
INTRODUCTION

1 THE SPIRIT OF MARATHON

‘The Battle of Marathon, even as an event in English history, is more important than the Battle of Hastings. If the issue of that day had been different (if the Greeks had not won), the Britons and Saxons might still be wandering in the woods.’ (J. S. Mill, *Edinburgh Review*, October 1846, 343)

‘Truth-loving Persians do not dwell upon
The trivial skirmish fought near Marathon.
... a mere reconnaissance in force
By three brigades of foot and one of horse ...’
(Robert Graves, *The Persian Version*, 1945)

‘We laugh at small children when they try to put on the boots and wear the garlands of their fathers; but when the leaders in the cities crazily stir up the masses by telling them to mimic the deeds and spirits and achievements of their forefathers, totally unsuited as those are to present crises and circumstances, their actions are laughable, but their sufferings are no laughing matter – unless they are simply treated with contempt... As for Marathon, Eurymedon, and Plataia, and those examples that just make the crowds swell with pride and haughtiness: just leave them in the rhetoricians’ school-rooms.’ (Plutarch, *Advice on Public Life* 17 814a–c)

‘He [Steven Runciman] never entirely retracted his mischievous but genuinely inquisitive view that Europe might have ended up a more historically interesting, culturally various continent had the Persians won the Battle of Marathon.’ (Dinshaw 2016: 565)

Mill and Runciman exaggerate: Marathon, fought on the east coast of Attica in 490 BC, was not even the decisive battle of the Persian Wars, still less of British or European history. Yet Graves’ mischievous poem is wrong too. Marathon was more than a ‘trivial skirmish’. True, if Persia had won Athens would have survived, and the returning tyrant Hippias would still have had a city to rule. The fate of Eretria (101.3n.) shows what would have happened. Temples and sacred places would have been burned, as they were to be in 480 (8.50, 53); some citizens, especially perhaps the best-looking boys and girls (cf. 32), would have been deported to Persia to make good Dareios’ threat and instructions (94.2), but by no means all – the ships would only take so many; most important of all, this would count as ‘enslavement’ (94.2) to the Persian king, with the blow to human

self-respect that this meant. Some other cities would doubtless have been cowed by this example to give ‘earth and water’ (48.1–2n.), but again by no means all; Sparta, for one, would scarcely give in so easily, and it is unlikely that even a victorious Persian force would be in a position to fight a second engagement and defeat the Spartan army, newly arrived after the battle (120). The project of conquering all Greece (94.1) – if this was indeed Dareios’ intention – would remain unfinished, and it was already late in the season (109–17n.). The Persians would need to return in any case, win or lose. But that return would have been different from the great invasion that eventually came ten years later. It would probably have come sooner; and it would not have had a (by then enlarged) Athenian fleet to contend with, important as that would prove to be at Salamis. So it is true that Marathon could only be a beginning, whatever the outcome. But it was a beginning that mattered.

Its memory came to matter even more, as its fighters became legendary and inspirational. Commemoration started early. The dead were buried at the site of the battle itself, an honour that was not unparalleled¹ but was still unusual enough to be singled out by Thucydides for special mention (2.34.5): the Athenians were buried in the *sōros* (funeral mound) that is still such a prominent feature of the site, the Plataians in a separate tomb (117n.). A dedication on the Athenian acropolis in the name of the polemarch Kallimachos (ML no. 18 = Fornara 49) was then probably erected very soon after the battle (114n.). A stone memorial to the dead of the Erechtheid tribe, listing 22 names (there may originally have been more), was also probably erected within a few years. It was found far away in the Peloponnese (below, p. 6), but was probably one of ten such monuments, one for each tribe, originally standing at the *sōros* itself. It has a verse inscription proclaiming that ‘talk (φῆμις) of their valour reaches the ends of the bright earth, relating how they died, fighting against the Medes and bringing a crown of glory to Athens, few against many’ (SEG 56.430).² Shortly after 480–479, so it seems, a further memorial was put up in the Athenian *agora* (IG 1³ 503/4). The best reconstruction³ suggests that it commemorated a sequence of three glorious Athenian battles, Marathon, Salamis, and a third that is uncertain (perhaps Mykale, though we might expect Plataia given the Athenians’ role there, 9.27–8,

¹ CT1: 294.

² The inscription is much discussed: see Petrovic 2013: 53–61, with bibliography. The reading of the first line of the verse is not certain, but its general sense seems clear.

