4

HISTORY, ETHNOGRAPHY, AND AETIOLOGY IN HERODOTUS' LIBYAN *LOGOS* *

Emily Baragwanath

Abstract: This chapter examines how Herodotus' narratives of Cyrene's foundation and of Persia's more recent imperial interest in Libya hark back to the proem and combine with the Libyan ethnography to produce an account that is essential to the *Histories*' overall design and to shaping one area of Greek cultural memory. These narratives probe cause and responsibility in relation to the war between Greeks and *barbaroi*, carrying further the *Histories*' dialogic program by exposing the distinctly Greek identities and assumptions readers bring to bear in explaining the past. Beyond preserving wondrous material, the Libyan *logos* illustrates how ethnographical awareness complicates and enriches historical interpretation.

Keywords: Herodotus, causation, explanation, responsibility, Greek identity, ethnography, Libyan *logos*

1. Introduction

Cyrene, on the North coast of Africa, was one of the earliest Greek colonies, sent out from Thera in around 630 BCE and led (so tradition held) by Battus the First. Tradition also held that Thera had been founded centuries earlier from Sparta, a tradition expressed in the founding stories preserved for us in various literary sources including three of Pindar's Pythian odes, in Callimachus, and in the 'Libyan *logos*'[1] of the fourth book of Herodotus' *Histories* (4.145–205).[2] Before the middle of

[1] Herodotus at 2.161 looks ahead to the 'Libyan *logoi*' plural; but as the narrative forms a unity I employ '*logos*'. Translations are my own or adapted from Waterfield's Oxford World's Classics edition or Godley's Loeb.

[2] On the colonisation of Cyrene and whether the traditions reflect semi-accurately the early historical background, see (answering in the affirmative) B. Mitchell (2002); Malkin (1994) 67–114 and (2003); and (sceptical) Osborne (2002) 506–8 and (2009) 8–17; also, Chamoux (1953) 93–127; Calame (1988); and esp. Giangiulio (2001). ML no. 5 (Cyrene's

the sixth century BCE Cyrene itself went on to found Barca, a settlement around the coast of Libya to the West. The twin foci of Herodotus' narrative are the foundation of Cyrene and its more recent history under King Arcesilaus III and his mother Pheretime, under whose rule Libya joined the succession of places that Persia eyed covetously as it expanded westwards. The account of more recent history includes a survey of the land and peoples of Libya. The last ruler of this unusually long-lasting Greek royal dynasty, Arcesilaus IV, would be killed in the middle of the fifth century BCE in a democratic revolution (scholiast on Pindar's *Pythian Four*). Herodotus does not mention this event, but his account of an earlier democratic reform at the hands of the significantly-named 'Demonax' ('ruler of the people', 4.161) and the royal resistance that followed (4.162.2) invites readers to look ahead to it.[3]

The Libyan *logos* is one of Herodotus' most perplexing, and most maligned. It has been judged muddled and overly abbreviated;[4] as having a merely transitional function in the wider work;[5] as including material not entirely relevant to the history of Persian expansion, since Herodotus insisted on incorporating the results of his ethnographical inquiries in Libya;[6] as representing a 'fraud on history' in depicting the Cyrenaeans, whose view the account must simply propagate, in conflict with the Persians rather than as the medisers they were.[7] Scholars have been tempted to subject it to the composition question, pronouncing it unfinished or assuming that Herodotus would have wished completely to excise it from his *Histories*.

And yet the voices raised in its support are growing stronger. Pietro Vannicelli appreciates the valuable contribution it makes to the work's chronological structure and emphasises Herodotus' discernment in determining what to include. The *logos* might have earned so much airtime thanks to its rich nucleus of traditions relating to Cyrene's foundation and the privileged status of origins in the evaluation of historical facts.[8] Carolyn Dewald observes the implicit contrast generated between the Scythians' union against the Persians, and the Greeks' ruinous dissension in Libya; as 'a foretaste of what Persian imperial power can do to a Greek population',

---

foundation decree, preserved in a fourth-century inscription). On the prior foundation of Thera: Malkin (1994) 89–95, 106–11. The nature of Greek colonisation is subject to debate: Osborne (1998).

[3] The dynasty and its end: Chamoux (1953) 128–68; B. Mitchell (2002). Demonax and his reforms: Chamoux (1953) 139–42; B. Mitchell (2002) 87–9. Demonax was not a local activist, but brought in on Delphic advice from Mantinea: Hdt. 4.161.

[4] E.g., Corcella (2007) 566–7, 569.

[5] E.g., Wood (1972) 111.

[6] Corcella (2007) 567, cp. Malten (1911) 95.

[7] Macan (1895) *ad* 4.203.3.

[8] Vannicelli (1993) 134–5, 147.

the *logos* provides a fitting transition between the Scythian narrative and the Ionian revolt.[9] Pascal Payen reads the Libyan ethnography alongside other Herodotean ethnographies as representing the perspective and resistance of would-be victims of Persian imperialism.[10] Rosaria Munson observes that Barca, like Troy (at 1.5), is a city shown becoming small, and Herodotus' remark in the Libyan *logos* about divine retribution (4.205) is one of the work's only two authorial generalisations (cp. 2.120.5) that explain why *eudaimoniē* shifts from one place to another.[11] The Barca narrative thus responds to the *Histories*' global program and represents a key explanatory site.[12]

This chapter aims to bring out further how the narratives of Cyrene's foundation and of Persia's more recent imperial interest in Libya combine with the ethnography of Libya to produce an account that is essential to the *Histories*' overall design and to shaping one area of Greek cultural memory. Together these narratives carry further the work's dialogic and culturally relativistic program, by challenging readers to recognise and interrogate the distinctly Greek identities and assumptions they bring to bear in explaining the past. Like other episodes of the *Histories*, the Libyan *logos* glances back to and invites qualification of the opposition between 'Greeks' and 'barbarians' set forth in the work's opening sentence and ensuing account of alleged rapes, which culminates in the Persian view of the Greeks as being inimical to them and Europe as 'having been cut off' from Asia (1.4.4).[13] Thus beyond preserving for posterity fascinating and wondrous material (in keeping with the *Histories*' first sentence), the Libyan *logos* illustrates how ethnographical awareness complicates and enriches interpretations of past events.

After examining ways in which the *logos* is heralded by the proem and contributes to embedding the *Histories* into the wider Greek collective memory, I will focus on how the historical narratives and ethnography together carry further the work's expressed aim of probing cause and responsibility in relation to the war between Greeks and *barbaroi* (1.1.1): for Barca would be the first Greek community to be attacked and enslaved by

---

[9] Dewald (1998) 658 *ad* 4.145–205.

[10] Payen (1997) 337. The subjection of Libya would represent the extension of Persian rule to a region which had not been part of one of the great ancient empires, habituated to record keeping and regular taxation, as Stephanie West reminds me. The empire was expanding eastwards as well: 4.44.

[11] See Munson (2001b) 183 (and 183–94 on divine retribution more broadly in the *Histories*). The other generalisation is 2.120.5. On the historical city of Barca, which was 'certainly large and second in size only to… Kyrene', see Hansen and Nielsen (2004) no. 1025 (quotation at p. 1241).

[12] Munson (2001b) 183 for 'global program', described at 181–2.

[13] Herodotus' undermining of Greek/barbarian polarity: Dewald (1990); Pelling (1997); Munson (1988) and (2001a); Gruen (2011) 21–39; Skinner (2012) 250; of the notion of the *Hellenikon*: Baragwanath (2008) 160–2, 171–8.

King Darius, and, together with Euesperidae, marks the westernmost extent of Persian expansionism (4.204).

2. Unity and Integration: The Libyan *Logos* and the Proem of the *Histories*

Far from being extraneous, the Libyan *logos* is carefully integrated into the wider work, where its themes are answered. The Phoenicians, who step onto the opening pages of the *Histories* as the first colonisers of the ancient Mediterranean, thus reappear in this same colonising guise:[14] for the Greek founders of Thera and subsequently Cyrene follow in their colonisers' footsteps, joining the Phoenician community already established in Thera (4.147.4), and even boasting some Phoenician ancestry (4.147.1). The depiction of broad movements across the Mediterranean—Minyans sailing from Lemnos westwards to the Peloponnese, the oikist Theras and followers from Lacedaimon south to Kalliste (then renamed Thera), and eventually on to Libya—and the depiction of flexible, shifting identities (with the melding of Spartans and Phoenicians) recalls the sense of cross-continental movement and shifting identities of the proem. Theras himself is Cadmean, and thus Phoenician by descent. In each case there follows a hardening into communities with more separate identities (Europe cut off from Asia, Cyrene gaining a more distinctly Greek identity).[15] In the ascription of motivation—Theras 'intended to settle among these people, **not to drive them out** but to claim them as his own (κάρτα οἰκηιεύμενος)' (4.148.1)—the negative presentation draws attention to a contrast with what readers might expect, with what happened later (when Greeks and Phoenicians fought on opposite sides in the Persian Wars), and perhaps also with the situation that results at the end of the proem (where the Persians have come to regard the Greeks as cut off from themselves, and claim as their own (οἰκηιεῦνται) the barbarian races that dwell within Asia: 1.4.4).

The proem's motif of abducted women, followed by petitions for justice and reparation (1.2.3; 1.3.1; 1.3.2), gets fleshed out in the Libyan *logos*: thus after a passing mention of female abduction (the Minyans have been expelled 'by the Pelasgians who stole the Athenian women from Brauron',

---

[14] Phoenicians in Herodotus: Bondì (1990); Mavrogiannis (2004).

[15] The group that will go on to settle Cyrene is thus labelled οἱ Ἕλληνες (4.158.2) (perhaps from the perspective of the Libyans leading them, who address them as ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες: 4.158.3). In a battle at Cyrene the Egyptians have no experience of Greeks (Ἑλλήνων), view them with contempt, and are defeated (4.159.6). We hear no more of the group's more complex ethnic composition (Herodotus' description of Demonax' division of the Cyrenaeans into three tribes (4.161) mentions only Greeks, though some take περιοίκων to refer to native Libyans: Corcella (2007) *ad* 4.161.3). Stephanie West points out to me that historically intermarriage between Greeks and Libyan women must have been commonplace (cf. 4.186), at the highest level (cf. 4.164).

4.145.2; at the end of Book 6 Herodotus returns to elaborate on this event, in connection with Miltiades' conquest of Lemnos, 6.138), Herodotus narrates the Minyans' petition to the Spartans to accept them into their land (the indirect discourse again recalling the proem) (4.145.4):

οἱ δὲ ἔφασαν ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν ἐκβληθέντες ἥκειν ἐς τοὺς πατέρας· **δικαιότατον γὰρ εἶναι οὕτω τοῦτο γίνεσθαι**· δέεσθαι δὲ οἰκέειν ἅμα τούτοισι μοῖράν τε τιμέων μετέχοντες καὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπολαχόντες.

They said that having been expelled by the Pelasgians they have come to the land of their fathers: **and for this to happen is most just**; they wanted to live with them and have a share of their privileges and obtain a portion of land.

