persian wars? Over the past century and a half, the “diversity of opinions” of the issue of completeness of Herodotus’ *The Histories* has never been settled.⁵ This problem seems to be unsolvable for

2016: 594; Donelli 2016: 12-22; van Rooxhuijzen 2017a: 464-484; Marincola 2018: 3-24; Clarke 2018: 6-10; Sinitsyn, Surikov 2019: 185-187.

³ Hdt. 1. Prooem. From the edition *Oxford classical texts*: Wilson 2015: I, 3.

⁴ Here Herodotus is cited after the translations by Alfred D. Godley from the edition Godley 1966: 3. See commentaries *ad prooem*. Stein 1901: 1-2; How, Wells 1991a: 53; Asheri 2007: 72-73. From recent studies: Krischer 1965; Miller 1984: 21-22; Węcowski 1996: 345-398; Węcowski 2004: 143-164; Scardino 2007: 62-82; Węcowski 2008: 34-57; Rood 2010: 43-74; Stadter 2012a: 53-56; Chiasson 2012: 114-143; Vasunia 2012: 183-198; Berruecos Frank 2015: 116 ff.; Adamik 2015: 377-386 (+ new bibliography and review); Węcowski 2016: 23-24, 26 ff.

⁵ See, e.g., Rosaria V. Munson 2013: 27: “the ending of the *Histories*, which has been traditionally regarded as puzzling or not a real ending at all”; and here ch. 3.7 “Look at his (Herodotus – *A. S.*) end”. On this issue Sinitsyn 2013a: 39-55 (literature supplied: pp. 41-42, nn. 10, 12; pp. 43-44, n. 18); Sinitsyn 2017a and Sinitsyn 2017b, with maps.

contemporary science, and it is hardly likely that it will be ever possible to answer this question. Most researchers hold that Herodotus' historical work was not completed; they argue that he was to bring his account of the confrontation between the Hellenes and the Persians down to the 449 BC Peace of Callias, the event that, in the current opinion, ended the half-a-century of struggle between the Ancient West and the Oriental Achaemenid Empire.

This is only a hypothesis undoubtedly in need of substantiating. And there will always be new readings and suppositions – more or less dependable, but always limited.

“Herodotean questions” encompass the issues of *The Histories*' contexture, of time and sequence of certain logoi, the questions of the design, elaboration and completeness of the work of “the Father of History”. Of course, they are “perennial issues” of the historical science and the source study of Antiquity. Here, again, I propose to discuss one of the principal “Herodotean questions”, that of the fullness of Herodotus' historical work.⁶ I will make some observations about the finale of Herodotus' epic – the expulsion of the barbarian conquerors from Europe, the victorious return of the Athenians and the symbolic act to mark the end of the war against the Persians.

II. Herodotus 9.121: the clinching sentence and “the formula of victory” in the finale of *The Histories*

In 9.121, Herodotus tells about the return of the Athenian fleet carrying loot and sums up the last year of the Greek-Persian war:

Ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ἀπέπλεον ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, τὰ τε ἄλλα χρήματα ἄγοντες καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ ὄπλα τῶν γεφυρέων ὡς ἀναθήσοντες ἐς τὰ ἱρά. Καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλεόν τούτων ἐγένετο.⁷

⁶ Cf. Victor Ehrenberg's opinion on this question: “I cannot share the view that Herodotus' last chapter shows that he did not finish his work. Another question is whether he had finally revised it... We are faced with a ‘Herodotean question’, regarding the composition of his work and his possible development” (Ehrenberg 1968: 343, n. 105).

⁷ Hdt. 9.121 (in Wilson 2015: II, 843). Commentaries to this passage: Macan 1908b: 827-828; Flower, Marincola 2002: 310-311. The old edition published by H. Stein contains a note to Hdt. 9.121, nn. 3 and 4: an indication of this [last] year (τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο) described by Herodotus: 479 BC, and a reference to two

“After performing these deeds⁸, they (the victorious Greeks – *A. S.*) sailed back home to Hellas; beside other spoil, they had with them the cables from the bridges, which they intended as offerings in temples. Nothing else, apart from these events, happened that year”.⁹

As to the last sentence with a rare (in no way exclusive)¹⁰ use by “the Father of History” of the temporal phrase – καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλεόν τούτων ἐγένετο, the researchers differed in their opinions of the temporal locution in Hdt. 9.121. Some regarded it as an interpolation in Herodotus' text, others believed that Herodotus had intended to continue his work on the Greek-Persian wars¹¹ and proposed to consider the last chapter of

places in *The Histories* featuring the phrase ἐπὶ πλεόν in Books 6 and 9 published by Stein 1893: 221, ad loc. (see here below, n. 9). While the authors of the classical commentary on Herodotus' work, W. W. How and J. Wells, ‘disregard’ this unique information in chapter 121 of Book 9 of *The Histories*, seemingly considering the evidence of the Athenian trophies as insignificant (?) and ignoring the outstanding temporal phrase used by the historian in the finale: καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο... ἐγένετο. See the discussion in Sinitsyn 2013a: 44-49.

⁸ It speaks of the events at the Hellespont in 479/8 BC – the siege and capture of the city of Sestus in Thracian Chersonese, which ended the war campaign off the coast of Asia Minor (for the discussion of these events, see below).

⁹ The translations into English here are my own.

¹⁰ Hdt. 6.42; 9.41; 9.107; see Stein 1893b: 157, ad loc. Hdt. 9.41: “dieselbe Redeweise” (the definition applies to the above-mentioned monotypic temporal phrases in Herodotus' work); cf. Hdt. 2.171; 5.51 – Herman Stein, publisher and commentator of Herodotus' work, also points to the passages containing the phrase οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλεόν τούτων (*nil his amplius*) (Stein 1894: 150, ad loc. Hdt. 6.42). See also Lipsius 1902: 195-196; Flower, Marincola 2002: 291, ad loc. Hdt. 9.107 and 310, ad loc. Hdt. 9.121. Reginald Walter Macan, for a good reason, regarded the phrase οὐδὲν ... τούτων as typical of the style of “the Father of History”, the classical scholar believed that for Herodotus it was a sustained stylistic device, *a formula*: Macan 1908b: 679, ad loc. Hdt. 9.41 (‘is a formula’); cf. *ibidem*, 811-812, ad loc. Hdt. 9.107 (‘the formula’). And C. Dewald defines this temporal clincher in Herodotus' work as “formulaic expression” (Dewald 1997: 63 = Dewald 2013: 385).

¹¹ By way of illustration, Lipsius 1902: 195-202. A hundred years ago, the German classical philologist, befuddled as he may have been, judging from the tone of his article, wrote: “Es ist mir von jeher unverständlich gewesen, wie man immer wieder behaupten kann, dass Herodots Geschichtswerk uns in abgeschlossener Gestalt vorliegt. Zum Gegenbeweise genügt, wie ich das

The Histories (9.122) as a peculiar “introduction” to a further account. The debate over the finale has been on for about two hundred years, and the main object of discord is the extent of (in)completeness of the work of the Halicarnassean historian.¹²

The contentious sentence occurring in the penultimate chapter of *The Histories* (Hdt. 9.121.2) seems of no great import, as such. At the end of the book Herodotus tells about the siege and the capture of Sestus by the Hellenes (9.114-119) and the homeward voyage of the Athenian fleet. Having narrated the last significant instance of the late autumn, the

historian sums up: “Nothing else, apart from these events, happened that year” (9.121.2). These last words virtually mean that the author, apart from what he had reported, was not going to describe any other events that happened over that period. Herodotus must have considered them of no consequence for his main subject – the history of the war between the Hellenes and the Persians.¹³

Sometimes historians note that the tone of this clincher in Hdt. 9.121.2 seems intentionally stern and dry, “bookish”, resembling the language of chronicles.¹⁴ Modern scholars have had different opinions. Some regarded it as an interpolation in the text of Herodotus,¹⁵ other researchers believed that this temporal phrase suggested that Herodotus intended to continue his work,¹⁶ thereby they proposed to consider the end of *The Histories* as a peculiar *prooemium* to further narration, but the versions of this virtual “sequel” have been different.¹⁷

seit zwanzig Jahren in meinen Vorlesungen betone, eine scharfe Betrachtung der Worte, mit denen der Faden der Erzählung im vorletzten Kapitel des neunten Buches abreisst (i.e. Hdt. 9.121 – A. S.); das letzte Kapitel bringt ja nur eine zeitlich zurückgreifende Episode. Nach kurzer Erwähnung der Heimfahrt der Hellenen nach der Einnahme von Sestos schliesst der Bericht über die Ereignisse des Jahres 479 mit den Worten καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἔτος τοῦτο οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλεόν τούτων ἐγένετο. Es kann doch nicht bestritten werden, dass wer so schreibt, noch nicht an das Ziel, das er sich gesteckt hat, gelangt ist (sic! – A. S.), sondern eine Weiterführung seiner Darstellung in Aussicht nimmt” (Lipsius 1902: 195).

¹² I shall refer to the recent research papers that sum up the discussion of this issue: Herington 1991: 149-160 (the article begins with presenting the range of different opinions the researchers had in the 1980s); Boedeker 1988: 30-48 = Boedeker 2013: 359-378); Dewald 1997: 62-82 = Dewald 2013: 379-401 (provides a review of opinions of the issue); cf. Flower, Marincola 2002: 310-311, ad loc. Hdt. 9.121 (with reference to C. Dewald’s article); Irwin 2013 (discusses the problem). I shall also refer differentially to other papers discussing the final chapters of Herodotus’ *The Histories*: Gomperz 1883a: 148 f.; Gomperz 1883b: 523; Meyer 1887: 146-148; Lipsius 1902: 195-202 (discusses the problem, with reference to A. Kirchhoff, O. Nitzsch, T. Gomperz, Ed. Meyer, C. Wachsmuth, E. Bachof, C.F. Lehmann, et al.); Jacoby 1913: 372-379; Pohlenz 1937: 164-167, 175-177; Powell 1939: 79-81; Myres 1953 299-300; Wolff 1964: 51-58; Wolff 1965: 668-678; Bischoff 1965: 681-687; Immerwahr 1966: 8-9, 43, 144-146; Ehrenberg 1968: 139, 343; Cobet 1971: 171, 174-176; Krischer 1974: 93-100; Miller 1984: 21; Asheri 1988: XX-XXI; Gould 1989: 59-60, 117-120; Lateiner 1989: 45, 46-50, 119, 243, 244, 257; López Eire 1990: 95; Vandiver 1991: 223-229; Pelling 1997b: esp. 58-59, 62-63 = Pelling 2013; Marincola 2001: 57-58; Desmond 2004: 31-40; Rood 2007a: 116-117; 2007b: 154-155; Scardino 2007: 321 ff.; Węcowski 2008: 45; Welser 2009: 367-372; Rosen 2009: 1-12; Grethlein 2009: 195-218; Rung 2010: 17-18; Stadter 2012a: 40, 45-46; Munson 2012: 273-274; Miles 2014: 119; Węcowski 2016: 21-23; Pelling 2016: 84-85; Raaflaub 2016: 596-598; Irwin 2018: 280, 282 ff., 286-287, 296 ff., 326-327, 331 ff.; Irwin 2019.

¹³ Cf. Flower, Marincola 2002: 310, ad loc. Hdt. 9.121: “The implication of these words is that other things took place during the next and subsequent years, things which Herodotus will not narrate”.

¹⁴ Thus, Carolyn Dewald characterized this phrase in Hdt. 9.121.2 as “a dry annalistic summary” (Dewald 1997: 63 = Dewald 2013: 285); and the German scholar Klaus Rosen made a remark about Herodotus’ finale: “Seiner Schlussszene fügte Herodot noch *den nüchternen chronikartigen Satz* an (italics mine – A. S.)”, Rosen 2009: 1-2.

¹⁵ This last sentence in Chapter 121 of Book 9 in R.W. Macan’s edition is enclosed in parentheses, see Macan 1908b: 827 and commentary *ibidem*, 827-8, ad loc. Hdt. 9.121, n. 3. Cf. Powell 1939: 78-80; Hignett 1963: 457 and Lateiner 1989: 119.

¹⁶ E.g., Lateiner 1989: 45: “Thus some critics believe that Herodotus has not put the finishing touch to his work, because the annalistic formula that generally introduces information for the following year, ‘nothing further happened in that year’ (9. 121), appears at the end where it presents an inelegant conclusion for the events reported”.

¹⁷ See opinion review (selectively): Jacoby 1913: 374-375 (with reference to G. Busolt, Ed. Meyer, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, T. Gomperz, H. Stein, J.H. Lipsius, O. Müller and other scholars of the 19th-20th centuries); Immerwahr 1966: 145 and n. 188; Borukhovich 2002: 598: “An account of the battle of Sestus *ends, rather, stops short*, Herodotus’ work (italics mine – A. S.) ... There are grounds to suppose that Herodotus was going to continue his work (no explanations at all – A. S.)”; Lateiner 1989: 119: “There are traces of a systematic chronology..., and the penultimate chapter 9.121 oddly presages the later annalistic framework (perhaps borrowed from, or added by, a chronicler)...” (with references to R.W. Macan, J.E. Powell, C. Hignett in

Some scholars ventured an opinion that the finale of Herodotus' work suggested a sequel – the history of a different hegemony, this time not that of the Persians but that of the Athenians, which asserted itself in the mid-5th century BC (slightly varied, this hypothesis has been getting popular of late). Igor E. Surikov thinks that this temporal phrase belongs to Herodotus, but he notes that the turn of speech “though not typical of the Herodotus style, fits well with Thucydides, who, contrary to his predecessor, narrated events year by year”.¹⁸ In his observations about the historian's failure to execute the design – hence, the incompleteness of his work, I.E. Surikov relies on M.L. Gasparov's hypothesis of the incompleteness *in toto* of the “pedimental architectonics” of Herodotus' *The Histories*.¹⁹ According to Surikov, the temporal clincher occurring in the finale of *The Histories* was borrowed by Herodotus from his younger contemporary, Thucydides, who, as is well-known, had developed

Lateiner 1989: 257, n. 30); Herington 1991: 149-160 (the author begins his article with presenting a range of opinions of the researchers of the 1980s on the issue of the finale of *The Histories* of Herodotus: K.H. Waters, D. Asheri, J. Gould et al.: *ibidem*, pp. 149 ff.); Moles 1996: 271-277; Dewald 1997 (provides the most complete review of the views on the issue: *ibidem*, p. 63, n. 13); Desmond 2004: *passim*, see p. 19: “the stories intended as interludes, preludes to further narrative (*italics mine – A. S.*)”; with literature Desmond 2004: *esp.* pp. 19-20, nn. 2, 3, 4, 36 ff.; Rood 2007a: 116-117: “Herodotus' story ends with strong hints that a new story of the Athenian rise to power is starting: nothing further may have happened in that year, but the story of the Athenian rise to naval hegemony would continue” (here with reference to D. Boedeker, J. Herington, J.L. Moles, C. Dewald et al.); Rood 2007b: 154-155; Rosen 2009; Strogetsky 2010: 114, 120; Munson 2013: 27-28; Andreev 2018: 99 (along with V.G. Borukhovich): “It is hardly likely that Herodotus was going to stop his narration short exactly at this point (the siege of Sestus by the Greeks – *A. S.*). Rather, *he just failed to end it properly*. Certain cursory remarks in the text of *The Histories* point to the possibility of *further development of the topic* (*italics mine – A. S.*)”; Harrison, Irwin 2018: 10; Irwin 2018: 279-334 (review of works on the content and purpose of the final chapters in Herodotus' *The Histories*, “which have so resoundingly established a number of levels upon which the last chapters of the Histories serve as a masterful conclusion to Herodotus' work”, p. 282).

¹⁸ Surikov 2010a: 361 = Surikov 2011: 276-277.

¹⁹ Gasparov 1989: 117-122 = Gasparov 1997: 483-489. Cf. Miller 1984: 46-78, *passim*, *esp.* pp. 69 ff., 73-74, 76 ff. (while elaborating the version of pedimental composition of individual *logoi* in *The Histories* by Herodotus).

the chronological method of writing history.²⁰ And if so, Surikov makes another logical move, there is a reason to speak about the intention of “the Father of History” to use Thucydides' chronological principle in accounting the subsequent clashes of the Greeks and the Persians – up to 449 BC.²¹ Surikov refers to W. Desmond's opinion,²² but advances his paradoxical hypothesis about “borrowing”.

I demonstrated in another article that such a temporal method in Hdt. 9.121.2 is not in the least unique in Herodotus' writing, and suggested that Thucydides, familiar with Herodotus' work, may have adopted this method (just outlined by “the Father of History”) and then developed his chronological method of writing history.²³

²⁰ See critical comments on this hypothesis in my works: Sinitsyn 2012a; 2013a; 2013b; 2017a; 2017b.

²¹ Surikov 2009: 223-224; 2010a: 362-363; 2011: 278 – on all occasions with references to Mikhail L. Gasparov's assertion 1989 and 1997. “We cannot help but feel: M.L. Gasparov is right, Herodotus wanted to continue narrating the events of the Greek-Persian wars till their actual end – the Peace of Callias in 449 BC. Moreover, he apparently intended to change the manner of narration of the events following 478 BC, making it stricter, that is, to narrate the course of further events year by year (*sic! – A. S.*). This last period of the creative biography of “the Father of History” falls on the 420s BC, when Thucydides started his work. It is not improbable that it was the manner of narration used by his younger contemporary that had influenced the Halicarnassian” (Surikov 2010a: 362-363; 2011: 278; also in his previous works Surikov 2007a: 143-151; 2009: 223-224). Cf. Munson 2013: 27: “It is unlikely that Herodotus' work was interrupted by external circumstances, as some have thought. We may rather speculate that his story had an ending he could not write, where the definitive cessation of hostilities between the Greeks and Persia (perhaps marked by the Peace of Callias of 449) overlapped inextricably with disturbing developments within the Greek world. He chose, at any rate, to close his work in a provisional way, which confirms the overall character of the *Histories* as an *opera aperta*”.

²² See Desmond 2004: 19-40.

²³ Here of interest are Philip A. Stadter's observations in the article “Thucydides as ‘A Reader’ of Herodotus” (Stadter 2012a: 39-66). See: “Finally, after the return of the Athenian fleet to Greece, the campaigns of the year end (IX. 121). Herodotus found that the best way to treat Xerxes' expedition was by summer and winters. Thucydides, in writing his history, decided to use the procedure utilized by Herodotus for the Persian campaign, but went one step further. Instead of introducing the seasons and years casually, as part of the narrative, he decided to make these notices formal and regular, establishing an unmistakably clear chronological framework” (Stadter 2012a: 45). “In interpreting Herodotus, Thucydides

But the penultimate chapter of *The Histories* – 9.121 – is significant not least because of Herodotus’ mentioning *the cables from the bridges* once spanning the Hellespont that the Greeks captured: “They had with them the cables from the bridges (τὰ ὄπλα τῶν γεφυρέων), which they intended as offerings in temples”. The very mentioning here of these linking cables (which as such seem to be an insignificant detail noted in passing) appears most interesting.

It should be noted that *here* Herodotus does not specify other numerous trophies that the Athenians brought from Asia Minor. And the booty of war during this lengthy expedition must have been quite large (!). The English classical scholar commenting upon *The Histories*, R. W. Macan, glosses χρήματα featuring in Hdt. 9.121.1 as “The spoils, chiefly from Mycale – where they had found θησαυρούς τινας χρημάτων”.²⁴ In Hdt. 9.106 says that in 479 BC, after the defeat of the barbarians at Mycale, the Greek army scooped a large profit (hic: θησαυρούς τινας χρημάτων). The victors put on the seashore the loot containing, according to our source, the Persian military chests. But upon their return the Athenians had brought the trophies captured not only in the battle at Mycale but in several battles for the islands and during the last campaign in Thracian Chersonese related by Herodotus in the final logos (9.114-119).

Yet, Herodotus calls the whole loot collectively – τά τε ἄλλα χρήματα. And he emphasizes that the victors had τὰ ὄπλα τῶν γεφυρέων on board their ships. Presumably, these particular trophies were of great importance for both the historian and his contemporaries, including those who had listened to *The Histories* and who had taken part in “great and marvellous deeds done by Greeks and foreigners and especially the reason why they warred against each other”.

III. γέφυρα and ὄπλα (τῶν γεφυρέων) in Herodotus’ work

Various bridges and stream crossings are frequently found in *The Histories*. According to *A Lexicon to Herodotus* by John E. Powell, the historian uses various forms of the word γέφυρα

42 times in his work:²⁵ on six occasions in the first book, once in books 3 and 5, while the fourth book has the greatest number (18) of γέφυρα. The famous Scythian logos tells about Darius’ march to the land of Scythians, about the construction and the use of bridges across the Thracian Bosphorus and the river Istrus. The pontoon-bridge on the isthmus of Bosphorus is a grandiose monument created by the Samian engineer, Mandrocles, was the first to connect Europe with Asia (Hdt. 4.87-89).²⁶

The word γέφυρα occurs 16 times in the books 7, 8 and 9 – in accounts of the construction in 481/0 BC of the bridges connecting Asia and Europe, of the great army’s crossing the Hellespont, of the march westward and the Persians’ crossing the river Strymon in the Thracian coast,²⁷ and finally, of the destruction of the bridges across the Hellespont in 479 BC, the execution of Artayctes on the spot where Xerxes ordered to construct a bridge, of the intention of Athenians to consecrate the cables from the Hellespont bridges in the temples, described in the finale of *The Histories*.

Herodotus describes graphically the debate at the Persian State Council over the issue of constructing the passage over the Hellespont to march off against Athens (Hdt. 7.8-12).²⁸ The historian makes Artabanus, Xerxes’ uncle, warn the King about the deadly danger that may befall Xerxes and his army if the Greeks succeed in destroying the bridge: this will intercept the retreat of the Persians from Europe to Asia.²⁹

²⁵ Powell 1966: 66, s.v. γέφυρα.

²⁶ See commentaries ad loc.: Stein 1893: 86-88; Macan 1895: 62-64; How, Wells 1991a: 333-334; Dovatour, Kallistov, Shishova 1982: 329, n. 529; Corcella 2007: 644-645. See also Dan 2015: 194-196, 221, 224.

²⁷ On Xerxes’ intrusion into Hellas and his march across Thrace: Hignett 1963; Müller 1975; Hammond 1988; Balcer 1988; Stronk 1998-1999, with maps and photos; Archibald 1998; Isserlin, Jones, Karastathis, Papamarinopoulos 2003, analysis of the archeological material; Tuplin 2003; Ruberto 2011; Bowie 2012; Zahrnt 2015; Vasilev 2015; Briquel 2016; Clarke 2017 and also van Rookhuijzen 2018: 89-117 (with new literature and pictures).

²⁸ It is one of the examples in *The Histories* where Herodotus gives an account of the open debates conducted by the Persians. For the discussion of the scene of the council of the Persian nobles, see: Jong 2001: 104-112; Schellenberg 2009: 136-139; Grethlein 2009: 195-218; Stahl 2012: 125-153; Zali 2015: 151-156.

²⁹ On Artabanus, the Persian sage, as a paragon of a warning counsellor in *The Histories* by Herodotus: Pelling 1991: 120-142; Surikov 2008: 80-82; 2010b: 81, 83-84; 2011: 244-246, 412-413, 414-415; Fulham 2014.

rethought his predecessor’s modes of presentation, subject, and themes. He adopted Herodotus’ treatment of war by campaign seasons for his whole narrative. Significant echoes from Herodotus gave focus and power to his narrative” (Stadter 2012a: 63).

²⁴ Macan 1908b: 827, ad loc. Hdt. 9.121.2, ad χρήματα (with reference to Hdt. 9.106).

“You will bridge the Hellespont (so you say) and march your army through Europe to Hellas (ζεύξας φῆς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἔλᾱν στρατὸν διὰ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα)”, – says the Persian sage at the assembly summoned by Xerxes. – “Now I will suppose that matters have so fallen out that you are worsted either by land or by sea, or even both; for the men are said to be valiant, and well may we guess that it is so, seeing that so great a host, that followed Datis and Artaphrenes to Attica, was destroyed by the Athenians alone. Be it, then, granted that they win not success both by sea and by land; but if they attack with their ships and prevail in a sea-fight, and then sail to the Hellespont and thereafter break your bridge, that, O king, is the hour of peril” (Hdt. 7.10β).³⁰

Prior to this (Hdt. 7.10α), Artabanus reminds Xerxes of the unfortunate expedition led by Darius to the Scythian lands; it was Darius who made the first attempt to link Asia to Europe by bridges and who feared lest he be unable to withdraw his army from Europe should the passage be destroyed. And no other than Artabanus, the brother of late Darius I, was advising the King against launching a campaign against the Scythians:

“It is from no wisdom of my own that I thus conjecture; it is because I know what disaster was that which wellnigh once overtook us, when your father, making a highway over the Thracian Bosphorus, and bridging the river Ister, crossed over to attack the Scythians. At that time the Scythians used every means of entreating the Ionians, who had been charged to guard the bridges of the Ister, to break the way of passage; and then, if Histiaeus the despot of Miletus had consented to the opinion of the other despots and not withstood it, the power of Persia had perished” (Hdt. 7.10γ).³¹

Artabanus, according to Herodotus, also warns Xerxes, his nephew, of the gods who may feel jealous and wish to punish presumptuous people:

“You see how the god smites with his thunderbolt creatures of greatness more than common, nor suffers them to display their pride, but such as are little move him not to anger; and you see how it is ever on the tallest buildings and trees that his bolts fall; for it is heaven’s way to bring low all things of surpassing bigness. Thus a numerous host is destroyed by one that is lesser, the god of his jealousy sending panic fear or thunderbolt among them, whereby they do unworthily perish; for the god suffers pride in none but himself” (Hdt. 7.10ε).³²

These words uttered by the Persian sage were meant to come true: Xerxes’ arrogance would be punished. The historian and poet Herodotus had had put the words about the King’s superhybris into the mouth of the Persian King: “... If we subdue those men (Athenians – *A. S.*), and their neighbours who dwell in the land of Pelops the Phrygian, we shall make the borders of Persian territory and of the firmament of heaven to be the same; for no land that the sun beholds will lie on our borders, but I will make all to be one country, when I have passed over the whole of Europe” (Hdt. 7.8γ).³³

All this – both the debate at the assembly of the Persian nobles called by the King, and the ghosts seen by Xerxes and Artabanus in their night dreams, who come to urge them to set out on a march against Hellas (Hdt. 7.12-18) – is certainly an artistic improvisation used by “the Father of History”, a narrative device meant for the reader, the reader who knew about the tragic outcome of the Persian hybriatic expansion.³⁴ But it is of crucial importance to note that such predictions and such writings on the wall are bound to come true. In Book 8, when the outcome of the barbarian invasion has already been foregone, the author repeats the warning he has put in Artabanus’ mouth, thereby making it prophetic.