³ See Bowie 2010 and esp. Petrovic 2013, whom we largely follow here; both give references to earlier treatments, among which Matthaiou 2003 is particularly important. Arrington 2015: 43–8 prefers to think that the inscription limits itself to the dead of 490, but includes casualties from the Aigina campaign (cf. 88–93 with n.) as well as from Marathon.

56.2, 60–61, 67, 70.2, 73). A slab lay across the top of the base saying ‘the glory of these men’s valour shines forth’ (λάμπει κλέος), as ‘on foot and . . .’ (presumably) by sea they ‘saved all Greece from seeing the day of slavery’; underneath were three separate verse inscriptions side by side, of which the first seems to refer to Marathon and the ‘mighty adamantine heart’ of those who stood their ground ‘before the gates’ (which may be metaphorical, those of Athens, without implying close proximity) and repulsed the Persians in the vicinity of a ‘shore’. Among the few words that survive of the Salamis verse are ‘on foot’ and ‘island’; the third verse begins ‘before the enclosure’ and mentions the ‘calf-nourishing fertile land’. It looks as if the various verses echoed one another, pointing out similarities in the encounters (shore, gates) and stressing the motif ‘by land and by sea’.

Soon other monuments sprang up, including an Ionic column at Marathon itself (Paus. 1.32.5 with **109–17n.**). There seems to be no Greek precedent for erecting such a memorial on the field of battle;⁴ like the on-site burial (p. 2), that confirms that the 490 victory was felt as very special. Delphi too, predictably, saw memorials and dedications (Paus. 10.10.1–2, 10.11.5), especially a group by Pheidias again placing Miltiades in a heroic setting, this time with Theseus and seven of the eponymous heroes. Other works too were later said, rightly or wrongly, to have been remembered as built from the spoils of Marathon, not least Pheidias’ massive image of Athena on Cape Sounion (Paus. 1.28.2, 9.4.1; cf. **117.1n.**) and a statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous, pointedly carved – so it was said – from the Parian marble that the Persians themselves had brought to commemorate the anticipated victory (Paus. 1.33.2–3).⁵ This was a battle that posterity was meant to remember.

The *agora* monument is already seeing Marathon as the first of the sequence of great Persian War battles, but commemorations looked backwards as well as forwards. Some of the language of those memorials is Homeric, as epigrams for the war dead so often are: that ‘glory’ or ‘talk’ that shines forth and fills the earth (cf. *Od.* 9.19–20, 264); that ‘calf-nourishing fertile land’, οὔθαρ δ’ ἀπείρου πορτιτρόφου (cf. *Il.* 9.141, 283, *HAp.* 21). A few years later the Stoa Poikile, also in the *agora*, depicted scenes of Marathon, featuring the fighting by the ships and highlighting Miltiades and Kynegiros (**109–17n.**), together with some supernatural moments involving Theseus, Herakles, Echetlos, and Epizelos (**116, 117.2–3 nn.**). It seems likely that a scene on a surviving sarcophagus at

⁴ Proietti 2015.

⁵ On these artworks see esp. Miller 1997: 30–2 and Arafat 2013, with references to earlier literature: on the Nemesis statue, now attributed to Agorakritos, see *LIMC* I. 351–5 and II. 679–80. The association with the battle of both the Athena and, especially, the Nemesis is in fact very dubious. On the Stoa Poikile see also Arrington 2015: 201–3.



Figure 1. The Brescia sarcophagus ©Archivio fotografico Musei di Brescia-Fotostudio Rapuzzi.

Brescia derives from the Stoa (figure 1);⁶ if so, we can see a striking adornment on the sterns of the ships, and a looming Persian with an axe about to descend on, presumably, Kynegiros (114n.).

Most significant of all is the setting, for the other paintings on the Stoa included two from the heroic world, the fighting against the Amazons and an assembly of the Greek commanders following the fall of Troy; the fourth concerned a battle at ‘Oinoe’ which is hard to pin down. This is the world in which Marathon already belongs, with modern-day fighters who match up to the heroes of legend. The poem of Simonides on Plataia, depicting the Spartans marching out to battle in terms that echo the Homeric Achilles, is doing something similar for that battle eleven years later.⁷

The Stoa probably dates from the 460s:⁸ it would be no surprise if there was much talk of Marathon at the time, when Miltiades’ son Kimon was so prominent in Athenian politics. Some have wished to develop this to a full-scale ideological ‘battle of the battles’, with Marathon being pushed by the more opulent class, those whose fathers would have fought there as hoplite foot-soldiers, against the claims of Salamis, the victory of the less wealthy citizens who rowed the boats.⁹ However that may be, it need

⁶ So Vanderpool 1966: 105, accepted by Harrison 1972: 359 and 365–6 and many since.

