

LIONEL SCOTT, *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6. Mnemosyne Supplements 268*, Leiden: Brill, 2005, xiii + 716 pp., ISBN 9004 14506 0.

Introduction.

The Classical commentary asks much of its writer: a thorough knowledge of the ancient and difficult language, of the idiom of the author, of his or her historical context, and in the case of a historian, of the events described as also known from literary, epigraphical, numismatic, archaeological, and (to keep the list manageable) demographic and topographical evidence. While some questions may be ignored, elided, or resolved *ex cathedra*, the piper (that is, the ancient author) calls the tune (cf. Hdt. 1.141) and not the page-turner (that is, the modern elucidators and their students).

The nature and utility of traditional commentaries have been questioned recently. Therefore, commentators have convened international conferences to discuss them and their comments on commentaries then published¹. All commentaries are tralatitium of necessity; they would fail in honesty and duty not to cite or credit what earlier editors have usefully said of a certain crux, vexed (for us) by textual, historical, or geographical improbabilities, or sheer ignorance (e.g., Hdt. 6.44.3: what percentage of Greeks or Persians

¹ The two examples that I know: Glenn W. Most, ed., *Commentaries—Kommentare*, Göttingen 1999; Roy Gibson - Christina Kraus, ed., *The Classical Commentary*, Leiden 2002. Rhiannon Ash's essay, "Between Scylla and Charybdis? Historiographical Commentaries on Latin Historians," (Gibson - Kraus, 269-94) raises issues pertinent to this review. Herodotus does not appear in the chief Index of either volume. Simon Goldhill, "Wipe your Glosses," a witty rumination on late nineteenth century British commentaries on Aeschylean tragedy (Most, 380-425 at 399), mentions the earlier historian in noting how commentators pass him on their way to Thucydides. This significant omission needs explanation but probably reflects the relative lack of recent production of commentary on this historian. Alternatively, it could result from the aleatory nature of these and other collections of essays.

knew how to swim?). Editors must cite parallels for unexpected constructions within the author, within the genre, or from any other ancient writer when no closer parallel can be found. In the current age, and in the future, any commentary is likely to be a meta-commentary, struggling with predecessors' significant achievements in part by supplementing them with new facts and new interpretive approaches², or providing a degree of detail heretofore unseen³. Scott cites thirteen prior Greek editions of Book VI. Some translations now come equipped with substantial commentaries⁴. There is a growing perception that historical and historiographical commentaries require a team of PhDs, since the expert on ancient naval warfare is not likely to be an expert on Persian administration or Greek topography.

Is a deliberately titled “historical commentary” a good or possible construct? The adjective plants a flag disclaiming steady

² Simon Hornblower in his *A Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1992, 1996) acutely and properly felt this need to explain his relationship to the deeply admired work of Arnold Gomme et al., *A Commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford 1956-81. His answer appeared only in the second volume.

³ Scott supplies 333 pages of commentary for Book VI, whereas W.W. How and Joseph Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, Oxford 1928, provided only 58 for Book VI in their commentary on all nine books. Reginald Macan *Herodotus IV-V-VI*, London 1895, offered 124 pages, plus or minus—it is hard to quantify since his comments appear in smaller print below a running text. All students of Ovid currently live in the shadow of Franz Bömer's huge seven volume (now an eighth with addenda, corrigenda, and indexes), magisterial, if often close to indigestible, commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Heidelberg 1969-86. The printing of a text above the commentary provides some limit to the comments—even Eduard Norden's and A.S. Pease's commentaries on Vergil and Cicero, with their overwhelming accretion of parallels and details, shunned the prospect of pages that were all comment and no text.

⁴ Carolyn Dewald annotated Robin Waterfield's Oxford translation (Oxford 1998) of Herodotus' *Histories* with 141 pages of perceptive endnotes. My revision of G.C. Macaulay's translation for Barnes and Noble (New York 2004) with introduction and convenient, true footnotes is less generous. The Fondazione Valla team's commentary with text and translation in nine volumes (Verona 1977-2006; edd. D. Asheri, A.B. Lloyd, A. Corcella, G. Nenci [Books v-vi], P. Vannicelli, and A. Masaracchia - D. Asheri) unfortunately is rarely quoted in the English-speaking world.

interest in, or attention to, literary parallels, structures, and the nature of narrative. Any historian, however, has habits of thought and quirks of expression, organization, and style that should not and cannot be ignored. Scott, like his Thucydidean predecessor A.W. Gomme, chose a title that promises the (elusive) factual. Since Scott's book claims a primarily historical interest, he remarks sparingly on interesting issues of text, dialect, grammar, literary forebears, characters (such as the clever girl Gorgo), or compositional techniques. Both men provide more than that, so the claim may mark only English modesty, but sometimes the reader requires more interpretation of an historian's style, modes of presentation, and explanatory methods than that electrified barbed-wire word "historical" promises.

For instance (6.72, 86), why does the account of Leutychidas' conviction and penalties for bribery and fraud anticipate his embassy to Athens? Herodotus proleptically presents the dénouement out of chronological order--while he is still the Spartan king and before he makes his diplomatic case to the Athenians, arguing (somewhat off-point) against fraud by telling a long story about the Spartan Glaucus who betrayed a Milesian's solemn trust. Scott barely touches the literary consequences of the involuted narration of Leutychidas already reported as caught red-handed in taking a bribe before he delivers to the Athenians his moralizing fable about the criminally minded (and now extinct) Spartan Glaucus defrauding his trusting Milesian depositor. Insofar as he is trying to convince the Athenians to give up the Spartan-deposited Aeginetan hostages, the irony is more evident than the irrelevance, since (315) the "Athenians were not denying the deposit⁵."

Scott the historian does not pay much attention to the placement, frequency, or narratological function of what he and other readers unhelpfully (arguably, in a pejorative way) call "digressions," i.e., extended deviations from the central thread

⁵ Scott observes (317) that *symbola* as a term for contractual tokens of identity appear only in this story and in tragedy. Heliodorus 5.4.7, a parody of dramatic convention, employs the same term, while in comedy, e.g., Menander *Epit.* (vv. 300-80) we find γνωρίσματα. Aristotle *Po.* 1454b19-30 uses σημεία to discuss the tokens of tragic recognitions.

of Persian expansion and conflicts, such as the passages on the houses of Alcmaeon and Miltiades that close their papyrus roll and this book. A current book about a book of history cannot so neatly separate the matter from the manner (a point developed by Rhiannon Ash also, in Gibson-Kraus, *The Classical Commentary*, 269-72).