A parallel between dialogues of Solon and Croesus in Book I of *The Histories* and those of Artabanus and Xerxes in Book 7 has been frequently drawn (about this, see Rutherford 2012: 24, with references to literature). I. E. Surikov calls the Herodotus a barbarian ‘vis-à-vis’ of Solon, the Hellenian sage. From the recent works on Artabanus: Rutherford 2012: 24-26; Stahl 2012: 132, 137-149; Baragwanath 2012: 295-297; Branscome 2013: 173-174; Zali 2015: 152 ff.; Pelling 2016: 77, 78, 80 f., 82.

³⁰ Godley 1968: 317.

³¹ Godley 1968: 317 and 319. Herodotus gives

a detailed account of the significance of this crossing for rescuing Darius’ army (4.133 and 134; 4.136-141), depicting the drama being acted out at the bridges when the Persians were retreating during their first march to Europe and the horror that struck Darius’ soldiers when they found out that the bridge they had relied on had been destroyed during the night (Hdt. 4.140).

³² Godley 1968: 319.

³³ Godley 1968: 311.

³⁴ Desmond 2004: 29; see also Papadimitropoulos 2008: 452 ff.



Map 1. The Balkan Greece, the Aegean Basin and Asia Minor



Map 2. Europe and Asia in the Area of the Hellespont and the Propontis

The historian puts it in the following way: after the Persian defeat at Salamis, the King makes a decision to retreat, remembering that the enemy might destroy the crossing over the Hellespont and fearing lest they should be cut off from Asia: “When Xerxes was aware of the calamity that had befallen him, he feared lest the Greeks (by Ionian counsel or their own devising) might sail to the Hellespont to break his bridges (ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον λύσοντες τὰς γεφύρας), and he might be cut off in Europe and in peril of his life; and so he planned flight” (Hdt. 8.97).³⁵

The word τὰ ὄπλα (in all cases – *pluralis*) meaning connecting ‘cables’ (‘cords’, ‘ropes’) used in the construction of the crossing is found four times in *The Histories* by Herodotus – twice at the beginning of Book 7 and twice at the end of Book 9, exclusively in Herodotus’ accounts of the bridges between Asia and Europe: Hdt. 7.25; 7.36 (*ter*) and Hdt. 9.115; 9.121.³⁶ The use in the Ancient Greek literature of the word ὄπλον (usually *pluralis* – ὄπλα) as a nautical term meaning ‘cables’, ‘ropes’, ‘cords’ or ‘halyards’ is found in works of the earliest authors – Homer and Hesiod.³⁷

Hdt. 7.25; 7.33-34; 7.36 tell in good detail about the two attempts to erect bridges connecting Asia and Europe, about making cables (ὄπλα) for the bridges from papyrus fibres (βύβλινα) and white flax (λευκόλινον).³⁸ The erection of these

immense constructions connecting the two continents is one of the highest water-marks of the engineering capabilities achieved in the ancient world³⁹. According to the historian, the Phoenicians and the Egyptians were charged with the making of cables (Hdt. 7.25; 7.33 and 34). Herodotus specifies the material the powerful cables were made of,⁴⁰ their size and weight, their functions in the erecting of the crossing over the Hellespont.⁴¹

“Having so done (the vessels had been moored side by side in the strait – *A. S.*), they stretched the cables from the land, twisting them taut with wooden windlasses; and they did not as before keep the two kinds apart,⁴² but assigned for each bridge two cables of flax and four of papyrus. All these were of the same thickness and fair appearance, but the flaxen were heavier in their proportion, a cubit thereof weighing a talent” (Hdt. 7.36).⁴³

N.G.L. Hammond and L.J. Roseman hold that “designing and construction of these unique bridges was within the compass of the engineers of those times”.⁴⁴

³⁵ Godley 1969: 95. On the retreat of the Persian army across the Thracian lands, M. Zahrt notes: “That the Persians had to make a detour via the Bosphoros can be explained by the events that were happening simultaneously in the area of the Hellespont: after the Greek fleet had totally destroyed the last Persian ships at the cape of Mycale, it sailed to the north and, after a lengthy siege, captured the city of Sestus and won the crossing of the Hellespont (Hdt. 9.114-121)” (Zahrt 2015: 39).

³⁶ Cf. Powell 1966: 266, s.v. ὄπλα (1), points out that Herodotus uses the word in its first meaning, ‘gear’, for τῶν γεφυρῶν (*hic* – ‘cables’), and in its second meaning as ‘arms, hoplite weaponry’, etc. (Powell 1966: 266-267, s.v. ὄπλα (2)). ὄπλα in its second meaning occurs in *The Histories* 35 times.

³⁷ Liddell, Scott 1996: 1240, s.v. ὄπλον (I): ‘a ship’s tackle, tackling’, especially ‘ropes, halyards’ (with reference to the sources, including *The Histories* by Herodotus). In greater detail: Amandry 1946: 6 (with references to the places in the texts by Homer, Hesiod, Apollonius of Rhodes, Hippocrates, lexicographers and other authors).

³⁸ Hdt. 7.25; 7.33-35; 7.36. See commentaries ad loc.: Stein 1908: 38-39, 45-52; Macan 1908a: 37-38, 47-56; How, Wells 1991b: 136, 140-144.

³⁹ The scholar N.G.L. Hammond in conjunction with the engineer L.J. Roseman in their article “The Construction of Xerxes’ Bridge across the Hellespont” evaluate these ancient engineering achievements: Hammond, Roseman 1996: 88-107 (with literature); Frassoni 2006: 105-152; Bednarowski 2009: 83-88 (chapter I. 4 “Bridging the Hellespont: Glorious Achievement or the Beginning of the End”); Ruberto 2011: 31-44, esp. pp. 36-41; Dan 2015: 191-235 (+ bibliography); Briquel 2016: 51-60. Also see a recent monograph by R. Stoneman 2015: 128-132 (+ map 4 “The Hellespont” showing the Persian bridges spanning the strait, p. 131).

⁴⁰ Hdt. 7.25: καὶ ὄπλα ἐς τὰς γεφύρας βύβλινά τε καὶ λευκόλινου. Cf. Hdt. 7.34 and 7.36 (with commentaries).

⁴¹ On the Hellespont and its area, I refer to a number of recent works: Tiveros 2008: 1-154; Surikov 2013a: 3-44; Surikov 2013b: 24-38; Minchin 2017: 66-68 (with a map on p. 67), 72 ff.; van Rookhuijzen 2018: 61-89.

⁴² The way it happened during the first throwing of the bridges, when “a great storm arising broke the whole work to pieces, and destroyed all that had been done” (Hdt. 7. 34). Here Herodotus points out that a double bridge had been constructed from Abydos (*ibidem*): “the Phoenicians one of flaxen cables, and the Egyptians the second, which was of papyrus (τὴν μὲν λευκόλινου Φοῖνικες, τὴν δ’ ἐτέρην τὴν βυβλίην Αἰγύπτιοι)” (Godley 1968: 347). See Stoneman 2015: 128 ff.

⁴³ Godley 1968: 351.

⁴⁴ Hammond, Roseman 1996: 95.

IV. The trophies of the Persian War and temples:
the sentence from the source and its variations

The expedition to the bridge over the Hellespont initially had been a joint venture of the Athenians and the Spartans (see Hdt. 9.106; 9.114). After finding out, when already at the place, that the crossing had been broken down, the Spartan army headed by Leotychides wasted no time to sail to Hellas,⁴⁵ but the Athenians stayed and, under the command of Xanthippus, crossed the Hellespont from Abydos (the town on the Asian side of the Hellespont) to the Thracian Chersonese (the eastern coast of the Strait).⁴⁶ There they immediately lay siege to Sestus (Hdt. 9.114-118; 9.119; cf. Thuc. 1.89.2).⁴⁷ After the town had surrendered, they established control over the area.

Herodotus frequently points out that it was only the Athenian army⁴⁸ that took part in the siege, and it returned with the cables from the bridges. The victorious Athenians sailed ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα intending to dedicate their trophies in temples (ἐς τὰ ἱερά). But the historian does not say they were *the Athenian τὰ ἱερά*.

Contemporary translations sometimes render this sentence of Herodotus in such a way as to suggest that the captured cables were meant solely for Athenian temples. For example, let us look at several well-known translations. Thus, A.D. Godley

from the edition *The Loeb Classical Library* (1925): "... they (Athenians – *A. S.*) sailed away to Hellas, carrying with them the tackle of the bridges to be dedicated in their temples"⁴⁹; and close to it is the English version by George Rawlinson (1858): "This done, they (Athenians – *A. S.*) sailed back to Greece, carrying with them, besides other treasures, the shore cables from the bridges of Xerxes (with comments on the text – *A. S.*), which they wished to dedicate in their temples".⁵⁰

Similarly, in the German translation: published in the series *Bibliothek der Antike* translated by Th. Braun: "... insbesondere nahmen sie (die Athener – *A. S.*) auch die Tauen von der Brücken mit, um sie als Weihgeschenke in ihren Tempeln aufhängen zu können";⁵¹ the same was in the old version by F. Lange: "... vornehmlich aber das Gerät von den Brücken, um es in ihre Tempel zu weihen";⁵² and one more version by Josef Feix in *Tusculum*: "Sie (die Athener – *A. S.*) führten die erbeuteten Schätze mit, besonders die Geräte von den Brücken, um sie in ihren Tempeln zu weihen".⁵³ See also, for example, in the French translation by Ph.-E. Legrand in the series *Les belles lettres* (1955): "Cela fait, les Athéniens retournèrent en Grèce, emportant, entre autres objets précieux, les câbles qui avaient servi pour les ponts, qu'ils avaient l'intention de consacrer dans leurs sanctuaires (which unambiguously means Athenian temples – *A. S.*)".⁵⁴

All these instances imply that the sanctuaries to which the victors intended to offer the cables from the "intercontinental bridges" are *theirs*, that is, *Athenian*.

The old Russian translation by Th. Mishchenko puts it differently: "... эллины отплыли в Элладу, причем взяли все сокровища и канаты от мостов для пожертвования в храмы" ("...the Hellenes sailed off to Hellas, and they had taken all the treasures and the cables from the bridges to offer them to sanctuaries...").⁵⁵ Close to this version is G. A. Stratanovsky's translation (1972): "... афиняне отплыли в Элладу. Они взяли с собой среди другой добычи также и канаты от мостов; [эти канаты] они хотели посвятить в храмы" ("... the Athenians sailed to Hellas. They had with them besides other loot the cables

⁴⁵ On further relations between the Athenians and the Persians, see Wiesehöfer 2006: 658 ff. (Thucydides and the Persians); Blösel 2012: 221-222.

⁴⁶ The difference in the actions performed by the Greek allies in this case is very indicative: the slow Spartans returned home, but the enterprising and mobile Athenians set heart on facing the matter out. Thucydides tells of the difference in the politics of the two contending poleis in a well-known passage from Book 1 of *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, putting it in the mouth of the Corinthians: Thuc. 1.70-71, esp. 70.4-5: "They (the Athenians – *A. S.*) are characterized by swiftness, you (the Lacedaemonians – *A. S.*) are inactive. They are never at home, you are never from it: for they hope by their absence to extend their acquisitions, you fear by your advance to endanger what you have left behind. They are swift to follow up a success, and slow to recoil from a reverse..." See commentaries ad loc. and literature: Classen, Steup 1919: 197-198; Gomme 1945: 230; Jaffe 2017: 122. Close to it is the statement made by Thucydides himself without attributing to his heroes (8.96.5) – on the contrast between Athens and Sparta. Cf. Thuc. 1.69.2, 4; 1.84.1.

⁴⁷ On the siege of Sestus by the Athenians, see the recent papers: Vasilev 2015: 212-216.

⁴⁸ See Hdt. 9.114; 9.117; 9.118; 9.119 and 9.121.

⁴⁹ Godley 1969: 299.

⁵⁰ Rawlinson 1909: IV, 284-285.

⁵¹ Braun 1985: II, 341.

⁵² Lange 1885: II, 368.

⁵³ Feix 2001: II, 1265.

⁵⁴ Legrand 2003: IX, 108.

⁵⁵ Mishchenko 1888: II, 377.

from the bridges; they wanted to offer [these cables] to sanctuaries”).⁵⁶

The French translation by P.-H. Larcher goes like this: “Les Athéniens retournèrent, après cette expédition en Grèce avec un riche butin, et consacèrent dans les temples (the Athenian or the Greek temples? – A. S.) les agrès des vaisseaux qui avaient servi aux ponts”⁵⁷ or the English one by G. C. Macaulay: “... they sailed away to Hellas, taking with them, besides other things, the ropes also of the bridges, in order to dedicate them as offerings in the temples...”⁵⁸ I shall adduce another one of French translation: “... ils (les Athéniens – A. S.) reprirent la route de la Grèce, portant avec eux grands trésors et richesses, ensemble l’équipage des ponts, pour les consacrer parmi les temples”.⁵⁹

All these versions suggest not particular Athenian sanctuaries but *certain* Greek temples.

The number of translations could easily be greatly increased. But even a random choice of a dozen available examples of the sentence which we are interested in shows that the interpretations of the ‘addressee’ of τὰ ἱρά where the victors wished to deliver their offerings are different. Pierre Giguet makes an interesting interpretation: “les Athéniens ... pour le consacrer en divers temples” (“to consecrate it [i.e. the cables from Xerxes’ bridges – A. S.] in different temples”).⁶⁰ Could the French scholar have thought that the Athenians had distributed the distinguished trophies of the Persian war among several Hellenic temples? Including the Athenian sanctuaries? – And, again, it should be pointed out that the text of *The Histories* does not make it clear.

V. What temples did the victors make the offering of the cables from the bridges to? Was Delphi the destination?

Over a century ago, R.W. Macon, an English commentator of Herodotus, noted that the new purpose of these τὰ ὄπλα τῶν γεφυρέων was not quite clear since all Athenian temples, likewise the polis itself, lay in ruins.⁶¹

⁵⁶ Stratanovsky 2002: 581.

⁵⁷ Larcher 1850: II, 301.

⁵⁸ Macaulay 1890.

⁵⁹ Saliat 1864: 671.

⁶⁰ Giguet 1886: 553.

⁶¹ “Their (Xerxes’ τὰ ὄπλα τῶν γεφυρέων, taken by the Greeks from Asia Minor – A. S.) fresh destination is not quite clear; the temples of Athens were in ruins, but the city was being rebuilt” (Macon 1908b: 827).

In the middle of the past century, the French archaeologist Pierre Armandry advanced a hypothesis that the cables from the bridges which had been taken in 478 BC from Asia Minor to the Greek continent had been sent to the sanctuary at Delphi.⁶² The inscription on the Athenian portico in Delphi says that the Athenians had dedicated ὄπλα and ἀκρωτήρια (the fragments of the ships) captured from (some) enemies.⁶³ According to P. Armandry, the record of τὰ ἡόπλα on the Athenian Stoa can be tallied with the very τὰ ὄπλα τῶν γεφυρέων mentioned by Herodotus in the finale of *The Histories* (9.121.1). Hence, the fragments of the inscription and the monument itself, according to P. Armandry, date from to the events of the early 470s BC.

This hypothesis had achieved prominence and was supported by W.K. Pritchett,⁶⁴ J.P. Barron⁶⁵ and some other scholars.⁶⁶ J.P. Barron, the author of “The Liberation of Greece” in Volume IV of *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Second edition), argued that part of the war trophies (cables from Xerxes’ bridges and fragments of the enemy’s ships) had decorated the stylobate of the new temple of Athena in Acropolis, but “what is almost certain is that parts of the cables, interspersed with stern-ornaments from the ships destroyed at Mycale, were hung at Delphi on posts erected against the polygonal retaining wall of the temple terrace and protected from the elements by a pretty stoa of the Ionic order”.⁶⁷

Yet it is not clear what time this dedication refers to. J. Walsh had a good reason to point out that if the dedicatory inscription made by the Athenians in Delphi had been made by the victors

⁶² Armandry 1946: 5-8; 1953: 37-121; see also Armandry 1978: 571-586.

⁶³ The text of the inscription and commentary: Meiggs, Lewis 1988: No 25: Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέθεσαν τὴν στοᾶν καὶ τὰ ἡόπλα[α κ]αὶ τὰ κροτήρια ἡελόντες τὸν πολε[μίου].

⁶⁴ Pritchett 1979: 281-282.

⁶⁵ Barron 1988: 620-621.

⁶⁶ For the discussion of the issue of dating the Athenian Stoa in Delphi and the dedicatory inscription, see works by: Armandry 1946 (with the preceding literature from 1881 to 1946); West 1965: 130-131; Armandry 1978: 582-586; Kuhn 1985: 269-287; Walsh 1986: 319-336; Meiggs, Lewis 1988: 53-54; Hansen 1989: 133-134; Immerwahr 1990: 145-146; Miller 1997: 29-41; Armandry 1998: 75-90; Flower, Marincola 2002: 310; Mikalson 2003: 222; Jung 2006: 96-108; Lattimore 2010: 461; Scott 2010: 75, 96; Jonkers 2012: 33-38; Greco 2016: 123-127; Duffy 2016: 533-536.

⁶⁷ Barron 1988: 620 f. (with reference to P. Armandry’s publications).

in the Greek-Persian wars and if these had been *the same very trophies* that the Athenians brought in 478 BC from the Hellespont, the donors would not have failed to indicate that the τὰ ἡόπλα καὶ τὰ κροτέρια had been captured from the Medians,⁶⁸ – to begin with. Second, ὄπλα, referred to in this source,⁶⁹ must mean not ‘gear’, ‘cables’ or ‘ropes’ (as Herodotus had it), but, rather, in its common sense, ‘weapons’.⁷⁰ It would be more logical to assume that in the sanctuary at Delphi, together with the decorations from the captured ships, the armour of the vanquished was dedicated to demonstrate *this* victory to all visitors of this temple. And finally, the main point of the discussion boils down to the following: we do not know which vanquished enemy⁷¹ is alluded to in this inscription.⁷²

The study of the archaeological, epigraphical and art-historical evidence does not allow for the exact dating of either the monument or the event related to this Athenian dedication. Epigraphic analysis⁷³ allows one to assume that the inscription was made between the last third of the 6th century BC and the mid-5th century BC.⁷⁴ Some researchers consider it more likely that the Athenians took the trophies in question not from the Persians but from certain rivals among the Hellenes themselves.⁷⁵

⁶⁸ Walsh 1986: 319-336.

⁶⁹ It is on the grounds that the text of the dedicatory inscription and the penultimate Chapter of Herodotus’ *The Histories* have τὰ ὄπλα that P. Amandry feels justified to establish the date of the construction of the Athenian stoa (Amandry 1946: 6 ss.). “... Je considère comme acquis que ces ἡόπλα (in the text of the inscription – *A. S.*) étaient les câbles des ponts de l’Hellespont, accrochés au mur polygonal, avec les *rostres* des bateaux perses, au retour de la croisière de la flotte, en 478, et que telle est, en conséquence, la date de la construction du portique (Delphes – *A. S.*)” (Amandry 1946: 6); “Aussi est-il naturel que les Athéniens aient consacré à Delphes non pas une statue ou un trépied, mais les câbles eux-mêmes” (Amandry 1946: 7).

⁷⁰ Walsh 1986: 322-323; cf. Greco 2016: 125.

⁷¹ The text of the inscriptions has the word in its plural form – anonymous πολέμιοι.

⁷² Scott 2010: 96, n. 110: “Its (J. Walsh – *A. S.*) reason for dedication, given the problems with date, is uncertain, particularly as its inscription does not name an enemy ([or enemies] whom the Athenians had defeated – *A. S.*)”.

⁷³ Here I rely on the opinion offered by experts who have analyzed this document (the works are cited in note 65).

⁷⁴ In detail: Walsh 1986. See also the Ph.D. thesis by X. S. Duffy 2016: 534-535 + notes 1416 and 1417.

⁷⁵ Different version of dating: Walsh 1986: 321; cf. Amandry 1998; Greco 2016: 124-126. In his article

J. Walsh maintained that the Stoa had been erected in the 450s and he dated this inscription from the times of the First Peloponnesian War. S. Lattimore is also inclined to date this unique epigraphic evidence from the mid-5th century BC (though with some reservations).⁷⁶ O. Hansen put forward a hypothesis that this dedication may have been spurred not by a particular war conflict but by Athenian victories in total.⁷⁷ The text has τῶν πολεμίων – without indicating a particular enemy (or enemies) – and this seems to reinforce O. Hansen’s assumption that this dedication in the sanctuary could have been made to commemorate victories in a series of conflicts⁷⁸ (in the first half of the 5th century BC we know of several victories won by the Athenians).⁷⁹

Thus, the dating of the dedicatory inscription remains an open question. We have no sufficient grounds to believe that τὰ ὄπλα (τῶν γεφυρέων), mentioned by Herodotus, which by the will of Xerxes had once linked Europe and Asia, later became the decoration at the sanctuary of Apollo in Delphi.

VI. The destroyed City of Pallas Athena and the trophies of the War. The destination – Athens?

Which temples were the trophies of the Persian war dedicated as offerings in? The above-cited note made by R.W. Macan (see above, note 61) stands to reason: where were the Athenians shipping the cables of the bridges of the Hellespont

published in 1946 in *BCH* Pierre Amandry cites the versions suggested by scholars, which fell within the range of over a century – between 532 and 429 BC: “huit dates (sic! – *A. S.*) au moins, échelonnées de 530 à 460 av. J.-C., aient pu être assignées à la construction du monument”, – writes the French scholar and completes this list with another probable date – 429 BC (with reference to Pausanias, 10.11.6). Yet, according to P. Amandry, “Aucune n’est pleinement satisfaisante” (Amandry 1946: 1 + note 3).

⁷⁶ Lattimore 2010: 461: “The Athenian Stoa at Delphi – little more than a display case for trophies – was long dated just after the Persian war but now appears to have been built around mid-century, for spoils from fellow Greeks rather than Persians” (with reference to Walsh’s article of 1986).

⁷⁷ Hansen 1989: 133-134.

⁷⁸ In fact, E. Greco called O. Hansen’s version “the bizarre hypothesis” (Greco 2016: 125, n. 31).

⁷⁹ See Amandry 1946: 1 (with reference to sources and literature in n. 3).

if their sanctuaries had been destroyed by the barbarians?⁸⁰ The English commentator makes this explanatory remark with reference to the passage by Thucydides 1.89.3, which says that “For of the encircling wall only small portions were left standing,⁸¹ and most of the houses were in ruins (τοῦ τε γὰρ περιβόλου βραχέα εἰστήκει καὶ οἰκίαι αἱ μὲν πολλαὶ ἐπεπτώκεσαν), only a few remaining in which the chief men of the Persians had themselves taken quarters”.⁸²

Another ancient, later testimony to the damage caused by the Persians in Athens and, for that matter, in the whole of Attica in 480-479 BC which researchers tend to refer to belongs to Diodorus Siculus’ *The Library of History* (11.28.1-6). Drawing upon his own sources, the Sicilian historian pictures a scene of total devastation and destruction of the Athenian polis and khora: “Mardonios in his fury at them laid waste the entire countryside, leveled the city, and totally destroyed any temples that had been left standing” (τὴν χώραν ἅπασαν κατέφθειρε καὶ τὴν πόλιν κατέσκαψε καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ καταλελειμμένα παντελῶς ἐλυμήνατο).⁸³

A recent comment on Book 9 of Herodotus’ *The Histories* made by Michael A. Flower and John Marincola runs: “... Mardonius determined to demolish as much of Athens as he could... Although Herodotus is probably exaggerating for effect, the general picture is confirmed by Thucydides (1.89.3)”.⁸⁴ Even here Herodotus

remains our main source; compare in this regard Peter Funke’s remark: “Unsere Kenntnisse über das wahre Ausmaß der in der Perserkriegszeit angerichteten Verwüstungen halten sich in Grenzen. Sieht einmal von der Schilderung des Aischylos (i.e., his tragedy *The Persians* – A. S.) und den zahlreichen einschlägigen Notizen Herodots ab, aus denen die späteren Autoren weitestgehend schöpfen, so bleiben eigentlich nur noch die archäologischen Befunde, die zwar durchaus eine große Aussagekraft besitzen können, die allerdings kaum ausreichen, um generelle Aussagen zu treffen (with examples and discussion – A. S.). ... Bei der Einschätzung der persischen Zerstörungen in Griechenland bleiben wir daher letztlich doch auf die erwähnten Darlegungen Herodots angewiesen, in denen er nicht müde wird, die Verwüstungen vor allem der griechischen Heiligtümer durch die Perser hervorzuheben”.⁸⁵

R.W. Macan’s remark was repeated, decades later, by P. Amandry (without referring to the English scholar). As was said above, the French scholar himself upheld the “Delphian version” of this dedication. His message is the same: if the Attic temples had been destroyed, if the Acropolis lay in ruins, and the Delian League had not been formed, what sanctuaries could the Athenians send the same very cables of the bridges to in 478 BC?⁸⁶

Telling about the retreat of the barbarians from Attica, Herodotus depicts a horrifying picture of the fire in the City of Pallas.⁸⁷ Aeschylus tells poetically about the devastation of the Attic sanctuaries – burned down temples, ruined altars and smashed sacred idols. In *The Persians* he puts into the mouth of the Shadow of Darius the prophetic words about the punishment awaiting Xerxes’ soldiers for their sacrilegious deeds

⁸⁰ Ferrari 2002: 25: “choreography of ruins”, as the archeologist characterized the aftermath of the massive destruction of Athens by the Persians in 480-479 BC.