In accepting the petition the Lacedaemonians are persuaded especially by the fact that the Tyndarids, brothers of Helen, had accompanied the Minyans' ancestors on the Argo—a reminder of Helen that recalls the proem; they make their only other appearance in the work defending Helen after her abduction by Theseus (9.73). There follows a sketch of the exchange of women cementing connections between far-flung places (4.145.5; 4.146), which again evokes the cross-continental connections produced by females in the proem, where Asian Europa gives her name to Europe.[16]

In the view of the learned Persians, the Phoenicians bear initial responsibility for the Graeco-Persian conflict because they abducted the Greek princess Io from Argos to Egypt (1.1), after which the Greeks reciprocated with their abduction of the Phoenician princess Europa from Tyre (1.2). The score now even, the Greeks became responsible for the second injustice, for 'after sailing in a long ship to Colchian Aea and the river Phasis, from there, once they had completely finished the other business for which they had come' (a mischievously elliptic reference to Jason's retrieval of the Golden Fleece), 'they seized the king's daughter Medea' (1.2.2). Paris next abducted Helen from Sparta, after which the Greeks escalated the violence (so becoming 'greatly responsible/to blame', μεγάλως αἰτίους, 1.4.1) by making war on Asia and destroying Priam's empire. Herodotus appends the learned Phoenicians' qualification of one part of this story: their insistence that Io was not abducted but accompanied the Phoenician merchants willingly after getting pregnant.

A second rejoinder to the learned Persians' accusations about the Phoenicians occurs in the Libyan ethnography, in the account given by Carthaginians (colonists from Phoenicia) about their transactions with a people beyond the Pillars of Heracles (4.196). The scenario of international

---

[16] See Dewald (1990).

interchange reported in indirect discourse recalls the proem's depiction of Phoenician traders of mythical times; and beyond this appear some possible resonances in detail (emboldened) (4.196):

λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τάδε Καρχηδόνιοι, εἶναι τῆς Λιβύης χῶρόν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπους ἔξω Ἡρακλέων στηλέων κατοικημένους, ἐς τοὺς ἐπεὰν ἀπίκωνται καὶ ἐξέλωνται **τὰ φορτία, θέντες αὐτὰ ἐπεξῆς παρὰ τὴν κυματωγήν** [cp. διατίθεσθαι τὸν φόρτον, 1.1.2], ἐσβάντες ἐς τὰ πλοῖα τύφειν καπνόν· τοὺς δ' ἐπιχωρίους ἰδομένους τὸν καπνὸν ἰέναι ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ἔπειτα ἀντὶ **τῶν φορτίων** χρυσὸν τιθέναι καὶ ἐξαναχωρέειν πρόσω ἀπὸ **τῶν φορτίων**· τοὺς δὲ Καρχηδονίους ἐκβάντας σκέπτεσθαι, καὶ ἢν μὲν φαίνηταί σφι ἄξιος ὁ χρυσὸς **τῶν φορτίων**, ἀνελόμενοι ἀπαλλάσσονται, ἢν δὲ μὴ ἄξιος, ἐσβάντες ὀπίσω ἐς τὰ πλοῖα κατέαται, οἱ δὲ προσελθόντες ἄλλον πρὸς ὧν ἔθηκαν χρυσόν, ἐς οὗ ἂν πείθωσι. **ἀδικέειν δὲ οὐδετέρους**· οὔτε γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἅπτεσθαι πρὶν ἄν σφι ἀπισωθῇ τῇ ἀξίῃ **τῶν φορτίων**, οὔτ' ἐκείνους **τῶν φορτίων** ἅπτεσθαι πρότερον ἢ αὐτοὶ τὸ χρυσίον λάβωσι.

And the Carthaginians also tell the following story. They say that there is a land in Libya and men who dwell beyond the pillars of Heracles. When they arrive there and unload **their cargo, after setting it out in orderly fashion along the beach**, boarding their ships they light a smoking fire; and at seeing the smoke the locals come to the seashore and set out gold in exchange for **the cargo**, and then withdraw far from the cargo. And the Carthaginians disembark and have a look, and if the gold seems worth the value of **the cargo**, taking it they sail away; but if it does not seem worth its value, boarding their ships again they wait, while the others come back and set out more gold, until they are persuaded. **Neither side commits injustices**; for they (the Carthaginians) do not touch the gold before it is made **equal** to the value of **the cargo**, nor do the others touch **the cargo** before the Carthaginians have taken the gold.

Thus, in implicit contrast to the picture of their forebears painted by the Persian *logioi*, the Carthaginians depict themselves avoiding the sort of intermingling that there led to conflict, and—so far from seizing the local women—as withdrawing in civilised fashion while potential buyers assess the fairness of the exchange. In contrast to the proem's depiction of successive injustices by both sides, here 'neither side acts unjustly'. The Carthaginians wait until the gold 'has been made equal to' (ἀπισωθῇ) the value of the cargo; here there is no progression as in the proem from a state of 'being equal for equal' (ἴσα πρὸς ἴσα) to a state of inequality ('*but afterwards …*', 1.2.1). Contemporary Carthaginians—Herodotus' informants—thus defend the actions of their Phoenician forebears, and their defence high-

lights again how closely this ethnography is woven into the wider work. This glance back to the *Histories'* beginning contributes to the closural movement that marks the end of the Libyan ethnography, as does the ensuing reference back to the ethnography's beginning: for Herodotus notes that still in his time most of these tribes cared nothing for the Persian King (4.197.1). There follow summarising observations about the ethnic groups that inhabit Libya and the quality of the land in relation to Europe and Asia, before the resumption of the main trunk narrative (prepared for by mention of the Persian king) with the arrival at Barca of the Persians sent by the satrap Aryandes (4.200).

The proem's stories relate obliquely to the historical narrative that ensues: Herodotus underscores their unverifiable nature in contrast to the events of more recent history that will be his main focus (1.5.3). Nonetheless they glance ahead to and cleverly introduce themes that will recur in the *Histories* and that are concentrated within the Libyan *logos*: female agency; reciprocity; international communication and exchange; change of name and identity; the tension between free will and external constraints. So too the proem's implied warning about the partial and partisan nature of narrative remains relevant to the Libyan *logos* in both its narrative histories and ethnography.[17] The proem's exposure of superficial explanatory patterning advertises Herodotus' broader concern to establish historical causation.[18] The Persian and Phoenician accounts also preview the 'point de vue décentré' that will be a prominent feature especially of the ethnographic narratives.[19]

By planting seeds for the remainder of the *Histories* in its references to mythical traditions that resurface later on, the proem also helps to anchor the work in the broader Greek imagination. Thus Book 2 will return to the Trojan cycle, with an account of the Trojan War and of Helen's séjour in Egypt, while the Libyan *logos* returns to the two other major complexes of Greek myth to which the proem refers, the Theban Cycle and the Argonautica. Phoenician Cadmus, founder of Thebes, appears on the search for his daughter Europa (4.147, cp. 5.57–9), and the Minyans, having been expelled from Lemnos, are received at Sparta by reason of their Argonaut heritage (4.145.3; the 'long ship' (1.2.2) is finally referred to by name, as again at 4.179.3); their descent from the abductors of the proem perhaps helps explain their *hybris* (4.146). Finally, some Minyans join in settling Thera and Cyrene (4.148). Further details about Jason and his

---

[17] Dewald (1999). Note e.g. 4.154.1 (inclusion of alternative traditions about Cyrene's foundation) with Giangiulio (2001), esp. 135–7; 4.173: 'I recount these things as the Libyans recount them'; 4.195.2: 'I don't know if these things are true, but I write what is said' (τὰ δὲ λέγεται γράφω); 4.197.2: only four nations inhabit Libya 'so far as we know'.

[18] Węcowski (2004), cp. 154. See Krischer (1965) 160–2 for the formal importance here of αἰτίη.

[19] Sauge (1992) 272; Payen (1997) 338; Węcowski (2004) 151 n. 45 with text.

expedition are woven into the Libyan ethnography: how after the Argo had been built and Jason had dedicated a bronze tripod on the site, he was blown off his course to Libya, gifted the tripod to the river Triton, and received in return a prophecy of future Greek city foundations (4.179).

The Libyan *logos* also carries on from the proem, not only in its interest in both the Greeks and Greek achievements and the *barbaroi* and theirs (opening sentence), but also in introducing another variation on the theme of Greek/barbarian conflict and the reasons that lie behind it:[20] the Persian interaction with the Greek colonies in Libya represents a precursor and parallel to the account of the Persian incursion against Greece, as in the person of the brutal and medising Pheretime, another Greek who *invites in* the Persians.[21] Barca's enslavement and submission to Persian rule stages a spectacle of what was on the cards for Greece. Like the account of the Scythians' defence against Darius' invasion and of the Ionian revolt, it thereby supplies comparative material to be borne in mind as readers contemplate the Persian campaign against the Greek mainland. It both equips them to grasp how close it came to falling under Persian rule, and encourages reflection on possible explanatory factors for the different outcome there: the Athenians' democratic government, with free-thinking, creative, independent individuals like Themistocles, which made them 'saviours of Greece' (7.139.5); the absence of corrosive and self-interested autocracy; divine will; even an element of pure chance.

The opening of the Libyan *logos* appears, then, to recall the proem, much as did the Samian *logos*,[22] with the connection in each case high-lighting the possibility that themes within the *logos* may illuminate the wider work. It also provides examples of motifs which recur in other episodes as well (for instance, the *hybris* of the Minyans, 4.146.1), and the themes as a whole culminate in its final sequence, where a Greek queen, Pheretime, pronounces guilt and personally exacts a terrible vengeance that includes the mutilation of women and impaling of men (4.162–5, 200–5). Among its other resonances the episode looks ahead to the mutilation of the wife of Masistes by the Persian Queen Amestris, near the *Histories'* close, where Amestris' refusal of an army (in lieu of her demand for Masistes' innocent wife), 'a distinctly Persian gift', might recall Pheretime's successive failed requests for an army from (Greek) Euelthon (4.162) and success in making the same request of (Persian) Aryandes. Like Lydian Sardis, the setting of Xerxes' first illicit lust (and of Candaules' lust and conjugal misconduct, 1.8–12),[23] from the mainland Greek perspective North African Cyrene was

---

[20] Cp. Payen (1997) 88–91.

[21] E.g., Syloson (3.139–49), the Argives (7.152.3). The motif of Greeks inviting in the Persians: Pelling (2000) 95–6; Baragwanath (2008) 190–1, 243.

[22] Cp. Baragwanath (2008) 86–7.

[23] See Wolff (1964) for the parallel between the story of Candaules and his wife and Xerxes and Masistes' wife.

perhaps liminal territory—in between 'Greek' and 'other'—that was conducive to transgressive deeds. Pheretime's violent and barbarous revenge looks ahead also to Hermotimus' exacting, in the marginal territory of Atarneus, of 'a greater vengeance for wrong done to him than had any man whom we know'.[24] Pheretime's son, on the other hand—the barbaric, impious, and tyrannical Greek monarch Arcesilaus III—finds not a reflection but a reverse-image in another non-Greek occupant of liminal Sardis, the pious and philhellenic Lydian Croesus.[25]

The account of Theras' foundation also finds an intriguing shadow in a later narrative of a failed attempt to colonise Libya, that of the Spartan royal Dorieus, who 'on account of his manly excellence' (5.42.1) expected to become king. The Spartans instead followed custom and crowned by right of age his half-brother, the mad Cleomenes. 'Thinking it a dreadful thing [δεινόν τε ποιεύμενος] and not deeming it right to be ruled by Cleomenes' (5.42.2), Dorieus asks for a company of men (λεών), whom he takes to found a colony, settling first in the 'fairest spot' (χῶρον κάλλιστον, 5.42.3) of Libya. The resonances between the two narratives are clear: Theras, after serving as Spartan regent for some time, left Sparta 'thinking it a terrible thing (δεινὸν ποιεύμενος) to be ruled by others after tasting power' (4.147.3), and sailed away with a company of people (λεών, 4.148.1) to *Kalliste* (4.147.5). In a negative mirror image, however, Dorieus 'neither consulted the Delphic oracle about which land to settle in, nor did anything else customary' (5.42.2), but angrily set sail for Libya, taking Theran men as his guides. Eventually driven out, he returned to the Peloponnese, from where, with Delphic assistance, he attempted to plant a colony in Sicily (5.43–6), only to be slain in battle (5.46). This more recent historical parallel of Theras' story is perhaps included as a moral tale and example of the vagaries of human fortune—for, Herodotus observes (5.48), 'had Dorieus endured Cleomenes' rule and stayed at Sparta, he would have been king of Lacedaemon', since Cleomenes soon died, leaving behind no male heir.