Scott even considers (213) chapters 49.2 to 94 to be “the digression on Athens, Sparta and Aegina.” This stretches the term unnaturally (although Scott has good company) and certainly misrepresents Herodotus’s intention stated in the preface: to show forth the deeds of men and their great works, both Hellene and barbarian, and especially [but not in any way ‘only’] the cause for which these waged war. This statement logically implies that the battles of the war (often criticized today for being reported too briefly) mean less to Herodotus than the reason for those conflicts and the other cultural achievements and prankish delights of individuals and communities. The term “digression” for over a third of a book implies a historiographic vision that suits the current critic and not the historian. Herodotus’ narrative uses *protheke*, *parentheke* for matters of a paragraph and welcomes the opportunities to add a detail or anecdote (4.30, 171, cf. 7.5). Herodotus’ larger literary technique, however, is not linear, although prose (by its etymology and nature) is. Herodotus’ text is globular, interwoven, and conversational⁶. As Scott notes elsewhere, specific persons, events, or institutions may not be mentioned, narrated, or explained, until their decisive moment has come (as in Homer). This different and innovative mode of thinking and “connecting the dots⁷”, should not be dismissed as

⁶ Rosaria Munson ably treated interweaving passages in her University of Pennsylvania dissertation, *Transitions in Herodotus*, Philadelphia 1983. Simon Slings in “Oral Strategies in the Language of Herodotus,” offers a linguistic demonstration of orality through linguistic theory (“pragmatics” with a heavy dose of difficult terminology) in Egbert Bakker, Irene de Jong, and Hans van Wees, edd. *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden 2002, 53-77.

⁷ One reason for new commentaries is the unhandiness of older, more expansive ones. This was one of J.D. Denniston and Denys Page’s uneasy justifications (Oxford 1957, 5: “use by students, ... need for compression,

inadequate organization or forethought. However oral Herodotus' text could be in origin or in intentional narrative techniques, the result is a literary artefact and its author recognized that reality as he shaped it.

To return to issues raised by the commentary in this new century, "books about other books," an old phenomenon, constitutes a process that requires some degree of voluntary amnesia, if the scholarly profession and the book publishing industry are to thrive, rather, to survive. No commentary, however scrupulous the commentator, can credit all his predecessors (even if known) for their original or assenting observations. No reader could slog through those jungles of annotation.

The commentary, further, like the law, is a jealous mistress. It demands decent attention to every detail. (Perhaps only writers of commentaries should review commentaries.) It demands palpable demonstration of what millennia of scholars have argued about as well as some new contribution⁸. If I do not always agree with Scott's arguments or conclusions, the reader should recognize that, while I can choose my ground for objections, Scott had an obligation to lemmatize nearly all the most diverse matters that Herodotus chose to include. These encompass the extraction of bitumen (and other technical procedures; cf. 402), the meaning of Persian names, the existence of Aegean sharks, and the nature of physiological disturbances (such as battlefield mental traumas, for example, hysterical blindness). The commitment and the product deserve deep respect, as do the different virtues of some other recent contributions mentioned below.

In recent decades, scholars have been busy in the 'handbook' and 'companion' markets of scholarship. Once clear distinctions between them are fading. Relevant to the Herodotean

... mere summary ... of elaborate essays") for following Eduard Fraenkel's edition of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (Oxford 1950) with 812 pages of notes by their own edition's mere 188 pages of notes.

⁸ The lyric poet W. B. Yeats, irritated at both the status and interference of commentators on Catullus, wrote "The Scholars": "Old, learned, respectable bald heads/ Edit and annotate the lines/.... All shuffle there; all cough in ink;/ All wear the carpet with their shoes;/ All think what other people think;/ All know the man their neighbour knows."

commentary under review, Carolyn Dewald and John Marincola's *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge 2006) recently joined Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees' *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden 2002) on the Herodotus ten-foot bookshelf among the bulky vademecums (373 and 652 pages respectively)⁹. "Companion" is a term more capacious than "Handbook," since the latter implies (although it does not always deliver) some essential set of tools for understanding an author or subject (cf. ἐγχειρίδιον, *manualis*). The nineteenth-century Germans were first in scholarly *Handbücher*. In Classics, for example, recall the well-known and impressive series published by C.H. Beck in Munich entitled *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*. (Few hands can easily hold any of these volumes.) A.J. Wace and F.H. Stubbings, *A Companion to Homer* (Oxford 1962) attempted to supply that tool-kit with a friendlier word. Richard Janko, a reviewer of its new but dissimilar and not entirely updated version, complained that it had veered towards the collection of essays, sometimes recycled papers. Some essays suggested to him that we are already "forgetting what we once knew"¹⁰. Pygmies again stand on the shoulders of giants.

Lionel Scott long practiced law as a barrister before returning to ancient history to complete his Ph.D. at the University of Leeds (2000). This 716-page book, "quarried from that thesis," profits from his legal experience, not least in evaluating conflicting and partial evidence in diplomatic and political traditions that interested Herodotus (e.g., 18 n.58). The long period of gestation enabled him better to see what a reader might need, whether

⁹ We can draw a hierarchy of comprehensiveness thus: Commentary--Handbook--Companion--Conference/Workshop--*Festschrift*. For the last, a Teutonic category without an English name, see a notable example in Peter Derow and Robert Parker, edd. *Herodotus and his World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, Oxford 2003. For the penultimate, fifteen essays in Nino Luraghi, ed. *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford 2001), a collection on Herodotus' historiographical context

¹⁰ In *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 98.5.20, reviewing Ian Morris and Barry Powell, edd., *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, priced at \$265.75.

one is a “hit and run” user or working one’s way through long stretches of events. The ancient textual, archaeological, and epigraphical evidence for this decade (498–489 BCE) remains regrettably exiguous.