⁷ Fr. 11 W²: ‘Simonides proposes to do for the Persian War what Homer did for the Trojan War’, Parsons 2001: 57.

⁸ That date seems confirmed by the latest excavations: Camp 2015: 476–94, e.g. 479, 480, 492–3 (‘second quarter of the 5th century BC’).

⁹ As Plato pointedly elevates Marathon and Plataia above the sea-battles of Salamis and Artemision, *Laws* 4.707b: so Podlecki 1966: 8–26, followed by Loraux 1986: 161 and others listed by Rhodes 2013: 19 n. 95. For doubts, Pelling 1997b: 9–12.

not be the reason for preferring Marathon as a theme for the Stoa: a land-battle was needed to underline the heroic parallels, and anyway sea-battles are harder to depict with individualised detail. But Marathon certainly remained a particularly evocative name in popular memory. It is not the men of Salamis but the ‘Marathon-fighters’, the *Μαραθωνομάχαι*, who figure in Aristophanes to summon up the sturdy fighters of old (*Ach.* 181, 697–8, *Knights* 781, *Clouds* 986) or the traditions which the young need to emulate (*Knights* 1334, *Wasps* 711, *Holkades* fr. 429 K–A).¹⁰

That note is struck even more emphatically in oratory, and again Marathon takes its place in a sequence of Athenian glories that begins in legend: the repulse of invading Skythians and Amazons, the championing of the Herakleidai – and Marathon, putting Dareios’ men to flight in a further victory over the *hybris* of the over-proud (Isok. *Panathenaios* 192–8). There is no holding back: Lysias lists, once again, Amazons, Herakleidai, and this time the aftermath of the Seven against Thebes. And then . . .

the Persians thought that, if they could only win this city over as a willing ally or defeat it if it resisted, they would easily rule over the rest of Greece: so they landed at Marathon . . . Their knowledge of the city’s history had led them to think that if they attacked any other city first, then they would be fighting against both that city and Athens, because the Athenians would enthusiastically hurry to help; but if they attacked here first, no other Greeks would dare to risk open enmity with the invader through going to the help of others. That was their thinking. But our ancestors gave no reckoning to the dangers of warfare but took the view that glorious death left an undying reputation for their virtue: they were not afraid of the enemies’ numbers, but put the trust more in their own valour . . . (*Lysias, Epitaphios* 22–3)

And more, a lot more. A much-admired and much-quoted passage of Demosthenes’ *On the Crown* culminates in his oath ‘by those of our ancestors who led the way in facing danger at Marathon, by those who took their stance in the line at Plataia, by those who fought at sea at Salamis and at Artemision . . .’ (18.208). The Athenians were a beacon of freedom to others; they were the liberators of Greece (Andok. *On the Mysteries* 107, Lyk. *Against Leokrates* 104). What is more, they did this by fighting at Marathon ‘alone of the Greeks’, so they often said,¹¹ ruthlessly effacing the contribution of plucky Plataia. They are doing this already within Herodotus’ text,

¹⁰ On Marathon in Aristophanes see esp. Carey 2013.

¹¹ Often but not always: for good rhetorical reasons Apollodoros plays up rather than down the Plataian contribution in *Against Neaira* ([Dem.] 59.94–103 with Pelling 2000a: 61–7). On Marathon in oratory see Volonaki 2013 and Efstathiou 2013, with references to earlier literature: on the ‘alone we fought’ motif, see Walters 1981.

as they make their claim for a place of honour in the battle-line at Plataia in 479 (μοῦνοι Ἑλλήνων, 9.27.5, after again the Herakleidai, the Seven, and this time the Trojan War; cf. **108**, **111.2** nn.). Thucydides' Athenian envoys repeat the 'alone' theme when they speak at Sparta in 432 (1.73.4).