We have seen how the opening of Herodotus' narrative prepares for the appearance of the Libyan *logos*, while the Libyan *logos* in turn invites readers to reflect on the proem. In two further dimensions, each with metatextual implications (offering insight into historical processes and their interpretation), this *logos* looks back to the proem, and these will be our focus in the rest of this paper. First, it fulfils the promise of the opening

---

[24] 8.104–6 with Hornblower (2003), esp. 44–5 on Atarneus as marginal territory by virtue of being *peraia*. On Lydia as a country in-between East and West see Pelling (1997) 56. Impaling as associated with barbarity: Hdt. 9.78–9, L. G. Mitchell (2012) 11 n. 41. Gray (1995) 208 describes Pheretime as 'barbarised by proximity to barbaric lands'. L. G. Mitchell (2012) 20–1 observes the remote location of most transgressive females in Archaic and Classical Greek sources. Herodotus does not by and large expose distinctly *female* transgression: Dewald (1980) and (1981); Gray (1995).

[25] Antonis Tsakmakis drew my attention to this parallel.

sentence to focus in on the *aitiē*: the cause of, or responsibility for, Greco-Persian hostility; and second, it promotes divergent, unfamiliar and foreign narratives and perspectives (like those of the Persian and Phoenician *logioi* ('learned men'), with their defamiliarising perspective on Greek mythology). We shall address in turn the historical narratives and the Libyan ethnography.

3. The Mythical/Historical Narrative

In his opening sentence Herodotus signals that an important aspect of his project will be the analysis of causation or responsibility: his display of *historiē*, which aims to preserve Greek and barbarian collective memory, will consider 'other matters and especially through what cause (δι’ ἣν αἰτίην)' the Greeks and Persians warred. Part and parcel of the interest in historical causation is the exposure of its tentative character.[26] Explanations also are of their nature as partial and partisan as the stories that contain them. Informants and actors alike tend to ask 'who's to blame' or 'who started it', and so to reduce explanation down to narrow questions of personal responsibility.

The profusion of such claims, with subsequent actions viewed by participants in terms of *counter*-actions (negative reciprocity), has promoted emphasis on the key explanatory importance of vengeance in the *Histories*, since ideas of vengeance surface readily in contexts of blame.[27] But the assigning of responsibility and explanation can be quite separate matters in the historian's inquiry. The proem stages this distinction in the contrast it draws between the accusations made by Persians and Phoenicians about cause and responsibility, and a genuine cause that the historian identifies (in the actions of Croesus). Tim Rood has critiqued readings of the proem as a programmatic statement about the importance of reciprocal justice between Greeks and non-Greeks on the grounds that what Herodotus there stages are shifting *claims* about justice and reciprocity.[28] Christopher Pelling has underscored how the *Histories* deflects the reflex that assumes that the aggressor in a defensive war—here the Persians—must be to blame, as by

---

[26] Baragwanath (2008) esp. 3–4 (main narrative); Mezzadri (2013) (ethnographies).

[27] Pagel (1927) and de Romilly (1971) understood vengeance in the *Histories* simply in terms of personal motivation, an assumption Gould (1989) and (1991) rightly contested, revealing reciprocity, positive and negative, to be a deep structuring and explanatory device. Immerwahr (1956) had already pointed to the complex and multiple nature of causation in Herodotus, of which vengeance is just one aspect. On the natural connection of *aitiē* and blame: Immerwahr (1956) 244–5; Pelling (2000) 88. See also Lateiner (1989) 189–210; Munson (2001b) 187–8; Fisher (2002) 217–24; Baragwanath (2008) 15 n. 39 with text, and now the magisterial Pelling (2019).

[28] Rood (2010); cp. Węcowski (2004) 152 (Herodotus humorously exposing the superficial causality that the chain of abductions assumes).

exposing how one party's blame of another may mask an ulterior motive.[29] Herodotus routinely complicates questions of moral and legal responsibility by emphasising the role of rhetoric and persuasion, and presenting a picture in which explanations proliferate. His frequent posture of staying above the fray, and avoiding attributions of responsibility, helps to establish his historiographical authority as impartial judge.

In its complex intertwining with the narrative of Persian intervention in Libyan affairs, Herodotus turns his narrative of the careers and demise of one of the last kings in the line of Greek colonial rulers of Cyrene and his mother into an instructive illumination of the complications of historical aetiology. The Persian expedition is initially explained as motivated by a desire for subjugation (ἐπὶ Λιβύης καταστροφῇ, 4.167.3). But this grandiose original objective soon fizzles out, and a stark contrast surfaces between the huge forces initially sent and the eventual outcome. What results is the conquest of the Greek settlement Barca (not the larger Cyrene) and the transportation of its surviving citizens, enslaved, to King Darius, who settles them in a town in Bactria that they also name Barca—which Herodotus observes 'was still an inhabited town up to my time' (4.204).[30] In a sense this entire section of the narrative turns out then to be an aetiology for the existence of a tiny Greek settlement in Bactria, a situation that highlights the potential dissonance between intentions or explanation, and historical outcomes. The relocation to Bactria also anticipates the fate of the Ionians in Book 6, taken off to Bactra (the threat made at 6.9 is partially fulfilled at 6.32).[31] As already noted (above, p. 157), Barca takes us back to the beginning of Herodotus by supplying an example of a city becoming small: an example of change over time, in accordance with a basic principle of the human condition (cp. 1.5.4; 1.32). Earlier in the *logos* Herodotus exposed the care required in constructing valid aetiological arguments in correcting a tradition that had grown up from a name given later: it is because the Pythia referred to the would-be king as 'Battus' that he gained that name, not that his stuttering as a child explains the name (4.155); a false aetiology (since 'Battus' = 'the Stutterer' in Greek) generated the notion of a speech impediment.

Herodotus exposes the challenging nature of the task of understanding causation in this *logos* in other ways. It is the Persian attempt at, and

---

[29] Pelling (2000) 96. On the complexities of Herodotus' ascriptions of blame see now Pelling (2019) 34–8, 123–8, with nuanced discussion of vengeance, reciprocity, and blame specifically in the Libyan *logos* at 125–8.

[30] Stephanie West observes that deportation from the Persian empire's most westerly point almost to its eastern limit has a symbolic quality, as if demonstrating the Great King's claim to be lord of all men from the sun's rising to its setting (Aeschines 3.132), but she raises practical objections to such a distant move, and suspects that linguistic confusion is involved in the destination.

[31] As Simon Hornblower points out to me.

ultimate failure to effect, conquest in Libya that connects this story to the
Histories' wider narrative arc. The first specific anticipation of this *logos* and
its interest in explanation was in Book 2 (2.161), where Herodotus promised
to relate 'in the Libyan *logoi*' more about a *prophasis*, explanation (one to do
with the demise of the Egyptian Pharaoh Apries; cp. 4.159). When he
reaches the Libyan *logos* he immediately draws attention to the red thread
of Persian conquest, and he raises the question of the *prophasis*[32] for Persian
interest in Libya, but only to delay addressing it (4.145.1):

> τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τοῦτον χρόνον ἐγίνετο ἐπὶ Λιβύην ἄλλος στρατιῆς μέγας
> στόλος, **διὰ πρόφασιν** τὴν ἐγὼ ἀπηγήσομαι προδιηγησάμενος πρότερον
> τάδε.

> Around about the same time another great expedition of an army
> occurred, against Libya, **because of a *prophasis* [explanation,
> justification]** that I will narrate fully once I have first recounted the
> following.

Preserving the mystery invites readers to keep in mind this question about
the reason for the expedition, as Herodotus delves eight generations back in
time to recount the history of Greek involvement in Cyrene, in an account
that has links still further back into the mythical past. When this colonial
back-story catches up with the moment of Persian contemplation of Libya,
Herodotus returns to explaining the attempt.[33]

One strand of explanation offers multiple contributory causes for
Persian imperial interest in Libya. The immediate cause or occasion of this
interest is Pheretime's invitation to Aryandes, the Persian satrap of Egypt.
She seeks his help in avenging the murder of her son Arcesilaus by the
citizens of Barca, holding out as a reason why the satrap should help her
the allegation that he was killed for his medism (4.165.3):

> ἀπικομένη δὲ ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἡ Φερετίμη Ἀρυάνδεω ἱκέτις ἕζετο,
> τιμωρῆσαι ἑωυτῇ κελεύουσα, **προϊσχομένη πρόφασιν** ὡς διὰ τὸν μηδισμὸν
> ὁ παῖς οἱ τέθνηκε.

---

[32] On *prophasis*: Sealey (1957) 5–6; Pelling (2000) 87–8 with 268 n. 9; Baragwanath (2008)
135.

[33] On the historical relationship of the Battiad dynasty to Persia and the nature of
Cyrene's submission to Persian rule: B. Mitchell (2002) 90–4. Giangiulio (2011) regards
Herodotus' account as an example of traditions' *construction* of events, preferring as more
historically accurate that of Menecles of Barca (*FGrHist* 270 F 5). As Stephanie West
observes, Pheretime's response to her son's assassination well illustrates the assumption
that submission to Persian rule implied support for the local rulers who acted as the
Empire's agents (cf. 4.137–8); but it was no mean feat for the satrap of Egypt to control
affairs at such a distance. The journey from the Delta to Cyrene was difficult, whether by
land or sea.

> Arriving in Egypt Pheretime threw herself before Aryandes as a suppliant, asking him to avenge her, **claiming [lit. 'holding out as a *prophasis*']** that her son had been killed because he was pro-Persian.

To explain Aryandes' decision to respond to her request, Herodotus paints a picture of complex personal motivation, with various factors in play, including pity: Aryandes 'took pity on' (4.167.1) the suppliant Pheretime, granting her his Egyptian forces. Her charge that her son was killed for medising opens up the possibility that another contributing factor was Aryandes' sense of Persia's obligation to return the favour. Aryandes' response also maps on to the wider pattern of subjects eager to favour the Great King so as to gain favour in return (e.g., Zopyrus, 3.154–60). The question Aryandes poses the people of Barca, *via* a herald—'who killed Arcesilaus?' (4.167.2)—and his later demand that the Barcaeans 'hand over those who are guilty of Arcesilaus' murder' (τοὺς αἰτίους τοῦ φόνου, 4.200.1), frames the campaign in its public aspect as motivated by concerns for justice: as exacting punishment on those responsible for murder. Accordingly, Aryandes despatches his forces with Pheretime only once the Barcaeans have admitted joint responsibility. But finally Herodotus discloses what in his opinion is the ultimate, underlying, cause of the expedition, the desire to subject Libya (4.167.3):

> αὕτη μέν νυν αἰτίη πρόσχημα τοῦ λόγου ἐγίνετο, ἐπέμπετο δὲ ἡ στρατιή, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν, ἐπὶ Λιβύων καταστροφῇ. Λιβύων γὰρ δὴ ἔθνεα πολλὰ καὶ παντοῖά ἐστι, καὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν ὀλίγα βασιλέος ἦν ὑπήκοα, τὰ δὲ πλέω ἐφρόντιζε Δαρείου οὐδέν.

> This *aitiē* [reason/accusation], then, was the *proschēma* [pretext, ostensible objective; 'that which is held before'] in word, but the army was sent, it seems to me, for the subjugation of Libya. For the tribes of the Libyans are many and varied, and only a few of them were subject to the King, whereas most paid no heed at all to Darius.