Scott’s section summaries in italics (e.g., 213 on 49.2–55) and introductory paragraphs on special problems (e.g., 213–20 for the same section of the text, discussing other possible and surviving sources, the nature of Demaratus’ policies, Spartan alliances, etc.) provide useful guidance to the detailed annotations ahead. Scott has been very thorough in his reading. I have often found, in forty years studying this exasperating historian, a lovably lithe narrator of others’ often self-serving accounts, that Reginald Macan’s older commentary on the last six books had already canvassed many of the likeliest possibilities—including some that later historians fail to mention. E.I. McQueen’s recent commentary, *Herodotus Book vi* (London 2000), is chiefly grammatical but also historical. This modest volume, directed to undergraduates and generous in information on grammar and syntax, offers substantial information and attractive arguments in its 150 pages of notes (e.g., on the Sakai, 113.1; on *proxenoi*, 57.2).

To isolate any book or section of the *Histories* seems perilous. The mass and diversity of subjects to master is so daunting that no one scholar has lately repeated How and Wells’ temerity of a century ago in commenting on the whole (although more than a rumor of one such Anglo-American attempt in progress exists). One Herodotean book per scholar in a lifetime already intimidates the hardy. Books V and VI, recording the Rebellion of Ionia from Persia, would seem a nearly inseparable pair for historical comment (thus Nenci’s combination in the Valla edition). This connectedness of events, however, is easy for the critic to observe, while to produce the appropriate commentary is another matter. The sixth book alone would occupy rolls 17 through 19 of S. Cagnazzi’s hypothetical 28 papyrus rolls¹¹. After that, 7.1 provides a clear break in its language and substance (74).

Book V begins after Pheretimos’s North African adventures, gruesomely wormy, and narrates the comic and not entirely

¹¹ “Tavola dei 28 logoi dei Erodoto,” *Hermes* 103, 1975, 385–423.

credible, indeed legendary, origins of the Ionian revolt. Aristagoras and Histiaeus activate Miletus and its neighbors against the clumsy but savage behemoth, the Persian imperial tribute-machine and military might. Aristagoras (and Histiaeus, to a lesser extent) supply the red thread of continuity throughout Book V and the first portion of Book VI. This text details the noteworthy final achievements and demise of that unexpected and frequently fractious, *ad hoc* East Greek alliance. The Ionians' tragic defeat should not erase their significant strategic planning and military victories on land and sea. (Hypothetical: One can imagine what European historians of the nineteenth century would have made of the American Revolution, had the colonists failed to gain independence from the British crown.)

Herodotus memorably recounts the smart Spartan rejection and the less easily defended (arguably stupid, given the logistics) Athenian acceptance of Aristagoras' invitation to join their forces to the East Hellenic cause before the Persian imperial armies and navies reached Europe. He seems to endorse the important argument that Persian aggression against the West Aegean Greeks was inevitable, so a strategy devised to fight invaders before they reach the defenders' territory already had promoters. Herodotus directs the (Greek) reader's attention to the foolish Athenian "democratic" decision by calling it both the result of a deception (διαβάλλειν; cf. 5.50.2, 9.116.2, 5.107, 8.110.1, 3.1.4) and "the beginning of evils" for European Greeks (5.97: αὐται δὲ αἱ νέες ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἑλληνῶν τε καὶ βαρβάρων). This intended echo of the first Greek narratologist, Homer (especially *Il.* 5.63 [the building of Paris' trans-Aegean ships] and, on a personal level, 11.604 [Achilles' dispatch of Patroklos to battle]) lends a genealogy and marks the solemnity of the decisive historical East-West moment. Thucydides' herald Melesippus (2.12) thought it a pronouncement worth imitating. Perhaps, these words ritually in fact initiated other Greek declarations of war.

This chunk of Herodotus, only much later to be designated "Book VI," concludes the five-book triumphalist survey of Persian emergence, growth, and conquest of the heartland of civilizations from the Hindu Kush and Afghanistan to Libya in central North Africa, from Upper Egypt in the south to Europe well north of the Black Sea. Now Herodotus slows the

pace of events and zooms in on one small part of the world, the western fringe of the Eastern Empire. Book VI, like Homer's *Iliad*, begins in the last year of its war (seven years, in this Ionian case) on the western fringe of Anatolia. Herodotus' important components include the sorry end of the Ionian rebellion and the anti-hero Histiaeus' demise (1-42). He then explores, in the detail that every Hellene seems to have craved, Spartan domestic and extra-territorial affairs between the battles of Lade and Marathon (under cover of a survey of Hellenic reactions to Darius' imperious demands, 48-93). He weaves into this account more briefly Argive, Aeginetan, and Athenian reactions to nearby and distant enemies. The book culminates in Darius' revenge, Datis' ambitious and amphibious invasion of new European terrain. The Hellenic responses include the compromised resistance of the Eretrians, the not yet significantly compromised resistance of the Athenians, better known as the battle of Marathon (94-124), and the mixed response and dilatory muster of the Spartans (6.106: waiting because the moon was not full!, a problem well canvassed by Scott's Appendix 17: political manipulation, divided opinion, religious observance, festival, etc.).

The Introductory Materials

The reviewer dutifully follows the book's commentary structure that necessarily results in a choppy read. Scott supplies four introductions occupying 77 pages: Reading Herodotus for the History, The Ionian Revolt, A Note on the Text, and Other Accounts of the Events in Book 6. The final two are much shorter, with little progress offered about our shadowy knowledge of Charon, Demon, and later sources such as Ephorus (known mostly through the dim-witted Diodorus). Scott savors the ironic possibility that, if we could read the earlier and later authorities, Herodotus might turn "out to be as reliable as any other writer" (77). Whether or not it be ironic, I believe it is probably true.

The first introduction attempts to distinguish Herodotus from his sources (with the caution appropriate to a student of K.J. Dover and Russell Meiggs) in judgments of events that occurred as many as sixty years earlier than his writing. A survey of the author's life ("teenager on Samos," travels to other places for which he claims autopsy) and oeuvre is intelligent and crisp; Scott finds

the often maligned ancient author honest and original (14). The Ionian's chronologies can be frustratingly vague but, at times, his dates and lists of generals or contingents are so precise that Scott suspects written sources. He recognizes that Spartan traditions pose special problems and that Herodotus is most comfortable with oral sources (23). He notes (33, ad 6.18-9) that "only one oracle [appears] in the whole Ionian revolt narrative, and none for" the next two pre-Xerxean expeditions, a contrast with both earlier and later events.

