HERODOTUS' CONCEPTION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES[*]

Introduction

In one of the most famous passages in his *Histories*, Herodotus has the Athenians give the reasons why they would never betray Greece (8.144.2): first and foremost, the images and temples of the gods, burnt and requiring vengeance, and then 'the Greek thing', being of the same blood and the same language, having common shrines and sacrifices and the same way of life.[1] With race or blood, and with religious cult, language appears as one of the chief determinants of Greek identity. This impression is confirmed in Herodotus' accounts of foreign peoples: language is—with religious customs, dress, hairstyles, sexual habits—one of the key items on Herodotus' checklist of similarities and differences with foreign peoples.[2] That language was an important element of what, to a Greek, it meant to be a Greek, should not perhaps be thought surprising. As is well known, the Greeks called non-Greeks βάρβαροι, a term usually taken to refer pejoratively to the babble of

---

[*] This paper has been delivered in a number of different versions at St. Andrews, Newcastle, and at the 1997 Classical Association AGM. I should like to express my thanks to all those who took part in the subsequent discussions, and especially to Robert Fowler, Alan Griffiths, Robert Parker, Anna Morpurgo Davies and Stephanie West for their extremely valuable comments on written drafts, to Hubert Petersmann for kindly sending me offprints of his publications, to Adrian Gratwick for his expert advice on a point of detail, and to David Colclough and Lucinda Platt for the repeated hospitality which allowed me to undertake the bulk of the research. All references are, unless specified, to Herodotus.

[1] Or culture: Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford, 1989) 165. See also on this passage J. M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997) 44-5, arguing against an '"essentialist" definition of Greekness' on Herodotus' part. J. M. Hall insists also that language and dialect should be seen as indicia rather than as criteria of ethnicity (e.g., p. 177). The best modern discussion of Greek 'nationality' is F. W. Walbank, 'The problem of Greek nationality', *Phoenix* 5 (1951) 41-60, reprinted in his *Selected Papers* (Cambridge, 1985) 1-19.

[2] See the list of references to foreign languages that make up Appendix 1. Compare the tables of topics in Herodotus' ethnographic sections prepared by J. L. Myres, *Herodotus, the Father of History* (Oxford, 1953) 73, and by G. Lachenaud, *Mythologies, Religion et Philosophie de l'Histoire dans Hérodote* (Paris, 1978) 124. Both tables emphasise the consistency of Herodotus' criteria for inclusion; neither features language.

foreign speech.[3] Nor should it be thought surprising of any people. Compare this definition from an Arabic-English dictionary of the three letter root *ae-ja-ma*: 'speaking incorrect Arabic, dumb, speechless, barbarian, non-Arab, foreigner, alien, Persian.' Polish friends inform me that they invariably find themselves seized by uncontrollable laughter on hearing spoken Czech: Czech allegedly sounds like Polish spoken by a five-year-old child, or while eating potatoes.[4] Herodotus himself ascribes a very Greek-sounding linguistic snobbery to his barbarians. The Egyptians call all who are not of the same language (ὁμογλώσσους) barbarians (2.158.5).[5] (Presumably here we are to understand that they called them 'the Egyptian for barbarians'.[6]) Herodotus' Persians also had ideas of language which reflected badly on the Greeks: people of the same language as one another should not, Mardonius says, make war on one another but make peace through heralds (7.9β.2). This is, of course, what they do, at least well and for long enough to defeat the Persians. There is perhaps also an implication in Mardonius' remark that those of different languages are a fit object of aggression.[7]

In other respects, however, Herodotus' conception of foreign languages—or the Greek conception of foreign languages implicit in the *Histories,* for the distinction between the two will occasionally be very grey—is very much more surprising, more complex and more contradictory than, at first sight, it might appear. Herodotus was not, of course, a professional philologist: we have no reason or right to expect a consistent or a rationalized theory of the nature of language implicit in his *Histories*, let alone explicitly presented, just as we cannot take for granted the existence of any single 'Greek view of language' of which he is the representative. What he gives us is a substantial body of material, scattered in a wide variety of contexts, suggestive of assumptions of the nature of language which are very different

---

[3] See E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 4. The linguistic associations of the term βάρβαρος are reflected most strongly (in the Classical period) at Ar. *Av.* 199-200, Pl. *Menex.* 242a, Pl. *Ep.* 8 353e. The idea that the term was onomatopoeic is advanced by Strabo, 14.2.28.

[4] And Polish correspondingly sounds snobbish to Czech ears. See, however, E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 4-5, for examples of cultures where language is not so privileged as a criterion of ethnic or national identity. A Greek parallel for the Arabic *ae-ja-ma* is the term 'solecism', allegedly derived from the incorrect Attic of the people of Soli in Cilicia: see Strabo, 14.2.28, D.L. 1.51 (cf. the term σολοικίζοντες used of the Sauromatae, 4.117).

[5] Herodotus' observation appears to have a basis in fact: cf. the inscription from Abu-Simbel (M–L 7a.4) in which Greek soldiers of Psammetichus are described as *alloglosos*; for Egyptian attitudes to foreign languages more broadly, see S. F. Donadoni, 'Gli Egiziani e le lingue degli altri', *VO* 3 (1980) 1-14, reprinted in his *Cultura dell' Antico Egitto* (Rome, 1986) 193-206.

[6] See Legrand ad loc., II.179 n. 5.

[7] Cf. Pl. *Resp.* 470e-471c.

from our own. The purpose of this paper is to try to tease out the assumptions underlying this material. I will concentrate on four main areas: his knowledge of foreign languages; his presentation of foreign languages (and the degree of awareness of language difference evident in his narrative); the Greek conceptualisation of foreign languages; and finally the imagined relationship between Greek and foreign languages.

1. Herodotus' Knowledge of Foreign Languages

How much does Herodotus know of any foreign language? How systematic is his interest in foreign languages?

It is probable that Herodotus could not read or speak any language other than Greek. We might have expected a Halicarnassian to have been able to understand Carian. Herodotus does tell a story of how the *promantis* of the oracle of Apollo Ptöos, when consulted by the Europian Mys on behalf of Mardonius, spoke in a 'barbarian language' (8.135.2): at first, those three Greek-speakers who had been deputed to take notes were at a loss at this marvel, but then Mys snatched the wax tablet from one of their hands and began to write, for he understood that the oracle was in Carian.[8] Elsewhere Herodotus introduces the question of whether the Carian language derives from the Caunian or *vice versa*, but cannot settle it (1.172). A glance at the range of remarks made by Herodotus on other foreign languages shows, however, that there is nothing here to suggest a special knowledge or even a special interest in Carian.[9] Nor can we merely take for granted from Herodotus' Carian background that he was able to understand the Carian language.[10]

---

[8] See L. Robert, 'Le Carien Mys et l'oracle du Ptöon (Hérodote, VIII, 135)', *Hellenica* 8 (1950) 23-38. Robert authoritatively dismisses the ideas that the oracles were delivered in Carian as a rule or that the story of Mys is evidence of the Carian origins of the cult. He is, however, excessively doubtful on the question of whether the *promantis* spoke Carian even on this one exceptional occasion, believing rather (pp.29-30) that Mys read what he was looking for into an incomprehensible babbling: see here Georges Daux, 'Mys au Ptôion (Hérodote, VIII, 135)', *Hommages W. Déonna* (Bruxelles, 1957) 157-62.

[9] See Appendix 1.

[10] Cf. H. Diels, 'Die Anfänge der Philologie bei den Griechen', *Neue Jahrbuch für Philologie* 25 (1910) 1-25 (at p.14), Robert, op. cit. (n. 8) 38: 'Au Ve siècle, dans les villes cariennes, il ne devait y avoir personne, si hellénisé fût-il, qui ne sût toujours le carien'. Carian decrees issued in Greek do not imply general bilingualism as supposed by D. J. Mosley, 'Greeks, Barbarians, Language and Contact', *Ancient Society* 2 (1971) 4. Contrast the exemplarily cautious approach of S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (Oxford, 1982) 27 and n. 165, 341-44.

In the case of other languages, he shows himself ignorant by his interest. Famously he asserts that all Persian names end in the letter *sigma*,[11] so revealing that he knew all his Persian through its Greek forms (1.139)[12]—and also ignoring his own evidence of the names of Persian women such as Atossa or Phaedyme. As Meyer commented on this passage, 'Mit Recht bewerkt er, dass die Perser selbst davon nichts wüssten; die Entdeckung zeigt uns, dass Herodot kein Wort persisch kannte.'[13] Herodotus seems to have mistaken all pictographic scripts for Egyptian, so that the discovery of various Hittite and other near-Eastern monuments convinced him that he had found traces of the campaign of Sesostris, a semi-mythical Egyptian king, in Asia Minor, Phoenicia, and even Thrace.[14] He also claims to have seen, and to have been able easily to read, examples of 'Cadmeian letters' inscribed in the temple of Apollo Ismenias in Thebes (5.59-61); these inscriptions, in immaculate Greek verse, he believed to have been inscribed by contemporaries of Oedipus and his father Laius.[15]

Herodotus' mistakes may sometimes be amusing, but his ignorance is neither unusual nor surprising. Themistocles was a rare example of a Greek who could speak a foreign language; he learnt Persian well enough, Plutarch tell us, in a year, to be able to converse fluently with Xerxes and incur the jealousy of the Persian nobility by his intimacy with the king (*Them.* 29.5).[16]

---

[11] Or *san* as the Dorians, unlike the Ionians, call it: for the significance of this ethnic distinction, see J. M. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 152-3.

[12] For Herodotus' knowledge of foreign languages, see E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur Alten Geschichte* (Halle, 1892) 192-5, H. Diels, op. cit. (n. 10) 14 ff., R. Schmitt, 'The Medo-Persian names of Herodotus in the light of the new evidence from Persepolis', *AAntHung* 24 (1976) 25-35 at p.35 (reprinted in J. Harmatta (ed.) *Studies in the Sources on the History of pre-Islamic Central Asia* (Budapest, 1979) 29-39), S. West, 'Herodotus' epigraphical interests', *CQ* 35 (1985) 278-305. S. Mandell's hypothesis, 'The language, eastern sources, and literary posture of Herodotus', *AncW* 21 (1990) 103-8, that Herodotus knew Aramaic founders simply on the fact that Herodotus nowhere reveals his knowledge of Aramaic as he is happy to reveal his ignorance of other languages. H. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland, 1966) 186 and n. 111, remarks that Herodotus' statement on Persian names 'is symbolic of the external magnificence, as well as the unity of the Persians'. Is this equally true, however, of his observation on Greek festivals (1.148.2)?

[13] Meyer, op. cit. (n. 12) 194. See, however, I. Gershevitch, 'The Old Persian Lisp', in G. Gnoli and A. Panaino (eds.) *Proceedings of the First European Conference on Iranian Studies* (Rome, 1990) I.115-33, for a rather elaborate alternative explanation of Herodotus' mistake as the result of the manner of transcription of Persian names by Elamite scribes.

[14] S. West, 'Sesostris' Stelae (Herodotus 2.102-106)', *Historia* 41 (1992) 117-20.

[15] S. West, op. cit. (n. 12) esp. 290-5.

[16] Cf. Thuc. 1.138.1, Corn. Nepos *Them.* 10, D.S. 11.57, Val. Max. 8.7 ext. 15. For a rather less tolerant attitude to foreign languages on Themistocles' part, see Plut. *Them.* 6.4 (on which see below, sect. 5). Less reliably, Alcibiades is said to have imitated

This vignette seems to show Themistocles' language skills as yet another re-flection of his special intelligence, the object rather of awe than imitation.[17] Even in the context of Alexander's conquest of Persia, we hear that Peucestas was the only Macedonian to learn Persian (Arr. *Anab.* 6.30.3).[18] Thucy-dides shows no greater a degree of sensitivity to foreign languages than He-rodotus: he describes what must have been a letter in Aramaic with the catch-all term Ἀσσύρια γράμματα (4.50.2).[19] For the most part indeed the Greeks seem to have thought (like the British today?) that the burden of re-sponsibility lay on foreigners to understand them.[20] The caste of interpreters in Egypt through whom the Greeks and Egyptians made themselves under-stood were Egyptian children brought up and educated by the Greeks, not the other way around (2.156.4).[21] As this example shows, when the Greeks

---

Pausanias in his medism, and adopted Persian dress and Persian speech, Athenaeus 12, 535e, and Pythagoras is said to have learnt Egyptian after a letter of introduction from Polycrates to Amasis, D.L. 8.3.

[17] Dubuisson, by contrast, 'Remarques sur le vocabulaire grec de l'acculturation', *RBPh* 60 (1982) 5-32, sees Themistocles' learning of Persian as presented as a purely prac-tical undertaking, devoid of any interest in Persian culture; Alcibiades' adaptation to dif-ferent customs is seen as a perversion. That Herodotus at least envisaged complete cul-tural assimilation as possible is suggested by the story of Miltiades' son, 6.41.4.

[18] Though see Arr. *Anab.* 3.6.6 for the *diglssos* Laomedon.

[19] See A. Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom* (Cambridge, 1975) 9, C. Nylander, '*Assyria Grammmata*: remarks on the 21st 'Letter of Themistocles', *Opuscula Atheniensia* 8 (1968) 119-36, West, op. cit. (n. 14) 119 and n. 14. Nylander ingeniously demonstrates that Themisto-cles' 21st letter contains evidence of knowledge in Greece of the invention of Old Persian script. M.-F. Baslez, *L'Étranger dans la Grèce Antique* (Paris, 1984) 186, assumes that the lan-guage learnt by Themistocles was also Aramaic. For Thucydides' knowledge of things Persian, see also R. Schmitt, 'Achaimenidisches bei Thukydides' in H. Koch and D. N. Mackenzie (eds.) *Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte der Achämenidenzeit und ihr Fortleben* (Berlin, 1983) 69-86.

[20] Momigliano, op. cit. (n. 19) 7-8, 18-19. For the Greek attitude to foreign languages, see in general M. Lejeune, 'La Curiosité linguistique dans l'Antiquité Classique', in *Con-férences de l'Institut de Linguistique de l'Université de Paris* 8 (1940-48) 45-61, V. Rotolo, 'La communicazione linguistica fra alloglotti nell' antichità classica', in *Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella* vol. 1 (Catania, 1972) 395-414, and a number of overlapping essays by J. Werner, 'Kenntnis und Bewertung fremder Sprachen bei den antiken Griechen', *Phi-lologus* 133 (1989) 169-76, 'Nichtgriechische Sprachen im Bewusstsein der antiken Griechen', in P. Händel and W. Meid (eds.) *Festschrift R. Muth* (Innsbruck, 1983) 583-95, 'Zur Fremdsprachenproblematik in der griechisch-römischen Antike, in C.W. Müller, K. Sier and J. Werner (eds.) *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Palingenesia 36 (Stuttgart, 1992).

[21] Is it significant that the oracle of Ammon addresses Alexander in Greek (Rotolo, op. cit. (n. 20) 396-7 and n. 9 on Plut. *Alex.* 27) while Greek oracles in general (cf. the story of Mys, 8.135.2) speak only in Greek? Greek oracles were, of course, consulted by non-

envisaged the process of learning a foreign language, they did so as something undertaken by children rather than adults.[22] Only in the Roman period, as a function perhaps of the Romans' stronger ethos of assimilating foreign cultures,[23] do we see any sign—for example, with a markedly more complimentary view of Themistocles from Cornelius Nepos—that competence in a language other than one's own was considered admirable.[24] Even then it is hard not to wonder how great a grasp these authors really had of the practicalities of multilingualism to imagine it possible for Mithridates or Cleopatra to have spoken up to twenty five languages (or how Nepos could have imagined it possible that Themistocles spoke Persian better than the Persians)—might Mithridates' and Cleopatra's knowledge of foreign languages have been the function of their status as the dangerous enemies of Rome?[25]

A distrust of foreign languages is also reflected in a number of parables of the dangers, indeed the ultimate impossibility, of cultural integration. So we have the story of the Scythian king Scyles, introduced by Herodotus as an illustration of the Scythian hatred of foreign customs (4.76.1). Scyles, having learnt the 'Greek language and letters'(4.78.1)[26] from his Istrian mother, became more and more enveloped into Greek culture until, on the eve of his initiation into the mysteries of Dionysus, his house was struck by a thunderbolt from the god; his people, as a result of his initiation, set up his brother in his place and killed him (4.78-80). The Median king Kyaxares offers some Scythian suppliants the opportunity to educate a group of children in the

---

Greeks (e.g. Croesus in Book I), but there are not sufficient grounds to speculate the existence of a fully polyglot clergy (as does M.-F. Baslez, op. cit. (n. 19) 60). Croesus and the Hyperboreans are scarcely everyday barbarians; and Croesus at any rate was assisted in his consultation of Delphi by the Athenian Alcmeon, 6.125.2. Sophocles' description of the oak of Dodona as πολυγλώσσου, *Trach.* 1168, cannot be taken as evidence that oracles at Dodona were given in a range of voices (cf. Hdt 2.54-47).

