Zeitmontagen

Formen und Funktionen gezielter Anachronismen

7. Kleine Mommsen-Tagung
am 14./15. Oktober 2016 in Dresden

Herausgegeben von
Antje Junghanß, Bernhard Kaiser und Dennis Pausch

INHALT

ANACHRONIEN ALS NARRATIVE TECHNIK

THE DISTANT PRESENT AND THE NEAR PAST

The Mounting of Time in Herodotean *Aiginetikos Logos*

Irene Polinskaya (London)

1. INTRODUCTION

It is not often noted that the opening of Herodotus' "Histories" introduces more than one protagonist. Herodotus is not alone on the stage of history, he has an opponent, and that opponent is time. Time works to render human achievements fuzzy, faded (ἐξίτηλα), and finally forgotten. Herodotus' object is to prevent that from happening: μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων **τῷ χρόνῳ** ἐξίτηλα γένηται.[1] In pursuit of this goal, Herodotus musters an array of narrative techniques that create an effect of overcoming the inexorable linear progression of time and enable time travel. While not always conspicuous, time references play a significant structuring role in the narrative. This paper explores a concise section of Herodotus' work, remarkable and perhaps unique within the "Histories" for the concentration of mounting time frames, in which anachronies perform a complex job of interrelating Past and Present, and Herodotus acts as a skillful stage director, guiding the experience of his audience/readership in a deliberate and purposeful manner.[2]

The section I will be exploring, "Histories" 5.82–89, is what might be called the 'Aiginetikos logos' – a digression on the Aiginetan past that ultimately introduces Aigina onto the stage of Herodotean narrative,[3] where she is destined to play a significant role in the course of the Greco-Persian wars. The *Aiginetikos logos* is a digression, an account that Herodotus calls "the beginning of hatred between Athens and Aegina," a telling of the origin of a conflict, within which a number of other tales of origin are embedded. As a digression, it interrupts, or pauses, the flow of time in the main narrative, but the departure from and the return to the main narrative are clearly punctuated. The inclusion of the digression is necessitated by Herodotus' intermediate goal to explain the situation in Athens in the run-up to

---

1   There is no comment on τῷ χρόνῳ in Asheri/Lloyd/Corcella 2007, 72 f., or in commonly cited discussions of the first sentence of Hdt. 1.1 (e. g. Nagy 1987). The dative of τῷ χρόνῳ is normally taken to designate duration, not instrumentality, but I see room for both possibilities.
2   On Herodotus' "audible, accessible, ever-present authorial presence", see Brock 2003, 15.
3   Prior to this extended appearance, Aigina and Aiginetans are mentioned in passing in 2.178.3 (Aiginetan temenos of Zeus at Naukratis), 3.59.3 (war between Samos and Aigina in the time of Amphikrates of Samos), 3.131.1 (Demokedes of Kroton as a *demosios* doctor on Aigina), 4.152.3 (Sostratos, the unrivalled Aiginetan merchant).

the Ionian revolt. That situation was in part a product of contemporary Athenian-Aiginetan relations.

This section of the "Histories" has been addressed by many scholars in passing;[4] among those who studied it in detail, two contrasting approaches have emerged: positivist and symbolist.[5] Positivist readings of 5.82–89 take the sequence of political conditions and events in these chapters as factual and seek to identify a historical moment that would match them.[6] Symbolist readings, by contrast, suggest such an elaborate allegorical encoding on the part of Herodotus that it puts him on the level with the Delphic oracle, but it is doubtful that Herodotus either wanted or needed to be as obscure.[7] The interpretations hinge on the symbolic reading of names, e. g. turning a common noun *gê* (Epidaurian land that yields no fruit: Ἐπιδαυρίοισι ἡ γῆ καρπὸν οὐδένα ἀνεδίδου) into a deity's name *Gê*.[8] Another reading performs a reverse procedure, turning proper names into common nouns. The names of the deities Damia and Auxesia, whose images are at the centre of the ancient dispute between Athens and Aigina, are read as *damie/dêmiê* and *auxêsiê*, the former associated with demos and democracy,[9] the latter with "growth", "increase," symbolizing the stakes in the competition between Athens and Aigina.[10]

---

4   Passim: e. g. Munson 2001, 42; Osborne 2002, 497, 503, 517; Rhodes 2003, 69. There is a related debate on the meaning and dating of *polemos akeruktos* (5.81.2), but I leave that out of my discussion.

5   Detailed studies: Dunbabin 1936–1937; Buck 1981; Jeffery 1976; Figueira 1993; Haubold 2007; Irwin 2011a, 2011b. Cf. Irwin 2011a, 384: "read on its symbolic level…"

6   See e. g. Jeffery 1976, 150; Buck 1981, 5–13; Figueira 1993, 57.

7   Cf. Haubold 2007, 227: "The narrative of chapters 77–81 sets up one central question: who is close to whom and for what reasons? That is what the Pythia challenges the Thebans to consider…" The reference is to 5.79.1 (ἡ δὲ Πυθίη … ἐκέλευε τῶν ἄγχιστα δέεσθαι), and the debate among the Thebans about the meaning of *hoi anchista*. Haubold continues: "The problem put to the Thebans in important ways prefigures that faced by the Ionians, and their attempts to cope with it are informed by similar concerns."

8   Ib., p. 231: "Reference to *Gê* anchors Herodotus' archaeology of Aeginetan-Athenian relations in a theogonic context." This step enables Haubold to read the aition of the Epidaurian cult of Damia and Auxesia as an epic triumph of divine will, and the sequence of chapters 82–88 as a model of historical change: from the world where gods rule to the world where men dominate, and finally, to the world of women.

9   Irwin 2011a, 381, n. 17: "*Damiê* perhaps may further suggest another association with Athens, newly democratic at this very point in the narrative… the Doric alpha, however, rendering it Dorian."

10   Ib., 383: "Aeginetans chose to articulate their Dorianism as a response to the attempt of a newly empowered neighbour to wrest *Auxêsiê* from her, while Athens, unable to deprive Aegina of her *Auxêsiê*, turned her efforts eastwards, forging a link with Ionia." See also Irwin 2011b, 430 ("*Auxêsiê* and *Damiê*, cult statues with significant names"), 445 ("The speaking names of the statues, in particular Auxêsiê ('Growth'), coupled with the ahistorical quality of the *logos*, suggest other methods of reading beyond the narrowly literate and historical"), continued on 446 ("…metaphorical interpretation. According to one version, the Athenians had some limited effect on (what) the statues (represent): although remaining in Aegina, *Auxêsiê* and *Damiê* are brought to their knees"). Cf. also Henderson 2007, 305, n. 54.

In my view, Herodotus' message in this digression is more concrete and political,[11] and without being simple, nevertheless aims to be understood, not misunderstood, which is always a danger with symbolic or allegorical readings. Paradoxically, positivist readings have to be credited with rightly asserting the importance of time references in the 'Aiginetikos logos', even if they err in viewing them chronologically. The Aiginetan digression is anything but a linear segment of chronological plupast;[12] rather, it is a collection of anachronic varieties, each imparting a special hue to the overall picture. The difficulty of anchoring this section of the "Histories" in time has been noted, but not fully explored.[13] In this paper, I offer a more detailed take on time references in the 'Aiginetikos logos' and reflect on its place in the narrative fabric of the "Histories".

1.1 Chronology and Anachrony from Narratological Perspective

The narratological approach has effectively redefined the problem of unity/disunity in the Herodotean narrative by emphasizing the structuring role of time and the crucial distinction between fabula and story.[14] In narratology, fabula is essentially a would-be chronological and logical unfolding of related events,[15] whereas story is the actual, often anachronic, sequencing of events as found in a given text.[16] What might have been previously seen as Herodotus' lack of ability or lack of interest in ordering his narrative chronologically,[17] narratologists prefer to identify

---

11 See Polinskaya 2013, 411–422 and n. 86. It may be added that Haubold's reading misses the wider context of the compositional rings that help us understand the place and role of the Aiginetan digression in the "Histories". E. g. his reading restricts the mythological world to chapter 82, which, he argues, is replaced by the world of men and then by that of women, but *spatium mythicum* (in the compositional ring 2 – see below) encloses the Aiginetan digression on both sides: that world has not been replaced, and it was not Herodotus' intention to suggest so. Haubold 2007 acknowledges as much: after arguing that the point of Herodotus' experiment in the Aiginetan digression was to show the shift of "historical agency programmatically from gods and/or men to women" (242), he concludes that Herodotus has a "powerful intuition that we are still in important ways in the same story… part of the unfolding history of the gods" (244).

12 On plupast in general, see Grethlein/Krebs 2012; in Herodotus: Bragawanath 2012.

13 E. g. Thomas 2012/2001, 203 f.; Osborne 2002, 503; de Jong 2002, 264 f.; Rhodes 2003, 69; Haubold 2007, 231; Irwin 2011a, 380, 388;

14 On unity/disunity: de Jong 2002. On the role of time: de Jong 2013/1999, 267–273, esp. 272 ("[u]pon reflection, it seems only logical to see 'time' as an important – perhaps the most important – structuralizing and unifying principle"), with reference to Carbonell 1985, 140: "It is not space that orders and organizes the Histories. It is time that makes of them a rigorously chronological work, even if this rigour requires an apparent disorder." On fabula and story: de Jong 2007, 2 f.

15 De Jong 2007, 3: "a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by characters."

16 De Jong 2013/1999, whose terminology I adopt in this essay, follows the taxonomy developed by Genette 1980.

17 E. g. Fränkel 1955; Lateiner 1989, as cited by de Jong 2013/1999, 273.

as a sophisticated and deliberate technique, which uses anachronies to a set purpose. Herodotus pauses his main narrative to insert digressions not because his mind strays or because he struggles with over-abundance of source material,[18] but because these digressions are needed to arm his audience/readership with the details that would allow them to follow and appreciate his storyline.[19]

Predictably, typologies of time in fabulas and stories would be different. Fabula presupposes linearity of time, from the past to the present and future. Story employs both chronologically ordered time and anachronies: analepses (flashbacks), prolepses (flash-forwards) and narratorial metalepses (author's intrusions into the narrated events). Herodotean analepses come in a variety of forms, which I discuss below. A story's anachronic structure can be fully appreciated only if mapped onto the would-be chronological (see Appendix).