The second introduction rationalizes "folkloric" elements of the Ionian revolt. Lydian and Persian exploitation (taxes, naval obligations, gifts) stunted eastern Hellenic self-consciousness and economic development. It then foundered in the face of Persian disdain for non-Persians and mainland lack of respect for eastern Greek "cousins" (in part fostered in Herodotus' day by this spectacularly failed rebellion). These factors (along with various cities' self-justifications for betraying the cause) created the revolt's sorry reputation in later tradition. However, the Persian military juggernaut came a cropper in Scythia, stalled infuriatingly in the face of informed resistance at tiny Naxos, and might easily have lost the naval decision at Lade (now landlocked by the effluvia of the Maeander River)—had Persian diplomacy and *baksheesh* not succeeded. Scott provides a good summary of the comic flounderer Histiaeus.

The Commentary Proper

The historical commentary occupies the next 375 pages. Scott comments on significant things and events by words and phrases (e.g., 320-1, chosen at random: seven lemmata on eleven lines of Greek text). The defeat of the Ionians and their rearrangements occupies Herodotus' first 45 chapters. Chapters 46 to 93 describe Persian demands and mainland Greek reactions, especially in Sparta and Athens, and the extended back-stories (with ethnological and constitutional data) that in some sense explain their bizarre refusal to cave in to demands for kowtowing subservience. Chapters 94 to 140, the third third of the book, recount the events of only a year, or two at the most: before, during, and after the battle of Marathon, with Herodotus' unexpected attention at the end to the two important Athenian houses of the eponymous Alcmaeon and

Philaios. The forward pace of the narrative is noticeably slowing down, not least because of pseudo-conversational “background repair.”

Scott justifiably describes Histiaeus as a figure distorted by folklore, but this term is not justified or explained (cf. 449, on Pelasgian rape). It is merely derogatory from a historian’s point of view, indicating “untrustworthy,” as if one can neatly divide those two categories of fact and fiction in the stories of Histiaeus, the Alcmaeonids (406), Bluebeard the Pirate, or Abraham Lincoln. Despite a nonce conflation, “urban myth”(294), Scott prefers “urban legend” (414, 436), a term that has no fixed meaning, often today and in the case of Alcmaeon and Croesus not even requiring an urban locale¹². The plainer term “legend” certainly and sufficiently implies a category of traditional, oral, localized, and *functional* narrative (see further, below).

Scott offers good parallels for “you stitched the shoe,” a proverb (no later than Herodotus; cf. 4.127, 6.129, for other exx.). The calculations of Greek manpower at Lade are usefully presented in summary form. Sometimes Scott seems too critical of reasonable but allegedly anachronistic translations of Greek terms such as “marines” for *epibatai* or “staff” for Miltiades’ military subordinates (101, 633 n.13). Good notes on Hellenic oath-processes appear at 23.4 and 62.1; Herodotus is interested in deceptive oaths (think of the Spartan Ariston here, Etearchus at 4.154, the Persians at Barca: 4.201). Scott explores the theme of the munificent oriental king at 24.2. Herodotus doubts (with the particle *κως*, 6.27) that divine interference produced the 98% mortality of a Chian youth chorus sent to Delphi. Scott cleverly suggests this hesitancy (cf. 6.51) may have arisen because the consistently bad luck of Chians controverts this historian’s theory of an observable balance of good and bad in human communities’ affairs. Scott then suggests more prosaically that food poisoning rather than any divine sign felled the children (144-5). The two are not mutually exclusive, as Scott realizes, but, more likely, the distancing adverb conveys Herodotus’ skeptical reaction to the certainties of conventional Greek (here Chian) piety.

¹² Cf. J.H. Brunvand, *Encyclopedia of Urban Legends*, New York 2001, xxi ff.

There is an interesting if inconclusive note on Persian beheadings anent Histiaeus' demise but referencing further Xerxes' unusually brutal treatment of Leonidas' corpse (6.29-30, 7.238). Scott has not found other references to Persian beheadings, but 3.79 and, even better, 8.90 meet the criteria. The culture that disfigures (3.69, 154 [a plausible ruse], 9.112) opponents and convicts and slices victims in half (7.39, Pythius' innocent son) and boasts of gruesome mutilations, tortures, crucifixions and impalements of its enemies (Darius' Behistun inscription) is not likely to shirk from mere, comparably humane, beheading¹³.

Scott lists time-markers in the text as years advance between the end of the Ionian revolt and the battle of Marathon (134, on 31.1, etc.). He notes "narrative markers" (usually particles or repeated participial verb forms), when Herodotus transits from one subject to another, as at 41.4. He rightly regards the stories of Persians performing a dragnet of conquered enemy territories as impossible. He shows how Herodotus or his sources have exaggerated reports of populations enslaved or killed, since the same or next generation of Milesians and their quondam allies soon provides significant numbers of ships and tribute (e. g., 156, 356). He corrects the misapprehension that Herodotus has a low opinion of Ionians (158). He corrects Herodotus' negative evaluation of Mardonius' 492 expedition (202-3) by listing his palpable achievements. Scott well discusses "earth and water" demands for fealty by Persian rulers (210).

Scott reconstructs sources from opposing camps in situations such as Demaratus' struggle with Cleomenes (214), the Aeginetans with the Athenians, the Philaids with the Alcmeonids. He questions the assumption of Spartan hegemony in Greece before

¹³ Cambyses maltreated Amasis' corpse (3.16, admittedly eccentric), Artaxerxes did the same to the younger Cyrus, his brother (*Xen. An.* 1.10.1). Cf. Carl Nylander, "Earless in Nineveh: Who mutilated Sargon's head?," *AJA* 84, 1980, 329-33. The later Parthian Suren cut off Crassus' head (*Plu. Crass.* 32), but he had a dramaturgical motive. For a Greek example of beheading, see 5.114; for the famous Greek example of Pausanias' refusal to enact such *tisis*, see 9.78. Herodotus recounts at least two examples of Persians burying men and children alive (3.35, 7.114).

480, although the then-and-now controversial Cleomenes certainly exerted himself in that direction (four expeditions against Athens alone ca. 510, 508, 506, 504 [proposed], also initiatives in Boeotia, Arcadia, Argos, Aegina, Sicyon, etc.). He collects the plentiful examples of Spartan bribe taking or allegations of that form of foreign and domestic policy (222). Elsewhere (269) he points out that the line might be narrow between official offerings to the god and unofficial offerings to officials. He lists (231) “some 22 lifetime honours” for Spartan kings while acknowledging that Herodotus is not writing a *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*.