The observation provides Herodotus with a convenient occasion for a lengthy ethnographic discursus on these Libyan tribes. Its placement immediately after the great armament embarks with Pheretime reproduces in narrative form the temporal delay generated by the troops' advance from Egypt to Barca (they arrive at 4.199) and generates suspense on the part of the reader as to what will be the outcome of this first Persian attack on a Greek city.

Herodotus' presentation keeps elegantly vague the question of whether the campaign is motivated by *Darius'* desire for conquest of Libya, or rather by Aryandes' anticipation of such desire for expansion in this direction. The sense that the underlying explanation is a desire for subjugation on the part of Persia and her Kings—Darius included—finds support in the narrative pattern of Persia's expansionist tendency: the *Histories* up to this point has created an impression of her inexorable imperialist drive. Herodotus has described the Persian conquest of Media, Lydia, and Egypt, and attempt to conquer Scythia. A further narrative and historical pattern is Persia's exploitation of others' self-seeking invitations to further her own imperialist design. And yet the second possibility—that Aryandes more than Darius is thinking in terms of the conquest of the whole of Libya (himself aware of the trajectory of Persian imperialism, and assuming motives on Darius' part)—remains in play as well: it gains force from the wider pattern of the Persian King's subjects acting independently on his behalf, in hope of benefits in return, and also from Darius' non-involvement in the campaign as it unfolds (right up until the moment when the Barcaean slaves are presented to him at the end of the Libyan *logos*, 4.204). The chance invitation that leads to a major policy objective also maps on to the pervasive Herodotean motif examined in detail by van der Veen of the significance of the (apparently) insignificant.[34]

The explanatory texture becomes even richer when we shift from considering the beginnings (of Persian imperial interest in Libya) to *ends*—also privileged moments for historical interpretation[35]—to examine the cause of the end of the Cyrenaean dynasty and of the earlier death of Arcesilaus III (which provoked his mother's vengeance). Delphic oracles have conveyed the workings of divine agency throughout the narrative of Cyrene's early history, and now described is the oracle received by Arcesilaus upon his inquiry 'about his return' (from exile) (4.163.1). This oracle articulates the over-arching trajectory of the dynasty's end and offers specific advice to the king, partly clear, partly obscure (4.163.2–3):

ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οἱ χρᾷ τάδε· ἐπὶ μὲν τέσσερας Βάττους καὶ Ἀρκεσίλεως τέσσερας, ὀκτὼ ἀνδρῶν γενεάς, διδοῖ ὑμῖν Λοξίης βασιλεύειν Κυρήνης· πλέον μέντοι τούτου οὐδὲ πειρᾶσθαι παραινέει. σὺ μέντοι ἥσυχος εἶναι κατελθὼν ἐς τὴν σεωυτοῦ. ἢν δὲ τὴν κάμινον εὕρῃς πλέην ἀμφορέων, μὴ ἐξοπτήσῃς τοὺς ἀμφορέας ἀλλ᾽ ἀπόπεμπε κατ᾽ οὖρον· εἰ δὲ ἐξοπτήσεις τὴν κάμινον, μὴ ἐσέλθῃς ἐς τὴν ἀμφίρρυτον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀποθανέαι καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ταῦρος ὁ καλλιστεύων.

---

[34] van der Veen (1996).

[35] Cp. Solon's advice 'look to the end': 1.32.9; Artabanus': 7.51.3; Marincola (2005).

> The Pythia replied as follows: 'For four Battuses and four Arcesilauses, eight generations of men, Loxias gives to you to rule Cyrene; more than this he advises you not even to try. Do you rather return to your country and be peaceful. If you should find an oven full of amphorae, do not fire the amphorae but send them off with a fair wind; but if you fire the oven, don't go to the sea-girt place, otherwise, you will perish, you and the bull that is most beautiful'.[36]

Arcesilaus ignores the advice to tread gently and employs his army to return to power. 'Obtaining power, he forgot the oracle', and sets about exacting harsh justice for his exile (4.164.1–2). Only after burning opponents to death in a tower does the meaning of the oracle dawn on him (4.164.3). Fearing the prophesied death, he avoids Cyrene, which he supposes to be the 'sea-girt' place, only to be slain in Barca together with his father-in-law, king of the Barcaeans (and presumably the 'most beautiful bull' of the oracle). Herodotus' later summary—'he worked his own destruction' (4.165.1)—reiterates the notion of Arcesilaus' personal responsibility. Presumably he could instead have 'kept quiet' (cp. 4.163.3), treating the Cyrenaeans mildly or even abandoning power, and so evaded death. Arcesilaus has also proved unreceptive to divine commands in other ways, as in attempting to claw back the people's divinely ordained privileges (4.162.1); and to this extent he seems responsible for his own demise.

But implicit in the oracle delivered to Arcesilaus (as in that delivered to Gyges, 1.13.2) are also notions of limits to, and the inherent instability of, autocratic rule.[37] There is the explicit statement that the reign will end after eight generations, but also the Pythia's expression with **πλέον … τούτου οὐδὲ πειρᾶσθαι** ('more than this … not even to try') where the infinitive resembles πεῖραρ (denoting 'end' or 'limit' in Ionic),[38] and οὖρον, which beyond 'fair wind' (its meaning here) can denote 'limit, range' (and is used in this sense by Solon, of the limit of a man's life: 1.32.2). The remark that 'obtaining power (Aryandes) forgot the oracle' (ἐπικρατήσας τῶν πρηγμάτων τοῦ μαντηίου οὐκ ἐμέμνητο, with the causal connection implicit in the participial construction) encapsulates an explanatory idea familiar in the *Histories*, of rulers' vulnerability to the delusion that power brings in its

---

[36] On the oracle and its interpretation: Corcella (2007) *ad loc.*; Hollmann (2011) 115–16.

[37] Cp. Corcella (2007) *ad* 4.163.2–3.

[38] The two words are semantically different (*peirasthai*, 'to try', cognate with πεῖρα, ἡ v. πεῖραρ), yet there seems to be a semantic convergence too, as Maria Fragoulaki points out to me: see Chantraine (2009) *s.v.* πεῖρα (ἡ) (cognate of πειρᾶσθαι): ἀπείρων ('endless' from α + πεῖραρ, τό) is a homonymous doublet of ἄπειρος (α + πεῖρα, 'inexperienced, not knowing'—i.e., having not tried). Compare Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 1088 with Jebb (1887) ad loc.: 'περάω, to go through, πεῖρα (περία), a going-through…, are closely akin to πέρα, beyond, πέρας, πεῖραρ a limit…: in poetical usage, then, their derivatives might easily pass into each other's meanings'.

train, implicit in the trajectories of Cyrus, Croesus, Cambyses, Polycrates, and Maiandrios (and expressed in the abstract by Otanes: 3.80.3). These rulers 'learned too late', if at all: Croesus, for instance, gained insight about Solon's advice only as he burned on the pyre (1.86.3), while Cambyses only on his deathbed recognised his self-destructive paranoia (3.65).[39] The way Arcesilaus' conduct and trajectory maps on to that of other such powerful figures suggests its near inevitability; to hold power and retain insight (like Sabacos: see below, p. 172) is unusual. It looks ahead to Xerxes' increasing inability to interpret his situation, which compromises his ability to make decisions and to act (e.g., at 7.209.1, 8.87–8). Arcesilaus' interpretative failure is partly also that of 'the despot, acting by himself, [who] fails to comprehend the potential for polysemy':[40] communities in the *Histories* prove more capable, through group debate, of interpreting oracles. Yet the pattern is not confined to rulers: also recalled is the Lydians' forgetting of the original Gyges oracle, which becomes crucial at the end of the Croesus *logos*.[41]

Indeed, the emphasis on limits also pertains to the limits more generally of *human* knowledge, which the Delphic oracles underscore throughout the Libyan *logos*. Julia Kindt has brought out in relation to Croesus how Herodotus employs the oracle to stage the limits of human knowledge in contrast to divine omniscience.[42] The same dynamic helps explain Arcesilaus' failed oracular interpretation and demise. The narratives of oracular consultation followed by inaction or misguided action accentuate the Greeks' ignorance of Libya and lack of awareness about the future (as at 4.150.4: the Greeks are ignorant of Libya and fear sending a colony to an uncertain goal, ἀφανὲς χρῆμα). In his pointed declaration after the Greeks' failure to found a colony in Libya itself, the Delphic god emphasised the limits of human knowledge and reasserted his own wisdom and authority (4.157):

Ἡ δὲ Πυθίη σφι πρὸς ταῦτα χρᾷ τάδε·
αἰ τὺ ἐμεῦ Λιβύην μηλοτρόφον οἶδας ἄμεινον,
μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐλθόντος, ἄγαν ἄγαμαι σοφίην σευ.

The Pythia replied to them as follows:
'If you know better than I sheep-breeding Libya,
when you have not been there and I have, I greatly admire your wisdom'.

---

[39] Similar vocabulary (with ἐξεργασ-) recurs, e.g., Cambyses ἐξεργασθέντος δὲ κακοῦ τοσούτου (3.65.3), τὸ μὲν δὴ ἔργον ἐξέργασταί μοι (3.65.5) ~ Herodotus on Arcesilaus: ἐξεργασμένος ἑωυτῷ κακόν (4.165.1).

[40] Barker (2006) 27, with primary reference to Croesus.

[41] See Pelling (2006), esp. 162–3.

[42] Kindt (2006).

General human inadequacy is then available as a further explanation for Arcesilaus' too-slow understanding of the advice about the amphorae found in the oven and failure correctly to interpret the place 'surrounded by water' (which turns out to be not Cyrene but Barca, 4.154). Details of the Battiad dynasty's starkly varied fortunes recall Solon's description of the human condition: the picture of human beings as 'altogether accident/misfortune' (1.32.4: πᾶν ἐστι ἄνθρωπος συμφορή), and the definition of the happy individual (ὄλβιος/εὐδαίμων) as the one who is 'unmaimed, not sick, without experience of evils, blessed with fine children and good looks' (ἄπηρος …, ἄνουσος, ἀπαθὴς κακῶν, εὔπαις, εὐειδής), and in addition 'ends his life well' (τελευτήσει τὸν βίον εὖ). Thus the forty year reign of 'Battus **the Fortunate**' (Βάττου τοῦ *εὐδαίμονος*, 4.159.2) is juxtaposed with the tumultuous reign of his son Arcesilaus, who after a major defeat in war suffers **illness** and is strangled by his brother; followed by the reign of **lame** Battus, under whose rule the Cyrenaeans suffer **misfortune** (*συμφορήν*); followed by the turbulent reign and violent death of Arcesilaus III; and Pheretime's even more ghastly end (see below). Herodotus omits reference to surviving children.

A further strand of explanation is suggested by the violence, *hybris*, and stasis that have peppered the dynasty over generations, and previously marked the Minyans, some of whom were ancestors of the Cyrenaean royal line. Ancestral predisposition is another factor, then, that lends intelligibility to Arcesilaus' conduct (as it did to Croesus'). The idea of inherited guilt and the corruption of the family line recalls myth and its expression in tragedy, for instance in relation to the Labdacids.[43] Herodotus (significantly?) included the detail that Battus the First was a descendant of Polynices (4.147.1).