In Herodotus' "Histories", the present is the narrator's time, when his text, the narrative we are studying, came into being and was fixed. It is the time, in Thucydides' terms (1.118.2), of the *pentekontaetia*, the years between 479 and 431, the period of rising tensions between Athens, Sparta and their respective allies that would eventually bring them to a clash in the Peloponnesian war. Herodotus' view of the political developments of the *pentekontaetia* inevitably finds its way into his narrative (on this, more below). The past has many depths in Herodotus, reflected in various levels of the narrative time. Persian wars constitute the time of the main narrative, the main past, in the fabula's chronologically sequenced time from the reign of Croesus to the Persian withdrawal from Greece in 479 BC. The main past is extended back into multiple plupasts and forward into the author's present. The future appears in the form of foreshadowing,[20] predictions, warnings, and repetitive patterns of historical development that Herodotus indicates for his readers at various points in the narrative.

1.2 Herodotean Analepses as Origin-Discourses

In terms of the unfolding main story of the "Histories", chapters 82–89 are a departure from the main narrative, designed to provide, through a series of analepses, the background to the strained relations between Athens and Aigina in the run-up to the Ionian revolt. Analepses introduce a variety of plupasts, temporal flashbacks, that represent what, in my opinion, amounts to a particular Herodotean typology of origin-discourses. Within this typology, we should distinguish a variety of explanatory modes such as: *aitiai* (human causes), *aitia*, beginnings, prece-

---

18   An overview of these opinions: de Jong 2013/1999, 267–269.
19   On anachrony as effective "instruments of historical narration" (de Jong 2002, 266) in Herodotus, see e. g. de Jong 2002; Rood 2007.
20   On foreshadowing devices: de Jong 2013/1999, 282–291.

dents, and cycles.[21] In this section, I introduce the three explanatory modes that are particularly prominent in the 'Aiginetikos logos': beginnings, *aitia*, and cycles.

Beginnings: In Herodotus, the use of the key term *archê* (a beginning) marks the start of a linear count of time and of a linear unfolding of events. This is a continuous segment of chronological time that stretches to the narrator's present, that is, in our case, to Herodotus' time.

The theme of beginnings is highlighted as one of the "Histories" main interests, at the very opening, in chapter 2: according to the Greeks, the abduction of Io was the first of injustices to begin the cycle of revenge between the Greeks and their Eastern neighbours (τῶν ἀδικημάτων πρῶτον τοῦτο **ἄρξαι** 1.2). According to the Persians, it was the Trojan war: τὴν **ἀρχὴν τῆς ἔχθρης** τῆς ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας (1.5). Significantly, this exact formulation, "the beginning of hatred", also brackets the opening and closing of the 'Aiginetikos logos' (5.81.2, 5.82.1, 5.89.1). The Athenian decision to send ships in aid of Ionians generates another *archê*, specifically of the Ionian revolt and of the Persian wars (5.97.3: αὗται δὲ αἱ νέες **ἀρχὴ κακῶν** ἐγένοντο Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροισι). The term *archê* punctuates and presages what is to follow and appears to carry negative connotations. It marks key turning points in the *Histories*, suggesting that the placement of Athens-Aigina conflict on the same plane as the epic conflict between Greeks and 'barbarians' calls for special consideration.

Aitia: This type of origin-discourse serves to explain something that the narrator knows to be in existence or in practice in his own time. This is the genre of *aition* in its narrow sense, a tale of origin. An *Aition* presents not something that takes a beginning in the past and then unfolds to the present following a unique and idiosyncratic path, but something that had taken place in the past and set up a pattern or model that would be repeated in the same way ever since. This type of origin-discourse is typically presented in the imperfect and is often marked by headers and summary formulae, using prepositional phrases *kata* + Acc. (e. g. κατ᾽ ἔριν τὴν Ἀθηναίων 5.88.2), *dia* + Acc. (e. g. διὰ τὴν Ἰλίου ἄλωσιν ἐοῦσαν τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἔχθρης 1.5.1); *pros* + Acc. (e. g. πρὸς ταῦτα 5.88.2). Something arises in the past and continues till today (*kai es eme*, *kai nun* 5.88.2). *Aitia* explain the shape of the present, which is the exact replica of countless earlier repetitions, and in this way they are different from the discourse of beginnings, which only marks the point, from which a sequence of events continues to unfold in a unique way, whether that beginning helps to understand the course of the unfolding or not.

Cycles: This origin-discourse is also introduced at the outset of the "Histories" (1.5) and gives the first explicit formulation of the author's philosophy of history: τὰ γὰρ τὸ πάλαι μεγάλα ἦν, τὰ πολλὰ σμικρὰ αὐτῶν γέγονε. τὰ δὲ ἐπ᾽

---

21 *Aition* understood as a tale of origin is not to be confused with the word and concept of *aitiê*, which "has a very special meaning in Herodotus: it indicates the fact that a historical event is due to human action, or has a human purpose or motive… *Aitiê* implies guilt" (Immerwahr 2013/1956, 161). A fuller discussion of the Herodotean typology of origin-discourses will appear in a forthcoming publication, currently in preparation.

ἐμεῦ ἦν μεγάλα, πρότερον ἦν σμικρά.[22] Unlike the discourses of beginnings or of *aitia*, the discourse of cycles puts emphasis on the sequence of specific progressive steps, rather than on who and under what circumstances may have invented a pattern or begun a process.[23] One such cycle is the rise of individuals or communities from subject to leadership status, followed by arrogance and over-reach, leading to a fall.[24] The discourse of cyclicity is an epistemological tool that allows Herodotus to reconstruct the past, interpret the present, and predict the future.

1.3 The Place of 'Aiginetikos Logos' in the "Histories"

The Aiginetan digression (5.82–89), focused on the ancient enmity between Athens and Aigina, occurs within a longer digression (5.55–97) on tyrannies in Athens and Corinth. It occupies, whether by design or not, a central position in the Herodotean composition (Book 5 being exactly in the middle of the total of nine books), and also in the Herodotean project more broadly, as Elizabeth Irwin convincingly shows.[25] Within the "Histories", Herodotus sets out to prevent the deeds of men from becoming *exitêla*, and especially great deeds performed in the context of Greco-Persian wars from losing their *kleos* (Hdt. 1.1). In accordance with this objective, he evaluates the position and contribution of various Greek states to the war effort, and among them, the role played by Athens and Aigina. Both are central to this exercise, in particular with reference to the pivotal battle of Salamis. In that battle, Athenians and Aiginetans would compete for *aristeia,* for the glory of being the first to attack the Persian (Hdt. 8.83–84, 8.122), and in that battle, taking place in the Saronic Gulf, the heroes who would be summoned to the battle as *symmachoi* of the Greek forces would be the Aiakids, arriving from Salamis and Aigina, and understood by Herodotus (8.64) to be the local Aiginetan heroes.[26]

According to Herodotus' presentation, it was also the impending war between Athens and Aigina (…ἐς τὸν πόλεμον, τὸν πρὸς Αἰγινήτας) that was used as an argument by Themistocles to convince his Athenian fellow citizens to spend the newly discovered silver at Laurion on the construction of a fleet (Hdt. 7.144.1); as chance would have it, the latter was built just in the nick of time to prepare Athens for the second Persian invasion.[27] The conflict with Aigina, therefore, stands at the root of the naval revolution at Athens,[28] and Aigina emerges as Athens' main

---

22 "Those cities that had been great in the old days, many of them became small, while those that were great in my time, had been small before."

23 Cf. Immerwahr 2013/1956, 164.

24 Cf. Rood 2007, 119. Harrison 2003 argues that the pattern of rise and fall is intimately linked to Herodotus' theology, his view of the role of the divine in history and human affairs.

25 Irwin 2011a, 277–278, 2011b (noteworthy is her observation on page 427: "Aegina is in fact the third most-mentioned Greek polis in the 'Histories' after Athens and Sparta.").

26 Irwin 2011a, 405–410; Polinskaya 2013, 136–140, 422–436, 479–481.

27 Forsdyke 2002, 547.

28 Irwin 2011b, 449 f., argues persuasively that Herodotus is explicit in attributing to the Aiginetans the *kleos* of being 'the salvation of the Greeks' (7.144–145), not only tangentially, by be-

rival for glory in the key naval encounter of the Persian wars, the battle of Sala-mis. Aigina continues to be a thorn in Athens' side or, as Pericles allegedly put it, "an eyesore of Piraeus," in Herodotus' time, throughout the *pentekontaetia*,[29] and Aigina happens to be the first state to be attacked by Athens at the outset of the Peloponnesian war in 431 BC, resulting in the expulsion of the local population to the Peloponnese and the takeover of the island by Athenian settlers (Thuc. 2.27). Herein lies the importance and relevance of the short Aiginetan digression for the Herodotean bigger project, yet it is noted by many that the temporal location of the events narrated in this analeptic digression is hard to pin down.[30] The digres-sion contains multiple anachronies, which have not been comprehensively studied or fully understood.

In what follows, I first look at several compositional rings (section 2) that sur-round the Aiginetan logos and integrate it into the Herodotean greater project on multiple levels. Here, the question of the 'floating gap' comes into consideration, as it concerns the *spatium mythicum* and *spatium historicum* of the Aiginetan past.[31] In section 3, I focus on chapters 82–89 of Book 5, the account of the an-cient enmity between Athens and Aigina, where the use of anachrony enables Herodotus to speak about the common Greek past, his own time, and the eternal cycles of social development that provoke inter-state rivalry and threaten the pre-servation of fair accounts of τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων (Hdt 1.1). Section 4 sums up my observations on the varieties and ordering of time in the 'Aiginetikos logos.'

2. RINGS OF COMPOSITION

The 'Aiginetikos logos' purports to present the history of relations between Athens and Aigina, the two neighbours and rivals in the Saronic Gulf, prior and up to the outbreak of the Ionian revolt. Although Athens is involved in this digres-sion and is the hook that allows it to be connected to the main narrative, it is Aigi-na that is the main protagonist. This excursus into Aiginetan history, or rather prehistory, must be read and understood within a set of preceding and following sections (55 to 97) that form several compositional rings around it, both temporal and thematic. Rings of composition have been identified as an important structur-

---

ing the cause of the Athenian decision to acquire a navy, but directly, through their naval and military contribution.