I doubt Herodotus’ statement (57.4) that the Spartan kings kept an archive of Delphic responses. Record keeping in this proudly almost illiterate and secretive community (Scott ad 57.4) trailed far behind the contentiously public, law-inscribing Athenians. Scott notes how often Herodotus is our first and/or best source for an archaic event or Spartan institution (e. g., the *gerousia*, 246, or testifying to Scott’s background in law, e.g., 255: women’s legal capacity). Cleomenes’ “lateral thinking” (300) presumably refers to what Americans call “thinking outside the box,” unconventional solutions for personal and political problems. We cannot say whether his nontraditional techniques of whipping (trademark of the oriental potentate and Hellenic autocrat), bumping, cheating and lying, bribing the gods’ agents, smart-aleck answers and puns were a result of nature, nurture, or a thirty-year reign in the Spartan “hot seat.” Like the later Spartans Brasidas and Lysander, he caused serious misgivings in those whom he was supposedly serving. We return below to this devious character and his distorted portrait.

Scott shies away from the frequent supernatural elements in Herodotus’ collections of accounts, even reports of theophanies attested for historical persons (such as the mysterious hero Astrabacus’ epiphany reported by or for Demaratus’ mother). Almost in the manner of Euhemerus, Scott supplies a rationalist’s explanation of epiphanies, visions of the divine: Philippides experienced a hallucination of Pan as a result of hypoglycemia, clinical depression, dehydration, etc. (369), and Epizelos suffered stroke, hysterical blindness, or hemianopia (395-6). While beyond any acceptable proof, one gladly prefers such modern

explanations to curt dismissal of “superstitious” oral traditions¹⁴. As Scott notes, epiphanies abounded in the records available for 480 BCE¹⁵. He should emphasize that Herodotus, too, is a fifth-century rationalist, often rationalizing (that is, explaining in human, non-supernatural terms) the credulous reports that he received. The marked word “folklore,” further, cannot merely dismiss evidence or communicate historiographical opprobrium (273). It ought to initiate historical inquiry into the self-interested developments of folk beliefs, local traditions¹⁶, and popular delusions, and the pressures they exert on the oral and written transmission of historical events¹⁷. History was and is a mode of self-justification before it became a supposedly objective academic discipline.

In book VI, Cleomenes and Leutychidas, the Spartan engineers of Demaratus’ downfall (280), possibly present the limiting cases of Spartan tolerance for creative genealogy and fraudulent politics. They suffer *tisis*, compensatory suffering, for their Machiavellian deceptions and crimes. *Pace* p. 35 and its alleged Herodotean examples, *tisis* need not be “divine retribution,” if it ever should be so explained. The doubly modified, alliterative cognate accusative phrase, τίσις τοιγύνηδε τινὰ Δημαρήτω ἐξέτεισε [Leutychidas], indicates the need to ponder in what sense the

¹⁴ This approach is more productive than attributing to Herodotus, student of doctors and sophists, blind faith in miracles.

¹⁵ Add, at least, P. Frisch, *Die Träume bei Herodot* (Göttingen 1968) for more than seventeen dreams in Herodotus, divinely inspired and inhabited or not, often originally misinterpreted (e.g., 1.128, as are oracles, also: 7.142).

¹⁶ The catalogue of wide-ranging suitors and princely dowry for a wedding-contest are labeled as Homeric elements in the anti-romantic legend of comely and rich Hippocleides. His upside-down downfall was a tale designed to be perhaps Alcmaeonid, anti-Philaid propaganda. Scott or his typesetter prints προίξ for προίξ at 129.1.

¹⁷ On the adulterous but very Spartan phantom Astrabakos, see Walter Burkert, “Demaratos, Astrabakos, and Herakles: Kingship, Myth and Politics at the time of the Persian Wars,” in *Savage Energies*, Chicago 2001 (orig. 1965), 97-110, and D. Ogden, *The Crooked Kings of Ancient Greece* (London 1997) with further bibliography on heroic appearances. For Cleomenes’ machinations, see the brilliant essay by A. Griffiths, “Was Cleomenes Mad?,” in A. Powell, ed. *Classical Sparta. The Techniques behind her Success*, London 1991, 51-78.

exposure of his crimes and their consequent punishments did fit his actions. Leutychidas was humiliatingly exposed as a thief and thereby lost his chance to be a military hero in Thessaly; he was exiled and his house demolished. Like Demaratus, his victim, he was tried and deposed, he left Sparta in danger and humiliation, and he lived the rest of his life an outcast from home (72.1). The fragmentizing lemmatization of Scott's information precluded or discouraged his presenting an extended argument on this topic and its anachronies.

The later narrative offers a Herodotean plethora of possibilities (84) for Cleomenes' *tisis*: his trials, his alleged dipsomania, his madness itself, his imprisonment, his self-murder, and his everlasting, wicked reputation. The nasty end of the reputedly sacrilegious Cleomenes is shrouded in rich, puzzling details. Scott reasonably suggests that Herodotus' tale might suffer from Spartan disinformation covering over an assassination (292; as also Max Duncker, for one, already had, in his *History of Antiquity* [1857]). *Tisis* is certainly not divine in Scott's "most interesting case," the natural world of "winged serpents" in 3.109—or in 5.79 or 9.78, where *tisis* refers to revenge, human agency alone. Scott, following A. Griffiths' article mentioned above ("Was Cleomenes Mad?"), draws the notable and suspicious folktale parallels between Cleomenes' madness and Cambyses' (279ff.). As with the unique *kyklos* of 1.207 and the fragile human happiness and prosperity of 1.6 (in the ancient author's own voice), there is no stability in human affairs, and the colluding king-impeachers and oracle-corrupters "got what they deserved," retribution—with no agent (divine or otherwise) indicated by Herodotus. Those with a conventional view of Herodotus the Churchgoer need to detect the hand of Zeus or some other, more abstract god, in every fitting compensation or *tisis*. The cases of Panionius and Oroetes (8.105-6, 3.128) are left *sub iudice*. "Poetic justice," deserved payback, need not be divine justice in either an ancient or a modern historian.