[22] Cf. 1.73.3, 4.78.1, *HHAphr.* 113-116, Pl. *Prot.* 325e, *Dissoi Logoi* DK 90 B 6, 12. The Scythians and Amazons do learn to understand each other as grown-ups, 4.111-117, but it is interestingly only the Amazon women who are able to learn the male Scythians' language, 4.114.1, and even then they only grasp it imperfectly, 4.117.

[23] See M. Dubuisson's description, op. cit. (n. 17) 31, of Rome as 'la cité hétérogène et assimilatrice par essence, le creuset de l'Italie puis du monde'. More generally, see W. G. Runciman, 'Doomed to Extinction: the *polis* as an evolutionary dead-end', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.) *The Greek City* (Oxford, 1990) 347-67, T. J. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome* (London, 1995), chs. 5-6.

[24] Themistocles: Nepos, *Them.* 10.

[25] Cleopatra: Plut. *Ant.* 27.3-4. Mithridates: Pliny *NH* 7.88, 25.67, Aul. Gell. *NA* 17.17, Val. Max. 8.7 ext. 16. Contrast the more modest, and more plausible, linguistic accomplishment of Ennius, Aul. Gell. *NA* 17.17, or of P. Licinius Crassus, Val. Max. 8.7.6.

[26] The two are almost universally seen as separate stages in the learning of a language.

Scythian language and in archery (1.73.3): after being harshly treated by Kyaxares one day, for returning empty-handed from a hunt, they have their revenge by killing one of the boys in their charge and feeding him to the king (1.73.5). Most illuminating perhaps is the story of the origin of the term 'Lemnian deeds' to describe outrageously bloody actions (6.138). The Athenian wives kidnapped by the Lemnians at the festival of Artemis at Brauron taught their children the 'Attic language and the manners (τρόπους) of the Athenians'. As a result they soon dominated the pure-bred Pelasgian children of Lemnos. The Pelasgians asked themselves what these Athenian children would achieve when they were men, and so killed them and their mothers. The Attic language and a characteristic Attic freedom of spirit go hand-in-hand here.[27] But another moral shouts out more clearly from all these stories: that each should keep to his own.

Herodotus does, nonetheless, introduce a number of foreign words (largely terms for exotic, untranslateable, trade items) into his *Histories*.[28] Ivan Linforth applauded Herodotus for being so sparing in his use of foreign words; he complains, by comparison, of modern travel-books 'sometimes rendered nearly unintelligible by foreign words'.[29] Whether or not he uses them often or sparingly is a difficult, since largely subjective, question: we cannot know how many foreign words he had at his disposal. We may perhaps judge—though it is again a subjective question—that Herodotus imparts his knowledge of foreign words with a certain relish, as if they were, in his mind, prized souvenirs of his enquiries (however those enquiries were carried out). Rather more concretely, we can compare his knowledge of foreign words with that of other authors.

If we take the list of loan words from the Near East compiled by Thomas Braun, Herodotus emerges as including in his *Histories* all but one of the archaic near-eastern loan words,[30] and a substantial proportion, five out of

---

[27] For 'Lemnian deeds', see also E. *Hec.* 886-7 and A. *Cho.* 631-8 with Garvie ad loc. Cf. also the linguistic resistance of the kidnapped wives of the first Milesian wives, 1.146, and the uncanny parallel preserved by the early ninth-century chronicler Nennius in his *Historia Brittonum* (tr. J. Morris) ch. 27 of the Armorican British 'who destroyed the western parts of Gaul to the ground, and did not leave alive those who piss against the wall. They married their wives and daughters and cut out their tongues, lest their descendants should learn their mothers' tongue. That is why we call them in our language 'Letewicion', that is, half-dumb, because their speech is muddled.'

[28] See Appendix 2. Cf. Immerwahr's observation, op. cit. (n. 12) 231 n. 118, that Herodotus' 'main linguistic interest' was in 'differences of vocabulary'.

[29] I. M. Linforth, 'Greek gods and foreign gods in Herodotus', *UCPClPh* 9 (1926) 1-25 (at p. 11).

[30] See Braun's list, 'The Greeks in the Near East', *CAH* III[2] pt.3, 1-31 (at pp. 25-6); see also for an excellent discussion of the background of contacts underlying the loan of

eighteen, of those words Braun classes as classical loan words. Of course, references to foreign words in extant Greek literature are hardly a reliable guide to general Greek usage; we certainly cannot argue from the silence of other sources that Herodotus was the first to discover a foreign word. The comparison of Braun's list with Herodotus, however, only strengthens the impression drawn from the discrepancy between his knowledge of archaic and of classical loan words that Herodotus' knowledge of foreign words is largely or exclusively second-hand, and that it is drawn from Greek sources. Of the five classical loan words from Braun's list, for example, δέλτος (writing tablet), βυσσός (a fine textile)[31], σίνδων (linen), κάμελος (camel) and κινάμωμον (cinnamon), only κινάμωμον clearly appears first in the *Histories*. The other four terms all appear in earlier authors, Aeschylus or Pindar, or in one case in Herodotus' contemporary Sophocles.[32] Those classical loan words from Braun's list that Herodotus does not include in his *Histories* largely appear in later sources, so perhaps suggesting that Herodotus' coverage of foreign words current in Greek vocabulary was pretty good, but they also appear in a wide variety of sources—orators, philosophers and playwrights as well as, less surprisingly, in Xenophon—confirming the impression of the lack of any particular 'professional' expertise in foreign words.[33] In short, it seems that, although Herodotus may have been adept at gathering together the foreign words for oriental exotica which were familiar in

---

words, W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution* (Cambridge Mass., 1992) 33-40, and for additional loan words, e.g., A. G. McGready, 'Egyptian words in the Greek vocabulary', *Glotta* 46 (1968) 247-54, B. Hemmerdinger, 'De la Méconnaissance de quelques etymologies Grecques', *Glotta* 48 (1970) 40-66, and R. Schmitt, '"Méconnaissance" altiranischen Sprachgutes im Griechischen', *Glotta* 49 (1971) 95-110, esp. 97-100. No list of loan words can be finally authoritative: I use Braun's merely as an example.

[31] Produced from filaments spun by a mollusc. Herodotus only includes the adjective *bussinos*, 1.200, 2.86.6, 2.95.3, 7.181.2.

[32] Δέλτος: Pi. fr. 52h 24 (Maehler), H. *Batr.* 3. Βυσσός (or βυσσινός): S. fr. 373.3 Radt, A. *Pers.* 125. Σίνδων: A. fr. 153. Κάμελος: A. *Suppl.* 285. The word ἀγγαρήιον (3.126.2, 8.98.2) used to describe the Persian postal service (for the etymology of which see Hemmerdinger, op. cit. (n. 30) 41) is foreshadowed by ἄγγαρος, A. *Ag.* 282. The terms παρασάγγαι (= 30 stades, 2.6, 6.42.2) and ὀροσάγγαι (the benefactors of the king, 8.85.3, for which terms see J. Wiesehöfer, 'Die "Freunde" und "Wohltäter" des Grosskönigs', *Studia Iranica* 9 (1980) 7-21) are paralleled respectively at S. fr. 520 Radt and at S. frs. 183, 634 Radt.

[33] Is. 8.23, Antiph. 121.6 KA (ἀρραβών, pledge), Xen. *Anab.* 1.5.6, S. fr. 1094 Radt (σίγλος), Orph. *Lith.* 267, 613 Abel, Pl. *Phaed.* 110d (ἴασπις, jasper), Ar. fr. 224 KA, Antiph. 216.3 KA (κάκκαβος, cooking pot), Ar. *Eq.* 1296, *Pl.* 806 (σιπύη, bread bin; cf. σιπύϊς, *RAL* 20 (1965) 454 ff., no. 10), *Anth. Pal.* 4.1.42 (κύπρος, henna), Thphr. *HP* 9.7.2, *Anth. Pal.* 4.1.43 (νάρδος, nard), S. fr. 849 Radt (νάβλας, harp), Arist. *Pol.* 1341b1 (σαμβύκη, harp), Hermipp. 91 KA, Ar. *Lys.* 730 (σής, moth), Thphr. *HP* 9.1.2, 9.7.2 (χαλβάνη, galbanum).

cultured Greek circles, he was in no sense a pioneer in the investigation of foreign languages. Indeed it is doubtful if there were any such pioneers. Though there may have been a greater interest shown in dialectical differences within the Greek language, there is no sign, arguably until Hesychius, of any systematic inquiry into foreign words.[34]

How representative is Herodotus of the general degree of knowledge of or interest in foreign languages among the Greeks? Surely, given the degree of contact between the Greek and 'barbarian' worlds in practice,[35] there must also have been a greater degree of linguistic contact as well. Still, however, the point stands that, whilst Herodotus and other authors used a smattering of foreign terms to inject spice and colour into their texts, little status seems to have been attached to the more systematic knowledge of foreign languages. That Herodotus, of mixed Carian and Greek background and a man (leaving aside the question of the extent of his actual travels) *at very least* with a professed interest in foreign cultures and an apparent delight in revealing his knowledge of foreign languages, should be no more knowledgeable than he is is stark testament to this.

2. Herodotus' presentation of foreign languages

Herodotus is also generally not sensitive to the question of the language in which his non-Greeks speak.[36] There is probably only one clear instance (if you exclude an oracle that is spoken in Carian on the grounds that it is pre-

---

[34] Cf. Lejeune, op. cit. (n. 20) 56, speaking of lexicons as well as of historians and geographers: 'il s'agit toujours de menues curiosités de collectionneurs, d'indications isolées, fournies au hasard de la description des vêtements, des armes, des habitations, des modes de vie, des coutumes, des lois, des croyances chez les populations barbares: les mots viennent s'insérer dans ce pittoresque ethnographique, dont l'antiquité était friande.' For differences between dialects, see *OCD*[3] s.v. glossa, glossary, and the argument of K. Latte, 'Glossographica', *Philologus* 80 (1925) 136-75, that Plato may have had access to a collection of lexical correspondences. Contrast J.M. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 174.

[35] For contacts between Greece and the Near-East, see Braun, op. cit. (n. 30) and n. 41 below for Greek-Persian contacts; see also now M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford, 1997) 606-24 on the 'dynamics of international transmission', commenting (p. 607) that 'there must have been far more who learned this or another oriental tongue in unrecorded circumstances'. For contacts between Greece and Egypt, see M. M. Austin, *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age, PCPhS* Supplement 2 (Cambridge, 1970), T. Braun, 'The Greeks in Egypt', *CAH* III[2].3, 32-56.

[36] As Anna Morpurgo Davies comments in the handout to a lecture 'Greeks and Barbarians: how can a great culture be monolingual?', first delivered as a Webster lecture at Stanford in April 1988, 'in historical narrative, the necessary existence of interpreters is often forgotten'.

sumably believed to be supernatural[37]) of a Greek speaking a foreign language in the *Histories*: Histiaeus, the originator of the Ionian Revolt, and for a long time beforehand a courtier of Darius, is explicitly stated to have shouted out to a Persian soldier who was chasing after him in the Persian language (Πέρσιδα γλῶσσαν μετιείς) that he was Histiaeus the Milesian (6.29.2). This story is matched by a single instance of a Persian speaking Greek. At the Theban banquet thrown by Attaginus in honour of Mardonius and the Persians before Plataea, a Persian was seated next to a Greek on every couch. Thersander, a man of Orchomenus, had a couch-mate who spoke Greek (Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἱέντα, 9.16.2) and who gave him a 'verbal memorial' of their meal together: the information that of all those seated before them, and of the army encamped by the river outside, in a short time the overwhelming majority would be dead. At the same time as he said these things he cried. To ask whether the other Greeks and Persians were having equally meaningful conversations, or to generalize on the basis of this story that 'the Persians could mix with other peoples without the provision of interpreters'[38] is surely to press this anecdote further than it allows. A Greek-speaking Persian (with the linguistic status of the remaining Persians left conveniently vague) might simply have seemed preferable to Herodotus to hypothesising a whole regiment of interpreters.[39]

On other occasions we simply cannot take for granted in what language Herodotus envisages conversations as taking place. One other possible instance of Greeks who speak Persian comes from the story of a Spartan embassy to Cyrus (1.153.1). The Spartans warn Cyrus that he must not meddle with the Greek cities of Asia Minor, or he will have them to answer to. Cyrus then turned to the Greeks present and enquired of them who were these Spartans and how many were they that they should come and pronounce to him in this fashion. This is one of a number of stories in Herodotus and elsewhere of Persian kings' asking 'where on earth' is Athens or Sparta; the tendency of the stories is to reinforce the status of the Greek cities as the plucky underdogs, the brave Davids in the struggle against the

---

[37] Rotolo, op. cit. (n. 20) 398, counts Aphrodite's speech at *HHAphr*. 113-6 as the first instance of bilingualism. The Delphic oracle also manages to speak one word of Libyan (4.155.3). For foreign languages as an analogy for mantic possession, see below, sect. III.

[38] As Mosley, op. cit. (n. 10) 5. Mandell, op. cit. (n. 12) 107, posits a general rule that 'when there is no indication in the text that he used an interpreter as an intermediary, there is no justification for assuming that he used one. Only where he specifically tells the reader that he needed an interpreter, are we justified in assuming that the implied narrator did not know the language in question…'

[39] Such problems, whether practical or historiographical, are avoided by the different seating arrangements at Alexander's Opis banquet, Arr. *Anab.* 7.11.8.

Persian Goliath.[40] The detail of the Greeks present at Darius' court is quite incidental. Now, of course, we know that there were Greeks at Darius' court,[41] and we might guess that they could speak a spattering at least of Persian. In general, it is reasonable to suppose also that there was a far greater degree of contact between Greece and Persia, and by extension of linguistic contact, than appears to be the case at first sight. But we cannot safely presume that Herodotus envisaged the conversation in Persian, or indeed that he ever thought to think about it.

Sometimes Herodotus makes explicit the presence of interpreters, for example during Cyrus' interview of Croesus on the pyre (1.86.6), or in the context of Darius' demonstration that the Callatian Indians would not burn their parents for any sum of money, whereas the Greeks would not (as the Callatian Indians do) eat their parents (3.38.3-4); Cambyses commandeers some fish-eaters to interpret with the Ethiopians (3.19.1); Darius talks through an interpreter to the Samian Syloson (3.140.3); Herodotus refers to his own interpreter on his (alleged) travels in Egypt (2.156.6); he also refers to the need for seven interpreters to accompany Scythians on visits to the Argippaei (4.24).[42] However, on other occasions, for example the earlier conversation between Syloson and Darius (3.139), or in written correspondence between people of different nationalities, for example the extended correspondence of the Samian Polycrates and the Egyptian king Amasis (3.40-43), Herodotus does not appear to bother himself—any more than his model, Homer—with the question of the language spoken. Though we may wonder in some instances whether the presence of interpreters constitutes a marker of the especially alien nature of the dialogue at issue—so, Herodotus' mention of an interpreter during Darius' 'seminar on comparative funerary practices' comes only after the introduction of the Callatian Indians[43]—there

---

[40] See T. Harrison, 'Aeschylus, Atossa and Athens' in E. Dabrowa (ed.) *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean World* (Kraków, forthcoming).