29   Plut. *Per*. 8.7; alternative attribution to Demades (Ath. 3.99d). See further Polinskaya 2009, 234, n. 7.

30   Rood 2007, 129: "a general sense of the past is produced only by the allusion to a change in clothing customs among Athenian women, but that sense of distance is in relation to the nar-rator's present." I shall argue that the sense of the past is produced by more than one type of device in this section of the "Histories".

31   Floating gap: Henige 1974; Vansina 1985, 23, 168; in application to Herodotus: Thomas 2012/2001; Cobet 1988, 229; Cobet 2002, 409–411; Bichler 2000, 35–42.

ing device in the "Histories".[32] The 'Aiginetikos logos' is enclosed within at least four nested rings of composition, with ring 1 marking the point of departure from and return to the main narrative, ring 2 delineating the *spatium mythicum*, the horizon of the Aiginetan heroic pedigree, ring 3 announcing the agency of memory, and ring 4 introducing the motif of beginnings.

2.1 Ring 1. The Coming of Aristagorês to Athens

The first ring of composition is formed by chapters 55 and 97 and is chronologically anchored in the main narrative time of the "Histories". This is the section that provides an account of the Milesian leader Aristagorês' mission to mainland Greece to obtain support for a revolt against Persia. Aristagorês' earlier mission to Sparta had proved unsuccessful. His mission to Athens is announced in chapter 55 – Aristagorês arrives in Athens that "has become free of tyrants" (ὁ Ἀρισταγόρης… ἤιε ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας γενομένας τυράννων ὧδε ἐλευθέρας). It is both a qualitative and chronological framing. Aristagorês arrives in Athens 'after' it had become free of tyrants and he arrives in a city that is 'free from tyranny'. We do not learn what happens upon his arrival for the next forty chapters (56 to 96), because there follows instead a series of imbedded digressions on tyranny and Athens-Aigina conflict, until, in chapter 97, we are brought back to the same point of chronology – Aristagorês' arrival in Athens (ἐν τούτῳ δὴ τῷ καιρῷ ὁ Μιλήσιος Ἀρισταγόρης… ἀπίκετο ἐς Ἀθήνας). In Athens, he obtains help and then returns to Miletos, where, unaware of all that we as readers have learned about tyranny in the intervening chapters, he still bids his messenger to represent him as tyrant (5.98.1 Ἀρισταγόρης ὁ Μιλήτου τύραννος; the irony is underlined by the juxtaposition of tyranny and *sôtêria*: ἔπεμψέ με Ἀρισταγόρης ὁ Μιλήτου τύραννος σωτηρίην ὑποθησόμενον ὑμῖν). The main narrative time is thus suspended for the duration of forty chapters, with extended analepses that take us into plupasts of various depth.

2.2 Ring 2. *Spatium Mythicum*: The Heroic Past of Aigina

In Chapter 80, we find the opening of the second compositional ring that is subsequently closed in Chapter 89. In these framing chapters, we find references to a war between Athenians and Boeotians and the involvement in it of the Aiginetan heroes, the Aiakids. The war represents a historical plupast in relation to the time of Aristagorês' visit to Greece. In that sense, the story of Athens-Boeotia conflict is an internal analepsis, but in another sense, it activates a switch from the *spatium*

---

32   Brock 2003, 6 f., with reference to Immerwahr 1966, 12, 54–58, and Beck 1971. Boedeker 2002, 104, points out that ring composition is a device that the "Histories" share with the Homeric epics.

historicum to the *spatium mythicum* by invoking the Age of Homeric heroes.[33] In Homer, Aiakos was the father of Peleus and grandfather of Achilles, all of them associated with Phthia, the area of south Thessaly. By the time of Herodotus, and in fact quite a bit earlier, by ca. 600 BC, the Aiakid stemma had been appropriated by Aiginetans and conjoined with the Telamonid stemma, so that Peleus and Telamon have become brothers, sons of Aiakos who is a native hero of Aigina, and Achilles and Ajax have become cousins. All these heroes come to be worshipped on Aigina, while Telamon and Ajax are also worshipped on Salamis. In sum, the Aiakid past of Aigina is a product of post-Homeric epichoric myth-making, reinforced by institutionalization in cult.[34]

The shift from the main past to the mythical plupast in Herodotus 5.80 is made via Theban attempts at interpreting a Delphic oracle, that is, the attempts to understand the meaning of οἱ ἄγχιστα, "the nearest", whereby they subordinate the significance of space (geographic proximity) to the significance of time (kinship that goes back to the mythical past). When Thebans solicit help from Aigina in obedience to the Delphic oracle, they do so on the basis of their mythical kinship with Aiginetans, as the two peoples stemming from sisters Theba and Aigina, daughters of Asopos. In the Theban interpretation, Aiginetans are the children of Aigina, and hence, their cousins (Ἀσωποῦ λέγονται γενέσθαι θυγατέρες Θήβη τε καὶ Αἴγινα·). By contrast, the Aiginetan response is based on the substitution of maternal lineage with paternal: Aiginetans are the children of Aiakos, who was the son of Aigina by Zeus (οἳ δέ σφι αἰτέουσι ἐπικουρίην τοὺς Αἰακίδας συμπέμπειν ἔφασαν), and the help (ἐπικουρία) they send is in the form of the images of their local heroes.[35] Herodotus then tells us that the *symmachia* with the Aiakids had done nothing to help the Thebans, so that they returned the Aiakids (heroes represented by images) and asked for Aiginetan men instead (5.81.1 αὖτις οἱ Θηβαῖοι πέμψαντες τοὺς μὲν Αἰακίδας σφι ἀπεδίδοσαν, τῶν δὲ ἀνδρῶν ἐδέοντο).

Herodotus' anecdote revolves around the clash of semantic equivalencies promoted by the two parties. The Thebans simply view contemporary Aiginetans as kinsmen, sharing common maternal ancestry. The Aiginetans prefer to emphasize their difference, their special status as descendants of the greatest Homeric heroes, the part of the genealogy that they do not share with the Thebans. They promote a two-step equation: first, of themselves with Homeric heroes, the Aiakids, and second, of epic heroes with their images housed on Aigina. In the Herodotean presentation of this episode, the Aiginetan interpretation of the Delphic oracle fails, and the Thebans revert to their own version. The way Herodotus handles this story gives us an insight into his view of the relationship between the Greek Heroic past and his contemporary world. It had been argued that Herodotus either did not perceive or in any case closed a 'floating gap' between the Heroic time, or *spatium*

---

33   There is a debate among scholars about the relative importance of the concepts of *spatium mythicum* and *spatium historicum*: e. g. Cobet 2002, 405–412; Boedeker 2002, 110; Harrison 2003, 239.

34   On the history of the Aiginetan appropriation of Aiakids: Polinskaya 2013, 422–436.

35   On the Aiakid genealogy, see ib., 347–350.

mythicum, and his own time.[36] We should, however, note the difference between Herodotus and his stated sources here:[37] in the Theban interpretation, there is no gap between the mythical past and their present; that is, together with the Aiginetans, they are direct descendants of Theba and Aigina. Their mythical past, however, is that vague 'time of origins,' which is not clearly connected to the Homeric past.[38] In the Aiginetan response to the Thebans, however, we perceive a different alleged continuity, specifically between the Homeric Aiakids and contemporary Aiginetans, and it is this continuity that Herodotus makes us question: he tells of the failure of the Aiginetan equation between Aiginetan men and the Aiakids (heroes/images). This suggests that Herodotus, whatever his view of historicity of the Homeric past, is keenly aware of the use and manipulation of that past by contemporary Greek communities.

Thus, in the internal logic of the anecdote, that is, in the narrated time of the Theban and Aiginetan discourse, there is indeed no gap, but in the Herodotean presentation we are given to see that the collapsing of distance and the erasure of a gap between the Homeric/Heroic past and the narrated past, when Thebes calls on Aigina for help against Athens, is the work of the Aiginetans. In other words, there is no floating gap in the epichoric traditions, but there is one in Herodotus. He himself opens it up for the discerning listeners/readers to see. The entry of Aigina into the history of Herodotus thus begins with a subtle and ironic reference, questioning the Aiginetan claim to the Heroic past.

2.3 Ring 3: The Agency of Memory

The compositional ring, introduced in Chapter 81 and closed in Chapter 89, is formed by invocations of Memory, and these in turn introduce a different type of the past. Memory (ἀναμνησθέντες 5.81.2) is named as the explicit agent in ring 3 that works as a membrane connecting ring 4 (Beginnings) with ring 1 (Aristagorês' visit to Athens). The ring opens in 81.2 with Αἰγινῆται… καὶ ἔχθρης παλαιῆς **ἀναμνησθέντες** ἐχούσης ἐς Ἀθηναίους ("Aiginetans… having recalled their ancient enmity against the Athenians"), and closes in 89.1 with προθύμως τῶν περὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα γενομένων **ἀναμιμνησκόμενοι** οἱ Αἰγινῆται ("Aiginetans, readily recalling the events surrounding the images…").

---

36 Cobet 2002, 411, defines the 'floating gap' as "the distance separating the time of Homer's narrative from his [Herodotus'] own and his audience's lifetime" and argues that Herodotus filled it, however "meagerly." On 'floating gap' as a concept in cultural anthropology: Henige 1974; Vansina 1985.

37 Thomas 2012/2001, 198, 202, rightly distinguishes between the issue of a 'floating gap' in Herodotus' narrative per se and in his source material, the stories he would have been using, which would have presented multiple 'floating gaps'; in addition, she argues that "Herodotus himself was aware, not of the floating gap itself, but that the results of manifestations of it needed explanation…"

38 Cf. ib., 202: "Typically of traditions of origin, they seem to exist on a separate chronological scale from the rest of Greek legends and history, separate even from the Trojan war."

Memory signals a different relationship to the past than that represented by *Spatium Mythicum*. In that case (in ring 2), it is not memory, but reasoning that helps Thebans to understand the oracle about their "nearest" (οἱ ἄγχιστα). Their kinship with the Aiginetans is not something that Thebans **remember**, but what they come **to figure out or understand** (μαθών… δοκέω συνιέναι). The verbs are μανθάνω and συνίημι, to learn and understand. Memory suggests a much closer, more immediate relationship with the substance of the narrated past. As a type of signposting, in Brock's terminology,[39] the invocation of memory highlights the importance of the enclosed narrative to the main narrative past. Memory produces a zooming-in effect that brings the Aiginetan plupast up-close, and it diverts our attention from the extreme vagueness of time references that follow. Despite this vagueness, our now focused attention would continue to follow closely, and in large format, the minutiae of the Aiginetan conflicts, first with Epidauros, then with Athens.