The complications of aetiology in Arcesilaus' case are encapsulated in Herodotus' stark summary of the interpretative possibilities: Ἀρκεσίλεως μέν νυν εἴτε ἑκὼν εἴτε ἀέκων ἁμαρτὼν τοῦ χρησμοῦ ἐξέπλησε μοῖραν τὴν ἑωυτοῦ ('Arcesilaus then, whether willingly or unwillingly, missed the meaning of the oracle and fulfilled his own destiny/fate', 4.164.4), where suggestions of personal responsibility (ἑκών, 'willingly'; ἁμαρτών, 'mistaking'; *ἐξέπλησε* μοῖραν τὴν ἑωυτοῦ, '**he fulfilled his own** fate') accompany suggestions of external constraint and divine agency (ἀέκων, *ἐξέπλησε μοῖραν τὴν ἑωυτοῦ*). Hollmann usefully draws attention to the root ἁμαρτ– describing the involuntary error in interpretation here and in the parallel cases involving Croesus and Cambyses (4.164.4, cp. 1.71.1, 3.65.4), and to Croesus' assessment of 'the role of personal responsibility borne by humans for the interpretation of signs' (1.96.1);[44] and yet in the cases of both

---

[43] See Gantz (1982); Sewell-Rutter (2007) 9–11, 15–48; Gagné (2013) 344–93.

[44] Hollmann (2011) 117.

Croesus[45] and Arcesilaus (in the mention of Moira), the Pythia's message nonetheless complicates a straightforward judgment of human responsibility.

'Moira' as 'fate' rarely occurs elsewhere in the *Histories*, and never in the authorial voice as here.[46] The perplexing mix of self-determination and fate invites recollection of the programmatic account of Croesus,[47] with Apollo's startlingly detailed description of the inescapable role of the Moirai (1.91). That narrative revealed complex determination,[48] with personal responsibility playing a role alongside external constraints including divine agency, even as those strands did not run entirely in parallel: the divine strand was revealed at the beginning and end. Croesus' reign was scheduled to come to its end (1.13.2, 1.91), but the trigger or occasion was his decision to attack Persia. Likewise Arcesilaus' actions perhaps precipitated what on the divine level was also set to occur, though not necessarily at that particular point in time. The Croesus *logos* brought out the possibility of flexibility in the details: the end of the Mermnad dynasty had been foretold generations earlier, but Apollo (according to the Lydians) was able to delay the sack of Sardis by three years. Croesus' misreading of the oracle (1.54, cp. 1.91.4) and decision to attack Persia supplied the occasion for his loss of power. The same distinction between general trajectory and trigger came out in the account of the Ethiopian ruler of Egypt: recognising that the god's instruction to murder the Egyptian priests was designed to supply an occasion (*prophasis*, 2.139.2) for them to punish him and so fulfil the fated end of his reign, Sabacos abdicated and left Egypt of his own accord (ἑκών). Earlier in the Libyan *logos* we saw the potential for humans to take responsibility in the face of a divine directive when King Grinnos redirected the divine command by asking Apollo to ask a younger man to lead the colony and pointing to Battus (4.150). So the presence of metaphysical agency need not cancel out all potential for self-determination.[49]

The statement of unresolved alternatives—with Arcesilaus meeting his end 'either willingly or unwillingly' (4.164.4)—in fact crystallises a key theme of the Libyan *logos* and the work as a whole, the tension between free will and divine determination, inner and external causation, already prominent in the question of the work's opening sequence of whether Io left of her free will or constrained by the sailors (with the traditional story of

[45] Cp. Harrison (2000) 224.

[46] Hdt. 1.121: Astyages speaking of Cyrus' fate; 3.142.3: Maeandrius of Polycrates fulfilling his fate. Cp. the Lydians' report of Apollo's reply about human fate (1.91.1) and personified Moirai (1.91.2). See also below, n. 49. Harrison (2000) 241 explains *moira* here as 'a 'theological term … be[ing] used in a loose, "proverbial" sense'.

[47] The Croesus *logos* as programmatic: *inter alia* Kindt (2006) 4–5; Pelling (2006) 142–3, 172–3; Grethlein (2010) 188 n. 125 with text.

[48] Pelling (2006); Sewell-Rutter (2007), esp. 11; Gagné (2013) 325–43.

[49] Fate and human responsibility in Herodotus: Gould (1989) 70–8; Harrison (2000) 223–42; Kindt (2006) 46 n. 61 with text; Grethlein (2010) 190.

Zeus' agency conspicuously suppressed). The complicated conception of responsibility we find here exposes the presence of not only dual determination (divine/human), but also other factors that circumscribe action. An active participant in the contemporary debate on responsibility and determination (reflected, for instance, in Gorgias' scandalous treatise exculpating Helen, Antiphon's soundings on personal responsibility in the *Tetralogies*, or tragedy's complicating of responsibility and blame), Herodotus injects this sensibility into his probing and shaping of Greek collective memory.

The remainder of the Libyan *logos*, recounting the grim twinned fates of Barca and Pheretime, uncovers further complications of historical aetiology. Pheretime claims to be exacting just revenge in cruelly punishing the people of Barca; but the god in turn takes horrific revenge on her.[50] The preceding narrative has presented justice and righteous action as a genuine motivating force but also shown that justice may be manipulated toward selfish ends: with the result that charges of legal responsibility cannot reveal where human responsibility lies. Thus the Minyans convinced the Spartans by holding out 'justice' as the reason they should provide land and privileges to descendants of sailors who accompanied Spartan Tyndaridae on the Argo (4.145.4)—so highlighting the explanatory power of kindred ties even in the mythical period to explain the recent past. The concern of Themison ('the man who does right') piously to fulfil the terms of his oath (4.154.4) though not Etearchus' brutal intention, painted justice as genuinely motivating virtuous individuals. But charges of legal responsibility have equally proved to be misdirected or disproportionate, with individuals blaming others to justify their own response, with claims of legal and moral responsibility obscuring what is really at stake. Thus Aryandes framed his response to Pheretime's plea in terms of justice, but Herodotus promoted an explanation more to do with (Aryandes' imagining of) Persian politico-military objectives. According to a story included between the account of Pheretime's plea and Aryandes' response, Darius would later execute the latter 'for making himself equal to Darius' (4.166.1) by minting a pure silver coinage on the model of Darius' gold; but Herodotus remarked that Darius chose a different (more publicly acceptable?) charge on which to put him to death: that he had rebelled (4.166.2).

The account of Barca showcases outright perversions of justice and the law. Unable to defeat their courageous opposition to the siege, the Persian commander entraps the Barcaeans through a deceptive perversion of oath-taking. The Persians have booby-trapped the earth outside so that their oath—set to last 'as long as the earth remains as it is'—immediately dissolves (4.201.3). The legalistic yet fraudulent application of the oath has

---

[50] The punishment of Pheretime: Munson (2001b) 186–8; Fisher (2002) 214–15.

disquieting implications.[51] The complete trust of the Barcaeans (πιστεύ-σαντες, 'trusting'; τὰς πάσας πύλας ἀνοίξαντες, 'opening all the gates') pointedly contrasts with the Persians' self-justifications of their conduct on the ground that it complies with the literal words of the oaths: Herodotus' exhaustive, repetitive account (4.201.3) conveys their self-justifying focalisation. The queen's claim to be exacting justice for her son's murder has been problematised by Herodotus' depiction of his tyrannical qualities, which supports the Barcaeans' view that they were justified in putting him to death (4.167.2). The Barcaeans' physical responsibility for the deed does not then straightforwardly map on to legal or moral responsibility, for in determining that—as their reply intimates: 'Before sending his army, Aryandes sent a herald to Barca to inquire who killed Arcesilaus. The Barcaeans unanimously claimed responsibility (αὐτοὶ ὑπεδέκοντο πάντες); **for they had suffered many wrongs at his hands**' (4.167.2)—one ought to consider the wider picture, and the possibility that their act was just.

Claims of justice are also exposed as deluded or disproportionate. Thus Arcesilaus 'demanded justice for his banishment' (4.164.1) and consequently sent citizens to Cyprus to be slain and burnt others to death in a great tower—punishments far severer than the crime. Pheretime's claim to be exacting just revenge is problematised by Herodotus' depiction of the disproportionate nature of that revenge. She impales those 'most guilty' of her son's murder (τοὺς … αἰτιωτάτους) around the top of the city wall, cuts off their wives' breasts and plants them around the wall too, and gives the rest of the Barcaeans to the Persians as booty. Finally she turns the city over to 'those who were of the House of Battus and did not share in the murder' (τοῦ φόνου οὐ μεταίτιοι, 4.202). The dissonance generated between the Barcaeans' prior admission of joint guilt and Pheretime's punishment of a mere segment of the community suggests again that the punishment does not directly fit the crime, but has been fuelled by her desire to be avenged and to keep power within the family.

Immediately upon her return to Egypt Pheretime 'dies horribly', eaten alive by worms, and Herodotus infers divine agency (4.205):

> … ὡς ἄρα ἀνθρώποισι αἱ λίην ἰσχυραὶ τιμωρίαι πρὸς θεῶν ἐπίφθονοι γίνονται. ἡ μὲν δὴ Φερετίμης τῆς Βάττου τοιαύτη τε καὶ τοσαύτη τιμωρίη ἐγένετο ἐς Βαρκαίους.

> … so far it would seem are excessive acts of vengeance by humans abominated by the gods. Such and so great was the vengeance wrought against the Barcaeans by Pheretime the daughter of Battus.

---

[51] Cp. Hollmann (2011) 221 on Amasis; Lateiner (2012) 162–3 on this and other 'extraordinary examples of cleverness and trickery, in and by oath' in the *Histories*.

Thus he closes the Libyan *logos* by underscoring the dissonance between vengeance and justice, and the distance that separates the judgments of mortals and gods: human perversions of notions of legal responsibility, efforts to blur the difference between justice and vengeance, and meting out of unwarranted punishments for vengeance's sake, over against divine enactment of retribution that is indeed just (albeit harsh). The gods' severe punishment of Pheretime makes clear that they regard her excessive vengeance as unjust. The same contrast surfaced at the beginning of the *Histories* between the accusations of injustice made by Persian and Phoenician *logioi* (which the historian neither corroborates nor refutes) and the enactment of divine justice to punish the true offenders in relation to the Trojan War (which Herodotus corroborates in Book 2: 2.120.5). Elsewhere too divine justice may be implicitly making up for inadequate human mechanisms for punishing legal responsibility, as when Ephialtes, the traitor who betrayed the Thermopylae pass, was killed later in time 'through another cause' (7.213), unrelated to the betrayal (though the Spartans honour his killer no less for that).

The story of Barca also opens up the possibility of an explanation in terms of the transgression of gender norms. The potential of women to influence events is visible throughout the *Histories*, right from the opening abductions,[52] and also in the Libyan *logos* in the account of Cyrene's foundation. In an example of positive female influence, the wives of the Minyans retrieved their husbands from jail and so saved their lives (4.146). A wicked stepmother (in one version: 4.154) persuaded her husband, King of Crete, to drown his daughter, but she was saved and went on to become a royal concubine and ultimately the mother of the first Battus. The narrative of more recent times has exposed the pernicious influence exercised by (Greek) Pheretime and highlighted more generally the issue of female agency. When Arcesilaus fled to Samos, 'his mother fled to Cyprian Salamis' (4.162.2). Her active initiative was underscored through its narration prior even to the account of Arcesilaus' response to his exile: Pheretime approached Euelthon, ruler of Cyprian Salamis, to demand an army with which she and her son could return to power. Euelthon would give her anything but that, and finally sent a golden spindle, distaff, and wool, with the message that 'women should be given such gifts as these, and not an army' (4.162.5).[53] After her son's relocation to Barca, Pheretime 'held his privileges in Cyrene and administered other things and sat in the council' (4.165.1), before learning of his death and heading to Egypt to exact revenge. Pheretime's transgressive otherness is thus partly that of the

---

[52] Dewald (1980) and (1981); Bichler (2000) 15–27; Blok (2002); Hazewindus (2004); Boedeker (2011).

