EMISSARIES IN THE NARRATIVE OF HERODOTUS

BY

ALISON L. LANSKI

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Philology
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Emeritus David Sansone, Chair
Professor Emerita Deborah Boedeker, Brown University
Associate Professor Maryline Parca
Associate Professor Kirk Sanders
Associate Professor Angeliki Tzanetou

ABSTRACT

Scores of messengers, heralds, and other emissaries fill the pages of Herodotus' *Histories*. Nevertheless, scholarship on narrative patterns has yet to consider their importance. This thesis uses methods from linguistics and narratology to demonstrate how Herodotus uses emissaries to support themes and reveal narrative structure throughout his text. An initial typology of vocabulary provides a basic framework for the investigation which follows in four main sections. First, emissaries are shown to embody geographic and temporal connections, thereby providing cues for the audience through Herodotus' digressive narrative. Second, Herodotus' conception of a "typical" emissary is determined (swift and reliable), which allows subsequent deviation from "type" to be understood as indicating negative assessments of characters. Third, scenes where messages are rejected provide a novel way to examine issues of relative status and the perception of power within the frame of reciprocity. Finally, three case studies (the Scythian *logos*, Cyrus' life, and preparations for the battle of Salamis) combine these modes of analysis to show how Herodotus manipulates the presentation of emissaries to direct the attention and judgment of his audience towards characters, cultural differences, and wider narrative themes.

For Ethan

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND TYPOLOGY

Why Emissaries?

Emissaries of all sorts are vital to the tales in Herodotus' *Histories*: they provide links between

people and places and are key cogs in a sprawling narrative of diplomacy and battles. We see

them bringing information, requests for aid, terms of negotiation, and more. They are the eyes,

ears, and voices of their rulers. Despite their important supporting role, emissaries and messages

in Herodotus as a whole have largely escaped scholarly notice. Instead, emissaries are treated

incidentally as discrete evidence in larger studies.

Much of Herodotean scholarship on emissaries stems from ideas previously examined in

the Homeric epics[1] and Athenian tragedy.[2] Representation of speech acts and focalization have

become important areas of narrative study[3] which in recent years have been applied to the

Histories. Although speech acts include statements made by proxies, de Jong's focus (2001,

2004) is on the narrative effect, not the emissary himself. Rood (2007) expands his analysis to

discuss the case of Talthybius, but his concern lies with the nature of the prolepsis, not the hero's

characterization or role as a herald. Other narratological points of interest are raised only in

passing as parts of larger works. Immerwahr (1966, 271) mentions a "messenger motif" but

provides no explanation. Bowie (2007, 98) recognizes the ability of emissaries to shift narrative

---

[1] Research on Homeric epic dealing with emissaries includes: Wéry (1967), Karavites (1987), Létoublon (1987), De Jong (1989), and Durán López (1999).

[2] The robust research on emissaries in Athenian tragedy includes: Bonet (1956), Rijksbaron (1976), Bremer (1976), Goblot-Cahen (1999), Guzmán García (1999), Payne (2000), Barrett (2002), and Gastaldi (2007). The works of Bremer, de Jong (1989, 1991), Goward (1999), and Payne tend to focus on narratological features of emissary speeches. However, since Herodotus rarely provides the actual words of an intermediary, the scholarship on speeches is largely inapplicable to the *Histories*. In addition, the ability of tragic emissaries to provide off-stage information (cf. Bremer, in particular) is unnecessary in a prose text which can simply relocate the scene to the place and time of the relevant action. Rijksbaron's analysis of the formulaic way a messenger scene begins will prove more useful for Herodotus.

[3] For speeches and speech acts in Herodotus, see the following: Hohti (1976), Lang (1984), Pelling (2006), and de Bakker (2007). Focalization and levels of discourse have been discussed in additional detail by Dewald (1999) and de Jong (1997, 1999, 2002 and 2004).

locations: "The arrival of an informant or messenger is a frequent narrative device in this book [8], here [chapter 8] covering the shift from the Persian to the Greek camp: cf. 21, 23, 24.2, 26.1, 50.1, 79, 82.1". Neither scholar goes into any further detail or cites any relevant bibliography.

Beyond this work, some scholars highlight the formulaic nature of the scenes in which emissaries appear, leading to interest in a sort of emissary type-scene (Sancho 2003); others point to the folk-tale nature of many stories involving emissaries (Griffiths 2006). Myers (1943) and Stouder (2006) additionally consider the linguistic question of what ἀκήρυκτος[4] means in the context of warfare. Finally there is some interest from a historical standpoint. Kraft (1964), Wéry (1966), and Sealey (1976) all consider the historicity of the story about the Persian heralds killed in Athens and Sparta in 491 (7.133). Mosley (1973) provides an in-depth historical account of all types of ambassadors and emissaries, but unfortunately his primary focus lies in the later 5th and 4th centuries. However his explication of the status, security, and responsibilities of emissaries provides useful background knowledge about Herodotean characters.[5]

De Bakker (2007) is a rare exception amid all this research in that he deals with intermediaries not only as providers of interesting speech acts but also as important thematic signals within Herodotus' narrative.[6] His dissertation focuses primarily on distinctions between types of speeches in the *Histories* (direct, indirect, transported,[7] etc.) but expands his analysis to consider the thematic implications of emissaries speaking to a particular third party as opposed to

---

[4] A single instance in Herodotus is found at 5.81.2. Issues of the vocabulary of emissaries are taken up below.
[5] Adcock and Mosley (1975) take up the broader role of diplomacy; the discussion of emissaries in their study does not add new or relevant material to Mosley's (1973) exposition. The nature of the characterization of emissaries will be discussed in Chapter 3. Gazzano (2002) suggests that common motives for sending emissaries and common motifs in their speeches reveal elements of historical diplomatic practices. She includes a discussion of vocabulary for emissaries (24-31) which focuses on overlapping duties. My own typology, below, makes divisions based on other criteria.
[6] See especially his Chapter 4 "Transported Speeches" (49-66).
[7] Transported speeches are those "which are presented in a situation where speaker and addressee are not able to communicate face to face, but, as a result of their physical separation, require an intermediary to deliver the message" (49).

their rulers addressing the same individual directly. De Bakker concludes that Herodotus characterizes situations intentionally through his choice of speaker (ruler vs. emissary), revealing, "among other things, the isolated position of supremacy of the Persian king at his court, the secrecy which is needed to communicate with an insider of that court, as well as symbolising the impediments to dialogue caused by hostility" (66).

Additionally, de Bakker is perhaps the first person to distinctly call attention to the importance of emissaries as thematic elements and characters: "From the quality and variety of transported speeches can be gathered that Herodotus took an interest in the role of intermediaries in interstate and interpersonal diplomacy" (50). In the study which follows, I extend the focus on emissaries beyond their speeches to their presentation in the text (even when speechless), e.g. their status, their reception and their official and unofficial behavior. Observation and analysis will show that Herodotus seems to care about these intermediaries for more than what their words represent. In what remains of this chapter, I lay out a general method and establish a typology of emissaries and messages, both of which serve as underpinnings for the rest of the thesis. The second chapter demonstrates how Herodotus uses emissaries to help structure the narrative. The third chapter posits a "typical" characterization of emissaries and shows how variation of that characterization (and related vocabulary) can guide the audience's reception of a particular story or character. The fourth chapter explores how the reception of emissaries and their messages play a role in the negotiation of status and power between ruling powers in various stories. A series of close-readings in the fifth chapter displays the thematic and structural depth Herodotus grants to *logoi* through the inclusion and patterning of emissaries. The sixth chapter speculatively entertains the possibility of viewing Herodotus as an emissary and the *Histories* as a message.

Method

Taken as a whole, the *Histories* contain a large number of intermediaries, most of whom are nameless and many of whom are seen but not heard.[8] The presence of emissaries, then, becomes more evident in aggregate than in particular, with a few notable exceptions (e.g. Philippides). In order to understand the implications within an individual scene (or description) involving an emissary, all such scenes must first be taken into consideration, to see in what ways Herodotus conforms to or diverges from the expectations he has established for the reader. In simple terms, this is an analysis based on variation from expected patterns, and how those variations affect the presentation of the text to the audience. Narratology and the study of formal patterns are useful tools for a broad investigation; discourse analysis is appropriate for examining individual phrases, sentences, or paragraphs.

Theme and variation as a narrative strategy in Herodotus have been the subject of much scholarly interest and inquiry. Immerwahr (1966), in the most enduring, large-scale account of this type, looks at various large-scale patterns within and across *logoi* in the *Histories*. His broad analysis uncovers numerous themes which are traced through eastern and western civilization and especially in the formalized structure of the battle scenes in later books. Immerwahr explains patterns as helping to build a narrative in a "single chain rather than complex interweaving" (59). In the sense that Herodotus is leading us from start to finish through his work with the goal of showing us the how and why of the Persians' desire for conquest and ultimate failure, I am in agreement with him. But I would suggest that the chain is intricately fashioned, as is discussed in more detail by later scholars, most notably de Jong. Separately,

---

[8] De Bakker counts 84 transported speeches voiced by emissaries (ἄγγελοι or κήρυκες). Many such emissaries (and others) appear without speaking as well. I count 241 distinct emissaries in the *Histories*. My criteria are discussed below.

Immerwahr steps back from his broad vision to note the following:

> One of the great merits of Herodotus as a historian is the fine balance his work maintains between the particular and the general, the individual and the pattern. No other ancient historian, it has been claimed, exhibits so much awareness for individuality. I would amend this to say that no other ancient historian shows such fine feeling for the individual within the framework of the typical. (149-50)

Immerwahr explores the "individual" mostly through large-scale and notable figures (e.g. the Persian Kings), but I believe his perspective is true throughout, and even for more minor characters. Despite all of his recounting of geography and animal life, Herodotus never forgets that history only arises when people are there to create it (and pass it along). Thus his histories are fully populated – one might even say overpopulated, given the sheer number of individuals of any and all types whom he fits in. Out of such populous disorder, people begin to stand out by class: eastern kings being the most notable, Spartan kings and Athenian leaders coming next, perhaps. Emissaries are another class of people that catch our attention, along with mothers, servants, sailors, etc. To examine the members of a less estimable class, such as emissaries, we need to look at patterns in a more fine-grained way. Hence we turn from Immerwahr to more recent work.

Lateiner (1989) applies the broad vision of Immerwahr to more specific patterns. He sets out the importance of repetition as follows (167):[9]

> Herodotus embeds patterns and even predictions that shape the data of human experience. Instead of "causal" historiography in the modern mode, one encounters a "symptomatic" variety, a method that connects more than it explains, analogizes more than it analyzes. Patterns, numerous and of varied origins (from, eg, folktales, legends, epic, and popular philosophy),[10] occur and recur in order to guide the reader through the maze of historical data and to lead him to an interpretation lurking in the text, the intellectual result of a vast and obscure sorting process on the author's part.

---

[9] This is not to suggest that no prior, important work on this topic existed. Lattimore's (1939) article on wise advisors and Bischoff's (1932) dissertation on warnings both set the stage for these (and other) later works.

[10] There is no clear evidence that emissaries themselves are a folktale motif: Uther (2004) lists many folk-tale types containing messengers, but the proxy is not himself relevant to any resulting moral lesson.

Lateiner's broader focus is on the way in which Herodotus goes about being a historian, but patterning plays an important role in the expression of the historian's method. Out of the numerous possibilities, Lateiner focuses on four. "Time, limit, ethnography, and an abstracted pattern of political behaviour structure and unify the data, the raw materials of the *Histories* into a remarkably comprehensive and comprehensible narrative form" (111). He examines subdivisions within each topic, in many cases looking not only at thematic repetition or re-expression of the same general concept, but delving even to the level of vocabulary. This micro-level of data will be essential to the proper study of emissaries, who exist very often only for a sentence at a time. Lateiner shows through his analysis that, in the aggregate, these discrete instances can compose a larger picture with significance for the interpretation of the work as a whole.

Repetition and variation at the lexical level have long been the province of Homeric scholars who focus on formulaic language. But this type of study has expanded to Herodotean research in recent years. The issues of meter are, obviously, not relevant in the prose setting, and the resulting freedom makes economy less of a concern (though with the scope of events and time Herodotus considers, one can hardly think that there is much extraneous material). What we have to look for in Herodotus is repetition of vocabulary, phrase, or syntax in description.[11] Long (1987, 38) provides a simple, clear explanation of the method for a basic investigation into the meaning behind repetition: one must collect examples of repetition, find similarity, explore (seemingly) unnecessary difference, and find what additional meaning arises from intentional change. Studying variation in this manner can be quite instructive, as has been shown in Homeric research. Long focuses only on the first book of the *Histories*, analyzing repetition in the stories of Gyges and Candaules, Arion, Atys and Adrastus, and others. By looking at the

---

[11] At a larger level, of course, there is repetition of an idea or overall theme.

expectations set up by repeated vocabulary, he determines places in which Herodotus cleverly subverts the expected meaning and outcome through the use of synonymous vocabulary. The manipulation of vocabulary is subtle and may not draw attention readily, but once this type of pattern is looked for, it becomes much easier to find.

Pattern and inversion of expected repetition exist on a larger scale (initially also related to Homeric studies) in the type-scenes.[12] While type-scenes are less formal in Herodotus than in Homer, there are still *logoi* in the text which show signs of traditional elements in a conventional order.[13] Similarly, type-scenes exist in tragedy; Rijksbaron (1976) examines the typical pattern of the messenger scene, especially in Euripides. This codified pattern of action, however, focuses mainly on the back-and-forth interaction between the messenger and his audience, making it difficult to draw a direct comparison with the much abridged Herodotean scenes.[14] Perhaps more interesting is the disparity between the formal, repeated nature of such a scene in tragedy and the wide variation of it in Herodotus.

When repetition and variation are used to frame events, they are elevated to the narrative strategy of ring composition. Ring composition in Herodotus can express its circle in a much less perfect way than the geometry of the word would suggest. In its most basic representation, the closing of a story, event, or *logos*, in some way mirrors and echoes the events which began it, with subtle or obvious variation. This structural symmetry is not always even. But the important

---

[12] Notably, Fenik (1968) on typical battle scenes.

[13] Immerwahr (1966, 68-9) does not use the term "type-scene", but he does lay out a standard pattern for campaigns and, in particular, battles. Sancho (2003) talks about "typical scenes" from tragedy which are also present in Herodotus, but she is more interested in the themes of these scenes than their structures. She views a "messenger scene" as having the main purpose of intensifying the dramatic or tragic aspect of the story at that point (29).

[14] Rijksbaron identifies the basic elements as follows. 1) The messenger enters (sometimes announced by another on stage). 2) He speaks introductory line(s) to arouse attention of the audience. 3) The audience asks for more. 4) The messenger gives the main point. 5) The audience asks for more detail. 6) The messenger takes a deep breath and tells the whole story. Rijksbaron further identifies repeated elements of the speeches themselves.

elements are still there: a cadence going in which finds repetition with variation going out.[15]

The combination of theme and variation occurs at almost every level of the text – from words (e.g. Long 1987 and Fisher 1992) to thematic elements (e.g. Immerwahr 1966 and Lateiner 1987), as expressed in single stories or across the entire text. These are the models that I will follow in my own investigation at all levels of analysis. On the micro-level, there is the simple question of the vocabulary of emissaries: how they are identified and what verbs are used to describe their motion and speech. Moving up a step, to formulaic scenes, we can look at the interplay and ordering of the acts of sending or receiving an emissary. What elements are consistently present in these micro-scenes? Which are regularly or exceptionally omitted? Which are emphasized, based on context or syntax? At this level of analysis, I also rely on the linguistic acumen of Dik (1995), Matić (2003), and Allan (2012). Their analysis of syntax helps point the way towards determining the most salient element of each sentence Herodotus writes, and therefore its role in providing meaning within a given context. Finally, on the level of *logoi*, books, and the entire text, we can look for ways in which emissaries embody or reveal larger themes to us, through their patterns of action and presence in the text.

Before we can analyze patterns related to emissaries, we must first determine who counts as an emissary and distinguish between various types. Hohti's (1976) and Hollmann's (2011) works on Herodotus, which categorize speeches and signs, respectively, provide useful models. Hollmann's typology sorts by vocabulary and part of speech; Hohti's sorts by function (e.g. causative and non-causative speeches).[16] My typology of emissaries attempts to take the best parts of these two approaches. I select the vocabulary to include based on context, then add to

---

[15] Cf. Immerwahr (1966), Beck (1971), Boedeker (2002), de Jong (2004), and Griffiths. Long (1987, 16-17) gives a summary of relevant German scholarship.
[16] Lang (1984) provides a different way of categorizing speeches, based on their role as part of a larger discourse as well as their manner of presentation.

these base terms by looking at etymologically-related terms (cognate verbs and nouns). For the sake of simplicity, I focus only on semantic distinctions in this typology. Distinctions in context or usage will be discussed in the following chapters when relevant.[17]

One final issue remains for this and any project that discusses narration and authorial intent: the oral foundation of the *Histories* and its relation to Herodotus' agency as author. Herodotus surely needed to help his audience through his digressive narrative by underlining important starting and ending points and highlighting topics, themes, or events that hold significance larger than their basic presentation might suggest.[18] To do so, it seems likely that he borrowed or adapted methods from oral tradition and the genres using such techniques. Whether or not adaptation and borrowing was a consciously deliberate act of a knowing author or an instinctive and natural way for Herodotus to present his tale I leave to others.[19] The process by which these features came about is immaterial to the fact that they exist and would perform the same purposes overall, with a conscious or unconscious creator. In my analysis of the text, I take the narrative simply as it stands.

Typology

Herodotus can signal the presence of an emissary in several ways. The typology established below is based on etymology and directness, that is, on how "obvious" the presence of the emissary is.

I. Explicit emissaries

---

[17] For example, following de Bakker (2007), the mode of presentation of speech may be relevant to scenes with emissaries (e.g. direct speech, indirect discourse, or simply some record of a speech act). Categories of reactions and responses to messages are another relevant feature, and will be discussed in Chapter 4.

[18] For work on transition and meaning in Herodotus, see especially Munson (1983) and Lang (1984).

[19] E.g. Johnson (1994) argues that oral features of the text do not require that the text was intended to be performed orally. Slings (2002) identifies many features of the narrative which stem from oral composition and suggests that such features indicate a desire on the part of the author to adopt an oral style. Oral elements may also stem from Herodotus' reliance (in part) on oral sources, e.g. Griffiths (2006).

The most obvious and explicit emissary is one identified as holding an official position of message delivery. Within this category, there are several terms which are not related etymologically and which express slightly different official functions and obligations.

A1. ἄγγελος

The most generic term which indicates an official emissary is ἄγγελος (*angelos*). It is used 100 times to refer to 67 distinct individuals or groups and is the most common explicit identifying term.[20] *Angeloi* provide a wide variety of functions in the *Histories*, all related to the carriage of information and requests. They are dispatched most often to arrange alliances, communicate demands, request help, share valuable information, and summon individuals. Mosley (1973, 39-40) reports that in Athens, historically, envoys were often elected but would not be given magistracies (as was typical for elected officials).[21] Instead, they were on "special assignment" and denied the powers of judging, deliberating, or commanding. In other words, they were not permitted to take independent action beyond their orders; they were simply a conduit for diplomatic interaction. Herodotus mentions two sub-types of *angeloi*, but neither appears often and they merit only the briefest of discussions.

A2. ἀγγελιηφόρος

In four places[22] an individual is identified as an ἀγγελιηφόρος (*angeliēforos*). The limited context in which Herodotus shows these men indicates that they primarily served in the households of Eastern kings and not as wider facilitators of diplomacy.

---

[20] When I say that this term describes 67 "distinct individuals", I mean that there are 67 separate individuals described by this noun. Some of those 67 individuals, however, may also be described by one of the terms below. This is true for all of the numbers reported in this typology. Accordingly, adding up the "distinct individual" numbers given here will exceed the total number of emissaries mentioned above. Examples of overlapping vocabulary for the same individual are cited below and discussed in Chapter 3.
[21] This fact does not hold true for heralds, discussed below in category B.
[22] 1.120.2, 3.118.2, 3.126.2, 4.71.4.

A3. ἐσαγγελεύς

Conceptually related to ἄγγελος and ἀγγελιηφόρος is ἐσαγγελεύς (*esangeleus*). This term is only

used once in Herodotus (3.84.2), when the Persian conspirators agree that they can see the ruler

without being announced (ἄνευ ἐσαγγελέος). When a situation of this nature actually presents

itself in 3.118.2, Herodotus uses ἀγγελιηφόρος instead, which suggests that these terms have

essentially the same meaning.

A4. συνάγγελος

Unique to the *Histories* is the term συνάγγελος, literally meaning "fellow-*angelos*".[23] Herodotus

describes the fate of several Spartans who were used as emissaries during the battle of

Thermopylae; one of them is identified as the *sunangelos* of another (7.230.1). The narrative

context suggests that no official difference existed between συνάγγελος and ἄγγελος, but that

Herodotus uses the term for effect.

A5. ἀγγαρήιον

The Persian ἀγγαρήιον, colloquially "pony-express", is an official system for sending messages

manned by ἄγγελοι. Herodotus describes them in 8.98.1-2:[24]

> 8.98.1 τούτων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐστὶ οὐδὲν ὅ τι θᾶσσον παραγίνεται θνητὸν ἐόν· οὕτω
> τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι ἐξεύρηται τοῦτο. λέγουσι γὰρ ὡς ὁσέων ἂν ἡμερέων ᾖ ἡ πᾶσα ὁδός, τοσοῦτοι
> ἵπποι τε καὶ ἄνδρες διεστᾶσι κατὰ ἡμερησίην ὁδὸν ἑκάστην ἵππος τε καὶ ἀνὴρ τεταγμένος· τοὺς
> οὔτε νιφετός, οὐκ ὄμβρος, οὐ καῦμα, οὐ νὺξ ἔργει μὴ οὐ κατανύσαι τὸν προκείμενον αὐτῷ
> δρόμον τὴν ταχίστην. ὁ μὲν δὴ πρῶτος δραμὼν παραδιδοῖ τὰ ἐντεταλμένα τῷ δευτέρῳ, ὁ δὲ
> δεύτερος τῷ τρίτῳ· τὸ δὲ ἐνθεῦτεν ἤδη κατ᾽ ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον διεξέρχεται παραδιδόμενα, κατά
> περ ἐν Ἕλλησι ἡ λαμπαδηφορίη τὴν τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ ἐπιτελέουσι. τοῦτο τὸ δράμημα τῶν ἵππων
> καλέουσι Πέρσαι ἀγγαρήιον.
> There is nothing mortal that is faster than the system the Persians have devised for

---

[23] This term is found twice more in all of the Greek available for search in the TLG, but not until the writings of Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus and Anastasius Sinaita; for Herodotus it therefore appears to be a hapax.

[24] Unless otherwise noted, the Greek text is from the Rosén edition, and the accompanying English translations are from Waterfield (1998).

sending messages. Apparently, they have horses and men posted at intervals along the route, the same number in total as the overall length in days of the journey, with a fresh horse and rider for every day of travel. Whatever the conditions – it may be snowing, raining, blazing hot, or dark – they never fail to complete their assigned journey in the fastest possible time. The first man passes his instructions on to the second, the second to the third, and so on, in the same kind of relay found in Greece in the torch-race which is run during the festival of Hephaestus. The Persian word for this postal system involving horses is *angareion*.[25]

The system seems geared solely towards speed; there is no indication that the *angeloi* utilizing this system are restricted to any particular purposes. Herodotus does not make use of this terminology elsewhere, but prefers to use the other terms discussed in this section.

B1. κῆρυξ

Less common but more honored than *angeloi* are κήρυκες (*kērykes*). This term is used 83 times to refer to 50 distinct individuals and is the second most common way for Herodotus to identify an official emissary. Just like *angeloi*, *kērykes* carry a wide variety information for various purposes. They are most commonly used to convey commands and demands, request help, share information, negotiate, and give warnings or make threats. Unlike *angeloi*, *kērykes* have a somewhat exalted status reflected in their inviolability.[26] The protection accorded to these men may explain, in part, their slightly more common role in bearing potentially contentious information or commands. Herodotus also informs us directly that (at least in Sparta and Egypt) the office of *kēryx* is hereditary, which provides another element of distinction:

> 6.60.1 οἱ κήρυκες αὐτῶν καὶ αὐληταὶ καὶ μάγειροι ἐκδέκονται τὰς πατρωίας τέχνας, καὶ αὐλητής τε αὐλητέω γίνεται καὶ μάγειρος μαγείρου καὶ κῆρυξ κήρυκος· οὐ κατὰ λαμπροφωνίην ἐπιτιθέμενοι ἄλλοι σφέας παρακληίουσι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἐπιτελέουσι.

> Town-criers, pipe players, and cooks inherit their work from their fathers; each of them is the son of a father who carried on the same trade. They cannot be displaced by others coming

---

[25] Asheri indicates that ἀγγαρήιον is a Babylonian loanword; the proper Persian term is ἀστάνδης, not used anywhere in the *Histories*. This term is used as an adjective at Ae. *Ag*. 282. It is not derived from the term ἄγγελος, despite the similar spelling (cf. Beekes 2010).

[26] Herodotus makes this status clear in the events of 7.134-7, where the Spartans are punished for killing a Persian *kēryx* and attempt to make restitution. This passage and the historical status of *kērykes* is further discussed by Wéry (1966) and Mosley ("Diplomatic Inviolability" 1973, 81-7).

along and taking up town-crying, for instance, on the basis of possessing a strong, clear voice: these jobs are inherited.[27]

We learn that the Spartan *kērykes* are descended from Talthybius in 7.134.1; Herodotus does not name the ancestors of any other such families.

B2. ἡμεροδρόμος

The only sub-type of *kēryx* presented by Herodotus is the ἡμεροδρόμος, literally "day-runner", appearing only twice (6.105.1 and 9.12.1). No additional information is given about these types of emissaries. Even their identification as *kērykes* is made indirectly through inference, since each individual named a ἡμεροδρόμος is also named a κῆρυξ nearby. From their actions in the text they are clearly prized for their ability to travel swiftly long distances by foot.

B3. κηρυκηΐη

A group of *kērykes* on a mission can be referred to as a κηρυκηΐη, "embassy". However, Herodotus only uses the term once (7.134.1) in an ethnographic context. It is of no major importance for this study.

C. πρέσβεις

Occurring only once in Herodotus is the term πρέσβεις,[28] literally "old men" but with the meaning of "ambassadors" (3.58.1). Given its isolated status and lack of any etymological connection to the vocabulary discussed above, these men are less easily categorized in relation to *kērykes* and *angeloi*. The context in which they appear is similarly ambiguous. Herodotus tells of an oracle from the Pythia to the Siphnians, in which they are instructed: φράσσασθαι ξύλινόν τε λόχον κήρυκά τ' ἐρυθρόν – "to beware the ambush of wood and the red herald" (3.57.4).

---

[27] Waterfield's translation reflects the ability of *kērykes* to make proclamations, but may prejudice the reader into thinking this is the only hereditary task.

[28] A frequency which will be surprising, perhaps, to anyone familiar with its prevalence in Thucydides.

Herodotus explains in 3.58.2 that this warning refers to Samian ships, which are painted red. The application of the word *kēryx* to an inanimate object is unique in Herodotus and the poetic nature of oracles suggests that perhaps we are to understand that the red ship in fact stands for emissaries within. But the relevant Samian ship is carrying πρέσβεις to Siphnos, and those are later identified as ἄγγελοι – no κήρυκες to be found. Saerens (1975, 618) points out that the grammar of this passage indicates that πρέσβεις is clearly synonymous with ἄγγελοι.[29] He takes it as an Atticism which most likely appears in the *Histories* at this point due to an Athenian source for the story. Although I accept this proposition as reasonable, the oracle's use of κήρυκα to refer to the same men muddies the equation of *presbeis* with *angeloi*. Without further comparanda, the exact relationship between these three identifying terms is difficult to clearly define. I have therefore chosen to list πρέσβεις as a separate category of official emissary, with the understanding that it may in fact be a subtype of one of the previous categories or an (Attic) umbrella term otherwise avoided by Herodotus.

D1. θεοπρόπος

Of more obvious specialization are the θεοπρόποι (*theopropoi*), whose sole function is to consult oracles on behalf of their rulers or governments.[30] This term is used 19 times, always in the plural, to refer to 15 groups of individuals. It is certainly possible for a character to consult an oracle directly, without using θεοπρόποι, just as it is possible for rulers to speak to one another directly without the use of formal emissaries, although rarely are these possibilities realized.

---

[29] His argument stems from the fact that the πρέσβεις come first, and that the ἄγγελοι have a definite article, which indicates that they are not new characters to the narration.

[30] LSJ lists θεοπρόπος as the Ionic form of θεωρός (never used by Herodotus), but the entries in Chantraine (2009) and Beekes (2010) consider the terms to be entirely separate with different etymologies. θεοπρόπος comes from θεός, whereas θεωρός comes from θεάομαι. Nightingale (2004, 3) explains the basic role of the θεωρός as making "a journey or pilgrimage abroad for the purpose of witnessing certain events and spectacles." This would be separate from the specific function of oracle consultation which was performed by a θεοπρόπος (not discussed by Nightingale). Correspondingly, Beekes does not mention oracles at all in his entry for θεωρός.

Oracle consultation is reserved for θεοπρόποι; ἄγγελοι and κήρυκες are never sent to perform

this function. Presumably, Herodotus uses this more technical and specific vocabulary either to

highlight the importance and ritualized nature of consulting an oracle within the context of his

narrative or simply to be accurate.[31]

D2. Πύθιοι

A particular subgroup of θεοπρόποι are the Πύθιοι (*Pythioi*), who are appointed by the Spartans

for life for the sole purpose of consulting with the oracle at Delphi. We learn about their

privileges in another rare moment of explicit attention from Herodotus to the role of emissaries:

> 6.57.2 καὶ προξείνους ἀποδεικνύναι τούτοισι προσκεῖσθαι τοὺς ἂν ἐθέλωσι τῶν ἀστῶν, καὶ Πυθίους αἱρέεσθαι δύο ἑκάτερον. οἱ δὲ Πύθιοι εἰσὶ θεοπρόποι ἐς Δελφούς, σιτεόμενοι μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων τὰ δημόσια ... [6.57.4] τὰς δὲ μαντηίας τὰς γινομένας τούτους φυλάσσειν, συνειδέναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Πυθίους.
>
> It is their [the kings'] privilege to appoint any citizen they like to act as the state's diplomatic representatives, and each of them also gets to choose two Pythians. These Pythians act as emissaries to Delphi and are maintained along with the kings at public expense. ... [The kings] look after any oracles the state receives, although the Pythians are aware of their content too.

Maintenance at public expense suggests the high status accorded to these men. Curiously, aside

from this information, Herodotus never discusses the Pythians or uses them in the narrative.[32]

Discussion

Despite the careful distinctions described above, it is not the case that Herodotus necessarily

means for his audience to see stark differences between all of his specialized vocabulary. While

theopropoi are clearly in their own category, *angeloi* and *kērykes* overlap much more in their

presence and use, to the point where the same individual (or group) may be described by terms

---

[31] If Herodotus' audience expected this term, to avoid it would draw unwanted attention. The salience of unexpected omissions of the vocabulary of official emissaries is taken up in the third chapter.

[32] The only story showing oracle consultation by the Spartans is in 1.67, where θεοπρόποι are sent to Delphi. Other interactions between the Spartans and the oracle at Delphi (e.g. 7.220.3 and 8.114.1) do not involve any type of emissary.

from both categories.[33]   The weakness of the distinction, in general, is made clear from the very beginning of the *Histories*.   In the opening story of Medea, we see:

> 1.2.3 **πέμψαντα** δὲ τὸν Κόλχων βασιλέα ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα **κήρυκα** <u>αἰτέειν τε δίκας τῆς ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀπαιτέειν τὴν θυγατέρα</u>

The king of Colchis sent a herald to Greece to ask for compensation for the abduction and to demand his daughter back.

The opening story of Helen is nearly identical, but contains different vocabulary:

> 1.3.2 οὕτω δὴ ἁρπάσαντος αὐτοῦ Ἑλένην, τοῖσι Ἕλλησι δόξαι πρῶτον **πέμψαντας ἀγγέλους** <u>ἀπαιτέειν τε Ἑλένην καὶ δίκας τῆς ἁρπαγῆς αἰτέειν</u>

And that his how he came to abduct Helen.   The Greeks' initial reaction, it is said, was to send men to demand Helen's return and to ask for compensation for her abduction.

In essence, the difference is hard to see.[34]

This muddling would come as no surprise to Karavites (1987), talking about epic, or Mosley (1973), about historical fact, both of whom point out that the various types of emissaries are not always carefully distinguished.[35]   Mosley suggests that most ancient historians are not particularly careful with the distinctions between *kērykes* and other envoys due to the ignorance of their audience: "The functions of heralds and ambassadors, as representatives of one state to another, fell broadly into the same category of official duties, and it is likely that an ordinary Greek, if he had bothered to think, might have hesitated before expressing a view of the differing

---

[33] There are six such situations.   First, Herodotus twice describes a situation where Cyrus contacts the Ionians; in 1.76 he sends *angeloi*, in 1.141, *kērykes*.   Second, the situation mentioned about about the πρέσβεις arriving in Siphnos (3.58.1).   Third, a *kēryx* sent by the false Smerdis to Cambyses is later called an *angelos* (3.62-3).   Fourth, (in a bit of a stretch) the Persian conspirators agree upon admission to see the king without the use of ἄγγελοι (3.118.1); Intaphrenes attempts to bypass an ἀγγελιηφόρος and claim this right (3.118.2).   Fifth, when Periander consults with Thrasybulus about the best way to rule, he sends an *angelos* who is henceforth referred to only as a *kēryx* (5.92ζ.1-2).   Sixth, Herodotus shows Xerxes sending Artabanus an *angelos*, who is then referred to as a *kēryx* (8.54.1).

[34] Long (1987, 48) comments on the variation in how the women are referred to in these passages, but does not have anything to say about the change in the vocabulary of the emissaries.   For a possible East-West distinction, see below.   Questions of vocabulary alteration will be taken up in more detail in Chapter 3.

[35] Karavites (1987, 65) says of epic that "while special envoys - particularly those with the powers to negotiate - could be described as *angeloi*, not all *angeloi* were ambassadors and not all of the missions of heralds were so simple as to differentiate them definitely from those of the *angeloi*.   The term *angelos* was broad enough to include many categories of agents, including the heralds.   It is interesting that along with the human and divine agents birds also served in the capacity of *angeloi* (Od. 15.526)."   In other words, he thinks that because the roles overlap, so does their vocabulary.

legal statuses of heralds and ambassadors" (89).[36] Herodotus appears to take a middle line between precision and ambiguity. As suggested above, ἄγγελος is a broader term than κῆρυξ and there are many situations in which either term can be used without any confusion. Overlap in duties is unremarkable, perhaps because the audience would not notice the distinction (as Mosley supposes) and Herodotus therefore would not need to be precise at all times. However, if precision were truly unnecessary, then the sheer number of distinct terms used (nine, as listed above) would be difficult to explain. What seems more likely is that Herodotus chooses his vocabulary primarily as a way to support his narrative goals, as I will argue, and the broad range of terminology allows him to do just that.

One potential distinction between these characters is that vocabulary choice may hinge, to some extent, on the relative status of sender and recipient. In the first book, where Herodotus is known to establish patterns, strong factions communicate with weaker ones through *kērykes* and nearly all *kērykes* are sent by easterners or Medized cities. When a weaker faction wishes to communicate with a stronger faction, or when both parties may be considered roughly equal, we find *angeloi* instead of *kērykes*. These distinctions do not hold up perfectly through the remaining books, but the broad strokes are consistent. The use of emissaries in revealing status will be taken up on more detail in the fourth chapter. What these characters have in common is their primary job: to report information accurately from a source to a recipient. I have therefore excluded κατάσκοποι (*kataskopoi*) from this section. Although they are perhaps a kind of emissary, their essential purpose is to observe and report on that visual information. It is

---

[36] By "ambassador" here, Mosley means to include the *angelos*. Of the Homeric corpus he says (1978, 88): "Its terminology recognized no difference between the humble messenger and the noble ambassador: both were angeloi."

17

possible for *kataskopoi* to facilitate communication, but only as a secondary function.[37] They are

proxies for the eyes, not the voice, and thus are unlike all of the "proper" emissaries under

discussion.

II. Indirect Emissaries

In addition to numerous emissaries, Herodotus presents a large number of missives of various

types. Missives, of course, are not emissaries in the same way people are, but they cannot be

properly delivered or communicated without some kind of intermediary. Hence, any mention of

a missive must explicitly provide (or implicitly suggest) the involvement of a person. Since this

intermediary is revealed indirectly through his circumstances instead of directly through an

official title, I refer to such characters as "indirect emissaries". For the purposes of the following

typology, the vocabulary indicating the missive is more important than any terms actually

identifying the individual.

A1. Cognate Vocabulary: ἀγγελίη

The noun ἀγγελίη (*angeliē*) is derived from ἄγγελος.[38] It is used 25 times to refer to 24 distinct

messages, for a wide variety of communicative functions. Messages are used most often to share

information, however they are also used to give commands and make requests. Homeric

ἀγγελίαι were strictly oral;[39] for Herodotus the exact nature of this information is not always

clear. Context may suggest whether the message was oral or written, and occasionally other

specifying vocabulary is used to describe the same missive (e.g. γράμματα).

---

[37] For example, Cambyses sends the Fish-eaters as covert spies to the Ethiopians. In addition to their observations, they are confronted by and have a conversation with the king before reporting back to Cambyses (3.19-25). This scene is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

[38] According to Chantraine (2009) and Beekes (2010), *s.v.*

[39] Following the entry in Cunliffe (1977) and stemming from the fact that there is no (undisputed) form of writing in the Homeric epics.

A2. Cognate Vocabulary: κήρυγμα

Similarly, people can make a κήρυγμα (*kērygma*) to an audience on behalf of a "sender".[40]

Context indicates that these missives are purely oral, and therefore the narrative can obscure the

presence of the emissary necessary to proclaim the information. Hence, a κήρυγμα in the text

suggests the presence of an intermediary without necessarily identifying anyone in that role: an

indirect emissary. Herodotus uses this term sparingly: only 8 times to refer to 7 distinct

proclamations.

B1. Analogous Vocabulary: γράμματα

If Herodotus can represent someone as an indirect emissary by having him carry a message, by

analogy anyone carrying γράμματα should fall into a similar category. Unlike all previous terms

discussed, not every use of the word γράμματα necessarily indicates a message. I have therefore

used contextual information to exclude a large number of instances, in particular, where

Herodotus is describing the act of writing or an inscription.[41] Inscriptions are problematic in that

they are a type of message, but one which is transmitted through time, not space, and which lacks

a defined audience. Since these features make inscriptions fundamentally different from

messages and proclamations, inscribed texts are omitted from this study.[42] Only 4 uses of

γράμματα remain, referring to 3 distinct missives. Three particular inscriptions, however, act

more like missives than records: Themistocles' instructions to the Ionians (8.22-3) and the

writing on and inside Nitocris' tomb (1.187).[43] Since these are marginal examples, I will

---

[40] Chantraine (2009) and Beekes (2010) list κήρυγμα as a derivative of κῆρυξ.

[41] I consider records to be in the same category as inscriptions; records are more private and may be more fragile. All singular forms (γράμμα) are omitted also, since they always refer to individual letters of the alphabet. In sum, 24 instances have been omitted.

[42] The communicative context of inscriptions is treated by Svenbro (1993) and Steiner (2001).

[43] West (1985) is confident that Nitocris' inscriptions are spurious, and that Herodotus' report of Themistocles' inscription does not adhere closely to the truth of the situation; either it was shorter, or (more likely) it was not an

consider them only as support for any other analysis of written missives. With the inclusion of

these inscriptions, our totals for γράμματα become 10 uses of the word to describe 6 distinct

missives.

B2. Analogous Vocabulary: βυβλίον

Less problematic than γράμματα is the alternative term βυβλίον (*bublion*). The meaning of this

term is unambiguous and always indicates a written missive.[44] This term is used 21 times to

refer to 8 distinct missives.

Discussion

In many ways, the nouns describing missives (and giving rise to indirect emissaries) show

similar patterns to the nouns describing official emissaries.[45] Among the "cognate" nouns,

ἀγγελίη is more common than κήρυγμα and represents a wider range of communicative

functions. Out of all possible vocabulary, ἀγγελίη has the least restricted meaning, with its

ability to refer to both oral and written missives. If we look at the status relationship between

sender and recipient, again only κηρύγματα are consistently sent from high to low. Non-cognate

vocabulary is also contextually specialized: all missives identified only as γράμματα or βυβλίον

are conveyed as concealed or covert messages for nefarious purposes.[46] I have excluded the term

σῆμα from this section, on the grounds that any message indicated through a "sign" requires

---

inscription in historical reality. She argues that the main point of presenting these inscriptions is thematic: the ideas of Darius' greed and Themistocles' resourcefulness are both reinforced.

[44] Literally, this word simply means "papyrus", but in Herodotus it always indicates papyrus with writing on it.

[45] As with explicit emissaries, vocabulary overlap to describe the same message is possible. There are 2 such situations: when Harpagus sends a concealed message in a hare to Cyrus (1.123.4-124.1, described as γράμματα and a βυβλίον), and when Darius sends a written command to Megabazus (5.14.1-2, described as γράμματα, a βυβλίον, and an ἀγγελίη).

[46] The friendly correspondence between Amasis and Polycrates is an exception. There appear to be good thematic reasons for Herodotus to present us with written communication in this story, which may supersede these connotations. For further discussion, see Chapter 2. Steiner (1994) and Rosenmeyer (2001) suggest that this association arises from the fact of a semi-literate society, in which the necessarily exclusive and intentionally private use of writing was viewed with suspicion.

interpretation and therefore is not a direct representation of speech in the same way as the other terms under consideration are.[47]

III. Implicit Emissaries

We have seen so far that Herodotus can identify someone as an emissary explicitly through vocabulary or indirectly, through the vocabulary of their missives. Similarly, Herodotus can use verbs describing emissary-like actions to suggest that the subjects of those verbs are implicitly acting as emissaries. A large number of verbs fall into this category, and there is little to say about them individually. Consequently, I have condensed the basic information about the cognate verbs (terms, definitions, frequency in the text) into Table 1, below. As above, verbs of writing may act in analogous fashion to the cognate verbs. They are presented in Table 2.

Table 1: Cognate Verbs

Classification	Term	Meaning (from Powell)	Frequency of Appearance	Distinct Examples
A1	ἀγγέλλω	to bring news	23	21
A2	ἀπαγγέλλω	to bring news	22	19
A3	ἐξαγγέλλω	to report	21	18
A4	ἐπαγγέλλω	to give orders/instructions; to offer or announce (mid.)	26	21
A5	ἐσαγγέλλω	to inform; to usher in (w. dat.)	4	3
A6	παραγγέλλω	to command	10	9
A7	περιαγγέλλω	to take news around	3	3
B1	ἐπικηρυκεύομαι	to send a message to	5	5
B2	κηρύσσω	to make a proclamation, put up for sale	3	3
B3	ἀνακηρύσσω	to put up for sale, be proclaimed victor	3	2
B4	ἐκκηρύσσω	to order out of the country	1	1
B5	ἐπικηρύσσω	to put a price on	2	1
C1	πρεσβεύω	to be an ambassador	1[48]	1

---

[47] For more on the meaning of σῆμα, see Hollmann (2011). In the situation where κήρυγμα refers to a trumpet-call, the meaning has been pre-set, and hence only translation is required, not interpretation.
[48] One other use of this verb is found at 7.2.2, but in that location it clearly means "to be older".

Table 2: Analogous Verbs

Classification	Term	Meaning (from Powell)	Frequency of Appearance[49]	Distinct Examples
D1	γράφω	to write down	14	11
D2	ἀπογράφω	to write down, record	2	2
D3	ἐγγράφω	to write on	1	1
D4	συγγράφω	to record (in writing)	4	3

Discussion

The meanings of all the verbs above somehow describe actions which are typically performed by

emissaries or which facilitate communication through a third party. The verbs in classifications

A and B are derived from the nouns ἄγγελος and κῆρυξ, respectively,[50] and presumably carry

some of the meaning from the shared roots. All of these verbs can have a wide range of subjects,

from anonymous individuals to kings. They can also have no subjects at all when given in the

passive. On a few occasions, an official emissary serves as the subject of one of these verbs.[51]

As in the previous two sections, we can see that the verbs deriving from ἄγγελος have a wider

range of meaning and are less specialized than the verbs deriving from κῆρυξ. The contexts in

which these terms are used show a similar distribution: verbs deriving from κῆρυξ are used most

often to indicate public pronouncements, whereas verbs deriving from ἄγγελος are used most

often for information sharing on a smaller scale. The latter are also commonly used for

commands and requests. None of these verbs can be used (alone) to represent an individual as an

---

[49] Some of these verbs occur more often than the number given here. I have excluded all uses of these verbs which indicate drawing or decoration and all uses which describe inscriptions and records, with the same exception as before. 19 uses of γράφω are omitted, including 7 used by Herodotus to describe his own writing. Four uses each of ἀπογράφω and ἐγγράφω have been removed. One example of συγγράφω has been removed, in which Herodotus describes his own writing. Other compounds are completely omitted: ἀναγράφω, ἐπιγράφω, καταγράφω, περιγράφω, and προσεγγράφω. For the many meanings of the simplex verb γράφω, see Chadwick (1996). For Herodotus as the subject of these verbs, see Chapter 6.

[50] Following Chantraine (2009) and Beekes (2010). LSJ erroneously lists κῆρυξ as a derivative of the verb κηρύσσω.

[51] The noun and the verb may have different roots in these situations, e.g. **ὁ** μὲν δὴ **κῆρυξ** οἰχώκεε **ἀγγελέων** ταῦτα Δαρείῳ (4.128.1) – "So this messenger went to deliver this message to Darius" and Κροῖσος μὲν δὴ ταῦτα **δι' ἀγγέλων ἐπεκηρυκεύετο** (1.69.3) – "This was the declaration Croesus made through his agents to the Lacedaemonians." While in the latter example Croesus is properly the subject, the *angeloi* are responsible for the action of the verb. See Chapter 2 for further discussion.

official emissary, but (as I will argue in Chapter 3) some of the characterization of emissaries may "rub off" on the subjects of these verbs.

The only verb in classification C, πρεσβεύω, derives from the adjective πρέσβυς. It describes Socleas (5.93.1) who, contextually, has been previously identified as an *angelos* summoned to Sparta as part of a council (5.91.2). His advice to the Spartans (5.92) is a series of stories about Corinthian rulers, presented at length and without any evident preparation before his arrival. This type of expository, persuasive speech from an *angelos* is unusual, and may explain the unexpected vocabulary. Much like πρέσβεις, discussed above, πρεσβεύω may be a more general term applicable to the actions of emissaries and may be generally avoided by Herodotus.[52]

The verbs in classification D are more easily laid out. Unlike the verbs of A, B, and C, they all originate from a verb (γράφω); the noun γράμμα is a derivative. Therefore the connection to communication through emissaries comes primarily from context rather than etymology. The importance of context explains the exclusion of so many instances of these verbs. For those that remain, however, their context is shared most often with the nouns discussed above: these verbs are used, namely in situations of covert communication.[53] The verb σημαίνω is excluded from this section. While it does refer to a kind of communication which can be effected through intermediaries, the connotations of this verb describe actions which exceed those typically performed by emissaries. Further discussion of the relationship between the verb σημαίνω and the "cognate verbs" can be found in Chapter 3.

---

[52] Also, like πρέσβεις, the verb is very commonly found in Thucydides. Saerens (1975, 628) ascribes the term's appearance to an "Attic context", and offers further thoughts on the verb's evolution of meaning.
[53] With the exception, again, of the exchange between Polycrates and Amasis.

IV. Dispatch Scenes

Scenes involving explicit emissaries can be categorized based on the type of event they contain. The first and most common is when an emissary is sent.[54] Second most common is when an emissary arrives.[55] In 14 situations, an emissary is mentioned solely as a way to explain the transmission of information. In 8 other situations, Herodotus refers to the abstract office of an emissary instead of a particular individual in that office. All other emissaries (48) are seen taking some other kind of action: departing, speaking, being instructed, etc. None of these scenes, aside from sending, show enough uniformity to give rise to any sort of archetypical order of events.[56]

Scenes where emissaries are sent show roughly the same elements in nearly the same order. In this way these scenes might be properly thought of as "type-scenes", similar to those in Homer as described by Clark (2004): "recurring situations which are narrated according to a more or less fixed pattern" (34). The value of recognizing type-scenes in Herodotus is that it provides a more solid foundation for expressing patterns and exploring the meaningful variation from those patterns. Again, following Clark (135): "The particularities of the scenes are as important as the similarity of their overall structure. The technique of the type-scene offers the poet a basic scaffolding, but it also allows the poet to adapt each scene for specific purposes." The "specific purposes" are presumably motivated by the poet's, or in this case Herodotus',

---

[54] 98 emissaries are shown being sent; 44 are *angeloi*, 42 are *kērykes*, 11 are *theopropoi*, and 1 is a group of *presbeis*. For these figures and those in the following notes, I am counting total mentions of emissaries, not distinct individuals.

[55] 43 emissaries are shown arriving; 26 are *angeloi*, 11 are *kērykes*, 3 are *theopropoi*, 1 is a *sunangelos*, and 1 is an *angeliēforos*.

[56] Dik (1995, Chapter 6) discusses the syntax of sentences with λέγω introducing speech. She mentions that ἔλεγε "usually opens a discussion when it precedes its corresponding utterance. Typically it is found with participial phrases implying a meeting (summons, arrival, sending a messenger)" (167). This is not the only way, however, to introduce the speech of an emissary. De Bakker (2007, Chapter 4) discusses four scene-types used for the presentation of speech facilitated (in some way) through an emissary. Aside from superficial differences in language, he points out that the intermediaries serve different purposes in each scene-type, from a narrative expedient allowing two parties to communicate to a character provided with full authority for independent speech (51-8).

communicative and thematic goals for the particular passage.

Nearly half of all scenes with emissaries depict their dispatch to a particular destination for a particular purpose. Salient contextual information can change what appears in the scene and in what order, but a basic "dispatch scene" emerges in aggregate. Intuitively, several pieces of information underlie the dispatch of an emissary: the sender or origin point, the recipient or destination, an emissary, a verb of sending, and a motivation for the dispatch. Every dispatch scene includes all of this information, either expressed explicitly or easily available from context. Details about the emissary's purpose or message are often supplied through an accusative-infinitive or participial construction. Verbatim messages are rarely given. Based on all of the dispatch scenes in the first *logos* of Book 1 (1.1-1.94), we can propose a basic ordering of these elements.[57] The first part of the sentence will have information about sender and motivation. The verb of sending (generally a participle or an indicative) and the emissary follow. Finally, we are given the destination or recipient and, often, an indirect expression representing the essential content or purpose of the message. The scheme below provides a standard approximation:

[Sender~Motivation (in either order)] [Sending] [Emissary] [Recipient/Destination]

[Purpose/Message]

A "perfect" example is when Alyattes sends a *kēryx* to establish a truce with Thrasybulus (1.21.1):

Ἀλυάττης δέ,	ὥς οἱ ταῦτα ἐξαγγέλθη,	αὐτίκα ἔπεμπε	κήρυκα
[sender]	[motivation]	[sending]	[emissary]
And Alyattes	after these things were announced to him	at once sent	a *kēryx*

ἐς Μίλητον	βουλόμενος σπονδὰς ποιήσασθαι Θρασυβούλῳ τε καὶ Μιλησίοισι χρόνον ὅσον ἂν τὸν νηὸν οἰκοδομέῃ.
[destination]	[purpose]
to Miletus	because he wanted to make a truce with Thrasybulus and the Milesians for long enough to build the temple.

---

[57] Scenes which are very similar to the basic pattern are: 1.19.2, 1.20.1, 1.21.1, 1.48.2, 1.60.4, 1.67.2, 1.69.1, 1.76.3, 1.77.4, 1.78.2, 1.81.1. Scenes with more divergence due to context are: 1.22.3, 1.36.2, 1.60.4, 1.78.2, 1.79.2, 1.83.1.

The available contextual information may alter the order or allow the exclusion of some of these elements in other examples, but typically all information about sender/motivation/sending comes before all information about emissary/recipient/destination, and the purpose or message is last.