⁸¹ After the Persian army had left Athens.

⁸² Thucydides’ work is cited as translated by Ch.F. Smith from the edition: Smith 1956: 151. See commentaries for the passage Thuc. 1.89.3: Classen, Steup 1919: 244-245; Gomme 1945: 256-258; Hornblower 1991: 135-136.

⁸³ Diod. 11.28.6. Diodorus Siculus is cited after the translations by Peter Green from the edition: Green 2006: 85. See Miles 2014: 119: “a furious Mardonius then destroyed all temples in Attica that were still standing; Diodorus specifically refers to the sanctuaries along the coast”.

⁸⁴ Flower, Marincola 2002: 123, ad loc. Hdt. 9.13 – with reference to J.M. Camp 1986 and T.L. Shear 1993. The archeological evidence also speaks of the extent of the destruction in Athens and the damage inflicted by the Persians on the Town, see, e.g.: “some ten wells have been found in Athens which were purposely clogged with dug bedrock, building debris, and potter’s clay at the time of the Persian invasion” (Flower, Marincola 2002: 123). On the Persian debris pits in the Agora: Shear 1993: 383-482; and on the Acropolis: Lindenlauf 1997; see also articles in the new collection Miles 2015.

⁸⁵ Funke 2007: 25, 26.

⁸⁶ Amandry 1946: 6-7: “En 478, quel sanctuaire se prêtait mieux que celui de Delphes à la consécration de l’armature des ponts de Xerxès? L’Acropole est un champ de ruines; les Athéniens, parant au plus pressé, reconstruisent les murs de la ville. La confédération athénienne, dont Délos deviendra le centre religieux, n’est pas encore formée”.

⁸⁷ See the new book by R. Garland *Athens Burning. The Persian Invasion of Greece and the Evacuation of Attica*, which analyzes the scale of destruction of this polis by the Persians: Garland 2017. Also the research by Kienast 1995: 117-133; Briant 2002: 547-550; Mikalson 2003; Holland 2005; Rung 2009: 164-165; Cartledge 2013; Miles 2014; Best 2015: 104; Paga 2015: 117-118, 119, n. 14; Rung 2016; Müller 2016; Wieshöfer 2017; van Rookhuijzen 2018; Sheehan 2018.

(Aesch. *Pers.* 809-814):⁸⁸ “For, on reaching the land of Hellas, restrained by no religious awe, they ravaged the images of the gods and gave their temples to the flames. Altars have been destroyed, statues of the gods have been overthrown from their bases in utter ruin and confusion. Wherefore having evil wrought, evil they suffer in no less measure; and other evils are still in store...”⁸⁹

The anti-Persian ideas cultivated in Hellas during the Greek-Persian wars show the conquering barbarians as miscreants ruthlessly burning down the ancient temples.⁹⁰ The worst sacrilege on the part of the Persians was the destruction of the Athenian Acropolis.⁹¹ “The worst religious crime, especially from the viewpoints of Herodotus and the Athenians, – writes Eduard V. Rung, – was surely the devastation and burning of the sanctuary of Pallas Athena at the Athenian Acropolis,

⁸⁸ Deratani 1946: 11 – On Xerxes condemned by Darius for the sacrilege: “these actions, from the viewpoint of the religions audience of Aeschylus, were deemed a serious crime”; cf. *ibidem*, 15. See Miles: “In Aeschylus’ *Persians* burnt temples are cited as significant factors that led to the defeat of Persia at Salamis, clear sacrilege that brings down severe punishment”, Miles 2014: 112.

⁸⁹ Aeschylus’ *The Persians* is quoted as translated by H.W. Smyth in the edition: Smyth 1922: I, 179, 181.

⁹⁰ Such an attitude is clear and fair enough if to visualize the magnitude of the destruction the Athenians saw upon their return to their home polis. The Persian invaders had razed the temples and statues to the ground. Cf. “After the victories at Salamis and Plataea, Herodotus does not tell us when exactly the Athenians returned to their lands and how they set about rebuilding their city, but we cannot underestimate the psychological effect this would have had on the entire population”, Meineck 2017: 53. But see: “...The exact historicity of such stories is often difficult to assess. [...] However, I have argued that such stories of destruction cannot be taken at face value. The armies under Xerxes’ command had by the time of Herodotus become associated with all kinds of atrocities. Ruined buildings, especially religious buildings, hold a powerful grip on the imagination cross-culturally”; “The idea that not all stories about Persian vandalism are necessarily historical, but reflect a Greek stereotype, is also recognised by Iranologists” (van Rookhuijzen 2018: 297, 298).

⁹¹ See discussions: Shear 1993; Kienast 1995; Kulishova 2001: 277-278; Funke 2007: 26-27, 30; Kousser 2009: 263-282; Miles 2014: 111, 118-119, 123-126; van Rookhuijzen 2017b; van Rookhuijzen 2018: 189-214, 296-298 (on the ‘Persian vandalism’ and the destruction of the Acropolis of Athens and on the turning of the Acropolis into a memorial space of the polis after the invaders had been driven away).

which they committed on the order of King Xerxes in 480 BC (τὸ ἰρὸν σὺλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν πᾶσαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν), having murdered those who took refuge in the sanctuary (τοὺς ἰκέτας ἐφόνευσον) (Hdt. 8.53).⁹² As O. Kulishova remarks,⁹³ “after the destruction of Athens the Greek propaganda must have presented the Persians as” destroyers, robbers, desecrators of shrines, criminals before the Hellenic gods.⁹⁴ Formed in the first half of the 5th century BC, this myth was still topical in Athens a century later, in the mid-4th century BC. The philosopher Plato in his major work *The Laws* (written at the end of his life) expounds on the satrapic nature of the Persian kingdom and Persian despots, characterizing them

⁹² Rung 2009: 165 (is cited here with some clarifications in the Greek text of Herodotus). E.V. Rung selects the examples from *The Histories* about the destruction and the burning of the Greek sanctuaries by the Persians (Rung 2009: 164 ff.). On the burning of the Greek temples, I shall refer to a specific work by Margaret M. Miles 2014 “Burnt Temples in the Landscape of the Past”(113-120). See the recent articles on the topic: Müller 2016: 173-182; van Rookhuijzen 2017b: 27-68; Rung, Chiglintsev 2017: 707, 709-710; van Rookhuijzen 2018: 170 ff., 201 ff., 207 ff., 210 ff. et al.

⁹³ Kulishova 2001: 276-277, when discussing D. Kienast’s work (1995) on the politicization of the national self-conscious of the Greeks during the Persian wars.

⁹⁴ According to P. Funke 2007: 30, “Jedenfalls scheint mir Alles darauf hinzudeuten, dass die Erfahrungen der Brandschatzungen und Verwüstungen in den Jahre 480/79 nicht schon der Bestätigung eines bereits zuvor voll ausgeprägten Feindbildes der Perser als Tempelschänder und Gottesfrevler gleichkamen, sondern dass diese Erfahrungen eigentlich erst die Voraussetzung für die Genese dieses Feindbildes waren. Das persische Zerstörungswerk dieser Jahre, das seinen Höhepunkt mit dem Niederbrennen der Tempel auf der Athener Akropolis erreichte, markierte einen entscheidenden Wendepunkte in der griechischen Wahrnehmung der Perser... Zu einem wichtigen Bestandteil dieses Feindbildes, das bekanntlich auf einen grundlegenden Wandel der griechischen Wahrnehmung des „Barbaren“ ins Negative hinauslief, wurde der Vorwurf der Hierosylia... Kaum ein anderer Vorwurf als der der Hierosylia war daher besser geeignet, dem griechischen Diskurs über die persischen Barbaren polemische Schärfe zu verleihen. So wurde das unabwiesbare Faktum der Tempelzerstörungen während der Perserkriege schon bald nach deren Ende ideologisch umgemünzt und dazu verwandt, die Perser mit dem Verdikt der Tempelschändung und des Gottesfrevels zu belegen und ihnen grundsätzlich eine primär religiös motiviertes Rachedenken zu unterstellen”. On ἱεροσυλία during the Greek-Persian wars (chiefly by Herodotus), e.g., Trampedach 2005: 143 ff., 148-149; Wiesehöfer 2017: 211, 214-218.

in the following way: “[The Persians]... are ready at any time to overturn States and to overturn and bum up friendly nations; and thus they both hate and are hated with a fierce and ruthless hatred” (Pl. *Leg.* 697d).⁹⁵

Sabine Müller speaks in her article about the first commemorative statues of Athenian citizens set up at the Agora, the archaic statues of Harmodios and Aristogeiton destroyed by Xerxes’ troops during the Persian sack of Athens in 480 BC: “this is entirely Greek biased view. In addition, the constant commemoration of the Persian destruction in the Greek collective memory primarily served the construction of Greek and particularly Athenian identity and self-definition. The topics of burnt temples and damaged or stolen statues were useful reminders of Athenian opposition to the threat of tyranny as well as Athens’ role as protector of Greece against foreign enemies, especially the evil from the East. Hence, the Akropolis sack was effectively presented by the Greeks and continuously commemorated as a key event in their history... In consequence, the Persian destruction developed into a topos”.⁹⁶

In 8.50 Herodotus reports word brought by an Athenian that on his way to Greece Xerxes had burned down Thespieae and Plataea, and “the barbarian had already arrived in Attica and was ravaging and burning it (ἤκειν τὸν βάρβαρον ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτὴν πυρπολέεσθαι)”. On another occasion the historian makes Themistocles condemn the unholy Persian King: “a man who esteems alike things sacred and things profane; who has cast down and burnt the very images of the gods themselves” (Hdt. 8.109). The same motif of Athens burned by the barbarians can be found in the Athenians’ refusal to make peace with the Persians: “We shall oppose him unceasingly, trusting in the aid of those gods and heroes whom he has lightly esteemed, whose houses and whose images he has burnt with fire” (Hdt. 8.143) and “The first and chief of these is the burning and destruction of our temples and the images of our gods” (Hdt. 8.144).

Herodotus frequently speaks about the burned idols and temples as the main crime committed by

the Persians and the hindrance to ending the war.⁹⁷ In 479 BC Mardonius, when retreating from Attica, ordered to set fire to the accursed polis (ἐμπρήσας τε τὰς Ἀθήνας),⁹⁸ “... and utterly overthrew and demolished whatever wall or house or temple was left standing”⁹⁹ (καὶ εἴ κού τι ὄρθον ἦν τῶν τειχέων ἢ τῶν οἰκημάτων ἢ τῶν ἱρῶν, πάντα καταβαλὼν καὶ συγχώσας, Hdt. 9.13).¹⁰⁰

The Persian wars had done that. Running parallel to *this* fire is an account in *The Histories*, at the beginning of Chapter 105 of Book 9, of the Hellenes, who after the victory won at the battle of Mycale, burned their ships and the fortification works.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ E.g., Hdt. 8.33; 8.50 (the invaders sacked and burned down the towns in the areas neighbouring Attica); 8.53; 8.54; 8.55; 8.65; 8.109; 8.140; 9.13; 9.65 (“[The Persians] put to the torch the temple [of Demeter] in Eleusis”). See Shear 1993: 383, 411, 413, 415–417, 418, 426–427 (archeological evidence and their interpretation); Ferrari 2002: 11–35; Rung 2009: 164, 166; Miles 2014: 113–120 (with numerous examples from Herodotus’ work and discussion of recent literature); Rung 2016: 168, 171, 173–174; Müller 2016: 173, 178 ff.; Meineck 2017: 52–53; Tuplin 2017: 48–49, n. 74 (but here with inaccurate references to passages from Herodotus’ *The Histories*); Waterfield 2018: 151.

⁹⁸ As H. Stein pointed out, Herodotus in the passage 9.13 means ἄστν (*Unterstadt*), as “Die Akropolis war schon im letzten Herbste verwüstet (c. [Hdt. 8.]53)” (Stein 1893: 131). And others commentaries *ad loc.*: Macan 1908b: 614; How, Wells 1991b: 291; Flower, Marincola 2002: 123 (see above).

⁹⁹ Godley 1969: 171. Hdt. 9.13 – the second, total, destruction of the City of Pallas Athena by the Persians; first – in September 480 BC, and second – midsummer 479 BC; cf. Green 2006: 85, n. 120, *ad loc.* Diod. 11.28.6; Garland 2017.

¹⁰⁰ See Funke 2007: 25–26, Anm. 18: “Inwieweit aber etwa neben der Zerstörung der Stadt Athen auch Attika von den persischen Plünderungen in Mitleidenschaft gezogen wurde, ist nur schwer auszumachen. Man wird jedenfalls die bemerkenswerte Aussage Herodots (9,13,1) ernst zu nehmen haben, dass Mardonios das attische Land ausdrücklich nicht plündern und verheeren ließ, um die Athener doch noch zu einem Bündnis mit den Persern zu bewegen. Ob und in welchem Umfang dann beim eiligen Rückzug der persischen Truppen nach Boiotien neben der endgültigen Brandschatzung der Stadt Athen (Hdt. 9,13,2) doch noch auch Teile Attikas verwüstet wurden, bedarf das Nachweises im Einzelfall” (with literature on the devastation of Attica and the destruction of Athens by the Persians); and also Miles 2014: 118 ff., 123 ff.; Rung 2016: 171–172; Wieshöfer 2017: 214–215, 217–218.

¹⁰¹ Hdt. 9.106: οἱ Ἕλληνες... τὰς νέας ἐνέπρησαν καὶ τὸ τεῖχος ἅπαν... ἐμπρήσαντες δὲ τὸ τεῖχος καὶ τὰς νέας ἀπέπλεον.

⁹⁵ Plato is cited after the translations by R.G. Bury from the edition Bury 1961: I, 237. See Tuplin 2017: 48.

⁹⁶ Müller 2016: 173–202, here 178–179, with reference to the opinion given by R. Kousser 2009: 269 f.: “...a very consistent and frequently replicated literary discourse linking the ruins to memory, with each smoke-scarred temple functioning as a memorial (*hypomnema*) to Oriental violence and impiety”. Cf. Gazzano 2014: 119–162.

After the battle at Mycale, a momentous event took place: instead of returning to Piraeus, the Athenian fleet headed to the north of Aegean Sea for the Hellespont. The Hellenes arrived in Abydos determined to destroy the bridges linking Europe to Asia. This is how Herodotus sees it (9.114), and he adds, “and on account of which especially they had come to the Hellespont (καὶ τούτων οὐκ ἦκιστα εἶνεκεν ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἀπίκοντο)”¹⁰² (cf. Hdt. 9.106). Was it so in reality? The purpose of this march seemed to have been to establish control over this area to allow for an uninterrupted supply of grain¹⁰³ from the Black Sea Region and of other goods needed badly by the Balkan Greeks, the Athenians, in particular.¹⁰⁴ The historian frequently speaks about that, for example, in Hdt. 9.101: “both the islands and the Hellespont were placed before them as prizes of the contest [for the victory in this war]”.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² See the new commentaries to Book 9 of *The Histories*: Flower, Marincola 2002: 300, ad. loc. οὐκ ἦκιστα (Hdt. 9.114).

¹⁰³ On the grain from the Black Sea Region for Athens and the importance of control in the area of the Hellespont, see the collection: Parkins, Smith 1998. Also see literature: Noonan 1973: 231-242; Keen 2000: 63-73; Tiveros 2008: 121-124; Surikov 2010c: 20-48; 2013a: 5, 25, 31, 34-37; 2013b: 30-31, 33 ff., 37-38; Tumans 2014: 81-82, 84; Strogetsky 2014: 246-250.

¹⁰⁴ On the economic and political importance of the Hellespont and the Bosphorus see several recent works: Rubel 2001: 39-51; Tiveros 2008 (based on vast archaeological material and analysis of recent literature); Rubel 2009: 336-355; Surikov 2013b; Leveniotis 2017; Russell 2017: 53-90 (with a review of literature on the topic).

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Hdt. 9.106 and 114. Herodotus speaks about the need for destroying Xerxes' bridge earlier, in Book 8, when relating the events following the Greek victory at Salamis. In 480 BC after the enemy had fled from Hellas, the Athenians were ready to sail to the Hellespont even alone (if the other Greeks had refused to support them) to pursue the barbarian ships and destroy the bridge that linked Europe and Asia: Hdt. 8.108 and 109 (the author speaks about Themistocles' intention, putting it in his mouth); Hdt. 8.110 (in Themistocles' messenger's speech to King Xerxes; Hdt. 8.111 (on the Hellenes resolving not to proceed further in pursuit of the barbarian fleet, allegedly on Themistocles' advice). Thucydides reports that Themistocles had relied on the good will of the Persian King, for it was supposedly he who in 480 BC had stood in the way of breaking the bridge across the Hellespont (1.137.4), and the Athenian historian adds: “the achievement he (Themistocles – *A. S.*) unreasonably attributed to himself” (*sic*: without elucidating substance of the case).

Were the bridges then the principal target for the Greek army on the march north-westward Asia Minor? – Who knows? But I shall note once again that it is what “the Father of History” emphasizes, and here he definitely reports the word of his informer, rather, several informers, surely the Athenians who took part in the legendary expeditions to “seize the cables”. At the conclusion of his work, Herodotus again draws attention of the reader to this – as it seems to us now – principal nuance related to the dedication of τὰ ὅπλα τῶν γεφυρέων.

We can conclude from the text of *The Histories* (though the author does not point it out directly) that the Athenians were carrying the trophies of this war campaign from Asia Minor to the one's fathers τὰ ἰρά. But in the early 470s BC, when the territory of Attica had been just recently liberated from the barbarian conquerors, the local temples had not been restored yet.¹⁰⁶ Years would pass before the Greek sanctuaries and monuments had been reconstructed and decorated, but for “the Father of History” this inconsistency was of minor importance. For Herodotus, as an historian and narrator, of greater importance was to show that the seized cables of the Xerxes' bridges had become *the symbol of the end of the Great War*. So the historian leaves without further elucidation the episode of the dedication of particular trophies to a certain “point of destination”.

VII. Xerxes' bridges and the hybrid of the Persians in Aeschylus' drama

The song about a unique construction erected on Xerxes' command was performed on the stage of the Athenian theatre.¹⁰⁷ The Chorus of Elders

¹⁰⁶ Commentators M.A. Flower and J. Marincola, referring to Pausanias' evidence, note that after the polis had been destroyed by the Persians, “Some temples (Athenian – *A. S.*) may also have survived” (Flower, Marincola 2002: 123). In the first book of his work, the Greek explorer and mythographer only mentions in passing the Athenian “ancient temples” – to the Dioscuri (τὸ δὲ ἱερόν τῶν Διοσκούρων ἐστὶν ἀρχαῖον, 1.18.1) and to Dionysus (τοῦ Διονύσου δὲ ἐστὶ ... τὸ ἀρχαιότατον ἱερόν, 1.20.3). But compare the archeologists' opinion: “... The evidence from this shrine further supports the claims of Herodotus – and bolsters the archaeological evidence from the city – that the walls, the houses, and the temples of Athens were burned during the Persian sack (9.13.2)” (Best 2015: 104, with reference to earlier materials and conclusions by T.L. Shear, *ibidem*, 106, n. 27).

¹⁰⁷ See, e.g., Hammond, Roseman 1996; Frassoni 2006.

constituting the State Council of the Persian in Aeschylus' tragedy are astonished at how the proud King "had bound the sea with fetters" (Aesch. *Pers.* 65-72, 100-106, 126-132):

"The royal armament, dealing destruction to cities, hath ere now passed to the neighbouring land upon the adverse shore, having crossed the firth of Helle,¹⁰⁸ daughter of Athamas, on a bridge of boats made fast by cables, by casting a stout-clamped roadway as a yoke upon the neck of the deep".

[...]

"And they have learned to look upon the domain of the deep when the broad-wayed sea whiteneth to foam beneath the tempest's blast, trusting in their finely wrought cables, and their devices to give passage to their host".

[...]

"For all the men-at-arms, they that urge on steeds and they that march along the plain, have left the city and gone forth, like bees in a swarm, together with the chief captain of the host; and have crossed the spur, projected into the sea and common to either continent, by which both shores are bound by a yoke".¹⁰⁹

Aeschylus does not use the word γέφυρα. While describing the passage constructed by the Persians, the poet uses different words; hic: λινόδεσμοφ σχεδιά πορθμόν ἀμείψας (Aesch. *Pers.* 68-69). This verse has σχεδιά¹¹⁰ – 'a bridge, a pontoon', that is, a bridge spanning the Hellespont that was tied together with flaxen cables (λινόδεσμος).¹¹¹ On other occasions Aeschylus uses the word πόρος (vv. 722; 747 et al.)¹¹² – 'passage' ('a bridge, a place for passage'); λαοπόρος (v. 105-106) – 'a pedestrian passage, a passage for peoples'¹¹³; πορθμός (vv. 69;

722; 799) – 'strait, channel' (ad verbum: 'place for passage/crossing');¹¹⁴ ὄδισμα (v. 71) – 'path, crossing' (about the same Hellespont bridge), etc.

Of interest is a poetic metaphor – a bridge(s) as 'a yoke'¹¹⁵ – occurring in *The Persians* (vv. 71-72): "As a yoke upon // The neck of the deep".¹¹⁶ The word ζυγόν meaning 'yoke, burden' figuratively and concretely,¹¹⁷ here again indicates *the bridge* linking the two continents.¹¹⁸ In *The Persians* the recurrent image of "the yoke of slavery" can be also found in Herodotus' work (7.8γ).¹¹⁹ The historian puts this

literally 'a place/means serving as a vehicle for people', i.e., a 'Bridge'; see Liddell, Scott 1996: 1029, s.v. λαοπόρος.

¹¹⁴ Aesch. *Pers.* 722 and 799: "Ἑλλης πορθμός, i.e., the Hellespont.

¹¹⁵ On the metaphor of 'yoke' in *The Persians* by Aeschylus: Anderson (1972: 166-174, esp. p. 167; Michelini 1982: 80-83; Boedeker 1988: 43-44; Rung 2005: 137; 2009: 155; Dan 2015: 217, 224-225; Bridges 2015: 15-16; Rung, Chiglintsev 2017: 706-707 (in articles – with reference to M. Anderson's article); van Roohuizen 2018: 84-85 (with reference to D. Boedeker and E. Bridges).

¹¹⁶ My translation: "And with many fetters bound it // For a yoke upon the shoulders of the tide (πολύγομοφ ὄδισμα // ζυγόν ἀμφιβαλὼν αὐχένη πόντου)". In this case πολύγομοφ – '[an object] fastened (hammered together) with many nails (wooden or metal) or screws'; here πολύγομοφ ὄδισμα – "stoutly built road", the bridge across the Hellespont built by the Persians with the help of numerous fixing devices (nails/γόμοφοι).

¹¹⁷ At the beginning of the tragedy, the Chorus of the Elders tells about Xerxes' campaign and the King's intention "on Hellas' neck to cast the bond slave's yoke" (ζυγὸν ἀμφιβαλεῖν δούλιον Ἑλλάδι, v. 50); cf. the Chorus's song in the first stasimon of the tragedy (Aesch. *Pers.* 594).

¹¹⁸ On ζυγός and its derivatives in the literature of Classical Greece, with references to our sources, see Anca Dan's article: "... Seulement à l'époque classique on leur attribue un verbe indiquant la jonction, comme ζεύγνυμι. Dans le cas de la traversée du Bosphore-Hellespont par Xerxès, le pont est désigné surtout comme 'attelage' (en grec ζεύγμα et les autres dérivés de la famille de ζυγός). ... Chez Eschyle, le rapprochement des mots désignant la volonté initiale du roi de 'joindre' les deux rivages et les deux parties du monde (ὑποζεύγνυσι, v. 190-192, et ἔξευξεν, v. 722) n'est certainement pas fortuit, mais doit être compris comme un raisonnement grec, qui part d'une formule ambiguë – concernant la construction du pont de navires enchaînés – pour aboutir à une l'image de l'attelage, symbole de l'esclavage", Dan 2015: 224.

¹¹⁹ Powell 1966: 266, s.v. ζυγόν (1). It is interesting to note that of the two instances of Herodotus using this word metaphorically, the second one (Hdt. 8.20.2) also speaks about the "bridge-yoke", made of papyrus, which

¹⁰⁸ The Straits of Hella, i.e. the Hellespont.

¹⁰⁹ Smyth 1922: 115, 117, 119.

¹¹⁰ Verse 69 in *The Persians* is the only occasion on which the playwright uses this word; cf. Wellauer 1831: 254, s.v. Σχεδιά; Linwood 1843: 306, s.v. Σχεδιά. See also van der Meer 2008.

¹¹¹ The same as in Herodotus, who also mentions the cables made of flax by the Phoenicians: λευκόλιον – 'white flax' (cf. here above, ch. III).

¹¹² This word occurs in different meanings in the tragedy *The Persians* 10 times; see Wellauer 1831: 187-188, s.v. Πόρος; Linwood 1843: 278, s.v. Πόρος.

¹¹³ The word λαοπόρος (in the pluralis) is found only in this place in Aeschylus's text and means

device of Aeschylus into the mouth of the Persian King Xerxes, who had set his heart to conquer the “whole Europe” (πάσης τῆς Εὐρώπης) and to put it in fetters (δούλιον ζυγόν).¹²⁰

On the wonderful construction to take peoples across the water (λαοπόροι μηχαναί), the construction that Xerxes managed to “close the mighty Bosphorus” with, the construction, as Aeschylus’ characters believe, could not have been erected without the help of a divine (τις δαίμων) intervention that deprived the proud Persian king of reason. This is what Atossa says answering the questions asked by the Ghost of Darius (Aesch. *Pers.* 718-726):

A t o s s a. Impetuous Xerxes, unpeopling the whole surface of the continent.