[41] For contacts between Greece and Persia, see D. M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden, 1977) and his 'Persians in Herodotus' in M. H. Jameson (ed.) *The Greek Historians. Papers presented* to A.E. Raubitschek (Palo Alto, 1985) 101-17; see also now M. C. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century* (Cambridge, 1997), esp. chs. 3-4. For widespread epigraphic evidence of Iranians in the Aegean (not just Asia Minor), see M.-F. Baslez, 'Présence et Traditions Iraniennes dans les Cités de l'Égée' *REA* 87 (1985) 137-55. For aristocratic contacts between the Persian and Greek worlds, see also the ingenious reconstruction of L. M. Whitby, 'Ion of Chios and the margins of the Delian League', in E. Dabrowa, op. cit. (n. 41), and now L. Mitchell, *Greeks Bearing Gifts* (Cambridge, 1997), ch. 6.

[42] Cf. Mosley's interpretation of this passage, op. cit. (n. 10) 2: 'they took with them seven interpreters, each of whom spoke seven different languages'.

[43] Both this suggestion and the phrase I owe to Stephanie West: the same highlighting of the 'alien element' might be seen, she suggests, in the contrast between Solon's interview with Croesus (where no interpreter is mentioned) and Croesus' with Cyrus.

is by no means always any apparent rhyme or reason to the presence of absence of interpreters. We cannot then assume on the basis of stories such as Solon's visit to the court of Croesus—anyway chronologically impossible—, and the lack of any mention of interpreters there, that 'Lydians … were able to understand Greek'.[44]

Again Herodotus' presentation of foreign languages is not out of keeping with that of many Greek writers. Though the Greek tragedians did sometimes try to convey barbarian speech through 'cacophony, other acoustic effects, and the use of scattered items of foreign vocabulary'[45] and of epic vocabulary, in general they follow the convention that barbarians speak Greek—though attention is at the same time drawn repeatedly to their barbarous speech,[46] and though speaking Greek can be taken as proof of being a Greek.[47] The Greek comedians appear to have been rather more interested in language difference, if only because they saw the comic opportunities of foreign (including regional Greek) accents.[48] Their impressions of for-

---

[44] Mosley, op. cit. (n. 10) 3. For Greek interpreters, see esp. Mosley, op. cit. (n. 10), B. Rochette, 'Grecs et Latins face aux langues étrangères', *RBPh* 73 (1995) 5-16; see also the comments on the presence of interpreters in Herodotus of M. L. West, op. cit. (n. 35) 608-9 ('The passages may not be historically reliable, but at least they bear witness to Herodotus' assumptions and expectations').

[45] E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 17; for foreign languages in tragedy, see Hall 17-21, 76-9, 117-121, 177-81. For the characterisation of the Persians in A. *Pers.*, see also C. Morenilla-Talens, 'Die Charakterisierung der Ausländer durch lautliche Ausdrucksmittel in den *Persern* des Aischylos sowie den *Acharnern* und *Vögeln* des Aristophanes', *IF* 94 (1989) 158-76. For Persian names in Aeschylus, see R. Schmitt, *Die Iranier-Namen bei Aischylos (Iranica Graeca Vetustiora I)* (Wien, 1978). P. D. Arnott, *Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre* (London, 1989) 135, compares the colouring of the language of Aeschylus' *Persians* with the 'German officer in an American- or British-made war film speaking accented English with a few German phrases thrown in'.

[46] e.g. A. *Suppl.* 117-19. In the same way, though Orestes and Pylades in Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* are said to adopt Phocian accents (560-4), they continue to speak in Attic trimeters that show no sign of any phonetic imitation: E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 118, A. Davies, 'The Greek notion of dialect', *Verbum* 10 (1987) 7-28 at p. 12 (though cf. P.T. Stevens, 'Colloquial expressions in Aeschylus and Sophocles', *CQ* 39 (1945) 95-105 at p. 96). As Davies points out, 'that [Orestes] then procedes to speak in beautiul Attic trimetres does not alter the import of the sentence' as evidence of dialect switching in everyday speech.

[47] Philoctetes, S. *Phil.* 223-34, needs to hear Neoptolemus speak before knowing that he is Greek (but cf. E. *Hel.* 83-4).

[48] In general see: S. Halliwell, 'The sounds of the voice in Old Comedy' in E. M. Craik (ed.) *'Owls to Athens'* (Oxford, 1990) 69-79, C. Brixhe, 'La langue de l'étranger non-Grec chez Aristophane' in R. Lonis (ed.) *L'Étranger dans le Monde Grec* (Nancy, 1988) 113-38, R. Schmitt, 'Perser und Persisches in der alten Attischen Komödie', *Acta Iranica* 23 (1984) 459-72. There is a vast secondary literature on individual passages in Aristophanes. For Ar. *Ach.* 91-122, esp. 100, see O. Hansen in Festschrift Max Vasmer (Wiesbaden, 1956)

eign speech may sometimes contain authentic elements of foreign languages; they offer some guide at least to the regional differences in pronunciation within Greece.[49]

It is only perhaps with Xenophon's *Anabasis*, that we see a more realistic appreciation of language difference. Thucydides is conscious of the practical opportunities of the differences in Greek dialects,[50] but his portrayal of foreign languages—for example of the Eurytanians who, 'so it is said, speak a language which is almost unintelligible and eat their meat raw' (ἀγνωσότατοι δὲ γλῶσσαν καὶ ὠμοφάγοι, 3.94.5)—is essentially caricatured. In the *Anabasis*, however, we see named interpreters (1.2.17, 1.8.12)[51] and a makeshift interpreter (5.4.4); noticeably also the language spoken by an interpreter is on one occasion specified (4.5.34).[52] (By contrast, Thucydides terms the Carian Gaulites δίγλωσσος (8.85.2) though it may make more sense to suppose him trilingual.[53]) Scenes like that of the slave peltast who comes forward from the ranks to interpret with his own people, the Macronians (4.8.4), of the cupbearer who to the amusement of all present understands Greek (7.3.25), of the interpreter who recognises Tissaphernes' brother (2.5.35), or of the interview through an interpreter with some Persian women at a spring (4.5.9-10) seem to reflect the real attempt of Xenophon to 'get by' in foreign lands. The convention that barbarians speak Greek has collapsed under the weight of his experience.

Herodotus' interpreters, by contrast, seem to be applied to the narrative like a linguistic panacea. Certainly Herodotus does not entertain the possibility of Scythian interpreters who can speak all seven languages required for a journey to the Argippaei, but he appears to imagine that the Greeks present at Darius' interview of the Callatian Indians were able to understand the Indians by means of a single Callatian-Indian-to-Greek interpreter—surely a rare commodity.[54] This passage must reflect the fact that

---

177-80, K. J. Dover, *Maia* (1963) 7-8, W. Brandenstein *WZKSO (Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde süd- und Ostasiens und Archiv für Indische Philosophie)* 8 (1964) 43-58, M. L. West, *CR* 18 (1968) 5-7, C. Chiasson, *CPh* 79 (1984) 131-36, Morenilla-Talens, op. cit. (n. 46). For the Triballian in Ar. *Av.*, see J. Whatmough, *CPh* 47 (1952) 26, Chiasson, *CPh* 79 (1984) 132 n. 6. For the archer scene in Ar. *Thesm.* (1001 ff.), see E. Hall, *Philologus* 133 (1989) 38-54 (for linguistic caricature esp. pp. 38-40).

[49] See the balanced discussion of S. Colvin, 'Aristophanes: dialect and textual criticism', *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995) 34-47.

[50] Thuc. 3.112.4, 4.3.3.

[51] Cf. the presumably bilingual envoy Timesitheus, 5.4.2.

[52] Other interpreters in the *Anabasis*: 2.3.17, 4.2.18, 4.4.5, 7.2.19, 7.6.8. See also the bilingual Pategyas, 1.8.1.

[53] Robert, op. cit. (n. 8) 38. Cf. Plut. *Alex.* 37.1-2, D.S. 17.68.5.

[54] Cf. Mosley's literal reading, op. cit. (n. 10) 5.

Herodotus' interpreters are rather more the products of narrative conven-
ience than of any great experience of the practicalities of language differ-
ence.[55] The temptation must be resisted, however, to imagine that the differ-
ence between the two historians is the reflection of a progressive enlighten-
ment with regards to foreign languages. The accounts of the campaigns of
Alexander show little of the practical awareness concerning language of
Xenophon, very probably due to the distance in time from the events.[56] It is
Xenophon, rather than Herodotus, who appears to be the exception to the
rule.

3. The Greek Conceptualisation of Foreign Languages

How did Herodotus and the Greeks envisage the difference between Greek
and foreign languages?

The entire frame within which the Greeks viewed foreign languages was,
in a number of ways, very different. First, although on a number of occa-
sions Herodotus refers to, or implies, the existence of a common Greek lan-
guage, including the quotation with which I began (8.144.2),[57] Herodotus has
no unambiguous way of referring to dialect as distinct from language.[58] On
one occasion he appears at first sight to come close to a formula for describ-
ing dialect. The cities of Ionia do not use the same language ($\gamma\lambda\hat{\omega}\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$) as
one another, but have four $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\hat{\eta}\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ $\gamma\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$, or forms of language
(1.142.3-4). He goes on immediately, however, in turning to the cities of
Lydia (Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedus, Teos, Clazomenae and Phocaea) to
say that these cities 'do not agree at all' in their language with the other
Ionians but 'sound the same as one another' ($\acute{o}\mu o\lambda o\gamma\acute{e}ov\sigma\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\gamma\lambda\hat{\omega}\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$

---

[55] A good analogy might be E. *Rhes.* 290-297 where a surprising degree of linguistic
competence is ascribed by Euripides to the Trojan shepherd: he is capable first of detect-
ing that Rhesus' Thracians were not Greek and then of questioning them in their own
Thracian.

[56] Arr. *Anab.* 3.6.6, 4.3.7, 7.1.5, *Ind.* 28.3-5, Curt. Ruf. 5.11.4-5, 5.13.7, 6.5.19, 6.11.4,
8.2.19, Plut. *Alex.* 37.1-2, D.S. 17.68.5.

[57] Cf. 2.56.3, 4.78, 8.135.

[58] See esp. Morpurgo Davies, op. cit. (n. 46); for consciousness of dialect relative to the
'cultural sense of Greek as a single language', see also Halliwell, op. cit. (n. 48) 72, K.
Mickey, 'Dialect consciousness and literary language: an example from ancient Greece',
TPhS (1981) 335-66, C. Brixhe and R. Hodot, 'À chacun sa koiné' in C. Brixhe (ed.) *La
Koiné grecque antique I—une langue introuvable* (Nancy, 1993) 7-21. For the reality of the rela-
tionship between Greek dialects and ethnic identity, see J. M. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1), ch. 6
(including a rather inappropriately entitled section 'The Greek Attitude to Dialect', pp.
170-77).

οὐδέν, σφίσι δὲ ὁμοφωνέουσι, 1.142.4).[59] Elsewhere Herodotus talks of the 'Attic language' (γλῶσσαν, 6.138.2). This haziness in the distinction of language and dialect is not unique to Herodotus. The expression 'the Attic language', for example, is used in the poetry of Solon;[60] Thucydides can speak of the 'Dorian language' and Aeschylus of the Phocian.[61] The term διάλεκτος can be used of foreign languages[62] and of the range of accents within a city[63] as much as of differences between cities or regions.[64] The distinction between dialect and language is, of course, inevitably a hazy one, given that it is often dictated rather more by political than linguistic criteria.[65] The rapid discovery of distinct Croatian, Serbian and Bosnian languages in the former Yugoslavia, the ongoing discussion as to the status of ancient Macedonian,[66] or the question of whether Scots or American English are distinct languages, provide eloquent proof of this.[67]

Just as the boundary between dialect and language is unclear, so also another common modern distinction is less prevalent: that is, the idea that language sets humans apart from animals. Another word, other than γλῶσσα *glossa*, used to denote language, φωνή *phone*, can be used as much to describe the sound of asses as the language of men (4.129.3);[68] Hermippus refers to the διάλεκτος of a lamb (fr. 3 KA). The term ἀνθρωπιστί, paralleling Περσιστί or

---

[59] This lack of a clear distinction between dialect and language explains the inclusion of translations between dialects as well as from foreign languages in Appendix 2.

[60] Solon fr. 36.11-12 West.

[61] Thuc. 3.112, A. *Cho.* 564.

[62] Pol. 1.80.6, D.S. 17.68.5 (cf. 5.6.5). Φωνή can also be used of what we would term dialect: Thuc. 6.5.1, 7.57.2.

[63] Ar. fr. 706 KA; cf. Dem. 37.55.

[64] Cf. also H. *Od.* 19.175-7, A. *Sept.* 169-70 with E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 178.

[65] See Morpurgo Davies, op. cit. (n. 46) 8: 'It is simply not true… that the structural distinctions between two so-called dialects of a language are always smaller than those between two so-called languages.'

[66] For which see E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 179-80 (with further refs.)

[67] 'Why', asked the American Rupert Hughes, 'should we permit the survival of the curious notion that our language is a mere loan from England, like a copper kettle that we must keep scoured and return without a dent' (quoted by H. L. Mencken, *The American Language* (London, 4th ed., 1963) 87). Similarly ideologically charged is the common idea that 'Received Pronunciation' is an absence of accent, as if regional accents were merely accretions to a pure original.

[68] Φωνή, according to Aristotle, is the sound made by a creature with a soul, *de. anim.* 420b. For such terminology in philosophical writers, see esp. W. Ax, *Laut, Stimme und Sprache* (Göttingen, 1986).

Δωριστί,[69] implicitly equates human with animal speech (S. fr. 827 Radt). Aristotle makes the equation explicit and develops it: animals differ, according to locality, both in their φωνή and in their διάλεκτοι, whereas men are all the same in φωνή but differ in their διάλεκτος (Arist. *Hist. Anim.* 536b).[70] In the Aristotelian *Problemata* the distinction between animals and humans is made that animals can only utter at most a few consonants (*Probl.* 895a); this has the consequence that children, before learning their letters, are like beasts. The common analogy of foreign speech with the sound of birds[71] perhaps reflects the same grey boundary between human and animal speech— though, of course, the analogy would not properly dehumanize the language of barbarians if there were *no* distinction drawn between human and animal speech.

Another broader idea that colours the characterisation of foreign languages is that the manner of speech of a people or of an individual reflects certain innate characteristics. So, Ion in Euripides' play prays that his mother be Athenian 'that from my mother free speech (παρρησία) might be mine (E. *Ion* 670-5).[72] A similar implication lies behind the discovery of the identity of the boy Cyrus. Cyrus, brought up after his exposure as a child as the son of a swineherd, is discovered when in a classless playground, encompassing both the sons of swineherds and of aristocrats, he is appointed king and whips the son of Artembares. When summoned before his grandfather, the king Astyages, his 'very free' manner of speech (ὑπόκρισις ἐλευθεριωτέρη, 1.116.1), together with his looks and age, reveal him as the rightful king of Media, and reduce Astyages to speechlessness. Cyrus' freedom of speech, one suspects, in so far as it is a marker of his royalty, is contrasted implicitly with the lack of freedom of his future subjects. Freedom of speech is something that the Chorus of Aeschylus' *Persians* look forward to as a result of the demise of their monarchy, but which they fail to achieve (591-4).[73] For the lack of such a free spirit is the characteristic of the slave, as

---

[69] Περσιστί: 8.85.3, 9.110.2. Δωριστί: Simonides test. 44 Campbell, Call. I.203.18 Pfeiffer.

[70] Cf. Arist. *Probl.* 895a: 'why does man show great variety of voice (πολλάς φωνὰς ἀφίησι) but other animals have only one, unless they are of different species? Or has man only one voice (μία φωνή) though many varieties of speech (διάλεκτοι)?'

[71] See below, n. 80.

[72] cf. E. *Hipp.* 421-3; see also the association of language and freedom of speech in the story of the Lemnian deeds, 6.138, for which see above, sect. 1. (Notice also how their Athenian genetic inheritance, even through the maternal line, predominates over the Pelasgian.)

[73] See further Harrison, op. cit. (n. 40). That this 'freedom of speech' is something that by definition cannot be a universal characteristic is suggested also by Gorgias' argument, Pl. *Gorg.* 452d-e, that speech gives you the freedom to make others your slaves.