Discussion

From the perspective of discourse analysis and pragmatics, we can usually explain the communicative reasons behind any reordering; the importance (generally) of word order is taken up in Chapter 2. Pragmatics may also explain, partially, why we appear to have a type-scene for sending emissaries but no equivalent type-scene for their arrival or other actions. The majority of arriving emissaries are appearing for the second time in the narrative, after their initial sending. Since the sending scene provided all of the relevant context for their mission, the audience does not need to be given all the information directly a second time. This is especially true when arrival follows hard upon dispatch. With greater narrative separation, we can understand that the emissary himself has come to embody this context, as will be discussed further in Chapter 2. Not surprisingly, the few scenes which show arrival not preceded by sending provide additional contextual information, in particular, the motivation and a clear indication of the sender or point of origin.[58] Other scenes involving emissaries also typically occur after dispatch (e.g. when speaking their assigned message), in which case their context will have been established previously or should be readily available from the surrounding text.

The fact that dispatch scenes alone appear to have a typical pattern may result from their frequency but also their depiction of the first fundamental action of any emissary. In other words, if an emissary's essential job is to provide connection and communication between two parties, the first step in performing that task is their instruction and initial transit. It is therefore

---

[58] E.g. 2.160.1-2, discussed further in Chapter 3.

the most common scene to be robustly depicted. Arrival, as the necessary result of dispatch, is

often relegated to a participial expression which simply provides context for the rest of the

actions described in that sentence.

The typology and the type-scene of dispatch established above provide a starting point

for the examination of pattern and variation in the chapters which follow. Vocabulary and

syntax are the building blocks of narrative but their contribution to meaning depends further on

discourse context and thematic content. Herodotus, as we shall see in the following chapters,

places and presents emissaries in his narrative in a way which dramatically enhances the ability

of the audience to follow the thematic and narrative structures of his *Histories*.

CHAPTER 2: EMISSARIES AS TOOLS OF NARRATIVE

Anyone who has read through Herodotus' account of the Persian wars knows that it is anything but straightforward. The narrative jumps around in time and space, departing from the main story to dwell on relevant tangents, including ethnography, geography, and flashbacks. To make sense of such an apparently discordant, or at least meandering, story, scholars have recently begun to use the formal tools of narratology to study the construction of the text. The manner in which the narrator tells the story is considered by narratologists to be a deliberate shaping with the intent of focusing the attention of the audience and of revealing meaning through connection. If we narrow our field of vision from this larger frame, we can see how the construction of an individual sentence emphasizes and connects information within a larger context. Such a locally-focused analysis is the province of pragmatics, also an approach applied in earnest to Herodotus only recently. The tools provided by both of these fields turn out to be an excellent way to approach the study of emissaries. Setting aside questions of characterization for the moment, this chapter will examine how emissaries contribute to the construction of the narrative. Using tools from narratology and pragmatics, we can determine the ways in which Herodotus uses intermediaries to organize his text and signal information about that organization to his audience. The placement of these intermediaries orients and directs the audience through portions of the main story while also highlighting thematic connections.

A Starting Point: Terms and Ideas

Many complementary organizing principles for the narrative of the *Histories* have been identified in previous scholarship. Recent work rooted in principles of narratology has expanded the organizing focus from cultural concerns (e.g. East vs. West) or literary themes (e.g. the role

of advisors) to more structural elements of the text. Narratology provides useful formal vocabulary for dealing with the study of narrative: it distinguishes *text* (the written account) from *story* (the events in the order written) which is based on *fabula* (the events in chronological order). De Jong (2007, 3) points out that a fourth layer, *source material*, has been posited as an apt addition for historiography in particular. Especially germane to this work is the idea of a *main story*, which is the story as it would unfold with all digressions removed. The teller of the story, at any given point, is the *narrator*, although the identity of that narrator can change, e.g. from a figure like Herodotus to a character like Solon who recounts an event. For the purposes of this dissertation, as discussed in Chapter 1, I do not draw a distinction between the primary narrator and Herodotus himself. More relevant to this discussion is *focalization* (narrative point of view).[59] For most events the narrator is also the focalizer; Herodotus focalizes the majority of the *Histories*. But when characters hear, speak, think, or otherwise use their senses, they can become focalizers as well, in that information is presented from their own point of view to the audience. Emissaries most frequently focalize when presenting a speech; rarely are we privy to their thoughts or perceptions.

The flow of time will also be relevant to this study of emissaries. At issue here are the numerous *analepses* (flashbacks) and *prolepses* (flashforwards or foreshadowings) which intrude on the linear chronology of the main story. De Jong (1999, 2007) and Rood (2007) see time as a fundamental element of the construction of the narrative, and explore examples to show how temporal shifts and the pace (*rhythm*) of the narrative can organize the text and underscore thematic concerns for the sensitive reader. Events of the *fabula* can be told in real-time (a *scene)*, shortened (a *summary*), or omitted entirely *(*an *ellipsis*). The action can also be interrupted by a *pause*. As we shall see, intermediaries are an immensely useful tool for

---

[59] Focalization is an essential concept behind the works of de Jong (1989), Dewald (1999), and de Bakker (2007).

temporal orientation and rhythm, and one not previously recognized in this capacity.

The benefit of narratology is that it provides a critical method and an idiom for examining a text without restricting the topics suitable for study. The drawback of narratology is that it has tended to focus on larger connections in a text at the expense of the mechanical means by which those occur: vocabulary and word order.[60] The syntactic mechanisms of connection and transition are too many to enumerate here, and many of their origins rest in oral tradition. Suffice it to say that repeated vocabulary and functional words (*particles*) are a vital component.[61] To distinguish between what connects and what should draw attention in a sentence, pragmatic studies of Greek word order are exceptionally useful. Dik (1995) argues that the basic clause structure consists of a *Topic* (which creates contextual orientation) and a *Focus* (which stands as the main point of attention), followed immediately by the main verb and any remaining elements of the clause (*Remainder*).[62] Matić (2003) and Allan (2012) update this scheme to allow analysis of a wider variety of sentence-types; I follow their conclusions while using Dik's simpler terminology.[63] These foundations for understanding the relationship between word order, vocabulary, and contextual meaning will prove useful in the discussion of specific examples of emissaries below.

The following analysis depends on one more important assumption about the use of an emissary and the construction of the text. In the source material available to Herodotus, intermediaries of many types were likely mentioned to some extent, due to their utility in

---

[60] Cf. Slings (2002).
[61] For a typology of transitions in Herodotus and a discussion of how they function, see Munson's 1983 dissertation. She pays careful attention to vocabulary and discusses the role of numerous particles, nouns, adjectives, verbs, and demonstratives in creating transitions in the narrative. She does not, however, include any of the vocabulary of emissaries discussed in my first chapter's typology .
[62] My description of the clause order components has been simplified for the sake of accessibility. Among other refinements, not every sentence will contain these elements in this order and some may have compound or multiple Topics and Focuses. Furthermore, a verb can be fronted into Topic or Focus position.
[63] Theoretical updates include additional categories of Topics and Focuses which may appear in a wider set of locations within a sentence.

situations of battle and diplomacy. But the choice to explicitly include or exclude these characters at specific points in the story and the manner of their presentation in the text (when they do appear) depend solely on the narrator. Therefore, I consider the existence and presentation of an explicit emissary to be indicative of narratological and pragmatic choices.

Geographic Orientation via Intermediaries

Although time has recently taken center-stage as a focus for narratological work on Herodotus, no less interesting is the question of geography.[64] In telling his history of the Persian wars, Herodotus widens his horizon to cover events occurring in the entire known world of the time. Since communication and alliance exist between these far-flung places, the narrative must provide a means to travel seamlessly between them. Emissaries are one way of dealing with geographic dispersion. Particles and demonstrative pronouns have previously been recognized as ways to manage this type of transition,[65] but intermediaries provide a distinct advantage for the audience: they are instantly understandable characters, not abstract semantic markers. When an emissary is seen being sent and arriving with a particular message, he gives form to the geographic transit required for the journey. The actual trip is almost always removed from the narrative (through ellipsis), but sometimes an acknowledgment of the distance or difficulty is indicated (through summary). Through his dispatch and arrival, this emissary also bridges time, since long-distance travel was rarely quick in the ancient world. Herodotus capitalizes on the ability of intermediaries to embody the dual transitions of time and place in his narrative. Abstracting this ability beyond the demands of the *fabula*, he can also use these intermediaries to organize larger chunks of text containing analepses and prolepses, especially those passages

---

[64] As above, see de Jong (1999, 2007) and Rood (2007) for time; Purves (2010) explores the narrative as if it represents physical geography.
[65] Notably by Bakker (2006).

whose events occur in a different location from the main story.

The simplest example of geographic shifting is a one-time change of location enabled by the transit of an emissary. A very neat example can be found in Book 9, where the Argives send a *kēryx* to Mardonius who is occupying Athens.

9.12.1-13.1 Ἀργεῖοι δὲ ἐπείτε τάχιστα ἐπύθοντο τοὺς μετὰ Παυσανίεω ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ Σπάρτης, **πέμπουσι κήρυκα τῶν ἡμεροδρόμων ἀνευρόντες τὸν ἄριστον ἐς τὴν Ἀττικήν**, πρότερον αὐτοὶ Μαρδονίῳ ὑποδεξάμενοι σχήσειν τὸν Σπαρτιήτην μὴ ἐξιέναι· **ὃς ἐπείτε ἀπίκετο ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας,** ἔλεγε, τάδε· [...] ὁ μὲν δὴ εἴπας ταῦτα ἀπαλλάσσετο ὀπίσω, Μαρδόνιος δὲ...

As soon as the Argives found out that Pausanias and his men had left Sparta, **they sent the fastest courier they could find to Attica**, since they had previously promised Mardonius that they would stop the Spartiates leaving the Peloponnese. **The courier arrived in Athens** and said, ...[Speech]... After delivering this message the courier took his leave. Mardonius...

This passage follows the standard type-scene of emissary dispatch discussed in my first chapter; the only remarkable element is that the *kēryx* is identified in more detail as "the best of the day-runners", i.e. long-distance couriers on foot. [66] Philippides is the only other character described as a "day-runner" (ἡμεροδρόμος) in the *Histories* (6.105-106). Thus the exceptional distance to be traveled in a short time is emphasized, placing attention on the ellipsis of the actual transit, which is usually passed over without notice by Herodotus. [67] Although we do not see the passage of the *kēryx* from the Peloponnese to Attica, his elided path simultaneously moves the narration so that we arrive easily without delay. Note the parallel start of the clause in each location: Ἀργεῖοι δὲ ἐπείτε... when we are still in Argos, then ὃς ἐπείτε... as he arrives at his destination. We can see also a narrowing of focus, from region to specific location: the *kēryx* is sent from Argos to Attica, which is narrowed down first by having Mardonius implicated as the addressee

---

[66] Flower and Marincola (*ad loc.*) also point out that "as a κῆρυξ, not an ἄγγελος, he presumably would have had the rights attendant on heralds, and would thus be able to get past the fortified and guarded Isthmus." The more privileged status of *kērykes* historically is supported by their presentation in the *Histories* (as discussed further in Chapter 1); see also Mosley (1973) for historical information.

[67] In this case, the *kēryx* would have covered ~54km (according to Asheri *ad loc.*) over uneven ground. By contrast, in 6.105-6 Philippides runs ~225km round-trip over two days (according to Dewald in Waterfield (1998) *ad loc.*) and the fact of his actual travel is emphasized by the scene of his encounter with Pan.

and refined again by having the *kēryx* arrive explicitly into Athens. Since he is depicted speaking directly, we can assume that he has reached Mardonius himself and thus we have arrived at the correct region, city, and person. Nothing more specific can be determined. At the start of 9.13, the *kēryx* leaves, but the narrative stays with Mardonius and the Persian army. We should expect the narration to linger at the destination and with the new subject matter, since Herodotus prefers to focus on specific locations at the expense of general ones (more on this below). The departure clause referred to the *kēryx* only with the definite article ὁ ("he", used as a pronoun followed by μέν) and his destination is kept vague, simply as ὀπίσω ("back"). He is no longer of any importance to us – his job in the story of delivering the message and his job in the narrative of delivering the audience to Mardonius in Athens are both completed.

Location changes can be performed by intermediaries even without explicit arrival – the act of sending is enough to justify an immediate shift in place, as in Book 3, when Darius sends an *angelos* with orders.

3.138.3 **πέμψας γὰρ ἄγγελον ἐς Κνίδον** κατάγειν σφέας ἐκέλευε Γίλλον ἐς Τάραντα· πειθόμενοι δὲ Δαρείῳ Κνίδιοι...
[Darius] ordered **the Cnidians, through a messenger**, to return Gillus to Tarentum. The Cnidians tried to carry out Darius' command...

The *angelos* is sent explicitly to his destination (again in accordance with the dispatch type-scene), and his message indicates what should happen next – in fact, the language of the second sentence cuts out the intermediary role of the *angelos* and treats the command as being made directly by the king to the subjects: literally translated as "Persuaded by Darius [=obeying Darius], the Cnidians...". Thus the formal dispatch of the *angelos* prepares us for transition: after this point his role is finished and he can be elided.[68] His message provides the connection between sentences from old to new location, from old subject (Darius) to new subject (the

---

[68] This is not to say that he *must* be elided when such a construction is used.

Cnidians).

Shifting can even be cued by a verb, without any explicit sending or arrival, as in Book 4

when Darius issues orders to his fleet, whose movements we then follow:

4.89.1-2 Δαρεῖος δὲ δωρησάμενος Μανδροκλέα διέβαινε ἐς τὴν Εὐρώπην **τοῖσι Ἴωσι παραγγείλας** πλέειν ἐς τὸν Πόντον μέχρι Ἴστρου ποταμοῦ· ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀπίκωνται ἐς τὸν Ἴστρον, ἐνθαῦτα αὐτὸν περιμένειν ζευγνύντας τὸν ποταμόν. τὸ γὰρ δὴ ναυτικὸν ἦγον Ἴωνές τε καὶ Αἰολέες καὶ Ἑλλησπόντιοι. ὁ μὲν δὴ ναυτικὸς Κυανέας διεκπλώσας ἔπλεε ἰθὺ τοῦ Ἴστρου, ...

So Darius crossed over into Europe. As well as rewarding Mandrocles, **he had also ordered the Ionians** to take the navy into the Euxine Sea and sail to the River Ister, where they were to bridge the river and wait for him. For the navy was commanded by the Ionians, Aeolians, and Hellespontine Greeks. So the fleet sailed between the Blue Rocks and made straight for the Ister.

No dispatch occurs here, hence the order of the sentence is not what we might expect – the

recipients (Ionians) precede the verb of messaging (παραγγείλας). This has the effect of linking

Darius more closely to the Ionians and eliminating the need for a formal proxy. The verb instead

introduces the command and clarifies that the navy is the "destination" of this information, just

as the Ionians are the recipients. Again, the message provides a means and preparation for a

change of location (indicated here through a shift in subject, from Darius to the navy itself),

though no actual emissary embodies that shift in this example.[69]

Of these three examples, it is worth noting that the most complete expression of an

intermediary being sent and arriving is also the only passage where the narrative remains at the

destination point for any period of time. Once we reach Mardonius in 9.13, the main story

proceeds to follow him and the Persian army for several chapters. In the other two examples,

where the use of the emissary is expressed in less robust terms, the shift is temporary, only

lasting the space of a few sentences. Thus it appears that more preparation is necessary for more

enduring changes: this is a very considerate and unobtrusive way to alert the audience to a major

---

[69] Military commands are generally shown to be passed through verbs rather than through explicit emissaries. The rigid command structure of the military may make the mechanism of transmission less important to display, since it may be readily inferred from general knowledge.

transition.

Orientation in Time and Place

Geographical transition is the simplest form of shifting enabled by intermediaries, but more

interesting is when intermediaries combine geographical shifting with temporal orientation. The

ability to do both at once, intrinsically, is an aspect which makes emissaries special in the pool of

transitional tools. The richness that can be added to the narrative by these emissaries is evident

in the interaction between Croesus and Sparta in the first book. After testing the oracles, Croesus

has asked if he should go to war with Persia and if he should obtain an ally. The answer,

appearing to be affirmative on both counts (1.53), compels him to approach Sparta to establish

an alliance which will last until his defeat at the hands of Cyrus. The several emissaries

facilitating the relationship of Croesus and Sparta are particularly useful to examine because they

are contained in the first major portion (*logos*) of the main story where Herodotus is known to

establish important patterns.[70] Since the diplomatic communication in this section is managed by

the first series of emissaries between two parties in the *Histories*, it sets a precedent for all later

examples of a similar type.

 We begin with another straightforward geographic shift: Croesus has determined that

Sparta is the strongest Greek state and sends *angeloi* to establish an alliance.

 1.69.1-2 ταῦτα δὴ ὦν πάντα πυνθανόμενος **ὁ Κροῖσος ἔπεμπε ἐς Σπάρτην ἀγγέλους**
δῶρά τε φέροντας καὶ δεησομένους συμμαχίης ἐντειλάμενός τε τὰ λέγειν χρῆν. **οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες
ἔλεγον·** ̔**ἔπεμψε ἡμέας Κροῖσος ὁ Λυδῶν τε καὶ ἄλλων ἐθνέων βασιλεύς** λέγων, τάδε. "ὦ
Λακεδαιμόνιοι, χρήσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν Ἕλληνα φίλον προσθέσθαι – ὑμέας γὰρ πυνθάνομαι
προεστάναι τῆς Ἑλλάδος – ὑμέας ὦν κατὰ τὸ χρηστήριον προσκαλέομαι φίλος τε θέλων
γενέσθαι καὶ σύμμαχος ἄνευ τε δόλου καὶ ἀπάτης.'''
 On the basis of all this information, then, **Croesus sent agents to Sparta**, to take gifts
and ask for an alliance. He had told them what to say, **and when they arrived in Sparta they
said, 'These are the words we bring from Croesus, king of the Lydians and other peoples**:

---

[70] See, e.g., Kindt (2006).

35

"Lacedaemonians, the oracle advised me to make the Greek my ally and now I have learnt that you are the leading Greek people. You, therefore, are the ones to whom I am extending the invitation the oracle recommended. I want to be on good terms with you and to enter into an alliance with you without treachery or deceit."'

Up until this point, the narrative has visited Sparta only through analepses, to provide the audience with historical information explaining the actions and decisions of Eastern peoples. This dispatch of emissaries finally allows the main story to shift its attention to the Spartans of the present time, and even lingers in Sparta to provide a prolepsis which will be relevant to future narrative. The transition is almost immediate: Croesus (located in Sardis, the capital city) sends his *angeloi* and we only have time to find out what they bear (gifts and a message) before they arrive indirectly through a participle (ἐλθόντες, "after arriving") and speak. The time of the journey is therefore omitted, and the (large!) geographic distance traveled is muted by the immediate focus on the words of Croesus, presented with direct speech after he has been introduced as speaker. This rare formulation creates the impression that the arrival of the *angeloi* has in some sense directly connected Croesus with Sparta. Herodotus caps the speech by emphasizing, once again, Croesus' direct connection to Sparta despite the physical reality of proxy speakers and geographical separation:

> 1.69.3 Κροῖσος μὲν δὴ ταῦτα **δι' ἀγγέλων ἐπεκηρυκεύετο**, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἀκηκοότες...
> This was **the declaration** Croesus **made through his agents** to the Lacedaemonians, who in fact had already heard...

Despite making Croesus the subject and starting point of this sentence, Herodotus is careful to emphasize twice over that intermediaries are the ones who actually transmitted the preceding message by putting the emissaries (δι' ἀγγέλων) in the Focus position followed by the main (cognate) verb ἐπεκηρυκεύετο. This belated emphasis on the emissaries reminds the audience

36

that Croesus is not, in fact, speaking directly and in person to the Lacedaemonians.[71] Instead, the

reference to these characters is a reminder that we have physically changed location and an

indication that our time in Sparta is not yet over; they finish speaking, but their departure is

omitted. Thus the vocabulary of this clause prepares us for the resumption of narrative

exclusively in Sparta, confirmed by the second half of the sentence starting with Λακεδαιμόνιοι

δὲ ("And the Lacedaemonians"...).

A paragraph later, in 1.71.1, we are returned to Sardis from Sparta by a μέν-δέ link. The

nascent diplomatic relationship between Lydia and Sparta is not revisited until 1.77.3, when

Croesus fears the approach of Cyrus and calls upon his allies for help.

1.77.1-4 Κροῖσος...ἐν νόῳ ἔχων **παρακαλέσας μὲν Αἰγυπτίους** κατὰ τὸ ὅρκιον
(ἐποιήσατο γὰρ καὶ πρὸς Ἄμασιν βασιλεύοντα Αἰγύπτου συμμαχίην πρότερον ἤ περ πρὸς
Λακεδαιμονίους), **μεταπεμψάμενος δὲ καὶ Βαβυλωνίους** (καὶ γὰρ πρὸς τούτους αὐτῷ
ἐπεποίητο συμμαχίη, ἐτυράννευε δὲ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον τῶν Βαβυλωνίων Λαβύνητος),
ἐπαγγείλας δὲ καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους παρεῖναι ἐς χρόνον ῥητόν, ἁλίσας τε δὴ τούτους καὶ τὴν
ἑωυτοῦ συλλέξας στρατιὴν ἐνένωτο τὸν χειμῶνα παρεὶς ἅμα τῷ ἦρι στρατεύειν ἐπὶ τοὺς Πέρσας.
καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα φρονέων, ὡς ἀπίκετο ἐς τὰς Σάρδις, **ἔπεμπε κήρυκας κατὰ τὰς συμμαχίας**
προερέοντας ἐς πέμπτον μῆνα συλλέγεσθαι ἐς Σάρδις·

What [Croesus] planned to do was this. He had made an alliance with the Egyptian king
Amasis, which preceded his alliance with Lacedaemon, and he had also entered into a similar
treaty with the Babylonians too (whose ruler at the time was Labynetus). **He intended to send
for the Egyptians and the Babylonians**, according to their sworn promises, **as well as telling
the Lacedaemonians** to come at a specific time; then, once they were all present and he had
mustered his own army too, he would let the winter go by and attack the Persians as soon as it
was spring. With these thoughts in mind, when he got back to Sardis **he dispatched heralds to
his various allies**, calling on them to assemble in Sardis in four months' time.

In the discussion of Croesus' plans, three allies are mentioned: the Egyptians, the Babylonians,

and the Lacedaemonians. Only the last of these is marked explicitly with the vocabulary of

emissaries, even if indirectly through a verb (ἐπαγγείλας). The stem of this verb, αγγειλ-, may

also recall the emissaries (ἀγγέλους and ἀγγέλων) who established this alliance in 1.69. Once

Croesus is done thinking, arrives in Sardis, and acts, we see that he sends *kērykes* to his allies in

---

[71] Following Luraghi (2003, 178-9), the *angeloi* in this construction (διὰ + genitive) can be considered to be acting
as a channel for Croesus.

37

general (κατὰ τὰς συμμαχίας) without singling out any particular location. Thus the narrative

does not prepare us for a geographic shift and accordingly it stays in Sardis with Croesus.[72]

Croesus' fear of Cyrus is justified and in 1.81 he finds himself besieged. Once again he

calls on his allies, and once again the Lacedaemonians are singled out through mention of

intermediaries.

1.81-82.1 τοῖσι μὲν δὴ κατεστήκεε πολιορκίη, Κροῖσος δὲ δοκέων οἱ χρόνον ἐπὶ μακρὸν
ἔσεσθαι τὴν πολιορκίην **ἔπεμπε ἐκ τοῦ τείχεος ἄλλους ἀγγέλους ἐς τὰς συμμαχίας**. **οἱ μὲν γὰρ
πρότερον διεπέμποντο** ἐς πέμπτον μῆνα προερέοντες συλλέγεσθαι ἐς Σάρδις, **τούτους δὲ
ἐξέπεμπε** τὴν ταχίστην δέεσθαι βοηθέειν ὡς πολιορκεομένου Κροίσου. ἔς τε δὴ ὦν τὰς ἄλλας
ἔπεμπε συμμαχίας **καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐς Λακεδαίμονα**. τοῖσι δὲ καὶ αὐτοῖσι [τοῖσι Σπαρτιήτησι] κατ᾽
αὐτὸν τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον...
So the Persians were besieging the city. Croesus expected the siege to last a long time, so
he **sent men out of the city with further dispatches for his allies**. Whereas **the men he had
sent before** had taken messages requesting the allies to gather in Sardis in four months' time,
this current lot of messengers were to ask them to come and help as quickly as possible, since
he was under siege. **The men were dispatched** to all his allies, **including the
Lacedaemonians**. Now, it so happened that the Lacedaemonians themselves were at that time...

This time the general statement of sending emissaries "to the allies" (ἐς τὰς συμμαχίας) comes

first and is even repeated (ἔς τε δὴ ὦν τὰς ἄλλας ἔπεμπε συμμαχίας) before any individual ally is

singled out – inverse order from 1.77. We are reminded of the first request for aid in 1.77 by

reference to the earlier emissaries (οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρότερον) who were sent with slightly different

instructions. That brief (and nonspecific) analepsis is contrasted with the present emissaries

(τούτους), who are as yet equally vague. Clarification, however, is limited: in the discussion of

recipients, the Babylonians and Egyptians are left lumped together as nameless "allies", and only

the Lacedaemonians are specifically mentioned. Furthermore, they are set apart by the formulaic

---

[72] Cf. 6.97, where Herodotus is vague about destination and provides a message but no actual location shift. Also
note that in 7.32, Xerxes sends *kērykes* all around Greece (generally) to ask for earth and water; we do not travel to
any of these places, but hear about the results of these requests when the emissaries return much later (7.131).
Athens and Sparta are specifically mentioned as places *not* visited (because Darius' emissaries to those locations
were murdered), and yet these are the only places to which the narrative shifts (7.133); detailed discussion can be
found in Chapter 4. Thus specificity with emissaries can cue location shifts, even if no emissaries were actually
sent.

phrase καὶ δὴ καὶ ("and especially"), which calls attention to the end of a list and signals that item as a point of continued interest. We are therefore prepared to expect a transition to Sparta, and indeed in the next sentence we have been relocated.[73]

At this point the narrative takes a pause in the main story of Croesus and inserts a description of current events in Sparta (including an analepsis with relevant background material). To end the digression, Herodotus sums up the situation in very general terms without providing a particular moment in time as a reference. Immediately after, Croesus' emissary, sent in 1.77, finally arrives.

1.83 τοιούτων δὲ τοῖσι Σπαρτιήτῃσι ἐνεστεώτων πρηγμάτων **ἧκε ὁ Σαρδιηνὸς κῆρυξ** δεόμενος Κροίσῳ βοηθέειν πολιορκεομένῳ.

That was the situation facing the Spartiates when **the herald arrived from Sardis** to ask them to come and help Croesus lift the siege.

The narrative shifted to Sparta immediately after the emissary was sent, but the chronology of the main story does not resume until he arrives. Here, for the first time in this sequence, we see the temporal orientation provided by emissaries. It is no coincidence that this orientation occurs after a pause in the main story, which could also be thought of as a way for Herodotus to indicate the necessary time for travel. Out of many parallel stories, the arrival of the emissary identifies which specific temporal thread we are to focus on at the present moment by linking back to the events that led to his dispatch. His sending instigated the shift in location, his arrival provides chronological orientation. Thus a single emissary can plant us correctly in space and time.

Since the sending and arrival scenes of this *kēryx* were robust, we should not be surprised that the narrative remains in Sparta. In fact, this same emissary is mentioned in the next sentence as a way to provide continued context for the next actions of the Spartans:

---

[73] The καὶ δὴ καί formulation (with the same shifting result) occurs again in 3.61, directing us specifically to Egypt. Dik (1995, 45-7) and Denniston (1996, 255-7) discuss the ability of this phrase to mark out a particular topic of interest.

1.83 οἱ δὲ ὅμως, ἐπείτε **ἐπύθοντο τοῦ κήρυκος**, ὁρμέατο βοηθέειν.

Despite their problems, the Spartiate response **to the man's news** was to set about providing help.[74]

The *kēryx*, old information at this point, is placed into an adverbial clause providing transitional information about the reason and setting of the action – he is no longer important, only his effect matters now. This is made doubly clear by the fact he follows his verb within his clause. Thus the Spartans take the place of relevance in this sentence (the Topic), and their preparations for the war are the main point of attention (the Focus). Almost immediately, another message from the East arrives with news of Croesus' defeat:

1.83 καί σφι ἤδη παρεσκευασμένοισι καὶ νεῶν ἐουσέων ἑτοίμων **ἦλθε ἄλλη ἀγγελίη**, ὡς ἡλώκοι τὸ τεῖχος τῶν Λυδῶν καὶ ἔχοιτο Κροῖσος ζωγρηθείς. οὕτω δὴ οὗτοι μὲν συμφορὴν ποιησάμενοι μεγάλην ἐπέπαυντο.

But in the middle of their preparations, when their ships were ready, **another message came**, this time with the news that the Lydian city had fallen and that Croesus had been taken prisoner. So, with a sense of deep regret, the Spartiates called off their preparations.

No geographic shifting has occurred, since the message arrives (without being sent) at Sparta where the narrative is already located. Temporally, time has been advancing in the scene as expected. But this message still provides an implicit change of location and time; by providing information about events in Lydia, it changes the subject (temporarily) to that region of the world and tells of events which are now past. Since our explicit geography and chronology, however, has remained unchanged and since the message (being inanimate) cannot "depart", the narrative remains in Sparta to describe the aftermath of this news.

In sum, the various intermediaries sent by Croesus in this series of examples show another way in which Herodotus manages the geographic and temporal threads of his narrative. But these transitions hardly occur in a vacuum: as scholars have routinely noted, changes in narrative subject, time, and place are deliberately placed to emphasize themes and help the

---

[74] Literally, "when they learned from the herald (Croesus' request)".

audience comprehend connections. We therefore can look again at the intermediaries between Croesus and Sparta with an eye for the thematic context: the results indicate as much (or more) about thematic construction as the analysis of shifting indicated about the construction of the text.

Thematic Orientation

What will shortly become clear is that the language and context surrounding emissaries can shine a light on issues of larger thematic significance in a particular *logos* or even as a part of the main story. In combination with temporal and spatial connection, this additional ability to construct or emphasize structure on a narrative and thematic level is similar, in a reductive way, to the function of particles. These small, functional words connect sentences, underscore important words, and color the tone of the text. They almost never start a sentence, but instead highlight whatever does come first. Similarly, emissaries are rarely themselves the focus of much attention in a sentence – they are minor, unnamed characters (for the most part) who serve a functional role in the narrative and often appear in the Remainder of their sentences. This is not to say that they are incapable of presenting meaning. Particles, such as the pair μέν and δέ, are a standard way to organize a narrative, and Bakker (2006) additionally discusses how these particles help the audience remain focused on a given theme through the various spatial and temporal jumps present in the text. In this section, I will show how emissaries can perform a surprisingly similar function to these abstract semantic markers. In particular, emissaries may in some respects be textual signals used to amplify information about interpersonal and intercultural relationships.

We have already seen how the proxies sent from Croesus to Sparta help the narrator to manage geography and time. If we focus on the diplomatic relationship, we see that every

message shown originates with Croesus as the sender; the Spartans may reply, but they do not

send any of their own men with words for Croesus. Furthermore, the single authority figure of

Croesus as sender stands out in comparison to the collective group of Spartans as recipients.

These contrasts keep the overall focus on the East and the eastern king, despite our occasional

excursions to mainland Greece and non-tyrannical (i.e. collective) political systems.[75]

Thematically this is appropriate: the first portion of the *Histories* deals with the succession of

kings in the East and the passing of tyrannical power. Despite the involvement of Sparta in the

politics of Croesus, the West is not a place that Herodotus wants to focus upon at this moment –

it will be a major focus in the future but its relevance now is indirect. Hence we visit Sparta in

asides and analepses, dwelling only briefly in the main storyline, and only because of Lydian

messages. The use of intermediaries will help to confirm Croesus' place as the main focal point

of this entire *logos* and will help to characterize his changing relationship with Sparta.

Starting back in 1.69, when Croesus sends emissaries to establish an alliance with Sparta,

we can see that the *angeloi* are not part of the salient information in the sentence. When they are

sent, they appear in the Remainder. Their arrival is indicated in Topic position, providing

contextual orientation for the verb, which follows as the Focus (οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες ἔλεγον· – "They,

having arrived, said:"). Speech is more salient than arrival for this sentence: speech represents

words from Croesus whereas the arrival simply allows them to be spoken in the right place. Our

geographic shift to Sparta is in the service of Croesus' story. In the introduction to Croesus'

actual words, the same emphasis is seen as that of the preceding sentence: the Topic (set off by

the personal pronoun "us" in second position) is about sending and Croesus, fully identified, is

---

[75] As further support for this focus, de Bakker (2007, 76-9) considers the analepses about Athens and Sparta (after Croesus hears the oracle and is deciding between them as allies) to be, in an oblique way, a transported speech (i.e. something reported via intermediaries). He points out that "this can be ascertained from the references to Croesus as the addressee of the information at the beginning, middle, and end of the digression. Thanks to these framing remarks, Croesus is continually in the background" (76).

the Focus ("ἔπεμψε ἡμέας Κροῖσος ὁ Λυδῶν τε καὶ ἄλλων ἐθνέων βασιλεύς..."). After the speech is finished, Croesus finally yields the salient Focus position to the *angeloi*, but does so in a flashy way; he is sentence-initial (as Topic) and is given additional prominence through the particle pair which immediately follows: Κροῖσος μὲν δή. He and his speech (ταῦτα) provide contextual connection for the now-salient emissaries (δι' ἀγγέλων), who re-center the narrative on the geographical shift and diplomatic connection which they have just established. This refocusing, as mentioned above, clears the way for events in Sparta to continue.

When Croesus calls for help in 1.77 and again in 1.81, both times the use of emissaries narrows the focus from the pool of his allies to the Spartans in particular, as discussed above. In addition to the repeated sending of emissaries, the manner in which we are informed of the alliances highlights the Spartans. Croesus' relationships with Egypt and Babylon are established in 1.77, both in short analepses, and even here Sparta plays a role. The alliance with Egypt is said to have been established "earlier than the one with the Lacedaemonians" (πρότερον ἤ περ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους), which refers to the events of 1.69. Thus Herodotus contrasts for us the inception of these relationships: one is told directly, using explicit emissaries in a scene, the other is told indirectly, displaced temporally and summarized. The Babylonians are at least considered in their own right before we turn to the Spartans and Croesus' request to the allies. The expression of his request also sets the Spartans apart: the Egyptians and Babylonians are summoned with verbs of calling (παρακαλέσας) and sending (μεταπεμψάμενος); the Lacedaemonians are provided with instructions by a cognate verb (ἐπ̲α̲γ̲γ̲εί̲λ̲ας). The vocabulary of this first scene in which Croesus summons help affirms his relationship with Sparta as the most important alliance for the main story at this point.[76] The way in which the Spartans are

---

[76] The vocabulary may also distinguish Sparta as relatively more powerful. Καλέω and compounds are typically used when summoning individuals of much lower status than the sender; see Chapter 4 for more discussion.

again singled out in the second summoning scene (1.81) prepares us for the geographic shift to

Sparta (as discussed above) but also continues to underscore this thematic focus on the

relationship between Croesus and the Greeks. Although the third and final act of sending to

Sparta omits the explicit emissaries from the sentence (leaving the sending verb without a direct

object: ...ἔπεμπε ...καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐς Λακεδαίμονα – "he sent [messengers] especially to

Lacedaemon"), the thematic connection the emissaries have already established makes their

presence at the end superfluous.

The emissary is not superfluous, however, when he arrives in Sparta (1.83). The arrival

of this *kēryx*, highlighted through a pre-posed verb (ἧκε, in clause-initial position), provides

temporal orientation and reminds the audience of the geographic and thematic connections

previously established. The pause in the narrative before this emissary arrives not only calls

attention to the time of transit, but also calls attention to the fact that in this situation (unlike in

1.69), the request contained in the message is highly time-sensitive. Croesus is not planning for

the future anymore; he is under direct attack when every day counts. The thematic emphasis on

the need for haste is continued by the next sentence, where the repeated mention of the *kēryx* is

followed immediately by the verb ὁρμέατο "to set in motion". This juxtaposition of vocabulary

suggests the immediacy of the response to the message: it is heard and in the next breath

preparations are underway.[77] The Spartans clearly understand the need for speed.

Despite the urgency of this message, Croesus does not appear directly in the main clause

when the emissary arrives. Nevertheless, Herodotus explicitly recalls the capital city of Lydia by

describing the *kēryx* as "Sardian" (with the adjective moved into prominence before its noun).

Geographic connection is likely Herodotus' goal, since there is no opportunity for narrative

---

[77] Croesus' decision to send a *kēryx* instead of an *angelos* may also indicate the gravity of his request through its emphasis of his status.

confusion about where this emissary has originated.[78] The Remainder of the sentence expresses

the fundamental purpose or message of the *kēryx*, that Croesus needs aid, in much the same

words as we saw in 1.81. But this second expression of the situation has different word order

due to pragmatic factors:

1.81	δέεσθαι	[βοηθέειν	ὡς	πολιορκεομένου	Κροίσου]
	ask	[help	because	besieged	Croesus]

1.83	δεόμενος	[Κροίσῳ	βοηθέειν	πολιορκεομένῳ]
	ask	[Croesus	help	besieged]

In both cases the message is introduced by a verb of request (δέεσθαι/δεόμενος), but in the

second version, after the emissary arrives, Croesus takes precedence over aiding and siege. In

the first case, presumably the context (Croesus sending the message) makes his involvement and

the rationale more evident (i.e. inferable), allowing the information to be postponed. But once in

Sparta, the essential element of the message evidently is not the circumstance (of besiegement)

or the desired result (of aid). Herodotus puts the sender of the message front and center within

the message itself, emphasizing again the personal, diplomatic connection between these two

peoples.[79] That connection is, unfortunately, short-lived, as the second and final arriving

message in 1.83 confirms the defeat of Croesus and the end of a need for Spartan intervention.

This second message in 1.83 is never seen to depart the east but only arrives.

Furthermore, it arrives as a message (ἀγγελίη) only, not as a human proxy bearing a message.

Again, arrival is stressed and the message content is postponed until later in the sentence. Less

identifying information is needed up front, since we have just received a message from the same

origin to the same destination. But even so, the personal connection between Croesus and Sparta

---

[78] Sparta has received no emissaries from other locations in this portion of the text, and no Spartan emissaries have been mentioned.

[79] In linguistic terms, Croesus is moved into Topic position, thereby providing the contextual orientation necessary for Spartans to understand the main point (Focus) of the message: that he needs help!

is de-emphasized in four ways: the message is never seen to be sent, the message arrives as a disembodied object instead of a person, the information about Croesus is postponed until the end of this final message, and Croesus never focalizes the information presented. In terms of postponed information, we can see that action (seizure) and physical space ("the wall", as a synecdoche for Sardis) are prioritized over people. Out of the people affected by the end of this siege, even, the Lydians are mentioned before Croesus, whose fate is delayed until the end of the message.[80]

In terms of focalization, this final message is the only exchange of information between Croesus and Sparta in which the message has not been focalized in Sardis before being received by the Spartans. In 1.69, Croesus focalizes the motivation (πυνθανόμενος...) for sending the emissaries and (generally) their speech (ἐντειλάμενος...). Although the *angeloi* focalize when they deliver his speech in Sparta (ἔλεγον...), he reclaims his place as focalizer of the message in the capping sentence: Κροῖσος...ἐπεκηρυκεύετο. *He* is the focalizer, according to the narrative, and the emissaries (δι' ἀγγέλων) are just the tools by which this focalization is accomplished. In 1.77 and 1.81 when he sends for aid, Croesus is again the one focalizing his motive (ἐν νόῳ ἔχων... in 77, δοκέων.. in 81); his message is focalized by his emissaries as they are being sent from Sardis (προερέοντες... in 77 and 81, δέεσθαι in 81). Thus the first message arriving in 1.83, focalized at that point by the *kēryx* (δεόμενος...), has previously been focalized in Sardis after the command of Croesus. The final message in 1.83 bucks this trend and arrives without previous focalization. Because no explicit emissary delivers this message, there is no character to focalize the message or provide any point of view on it. Instead, we must assume that Herodotus resumes

---

[80] This order (Lydian walls, then Croesus) is even more remarkable if we consider that usually specific orientation information is provided before general orientation information, following Dik (2007). Croesus would seem to be more specific than "Lydian walls", and thus if communicative clarity were principal in this situation, we should expect him to be mentioned first.

his role as narrator and focalizer. Thus at the moment his downfall is recounted to his ally, Croesus and his words are marginalized as much as possible by his presentation in the narrative.

Syntax and focalization are not the only sign of Croesus' sudden change in status. The first emissary to arrive in 1.83 is identified as a κῆρυξ, which is one way to indicate Croesus' power as an Eastern ruler (as discussed in the typology of the first chapter and above). The close narrative juxtaposition of a *kēryx* with a message (ἀγγελίη) expressed in vocabulary lacking any connotations of high status may serve as a metaphor for Croesus' sudden drop in power; he is not even the one, necessarily, who sends the second message.[81] The report makes clear that he is no longer in power, so the official relationship between him and Sparta is finished by default. His failure in battle is exaggerated by the fact that we hear news of his defeat while amidst a society with a warlike reputation currently gearing up for a fight. In addition, the ἀγγελίη is the first message in this sequence which has not been explicitly sent – it only arrives. From the perspective of the text, this is a surprise message: we were not explicitly prepared for its arrival. The content of the message may not surprise us, the external audience, since Herodotus has already revealed Croesus' end in 1.70 and 1.78 (and it is a matter of historical fact), but we can still be surprised by the timing. The narrative, however, has not prepared itself for this message to arrive – there is no warning and since we are currently located in Sparta, there is no scene of Croesus' downfall (yet). Thus the implication of arrival without sending is the unexpected outcome and, in particular, the speed of that outcome.[82] We might have expected more from our first eastern king.

What we can gather from this analysis is that emissaries can help us stay on track through

---

[81] Ἀγγελίαι are the only type of messages which routinely appear in the *Histories* anonymously or provided by individuals clearly of lower status.

[82] The surprise and speed represented by the arrival of an unexpected emissary will prove to be important, thematically, in other scenes as well. This discussion will be taken up in Chapter 5.

a (geographically and temporally) nonlinear narrative while also focusing our attention on different aspects of a two-party strategic relationship. Croesus' dispatches of emissaries, and the specific choices in syntax and diction made by Herodotus to describe them, are in themselves a microcosm of the relationship between Croesus and Sparta and his own personal status. Much like particles, intermediaries provide narratological and pragmatic information about the text which help to guide and orient the reader not only through the events of the main story, but also through an understanding of it.

Beyond Book One

The example of intermediaries between Croesus and the Spartans is particularly persuasive because it encapsulates an entire diplomatic relationship, from rationale and inception to dissolution, in addition to a series of geographical transitions. Many exchanges of intermediaries in the *Histories* are more sparse, with fewer emissaries, fewer separate scenes, and less important thematic information at stake. But even these less robust situations can provide insight toward textual construction and thematic focus. Having learned from the example of Croesus and Sparta, the audience is cued to expect the linked and repeated use of emissaries to express more meaning than just facilitating a simple progression of events. Even an intermediary appearing only once can perform some of these tasks.

A highly productive message starts Book Seven. The end of the sixth book narrated the battle of Marathon and then discussed current and past events involving the Athenian general Miltiades. To start the seventh book, Herodotus makes a jump in time, space, and subject matter from an analepsis about the Athenians on Lemnos to the present time and Darius, the king of

Persia, in Sardis (7.1.1).[83]   The narrative elegantly signals that transition is coming, even though

we don't know where we'll end up, in the first words of the book: [84] ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀγγελίη ἀπίκετο –

"When a message arrived...". We have been trained to know that messages can signal changes in

scene, time, and subject, so we know to expect the contextual information which comes next:

περὶ τῆς μάχης τῆς ἐν Μαραθῶνι γενομένης – "...about the battle that happened at Marathon...".

With this information we are temporally oriented into the right thread of the main story; our new

subject matter and location follow: παρὰ βασιλέα Δαρεῖον τὸν Ὑστάσπεος – "...to King Darius,

son of Hystaspes." Clearly we have been returned to the Persian king (who is still in Persia) at a

time shortly after the end of the battle of Marathon. This shift was not prepared in the narrative

in any way. The message is not seen being sent nor have the Persians been discussed in over

twenty chapters: the navy is at sea in 6.118, and Darius appears in a brief digression at 6.119. By

starting with a word that can signal transition in itself, the audience's surprise at this sudden

relocation is cushioned and their expectations are well managed. Once given, the message has

no further purpose and the scene moves on to the reaction of Darius and his plans for a second

invasion of Greece. This single occurrence of a message still has the power to orient and refocus

the audience, and indeed may be the easiest way to smooth such a stark transition.

In addition to smoothing a surprising transition, Herodotus can use a single emissary to

shift backwards, in a way, in place and time. In Book Eight, the narrative is concerned with the

Greek fleet when an unexpected group of *angeloi* arrives from Ionia:

8.132.1 ὡς δὲ παρεγένοντο ἐς τὴν Αἴγιναν πᾶσαι αἱ νῆες, **ἀπίκοντο Ἰώνων ἄγγελοι** ἐς
τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν Ἑλλήνων, οἳ καὶ ἐς Σπάρτην ὀλίγῳ πρότερον τούτων ἀπικόμενοι ἐδέοντο

---

[83] It is worth noting that the analysis of this scene is not dependent on the fact that it occurs at the beginning of a new book: it is convenient, certainly, but not essential. More notable is the fact that no Persians have recently been subjects of the narrative. It is tempting to think that the division between Books 6 and 7 was placed here in part because of the drastic change of subject and in part because of the natural shift permitted by the clause about the message.
[84] My translations here; Waterfield (1998) unhelpfully rearranges the syntax.

Λακεδαιμονίων ἐλευθεροῦν τὴν Ἰωνίην,...

     The whole fleet had assembled at Aegina when an **Ionian delegation** (which had also visited Sparta a little earlier and asked the Lacedaemonians to liberate Ionia) **came** to the Greek forces there.

The transition here is more abrupt syntactically than the previous example (arrival is first, before the origin or the emissaries are directly mentioned), and the narrative then takes a curious turn. The brief analepsis about their trip to Sparta is mentioned only here, not anywhere prior in the narrative, creating a tiny shift in time and geography but establishing the subject (the liberation of Ionia) which will presumably be at issue in the main story. But surprisingly, the narrative then further identifies these emissaries:

     8.132.2. ...τῶν καὶ Ἡρόδοτος ὁ Βασιληίδεω ἦν· οἳ στασιῶται σφίσι γενόμενοι ἐπεβούλευον θάνατον Στράττι τῷ Χίου τυράννῳ ἐόντες ἀρχὴν ἑπτά·
     One of these [messengers] was Herodotus the son of Basileïdes. There had originally been seven of them, forming a political cabal with the intention of assassinating Strattis, the tyrant of Chios.

Not only is an *angelos* singled out by being given a name and a patronymic, which is highly unusual, but the narrative then passes into an analepsis explaining the backstory of the entire group. This analepsis continues only for one more sentence, before events return us to the present time of the main story and the fleet returns as the subject of narration. Thus a single emissary scene can, in some cases, shift us back to the time and place of their origin, out of the main story, instead of relocating us in a way which moves us forward within the main story. This remarkable inversion of the typical structuring we expect emissaries to signal reveals the versatility which intermediaries provide and which the narrative fully exploits.

     Thus a single emissary or message can still be an effective way for Herodotus to signal and smooth changes in temporal or physical location, as well as in subject matter. Similarly, small numbers of emissaries in short stories can provide abbreviated structural support for the narrative and for thematic content. Although their presence falls between the single emissaries

discussed above and the rich interaction between Croesus and Sparta, their relative brevity does not necessarily make their role in the text any less rich.

A simple example occurs in Book Three, when Herodotus interrupts the explanation of how Cambyses obtained water for his army by inserting a brief ethnography of Arabia. The idea of sending an intermediary is presented in 3.4.3 when Phanes advises Cambyses "to send someone to the Arabian king to ask for safe passage across the desert" (...πέμψαντα παρὰ τὸν Ἀραβίων βασιλέα δέεσθαι τὴν διέξοδόν οἱ ἀσφαλέα παρασχεῖν). No actual emissary is mentioned at this point, and since no intermediaries have been mentioned recently the omission may be a deliberate suppression of detail, not an exclusion expected due to context. Although the narrative continues with information about the desert and its water supply, we are not moved to the Arabian king yet – the introductory information was specific about location but vague about the emissary, hence the full transition is not adequately prepared. A few chapters later (3.7.2), the narrative returns to the moment of the advice (Καμβύσης πυθόμενος) and this time continues with him acting upon it:

> 3.7.2 ...**πέμψας παρὰ τὸν Ἀράβιον ἀγγέλους** καὶ δεηθεὶς τῆς ἀσφαλείης ἔτυχε πίστις δούς τε καὶ δεξάμενος παρ' αὐτοῦ.
> ...**he sent messengers to the king of Arabia**, asked for safe passage, and received it. Pledges were given and received between them.

Here we have specific information and explicit emissaries, so the geographic shift to Arabia is formally signaled. The actual transition to the new geographic subject occurs in the same sentence as the *angeloi* are sent, swallowing the entire time of transit in an ellipsis. But once moved to Arabia, we linger briefly in an ethnographic discussion of their means of making oaths. This is the type of ethnography where time is suspended and the narrative dwells on characteristics, not events. To bring us back to the temporal present, Herodotus therefore reintroduces the dispatched emissaries, taking the opportunity they provide to explicitly recall

the circumstances of their sending:[85]

     3.9.1 ἐπεὶ ὦν τὴν πίστιν **τοῖσι ἀγγέλοισι τοῖσι παρὰ Καμβύσεω ἀπιγμένοισι** ἐποιήσατο ὁ Ἀράβιος, ἐμηχανᾶτο τοιάδε·

     So since the Arabian king had given his pledge **to Cambyses' agents**, he came up with the following plan.

The ἐπεί-clause provides both local and more distant context; the pledge (τὴν πίστιν) connects to the preceding ethnographic discussion, whereas the emissaries and the summary of their situation (τοῖσι ἀγγέλοισι...ἀπιγμένοισι) connect to the preceding events of the main story. The mention of the emissaries brings to mind their embodiment of transit and transition. Their connective function is immediately reinforced with a mention of their sender (παρὰ Καμβύσεω) and of their current status as "having arrived" (ἀπιγμένοισι). These emissaries orient us temporally out of the timeless ethnography and orient us contextually, reminding us of why the narrative is now located in Arabia and how that shift occurred.

     These emissaries may seem only to frame a single ethnography for the narrative, but the connection established between Cambyses and the Arabian king is in fact vital for his *logos*. This transmission occurs towards the beginning of the *logos* and the result of this alliance will permit Cambyses to successfully undertake his Egyptian campaign. The importance of Egypt to the *logos* of Cambyses is manifest in the narrative: a huge ethnography and geography of Egypt immediately follows Cambyses' ascension to kingship, and all of his successes and failures (including his famous madness and death) occur or are based in Egypt. Yet his army could not make its conquering journey without the safe passage and water through the desert provided by the Arabian king. Thus, although seeming like a tossed-off framing device, the sending and

---

[85] Hartog (1988, 254-55) sees ethnography as timeless; Munson (2001, 21) disagrees, arguing that, in ethnography, "the present tense describes circumstances that may also obtain at the time reached by the historical narrative to which the description is attached." In other words, a present-tense ethnographic discussion is to be read as referring to the time of the surrounding main story. While her point has merit, there is a distinction between a generic present situation and a specific moment of action in the present; the connection created by emissaries focuses the audience on the latter out of the former.

arriving of these *angeloi* help to demonstrate the vital nature of this connection for all of the ensuing events.

Herodotus steps away from the story of Cambyses and his Egyptian campaign to provide a story entirely in analepsis about the friendship of Polycrates, king of Samos, and Amasis, king of Egypt. The explicit communication between the two rulers is facilitated not by people, but by the written word.[86] These cordial letters are unique in the *Histories* – as discussed in the first chapter, writing is generally considered suspect and used for sinister purposes. Although exceptional in this semantic regard,[87] narratologically these letters still act as expected when it comes to shifting and diplomatic connection.

The official friendship between Polycrates and Amasis is established in 3.39 with an exchange of gifts, but their relationship does not flower until Amasis, worried about Polycrates' overwhelming successes, sends a cautioning letter.