D a r i u s. Was it by land or sea that he made this mad emprise, the reckless man?

A t o s s a. By both. There was a twofold front of double armament.

D a r i u s. But how was it that so vast a land force won a passage to the farther shore?

A t o s s a. By artful contrivances he yoked the firth of Helle so as to gain a passage.¹²¹

D a r i u s. What! Did he succeed in closing the mighty Bosphorus?

A t o s s a. Even so. Some one of the powers divine, methinks, assisted him in his intent.

D a r i u s. Alas! ’Twas some mighty power that came upon him so that he lost his sober judgment.

A t o s s a. Aye, since by the issue ’tis plain how great the ruin he has wrought.¹²²

Telling the ghost of her deceased husband about the tragic defeat of his son and his flight from Hellas, the Queen says that Xerxes “Reached

to his joy the bridge yoking the two continents”¹²³ (Aesch. *Pers.* 736: ἄσμενον μολεῖν γέφυραν γαῖν δυοῖν ζευκτηρίαν). Here Aeschylus again uses the word γέφυρα¹²⁴ – “the bridge” which literally “joint the two lands (worlds or continents)” (γέφυραν γαῖν δυοῖν ζευκτηρίαν), that is, Europe and Asia. Aeschylus regarded the bridge across the Hellespont (and this was to be clearly understood by his audience) as a symbol of enthrallment of Europe, its assimilation with Asia dominated by the Persians.¹²⁵

In response to this, the Shadow of Darius condemns the *hybris* of his son,¹²⁶ who had fettered the waters of the Thracian Bosphorus chains, like a slave, and challenged Poseidon himself (Aesch. *Pers.* 744-751): “A son of mine it was who, in his ignorance, brought these things to pass through youthful recklessness; for he conceived the hope that he could by shackles, as if it were a slave, restrain the current of the sacred Hellespont, the Bosphorus, a stream divine; set himself to fashion a roadway of a new order, and, by casting upon it hammer-wrought fetters, made a spacious causeway for his mighty host. Mortal though he was, he thought in his folly that he would gain the mastery over all the gods, aye even

¹²³ Smyth 1922: 173.

¹²⁴ This is the only occasion on which the word γέφυρα occurs in the texts of the extant plays by Aeschylus (*Pers.* 736); cf. Wellauer 1830: 111, s.v. Γέφυρα (‘pons’); Linwood 1843: 71, s.v. Γέφυρα (‘bridge’). For the word γέφυρα occurring in classical literature, I will make a reference to recent works: van der Meer 2008: 305-324; Dan 2015: 224-225, with literature.

¹²⁵ Cf. an opinion expressed by A. Dan 2015: 224-225: “Pour l’Athénien, Xerxès voulait mettre le joug à la Grèce (v. 50), à l’Hellespont (v. 71-72), comme il l’a fait avec toute l’Asie (v. 594). Le pont sur l’Hellespont devient ainsi, en perspective grecque, un symbole de la soumission de l’Europe comme de l’Asie, mise en scène dans le rêve de la reine-mère, Atossa (vv. 186-199; cf. 584-594). En effet, dans la plus ancienne tragédie conservée jusqu’à nous, les deux parties de l’œkoumène archaïque, reconnues comme telles par les Grecs et par les Perses, apparaissent anthropomorphisées pour la première fois, selon le procédé oriental de la personnification des pays et des peuples. Directement liés, le joug des deux parties du monde et celui du Bosphore-Hellespont représentent une des images fortes des discours grecs et romains contre le danger de l’esclavagisme oriental”.

¹²⁶ On Aeschylus’ visualization of the Persian Kings, Darius and Xerxes, see Saïd 1981: 17-38. On the Ghost of Darius’ father discussing the excessive insolence of his son: Griffith 1998: 54-55, 60; Papadimitropoulos 2008: 451-458; Neilson 2016: 378-379. As G. van Steen 2018: 256, notes, “The (ghost of) Darius of Aeschylus shields himself, the Persian dynasty, and Persian culture by attributing full culpability to his son”.

the foreigner, speaking in a barbarian way, cast on the sea: βαρβαρόφωνος ὅταν ζυγὸν εἰς ἄλα βάλῃ βύβλινον κτλ. Bacis’ prophesy which “the Father of History” cites here names the building material for *those very constructions* – βύβλινοσ. Cf. Hdt. 7.25; 7.34; 7.36; and Macan 1908b: 384, ad loc. Hdt. 8.20.2 (see also above, ch. III). On the metaphor of ‘yoke’ in Herodotus’ work: Bridges 2015: 57-59; Rung, Chiglintsev 2017: 706-707, 709-710.

¹²⁰ R.W. Macan briefly comments on passage Hdt. 7.8γ(3): “appears to be an Aischylean reminiscence, *Pers.* 50” (Macan 1908a: 12); cf. commentaries ad loc. Hdt. 7.8γ(3): Stein 1908: 15; How, Wells 1991b: 129.

¹²¹ Aesch. *Pers.* 722: μηχαναῖς ἔζευσεν Ἑλλῆς πορθμόν, ὧστ’ ἔχειν πόρον.

¹²² Smyth 1922: 169 and 171.

over Poseidon. Must this not have been a distemper of the soul that possessed my son?"¹²⁷

The poet understands the defeat of Xerxes as a wrath sent by gods to himself and his people.¹²⁸ This is evident not only from the quoted lines but from the exodus of the drama – in the scene of the lamenting the Chorus of Elders and the Persian King, who appears as miserable, humiliated man, dressed in rags.¹²⁹ Shame had befallen Xerxes because he had trespassed upon the compass of the allowable and stepped beyond the borders of the Hellespont. The wretched Barbarian suffers from his ὕβρις.¹³⁰

In 1988 the English scholar S. D. Goldhill¹³¹ in his article on the ideological and political topicality of Aeschylus' *The Persians* offered an opinion about the importance of the Chorus elucidating matters of fair (and more perfect) Athenian rule. The Chorus of Persian Elders, in answer to the questions asked

¹²⁷ Smyth 1922: 173 and 175.

¹²⁸ Rung 2009: 155-156: "Aeschylus is not only explicit when formulating the idea of punishment but he also calls for retribution. The playwright's work reveals the traces of the Greek, mainly, Athenian, ideology, according to which the Persians' sacrilege in Greece calls for retribution..."; cf. Rung, Chiglintsev 2017: 707, 710. See also Fountoulakis 2017: 104: "The wealth, power, prosperity, ignorance, arrogance and recklessness of Xerxes and his men leads to the creation of a pattern of thought and action, in which *olbos* leads to *hybris* and *hybris* to *ate*, and eventually to *nemesis* and *tisis*. This pattern already occurs in Herodotus 8.56-99, but is more fully developed as a central pattern in Greek tragedy, and of course in the *Persae* (by Aeschylus – A. S.)". See Jouanna 1981: 3-15.

¹²⁹ On the motif of tattered clothes of Xerxes in the finale of this tragedy, see specifically: Anderson 1972; McClure 2006: 71-97; Garvie 2009: 319; Balot 2014: 78-79; Garvie 2014: 111-40, esp. pp. 114-115, 118-126 (the theme *nostos* of Xerxes in Aeschylus' *The Persians*); Bridges 2015: 30-37 + literature; Gazzano 2017: 61.

¹³⁰ On *hybris* see Fisher 1992. On the theme of crime – punishment and the divine justice in Aeschylus' work: Lloyd-Jones 1983: 79-101. Also: Cairns 1996: 1-32; Nielsen 1997: 51-53; Mikalson 2003: 152-155; Irwin 2013 (Herodotus and Thucydides, and "the *hybris* of Theseus"); Papadimitropoulos 2008; Shevtsov 2014; Dan 2015: 223-224, 226-227; Che 2015; Neilson 2016: 374-80 ("His spirit summoned, Darius laments Xerxes' hubris in constructing bridges over the Hellespont. Atossa, significantly, blames those who had encouraged Xerxes to compare himself with his father...", p. 378); Rung, Chiglintsev 2017: 704-705; Gazzano 2017: 59 ss.; Clarke 2018 (part IV, 7[b] "Thinking Big: Imperial Designs and the Problem of Hybris").

¹³¹ Goldhill 1988: 189-193 = in the collection Harrison 2002: Goldhill 2002: 50-61.

by Queen Atossa (Aesch. *Pers.* 230-247) praises the absence of an autocratic king and the priority of the collective will;¹³² the Athenians are hoplites, which makes them powerful, the Athenian polis is rich, but the citizens of the country use this wealth as an agent to serve their safety and not as a luxury. Researchers see in this drama an important aspect of the Hellenes juxtaposing themselves to the barbarian Persians,¹³³ and many regards it as the earliest extant evidence of polarization of the Greek and the barbarian worlds. As notes Edith Hall in *Inventing the Barbarian*, "Aeschylus' *Persae*, which celebrates the victories over Persia, is the earliest testimony to the absolute polarization in Greek thought of Hellene and barbarian, which had emerged at some point in response to the increasing threat posed to the Greek-speaking world by the immense Persian empire",¹³⁴ and L.P. Marinovich (where the author reiterates the opinion offered by E. Hall): "... This tragedy (Aeschylus' *The Persians* – A. S.) is rightly deemed to be the earliest evidence of absolute polarization of Hellenism and Barbarism".¹³⁵

Now many researchers are apt to think that the ethnic and cultural dichotomy "the Greeks – the Non-Greeks" ("us and them") emerged in Hellenes as a result of the Greek-Persian wars.¹³⁶

¹³² Aesch. *Pers.* 242: "Of no man are they called the slaves or vassals" (Smyth 1922: 129); contrary to the Persians, who are slaves of their master.

¹³³ See Michelini 1982; Goldhill 1988; Hall 1989: 10-11, 56-57, 63-64, 69-77, et al.; Georges 1994: 96-102; Rosenbloom 1995: 91-130; Hall 1996; Pelling 1997a: 1-19; Harrison 1998: 69-86; Harrison 2000; Lincoln 2000: 12-20; Kantzios 2004; Rung 2005: 133-144; Rosenbloom 2006; Rung 2009: 116-126; Rosenbloom 2011: 353-381; Balot 2014: 74-81 (discussion of the researchers' opinions of the issue); Lincoln 2011: 526-540; Lincoln 2014: 173-181 (with literature in the notes on pp. 238-243); Fountoulakis 2017: 105; Gazzano 2017: 55-73, esp. pp. 58-61.

¹³⁴ Hall 1989: 57.

¹³⁵ Marinovich 2006: 15. Cf. Rung 2005: 134; 2009: 116-117 (in both cases with reference to E. Hall's opinion), 119, 126, 153 ff. For the review of researchers' stances, see in the recent article: Rung, Chiglintsev 2017: 703, esp. notes 33-36. Also see my article speaking about the origin of the fundamental ethnic and cultural dichotomy the Hellenes – the Barbarians (Self versus Other): Sinitsyn 2015: 193-196; 2017c: 57-60.

¹³⁶ Here I shall confine myself to the very essential list of papers that, in my view, are most telling in the "Hellenes – Barbarians" opposition and in the topic of the making of ethnic identity of the Greeks; and here I realize how subjective and incomplete any selection on this subject can be, see Bacon 1961; Reverdin 1962 (the collection *Grecs et barbares* contains articles by

The dichotomy “the Hellenes – the Barbarians” had been finally formed in the Balkan Greece in the course (or as an outcome) of the intervention of foreigners into Europe, as a hubristic violation by the Persian of the boundaries of continents. For the first time ever, this idea had been translated into the Athenian tragedy bearing a “barbarian” name. One can admit that Aeschylus’ celebrated *The Persians* had a great impact on the making of the social opposition that later became tenable and traditional for the whole Antiquity.¹³⁷ According to S.D. Goldhill, the tragedy *Persians* suggested a warning addressed to the contemporary fellow citizens to make them suppress the ὕβρις that once had brought down the Persian King and his army¹³⁸.

The Persians, part of the tetralogy along with the extinct tragedies *Phineus* and *Glaucus* and the satyr play *Prometheus the Fire-lighter*,¹³⁹

were staged at the Athenian theatre of Dionysus in 472 BC, eight years after the triumph at Salamis, seven years after the pan-Hellenic victory at Plataea and the banishment of occupants from Hellas.¹⁴⁰ Why should this play become topical at the end of the 470s BC? Why the idea of the divine punishment of Xerxes for his ὕβρις was hailed by the Athenian audience (we do know how powerful the effect on the audience was)? Was it so because following the formation of the Delian League (478 BC), in which Athens played the role of a “protagonist”, by the end of the 470s BC it had started to show the first traits of pretention to “great power” status, peculiar to the arrogant polis, and this tragedy could serve as a warning addressed by the playwright to his fellow citizens?¹⁴¹

Aeschylus is a whole human lifespan older than Herodotus. When “the Father of History” was a boy (if to rely on the Ancient tradition, in 479 BC he was hardly over 5 years old), “the Father of Tragedy” had already distinguished himself as a hero in the Greek-Persian wars: he had likely fought in the decisive battles at Salamis and Plataea, and a decade earlier had taken part in the Battle of Marathon.¹⁴² The Athenian playwright belonged to “the mighty, daring tribe” of the victors. The Great tragic historical play created by the veteran of the wars against the Persians and presented to his veteran fellows in arms¹⁴³ is not only (and not so much) an encomium for Salaminomachoi, glorification of the Greek arms and the Athenian state structure, a hymn to the liberty of the Greeks, but also (even to a higher degree) the tragedy of the haughty despot, Xerxes, as it was performed in *The Persians* and how the Athenian audience

H. Schwabl, H. Diller, O. Reverdin, A. Dihle *et al.* and the discussion on the relations between the Greeks and Non-Greeks); Weiler 1968 (together with the previous literature); Diller 1971: 419-50; Bengtson 1974: 158-173; Backhaus 1976: 170-185; Funck 1981; Lévy 1984; Long 1986; Hartog 1988; Lateiner 1989; Georges 1994; Dihle 1994; Battagazzore 1995/1996; Cobet 1996; Rochette 1997; Hall 1997; Coleman, Walz 1997; Cohen 2000; Dubuisson 2001 (with literature); Bichler 2001; Cartledge 2002; Harrison 2002 (the collection of articles on the *Greeks and Barbarians* also includes the republished articles by S. Goldhill, F. Hartog, S. Säid, F. Lissarrague *et al.*); Hall 2002; Lund 2005; Sinitsyn 2006; Domínguez 2006; Sánchez 2007; Mitchell 2007; Sinitsyn 2008; Papadodima 2010; Sinitsyn 2011; Vlassopoulos 2012; Cohen 2012; Sinitsyn 2012b; Skinner 2012; Wiesehöfer 2013; Kim 2013; Basile 2013; Vlassopoulos 2013; Almagor, Skinner 2013; Garland 2014; McPhail 2015; Wiesehöfer 2017: 212 f.; Garsía Alonso 2017; Macale, Mari 2017; Muller 2017; Sinitsyn 2017c (with reference to the previous literature on the topic); Coghlan 2018: 234-236.

¹³⁷ On its influence even outside the Hellenic world, see, for example, Fountoulakis 2017: 104 ff. “In the fifth century, Aeschylus’ *Persae*, along with other texts such as Herodotus’ relevant narratives, contributed to the creation and promotion of an image of Athens as the savior of the Greeks as well as to the consolidation of its hegemonic role in the Greek world after the Persian wars. In later times, the same texts promoted a discourse of ethnicity as well as of military, political and cultural competition between Greeks and non-Greeks” (Fountoulakis 2017: 105). In particular, Andreas Fountoulakis discusses the dependence of the text of Ezekiel on Aeschylus’ *The Persians*.

¹³⁸ Cf. Goldhill 1988 = Goldhill 2002.

¹³⁹ Frag. 430-457a, the edition Mette 1959: 158-166 (XL: *Die Perser-Tetralogie*). See Sommerstein 2008; 2012: 95-107; Smith 2018: 9-53, esp. pp. 10 ff., 31-36.

¹⁴⁰ On the performed and the reperformed *The Persians* in Athens and Sicily: Smith 2018: 12-13. On the reception of Aeschylus in Antiquity and the Byzantine era, see works in *Brill’ Companion*: Kennedy 2018, part 1 “Pre-Modern Receptions”, here, the works by D.G. Smith (in Sicily), D. Rosenbloom (Comedy), D. LaCourse Munteanu (Aristotle), S. Nervegna (in the Hellenistic Period), G.W.M. Harrison (in Rom) and C. Simelidis (in Byzantium).

¹⁴¹ The positions the researchers take (see works mentioned in nn. 132, 134 and 135) regarding political actualization of *The Persians* are different. For example, T. Harrison (2000) sees in this tragedy high appreciation of Athens’ belief in her Imperial project.

¹⁴² Miles 2014: 113: “Since Aeschylus (famously) fought at Marathon and likely Salamis”. The ancient evidence, including the self-epitaph of the tragedian, presents him as a veteran of the Greek-Persian wars. Cf., yet: Lefkowitz 2012.

¹⁴³ Ferrario 2016: 197.

understood it, which could have taught a lesson to Athens, getting all too proud of itself. *The Persians* by Aeschylus may be interpreted as a prophetic admonition to his contemporaries and to posterity.

VIII. Land and Sea (1):

The straits as borders,
their outrunning and punishment

What has been said in the previous chapters (III and VII) about Xerxes' hybriatic aspiration to subdue Europe by spanning the two continents with a bridge is by all means the Hellenic interpretation of the accomplishments of the Persian lord. First of all, undoubtedly, it is the evidence from the time of the Persian invasions in the Balkans and the victories won by the Hellenes: Aeschylus and his audience and, several decades later, Herodotus and his audience/readers. The account of the act of Xerxes' mastering of the Hellespont given in *The Persians* and Herodotus' historical work reflected the Persian view that had been formed in the Attic culture after the Second Graeco-Persian War. Yet these and other performances (both at the theatre – in the ancient Greek tragedy, and at public recitals when Herodotus read his *logoi*) buttressed the ideologeme of presumptuousness and sacrilege of the Great King and contributed to the making of the myth of the otherness of the Barbarian. It was the European, that is, Hellas-minded, interpretation effective in the framework of the ethno-cultural dichotomy “us – them”, “friend – foe”, “the Hellenes – the aliens/*barbaroi*”.¹⁴⁴

The second attempt made by the Persians to conquer European Greece (Xerxes' great campaign) was to bridge the Hellespont by putting a Persian yoke on the strait to link Asia with Europe. But *hybris* accounting for Xerxes' act is a decidedly Greek invention.¹⁴⁵ Recent

¹⁴⁴ See Cobet 1996: 405-419, also see other above-mentioned papers, note 135.

¹⁴⁵ Drawing upon the research into Indo-European mythology and ideology, Dominique Briquel arrives at the conclusion: “... Xerxes, this enemy of the Greeks, as he let his men overcome the resistance of the Hellespont. They could in that way prove they were agreed by the gods and, normally, such a behaviour should have let them to victory in the war in which they were involved... But Greeks, and even a so acute Hellenic observer as Herodotus, were unable to seize the religious meaning of such a behaviour and considered it according to their own concepts: for them, it was nothing else as a sign of contempt of gods, of *hybris*” (Briquel 2016: 56);

research¹⁴⁶ emphasizes the fact that the Persians in no way regarded the punishment of the waters of the Bosphorus as an affront to the divinity, on the contrary, the Iranians themselves interpreted this act not as Xerxes' *hybris* but as his desire to prevail over the evil demon who prevented the righteous King to conquer the world.¹⁴⁷ Yet this issue

and “Several Greek myths or legends can be connected to this old Indo-European model. But it could not help Herodotus or his fellow citizens to understand the real sense of Xerxes' behaviour as he scourged the Hellespont” (Briquel 2016: 58). Also see Ruberto 2011: 41: “Fondendo quanto sappiamo sulla religione mazdea e sulla ideologia regale achemenide, si può, quindi, presumere che ciò che al greco Erodoto parve effetto dell'ira di un barbaro, probabilmente fu il meditato atto di propaganda di un re”.

¹⁴⁶ The following works on the topic seem to be interesting: Briquel, Desnier 1983: 24-30; Frassoni 2006: 105-152; Piras 2011: 111-138; Ruberto 2011: 39-41; Gazzano 2014: 119-162; Dan 2015: 191-235 (a comprehensive discussion of the issue of crossing straits in the Ancient and Oriental traditions); Briquel 2016: 51-60 (the concept of “fire in water” in old Indo-European model); Gazzano 2017: 60 and literature in n. 33. Cf. Coloru 2017: 101, n. 18: “Sul ponte di Serse e le interpretazioni dei rituali compiuti dal re per propiziare la traversata dell'Ellesponto”.

¹⁴⁷ See, for example, the already mentioned article by A. Dan: “Courant du Nord, l'Hellespont pouvait inspirer l'idée d'un danger infernal aussi bien aux Grecs qu'aux Perses: mais là où les Grecs estimaient nécessaire la soumission de l'homme devant les dangers insoutenables de la mer, le Grand Roi s'estimait capable de combattre tout le mal, à l'aide des dieux suprêmes, pour étendre l'empire du bien. Incompris par les Grecs, les Perses étaient coupables de ὑβρις à chaque fois qu'ils combattaient une mer hostile: avec la punition de l'Hellespont, la percée de la montagne Athos par le découpage de la Chersonèse a fait de Xerxès un tyran qui courait à sa perte – la défaite maritime de Salamine” (Dan 2015: 223). And further: “le pont exceptionnel dressé par Xerxès correspondrait à une dimension sacrée de la royauté iranienne: le Grand Roi pouvait soumettre la nature et les hommes, grâce à sa légitimation divine, le *χ'arənah* – littéralement ‘la capacité à assurer l'abondance’. ... Les différentes formes de victoire des rois iraniens sur les eaux symboliseraient donc une nouvelle récupération de la ‘gloire’ et de la reconnaissance d'Apam Napāt, en tant qu'instrument de la souveraineté du bien. En d'autres termes, la nature même se soumettait au possesseur du *χ'arənah*, lui permettant d'accomplir des exploits surhumains – autant d'outrages pour ceux qui les regardaient de l'extérieur, comme c'était le cas de bien de peuples en contact en Asie Mineure” (Dan 2015: 226, with references to the collaborative article by Briquel, Desnier (1983) and other articles by the same authors from the 1980s to the 2000s, which I have failed to find). “Ce que pour les Grecs

(surely of great interest, in terms of differences of interpretations of the same acts from different angles, those of the Greeks and the Persians) lies outside the topic of my immediate concern, which is to understand the symbolic value of τὰ ὄπλα τῶν γεφυρέων of the Persian War.

The issue of the demarcation of boundaries between Europe and Asia (physical, geopolitical, mental, and cultural) in the Ancient world (from the Archaic Greek era to the times of the Roman Empire) also constitutes a special topic, which I shall briefly outline. In the recent two decades, the topic of the history of Euro-Asian borders and of defining Europe has become especially urgent. The reconstruction of the Greek quest for the demarcation of the two continents has been dealt, for example, by V. Musbakhova;¹⁴⁸ different versions of the eastern boundaries of Europe in the Ancient Age are considered in the works by J. Cobet,¹⁴⁹ S. Fischerová,¹⁵⁰ A.C. Rufino,¹⁵¹ and other scholars (not only antiquity researchers).¹⁵²

The dividing line between Europe and Asia has always been (and will remain) conventional, so in different historical periods – from the Antiquity to the end of the Modern Era – it had been perceived differently. The demarcation line had always “fluctuated” winding its way to expand eastward or to

squeeze its territory westward. Sometimes geographers, historians, politologists and culturologists regard *this very line* separating Europe from Asia as “invisible”.¹⁵³ That is, in other words, there is no such thing as a border here, for Europe is an idea.¹⁵⁴ But throughout the history, the mental (invisible, yet significant) border dividing the two continents – the two worlds – had had a physical form, usually determined by the *water* divide between Europe and Asia.¹⁵⁵

It is not an overstatement to say that the literary tradition had linked the key moments in the Ancient history (and not only) to straits – the bridges of the world (“des charnières du monde”), as G. Tolia put it: “Dès l’Antiquité, les Colonnes d’Hercule, le système de l’Hellespont et du Bosphore de Thrace ainsi que le Bosphore Cimmérien (le détroit de Kertch), sont conçus comme des charnières du monde, délimitant les parties qui le composent, l’Afrique, l’Europe et l’Asie”.¹⁵⁶ Among these “charnières du monde”, the Hellespont takes pride of place – the “stormy seas”, one of the most important boundaries; and it has always been regarded as such, even after the Antiquity up to the modern times. The Dardanelles (a new name of the Hellespont) and the Bosphorus are the fateful boundaries, the straits par excellence.¹⁵⁷

apparaissait comme colère, devait être, chez les Iraniens, une violence justifiée du Grand Roi devant les démons du mal, pour l’établissement d’un empire mis sous le signe d’Ahura Mazdā, avec l’aide de Miθra et d’Apām Napāt” (Dan 2015: 227) and “Si les Grecs voient dans la destruction des premiers ponts (across the Hellespont – A. S.) l’accomplissement du rôle défensif que tout fleuve était censé accomplir pour sa communauté, les Perses l’interprètent comme un obstacle démoniaque qui ne peut résister au Grand Roi, chargé d’une mission sacrée” (Dan 2015: 228).

¹⁴⁸ Musbakhova 2014: 75-92 (Hecataeus of Miletus).

¹⁴⁹ Cobet 2008: 407-429; 2010: 37-57 (discussion and literature), also see other articles by Justus Cobet, cited in note 152.

¹⁵⁰ Fischerová 2012: 161-171 (Hippocrates), with literature.

¹⁵¹ Rufino 2014 + specialist literature, pp. 38-39.