Sophocles makes clear by implication when Deianeira in the *Trachiniai* asserts that a slave *can* speak a free λόγος (Soph. *Trach.* 62-3). The slave or foreigner's lack of freedom of speech is not just the result of their circumstances (it is not just for fear of being whipped that slaves are not habitually outspoken[74]), but of their nature.[75] This idea seems to be connected to another image of barbarian speech, that it is verbose and lacking in content.[76] Barbarian speech is perhaps then at the opposite pole to the archetypally pithy (and free?) Laconic speech.[77]

The central element in the characterisation of foreign languages is the emphasis on their incomprehensibility. So, for example, as we have seen, Thucydides described a group of Aetolians as ἀγνώστατοι δὲ γλῶσσαν (3.94.5).[78] It is by analogy to this that Greek dialects or accents, such as the Lesbian of Pittacus, can be described as barbarian (Pl. *Prot.* 341c)—though it would not seriously have been maintained that a Lesbian was not Greek—or that a man can be said to have lapsed into 'sub-barbarian speech'.[79] It is also because of the imagined incomprehensibility of foreign languages that the frequent analogy is drawn between foreign languages, prophecy and the sound of birds. Herodotus' rationalisation of the myth of the foundation of the oracle of Dodona rests on the idea that Egyptian women could have been described as black birds from the sound of their speech (2.54-7). Cassandra's prophecies likewise are described as uttered in a 'barbarian lan-

---

[74] Though enforcement of a correctness of speech may be implied by Pl. *Gorg.* 485b-c as suggested by Halliwell, op. cit. (n. 48) 70-1.

[75] Cf. Ar. fr. 706 KA. See here (and for the different speech of other groups, esp. women) Halliwell, op. cit. (n. 48) 70-1; for women's speech, see also M. E. Gilleland, *AJPh* 101 (1980) 180-3, D. Bain, *Antichthon* 18 (1984) 24-42.

[76] See esp. Simonides 653 *PMG*, or the Phrygian in E. *Orestes;* cf. Pi. *Ol.* 2.86 f., Anacreon 403 *PMG*, Simonides 600 *PMG*. For the idea that barbarian speech was imagined to be lacking in *logos,* reason, see Baslez, op. cit. (n. 19) 186. Cf. the λόγος–φωνή antithesis of Arist. *Probl.* 895a.

[77] 3.46, Pl. *Prot.* 342e. A Doric which was 'almost music' was the language of choice of a miraculous polyglot discovered in the Arabian gulf by Cleombrotus: Plut. *Mor.* 421b (*de def. orac.*).

[78] The superlative does not necessarily reflect any desire to understand foreign peoples, but more likely just a relative scale of barbarism. Cf. the presumably paradoxical expression βάρβαρα σαφηνῆ at A. *Pers.* 633-6, for which see G. Paduano, *Sui Persiani di Eschilo: problemi di focalizzazione drammatica* (Rome, 1978) 23, A. Tourraix, 'Les *Perses*: la Géopolitique et l'Histoire', in P. Ghiron-Bistagne, A. Moreau and J.-C. Turpin (eds.) *Les Perses d'Eschyle* (Montpellier, 1992/3) 99-117.

[79] Halliwell's translation, op. cit. (n. 48) 70, of Pl. *Lys.* 223a. For Pittacus and Lesbian, see further J. Werner, 'Das Lesbische als barbarische Sprache?', *Philologus* 135 (1991) 55-62.

guage' like a swallow (φωνὴν βάρβαρον, A. *Ag.* 1050-2).[80] That this idea is not just a rather feeble simile is suggested by the use of the same term ἑρμηνεύς to describe both the interpreter of oracles and of foreign languages.[81] More outlandish languages, or the languages of more outlandish peoples, are compared to the sounds emitted by less attractive animals: the Troglodyte Ethiopians, the fastest runners in the world (something to do perhaps with their being hunted in chariots by their neighbours the Garamantes), have a language 'similar' to no other, but sounding like screeching bats (4.183.4).

The Troglodyte Ethiopians provide an example of how Herodotus and the Greeks were willing and able to see quite fundamental differences between their own language and those of other peoples, and so to go to extremes in dehumanising them. As well as the Troglodytes, we also hear of the Atarantes, the only 'anonymous' people of whom we know (4.184.1), in that they have no personal names.[82] In other ways, however, just as Herodotus sees patterns in the geography of his world (the Nile mirroring the Danube) or in human customs (Egyptian men urinating sitting down and women standing up), so he tends to see artificial patterns in languages. It is this desire to systematise language, for example, that leads him to the false conclusion that all Persian names end in the letter *sigma* (1.139), or to the true observation that the names of all Greek festivals end in the letter *alpha* (1.148.2).[83] A similar schematism can be seen in the characterisations of foreign peoples (in terms both of their languages and other characteristics) listed in Appendix 1. It is all a little too tidy, too convenient, the manner in which human beings are presented as being the sum of five or six cultural components (e.g., the Androphagoi, 4.106), or when he is less concerned to

---

[80] Cf. S. *Trach.* 1060, *Ant.* 1002, E. *Ba.* 1034-5, Ar. *Av.* 199-200, *Ran.* 679-82, *Pax.* 681. The analogy of barbarian speech and the sound of birds is perhaps suggested of the Trojans at H. *Il.* 3.1-9.

[81] A. *Ag.* 615-6, 1062-3, 615-6 (cf. 1254). See further Lejeune, op. cit. (n. 20) 58 (commenting also on the commercial overtones of *interpres*), Rotolo, op. cit. (n. 20) 396 n. 9, E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 117-8. For analogy of poet and ἑρμηνεύς: Pl. *Ion* 534e.

[82] Such a phenomenon has never been recorded of any human society (see R. D. Alford, *Naming and Identity: A Cross-Cultural Study of Personal Naming Practices* (New Haven, 1988) 1)—or any *other* human society, one is tempted to add. There are, however (see Alford, pp. 112-3) societies with taboos on the use of personal names: though I am keen to resist the tendency to attempt to vindicate Herodotus' accuracy at every turn, we might wonder if this is the source of the confusion here.

[83] Anna Morpurgo Davies points out to me that Herodotus might have been interested here in showing that the various forms of speech in Greece were not so remote from each other. For the schematism of Herodotus' view of foreign lands and peoples, see esp. J. Redfield, 'Herodotus the Tourist', *CPh* 80 (1985) 97-118, F. Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus*, tr. J. Lloyd (Berkeley, 1988), P. Cartledge, 'Herodotus and the "Other": a meditation on empire', *EMC* 34 (1990) 27-40.

give details, just two (e.g., the eastern Ethiopians, 7.70.1). The schematism of Herodotus' accounts of foreign peoples becomes even more pronounced on those occasions on which he attempts to blur his categories, for example by his observations on the language of the Geloni, half-Scythian, half-Greek (4.108.2), that of the Ammonians, 'between' Egyptian and Ethiopian (2.42.4), or the dress of the Sagartian nomads, half-Persian, half-Pactyan (7.85.1). That such an outlook was not uncommon can be seen from the widespread use of terms such as μιξέλλην μειξοβάρβαρος or ἡμιβάρβαρος.[84]

The most drastic form of schematism possible in characterising foreign languages is one that Herodotus avoids, however: that is to speak as if all languages other than Greek were one 'barbarian language' (S. *Aj.* 1262-3).[85] It is not necessary to imagine that anyone seriously held that there were only two languages, nor is it necessary to envisage a progression from this abstract idea of two languages to a vision of a world with countless competing languages (or the reverse progression).[86] What we have is rather two models of thought that alternate: just as in tragedy the 'stylized literary milieu' in which all barbarians speak Greek is penetrated by 'isolated touches of realism', in Edith Hall's words,[87] so one attitude of indifference to foreign languages, leading to the characterisation of barbarians as a single monolithic group, alternates with another attitude based on the observation of linguistic differences. The differentiation of foreign languages does not originate in a philosophical or highbrow reaction to a popular notion of two languages, but is indeed itself a popular idea: the representation of barbarians as an untidy horde made up of countless different peoples each with their own languages is a cliché from Homer through Herodotus and Aeschylus to Plato

---

[84] Cf. Xanthus, *FGrHist* 765 F 15 for Mysian as μιξολύδιον and μιξοφρύγιον. For references and for the meaning of such expressions, see Dubuisson, op. cit. (n. 17) 11-16; Dubuisson suggests that such expressions reflect the assumption that while barbarians can become Greek through the acquisition of Greek culture, Greeks cannot acquire barbarian culture (as there is no such thing) but can only become barbarians through mixed blood. Cf. Lejeune, op. cit. (n. 21) 56 n. 4.

[85] Cf. the terms βαρβαριστί, Ar. fr. 81 KA, or βαρβαρικός, Xen. *Anab.* 1.8.1, 'the barbarian dialect', D. S. 5.6.5, βαρβάρικα γράμματα, Arr. *Anab.* 3.6.6, 'the φωνή of the barbarians', Pl. *Tht.* 163b, or the remark of Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrh. Hyp.* 1.74 that the φωνή of the barbarians is μονοειδῆ, or 'of one form'.

[86] Cf. Morpurgo Davies, op. cit. (n. 46) 15, on Pl. *Pol.* 262d where Plato 'attacks the type of classification that divides mankind into two' despite the evidence of differences in language. A similarly simplistic polarisation can be found at Pl. *Resp.* 470c-471c, and in much earlier Greek literature: see E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 57, on the absolute polarisation of Hellene and Barbarian implied by Aeschylus' *Persae*.

[87] E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 19.

and Polybius.[88] A similar association of all barbarians together can be seen in the idea that barbarians are ἄγλωσσος (S. *Trach.* 1060). This cannot presumably reflect a belief that they did not speak, only that their language, by comparison with Greek, in some sense did not constitute an authentic language.[89] This would tally with the frequent characterisation of foreign languages in terms of animal sounds.

Another way in which Herodotus' presentation of foreign languages resists an over-deterministic schematism is on the subject of the structure of language. The Greeks tended to see differences between languages as being differences in names. Learning a language was merely a process of 'learning names' (*Dissoi Logoi*, DK B 90 6 (12)). A sentence, in the phrase of Denyer, was merely a 'dollop of names'.[90] The same idea of 'language as nomenclature' is perhaps reflected in the characterisation of foreign languages through sounds, in the Homeric language of the gods, itself just a series of separate names, or in the remark of Hermogenes in Plato's *Cratylus* that 'different cities use different names for the same things' (Pl. *Crat.* 385d-e).[91]

Certain details of Herodotus' presentation of foreign languages might have been used to argue against such a position. To begin with, there are not always equivalent words in one's own language for the words of foreign languages. The Greeks never knew a crocodile until they discovered them in Egypt. So they named crocodiles, or χάμψαι, as they were known in Egypt according to Herodotus (2.69.3), by analogy to something which they did have a word for, which a crocodile resembled, and which, through being in another sense preposterously *unlike* a crocodile, served at the same time to belittle the Egyptians, or to reduce their marvels to a more manageable scale: a lizard or, in Greek, a κροκόδειλος[92]. In this case, the Greeks used a

---

[88] See e.g. H. *Il.* 2.803-4, 4.436-8, A. *Pers.* 399-407, Pol. 1.67.13, 23.13.

[89] Davies, op. cit. (n. 46) 15-16. Contrast the Russian term for 'German', *nemec,* related to the word for 'dumb'.

[90] N. Denyer, *Language, Thought and Falsehood in Ancient Greek Philosophy* (London, 1991) 74; see further ch. 9, 'Names, verbs and sentences'. The distinction of different types of names was begun by Protagoras, DK 80 A 1, 53, A 27, A 29.

[91] In the words of Morpurgo Davies (n. 36), we find in Greek 'no structuralist views according to which in different languages similar semantic fields are differently divided and there is no one-to-one semantic correspondence between words.' The divine names in Homer are at *Il.* 1.403-4, 2.813-4, 14.290-1, 20.74, *Od.* 10.305, 12.61; that the language of the gods was a series of separate names is observed by Socrates at Pl. *Crat.* 392d.

[92] Similar antonyms are ὀβέλισκος (spit) πυράμιδος (a variety of cake) and στροῦθος (sparrow or ostrich). Herodotus appears to have preserved the Egyptian word fairly accurately: see J. Cerný, 'Philological and etymological notes', *ASAE* 42 (1943) 346-8, T. O. Lambdin, 'Another cuneiform transcription of Egyptian *msh,* "crocodile"', *JNES* 12 (1953)

word already in their language; in another case they borrow a word, albeit translating it on the way: the one-eyed people, he remarks, 'we name in Scythian' as 'Arimaspians' as 'Arima' means one, and 'spou' eye (4.27).[93] Herodotus was also aware, as the case of the crocodile implies, of what we would call homonyms, that the same name might apply to two different things: the Ligyes who live above Massalia call traders σίγγυναι whereas the Cypriots use the same word to describe spears (5.9.3).[94] Most importantly perhaps, from the point of view of the idea of 'language as nomenclature', Herodotus shows an awareness that foreign words do not always mean the same as the equivalent Greek word: that is to say, the referent may be the same whilst the meaning is different. The Egyptian name for the Ethiopian deserters, Ἀσμάχ, means 'those who stand on the left-hand side of the King' (2.30.1).[95]

These observations *might* have led Herodotus to question the idea of 'language as nomenclature'. Self-evidently, however, they did not. There is no sign that Herodotus ever thought through the implications of such material, or indeed that he ever formulated any general views on the nature of language.

4. The imagined relationship between Greek and foreign languages

We move now to the most complex and involved question, that of the imagined relationship between Greek and foreign languages. As we have seen, Herodotus is aware of the existence of what we would call 'loan words' and of the need to formulate new words to designate unfamiliar things. Does he, however, envisage a broader connection between different languages? And,

---

284-5. The word χάμψα was in Hecataeus, however, *FGrHist* I F 324a, though it probably cannot be read at A. *Suppl.* 878 (see E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 120).

[93] For doubt concerning Herodotus' etymology, see Corcella, ad loc. (p. 256).

[94] Cf. 4.192.3 (Libyan word, ζεγέριες, for a type of mouse in Greek means 'hills', βουνοί), 5.52.4 (two rivers have the same name though they do not even have the same source; both rivers are anonymous, although, according to Rawlinson ad loc., what Herodotus says is true of the greater and lesser rivers Zab). Cf. Heraclitus DK 22 B 48 on the two meanings of *bios* as life and arrow; Heraclitus points out that an arrow deals death, the opposite of life, so perhaps revealing a desire to see some underlying order or appropriateness to names (for which see further below, sect. IV). The idea that the same word might be used to describe two different, even fundamentally opposed, things is one, of course, exploited by Thucydides in his account of the Corcyraean revolution, 3.82.4 ff..

[95] For Herodotus' etymology here (and a cautious approval), see Lloyd ad loc., II.128-9.

if so, of what nature is that connection? First and famously, Herodotus as-
cribes the introduction of the alphabet to the Phoenicians (5.58):

> The Phoenicians who arrived with Cadmus (who included the Gephy-
> raioi) introduced many skills to the Greeks upon settling in this land,
> and in particular letters (γράμματα); for, as it seems to me, the Greeks
> did not have them before this. To begin with these Phoenicians used
> the letters which all the Phoenicians used. In the course of time, they
> changed at the same time as the language the shape of their letters.
> Now the Greeks who chiefly lived about them in those parts were at
> that time the Ionians. They then learnt the letters from the Phoeni-
> cians, and after making modifications to the shape of a few of them,
> used them.