[53] The gesture is Homeric (cp. *Iliad* 6.490–3) and symbolises decorous female activity: Bichler (2000) 23, L. G. Mitchell (2012) 10–11.

barbarian, partly that of the tyrant or royal (standing alongside her tyrannical son Arcesilaus),[54] but also (like Artemisia, whose 'manly courage' drove her to war: 7.99.1; cp. 8.93) partly that of the manly woman.[55]

Herodotus' presentation points also to the explanatory potential of culture in Greek Euelthon's resistance to Pheretime's repeated requests (4.162), in contrast to Persian Aryandes' immediate compliance in granting forces (4.167.1). In a parallel later episode Xerxes gives in with disastrous results to two successive requests by women (9.109, 110). In the case of Artaÿnte's (which follows his mistaken assumption that she will ask for 'everything other' ($\pi\hat{a}\nu$ $\mu\hat{a}\lambda\lambda o\nu$) than what she does: 9.109.2), 'Xerxes was offering her cities and abundant gold and an army ($\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota s$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\grave{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\iota}\delta o\upsilon$ $\kappa a\grave{\iota}$ $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\grave{o}\nu$ $\mathring{a}\pi\lambda\epsilon\tau o\nu$ $\kappa a\grave{\iota}$ $\sigma\tau\rho a\tau\acute{o}\nu$) of which she would have sole command; for an army is a typically Persian gift' (9.109.3; cp. Euelthon in 4.162.4: **$\pi\hat{a}\nu$ $\mu\hat{a}\lambda\lambda o\nu$ $\mathring{\eta}$ $\sigma\tau\rho a\tau\acute{\iota}\eta\nu$ $o\acute{\iota}$ $\grave{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\iota}\delta o\upsilon$**). The ethnographic gloss underscores the relevance of culture and by drawing attention to the concept of armies as gifts recalls the memorable interaction of Pheretime and Euelthon. The parallel retrospectively emphasises further the explanatory role of culture, especially perhaps in (too-lenient) Persian cultural attitudes to women. In turn, the episode in the Libyan *logos* qualifies readers' interpretations of that later narrative: Pheretime's action intimates that the polarities of Greek and non-Greek are inadequate for explaining Amestris' shocking behaviour, for a Greek queen was capable of something similar, only worse: the death and mutilation of many citizens.

After enslaving the Barcaeans the Persians set off on their journey back east, at which point dissent between the commanders results in a significant consequence: the failure to take Cyrene when the opportunity arises. This again sets a pattern for later, where the dispute between Megabates and Aristagoras has as its upshot the Persians' failure to take Naxos (5.33), which in turn will move Aristagoras to change sides and plot the Ionian Revolt (5.35).[56] Before they finally reach Egypt, Persian stragglers are slain by some Libyans 'for the sake of their clothes and equipment' (4.203.4)—a random event that suggests carelessness on the Persians' part: a failure to guard against the unpredictable agency of those not subject to Persian rule.

---

[54] Cp. Gray (1995).

[55] L. G. Mitchell (2012) 10–11 sets Pheretime—a Greek royal woman who is 'prepared to push at the boundaries of acceptable [womanly] behaviour' in becoming actively involved in war—against the background of the panhellenic phenomenon of *basileia*, whereby already in Archaic and Classical periods women of ruling families exercised considerable influence. On the historical Pheretime, see also B. Mitchell (2002) 92.

[56] There will be command disagreements on the Greek side as well; polarities are again qualified. I thank Christopher Pelling for his insights here.

4. The Libyan Ethnography

Enclosed within the historical/mythical narratives of the Libyan *logos* is an extensive survey of the Libyan land, peoples, and customs.[57] Its placement (sandwiched between historical narratives) and the resulting juxtaposition of discourses and explanatory modes—historical discourse and narrative explanation, on the one hand, ethnographical discourse and explanation through the depiction of culture and the collective, on the other[58]—spurs readers to compare history and ethnography, thereby further enriching the picture of historical aetiology in general and explanations for the *aitiē* of Greco-Persian conflict in particular. The process of comparison is encouraged by the polemical remarks about the shape of the world that were nested within the preceding Scythian *logos*: Herodotus' criticism of simplistic contemporary notions of continental division (4.36–45) included a pointed challenge to the narratives of the proem (1.1–5), which in accounting for the origins of Greco-Persian hostility assumed a binary cultural and geographical division of the world and a model wherein female abductions led to the naming of continents.[59] Within the Libyan *logos*, Herodotus has identified ethnographical awareness as a crucial ingredient for accurate historical understanding: his knowledge that 'Battus' was the Libyan word for king equipped him to expose a flaw in the reported tradition (the same superior knowledge as that possessed by the Pythia, who 'called [the would-be Battus] by a Libyan name, knowing (εἰδυῖαν) that he would be king in Libya', 4.155.2.).

The Libyan ethnography's complications of aetiology are occasionally explicit, as where Herodotus corroborates the Libyans' extreme health, but beyond the correlation refuses to affirm a *causal* connection with their

[57] On the Libyan ethnography, see Lloyd (1990) 236–44 and Corcella (2007) 668–721, each with further references.

[58] To use a distinction of convenience: throughout his work Herodotus engages in '*historiē*', inquiry, which is also the term he employs for the published form of his research, and in his wake ethnographical practices came to be viewed in antiquity as 'quintessentially historical': Dench (2007) 493, cp. 499. On the close intertwining in Herodotus of ethnography and history: Payen (1997); Skinner (2012) 244–8. The distinction may be framed as (sequential) 'narrative' versus (descriptive) 'non-narrative': Marincola (1999) 302–3: '[b]oth can be historical, although pursuing different ends, and both can be concerned with causes and explanations' (302); cp. Lateiner (1989) 145–62; Baron (2013) 210–18. Munson (2001b) 45–133 highlights differences between diachronic historical narrative and synchronic geography/ethnography.

[59] Hdt. 4.42 (with Thomas (2000) 81–3), 4.45: Herodotus cannot guess why the earth, which is one, has three names, all of women, and why rivers are set as its boundary lines; nor from where the continental names actually derive; Europa 'was clearly from Asia and never came to this land which the Greeks now call Europe, but only from Phoenicia to Crete and from Crete to Lycia'; but he will employ the names established by custom (4.45.5). Cp. Munson (2001b) 84–7.

practice of cauterising their children's heads. (Challenging a possible aetiology in this case appears to involve challenging contemporary medical explanations: 4.187.3).[60] More often, the complications surface implicitly, through the comparison of historical narrative and ethnography. Whereas the diachronic historical discourse had Greek Delphi as its centre of gravity and emphasised individuals and the personal, the ethnographical discourse emphasises the collective,[61] and through its diffusion across space and time creates further layers of historical aetiology. Thus while the historical narrative highlighted changes of identity on the level of the individual—a boy (in the version Herodotus believes) adopted the name Battus, which reflects his new status as king (4.155); an island adopted the name of its individual founder (Kalliste becoming Thera); an individual king (Darius) will be the agent of the Barcaeans' relocation from Greece to Bactria—the ethnography depicts such change from a more distanced vantage point and from the perspective of the collective. In this way, after an ecological disaster, the Psylloi march south and are buried in a sandstorm and the Nasamones take over their country (4.173).

The ethnographical narrative offers different perspectives on explanation and historical change in relation to factors that include the divine, Greek/non-Greek exchange and identity, *nomos*, war, and agricultural fertility. In place of the depiction in the historical narrative of oracular consultations (individual or communal) that occur on defined occasions and seek to shape the future in specific ways, in the ethnography Herodotus describes communities' on-going religious festivals (e.g., 4.180: the Auseans' yearly festival in honour of Athene; 4.188: the nomads' sacrificing to sun and moon) and divination practices (4.172.3), without indicating specific objectives (beyond the presumed aim of securing divine favour). Exchanges between Greeks and non-Greeks within the historical narrative are intimate and personal (marriages for example), but those of the ethnography present a distanced perspective that emphasises the collective.[62] Thus the Adrymachidae, who dwell closest to Egypt, use for the most part Egyptian *nomoi*, but wear clothes like the other Libyans (4.168); whereas the Asbystae, who dwell inland of Cyrene, imitate most of the Cyrenaean *nomoi* (4.171, cp. also 4.189). In this way the historical narrative paints a specific, personal picture, while the ethnographic clarifies the broader implications of that picture, bringing out for example how colonisation leads to adoptions of *nomoi*. Conversely, the depiction within the historical narrative of interconnections between Greek and Other is reinforced by the plurality of exchange

---

[60] With Thomas (2000) 35–7. Cp. Węcowski (2004) 152–3 on the proem as exposing superficial explanatory patterning.

[61] Cp. Bichler (2000) 14: in Herodotus' historical narrative women appear as individuals, in the ethnography 'only in the collectivity of their sex'.

[62] Immerwahr (1966) 113 points to 'the idea of the relations between Greeks and natives in Africa' as joining thematically the history of Cyrene and the Libyan ethnography.

(between Greeks and non-Greeks and also between the different communities of non-Greeks) described in the ethnographical narrative. With respect to the explanatory polarity of Greek/non-Greek, the terminology of the historical narrative—the denomination of 'Libyans' (also used by Herodotus himself of his informants in the ethnography)[63]—is shown to be inadequate by the ethnography's revelation of multiple and diverse Libyan peoples. In this way ethnographic knowledge enables the historian to challenge the ethnic labelling of *barbaroi* that occurred within the historical narrative. The way the Phoenicians and Greeks at the end of the ethnography stand side by side as ἐπήλυδες ('settlers', 'foreigners', 4.197.2), in contrast to the autochthonous Libyans and Ethiopians, qualifies once again the earlier explanatory principle of 'Greek versus Other'. The extensive description within the ethnography of communities' *nomoi* stands in tension with the historical narrative's usual emphasis on exceptions that challenge *nomos* as a key explanatory tool: as when Pheretime's behaviour transgresses Greek *nomoi* regarding women.[64] Similarly the ethnographical narrative describes the Nasamones' practice in oath taking (3.172.3–4), whereas the main narrative detailed instances of oaths compromised or contravened.

The way the ethnography punctures Greek assumptions is especially striking in how Herodotus offhandedly notes things that are 'spectacularly at variance with Greek custom'.[65] The alternative, ethnographical perspectives on gender and female agency thus defamiliarise and thereby highlight the distinctly Greek assumptions of the surrounding narrative.[66] The false accusation of lewdness against Phronime (4.154.2)—which plays a crucial explanatory role (on the Cyrenaeans' account prompting her father to arrange her drowning, but ultimately securing her future as mother of Battus)—could have no purchase in the society of the Gindanes, where a woman dons an ankle-bracelet for every man she sleeps with and 'she who has the most is deemed to be the best since she has been loved by the most men' (4.176).[67] Greek norms about women and war and the danger of mixing the two (nicely crystallised in Euelthon's gift of the spindle to

---

[63] Hdt. 4.158: *bis*, 4.160: *ter*, 4.160.2: τοὺς ἠοίους τῶν Λιβύων. 'Libyans' used of Herodotus' informants: e.g., 4.173 (Λίβυες).

[64] *Nomos* in the *Histories*: 3.38.4 ('*nomos* is king of all') with Thomas (2000) 125–6; Munson (2001b) 167–72; Rood (2006) 298–300; Demont (2013); Mezzadri (2013). Baragwanath (2008) 107–20 highlights Herodotus' interest in *transgressions* of *nomos* and its limits as determinant of human behaviour.

[65] Lloyd (1990) 241; cp. Rosellini and Saïd (1978); Dewald (1981) 101–4; Bichler (2000).

[66] See more generally Bichler (2000) 13. Depiction of women in the Libyan ethnography: Rosellini and Saïd (1978) 975–85.