3.40.1 πολλῷ δὲ ἔτι πλεῦνός οἱ εὐτυχίης γινομένης <u>γράψας ἐς βυβλίον τάδε</u> ἐπέστειλε ἐς Σάμον·
As Polycrates' successes continued to mount <u>he wrote the following letter</u> to him at Samos...

Just as with the sending of emissaries, this writing and sending of a letter is specific about the destination (Samos); the recipient does not need to be mentioned here since he was explicitly discussed in the previous sentence. The actual message is given directly, and then capped with Polycrates' reaction:

3.41.1 <u>ταῦτα ἐπιλεξάμενος</u> ὁ Πολυκράτης καὶ νόῳ λαβών, ὥς οἱ εὖ ὑπετίθετο ὁ Ἄμασις...
When Polycrates <u>read this letter</u> and realized the extent of Amasis' good will towards him...

---

[86] For a discussion of narrative features which are shared by this story and the later stories of Oroetes and Bagaeus, see Kazanskaya (forthcoming).
[87] The unusual use of letters may stem, in part, from the story's dependence on physical objects: Polycrates' attempt to foil fate is entirely mediated through his ring and the fish. In keeping with this theme, Herodotus may choose to show the kings conversing through physical objects (letters) instead of communicating through the more usual *angeloi* or *kērykes*. I owe this observation to a discussion with David Sansone.

Here a verb of reading substitutes for the more usual verb of hearing or speaking, an appropriate adjustment for the means of communication. By omitting the sending and arrival of this letter, the narrative deliberately omits the means of its transit from Egypt to Samos and therefore appears to create an instantaneous and direct connection between the two kings. Furthermore, the lack of a personal intermediary means that there is no third party who can impose a focalization or a particular point of view on the message contained in the letter. Polycrates alone can read these words and decide (as focalizer) how to view them. Thus the presentation of this letter in the text (to say nothing of the message it contains) emphasizes the closeness of their friendship.

Polycrates, taking Amasis' advice, attempts to cause himself grief but is met only by good fortune: he throws his favorite ring into the sea but is later presented with a magnificent fish, whose stomach contains his ring. Concerned, he writes to Amasis, this time asking directly for advice. The result is not what he presumably expected:

3.42.4-43.2 τὸν δὲ ὡς ἐσῆλθε θεῖον εἶναι τὸ πρῆγμα, γράφει ἐς βυβλίον πάντα, τὰ ποιήσαντά μιν οἷα καταλελάβηκε, γράψας δὲ ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἐπέθηκε. ἐπιλεξάμενος δὲ ὁ Ἄμασις τὸ βυβλίον τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Πολυκράτεος ἧκον, ἔμαθε, ὅτι ἐκκομίσαι τε ἀδύνατον εἴη ἀνθρώπῳ ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τοῦ μέλλοντος γίνεσθαι πρήγματος, καὶ ὅτι οὐκ εὖ τελευτήσειν μέλλοι Πολυκράτης εὐτυχέων τὰ πάντα, ὃς καὶ τὰ ἀποβάλλει εὑρίσκει. **πέμψας δέ οἱ κήρυκα ἐς Σάμον** διαλύεσθαι ἔφη τὴν ξεινίην· τοῦδε δὲ εἵνεκεν ταῦτα ἐποίεε, ἵνα μὴ συντυχίης δεινῆς τε καὶ μεγάλης Πολυκράτεα καταλαβούσης αὐτὸς ἀλγήσειε τὴν ψυχὴν ὡς περὶ ξείνου ἀνδρός.

It occurred to Polycrates that this might be a religious portent, so he wrote in a letter a thorough account of what he had done and what happened and sent it to Egypt. When Amasis read the letter from Polycrates, he realized that it was impossible for one person to rescue another from what was going to happen and that, because he was so completely lucky that he even found things he had thrown away, Polycrates was fated to die miserably. **He therefore sent a herald to Samos** to dissolve their guest-friendship, so that he would not be as upset as he would be at the loss of a friend, when great and dreadful disaster overwhelmed Polycrates.

At the start of this section, the act of writing the letter is pre-posed into a place of prominence (i.e. clause-initial position) in the first sentence: this type of "intermediary" communication, dependent on an actual (and still elided) transmitter, remains important. At this point, their

54

relationship is still close, cordial, and frank, indicated again by the fact that only Amasis can and does focalize the contents of the letter and his response. The act of writing is mentioned a second time as the contextual setting for its clause, which places into Focus position the destination (Egypt). We are therefore prepared to be moved into Egypt, a shift which happens without delay. The scene again elides the transit of the letter: a deliberate exclusion of the time and personnel which, practically speaking, separate these rulers. Accordingly, the closeness of the rulers is reemphasized (as above) by the fact that the narrative only permits Amasis to focalize and react to the message of Polycrates. To underscore their close connection further, we are given the names of both kings in the next sentence. Contextually this is unnecessary since their identities are readily inferred. Pragmatically, the identification in these words may recall the information in the header of the letter itself.[88] Although we are not given the content of the letter this time, Amasis is shown to have read it (ἐπιλεξάμενος δὲ ὁ Ἄμασις), mirroring the vocabulary of receipt of the first letter to Polycrates (ἐπιλεξάμενος ὁ Πολυκράτης), and again emphasizing the closeness of these men. But almost immediately, their physical separation is implicitly mentioned; Herodotus describes the letter as one which has arrived from Polycrates (τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Πολυκράτεος ἧκον). This hint of distance is soon expanded into an explicit political and interpersonal separation through the official dissolution of their friendship. As a clearly thematic touch, Herodotus shows Amasis sending a *kēryx*, not a letter, with this information.[89] Just as the direct letters symbolized the closeness of the kings, this most official type of emissary now intervenes in the relationship, symbolizing the end of their friendly

---

[88] For example, the first letter from Amasis to Polycrates begins as follows, naming clearly the sender and recipient: Ἄμασις Πολυκράτεϊ ὧδε λέγει – "Amasis [writes as follows] to Polycrates" (3.40.2).
[89] Cf. Rosenmeyer (2001, 52).

association before the message is even transmitted.[90] Correspondingly, once the narrative returns to Samos (prepared by the sending of this *kēryx*), we hear of Polycrates' exploits in other regions of the world. Thus the status of a political and personal relationship between two kings is expressed, in part, by the use of intermediaries and the choices made about their description.

Furthermore, this story shows the versatility of Herodotus as a narrator. Thematically, this short story focuses excessively on physical objects as means of interaction: Polycrates attempts to thwart fate by discarding an object (his ring); this object is returned to him through presentation of another object (the fish). Intermediaries of all types are deliberately excluded throughout the story – the fisherman, even, insists on presenting his fish to Polycrates in person. With such a focus on physical objects and lack of intervening personnel, Herodotus thus appropriately represents communication between the rulers as occurring through physical objects: letters. We can see, then, that the vocabulary used to represent emissaries and their messages can also play an important supporting role to themes already established in the story. In the end, this series of examples shows one essential thing: the presence and presentation of emissaries is highly relevant to narrative structure and thematic content. We have seen how intermediaries can prepare and signal geographic transitions and conversely how insufficient information about their destination can preclude geographic transition or at least shorten our time at the arrival point. Similarly, when the main story is paused by an analepsis or ethnographic section, the main action can be resumed through the orientation of time, place, and context provided by emissaries. Herodotus can position and present emissaries (in terms of syntax and focalization) in order to highlight important thematic issues. In sum, these characters can be used to establish cues for the audience about when and where the story is located, where it is

---

[90] As with the situation of Croesus and Sparta, discussed above, the employment of a *kēryx* may similarly highlight the gravity of the situation.

going, and what thematic elements are salient.

CHAPTER 3: CHARACTER AND IDENTITY

We have just seen how emissaries can be used as tools to organize the structure of a narrative.

Fundamentally, however, emissaries are characters who represent others by performing the

duties of a particular office. Herodotus clearly sees these characters as important, since we are

given 241 separate examples of emissaries (explicit, indirect, and implicit).[91] Such frequency

comes at a price: the narrative cannot describe each of these intermediaries without bogging

down the flow of the text. To understand the characterization of each individual, then, we need

to look to the class of people identified as official intermediaries. Although little is revealed

about the average emissary, in the aggregate a "typical" emissary emerges.[92] This

characterization, as we shall see, follows some of the precedents of epic, tragedy, and historical

practice, but not all of them. Once we have determined how emissaries are usually

characterized, outliers become noticeable. Many intermediaries are provided with additional

description which may color our impression of them. This chapter will further show that since

Herodotus establishes an essential type, he can manipulate the narrative description of an

individual to express deviation from this type and to indicate authorial judgment about that

deviation. The treatment of outliers further confirms the essential characterization of the typical

emissary and what he represents.

Literary and Historical Context

Any discussion of emissaries and characterization needs to take into consideration the literary

---

[91] This number is determined by counting up all individuals identified by the vocabulary discussed in the typology contained in Chapter 1. If an explicit or indirect emissary is described multiple times by vocabulary words, only one instance is counted here. However the same individual can be counted multiple times as an implicit emissary (denoted only by the use of a cognate verb) if each use of a verb pertains to a different event in the *Histories*.
[92] As mentioned in Chapter 1, all explicit and indirect emissaries are male. Women and non-humans (e.g. ships and doves) can be the subjects of cognate verbs, but this is rarely the case.

and cultural contexts with which Herodotus was engaged. Epic and tragedy are the traditional

genres in which *angeloi* and *kērykes* play an important role, but many of the attributes of

emissaries in those genres are not applicable to the *Histories*. For example, Goblot-Cahen

(1999) establishes a fundamental distinction between *kērykes* and *angeloi* in Greek tragedy: the

former bring injunctions, the latter bring information. Herodotus belies this difference

immediately in the narrative, since nearly identical messages under nearly identical

circumstances are presented in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2, one given by ἄγγελοι and one by a κῆρυξ. These

closely juxtaposed examples also suggest that Wéry's (1967) interpretation of *kērykes* as passive

and *angeloi* as active does not apply in the *Histories*. Barrett's (2002) identification of

emissaries as socially marginal characters is also not applicable. Although many Herodotean

intermediaries lack identifying information, others are presented in positions of high respect and

authority, and some politically important figures serve as emissaries.[93] This accords better with

the view of Karavites (1987) with respect to Homeric intermediaries. Setting aside divine

emissaries like Hermes and Iris, he finds that human diplomats in epic tend to be older and

respected. They could be chosen from high administrative office and in many cities being a

herald was hereditary. Furthermore, Karavites distinguishes between public and private *kērykes*,

while still allowing for overlap in duties, and determines that *angeloi* are often 40-50 years old

and are identified by name.[94] These details of identity are not apparent in Herodotus, who rarely

provides names for his intermediaries and does not mention age.[95] Despite these features of epic

---

[93] E.g. Alexander (8.136.1) is used as an *angelos* while he is the ruler of Macedon; Aristodicus accompanies a group of *theopropoi* to question the oracle at Branchidae (1.158.2) after being identified as τῶν ἀστῶν ἐὼν δόκιμος.

[94] Herodotus makes this distinction implicitly by presenting some household-based emissaries in Persia: the ἀγγελιηφόρος (1.120.2, 3.118.2, 4.71.4) and the ἐσαγγελεύς (7.230.1). The ἀγγελιηφόρος at 3.126.2, while still a household member, is shown abroad. Asheri (*ad loc.*) reads ἀγγαρήιον at 3.126.2, but Rosén's reading makes more sense: if Darius is not yet king, he would not have the authority to send messages through the *angareion*.

[95] According to Karavites (1987), the age distinction is to contrast (old) human emissaries with (young) divine *angeloi*. Herodotus does not clearly uphold this distinction, presumably because his divine messages are few and the message-giver is generally not a recognizable god like Iris but rather a vision or dream divinely imposed.

and tragic intermediaries which are not applicable to this first example of historiography, one thread appears consistent through all three genres: an intermediary is "swift, reliable, and always tells all".[96] Barrett says this essential character of emissaries is adopted into tragedy from epic (and lyric), and the evidence presented in this chapter should demonstrate that the same traits are also present in the generic Herodotean emissary.

Herodotus operated not only in a literary context but also in a cultural one. For the historical realities of *angeloi* and *kērykes*, Mosley's 1973 monograph has yet to be supplanted. Although the preponderance of his evidence derives from the Peloponnesian war and later, it seems unlikely that the basic duties of and expectations about emissaries were far different during the Persian wars.[97] As he tells us, envoys were on "special assignment" and denied the powers of judging, deliberating, or commanding.[98] Their main role was simply to report information or negotiate only as commanded. Their honesty was assumed, and punishment (with a divine flavor) was visited upon the dishonest.[99] This general characterization of powers seems to correspond reasonably well with the idea of reliability and "telling-all" from tragedy and epic, and also seems to be upheld by the portrayal in Herodotus' narrative. For example, a handful of *angeloi* and *kērykes* are reported as saying τὰ ἐντεταλμένα upon reaching their destinations.[100]

Resorting to direct contact with divine messengers would also not be suitable for Herodotus' worldview, which shared a concern about rationality with his fellow Ionian intellectuals. See Raaflaub (2002) for an overview.

[96] Barrett (2002, 23). Odysseus' altered transmission of Agamemnon's message to Achilles is a well-known exception (*Iliad* 9.225-306).

[97] Mosley's earliest literary evidence is taken from the *Histories*, leading to a problem of circularity for this thesis. Since, however, his later historical evidence (from inscriptions and legal records) comes, in part, from Herodotus' lifetime, it should thus represent the experiential knowledge about emissaries which was available to Herodotus.

[98] Mosley (1973, 39). He takes Ar. *Pol*. 4.12.1299a as evidence. Although written after Herodotus' time, the legal standing of emissaries may not have changed in the intervening period. At the least, the presentation of envoys in the *Histories* does not contradict this assessment.

[99] Mosley (1973, 88): "If a herald or an ambassador on a mission to a friendly or a hostile state distorts or fabricates messages, then he is guilty of an offence against the sacred messages and commands of Zeus and Hermes. Aristophanes makes allusion to a sacrificial rite, described more fully by Athenaeus, when he suggests that the tongue of a lying messenger be cut out. [The rite] is the practice of cutting out the victim's tongue and dedicating it to Hermes."

[100] 1.60.4, 6.106.3, 7.148.3, 8.98.2, 9.55.2.

The credence with which messages are received[101] also indicates that the senders and recipients

of messages trusted the envoys to be reliable. The time of journeys is rarely explicitly

commented on, but Herodotus' occasional remarks pertain to the presence of speed, not delay,

e.g. κατὰ τάχος (1.152.1, 8.141.2).[102]

One other historical fact seems to carry through epic, tragedy, and the *Histories*: *kērykes*

are under divine protection and thus inviolable. This feature is not obviously relevant in the

narrative until a series of events in Book 7.   The details of the historical circumstances are

subject to much debate, but the essential situation is that Persian *kērykes*, sent by Darius to

Athens and Sparta to ask for earth and water, were killed (7.133.1). Herodotus explicitly

discusses the aftermath of this deed for the Spartans, due to their need to atone for such great

impiety and thereby end divine censure (7.134-137).[103] The same divine protection is not shown

to apply directly when *angeloi* are harmed (e.g. at 5.20.5, where Alexander has some Persian

angeloi killed). This is one of the few historical distinctions between *angeloi* and *kērykes* that is

shown to operate in the narrative.

The "Typical" Intermediary

As we saw in the first chapter, Herodotus provides very little explicit information about

emissaries, and what he does provide is not presented in the first parts of his narrative.

Accordingly, we can take the general features expressed in these few explicit descriptions and

add them as further evidence for the basic characterization, discussed above, of speed and

---

[101] This is true most of the time. Notable exceptions occur at 1.158.2 (Aristodicus doubting *theopropoi*) and 3.118.2 (Intaphrenes doubting Darius' message-bearer) and will be discussed in Chapter 4. These stories show more about the character of those evaluating the emissaries than they do about the emissaries themselves.

[102] When emissaries appear to be slow, they have simply been outpaced by events. E.g. in 1.78.2, Croesus sends oracle-bearers to consult about bad omens he has received; their return comes after Croesus' destruction due to his rapid decline, not any fault on their part. Indeed, we might even see this sequence of events as reinforcing the speed of Croesus' decline in power – it even outpaces the normally swift emissaries!

[103] Further discussion of these events will be taken up in Chapter 4.

reliability. From the passage about Spartan heredity in 6.60.1, we can infer that ideal *kērykes*

(and, presumably, other emissaries) speak in a loud and clear voice (κατὰ λαμπροφωνίην). The

speed and reliability of *angeloi* is reinforced by the description of the Persian *angareion* (pony-

express) in 8.98.1-2. Not only is their speed of delivery mentioned explicitly by Herodotus, but

their ability to pass off messages to each other through all kinds of conditions suggests that they

are committed to their task and thoroughly trustworthy.

If these pieces of information about emissaries were vital for the audience to understand,

however, it is unlikely that Herodotus would wait until the sixth and eighth book to share

them.[104] Indeed, the very first emissary of the *Histories* (1.2.3) is bereft of any characterizing

information,[105] and many other emissaries are described (at most) with their ethnicity and a

description of their expected activities (e.g. arriving and delivering a message).   To understand

these characters, then, the audience must have had a basic understanding of an ideal emissary,

presumably from previous experiences with literature or cultural context. When confronted with

a minimal scene, like 1.2.3, the audience could expect the *kēryx* to make his trip as swiftly as

possible, deliver the demands of the king of Colchis without deviation, and return with a

response without delay.

Thus far the characterization discussed has pertained specifically to human bearers of

messages who are named as holding some official position as envoys (called "explicit

---

[104] If the value of the information itself is not high, then the next most logical explanation is that the placement of these descriptions serves some narrative or thematic purpose. E.g., the identification of Talthybius as the founder of the Spartan family of *kērykes* (7.134.1) may call to mind the Trojan war. Alluding to this conflict just after the story of the Greeks killing Persian *kērykes*, the echo of a clash of geographic powers is evident. Similarly, the description of the Persian pony-express (8.98.1-2) comes when Xerxes has dispatched a message to Susa from Salamis. The focus on message transit may help the audience appreciate the distance that Xerxes has traveled and the extent of the Persian advance at its farthest point.

[105] πέμψαντα δὲ τὸν Κόλχων βασιλέα ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα κήρυκα αἰτέειν τε δίκας τῆς ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀπαιτέειν τὴν θυγατέρα – "The king of Colchis sent a herald to Greece to ask for compensation for the abduction and to ask for his daughter back."

emissaries" in the first chapter). This is not accidental: 131 distinct characters[106] (or groups of

characters) are presented as official emissaries via an appropriate title. Almost 29% of these

emissaries (38) are not identified or described aside from their official title. As characters, we

must assume they are typical since no further information is given. From a narrative perspective,

given that most of these characters are simply forming links between their senders and their

arrival points, detail about them as people would serve no essential purpose. This linking

function is emphasized by the context of their appearance: some information about their point of

departure or their sender is almost always provided, anchoring the emissary in a culture and

under the authority of a ruler or people. Contextual description of this sort primarily serves a

narrative purpose, although there are exceptional cases where the ethnicity of the emissary is

somehow relevant to their characterization or personality (see below). Close to 18% (23) of

emissaries are only provided with non-characterizing descriptions (e.g. a demonstrative

adjective) or with actions which use common words for arriving and speaking (occasionally with

a form of ἀγγέλλω). These dry descriptions add little to our understanding of the given

intermediary, aside from confirming his adherence to his expected duties and his essential type.

But 53% of Herodotus' distinct emissaries (70) are provided with ethnic or other descriptive

adjectives and/or participles and verbs which either add detail to their actions or expand beyond

their standard and expected role. These emissaries will be the primary focus of the following

sections.

Additional Characterizing Information

Surprisingly few emissaries receive additional characterization, and the details of that

characterization can vary widely. Of these additions, most common is an ethnic adjective or a

---

[106] This comes to 54% of all messages under discussion in this dissertation.

genitive noun expressing the culture of origin. The inclusion of this information can serve any of three distinct purposes. First, it supports the linking effect of intermediaries through the narrative. Second, in some places it may be important referential information used to distinguish between multiple speakers in a conversation. Third, it may call attention to how the intermediary expresses behavior stereotypical of his cultural background. In this last way, the emissary is a full representative of his sender, both in the words he brings and the manner in which he brings them. This last function is especially notable for intermediaries who are provided with some additional description building upon the ideas connoted by their ethnic.

An isolated example is when Elean *angeloi* arrive in Egypt in 2.160.1-2. Although ethnic adjectives help establish links across the narrative to people and places (as discussed in Chapter 2), the presentation of these emissaries minimizes this function. We do not see them being sent, nor have we spent any time in Elis thus far. Accordingly, any link to Elis thereby created is abstract and does not compel any narrative recall. Instead, the arrival of these emissaries comes as a surprise for the Egyptians and for us. As a further surprise, Herodotus describes the *angeloi* as "boasting":[107]

2.160.1-2 ἐπὶ τοῦτον δὴ τὸν Ψάμμιν βασιλεύοντα Αἰγύπτου **ἀπίκοντο Ἠλείων ἄγγελοι αὐχέοντες** δικαιότατα καὶ κάλλιστα τιθέναι τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ ἀγῶνα πάντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ **δοκέοντες** παρὰ ταῦτα οὐδ’ ἂν τοὺς σοφωτάτους ἀνθρώπων Αἰγυπτίους οὐδὲν ἐπεξευρεῖν· ὡς δὲ **ἀπικόμενοι** ἐς τὴν Αἴγυπτον **οἱ Ἠλεῖοι ἔλεγον τῶν εἵνεκα ἀπίκατο**, ἐνθαῦτα ὁ βασιλεὺς οὗτος συγκαλέεται Αἰγυπτίων τοὺς λεγομένους εἶναι σοφωτάτους.

During King Psammis’ reign**, a delegation of Eleans came** to Egypt **to boast** that the fairest and finest institution in the world was their own Olympic Games, and **to claim** that not even the Egyptians, for all their superlative wisdom, could come up with anything comparable. **When they arrived** in Egypt **and stated the purpose of their visit**, Psammis convened a meeting of all the Egyptians with the greatest reputation for wisdom.

Herodotus reinforces the notion of boasting by including numerous superlatives (δικαιότατα,

---

[107] This verb is used only one other time by Herodotus, at 7.103.2 when Xerxes uses it to mock Demaratus’ claims about the abilities of the Spartan troops at Thermopylae. Xerxes focalizes Demaratus’ opinion as a boast (αὐχέετε τοσοῦτον) and in the context of his speech the term is not complimentary.

κάλλιστα, σοφωτάτους). The behavior and message of these men is unusual and stands out by comparison to the second sentence, where they engage in typical behavior: they arrive (ἀπικόμενοι) and speak (ἔλεγον) using standard vocabulary. The conversation which follows is a rare occurrence between *angeloi* and message recipients, but it does not otherwise contain any surprising or unexpected features. The content of the exchange, however, does permit the claims of the Eleans to be proven false – the Egyptians *are* able to improve upon the "most just" system of selecting winners of Olympic events.[108] Thus the initial boasting is, in fact, overdone and excessive instead of being proudly accurate, and suggests that we should see the Eleans as either arrogant or overconfident in their new role as administrators of the games. Such strong, if misguided, advocacy may have stemmed from a desire to overcome any stigma associated with being newly in charge.[109] The Eleans' cultural needs are acted out by their *angeloi* abroad. These men are represented in the narrative as proxies for their culture, not just as carriers of a verbal message. Herodotus makes this clear through the unusual language of boasting. Furthermore, their unexpected arrival in the text mirrors the surprise which must have been felt by the Egyptians at their arrival. The Egyptians would likely have been unaware that the Eleans had taken over control of the Olympics, and indeed, based on the ensuing conversation, they seem wholly ignorant of the games. Thus characterization and narrative presentation go hand in hand in this scene to vividly express the nature of the cultural contact described.

Herodotus appears to reserve characterization via cultural stereotype for scenes where serious cultural contact exists or first contact occurs; such are presumably situations important enough for him to slow down and qualify through these (and other) additions. An extended

---

[108] In 2.160.4, the Egyptians point out that it would be more just if the Eleans, as administrators, did not also participate in the games.
[109] Following Asheri (*ad loc.*), who suggests that this scene is part of a propaganda campaign justifying the Elean administration of the games.

passage from the first book demonstrates the effective way in which this type of ethnic

characterization can be imposed and then juxtaposed with a different set of intermediaries.

Fearing Cyrus and the Persians, the Ionians and Aeolians send *angeloi* to Sparta to ask for help.

Upon arriving in typical fashion, these ἄγγελοι select Pythermus to speak for them. His clothing

and manner are described before he delivers his message. The Spartans, in response to this visit,

end up dispatching their own men to Persia to speak with Cyrus. These Spartans, upon arriving

in Asia, select their most worthy member and send him, now described by name (Lacrines), to

speak to Cyrus where he is finally identified as a *kēryx*. The important element of this sequence

begins with the arrival of the initial delegation in Sparta.

1.152.1-153.1 ὡς δὲ **ἀπίκοντο** ἐς τὴν Σπάρτην **τῶν Ἰώνων καὶ Αἰολέων οἱ ἄγγελοι**, κατὰ γὰρ δὴ τάχος ἦν ταῦτα πρησσόμενα, **εἵλοντο** πρὸ πάντων λέγειν **τὸν Φωκαέα**, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν **Πύθερμος**. ὁ δὲ πορφύρεόν τε εἷμα **περιβαλόμενος**, ὡς ἂν πυνθανόμενοι πλεῖστοι συνέλθοιεν Σπαρτιητέων, καὶ **καταστὰς ἔλεγε πολλὰ** τιμωρέειν ἑωυτοῖσι χρήζων. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ οὔ κως ἤκουον, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπέδοξέ σφι μὴ τιμωρέειν Ἴωσι· **οἱ μὲν δὴ ἀπαλλάσσοντο**, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἀπωσάμενοι **τῶν Ἰώνων τοὺς ἀγγέλους** ὅμως ἀπέστειλαν πεντηκοντέρῳ <u>ἄνδρας</u>, ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέει, <u>κατασκόπους</u> τῶν τε Κύρου πρηγμάτων καὶ Ἰωνίης. <u>ἀπικόμενοι</u> δὲ <u>οὗτοι</u> ἐς Φώκαιαν <u>ἔπεμπον</u> ἐς Σάρδις <u>σφέων αὐτῶν τὸν δοκιμώτατον</u>, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν <u>Λακρίνης</u>, <u>ἀπερέοντα</u> Κύρῳ Λακεδαιμονίων <u>ῥῆσιν</u> γῆς τῆς Ἑλλάδος μηδεμίαν πόλιν σιναμωρέειν ὡς αὐτῶν οὐ περιοψομένων. ταῦτα **εἰπόντος τοῦ κήρυκος** λέγεται Κῦρον...

Matters proceeded apace, and when the **messengers** sent **from Ionia and Aeolis arrived** in Sparta, **they chose a Phocaean called Pythermus** to speak for them all. **He wore a purple cloak** so as to attract the Spartiates' attention and get as many of them as possible along to the meeting. **He gained an audience and spoke at length**, requesting help for their people, but he did not convince the Lacedaemonians, who decided against supporting the Ionians. **The Ionian delegation left**, but, despite having rejected them, the Lacedaemonians still sent <u>men</u> in a penteconter <u>to reconnoitre</u> Cyrus' situation and see what was happening in Ionia – at least, that seems to me to have been the purpose of the mission. <u>When these men reached</u> Phocaea <u>they sent</u> to Sardis <u>their most distinguished member</u>, a man called <u>Lacrines, to deliver a message</u> to Cyrus, telling him not to harm any settlement on Greek soil, since the Lacedaemonians would not tolerate it. Cyrus' response to **this message** [*lit.* what **the herald said**] was reputedly....

The criteria used to choose Pythermus are not mentioned directly, but his actions may indicate

the reason for his selection: he appears to be full of showmanship. His efforts to attract a crowd

are unusual behavior for an *angelos* and suggest a particular need to impress, perhaps motivated

by the dire situation in Ionia. Furthermore, he is shown to speak "at length" (ἔλεγε πολλά). The

flamboyance of Pythermus stands in sharp contrast to the demeanor of Lacrines. We are directly

told the reason his compatriots chose him, and he delivers his message without delay or

flashiness. Herodotus describes his speech as a "rhesis" (ῥῆσιν), a term he rarely uses and which

elsewhere seems to indicate a lengthy presentation.[110] However we see the essential speech

given by Lacrines, hardly long-winded, though maybe considered so by Spartan standards: γῆς

τῆς Ἑλλάδος μηδεμίαν πόλιν σιναμωρέειν ὡς αὐτῶν οὐ περιοψομένων.[111] The bluntness of his

statement, especially following Pythermus' showmanship, emphasizes several differences of

character between the two cultures, Sparta and Ionia, and their dealings with other places. Ionia

has tried to plead with Cyrus and Sparta, failing both times. The purple cloak, as Asheri (*ad loc.*)

points out, is an element of Eastern excess. The Spartans, by contrast, deal with both the Ionians

and Cyrus in a straightforward manner, warning off each party. The starkness of their behavior

(rejection of the Ionian request and then a threat to Persia) accords with their stereotypical brash

and martial nature. The incongruity of (relatively) tiny Sparta warning off the Persian empire

from Greece is emphasized by Cyrus' reaction: before responding, the king has to ask who, in

fact, the Spartans are.[112] Again, we see that additional description of emissaries supplies not just

their characterization, but also conveys the character of their entire culture and the way it

interacts with other societies.

---

[110] 8.83.1 and 4.127.4; the latter stands in a summarizing sentence bracketed by Rosén.

[111] The use of ῥῆσιν to describe Lacrines' speech may very well be a joke, though it is impossible to prove as such. Dry wit of this sort is typical of Herodotus, according to Griffiths (1995, 34): "Herodotos' brand of humour is essentially ironic, dry and deadpan, depending on the passing wink and the throwaway barb at the end of the tale; such wit is by its very nature hard to establish beyond argument." He follows Halliwell (1991) in arguing that Herodotus displays only subtle forms of humor as a narrator to avoid the vulgarity inherent in boisterous humor. The humor in this passage is similar to that in the story at 3.46.1-2, where the Samians ask for help from the Spartans, are told to be more brief, rephrase their request in four words (τὸν θύλακον ἀλφίτων δέεσθαι), and are still chastized for being too wordy.

[112] The Persian ignorance of Greek states is not limited to Sparta. Hystaspes has to ask the Athenian *angeloi* to Sardis (after they have given their message!) who they are and where they are from, thereby signaling his ignorance (5.73.2).

One further issue brought up by these examples is the use of proper names. Very few explicit emissaries (13) and even fewer indirect emissaries (4) are named in the text.[113] Together, these men account for only 7% of the 241 examples under review. If we look for situations where named emissaries appear, we can see that many of them are part of important points of contact – e.g., as seen above, the attempt at a Greek alliance between Ionia and Sparta followed by the first diplomatic communication from Sparta to Persia. Several of the named emissaries are involved in the battles of Marathon and Thermopylae, surely pivotal moments in the wars and also in the cultural mindset of Greece. Their names, in this light, may be presented in the narrative not necessarily as a narrative device, but as a point of historical fact. Despite the high status that many *kērykes* and *angeloi* may have enjoyed, that status pales in comparison to the figures most commonly named by Herodotus: kings, rulers, and generals. The names of those commanding men were certainly preserved in local histories (whether written records or oral traditions), whereas the names of *angeloi* and *kērykes* were likely considered less important to preserve except in particularly notable situations.[114] Accordingly, the presence of personal names may primarily be another means to confirm Herodotus' skills as a researcher and to support his authority as a narrator, instead of a key component of characterization.[115]

---

[113] Named ἄγγελοι are: Cyrus (1.79.2, discussed below and in Chapter 5); Pythermus (1.152.1); Hermippus (6.4.1); Aristodamus (7.230.1); Pantites (7.232.1); Herodotus (8.132.1, son of Basileïdes); Alexander (introduced at 8.136.1, discussed in Chapter 5); the group of Lampon, Athenagoras, and Hegesistratus (9.90.1). Named κήρυκες are: Lacrines (1.153.1); Philippides (6.105.1); Talthybius (7.134.1). If every *kēryx* in Sparta descends from Talthybius, he must be an ancestor of Lacrines. Named carriers of ἀγγελίη are: Prexaspes (3.34.1); Myrsus (3.122.1). Named carriers of writing (γράμματα and/or a βυβλίον) are: Hermippus (6.4.1, listed again); Mys (8.135.3). Bagaeus (3.128.1ff) is a curious character, since he is never described as a message-carrier directly, yet pretends to be one for letters he has written himself (but on the authority of Darius). His story is discussed below. More obliquely, Cyrus (1.125.2) writes a letter which he then pretends to have received from Astyages. Bagaeus, Cyrus, and Hermippus are not counted as message-carriers for the percentages determined here.

[114] Much like the occasional preservation of the name of a scribe (or other respected attendant) who is in some way exceptional. Herodotus provides an example of this when recounting how the name of Darius's groom, Oebares, is inscribed on a statue built in honor of Darius' accession to the throne (3.88.3). Another source of names could be private records or oral histories within aristocratic families who preserved the names of their members so honored.

[115] Work on Herodotus' authority as a narrator generally focuses on his use of sources and critical judgments (e.g., Dewald 1987, Marincola 2006). Hornblower (2000), unusually, focuses on the historicity of naming. Hollmann

Messages and Deception

If we set aside naming as an issue of sources and historicity and if we set aside ethnicity as an

issue of cultural stereotypes, little is left with which individual *angeloi* can be distinctively

characterized. This makes the basic, cognate vocabulary all the more important. Someone

presented in the text as an ἄγγελος, κῆρυξ, or θεοπρόπος will be expected to behave in a

particular manner without deviation. Deviant behavior, as will be discussed below, is met with

censure either directly from other characters in the text or indirectly, through the manner of

narrative description. The norm is conformity, however, and in the vast majority of cases that is

exactly what we find. These typical features of intermediaries (reliability and speed) are not

attributes limited to explicit emissaries. Instead, it appears that these characteristics are extended

as connotations to other forms of third-party communication, namely oral and written messages.

In both cases, Herodotus never provides an example of the message's content being altered in

transit. Messages are either shown to be identical on sending and receipt or, more commonly,

are only shown once.[116] The absence of any remarkable stories of messages being tampered with

suggests that in this narrative, message reliability is not a concern. A sender can trust that

regardless of message type (written or oral) or emissary type (explicit or indirect), his words will

be delivered just as they were sent.

(2011, 160-2) argues that Herodotus deliberately includes or omits names as a way of bestowing or denying *kleos*
upon individuals. This interpretation supports my view that we are given names at important points of contact,
where presumably the historical record is more robust (and preserves names) and Herodotus might wish to assign
kleos to the individuals involved.

[116] It is very common for the scene to be sufficiently shortened so that the instruction of the emissaries and the
delivery of the message become chronologically merged, e.g., in 1.67.2: ἐπειδὴ αἰεὶ τῷ πολέμῳ ἑσσοῦντο ὑπὸ
Τεγεητέων, πέμψαντες θεοπρόπους ἐς Δελφοὺς ἐπειρώτων, τίνα ἂν θεῶν ἱλασάμενοι κατύπερθε τῷ πολέμῳ
Τεγεητέων γενοίατο. ἡ δὲ Πυθίη σφι ἔχρησε τὰ Ὀρέστεω τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος ὀστέα ἐπαγαγομένους. – "Since they
were constantly being beaten by the Tegeans, they sent emissaries to Delphi to ask which god they should propitiate
in order to start winning the Tegean War, and the Pythia replied that they had to bring the bones of Orestes the son
of Agamemnon back home." By summarizing events in this manner, the focus is placed on the ability of emissaries
to provide links rather than on their typical characteristics.

The implication of reliability finds an interesting expression in passages involving written messages. As discussed in the first chapter, *grammata* and *bublia* are almost always sent to share covert information. The negative connotations of the situations involving written messages[117] might lead one to suspect that written messages themselves are, in some way, a suspect form of communication which is not to be trusted. And yet we find the complete opposite. Letters and their contents are reliable, if potentially disreputable.[118] This faith in the written word is exemplified by the story of Oroetes' death. Darius wishes to have him killed for his crimes, but has no interest in publicly waging a battle (3.127). Bagaeus' plot is simple: he will write letters on Darius' authority to test the loyalty of Oroetes' personal guard and to persuade them to kill Oroetes.[119] Although Darius does not write the letters himself, Bagaeus does accurately represent his will; in this matter, Darius has passed his authority to Bagaeus. No hesitation is apparent on the part of the recipients, confirming that they believe the false letters to be reliable conveyors of their king's commands.

3.128.2-5 λαχὼν δὲ ὁ Βαγαῖος ποιέει τάδε· βυβλία γραψάμενος πολλὰ καὶ περὶ πολλῶν ἔχοντα πρηγμάτων σφρηγῖδά σφι ἐπέβαλε τὴν Δαρείου, μετὰ δὲ ᾔε ἔχων ταῦτα ἐς τὰς Σάρδις. ἀπικόμενος δὲ καὶ Ὀροίτεω ἐς ὄψιν ἐλθὼν τῶν βυβλίων ἓν ἕκαστον περιαιρεόμενος ἐδίδου τῷ γραμματιστῇ τῷ βασιληίῳ ἐπιλέγεσθαι (γραμματιστὰς δὲ βασιληίους οἱ πάντες ὕπαρχοι ἔχουσι), ἀποπειρώμενος δὲ τῶν δορυφόρων ἐδίδου τὰ βυβλία ὁ Βαγαῖος, εἴ οἱ ἐνδεξαίατο ἀπόστασιν ἀπὸ Ὀροίτεω. ὁρέων δέ σφεας τά τε βυβλία σεβομένους μεγάλως καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐκ τῶν βυβλίων ἔτι μεζόνως διδοῖ ἄλλο, ἐν τῷ ἐνῆν ἔπεα τοιάδε· 'ὦ Πέρσαι, βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος ἀπαγορεύει ὑμῖν μὴ δορυφορέειν Ὀροίτεα.' οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες τούτων μετῆκάν οἱ τὰς αἰχμάς. ἰδὼν δὲ τοῦτό σφεας ὁ Βαγαῖος πειθομένους τῷ βυβλίῳ, ἐνθαῦτα δὴ θαρσήσας τὸ τελευταῖον τῶν βυβλίων διδοῖ τῷ γραμματιστῇ, ἐν τῷ ἐγέγραπτο· 'βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος Πέρσῃσι τοῖσι ἐν Σάρδισι ἐντέλλεται κτείνειν Ὀροίτεα.' οἱ δὲ δορυφόροι, ὡς ἤκουσαν ταῦτα, σπασάμενοι τοὺς ἀκινάκας κτείνουσι παραυτίκα μιν.

Now that the mission was his, Bagaeus <u>had a number of letters written</u>, on various matters, and sealed them with Darius' seal. Then <u>he took these letters</u> with him to Sardis. When he got there and came into Oroetes' presence <u>he opened the letters</u> and gave them <u>one by one</u> to

---

[117] Aside from the friendly correspondence of Polycrates and Amasis (3.40-43), all such written messages contain information encouraging or facilitating revolts and other seizures of power.

[118] For further discussion of the negative connotation of writing, see Chapters 1 and 2.

[119] Bagaeus' plot to kill Oroetes reflects Oroetes' plot to kill Polycrates. In both cases the actions of a scribe are vital to success. For more on this sequence of events, see Chapter 4.

the royal secretary (all the provincial governors of the Persian empire have these secretaries). Bagaeus gave the secretary the letters to read so that he could see whether the members of Oroetes' personal guard might possibly be receptive to the idea of rising up against Oroetes. It was clear that they respected the letters and still more the message they contained, so he gave another letter to the secretary. This time the content of the letter was as follows: 'Men of Persia, King Darius forbids you to serve as Oroetes' personal guard.' When the soldiers heard these words, they let their spears fall to the ground, and Bagaeus could see that they were obeying the letters' commands so far. This encouraged him, and he gave the secretary the last of his letters, which read: 'King Darius orders the Persians in Sardis to kill Oroetes.' At these words the guardsmen drew their *akinakeis* and killed him on the spot.

We can see that the scribe and the guardsmen implicitly trust in the authority and content of the letters.[120] Their trust is probably encouraged at least in part by the visibility of Darius' seal (σφρηγῖδά σφι ἐπέβαλε τὴν Δαρείου).[121] Despite Herodotus' inclusion of this visual marker, the information is provided during the preparatory phase and not when the plot is carried out. This placement suggests that the inclusion is primarily for the benefit of the audience, to show the attention to detail which Bagaeus gives to his ruse. Although the contents of the letters are unexpected by all recipients and intended to subvert Oroetes' authority, their negative message does not mean that the letters themselves are suspect.[122]

The most notable covert message in the entire narrative is probably the message concealed in a hare which Harpagus sent to Cyrus (1.123). Despite the extreme secrecy and conniving involved in sending this letter (described alternately as *grammata* and *bublion*), its delivery is swift and the contents are reliably delivered. This accords well with what we have

---

[120] Strangely, Herodotus does not show Oroetes making any attempt to contradict the content of the letters or to escape. This absence may speak to both the authority of the letters themselves and the speed with which the undertaking may occur; Oroetes may simply not have had time to react. He is in the room (Ὀροίτεω ἐς ὄψιν ἐλθών) the entire time, and the letters were evidently given to the γραμματιστής who would have read them out loud.
[121] Following Asheri (*ad loc.*), it is assumed that out of all the characters in this scene, only the scribe is capable of reading. Everyone else simply sees the letters with Darius' seal and listens to their words.
[122] Similarly, the message hidden under wax by Demaratus (7.239) which alerted the Spartans to the upcoming Persian invasion of Greece, is shown being opened (revealed) before it is read. The message and its origin are not questioned. I have refrained from examining this example in more detail for two reasons: the potential interpolation of this story (cf. Macan *ad loc.*) and the fact that it adds nothing new to the analysis presented here. Another supporting example is that of the message carved by Themistocles into the rocks near shore (8.22), as an attempt to compromise the Ionian forces fighting on behalf of the Persians.

just seen about Bagaeus' letter: covert, malicious intent does not mean that a letter itself is not accurate or trusted. Indeed, Harpagus' message contains a viable plan which will be put into effect by Cyrus. We see that the letter is unaltered and the content, while demonstrating Harpagus' devotion to Astyages to be false, provides a genuine connection between Harpagus and Cyrus. In this regard, concern about letters being used in illicit situations (such as fomenting revolt) notwithstanding, everything else about the exchange upholds typical ideals for message transmission: the message is delivered just as it was given to the carrier (down to the detail of still being inside a hare!) and the contents are honest. But this time the illicit surrounding context immediately gives rise to a false letter. Cyrus needs some way to convince the Persian army that Astyages has put him in charge so he can then corrupt their loyalty. Since letters and messages are trusted forms of communication (as established above), forging a letter is an easy way for Cyrus to usurp the authority he desires while giving it the sheen of official sanction. The narrative describes how Cyrus writes a letter posing as Astyages, then reads it out to the army as if it had actually been sent and received. Herein lies the danger of written messages: they are communication for the elite against which common (illiterate) soldiers have no real defense. Cyrus exploits well the exclusivity of letters:

> 1.125.1-2 ἀκούσας ταῦτα ὁ Κῦρος ἐφρόντιζε, ὅτεῳ τρόπῳ σοφωτάτῳ Πέρσας ἀναπείσει ἀπίστασθαι, φροντίζων δὲ εὑρίσκεται ταῦτα καιριώτατα εἶναι· ἐποίεε δὴ ταῦτα. <u>γράψας ἐς βυβλίον</u>, τὰ ἐβούλετο, ἁλίην τῶν Περσέων ἐποιήσατο, μετὰ δὲ <u>ἀναπτύξας τὸ βυβλίον</u> καὶ ἐπιλεγόμενος ἔφη Ἀστυάγεά μιν στρατηγὸν Περσέων ἀποδεικνύναι. 'νῦν τε,' ἔφη λέγων, 'ὦ Πέρσαι, προαγορεύω ὑμῖν παρεῖναι ἕκαστον ἔχοντα δρέπανον.' Κῦρος μὲν ταῦτα προηγόρευσε·
>
> Once he had received this message, Cyrus began to think up a subterfuge to persuade the Persians to rebel, and he came up with a very neat plan, which he proceeded to put into effect. He wrote what he had in mind in a letter and called the Persians to a meeting, where he unrolled the letter and read out that Astyages had appointed him commander of the Persian forces. 'And now, men of Persia,' he said, 'I command you all to present yourselves here with scythes.' That was Cyrus' order.

The false letter is unrolled (ἀναπτύξας) in front of everyone, perpetuating the sham that this

missive has just arrived from Astyages in Media.[123] This verb, particular to rolled or folded written messages, is only used one other time in the *Histories* where it describes Croesus unrolling the transcriptions of the oracles given (1.48.1) as part of his testing. In that situation, with multiple transcriptions to read, it would be vital to keep them sorted by their oracle; by publicly opening the messages, there can be no doubt that they arrived without tampering. Cyrus, presumably, plays up this showiness to imply the same fidelity of delivery. His pretense works: the army shows complete and utter faith in the letter, doing as Cyrus asks.

This series of events highlights the importance of the origin of a written message, and the same caution should be applied to messages passed through official emissaries. While it is clear that message contents are always reliably transmitted, reliable transmission does not guarantee that the content of the message is true or accurate. The type of deception Cyrus has just perpetrated falls into this category and is not the only such case. Indeed, towards the very beginning of the narrative we are shown a *kēryx* who performs his task exactly as commanded, but unintentionally brings back deceptive information to Alyattes. The placement of this story (1.21ff) allows Herodotus to highlight, early on, that the fidelity of a message's transmission is no guarantee of the honesty of its contents, the intentions of its source, or who that source even is.

1.21.2-22.3 ὅσος ἦν ἐν τῷ ἄστεϊ σῖτος καὶ ἑωυτοῦ καὶ ἰδιωτικός, τοῦτον πάντα συγκομίσας ἐς τὴν ἀγορὴν προεῖπε Μιλησίοισι, ἐπεὰν αὐτὸς σημήνῃ, τότε πίνειν τε πάντας καὶ κώμῳ χρᾶσθαι ἐς ἀλλήλους. ταῦτα δὲ ἐποίεέ τε καὶ προηγόρευε Θρασύβουλος τῶνδε εἵνεκεν, ὅκως ἂν δὴ **ὁ κῆρυξ ὁ Σαρδιηνὸς ἰδών** τε σωρὸν μέγαν σίτου κεχυμένου καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐν εὐπαθείῃσιν ἐόντας **ἀγγείλῃ** Ἀλυάττῃ. τὰ δὴ καὶ ἐγένετο, ὡς γὰρ δὴ **ἰδών** τε ἐκεῖνα **ὁ κῆρυξ καὶ εἴπας** πρὸς Θρασύβουλον τοῦ Λυδοῦ τὰς ἐντολὰς **ἀπῆλθε** ἐς τὰς Σάρδις, ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι, δι' οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐγένετο ἢ διαλλαγή· ἐλπίζων γὰρ ὁ Ἀλυάττης σιτοδείην τε εἶναι ἰσχυρὴν ἐν τῇ Μιλήτῳ καὶ τὸν λεὼν τετρῦσθαι ἐς τὸ ἔσχατον κακοῦ, ἤκουε **τοῦ κήρυκος νοστήσαντος** ἐκ τῆς Μιλήτου τοὺς ἐναντίους λόγους ἢ ὡς αὐτὸς κατεδόκεε.

He had all the food there was in the city, whether it was his own or belonged to ordinary

---

citizens, brought into the city square; then he told the Milesians to wait for his signal, which would let them know when to start drinking and making merry with one another. Thrasybulus did this and gave these instructions in order to ensure that **the herald from Sardis would report** back to Alyattes about the huge stockpile of food **he had seen** and about how people were living a life of luxury. And this is in fact exactly what happened. When **the herald had seen** all this (**and once he had given** Thrasybulus the message the Lydian king had told him to deliver), **he returned** to Sardis; and, as I heard it, the end of the war occurred for this reason and no other. The point is that Alyattes expected there to be a severe shortage of food in Miletus, and he thought that the people would have been ground down to a life of utter hardship – and then the report **the herald** gave **on his return** from Miletus contradicted these expectations of his!

The *kēryx* is identified by the ethnic Σαρδιηνός. This adjective serves a dual purpose. First, it allows the *kēryx* to become an explicit link between Sardis and Miletus, helping the audience to contextualize the situation. Second, as discussed above, the use of the ethnic to describe the *kēryx* may, in some way, situate him more directly as representative of the people of his origin point. Since there is no "Sardian" stereotype for him to uphold,[124] his credulous acceptance of the situation is perhaps meant to indicate that Sardis will be similarly fooled. The description of the situation as imagined by Thrasybulus upholds this synecdoche: he imagines that the *kēryx* will see things (ἰδών) and then announce them to Alyattes (ἀγγείλη). The visual deception is all that is presented since it comprises everything that is (or will be) relevant to Sardis as a whole. But more actually happens. Although the narrative indicates that this imagined situation is exactly what comes to pass (τὰ δὴ καὶ ἐγένετο), it provides a slightly different description of the actual events. In this second recounting, the *kēryx* sees (ἰδών) and conveys the message to Thrasybulus, the contents of which are omitted (εἴπας πρὸς Θρασύβουλον τοῦ Λυδοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς). He does not return to Alyattes until those tasks are completed (ἀπῆλθε ἐς τὰς Σάρδις) but, upon returning, he does provide the information without delay (ἤκουε τοῦ κήρυκος νοστήσαντος ἐκ τῆς Μιλήτου). Here, the added details about the *kēryx* (speaking as

---

[124] That is, no stereotype has been recognized by modern readers which distinguishes Sardis from the rest of Lydia. Sardis was a place of wealth, but this attribute does not seem to create any characterization for its citizens. See Ramage (2000) for Sardis' historical relationship with gold and Pedley (1972) for literary evidence on the Lydian capital.

commanded) reinforce the idea that he is conforming to the typical characterization of reliability.

What is non-typical, however, is the repeated focus on observation. As explained in the first chapter, emissaries are proxies for the voice of a ruler, whereas spies are proxies for the eyes. Spies therefore appear to have an advantage in evaluating visual displays or, perhaps more accurately, anyone who is not a spy is at a disadvantage. Herodotus provides few examples of visual trickery, but in all three cases someone other than a dedicated spy is fooled. Aside from Alyattes' *kēryx*, we see Astyages send worthy spear-bearers to verify the death of infant Cyrus,[125] and Polycrates send his scribe Maeandrius to verify the riches he has been promised by Oroetes.[126] In each situation, no blame is assigned to the observer who brings back deceptive information.[127] In the case of Alyattes' *kēryx*, since his actions throughout perfectly align with our expectations for emissaries, his failure at a non-traditional task does not draw censure.[128] Instead, the fault lies, implicitly, with the sender due to his failure to properly analyze the visual information reported to him. Herodotus makes clear that, for the purposes of research, direct observation is the most important and reliable method, followed by the report of an

---

[125] 1.113.3 πέμψας δὲ ὁ Ἅρπαγος τῶν ἑωυτοῦ δορυφόρων τοὺς πιστοτάτους εἶδέ τε διὰ τούτων καὶ ἔθαψε τοῦ βουκόλου τὸ παιδίον, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐτέθαπτο... – "Harpagus sent his most trusted personal guards, and they carried out an inspection on his behalf and buried the herdsman's child."

[126] 3.123.1 ἀποπέμπει πρῶτα κατοψόμενον Μαιάνδριον Μαιανδρίου ἄνδρα τῶν ἀστῶν, ὅς οἱ ἦν γραμματιστής· – "He first sent his secretary, a fellow Samian called Maeandrius the son of Maeandrius, to inspect Oroetes' financial situation."

[127] Although Maeandrius (3.122.4) and Harpagus' spear-bearers (1.113.3) are described as being exceptionally trustworthy (πιστότατος), this is no bar to them being fooled by what they see. In fact, Herodotus repeatedly emphasizes the visual nature of Maeandrius' task (ἀποπέμπει πρῶτα κατοψόμενον; ἀποδέξω; θεησάμενος), implicitly highlighting the contrast between the visual duties required of him and the verbal nature of his usual tasks. Indeed, Maeandrius reports what he has seen (ἀπήγγελλε) as the truth and Polycrates, believing him, takes actions leading to his death. (For the characterizing role of cognate verbs, see below.) Herodotus assigns no blame to Maeandrius for being fooled, possibly because visual examination is outside his normal purview. Polycrates, who makes the mistake of sending a scribe to observe, thereby showing poor judgment, is the one who pays the price.