Herodotus sometimes finds it difficult to imagine any historical change
as evolutionary: so, for example, the Lydians' transformation from great
warriors to decadent tradesmen wearing slippers is the result of a plan of
Croesus to save his people from a worse fate at the hands of Cyrus (1.154-56).
In the case of the introduction of the alphabet, he appears to envisage a rela-
tively natural, evolutionary change, something not true of those of his con-
temporaries who ascribed the introduction of the alphabet to individual in-
ventors, whether it be Cadmus, Palamedes, Hermes, Theuth, Danaus or
Prometheus.[96] Herodotus' theory of the introduction of the alphabet is

---

[96] Hecataeus, *FGrHist* 1 F 20, Dionysius of Miletus, *FGrHist* 687 F 1, Anaximander,
FGrHist 9 F 3, Andron, *FGrHist* 10 F 9, Apollodorus, *FGrHist* 244 F 165, Stesichorus fr. 213
PMG, E. fr. 578 N, Gorg. *Pal.* 30, Pl. *Phil.* 18c, *Phdr.* 274c-d, Arist. fr. 501 Rose, many of
which are collected and discussed at schol. Dionysius Thrax's *Ars Gramm.* (ch. 6) p. 183
(Hilgard). Aeschylus' picture of man's acquisition of letters depends on the agency of
Prometheus, A. *PV.* 447-68; it is the combination of letters (γραμμάτων τε συνθέσεις, 460)
that makes letters useful for memory and the muses (the priority of literature is striking),
as it is the combination of letters in a name that captures the essence of a thing, Pl. *Crat.*
424d-e. For Greek ideas of the origins of writing, see H. Grassl, 'Herodot und die
griechischen Schrift', *Hermes* 100 (1972) 169-75, S. West, op. cit. (n. 12) 294, but especially
L. H. Jeffery, '*Archaia Grammata*: some ancient Greek views', in W. C. Brice (ed.) *Europa.*
Festschrift Ernst Grumach (Berlin, 1967), 152-66; see now also Deborah Steiner, *The Tyrant's*
Writ (Princeton, 1994). For the manner in which the alphabet was really introduced into
Greece, see now the survey of J. M. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 143-53. The idea that the invention
of the Greek alphabet was the work of a single man is alive and well in the theory of the
'single adapter' of Phoenician script: see Lejeune, op. cit. (n. 20) 45, and now B. B. Pow-
ell, *Homer and the Origin of the Greek Alphabet* (Cambridge, 1991) 10-12, and in his 'Homer
and writing', in I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.) *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden, 1997) 3-
32; Powell even speculates as to whether 'Palamedes were the actual name of the
adapter' (p.26).

based, of course, on his observation of the differences between the letter-forms of his day and of his Καδμήια γράμματα from Thebes. (It is perhaps the relatively familiar form of these inscriptions that made it necessary for him to reconstruct the development of the Greek alphabet in two stages.) The shapes of the letters of the alphabet, however, appear in Herodotus' account almost to mould themselves to the sounds of the Greek language. Why should a change of language necessitate a change in letter-forms? Clearly this was not a question which Herodotus thought to ask himself. Does he, however, assume that there is an ideal fashion in which a letter represents a sound?[97]

We might also expect signs of non-Greek influence on the Greek language in Herodotus' discussion of the Pelasgian origins of the Greeks (1.56-8). Herodotus' argument here requires a fairly lengthy précis.

His discussion comes in the context of his first introduction of the Spartans and the Athenians (1.56.2), one of the Doric *genos*, one of the Ionic. These two peoples were 'in ancient times one Pelasgian, the other a Hellenic people', one a people which had never left its home, the other one which had wandered widely. (Herodotus then recounts the wanderings of the Hellenes in the reign of Deucalion until the point at which they enter the Peloponnese and are called Dorian, 1.56.3.) What language the Pelasgians spoke, Herodotus cannot say for certain, but if it is possible to say (εἰ τούτοισι τεκμαιρόμενον δεῖ λέγειν, 1.57.2), the evidence of the surviving Pelasgians, those who dwelt at Creston,[98] or those who had founded Placia and Scylace on the Hellespont, suggests that the original Pelasgians spoke a barbarian language. That the language these peoples speak is Pelasgian (or at least a reliable index of the barbarian nature of Pelasgian) is suggested also by the

---

[97] We may ask whether a similar idea lies behind the analogy between painting and naming by a combination of letters at Pl. *Crat.* 424 d-e. Of course, a change to Phoenician script did take place, the addition of vowels, leading Powell to approve of Herodotus' version of the introduction of the alphabet, Morris and Powell op. cit. (n. 96) 22; it is questionable, however, in the light of his Καδμήια γράμματα whether Herodotus had any such accurate knowledge of the nature of the differences between Phoenician and Greek script. On the question of the significance of the (actual) changes from Phoenician to Greek script, see now the arguments of R. Woodard, *Greek Writing from Knossos to Homer* (New York, 1997) 250 ('Had the Greeks simply continued the Phoenician tradition of only representing consonants in their writing system, those achievements of the human intellect and spirit revealed since antiquity through the alphabetic medium would not, I suspect, have been compromised… this is to confuse the genius of human thought with the mechanical means of its graphic expression.')

[98] For textual problems, and for the related question of the Pelasgian origins of the Etruscans, cf. R. A. McNeal, 'How did Pelasgians become Hellenes? Herodotus I.56-8', *ICS* 10 (1985) 11-21, for a sensible defence of Creston, 13-16. See also D. Briquel, *Les Pélasges en Italie. Recherches sur l'Histoire de la Légende* (Rome, 1984).

observation that their language is unlike that of any of their neighbours, whereas the peoples of Creston and of Placia and Scylace speak the same language as one another: this 'makes clear' that these peoples imported the character of their language (γλώσσης χαρακτῆρα) when they moved to their present lands and that they had guarded their common language.[99]

Where does this leave the Pelasgian Athenians? The Attic race (τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος), being Pelasgian (ἐὸν Πελασγικόν), at the same time as they changed to become Greeks learnt the language (ἅμα τῇ μεταβολῇ τῇ ἐς Ἕλληνας καὶ τὴν γλώσσαν μετέμαθε, 1.57.3). The Greek race (τὸ Ἑλληνικόν), in Herodotus' opinion, have used the same language ever since they first came into being (ἐπείτε ἐγένετο, 1.58.1). When the Greek race[100] was separated off from the Pelasgian (ἀποσχισθὲν … ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελασγικοῦ), it was weak and small, but then by the introduction of Pelasgians and other barbarians, it grew to a multitude of races (ἐς πλῆθος τῶν ἐθνέων). The Pelasgian race, on the other hand, being barbarian, never grew greatly (οὐδαμὰ μεγάλως αὐξηθῆναι).

This is a notoriously muddled and difficult passage of the *Histories*,[101] crammed with revealing assumptions. (In what sense, for example, do barbarian races 'never grow greatly'? Not, we might suppose, in terms of num-

---

[99] The further complication of surviving Pelasgians who are no longer called Pelasgian but have changed their name (τὸ οὔνομα μετέβαλε) clearly opens Herodotus up to a charge of circularity, and may suggest an interpolation. Cf. the preservation by the Eretrians transported to the Arabian Gulf of their language, 6.119.4, or Herodotus' argument, 2.105, introduced rather late in support of the belief that Colchians are Egyptians, that their whole way of life and language are similar. Lloyd, ad loc, II.25-6 (cf. I.161-2) rationalises Herodotus' claim as 'based on nothing more than a similarity of sound between one or two of the few Egyptian and Colchian words that he or his sources knew'. Constrast D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources'*, tr. J. G. Howie (Leeds, 1989) 132, arguing that Herodotus' assertion is 'merely a secondary consequence of his erroneous theory', citing the parallel language proofs of Xanthus, *FGrHist* 765 F 15-16 and at D. S. 5.46.3. W. K. Pritchett makes no mention of the similarity of language between Colchians and Egyptians in the course of his violent riposte to Fehling, *The Liar School of Herodotus* (Amsterdam, 1993) 12-16.

[100] Or the Greek part of the Athenians: see A. G. Laird, 'Herodotus on the Pelasgians in Attica', *AJPh* 54 (1933) 97-119 (at p.114), R. A. McNeal, op. cit. (n. 98) 17-18. It is hard to see, however, in what sense the Athenians could have been said to have grown into a multitude of races.

[101] See esp. J. L. Myres, 'A History of the Pelasgian Theory', *JHS* 27 (1907) 170-225, A. G. Laird, op. cit. (n. 100) 97-119, R. A. McNeal, op. cit. (n. 98) 11-21. For a collection of all ancient sources on the Pelasgians, see Lochner von Hüttenbach, *Die Pelasger* (Vienna, 1960). Sayce, ad loc. (pp. 30-31 n. 5), loses patience with Herodotus: 'We must leave Herodotus to harmonize [his] inconsistent statements… His speculations on philology and ethnology are never very profound.'

bers: barbarians are, in general, archetypally numerous.[102]) On the question of language, however, the passage begs a number of questions. First, Herodotus manages to maintain an ideal of Greek linguistic purity, but only because of the convenient theory that while they spoke another language they were not in fact Greek. How did the Athenians become Greek? What does it mean to change to become Greek? Herodotus makes it sound almost as though learning a language was a condition of joining the club.[103] Finally, how did the Greek language come about? No answer is given. Greek was always Greek and the Greeks always spoke Greek:[104] these are Herodotus' priorities.

In other instances, however, Herodotus concedes a greater degree of non-Greek influence on Greek. Herodotus' account, for example, of the adoption by the Pelasgians of the names of the gods (2.52.1) suggests a much closer relationship between the Pelasgian and Greek languages. Before they heard the names of the gods, the Pelasgians (assuming, interestingly, the existence of a number of gods[105]) called them simply θεοί, on the grounds that they had 'established (θέντες) all affairs in their order'. This etymology, ad-

---

[102] For example, the image of the Asian hordes of Xerxes presented in Aeschylus' *Persians,* e.g. 333-47, and in Herodotus, e.g. 1.136.1, 7.47-49; cf. Pi. *Isthm.* 5.49-50, E. *Tro.* 748, Hipp. *AWP* 12.

[103] As Myres puts it, op. cit. (n. 101) 206, 'Herodotus rests content with a view of the process of Hellenization which… assumes a kind of spontaneous generation.' See, however, the reaction of Laird, op. cit. (n. 101) 109-110, citing the gradual Dorianisation of the Cynourians (8.73), 'due to being subject to the Argives and the passage of time'. Cf. Thuc. 2.68.5 on the linguistic 'hellenisation' (ἠλληνίσθησαν τὴν γλῶσσαν) of the Amphilocians through the influence of some Ambraciots they asked to live with them.

[104] As Robert Fowler has commented to me in correspondence, 'once the Hellenes and their language were differentiated from the Pelasgian, they never changed. Hellene and Pelasgian are immutable essences; one can abandon one essence for the other, but the essences do not adapt, evolve or commingle. As it happened, historically the traffic was all one way (how satisfying).'

[105] Contrast Burkert's characterisation of the Pelasgian θεοί as an 'ungeschiedene Einheit', 'Herodot über die Namen der Götter: Polytheismus als Historisches Problem', *MH* 42 (1985) 121-32 (at p. 130), or the remark of Immerwahr, op. cit. (n. 12) 312, that the Pelasgians 'had perceived a unity of religious forces that Herodotus also detected behind divergent traditions'. How and Wells and H. Usener, whilst they also read too much into Herodotus' words, do so in an opposite fashion: How and Wells, ad loc., offer the comment 'without having definite names for them… e.g. the sun, but not Apollo'; Usener, *Götternamen: Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung* (Bonn, 1896) 279, sees the Pelasgian *theoi* as Sondergötter described only adjectivally as opposed to gods with personalities, myths and proper names. See also the rather over-ingenious theory of Myres, op. cit. (n. 101) 198 (usefully summarised by Lloyd, II.243-5.)

vanced apparently in all seriousness,[106] seems to suggest that the Pelasgians spoke a language at least 'akin to' Greek.[107]

The most intriguing material, however, suggesting a broader relationship between Greek and foreign languages—and the material that will be the focus of my remaining discussion—is that surrounding the names of the gods themselves. As is well known, the Greeks assimilated foreign gods by supposing that they were not in fact foreign at all, but were merely the Greek gods worshipped under other names and with other rites. Herodotus, in the words of Robert Parker, 'tends to suppose that Greek and foreign gods can be translated into one another, like Greek and foreign words.'[108] So, to take only Egyptian examples, Herodotus tells us that the Egyptians call (καλέουσι) Zeus 'Amon' (2.42.5), that Bubastis is 'in the Greek language' (κατὰ Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν) Artemis (2.137.5), or that the Greeks name (ὀνομάζουσι) Horus 'Apollo' (2.144.2). However, there is a problem. For despite his translating many if not all foreign gods' names, despite then his evident awareness that the names of foreign gods differed, he makes the assertion that the Greek names of the gods came from Egypt (2.50):

Almost all the names of the gods came from Egypt to Greece (σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ πάντων τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν θεῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐλήλυθε ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα). For that they came from the barbarians I found by investigation to be true, and I think that they arrived especially from Egypt. For except for Poseidon and the Dioscuri, as I explained before, and Hera and Hestia and Themis, and the Graces and the Nereids, the names of the other

---

[106] As recognised by W. Burkert, 'Herodot als Historiker fremder Religionen' in W. Burkert et. al, *Hérodote et les Peuples non-Grecs* (Geneva, 1990) 28-9, Lloyd ad loc. (II. 245); see, however, Fehling's argument, op. cit. (n. 99) 89-90, that Herodotus ascribed an undifferentiated pantheon to Dodona in the light of H. *Il.* 16.233. On Herodotus' etymology of *theoi*, see Diels, op. cit. (n. 10) 19, judging the etymology false, though see now H. Petersmann, 'Les dieux anciens et leur professions', *Ktema* 15 (1990) 75-80, and his 'Beobachtungen zu den Apellativen für 'Gott', in K.-F. Kraft, E.-M. Lill, U. Schwab (eds.) *triuwe. Studien zur Sprachgeschichte und Literaturwissenschaft. Gedächtnisbuch für Elfriede Stutz* (Heidelberg, 1992) 127-141, esp. 139-41.

[107] Rawlinson II.96. Cf. Aesch. *Suppliants* where no reference is made to the barbaric nature of the Pelasgians' speech, unlike that of the Chorus, 972-4: see further E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 171-2.

[108] R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford, 1996) 159. On the identification of Greek and foreign Gods, see (in addition to Parker, ch. 9) esp. Linforth, op. cit. (n. 28), W. Burkert, op. cit. (n. 106), J. Rudhardt, 'Les attitudes des grecs à l'égard des religions étrangères', *RHR* 209 (1992) 219-38. The equation of foreign and Greek gods is often seen as a reflection of an essentially tolerant attitude to foreign religions, a position I intend to qualify in a chapter of a forthcoming monograph, *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (provisional title).

gods the Egyptians have always had in their land (τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν Αἰγυπτίοισι αἰεί κοτε τὰ οὐνόματά ἐστι ἐν τῇ χώρῃ). I say what the Egyptians themselves say. Those gods whose names the Egyptians say they do not know, these seem to me to have been named by the Pelasgians, except Poseidon, for this god they discovered from the Libyans. No other people except the Libyans have had Poseidon's name established among them from the beginning, and they have always honoured him.

How are we to square these two apparently contradictory positions? One solution that has often been adopted is that Herodotus here does not mean by 'names of the gods' the names of the gods, but the practice, the habit, of giving names to those gods, the recognition of them as distinct.[109] So, according to Ivan Linforth, when Herodotus 'wishes to say that the Greeks derived their knowledge of a god from Egypt, he says that the name came to them from Egypt, and this in spite of the fact that the Greek name and the Egyptian name are totally different'.

    This solution has the advantage of solving the immediate contradiction, but it gives rise to a number of even greater problems. There is only time here to sketch the main outlines of these difficulties.[110] As Lattimore argued, οὔνομα might mean something *more* than 'name', but it is hard to see how it can mean anything less: 'if Herodotus means to tell us that the Pelasgians derived from Egypt everything about the gods *except* their names, he is deliberately emphasising the most misleading of possible terms'.[111] Linforth's solution of a 'technical sense' of the word οὔνομα also has the effect of making a nonsense of a number of nearby passages. In his account of the Pelasgians' discovery of the names of the gods, Herodotus says that they had 'not yet heard' the names (οὐ γὰρ ἀκηκόεσάν κω, 2.52.1). Before they heard the names of the gods, the Pelasgians simply called the gods 'θεοί'. If we were to assume that the Pelasgians merely called them the Pelasgian for θεοί, Herodotus' etymology of the term (unless he were to assume that the Pelasgian term for θεοί somehow had a parallel etymology?) would be difficult to explain.[112] It is

---

[109] See esp. Linforth, op. cit. (n. 28) 18-19 (foreshadowed by Linforth at *UCPClPh* 7 (1924) 275, and restated in his 'Greek and Egyptian Gods (Herodotus II.50 and 52)', *CPh* 35 (1940) 300-1), Rudhardt, op. cit. (n. 108) 227-8, W. Burkert, op. cit. (n. 106).

[110] See esp. R. Lattimore, 'Herodotus and the names of the Egyptian Gods', *CPh* 35 (1940) 357-65 and Lloyd II.203-5, but also Diels, op. cit. (n. 10) 16, Meyer, op. cit. (n. 12) 194. A full discussion of the arguments will form an appendix to Harrison (n. 109).