2.4 Ring 4: The Beginning of Athens-Aigina conflict

The ring of beginnings ("the beginning of a long-standing enmity between Athens and Aigina") opens in section 82.1 (ἡ δὲ ἔχθρη ἡ προοφειλομένη ἐς Ἀθηναίους ἐκ τῶν Αἰγινητέων ἐγένετο ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοιῆσδε) and closes in section 89.1 (τῆς δὲ ἔχθρης τῆς πρὸς Αἰγινήτας ἐξ Ἀθηναίων γενομένης ἀρχὴ κατὰ τὰ εἴρηται ἐγένετο).[40] The word used consistently to identify the subject of the story is "hatred, enmity" (5.81.2, 82.1, 89.1). This fourth compositional ring introduces a different slice of the past than rings 2 and 3.

The theme/motif of beginnings links the 'Aiginetikos logos' to the main subject of Herodotus: just as the war between Greece and Persia has a "beginning" (*archê*) in the Ionian revolt, bringing Athens into conflict with Persia, the Athenian eventual ability to repel Persians on sea and build its own Athenian "empire" (*archê)* has a "beginning" (*archê*) in the Athenian conflict with Aigina. The deliberate and artful use of compositional rings in Herodotus is indicated not only by repetitions of nearly identical formulae as opening and closing brackets of each ring, but also by such phrases as κατὰ τὰ εἴρηται (5.89.1), which cast the spotlight upon the epideictic narrator as the hand behind the narrative design.[41]

---

39 Brock 2003, 6–9.
40 82.1 "the long-standing hatred of Aiginetans towards the Athenians came about from the following beginning (archê)"; 89.1 "the beginning (archê) of the hatred of Athenians towards the Aiginetans occurred according to what has been told."
41 De Jong 2013/1999, 265–267, on Herodotus as epideictic narrator "between *epos* and *logos*."

3. THE MOUNTING OF TIME IN HERODOTUS 5.82–89

3.1 Aitiological and Cyclical Time in the 'Aiginetikos logos'

This section offers a detailed analysis of time references in chapters 82–84 of He-
rodotus' Book 5. The heading of 82.1, announcing the subject as *archê*, might
pass unnoticed if it were not for the nearly verbatim repetition forming the closing
bracket of this compositional ring in 89.1. The double mention of *archê* signals
that the term bears more than casual significance in this section of the "Histories".
Brock, discussing signposts in the Herodotean narrative, notes that Herodotus "is
not simply concerned with firsts, or stages in a single linear process" but that often
signposts "highlight major, thematic changes in the grand narrative."[42] The signi-
ficance of the repeated *archê* here should be seen in the way it echoes the other
places in the "Histories" where *archê* marks the beginning of troubles, namely in
1.5 where it refers to the start of Greco-Persian enmity, and in 5.97.3 where it
marks the start of the Athenian involvement in the Ionian revolt. Moreover, in 1.5,
it is also the whole phrase, the "beginning of enmity" – τὴν **ἀρχὴν τῆς ἔχθρης**
that is used, just as in 5.82 and 5.89. The enmity between Athens and Aigina
stands out as a sort of mise-en-abîme of the enmity between Persia and Greece.[43]
Archê appears as a symbolically charged term: the lexicon to Herodotus shows
that when *archê* is used in the sense of "beginning" (66 times altogether) and sub-
stantively (only seven times out of 66, while the rest are adverbial usages), four
times it signals the start of troubles, twice seems to be used neutrally, and once is
used again contentiously,[44] where Athenians and Aiginetans (again!) are disputing
whose ship was the first to charge at the battle of Salamis (8.84.2) and therefore
who deserves the honour of *aristeia*.

   Chapter 82 tells of a *symphora*, a misfortune that befalls the land of Epidau-
ros: Ἐπιδαυρίοισι ἡ γῆ καρπὸν οὐδένα ἀνεδίδου. The imperfect tense prevails and
expresses the simple indefinite past. One temporal reference, κατὰ χρόνον ἐκεῖνον
(5.82.2), emphasizes the disconnectedness of this past from other past events.
What is "that time" we are not given to find out, apart from a sense that it is dis-
tant. This imprecision or vagueness of temporal reference marks the misfortune of
Epidaurian land's infertility and the setting up of the statues (τὰ ἀγάλματα) of Da-
mia and Auxesia to cure it as timeless: the occurrence is a topos, its time is 'any
time whenever such misfortune occurs.' The following chapter makes it clear that
the purpose of chapter 81 is nothing more than to serve as a prequel to chapter 82:
the images of the goddesses first need to appear at Epidauros before they can be
stolen from there. The past in this chapter constitutes a timeless paradigm:[45] when

---

42   Brock 2003, 7.
43   On *mise en abîme*: de Jong 2013/1999, 283. Immerwahr 2013/1956, 166, 184, strangely
     enough transposes (without a comment) the label of *echthrê palaie* attached by Herodotus
     specifically to Athens-Aigina conflict to the *echthrê* between Greece and Asia (Hdt. 1.5).
44   Powell 1938, s. v. ἀρχή. There is also a single substantive use is in the sense "end of a rope."
45   Cf. Rood 2007, 130.

there is a misfortune, one should consult the Delphic oracle, follow its instruc-
tions, and all would be well (οἱ Ἐπιδαύριοι… ἀγάλματα ἐκ τῶν ἐλαιέων τουτέων
ποιησάμενοι ἱδρύσαντο· καὶ ἥ τε γῆ σφι ἔφερε καρπὸν). This timeless chapter is
therefore unconnected to the *spatium mythicum* of the preceding chapters 80–81:
from the heroic time genealogically linked to the present we are taken to a timeless
world where the Delphic oracle always knows best. There is, however, a small
kink in the timeless equilibrium of this chapter: the reasoning of the Epidaurians
that explains their choice of Athens as the source of olive wood for the images of
Damia and Auxesia (ἱρωτάτας δὴ κείνας **νομίζοντες** εἶναι) is suddenly undermin-
ed by a narratorial metalepsis, which provides an alternative explanation linked to
the narrator's present: **λέγεται δὲ** καὶ ὡς ἐλαῖαι ἦσαν ἄλλοθι γῆς οὐδαμοῦ **κατὰ
χρόνον ἐκεῖνον** ἢ ἐν Ἀθήνησι. What the citation in the present tense points out is
that the story recited in 82.1–2 is an aition, which is current in the day of Herodo-
tus, and which he may have heard in two versions, with a different explanation in
each. Alternative explanatory connectors of this kind ("because those olive trees
were the holiest" or "because there were no olive trees in any other land at that
time but in Athens"), each a topos in its own right, would be quite common for the
circulation of folk stories.

   After the Epidaurians had obtained their object (the cessation of land's infer-
tility through the agency of cult images of Damia and Auxesia), the story should
have continued with something like this: "and then one day, the Aiginetans came
and stole these images and took them to Aigina." Instead, the next chapter (5.83)
begins with an internal analepsis, taking us to the time that apparently precedes
the Epidaurian *symphora* and the introduction of the cult of Damia and Auxesia to
Epidauros: "at that time and **before then**" (τοῦτον δ᾽ ἔτι τὸν χρόνον **καὶ πρὸ τοῦ**
5.83.1). Tantalizingly, this reference pretends as if the previous chapter was some-
how helpful in anchoring us in the flow of time, but since the past of chapter 82 is
aitiological and hence timeless, the historical reality of chapter 83 is equally free-
floating (τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦδε 5.83.1). Although equally temporally unanchored, this
chapter introduces a different type of time, which is paradigmatic in its own way –
it is the cyclical time of the rise and fall of cities. At an indistinct point in the past
(τοῦτον δ᾽ ἔτι τὸν χρόνον καὶ πρὸ τοῦ 5.83.1), Aigina finds itself subject to Epi-
dauros (Αἰγινῆται Ἐπιδαυρίων ἤκουον), then begins building ships (τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ
τοῦδε νέας τε πηξάμενοι), becomes arrogant (ἀγνωμοσύνη χρησάμενοι), revolts
from Epidauros (ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἐπιδαυρίων) and becomes the aggressor (ἄτε
δὲ ἐόντες διάφοροι ἐδηλέοντο αὐτούς), stealing the images of Damia and Auxesia
because, as rulers of the sea, they can (ὥστε θαλασσοκράτορες ἐόντες). We see a
cycle of social development in its phase of growth – from subject to aggressor –
the rising turn of the Aiginetan wheel of fortune. If we, as modern readers of
Herodotus, are attentive to what the narrator tells us, we might have a premonition
that a downward turn of the wheel of fortune would follow eventually, but Hero-
dotus' contemporaries would have indeed known it for a fact, as the reality of their
own present or the recent past: by 457 Aigina was subject to Athens and forced to
pay tribute; by 431 Aiginetans would be expelled from Aigina and replaced with
Athenian settlers. That Herodotean contemporaries were meant to project the cyc-

lical time into their present is clear from a stark zooming-in effect of cultic arrangements for Damia and Auxesia on Aigina: we are dropped from an outer-space vista point of history to a precise spot in the Aiginetan landscape where Aiginetans set up the images of the two goddesses – at the place called Oie, in the hinterland of the island, 16 stades from their coastal city. And we are made to linger there to receive an account of cultic regulations, whose importance to the narrative development at this particular point is, to say the least, marginal. Adding further to the prolepsis into the present time, Herodotus provides a footnote on the Epidaurian cult that is apparently the reality of his own time: **εἰσὶ δέ** σφι καὶ ἄρρητοι ἱρουργίαι ("but there **are** for them (that is, Epidaurians have) also secret rites"). So, in the space of one chapter, Herodotus activates the cyclical time, then returns us to the time of beginnings (when Aiginetans steal the images), and finally, bypassing the main narrative past (Persian wars), propels us forward to the narrator's present.