The note on Datis the Mede (337) well exemplifies the scope of Scott's digging. Among the ancient sources, we find Herodotus himself (cross-references to Medes conducting military operations), the Persepolis tablets, Ctesias in Jacoby's *Fragmente*, Aristophanes and one of his scholiasts, Diodorus, the *Athenaion*

Politeia, ostraka, and Plutarch. Among the modern sources, he mentions here the revised *Cambridge Ancient History* (esp. for Persian affairs), R. Schmitt's article for the meaning of Persian names, Cagnazzi's article, Platnauer's commentary on Aristophanes' *Pax*, Lang's catalogue of the Athenian ostraka, Davies' *Athenian Propertied Families*, articles by Raubitschek, Piccirilli, Figueira, Bicknell, Rapke, and Rhodes' commentary on the *Ath. Pol.*

Scott does not think that Thucydides 2.8.3 corrects Herodotus on the notorious problem of the earthquake at Delos. Herodotus reported a phenomenon of ca. 491 at 6.98: "Delos was moved, unshaken before then and since then down to my own day." When Thucydides says that Delos (ca. 432) was "never before shaken within Hellenic recollection," he certainly intends to correct somebody, perhaps certain Delians who favored *hapax genomena*. Since we have no remotely reliable date of publication for the whole or any of the units of either author (or even a grasp of the proper ancient conception of "publication" for these two historians), conceivably Herodotus wrote his geological statement after Thucydides wrote his¹⁸. A clearer contradiction is hard to imagine; a solution *non liquet invenire*. Ivan Linforth best explained Herodotus' peculiar use of the vague ὁ θεός (with regard to this *teras*, Scott 346)¹⁹.

Scott is good at supplying motivations for self-exculpatory and other-inculpatory oral sources, for example, why the Athenians did not offer Eretria military or even moral support when the Persians arrived in Western waters (353), and how the prosecution

¹⁸ Scott comments, in another note on geography, that the river Styx in Arcadia "was the only waterfall in mainland Hellas" (excepting those further north in Edessa, Macedonia), but I recall seeing in 1969 a cascade of the Hyrcinus at Levadhia in Boeotia with rugs swirling in the waters at the bottom. Neither Herodotus nor his commentators ask whether Cleomenes or his Arcadian allies believed that their real Styx was identical to its mythic homonym.

¹⁹ "Named and Unnamed Gods in Herodotus," *UCal Pub.Cl. Ph.* 9, 1928, 201-43 at 223: sometimes a collective singular (cf. 1.69, 80), sometimes a shorthand for his own uncertainty as to which one, and with Linforth's caution: if Herodotus does not specify, let us not supply.

assassinated the character of Miltiades at his trials (366). Scott rightly acknowledges the limitations and the real virtues of Herodotus' account of Marathon (378). The best reconstructions can only claim plausibility, but Scott seems determined to deny strategic and tactical thought to the Athenians (and Plataeans—never forget them!). He often follows Lazenby's reconstruction²⁰, and so here (at 111.3-113.2) he wants to deny to the *hapax* (and pluperfect) ἔρρωτο the meaning “were strengthened on the wings” in favor of “were strong on the wings”. As long as we agree, however, that the Athenian-Plataean center was thinned out (to equal the length of the Persian line—already in place—this was Lazenby's point), it makes little difference: someone Athenian was planning an unconventional frontline for attack or defense against a numerically superior foe. Scott does not see this as “a pre-planned strategy... ancient commanders did not think on such lines” (391). Neither Miltiades (nor the Polemarch Callimachus nor Herodotus) was a Hannibal, but the Carthaginian executed precisely this tactic of ‘double envelopment’ with his smaller army against the Romans (Cannae 216 BCE). To convert a defensive disadvantage to an offensive plan may be unexpected, but that explanation seems more likely than to imagine that when the generals decided to attack, rather than wait further for a Persian assault, it did not occur to them to alter their prior formation.

Scott attributes “plausible insincerity” and worse to Herodotus for his defense of the Alcmaeonids. He does not explain what this could mean. Can Scott disbelieve in the reality of any shield signal but accuse Herodotus of inappropriate defense of the Alcmaeonids who denied responsibility for something that did not happen? I suppose that Scott could disbelieve that a shield was actually intended to signal a message (although Herodotus claimed otherwise). Then he could believe that some Alcmaeonid raised one (although Herodotus says they did not), but that Herodotus wished to absolve them of the burden of guilt/ shame/ treason that some ill-disposed Athenians alleged that they had incurred. This approach, however, seems too convoluted.

²⁰ J.F. Lazenby, *The Defense of Greece*, Warminster 1993, 45-80, esp. 64, and for Hannibal's manoeuvre, idem, *Hannibal's War*, Norman (Okla.) 1998², 77-86.

Scott proposes *apotympanismos* as the likely punishment that Miltiades would have incurred, had he been executed for his Parian failure²¹. Our sources, however, seem to indicate that this method was intended for common criminals, to humiliate as well as to kill those being executed for outrageous crimes, and not for elite political types who had deceived the demos or failed in their mission. It is legitimate to speculate but this guess is *explicare obscura per obscuriora*, since we remain otherwise unsure what this mode of execution consisted of or on whom it was inflicted. Scott recognizes the importance of personalities in the relationship of Miltiades to the Parians arising from Lysagoras' report about him to the Persian commander Hydarnes²². He, however, then seems ambivalent about Herodotus' sophistication in explaining the political decisions of the archaic age, describing the attribution of such personal motives for political action as "typically Herodotean." It does not read as a compliment. He rightly emphasizes the enormous nature of the fifty talent fine imposed on Miltiades by providing ancient comparanda.

The Back Matters

Eighteen appendices on substantial matters such as chronology (Scott favors 495 BCE for the Lade battle) and "naval matters" occupy the next hundred pages. While it falls to the nature of a word-by-word commentary to atomize a continuous narrative into an expandable set of a thousand or more specific problems, and no one but a reviewer expects to read a commentary cover-to-cover, I began to wonder whether the point-by-point segmentalized nature of this multi-year task had shaped the mind of the learned commentator. Four introductions and eighteen appendices daunt the student who might benefit more at some point from a modern continuous narrative. Even within the appendices, such as 17, "Marathon," one encounters separate, disruptive morsels A through H and, inside them, numbered paragraphs 1-7, *vel sim*. The author would retort, I imagine,

²¹ See for details of this brutality, L. Gernet, "Sur l'exécution capitale," *REG* 1924, 261-93.

²² A grudge, here at 133.1 [neither man appears in the index]; cf. 73.1 and three other instances of *engkoton*.

that he only wants to print paper where he has something new to say.