[111] Lattimore, op. cit. (n. 111) 359-60.

[112] Similar difficulties arise in trying to reconcile Linforth's theory with Herodotus' discussion of the name of Heracles (2.43.1-4): see Harrison (n. 108).

also possible to make out a very good case that, at least in the case of some gods, Herodotus really does believe that the Greek names derived from Egypt. The case is especially strong in the cases of Dionysus and of Heracles where Herodotus offers precise contexts for the introduction of their cults from Egypt to Greece (2.43-5, 49); in both cases, interestingly in the light of his argument that the Greek alphabet derived from the Phoenicians, the middlemen in the introduction of these cults are Phoenician.[113]

We are still left with the original contradiction, however. How can Herodotus believe both that the name 'Dionysus' derived from Egypt, and that Dionysus is the Greek name for Osiris (2.144.2)? Richmond Lattimore suggested that the solution lay in the fact that gods can have more than one name. However, Herodotus' manner of making equations suggests a translation of equivalent names, not that the Egyptians or Scythians have, as it were, another name tucked away. His translations of gods' names are performed in precisely the same way as his translations of more humdrum pieces of vocabulary, for example his observation that $\pi i \rho o \mu \iota s$ is 'in the Greek language $\kappa \alpha \lambda \grave{o} s$ $\kappa \grave{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \acute{o} s$' (2.143.4). (Are we to assume in these cases that the Egyptians in fact used the term $\kappa \alpha \lambda \grave{o} s$ $\kappa \grave{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \acute{o} s$ alongside $\pi i \rho o \mu \iota s$, or that they were all bilingual?) For a brief moment, I fantasized recently that another, similarly bold, solution might exist. If the names of the Egyptian gods, for example Horus 'the lofty one', were in fact taboo names,[114] might Herodotus have thought that the Greeks' names were the real, unmentionable, Egyptian names? However, we should, I think, resist solutions which presume that Herodotus knew much more than he wanted to disclose. Herodotus repeatedly mentions the name of Osiris despite a considerable display of reluctance to do precisely that: surely, then, he would at least have mentioned the existence of other names, had he known them.[115]

Ultimately perhaps we should not struggle too officiously to make Herodotus consistent. There are, however, some ways of softening, or helping to understand, the contradiction: and these lie in his understanding of the nature of language. To begin with, despite the impression of his discussion of the Pelasgians that the Greek language was born fully-fledged, and despite the success of the surviving Pelasgians in 'guarding' their original language, Herodotus knows that language changes. This is implicit, of course, in the idea of the Pelasgians' preservation of their language. It is also evident

---

[113] See Harrison (n. 108).

[114] See, e.g., S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion,* tr. A. E. Keep (London, 1973) 21 ff..

[115] 2.86.2, 132.2, 170.1. For an explanation of Herodotus' occasional reticence concerning the divine in his account of Egypt, and for further references, see my 'Herodotus and the certainty of divine retribution', in A. B. Lloyd (ed.) *What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity* (London, 1997) 106 and n. 23 (p.118).

from a number of frequently repeated expressions in the course of the Histo-
ries, for example when he introduces a city or people as 'now called x' or
'formerly called y',[116] or when he gives details of how the names of different
peoples have changed, almost always as a result of a (Greek) mythical
eponymous ancestor.[117] Given Herodotus' acknowledgement of language
change, perhaps then he thought (or might have thought, if someone had
confronted him with his contradiction) that the Egyptians had once used the
Greek names, but that, having imparted these to the Greeks, and the names
having fallen out of use in Egypt, they had begun to use different names.[118]
There is a vast gulf in time, according to Herodotus, between the the intro-
duction to Greece of the names of the gods and his own day: knowledge of
Dionysus came to Greece sixteen hundred years before his lifetime, knowl-
edge of Pan around eight hundred years (2.145.4).

More interestingly, however, there are a number of passages in the *His-
tories* which are suggestive of the idea, famously proposed in Plato's *Cratylus,*
of the natural appropriateness of names, a 'certain rightness of names
(ὀρθότητά τινὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων), the same both for Greeks and barbarians' (Pl.
Crat. 383a-b).[119] Similar ideas may, for example, lie behind his discussion of
the origins of the names of the continents (4.45.2-5):

> I cannot work out why it is, since the earth is all one, that there should
> be three names set upon it (μίῃ ἐούσῃ γῇ οὐνόματα τριφάσια κεῖται), all
> having the eponyms of women; nor why for boundaries the Egyptian
> river Nile is given as one and the Colchian river Phasis as another—
> though there are those who speak for the Maeetian river Tanais and

[116] See 1.57.1 (Thessaliotis), 2.99.4 (Memphis), 2.111.3 ('Red soil'), 2.113.2 (Canobic
mouth), 2.156.4 (floating island), 4.8.3 (Scythian territory), 4.160.1 (Barca), 7.94 (Achaea),
7.108.3 (Briantik), 8.43 (Doris), 8.44.2 (Hellas), 8.46.1 (Aegina). For examples in Herodo-
tus' contemporaries, esp. Hecataeus and Pherecydes, see R. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his
contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996) 73 n. 86.

[117] See Appendix 3. For this 'mythological colonisation' of foreign peoples, see Braun,
op. cit. (n. 30) 29-31, E. Hall, op. cit. (n. 1) 36, Fowler, op. cit. (n. 116) 73 and n. 82 ('The
use of eponyms is so common and universal that I have not bothered to illustrate it').

[118] As suggested by Lloyd, II.204-5.

[119] For the *Cratylus* and its philosophical background, see C. J. Classen, 'Study of lan-
guage among Socrates' contemporaries', in *Sophistik, Wege der Forschung* Bd. 187 (Darm-
stadt, 1976) 215-47, S. B. Levin, 'What's in a name?: a reconsideration of the *Cratylus'* his-
torical sources and topics', *Ancient Philosophy* 15 (1995) 91-115, but esp. T. M. J. Baxter, *The*
Cratylus*: Plato's Critique of Naming, Philosophia Antiqua* vol. 58 (Leiden, 1992). The idea of
the appropriateness of names is ascribed in the dialogue itself to Prodicus (384b) and to
Euthyphro (396d-e, 428c), but Baxter, ch. 5, stresses the wide range of targets against
whom Plato is arguing: Plato 'is battling against what he sees as a culture-wide mistaken
belief in the power of names' (p.107).

the Cimmerian ferries. Nor can I find out the names of those who established these boundaries or from where they got these eponyms. For instance, Libya is said by many Greeks to have that name from Libya, a woman native to that land, and Asia has its name by attribution to Prometheus' wife. Yet the Lydians claim a share in the name Asia too, in that they say Asia was so called from Asies, the son of Cotys, the son of Manes, from whom the tribe of Asiads in Sardis is called; and so, according to them, the name is not from Prometheus' wife at all. But about Europe, no one knows whether it is surrounded by water, nor is it known whence came its name or who it was that gave it its name, unless we say that the country gots its name from Tyrian Europe, being before then without a name like the other lands. But this woman appears to be from Asia and did not arrive in this land which is now called by the Greeks Europe, but only as far as from Phoenicia to Crete and from Crete to Lycia. That is enough said. We will use the established names for these things.

Now clearly Herodotus has some problems with the conventional names, even though he decides ultimately to opt for them. At the same time, however, there is a lingering idea here that the distinctions of language *should* reflect real rather than merely arbitrary distinctions; he wants the names to make sense and is disappointed that they do not. The same idea that names can be appropriate to the object named can be seen perhaps more baldly behind an odd, apparently throwaway, remark of Herodotus' that the names of the Persians fitted their bodies and magnificence (τὰ οὐνόματά σφι ἐόντα ὅμοια τοῖσι σώμασι καὶ τῇ μεγαλοπρεπείῃ, 1.139).[120]

There are a number of parallels between the question of the names of the continents and that of the names of the gods. As well as just trying to find names that are loosely appropriate to the objects named, Herodotus is also keen in this passage to ascertain the one original source of any name. The etymologies of the Greeks and the Lydians are alternatives, but there are no alternative names: Asia is called 'Asia' by both Lydians and Greeks. In the same way, just as Herodotus goes back and looks for the first inventor or the first instance of any number of phenomena,[121] so he also looks for the origins of the names of the gods, and seems to assume that that there is an

---

[120] Immerwahr asserts, op. cit. (n. 12) 186 n. 111, that Herodotus' statement 'should refer to the length and peculiar sound of the names, not to their meaning'.

[121] Some prominent 'firsts' in Herodotus: 1.5.3, 1.6.2, 1.23, 1.94.1, 1.105.1, 1.163.3, 2.2-3, 6.112.3. See more generally A. Kleingünther, Πρῶτος Εὑρέτης, *Philologus* Suppl. 26 (Leipzig, 1933) 43-65, B. A. van Groningen, *In the Grip of the Past* (Leiden, 1953) 33-4, Fowler, op. cit. (n. 116) 73-4 and n. 87.

authentic name which was held from the beginning.[122] Some peoples always possessed the names of certain gods. Herodotus distinguishes, for example, between those gods to whom the Persians sacrificed 'from the beginning',[123] and Aphrodite to whom they learnt to sacrifice (1.131.3). The names of the majority of the gods, he says, had always been in Egypt (2.50.2), and the Libyans are the only people to have possessed the name of Poseidon 'from the beginning' (2.50.3). In the case of those gods who have no obvious origin, Herodotus attempts to find one almost by a process of elimination: those gods of whose names the Egyptians deny knowledge Herodotus reckons (with the exception of Poseidon) 'to have been named', presumably named for the first time, by the Pelasgians.

Another parallel between the names of the continents and the names of the gods (in particular with his discussion of the Pelasgians' discovery of the names of the gods) is that just as the Pelasgian gods were once anonymous, so were the continents until the lifetimes of the women after whom they are named.[124]

Finally, Herodotus' resolution that he should give the benefit of the doubt to the current names of the continents is reminiscent of a common attitude to the names of the gods: 'Zeus', say the Chorus in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (160-5), 'whoever Zeus may be, if this name is pleasing to him, by this name I address him. I can compare with him, measuring all things against him, none but Zeus.'[125] The implication of such passages is not that names are merely conventional, but rather that, should the right name be hit upon, a name indeed has a certain power.

These parallels between Herodotus' discussion of the names of the gods and of the continents suggest that he may, in his discussion of the gods' names, have been thinking instinctively in terms of a single set of authentic

---

[122] Though contrast the common idea of gods as 'many-named': e.g. A. *PV* 212, Soph. *OC* 42-3 (cf. A. *Eum.* 418), S. fr. 941 Radt, E. *Hipp.* 1-2, *Bacch.* 275-6.

[123] As Rudhardt remarks, however, op. cit. (n. 108) 225-6, it is relatively easy to know the sun, moon, stars etc. from the beginning.

[124] Peoples, by contrast, seem usually to have had a name before their current name: see above, n. 116. Ion also was anonymous before his identity was discovered: E. *Ion* 1372-3.

[125] For other instances of this uncertainty re. the names of the gods, see S. J. Pulleyn, 'The power of names in classical Greek religion', *CQ* 44 (1994) 17-25, now revised as ch. 6 of his *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1997), concluding that names had no magical power. His suggestion that philosophical influence may lie behind some such instances of uncertainty (e.g. E. fr. 912.2 N, *Tro.* 884, *Bacch.* 275) is undermined by A. *Ag.* 160-5 (as Pulleyn acknowledges). Moreover, expressions of fear concerning 'theological' speculation such as Pl. *Crat.* 400d-401a, 407d-e, *Phil.* 12c, cannot be dismissed as merely or exclusively philosophical in tone.

names. However, how might he have accounted for the existence of other names in parallel to the authentic names? A very similar objection was advanced against the idea of the natural appropriateness of names, first by Hermogenes in the *Cratylus* (385d-e) and later by Sextus Empiricus (*adv. math.* 1.45; cf. *Pyrrh Hyp.* 2.214), that different cities and different peoples use different names for the same thing. Other arguments were advanced by Democritus: the existence of homonyms and of synonyms and the fact that names may change.[126] The *Cratylus* itself provides a number of responses to these criticisms. One response is to hold that different names for the same thing can capture its essence equally well. As Socrates argues (*Crat.* 389d-390a), 'if different lawgivers do not embody it [the name] in the same syllables, we must not forget this ideal name on that account; for different smiths do not embody the form in the same iron, though making the same instrument for the same purpose, but so long as they reproduce the same ideal, though it be in different iron, still the instrument is as it should be, whether it be made here or in foreign lands.'[127] As Baxter puts it, 'a Greek name and a barbarian name of completely different letters and syllables can be qualitatively equivalent by reproducing the same idea.'[128] An alternative position, however, is to suppose that some names are more valid than others. A chauvinist version of this stance, one that we have seen already in the view that barbarians are ἄγλωσσοι, might be that Greek names and valid names are one

---

[126] Democritus DK 68 B 26. Diodorus Cronus took a more practical approach to disproving the 'natural appropriateness of names' by giving the names *men* and *de* to his sons, the name *allamn* to a servant, and Theognis to his daughter: G. Giannantoni, *Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae* vol. 1 (Naples, 1990) II. F 6-7.

[127] Cf. Arist. *de interpr.* 1.16a: names may not be the same among all peoples, but the 'impressions of the soul' (παθήματα τῆς ψυχῆς) are the same for all men, as are the *pragmata* that the impressions represent. For the gradual Greek distinction of name and thing, see further Burkert, op. cit. (n. 105), M. Salvadore, *Il Nome, La Persona. Saggio sull' Etimologia Antica* (Genova, 1987). Cf. also the charming argument of Epicurus, *Letter to Herodotus* 75-6 (tr. C. W. Chilton, 'The Epicurean Theory of the Origin of Language. A Study of Diogenes of Oenoanda. Fragments X and XI (W)', *AJPh* 83 (1962) 159-67 at p. 161), maintaining the idea of the naturalness of language in such a way as to account for linguistic differences: 'And so names were not originally brought into being by arbitrary determination, but men's own natures in their different races, feeling their particular emotions and receiving their particular impressions, emitted in their particular fashion the air forced out by each of these emotions and impressions with the added differences caused by the places of the abode of the nations at the time. Then later by common agreement in their different races particular names were settled on so as to make their meanings less ambiguous to one another and more briefly expressed.' Diogenes of Oenoanda criticised the idea of the naturalness of names as absurd, 'in fact… more absurd than any absurdity as well as being quite impossible': see Chilton, p. 163.

[128] Baxter, op. cit. (n. 119) 44

and the same. That is not a position adopted in the *Cratylus*. Indeed one of the possible let-out clauses which explain any name whose meaning cannot be discovered through etymology is that it is a foreign name taken from barbarians older than the Greeks (*Crat.* 425e-426a; cf. 421d). But another possibility is also raised, and that is simply that some names might be artificial and conventional, and by extension that there are two levels of language: Hermogenes' name, for example, since he is not really 'born from Hermes' must either not be his name or be a merely conventional name.[129]

What evidence does Herodotus present on these questions? The first passage that may be relevant is the famous story of Psammetichus' language test in Book II (2.2-3). Psammetichus wished to settle the question of who were the oldest people of mankind. And so he gave two new-born children to a shepherd, with instructions that no word should be spoken to them, but that they should be left alone in a room and fed by goats introduced from time to time into their room. After two years the shepherd was met one day by the two children crying out 'βεκός' as they held out their hands. When this occurred repeatedly, the shepherd reported this to the king, who in turn ascertained that βεκός was the Phrygian name for bread. So the Egyptians concluded that the Phrygians were the oldest people in the world and also (without any proof to this effect) that they, the Egyptians, were the second oldest people.[130]

What are the implications of this story? Firstly, it presupposes that the first language will have been spoken by the first people: Herodotus does not entertain the possibility that there might have been an older people still who had no language.[131] More importantly, one language emerges, given the absence of other 'nurturing influences', as the default setting, the natural, au-

---

[129] Cf. Baxter, op. cit. (n. 119) 10.