In chapter 84, time references continue to be relative. The genitive absolute (κλεφθέντων δὲ τῶνδε τῶν ἀγαλμάτων 84.1) establishes only the relative sequencing of events, not a specific temporal location, that is, what follows happens "after these images had been stolen." The past is narrated in the imperfect throughout the rest of the chapter, its duration emphasised by a progressive temporal expression: ὅσον μὲν γὰρ χρόνον… ἐπεὶ δὲ.[46] It is related in a single voice, that of the narrator, presenting the shared plupast of the Athenians, Epidaurians, and Aiginetans. This chapter resumes the time flow of chapter 82, which was interrupted by the analepses and prolepses of chapter 83. Only the last sentence of this chapter, the Aiginetan answer to the Athenian demand for the return of the images of Damia and Auxesia (οἱ δὲ Αἰγινῆται ἔφασαν σφίσι τε καὶ Ἀθηναίοισι εἶναι οὐδὲν πρῆγμα 84.2) gives a hint that the time is probably both past and present (present implicit, see below): while the indirect speech is introduced by a verb in the past tense (ἔφασαν), the answer itself is suggestive of Herodotus' time: Aiginetans would have nothing to do with the Athenians,[47] more specifically, with their alliance (*archê*) and tribute (*phoros*).

---

46   Cf. Basset 2009 on the imperfect tense as a marker of narrative cohesion. On "[p]rogressive use of temporal expression" as a type of anticipatory constructions cf. Brock 2003, 5.

47   I cannot agree with Haubold's 2007, 236, reading: "By denying that they [Aeginetans] have any business with the Athenians they themselves effectively deny the rationale behind the making of the statues and hence their original religious function… The Aeginetans might say that men, not gods, are what counts now." This reading overlooks the religious rationale behind the stealing of the Epidaurian statues and the Aiginetan efforts to placate the deities and institute a proper cult for them on Aigina. It is precisely the struggle for divine support that is at stake here, and the Aiginetans take divine support as seriously as all other parties in the conflict: see Polinskaya 2013, 419–422, 466–473.

3.2 Present Explicit (5.85–88): Athenian, Aiginetan, Argive

The interweaving of time frames continues, as we switch back into the present in chapter 85, where Herodotus introduces additional narrators, his contemporaries (we set aside for the moment whether they are real or fictional), who will in turn present their versions of an allegedly common past. Here we nominally confront the akoê, the oral history of the region, or in narratological terms, we enter the metanarrative of the "Histories".[48]

Chapter 5.85 begins with an emphatic reference to the present (Ἀθηναῖοι μέν **νυν** λέγουσι), and the Athenian version recalls, in the accusative and infinitive constructions, their expedition to Aigina to retrieve the statues of Damia and Auxesia. In this version, the Athenians are afflicted with madness (ἀλλοφρονῆσαι) at the moment when they are dragging the statues from their bases. In this altered state of mind, they slay each other until only one survivor is left who returns to Phaleron. The Athenian story uses the folk motif of 'divine image's revenge against its violator.'

The first sentence of chapter 5.86.1 uses a summary phrase,[49] restating that the preceding story was the Athenian version (Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν **οὕτω** γενέσθαι λέγουσι), and introduces the dissenting Aiginetan version (**Αἰγινῆται δὲ…**), which rejects the Athenian claim that they had come in one trireme only, claiming that there was a whole fleet of them instead (**πολλῇσι νηυσὶ** ἐπιπλέειν σφίσι ἐπὶ τὴν χώρην). Herodotus presents each epichoric version as if the disputants were in the same room and each were responding to the other, but the narratorial metalepsis (οὐκ ἔχουσι δὲ τοῦτο διασημῆναι ἀτρεκέως, οὔτε εἰ ἥσσονες συγγινωσκόμενοι εἶναι τῇ ναυμαχίῃ κατὰ τοῦτο εἶξαν, οὔτε εἰ βουλόμενοι ποιῆσαι οἷόν τι καὶ ἐποίησαν 5.86.2) shows Herodotus as an investigator (*histor*) at work, hearing alternative stories, possibly each in their own context, comparing them and drawing his own conclusions.[50] Section 5.86.3 resumes the Aiginetan story, but it is immediately interrupted by another narratorial metalepsis, distancing Herodotus from the narrated subject matter (**ἐμοὶ μὲν** οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, **ἄλλῳ δὲ τεῷ**· ἐς γούνατα γάρ σφι αὐτὰ πεσεῖν, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τούτου χρόνον διατελέειν **οὕτω** ἔχοντα). The narrator's comment once again serves to tie the plupast with the present, this time not through an allusion to political realities, but via an aitiological link (τὸν ἀπὸ τούτου χρόνον… οὕτω): the images of Damia and Auxesia have remained in the kneeling position since (and because of) the narrated past and up to the narrator's present.

Herodotus signposts again at the start of 5.87 (λέγεται μέν νυν ὑπ᾽ Ἀργείων τε καὶ Αἰγινητέων τάδε) and then continues his comparison and analysis of epichoric versions: ὁμολογέεται δὲ καὶ ὑπ᾽ Ἀθηναίων… πλὴν Ἀργεῖοι μὲν λέγουσι…

---

48   See Luraghi 2012b/2001.
49   Brock 2003, 7, defines 'summary phrases' as a form of 'signposting' in Herodotus, which is a facet of narrative management.
50   I am sure that Luraghi 2013/2005], 97, is right that "Herodotus' work must have consisted, by no means exclusively, yet to a significant extent, in connecting and/or reworking pre-existing narratives: in marshalling stories."

Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ… The resumption of the Athenian version is announced by the pro-
spective formula – τρόπῳ τοιῷδε – and the story relates (in the accusative and in-
finitive) the demise of the Athenian survivor of the expedition to Aigina at the
hands of Athenian women.[51] In this story, we recognise the Herodotean topos of
'sole survivor meets a bad end.'[52] The account closes with another signpost: καὶ
τοῦτον μὲν οὕτω διαφθαρῆναι (5.87.3) and merges with an aition of the Ionian
dress in Athens. And again, as before in the account of the Aiginetan dependence
on Epidauros (τοῦτον δ᾽ ἔτι τὸν χρόνον καὶ πρὸ τοῦ 5.83.1), we are presented with
an indeterminate two-storey plupast: the time of the Athens-Aigina conflict that
changed the Athenian dress fashion and the time before then (πρὸ τοῦ 5.87.3, τὸ
παλαιὸν 5.88.1). The effect of the aition, which, by definition, brings the past into
the present by explaining a current practice, is amplified by the narratorial meta-
lepsis, as Herodotus launches an ethnographic aside on the relationship of various
dress fashions (Ionian, Dorian, Carian, Corinthian). The use of νῦν and the present
tense of καλέομεν continue to build the impression of the immediate relevance of
the past to the present, erasing the distance between them, but Herodotus' empha-
sis on his remarks as truth (ἀληθέι λόγῳ 5.88.1), in apparent contrast to the claims
made in epichoric versions, works to undermine the reliability of the latter.

The Aiginetan digression is brought to a close in 5.88.2 with a final aition that
explains (καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα… ἐκ τόσου) votive and broader cultic regulations for
Damia and Auxesia,[53] as well as the continued use of long dress pins on Aigina –
"now, in my own time, as before" (νυν… ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἢ πρὸ τοῦ). The next sen-
tence (5.89.1) seals the fourth compositional ring (the ring of beginnings), which
was opened in 82.1.

Throughout chapters 85–88, the use of verbs in the present tense, as well as of
relevant temporal adverbs and prepositional phrases positions the reader in the
Present Explicit, where we hear divergent epichoric voices, narrator's comments,
as well as the details of topography, cultic reality, and material culture of Herodo-
tus' own time. What the epichoric voices, representing corporate actors (Athenians,
Aiginetans, Argives), deliver is a metanarrative of converging and diverging tales
interlaced with narratorial metalepses. The effect is that of an extremely chopped
up account,[54] constantly interrupted in its flow. At the same time, this metanarra-
tive sewn from heterogenous pieces carries a dual functional load. Firstly, it bridges
the narrated plupasts and the narrator's present aitiologically, offering a number of
explanatory links (all rhetorically valid, if historically doubtful, not least in the
eyes of Herodotus). Secondly, it partially fills in the 'floating gap' between the
spatium mythicum and the main narrative time of the *Histories*: the time of the
'beginning of the ancient enmity,' embroiling Athens and Aigina, falls somewhere

51 On prospective sentences as anticipatory construction helping the forward flow of the narra-
    tive: Brock 2003, 4.
52 This might be a folk motif that Herodotus retained from his sources. Other similar cases: Hdt.
    1.82, 7.232.
53 Cf. Irwin 2011a, 389.
54 Luraghi's term 'disarticulation' (2013/2005, 99, 101, 103) aptly grasps this effect.

between the time of the Aiakids, that is, the Age of Heroes, and the *spatium historicum*, the run-up to the Persian wars.[55]

3.3 Present Implicit: Allusions to Athenian *archê*

In addition to the present explicit, a number of details in the 'Aiginetikos logos' can be identified as implicit allusions to the political reality of Herodotus' time. Here we come up against the issue of Herodotus' attitude towards his time and his message to contemporaries. In particular, scholars argue bitterly about his attitude to Athens and Pericles. Opinions are divided: Herodotus is seen by some as an unconditional admirer of Athens; by others, as a critic of the Athenian empire; yet others argue that Herodotus reserves the right to admire and critique selectively, so that he praises Athens of the Persian wars, but not of the Athenian *archê*.[56]

In what follows, I discuss the elements of the 'Aiginetikos logos' that firmly anchor it in the 5th-century present. Alluding to the practices of the Athenian *archê*, among others,[57] they work as a warning and foreshadow the future. This has been suggested by others before me: sometimes Herodotus is explicit in doing so and uses external prolepses,[58] but at other times, he is more subtle, subversive and ambiguous. Unlike in other parts of the "Histories", there are no explicit prolepses in the section under consideration, however, allusions to the present of Herodotus are unmistakable. These allusions constitute what might be called the present implicit. The allusions to foreign policies of the Athenian *archê* include: the payment of tribute by allies, the sending of ritual contributions to Athenian cults and festivals, the requirement for allies to stand trial/settle disputes using the Athenian legal system.[59]

In 5.82.3, within the aition of the Epidaurian cult of Damia and Auxesia, the Athenians require from the Epidaurians an annual payment to Athena Polias and

---

55 Cf. Cobet 2002, 411: "Therefore the twofold division of mythical and historical time does not really apply to Herodotus. Instead, I recognize three distinctive periods beyond the *spatium 'adêlon*,' the time nobody can know of: 1) the complex stories about beginnings, the age of the Greek poets' gods and heroes, traditionally the mythical period; 2) the meagerly filled in 'floating' gap or 'Dark Age;' 3) the spatium historical in the proper sense, to be divided into the horizon of the oriental kings and the 'recent past' of the three generations."