Scott rightly defends the battleship exercises of Dionysius of Phocaea (a survivor and later, *faute de mieux*, a pirate) while explaining the development of the trireme and essentials (app. 2) of Greek naval tactics. His argument is based on the results of the British reconstructed Trireme Project. He emphasizes the rarity of prior naval battles in Greek history. He gathers information on the Persians' largely Phoenician navy and ancient travel times (app. 4).

He reserves for the appendices the peculiarities of Spartan institutions and their unpredictable product, Cleomenes, that appealingly eccentric figure of reported wit in twisting words and alleged conspiracies (app. 13, 14)²³. As elsewhere (Miltiades' wound), Scott has solicited informed contemporary opinion to weigh, as best one can, medical problems, for instance here, Cleomenes' mental state: personality disorder, mental instability, mania, euphoria, suicidal tendencies, etc. He suggests that Cleomenes' self-mutilation began as depression, may have been intended as a signal to his family, but ended with unintended death. The psychology of any Spartan, *a fortiori* a king, and an unusual Spartan king at that, is hard to fathom; this scenario, one of many that historians have imagined, seems dubious to me. The aggressive Cleomenes was an inconvenience for any continuous and coherent but unimperialistic foreign policy overland or overseas developed by the Spartan establishment.

Scott makes good use of numismatics in his appendix 16 on the shadowy Pheidon(s). I enjoyed the wide-ranging economic "implications of keeping racehorses" (app. 9) for archaic social history. The chronology of Athens and Aegina's disputes poses very difficult problems, but Scott attempts to order the displaced and untidy factoids (app. 12). Scott's investigative energy appears when he sought (but failed to find) confirmation from midwives

²³ The priceless Reginald Macan wrote (1895, appendix vii: "Spartan History" 79-101 at 89) with high rhetoric and memorable insight: "Is it strange that through the mists of oblivion, rivalry, prejudice and afterthought, the figure of Kleomenes looms as an enigma in Spartan history rather than as an intelligible and manageable agent?"

for the Hellenic or Herodotean notion that mothers of twins tend to the elder infant first (ad 52.6).

Scott delivers a fresh thirty-three page appendix on Marathon, surveying the chief issues. While the battle provoked pride and scribblers' reflections for a thousand years, other sources add little to Herodotus' regrettably meager, if inspiring, account. Scott provides information on the locale, further obscured by the 2004 Olympic contests. His survey of why the Athenians and Persians chose Marathon for their battle is less comprehensive and persuasive than the remarkable article of Whatley (*JHS* 1964), a model for the study of ancient conflicts. Scott does not believe that the Spartans were cynically or expediently exploiting their full-moon religious practices to avoid marching out in time for the battle—although he does not eliminate those possibilities as factors among many. Herodotus mentions the Carneian festival for the delay before Thermopylae but not for Marathon²⁴. Scott canvasses the existence and role of the Persian cavalry at Marathon; he raises the possibility that $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma\ \iota\pi\pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ was “disinformation sent by Datis” (623) to encourage the Athenians to come out and fight. Scott does not think that ancient armies ever planned a weaker center to enfold and trap their foes (625), precisely Hannibal's strategy at Cannae in 215. Scott (626-7) does not follow Lazenby's excellent discussion of “the shield signal” after the battle (Did it happen? Who did it? What did it mean?); this earlier British historian of the Persian conflicts explains it as either an innocent incident (bronze-faced shields will reflect sunlight) or an invention of political malice (see discussion, *supra*). Scott rejects it altogether, but one might argue that Herodotus exploited another opportunity to proclaim the Alcmaeonids' democratic loyalties.

Scott examines again (app. 18; cf. *AHB* 2002, 111ff.) the seemingly contradictory ancient sources for Miltiades' Paros campaign and its abrupt termination. In the manner of the neo-fundamentalist and sometimes “over-ingeniously” reconstructive

²⁴ Cf. 7.206 to 6.106, 120; also 8.72 and 9.7; generally, on the influence of religion on Greek warfare, W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War I*, Berkeley 1971, 116-26.

N.G.L. Hammond, he tries to reconcile bits of often garbled and very late information with Herodotus' relatively contemporaneous account. The result may be coherent, without being at all correct. One hesitates to discard any datum that contains some factoid possibly correct or one that even misrepresents something that once expressed information possibly correct. This reluctance restrains the ancient historian even if the information is as distant and untestable as the scholia to the second-century rhetorician Aristides composed in the fourth century CE by the rhetor Sopator (speculatively imagined to rely on—with intermediary sources and epitomators admitted—Hellanicus, or the even less trustworthy Stesimbrotus, or Ion of Chios).

Compared to the fourth-century CE writers reconstructing the fifth century BCE, one might hope to welcome Nepos' first-century BCE account of Marathon (*Milt.* 7), composed when more intermediate sources were available. When, however, the hasty and careless Nepos can be checked, his work (400? biographies originally) contains dreadful howlers. In just this brief excerpt alone (presumed to derive from the none-too-trustworthy and Herodotus-hostile Ephorus), Nepos reports that Miltiades' Parian troops observed a random fire in a grove on the [totally invisible] mainland (*procul in continenti* [Attica, mainland Ionia?] *lucus, qui ex insula conspiciebatur*). He asserts (or copies) that it was visible from the Athenian camp on Paros and that Miltiades (mis-) interpreted it as a signal that a Persian fleet was approaching and embarked his Attic expeditionary force in order to flee. The odd name "Sagoras," in this Nepos tradition, emended or not, cannot explain Miltiades' [long dead] brother's presence and participation at his final trial. Further, Nepos has everywhere conflated the two Miltiades into the Junior. Scott knows all this and more²⁵. He comments, "Other details leave a good deal to be desired," but his way of "reconciling the various sources" (644, not "the only way") raises questions of consistent method. Can we confidently extract anything from Nepos'

²⁵ P. 632 refers to J.R. Bradley, *The Sources of Cornelius Nepos*, Harvard diss. 1967; rev. New York 1991.

farrago of confusion? Scott seems to have saved dirty bathwater without having any baby left worth saving.