¹⁵² See collections Kneissl, Losemann 1998; Cobet, Gethmann, Lau 2000; Pagden 2002; García 2014. Only selected works from the recent years: Jouanna 1994: 21-38; Gauer 1995: 204-215; Cobet 1996: 405-419; Zimmermann 1997: 285-98; Alonso-Núñez 2003: 145-152; Cerere 2006: 127-145; Surikov 2007b: 149-160; Sonnabend 2007: 10, 60 ff., 63 f., 89; Romm 2013: 21-42; Bancalari Molina 2013: 47-58; Kern 2014; Jaroszyński 2016: 205-215; Muller 2017: 26-34; Romney 2017: 862-881; Coghlan 2018.

¹⁵³ See, for example, Elena Rabinovich’s historical and cultural essay, which is entitled precisely “The Invisible Border”: Rabinovich 2007: 267-290.

¹⁵⁴ Many works on this topic have been published in recent years; for example, I shall refer to an article by L. Bekemans 2012: 65-81 (with literature) and the above-mentioned article by A.C. Rufino “La fundamentación clásica de la idea de Europa” (Rufino 2014: 15-39).

¹⁵⁵ Sonnabend 2007: 63 (“Bei der Frage nach den kontinentalen Grenzen ... eine West-Ost-Achse mit den Fixpunkten Mittelmeer, Hellespont (Dardanellen), Phasis und Kaspisches Meer, andererseits eine Nord-Sued-Achse mit dem Tanais (Don), dem Schwarzen Meer, dem Mittelmeer und dem Roten Meer”); Rabinovich 2007; Etkind 2013; Musbakhova 2014: 77 f., 80 f., 83 et al. (“...the search for a physical and necessarily water boundary between Europe and Asia went on during the Modern Age, when the Russian colonialization of Siberia and the Far East had reached the eastern Ocean”, Musbakhova 2014: 80, n. 10, with reference to A. Etkind, who expounded on the travels around Eurasia of a new-European “Ulysses”, a Robinson Crusoe, after the famous literary character from Daniel Defoe’s novel; see Etkind 2013: 48-52, and, largely, Part I “The Non-traditional Orient”, pp. 25-66); Tolia 2017: 130-131, 133-135.

¹⁵⁶ Tolia 2017: 133.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Tolia 2017: 133: “... des Dardanelles et du Bosphore, *Détroits par excellence*, du fait de leur

Andrew Davison in his “Border Thinking on the Edges of the West”¹⁵⁸ speaks about the role the Hellespont played in European culture. The author deliberates on borders and “border thinking” in different historical epochs. He demonstrates, resorting to different case studies, that a border-crossing act usually conceptualizes violence, which is interpreted as a violation of the established order by an entity that has transgressed a physical bordering line (a mythical hero, a people, a state, a ruler or an army). Davison examines references to various ways of crossing the border of the “Western” world: (the Alps, the Taurus mountain range et al.), rivers and straits.¹⁵⁹ The first part of the book focuses on the Hellespont (the Dardanelles) separating “Europe” from “Asia”. Davison, “the inherited classics of the Western tradition constitute as one special liminal space between Europe and Asia – the small waterway known as the Hellespont (literally, Sea of Helle) where significant conflict between warring parties coming from both its shores has occurred and what the texts I examine produce as the division between worlds. ... The Hellespont was not only a key strategic passage in the history of human conflict; going from Sestos in the west or Abydos in the east also figures prominently in the mythopoetic imagination of Western civilization”.¹⁶⁰

The Hellespont is a telling example of a mental perception of a physical border between “civilized” and “barbarian” spaces. In her article on strait borders A. Dan notes: “L’Hellespont ne correspondait à aucune frontière au moment où il était traversé par Xerxès”; yet the researcher immediately specifies that it was the Hellespont that the European

Greeks identified as the eastern border of *their realm*: “Cependant, il est présenté toujours par les Grecs comme limite symbolique majeure de Hellas, au même titre que le Halys ou le Strymon”.¹⁶¹

The concept of the Hellespont as the “major symbolic bounds of Hellas” (in the East, as a water divide between Europe and Asia), as far as we can judge, had remained in force down to the Persian wars, and the “Herodotean Age”, and later.¹⁶² Both “the Father of History” and his audience in the 5th century would have entertained this idea.

Contemporary scholars of Antiquity have frequently discussed the topic of the sea as a barrier (an impediment, a boundary, even an enemy). Rivers, seas and straits as borders (of ‘our’ and ‘their’ worlds),¹⁶³ as well as their overlapping (with inevitable implications for those transgressing them) were significant motifs in Ancient literature from the Archaic times,¹⁶⁴ including classical historiography. The idea of the sea/river as a divider plays a significant role in the works of Herodotus (here “the Father of History” is congruent with the established tradition).

Antonis Tsakmakis and Charalambos Themistokleous in their article published in the collection “Thucydides between History and Literature” express their opinion about transgressing the borders and the ensuing tragic implications (with reference to the sources) as a topos in the Ancient historiographical tradition: transgression of geographic limits usually results in punishment: “a familiar motif in the historiographic tradition, namely the transgression of geographical limits, reference to which is usually connected to a disastrous outcome, especially in Herodotus”.¹⁶⁵

fonction de carrefour des grandes voies de communication maritime et continentale, et de celle d’assise de cités importantes, telles la légendaire Troie mais surtout de Byzance, appelée par la suite Constantinople, puis Istanbul, capitale des empires. Le système complexe formé par la confrontation des façades de la Thrace et de l’Asie Mineure, avec la succession de canaux et de bassins marins unissant la mer Égée et la mer Noire, constitue dans la culture géographique antique une articulation centrale du monde, modèle de démarcation terraquée à partir duquel les Grecs imaginèrent l’agencement de leur univers. ... La fissure du Bosphore et la vallée maritime de l’Hellespont (mais aussi Gibraltar) sont en effet des canaux d’échange entre deux courants, l’un coulant à la surface, l’autre moins abondant et plus chargé de sel qui se meut dans les profondeurs. Leur traversée s’avérait périlleuse et la légende associa leur passage à des mythes ténébreux”.

¹⁵⁸ Davison 2014.

¹⁵⁹ See the review of this book Tolay 2016: 547-548.

¹⁶⁰ Davison 2014: 18.

¹⁶¹ Dan 2015: 226-227.

¹⁶² See about this, and its various aspects, see the above-mentioned works on the Hellespont: Stronk 1998-1999; Keen 2000; Rubel 2001; Frassoni 2006; Rubel 2009; Ruberto 2011; Piras 2011; Rood 2012; Vasunia 2012; Surikov 2013a; Romm 2013; Bancalari Molina 2013; Davison 2014; Dan 2015; Briquel 2016; Minchin 2017; Leveniotis 2017; van Rookhuijzen 2018.

¹⁶³ On hydro-borders as markers of ‘Worlds’ in the eyes of ancient Greeks, see works of Aleksandr Podosinov: Podosinov 2007: 16 ff.; 2011: 345-356; 2012: 83 ff.; 2015: 40-41, 45-46; Podosinov, Dzhakson, Konovalova 2016: 47 ff. Also Dan 2015: 191-235, with literature; Briquel 2016: 51-60; Tolia 2017: 130-138.

¹⁶⁴ Examples of this are found in the works of Homer, Hesiod, Ionic thinkers, etc.

¹⁶⁵ Tsakmakis, Themistokleous 2013: 399. Also here, on the importance of this theme in Polybius’s work: “The importance of this motif in the tradition of Greek historiography is also evident in Polybius”.

Bruce Lincoln is of the same opinion: as to the construction of bridges linking Asia and Europe (in Hdt. 7.33-39), the scholar remarks that Xerxes' attempt to cross the Hellespont was the acme of hybridic folly of the King and the main cause of the Persian disaster.¹⁶⁶ Egidia Occhipinti in his book, the chapter called "The Sea as a Barrier", provides a number of examples of crossing water barriers in *The Histories*.¹⁶⁷ The researcher points out that such crossing always derive from unbridled impertinence (ὕβρις) of the aggressor: "The notion of the river as a limit as well as the topic of the crossing of rivers or branches of sea, such as the Hellespont, are significant motives in Herodotus' narrative; here the idea of crossing of boundaries often hints at the *hybris* of an aggressor and is applied in particular to cases concerning Lydian and Persian territories".¹⁶⁸

See also in *The Tragedy in History* by Flemming A.J. Nielsen: "In Herodotus, too, the Persians' crossing of the Hellespont and the building of Xerxes' bridge are the main events that constitute *hubris* (Hdt. 7.33-36; 7.54-57): Separate lands and continents should not be conjoined or in any other way allowed to mingle. *The account of the Persian defeat ends symbolically with the sacrifice by the Greeks of the torn ropes that for a short and fateful time joined Europe and Asia* (Hdt. 9.121) (*italics mine – A. S.*)".¹⁶⁹

About myths and continents, landscape and omens, barriers and crimes see in *Herodotus and the Topography of Xerxes' Invasion* by Jan Z. van Rookhuijzen: "Clearly, Xerxes was not welcomed by the same divine forces which he tried to appease. They gave Herodotus' readership a religious answer to the question why Xerxes was to fail in his attempts to control Greece. Similarly, the grave of Helle, who was by her tragic death doomed to stay in Europe, was a reminder that the border between Europe and Asia was inviolable. Yet Xerxes ignored the advice that the landscape, and many omens, gave him: by constructing his Hellespont bridges, he connected two continents that should have remained separate".¹⁷⁰ And next: "Xerxes' crossing of

the natural boundary between Asia and Europe was an act of transgression. The fall of Sestos, which was remembered as a reversal of the typical siege story encountered most notably at the Acropolis of Athens, marked the end of Persian domination of Europe".¹⁷¹

Such is the conception of 'crime and punishment' that plays a principal role in the historical epopee by Herodotus. And this, as was shown above, is concordant with the idea expressed by Aeschylus in the historical play *The Persians*.¹⁷²

At the beginning of his narration about the Persian wars, Herodotus, deliberating about the origin of antagonism in the East and The West, sets the two continents, the two lands, in opposition, as diametrically opposed: "Ever since then we have regarded Greeks as our enemies."¹⁷³ The Persians claim Asia for their own, and the foreign nations that dwell in it; Europe and the Greek race they hold to be separate from them" (Hdt. 1.4).¹⁷⁴

At the end of *The Histories* Herodotus repeats his assertion about the whole of Asia (ἡ Ἀσίη πᾶσα) being submitted to the power of the Persians: "The Persians consider all Asia to be theirs and to belong to their reigning king" (Hdt. 9.116). The idea of opposing Asia to Europe, as notes Rung, "runs through the whole of Herodotus' account".¹⁷⁵ Likewise Aeschylus, "the Father of History" sees *this war* as Persian (Asia) aggression against Hellas (Europe)¹⁷⁶ and the struggle of the Hellenes for liberating their native land from the barbarian conquerors.

¹⁷¹ van Rookhuijzen 2018: 289.

¹⁷² Cf. Miles 2014: 113: in of Aeschylus' *The Persians* "The crossing of the natural boundary of the Hellespont (*Pers.* 749-751) and the deliberate sacrilege of burning temples are set in place as reasons for future reprisals. ... The ghost of Darius puts the responsibility squarely on religious violations by the Persians" (with literature in note 2).

¹⁷³ The historian means the Trojan War (Hdt. 1.3 and 4), for which "the Greeks were greatly to blame; for they invaded Asia before the Persians attacked Europe".

¹⁷⁴ Godley 1966: 7.

¹⁷⁵ Rung 2009: 157 (with numerous examples from Herodotus, pp. 157-158). To this the historian remarks: "Yet it is 'the Father of History' who was the pioneer of reconsidering the historical mission of the Greeks to defend not only Hellas itself but also the whole of Europe", Rung 2009: 158.

¹⁷⁶ Hdt. 7.1; cf. Rung 2005: 133 ff.; 2009: 153 ff. – Aeschylus and the poetic tradition of presenting the Greek-Persian wars as aggression committed by Asia against Europe). And Rung 2005: 144 ff.; 2009: 157 ff. – Herodotus and the Greek-Persian wars.

¹⁶⁶ Lincoln 2011: 528, n. 12: "... [Herodotus] treats Xerxes' attempt to bridge the Hellespont as the culminating act of his hybridic folly and the ultimate cause of the Persians' disaster"; and in Lincoln 2014: 239, n. 13.

¹⁶⁷ Occhipinti 2016: 120-130 (Chapter 6. 2); on seas and rivers as barriers in *The Histories* of Herodotus: *ibidem*, 120-123.

¹⁶⁸ Occhipinti 2016: 120.

¹⁶⁹ Nielsen 1997: 52, with references to works by D. Lateiner 1989 and H.R. Immerwahr 1966.

¹⁷⁰ van Rookhuijzen 2018: 89.

IX. Land and Sea (2):

γῆ καὶ θάλασσα in Artabanus' advice
and Herodotus' epilogue

The theme of *the land and the sea* is recurrent in the work by Herodotus. Artabanus' advice given to Xerxes at the Hellespont prior to the march to Hellas illustrates the idea of the sea as a barrier and an enemy.¹⁷⁷ Artabanus warns the King that he has two horrible enemies, “and these two enemies are the land and the sea”.¹⁷⁸ In the name of Artabanus, Herodotus expounds why γῆ καὶ θάλασσα are so very dangerous for the Persian haughty King: “If you gather more, those two things whereof I speak grow yet the more your enemies. These two are the land and the sea. [...] this is how the land is your enemy: if so be that nothing stands in your way to hinder you, the land is the more your enemy the further you advance, with never true knowledge of what lies beyond” (Hdt. 7.49).¹⁷⁹

The King does not accept Artabanus' warning about “the two enemies” (Hdt. 7.50), but “the Father of History” shows that Xerxes himself takes these elemental forces as supernatural.¹⁸⁰

Herodotus' historical work ends with an account of the capture of Artayctes and his son and their cruel deaths (Hdt. 9.118-120 and 122)¹⁸¹ and the advice once given by Artembares, the grandfather of the

¹⁷⁷ Occhipinti 2016: 120–121, citing the passage Hdt. 7.49.

¹⁷⁸ Hdt. 7.47: δύο τὰ μέγιστα πάντων ἐόντα πολεμιώτατα; and Hdt. 7.49: τὰ δὲ δύο ταῦτα ἐστὶ γῆ τε καὶ θάλασσα.

¹⁷⁹ Godley 1968: 363. The motif of *land as an ally* (ξύμμαχος) of the Hellenes, hence, the enemy of the barbarians, runs through Aeschylus' *The Persians*: “For Earth herself fights with him in his fight” (αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ γῆ ξύμμαχος, Aesch. *Pers.* 792); see Deratani 1946: 16.

¹⁸⁰ See, e.g., Hdt. 7.35. Also Pelling 1991: 136-140; Occhipinti 2016: 121, n. 16 (with reference to the cited work by C.B.R. Pelling): “Land and sea are read by Pelling as elemental forces, which Xerxes faces, something supernatural, or even magical”.

¹⁸¹ It is interesting to note that the historian mentions for the first time the execution of Artayctes by the Athenians before he gives an account of the successful construction of the bridge across the Hellespont (Hdt. 7.33). The repetition – bis! – of the execution of the satrap of Sestus seems significant (on his crimes: Hdt. 9.116): he was nailed living to a plank on “the tongue of land where the bridges of Xerxes had been fixed”, the bridge that linked the two continents (Hdt. 7.33 and 9.120). This *repetitio* draws a parallel between the preparation for the barbarian invasion of Hellas and their expulsion by the Greeks from Europe – the beginning and the end of the logos about the great march of the Persians.

very same unholy Artayctes,¹⁸² to the ruler Cyrus the Great (Hdt. 9.122). This “advice about the land” is as follows: “let us now remove out of the little and rugged land that we possess and take to ourselves one that is better. There be many such on our borders, and many further distant; if we take one of these we shall have more reasons for renown” (Hdt. 9.122).¹⁸³

The Persians refused the hybriistic advice given by Artembares to conquer “better lands”, which would bring them greater glory, when Cyrus – this great conqueror, the founder of the great Persian power, the vanquisher of the Greek Ionia – gave a wise warning about the influence of geographical factors on the character of a people.¹⁸⁴ The desire to acquire vast, better, neighbouring (much coveted) lands surely points to ὕβρις. Cyrus fears lest the Persians, if not restricted, should grow soft and lose their former might,¹⁸⁵ that they “should cease to be rulers [of other peoples] and turn into slaves themselves” – this warning is a precept for the future, and, so to say, the (the author's) warning received from the future.

The events of later decades orchestrated by Xerxes, grandson of Cyrus the Great, resulted in the tragedy for the Persian people, who dared, on the command of their king, to put a “yoke” on the Hellespont and conquer the whole of Europe. Declares the Persian King haughtily: “for no land that the sun beholds will lie on our borders, but I will make all to be one country, when I have passed over the whole of Europe (διὰ πάσης διεξελθὼν τῆς Εὐρώπης)” (Hdt. 7.8γ).¹⁸⁶

The liberation of the lands of Hellas from the barbarian yoke ends Herodotus' work, when the Persians had been punished for transgressing the geographical borders of Europe and Asia, the boundaries had been restored and the cables from

¹⁸² Herodotus here (9.120 and 9.122) refers to three generation: grandfather, grandson and great grandson (the father of Artayctes, Cherasmis, is only mentioned in Hdt. 7.78) – the past, the present and the future (the historian does not give the name of Artayctes' son, but says that he was stoned before the eyes of his crucified father: Hdt. 9.120).

¹⁸³ Godley 1969: 301.

¹⁸⁴ See Rosen 2009 – on the issue of interpreting the final chapter of Herodotus' *The Histories* (9.122).

¹⁸⁵ Pelling 2016: 80: “The final chapter of the whole work captures Cyrus' advice *not* to take over a luxurious land, though admittedly that is still because *restraint* (italics mine – A. S.) in that single case is a better path to becoming ‘rulers rather than slaves of others’, the very final words of all (9.122)”.

¹⁸⁶ Godley 1968: 311.

the bridges with which the enemies had tied the two continents were taken by the victorious Greeks on their ships.

Chapter 121 of Book 9 of *The Histories* is the last in Herodotus' study of "great and marvellous deeds done by Greeks and foreigners especially the reason why they warred against each other".¹⁸⁷ As Rung notes regarding Hdt. 9. 121, "a short historical digression (Hdt. 9.122 – *A. S.*) following this passage about the advice which Artembares – grandfather of Artayctes, the commander of the Garrison at Sestus – allegedly gave to Cyrus the Great thereby urging the Persian King to start his conquest¹⁸⁸ is a worthy end of the narration (Hdt. 9.122)".¹⁸⁹ It is clear the advice given by Artembares to Cyrus from the last episode, allegedly occurring in the days of yore, is a work of fiction done by the historian. In my opinion, the last (122) chapter of Herodotus' work should be regarded as an *epilogue*.¹⁹⁰ The final (and principal) dictum thereof serves as a warning about inevitable punishment of anyone – be it a man, ruler, state or people – for one's unruly actions. And I agree with Rung that this warning epilogue is "a worthy end of the account" of the history of τὰ Μηδικά.¹⁹¹

X. Herodotus' heroic epos
on the Greek-Persian wars as an allusion
and/or the author's admonition
to his contemporaries?

The barbarians' hubristic attempts to conquer the whole of Europe (interventions of 490 and

480/79 BC) fell flat, and there were no other marches to the continent of Hellas. The assertion about the end of Persian invasions of Europe after the Persians had been driven out in 479 BC is an evaluating view of the historian of Halicarnassus on the Greek-Persian wars (and highly likely, that of his contemporaries), the view that was formed decades after the triumphal return of the Athenians from the coasts of Asia Minor; this view stems from the 440s-430s BC, when the historian after his roaming the oecumene was working on his heroic epos of the war that had long become a legend. But this story about what sort of people "were those in our time" is addressed to his contemporaries.¹⁹² The epilogue of *The Histories* (Hdt. 9.122) could have been addressed to the Athenians as a warning against the overbearing acts performed by the leaders of *arche*, aiming to spread their power in Hellas and willing to impose their will on the Greek poleis, members of the First Athenian League.¹⁹³

Or (which is not unlikely) as allusions made by the historian, which (according to his design) were to admonish the Hellenes – potential readers of/listeners to *The Histories* – against the danger created not only by Athenian but also Spartan imperialistic claims. Ph. A. Stadter advanced the hypothesis that "the Father of History" tried to warn his Greek fellow countrymen against a possible pan-Hellenic threat of ambitious Sparta.¹⁹⁴ According to

¹⁸⁷ As Hdt. 1. Prooem. and see above, note 3 (with references to the literature).

¹⁸⁸ Herodotus (9.122) with his last sentence points to the fact that "Thereat the Persians saw that Cyrus reasoned better than they, and they departed from before him, choosing rather to be rulers on a barren mountain side than slaves dwelling in tilled valleys", Godley 1969: 301.

¹⁸⁹ Rung 2010: 17.

¹⁹⁰ Cf., however, the opinion offered by a Russian researcher, T. A. Miller 1984: 21: "The account of the events ends (by Herodotus – *A. S.*) with the capture of Sestus by the Athenians in 478 BC (the Greek-Persian wars lasted till 449 BC), and the last chapter of *The Histories* is explanatory rather than concluding, which makes us regard Herodotus' work as *incomplete and aborted* (italics mine – *A. S.*)".

¹⁹¹ On classical historiographic understanding of the Greek-Persian wars and the approaches in the contemporary historiography to the periodization of the Greek-Persian wars, see an interesting article Rung 2010: 12-21, with literature, pp. 28-30.

¹⁹² From new research papers on the audience of Herodotus' contemporaries: Fowler 1996: 62-87 = Fowler 2013: 46-83; Stadter 2012b: 1-3; Munson 2013: 11-13, 25-26; and Dissertation by Ian C. Oliver 2017: 21 ff., 55-63, 113-134, 159 ff., et al. (with literature and discussion).

¹⁹³ Similar assumptions: Rosen 2009. Also I. Surikov: "Athens, for that matter, had followed the same path as the Persians before them: from victories, triumphs, and successes to trials, defeats and fall. Their lot demonstrated the 'fundamental laws of history', as seen by Herodotus, first and foremost, the law of divine retribution for 'excessive' might that engenders arrogant pride (ὑβρις) ... Could it be that Herodotus wished to warn the Athenians, so dear to his heart, against the Persian mistakes?" (Surikov 2010a: 362 = 2011: 278). The idea that the historian in the epilogue wished to warn the haughty Athenians he like so well seems reasonable; as to Surikov's declaration that "the end of *The Histories* (i.e. epilogue in Hdt. 9.122 – *A. S.*) produces an unusual impression of a peculiar 'end of the beginning' (sic! – *A. S.*)", this very impression the colleague has seems really peculiar.

¹⁹⁴ Stadter 2012b: 1-14 (in what follows, references to pages of this book are made in the main text); cf. Stadter 1992: 781-809; 2013: 334-356. See other recent

the American scholar, “Herodotus wanted his hearers or readers not only to learn of the great deeds of the Persian wars, but to consider contemporary events in the light of the past. [...] Herodotus... wanted to suggest that Athens revealed indications of imperialism and had become in a sense the heir of the Persians in their domination of the Aegean. This analysis, however, leaves the impression that the Spartans escaped from this criticism. Instead, I hope to have brought to light the ambivalence which characterises the presentation of Sparta in the *Histories*. With all his great admiration for their courage and their indispensable role in saving Greece from the Persian attack, Herodotus shows another aspect of the Spartans, their imperialism and self-interest”.¹⁹⁵ “... Two episodes that Herodotus places at the centre of a network of events especially reveal to his contemporaries negative aspects of the Spartans and suggest a certain caution concerning Spartan propaganda”.¹⁹⁶

Stadter discusses Herodotus’ historical *logoi*, which, in his opinion, testify to Spartan “imperialism” and “Spartan Imperialists” – Cleomenes, Leonides et al.¹⁹⁷ We have to admit that Stadter’s arguments stand to reason. However, as the scholar believes, “Unfortunately, his (Herodotus – *A. S.*) words fell on deaf ears”.¹⁹⁸

The issue of the deliberate resolve displayed by “the Father of History” is a separate topic, which I am not going to dwell on. But if this interpretation is true, if Herodotus’ work contains various hints and allusions to the danger of “a civil war (στάσις ἔμφυλος) – that is, war among Greeks” for both (the Athenians and the Spartans), we have to admit that Herodotus’ allusions have proved to be *margaritas ante porcos*. R.V. Munson points it out: “[Herodotus] communicates to his fellow-Greeks a lesson about policies and behaviours they should (and presumably could) avoid. It is consistent with the characterization of many warning figures in the *Histories* that Herodotus was not heeded, as subsequent history shows...”¹⁹⁹ Similarly, Josef Wiesehöfer in his recent article remarks on Herodotus’ account of the atrocious, barbarously punishment the Athenians

meted out to Artayctes and his son by in the finale of *The Histories*: “In Herodotus’ view, the Athenians, who were later to gain dominance in the Aegean Sea, thus seem to follow the tracks of the Persians with their despotic conduct”.²⁰⁰

In the last quarter of the century, there has emerged in contemporary historiography a discernible trend in the study of Herodotus and his work. Namely that *The Histories* is, by and large, regarded as a work full of allusive warnings meant for Herodotus’ contemporary audience. The work by “the Father of History” came to be taken as a book about the past aimed at the future to warn the readers/listeners from the Pentecontaetia and the Peloponnesian wars against the growing “imperialism”, which would bring about (or had already brought about by the time Herodotus had completed his work) to great upheavals – ubiquitous *staseis* and the Pan-Hellenic war.

This way or another, but the immediate past history of Hellas, as is related by the “the Aoidos” of the heroic age Persian war, taught the proud-hearted Greeks nothing; the audience Herodotus (may have) appealed to would not hear his “prognostications”. Here I am willing to agree with Ph.A. Stadter, R.V. Munson and other adherents of the view that the ancient historian’s appeal to the warring sides to curb their ambitions was “a lone voice in the wilderness”. Yet, as was said, this is another matter requiring separate discussion.