56 See e. g. Moles 2002; Fowler 2003, both influenced by Strasburger 2013/1955 and Stadter 2013/1992.

57 Fowler 2003 discusses other contemporary debates and concerns that find reflection in the "Histories"; but he also notes that the present affects the construction of the past (312): "the point about oral history is that the present helps to create the record of the past in the first place."

58 E. g. 7.137 (ἡ Θαλθυβίου μῆνις… **χρόνῳ δὲ μετέπειτα πολλῷ** ἐπηγέρθη κατὰ τὸν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων πόλεμον, ὡς λέγουσι Λακεδαιμόνιοι) and in 8.3.2 (οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι… ὡς γὰρ δὴ ὠσάμενοι τὸν Πέρσην περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ἤδη τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐποιεῦντο, πρόφασιν τὴν Παυσανίεω ὕβριν προισχόμενοι ἀπείλοντο τὴν ἡγεμονίην τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους. **ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὕστερον ἐγένετο**), as noted by Rood 2007, 127.

59 Cf. Fowler 2003, 307.

Erechtheus for the supply of olive wood: **ἀπάξουσι** ἔτεος ἑκάστου τῇ Ἀθηναίη τε τῇ Πολιάδι **ἱρὰ** καὶ τῷ Ἐρεχθεῖ. The language in which this arrangement is coached is typical of that used for the payment of tribute (*phoros*) in the Athenian alliance,[60] e. g. in Aristophanes *Wasps,* 707 (εἰσίν γε πόλεις χίλιαι ἃι νῦν **τὸν φόρον** ἡμῖν **ἀπάγουσι**). In addition, in Thucydides 5.53 (Book 5 describes years 422–415 BC), we find a strikingly similar situation involving the same players (Athens, Epidauros, Aigina, and Argos) if in a slightly different disposition: Epidaurians default on a payment of a religious duty to Argos, and Argives interfere to secure it out of self-interest and loyalty to Athenians.[61] Both an obligation to pay another state a religious duty and the aggression aimed to exact the missing payment echo the allegedly ancient dispute between Athens and Epidauros described in Herodotus. The date of the Argos-Epidauros episode is perhaps too late to support a claim of it being an exact source for Herodotus' modeling of the Aiginetan prehistory, yet it attests a 5th-century cultic arrangement that could have aligned in Herodotus' mind with another well-known Athenian practice.

As we know from the epigraphic evidence, at some point in the second half of the 5th century, Athens instituted a policy requiring her allies to contribute annual gifts to several Athenian cults and festivals. The so-called 'first-fruits decree,' *IG,* I3 78a (435 BC?), lines 14–18, instructs Athenian allies to send first-fruits to the Eleusinian cult: "and *the allies shall contribute the first-fruits* in the same way (ἀπάρχεσθαι δὲ καὶ τὸς χσυμμάχος κατὰ ταὐτά), and the cities shall choose collectors in whatever way it seems to them that the crops will be best collected; and when they have been collected *they shall send them to Athens* (ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἐγλεχθεῖ, ἀποπεμφσάντον Ἀθέναζε·); and those who bring them shall hand them over to the sacred officials at Eleusis…"[62]

The Thoudippos' decree, *IG,* I3 71 (425/4 BC), one of several that stipulated the reassessment of tribute of the Delian league, reads in lines 56–58: "*those cities for which tribute was assessed* under the Council for which Pleistias was first secretary, in the archonship of Stratokles (425/4), *shall all bring a cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaia* (βο[̄ν καὶ πανhοπ]λ[ίαν **ἀπάγεν** ἐς Παναθ]έναια τὰ με[γάλα]), and they shall take part in the procession…"[63] Similarly, the so-called

---

60 Cf. Stadter 2013/1992, 345–347.

61 "In the same summer there broke out a war between the Epidaurians and the Argives. The occasion of the war was as follows: The Epidaurians were bound to send a victim as a tribute for the meadows to the temple of Apollo Pythaeus (προφάσει μὲν περὶ θύματος τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθαέως, **ὃ δέον ἀπαγεῖν** οὐκ ἀπέμπον ὑπὲρ βοταμίων Ἐπιδαύριοι) over which the Argives had chief authority, and they had not done so. But this charge was a mere pretext; for in any case Alcibiades and the Argives had determined, if possible, to attach Epidaurus to their league, that they might keep the Corinthians quiet, and enable the Athenians to bring forces to Argos direct from Aigina instead of sailing round the promontory of Scyllaeum. So the Argives prepared to invade Epidauria, as if they wished on their own account to exact payment of the sacrifice" (trans. B. Jowett).

62 Transl. by S. Lambert, R. Osborne, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IEleus/28a (updated 18 Mar 2018).

63 Transl. by S. Lambert, P. J. Rhodes, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGI3/71 (updated 2 Jul 2018).

"Kleinias' decree," *IG,* I³ 34 (425/4 BC), ll. 41–43, stipulates: "and if anyone [of the allies] does wrong with regard to *the bringing of the cow and panoply* (περὶ τὲν **ἀπα|γογὲ |ν** τε͂ς βοὸς ε͂ [τε͂ς πανhοπλία]ς), the accusations against him and the punishment shall be handled in the same manner."[64] In both inscriptions, the tribute is described with the cognates of the verb *apagô* used in Herodotus 5.82.3. Overall, the presumably ancient cultic arrangement between Athens and Epidauros, and especially its enforcement by means of invasion, parellel rather closely the conditions of the Athenian *archê*.

Chapter 83.1 describes an ancient state of dependency of Aigina upon Epidauros, but the form this dependency takes is peculiar: Αἰγινῆται Ἐπιδαυρίων ἤκουον τά τε ἄλλα καὶ δίκας διαβαίνοντες ἐς Ἐπίδαυρον ἐδίδοσάν τε καὶ ἐλάμβανον παρ᾽ ἀλλήλων οἱ Αἰγινῆτα. Aiginetans are required to cross over to Epidauros to use the Epidaurian legal system for the settling of their suits. This provision, unattested by any other source that mentions Aigina's relationship to Epidauros, is again paralleled in the Athenian relations with their allies. E. g., *IG,* I³ 10 (450?), sets up regulations for the Phaselitai*,* and in lines 6–11, reads: "Whatever cause of action arises at Athens against any of the Phaselites**,** the trials are to be held at Athens before the polemarch, as for the Chians, and nowhere else."[65] These relations are not to be understood as a benefit imparted upon the allies,[66] but as an imposition and curtailment of their autonomy.[67] As Greenwood and Irwin poignantly observe: "Herodotus depicts an Epidaurus (implausibly) anticipating Athenian archê in exerting the same legal controls over a dependent Aegina, moreover portrays this relationship as one from which the dependency successfully revolts."[68] The point of course is not to catch Herodotus at failing to convince us of the plausibility of such an archaic arrangement between Epidauros and Aigina, but to demonstrate again that their alleged relationship as master and subject is con-

---

64 Transl. by S. Lambert, P. J. Rhodes, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/OR/154 (updated 30 Apr 2018).

65 Transl. by S. Lambert, P. J. Rhodes, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGI3/10.

66 Haubold's view (2007, 233) of the comparable relationship between Epidauros and Aigina, in which Epidauros is allegedly the agent of justice, imparting benefit upon Aigina ("the Aeginetans abandon a system that so far guaranteed a fair dispensation of justice"), cannot be sustained.

67 The use of the verb ἤκουον ("they gave ear, obeyed") is evocative of the term ὑπήκοοι, οἱ, used in reference to Athenian tribute-paying allies, e. g. Thuc. 7.57.3–4.

68 Irwin/Greenwood 2007, 27, n. 68: "One may note the unprecedented nature of this aspect of Athens' relationship to her allies from [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.*, 1.16 and from the Athenian defence of this practice in Thuc. 1.71. On (lack of) autonomy as particularly vexing to Aegina of the late 430s see Thuc. 1.67.2." Cf. Thuc. 1.71: καὶ ἐλλασσούμενοι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ξυμβολαίας πρὸς τοὺς ξυμμάχους δίκαις καὶ παρ᾽ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐν τοῖς ὁμοίοις νόμοις ποιήσαντες τὰς κρίσεις φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν. Cf. Irwin 2011a, 381 ("Once upon a time Aegina was subordinate to her mother city Epidauros, in a subject relationship defined in terms characteristic of Athenian *archê*"), however, the description of Epidauros as Aigina's mother city is misleading here, as it is not in Herodotus, and moreover, not attested in textual sources before the Hellenistic period: see Polinskaya 2013, 395–400.

structed entirely from the material of the 5th century.[69] It is a mirror image project-
ed into the past. Yet Herodotean mirrors are rarely flat, rather they are distorting
mirrors, exaggerating or diminishing some features of the original to make a
point, or complicate an analogy.

Finally, chapter 88 details the measures taken by Aiginetans, after the repul-
sion of the Athenian attack, to obliterate all traces of Athenian interference in their
local cult: they prohibit the use of Attic pottery for ritual use and of anything Attic
as offerings. Such a regulation in cult is highly unusual, and yet most historians
have been moved to take the Herodotean information at face value, even looking
for archaeological confirmation on Aigina.[70] Such material confirmation has been
impossible to obtain, if only because the site of the sanctuary is still unknown, so
archaeological data of that sort are unavailable, and the only piece of epigraphic
data (an inventory of the sanctuary, *IG,* IV² 787) does not list ceramic objects, nor
the provenance of metal and wooden objects in the inventory.[71]

I am rather inclined to view even this report of cultic regulations as a reaction
to the policies of the Athenian *archê*, although the date of Herodotean composi-
tion makes this a little less secure than the other observations. I have in mind the
so-called Standards Decree, *IG,* I³ 1453 (ca. 430–405 BC), enforcing the use of
Athenian coins, weights and measures.[72] Whatever the exact date of the inscrip-
tions,[73] discussions of such measures may have been around for a while before
they were formalized in a decree. An imposition of Athenian standards upon the
allies, among whom Aigina found itself since 457 BC, could provoke an extreme
Aiginetan response of rejecting anything Athenian from the local cultic context,
and the latter could find reflection either in the Herodotean construction of the
story or in the Aiginetan aition that may have been its source.[74]

There are two ways to understand the presence of analogies to the fifth-centu-
ry Athenian policies in Herodotus. One is politically neutral: everything indicates
that Herodotus had no other sources at his disposal except the competing contem-
porary epichoric stories, and he may have simply reflected their respective agen-
das. In these stories, some elements function as 'facts,' the given, and other

---

69 Cf. e. g. Luraghi 2013/2005, 109 on the story of Periander, Lycophron and the Corcyrans,
    which he sees as an attempt "to root in the distant past a hostility which may have been noth-
    ing more than a projection backwards of recent conflicts."