Herodotus' twenty-six-day siege of Paros "has the ring of an accurate detail" (439, ad 135.1) and elsewhere possesses "the ring of authenticity" (635). Such precise numbers may be right in any one or another case and may have respectable sources, but here Scott seems to misunderstand the nature of Herodotean numbers, whether unique, rounded off, typical (three, seven, 600, powers of ten), or conventional (ten, one hundred). I generally reject Detlev Fehling's thorough-going but misguided deconstruction of Herodotus' *History* as an elaborate fiction composed without leaving home ("Detail macht glaubwürdig in Lügendichtung", that is, "Detail makes for credibility in Lying-literature.")²⁶ Nevertheless, the evidence and argument of the monograph do persuade us that no precise number in a non-contemporary ancient source gains sufficient credibility simply by being a non-multiple (e. g., 192 Athenians dead at Marathon; 1207 ships in Xerxes' armada). It requires other evidence, such as an inscription—unmentioned by Herodotus [cf. Paus. 1.32.3; *IG* II². 1006.69] but known from the *polyandreion* at the Soros at Marathon and from a cenotaph at Athens (Scott ad 117.1).

Family stemmata of the Pisistratids, Philaids, Alcmaeonids, Spartan royals, and Inachos follow (cf. app. 5 on Darius' family), then ten rather basic maps (including one based on autopsy, personal observation, essential for Chian strategic outposts, a question addressed in app. 7), a comprehensive, twenty-page bibliography, and three indexes (Herodotean idiolect, citations, and "General"). Scott is helpful in the commentary on sorting out the Philaid clan, who are more often in Herodotus' period the Cimonid. His frequent references to D. Müller's *Topographischer Bildkommentar zu den Historien Herodots* (Tübingen 1987, 1997) may help those who have access to these magnificent volumes (only one copy listed in the state of Ohio!).

²⁶ *Herodotus and his "sources," Citation, Invention, and Narrative Art*, 1971; Eng. transl. Howie, Leeds 1989, 120.

Concluding Remarks

Misprints are few, but I noticed these: 23 n. 71: “detail in the panting”, 62: “and ‘and’”, 309: ἐκ διαμονίου in a discussion rejecting both Argive and Spartan explanations for Cleomenes’ craziness—divine irritation or Scythian wine-drinking customs, 612 n.38: “we do no know”, 582: “Plutarch says in terms that the Sepeia widows...”, 582 n.26: “Outwith [Outside?] this Appendix”. A word is occasionally dropped: “time for the invitation be sent” on 131, “it need no more than that” on 307, and elsewhere. Some of them are perplexing (15 n.49: “some 12 ll passages”, 645: “those who give back-word on their agreements”). Readers may puzzle over the perhaps British academic slang [or idiolectal] use of the Latin verb “*quaere*” (169, 204, 594), the idiom “different to” (251, 595, etc.). Occasional slang or anachronisms enliven the text (212: “red herrings,” 563: “it takes two to tango,” 635: “keep the Philaid flag flying”). There are few slips: Arete is the wife, not the daughter, of Homer’s Alcinous (261); the Greek lemma ἐλθόντα at 50.2: “Who would willingly become a hostage?” suggests that Scott is thinking of ἐθελόντα. He once writes “Waterhouse” for the Oxford Press translator Waterfield (238).

The preference of the Brill Press for omitting stops on abbreviations leads to some ugly although not confusing moments: Nic Dam and Hellanic and Plut jostle with Ael Arist and Thuc *inter alios*. References such as “See Appx 6, esp paras 8-10” (571 n.3) and “chaps 6 to 9” (41: chapters, not British boys) cloud the future of punctuation. The abbreviation “no” without stop for the word “number” occasionally leads to genuine confusion with the English negative “no.” There are no page headers (only the emboldened lemmatic subsections in the text of the commentary) to guide the scholar to the page one needs. Thus, if one opens to pages 118-9, for instance, neither a header nor a lemma, such as **19.3**, anywhere indicates where in the text we are. Gomme’s *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, *per contra*, offers three essentials on a typical double page header (text reference, year of war and season/date): VI.70.1 YEAR SEVENTEEN: SUMMER –415 B.C.~~~YEAR SEVENTEEN: SUMMER 414 B.C. VI.72.2. Hornblower’s *Thucydides* commentary intelligently offers a topic in addition to date and book/ chapter reference, e.g., “Final Preparations for War.” How and Wells’ *Herodotus* commentary

offered inclusive book and chapter numbers (“Book II 50.3–51.3”). Should the Brill operations managers respond, “That was the Oxford University Press, this is the independent Brill,” I reply that even Brill’s own three volumes, A.B. Lloyd’s *Herodotus Book II* (Leiden 1975–88), provided “CH. 86–7” in its page headers. Finally, with respect to the exigencies of scholarship, the unfortunately grand price of Brill volumes demands notice. While the reviewer is no economist, he can emphatically state that prices like these impede the sales of Brill’s impressive products to all except university libraries and independently wealthy scholars.

How often an important ancient author needs or deserves a new commentary, or a new one pitched at a different audience, is a nice question. Not only do interpretive fashions change, but, with an historical author, information can radically expand (for Herodotus: inscriptions, knowledge of peripheral cultures, attitudes towards the author’s reliability and sophistication). One hears a rumor that John Marincola and Michael Flower’s excellent edition of *Herodotus Book ix* (Cambridge 2002) will be complemented in the next decade by volumes dedicated to the previous eight. They will obey the “Green and Yellow” series’ elastic injunction of “assisting the intermediate and advanced Greek student.” They will complement, although not surpass, Scott’s effort, since, like Lloyd’s edition of *Herodotus Book II*, his volume has a more specialized and advanced audience in mind, reader to digest reams of scholars’ comment. (The question of how much commentary is too much remains unsettled.) Such audiences regrettably require the journals, commentaries, and full panoply of historical studies found only in research universities’ libraries.

Scott expresses a sense of oppression caused by the ever-increasing mountain of Herodotean scholarship and laments “the unmanageable bibliography” of modern studies (ix). To this heap, of course, he has inevitably added, but he avoids no problem presented by the severe and demanding form of the scholarly commentary. He simplifies the task of historians and philologists who still grasp imperfectly what Herodotean historiography is —although the wily Macan more often than Scott reflects on Herodotean method and parallel narratives. We greet with

pleasure Lionel Scott's significant and thorough commentary on an important period in Herodotus' *History*. The epoch deserves, and now may receive, more attention than it has so far found--Marathon always to be excepted.

DONALD LATEINER
Ohio Wesleyan University
dglatein@owu.edu