[130] For the story of Psammetichus, see R. Kassel, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1991) 66-7, but esp. now P. Vannicelli, 'L'esperimento linguistico di Psammetico (Herodot. II.2): c'era una volta il frigio', in *Frigi et Frigio: Monografie scientifiche—Serie Scienze umane et sociale* (Rome, CNR, 1997) 201-17. Similar experiments are ascribed also to Frederick II of Germany, James IV of Scotland and the Moghul emperor Akbar: for these parallels, see esp. A. Sulek, 'The experiment of Psammetichus: fact, fiction, and model to follow', *JHI* 50 (1989) 645-51. The experiment of James IV of Scotland (on the isle of Inchkeith in the Firth of Forth) ends, in the account of Robert Lindesay of Pitscottie's *The Histories and Chronicles of Scotland*, ed. Aeneas J. G. Mackay (Edinburgh, 1899) I.237, in the Herodotean judgement: 'Sum sayis they spak goode hebrew bot as to my self I knew not bot be the authoris reherse'. For later parallels to the idea of 'natural language', e.g. that different languages retained elements of the original, perfect language created by Adam, see Baxter, op. cit. (n. 119) 65-72, E. Said, *Orientalism* (London, 1978) 135-8.

[131] A possibility raised at least in theory by Euripides, *Suppl.* 201-4 (god first gave intelligence to men and then language, the messenger of *logoi*), or by references to non-verbal communication (e.g. E. *IA* 465-6, *Or.* 1245 (cf. S. *Ant.* 700), 4.111 ff..

thentic language of men. That such an idea had a wider currency is sug-
gested also by its refutation in the *Dissoi Logoi* (DK 90 B 6 (12)): if a small
(Greek) child were transported to Persia, we are told, he would speak Per-
sian—and *vice versa*. The story is also reminiscent of an idea expressed in the
Cratylus, referred to above, that certain names (whose etymologies are impos-
sible to discover) are derived from barbarian languages older than Greek.
The story may also presuppose, as Alan Lloyd has put it, that 'one language
was invented and all others somehow descended from it'.[132] This is not nec-
essarily the case, however. The story emphasises the exceptional quality of
one language, its absolute rather than relative originality. It is possible, say,
that different languages were generated independently of one another.[133]

Another passage that sheds further light on Herodotus' idea of the rela-
tionship between different languages is that in which he translates the names
of the Persian kings (6.98.3):

> These names mean in the Greek language: Darius worker (ἐρξίης),
> Xerxes warrior (ἀρήιος), and Artaxerxes great warrior (μέγας ἀρήιος).
> Thus rightly (ὀρθῶς) the Greeks would call them in their own lan-
> guage.[134]

Herodotus presumes that the names of the kings mean something, that they
therefore have a Greek equivalent. A. B. Cook made the intriguing sugges-
tion, however,[135] that Herodotus' translations of the king's names have been

---

[132] Lloyd, II.5.

[133] The relationship between different languages is an area that receives no concentra-
tion in ancient myths\theories of the origin of languages, even those in which multiple
languages are a feature, e.g. *Gen.* 11.1-9, *FGrHist* 273 F 79, Philo. Alex. *de. post. Caini* 91;
likewise, there is no idea at Plut. *Mor.* 370b of how the future of one politeia and one lan-
guage might be realised. Other myths are of the origin of speech, letters, sound, a first
language, but not of a number of languages: Pl. *Tim.* 47c-d, *Phdr.* 274c-d, *Crat.* 408a-b,
D.S. 1.16.1, P. Derveni col. 17 ff. (in the translation of Laks and Most).

[134] See R. Schmitt's suggestion, 'Die Verfassungsdebatte bei Herodot 3,80-82 und die
Etymologie des Dareios-Namens', *Historia* 26 (1977) 243-4, that Herodotus reveals knowl-
edge of the real Iranian etymology of Darius' name at 3.82.5. For the real meaning of the
Persian kings' names, see A. Hofmann-Kutschke, 'Iranisches bei den Griechen', *Philologus*
66 (1907) 173-91, esp. 174-6, H. Schmeja, 'Dareios, Xerxes, Artaxerxes. Drei persische
Königsnamen in griechischer Deutung (Zu Herodot 6,98,3)', *Die Sprache* 21 (1975) 184-88,
with an alternative explanation of the Herodotean etymology.

[135] 'Nomen Omen', *CR* 21 (1907) 169, accepted now by H. B. Rosén in his new Teub-
ner edition. Cf. S. Benardete, *Herodotean Inquiries* (The Hague, 1969) 162, arguing that He-
rodotus 'thus denies that their looks can tell one anything at all. Translation from Persian
to Greek cannot be done by likeness of letters to letters, but it depends on the sameness of
meanings.'

distorted in transmission, and should read instead: Darius ἀρήιος, Xerxes ἐρξίης, and Artaxerxes κάρτα ἐρξίης. This may be thought to be asking a lot of textual transmission: first that ἀρήιος and ἐρξίης are confused, and then that the situation is rationalized by Artaxerxes becoming κάρτα-ἀρήιος; then, though this is less important, that κάρτα is replaced by the more common μέγας. There are other areas of doubt: the confusion may, of course, not be in the manuscript tradition, but be Herodotus' own or that of his source (though whether the ideas of language underlying this passage are those of Herodotus or of his source is, arguably, not very important). Against the first objections is the powerful argument of the uncanny phonetic resemblance between the names and their Greek 'translations'. Moreover, why, as Cook asked, 'should Herodotus have used the excessively rare word ἐρξίης, unless he wished to bring out what he took to be the obvious etymology of Xerxes?'

If Cook's theory is correct, Herodotus appears to envisage not only that these Persian names have a meaning which can be rendered in Greek, but that their meaning can only be discovered through their Greek etymologies. It is for this reason, because the Persian names mean something in Greek (rather than simply because of the appropriateness of their meanings), that Herodotus can say that the Greeks call the kings 'rightly in their own language.'[136] Were these Persian names, however, exceptional in that their meaning could be understood through Greek, or can we make any judgement about a general relationship between Greek and Persian, for example that Persian is a distorted, corrupt version of Greek?

The possibility that only a few Persian names might have been imagined to have had Greek derivations is arguably supported by the barbarian derivations of the *Cratylus*: only a handful of Greek words are imagined to be in origin barbarian words on the grounds that they do not allow of a Greek etymology. The words are notably Greek-sounding: πῦρ, ὕδωρ, κύων (*Crat.*

---

[136] The meanings of the kings' names may, of course, alternatively or in addition be appropriate to the characters of the respective kings (cf. 1.139). Cf. 4.59.2 where the Scythians are said to have named Zeus 'Papaios' most correctly or most appropriately (ὀρθότατα) One possibile explanation is that Herodotus knew that Papaios meant 'father' in Scythian and Api 'mother': see K. Meuli, 'Scythica', *Hermes* 70 (1935) 121-76 at p. 141, L. Zgusta, 'Zwei Skythische Götternamen: *Papaios* und *Api*', *Archiv Orientální* 21 (1953) 270-1, and his *Die Personennamen griechischer Städte den nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste* (Praha, 1955) 303-4. (This may be connected to Herodotus' notorious mistake of supposing that the Persian god Mitra was female, in that he may have been misled by a verbal resemblance into supposing that Mitra was a mother-goddess: R. Merkelbach, *Mithras* (Königstein, 1984) 10 n. 1.) However, we might ask why it is that Herodotus does not mention the meaning of 'Papaios' if he knew of it. The appropriateness of Papaios' name could consist simply in a similarity of ritual between Zeus and Papaios (in other words, he is saying that the identification of the two gods is a good one).

410a), σοφία (412b), κακόν (416a), or ἀλγηδών (419c). However, that Herodotus envisaged a broader relationship between Greek and Persian is suggested by the fact that the assimilation of Persian names to Greek words was a very much more widespread practice amongst the Greeks.[137] Some of these are what one might term weak cases of assimilation, the mere moulding of Persian names into recognisable and convenient forms, for example the name Androbazus, influenced by the Greek ἀνδρο-, Artabes, influenced by ἀρτάβη, the Persian measure, or Artibios, influenced by the Greek word βίος. Others, however, one might describe as examples of 'ideologically charged' assimilation: Ἀβροκόμης, influenced by the Greek ἀβρο-, soft,[138] Ἀρμαμίθρης influenced by the Greek ἅρμα for chariot,[139] Ἅρπαγος, the name of the Median general who ravaged the coast of Asia Minor for Cyrus, influenced by the Greek ἁρπαγή, plunder, and Cyrus himself, influenced by τὸ κῦρος, supreme authority.[140] Great play is made in Herodotus' account of the name of Cyrus, of whether, for example, the baby Cyrus was indeed Cyrus:[141] 'the baby named Cyrus', Herodotus says on two occasions, before correcting himself, and saying that he had another name and not Cyrus (1.113.3; cf. 1.114.4). His name is subsequently discovered at the same time as his kingship is revealed through his free manner of speech: his name has encoded within it his royal authority. Most ideologically charged of all, however, is the name of the Persians themselves, meaning in Greek 'destroyers', something picked up on in

---

[137] In general, see Immerwahr, op. cit. (n. 12) s.v. etymologies (and see refs. in n. 144 below), R. Schmitt, 'Medisches und persisches Sprachgut bei Herodot', *ZDMG* 117 (1967)) 119-45, Schmitt, op. cit. (n. 12), O. K. Armayor, 'Herodotus' Persian vocabulary', *AncW* 1 (1978) 147-56, M. Mayrhofer, *Iranisches Personennamenbuch I. Die Altiranischen Namen* (Wien, 1979), index sect. 3.3 (pp. III.23-4), R. Zwanziger, 'Lautentsprechung und/oder Volksetymologie? Zu einer iranischen Namen der griechischen Nebenüberlieferung', *Klagenfurter Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 7 (1981) 61-8. All Herodotus' Persian names are gathered 'within the boundary of one dialect area' according to D. Hegyi, 'Historical Authenticity of Herodotus in the Persian "Logoi", *AAntHung* 21 (1973) 73-87.

[138] For ἀβρο- compound names, see Schmitt, 'Bakchylides ἀβροβάτας und die Iranier-Namen mit Anlaut *ABRA/O-*', *Glotta* 53 (1975) 207-16, E. Hall, 'Asia Unmanned: images of victory in classical Athens', in J. Rich and G. Shipley (eds.) *War and Society in the Greek World* (London, 1993) 108-33, esp. 122-3.

[139] The transition from *Arbamithra may (Schmitt op. cit. [n. 12] 31) have been 'facilitated in that the original *arba- has been brought up to the indigenous names containing the name of the lunar god *Arma* in Asia Minor.'

[140] The pun is made explicit by Numenios of Tarsus, *Anth. Pal.* 2, 28.

[141] Cf. Immerwahr, op. cit. (n. 12) 163 n. 38.

Aeschylus' *Persians* as well as in two of the most famous oracles of the time of the Persian wars (7.220.4, 8.77.1, A. *Pers.* 65).[142]

Such word-plays appear too frequently to be merely the self-conscious product of literary artists, but are rather the reflection of a more deep-rooted idea of language.[143] Greek names too were significant in their meanings. 'Who would have thought', Sophocles' Ajax cries (430-3; cf. 914), 'that my name would come to harmonise with my sorrows' [the cry αἰαῖ]?[144] It was not only mythical characters whose names were so significant, moreover. The story of Hegesistratus, whose name was taken as an omen of the success of the Mycale expedition (9.91), shows that even in relatively everyday con-

---

[142] Cf. Immerwahr, op. cit. (n. 12) 44 n. 85, A. Moreau, 'Le songe d'Atosse', in P. Ghiron-Bistagne, A. Moreau and J.-C. Turpin (eds.) *Les* Perses *d'Eschyle* (Montpellier, 1992/3) 29-51 at p. 39, and esp. H. N. Couch, 'Three puns on the root of *pertho* in the *Persae* of Aeschylus', *AJP* 52 (1931) 270-3. For the real etymology of the name Persians (and Artaeans), see Eric Pirart, 'Les Noms des Perses', *JA* 283 (1995) 57-68.

[143] See the comments of Fowler, op. cit. (n. 116) 72 n. 77, on the distinction between popular and 'scientific' etymology: 'the latter usually seems more self-conscious and displays a pretence of being based on some theoretical understanding of the phenomenon; in particular, it may be used to construct or confirm an historical hypothesis.' The difference between ancient and modern etymology is explored by Baxter, op. cit. (n. 119) 57-65.

[144] Other more or less likely wordplays or 'speaking names' in the *Histories,* including both Greek names and Hellenised foreign names: Atys and Adrastus (Immerwahr, op. cit. (n. 12) 158 n. 25, Hellmann, *Herodots Kroisos-Logos* (Berlin, 1934) 62), Tellus (Immerwahr, 156-7 n. 21), Deiphonus (Immerwahr, 301), Prexaspes (3.62.2: Powell *CR* 51 (1937) 104, Immerwahr, 163 n. 38), Proteus (2.118.4: Powell *CR* 51 (1937) 104), Leonidas (7.225.2: Immerwahr, 260-1 n. 69), the seers Teisamenus, Hegesistratus and Hippomachus (Immerwahr, 294-5 and n. 164), Callimachus (Immerwahr, 250 n. 37; cf. the exaggerated comments of Myres, op. cit. (n. 2) 208), Peisistratus (Immerwahr, 196), Astyages (1.107.1, 128.2: Immerwahr, 162 n. 37), Deioces (S. Flory, *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus* (Detroit, 1987) 124, Telesarchus (Flory, 145), Phye (Flory, 128). For etymologies in Hellanicus and other authors, esp. fragmentary historians, see Fowler, op. cit. (n. 116) 73 n. 78-9, noting an 'obvious concentration of this activity in the later part of the fifth century.' Examples in tragedy are almost endless: e.g. Helen (E. *Hel.* 1670-5, A. Ag. 681-998; cf. Hecataeus *FGrHist* 1 F 128), Ion (E. Hel. 661-3, 802, 830-1, E. *Ion* 80- 1, 661-3, 802, 830-1, 1372-3), Odysseus (S. fr. 965 Radt), Polyneices (A. Sept. 831-3). For Homer, see E. Risch, 'Namensdeutungen und Worterklärungen bei den ältesten griechischen Dichtern', in *Eumasia. Festschrift für Ernst Howald* (Zurich, 1947) 72-9, reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1981) 294-313, N. Austin, 'Name magic in the Odyssey', *CSCA* 5 (1972) 1-19, or for the discussion of the names Odysseus and Achilles respectively (with further refs.), S. West ad. H. *Od.* 1.52, G. Nagy, *ICS* 19 (1994) 3-9. For Hesiod as etymologist, see M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford, 1966) s.v. 'etymologizing' and *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978) s.v. 'etymologizing word-play' and 'etymology, ancient'. See also now, in general, S. B. Levin, 'Greek conceptions of naming: three forms of appropriateness in Plato and the literary tradition', *CPh* 92 (1997) 46-57, esp. 48-49.

texts a name might be thought to indicate its bearer's destiny.[145] Greek names, in general, are unusually meaningful, and stories in the *Histories* of how an individual came by his name[146] suggest that the Greeks were conscious of this, even perhaps that children were named with a view to the fulfilment of their ominous names.[147]

When the Greeks then saw meaning in Persian names, they were doing no more than they did in relation to their own names—except for the presumption perhaps that the meaning of Persian names was not similarly evident to Persians.[148] Clearly not all Persian names were susceptible to Greek etymologising. However, a sufficient number of Persian names are believed to reveal their meaning in Greek (and *only* in Greek) to suggest some belief that, presumably in the distant past, there was a link between the Greek and Persian languages. Moreover, the fact that Persian names can be understood through Greek and not apparently *vice versa* (though this could, of course, be due simply to relative ignorance of Persian), and the fact that only a handful of Greek words in the *Cratylus* are said to derive from barbarian languages, might suggest that the relationship was not a relationship of equals, but that

---

[145] Cf. Plut. *Nic.* 1.2.

[146] e.g. 5.92.ε1, 6.63.3. Often, we may suspect, such stories grew out of the names; the names then came to constitute 'proof' of the truth of the stories. For the parallel way in which monuments give rise to anecdotes, see E. Gabba, 'True history and false history in Classical Antiquity', *JRS* 71 (1981) 50-62 (at p. 61).