[128] Thrasybulus sets up the false display in the agora so that the *kēryx* cannot avoid seeing it; his lack of expertise in the visual arena presumably makes him uncritical of what he sees. A seasoned spy might have made more detailed observations to unmask the ploy. The larger issue in these scenes of deception may simply be the difference between proper spies and everyone else. No one identified as a *kataskopos* by Herodotus has any trouble reporting accurate (and true) visual information.

75

eyewitness.[129] The rulers here are depending on reports, but since emissaries are utterly reliable,

their reports should stand in as an equivalent substitute for direct observation.[130] Emissaries are

meant to report accurately, not to make judgments, thus the critical work required to properly

evaluate visual information must be done by the senders. They allow themselves to be deceived

through their failure of inquiry: they prohibit themselves from direct observation-based inquiry

and they show no critical interest in the reports brought to them.[131]

Deceptive visual displays are not the only way to confound the recipient of a message.

Another tactic that is successfully used is changing the fundamental meaning of the message. In

an analepsis about conflict between Argos and Sparta, we learn that Argive forces have been

instructed to follow the commands of the Spartan *kērykes*. Cleomenes, realizing this, changes

the meaning of the command to eat (ἄριστον). Thus the content of the pronouncement from the

kēryx is deceptive, even though the *kēryx* himself transmits accurately what he is told to

transmit.[132]

6.78.1-2 μαθὼν δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ποιεῦντας τοὺς Ἀργείους ὁκοῖόν τι **ὁ σφέτερος κῆρυξ σημήνειε**, <u>παραγγέλλει σφι</u>, ὅταν **σημήνῃ ὁ κῆρυξ** ποιέεσθαι ἄριστον, τότε ἀναλαβόντας τὰ ὅπλα χωρέειν ἐς τοὺς Ἀργείους. ταῦτα καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπιτελέα ἐκ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων· ἄριστον γὰρ ποιευμένοισι τοῖσι Ἀργείοισι <u>ἐκ τοῦ κηρύγματος</u> ἐπεκέατο, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἐφόνευσαν αὐτῶν,...

When Cleomenes noticed that the Argives were following every command the **Spartiate crier was issuing**, <u>he told his men</u> that the next time **the crier announced** that it was time for them to eat, they should pick up their weapons and attack the Argives. And that is exactly what the Lacedaemonians did. The Argives had followed <u>the crier's command</u> and were busy with their meal when the Lacedaemonians attacked them.

---

[129] E.g. Marincola (1997, 67) and Luraghi (2006). It seems that within the narrative, a spy or emissary counts as a "direct observer" and not as an eyewitness, due to the presumed fidelity of their reporting. They are proxies for the eyes and ears of their sender, and hence it is as if the sender is actually the observer.

[130] Luraghi (2006, 83-85) discusses the drawbacks of knowledge acquired through information provided by others; his concerns about unreliable or biased information are not applicable to the reports of emissaries.

[131] Indeed, as Marincola points out (1997, 133), Herodotus' authority as a narrator (in contrast to other authors) stems entirely from his skill at inquiry. For the importance of inquiry as it relates to Herodotus as narrator and our reception of the *Histories*, see Bakker (2002), Fowler (2006), and Luraghi (2006). It is possible that Astyages and Polycrates allow themselves to be deceived, in part, through their eagerness to believe that the apparent (and advantageous) situation is true.

[132] Scott (*ad loc.*) points out that misusing a *kēryx* is sacrilegious, which reflects poorly on Cleomenes' character.

As a result of this trickery, the Argives are routed and eventually killed by Cleomenes. If we want to consider the already-established danger of believing messages from an unfamiliar third party, believing messages from a clearly inimical third-party seems even worse. Furthermore, in some sense the Argives are "stealing" these messages – they are not the intended recipients but are availing themselves of the content anyway. Their intentional interception of messages is unique in the *Histories*.[133] This usurpation places them outside of the proper context in which the message is given and received, leading to their inability to interpret the content properly. Misbehavior thus occurs on both sides: the Argives follow a command not addressed to them, and the Spartans change the meaning of those commands to catch them in an ambush. While an additional point here may be the danger of stealing information, the obvious lesson is, again, not to trust information from an unfamiliar, inimical, source.[134]

The thrust of these examples is similar in every case: we can trust that messages (oral or written) will be delivered exactly as sent. In this sense, messages are reliable, much like explicit emissaries. Reliable transmission (regardless of the status of the bearer), however, does not ensure that the content of those messages is true and not intended to deceive the recipient. As with any communication, motivations must be taken into consideration when determining whether to trust someone's words or advice.

Characterization of Message Bearers

In the sections above we have focused on typical explicit emissaries and the typical connotations

---

[133] For other misdelivered messages, see below.

[134] The Argives, ironically, put themselves in this situation in a failed attempt to avoid trickery. This passage also illustrates the important distinction between the cognate verbs and σημαίνω. The Argives, by depending upon signaled (not announced) information, must possess the proper key to decode it. By having Cleomenes change the meaning of the signal using the verb παραγγέλλει, Herodotus emphasizes the difference between reliable (and clear) announcements and those which may be intrinsically deceptive (σημήνη). See below for more on the cognate verbs.

of explicit messages. We have dealt only incidentally with the fact that the act of carrying a

message can itself characterize an individual. Someone said to be bearing a message is not being

explicitly named as an intermediary, but is certainly being used in that capacity when cognate

vocabulary expresses his task. For example, the horseman/courier in the following passage

exhibits all the best behavior of a proper emissary:

> 5.14.1-2 ἐνθαῦτα Δαρεῖος <u>γράφει γράμματα</u> Μεγαβάζῳ, τὸν ἔλιπε ἐν τῇ Θρηίκῃ
> στρατηγόν, ἐντελλόμενος ἐξαναστῆσαι ἐξ ἠθέων Παίονας καὶ παρ᾽ ἑωυτὸν ἀγαγεῖν καὶ αὐτοὺς
> καὶ τὰ τέκνα τε καὶ γυναῖκας αὐτέων. αὐτίκα δὲ <u>ἱππεὺς ἔθεε φέρων τὴν ἀγγελίην</u> ἐπὶ τὸν
> Ἑλλήσποντον, <u>περαιωθεὶς δὲ</u> <u>διδοῖ τὸ βυβλίον τῷ Μεγαβάζῳ.</u> ὁ δ᾽ ἐπιλεξάμενος...[135]
>
> Darius next <u>wrote a letter</u> to Megabazus, the military commander he had left in Thrace,
> ordering him to uproot the people of Paeonia – men, women, and children – from their native
> land and bring them to him. <u>A man raced off on horseback</u> to the Hellespont <u>with the message</u>,
> crossed over into Europe, and <u>delivered the message to Megabazus</u>. He read it...

After Darius writes his letter, we see it delivered without any narrative delay. Indeed, the

vocabulary emphasizes speed. The courier departs at once (αὐτίκα) and moves swiftly (ἔθεε);

upon arriving (περαιωθείς, more or less) he delivers Darius' message to the proper recipient

(διδοῖ τὸ βυβλίον τῷ Μεγαβάζῳ), once again without any narrative delay. In terms of actions,

this courier is certainly a typical emissary. The use of the official vocabulary of messages helps

encourage that association – he is described as bearing a message (φέρων τὴν ἀγγελίην) which,

of course, is what every proper ἄγγελος does. The fact that this ἀγγελίη is a written message

instead of an oral one is of no account.   Although the reliability of the courier and the integrity

of the message he carries are implicitly apparent, the explicit narrative focus is evidently on

speed. It may be for this reason that the courier is described as a horseman instead of as a proper

ἄγγελος. Horses obviously run faster than men, and the distance from Sardis to Thrace prohibits

a swift delivery on foot.

Similarly, Myrsus delivers a message from Oroetes to Polycrates without being named

---

[135] Rosén prints Μεγαβάζω, which is surely a typographic error.

explicitly as an emissary: ὁ δὲ ὦν Ὀροίτης...ἔπεμπε <u>Μύρσον τὸν Γύγεω ἄνδρα Λυδὸν</u> ἐς Σάμον

<u>ἀγγελίην φέροντα</u>... – "In any case, Oroetes...sent a <u>Lydian called Myrsus the son of Gyges</u> to

Samos <u>with a message</u>" (3.122.1).   The situation described in the message is fabricated, intended

to fool Polycrates into being killed by Oroetes, but the narrative gives us no reason to doubt

Myrsus' reliability in delivering the false information. In fact, the message is presented in direct

speech with Oreotes grammatically as the speaker of the words to Polycrates, despite the obvious

fact he does not actually deliver the words himself: ὁ Ὀροίτης πέμψας <u>ἀγγελίην</u> ἔλεγε, τάδε –

"Oroetes...sent the following <u>message</u> [and said]" (3.122.3). By revisiting the act of sending the

message, Myrsus' role is recalled out of the contextually available information previously

provided in the narrative. By presenting Oroetes as the message's (grammatical) speaker, there

is no doubt that the words of the message are unaltered and therefore there is no way to depict

the (excluded) message-bearer as unreliable.[136] From a thematic perspective, allowing Oroetes

to appear to speak directly to Polycrates emphasizes the personal nature of his appeal and the

direct connection between rulers which the message is hoping to create.

Carrying a message, however, is not the only way to confer a semblance of reliability

upon an otherwise unknown character. Speaking a message, i.e. being the subject of a verb

cognate with ἄγγελος or κῆρυξ, appears to have the same effect.[137] Such cognate verbs are used

most often when an individual brings new information to an authority figure and when an

authority figure issues commands to his subjects (through unmentioned intermediaries). In either

---

[136] Many clear examples of this grammatical organization exist; some have messages in direct speech but more commonly Herodotus simply gives a summary of their contents. Book 1: 67.2, 76.3, 141.3, 157.3, 158.1, 206.1, 212.1. Book 3: 1.1, 7.2, 14.8, 43.2, 51.2, 53.6, 119.3, 138.3. Book 4: 125.4, 145.3, 167.2. Book 5: 24.1, 70.2, 108.2. Book 6:22.2, 46.1, 48.2, 79.1, 97.1, 133.2. Book 7: 169.1, 203.1. Book 8: 29.1, 112.1. Book 9: 18.3, 48.1, 48.3 (notably, this example is contained within a speech by Mardonius), 98.2.

[137] Passive verbs often have no overt subject, but can still lend an air of reliability to the anonymous source or the message itself. Verbs related to γράφω do not appear to have the same characterizing effect when they refer to the creation of messages. For example, in the passage above (5.14.1-2), Darius does not appear to take on the attributes of a typical emissary, despite having been the subject of the verb γράφει. There is no need for that identification, since an indirect emissary is also present in the scene (ἱππεὺς...φέρων τὴν ἀγγελίην).

case, the communication is depicted as occurring directly (e.g. person A announces something to person B), with the result that there is no opportunity for the content of the message to be altered: it is received exactly as sent. The reliability conferred on these message-speakers is evident if we look at who, exactly, performs the actions of these verbs and how they are received. We are accustomed to high-status individuals being heard throughout the *Histories*, and they are often the subjects of the cognate verbs. Official individuals, like *angeloi* and *kērykes* occasionally report their messages using cognate verbs. Even spies can share information using these verbs, although they only do so when reporting back (reliably, we can assume) to their senders. In addition, many low-status individuals report information to high-status authority figures and their words are trusted. These individuals can be identified by ethnic or occupation, or may not be distinguished at all; six times the indefinite pronoun τις represents the reporter of information.[138] In nearly every case, regardless of who the subject is, the information presented using a cognate verb is accepted as accurate and true without suspicion.[139] Thus the reliability we have come to expect from explicit and indirect emissaries can be bestowed by cognate verbs upon their subjects, the implicit emissaries.

Fallible Emissaries

We have observed thus far the consistency with which the ideals of reliability, honesty, and speed are conveyed through the characterization of explicit, indirect, and implicit emissaries. But not every emissary upholds these noble standards at all times. In a few passages, intermediaries fail in some respect at their appointed task and are explicitly judged by other characters in the text. The treatment they receive from their peers reveals the opinion Herodotus

---

[138] 1.43.3 (from context, a Mysian); 2.152.4 (directly identified as τῶν τις Αἰγπτίων); 3.64.1 (an unidentified dream-figure); 3.129.3; 5.33.3; 6.63.2 (directly identified as τίς οἱ [Ariston] οἰκετέων).

[139] In a few cases a message is received with doubt; these are discussed in Chapter 4 and appear to reflect more upon the character of the recipients than on that of the implicit emissaries.

may hold about their fitness for their entitled office. Two passages offer direct criticism of a

failed emissary. In the first example, Herodotus describes a situation in which Athenian *angeloi*

overstep their authority to negotiate. They are sent to Persia to make an alliance but, perhaps

without realizing it, promise Athenian submission instead.

> 5.73.1-3 οὗτοι μέν νυν δεδεμένοι ἐτελεύτησαν, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα Κλεισθένεα καὶ τὰ ἑπτακόσια ἐπίστια τὰ διωχθέντα ὑπὸ Κλεομένεος μεταπεμψάμενοι πέμπουσι **ἀγγέλους** ἐς Σάρδις συμμαχίην βουλόμενοι ποιήσασθαι πρὸς Πέρσας, ἠπιστέατο γάρ σφι πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους τε καὶ Κλεομένεα ἐκπεπολεμῶσθαι· **ἀπικομένων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων** ἐς τὰς Σάρδις **καὶ λεγόντων τὰ ἐντεταλμένα** Ἀρταφρένης ὁ Ὑστάσπεος Σαρδίων ὕπαρχος ἐπειρώτα, τίνες ἐόντες ἄνθρωποι καὶ κοῦ γῆς οἰκημένοι δεοίατο Περσέων σύμμαχοι γενέσθαι, πυθόμενος δὲ πρὸς τῶν ἀγγέλων ἀπεκορύφου σφι τάδε· εἰ μὲν διδοῦσι βασιλέϊ Δαρείῳ γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ συμμαχίην σφι συνετίθετο, εἰ δὲ μὴ διδῶσι, ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐκέλευε. **οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι ἐπὶ σφέων αὐτῶν βαλόμενοι διδόναι ἔφασαν βουλόμενοι τὴν συμμαχίην ποιήσασθαι. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ ἀπελθόντες ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν αἰτίας μεγάλας εἶχον**.

> After the prisoners had been executed, the Athenians recalled Cleisthenes and the seven hundred families who had been banished by Cleomenes. Then they sent **a delegation** to Sardis, because they knew that Cleomenes and the Lacedaemonians were up in arms against them, so they wanted to enter into an alliance with the Persians. **The delegation reached** Sardis and **was in the middle of delivering its message** when Artaphrenes the son of Hystaspes, who was the governor of Sardis, asked the Athenians who they were and where they were from that they sought an alliance with the Persians. The Athenian delegates gave him the information he had asked for, and then he curtly stated his position as follows: 'If the Athenians give King Darius earth and water, he will enter into an alliance with them; otherwise, they will have to leave.' **The delegates wanted to conclude the alliance, so of their own accord they agreed to offer the king earth and water. This got them into a lot of trouble on their return home.**

Initially these *angeloi* appear to be on the right track. They are sent, arrive, and speak as

commanded, just as expected. But after their conversation with Artaphrenes, they overstep their

authority. Emissaries were not permitted to deliberate nor to negotiate beyond their authority.[140]

The fact that they agree to hand over earth and water because of their own desire and on their

own authority (ἐπὶ σφέων αὐτῶν .... βουλόμενοι) violates their standard duties: it is an excessive

act, beyond their typical function. Their wrongdoing does not go unnoticed. Herodotus implies

(via ἀπελθόντες) that the emissaries are censured by the Athenians who sent them, and their folly

---

[140] Following Mosley (1973, 39), as above.

is explicitly pointed out, even if the punishment is vague (ἑωυτῶν αἰτίας μεγάλας εἶχον). The

message to the audience is clear, however: excessive or inappropriate actions by emissaries do

not pass without comment.

Similarly, the Getae explicitly chastise the *angelos* they send to their god Salmoxis if his

delivery fails. The oddness of this message delivery merits detailed explanation in the narrative,

including the conditions for a successful transmission and those for an unsuccessful one.

4.94.2-3 διὰ πεντετηρίδος δὲ τὸν πάλῳ λαχόντα αἰεὶ σφέων αὐτῶν **ἀποπέμπουσι ἄγγελον παρὰ τὸν Σάλμοξιν** ἐντελλόμενοι, τῶν ἂν ἑκάστοτε δέωνται, πέμπουσι δὲ ὧδε· οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ταχθέντες ἀκόντια τρία ἔχουσι, ἄλλοι δὲ διαλαβόντες τοῦ ἀποπεμπομένου παρὰ τὸν Σάλμοξιν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας ἀνακινήσαντες αὐτὸν μετέωρον ῥίπτουσι ἐς τὰς λόγχας· ἢν μὲν δὴ ἀποθάνῃ ἀναπαρείς, τοῖσδε ἵλεος ὁ θεὸς δοκέει εἶναι, **ἢν δὲ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ, αἰτιῶνται αὐτὸν τὸν ἄγγελον φάμενοί μιν ἄνδρα κακὸν εἶναι, αἰτιησάμενοι δὲ τοῦτον ἄλλον ἀποπέμπουσι·** ἐντέλλονται δὲ ἔτι ζῶντι.

At five-year intervals, they cast lots to choose someone <u>to send to Salmoxis (a deity) as their messenger,</u> with instructions as to what favours they want him to grant on that occasion. This is how they send the messenger. They arrange three lances, with men to hold them, and then others grab the hands and feet of the one being sent to Salmoxis and throw him up into the air and on to the points of the lances. If he dies from being impaled, they regard this as a sign that the god will look favorably on their requests. <u>If he does not die, however, they blame this failure on the messenger himself, call him a bad man, and then find someone else to send.</u> They tell him the message they want him to take to Salmoxis while he is still alive.

The unsuccessful *angelos*, as we discover, is one who does not die and therefore fails to deliver

the message. Anyone failing in this respect is blamed and called, outright, a bad man. The

blame is expressed three times in the narrative: twice through the verb αἰτιῶμαι and once through

the content of that censure (ἄνδρα κακὸν εἶναι). No ambiguous or implicit judgment is offered;

we are directly and explicitly informed that this failed *angelos* is a bad man in the eyes of his

people. Whether or not we agree with his designation as κακός, it is true that he has failed:

successfully delivering a message *is* the most basic task of an emissary.[141]

The Getae's censure for failed performance seems fair on their terms, but Herodotus can

---

[141] For more discussion of this passage and its thematic relevance, see Chapter 5.

express his negative opinion of these fallible emissaries in another, more subtle way, through the manipulation of vocabulary.[142] For a handful of emissaries, Herodotus reveals his judgment implicitly through the withdrawal of relevant cognate vocabulary. An official title can be withheld from a character in light of inappropriate action. Violation of the typical characterization for an emissary may not change the factual status of an individual, but can certainly change their presentation in the narrative.

In the following passage, Herodotus removes the title ἄγγελοι from a group of Persians who misbehave. Dropping the use of an official title is itself nothing notable, since Herodotus can rely on the audience's contextual awareness and replace titles with relevant pronouns or participles. Instead of this common technique, however, Herodotus chooses to refer to these men almost exclusively as "Persians", thereby placing undue emphasis on their ethnicity and the corresponding cultural stereotypes. The *angeloi* are sent out of the Persian army by Megabazus to request earth and water from Amyntas (the King of Macedonia) on Darius' behalf.

5.17.1 Μεγάβαζος δὲ ὡς ἐχειρώσατο τοὺς Παίονας, πέμπει **ἀγγέλους ἐς Μακεδονίην ἄνδρας ἑπτὰ Πέρσας, οἳ** μετ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον **ἦσαν δοκιμώτατοι ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ**, **ἐπέμποντο** δὲ **οὗτοι** παρὰ Ἀμύντην **αἰτήσοντες** γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ Δαρείῳ βασιλέϊ.

5.18.1-2 **οἱ ὦν Πέρσαι οἱ πεμφθέντες οὗτοι** παρὰ τὸν Ἀμύντην ὡς **ἀπίκοντο, αἴτεον ἐλθόντες** ἐς ὄψιν τὴν Ἀμύντεω Δαρείῳ βασιλέϊ γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ. ὁ δὲ ταῦτά τε ἐδίδου καί **σφεας** ἐπὶ ξείνια καλέει, παρασκευασάμενος δὲ δεῖπνον μεγαλοπρεπὲς ἐδέκετο **τοὺς Πέρσας** φιλοφρόνως. ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ δείπνου ἐγίνοντο, **διαπίνοντες εἶπαν οἱ Πέρσαι,** τάδε...

After his victory over the Paeonians, Megabazus sent **to Macedonia a delegation [*angeloi*] consisting of the seven most important Persians in his army** after himself. **The purpose of their mission** to Amyntas **was to demand** earth and water for King Darius.

When the Persian delegation arrived at Amyntas' residence, **they gained an audience** with him and **demanded** earth and water for King Darius, which Amyntas gave them. He then invited **them** to dine with him, prepared a magnificent banquet, and entertained the Persians generously. After the meal, **over the wine, the Persians said**...

The men are identified as *angeloi*, and then further described as "seven Persian men" who are the "most worthy" in the army. By adding these qualifiers, Herodotus points out the high status

---

[142] Similarly, Naiden (2006, 133-60) discusses several ways a suppliant can violate typical expectations, resulting in censure or the denial of the title of "suppliant".

of these *angeloi*, while at the same time establishing firmly their connection to Persia and, in

particular, to the acquisitive desire of the Persians represented through their military campaigns.

In their initial actions, nothing unexpected is represented. They are sent with their message, then

arrive and deliver it just as it was commanded to them.[143] Since the content of the message is

presented during both instruction and delivery (an unusual doublet), we can confirm that these

men are executing their duties faithfully, as their office demands. Herodotus' language,

similarly, is unexceptional up to this point. Referential pronouns and verbs marking typical

behavior are used to describe the *angeloi*.   The summary of their dispatch in 5.18.1 reintroduces

the ethnic adjective, whose likely primary function is to underscore the link being created

between Persia and Macedonia by these men through their physical transit. But as soon as the

business of the message is finished and Amyntas offers them hospitality, things rapidly

deteriorate. The *angeloi* take advantage of their host's generosity by spurning local customs and

violating Amyntas' female household members. Such behavior is obviously inappropriate for

official representatives of state and especially for men welcomed under the conventions of *xenia*.

It is no part of the duties of emissaries and, by any standard, appears to be excessive behavior in

general. Herodotus adapts his language accordingly, referring to them only as "Persians" and

never again as *angeloi*: their behavior has made the application of such a title inappropriate,

desipte their actual status. Instead, their ethnic adjective now serves as the primary basis for

their identity and prepares the audience to expect the negative and stereotypically "Persian"

actions which follow.

---

[143] The syntax of the message is reordered slightly to express different pragmatic situations in each section, but otherwise the content is identical. During instruction, the *angeloi* are to ask for γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ Δαρείῳ βασιλέι. Since they are serving as soldiers for Darius, evidently, his name and status are less relevant to them than the reason for their message – the need to obtain earth and water. When the *angeloi* arrive and speak to Amyntas, he may not be aware of their allegiance, hence the information about Darius becomes contextually necessary and jumps into initial position: Δαρείῳ βασιλέι γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ.

Herodotus' reliance on the ethnic adjective to identify these fallible *angeloi* appears to be deliberate. Once the initial connection with Amyntas has been made, the need for linking has ended. In the events which follow, the *angeloi* are the only plural, masculine group of characters, which means that referential pronouns and participial descriptions should obviously only refer to these men, without need for additional identification. As we saw above, the other major reason for ethnic adjectives is to create a conceptual link to that culture, and it looks as if Herodotus repeatedly employs the adjective "Persian" to hammer home the stereotypical features being expressed through the actions of these emissaries. While they are still mentioned in neutral terms (σφεας) when *xenia* is extended, their excessive behavior and the ethnic adjectives show up hand-in-hand immediately after. In the passage above, Herodotus hints at what is to come with the first ethnic (τοὺς Πέρσας) and then confirms the brewing trouble through a second ethnic, hard upon a participle indicating that the *angeloi* are getting drunk (διαπίνοντες εἶπαν οἱ Πέρσαι). This intemperate behavior bleeds into what follows: their speech shows no regard for the customs of Macedonia but imposes cultural Persian desires upon their Macedonian host; Amyntas can hardly refuse.[144]

5.18.2-3 ʽξεῖνε Μακεδών, **ἡμῖν** νόμος ἐστὶ **τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι**, ἐπεὰν δεῖπνον προτιθώμεθα μέγα, τότε καὶ τὰς παλλακὰς καὶ τὰς κουριδίας γυναῖκας ἐσάγεσθαι παρέδρους· σύ νυν, ἐπεί περ προθύμως μὲν ἐδέξαο, μεγάλως δὲ ἐξείνισας, διδοῖς δὲ βασιλέϊ Δαρείῳ γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ, ἕπεο νόμῳ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ.' εἶπε πρὸς ταῦτα Ἀμύντης· ʽ**ὦ Πέρσαι**, νόμος μὲν ἡμῖν γέ ἐστι οὐκ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ κεχωρίσθαι ἄνδρας γυναικῶν· ἐπείτε δὲ **ὑμεῖς ἐόντες δεσπόται** προσχρηίζετε τούτων, παρέσται ὑμῖν καὶ ταῦτα.'

ʽMacedonian ally, **in Persia** it is customary **for us** to bring in our concubines and wives to join us at the close of important meals. You have made us very welcome, you are entertaining us so lavishly, and you have given King Darius earth and water – let's see you observe this custom of ours.' ʽMy friends **from Persia**,' Amyntas replied, 'that is not the way we do things here: we keep men and women separate. But **since you are our masters**, if that's what you want, you shall have it.'

The use of ethnic adjectives continues within the speeches, and Amyntas' response gets to the

---

heart of the matter by identifying the men in their new political status (δεσπόται).[145] The actions

of the Persians so far have been the actions of tyrants: excessive desires and no regard for the

customs of their subjects. By promising earth and water, Amyntas has elevated Darius and, by

analogy, these Persian *angeloi* to such a status. Herodotus' language calls attention to the way in

which their tyrannical (Persian) nature overwhelms their role as *angeloi* by abandoning the

vocabulary of emissaries. Although their new status is not mentioned directly again, their

continued actions are emblematic of the worst behavior of tyrants, and their presentation in the

narrative relies heavily upon their ethnic epithets.[146] Again, as the only male and plural

characters in the scene, pronouns or articles alone would suffice to identify the fallible

emissaries. Their ethnicity and all of its connotations are therefore deliberately called up.

> 5.18.3: ἐπεξῆς ἀντίαι ἵζοντο **τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι**
> the women...sat in a row opposite **the Persians**

> 5.18.4: ἐνθαῦτα **οἱ Πέρσαι** ἰδόμενοι γυναῖκας εὐμόρφους **ἔλεγον** πρὸς Ἀμύντην **φάμενοι**
> When **the Persians** saw how beautiful the women were, they **told** Amyntas...
> [**saying**...]

> 5.18.5: αὐτίκα **οἱ Πέρσαι** μαστῶν τε **ἅπτοντο** οἷα πλεόνως **οἰνωμένοι**, καί κού τις καὶ
> **φιλέειν ἐπειρᾶτο**.
> As soon as [the women moved to sit next to the Persians, as requested], **the
> Persians, who were exceedingly drunk**, **began to touch** their breasts, and one or another of
> them **would** even **try to embrace them**.

In the end, the Persians are doubly excessive: they are drunk and they escalate every concession

Amyntas makes with regard to the women. First the absence of women is not acceptable, then

the women are not properly located, and, once these demands are met the Persians immediately

(αὐτίκα) escalate the situation again with inappropriate touching. Alexander, Amyntas' son, has

---

[145] One might argue that, in point of fact, these men have replaced their role as emissaries with their new role as tyrants. But I would argue, as above, that the task of an emissary is not complete until he returns to his sender. These men still need to bear Amyntas' earth and water to Mardonius, and hence are not yet relieved of their duties as *angeloi*.
[146] For more on the way that tyrants (and especially Persian tyrants) treat women, see Boedeker (2011; this passage is discussed on 17-8).

had enough. He pretends to let the Persians have sex with the women, but instead sends in

disguised men to kill them. He has not given earth and water, and although his father's actions

should apply to him also, he rejects the tyrannical actions of the Persians and, at the same time,

the subjugation of Macedonia to Persia.[147] At first, Alexander refers to them as guests (ξεῖνοι),

perhaps ironically, given the ways in which they have violated their host's hospitality. [148] But he

acknowledges the Persians' extreme acquisitiveness by pretending to escalate, yet again, their

association with the household women.

> 5.20.1-2: λέγει ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος πρὸς **τοὺς Πέρσας**· 'γυναικῶν τουτέων, **ὦ ξεῖνοι**, ἔστι **ὑμῖν**
> πολλὴ εὐπετείη, καὶ εἰ ἁπάσῃσι βούλεσθε μίσγεσθαι καὶ ὁκόσῃσι ὦν αὐτέων. τούτου μὲν πέρι
> αὐτοὶ ἀποσημανέετε· νῦν δέ, σχεδὸν γὰρ ἤδη τῆς κοίτης ὥρη προσέρχεται ὑμῖν καὶ καλῶς
> ἔχοντας **ὑμέας** ὁρῶ μέθης, γυναῖκας ταύτας, εἰ ὑμῖν φίλον ἐστί, ἄφετε λούσασθαι, λουσαμένας
> δὲ ὀπίσω προσδέκεσθε.'
>
> Alexander said to **the Persians**, '**Sirs**, these women are at **your** disposal. They are all
> available for sex, and you can pick as many of them as you want. You need only indicate your
> wishes. For the time being, however, since it's nearly time for you to go to bed, and **you're**
> obviously pretty well drunk, I suggest that you let these women go and bathe, if that suits you,
> and then you'll get them back afterwards.'

The Persians trust his false offer, setting up his betrayal of them and their execution. Their

conformity to cultural stereotype instead of adherence to their assigned office will be their

downfall.

> 5.20.3-5: **συνέπαινοι** γὰρ **ἦσαν οἱ Πέρσαι**... παράγων δὲ τούτους ἔλεγε **τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι,**
> τάδε 'ὦ **Πέρσαι**, οἴκατε πανδαισίῃ τελέῃ ἱστιῆσθαι· τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα, ὅσα εἴχομεν καὶ πρὸς τὰ οἷά
> τε ἦν ἐξευρόντας παρέχειν, πάντα ὑμῖν πάρεστι, καὶ δὴ καὶ τόδε τὸ πάντων μέγιστον, τάς τε
> ἑωυτῶν μητέρας καὶ τὰς ἀδελφεὰς ἐπιδαψιλευόμεθα ὑμῖν, ὡς παντελέως μάθητε τιμώμενοι πρὸς
> ἡμέων, τῶν πέρ ἐστε ἄξιοι, <u>πρὸς δὲ καὶ βασιλέϊ τῷ πέμψαντι ἀπαγγείλητε</u> ὡς ἀνὴρ Ἕλλην,

---

[147] By killing the *angeloi* he ensures that the earth and water given to them by Amyntas will never reach Darius.
Effectively, Alexander reasserts Macedonia's independence through this deed. He escapes punishment (by Darius)
for these actions by bribing into silence the Persian who later investigates (5.21). Fearn (2007), however, points out
that the bribe consists of Alexander's sister: he has saved his household women at the expense of his own female
relation, and the resulting alliance will reestablish some connection with Persia. For the irony of this result, see also
Dewald (1981, 96).
[148] Herodotus may be playing on the dual meanings of *xeinos* as "stranger" and "guest"; the Persians are supposed to
be the latter but are acting like the former. This passage is the second time Alexander focalizes the *angeloi* as
xeinoi. When he confronts Amyntas and says, essentially, "I'll take it from here, Dad", he refers to the Persians as
τοῖσι ξείνοισι (5.19.1), whereas Amyntas calls them ἄνδρας τούτους (5.19.2). Amyntas' language is generic and
matches his actions of repeatedly conceding to these Persians whatever they want.

Μακεδὼν ὕπαρχος, εὖ **ὑμέας** ἐδέξατο καὶ τραπέζῃ καὶ κοίτῃ.᾽ ταῦτα εἴπας ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος παρίζει **Πέρσῃ ἀνδρὶ** ἄνδρα Μακεδόνα ὡς γυναῖκα τῷ λόγῳ· οἱ δὲ ἐπείτε σφέων **οἱ Πέρσαι ψαύειν ἐπειρῶντο**, διεργάζοντο **αὐτούς**.

The Persians approved of this suggestion...He [Alexander] brought them [men dressed as women] into the room and said **to the Persians**, 'Sirs, it seems to me that you have had the perfect banquet. You have had the benefit of everything that we have, and everything we could get for you as well, and now, to crown it all, we are making you a present of our own mothers and sisters. All this should leave you in no doubt that we honour you as you deserve, and you can also make it clear to the king who sent you on this mission how welcome **you** were made by a man of Greece, his governor in Macedonia, and how generous he was with bed and board.' With these words, Alexander had every Macedonian man, disguised as a woman, sit down next to **a Persian man**, and when **the Persians tried to fondle them**, the Macedonians killed **them**.

Alexander's triumphant speech points out the Persians' wrongdoing and again reminds them of their proper role (through vocabulary), this time as emissaries and not just as guests. He recalls their initial mission, being sent by the king (πρὸς δὲ καὶ βασιλέϊ τῷ πέμψαντι), and what their next "typical" action should have been (ἀπαγγείλητε), taking the Macedonian response back, underscoring their lost role through the use of a cognate verb. Aside from this brief statement, the rest of the speech (and Herodotus' narrative) treats them only as "Persians". And indeed, they cannot be refashioned into their original identity. Their last action before death is an attempt to paw at the women: they have not taken heed of Alexander's implicit exhortations to be proper guests or emissaries. Throughout this story, then, Herodotus shows how the negative stereotype of "Persia as overreaching tyrant" overwhelms the respectability of these "most worthy *angeloi*" simultaneously in diction and characterization.

A briefer but more unsettling passage shows an *angelos* who delivers the letters he carries to the wrong individual. Histiaeus has sent Hermippus with letters to some Persians in Sardis hoping to arrange a revolt, but the letters are given to Artaphrenes, the governor of Sardis, instead. As above, Hermippus is first identified as an *angelos*, then by name and ethnic (as Atarnean). But after this introduction, he is referred to primarily by name and is demoted from *angelos* to "letter-carrier":

6.4.1-2 μετὰ δὲ ὁ Ἱστιαῖος **δι’ ἀγγέλου** ποιεύμενος **Ἑρμίππου ἀνδρὸς Ἀταρνίτεω** τοῖσι ἐν Σάρδισι ἐοῦσι Περσέων ἔπεμπε <u>βυβλία</u>, ὡς προλελεσχηνευμένων αὐτῷ ἀποστάσιος πέρι. **ὁ δὲ Ἕρμιππος, πρὸς οὓς μὲν ἀπεπέμφθη, οὐ διδοῖ, φέρων δὲ ἐνεχείρισε τὰ βυβλία τῷ Ἀρταφρένεϊ**. ὁ δὲ μαθὼν ἅπαν τὸ γινόμενον ἐκέλευε **τὸν Ἕρμιππον** τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῦ Ἱστιαίου δοῦναι φέροντα, τοῖσί περ ἔφερε, τὰ δὲ ἀμοιβαῖα τὰ παρὰ τῶν Περσέων ἀντιπεμπόμενα Ἱστιαίῳ ἑωυτῷ δοῦναι. τούτων δὲ γενομένων φανερῶν ἀπέκτεινε ἐνθαῦτα πολλοὺς Περσέων ὁ Ἀρταφρένης.

Later, Histiaeus used **a man called Hermippus, from Atarneus**, to take <u>a letter</u> to Sardis; there were Persians there with whom Histiaeus had already spoken about rebellion against Darius. **But Hermippus did not deliver the letter to its addressees; instead he went and put it in Artaphrenes' hands.** When Artaphrenes found out what was going on, he told **Hermippus** to take Histiaeus' letter and give it to the people to whom he was supposed to deliver it, but then to give him the reply they sent back to Histiaeus. With the discovery of this plot, Artaphrenes put to death a large number of Persians.

Herodotus does not say to what extent Hermippus should be blamed for his unreliable delivery, and the language he uses supports this noncommittal attitude. If we simply pay attention to the typical characterization of emissaries, Hermippus violates the feature of reliability by misdelivering Histiaeus' letters. Herodotus emphasizes this fault by reminding the audience of his duties (πρὸς τοὺς μὲν ἀπεπέμφθη) before showing his failure to complete them (φέρων δὲ ἐνεχείρισε τὰ βυβλία Ἀρταφρένεϊ). In the moment of incorrect delivery, Hermippus is described neither by name nor by title, but indirectly as a man carrying letters. Although Herodotus does not completely omit the vocabulary of emissaries, as in the case of the seven Persians above, he takes a step back away from the official title. The reluctance to permit Hermippus any continued association with the vocabulary of emissaries may be related to the fact that Herodotus assigns no explicit blame to Hermippus – his misdelivery may have been compelled by Artaphrenes, not done voluntarily.[149]

---

[149] Scott (*ad loc.*) is also not convinced that Hermippus is at fault for his initial betrayal: "It is unclear whether [Hermippus] was unexpectedly arrested, or Histiaeus intended that Artaphrenes should see the letters." The only other example of message misdelivery lays no blame upon the message bearer. In 8.128, Herodotus describes how Timoxenus and Artabanus send covert messages to each other by attaching written notes to an arrow shaft, then shooting the arrow into a pre-arranged location. One of Artabanus' shots goes awry and ends up in someone's shoulder, leading to discovery of the treacherous communication. Thus the message is not delivered to its correct recipient, but it is hardly the fault of the message bearer (the arrow), since the sender (Artabanus) was the one to set its course.

The picture of Hermippus' innocence or guilt is only made more complicated by what follows. Hermippus evidently complies with Artaphrenes' demand to show him further correspondence. Whether or not he should be under Artaphrenes' authority, he does deliver all the letters reliably after this point: the initial letters are given to the conspirators and their responses are given to Artaphrenes and then to Histiaeus. Herodotus does not show these actions, but allows them to be inferred from Artaphrenes' successful sting. Hermippus is only mentioned directly once more and is simply mentioned by name, which is not unusual for named emissaries.[150] In sum, we have an emissary whose initial task is completed only after delay and incorrect delivery, but the fault is not necessarily his. Aside from this set-back, his behavior appears to be typical: he does what is commanded of him by his (new) sender without further error. As above, the ethnic adjective initially describing him may be used as explanation or support for his odd behavior and ambiguous status. Atarneus is associated elsewhere in the *Histories* with perfidious actions, and connecting Hermippus to such a place may cast a pall on our perception of him.[151] In 1.160 when the Chians give up Pactyes (a suppliant) to the Persians, an impious act, they are rewarded with Atarneus, a location which henceforth cannot supply offerings to the gods.[152] In 8.106, Hermotimus convinces Panionius to move his household to Atarneus where he exacts revenge by forcing Panionius and his sons to castrate each other. The

---

[150] Just as referential pronouns often replace official vocabulary for emissaries, named emissaries are generally referred to only by name once their role has been established. In both cases, once the proper context has been given it is easily available to the audience and can be supplied as needed.

[151] As Dewald notes (in Waterfield, *ad loc.*): "Atarneus, on the Aeolian coast, is connected with two other tales of perfidy, in 1.160 and 8.106; it is also where Histiaeus is finally captured, 6.28." Scott concurs (*ad loc.*): "as noted by Hornblower (2003) 44-5, in Herodotus, Atarneus is always a 'bad place' (so the story at 8.104-6). Here not only is [Hermippus'] mission a failure ... but there is, perhaps, a cycle of fate theme: Histiaeus was captured at Atarneus and taken to his execution a few years later, §29.1."

[152] Following Asheri (*ad loc.*), who says that Herodotus' story about Pactyes is etiological to explain the religious restrictions (1.160.5): ἦν δὲ χρόνος οὗτος οὐκ ὀλίγος γινόμενος, ὅτε Χίων οὐδεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Ἀταρνέος τούτου οὔτε οὐλὰς κριθέων πρόχυσιν ἐποιέετο θεῶν οὐδενὶ οὔτε πέμματα ἐπέσσετο καρποῦ τοῦ ἐνθεῦτεν, ἀπείχετό τε τῶν πάντων ἱρῶν τὰ πάντα ἐκ τῆς χώρης ταύτης γινόμενα. – "For quite a long time afterwards, no Chian would use barley from Atarneus as an offering to any of the gods nor would he use grain from there to make sacrificial cakes; in fact nothing from that region was allowed in any sanctuary."

crime of Hermippus, by comparison, does not seem so terrible, yet it may be that Herodotus casts aspersions on him simply by associating him with this place and the acts for which it is a setting. However much he fails as an *angelos* (by misdelivering messages, for whatever reason), perhaps by that same amount he "succeeds" as an Atarnean in that he is involved with destructive acts, regardless of his intentions or motives. Atarneus, after all, is only a place: its reputation for perfidy comes entirely from the actions of others.[153] Hermippus may best exemplify his "Atarnean" nature simply by being caught up in the schemes of others.

Suspect Emissaries

The examples so far have shown the sophisticated way in which the narrative can guide the audience to regard fallible emissaries in accordance with Herodotus' judgment of them. The inadequacy of these men is addressed in one of two possible ways: either Herodotus implicitly judges them by altering how he presents them in the narrative, or characters internal to the text judge them by explicitly censuring their behavior. A third type of judgment is possible, when someone who does not display the proper qualities of an intermediary somehow redeems himself and an official title is bestowed upon that character at the completion of his actions. This pattern of first withholding and then bestowing the vocabulary of emissaries is most notable in situations involving spies. As explained in the first chapter, spies stand in a separate category from regular emissaries since their main duties rely on visual observation. They are a proxy for the eyes, whereas proper emissaries are a proxy for the voice. There is no clear expectation, then, that spies should uphold the typical characterization of official emissaries and therefore they must prove their worthiness before being described with cognate vocabulary.

---

[153] The same cannot be said about the "Persians", and other ethnics discussed in this chapter. For Atarneus, a location of minor importance, we are told stories that relate to events that occurred on its soil. For all of the other ethnics discussed, the actions of many characters from those locations (and commonly held stereotypes) provide a characterization.

Herodotus is initially cagey about the status of Lacrines when he goes to deliver the

Spartan ultimatum to Cyrus (1.152-3, discussed above).   The narrative calls the Spartan

expedition "men" and Herodotus suggests (in his own opinion) that they are actually spies

(ἄνδρας, ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκέει, κατασκόπους).   If their primary function is furtive and non-

communicative observation, his application of vocabulary would be appropriate. Yet the

following description of the behavior of this group – arriving and selecting out a member to

speak (1.152.3) – so closely mirrors the situation with Pythermus just described above (1.152.1)

that Herodotus must have meant for his audience to notice the similarity. This similarity creates

a context in which it is possible to view Lacrines as a proper emissary instead of as a spy. And

indeed, once selected, he speaks his message and is immediately given the title of *kēryx* (ταῦτα

εἰπόντος τοῦ κήρυκος).   Thus Herodotus can bestow cognate vocabulary on his characters when

their behavior and intentions do match his expectations for emissaries.

The status of Lacrines is supported by the many parallels between his actions and those

of Pythermus, whose status as an official emissary (an *angelos*) is never in doubt. What

Herodotus establishes in this scene, in particular, is the fundamental distinction between official

emissaries and spies; the two groups may be thought of as forming a minimal pair, in which a

member of one group cannot be considered a proper member of the other. In the case of

Lacrines, Herodotus admits that he is a proper emissary and hedges about naming him a spy,

making it clear that such an appellation is only his opinion. But in the case of the Fish-eaters

(3.19-25), no such hedging is necessary and Herodotus's language confirms that spies are not to

be conflated with emissaries.

The Fish-eaters are given two immediate classifications; they are spies and translators:

3.19.1 Καμβύσῃ δὲ ὡς ἔδοξε πέμπειν <u>τοὺς κατασκόπους</u>, αὐτίκα μετεπέμπετο ἐξ
Ἐλεφαντίνης πόλιος <u>τῶν Ἰχθυοφάγων ἀνδρῶν τοὺς ἐπισταμένους τὴν Αἰθιοπίδα γλῶσσαν.</u>

As soon as Cambyses had decided to send <u>spies</u> to Ethiopia, he summoned from the city of Elephantine <u>some members of the tribe of Fish-eaters who knew the Ethiopian language</u>. The former is an occupation they are being asked to take up, the latter is a characteristic of their identity. As such, it seems plausible that Herodotus can access the idea of their translation skills by using the ethnic adjective. To access their identity as spies, he must rely on the explicit designation or show them performing visual tasks. Much like the Persians who are sent to Amyntas, the behavior demonstrated by these individuals here is underscored by the identifying vocabulary chosen by Herodotus. Their status as translators and spies both supersede the emissary-like nature of their initial tasks, evidently, since Herodotus continuously eschews any words cognate with *angelos* or *kēryx*. Furthermore, when they arrive to be instructed by Cambyses, the lack of any explicit observational tasks may explain why Herodotus uses the ethnic only to describe them, omitting *kataskopoi*.[154]

3.20.1 ἐπείτε δὲ τῷ Καμβύσῃ ἐκ τῆς Ἐλεφαντίνης <u>ἀπίκοντο οἱ Ἰχθυοφάγοι, ἔπεμπε αὐτοὺς</u> ἐς τοὺς Αἰθίοπας ἐντειλάμενός τε, τὰ λέγειν χρή, καὶ δῶρα φέροντας... οἱ δὲ Αἰθίοπες οὗτοι, ἐς τοὺς <u>ἀπέπεμπε</u> ὁ Καμβύσης, λέγονται εἶναι μέγιστοι καὶ κάλλιστοι ἀνθρώπων πάντων·

<u>When the Fish-eaters arrived</u> from Elephantine, Cambyses told <u>them</u> what they had to say and sent them off to Ethiopia. He gave them gifts to take, including... The Ethiopians in question, the ones to whom Cambyses <u>sent [the delegation]</u>, are said to be the tallest and most attractive people in the world.

Their emissary-like behavior, depending on their skill as translators, continues when they arrive into Ethiopia.

3.21.1 ἐς τούτους δὴ ὦν τοὺς ἄνδρας ὡς <u>ἀπίκοντο οἱ Ἰχθυοφάγοι, διδόντες τὰ δῶρα τῷ βασιλέι αὐτῶν ἔλεγον, τάδε</u> ʿβασιλεὺς ὁ Περσέων Καμβύσης, βουλόμενος φίλος καὶ ξεῖνός τοι γενέσθαι <u>ἡμέας</u> τε ἀπέπεμψε ἐς λόγους τοι ἐλθεῖν κελεύων, καὶ δῶρα ταῦτά τοι διδοῖ τοῖσι καὶ αὐτὸς μάλιστα ἥδεται χρεώμενος.ʾ

<u>So when the Fish-eaters reached</u> these Ethiopians, <u>they offered the gifts to the king and said</u>, ʿIt is because Cambyses, king of Persia, wants to be your guest-friend and your ally that he has sent <u>us</u> with instructions to hold talks with you, and that is also why he is giving you these gifts, which he particularly enjoys using.ʾ

---

[154] Signaling that they are to impersonate emissaries, however, Herodotus does use a phrase of instruction found elsewhere in contexts with official emissaries (1.69 and 8.75): ἐντειλάμενός τε, τὰ λέγειν χρή (3.20.1).

By showing us the instruction of the Fish-eaters in 3.20.1 and the subsequent fulfillment of these

duties, Herodotus confirms the reliability of these men and presents them in much the same

fashion as we have seen him describe many other official emissaries. By showing their direct

speech to the Ethiopian king, he confirms their linguistic abilities. But their true occupational

status during this story is as spies. Although they have not yet been shown performing

observational tasks, the king sees through their ruse and returns the vocabulary of spying to the

story.

> 3.21.2 ὁ δὲ Αἰθίοψ μαθών, ὅτι <u>κατόπται</u> ἥκοιεν, λέγει <u>πρὸς αὐτοὺς</u> τοιάδε· ʽοὔτε ὁ
> Περσέων βασιλεὺς <u>δῶρα ὑμέας</u> ἔπεμψε <u>φέροντας</u> προτιμῶν πολλοῦ ἐμοὶ ξεῖνος γενέσθαι, <u>οὔτε
> ὑμεῖς λέγετε ἀληθέα, ἥκετε γὰρ κατόπται τῆς ἐμῆς ἀρχῆς</u>, οὔτε ἐκεῖνος ἀνήρ ἐστι δίκαιος. εἰ γὰρ
> ἦν δίκαιος, οὔτ᾽ ἂν ἐπεθύμησε χώρης ἄλλης ἢ τῆς ἑωυτοῦ οὔτ᾽ ἂν ἐς δουλοσύνην ἀνθρώπους
> ἦγε, ὑπ᾽ ὧν μηδὲν ἠδίκηται. νῦν δὲ αὐτῷ τόξον τόδε διδόντες τάδε ἔπεα λέγετε·

> The Ethiopian king, however, realized that <u>they had come as spies</u>, so he said <u>to them</u>:
> ʽThe Persian king has not sent <u>you with gifts</u> because he really wants my friendship. <u>You're
> lying: the real reason you are here is to spy on my kingdom</u>. Your master's behaviour is
> reprehensible too. If he were a good man, he would not have wanted to possess any land other
> than his own, and he wouldn't have enslaved people who have done him no wrong. That is how
> things are, so I want you to give him this bow and say to him...'

The king accuses the Fish-eaters both of being spies and of lying about their status, neither of

which is appropriate for emissaries. His accusations are based on his own knowledge of them,

which is presented both in the narrative (μαθὼν ὅτι κατόπται ἥκοιεν) and in his speech (ἥκετε

γὰρ κατόπται τῆς ἐμῆς ἀρχῆς). Yet the Ethiopian king commands the Fish-eaters to take a

response back to Cambyses, much in the same way as we would expect him to address proper

emissaries (νῦν δὲ αὐτῷ τόξον τόδε διδόντες τάδε ἔπεα λέγετε). His command to them mirrors

their original instructions from Cambyses, in that it involves both a gift and a speech. It is

strange that the king would doubt the fidelity of these men and then entrust them with tasks, but

perhaps their reliable behavior thus far provides a measure of comfort.

From this point on, the Fish-eaters converse with the Ethiopians about ethnographic

issues and go sightseeing, actions which combine their mandate to spy with their inherent

linguistic skills. Accordingly, Herodotus' language relies on verbs of seeing and uses the word

kataskopoi in this section more often than their bare ethnic adjective. None of their actions are

typical of emissaries at this point, so the lack of cognate vocabulary is expected. Their visit ends

with observation, so it makes sense for Herodotus to focus on their status as spies when they

finish their duties:

> 3.25.1 θεησάμενοι δὲ τὰ πάντα οἱ κατάσκοποι ἀπαλλάσσοντο ὀπίσω·
> Once they had reconnoitred everything, the spies left Ethiopia and returned to Egypt.

Back in Egypt, however, their observational role is finished. Their only job now is to report to

Cambyses what they have seen and to fulfill the task set to them by the Ethiopian king. Here,

finally, they are allowed to be recognized through vocabulary as fulfilling their tasks in a manner

suitable for emissaries.

> 3.25.1 <u>ἀπαγγειλάντων δὲ ταῦτα τούτων</u>, αὐτίκα ὁ Καμβύσης ὀργὴν ποιησάμενος
> ἐστρατεύετο ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἰθίοπας...
> <u>Their report</u> made Cambyses so angry that he immediately set out to attack the
> Ethiopians...

Their association with the qualities of emissaries, through a cognate verb, is sufficiently strong

that it supersedes any other identification for the moment.[155] In this passage, the cognate verb

(ἀπαγγειλάντων) may add weight to the authority of their report, thereby giving better

justification for Cambyses' violent reaction. It may also be an implicit answer to the charge of

deceit from the Ethiopian king and assurance for the audience that the Fish-eaters are

trustworthy, if temporary, representatives for Cambyses. Regardless of the thematic elements

emphasized by this choice of vocabulary, the story of the Fish-eaters shows Herodotus'

---

[155] Herodotus repeats Cambyses' rage in 3.25.2, this time explaining it as caused by what he heard from the Fish-eaters (ὡς ἤκουσε τῶν Ἰχθυοφάγων). The ethnic adjective may be used here primarily for basic identification, since Ethiopians and Greeks are also mentioned in close proximity.

command of language in his narrative: people who are not proper emissaries will not be categorized as such through vocabulary, but rather their identification will support the role indicated by their actions. In the case of Lacrines, Herodotus withholds the title of *kēryx* due to his suspicions about the Spartans' motive. In the case of the Fish-eaters, Herodotus has a firmer basis for his suspicions and therefore withholds all explicit and indirect emissary vocabulary, allowing only at the very end any recognition of their emissary-like behavior by means of a cognate verb.