XI. Conclusions

In this essay I wished to draw attention to the symbol specifically mentioned in the finale of *The Histories*. Herodotus tells that the Athenian heroes on their way back home had many dedicatory gifts with them, but he names only the *cables of the Xerxes bridges*. The historian – hardly likely that he went beyond the evidence supplied by the informers – specifies the ritual nature of these objects. That is so, what mattered was the *symbolic meaning* of the remains of τὰ ὄπλα τῶν γεφυρέων, not their practical use, for the Greeks on their way back to Athens, the Greeks who (at the time when they were interviewed by the historian) were the veterans of the Persian war.²⁰¹ Even more so this detail had

works: Welser 2009: 359–385; Ruffing 2018; Spartan selfishness and imperialism is treated meticulously in the article by Wolfgang Blösel “Herodotus’ Allusions to the Sparta of his Day”, Blösel 2018: 243-264.

¹⁹⁵ Stadter 2012b: 11.

¹⁹⁶ Stadter :2012b: 3.

¹⁹⁷ Stadter 2012b: 3-8.

¹⁹⁸ Stadter 2012b: 12.

¹⁹⁹ Munson 2013: 27 (here with reference to Ph.A. Stadter).

²⁰⁰ Wiesehöfer 2017: 218.

²⁰¹ In the eyes of the Persians (and other peoples of the Orient, for whom Xerxes’ ritual gesture was meant), the Great King’s taming of the Bosphorus also looked *symbolic* (specifically about this, see Briquel, Desnier 1983: 28-29; Dan 2015: 217, 222, 224 and 226;

a symbolic meaning for “the Aoidos” of *that war*, which thereby must have emphasized the final act of banishing the invaders from Europe and the restoration of the borders they had trampled.

Where were these unique trophies kept later: were they left in Athens to be dedicated to their gods years later after the restoration of the temples?²⁰² Or were they taken to Delphi and dedicated to Apollo? – Herodotus does not specify. For the historian (and the audience he aimed at) these details seemed insignificant.

The epic historian selects the evidence gained from different sources according to his vision of the picture of the past, while arranging the war events according to the available information; he invents something as is typical of every artist, but invariably pursues the main course: crime and punishment of the Persian conquerors. The Persians’ hubristic desire to conquer Europe was punished by the gods, and this was translated into the Hellenes’ will to struggle for their land. It is not fortuitous that it is the account of the victorious *nostos* of the heroes of the past with the cables of the Xerxes’ bridges that Herodotus ends his work with. It is a hymn of the liberation of Hellas, and in the end the final chord of the war played by the Athenians.

It is this bombastic note – the tragic punishment of Xerxes and the glorification of the victory won by the Greeks over the intruding barbarians – that the historian, believing his task to be fulfilled, was to finish his work with. Decades earlier, his older contemporary, Aeschylus (*The Persians*), had interpreted the events in the same way. Presumably, in the middle and the second half of the 5th century BC, when Herodotus was working on *The Histories*, this was how the end of the great war was perceived by the contemporaries of “the Father of Tragedy” and “the Father of History”, and by the next generation – Thucydides and his contemporaries.²⁰³

van Rookhuijzen 2018: 83-85 and notes 190, 192, 194), but, as I noted above with references to the literature, *sub specie Persarum*, it was symbolic in a totally different sense. See also Desnier 1995, in the Near East for the crossing of bounds/rivers as the symbolic action.

²⁰² Meineck 2017: 53: “As for the destruction of the Acropolis shrines, we see no major rebuilding there for over 20 years, except the clearing of debris and the building of walls, until the erection of the large bronze statue of Athena Promachus in 458 BCE”. (Also see the above-mentioned literature.)

²⁰³ Thuc. 1.23.1: “The greatest achievement of former times was the Persian war, and yet this was quickly decided in two sea-fights and two land-battles”,

In view of the ambitions Herodotus articulated at the beginning of his work and of the composition of *The Histories*, such a finale seems to bespeak of completeness and integrity of Herodotus’ text constituting a complete work with a prologue (Hdt. 1. Prooem.) and an epilogue (9.122).²⁰⁴ Certain passages of *The Histories* (and, by design, in the epilogue) contain the author’s warning aimed at his contemporaries of the 440s–420s BC, when he was working on his epos.²⁰⁵ By comparing

Smith 1956: 41. Thucydides must have believed that the Persian war ended in 479 BC. Cf. Flower, Marincola 2002: 310, ad loc. Hdt. 9.121.2: “Thucydides begins his digression on the development of Athenian power between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars... with the siege of Sestos, which suggests that he accepted Herodotus’s ending Herodotus, like Thucydides (1.23.1), considered the Persian Wars, strictly speaking, to have ended with Mycale”. The Athenian historian did not include the events of Pentecontaetia (1.89-117) in the period of τὰ Μηδικά/ὁ Μηδικὸς πόλεμος (see Thuc. 1.89.2; cf. also Thuc. 1.18.3; 1.95.7 and 1.97.1). On Thucydides’ account of the Greek-Persian wars, see, for example, Bowie 1993; Rood 1998: 246-254; 1999 141-168; Wiesehöfer 2006: 657-667; Marincola 2007b; Rung 2010: 14-20, 28-29; Stadter 2012a: 40, 42-43, 45, 46 ff. et al.; Zali 2016: 34-58, esp. pp. 35-47.

²⁰⁴ See E. Irwin 2018: 282: “end the ‘Histories’ at the site that marks for some *the symbolic divide between Asia and Europe, bridged by the hybris of Xerxes*, and with the figure of Protesilaus, who as the first Greek of the Trojan War to step on Asian soil and first to die there *recalls the proem’s allusion to that epic campaign* (italics mine – A. S.)”.

²⁰⁵ Contemporary scholars still have doubts as to the time when Herodotus started writing the Histories and when he finished working on them. The work is generally believed to have been completed in the mid 420s; some scholars argue in favour of 414/3 BC; see Fornara 1971a: 25-34; 1971b: 57-64, 75-91; 1981: 149-156; also Raaflaub 1987: 221-248 (with earlier literature); *contra* Cobet 1977: 2-27; 1987: 508-511. For discussion, e.g., Jacoby 1913: 230-232; Todd 1922: 35-36; Pearson 1936: 33-35; Lattimore 1958: 9-21; Cobet 1971: 59-71; Evans 1979: 245-249; 1982: 15-18; Sansone 1985: 1-9; Evans 1987: 226-228; 1988; How, Wells 1991a: 51; Figueira 1993: 139-142 (and literature, p. 140, n. 61); Raaflaub 2002a: 36-37; 2002b: 152-153; Surikov 2011: 272-275, 278-279; Stadter 2012a: 42-43; 2012b: 2-3; Munson 2013: 11-13, 25-26; Raaflaub 2016: 595-596; Pelling 2016: 84; Oliver 2017: 2, 76-77; Harrison, Irwin 2018: 9. Yet Elizabeth Irwin in some of her recent works (e.g., Irwin 2013: 7-84; 2018: 279-334 and 2019) upholds a much later dating of the first *The Histories*. She argues that Herodotus’ work was created during the Peloponnesian wars, that the historian had lived through this war, knew about its outcome and till the end of the war

the Athenian polis to the Persian Power that once had plunged into pernicious arrogance only to take the consequences with a vengeance (which the historian had duly described), Herodotus aimed to identify the signs of *hybris* that had already come in full force; this warning against the Athenian *hybris* may have been aimed at all the Greeks. Or as a warning against the pan-Hellenic threat looming on the opposite side – from the stern bellicose Spartans? Striving to expand its clout, Sparta encouraged the Greeks to join their efforts to counter the Athenian growing imperial claims. The historian may have wished to warn against the danger coming from both hegemon poleis whose contention finally affected the whole of Hellas and divided the Greek world into two parts – the pro-Athenian and the pro-Spartan.

Thus, if my assumptions regarding the symbolic meaning of the cables and bridges in the last chapter of *The Histories* (9.121) and the general speculation about the pathos of the historical and epic work of

kept working on it. The researcher assumes that “there are strong grounds (sic! – *A. S.*) for believing Herodotus’ logos to have been written in response to Thucydides” (Irwin 2013: 9). But the thesis of “response” given by Herodotus to Thucydides seems to carry little credibility. E. Irwin finds relatable pieces in the works of Herodotus and Thucydides and holds that “These parallels, and others like them in the last logos (in Herodotus’ work — *A. S.*), cannot be coincidental” (Irwin 2018 and also Irwin 2019). The coincidences occurring in several passages in the first two *Histories* examined by Irwin seem (not without doubt) relatable, but the question still remains as to whether these “parallels” in Herodotus’ and Thucydides’ works, which Irwin traces, testify to the actual overlapping of their *logoi* and plots? The idea is of certain interest, someone may find it very tempting, but, in my view, the very idea begs the question. Critical remarks on E. Irwin’s hypothesis can be found in reviews of the collection edited by Dunsch, Ruffing 2013; Heubach 2014 (“Diese These, die die Autorin selbst als ‘controversial position’ (S. 9) beschreibt, kann jedoch im Folgenden leider nicht überzeugend belegt werden. ... Doch scheint der Perspektivenwechsel und die Neuordnung der beiden klassischen Historiographen [Herodots und Thukydidēs – *A. S.*] wenig plausibel”); Stronk 2015 (“[Irwin] adduces a considerable amount of evidence, ingenuity, and scholarship, but at the end she fails to completely convince me, though I admit her theory may be appealing to those who believe in multiple layers hidden in the *Histories*”); Haywood 2015: 190 (here is a more restrained response to “Irwin’s ambitious contribution”); also Pelling 2016: 84, n. 44; Rutherford 2018: 10-11 + n. 28. The issue of the dating of the first History also should be classed among the so-called “Herodotean questions”. Again, this is a topic for a separate study.

Herodotus are right, we can be more assured of the fulfilment of the Halicarnassian historian’s design and the completeness of his work on the Great war waged by the Hellenes against the Persians.

Abbreviations

- ABSA – *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, Athens and London.
 AJA – *American Journal of Archaeology*, Boston.
 AJPh – *American Journal of Archaeology*, Baltimore.
 AMA – *Antichnyi mir i arkheologiia (Ancient World and Archaeology)*, Saratov.
 AWE – *Ancient West and East*, Leiden and Boston.
 BCH – *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, Paris.
 BMCR – *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*.
 C&M – *Classica et Mediaevalia revue danoise de philologie et d’histoire*, Aarhus and Copenhagen.
 ClAnt – *Classical Antiquity*, Berkeley.
 CPh – *Classical Philology*, Chicago.
 CQ – *Classical Quarterly*, Oxford.
 CW – *Classical World*, Baltimore.
 GR – *Greece & Rome*, Cambridge.
 GRBS – *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, Durham.
 ICS – *Illinois Classical Studies*, Chicago.
 JDAI – *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, Berlin.
 JHS – *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, London.
 RE – *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Neue Bearbeitung, begonnen von G. Wissowa, Hrsg. von W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, K. Ziegler, Stuttgart – München, 1893-1980.
 RhM – *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Frankfurt am Main.
 TAPA – *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Boston.
 VDI – *Vestnik drevnei istorii (Journal of Ancient History)*, Moscow.

Literature

- Adamik T. 2015. *The preface to Herodotus' Histories, as evidence for the importance of the sea*, *Historika. Studi di Storia Greca e Romana*, 5, 377-386 (URL: www.ojs.unito.it/index.php/historika/article/viewFile/1926/1689).
- Almagor E., Skinner J. (eds.), 2013. *Ancient Ethnograph: New Approaches*, London; New York.
- Alonso-Núñez J.M. 2003. *Herodotus' Conception of Historical Space and the Beginnings of Universal History*. In P. Derow, R. Parker (eds.), *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, Oxford, 145-152.
- Amandry P. 1946. *Le portique des Athéniens à Delphes*, *BCH*, 70, 1, 1-8.
- Amandry P. 1953. *Fouilles de Delphes. T. II. La colonne des Naxiens et le portique des Athéniens*, Paris.
- Amandry P. 1978. *Consécration d'armes galates à Delphes*, *BCH*, 102, 2, 571-586.
- Amandry P. 1998. *Notes de topographie et d'architecture delphiques. X. Le "socle marathonnier" et le trésor des Athéniens*, *BCH*, 122, 1, 75-90.
- Anderson M. 1972. *The Imagery of The Persians*, *GR*, 19, 1, 166-174.
- Andreev Yu.V. 2018. *Istoriia i mif*, St Petersburg.
- Archibald Z.H. 1998. *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace: Orpheus Unmasked*, Oxford.
- Asheri D. 1988. *Erodoto. Le Storie, I, Introduzione generale di D. Asheri, Libro I, La Lidia e la Persia, testo e commento a cura di D. Asheri, traduzione di V. Antelami*, Milano.
- Asheri D. 2007. *[Commentary on Herodotus] Book I*. In D. Asheri, A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, O. Murray, A. Moreno (eds.), with a contribution by M. Brosius, *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, Oxford, 57-218.
- Backhaus W. 1976. *Der Hellenen-Barbaren-Gegensatz und die hippokratische Schrift Περὶ ἀέρων ὑδάτων τόπων*, *Historia*, 25, 2, 170-185.
- Bacon H.H. 1961. *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy*, New Haven.
- Balcer J.M. 1988. *Persian Occupied Thrace*, *Historia*, 37, 1, 1-21.
- Balot R.K. 2014. *Courage in the Democratic Polis: Ideology and Critique in Classical Athens*, Oxford.
- Bancalari Molina A.B. 2013. *Europa en Heródoto: noción y sentido*. In F.V. Cerqueira, A.T.M. Gonçalves, E.B. Medeiros, J.L.L. Brandão (eds.), *Saberes e poderes no Mundo Antigo. Estudos ibero-latino-americanos*, Vol. 1: Dos saberes, Coimbra, 47-58.
- Baragwanath E. 2012. *Returning to Troy: Herodotus and the Mythic Discourse of his own Time*. In E. Baragwanath, M. de Bakker (eds.), *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, Oxford, 287-312.
- Baragwanath E., Bakker M. de (eds.) 2012. *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, Oxford.
- Barron J.P. 1988. *The Liberation of Greece*. In J. Boardman, N.G.L. Hammond, D.M. Lewis, M. Ostwald (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. IV: Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525 to 479 B.C.*, Cambridge, 592-622.
- Basile G.J. 2013. *El término bárbaros: un análisis discursivo de los testimonios tempranos*, *Argos*, 36, 2, 113-134.
- Battegazzore A.M. 1995/1996. *La Dicotomia greco-barbari nella Grecia classica: riflessioni su cause ed effetti di una visione etnocentrica*, *Sandalion. Quaderni di cultura classica, cristiana e medievale*, 18, 5-34.
- Bednarowski K.P. 2009. *Negotiating Dramatic Character in Aeschylean Drama*, Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Texas at Austin (URL: <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/7548/bednarowskik05014.pdf>).
- Bekemans L. 2012. *The Idea of Europe: Identity-building from a Historical Perspective*. In L. Bekemans (ed.), *A Value-Driven European Future*, Brussels et al., 65-81.
- Bengtson H. 1974. *Kleine Schriften zur alten Geschichte*, München.
- Berruecos Frank B. 2015 *Heródoto ὀμηρικώτατος. La transformación del léxico homérico en las Historias de Heródoto*, *Nova tellus*, 32, 2, 115-171 (<http://www.scielo.org.mx/pdf/nova-tell/v32n2/0185-3058-novatell-32-02-00115.pdf>).
- Best J. 2015. *Roadside Assistance: Religious Spaces and Personal Experience in Athens*. In M.M. Miles (ed.), *Autopsy in Athens. Recent Archaeological Research on Athens and Attica*, Oxford; Philadelphia, 100-107.
- Bichler R. 2001. *Herodots Welt: der Aufbau der Historie am Bild der fremden Länder und Völker, ihrer Zivilisation und ihrer Geschichte, 2. Aufl.*, Berlin.
- Bischoff H. 1965. *Sinn des letzten Kapitels*. In W. Marg (ed.), *Herodot. Eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung, 2. Aufl.*, Darmstadt, 681-687.
- Blösel W. 2012. *Thucydides on Themistocles: A Herodotean Narrator?* In E. Foster, D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 215-240.

- Blösel W. 2018. *Herodotus' Allusions to the Sparta of his Day*. In T. Harrison, E. Irwin (eds.), *Interpreting Herodotus*, Oxford, 243-264.
- Boedeker D. 1988. *Protesilaos and the End of Herodotus' Histories*, *ClAnt*, 7, 1, 30-48.
- Boedeker D. 2001. *Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea*. In D. Boedeker, D. Sider (eds.), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, Oxford, 120-134.
- Boedeker D. 2002. *Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus*. In E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. de Jong, H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden: Boston; Köln, 97-116.
- Boedeker D. 2013. *Protesilaos and the End of Herodotus' Histories*. In R.V. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus: Volume I: Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past*, Oxford Readings in Classical Studies; Oxford; New York, 359-378.
- Bowie A.M. 1993. *Homer, Herodotus and the 'Beginnings' of Thucydides' History*. In H.D. Jocelyn (ed.), *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes presented to John Pinsent*, Liverpool, 141-147.
- Bowie A.M. 2012. *Mythology and the Expedition of Xerxes*. In E. Baragwanath, M. de Bakker (eds.), *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, Oxford, 269-286.
- Branscome D. 2013. *Textual Rivals. Self-Presentation in Herodotus' Histories*, Ann Arbor.
- Braun Th. 1985. *Herodot. Das Geschichtswerk*. Aus dem Griechischen übersetzt von Th. Braun; bearbeitet und Anmerkungen von H. Barth; Einleitung von H.-J. Diesner, 2. Aufl., Bd. I-II, Berlin; Weimar.
- Briant P. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, Trans. by P.T. Daniels, Winona Lake, IN.
- Bridges E. 2015. *Imagining Xerxes: Ancient Perspectives on a Persian King*, London et al.
- Briquel D. 2016. *The Punishment of the Hellespont by Xerxes: Perception of Religious Behaviour of the Enemy in Conflict Situations*, *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, 21, 2, 51-60 (URL: https://digilib.phil.muni.cz/bitstream/handle/11222.digilib/136226/1_GraecoLatinaBrunensia_21-2016-2_7.pdf).
- Briquel D., Desnier J.-L. 1983. *Le passage de l'Hellespont par Xerxès*, *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 1, 1, 22-30.
- Bury R.G. 1961. *Plato. Laws, With an English trans. by R. G. Bury. In two volumes, Vol. I: Books 1-6*, Cambridge, MA and London (= London and New York, 1926).
- Cairns D.L. 1996. *Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big*, *JHS*, 116, 1-32.
- Camp J. 1986. *The Athenian Agora: Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens*, London.
- Cartledge P.A. 2002. *The Greeks. A Portrait of Self and Others*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Cerere G. 2006. *Wo Europa endet. Die Grenzen zwischen Europa und Asien im 18. Jahrhundert*. In C. Dipper, U. Schneider (eds.), *Kartenwelten. Der Raum und seine Repräsentation in der Neuzeit*, Darmstadt, 127-145.
- Cartledge P.A. 2013. *After Thermopylae: The Oath of Plataea and the End of the Graeco-Persian Wars*, Oxford.
- Che J. 2015. *Socio-Political Significance of Herodotus' Hybris and Phthonos and Thucydides' Rule of Power and Tyche*, *Athens Journal of History*, 1, 1, 65-81 (URL: <https://www.atiner.gr/journals/history/2015-1-1-5-Che.pdf>).
- Chiasson C.C. 2012. *Herodotus' Prologue and the Greek Poetic Tradition*, *Histos*, 6, 114-143 (URL: <https://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/documents/2012A07ChiassonHerodotusPrologueandtheGreekPoeticTradition11443.pdf>).
- Clarke K. 2017. *Walking through History: Unlocking the Mythical Past*. In G. Hawes (ed.), *Myths on the Map. The Storied Landscapes of Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 14-31.
- Clarke K. 2018. *Shaping the Geography of Empire. Man and Nature in Herodotus' Histories*, Oxford.
- Classen J., Steup J. 1919. *Thukydides. Erklärt von J. Classen, bearbeitet von Ju. Steup. I: Einleitung. Buch I. 6. Aufl. Mit einem Nachwort und bibliographischer Nachträgen von R. Stark*, Berlin.
- Cobet J. 1971. *Herodots Exkurse und die Frage der Einheit seines Werkes*, Wiesbaden.
- Cobet J. 1977. *Wann wurde Herodots Darstellung der Perserkriege publiziert?* *Hermes*, 105, 1, 2-27.
- Cobet J. 1987. *Philologische Stringenz und die Evidenz für Herodots Publikationsdatum*, *Athenaeum* 65, 508-511.
- Cobet J. 1996. *Europa und Asien – Griechen und Barbaren – Osten und Westen. Zur Begründung Europas aus der Antike*, *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 47, 405-419.
- Cobet J. 2008. *Alte Geschichte und Europa*. In U. Ludwig, T. Schilp (eds.), *Nomen et Fraternitas, Festschrift für Dieter Geuenich zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin, 407-429.
- Cobet J. 2010. *Europabilder in der Antike und aus der Antike*. In B. Drechsel, F. Jaeger, H. König, A.-K. Lang, C. Leggewi (eds.), *Bilder von Europa: Innen- und Außenansichten von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Bielefeld.

- Cobet J., Gethmann C.F., Lau D. (eds.) 2000. *Europa. Die Gegenwärtigkeit der antiken Überlieferung*, Aachen.
- Coghlan K. 2018. *Écrire le monde: le discours géographique à l'époque hellénistique d'Ératosthène à Artémidore*, Ph.D. thèse, Québec, Université Laval (URL: <https://corpus.ulaval.ca/jspui/bitstream/20.500.11794/29989/1/34117.pdf>).
- Cohen B. (ed.) 2000. *Not the Classical Ideal. Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*, Leiden; Boston; Köln.
- Cohen B. 2012. *The Non-Greek in Greek Art*. In T.J. Smith, D. Plantzos (eds.), *A Companion to Greek Art, Vol. II*, Malden, MA; Oxford, 456-479.
- Coleman J.E., Walz C.A. (eds.) 1997. *Greeks and Barbarians: Essays on the Interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences for Eurocentrism*, Bethesda; Maryland.
- Coloru O. 2017. *Potere e territorio. Gli Achemenidi nei Geographikà di Strabone*, Electrum, 24, 93-105.
- Corcella A. 2007. [Commentary on Herodotus] *Book IV*. In D. Asheri, A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, O. Murray, A. Moreno (eds.), with a contribution by M. Brosius, *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, Oxford, 543-721.
- Dan A. 2015. *Greks et Perses sur les Détroits: Le démon enchaîné et la démesure du Grand Roi*, AWE, 14, 191-235.
- Davison A. 2014. *Border Thinking on the Edges of the West: Crossing Over the Hellespont*, New York.
- Deratani N.F. 1946. *Eskhil i greko-persidskaia voina*, VDI, 1, 9-19.
- Desmond W. 2004. *Punishments and the Conclusion of Herodotus' Histories*, GRBS, 44, 1, 19-40.
- Desnier J.-L. 1995. *Le passage du fleuve. De Cyrus le Grand à Julien l'Apostat: Essai sur la légitimité du souverain*, Paris.
- Dewald C. 1997. *Wanton Kings, Pickled Heroes, and Gnostic Founding Fathers: Strategies of Meaning at the End of Herodotus' Histories*. In D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, D. Fowler (eds.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, Princeton, 62-82.
- Dewald C. 2013. *Wanton Kings, Pickled Heroes, and Gnostic Founding Fathers: Strategies of Meaning at the End of Herodotus' Histories*. In R.V. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus: Volume I: Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past*, Oxford; New York, 379-401.
- Dihle A. 1994. *Die Griechen und die Fremden*, München.
- Diller H. 1971. *Kleine Schriften zur antiken Literatur*. In H.-J. Newiger, H. Seyffert (eds.), München.
- Domínguez A.J. 2006. *Hellenic Identity and Greek Colonisation*, AWE, 4, 2, 446-457.
- Donelli G. 2016. *Herodotus and Greek Lyric Poetry*. In V. Liotsakis, S. Farrington (eds.), *The Art of History. Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography*, Berlin; Boston, 11-36.
- Dovatur A.I., Kallistov D.P., Shishova I.A. 1982. *Narody nashei strany v "Istorii" Gerodota. Teksty. Perevod. Kommentarii*, Moscow.
- Dubuisson M. 2001. *Barbares et barbarie dans le monde gréco-romain*, L'Antiquité classique, 70, 1-16.
- Duffy X.S. 2016. *Monuments, Memory, and Place: Commemorations of the Persian Wars*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Birmingham (URL: <http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/6727/DuffyX16PhD.pdf>).
- Ehrenberg V. 1968. *From Solon to Socrates: Greek history and civilization during the sixth and fifth centuries B. C.*, London.
- Erbse H. 1962. *Studien zum Verständnis Herodots*, Berlin.
- Etkind A. 2013. *Vnutrenniaia kolonizatsiia. Imperiskii opyt Rossii*, Trans. V. Makarov, Moscow.
- Evans J.A.S. 1979. *Herodotus' Publication Date*, Athenaeum, 57, 245-249.
- Evans J.A.S. 1982. *Herodotus*, Boston.
- Evans J.A.S. 1987. *Herodotus 9.73.3 and the Publication Date of the Histories*, CPh, 82, 3, 226-228.
- Evans J.A.S. 1988. *The Medism of Pausanias: Two Versions*, Antichthon, 22, 1-11.
- Feix J. 2001. *Herodot. Historien. Bücher I-IX*, Herausgegeben und übersetzt von J. Feix. Zweisprachige Ausgabe Griechisch-Deutsch in zwei Bänden. Reihe Tusculum, Bd. II, Düsseldorf.
- Ferrari G. 2002. *The Ancient Temple on the Acropolis at Athens*, AJA, 106, 1, 11-35.
- Ferrario S.B. 2016. *Aeschylus and Western Opera*. In S.E. Constantinidis (ed.), *The Reception of Aeschylus' Plays Through Shifting Models and Frontiers*, Leiden; Boston, 176-212.
- Figueira T.J. 1993. *Excursions in Epichoric History: Aiginetan Essays*, Lanham.
- Fischerová S. 2012. *The Europe-Asia Antithesis in the Hippocratic Treatise On the Airs, Waters, Places as Scientific Image and Mythical Heritage. A Short Chapter from the History of Ideas*, Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica 3, Craecolatina Pragensia, 24, 161-171.
- Fisher N.R.E. 1992. *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece*, Warminster.