So Marathon is well on the way to becoming a slogan rather than a memory, a word to deploy whenever a glorious past is called up for inspiration in a disappointing present. No wonder the fourth-century historian Theopompos put Marathon as a prime example of 'Athens playing the braggart and fooling the Greeks' (*FGrHist* 115 F 153). No wonder, either, that centuries later Plutarch could warn against its abuse, in the third of our epigraphs: under the Roman masters in the early second century AD – 'the men of power above', as he disconcertingly calls them just afterwards in the same work (*Advice on Public Life* 18 814c) – one had to watch one's lip and pick one's inspirations carefully. There are indeed some enthusiastic treatments of Marathon a generation or so after Plutarch in the works of Aelius Aristides – Marathon, 'the greatest of deeds, with Salamis the second greatest' (*Against Plato on rhetoric*, p. 85 J.) It would have been about the same time that Herodes Atticus, a Marathon-dweller himself, moved the memorial of the Erechtheis tribe from Marathon to his estate in the Peloponnese (**109–17n.**).¹² Roman Greece often revelled in its past glories, and none, still, was more glorious than this.

So it has ever remained:¹³ Marathon is still the name to warm the blood, and that doubtless was why Mill chose it rather than Salamis to make his point. And it was at Marathon,¹⁴ 'musing there an hour alone', that Byron's troubadour

'dream'd that Greece might still be free:
For standing on the Persians' grave
I could not deem myself a slave.'

(*Don Juan* Canto 3 [1819])¹⁵

¹² For second-century AD celebration of Marathon see Bowie 2013.

¹³ Though not always to the same degree: Rood 2007 suggests that it was in the nineteenth century that Marathon overtook Thermopylai in a further 'battle of the battles'.

¹⁴ Not that Byron elevates Marathon over other battles: this same passage of *Don Juan* goes on to dwell on Salamis and Thermopylai, and Thermopylai in particular is prominent in his other writings. Still, his Marathon has proved especially resonant: 'Bad Lord Byron went to the firing, helmet and dogs and all | He rode and he swam and he swam and he rode but now he rode for a fall; | Twang the lyre and rattle the lexicon, Marathon, Harrow and all, | Lame George Gordon broke the cordon, nobody broke his fall . . .' (Louis MacNeice, *The Cock O'the North* (1953), lines 1–4). (We are grateful to Karen Caines for advice here.)

¹⁵ Byron in fact knew full well that the *sōros* was the burial mound for the Athenians rather than the Persians: Rood 2007: 287. There may be other ironies too: Byron is not speaking in his own voice there but in that of a 'time-serving bard'

Herodotus will have seen the Stoa Poikile and at least some of the inscriptions; he may have heard some of the speeches; his ear will doubtless have been bent by many proud Athenians, and probably a few more sceptical non-Athenians too. His audiences, not just in the 420s when his text had reached or was reaching its final version¹⁶ but for decades before, would have heard a lot of such talk as well, and doubtless many of his readings led to animated discussions afterwards. Sometimes he produces his own version of some of those themes of the inscriptional epigrams: there are several points, for instance, where Marathon prefigures themes in the other great battles that are to come, stressing the motifs that they share (109–17, 109.3, 112.2, 132 nn.). But his response is measured and critical. Some of the divine epiphanies figure, but he picks and chooses, leaving some aside that he must have known about (117.2–3n.). He goes out of his way to stress the contribution of the Plataians, who are allowed a considerable amount of narrative space (108, 111.2, 113.1 nn.); when those Athenian speakers in Book 9 trot out the ‘alone of the Greeks’ line, an attentive reader or hearer will recognise the cliché and remember from Book 6 that it is a lie, or at least stretches the truth (111.2n.). Nor is there any ‘beacon of freedom’ rhetoric on the example given to the rest of Greece, though it is certainly acknowledged that enslavement is what is at stake (109.3, cf. 11.2). Instead a realistic tinge is given to the debate, making it clear that an important reason for bringing on the battle was the fear of *stasis* and treachery at Athens, and treachery there indeed goes on to be (109.5, 115, 124.2 nn.). Most important, he keeps a sense of proportion. The battle narrative itself is very brief, much briefer than those of Thermopylai, Artemision, Salamis, and Plataia (109–17n.). The text as a whole leaves no doubt that it is those battles, not this, that would decide the fate of Greece. The elaborately fashioned new start given in Book 7 underlines the point, with the extensive court debate that launches Xerxes on his expedition. Bks. 7–9 will form a powerful unity, but that greater story has not started yet. The two big battles of Book 6, Lade and Marathon, can indeed be viewed as alternative preliminaries for what is to come: Marathon presages the Greek success, Lade shows how easily it could all have gone the other way and how freedom rhetoric, in that case that of Dionysios of Phokaia (11), can lead people astray.