Darius: A Denied Emissary

As we have just seen, Herodotus can show his judgment of an individual's behavior and status by manipulating the vocabulary of emissaries. In all the situations discussed in this chapter, the individual in question has shown his fitness for office through behavior at some point or in some way during the scene, thereby justifying the title of "emissary" when it is given to him.[156] But in at least one scene, Herodotus presents the most subtle, implicit judgment of all: the cognate vocabulary of emissaries is entirely absent from the description of an individual and his actions even though context has cued our expectation of it. In comparison to previous examples, such an omission stands out and suggests that Herodotus must have a good reason for his decision to withhold the designation: extreme violation of the typical characterization of an emissary which renders the individual unworthy of such a status.

Darius' plan to overthrow the Magi (3.72) depends (in part) on his ability to impersonate an emissary. He proposes to gain access to the palace by claiming that he has come to deliver a message from his father. In his description of his presumed role, we should expect him to be

---

[156] The Getae's failed *angelos* to Salmoxis might be raised as an objection. But note that Herodotus presents this failure only within a present general conditional ("if he dies, then...") and follows it immediately by blame. This conditional suggests that the Getae have an expectation of reliable delivery even though Herodotus only directly shows us failure.

identified as an emissary (explicitly or indirectly) or, at least, to be characterized through a

cognate verb; indeed the inference is strong enough that the English translation speaks of a

"message". But the vocabulary used (ἔπος...σημῆναι) suggests a deliberate omission of the usual

language of emissaries.

3.72.1-5 ...ἀμείβεται Δαρεῖος τοῖσδε· Ὀτάνη, ἦ πολλά ἐστι, τὰ λόγῳ μὲν οὐκ οἷά τε δηλῶσαι, ἔργῳ δέ· ἄλλα δ᾽ ἐστί, τὰ λόγῳ μὲν οἷά τε, ἔργον δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν λαμπρὸν γίνεται. ὑμεῖς δὲ ἴστε φυλακὰς τὰς κατεστεώσας ἐούσας οὐδὲν χαλεπὰς παρελθεῖν. τοῦτο μὲν γάρ – ἡμέων ἐόντων τοιῶνδε – οὐδείς, ὅστις οὐ παρήσει τὰ μέν κου καταιδεόμενος ἡμέας, τὰ δέ κου καὶ δειμαίνων· τοῦτο δὲ ἔχω αὐτὸς σκῆψιν εὐπρεπεστάτην, τῇ πάριμεν, <u>φὰς ἄρτι τε ἥκειν ἐκ Περσέων καὶ βούλεσθαί τι ἔπος παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς σημῆναι τῷ βασιλέι.</u> ἔνθα γάρ τι δεῖ ψεῦδος λέγεσθαι, λεγέσθω, τοῦ γὰρ αὐτοῦ γλιχόμεθα οἵ τε ψευδόμενοι καὶ οἱ τῇ ἀληθείῃ διαχρεώμενοι· οἱ μέν γε ψεύδονται τότε, ἐπεάν τι μέλλωσι τοῖσι ψεύδεσι πείσαντες κερδήσεσθαι, οἱ δ᾽ ἀληθίζονται, ἵνα τι τῇ ἀληθείῃ ἐπισπάσωνται κέρδος καί τι μᾶλλόν σφισι τράπηται· οὕτω οὐ ταὐτὰ ἀσκέοντες τὠυτοῦ περιεχόμεθα, εἰ δὲ μηδὲν κερδήσεσθαι μέλλοιεν, ὁμοίως ἂν ὅ τε ἀληθιζόμενος ψευδὴς εἴη καὶ ὁ ψευδόμενος ἀληθής. ὃς ἂν μέν νυν τῶν πυλουρῶν ἑκὼν παριείη, αὐτῷ οἱ ἄμεινον ἐς χρόνον ἔσται, ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἀντιβαίνειν πειρᾶται, διαδεικνύσθω ἐνθαῦτα ἐὼν πολέμιος· καὶ ἔπειτα ὠσάμενοι ἔσω ἔργου ἐχώμεθα.'

'Otanes,' Darius replied, 'many things cannot be clarified by words, but can by action. Then again, some things may be clearly describable but lead to nothing spectacular. You know it isn't hard to get past the guards on duty. In the first place, they're bound to let people like us past, out of either respect or fear. In the second place, I myself can provide us with a very plausible excuse for getting in, <u>since I can claim that I've just come from Persia and want to give a message from my father to the king.</u> Where a lie is necessary, let it be spoken. Our objective is the same whether we use lies or the truth to achieve it. People lie when they expect to profit from others' falling for their lies, and they tell the truth for the same reason – to attract some profit to themselves or to gain more room to manoeuvre in. In other words, the means may differ but we're after the same thing. If there's no profit to be gained, our truth-teller might as well lie and our liar might as well tell the truth. Any guard who willingly lets us past will be better off in the long run, and if any of them tries to block our way, we must immediately mark him as our enemy, then push past him and set to our work.'

If Darius carries out this plan, he will violate in extraordinary fashion one of the basic tenets of

the typical characterization of emissaries: reliability. The entire plot is predicated upon a non-

existent message and can only be accomplished through lies. Even Darius himself admits the

unprecedented nature of his proposal in that he spends more time justifying his dishonesty than

he does establishing the plan in the first place. This justification is doubly necessary since

Darius' proposal violates the typical expectations for emissaries as well as the ideal

characterization of Persians, for whom lying is an extremely shameful act.[157] Although the details of this plan may cleverly support the noble intentions of the conspirators, Darius' justification does not redeem him as an emissary.[158]

Darius' language suggests that he recognizes his lack of conformity to the ideal characterization of an emissary, despite the fact that his proposed actions appear to be those of a message-bearer. Furthermore, he may consider himself to be too exalted to serve as an *angelos*: he is a proto-ruler, subserviant to no one. His vocabulary speaks both to his high opinion of himself and the duplicity of the plot he proposes. Darius will not speak or announce anything, he will "indicate" it (σημῆναι). And he does not pretend to bear a message, but rather a "speech" (ἔπος) from his father. Both of these terms are often associated elsewhere in Herodotus with misleading or indirect information, including oracular pronouncements, which are notoriously difficult to understand properly and may serve as a kind of test for the recipient.[159] Vital to Darius' plot, however, is the fact that both of these terms can confer authority upon their subjects in a way similar to the cognate verbs of emissaries. The fundamental difference between the cognate verbs and σημαίνω is that the authority bestowed on the subject arises in different ways. The authority of σημαίνω stems, originally, from an advantage in observation (being on the high

---

[157] Herodotus makes this clear in 1.138.1: αἴσχιστον δὲ αὐτοῖσι τὸ ψεύδεσθαι νενόμισται, δεύτερα δὲ τὸ ὀφείλειν χρέος, πολλῶν μὲν καὶ ἄλλων εἵνεκα, μάλιστα δὲ ἀναγκαίην φασὶ εἶναι τὸν ὀφείλοντα καί τι ψεῦδος λέγειν – "The most disgraceful thing, in their view, is telling lies, and the next most disgraceful thing is being in debt; but the main reason (among many others) for the proscription of debt is that, according to the Persians, someone who owes money is obliged to tell lies as well." Darius' contrary argument here on the benefits of lying is echoed in Sophocles' tragedies by Orestes and Odysseus; both indicate that lying can be justified if it brings κέρδος (*El.* 61 and *Phil.* 111-12).

[158] In other scenes without deception, however, there is no difficulty in associating Darius with the cognate verbs. Darius is shown to παραγγέλλειν once (ordering the fleet in 4.89.1), to ἐπαγγέλλειν thrice (twice to Democedes about his scouting mission in 3.135.3, once to levy armies in 7.1.2)..

[159] According to Powell, ἔπος is used nine times to refer to hexameter oracular speech. In 34 other places it indicates speech, but this is the only passage where it signifies a "message". Powell is less useful for σημαίνω, but Hollmann (2011) and Nagy (1990) connect it firmly with ideas of the coding and interpretation of information, especially when representing divine speech. Heraclitus' famous fragment (in Plut. *De Pyth.* 404e) also casts light on the special role of σημαίνω, saying ὁ ἄναξ, οὗ τὸ μαντεῖόν ἐστι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει – "The god whose oracle is in Delphi does not 'tell' or 'conceal', but 'indicates'."

ground), whereas the authority of the cognate verbs stems from the characteristics of a typical emissary, especially reliability.[160] Thus by selecting this vocabulary, Darius can have it both ways: he can avoid the vocabulary of emissaries due to his admitted dishonesty, and he can still use words that confer the idea of authoritative speech that is essential for the execution of the scheme.

Darius' behavior in this plot contrasts explicitly with that of a proper emissary, and implicitly with another ruler who himself is characterized (briefly) as an *angelos*. These contrasts help to confirm the absence of cognate vocabulary in this case as deliberate and, therefore, the inability of Darius to be properly categorized as an emissary. For the explicit case, we can look to the actual events when the seven conspirators try to enter the palace and kill the Magi. They have no trouble with the outer guards, but the inner servants cause more trouble:

> 3.77.2-3 ἐπείτε δὲ καὶ παρῆλθον ἐς τὴν αὐλήν, ἐνέκυρσαν τοῖσι τὰς ἀγγελίας ἐσφέρουσι εὐνούχοισι, οἵ σφεας ἱστόρεον ὅ τι θέλοντες ἥκοιεν· καὶ ἅμα ἱστορέοντες τούτους τοῖσι πυλουροῖσι ἀπείλεον, ὅτι σφέας παρῆκαν, ἴσχόν τε βουλομένους τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἐς τὸ πρόσω παριέναι. οἱ δὲ διακελευσάμενοι καὶ σπασάμενοι τὰ ἐγχειρίδια τούτους μὲν τοὺς ἴσχοντας αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ συγκεντέουσι, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἦσαν δρόμῳ ἐς τὸν ἀνδρεῶνα.

> They got as far as the courtyard and there they met the eunuchs whose job it was to take messages in to the king. The eunuchs enquired what business had brought them there, began to threaten the guards with punishment for letting them in, and stopped the seven when they wanted to go further in. At a signal, the seven drew their daggers, attacked the eunuchs who were blocking their way, and cut them down on the spot. Then they ran towards the main hall.

The narrative classifies these eunuchs indirectly as emissaries (bearers of messages), thus imbuing them with the typical qualities of an intermediary; certainly their actions indicate their reliability and obedience to their ruler. It is not clear whether Darius attempts to impersonate an intermediary poorly, or if the ruse is simply not attempted. Either way, he is a failed emissary in

---

[160] Once again, we can see the fundamental distinction between individuals relying on vision and those relying on speech. Hollmann (2000) argues that ἔπος connotes authoritative, marked speech and he (2011, 20-1) follows Nagy (1990, 165) who calls attention to the idea that σημαίνω originally referred to information from a superior vantage point and evolved to indicate authoritative speech in general, often from the gods. Darius evidently envisions himself in lofty company.

all respects. Before, the problem was his dishonesty; now, the problem is his reliability expressed by his failure to deliver the invented message. The contrast provided by the diligent eunuchs makes his denied status all the more clear.

Darius' essential motive of posing as an emissary in order to confront and destroy a ruler has an implicit parallel, much earlier in the *Histories*. When Cyrus defeats Croesus for control of Lydia, he is characterized as an official emissary:

1.79.2 ὡς δέ οἱ ταῦτα ἔδοξε, καὶ ἐποίεε κατὰ τάχος, ἐλάσας γὰρ τὸν στρατὸν ἐς τὴν Λυδίην **αὐτὸς ἄγγελος** Κροίσῳ **ἐληλύθεε**.
No sooner had he come to this decision than he put it into action and marched into Lydia. <u>He himself was the messenger</u> through whom Croesus heard <u>of his arrival</u>.

Given the context of this passage, it seems likely that Herodotus uses the vocabulary of emissaries to underscore the speed with which Cyrus arrived: he outpaced any other intermediaries and thus delivered (reliably) the third-party information about his approach through his unexpected presence.[161] But when we reach the telling of Darius' scheme, the broader context of conflict in Cyrus' story provides an evident point of comparison: both men are arriving to confront and overthrow a ruler. Darius will be able to take control of the Persian empire from a usurper as a result of his action; Cyrus will be eliminating a rival and expanding the Persian empire. Cyrus' actions and behavior are in no way contrary to that of a good, typical intermediary. Hence, even if his classification as an *angelos* happens mostly for literary effect, he does nothing to indicate that the label is inappropriate in this situation. The parallels in these two scenes make the complete absence of cognate vocabulary for Darius all the more noticeable. Cyrus is bestowed the title by the narrative; Darius does not even attempt to take the title for himself, as if acknowledging his unsuitability to play such a role. Thus the absence of the vocabulary of emissaries in Darius' speech and the contrasts established between him and other

---

[161] For a complete discussion of this scene and Cyrus' characterization as an emissary, see Chapter 5.

emissaries confirm the typical characterization of emissaries and show how strictly that type was adhered to.

As determined in this chapter, an emissary is expected to be swift, reliable and honest, even when the message he carries is deceptive in nature. This "typical" characterization shares features with emissaries of epic and tragedy, which suggests an underlying cultural ideal. A proper emissary, for Herodotus, expresses these characteristics in the narrative by arriving and returning promptly, telling all that he has been instructed, and not overstepping his authority. His primary role is to speak, not see; visual observation is a task at which he is likely to fail. When a character identified as an emissary does not live up to the expected "type", censure for his inadequate performance in that role is communicated through the text. These repercussions can be felt directly (through explicit character judgment) or indirectly (through manipulation of descriptive vocabulary). Similarly, someone who does not appear to be an emissary initially, but performs the tasks of an emissary in admirable fashion, may be later given an appropriate title. In extreme cases, someone performing tasks of an emissary while simultaneously defying the typical characterization may be denied the appellation entirely. Through these various methods, Herodotus can direct the attention and judgment of the audience towards the success of these individuals as ideal emissaries.

CHAPTER 4: DON'T KILL THE MESSENGER!

Reacting to Emissaries

In the previous chapter, we focused on the presentation of emissaries to the exclusion of other

characters. This chapter remedies that deficit by considering how scenes with emissaries

enhance our understanding of the relationship between senders and recipients. Given the

challenges of geography, transit, and security in the ancient world, face-to-face meetings

between rulers are understandably rare.[162] Emissaries bridge these distances and difficulties, and

their "typical" characterization (swift and trustworthy, as shown in Chapter 3) ensures that they

reliably represent the interests of their sender. As discussed in Chapter 2, emissaries in this way

provide a narrative convenience for Herodotus. He can mention an emissary to acknowledge

that communication between two parties is not direct, while still representing their interaction as

if it were.[163] If the narrative draws no effective distinction between direct communication and

communication through emissaries, then we can understand emissaries abstractly as full

representatives for the speech and attitude of their senders. Consequently, the way in which

recipients treat emissaries (and their messages) can be interpreted as representing their opinion

towards senders. By examining how Herodotus renders the dispatch and reception of emissaries,

we can better understand diplomatic relationships from the perspective of the characters within

the text.

Communication through emissaries reveals the sender's perception of the recipient and

---

[162] Face-to-face meetings between rulers typically occur only in situations where one party is not presently in a leadership position. Deprivation of power can be due to exile (e.g. Solon and Demaratus), death (e.g. Cyrus), or defeat (e.g. Croesus).

[163] For example (from Chapter 2), 3.138.3 shows Darius giving commands which are obeyed by the Cnidians. Herodotus does say that Darius did this by sending an *angelos*, but nowhere is that emissary shown voicing the message: πέμψας γὰρ ἄγγελον ἐς Κνίδον κατάγειν σφέας ἐκέλευε Γίλλον ἐς Τάραντα· πειθόμενοι δὲ Δαρείῳ Κνίδιοι... – "[Darius] ordered the Cnidians, through a messenger, to return Gillus to Tarentum. The Cnidians tried to carry out Darius' command..."

vice versa. The content of the message makes the position of the sender clear; the response of

the recipient displays either acquiescence or rejection of that position. "Reactions", in general,

can be expressed explicitly through words or implicitly through actions following receipt (or

dispatch only) of a message. A positive reaction indicates agreement of perception through

acquiescence, e.g. when Darius asks for earth and water from a multitude of Greek states (6.48.2)

and receives it from many (6.49.1). Darius thinks that the states should be subservient to him;

their positive responses indicate that they accept his perception that they are inferior (or at least

weaker). I consider all cases where no reaction (of any type) is shown to indicate agreement by

the recipient, since Herodotus presents no evidence to the contrary.[164] Much more interesting,

and the focus of this chapter, are situations where recipients react negatively to messages (and, in

rare cases, to the emissaries who bear them) thereby rejecting the perspective of the message

sender (e.g. the Athenian and Spartan murder of Darius' emissaries in 7.133, discussed below).

This chapter will argue that responses to messages reveal an ongoing negotiation of

relative status and power between characters or polities. Herodotus occasionally comments

explicitly on imbalances of power,[165] but most relationships are left up to contextual cues or the

audience's historical knowledge. Examining cases of rejected messages allows the audience to

see the situation through the eyes of the involved parties, regardless of who is "right" in their

assessment of the situation. To use Braund's term, we can say that "under-negotiation" underlies

every relationship which leads to rejection. He explains that under-negotiation is "all that is not

explicit and not agreed in reciprocal exchange but which may impinge upon thoughts and actions

---

[164] This assumption is supported, in part, by the most common type of message, which simply shares information. For these messages, rejection makes little sense since it would serve no real purpose.

[165] E.g., Darius asks Idanthyrsus to acknowledge his authority: εἰ δὲ συγγινώσκεαι εἶναι ἥσσων, σὺ δὲ καὶ οὕτω παυσάμενος τοῦ δρόμου δεσπότῃ τῷ σῷ δῶρα φέρων γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ ἐλθὲ ἐς λόγους – "But if you recognize that you are weaker than me, you can still stop running: come and discuss terms with me instead, acknowledging me as your master with gifts of earth and water" (4.126). Similarly, the Thessalians claim superiority over the Phocaians: ὦ Φωκέες, ἤδη τι μᾶλλον γνωσιμαχέετε μὴ εἶναι ὅμοιοι ἡμῖν – "Men of Phocis, now more than ever you must admit that you are no match for us" (8.29.1).

surrounding that exchange or process of exchange" (1998, 161). In other words, under-negotiation is anything undiscussed, unresolved, and contextually available to the involved parties which may have an effect on their decisions and actions. Although every situation of message rejection displays unique elements, the single characteristic shared by all is some clash in the perception of status: the claimed authority of the sender is denied.[166]

The second major argument advanced in this chapter is that negative responses to messages, indicative of the under-negotiation of status, can set the stage for later actions which serve as a form of reciprocity, even if Herodotus does not make the connection explicit.[167] This theoretical idea also stems from Braund, who argues that "reciprocity entails interaction whose course, end, and interpretation are under-negotiated" (1998, 161).[168] The logical converse, relevant for this chapter, is that situations of under-negotiation may give rise to reciprocity but do not necessarily do so. The key function of reciprocity in this environment is to restore equilibrium between the two parties at the appropriate level. Thus to resolve a conflict of perception, both parties simply need to adopt the same point of view. Sometimes the initial under-negotiation stems from innocent ignorance and can be resolved through the act of the message-rejection itself, which provides sufficient information to the sender. Other times,

---

[166] By corollary, we can say that situations of positive responses to messages are "sufficiently-negotiated", in that the recipient either shares or accepts the view of the sender.

[167] Most previous studies of reciprocity (see below) consider only actions which Herodotus clearly identifies in a cause-and-effect relationship, typically through the words δίκη, τιμή, or αἰτίη. Some of the examples in this chapter fall into that category, but not all do. Even if Herodotus fails to explicitly identify a situation as a form of retribution, the contextual background provided by message rejection may be sufficient to suggest that later actions by the sender towards the recipient are in some way a response which will restore proper balance.

[168] Braund's approach to reciprocity is less focused on narrative structure in favor of narrative context, a pragmatic view which I also follow. The structural approach to reciprocity was brought notably to the forefront by Immerwahr (1966) and expanded upon by de Romilly (1971). She explores revenge as a mechanical means for Herodotus to structure the narrative and ease transition. Contextual factors, however, are an important component of most following work. Lateiner (1989) looks specifically at the idea of transgression, and writes about a delicate balance in the world which must be maintained through acts of aggression or revenge (141). Gould (1989) sees vengeance and obligation as generative for the narrative, and defines reciprocity as a counterbalance for human action (65). Desmond (2004) deals with punishment over reciprocity generally, but also subscribes to the idea of the need to maintain equilibrium. For related issues of morality and hubris, see also Fisher (1992 and 2002) and Darbo-Pechanski (1988).

however, the sender is not content with the negative response and further action must be taken to force realization of the proper equilibrium on both parties. Although reciprocity, generally, can be beneficial or punitive, in these situations retribution is the expected outcome. As will be shown below, the severity of this retribution depends upon the manner of the rejection.

Examining the role of message rejection in this way has several benefits. First, the idea of under-negotiation allows a way to explore status conflicts from the perspectives of the characters themselves, and makes the audience less dependent on the narrator's explicit judgments. Second, by recognizing message-rejection as stemming from under-negotiation, we are prepared to expect later actions which serve as reciprocity, even if Herodotus does not label them as such. A narrative pattern is thus established, and the audience is not only prepared for later action, but may also expect it and recognize its implicit reciprocal nature.

Saying "No"

The simplest and most generic type of negative reception is a straightforward rejection of a message's content, either in words or in actions. The first two messages in the *Histories* are treated in this fashion, when the king of Colchis asks for Medea back (1.2.3) and when the Greeks ask for Helen back (1.3.2). In both cases the request is refused, and in the latter, the failure to return Medea is cited as a reason. Based on the treatment of Medea's father, Alexander (and by association the Trojans) share the perception that woman-stealing is behavior which will go unpunished. But this is clearly not the case: Alexander's actions and the resultant rejection of the Greeks' message lead directly and explicitly to the Trojan war.[169] In both situations we

---

[169] Helen is presented as the direct cause: Ἕλληνας δὲ Λακεδαιμονίης εἵνεκεν γυναικὸς στόλον μέγαν συναγεῖραι καὶ ἔπειτα ἐλθόντας ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην τὴν Πριάμου δύναμιν κατελεῖν – "The Greeks raised a mighty army because of a woman from Lacedaemon, and then invaded Asia and destroyed Priam and his forces" (1.4.2). Herodotus adds more detail in Book 2: Menelaus goes with a delegation of emissaries to Troy and asks for Helen (2.118.2). They say that they cannot return her because she is actually in Egypt (where Menelaus will later claim her). This type of

encounter a context of under-negotiation indicated by the divergent opinions about recompense for abducting a woman. Alexander's actions attempt to reset the balance, but this reciprocity serves only to make the situation worse.[170] The toll of the following war for both sides, although not discussed in this section by Herodotus, would be familiar to his audience and would resolve the questions of status: the Greeks show their military superiority, and East and West (in broad terms) are established as inimical parties.

Not all rejections of messages necessarily lead to later reciprocal action; the act of rejection itself may simultaneously be the result and resolution of under-negotiation. For example, when Mardonius and the Persian army threaten Athens for the second time, the Athenians reject offers of help from the Lacedaemonians and the allies (8.141-2): they are, essentially, asserting their independence and strength. The allies and Lacedaemonians, by implication, assumed an insufficiently strong status for Athens when they sent their emissaries. This under-negotiation is resolved precisely through the act of rejection: the allies, Lacedaemonians, and Athenians now share the Athenian perspective, as indicated by the actions taken next.[171] Similarly, Aristagoras is denied further help in Ionia during the revolt (5.103.1) despite his many attempts to summon the Athenians by messengers. His request reveals that he does not comprehend the Athenian point of view: they have no desire to provide additional aid. Their repeated negative responses evidently resolve the situation since no additional contact is made and both sides go their separate ways. In general, the wider context of the under-

rejection, which offers an alternative solution, is categorized as a "counteroffer" and will be discussed below. Herodotus may distance himself from the factual truth of either story by indicating his sources: Persians for the passage in Book 1 and Egyptians for the passage in Book 2.

[170] Long (1987, 48) argues that the seizure of Helen exceeds proper reciprocity for the abduction of Medea, since Helen is married at the time. He relies on the fact that Helen is mentioned by name whereas Medea is still identified as a daughter (θυγάτηρ). We can note that Herodotus places these events one after another without any indication of passing time; the narrative ignores any accurate chronological separation between the two events as a way to bind them more closely together.

[171] Resolution of divergent perspectives does not mean that the Athenian point of view is correct, however. All of the allies will be needed to push back the Persians for good.

negotiation suggests whether the audience should accept the rejection as restoring balance or should expect further reciprocal action.

Resolutions are most easily comprehended when they immediately follow clearly delineated situations of conflict. For example, when the Samians, impoverished by a Lacedaemonian siege (3.54-56), attempt to demand money from the Siphnians, they fail. The Siphnians feel confident, perhaps due to their wealth, and therefore discount the desperation and military might of the Samians.[172] Equilibrium and proper perspective are swiftly restored.

3.58.1, 3-4 ἐπείτε γὰρ τάχιστα πρὸς τὴν Σίφνον προσῖσχον οἱ Σάμιοι, ἔπεμπον τῶν νεῶν μίαν πρέσβεας ἄγουσαν ἐς τὴν πόλιν. ... ἀπικόμενοι ὦν ἄγγελοι ἐδέοντο τῶν Σιφνίων δέκα τάλαντά σφι χρῆσαι· οὐ φασκόντων δὲ χρήσειν τῶν Σιφνίων αὐτοῖσι οἱ Σάμιοι τοὺς χώρους αὐτῶν ἐπόρθεον. πυθόμενοι δ' ἰθὺς ἦκον οἱ Σίφνιοι βοηθέοντες καὶ συμβαλόντες αὐτοῖσι ἐσσώθησαν, καὶ αὐτῶν πολλοὶ ἀπεκλήσθησαν τοῦ ἄστεος ὑπὸ τῶν Σαμίων· καὶ αὐτοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα ἑκατὸν τάλαντα ἔπρηξαν.

For the first thing the Samians did when they reached Siphnos was send ambassadors to the town on one of their ships. ... Anyway, when the messengers arrived in the town, they asked the Siphnians to lend them ten talents. The Siphnians refused, so the Samians set about plundering their land. As soon as they found out, the Siphnians came to the rescue and gave battle, but were defeated, and a considerable number of their men were pinned inside the town by the Samians, who subsequently made them pay a hundred talents.

The Samians, in sending their messengers with such a request, clearly view themselves as the superior power out of the two polities. But the Siphnians, as evidenced by their response, do not share this opinion of their lower relative status: they see no reason to submit to the Samians and might set a dangerous precedent by loaning money to anyone, given their wealth (3.57). The negative reaction of the Siphnians indicates a contrast of perception and, essentially, lays claim to a status which they may well think they deserve but which is factually inaccurate. Resolution for this struggle of status comes quickly (for both sides and for the audience) through the Samian military action and the Siphnian capitulation. Even though there is no explicit mention of δίκη,

---

[172] The Siphnians also fail to recognize that this situation is what the Pythia warned them about (3.57.4). By presenting this oracle and then explaining it again (3.58.2), Herodotus makes clear that the Siphnian confidence is misguided.

τιμή, or αἰτίη, it is clear that the battle and outcome restore the equilibrium between the two parties: it is a form of reciprocity. The direct connection between rejection and the ensuing military action is reinforced by the absence of any delay between cause and effect.[173]

Reciprocity, however, does not necessarily follow immediately upon the situation which cues it, and narrative delay may be due to Herodotus' choosing to work within historical chronology. Although he could elect to jump the narrative forward in time in order to show resolution immediately after under-negotiation, his broader narrative goals may inhibit such temporal dislocation. For example, when Cyrus begins his campaign against Croesus, his request for the Ionians to revolt goes unheeded (1.76.3).[174] No immediate reciprocity is provided, which might suggest (based on our interpretive scheme) that by saying no, the Ionians reset Cyrus' perception correctly. The situation, however, makes this conclusion unlikely. Cyrus' aggressive stance towards Croesus contrasts with the static and submissive Ionians, and his claim of superior status is emphasized by the fact that he sends *kērykes*, not *angeloi*.[175] Since this interaction occurs within Croesus' *logos*, an extended digression to resolve the under-negotiation between Cyrus and Ionia would be a thematic intrusion. The delay of resolution until Cyrus' *logos* preserves the larger thematic implication of each scene and offers the additional advantage of occurring in line with the main story's chronology. Accordingly, resolution through reciprocity does not happen until the Ionians send their own emissaries to Cyrus (after

---

[173] The rejection is contained in a genitive absolute which is followed immediately by the attack of the Samians. Similar passages of message rejection followed directly by restorative military action occur at 4.200.1, 6.133.2, and 8.27.1ff. Although not resulting in military action, Darius' decision to open the tomb of Nitocris, despite a warning inscription, is immediately dealt with by a second inscription within the tomb, condemning the would-be thief (1.187.1-3).

[174] The Ionian rejection does not necessarily indicate that they are denying Cyrus higher relative status. It is possible that they simply think Croesus is mightier than Cyrus.

[175] As discussed in the first chapter, *kērykes* are typically sent by eastern kings and from high to low status individuals.

Croesus' defeat) and end up with their request denied (1.141).[176] In this situation, the narrative

provides a clever symmetry in that the balance is upset and restored in both cases by the denial of

a request brought through emissaries. And the connection between the two requests is made

perfectly clear, since Herodotus explains Cyrus' response by revisiting the Ionians' previous

refusal (1.76.3). The fact that Herodotus is the one to draw the connection suggests that the

characters themselves need not be consciously aware of the balance they are restoring or of the

under-negotiation that is being resolved; they simply need to engage in a course of action which

will realize these goals.[177]

Contradiction and Clarification

Despite the relatively straightforward examples just discussed, conflicts of status and perception

are not so easily resolved in every situation. Aristodicus' treatment of θεοπρόποι (1.158) brings

out a particularly knotty under-negotiation while simultaneously imposing contradictory

characterization upon him. The situation begins when the Cymeans consult the oracle at

Branchidae to determine if they should hand over the suppliant Pactyes to the Persians.[178]

Aristodicus rejects the oracular response, but he does so by impugning the credibility of the

emissaries.

1.158.1-2 πέμψαντες ὦν οἱ Κυμαῖοι ἐς τοὺς Βραγχίδας θεοπρόπους εἰρώτευν περὶ
Πακτύην, ὁκοῖόν τι ποιέοντες θεοῖσι μέλλοιεν χαριεῖσθαι· ἐπειρωτῶσι δέ σφι ταῦτα χρηστήριον
ἐγένετο ἐκδιδόναι Πακτύην Πέρσῃσιν. ταῦτα δὲ ὡς ἀπενειχθέντα ἤκουσαν οἱ Κυμαῖοι, ὁρμέατο
ἐκδιδόναι. ὁρμωμένου δὲ ταύτῃ τοῦ πλήθεος <u>Ἀριστόδικος ὁ Ἡρακλείδεω ἀνὴρ τῶν ἀστῶν ἐὼν</u>
<u>δόκιμος ἔσχε μὴ ποιῆσαι ταῦτα Κυμαίους ἀπιστέων τε τῷ χρησμῷ καὶ δοκέων τοὺς θεοπρόπους</u>
<u>οὐ λέγειν ἀληθέως, ἐς ὃ τὸ δεύτερον περὶ Πακτύεω ἐπειρησόμενοι ἦσαν ἄλλοι θεοπρόποι, τῶν</u>

---

[176] The Ionian (and Aeolian) request indicates ongoing under-negotiation. By asking for the same terms of
subjugation as they had under Croesus, they fail to acknowledge that Cyrus now has status and power above that of
Croesus.

[177] Evidence of such resolution in this scene is provided by the immediate actions taken by the Ionians and Aeolians.
Their appeal to the Spartans for assistance demonstrates that they finally understand their position relative to Cyrus.

[178] Fontenrose (1978, 121) considers this sequence of oracle-consultation to be quasi-historical and, due to the
inclusion of a rebuke, "at best dubious". Nevertheless, the patterning and themes Herodotus relies on should not be
diminished by doubt towards the historicity of this story.

καὶ Ἀριστόδικος ἦν.

So the Cymeans sent emissaries to the priests at Branchidae to ask what the gods would prefer them to do about Pactyes, and the response was that they should surrender him to the Persians. That was the course of action they set in motion, once they had heard the oracle's response. <u>Although that was the preference of the majority, however, an eminent Cymean called Aristodicus the son of Heraclides stopped them from carrying out the plan, because he did not find the oracle credible; in fact, he thought the emissaries were lying. So he wanted to wait until another delegation of emissaries, including himself, had gone and repeated the question about Pactyes.</u>

Aristodicus' doubt and rejection create a crisis of characterization for the audience, which goes hand-in-hand with under-negotiation. Herodotus explicitly characterizes Aristodicus as a respectable citizen (ἀνὴρ τῶν ἀστῶν ἐὼν δόκιμος), yet immediately undermines this description by showing his mistrust of the emissaries. Since there is no sign of the emissaries having failed in any way, Aristodicus' opinion (τοὺς θεοπρόπους οὐ λέγειν ἀληθέως) is unexpected and suggests flawed judgment from an otherwise worthy man.[179] His attempt to find resolution by personally consulting the oracle only compounds the issue. By rejecting the oracle's confirmation, Aristodicus denies the authority of the oracle directly and reveals that he values his own judgment more. This under-negotiation stems from the fact that the oracle's response contradicts divine law, and Aristodicus is more concerned with upholding divine law than following an oracle.[180] But his attempt to force the oracle to adopt his perspective, accomplished by pointing out its hypocrisy, once again shows him as upstanding in principles but impious in actions. Indeed, the oracle makes this negative characterization explicit, by addressing him as "most impious" (ἀνοσιώτατε ἀνθρώπων, 1.159.3).

Although Aristodicus' characterization may still be in doubt, his visit to the oracle

---

[179] The honesty of these emissaries, in particular, is shored up by the presentation of their visit to the oracle. Herodotus inserts the oracular response (ἐπειρωτῶσι δέ σφι ταῦτα χρηστήριον ἐγένετο ἐκδιδόναι Πακτύην Πέρσῃσιν), therefore ensuring that the audience (at the moment of the accusation) knows the emissaries are reporting back truthfully.

[180] Brown (1978) has tried to explain this clash historically by pointing out that the oracle was located in Miletus and, for political reasons, likely to give a pro-Persian response.

partially resolves the under-negotiation by making each side's perspective perfectly clear to the other. The oracle explains that its original response was intended to punish Cyme for doubting divine law, thus indicating that it and Aristodicus do share some moral footing.[181] They are reaching a common understanding, even if they are not quite all the way there. The limits of this resolution and the conflicts in Aristodicus' characterization are both reflected in the agonizing decision that Cyme must make upon hearing the oracle's commandment for the second time. The Cymeans want to appease two powerful forces at once: divine law, which calls for the protection of suppliants, and the Persians (along with the oracle), who demand the surrender of a suppliant. [182] There is no way to "win" this conflict outright; the two forces are each too strong for Cyme to resist. Aristodicus finds a partial balance with the oracle through understanding its point of view, and as an individual he avoids any direct dealings with Persia. Furthermore, his actions in this scene allow the Cymeans to find balance between the demands of the Persians and of divine law by sending Pactyes away to a new haven.[183] These partial solutions confirm the characterization of Cyme as a weak power with conflicted ethics, trapped between others, and reassert the initial description of Aristodicus as worthy.

Other Types of Negative Reactions

In addition to straightforward rejection, characters can indicate under-negotiation and cue reciprocal action through other types of negative reactions: condescension, counteroffers,

---

[181] τὸν δὲ αὖτις ἀμείψασθαι τοῖσδε· 'ναὶ κελεύω, ἵνα γε ἀσεβήσαντες θᾶσσον ἀπόλησθε, ὡς μὴ τὸ λοιπὸν περὶ ἱκετέων ἐκδόσιος ἔλθητε ἐπὶ τὸ χρηστήριον.' – "'Yes,' answered the god, 'that is my command. Why? To hasten the impiety and consequent destruction of Cyme, so that you never again come to consult me on the issue of the surrender of suppliants'" (1.159.4).

[182] Gould (1973) holds up this story as an example of the agony which can be attendant upon dealing with suppliants. Aristodicus sums up the trouble when he speaks to the oracle: ἡμεῖς δὲ δειμαίνοντες τὴν Περσέων δύναμιν τὸν ἱκέτην ἐς τόδε οὐ τετολμήκαμεν ἐκδιδόναι – "'Although we are afraid of the power of Persia, we have not dared to give him [Pactyes] up so far, since he is a suppliant'" (1.159.2).

[183] The half-solution settled upon here may be echoed in a later passage (7.194) when Darius decides to crucify Sandoces (a Cymean) and then, part-way through the crucifixion, changes his mind.

111

disregard/doubt, trickery, and violence. As before, issues of differently-perceived status appear to underlie these conflicts and resolution is only found when in some way the balance is reset appropriately and both sides come to a shared understanding. These reactions vary in severity, and the consequences vary accordingly. Violence, the most grievous offense, will be discussed fully in a separate section below.

Condescension is perhaps the most obvious product of under-negotiation. Cyrus displays it in two separate encounters and Xerxes in one. The first is when Astyages, king of the Medes, summons Cyrus, who is marching to attack out of Persia. Cyrus replies (through an *angelos*) that he will come sooner than Astyages wants (1.127). The second is when the Spartans send Lacrines, a *kēryx*, to warn Cyrus off from attacking Greece. Cyrus responds by belittling Greek customs (1.152-3). In both situations, Cyrus evidently thinks there is something laughable about the request being made of him, and his response demonstrates his perception of his own superiority.[184] In the case of Astyages, Cyrus' perspective is correct, and Astyages will be convinced of this through his upcoming military losses.[185] Cyrus' contempt for Lacrines and the Spartans is even more evident. Not only does he deny their request with an indirect threat, but he appears to have no idea who the Spartans even are. The under-negotiation represented here is presumably due mostly to ignorance; these two cultures have not yet had any contact on which to form a basis of shared understanding. The precedent set by Lacrines' demand and Cyrus' response permeates the rest of the *Histories* in the form of Persian and Greek arrogance and (clearly) unresolved questions of status and the value of autonomy which require repeated military actions to sort out. As mentioned in Chapter 3, Lacrines is representative of Sparta and

---

[184] Under the assumption that one is more likely to take notice of stronger powers than weaker ones, Cyrus' ignorance and response may signal that he is correct in his attitude.
[185] It is possible, even, that Cyrus' response is illuminating for Astyages. Astyages' actions (1.127) – sending a non-specific threatening message, arming all of the Medes, putting Harpagus in charge – all seem to have an air of desperation.

Cyrus of Persia in this exchange not only by virtue of their origins but also by the

characterization Herodotus bestows on them. In a way, then, we can see this confrontation as

occurring between Sparta and Persia, or even between Greece and Persia. The reciprocity cued

by this under-negotiation, accordingly, does not depend on Cyrus to be realized, but can be

delayed and indirectly carried out through later battles between the Greeks and the Persians.

Xerxes' mocking response to the Spartan herald (dispatched to ask recompense for

Leonidas' death at Thermopylae, in accordance with an oracle) recalls and updates the

interaction of Lacrines and Cyrus:

> 8.114.1-2 πέμπουσι δὴ κήρυκα τὴν ταχίστην Σπαρτιῆται, ὃς ἐπειδὴ κατέλαβε ἐοῦσαν ἔτι πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὴν ἐν Θεσσαλίῃ, ἐλθὼν ἐς ὄψιν τὴν Ξέρξεω ἔλεγε, τάδε 'ὦ βασιλεῦ Μήδων, Λακεδαιμόνιοί τέ σε καὶ Ἡρακλεῖδαι οἱ ἀπὸ Σπάρτης αἰτέουσι φόνου δίκας, ὅτι σφέων τὸν βασιλέα ἀπέκτεινας ῥυόμενον τὴν Ἑλλάδα.' <u>ὁ δὲ γελάσας τε καὶ κατασχὼν πολλὸν χρόνον, ὥς οἱ ἐτύγχανε παρεστεὼς Μαρδόνιος, δεικνὺς ἐς τοῦτον εἶπε· 'τοιγάρ σφι Μαρδόνιος ὅδε δίκας δώσει τοιαύτας, οἵας ἐκείνοισι πρέπει.'</u>
>
> The Spartiates sent a herald straight away, and he caught up with the Persian army in Thessaly. He came before Xerxes and addressed him as follows: 'King of Persia, the Lacedaemonians and the Heraclidae of Sparta demand compensation from you for the murder of their king who died defending Greece.' <u>Xerxes burst out laughing and then, after a long pause, he pointed to Mardonius, who happened to be standing by his side, and said, 'All right, then, here's Mardonius. He'll pay them what they deserve.'</u>

Xerxes' intention is that Mardonius' "payment", of course, be his continued conquest in Greece

– no real compensation at all for the Spartans.[186] The condescension of Xerxes' response is

made all the more clear by Herodotus' characterization of Xerxes in the scene: laughing[187] and

making his decision spontaneously when Mardonius happens to be at hand. He does not take the

request seriously in any way, except that he does finally provide a reply; clearly under-

negotiation still exists between Persia and Sparta. But just as the condescension of Cyrus may

have (indirectly) cued the start of these wars, the condescension of Xerxes points to their

---

[186] Although, of course, the continued conquest of Mardonius will end in failure.
[187] See Lateiner (1977) for a thorough discussion of the disdain expressed through laughing and esp. 180-1 on this scene.

conclusion. He gives this response not while at the current height of his power, as Cyrus does both times, but in the throes of his own retreat. The Spartan *kēryx* comes with the moral backing of the oracle and a full understanding of the Persians with whom he is dealing, unlike the naive ignorance of Lacrines. And the aftermath, perhaps reciprocity, for this remark shows that the balance must be set firmly on the side of the Spartans and the Greeks. Mardonius' second victory at (abandoned) Athens is hollow, and the subsequent loss at Plataea (including his death) leads quickly to Persian flight.[188] These events, following Xerxes' retreat and followed (in the narrative) by the fleet's rout at Mycale, compel the Persians, finally, to accept the Spartan and Greek perspective.

Trickery, in some sense, represents the opposite of condescension. Whereas condescension allows the recipient to scorn the sender and claim a high status, trickery is a way for the recipient to conceal weakness.[189] The two obvious examples are when Thrasybulus, the tyrant of Miletus, fools a herald sent by Alyattes, the king of Lydia, through a visual trick (1.19-21) and when Democedes, unwillingly trapped in Persia, pretends to accept Darius' offer of a reward for reconnaissance on Greece but instead plans an escape (3.135).[190] A response in the form of trickery allows the weaker party to take advantage of the sender.[191] Thrasybulus exploits the typical character of the herald, knowing that Alyattes will trust the false report even though it contradicts his expectations. Democedes exploits Darius' ignorance about his unhappiness at

---

[188] Although Herodotus explicitly states that Mardonius' death provides reciprocity for Leonidas' death (9.64.1), the reciprocity required for Xerxes' condescending attitude is a separate matter.

[189] The many examples of concealed or false messages are not included in this section since the trickery in those situations is due to actions of the sender, not of the recipient.

[190] As discussed in Chapter 3, cognate verbs (like ἐπαγγέλλω, which takes Darius as its subject) imbue their subjects (temporarily) with the typical characterization of emissaries. Herodotus may choose this verb here to provide a contrast between the earnest offer Darius is making and Democedes' deceptive response. It may also confirm for the audience that Darius is telling the truth, despite Democedes' doubts. Democedes' actions might more properly be thought of as a combination of a counteroffer and trickery. He is worried that Darius' offer is a ruse, so gives him a counteroffer in return. But this counteroffer is part of Democedes' own trickery, meant to aid his eventual escape.

[191] Similarly, a sender may employ trickery as a way to project sufficient authority to ensure the positive response of the recipient, e.g. 1.125, 3.123-4, and 3.128.

living in Persia and his desire to return to Greece by leaving his reward behind against his

(nonexistent) return. The trickery works in both cases precisely because of under-negotiation:

one party is not fully aware of the other's situation, and so cannot properly make an evaluation.

In fact, by utilizing such trickery, the recipient manages surreptitiously to gain the upper hand:

no reciprocal actions are successfully taken.[192]

Counteroffers are the most egalitarian of negative responses; they show some, but not

complete acceptance of the sender's premise. Far in the other direction are situations of

disregard, where the recipient does not find the sender to be even worthy of acknowledgement.

The interaction between Lycophron and Periander, through emissaries, serves as a good

illustration of both of these responses and shows how under-negotiation can be resolved in stages

instead of in one fell swoop. Periander, tyrant of Corinth, has exiled his son Lycophron to

Corcyra for believing (correctly) that Periander killed Lycophron's mother (3.50-2). Periander

has the political power, but Lycophron has the moral high-ground. Both are in a position of

strength, even if unacknowledged by the other, when Periander reestablishes contact.

When Periander realizes that he wants Lycophron to be his successor, he sends a "man

bearing a message" in an attempt at reconciliation which fails utterly.

3.53.1-2 ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ χρόνου προβαίνοντος ὅ τε Περίανδρος παρηβήκεε καὶ
συνεγινώσκετο ἑωυτῷ οὐκέτι εἶναι δυνατὸς τὰ πρήγματα ἐπορᾶν τε καὶ διέπειν, πέμπων ἐς τὴν
Κέρκυραν ἀπεκάλεε τὸν Λυκόφρονα ἐπὶ τὴν τυραννίδα· ἐν γὰρ δὴ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῶν παίδων
οὐκ ἐνώρα, ἀλλά οἱ κατεφαίνετο εἶναι νωθέστερος. ὁ δὲ Λυκόφρων οὐδὲ ἀνακρίσιος ἠξίωσε τὸν
φέροντα τὴν ἀγγελίην.
    Time passed. When Periander was getting on and began to realize that administering and

---

[192] Darius attempts to punish Democedes, but his pursuers fail. Alyattes never learns of Thrasybulus' deception. More subtle trickery is found in the interaction between Athens and Sparta at the beginning of Book 9. The Athenians want the Spartans to send troops (9.6) but a response is repeatedly delayed (9.7). The Spartans appear (to the audience, at least) to have no intention of complying until Chileus counsels the ephors about the danger of alienating Athens and forcing them to turn to the Persians as allies (9.10). Compared with this hypothetical combined force, the Spartans realize their relative weakness and understand that the situation with Athens must be rectified immediately. By sending an army but concealing it from the Athenian *angeloi* for a day (a minor trick), they can speak with mock righteousness to the *angeloi* without the Athenians being any wiser, and escape any repercussions.

managing his affairs was starting to be beyond him, <u>he sent a message to Corcyra inviting Lycophron to come back and take over as tyrant</u>; he regarded his older son as rather stupid and did not think that he would be up to the job. <u>Lycophron, however, did not even bother to give Periander's messenger a reply</u>.

The vocabulary used by Herodotus points out the wide disparity in perception between the two men. He has Periander summon Lycophron using a verb (ἀπεκάλεε) that is typically reserved for those of undisputedly lower status.[193] Yet Lycophron does not acknowledge this difference and, in fact, his treatment of the message-bearer (being unworthy of a response) suggests that he intentionally denies that Periander has any direct authority over him. This understanding is false, of course, since Periander is his father and the reason behind his living in exile. But Lycophron's moral certainty gives him the perspective that he has power also. Nevertheless, it is one thing to react poorly to the content of a message; it is quite another to pay it no attention at all. Ignoring a message is a sign that the sending party is not worth attention or respect, due to his (perceived) inferior status, and the consequences of such an action can be dire.[194] Periander's choice to reattempt contact instead of exacting retribution is the first sign that he admits some relative weakness: he partially accepts his son's point of view.

Lycophron's perspective does not change until Periander sends a second message through Lycophron's sister. Herodotus implicitly suggests that she is like an emissary through the vocabulary used to describe her actions.[195] The second message she brings reflects Periander's

---

[193] The single other example of ἀποκαλέω in Herodotus is used to describe a general issuing commands to his army (4.203.3). But the implied status differential is evident even in the simplex form of the verb, and the pattern is well established in Book 1, with situations of naming omitted. Candaules' wife summons Gyges (11.1 *ter*); Periander summons the sailors who betrayed Arion (24.7); Astyages summons Harpagus several times (108.3, 117.1, 119.1), the Magi (120.1), and Cyrus as a boy (121.1); Harpagus summons a shepherd to dispose of baby Cyrus (1.110.3) and tells Astyages about summoning the shepherd (1.117.4); Cyrus summons Mazares (156.2) and Hystaspes (209.3). The only outlier is when Astyages summons Cyrus as a man (127.1); however Astyages surely perceives Cyrus as inferior here (see Chapter 5).
[194] The serious consequences of ignoring a message (the events of 3.121-122) will be taken up below. Large perceived status differentials also appear in situations where a message is doubted or discounted, e.g. 1.212, 6.10, 8.23, 9.48.
[195] She reports back to Periander with a cognate verb: ἀπαγγειλάσης δὲ ταύτης ταῦτα – "This was the message she brought back" (3.53.6). As discussed in Chapter 3, Periander's sister is the only woman identified with the

adjusted point of view: it is given by a familiar individual and attempts to persuade instead of

transmitting a command. Lycophron's counteroffer in response (instead of further disregard)

suggests that he is changing his own perspective.

> 3.53.2-5 Περίανδρος δὲ περιεχόμενος τοῦ νεηνίεω δεύτερα ἀπέστελλε ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τὴν
> ἀδελφεήν, ἑωυτοῦ δὲ θυγατέρα, δοκέων μιν μάλιστα ταύτης ἂν πείθεσθαι. ἀπικομένης δὲ ταύτης
> καὶ λεγούσης ‘ὦ παῖ, βούλεαι τήν τε τυραννίδα ἐς ἄλλους πεσέειν καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς
> διαφορηθέντα μᾶλλον ἢ αὐτός σφε’ ἀπελθὼν ἔχειν; ἄπιθι ἐς τὰ οἰκία, παῦσαι σεωυτὸν ζημιῶν·
> φιλοτιμίη κτῆμα σκαιόν· μὴ τῷ κακῷ τὸ κακὸν ἰῶ· πολλοὶ τῶν δικαίων τὰ ἐπιεικέστερα
> προτιθεῖσι. πολλοὶ δὲ ἤδη τὰ μητρῷα διζήμενοι τὰ πατρῷα ἀπέβαλον· τυραννὶς χρῆμα
> σφαλερόν, πολλοὶ δὲ αὐτῆς ἐρασταί εἰσι· ὁ δὲ γέρων τε ἤδη καὶ παρηβηκώς· μὴ δῷς τὰ σεωυτοῦ
> ἀγαθὰ ἄλλοισι’, ἡ μὲν δὴ τὰ ἐπαγωγότατα διδαχθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔλεγε πρὸς αὐτόν, <u>ὁ δὲ
> ὑποκρινάμενος ἔφη οὐδαμὰ ἥξειν ἐς Κόρινθον, ἔστ’ ἂν πυνθάνηται περιεόντα τὸν πατέρα.</u>[196]

> Periander was reluctant to give up on the young man, so he tried again. This time he sent
> his daughter, Lycophron's sister, since he thought that he would listen to her, if anyone. Once
> she arrived on Corcyra, she said, 'Do you want the tyranny to fall into others' hands, child? Do
> you want your father's house to be torn apart? Wouldn't you rather come home and have it
> yourself? Come home; stop punishing yourself. Stubborn pride warps a person, and two wrongs
> don't make a right. There are plenty of precedents for doing what is reasonable rather than what
> is strictly right – and also plenty of cases where siding with the mother has meant losing a
> paternal inheritance. Absolute power is difficult and dangerous; there are always lots of people
> who lust after it, and he is an old man now, past his prime. Don't give others the good things in
> life which are rightfully yours.' Her father had taught her what to say to try to win him over, but
> Lycophron replied that he would never come to Corinth as long as he heard that his father was
> still alive...

Some of Lycophron's new attitude may stem from the knowledge that Periander has been the

first to concede ground: Periander's persistence and willingness to bargain indicate his own shift

in perspective towards Lycophron.[197] Yet full resolution has clearly not been reached. Although

Lycophron does respond, his counteroffer is particularly stark ("I'll come when you're dead")

and only implicitly addresses the issue of ruling.   His perspective may have changed, but not by

much; in general, counteroffers or bargaining occur only in situations where the recipient

---

vocabulary of emissaries. Herodotus may be exploiting the connotations of the cognate verbs to quickly establish
her credibility. The unusual use of a woman as emissary may also signal Periander's desperation.