- Flower M.A. 1998. *Simonides, Ephorus, and Herodotus on the Battle of Thermopylae*, CQ, 48, 2, 365-379.
- Flower M.A., Marincola J. 2002. *Herodotus. Histories. Book IX*, Cambridge.
- Fornara C.W. 1971a. *Evidence for the Data of Herodotus' Publication*, JHS, 91, 25-34.
- Fornara C.W. 1971b. *Herodotus. An Interpretative Essay*, Oxford.
- Fornara C.W. 1981. *Herodotus' Knowledge of the Archidamian War*, Hermes, 109, 2, 149-156.
- Foster E. 2012. *Thermopylae and Pylos, with Reference to the Homeric Background*. In E. Foster, D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 185-214.
- Fountoulakis A. 2017. *When Dionysus Goes to the East: On the Dissemination of Greek Drama beyond Athens*. In A. Fountoulakis, A. Markantonatos, G. Vasilaros (eds.), *Theatre World. Critical Perspectives on Greek Tragedy and Comedy. Studies in Honour of Georgia Xanthakis-Karamanos*, Berlin; Boston, 75-117.
- Fowler R.L. 1996. *Herodotus and his contemporaries*, JHS, 116, 62-87.
- Fowler R.L. 2013. *Herodotus and his contemporaries*. In R.V. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus: Volume I: Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past*, Oxford; New York, 46-83.
- Frasconi M. 2006. *Serse e l'Ellesponto: da Eschilo (Pers. 745-750) ed Erodoto (VII 35) a Giovenale (X 173-187)*. In O. Vox (ed.), *Memoria di testi teatrali antichi*, Lecce, 105-152.
- Fulham A. 2014. *From the Gates of Ivory: the Dreams of Agamemnon, Xerxes and Artabanus in Homer and Herodotus*, Brock University St. Catharines. Ontario (https://www.academia.edu/16181255/From_the_Gates_of_Ivory_the_Dreams_of_Agamemnon_Xerxes_and_Artabanus_in_Homer_and_Herodotus).
- Funck B. 1981. *Studie zur Bezeichnung βάρβαρος*. In E.C. Welskopf (ed.), *Soziale Typenbegriffe im alten Griechenland und ihr Fortleben in den Sprachen der Welt*, Berlin, 26-51.
- 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*, Köln; Weimar; Wien, 21-34.
- Gainsford P. 2013. *Herodotus' Homer: Troy, Thermopylae, and the Dorians*. In C. Matthew, M. Trundle (eds.), *Beyond the Gates of Fire: New Perspectives on the Battle of Thermopylae*, Barnsley, 117-137.
- Garland P. 2014. *The Wandering Greeks: The Ancient Diaspora from Age of Homer to the Death of Alexander the Great*, Princeton; Oxford.
- Garland R. 2017. *Athens Burning: The Persian Invasion of Greece and the Evacuation of Attica*, Baltimore.
- García G.C. (ed.) 2014. *Historia de Europa (ss. X a. C.-V d. C.)*, Sevilla.
- García Sánchez M. 2007. *Los bárbaros y el Bárbaro: identidad griega y alteridad persa*, Faventia, 29, 1, 33-49.
- García Alonso Ju.L. 2017. *Whoever is not Greek is a Barbarian*. In A.P. Arnaut (ed.), *Identity(ies): A Multicultural and Multidisciplinary Approach*, Coimbra, 9-26.
- Garvie A.F. (ed.) 2009. *Aeschylus, Persae, With Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Garvie A.F. 2014. *Sunshine over the Strymon*. In E. Vintró, F. Mestre, P. Gómez (eds.), *Som per mirar (I). Estudis de filologia grega oferts a Carles Miralles*, Barcelona, 111-140.
- Gasparov M.L. 1989. *Nepolnota i simmetriia v 'Istorii' Gerodota*, VDI, 2, 117-122.
- Gasparov M.L. 1997. *Izbrannye trudy. I: O poetakh*, Moscow.
- Gauer W. 1995. *Europa und Asien. Die Entdeckung der Kontinente und die Einheit der alten Welt*, Saeculum, 46, 204-215.
- Gazzano F. 2014. *Sovrani 'barbari' e santuari greci: qualche riflessione*. In L.R. Cresci (ed.), *Spazio sacro e potere politico in Grecia e nel Vicino Oriente*, Roma, 119-162.
- Gazzano F. 2017. *The King's Speech. La retorica dei re persiani fra Eschilo, Erodoto e Tuciddide*, Electrum, 24, 55-73.
- Georges P. 1994. *Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience: From the Archaic Period to the Age of Xenophon*, Baltimore; London.
- Giguet P. 1886. *Hérodote. Histoires d'Hérodote*, Traduction nouvelle avec une introduction et des notes par P. Giguet. 6e éd., Paris.
- Giraudeau M. 1984. *L'héritage épique chez Hérodote*, Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé, 1, 4-13.
- Godley A.D. 1966. *Herodotus*, With an English transl. by A.D. Godley. In four volumes, Vol. I: Books I and II, Cambridge, MA; London (= London and New York, 1920).
- Godley A.D. 1968. *Herodotus*, With an English transl. by A.D. Godley. In four volumes, Vol. III: Books V-VII, Cambridge, MA; London (= London and New York, 1922).
- Godley A.D. 1969. *Herodotus*, With an English transl. by A.D. Godley. In four volumes,

- Vol. IV: Books VIII-IX, Cambridge, MA; London (= London and New York, 1925).
- Goldhill S. 1988. *Battle Narrative and Politics in Aeschylus' Persae*, JHS, 108, 189-193.
- Goldhill S. 2002. *Battle Narrative and Politics in Aeschylus' Persae*. In T. Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians*, New York, 50-61.
- Gomme A.W. 1945. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 1: Book I*, Oxford.
- Gomperz T. 1883a. *Herodoteische Studien*, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 103, 141-178.
- Gomperz T. 1883b. *Herodoteische Studien*, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse 103: 521-606.
- Gould J. 1989. *Herodotus*, London; New York.
- Greco E. 2016. *With Pausanias (and Others) in the Agora of Sparta*. In A. Ercolani, M. Giordano (eds.), *Submerged Literature in Ancient Greek Culture. The Comparative Perspective*, Berlin; Boston, 113-130.
- Green P. 2006. *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11-12.37.1. Greek History 480-431 B. C. – the Alternative Version*, Trans., with Introduction and Commentary by P. Green, Austin.
- Grethlein J. 2006a. *Das Geschichtsbild der Ilias. Eine Untersuchung aus phänomenologischer und narratologischer Perspektive*, Göttingen.
- Grethlein J. 2006b. *The Manifold Uses of the Epic Past: The Embassy Scene in Herodotus 7. 153-163*, AJPh, 127, 4, 485-509.
- Grethlein J. 2009. *How Not to Do History: Xerxes in Herodotus' Histories*, AJPh, 130, 2, 195-218.
- Grethlein J. 2012. *Homer an Heroic History*. In J. Marincola (ed.), *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, Edinburgh, 14-36.
- Grethlein J. 2014. *The Many Faces of the Past in Archaic and Classical Greece*. In K.A. Raaflaub (ed.), *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*, Blackwell, 234-255.
- Griffith M. 1998. *The King and Eye: The Rule of the Father in Greek Tragedy*, Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, 44, 20-84.
- Hall E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*, Oxford.
- Hall E. 1996. *Aeschylus. Persians*, Warminster.
- Hall J.M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Hall J.M. 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago.
- Hammond N.G.L. 1988. *The Expedition of Xerxes*. In J. Boardman, N.G.L. Hammond, D.M. Lewis, M. Ostwald (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. IV: Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525 to 479 B.C.*, Cambridge, 518-590.
- Hammond N.G.L., Roseman L.J. 1996. *The Construction of Xerxes' Bridge over the Hellespont*, JHS, 116, 88-107.
- Hansen O. 1989. *Epigraphica bellica. On the Dedication of the Athenian portico at Delphi*, C&M, 40, 133-134.
- Harrison T. 1998. *Aeschylus, Atossa and Athens*, Electrum, 2, 69-86.
- Harrison T. 2000. *The Emptiness of Asia: Aeschylus' Persians and the History of the Fifth Century*, London.
- Harrison T. (ed.) 2002. *Greeks and Barbarians*, New York.
- Harrison T., Irwin E. 2018. Introduction. In T. Harrison, E. Irwin (eds.), *Interpreting Herodotus*, Oxford, 1-16.
- Hartog F. 1988. *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, Trans. by J. Lloyd, Berkley; Los Angeles; London.
- Herington J. 1991. *The Closure of Herodotus' Histories*, ICS, 16, 149-160.
- Heubach K. 2014. Rez.: Dunsch, Boris; Ruffing, Kai (hrsg.): *Herodots Quellen – Die Quellen Herodots*. Wiesbaden 2013, *Humanities- Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte*, 01.09.2014 (URL: <http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/rezensionen/2014-3-118>>).
- Hignett C. 1963. *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*, Oxford.
- Holland T. 2005. *Persian Fire: The First World Empire and the Battle for the West*, New York.
- Hornblower S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. III: Books I-III*, Oxford.
- How W.W., Wells J. 1991a. *A Commentary on Herodotus with Introduction and Appendixes. In two volumes. Vol. I: Books I-IV*, Oxford; New York (orig. Oxford, 1912).
- How W.W., Wells J. 1991b. *A Commentary on Herodotus with Introduction and Appendixes. In two volumes. Vol. II: Books V-IX*, Oxford; New York (orig. Oxford, 1912).
- Huber L. 1965. *Herodots Homerverständnis*. In H. Flashar, K. Gaiser (eds.), *Synusia: Festgabe für Wolfgang Schadewaldt zum 15. März 1965*, Pfullingen, 29-52.
- Huxley G.L. 1989. *Herodotus and the Epic*, Athens.
- Haywood J. 2015. Rev.: (B.) Dunsch and (K.) Ruffing Eds. *Herodots Quellen – die Quellen Herodots*. (Classica et orientalia 6). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013, JHS, 135, 190-191.

- Immerwahr H.R. 1966. *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, Cleveland.
- Immerwahr H.R. 1990. *Attic Script. A Survey*, Oxford.
- Irwin E. 2013. 'The Hybris of Theseus' and the Date of the Histories. In B. Dunsch, K. Ruffing (eds.), *Herodots Quellen – Die Quellen Herodots*, Wiesbaden, 7-84.
- Irwin E. 2014. *Ethnography and Empire: Homer and the Hippocratics in Herodotus' Ethiopian Logos*, 3.17-26, *Histos*, 8, 25-75.
- Irwin E. 2018. *The End of the Histories and the End of the Atheno-Peloponnesian Wars*. In T. Harrison, E. Irwin (eds.), *Interpreting Herodotus*, Oxford, 279-334.
- Irwin E. 2019. *Date of Composition*. In C.A. Baron et al. (eds.), *The Herodotus Encyclopedia*, Vols. I-III, Oxford (https://www.academia.edu/34693443/Date_of_Composition_to_appear_in_C_Baron_et_al_ed_The_Herodotus_Encyclopedia_Wiley_).
- Isserlin B.S.J., Jones R.E., Karastathis V., Papamartinopoulos S.P. 2003. *The Canal of Xerxes: Summary of Investigations 1991-2001*, *ABSA*, 98, 369-385.
- Jacoby F. 1913. *Herodotos (7)*, *RE Suppl. II*, 205-520 (repr. in idem (1956) 7-164).
- Jacoby F. 1956. *Griechische Historiker*, Stuttgart.
- Jaroszyński P. 2016. *What is Europe? The Greek Beginnings*, *Studia Gilsoniana*, 5, 1, 205-215.
- Jaffe S.N. 2017. *Thucydides on the Outbreak of War: Character and Contest*, Oxford.
- Jong I.J.F. de. 2001. *The Anachronical Structure of Herodotus' Histories*. In S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Text, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*, Oxford, 93-116.
- Jong I.J.F. de. 2015. Leonidas 'the best of the Achaeans': how Herodotus anchors prose via poetry, *Oikos*. Proceedings of Anchoring Innovation in Antiquity, 17-20 December 2015, 1-11 (URL: https://www.academia.edu/24058732/Leonidas_the_best_of_the_Achaeans_how_Herodotus_anchors_prose_via_poetry).
- Jonkers J.A. 2012. *Athenian Presence in Delphi. An Investigation of the Epigraphical Evidence from Sixth and Fifth Century Delphi and Athens*, Utrecht University. Faculty of Humanities Theses (URL: <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/253279>).
- Jouanna J. 1981. *Les causes de la défaite des Barbares chez Eschyle, Hérodote et Hippocrate*, *Ktéma*, 6, 3-15.
- Jouanna J. 1994. L'image de l'Europe chez Hérodote et Hippocrate: Essai de comparaison. In M. Perrin (ed.), *L'idée de l'Europe au fil de deux millénaires*, Paris, 21-38.
- Jung M. 2006. *Marathon und Plataiai. Zwei Perserschlachten als 'lieux de mémoire'*, Göttingen.
- Kantzios I. 2004. *The Politics of Fear in Aeschylus' Persians*, *CW*, 98, 1, 3-19.
- Keen A.G. 2000. "Grain for Athens": The Importance of the Hellespontine Route in Athenian Foreign Policy before the Peloponnesian War. In G.J. Oliver, R. Brock, T.J. Cornell, S. Hodkinson (eds.), *The Sea in Antiquity*, Oxford, 63-73.
- Kennedy R.F. (ed.) 2018. *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aeschylus*, Leiden; Boston.
- Kern P. 2014. *Zwischen Erweiterung und Ideologisierung: Der Begriff 'Europa' in der Antike und seine Rezeption im 20. Jahrhundert*, Hamburg.
- Kienast D. 1995. *Die Politisierung des griechischen Nationalbewußtseins und die Rolle Delphis im großen Perserkrieg*. In C. Schubert, K. Brodersen (eds.), *Rom und der griechische Osten. Festschrift für Hanno H. Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Münchener Kollegen*, Stuttgart, 117-133.
- Kim H.J. 2013. *The Invention of the 'Barbarian' in Late Sixth-Century BC Ionia*. In E. Almagor, J. Skinner (eds.), *Ancient Ethnography. New Approaches*, London, 25-48.
- Kim L. 2010. *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*, Cambridge.
- Kneissl P., Losemann V. (eds.) 1998. *Imperium Romanum. Studien zur Geschichte und Rezeption. Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 75. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart.
- Konstan D., Raaflaub K.A. (eds.) 2010. *Epic and History*, Chichester; Malden, MA.
- Kousser R. 2009. *Destruction and Memory on the Athenian Acropolis*, *Art Bulletin*, 91, 3, 263-282.
- Krischer T. 1965. *Herodots Prooimion*, *Hermes*, 93, 159-167.
- Krischer T. 1974. *Herodots Schlusskapitel, seine Topik und seine Quellen*, *Eranos*, 72, 93-100.
- Kuhn G. 1985. *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Säulenhalle in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*, *JDAI*, 100, 169-317.
- Kulishova O.V. 2001. *Del'fiiskii orakul v sisteme antichnykh mezhgosudarstvennykh otnoshenii (VII-V vv. do n. e.)*, St Petersburg.
- Lange F. 1885. *Herodotos. Die Geschichte des Herodotos*, Übersetzt von F. Lange; O. Güthling (Hrsg.), Bd. I-II, Leipzig.
- Larcher P.-H. 1850. *Hérodote. L'Histoire*, Texte établi et traduit par P.-H. Larcher avec des notes de S. Bochart et al. T. I-II, Paris.

- Lateiner D. 1989. *The Historical Method of Herodotus*, Toronto.
- Lattimore R. 1958. *The Composition of the History of Herodotus*, CPh, 53, 1, 9-21.
- Lattimore S. 2010. *From Classical to Hellenistic Art*. In K.H. Kinzl (ed.), *A Companion to the Classical Greek World*, Malden, MA; Oxford, 456-479.
- Lefkowitz M.R. 2012. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, 2nd ed., London.
- Legrand Ph.-H. 2003. Hérodote. *Histoires*, Texte établi et traduit par Ph.-H. Legrand, Vol. IX: Livre IX. Calliope. 3e éd., Paris.
- Leveniotis G.A. 2017. *Abydos of Hellespont and its Region*, Thessaloniki.
- Lévy E. 1984. *Naissance du concept de barbare*, *Ktèma*, 9, 1, 5-14.
- Liddell H.G., Scott R. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon, compiled by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott; rev. and augm. throughout by Sir H. S. Jones; with the Assistance of R. McKenzie and with the Cooperation of Many Scholars. New Supplement*, Oxford.
- Lincoln B. 2000. *Death by Water: Strange Events at the Strymon (Persae 492-507) and the Categorical Opposition of East and West*, CPh, 95, 1, 12-20.
- Lincoln B. 2011. On the Sisterhood of Europe and Asia. In F. Prescendi, Y. Volokhine (eds.), *Dans le laboratoire de l'historien des religions. Mélanges offerts à Philippe Borgeaud*, Genève, 526-540.
- Lincoln B. 2014. *Discourse and the Construction of Society. Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual, and Classification*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Lindenlauf A. 1997. *Der Perserschutt der Athener Akropolis*. In W. Höpfner (ed.), *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis. Internationales Symposium vom 7. bis 9. Juli 1995 in Berlin*, Berlin, 46-115.
- Linwood W. 1843. *A Lexicon to Aeschylus. Containing a Critical Explanation of the more Difficult Passages in the Seven Tragedies*, London.
- Lipsius J.H. 1902. *Der Schluss des Herodotischen Werks*, *Leipziger Studien zur klassischen Philologie* 20: 195-202.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. *The Justice of Zeus*, 2nd ed., Berkeley.
- Long T. 1986. *Barbarians in Greek Comedy*, Corbendale.
- López Eire A. 1990. *De Heródoto a Tucídides*, *Studia historica. Historia antiqua*, 8, 75-96.
- Lund A.A. 2005. *Hellenentum und Hellenizität: Zur Ethnogenese und zur Ethnizität der antiken Hellenen*, *Historia*, 54, 1, 1-17.
- Macale L., Mari F. 2017. *Le lexique grec de l'Oriental dans la poésie lyrique archaïque et chez Eschyle, Archimède: Archéologie et histoire ancienne*, 4, 6-18.
- Macan R.W. 1895. *Herodotus. The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books. With Introduction, Notes, Appendices, Indices, Maps. I. 1: Introduction, Text with Notes*, R.W. Macan (ed.), London; New York.
- Macan R.W. 1908a. *Herodotus. The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books. With Introduction, Text, Apparatus, Commentary, Appendices, Indices, Maps. I. 1: Introduction, Book VII (Text and Commentaries)*, R.W. Macan (ed.), London.
- Macan R.W. 1908b. *Herodotus. The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books. With Introduction, Text, Apparatus, Commentary, Appendices, Indices, Maps. I. 2: Books VIII and IX (Text and Commentaries)*, R.W. Macan (ed.), London (repr. Cambridge, 2013).
- Macaulay G.C. 1890. *Herodotus. The History of Herodotus, Trans. by G.C. Macaulay, Vols. I-II*, London; New York.
- Marincola J. 2001. *Greek Historians*, Cambridge.
- Marincola J. 2006. *Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past*. In C. Dewald, J. Marincola (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, Cambridge, 13-28.
- Marincola J. 2007a. *Odyseus and the Historians*, *Syllecta Classica*, 18, 1-79.
- Marincola J. 2007b. *The Persian Wars in Fourth-Century Oratory and Historiography*. In E. Bridges, E. Hall, P.J. Rhodes (eds.), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium*, Oxford, 105-126.
- Marincola J. 2013. *Odyseus and the Historians*. In R.V. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus: Volume II: Herodotus and the World*, Oxford; New York, 109-132.
- Marincola J. 2018. *Ὀμηρικώτατος? Battle Narratives in Herodotus*. In E. Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus: Narrator Scientist, Historian*, Berlin; Boston, 3-24.
- Marinovich L.P. 2006. *Vozniknovenie i evoljutsija doktriny prevoskhodstva grekov nad varvarami*. In L.P. Marinovich (ed.), *Antichnaia tsivilizatsiia i varvary*, Moscow, 5-29.
- McClure L. 2006. *Maternal Authority and Heroic Disgrace in Aeschylus' Persae*, *TAPA*, 136, 71-97.
- McPhail C. 2015. *The Roles of Geographical Concepts in the Construction of Ancient Greek Ethno-cultural Identities, from Homer to Herodotus: An Analysis of the Continents and the Mediterranean Sea* (A thesis submitted fort

- he degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Otago, Dunedin) (<https://ourarchive.otago.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10523/6251/McPhailCameronK2015PhD.pdf?sequence=1>).
- Meiggs R., Lewis D.M. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford.
- Mette H.J. 1959. *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos*, Berlin.
- Meyer E. 1887. *Ist Herodots Geschichte vollendet?* RhM, 42, 146-148.
- Michelini A.N. 1982. *Tradition and dramatic form in the Persians of Aeschylus*, Leiden.
- Mikalson J.D. 2003. *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*, Chapel Hill; London.
- Mikkeli H. 1998. *Europe as an Idea and an Identity*, Basingstoke.
- Miles M.M. 2014. Burnt Temples in the Landscape of the Past. In J. Ker, C. Pieper (eds.), *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World*, Leiden; Boston, 111-145.
- Miles M.M. (ed.) 2015. *Autopsy in Athens. Recent Archaeological Research on Athens and Attica*, Oxford; Philadelphia.
- Miller M.C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC*, Cambridge.
- Miller T.A. 1984. *Grecheskaia epicheskaia istoriographiia*. In M.L. Gasparov (ed.), *Kuznetsova, T.I., Miller, T.A. Antichnaia epicheskaia istoriographiia: Gerodot. Tit Livy*, Moscow, 6-79.
- Minchin E. 2017. *Mapping the Hellespont with Leander and Hero: 'The Swimming Lover and the Nightly Bride'*. In G. Hawes (ed.), *Myths on the Map. The Storied Landscapes of Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 65-82.
- Mishchenko Th. 1888. *Gerodot. Istorija v devjati knigakh*, Trans. by Th.G. Mishchenko. T. II, Moscow.
- Mitchell L.G. 2007. *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Swansea.
- Moles J. 1996. *Herodotus Warns the Athenians*. In F. Cairns, M. Heath (eds.), *Roman Poetry and Prose, Greek Poetry, Etymology, Historiography* (Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar 9) Leeds, 259-284.
- Muller Ya. 2017. *Le monde 'oriental' et ses habitants chez Thucydide*, Archimède: Archéologie et histoire ancienne, 4, 26-34.
- Müller D. 1975. *Von Doriskos nach Therme: Der Weg des Xerxes-Heeres durch Thrakien und Ostmakedonien*, Chiron, 5, 1-11.
- Müller S. 2016. *Arrian, the Second Sophistic, Xerxes, and the Statues of Harmodios and Aristogeiton*. In R. Rollinger, S. Svärd (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Studies in Near Eastern History and Literature*, Münster, 173-202.
- Munson R.V. 2012. *Persians in Thucydides*. In E. Foster, D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 241-275.
- Munson R.V. 2013. *Introduction*. In R.V. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus: Volume I: Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past*, Oxford; New York, 1-28.
- Musbakhova V.T. 2014. *V poiskakh granitsy mezhdu Evropoi i Aziei: Gekatei Miletskii*, Ladoga v kontekste istorii i arkeologii severnoi Evrazii, St Petersburg, 75-92.
- Myres J. 1953. *Herodotus, Father of History*, Oxford.
- Neilson H. 2016. *Herodotus in Fiction: Gore Vidal's Creation*. In J. Priestey, V. Zali (eds.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden; Boston, 367-388.
- Nielsen F.A.J. 1997. *The Tragedy in History. Herodotus and the Deuteronomistic History* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 251; Copenhagen International Seminar, 4; Sheffield).
- Noonan T.S. 1973. *The Grain Trade of the Northern Black Sea in Antiquity*, AJPh, 94, 3, 231-242.
- Occhipinti E. 2016. *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia and Historiography: New Research Perspectives*, Leiden; Boston.
- Oliver I.C. 2017. *The Audiences of Herodotus: the Influence of Performance on the Histories*, Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Colorado at Boulder (URL: https://scholar.colorado.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1012&context=clas_gradetds).
- Paga J. 2015. *The Monumental Definition of Attica in the Early Democratic Period*. In M.M. Miles (ed.), *Autopsy in Athens. Recent Archaeological Research on Athens and Attica*, Oxford; Philadelphia, 108-125.
- Pagden A. (ed.) 2002. *The Idea of Europe. From Antiquity to the European Union*, Cambridge.
- Pallantza E. 2005. *Der Troische Krieg in der nach-homerischen Literatur bis zum 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart.
- Papadimitropoulos L. 2008. *Xerxes' 'hybris' and Darius in Aeschylus' 'Persae'*, Mnemosyne, 61, 3, 451-458.
- Papadodima E. 2010. *The Greek/Barbarian Interaction in Euripides' Andromache, Orestes, Heracleidae: A Reassessment of Greek Attitudes to Foreigners*, Digressus, 10, 1-42.
- Parkins H., Smith C. (eds.) 1998. *Trade, Traders and the Ancient City*, London; New York.
- Pearson L. 1936. *Propaganda in the Archidamian War*, CPh, 31, 1, 33-52.