(Rood 2007: 292) who knows how to tailor his theme to his audience, and this is what he ‘would, or could, or should have sung’ in Greece itself. Still, the dream of freedom is one that Byron would have endorsed.

¹⁶ The date of any such ‘final version’ is disputed: the traditional date is around 425, but that rests on an inference from Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* that is insecure (Pelling 2000a: 154–5, Henderson 2012: 146–7). 98.2 takes us down to the 420s, probably but not certainly to a date after 424 (n.); 91.1 (n.) may suggest a date a little later. Fornara 1971b has arguments for a date closer to 414. Irwin 2013 argues for a date as late as the fourth century, but we would not go that far.

Still, Herodotus' treatment is measured rather than subversive. Various narrative techniques make it clear that something very special is about to happen, not least the evocative use of the name 'Marathon' itself (103–4n.). When it comes, the courage is not downplayed: indeed, Herodotus rather overdoes the extraordinariness as the troops charge 'at the run', the first – or so he over-generously says – to stand up in battle to Median dress and refuse to be terrified (112.3n.). It is an important part of his programme to ensure 'that things originating from humans should not be wiped out by time' (ἐξίτηλα, erased as words on an inscription might be erased) and that great and wonderful achievements should not 'lose their glory', become ἀκλεῖα (Proem); his whole narrative can indeed be seen as a sort of prose equivalent of those memorial verses and monuments. The counterparts go further: he has his own Homeric touches, and they too, like the language of the epigrams, elevate the fighters' achievement to heroic stature (113.2n., cf. 11.1n.: below, p. 28). He does not withhold that highest form of praise for some who died, 'he became a good man', another phrase frequent in memorial inscriptions (14.3, 114.1, 117.2 nn.); here too the Greeks are outnumbered (8.2–9.1, 109.1, 117.1), even if not by the 'countless myriads' of later exaggeration (109–17n.). The gods always need to be mentioned with appropriate caution, but he gives space to the possibility, probably the likelihood, that these events were momentous enough to excite divine interest and support (105.2n.). That plays a part in his tracking of morale through this and the remaining books: for the moment all that is hoped is that the gods may allow them a fair fight (11.3, 109.5), but by the end of Book 8 the Athenians will have seen enough to be confident that the gods must be on their side (8.143.2, cf. 11.3n.). So for Herodotus too Marathon is only a beginning, an *hors d'oeuvre* with a very substantial main course to come; but for Herodotus too it is a beginning that matters.

It is a beginning of something else as well. Miltiades' choice of rhetoric is telling when he urges Kallimachos to take his own view and press on to fight (109). Yes, there is that realistic touch of the danger of *stasis*; and the realism has a positive touch, for the choice affords Kallimachos the chance 'to free your city and leave for yourself a memorial for all human eternity such as not even Harmodios and Aristogeiton won'. The optimism extends to the city too: 'if the city wins through, it can become the first city of all Greece'. That points to a broader future, one that includes all that would happen down to Herodotus' own time. It points to the way that Marathon would indeed be the first step along Athens' path to empire, aided by the disgrace of the Spartan Pausanias and the Spartan withdrawal from hegemony in carrying the fight to Persia after 479 (8.3.2). Other touches in Book 6 too carry the audience to much later events, including the birth of Perikles – a 'lion', with all the suggestions of that figuring for good or for

ill (131.2n.). The other foreshadowings are typically inexplicit, but rather mentions of individuals or gestures towards more recent events that would be in any reader's or hearer's mind – Archidamos the Spartan king, Aigina and its enmity with Athens, Plataia and its Athenian alliance, Delion, the powerful Alkmeonids, Athenian pressure on the islands, Miltiades' son Kimon (71.1, 73.2, 91.2, 108, 118.2, 126–31, 132–40, 136.3 nn.). What those readers or hearers would make of it all is a further question. Some, especially Athenians, might thrill with pride: others would find the thought of Athenian domination less to their taste. And all might wonder what the implications of the story might be for Athens herself: would that empire too be riding for a Xerxes-like fall? Or would this new, democratic, Greek empire be different?