[67] Cp. the Nasamones' custom for a man to have many wives, for sexual intercourse to be promiscuous, and for a bride on the first night of marriage to have sex with all the wedding guests, each of whom gives her a gift (4.172).

Pheretime) are contextualised as distinctively Greek by the observation that the women of the Zauekes drive their chariots to war (4.193). The ethnography's numerous glimpses of women in relationships with their husbands and communities that are unexceptional and regulated by *nomos* also present a perspective that counters the explanatory value of women as suggested by the story of Pheretime. So far from being transgressive females, we find Cyrenaean and Barcaean women singled out in the ethnography as arbiters of correct custom (**οὐδ᾽ αἱ Κυρηναίων γυναῖκες δικαιοῦσι πατέεσθαι…**, 4.186).[68]

The very assumption of war as a key agent of historical change (*Histories passim*, cp. Heraclitus, DK 22 B 80) is put to the test by the account of the Garamantes, who flee other human beings and possess neither weapons nor knowledge of self-defence (4.174). The observation that most of the many Libyan tribes care nothing for Darius represents a wholly different perspective on Persian power from the Greeks' (4.167, amplified at 4.197.1), and again prompts the reader to ask how the Persians could be so careless (see above, p. 176).

The initial historical narrative evoked the unfamiliar landscape of former times, including the difficulty even of finding Libya: thus the Samians encountered Tartessus, which 'was at this time an untouched port' (4.152)—a distinctly Greek perspective (untouched, *by Greeks*). Enigmatic oracles and the depiction of anxieties on the part of those receiving them created a sense of uncertainty about the physical space of Libya as well as future time. The ethnography instead displays the more comprehensive mapping of the continent in more recent times, assuming the exploration of parts of Libya by Greeks. Cyrene has become so familiar that it can serve as a touchstone for communicating the character of a less familiar site (4.156.3). The contrast points to the possibility of evolving perspectives and motivations over time: in the absence of detailed geospatial knowledge the early Greek settlers were dependent on the god's instruction, whereas their later counterparts alight upon a land whose advantages have become familiar—and familiar doubtless to the *Persians* as well. The 'historical' narrative had already hinted at changing motivations over time in the oracle from Delphi in the time of Battus the Fortunate that urged 'all Greeks' to head to 'lovely Libya' (Λιβύην πολυήρατον—an adjective deriving from ἐράω, used among other things of weddings and marriage-beds, presenting Libya as an object of desire), and not to wait until the land has already been divided up (4.159.3)—which indeed precipitated land-grabbing conducted by a 'great crowd' of new settlers.

The ethnography's description of the fertility of certain places in Libya, and especially Cyrene's triple harvest seasons (4.198–9), likewise raises the possibility of positive motivations, characterising the settlers as economic

---

[68] Cp. Dewald (1981) 104 on women in Herodotus' ethnographic descriptions as guarantors of the survival of their cultures.

migrants as much as individuals compelled by divine constraint. The picture of agricultural abundance also recalls earlier hints in the narrative of more positive drives: as in Thera's former name 'Kalliste', and in the possibility that Cadmus put in there 'because the land pleased him' (4.147).[69] Delphi's oracles too hinted at the land's riches.[70] All this also helps explain *Darius'* interest, feeding in to the text's explanations for Persian imperialism in this part of the world.

5. Conclusion

The Libyan *logos* as a whole reveals how seriously Herodotus is interrogating causation, in keeping with his announcement in the proem, and subjects the Greek collective memory to rigorous analysis in this regard. A key challenge was to construct a narrative of the past that preserved its complexities. What the Libyan *logos* presents is not inexplicable or unintelligible, but a complicated, multi-stranded variety of explanation. The over-determination of explanation does not obliterate the narrative's truth-value; instead it allows for the presentation of a richer, more complex, and more truthful account.

Herodotus was constrained by the material available to him, plentiful in relation to Barca and especially Cyrene, scarce on Libya's desert interior and the Carthaginian-controlled west.[71] And yet so far from being at the mercy of informants keen to distort their role in history, we find him in full control,[72] selecting what to narrate of the material available and how to do so, in accordance with his announced aims and especially his desire to enrich and illuminate the broader work and to emphasise the slipperiness of stories told about the past.

---

[69] Note also the mention of the 'fairest [κάλλισται] of groves' that enclose Aziris (4.157.3); how the locals led the Greeks past Irasa, 'the fairest place in their country' (τὸν κάλλιστον τῶν χώρων), by night so that its charms would not tempt them to stay (4.158.2); the locals' reference to how at Cyrene 'the heaven has holes in it' (indicating the abundance of rain) (4.158.3). On Cyrene's fertility: Cawkwell (2011) 11–32. See RO 96, 330–326 BCE, for the importation of grain from Cyrene to the Greek mainland and the islands.

[70] E.g., Λιβύην … μηλοτρόφον, 'sheep-breeding Libya' (4.155.3, 4.157.2); Λιβύην πολυ-ήρατον (4.159.3).

[71] Herodotus provides no description at all of Carthage, though Carthaginians do number among his informants. On Herodotus' sources of information on Libya: Corcella (2007) 568–9.

[72] Malten (1911) 96 already underscored the purposeful structure of Herodotus' Libyan *logos*, countering the notion that the account ended with Arcesilaus' death because of Herodotus' dependence on a source that ended there; the history of Cyrene is not an end in itself, but helps one appreciate the 'Hauptthema', the punitive expedition of the Persians against Barca.

Embroilment in a long-term, major conflict in the late fifth-century likely sparked heightened awareness of, and reflection on, *prophasis* and *aitiē*, explanation on a spectrum ranging from allegation to genuine cause—a development that Thucydides' unexpected and purposeful use of *prophasis* perhaps reflects (Thuc. 1.23.5–6 and 6.6.1, with n. 32 above). In the *Histories* the discourse of *prophasis* (as 'pretext') and *aitiē* (as 'accusation') underscores the distance between allegations and likely explanations, while the semantics of *aitiē* encodes this possibility for slippage between *aitiē* as objective 'explanation' and *aitiē* as subjective 'accusation' (much as *prophasis* can denote either 'pretext' or neutral 'reason given'). *Aitios* (denoting 'guilty' or 'responsible') and *aitiē* (where it denotes 'charge' or 'accusation') occur frequently on the lips of the *Histories'* actors, but Herodotus refrains from endorsing such charges except in cases of unmistakable guilt. The prevalence of the expression δίκας διδόναι is perhaps likewise to be ex- plained in part by its productive ambivalence: *dike/dikas* draws one into pondering the disjunction between these things.[73] Even if false or misguided explanations (in the form of rhetorical claims and justifications) do not map on to the primary underlying reasons, they may still have an indirect explanatory function, since they are available to be grasped by others as motives (as in the *prophasis* of medism that Pheretime held out to Aryandes). Herodotus' lengthy account of Theraean and Cyrenaean traditions about the founding of Cyrene was indeed a story of manifold allegations—true or false—that induced persuasion and motivated behaviour. Even as *prophaseis* are brought into question (as being too narrow, or as problematic in other ways as direct explanations), they give a sense of the arguments that entered the rhetorical discourse and could thereby become real causes. Thus instead of simply offering *ex eventu* judgments, Herodotus' text performs complex possibilities that seemed to be present at the time.

Joseph Skinner has observed in relation to Herodotus that ethno- graphical discourse, defined as 'thinking about culture from the point of view of the outsider', is 'intrinsically bound up in explaining past events— and, by extension, the present … Ethnographic enquiries can be detected at every level of Herodotean analysis …'.[74] The Libyan *logos* offers further support for this position, and points in addition to Herodotus' use of ethnography to invite readers to engage in self-aware metahistorical reflection on historical explanation. It encourages (Greek) readers to take stock and be mindful of their distinctive world-views, and to bear in mind

---

[73] See Lateiner (1980) on how *dikas didonai* in Herodotus invariably represents a subjective judgment.

[74] Skinner (2012) 245, cp. 248; and Dench (2007) 500: '[Herodotus'] observations on customs and environment are directly linked to the patterning of imperial growth, success, and ultimate failure in the work as a whole'. See also Pelling (1997); Gruen (2011) 21–39. Immerwahr (1966) already brought out how far Herodotean ethnography engages with themes of the wider work.

different possible ways of explaining the past (and also the present). Thus the ethnographical narrative inserted within the historical account reinforces the dialogism of the work, especially in terms of the richness of its explanatory paradigms. Munson has noted how frequently Herodotus' descriptions of foreign cultures 'imply a context of Greek ignorance and prejudice and thereby signal the ethnographer's corrective aims'.[75] Our analysis points to the way in which these corrective aims may relate not only to the ethnographical account, or to notions about the role of culture in explaining action, but also more generally (on a more theoretical level) to readers' conceptions of historical aetiology.

The Greeks of Cyrene in North Africa under their newly democratic regime were perhaps especially appreciative of the dialogic, even democratic, qualities of the *Histories*, and of this *logos* in particular—and indeed the Libyan *logos* perhaps offers us some insight into this audience of Greeks residing in North Africa. They will have been crucial informants for Herodotus; and the vibrancy and detail of his account may in part reflect their concern to better understand Cyrene's early history and its more recent entanglements with Persia, as well as Libya as a physical space. The theme of 'Libya the unknown' surfaces at the continent's first major appearance in the *Histories* (in Book 2), in the high-spirited Nasamonian adventurers' determination to travel to the unknown Libyan deserts and find out 'if they might see more than those who had seen the most remote parts' (τὰ μακρότατα, 2.32); Herodotus' own enquiries in Libya likewise lead him 'to the most remote' (ἱστορέοντες ἐπὶ μακρότατον … ἐξικέσθαι, 4.192), while the reports of others require him to separate what is plausible from what is fantasy.[76] In describing the continent he makes a clear effort to trace human knowledge as far as it goes (as in describing the chain of oases that stretch across the continent from east to west: 4.181–5), even as a powerful sense of the unknown remains.[77] The inclusion of the Libyan *logos* also implies curiosity on the part of Greeks more generally in this area of the world. Athens' covetous imperialistic gaze alighted upon Libya too, and this doubtless sparked increased interest in the region in the second part of the fifth century, especially on the part of Athenian audiences.[78] For readers

---

[75] Munson (2001b) 141.

[76] Note, e.g., 4.192: In eastern Libya 'are the huge snakes and the lions and the elephants and the bears and asps and donkeys with horns and the headless with eyes in their breasts (at least, that is what the Libyans say), and wild men and women, and many other creatures that are not fabulous'.

[77] I thank Rosalind Thomas for her guidance here.

[78] Carthage as potential object of Athenian imperialism (according to Alcibiades): Thuc. 6.90, cp. 6.15. See also Thuc. 6.34 (Hermocrates attributes to Carthage a fear of Athenian attack); Hermippus, *Porters* F 63.23 (*PCG* V.594) (performed before 424 BCE: Rusten (2011) 170): mention of 'rugs and fancy pillows' coming to Athens from Carthage, Ar. *Knights* 1300–15: triremes assemble to discuss their concern about Hyperbolus' plans to send a hundred ships against Carthage.

more generally, Athens' behaviour and rhetoric likely provoked comparisons between past and present, between the imperial superpowers of Persia and Athens. The *Histories* invites comparisons between Persia and other powers, including Athens; and Carthage could be figured as Persia's Western counterpart.[79] What our discussion has sought to clarify are ways in which Herodotus in his Libyan *logos*, in selecting, preserving, and shaping the traditions available to him, builds upon and filters this contemporary interest, thereby making readers' understanding of Libya contribute to their broader understanding of the past. Far from being at the mercy of distinct strands of collective memory, we have seen Herodotus carefully moulding and critiquing it, and thereby producing a valuable reflection, among other things, on the complexity of historical explanation and the shortcomings of the stories people tell about themselves.

ebaragwanath@unc.edu

[79] Comparisons invited between Persia and other powers: Stadter (1992); emphasis on Athens in particular: Moles (1996); Blösel (2004). We glimpse the relevance of Carthage to the struggle of Greece against Persia, and Carthage as symbolic counterpart to Persia, at 7.165–7. Herodotus' depiction of the Carthaginians: Bondì (1990) 278–86. Greek-Carthaginian relations too were a charged issue in the late fifth century, and one that perhaps provoked reflection on whether in-fighting within the Greek colonies of Libya a century earlier had compromised Greece's strength *vis-à-vis* the Carthaginian colonial power, much as Hellenic intra-polis conflict threatened to compromise the effort against Persia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bakker, E. J., I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees, edd. (2002) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden and Boston).