- Pelling C.B.R. 1991. *Thucydides' Archidamus and Herodotus' Artabanus*. In M.A. Flower, M. Toher (eds.), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell*, London, 120-142.
- Pelling C.B.R. 1997a. *Aeschylus' Persae and History*. In C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, Oxford, 1-19.
- Pelling C.B.R. 1997b. *East is East and West is West – or are they? National Stereotypes in Herodotus*, *Histos*, 1, 51-66.
- Pelling C.B.R. 2006. *Homer and Herodotus*. In M.J. Clarke, B.G.F. Currie, R.O.A.M. Lyne (eds.), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils*, Oxford, 75-104.
- Pelling C.B.R. 2013. *East is East and West is West – or are they? National Stereotypes in Herodotus*. In R.V. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus: Volume II: Herodotus and the World*, Oxford; New York, 360-379.
- Pelling C.B.R. 2016. *Herodotus' Persian Stories: Narrative Shape and Historical Interpretation*, *Syllecta Classica*, 27, 65-92.
- Piras A. 2011. *Serse e la flagellazione dell'Ellesponto. Ideologia avestica e conquista territoriale achemenide*. In A. Panaino, A. Piras (eds.), *Studi iranici ravennati*, Vol. I, Milano, 111-138.
- Podosinov A.V. 2007. *Gidrografia Vostochnoi Evropy v antichnoi i srednevekovoi geokartografii*. In T.N. Dzhakson, T.M. Kalinina, I.G. Konovalova, A.V. Podosinov, "Russkaia reka": *Rechnye puti Vostochnoi Evropy v antichnoi i srednevekovoi geografii*, Moscow, 11-97.
- Podosinov A.V. 2011. *Okean, moria, prolivy i reki v arkhaischeskoi kartine mira drevnikh grekov*. In N.Yu. Gvozdetskaia et al. (eds.), *Visy družby: Sbornik statei v chest' T.N. Dzhakson*, Moscow, 345-356.
- Podosinov A.V. 2012. *Kuda plaval Odissei? O geograficheskikh predstavleniiakh grekov v svyazi s puteshestviiami argonavtov, Gerakla i Odisseia*, *Aristei*, 5, 72-113.
- Podosinov, A.V. 2015. *Kuda plaval Odissei? O geograficheskikh predstavleniiakh grekov arkhaischeskoi epokhi*, Moscow.
- Podosinov A.V., Dzhakson T.N., Konovalova I.G. 2016. *Skifija v istoriko-geograficheskoi traditsii antichnosti i srednikh vekov*, Moscow.
- Pohlenz M. 1937. *Herodot. Der erste Geschichtschreiber des Abendlandes*, Leipzig; Berlin.
- Powell J.E. 1939. *The History of Herodotus*, Cambridge.
- Powell J.E. 1966. *A Lexicon to Herodotus*, 2nd ed., Hildesheim.
- Priestley J. 2014. *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*, Oxford.
- Pritchett W.K. 1979. *The Greek State at War. Part III: Religion*, Berkeley; Los Angeles.
- Raaflaub K.A. 1987. *Herodotus, Political Thought and the Meaning of History*, *Arethusa*, 20, 1-2, 221-248.
- Raaflaub K.A. 2002a. *Herodot und Thukydides. Persischer Imperialismus im Lichte der athenischen Sizilienpolitik*. In N. Ehrhardt, L.-M. Günther (eds.), *Widerstand-Anpassung-Integration. Die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom. Festschrift für Jürgen Deininger*, Stuttgart, 11-40.
- Raaflaub K.A. 2002b. *Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his Time*. In E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. de Jong, H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden; Boston; Köln, 149-186.
- Raaflaub K.A. 2016. *Die große Herausforderung: Herodot, Thukydides und die Erfindung einer neuen Form von Geschichtsschreibung*, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 302, 593-622.
- Rabinovich E.G. 2007. *Mifotvorchestvo klassicheskoi drevnosti: Hymni Homerici. Mifologicheskije ocherki*, St Petersburg.
- Rawlinson G. 1909. *The History of Herodotus*, Trans. from the Ancient Greek by G. Rawlinson (The Historians of Greece, Vols. I-IV). Vol. IV: Book VII, Part II – Book IX, New York.
- Rengakos A. 2001. *Epic Narrative Technique in Herodotus' Histories*, *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca*, 4, 2, 253-270.
- Rengakos A. 2004. *Strategien der Geschichtsdarstellung bei Herodot und Thukydides – oder: Vom Ursprung der Historiographie aus dem Geist des Epos*. In V. Borsò, C. Kann (eds.), *Geschichtsdarstellung: Medien – Methoden – Strategien*, Köln, 73-99.
- Rengakos A. 2006a. *Thucydides' Narrative: The Epic and Herodotean Heritage*. In A. Rengakos, A. Tsakmakis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden; Boston, 279-300.
- Rengakos A. 2006b. *Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Technique on Herodotus and Thucydides*. In F. Montanari, A. Rengakos (eds.), *La poésie épique grecque: Métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire*, Vandœuvres; Genève, 183-209.
- Reverdin O. (ed.) 1962. *Greks et barbares. Fondation Hardt. Vandœuvres, Genève, 4-9 septembre 1961, Six exposés et discussions par H. Schwabl et al.*, Vandœuvres; Genève.

- Rochette B. 1997. *Greco, Romains et Barbares. A la recherche de l'identité ethnique et linguistique des Grecs et des Romains*, Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire, 75, 1, 37-57.
- Romney J.M. 2017. *Herodotean Geography (4. 36-45): A Persian Oikoumenē?*, GRBS, 57, 4, 862-881.
- Rood T. 1998. *Thucydides and his Predecessors*, Histos, 2, 230-267.
- Rood T. 1999. *Thucydides' Persian Wars*. In C.S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, Leiden, 141-168.
- Rood T. 2007a. 'Herodotus'. In I.J.F. de Jong, R. Nünlist (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, Vol. II, Leiden, 115-130.
- Rood T. 2007b. *The Development of the War Monograph*. In J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Vol. I, Malden, MA, 147-158.
- Rood T. 2010. *Herodotus' Proem: Space, Time, and the Origins of International Relations*, Ariadne, 16, 43-74.
- Rood T. 2012. *Herodotus*. In I.J.F. de Jong (ed.), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, Leiden; Boston, 121-140.
- Romm J.S. 2013. *The boundaries of Earth*. In R.V. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus: Volume II: Herodotus and the World*, Oxford; New York, 21-42.
- Rosen K. 2009. *Herodots Schlusskapitel: Ein kritischer Blick auf Athen*. In M. Rathmann (ed.), *Studien zur antiken Geschichtsschreibung*, Bonn, 1-12.
- Rosenbloom D. 1995. *Myth, History, and Hegemony in Aeschylus*. In B. Goff (ed.), *History, Tragedy, Theory*, Austin, 91-130.
- Rosenbloom D. 2006. *Aeschylus. Persians*, London.
- Rosenbloom D. 2011. *The Panhellenism of Athenian Tragedy*. In D. Carter (ed.), *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics*, Oxford, 353-381.
- Rufino A. C. 2014. *La fundamentación clásica de la idea de Europa*. In G.C. García (ed.), *Historia de Europa (ss. X a. C.-V d. C.)*, Sevilla, 15-39.
- Rubel A. 2001. *Hellespontophylakes – Zöllner am Bosporos? Überlegungen zur Fiskalpolitik des attischen Seebundes*, Klio, 83, 1, 39-51.
- Rubel A. 2009. *Die ökonomische und politische Bedeutung von Bosporos und Hellespont in der Antike*, Historia, 58, 3, 336-355.
- Ruberto A. 2011. *Ira del barbaro, giustizia del Re: La punizione dell'Ellesponto fra immaginario greco ed ideologia regale achemenide*, Ancient Society, 41, 31-44.
- Ruffing K. 2018. *Gifts for Cyrus, Tribute for Darius*. In T. Harrison, E. Irwin (eds.), *Interpreting Herodotus*, Oxford, 149-162.
- Rung E.V. 2005. *Predstavlenie persov kak varvarov v grecheskoi literaturnoi traditsii V v. do n. e.*, Mnemon, 4, 125-166.
- Rung E.V. 2009. *Greko-persidskie otnosheniia: politika, ideologiia, propaganda*, Kazan'.
- Rung E.V. 2010. *Podkhody k oboznacheniiu i periodizatsii istoricheskikh sobytii v grecheskoi istoriografii klassicheskogo perioda*, Vestnik Rossiiskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarnogo universiteta, 10, 11-30.
- Rung E.V. 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; Boston, 166-179.
- Rung E.V., Chiglintsev E.A. 2017. *Darius versus Xerxes: Obrazy Dariia I i Kserksa v drevnepersidskikh tekstakh i v proizvedeniiakh Eskhila i Gerodota*, VDI, 3, 696-719.
- Russell T.J. 2017. *Byzantium and the Bosporus. A Historical Study, from the Seventh Century BC until the Foundation of Constantinople*, Oxford.
- Rutherford R.B. 2012. *Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography*. In E. Foster, D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 13-38.
- Rutherford R.B. 2018. *Herodotean Ironies*, Histos, 12, 1-48.
- Saïd S. 1981. *Darius et Xerxès dans les Perses d'Eschyle*, Ktèma, 6, 17-38.
- Saliat P. 1864. *Hérodote. Histoires*, Trans. P. Saliat, Paris.
- Sansone D. 1985. *The Date of Herodotus' Publication*, ICS, 10, 1-9.
- Scardino C. 2007. *Gestaltung und Funktion der Reden bei Herodot und Thukydides*, Berlin.
- Schellenberg R.S. 2009. *"They Spoke the Truest of Words": Irony in the Speeches of Herodotus's Histories*, Arethusa, 42, 131-150.
- Scott M. 2010. *Delphi and Olympia. The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, Cambridge.
- Shear T.L. Jr. 1993. *The Persian Destruction of Athens: Evidence from Agora Deposits*, Hesperia, 62, 4, 383-482.
- Sheehan S. 2018. *A Guide to Reading Herodotus' Histories*, London; New York.
- Shevtsov S.P. 2014. *K voprosu o znachenii termina hybris v arkhaiskii period*, ΣΧΟΛΗ (Schole), 8, 2, 399-417.

- Sinitsyn A.A. 2006. *Gerodot, Sofokl i egipetskie dikovinki (Ob odnom istoriograficheskom mife)*, AMA, 12, 363-405.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2008. *Sofokl i Skifskii logos Gerodota*, Arkheologiya Vostochno-Evropeiskoi stepi, 6, 269-292.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2011. *Po povodu upominaniia v klasicheskoi drame ekstravagantnogo 'bosporskogo fenomena' (Soph. Frag. 473 TrGF 4 Radt)*, Bosporskii fenomen: naselenie, iazyki, kontakty, St Petersburg, 626-641.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2012a. *Fronton i final: po povodu 'zaimstvovaniia' Gerodotom u Fukidida printsipa khronologicheskogo povestvovaniia*. In *Problemy istorii i arkheologii Ukrainy: Materialy VIII mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii* (Kharkov, 9-10 noiabria 2012 g.), Kharkov, 58.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2012b. *ΣΚΥΘΙΣΤΙ ΧΕΙΡΟΜΑΚΡΟΝ. Sophocles' record of the extravagant Scythian custom*, Anabasis, 3, 49-73.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2013a. *Fukidid i Gerodot, povliavshie drug na druga? (po povodu odnogo 'interesnogo niuansa')*, AMA, 16, 39-55.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2013b. *Khronos i topos v trudakh 'otsov istorii': Gerodot i Fukidid*. In *Khudozhestvennyi khronotop: novye podkhody*, St Petersburg, 124-126.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2015. *Greki i monstry: ob antichnoi mifologii kak zanimatel'noi etnogeografii (eskiz na temy puteshestvii i otkrytii)*, Bosporskie issledovaniia, 31, 186-213.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2017a. *Gerodot ob izgnanii varvarov iz Evropy i problema zavershennosti pervoi 'Istorii'*, *Metamorfozy istorii*, 10, 35-92.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2017b. *Kanaty i mosty Greko-persidskoi voiny*. In O.L. Gabelko, E.V. Rung, A.A. Sinitsyn, E.V. Smykov (eds.), *Iranica: Iranskie imperii i greko-rimskii mir v VI v. do n. e.-VI v. n. e.*, Kazan', 137-171.
- Sinitsyn A.A. 2017c. *'Know thyself' through the dialogue with the Others: Formation of the ancient cultural dichotomy 'Hellenes-Barbarians'*, *Judaica Petropolitana*, 8, 48-82.
- Sinitsyn A.A., Surikov I.E. 2019. *Novyi kollektivnyi trud ob "ottse istorii" kak uchenom i rasskazchike*, *Mnemon*, 19, 1, 183-216.
- Skinner J.E. 2012. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus. Greeks overseas*, Oxford.
- Smith C.F. 1956. *Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War*, With an English trans. by C.F. Smith. In four volumes. Vol. I: Books I-II, Cambridge, MA; London.
- Smith D.G. 2018. *The Reception of Aeschylus in Sicily*. In R.F. Kennedy (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aeschylus*, Leiden; Boston, 9-53.
- Smyth H.W. 1922. *Aeschylus, with an English translation by H.W. Smyth. In two volumes. Vol. I: Suppliant Maidens, Persians, Prometheus, Seven against Thebes*, London; New York.
- Sommerstein A.H. 2008. *Aeschylus Fragments*, ed. and trans. A. H. Sommerstein, Cambridge, MA.
- Sommerstein A.H. 2012. *The Persian War Tetralogy of Aeschylus*. In D. Rosenbloom, J. Davidson (eds.), *Greek Drama IV: Texts, Contexts, Performance*, Oxford, 95-107.
- Sonnabend H. 2007. *Die Grenzen der Welt. Geographische Vorstellungen der Antike*, Darmstadt.
- Stadter P.A. 1992. *Herodotus and Athenian archē*, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*, 22, 3, 781-809.
- Stadter P.A. 2012a. *Thucydides as 'Reader' of Herodotus*. In E. Foster, D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 39-66.
- Stadter P.A. 2012b. *Speaking to the Deaf: Herodotus, his Audience, and the Spartans at the Beginning of the Peloponnesian War*, *Histos*, 6, 1-14.
- Stadter P.A. 2013. *Herodotus and Athenian archē*. In R.V. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus: Volume I: Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past*, Oxford; New York, 334-356.
- Stahl H.-P. 2012. *Herodotus and Thucydides on Blind Decisions Preceding Military Action*. In E. Foster, D. Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 125-153.
- Stein H. 1893a. *Herodotos*, Erklärt von H. Stein. Bd. II: Buch III und IV, 5. Aufl., Berlin (repr. 1963).
- Stein H. 1893b. *Herodotos*, Erklärt von H. Stein. Bd. V: Buch VIII und IX, Namenverzeichnis, mit und zwei Karten, 6. Aufl., Berlin (repr. 1962).
- Stein H. 1894. *Herodotos*, Erklärt von H. Stein. Bd. III: Buch V und VI, 6. Aufl., Berlin (repr. 1963).
- Stein H. 1901. *Herodotos*, Erklärt von H. Stein. Bd. I: Buch I und II, mit einer Einleitung über Leben, Werk und Dialekt Herodots und einer Karte, 7. Aufl., Berlin (repr. 1962).
- Stein H. 1908. *Herodotos*, Erklärt von H. Stein. Bd. IV: Buch VII, mit drei Karten, 7. Aufl., Berlin (repr. 1963).
- Stoneman R. 2015. *Xerxes: a Persian Life*, New Haven; London.
- Stratanovsky G.A. 2002. *Gerodot. Istorii. V 9 knigakh*, Trans. by G.A. Stratanovsky, Moscow.
- Strasburger H. 1972. *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung*, Heidelberg.

- Strogetsky V.M. 2010. *Stanovlenie istoricheskoi mysli v drevnei Gretsii i vozniknovenie klassicheskoi grecheskoi istoriografii: Gerodot, Fukidid, Ksenofont, T. I: Gerodot*, Nizhnii Novgorod.
- Strogetsky V.M. 2014. *Afiny i Sparta. Bor'ba za gegemoniiu v Gretsii v V v. do n. e.*, Moscow; Berlin.
- Stronk J.P. 1998-1999. *Crossing the Straits: The Persians in Thrace*, *Talanta*, XXX-XXXI, 55-72.
- Stronk J.P. 2015. Rev.: *Boris Dunsch, Kai Ruffing (ed.), Herodots Quellen – Die Quellen Herodots. Classica et Orientalia, Bd. 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013*, *BMCR*, 2015.02.05 (<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2015/2015-02-05.html>).
- Surikov I.E. 2007a. 'Nesvoevremennyi' Gerodot (*Epicheskii prozaik mezhdou logografami i Fukididom*), *VDI*, 1, 143-151.
- Surikov I.E. 2007b. *Gerodot i 'pochishchenie Evropy' (pervyi grandioznyy etnotsivilizatsionnyy mif v istorii Zapada)*, *Dialog so vremenem*, 21, 149-160.
- Surikov I.E. 2008. *Kvazi-Solon, ili Krez v persidskom plenu (k voprosu o povestvovatel'nom masterstve Gerodota)*. In A.Yu. Dvornichenko (ed.), *Istoriia: mir proshlogo v sovremenom osveshchenii: sbornik nauchnykh statei k 75-letiiu so dhia rozhdeniia E.D. Frolova*, St Petersburg, 67-82.
- Surikov I.E. 2009. *Gerodot*, Moscow.
- Surikov I.E. 2010a. *Poslednie glavy 'Istorii' Gerodota i vopros o stepeni zavershennosti ego truda*. In T.N. Dzhakson, I.G. Konovalova, G.R. Tsetskhladze (eds.), *Gaudeamus igitur: sbornik statei k 60-letiiu A.V. Podosinova*, Moscow, 356-363.
- Surikov I.E. 2010b. *Paradoksy 'otssa istorii': Gerodot – issledovatel' arkhaiskoi i klassicheskoi Gretsii*, *Vestnik Rossiiskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarnogo universiteta*, 10, 66-100.
- Surikov I.E. 2010c. *Velikaia grecheskaia kolonizatsiia: ekonomicheskie i politicheskie motivy (na primere rannei kolonizatsionnoi deiatel'nosti Afin)*, *AMA*, 14, 20-48.
- Surikov I.E. 2011. *Ocherki ob istoriopisanii v klassicheskoi Gretsii*, Moscow.
- Surikov I.E. 2013a. 'Gellespont burnotechnyi' (*Proliv mezhdou Egeidoi i Propontidoi i ego rol' v antichnoi istorii*), *Problemy istorii, filologii i kul'tury*, 4, 3-44.
- Surikov I.E. 2013b. *Nekotorye problemy istorii drevnegrecheskikh gorodov v regione chernomorskikh prolivov*, *AMA*, 16, 24-38.
- Tiveros M. 2008. *Greek Colonisation of the Northern Aegean*. In G.R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, Vol. II, Leiden; Boston, 1-154.
- Todd O.J. 1922. *On the Date of Herodotus' Death*, *CQ*, 16, 1, 35-36.
- Tolias G. 2017. *Représentations de l'espace, fin du Moyen Âge – époque moderne*, *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des sciences historiques et philologiques (Résumés des conférences et travaux*, 148 (2015-2016), 130-138 (URL: <http://ashp.revues.org/1947>).
- Tolay J. 2016. [Rev.] *Border Thinking on the Edges of the West: Crossing Over the Hellespont. By Andrew Davison. New York, NY: Routledge, 2014, 289 p.*, *Perspectives on Politics*, 14, 2, 547-548.
- Trampedach K. 2005 *Hierosylia: Gewalt in Heiligtümern*. In G. Fischer, S. Moraw (eds.), *Die andere Seite der Klassik. Gewalt im 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart, 143-165.
- Tsakmakis A., Themistokleous C. 2013. *Textual Structure and Modality in Thucydides' Military Exhortations*. In A. Tsakmakis, M. Tamiolaki (eds.), *Thucydides between History and Literature*, Berlin; Boston, 391-408.
- Tumans H. 2014. 'Miltiad Starshiy kak zerkalo grecheskoi kolonizatsii', *Mnemon*, 14, 59-94.
- Tuplin C. 2003. *Xerxes' March from Doriscus to Therme*, *Historia*, 52, 4, 385-409.
- Tuplin C. 2017. *War and Peace in Achaemenid Imperial Ideology*, *Electrum*, 24, 31-54.
- Vandiver E. 1991. *Heroes in Herodotus: The Interaction of Myth and History*, Frankfurt am Main et al.
- van der Meer M.N. 2008. *Bridge over Troubled Waters? The γέφυρα in the Old Greek of Isaiah 37:25 and Contemporary Greek Sources*. In M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007*, Atlanta, 305-324.
- van Rookhuijzen J.Z. 2017a. *How not to Appease Athena: A Reconsideration of Xerxes' Purported Visit to the Troad (Hdt. 7. 42-43)*, *Klio*, 99, 2, 464-484.
- van Rookhuijzen J.Z. 2017b. *Where Aglauros Once Fell Down. The Memory Landscape of the Persian Siege of the Acropolis*. In E. Franchi, G. Proietti (eds.), *Conflict in Communities. Forward-looking Memories in Classical Athens*, Trento, 27-68.
- van Rookhuijzen J.Z. 2018. *Herodotus and the Topography of Xerxes' Invasion: Place and Memory in Greece and Anatolia*, Berlin; Boston.

- van Steen G. 2018. *Inglorious Barbarians: Court Intrigue and Military Disaster Strike Xerxes, 'The Sick Man of Europe'*. In R.F. Kennedy (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aeschylus*, Leiden; Boston, 243-269.
- Vasilev M.I. 2015. *The Policy of Darius and Xerxes towards Thrace and Macedonia*, Leiden; Boston.
- Vasunia P. 2012. *Between East and West: Mobility and Ethnography in Herodotus' Proem*, *History and Anthropology*, 23, 2, 183-198.
- Vlassopoulos K. 2012. *The barbarian repertoire in Greek culture*, *Αριόδνη*, 18, 53-88.
- Vlassopoulos K. 2013. *Greeks and Barbarians*, Cambridge.
- Walsh J. 1986. *The Date of the Athenian Stoa at Delphi*, *AJA* 90, 3, 319-336.
- Waterfield R. 2018. *Creators, Conquerors, and Citizens. A History of Ancient Greece*, Oxford.
- Węcowski M. 1996. *Forma i funkcja prologu 'Historii' Herodota z Halikarnasu*, *Przegląd Historyczny*, 87, 2, 345-398.
- Węcowski M. 2004. *The Hedgehog and the Fox: Form and Meaning in the Prologue of Herodotus*, *JHS*, 124, 143-164.
- Węcowski M. 2008. *Friends or Foes? Herodotus in Thucydides' Preface*. In J. Pigoń (ed.), *The Children of Herodotus: Greek and Roman Historiography and Related Genres*, Newcastle, 34-57.
- Węcowski M. 2016. *Herodotus in Thucydides: A Hypothesis*. In J. Priestley, V. Zali (eds.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden; Boston, 17-33.
- Wellauer A. 1830. *Lexicon Aeschyleum*, Vol. I, Lipsiae.
- Wellauer A. 1831. *Lexicon Aeschyleum*, Vol. II, Lipsiae.
- Welser C. 2009. *Two Didactic Strategies at the End of Herodotus' Histories (9. 108-122)*, *ClAnt*, 28, 2, 359-385.
- West W.C. 1965. *Greek Public Monuments of the Persian Wars*, Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina.
- Weiler I. 1968. *Greek and Non-Greek World in the Archaic Period*, *GRBS*, 9, 1, 21-29.
- Wiesehöfer J. 2006. *'...Keeping the Two Sides Equal': Thucydides, the Persians and the Peloponnesian War*. In A. Rengakos, A. Tsakmakis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden; Boston, 657-667.
- Wiesehöfer J. 2013. *Die Griechen und der Orient im I. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*. In H.-J. Gehrke, H. Schneider (eds.), *Geschichte der Antike*, 4. Aufl., Stuttgart, 47-63.
- Wiesehöfer J. 2017. *Herodotus and Xerxes' hierosyllia*. In R. Rollinger (ed.), *Die Sicht auf die Welt zwischen Ost und West (750 v. Chr.-550 n. Chr.) / Looking at the World from the East and the West (750 BCE-550 CE)*, Wiesbaden, 211-220.
- Wieżel I. 2015. *Historie by Herodotus of Halicarnassus – Theoretical Issues*, *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, 63, 3, 43-52.
- Wilson N.G. 2015. *Herodoti Historiae*, *Recognovit brevis adnotatione critica instruit* N.G. Wilson, T. I-II, Oxonii.
- Wolff E. 1964. *Das Weib des Masistes*, *Hermes*, 92, 1, 51-58.
- Wolff E. 1965. *Das Weib des Masistes*. In W. Marg (ed.), *Herodot. Eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung*, 2. Aufl., Darmstadt, 668-678.
- Zahrnt M. 2015. *Early History of Thrace to the Murder of Kotis I (360 BCE)*. In Ju. Valeva, E. Nankov, D. Graninger (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*, Wiley Blackwell, 35-47.
- Zali V. 2009. *Reshaping Herodotean Rhetoric. A Study of the Speeches in Herodotus' Histories with special attention to Books 5-9*, Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the University College of London for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University College of London (URL: <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/18953/1/18953.pdf>).
- Zali V. 2015. *The Shape of Herodotean Rhetoric: A Study of the Speeches in Herodotus' Histories with Special Attention to Books 5-9*, Leiden; Boston.
- Zali V. 2016. *Herodotus and His Successors: The Rhetoric of the Persian Wars in Thucydides and Xenophon*. In J. Priestley, V. Zali (eds.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden; Boston, 34-58.
- Zimmermann K. 1997. *Hdt. IV 36, 2 et le développement de l'image du monde d'Hécatée à Hérodote*, *Ktèma*, 22, 285-298.

Aleksandr Sinitsyn
ORCID 0000-0001-9229-0217
Ph.D., CSc in History, Associate Professor,
The Russian Christian Academy
for the Humanities;
Saint Petersburg State University,
Institute of Philosophy
aa.sinizin@mail.ru