[147] For wish-fulfilment in naming in antiquity, see A. Erskine, 'Rome in the Greek World: the Significance of a name', in A. Powell (ed.) *The Greek World* (London, 1995) 371. Immerwahr, op. cit. (n. 12) 295 n. 164, raises the question of whether seers or generals were chosen because of their names. See also S. Hornblower, 'The religious dimension to the Peloponnesian War', *HSCP* 94 (1992) 169-97 (at 189 and n. 72), on the choice of Alcidas to lead the foundation of Herakleia, Miltiades for an Athenian colony to the Chersonese of the 320s (Tod 200), or of Melanthius to lead the Athenian contingent in support of the Ionian revolt (5.97.3). Hornblower sees the lack of name-puns in Thucydides, and the lack of any mention of the significance of Alcidas' name, as reflecting a conscious reaction against Herodotus, 'who like many Greeks back to Homer and down to Sophocles saw significance in proper names', something 'totally absent' in Thucydides. I for one am willing, despite the scornful comments of Hornblower, 189 and n. 73 and in his *Thucydides* (London, 1987) 94, to accept the existence of the three wordplays detected by Powell in Thucydides, op. cit. (n. 144) 103; I would concede, however, that they are perhaps more purely 'literary' wordplays than, say, 9.91. The case of Melanthius, 5.97.3, where Herodotus too fails to draw attention to the significance of a name, suggests that Hornblower's argument relies simply on the number, and the prominence, of examples of name-puns in Herodotus by comparison with Thucydides; the difference may be due as much to the different periods about which each author was writing, and consequently of the different material each had at his disposal, as to a conscious reaction on Thucydides' part.

[148] Cf. Herodotus' observation that the Persians had not noticed that all their names ended in the same letter, 1.139.

the Persian language was believed, at least in part, to derive from and to be subordinate to Greek. This is not to say that Herodotus could not tell the difference between Greek and foreign names in his own day. Indeed he comments that the name of the northern river 'Eridanus' is transparently Greek, and so cannot be a barbarian name but must have been invented by some poet (3.115.2). However, as the *Cratylus* demonstrates repeatedly, names were believed to undergo significant distortion over time: it is only by a certain rearrangement, just as with Herodotus' etymology of the Persian kings' names, that the meaning of a Greek name can be teased out. As we have seen, perfectly Greek-sounding words in the *Cratylus* are ascribed an unknown barbarian etymology. In order to maintain then, for example, that Herodotus really did believe that the Greek gods' names came from Egypt, it is not necessary to believe him totally lacking in any sense of the difference between Greek and Egyptian in his own day. As we have seen, he knew that the Egyptians had different names both for the gods and for other things. The names of the gods that came from Egypt might, in Herodotus' view, have arrived in a rather different form from that in which he knew them in his own day.[149]

Can we, finally, reconstruct any consistent plan of how Herodotus conceived of the relationship between different languages? The *Cratylus* envisaged that certain Greek words derived from barbarian languages that were older than Greek. Might Herodotus have believed not only that the names of the gods came from Egypt, but that Greek in general derived from Egyptian, and Egyptian in turn from Phrygian? It is impossible to be certain. Of the Greek language, only the gods' names are certainly of Egyptian origin. Of the Persian language, all that we can be certain of is that a large number of personal names were believed to be understandable only through their Greek etymologies. His remark that Persian names were appropriate to their bodies suggests that he ascribes at least a degree of authority or appropriateness even to Persian names. There is nothing, moreover, in the story of Psammetichus' language test that *necessitates* the idea that one language must descend wholesale from another. If Herodotus had ever formed any overarching theory of the relationship of languages, we might expect to have heard about it rather more fully. What we have is surely more likely to represent the half-digested fragments of a broader Greek debate. (Other Greek writers, for example, ascribed the origins of writing to the Phrygians.[150]) That

---

[149] Some clue to the degree of corruption of these names can perhaps be gleaned from Hecataeus' statement, *FGrHist* 1 F 21, that the Phoenicians pronounced Danaë as Dana.

[150] See the discussion of Jeffery, op. cit. (n. 96) 152, 160. For the evidence of the actual relationship between Greek and Phrygian, see Günter Neumann, 'Phrygisch und Griechisch', *SAWW* 499 (1988).

other Greeks might have formulated such ideas, however, and that such ideas were, as it were, at the back of Herodotus' mind, is a tantalizing possibility.

5. Conclusion

In their view of foreign languages, Herodotus and the Greeks emerge then finally as adopting a number of different, even contradictory, strategies: they may ignore language difference, they may caricature it; they may seek to differentiate between foreign languages, and they may assimilate all foreign languages into a single 'barbarian language'; they may seek to distance foreign languages from Greek, and then they may see connections between their own and foreign languages.

Two questions remain. First, what explanation can there be for the Greeks' lack of curiosity in foreign languages? Anna Morpurgo Davies has suggested that the lack of scholarly interest in the description or classification of foreign languages may have been the result of the view of foreign languages as mere collections of names.[151] We might suppose then that the broader Greek lack of interest in foreign languages was simply a function of their chauvinism. The *Old Oligarch* remarks disapprovingly that the Athenians, as they drew also on foreign cuisine, mixed their language from Greeks and barbarians ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 2.8), whereas other Greeks merely used their own language. The passage presupposes an ideal that one should preserve one's language against foreign influence, something that twice in the *Histories* we hear of a people doing (1.57.3, 6.119.4). But how does one in practice 'guard one's language' (even with the forces of the Académie Française on one's side)? If the Athenians' use of foreign words was the result of their naval influence and contacts, how did other Greeks remain untainted by the same foreign influence?[152] Other chauvinist cultures, not least that of the British empire, have responded in a rather different fashion with regard to the languages of other peoples, by classifying and ordering them.[153] Of course, the British settled India. The number of Indian words (bungalow, tandoori, etc.) that have penetrated into everyday English is not perhaps of such a different order to the number of foreign loan words in Greek. However, the Greek lack of curiosity in foreign languages extends even into the Hellenistic period.[154] In other areas, moreover, for example in that of relig-

---

[151] Morpurgo Davies (n. 36).

[152] Contrast the tone of cheerful cosmopolitanism of *Anth. Pal.* 7,419.

[153] This is one of the main themes of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (n. 130).

[154] See esp. Momigliano, op. cit. (n. 19) ch.1.

ion, Greek chauvinism took a different direction: the Greeks may have known little about foreign religion, but what they did know they ordered systematically by analogy to their own gods and rituals. To return, finally, to the question with which I began, how chauvinist were the Greeks in their characterisation of foreign peoples through language? According to Morpurgo Davies again, we find in Greece 'no Romantic views about the uniqueness of each language as an expression of national spirit.'[155] We find in fact a whole range of attitudes concerning language difference, from a sentimental pride in one's own language to outright hostility to those of others. A relatively innocent pride in the Greek language can be seen in Philoctetes' response to first hearing Greek on Lemnos (S. *Phil.* 225, 234-5): we can surely presume that Sophocles' audience would have sympathised with this element of Philoctetes' plight, and that the average Greek, stranded far from Greece, might also have longed for the sound of a familiar voice. A degree of 'tabloid' xenophobia must be implicit in the satire of foreign accents, both non-Greek and non-Attic, that we see in Aristophanes.[156] The Suppliants of Aeschylus' play likewise expect difficulties on account of their speaking a foreign language (A. *Suppl.* 972-4). More poisonous, however, are a number of passages suggestive of an idea of linguistic superiority, even of linguistic purity. Themistocles, according to Plutarch, recommended the execution of a Persian-Greek interpreter for daring to use the Greek language to transmit the commands of a barbarian (Plut. *Them.* 6.4). Plutarch also offers an interesting variation on the story of Mys and the Carian oracle (*Mor.* 412a, *de def. orac.*): the reason why the oracle answered in Carian was that 'it is not for barbarians ever to receive a word in the Greek tongue that is subservient to their command.' Though such passages are both late, they are reminiscent of the characterisation of foreign peoples in terms of the freedom of spirit of their language; Herodotus too, in a more historical and detached spirit, is concerned in his account of the 'Pelasgian theory' with maintaining the linguistic integrity of Greek.

The same sense of superiority was felt by the Athenians of their 'dialect'. Solon lamented the scandal that Athenians had wondered so long away from their homeland that they 'no longer spoke the Attic language' (γλῶσσαν οὐκέτ᾽ Ἀττικὴν ἱέντας, fr. 36.10-12 West). According to Thucydides' Nicias, non-Athenian sailors on the Sicilian expedition had adopted Attic out of

---

[155] Morpurgo Davies (n. 36).

[156] See C. Brixhe in R. Lonis, op. cit. (n. 48) 137, distancing this 'banale manifestation de ce qu'on pourrait appeler la xénophobie ordinaire' from the 'vision idéologique de la langue' of the *Cratylus*. See also Halliwell, op. cit. (n. 48) 71, and (very much less subtle) E. Jannsens, 'Les Étrangers comme élément comique dans les comédies d'Aristophane', *Mélanges Georges Smets* (Bruxelles, 1952) 455-60.

admiration for Athens (Thuc. 7.63.3). The most markedly pejorative characterisation of foreign languages comes, however, from a source for the Persian Wars other than Herodotus: the messenger's account of the battle of Salamis from Aeschylus' *Persians*. First we have the paean of the Greeks: 'O sons of the Greeks, come on, liberate your fatherland, liberate your children, our wives, the shrines of the ancestral gods and the graves of your forefathers. Our struggle now is on behalf of them all.' Then in response comes the untidy clamour (ῥόθος) of the Persian tongue (399-407). The cries of the Greeks are echoed back by the island rocks, as a symbol of the support of land and sea for the Greeks, and with the result that the Persians are inspired by terror (388-92). The Greek language then is a symbol of Greek unity and of the Greeks' belonging to their land; it is also a weapon.

University College, London   THOMAS HARRISON

APPENDIX 1
REFERENCES TO FOREIGN LANGUAGES

- Ionians do not use the same language (γλῶσσαν) as one another, but have 4 dialects (χαρακτῆρες γλώσσης); those cities which are in Lydia (Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedus, Teos, Clazomenae and Phocaea) agree in no way in their language with these (1.142.3-4).
- Does Carian derive from Caunian or *vice versa* (1.172)?
- Ammonians settlers of Egyptians and of Ethiopians, but they use a language between both (φωνὴν μεταξὺ ἀμφοτέρων νομίζοντες, 2.42.4).
- Colchians and Egyptians: way of working linen, whole way of life and language v. similar to one another (2.105).
- Egyptians call barbarians all those who have not the same language as them (ὁμογλώσσους, 2.158.4).
- There are many Indian peoples, none of whom speak the same language as one another (οὐκ ὁμόφωνα σφίσι, 3.98.3)
- Argippaeans use Scythian clothing … but have own language (φωνὴν δὲ ἰδίην ἱέντες, 4.23.2)
- Scythians use 7 languages and 7 interpreters on journey to Argippaei (4.24).
- Androphagoi: nomads, wear clothes like the Scythians, have their own language, and are the only ones of these who eat people (4.106).
- Geloni (in ancient times Greek) speak a language half-Scythian, half-Greek (4.108.2).
- Budini do not use the same language as the Geloni (4.109.1)
- Sauromatae use Scythian language but not correctly as Amazons learned it imperfectly at first (4.117).
- The Troglodyte Ethiopians have a language 'similar' to no other, but sounding like screeching bats (4.183.4).
- Atarantes are the only anonymous people of whom we know (4.184.1).
- Eretrians, transported by Darius to Arabian Gulf, guarded their own language (6.119.4).
- Since the Greeks are of the same language (ὁμογλώσσους), they should, Mardonius says, deal with one another through heralds rather than making war (7.9.b2).
- Eastern Aithiopians differed not at all in form from other (Ethiopians), leaving aside language (φωνήν) and hair (7.70.1).
- Sagartians nomads, in language (φωνῇ) a Persian people, in dress half-Persian, half-Pactyan (7.85.1).
- The Athenians' reasons for not betraying Greece (8.144.2).
- Prophecy of Bacis: 'when a βαρβαρόφωνος shall throw a byblus yoke over the water'… (8.20.2).

APPENDIX 2
TRANSLATIONS BETWEEN LANGUAGES AND DIALECTS[157]

- Candaules, whom the Greeks name Myrsilus (1.7.2).
- Cappadocians named Syrians by Greeks (1.72.1).
- Scythians call those with female disease ἐνάρεας (1.105.4).
- The name of Mitradates' wife was Kyno in the Greek language, in the Median language Spako (1.110.1); for the Medes call a bitch (κύνα) σπάκα.
- Persian ἀρτάβη converted into Attic choinix (1.192.3).
- The palm trees which the Greeks call male (1.193.5).
- The Phrygians (Psammetichus learns) call bread βεκός (2.2.4).
- Conversion of stades, parasangs and schoinoi (2.6).
- The Ethiopian deserters called in Egyptian Ἀσμάχ, or 'those who stand on the left-hand side of the king' (2.31).
- Crocodiles called χάμψαι by Egyptians (2.69.3): named by analogy to lizards by Ionians.
- Egyptian loaves called κυλλήστις (2.77.4).
- Linus is the same as Maneros, and has different name according to the people (2.79.2).
- Tunics the Egyptians call καλασίρις (2.81.1).
- Water-lily (κρίνεα) the Egyptians call λωτός (2.92.2).
- Silicyprium oil the Egyptians call κίκι (2.94.1).
- The Colchian linen is called Sardinian by the Greeks, Egyptian called 'Egyptian' (2.105).
- A Memphite became king whose name 'in the Greek language' was Proteus (2.112.1).
- Πίρομις is in the Greek language καλός κἀγαθός (2.143.4).
- The Egyptians call all those who are not of the same language (ὁμογλώσσους) barbarians (2.158.5).
- This place is called in the Greek language 'the island of the blessed' (3.26.1).

---

[157] This list is an *attempt* at a comprehensive list of translations between languages or (what we would term) dialects. It does not include translations of the names of the gods (see above, n. 108). The equivalances are not always perfect (e.g. 2.69.3). In a number of instances Herodotus seems to take for granted, when he says that a foreign people calls x y, that they called x 'y in their own language' (e.g. 2.158.5). Other problematic cases are where the Greek translation of a foreign name means something in Greek, e.g. 3.26.1 (a place called in the Greek language 'the island of the blessed') or 4.52.3 (a Scythian place-name Exampaios rendered in the Greek language 'Sacred Roads'): does he consider by 'in the Greek language' that the meaning of the Scythian or Egyptian name is being rendered into Greek, or merely that the two names refer to the same place?

- Arabians call ledanum (λήδανον) λάδανον (3.112).
- Scoloti called Scythians by Greeks (4.6.2).
- An island called by the Greeks Erytheia (4.8.2).
- One eyed people we name in Scythian as 'Arimaspians' as ἄριμα is one, σποῦ is eye (4.27).
- Hyperborean maidens who went to Delos named by the Delians as Hyperoche and Laodice (4.33.3).
- Place in Scythian is Exampaios, in Greek language Sacred Roads (4.52.3).
- Large fish which Scythians call ἀντακαῖοι (4.53.3).
- Scythians call Amazons Οἰόρπατα (which means man-killers in the Greek language): they call man οἰόρ, πατά is to kill (4.110.1).
- Libyans call king *Battus* (4.155.2).
- Ζεγέριες is Libyan word for one of three varieties of mouse; in Greek means 'hills' (4.192.3).
- The Ligyes who live above Massalia call traders σιγύνναι, whereas the Cypriots use the same word to describe spears (5.9.3).
- *Parasang* is what the Persians call 30 stades (6.42.2).
- The Persians call the oil from Ardericca ῥαδανίκη (6.119.3).
- Persian sword which they call ἀκινάκην (7.54.3).
- Assyrians called Syrians by the Greeks, but Assyrian by the barbarians (7.63).
- The Persians call all Scythians Σάκαι (7.64.2).
- These Syrians called Cappadocians by the Persians (7.72.1).
- Hot baths near Thermopylae called Χύτροι (7.176.3).
- The Achaeans call a *prytaneion* a λήιτον (7.197.2).
- The benefactors of the king are called in Persian ὀροσάγγαι (8.85.3).
- The Persians call their postal service ἀγγαρήιον (8.98.2)
- The Spartans call Barbaroi ξεῖνοι (9.11.2).
- The knife-bearers called Καλασίριες, the only Egyptian fighting men (9.32.1).
- A pass which the Boeotians call 'three heads' and the Athenians 'oak-heads' (9.39.1).
- Persian feast is called in Persian τυκτά, in the Greek language *teleion* (9.110.2).