70 E. g. Morris 1984.

71 Polinskaya 2013, 406–411, 469–473, and Appendix 4.

72 Line 10: "and the secretary of the Council [and the People?] is to add the following to the
    oath of the Council: if anyone strikes silver coinage in the cities and does not use the coins of
    the Athenians or their weights or measures, but foreign coins and weights and measures…"
    (Transl. by S. Lambert and R. Osborne, https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/OR/
    155, updated 12 Aug 2017).

73 Used to be dated 449? BC (*ATL,* II, pp. 63–65); see discussion of the date of 414? BC in *Attic
    Inscriptions Online* (https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/OR/155, updated 12 Aug
    2017).

74 Sources can be seen as a fourth layer of narrative: "the material from which a narrator forms
    his fabula" (de Jong 2007, 3).

elements serve as 'connectors,' as I discuss elsewhere.[75] Some connectors are retained from the source material and some are forged by Herodotus in the process of disarticulating and stitching anew the epichoric tales to present his own view of history.[76] Both the epichoric stories and their treatment by Herodotus could have been influenced by the contemporary knowledge of inter-state relations,[77] as well as by the contemporary language used to describe such relations. So, the vocabulary of the Athenian empire that we encounter in chapters 5.82–87 might be generally representative of the contemporary idiom, but the subject matter (inter-state conflicts) and the specific positions occupied by individual states in these conflicts, point to a deliberate choice on the part of Herodotus to include multiple allusions to the present in the representation of the Athenian-Aiginetan plupast. This would be the second (politically partisan) way of reading these allusions. In 5.83, Herodotus introduces the cycles model, the rise and fall of cities, where Aigina is on the rise, still mighty and willful, while the four allusions, in chapters 82, 83, 84, 88 (see Table) would have worked as an ominous foreshadowing of the narrative future/narrator's present, reminding Herodotus' contemporary audience how far Aigina was going to fall: a subdued tribute-paying ally by 454 and a defeated state dispossessed of its home territory by 430.[78]

4. THE VARIETIES AND ORDERING OF TIME IN THE 'AIGINETIKOS LOGOS'

4.1 Varieties of Time

A wide array of compositional devices, narrative patterns and temporal expressions contributes to the complex role of time in the 'Aiginetikos logos' and its framing rings of composition. In the above, we have discussed the following time varieties relevant to the 'Aiginetikos logos':

–   Aitiological Time. Its main function is to explain the shape the world takes as a result of events described in the aition. As such, it is not dependent on historical timeline, and in that sense, is timeless.
–   *Spatium Mythicum* is the Heroic Age, shaped by the epic tradition, which provides the source of legacy and identity, often directly linked to *Spatium Historicum* in epichoric traditions.
–   Cyclical Time is self-referential. It sets up a sequential pattern that is bound to recur in the course of history: e. g. the rise and fall of cities or rulers. The use

---

75   Polinskaya 2013, 411–416.
76   Cf. Luraghi 2013/2005.
77   Cf. Stadter 2014, 356: "Herodotus' *Histories* were not accounts of a past distant and dead, but the earlier episodes in a history which was still continuing and whose contemporary events clarified and gave meaning to the past, as the past gave meaning to the present."
78   Aigina as a tribute-paying ally of Athens: *ATL,* I, 218 f., III, 38, 57, 303. See discussion in Polinskaya 2009, 249 f. and n. 82, with references to earlier bibliography.

of cyclical time triggers the effect of pattern recognition in the audience, inviting comparisons with their own experience, that is, with the present. Such use moves the past closer to the present, making it a near past.

− *Spatium Historicum* covers a range of historical pasts. In the presentation of Herodotus, the historical past often splits into multiple epichoric pasts and plupasts represented by divergent voices. The historical time of the main narrative is the time of the Greco-Persian wars.

− Narrator's present is the time of Herodotus' composition of the *Histories*. This time appears in the narrative in the form of authorial metalepses, but also in the metanarrative of the *Histories* and is found in two varieties: Present Explicit and Present Implicit.

− Present Explicit. Contemporary epichoric accounts are signified by the present tense of *legousi*. As they often disagree, their effect is to create uncertainty in our (audience's/readers') knowledge, perhaps to suggest that knowledge, and hence truth about the past, is plural: around each detail of a disputed past, a sort of double vision occurs, which blurs the outlines of past events. Alternative versions of past events not only raise doubts about the recoverability of the past and the quality of memory, but disturb the quality of the present. As the present appears unable to obtain a unity of vision, hinting that historical truth remains in the past, unable to reach us through the barrier of disputes and distortions, the present itself recedes into the distance, becomes hard to grasp; the present becomes distant.

− Present Implicit. Allusions to narrator's own time are distinct from overt, explicit prolepses and metalepses, as well as from the metanarrative level of presentation.

In the preceding discussion, I have made only a cursory mention of the Time of Origins and have not touched upon the role of the divine in human history.[79] Both subjects are relevant to the 'Aiginetikos logos' but require a much wider analysis, going far beyond the scope of this paper. Their treatment forms part of a separate study currently in preparation.

4.2 The Ordering of Time in the 'Aiginetikos Logos'

[55] Ring 1 opens: Aristagorês comes to Athens
  [77–79] *Spatium Historicum* – Main Narrative Past (war between Athens and Thebes, where Aigina joins on the side of Thebes; run-up to the Persian wars)

---

79 See section 2.2 above. On divine will, functioning as an external factor that humans should not presume to control, see Strasburger 2013/1955, 299 f., 312: "For Herodotus, most historical phenomena are indications of divine intention, demonstrations that strike him as secret and ominous, at least as long as the end of a definite chain of fate remains invisible." Harrison 2003 is a key contribution to the subject.

[80] Ring 2 opens: *Spatium Mythicum* (mythical past and heroic genealogies of Thebes and Aigina)

　[81] *Spatium Historicum* – Main Narrative Past (Thebans require men, not heroes/images)

[81] Ring 3 opens: Memory

[82] Ring 4 opens: Beginnings (*archê echthrês*)

　[82] Aitiological Time (Epidaurian cult aition), Present Explicit (metanarrative) and Present Implicit (allusion to Athenian *archê*)

　[83] Cyclical Time (subjection → thalassocracy → rebellion → arrogance → aggression) and Present Implicit (allusion to Athenian *archê*)

　[83] Present Explicit (topography and cult of the Aiginetan Damia and Auxesia)

　[84] Floating gap filled-Shared Plupast (Epidaurians, Athenians, Aiginetans) and Present Implicit (allusion to Athenian *archê*)

　[85] Present Explicit and Floating gap filled-Epichoric Plupast (Athenian version)

　[86] Present Explicit and Floating gap filled-Epichoric Plupast (Aiginetan and Argive version); Authorial metalepsis; Aitiological Time (the kneeling posture of Aiginetan cult images)

　[87] Present Explicit and Floating gap filled-Epichoric Plupast (Athenian version); Aitiological Time (Dorian → Ionian dress change in Athens)

　[88] Authorial Metalepsis (origins of dress fashions in Greece); Aitiological Time (iron pins as votives in the Aiginetan cult); Present Implicit (allusion to Athenian *archê*).

[89] Ring 4 closes: Beginnings (*archê echthrês*)

[89] Ring 3 closes: Memory (return to the Main Past – the narrative of the war between Athens and Thebes, with Aigina as ally)

[89] Ring 2 closes: *Spatium Mythicum* (return to the Heroic Past, which is now contested (Aiakos for Athens), but also hints at the thread that stretches from the beginning (*archê*) of enmity between Athens and Aigina all the way to the present (the *temenos* of Aiakos is now, in Herodotus' time, in the agora of Athens)).

[97] Ring 1 closes: Aristagorês comes to Athens

4.3 The Distant Present and the Near Past

The mounting of Time in the 'Aiginetikos logos' and its framing rings of composition is significant, but not chaotic, as de Jong also argues for Herodotus in general.[80] Herodotus employs several parallel strategies for ordering the narrative. Ring compositions are particularly effective devices punctuated with almost iden-

---

80　De Jong 2013/1999, 271: "the narrator [Herodotus] places his analepses in a very subtle and effective way […]. We now see that […] not only the ethnographical and geographical digressions, but also the historical digressions, are well placed. Here, then, is a first indication that the 'chaotic' structure of Herodotus in fact has its own logic and its own effectiveness."

tical formulations (opening and closing formulae). Tightly nested one inside the other (the ring of beginnings within the ring of memory within the ring of mythical time within the ring of Aristagorês' visit to Athens), they hold together large sections of the narrative and integrate them into the wider Herodotean project.

Inside the brackets of ring compositions, Herodotus skillfully manipulates time registers: now allowing the cacophony of arguing epichoric voices to be heard in the present, now reining in the multiplicity of pasts with a bird-eye perspective of cyclical, aitiological time, or authorial comments, then surprising his audience with a stern reminder of divine will. A paradoxical consequence of the Herodotean approach to time is that the past, in its aitiological and cyclical varieties, can emerge sharp, clear, and peculiarly near, becoming near past, while the present diffused into multiple epichoric accounts ('Athenians say… but Epidaurians say…'), subjected to authorial metalepses, and shot through with the Present Implicit allusions can split into a double/triple vision, becoming blurred, uncertain, receding into the distance, becoming distant present.