Whatever the rights and wrongs of that new empire, Herodotus does not paint that future history in rosy colours. All that has happened through three successive Persian reigns has been 'bad' for Greece, κακά, worse than in the twenty generations that preceded. The Greeks themselves were partly to blame, for some of those κακά came from Persia but some from the leading states fighting for 'rule', ἀρχή (98.2). There is nothing mealy-mouthed about that.

2 ARCHITECTURE

The Greek war has been looming from the start of the *Histories*, with the promise of 'many and wonderful achievements, some of Greeks and some of barbarians' culminating in 'other things and the αἴτιη why they came to war with one another' (proem). Book 1 had duly kept a close eye on Greece, first with Solon's Greek wisdom at Kroisos' Lydian court (1.29–33), then with the background painted for Greece's two most powerful cities, Athens and Sparta. To give that Spartan background meant going back a long way, all the way to Lykourgos and the bones of Orestes (1.65–8). Athens had pushed forward more recently, so that after a few enigmatic words on the Pelasgians (1.57–8, cf. 137.1n.) Herodotus gives most of his space to Peisistratos and his tyranny (1.59–64): that is the context for the first introduction of two names that will be often heard in Book 6 as well, Marathon itself, where Peisistratos' own landing heralded a more successful return (1.62) than that of his son Hippias (102), and the Alkmeonids (1.61.1, 64.3), with the beginning of their up-and-down relations with the tyrants' family (121.1, 124.1 nn.). By the end of Book 1 'the barbarians' have duly come to war with Greeks, and very successfully, with their conquest of so many of the Greeks of Asia Minor: these are the first and the second 'enslavements' of Ionia that are summarised at 32.

After that strong introduction Greece recedes into the background, and bks. 2–4 keep a strong eastern focus as Persia expands into Egypt, Babylonia, Skythia (not successfully), and Libya. There are still reminders that Greece will lie at the end of this expansionist trajectory, especially when Queen Atossa impresses her husband Dareios with her hankering after Greek maidservants (3.134). Book 3 indeed has quite a lot of Greek material, with the sketches of Polykrates of Samos and Periandros of Korinth (3.39–60) and a little on a Spartan campaign against Samos (3.44.1, 54–6); still, Herodotus could there have given much more material on the Greek world had he wished. Kleomenes is allowed a cameo appearance at 3.148, where he is tempted by the slippery rhetoric of the Samian Maiandrios, and even more by the silver and golden goblets that he offered: that is a suggestive antecedent for the fuller picture of Kleomenes given in bks. 5 and 6 (below, Section 3), but for the moment this too is left unelaborated.

It is bks. 5 and 6 – the book-divisions are not Herodotus' own, and these two go closely together¹⁷ – that reintroduce the Greek world, and in a big way. First in Book 5 comes some Thracian and Macedonian material, some of which (especially the introduction of Alexandros the Philhellene, 5.17–22) looks forward to later books. Then come the stirrings of the Ionian Revolt, a story that is not complete until Book 6. In the middle of Book 5 Herodotus fills in a good deal of what had been happening in Athens, jumping back some years to pick up the story of the Peisistratids from where it had been left in Book 1 (5.55–73); Book 6, as we shall see, tells a great deal about Sparta. Within the narrative Aristagores of Miletos is the first to shift the gaze across the Aegean, as he tries to interest the Persian commander Artaphrenes in a Greek adventure (5.30–1). Artaphrenes duly agrees, but this ends badly (5.32–5), and Aristagores is soon playing the opposite game, spurring on Sparta (unsuccessfully) and Athens (successfully) to support the Ionian rebels.

In an important moment several times recalled in Book 6 (9.3, 32, 101.3 nn., cf. 1.1n. and 97.2n.), Athenian and Eretrian troops penetrate to Sardis, and the fire spreads to the temple of Kybebe (5.102.1). It is this provocation that refocuses Dareios' mind and Herodotus' narrative on the west: every evening Dareios' slave reminds him, 'Sire, remember the Athenians' (5.105.2). That is partly, perhaps largely, a matter of revenge, fitting a pattern of reciprocal give-and-take that is fundamental to Herodotus' picturing of history: the Greeks have given it out, and now they must take it in return. At 5.102.1 itself Herodotus looks forward to

¹⁷ Consequently several of the themes of this section deal with topics already discussed, sometimes in fuller detail, in the introduction to Hornblower 2013: 1–15.