[196] The strange prevalence of asyndeton in this speech is due to the multiple imperatives and the many included
moral maxims, cf. Asheri (*ad loc.*).

[197] That Lycophron's sister is the one to bring the persuasive words surely also helps.

considers himself to be on equal status with, or superior to, the sender.[198]

Periander, once again, shows his desperation by further adjusting his own perspective and sending a third message. Lycophron's acceptance of this final offer indicates that both parties agree on their relative status and ends the ongoing under-negotiation without recourse to additional reciprocity.[199]

3.53.6-7 ...<u>τὸ τρίτον Περίανδρος κήρυκα πέμπει βουλόμενος αὐτὸς μὲν ἐς Κέρκυραν ἥκειν, ἐκεῖνον δὲ ἐκέλευε ἐς Κόρινθον ἀπικόμενον διάδοχον γίνεσθαι τῆς τυραννίδος.</u> καταινέσαντος δ' ἐπὶ τούτοισι τοῦ παιδὸς ὁ μὲν Περίανδρος ἐστέλλετο ἐς τὴν Κέρκυραν, ὁ δὲ παῖς οἱ ἐς τὴν Κόρινθον.

<u>He tried a third time, however. He sent a message [*lit. kēryx*] expressing his own willingness to come and live on Corcyra and suggesting that Lycophron come to Corinth to take his place as tyrant.</u> Lycophron agreed to these terms, and the two of them were all set to move, Periander to Corcyra and Lycophron to Corinth.

The dispatch of a *kēryx* with this third message has two effects. First, it demonstrates the existence of a proper diplomatic relationship between the two parties that no longer needs manipulation through family members. Second, it may signal that Periander is attempting to preserve his high status while still capitulating to Lycophron's demands. Although he has accepted Lycophron's moral authority, he has not conceded his own political power.[200]

The most extreme form of a negative response is when violence (in the form of mutilation or death) is visited upon the unfortunate emissary. The types of refusal discussed so far allow recipients to express their opinions through negative replies or deliberate disregard. Violence, however, transforms refusal into a physical reaction: a literal and metaphoric blow.

---

[198] Counteroffers can be expressed in word (e.g. Croesus to the Mysians in 1.36) or in deed (e.g. Cyme to Mazares 1.157-160 and the Spartans to the Ionians and Aeolians in 1.152-3). Counteroffers expressed in deed take the form of an action by the recipient which partially addresses the desires of the sender.

[199] This success, of course, is short-lived: the Corcyrans kill Lycophron to prevent Periander from trading places with him. Perhaps we are supposed to consider this, indirectly, as another sign of under-negotiation that was not resolved; Lycophron appears not to have considered the will of his citizens when accepting Periander's final offer and pays the price. If nothing else, the Corcyrans are surely attempting to preserve their relative autonomy from the ruthless rule Periander would bring.

[200] In an elegant use of ring-composition, the entire relationship between Periander and Lycophron starts and ends through emissaries; Periander issues edicts and proclamations to exile Lycophron and then uses a variety of emissaries to bargain successfully for his return.

The direct harm done to the emissary represents what the recipient would like to visit upon the sender and suggests an immovable differing perspective. The gravity of the conflicts in these scenes make them an ideal vehicle for larger narrative themes. Herodotus takes full advantage of this opportunity, as will be discussed in the remainder of the chapter.

Greeks and Persians

Out of all Greek states, Sparta has the most contentious relationship with Persia, with Athens as a close second. Initially, however, there is no way for the Greeks and Persians to easily size each other up due to their geographic separation. Lacrines' visit to Cyrus (1.153) is far in the past (temporally and narratively) by the time we get to the main Persian invasion, so Darius sends emissaries to test the Greek perspective. Herodotus, however, delays narrating this expedition until Xerxes undertakes a similar task much later. Xerxes' attempt to gain earth and water is successful in some states and unsuccessful in others, and Athens and Sparta are singled out as locations of interest by his decision not to make any requests of them. They are singled out again, in implicit contrast to the other states, when we discover that instead of responding with a simple rejection, they resort to murdering Darius' emissaries. Thus the way Herodotus reports these events ties a single expression of under-negotiation to the larger ongoing conflict between East and West.

The rejection of Darius' emissaries is framed by references to Xerxes, which not only explains the placement of the story at this point in the narrative but also draws a thematic connection between the two kings and their relationship with Greece.

7.133.1-7.134.1 ἐς δὲ Ἀθήνας καὶ Σπάρτην οὐκ ἀπέπεμψε Ξέρξης ἐπὶ γῆς αἴτησιν κήρυκας τῶνδε εἵνεκα· πρότερον Δαρείου πέμψαντος ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο οἱ μὲν αὐτέων τοὺς αἰτέοντας ἐς τὸ βάραθρον, οἱ δ' ἐς φρέαρ ἐσβαλόντες ἐκέλευον γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ ἐκ τούτων φέρειν παρὰ βασιλέα. τούτων μὲν εἵνεκα οὐκ ἔπεμψε Ξέρξης τοὺς αἰτήσοντας. ὅ τι δὲ τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι ταῦτα ποιήσασι τοὺς κήρυκας συνήνεικε ἀνεθέλητον γενέσθαι, οὐκ ἔχω εἶπαι, πλὴν

ὅτι σφέων ἡ χώρη καὶ ἡ πόλις ἐδηιώθη, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο οὐ διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίην δοκέω γενέσθαι. τοῖσι δὲ ὦν Λακεδαιμονίοισι μῆνις κατέσκηψε Ταλθυβίου τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος κήρυκος.

No heralds were sent by Xerxes to Athens and Sparta with a demand for earth because Darius had done exactly that earlier, and the heralds had been hurled into the Pit in Athens, and into a well in Sparta, with the suggestion that they fetch earth and water from there to take to the king. That is why Xerxes did not send men to demand earth and water from Athens and Sparta. I am not in a position to say what happened to the Athenians as a result of the treatment of the heralds.[201] It is true that their land and their city were devastated, but in my opinion that was not due to their treatment of the heralds. The Lacedaemonians, however, felt the force of the anger of Talthybius, Agamemnon's herald.

Following our model, the violence which Athens and Sparta visit upon the emissaries is meant to be visited upon Darius himself and reveals an intractable opinion.[202] The idea of Darius' authority is so distasteful to these two cities that they allow emotion to goad them into violating the divine protection of *kērykes*, a separate crime in its own right. Herodotus is explicit that both Sparta and Athens will see retribution as a result (διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίην), although the consequences for the Athenians are left vague (ἀνεθέλητον). The following discussion of the Spartan aftermath (7.134-7) gives resolution for their impious act, but does not resolve the fundamental conflict with the Persians. If anything, it indicates that the under-negotiation from Darius' time is still active in Xerxes'.[203] Each culture still does not fully understand the driving

---

[201] Or, more precisely, Herodotus cannot say what evil thing befell the Athenians. Waterfield's translation may give the (erroneous) impression that no negative consequence necessarily existed. The disparity between the retribution against Sparta and the apparently minimal effect for Athens has not gone unnoticed. Wéry (1966) suggests that the Athenians killed interpreters instead of heralds, or that the crime in Athens was a private matter paid for by a private citizen and not recorded. Her suggestion that the Athenian involvement could be invented by the Spartan sources (so as not to be alone in their impiety) is intriguing, given that the major diplomatic confrontations between Greece and Persia have so far been undertaken between the kings and the Spartans, in particular. Chronology is debated by Kraft (1964), who thinks that the events might actually have happened to Xerxes' heralds, and by Sealey (1976), who defends Herodotus' order of events. For the narrative reasons discussed, I side with Sealey. Herodotus' caveat about the sack of Athens indicates the tension between his narrative goals and historical fact: he clearly views some kind of reciprocal action as desirable and necessary, but history does not cooperate.
[202] The Spartans outdo the Athenians by responding doubly with murder *and* condescension, a combination that only makes sense if the emissary is considered to be a full proxy for his sender. By killing the *kēryx*, the Spartans ensure that their snide remark cannot actually be heard by Darius, thus it must be the case that they are metaphorically addressing him through his representative.
[203] The Spartan attempt to expiate the killing of Darius' *kērykes* goes poorly. Sperthis and Boulis, sent to be killed by Xerxes, refuse to prostrate themselves (7.136), an action which Persians perform for kings or to indicate their inferior status (1.134) but Greeks reserve only for the gods (following Dewald (in Waterfield 1998) and Asheri (*ad loc.*)). Their refusal may be interpreted by Xerxes as an attempt to claim equal status and influence his decision to deny their request. Surely the situation does not help relations between Sparta and Persia in any way.

ethos of the other.

Everything about the placement of this scene emphasizes connection across time. By delaying the narration of events in Darius' time until Xerxes undertakes a similar action and by explicitly linking the two events, Herodotus makes clear the thematic continuity.[204] Xerxes' decision not to ask Athens and Sparta for earth and water confirms that their mutual ignorance of perspective was resolved in Darius' time, but disagreement about the correct view of their relative status persists as a concern: the Persians still want submission but the two cities will not comply. The flashback to Darius' contact with Sparta surely brings to mind a further connection to Cyrus' less-contentious and never-resolved under-negotiation, when he condescendingly replies to the Spartan ultimatum and thereby promotes his own superiority (1.153). Even after the battle of Thermopylae and the sack of Athens (closely following, in the narrative, the episode of the pit and the well), resolution has still not been reached.[205] The persistent disagreement is revisited when Spartan emissaries are condescended to by Xerxes (8.114, as discussed above), and does not reach equilibrium until the Persians choose to end their attempted conquest of Greece. This extended sequence of rejections emphasizes the important idea that under-negotiation cannot be resolved without agreement, in this case about the value of autonomy to the Greeks. Consequently, attempts to resolve the persistent under-negotiation between Athens, Sparta, and Persia are a driving force for the events throughout the *Histories*.

---

[204] The near-permanent under-negotiation is even emphasized syntactically, by placing the involved locations early in each relevant sentence. I provide literal translations to show what the effect might be in English. When Xerxes is about to send his emissaries, we have: πλὴν **οὔτε ἐς Ἀθήνας οὔτε ἐς Λακεδαίμονα** ἀπέπεμπε ἐπὶ γῆς αἴτησιν – "**Neither to Athens nor to Lacedaemon**, did he send [heralds] to request earth" (7.32). 7.133.1 is nearly identical in form: **ἐς δὲ Ἀθήνας καὶ Σπάρτην** οὐκ ἀπέπεμψε Ξέρξης ἐπὶ γῆς αἴτησιν – "**To Athens and Sparta**, Xerxes did *not* send [heralds] to request earth". In both sentences, the locations are in Topic position, with sending (or not-sending) occupying the Focus (following the scheme of Dik (1995)). The syntax shows that location and connection are the dominant themes.

[205] Similarly, the second sack of Athens follows immediately after the Athenians reject Mardonius' (and Xerxes') offer of alliance brought by Alexander, acting as an ἄγγελος (8.136.1ff).

Darius' Precarious Rule

After the seven conspirators overthrow the Magi, Darius takes the kingship but does not easily

consolidate his newfound power. Herodotus shows Darius' struggle to demonstrate his newly

increased status through the device of message rejection and resulting reciprocity. In two stories,

emissaries are mutilated or killed, indicating a challenge to Darius' authority which must be

answered.

The first sign of trouble is also the story of Darius' first action as a ruler. Intaphrenes,

one of the conspirators, attempts to visit Darius at the palace, is refused, mutilates the message-

bearer, and will be killed in retribution.

3.118.1-119.2 τῶν δὲ τῷ μάγῳ ἐπαναστάντων ἑπτὰ ἀνδρῶν, ἕνα αὐτῶν Ἰνταφρένεα κατέλαβε ὑβρίσαντα τάδε ἀποθανεῖν αὐτίκα μετὰ τὴν ἐπανάστασιν. ἤθελε ἐς τὰ βασιλήια ἐσελθὼν χρηματίσασθαι τῷ βασιλέι· καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ὁ νόμος οὕτω εἶχε, τοῖσι ἐπαναστᾶσι τῷ μάγῳ ἔσοδον εἶναι παρὰ βασιλέα ἄνευ ἀγγέλου, ἢν μὴ γυναικὶ τυγχάνῃ μισγόμενος βασιλεύς. οὐκ ὦν δὴ Ἰνταφρένης ἐδικαίου οὐδένα οἱ ἐσαγγεῖλαι, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἦν τῶν ἑπτά, ἐσιέναι ἤθελε· ὁ δὲ πυλουρὸς καὶ ὁ ἀγγελιηφόρος οὐ περιώρων, φάμενοι τὸν βασιλέα γυναικὶ μίσγεσθαι. ὁ δὲ Ἰνταφρένης δοκέων σφέας ψεύδεα λέγειν ποιέει τοιάδε· σπασάμενος τὸν ἀκινάκεα ἀποτάμνει αὐτῶν τά τε ὦτα καὶ τὰς ῥῖνας καὶ ἀνείρας περὶ τὸν χαλινὸν τοῦ ἵππου περὶ τοὺς αὐχένας σφέων ἔδησε καὶ ἀφῆκε. οἱ δὲ τῷ βασιλέι δεικνύουσι ἑωυτοὺς καὶ τὴν αἰτίην εἶπον δι' ἣν πεπονθότες εἶησαν. Δαρεῖος δὲ ἀρρωδήσας μὴ κοινῷ λόγῳ οἱ ἓξ πεποιηκότες ἔωσι ταῦτα, μεταπεμπόμενος ἕνα ἕκαστον ἀπεπειρᾶτο γνώμης, εἰ συνέπαινοί εἰσι τῷ πεποιημένῳ. ἐπείτε δὲ ἐξέμαθε, ὡς οὐ σὺν ἐκείνοισι εἴη ταῦτα πεποιηκώς, ἔλαβε αὐτόν τε τὸν Ἰνταφρένεα καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς οἰκηίους πάντας ἐλπίδας πολλὰς ἔχων μετὰ τῶν συγγενέων μιν ἐπιβουλεύειν οἱ ἐπανάστασιν, συλλαβὼν δέ σφεας ἔδησε τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ.

One of the seven who had rebelled against the Magus died shortly after the uprising; this was Intaphrenes, and he died because he committed an act of violence. He wanted to enter the palace to do some business with the king; and indeed the rule stated that the conspirators could go in to see the king unannounced, unless he happened to be having sex with a woman. So Intaphrenes thought it his right not to be announced, but because he was one of the seven to go right in as he wanted. But the gatekeeper and the message-bearer would not let him in, on the grounds that the king was having sex with a woman. Intaphrenes thought they were lying, however. He drew his *akinakes*, cut off their ears and noses, and threaded them on to his horse's bridle. Then he tied the bridle around their necks and sent them away. The men showed themselves to the king and explained why they had been treated this way. Darius was afraid that the six might have jointly had a hand in the act, so he sent for them one by one and questioned them to find out whether they had approved of what happened. When he was certain that they had not been involved, he arrested not just Intaphrenes himself, but also his sons and all his male relatives, since he was sure that Intaphrenes and his relations were plotting to overthrow him.

Once he had them all in custody, he put them in prison to await death.

Much like the situation with Aristodicus and the θεοπρόποι, Intaphrenes thinks a presumably "typical" emissary is lying without any evidence beyond his own opinion.[206] But instead of confirming the message a second time, as Aristodicus does, Intaphrenes' violent response physically expresses his rejection of the message as well as his poor judgment. The under-negotiation is based on conjecture by Intaphrenes, not fact, and therefore is uniquely one-sided. His reaction signals an underlying concern that, in the eyes of Darius, he has lost rightful status and is no longer perceived to be entitled to the privileges that he is owed. By mutilating the message-bearer, he attempts to reclaim through force what he (incorrectly) thinks he has lost, and consequently he asserts a higher status than he deserves.[207] His simultaneous insecurity and arrogance are revealed through his hubristic action.

Intaphrenes' challenge is taken very seriously by Darius, and it shows Darius' insecurity in his new role as king. Whereas we might expect anger to dominate him, he turns first to fear (ἀρρωδήσας), an emotion reserved (by Herodotus) for weaker, lower-status, or vulnerable individuals.[208] Intaphrenes' actions are so unsettling that Darius verifies the absence of any other plots against him (by questioning the other conspirators) before arresting Intaphrenes and his

---

[206] Herodotus does not say if Darius was having sex, leaving Intaphrenes' opinion unverifiable. Based on typical patterns, however, we should probably trust the reliability of the emissary over the accusation of an evidently frustrated man. Furthermore, Herodotus explicitly identifies Intaphrenes' actions as hubristic (ὑβρίσαντα), making his judgment generally questionable.

[207] Strid (2006, 397) suggests that the mutilation may be intended to prevent vengeance from following Intaphrenes. The main thrust of his article deals with the voiceless nature of victims in Herodotus. Intaphrenes does not ever speak directly in this scene, although his actions (prior to becoming a voiceless-victim) certainly make his point of view clear to Darius. Hardy (1996, 103) summarizes previous research on characterization in this scene, none of which contradicts my own reading. Evans (1982) shows how this scene emphasizes that the two fellow-conspirators are no longer equals.

[208] The idea expressed elsewhere in Greek literature that fear is characteristic of a tyrant (e.g. Soph. *OT* 585, Eur. *Ion* 621-5) is not robustly expressed by Herodotus. Cambyses shows fear in 3.30.3, but fear is not mentioned during the constitutional debate. Regardless, fear appears to stem from insecurity in tyrannical power, and ἀρρωδέω/ἀρρωδίη appears to convey a stronger emotion than φροντίς. Fear often stems from vulnerability, e.g., the Persians are concerned about the Ionians abandoning the Hellespont bridge (4.140), and Eurybiades is concerned about losing the rest of the Greek fleet (8.63). Darius' fear seems to reflect a similar situation.

family. Darius' main concern is preserving his status and safety, metaphorically at risk through the mutilation of the message-carrier. By placing Intaphrenes and his family in prison and then executing them, he restores correct perspective on all sides. Darius can feel secure again, Intaphrenes has been taught his proper place, and the violence against the message-carrier has been answered with violent punishment for the perpetrator.

Unfortunately, Intaphrenes' actions are not the only challenge to authority that Darius faces in his early days. Oroetes, governor of Sardis, acts like a rogue king, which implicitly challenges the Persian king's authority and must therefore be addressed. Herodotus shows the pattern of Darius' defensive behavior by passing from the situation with Intaphrenes into an extended flashback about Oroetes which details his crimes from the time of Cambyses' rule. Oroetes starts by murdering a Greek tyrant (Polycrates); he next kills a Persian governor (Mitrobates) and an emissary from Darius during the rule of the Magi. The common thread between these various crimes is their function as assertions of Oroetes' status.[209] They also suggest an unpredictable nature, which is reflected particularly well in the murder of Darius' emissary:

3.126.2 ἄλλα τε ἐξύβρισε παντοῖα καί τινα ἀγγελιηφόρον Δαρείου ἐλθόντα παρ᾽ αὐτόν, ὡς οὐ πρὸς ἡδονήν οἱ ἦν τὰ ἀγγελλόμενα, κτείνει μιν ὀπίσω κομιζόμενον ἄνδρας οἱ ὑπείσας κατ᾽ ὁδόν, ἀποκτείνας δέ μιν ἠφάνισε αὐτῷ ἵππῳ.
He demonstrated his brutality in all sorts of other ways as well. In one instance, he killed an [emissary] who had come from Darius simply because the message he brought displeased him. What he did was arrange for men to ambush the [emissary] when he was on his way back home, and make sure that his dead body and horse were never found again.[210]

Herodotus has Oroetes focalize the reason for his murder (ὡς οὐ πρὸς ἡδονήν οἱ ἦν τὰ

ἀγγελλόμενα), and the language demonstrates the triviality of Oroetes' objection: his lack of

---

[209] Herodotus makes Oroetes' concern for status explicit when discussing his motivations for killing Polycrates and Mitrobates. By murdering Darius' emissary, he implicitly rejects any authority Darius might presume to have at the time.

[210] I have replaced Waterfield's "*angaros*" with the more neutral "emissary", to match better with Rosén's choice of ἀγγελιηφόρον over ἀγγαρήιον.

delight is front-loaded in the clause, with the content of the message left in the remainder. The care he takes with the disposal of the body suggests that in some way he is still wary of Darius, and rightfully so.[211] Oroetes has shown himself unwilling to accept the authority of others, a situation which Darius, as king, cannot allow to continue.

Oroetes' past actions represent an affront to Darius in particular and to Persia in general; he needs to be checked before his rogue behavior continues and creates further danger. Furthermore, the under-negotiation indicated by Oroetes' killing of Darius' *kēryx* may not have required resolution before Darius was king, but in his new position it can no longer be ignored. The delicate and vital matter of consolidating his new power as king is mentioned explicitly by Herodotus as an explanation for how Darius plans to neutralize Oroetes:

3.127.1-3 Δαρεῖος δὲ ὡς ἔσχε τὴν ἀρχήν, ἐπεθύμεε τὸν Ὀροίτεα τίσασθαι πάντων τῶν ἀδικημάτων εἵνεκεν καὶ μάλιστα Μιτροβάτεω καὶ τοῦ παιδός. ἐκ μὲν δὴ τῆς ἰθείης στρατὸν ἐπ' αὐτὸν <u>οὐκ ἐδόκεε πέμπειν ἅτε οἰδεόντων ἔτι τῶν πρηγμάτων καὶ νεωστὶ ἔχων τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸν Ὀροίτεα μεγάλην τὴν ἰσχὺν πυνθανόμενος ἔχειν, τὸν χίλιοι μὲν Περσέων ἐδορυφόρεον, εἶχε δὲ νομὸν τόν τε Φρύγιον καὶ Λύδιον καὶ Ἰωνικόν.</u> πρὸς ταῦτα δὴ ὦν ὁ Δαρεῖος τάδε ἐμηχανήσατο· συγκαλέσας Περσέων τοὺς λογιμωτάτους ἔλεγέ σφι, τάδε 'ὦ Πέρσαι, τίς ἄν μοι τοῦτο ὑμέων ὑποστὰς ἐπιτελέσειε σοφίῃ καὶ μὴ βίῃ τε καὶ ὁμίλῳ – ἔνθα γὰρ σοφίης δέει, βίης ἔργον οὐδέν – ὑμέων δὲ ὦν τίς μοι Ὀροίτεα ἢ ζῶντα ἀγάγοι ἢ ἀποκτείνειε, ὃς ὠφέλησε μέν κω Πέρσας οὐδέν, κακὰ δὲ μεγάλα ἔοργε; τοῦτο μὲν δύο ἡμέων ἤιστωσε, Μιτροβάτεά τε καὶ τὸν παῖδα, τοῦτο δὲ τοὺς ἀνακαλέοντας αὐτὸν καὶ πεμπομένους ὑπ' ἐμεῦ κτείνει, ὕβριν οὐκ ἀνασχετὸν φαίνων. πρίν τι ὦν μέζον ἐξεργάσασθαί μιν Πέρσας κακόν, καταλαμπτέος ἐστὶ ἡμῖν θανάτῳ.'

When Darius came to power, he wanted to punish Oroetes for all his crimes, and especially for the deaths of Mitrobates and his son. <u>He did not think it would be a good idea to make open war on him for several reasons: matters were still unstable, he had just come to power and he found out that Oroetes was very strong, not just because he had a personal guard of a thousand Persians, but also because the provinces of Phrygia, Lydia, and Ionia were all under his control.</u> So the plan Darius adopted under these circumstances was to summon all the most eminent Persians to a meeting and address them as follows: 'Men of Persia, I am calling for a volunteer for a job which will take cunning rather than brute force or numerical superiority. After all, in a situation that needs cunning, brute force is useless. So which of you will either capture or kill Oroetes for me? He has not lifted a finger to help the Persians, and he has murdered two of us, Mitrobates and his son, and in the second place he kills anyone I send to summon him to a meeting. This is obviously intolerable violence. He must be killed before he does the Persians worse harm.'

---

[211] The disposal of the body is echoed by Alexander's treatment of Darius' messengers (5.21).

The conflict of illegitimately- and legitimately-asserted status is emphasized by the focus on Oroetes' crimes against other Persians and his defiance of Darius' new power (τοὺς ἀνακαλέοντας αὐτὸν καὶ πεμπομένους ὑπ' ἐμεῦ κτείνει – "he kills the men summoning him, even when (they are) sent by *me*").[212] The pattern of events shows that Oroetes and Darius have an intractable difference of perspective: this under-negotiation will never be resolved through Oroetes adjusting his point of view, and Darius' decision to kill him seems like the only way to reach resolution.

In a clever ring-compositional way, the death of Oroetes is accomplished through messages, although Herodotus writes it in such a way that no official emissary is involved: only a man (Bagaeus) using writing and his wits.[213] Although Herodotus explicitly presents Oroetes' death only as retribution for murdering Polycrates (3.128.5), implicitly it provides a double resolution by also resolving the underlying conflict of status expressed by Oroetes' treatment of Darius' emissary. The elimination of this threat completes the consolidation of Darius' power, and he is ready to look outside of Persia. Dewald (in Waterfield (1998)) points out that the situation with Oroetes leads directly to the invasion of Greece. Atossa suggests that course of action to Darius as repayment for the doctor Democedes who was discovered among the slaves of Oroetes, where he ended up after Polycrates' death. This chain illustrates how Herodotus likes connecting inconsequential men, more or less, with outsized effects. In the same vein, we can note that the treatment of emissaries, a category of seemingly inconsequential men, plays a

---

[212] For the historical power of Oroetes, see Vargyas (2000). In addition to the control recounted by Herodotus, Vargyas (158) points out the importance of Sardis as a base for coinage and, therefore, Oroetes' power there. Note the presence of the verb ἀνακαλέω in this passage which, as mentioned earlier, indicates a much higher relative status for the one summoning than the one being summoned. Bagaeus' trick and the use of letters, in particular, is discussed further in Chapter 3. For structural parallels in the use of letters in these stories (of Oroetes and Bagaeus) and the letter written by Amasis to Polycrates (3.40), see Kazanskaya (forthcoming). Her conclusion that Herodotus intends to warn his audience against naïve trust in letters supports my own findings.

[213] Bagaeus' mission is described in 3.128 and discussed in Chapter 3. Ring-composition is more clearly shown by references to *tisis* which start (3.126.1) and end (3.128.5) Oroetes' story.

large role in our understanding of what happens to the major historical players and why.

CHAPTER 5: EMISSARIES IN NARRATIVE: THREE CASE STUDIES

Thus far we have seen how Herodotus uses emissaries to organize his narrative and reveal the

nature of diplomatic relationships, as well as how he variously employs the language of

emissaries to provide judgment on individuals. These strategies operate in conjunction when

considered as part of larger segments of the *Histories* and attention to them reveals new insights.

This chapter demonstrates the benefits of analyzing emissaries in a variety of narrative segments:

a single extended scene, an ethnographic *logos*, and connected *logoi*. In other words, no matter

how small or large a portion of the text we consider, emissaries (when present) should color our

understanding of what is presented. They are vital to building the scene or *logos*, and are often

present at important strategic moments in the narrative.

The Single Sequence of Events: Themistocles and Salamis

The extended story of how Themistocles manipulates the Persian and Greek fleets before the

battle of Salamis (8.75-81) provides a relatively compact, yet robust, example of how Herodotus

can use emissaries to their full potential. Each of the main events involves the transmission of

information, either with cognate vocabulary (*angelos, kēryx,* and related terms) or a marked

absence of it. By going through these nine chapters in order, we can see how the narrative

carefully uses the vocabulary of emissaries to direct our judgment of characters and to subtly

enhance our understanding of the different cultures of Persia and Greece.

The first point of contact is conspicuously lacking any cognate vocabulary.

Themistocles, determined to force the other Greeks to adopt his plan, sends a covert message to

the Persian fleet. Sicinnus, the message bearer, is not an official emissary, nor does any

vocabulary classify him as an implicit emissary. This omission is particularly striking given the

robust nature, otherwise, of this dispatch scene: he is instructed and sent to a specific destination, then arrives, speaks, and leaves.

8.75.1-76.1 ἐνθαῦτα Θεμιστοκλέης ὡς ἐσσοῦτο τῇ γνώμῃ ὑπὸ τῶν Πελοποννησίων, λαθὼν ἐξέρχεται ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου, ἐξελθὼν δὲ <u>πέμπει ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ Μήδων ἄνδρα πλοίῳ ἐντειλάμενος, τὰ λέγειν χρεόν, τῷ οὔνομα μὲν ἦν Σίκιννος, οἰκέτης δὲ καὶ παιδαγωγὸς ἦν τῶν Θεμιστοκλέος παίδων·</u> τὸν δὴ ὕστερον τούτων τῶν πρηγμάτων Θεμιστοκλέης Θεσπιέα τε ἐποίησε, ὡς ἐπεδέκοντο οἱ Θεσπιέες [πολιήτας], καὶ χρήμασι ὄλβιον. ὃς <u>τότε πλοίῳ ἀπικόμενος ἔλεγε πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγοὺς τῶν βαρβάρων, τάδε·</u> 'ἔπεμψέ με στρατηγὸς ὁ Ἀθηναίων λάθρῃ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων – τυγχάνει γὰρ φρονέων τὰ βασιλέος καὶ βουλόμενος μᾶλλον τὰ ὑμέτερα κατύπερθε γίνεσθαι ἢ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πρήγματα – φράσοντα, ὅτι οἱ Ἕλληνες δρησμὸν βουλεύονται καταρρωδηκότες, καὶ νῦν παρέχει κάλλιστον ὑμέας ἔργων ἁπάντων ἐξεργάσασθαι, ἢν μὴ περιίδητε διαδράντας αὐτούς· οὔτε γὰρ ἀλλήλοισι ὁμοφρονέουσι οὔτ' ἔτι ἀντιστήσονται ὑμῖν, πρὸς ἑωυτούς τε σφέας ὄψεσθε ναυμαχέοντας, τοὺς τὰ ὑμέτερα φρονέοντας καὶ τοὺς μή.' <u>ὁ μὲν ταῦτά σφι σημήνας ἐκποδὼν ἀπαλλάσσετο·</u>

In the debate [between the Greek generals], Themistocles was being beaten by the Peloponnesians. He quietly slipped away from the meeting, <u>briefed[214] one of his men (a house-slave of his – his children's attendant, to be precise – whose name was Sicinnus), and sent him over to the Persian camp in a boat.</u> Subsequently, when the war was over, Themistocles had him enrolled as a citizen of Thespiae, which was accepting new citizens, and made him a wealthy man too. <u>At the time in question, Sicinnus sailed over and said to the Persian commanders,</u> 'I am on a secret mission for the Athenian commander, who is in fact sympathetic to Xerxes' cause and would prefer you to gain the upper hand in the war rather than the Greeks. None of the other Greeks know that I am here. The message from my master is that the Greeks are in a state of panic and are planning to retreat. Unless you just stand by and let them escape, you have an opportunity here to achieve a glorious victory. They are disunited, in no position to offer you resistance; in fact you'll see them pitting their ships against one another, those who are on your side fighting those who are not.' <u>After delivering this message, Sicinnus left.</u>

If we look at the description of Sicinnus' behavior, nothing suggests that he acts in a way inappropriate for an official emissary, yet cognate vocabulary is entirely absent. His covert mission and status as a slave may explain the absence of an official title (e.g. of *angelos*),[215] but these situational features do not inherently prevent Herodotus from using cognate nouns or verbs to describe his actions. The scene is set up just as many other scenes with emissaries, and there is no reason to suspect he fails in any respect at his task.

The key to the absence of cognate vocabulary may lie in Sicinnus' explicit

---

[214] More literally, "commanded what should be said".

[215] The underhanded nature of this message is reinforced by its anonymity: no names are mentioned to the Persians (ἔπεμψέ με στρατηγὸς ὁ Ἀθηναίων λάθρῃ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων).

characterization. We saw in Chapter 3 how overt characterization can sufficiently conflict with

the expectations for an emissary that the expected vocabulary is not present. The messengers to

Amyntas were undone by their Persian (and, by association, tyrannical) nature (5.17-21),

Hermippus could not escape his Atarnean nature (6.4), the Fish-Eaters were constrained by their

occupation as spies (3.19-25), and Darius was prevented from any association with emissaries by

his promotion of lying (3.72).[216] In each of these situations, some aspect of the emissary's

actions or identity circumscribed his ability to be labeled with the vocabulary of emissaries.

Sicinnus' actions are not at fault, so we should look to his identity: he is defined entirely by his

relationship to Themistocles (οἰκέτης δὲ καὶ παιδαγωγὸς ἦν τῶν Θεμιστοκλέος παίδων).[217] This

provides two characterizing elements: his tasks in the household indicate his trustworthiness, and

his status as an οἰκέτης indicates that he is a possession and thus a tool Themistocles can use on

his behalf.[218] Then, before he undertakes his present mission, the narrative gives a prolepsis

about his future success, also due entirely to the actions of Themistocles (τὸν δὴ ὕστερον τούτων

τῶν πρηγμάτων Θεμιστοκλέης Θεσπιέα τε ἐποίησε, ὡς ἐπεδέκοντο οἱ Θεσπιέες πολιήτας, καὶ

χρήμασι ὄλβιον – "After these events, Themistocles made him a Thespian, since they were

accepting citizens, and made him wealthy"). Despite Sicinnus' reliable nature and the noble

intentions of his actions, he cannot escape the connotations of being so closely associated with

Themistocles and is denied the expected vocabulary.[219] Themistocles, after all, is no paragon of

virtue, and is clearly unsuitable to be characterized as an emissary. In addition to this

unauthorized, covert mission, we have previously seen him bribe and embezzle (8.4-5) and

---

[216] Note that in the case of Darius and in this example, the message is said to be given using the verb σημαίνω.

[217] As mentioned in Chapter 3, the fact that Sicinnus' name is provided simply lends more authority to Herodotus as a successful researcher and perhaps to provide *kleos*. It is not a significant element of characterization.

[218] Following Aristotle's definition of a slave as an ὄργανον of his master (e.g., Ar. *Pol*. 1253b.25-35).

[219] Similarly, according to Naiden (2006, 133-6), guilt by association can prevent an individual from being recognized as a suppliant, even if that individual exhibits no problematic behavior.

attempt to sow discord between the Ionian and Persian forces (8.22). His plot with Sicinnus emphasizes his cunning wisdom (σοφίη), which is not a characteristic of emissaries. Despite Themistocles' generally good intentions, his methods are not licit or trustworthy. Thus, the repeated, explicit links to Themistocles may suggest that the audience should view Sicinnus' characterization as depending, in part, on Themistocles' and therefore as rendered ineligible to be described by cognate vocabulary. The absent vocabulary for Sicinnus, therefore, indicates that Themistocles should also be denied the vocabulary of emissaries where it might otherwise be expected. Herodotus will show this inhibition shortly.

Despite the illicit nature of the message and its false contents, the Persians decide to treat the information as trustworthy:

8.76.1 **τοῖσι δὲ ὡς πιστὰ ἐγίνετο τὰ ἀγγελθέντα,** τοῦτο μὲν ἐς τὴν νησῖδα τὴν ψυττάλειαν, μεταξὺ Σαλαμῖνός τε κειμένην καὶ τῆς ἠπείρου πολλοὺς τῶν Περσέων ἀπεβίβασαν·

The Persian reaction to the message, which they felt to be reliable, was first to send a sizeable body of troops ashore on the little island that lies between Salamis and the mainland...

The audience knows that the message is false, yet the narrative here describes it as πιστά and, perhaps redundantly, identifies it using an articular participle from a cognate verb (τὰ ἀγγελθέντα). This overtly and implicitly positive classification of a deceptive message is explained by focalization. The descriptors are given within a ὡς clause, which indicates that the Persians (τοῖσι) are the (only) ones holding this opinion. The fact that they describe the message in this way confirms that they have been properly duped. It does nothing to rehabilitate the ability of Sicinnus or Themistocles to be identified as emissaries.

Honest reporting of information is not found until Aristeides comes to tell Themistocles about the movement of the Persian fleet. Not coincidentally, Aristeides is the first person up to

this point in the scene to be explicitly characterized in a way befitting an emissary:[220]

8.79.1 τὸν ἐγὼ νενόμικα, πυνθανόμενος αὐτοῦ τὸν τρόπον ἄριστον ἄνδρα γενέσθαι ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι καὶ δικαιότατον.

In my considered opinion, from all I hear about his character, he was the best and most honorable man in Athens.

His honorable presentation is not undermined in any way, as Sicinnus' was, and consequently,

we will not be surprised when Aristeides is implicitly characterized by cognate verbs.

Themistocles, on the other hand, is less deserving. We do not have to depend on Herodotus for

these judgments, but can see them coming from the mouths of the characters themselves. When

Aristeides finishes his report, he gives Themistocles the following exhortation:

8.79.4 'ἀλλ' ἐσελθών σφι ταῦτα <u>σήμηνον</u>.'
'You'd better go back into the meeting and <u>tell</u> them the news'

The term Aristeides chooses for the command, σήμηνον, might be unexpected without the

context of the rest of this section. Here Herodotus verifies that Themistocles himself lacks the

ability to be named even as an implicit emissary through a cognate verb.[221] The difference

between the evident reliability of Aristeides and the untrustworthiness of Themistocles is

acknowledged by Themistocles himself in the language he chooses for his response:

8.80.1-2 'κάρτα τε χρηστὰ διακελεύεαι καὶ **εὖ ἤγγειλας**· τὰ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐδεόμην γενέσθαι, αὐτὸς αὐτόπτης γενόμενος ἥκεις. ἴσθι γὰρ ἐξ ἐμέο τὰ ποιεύμενα ὑπὸ Μήδων· ἔδεε γάρ, ὅτε οὐκ ἑκόντες ἤθελον ἐς μάχην κατίστασθαι οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἀέκοντας παραστήσασθαι. σὺ δὲ ἐπεί περ ἥκεις χρηστὰ **ἀπαγγέλλων**, **αὐτός** σφι **ἄγγειλον**. ἢν γὰρ ἐγὼ αὐτὰ λέγω, δόξω πλάσας λέγειν καὶ οὐ πείσω ὡς οὐ ποιεύντων τῶν βαρβάρων ταῦτα. ἀλλά σφι <u>σήμηνον</u> αὐτὸς παρελθών, ὡς ἔχει. ἐπεὰν δὲ <u>σημήνῃς</u>, ἢν μὲν πείθωνται, ταῦτα δὴ τὰ κάλλιστα, ἢν δὲ αὐτοῖσι μὴ πιστὰ γένηται, ὅμοιον ἡμῖν ἔσται· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι διαδρήσονται, εἴ περ περιεχόμεθα πανταχόθεν, ὡς σὺ λέγεις.'

---

[220] With the exception of his status as an exile, which would prevent him serving in an official capacity (8.79.1, just preceding: ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος μέν, ἐξωστρακισμένος δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου – "[Aristeides] was an Athenian who had been ostracized by the democratic government)." Being an aristocrat is no bar to being used as an official emissary, e.g., Alexander as an *angelos* in 8.136.

[221] For comparative purposes, in 7.18 Artabanus suggests that Darius tell the Persians about his dream, using σημαίνω as a command. In this case, the information being shared clearly requires interpretation; the need to interpret what Themistocles says is due to his nature, not the source of his information. Munson (2001, 43) points out that Herodotus separates his evaluation with respect to morals and strategy: "The gloss [on Aristeides' character] is designed to underline the element of ἀρετή (moral excellence) in the narrative of Salamis, otherwise dominated by an ethically more ambiguous σοφίη (cleverness) of Themistoclean stamp."

'That's a very good idea,' Themistocles replied. 'And **you've brought good news**. That's exactly what I wanted to happen – and you've seen it with your own eyes. I should explain that this move on the part of the Persians was instigated by me. The Greeks didn't want to join battle, so I had to force them into it. But since you are the one **who has brought this good news, why don't you deliver the message yourself**? If I tell them, they'll think I'm making it up and they won't believe me, on the grounds that the Persians couldn't be doing any such thing. Go in and <u>explain</u> the situation in person. They may believe <u>what you're saying</u>, which would be best, but even if they don't, that won't make any difference, since they still won't be able to run away if we're completely surrounded, as you say.'

Whereas Themistocles is willing to describe Aristeides' speech with cognate vocabulary, he does not extend those words to his own speech. Aristeides' command to Themistocles (σήμηνον) is reflected by Themistocles' command to Aristeides (ἄγγειλον). The implicit contrast of characterization is clear, and Themistocles makes it even more explicit when he admits that if he were to report this information himself, he might not be believed (ἢν γὰρ ἐγὼ αὐτὰ λέγω, δόξω πλάσας λέγειν καὶ οὐ πείσω, ὡς οὐ ποιεύντων τῶν βαρβάρων ταῦτα). Surprisingly, in his reiteration that Aristeides should pass along the information, all cognate vocabulary is missing, even the verbs he used previously. It may be that Themistocles' mention of the doubt everyone has in him established the theme of disbelief so firmly that his remaining instructions to Aristeides (including the possibility that they might not believe even him - ἢν δὲ αὐτοῖσι μὴ πιστὰ γένηται) refrain from using cognate verbs and rely solely on σημαίνω. Once again, association with Themistocles appears to inhibit the use of cognate vocabulary.

Themistocles' concern about disbelief turns out to be well-founded: Aristeides speaks to the commanders but does not persuade them:

8.81.1 ταῦτα <u>ἔλεγε</u> παρελθὼν ὁ Ἀριστείδης <u>φάμενος</u> ἐξ Αἰγίνης τε ἥκειν καὶ μόγις ἐκπλῶσαι λαθὼν τοὺς ἐπορμέοντας, περιέχεσθαι γὰρ πᾶν τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ὑπὸ τῶν νεῶν τῶν Ξέρξεω, παραρτέεσθαί τε συνεβούλευε ὡς ἀλεξησομένους. καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα εἴπας μετεστήκεε, τῶν δὲ αὖτις ἐγίνετο λόγων ἀμφισβασίη· **οἱ γὰρ πλεῦνες τῶν στρατηγῶν οὐκ ἐπείθοντο τὰ ἐσαγγελθέντα**.

So Aristeides went in to the Greek commanders. He <u>told</u> them that the Greek navy was entirely surrounded by Xerxes' fleet – so much so that on his way from Aegina he had only just managed to slip past the enemy blockade – and he advised them to get ready to face an attack.

Afterwards, he left the meeting. Then the arguments began all over again, **because most of the commanders did not believe the news**.

Herodotus represents both the doubt of the commanders and the underlying truth of the message through his vocabulary. Aristeides no longer speaks using cognate vocabulary, but instead is shown to speak with the less compelling and unmarked verbs λέγω and φημί. This generic vocabulary minimizes his characterization as an authoritative and reliable source without ruling it out as a possibility. But the truth of his words is supported for the audience by the articular cognate participle (τὰ ἐσαγγελθέντα); in contrast to the situation with the Persians above, the narrator is the focalizer who judges the accuracy of the message. Whereas the Persians focalized incorrect information as reliable, the narrator here focalizes information as reliable which the Greeks think is incorrect. The thematic elements of this disbelief will be taken up below.

A more immediate concern is that doubt in this fashion suggests under-negotiation. At issue in this rejection is Aristeides' worth as a bearer of new information. We and Themistocles know that he is worthy of having the characteristics of a "typical" emissary, and as added credibility he speaks as an eye-witness. Nevertheless, the generals do not accept his news as they ought to,[222] possibly because they would not expect an exiled man to be more current with military developments than they are.[223] Happily, the situation is easily resolved (and without the usual recourse to violence) when the report is spontaneously confirmed:

8.82.1 ἀπιστεόντων δὲ τούτων ἦκε τριήρης ἀνδρῶν Τηνίων αὐτομολέουσα, τῆς ἦρχε ἀνὴρ Παναίτιος ὁ Σωσιμένεος, ἥ περ δὴ <u>ἔφερε τὴν ἀληθείην πᾶσαν</u>.

Just then, while they were still inclined to disbelieve Aristeides' report, a crew of Tenian deserters, commanded by one of their countrymen called Panaetius the son of Sosimenes, brought their trireme into Salamis. They were <u>able to give the Greeks a complete and accurate account of the situation</u>.

---

[222] Themistocles' belief that Aristeides, as an eyewitness, has a better chance of being believed does not yield results. For the value of autopsy vs. the value of an emissary's report, see Chapter 3.

[223] Another possibility is that the generals are wary of him being in collusion with Themistocles, given that they are both Athenians.

Herodotus sidesteps any question of implicit reliability in this report by declaring the information to be "the whole truth" (τὴν ἀληθείην πᾶσαν). With such authoritative characterization, the more subtle use of cognate vocabulary is unnecessary.

The deliberation scene ends by establishing, once again, the contrast between the Greek and Persian responses to information about their opponents' fleets. After the second report, Herodotus depicts the Greek response to this confirming information:

8.83.1 τοῖσι δὲ Ἕλλησι ὡς πιστὰ δὴ τὰ λεγόμενα ἦν τῶν Τηνίων ῥήματα, παρεσκευάζοντο ὡς ναυμαχήσοντες.
Now that the Greeks had accepted the Tenians' report, they prepared themselves for battle.

The syntax here mirrors, almost exactly, the Persian response (8.76.1) to Sicinnus' message: the words are classed as trustworthy within a ὡς-clause indicating that the Greeks (only) are providing this focalization. The fact that the correct judgment here makes use of generic words for speaking (τὰ λεγόμενα, ῥήματα) may draw the contrast between the Greeks and the Persians even more strongly. The Persians, aggressive and avaricious, are quick to categorize any promising information as reliable. The Greeks, earnest and careful, focalize it plainly and simply as "trustworthy speech" (πιστὰ δὴ τὰ λεγόμενα), despite the fact that Herodotus has twice already confirmed its reliability with stronger implicit and explicit vocabulary (τὰ ἐσαγγελθέντα; τὴν ἀληθείην πᾶσαν).

The near-identical syntax of 8.76 and 8.83 reflects the ring-compositional structure of the entire story. For both the Persians and the Greeks, we see a message brought by a well-characterized third party and the reaction of the recipients. The intermediaries are contrasted through their characterization, both explicit and implicit, just as the two cultures are contrasted through their responses to the information they are given. All of the characterization provided and evoked in this story is presented relative to Themistocles' characterization and his actions.

The importance of cognate verbs (as opposed to σημαίνω) and the characterizing effect of a difference of perspective requiring resolution in a non-combative setting is made clear.

Ethnography and Emissaries: The Scythians

Authorial judgment and direction, as just discussed, can provide implicit comments on an individual or a culture within a particular contextual sphere. The use of emissaries is similarly revealing in ethnographic sections and may color our view of the future actions of the main story involving those cultures. We have already seen how direct information about emissaries can be placed within the narrative at junctures which carefully support local themes.[224] By juxtaposing emissaries behaving in expected and unexpected ways through the Scythian *logos*, Herodotus implicitly emphasizes the oddities of their culture and its distance from Greek norms and expectations. The use of emissaries in this fashion extends the arguments of Hartog's (1988) seminal study on the "otherness" of the Scythians. Furthermore, the use of emissaries in the Scythian *logos* prepares its original audience for certain elements of the subsequent Persian invasion of Greece and helps to cast the outcome in Scythia as a warning for Persia which was not heeded.

Hartog approaches the otherness of the Scythians through the idea of "systematic differentiation", which allows Herodotus' Greek audience to comprehend the Scythians through their relative adherence to (or distance from) traditional Greek models of culture and society.[225] The starting Greek model for emissaries is presumably that which has been discussed in the first and third chapters: they are swift and reliable with further characteristics indicated by specific vocabulary. Excessive or non-typical behavior is cause for censure. For the most part, Scythian

---

[224] See Chapter 1 for the information content and Chapter 3 for the placement and thematic force of that information.
[225] As explained by Hartog (1988, 9-10), who builds on Redfield's (1985) suggestion that tourists comprehend by evaluating difference (specifically "symmetrical opposition" (106)). Munson (2001, 45-133) refines and generalizes Hartog's approach, by considering the various explicit and implicit ways a narrator can make comparisons.

emissaries conform to expectations: cognate verbs give authority to unknown individuals and suggest the presence of emissaries for disseminating commands,[226] emissaries communicate messages as instructed,[227] and inappropriate parties are not labeled with cognate vocabulary.[228] Emissaries are also evident as tools to manage the pace and setting of the narrative, particularly when Herodotus uses messengers to frame an ethnographic digression about the tribes bordering on Scythia (4.102 and 4.118). Overall, in other words, we find conformity with the standard model. The only refinement comes early on, when we learn that the Gerrhians bury an ἀγγελιηφόρος along with their kings. Since message-bearers are associated with the households of eastern kings, this association confirms that Scythians are to be seen (from the Greek perspective) as more like Persians than Greeks. This identity conforms with Hartog's

---

[226] In the Propontis, the apparent death of Aristeus (4.14) is announced by a fuller using cognate vocabulary (ἀγγελέοντα), lending him instant authority even if his information later turns out to be potentially false. In 4.80, Sitalces averts a battle between himself and Octamasades through diplomacy; he is depicted (grammatically) as speaking directly to his opposing general and in the capping sentence of his speech is the subject of a cognate verb: ταῦτά οἱ πέμψας ὁ Σιτάλκης ἐπεκηρυκεύετο – "Sitalces sent [an emissary] and announced the following to him [Octamasades]..." (4.80.4). This verb may signal, in part, the logistical likelihood that these words were spoken by an intermediary instead of directly. It may also confirm the trustworthy nature of Sitalces and therefore provide an implicit justification for Octamasades' acceptance of his offer of exchange and the subsequent resolution of their conflict without fighting. Similarly, Persians act as expected (in relation to "typical" emissary behavior) during the Scythian *logos*. In a brief excursion back to the Persian forces, Darius commands his territories to prepare for the invasion of Scythia by sending *angeloi* (4.83.1: παρασκευαζομένου Δαρείου ἐπὶ τοὺς Σκύθας καὶ περιπέμποντος ἀγγέλους [ἐπιτάξοντας τοῖσι μὲν...] – "Now Darius was getting ready to invade Scythia. He send out messengers in all directions, ordering some of his subjects...") Once preparations are suitably made, Darius commands the fleet to set sail through a cognate verb, discussed further in Chapter 2. (4.89.1: τοῖσι Ἴωσι παραγγείλας πλέειν ἐς τὸν Πόντον μέχρι Ἴστρου ποταμοῦ, ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀπίκωνται ἐς τὸν Ἴστρον, ἐνθαῦτα αὐτὸν περιμένειν ζευγνύντας τὸν ποταμόν – "He had also ordered the Ionians to take the navy into the Euxine Sea and to sail to the river Ister, where they were to bridge the river and wait for him.") The cognate verb emphasizes the need for the implicit emissaries used to pass the message and confirms Darius as the authority figure for the expedition, a touch which is hardly needed.

[227] The Scythians send *angeloi* to their neighbors asking for help against the threatening Persians (4.102, arriving in 4.118, discussed further below). In 4.125, the Agathyrsians send a *kēryx* to the Scythians during their planned flight from the Persians, warning them off from entering their country; the Scythians comply, suggesting that no under-negotiation exists and that they accept the independence and neutrality of the other tribe.

[228] Herodotus describes the way the Hyperboreans send offerings to Delos and explains that their current custom stems from the journey of Hyperoxe and Laodike who were sent with gifts but never returned (4.33). These women are (correctly) not named as emissaries – not only are they young women (δύο κόρας), but their task is simply the delivery of offerings, not any further communication. Bearing gifts only, without an accompanying message, is a task rarely designated to emissaries. Their retinue is described in some detail, but these men are similarly not denoted as emissaries, which is appropriate given their status only as escorts (4.33.3: τῶν ἀστῶν ἄνδρας πέντε πομποὺς τούτους, οἳ νῦν Περφερέες καλέονται, τιμὰς μεγάλας ἐν Δήλῳ ἔχοντες – "[they sent the girls] together with five men from their country to act as their escorts and protect them; these are the men who are nowadays known as Perphereis and are greatly revered in Delos.")

proposition that within the Scythian *logos*, the Scythians play the role of the Persians and the Persians play the role of the Greeks.[229] This example is framed, however, by traditional uses of the cognate verbs, suggesting that on the whole, even among Scythians, the regular operation of the vocabulary of emissaries can be expected.