Formally, the 'Aiginetikos logos' is a digression that aims to explain the position of Athens and Aigina towards each other at the time of the Persian wars, that is, in the main narrative time of the "Histories". In effect, through the presentation of competing epichoric versions of the past and allusions to the present, Herodotus shows that the antagonism is ongoing: the *echthrê* is alive and operating, continuing to shape history. The digression presents the account of its *archê*, its beginning, but the rest of the "Histories" continue the tale of this unfolding conflict through the Persian wars and beyond. The variability and constant shifting of time perspectives in Herodotus, including his use of the present implicit, demand active audience participation: by contrasting pasts of varying nature and depth with the permanently unfolding present (in all its multiplicity of political, local, cultural, ethnic, and personal perspectives), Herodotus presents *historie* as a joint narrator-audience pursuit, as a responsibility of contemporaries to ponder the past in order to define their roles in the present.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ATL = Athenian Tribute Lists
I = Meritt, Benjamin Dean / Wade-Gery, Henry Theodore / McGregor, Malcolm Francis (1939): The Athenian Tribute Lists I, Cambridge.
III = Meritt, Benjamin Dean / Wade-Gery, Henry Theodore / McGregor, Malcolm Francis (1950): The Athenian Tribute Lists III, Princeton.
Asheri, David / Lloyd, Alan / Corcella, Aldo (2007): A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV, ed. by O. Murray, A. Moreno, with a contribution by M. Brosius, translated by B. Graziosi, M. Rossetti, C. Dus, V. Cazzato, Oxford.
Basset, Louis (2009): The Use of the Imperfect to Express Completed States of Affairs: The Imperfect as a Marker of Narrative Cohesion. In Bakker, Stéphanie J. / Wakker, Gerry C. (Eds.): Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek, Leiden, 205–220.
Beck, Ingrid (1971): Die Ringkomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik, (= Spudasmata 25). Hildesheim.

Bichler, Reinhold (2000): Herodots Welt. Aufbau der 'Historie' am Bild der fremden Länder und Völker, ihrer Zivilisation und ihrer Geschichte, Berlin.

Boedeker, Deborah (2002): Epic Heritage and Epic Patterns in Herodotus. In: Bakker, Egbert J./de Jong, Irene J. F./van Wees, Hans (Eds.): Brill's Companion to Herodotus, Leiden, 98–116.

Bragawanath, Emily (2012): The Mythic Plupast in Herodotus. In: Grethlein, Jonas/Krebs, Christopher (Eds.): Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: The 'Plupast' from Herodotus to Appian, Cambridge, 35–56.

Brock, Roger (2003): Authorial Voice and Narrative Management in Herodotus. In: Derow, Peter/Parker, Robert (Eds.): Herodotus and His World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest, Oxford, 3–16.

Buck, Robert J. (1981): Epidaurians, Aeginetans and Athenians. In: Shrimpton, Gordon Spencer/McCargar, David Joseph (Eds.): Classical Contributions. Studies in Honour of Malcolm Francis McGregor, New York, 5–13.

Carbonell, Charles-Olivier (1985): L'Espace et le temps dans l'oeuvre d'Hérodote. Storia della Storiografia 7, 138–149.

Cobet, Justus (1988): Herodot und mündliche Überlieferung. In: von Ungern-Sternberg, Jürgen/Reinau, Hansjörg (Eds.): Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung. Colloquium Rauricum I, Stuttgart, 226–233.

Cobet, Justus (2002): The Organisation of Time in the Histories. In: Bakker, Egbert J./de Jong, Irene J. F./van Wees, Hans (Eds.): Brill's Companion to Herodotus, Leiden, 387–412.

Dunbabin, Thomas James (1936–7): Ἐχθρὴ παλαίη. ABSA 37, 83–91.

Figueira, Thomas J. (1993): Excursions in Epichoric History, Lanham, Maryland.

Fornara, Charles (2013/1971): Herodotus' Perspective. In: Munson, Rosaria Vignolo: Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Herodotus: Volume 1. Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past, Oxford, 321–333.

Forsdyke, Sara (2002): Greek History, c. 525–480 BC. In: Bakker, Egbert J./de Jong, Irene J. F./van Wees, Hans (Eds.): Brill's Companion to Herodotus, Leiden, 521–549.

Fowler, Robert (2003): Herodotus and Athens. In: Derow, Peter/Parker, Robert (Eds.): Herodotus and his World: Essays from a conference in Memory of George Forrest, Oxford, 305–318.

Fränkel, Hermann (1955): Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens, Munich.

Genette, Gérard (1980): Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method. Translated by J. E. Lewin, Ithaca/London.

Grethlein, Jonas/Krebs, Christopher (2012): Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography. The "Plupast" from Herodotus to Appian, Cambridge.

Harrison, Thomas (2003): 'Prophecy in Reverse'? Herodotus and the Origins of History. In: Derow, Peter/Parker, Robert (Eds.): Herodotus and his World: Essays from a conference in Memory of George Forrest, Oxford, 237–255.

Haubold, Johannes (2007): Athens and Aegina (5.82–9). In: In Irwin, Elizabeth/Greenwood, Emily (Eds.): Reading Herodotus. A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus, Cambridge, 226–244.

Henderson, John (2007): The Fourth Dorian Invasion and the Ionian Revolt. In Irwin, Elizabeth/Greenwood, Emily (Eds.): Reading Herodotus. A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus, Cambridge, 289–310.

Henige, David P. (1974): The Chronology of Oral Tradition. Quest for a Chimera, Oxford.

Immerwahr, Henry Rudolph (1966): Form and Thought in Herodotus, Cleveland, Ohio.

Immerwahr, Henry Rudolph (2013/1956): Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus. In: Munson, Rosaria Vignolo: Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Herodotus: Volume 1. Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past, Oxford, 157–193.

Irwin, Elizabeth (2011a): Herodotus on Aeginetan Identity. In: Fearn, David (Ed.): Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC, Oxford, 373–425.

Irwin, Elizabeth (2011b): 'Lest the things done by men become exitela': Writing up Aegina in a Late Fifth-Century Context. In: Fearn, David (Ed.): Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC, Oxford, 426–457.

Irwin, Elizabeth/Greenwood, Emily (2007): Reading Herodotus: A Study of the Logoi of Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories, Cambridge.

Jeffery, Lilian Hamilton (1976): Archaic Greece. The City-States c. 700–500 B. C., New York.

de Jong, Irene J. F. (2001): The Anachronical Structure of Herodotus' Histories. In: Harrison, Stephen John (Ed.): Texts, Ideas and the Classics, Oxford, 93–116.

de Jong, Irene J. F. (2002): Narrative Unity and Units. In: Bakker, Egbert J./de Jong, Irene J. F./ van Wees, Hans (Eds.): Brill's Companion to Herodotus, Leiden, 245–266.

de Jong, Irene J. F. (2007): Introduction. Narratological Theory on Time. In: de Jong, Irene J. F./ Nünlist, René (Eds.): Time in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative. Vol. 2, Leiden/Boston, 1–16.

de Jong, Irene J. F. (2013): Narratological Aspects of the Histories of Herodotus. In: Munson, Rosaria Vignolo: Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Herodotus: Volume 1. Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past, Oxford, 253–294 [= de Jong, Irene J. F. (1999). Aspects narratologiques des 'Histoires' d'Hérodote. Lalies, 19, 219–277].

de Jong, Irene J. F. (2014): Diachronic Narratology (the example of Ancient Greek narrative). In: Hühn, Peter/Meister, Jan Christoph/Pier, John/Schmid, Wolf (Eds.): Handbook of narratology 1, Berlin/Boston, 115–122.

Lateiner, Donald (1989): The Historical Method of Herodotus (= Phoenix Supplement 23), Toronto.

Luraghi, Nino (2012a/2001): The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus, Oxford.

Luraghi, Nino (2012b/2001): Local Knowledge in Herodotus' Histories. In: Luraghi, Nino: The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus, Oxford, 138–160.

Luraghi, N. (2013/2005): The Stories Before the Histories: Folktale and Traditional Narrative in Herodotus. In: Munson, Rosaria Vignolo: Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Herodotus: Volume 1. Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past, Oxford, 87–112.

Moles, John (2002): Herodotus and Athens. In: Bakker, Egbert J./de Jong, Irene J. F./van Wees, Hans (Eds.): Brill's Companion to Herodotus, Leiden, 33–52.

Morris, Sarah P. (1984): The Black and White Style: Athens and Aigina in the Orientalizing Period, New Haven/London.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo (1993): Herodotus' Use of Prospective Sentences and the Story of Rhampsinitus and the Thief in the Histories. American Journal of Philology 114, 27–44.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo (2001): Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo (2013): Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Herodotus: Volume 1. Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past, Oxford.

Nagy, Gregory (1987): Herodotus the "Logios". Arethusa 20, 175–184.

Osborne, Robin (2002): Archaic Greek History. In: Bakker, Egbert J./de Jong, Irene J. F./van Wees, Hans (Eds.): Brill's Companion to Herodotus, Leiden, 497–520.

Polinskaya, Irene (2009): Fifth-Century Horoi on Aigina: A Reevaluation. Hesperia 78, 231–267.

Polinskaya, Irene (2013): A Local History of Greek Polytheism. Gods, People, and the Land of Aigina, 800–400 BCE, Leiden/Boston.

Polinskaya, Irene (forthcoming): Aitia and Aigina: Rewriting Origins from Hesiod to Herodotus. In: Klooster, Jacqueline/Wessels, Antje B. (Eds.): Functions of Aetiology, Leiden.

Powell, John Enoch (1938): A Lexicon to Herodotus, Cambridge.

Rhodes, Peter John (2003): Herodotean Chronology Revisited. In: Derow, Peter/Parker, Robert (Eds.): Herodotus and his World: Essays from a conference in Memory of George Forrest, Oxford, 58–72.

Rood, Tim (2007): Herodotus. In: de Jong, Irene J. F./Nünlist, René (Eds.): Time in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative. Vol. 2, Leiden/Boston, 115–130.

Stadter, Philip A. (2014/1992): Herodotus and the Athenian archê. In: Munson, Rosaria Vignolo: Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Herodotus: Volume 1. Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past, Oxford, 334–356 [reprinted from ASNP 22 (1992) 781–809].

Strasburger, Hermann (1956): Herodots Zeitrechnung. Historia 5, 129–161.

Strasburger, Hermann (2013/1955): Herodotus and Periclean Athens, transl. by J. Kardan and J. Foster. In: Munson, Rosaria Vignolo: Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Herodotus: Volume 1. Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past, Oxford, 295–320 [Originally published in German in Historia 4 (1955):1–25].

Thomas, Rosalind (2012/2001): Herodotus' Histories and the Floating Gap. In: Luraghi, Nino: The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus, Oxford, 198–210.

Vansina, Jan (1985): Oral Tradition as History, London.