Baragwanath, E. (2008) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).

Barker, E. (2006) 'Paging the Oracle: Interpretation, Identity, and Performance in Herodotus' *History*', *G&R* 53: 1–28.

Baron, C. A. (2013) *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography* (Cambridge).

Bichler, R. (2000) 'Herodots Frauenbild und seine Vorstellung über die Sexualsitten der Völker', in R. Rollinger and R. Bichler, edd., *Geschlechterrollen und Frauenbild in der Perspektive antiker Autoren* (Innsbruck) 13–56.

Blok, J. (2002) 'Women in Herodotus' *Histories*', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 225–42.

Blösel, W. (2004) *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert: Studien zur Geschichte und historiographischen Konstruktion des griechischen Freiheitskampfes 480 v. Chr.* (Stuttgart).

Boedeker, D. (2011) 'Persian Gender Relations as Historical Motives in Herodotus', in Rollinger–Truschnegg–Bichler (2011) 211–35.

Bondì, S. F. (1990) 'I Fenici in Erodoto', in Nenci and Reverdin (1990) 255–87.

Calame, C. (1988) 'Mythe, récit épique et histoire: le récit hérodotéen de la fondation de Cyrène', in C. Calame and C. Bérard, edd., *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique* (Geneva) 105–25.

Cawkwell, G. (2011) *Cyrene to Chaeronea: Selected Essays on Ancient Greek History.* (Oxford).

Chamoux, F. (1953) *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Paris).

Chantraine, P., J. Taillardat, and A. Blanc (2009) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris).

Corcella, A. (2007) 'Book IV', in D. Asheri, A. B. Lloyd, and A. Corcella, edd., *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV* (Oxford) 543–721.

Demont, P. (2013) 'Le *Nomos*-Roi: Hérodote, III, 38', in J. Alaux, ed., *Hérodote: formes de pensée, figures du récit* (Rennes) 37–45.

Dench, E. (2007) 'Ethnography and History', in J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, 2 vols (Malden, Mass. and Oxford) II.493–503.

Derow, P. and R. Parker, edd. (2003) *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford).

Dewald, C. (1980) 'Biology and Politics: Women in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Pacific Coast Philology* 15: 11–18.

—— (1981) 'Women and Culture in Herodotus' *Histories*', in H. P. Foley, ed., *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York) 91–125; repr. in Munson (2013) II.151–79.

—— (1990) 'Review of F. Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus*', *CPh* 85: 217–24.

—— (1998) 'Explanatory Notes', in *Herodotus: The Histories*, trans. by R. Waterfield (Oxford) 594–735.

—— (1999) 'The Figured Stage: Focalizing the Initial Narratives of Herodotus and Thucydides', in J. Peradotto, T. M. Falkner, N. Felson, and D. Konstan, edd., *Contextualizing Classics: Ideology, Performance, Dialogue: Essays in Honor of John J. Peradotto* (Lanham, Md.) 221–52.

Fisher, N. (2002) 'Popular Morality in Herodotus', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 199–224.

Gagné, R. (2013) *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).

Gantz, T. (1982) 'Inherited Guilt in Aischylos', *CJ* 78: 1–23.

Giangiulio, M. (2001) 'Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene', in N. Luraghi, ed., *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford) 116–37.

—— (2011) 'Greeks and Persians in Cyrenaica: The Campaigns Towards the Greek Cities', in Rollinger–Truschnegg–Bichler (2011) 705–16.

Gould, J. (1989) *Herodotus* (London and New York).

— (1991) *Give and Take in Herodotus: The Fifteenth J. L. Myres Memorial Lecture* (Oxford); repr. in id., *Myth, Ritual, Memory, and Exchange: Essays in Greek Literature and Culture* (Oxford, (2001) 283–303.

Gray, V. (1995) 'Herodotus and the Rhetoric of Otherness', *AJPh* 116: 185–211.

Grethlein, J. (2010) *The Greeks and their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge).

Gruen, E. S. (2011) *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton).

Hansen, M. H. and T. H. Nielsen, edd. (2004) *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford).

Harrison, T. (2000) *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford).

Hazewindus M. W. (2004) *When Women Interfere: Studies in the Role of Women in Herodotus'* Histories (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 12; Amsterdam).

Hollmann, A. (2011) *The Master of Signs* (*Hellenic Studies* 48; Cambridge, Mass.).

Hornblower, S. (2003) 'Panionios of Chios and Hermotimos of Pedasa (Hdt. 8.104-6)', in Derow and Parker (2003) 37–57.

Immerwahr, H. R. (1956) 'Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus', *TAPhA* 87: 241–80; repr. in Munson (2013) I.157–93.

— (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland).

Jebb, R. (1887) *The* Oedipus Tyrannus *of Sophocles*, edited with introduction and notes (Cambridge).

Kindt, J. (2006) 'Delphic Oracle Stories and the Beginning of Historiography: Herodotus' *Croesus Logos*', *CPh* 101: 34–51.

Krischer, T. (1965) 'Herodots Prooimion', *Hermes* 93: 159–67.

Lateiner, D. (1980) 'A Note on ΔΙΚΑΣ ΔΙΔΟΝΑΙ in Herodotus', *CQ* n.s. 30: 30–2.

—— (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto).

—— (2012) 'Oaths: Theory and Practice in the *Histories* of Herodotus and Thucydides', in E. Foster and D. Lateiner, edd., *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford) 154–84.

Lloyd, A. B. (1990) 'Herodotus on Egyptians and Libyans', in Nenci and Reverdin (1990) 215–44.

Macan, R. W. (1895) *Herodotus: The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books*, 2 vols (London).

Macleod, C. (1983) 'Reason and Necessity: Thucydides 3.9-14, 37-48', in id., *Collected Essays* (Oxford) 88–102.

Malkin, I. (1994) *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge).

—— (2003) '"Tradition" in Herodotus: The Foundation of Cyrene', in Derow and Parker (2003) 153–70.

Malten, L. (1911) *Kyrene: sagengeschichtliche und historische Untersuchungen* (Philologische Untersuchungen, 20; Berlin).

Marincola, J. (1999) 'Genre, Convention and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography', in C. S. Kraus, ed., *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden) 281–324.

—— (2005) 'Concluding Narratives: Looking to the End in Classical Historiography', *PLLS* 12: 285–320.

Mavrogiannis, T. (2004) 'Herodotus and the Phoenicians', in V. Karageorghis and I. G. Taiphakos, edd., *The World of Herodotus: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis, Nicosia, September 18-21, 2003* (Nicosia) 53–71.

Meiggs, R. and D. Lewis, edd. (1988) *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC*, rev. ed. (Oxford).

Mezzadri, B. (2013) 'Penthée-Skylès ou les périls de l'acculturation', in J. Alaux, ed., *Hérodote: formes de pensée, figures du récit* (Rennes) 19–36.

Mitchell, B. (2002) 'Cyrene: Typical or Atypical?', in R. Brock and S. Hodkinson, edd., *Alternatives to Athens* (Oxford) 82–102.

Mitchell, L. G. (2012) 'The Women of Ruling Families in Archaic and Classical Greece', *CQ* 62: 1–21.

Moles, J. L. (1996) 'Herodotus Warns the Athenians', *PLLS* 9: 259–84.

Munson, R. V. (1988) 'Artemisia in Herodotus', *ClAnt* 7: 91–106.

—— (2001a) '*Ananke* in Herodotus', *JHS* 121: 30–50.

—— (2001b) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (Ann Arbor).

——, ed. (2013) *Herodotus*, 2 vols (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies; Oxford).

Nenci, G. and O. Reverdin, edd., *Hérodote et les peuples non grecs* (Vandoeuvres-Genève)

Osborne, R. (1998) 'Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West', in N. Fisher and H. van Wees, edd., *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence* (London) 251–69.

—— (2002) 'Archaic Greek History', in Bakker–de Jong–van Wees (2002) 497–520.

—— (2009) *Greece in the Making 1200-479 BC*² (London and New York).

Pagel, K.-A. (1927) *Die Bedeutung des aitiologischen Momentes für Herodots Geschichtsschreibung* (Berlin).

Payen, P. (1997) *Les îles nomads: conquérir et résister dans l'enquête d'Hérodote* (Paris).

Pelling, C. B. R. (1997) 'East Is East and West Is West—Or Are They? National Stereotyping in Herodotus', *Histos* 1: 51–66; revised reprint in Munson (2013) II.360–79.

—— (2000) *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London and New York).

—— (2006) 'Educating Croesus: Talking and Learning in Herodotus' Lydian Logos', *ClAnt* 25.1: 141–77.

—— (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin).

Rhodes, P. J. and R. Osborne, edd. (2003) *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 BC* (Oxford).

Rollinger, R., B. Truschnegg, and R. Bichler, edd., *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich / Herodotus and the Persian Empire* (Wiesbaden).

Romilly, J. de (1971) 'La vengeance comme explication historique dans l'oeuvre d'Hérodote', *REG* 84: 314–37.

Rood, T. C. B. (2006) 'Herodotus and Foreign Lands', in C. Dewald and J. Marincola, edd., *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge) 290–305.

—— (2010) 'Herodotus' Proem: Space, Time, and the Origins of International Relations', *Ariadne* 16: 43–74.

Rosellini, M., and S. Saïd (1978) 'Usages des femmes et autres nomoi chez les "sauvages" d'Hérodote. Essai de lecture structurale', *ASNP* 8: 949–1005; abridged Eng. trans. in Munson (2013) II.213–44.

Rusten, J., ed. (2011) *The Birth of Comedy: Texts, Documents, and Art from Athenian Comic Competitions, 486–280* (Baltimore).

Sauge, A. (1992) *De l'epopée à l'histoire: fondement de la notion d'historié* (Frankfurt).

Sealey, R. (1957) 'Thucydides, Herodotus, and the Causes of War', *CQ* 7: 1–12.

Sewell-Rutter, N. (2007) *Guilt by Descent: Moral Inheritance and Decision Making in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).

Skinner, J. E. (2012) *The Invention of Greek Ethnography* (New York and Oxford).

Stadter, P. A. (1992) 'Herodotus and the Athenian *Archē*', *ASNP* 22: 781–809.

Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge).

Vannicelli, P. (1993) *Erodoto e la storia dell'alto e medio arcaismo: Sparta-Tessaglia-Cirene* (Incunabula Graeca 95; Rome).

Veen, J. E. van der (1996) *The Significant and the Insignificant: Five Studies in Herodotus' View of History* (Amsterdam).

Węcowski, M. (2004) 'The Hedgehog and the Fox: Form and Meaning in the Prologue of Herodotus', *JHS* 124: 143–64.

Wolff, E. (1964) 'Das Weib des Masistes', *Hermes* 92: 51–8.

Wood, H. (1972) *The Histories of Herodotus: An Analysis of the Formal Structure* (The Hague).