Only two scenes stand out as displaying substantial differences from the Greek model, and their placement suggests that Herodotus wishes to highlight those differences as one of his thematic strategies. The first scene (4.94) is part of an ethnographic section and thus the thematic information is communicated primarily to Herodotus' audience. The second scene (4.131) is part of the narration of the main story and thus the thematic information is communicated not only to the audience but also to the Persians receiving the emissary. The dynamics of these scenes strongly suggest the otherness of Scythia and the danger of launching military campaigns against such otherness. The Persians clearly do not pick up on this warning, as their subsequent failed invasion of Greece makes clear, but Herodotus' audience may be more astute. By surrounding these unusual scenes with typical emissaries, the divergent customs and behavior stand out in stark relief.

Darius' invasion of Scythia is mentioned several times before any action begins; in parallel fashion, Scythian emissaries are initially typical but show unusual qualities once Darius is on the move. Darius conceives of the invasion during a conversation with his wife Atossa (3.134). After some brief Persian campaigns elsewhere, Herodotus explains Darius' motivation to attack Scythia as a form of retribution (4.1) and opens the section referred to as the Scythian *logos*, complete with ethnographic and analeptic information about the region. Darius' campaign, however, does not start properly until 4.83, when he makes preparations and sets his troops in motion. Up to this point, the vocabulary of emissaries is presented in typical fashion.

---

[229] Especially with reference to battle-style (49).

All of this changes when the Persians finally encounter Scythians for the first time.

The Persians are still traveling in 4.93 and meet with their first belligerent opponent, the

Getae.[230] This first conquest is captured in a single sentence with very little detail, and is only

minimally expanded upon:

4.93.1 πρὶν δὲ ἀπικέσθαι ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴστρον, πρώτους αἱρέει Γέτας τοὺς ἀθανατίζοντας. ...οἱ δὲ Γέται πρὸς ἀγνωμοσύνην τραπόμενοι αὐτίκα ἐδουλώθησαν Θρηίκων ἐόντες ἀνδρειότατοι καὶ δικαιότατοι.

Before reaching the Ister, [Darius] first conquered the Getae, who believe themselves to be immortal. ... The Getae, however, who are the most courageous and upright Thracian tribe, offered stiff resistance, and were promptly enslaved.

Herodotus next gives us a few sections of ethnography before summarizing their defeat again in

similarly spare fashion:

4.96.2 οὗτοι μὲν δὴ τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ χρεώμενοι ὡς ἐχειρώθησαν ὑπὸ Περσέων, εἵποντο τῷ ἄλλῳ στρατῷ·

Anyway, once the Getae had been defeated by the Persians, they were conscripted into the army.

Clearly the battle and the military power of the Getae are uninteresting to Herodotus and

essentially irrelevant. What he does appear to be fascinated by (or at least to find remarkable) is

the belief held by the Getae of their own immortality, and the relation of that belief to their god

Salmoxis. Hartog (1988, 84-109) goes into much detail about the thematic elements of

Salmoxis, of the beliefs of the Getae, and of Herodotus' mode of presenting this ethnographic

information.[231] But Hartog's conclusions about the "otherness" of the Getae and the distance

Herodotus' narration creates between their culture and Greek culture focus mainly on Salmoxis

---

[230] I follow Hartog in considering this passage as part of the Scythian *logos* even though the Persian forces have not yet properly entered Scythia by crossing the Ister. Regarding the proper categorization of the Getae, he writes (1988, 62 n1) "On the whole, the *logos* wins out over the *ethnos*."
[231] For a discussion of the characterization of the Getan *angelos* in this scene, see Chapter 3.

and pass superficially over the bizarre ritual involving emissaries (4.94).[232] In fact, careful

attention to the presentation of emissaries in this ritual builds an equally strong case for the

otherness of the Getae and hence helps reveal the rabbit-hole that the Persians are entering into

on this campaign.

Herodotus explicitly marks out the Getae as unusual, even among their neighbors, when

he introduces them: they consider themselves to be immortal. Their singular attempt to fight

back against the Persians is a secondary mark of distinction. Herodotus shows a concrete

example of their belief in immortality as it is expressed through communication with their god

Salmoxis: the large-scale "otherness" extends its influence to periodic ritual. Even within this

unusual means of sending a message, the behavior of the emissary is still expected to conform to

type. As discussed in Chapter 3, the Getae send an emissary to their god Salmoxis by killing

him; if he fails to deliver his message (by surviving) he is explicitly censured.[233] The blame he

receives suggests that, like all typical emissaries, this messenger is expected to pass along the

message he was given swiftly and reliably. Herodotus is thus able to contrast the bizarre

elements of the sending ritual with the standard frame of typical characterization as well as with

the standard presentation of selection and dispatch.

The first bizarre element of the scene is the manner of the emissary's selection, chosen by

lot (τὸν πάλῳ λαχόντα). Nowhere else in the *Histories* is intentional transmission of a message

left to chance in such a way. Selection is not often discussed, but the explicit identification of

several emissaries as (trust)worthy, often in the superlative, suggests that every effort is made to

---

[232] Cf. Hartog's discussion of narrative style in this passage (104). Salmoxis receives much more thematic attention: his literal and metaphoric "untranslatable" nature (245); his unclear identity (39; 87). Hartog additionally discusses ambiguity in the identity of the narrator (254) and narrative flow reinforcing the idea of distance (104; 131).

[233] The irony, emphasized by Herodotus' repeated used of ἀποθνήσκω, is that an immortal man is punished for not dying.

choose the best man for the job.[234] Beyond the narrative, deliberate selection seems likely to

have been a historical reality also: Mosley (1973, 39) suggests that emissaries (in Athens, at

least) were elected to their positions. Leaving such a position to chance, therefore, is an entirely

alien approach from the perspective of both Greeks and Persians.[235] Aside from this unorthodox

selection, the Getae fail to even send the "right" kind of emissary. As discussed in the typology

of Chapter 1, *theopropoi* are the emissaries who carry messages to (and from) the gods. Thus

both the manner of selection and the reason for dispatch stretch the meaning and customs of

angeloi to their most general limit.

> 4.94.2-3 διὰ πεντετηρίδος δὲ τὸν πάλῳ λαχόντα αἰεὶ σφέων αὐτῶν ἀποπέμπουσι ἄγγελον παρὰ τὸν Σάλμοξιν ἐντελλόμενοι, τῶν ἂν ἑκάστοτε δέωνται. πέμπουσι δὲ ὧδε· οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ταχθέντες ἀκόντια τρία ἔχουσι, ἄλλοι δὲ διαλαβόντες τοῦ ἀποπεμπομένου παρὰ τὸν Σάλμοξιν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας ἀνακινήσαντες αὐτὸν μετέωρον ῥίπτουσι ἐς τὰς λόγχας· ἢν μὲν δὴ ἀποθάνῃ ἀναπαρείς, τοῖσδε ἵλεος ὁ θεὸς δοκέει εἶναι, ἢν δὲ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ, αἰτιῶνται αὐτὸν τὸν ἄγγελον φάμενοί μιν ἄνδρα κακὸν εἶναι, αἰτιησάμενοι δὲ τοῦτον ἄλλον ἀποπέμπουσι· ἐντέλλονται δὲ ἔτι ζῶντι.

> At five-year intervals, they cast lots to choose someone to send to Salmoxis [a deity] as their messenger, with instructions as to what favours they want him to grant on that occasion. This is how they send the messenger. They arrange three lances, with men to hold them, and then others grab the hands and feet of the one being sent to Salmoxis and throw him up into the air and on to the points of the lances. If he dies from being impaled, they regard this as a sign that the god will look favorably on their requests. If he does not die, however, they blame this failure on the messenger himself, call him a bad man, and then find someone else to send. They tell him the message they want him to take to Salmoxis while he is still alive.

Once the random emissary has been selected, he is sent to his destination in equally

bizarre fashion. The internal logic, for the Getae, makes sense: immortal men needing to reach a

god can do so by passing through death. But regardless of cultural consistency, the details of

dispatching this emissary are far from ordinary. In general, the transit of an emissary is rarely

commented upon by Herodotus and the few examples that mention travel seem to emphasize that

---

[234] E.g., Mardonius' reasons for selecting Alexander as an emissary to the Greeks are made abundantly clear (8.136).
[235] Although selection by lot was typical for Athenian offices, this selection method is not shown for any emissary in the *Histories*. The closest exception is Bagaeus' random selection to be responsible for the death of Oroetes, but he decides to assume the role of an emissary for that task; the office is not assigned to him.

a great distance is being covered at high speed. Within that frame, the attention paid to transit here makes sense: surely transit from life to death encompasses a vast journey (if temporally short) worth the maximum non-fanciful description Herodotus can provide. The details of this journey, however, are unlike the details he offers elsewhere. For one thing, the Getan emissary has no agency in his own transit nor is his dispatch accomplished through performative speech. Instead, he is physically flung by his senders onto the path (death by impalement) which will lead him to his recipient.[236]

Assuming he succeeds (by dying), we are presented with three other highly non-typical results. First, it is impossible for Herodotus (or anyone) to verify his arrival. Although the arrival of emissaries is not always presented in the narrative, in general such information is at least possible to represent. Not so here, since there is no way to see beyond life. Second, there is an understood implication that any emissary dispatched will return with a response for his sender. For other emissaries, Herodotus occasionally shows departure from the destination, if not the full return. Since the Getan *angelos* has died, however, he is precluded from bringing back any news about the reception of his message to the still-living. Although the Getae consider his death to be a positive response from Salmoxis, the logical Greek (or astute audience) will realize that successful delivery does not guarantee acceptance of a message. Third, the death of an emissary is the preferred outcome, and it does not lead to dire consequences or represent severe under-negotiation as it does elsewhere in the *Histories* (as discussed in Chapter 4). Thus in nearly every way, we can see that the selection and sending of this emissary is

---

[236] Hartog discusses the inverted use of the lances further (1988, 107): "[The emissary] is tossed onto the points of three javelins or spears, whereas in normal practice the javelins would be thrown at him. Furthermore, the javelins are used in vertical position, whereas normally they are deployed horizontally. The Getae's use of their spears is thus doubly abnormal. The play made with this reversal orients the ritual and perhaps suggests the meaning of its 'otherness'." Hartog's interpretation does not consider the emissary's actions or characteristics, which by my model should play a similarly large role.

inverted from what is customary and expected.[237] The consistency of the inversion suggests that Herodotus is deliberately showing off the cultural distance between the Getae and typical practices of the Persians and Greeks.

It might be tempting for the Greek audience to simply discount this extraordinary custom on the grounds that the Getae operate in a different world from their own, but Herodotus prevents this judgment through his description of the success and failure of the Getan emissary. If the Getan *angelos* dies, his mission is accomplished and he is of no further interest. But if he survives, he has failed and is first censured, then replaced. The Getae's reaction confirms that despite their strange practices, they hold their emissaries to the same standards as everyone else in the ancient world. If speed is paramount for a proper emissary, the failure to die at the appointed moment means that the message cannot be delivered on-schedule and would otherwise have to wait until the emissary dies a natural death, which, given the nature of his injuries, might not be so far off. Yet the Getae do not wait, nor do they re-attempt to send this emissary to Salmoxis. Their decision to censure the survivor and to choose a replacement suggests that his failed first attempt has revealed an unreliable character which is unsuitable for an emissary: he is, in the end, just a "bad man" (ἄνδρα κακὸν). Judgment of this sort indicates that the Getae expect their emissaries to conform to the same typical characterization that we see in the *Histories* as a whole. Against this standard frame, the exceptional elements of their practices are sharply delineated.

The Getae occupy a privileged place in the Scythian *logos* as the first tribe to confront the attacking Persians. As such, they provide the first direct cultural contact for these two cultures and thus set the tone for the audience's understanding of the entire campaign. Since the

---

[237] Another oddity is that this emissary is not sent to facilitate interstate diplomacy; in physical terms he does not even leave his starting point. While it is likely that the Getae did use emissaries to interact with the outside world, Herodotus does not demonstrate that typical employment to his audience.

description of these emissaries occurs within an ethnographic description, the information it contains and the "otherness" it represents are available only to the audience and not to the conquering Persians. We, as the audience, are being cued to see the outlandish nature of the Scythians in a way that Darius and his forces have yet to be introduced to. Not only does this privileged position allow the audience interpretive superiority over the Persians, but it creates a sensitivity to the other inversions of typical practices involving emissaries which follow in the *logos* and prefigure, in some ways, the later Persian invasion of Greece.[238]

The subsequent emissaries in the *logos* generally conform to the expectations set for typical emissary characterization, but the events in which they partake or the nature of their messages are inverted from what we have been led to expect in other parts of the *Histories*. When the Scythians send *angeloi* to their neighbors asking for an alliance against the advancing Persians, nothing about the emissaries themselves stands out as remarkable. They are sent in 4.102, and they arrive and deliver their message in 4.118. A summarizing sentence caps their speech in 4.119 with a cognate verb. None of this is unusual, nor is the way in which the departure and arrival of the emissaries frame an ethnographic digression and orient the audience back to the main story. Thematically, however, this method of asking for help is opposite to the customs of the Greeks and the Persians. The Scythians, a single tribe, have sent emissaries to a collected group of kings asking all of them at once for aid. In the rest of the *Histories*, single cultures send emissaries divergently or sequentially to multiple discrete recipients asking for aid. They do not approach existing meetings of multiple powers.[239] Hartog points to this scene as

---

[238] Hartog (1988, 36-40) lists a series of parallels between events in the Scythian *logos* and later parts of the *Histories*; those events which involve emissaries will be discussed below.   Munson (2001, 107-118) shows parallels between Scythian ethnography and Spartan culture, in particular, as opposed to Hartog's focus on the Athenians.
[239] Single recipients are the norm in the *Histories* for requests relating to assistance and alliances, regardless of the number of senders, recounted below. The closest parallel to the Scythian situation is when the Megarian forces holding off a Persian attack near Mt. Cithaeron (just before the battle of Plataea) send a request to the Greek generals asking for aid, and each state can separately decide to send troops (9.21). The difference is that even

prefiguring the Greek attempt to gain allies in advance of Xerxes' invasion (7.145), suggesting

that the Scythian *logos* needed "to introduce a sequence to occupy the same position as that of

the Athenian ambassadors and to stand in its stead" (1988, 40); he does not consider the

difference between sending emissaries to collected allies and to separate allies. In practical

terms, the difference is inconsequential since either way the message will be delivered and

individual kings can make their own response. But in terms of structure, the inversion of

customary situations involving emissaries continues to build on the "otherness" of the Scythians

which was established in the Getan ethnography. The essential frame is globally consistent with

typical features, but the unexpected situations in which we find emissaries create a subtly

inverted version of the normative Greek world.

The Persian and Scythian forces begin their battle (or, more properly, their chase) in

4.122, thus finally allowing the Persians to see the otherness of those whom they have chosen to

attack. Accordingly, Darius becomes confused and asks a Scythian king, Idanthyrsus, to explain

their tactics and, ideally, reform themselves to act more like the Persians (or, to take Hartog's

interpretation (1988, 49), more like Greek hoplites). Darius confronts Idanthyrsus through a

hippeus who, upon returning with Idanthyrsus' answer, is identified as a *kēryx* (4.126-8). Much

like the Scythian attempt to gain allies, Darius' emissary is himself typical but the situation of

the message is inverted from standard practice.[240] Idanthyrsus is exhorted to choose between

submission and standing his ground to fight and is asked why his forces continuously flee.

Darius is addressing his confusion and directly confronting the nomadic "other" nature of the

Scythians. His request for submission is ordinary, but asking a fleeing enemy to stand and fight

---

though the message is sent to a group of autonomous parties, Pausanias speaks as the leader of all of them. The
neighboring tribes in the Scythian example speak with multiple voices; in all other situations of message responses,
regardless of the number of recipients, the reply is made by a single voice.

[240] The initial identification of the *kēryx* as a *hippeus* is likely thematically motivated. When trying to contact a
swiftly moving force in flight, speed is of the essence and thus a mounted emissary is required.

is highly unusual. Messages sent to foes are more commonly threats meant to intimidate or, on the other side of the spectrum, requests for truces. Military flight typically results in surrender or siege, not an uninterrupted chase. Thus Darius confronts an inverted military situation with an inverted military request, alongside a more traditional suggestion. Idanthyrsus' response is negative in every way: he will not stop fleeing and he will not submit. The direct rejection on both fronts indicates (as expected) an under-negotiation between the Scythians and the Persians which requires further resolution (coming in 4.131ff). The explanation of nomadism brought back to Darius by the *kēryx* evidently is not sufficient to drive home the alien nature of the Scythians and the futility of continued conquest.

Darius' request for earth and water goes unheeded, but not long afterwards the Scythians send him a message in the form of alternate gifts (4.131). These gifts appear to address the unresolved under-negotiation with Idanthyrsus by finally lending Darius the appropriate perspective on his overall situation.

4.131.1-2 πολλάκις δὲ τοιούτου γινομένου, τέλος Δαρεῖός τε ἐν ἀπορίῃσι εἴχετο, καὶ οἱ Σκυθέων βασιλέες μαθόντες τοῦτο ἔπεμπον κήρυκα δῶρα Δαρείῳ φέροντα ὄρνιθά τε καὶ μῦν καὶ βάτραχον καὶ ὀιστοὺς πέντε. Πέρσαι δὲ τὸν φέροντα τὰ δῶρα ἐπειρώτεον τὸν νόον τῶν διδομένων· ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν ἔφη οἱ ἐπεστάλθαι ἄλλο ἢ δόντα τὴν ταχίστην ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι, αὐτοὺς δὲ τοὺς Πέρσας ἐκέλευε, εἰ σοφοί εἰσι, γνῶναι τὸ θέλει τὰ δῶρα λέγειν.

After this had happened a number of times, things were starting to go very badly for Darius. The Scythian kings realized this and sent a herald with gifts for him – a bird, a mouse, a frog, and five arrows. The Persians asked the man who had brought the gifts what the kings meant by them, but he said that all he was supposed to do was hand over the gifts and leave straight away – he had received no further instructions. However, he told the Persians that if they were clever they would work out what the gifts meant.

Two important features stand out in this scene: the behavior of the emissary and the content of the message. The Scythian emissary is, surprisingly, non-typical. He is sent and arrives in normal fashion, but speaks beyond his authority after acknowledging his given limits. This additional communication delays his departure, also violating his charge to be swift. Herodotus

may subtly indicate disapproval for his actions by referring to him only by task and demonstrative once he has been sent, but the lack of any consistent replacement vocabulary (e.g. a name or ethnic adjective) makes this implicit censure (through title-removal) tenuous. No motivation for this inappropriate act is given aside from the Persian inquiry about meaning, but to be fair, the emissary's additional response is quite brief and hardly useful. This caveat may save the *kēryx* from clear censure despite his transgression.

The message itself, however, is a clear situational inversion which follows upon those previously discussed. Darius has requested earth and water and has been denied by Idanthyrsus. Nevertheless, he presumes that the strange gifts from the Scythian kings are a Scythian version of earth and water, when in fact they are the complete opposite: a threat instead of submission.[241] The message is also atypical in being presented through objects in need of interpretation instead of being articulated through intelligible words.[242] Emissaries rarely deliver messages that are not in some way verbal; the only exception is Thrasybulus' advice for Periander (5.92ζ.1-3), communicated through chopping the heads off stalks of grain. In this situation, however, the meaning of the message is easily comprehended by the recipient and is unknown to the emissary himself.[243] Not so for Darius; the situation is exactly reversed. The emissary apparently knows the meaning but will not tell, and Darius' interpretation of the message is completely wrong, fixed only through consultation with others.[244]

The upheaval of traditional order and its implicit danger, as indicated repeatedly to the

---

[241] West (1988, 211): "...the perplexing message contributes powerfully to our sense of imminent disaster and an incalculable foe..."

[242] That is, non-typical from the perspective of the Greeks and, to a lesser extent, of the Persians. For the historicity of messages through objects in this region and the issue of intelligibility, see West (1988).

[243] The gifts from Cambyses to the Ethiopians (3.20) appear to have no hidden message. The bow sent by the Ethiopian king as a gift is meant as a threatening message, but the meaning is explicitly given to the κατάσκοποι along with the object (3.21). Nothing is hidden. Similarly, the tattoos placed on an emissary's head (5.35-6) are concealed by his hair, but the message is clearly communicated once he shaves.

[244] Gobryas recognizes the threat in his interpretation: the Persians will be struck down by Scythian arrows unless they can flee into the sky, ground, or water like birds, mice, or frogs, respectively (4.132).

audience through these unusual scenes with emissaries, is still not quite enough to get through to Darius. The gifts from the Scythians prompt him to reevaluate his strategy and to decide on retreat only in conjunction with the next incident, when the Scythians abandon their battle lines to chase after a hare (4.134). Hartog (1988, 43) explains the hare as a metaphor for the Persians and essentially as a portent for Darius confirming the contempt of the Scythians and the wisdom of retreat. But Hartog does not take into consideration the double persuasion that was necessary: the incident with the hare combined with the proper interpretation of the gifts.[245] Darius needs extra help to see the right solution, and his stubbornness or over-confidence here is reflected in the future assaults by the Persians on Europe.

Neither Darius nor Xerxes takes the lesson they should from the failure in Scythia: Europe is too tough a nut to crack, primarily because of fundamental cultural differences.[246] The nomadism of the Scythians made them a target impossible to hit; for the Greeks, their freedom and chosen unity give them wisdom and military ability beyond what the subjugated Persians are capable of. The cultural contrast is clear to the audience through the placement of these inverted scenes of emissaries, framed by the advance and retreat of the Persians. The Getan ethnography suggests to the audience that things are too alien for the Persians to have a chance; the gifts from the Scythians and the situation with the hare suggest the same conclusion to Darius much later.[247] The importance of the thematic elements of these scenes is emphasized through this ring-compositional structure. Although the Getan emissary may be the most salient point of reference

---

[245] 4.134.1-2 πυθόμενος δέ σφεας τὸν λαγὸν διώκοντας εἶπε ἄρα, πρὸς τούς περ ἐώθεε καὶ τὰ ἄλλα λέγειν· ʽοὗτοι ὦνδρες ἡμέων πολλὸν καταφρονέουσι, καί μοι νῦν φαίνεται Γοβρύης εἰπεῖν περὶ τῶν Σκυθικῶν δώρων ὀρθῶς. ὡς ὦν οὕτως ἤδη δοκεόντων καὶ αὐτῷ μοι ἔχειν, βουλῆς ἀγαθῆς δεῖ, ὅκως ἀσφαλέως ἡ κομιδὴ ἡμῖν ἔσται τὸ ὀπίσω.ʼ – "When [Darius] heard that they were chasing a hare, he told his confidants, 'These Scythians certainly hold us in contempt. I now think that Gobryas' interpretation of their gifts was right, and what we need is a good plan for getting safely back home.'"
[246] For the justification of including Scythia as part of Europe, see Hartog (1988, 30-3).
[247] In addition to not having the benefit of knowing the Getan ethnographic information, Darius is similarly hampered in reaching this conclusion earlier due to his easy conquest of the Getae.

for the audience, the Persians should have taken the gifts of the Scythian kings as an enduring

lesson.

One of the most unusual features of the Scythian gifts to Darius is that they stand in the

stead of the normal earth-and-water tribute. In most situations, it appears that when the Persians

ask for earth and water it is plainly given or denied. Only in two scenes, additional to this one,

does the request result in alternative "gifts", namely the death of the inquiring emissaries. These

scenes may act as reflections of the Scythian events. Megabazus, on behalf of Darius, attempts

to gain earth and water from Macedonia (5.17-21). As discussed in Chapter 3, although the

Macedonian king Amyntas does initially provide earth and water, his son Alexander undoes this

show of submission and substitutes for it the death of the emissaries who accepted it. He even

makes a further replacement, in that he bribes the Persian investigating the emissaries'

disappearance by offering marriage to his sister. The Athenians and Spartans also give

replacement "gifts" to Darius' *kērykes* (7.133) who come asking for earth and water, by giving

them death in a pit and a well instead. The Spartans make the deliberate substitution obvious, by

commanding the emissaries to take their items from the well back to Persia.[248] In both situations,

the events in Scythia are expanded and made more dire. The request for earth and water is met

with a threat that is carried out not only in gifts but in actions. The farther west we move, and

the closer to freedom, the more severe the inversion of the typical earth and water ritual

becomes.

If the Scythian *logos* has trained the audience to recognize inversion and European

"otherness" as toxic to Persian invasion, then these scenes of replaced earth and water should cue

---

[248] 7.133.1: οἱ δ᾽ ἐς φρέαρ ἐμβαλόντες ἐκέλευον γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ ἐκ τούτων φέρειν παρὰ βασιλέα – "the heralds had been hurled ... into a well in Sparta, with the [command] that they fetch earth and water from there to take to the king."

the expectation of Persian failure or, at least, retreat.[249] And so it happens that the Macedonian

scene occurs just before Megabazus leaves Thrace for good. The delay between the Spartan and

Athenian scene and the total Persian flight is much greater, but the effect is also more stark. The

inversion in this scene, already echoing the situation of the Scythian gifts and Darius' retreat, is

juxtaposed with the Persian entry into Greece proper. In a sense, it corresponds structurally with

the Getan ethnography in the narrative, and perhaps represents some of the same thematic

significance. Even though Greek victory is a long way off, it is coming. The Persians have

failed to learn three times from Darius' emissaries that unexpected responses to requests for earth

and water signal foreign cultures which cannot be fully and properly conquered.[250] The

connection between these scenes is reinforced not only through the content but through the

particular treatment of emissaries and messages. Broadly, this treatment demonstrates how

effectively Herodotus can use ethnography in conjunction with the main story to encourage a

thematic awareness in his audience which is applicable not only within a *logos* but throughout

the wider narrative of the *Histories*.

The Personal Logos: Cyrus in Book 1

As we saw in Chapter 2 about Croesus and just above about Themistocles, emissaries and the

language of emissaries can add depth to our understanding of the position of a particular

---

[249] Hartog considers the "cuing" effect of many other scenes, but not this one (1988, 36): "In other words, in relation to the Persians, the Scythians resemble what the Athenians were in relation to those same Persians. This recurrent analogy, which serves as a model of intelligibility for the Scythian expedition, results in the Scythians, in this instance, being turned into Athenians of a kind. That being so, all we need to do is explicitly to establish the connections between the two expeditions, noting a number of references from one to the other that force one to read the first as a rehearsal for the second." West is more conservative (2002, 439): "In the manner of their resistance the Scythians to some extent prefigure the Athenian role in the defeat of Xerxes; but Herodotus does not alert us to this partial parallel, and there is a danger of over-emphasizing its importance for his thought." It is true that Herodotus never makes an explicit connection, but the consistency of his approach towards emissaries and messages suggests that when they appear in related contexts, they may cue the recognition of a pattern.

[250] This inability is due, in part, to the extreme cultural differences in governance and submission. The Persians fail to understand that for free people, submission to Persia is like a willing enslavement to be avoided at all costs. (Expressed with regard to Sparta directly by Demaratus to Xerxes in 7.102).

individual in relation to other powers concerning a particular sequence of events. The *logos* of

Cyrus, in Book 1, uses the features of emissaries beyond a single scene or even a sequence of

scenes, and instead allows them to characterize Cyrus' entire life, from birth to death, and even

his personal character. Although the life of Cyrus has been examined previously with an eye for

structure and theme (e.g. Immerwahr 1966, Avery 1972), the role and placement of emissaries in

it has escaped notice. By adding an awareness of them into the analysis of Cyrus' life, a more

fruitful understanding of the focal elements of his *logos*, his presence in Croesus' *logos*, and the

parallels with the surrounding *logoi* are made possible.

It is prudent to start with what scholarship has already pointed out about Cyrus' *logos*,

and then to show in what ways the presence and the language of emissaries add to those

analyses. In terms of basic narrative structure, the symmetry and duality of Cyrus' story has

been noted by Immerwahr and Avery. Avery (1972), in particular, identifies many doublets

throughout Cyrus' story which Herodotus can use to establish a context which eases the use of

larger thematic dualities.[251] Avery also discusses several ways in which Cyrus' character is

inverted once he takes power and how his actions and characterization at the end of his rule are

similar to Croesus' at the beginning of his own reign.[252] Immerwahr (1966) is concerned more

generally with the narrative structure of Cyrus' *logos* (origin, quick consolidation of power, and

---

[251] Avery (1972, 536 n.15): "Duality plays an important role in the story Herodotus chooses to tell about Cyrus' early life. First, Herodotus makes much of Delphi's riddle about Cyrus' being a mule (55, 2) with the explanation that Cyrus was born of unequal parents [1.91.5-6]. More significant, however, are the dualities found in the story of Cyrus' birth and how he survived to become king of Persia. Cyrus had two lives, for all had thought he had died of exposure soon after birth. At [1.124.1] Harpagus reminds Cyrus that Astyages is his murderer, so Cyrus is in the unique position of being able to avenge his own murder. Furthermore, Cyrus has two sets of parents: Mandane and Cambyses, and Spako and Mitradates. Cyrus becomes king twice: once while a child [1.114] and once again when grown (Astyages and the magi accept the legitimacy of the first kingship: [1.120.2-6]). Cyrus has two names, though we are not told what his name as the shepherd's son was [1.113.3]. Finally, in a sense, Cyrus is a twin, for Spako's still-born child [1.112.2-113.3] was virtually his exact contemporary. The dead child takes Cyrus' place in the coffin and receives the royal burial meant for Cyrus. These dualities set the stage for the larger dualities discussed below."
[252] Avery (1972, 536ff). His main argument is that Cyrus is presented initially as intelligent, a good evaluator of advice, restrained, and with a healthy respect for the gods and the consequences of his actions; when he takes power in Persia and begins his campaigns, all these aspects turn into their opposites with their culmination in his botched attack on the Massagetae.

lengthy exposition of reign ending in defeat or decline) (76) and shows its similarity to Croesus'

logos (88-9). The more careful exegesis on motifs (89-93 and 161-7) does not consider

emissaries in any way.[253] Wood (1972, 51-56) focuses on narrative and thematic parallels

between Cyrus' campaigns against Babylon and the Massagetae. Konstan (1983) explores the

symmetric elements between Cyrus' relationships with Astyages and Tomyris. He sees many

"structural analogies" (9), such as the parallel dreams about succession leading to violence

against children and violations of the limits between bestiality and humanity (expressed through

cannibalism and blood-dunking) (8-10). These scholars separate, at a minimum, Cyrus'

childhood from his campaigns, meaning that the transition from exile to ruler is a vital dividing

line, structurally, for the story. But these analyses do not consider explicitly how this division is

blurred by the fact that Cyrus is introduced to us on campaign (against Croesus) before we hear

of his birth, childhood, and seizure of power. For these events, just as for his eventual death,

emissaries play a key role in demarcating sections, providing connection through the narrative,

and highlighting important themes.

Cyrus makes his first appearance in the *Histories* as part of Croesus' *logos*, in the long

lead-up to Croesus' defeat and capture at Sardis (1.46-91). Cyrus' agency increases as his

presence in the *logos* does, but Croesus remains the overall focus. Indeed, we see Cyrus for the

first time only obliquely: Croesus is concerned about the fact that Alyattes was overthrown and

Cyrus' identity is practically buried at the end of a long clause:

1.46.1 μετὰ δὲ ἡ Ἀστυάγεος τοῦ Κυαξάρεω ἡγεμονίη καταιρεθεῖσα ὑπὸ Κύρου τοῦ
Καμβύσεω καὶ τὰ τῶν Περσέων πρήγματα αὐξανόμενα πένθεος μὲν Κροῖσον ἀπέπαυσε, ἐνέβησε
δὲ ἐς φροντίδα, εἴ κως δύναιτο, πρὶν μεγάλους γενέσθαι τοὺς Πέρσας, καταλαβεῖν αὐτῶν
αὐξανομένην τὴν δύναμιν.
When <u>Cyrus the son of Cambyses</u> deprived Astyages the son of Cyaxares of his power,
the growing might of the Persian caused Croesus to put aside his grief and he began to wonder

---

[253] Emissaries are barely mentioned in summaries of events, much less the analysis, e.g., we hear briefly that there
were Greek embassies to Cyrus (Ionian and Spartan, in a nice symmetry) (1966, 89).

whether there might be a way for him to restrain the growing power of the Persian before it became too great.

Astyages' rule and his recent demotion take precedence over the author of that change, and Croesus' position as the subject of the main clause (ἐνέβησε) confirms that the opening temporal clause is important narratologically as a motivation for Croesus' following actions, not as a simple statement of events. The situation is similar in 1.54 when Croesus (having heard an apparently positive oracle from Delphi) decides to try to overthrow Cyrus.

> 1.54.1 ἐπείτε δὲ ἀνενειχθέντα τὰ θεοπρόπια ἐπύθετο ὁ Κροῖσος, ὑπερήσθη τε τοῖσι χρηστηρίοισι, πάγχυ τε ἐλπίσας καταλύσειν <u>τὴν Κύρου βασιληίην</u>...
>
> When Croesus heard the answers his men brought back, he was delighted with the oracles and was convinced that he would destroy <u>Cyrus' empire</u>.

The main focus is on Croesus, with Cyrus shunted into the Remainder of a participial clause.[254]

When Cyrus finally does start to get some agency (as the subject of a main verb) in 1.73, the main issue is still his role as the deposer of Astyages and hence a threat to Croesus:

> 1.73.1-2 ἐστρατεύετο δὲ ὁ Κροῖσος ἐπὶ τὴν Καππαδοκίην τῶνδε εἵνεκα, καὶ γῆς ἱμέρῳ προσκτήσασθαι πρὸς τὴν ἑωυτοῦ μοῖραν βουλόμενος καὶ μάλιστα τῷ χρηστηρίῳ πίσυνος ἐὼν καὶ <u>τίσασθαι θέλων ὑπὲρ Ἀστυάγεος Κῦρον</u>. Ἀστυάγεα γὰρ τὸν Κυαξάρεω ἐόντα Κροίσου μὲν γαμβρόν, Μήδων δὲ βασιλέα, <u>Κῦρος ὁ Καμβύσεω καταστρεψάμενος εἶχε</u>, γενόμενον γαμβρὸν Κροίσῳ ὧδε.
>
> The main reasons for Croesus' invasion of Cappadocia, in addition to the fact that his desire for land led him to want to increase his share of territory, were his faith in the oracle and his wish to punish Cyrus for what had happened to Astyages. Astyages the son of Cyaxares was Croesus' brother-in-law and the king of the Medes, and Cyrus the son of Cambyses had defeated him and was holding him captive.

In this passage and in the situation summary in 1.75, Cyrus' agency is limited not only by the fact that his importance is subsumed by that of Croesus for the *logos*, but also by the fact that he

---

[254] Recall from Chapter 2 that the Remainder is the least pragmatically marked portion of a sentence, occurring after the Topic, Focus, and Verb. Cyrus is similarly rendered unimportant pragmatically in 1.71.1, where he is mentioned in the Remainder of a relative clause (itself in the Remainder of the main sentence), and shares nearly equal prominence with the Persians as a whole who are mentioned there also: Κροῖσος δὲ ἁμαρτὼν τοῦ χρησμοῦ ἐποιέετο στρατηίην ἐς Καππαδοκίην, ἐλπίσας καταιρήσειν <u>Κῦρόν</u> τε καὶ τὴν Περσέων δύναμιν – "Meanwhile, due to his misunderstanding of the oracle, Croesus invaded Cappadocia, on the assumption that he would depose <u>Cyrus</u> and destroy the Persian empire."

does not progress in activity in any way from the time he was first introduced. His actions

relevant to Croesus are static: all we know of him is that he overthrew Alyattes and is keeping

him alive, which is unchanged from the situation in 1.46.[255] But in 1.76, Croesus finally sets in

motion his attack against Cyrus and, probably not coincidentally (for pragmatic and

foreshadowing reasons), Cyrus gains prominence, agency, and our first emissaries show up.

Despite Croesus' prior preparations and intentions, the narrative does not actually present

his invasion of Cappadocia until 1.76, when he has crossed the Halys river and sets up camp in

anticipation of his battle with Cyrus. The way in which crossing boundaries like rivers serves as

a metaphor for over-extension and avarice throughout the *Histories* is well documented, and

Croesus' actions here are no exception.[256] The physical actions which will set the stage for his

downfall have been set in motion; accordingly, Cyrus finally begins to come into his own as an

active character in the narrative. Croesus' activities in Cappadocia (Pteria, to be precise) are

followed immediately by Cyrus' own preparations for battle, the first time we see him in action

as a conqueror. He first gathers his troops and then attempts to gain allies, just as Croesus had

done in 1.69 by approaching Sparta. Where Croesus was successful, however, Cyrus fails.

Nonetheless, he attacks. The syntax, in contrast to what we have seen before, notably places

Cyrus front and center. Croesus is still present (as he should be in his own *logos*) but is losing

prominence.

1.76.2-4 Κῦρος δὲ ἀγείρας τὸν ἑωυτοῦ στρατὸν καὶ παραλαβὼν τοὺς μεταξὺ οἰκέοντας
πάντας ἠντιοῦτο Κροίσῳ· πρὶν δὲ ἐξελαύνειν ὁρμῆσαι τὸν στρατόν, **πέμψας κήρυκας ἐς τοὺς**
Ἴωνας ἐπειρᾶτό σφεας ἀπὸ Κροίσου ἀπιστάναι. Ἴωνες μέν νυν οὐκ ἐπείθοντο, Κῦρος δὲ ὡς
ἀπίκετο καὶ ἀντεστρατοπεδεύσατο Κροίσῳ, ἐνθαῦτα ἐν τῇ Πτερίῃ χώρῃ ἐπειρῶντο κατὰ τὸ

---

[255] The static nature of this situation stands out in contrast to Herodotus' typical narrative pattern of summarizing
and then adding to that summary, as discussed by Lang (1984, 5): "And many of the cases of so-called ring-
composition should perhaps be better seen as a kind of spiraling forward, since the wrap-up statement does more
than echo the beginning statement; it very frequently builds on the first statement by using material from the
digression to make a new directional statement, thus moving the narrative forward rather than coming back to the
same place." Here, no "spiraling" happens with respect to Cyrus.

[256] E.g., Immerwahr (1966), Lateiner (1989).

ἰσχυρὸν ἀλλήλων. μάχης δὲ καρτερῆς γενομένης καὶ πεσόντων ἀμφοτέρων πολλῶν τέλος
οὐδέτεροι νικήσαντες διέστησαν νυκτὸς ἐπελθούσης. καὶ τὰ μὲν στρατόπεδα ἀμφότερα οὕτως
ἠγωνίσατο.

     Meanwhile, Cyrus mustered his army and went to meet Croesus, conscripting all the
inhabitants of the regions he passed through on the way. Before setting off with his army on this
expedition, **he had sent messengers to the Ionians and tried to incite them to rebel against
Croesus, but the Ionians had refused to listen**. Anyway, Cyrus reached Pteria and positioned
his army opposite Croesus' camp, so Pteria was the site of the trial of strength between the two
armies. A fierce battle took place, with heavy losses on both sides, but by nightfall, when the
two armies separated, neither side had won.

This scene occurs at a decisive moment for Croesus and Cyrus, just before their first military

clash which will result in a complete shift in the regional balance of power. Despite the fact that

we are still within Croesus' *logos*, from this point on Cyrus' importance (and military power)

will come to dominate the shape and tone of events. The presentation of Cyrus in the narrative

demonstrates his burgeoning influence. Cyrus takes the Topic position at the start of this passage

(Κῦρος δέ), in contrast to Croesus who previously held that position.[257] His military prowess is

hinted at by the references to his army and aggression. His side of this affair is much condensed,

compared to the treatment given to Croesus' gathering of troops and allies, but this difference

can be attributed to the fact that, regardless of who is surging in power, we are still nominally in

Croesus' *logos*.

    At this pivotal point in the *logos*, building up to the first clash of powers, Herodotus

provides us with the extra thematic marker of a sending scene with official emissaries. The

sequence is in the expected order with nearly all of the pieces given explicitly: sending,

emissaries, destination, purpose. Both the sender and the motivation are easily inferred from

context, which allows more attention to be paid to the connection being made here between Ionia

and Cyrus. The scene of dispatch is relatively robust, signaling a narrative shift to the

destination (which does occur, however briefly, in that we see the Ionian point of view in the

---

[257] Capital descriptors like "Topic" indicate the pragmatic categories introduced in Chapter 2.

next sentence). The brevity of our time in Ionia and the stark rejection of Cyrus' request (Ἴωνες μέν νυν οὐκ ἐπείθοντο) signal an under-negotiation of status (*per* Chapter 4) which will need to be resolved. Thus, even though we promptly leave Ionia and are returned to the matter at hand between Croesus and Cyrus, we can be certain that Herodotus is cuing a later interaction between Cyrus and Ionia to resolve the misunderstanding represented here.[258] Furthermore, the choice of emissary vocabulary may be another signal of Cyrus' ascendant power. *Kērykes*, as we recall from Chapter 1, are generally sent from strong to weak powers (relatively speaking) and especially by easterners. Cyrus' decision to send *kērykes* (or Herodotus' decision to represent ambiguous emissaries as *kērykes*) may therefore reflect his higher status or be a way for him to claim that status through his actions (or for Herodotus to forecast his eventual success). In sum, this dispatch of emissaries prepares the audience for a temporary location shift, points to Cyrus' elevated status, and plants a seed for future interactions between Cyrus and Ionia through the rejection of his message. It stands out structurally by virtue of occurring at the inception of Cyrus' battle against Croesus and his domination of Lydia, and also through its general symmetry to the preparations of Croesus. Finally, as we shall see, it begins the process of connecting emissaries as a theme to the life and events of Cyrus. This brief passage provides him with only two resources, both of which will be vital to his ascension and rule: army (στρατόν) and emissaries (κήρυκας).

Once the battle is joined, Croesus quickly becomes the main focus of the *logos* again, and we are treated much more extensively to his perspective on, and reactions to, the battle. Retreating to Sardis, he calls upon his allies to assist him and then requests interpretation of an omen (1.77-8). In 1.79 we return to Cyrus' point of view and actions again.[259] This time in

---

[258] Resolution comes in 1.141, discussed below.
[259] This passage is also discussed in Chapter 3, from the perspective of characterization.

addition to giving Cyrus the initial Focus position, Herodotus also shows us Cyrus' point of view

by allowing him to focalize his plans. These few sentences set up Cyrus' military response and

immediately lead into the second clash of powers, this one much greater and (as it will turn out)

much more devastating for Croesus. At this second pivotal point of contact, we are again shown

Cyrus linked with an emissary, this time much more intimately.

1.79.1-2 <u>Κῦρος δὲ</u> αὐτίκα ἀπελαύνοντος Κροίσου μετὰ τὴν μάχην τὴν γενομένην ἐν τῇ
Πτερίῃ μαθών, ὡς ἀπελάσας μέλλοι Κροῖσος διασκεδᾶν τὸν στρατόν, <u>βουλευόμενος εὕρισκε</u>
<u>πρῆγμά οἱ εἶναι ἐλαύνειν ὡς δύναιτο τάχιστα ἐπὶ τὰς Σάρδις πρὶν ἢ τὸ δεύτερον ἁλισθῆναι τῶν</u>
<u>Λυδῶν τὴν δύναμιν</u>. ὡς δέ οἱ ταῦτα ἔδοξε, καὶ ἐποίεε κατὰ τάχος, ἐλάσας γὰρ τὸν στρατὸν ἐς τὴν
Λυδίην **αὐτὸς ἄγγελος Κροίσῳ ἐληλύθεε**. ἐνθαῦτα Κροῖσος ἐς ἀπορίην πολλὴν ἀπιγμένος, ὥς
οἱ παρὰ δόξαν ἔσχε τὰ πρήγματα ἢ ὡς αὐτὸς κατεδόκεεν, ὅμως τοὺς Λυδοὺς ἐξῆγε ἐς μάχην.

As soon as Croesus withdrew his troops after the battle in Pteria, Cyrus learnt that he
intended to disband his men. <u>After some thought, he realized that he had better march as quickly</u>
<u>as possible on Sardis, before the Lydian forces could gather for the second time</u>. No sooner had
he come to this decision than he put it into action and marched into Lydia. **He himself was the**
messenger through whom Croesus heard of his arrival. This put Croesus into an impossible
situation, because things had not gone according to his expectations; nevertheless, he led his
troops out to battle.

The identification of Cyrus as his own *angelos* is unmatched by any other scene with emissaries

in the *Histories*, although it is echoed at 1.127 (discussed below). If Cyrus is being

characterized, rather explicitly, as an official emissary, the natural question is how he upholds

the "typical" characterization expected of the position. The obvious element is that of speed,

which is stressed throughout this passage in vocabulary (αὐτίκα, ὡς...τάχιστα, κατὰ τάχος) and

context, and contrasts with the long-term plans of Croesus. Cyrus, through the title of *angelos*,

embodies the speed of his army and physically moves the narrative to Lydia and to Croesus. In

addition, the fact that he arrives without a typical dispatch scene emphasizes the surprise that

Croesus must feel at his unexpected arrival: the narrative has not prepared him or the audience to

expect the arrival of an emissary at this moment. More abstractly, Cyrus embodies the reliability

of the "message" he is delivering: there is no escaping his military superiority or Croesus'

eventual defeat. Once again at a crucial point of contact, Cyrus is connected with two key resources: his army (στρατόν) and emissaries (ἄγγελος). In the latter case, he is his own best resource, emphasized by the subject pronoun αὐτός.[260] Herodotus is once again the focalizer for this scene and thus he ascribes these qualities to Cyrus, presumably for all of the effects mentioned. In sum, this scene strengthens Cyrus' place in the narrative through the use of focalization and the vocabulary of emissaries at the moment when he is about to engage in battle with Croesus for the second and final time. It also creates a strong thematic connection between Cyrus and emissaries which will continue into Cyrus' own *logos*.

From this point on, the balance of power shifts rapidly. Croesus is quickly pushed behind the walls of Sardis (1.80);[261] fourteen days later Cyrus' forces breach the walls and capture him before Croesus' allies have time to respond (1.81-84).[262] Through these actions, Cyrus has obtained a position of complete authority within Croesus' *logos*. Croesus, by contrast, must be saved from certain death twice by the intervention of others; he has lost agency along with power.[263] His newly-reduced political status is reinforced by his new occupation as Cyrus' slave and advisor (1.89-90). The *logos* closes, in ring-compositional style, with an explanation from Delphi about the oracle which encouraged Croesus to start his campaign against Cyrus (1.91). Thus in every step of Croesus' decline from king to slave, Cyrus' presence is felt. Although everything he does is relevant to Croesus in some way, his actions and presentation also serve to

---

[260] Avery (1972, 537) argues that Cyrus' ascension is marked by positive qualities in a ruler, including good ideas and judgment; the intrinsic qualities of (typical) emissaries bestowed on Cyrus when he is described as his own *angelos* may be another positive quality. It is notable that in this same passage Cyrus is shown to evaluate and deliberate (correctly, as it turns out) about the situation. Even though such actions might not be suitable for regular emissaries to undertake, Cyrus is certainly no ordinary emissary in this scene, and his identification as such falls aptly into a scene of arrival.

[261] The nascent power and victory for Cyrus may be indicated in part by Herodotus' description of him as frightened in 1.80 (cf. Darius' fear of Intaphrenes as discussed in Chapter 4).

[262] For a discussion of the emissaries from Croesus (1.81-83) and their thematic connection to his defeat, see Chapter 2.

[263] In 1.85, Croesus' mute son, as predicted by the Pythia, speaks to save his life. In 1.87, he prays to Apollo for rain to save him from being burnt alive on a pyre once he realizes that Cyrus has changed his mind about putting him to death.

establish his character and relevant themes for the full-fledged *logos* about him which follows.[264]

In 1.108, Cyrus is born and almost immediately condemned to death by Astyages. He is saved from this fate overtly by the herdsman and his wife (1.110-3), but the circumstances are facilitated again by what will prove to be Cyrus' two main strengths: emissaries and military forces. Astyages does not want to kill Cyrus himself and passes the task off to Harpagus as a proxy. When Harpagus also passes off the task, this time to an individual who will save Cyrus' life, he initiates contact through an emissary:

> 1.110.1: ταῦτα εἶπε καὶ **αὐτίκα ἄγγελον ἔπεμπε** ἐπὶ τῶν βουκόλων τῶν Ἀστυάγεος, τὸν ἠπίστατο νομάς τε ἐπιτηδεοτάτας νέμοντα καὶ ὄρεα θηριωδέστατα, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Μιτραδάτης. συνοίκεε δὲ ἑωυτοῦ συνδούλη,...
> No sooner said than done. **He sent a message** to a man called Mitradates, who of all Astyages' herdsmen was the one who, Harpagus knew, pastured his cattle in countryside that particularly suited his purpose – that is, in mountains full of wild animals.

The *angelos* is completely generic in this scene and provides only functional benefits to the narrative: he signals our transition to the countryside for a quick description and delineates a vital moment, yet again, for Cyrus. The summoned shepherd will save his life. Cyrus' survival also hinges on the favorable use of military power. Harpagus uses spear-carriers to verify the death of the infant "Cyrus", and the faulty observation of these military figures allows him to survive.[265]

Cyrus' rise to power is equally marked by military force and emissaries several times over. Cyrus' true birth is revealed when he comes to the attention of Astyages for his actions

---

[264] Even though the *logoi* of Croesus and Cyrus follow the narrative pattern identified by Immerwahr (1966) for rulers (origin, ascension, rule, decline), Cyrus' strong presence in Croesus' *logos* suggests that the boundaries between *logoi* are more permeable than Immerwahr suggests.

[265] 1.113.3: πέμψας δὲ ὁ Ἅρπαγος τῶν ἑωυτοῦ δορυφόρων τοὺς πιστοτάτους εἶδέ τε διὰ τούτων καὶ ἔθαψε τοῦ βουκόλου τὸ παιδίον, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐτέθαπτο, τὸν δὲ ὕστερον τούτων Κῦρον ὀνομασθέντα παραλαβοῦσα ἔτρεφε ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ βουκόλου, οὔνομα ἄλλο κού τι καὶ οὐ Κῦρον θεμένη. – "Harpagus sent his most trusted personal guards, and they carried out an inspection on his behalf and buried the herdsman's child. So the one child lay in his grave, while the other – the one who was later called Cyrus – was adopted and brought up by the herdsman's wife, although she called him something else, not Cyrus." The danger of sending anyone other than spies to perform visual verification tasks is discussed in Chapter 3.

while playing with other children. The story of Cyrus playing at being king is told twice, once

focalized (in the narrative) by Herodotus (1.114) and once focalized (in direct discourse) by

Astyages (1.120). As mentioned above, Avery (1972, 536 n.15) notes that the Magi and

Astyages accept Cyrus as king among the boys (1.120.2-6), mirroring the later kingship he will

hold over Persia. This moment of play, then, is defining for Cyrus both for the future it reflects

and for its role in bringing him to Astyages' attention and restoring him to his birthright. Not

surprisingly, we discover that in both presentations of his acts as "king", spear bearers and

emissaries are present and in fact are the only occupations listed in both tellings.

> 1.114.2: ὁ δὲ αὐτῶν διέταξε τοὺς μὲν οἰκίας <οἱ> οἰκοδομέειν, <u>τοὺς δὲ δορυφόρους</u> εἶναι, τὸν δέ κού τινα αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμὸν βασιλέος εἶναι, <u>τῷ δέ τινι τὰς ἀγγελίας ἐσφέρειν ἐδίδου γέρας</u> ὡς ἑκάστῳ ἔργον προστάσσων.
> He gave them various jobs to do: some built houses, <u>some formed his bodyguard</u>, one of them was the King's Eye, and <u>one of them was privileged enough to be allowed to bring messages in to him</u>. To each he assigned a task.

> 1.120.2: ὁ δὲ πάντα, ὅσα περ οἱ ἀληθέι λόγῳ βασιλέες, ἐτελέωσε ποιήσας· καὶ γὰρ <u>δορυφόρους</u> καὶ θυρωροὺς καὶ <u>ἀγγελιηφόρους</u> καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα διατάξας ἦρχε.
> He accomplished everything by acting just like a real king. He gave everyone their various jobs to do – as his <u>bodyguards</u>, porters, <u>heralds [*lit.* message-bearers]</u>, and so on – and ruled over them.

 Neither the spear bearers nor the message carriers perform any action, they simply are listed as

(evidently) vital components of a king's household along with builders, spies, and porters.[266]

They are quite possibly the most important elements of retaining power. A king needs to make

his will known (through emissaries) and enforced (through military), and he additionally needs

the protection that each provides, by separating the king from direct danger. The presence of

such characters at this point in the narrative confirms their important relationship, thematically,

with Cyrus and his rule.

Actual kingship does not come for Cyrus until he is spurred to action by Harpagus.

---

[266] For the historical positions given here and further references, see Asheri (*ad loc.*).

Cyrus, now an adult in Persia, is approached indirectly by Harpagus with a plan to overthrow Astyages. Harpagus' communication of this idea to Cyrus and Cyrus' execution of Harpagus' plan depend on written messages.[267] The lack of official emissaries at this important juncture may be due to the illicit and covert nature of the messages described. Harpagus' call for a revolt is likely the most famous message in the *Histories*, due its singular status of being cleverly concealed and delivered in a hare (1.123-4). Great attention is drawn to this message by several means, all of which are fully described: its cunning delivery, the act of writing and reading it (instead of a more usual messenger speech), and Harpagus' traitorous motivations.[268] Cyrus' reaction is treated in equal detail, if more briefly, and mirrors the actions of Harpagus: he deliberates, writes a message, and then "delivers" it to his target audience (1.125). As discussed in Chapter 3, Cyrus goes to great lengths to convince the Persian troops that his invented letter is genuine and reliable.[269] His showmanship is the inverse of Harpagus': whereas Harpagus' elaborate display (of the hare) is intended to hide his message from Astagyes' power,[270] Cyrus' display is intended to co-opt publicly Astyages' power for himself. The thematic changes between the two corresponding messages confirm that power and the focus of the narrative are passing from concealment to brazenness, from Media to Persia, from old to young, and from underling to ruler.[271]

The lead-up to the battle between Cyrus and Astyages in many ways parallels the initial

---

[267] These messages are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

[268] For the differences between oral and written message, see Chapter 1.

[269] In particular, he takes great care to unroll the letter in front of them, as discussed in Chapter 3.

[270] Cf. Asheri (*ad loc.*) for Astyages' control of the roads.

[271] The concealment of Cyrus as a baby and then as a young man in Persia (out of sight, out of mind) is taken up by the concealment of the message in the hare. Cyrus embodies a new brazenness in his openly-visible counterfeit letter and this subsequent military strike. The transition from Media to Persia is also two-fold. In the narrative, Cyrus' *logos* so far has taken place in Media and does not shift locations to Persia until Harpagus' message carries us there. In terms of power, the messages of Harpagus and Cyrus begin the shift of power away from Astyages and towards Cyrus. Similarly, Harpagus and Astyages represent the older generation, and Cyrus the younger. Finally, Harpagus and Cyrus have both been, to this point, obedient subjects to Astyages' rule; their revolt is a rejection of that status. Even though Harpagus will remain subservient to Cyrus, his gloating words to Astyages (1.129) show that he considers himself the power behind Cyrus' success.

battle between Cyrus and Croesus. The preparations again consist of consolidating an army and

gaining allies (1.125-6), and speed is stressed as an important factor for this revolt.[272] Cyrus'

first contact with Astyages mirrors his first contact with Croesus on the field of battle: both are

accomplished through emissaries. In the case of Croesus, the speed of Cyrus' actions was

embodied through his identification as his own *angelos*; here the speed of his actions may recall

that identification even though it is not explicitly given a second time.[273] In a reversal of what

happened before, the established ruler (Astyages) sends an emissary to Cyrus, but the essential

result again focuses on speed:

> 1.127.1-2 Ἀστυάγης δὲ ὡς ἐπύθετο Κῦρον ταῦτα πρήσσοντα, πέμψας ἄγγελον ἐκάλεε
> αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ Κῦρος ἐκέλευε τὸν ἄγγελον ἀπαγγέλλειν, ὅτι πρότερον ἥξοι παρ' ἐκεῖνον ἢ
> Ἀστυάγης αὐτὸς βουλήσεται.
>
> When Astyages found out what Cyrus was up to, he sent a message ordering him to
> appear before him. Cyrus told the messenger, however, to inform Astyages that he would come
> sooner than Astyages wanted.

The emissary here, as before, deals directly with a meeting of Cyrus and his enemy. The speed

with which Cyrus is imbued is made clear again through his confident response, and particularly

the word αὐτός. In 1.79 this term reinforced Cyrus' identity as a speedy and reliable emissary;

here, it is used to emphasize Astyages' lack of preparation for Cyrus' speed and (inevitable)

conquest. Astyages lacks proper mental preparation in that he does not understand the danger

posed by Cyrus. The language and events throughout this brief scene emphasize his

misunderstanding. Sending an *angelos* is a more neutral act than sending a *kēryx*, but

summoning someone (ἐκάλεε) typically indicates a large differential in status.[274] Cyrus'

---

[272] Harpagus' initial message urges quick action (1.124.3: ὡς ὦν ἑτοίμου τοῦ γε ἐνθάδε ἐόντος ποίεε ταῦτα καὶ ποίεε κατὰ τάχος – "Everything is ready here, then, so do as I suggest – and don't delay.") as does Cyrus' speech to his allied Persian tribes (1.126.6: ἀπίστασθε ἀπ' Ἀστυάγεος τὴν ταχίστην – "There is no time to waste: rise up against Astyages!").

[273] Oddly enough, in chronological terms the battle with Astyages happens before the battle with Croesus, yet the two are recounted in reverse order. Hence this later part of the narrative mirrors an earlier portion, even though it occurs out of temporal sequence.

[274] As discussed in Chapter 4.

response is an ironic acceptance of Astyages' demand: he is coming, but on his own terms and in his own time. This implicit rejection allows Cyrus to fight back against the assumptions of Astyages and to expose the under-negotiation of their relationship. He further asserts his authority by co-opting the ability to command Alyattes' emissary (ἐκέλευε τὸν ἄγγελον ἀπαγγέλλειν) instead of issuing a simple reply.[275] Once again, at a pivotal moment of diplomatic contact, Herodotus uses emissaries as a strong thematic element of Cyrus' continuing rise to power and a signal of his upcoming success.

Immediately following this confrontation, the forces of Cyrus and Astyages fight, although a large part of Cyrus' victory is realized through defection (1.127-8). Cyrus is confirmed as a conqueror at the end, and the second portion of his *logos*, the acquisition of power, is closed with a Persian ethnography (1.129-140). When the main story returns to Cyrus' rule in 1.141, the narrative finally deals with the unresolved situation of 1.76 and Cyrus' relationship with Ionia. At that point, when Cyrus was collecting his forces and hoping to persuade Ionia to revolt from Croesus, we saw Cyrus taking action as a force to be reckoned with for the first time. Here in 1.141, we see his first actions as a ruler and once again they involve Ionia and emissaries. When the Ionians and Aeolians send their messengers, they accept that Cyrus has supplanted Croesus' authority over them. But this acknowledgement is not sufficient to rectify the under-negotiation of 1.76. Cyrus does not simply replace Croesus but rather exceeds him, and the Ionians are instructed accordingly. Cyrus' rejection of their emissaries' message (reaffirming that they still do not understand the extent of his power) comes with doubled explanation. Cyrus provides a parable (about fish refusing to dance for a piper until circumstances compel them), which Herodotus further explains in the narrative by drawing an

---

[275] Similarly, Pan commands Philippides to ἀπαγγέλλειν his message to the Athenians (6.105.2). His authority cannot be (and is not) questioned.

explicit connection between the under-negotiations of 1.76 and 1.141:

1.141.3-4 Κῦρος μὲν τοῦτον τὸν λόγον τοῖσιν Ἴωσι καὶ τοῖσι Αἰολεῦσι τῶνδε εἵνεκα ἔλεξε, ὅτι δὴ οἱ Ἴωνες πρότερον αὐτοῦ Κύρου δεηθέντος δι᾽ ἀγγέλων ἀπίστασθαί σφεας ἀπὸ Κροίσου οὐκ ἐπείθοντο, τότε δὲ κατεργασμένων τῶν πρηγμάτων ἦσαν ἕτοιμοι πείθεσθαι Κύρῳ. ὁ μὲν δὴ ὀργῇ ἐχόμενος ἔλεγέ σφι τάδε·

The reason Cyrus told this story to the Ionians and Aeolians <u>was that the Ionians had in fact refused to listen to Cyrus earlier, when he had sent a message asking them to rise up against Croesus,</u> whereas now that the war was over and won, they were ready to do what he wanted. So that was his angry response to them.

Herodotus' second recounting of the rejected request uses slightly different vocabulary, changing the main verb of the request from ἐπειρᾶτο to δεηθέντος and the emissary type from κήρυκας to ἀγγέλων. In both cases, the vocabulary seems to have been "downgraded" to more generic terminology which allows Herodotus to focus more on the fact of rejection than on the details of the request. At the same time, by expressing the contact as occurring through *angeloi*, Herodotus may be again hinting at their association with Cyrus and thereby suggesting that the Ionian rejection of his request was, in essence, a rejection of himself.[276] The reaction of the Ionians here (calling upon Sparta for aid) shows that they finally understand the full might of Cyrus and their relatively low status, even lower than it was under Croesus. The shared understanding of Cyrus and the Ionians indicates that under-negotiation caused by the Ionian rejection in 1.76 has been finally resolved.

Cyrus' rejection of the Ionian request in 1.141 is escalated by his rejection of the Spartans in 1.153. Unlike the Ionians, the Spartans do not come meekly with *angeloi* but send a *kēryx* making demands.[277] Cyrus' condescending rejection of their request parallels his rejection of the Ionians. The subsequent Persian rampage around Ionia (led by Harpagus 1.163-176) engenders

---

[276] All emissaries, of course, represent their rulers or regions (e.g. the discussion of ethnic adjectives in Chapter 3), but the particular identification of Cyrus as a messenger makes this representation even more of a close connection. The situation of under-negotiation between Cyrus and Ionia is also discussed in Chapter 4.
[277] The contrasts in character between Ionia, Sparta, and Persia in this scene has been dealt with in Chapter 3.

no Spartan response and thus confirms Cyrus' opinion towards Ionia and Sparta.[278] Even if

Sparta does not entirely agree with Cyrus' perspective, a situation of under-negotiation,

resolution of this differing opinion is much delayed. These brief diplomatic meetings narrated

here by Herodotus are the only direct interactions between Cyrus and Greeks, since all of the

campaigns in Ionia are led by subordinates.

　　　With the West now dealt with, Cyrus can focus on campaigning in the East. He meets

with continuous success until his defeat by the Massagetae which, not coincidently, is where the

use of emissaries also returns to the narrative. The thematic support provided by emissaries in

this final sequence of events is all the more powerful since Herodotus has so carefully built up

their association with Cyrus in the preceding portion of the *logos* and extending back to Croesus'

logos. But, much to our surprise, Cyrus is not the one making use of emissaries, nor does he

appear to be representing any of their typical qualities. The astute audience might wonder if

Herodotus is distancing Cyrus from his previous association with emissaries and if that distance

is indicative of his coming defeat. Avery (1972, 542) argues that "Cyrus failed against the

Massagetae because he had none of the virtues he displayed in his first conquests", and shows

many ways in which Cyrus changes his nature for the worse (536ff). His passive interactions

with Tomyris' envoys contrast in tone with his prior confident dealings with the emissaries of

Astyages, the Ionians, and the Spartans, and perhaps should be added to Avery's list as a virtue

whose loss will contribute to Cyrus' defeat.

---

[278] Taken more abstractly, however, the result is less clear and may point towards the conflicts later in the *Histories*. Lacrines, despite his Spartan origin, speaks in defense of all Greece in his warning to Cyrus (1.152.3: γῆς τῆς Ἑλλάδος μηδεμίαν πόλιν σιναμωρέειν – "[telling him] not to harm any settlement on Greek soil") and Cyrus' response is similarly general in that it provides a comparison between Greek and Persian culture (1.153.1). Herodotus even clarifies that Cyrus means to belittle the Greeks in general, not the Spartans alone (1.153.2: ταῦτα ἐς τοὺς πάντας Ἕλληνας ἀπέρριψε ὁ Κῦρος τὰ ἔπεα – "This was intended by Cyrus as a slur against Greeks in general"). This conversation, then, may represent the larger coming clash of East vs. West, even if it does not occur within the reign of Cyrus. The attitudes expressed here may be accurate at present, but in the future will prove to be indicative of under-negotiation. For Cyrus' rejection of the Spartans as providing a motivation for the later Persian wars, see Chapter 4.

Uncharacteristically, Cyrus' first real contact with Tomyris does not involve emissaries explicitly, although some sort of proxy was certainly involved as a practical matter:

1.205.1-2 ἦν δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀποθανόντος γυνὴ τῶν Μασσαγετέων βασίλεια· Τόμυρίς οἱ ἦν οὔνομα. <u>ταύτην πέμπων ὁ Κῦρος ἐμνᾶτο (τῷ λόγῳ θέλων γυναῖκα ἣν ἔχειν)</u>. ἡ δὲ Τόμυρις συνιεῖσα οὐκ αὐτήν μιν μνώμενον ἀλλὰ τὴν Μασσαγετέων βασιληίην, ἀπείπατο τὴν πρόσοδον. Κῦρος δὲ μετὰ τοῦτο, ὥς οἱ δόλῳ οὐ προεχώρεε, ἐλάσας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀράξην ἐποιέετο ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανέος [ἐπὶ τοὺς Μασσαγέτας] στρατηίην γεφύρας τε ζευγνύων ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ διάβασιν τῷ στρατῷ καὶ πύργους ἐπὶ πλοίων τῶν διαπορθμευόντων τὸν ποταμὸν οἰκοδομεόμενος.

At the time the Massagetae were ruled by a woman, since her husband had died. Tomyris was her name. <u>Cyrus sent an ambassador to her with a message ostensibly of courtship, saying that he wanted her to be his wife</u>. However, Tomyris realized that it was not her he was courting so much as the Massegetan kingdom, so she rejected his advances.[279] Since Cyrus had gotten nowhere by trickery, he next marched to the Araxes and started to wage open war against the Massagetae. He began by bridging the river to enable his army to cross and building towers on the boats which ferried his troops across the river.

Herodotus describes what is very nearly a dispatch scene, but omits any overt emissary. Normally such an omission would occasion no comment, as is common in the *Histories*, but given Cyrus' prominent associations with emissaries especially during situations of first contact, the elision is surprising. Tomyris' rejection of this deceptive offer of marriage forces Cyrus to deal with the problem of crossing the Araxes river. The symbolism of river crossing here is a clear sign of overreach, just as it was for Croesus earlier, and in conjunction with the absence of overt emissaries shows that Cyrus is abandoning the good sense and associations which have made him successful. His sound use of military power is also notably absent. In his first contacts with both Croesus and Alyattes, Cyrus follows his emissary interaction immediately with a military strike. But here his military action is delayed by the need to cross the river. Thus the associations of military power and emissaries are both shown to be neutralized by the narrative.

Cyrus again fails to take decisive action when Tomyris interrupts his bridging preparation

---

[279] Tomyris' intelligence here is mirrored by the Ethiopian king in 3.21 (discussed in Chapter 3) who sees Cambyses' spies for what they are.

and sends a *kēryx* offering terms of engagement:

1.206.1-3 ἔχοντι δέ οἱ τοῦτον τὸν πόνον **πέμψασα ἡ Τόμυρις κήρυκα ἔλεγε, τάδε** ‘ὦ βασιλεῦ Μήδων, παῦσαι σπεύδων τὰ σπεύδεις, οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἰδείης, εἴ τοι ἐς καιρὸν ἔσται ταῦτα τελεόμενα· παυσάμενος δὲ βασίλευε τῶν σεωυτοῦ καὶ ἡμέας ἀνέχευ ὁρέων ἄρχοντας, τῶν περ ἄρχομεν. οὐκ ὦν ἐθελήσεις ὑποθήκῃσι τῇσιδε χρᾶσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντως μᾶλλον ἢ δι’ ἡσυχίης εἶναι· σὺ δὴ ἢν μεγάλως προθυμέαι Μασσαγετέων πειρηθῆναι, φέρε μόχθον μέν, τὸν ἔχεις ζευγνὺς τὸν ποταμόν, ἄφες, σὺ δὲ ἡμέων ἀναχωρησάντων ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τριῶν ἡμερέων ὁδὸν διάβαινε ἐς τὴν ἡμετέρην· εἰ δ’ ἡμέας βούλεαι ἐσδέξασθαι μᾶλλον ἐς τὴν ὑμετέρην, σὺ τὠυτὸ τοῦτο ποίει.’ ταῦτα δὲ ἀκούσας ὁ Κῦρος συνεκάλεσε Περσέων τοὺς πρώτους, συναγείρας δὲ τούτους ἐς μέσον σφι προετίθεε τὸ πρῆγμα συμβουλευόμενος, ὁκότερα ποιῇ. τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὠυτὸ αἱ γνῶμαι συνεξέπιπτον κελευόντων ἐσδέκεσθαι Τόμυρίν τε καὶ τὸν στρατὸν αὐτῆς ἐς τὴν χώρην.

While this work was in progress, **Tomyris sent the following message to Cyrus**:[280] ‘King of Persia, abandon your zeal for this enterprise. You cannot know if in the end it will come out right for you. Stop and rule your own people, and put up with the sight of me ruling mine. But no: you are hardly going to take this advice, since peace is the last thing you desire. If you really are committed to a trial of strength with the Massagetae, you need not bother with all the hard work of bridging the river; we will pull back three days’ journey away from the river and then you can cross over into our land. Or if you would rather meet us in your own land, you withdraw the same distance.’ After hearing this message, Cyrus called all the leading Persians to a conference, and once the meeting had convened he threw the matter open for discussion, looking for advice as to what he should do. They unanimously felt that they should meet Tomyris and her army on their own ground.

Tomyris appears to be an intelligent and perceptive queen. Not only does she see through Cyrus’ ruse of marriage in 1.205, she also is capable of seeing the situation from Cyrus’ perspective. Her message lays out her true desires, and then revises them to terms Cyrus might be willing to accept (οὐκ ὦν ἐθελήσεις ὑποθήκῃσι τῇσιδε χρᾶσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντως μᾶλλον ἢ δι’ ἡσυχίης εἶναι): battle, after retreat or forward progress. In essence, her message recognizes a difference of perception about the relative strength of the Massagetae and the Persian forces (an under-negotiation) and offers a way to approach resolution through a military test. Cyrus’ response to Tomyris’ *kēryx* is much less impressive. He does not answer her with direct action or a confident rejoinder, but instead calls a council to weigh his options. His previous swiftness and reliability are nowhere to be seen. Two chapters later he replies with hardly any agency.

---

[280] Literally, “Tomyris sent a herald and said”.

1.208.1 γνῶμαι μὲν αὗται συνέστασαν, Κῦρος δὲ μετεὶς τὴν προτέρην γνώμην, τὴν Κροίσου δὲ ἑλόμενος <u>προηγόρευε Τομύρι</u> ἐξαναχωρέειν ὡς αὐτοῦ διαβησομένου ἐπ᾽ ἐκείνην.

Faced with these conflicting viewpoints, Cyrus abandoned the first one and adopted Croesus' plan. So he told Tomyris to pull her troops back, because he was going to cross over the river into her territory.

His response is based on the opinions of others, and again fails to be followed by decisive military action.[281] Instead, before crossing the river, Cyrus establishes Cambyses as his heir, dreams about the succession of Darius, and sends Hystaspes back to Persia to keep an eye on Darius.[282] For the first time, Cyrus looks back before looking forward.

When Cyrus does finally take action (1.211), he does not engage in straightforward battle, but instead relies on a stratagem based on the sacrifice of his own troops: willfully giving up a portion of his other great asset, military power.[283] In the short term, the ruse suggested by Croesus is successful and Cyrus manages to kill a portion of Tomyris' forces and capture her son. Outraged by this result, Tomyris sends a second message to Cyrus through a *kēryx*, and once again Cyrus does not respond as we might expect.

1.212-213 ἡ δὲ πυθομένη τά τε περὶ τὴν στρατιὴν γεγονότα καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν παῖδα **πέμπουσα κήρυκα παρὰ Κῦρον ἔλεγε, τάδε**· ῾ἄπληστε αἵματος Κῦρε, μηδὲν ἐπαρθῇς τῷ γεγονότι τῷδε πρήγματι, εἰ ἀμπελίνῳ καρπῷ, τῷ περ αὐτοὶ ἐμπιπλάμενοι μαίνεσθε οὕτως, ὥστε κατιόντος τοῦ οἴνου ἐς τὸ σῶμα ἐπαναπλέειν ὑμῖν ἔπεα κακά, τοιούτῳ φαρμάκῳ δολώσας ἐκράτησας παιδὸς τοῦ ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ μάχῃ κατὰ τὸ καρτερόν. νῦν ὦν μευ εὖ παραινεούσης ὑπόλαβε τὸν λόγον· ἀποδούς μοι τὸν παῖδα ἄπιθι ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς χώρης ἀζήμιος, Μασσαγετέων τριτημορίδι τοῦ στρατοῦ κατυβρίσας· εἰ δὲ ταῦτα οὐ ποιήσεις, Ἥλιον ἐπόμνυμί τοι τὸν Μασσαγετέων δεσπότην, ἦ μέν σε ἐγὼ καὶ ἄπληστον ἐόντα αἵματος κορέσω.᾿ <u>Κῦρος μὲν ἐπέων οὐδένα τούτων ἀνενειχθέντων ἐποιέετο λόγον</u>· ὁ δὲ τῆς βασιλείης Τομύριος παῖς Σπαργαπίσης, ὥς μιν ὅ τε οἶνος ἀνῆκε καὶ ἔμαθε, ἵνα ἦν κακοῦ, δεηθεὶς Κύρου ἐκ τῶν δεσμῶν λυθῆναι ἔτυχε, ὡς δὲ ἐλύθη τε τάχιστα καὶ τῶν χειρῶν ἐκράτησε, διεργάζεται ἑωυτόν.

---

[281] To be fair, Croesus' advice does seem reasonable. When he retreated from enemy territory, he was defeated at home and his country was subsumed by another.

[282] These events, where Cyrus shows how he has lost the characteristics of the "*angelos*" he once was, are juxtaposed with a cognate verb perhaps to reinforce his decline. Hystaspes, summarizing the dream Cyrus has had, says (1.210.3): εἰ δέ τίς τοι ὄψις <u>ἀπαγγέλλει</u> παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν νεώτερα βουλεύειν περὶ σέο... – "If your dream tells you that my son is conspiring against you..." His vocabulary indicates his trust in the words of the vision as reported to him by Cyrus which is ironic given Cyrus' misinterpretation of the dream.

[283] Avery (1972, 544-5) points out that the sacrifice of these troops is useless since Cyrus will end up defeated at the end of the battle anyway.

When news of what had happened to her army and her son reached the queen, she **sent a herald to Cyrus with the following message**: 'You bloodthirsty man, Cyrus! What you have done should give you no cause for celebration. You used the fruit of the vine – the wine which you swill until it drives you so mad that as it sinks into your bodies foul language rises up to your tongues. That was the drug, that was the trick you relied on to overcome my son, rather than conquering him by force in battle. Now I am giving good advice, so listen carefully: give me back my son, and then you can leave this country without paying for the brutality with which you treated a third of the Massegetan army. But if you do not, I swear by the sun who is the lord of the Massagetae that for all your insatiability I will quench your thirst for blood!' <u>This was the message that was brought back to Cyrus, but he took not the slightest notice of it</u>. When Spargapises, the son of Queen Tomyris, recovered from the wine and saw the trouble he was in, he begged Cyrus to release him from his chains. Cyrus granted his request, but as soon as Spargapises was free and had regained control of his hands, he killed himself.

Tomyris' inflammatory and provocative message appears to have little impact on Cyrus' plan of action.[284] His response is to ignore her exhortations, which represents his contempt for her (as we saw in Chapter 4), even as it provides a very passive rejection of her message.[285] The situation here reinforces the difference of perception revealed in 1.206, just before it will be resolved through a pitched battle and Cyrus' defeat. Before that furious action occurs, however, Herodotus focuses again on the strangely passive nature of Cyrus. In addition to rejecting the message through inaction, Cyrus again fails to take immediate military action. Instead, he deals with Tomyris' son who, in a notable contrast, takes swift and decisive action (he kills himself) at the first opportunity granted to him. Herodotus emphasizes the difference between Spargapises and Cyrus in particular through the use of the adverb τάχιστα, showing just how much speed Cyrus has lost since his first assault on Croesus in 1.79.

Given Cyrus' slow progress in this sequence of events, the speed of his death may come as a surprise, even if the outcome is no mystery. Tomyris' motivation for battle is made clear

---

[284] For the audience, the fact that she sends *kērkyes* to Cyrus instead of *angeloi* should also be provocative. Herodotus' vocabulary emphasizes her power as an eastern tyrant in the face of Cyrus' impending destruction.
[285] Avery (1972, 545-6) says that Cyrus' insatiable nature contrasts with his earlier restraint, still evident during the capture of Babylon when he heeds the inscription on Nitocris' tomb and leaves it untouched (by implication, since Darius is the one to open the tomb later). What Avery fails to note is that the inscription is a written message (of sorts), and that it contains advice from an eastern queen. It thus points back to Cyrus' prior compliance with written messages (i.e. from Harpagus) and looks forward to his rejection of advice from Tomyris.

and stems from the under-negotiation revealed through her second message:

> 1.214.1, 3-5 Τόμυρις δέ, ὥς οἱ Κῦρος οὐκ ἐσήκουσε, συλλέξασα πᾶσαν τὴν ἑωυτῆς δύναμιν συνέβαλε Κύρῳ. ... ἥ τε δὴ πολλὴ τῆς Περσικῆς στρατιῆς αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ διεφθάρη καὶ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς Κῦρος τελευτᾷ βασιλεύσας τὰ πάντα ἑνὸς δέοντα τριήκοντα ἔτεα. ἀσκὸν δ᾽ ἐμπλήσασα αἵματος ἀνθρωπηίου Τόμυρις ἐδίζητο ἐν τοῖσι τεθνεῶσι τῶν Περσέων τὸν Κύρου νέκυν· ὡς δὲ εὗρεν, ἐναπῆπτεν αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐς τὸν ἀσκόν· λυμαινομένη δὲ τῷ νεκρῷ ἐπέλεγε, τάδε ‘σὺ μὲν ἐμὲ ζῶσάν τε καὶ νικῶσάν σε μάχῃ ἀπώλεσας παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν ἑλὼν δόλῳ· σὲ δ᾽ ἐγώ, κατά περ ἠπείλησα, αἵματος κορέσω.’

Since Cyrus refused to take her advice, Tomyris mustered all her forces and engaged Cyrus in battle. ... Most of the Persian army was wiped out there, and Cyrus himself died too; his reign had lasted for twenty-nine years. Tomyris filled a wineskin with human blood and searched among the Persian corpses for Cyrus' body. When she found it, she shoved his head into the wineskin, and in her rage addressed his body as follows: 'Although I have come through the battle alive and victorious, you have destroyed me by capturing my son with a trick. But I warned you that I would quench your thirst for blood, and so I shall.'

Just as the speed of her son's suicide contrasted with Cyrus' delayed action, Tomyris' immediate call to arms and attack recall Cyrus' earlier reliance on decisive military action and his failure to proceed in the same manner for the duration of his Massagetan expedition. Her defeat of his army strips him of his military power, and her final address given directly to his corpse eliminates the need for any emissaries between them.

Cyrus' defeat and death in this manner close his story with an inversion of how it began. In 1.79, Cyrus arrived swiftly and unexpectedly into Croesus' lands, earning himself the characteristics of a typical emissary. This scene represents the first real contact between the two rulers and prefaces Cyrus' first (in the narrative) major victory over a large and powerful empire. Here, in the closing of his *logos*, Cyrus arrives without haste into Tomyris' lands. His contact with her through explicit emissaries occurs twice rather than once, but the emissaries are hers, just as is all swiftness and decisiveness. Cyrus, instead of being a surprise to his enemy, is himself surprised (surely) by his first major military defeat and, more importantly, his death.[286] Tomyris and her son have taken on the features that once made Cyrus great, completing the ring

---

[286] Of Cyrus' many flaws at the end of Book One, Avery (1972, 538) notes that he has lost his sense of mortality. Asheri at 1.214.5 notes that Herodotus' account of Cyrus' death differs from other accounts through its immediacy.

of his story.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

Herodotus and his Histories

If the primary function of an emissary is to transmit information, a natural question arises about the status of Herodotus and of the *Histories*: are they emissary and message, respectively? Based on the work done in this study, I would argue that Herodotus precludes the possibility of identification as an emissary of any sort, although it may be possible to view the *Histories* as a sort of message.

The main question is how well Herodotus presents himself in accordance with the typical characteristics of an emissary. His swiftness is difficult to evaluate if we consider him to be a transmitter of his sources, although he does introduce narrative delay within the main story, e.g. through ethnographic digressions and comments about topics he will return to in the future.[287] Herodotus certainly presents himself as a reliable transmitter of information preserved in other cultures, even if he also presents his opinions on that information. This last point, however, is what fundamentally disqualifies Herodotus from being thought of as a proper emissary. Ideal emissaries do not interpret or comment on the information they transmit, and only express opinions representative of their senders when negotiation is necessary. Exceptions and behavior excessive of what is "typical" are met with censure, either implicit or explicit (e.g. the Persians *angeloi* sent to Amyntas and the Athenian *angeloi* in Persia).

Herodotus clearly exceeds the behavior of a good and typical emissary: even in his prologue he lays out the importance of inquiry, yet active judgment of this nature is not required and evidently discouraged in emissaries. The work of Hollmann (2011) should similarly give us pause. He argues that Herodotus should be seen as the ultimate interpreter of signs in the

---

[287] Or even simply by separating information from when we might have expected it to be given, i.e. by delaying information about the Spartan family of heralds to 7.134 after mentioning it originally in 6.60.1.

Histories, and shows how verbs like σημαίνω and φράζω which refer to narratorial activity

reinforce this perception. As discussed in my own study, the fundamental interpretive nature of

σημαίνω distinguishes it from verbs which are clearly related to emissaries. With this dichotomy

in place, it is particularly striking that Herodotus never refers to his own activity with the cognate

verbs related to ἄγγελος or κῆρυξ, even though he frequently uses them to show his characters

reporting information.[288] Following the argument of my third chapter, this omission suggests

that either Herodotus sees himself as a failed emissary (likely due to his excessive personal

judgments) or never considers himself to belong in such a category at all. His agency and

autonomy as an author prevent his identification as a simple transmitter.

The status of the *Histories* is less clear cut, but appears to share more features with

inscriptions than with written messages as discussed in this study. Herodotus does refer to his

own activity using the verb γράφω several times, which suggests that his text might properly be

considered γράμματα, though it is never named as such.[289] But the *Histories* is a *logos*, and

messages are never *logoi*.[290] One point in favor of the *Histories* as a written message is that both

are static but not always straightforward: they may require interpretation by their audience to be

understood properly.[291] A proper written message, however, does not exhort its recipient to read

it in a certain way; it simply provides information to be digested. Not so for Herodotus' text,

which may indicate the need for its interpretation.[292] Finally, the primary function of messages

---

[288] Solon does not show the same inhibition, writing of himself: αὐτὸς κῆρυξ ἦλθον – "I myself as a herald come..."
(1.1, Greek text from West). He may be tapping into a cultural idea of emissaries as reliabile in order to lend
credence to his poetry about Salamis.
[289] Uses of γράφω in this manner are located at 1.93.3, 1.95.1, 2.70.1, 2.123.1, 2.123.5, 4.195.2, 6.14.1 (the
compound συγγράφω), and 6.53.1.
[290] The closest thing is that messages sometimes "say" (using a form of λέγω) their contents. See Rösler (2002) for
Herodotus' somewhat interchangeable use of λέγω and γράφω.
[291] Interpretation is required for oracular responses recorded in writing at 1.47-48, 7.142.1, and 8.135.2. Some
written messages are hidden, and require ingenuity simply to be discovered, e.g., at 1.123-4 and 7.239.
[292] For the necessity of actively questioning the content of the *Histories* as indicated by Herodotus' prologue, see
Bakker (2002).

is to transmit information from one place to another, yet Herodotus' transmission is admittedly selective.

Although the *Histories* is clearly identified as a piece of writing through Herodotus' vocabulary, it has no identified recipients or destination, making it unlike any other message in the text. Instead, it transmits information to an unspecified audience and across time: a feature particular to inscriptions. Although Herodotus does not express his hopes for the longevity of his writing as explicitly as Thucydides does (using the famous phrase κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί – "a possession for all time"), he shows conscious interest in recording events so that they are not forgotten: ὡς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται – "the purpose is to prevent the traces of human events from being erased by time" (1.1). In this way, he positions the *Histories* in line with what we expect of inscriptions: a monument to preserve what might otherwise seem fleeting, and to boast of accomplishments. Herodotus appears to take pride in his collection of research and, although less compelling than a military victory, his *Histories* themselves are a record of his intellectual feats as much as a memorial to others' historical deeds.

This dissertation has shown how Herodotus uses emissaries to organize his narrative, indicate authorial judgment, reveal diplomatic strife, and draw attention to narrative themes. After a general discussion of previous research on emissaries and the use of patterns in the *Histories*, a typology of emissaries and their related vocabulary was established. These emissaries are sorted into three large categories based on etymology and semantics. Explicit emissaries are given the title of their office (e.g. ἄγγελοι), whereas indirect emissaries are identified by their status as carriers of messages (e.g. γράμματα). Finally, verbs that are etymologically related to these terms may be used to implicitly identify individuals with the actions or characteristics of emissaries or to characterize received information (e.g. ἀγγέλλω,

ἐπικηρυκεύομαι, and γράφω). Within these categories, patterns of use suggest that ἄγγελος and its cognates are the most generic way to refer to emissaries or messages. Furthermore, it was suggested that the regularity of elements in scenes where an emissary is dispatched indicates that they may correspond to a "type-scene" in the Homeric sense, and that variations in the order or the depiction of events enhance our sensitivity to narrative or thematic context.

Within and across the narrative, emissaries establish connections of time, place, and theme. An arriving emissary, for example, cues the audience to recall the situation and location of his dispatch while easing the transition to a new location or moment in the main story. Consequently, Herodotus often uses emissaries to frame digressions or to provide boundaries between sections of the text. Much like the particles μέν and δέ (as discussed by Bakker 2006), emissaries can be placed in ways which point the audience to expect later shifts in location and to reinforce the expression of themes, while having the advantage of being concrete characters instead of abstract markers. Pragmatic theories of syntax clarify the importance of word order when determining the role of emissaries in the structural management of the narrative.

Emissaries in Herodotus were shown to have "typical" characteristics which have some continuity with their expression in tragedy and epic, and may suggest a relatively standard popular conception of such individuals. The primary characteristics are accuracy, swiftness, and reliability in executing duties within their limited authority. When emissaries in some way violate their "type", Herodotus uses two methods to demonstrate his judgment of them. First, characters in the text or Herodotus himself may explicitly condemn their behavior. Second and more subtly, Herodotus may alter the presentation of such emissaries by replacing their official titles with other identifying vocabulary, often adjectives with pejorative connotations. In extreme cases, situations may be constructed to suggest that, contextually, a character ought to

be identified as an emissary, yet no related vocabulary occurs in a scene. Through this careful use of language, Herodotus leads the audience to see (and share in) his judgment of deviant individuals.

When we examine diplomatic relationships, emissaries stand as full representatives, proxies, for the opinions of their senders. When a recipient rejects an emissary or his message, he indicates that he has a different perception than the sender does with regard to their relative status and power. This conflict of perception requires resolution to ensure that both parties end up with the same perspective. The need to restore such an equilibrium explains later active conflicts between sender and recipient. This model extends the common understanding of reciprocity as marked by specific vocabulary (e.g. τιμή, αἰτίη, δίκη) by recognizing implicit connections between cause and effect marked out by scenes involving emissaries. Extreme cases where reciprocity takes the form of violence are particularly notable, and Herodotus employs them to reinforce larger themes in his narrative which pertain to cultures or characters.

Through select case-studies, I combine these types of analysis to show the full effect an emissary can have on multiple levels within a series of scenes, a *logos*, and across *logoi*. The first study explores how variations in vocabulary for emissaries and for the reception of their messages in the lead-up to the battle at Salamis emphasize distinctions in characterization between leaders who are more and less admirable (Aristeides and Themistocles), and between stereotypical elements of Persian and Greek (Spartan and Athenian, in particular) cultures. The second study argues that when Herodotus juxtaposes emissaries behaving in expected and unexpected ways through the Scythian ethnography and Persian expedition, he implicitly emphasizes the oddities of Scythian culture and its distance from Greek norms and expectations. The use of emissaries in this fashion helps cast the outcome in Scythia as a warning for the

Persians which they do not heed, and as a corresponding predictive tool for the audience, thereby extending the arguments of Hartog's (1988) seminal study on the "otherness" of the Scythians. The third study demonstrates how Cyrus' story and our perception of him is colored by the presence of emissaries at important junctures in his rise and fall. The continuous association of Cyrus and emissaries offers a new way to read his death and the end of his story, which mirrors and inverts the events which began it.

This dissertation, taken as a whole, proves the importance of considering the presentation of emissaries for any analysis interested in narrative structure or thematic expression in the *Histories*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: Journal abbreviations follow *L'Année philologique*

Adcock, F.E. and D.J. Mosley. (1975) *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*. Thames and Hudson.

Allan, R.J. (2012) "Clause Intertwining and Word Order in Ancient Greek." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12: 5-28.

Asheri, D., A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, O. Murray, and A. Moreno. (2007) *A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I-IV*. Oxford University Press. [= Asheri]

Asheri, D. (1994-98) *Erodoto: Le storie (V-IX)*. 4 vols. Fondazione Lorenzo Valla. [= Asheri]

Avery, H.C. (1972) "Herodotus' Picture of Cyrus." *AJPh* 93.4: 529-46.

Bakker, E.J. (2006) "The Syntax of *historie*: How Herodotus Writes." In Dewald and Marincola, eds. 92-102.

_____. (2002) "The Making of History: Herodotus' *Historiēs Apodexis*." In Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees, eds. 3-32.

Bakker, E.J., I.J.F de Jong, and H. van Wees, eds. (2002) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Brill.

Beck, I. (1971) *Die Ringkomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik*. Georg Olms Verlag.

Beekes, R. (2010) *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. With the assistance of L. van Beek. Brill.

Bischoff, H. (1932) *Der Warner bei Herodot*. PhD Diss., University of Marburg.

Boedeker, D. (2011) "Persian Gender Relations as Historical Motives in Herodotus." In Rollinger, Truschnegg, and Bichler, eds. 211-36.

_____. (2002) "Epic Heritage and Mythic Patterns in Herodotus." In Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees, eds. 97-116.

Bonet, J.P. (1956) "Los heraldos, Taltibio y Euripides." *Helmantica* 7.2: 345-55.

Bowie, A. (2007) *Herodotus: Histories Book VIII*. Cambridge University Press.

Braund, D. (1998) "Herodotus on the Problematics of Reciprocity." In *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, edited by C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite, and R. Seaford, 159-180. Oxford University Press.

Bremer, J.M. (1976) "Why Messenger Speeches?" In Bremer, Radt, and Ruijgh, eds. 29-49.

Bremer, J.M., I.J.F. de Jong, and J. Kalff, eds. (1987) *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry. Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretation*. Gruner Publishing.

Bremer, J.M., S.L. Radt, and C.J. Ruijgh, eds. (1976) *Miscellanea tragica in honorem JS Kamerbeek collegerunt*. Hakkert.

Brown, T. (1978) "Aristodicus of Cyme and the Branchidae." *AJPh* 99.1: 64-78.

Caire, E. and S. Pittia, eds. (2006) Guerre et diplomatie romaines (IVe-IIIe siècles): pour un réexamen des sources. Université de Provence.

Chantraine, P. (2009) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. Klincksieck.

Clark, E. (2004) *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*. Harvard University Press.

Cunliffe, R.J. (1977) *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect.* University of Oklahoma Press.

Darbo-Pechanski, C. (1988) "La vie des morts. Représentations et fonctions de la mort et des morts dans les *Histoires* d'Hérodote." *AION (archeol)* 10: 41-9.

de Bakker, M. (2007) "Speech and Authority in Herodotus' *Histories*." PhD Diss., University of Amsterdam.

de Jong, I.J.F. (2007) "Introduction. Narratological Theory on Time." In de Jong and Nünlist, eds. 1-16.

_____. (2004) "Chapter Seven. Herodotus." in de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie, eds. 101-14.

_____. (2002) "Narrative Unity and Units." In Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees, eds. 245-66.

_____. (2001) "The Anachronical Structure of Herodotus' *Histories*." In Harrison, S.J. ed. 93-116.

_____. (1999) "Aspects Narratologiques des *Histoires* d'Hérodote." *Lalies. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature.* 19: 217-75.

_____. (1997) "Narrator Language Versus Character Language: Some Further Explorations." In Létoublon, ed. 293-302.

_____. (1991) *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger Speech*. Mnemosyne Supplement 116. Brill.

_____. (1989) *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentations of the Story in the* Iliad. B.R. Gruner Publishing Co.

de Jong, I.J.F. and R. Nünlist, eds. (2007) *Time in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*. Volume Two. Brill.

de Jong, I.J.F., R. Nünlist, and A. Bowie, eds. (2004) *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative.* Volume One. Brill.

de Romilly, J. (1971) "La vengeance comme explication historique dans l'oeuvre d'Hérodote." *REG* 84: 314-37.

Denniston, J.D. (1996) *The Greek Particles.* 2nd edition. K.J. Dover, rev. Hackett.

Desmond, W. (2004) "Punishments and the Conclusion of Herodotus' *Histories*." *GRBS* 44: 19-40.

Dewald, C. (1999) "The Figured Stage: Focalizing the Initial Narratives of Herodotus and Thucydides." In Falkner, Felson, and Konstan, eds. 221-52.

_____. (1987) "Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories*." *Arethusa* 20.1/2: 147-70.

_____. (1981) "Women and Culture in Herodotus' Histories." In Foley, ed. 91-125.

Dewald, C. and J. Marincola, eds. (2006) *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*. Cambridge University Press.

Dik, H. (2007) *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue.* Oxford University Press.

_____. (1995) *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 5. J.C. Gieben.

Durán López, M.A. (1999) "Bardos, heraldos y mensajeros en los poemas homéricos." In Jiménez and Andreotti, eds. 9-38.

Evans, J.A.S. (1982) *Herodotus.* Twayne.

Falkner, T.M., N. Felson, and D. Konstan, eds. (1999) *Contextualizing Classics: Ideology, Performance, Dialogue. Essays in Honor of John J. Peradotto.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Fearn, D. (2007) "Narrating Ambiguity: Murder and the Macedonian Allegiance." In Irwin and Greenwood, eds. 98-127.

Fenik, B.C. (1968) *Typical Battle Scenes in the* Iliad*. Studies in the Narrative and Techniques of Homeric Battle Description*. Hermes Einzelschriften 21. Franz Steiner Verlag.

Fisher, N. (2002) "Popular Morality in Herodotus." In Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees, eds. 199-224.

_____. (1992) *HYBRIS: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece.* Aris & Phillips Ltd.

Flower, M.A. and J. Marincola. (2002) *Herodotus: Histories Book IX.* Cambridge University Press. [= Flower and Marincola]

Foley, H.P., ed. (1981) *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers

Fontenrose, J. (1978) *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations.* University of California Press.

Fowler, R.L. (2006) "Herodotus and his Prose Predecessors." In Dewald and Marincola, eds. 29-45.

Gastaldi, V. (2007) "Embajadores trágicos: la retórica del *kerux* en Heraclides de Eurípides." *AC* 76: 39-50.

Gazzano, F. (2002) "*La diplomazia nelle «Storie» di Erodoto. Figure, temi, problemi.*" In Piccirilli, L., ed. 9-67.

Goblot-Cahen, C. (1999) "Les hérauts et la violence." *Cahiers du Centre Gustave-Glotz* X: 189-207.

Gould, J. (1973) "HIKETEIA." *JHS* 93: 74-103.

_____. (1989) *Herodotus*. George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd.

Goward, B. (1999) *Telling Tragedy: Narrative Technique in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides.* Duckworth.

Griffiths, A. (2006) "Stories and Storytelling in the *Histories.*" In Dewald and Marincola, eds. 130-44.

_____. (1995) "Latent and Blatant: Two Perspectives on Humour in Herodotos." In Jäkel and Timonen, eds. 31-44.

Guzmán García, H. (1999) "La escena de mensajero en la tragedia greiga." In Jiménez and Andreotti, eds. 39-56.

Halliwell, S. (1991) "The Uses of Laugher in Greek Culture." *CQ* 41: 279-96.

Hardy, C.S. (1996) "Nomos and Replaceability in the Story of Intaphrenes and His Wife." *TAPA* 126: 101-9.

Harrison, S.J., ed. (2001) *Text, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory and Classical Literature.* Oxford University Press.

Hartog, F. (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History.* J. Lloyd, trans. University of California Press.

Hohti, P. (1976) *The Interrelation of Speech and Action in the Histories of Herodotus*. Commentationes humanarum litterarum 57. Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Hollmann, A. (2011) *The Master of Signs: Signs and the Interpretation of Signs in Herodotus'* Histories. Harvard University Press.

_____. (2000) "*Epos* as Authoritative Speech in Herodotus' *Histories*." *HSPh* 100: 207-25.

Hornblower, S. (2000) "Personal Names and the Study of Ancient Greek Historians." In Hornblower and Matthews, eds. 129-143.

Hornblower, S. and E. Matthews, eds. (2000) *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence.* Oxford University Press.

Immerwahr, H.R. (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Press of Western Reserve University.

Irwin, E. and E. Greenwood, eds. (2007) *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the* Logoi *in Book 5 of Herodotus'* Histories. Cambridge University Press.

Jäkel, S. and A. Timonen, eds. (1995) *Laughter Down the Centuries.* Volume Two. Turun Yliopisto.

Jiménez A.P. and G.C. Andreotti, eds. (1999) *Aladas palabras: Correos y comunicaciones en el Mediterráneo*. Mediterranea 5. Ediciones Clásicas.

Johnson, W.A. (1994) "Oral Performance and the Composition of Herodotus' *Histories.*" *GRBS* 35.3: 229-54.

Karavites, P. (1987) "Diplomatic Envoys in the Homeric World." *RIDA* 36: 41-100.

Kazanskaya, M. (forthcoming) "The Role of Letters in Polycrates' Destiny." *Atti dei seminari di antichità classica e del vicino oriente antico: Ricerche a confronto*.

Kindt, J. (2006) "Delphic Oracle Stories and the Beginning of Historiography: Herodotus' *Croesus Logos*." *CP* 101.1: 34-51.

Konstan, D. (1983) "The Stories in Herodotus' *Histories*, Book I." *Helios* 10: 1-22.

Kraft, K. (1964) "Bemerkungen zu den Perserkriegen." *Hermes* 92.2: 144-71.

Lang, M.L. (1984) *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse*. Harvard University Press.

Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus*. University of Toronto Press.

_____. (1977) "No Laughing Matter: A Literary Tactic in Herodotus." *TAPA* 107: 173-82.

Lattimore, R. (1939) "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus." *CP* 34.1: 24-35.

Létoublon, F. (1987) "Le messager fidèle." In Bremer, de Jong, and Kalff, eds. 123-44.

Long, T. (1987) *Repetition and Variation in the Short Stories of Herodotus*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 179. Athenaeum.

Luraghi, N. (2006) "Meta-*historiē*: Method and Genre in the *Histories*." In Dewald and Marincola, eds. 76-91.

Luraghi, S. (2003) *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases: The Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek.* J. Benjamins Publishing Company.

Macan, R.W. (1908) *Herodotus: The Seventh, Eight, & Ninth Books*. Macmillan. [= Macan]

Marincola, J. (2006) "Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past." In Dewald and Marincola, eds. 13-28.

_____. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography.* Cambridge University Press.

Matić, D. (2003) "Topic, Focus, and Dicourse Structure: Ancient Greek Word Order." *Studies in Language* 27.3: 573-633.

Mosley, D.J. (1973) *Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*. Historia Einzelschriften 22. Franz Steiner Verlag.

Munson, R.V. (2001) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus*. University of Michigan Press.

_____. (1983) "Transitions in Herodotus: An Analysis Based Principally on the First Book." PhD Diss., University of Pennsylvania.

Myers, J.L. (1943) "ΑΚΗΡΥΚΤΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ (Herodotus, V. 81)." *CR* 57.2: 66-7.

Nagy, G. (1990) *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past.* Johns Hopkins University Press.

Naiden, F.S. (2006) *Ancient Supplication*. Oxford University Press.

Nightingale, A. (2004) *Spectacles of Truth in Classical Greek Philosophy:* Theoria *in its Cultural Context.* Cambridge University Press.

Payne, M.E. (2000) "Three Double Messenger Speeches in Sophocles." *Mnemosyne* 53.4: 403-18.

Pedley, J.G. (1972) *Ancient Literary Sources on Sardis.* Harvard University Press.

Pelling, C. (2006) "Speech and Narrative in the *Histories.*" In Dewald and Marincola, eds. 103-21.

Piccirilli, L, ed. (2002) *La retorica della diplomazia nella Grecia Antica e a Bisanzio.* «L'erma» di Bretschneider.

Powell, J.E. (1938) *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. Cambridge University Press. [= Powell]

Purves, A. (2010) *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative.* Cambridge University Press.

Raaflaub, K.A. (2002) "Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his Time." In Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees, eds. 149-186.

Ramage, A. and P. Cradock. (2000) *King Croesus' Gold: Excavations at Sardis and the History of Gold Refining.* Harvard University Press.

Redfield, J. (1985) "Herodotus the Tourist." *CP* 80.2: 97-118.

Rijksbaron, A. (1976) "How Does a Messenger Begin his Speech?: Some Observations on the Opening Lines of Euripidean Messenger Speeches." In Bremer, Radt, and Ruijgh, eds. 293-308.

Rollinger, R., B. Truschnegg, and R. Bishler, eds. (2011) *Herodotus and the Persian Empire.* Harrassowitz-Verlag.

Rood, T. (2007) "Chapter Seven. Herodotus." In de Jong and Nünlist, eds. 115-30.

Rosén, H.B. (1987-97) *Herodoti Historiae*. 2 vols. Teubner. [= Rosén]

Rosenmeyer, P.A. (2001) *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*. Cambridge University Press.

Rösler, W. (2002) "The *Histories* and Writing." In Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees, eds. 79-96.

Saerens, C. (1975) "Πρέσβεες 'Gezanten', een Atticisme bij Herodotus." *AC* 44.2: 618-29.

Sancho, S. (2003) "La dramatització a les Històries d'Heròdot: alguns prodiments de caire literari." *Ítaca: Quaderns Catalans de Cultura Clàssica, Societat Catalana d'Estudis Clàssics* 19: 27-37.

Scott, L. (2005) *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6.* Brill. [= Scott]

Sealey, R. (1976) "The Pit and the Well: The Persian Heralds of 491 BC." *CJ* 72: 13-20.

Slings, S.R. (2002) "Oral Strategies in the Language of Herodotus." In Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees, eds. 53-77.

Steiner, D. (2001) *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought.* Princeton University Press.

_____. (1994) *The Tyrant's Writ.* Princeton University Press.

Stouder, G. (2006) "Πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος: La guerre sans héraut." In Caire and Pittia, eds. 209-22.

Strid, O. (2006) "Voiceless Victims, Memorable Deaths in Herodotus." *CQ* 56.2: 393-403.

Svenbro, J. (1993) *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece.* J. Lloyd, trans. Cornell University Press.

Uther, H.-J. (2004) "The Types of International Folktales: A Classification and Bibliography Based on the System of Antti Aarne and Stith Thompson" *FF Communications* 284-6.

Vargyas, P. (2000) "Darius and Oroites." *AHB* 14.4: 155-61.

Waterfield, R. (1998) *Herodotus: The Histories*. Introduction and notes by C. Dewald. Oxford University Press.

Wéry, L.-M. (1967) "Le fonctionnement de la diplomatie à l'époque homérique." *Revue Internationale des Droits de L'Antiquité,* 3rd series. 14: 169-205.

_____. (1966) "Le meurtre des hérauts de Darius en 491 et l'inviolabilité du héraut." *AC* 35: 468-86.

West, M.L., ed. (1972) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci: Ante Alexandrum Cantati*. Volume Two. Oxford Clarendon Press. [= West]

West, S. (2002) "Scythians." In Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees, eds. 437-56.

_____. (1988) "The Scythian Ultimatum (Herodotus IV 131, 132)" *JHS* 108: 207-11.

_____. (1985) "Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests." *CQ* 35.2: 278-305.

Wood, H. (1972) *The Histories of Herodotus. An Analysis of the Formal Structure.* Mouton.